

BRITISH TRAGEDY 1695-1740

BRITISH PRINTED TRAGEDY 1695-1740

By

PETER BUCKROYD, B.A. (Leeds) M.A.

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies

in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

McMaster University

June 1974

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (1974)

(English)

McMASTER UNIVERSITY

Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: British Printed Tragedy 1695-1740

AUTHOR: Peter Buckroyd B.A. (Leeds) M.A. (McMaster)

SUPERVISOR: Professor Richard E. Morton

NUMBER OF PAGES: v, 355.

SCOPE AND CONTENTS: In its analysis of the whole corpus of tragedy in Britain from 1695 to 1740 this thesis divides into sections dealing with a survey of research already undertaken in the field; an analysis of the recurring patterns in the plays throughout the period; a study of the settings for tragedy and a discussion of the plays with Ancient (Greek and Roman), European, Middle Eastern and British (ancient, historical and modern) settings; a study of the adaptations made during the period; and analyses of the tragedies of Nicholas Rowe and George Lillo, the two best and most significant writers of tragedy. The attempt by George Lillo and one or two writers before and after him to invigorate the dying form of tragedy is seen to fail, and by 1740 it is clear that the best writers of tragedy are interested in verse rather than in stage entertainment. Tragedy overcomes the influence of vivid visual attractions of the opera of 1700 only to become bogged down in the undramatic verse of 1740. Writers of tragedy in 1740 try to be much simpler than writers in 1695, and tragedy of action at the turn of the century turns into tragedy of discussion and contemplation, the herald of the closet drama of the nineteenth century.

## PREFACE

The idea for this thesis grew from a study of two of the plays of Nicholas Rowe for my M.A. thesis, and from an interest in George Lillo's The London Merchant, stimulated by my attempt to act in a few scenes from it during a drama workshop at the lovely Georgian theatre in Richmond, Yorkshire, in 1968. Rowe and Lillo afford such an interesting contrast that I thought it might be profitable to read all the tragedies in between them, and so set to work.

I am most grateful to the Dean of Graduate Studies at McMaster for granting me leave to study in England in the major research libraries from June 1971 to January 1972, and from September 1972 to the completion of the thesis. I am also greatly indebted to the Canada Council for the tenure of a Doctoral Fellowship and to McMaster University for the tenure of a University Scholarship in my first doctoral year.

The staffs of several libraries have been most helpful: The University Library, Cambridge; The British Museum North Library; The Scottish National Library; The Bodleian Library, Oxford; The Victoria and Albert Museum Library; Mills Memorial Library, McMaster. I also wish to record my thanks to the Trustees of the Henry Huntington Library, San Marino, California for allowing me to see some of their rare books in June 1972, and for permission to quote from the following plays in their keeping: John Hewitt's The Fair Rivals (1729), Thomas Biddle's Augustus (1717) and Courtney Earl of Devonshire; or, The Troubles of the Princess Elizabeth [c. 1705].

My supervisor, Professor Richard Morton, was most helpful while I

was still in Canada and my sincere thanks are due to Mrs Christine Solzi of Cambridge University for typing the thesis so efficiently. The whole venture would never have been brought to a satisfactory conclusion without the help, support and understanding of my wife Julia, now at Darwin College Cambridge.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	iii
Table of Contents	v
Chapter I Introduction	1
Notes	10
Chapter II Settings	17
Notes	88
Chapter III Patterns	123
Notes	162
Chapter IV Adaptations	169
Notes	206
Chapter V The Tragedies of Nicholas Rowe	220
Notes	272
Chapter VI The Tragedies of George Lillo	286
Notes	322
Bibliography Primary	327
Secondary	342

## CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

Studies in post-Restoration drama have received a great fillip from the publication of the five parts of The London Stage 1660-1800.<sup>1</sup> These sumptuous and scholarly volumes have provided readily available information about the theatre which has been hitherto laborious to compile. The publication of separate paperback volumes of the introductions to these volumes has made far more students aware of the general picture of dramatic and theatrical activity during the period than ever before.<sup>2</sup> The recent suggestion that the material of these volumes is to be placed on computer has already spurred scholars to increased activity in the field.<sup>3</sup> The late Father Stratman's work in the bibliography of the period<sup>4</sup> has meant that basic lists of all kinds<sup>5</sup> of research material are also now available.

So far, however, there has been no comparable activity in the description of the plays listed in the bibliographies and in The London Stage, and we now tend to know far more about children or drums and trumpets in the drama than about the plays themselves.<sup>6</sup> John Genest's Some Account of the English Stage, first published in 1832 in Bath and recently reprinted<sup>7</sup> remains the only comprehensive descriptive account of all these plays. This can be supplemented by the invaluable comments of Downes in Roscius Anglicanus (1706),<sup>8</sup> but this author's comments are brief and primarily value judgemental, although in many cases (the brief assessment of Rowe's The Fair Penitent for example)<sup>9</sup> Downes's comment seems to be more pertinent than any later critic's. Allardyce Nicoll's A History of English Drama 1660-1900<sup>10</sup> gives a brief description of many of the plays of the period, but the chief importance of these volumes lies in the appendices which seem now to have been superseded in the case of tragedy

by Stratman's Bibliography of English Printed Tragedy<sup>11</sup> and by the performance lists in The London Stage. However, in many cases Nicoll is all we have to go on. Because all the drama is dealt with, no great space can be devoted to any one play, and the primary intention seems to be to show that the plays belong to one or another easily definable dramatic tradition. Thus we have chapters on "English and Foreign Models", "Heroic Dramas", "Pseudo-Classic Tragedies", "Augustan Tragedies" and "Domestic Tragedies". While not denying the interest of this type of organisation, I would like to suggest that Nicoll fails to capitalise on the significance of these labels partly because he is so selective about which plays he describes, and partly because we are never exactly sure, when faced with a play not described, whether it is "Heroic", "Pseudo-Classic" or "Augustan". One of the most striking features of the tragedy of the period is that it is so homogeneous. There are very few distinctive plays, and the same stock patterns return time and time again.

In his Introduction to Eighteenth-Century Drama 1700-1780,<sup>12</sup> F.S. Boas deals instead with the plays of those he considers to be the main dramatists. Thus we have descriptions of the plays of Rowe, Cibber, Mrs Centlivre, Addison, Ambrose Philips, Dennis, Thomson, Charles Johnson and Lillo, figures who do represent the mainstream of dramatic writing in the period. Boas tries to be sympathetic to the plays and his practice of quoting from the texts wherever possible gives a good indication of what they were actually like. Boas seems to have a preference for plays set in Greece and Rome though he also includes examples of others.<sup>13</sup>

The best and most recent study of the drama of the period is Eric Rothstein's Restoration Tragedy: Form and the Process of Change.<sup>14</sup> The author shows sympathy and appreciation of the efforts of the dramatists he

discusses but only deals with plays up to about 1705, the first decade of the period I have dealt with. The most interesting part of the book is the last, "The Genre: Tastes and Techniques" where the "Ethos" of the plays is considered along with "Conventions of Structure" and "Language". Rothstein prepares the way for the present study most effectively in that he traces the same patterns which have attracted my attention from 1660 to about 1705. His are the first critical remarks on the immense significance of the pastoral as escape, an Epicurean philosophy, and it becomes increasingly clear as the eighteenth-century wears on that this escapism is at the root of the drama.

John Loftis's invaluable book The Politics of Drama in Augustan England<sup>15</sup> traces the relationship of the theatre to political life and makes many comments about individual plays with political, apologetic and satirical bias. Several articles outline the difficulties of authors in getting their plays staged, particularly those affected by the 1737 Licensing Act.<sup>16</sup> Other comprehensive treatments of the History of the English Stage are to be found by David Erskine Baker,<sup>17</sup> Charles Dibdin,<sup>18</sup> Theophilus Cibber,<sup>19</sup> and Dr Doran.<sup>20</sup> Harbage's Annals of English Drama<sup>21</sup> and Nettleton's English Drama of the Restoration and Eighteenth Century<sup>22</sup> are still useful. A good recent study which deals not with the plays themselves but with their reception is Leo Hughes's The Drama's Patrons (1971).<sup>23</sup> In the same vein Emmett Avery has an article on the subject of the Restoration audience<sup>24</sup> and Lynch's Box, Pit and Gallery (1953)<sup>25</sup> is useful on the earlier period. The nature of the relationship of the plays and the audience produced a debate in Komos a few years ago.<sup>26</sup>

The influence of classical and neo-classical criticism, the most talked about element in the field, has not produced as many articles as one might have expected,<sup>27</sup> but there is a good study of the influence of the plays

of Racine and Corneille on the English stage by Voisine in French<sup>28</sup> and several articles dealing with adaptations and translations of French plays. Two authors have dealt with the influence of the Oriental on the drama of the period, but there is scope for a new study of this subject as the more recent of the two was by Thomas Blake Clark in 1939.<sup>29</sup> Other general criticism deals with the argument about "Poetic Justice" and the pastoral.<sup>30</sup>

Perhaps a disproportionate amount of space has been given to adaptations. Interest in Shakespeare alterations is understandable and there are at least a dozen papers.<sup>31</sup> The influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Restoration drama is the subject of books by John Harold Wilson<sup>32</sup> and Arthur Colby Sprague.<sup>33</sup> Theobald's adaptations of Webster have also produced a couple of articles<sup>34</sup> and a book.

The plays of Nicholas Rowe have attracted more attention than the works of any other tragedian, and it is interesting that a lot of work was done on Rowe in the early years of the present century in Germany.<sup>36</sup> Alfred Jackson's "Rowe's Historical Tragedies" (1930)<sup>37</sup> paved the way for a re-examination of this dramatist which has resulted in articles on Tamerlane,<sup>38</sup> The Fair Penitent,<sup>39</sup> and Jane Shore.<sup>40</sup> Other essays include a recent one on "Pathos and Personality" and an early one on Rowe's debt to Paradise Lost.<sup>41</sup>

George Lillo's The London Merchant attracted some interest before 1950,<sup>42</sup> but it is within the last few years that Lillo studies have blossomed with several reappraisals of the most famous play,<sup>43</sup> and some attention given to Fatal Curiosity,<sup>44</sup> as well as an attempt to sort out the obscure details of Lillo's life.<sup>45</sup>

Authors best known for genres other than tragedy also claim some critical attention. Addison's Cato is examined by German<sup>46</sup> as well as British

and American critics<sup>47</sup> and a recent article by Aubrey Williams has brought Congreve's Mourning Bride back to our minds<sup>48</sup> after a flurry of activity in the first half of the century.<sup>49</sup> Elmer B. Potter's "The Paradox of Congreve's Mourning Bride" (1943)<sup>50</sup> is particularly worth reading.

Women played a considerable part in the eighteenth-century theatre not only as actresses but also as authors. During the early part of this century several writers drew attention to the presence of women playwrights, the most interesting being a book by Walter and Clare Jerrold, Five Queer Women.<sup>51</sup> Mrs Centlivre's The Cruel Gift was the subject of a German dissertation in 1912,<sup>52</sup> and two writers have looked at the life and achievements of Mary de la Rivière Manley.<sup>53</sup> Eliza Haywood has also attracted interest with a book in 1915<sup>54</sup> and a more recent article in Theatre Survey.<sup>55</sup>

Of the rest, the best two articles are both, curiously, about the same play, Ambrose Philips's The Distrest Mother. Both Paul E. Parnell<sup>56</sup> and Katharine Wheatley<sup>57</sup> show what can be done to excellent effect with the whole range of the drama of the period. Their starting point is the French source, but Katharine Wheatley in particular shows great sympathy with the aims and achievements of eighteenth-century dramatists. Among other tragedians covered are Colley Cibber,<sup>58</sup> Charles Johnson,<sup>59</sup> one play by Hopkins,<sup>60</sup> Edward Young,<sup>61</sup> James Thomson,<sup>62</sup> John Hughes,<sup>63</sup> David Mallet,<sup>64</sup> Aaron Hill<sup>65</sup> and Elijah Fenton.<sup>66</sup> Other interesting papers include one on Trapp's Abra-Mule,<sup>67</sup> and two on the authorship of The Fatal Extravagance.<sup>68</sup>

It has become increasingly clear to me that the lack of detailed treatment and critical analysis of the development of the tragedies in the period is attributable to the poor quality of the plays concerned. This is, perhaps, to state the obvious, but the reasons for this poor quality are by

no means so obvious.

The present study has emerged from a reading of all the extant British printed tragedies between 1695 and 1740. In it I have been concerned to try to see a pattern of the development of the form, without excluding any play. What has clearly emerged is that with very few exceptions writers followed sets of stereotypes. First of all there are certain patterns which almost every writer of tragedy thought he should include in his play, and some of these I have described in Chapter III. Secondly are certain stereotypes which seem to be related directly to the setting of the play, and these are outlined in Chapter II. Hence a play set on the continent of Europe is more likely to have some subtlety in its treatment of politics than a play set in the Middle East, and a play set in Greece or Rome is much less likely to deal with the trials and tribulations of a heroine than one set in Britain. The most difficult question to decide upon is whether authors chose their setting because they wanted to incorporate certain ideas and themes which previous plays of that genre had examined, or whether the chosen setting determined the ideas and themes included. This chicken and egg question is perhaps not what is most important. What is quite clear is that very few writers actually have 'something to say' which has not been said in the same way by many before them; most writers of these tragedies are more interested in the mode of expression than in what is being said, and therefore their material is readily classified into one category or another. What I am saying is that the forms have already in the past largely determined what themes and treatments are acceptable, and so writers merely follow the same lines, with little desire to experiment. The changes which are made as the period progresses are, I think, those which are dictated by the taste of the times, rather than those

decided by the dramatists as spokesmen or thinkers.

With very few exceptions, then, the setting of the play determines the content of the tragedy. As the years go by dramatists become increasingly interested in the Middle East setting, and less interested in the European. This matches a steady development throughout the period towards simplification. There are fewer characters in the plays of 1740 than of 1695; there is less action on stage; there is less spectacle; there is less complexity of themes. The plays of 1740 are far more concerned to embody smooth verse and scenes of discussion than their predecessors, and this leads to an eventual breakdown in the use of conflict - the element which by and large ensures drama's continuing vitality. Hand in hand with this trend towards simplification comes even greater dependence upon set patterns (of the sort outlined in Chapter III) which heighten the themes and atmosphere of the pathetic, the sentimental (tearful) and the unrealistic. An audience of the twentieth century would dismiss any of these plays, even from early in the period, as ridiculous, hyperbolic and unrealistic, but towards 1740 the plays also become static.

Vitality seems to leave the tragedy at the same time as it enters the novel. There is, however, one major exception: the attempt by certain writers to enliven tragedy by making it more socially relevant. The high point of this movement is seen in the best of its exponents, George Lillo, whose plays I have discussed separately at the end of the thesis in a chapter of their own, VI. Several writers had set their plays in Britain to try to suggest that the actions, beliefs and conduct of the characters in the plays had some greater relevance to the audience than the actions of characters in more remotely set plays. Nevertheless, the characters were still conventional

kings, princes and political leaders. The first of a different sort of tragedy comes with The Fatal Extravagance although several elements of a revitalised form can be seen before this play. Lillo continues the precedent of choosing characters not part of a social elite, and he writes what can be seen to be a tragedy of modern man, sentimental though it is. Lillo's two main plays are significant not only because they use persons with whom the audience could much more easily identify but also because they are written in a tension-filled way. It seems to me that Lillo shows the way in which British tragedy could have developed had not the trend to simplification been so firmly entrenched. What in fact happens is that writers who do follow his lead simplify the pattern so much that it ceases to have dramatic vitality or complexity, and hence the followers of Lillo remain pale shadows of their source of inspiration. The other feature of George Lillo's tragedies which makes him worthy of note is that he himself ceased to develop the pattern he set forward, in that after Fatal Curiosity he produced an utterly conventional, simplified play of no dramatic interest and no ethical or social interest either. The neglect of the pattern which could have led to really good tragedy in Britain once again, then, is epitomised by its principal exponent.

The best writer of the earlier sort of plays was Nicholas Rowe, whose plays are discussed in Chapter V. Rowe experimented with each of the main types of setting, and his progress as a dramatist in turning towards plays set in Britain with a much more strongly sentimental flavour, mirrors that of all the best writers of tragedy from 1700 to 1720. Just as Lillo demonstrates the interests of the writers of the last ten years of the period, so Rowe shows what was being done in the first fifteen years.

My thesis groups the plays according to their settings, shows what

patterns were used time and time again, describes the adaptations of earlier plays (in Chapter IV) and analyses the achievement of the best two writers of tragedy during these forty-five years. What is now needed, I think, is an extension of this study into a wider sphere, so that we can begin to understand the decline of tragedy in the context of a decline in drama generally, and in the context of Europe as a whole, so that drama can then be placed in a wide examination of literature. As far as I know no one has attempted to do the latter. Precisely how, for example, did the novel take over the ideas which used to be treated in tragedies? What was it about the climate of the early eighteenth century which caused at one the expansion of theatres and the decline of dramatic writing? Is it simply that art declines once imitation of previously successful forms begins? It seems ironic that at a time when literary endeavour was directed to imitating the spirit and form of the ancient writers, insofar as they were seen as the highest possible form of achievement, tragedy should subside under the oppressive weight of plays merely imitative of their immediate predecessors. It would seem in tragedy at least that imitation of life gave way to the mere imitation of art.

### Notes

- 1 Southern Illinois University Press: Carbondale & Edwardsville, 1960-68.
- 2 See Restoration & 18th Century Theatre Research passim, especially 9 No. 2 (1970), 56-8.
- 3 Ibid.
- 4 Especially A Bibliography of English Printed Tragedy 1565-1900. Southern Illinois University Press, 1966 and Bibliography of Restoration & 18th Century Theatre Research 1900-68. Southern Illinois University Press, 1971.
- 5 The Bibliography of English Printed Tragedy has author, collections, chronological lists. The London Stage has a vast amount of material included in the chronological performance lists - about actors, actresses, stage history, periodical references.
- 6 See Restoration & 18th Century Research articles. For Drums and Trumpets see 9 No 2 and 10 No 1 (1970 & 1971). For children see 11 No 1 (1972) and my forty-two additions in 12 (1973).
- 7 Bath 1832. Reprinted Burt Franklin: New York, 1964.
- 8 Ed. Montague Summers. London: Fortune Press, 1928.
- 9 See Roscius Anglicanus, p. 46 where Downes says "a very good Play for three Acts; but failing in the two last, answer'd not their Expectation", a view of the play which coincides with my own.
- 10 Cambridge University Press. See I, II, 1967, 1969.
- 11 See supra, note 4.
- 12 Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953.
- 13 Like Nicoll, Boas is not, of course, concerned exclusively with tragedy. Boas pays no attention to Mrs Centilevre's two tragedies and ignores Colley Cibber's many tragic efforts. Rowe and Lillo, however, are well treated.
- 14 Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967.
- 15 Oxford University Press, 1963.

- 16 Notably Brooke's Gustavus Vasa, Thomson's Edward and Eleonora and Paterson's Arminius. See Herbert G. Wright, "Henry Brooke's 'Gustavus Vasa'" Modern Language Review 14 (1919), 173-82, 15 (1920), 304; Alan D. McKillop, "Thomson and the Licensers of the Stage" Philological Quarterly 37 (1958), 448-53; Jean B. Kern, "The Fate of Thomson's Edward and Eleonora" Modern Language Notes 52 (1937), 500-502.
- 17 Biographia Dramatica; or a Companion to the Playhouse. 2 vols. Dublin, 1782.
- 18 Charles Dibdin, A Complete History of the English Stage. 5 vols. London [1797-1800].
- 19 Theophilus Cibber, The Lives of the Poets of Great Britain and Ireland to the Time of Dean Swift. 3 vols. London, 1753.
- 20 Dr Doran, Annals of the English Stage. 3 vols. London: John C. Nimmo, 1888.
- 21 Annals of English Drama 975-1700. Revised S. Shoenbaum. London: Methuen, 1964.
- 22 New York: MacMillan, 1932. Nettleton is particularly useful with regard to the "domestic" tragedies, London Merchant and the like.
- 23 The Drama's Patrons: A Study of the Eighteenth-Century London Audience. University of Texas Press; Austin & London, 1971.
- 24 "The Restoration Audience" Philological Quarterly 45 (1966), 54-61.
- 25 J.J. Lynch, Box, Pit and Gallery. University of California University Press: Berkeley & Los Angeles, 1953.
- 26 See Harold Love, "The Myth of the Restoration Audience" Komos 1 (1967), 49-56 and the rejoinder, A.S. Bear, "Criticism and Social Change: The Case of Restoration Drama" Komos 2 (1969), 23-31. For an older paper in the same vein see Elmer Edgar Stoll, "Literature and Life Again" PMLA 47 (1932), 283-302.
- 27 See A.F.B. Clark, Boileau and the French Classical Critics in England (1660-1830) (Paris, 1925); Marvin T. Herrick, "Joseph Trapp and the Aristotelian Catharsis" Modern Language Notes 41 (1926), 158-163; Katharine E. Wheatley, Racine and English Classicism (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1956); Alexandre Macrocordato, "La Critique Anglaise et la Fonction de la Tragédie (1660-1720)" Etudes Anglaises 14 (1961), 10-24 and La Critique Classique en Angleterre de la Restauration à la mort de Joseph Addison (Paris: M. Didier, 1964).
- 28 J. Voisine, "Corneille et Racine en Angleterre au dix-huitième siècle" Revue de Littérature Comparée 22 (1948), 161-75.
- 29 Thomas Blake Clark, Oriental England: A Study of Oriental Influences in Eighteenth-Century England as Reflected in the Drama. Shanghai: Kelly and Walsh, 1939. The other study only covers the years up to

about 1707 and is Louis Wann's "The Oriental in Restoration Drama" Studies in Language and Literature 2 (1918), 163-86. The problem here is with a definition of the orient, and both these authors tend to include a large number of plays set in Portugal and Spain which make references to the Moors.

- 30 The one pastoral tragedy, Lady Winchelsea's Aristomenes is described with great distaste in Jeanette Augustus Marks, English Pastoral Drama from the Restoration to the Date of the Publication of the Lyrical Ballads (London: Methuen, 1908). Three articles on the question of poetic justice are more interesting: Lewis M. Margill, "Poetic Justice: The Dilemma of the Early Creators of Sentimental Tragedy" Washington Stage College Research Studies 25 (1957), 24-32; A.N. Wilkins, "John Dennis and Poetic Justice" Notes & Queries 202 (1957), 421-4; Amrih Singh, "The Argument on Poetic Justice (Addison versus Dennis)" Indian Journal of English Studies 3 (1962), 61-77.
- 31 Among them are these: Arthur Colby Sprague, "A New Scene in Colley Cibber's Richard III" Modern Language Notes 42 (1927), 29-32; Albert E. Kalson, "The Chronicles in Cibber's Richard III" Studies in English Literature 1500-1900 3 (1963), 253-67; John J. McAleer, "Colley Cibber -- Shakespeare's Adapter" Shakespeare Newsletter 11 (Dec. 1961), 42; K. Koppe, "Das Verhältniss von Cibber's 'Papal Tyranny in the Reign of King John' en Shakespeare's 'King John'". Halle, 1902; Landon C. Burns, "Three Views of King Henry V" Drama Survey 1 (Winter 1962), 278-300; Kenneth Muir, "Three Shakespeare Adaptations" Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society Proceedings: Literary and Historical Section 8 (1959), 233-40; James G. McManaway, "Richard II at Covent Garden" Shakespeare Quarterly 15 (1964), 161-75; H.B. Charlton, "Buckingham's Adaptation of 'Julius Caesar' and a note in the 'Spectator'" Modern Language Review 16 (1921), 171-2; Adolphus J. Bryan, "Humphrey Duke of Gloucester: A Study in Eighteenth-Century Adaptation" Studies for William A. Reed Ed. Nathaniel M. Coffee and Thomas A. Kirby (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1940), 221-36; Christopher Spencer, "A Word for Tate's King Lear" Studies in English Literature 1500-1900 3 (1963), 241-51; W. Moelwyn Merchant, "Shakespeare 'Made Fit'" Restoration Theatre Ed. John Russell Brown and Bernard Harris (Stratford-upon Avon Studies 6: London: Edward Arnold, 1965), 195-219; Peter Carracciolo "Dryden and the Antony and Cleopatra of Sir Charles Sedley" English Studies (Anglo-American Supplement), 1969, 1-1v; Paul Sawyer, "The Popularity of Shakespeare's Plays at Lincoln's Inn Fields Theatre 1714-17" Notes & Queries 18 (1971), 151-2.
- 32 The Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Restoration Drama. Ohio State University Press, 1928. Reprinted Benjamin Blom: New York, 1967.
- 33 Beaumont and Fletcher on the Restoration Stage. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1965. Reprint of the 1926 edition.
- 34 Bertram L. Joseph, "Lewis Theobald and Webster" Comparative Literature Studies 17-18 (1945), 29-31; R.K. Kaul, "What Theobald Did to Webster"

Indian Journal of English Studies 2 (1961), 138-44.

- 35 Don D. Moore, John Webster and His Critics 1617-1964. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1966.
- 36 Most of these were inaugural dissertations. See Alfred Behrend, Nicholas Rowe als dramatischer, Leipzig, 1907; Paul Borgwardt, The Royal Convert von Nicholas Rowe 1707, Rostock: Wirst Winterberg's Buchdruckerei, 1909; W. Budig, Untersuchungen über 'Jane Shore', Rostock, 1908; Eduard Bunning, Nicholas Rowe's Tamerlane, 1702, Rostock, 1909; Ottokar Intze, Nicholas Rowe, Leipzig, 1910; Ferdinand H. Schwartz, Nicholas Rowe's 'Fair Penitent', Berne: Buchler & Co., 1907; Ludwig Stahl, Nicholas Rowe's drama 'The Ambitious Step-Mother', 1700, Rostock, 1909.
- 37 Anglia 54 (1930), 307-30.
- 38 Willard Thorp, "A Key to Rowe's Tamerlane" Journal of English and Germanic Philology 39 (1940), 124-7; Donald B. Clark, "The Source and Characterisation of Nicholas Rowe's Tamerlane" Modern Language Notes 95 (1950), 145-52.
- 39 Donald B. Clark, "An Eighteenth-Century Adaptation of Massinger" Modern Language Quarterly 13 (1952), 239-52; Lindley A. Wyman, "The Tradition of the Formal Meditation in Rowe's The Fair Penitent" Philological Quarterly 42 (1963), 412-6; Frank J. Kearful, "The Nature of Tragedy in Rowe's The Fair Penitent" Papers in Language and Literature 2 (1966), 351-60; John A. Dussinger, "Richardson and Johnson: Critical Agreement on Rowe's The Fair Penitent" English Studies 49 (1968), 45-7.
- 40 Alfred Schwartz, "An Example of Eighteenth-Century Pathetic Tragedy: Rowe's Jane Shore" Modern Language Quarterly 22 (1960), 236-47; D.F. Rowan, "Shore's Wife" Studies in English Literature 1500-1900 6 (1966), 447-64.
- 41 Malcolm Goldstein, "Pathos and Personality in the Tragedies of Nicholas Rowe" in English Writers of the Eighteenth Century: Essays in Honour of James Lowry Clifford. Ed. John H. Middendorf (New York: Columbia University Press, 1971), pp. 172-85. George W. Whiting, "Rowe's Debt to Paradise Lost" Modern Philology 32 (1935), 271-9.
- 42 R.H. Griffith, "Early Editions of Lillo's London Merchant" University of Texas Studies in English 15 (1935), 23-7; George Bush Rodman, "Sentimentality in The London Merchant" ELH 12 (1945), 45-61; Raymond Dexter Havens, "Sentimentality in The London Merchant" ELH 12 (1945) [Sep.], 183-7.
- 43 Wallace Jackson, "Dryden's Emperor and Lillo's Merchant: the Relevant Bases of Action" Modern Language Quarterly 26 (1965), 536-44;

- Herbert L. Carson, "The Play That Would Not Die: George Lillo's The London Merchant" Quarterly Journal of Speech 49 (1963), 287-94; C.F. Burgess, "Lillo, sans Barnwell, or the Playwright Revisited" Modern Philology 65 (1968), 5-29; John H. Brashear and Lucy Brashear, "Economic Theory Reflected in George Lillo's The London Merchant" Appalachian State University Faculty Publications 66 (1969), 49-53.
- 44 Michael M. Cohen, "Providence and Constraint in Two Lillo Tragedies" English Studies 52 (1971), 231-6; George E. Wellwarth, "George Lillo and the Finger-Wagging Drama" Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society; Literary and Historical Section 14 part 3 (1970), pp. 75-97.
- 45 C.F. Burgess, "Further Notes for a Biography of George Lillo" Philological Quarterly 46 (1967), 424-8; William H. McBurney, "What Lillo Read: A Speculation" Huntington Library Quarterly 29 (1966), 275-86.
- 46 Adolphe G. Hegnauer, Der Einfluss von Addison's 'Cato' die dramatische Literatur England's und des Sentiments in der I. Hälfte des 18 Jahrhunderts, Hamburg: M. Lange, 1912; Albert Zeitvogel, Addison's Cato. Eine geschichtliche und dramatische Quellen unter suchung, Münster, 1936; F.E. Noalk, Die bürgerlichen Züge in Addison's 'Cato', Berlin: Funk, 1940.
- 47 Stuart Atkins, "Addison's Cato: I i, 47-53" Philological Quarterly 21 (1942), 430-33; Emmett L. Avery, "The Popularity of The Mourning Bride in the London Theatres in the Eighteenth Century" Research Studies of the State College of Washington 9 (1941), 115-6; Emmett L. Avery, "The Première of The Mourning Bride" Modern Language Notes 57 (1942), 55-7; "Congreve" Notes & Queries (1928), 236; J.P. Wickersham Crawford, "On the Relations of Congreve's Mourning Bride to Racine's Bajazet" Modern Language Notes 19 (1904), 193-4; Robert Halsband, "Addison's Cato and Lady Mary Wortley Montagu" PMLA 65 (1950), 1122-29; M.M. Kelshall, "The Meaning of Addison's Cato" Review of English Studies 17 (1966), 149-62; Carl J. Stratman CSV, "Unrecorded Editions of Addison's Cato, Published before 1756" Theatre Notebook 15 (1961), 102.
- 48 "The 'Just Decrees of Heav'n' and Congreve's Mourning Bride" in Congreve Consider'd (Los Angeles: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, University of California Los Angeles, 1971), pp. 1-12.
- 49 See above, note 47.
- 50 PMLA 58 (1943), 977-1001.
- 51 New York: London: Brentano, 1929. See also Herbert Carter, "The Women Dramatists of the Restoration" Bookman's Journal 13 (1925), 91-7.
- 52 Hans Evardson, Mrs Centlivre's Drama "The Cruel Gift" und seine Quellen. Kiel: H. Fiencke, 1912.

- 53 Paul Bunyan Anderson, "Mistress Delarivière Manley's Biography" Modern Philology 33 (1936), 261-78; Gwenddyn B. Needham, "Mary de la Rivière Manley, Tory Defender" Huntington Library Quarterly 12 (1949), 253-88.
- 54 George Frisbie Whicher, The Life and Romances of Mrs Eliza Haywood. New York: Columbia University Press, 1915.
- 55 John R. Elwood, "The Stage Career of Eliza Haywood" Theatre Survey 5 (1964), 107-116.
- 56 Paul E. Parnell, "The Distrest Mother, Ambrose Philips' Moralistic Play" Comparative Literature 11 (1959), 111-123.
- 57 Katharine E. Wheatley, "Andromache as the 'Distrest Mother'" Romanic Review 39 (1948), 3-21.
- 58 Leonard R.N. Ashley, Colley Cibber, Twayne Publications Inc.: New York, 1965. Ashley does not seem to be very interested in Cibber's tragedies.
- 59 Edward N. Hooker, "Charles Johnson's 'The Force of Friendship' and 'Love in a Chest': A Note on Tragi-Comedy and Licensing in 1710" Studies in Philology 34 (1937), 407-11; Maurice M. Shudofsky, "Charles Johnson and 18th Century Drama" ELH 10 (1943), 131-58.
- 60 Baldwin Maxwell, "Notes on Charles Hopkins's Boadicea" Review of English Studies 4 (1928), 79-83.
- 61 Henry C. Shelley, The Life and Letters of Edward Young. London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, 1914; C.V. Wicker, Edward Young and the Fear of Death; A Study in Romantic Melancholy. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1952.
- 62 Leon Morel, James Thomson, sa vie et ses oeuvres, Paris, 1895; Jean B. Kern, "James Thomson's Revisions of Agamemnon" Philological Quarterly 45 (1966), 289-303.
- 63 John Robert Moore, "Hughes's Source for The Siege of Damascus" Huntington Library Quarterly 21 (1958), 362-6.
- 64 Herbert W. Starr, "Notes on David Mallet" Notes and Queries 178 (1940), 277-8; Herbert W. Starr, "Sources of David Mallet's Mustapha, a Tragedy" Notes and Queries 181 (1941), 285-7.
- 65 Austin Dobson, "Aaron Hill" The National Review 63 (1914), 443-60.
- 66 Earl Harlan, Elijah Fenton 1683-1730, Philadelphia, 1937.
- 67 Berna Moran, "The Source of Joseph Trapp's Abra-Mule" Modern Language Review 53 (1958), 81-3.

68 Paul S. Dunkin, "The Authorship of The Fatal Extravagance" Modern Language Notes 60 (1945), 328-30; Paul Philemon Kies, "The Authorship of The Fatal Extravagance" Washington State College Research Studies 12 (1945), 155-8, 14 (1946), 88.

## CHAPTER II SETTINGS

In this chapter each of the tragedies of the period is placed into one group or another. I shall begin by discussing those plays which have as their setting ancient Greece and then pass on to those set in ancient Rome. These plays are the most formal of all the tragedies in the period. Many of them are written with the sort of purity of line which the followers of French neo-classicism were trying to recapture. The sources for these plays were most probably very similar, and a tradition on the continent of Europe had already grown up of Greek and Roman plays. At the end of this brief survey I have placed two rather odd plays, one a biblical play and the other a play about Socrates, after a discussion of the one true pastoral tragedy of the period. There are bound to be exceptions to whatever rule of classification is followed, but I have found it rather surprising that the number of plays which fail to follow one of the patterns I have suggested is only about five per cent.

I then go on to examine the largest group of plays, those set on the continent of Europe. Love, revenge and politics are the chief recurring themes. The vogue for plays of this sort was very strong during the first two decades of the eighteenth century. As well as plays about love and revenge there are several dealing with politics in a rather different way. In these two small groups (one consisting of two plays about French kings, and the other consisting of several plays dealing with the theme of revolutions) there is a more obvious attempt to relate the actions in the plays themselves to the contemporary or recent past in British politics. Authors are aware of the

great stirrings caused in British life by the Commonwealth, and are concerned to confirm the Restoration, partly, I think, because of the threats of Jacobite rebellions throughout the early part of the period. The moral and political viewpoint of the authors is almost uniformly conservative, in that the ruling party (in whatever political arrangement) has the right to continue against the threats of usurpers. The status quo is thus almost always confirmed and usurpers are condemned. Also under this heading I have discussed the six plays with far-away fantasy settings, all of which display some degree of originality in theme or presentation of theme.

From this large group I turn to the other very large group of plays, those set in the Middle East. Often a clash of nationalities is presented; there had been several plays set in the continent of Europe which examined the clash of different national interests and characteristics, and this theme is continued in the Eastern plays. Emotions are presented very strongly; there is frequently an air of exaggeration about these plays, with villains, helpless heroines, rape and violence being common themes.

Much more interesting are the plays set in Britain, and I have devoted more space to these than to the rest. First of all are several plays set in ancient Britain, all attempting to establish British culture in some primitive context, and to examine the struggle towards independence. Rugged national and natural characteristics of personality are portrayed, and some of these plays have a quality of freshness and vigour lacking in the Eastern plays.

There are also plays of a later period in British history, often drawing some parallel between political and historical events in the past with those of the present or more recent past. Kingship here is the dominant theme, allied with the theme of love and its place in the affairs of royal

characters. In almost all the plays dealt with up to this point in the chapter, the characters have been noble, or royal.

The last group of plays, and in my view by far the most interesting, consists of those which lead up to and follow from George Lillo's experiments in theme and form in The London Merchant and Fatal Curiosity. Each of these plays is tearful (sentimental) and each deals to some extent with modern man, not the kings and princes of the other plays. Various labels have been applied to these plays - domestic, sentimental, bourgeois, didactic - and all have an element of appropriateness for several of the plays. At the close of this discussion of the last group of plays in the period I have briefly described four tragedies which embody several characteristics of sentimentality, but which use a continental setting and deal with upper class characters. This in fact is typical of tragedy of the period. It might seem that Lillo's plays point the way forward to a new, revitalised, form of tragedy, but in fact what happens is that authors revert to traditional and conventional patterns, and Lillo's ideas are not really developed fully and interestingly.

Throughout this chapter I have made brief reference from time to time to the plays of Nicholas Rowe and George Lillo, but I have not described them in any detail because a fairly detailed analysis of each of the plays by these dramatists appears in Chapters V and VI to which readers are referred for a detailed analysis of each of the types of play outlined in this chapter.

I am suggesting in dealing with the plays in this way that there were certain limits inherent in each of these forms beyond which the authors did not venture. It is also clear that certain themes were thought to be more appropriate to some settings than others. Incest would be placed firmly within a European setting; rape would be most likely to be associated with

the Middle East; classical plays would be the ones most likely to deal with the questions of fate and mythmaking. By looking at each of these forms we can see how writers of tragedy constantly placed restrictions on themselves. They wrote what was appropriate rather than what they had a burning desire to express. Thus it is clear that dependence upon form and "correctness" tended to stifle originality, so that the plays in each group have a remarkable (and, in the case of the Middle Eastern plays, depressing) degree of homogeneity.

It is no surprise to find a substantial number of plays in the period dealing with the material of ancient Greece and Rome. What is, perhaps, surprising, is that the two groups are so different. While the Greek plays, set in an atmosphere of remoteness, concentrate heavily on the examination of moral strength in characters torn between different interpretations of the desires of the gods for them, the Roman plays concentrate on political upheaval, the evil of tyranny, the corruption of Rome, and the need for revolution. Thus while the Greek plays are essentially remote, the Roman ones shed light on contemporary interests in the cause and effects of political struggles.

The plays of ancient Greece make a close connexion between their characters and the gods. This is partly because the characters are set in a context of temples, gods, attending virgins and sacrifices. Iphigenia is seen contending with the alien Queen of Parthia in Dennis's Iphigenia (1700)<sup>1</sup> and with the gods in her native country in Abel Boyer's Achilles<sup>2</sup> (1700) and Charles Johnson's The Victim (1714)<sup>3</sup>. In all three plays she soars majestically at the end, and defies the vengeful gods, who are ironically on her side, by overcoming the evil force of the priests. Achilles is a popular figure; he appears also in Lord Lansdowne's Heroick Love (1698)<sup>4</sup> based on the Homeric

Legends,<sup>5</sup> Hatchett's The Rival Father (1730)<sup>6</sup> based on Corneille's La Mort d'Achille,<sup>7</sup> and Nicholas Rowe's Ulysses (1706).<sup>8</sup> The latter is perhaps one of the most interesting treatments of the myths, in that it attempts to emphasise the domestic nature of its source, and therefore selects that material which will heighten the family nature of the play. Yet in all these plays we sample the atmosphere of a primitive yet small world where virtues of heroism and nobility are cherished, and where there is a constant battle by the "good" characters to overcome the evil influence of the "bad" characters who take it upon themselves to interpret the fate the gods decree. Thus oracles and temples play a highly significant yet ambivalent part in all these works, and are used, to a great extent, as a device to bring about a just outcome.

The influence of French classical tragedy can be seen in the plays of this nature, as it, too, treated the same subjects in the same sort of way, attempting to isolate majestic and noble characteristics in order to bring about a state of katharsis. Johnson's Medaea (1731)<sup>9</sup> is a fascinating treatment of the classical story,<sup>10</sup> presenting the title character in all her ambiguity, so that she achieves colossal stature by the end of the play. Both Robert Owen's Hypermnestra (1703)<sup>11</sup> and John Sturmy's Love and Duty (1722)<sup>12</sup> deal with the same story, though Sturmy's version is the more convincing because of its relentless haste; it manages to avoid the repetitive moralising of the earlier English version. Although Richard West states that he is not following Corneille closely in Hecuba (1726),<sup>13</sup> he manages to achieve an effect which comes close to an eighteenth-century idea of the purity of classical line, partly because he concentrates doggedly on the domestic relationship of mother and son throughout the play, and thus avoids the

temptation of sharing the focus between several characters.

An instructive idea of the development of the Greek form in the period can be gained from the contrast of Charles Hopkins' Pyrrhus, King of Epirus,<sup>14</sup> right at the beginning of our period, 1695, which is heavily dependent upon stage machines, images and elaborate stage effects with James Thomson's Agamemnon (1738),<sup>15</sup> a play which has received more critical attention than most.<sup>16</sup> Here we have substantial periods of concentration upon the exile, Egisthus, an opportunity for some extended passages of lyrical poetry which point up the contrast between court and country. The characters in this play are drawn with complexity and vigour, and the play forces the audience to transfer its attentions away from the present into an area of myth where time can stand still, and where moral grandeur can be examined.

The insistent presentation of moral grandeur seems to be the key to an understanding of all the Greek plays. The pageant-like quality of the drama is emphasised by the delineation of ritual and formality both in creed and behaviour, and the most successful plays are those which force us to focus with the most rigid attention on the power of inner strength - usually moral strength - which the central characters exhibit.

Most of the Greek plays deliberately evoke an atmosphere of myth and timelessness where man is seen to act within the limits prescribed for him by the pagan gods. Occasionally there is a suggestion that the pagan gods are closely related to the Christian God, but this is chiefly through the moral rhyming tags at the ends of acts and scenes where characters step out of character for a moment to deliver some sort of simile, analogy or warning to the audience. The tension in the plays comes chiefly from the tension within the characters themselves as they attempt to assess conflicting opinions

of the will of the gods for them. Most of the Greek plays have a strong visual appeal, for the whole elevated epic machinery of the remote setting demands temples, trains of attendant virgins, sacrifices, pomp, ceremony and priests and priestesses. The depiction of moral grandeur and the evocation of ritual seem to be the key elements in this sort of play.

The Roman plays depend much more on day-to-day changes and manipulations within a political framework of upheaval. The tyranny of one man, usually king or emperor, is a focal point for rebellion and for a discussion of the duties of an aware citizen who is fired both with humanitarian urges and an ardent patriotism. Rome is frequently shown to be corrupt, the reverse side of the classical coin to Greece, where nobility and chivalry are shown at their greatest. In Rome everyone seems to be involved in a power struggle, where merit is often neglected by powerful and ruthless power seekers, determined to subdue opposition at all costs. The people thus play a far more important role than in the Greek plays. Instead of spectators they are in Rome the touchstones which reveal whether a tyrant or a freedom fighter has gone far enough or too far.

A thoroughly corrupt Rome is presented in Charles Gildon's The Roman Bride's Revenge (1697),<sup>17</sup> where opposing elements each pursue an ethic of revenge. This ethic is throughout undermined, and perhaps the statement of the play is that a society cannot progress where revenge is uppermost in the minds of its leaders. Crowne's Caligula (1698)<sup>18</sup> portrays a tyrant whose lust and greed reach almost the height (or depth) of caricature. But in order to get away with this, Crowne skilfully employs comic or semi-comic scenes which by no means undermine the seriousness of the Emperor's grotesquely extravagant tastes. Thomas Southerne's The Fate of Capua (1700)<sup>19</sup> deals with a tyrant

who never appears on stage, Hannibal. He remains throughout a symbol of oppression against which personal qualities of friendship and heroism are impotent. Cibber's Perolla and Izadora (1706),<sup>20</sup> also dealing with Hannibal, is much less effective<sup>21</sup> as the misunderstandings of the play are resolved in a sentimental and unlikely dénouement. With revolution plays unlikelihood destroys the value of the premises on which they tend to be built. Appius and Virginia (1709)<sup>22</sup> by John Dennis satisfactorily shows tyranny in a bad light, but the conspirators are not characterised well enough to be really viable; the weak characterisation here spoils an unusually well-contrived plot. William Hunt's Fall of Tarquin (1713)<sup>23</sup> introduces several bizarre effects such as a flying dragon, but much of the writing is good; the play is concerned with the near-divinity of kingship and the possibility of overthrow, and the author manages to keep the love interest essentially subservient to a central political theme. Robert Hurst's The Roman Maid (1725)<sup>24</sup> involves the clash of the Greek and Christian worlds; it is more sentimental, more pathetic, and more in tune with the desire for domestic treatment than the rest of the plays; it seems to mark the end of the view of Greek heroes and heroines as supremely worthy.

Addison's Cato (1713)<sup>25</sup> is the chief exception to this pattern, and the most popular of these plays on the stage. While most of the contemporary interest in the play was in its political nature, the hero, Cato, is not a tyrant but a benevolent, kind, honest and morally right man, who fails against the powers of corruption at large. He is glorified as an example of the sort of inner moral strength which one finds chiefly in the Greek plays.

The plays of Greece and Rome thus present different and opposed pictures of the Golden Age of Classicism. Both lend themselves to tragedy,

but the Greek world is the more idealised, the more remote, and the more attractive in that man is close to the gods whether he likes it or not, and he has some creed by which to live. Some of the dealings of the Roman world, however, even though they are ruled by the head rather than the heart, are seen to be potentially destructive and uncreative. Lady Winchelsea's pastoral tragedy, Aristomenes (1713),<sup>26</sup> presents this dichotomy in terms of court and country. Both court and country characters cannot understand why each wishes to be part of the other world. Each is romanticised for the other party, although in the final analysis country is more attractive because less traumatic.

The pastoral implies the court and vice versa. The world of noble action implies a world of treachery. The world of love implies a world of hate. The world of law implies a world of anarchy. One or more of these oppositions is presented in every tragedy of the period, and conflict is the basis of the action. Love cannot be triumphant as well as honour and duty. Family ties are bound to be opposed to ties of love. Virtuous and rightful love is bound to meet with lechery and desire for sexual self-gratification. These are all recurring patterns in the drama, and it does not seem ultimately to be of paramount importance whether the play ends happily for the lovers or not. Towards the end of the period there is an increasing tendency for love to be rewarded and villainy punished, but never is there an example of all sides being satisfied in the dénouement.

Two other plays which do not strictly fit into any of the outlined categories should also be included here. The first is a biblical play, The Tragedy of King Saul (1703)<sup>27</sup> by Dr Joseph Trapp, designated on the title page "Written by a Deceas'd Person of HONOUR, And now made Publick at the

Request of Several Men of Quality who have highly Approv'd of it". It was clearly intended to be read, and was never acted as the Epistle Dedicatory states that it was offered "without those Theatrical Decorations that add a false and perishing Beauty to Performances that come from the Stage".<sup>28</sup> The play is incredibly busy, very stilted (with mediocre rhyming couplets) and very long-winded. Had it been produced on stage King Saul would have been an elaborate and visually extraordinary spectacle, but the dramatic aspect is rather poor; characterisation is weak and David is not given enough heart-warming sympathy although he is outspoken, honest and vigorous. He is a blood and thunder Old Testament figure who knows his own strengths and abilities, but the general blood-thirstiness of the play and its insistent pattern of jealousies and revenge becomes not only tiresome but morally confusing.

The other play, Socrates Triumphant; or, The Danger of Being Wise in a Commonwealth of Fools (1716)<sup>29</sup> does not appear to have been designed for theatres. Written by an anonymous Officer of the Army it is a curious mixture of comedy, farce, satire and tragedy which has elements of the entertainment and of the morality pageant. Although a tragedy, because Socrates dies in prison at the end of the play, the work is really non-literary and was written for private enjoyment rather than the public theatres. It is, however, a lively and amusing piece.

The largest group consists of plays set in continental Europe, and all are concerned with love, revenge and politics. Often an incest theme plays a part in the pattern of deceptions which emerges, but this is chiefly during the first half of the period. Revenge is the primary motive not only of the villain, but also of the wronged lover or deceived friend. Rarely does deception lead to success; calamities abound, and self-seeking is shown

to lead to death and loss of love. The vogue for European plays shows itself early in the period, but this type of play is then almost entirely replaced by the Eastern play. There may well be several reasons for this, including the desire to place a play at an even more remote distance from the audience and its behaviour, but the most compelling seems to be that the Eastern stereotype suited the dramatist best when he wanted to concentrate on the conflict arising between characters embodying strong passions.

Most of the plays with European settings were published between 1695 and 1720. In fact after 1720 there are only six plays of this type and two adaptations. Perhaps this may be accounted for by the steadily growing emphasis on the pathetic, for this element is by and large incompatible with the elements of love, revenge and political intrigue and upheaval which characterise this group of plays. Six tragedies with far-away fantasy settings, three taking place in the Americas, one in the far east, one in Canada and one in "Tombut", all deal with the themes mentioned above but with a greater degree of detachment, since their setting is deliberately remote. In Elizabethan and Jacobean times love and revenge plays were frequently set on the continent of Europe, and this literary pattern is taken over, most of the plays taking place in Italy, Spain and Portugal, where the idea of a more fiery and volatile personality was thought more congruous with the surroundings than it would have done had it been presented in Britain.

The first group of plays deals with the conflicts between love and duty, reason and passion, and the earliest, Gould's The Rival Sisters<sup>30</sup> (1696), is a bloodthirsty tale of revenge and intrigue, set in motion by a woman who waits until the deaths are in train before making any disclosures. A prose sub-plot parallels the main action without incorporating the dire consequences of the dénouement. Mrs Trotter's Agnes de Castro (1696)<sup>31</sup> sets a theme of

revenge in the opening moments and involves a pathetic treatment of the chief women by contrasting them with bloodthirsty, violent men. Congreve's Mourning Bride (1697),<sup>32</sup> a highly popular play,<sup>33</sup> mixes the European setting with Middle Easternism as the hero has disguised himself as Osmyn in an attempt to prolong his life. An eastern princess, Zara, contrasts with the European heroine, but evil is seen to permeate both cultures. Filmer's The Unnatural Brother (1697),<sup>34</sup> shortened to one act in the same year as The Unfortunate Couple,<sup>35</sup> lacks motivation of characters. The longer version is very drawn out and the characters come perilously close to stereotype villains and heroes. The anonymous The Fatal Discovery (1698)<sup>36</sup> which mixes prose and verse scenes is marked by a strong incest theme where at the end of the play the mother goes mad and her son finds that his sister, daughter and wife are all the same person. The possibilities of sensational personal relationships are here carried almost to their limit. Incest also has a part to play in Motteux's Beauty in Distress (1698)<sup>37</sup> though its importance is not emphasised. As in the Mourning Bride the hero is disguised as an eastern gentleman with an eastern servant. Motteux makes too much use of sword fights and people throwing themselves on the ground; he seems to feel that language is not strong enough to convey the violence of emotion inherent in the characters' actions, but even those actions tend to become mannerisms. William Philips in The Revengeful Queen (1698)<sup>38</sup> notes the prevailing passions of many of his characters in the Dramatis Personae list. He also uses a prose sub-plot but this becomes fully integrated in the main action, although the play remains poor. The love interest is not connected fully enough with the political emphasis. Catharine Trotter's The Fatal Friendship (1698)<sup>39</sup> is much better; the characters are well drawn and although the language tends

to be exclamatory the author paints a convincing heroine, torn between duty and love, trying to be positive although her countermand for the revenge comes too late. Mrs Centlivre's The Perjur'd Husband (1700)<sup>40</sup> shows that her true dramatic ability lies in comedy intrigues rather than in her attempts to portray noble tragic actions in the verse parts of the play. Serious elements are thus forgotten in the end while the memory of the comedy lingers. Mrs Pix's The False Friend involves rivalry for love, jealousy, madness and disguise along with mistaken identities. Hopkins's Friendship Improv'd (1700)<sup>42</sup> is set in Sicily in Roman times and the central deception is sexual; Locris, the usurper's daughter, has been brought up in men's clothes. The general, at the end of the play, is easily able to transfer his male friendship into heterosexual love. Poetic justice is achieved as all the wicked characters die at the end and the good ones live. R. Phillips's Fatal Inconstancy (1701)<sup>43</sup> purports to be set in London but all the characters have Italianate names. Prose scenes involve a drunken woman (a very unusual feature), male friendship, jealousy and a lot of deaths. Satire directed at amours which may be potentially tragic is also a marked feature of the play, and Fatal Inconstancy bears more than a little resemblance to some of the comedies of manners.

The most famous plays of the type, Rowe's Fair Penitent (1703)<sup>44</sup> has a very strong theme of male friendship which breaks down because of the hero's inability to see things as they really are. The author's moral viewpoint is interesting because all the characters appear to be undercut, and the tragic dénouement comes about because of the psychological nature of each of the main characters and not simply because the author is following conventional patterns. When each character has been fully established, however, both the interest of and the tension in the play drops. Rowe seems to be more interested

in motivation than in action, the reverse of the usual pattern in these plays, with the result that the characters lose their vitality and some of their individuality at the end. Mrs Pix's The Conquest of Spain (1705)<sup>45</sup> concerns conflict between the Spanish and the Moors; private marriage and a lascivious king add to the intrigue. Mrs Trotter's The Revolution of Sweden (1706)<sup>46</sup> begins with the peasants; a revolutionary situation set, at least initially, in a social context. Gustavus and his party contrast with the evil schemers of the Church party, and there is a splendid depiction of a female patriot. Democracy and freedom are the key issues here, but at the end of the play justice is dispensed in a violent and hasty way. Charles Johnson's The Force of Friendship (1710)<sup>47</sup> reflects a growing tendency to simplification as it has only seven characters. The central situation is one of rivalry in love between two friends. The action is single-minded and pathetic, but it is repetitive and lacks dramatic impetus. Lewis Theobald's The Perfidious Brother (1715)<sup>48</sup> is also single-minded; mistaken motives and actions disseminated by a villain lead to the uncovering of his design and a happy ending. Mrs Centlivre's The Cruel Gift (1717)<sup>49</sup> is busy and complex; the author this time avoids a sub-plot, with the result that the focus of her play is clearer. There is a happy ending as the villain is killed and the king's uncle appears as a hermit. Attention is divided between the two women, so that balance is maintained.

Moses Browne employs comic scenes in Polidus (1723),<sup>50</sup> a play "to be performed by young gentlemen for their diversion." The action and stage directions also suggest that it was not intended for public consumption. It is done with enthusiasm but there are some gory scenes, particularly the one in which Polidus is seen on the rack. There is a vituperative heroine who

is unable to see that what happens to her is a result of the actions of the villain, not of her husband. Edward Young's Revenge (1721)<sup>51</sup> involves a villainous captive Moor and his mistress who set themselves against the rulers. The continual portrayal of heightened passions becomes monotonous but it clearly appealed to audiences in the eighteenth-century as Revenge was frequently performed up until the end of the century. The villain and the lovers form a Iago-Othello-Desdemona-like relationship and the reference back to Shakespeare may well have had something to do with the play's appeal.

The four plays with European settings which come after 1725 seem to have more in common with each other than with the rest of the plays discussed in this chapter. Eliza Haywood's Frederick, Duke of Brunswick-Lunenburgh (1729)<sup>52</sup> is deliberately historical, set in fifteenth-century Germany. The play is gripping and complex and its patriotic intention by no means makes the treatment trite because the characters are all given ample motivation for their actions, and once their natures are established they continue to act within the scope which their nature allows them. Henry Brooke's Gustavus Vasa (1739)<sup>53</sup> was the first play to be prohibited under the terms of the 1737 Licensing Act, chiefly because the author's description of the many corruptions in Sweden were thought to resemble those of England rather too closely.<sup>54</sup> Patriotism is one of the chief concerns of the play as the author makes clear in the Epistle Dedicatory,<sup>55</sup> and Gustavus is treated most sympathetically as a whole-hearted patriot. The conflict between the hero and King Cristiern is described forcefully and had the play been presented on stage the vigour and pertinence of the actions would have been impressive. Brooke achieves an effective balance between political revolution and sympathetic human virtues. Paterson's Arminius (1740)<sup>56</sup> is set in Germany in Roman times and he makes capital of

the sentimental aspects of the play, presenting several scenes where the characters indulge their emotions. Lillo's last play, Elmerick (1740),<sup>57</sup> is set in the palace of King Andrew II of Hungary at Buda. The plot is simple but rather less interesting than either Frederick or Gustavus Vasa. The play is neatly balanced, with a male and female evil character opposing a male and female good character but Elmerick himself, meant to be a paragon figure, fails to arouse our interest; his moral certainty is too absolute to be attractive and the author fails to make his supreme example of goodness anything but boring and rather shallow.

Two plays about French kings make similar liberal use of political manoeuvres. Both plays are modern versions of the old chronicle play in that they place themselves clearly and definitely in history, so that revenge, love, intrigue and politics can be seen as an integral part of history, not simply as dramatic devices. Mrs Trotter's The Unhappy Penitent (1701)<sup>58</sup> involves international jealousies and broken marriage vows. Jealousy in love and politics prompts the intrigue of the play, which ends without any deaths, and seems to be an examination of different types of passion. Charles Beckingham's The Tragedy of King Henry IV of France (1720)<sup>59</sup> is much clearer, a descendant of Shakespeare's history plays. The jealous king's amorous inclinations are urged on by the church party who are seen to be the focus of discord and corruption. The play is concerned with kingship rather than with love and duty and it is marred only by weak characterisation of the women and by a somewhat blatant and overzealous anti-Catholicism.

Many of the foregoing tragedies deal in some measure with revolution, but several plays have the question of revolution as their most significant feature. In almost every case the monarchical status quo is either affirmed

or reinstated, and the Restoration of Charles implicitly confirmed.

Few tragedies in the period deal with the common people. The chief view of the writers (or, rather, of the characters in the plays themselves) is that the mob is unruly, always bending with the wind, rarely in control of its actions or members. In the revolution plays, however, an attempt is made to show disruptions in affairs of state in a context of ordinary individuals. Henry Smith's The Princess of Parma (1699)<sup>60</sup> involves dissent in the rebels' cause which is led by a villain, but the attention moves from a framework of politics to the themes of intrigue and revenge, and the revolutionaries are finally killed. Thomas D'Urfey's two plays, The Famous History of the Rise and Fall of Massaniello (1700)<sup>61</sup> and The Famous History and Fall of Massaniello [sic.]; or, A Fisherman A Prince. The Second Part (1699 [sic.])<sup>62</sup> are most interesting, the first showing the rebel leader's rise to power and the second depicting his fall. The cast is large and the movements complex, involving some prose comedy and detailed treatment of the struggles within the leadership of the rebel camp. The church is seen to be an abettor of the revolutionaries, before it is finally and utterly discredited. D'Urfey characterises his hero fully and is able to reveal a many-sided personality. The Second Part is more conventional, with intrigue for love playing a greater part, and it ends with defeat for Massainello and his cause. Throughout these two plays the rebels are seen to be in constant disagreement about their intentions, actions and methods, but the revolution is in a valid sense "popular". In characterising the rebels as fishermen, bakers and other tradespeople D'Urfey makes the most unusual move of endowing ordinary men with some nobility, intelligence and power to bring about change. Their revolution fails, but in this case they do attain the political objective they set out to achieve. Fall comes about because of personal over-reaching, not because of an intrinsic

error in motive or political judgement.

Bevil Higgons' The Generous Conqueror (1702)<sup>63</sup> is extremely busy with disguise, mistaken identity and trickery. The revolution here is prompted and sustained by greed and jealousy, and is therefore doomed to failure. The play takes place entirely within the court, and there is a suppressed theme of incest. Gildon's The Patriot (1703)<sup>64</sup> concerns a counter-revolution, an attempt by the nobility to regain power. The revolution fails, and Cosmo, an unusual hero, has his status confirmed at the end of the play; although he displays much of the ruthlessness associated with a villain all his opponents are disposed of. Charles Johnson's Love and Liberty (1709)<sup>65</sup> shows the contrary motion with the defeat of the tyrant usurper. The return of the banished Ascanio is interestingly depicted; although he brings peace and order to bear he is barely characterised, and this gives the restoration a ritual dimension. Sterling's The Rival Generals (1722)<sup>66</sup> immediately establishes a military context. It is a blood and thunder intrigue play but there do not seem to be any significant political movements. The importance of the action seems to lie in the intrigue itself rather than in political or moral resolution.

The six plays with fantasy settings are all interesting and all display some measure of originality. Southerne's Oroonoko (1696)<sup>67</sup> was immensely popular throughout the century and employs a comic sub-plot of intrigue and disguised sex in a setting of planters in Surinam. The noble title character is a captive slave, and the author skilfully exposes the different attitudes of colonisers to the rights of slaves to rebel. The author's use of verse and prose makes clear that there are noble savages and wicked Europeans and vice versa. In this Oroonoko has much in common with

Dennis's Liberty Asserted (1704)<sup>68</sup> set in Canada, a very interesting tale of the conflicts between the French and the English colonisers and of both with the Indians. A suppressed radical tendency in the treatment of the subject of colonisation is dissipated towards the end when it becomes clear that English attitudes are being praised at the expense of French. Sir Thomas Moore's Mangora, King of the Timbusians (1715)<sup>69</sup> seems to lack the deadly seriousness of most of the productions of the period. There is a touch of the burlesque as effect is seen to be all-important while subtlety of motivation is neglected. The play has to do with tyranny and the influence of opera is apparent. The comic scenes are well wrought and the author seems to be aware of his dependence upon extravagant for half-critical purposes.

Much more operatic than Mangora is John Dennis's Rinaldo and Armida (1699)<sup>70</sup> based upon Tasso's story. The play is set in the Canaries and conjures up an atmosphere of remoteness and ritual action with its use of spirits and invisible goddesses. It has a pageant quality. Virtually no attempt is made to give characters motivation, and its only value would have been as stage spectacle, which could well have been considerable. Neither of the other two plays is much better. William Walker's Victorious Love (1698)<sup>71</sup> is brief, very formal and lacking in impact, set in the imaginary "Tombut," and an anonymous young lady's The Unnatural Mother (1698)<sup>72</sup> is very strange indeed. Set in Siam, and written almost entirely in prose, it is different from almost anything else in the period, comparing comic country bumpkins (though Siamese ones) with other strata in society. The play was written, no doubt, for private amusement, and it does contain some witty lines, though it is not a contribution to serious drama.

From these European plays which lose their popularity after 1720 we move to a consideration of the sort of play which took their place. Plays set in the Orient during the Restoration were examined by Louis Wann in an article of 1918,<sup>73</sup> and then further treated on a larger scale by Thomas Blake Clark in Oriental England.<sup>74</sup> They appear throughout this period. We may conveniently take Wann's definition of the orient:

In Europe, the Balkan States, Greece and European Turkey; in Africa, all the lands bordering the southern shore of the Mediterranean, including the modern states of Morocco, Algeria, Tunis, Tripoli and Egypt; in Asia, practically the entire continent, from the Mediterranean to the Pacific, including the Oceanic Archipelago.<sup>75</sup>

It is, perhaps, true that oriental persons exhibit no different characteristics from stage Europeans, yet in plays in which both types are juxtaposed there is an attempt to make the easterners more violent, more thoroughly controlled by their passions. Interest in middle eastern settings and personages abounds, and these plays are characterised by particularly nasty scheming villains, usually intent on rape or sexual fulfilment with one of the women of the court or seraglio, and the villain is frequently a prime minister figure. Sexuality is treated more evidently and more insistently here than elsewhere as the prime force governing politics and the course of revolution, though nearly always the attempted conquest ends in death for the villain. Rape, jealousy between rivals in love, incest, the love of father and son for the same woman and complicated intrigues are frequently recurring patterns. A large number of the plays, particularly towards the end of the period, begin with two characters commenting on the present disgrace of the country. They usually turn out to be villainous schemers, but this is by no means always so.

In all these Eastern plays there is some contrast to "European"

character in that the villains are all more villainous and more sexually motivated than their European counterparts. One play, James Thomson's Edward and Eleonora (1739),<sup>76</sup> bridges the settings for, though set in Palestine and therefore strictly Eastern in setting, it involves an English Prince and Princess, a French ecclesiastical politician, and several Eastern opponents. The play was barred from the stage for political reasons, and one of its chief points is that war cannot be holy, and that nobility may well rest with those who are being conquered as much as with those doing the conquering.

Each of the plays in the first group concerns a seraglio, and these plays bear a marked atmospheric and emotional similarity to each other even though they span the whole of the period. In each mutes, eunuchs, and grotesque murders appear in the context of a seraglio where there is almost always an attempted rape and matters are made worse by the evil intentions and actions of a prime minister figure. Mrs Manley's The Royal Mischief (1696)<sup>77</sup> and Mrs Pix's Ibrahim (1698)<sup>78</sup> are both very bloody affairs which involve the use of poison and malicious scheming. Rowe's The Ambitious Step-Mother (1701)<sup>79</sup> has a female villain and interesting patterning and paralleling of events. Rowe succeeds in eliciting more audience sympathy for the misled than the two previous authors. Mrs Wiseman's Antiochus the Great (1702)<sup>80</sup> begins with revenge but is more pathetic than the previous plays as it introduces a child for pathetic effect at the end and closes with the queen's desire to abandon politics for a pastoral retreat. In Trapp's Abra-Mule (1704)<sup>81</sup> trouble for the heroine comes from the schemes for self-gratification on the part of the villain, and the play seems to set up proponents of reason, passion and moderation, though the resolution

is rather ineffective because the whole ethos of the play depends on violence. Mrs Manley, at the beginning of Almyna (1707),<sup>82</sup> tries to establish a strange world where women are thought by the king to have souls like beasts and therefore cannot have been designed for immortal life. The status of women and the final recognition of a woman's equality with men as a human being is the central issue of debate in the play. Goring's Irene (1708)<sup>83</sup> is politically curious as the dithering emperor finally decides on empire rather than love, and apparently justifiable opposition fades away into the background. Hill chooses Siam for The Fatal Vision (1716)<sup>84</sup> but the play otherwise operates in the same way as the middle eastern plays with mutes, a eunuch, jealousy, a villain and death. Revenge and kingship are the central issues explored by means of disguise and mistaken identity on the part of the "right" characters. The Fair Captive (1721),<sup>85</sup> attributed to Eliza Haywood even though she attempts to disclaim responsibility for it, involves the attempt of two Spaniards to rescue Isabella from the Turkish seraglio. The Sultan, the supreme authority, never appears, and in the end right prevails. At the end of the period two treatments of the story of George Castriot appeared, Havard's Scanderbeg (1733)<sup>86</sup> and Lillo's The Christian Hero (1735).<sup>87</sup> Of the two Lillo's is the more sophisticated, and in both the Christians triumph. Mallet's Mustapha (1739)<sup>88</sup> reflects the tendency of the late 1730s towards plays of discussion rather than plays of action, and involves a female's attempt to bring about some sort of revolution because of jealousy.

These eastern plays are spread right through the period, and nearly all deal with the same concerns of sex, property, possession and one-upmanship. Personal matters of love and lust always involve a large-scale upheaval in the state and often involve wars or feuds because of the stealing or maltreatment of a woman from outside the seraglio.

Sexuality is the theme of Charles Hopkins's Neglected Virtue (1696)<sup>89</sup> but in the end only the love of the sub-plot characters prevails. The sub-plot deals openly with sex and provides the only indication of what really motivates all characters, be they low or noble. Pausanias (1696),<sup>90</sup> attributed to Richard Norton, is rather different as it concentrates on complicated political manoeuvres; there are very few deaths at the end and political rebellion is defeated. The play celebrates an old patriotic heroine who acts as she should regardless of the consequences. Banks's Cyrus the Great (1696)<sup>91</sup> ends in carnage and a curious resolution of the love relationships despite the fact that no moral pattern is imposed at the end. Gildon's Phaeton (1698)<sup>92</sup> begins with shepherds and shepherdesses in an Egyptian court; the plot is simple but the language poor and the dramatis personae weakly characterised. Cibber's Xerxes (1699)<sup>93</sup> is more interesting and uses a child for pathetic effect. The general rabble are seen to act violently though without discrimination and the play centres on the king's desire for sexual liaison. In The Double Distress (1701)<sup>94</sup> by Mrs Pix, and The Czar of Muscovy (1701)<sup>95</sup> thought to be by her,<sup>96</sup> exclamatory language and purple passages spoil the general effect of these revenge plays. The latter, largely in prose,<sup>97</sup> is by far the better of the two, full of action and complexity, though I am not convinced that it exhibits the same ranting style of the rest of Mrs Pix's achievements. Rowe's Tamerlane (1701),<sup>98</sup> a play which was performed regularly throughout the eighteenth century as almost a national institution is a kind of political allegory, showing the conquest of Tamerlane (William III) over Bajazet (Louis XIV). It is, like all Rowe's plays, skillfully patterned, and it makes subtle and soft use of many traditional eastern patterns. Oldmixon's The Governor of Cyprus (1703)<sup>99</sup> concentrates

on only six characters and begins with the heroine in a garden lying on a bank of flowers. The play is poor and no character seems to be able to carry out a sustained logical or reasonable course of action. Zelmane (1705)<sup>100</sup> involves misalliances and schemed deaths, but the queen manages well with miscarriages of fortune and is clearly intended to represent the justice and wisdom of Queen Anne.<sup>101</sup> Smith's Phaedra and Hippolitus (1709)<sup>102</sup> involves only six characters but contains most of the elements of the eastern type of play - love, intrigue, jealousy, madness, heightened emotions at accusations and counter-accusations, and a suppressed incest theme.

Lewis Theobald's Persian Princess (1715)<sup>103</sup> is a blood and thunder play which ends with the dispensation of poetic justice as the evil characters die while the good ones remain to enjoy the benefits of love and life. There is here a sense of successful political destiny as the characters prepare to live in peace and prosperity so that the effect of the recent victory of the Persians over the Armenians can be consolidated. Beckingham's Scipio Africanus (1718)<sup>104</sup> takes place in Carthage and shows love as an aberration which should be eschewed in the interests of glory, fame and empire. It ends in a celebration of Scipio who manages to rise above his own feelings of love and can therefore forgive and pity Trebellius for killing his friend for love. Southerne's Spartan Dame (1719)<sup>105</sup> concerns the ousting of a king by conspirators and is a sophisticated and coherent piece with a cynical intellectual commentator, Crites, who is unmasked before the final catastrophe. The play ends not with domesticity but with questions of morality and political justice. Young's Busiris (1719)<sup>106</sup> wanders in its focus between political manoeuvring, sexual gratification, domestic turmoil and questions of love while John Mottley's Imperial Captives (1720)<sup>107</sup>

suggests that the main character is doomed to failure precisely because he fails to differentiate between love and politics. Because he treats them both in the same way he can never be happy in a world regulated by contrivances and shady dealings. Hughes's The Siege of Damascus (1720)<sup>108</sup> sets out to be deliberately historical<sup>109</sup> and introduces questions of religious enthusiasm and individual motivations.<sup>110</sup> The villain changes sides having realised the disastrous effect of his actions, and both parties, the Christians and the Saracens, have noble adherents of integrity. The play is thus complex and interesting, but fuller characterisation would have improved both clarity and the author's intention. The lack of these, however, was no bar to the play's considerable stage success.

Whereas the number of plays with European settings begins to decline at this point in the period, increased activity directed towards a simplification of the form and ideas of the Middle Eastern plays begins to take place after 1720. Fenton's Mariamne (c. 1720)<sup>111</sup> is the one play set in biblical times, and deals with Herod's treatment of his wife and rival loves, but it is poor.<sup>112</sup> D'Urfey's Grecian Heroine (1723)<sup>113</sup> concerns revenge, tyranny, jealousy, double-crossing and besieging. It is a rather gory play but was never acted, and it is clear from the list of dramatis personae that the play was written to be read not seen. Revenge is seen as ultimately unsatisfactory and the play involves the reader in an effective way in the emotional pattern set up. Mottley's Antiochus (1721)<sup>114</sup> witnesses the victory of good over evil and emphasises the domestic and the pathetic, though the last act is somewhat melodramatic. Jacob's Fatal Constancy, printed two years later (1723),<sup>115</sup> is similarly simple but more monotonous as the characters display little individuality and the language is dull throughout. Gay's The Captives (1724)<sup>116</sup>

is far more vigorous, a revenge play which ends with the dispensation of poetic justice as evil is punished, the villain dies, and the king eventually acts wisely. Philips's Belisarius (1724)<sup>117</sup> opens with jealousy and turns into a nasty plot where the title character is blinded on the orders of a misguided king. The moral patterning is rather heavy; Belisarius is seen as a suffering saint and the schemers as thoroughly jealous villains. The king is kindly but insecure and misled. The best feature of the play is the heroine, Almira, who remains most of the time in the background yet is still an effective symbol of virtue and faithfulness. Lewis's Philip of Macedon (1727)<sup>118</sup> involves a conspiracy against the king, but the noble hero Antigonus refuses to join in it. He upholds strong moral principles and, although he is forced by the villains into disgrace, stands up against the misguided reactions of the king and ultimately forces him to see where his mistakes lie. Frowde's Fall of Saguntum (1727)<sup>119</sup> is less satisfactory. It deals with war, politics, honour and treachery but characterisation is weak and the play has a superfluity of abstract nouns and unnecessary details. The Virgin Queen (1728)<sup>120</sup> by Barford again centres around a conspiracy against the king and much of it is effective. The emphasis, particularly at the end, is pathetic and Olympia is well characterised, moving from a brazen lover through madness to vision, her grief and insight leading to the proper exercise of reason. Sturmy's Sesostris (1728)<sup>121</sup> involves revolution and counter-revolution and is based on intrigue. Dramatic justice is rigorously applied as only the villain dies and disguise and mistaken identity create irony despite the fact that they tend to be over-worked and are occasionally a little strained. Madden's Themistocles (1729)<sup>122</sup> involves some elaborate visual effects and a marked use of static debates<sup>123</sup>

which are too verbose to be dramatically very successful. Xerxes is controlled by his passions and Themistocles by human sympathy, but both sentiments lead the men to morally doubtful actions, and the moral pattern of the play does not seem to be resolved at the end. Both Madden and Martyn in Timoleon (1730)<sup>124</sup> follow Plutarch and both are long-winded. Martyn draws out Timoleon's moral dilemma by having him undecided about what to do, and thus many of the actions and thought patterns in the play are repetitive. We are chiefly interested in Timoleon and Timophanes, the central figures, as characters rather than in them as political or moral spokesmen.

James Thomson's first play, Sophonisba (1730),<sup>125</sup> attracted large audiences at rehearsals though the final product was apparently a disappointment. Thomson seems chiefly interested in tragedy as language and ritual rather than as plot and action, but he is one of the few dramatists of the period able to sustain interest in the long speeches of his frequent debates. The play is influenced by French patterns of long speeches, few characters on stage at any one time and static groupings and discussions. There is virtually no action in the play after the first act and concentration is thus forced away from business to language, from eye to ear.<sup>126</sup> Periander (1731)<sup>127</sup> attributed to John Tracy is bloody and full of treachery. At the same time, however, the author shows an interest in the discussion of political thought,<sup>128</sup> for at the end there is no resolution although alternatives have been discarded and discredited. Mallet uses the same basic story for his Eurydice (1731);<sup>129</sup> his version is clearer, more sentimental but ultimately more conventional. The moral stance is less in doubt and the play closes with tears. Frowde's Philotas (1731)<sup>130</sup> begins with

sexual jealousy and false accusations but in the later part of the play attention is focused entirely on the emotions - grief, pity, remorse and repentance - as Philotas dies on the rack and the other characters are left to celebrate him with Cleora weeping over his body.

The simple plot of Darcy's Love and Ambition (1732)<sup>131</sup> moves forward slowly with measured pace. At the end the king's status is confirmed and the schemers disposed of. Bond's Tuscan Treaty (1733)<sup>132</sup> is a peculiar piece and it seems strange that it should have been given the alternate title Tarquin's Overthrow. Tarquin is indeed overthrown but he is a shadowy figure who seldom appears and our attention is placed instead on the king and his son. Sentimentality is strongly stressed as many tearful exchanges are accompanied by a discussion of the value and virtues of pastoral retreats as an alternative to the schemes of the court in the last act. The best feature of the play is the characterisation of Vario, misled by the villain's use of his love, but finally prepared to assert his sense of honour and virtue even at the expense, if need be, of self-interest. James Sterling's The Parricide (1736)<sup>133</sup> concerns jealousy and a great deal of scheming prompted by lust, and this is capped by rape and the final revelation of incest. The play is tremendously exclamatory and turns to sensationalism at the end. Marsh's Amasis (1738)<sup>134</sup> concerns a misled king who finally comes to realise what he has done and who punishes villainy. His violence at the beginning of the play is juxtaposed with a great deal of pathos and sentimental languorous verse which is resolved at the end by the theme of a king who repents and who thereby attempts to gain salvation. Antiochus (1740)<sup>135</sup> attributed to Shuckborough is the culmination of the growth of sentimentality throughout the period. It is a verse drama with virtually

no action. Sins are emphasised and recognised at the end, and there is an insistent pattern of the heightening of all emotions throughout the play. Characters are interesting here not because of their personalities which lead them to actions, but because they are articulators of various different kinds of emotion.

An important current of plays with ancient British settings runs through the period from Charles Hopkins' Boadicea, Queen of Britain (1697) to William Shirley's Parricide (1739). These plays are connected by setting, in that in most cases there is an attempt to trace some sort of parallel with contemporary British life, whether this be the depiction of a primitive society which took over Christianity, the presentation of important basic virtues of man, the portrayal of tribal warfare and inter-party struggles which are replaced by a form of stable government (with the obvious parallel of a conservative view of post-Commonwealth England), or the presentation of Ireland under siege by invading powers, which can be paralleled by the contemporary exploitation of Ireland by the English.

The first group of plays deals with the invasion of the Romans in some way, with accompanying themes of freedom, subjection, understanding or negotiation, or those presenting noble human virtues in an unstable political situation which is gradually moving to stability.

Charles Hopkins' Boadicea, Queen of Britain (1697)<sup>136</sup> depicts the British struggle to be free from Roman tyranny. It is one of the few plays still written in rhyming couplets, but these are used well, for their regularity avoids the excesses of the blank verse in many of the tragedies of the period, particularly when used like Mrs Manley's in Lucius, the First Christian King of Britain (1717).<sup>137</sup> A number of set pieces are taken from

formal tragedy; there are oracles, a temple, music, tortures, the patriotic enactment of "The Triumphs of the Isle", all of which indicate stage machines and the element of the Entertainment. The battle scenes in Act II, and the dénouement of Act V also exhibit rigid formal tendencies. Set against all this, however, is the depiction of the characters as personalities; Cassibelan is throughout good - his open-mindedness and love can overcome traditional assumptions. His love, Camilla, is also good but credible. After her rape, however, she turns into a stock figure who laments her loss of honour, takes poison, turns mad, and dies full of grief, anguish and disgrace. Boadicea is portrayed both as military leader and sympathetic female until she, too, becomes trapped in Hopkins' traditional dénouement, and turns into a death-dispensing agent, finding suicide as the only solution to her knowledge of her daughter's rape.

The play is governed by revenge and the pagan gods, but there is in the earlier acts a suggestion of a more sentimental mode - a way of life which can depend on emotion and personal fulfilment rather than on traditionally accepted codes of behaviour - both in the realm of the dramatic tradition and practical living. Thus Boadicea, cast in couplets, with a close full of set pieces, has in it hints of an alternative dramatic solution and of a different moral creed. Hence the setting in ancient Britain is appropriate; there is an attempt on the part of the Queen to break from Roman bondage, and this fails because of personal reactions to treachery rather than because of political failure. In the same way, Hopkins is unprepared to portray a serious moral play with a different moral framework and solution, but he goes some way to hinting that goodness and human sympathy (in Cassibelan) could form the basis for a more hopeful

and satisfactory world-view.

Charles Gildon's intention in Love's Victim, or The Queen of Wales (1701)<sup>138</sup> is to present a situation with which the British people can identify; even though the play is actually set in Bayonne he makes much of relevance in the Preface. Attempting first of all a vindication of Otway, he goes on to suggest that to avoid the "sin against Manners" he has chosen people of his own country:

The Fable therefore is partly Fiction, and partly built on the 8th book of Caesar's Commentaries.

Gildon notes that the ancient poets used "Domestic Fables" so

that the Manners of their Dramatic Persons being the same, with those of the Audience, their Examples were more moving and instructive, as is evident from a modern Example of our own [sic.] in the Earl of Essex.

As soon as the play opens we are presented with an ancient picture, deliberately chosen to evoke some sort of primitive scene:

The Inside of a Magnificent Temple the whole Extent of the Stage; at the farther End of which a stately Altar, on it the Statue of Mercury: beneath that, a Couch. The Curtain rises with the terrible Claps of Thunder and Guinoenda is discover'd sitting in a melancholly Posture, and on each side Priestesses comforting her; on the Front of the Stage Dumnacus and a Druid.

The Druids not only evoke a primitive British religion, but one with some Welsh overtones.

Lord Lansdowne's The British Enchanters, or, No Magick Like Love (1706)<sup>139</sup> at first glance seems to contain within it some of the elements of a play like Boadicea. The setting is in ancient Britain where the Emperor of Rome, Constantinus, is in love with Oriana, the daughter of the

British King. But the play is operatic rather than tragic per se in that our interest is focused mainly on the stage effects which indicate a tremendously elaborate and colourful entertainment. There is very little characterisation in the play and it seems to owe something to the masque tradition with the opposing camps of good and evil magicians, and the good and evil humans counterbalancing them. The British Enchanters is a rhetorical and ritualistic pageant, owing little to the tradition of tragedies, but related to them through the setting. What prevents any serious attempts at analysing moral questions is the fact that the king is merely a puppet; none of the characters are presented as personalities, and even the magicians (the most nearly characterised) are cardboard figures. The setting of ancient Britain is simply designed to promote unreality, a never-never world where magicians usurp the power of fate and have competitions with each other and where humans play the same sort of part. That the good side wins is not a moral resolution, simply a fairy tale device; it indicates a desire not to disturb the more important matter of exhibiting song, dances, period costume and an elaborate set.

The most interesting features of Ambrose Philips' The Briton (1722)<sup>140</sup> are the examination of the rise of a cultured attitude from a primitive society, and the presentation of the Romans as an essentially noble group, while most writers tend to see them as tyrants. Philips shows that though their power is declining (perhaps even because their power is declining, although he does not state this) their following of the path of moderation is accompanied by civilised and basically humanitarian responses. The Queen, Cartismand, and Gwendolen are well contrasted, and we may be able to see Cartismand as the representative of the old violent heroic way of

life and Gwendolen as the representative of the new sentimental, humanitarian, mode of living. In both life presented in the plays and in type of tragedies being written we can, perhaps, see bombast giving way to a new conception of refinement.

Heroick Friendship,<sup>141</sup> published in 1719, is attributed to "the late Mr Otway" on the title page, though there seems to be no evidence for this attribution. The play centers around the theme of tyranny in the person of the rightful king, and the better claim to the throne, in moral terms, of the younger brother. The Epilogue indicates the nature of the play; it points to virtue through distress, and suggests that the passions are even stronger in the crisis of a friend's life than in matters of normal heterosexual relationships. Hence the play notes the changes which can occur even in the mind of a tyrant when he is confronted by an example of male friendship. We recognise this as a theme frequently associated with the sentimental, the pathetic and tear-provoking, and here the effect is heightened by the heterosexual love-patterns in the play.

Three plays examine noble conduct in a setting which is made deliberately remote from contemporary Britain, and where virtues are seen at their most rugged. The first of these, Aaron Hill's Elfrid; or, The Fair Inconstant (1710)<sup>142</sup> is a surprisingly good play based upon the question of jealous love.

The end of the play is a set of calamitous chances, and the realisation of forgiveness and qualities of human sympathy comes too late to avert the deaths at the end. What the play seems to suggest is that women need a strong hand, and that the status quo, both political and marital, should not be disturbed. The play also very strongly separates

court from country, and suggests that these two worlds are incompatible. The dramatist implicitly points out the dangers of allowing self-interest and matters of love to have any connection with politics. It is conservative, but Hill's handling of the verse is such, in the opening acts, that one can imagine the strength of a stage performance.

Hill revised this play as Athelwold in 1731<sup>143</sup> and the Preface to the Reader indicates that the author wanted to produce something better on the same theme. However, we can, I think, agree with Genest when he says:

In his Preface he speaks slightly of his first play... it so happens, however, that as the second play is better than the first in some respects, so it is worse in others - Hill had by this time acquired vast notions of regal consequence - he says that in Elfrid, the King came out of his hands stript of every thing that became his condition, and only a Monarch in title - to make amends for this deficiency, he here sets Edgar on royal stilts - but in the old play he had drawn the King's character in a manner, not only more natural, but more conformable to history - (III, 327) - in the preface to Athelwold, he calls his first play an unpruned wilderness of fancy, and allows that he had taken too great a liberty with the character of Elfrid - he speaks too ill of his first play, and evidently thinks too well of the second. (II, 433)

The scene in the amended version is at court in Chester, and Genest notes the alteration that this entails to the central design:

this alteration is vastly for the worse, not merely because the principal events of the play did actually take place at Athelwold's house, but because they cannot with any degree of propriety be supposed to take place elsewhere. (III, 328)

In the new play Hill immediately places Athelwold in the wrong - an entirely new focus which completely changes the successful moral ambivalence of Elfrid - for he had promised to marry Ethelinda. He feebly excuses his actions by saying that he looked on Ethelinda with "Desire" but on Elfrid

with "Love". The moral vision of Athelwold is more conservative than that of the earlier version of the play; marriage partners prove loyal to each other; the sanctity of marriage is held to be more binding than a broken pledge, and proper rites of courtship are held up as admirable.

The third play, George Jeffrey's Edwin (1724)<sup>144</sup> is not very clear. It deals largely with political intrigue, mistaken identities, family guilt, accidents and plottings against the throne. Gomel is like the prime minister figure in the Eastern plays though he is left in the background during most of the action. The chief weakness is that both language and plot are so involved that it is doubtful whether the audience would catch precisely what is happening. The play presents a primitive Britain where all is politically obscure and the author imbues his plot with mystery, the unfolding of which becomes our chief interest.

From a discussion of three plays set in ancient Britain, reminding the nation of its heritage, we turn to two plays set in ancient Ireland. Both Shadwell's Rotherick O'Connor (1722)<sup>145</sup> and William Philip's Hibernia Freed (1722)<sup>146</sup> present a bitter primitive struggle for power. The opposition between the Irish and the Danes in this latter play is the same opposition as that between the Britons and the Romans in some of the plays set in Britain. The Britons and Irish are "right"; that is, they have natural order on their side, and their struggle to assert themselves can be seen as an action of counter-revolutionaries. They are trying to regain their natural possessions of country and regain the original status quo. Thus both Druidic religion and the paganism of the Romans must eventually give way to Christianity, and it is the advent of the latter which conforms the "rights" of the Britons as the "chosen" race.

Rotherick O'Connor is a savage and brutal play. The deaths at the end are not sufficiently justified in dramatic terms, but at the same time we can see that this sort of atrocity is inevitable in such a greedy and martial society. Although Rotherick is utterly evil and tyrannical, Dermond is not to be greatly preferred; he is weak and never becomes a motivated character. The repetitive rape theme is both tedious and distasteful. Shadwell may be trying to make a specific point about England's involvement with Ireland, about the self-interest and self-destructiveness of warring tribes, or about the role of religion, but the point is obscure. The message seems to be entirely negative, for we are left at the end only with the picture of the total disintegration of the two societies. The only point one could infer is that Ireland was (and still is?) incapable of dealing with its own problems, but there is insufficient evidence that this was the author's intention. The play is confused and lacking in unity, and although the idea of the primitivism of the society comes through very strongly, the intention stated in the Prologue seems to be almost ironical:

All Tragedies this Moral shou'd observe,  
The best of Kings does surely best deserve.

William Philips's Hibernia Freed (1722) is intended to evoke the same historical period of Irish history, and the impetus of the work is patriotic and moral as can be seen by the dedication

To the Right Honourable Henry O'Brien, Earl of  
Thomonde.  
When O'Brien is my Hero, the Head of that Illustrious  
Family will vouchsafe to be my Patron.

The play is certainly serious, and its ending, cloyingly patriotic, is an attempt to portray the just rewards of virtue and goodness.

Shirley's The Parricide (1739)<sup>147</sup> is domestic rather than national in its focus and interest. The play's characters are not figures of national importance, nor are they seen to have any direct influence on political change; they are simply residents of ancient Britain who are subjected to a series of most unpleasant events and murders. The villain, Castor, is a kind of primitive epitome of villainy, but the message of the play is that human qualities are the most important feature - kindness and nobility are in the end cosmically triumphant, even though death may come to several good people through villainy.

The only one of these plays which is a relative artistic success is Nicholas Rowe's Royal Convert (1708)<sup>148</sup> for Rowe exhibits a complexity and direction of artistic purpose, plot and theme development which escaped all these other writers. All Rowe's characters are developed as personalities to some extent as they struggle with love, with the arrival of Christianity in a pagan setting, and with the necessity of each person defining his own ideas and motivations separately, as they relate to his own personality. Yet the crucial question of patriotism is thrown up at the end of the play, and this weakens the tragic effect, for Rowe seems to be suggesting that despite the fate of the individuals in the play, the long term effect for Britain is good. Britain will eventually become a country full of promise and security, and the drama depicts the sort of things which will lead to this happy situation. In his use of Christianity as a powerful force for good in the world of ancient Britain, Rowe suggests that there is some Christian pre-ordination at work, at least in his image of Britain as a land specially chosen by God for good things.

During the early part of the eighteenth-century plays set in

Britain were not confined to evoking an atmosphere of primitivism, for another group of plays, set in a later period, corresponds in size to that of plays dealing with the Matter of Ancient Britain. Both Mrs Pix's Queen Catharine, or The Ruines of Love (1698)<sup>149</sup> and the anonymous Courtney Earl of Devonshire[c.1705]<sup>150</sup> show the continuing interest of the dramatists of this period in the old question of the nature of kingship and the place of love in the affairs of royal characters. Similarly, questions of love, allegiance, and self-interest in a court setting are evoked in many other plays of which Rowe's Lady Jane Gray (1715)<sup>151</sup> is perhaps the most successful. In this play the nine-days queen is presented so that she will gain the greatest possible sympathy from the audience, but she is placed in a context of political manoeuvrings which highlight the strength of her personality and her ability to come to terms with her fate. In George Sewell's Sir Walter Raleigh (1719)<sup>152</sup> the title character, one-time favourite of the queen, is the victim of court jealousies and shady practices which set him in general disfavour; Sewell points to Raleigh's personal tragedy by portraying him as a martyr for the cause of truth, aware that he is being used as a tool of those who are out to further their own advancement, and also aware that he can do nothing in face of a large and efficient political machine which distorts truth to its own ends. Genest's comment misses the point about this tightly-knit play. He points to its thirteen performances but misreads a crucial part of the action:

the characters of Sir Walter and Howard are well supported - the other characters have not much to recommend them, and the story is by no means well calculated for the stage - the love Episode between Young Raleigh and Olympia is bad - Raleigh's son was killed in the expedition to Guiana, and it does not appear that he had another son - Olympia stabs herself very foolishly. (II, 650-51)

Historical accuracy is not Sewell's chief concern. He explores the qualities of honesty and constancy in the context of a corrupt court where even majesty cannot intervene to counteract injustice. Raleigh is glorified for the present age by his humanitarian concern, not by his moral prowess. Olympia too is an important figure in the moral drama, for she finally forces the Young Raleigh to awareness; her death can be seen not as a foolish act but as an act of martyrdom and total self-abnegation for the cause of genuine humanity - she dies for love but she also dies to liberate her love from the narrow restriction of the code of honour and faction, to thrust him into his father's world of moral responsibility.

What we have with this group of plays is a new and vigorous concentration upon a central character, a character moreover who is well known to the audience. The facts of the histories that are related are familiar, and in several cases potted histories were printed by the publishers of the plays, so what the audience has to do is concentrate all its attention on the character as a combination of noble qualities. This is perhaps what is most often meant by "sentimentality"; it is not only weeping by the characters and by the members of the audience which constitutes this curious element, but the depiction of virtue in a tangible way, so that the members of the audience can thereby learn virtue, both what it is and how to practise it.

The influence of sentimentality is evident in two very different plays, Savage's Sir Thomas Overbury (1724)<sup>153</sup> and Rowe's Jane Shore (1713).<sup>154</sup>

In Savage's play the audience is forced to be involved in a portrayal of the value of absolute male friendship; the characters themselves do not

see the value of the relationship until tragic events have taken place through trickery and treachery, but when a reconciliation has been achieved the author does his best to make both characters and audience shed their tears. In Jane Shore, one of the few plays of the period which has received some critical acclaim, the heroine is the focal point of the drama, and we are made to feel for her plight, cast on the streets, rejected by all who once held her dear. It is precisely because she still suffers, even though she recognises her fault, that we feel for her, and the author provokes the tears of the audience by showing the forgiveness which her husband offers, even after all he has suffered on her account. Sentimentality seems to involve, especially in cases like this, an utter rejection of the old principle of retribution, and a substitution of the newer human, sympathetic values of forgiveness and harmony.

The Earl of Warwick (1719)<sup>155</sup> relies largely for its effect on recognition and reconciliation; the title character has been away from Britain and returns to try to catch up with his old world again. It is a play of mistaken motives, mistaken identities and court trickery, and is chiefly a working out of the theme of conflict between reason and the passions.

The final group of plays consists of those which are primarily political. There are two versions of the story of King Charles I, Alexander Fyfe's The Royal Martyr, King Charles I (1705)<sup>156</sup> and William Havard's King Charles the First (1737).<sup>157</sup> Both are celebratory, falsifying history in order to present the theme of the divine right of kings and thereby to confirm the rightness of the Restoration of Charles. It would, I think, be difficult to think of a more improbable "royal

martyr" than Charles I, but nevertheless the political significance in an age where Jacobite rebellions were always threatening is clear. If Charles I is a noble and heroic martyr, then there can be no possible grounds for getting rid of Charles II, and the plays attempt to present this theme as hard as they can.

The anonymous Majesty Misled; or, the Overthrow of Evil Ministers (1734)<sup>158</sup> is a very long political play which was prohibited from being presented on stage because it makes "allegorical strictures on Walpole ... so apparent that the play could scarcely have been intended for performance".<sup>159</sup> The scene changes frequently within the acts and the playwright uses some of the techniques of the didactic domestic tragedies in that these short scenes are presented as climaxes in the action; there is little attempt to link one scene directly to the next, and the imagined audience gets an impression of the various episodes in the action in an accumulated way. The whole play is concerned with the influence of the two Spencers, father and son, on the decisions and conduct of the king. At the beginning of the play he ignores the rebellion of the Scots and is ruled by the evil Spencers. At the end he and the Spencers are unable to think of what they can do, and shortly hereafter the elder Spencer is seen on his way to execution, realising that he lived honourably until he breathed the infection of the court air. The ambition of wanting to see his son prime minister of state has brought him now to his destruction. He is the classic over-reacher. Baldoc and the Young Spencer are sent to the gallows and Edward to confinement. In the final scene the king agrees to his dethronement, gives up his seal and points the moral to other kings - to see in these events the cause for overthrow:

Their subjects love be studious to obtain  
 And in their hearts, not in their fav'rites reign. (V [viii], p. 85)

We are not meant to see this as the final dawning of awareness, though.

It is an authorial moral comment concluding a political moral-play. Much of the writing is very good; there is a great deal of action and the device of presenting juxtaposed scenes in different settings is effective. The verse flows easily, and is throughout speedy, despite a few purple passages and set pieces.

Neither of the two remaining plays to be discussed here has much interest. Robert Ashton's The Battle of Aughrim (1728)<sup>160</sup> is a rare battle play set in Ireland. It is technically very conservative and weak in structure. The play's patriotic intention is less forceful than it would have been with more considerable characterisation. The attempt at love interest is unconvincing, and the character caught between the two factions of the English and the Irish is too much like a puppet. Ashton fails to make capital of his hero's awkward position caught between the two sides.

Sewell's sketch for a play set near Jerusalem, Richard the First (1728)<sup>161</sup> tells us little of what might have taken place had the author completed his design. The most interesting feature could have been the clash between the British and the Eastern worlds, but we have only a few disconnected scenes. In taking the king as the central character, though, it again emphasises the concern of many of these dramatists to explore in some detail what went on in the rememberable past of their own country.

Behind all these plays there seems to be an attempt to be constructive in the political sphere, an attempt to analyse the nature of the court and the political manoeuvres therein. This intention often carries

with its strong comment on the contemporary state of affairs, but it is interesting that, no matter what the political viewpoint expressed, some sort of patriotic intention and inculcation comes through.

The final group of plays to be considered concerns those which lead towards and follow from Lillo's The London Merchant (1731) and Fatal Curiosity (1737). All of them deal with moral questions, family situations and the evocation of pity. Only Lillo achieves true dramatic richness, but The Fatal Extravagance (1721 and 1726) has some most interesting features, and Johnson's Caelia (1733) and the hitherto ignored Vanella (1736) show moral concerns being worked out in tragedy by using other dramatic genres. Thus these plays are closely related to the sermon, the novel and even satire, as well as to earlier tragedies.

Several of these dramatists show interest in the nature of modern man - his yearning for domestic harmony, his consciousness of the generation gap and his awareness of the work ethic. Ordinary men begin to take the place of princes in these plays, often referred to as "domestic", "sentimental" or "bourgeois" dramas. Johnson's Caelia portrays prostitutes and their most perilous situation, presenting a "nice girl" confronted by a rakish self-gratifier. Two worlds normally separate in tragedy - the court with an elevated and exaggerated code of conduct, and the streets where girls are corrupted by the lure of money - are juxtaposed. Johnson's achievement is to make the lower class world "real"; there is comedy in the prose scenes, but there is also pathos and, because he gives some genuine humanity to the mistress of the brothel, he is able to make some interesting comments about the worlds of innocence and experience he chooses. The anonymous Vanella also deals with the problem of a young girl in love with

a rake, but it takes place entirely within the court.

One significant feature of many of these plays is their treatment of fate; preoccupation with free-will and predestination runs through several of them. The writers are not concerned with Aristotle but with the state of the human soul, and Lillo especially is concerned to offer the possibility of salvation and redemption to even the greatest of sinners. Eternal life is possible even if life on earth is destroyed. Lillo's plays exhibit a revolutionary spirit in the drama but it does not seem to have been followed up in England to any great extent. His bourgeois mercantilist ethic forms a basis on which other writers can display moral qualities, and social and ethical concerns, in a dramatic form, but nowhere else is offered the same emphasis on philosophical distinctions within a rich and complex dramatic framework.

There is much greater flexibility in this area of dramatic writing than in any of the other plays previously examined. Cooke uses verse, five acts and bourgeois characters for The Mournful Nuptials (1739). Johnson prefers three acts, prose and a mixture of middle and lower class characters for Caelia. Gould uses a traditional basis, foreign setting, five acts and verse for Innocence Distress'd (1737). The characteristic features, however, are sentimental language, domestic situations, and an intense atmosphere (often of gloom) which reflects the heavy social and ethical pressures on the key characters.

Most of the writers employ a British setting which on many occasions allows them to point some direct moral at the audience or make some sort of patriotic plea for a better Britain, but a few still adhere to the tradition of European settings, emphasising pathos and tear-jerking

sentimentality. All attempt to show the audience the pitfalls of human life and to elicit sympathy for those in distress. Perhaps one of the reasons for the failure of this form to develop was that these ideas, together with a rich social pattern, were soon taken over by the novel.

Early in the century an anonymous author produced A Fatal Secret; or, The Rival Brothers (1706)<sup>162</sup> in verse and prose and set in England. The names of the chief characters are not particularly English; Lord Honorius, Alithea, Belinda and Victoria could well be the names of the characters in any play with a Spanish or Italian setting. They are entirely court characters and all the material is upper-middle class. There is some ill-defined attempt to give the play some connexion with contemporary life but all the machinery is traditional with strong use of revenge and friendship motifs. The similarity of the plot to that of The Orphan has been pointed out by Nicoll,<sup>163</sup> but it is significant that the heroine does not die by the traditional dagger or poison; her death heralds the new sentimentality in that she dies simply through the force of her grief.

The early part of the play hinges on marriage and courtship. Both Theodor and Horatio are in love with Victoria, the daughter of Lord Honorius. The latter is half-brother to Alithea, the mother of Victoria's two rivals. Lord Belmont is "A Favourite at Court, coming in the country to propose a marriage between the Lady Alithea and himself, he falls in love with Victoria."<sup>164</sup> The Lord knows he has a rival, but not that he has two, and so he proposes a match between Theodor and Belinda. Belinda in fact loves the other brother, Horatio. Victoria secretly marries Theodor, but by a series of night-time intrigues finds that she has slept with Horatio. On hearing of the marriage Horatio is duly aghast at having defiled his brother's

marriage bed:

Hast thou, Incestuous as thou art, hast thou  
Defil'd thy Brother's Bed! Abus'd thy Friend! (IV i, p. 83)

Thus Victoria is left finding her only consolation in death, and Horatio admits that he was "Blinded both/ With Love and Anger" (IV i, p. 86).

What is good, and unusual, is that at this point neither accuses the other; each accepts his guilt and shame without thought of revenge. Hence we have the sentimentality, and the calamity at the end consists of suicides not murders. The closing scene of the play is moving as Victoria asks her husband not to inquire about the cause of her grief but to think instead

How lamentable is her case, who now  
Seeks Death, to hide her from those dear kind eyes. (V [ii], p. 98)

Significant in terms of the sentimentality is Theodor's attitude to love:

Thou never did'st consent to injure me,  
Then still thou'rt undefil'd, and still untouch'd....  
No, I love you, I love your very self,  
And with a Love, which nothing can diminish. (V [ii], pp. 101-2)

This humane attitude is in marked contrast to most of the other plays where obsession with virginity is such that countless numbers of people are killed through revenge after the seduction or rape of the heroine. Victoria praises him for his generosity of spirit but sinks through shock and grief. A dagger drops from her as she faints with which Theodor kills himself. Like Lillo later the author emphasises the role of fate through Theodor who says "Tis all the work of my fantastick Fortune" (V [ii], p. 100) and the moral is intended to guide the audience to better conduct:

A Secret proves as fatal many times  
Amongst true Friends; For some cannot be just,  
But where there is good reason for distrust. (V [ii], p. 106)

A Fatal Secret certainly breaks new ground but it is crude. The language

is rarely convincing; the lines are choppy and frequently self-conscious. Lord Belmont's love for Victoria is rather absurd and this part of the play is poor. What is significant, though, is that our attention is turned from rape and intrigue to domestic and friendship themes, the depiction of virtue, and to a final mood of grief and repentance.

The next significant move towards bourgeois drama comes in 1721 with Mitchell or Hill's The Fatal Extravagance,<sup>165</sup> a play in one<sup>166</sup> act later extended to five in 1726. The Preface makes clear that a Christian ethos is very important, and the author urges that the pulpit has not yet taken over the work of tragedy:

In countries, where Christianity is received and established, some may, possibly, imagine, there is, now, no longer need of the assistance of Tragedy: but experience convinces us, that many frequent the Stage, who would hardly be prevailed upon, to receive counsel from the Pulpit. The Clergy, therefore, should consider, as auxiliaries and fellow-labourers, those Poets, who preach virtue, from the Press, or the Theatre.

The writer is concerned to clear himself from ecclesiastical attack, and continues:

But some, who are moderate, because more wise, than those I have had to do with, confess the Stage capable of being made useful, yet condemn it, on account of the abuses it indulges. Would they destroy the being of an art, because its use is corrupted? They argue, like these zealous indeed, but weak reformers, who were for demolishing churches, that they might be sure to leave no images. According to these men's way of reasoning, every thing, that is not perfect, is dangerous and abominable; for there is nothing so excellent, where abuses may not enter.

He appeals not only to good Christians who, he hopes, will accept and welcome the play, but to "good critics" who will not censure it "notwithstanding the uncommon manner, in which I have attempted it." He also

strongly argues the case for relevant and moral tragedy:

Every thing, in a Tragedy which has not a direct, and visible, tendency to the moral it is writ for, is superfluous, and monstrous; and however pompously embellished, serves for nothing, but to weaken the instruction, and distract the attention, and apprehension, of the audience.<sup>167</sup>

The drama is didactic and the author shows a sharp preference for the necessity of content being more important than form. The plot of The Fatal Extravagance is simple, attention being directed to the results of riotous living and the various Christian virtues subsequently brought into play. The audience is prodded into sympathy all the time. There are only four characters in the 1721 version and this allows the audience to concentrate on the moral and ethical issues.

The play opens in Bellmour's house where his wife, Louisa, is speaking to a friend, Courtney. Louisa indicates that her husband's recent conduct has shown him changed:

Misfortunes have instructed him to think,  
And thought has captur'd every madding passion. (p. 295)

She has already posed one of the crucial issues, the conflict between passion (which motivated Bellmour's riotous living) and reason (defined in an explicitly religious way).

Bellmour sees his financial collapse as social disgrace, and this leads him to deep depression, but Courtney praises him for his former generosity, and the author further obtains sympathy by the mention of children:

Bellmour could ne'er behold a stranger wretched,  
But he partook his pain, 'till he could ease it.  
How, then, will he support the weeping anguish,  
Of three poor children, all undone by him? (p. 296)

Courtney, like Lillo's idealistic Thorowgood<sup>168</sup> later, is particularly prone to moral sententiae, with the result that he becomes a little tiresome; this is one of the primary difficulties in drama of this sort. To portray good involves the pitfall of creating an impossibly inhuman sort of paragon. Courtney's remarks on modes of life is thus morally edifying while dramatically weak:

Men must be rigid, and severe, in virtue!  
 Serious and noble aims distinguish reason.  
 To live for taste is not to live at all, ...  
 The man of pleasure dreams away his days. (pp. 296-7)

Similarly overdone are Louisa's melodramatic responses as she anticipates ruin:

Soon Ruin, with his palsied hand, will seize  
 This ancient pile, and shake it into dust!  
 Not thrice the worth of all, that now is ours,  
 Will save poor Woodly from the fatal bond,  
 He sign'd, to serve my Bellmour. (p. 297)

Bellmour's entry intensifies the sentimentality; he is thinking of the children, innocent victims of the debauchery of a corrupt and essentially adult world, and he wonders which of his three boys

Some few years hence, when I am dissolv'd in death,  
 Will act the begger best! run barefoot, fastest!  
 And with most dextrous shrugg, play tricks for charity! (p. 298)

Bellmour praises Louisa for not having deserted him but his concern with public shame returns. Motification is doubled when it is seen by others; the same happens to Maria at the end of The London Merchant, for she says her shame is complete when she realises that others will point her out as an example.<sup>169</sup>

The effects of debauchery are wide. Woodly, the creditor, is taken off to prison for failing to make good Bellmour's debts and his wife is left weeping. Her husband was

Hem'd by a swarthy guard of licenc'd villains,  
 The law's grim blood-hounds. With rapacious talons  
 They dragg'd him on, in merciless serenity. (p. 301)

Even the paragon Courtney is led to suggest that Bellmour should evade the forces of law altogether by escaping through the grove. By refusing to do this Bellmour exhibits moral courage, but his speech ends with a more conventional call for vengeance.

The author intensifies our sympathy for Bellmour by going on to reveal that the very financial premises for his downfall are shaky.

Bellmour recites his wrongs:

Think how this bond,  
 Was fraudulently and, by shameful arts,  
 Won from my clouded reason! when the fumes,  
 Of madding wine had warm'd my yielding fancy  
 Fit for a knave's impression! - Hast thou humanity?  
 And dost not feel a ruin thou hast caused? (p. 305)

What the author seems to be presenting is a traditional Protestant position - that money-lending is an act of recklessness, an operation singularly prone to lead to disaster, and closely linked to corruption and downfall. Though Bargrave is vindictive he must be seen to be legally in the right while at the same time emotionally in the wrong.

At this point the play loses much of its moral complexity as Bellmour has another fit of passion and kills Bargrave, stealing the bond from his pocket. Louisa dreams of a pastoral retreat "in some poor cottage" (p. 307), and Bellmour declares his fate:

Fix'd as my Fate, I stand, unmov'd, to expect it.  
 I'll stir not hence, by Heav'n. (p. 307)

Bellmour prepares to poison the family and the sentimentality becomes mawkish as Louisa announces that the family is ready:

Your little wanderers are ready dress'd  
To act the pilgrim with us. (p. 313)

Louisa suddenly realises that the children are not spiritually prepared for death, and she uses the chance for a little instruction. She rushes off to see them and Bellmour stabs himself. Courtney then rushes in to reveal that Bellmour has been over hasty because he has been rescued; Courtney exchanged the poison for some safe liquid, and announces that a kinsman of Woodly died on his return from the east and left Bellmour all his wealth.

The dénouement is unlikely and unconvincing. The power of the form, though, depends not upon realism but on its fundamental situational ethic. A series of moral points is made, each almost independent of its context. Different moral points are made at different stages of the piece, and the author is not concerned to present a thoroughly coherent moral pattern in a thoroughly coherent story. The final moral of the play emphasises only the evil of society, rather than the saving faith which Louisa voices in the play, and it reflects the interest of contemporary preachers who unleashed all their rhetorical powers on the iniquities of society, saving the promise of salvation for believers until the very end of their sermons:

From this sad story let observers know,  
That early riot ends in lasting woe.  
Mean, and ignoble, pleasures break the mind,  
Un-nerve our judgement, and our reason blind,  
'Till Heav'n o'ertakes us, with some direful fate,  
And the touch'd soul grows sensible, too late. (p. 317)

Woodly's kinsman is the most interesting feature of the play, uniting the Protestant ethic and divine intervention; he is an unknown figure who in effect has the potential of the merchant-saviour.

The enlargement of The Fatal Extravagance in 1726<sup>170</sup> makes several significant changes to the moral pattern. Bargrave is so blackened that

he has no virtue; his murder is premeditated by Bellmour; there is a proto-sexual intrigue between Bargrave and Bellmour's sister, Belinda; the friendship theme is emphasised with the introduction of Woodly, and the children appear on stage in order to heighten the pathos.

Bargrave is seen to be unscrupulous in the sexual as well as the financial sphere; he disapproves of marriage and wants only to possess Belinda:

Belinda: Thy Soul is all Infection.

Bargrave: 'Tis no matter -

My Body's sound, and that's enough for you. (III vi, p. 57)

He divorces desire from morality and soul from body. A reasonable proposal to him is one which conforms to his interest, and so he is seen to be unable to discriminate between essential oppositions. Bargrave becomes emblematic of evil and Bellmour becomes a trapped man. The premeditated murder is hard to justify morally, although it is understandable in the context of Bargrave's behaviour, so the author seems to have moved away from the strictly didactic purposes he set forward in the 1721 Preface. Attention is shifted to the sexual dilemma of Belinda and the reactions of the others, from the original theme of the results of debauchery. Caught up in a web of events not instigated by him, Bellmour's wish for a pastoral retreat carries much more weight. He laments at the beginning of Act III that he married to beget a race of beggars:

Bear me, some Tempest, to a desert land,  
Where Print of human Feet was never found;  
There let me range with Birds and Beasts of Prey,  
Thro' gloomy Caves, and Rocks, o'ergrown with Moss.  
There let me groan and weep my Horrors out,  
Grow wild and savage, as my fellow Brutes. (III i, p. 51)

Though the idea is utterly conventional its use here is appropriate as

bourgeois man, trapped in the world of bonds, creditors and sexual threats to his family with which he cannot adequately contend, wishes to be freed to the world of elemental Nature. It is the sort of vision which is realistic as well as idealistic, for the land is "desart"; there is no material comfort to be found there: an appealing alternative to capitalist society.

One of the immediate results of Lillo's The London Merchant was Charles Johnson's Caelia (1733),<sup>171</sup> a moral play which relies partly on the tradition of sentimental comedy. Indeed, the most effective scenes are those which are almost wholly comic in character.

Caelia, a naive and virtuous maid, has been raped by Wronglove, an archetypal rake who has no intention of marrying her, and who places her in a bawdy house under the direction of Mrs Lupine, which the villain pretends is a nursing home for unmarried pregnant women. Caelia is totally out of place in the company of the prostitutes who tease her mercilessly, though Mrs Lupine is given some traits of human sympathy as she does her best to be friendly to the girl. The climax of the story comes when the brothel is raided by the law, and the inhabitants sent to a House of Correction, Caelia included. The keeper's wife takes pity on Caelia because she is "not known to be a Practiser" (V [ii], p. 53), and she allows Caelia's father, Lovemore, to visit her. Meanwhile Wronglove is killed in a duel by the honourable and upright Bellmour, and just before he dies he repents and leaves his entire estate to Caelia. The heroine, though, dies through grief, and Meanwell closes the play with a moral which condemns libertinism and focuses attention on the grief of the father.

The play divides roughly into halves, the first comic and the second

pathetic, but the reaction of the audience sheds useful light on the assumptions of theatre-goers. Johnson says in the Preface:

I had the mortification to see this Play acted the First Night, and to hear the Characters of Mother Lupine and her Women disapprov'd by several of the Audience, who, as if they thought themselves in bad company, were very severe....

I had the Pleasure, however, to see some of those very Spectators, who were offended at the lower Characters, join with Caelia in her Tears.

There is a sort of double moral standard operating in the assumptions of the audience, for while they are delighted by representations of licentiousness in comedies, they anticipate moral edification in a tragedy. The mixing of genres in the drama of the period was clearly unacceptable. If tragedy (with one set of moral preconceptions) is mixed with comedy (with an entirely opposed set of criteria in the mind of the audience), then confusion of which set to adopt is bound to occur, and the spectators feel they are left with no preconceived, separate and external moral standards to apply.

The main problem with this play is that it is hard to believe that Caelia could have knowingly become associated with Wronglove. Had she been utterly naive the plot might have been pathetic but valid. However, Bellamy attributes both sense and awareness to her, and this makes much of her thought and behaviour unlikely. Johnson strives too hard to achieve a sentimental effect. Caelia's mother dies through grief, her father is said to be failing in strength because of the strain, and Meanwell makes clear that he thinks these to be natural and appropriate responses. We are led therefore to assume that this sort of moral tragedy is built upon colossally hyperbolic assumptions about human life and society. Indeed, everything about the play is exaggerated; moderation is throughout ignored for the sake

of pathetic effect. Wronglove advises Mother Lupine to train Caelia as a prostitute quickly; a duel ensues; the law punishes innocent and guilty alike; deaths follow, and the only part of the play which is successful in evoking a satisfactory response is the section devoted to revealing Wronglove as a reckless libertine.

The argument between Bellamy and Wronglove does have some merit. Set in a public place, it is in the context of contemporary London which brings home the immediate social relevance. A moral question is resolved by these men as they quarrel and "People in the Walks interpose, and part them" (stage dir., IV [iii], p. 50). Here the real world impinges on what might otherwise be seen as an isolated moral exemplum.

For the final scenes Johnson follows Lillo's precedent in choosing a prison setting. There moral questions can be isolated and examined, and the atmosphere can be of reflection and evaluation rather than action. But the author fails to make any significant religious comment, although the diction concerns Christian moral ideals:

Caelia: Sure, never was a Father's Heart so full of sweet  
Indulgence, Love and Mercy.

Lovemore: Mercy is Heaven's peculiar Attribute; 'tis the  
soft Manna that descends and nourishes, and keeps us from  
Despair and Death. (V [ii], p. 56)

Caelia is more effective as a didactic piece than The London Merchant. What we are to think is quite clear; Wronglove has been punished for his violation by the revenge of a friend; Caelia dies as a result of grief after transgression, and havoc descends on family and friends alike. But it is all too straight-forward to achieve dramatic impetus. As a play (as opposed to a medium of instruction) Caelia is unsatisfactory; no attempt is made to portray the downfall. Everything is concentrated on the effect

of action and so the only judgements that can be made are that Caelia is "right" and Wronglove "wrong". Even the emblematic names suggest that motives can be judged after a glance at the dramatis personae.

Moral conduct and the world of comedy are also the keystones of the anonymous Vanella (1736)<sup>172</sup> which reads like a sketch for a play rather than a finished work. There are several scenes in three acts, some related by a tenuous intrigue plot, and others which do not seem to be related closely to each other at all. The Prince of Utopia, Adonis, has left Vanella, "a young Lady of Quality" (dramatis personae) for Miss Anodyne, but at the opening of the play is preparing to transfer his allegiance to Lady Myrtle. Lord Myrtle quarrels with his wife but eventually (after some amorous intrigue) decides to patch up his differences with her. Then, inexplicably, we turn to the final scene where Vanella is dying, having heard of Adonis's marriage. There seems to be a huge gap before this scene, so either the author becomes bored with the play, or never had any intention of seeing a fairly complicated plot through.

The latter suggestion is the more likely. Charles B. Woods asserts convincingly that a contemporary comedy, The Modish Couple (1732), is a satiro-political allegory of the court scandal in which the Prince of Wales cast off his mistress, Miss Vane, just before his marriage with the Princess of Saxe-Gotha.<sup>173</sup> Modish is a depiction of Charles Bodens, "doubtless a procurer of efficiency for Frederick before his marriage"<sup>174</sup> and this is why Modish is concerned lest the prince (Frederick-Adonis) should not require his services further, should the prince grow sick of love affairs.<sup>175</sup> Woods further shows that this material was also used in a ballad opera, The Honours of the Court; or, Modern Gallantry (1732), where the names Vanessa

(very close to *Vanella*), *Adonis* and *Modish* are used. Loftis<sup>176</sup> also notes the correspondence between the two comedies, but a footnote of Woods is the only critical mention of *Vanella*. The play is a dramatic failure, but its intention in universalising the moral problems of the scandal could have been well used had the tragic form been more consistent.

In *The Epistle Dedicatory* the author bids Miss Anodyne arm herself against the possibility of separation:

You have Youth and Beauty on your Side, and tho' you have  
Sacrific'd your Virginity, yet may you find many gentlemen  
who will gladly wed you, some for Interest, and others  
for Love, and make you ever Happy.

At the end of the play, however, the author reverts to a conventional statement, saying that young Ladies of Quality die when forsaken and death is better than neglect. These two statements are contradictory, but it can be seen that the author's intention is more interesting than his execution. The moral message of the whole play is pragmatic rather than absolute. The author is inept at uniting the moral and the topical, though, for Miss Anodyne is presented as a society lady with all the accoutrements of vanity. At times, then, we move away from the world of tragedy, or the world of morals, and become immersed in allegorical satire. The effect is therefore very confused.

Miss Anodyne says that she could not guard against *Adonis* if the "loving fit" (II ii, p. 27) was upon her at any particular time. Then we move to a passage strongly reminiscent of sentimental comedy:

But come, Lucy, it is Time to dress, it will not be above  
two Hours before I shall see him, if he designs to come to  
Day. (II ii, p. 28)

Her companion Lucy gives the servant view of the events:

you would make but a scurvy Figure, to go home to your

old Father, with a crack'd Pipkin, a great Belly, and no  
Settlement to set you above the Pity of your Country  
Neighbours. (II ii, p. 26)

The clash of the two worlds of comedy and pathetic tragedy could have been most effective, but it is presented in an unsubtle way, and the tragic form is too weak.

Perhaps we are meant to draw something of a contrast between Miss Anodyne and Vanella, for while the former is concerned about appearances and her impression upon society, Fidelia says of Vanella:

But you was made for a poor tame household Dove, without  
Gall; and would have done very well to have been a  
Shepherdess, in those Times, when every Swain was  
faithfull to his Nymph, and Love triumphant reign'd  
throughout the Plains. (I ii, p. 15)

This may be censorious; Vanella should not pretend to belong to a different world. Her grief and death come because she is not able to adapt to the non-ideal world. If this is what the author is trying to say it contrasts with the Christian emphasis of some of the moral plays. Furthermore, the failure of the author to relate the Vanella thread of the story to the rest of the play may be an attempt to note her alienation from the "real" world of practical concerns, to which even princes seem to be tied.

The author examines the whole question of sexual behaviour in a permissive society. He treats it with interest, and objectivity, and it is this distancing which prevents the play from being at all bourgeois, for his primary concern is not to condemn libertinism but to examine it. Vanella is the only explicitly moral tragedy of the period which presents a tragic situation in a contemporary court environment. Had the execution of the design been in any way skilful we could say that it was an attempt, morally at least, to introduce philosophical pragmatism into the serious drama of the period.

In Fatal Falsehood (1734)<sup>177</sup> John Hewitt looks back to The Fatal Extravagance for his inspiration. The play focuses on bonds of friendship and love. One of its chief statements is that the utter supremacy of reason over passion in marriage can be catastrophic. It focuses on jealousy, love and the suggestion that the main character is bigamous. Hewitt extracts as many tears as possible through the course of the play but Maria's fate is that of so many love-forsaken heroines in the more traditional "blood and thunder plays"; she goes mad, speaks of winds, seas, light, breezes and clouds of fire, and begs Bellardine to take her to the grave with him.

Though we have a complaint at the end of the play against fate's conduct and orderings, there is little sign of the accompanying Christianity we might expect. An early suggestion that the characters are operating outside a Christian framework seems to be confirmed at the end. Bellardine previously exclaimed against fate, but it was rather as an external focus at which to direct his complaint than the effect of belief in Calvinist determinism:

for 'tis in vain to think of Bliss,  
 Since Fate inevitable, tears me from Thee,  
 And fondness only aggravates my Loss. (III iv, p. 39)

Though domestic and sentimental, and though moral in the sense that it is dealing with moral questions, the play is social in a wider sense than is usual in plays of this genre. The viewpoint is not didactic (in that its teaching seems to be, to say the least, shaky) but exploratory. Hence the power of love and its associated pitfalls is explored, though there is no model conduct suggested for the audience.

Hewitt is ultimately glued to the amoral vision of the Eastern plays; he does not break away from blank verse, pretends to have characters taken

from the gentry in Bristol, and refuses to delineate precisely who his characters are; thus they remain ill-defined types and, unlike Lillo's characters, never come to life. Genest seems to have felt the same way when he stated:

it is a poor piece - it would have been better if the author had written it in prose. (op. cit., III, 413)

We have seen how many of these plays are extremely unsubtle. The two most formalised and abstracted pieces of the period are The Faithful Pair and Honesty in Distress. John Maxwell's The Faithful Pair; or, Virtue in Distress (1740)<sup>178</sup> is a brief three act play of very little dramatic value which exemplifies virtue in a very abstract way. The play reads more like extracts from a sermon than a theatrical piece, and throughout are extended psuedo-philosophical speeches proclaiming the attributes of virtue. Virtue, however, is accidentally made less credible by being personified in Olinda. Her sheltered life is described at the beginning of the play; she was bred in solitude and seems to be divorced from practical concerns:

Books and Religion took up all my Time,  
Except where Nature prompted to unbend,  
And in some rural Scene refresh this Frailty. (I i, p. 5)

The friendship theme, an essential ingredient of sentimental drama, is outlined frequently by the two women, Delia and Olinda, as they repetitively joy in the pleasures of each other's company. The two women visit Archon in prison, and he edifies them with a long and solemn speech in praise of hope and

each Part of  
This Creation! How various are its Beauties! And  
What do some with Innocence enjoy, even in this  
Fall'n state! Then how much greater had not Man  
Transgress'd? Then can we think than in Variety, Heav'n  
Will be barren? No: The Difference is so wide,  
It will not bear Comparison; let this suffice

To make us persevere. (I [ii], p. 11)

Such philosophic ramblings in verse which might equally well be prose are a striking feature of the play.

The Faithful Pair is stilted, undramatic and pietistic, but it is all the more remarkable for a statement "By the Author" at its close which extols the world of pastoral nature - the grove, fruit, streams and flowers - which includes a chapel, a holy man and several righteous neighbours. Then follows an injunction to consider the poor as the favourites of heaven who, retired from the world, are the best examples of true virtue. Hewitt says that the solitary man inherits the rewards of the "Sacred Name" and, by sharing his experience with a

gen'rous Friend, doth add a Lustre to  
The mighty Bliss. (p. 38)

Out of this grows the suggestion that the Almighty should limit the days of all men to exactly the same length so that all could sink to the grave equal. Thus Hewitt is not content simply to personify virtue; he also presents his vision of a post-lapsarian world which most nearly approaches the unfallen state - with all the adjuncts of hermits, holy men, and a pastoral retreat in nature. So undramatic is the play that it is no surprise that we have no evidence of its ever having been acted.

This example of drama as sermon reminds us of a similar aberration of an earlier decade, Edward Ward's Honesty in Distress but Reliev'd by No Party (1705).<sup>179</sup> The title page states that the play is "A Tragedy ... Acted by Her Majesty's Servants upon God's Stage the World" and the stage metaphor is continued from time to time during the course of the play. The prologue is spoken by a miser "going to receive Money (suppos'd at the Play-

House)"<sup>180</sup> who cannot hear or see Dame Honesty in the boxes or in the gallery or pit, or even among the men of wit. The two chief themes of Christianity and the opposition between honesty and interest are then outlined:

For in this Iron-Age we daily see  
That knav'ry gets the start of Honesty;...  
For he that in our Christian City thrives,  
Must run, when Int'rest that dear Devil drives.

The play is really a moral essay<sup>181</sup> in rhyming couplets as Honesty comes

From Anch'rites lonely Caves, from Hermites Cells,  
And rural Huts, where sweet Contentment dwells:  
From consecrated Groves and Heav'nly Meads,  
Where no vile Wretch, or lustful Harlot treads. (I i, p. 1)

She visits the rich and great, lawyers, and anyone she can find as she ranges through the city like a medieval Mystery play figure, but nowhere can she find any help or comfort, even from the

Good pious Christians, who are hither come  
From all the Trading parts of Christendom. (III i, p. 22)

Most of the people she meets are simply satirical butts. Finally Honesty can only exclaim against the wicked age and point the moral:

Poor Indians, whom the Christian World deride,  
That follow Nature as their only Guide  
Untaught by Scriptures, unimprov'd by Schools,  
But from dim Reason draw their doubtful Rules (III i, p. 24)

are morally far superior to the English. There is no development of character in the play, and its close relationship to the sermon is emphasised in the long Preface where the author traces the usefulness of instruction in plays and discusses the immorality of the contemporary theatre. The device of presenting the message in play form is thus seen to be ironic.

The last play to be discussed here is also the best of Lillo's successors. Thomas Cooke's The Mournful Nuptials; or, Love the Cure of All Woes (1739)<sup>182</sup> is based on questions of class and marriage and is a socio-

moral rather than an ethical-moral story. It also follows Lillo's precedent of a bourgeois basis. Cooke says in the Preface (p. xv):

I took the hint from an old legal story; whether the case is in any book of reports I can not positively say: the characters, as related in the story, are in very low life; and persons of such condition have seldom qualitys or virtues sufficient to interest an audience in their favour; I therefore lifted some of the characters a little higher than they are described in the story, and supplied by invention what was wanted in fact to render it a fit fable for a play.

A love story is told in the first three acts. Our interest is in the way prejudice is broken down so that forgiveness of ill manners can lead to what seems to be a happy conclusion. Freeman and Briar, neighbouring farmers, have had a long feud relating to a "trespass". Freeman married above himself and his wife is still a snob, particularly showing herself to be so when she is confronted by the rustic simplicity of Briar. The offspring of the farmers, Young Freeman and Charlotte Briar, fall in love and their marriage is all set to proceed when Mrs Freeman insults the Briars. Through the intervention of Mrs Briar who, in a spirit of opportunism, sees a way of ending their financial worries, Briar forgives the insult and all is about to end happily at the end of Act III. Then Cooke unexpectedly introduces a new character in Act IV who says that Briar is dead and Freeman the accused murderer. Mrs Briar dies from grief (a now familiar sentimental element) and calamity is expected even though Weldon hints that all will be well in the end.

The final extraordinary scene takes place in court. The long reports and recapitulations gradually dissipate the tragic intensity which has been laboriously built up, and Weldon returns a verdict of "not guilty". The surprised judge agrees to befriend Briar's cause, but Weldon says he killed

Briar in self-defence after a quarrel about an unpaid account. He relates how then Freeman arrived on the scene and, horrified, picked up the wrong staff. One moment of poignancy is dramatically achieved when Freeman describes how

Gay and joyful as the sun I went  
To ask th'unhappy man, that's dead, to come  
To my son's wedding feast. (V iii, p. 69)

The two halves of the story are not sufficiently integrated, and the judge's moral seems out of keeping with the play as a whole. He warns that judges

Shou'd not too rashly pass the dreadful sentence  
On the accused from circumstances only:  
Better that twenty shou'd escape the laws  
Than one shou'd suffer in a wrongful cause. (V iii, p. 70)

The play mixes low key verse with prose. From time to time the prose comes very near to passing for normal speech and the verse is only somewhat more formalised.

The love story is very well presented. Young Freeman opens the play by pointing to the pastoral significance of their setting and names:

Why, Charlotte, hangs this melcholly [sic.] on thy brow?  
Why droops my love? Why droops my ev'ry flow'r  
Compris'd in one? (I i, p. 19)

His father is generous minded, and Briar is throughout presented as an organic part of the natural country world. Briar is seen to possess intrinsically good characteristics. He tells his daughter that

The bitter indignation that I bear  
To Freeman is not level'd at his son:  
I will love him, my girl, for loving you. (II i, p. 27)

Mrs Freeman is rather like a caricature of a snob but she achieves dramatic tension by being so forthright. Briar reacts strongly to her in a way we can applaud morally as well as dramatically:

Waste not a tear, my child. --- Woman, be gone;

Civility to thee wou'd be a crime. (II ii, p. 29)

In a very well written scene Cooke goes on to present Mrs Briar breaking away from her customary role of wifely obedience to speak her mind to her husband:

With the submission of an humble wife, I do intreat my husband to recollect the vows he pay'd to me. Had I when of our daughter's age, been torne from you, I shou'd not now, so well I know my heart, have liv'd to intercede for her to you.

Briar: The woman's always contradicting me. Do'st thou imagine that thou lov'st the girl better than I do? (II iv, p. 31)

This rich interchange illuminates the class question of the relative status of husband and wife. It is also dramatically moving, for we feel for Mrs Briar's humility and integrity, and lament that she is dominated by her rough hewn husband when he is so angry that his passions completely take over from his reason.

Love in the play conquers adversity convincingly, but when the "tragic" phase of the play begins the dramatic form loses its tightness. Act IV is very late to introduce a character so important as Weldon, particularly as he acts as a rather shady deus ex machina. The friendship theme, introduced between Young Freeman and Weldon, does little to allay a feeling of foreboding. The trouble with the disclosure of Briar's murder is that Weldon keeps all his information to himself. For a man to impersonate Fate in this way takes away all the realism which was exhibited early in the play. Mrs Briar's death, too, is unsatisfactory, and is hyperbolic in the same way as deaths from grief in earlier plays of this type.

Cooke is much less able to present the domestic situation in adversity than he is to present marital problems. Searching for the tearful he is often tempted to go too far. He has already extracted many

tears and exclamations from Charlotte and the audience and when news comes of her mother's death there is nothing left for her to do or say; she can only faint.

Weakness of plot development is thus the chief weakness of The Mournful Nuptials. The focus wavers, and at the end we do not know where our chief interest lies - whether with the judge, the love of the young couple or with Freeman's safety. Much of the play is good, but its unevenness prevents its being compared to Lillo's plays to its own advantage.

It is clear by this stage in the century that Lillo's experiments were not to be the heralds of a new awakening of a vital form of tragedy in Britain, and this is confirmed by the fact that the sentimental elements of his plays were taken over by the more conventional tragedies while the complex moral and social examinations were discarded. The four last plays for description here emphasise this point. All of them have an atmosphere of heightened sympathies, but they are all set in the higher echelons of society, and all contain elements of the revenge play. Their authors are in fact making more respectable the least surprising elements of Lillo's plays. Nevertheless, although it is apparent throughout the period that by far the greatest majority of dramatists were amazingly conservative, it is surprising that so few writers tried to emulate Lillo's plays as far as their commercial appeal was concerned. His two most famous plays were astonishingly popular, and one would have thought that this would have produced a spate of imitations, but instead writers went back to the old safe, unexciting, patterns. Indeed Lillo himself, having proved that he could write both popular and complex tragedies, went back to conventional patterns. These four last plays, then, are tearful, sentimental and designed

to elicit sympathy for their characters, but their interest is neither moral nor social. They aim for pity, but discard the attempt to draw relevant parallels to the lives of the audience.

Wandesford's Fatal Love (1730)<sup>183</sup> points in the Prologue to the fact that although the scene is set in "proud Iberia", the events could equally well have taken place in Britain:

With Scenes as natural as they're just and true.  
 In private Life, his Characters appear;  
 The Plot, tho' Foreign, might have happen'd here.  
 From these Examples all Degrees may learn,  
 And Wits true Morality discern:..  
 The Force of Malice, Love and Virtue sings.

This is misleading, however, for the play is largely traditional, although there are certain elements which belong to the plays of heightened sympathies; there is a strong treatment of a sentimental friendship between Cleone and Julia:

As Fire and Water are of common Use,  
 And in their kind essential for Support;  
 So is a Friend, just such a Friend as you;  
 The Joys of Life are heighten'd by a Friend,  
 The Woes of Life are lessen'd by a Friend;  
 In all the Cares of Life, we by a Friend  
 Assistance find - who'd be without a Friend? (III i, p. 30)

Similarly, the old conflict between reason and passion is made clear by Cleone's insistence that

Love by Nature of itself is free,  
 And, let me tell you, will not be compell'd. (III i, p. 31)

While the young people are free in their thoughts about love, their parents' feelings of power and authority are unswayed by the young people's arguments. The most interesting feature of the play is the villain, Pedro, because he raises the question of the extent to which fate governs his actions. In

fact he seems very like an Elizabethan character from time to time:

I'm all a Hell within, yet can't repent,  
 And what is worse, must still in Guilt go on;  
 For tho' I wou'd repent me of my crimes,  
 I know not how nor where I shou'd begin:  
 This is my State, and yet I must proceed,  
 Till I have run in Evil my full Course. (II i, p. 19)

Wandesford remains content to present a character with the same sort of evil as Claudius in Hamlet; he would like to repent but feels he cannot. He does not make the question immediately relevant to his audience by discussing ethics and motivations in a Christian context, as Lillo did. The traditional elements with which we are now familiar are all present; the pastoral retreat, a feeling of repressed and frustrated sexuality, deaths, a heroine who goes mad, images of fire and freezing, intrigue and rivalry for love, are all integral parts of the play. In this case the traditional desire for the pastoral retreat is made more sentimental than in most other instances. Wandesford adds another layer to the emotional response of the audience by incorporating the whole gamut of "poetic diction" in order to make the scene more sentimental. Rinaldo suggests that he and Cleone should:

there seek out some rural sweet Retreat  
 Beneath the Shelter of a Sylvan Shade,  
 That neighbouring to it has a murm'ring Brook  
 Gilding its Silver Currents gently on,  
 So clear, that at all times may be discern'd  
 The shining Gravel and the pearly Shells:  
 The finny Fry, as numberless as the Sands,  
 Cutting in sportive Play the limpid Stream....  
 Wou'd make us blest as the first happy Pair. (I ii, pp. 11-12)

This vision of Eden does not usually include the emphasis on "pearly Shells" and "sportive ... finny Fry".

The moral actually follows from the conduct and action of the play,

and is social in its implication, and this, too, ties it to the realm of didactic and sentimental tragedy:

Parents take warning by these mighty Ills,  
Force not your Children's Hands against their Wills.  
From Pedro's Fate let all Example take,  
How they unjustly wou'd a Fortune make;  
For Shame and Horror ever will attend  
Base and unworthy Actions in the End. (V iv, p. 70)

The Prologue to Injur'd Innocence (1732), attributed to Fettiplace Bellers,<sup>184</sup> makes clear that the author recognises that drama is in a state of decline in England at this time:

But in each clime the drama has its date,  
Its youth, its manhood, and decaying state

and the play is a good example of this, for while it embodies certain of the elements of the sentimental drama, it is not able to draw away very markedly from the old-fashioned type of play with its dependence upon court intrigues, misunderstandings, deaths and villains. The setting of the play is in Naples, and the author appends this note to his list of Dramatis Personae: "The TALE, a Fiction"; he is to have nothing to do with any vogue for newspaper reports.

Robert Gould's Innocence Distress'd, or, the Royal Penitents (1737)<sup>185</sup> is similarly based on a previous tradition of intrigue, deceit and mistaken identity. There are some poignant meetings between lovers, and Gould is skilful in keeping the play restrained; though sentimental, the meetings of the lovers never become mawkish. Most interesting is the ending, where Seraphina becomes the wronged penitent, pleading for mercy, the Christian heroine who is victorious and untainted by any of the moral evil with which she comes into contact. The misunderstanding is finally exposed, and the Duchess's secrecy is to blame that

This wretched, wretched Daughter!  
 She had by her own Son, this very Night  
 Was marry'd wedded, bedded, to her own Father! (V i, p. 57)

But, incest apart, the play works towards a Christian vision at its close.

Adorissa bids the Duke prepare himself for Heaven; she says that incest cannot trouble their peace in heaven, and they kneel together to the powers which have involved them "in these Mists of Fate" (V i, p. 62). While the Dutchess is dying, distracted, Seraphina pleads with her to

Try, try Repentance, Madam, call for Mercy (V i, p. 64)

but in her madness she sees others mounting to heaven and herself descending to hell as she dies. Berino realises that he wronged Seraphina:

From the first op'ning of this horrid Story,  
 I saw thy Innocence, and will reward it  
 With Truth and Love, and more than now I'll mention. (V i, p. 65)

So, although very strongly linked to an old-fashioned tradition, the play has seeds of Christianity and sentimentality, which tie it to the didactic realm. The prolonged Masque at the beginning of the second act (ostensibly to welcome the Duke home after eighteen years away) suggests the eventual triumph of Loyalty over Interest and Schism, and the eventual supremacy of Peace and Truth; this is what the poet is trying to substantiate in the play itself. The trite moral warns against evil, but the characters in the play indicate their faith in God's mercy and forgiveness. Hannah Gould indicates in the Epistle Dedicatory that

the following Tragedy was, no doubt, design'd by my  
 Father for the Stage, yet as it is now publish'd  
 after a different Manner, having never been acted.

Although Quin said The Fatal Retirement<sup>186</sup> attributed to Anthony Brown (1739) was "the very worst Play he had read in his Life",<sup>187</sup> an edict

sufficient to damn it at its only performance. There seem to have been private reasons for this, as in the 1739 edition a note is appended to the effect that the author was very disgruntled that Quin promised to study the part and then later went back on his word.<sup>188</sup> The play is by no means as bad as Quin suggested; though it consists of "Scenes of Private Woe" (Epilogue), it is basically a revenge play which keeps closely to the Unities. There is very little business on stage, and the story could quite easily have taken place in two and a half hours. The cast is small - only eight characters - and the verse moves swiftly throughout. Revenge and hate themes take over in the last act, and although Lanertes thinks of the after-life, hoping that the gods will call him, Artamon still voices heaven's approval of revenge. This is anti-sentimental, and the play thus moves back to earlier tradition in its later stages.



the plot is the same, but Johnson makes no mention of Boyer's play, and there are several changes and additions. We should therefore see this piece as another treatment of the same Racine source (Iphigénie) which also makes use of Boyer's denouement.

4 George Granville, Lord Lansdowne, Heroick Love. For F. Saunders, H. Playford, and B. Tooke, 1698. C Syn.6.68.49<sup>3</sup>.  
Jan 1698 LIF (date of première unknown)  
Tu 18 Mar 1766 DL

5 John Genest, Some Account of the English Stage, II, 150. All future references will be to Genest with volume and page numbers.

6 [William Hatchett], The Rival Father; or, The Death of Achilles. For William Mears and Thomas Corbett, 1730. BM 163.k.53.  
Wed 8 Apr 1730 HAY

7 Hatchett is at pains to point out the changes he has made to the original in the "Apology By way of Preface To that Useful Branch of Literature, the Criticks". In the first act he allows Pyrrhus to leave the stage for a while, and he closes the act with Pyrrhus, as Polyxena in the original is left "to versify" (p.iv). In the second act Achilles is taken off stage for a time and the scene in which Briseis influences him to make peace with Troy is omitted. Pyrrhus is given relief in the third act, but Hatchett says the fourth conforms to Corneille. Hatchett reintroduces Achilles in the final act, and he allows Achilles rather than Briseis to end the play. The author quotes Ambrose Philips, acknowledges that he followed the example of The Distrest Mother, but points out that La Mort d'Achille was written before Andromache.

8 Nicholas Rowe, Ulysses. For Jacob Tonson, 1706. MM B.3332. See also infra, pp.245-9, 279.

9 Charles Johnson, The Tragedy of Medaea. For R. Franklin, 1731. BM 162.i.19.  
Fri 11 Dec 1730 DL Mon 14 Dec 1730 DL  
Sat 12 Dec 1730 DL

10 Charles Johnson's adaptations from Seneca and Euripedes in Medaea are well summarised by Genest:

Seneca in his Medea does not differ materially from Euripedes - he calls Creon's daughter Creusa.

Johnson has founded his play on that of Euripedes - but he makes some important changes in the story - AEgeus is improperly made three syllables instead of two, and he is most absurdly said to have fallen in love with Medea at Colchis, before Jason sailed thither in the Argo, which, according to the poets, was the first ship - Creusa dies on stage - Creon stabs himself - Medea kills herself but not her children - in the Greek and Latin play the daughter of Creon is

not one of the D.P. - Medea's Nurse is a character of some importance - Johnson has turned her into the sister of Medea, perhaps thinking that the original character would not suit an English Audience. (III, 285)

- 11 Robert Owen, Hypermnestra; or, Love in Tears. For Bernard Lintott, 1703.  
BM 841.c.8(11).  
Not known to have been acted.
- 12 John Sturmy, Love and Duty; or, The Distress'd Bride. For W. Chetwood, 1722.  
BM 82.c.15(1).  

Mon	22 Jan	1722	LIF	Th	25 Jan	1722	LIF
Tu	23 Jan	1722	LIF	Fri	26 Jan	1722	LIF
Wed	24 Jan	1722	LIF	Sat	27 Jan	1722	LIF
- 13 [Richard West], Hecuba. By W. Wilkins, and sold by J. Peele, and N. Blandford, 1726. BM 841.c.10(2).  

Wed	2 Feb	1726	DL	Fri	4 Feb	1726	DL
Th	3 Feb	1726	DL				
- 14 Charles Hopkins, Pyrrhus, King of Epirus. For Samuel Briscoe, Peter Buck, and Daniel Dring, 1695. C Syn.6.68.35<sup>1</sup>.  
August 1695 LIF (date of première unknown)
- 15 James Thomson, Agamemnon. Printed for, and sold by A Millar, 1738. MM B. 2408.  

Th	6 Apr	1738	DL	Tu	18 Apr	1738	DL
Fri	7 Apr	1738	DL	Wed	19 Apr	1738	DL
Sat	8 Apr	1738	DL	Th	20 Apr	1738	DL
Mon	10 Apr	1738	DL	Tu	25 Apr	1738	DL
Sat	15 Apr	1738	DL				
- 16 The best criticism of Agamemnon is in an article by Jean B. Kern ("James Thomson's Revisions of Agamemnon" Philological Quarterly 45 (1966), 289-303) which highlights the changes Thomson made between a Larpent manuscript in the Huntington Library (Larpent 4, see Kern, 289) and the printed version of 1739. Kern points to the contemporary features of the play, the increasing interest in nature reflected by Melisander's long speeches describing his exile on the deserted island (Act III i, ll.64ff. Kern mistakenly says Act III scene ii in op.cit., 293), and the de-emphasis in Clytemnestra's guilt, building Egisthus into a strong character. Kern also rightly suggests that Agamemnon's tenderness for Orestes and Electra is a reflection of the sentimental taste. What is remarkable, Kern says, is that the printed version shows more intense psychological understanding of Egisthus "than any English pre-Freudian statement of the legend" (293). Kern also discusses the sources for the play and follows Leon Morel's hint (James Thomson, sa vie at ses oeuvres, Paris, 1895, pp.557-70) that the author borrowed little from

French models, turning back instead to Seneca's modification of the Greek model of Aeschylus. He says that Seneca's use of Electra as a link between Agamemnon's death and Orestes's revenge may also have been a hint of Thomson's ending. However, despite all this, the flavour of the play is distinctly eighteenth century and Kern points to four main elements: the development of Egisthus into a Renaissance villain, the making of proud Agamemnon into a tender father treating Cassandra like a daughter and offering to find her a husband worthy of Priam's daughter (IV ii, ll.47-8), the use of Melisander to introduce the elaborate nature description which almost takes over Act III, and finally the attempt to motivate all the characters according to the theory that art mirrors nature (Kern, 293-4).

- 17 Charles Gildon, The Roman Bride's Revenge. For John Sturton, 1697. BM 644.e.12.  
 Pagination awry in this edition: 1-16, 9-13, 41, 51, 16, 25-52. It seems also that something is missing between collations D and E.  
 Nov 1696 DL (date of première unknown)
- 18 John Crowne, Caligula. By J. Orme, for R. Wellington, 1698. C U\*.5.128(d).  
 March 1698 DL (date of première unknown)
- 19 Thomas Southerne, The Fate of Capua. For Benjamin Tooke, 1700. BM 644.i.57.  
 Mid April 1700 LIF (date of première unknown)
- 20 Colley Cibber, Perolla and Izadora. For Bernard Lintott, 1706. BM 11778.g.40.
- |     |       |         |     |       |         |
|-----|-------|---------|-----|-------|---------|
| Mon | 3 Dec | 1705 DL | Fri | 7 Dec | 1705 DL |
| Tu  | 4 Dec | 1705 DL | Sat | 8 Dec | 1705 DL |
| Wed | 5 Dec | 1705 DL | Wed | 2 Jan | 1706 DL |
| Th  | 6 Dec | 1705 DL |     |       |         |
- 21 The Prologue, insisting that the fable is the soul of the play rather than the language, and that no high language can be found in Perolla and Izadora, is very misleading. The play, apparently, pleased no one: see Leonard R.N. Ashley, Colley Cibber (Twayne Publishers Inc.: New York, 1965), p.60. Dennis described Ximena and this piece as "full of Nonsense and False English... and are full of stiff, awkward Stuff, and Lines that make as hideous a Noise as if they were compos'd in an Itinerant Wheel-Barrow" (John Dennis, Critical Works, (ed. E.N. Hooker, Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1939-43) I, 407).
- 22 John Dennis, Appius and Virginia. For Bernard Lintott, [1709]. BM 841.c.10(1).
- |     |       |         |     |       |         |
|-----|-------|---------|-----|-------|---------|
| Sat | 5 Feb | 1709 DL | Tu  | 8 Feb | 1709 DL |
| Mon | 7 Feb | 1709 DL | Wed | 9 Feb | 1709 DL |
- 23 [William Hunt], Fall of Tarquin. York: by John White, 1713. BM 11775.b.41.  
 Not known to have been acted.

24 Robert Hurst, The Roman Maid. For George Strahan, 1725. C S721.d.70.12.

Tu 11 Aug 1724 LIF  
 Fri 14 Aug 1724 LIF

Tu 18 Aug 1724 LIF

25 Joseph Addison, Cato. For J. Tonson, 1713. MM B.3331.

Tu 14 Apr 1713 DL	Mon 19 Mar 1716 DL
Wed 15 Apr 1713 DL	Fri 13 Apr 1716 DL
Th 16 Apr 1713 DL	Mon 21 May 1716 DL
Fri 17 Apr 1713 DL	Th 24 Jan 1717 DL
Sat 18 Apr 1713 DL	Tu 5 Mar 1717 DL
Tu 21 Apr 1713 DL	Sat 19 Oct 1717 DL
Wed 22 Apr 1713 DL	Sat 22 Feb 1718 DL
Th 23 Apr 1713 DL	Sat 8 Mar 1718 DL
Fri 24 Apr 1713 DL	Sat 19 Apr 1718 DL
Sat 25 Apr 1713 DL	Fri 25 Apr 1718 DL
Tu 28 Apr 1713 DL	Th 16 Oct 1718 DL
Wed 29 Apr 1713 DL	Fri 17 Oct 1718 DL
Th 30 Apr 1713 DL	Sat 25 Oct 1718 DL
Fri 1 May 1713 DL	Fri 26 Dec 1718 DL
Sat 2 May 1713 DL	Th 5 Feb 1719 DL
Tu 5 May 1713 DL	Tu 21 Apr 1719 DL
Wed 6 May 1713 DL	Tu 13 Oct 1719 DL
Th 7 May 1713 DL	Tu 9 Feb 1720 DL
Fri 8 May 1713 DL	Fri 13 May 1720 DL
Sat 9 May 1713 DL	Tu 29 Nov 1720 DL
Mon 19 Oct 1713 DL	Wed 1 Feb 1721 DL
Tu 20 Oct 1713 DL	Tu 14 Mar 1721 DL
Th 29 Oct 1713 DL	Th 28 Dec 1721 DL
Th 12 Nov 1713 DL	Sat 31 Mar 1722 DL
Th 3 Dec 1713 DL	Th 11 Oct 1722 DL
Th 17 Dec 1713 DL	Wed 12 Dec 1722 DL
Tu 29 Dec 1713 DL	Wed 1 May 1723 DL
Sat 16 Jan 1714 DL	Th 15 Sep 1723 CH
Mon 15 Mar 1714 DL	Th 31 Oct 1723 DL
Tu 6 Apr 1714 DL	Sat 23 Nov 1723 GR
Th 22 Apr 1714 DL	Th 5 Dec 1723 GR
Sat 8 May 1714 DL	Th 2 Jan 1724 DL
Tu 28 Sep 1714 DL	Tu 25 Mar 1724 DL
Sat 2 Oct 1714 DL	Th 9 Apr 1724 DL
Sat 23 Oct 1714 DL	Th 12 Nov 1724 DL
Wed 10 Nov 1714 DL	Tu 9 Feb 1725 DL
Fri 7 Jan 1715 DL	Sat 6 Mar 1725 DL
Wed 19 Jan 1715 DL	Wed 14 Apr 1725 DL
Tu 1 Mar 1715 SH	Wed 13 Oct 1725 DL
Tu 3 May 1715 DL	Mon 7 Feb 1726 DL
Fri 21 Oct 1715 DL	Mon 11 Apr 1726 DL
Th 29 Dec 1715 DL	Th 19 Jan 1727 DL
Mon 6 Feb 1716 DL	Wed 25 Jan 1727 DL

Sat	4	Mar	1727	DL	Th	26	Dec	1734	DL
Th	13	Apr	1727	DL	Wed	5	Feb	1735	GF
Fri	12	May	1727	DL	Sat	1	Mar	1735	DL
Wed	18	Oct	1727	DL	Sat	10	May	1735	DL
Sat	30	Dec	1727	DL	Wed	11	June	1735	DL
Sat	14	Dec	1728	DL	Sat	20	Sep	1735	DL
Sat	22	Feb	1729	DL	Sat	13	Dec	1735	DL
Tu	7	Oct	1729	DL	Wed	17	Dec	1735	DL
Mon	27	Oct	1729	DL	Sat	6	Mar	1736	DL
Sat	27	Dec	1729	DL	Mon	29	Mar	1736	LIF
Mon	20	Apr	1730	LIF	Mon	17	May	1736	CG
Wed	6	May	1730	DL	Wed	27	Oct	1736	DL
Th	21	May	1730	LIF	Th	28	Oct	1736	LIF
Th	1	Oct	1730	DL	Sat	30	Oct	1736	LIF
Th	12	Nov	1730	GF	Tu	2	Nov	1736	LIF
Fri	13	Nov	1730	GF	Fri	5	Nov	1736	LIF
Sat	14	Nov	1730	GF	Fri	3	Dec	1736	DL
Mon	16	Nov	1730	GF	Mon	14	Feb	1737	HAY
Th	3	Dec	1730	GF	Sat	19	Feb	1737	DL
Tu	29	Dec	1730	DL	Wed	2	Mar	1737	DL
Mon	15	Mar	1731	GF	Th	12	May	1737	DL
Tu	26	Oct	1731	GF	Tu	17	May	1737	DL
Th	2	Dec	1731	GF	Tu	31	May	1737	CG
Sat	1	Jan	1732	DL	Th	8	Sep	1737	DL
Fri	18	Feb	1732	GF	Tu	4	Oct	1737	DL
Tu	14	Mar	1732	DL	Mon	2	Jan	1738	DL
Th	5	Oct	1732	DL	Tu	12	Sep	1738	DL
Sat	14	Apr	1733	DL	Th	23	Nov	1738	DL
Th	19	Apr	1733	GF	Th	7	Dec	1738	CG
Th	24	May	1733	GF	Fri	19	Jan	1739	DL
Mon	20	Aug	1733	HAY	Sat	20	Jan	1739	DL
Fri	2	Nov	1733	GF	Sat	24	Mar	1739	DL
Wed	28	Nov	1733	HAY	Mon	7	May	1739	DL
Fri	18	Jan	1734	CG	Th	13	Sep	1739	DL
Sat	19	Jan	1734	CG	Fri	12	Oct	1739	DL
Tu	12	Mar	1734	CG	Th	15	Nov	1739	DL
Th	25	Apr	1734	GF	Tu	8	Jan	1740	DL
Tu	14	May	1734	DL	Th	6	Mar	1740	DL
Th	23	May	1734	JS	Th	16	Oct	1740	DL
Sat	14	Sep	1734	DL	Wed	12	Nov	1740	DL
Tu	17	Sep	1734	DL	Th	20	Nov	1740	CG
Sat	21	Sep	1734	DL	Mon	27	Apr	1741	DL
Wed	2	Oct	1734	GF	Mon	11	May	1741	JS
Th	10	Oct	1734	DL	Tu	8	Dec	1741	DL
Th	28	Nov	1734	CG	Th	4	Mar	1742	CG
Fri	29	Nov	1734	CG	Th	25	Mar	1742	DL
Mon	2	Dec	1734	CG	Mon	18	Oct	1742	CG
Tu	3	Dec	1734	CG	Th	18	Nov	1742	CG

Fri	4 Feb	1743	DL	Sat	24 Mar	1750	CG
Sat	12 Feb	1743	CG	Sat	1 Dec	1750	CG
Fri	22 Apr	1743	CG	Sat	29 Dec	1750	CG
Th	5 May	1743	CG	Tu	12 Feb	1751	CG
Tu	27 Sep	1743	DL	Wed	27 Nov	1754	CG
Tu	18 Oct	1743	DL	Fri	6 Dec	1754	CG
Fri	28 Oct	1743	CG	Fri	7 Feb	1755	CG
Fri	2 Dec	1743	CG	Sat	11 Dec	1756	DL
Fri	3 Feb	1744	DL	Tu	14 Dec	1756	DL
Th	16 Feb	1744	CG	Fri	7 Jan	1757	DL
Sat	10 Mar	1744	CG	Sat	5 Feb	1757	DL
Th	4 Oct	1744	DL	Sat	18 Oct	1760	DL
Th	18 Oct	1744	CG	Tu	21 Oct	1760	DL
Th	31 Jan	1745	CG	Tu	16 Apr	1765	DL
Sat	30 Mar	1745	CG	Mon	14 Apr	1766	CG
Sat	9 Nov	1745	DL	Sat	28 Mar	1767	CG
Mon	9 Dec	1745	GF	Mon	30 Apr	1770	CG
Fri	4 Mar	1746	HIC	Mon	11 May	1772	CG
Fri	24 Oct	1746	CG	Mon	25 May	1772	CG
Sat	20 Dec	1746	CG	Sat	21 Oct	1775	CG
Th	22 Jan	1747	GF	Fri	17 Nov	1775	CG
Sat	14 Mar	1747	GF	Mon	26 Feb	1776	CG
Sat	16 Apr	1748	CG	Tu	15 Oct	1776	CHR
Tu	25 Oct	1748	CG	Th	14 Aug	1777	HAY
Sat	12 Nov	1748	CG	Mon	18 Aug	1777	HAY
Wed	21 Dec	1748	CG	Mon	18 Jan	1779	CG
Sat	7 Jan	1749	LEI	Wed	28 Apr	1784	DL
Sat	4 Feb	1749	CG	Mon	15 Nov	1784	DL
Th	6 Apr	1749	CG	Wed	31 June	1797	CG
Sat	11 Nov	1749	CG	Mon	4 Dec	1797	HAY
Sat	27 Jan	1750	CG				

Both Whigs and Tories were eager to see Cato representing their own interests and positions. M.M. Kelsall has written at some length of "The Meaning of Addison's Cato (Review of English Studies 17 (1966), 149-62) stressing the themes in the play of liberty, freedom, virtue and Rome, and linking them with contemporary British political life, and the desire to see plays set in Rome mirroring England by looking at the Golden Age. But Cato himself is essentially a patriot as Addison presents him, and it is for this reason that he is glorified in the Prologue:

He bids your Breasts with Ancient Ardor rise,  
 And calls forth Roman Drops from British Eyes.  
 Virtue confess'd in human Shape he draws,  
 What Plato thought, and God-like Cato Was.

26 [Anne Finch Winchelsea], "Aristomenes" in Miscellany Poems on Several Occasions. For J.B., and sold by Benj. Tooke, William Taylor, and James Round, 1713. LVAd 10644.

There are three copies of this edition under this number in the Dyce

Collection in the Victoria and Albert Museum. Two of them do not print the author's name on the title page, but the third copy, with a different title page, states that the volume is by Lady Winchelsea. Not known to have been acted.

- 27 Joseph Trapp, The Tragedy of King Saul. For Henry Playford, and sold by John Nutt, 1703. BM 162.1.6.  
Not known to have been acted.
- 28 Epistle Dedicatory to the Right Honourable the Countess of Burlington &c. By Henry Playford.
- 29 "Socrates Triumphant; or, The Danger of Being Wise in a Commonwealth of Fools" in Military and Other Poems upon Several Occasions. By an Officer of the Army. For the Author, and sold by J. Browne, 1716. 0  
Not known to have been acted.
- 30 Robert Gould, The Rival Sisters; or, The Violence of Love. For Richard Bentley, Francis Saunders, and James Knapton, 1696. BM 161.i.71.  
Oct 1695 (date of première unknown)
- 31 Catharine Cockburn Trotter, Agnes de Castro. For H. Rhodes, R. Parker, S. Briscoe, 1696. BM 644.i.65.  
Dec 1695 DL (date of première unknown)
- 32 William Congreve, Mourning Bride. For Jacob Tonson, 1697. BM 1343.i.37.
- |     |        |              |     |        |             |
|-----|--------|--------------|-----|--------|-------------|
| Sat | 20 Feb | 1697 LIF     | Fri | 9 Jan  | 1719 DL     |
| Mon | 22 Feb | 1697 LIF     | Mon | 12 Jan | 1719 DL     |
| Tu  | 23 Feb | 1697 LIF     | Tu  | 13 Jan | 1719 DL [?] |
| Wed | 24 Feb | 1697 LIF     | Wed | 14 Jan | 1719 DL     |
| Th  | 25 Feb | 1697 LIF     | Th  | 15 Jan | 1719 DL     |
| Sat | 27 Feb | 1697 LIF     | Tu  | 10 Feb | 1719 DL     |
| Mon | 1 Mar  | 1697 LIF     | Wed | 1 Apr  | 1719 DL     |
| Tu  | 2 Mar  | 1697 LIF     | Tu  | 8 Dec  | 1719 DL     |
| Wed | 3 Mar  | 1697 LIF     | Wed | 20 Jan | 1720 DL     |
| Th  | 4 Mar  | 1697 LIF     | Sat | 26 Nov | 1720 DL     |
| Sat | 6 Mar  | 1697 LIF     | Mon | 20 Mar | 1721 DL     |
| Mon | 8 Mar  | 1697 LIF     | Tu  | 17 Apr | 1722 DL     |
| Tu  | 9 Mar  | 1697 LIF     | Tu  | 23 Oct | 1722 DL     |
| Tu  | 27 Apr | 1700 LIF     | Wed | 19 Dec | 1722 DL     |
| Wed | 28 May | 1707 Queen's | Tu  | 15 Oct | 1723 DL     |
| Th  | 25 Mar | 1708 DL      | Mon | 13 Jan | 1724 DL     |
| Wed | 18 Jan | 1710 DL      | Fri | 9 Oct  | 1724 DL     |
| Sat | 8 Mar  | 1712 DL      | Th  | 17 Dec | 1724 DL     |
| Th  | 8 May  | 1712 DL      | Tu  | 23 Feb | 1725 DL     |
| Tu  | 18 Nov | 1712 DL      | Th  | 25 Feb | 1725 DL     |
| Tu  | 17 Nov | 1713 DL      | Tu  | 19 Oct | 1725 DL     |
| Wed | 12 Dec | 1716 DL      | Fri | 7 Jan  | 1726 DL     |

Tu	22	Feb	1726	DL	Wed	17	Dec	1735	CG
Tu	29	Mar	1726	DL	Wed	28	Jan	1736	CG
Wed	18	May	1726	DL	Th	11	Nov	1736	DL
Sat	4	Feb	1727	DL	Th	24	Feb	1737	DL
Th	23	Mar	1727	DL	Wed	9	Mar	1737	DL
Tu	2	May	1727	DL	Th	31	Mar	1737	CG
Fri	6	Oct	1727	DL	Mon	2	May	1737	DL
Sat	5	Oct	1728	DL	Wed	19	Oct	1737	CG
Tu	31	Dec	1728	DL	Sat	21	Jan	1738	CG
Sat	27	Sep	1729	DL	Fri	10	Feb	1738	DL
Mon	15	Dec	1729	DL	Wed	19	Apr	1738	CG
Th	8	Jan	1730	DL	Wed	26	Apr	1738	DL
Th	26	Feb	1730	DL	Sat	28	Oct	1738	CG
Fri	15	May	1730	DL	Wed	1	Nov	1738	DL
Sat	19	Sep	1730	DL	Fri	2	Feb	1739	CG
Sat	7	Nov	1730	DL	Fri	2	May	1740	DL
Sat	10	Apr	1730	DL	Wed	12	Nov	1740	GF
Th	9	Dec	1730	GF	Wed	28	Jan	1741	CG
Sat	11	Dec	1731	GF	Th	5	Feb	1741	CG
Th	16	Dec	1731	GF	Th	17	Dec	1741	CG
Sat	1	Apr	1732	GF	Sat	10	Apr	1742	CG
Sat	1	Apr	1732	DL	Sat	15	Oct	1743	DL
Sat	16	Sep	1732	DL	Th	22	Feb	1750	HAY
Wed	18	Oct	1732	GF	Tu	3	Apr	1750	CG
Th	19	Oct	1732	GF	Mon	3	Dec	1750	DL
Fri	20	Oct	1732	GF	Tu	4	Dec	1750	DL
Sat	21	Oct	1732	GF	Wed	5	Dec	1750	DL
Mon	23	Oct	1732	GF	Fri	7	Dec	1750	DL
Wed	1	Nov	1732	GF	Sat	8	Dec	1750	DL
Th	21	Dec	1732	GF	Mon	10	Dec	1750	DL
Sat	3	Feb	1733	GF	Tu	11	Dec	1750	DL
Tu	13	Feb	1733	GF	Wed	12	Dec	1750	DL
Th	5	Apr	1733	GF	Sat	15	Dec	1750	DL
Sat	5	May	1733	GF	Th	20	Dec	1750	DL
Fri	14	Sep	1733	GF	Tu	19	Feb	1751	DL
Tu	13	Nov	1733	GF	Mon	15	Apr	1751	DL
Wed	28	Nov	1733	GF	Tu	30	Apr	1751	DL
Sat	26	Jan	1734	GF	Sat	7	Mar	1752	DL
Tu	26	Mar	1734	GF	Sat	11	Apr	1752	DL
Mon	22	Apr	1734	GF	Th	22	Mar	1753	DL
Fri	17	May	1734	GF	Tu	22	May	1753	DL
Sat	28	Sep	1734	DL	Sat	25	Jan	1755	DL
Tu	1	Oct	1734	DL	Mon	27	Jan	1755	DL
Tu	19	Nov	1734	DL	Wed	29	Jan	1755	DL
Fri	22	Nov	1734	GF	Th	20	Feb	1755	CG
Th	12	Dec	1734	DL	Sat	22	Feb	1755	CG
Wed	12	Nov	1735	DL	Sat	1	Mar	1755	CG
Wed	3	Dec	1735	DL	Sat	22	Mar	1755	DL

Wed	23	Apr	1755	DL	Mon	4	Feb	1765	DL
Mon	28	Apr	1755	CG	Wed	23	Oct	1765	DL
Wed	21	May	1755	DL	Fri	6	Dec	1765	DL
Mon	20	Sep	1755	DL	Fri	27	Dec	1765	DL
Tu	30	Sep	1755	DL	Mon	20	Jan	1766	DL
Tu	21	Oct	1755	DL	Mon	2	Mar	1767	CG
Tu	25	Nov	1755	DL	Mon	21	Sep	1767	CG
Sat	3	Jan	1756	CG	Tu	24	Nov	1767	DL
Fri	9	Jan	1756	CG	Sat	23	Apr	1768	DL
Tu	30	Mar	1756	CG	Mon	26	Sep	1768	DL
Mon	3	May	1756	CG	Fri	20	Jan	1769	DL
Fri	7	May	1756	DL	Mon	30	Oct	1769	DL
Wed	17	Nov	1756	DL	Mon	22	Jan	1770	DL
Mon	6	Dec	1756	DL	Mon	8	Oct	1770	DL
Fri	14	Jan	1757	DL	Th	11	Oct	1770	DL
Tu	25	Jan	1757	DL	Wed	19	Dec	1770	HAY
Wed	9	Feb	1757	DL	Mon	29	Apr	1771	DL
Tu	29	Mar	1757	DL	Sat	28	Sep	1771	DL
Th	31	Mar	1757	CG	Sat	11	Apr	1772	DL
Th	12	May	1757	DL	Tu	19	May	1772	DL
Tu	20	Sep	1757	DL	Sat	24	Oct	1772	DL
Fri	21	Oct	1757	CG	Sat	16	Jan	1773	DL
Fri	2	Dec	1757	CG	Tu	11	May	1773	DL
Tu	10	Jan	1758	DL	Sat	13	Nov	1773	DL
Mon	16	Jan	1758	DL	Mon	29	Dec	1773	DL
Mon	1	May	1758	DL	Mon	1	May	1775	DL
Tu	10	Sep	1758	DL	Tu	21	Nov	1775	DL
Mon	11	Dec	1758	DL	Sat	30	Dec	1775	DL
Fri	12	Jan	1759	CG	Mon	14	Oct	1776	CHR
Sat	10	Mar	1759	DL	Wed	18	Dec	1776	CG
Tu	29	May	1759	DL	Mon	16	Nov	1778	DL
Th	4	Oct	1759	DL	Sat	16	Jan	1779	DL
Wed	31	Oct	1759	DL	Wed	1	Nov	1780	DL
Fri	4	Jan	1760	CG	Mon	14	May	1781	CG
Wed	30	Apr	1760	DL	Th	20	Dec	1781	CG
Wed	28	Jan	1761	DL	Sat	29	Dec	1781	CG
Wed	6	May	1761	DL	Mon	18	Mar	1782	CG
Mon	21	Sep	1761	DL	Mon	15	Apr	1782	CG
Fri	23	Oct	1761	CG	Mon	2	Dec	1782	CG
Sat	14	Nov	1761	DL	Wed	15	Jan	1783	CG
Sat	6	Mar	1762	DL	Tu	18	Mar	1783	DL
Mon	1	Nov	1762	DL	Sat	24	May	1783	DL
Mon	28	Feb	1763	DL	Mon	2	June	1783	DL
Mon	17	Oct	1763	CG	Fri	24	Oct	1783	DL
Mon	7	Nov	1763	DL	Th	5	Feb	1784	CG
Tu	13	Mar	1764	CG	Sat	21	Feb	1784	DL
Mon	15	Oct	1764	CG	Sat	17	Apr	1784	DL
Mon	19	Nov	1764	CG	Fri	14	Jan	1785	DL

Th	24 Feb	1785 DL	Sat	6 June	1789 CG
Tu	26 Apr	1785 DL	Sat	14 May	1891 DL
Sat	24 Sep	1785 DL	Mon	26 Nov	1792 HAY
Wed	19 Apr	1786 CG	Tu	5 Feb	1793 DL at HAY
Th	4 May	1786 CG	Mon	4 Mar	1793 DL at King's
Mon	30 Oct	1786 CG	Tu	28 May	1793 DL at HAY
Sat	19 May	1787 DL	Sat	29 Nov	1794 DL
Wed	30 May	1787 CG	Mon	12 Oct	1795 DL
Mon	10 Mar	1788 CG	Mon	22 Feb	1796 HAY
Tu	27 May	1788 CG	Fri	9 Dec	1796 DL
Fri	26 Dec	1788 CG	Mon	20 May	1799 DL

33 Elmer B. Potter, in a long and thorough article, has traced the critical reception of Mourning Bride, its history on stage, and the history of the cut and altered versions ("The Paradox of Congreve's Mourning Bride" PLMA 58 (1943), 977-1001). Potter suggests that though the chief faults of the play are its bombast and the thinness of the characterisation, these are the qualities which contemporary actors would have been best able to deal with. In an early article J.P. Wickersham Crawford attempted to relate the play to Racine's Bajazet, although he notes that there are no direct borrowings of phraseology and that the first two acts are Congreve's own ("On the Relation of Congreve's Mourning Bride to Racine's Bajazet" Modern Language Notes 19 (1904), 193-4). The theme of intrigue against the government in Bajazet is suppressed in Mourning Bride and Congreve makes Osmyn and Almyna already married (this is seen to be a weakness). Crawford's chief claim is that the same psychological problem is expounded and examined in each play, but this does not seem to be a strong enough claim to be able to go on to say, as Wickersham Crawford does, that Bajazet should be therefore considered to be a significant source for Mourning Bride.

34 Edward Filmer, The Unnatural Brother. By J. Orme, for Richard Wilkin, 1697. C Syn.6.68.50<sup>7</sup>.  
Jan 1697 LIF (date of première unknown)

35 Edward Filmer, "The Unfortunate Couple" in Peter Anthony Motteux, Novelty. Every Act a Play. For Rich. Parker, and Peter Buck, 1697. BM 11774. f.18.  
June 1697 LIF (date of première unknown)  
Th 17 Aug 1704 LIF

36 The Fatal Discovery; or, Love in Ruines. By T. Orme, for R. Wellington, 1698. LVAd 3680.  
Feb 1698 DL (date of première unknown)

37 Peter Anthony Motteux, Beauty in Distress. For Daniel Brown, and Rich. Parker, 1698. C Acton.b.sel.48<sup>0</sup>.  
Late April 1698 LIF (date of première unknown)

- 38 William Philips, The Revengeful Queen. For P. Buck, 1698. LVAf 6976<sup>22</sup>.  
June 1698 DL (date of première unknown)
- 39 Catharine Cockburn Trotter, Fatal Friendship. For Francis Saunders, 1698.  
BM 644.i.66.  
May 1698 LIF (date of première unknown)
- 40 Susanna Centlivre, The Perjur'd Husband; or, The Adventures of Venice.  
For Bennet Banbury, 1700. BM 644.g.27.  
Date of performances unknown.
- 41 Mary Griffith Pix, The False Friend; or, The Fate of Disobedience. For  
Richard Basset, 1699. BM 83.b.10(3).  
May 1699 LIF (date of première unknown)
- 42 Charles Hopkins, Friendship Improv'd; or, The Female Warrior. For J.  
Tonson, 1700. C Syn.6.68.35<sup>3</sup>.  
Nov 1699 LIF (date of première unknown)
- 43 [R. Phillips], Fatal Inconstancy; or, The Unhappy Rescue. By R. P., for  
the Author, 1701. BM 162.k.53.  
Not known to have been acted publicly, but the title page refers to  
a private performance.
- 44 Nicholas Rowe, The Fair Penitent [1703]. Ed. William H. McBurney. London:  
Edward Arnold, 1968. See also infra, pp. 237-45, 276-9.
- 45 Mary Griffith Pix, The Conquest of Spain. For Richard Wellington, 1705.  
BM 841.e.6.  
May 1705 Queen's (date of première unknown)
- 46 [Catharine Cockburn Trotter], The Revolution of Sweden. For James Knapton,  
and George Strahan, 1706. BM 841.d.9(6).  
Mon 11 Feb 1706 Queen's                      Th 14 Feb 1706 Queen's  
Tu 12 Feb 1706 Queen's                      Sat 16 Feb 1706 Queen's
- 47 Charles Johnson, The Force of Friendship. For Egbert Sanger, 1710. BM  
162.i.13.  
Tu 20 Apr 1710 Queen's                      Mon 1 May 1710 Queen's
- 48 Lewis Theobald, The Perfidious Brother. Printed and sold by Jonas Brown,  
1715. LVAf 6976.  
Tu 21 Feb 1716 LIF                      Sat 25 Feb 1716 LIF  
Th 23 Feb 1716 LIF                      Mon 27 Feb 1716 LIF
- 49 Susanna Centlivre, The Cruel Gift; or, The Royal Resentment. For E.  
Curll, and A. Bettesworth, 1717. BM 11777.a.20.

Mon	17 Dec	1716 DL	Fri	21 Dec	1716 DL
Tu	18 Dec	1716 DL	Sat	22 Dec	1716 DL
Wed	19 Dec	1716 DL	Fri	3 May	1717 DL
Th	20 Dec	1716 DL			

50 [Moses Browne], Polidus; or, Distress'd Love. Printed in the Year 1723.  
BM 162.c.24.

Not known to have been acted publicly, but the Prologue is said to have been "Spoken at the Acting of it, by Young Gentlemen for their Diversion, at the Private Theatre in St, Alban's Street".

51 Edward Young, Revenge. For W. Chetwood, and S. Chapman, 1721. C XXIII.16.  
31<sup>1</sup>.

Tu	18 Apr	1721 DL	Sat	16 Feb	1751 CG
Wed	19 Apr	1721 DL	Mon	18 Feb	1751 CG
Th	20 Apr	1721 DL	Th	14 Mar	1751 CG
Fri	21 Apr	1721 DL	Th	10 Oct	1751 DL
Sat	22 Apr	1721 DL	Sat	12 Oct	1751 DL
Mon	24 Apr	1721 DL	Tu	15 Oct	1751 DL
Th	21 June	1722 HAY	Th	31 Oct	1751 DL
Mon	23 Dec	1723 HAY	Tu	19 Nov	1751 DL
Wed	8 Jan	1724 HAY	Tu	17 Dec	1751 DL
Wed	24 May	1732 HAY	Fri	3 Jan	1752 DL
Mon	19 Jan	1736 HAY	Sat	11 Jan	1752 DL
Tu	20 Jan	1736 HAY	Th	5 Mar	1752 DL
Mon	2 May	1737 YB	Th	21 Sep	1752 DL
Mon	12 Nov	1744 CG	Fri	29 Sep	1752 DL
Tu	13 Nov	1744 CG	Mon	2 Oct	1752 DL
Wed	14 Nov	1744 CG	Wed	18 Oct	1752 DL
Sat	17 Nov	1744 CG	Sat	13 Jan	1753 CG
Tu	20 Nov	1744 CG	Th	10 May	1753 DL
Tu	4 Dec	1744 CG	Tu	18 Sep	1753 DL
Tu	18 Dec	1744 CG	Mon	22 Oct	1753 DL
Th	10 Jan	1745 CG	Fri	28 Dec	1753 DL
Tu	15 Jan	1745 CG	Tu	8 Oct	1754 DL
Tu	22 Jan	1745 CG	Tu	14 Jan	1755 CG
Th	7 Feb	1745 CG	Wed	26 Nov	1755 CG
Tu	19 Mar	1745 CG	Fri	28 Nov	1755 VG
Wed	24 Apr	1745 HAY	Wed	27 Oct	1756 DL
Mon	27 Oct	1746 GF	Mon	7 Feb	1757 DL
Th	13 Nov	1746 GF	Fri	14 Oct	1768 DL
Mon	30 May	1748 JS	Mon	7 Nov	1768 DL
Th	1 Dec	1748 JS	Mon	14 Nov	1768 DL
Sat	7 Jan	1749 HAY	Th	29 Dec	1768 DL
Tu	16 May	1749 CG	Th	28 Sep	1769 DL
Wed	31 Jan	1750 CG	Fri	20 Oct	1769 DL
Sat	7 Apr	1751 CG	Sat	17 Mar	1770 HAY

Th	21 Apr	1774 CG	Fri	3 Oct	1788 CG
Wed	25 May	1774 CG	Mon	19 Jan	1789 DL
Th	24 Apr	1777 DL	Th	22 Jan	1789 DL
Wed	7 May	1777 CG	Wed	6 May	1789 DL
Sat	3 Jan	1778 CG	Mon	12 Dec	1791 DL at King's
Th	24 Apr	1783 DL	Mon	4 Nov	1793 HAY
Sat	26 Apr	1783 CG	Mon	2 June	1794 HAY
Mon	26 May	1783 DL	Tu	2 Oct	1798 DL
Fri	23 Jan	1784 DL	Th	3 Oct	1799 DL

- 52 Eliza Haywood, Frederick, Duke of Brunswick-Lunenburg. For W. Mears, J. Brindley, 1729. BM 643.e.1.  
 Tu 4 Mar 1729 LIF Sat 8 Mar 1729 LIF  
 Th 6 Mar 1729 LIF

- 53 Henry Brooke, Gustavus Vasa, the Deliverer of His Country. For R. Dodsley, 1739. C S721.d.70.12<sup>10</sup>.  
 Not known to have been acted. Censored: see London Stage III, liii, 764.

- 54 Brooke's plight attracted the pen of Samuel Johnson who wrote A Complete Vindication of the Licencers of the Stage, from the Malicious and Scandalous Aspersions of Mr Brooke, Author of Gustavus Vasa. Herbert Wright points out that there was little doubt that the corruption in Sweden was meant to represent the condition of England under Walpole's administration and that Trollio stood for Walpole himself ("Henry Brooke's 'Gustavus Vasa'" Modern Language Review 14 (1919), 173-82, especially 178). See also the addition to this by Wright: "Henry Brooke's 'Gustavus Vasa': a Correction" MLR 15 (1920), 304.

- 55 He writes:

I took my Subject from the History of Sweden, one of those Gothic and glorious Nations, from whom our Form of Government is derived, from whom Britain has inherited those indistinguishable Sparks of Liberty and Patriotism.

Patriotism, or, Love of Country, is the great and single Moral which I had in View thro' this Play. This Love (so superior in its Nature to all other Interests and Affections) is personated in the Character of Gustavus. It is the Love of National Welfare; National Welfare is National Liberty; and He alone can be conscious of it, He alone can contribute to the Support of it, who is personally free. (p.iv-v)

- 56 [William Paterson], Arminius. For A. Millar, 1740. BM 162.k.56.  
 Not known to have been acted. Censored. Title page reads: "Was to have been Acted at the Theatre-Royal".

- 57 George Lillo, Elmerick; or, Justice Triumphant. For John Gray, 1740. C  
S721.d.70.7<sup>b</sup>.  
See infra, pp. 315-21, 326.
- 58 Catharine Cockburn Trotter, The Unhappy Penitent. For William Turner, and  
John Nutt, 1701. BM 81.c.13(3).  
Tu 4 Feb 1710 DL
- 59 Charles Beckingham, The Tragedy of King Henry IV of France. For E. Curll,  
T. Jauncy, A. Bettesworth, and J. Brotherton, 1720. BM 1346.f.10(4).  
Sat 7 Nov 1719 LIF Tu 10 Nov 1719 LIF  
Mon 9 Nov 1719 LIF Th 12 Nov 1719 LIF
- 60 Henry Smith, The Princess of Parma. For Joseph Wilde, 1699. LVaf 6976<sup>21</sup>.  
Mid April 1699 (date of première unknown)
- 61 Thomas D'Urfey, The Famous History of the Rise and Fall of Massaniello.  
For John Nutt, 1700. LVad 3387.
- 62 Thomas D'Urfey, The Famous History and Fall of Massainello; or, A Fisherman  
a Prince. The Second Part. For John Nutt, 1699. LVad 3388.  
These plays were first performed May 1699 at DL though the date of the  
première is unknown. They were however revived:  
Fri 31 July 1724 LIF\* Mon 29 Mar 1725 LIF\*\*  
Tu 4 Aug 1724 LIF Sat 24 Apr 1725 LIF  
Fri 7 Aug 1724 LIF Fri 21 May 1725 LIF  
\*"Not acted these 20 years. Carefully revis'd and alter'd from D'Urfey.  
And Machines and other Decorations proper to the play." (London Stage  
II, 782)  
\*\*"Massaniello; or, A Fisherman a Prince." (London Stage II, 814)  
It was probably presented as one play in 1724 and 1725, though the  
shortened version was not printed.
- 63 Bevil Higgons, The Generous Conquerour; or, The Timely Discovery. For S.  
Briscoe, 1702. BM 162.h.29.  
Dec 1701 DL (date of première unknown)
- 64 Charles Gildon, The Patriot; or, The Italian Conspiracy. For William Davis,  
and George Strahan, 1703. LVad 4045.  
Dec 1702 DL (date of première unknown)  
The play is a free adaptation of Nathaniel Lee's Lucius Junius Brutus  
(Ed. John Loftis, London: Edward Arnold, 1968) but Gildon moves far  
from his source.
- 65 Charles Johnson, Love and Liberty. For Bernard Lintott, 1709. BM 162.i.16.  
Not known to have been acted.
- 66 James Sterling, The Rival Generals. For A. Bettesworth, 1722. BM 163.i.47.  
Not known to have been acted in London.

67 Thomas Southerne, Oroonoko. For H. Playford, B. Tooke, and S. Buckley, 1696. BM 644.i.56.

Nov 1695 DL (date of premiere unknown)

Until 1766 the play was revived many times probably in the version close to that printed in 1696. After that date, however, revivals until the end of the century were probably of one of the adaptations. A performance on Fri 18 Sep 1767 at HAY was of the adaptation by Francis Gentleman: The Royal Slave.

The performance of Mon 17 Apr 1769 at CG was of Hawkesworth's adaptation: Croonoko; or, The Royal Slave.

That of Mon 21 Dec 1795 at CG is described: "Mainpiece: Alter'd into Three Acts. All the comic part of the play is cut out" (Monthly Mirror Dec 1795, p.123; see London Stage V, 1816).

In view of these difficulties details of stage performances are here included up to the first performance of Gentleman's version as noted above.

Fri 6 Nov 1696 DL	Tu 17 Feb 1713 DL
Fri 23 Apr 1697 DL	Tu 6 Oct 1713 DL
Sat 12 June 1697 DL	Th 31 Dec 1713 DL
Sat 9 July 1698 DL	Fri 11 June 1714 DL
Perhaps revived sometime 1699	Wed 13 Oct 1714 DL
Tu 7 July 1702 DL	Mon 24 Jan 1715 LIF
Sat 2 Jan 1703 DL	Th 3 Feb 1715 LIF
Tu 27 Apr 1703 DL	Sat 26 Feb 1715 LIF
Sat 19 June 1703 DL	Th 20 Oct 1715 LIF
Th 21 Oct 1703 DL	Fri 16 Dec 1715 DL
Mon 15 Nov 1703 DL	Wed 1 Feb 1716 DL
Fri 7 Jan 1704 DL	Th 5 Apr 1716 LIF
Th 27 Apr 1704 DL	Sat 13 Oct 1716 LIF
Wed 7 June 1704 DL	Wed 9 Jan 1717 DL
Sat 30 Sep 1704 DL	Fri 25 Jan 1717 DL
Wed 25 Oct 1704 DL	Sat 30 Mar 1717 LIF
Tu 22 Jan 1706 DL	Fri 7 June 1717 LIF
Tu 21 May 1706 DL	Wed 20 Nov 1717 LIF
Tu 4 Feb 1707 DL	Th 28 Nov 1717 LIF
Mon 24 Mar 1707 Queen's	Sat 5 Apr 1718 DL
Mon 19 Apr 1708 DL	Wed 4 June 1718 DL
Mon 21 Mar 1709 DL	Sat 30 Aug 1718 RI
Fri 2 Dec 1709 DL	Sat 11 Oct 1718 DL
Sat 7 Jan 1710 Queen's	Tu 3 Feb 1719 DL
Fri 21 Apr 1710 DL	Tu 7 Apr 1719 DL
Mon 26 June 1710 GR	Th 8 Oct 1719 DL
Sat 9 Dec 1710 DL	Mon 28 Dec 1719 DL
Th 19 Dec 1710 DL	Sat 13 Feb 1720 LIF
Fri 6 July 1711 DL	Tu 23 Feb 1720 LIF
Tu 20 May 1712 DL	Th 24 Mar 1720 LIF
Tu 7 Oct 1712 DL	Tu 7 Apr 1720 LIF

Sat	9 Apr	1720	DL	Th	19 Sep	1728	DL
Th	19 May	1720	LIF	Tu	26 Nov	1728	DL
Th	2 June	1720	LIF	Tu	25 Feb	1729	HAY
Th	6 Oct	1720	DL	Mon	24 Mar	1729	DL
Sat	8 Oct	1720	LIF	Tu	11 Nov	1729	GF
Th	17 Nov	1720	DL	Fri	12 Dec	1729	GF
Wed	7 Dec	1720	LIF	Fri	23 Jan	1730	GF
Tu	14 Feb	1721	LIF	Mon	26 Jan	1730	LIF
Tu	28 Mar	1721	DL	Mon	9 Mar	1730	LIF
Sat	29 Apr	1721	LIF	Sat	21 Mar	1730	GF
Wed	10 May	1721	DL	Wed	13 May	1730	LIF
Th	14 Sep	1721	DL	Wed	1 July	1730	GF
Sat	11 Nov	1721	LIF	Mon	28 Sep	1730	LIF
Fri	24 Nov	1721	LIF	Fri	27 Nov	1730	GF
Sat	20 Jan	1722	LIF	Wed	9 Dec	1730	DL
Mon	5 Feb	1722	DL	Tu	22 Dec	1730	DL
Wed	16 May	1722	DL	Th	8 Apr	1731	GF
Tu	11 Sep	1722	DL	Fri	7 May	1731	DL
Mon	31 Dec	1722	LIF	Wed	13 Oct	1731	LIF
Wed	16 Jan	1723	DL	Mon	22 Nov	1731	DL
Sat	16 Feb	1723	LIF	Mon	13 Dec	1731	GF
Mon	18 Feb	1723	SOU	Th	10 Feb	1732	GF
Tu	21 May	1723	DL	Tu	9 May	1732	GF
Sat	21 Sep	1723	DL	Th	9 Nov	1732	LIF
Mon	18 Nov	1723	LIF	Mon	27 Nov	1732	GF
Th	12 Dec	1723	LIF	Tu	23 Jan	1733	GF
Sat	25 Jan	1724	LIF	Fri	27 Apr	1733	GF
Mon	3 Feb	1724	DL	Wed	16 May	1733	CG
Sat	21 Mar	1724	DL	Th	2 Aug	1733	CG
Tu	21 Apr	1724	LIF	Mon	8 Oct	1733	DL
Th	1 Oct	1724	DL	Tu	9 Oct	1733	GF
Tu	17 Nov	1724	LIF	Th	18 Oct	1733	SOU
Mon	28 Dec	1724	DL	Fri	23 Nov	1733	HAY
Tu	26 Jan	1725	LIF	Tu	4 Dec	1733	CG
Th	22 Apr	1725	DL	Fri	7 Dec	1733	DL
Th	6 May	1725	LIF	Mon	7 Jan	1734	HAY
Th	16 Sep	1725	DL	Th	31 Jan	1734	DL
Mon	25 Oct	1725	DL	Th	18 Apr	1734	GF
Fri	3 Dec	1725	DL	Wed	12 June	1734	HAY
Wed	2 Feb	1726	LIF	Wed	11 Sep	1734	GF
Tu	10 May	1726	DL	Sat	5 Oct	1734	DL
Tu	13 Sep	1726	DL	Th	10 Oct	1734	HAY
Tu	7 Feb	1727	LIF	Fri	3 Jan	1735	DL
Wed	20 Sep	1727	LIF	Tu	14 Jan	1735	GF
Tu	19 Dec	1727	LIF	Mon	10 Mar	1735	YB
Wed	20 Sep	1727	LIF	Tu	18 Mar	1735	GF
Tu	19 Dec	1727	LIF	Tu	15 Apr	1735	GF

Wed	20	Apr	1735	GF	Fri	4	Oct	1745	CG
Th	1	May	1735	DL	Th	28	Nov	1745	GF
Mon	5	May	1735	CG	Wed	29	Oct	1746	SOU
Mon	15	Sep	1735	GF	Wed	10	Dec	1746	GF
Fri	7	Nov	1735	DL	Tu	16	Dec	1746	GF
Sat	15	Nov	1735	GF	Sat	16	Jan	1748	CG
Mon	17	Nov	1735	GF	Wed	20	Apr	1748	CG
Tu	18	Nov	1735	GF	Tu	15	Nov	1748	CG
Sat	10	Jan	1736	DL	Wed	30	Nov	1748	NW SM
Mon	1	Mar	1736	DL	Tu	7	Mar	1749	CG
Fri	2	Apr	1736	LIF	Tu	28	Mar	1749	CG
Th	8	Apr	1736	CG	Wed	3	May	1749	CG
Tu	12	Oct	1736	CG	Fri	3	Nov	1749	CG
Sat	27	Nov	1736	LIF	Wed	21	Feb	1750	CG
Th	2	Dec	1736	CG	Mon	22	Apr	1751	CG
Mon	24	Jan	1737	CG	Tu	22	Oct	1751	DL
Fri	13	May	1737	CG	Wed	23	Oct	1751	DL
Mon	19	Sep	1737	CG	Th	24	Oct	1751	DL
Tu	28	Feb	1738	DL	Fri	26	Oct	1751	DL
Mon	24	Apr	1738	CG	Wed	30	Oct	1751	DL
Wed	20	Sep	1738	CG	Wed	13	Nov	1751	DL
Th	9	Nov	1738	DL	Mon	18	Nov	1751	CG
Wed	24	Jan	1739	CG	Mon	25	Nov	1751	DL
Sat	8	Sep	1739	DL	Sat	28	Dec	1751	DL
Th	4	Oct	1739	DL	Mon	13	Jan	1752	DL
Sat	22	Dec	1739	CG	Mon	6	Apr	1752	CG
Mon	18	Feb	1740	DL	Mon	13	Apr	1752	DL
Th	11	Sep	1740	DL	Th	5	Oct	1752	DL
Th	9	Oct	1740	SOU	Th	2	Nov	1752	DL
Mon	20	Oct	1740	GF	Tu	16	Jan	1753	DL
Tu	30	Dec	1740	GF	Mon	19	Nov	1753	DL
Th	22	Jan	1741	CG	Wed	24	Apr	1754	CG
Wed	1	Apr	1741	CG	Th	19	Sep	1754	DL
Mon	5	Oct	1741	CG	Mon	5	May	1755	DL
Fri	23	Oct	1741	GF	Mon	13	Oct	1755	DL
Mon	30	Nov	1741	JS	Tu	14	Oct	1755	DL
Mon	21	Dec	1741	GF	Th	16	Oct	1755	DL
Sat	23	Jan	1742	GF	Th	20	Nov	1755	DL
Tu	2	Feb	1742	CG	Mon	29	Dec	1755	DL
Tu	16	Feb	1742	GF	Fri	2	Jan	1756	DL
Th	22	Apr	1742	GF	Sat	1	May	1756	DL
Wed	12	May	1742	DL	Fri	12	Nov	1756	DL
Sat	13	Nov	1742	CG	Mon	28	Feb	1757	DL
Tu	14	Dec	1742	DL	Tu	17	May	1757	DL
Wed	2	Feb	1743	JS	Sat	15	Oct	1757	CG
Mon	2	May	1743	DL	Fri	25	Nov	1757	CG
Th	29	Oct	1743	DL	Th	26	Jan	1758	CG
Tu	11	Dec	1744	DL	Tu	8	May	1759	CG
Sat	15	Dec	1744	GF	Sat	1	Dec	1759	DL

Mon	3 Dec	1759 DL	Tu	20 Oct	1761 CG
Tu	4 Dec	1759 DL	Th	7 Oct	1762 DL
Th	6 Dec	1759 DL	Wed	25 Apr	1764 DL
Sat	8 Dec	1759 DL	Wed	9 May	1764 DL
Mon	10 Dec	1759 DL	Mon	15 Oct	1764 DL
Tu	11 Dec	1759 DL	Sat	27 Oct	1764 DL
Fri	28 Dec	1759 DL	Fri	25 Apr	1766 CG
Mon	11 May	1761 DL	Tu	2 Dec	1766 DL

68 John Dennis, Liberty Asserted. For George Strahan, and Bernard Lintott, 1704. BM 841.c.6(3).

Th	24 Feb	1704 LIF	Th	9 Mar	1704 LIF
Fri	25 Feb	1704 LIF	Sat	11 Mar	1704 LIF
Sat	26 Feb	1704 LIF	Th	16 Mar	1704 LIF
Tu	29 Feb	1704 LIF	Mon	27 Mar	1704 LIF
Th	2 Mar	1704 LIF	Wed	23 Apr	1746 CG
Sat	4 Mar	1704 LIF	Fri	25 Apr	1746 CG
Mon	6 Mar	1704 LIF			

69 Sir Thomas Moore, Mangora, King of the Timbusians. For W. Harvey, and E. Nutt, 1718. BM 841.d.11(5).

Sat	14 Dec	1717 LIF	Tu	17 Dec	1717 LIF
Mon	16 Dec	1717 LIF	Wed	18 Dec	1717 LIF

70 John Dennis, Rinaldo and Armida. For Jacob Tonson, 1699. BM 83.b.12(1).  
Nov 1698 LIF (date of première unknown)

71 William Walker, Victorious Love. For Ralph Smith, 1698. BM 83.a.6(1).  
Late May 1698 DL (date of première unknown)

72 The Unnatural Mother, The Scene in the Kingdom of Siam. Written by a Young Lady. By J.O., for R. Basset, 1698. BM 163.k.69.  
Not known to have been acted.

73 Louis Wann, "The Oriental in Restoration Drama" Studies in Language and Literature 2 (1918), 163-86.

74 Thomas Blake Clark, Oriental England: A Study of Oriental Influences in ... the Drama. Shanghai: Kelly and Walsh, 1939.

75 Wann, op.cit., 164.

76 James Thomson, Edward and Eleonora. For the Author, and sold by A. Millar, 1739. C S721.d.70.72.  
Not known to have been acted.

77 Mary de la Rivière Manley, The Royal Mischief. For R. Bentley, F. Saunders, and J. Knapton, 1696. BM 841.c.5(8).  
Apr 1696 LIF (date of première unknown)

78 Mary Griffith Pix, Ibrahim, the Thriteenth Emperour of the Turks. For John Harding, and Richard Wilkin, 1696. BM 83.b.9(2).

Late May 1696 (date of première unknown)

Tu	20 Oct	1702 DL	Mon	14 Mar	1715 DL
Sat	8 Jan	1704 DL	Tu	15 Mar	1715 DL
Fri	18 Feb	1704 DL			

79 Nicholas Rowe, The Ambitious Step-Mother. For Peter Buck, 1701.

See also infra, pp. 223-9, 272.

80 Jane Holt Wiseman, Antiochus the Great; or, The Fatal Relapse. For William Turner, and Richard Basset, 1702. BM 163.k.23.

Nov 1701 LIF (date of première unknown)

81 [Joseph Trapp], Abra-Mule; or, Love and Empire. For Jacob Tonson, 1704.

BM 841.c.6(4).

Th	13 Jan	1704 LIF	Mon	20 Mar	1721 LIF
Fri	14 Jan	1704 LIF	Th	23 Mar	1721 LIF
Sat	15 Jan	1704 LIF	Wed	26 Apr	1721 LIF
Mon	17 Jan	1704 LIF	Th	2 Nov	1721 LIF
Tu	18 Jan	1704 LIF	Tu	28 Dec	1721 LIF
Th	20 Jan	1704 LIF	Sat	19 May	1722 LIF
Fri	21 Jan	1704 LIF	Sat	27 Oct	1722 LIF
Sat	22 Jan	1704 LIF	Mon	26 Nov	1722 LIF
Mon	24 Jan	1704 LIF	Fri	17 May	1723 LIF
Tu	25 Jan	1704 LIF	Sat	2 Apr	1726 LIF
Fri	28 Jan	1704 LIF	Mon	9 May	1726 LIF
Th	10 Feb	1704 LIF	Sat	15 Feb	1735 CG
Mon	20 Mar	1704 LIF	Mon	17 Feb	1735 CG
Mon	3 Apr	1704 LIF	Tu	18 Feb	1735 CG
Tu	25 Apr	1704 LIF	Tu	11 Mar	1735 CG
Sat	2 Dec	1704 LIF	Fri	18 Apr	1735 CG
Tu	12 Dec	1704 LIF	Sat	27 Mar	1736 CG
Th	26 Jan	1710 DL	Th	12 Mar	1741 CG
Tu	20 Mar	1711 DL	Mon	13 Apr	1741 CG
Sat	18 Mar	1721 LIF	Th	8 Mar	1744 CG

82 [Mary de la Rivière Manley], Almyna; or, The Arabian Vow. For William

Turner, and Egbert Sanger, 1707. BM 83.a.2(3).

Mon	16 Dec	1706 Queen's	Wed	18 Dec	1706 Queen's
Tu	17 Dec	1706 Queen's			

83 Charles Goring, Irene; or, The Fair Greek. For John Bayley, 1708. LVAf 6976<sup>14</sup>.

Mon	9 Feb	1708 DL	Wed	11 Feb	1708 DL
Tu	10 Feb	1708 DL			

84 Aaron Hill, The Fatal Vision; or, The Fall of Siam. For Edw. Nutt, [1716]. O 2229.

Tu	7 Feb	1716 LIF	Mon	13 Feb	1716 LIF
Wed	8 Feb	1716 LIF	Tu	14 Feb	1716 LIF
Th	9 Feb	1716 LIF	Tu	6 Mar	1716 LIF
Sat	11 Feb	1716 LIF			

85 Eliza Haywood, The Fair Captive. For T. Jauncy, and H. Cole, 1721. BM 162.h.18.

Sat	4 Mar	1721 LIF	Tu	7 Mar	1721 LIF
Mon	6 Mar	1721 LIF	Th	16 Nov	1721 LIF

86 William Havard, Scanderbeg. For J. Watts, 1733. BM 83.a.33(1).

Th	15 Mar	1733 GF	Mon	26 Mar	1733 GF
----	--------	---------	-----	--------	---------

87 George Lillo, The Christian Hero. For John Gray, 1735. BM 643.g.16(10).

Also see infra, pp. 307-15, 326.

88 David Mallet, Mustapha. For A. Millar, 1739. C S721.d.70.21<sup>9</sup>.

Tu	13 Feb	1739 DL	Wed	21 Feb	1739 DL
Wed	14 Feb	1739 DL	Th	22 Feb	1739 DL
Th	15 Feb	1739 DL	Sat	24 Feb	1739 DL
Fri	16 Feb	1739 DL	Tu	27 Feb	1739 DL
Sat	17 Feb	1739 DL	Wed	28 Feb	1739 DL
Mon	19 Feb	1739 DL	Th	1 Mar	1739 DL
Tu	20 Feb	1739 DL	Sat	3 Mar	1739 DL

Herbert W. Starr has shown ("Sources of David Mallet's Mustapha, a Tragedy" Notes & Queries 181, 185-7) that the sources for this play are three: Knolle's Generall Historie of the Turkes, 1638, pp.759-63; Fulke Greville's Mustapha, 1609 and 1633; and Roger Boyle's The Tragedy of Mustapha, the Son of Solyman the Magnificent, 1690. But Starr goes on to suggest that the Boyle play offers little in addition to what was taken from the earlier sources, and that Mallet's chief debt was to Knolle's Historie.

89 Charles Hopkins, Neglected Virtue; or, The Unhappy Conquerour. For Henry Rhodes, Richard Parker, Sam. Briscoe, 1696. BM

Dec 1695 DL (date of première unknown)

90 [Richard Norton], Pausanias, the Betrayer of His Country. For Abel Roper, E. Wilkinson, and Roger Clavell, 1696. BM 644.h.71.

Apr 1696 DL (date of première unknown)

91 John Banks, Cyrus the Great. For Richard Bentley, 1696. C Syn.6.68.27<sup>3</sup>.

Mid Dec 1696 (Date of première unknown)

92 Charles Gildon, Phaeton; or, The Fatal Divorce. For Abel Roper, 1698. BM 644.h.38.

Mar 1698 DL (date of première unknown)

Tu 17 May 1698 DL

- 93 Colley Cibber, Xerxes. By John Nutt, 1699. LVaf 6976<sup>30</sup>.  
Mid Feb 1699 LIF (date of première unknown)
- 94 Mary Griffith Pix, The Double Distress. For R. Wellington, and B. Bernard Lintott, 1701. LVAd  
Mar 1701 LIF (date of première unknown)
- 95 Mary Griffith Pix, The Czar of Muscovy. For B. Bernard Lintot, 1701. BM 83.b.9(6).  
Mar 1701 LIF (date of première unknown)  
Pagination irregular: 1-56, 55.
- 96 For the controversy see: Genest II, 241; Biographia Dramatica, p.575; DNB 45, p.1702; Downes, Roscius Anglicanus, p.48.
- 97 The first two and a half pages are in verse, the rest in prose, although the prose is frequently iambic pentameter written out in prose form.
- 98 Nicholas Rowe, Tamerlane [1702]. Ed. Landon C. Burns Jr. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1966. Also see infra pp.229-37, 272-5.
- 99 John Oldmixon, The Governour of Cyprus. By R. Tookey, for Rich. Parker, 1703. BM 83.a.4(3).  
Jan 1703 LIF (date of première unknown)  
This edition seems to have been printed in separate halves.
- 100 William Mountfort, Zelmane; or, The Corinthian Queen. For William Turner, and sold by John Nutt, 1705. BM 11775.d.1(9).  
Mon 13 Nov 1704 LIF Sat 18 Nov 1704 LIF  
Authorship questionable; play finished by an unknown hand. P.67 mis-numbered 27.
- 101 In view of the strongly celebratory nature of the last act it seems very likely that this part of the play was written to congratulate Queen Anne. In the early part of the play, however, Anne could hardly have been flattered by the portrait of a jealous, cruel and utterly misguided monarch. It seems more than likely that the last act is the work of a different, later author, and that the first four acts may have been the work of Mountfort. There seems little indication in the last act that its author was at all concerned to work out the details of plot expounded in the first four acts. The last act, however, adheres to strict ideas about poetic justice, and I think it unlikely that its author was Mrs Pix as the Diverting Post of October 28 1704 suggested. See Stratman op.cit., p.482.
- 102 Edmund Smith, Phaedra and Hippolitus. For Bernard Lintott [1709]. C Acton.b.sel.48<sup>4</sup>.  
Pagination: 1-32, 31-8, 41-64.



108 John Hughes, The Siege of Damascus. For John Watts, 1720. BM 643.g.12(10).

Wed 17 Feb 1720 DL	Mon 26 Nov 1744 CG
Th 18 Feb 1720 DL	Th 3 Jan 1745 CG
Fri 19 Feb 1720 DL	Tu 12 Mar 1745 GF
Sat 20 Feb 1720 DL	Tu 20 Jan 1747 CG
Mon 22 Feb 1720 DL	Tu 10 Feb 1747 CG
Tu 23 Feb 1720 DL	Tu 27 Dec 1748 HAY
Wed 24 Feb 1720 DL	Th 23 Feb 1749 CG
Th 25 Feb 1720 DL	Mon 5 Feb 1750 CG
Fri 26 Feb 1720 DL	Th 5 Dec 1750 CG
Fri 29 Apr 1720 DL	Fri 6 Dec 1751 CG
Fri 4 May 1722 CLA	Sat 7 Dec 1751 CG
Th 6 Dec 1722 DL	Mon 9 Dec 1751 CG
Th 15 Mar 1733 CG	Wed 11 Dec 1751 CG
Sat 17 Mar 1733 CG	Mon 23 Dec 1751 CG
Tu 24 Apr 1733 CG	Sat 11 Jan 1752 CG
Sat 22 Mar 1735 DL	Sat 25 Jan 1752 CG
Tu 11 Jan 1737 DL	Tu 4 Feb 1752 CG
Wed 12 Jan 1737 DL	Mon 9 Mar 1752 CG
Fri 14 Jan 1737 DL	Wed 15 Apr 1752 CG
Sat 15 Jan 1737 DL	Sat 25 Apr 1752 HAY
Tu 18 Jan 1737 DL	Fri 1 May 1752 CG
Sat 29 Jan 1737 DL	Sat 9 Dec 1752 CG
Tu 26 Apr 1737 DL	Fri 15 Dec 1752 CG
Wed 19 Oct 1737 DL	Sat 30 Dec 1752 CG
Sat 28 Jan 1738 DL	Sat 7 Apr 1753 CG
Sat 25 Mar 1738 DL	Fri 11 May 1753 CG
Wed 6 Dec 1738 DL	Wed 28 Nov 1753 CG
Tu 23 Jan 1739 DL	Th 3 Jan 1754 CG
Mon 31 Dec 1739 DL	Th 4 Apr 1754 CG
Wed 5 Jan 1743 CG	Sat 3 Apr 1756 CG
Th 6 Jan 1743 CG	Wed 29 Mar 1758 CG
Fri 7 Jan 1743 CG	Th 4 May 1758 CG
Sat 8 Jan 1743 CG	Fri 27 Oct 1758 DL
Mon 10 Jan 1743 CG	Sat 18 Nov 1758 DL
Tu 11 Jan 1743 CG	Tu 21 Nov 1758 DL
Wed 12 Jan 1743 CG	Sat 25 Nov 1758 DL
Th 13 Jan 1743 CG	Tu 28 Nov 1758 DL
Fri 14 Jan 1743 CG	Tu 5 Dec 1758 DL
Sat 15 Jan 1743 CG	Sat 13 Jan 1759 CG
Sat 29 Jan 1743 CG	Tu 13 Feb 1759 CG
Th 3 Mar 1743 CG	Sat 12 May 1759 CG
Tu 5 Apr 1743 CG	Th 7 Feb 1760 CG
Tu 19 Apr 1743 CG	Wed 31 Dec 1760 CG
Mon 23 May 1743 CG	Mon 28 Feb 1765 HAY
Fri 3 Feb 1744 CG	Wed 15 Mar 1765 CG
Mon 27 Feb 1744 CG	Sat 8 Nov 1766 DL
Tu 20 Mar 1744 JS	Tu 11 Nov 1766 DL
Fri 5 Oct 1744 CG	Tu 18 Nov 1766 DL

Sat 27 Jan 1770 DL	Mon 27 Apr 1772 CG
Mon 19 Jan 1770 DL	Mon 17 Jan 1780 CG
Sat 10 Feb 1770 DL	Mon 24 Jan 1780 CG
Sat 17 Feb 1770 DL	Mon 28 Feb 1785 CG
Tu 24 Mar 1772 CG	

109 Hughes places the play in a deliberately historical context in the Introduction to the 1722 edition:

The Spirit of Enthusiasm, newly pour'd forth among them, acted in its utmost vigour; and the Perversion, that they who turn'd their Backs in Fight were accurs'd of God, and that they who fell in Battle pass'd immediately into Paradise, made them an Overmatch for all the Forces, which the Grecian Emperor Heraclitus could send against them. (For J.W., and sold by Samuel Chapman, 1722. C S721.d.72.28.)

110 J.R. Moore points out that the religious element in the Prologue is a direct reflection of the peace after the feeble Jacobite rebellion of 1719, and further says that Hughes's source for the play is Ockley's History of the Saracens, 1708 ("Hughes's Source for The Siege of Damascus" Huntington Library Quarterly 21 (1958), 362-6). The Jacobite rebellions are therefore in the forefront of the minds of a large number of these dramatists. Religious motivations and questions are also seen to be important in Hughes's play, and the author stresses the barbarities which can be perpetrated in the name of religion.

111 Elijah Fenton, Marianne For the Company of Booksellers, [c.1721]. Edition used: For J. Tonson, 1723. C S721.d.70.12<sup>9</sup>.

Fri 22 Feb 1723 LIF	Wed 5 Feb 1724 LIF
Sat 23 Feb 1723 LIF	Th 12 Nov 1724 LIF
Mon 25 Feb 1723 LIF	Th 24 Mar 1726 LIF
Tu 26 Feb 1723 LIF	Sat 30 Apr 1726 LIF
Th 28 Feb 1723 LIF	Fri 3 Nov 1727 LIF
Sat 2 Mar 1723 LIF	Mon 1 Apr 1728 LIF
Mon 4 Mar 1723 LIF	Wed 6 May 1730 LIF
Tu 5 Mar 1723 LIF	Fri 13 Apr 1733 CG
Th 7 Mar 1723 LIF	Th 13 Mar 1735 CG
Sat 9 Mar 1723 LIF	Tu 13 Mar 1739 CG
Tu 12 Mar 1723 LIF	Mon 9 Apr 1739 CG
Th 14 Mar 1723 LIF	Sat 15 Sep 1739 CG
Sat 16 Mar 1723 LIF	Mon 11 Mar 1745 CG
Mon 18 Mar 1723 LIF	Tu 12 Mar 1745 CG
Mon 1 Apr 1723 LIF	Fri 27 Jan 1758 CG
Mon 15 Apr 1723 LIF	Sat 28 Jan 1758 CG
Th 16 May 1723 LIF	Tu 31 Jan 1758 CG
Fri 7 June 1723 LIF	Th 2 Feb 1758 CG
Sat 7 Dec 1723 LIF	Tu 7 Feb 1758 CG
Wed 18 Dec 1723 LIF	Sat 11 Feb 1758 CG
Wed 29 Jan 1724 LIF	Sat 4 Mar 1758 CG

Sat 16 Mar 1765 DL                      Mon 14 Mar 1774 CG\*\*  
 Tu 20 Mar 1770 DL\*  
 \* "Herod and Mariamne" See Genest V, 269.  
 \*\* "Trans. Samuel Pordage".

- 112 In his study of The Tragedies of Herod and Mariamne (New York: Columbia University Press, 1740. See also J.B. Fletcher, "Herod in the Drama" Studies in Philology 19 (1922), 292-316); Earl Harlan, Elijah Fenton 1683-1730, Philadelphia, 1737) Maurice Valency devotes very little space to Mariamne, and this is probably a just assessment of its interest. The plot is very weak and there is barely enough material to last for five acts. This means that Fenton repeats scenes merely given over to the expression of emotion. Herod is meant to be seen as a weak but passionate king motivated only by sexual desire, but he is given few other characteristics and this means that the play is insis- tently pedestrian.
- 113 Thomas D'Urfey, "The Grecian Heroine; or, The Fate of Tyranny" in New Opera's, with Comical Stories, And Poems, on Several Occasions. For William Chetwood, 1721. O.  
 Not known to have been acted.
- 114 John Mottley, Antiochus. For T. Harbin, W. Meadows, J. Peel, and J. Graves, 1721. BM 80.c.23(2).  
 Th 13 Apr 1721 LIF                      Sat 15 Apr 1721 LIF  
 Fri 14 Apr 1721 LIF
- 115 Hildebrand Jacob, The Fatal Constancy. For J. Tonson, 1723. BM 7720.c.51.  
 Mon 22 Apr 1723 DL                      Mon 29 Apr 1723 DL  
 Tu 23 Apr 1723 DL                      Wed 12 Feb 1724 DL  
 Fri 26 Apr 1723 DL                      Th 13 Feb 1724 DL
- 116 John Gay, The Captives. For J. Tonson, 1724. MM B.376.  
 Wed 15 Jan 1724 DL                      Mon 20 Jan 1724 DL  
 Th 16 Jan 1724 DL                      Tu 21 Jan 1724 DL  
 Fri 17 Jan 1724 DL                      Wed 22 Jan 1724 DL  
 Sat 18 Jan 1724 DL
- 117 William Philips, Belisarius. Printed and sold by T. Woodward, J. Walthoe, and J. Peele, 1724. BM 162.k.65.  
 Tu 14 Apr 1724 LIF                      Sat 18 Apr 1724 LIF  
 Wed 15 Apr 1724 LIF                      Mon 20 Apr 1724 LIF  
 Th 16 Apr 1724 LIF                      Tu 24 Nov 1724 LIF  
 Fri 17 Apr 1724 LIF                      Th 28 Jan 1725 LIF
- 118 David Lewis, Philip of Macedon. By J. Watts, and sold by J. Roberts, 1727. C Hib.7.727.16.  
 Tu 2 May 1727 LIF                      Th 11 May 1727 LIF

- 119 Philip Frowde, Fall of Saguntum. For J. Crockatt, and T. Wood, 1727. C S721.d.70.20<sup>5</sup>.
- |                     |                     |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| Mon 16 Jan 1727 LIF | Mon 23 Jan 1727 LIF |
| Tu 17 Jan 1727 LIF  | Tu 24 Jan 1727 LIF  |
| Wed 18 Jan 1727 LIF | Th 26 Jan 1727 LIF  |
| Th 29 Jan 1727 LIF  | Fri 27 Jan 1727 LIF |
| Fri 20 Jan 1727 LIF | Sat 28 Jan 1727 LIF |
| Sat 21 Jan 1727 LIF | Th 18 May 1727 LIF  |
- 120 Richard Barford, The Virgin Queen. Dublin: by A. Rhames, for R. Gunne, 1728. BM 640.h.33(5).
- |                    |                    |
|--------------------|--------------------|
| Sat 7 Dec 1728 LIF | Tu 10 Dec 1728 LIF |
| Mon 9 Dec 1728 LIF |                    |
- 121 John Sturmy, Sesostris; or, Royalty in Distress. For J. Crockatt, 1728. BM 11775.f.39.
- |                     |                     |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| Wed 17 Jan 1728 LIF | Mon 22 Jan 1728 LIF |
| Th 18 Jan 1728 LIF  | Tu 23 Jan 1728 LIF  |
| Fri 19 Jan 1728 LIF | Fri 26 Jan 1728 LIF |
| Sat 20 Jan 1728 LIF | Sat 27 Jan 1728 LIF |
- 122 Samuel Madden, Themistocles, the Lover of His Country. For R. King, 1729. C S721.d.70.23<sup>5</sup>.
- |                     |                     |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| Mon 10 Feb 1729 LIF | Fri 14 Feb 1729 LIF |
| Tu 11 Feb 1729 LIF  | Sat 15 Feb 1729 LIF |
| Wed 12 Feb 1729 LIF | Mon 17 Feb 1729 LIF |
| Th 13 Feb 1729 LIF  | Th 20 Feb 1729 LIF  |
- 123 The plot is taken from Plutarch and Nepos, but Dr Madden notes in the Preface that there are some little Deviations in this Piece from the antient Historians; such as Aristides bringing over, and dying with Themistocles, Xerxes's Passion for, and Marriage with Nesiptolema, and Artemisa's Affection to Xerxes; yet, as some Historians assure us, Aristides died in that Country about the publick Affairs, near that Time, and that Xerxes actually shew'd a tender Care of Nesiptolema, and made her a Priestess of the Sun, and that Artemisa's constant Attendance on Xerxes's Wars and Person, makes the Passion here given her, no ways improbable, are at least pardonable if not approveable.
- 124 [Benjamin Martyn], Timoleon. For J. Watts, 1730. C S721.d.70.23<sup>6</sup>.
- |                    |                    |
|--------------------|--------------------|
| Mon 26 Jan 1730 DL | Th 5 Feb 1730 DL   |
| Tu 27 Jan 1730 DL  | Fri 6 Feb 1730 DL  |
| Wed 28 Jan 1730 DL | Sat 7 Feb 1730 DL  |
| Th 29 Jan 1730 DL  | Mon 9 Feb 1730 DL  |
| Sat 31 Jan 1730 DL | Mon 16 Feb 1730 DL |
| Mon 2 Feb 1730 DL  | Tu 17 Feb 1730 DL  |
| Tu 3 Feb 1730 DL   | Wed 13 May 1730 DL |
| Wed 4 Feb 1730 DL  | Tu 20 Feb 1733 GF  |

Th 22 Feb 1733 GF  
 Sat 24 Feb 1733 GF  
 Tu 27 Feb 1733 GF

Th 15 Nov 1750 JS  
 Sat 28 Mar 1772 DL

125 James Thomson, Sophonisba. For A. Millar, 1730. C S721.c.73.1.

Sat 28 Feb 1730 DL  
 Mon 2 Mar 1730 DL  
 Tu 3 Mar 1730 DL  
 Th 5 Mar 1730 DL  
 Sat 7 Mar 1730 DL  
 Mon 9 Mar 1730 DL  
 Tu 10 Mar 1730 DL  
 Th 12 Mar 1730 DL  
 Sat 14 Mar 1730 DL

Tu 17 Mar 1730 DL  
 Wed 7 Apr 1731 YB  
 Fri 9 Apr 1731 YB  
 Fri 21 May 1731 GF  
 Tu 1 June 1731 GF  
 Fri 6 July 1733 CG  
 Tu 10 July 1733 CG  
 Sat 15 Mar 1735 CG

- 126 The play is a deliberate attempt to write according to the principle of "unity of design" whereby the story is one, regular, and uniform, not charged with a multiplicity of incidents, and yet affording several revolutions of fortune; by which the passions may be excited, varied, and driven to their full tumult of emotion (Preface) and the author quotes Racine to support his own practice. Thomson insists that the character of Sophonisba is drawn according to history, and the patriotic intention of the play is suggested with reference to Sophonisba's own "disdain of servitude" (ibid.). Genest notes: This T. raised such expectation, that every Rehearsal was dignified with a splendid audience, collected to anticipate the delight, which was preparing for the publick; it was observed however that nobody was much affected and that the company rose as from a moral lecture (III, 256-7).

127 [John Tracy], Periander. For J. Watts, 1731. C S721.d.70.48<sup>7</sup>.

Wed 13 Jan 1731 LIF  
 Th 14 Jan 1731 LIF  
 Fri 15 Jan 1731 LIF

Sat 16 Jan 1731 LIF  
 Mon 25 Jan 1731 LIF

- 128 Periander is prefaced with "The History of Periander, King of Corinth: Extracted from the most Authentick Greek and Latin Historians, And the Chevalier Ramsay's CYRUS. By a Gentleman of Cambridge". Genest (III, 309) criticises Tracy for following the French source and suggests that he would have been more accurate to follow Herodotus and Diogenes.

129 David Mallet, Eurydice. For A. Millar, 1731. C S721.d.70.48<sup>8</sup>.

Mon 22 Feb 1731 DL  
 Tu 23 Feb 1731 DL  
 Wed 24 Feb 1731 DL  
 Th 25 Feb 1731 DL  
 Fri 26 Feb 1731 DL

Sat 27 Feb 1731 DL  
 Mon 1 Mar 1731 DL  
 Tu 2 Mar 1731 DL  
 Th 4 Mar 1731 DL  
 Sat 6 Mar 1731 DL

Tu 9 Mar 1731 DL	Sat 3 Mar 1759 DL
Th 11 Mar 1731 DL	Tu 6 Mar 1759 DL
Sat 13 Mar 1731 DL	Tu 13 Mar 1759 DL
Mon 26 Apr 1731 DL	Sat 17 Mar 1759 DL

- 130 Philip Frowde, Philotas. For A. Millar, 1731. C S721.d.70.48<sup>5</sup>.  
 Wed 3 Feb 1731 LIF Sat 6 Feb 1731 LIF  
 Th 4 Feb 1731 LIF Mon 8 Feb 1731 LIF  
 Fri 5 Feb 1731 LIF

- 131 John Darcy, Love and Ambition. Dublin, printed; London, reprinted for J. Roberts, 1732. BM 161.i.1.  
 Not known to have been acted.

- 132 [William Bond], The Tuscan Treaty; or, Tarquin's Overthrow. For J. Watson, 1733. C S721.d.70.46<sup>c</sup>.  
 Mon 20 Aug 1733 CG Tu 21 Aug 1733 CG

- 133 James Sterling, The Parricide. For John Walthoe, 1736. BM 163.i.48.  
 Th 29 Jan 1736 GF Tu 3 Feb 1736 GF  
 Sat 31 Jan 1736 GF Wed 3 Mar 1736 GF  
 Mon 2 Feb 1736 GF

- 134 Charles Marsh, Amasis, King of Egypt. For Charles Marsh, 1738. C S721.d.70.21<sup>3</sup>.  
 Wed 30 Aug 1730 CG

- 135 [Charles Shuckburgh], Antiochus. For J. Shuckburgh, 1740. BM 163.k.34.  
 Not known to have been acted.

- 136 Charles Hopkins, Boadicea, Queen of Britain. For Jacob Tonson, 1697. C Syn.6.68.35<sup>c</sup>.  
 Nov 1697 LIF\*  
 \*For dating of first performance see Baldwin Maxwell, "Note on Charles Hopkins' Boadicea" RES 4 (1928), 79-83; Downes, Roscius Anglicanus, p. 44; London Stage I, 487.

- 137 Mary de la Rivière Manley, Lucius, the First Christian King of Britain. For John Barber, 1717. BM 841.c.9(5).  
 Sat 11 May 1717 DL Sat 18 May 1717 DL  
 Mon 13 May 1717 DL Wed 27 Apr 1720 DL

- 138 Charles Gildon, Love's Victim; or, The Queen of Wales. By M. Bennet, for Richard Parker, and George Strahan, 1701. BM 841.d.9(5).  
 Apr 1701 LIF (date of première unknown; see London Stage II, 10).

- 139 George Granville, Lord Lansdowne, The British Enchanters; or, No Magick Like Love. For Jacob Tonson, 1706. BM Huth 109.

Th 21 Feb 1706 Queen's	Tu 12 Mar 1706 Queen's
Sat 23 Feb 1706 Queen's	Tu 26 Mar 1706 Queen's
Mon 25 Feb 1706 Queen's	Tu 2 Apr 1706 Queen's
Tu 26 Feb 1706 Queen's	Fri 3 May 1706 Queen's
Th 28 Feb 1706 Queen's	Sat 22 Mar 1707 Queen's
Sat 2 Mar 1706 Queen's	Tu 25 Mar 1707 Queen's
Tu 5 Mar 1706 Queen's	Mon 14 Apr 1707 Queen's
Sat 9 Mar 1706 Queen's	

140 Ambrose Philips, The Briton. 3rd. edition. For T. Woodward, J. Walthoe Jun., and J. Peele, 1725. MM Disbd.

Mon 19 Feb 1722 DL	Tu 27 Feb 1722 DL
Tu 20 Feb 1722 DL	Th 1 Mar 1722 DL
Th 22 Feb 1722 DL	Tu 3 Apr 1722 DL
Sat 24 Feb 1722 DL	Wed 25 Apr 1744 JS
Mon 26 Feb 1722 DL	

141 [Thomas Otway], Heroick Friendship. For W. Mears, and R. King, 1719. C Syn.6.68.38<sup>4</sup>.

For this very doubtful attribution see Jacob Giles in The Poetical Register of 1719 who denied that the play was by Otway. Most critics today agree with this view. See Ghosh's edition of Otway I, 63.

(Stratman, Bibliography of English Printed Tragedy, p.502)

Not known to have been acted.

142 Aaron Hill, Elfrid; or, The Fair Inconstant. For Bernard Lintott, and Egbert Sanger [1710]. LVAf 6976.

Tu 3 Jan 1710 DL	Mon 9 Jan 1710 DL
Wed 4 Jan 1710 DL	Tu 21 Feb 1710 DL
Th 5 Jan 1710 DL	Wed 24 July 1723 HAY

143 Aaron Hill, Athelwold. Dublin: by S. Powell, for Abraham Bradley, 1732.

BM 11774.aaa.20(1).

Fri 10 Dec 1731 DL	Mon 1 Apr 1771 HAY
Mon 11 Mar 1771 HAY	Wed 24 Apr 1771 HAY

144 George Jeffreys, Edwin. By T. Woodward, J. Walthoe, J. Peele, and T. Wood, 1724. C S721.d.70.12<sup>7</sup>.

Mon 24 Feb 1724 LIF	Sat 29 Feb 1724 LIF
Tu 25 Feb 1724 LIF	Tu 3 Mar 1724 LIF
Th 27 Feb 1724 LIF	Th 5 Mar 1724 LIF

145 Charles Shadwell, "Rotherick O'Connor" in Five New Plays. For A. Bettesworth, and sold by J. Graves, 1720. C S721.d.72.1.

No known performance in London but title page of Five New Plays reads "As they are acted at the Theatre-Royal in Dublin".

- 146 William Philips, Hibernia Freed. For Jonah Bowyer, 1722. BM 162.k.66.  
 Tu 13 Feb 1722 LIF                      Tu 20 Feb 1722 LIF  
 Th 15 Feb 1722 LIF                      Th 22 Feb 1722 LIF  
 Sat 17 Feb 1722 LIF                      Sat 17 Mar 1722 LIF  
 Mon 19 Feb 1722 LIF
- 147 William Shirley, The Parricide; or, Innocence in Distress. For J. Watts, 1739. C S721.d.70.21'.  
 Wed 17 Jan 1739 CG
- 148 Nicholas Rowe, The Royal Convert. For Jacob Tonson, 1708. 2nd. edition revised 1714. MM B.4296. Also see infra, pp. 249-57, 280.
- 149 Mary Griffith Pix, Queen Catharine; or, The Ruines of Love. For William Turner, and Richard Basset, 1698. BM 841.d.10.  
 June 1698 LIF (date of première unknown)
- 150 Courtney, Earl of Devonshire; or, The Troubles of the Princess Elizabeth. Comprehending a great part of the Reign of Queen Mary, with the Death of Jane Gray. For Nicholas Cox [c.1705]. CSMH.  
 Not known to have been acted.
- 151 Nicholas Rowe, The Tragedy of the Lady Jane Gray. For Bernard Lintott, 1715. MM B.3409. Also see infra pp. 264-71, 284-5.
- 152 George Sewell, The Tragedy of Sir Walter Raleigh. For John Pemberton, and John Watts, 1719. BM 1346.c.16.  
 Fri 16 Jan 1719 LIF                      Aat 14 May 1720 LIF  
 Sat 17 Jan 1719 LIF                      Tu 17 Jan 1721 LIF  
 Mon 19 Jan 1719 LIF                      Sat 21 Apr 1722 LIF\*  
 Wed 21 Jan 1719 LIF                      Wed 17 Sep 1729 LIF  
 Fri 23 Jan 1719 LIF                      Th 18 Sep 1729 LIF  
 Sat 24 Jan 1719 LIF                      Tu 25 Sep 1739 DL\*\*  
 Mon 26 Jan 1719 LIF                      Wed 26 Sep 1739 DL  
 Wed 28 Jan 1719 LIF                      Th 27 Sep 1739 DL  
 Mon 2 Feb 1719 LIF                      Fri 28 Sep 1739 DL  
 Fri 6 Feb 1729 LIF                      Sat 29 Sep 1739 DL  
 Tu 10 Mar 1719 LIF                      Mon 1 Oct 1739 DL  
 Wed 1 Apr 1719 LIF                      Tu 2 Oct 1739 DL  
 Sat 31 Oct 1719 LIF                      Tu 27 Nov 1739 DL  
 Sat 9 Jan 1720 LIF                      Mon 14 Sep 1739 DL  
 Sat 6 Feb 1720 LIF
- \*"With an Additional Scene of the Madness of Cobham" (London Stage II, 674)
- \*\* The political implications of the revival of this play in its new production are made clear in Egmont's Diary III, 83 (as quoted in London Stage III, 789): "They choose one to represent Count Gundemar, who in all things is like Mr. Giraldini, the Spanish Minister at our Court lately recalled, and whenever any severe things were said which bore a resemblance to our ministry's trans-



- 161 George Sewell, The Tragedy of Richard I, King of England. For G. Sewell, ... 1728. BM 163.h.62.  
A fragment: not acted.
- 162 A Fatal Secret; or, The Rival Brothers. Printed and sold by Benj. Bragg, 1704. O  
Pagination of the text: 1-32, 65-96, 99-102, 97-8, 103-106.  
Title page suggests that the play was acted at LIF. Details unknown.
- 163 Nicoll, op.cit., II, 117.
- 164 Dramatis Personae list.
- 165 The Fatal Extravagance. For T. Jauncy [1720]. This one act version also printed in Aaron Hill, The Dramatic Works. For T. Lowndes, 1760. 2 vols. BM 83.b.7-8.  
Fri 21 Apr 1721 LIF                      Mon 7 May 1722 LIF  
Wed 22 Nov 1721 LIF                      Wed 14 May 1794 LIF  
Th 11 Jan 1722 LIF  
On the question of authorship, whether Joseph Mitchell or Aaron Hill, see Stratman op.cit., pp.465-6; Paul S. Dunkin, "The Authorship of The Fatal Extravagance" Modern Language Notes 60 (1945), 328-330; P. P. Kies, "The Authorship of The Fatal Extravagance" Research Studies of the State College of Washington 13 (1945), 155-58.
- 166 The Preface mistakenly reads "three". There is in fact only one act.
- 167 Preface to The Fatal Extravagance. The material and ideas here are taken from Dryden's Preface to Troilus and Cressida.
- 168 The London Merchant passim. See especially I i, pp.10-12; I [ii], pp.12-15; II [iv], pp.29-31; IV [xvii], pp.60-63; the whole of Act V. Also see infra, pp. 288-300, 322-4.
- 169 See The London Merchant V [ix], p.77.
- 170 Joseph Mitchell [?], The Fatal Extravagance. For J. Millan [sic.] and sold by J. Stagg, and N. Blandford, 1726. BM 162.d.40.  
Sat 21 Feb 1730 LIF                      Fri 29 June 1733 CG  
Tu 24 Feb 1730 LIF                      Fri 27 July 1733 CG  
Th 26 Feb 1730 LIF                      Tu 31 July 1733 CG  
Sat 28 Feb 1730 LIF                      Mon 29 Apr 1734 JS  
Th 5 Mar 1730 LIF                      Mon 25 Nov 1734 CG  
Tu 10 Mar 1730 LIF                      Wed 12 Mar 1735 CG  
Tu 21 Apr 1730 LIF                      Th 27 July 1735 YB  
Tu 12 May 1730 LIF                      Mon 2 Feb 1736 HAY  
Tu 26 June 1733 CG                      Fri 30 July 1736 HAY

- 171 Charles Johnson, Caelia; or, The Perjur'd Lovers. J. Watts, 1733. BM 643.g.14(7).  
Mon 11 Dec 1732 DL
- 172 Vanella. For D. Ashburn, 1736. E Not known to have been acted.
- 173 Charles B. Woods, "Captain B-'s Play" Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature 15 (1733), 243-55. See especially p.251.
- 174 Ibid., p.251.
- 175 This correlation works for the parallels Woods suggests for the same characters in different plays.
- 176 John Loftis notes this correspondance between the two comedies in The Politics of Drana in Augustan England (Oxford University Press, 1963), p.113.
- 177 John Hewitt, The Fatal Falsehood; or, Distress'd Innocence. For T. Worrall [1734]. C 721.d.70.46 .  
Mon 11 Feb 1734 DL Th 14 Feb 1734 DL  
Tu 12 Feb 1734 DL Fri 15 Feb 1734 DL
- 178 John Maxwell, The Faithful Pair; or, Virtue in Distress. York: by Thomas Gent, 1740. BM 1346.e.45.  
Not known to have been acted.
- 179 [Edward Ward, Honesty in Distress, but Reliev'd by No Party. Printed and are to be sold by B. Bragge, 1705. BM 11778.c.15.  
Not known to have been acted.
- 180 A jibe at the theatre itself and its patrons in a play which, though it uses theatrical form, was clearly never intended to be represented on stage.
- 181 It can also be noted that the tract quality of the work is highlighted in later prose versions. See especially Honesty in Distress but Reliev'd by No Party [A Chapbook]. [London? 1770?]. BM 11621.e.3(21).
- 182 Thomas Cooke, The Mournful Nuptials; or, Love the Cure of All Woes. For T. Cooper, 1739. C S721.d.70.73.  
Mon 19 Dec 1743 DL\*  
\*Performance entitled Love the Cause and Cure of Grief; or, The Innocent Murderer, the title given to the second edition of the play, printed 1743.
- 183 Osborne Sidney Wandesford, Fatal Love; or, The Degenerate Brother. For T. Worrall, 1730. BM 163.k.12.

Wed 21 Jan 1730 HAY  
Th 22 Jan 1730 HAY

Mon 2 Feb 1730 HAY

184 [Fettiplace Bellers], Injur'd Innocence. For J. Brindley, 1732. BM  
161.g.35.

Th 3 Feb 1732 DL  
Fri 4 Feb 1732 DL  
Sat 5 Feb 1732 DL

Mon 7 Feb 1732 DL  
Tu 8 Feb 1732 DL  
Wed 9 Feb 1732 DL

185 Robert Gould, Innocence Distress'd; or, The Royal Penitents. For T.  
Longman, and sold by J. Roberts, 1737. C 721.d.70.222.  
Not known to have been acted.

186 [Anthony<sup>u</sup> Brown], The Fatal Retirement. For T. Osborn, 1739. C S721.d.  
70.7.  
Mon 12 Nov 1739 DL

187 Whincop, Scanderbeg; or, Love and Liberty &c., p.182. Quoted in Nicoll  
op.cit., p.123.

188 This note appears only in the 1739 edition of the play:

Mr Quin was requested to study the part of Artamon, but after he had read the Manuscript, made choice of Ceron, and promis'd to perform it. However, some Time before the Play was represented on the Stage, He threw up that Part, which himself had chose, and (with such Haughtiness of his Behaviour, as cannot be describ'd) absolutely refus'd to be concerned in the Performance: This Refusal, from a Man who in the capacity of a Player, doubtless deserves Applause, (I wish that Merit in Him were possibly consistent with Humiltiy,) so far prejudic'd the other Actors, that they almost wholly neglected the study of their Parts; and when the Play was perform'd, several Speeches, nay, sometimes whole Pages, were omitted. So that the Whole appear'd to the Audience a confus'd Piece, without any Manner of Connection. The Author indeed confesses, there are a great many Faults in it; but cannot yet think (had it been acted fairly) that 'twou'd have deserv'd so hard a Fate as it met with. Time may probably alter his Opinion; for he is apt to believe, that every Author is generally the last Person who discerns the Badness of his own Production.

### CHAPTER III PATTERNS

Eric Rothstein points out that

What might be poignant or grave in context lies flat on the critic's page, a cliché amid the school of its equally fished-out fellows. To find a least common denominator for the drama of artists or hacks reduces everything to tedious naïveté or sleazy criticism.<sup>1</sup>

With this proviso I should now like to point out some of the recurring patterns in the tragedies of the period, not so much for the sake of reducing them all to the same level or of suggesting that they are all alike in so many ways, but because it seems to me that the constant repetition of certain ideas and devices year after year in the various London theatres gave the members of the audience a kind of shorthand for interpreting what they saw and heard.

Beginning with the use of verse and prose I shall go on to discuss the frequently recurring images of the merchant-mariner and fire and freezing, before examining the role of the pastoral, particularly the ideal of the pastoral retreat. The characters frequently compare their own lives to the pastoral, and also to the world of ordinary men, so I then proceed to an analysis of the treatment of the crowd in the tragedies. Other devices frequently used are disguise, mistaken identity, and the inclusion of foreigners. Most important, though, in the early part of the period is the rise of entertainment. Dancing, music, set spectacles, machines, elaborate scenery and ghosts are also common elements of tragedy at the beginning of

the century. Ghosts, oracles and the supernatural play a considerable part in heightening the characters' awareness of something outside themselves, and later in the period the prison is used as a place for meditation. With introversion comes sentimentality, the best indications of which are the use of children for pathetic effect, the depiction of a virtuous but helpless and neglected heroine, and the self-sacrificing relationship of male friends.

Most of the tragedies are written in blank verse. A few plays, however, are still written in rhyming couplets.<sup>2</sup> All except one of these fall within the first eleven years of the period. Crowne's last tragedy, Caligula (1698),<sup>3</sup> and two of Charles Hopkins's plays, Boadicea (1697)<sup>4</sup> and Friendship Improv'd (1700),<sup>5</sup> are all old-fashioned, perpetuating a form of tragedy which was dying out. Caligula, however, is remarkable for the way in which the couplets are admirably suited to the ambivalent treatment of the central character who tends not only to be alarmingly sententious and rigid in his arbitrary decisions, but is treated with a refreshing sense of humour which only occasionally turns sour. Sir Charles Sedley is deliberately evoking a formal classicism in his adaptation of Shakespeare, Beauty the Conqueror (1702)<sup>6</sup> and Edward Ward's curious play Honesty in Distress (1706)<sup>7</sup> is a moral treatise, using the image of a play to reflect social conditions in which honesty cannot thrive without great difficulty. The latter play could perhaps better be described as a dialogue poem. Joseph Trapp uses the couplet for heightening and distancing King Saul (1703),<sup>8</sup> so that it appears formal and dignified. Two other plays, Fyfe's The Royal Martyr (1705)<sup>9</sup> and Granville's British Enchanters (1706),<sup>10</sup> are operatic, depending heavily on elaborate visual effects, and the couplets

help elevate the tone. The last play in couplets, Robert Ashton's Battle of Aughrim (1728),<sup>11</sup> is curious: a battle play unlike any other tragedies in the period; it is not known to have been acted, and could possibly have been written as a poetic exercise rather than a theatrical venture.

Many of the early plays utilise a prose sub-plot - this reflects in some cases an attempt to use what was seen to be an Elizabethan device - but the extent to which the sub-plot has anything to do with the main action varies considerably. In Hopkins's Neglected Virtue (1696)<sup>12</sup> the sub-plotters are low-class characters who indulge in bawdy banter and discuss their sexual preoccupations quite openly (a contrast to the covert sexual activities of the actors in the main plot). In The Rival Brothers (1704)<sup>13</sup> the prose is used mainly for the purpose of objective comment by subsidiary characters on the actions of the main characters. The prose figures in The Unnatural Mother (1698)<sup>14</sup> are comic and semi-comic, but in this play the main characters also speak in prose, although in moments of heightened intensity the main characters tend to speak scarcely concealed pentameters. Similarly, in parts of Lillo's The London Merchant (1731)<sup>15</sup> (particularly when George and his uncle are setting the atmosphere for the murder) the prose often proves to be pentameters with very few variations. In D'Urfey's two Massaniello plays (1699 and 1700)<sup>16</sup> the comedy is in prose, but that is not to say that the characters who use prose are wholly comic; D'Urfey's careful control of tone ensures that the constant interplay between verse and prose creates some complex and effective contrasts and subtleties. This kind of subtlety has social overtones in Moore's Mangora, King of the Timbusians (1718),<sup>17</sup> for while the king (a thoroughly noble character) speaks in verse, his brother, the ignorant villain Siripus,

uses prose. In the later part of the period prose is used for two main reasons, either in plays which are adaptations of earlier plays themselves having prose sub-plots, or for depicting class differences, as in The Mournful Nuptials (1739)<sup>18</sup> which has the less affluent Briars speaking from time to time in prose. There are, however, a few plays which are written entirely or almost entirely in prose.<sup>19</sup>

Couplets are sometimes used, as at the beginning of Mrs Pix's Double Distress (1701)<sup>20</sup> to give heightening to specific passages; in this case King Darius is established as a dignified, haughty personage in contrast to the less majestic characters introduced on the stage at the same time. Couplets are used in nearly every play at the ends of each act and sometimes (whether the scene divisions are marked in the printed text or not) at the ends of the scenes. At these points characters tend to step out of their established personalities for a few moments in order to comment on the progress of the action, or to present the audience with a moral which has some bearing on the action. At the beginning of the period the favourite sort of rhyming tag is one where there is extended simile of a sailor, shipwreck and storm which parallels the storm in the lovers' relationships. The other most frequently used device is of a merchant, and the merchant is often presented as adrift at sea after or during a storm, his job being seen as weathering the impending crises.

It seems quite clear that the new importance of the merchant class was well known to most of the dramatists concerned, particularly as they knew that members of this class constituted an ever-increasing proportion of the London theatre audience. The awareness of merchant travellers is reflected throughout the period in the depiction of people who returned to

England with their fortunes (as in The Fatal Extravagance<sup>21</sup> or Lillo's two most famous plays<sup>22</sup>) or who went abroad to seek wealth (the Welltons in Southerne's Oroonoko (1696)).<sup>23</sup> Dramatists are also concerned to show, however, that merchants and mariners can lead to conflict with the natives, and this can be seen in Dennis's Liberty Asserted (1704)<sup>24</sup> where European colonisers are seen from the natives' point of view as unwelcome disturbers. Trade and commerce, then, can be linked to the question of international conflicts, but Southerne goes a step further to draw a parallel between the behaviour of merchants in bargaining, and the activities of husbands in search of wives. Wellton uses a great deal of mercantile language in Oroonoko when speaking of trying to find a wife. He/she speaks of rates, prices, a broker and a dealer, and the emblem of commerce as a parallel to sexual behaviour is brought out in the financial trickery which is at the basis of Wellton's concealment of her sexual identity. Charles Johnson takes up this theme in Caelia (1733)<sup>25</sup> when Mother Lupine tells Caelia that she had a whole load of "goods" quite "spoilt" on the way from Lancashire to London. Caelia's mistaking Mother Lupine's reference to her new prostitutes for legitimate trading, adds to the poignancy of the scene and to the audience's awareness of the confusion of two moral codes - one for things and another for people.

The merchant simile, therefore, can be used to make several connections: the sudden change of fortunes, the destruction of comfort and security by a shipwreck, or the means of bringing un hoped for financial salvation. In all these areas the dramatist compares the situation of his characters to that of his audience so that the fate of kings and princes is expressed in images which have immediate economic relevance to the

audience. By going one step further authors can draw on the conventional pun of "trading" to link the world of merchant venturing and sudden gain or loss to the world of love both for the characters (in their sudden reversals) and for the audience in their awareness of contemporary social life and behaviour where finding a husband, wife or lover can involve some legal or illegal form of "trading". The rising importance of the economic activity of London is thus constantly compared to questions of sexual behaviour.

There may sometimes be a deliberate undertone of irony in the use of the merchant simile, for a writer like Charles Hopkins is aware that the search for wealth in foreign parts may be morally very dubious; in Pyrrhus (1696)<sup>26</sup> the following simile appears:

[Kings] use not what they have  
As Merchants, venturing on the faithless Seas  
For needless Wealth, are driv'n by sudden Storms  
On Banks of Sands, or dash'd against the Rocks,  
And all they have is sunk, and lost at once. (IV i, p. 36)

Yet in contrast to this the merchant venture is seen as inevitable in Higgons's Generous Conqueror (1701).<sup>27</sup> Here the simile refers to the plight of the lovers; even though they are in extreme danger their love is bound to continue, and they will nevertheless proceed with their dangerous course:

The Merchant Stranded, and his Fortune's Lost,  
Fix'd on the Floating Mast each God implores,  
With longing Eyes the distant Mountains views,  
And Vows he'll never trust the Oceans more:  
But when escap'd, all his Resolves are vain. (III ii, p. 44)

At the end of the first act of Johnson's The Victim (1714)<sup>28</sup> the dramatist goes on from a statement of the merchant idea to a few pastoral couplets:

The Florists thus, when Winter's Rage is o'er,  
 When Frosts and Snows, and Tempests are no more,  
 To the kind Soul commits the future Flower....  
 Secure, he views the harbour with Delight;  
 When unexpected, in one piercing Night,  
 His promis'd Joys are curs'd by a disastrous Blight. (I i, p. 13)

The sexual innuendos here should not be overlooked. The "harbour" and the "piercing Night" both refer on one level to the sexual act, and "Joys" is used interchangeably throughout the period with "Bliss" to denote the pleasure of intercourse. Thus in this example we have the three principal associations of the merchant simile - the change in fortunes, the pastoral and the sexual - all brought together. In The False Friend (1699)<sup>29</sup> by Mrs Pix, an author who never hesitates to pile one effect on top of another, Louisa enters distracted, her hair down, wounded in her arms and bosom, and also poisoned:

Give me way. I am all Consuming Flames.  
 Unhand me. Let me Launch my  
 Veins yet deeper! They are all on Fire!  
 Blood cannot quench 'em! My Breath is  
 Flakes of Fire! My Eyes like Flaming  
 Meteors Shoot! My Nerves, My Arteries,  
 Like Shrivell'd Parchments shrink in Fire -  
 I Burn; I Blaze; I Dye - Oh that I cou'd -  
 For Death they say is cold! (V [ii], p. 57)

If the sexual nature of her thoughts is not clear enough with this, Mrs Pix goes on to have her say:

Hold Off a little. - thus let us meet,  
 Thus let me Clasp thee... Thus will  
 We Mount together. (V [ii], p. 60)

In madness and death characters can express their sexual preoccupations which they have often been at pains to suppress during their sanity or during the course of the rest of the play. Sexuality is at the very base of all these plays, for love, lust and sexual fulfilment come into virtually every tragedy.

It is the common preoccupation of mankind, and one which, it seems, people find the greatest difficulty in vocalising. Rivalry in love, the attentions of a lascivious self-seeker, the aspirations of noble lovers, the lives ruined by the failure of love, and the conflict between morality and impulse, between reason and passion in action, all lie at the very centre of tragedy in this period.

A further recurring image in the plays of the period is that of fire and freezing. Read properly this image immediately conjures up the whole area of sexual passion. The usual word for the sexual act, as I have suggested, is "Bliss" or "Joys", but the recurring image also frequently has the association of madness. Fire and freezing evoke an extreme emotion, which may be love, lust, madness or the state of having been poisoned. All these connotations can easily be explained in terms of colloquial language; one is out of one's mind if one is in love, or mad, and madness seems to have been very often a stage device for suggesting poison. A few examples of this will suffice. In Hill's Elfrid (1710)<sup>30</sup> the king is intent upon enjoying Elfrid; Egbert tries to persuade the king to be patient but the latter exclaims:

Patience! thou Lump of Ice! a Curse on Patience!  
 Preach Patience to the Ocean when it roars,...  
 I am on Fire within me, and the Streams  
 Of gushing Rivers might rush thro' me now,  
 And fail to quench my burning. (III i, p. 25)

In Act III of Rowe's Ambitious Step-Mother (1701)<sup>31</sup> Mirza momentarily hesitates on his path of revenge:

And now like Oyl my flaming Spirits blaze;  
 My Arteries, my Heart, my Brain is scortch't.  
 And I am all one fury. Feeble Mirza!

Can'st thou give way to dotage, and become  
The jest of Fools? No! 'tis Impossible. (III ii [i.e. iii])

Finally the close connexion between sex and madness is illustrated in The Fatal Discovery (1698);<sup>32</sup> Beringaria comes on stage distracted:

No, no, no more of Beds. -  
May I not hug him now - Dear, dear Cornaro,  
Let me Dye in they Arms -  
Ha! see, see, there's my Husband come  
To blast my Eyes, and curse me for the Birth of Eromena. (V i, p. 49)

Having briefly surveyed the recurring images of the merchant and of fire and freezing, we turn to the third, and most important, recurring image in the tragedies of the period, the pastoral retreat. Eric Rothstein has devoted some very good pages to an analysis of the function of the pastoral in Restoration drama. In almost every play in the period there is a passage where one of the leading characters expresses a desire to leave the world of court intrigue and go to retire to the "natural" world of shepherds, woods and streams where it would be possible to live happily ever after. In its simplest and most obvious form the pastoral world is one of innocence, contrasting with the intrigue and often evil of the court, and Rothstein connects it helpfully with Epicurean philosophy<sup>34</sup> and the "Golden Age":

One can, however, perceive the connections between classical simplicity (reason, Golden Age), simplicity of style (natural style), and simplicity of pastoral life: the hero and heroine of pathetic tragedy committed themselves to all.<sup>35</sup>

The pastoral can, however, also be used to suggest more than a simple world of innocence and commitment to simplicity.

In Mrs Trotter's Revolution of Sweden (1706)<sup>36</sup> the natural world is symbolised by the wood in which Gustavus and his followers are hiding. But just as the woods are a place of safe retreat for those who are normally

in the right, so they are a maze, a place of deception and ambush, for their opponents, both the church and state parties. At other times in the play the woods are an impartial, amoral force, and even Gustavus's party is misled by the subtle use of the natural world by his opponents. Indeed, for other people in other plays the natural world is seen as the ultimate punishment. In Mrs Pix's Conquest of Spain (1701)<sup>37</sup> Jaccinta has a long speech depicting the natural world as a place of shameful exile:

Let me go  
 From whence I never may again return.  
 Where shall I find a Place to shroud my Shame?  
 To Rocks, to Barren Desarts let me fly,  
 To dusky Caverns, far from humane Sight,  
 To solitary Groves whose untrod Paths  
 Are dark and silent, as are those below,  
 Where gloomy Poplar and the baneful Yew  
 Compose a dismal Shade, fitting my Woes;  
 Where Bats and Owls build their aboding Nests,  
 And Adders crawl on the unwholesome Ground:  
 There undisturb'd let me indulge my Grief,  
 Till Death appears and brings me wish'd Relief. (III [ii], p. 37)

One of the significances of the pastoral, then, is that its implications depend upon the state of mind of the speaker. When Lorrain is lying extended on a bank of flowers in a garden, sunk in lethargy at the beginning of the last act of Mrs Trotter's The Unhappy Penitent (1701),<sup>38</sup> his griefs move him to feel that he is a second Adam, re-enacting the sorrows of the whole world. Similarly a distressed Julio lies extended on the ground in a melancholy posture in Act III of Gildon's The Patriot (1703),<sup>39</sup> and he later says:

Throw thy abandon'd Body on the Ground,  
 With thy dear Breast lie wedded to the Dew. (III i, p. 28)

He feels that union with the ground, the mother earth, can ease his sorrows.

There is an interesting stage direction in Hunt's Fall of Tarquin (1714):<sup>40</sup>

Upon which Brutus pretending to stumble falls down and kisses the Earth, which is the common Mother of all men. (IV iii, p. 51)

In extremity, then, men can draw consolation from nature, the foundation of their being.

In Southerne's Fate of Capua (1701)<sup>41</sup> Junius looks back to the past nostalgically when speaking to Favonia:

There was a time, in the gay Spring of Life,  
When every Note was as the mounting Lark's  
Merry, and cheerful, to salute the Morn;  
When all the day was made of Melody.  
But that is past, that day is spent, and gone. (II [iii], p. 36)

The suggestion which recurs most frequently, however, is that the pastoral represents the ideal, unfallen world. When Honesty emerges in London in Honesty in Distress (1705) she comes

From Anch'rites lonely Caves, from Hermites Cells,  
And Rural Huts, where sweet Contentment dwells:  
From Consecrated Groves and Heav'nly Meads.  
Where no vile Wretch, or lustful Harlot treads. (I i, p. 1)

The dances of shepherds and nymphs are frequently used as a court entertainment to present an antithesis to court life, and good court characters are nearly always aware that the life of the country offers them considerable attraction. In Hill's Elfrid (1710) Athelwold berates his wife for leaving their pastoral retreat out of sheer curiosity to see the court; he knows that as soon as the king sets eyes on Elfrid his passion will be aroused, and he is proved right. Athelwold tells Elfrid:

The meanest Cottager, that tills the Lands,  
In one short moment knows more solid Bliss  
Than Ages give those Courtiers. (I i, p. 3)

The king is told in Banks's Cyrus the Great (1696)<sup>42</sup> that the happiest man was

not Croesus but the humble Tellius, a citizen of Athens:

Who, like the first Man, liv'd in Paradise...  
Fed on the Flesh of his own teeming Flocks,  
And wore no Cloaths but what their Backs afforded. (II i, p. 12)

In Mrs Pix's Czar of Muscovy (1701),<sup>43</sup> an example quoted here because it is written in prose rather than the more customary verse, Marina in a garden says:

How happy is the humble Cottager, who never knows the Madness  
of Ambition? Wou'd I had been born a simple Shepherdess, or  
any other mean and lowly Maid; an humbler Fortune wou'd a  
suited better with my tender Nature; had I been such, I might  
have past my unenvy'd Days in an obscure Retreat, more to be  
valu'd than the anxious Cares of exalted Greatness. (V [iii], p.52)

Marina makes it clear that her utterance is only a dream, merely wishful thinking, but no less attractive for that.

A more startling example of the pastoral as an ideal place of retreat is to be found in Smith's Princess of Parma (1699).<sup>44</sup> Almira rescues Doria from a dungeon where he is imprisoned in Act II and she gives him freedom, saying:

Beneath a fragrant Shade of twisted Greens,  
The peaceful Seat of Sacred Innocence,  
Rich but in mutual Love, and humble Thoughts,  
Contented Poverty shall be our Portion;  
No wish of Honour shall our rest devour...  
Whilst cheerful Birds, in simpathizing Notes,  
Repeat the Sounds of our increasing Loves. (II ii, p. 14)

But Almira makes it clear that she does not expect Doria to go with her, or even that she will go herself, for they are not now part of the world of "Sacred Innocence" because they have to do something about revenge, and instead of departing together for a bower of eternal pastoral bliss Almira bids Doria to go quickly to "strike the Monster of Rebellion dead". The

pastoral world is somewhere where emotions are at theirfullest and best, and there is no solace for grief so effective as that of nature; Zoraida in Mrs Manley's Almyna (1707)<sup>45</sup> says:

The Baleful Yew Tree, and the Mournful Cypress,  
 (Fit Emblems of my Sorrow) form the Shade,  
 On wither'd Turf, or Mossy roots extend me,  
 There I in Death, dear Youth, will pardon all. (III i, p. 37)

The opposition between court and country is at its clearest in Lady Winchelsea's Aristomenes (1713),<sup>46</sup> the one genuine pastoral tragedy of the period. In this play the characters who are right both politically and morally have left the court and are living among shepherds and shepherdesses. There are real and assumed shepherds just as there are real and assumed positions in the court. Climander (one of the court characters pretending to be a shepherd) has come to the country because he has been told that only there would he find the daughter of the "Best of Men". Aristomenes is led to freedom from imprisonment by a fox, which leads him from dungeon to garden, from evil to innocence. Climas utters an effective lament about war:

Let every Shepherd weep!  
 Turn their sweet Harmony to Sighs and Groans!  
 To the fierce Wolves deliver up their Flocks!  
 And leave Messenia to the Cruel Victor! (I i, p. 3)

The natural world is the only place for the whole man, in this escapist view; whole men also inhabit the court in some of the plays, but these same men are above all aware that they cannot live as whole men in the court, even though they may seem to be doing so.

A pastoral setting is frequently chosen as an ideal place in plays

dealing with the introduction of Christianity; it is in a pastoral retreat where the Christians often meet, and in Hurst's Roman Maid (1725)<sup>47</sup> there is a very effective passage where the activities of the Christians are described by the Roman Maximus:

Just at the bottom of Mount Aventine,  
 There stands a melancholy, gloomy Wood,  
 Obscure as Hell, and Dismal as the Grave,  
 Where Ghosts and Spectres lament, oft at Midnight,  
 Strange sights appear, and Groans and fearful Cries  
 Are heard most plain, and scare the trembling Hinds  
 That dwell in scatter'd Cottages around,  
 Within, there is a Cave o'ergrown with Moss,  
 Just at the foot of an old, withered Oak  
 Long since with Light'ning blasted, on whose Boughs,  
 All the Night long the doleful Owlet Screams,  
 And croaking Ravens build by Day, The Christians  
 Assemble there, practice the Magic-Art,  
 And try the horrid Force of Philtres, Charms,  
 Dire Incantations and Infernal Witchcraft. (III ix, pp. 48-9)

The effectiveness of this passage depends upon its relentless ironic inversion, where good becomes bad, civilised becomes pagan, light becomes darkness, and heavenly sighs become evil omens. Christianity and the pastoral represent enlightened morality to the Christians, but the same things convey the opposite to the Romans who still retain their belief in the pagan gods. In this case the pastoral is meant to be seen as the ideal, but it is an ideal which for the pagans is as unattainable as a pastoral retreat for a dying heroine.

The pastoral represents the world outside the immediate environment and experience of the characters, and something to which they are strongly attracted. Nearly all the plays involve only a small number of dramatis personae and rarely make reference to anything outside their present experience except to the pastoral and also to the "crowd" - the world of ordinary men, usually referred to as the "rabble" or the "vulgar". Hence we have a limited

area of experience contrasted to an ideal world (the pastoral) or a generalised concept of the actual world (the vulgar). Neither of these, however, represents a viable alternative for the characters; they are both dreamworlds, both rhetorical abstractions. While the pastoral symbolises very often the antithesis of the difficulties in which the characters are placed, the body of common people serve the function of a body of inferior minds and spirits with which the characters can compare themselves and then feel secure and superior.

In most of the revolution plays the crowd is pictured as a vast uninformed mass which changes its allegiances very easily. Its members are "the shouting Swarms" in Hill's Athelwold (1732)<sup>48</sup> or "the giddy Crowd" and "an impatient People" in Boyer's Achilles (1700).<sup>49</sup> In Johnson's Medaea (1731)<sup>50</sup> they are the "ignorant Vulgar" who are both pleased and displeased by the wedding of Jason and Creusa, though they have no idea of the reasons for their impressions. In this play AEGEUS who is describing them can set himself up as a man with far superior insight to that of the common people. Later in the same play Medaea has a splendid "ubi sunt" passage which begins with the idea of the crowd and concludes with the idea that man has ultimately only himself for judgement and solace:

Where are the shouting Crowds, who press'd to see  
Thy Chariot pass, and scatter'd Roses round thee?  
Where are the Minstrels now, who sounded high  
The bridal Song? Where is the gilded Circle,  
That bent the flattering Knee, and bless'd thy Bed?  
Where are the Priests, who sanctify'd thy Nuptials?  
Where are the Gods, who gave their lucky Auspices?  
Where is thy royal Father, fam'd for Politicks,  
And wicked Wiles? And lastly, tell me, Jason,  
Where is thy Mourning Bride? (V i, p. 66)

Lorenzo in Gildon's The Patriot refuses to be swayed by the arbitrary

decisions of the ignorant people, this "Mob-Government", and Cleopatra is most reluctant to give the crowd any credit for right action in Sedley's Beauty the Conqueror (1702):

They have done right by Chance, excuse 'em for't;  
Tempests sometimes drive ships into the Port. (IV iv, p. 37)

This view of the mass of humanity as both ignorant and stupid is also reflected in three early plays; Queen Lanassa complains in Hopkins's Pyrrhus (1695) that death always lops off the noble but spares the vulgar, King Charles sees the crowd in league with evil forces in Fyfe's The Royal Martyr (1705):

London, the Seat of this bewitching Fraud,  
The Treason by the Giddie Mob applaud (I i, p. 7)

and Queen Rosalinda sets herself up above the common people in Mrs Manley's Lucius (1717):<sup>52</sup>

Mine's not a Vulgar Fate,  
To be weigh'd out by ev'ry common Hand,  
Or at a Moment's Call, to be determin'd. (II i, p. 16)

Reference to the crowd can denote that the character is giving way to impulses which he would much rather control; L. Icilius complains in Dennis's Appius and Virginia (1709):<sup>53</sup>

And I am now become like vulgar Minds;  
Oh! I am softer, weaker than a Woman. (II i, p. 51)

But there are occasions where the crowd is seen as the repository of worldly wisdom and common sense; Herodorus compares the openness of the crowd with the empty homages which the flattering Didius has been paying:

Yon undesigning Croud wears no Disguise,  
But this Man's artful Words too smoothly flow  
To spring from that plain Thing, an honest Heart. (I iv, p. 9)

Thus in this play, Philip of Macedon (1727)<sup>54</sup> by Lewis, the crowd is seen to be on the side of right. Southerne in The Fate of Capua (1700) makes an even more interesting comment on the role of the crowd; indeed in this play the ordinary people play a considerable part as sort of chorus, and speak several times. The citizens are shown to have a good deal of moral awareness, even though they have little skill in the manoeuvrings of the politics of their leaders. They are largely responsible for the admittance of Hannibal, but show their doubts as soon as they see him, for he is not nearly as impressive as they had expected. Their doubts are confirmed when he orders Decius Magius to be paraded through the streets in chains, and they turn against him, having no hesitation in changing sides once again when he abuses the power which they have given him, and when he turns into a worse tyrant than they expected. The most sophisticated treatment of the crowd, however, is to be found in Lillo's The London Merchant where Maria is unable to think of any greater disgrace than to be sneered at by the crowd; her bourgeois morality dictates that public shame is far worse than private shame. She says at the end of the play:

this dreadful catastrophe virtue herself abhors. To give a holiday to suburb slaves and, passing, entertain the savage herd who, elbowing for a sight, pursue and press on him like his fate. A mind with piety and resolution armed may smile on death. But public ignominy, everlasting shame (shame, the death of souls, to die a thousand times and yet survive even death itself in never-dying infamy), is this to be endured? Can I, who live in him and must each hour of my devoted life feel all these woes renewed, can I endure this? (V ix, 64-72)

In each of these cases, when characters think of the pastoral retreat to which they wished they could escape, or when they compare themselves to the mass of humanity, they are concerned to confirm their own identity in a time

of great stress.

In some of the plays, however, the question of identity becomes not an important human issue, but a mere technical device. Disguise and mistaken identity are an integral part of any play which is concerned with revenge and political manoeuvring. Killing the wrong person because he or she is disguised as another character in the play is a frequent element of the European plays, and will not be discussed in detail here because its purpose is clear - an attempt to heighten the element of chance in revenge-centered plays, an example of the way in which one should not take it upon oneself to execute what one thinks to be the will of fate, the arbitrary deaths which are bound to occur if disguise is employed to further trickery, the influence of the corruption in courts. There are some plays, however, which involve sexual confusion. Most of the examples involve women disguising themselves as men; an odd situation arises in Hopkins's Friendship Improv'd (1700) because Locris is disguised as a man, and General Maherbal says several times that he wishes Locris were a woman. When Locris in fact proves to be a woman at the end of the play Maherbal is only too eager to invite her to marry him. Laura disguises herself as Fredage in Mrs Trotter's Revolution of Sweden (1706), and Ipanthe disguises herself as a man in Hill's Fatal Vision (1716),<sup>55</sup> but her identity is disclosed at the end of the play when her turban falls off to reveal lots of female hair. In Hewitt's Fatal Falsehood (1734)<sup>56</sup> Louisa disguises herself in boy's clothes in order to have revenge on her rival Maria. In this play both women are married to the same man, and the tragedy is intensified at the end precisely because the identities cannot be understood visually. Charlot Welldon in Southerne's Oroonoko (1696) disguises herself as her imaginary brother in order to cheat Widow Lackett

of £1000. There are two examples of men disguising themselves as women; both examples are to be found in prose sub-plots, and both are comic. In Fatal Discovery (1698) Captain Conall disguises himself as a woman in order to gain sexual access to Margaretta, and there follows a scene in which he and Dandalo (Margaretta's jealous husband) are seen in bed together. Similarly in Mrs Centlivre's Perjur'd Husband (1706)<sup>57</sup> Ludovico dons women's clothes, though he is comically disrobed in Act IV. Another aspect of the disguise motif is to be found in Banks's Cyrus the Great (1696) where the mad Lansaria is seen "Distracted, drest like a Cupid, with a Bow and Quiver". In her distraction Lansaria loses all sense of her real identity and becomes the personification of the chief source of her problem, Cupid.

The final theme which is used several times to compare identities, is the use of foreigners. In most cases the world of early eighteenth century tragedies is very limited, but sometimes the authors are able to examine particular facets of behaviour by juxtaposing characters of different nationalities. We have seen that a setting by and large limits the scope of a play and calls into operation certain sorts of themes. A few sets of plays are concerned with a specific sort of clash of characters: Romans against barbarians, English against Romans, Spanish against the Moors and faction against faction within the given country. In a few plays nationalities clash in an interesting way as in the plays with fantasy settings (like Oroonoko, Liberty Asserted, and Mangora) and in Thomson's Edward and Eleonora (1739).<sup>58</sup> Some generalisations can be made about the treatment of foreigners, and what constitutes a foreigner. In the Eastern plays when European characters appear, they are almost always superior to the native Easterners. In Mrs Haywood's Fair Captive (1721)<sup>59</sup> Alphonso manages to reach the inside of the seraglio

where he hopes to find and rescue his love through the unscrupulousness of a Jew whom he bribes. Alphonso, however, is morally superior to the members of the seraglio, and so the Jew is operating in support of noble characters in letting him in, although he is seen to be a traitor by the Sultan. In both Mangora (1718) and Liberty Asserted (1704) the foreigners (Indians in both cases) are both good and bad, like the Europeans. Southerne seems to go a little further in Oroonoko in making his slave the hero, though Oroonoko's traits of nobility are recognisably European (Oroonoko, for example, gains stature by his refusal to be bigamous even though his religion and morality say that he can be). In Congreve's Mourning Bride (1697)<sup>60</sup> there are good and bad Moors, but the noble Gonzalez uses the disguise of a mute in order to carry out his intrigue (morally rightful intrigue). In Mrs Pix's Conquest of Spain (1705) the Moors are uncharacterised enemies, and in Cibber's Perolla and Izadora (1706)<sup>61</sup> the people who fight are masked in African habits. Much more damning as a view of foreigners is Sebastian's outburst to his wife in Theobald's Perfidious Brother (1715):<sup>62</sup>

Enough! - No more:-

She's foul, and tainted as the swarthy AEthiop! (II i, p. 20)

Finally, in Mrs Centlivre's Perjur'd Husband (1701) there is a masque in Bassino's house where foreign dress is used for a picturesque effect when "three Men and three Women of several Nations" perform a dance.

The early part of the eighteenth century witnesses the great rise in the popularity of the entertainment in the London theatres. The playbill almost always included some form of music, singing or dancing, and this trend is reflected in many of the tragedies. Music in one form or another is employed in about half of the tragedies, though more frequently in 1700 than

in 1740. A few plays, like Sedley's Beauty the Conqueror (1702) or John Sheffield's Julius Caesar and Marcus Brutus (1723),<sup>63</sup> all attempts to formalise and classicise Shakespeare, employ a chorus at the ends of the acts, but it is worth noting that these three plays were in fact never staged. Sounds of warlike instruments appear in William Philips's Hibernia Freed (1722),<sup>64</sup> Ashton's Battle of Aughrim (1728), Goring's Irene (1708),<sup>65</sup> Cibber's Xerxes (1699),<sup>66</sup> Beckingham's Scipio Africanus (1718),<sup>67</sup> Walker's Victorious Love (1698),<sup>68</sup> Congreve's Mourning Bride (1697) and many others where drums and trumpets<sup>69</sup> herald battles, the arrival of a victorious conqueror, or the presence of a king. In Dennis's Iphigenia (1700)<sup>70</sup> we have "Flat Trumpets", a "Dreadful Symphony" and an ode, and several plays have a war-like dance. Trapp's King Saul (1703) has a number of musical elements, including the sound of trumpets, a "Sett of Musick", a victory song to David, a "Martial Dance, while the Trumpets sound a Levett" and trumpets sounding a charge. Goring's Irene (1708) involves a song and Turkish dance, and D'Urfey's second play about Massainello (1699) has:

a Comical Entertainment of Mimicking Dancing at a Ball with Clowns, Morrice-Dancers and Tumblers mixt, and several Humourous Songs and Dialogues. (II ii)

Mrs Centlivre's Perjur'd Husband (1700) begins with a dance, and more dances are to be found throughout the period from Crowne's Caligula (1698) to Lillo's Christian Hero (1735).<sup>71</sup>

Music is sometimes associated with religious ritual, particularly in the plays set in Greece; there is music in the temple of Bacchus in John Sheffield's Marcus Brutus (1723), an ode to Vesta in the Temple of Vesta in Hurst's Roman Maid (1725), and "After the Vocal Musick, a solemn Call by Instrumental Musick to the Altar" in Johnson's Victim (1714). A Hymn to

Isis is to be found in Young's Revenge (1719),<sup>72</sup> a chorus of youths and virgins who sing in the temple in Barford's Virgin Queen (1728),<sup>73</sup> a dialogue song between Juno and Hymen in Gildon's Phaeton (1698)<sup>74</sup> and a Hymn to Light in Rowe's Ambitious Step-Mother (1701).

Other musical features include a dialogue song which is supposed to take place between a eunuch boy and a virgin in Mrs Pix's Ibrahim (1698),<sup>75</sup> a dialogue song between a shepherd and a shepherdess in Gould's Rival Sisters (1696),<sup>76</sup> a threatening song which is performed to Danaus by furies in Owen's Hypermmestra (1703),<sup>77</sup> and a song which heralds the suicide scene in William Philip's Revengeful Queen (1698);<sup>78</sup> Tate's singing witches in Macbeth (1731)<sup>79</sup> need hardly be mentioned.

Soft music is employed in Hewitt's Fatal Falsehood (1734) to accompany Louisa's melancholy in the opening act, and soft music also plays while Zoraida sleeps on a repose of flowers in Mrs Manley's Almyna (1707). Few specific details are given of most of the music in most of the plays, but we learn the composer of the songs and symphonies in several plays; the setting for the song in Boyer's Achilles (1700) is by Purcell. A few of the entertainments, however, are described in some detail. Cibber outlines fairly specifically what he requires for Xerxes (1699) - a chorus, a triumphal song, a martial symphony, a song by Loyalty, two pageants and the appearance of Hymen, Cupid and Venus. There are many songs in Granville's British Enchanters (1706), loud music, and an entertainment which is followed by the intervention of the gods' comments in the form of thunder. Dennis's Rinaldo and Armida (1699),<sup>80</sup> a play closely related to opera, has a great deal of music; an overture with trumpets, soft music, a symphony of flutes, serpents and basses hissing softly under the stage, "Horrid Musick", a

a chorus of Loves and Graces, a singing spirit and a note to the effect that "The foresaid Alarm is repeated for the Act Tune". Ravenscroft's The Italian Husband (1698) has a very elaborate entertainment in the opening act, a Masque of Ixion in Act III and an overture with violins, hautboys, trumpets and kettle-drums. The first part of D'Urfey's Massaniello has music in the Cathedral which is meant to celebrate victory and which involves a song between Fate and St Genaro; later in the play a martial symphony is played by trumpets, kettle-drums and hautboys, and this is followed by music at a banquet and an entertainment of singing and dancing. The most curious music is to be found in Moore's Mangora (1718); there is a song between an Indian man and woman, the "jarring of untun'd Instruments" and an elaborate spectacle when

Malivag waves a Wand, and a glorious Machine descends, with  
the Musicians richly habited, who perform a very fine new  
consort.

Music is thus an integral part of many of the plays, and an expected feature of an evening's entertainment at the theatre.

Machines are to be found chiefly in the earlier plays, for they appear to have gone out of fashion as soon as their novelty wore off. Mangora calls for not one machine but two, although the play was never acted in a public theatre. As well as the musical one just mentioned Moore asks for a machine on which "Fame rises with Wings on a Pedestal". Like Mangora, Trapp's King Saul is not known to have been acted, but the author calls for a number of elaborate devices. In the stage directions in Act IV he states "several great Clouds appear, the Moon partly seen; from behind one of them enter David and Abishai" (IV [iv], p. 48). Later in the same act, after "A hollow Noise and Flashes of Fire", Trapp specifies:

The Spirits cause a Cloud to descend, in which the Witch being plac'd, they bear her away in it, and the SCENE changes to the Camp. (IV [ii], p. 58)

An apparition in the skies is called for in D'Urfey's second Massainello play:

Here the Clouds open, and an Apparition of St Genaro is seen, with his Sword drawn: He Sings this Song of Comfort, and then disappears.

In Dennis's Rinaldo and Armida (1699) spirits rise, and later in the play the "Scene opens, and discovers Fame, Hero and Heroines in the Clouds". Johnson describes a very elaborate marriage ceremony between Jason and Creusa in the Temple of Hymen in his play Medaea (1731):

Thunder and Coruscations in the Air. When the flat Scene opens and a Cloud appears, which disperses; then Medaea is discover'd descending from the Chariot of the Sun, described with golden Rays.

In Rowe's Ulysses (1706) Pallas Athene descends in a flood of light but does not speak. There are two interesting stage directions in Granville's British Enchanters (1706), only the second of which involves a machine. For the first, though, unusual devices would be required:

The Grove appears in an Instant all in a Flame. Fountains from below cast up Fire as in Spouts: a Rain of Fire from above.

Later in the same play "The Chariot descends, swiftly drawn by Dragons ... The Chariot mounts in the Air". There is something very curious in Hunt's Fall of Tarquin (1714): "A Prodigy appears viz. A Flying dragon". An eagle is used in Hopkins's Boadicea (1697):

At the end of the Song an Eagle flies from the Temple, and flutters a while about the Flame of the Sacrifice; at last falls in, and is burnt.

Aristomenes in Lady Winchelsea's play of the same name, as we have noted, is saved from his dungeon by the fox:

A Machine, like a Fox, runs about the Dungeon, smelling,  
and rushes against Aristomenes who taking it for his evil  
Genius catches at it

and it delivers him to the safety of the myrtle grove.

The plays are also useful in indicating which elements of stage scenery were used at which points. The Rival Brothers (1704) has a rare instruction: "The small Side-scene draws", and Mrs Wiseman notes in the first act of Antiochus (1702):<sup>83</sup> "Scene draws to the end of the Stage". There are many examples of a scene being opened to reveal another behind as in Hopkins's Friendship Improv'd (1700) when in the last act the scene of the grove opens to reveal a temple. Boyer's Achilles (1700) combines several effects:

As Iphigenia is leading to be Sacrific'd the Sun is eclips'd; Shrieks in the Air; Subterranean Groans and Howlings; Thunder ... The Altar is lighted; the flat Scene opens, and discovers a Heaven at a Distance; Diana in a Machine crosses the Stage.

The question of darkness is interesting. I am not at all sure how this would have been effected, though darkness or a blackout of some sort is called for in a number of plays. In Mangora, for example, Moore states: "The Fort seems all on fire in a transparent flat Scene, the Stage being darken'd". The stage is also thrust into darkness in Dennis's Rinaldo and Armida (1699) and Shirley's Parricide (1739),<sup>84</sup> as well as Hill's Elfrid (1710).

In Gildon's Love's Victim (1701)<sup>85</sup> "The Curtain rises with terrible Claps of Thunder" and a splendid scene is clearly envisaged in Mrs Manley's Royal Mischief (1696):<sup>86</sup>

The Curtain flies up, to the sound of Flutes, and Hoboys and discovers the River Phasis, several little gilded Boats, with Musick in them; a walk of Trees, the length of the House; Lights fixt in Chrystal Candelsticks to the Branches.

Altars are seen either blazing with light or flaming with sacrifice in Johnson's The Victim (1714) and The Faithful General (1706),<sup>87</sup> and there are "large Pyramids of Lights on each side the Stage, as celebrating the Byram Feast" in Goring's Irene (1707).

The area beneath the stage is used in the many plays which call for subterranean groanings, or for horrid music from below, but a trap door is specifically mentioned in Mrs Centlivre's The Cruel Gift (1717),<sup>88</sup> through which Lorenzo escapes from his pursuers to the bower of love. Another interesting device is the spring which locks Alfonso in his chair in Ravenscroft's Italian Husband (1698). Two very large erections are called for; one is the "Monumental Chappel of the Doria's" in Smith's Princess of Parma (1699)<sup>89</sup> and the other the monument in the outer isle of the Cathedral in Massainello II on which a long inscription can be read by the audience.

Despite the edicts of the followers of French neo-classicism, violence was not eschewed on stage in many of the plays. Emotional violence is perpetrated in the adaptations of The Duchess of Malfy, and a scene with a Death's Head is called for in Ravenscroft's Italian Husband (1698). Banks demands that the whole stage shall be covered with carcasses in Cyrus the Great (1696), and one of them even rises to speak. Oroonoko is seen "on his Back, his Legs and Arms stretch'd out, and chain'd to the Ground" in Southerne's play of the same name (1696), while Polidus is shown on the rack with executioners beside him in Browne's Polidus (1723),<sup>90</sup> Siripus being shown broken on the wheel in Moore's Mangora (1718).

Scenes of groves, fountains, river banks, prospects of flowers, or mountains, or large houses abound in the period, but the anonymous Majesty Misled (1734)<sup>91</sup> is the only play which calls for "a thatch'd House". It

is a point of interest that many of the plays which ask for the most elaborate settings and indicate the most unusual machines are not known to have been acted. It would be instructive to know whether such plays failed to be performed because of some of the technical details involved, or whether authors who did not intend to submit their plays to a theatre for consideration automatically gave their imaginations a more free rein.

Supernatural intervention in and comment on the affairs of men is a frequently recurring pattern in these plays. We have seen how altar scenes and the descent of gods and goddesses in machines helped satisfy a desire for spectacle in serious theatre; oracles, ghosts and spirits also play their part in about a third of the plays. Most characters are aware of some supernatural force which governs or has effect on their lives, and the most frequent utterance of this awareness comes in the form of an exclamation by the thwarted lover of the "malignant stars" or "my unhappy fate". But oracles play a considerable part in the Greek and Roman plays, and in those which are deliberately historical in setting. In Hopkins's Friendship Improv'd (1700) both Maherbal and Locris are told by a ghost or oracle that they will be lost if they marry. Several witches rise and appear before the two Spencers on Blackheath to warn them to avoid what is almost certain to be their fate in Majesty Misled (1734). Xerxes visits the cave of the Magi in Xerxes (1699) by Colley Cibber, and there the spirit Sophiel rises to tell him his fate in the guise of an old man dressed all in white. In Banks's Cyrus the Great (1696) one of the dead carcasses strewn about the stage rises and says that he is sent from Pluto with the message of the oracle. Later in the same play Cyrus enters after Panthea has killed herself led by a Ghost which vanishes as soon as he has appeared on stage. A third ghost, that of the dead Lansaria,

stands protecting Cyrus when Thomrys is about to shoot him. Ghosts of recently deceased members of the dramatis personae often appear to warn other characters of their actions; Banquo's ghost is used in Tate's Macbeth (1731) for this purpose, the ghost of Lancaster appears to the King in Majesty Misled (1734), and there are several ghosts and supernatural characters in Owen's Hypermnestra (1703) - Idmon's ghost comes in bloody and walks across the stage, the bloody ghost of Aegyptus comes in with others and shakes its head at Danaus, the same ghost reappears at a later stage in the play, and on another occasion:

It Thunders. Enter Furies, Alecto, Tisiphone, and Magaera,  
with flaming Torches in one Hand, and Whips in the other.

After groans, bloody phantoms appear before Danaus in Sturmy's Love and Duty (1722),<sup>92</sup> the Ghost of Alexander appears "all in Armour" in Hopkins's Pyrrhus (1696) and shows its approval that Pyrrhus has resolved to act. Another example of the way in which ghosts prompt a character to act is to be found in Ashton's Battle of Aughrim (1728) where the ghost of Herbert's father appears to Sir Charles Godfrey and gives a horrid epic tale of how he met his death. The Ghost of Sapritus rises in Griffin's Injur'd Virtue (1715) after we have seen an angel with a cross in her hand, and in D'Urfey's Grecian Heroine (1724)<sup>93</sup> the Ghost of Clorona descends in Act III. In Mrs Trotter's Agnes de Castro (1696)<sup>94</sup> the arrival of the ghost is heralded by a song, while music is similarly associated with the supernatural in Granville's British Enchanters (1706):

Spirits descend in Clouds, some continue in the Air,  
playing upon Instruments of War, Others remain rang'd  
as for Battel. Others descend upon the Stage.

The genius of Socrates is called for in Socrates Triumphant (1716)<sup>95</sup> and

for the Prologue of Dennis's Iphigenia (1700) "The Genius of England rises to a Warlike Symphony ... He sinks to the same Symphony that he rose". Joseph Trapp in King Saul (1703) stipulates "The Ground opens, and the Ghost ascends like an Old Man Mantled" and in the same play has the spirit Tolo enter "flying". Spirits can also be used to represent the inner thoughts of characters which they dare not express; thus in Dennis's Rinaldo and Armida (1699) the spirits of Rinaldo's parents Bertoldo and Sophia, and the ghosts of some of the men he slew in battle, appear to represent his own misgivings and anxieties. Finally, in Walker's Victorious Love (1698) Zaraida is shown asleep with the ghost of her mother standing by her. The author can in this way show what his character is dreaming about.

The prison scene in Lillo's The London Merchant (1730) can be cited as an example of the trend in the drama towards introspection, for it is in prison that George recalls the events of his past life, admits his sins, and receives the help of the Christian ambassador Thorowgood. But prison scenes without this meditation theme abound. Characters who are involved in events of political intrigue are often seen in prison, either languishing and awaiting execution as in Browne's Polidus (1723) or waiting to be rescued as in Lady Winchelsea's Aristomenes (1713) or Hopkins's Boadicea (1696). Alucius is seen in chains in Beckingham's Scipio Africanus (1718) and a particularly gory scene is described in Granville's British Enchanters (1706) where men and women are chained opposite each other in the dungeons and instruments of horror are shown with a background of plaintive music. In Heroic Friendship (1719)<sup>96</sup> Decimus is seen receiving consolation from his reading of Lucretius. Sewell's Sir Walter Raleigh (1719)<sup>97</sup> is based around

the prison for the title character is imprisoned for the whole of the play; although he is promised freedom several times the decrees are always revoked, and the play is centrally concerned with the issue of his freedom. A poignant example of unjust imprisonment is to be found in Johnson's Caelia (1731) where Caelia is thrust into prison without proper trial after the police raid on the brothel where she has been left by the villain. There is a sentimental (very tearful) scene where her father comes to visit her in prison, and the whole machinery of the brothel can be interpreted as a prison as far as she is concerned. Similarly in Maxwell's The Faithful Pair (1740)<sup>98</sup> Archon is shown in prison twice, and by this date the inclusion of a prison scene is always a clue that the audience's sympathies are to be involved with the suffering character.

Three more indicators of the growing popularity of tearful, sentimental tragedies can be seen in the use of children for pathetic effect, the scenes of self-sacrificing virtue, and the use of a strong theme of male friendship. Lenemaja Friedman recently published a list of children in the drama from 1660 to 1800,<sup>99</sup> but included only a few of the children in the tragedies of this period.<sup>100</sup> There are many examples of plays where pages are called for, and where young people may have been used as Cupids, Choruses of Virgins, or Water Nymphs and the like. The significance of the use of children in these plays is that in several places children speak in order to heighten the impact of the distress of their parents (usually their mother), and to draw a tearful response from the audience who are forced to acknowledge that the children are unwitting victims of what happened. In Mrs Pix's Ibrahim (1696) Leodice arrives on stage in mourning habit with her confidante and

an unnamed child whom she gets to intercede for her with Ibrahim. The same sort of thing happens in Gildon's Phaeton (1698) when Althea brings her children to say goodbye to Phaeton:

1 Child: Father, what have we done to make you leave us?  
 Have I done any thing to anger you?  
 If I have been a naughty Boy, indeed  
 I'm sorry for't, indeed I am. (IV i, p. 28)

In Motteux's Beauty in Distress (1698)<sup>101</sup> Laura in the last act introduces her two children for pathetic effect; Placentia threatens to kill them, but she is moved by the event and embraces them instead. There are children in the procession of captives seen in Cibber's Xerxes (1699), but the most affecting moment in this play is in the last act where Tamira's child runs into her arms when she is being attacked by the crowd. We may also note at this point that it is Oroonoko's fear lest his children should be born slaves that makes him decide to lead a rebellion against the plantation owners. Virginius is seen in Southerne's Fate of Capua (1700) taking away a child from Favonia, and in Gildon's Love Victim (1701) the thirteen year old Tyrelius and the ten year old Manselia do their best to behave as mini-adults in their vows at the end of the play. Much is made of the mother and son relationship in Ambrose Philips's Distrest Mother (1713)<sup>102</sup> although Andromache's son Astyanax is never in fact seen on stage. In the very curious Socrates Triumphant (1716) Xantippe sings a lullaby to her young child, and in Theobald's Fatal Secret (1735)<sup>103</sup> the Young Duke of Malfy runs to his mother in the last act. Paulinus brings out his twins in The Roman Maid (1725), and they run to Dioclesian and hang upon his magnificent robe. In the final act of the play Paulina lays her hands upon them while she is dying of her wounds. Johnson

deals splendidly with the two children of Jason and Medaea in Medaea (1731); they create some good pathetic moments in Act IV and then later kneel to Creusa who receives the gifts from Medaea, the children here the unwitting instruments of Creusa's death. The most striking examples of the use of children are in D'Urfey's unacted Grecian Heroine (1721) and The Fatal Extravagance (1721 and 1726). In the former Clindor is pictured playing with an orange with other children before he goes to Aristander most enthusiastically, but (in a heart-rending scene which has no parallel in the period) is ordered away to his death by the tyrant. In the first one-act version of The Fatal Extravagance by either Mitchell or Hill (1721) Belinda's three children are just mentioned, but in the later five-act version (1726) they enter and are used very tearfully.

Nicholas Rowe's last two plays have been called "she-tragedies". They both concern a noble, virtuous self-sacrificing heroine who meets with personal dire misfortune but who is nevertheless able to die with dignity and, perhaps, even increased stature because of her misfortune. The vulnerability of the position of women in the drama is emphasised time and time again, but at the beginning of the period many of the women exert a great deal of energy in intrigue. Indeed Rowe's first play involves a female villain, the Ambitious Step-Mother herself, who transfers all her frustrations to her son, and tries to gain for him the glory and empire from which she felt she was barred because of her sex. There are many similar examples of nasty vindictive women in the plays. But throughout the period there is an increasing tendency to portray women as helpless victims of a male-dominated society. Ambrose Philips's Distrest Mother (1713) focuses on

Andromache who at the end of the play draws the moral that noble minds should never despair even when they are surrounded by ills of all sorts. The play expounds the belief that the gods will interpose their succour and relief in times of calamity. It is the domestic mother-and-son relationship which is at the core of this play, rather than love interest or political intrigue, and the end of the play is concerned with the mother's reward for her love for her son. In Johnson's Caelia (1731) the title character is the victim of the libertinism of the man who raped her and then left her. The event has dire domestic consequences as it results in the death of Caelia's mother through grief for the fate of her daughter. Similarly helpless to do anything about her situation is Louisa in The Fatal Extravagance (1721 and 1726); she is the victim of poverty, and like Caelia, the play deals with dire effects in a materialist society when money is held to be more important than virtue. Tate's adaptation of Shakespeare's Macbeth (1731) reflects this increase in interest in the helpless virtuous woman, for Tate pays far more attention to Lady Macduff than did Shakespeare, and she is raised into a major character in scenes with her husband and with her son. Vanella (1736)<sup>104</sup> tries to be positive about the plight of the woman who is cast off by an unscrupulous man, and left forsaken and bereft of friends. The play has direct contemporary relevance as a satiric treatment of a specific case, but the message is that women should never give up, nor submit totally to despair, for life does not end with the departure of any lover. Charlotte Briar in Cooke's The Mournful Nuptials is for most of the play a similar sort of character. Her love deserves to succeed, and when her parents both die, her father mysteriously killed and her mother

dying of grief Charlotte appeals to the audience, saying

But now awak'd from the fallacious dream,  
I find myself again a fatherless child,  
Left with my weeping mother, to bemoan  
A parent murder'd by my husband's fire. (V i, p. 61)

But though she loses her parents her love is rewarded with success at the close of the play when the events of the murder are finally sorted out in a peculiar final court scene.

One of the features of emotional involvement in these plays is the recurring theme of male friendship which is of a constant and self-sacrificing nature. There are several examples of plays in which one character refuses to kill another on the opposing side because of some special treatment he has received in the past. In Liberty Asserted, for example, Ulamar refuses to kill the Frenchman (who later turns out to be his father) because he says he could see the transcendent nobility in the man's face. Thus when the tide turns against Ulamar, it is the Frenchman who remains constant to his son (though he does not recognise him at that stage to be such) and saves him from downfall. This pattern occurs throughout the period, though its appearance is more regular in the later plays. In Dennis's Iphigenia (1700) Orestes and Pilades remain constant to each other, and the same thing happens in Theobald's Persian Princess (1715)<sup>105</sup> where Oxartes remains true to his friend Artaban; when the latter is imprisoned Oxartes goes off to find rescuing forces, and at the end of the play dissuades Artaban from committing suicide. The two Spaniards Alphonso and Pedro remain true in Mrs Haywood's The Fair Captive (1721) when they visit the Turkish seraglio to try to rescue Isabella who is held captive there. There is a double example of male friendship in Hewitt's The Fair Rivals (1729);<sup>106</sup> Villecerfe and Frankville

remain the best of friends and so do Larouche and Gramont. When this play was expanded into The Fatal Falsehood (1734) the same pattern remained although the names were changed; Bellardine and Manlove are balanced by Rainford and Wilmot, and the sentimentality which permeates the play can be seen in Rainford's statement at the end of the play:

When I look back, and view  
The melancholy Scene, which cannot fail  
To raise Compassion in the hardest Heart,  
The Woman in me, quite o'erwhelms the Man. (III v, p. 41)

Heroick Friendship (1719), a play probably wrongly attributed to Otway, uses the male friendship theme as its basis. Decimus, the Roman general, is a friend of Guiderius, brother to the King of Britain. Decimus describes his friend thus at the beginning of the play:

The Young, the Beautiful, the Gay Guiderius,  
Chief of the Courtiers, Darling of the Fair,  
With Bravery unlook'd for, forcing Fame. (I i, p. 2)

Decimus stands as proxy for his friend in prison while Guiderius, sentenced to death, visits his love. Guiderius stays longer than he said he would, and Decimus is seen receiving comfort from Lucretius as he awaits what he feels is certain death. Guiderius returns, amazed to find Decimus asleep in the face of imminent death. Guiderius wakes his friend, and Decimus chastises himself for having doubted that his friend would return. A sort of competition for glory takes place near the end of the play when Decimus complains:

How the Gods labour to erect thy Fame?  
Immortal happy Youth! now what am I?  
Thy Foil, the Setter off, is it not so?  
Why did'st thou not, when urg'd, leave me to Death?  
Yet so I had engross'd the work of Glory,  
And left thee nought but Dross thou worthy all! (V i, p. 63)

Thus the whole play is a celebration of what is seen to be the highest possible form of friendship. An interesting example of the pattern is to be found in Hurst's The Roman Maid (1725) where Carus (only a minor character with an emblematic name) shows unusual faithfulness and fortitude throughout the play in his active support of Galerius. In Lillo's The London Merchant (1731) George Barnwell receives the constant support of Trueman (who is not well characterised), and at the end of the play his former employer Thorowgood, the agent of Christianity, not only offers the penitent George hope for the afterlife, but behaves as a friend in the best sense. At the end of the period the friendship of Gustavus and Arwide in Gustavus Vasa (1739)<sup>107</sup> by Brooke is convincingly portrayed, for Arwide unwittingly betrays Gustavus, and is most penitent, eager for death at the hands of the man he betrayed. But Gustavus insists on their continuing friendship for two reasons, the good of the state (and the success of their revolution), and personal attachment. At the end of Act IV of William Shirley's Parricide; or, Innocence Distressed (1739) Godrick bids his friend Albert be brave with "Fortitude of Mind,... A British Spirit, and A Christian Faith", the three elements which by the end of the period are held in the highest esteem.

As the period progresses writers make increasing use of certain patterns which emphasise the philosophical, abstract qualities of the plays and the ideas expressed in those plays. At the beginning of the period there are many writers who express the plight of their heroes and heroines in an exaggerated fashion, through loud and violent verse and through ranting speeches. Slowly the rant in language disappears so that by 1740 the verse

is very smooth, soft and descriptive. At the same time the use of actual violence on stage decreases. We move from drama based on and embodying action in 1700 to drama based on contemplation, discussion and analysis in 1740. Whereas characters showed their personal characteristics through their actions in 1700, by 1740 characters tend to be described as having ideal characteristics like virtue, beauty and heroism. We thus believe what the author says about his characters, rather than take our opinions from an analysis of the actions of those characters.

Round 1700 many writers experiment with elaborate stage machines and scenery, but interest in these devices wanes. Battles, processions and scenes of significance to the plot of the plays are shown on stage in 1700 but are described by narration in 1740. Instead of the musical interludes where heroines find their spirits calmed by listening to a small consort in 1700, reference is made at the end of the period to the power which music has to calm troubled spirits. Thus we can see that the attention of the audience is directed away from their eyes to their ears. Yet what seems to be a purified and simplified dramatic form is actually a debased one, for it is only one step further to the situation where stage presentation itself is seen as a hindrance and the audience gives place to a reader, studying the play in the quiet of his own study, and drawing pleasure from the effect of beautiful poetry. We have several examples towards the end of the period where authors place emphasis on an elaborate and smooth verbal surface. These plays were not successful on the stage, and some of them were not even presented on the stage. A glance at the list of plays in Stratman's Bibliography of English Printed Tragedy<sup>108</sup> will

show that there is an ever-increasing proportion of plays which were published but never acted from 1710 onwards.

Thus it is my contention that the increasing use of set patterns throughout this period is an indication of authors' increasing lack of faith in the theatre as a valid vehicle for tragedy. At the same time authors have less and less of an individual nature to say. They are for the most part simply ringing a few changes on the set patterns which they and their audiences take for granted and know very well. It does, I think, give the audience a comforting sense of the familiar to hear the same patterns repeated time and time again, and The London Stage gives ample evidence for the contention that anything new may well be threatening. There are of course exceptions. Lillo is the most obvious. Yet at the same time Lillo's experiments were not fully followed up, and authors took the most conventional aspects of his plays for their own later efforts, not his most exciting and innovative ideas. Simplification seems, then, to be a keynote of the development of tragedy during the period.

Hand in hand with increased simplification goes increased abstraction. Lillo's moral and social concerns are effectively portrayed because we realise that analysis of his problems is essential to the sanity of the title character. He must sort out his problems, and this involves him in an analysis of fate, moral conduct, and his place in society. At the end of the period, however, we have authors praising abstract qualities of patriotism and Christian virtue, but they are not convincingly embodied in the characters. The characters give utterance to positions, but we cannot feel that these positions arise from the situations in which the characters are placed. In 1740, then, we no longer have characters working out their own problems,

but authors making abstract comments about morality, conduct and belief.

The removal of violence from the stage, and the attempts to introduce the unities at the end of the period may at first seem to be the fulfilment of the neo-classical ideal of tragedy, but in fact we have a debased neo-classicism, and a debased drama. What the tragedies of 1740, with rigid and uniform use of set patterns, point to, is the verse dramas of Wordsworth and Shelley, rather than any vital stage spectacle. By 1740 use of the 'pattern' has robbed tragedy in Britain of any hope of vital and lively development.

Notes

- 1 Eric Rothstein, Restoration Tragedy: Form and the Process of Change (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967), p.135.
- 2 In the rest of this section the lists given in the text are not intended to be taken as comprehensive; examples only are given, though in the case of the rhyming plays all are mentioned.
- 3 John Crowne, Caligula. By J. Orme, for R. Wellington, 1698. C U\*.5.128(D).
- 4 Charles Hopkins, Boadicea, Queen of Britain. For Jacob Tonson, 1700. C Syn. 6.68.35<sup>2</sup>.
- 5 Charles Hopkins, Friendship Improv'd; or, The Female Warrior. For J. Tonson, 1700. C Syn.6.68.35<sup>3</sup>.
- 6 Sir Charles Sedley, "Beauty the Conqueror, or, The Death of Marc Anthony" in Miscellaneous Works. Printed and sold by J. Nutt, 1702. LVAd 8808.
- 7 [Edward Ward], Honesty in Distress, but Reliev'd by No Party. Printed and are to be sold by B. Bragge, 1705. BM 11778.c.15.
- 8 [Joseph Trapp], The Tragedy of King Saul. For Henry Playford, and sold by John Nutt, 1703. BM 162.1.6.
- 9 [Alexander Fyfe], The Royal Martyr, King Charles I. A Tragedy. Printed in the Year 1709, and are to be sold by John Morphew. C U\*.5.157<sup>1</sup>(D).
- 10 George Granville, Lord Lansdowne, The British Enchanters; or, No Magick Like Love. For Jacob Tonson, 1706. BM Huth 109.
- 11 Robert Ashton, The Battle of Aughrim; or, The Fall of Monsieur St. Ruth. Dublin: by S. Powell, for Richard Morris, 1728. E.
- 12 Charles Hopkins, Neglected Virtue; or, The Unhappy Conqueror. For Henry Rhodes, Richard Parker, Sam. Briscoe, 1696. BM 643.d.67.
- 13 The Fatal Secret; or The Rival Brothers. Printed and sold by Ben. Bragge, 1704. LVAd 8242.
- 14 The Unnatural Mother. The Scene in the Kingdom of Siam. Written by a Young Lady. By J. O., for R. Basset, 1698. BM 163.k.69.
- 15 George Lillo, The London Merchant; or, The History of George Barnwell. Ed. William H. McBurney. London: Edward Arnold, 1965. First edition 1731.

- 16 Thomas D'Urfey, The Famous History of the Rise and Fall of Massaniello. For John Nutt, 1700. LVAd 3387. The Famous History and Fall of Massainello [sic.]; or, A Fisherman a Prince. The Second Part. For John Nutt, 1699 [sic.]. LVAd 3388.
- 17 Sir Thomas Moore, Mangora, King of the Timbusians. For W. Hervey, and E. Nutt, 1718. BM 841.d.11(5).
- 18 Thomas Cooke, The Mournful Nuptials; or, Love the Cure of All Woes. For T. Cooper, 1739. C S721.d.70.72.
- 19 The Unnatural Mother, 1698; Pix, Czar of Muscovy, 1705; Johnson, Caelia, 1733; Vanella, 1736; The London Merchant, 1731.
- 20 Mary Griffith Pix, The Double Distress. For R. Wellington, and B. Bernard Lintott, 1701. LVAd.
- 21 Joseph Mitchell, The Fatal Extravagance. For J. Millan, and sold by J. Stagg, and N. Blandford, 1726. BM 162.d.40. Also see infra, pp.63-9.
- 22 George Lillo, The London Merchant (1731) and Fatal Curiosity (1737). Also see infra, pp.288-307.
- 23 Thomas Southerne, Oroonoko. For H. Playford, B. Tooke, and S. Buckley, 1696. BM 644.i.56.
- 24 John Dennis, Liberty Asserted. For George Strahan, and Bernard Lintott, 1704. BM 841.c.6(3).
- 25 Charles Johnson, Caelia; or, The Perjur'd Lover. J. Watts, 1733. BM 643.g.14(7).
- 26 Charles Hopkins, Pyrrhus, King of Epirus. For Samuel Briscoe, Peter Buck, and Daniel Dring, 1695. C Syn.6.68.35<sup>1</sup>.
- 27 Bevil Higgons, The Generous Conqueror; or, The Timely Discovery. For S. Briscoe, 1702. BM 162.h.29.
- 28 Charles Johnson, Victim. Printed and sold by Ferd. Burleigh, 1714. BM 11775.b.46.
- 29 Mary Griffith Pix, The False Friend; or, The Fate of Disobedience. For Richard Basset, 1699. BM 83.b.10(3).
- 30 Aaron Hill, Elfrid; or, The Fair Inconstant. For Bernard Lintott, and Egbert Sanger [1710]. LVaf 69769.
- 31 Nicholas Rowe, The Ambitious Step-Mother. For Peter Buck, 1701.

- 32 The Fatal Discovery; or, Love in Ruines. By J. Orme, for R. Wellington, 1698. LVAd 3680.
- 33 See Eric Rothstein, op.cit., pp.113-27.
- 34 Ibid., pp.118-27.
- 35 Ibid., p.121.
- 36 [Catharine Cockburn Trotter], The Revolution of Sweden. For James Knapton, and George Strahan, 1706. BM 841.d.9(6).
- 37 Mary Griffith Pix, The Conquest of Spain. For Richard Wellington, 1705. BM 841.e.6.
- 38 [Catharine Cockburn Trotter], The Unhappy Penitent. For William Turner, and John Nutt, 1701. BM 81.c.13(3).
- 39 Charles Gildon, The Patriot; or, The Italian Conspiracy. For William Davis, and George Strahan, 1703. LVAd 4043.
- 40 [William Hunt], Fall of Tarquin. York: by John White, 1713. BM 11775.b.41.
- 41 Thomas Southerne, The Fate of Capua. For Benjamin Tooke, 1700. BM 644.i.57.
- 42 John Banks, Cyrus the Great; or, The Tragedy of Love. For Richard Bentley, 1696. C Syn.6.68.27<sup>2</sup>.
- 43 Mary Griffith Pix, The Czar of Muscovy. For Bernard Lintot, 1701. BM 83. b.9(6).
- 44 Henry Smith, The Princess of Parma. For Joseph Wilde, 1699. LVaf 6976<sup>21</sup>.
- 45 Mary de la Rivière Manley, Almyna; or, The Arabian Vow. For William Turner and Egbert Sanger, 1707. BM 83.a.2(3),
- 46 Anne Finch Winchelsea, "Aristomenes" in Miscellany Poems on Several Occasions. For J.B., and sold by Benj. Tooke, William Taylor, and James Round, 1713. LVAd 10644.
- 47 Robert Hurst, The Roman Maid. For George Strahan, 1725. C S721.d.70.12<sup>10</sup>.
- 48 Aaron Hill, Athelwold. Dublin: by S. Powell, for Abraham Bradley, 1732. BM 11774.aaa.20(1).
- 49 Abel Boyer, Achilles; or, Iphigenia in Aulis. Tho. Bennett, 1700. LVaf 6976<sup>2</sup>.

- 50 Charles Johnson, The Tragedy of Medaea. For R. Francklin, 1731. BM 162.  
i.19.
- 51 [Alexander Fyfe], The Royal Martyr, King Charles I. First printed as 'An  
Opera', 1705, but reissued with a new title page as 'A Tragedy', 1709.
- 52 Mary de la Rivière Manley, Lucius, the First Christian King of Britain.  
For John Barber, 1717. BM 841.c.9(5).
- 53 John Dennis, Appius and Virginia. For Bernard Lintott, [1709]. BM 841.  
c.10(1).
- 54 David Lewis, Philip of Macedon. By J. Watts, and sold by J. Roberts, 1727.  
C Hib.7.727.16.
- 55 Aaron Hill, The Fatal Vision; or, The Fall of Siam. For Edw. Nutt [1716]. O.
- 56 John Hewitt, The Fatal Falsehood; or, Distress'd Innocence. For T. Worrall,  
[1734]. C S721.d.70.46<sup>8</sup>.
- 57 Susanna Centlivre, The Perjur'd Husband; or, The Adventures of Venice.  
Written by S. Carroll. For Bennet Banbury, 1700. BM 644.g.27.
- 58 James Thomson, Edward and Eleonora. For the Author, and sold by A. Millar,  
1738. MM B.2408.
- 59 Eliza Haywood, The Fair Captive. For T. Jauncy, and H. Cole, 1721. BM 162.  
h.18.
- 60 William Congreve, Mourning Bride. For Jacob Tonson, 1697. BM 1343.i.37.
- 61 Colley Cibber, Perolla and Izadora. For Bernard Lintott, 1706. BM 11778.g.40.
- 62 Lewis Theobald, The Perfidious Brother. Printed and sold by Jonas Brown,  
1715. LVAf 6976.
- 63 John Sheffield, Duke of Buckingham, "Julius Caesar Altered" and "Marcus  
Brutus" in The Works. 2 vols. For John Barber, 1723. C Rel.f.1.a.38-9.
- 64 William Philips, Hibernia Freed. For Jonas Bowyer, 1722. BM 162.k.66.
- 65 Charles Goring, Irene; or, The Fair Greek. For John Bayley, 1708. LVAf  
6976<sup>14</sup>.
- 66 Colley Cibber, Xerxes. By John Nutt, 1699. LVAf 6976<sup>30</sup>.
- 67 Charles Beckingham, Scipio Africanus. For W. Mears, J. Browne, and F. Clay,  
1718. BM 162.c.8.

- 68 William Walker, Victorious Love. For Ralph Smith, 1698. BM 83.a.6(1).
- 69 See E. Nelson James, "Drums and Trumpets" Restoration & 18th Century Theatre Research 9 (No 2, 1970), 46-55, 10 (No 1, 1971), 54-7.
- 70 John Dennis, Iphigenia. For Richard Parker, 1700. BM 643.b.12(1).
- 71 George Lillo, The Christian Hero. For John Gray, 1735. BM 643.g.16(10).
- 72 Edward Young, Revenge. For W. Chetwood, and S. Chapman, 1721. C XXIII. 16.31<sup>1</sup>.
- 73 Richard Barford, The Virgin Queen. Dublin: by A. Rhames, for R. Gunne, 1728. BM 640.h.33(5).
- 74 Charles Gildon, Phaeton; or, The Fatal Divorce. For Abel Roper, 1698. BM 644.h.38.
- 75 Mary Griffith Pix, Ibrahim, the Thirteenth Emperour of the Turks. For John Harding, and Richard Wilkin, 1696. BM 83.b.9(2).
- 76 Robert Gould, The Rival Sisters; or, The Violence of Love. For Richard Bently, Francis Saunders, and James Knapton, 1696. BM 161.i.71.
- 77 Robert Owen, Hypermnestra; or, Love in Tears. For Bernard Lintott, 1703. BM 841.c.8.
- 78 William Philips, The Revengeful Queen. For P. Buck, 1698. LVAf 6976<sup>22</sup>.
- 79 Nahum Tate, Macbeth. Edinburgh: By T. and W. Ruddiman for Alen Ramsay, 1731. BPL
- 80 John Dennis, Rinaldo and Armida. For Jacob Tonson, 1699. BM 83.b.12(1).
- 81 Edward Ravenscroft, The Italian Husband. For Isaac Cleave, 1698. BM 81. c.16(6).
- 82 Nicholas Rowe, Ulysses. For Jacob Tonson, 1706. MM B.3332.
- 83 Jane Holt Wiseman, Antiochus the Great; or, The Fatal Relapse. For William Turner, and Richard Basset, 1702. BM 163.k.23.
- 84 William Shirley, The Parricide; or, Innocence in Distress. For J. Watts, 1739. C S721.d.70.21<sup>1</sup>.
- 85 Charles Gildon, Love's Victim; or, The Queen of Wales. By M. Bennet, for Richard Parker, and George Strahan, 1701. BM 841.d.9(5).

- 86 Mary de la Rivière Manley, The Royal Mischief. For R. Bentley, F. Saunders, and J. Knapton, 1696. BM 841.c.5(8).
- 87 The Faithful General. Written by a Young Lady. For Richard Wellington, 1706. O
- 88 Susanna Centlivre, The Cruel Gift. For E. Curll, and A. Bettsworth, 1717. BM 11777.a.20.
- 89 Henry Smith, The Princess of Parma. For Joseph Wilde, 1699. LVAf 6976<sup>21</sup>.
- 90 [Moses Browne], Polidus; or, Distress'd Love. Printed in the Year 1723. BM 162.c.24.
- 91 Majesty Misled; or, The Overthrow of Evil Ministers. Printed and sold by J. Dormer, 1734. C S721.d.73.30.
- 92 John Sturmy, Love and Duty; or, The Distress'd Bride. For W. Chetwood, 1722. BM 82.c.15(1).
- 93 Thomas D'Urfey, "The Grecian Heroine; or, The Fate of Tyranny" in New Opera's with Comical Stories, and Poems, On Several Occasions. For William Chetwood, 1721. O
- 94 [Catharine Cockburn Trotter], Agnes de Castro. For H. Rhodes, R. Parker, S. Briscoe, 1696. BM 644.i.65.
- 95 "Socrates Triumphant; or, The Danger of Being Wise in a Commonwealth of Fools" in Military and Other Poems upon Several Occasions. By an Officer of the Army. For the Author, and sold by J. Browne, 1716. O
- 96 Thomas Otway [?], Heroick Friendship. For W. Mears, and R. King, 1719. C Syn.6.68.38<sup>4</sup>.
- 97 George Sewell, The Tragedy of Sir Walter Raleigh. For John Pemberton, and John Watts, 1719. BM 1346.c.16.
- 98 John Maxwell, The Faithful Pair; or, Virtue in Distress. York: by Thomas Gent, 1740. BM 1346.e.45.
- 99 Lenemaja Friedman, "Bibliography of Restoration and Eighteenth Century Plays Containing Children's Roles" Restoration & 18th Century Theatre Research 11 (No 1, 1972), 19-30.
- 100 In the sections covering plays in this period Dr Friedman lists only a very few of the plays which include parts for children, and also omits some of the children in the plays listed. My additions of almost forty plays appear in "More Children in Tragedy 1695-1750" Restoration & 18th Century Theatre Research 12 (No 1, 1973), 49-51.

- 101 Peter Anthony Motteux, Beauty in Distress. For Daniel Brown, and Rich. Parker, 1698. C Acton.b.sel.48<sup>8</sup>.
- 102 Ambrose Philips, The Distrest Mother. For S. Buckley, and J. Tonson, 1712. BM 841.d.11(4).
- 103 Lewis Theobald, The Fatal Secret. For J. Watts, and sold by W. Feales, 1735. BM 162.e.13.
- 104 Vanella. For D. Ashburn, 1736. E
- 105 Lewis Theobald, The Persian Princess; or, The Royal Villain. For Jonas Brown, 1715. BM 162.e.11.
- 106 John Hewitt, The Fair Rivals. Bath: by J. Lyons, 1729. CSmH
- 107 Henry Brooke, Gustavus Vasa, the Deliverer of His Country. For R. Dodsley, 1739. C S721.d.70.12<sup>10</sup>.
- 108 Carl Joseph Stratman CSV, ed. A Bibliography of English Printed Tragedy 1565-1900. Southern Illinois University Press: Carbondale and Edwardsville, 1966. See particularly the "Chronological List of Tragedies" pp.771ff.

#### CHAPTER IV ADAPTATIONS

Many plays were altered, translated and adapted during this period, but the aims of those who changed plays are by no means uniform. Shakespeare is the author most frequently changed; all authors are concerned to simplify his works, though while some authors merely shorten, others cut some scenes and substitute them with their own. There is throughout the period a desire to simplify and purify, the best example being John Sheffield's purifications of Julius Caesar into two separate, very formal verse plays with choruses. It is the history plays of Shakespeare which attracted the most attention, those dealing with classical or British material.

Webster and Beaumont and Fletcher also attracted the pen of adaptors. In fact there are few plays of the late seventeenth century which are reworked, although the most interesting adaptations concern new political interpretations of Restoration tragedies.

It is not surprising that a third group of adaptations concerns foreign plays. Two Italian plays were remodelled for the English stage, and a number of attempts were made to reconstruct some of the plays of Racine and Corneille. At the end of the period Aaron Hill spent some time translating Voltaire's new plays for the London audience.

The great interest in Shakespeare's history plays in the period, and the attempt to bring them up to date or to make them acceptable to a modern audience can be seen in Colley Cibber's The Tragical History of King

Richard III.<sup>1</sup> Cibber's play is not very interesting per se, even though it was very popular on the stage but the Preface sheds some interesting light on reaction to such adaptations:

The whole was an Inoffensive piece, and free from any bold Parallel, or ill manner'd reflection, yet this was no Satisfaction to him who had the Relentless power of licencing it for the Stage. I did not spare for intreaties; but all the reason I cou'd get for its being refus'd, was, that Henry the Sixth being a Character Unfortunate and Pitied, wou'd put the Audience in mind of King James.

Cibber says that he never thought of this while he was writing the play and adds:

I am only sorry it happen'd to be in the best Act in the whole.

Although there is little danger of Cibber's lines being taken for those of Shakespeare, the author notes:

I have caus'd those that are intirely Shakespeare's to be printed in the Italick Character; and in the best dress I could afford 'em.

a practice which many other adaptors of Shakespeare followed.

Lewis Theobald's King Richard II<sup>2</sup> appeared in 1720, but the focus of the play is different from Shakespeare's as Theobald uses only parts of the original play and adds a considerable amount of new material. The first act consists of much of Shakespeare's third act and an added soft love scene between Richard and his Queen. The second act opens with a love scene between Aumerle and Lady Piercy; she is resentful at his accusations of infidelity, and she proves her love by showing him a "mystic Scroll" from her father which forbids her to listen any more to Aumerle's addresses. The final two scenes in the act are two of Shakespeare's scenes adapted<sup>3</sup> -

II iv with Bolingbroke, Northumberland, Ross, Willoughby and Aumerle, and III iii somewhat curtailed - with four italicised couplets at the end. Act III is a similar example of patchwork. The play is not very convincing, mainly because of Theobald's desire to "piddle" with Shakespeare, as the Dunciad points out. The play is really about the tragic fall of Richard and the tragic loss of Aumerle and Lady Piercy. A sense of the domestic, family tragedy is emphasised at the end of the play when Northumberland cries "My Daughter! Fate pursues my Guilt too fast" (V [iii], p. 59).

Aaron Hill's King Henry the Fifth, or the Conquest of France by the English (1723)<sup>4</sup> condenses Shakespeare's dialogue considerably and turns the play into one which centres around love interest. In the central part of the play Shakespeare is forgotten almost entirely as Acts III and IV focus on the Princess, Charlot and Henry. Ambrose Philips in Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester (1723)<sup>5</sup> acknowledges the lines he takes from Shakespeare with quotation marks, and he adapts his source to form the rest of what he needs for a rather exclamatory piece with many very odd, broken up lines which give the impression of jerkiness. Theophilus Cibber's King Henry VI (1720)<sup>6</sup> seems to have been designed as a sequel to Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, and Cibber mixes material from Shakespeare's King Henry VI Part 2 and King Henry VI Part 3 with Crowne's King Henry VI (1681).<sup>7</sup> Cibber in fact adds very few lines indeed; Act I of his play consists of the final act of Shakespeare's King Henry VI Part 2 and the first two acts of Crowne's play, with only six lines of his own. It is an extraordinary exercise in dramatic patchwork. The pattern of the first act, with its alternation between these two original sources, is followed throughout the

play. Cibber adds twenty-four new lines in two speeches in the second act, but contributes little of originality to the play as a whole.

Charles Sedley's Beauty the Conqueror; or, The Death of Marc Antony (1702)<sup>8</sup> is based on Shakespeare's Antony and Cleopatra, and was intended, says Pinto, as "a reconstruction of the play as a classical tragedy with a chorus that sings lyrics between the acts";<sup>9</sup> Act 2, for example, ends with a five verse song. The Title Page states that the play is "In Imitation of the Roman Way of Writing" and it is clear that the author felt best able to do this through the use of rhyming couplets and of only a few characters, thirteen in all. There is some sympathy for Caesar at the end for he represents honesty, virtue and steadfastness. He is far more hero than Antonius who is throughout seen as rather a rat in a maze. There is dramatic justice, too, in the death of the villain, Achillas, but the play is largely bad. Apart from the battle act the play is static and Sedley rarely manages to build up or maintain dramatic intensity.

Another play dealing with the story of Antony and Cleopatra is Edward Biddle's Augustus (1717).<sup>10</sup> Biddle, however, only published the first act of the play and Genest noted that he is injudicious to call Octavius Caesar Augustus (X, 155).<sup>11</sup> In the opening scene Octavia begs her brother to moderate his impulse to revenge, for she knows that this will achieve nothing. In a speech which is as exclamatory as anything else which can be found in the period she says:

O War! O Fate! O Fortune! O my Fears!  
 My Sorrow, Grief, my Rage, my Apprehension!...  
 O black, O horrid, dark and doleful Day!  
 O Time! O Day! O hopeless, hapless, miserable Day. (I i, p. 28)

If Biddle was intending to produce more of this stuff it is perhaps as well that he went no further.

The adaptation of Shakespeare's Julius Caesar attributed to Davenant and Dryden,<sup>12</sup> The Tragedy of Julius Caesar, With the Death of Brutus and Cassius (1719),<sup>13</sup> involves only minor changes. Some of the stage directions are simplified a little, lines are omitted, Brutus's speech in Act III (II iii in the original) is placed in verse rather than in prose, III iii of the original, with Cinna the Poet and the citizens, is omitted, and there are one or two other minor alterations; Cassius, for example, is made to fall on his sword instead of being stabbed by Pindarus in the final act. But so little is changed that this text merits very little attention as an adaptation, and only four lines appear to have been added; at the end of Act IV Brutus closes with:

Sure, they have rais'd some Devil to their Aid,  
And think to frighten Brutus with a shade.  
But e'er the night closes this fatal Day  
I'll send more Ghosts this visit to repay -- [Exit (IV, p. 65)

The senators are omitted from the Dramatis Personae and one or two minor adjustments are made so that minor characters can be omitted. The authors preface the play with "The Life of Julius Caesar" abstracted from Plutarch and Suetonius.

John Buckingham's Julius Caesar Altered (1722) and Marcus Brutus (1723) both appear in the 1723 edition of his Works.<sup>14</sup> The author breaks Shakespeare's Julius Caesar in half and spreads the action of each half into a five act play.

Buckingham begins Julius Caesar with a scene between two Roman

Senators, Trebonius and Casca, who discuss the triumphs of Caesar; some of the material is utilised here from Marcellus's long speech in Shakespeare's I i, 36-60. The talk of the tradespeople in the next scene is longer and less witty than in the original. Trebonius curses Caesar's wild ambition and tyranny and wonders if they will be punished for speaking thus. The scene narrated by Casca in I ii, 230-60 is here presented on stage, with Caesar as an unpleasant man who scorns the common people. Then Shakespeare is used again: I ii, 25-176 and I iii 41-end. A note at the end of the act points out that

Instead of the Musick usually play'd between the Acts,  
the following Verses are, after this Act, to be sung  
by a Chorus representing the Roman People. (I v, p. 242)

This pattern is continued throughout the play, and is one of Buckingham's chief elements of "classicising". The second act consists chiefly of a love scene where Brutus takes over most of Portia's lines. Buckingham uses II iv, 65-72, 93-96, 103-107, but the absence of both the Soothsayer and Calphurnia give a different emphasis to this part of the play. The Soothsayer's absence also changes the beginning of the fourth act (Shakespeare's III 1-8, 12-30). The occasion for the murder also seems different for immediately before it Caesar gives a long speech declaring that all shall bow to Roman arms; he will rule with absolute justice. After the murder this adaptor uses III i, 105-110, 111-121, 148-50, 160-83 but considerably expands it before rephrasing III i, 190-201, 222-46. Anthony does not speak the soliloquy "O pardon me, thou bleeding piece of earth" but instead praises Caesar's ambition and foretells civil wars. The final act begins with Brutus, Cassius and a crowd of citizens who use III ii, 1-10, 12-258.

Brutus's speech is turned from prose to blank verse and Mark Antony's is paraphrased. Buckingham adds some lines of his own, uses III ii, 259-64 and then allows Antony to close the play:

Take now what course thou wilt! Destruction, Ruin,  
 The baneful Issue of so black a Deed!  
 Ambition, when unbounded, brings a Curse,  
 But an Assassinate deserves a Worse. (V i, p. 325)

Marcus Brutus follows the same pattern. Pope wrote the Chorus at the end of the first and second acts and it is clear that Buckingham was aiming at a pseudo-classical simplicity and purity of line and style; he is much more successful in these aims than he was in Julius Caesar. The play is well organised and movingly presented as Brutus is both idealistic and honourable; we adopt his point of view throughout and so we are relieved of the complexity of mixed feelings which Shakespeare presents. It is quite a different play.

John Dennis altered Coriolanus as The Invader of His Country; or, The Fatal Retirement (1720)<sup>15</sup> but took far greater liberties than the authors of the previously considered plays. Dennis places much more emphasis on the element of fighting for one's own country, and in the second act with Volumnia and Virgilia there are tender and soft recollections of family ties. Just as the sentimentality is heightened so the political situation is clarified. The scenes in the Capitol (II i, 220-229, 274-84, II ii, 136-57) and the Roman Forum (II iii, 1-43) are expanded to show a confrontation between the members of Corolanius' and Sempronius' parties. The occasion is used to present lots of threats and potential violence, and then Dennis uses the rest of II iii, 43-271 with some additions and minor contractions.

The third act is mainly Shakespeare. III i, 1-29, 163-337 is followed by III ii, 1-40, 92-end, III iii, 1-42, 68-136, IV i, 3-19. Dennis adds at the end of this a tearful parting between Coriolanus and Virgilia. Dennis's fourth act follows the same sort of pattern. IV iv, 1-54 is slightly enlarged (ten more lines are added in the same vein); IV v 60-70 is followed by IV v 107-153 and then by a comic prose scene (IV v 180-250) where the content is the same although the dialogue is simplified and formalised. The final scene of the act takes place in Rome and uses Shakespeare's IV vi, 1-2, 17-18, 29-42, 57-84, 86, 88-149. Act V makes clear that Dennis's primary aim was to "correct" the dénouement of the play. With Virgilia, Volumnia, Valeria and young Marcius all in mourning habits, there is much more emphasis on the domestic; Volumnia's long speeches (V iii, 84-209) are cut up and largely reconstructed, but the sentiments are similar. Aufidius and Coriolanus argue violently before Aufidius falls and dies. The tribunes then enter in order to kill the villain who killed Aufidius; Coriolanus kills three of them, the women shriek behind the scenes, but Coriolanus is killed by the fourth tribune. The women bid him a tearful farewell but Volumnia can glory in his death:

Yet in his Fall he still is Coriolanus,  
Himself alone a Conqueror o'er Numbers;  
Himself the dread Revenger of this Murther.  
But the just Gods require an ampler Vengeance. (V i, p. 78)

Cominius orders a funeral procession, tells the ladies that they "shall receive immortal Honours" (V, p. 79) for saving their country, and he closes the play with a statement condemning both ambition and revenge, and pointing to the just fate which awaits those who

join with foreign Foes  
T'invade or to betray their Native Country. (Ibid.)

Dennis heightens the domestic and pathetic appeal of the play, but despite its change of focus The Invader of His Country has some powerful writing and well-contrived scenes.

Most of these writers were chiefly interested in Shakespeare's history plays, but both Hamlet and Macbeth were seen on stage during this period. Neither of the two versions of Hamlet, the one attributed to Thomas Betterton, 1703,<sup>16</sup> and that attributed to John Hughes, 1718,<sup>17</sup> is an adaptation. Both indicate the lines omitted in performance and of the two the latter is closer to a modern edition.<sup>18</sup> Hamlet's soliloquy in I ii ("O that this too too solid flesh") omits five half lines in the 1703 version, and then more lines are omitted as follows: II ii 237-69, 322-3, 332-58, 394b-395. The only significant alteration in the 1718 version is the omission of the dumb show in III ii. Both versions have a similar treatment of Hamlet's soliloquy in III iii:

Where is this Murderer, he kneels and Prays,  
And now [I]'ll do't, and so he goes to Heaven.  
And so am I reveng'd that would be scann'd;  
He kill'd my Father, and for that  
I his sole Son send him  
To Heaven  
Why this is a reward, - not revenge. (1703, III i, p. 48; cf. Alexander  
III iii, 73-9)

In performance the omitted lines vary but both versions very much shorten the roles of Polonius and Fortinbras; the long speeches are fairly uniformly pruned and the scenes between players and gravediggers are cut the most.

Nahum Tate's revision of Macbeth (1731)<sup>19</sup> also falls within this period. Tate waters down Shakespeare's language and introduces the singing

witches, but the most significant alteration consists of the addition of scenes between Lady Macduff and her husband, and the attempt to turn the focus of the play away from Lady Macbeth. One example of the sort of thing Tate does with Shakespeare's language will suffice; Macbeth's famous soliloquy is treated in this way:

If it were done when well done, then it were well.  
 It were done quickly; if his Death might be  
 Without the Death of Nature in my self,  
 And killing my own Rest, it wou'd suffice;  
 But Deeds of this Complexion still return  
 To plague the Doer, and destroy his Peace. (I i, p. 16)

John Webster's plays were also changed. Nahum Tate's Injur'd Love; or, The Cruel Husband (1707)<sup>20</sup> is an unacknowledged alteration of The White Devil,<sup>21</sup> but Tate makes no attempt to disguise names. Flamineo's role is vastly reduced in the opening pages, and the scenes between Isabella and Brachiano and the following scene between Flamineo, Francisco, Montecelsi, Marcello and Camillo are omitted. Act II begins in

A Grotto, Isabella leaning over a Fountain, Brachiano enters with a surly Deportment, she makes him a low Reverence, and moving forward a second or third time. (stage dir., II i, p. 15)

The plot is much more sensational but the language is weaker. A noise is heard under the ground, followed by thunder and lightning, and there is a lot of weeping on Isabella's part. She tends to sentimentality:

Our Sacred Band dissolv'd, methinks we look  
 Like the Transgressing Pair from Eden chas'd (II i, p. 17)

and at the end of the scene speaks of mourning like an unmatched turtle. New material follows with a sorrowful Brachiano suing for reconciliation:

Isabella looks by Turns upon her Husband and Child, then Swoons with Passion. (stage dir., II i, p. 20)

News comes of Vittoria's apprehension and custody after the second dumb

show of the original.

Act III begins with the first dumb show. Some reshuffling of the action characterises the central act and news comes that Isabella has fled and Montecelsi on stage says he will prosecute against all that is Vittoria's and Brachiano's. A substantial part of Act IV is condensed and the act ends with Brachiano's poisoning. Twelve pages of Act V are shortened to six, and the play progresses to the end, though Tate shortens it as much as possible.

Webster's Duchess of Malfy<sup>22</sup> was altered twice during the period. First came the anonymous The Unfortunate Dutchess of Malfy; or, The Unnatural Brothers (1708)<sup>23</sup> where the lines omitted on stage are noted by quotation marks. Many of the long speeches were drastically curtailed for the stage, so much of the sting and complexity of the original vanished. Bosola, for example, dies quite simply:

In a Mist: I know not how:  
Such a Mistake as I have often seen  
In a Play: Oh, I am gone. (pp. 74-5)

The Dutchess's last speech of Act III is similarly simplified and given a new moral slant. Omitting the sixteen lines denoted by quotation marks this would appear:

I Prithee who is greatest? can you tell?  
Sad Tales befit my woe: I'll tell you one.  
Men of't are valu'd high, when th'are most wretched.  
But come, whither you please; I am arm'd 'gainst Misery;  
Bent to all Sways of the Oppressors Will  
There's no deep Valley, but near some great Hill. (p. 42)

As her story is omitted on stage, nothing but a kind of triteness is gained from the speech. The text is clearly intended to represent what went on at a stage performance, with the omitted passages included for the reader's

incidental interest.

More interesting in that it is a genuine adaptation is Lewis Theobald's The Fatal Secret (1735).<sup>24</sup> Theobald adds the "Young Duke of Malfy, about 12 Years old" (dramatis personae) and his tutor, Flavio; he omits Castruchio, Julia and Count Malateste, brings in Urbino, Secretary to Duke Ferdinand, and gives names to three servants of the Cardinal. The adaptation has very little to do with Webster although it uses the same characters and some of the same speeches. Genest seems to have been quite kindly disposed to it:

Theobald's alteration on the whole is not a bad one, but it is too violent - he should have retained more of the original play. (III, 393)

There is certainly not much of Webster in The Fatal Secret.

Several other authors of the Elizabethan and Jacobean period had their plays altered. Thomas Scot's The Unhappy Kindness; or, A Fruitless Revenge (1697)<sup>25</sup> is an adaptation of John Fletcher's A Wife for a Month<sup>26</sup> which avoids all Fletcher's peripheral characters and substitutes a more concentrated, more direct dénouement. While Fletcher's material has been selectively used throughout the first four acts the final act is Scot's. The play is transformed from a tragi-comedy to a tragedy. There is no sense of reconciliation or the victory of goodness. The central part is heavily reliant on Fletcher but the outside acts are new. Alphonso receives a great deal more prominence and it is his fall which we follow. Scott makes Valerio equally interesting, and the statement at the end of the play that he is saved from suicide by love is deftly suggested. The language is still rich and potent in the revised version.

In 1696 George Powell<sup>27</sup> adapted Beaumont and Fletcher's Bonduca; or, The British Heroine,<sup>28</sup> although Powell shelves some of the responsibility for the revision:

This Consideration prompted a Friend of mine, a much abler Hand than my own to attempt it; not that his Leisure, Attendance, or Inclinations would permit him to make any long Toil of it, For to tell the Truth, the Play was revised quite through, and likewise studied up in one Fort-night.<sup>29</sup>

Christopher Bullock's The Traytor (1718)<sup>30</sup> is a working of Shirley's play of the same name in 1635.<sup>31</sup> It is largely a curtailment for stage performance in that most of the long speeches are consistently cut. A number of minor characters are cut without detriment to sequence, and the only addition is a scene in Act I in prose between Depazzi and Sancho. The prose is not nearly so tight as Shirley's and it does not fit particularly well into the language of the rest of the play. It is not a very significant scene; Depazzi is a foppish, worldly character moaning about being a courtier:

Hark ye Sancho - Come hither - And tell me - Are you sure -  
I say, are you sure - The Doors are shut? - Lard bless me,  
What was I going to ask this Fellow! I have taken too strong  
a Dose of Sedition, and it Emits at every Pore. [Aside. (I i, p. 6)

There is a slight change later in the act where Lorenzo reads the letter only alluded to in the original. The opening comic scene of Act III is retained but takes place between Depazzi and Sancho (not Depazzi and Rogero as in the original). The description of the Pageant is shorter and the song not printed. The scene between Pisano, Amidea and Oriano in Act IV is abruptly cut off as the last page and a half are omitted; this seems very sudden. In the final act the scene is omitted between Lorenzo and Petruccio where Lorenzo finds the Duke's picture with the poignard, and where there

is a long accompanying descriptive speech, but the last few pages of the play are retained as they are.

The Rape (1730),<sup>32</sup> an adaptation of Brady's The Rape; or, The Innocent Impostors (1692),<sup>33</sup> does not mention the original, and it may well have been an attempt to plagiarise because the names are changed. Apart from this the alterations are all minor. The lines are regularised to pentameters, the song in Act II is changed, the Song to a Lute and Flutes and the Entertainment (p. 35 of the original) are cut, pp. 27-8, 50-51 are cut, pp. 34, 36 and 38 are considerably shortened, and the opening scene of the last act is omitted.

The Roman Actor (1722)<sup>34</sup> attributed to Thomas Betterton, and an alteration of the play of the same name by Massinger (1629),<sup>35</sup> involves few changes and these consist chiefly of curtailments of the longest speeches, particularly those by Caesar. This copy appears to be an acting edition rather than a full scale adaptation.

Colley Cibber's Caesar in AEGYPT (1725)<sup>36</sup> is based largely on Fletcher and Massinger's The False One (1674).<sup>37</sup> Leonard Ashley describes Cibber's use of his sources thus; he says the play

treats of the treacherous murder of Pompey by Septimus ("The False One"); the intrigues of Photinus against Ptolemy and Cleopatra (joint rulers of Egypt); the Alexandrian revolt and Caesar's suppression of it; the death of Ptolemy; and Caesar's affair with Ptolemy's celebrated sister, Cleopatra. To this material is added some ormolu from Corneille's Pompée (1642 or 1643) and a little scrollwork of Cibber's own. Cibber gave no indication that the whole work was not his own.<sup>38</sup>

The opening acts of the play are quite well contrived as the author makes us take the viewpoint of each speaker, and these viewpoints are corrected

time and time again. Only in the final act do we fully appreciate Caesar's worth over Ptolomy. The dénouement, though, is too hasty. Cleopatra is not very well developed, we expect Anthony to be more involved in the action, and the lapse in time in the final act makes everything too busy. Characters are killed rather than proved wanting. Caesar is a good tyrant, Cleopatra is an opportunist and Ptolomy is a weak, indecisive politician; these three characters, though, are not sufficiently developed for us to see the events of the play as arising from the juxtaposition of wills. Caesar's victories are all too true; we do not really appreciate why or how he is victorious in Caesar in Aegypt; we are simply told that he is.

The question of Roger Boyle's Altemira (1702)<sup>39</sup> is a complicated one. Lord Orrery's son, Charles, revised the last act of the play, but the original from which it was revised was not printed. William Smith Clark unsorts the problem in his edition of Orrery's Works.<sup>40</sup> There are two texts of the original, The Generall, a manuscript in Worcester College, Oxford<sup>41</sup> and a text by Halliwell-Phillipps published 1855.<sup>42</sup> Clark has collated these and compared the result with Altemira. Clark notes that Act V is drastically curtailed, IV iv is inserted after IV l.326 and there is a change of plot in the last scene of IV; Melizer in Altemira listens quietly to a confession of guilt and repentance from the lips of the usurper and allows him to depart to a hermitage while in The Generall Melizer kills the usurping king in a duel. Songs are added in 1702; Lucidor at the beginning of I ii sings beneath the balcony of Altemira's house and in II ii two songs are added to the merrymaking when officers gather in Filadin's tent to talk of their love. The last added lyric is given to Candace who in IV ii walks

alone in a grove and sings an elegy of unrequited love.<sup>43</sup> Clark also lists several omissions: I i 174-91, 270-309, IV 49-101, 435-end, V 1-16, 296-end, and adds the comment that there is a general reduction in length and polishing of the dialogue.<sup>44</sup>

By comparing Altemira with Clark's edition of The Generall these remarks can be elaborated and made more precise. There are four new lines in II i between 100-101; in II [ii] Filadin is given a new soliloquy of 23 lines, and another short scene is added after Clark's II iii between the king and Gesippus to the effect that Filadin has been successful in quashing the rebellion of Lucidor and Memnon. The interview between Altemira and Candace in II iv is made more weepy.

In Act III many lines are omitted: 25-8, 53-4, 59-60, 71-2, 91-4, 97-102, 107-8, 113-4, 117-8, 169-80, but Altemira's speech to Clorimon in III ii is extended and Candace is given an extra rhyming tag at the end of the scene. III 256-8, 271, 273-80 and 285-6 are omitted but the king adds the promise of a ring to Clorimon if he can bring Altemira to him. Further omissions are as follows: III iii 2-3-4, 329-32, 335-6, 353-4, 359-62, 365-6, 373-87, 397-8, 405-6, 419-20. Gesippus has an extra 12 lines to the king after Clark's III iv. III iv 435-8 are omitted and after 439 the king has 12 lines on Altemira's beauty which begin:

What glorious Beams do these bright Eyes display!  
Beams, which transcend the Planet rules the Day!  
Her Eyes at once, like that refulgent Light,  
Inspire with Heat, and dazzle my weak Sight. (III i, p. 31)

Clark's IV ii 49-101 are omitted, a song is added and a scene is added after IV iii where the king persuades Candace to become his confidante;

this is merely related in the original (Clark IV [v], 154-73) and the new scene takes the place of Lucidor's soliloquy in Clark IV [iv]. Altemira declares her innocence to Candace at rather greater length and Lucidor's soliloquy is then replaced (after IV [iv], 260), and is followed by Altemira's soliloquy. IV 277-88, 291-4 are omitted and Altemira's speeches when she takes the poison remodelled. IV 363-7 is omitted before the change of plot noted by Clark.

In the last act V 1-16, 24-37, 39-46 are left out; Clorimon has here 14 new lines when he decides to act and the omissions continue as follows: V 93-6, 103-4, 125-9, 133-6, 147-9, 152-3, 166-9, 174-5, 182-5, 199-202. Some of Candace's long account is omitted and the lines after 296 are not used. The play comes to an abrupt halt when Melizer enters to offer congratulations to Altemira and Lucidor, proclaiming nuptial rites and denying a pompous funeral to the villainous Altemast who was disguised as Candace. The ending is thus more concise and more dramatically pungent, and the whole has much greater polish than The Generall. Thus the play does not bear out the remarks of Francis Manning in the Epistle Dedicatory that "this Tragedy was left extreamly unfinished by the Noble Author" but it is true that the reviser did

Separate from a vast variety of Wit, and Redundance of  
Modern Thoughts (which made the Whole of an extream Length)  
the most Beautiful and Instructive Turns of Both, so as to  
Reduce the Poem within a reasonable Compass. (Ibid.)

Stratman<sup>45</sup> lists Zoroastres as appearing for the first time in The Dramatic Works of Lord Orrery published in two volumes in 1739.<sup>46</sup> None of the copies in Britain which I have seen,<sup>47</sup> however, possess the play and

Montague Summers in an article of 1917<sup>48</sup> says that the play was never published. It seems likely then, that the first edition of the play was in Clark's edition of 1937<sup>49</sup> and that Stratman had merely confused the order of the date's digits. Indeed Clark claims that his edition is the first printing of the play, edited from the British Museum Sloane ms. 1828. The manuscript is inscribed "Written in 1676" and so falls outside our period of study, but it is readily available in Clark's edition.

Genest is at his liveliest when dealing with an anonymous young lady's version of Beaumont and Fletcher's The Loyal Subject (a "tragi-comedy" - title page)<sup>50</sup> called The Faithful General (1706):<sup>51</sup>

those parts of it, which are now written by Fletcher, are bad - the scene lies at Byzantium in Greece - the Young Lady who produced the Faithful General seems to have had no mere opinion of her abilities - her time however would have been better employed in mending her own lines than in mangling Fletcher - her T. is intolerably long - the players in the representation made a free use of the pruning-knife to her great annoyance - when she printed it, she was determined, like Dogberry, to bestow all her tediousness upon the reader - In the preface to the Loyal Subject, as re-printed in 1706, it is said that the original play had been well received on its revival - and that when the legitimate offspring of Fletcher appeared on the very same day as the By-Blow died, the town quitted the impostor to embrace the legitimate. (II 346-7)

The young lady's cast is smaller; she omits one of the two daughters of Archas, disposes of the bawd and of the comedy and renames the characters. The Great Duke of Muscovia becomes Galerius, Archas becomes Marus, Theodore is only slightly modified to Theodorus, his brother Putshie is called Macario and the Emperor's favourite Burris is renamed Lycinius. Minor characters are reshuffled. The adaptor takes the opportunity to introduce an elaborate scenic effect at the beginning of Act III:

Soft Musick. Scene draws and discovers a Magnificent Temple, in the midst an Image of Jupiter on Gold, arm'd with Thunderbolts, standing upon a large Pedestal. An Altar flaming with Sacrifice. Priests waiting round it, crown'd with Gold; Choristers in white on each side in Rows. The Emperor, Const, Art, Lycim, Guards and Attendants. The Emperor gazes fixedly upon Art, who with Const Kneels before the Altar, while the Priests and Choristers Sing the following Song. (stage dir., III i, p. 26)

The adaptation is indeed long-winded; its element of debate is reminiscent of French tragedy, but the adaptation is not successful because of its diffuseness. The Faithful General makes considerable changes to its original both in plot and language but it is neither lively nor interesting.

Benjamin Griffin's Injur'd Virtue; or, The Virgin Martyr (1715)<sup>52</sup> an adaptation of Massinger and Dekker's The Virgin Martir.<sup>53</sup> The action of the first act is the same although the language is substantially changed. Instead of Massinger and Dekker's long prose scene in Act II between Spurgius and Hercius who counterfeit devotion when Angelo comes in with a taper, and instead of the discussion between Angelo and Dorothea, Griffin has Dorothea and Hellena discoursing on the horrors of prison and pitying those who are chained for their religion. This new material takes just over a page, against the original's equivalent six and a half. The next scene is the same but Griffin then omits that between Theopilus and Harpax. The last scene in Act II is also omitted. Several new scenes are added to the third act and the material of the fourth is changed to accommodate a very sentimental scene as Dorothea's death is described. Sapritus stabs himself and asks to be buried with his son, shortly before Theopilus laments all the dreadful events. This is miles away from the original but though the language is neither very strong nor concrete the scene is effective in an emotional way.

In Act V the opening scene contains the same facts but there is a

very atmospheric opening with the silence of the night, hushed winds and omens. A scene is added where Dorothea descends like an angel with a cross in her hand. After another short scene the original has only a page to run but Griffin spins it out and loses the fine visionary impact of his source. A glow of Christianity pervades the end of the play. The plain phrases of the source are filled out with a large number of abstract nouns, and couplets are provided for the ends of the acts.

Sir Charles Sedley's The Tyrant King of Crete (1722)<sup>54</sup> is a shortened version of Henry Killigrew's Pallantus and Eudora.<sup>55</sup> Sedley omits several characters in the list of dramatis personae but they nearly all appear except Cleander (whose lines are given to Pallantus), one lord, and the tutor Arcates. Killigrew's opening scene is omitted (I i 1-193) and the play begins with the shipwreck followed by 194-6, 199-259, 269-375 (somewhat shortened), 385-422. Then come II i 329-59, 367-82, 392-457 (curtailed), 468-75, 491-7, 510-11.

Sedley's second act begins with a short soliloquy by Pallantus which does not seem to be derived from Killigrew.

A Forest. Pallantus is discover'd sleeping under a Tree; adjoining to which is a large Fountain, from whence arises six Maids, or Water Nymphs. They sing, and disappear. (stage dir., II i, 331)

Then the original is taken up where it was left with II i 512-42 (shortened), 563-89. Sedley's II iii continues with the beginning of Killigrew's Act III and Sedley adds an effect

Representing a Temple of the Heathen Gods, where twelve Priests stand attending at the Altar with lighted Torches. (stage dir., II iii, 334)

This is followed by III i 1-17, 48-53, 76-133, 145-6, 169-74, 184-217, 242-62,

269-79, 289-413, 416-57, 473-81, 490-7, 506-21.

Sedley's third act continues straight on: III 522-4, 535-8, 553-611, IV i 1-17, 32-3, 42-52, 57-102, 107-71, 177-214, 220-2, 232-305.

Act IV of Sedley's play continues with IV i 306-end with some curtailments, particularly during the scene between Pallantus and Eudora and this takes us to IV iii of The Tyrant King. A substantial part of the original is here omitted (the first six and a half folio pages) and the play resumes with Polyander, Menetius, Comastes and the Captain of the Guards with Timeus. V i 393-608 follows with Comastes's long prose speech put into verse but unaltered.

Sedley's final act further curtails Killigrew's play by omitting the interview between Timeus and Eudora and showing instead a brief scene between Eudora and Rodia. Pallantus then comes in to her and speaks at great length before the final events of the play are shown with Pallantus kissing Eudora's hand and asking forgiveness. Sedley adds nothing except elaborate stage directions; he retains most of the serious interviews between the major characters but greatly decreases the amount of court business. There is little action in the play; it is made chiefly discussion.

The two most interesting adaptations are of plays much less remote in time. In his Fall of Mortimer (1731)<sup>56</sup> William Hatchett seems to fall between two styles in his adaptation of the earlier King Edward the Third (1691).<sup>57</sup> The adaptor retains much of the original, but the parallel between a) the Chancellor of England and the slut Maria and b) the Queen and Mortimer in the original is lost as the Chancellor is omitted, his lines being redistributed among other characters. No nobility is given to Mortimer at

all. There is either great haste or longish political debate, so the play tends to lack unity of style. The author adds several scenes which can, I think, be seen as attempts to "Shakespearianise" the original, in the sense that he adds scenes somewhat reminiscent of the sort of comedy in Shakespeare's Henry IV.

A long tavern scene takes place in Act 1 with low, comic characters one of whom, Bumper, complains that Mortimer is now too great to use his house. The model is quite clearly Falstaff. There is a certain amount of displacement of scenes and some minor alterations with one or two brief omissions or changes of word in the third and fourth acts. Much is changed in the final act, however; the first scene between Mortimer and the Queen is omitted, and Hatchett begins the act with a scene between Mortimer and Maria. In the new play Mortimer carries on with Maria and not with the Queen, and a new dimension is added to Mortimer's character by the fact that he shares the Chancellor's original lines with Eitherside. The author then adds two mob scenes (V i, pp. 51-53 and V [iv]). Instead of the long laments and portrayals of sorrow in the original the close of the adaptation is very swift. John Loftis<sup>58</sup> notes that the revision is an obvious attack on the government, and this is the reason for the obscurity of the authorship. Loftis notes the passages of crude and direct allegory where Mortimer, chief councillor of the young king, is supported by Queen Mary, and exercises tyrannical control over the nation's affairs. The three years since Mortimer began to rule can be compared, says Loftis, to George II's reinstatement of Walpole after his accession. Thus the play states that favourites must fall when the young king, educated by patriots, arrives at an understanding of his prerogative, and Loftis sees Fall of Mortimer as

the precursor of the opposition plays of the decade.

James Ralph's adaptation<sup>59</sup> of Banks' The Unhappy Favourite, or the Fall of the Earl of Essex (1682)<sup>60</sup> is a more subtle attempt than Hatchett's to draw a contemporary parallel. Loftis notes<sup>61</sup> that Essex is sheltered by the Queen as Walpole has the confidence of Queen Caroline, and the particulars of the charge against Essex would have sounded like an arraignment of Walpole in 1731. Loftis maintains that the propagandist blows here are indirect, but effective because they would be so much the less vulnerable to government interference. The rendering is much less complex than the original; the language is throughout altered, and although the first act is the same as far as the matter is concerned, the majestic language of the second act is almost entirely cut, and instead we have a very sentimental love scene between Essex and his wife. The transference of the strong, concrete language to vaguer prosy verse, full of abstract nouns which signify qualities rather than display or embody them, leads to monotony in this play. Loftis maintains that its political power would be obvious to the audience, but poetically and dramatically The Unhappy Favourite is an inferior piece. The other Banks' alteration was by the author himself who in 1704 revised and slightly shortened (64 pages against 70) his The Island Queens; or, the Death of Mary Queen of Scotland (1684),<sup>62</sup> to become The Albion Queens; or, the Death of Mary Queen of Scotland.<sup>63</sup> The revised version takes the form of an acting copy, for cues are noted in the text with the names of actors rather than characters.

The final section of this discussion concerns adaptations, alterations and translations from French and Italian plays. Of the earliest Edward

Ravenscroft says that his The Italian Husband (1698)<sup>64</sup> is written "in the stile of the Italian tragedies" (The Praelude) and E.T. Norris<sup>65</sup> has shown that this three-act tragedy is an adaptation of Il Tradimento per l'Honore by Giacinto Andrea Cicognini (Rome, 1664). The list of dramatis personae is the same except for some anglicising of the names, the two plots are identical even to details, and Norris quotes a couple of scenes to show that the Italian is closely paraphrased. Ravenscroft adds the musical entertainment and interludes in Act I and the Masque of Ixion in Act III which counterbalances his tendency to omit unimportant scenes by minor characters, and to reduce Cicognini's dialogue to make a three-act play.

Colley Cibber's adaptation of Corneille's Le Cid<sup>66</sup> entitled Ximena<sup>67</sup> was published in 1719. Unlike Ozell's translation of the play in 1714,<sup>68</sup> Cibber takes considerable liberties with the play which is prefaced by a long address to the reader and "An Examen of the Cid and the Heroick Daughter". Cibber notes that the great beauties of the French play are to be found in the tender compassion arising from the love of Rodrigue and Chimene and he complains of Corneille's harsh treatment of his heroine in the opening scene. Cibber thus tries to heighten her character at the beginning and to present Rodrigue as an unmistakable example of courage, love and honour. The Infanta's role is cut, for Cibber complains she "is always dropping in like cold Water upon the Heat of the main Action" (p. 189). Cibber dislikes Corneille's Don Diègue; he says that in Act III he "is wandering up and down alone in search of his Son" (p. 193) and leaves his guests alone in order to do this, at last meeting his son

with whom he falls into a tedious Argument; and to comfort  
his Sorrows for the Loss of his Mistress, tells him, there

are more Women than Ximena, and would have him shew the Greatness of his Heart, in shaking off his Weakness for her. This seems unpardonable, and stains the Character of the Father; for to suppose him capable of changing his Mistress, takes away half the Merit of the Son's having reveng'd his Honour. (p. 193)

Cibber's chief change is as follows:

the Heroick Daughter, having a whole first Act added before the Action of the Cid begins, of consequence transfers the Third Act of the French Play into the Fourth of the English; by which Expedient, the necessary Matter of the two last Acts of the one, are easily contain'd in the single Fifth Act of the other. (p. 194)

The last act of Le Cid, Cibber complains, is "too declamatory and romantick" (p. 196); this, he says,

I have endeavour'd to avoid, by giving a more spirited Turn to the Passions, and reducing them nearer to common Life. (p. 196)

Despite this deliberate modernising the opening lines of Ximena reveal a pointed anachronistic use of language; Alvarez exclaims:

Alliance! ha! and with the Race of Gormaz!  
My mortal Foe! The King enjoins it, saidst thou?  
Let me not think thou couldst descend to ask it. (I i, p. 203)

When Alvarez and Ximena meet they are both effusive, and Alvarez eagerly, if somewhat sentimentally, joins the hands of Ximena and his son. Ximena's maid, Belzara, is forsaken by Don Sanchez to whom she has been recently betrothed, and Sanchez is secretly pursuing Ximena. Thus Cibber turns the role of confidante into one of a character equal on the social plane, and makes her a rival to her friend.

Cibber's selection of material corresponds to his intentions expressed in the Preface. Some of the omitted events (such as the Don Diègue scene which Cibber complained about) are narrated at the beginning of Act V by

Alonzo. It is the tearful which is stressed at the end of the play.

The adaptation of Corneille's Cinna attributed to Colley Cibber<sup>69</sup> in 1713 entitled Cinna's Conspiracy<sup>70</sup> is a translation of the French play rather than an adaptation; the author retains the original characters and sequence of speeches. Distaste for certain elements of French neo-classicism can be seen from the Prologue:

No Ghost is rais'd, no Incantations sung,  
Nor a stuff'd OEdipus from Windows flung,  
We, of the French, their Stage-Decorum prize  
And justly such Absurdities despise,  
Approve their Unity, of Place and Time:  
But shun their trivial Points, and gaudy Rhyme.

The only significant departure from Corneille is in the middle of the first act where Cinna has a very long monologue in which he describes his encounters with the conspirators, and the decisions reached. Instead of this reported speech by Cinna, the translator here has Cinna meet with the conspirators, three of whom are named, Marcellus, Glabrio and "Rutil", but not included in the list of Dramatis Personae. This departure conforms to the usual pattern of English adaptors attempting to break up the long speeches of the French originals.

Several writers adapted Racine's plays to make them acceptable to the English stage. Mrs Robe admits in the Epistle Dedicatory to her Fatal Legacy (1723)<sup>71</sup> that the first four acts of her play are taken chiefly from Racine, and the play as a whole is a loose translation of La Thébaïde.<sup>72</sup> The work is clearly an attempt to render the plot and speeches of Racine into English which is in line with the dramatic tradition of the time, and so most of Racine's pungency is turned into verbosity. The order of several

speeches is changed, but Mrs Robe's verse is very uneven. She adds violence, a new ending and a great deal of imagery. One example will suffice to indicate the sort of embellishment made in the play. Racine's speech by Etéocle:

Hé! Madame, à quoy bon ce mystère?  
Tous ces embrassements ne sont guère à propos,  
Qu'il parle, qu'il s'explique & nous laisse au repos (IV iii, p. 48)

becomes:

Why all this mysterious Talk?  
Madam, all these Embraces show no more  
Than bending Poppies, or the bowing Reeds,  
That only take their Motions from the Wind;  
Or couchant Flatterers, that mean no good  
When they caress you, and the Ponyard's hid.  
E'en let him speak, explain himself, and leave  
Me to repose and canvass what he says. (IV iii, p. 54)

The interpolated lines are mere padding and are not even particularly clear. Mrs Robe regularises the acts by adding rhyming tags and triplets to her blank verse at the end of the acts, and she anglicises the play to a considerable extent, or, rather, she makes it conform to what was clearly a popular conception of French tragedies translated into English.

Charles Johnson's The Sultanness (1717)<sup>73</sup> is a translation and adaptation of Racine's Bajazet<sup>74</sup> but despite Genest's comment "this T. professedly taken from Racine" (II, 598) it is in fact a close translation, not word for word, but speech for speech, of the original. Johnson adds a few rhyming tags at the ends of the acts and adds some speeches between Acomat and Zaire at the end with 7 lines of italicised rhyme. Acomat's promise to erect a lasting monument is Johnson's only substantial contribution to the play:

Osmyn, do thou convey the Lovers hence;

Let their Remains be plac'd on Board my Vessel;  
 I will my self, in happier Climes, erect  
 Their lasting Monument; 'tis fit one Tomb  
 Should hold them both, whom Love and Fate have join'd. (V xi, p. 55)

Thomas Brereton's Esther; or, Faith Triumphant (1715)<sup>75</sup> is largely a literal translation of Racine's Esther;<sup>76</sup> there are several embellishments in the style of Mrs Robe's Fatal Legacy<sup>77</sup> and the songs are translated. The verse is very stilted, very formal and without any real poetic or syntactic English unity. Voltaire denounced Racine's play as "sans intrigue, sans action, sans intérêt"<sup>78</sup> and the same could be said of Brereton's attempt to render it into English.

The best adaptation of Racine during the period (it is based on Andromaque)<sup>79</sup> is Ambrose Philips' The Distrest Mother (1712)<sup>80</sup> which has received a fair amount of critical attention in two articles, Katharine Wheatley's "Andromache as the 'Distrest Mother'"<sup>81</sup> and Paul Parnell's "The Distrest Mother, Ambrose Philips' Moralistic Play".<sup>82</sup> The first critic writes a Racine centered article, showing how Philips adapted his source, and how he, along with all the other eighteenth-century adaptors of Racine, failed to understand the French masterpieces for what they were. Parnell attempts to vindicate Philips to some extent, and is much more sympathetic in trying to see what the English playwright was doing, and he summarises thus:

if it now seems that the adaptor did not grasp the peculiar qualities of the original, it must be understood that he succeeded in his aims: a simplified characterisation, and a sharpened didactic emphasis. The result was to change the Andromaque of Racine into something like a morality play.<sup>83</sup>

I would suggest that this is going too far, because it rather ignores the

whole backdrop of this kind of drama in England, but Parnell is surely right in saying that the eighteenth-century dramatists were concerned to present a "moral grandeur" on the stage in contrast to the contemporary taste for "the superficial grandeur of costume and ceremony"<sup>84</sup> and he makes a very helpful observation about the drama of the period in general which is worth quoting:

The French see love as a real battle of the sexes, in which the weapons of each side are roughly equal, since they are mainly psychological. The English view is much simpler - the main male asset is physical force, and the woman's only hope is the pathos of virtuous weakness. If a woman loses her virtue, she has no claim on anyone's sympathy; but she might well lose her virtue as engage in psychological manoeuvring. Weeping and righteous indignation are the only procedures countenanced.<sup>85</sup>

Andromache succeeds because her character is flawless, while the others all fail because of their moral shortcomings.<sup>86</sup>

Philips' play is chastely neo-classical, with no violence on stage, and well-defined characters acting within the framework of the Unities. The central focus of the play is neither the love theme nor the political intrigue theme, but the domestic relationship of mother and son (the son interestingly never appears - it is all kept on an effective Platonic level). It is the mother who wins through the strength of her own virtue, even when hope for her seems to be beyond the bounds of possibility.

In the Preface to Junius Brutus (1735)<sup>87</sup> William Duncombe stresses that he attempted to make Voltaire's Le Brutus<sup>88</sup> more acceptable to English taste. He exclaims against Lee's Lucius Junius Brutus:<sup>89</sup>

the Character of Brutus is there so shockingly Severe, without any Softnings of Tenderness and Humanity, that (however vouch'd by History) it can scarce seem natural to a discerning Audience, much less agreeable to a polite one.

It is no doubt for this very reason that Duncombe was struck by Buckingham's adaptations. He says that he intended to follow the earlier writer's example:

I had, at the Instance of some learned Friends, prepared Choruses, for this Play, after the manner of the Ancients; but finding no Disposition in the Managers of the Theatres to be at the Expence necessary for such an Undertaking, was oblig'd to drop that Design.

I am inform'd, that Mr Galliard has set to Musick the Choruses for the late Duke of Buckingham's Tragedy of Julius Caesar, all writ by the Duke himself; and that Signor Bononcini has set those to his Grace's Tragedy of Marcus Brutus, writ by the Duke and Mr Pope.

Whenever they are perform'd, I doubt not but that they will convince the Public, more effectually than any thing that I cou'd offer, how Subservient Musick might be made to the Drama.

Duncombe renames some of the characters; Arons becomes Caelius, Tullie becomes Lucia, Algine becomes Hortensia and the unnamed Senators in Voltaire are called Sylvius and Rufus. Some of the longer speeches are cut in the middle and the translation tends to simplify somewhat; at the end of Act I for example

Dieux, protége ainsi contre nos Ennemis  
Le Consulat du Père, & les Armes du Fils! (I ii, p. 10)

is translated

Ye Righteous Pow'rs! continue still to bless  
The glorious Cause of Freedom with Success. (I ii, p. 26)

Duncombe enlarges the final speech of Act IV from six lines to sixteen by adding two couplets and three triplets. Instead of the confrontation between father and son in V vii Duncombe presents a scene where Lucia throws herself on her knees before Brutus and begs the life of her son. Titus and Lucia have a new sentimental parting scene in V viii and so

ends the scene by killing herself. Titus

upon seeing Lucia kill herself, at first starts; and then stands awhile silent, as stupify'd with Grief. At last he breaks forth into this Exclamation (stage dir., p. 90)

where he bids his heart break from grief. In V ix two lines are taken from Lee's play and the focus of the scene is shifted to Lucia's death. Voltaire's final scene is magnificently economical but Duncombe expands it and ends the play with a longish speech:

Forbear! The Fatal Debt is paid to Justice,  
And Rome is free. Return we thanks to Heav'n!  
REASON's just Laws with jealous Care obey,  
And never from the Paths of VIRTUE stray.  
It will be in vain, illustrious Deeds to boast,  
When by Our Crimes, the Fame of All is lost. (V x, p. 95)

The play is made more diffuse and rather more sentimental by Duncombe's alterations.

Aaron Hill's translation of Voltaire's Alzire, ou les Américains (1735)<sup>90</sup> appeared the following year, 1736, as Alzira.<sup>91</sup> Hill has a curious habit of italicising a lot of words. The sequence of speeches is retained, but they are often padded out. "Un Américain" is interestingly translated ad "Indian Captain" in Act II, and Alzira's opening speech in Act III is made more exclamatory and more sentimental. The final speech of the play undergoes a strange transformation. Alvare's

Je vois le doigt de Dieu marqué dans nos malheurs.  
Mon coeur désespéré se soumet, s'abandonne  
Aux volontés d'un Dieu, qui frape, & qui pardonne (p. 79)

becomes

I see the Hand of Heaven, in our Misfortune.

In his translation of Voltaire's Le Zayre<sup>92</sup> Aaron Hill stayed very close to the original for Zara (1736)<sup>93</sup> published four years after the first

appearance of the French play. Hill discards Voltaire's scene divisions and introduces some stage business in Act I by having a paper read and then redelivered to Orosmin. Scene ii is somewhat reduced as in the original. Orosmin has a speech lasting two and a half pages. The central part of Voltaire's final scene in Act II is curtailed by about a full page because of the long speeches. The only other change seems to be that the opening brief scene with "Orosmane à l'Esclave" in Act V is omitted. Hill manages not only to translate the words but also a considerable amount of the tone of the original.

Two attempts were made during the period to introduce Maffei's Merope<sup>94</sup> to the English stage. The version attributed to William Ayre, Merope (1740)<sup>95</sup> is a translation; the author retains the same number of characters, the action of the original and, with minor modifications, the length and sequence of speeches. George Jeffreys's Merope (1731),<sup>76</sup> however, is a much more radical departure from the original. He increases the original seven characters to twelve, renames some of them and presents quite different action based upon the original story. The plot is very similar to that of the source but by diversifying characters Jeffreys gives more attention to the women and greater justification to the fall of Glycon by characterising him as a wicked schemer.

The now rare Romulus (1724)<sup>97</sup> by Henry Johnson is a translation of the play by the same name by Antoine Houdart de la Motte<sup>98</sup> an unsuccessful piece published in 1722 and later reprinted in the collected edition of de la Motte's plays. The translation is mannered and Johnson has considerable difficulty in making his lines smooth. In the opening scene of the play

La Motte has Hersile say:

Cruelle, avec quel art tu surprends ma tendresse!  
 Mon coeur ne t'a donc pu déguiser sa foiblesse?  
 Ciel! En la découvrant que tu me fais trembler!  
 Aux yeux de mon vainqueur l'aurai-je pu céler? (I i, 85)

and Johnson translates this:

Oh Cruelty! How great Surprize is this!  
 Thou'st lain in Ambush for my melting Soul!  
 And my weak Heart appear'd through its Disguise.  
 Heav'ns! How at this Discovery I tremble,  
 Left to my Conqueror's Eyes I stand confest! (I i, p. 6)

The whole translation is in an antiquated sort of English. This parallels to some extent de la Motte's attempt to heighten by using outmoded forms of speech, but it leads to some curious and infelicitous expressions. At the end of the second act Hersilia exclaims "What do I hear! a Dying! Heaven support me!" (II iv, p. "32" i.e. 23). Johnson follows the original carefully, occasionally adding a stage direction in the earlier part of the play, and placing three one line notes at the foot of the page at relevant points, two giving the French line and one pointing out a fact. However, neither the original nor the translation shows any great sophistication, and neither is very interesting.

The one guiding principle behind all these very different sorts of alteration is that of simplification, whether of plot, language, purpose or, more likely, a combination of all three. The desire of adaptors as well as writers of original tragedies during the period is to present a straightforward plot with as few characters as possible. Thus any alteration from the tragedies of an earlier period must necessitate the omission of a large number of the dramatis personae. Adaptors at the beginning of the eighteenth century will achieve something which is much more like French neo-classicism

than their original, though it should be pointed out that the impact of the adaptation is never as strong as that of the French writers. Adaptation of Elizabethan and Jacobean plays takes writers much closer to the Unities, and what is seen to be superfluous action is omitted. There is less action, more concentration on a few events and characteristics as well as on fewer themes, and in some cases the authors follow what they think to be neo-classical lines. The Duke of Buckingham, for example, adds choruses as do other writers. In Esther Brereton wanted to have

"after the Manner of the ancient Greek Chorus's, (long since recommended to our Imitation by the late Critick Mr Rhymer) diverse Psalms or Hymns; which to such as are especially inclin'd to Musick, will have all the good Effects of the Modern Opera, without any of its Absurdities."

Brereton later makes clear that he thinks tragedy to be "next to Preaching... the most conducive to Morality" and no doubt a religious purpose induced him to choose a religious play in the first place as well as to introduce hymns. These writers are prompted to include their choruses, essentially embellishments, because they are representative of the greater simplicity which they see inherent in the neo-classical form of writing. Clarity of design, of shape, is the ideal. Some writers discard the sub-plot of their source so that they can concentrate on the essentials of their original material. Other writers increase the amount of their sub-plot though for the same reason of simplification. In these cases they abandon the complex relations between main and sub-plot, and instead have prose simply for comic relief or for the sort of comment which is so straightforward it is really allegorical.

Lewis Theobald in his Preface to King Richard II shows that plot

(of which I think he is chiefly speaking here) and language are treated in much the same way:

The many scatter'd Beauties, which I have long admir'd in His [Shakespeare's] Life and Death of K. Richard the II induced me to think they would have stronger Charms, if they were interwoven in a regular Fable.

What he likes about the play he calls "Beauties", a word more likely to describe something decorative than fundamental. Theobald says that he intends to gather together all these disparate bits which he likes and "weave" them together, another word which suggests something decorative. The idea that pleasing bits can be taken out of one context and joined together with different links is surely not one which fits with an idea of tragedy as an entity with something to say. The whole concept of tragedy as outlined here, and Theobald is by no means exceptional, is of something essentially superficial. It is no surprise, therefore, that any liberties may be taken in order to make the source as regular in its decorative pattern as the author desired. Language is always simplified in that irony, ambivalence, ambiguity and nuance are purged from the text. The "meaning" is made very plain, although there is also a strong emphasis on a decorative framework. This framework, however, consists of an embellishment round a simple thought, with the hope that the thought is clarified by the addition of synonyms and examples. We thus get something diffuse but essentially straightforward in "meaning", rather than the dense texture of the French neo-classicists where the reverberations spread far wider than the couplet. Here what is being said is far simpler but its expression lengthier. Thus often writers are led to modernise the language of their

original so that its meaning will be plainer to the audience. Theobald goes on, later in the same Preface, to complain about Shakespeare's language:

As these Qualities led him to say, and express, many Things sublimely, figuratively and elegantly; so they often forc'd him out of his Way, upon false Images, hard Metaphors, and Flights, where the Eye of Judgment cannot trace him.

It is essentially the concept of a dense verbal structure which Theobald finds unacceptable. That the audience should have to puzzle out connexions is something foreign to the early eighteenth-century writers.

We have seen that the most interesting adaptations are those which point some contemporary political significance. This is perhaps because in their attempt to portray something important to themselves and to the audience the authors find appropriate language for their intentions. The more real and the more clearly defined the intentions of the adaptor, the more likely the play is to have some direct impact. Yet we have also seen that this in itself is an act of simplification, for the audience would be able to appreciate at once the political significance of The Fall of Mortimer. In adaptations effected for political relevance the nuance of the original is discarded for the more direct and immediate grasp of the new significance. But there are other ways in which the intention of the original author is simplified. Aaron Hill in his translation of Voltaire's Zaire is treating a contemporary source, yet he nevertheless gives himself some leeway for what seems at first to be a weak reason:

If, in translating this excellent Tragedy, I have regarded, in some Places, the Soul, and, in others, the Letter, of the Original, Monsieur de Voltaire, who has made himself a very capable Judge, both of our Language, and Customs, will indulge

me that Latitude; except, he shou'd, in observing some Alterations I have made, in his Names, and his Diction, forget, that their Motives are to be found, in the Turn of our National Difference.

Hill is saying that he has made some changes because the English stage demands something different from the French, and thus he is taking it upon himself to allow himself as much latitude as he requires, and is, moreover, sure that the author will agree that his alterations were necessary.

Dismissing the false modesty of the expression, one nevertheless feels that Hill is unwilling to recognise that the original play may have some validity of its own which could be transmitted even with a very close translation. The intention of the original author, therefore, is not seen to be very important anyway. Most significant of all is the point raised by the following extract from Duncombe's Preface to Junius Brutus. He complains of Nathaniel Lee's version that there are far too many rants and goes on:

the Character of Brutus is there so shockingly Severe, without any softenings of Tenderness and Humanity that (however vouch'd by History) it can scarce seem natural to a discerning Audience, much less agreeable to a polite one.

The use of "natural" is significant, for Duncombe really means "everyday" in this context. He means that Brutus is so nasty that one would never meet a man like him, and that one could never accept the existence of such a man. This denies the right of an author to have any purpose to which characters must be subservient. In fact, here Duncombe is really denying the artistic principle, for the question ought to be "Why does Lee make Brutus so severe?" Not only, then, are the adaptors of the early eighteenth century simplifying the language, plot and intention of their original, but they are subordinating intention or purpose to pattern, so that in the most extreme case there is no purpose left, merely pattern and embellishment.

Notes1 Colley Cibber, The Tragical History of King Richard III. For B. Lintott

... and A. Bettesworth [1700]. BM 11764.f.7.

Tu 4 Apr 1704 DL	Mon 27 Mar 1721 LIF
Sat 28 Jan 1710 Queen's	Sat 7 Oct 1721 LIF
Mon 27 Mar 1710 Queen's	Sat 16 Dec 1721 LIF
Sat 13 May 1710 Queen's	Tu 26 Dec 1721 LIF
Sat 14 Feb 1713 DL	Mon 14 May 1722 DL
Th 26 Feb 1713 DL	Th 4 Oct 1722 LIF
Mon 27 Apr 1713 DL	Th 15 Nov 1722 LIF
Sat 2 Jan 1714 DL	Sat 19 Mar 1723 DL
Sat 27 Feb 1714 DL	Th 10 Oct 1723 LIF
Sat 17 Apr 1714 DL	Th 30 Apr 1724 LIF
Fri 15 Oct 1714 DL	Th 22 Oct 1724 LIF
Th 27 Jan 1715 DL	Sat 6 Feb 1725 DL
Tu 6 Dec 1715 DL	Sat 1 May 1725 LIF
Tu 1 Jan 1717 DL	Tu 9 Nov 1725 LIF
Sat 9 Nov 1717 DL	Mon 17 Oct 1726 LIF
Sat 15 Mar 1718 DL	Th 3 Nov 1726 DL
Th 12 Feb 1719 DL	Th 29 Dec 1726 LIF
Sat 26 Sep 1719 DL	Tu 17 Jan 1727 DL
Sat 13 Feb 1720 DL	Wed 3 Jan 1728 LIF
Th 19 May 1720 DL	Th 23 May 1728 DL
Sat 3 Dec 1720 DL	Mon 19 Aug 1728 HAY
Sat 11 Mar 1721 LIF	Wed 6 Nov 1728 DL
Mon 13 Mar 1721 LIF	Wed 20 Nov 1728 DL

There were a great many performances of this play throughout the century See London Stage, IV and V. All volumes list the play under Shakespeare except IV part 1 which lists the play under Cibber. IV part 2 does not state that it is Cibber's adaptation, but V (all three parts) lists the play under Shakespeare, noting that it is this adaptation which was performed.

2 Lewis Theobald, The Tragedy of King Richard the Second. For G. Strahan,

W. Mears, T. Meighan, B. Barker, and Sold by J. Morphew, 1720.

BM 642.d.27(2).

Th 10 Dec 1719 LIF*	Sat 2 Jan 1720 LIF
Fri 11 Dec 1719 LIF	Mon 25 Jan 1720 LIF
Sat 12 Dec 1719 LIF	Sat 7 Jan 1721 LIF
Mon 14 Dec 1719 LIF	Sat 4 Feb 1721 LIF
Sat 19 Dec 1719 LIF	Tu 24 Oct 1721 LIF

\*"With new Scenes and Habits" (London Stage II, 559).



- 13 William Davenant and John Dryden, The Tragedy of Julius Caesar; With the Death of Brutus and Cassius. For J. Tonson, 1719. BPL 113702. It is not possible to ascertain which version of Shakespeare was played on which particular occasion as this was not usually mentioned on the playbills. It is very likely, however, that this particular alteration was acted.
- 14 John Sheffield Buckingham, "Julius Caesar Altered." In The Works. 2 vols. For John Barber, 1723. C Rel.f.l.a.38-39. Not known to have been acted.
- 15 John Dennis, The Invader of his Country; or, The Fatal Resentment. For J. Pemberton, and J. Watts, 1720. C S.721.d.70.43<sup>2</sup>.  
 Wed 11 Nov 1719 DL Sat 14 Nov 1719 DL  
 Th 12 Nov 1719 DL Fri 1 Jan 1720 LIF  
 Fri 13 Nov 1719 DL
- 16 [Thomas Betterton], A Tragedy of Hamlet Prince of Denmark. For Rich. Wellington, and E. Rumball, 1703. DFo Mflm.
- 17 [John Hughes], Hamlet. By J. Derby, for M. Wellington, 1718. CSmH Mflm.
- 18 William Shakespeare, The Complete Works. Ed. Peter Alexander. Collins: London & Glasgow, 1951. See pp. 1028-72 for Hamlet.
- 19 Nahum Tate, Macbeth, Edinburgh: by T. and W. Ruddiman for Alan Ramsay, 1731. BPL  
 No details of performances in London Stage.
- 20 Nahum Tate, Injur'd Love; or, The Cruel Husband. For Richard Wellington, 1707. E H.27.c.3(11).  
 Not known to have been acted.
- 21 John Webster, The White Devil; or, The Tragedy of Paulo Giordano, Ursini, Duke of Brachiano With the Life, and Death, of Vittoria Corombona, the famous Venetian Curtizan. For Hugh Perry, 1631. E H.28.e.2(3).
- 22 John Webster, The Dutchess of Malfey. For D.N., and are to be sold by Simon Neale, 1678. BM 163.k.65.
- 23 The Unfortunate Dutchess of Malfy; or The Unnatural Brothers. For H.N., and are to be sold by J. Morphew, 1708. BM 644.i.71.  
 Tu 22 July 1707 Queen's Fri 8 Aug 1707 Queen's  
 Tu 29 July 1707 Queen's
- 24 Lewis Theobald, The Fatal Secret. For J. Watts, and sold by W. Feales, 1735. BM 162.e.13.  
 Wed 4 Apr 1733 CG Fri 6 Apr 1733 CG

- 25 [Thomas Scott], The Unhappy Kindness; or, A Fruitless Revenge. For H. Rhodes, S. Briscoe, and R. Parker, 1697. BM 81.c.17(2); C Syn.6.68.68<sup>2</sup>.  
 Pagination irregular: 1-40, 51-55.  
 July 1696 DL\*  
 \*Date of première unknown.
- 26 Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher, "A Wife for a Month; a Tragi-Comedy" in Fifty Comedies and Tragedies. For John Martyn, Henry Herringman, Richard Marriot, 1679, 469-89. C Y.7.5.
- 27 Attributed to Powell in Stratman, Bibliography of English Printed Tragedy, p. 530, //5102. See also Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature, II, 426
- 28 George Powell, Bonduca; or, The British Heroine. For Richard Bentley, 1696. BM 1346.d.8.  
 Compare with Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher, Bonduca. For J.T., and sold by J. Brown, 1718. BM 1346.d.6.  
 Sept 1695 DL\*  
 \*Date of première unknown. See London Stage I, 452-53; Leslie Hotson, The Commonwealth and Restoration Stage, p. 377; London Stage, I, 568.
- |                          |                     |
|--------------------------|---------------------|
| Sat 28 Sep 1695 DL or DG | Tu 10 July 1716 DL  |
| Tu 12 Feb 1706 DL        | Fri 25 July 1718 DL |
| Mon 18 Feb 1706 DL       | Fri 22 Aug 1718 DL  |
| Fri 5 Aug 1715 DL*       | Th 31 Jan 1723 HAY  |
| Tu 9 Aug 1715 DL         | Fri 13 June 1729 DL |
| Fri 12 Aug 1715 DL       | Wed 18 June 1729 DL |
| Tu 23 Aug 1715 DL        | Tu 15 July 1729 DL  |
| Tu 26 June 1716 DL**     |                     |
- \*Bonduca, or The British Worthy.  
 \*\*Bonduca, or The British General.
- 29 Preface to the Reader.
- 30 [Christopher Bullock], The Traytor. Reviv'd with several alterations. For W. Chetwood, and J. Peele, 1718. BM 11773.b.15.
- |                     |                     |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| Sat 11 Oct 1718 LIF | Sat 21 Mar 1719 LIF |
| Mon 13 Oct 1718 LIF | Th 11 Feb 1720 LIF  |
| Tu 14 Oct 1718 LIF  | Wed 27 Apr 1720 LIF |
| Mon 27 Oct 1718 LIF | Th 1 Dec 1720 LIF   |
| Mon 5 Jan 1719 LIF  |                     |
- 31 James Shirley, The Traytor. For William Cooke, 1635. BM C.12.f.16(1).
- 32 The Rape. For J. Roberts, 1730. BM 164.i.10.
- |                     |                     |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| Tu 25 Nov 1729 LIF  | Th 27 Nov 1729 LIF  |
| Wed 26 Nov 1729 LIF | Fri 28 Nov 1729 LIF |

- 33 Nicholas Brady, The Rape; or, The Innocent Impostors. For R. Bentley, 1692. BM 644.g.22.
- 34 [Thomas Betterton], The Roman Actor. For W. Mears, and D. Brown, W. Chetwood, and J. Woodman, S. Chapman, 1722. BM 643.c.43.  
Not known to have been acted.
- 35 Philip Massinger, The Roman Actor. By B.A., and T.F., for Robert Allot, 1629. BM Ashley 1117.
- 36 Colley Cibber, Caesar in AEGYPT. For John Watts, 1725. C S.721.d.  
70.47 .  
Wed 9 Dec 1724 DL                      Sat 12 Dec 1724 DL  
Th 10 Dec 1724 DL                      Mon 14 Dec 1724 DL  
Fri 11 Dec 1724 DL                      Tu 15 Dec 1724 DL
- 37 Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher, The False One. In The British Drama. Vol. I, Part I. London: by William Miller; Edinburgh: by James Ballantyne, 1804.
- 38 Leonard R.N. Ashley, Colley Cibber (MacMillan: New York, 1964) pp. 71-2.
- 39 Roger Boyle Orrery, Altemira. For John Nutt, 1702. E. Bute 406.  
Not known to have been acted.
- 40 Roger Boyle Orrery, The Dramatic Works. 2 vols. Ed. William Smith Clark II. Cambridge Mass: Harvard University Press, 1937.
- 41 Ibid., II, 838.
- 42 J.O. Halliwell [-Phillipps], A Brief Description of the Ancient and Modern Manuscripts Preserved in the Public Library, Plymouth: To which are added, some Fragments of Early Literature Hitherto unpublished, Plymouth, 1855.
- 43 Orrery, Dramatic Works. Ed. Clark, I, 106-7.
- 44 Ibid.
- 45 Stratman, op. cit., p. 495.
- 46 Roger Boyle Orrery, The Dramatic Works. 2 vols. R. Dodsley, 1739. BM 80.  
c. 19-20; E Al.a.1.
- 47 British Museum, Edinburgh, Bodleian and Victoria and Albert Museum.
- 48 Montague Summers, "Orrery's 'The Tragedy of Zoroastres'". Modern Language Review 12 (1917), 24-32.

- 49 Orrery, Dramatic Works. Ed. Clark, II, 643-99.
- 50 Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher, "The Loyal Subject" in Fifty Comedies and Tragedies. By J. Macock, for John Martyn, Henry Herringman, Richard Marriot, 1679. Pp. 255-80. C Y.7.5.
- 51 The Faithful General. For Richard Wellington, 1706. O.  
Details of performance unknown although Genest (II, 346-7) suggests that it was performed.
- 52 Benjamin Griffin, Injur'd Virtue; or, The Virgin Martyr. For Jonas Browne, and J. Richardson, 1715. BM 162.c.59.  
Mon 1 Nov 1714 SOU\*  
\*"At the King's-Arms Tavern in Southwark" (London Stage, II, 331)
- 53 Philip Massinger and Thomas Dekker, The Virgin Martir. By B.A., 1651.  
BM Ashley 1112.
- 54 Charles Sedley, "The Tyrant King of Crete" in Works II. For S. Briscoe, 1722. Pp. 317-84. C 7720.d.387-8.  
Not known to have been acted.
- 55 Henry Killigrew, Pallantus and Eudora. For John Hardesty, 1653. C Sel.3. 162.<sup>38</sup>
- 56 [William Hatchett], The Fall of Mortimer. For J. Millan [sic.], 1731. BM 1346.e.43. Listed under "John Bancroft" in BM Catalogue.
- |                     |                       |
|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Wed 12 May 1731 HAY | Tu 1 June 1731 HAY    |
| Th 13 May 1731 HAY  | Wed 2 June 1731 HAY   |
| Fri 14 May 1731 HAY | Fri 4 June 1731 HAY   |
| Mon 17 May 1731 HAY | Sat 5 June 1731 HAY   |
| Fri 21 May 1731 HAY | Mon 7 June 1731 HAY   |
| Mon 24 May 1731 HAY | Mon 14 June 1731 HAY  |
| Wed 26 May 1731 HAY | Wed 30 June 1731 HAY* |
| Th 27 May 1731 HAY  | Th 30 Nov 1732 FS**   |
| Fri 28 May 1731 HAY |                       |
- \*"Wed 21 July 1731 Daily Journal, 22 July: Last Night when the Company ... was going to perform the Fall of Mortimer, the High Constable ... came with a Warrant from several Justices of the Peace, to seize Mr. Mullet, who play'd the part of Mortimer, and the rest of the Performers, but they all made their Escapes" (London Stage III, 148).  
\*\*"By a Society of Gentlemen, for their Diversion. At the Old House in Crane Court, Fleet Street" (London Stage III, 252).
- 57 William Mountfort, King Edward the Third with the Fall of Mortimer, Earl of March. An Historicall Play, London, 1691. BM 644.f.17. "[By J. Bancroft? With a dedication by William Mountfort]" (BM Catalogue).

58 Loftis, op. cit., pp. 105-6.

59 [James Ralph], The Fall of the Earl of Essex. For W. Meadows, and S. Billingsley, 1731. BM 642.h.28(2).

Mon	1 Feb	1731	GF	Wed	3 Feb	1731	GF
Tu	2 Feb	1731	GF	Th	4 Feb	1731	GF

60 John Banks, The Unhappy Favourite; or, The Earl of Essex. For Richard Bentley and Mary Magnes, 1682. BM 840.g.32.

61 Loftis, op. cit., p. 107.

62 John Banks, The Island Queens; or, The Death of Mary Queen of Scotland. For R. Bentley, 1684. BM 81.c.11(4).

"Published only in Defiance occasion'd by its being prohibited the Stage" (title page).

Never acted.

63 John Banks, The Albion Queens; or The Death of Mary Queen of Scotland. For Richard Wellington [1704]. BM 644.g.3.

Mon 6 Mar 1704 DL\*

\*"And by reason of the extraordinary charge in the Decoration of it, the Prices will be raised". (London Stage II, 60)

Tu	7 Mar	1704	DL	Mon	11 Feb	1734	HAY
Th	9 Mar	1704	DL	Th	7 Mar	1734	DL
Sat	11 Mar	1704	DL	Mon	30 Sep	1734	CG
Mon	13 Mar	1704	DL	Wed	2 Oct	1734	CG
Th	16 Mar	1704	DL	Fri	4 Oct	1734	CG
Tu	21 Mar	1704	DL	Tu	19 Nov	1734	CG
Wed	22 Nov	1704	DL	Mon	21 Apr	1735	DL
Sat	10 Mar	1711	DL	Wed	7 Jan	1736	CG
Tu	13 Mar	1711	DL	Sat	21 Feb	1736	CG
Sat	14 Mar	1713	DL	Sat	30 Oct	1736	CG
Th	10 Dec	1713	DL	Tu	30 Nov	1736	CG
Mon	29 Mar	1714	DL	Mon	31 Oct	1737	CG
Mon	29 Mar	1714	DL	Wed	22 Nov	1738	CG
Tu	18 Nov	1714	DL	Mon	1 Jan	1739	CG
Sat	2 Mar	1723	DL	Mon	30 Apr	1739	DL
Tu	5 Mar	1723	DL	Wed	28 Nov	1739	CG
Sat	19 Nov	1726	DL	Th	4 Feb	1742	CG
Mon	21 Nov	1726	DL	Wed	24 Feb	1742	CG
Th	24 Nov	1726	DL	Mon	14 Feb	1743	CG
Mon	26 Dec	1726	DL	Mon	17 Oct	1743	CG
Fri	7 Apr	1727	DL	Th	5 Apr	1750	CG
Th	30 Nov	1727	DL	Th	17 Apr	1750	CG
Tu	26 Mar	1728	DL	Tu	13 May	1766	CG
Th	26 Dec	1728	DL	Fri	28 Nov	1766	CG
Wed	21 Jan	1730	DL	Mon	4 May	1767	CG
Th	8 Mar	1733	DL	Tu	28 Mar	1769	CG
Sat	31 Mar	1733	DL	Wed	19 Apr	1769	CG
Sat	12 Jan	1734	HAY	Fri	16 Apr	1773	CG
Mon	14 Jan	1734	HAY	Th	20 May	1779	CG
Tu	15 Jan	1734	HAY				

- 64 Edward Ravenscroft, The Italian Husband. For Isaac Cleave, 1698. BM 81.c.16(6).  
Nov 1697 LIF\*  
\*Date of première unknown.
- 65 E.T. Norris, "The Italian Source for Ravenscroft's The Italian Husband." Review of English Studies X (1934), 202-205.
- 66 Pierre Corneille, Le Cid. Augustin Courbée, Paris, 1637. BM 11737.ff.35(1).
- 67 Colley Cibber, "Ximena; or, The Heroick Daughter" in Plays. 2 vols. For B. Lintot, W. Mears, and W. Chetwood, 1721. II, 177-271.  
C S721.b.72.4.  
Fri 31 Oct 1718 DL                      Tu 11 Nov 1718 DL  
Sat 1 Nov 1718 DL                      Sat 21 Mar 1772 CG  
Mon 3 Nov 1718 DL
- 68 John Ozell, The Cid; or, The Heroick Daughter. London, 1714. BM 162.e.26.
- 69 The attribution to Colley Cibber is doubtful; the details of the performances give "Author Unknown". See also Leonard R.N. Ashley, Colley Cibber (Macmillan: New York, 1964), p. 78.
- 70 [Colley Cibber?], Cinna's Conspiracy. For Bernard Lintott, 1713. E.  
Th 19 Feb 1713 DL                      Mon 23 Feb 1713 DL  
Sat 21 Feb 1713 DL
- 71 Mrs. J. Robe, The Fatal Legacy. For E. Symons, J. Roberts, and A. Dodd, 1723. O.  
Tu 23 Apr 1723 LIF                      Fri 26 Apr 1723 LIF  
Wed 24 Apr 1723 LIF
- 72 Jean Racine, La Thébayde, ou les Frères ennemies. G. Quinet: Paris, 1664. BM C.47.a.9.
- 73 Charles Johnson, Sultanness. By W. Wilkins, for J. Brown, W. Hinchcliffe, J. Walthoe Jun, 1717. BM 162.i.22.  
Mon 25 Feb 1717 DL                      Wed 27 Feb 1717 DL  
Th 26 Feb 1717 DL                      Th 28 Feb 1717 DL
- 74 Jean Racine, Oeuvres II. A Londres: J. Tonson and J. Watts, 1723.
- 75 Thomas Brereton, Esther; or, Faith Triumphant. For J. Tonson, 1715. BM 642.b.1.  
Not known to have been acted.
- 76 Jean Racine, Esther, tragédie tirée de l'Écriture Sainte. Paris, 1689. BM 640.k.9(1).

77 See above note 71.

78 Racine, Esther. Ed. George Saintsbury. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1866, p. 54.

79 Jean Racine, Andromache. Thomas Iolly, Paris, 1668. BM C.97.aa.18.

80 Ambrose Philips, The Distrest Mother. For S. Buckley, and J. Tonson, 1712. BM 841.d.11(4).

Mon 17 Mar 1712 DL	Sat 19 Jan 1723 DL
Tu 18 Mar 1712 DL	Sat 30 Mar 1723 DL
Th 20 Mar 1712 DL	Mon 27 Jan 1724 DL
Sat 22 Mar 1712 DL	Sat 29 Feb 1724 DL
Mon 24 Mar 1712 DL	Tu 20 Oct 1724 DL
Tu 25 Mar 1712 DL	Sat 5 Dec 1724 DL
Th 27 Mar 1712 DL	Sat 20 Feb 1725 DL
Sat 29 Mar 1712 DL	Tu 26 Oct 1725 DL
Sat 27 Sep 1712 DL	Tu 4 Jan 1726 DL
Sat 18 Oct 1712 DL	Sat 19 Feb 1726 DL
Tu 25 Nov 1712 DL	Th 14 Apr 1726 DL
Mon 22 Dec 1712 DL	Mon 16 Jan 1727 DL
Tu 10 Feb 1713 DL	Mon 13 Mar 1727 DL
Mon 13 Apr 1713 DL	Fri 14 Apr 1727 DL
Sat 24 Oct 1713 DL	Tu 24 Oct 1727 DL
Th 1 Apr 1714 DL	Tu 8 Oct 1728 DL
Sat 19 Feb 1715 DL	Sat 16 Nov 1728 DL
Mon 7 Mar 1715 DL	Sat 23 Nov 1728 DL
Mon 9 May 1715 DL	Th 16 Jan 1729 DL
Fri 2 Dec 1715 DL	Tu 4 Mar 1729 DL
Th 16 Feb 1716 DL	Th 17 Apr 1729 DL
Th 23 Oct 1716 DL	Th 18 Sep 1729 DL
Tu 15 Jan 1717 DL	Tu 11 Nov 1729 DL
Tu 20 May 1718 DL	Mon 8 Dec 1729 DL
Fri 17 Apr 1719 DL	Fri 20 Nov 1730 DL
Sat 25 Apr 1719 DL	Wed 3 Feb 1731 DL
Wed 17 July 1719 DL*	Mon 15 Feb 1731 GF
Sat 23 Apr 1720 DL	Th 25 Feb 1731 GF
Sat 21 Jan 1721 DL	Th 13 May 1731 DL
Fri 13 Apr 1722 DL	Tu 17 Dec 1731 GF
Th 18 Oct 1722 DL	Fri 9 June 1732 DL

\*"Acted by Children" (London Stage, II, 543)

Tu	7	Nov	1732	DL	Sat	11	Feb	1749	CG
Wed	10	Jan	1733	DL	Mon	13	Feb	1749	CG
Wed	17	Jan	1733	GF	Tu	14	Feb	1749	CG
Fri	8	Feb	1734	DL	Th	16	Feb	1749	CG
Mon	18	Feb	1734	GF	Th	16	Nov	1749	CG
Fri	26	Apr	1734	GF	Wed	10	Jan	1750	CG
Th	9	Jan	1735	CG	Th	25	Jan	1750	SOU
Fri	10	Jan	1735	CG	Sat	3	Feb	1750	CG
Th	16	Jan	1735	CG	Wed	7	Feb	1750	CG
Th	13	Nov	1735	CG	Tu	18	Dec	1750	CG
Wed	10	Dec	1735	CG	Th	20	Dec	1750	CG
Fri	23	Jan	1736	CG	Sat	22	Dec	1750	CG
Wed	4	Feb	1736	CG	Sat	12	Jan	1751	CG
Fri	20	Feb	1736	GF	Mon	4	Feb	1751	CG
Tu	23	Mar	1736	CG	Wed	17	Apr	1751	CG
Fri	15	Oct	1736	CG	Fri	20	May	1751	CG
Fri	31	Dec	1736	CG	Tu	10	Dec	1751	DL
Sat	16	Apr	1737	DL	Wed	22	Apr	1752	DL
Fri	6	May	1737	CG	Mon	26	Mar	1753	CG
Sat	7	May	1737	DL	Mon	30	Apr	1753	CG
Fri	7	Oct	1737	CG	Th	10	Jan	1754	CG
Th	12	Jan	1738	CG	Sat	12	Jan	1754	CG
Sat	22	Apr	1738	DL	Tu	15	Jan	1754	CG
Tu	31	Oct	1738	CG	Th	17	Jan	1754	CG
Sat	9	Dec	1738	CG	Sat	19	Jan	1754	CG
Tu	4	Dec	1739	CG	Th	7	Feb	1754	CG
Sat	19	Jan	1740	DL	Sat	16	Feb	1754	CG
Wed	13	Feb	1740	CG	Tu	19	Feb	1754	CG
Sat	15	Mar	1740	DL	Th	14	Mar	1754	CG
Wed	26	Nov	1740	GF	Th	25	Apr	1754	CG
Th	17	Feb	1741	CG	Tu	29	Oct	1754	DL
Mon	14	Dec	1741	DL	Th	31	Oct	1754	DL
Fri	5	Feb	1742	DL	Mon	25	Nov	1754	DL
Sat	18	Dec	1742	CG	Tu	4	Feb	1755	CG
Sat	26	Feb	1743	CG	Wed	16	Apr	1755	DL
Wed	13	Apr	1743	CG	Wed	23	Apr	1755	CG
Fri	29	Apr	1743	DL	Tu	6	Apr	1756	CG
Th	23	Feb	1744	CG	Wed	5	Jan	1757	CG
Wed	17	Oct	1744	DL	Fri	7	Jan	1757	CG
Sat	20	Oct	1744	HAY	Tu	15	Nov	1757	DL
Fri	11	Jan	1745	DL	Fri	9	Dec	1757	CG
Sat	4	Apr	1747	CG	Wed	14	Dec	1757	DL
Tu	7	Apr	1747	CG	Sat	8	Dec	1764	DL
Fri	1	May	1747	CG	Tu	11	Dec	1764	DL
Th	10	Mar	1748	DL	Mon	17	Dec	1764	DL
Tu	15	Mar	1748	DL	Sat	22	Dec	1764	DL
Sat	28	Jan	1749	CG	Sat	29	Dec	1764	DL
Tu	31	Jan	1749	CG	Tu	19	Feb	1765	DL
Wed	1	Feb	1749	CG	Th	25	Apr	1765	DL
Fri	3	Feb	1749	CG	Fri	15	Nov	1765	DL
Th	9	Feb	1749	CG	Sat	30	Nov	1765	DL

Mon 10 Feb 1766 DL	Mon 2 Dec 1776 DL
Mon 4 May 1767 DL	Sat 27 Oct 1777 DL
Th 29 Oct 1767 CG	Wed 31 Dec 1777 DL
Th 12 Nov 1767 CG	Th 19 Nov 1778 CG
Tu 26 Apr 1768 CG	Fri 20 Nov 1778 CG
Th 4 Apr 1771 HAY	Tu 24 Nov 1778 CG
Wed 4 Jan 1775 DL	Wed 23 Dec 1778 CG
Sat 7 Jan 1775 DL	Sat 2 Jan 1779 CG
Sat 7 Jan 1775 CG	Mon 15 Mar 1779 CG
Mon 9 Jan 1775 DL	Tu 27 Mar 1781 DL
Mon 9 Jan 1775 CG	Th 14 Mar 1782 CG
Wed 11 Jan 1775 CG	Th 31 Oct 1782 CG
Sat 14 Jan 1775 CG	Th 19 Feb 1784 CG
Mon 16 Jan 1775 DL	Tu 31 Jan 1786 CG
Fri 20 Jan 1775 CG	Fri 3 Feb 1786 CG
Mon 6 Feb 1775 CG	Mon 6 Feb 1786 CG
Th 30 Mar 1775 DL	Sat 4 Mar 1786 DL
Mon 3 Apr 1775 CG	Wed 6 Dec 1786 DL
Th 4 May 1775 DL	Sat 14 Apr 1787 CG
Sat 14 Oct 1775 DL	Mon 14 Jan 1793 DL at King's
Tu 17 Oct 1775 CG	Fri 20 Dec 1793 CG
Sat 9 Dec 1775 DL	Sat 26 Apr 1794 DL
Sat 2 Mar 1776 DL	Sat 25 Oct 1794 DL
Sat 11 May 1776 CG	Tu 15 Dec 1795 CG
Fri 17 May 1776 CG	Fri 29 Jan 1796 DL
Wed 2 Oct 1776 CG	Sat 10 Dec 1796 CG
Tu 22 Oct 1776 DL	Wed 21 Dec 1796 DL

81 Katharine E. Wheatley, "Andromache as the 'Distrest Mother'".  
Romanic Review 39 (1948), 3-21.

82 Paul E. Parnell, "The Distrest Mother, Ambrose Philips' Moralistic Play".  
Comparative Literature 11 (1959), 111-123.

83 Parnell, p. 111.

84 Ibid., 112.

85 Ibid., 114.

86 Ibid., 121.

87 William Duncombe, Junius Brutus. Printed and sold by J. Roberts, 1735.  
BM 11775.f.12.

Mon 25 Nov 1734 DL	Fri 29 Nov 1734 DL
Tu 26 Nov 1734 DL	Sat 30 Nov 1734 DL
Wed 27 Nov 1734 DL	Mon 24 Feb 1735 DL
Th 28 Nov 1734 DL	

88 François Marie Arouet de Voltaire, Le Brutus. Je. Fr. Jossé: Paris,  
1731. BM 640.e.19(1).

- 89 See Nathaniel Lee, Lucius Junius Brutus [first edition 1681]. Ed. John Loftis. London: Edward Arnold, 1968.
- 90 François Marie Arouet de Voltaire, Alzire, ou les Américains. J.B.C. Bauche, Paris, 1736. BM 640.e.20(5).
- 91 Aaron Hill, Alzira. For John Osborn, 1736. BM 11775.f.6.
- |                      |                    |
|----------------------|--------------------|
| Fri 18 June 1736 LIF | Tu 14 Oct 1736 LIF |
| Tu 22 June 1736 LIF  | Th 21 Apr 1737 LIF |
| Fri 25 June 1736 LIF | Mon 30 May 1744 DL |
| Th 1 July 1736 LIF   | Tu 18 Mar 1755 CG  |
| Fri 2 July 1736 LIF  | Th 20 Mar 1755 CG  |
| Wed 7 July 1736 LIF  | Th 29 Apr 1756 CG  |
| Wed 14 July 1736 LIF | Wed 11 Jan 1758 CG |
| Fri 16 July 1736 LIF | Fri 13 Jan 1758 CG |
| Wed 21 July 1736 LIF | Wed 19 Apr 1758 CG |
- 92 François Marie Arouet de Voltaire, Le Zayre. Paris: Chez J.-B. Bauche, 1733. BM 640.e.19(2).
- 93 Aaron Hill, The Tragedy of Zara. For J. Watts, 1736. BM 11774.e.3(1).
- |                     |                     |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| Wed 28 May 1735 YB* | Tu 19 Mar 1751 CG   |
| Th 29 May 1735 YB   | Fri 3 May 1751 CG   |
| Fri 30 May 1735 YB  | Mon 21 Oct 1751 CG  |
| Mon 2 June 1735 YB  | Fri 8 Nov 1751 CG   |
| Fri 6 June 1735 YB  | Th 2 Jan 1752 CG    |
| Fri 13 June 1735 YB | Mon 27 Jan 1752 CG  |
| Wed 18 June 1735 YB | Sat 14 Mar 1752 CG  |
| Wed 9 July 1735 YB  | Mon 13 Apr 1752 CG  |
| Mon 12 Jan 1736 DL  | Fri 15 July 1752 CG |
| Tu 13 Jan 1736 DL   | Tu 12 Dec 1752 CG   |
| Wed 14 Jan 1736 DL  | Sat 29 Jan 1753 CG  |
| Th 15 Jan 1736 DL   | Mon 25 Mar 1754 DL  |
| Fri 16 Jan 1736 DL  | Wed 24 Apr 1754 DL  |
| Sat 17 Jan 1736 DL  | Tu 8 Apr 1755 DL    |
| Mon 19 Jan 1736 DL  | Wed 30 Apr 1755 DL  |
| Tu 20 Jan 1736 DL   | Fri 9 May 1755 DL   |
| Wed 21 Jan 1736 DL  | Th 27 Jan 1757 DL   |
| Th 22 Jan 1736 DL   | Tu 1 Feb 1757 DL    |
| Fri 23 Jan 1736 DL  | Wed 16 Feb 1757 DL  |
| Sat 24 Jan 1736 DL  | Tu 31 May 1757 DL   |
| Mon 26 Jan 1736 DL  | Tu 25 Oct 1757 DL   |
| Tu 27 Jan 1736 DL   | Wed 2 Nov 1757 DL   |
| Wed 7 Apr 1742 JS   | Wed 11 Jan 1758 DL  |
| Sat 17 Mar 1751 CG  | Sat 22 Apr 1758 DL  |
- \*"Rehearsed before a great Appearance of Nobility and other Persons of Distinction" (London Stage III, 495).

Wed	8	Nov	1758	DL	Tu	21	Feb	1768	CG
Wed	20	Dec	1758	DL	Mon	8	May	1769	DL
Th	11	Jan	1759	CG	Tu	2	Jan	1770	DL
Fri	19	Jan	1759	CG	Wed	28	Nov	1770	DL
Mon	19	Mar	1759	DL	Mon	18	Nov	1771	DL
Wed	2	May	1759	DL	Th	16	Jan	1772	DL
Th	31	May	1759	DL	Sat	7	Nov	1772	DL
Sat	3	Nov	1759	DL	Sat	22	May	1773	DL
Wed	5	Dec	1759	DL	Fri	8	Oct	1773	DL
Wed	12	Dec	1759	CG	Mon	13	Dec	1773	DL
Fri	14	Dec	1759	DL	Fri	13	May	1774	DL
Th	27	Mar	1760	DL	Th	13	Oct	1774	DL
Wed	8	Oct	1760	DL	Sat	3	Dec	1774	CG
Th	5	Feb	1761	DL	Th	8	Dec	1774	CG
Th	5	Mar	1761	DL	Sat	31	Dec	1774	DL
Mon	27	Apr	1761	DL	Fri	3	Feb	1775	CG
Tu	29	Sep	1761	DL	Tu	7	Mar	1775	DL
Mon	19	Oct	1761	CG	Th	12	Oct	1775	CG
Tu	17	Nov	1761	DL	Wed	25	Oct	1775	DL
Sat	27	Nov	1762	DL	Th	14	Dec	1775	DL
Fri	17	Dec	1762	DL	Wed	31	Jan	1776	CG
Sat	30	Apr	1763	DL	Sat	3	Feb	1776	DL
Sat	7	Jan	1764	DL	Th	7	Mar	1776	DL
Mon	16	Jan	1764	DL	Fri	12	Feb	1779	CG
Th	26	Jan	1764	DL	Fri	15	Dec	1780	DL
Th	2	Feb	1764	DL	Tu	2	Jan	1781	DL
Wed	6	Feb	1765	DL	Sat	3	Feb	1781	DL
Mon	29	Apr	1765	DL	Th	10	Jan	1782	CG
Sat	12	Oct	1765	DL	Th	17	Jan	1782	CG
Th	23	Jan	1766	DL	Th	10	Oct	1782	CG
Fri	31	Jan	1766	DL	Mon	25	Nov	1782	CG
Sat	19	Apr	1766	DL	Th	4	Mar	1784	CG
Sat	18	Oct	1766	DL	Tu	28	Sep	1784	CG
Wed	11	Nov	1767	DL	Wed	17	Nov	1784	DL
Sat	14	Nov	1767	DL	Wed	24	Nov	1784	DL
Tu	10	May	1768	CG	Mon	26	Dec	1785	DL
Tu	11	Oct	1768	DL	Fri	7	Oct	1791	CG
Sat	19	Nov	1768	CG	Mon	16	Dec	1796	CG

94 Francesco Scipione Maffei, La Meropa. Napoli: Nella Stamparia di Felice Mosca, 1721. BM 638.d.22.

95 Francesco Scipione Maffei, Merope. Translated by Mr. Ayre. London, 1740. BM 1342.k.32.  
Not known to have been acted.

- 96 George Jeffreys, Merope. Printed and sold by J. Roberts, T. Cox, and T. Woodward, 1731. BM 162.h.62.
- |                        |                        |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Sat 27 Feb 1731 LIF    | Tu 18 Jan 1737 King's  |
| Tu 2 Mar 1731 LIF      | Sat 22 Jan 1737 King's |
| Sat 8 Jan 1737 King's  | Tu 25 Jan 1737 King's  |
| Sat 15 Jan 1737 King's | Sat 29 Jan 1737 King's |
- 97 Henry Johnson, Romulus. For S. Billingsley, and sold by J. Roberts, A. Dodd, C. King, J. Noon, and J. Billingsley, 1724. BM 11740.bb.25(21)  
Not known to have been acted. Pagination: 1-22, 32, 24-40, 33-42.
- 98 Antoine Houdart de la Motte, Romulus. In Oeuvres de Théâtre. Paris: Chez Gregoire Dupuis, 1739. BM 241.g.19.

## CHAPTER V    THE TRAGEDIES OF NICHOLAS ROWE

Nicholas Rowe, born in 1674, is the best and most popular of the early eighteenth century writers of tragedy. His most famous plays, Tamerlane, The Fair Penitent and Jane Shore continued to be presented on the London stage into the nineteenth century. Indeed, as J.J. Lynch points out

Altogether the plays of Rowe were acted so frequently that the number of their performances amount to 10% of the nights devoted to tragic drama of all types and to nearly half as many nights as were devoted to the tragedies of Shakespeare. So far had tragedy become synonymous with pathos.<sup>1</sup>

It is, of course, as a writer of pathetic tragedy that Rowe is best known, and above all as the writer of "she-tragedies", a form to which he came at the end of his dramatic career in Jane Shore and The Tragedy of Lady Jane Gray.

In fact Rowe is in very many ways typical of the state of tragedy in the first half of the eighteenth century, and he is important because he undoubtedly had more dramatic skill than most writers for the stage. We have seen in this study that certain forms of drama, certain settings, were followed almost slavishly, and Rowe experimented with each of these. He began his career with The Ambitious Step-Mother, a play set in the middle east, dealing with an evil prime minister, a seraglio, political and sexual jealousies, and he endowed it with some structural skill which was unusual. Many of the eastern plays were utterly sterile, but Rowe makes some of his characters vital, and shows greater interest in psychology than other writers

had done in their treatment of this type of play. Rowe makes his comments about life by comparing characters in the same environment faced with the same sort of situation. He shows which characters are right by their attitude to religion, and by their degree of personal honesty in dealing with others. He develops all these themes later in his career. From this he turns to another eastern play, Tamerlane, which was seen to have political allegory as its purpose, but which may also be attempting to examine different attitudes to love. Rowe's other main thematic preoccupation is introduced here, that of patriotism.

From these early formal plays Rowe turned to the European setting for The Fair Penitent, using the plot for the purposes of drawing sympathy from the audience for the central characters, and for analysing the effects of decadence on the love of various characters. Here, perhaps, are the beginnings of sentimental tragedy where the attention of the audience is directed to pity for a central character. From Europe Rowe turned to classical Greece for Ulysses, where he was able to make more than most of his contemporaries of the family nature of the situation. He introduced pity because of the family's dilemma, and again he balanced his characters carefully, so that the audience's response was not merely obvious. Love and duty are still themes of importance in Ulysses but it is the member of the younger generation who appeals to us most. In The Royal Convert, set in ancient Britain, reflecting the growing eighteenth century interest in antiquarianism, the idea of a future is again important. Here the future is of a united Christian Britain, and the two themes which were introduced earlier, Christianity and patriotism, are thus brought together and fulfilled

in a play which at the end praises Queen Anne's reign as befits a future Poet Laureate. We should, I think, see The Royal Convert as the culmination of Rowe's early thought, and also the culmination of the sort of tragedy which deals with love, duty, honour, and the role of the gods. The play ends in optimism and a confirmation of the glory of Britain, and can be seen as the expression of tremendous national self-satisfaction.

Rowe's most important achievement comes with Jane Shore, a play which is tremendously deft in its touch, and which focuses on a much more ordinary person. Up to this point Rowe's main characters have all been kings and princes, the matter of heroic tragedy. But now he branches out to express pity for a woman despised and cast off, but a person of great warmth and integrity. Here Rowe is expressing the best of human nature and although his view is sentimental, although we are asked to weep with the distress of the heroine, it is nevertheless realistic in a way none of the tragedies before 1713 were. Rowe expresses here belief in human worth and human sympathy in a way which transcends mere patterns for the work. There is something new and something vital in the play. At the same time we must be aware that what later writers imitated was the pathos, the tearfulness, rather than the realism and the human understanding. While Rowe was able to present in this play something approaching a full, "real" person, later writers were able merely to reproduce the tears and the posturing. So when Rowe came to his last play, Lady Jane Gray he did just what his imitators later were to do. He presented the sad situation without the rounded character. Lady Jane says all the right and noble things, but she lacks credibility. Indeed the only play by Rowe which justifies his

position as a major dramatist is Jane Shore. The rest are all flawed pieces. This, too, makes him a good example of the early eighteenth century state of tragedy. There are one or two good plays, but there is no uniformly good dramatist. Jane Shore is the best play in the first two decades of the century, but its sureness of touch was not to be recaptured even by the dramatist himself.

What is good about Jane Shore is the humanness of Jane's character. What is good in the earlier flawed plays is the element of intellectual detachment balancing the pleas for sympathy. Other writers were well able to create sympathetic characters, but only Rowe is able to sustain our interest through a constant reappraisal on our part of the significance of a character's actions. We in the end learn what was "good" by an overview. In Lady Jane Gray, however, we know that Lady Jane is a paragon before she enters, just as we knew that Tamerlane was. We are forced, I think, at the end of the earlier play, to examine the "mistake" Tamerlane made, but Lady Jane makes none. In tragedy after Rowe writers very rarely write with any moral complexity. We usually know who is right and who is wrong before they enter, and thus the moral pattern is usually simplified to the point of obviousness. Rowe marks this movement towards a simplified moral pattern at the same time as he marks the movement to more sympathetic portrayal of character. It is interesting that it is in him alone that these two important ingredients are in balance.

In a recent dissertation Landon C. Burns Jr. has examined the relationship of Rowe's first play, The Ambitious Step-Mother (1701)<sup>2</sup> to the heroic tradition, pointing to Artaxerxes as the hero with the great soul,

a god-like figure driven by extreme ambition and finally overcome by love, as the very basis of the heroic play.<sup>3</sup> Burns sees Mirza and Magas as archetypal villains, and their counterpart Memnon as a wise and doting father. Amestris is seen as the incredibly beautiful 'fair one' who both merits and wins the love of the 'brave one' while Artaban is the rival who allows the hero to show his magnanimity.

In allowing wholesale slaughter at the end of the play whereby all but two of the significant dramatis personae are killed, Rowe takes his form too far, but he is still close to an essentially exaggerated stereotype which dictates that the effects are very strong. The matter of the ending, however, caused some contemporary concern because of its violence and brutality; we read in the Epistle Dedicatory:

Some People, whose Judgment I ought to have a deference for, have told me that they wisht I had given the latter part of the story quite another turn; that Artaxerxes and Amestris ought to have been preserv'd, and made happy in the Conclusion of the Play; that ... there might have been also a more Noble and Instructive Moral drawn that way.<sup>4</sup>

Rowe states that there are two possible ways of ending such a play, either rewarding the virtuous in a happy ending, or ending with disaster so that the audience is sent away with the impression of pity and fear. Never again is fear to be so emphasised in Rowe's plays, and the progress of his dramatic career marks a steady development to the increasing atmosphere of pity.

The most striking feature of the play is that each of the main characters is balanced; the play is constructed on a series of oppositions. Only the step-mother herself lacks an opposite number and this is significant in that it is she who sparks off the action of the play.

The basic situation is the competition of Artaxerxes and Artaban for the crown. Artemisa tries to engineer the situation so that her son, Artaban, becomes king instead of the rightful heir, Artaxerxes, son of the now ailing king by his first wife. It is established early in the play that Artaxerxes's party is in the right, and this is done in a way which is to become a hallmark of Rowe's early writing, the criteria being the characters' attitude to religion, and their personal integrity. Thus in the opening act Mirza, the wicked prime minister figure, damns himself in the audience's eyes by scheming to bring about the downfall of the politically naive and manipulated High Priest, Magas. Thus already we can see that the pattern is more subtle than that outlined by Burns, for while we later sympathise with Memnon against Magas, right at the beginning of the play we sympathise with Magas against Mirza. Mirza's opposite in the play is Memnon, a disgraced minister of state of advanced age whose integrity Rowe at once shows, and who is highly vocal in support of Artaxerxes. The other main strand in the plot is the search for love by the two princes. Artaxerxes is in love with, and early in the play marries, Amestris, the daughter of Memnon. Artaban is in love with Cleone, the daughter of Mirza, but Cleone rejects his continuing advances because she is secretly in love with Artaxerxes, although she is not prepared to fight for him because she acknowledges the prior claim of Amestris.

Act I presents the situation in terms of simple opposition. Mirza sets himself against Magas in the first scene which is crowded with images of universal darkness. Mirza is then seen with the step-mother, Artemisa, who has decided to give Cleone to Artaban. Rowe then turns from politics

to love and presents first Cleone and then Amestris, also unhappy with events, also dreaming of obscurity in a pastoral retreat, but at the same time attempting to steel herself for the hardships which she is sure ambition will bring. Amestris's view of ambition is directly contrasted with that of Artaxerxes:

Ambition! The desire of active Souls,  
That pushes 'em beyond the bounds of Nature,  
And elevates the Hero to the Gods. (I i, p. 10)

The desires and aims of men are utterly opposed to those of women, because in a heroic world love and ambition are always at odds with each other. While Artaxerxes has the comforts of a military ethic to comfort him when he is depressed, the heroine has only prayer and dreams of escape to a pastoral ideal.

In Act II Memnon is seen to be superior both to Magas and Mirza because he associates himself with the 'natural' world of the seasons rather than with the decadence of the present court hierarchy, but it is the mention of the military ideals which makes his speech into the stereotype of a hero fallen from favour:

Full fifty years harness in rugged Steel,  
I have endur'd the biting Winter's blast,  
And the severer heats of parching Summer;  
While they who loll'd at home on lazy Couches,  
Amidst a Crew of Harlots and soft Eunuchs,  
Were at my cost secure in luxury. (II i, p. 14)

The second part of the act presents the growth of disharmony in Artaban's camp. Rowe spends some time outlining Artemisa's past motives and it is this element which helps the play at times to rise above the merely humdrum. Artemisa wishes to cheat Artaxerxes of the crown because she is jealous of

his popularity with the people. Artaxerxes accuses his mother of marital infidelity and this prompts a clash between the two princes. They are well matched, both men of high heroic seriousness, wishing to leave all rancour aside until after the death of their father. Rowe allows Artaban some nobility as he responds with vigour to his brother's heroic insult that he is merely a 'beardless boy'.

In Act III a song warns the melancholy Cleone not to court despair. She will not give way to self-pity, but neither will she accept Artaban and she is thus seen refusing him again. In contrast to this pair Amestris and Artaxerxes are revelling at the prospect of their imminent sexual pleasures now they are married. Artaxerxes is at times irritatingly optimistic, but he is able to parry his wife's vague fears that he will either grow tired of her or forget her. Each prince has thus been seen with the woman he loves, and the success of the rightful heir and the failure of the pretender in love may be seen as Rowe's reinforcement of their relative moral deserts.

In the central part of the play calamity occurs. After a Hymn to Light has been sung in the Temple Artaxerxes is captured, Mirza gleefully rubs his hands with pleasure, Memnon rants, and only Amestris meets adversity with calm. Artaxerxes and Amestris are separated, and Mirza looks forward to raping her before casting her away. At this point the villain's villainy gets a little out of hand and characters have turned into caricatures.

General disorder has set in when we turn to Act IV, and it is at this point when Artaban begins to grow in stature. He acknowledges the general unrest to be the direct result of his actions and then refuses to see his father's death as merely good luck. He is only prepared to take

the throne within the moral limits prescribed by his creed; he must satisfy both the people and the gods. Artemisa uses insults, taunts and scorn in order to get him to steal the throne at once, but she fails. Horrified that she cannot control her son in the same way as she controlled her husband, she seeks comfort with her eunuch. Here again Rowe equates political corruption with moral decadence.

Attention turns to Cleone who cannot live happily without Artaxerxes and so determines to die, *and* at the same time to achieve a heroic act as she decides to be the self-sacrificing instrument of the hero's liberation. Disguised as her own servant she visits Memnon and Artaxerxes and their relentless questioning of their visitor's honesty and motivations is one of the best elements of the play. Pathos is evoked as Artaxerxes can hardly believe that Cleone could continue to wish him well even after he refused to marry her. Cleone kills herself in order to prove her honesty:

May every God Assist and Guard your flight;  
 And oh when all your hopes of Love and Glory  
 Are Crown'd with just Success; will you be good  
 And think with Pity on the lost Cleone. (IV iii, p. 53)

At the end of the act the mood changes momentarily from gloom and decay to hope and brightness with the imagery of light and flowers as Artaxerxes mourns her death with gratitude. Nor does Rowe miss the opportunity for some religious comment, for the hero's confident hope is that the dead maiden will know something of paradise.

The last act ties up the loose ends. Magas laments the way Artaxerxes's capture involved profaning the temple. Mirza dismisses religion and rushes off to rape Amestris. Amestris manages to stab him and he dies incoherent. Amestris staggers off to try to find her husband after she had been stabbed

by one of the guards. Artaxerxes stabs himself and Memnon rushes off to commit suicide. There is promise of a better ending than these exaggerated events have led us to believe, however. Artaban rejects his mother, commanding her to be watched, and he receives the news that Magas has been slaughtered by the crowd. Not only has Artaban rejected the evil symbolised by his mother, but he has also clearly managed to learn from his brother the importance of popularity with the people. The very haste of the deaths at the end of the play, however, suggests that the moral questions inherent in and suggested by the action of the play have not been sufficiently well worked out.

Rowe is too hidebound by the conventional framework of tying up loose ends of plot to pay enough attention to the careful exposition and conclusion of the ideas in the play. There are, however, some good features, and the way in which the characters are balanced and shown off one against another indicates the way in which Rowe is to develop his talent. There are no original creations among the dramatis personae but we are interested in the way in which nobility is given to Artaban, and Cleone is endowed with more life, vigour and sympathy than the traditional scorned maid. Indeed it is she who wins most of our sympathy, and she contains within her character some of the germs of Rowe's future tragic heroines.

The choice of another Eastern setting for his second play, Tamerlane (1702)<sup>5</sup> was appropriate because here Rowe has been thought to be more interested in political and topical allegory than in refining a given sort of tragedy. The Eastern plays had tended to be more violent, more single-minded in character than the other varieties of tragedy and so it was a

useful choice. It is made clear in the Epistle Dedicatory that the play was written to glorify King William:

There are many features, 'tis true, in that Great Man's life, not unlike His Majesty: His Courage, his Piety, his Moderation, his Justice, and his Fatherly Love of his People, but above all, his Hate of Tyranny and Oppression, and his zealous Care for the Common Good of Mankind, carry a large Resemblance of him: Several Incidents are alike in their Stories; and there wants nothing to his Majesty but such a deciding Victory, as that by which Tamerlane gave Peace to the World. That is yet to come; but I hope we may reasonably expect it from the Unanimity of the present Parliament, and so formidable a Force as that Unanimity will give Life and Vigour to.<sup>6</sup>

Thus Rowe looks forward to the time of the complete subjection of the French by the English, and when that happened Tamerlane's success was assured and the play continued to be produced on the London stage into the nineteenth century. After 1704 the play was frequently acted on November 4 and 5, the anniversary both of William's birthday and his landing on English soil.<sup>7</sup>

Both Willard Thorp<sup>8</sup> and Donald B. Clark<sup>9</sup> have outlined the political interpretations and significance of the play, and have attempted to assign politicians to the characters outside the obvious two of William-Tamerlane and King Louis-Bajazet. Thorp suggests that Axalla, the well bred but foreign follower of Tamerlane is Bentinck whose friendship with William was as significant to English political life as Axalla's was to Tamerlane's in Galatia. Indeed Thorp shows that a stage presentation of Bentinck was timely as he had just survived impeachment proceedings against him.<sup>10</sup> As Rowe is concerned to glorify the Whigs in the play, a reminder to the Tories, the Tartar Lords, of his past successes would be particularly needling. Several writers have attempted to find a figure to fit Omar,

the Tartar general; Sutherland fitted Omar to Prince Eugene<sup>11</sup> but Thorp argues in some detail that Omar is more likely to be Thomas Osborne, although he had been out of the political picture for some six years.<sup>12</sup> Other suggestions were The Earl of Shrewsbury, though he was a Tory and seems therefore an unlikely candidate, or Godolphin, the most hated Tory of the time,<sup>13</sup> but Clark seems to think Osborne, Earl of Danby to be the most likely candidate.<sup>14</sup>

Rowe was not, I think, concerned about sources for the story as several critics have suggested. Although Clark is right when he says that Rowe's story is closer to Knolles' General Historie of the Turkes than to Marlowe or Charles Saunders' Tamerlane,<sup>15</sup> the simple reason for such a choice of plot is perhaps that Tamerlane was by now a mythological figure - one who had conquered wisely, powerfully and well, and one who would appeal to an age which was fond of making comparison of its leading politicians and statesmen to those of the past.

The play affords Rowe the opportunity to introduce two themes which are to occupy him for the rest of his dramatic career, religion and patriotism. The latter is seen to be at the core of Tamerlane, for it is essentially the story of a man who rescues his country from danger. Indeed the picture painted of Tamerlane both in the Epistle Dedicatory and in Act I before he appears is of a paragon. Although he is not a Christian Mirvan says in the opening moments of the play:

Well has our Holy Alha mark'd him out  
 The Scourge of lawless Pride, and dire Ambition,  
 The great Avenger of the groaning World.  
 Well has he worn the sacred Cause of Justice  
 Upon his prosp'rous Sword: approving Heav'n  
 Still crown'd the Righteous Warrior with Success;  
 As is said, Go forth, and be my Champion,  
 Thou most like me of all my Works below. (I i, p. 23)

Rowe is well aware, however, of the danger of glorifying his hero merely in military terms, so that he is sure, once Tamerlane appears, to offer some sort of corrective insight on Tamerlane's part, showing that though he knows it his duty to purge evil by military means, nevertheless he also has full humanitarian ideals. Interestingly he too appeals to the deity:

Yet, yet a little, and destructive Slaughter  
 Shall rage around, and marr this beauteous Prospect;  
 Pass but an Hour, which stands betwixt the Lives  
 Of Thousands and Eternity: What Change  
 Shall hasty Death make in yon glitt'ring Plain?  
 Oh thou fell Monster, War! That in a Moment  
 Lay'st waste the noblest part of the Creation,  
 The Boast and Master-piece of the Great Maker,  
 That wears in vain th'Impression of his Image,  
 Unprivileg'd from thee. (I i, p. 25)

Bajazet fights because he can thus achieve his lust for power and destruction but Tamerlane is seen as a reluctant fighter, knowing that war is degrading man, but nevertheless keen to avenge wrongs which have been done. Rowe is thus not only glorifying his king, but making an attempt to justify war in a Christian context. Also in the first act Tamerlane is seen as having a charismatic personality; Axalla, a Christian bred finely in Italian courts, left the comforts of his principedom to fight for Tamerlane; Bajazet's daughter, Selima, is completely won over by Tamerlane when he grants her freedom even though she has been taken captive; and the captured Moneses vows to spend his life fighting for Tamerlane if the latter will assist him to bring his sister Arpasia from the clutches of the fiend, Bajazet. Having set forward these traits of his hero, however, Rowe must also get a plot moving, and so he presents Selima as the former love of Axalla, still smitten by her charms, and she wins from him a promise not to kill her father if he should

meet him in battle.

It is partly because the play is a celebratory piece that it is so highly rhetorical. The language is very high flown and undramatic, full of literary allusions, especially to Milton. Because he wants to present a paragon he also presents someone who seems irritatingly sententious and abstract. Whatever anyone else says after his victory in battle Tamerlane seems to have something even more righteous to add, and there is a certain irony when Bajazet counters

This vile Speeching,  
This After-game of Words is what most irks me;  
Spare that, and for the rest 'tis equal all -  
Be it as it may. (II ii, p. 43)

There is much that is magnificent in a very formal and rhetorical way about the post-battle confrontation between the two leaders. Point is taken up, insults are thrown, home truths are told, and Tamerlane infuriates Bajazet most by granting him his life. After Bajazet's anger and forthright curses, Arpasia's lament to Moneses that she was married to Bajazet and bedded by him is somewhat anti-climatic. The loss of Arpasia's virginity in marriage does not impress us nearly as much as Rowe would have liked, and does not really warrant the high-flown rhetoric with which it is described.

In Act III Axalla tries to bargain with Bajazet for the love of his daughter, but needless to say Axalla was over-optimistic:

Axalla: Oh! name the mighty Ransom, task my Power,  
Let there be Danger, Difficulty, Death,  
T'enhance the Price.

Bajazet: I take thee at thy Word,  
Bring me the Tartar's Head.

Axalla: Ha!

Bajazet: Tamerlane's,  
That Death, that deadly Poison to my Glory! (III, i, pp. 62-3)

In the early part of the play Rowe was concerned to give Tamerlane's position and ideas psychological and philosophical validity, but here, in the middle of the play, he is presenting extreme, almost caricature situations, where the kind of complexity of mind shown in the first act is inappropriate. It is indeed true that Tamerlane is a far more sophisticated figure than Bajazet and that this is deliberate, but all the same we move on to such uncomplex happenings that we are dissatisfied. However, when our attention turns back to the character of Tamerlane in Act III scene ii, things improve. Tamerlane is tempted by a Dervice to believe that Mahomet is angry that Tamerlane should favour a Christian (Axalla), but Tamerlane is wise to a fraud and narrowly avoids being stabbed by the impostor. Yet, braving danger, he lets the Dervice go as he had let Bajazet go. At the end of the act Tamerlane makes another wise decision, that he cannot rescue Arpasia from Bajazet for Moneses because she is the tyrant's lawful wife.

Out of the goodness of his heart Tamerlane visits Arpasia to try to cheer her but he is seen by Bajazet and condemned for lecherous thoughts, and then for rank adultery. Tamerlane is made furious, Arpasia, also a character symbolising goodness, pleads for her husband's life, and Bajazet is released again. A sentimental reunion between Arpasia and Moneses is followed by an extraordinary scene where Axalla has been captured by Oman and Bajazet, and is threatened with death unless he tries to kill Tamerlane.

In the final act the plot is brought to its conclusion. Arpasia and Moneses decide to die together. Moneses is strangled on the orders of Bajazet, but he had not thought that Arpasia would also die, and he sends

for cordials. Just when Bajazet's villainy seems to be gaining the upper hand, however, Tamerlane's battle forces are seen, having been warned of Bajazet's evil by Axalla, freed by Selima and equipped with a disguise by her. Tamerlane arrives just in time to prevent Bajazet killing Selima, who is reunited with Axalla. All this presented Rowe with problems, but he glossed over them in a rather perfunctory way. Had Bajazet been secured in the first place, and had evil been stemmed, then all the dire results would not have followed. Rowe tries to get over this difficulty by having Tamerlane say:

Mercy at length gives up her peaceful Scepter,  
 And Justice sternly takes her turn to govern;  
 'Tis a rank World, and asks her keenest Sword,  
 To cut up Villainy of monstrous growth.  
Zama, take Care, that with the earliest dawn,  
 Those Traitors meet the Fate, their Treason merits. (V i, p. 105)

Bajazet is caged unrepentant, and Tamerlane moralises about pride at the end of the play.

It would be wrong, then, to persist in the traditional view that Tamerlane is fully allegorical, for it is only so in certain aspects. We must not apply the same criteria throughout. Tamerlane in the early part of the play is made into a thoughtful and philosophical figure, but his error must not be seen as an error. When he released Bajazet this act must be seen as one of Christian mercy, not at all as a mistake which eventually brings about the death of Moneses. We are concerned not to see events and actions as causes which bring about certain effects, but to read into the actions the motives which prompted them. It is difficult to deal with this sort of form critically, because it is so unsatisfactory in that the criteria for judgement are constantly varying, but an audience was required to praise Tamerlane wholeheartedly. After William's victory against Louis it would

be much more easy to do so, for the play was then seen as prophetic, not in the elements of all the characters, but in the final outcome. The eighteenth century audience, therefore, saw in the play the result, the final victory, and the character of Tamerlane as portrayed in the opening act, one whose ideas show the attributes of a Christian king, and one whose actions work out for the good of the kingdom.

What it seems to me that Rowe was interested in, however, was how this apparent paragon figure could make such a bad tactical error and still get away with it. I think that Rowe was also interested in the psychology of his characters in a different way from that which the audience and modern critics have seen. He seems to me to have been concerned to examine the nature of a charismatic personality, its conflicts with an evil which at first it cannot understand, and the necessary compromises needed in the end to deal with actions outside the creed of the title character. This, I think, is why Tamerlane is contrasted on the one hand by Bajazet, but also on the other by Moneses, whose actions are prompted by love of family, by Axalla, whose actions are prompted by love of a woman, and by Selima, caught in the complex web of political manoeuvres, but still able to balance her concerns - for her father, for her lover, and for her country.

Tamerlane looks forward to the later productions of Rowe to a much greater extent than does The Ambitious Step-Mother, but critics have been unable to see precisely what he was achieving in the play because of the simplistic reaction of the audience. It is quite likely that Rowe intended the character of Tamerlane to remind the audience of William, for it is keeping with his patriotic intentions shown right through his career, but

the play is not an allegory. It deals with the old questions of love - for family, for country, and for woman - but also tries to be more philosophical about the nature of religion and war than other dramatists' creations. Rowe is here showing his thoughtfulness as a dramatist. But it does not make Tamerlane a good play; the language is very high-flown and remote, and the characters are too abstract and sententious. It can best be seen as another apprentice piece experimenting with different ideas and techniques **from** the previous play. It is with The Fair Penitent that we see Rowe still experimenting, and still not really managing to succeed in creating a unified dramatic piece, but nevertheless creating something new and exciting, in a way that the two previous plays just avoided being either of these.

The Fair Penitent (1703)<sup>16</sup> has attracted considerably more critical attention than most of the plays of the period probably because the character of Lothario is the prototype for Richardson's Lovelace. Both Frank J. Kearful<sup>17</sup> and Donald B. Clark<sup>18</sup> have dealt fully with Rowe's debt to Massinger's The Fatal Dowry,<sup>19</sup> Rowe's chief and unacknowledged source. Kearful notes that Rowe attempts to make the action more clearly related to the experience of the audience, placing the action of the first two acts of the original in retrospective narration, pruning the cast from twenty-eight to eight and shifting the attention from Charalois (Rowe's Altamont) to Beaumelle (Rowe's Calista). The issues of property and respectability are injected to reveal the complexity of moral experience and Kearful sees Horatio as the ethical perspective within which the tragedy occurs. Calista is seen as having a "genuinely human complexity of moral awareness which

raises her tragedy above the level of formulary exemplum."<sup>20</sup> Clark's analysis of Rowe's play is more thorough and he traces the influence of Otway on Rowe's emphasis on the pathetic and the moral. Kearful insists that Lothario is not a stage villain and points to the place where he says he would have married Calista. Clark rightly corrects this view, pointing to the long following passage in I i where Lothario is clearly a rake whose interest in Calista was exhausted once he had bedded her. Another paper, Lindley A. Wyman's on the tradition of the formal meditation, directs our attention to the stage direction at the beginning of V i noting that Calista's book is not the bible but a devotional treatise which she throws away not because she does not want to take the medicine of repentance but because that particular medicine is not strong enough.<sup>21</sup> Her anguish, not the need for repentance, is what is being described and her last words are "Mercy Heav'n" (V i, 264). Malcolm Goldstein also notes this in his Introduction to his edition of The Fair Penitent<sup>22</sup> where he provides a good analysis of the play. In the following pages I shall be bound to repeat some of the elements which other critics have noted but I think Rowe goes further in his moral treatment of the characters at the beginning of the play than has elsewhere been suggested.

The play opens on Altamont, "a young lord, in love with Calista, and designed her husband by Sciolto" (dramatis personae) with his friend Horatio. Male friendship is thus strongly celebrated at the beginning of the play but Altamont's animated enthusiasm sets us on guard:

O great Sciolto! O my more than father!  
 Let me not live but at thy very name  
 My eager heart springs up and leaps with joy. (I i, 19-21)

It is Horatio who fills in the background to the action and Altamont who oozes words. When Sciolto enters he speaks in the same vein:

Joy to thee, Altamont! Joy to myself!  
 Joy to this happy morn that makes thee mine,  
 That kindly grants what nature had denied me,  
 And makes me father of a son like thee. (I i, 64-7)

This effervescent mutual congratulation continues for some time and Sciolto is so keen to be benevolent and sentimental that he quite casts aside Altamont's remark that his new wife, Calista, seemed cold. So far Horatio has provided information and the other two have been undercut by their effusions. Then follows the famous scene where Lothario discusses Calista with Rossano. He is an utter sensualist and having "snatched the glorious, golden opportunity" (I i, 156) and passed the night

"In ecstasies too fierce to last forever" (I i 160-61)

he lost interest in her and feigned illness when she pursued him. Lothario banter savagely with Lucilla (Calista's confidante) who gives him a letter telling him that she has married Altamont. Lothario's attitude immediately changes when the threat of marriage has gone:

Nay, no more angry words; say to Calista,  
 The humblest of her slaves shall wait her pleasure,  
 If she can leave her happy husband's arms  
 To think upon so lost a thing as I am. (I i, 262-5)

The irony and sarcasm is obvious but the ambiguity of tone remains. Horatio picks up the letter which Lothario dropped and he rails against Lothario. His wife Lavinia condemns him for his secrecy and Horatio ends the act in praise of her goodness.

Calista insists on her grief in Act II. Lucilla's plea for moderation and optimism are roundly rejected and Calista decides she must see Lothario

again. Her attitude is both self-indulgent and masochistic. Quite clearly she and Altamont are utterly incompatible. He enters brimming with joie de vivre and Calista is merely sour. She does however recognise that

Such hearts as ours were never paired above;  
Ill suited to each other; joined, not matched (II i, 99-100)

but it is somewhat late for realisations of this sort. Her statement that she will remember this day as the one

In which my father gave my hand to Altamont;  
As such I will remember it forever (II i 118-9)

is both sullen and rude. Sciolto enters, still brimming with joy and they listen to a song by Congreve with music and dancing. Sciolto is extraordinarily unaware and unobservant:

O, grant, ye powers, that I may see these happy,  
Pointing to Altamont and Calista  
Completely blest, and I have life enough. (II i, 151-2)

Horatio soliloquises on what to do and the scene changes to his confrontation with Lothario. The latter pretends to be insulted and offers to draw, but then glories in his sexual conquest of Calista. Horatio then becomes angry, calls him "boy" (II [ii], 130), they draw and finally agree to fight a duel.

In Act III Sciolto has tumbled to the realisation that Calista is "wayward... Perverse and sullen all this day of joy" (III i, 3). He is right about his daughter's character, but blind about the marriage. Calista becomes aggressive when she is confronted by Horatio:

To steal unlook'd-for on my private sorrow  
Speaks not the man of honor nor the friend,  
But rather means the spy. (III i, 62-4)

She disclaims the fact of their marriage, appealing to "minds" rather than

"wills" (III i, 77, 75). Calista is bitterly sarcastic in asking Horatio where she can find happiness but he misses her tone and comes up with the splendidly dramatic if sententious thought:

Then - to be good is to be happy. Angels  
Are happier than mankind, because they are better. (III i, 99-100)

This charming though naive philosophy is typical of Horatio. By acting on high moral principles he becomes unconvincing:

By honor and fair truth, you wrong me much,  
For on my soul nothing but strong necessity  
Could urge my tongue to this ungrateful office. (III i, 128-30)

Horatio is hurt that Calista is unable to be reasonable and agree with him and Rowe, I think deliberately, undercuts him here as a moral norm, particularly as he goes on to preach at Calista who tears the letter with the poignant lines

To atoms thus,  
Thus let me tear the vile, detested falsehood,  
The wicked, lying evidence of shame. (III i, 173-5)

The pun on "lying" and the subtle irony of "lying evidence" are most effective. Calista means that the letter is false evidence while it is in fact evidence of her own falsehood and of her having lain with Lothario. Altamont enters cheerful as ever but Calista vehemently accuses Horatio before stalking out. The interview between the two men is deliberately spun out as Altamont refuses to hear anything against Calista. Horatio holds him and they fight. Lavinia enters, Horatio condemns Altamont as a "vain boy" (III i, 317), the same insult which Lothario used to Horatio, and the latter indulges in the most (self-) righteous indignation possible:

Ask'st thou what made us foes? 'Twas base ingratitude;  
'Twas such a sin to friendship as heaven's mercy,

That strives with man's untoward, monstrous wickedness,  
 Unwearied with forgiving, scarce could pardon.  
 He who was all to me, child, brother, friend!  
 With barb'rous, bloody malice sought my life. (III i, 327-32)

Here Horatio replies (in vague, high-flown moral terms) to a question meant only rhetorically as a chastisement, and he ends in self-pity without having said anything material.

Lavinia tries to make Altamont stay but he breaks away and Lavinia is left with her husband and her grief. The rest of the act is conventional as Lavinia speaks of shipwreck, pastoral nature and her love for her husband, ending with a seafaring merchant simile; but if we credit Rowe with psychological intentions here, then we may infer that Lavinia is also escapist and self-indulgent. Though she acted splendidly in trying to reconcile the two friends, when she met with stern resistance her resort was to weeping and introspection. Because the elements at the end of the act are so conventional it may seem to be going too far to see Rowe using them critically and with purpose, but I feel from the play so far that he is concerned to examine reactions to situations more than situations themselves and thus is careful to control the effect of the verse - to draw attention to stock responses in fact, and to infuse them with meaning, to use them as criticisms of the characters. Thus it is not only the stock responses of the audience which he is questioning but the stock responses of the characters themselves, the very element which leads them into an impasse and into irreconcilable difficulties.

Altamont soliloquises in a depressed state on the events and then Lothario is seen trying to seduce Calista again. Lothario is an accomplished actor and revels in his part, even going so far as to complain of Calista's falsehood in marrying another. If he is not a villain he is perilously close to being

one. Altamont overhears Calista's vows of love and comes forward:

They fight; Lothario is wounded once or twice, and then falls. (stage dir., IV i, 108-9)

Lothario dies smiling on his revenge. Calista offers to kill herself but is prevented by Altamont. Rowe then seems to lose control when he has her ask the ludicrous question "Is it the voice of thunder, or my father?" (IV i, 133) when she hears Sciolto calling. Indignant at her sin Sciolto offers to kill Calista, surely an act which demands condemnation. Calista then rejects her husband's forgiveness; for her the masochism of death at the hand of her father is more real. Sciolto curses her and he postures, imagining himself remembering her with "Fasting and tears and hardship" (IV i, 208), the outward manifestations of penitence.

At the end of Act IV Horatio and Altamont argue but are finally reconciled with a gush of sentimentality. Horatio says:

Do thou and my Lavinia both forgive me;  
A flood of tenderness comes o'er my soul;  
I cannot speak! I love, forgive, and pity thee! (IV i, 412-4)

Thus Rowe paves the way with this emphasis on forgiveness, pity and tenderness for the further questioning of penitence at the beginning of the last act.

The

SCENE is a room hung with black: on one side, Lothario's body on a bier; on the other, a table with a skull and other bones, a book, and a lamp on it. Calista is discovered on a couch in black, her hair hanging loose and disordered; after music and a song she comes forward. (stage dir., V i)

Calista throws away the book because "Is it become an art then?" (V i, 26) and because the aids to contrition are mere "pageantry - they look uncouthly" (V i, 32). What is significant here, I think, is the emphasis on art rather

than that on penitence. Throughout the play Calista has been singularly blind to the reality of her situation; indeed she has been in retreat in a dream world, and now she comes to some form of reality she finds that it, too is all art. Her remarks on penitence bear out her concern with seeming; a way, one suspects, of avoiding being. Nevertheless she revels in the gory sight of the corpse (yet another manifestation of "art"). Instead of urging repentance Sciolto gives her a dagger. "She offers to kill herself; Sciolto catches hold of her arm" (stage dir., V i, 104-5) because though he wants her to die he wants to be spared the sight, admitting that she is his daughter still. Altamont also visits her, reminds her that he never complained and when she is determined to die he says he will join her. His thoughts, though, are not tied to reality either; he fantasises about the afterlife, whether

In gloomy groves with discontented ghosts,  
Or whether through the upper air we fleet,  
And tread the fields of light, still I'll pursue thee  
Till Fate ordains that we shall part no more. (V i, 202-5)

Calista bids him live and remarry, when Horatio enters with the news of Sciolto's death at the hands of Lothario's gang. Calista stabs herself:

Altamont offers to kill himself; Horatio prevents him, and wrests the sword from him. (stage dir., V i 237)

The dying Sciolto enters, Calista dies, Sciolto bequeaths his fortune to Horatio and Altamont and dies, Altamont bids Horatio take all the money for he will die, and he faints to be carried off while Horatio warns against unlawful love.

The Fair Penitent is an excellent example of the growing tendency to sentimentality which is not shown through the women but through the men,

all of whom are morally flawed and all of whom are weak. Lothario, the only strong male character in the play dies in Act IV and the steam goes out of the play from that point, not entirely because of his disappearance but because the subtleties of Rowe's characterisation are fully revealed at the end of Act III. The first three acts are splendid writing but when Act IV begins the dénouement our sole interest is to see the plot worked out. No new revelations of character are made and Calista, strong at the beginning of the play with several indications that she is a bitch, loses most of her spirit and momentum as soon as Lothario dies. None of the characters embody a norm and, because none has the necessary morality for a fully rounded character, tragedy must ensue. Tragedy, then, is an indication of the fallen world and the less the characters are able to come to terms with their situations and actions, the more dire will be the consequences. The moral is thus implicit in the characters but the weakness of the play is that all this is revealed by the end of the third act and the last two acts merely show results. Rowe, then, seems at his best to be far more interested in psychology and motivation than in action itself and this tends to elevate him above the rest of the dramatists of the period even in this flawed piece.

Rowe turns to Greek mythology for his next play, Ulysses (1706)<sup>23</sup> a tragedy which has never received as much acclaim as his other plays, but which is quite well constructed. The plot is based on Books 17-23 of The Odyssey, but Rowe makes several changes, attempting to humanise Ulysses by giving him genuine motivation for his actions, and locating the characters in a domestic situation. Ulysses's testing of Penelope is seen to be legitimate, all the more because the hero steps in just where it looks as

if her fidelity is beginning to falter. The gods and hero work together to preserve the Queen's honour in a way that is attractive but hardly Homeric. Telemachus is given much more prominence than he had in the original, and his youthful vigour and energy are well portrayed. His love affair with Semanthe seems to be Rowe's own invention, but it is not an "Episode" as Genest says,<sup>24</sup> rather an integral part of the plot. We are prevented from seeing things too much from the young lovers' point of view because Ulysses narrates the background while they are off stage. We take his point of view early in the play, and though we are sorry that the love story is frustrated, we nevertheless realise that the primary focus is on Ulysses and Penelope. Because it is Telemachus who kills Semanthe's father there is an element of tragic pathos, but Rowe presents filial duty as much more important than duty to love.

Rowe dispenses with the nurse and the whole paraphernalia of the recognition of the returning hero. Tragedy is averted not through divine intervention, but because the hero behaves like a modern man.

D.B. Clark points out that the sub-plot was taken from Corneille's Le Cid<sup>25</sup> but the French influence does not seem to be very important. Nor is Rowe so hidebound by a desire to conform to French classical taste as J.R. Sutherland suggests.<sup>26</sup> The most striking feature of the play is its vitality, maintained by a rigorous control of balance. The marriage of Ulysses and Penelope, fraught by great difficulties, is balanced by the secret marriage of Telemachus and Semanthe which experiences its hardships on the stage. The suit of Eurymachus for Penelope is balanced by that of Antinous, and both are characterised by the same sort of intrigue and

ingratiating, Eurymachus hoping to manipulate the disguised Ulysses, and Antinous hoping to do the same with Telemachus. The family of Ulysses is thus brought into direct conflict with the King of Samos, but both are opposed by the rebellious family of Ithaca, symbolised by Antinous. As the hero eventually uses his son to help him bring justice to bear, all these strands become inextricably linked, but in striving for this precise structure, and in modernising the old fable, Rowe falls into one or two weaknesses. In the fourth act there seems to be no good reason why Semanthe should be looking after the queen at that very moment when her father is expected to perform his ritual rape of Penelope. Rowe here seems to have sacrificed likelihood for a sentimental and pathetic scene. The marriage of Telemachus and Semanthe, too, is a weak element, partly because it is hard to believe that the two young people would marry, especially as they appear to be otherwise so resourceful and level-headed. Rowe gains nothing from the fact of their marriage, and he seems to have introduced it precisely because it was an expected stock element in the tragedies of the period.

The first act sets out the "wiles" of each of the main characters, and the second catches the audience with the infection of the action; here there is something of the atmosphere of an unfolding mystery story. As Aethon/Ulysses has by the end of the first act become completely in charge of his own sphere, so does Penelope in the second. The central act is the Act of Reconciliation, and its flavour is primarily domestic. Centrally placed is the pivot on which the play turns; from the testing of Penelope's faithfulness we move to a justification of Ulysses who begins to take control, and becomes the deus ex machina. The fourth act is devoted to problems,

both on the domestic and national fronts. The last act turns to the whole family of Ithaca after the isolated, domestic death of Eurymachus. Here tragedy is just averted by the association of the hero and the gods, and Telemachus proves his valour and his worth by relieving his mother. Finally the various elements are unsorted; love has to be subservient to honour, and the domestic has finally to give way to the heroic. Ulysses is, as I have attempted to suggest elsewhere,<sup>27</sup> a finely patterned and skilfully written play; its construction is not merely conventional, but significantly organised, and it bears the mark of a highly competent dramatist. Just as the play begins with an abstract philosophical statement, so at the end of the play we have the same realisation confirmed, but now in maturity with a wealth of experience to back it up. The play opens with Telemachus lamenting his high state to his tutor, Mentor, and Mentor's stoicism sets the mood for the play; he tells the young man that his task should be

to struggle with Adversity,  
To wait the Leisure of the righteous Gods. (I i, p. 1)

This stoicism, however, is tempered with optimism, because Mentor is sure that the gods are on the side of Ulysses and his family. At the end of the play Telemachus sees the strangers bearing "the sad Semanthe back to Samos" (V i, p. 64); his only consolation is to be found in mourning her departure and in looking to the future. Ulysses, however, tempers his misery with the plea to look eagerly to the future:

Thou that art born a Man art born to Pain;  
For Proof, behold my tedious Twenty Years  
All spent in Toil, and exercis'd in Cares:  
'Tis true, the gracious Gods are kind at last,  
And will reward me here for all my Sorrows past. (Ibid.)

Rowe's play is such that we can believe such a statement, and this verse is thus transformed from a traditional rhyming tag into a meaningful outline of the philosophical stance which the play examines and attempts to justify.

Having chosen for his earliest plays Eastern, European and Classical settings, Rowe turns to his native land for the material for the rest of his plays, beginning with ancient Britain where he can examine the theme of love in both a pagan and a Christian context in The Royal Convert (1708).<sup>28</sup>

Both Hengist (the king) and his brother Aribert are in love with Ethelinda. The conflict is presented with great pathos, and although much of the moral/ethical problem resides in the fact that Hengist's father forbade any marriage with a Christian, love transcends this edict, and is seen to be a more powerful force than could be controlled merely by religious questions. The non-Christians and Christians alike have grandeur and nobility of spirit, so that when the Christian pair, Ethelinda and Aribert, emerge triumphant at the end, forming a basis for the successful development of Britain as a Christian country, our attention is focused primarily on personal characteristics rather than on political and ideological considerations.

Because there are only a few characters, Rowe is able to establish all the main actors as fully developed personalities, and the rigorous control of tone and pace ensures the audience's involvement in the action, particularly in the more pathetic passages. In order to achieve this, the first act consists of only two scenes, where Aribert and the King are presented. Aribert opens the play with a strong statement of the unchanging nature of love - a theme which underlies the play effectively, as all four of the main characters are seen to hold this view; Aribert, Hengist, Ethelinda and

Rodogune (the Saxon princess).

Hengist had promised to marry Rodogune, Offa's daughter, but surprisingly postponed the marriage just before it was to have taken place, because, we find out, he is now in love with Ethelinda, Aribert's wife. Rodogune in her turn is not in love with the king but with Aribert, and when news of Aribert's marriage is made public she wavers between jealousy of Ethelinda and a desire to save Aribert no matter what the cost. At the end of the play she emerges as a tragic victim of circumstance, thwarted in her love but still full of nobility.

Having first outlined the love situation Rowe goes on to outline the religious one. Oswald, Aribert's friend and confidant, knows that Ethelinda is a Christian, and he can respond to Aribert's enthusiastic description of his own conversion to his wife's faith, but Oswald points out that

Crowds will still believe, and Priests will teach  
As wandering Fancy, and as Int'rest leads. (Ibid.)

The question for him is not whether Aribert was morally right in adopting his new faith, but whether he was practically wise to do so, after his late father

forc'd the King, my Brother, and my self,  
To kneel and swear at Woden's cruel Altar,  
First, never to forgo our Country's Gods;...  
Never to chuse a Wife among the Christians. (I i, p. 16)

Aribert is sure that he is right in following his conscience, but Oswald's advice is

In holy Matters, Zeal may be your Guide,  
And lift you on her flaming Wings to Heav'n;  
But here on Earth trust Reason, and be safe. (Ibid.)

Thus we see that there is here an essential divorce between the spiritual/religious and the earthly/practical, and Oswald goes further to justify his a-religious stance by pointing to the domestic turmoil and Offa's discontent about the sudden rejection of his daughter. Thus we are introduced to another sphere of activity where one man's "right" is seen to be at variance with the "right" of others. Aribert is "right" to adopt Christianity and thereby disregard his father's commands because of his conscience; Offa is "right" first to be angry at the delay to his daughter's marriage; Rodogune is "right" first to be angry at being despised and secondly to look at her new lover, Aribert; and the king is "right" to reject Rodogune whom he does not love, and to turn instead to Ethelinda whom he does love. Of all these possibilities Rowe denounces only the king's position; Hengist's love is suspect, for he took Ethelinda by force, he becomes tyrannically jealous of his brother, and his accusations are too passionate and seem to be ill-founded. While he is right to berate Aribert for disobeying parental commands, he forgets (or chooses not to see) that he is doing exactly the same in loving Ethelinda himself, even though he is not proposing to marry her.

Rowe presents these criteria for the judging of "right" as essentially different for each individual. Rightness cannot be judged by objective rules, and thus potentially tragic situations are formed where several characters are "right" within their own terms, although their standpoints are mutually irreconcilable.

Rodogune is presented by Aribert as a truly formidable woman:

To me she seems most fair; and yet, methinks,

Do'st thou not mark? there is I know not what  
 Of sullen and severe, of fierce and haughty,  
 That pleases not, but awes; I gaze astonish'd,  
 And Fear prevents Desire. (I i, p. 18)

When Rodogune comes on stage, therefore, it is no great surprise that her first words concern war and the martial Ambrosius. She makes Hengist look weak as he tries several different ploys in order to win over Offa, and she concludes:

For know e'en from the first, my Soul disdain'd thee;  
 Nor am I left by thee, but thou by me.  
 So was thy Falsehood to my Will subservient,  
 And by my Purpose bound; thus Man, tho' limited  
 By Fate, may vainly think his Actions free,  
 While all he does, was at this Hour of Birth,  
 Or by his Gods, or potent Stars ordain'd. (I i, p. 21)

Rowe further establishes the king's character by presenting him in discussion with his elder statesman Seofrid, whose role is to bolster up the king's sagging self-confidence. Hengist reflects self-pityingly on the unsatisfying role a king has to play:

What? but the common Victim of the State:  
 Born to grow old in Cares, to waste his Blood,  
 And still be wretched for the public Good. (I i, p. 23)

Hengist tells Aribert that Rodogune loves him, but Aribert's rejection of the Saxon princess is absolute. Then Hengist gets round to the point and declares his love for Ethelinda to whom Aribert is already secretly married. After all these disclosures Ethelinda joins Aribert who by now is very jumpy and, realising that Seofrid has overheard them, threatens the old man with the sword. After surprises and tension-filled scenes Rowe slackens the pace for Ethelinda to recount what happened to her after Aribert left her in her idyllic pastoral retreat. We thus get at this point the necessary details

which clear up the plot so far. Ethelinda tells how she was captured by the king despite the heroic attempts of Adelmarr and Kenwald, Aribert's servants, who tried to protect her. Aribert is very alive to the continuing danger from Hengist's lust but Ethelinda's calm cannot be shaken; she believes that

The great Angelick Pow'rs go forth by Bands,  
To succour Truth and Innocence below. (II i, p. 37)

In the third act Rowe begins to use Seofrid in a more complex way than his role as commentator might suggest, for Seofrid is also motivated by self-interest. At the beginning of Act III he determines to act as the king's counsellor and to maintain the status quo; he would like to be able to

preserve 'em both, the Royal Brothers;  
But if their Fates ordain that one might fall,  
Then let my Master stand. (III i, p. 40)

Thus he schemes with Aribert, pointing out his own danger, so that Aribert will agree to take all responsibility should a reconciliation misfire. It is also possible that Seofrid, too, has been influenced by Ethelinda's charms, because he points out the danger of her rape in the most vivid colours. Seofrid is the one to suggest that Ethelinda should go away, but it is left to Aribert to work out the details of sending her to the British camp. Thus Seofrid is a catalyst who still ensures that he maintains the safety of his own position. Rowe thus turns him from a stock character into a man who, perhaps, exemplifies "human Wisdom" (III i, p. 40) acting with reason. Seofrid contrasts with the other characters because he is prepared to hazard nothing, determined not to sacrifice position to passion as he showed at the beginning of the play. He is also instrumental in involving

Aribert in an act of deceit:

It will import us much, that you should seem  
 Inclined to meet the Love of haughty Rodogune:  
 'Twill cost you but a little courtly flattery,  
 A kind respectful Look, join'd with a Sigh,  
 And few soft tender Words, that mean just nothing,  
 Yet win most Womens Hearts. (III i, p. 46)

The last clause gives Seofrid away; although he knows that Aribert has accidentally won Rodogune's heart, he still eggs him on to potential danger because this will enable Seofrid to serve the king's best interests.

The second half of Act III together with Act IV is devoted to further manoeuvres so that the final dénouement can proceed. The pace of the play increases as Aribert is condemned to "bloody Altars" (III i, p. 52) for marrying a Christian and for himself being converted to Christianity.

Rodogune tries to restore Aribert's desire to live (with the unspoken proviso that he lives for her) but Aribert keeps returning to the theme of his love for Ethelinda and so, because everything else she knows about has failed, Rodogune decides on revenge.

It is Seofrid who comes to the rescue when Aribert is bound and led to the altar by the priests. He urges the present political dangers and begs Hengist to defer his brother's death until the forces of Rodogune and Offa are defeated. Seofrid has enough force of personality to sway the king, but Rodogune wins the battle and Ethelinda is brought in captive. In a moment of such intensity Ethelinda thinks of the after-life; thus she is able to retain her poise and at the same time achieve some sort of vision:

Then let the Myrtle and the Rose be strow'd,  
 For 'tis my second better Bridal Day.  
 On my cold Bosom let his Head be laid,  
 And look that none disturb us;  
 'Till the last Trumpet's Sound break our long Sleep,  
 And call us up to everlasting Bliss. (IV i, p. 69)

Similarly Rodogune also enters a dreamworld where she imagines her soul soaring upwards and finding fulfilment after death to compensate for the constant frustration it has experienced throughout Rodogune's own life. This is the only recourse for her in the face of Ethelinda's willingness to die rather than yield to Rodogune, and Rowe does well to move to a mental dream vision for both his women, in a situation where railings could have added nothing to the poignancy already achieved. It is this avoidance of railing and ranting in a moment of true stress for the characters which demonstrates Rowe's movement away from the heroic and bombastic style to the sentimental and tearful; he is presenting characters now as introverted in crises rather than as extroverted and exclamatory.

The final act witnesses Hengist's despair at the imminent death of his love. Again it is Seofrid who wakes the king from lethargy to propose an alliance with the Britons, even though Hengist hates them. It is only the hardened courtier who can keep affairs of state moving when the monarch is weakly weighed down by personal grief, yet at the same time Rowe makes us stop for a moment to analyse Seofrid's conduct. He certainly keeps Hengist to his task of maintaining political movement, but Rowe also intends us to condemn his cynicism as he comments on the role of fate:

'tis all in vain.  
Blind Goddess Chance: henceforth I follow thee.  
The Politicians of the World may talk,  
May make a mighty Bustle with their Foresight,  
Their Schemes and Arts; their Wisdom is thy Slave. (V i, p. 74)

The love and faith of Aribert and Ethelinda as they are committed to death by Rodogune contrast strongly with the relentless but defeated arrogance of the Saxon princess. When Rowe has extracted all the pathos

he can from the situation there is another surge of action as "The King with sudden Fury sallies forth" (V [iii], p. 79) and is wounded. The mood changes to regret and grief as Ethelinda begs Hengist to repent of the evil he has done, and the justice of his impending death is emphasised when he reveals that he intended to spend that night in her arms. Hengist dies, Aribert is crowned and reunited with Ethelinda, Rodogune departs cursing, and it is left to Ethelinda to refer to the country's future prosperity by expounding the vision of "A venerable, old and Saint-like Hermit" (V [iii], p. 83) who foretold a united, Christian Britain. Here Rowe's patriotism takes over from the gloom. Just as fate had decreed the death of King Hengist, so too fate seems to have decreed glories for the nation:

Of Royal Race a British Queen shall rise,  
Great, Gracious, Pious, Fortunate and Wise;  
To distant Lands she shall extend her Fame,  
And leave to latter Times a mighty Name:  
Tyrants shall fall, and faithless Kings shall bleed,  
And groaning Nature to her Arms be freed. (Ibid.)

With patriotic fervour, appropriate for the future Poet Laureate, Rowe sings through Ethelinda of a happy, united Britain, blessed with what sounds like a paragon of a queen.

The play in toto works against the spirit of true tragedy, for the patriotism suggest that fate had determined a great future for Britain, and the scenes enacted are one step towards this glory. The point of the play, then, lies not in the characters but in the message. Indeed, Ethelinda, the paragon, is Rowe's Christian Queen, a prefigurement of Queen Anne. The moral resolution, the victory of the married couple against the king's desire for rape and possession, thus seems to be incidental. In its emphasis on fate and predestination and in its happy ending, based on Christian ideas,

The Royal Convert looks forward to the domestic tragedies later in the century. This, though, is only in spirit, for its preoccupation with kings and princes sets it firmly in its period at the beginning of the century.

From a play which is more a celebration than a tragedy, in the final analysis, we turn to Rowe's greatest achievement, his last two plays. Here he concentrates on one female character and examines her in a context of her background. He has thus abandoned the earlier methods of following one or another set pattern, or his own modification, trying to mould the earlier patterns to his own themes of Christianity and repentance or patriotism. With Jane Shore (1713)<sup>29</sup> and Lady Jane Gray (1715) we come to ground which has received more critical attention than most of the other tragedies in the period, and to drama which really proved its popularity on the eighteenth-century stage. Indeed, Jane Shore was one of the most frequently presented tragedies in the eighteenth-century and proved its worth right from its opening run of nineteen nights.<sup>30</sup> Both Alfred Jackson<sup>31</sup> and Alfred Schwartz<sup>32</sup> have indicated the sources and bases for Jane Shore, and Schwartz is helpful in pointing to the contrast with Addison's Cato in that Rowe neglects the "rules" which seemed at any rate partly responsible for Cato's success. Rowe

won the sympathy of his audiences for the sufferings of his repentant sinner. This trend in taste continued, and during the course of the century the popularity of Cato, though still considerable, was definitely overshadowed by that of the leading pathetic family tragedies.<sup>33</sup>

By "Written in Shakespeare's Style" (the description of Jane Shore on the

title page) Rowe means not that he is trying to imitate the iambic pentameters and language of the master but that he is drawing on the sort of way the Elizabethan playwright patterned his tragedies both structurally and emotionally, and is returning to a native English tradition. There are touches of Shakespearian language and imagery, but the most important departure from the "high tragedy" of the Restoration is in abandoning the unities so that scenes can follow one another naturally to their climax. Jane Shore is the focus of the play and Rowe stripped his plot of anything which he felt would separate the audience from his heroine. In this he drew from life rather than from other art, and portrayed a character who was socially not all she might be; she is the wife of a shopkeeper who has fallen morally (tainted with the corruption and lure of the court) and who wishes to redeem herself.

Jane was formerly the mistress of King Edward but she realises at the beginning of the play that one of the chief causes of her downfall lay in her having over-reached her station:

'Tis true, the Royal Edward was a Wonder,...  
 But what had I to do with Kings and Courts?  
 My humble Lot had cast me far beneath them;  
 And that he was the first of all Mankind,  
 The bravest and most lovely was my Curse. (I ii, p. 9)

Rowe strikingly presents Jane's moral plight in a brief interchange where Alicia suggests that she should seek out the Protector's aid; Jane, however, immediately fears that she will have no success because "My Form, alas! has long forgot to please" (Ibid.). This is her only link with the court - pleasing through her body. Alicia too is imbued with these values, for she believes that if Hastings takes up her case he will very

soon become infected with her charms. Jane renounces the carnal world and rejoices in the faithfulness of her friend. In attempting to reject her view of herself as whore, Jane cannot help but formulate ideas of how to gain help in the same sort of terms. To contrast with her own view of herself Rowe juxtaposes Biblical echoes; Jane sees herself as abject and despicable and Alicia tries to cheer her:

Think not, the good,  
The gentle Deeds of Mercy thou hast done,  
Shall dye forgotten all; the Poor, the Pris'ner,  
The Fatherless, the Friendless, and the Widow,  
Who daily own the Bounty of thy Hand,  
Shall cry to Heav'n, and pull a Blessing on thee. (I ii, p. 11)

The act closes with a statement bemoaning the fate of women in society, trodden on by the libertine Man, and relentlessly condemned to ruin if they once stray from the path of accepted virtue. Here Jane prefigures her own end, and our interest in the play is partly in seeing how this prophecy is fulfilled.

Hastings betrays his anxiety on seeing Alicia when he was instead hoping to succour Jane Shore, and despite her attempts to restrain her grievance and anguish Alicia cannot prevent her resentment of Hastings' behaviour. She comes out of the encounter far better than Hastings. She has a just cause for her distress but Hastings, who acknowledges his infidelity in an aside at the beginning of the scene, attempts to act in a self-righteous and superior manner. Having voiced her complaint Alicia retires inveighing against the man's imperious treatment of her, and Hastings does nothing to redeem himself by soliloquising upon his superiority over weak woman:

How Fierce a Fiend is Passion? With what Wildness,  
What Tyranny untam'd, it Reigns in Woman.

Unhappy Sex! Whose easie yielding Temper  
Gives way to every Appetite alike. (II i, p. 17)

This is skilful; we recognise the necessity for restraint of passion, but also see Hastings caught up in the same court attitude of male chauvinism. This is heightened on Jane's entry when Hastings acts in quite a different vein, both urging his love before it is appropriate to do so, and acting as a prostrate subject before his goddess. The tension of the scene builds convincingly as Jane rejects his advances which she associates with "My past polluted Life" (II i, p. 20). This is "dull Stuff" (Ibid.) to Hastings, and he thrusts himself forward so that she is forced to make an immediate moral choice:

Hastings. Ungrateful Woman! is it thus you pay  
My Services? -  
Jane Shore. Abandon me to ruin -  
Rather than urge me - (II i, p. 21)

While professing to want to aid her because of her fallen fortune, this Lord still treats her as a prostitute who will pay in the understood way for services rendered. The "ruin" to which Jane is prepared to be abandoned, however, is spiritual not sexual. Her actions confirm her repentance and strength in pursuing her newly directed moral path. Dumont, responding to Jane's cries for help, is similarly prepared to accept ruin in following his determined path of helping the afflicted. After extreme provocation by Hastings the two men fight, but moral strength triumphs and Hastings is disarmed. Dumont scorns Hastings' power to be retributive, and he bids Jane retire from the world. Bellmour has found an ideal pastoral retreat for her where the priest is an essential element for Jane's character and spiritual development.

In the third act Hastings utters a speech of patriotic sentiments:

Beyond my self I prize my Native Land:  
 On this Foundation would I build my Fame,  
 And emulate the Greek and Roman Name;  
 Think England's Peace bought cheaply with my Blood,  
 And die with Pleasure for my Country's Good. (III i, p. 34)

Our feelings towards Hastings are now ambiguous. We sympathise with Jane against his advances, but with him against Gloucester's selfish and devious pursuit of power.

Despite various changes in political fortunes, and despite her own harsh treatment at the king's hands, Jane shows that she has a strong sense of moral justice. She says that although Edward wronged her she cannot "Stand by, and see his Children robb'd of Right" (IV i, p. 39). Indeed she shows remarkable and affecting strength of purpose:

Let me be branded for the publick Scorn,  
 Turn'd forth, and driven to wander like a Vagabond,  
 Be friendless and forsaken, seek my Bread  
 Upon the barren, wild, and desolate Waste,  
 Feed on my Sighs, and drink my falling Tears;  
 E'er I consent to teach my Lips Injustice,  
 Or wrong the Orphan, who has none to save him. (IV i, p. 40)

Jane Shore is turned out, friendless and helpless, then, as she had forecast earlier:

No Pity for my Sufferings here I crave,  
 And only hope Forgiveness in the Grave. (IV i, p. 41)

The "good" which Hastings showed in his patriotism is now confirmed at the end of Act IV. Jane's moral awareness is paralleled by Hastings, whose final wish is that no harm should come to Jane. He exchanges forgiveness with Alicia and Christian charity appears to be flourishing until Alicia prays that Jane may have the same wretched fate as herself.

Rowe extracts further anguish and pitiful effect from the play

as he reveals in the stage direction at the beginning of the final act that Dumont is Shore in disguise. Full impact is gained from Bellmour's description of Jane's return from "solemn Penance" at "the Public Cross" (V i, p. 49). Bellmour's attempts to send her succour and relief have all failed, but Shore vows to go forth to meet her in his own proper guise of husband. He has long been studying to remove his feelings of resentment; he recalls the previous happy times he had with his wife, how she deserted him for the king, and how she now suffers under unmitigated distress. Nostalgia is the keynote of the passage, but praise for the strength and courage of Shore's actions is heightened by the recapitulation of earlier events with his wife.

When the heroine enters "her Hair dangling loose on her Shoulders, and bare-footed" (stage dir. V i, p. 53) we are presented with a picture of the true penitent. It is the restrained note of her conversation with Alicia which is so moving:

Alicia. What Wretch art thou? Whose Misery and Baseness  
Hangs on my Door; whose hateful Whine of Woe  
Breaks in upon my Sorrows, and distracts  
My jarring Senses with thy Beggar's Cry.  
Jane Shore. A very Beggar, and a Wretch indeed;  
One driv'n by strong Calamity to seek  
For Succour here. One perishing for Want,  
Whose Hunger has not tasted Food these three Days;  
And humbly asks, for Charity's dear sake,  
A Draught of Water, and a little Bread. (V i, p. 55)

We see Jane here as the humble, wandering, repentant Christian exile. Alicia's madness, in asking Jane where her Edward is, has the effect of purging Jane's feelings of sin, so that instead of having self-pity she is affected by the need of her former friend. Bellmour raises Jane and introduces her to Shore at which discovery Jane faints. Shore promises

to restore her as his wife, but Jane cannot believe this and once again echoes the expected moral code of the Old Testament:

No, arm thy Brow with Vengeance; and appear  
The Minister of Heav'n's enquiring Justice;  
Array thy self all terrible for Judgment,  
Wrath in thy Eyes, and Thunder in thy Voice. (V i, pp. 59-60)

Shore's sentence, however, is rest and peace. There is here a marvellous touch of the world of everyday:

Jane Shore. What shall I say to you? But I obey -  
Shore. Lean on my Arm -  
Jane Shore. Alas! I am wondrous faint:  
But that's not strange, I have not eat these three Days.  
Shore. Oh Merciless! look here my Love, I've brought thee  
Some rich Conserves. - (V i, p. 60)

Thus we are thoroughly immersed not in a world of repentance but in one of love where physical and spiritual wants are both supplied by the generous and forgiving husband. Rowe does not end here, however, for the political aspect of the play - the sense that these personal actions are taking place within a larger, more oppressive framework of intrigue and jockeying for power - catches up with the characters. Even if repentance and forgiveness operate on the spiritual level, court justice instead demands the Old Testament philosophy of an eye for an eye which Jane was so happy that Shore had transcended. **Public** and private morality, then, are seen in practice to be incompatible. It is this which brings about tragedy, and it is the external element which the characters themselves cannot control that makes Jane Shore into a tragedy. Because we understand Jane as a character and feel for her position the play is also an effective and moving tragedy. Rowe in this play has moved a long way from the extravagance of the tragedies

of the first few years of the century, for he presents Jane's death at the end of the play in a splendidly calm and low-key way:

Then all is well, and I shall sleep in Peace -  
 'Tis very dark, and I have lost you now -  
 Was there not something I would have bequeath'd you?  
 Nothing but one sad Sigh. Oh Mercy Heav'n! [Dies. (V i, p. 62)]

The audience going to see Rowe's last play, The Tragedy of Lady Jane Gray (1715)<sup>34</sup> was apparently expecting a play by "Rag" Edmund Smith only corrected by Rowe, but the reviser is at pains in the Preface to show exactly what he found:

I found the quantity of about two Quires of Paper written over in odd pieces, blotted, interlin'd and confus'd. What was contain'd in 'em in general, was loose Hints of Sentiments, and short obscure Sketches of Scenes. (p. ix)

Rowe borrows from Banks' The Innocent Usurper and The Island Queens, Addison's Cato, and his own The Fair Penitent and The Royal Convert, grafting all these onto the historical narrative of Jane Gray found in Bishop Burnet's History of the Reformation.<sup>35</sup> The historical point of view of the latter is made clear; Rowe says that Burnet maintained

and I believe very justly, the horrible Cruelties that were acted at that time, rather to the Charge of that Persecuting Spirit by which the Clergy were then animated, than to the Queen's own natural Disposition. (Preface, p. x)

Thus the dedication to "Her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales" is appropriate in that Princess Caroline was strongly theologically minded and prided herself on her theological discernment.

The dual basis of the moral impact of the tragedy - religious and patriotic - is thus established before the play begins and the Prologue pictures Lady Jane as a super-heroine: "A Heroine, a Martyr and

a Queen", the three qualities most likely "To warm the generous Soul, and touch the tender Heart". Rowe's play thus arouses the indignation of the audience at the thought of a Catholic monarchy - appropriate because of the threatened Jacobite rising - and so fills the audience with gratitude for the present Protestant line.

The play opens with Suffolk remarking to Northumberland and Sir John Gates on the present woeful state of England, and its loss when the ailing King Edward dies. The political situation, the major character and the themes of tearfulness and religion are thus at once established:

Religion melts in ev'ry holy Eye,  
 All comfortless, afflicted and forlorn  
 She sits on Earth, and weeps upon her Cross:  
 Weary of Man and her detested Ways,  
 Ev'n now she seems to meditate her Flight,  
 And waft her Angel to the Thrones above. (I i, p. 1)

Princess Mary is described as a "blinded Zealot" (Ibid.) only too eager to be ruled by the "presuming Romish Priests" (Ibid.), so the precariousness of the Protestant succession is also immediately established.

Northumberland tries to woo Pembroke to his cause of marrying Lady Jane Gray to Pembroke before Edward dies, but Pembroke mistrusts the older man although he is more open about religious questions than might be expected from a stage Catholic:

But were it so, what are these Clergy Quarrels,  
 These wordy Wars of proud ill-manner'd Schoolmen  
 To us and our Lay-Interests? Let 'em rail  
 And worry one another at their Pleasure. (I i, p. 6)

Rowe uses the sentimental device of all-embracing male friendship in order to establish the goodness of Guilford when the two rivals for the love of Lady Jane Gray meet. Pembroke at first thinks that he would be able

to accept her love being given to Guilford, but he then realises that this would be impossible, and he does some more interesting self-analysis in order to prevent himself from becoming angry:

While mine [Temper] disdain'g Reason and her Love  
 Like all thou can'st imagine wild and furious,  
 Now drive me head-long on, now whirl me back  
 And hurry my instable, flitting Soul  
 To ev'ry mad Extream. (I i, p. 7)

Reason is the key to all successful relationships; it will maintain the necessary balance between conflicting extreme emotions and will ensure lasting friendship even in the face of adversity. But the two men quarrel so that in the final act Rowe can come back to a presentation of actions which are in fact governed by reason.

The marriage between Lady Jane and Guilford is decided upon at the beginning of Act II. The prospective bride is the epitome of grief:

All desolate and drown'd in flowing Tears,  
 By Edward's Bed the pious Princess sits.  
 Fast from her lifted Eyes the Pearly Drops,  
 Fall trickling o'er her Cheek, while Holy Ardor,  
 And fervent Zeal pour forth her lab'ring Soul;  
 And ev'ry Sigh is wing'd with Pray'rs so potent,  
 As strive with Heav'n to save her dying Lord. (II i, p. 12)

While it is true that Rowe's single-minded and central concern is to present the piety and patriotic worth of his heroine, his language is too full of references to these two attributes. The author seems to forget that his convincing portrayal of Jane Shore was partly, at least, due to her realistic and not her emblematic qualities. Pathos is further increased as Lady Jane extracts every tear from the audience with her announcement of the king's death.

Lady Jane admits her love for Guilford, but again Rowe goes too far in having Guilford agree to "forgo a Bridegroom's sacred Right" (II i, p. 16) in order to mourn Edward's death with her. The oppressive atmosphere of melancholy is at last dispersed by Pembroke's entrance:

Pembroke. Thou hast step'd in between me and my Hopes,  
And hast ravish'd from me all my Soul held dear.

Thou hast betray'd me -

Guilford. How! Betray'd thee! Pembrook!

Pembroke. Yes, falsely, like a Traytor.

Guilford. Have a Care.

Pembroke. But think not I will bear this foul Play from thee.  
(II i, p. 21)

Dramatic conflict and impetus are thus given to an act which has by this point become static.

In the quarrel between the rivals Pembroke to some extent wins our sympathy because of his directness, youthful vigour and imagination. On the other hand Guilford tends to be rather self-righteous in his replies, and also somewhat blind to the fact that comments about "love and Friendship" (II i, p. 22) will only make Pembroke angrier. Pembroke gives way to vengeance in the style of earlier less sophisticated tragedy, and at the end of the act Guilford realises that his love must finally break all other commitments to either friendship or reason. Rowe rescues the play by an injection of tension and argument but seems to be on the point of a very conventional resolution.

Pembroke condemns himself at the beginning of Act III. He associates with the machiavellian schemer Bishop Gardner and admits to him:

Oh! Winchester, thy hoary frozen Age  
Can never guess my Pain; can never know  
The burning Transports of untam'd Desire.  
I tell thee, Rev'rend Lord, to that one Bliss,  
To the Enjoyment of that lovely Maid,  
As to their Center, I had drawn each Hope. (III i, p. 25)

But Pembroke is not simply evil, for after all this Rowe makes him compare himself with Adam driven out of paradise:

There for his happy Eden's Plains beheld,  
 A Barren, wild, uncomfortable Field.  
 He saw 'twas vain the Ruin to deplore,  
 He try'd to give the sad Remembrance o'er,  
 The sad Remembrance still return'd again,  
 And his lost Paradise renew'd the Pain. (III i, p. 27)

We are thus meant to see the seeds of tragedy and the hint of universal fall in this speech though we miss the point if we fail to see the sardonic irony of the comparison between Eden and sexual gratification at all costs.

The last part of the third act examines these characters in a political context. Lady Jane is a reluctant queen:

Rise all! nor cover me with this Confusion.  
 What means this Mock, this masquing Shew of Greatness?  
 Why do you hang these Pageant Glories on me,  
 And dress me up in Honours not my own? (III i, p. 31)

She wants to be democratic but she is moved by her husband's condemnation of papism. She is a sentimentalist, clearly unfit for the harsh realities of the throne and the rigours of government.

Guilford and Gardner are seized as traitors and the male friendship theme returns as Guilford tries to save Pembroke's life. When Guilford reveals Northumberland's plot to kill Pembroke - a ruthlessness which seems out of keeping with the old man's verbosity - Pembroke recognises his friend's honesty and integrity. Now friendship returns as a supreme moral value, superior in worth even to family.

By now we can, I think, see that Rowe is constantly thinking of the effect of certain words and actions on the emotions of the audience. He has done it in the exchange between angry rivals, in the emphasis on the

heroine's piety and sentimental sympathy, in the emphasis on family as well as body politic, and now he takes the device one stage further in having the heroine enter reading Plato. This Elizabethan device serves to introduce a religious debate so that Rowe can reveal the simplicity of Lady Jane's faith. She says that Plato must be wrong because his teachings are not Protestant. It seems to me that Rowe ruins dramatic significance here. What he has his heroine say is banal. He seems no longer to be concerned with presenting a character as giving a collection of traits. So from one sort of simplification - that of concentration on one character set against a background of others - he has moved to another, much less successful - that of simplifying everything, indeed, themes and actions so as to make them more obvious to the audience. It is this which allows Jane Shore to be the high point of sentimental tragedy of the old sort, and which marks out Lady Jane Gray as the herald of tragedy of mere emotional effect.

Rowe allows the interest of the play to pick up somewhat as he also shows Lady Jane to represent the voice of common sense:

Think not thy Arm can stem the driving Torrent,  
Or save a People, who with blindfold Rage,  
Urge their own Fate, and strive to be Undone. (IV i, p. 47)

Her reign is soon ended though. The characters are rounded up and there is some good character contrast. Suffolk is officiously precise, Gardner maliciously impulsive, Guilford still self-righteous and sentimental, Lady Jane concerned yet calm. The heroine is far stronger than her husband and she instructs him in his duty, bidding him again adopt "uncommon Fortitude". It is "Truth and Innocence" which Lady Jane says have brought about her "unshaken Courage" (IV i, p. 52), and she is given the opportunity to present

her vision of eternity. Basing her ideas on the cycle of death and rebirth in the seasons, her thought moves from the local to the eternal truths which she and Rowe so heartily believed in. Finally, her morbid resignation turns into something more positive - a constructive and lasting hope that good will come out of evil. Lady Jane's death is both tragic waste and glorious death leading to life eternal. The idea is undramatic, though, for tension cannot exist alongside this hope, and the drama becomes "poetic" rather than theatrical when focusing on the heroine at the end.

In the final act many of the more tearful scenes are told in narrative form. The act is crowded with activity and stage interest; Gardner is at pains to exclude the public from the execution because he is perceptive enough to realise that Lady Jane will die a martyr, but he does allow the couple to see each other. Pembroke has managed to secure the queen's mercy for the couple - finally convinced of the value of Guilford's unselfish friendship - and he denounces Gardner:

Thy narrow Soul  
Knows not the godlike Glory of Forgiving. (V i, p. 57)

In their heated encounter is a splendid contrast and use of invective:

Gardner. Come, come, my Lord,  
You have too little of the Statesman in you.  
Pembroke. And you, my Lord, too little of the Churchman. (Ibid.)

As Pembroke goes to tell the couple of their royal pardon Guilford is seen investing Lady Jane with all the characteristics of a saint. She is too wrapped up in her devotions to welcome an encounter, even with her husband, but she accepts her freedom with pleasure. This freedom is rescinded because Gardner persuaded the queen to change her mind and Lady Jane prepares

for death, devoting the rest of her time to trying to persuade her husband to copy her "divine example" (V i, p. 63). Guilford is led off to execution but news of his death merely irritates Lady Jane; she says to Gardner

Cease, thou Raven;  
 Nor violate with thy profaner Malice  
 My bleeding Guilford's Ghost -- 'tis gone, 'tis flown;  
 But lingers on, and waits for me. (V i, p. 64)

Lady Jane condemns violence as she mounts the scaffold, and prays that God will raise a monarch to save her country from "the Rage of Rome" (V i, p. 65).

In this play Rowe concentrates almost entirely on his heroine. She is a Queen, a lover and a saint. The mood at the end wavers between domestic sentimentality (in the fourth act) and martyrdom (at the end). But there is some weakness in characterisation; in Guilford we have a man who is good, but dramatically too weak, and who therefore seems to be manipulated by his wife. Pembroke is the most vivid and exciting character in the play. His vitality and hot-temperedness soon gain our admiration, and his realisation of Guilford's forgiving nature is well presented. The author seems to be trying to fuse two ideas here - tragedy and the Christian exemplum play, but the preponderance of speeches intended to provoke tears clogs the development of the play from time to time so that it is often on the point of becoming static.

Notes

- 1 J.J. Lynch, Box, Pit and Gallery (University of California Press: Berkeley & Los Angeles, 1953), p. 38.
- 2 Nicholas Rowe, The Ambitious Step-Mother. For Peter Buck, 1701. Edition used: For R. Wellington, and Thomas Osborne, 1702. MM B.3351.
- |                        |                    |
|------------------------|--------------------|
| Dec 1700 LIF*          | Mon 5 Feb 1759 DL  |
| Fri 6 Dec 1706 Queen's | Th 8 Feb 1759 DL   |
| Wed 14 Dec 1715 LIF    | Sat 10 Feb 1759 DL |
| Th 29 Dec 1715 LIF     | Fri 9 Feb 1759 DL  |
| Th 25 Jan 1722 DL      | Mon 19 Feb 1759 DL |
| Th 1 Feb 1759 DL       |                    |
- \*Date of première unknown.
- 3 Landon C. Burns Jr., "The Tragedies of Nicholas Rowe". unpubl. doctoral diss. Yale University, 1966.
- 4 Epistle Dedicatory to the Right Honourable the Earl of Jersey, A2v.
- 5 Nicholas Rowe, Tamerlane. For Jacob Tonson, 1702. Edition used: Ed. Landon C. Burns Jr. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1969.
- |                        |                      |
|------------------------|----------------------|
| Dec 1701 LIF*          | Wed 29 Jan 1718 DL   |
| Th 6 Apr 1704 LIF      | Sat 1 Feb 1718 LIF   |
| Sat 13 Jan 1705 LIF    | Tu 11 Feb 1718 LIF   |
| Mon 4 Mar 1706 Queen's | Wed 8 Oct 1718 LIF   |
| Th 19 Nov 1706 Queen's | Tu 4 Nov 1718 DL     |
| Th 15 Apr 1708 DL      | Tu 4 Nov 1718 LIF    |
| Tu 7 Mar 1710 GR       | Wed 5 Nov 1718 DL    |
| Fri 13 May 1715 LIF    | Th 1 Jan 1719 DL     |
| Mon 16 May 1715 LIF    | Th 12 Mar 1719 DL    |
| Th 26 June 1715 LIF    | Mon 4 May 1719 DL    |
| Sat 15 Oct 1715 LIF    | Wed 4 Nov 1719 DL    |
| Mon 5 Nov 1716 DL      | Th 5 Nov 1719 DL     |
| Tu 6 Nov 1716 DL       | Sat 2 Apr 1720 DL    |
| Wed 7 Nov 1716 DL      | Fri 4 Nov 1720 DL    |
| Th 8 Nov 1716 DL       | Sat 5 Nov 1720 DL    |
| Fri 9 Nov 1716 DL      | Mon 6 Feb 1721 SOU   |
| Sat 10 Nov 1716 DL     | Sat 11 Feb 1721 DL   |
| Th 15 Nov 1716 DL      | Tu 25 Apr 1721 LIF   |
| Th 6 Dec 1716 DL       | Sat 14 Oct 1721 LIF  |
| Th 27 Dec 1716 DL      | Sat 4 Nov 1721 DL    |
| Sat 16 Mar 1717 DL     | Sat 4 Nov 1721 LIF   |
| Mon 19 Apr 1717 DL     | Mon 6 Nov 1721 DL    |
| Mon 4 Nov 1717 DL      | Sun 19 Nov 1721 GR** |
| Tu 5 Nov 1717 DL       | Sat 14 Apr 1722 GR   |
- \*Date of première unknown.  
 \*\*See London Stage, II, 652.

Tu	15	May	1722	LIF	Th	4	June	1730	LIF
Mon	21	May	1722	DL	Wed	4	Nov	1730	DL
Mon	5	Nov	1722	LIF	Wed	4	Nov	1730	LIF
Mon	5	Nov	1722	DL	Th	5	Nov	1730	DL
Tu	6	Nov	1722	LIF	Th	5	Nov	1730	LIF
Tu	6	Nov	1722	DL	Th	5	Nov	1730	GF
Sat	2	Feb	1723	LIF	Mon	9	Nov	1730	GF
Wed	15	May	1723	LIF	Sat	21	Nov	1730	GF
Mon	4	Nov	1723	DL	Tu	19	Jan	1731	DL
Mon	4	Nov	1723	LIF	Fri	12	Feb	1731	GF
Tu	5	Nov	1723	DL	Th	25	Mar	1731	GF
Tu	5	Nov	1723	LIF	Th	4	Nov	1731	DL
Tu	3	Nov	1724	King's	Th	4	Nov	1731	LIF
Wed	4	Nov	1724	DL	Th	4	Nov	1731	GF
Wed	4	Nov	1724	LIF	Fri	5	Nov	1731	DL
Th	5	Nov	1724	DL	Fri	5	Nov	1731	LIF
Th	5	Nov	1724	LIF	Fri	5	Nov	1731	GF
Sat	1	May	1725	DL	Tu	28	Dec	1731	DL
Th	4	Nov	1725	DL	Tu	28	Mar	1732	GF
Th	4	Nov	1725	LIF	Sat	4	Nov	1732	DL
Fri	5	Nov	1725	DL	Sat	4	Nov	1732	LIF
Fri	5	Nov	1725	LIF	Sat	4	Nov	1732	GF
Fri	4	Nov	1726	DL	Mon	6	Nov	1732	LIF
Fri	4	Nov	1726	LIF	Mon	6	Nov	1732	GF
Sat	5	Nov	1726	DL	Tu	7	Nov	1732	GF
Sat	5	Nov	1726	LIF	Sat	11	Nov	1732	GF
Th	16	Feb	1727	DL	Sat	30	Dec	1732	GF
Sat	25	Apr	1727	DL	Tu	20	Feb	1733	HAY
Th	11	May	1727	DL	Th	23	Aug	1733	BF
Before	7	June	1727	MH*	Tu	4	Sep	1733	BF
Sat	4	Nov	1727	DL	Mon	5	Nov	1733	DL
Sat	4	Nov	1727	LIF	Mon	5	Nov	1733	CG
Mon	6	Nov	1727	DL	Mon	5	Nov	1733	GF
Mon	6	Nov	1727	LIF	Mon	5	Nov	1733	HAY
Tu	13	Feb	1728	DL	Tu	6	Nov	1733	CG
Wed	29	June	1728	DL	Tu	6	Nov	1733	GF
Mon	1	July	1728	HAY	Tu	6	Nov	1733	HAY
Sat	14	Sep	1728	DL	Mon	8	July	1734	YB
Mon	4	Nov	1728	DL	Mon	4	Nov	1734	DL
Mon	4	Nov	1728	LIF	Mon	4	Nov	1734	CG
Tu	5	Nov	1728	DL	Mon	4	Nov	1734	GF
Tu	5	Nov	1728	LIF	Mon	4	Nov	1734	GR
Fri	2	May	1729	HAY	Tu	5	Nov	1734	DL
Mon	5	May	1729	DL	Tu	5	Nov	1734	CG
Tu	4	Nov	1729	DL	Tu	5	Nov	1734	GF
Tu	4	Nov	1729	LIF	Tu	5	Nov	1734	GR
Wed	5	Nov	1729	DL	Wed	6	Nov	1734	CG
Wed	5	Nov	1729	LIF	Fri	27	Dec	1734	CG
Wed	31	Dec	1729	DL	Tu	21	Jan	1735	DL
Th	7	May	1730	DL	Tu	4	Mar	1735	DL

\*See London Stage, II, 929.

Mon	14	Apr	1735	GF	
Tu	4	Nov	1735	DL	
Tu	4	Nov	1735	CG	
Tu	4	Nov	1735	GF	
Wed	5	Nov	1735	DL	
Wed	5	Nov	1735	CG	
Wed	5	Nov	1735	GF	
Th	6	Nov	1735	GF	
Sat	22	Nov	1735	GF	
Th	4	Nov	1736	DL	
Th	4	Nov	1736	CG	
Th	4	Nov	1736	LIF	
Fri	5	Nov	1736	DL	
Fri	5	Nov	1736	CG	
Fri	4	Nov	1737	DL	
Fri	4	Nov	1737	CG	
Sat	5	Nov	1737	DL	
Sat	5	Nov	1737	CG	
Mon	7	Nov	1737	DL	
Fri	21	July	1738	CG	
Sat	4	Nov	1738	DL	
Sat	4	Nov	1738	CG	
Mon	6	Nov	1738	DL	
Mon	6	Nov	1738	CG	
Tu	7	Nov	1738	DL	
Mon	5	Nov	1739	DL	
Mon	5	Nov	1739	CG	
Tu	6	Nov	1739	DL	
Tu	4	Nov	1740	DL	
Tu	4	Nov	1740	CG	
Tu	4	Nov	1740	GF	
Wed	5	Nov	1740	DL	
Wed	4	Nov	1741	DL	
Wed	4	Nov	1741	CG	
Wed	4	Nov	1741	GF	
Th	5	Nov	1741	DL	
Th	5	Nov	1741	CG	
Th	4	Nov	1742	DL	
Th	4	Nov	1742	CG	
Fri	5	Nov	1742	CG	
Fri	4	Nov	1743	DL	
Fri	4	Nov	1743	CG	
Sat	5	Nov	1743	DL	
Mon	5	Nov	1744	DL	
Mon	5	Nov	1744	CG	
Tu	6	Nov	1744	CG	
Sat	10	Nov	1744	DL	
Th	22	Nov	1744	DL	
Mon	26	Nov	1744	DL	
Fri	30	Nov	1744	DL	
Mon	14	Jan	1745	JS	
Mon	4	Nov	1745	DL	
Mon	4	Nov	1745	CG	
Tu	5	Nov	1745	DL	
Tu	5	Nov	1745	CG	
Tu	4	Nov	1746	DL	
Tu	4	Nov	1746	CG	
Tu	4	Nov	1746	GF	
Wed	5	Nov	1746	CG	
Wed	5	Nov	1746	GF	
Tu	27	Jan	1747	RL	
Sat	22	Aug	1747	BF	
Wed	4	Nov	1747	DL	
Th	5	Nov	1747	DL	
Fri	4	Nov	1748	DL	
Fri	4	Nov	1748	CG	
Sat	5	Nov	1748	DL	
Sat	5	Nov	1748	CG	
Sat	4	Nov	1749	DL	
Sat	4	Nov	1749	CG	
Mon	6	Nov	1749	CG	
Th	10	May	1749	NW	SM
Mon	5	Nov	1750	DL	
Mon	5	Nov	1750	CG	
Tu	6	Nov	1750	DL	
Tu	6	Nov	1750	CG	
Wed	7	Nov	1750	CG	
Th	11	Apr	1751	CG	
Mon	4	Nov	1751	DL	
Mon	4	Nov	1751	CG	
Tu	5	Nov	1751	DL	
Tu	5	Nov	1751	CG	
Tu	12	Mar	1752	HAY	
Sat	4	Nov	1752	DL	
Sat	4	Nov	1752	CG	
Mon	6	Nov	1752	CG	
Mon	5	Nov	1753	DL	
Mon	5	Nov	1753	CG	
Tu	6	Nov	1753	CG	
Mon	4	Nov	1754	DL	
Mon	4	Nov	1754	CG	
Tu	4	Nov	1755	DL	
Tu	4	Nov	1755	CG	
Th	4	Nov	1756	DL	
Th	4	Nov	1756	CG	
Fri	4	Nov	1757	DL	
Fri	4	Nov	1757	CG	
Sat	5	Nov	1757	DL	
Sat	4	Nov	1758	DL	
Sat	4	Nov	1758	CG	
Mon	6	Nov	1758	CG	
Mon	5	Nov	1759	DL	
Mon	5	Nov	1759	CG	
Sat	3	May	1760	DL	

Wed	4	Nov	1761	DL	Wed	4	Nov	1772	CG
Wed	4	Nov	1761	CG	Fri	14	May	1773	DL
Th	5	Nov	1761	CG	Th	4	Nov	1773	DL
Th	4	Nov	1762	DL	Th	4	Nov	1773	CG
Fri	5	Nov	1762	CG	Fri	5	Nov	1773	DL
Fri	4	Nov	1763	DL	Fri	4	Nov	1774	DL
Fri	4	Nov	1763	CG	Sat	4	Nov	1775	DL
Mon	5	Nov	1764	DL	Sat	4	Nov	1775	CG
Mon	5	Nov	1764	CG	Mon	6	Nov	1775	CG
Mon	11	Nov	1765	DL	Mon	4	Nov	1776	DL
Tu	4	Nov	1766	DL	Sat	26	Apr	1777	DL
Tu	4	Nov	1766	CG	Tu	4	Nov	1777	DL
Wed	4	Nov	1767	DL	Wed	4	Nov	1778	CG
Wed	4	Nov	1767	CG	Mon	1	May	1780	CG
Th	5	Nov	1767	DL	Sat	4	Nov	1780	DL
Th	5	Nov	1767	CG	Sat	4	Nov	1780	CG
Mon	30	Nov	1767	DL	Mon	5	Nov	1781	CG
Fri	4	Nov	1768	DL	Tu	4	Nov	1783	CG
Sat	4	Nov	1769	DL	Wed	5	Nov	1783	CG
Sat	4	Nov	1769	CG	Th	4	Nov	1784	CG
Mon	6	Nov	1769	DL	Mon	6	Mar	1786	HAY
Mon	6	Nov	1769	CG	Mon	22	Dec	1788	HAY
Mon	15	Jan	1770	CG	Th	4	Nov	1790	CG
Mon	5	Nov	1770	DL	Fri	3	Feb	1797	DL
Mon	5	Nov	1770	CG	Mon	6	Feb	1797	DL
Wed	7	Nov	1770	DL	Wed	8	Feb	1797	DL
Mon	4	Nov	1771	DL	Fri	24	Feb	1797	DL
Mon	4	Nov	1771	CG	Th	2	Mar	1797	DL
Tu	5	Nov	1771	DL	Tu	7	Mar	1797	DL
Wed	6	Nov	1771	CG	Sat	25	Mar	1797	DL
Wed	20	May	1772	DL	Sat	4	Nov	1797	DL
Wed	4	Nov	1772	DL	Wed	29	Nov	1797	DL

- 6 Epistle Dedicatory to the Right Honourable William, Lord Marquis of Hartington, pp. 17-18.
- 7 Also note the anniversary of the gunpowder plot; this would increase the element of anti-Catholicism.
- 8 Willard Thorp, "A Key to Rowe's Tamerlane" Journal of English and Germanic Philology, 39 (1940), 124-7.
- 9 Donald B. Clark, "The Source and Characterisation of Tamerlane" Modern Language Notes 65 (1950), 142-52.
- 10 Thorp, op. cit., 125.
- 11 J.R. Sutherland, Three Plays by Nicholas Rowe (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929), p. 339.

12 Thorp, op. cit., 126.

13 Ibid., 127.

14 Clark, op. cit., 148.

15 Ibid., 149ff.

16 Nicholas Rowe, The Fair Penitent. Ed. Malcolm Goldstein. London: Edward Arnold, 1969. First edition: For Jacob Tonson, 1703.

May 1703 LIF\*

Th	8	June	1703	LIF	Mon	7	Dec	1730	HAY
Th	18	Aug	1715	LIF	Fri	22	Jan	1731	GF
Tu	23	Aug	1715	LIF	Th	29	Apr	1731	GF
Tu	3	Nov	1715	LIF	Mon	21	June	1731	WINH
Sat	7	Apr	1716	LIF	Tu	12	Oct	1731	DL
Sat	11	Jan	1718	LIF	Tu	21	Mar	1732	DL
Th	16	Jan	1718	LIF	Th	14	Sep	1732	DL
Sat	15	Mar	1718	LIF	Tu	17	Apr	1733	CG
Fri	20	Mar	1719	CG	Th	12	Aug	1733	HAY
Tu	14	June	1720	DL	Tu	5	Mar	1734	GF
Fri	2	June	1721	DL	Sat	30	Mar	1734	DL
Mon	16	Dec	1723	HAY	Fri	19	Apr	1734	DL
Tu	17	Dec	1723	HAY	Wed	19	June	1734	HAY
Fri	3	Jan	1724	HAY	Wed	21	Aug	1734	HAY
Th	12	Mar	1724	HAY	Mon	2	Sep	1734	RI
Fri	12	Nov	1725	DL	Th	18	Dec	1735	YB
Sat	13	Nov	1725	DL	Mon	15	Mar	1736	CG
Mon	15	Nov	1725	DL	Tu	23	Mar	1736	GF
Sat	11	Dec	1725	DL	Mon	5	Apr	1736	GF
Wed	19	Jan	1726	DL	Th	15	Apr	1736	CG
Tu	8	Mar	1726	DL	Mon	31	Jan	1737	YB
Th	8	Sep	1726	DL	Fri	11	Feb	1737	CG
Sat	11	Mar	1727	DL	Th	24	Feb	1737	CG
Tu	11	Apr	1727	DL	Sat	2	Apr	1737	CG
Sat	9	Dec	1727	DL	Tu	15	Nov	1737	CG
Th	2	May	1728	DL	Fri	3	Feb	1738	CG
Tu	22	Oct	1728	DL	Sat	29	Apr	1738	DL
Tu	17	Dec	1728	DL	Sat	18	Nov	1738	CG
Tu	11	Feb	1729	DL	Sat	27	Feb	1739	CG
Tu	25	Mar	1729	DL	Sat	6	Oct	1739	CG
Mon	8	Dec	1729	GF	Sat	3	Nov	1739	DL
Sat	20	Dec	1729	DL	Th	27	Mar	1740	DL
Th	15	Jan	1730	GF	Th	20	Nov	1740	GF
Sat	24	Jan	1730	GF	Tu	7	Apr	1741	GF
Th	19	Feb	1730	DL	Tu	16	June	1741	JS
Sat	21	Feb	1730	DL	Wed	2	Dec	1741	GF
Th	19	Mar	1730	DL	Th	3	Dec	1741	GF
Wed	27	May	1730	GF	Sat	12	Dec	1741	GF
Tu	7	July	1730	HAY	Mon	28	Dec	1741	GF
Tu	27	Oct	1730	GF	Sat	16	Jan	1742	GF
Sat	5	Dec	1730	DL	Fri	22	Jan	1742	GF

Th	11	Feb	1742	GF	Th	4	Feb	1748	DL
Mon	22	Feb	1742	GF	Sat	6	Feb	1748	DL
Sat	27	Feb	1742	GF	Th	22	Mar	1748	DL
Mon	19	Apr	1742	GF	Tu	26	Apr	1748	DL
Mon	24	May	1742	GF	Mon	4	July	1748	SOU
Th	21	Oct	1742	CG	Mon	10	Oct	1748	CG
Sat	6	Nov	1742	CG	Wed	12	Oct	1748	CG
Fri	10	Dec	1742	CG	Sat	22	Oct	1748	DL
Fri	21	Jan	1743	LIF	Th	24	Nov	1748	DL
Tu	25	Jan	1743	CG	Tu	24	Jan	1749	DL
Tu	8	Mar	1743	LIF	Mon	27	Feb	1749	DL
Mon	14	Mar	1743	CG	Mon	6	Mar	1749	CG
Th	24	Mar	1743	DL	Fri	31	Mar	1749	DL
Tu	12	Apr	1743	CG	Tu	18	Apr	1749	HAY
Mon	18	Apr	1743	DL	Mon	3	July	1749	JS
Fri	20	May	1743	CG	Sat	21	Oct	1749	DL
Tu	20	Dec	1743	DL	Th	26	Oct	1749	HAY
Tu	7	Feb	1744	CG	Sat	25	Nov	1749	DL
Wed	28	Mar	1744	JS	Wed	6	Dec	1749	DL
Sat	21	Apr	1744	DL	Tu	20	Mar	1750	CG
Mon	11	June	1744	MF	Mon	20	Aug	1750	NW SM
Fri	28	Sep	1744	CG	Sat	10	Nov	1750	HAY
Sat	20	Oct	1744	DL	Wed	28	Nov	1750	DL
Wed	31	Oct	1744	DL	Sat	19	Jan	1751	CG
Wed	21	Nov	1744	DL	Mon	21	Jan	1751	DL
Th	24	Jan	1745	GF	Mon	21	Jan	1751	CG
Th	7	Feb	1745	DL	Wed	23	Jan	1751	CG
Fri	8	Mar	1745	JS	Th	31	Jan	1751	CG
Mon	11	Mar	1745	DL	Fri	26	Apr	1751	DL
Sat	6	Apr	1745	DL	Wed	15	May	1751	CG
Tu	30	Apr	1745	DL	Fri	8	Nov	1751	DL
Mon	6	May	1745	GF	Sat	9	Nov	1751	DL
Th	12	Dec	1745	DL	Mon	11	Nov	1751	DL
Th	26	Dec	1745	JS	Fri	15	Nov	1751	DL
Wed	29	Jan	1746	DL	Fri	22	Nov	1751	DL
Fri	14	Nov	1746	CG	Fri	20	Dec	1751	HAY
Sat	15	Nov	1746	CG	Mon	23	Dec	1751	DL
Wed	19	Nov	1746	CG	Fri	24	Apr	1752	CG
Th	20	Nov	1746	CG	Wed	13	May	1752	CG
Fri	21	Nov	1746	CG	Wed	11	Oct	1752	DL
Sat	22	Nov	1746	CG	Tu	7	Nov	1752	DL
Th	27	Nov	1746	CG	Wed	22	Nov	1752	CG
Sat	29	Nov	1746	CG	Th	1	Feb	1753	DL
Mon	1	Dec	1746	CG	Th	15	Feb	1753	CG
Tu	16	Dec	1746	CG	Sat	24	Mar	1753	CG
Wed	31	Dec	1746	CG	Th	26	Apr	1753	DL
Mon	30	Mar	1747	CG	Fri	27	Apr	1753	CG
Th	7	May	1747	CG	Wed	31	Oct	1753	DL
Wed	27	June	1747	CG	Sat	3	Nov	1753	DL
Mon	1	Feb	1748	DL	Fri	30	Nov	1753	CG
Tu	2	Feb	1748	DL	Mon	31	Dec	1753	HIC

Wed	2	Jan	1754	HIC	Sat	21	Apr	1770	DL
Fri	4	Jan	1754	DL	Mon	9	July	1770	HAY
Th	28	Mar	1754	DL	Fri	13	July	1770	HAY
Mon	29	Apr	1754	CG	Wed	18	July	1770	HAY
Wed	6	Nov	1754	DL	Mon	30	July	1770	HAY
Wed	14	May	1755	DL	Sat	1	Sep	1770	HAY
Mon	12	Jan	1756	DL	Sat	20	Oct	1770	DL
Sat	3	Apr	1756	DL	Sat	27	Oct	1770	DL
Tu	23	Nov	1756	DL	Th	15	Nov	1770	CG
Mon	21	Feb	1757	CG	Mon	19	Nov	1770	CG
Th	24	Feb	1757	CG	Wed	16	Jan	1771	CG
Mon	28	Feb	1757	CG	Mon	28	Jan	1771	HAY
Th	24	Mar	1757	CG	Fri	16	Apr	1771	DL
Fri	22	Apr	1757	CG	Sat	2	Nov	1771	CG
Wed	12	Apr	1758	CG	Tu	12	Nov	1771	DL
Fri	11	Apr	1760	DL	Tu	17	Mar	1772	CG
Th	20	Nov	1760	DL	Tu	6	Oct	1772	DL
Sat	29	Nov	1760	DL	Tu	5	Jan	1773	DL
Th	4	Dec	1760	DL	Tu	4	May	1773	DL
Sat	6	Dec	1760	DL	Tu	26	Oct	1773	DL
Fri	19	Dec	1760	DL	Sat	26	Feb	1774	CG
Fri	2	Jan	1761	DL	Tu	1	Mar	1774	CG
Mon	30	Mar	1761	DL	Sat	5	Mar	1774	CG
Tu	15	Mar	1763	DL	Th	10	Mar	1774	CG
Fri	8	Apr	1763	DL	Sat	11	Feb	1775	CG
Sat	17	Nov	1764	DL	Tu	14	Feb	1775	CG
Wed	21	Nov	1764	DL	Sat	28	Oct	1775	DL
Th	7	Mar	1765	DL	Fri	10	Nov	1775	CG
Th	28	Mar	1765	DL	Tu	16	Jan	1776	DL
Th	2	May	1765	DL	Mon	29	Apr	1776	CG
Tu	15	Oct	1765	DL	Wed	8	May	1776	CG
Wed	16	Oct	1765	DL	Th	3	Oct	1776	DL
Wed	20	May	1766	HAY	Wed	18	June	1777	CHA
Mon	15	Sep	1766	King's	Mon	16	Feb	1778	CG
Th	16	Oct	1766	DL	Tu	6	Apr	1779	CG
Fri	7	Nov	1766	CG	Wed	14	Apr	1779	CG
Th	13	Nov	1766	CG	Mon	4	Oct	1779	CG
Sat	15	Nov	1766	CG	Wed	18	Oct	1780	CG
Tu	2	Dec	1766	CG	Tu	2	Jan	1781	CG
Mon	8	Dec	1766	DL	Mon	12	Mar	1781	CG
Tu	28	Apr	1767	DL	Tu	27	Mar	1781	CII
Th	22	Oct	1767	CG	Tu	1	Jan	1782	CG
Sat	24	Oct	1767	CG	Mon	26	Aug	1782	HAY
Fri	20	Nov	1767	CG	Mon	2	Sep	1782	HAY
Mon	7	Dec	1767	CG	Fri	27	Sep	1782	CG
Wed	12	Oct	1768	CG	Fri	29	Nov	1782	DL
Sat	18	Mar	1769	DL	Mon	2	Dec	1782	DL
Wed	19	Apr	1769	DL	Fri	6	Dec	1782	DL
Th	4	May	1769	CG	Mon	23	Dec	1782	DL
Sat	11	Nov	1769	DL	Mon	30	Dec	1782	HAY
Sat	6	Jan	1770	DL	Sat	4	Jan	1783	DL

Tu 14 Jan 1783 DL	Mon 2 May 1785 CG
Mon 20 Jan 1783 DL	Wed 27 July 1785 HAMM
Mon 10 Feb 1783 DL	Wed 15 Feb 1786 DL
Mon 17 Feb 1783 CG	Sat 18 Nov 1786 DL
Fri 21 Feb 1783 DL	Mon 27 Nov 1786 CG
Fri 28 Feb 1783 DL	Fri 29 Dec 1786 CG
Sat 22 Mar 1783 DL	Fri 5 Jan 1787 DL
Sat 5 Apr 1783 DL	Mon 16 Apr 1787 DL
Th 1 May 1783 DL	Tu 11 Nov 1788 DL
Th 22 May 1783 DL	Mon 14 Dec 1789 CG
Tu 21 Oct 1783 DL	Tu 31 Feb 1792 DL at King's
Sat 3 Jan 1784 CG	Sat 3 Nov 1792 CG
Sat 10 Jan 1784 CG	Tu 23 Apr 1793 DL at King's
Tu 24 Feb 1784 DL	Tu 18 Feb 1794 CG
Tu 16 Nov 1784 DL	Sat 8 Nov 1794 CG
Tu 12 Apr 1785 CG	

- 17 Frank J. Kearful, "The Nature of Tragedy in Rowe's The Fair Penitent". Papers in Language and Literature II (1966), 351-60.
- 18 Donald B. Clark, "An Eighteenth-Century Adaptation of Massinger". Modern Language Quarterly XIII (1952), 239-52.
- 19 Philip Massinger, The Fatal Dowry. Ed. T.A. Dunn. Oliver & Boyd: Edinburgh, 1969.
- 20 Kearful, op. cit., 359
- 21 Lindley A. Wyman, "The Tradition of the Formal Meditation in Rowe's The Fair Penitent". Philological Quarterly XLII (1963), 412-6.
- 22 Ed. Malcolm Goldstein. See note 16.
- 23 Nicholas Rowe, Ulysses. For Jacob Tonson, 1706. MM B.3332.
- |                         |                         |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Fri 23 Nov 1705 Queen's | Fri 30 Nov 1705 Queen's |
| Sat 24 Nov 1705 Queen's | Sat 1 Dec 1705 Queen's  |
| Mon 26 Nov 1705 Queen's | Th 6 Dec 1705 Queen's   |
| Tu 27 Nov 1705 Queen's  | Sat 8 Dec 1705 Queen's  |
| Wed 28 Nov 1705 Queen's | Sat 15 Dec 1705 Queen's |
|                         | Tu 19 Feb 1706 Queen's  |
|                         | Tu 23 Mar 1756 CG       |
- 24 John Genest, A History of the English Stage (Bath, 1832) II, 345.
- 25 Donald B. Clark, "Nicholas Rowe: a Study in the Development of the Pathetic Tragedy." George Washington University... Summaries of Doctoral Dissertations, 1947 and 1948, p. 13.

26 Three Plays. Ed. J.R. Sutherland, p. 31.

27 See my M.A. thesis, Nicholas Rowe and His Neglected Tragedies, McMaster University, 1970, pp. 74-118 for a much fuller treatment of this play.

28 Nicholas Rowe. The Royal Convert. For Jacob Tonson, 1714. MM B.4296.

Tu 25 Nov 1707 Queen's	Tu 7 Dec 1762 CG
Wed 26 Nov 1707 Queen's	Tu 17 May 1763 CG
Th 27 Nov 1707 Queen's	Mon 3 Oct 1763 CG
Fri 28 Nov 1707 Queen's	Sat 5 Nov 1763 CG
Sat 29 Nov 1707 Queen's	Wed 14 Dec 1763 CG
Mon 1 Dec 1707 Queen's	Tu 3 Jan 1764 CG
Sat 3 Jan 1708 Queen's	Tu 31 Jan 1764 CG
Th 16 Jan 1724 HAY	Mon 9 Apr 1764 CG
Th 20 Feb 1724 HAY	Tu 1 May 1764 CG
Mon 16 Mar 1724 HAY	Mon 1 Oct 1764 CG
Th 4 Jan 1739 CG	Fri 2 Nov 1764 CG
Fri 5 Jan 1739 CG	Sat 26 Jan 1765 CG
Tu 9 Jan 1739 CG	Th 16 May 1765 CG
Th 18 Jan 1739 CG	Th 3 Oct 1765 CG
Th 25 Mar 1739 CG	Sat 23 Nov 1765 CG
Mon 15 Nov 1762 CG	Mon 10 Feb 1766 CG
Wed 17 Nov 1762 CG	Fri 21 Nov 1766 CG
Sat 20 Nov 1739 CG	Th 14 Nov 1776 CG*
Th 25 Nov 1762 CG	Mon 18 Nov 1776 CG*
Wed 1 Dec 1762 CG	Tu 3 Dec 1776 CG*

\*Performances entitled "Ethelinda; or, The Royal Captive". (London Stage V, 36)

29 Nicholas Rowe, The Tragedy of Jane Shore. For Bernard Lintott [1714]. MM B.3328.

30 Jane Shore is one of the very few plays of this period to last right through the eighteenth-century. The list of performances is as follows:

Tu 2 Feb 1714 DL	Mon 1 Mar 1714 DL
Wed 3 Feb 1714 DL	Th 4 Mar 1714 DL
Th 4 Feb 1714 DL	Tu 16 Mar 1714 DL
Fri 5 Feb 1714 DL	Tu 20 Apr 1714 DL
Sat 6 Feb 1714 DL	Sat 25 Sep 1714 DL
Mon 8 Feb 1714 DL	Sat 6 Nov 1714 DL
Tu 9 Feb 1714 DL	Sat 11 Dec 1714 DL
Th 11 Feb 1714 DL	Wed 23 Feb 1715 DL
Sat 13 Feb 1714 DL	Tu 17 May 1715 DL
Mon 15 Feb 1714 DL	Tu 18 Oct 1715 DL
Tu 16 Feb 1714 DL	Mon 2 Jan 1716 DL
Th 18 Feb 1714 DL	Sat 12 May 1716 DL
Sat 20 Feb 1714 DL	Th 1 Nov 1716 DL
Tu 23 Feb 1714 DL	Fri 30 Dec 1716 DL
Th 25 Feb 1714 DL	Sat 30 Nov 1717 DL

Sat	11	Jan	1718	DL	Tu	9	Nov	1736	CG
Th	6	Mar	1718	DL	Fri	26	Nov	1736	CG
Tu	21	Oct	1718	DL	Fri	28	Feb	1737	CG
Tu	30	Dec	1718	DL	Tu	27	Oct	1737	CG
Sat	5	Dec	1719	DL	Sat	28	Jan	1738	CG
Sat	26	Mar	1720	DL	Wed	18	Oct	1738	CG
Fri	3	Feb	1721	DL	Wed	10	Jan	1739	CG
Sat	1	Apr	1721	DL	Sat	17	Mar	1739	DL
Tu	14	Nov	1721	DL	Th	22	Nov	1739	CG
Th	28	July	1722	HAY	Mon	3	Nov	1740	GF
Tu	8	Jan	1723	DL	Mon	9	Feb	1741	GF
Sat	30	Dec	1723	DL	Th	26	Feb	1741	CG
Mon	2	Mar	1724	HAY	Sat	2	May	1741	GF
Th	12	Mar	1724	DL	Wed	23	Sep	1741	GF
Sat	25	Apr	1724	DL	Th	18	Mar	1742	CG
Tu	22	Dec	1724	DL	Sat	3	Apr	1742	CG
Th	9	Feb	1727	DL	Fri	11	Feb	1743	LIF
Th	16	Mar	1727	DL	Th	3	Mar	1743	DL
Mon	27	Nov	1727	DL	Tu	15	Mar	1743	DL
Th	28	Jan	1728	DL	Sat	9	Apr	1743	DL
Sat	11	Oct	1729	DL	Tu	12	Apr	1743	DL
Fri	7	Nov	1729	GF	Tu	19	Apr	1743	DL
Tu	16	Dec	1729	GF	Mon	3	Oct	1743	CG
Wed	15	Apr	1730	DL	Th	24	Nov	1743	DL
Mon	13	July	1730	GF	Fri	21	Dec	1744	GF
Sat	5	Dec	1730	GF	Fri	28	Dec	1744	GF
Mon	22	Mar	1731	DL	Mon	6	May	1745	MF
Tu	18	Nov	1731	GF	Fri	10	May	1745	MF
Tu	15	Aug	1732	DL	Fri	6	Dec	1745	GF
Mon	12	Feb	1733	GF	Fri	2	Jan	1747	CG
Fri	13	Apr	1733	DL	Sat	3	Jan	1747	CG
Th	23	Sep	1733	BF	Mon	5	Jan	1747	CG
Mon	29	Oct	1733	HAY	Tu	6	Jan	1747	CG
Th	17	Jan	1734	HAY	Th	8	Jan	1747	CG
Tu	19	Mar	1734	GF	Fri	9	Jan	1747	CG
Tu	20	Aug	1734	HAY	Sat	10	Jan	1747	CG
Mon	11	Nov	1734	GF	Mon	12	Jan	1747	CG
Sat	25	Jan	1735	CG	Fri	16	Jan	1747	CG
Mon	27	Jan	1735	CG	Mon	23	Mar	1747	CG
Fri	31	Jan	1735	GF	Tu	24	Mar	1747	HAY
Fri	7	Feb	1735	CG	Mon	27	Apr	1747	CG
Tu	13	May	1735	CG	Fri	29	June	1747	CG
Wed	17	Sep	1735	HAY	Th	24	Oct	1747	SF
Fri	26	Sep	1735	YB	Sat	2	Jan	1748	DL
Mon	29	Sep	1735	YB	Mon	4	Jan	1748	DL
Wed	3	Dec	1735	CG	Tu	5	Jan	1748	DL
Wed	14	Jan	1736	CG	Fri	8	Jan	1748	DL
Wed	11	Feb	1736	HAY	Sat	9	Jan	1748	DL
Mon	16	Feb	1736	GF	Mon	11	Jan	1748	DL

Fri 29 Jan	1748	DL	Sat 30 Nov	1754	DL
Mon 14 Mar	1748	DL	Mon 14 Apr	1755	DL
Th 21 Apr	1748	DL	Tu 15 Apr	1755	CG
Mon 2 May	1748	HAY	Th 6 Nov	1755	DL
Fri 21 Oct	1748	CG	Tu 6 Apr	1756	DL
Wed 2 Nov	1748	DL	Mon 21 Mar	1757	DL
Sat 3 Dec	1748	CG	Mon 25 Apr	1757	DL
Mon 5 Dec	1748	CG	Tu 1 Nov	1757	DL
Mon 19 Dec	1748	CG	Tu 25 Apr	1758	DL
Mon 26 Dec	1748	JS	Th 2 Nov	1758	DL
Wed 28 Dec	1748	CG	Tu 5 Apr	1759	CG
Th 5 Jan	1749	NW MF	Mon 16 Apr	1759	CG
Tu 10 Jan	1749	NW MF	Mon 14 May	1759	CG
Tu 7 Feb	1749	CG	Tu 20 Dec	1759	DL
Mon 20 Feb	1749	SOU	Mon 24 Jan	1760	CG
Mon 13 Mar	1749	CG	Fri 28 Jan	1760	CG
Wed 15 Mar	1749	JS	Wed 13 Feb	1760	CG
Th 16 Mar	1749	DL	Th 8 Jan	1761	DL
Tu 4 Apr	1749	DL	Th 29 Jan	1761	DL
Mon 18 Sep	1749	SOU	Mon 13 Apr	1761	CG
Th 2 Nov	1749	CG	Sat 30 June	1761	DL
Wed 27 Dec	1749	JS	Fri 18 Sep	1761	DL
Sat 6 Jan	1750	CG	Wed 28 Oct	1761	DL
Mon 5 Mar	1750	SOU	Wed 3 Feb	1762	CG
Sat 21 Apr	1750	CG	Sat 3 Apr	1762	DL
Fri 19 Oct	1750	DL	Sat 16 Oct	1762	DL
Th 1 Nov	1750	CG	Th 21 Oct	1762	DL
Fri 2 Nov	1750	CG	Fri 7 Jan	1763	DL
Mon 19 Nov	1750	DL	Mon 13 Feb	1764	CG
Sat 22 Dec	1750	DL	Th 12 Apr	1764	DL
Tu 20 Jan	1751	CG	Mon 14 May	1764	DL
Th 14 Feb	1751	CG	Wed 23 May	1764	CG
Mon 8 Apr	1751	CG	Mon 22 Oct	1764	CG
Tu 23 Apr	1751	CG	Fri 26 Oct	1764	DL
Mon 14 Oct	1751	DL	Wed 26 Jan	1765	CG
Fri 25 Oct	1751	CG	Fri 24 May	1765	CG
Th 31 Oct	1751	CG	Wed 9 Oct	1765	CG
Tu 7 Jan	1752	DL	Mon 16 Dec	1765	CG
Fri 10 Nov	1752	CG	Mon 7 Apr	1766	DL
Wed 15 Nov	1752	CG	Fri 9 May	1766	DL
Sat 3 Feb	1753	CG	Fri 26 Oct	1766	DL
Th 22 Mar	1753	CG	Wed 10 Dec	1766	CG
Th 12 Apr	1753	CG	Fri 29 June	1767	DL
Wed 9 May	1753	CG	Mon 6 July	1767	HAY
Sat 22 Dec	1753	DL	Fri 16 Oct	1767	CG
Sat 5 Jan	1754	DL	Wed 11 Nov	1767	CG
Mon 18 Mar	1754	CG	Sat 28 Nov	1767	CG
Sat 23 Mar	1754	CG	Sat 16 Apr	1768	CG
Mon 29 Apr	1754	DL	Sat 23 Apr	1768	CG

Wed	28	Sep	1768	CG	Mon	9	May	1774	CG
Sat	1	Oct	1768	CG	Tu	1	Nov	1774	DL
Sat	12	Nov	1768	CG	Mon	21	Nov	1774	DL
Th	24	Nov	1768	DL	Sat	17	Dec	1774	DL
Sat	26	Nov	1768	DL	Wed	21	Dec	1774	CG
Fri	27	Jan	1769	CG	Th	26	Jan	1775	CG
Wed	5	Apr	1769	CG	Fri	10	Feb	1775	DL
Fri	5	May	1769	CG	Th	12	Oct	1775	DL
Th	26	Oct	1769	CG	Tu	9	Jan	1776	DL
Fri	10	Nov	1769	CG	Sat	24	Feb	1776	DL
Sat	25	Nov	1769	CG	Tu	24	Sep	1776	DL
Wed	13	Dec	1769	DL	Sat	23	Nov	1776	DL
Fri	12	Jan	1770	CG	Wed	25	June	1777	CHR
Sat	17	Feb	1770	CG	Mon	9	Feb	1778	HAY
Mon	21	May	1770	DL	Tu	10	Feb	1778	HAY
Fri	16	Nov	1770	HAY	Mon	20	Apr	1778	DL
Th	29	Nov	1770	CG	Mon	1	June	1778	CHR
Mon	10	Dec	1770	CG	Sat	31	Oct	1778	CG
Tu	8	Jan	1771	CG	Mon	2	Nov	1778	CG
Sat	13	Apr	1771	CG	Sat	7	Nov	1778	CG
Th	25	Apr	1771	CG	Th	12	Nov	1778	CG
Tu	5	Nov	1771	CG	Mon	16	Nov	1778	CG
Th	21	Nov	1771	DL	Sat	28	Nov	1778	CG
Tu	3	Dec	1771	CG	Mon	21	Dec	1778	CG
Tu	4	Feb	1772	CG	Wed	30	Dec	1778	CG
Sat	7	Mar	1772	CG	Mon	15	Feb	1779	CG
Fri	1	May	1772	CG	Mon	22	Feb	1779	CG
Tu	5	May	1772	DL	Sat	27	Mar	1779	CG
Mon	5	Oct	1772	CG	Mon	20	Dec	1779	HAY
Wed	7	Oct	1772	CG	Th	1	June	1780	CG
Mon	12	Oct	1772	CG	Wed	4	Oct	1780	CG
Sat	24	Oct	1772	CG	Tu	17	Oct	1780	DL
Mon	14	Dec	1772	CG	Mon	6	Nov	1780	DL
Wed	23	Dec	1772	CG	Tu	19	Dec	1780	CG
Fri	8	Jan	1773	CG	Mon	8	Jan	1781	CG
Fri	5	Feb	1773	CG	Th	8	Mar	1781	CG
Sat	20	Feb	1773	CG	Sat	31	Mar	1781	CG
Fri	14	May	1773	CG	Mon	23	Apr	1781	CG
Mon	11	Oct	1773	CG	Mon	10	Dec	1781	CG
Th	28	Oct	1773	CG	Mon	21	Jan	1782	CG
Sat	6	Nov	1773	DL	Wed	23	Jan	1782	CG
Mon	8	Nov	1773	DL	Mon	28	Jan	1782	CG
Fri	12	Nov	1773	DL	Mon	1	Apr	1782	CG
Mon	22	Nov	1773	DL	Fri	26	Apr	1782	CG
Mon	6	Dec	1773	DL	Fri	8	Nov	1782	DL
Fri	17	Dec	1773	DL	Mon	11	Nov	1782	DL
Mon	3	Jan	1774	CG	Sat	23	Nov	1782	DL
Mon	10	Jan	1774	CG	Wed	18	Dec	1782	DL
Wed	6	Apr	1774	CG	Mon	6	Jan	1783	DL

Sat 11 Jan 1783 DL	Wed 26 Dec 1787 CG
Th 23 Jan 1783 DL	Sat 19 Jan 1788 DL
Mon 27 Jan 1783 CG	Tu 9 Sep 1788 HAY
Sat 1 Feb 1783 DL	Fri 28 Nov 1788 DL
Th 13 Feb 1783 DL	Tu 24 Feb 1789 DL
Sat 8 Mar 1783 DL	Mon 30 Nov 1789 CG
Tu 1 Apr 1783 DL	Mon 21 Mar 1791 DL
Tu 29 Apr 1783 CG	Mon 26 Dec 1791 CG
Wed 30 Apr 1783 DL	Tu 24 Jan 1792 DL at King's
Sat 3 May 1783 DL	Fri 21 Dec 1792 DL at King's
Tu 13 May 1783 DL	Sat 26 Jan 1793 DL at HAY
Mon 19 May 1783 DL	Sat 11 May 1793 DL at HAY
Sat 11 Oct 1783 DL	Th 19 Dec 1793 CG
Sat 31 Jan 1784 CG	Tu 14 Oct 1794 DL
Fri 6 Feb 1784 DL	Sat 13 Dec 1794 DL
Th 6 May 1784 DL	Sat 11 Apr 1795 DL
Sat 23 Oct 1784 DL	Mon 5 Oct 1795 DL
Th 7 Apr 1785 DL	Th 22 Oct 1795 CG
Mon 4 July 1785 HAMM	Th 29 Oct 1795 CG
Tu 8 Nov 1785 DL	Fri 22 Jan 1796 DL
Wed 14 Dec 1785 CG	Th 14 Apr 1796 DL
Tu 20 Dec 1785 CG	Th 22 Sep 1796 DL
Wed 8 Feb 1786 DL	Tu 14 Feb 1797 DL
Mon 20 Feb 1786 DL	Wed 27 Dec 1797 CG
Th 1 June 1786 CG	Sat 17 Mar 1798 DL
Th 20 June 1786 HAY	Mon 19 Mar 1798 CG
Fri 6 Oct 1786 CG	Th 20 Sep 1798 DL
Fri 13 Oct 1786 CG	Sat 19 Jan 1799 DL
Tu 26 Dec 1786 DL	Sat 20 Apr 1799 DL
Mon 7 May 1787 CG	Th 7 Nov 1799 CG
Tu 5 June 1787 CG	Mon 25 Nov 1799 DL
Wed 29 Sep 1787 HAY	Th 26 Dec 1799 CG
Fri 9 Nov 1787 CG	Th 17 Apr 1800 DL
Fri 16 Nov 1787 DL	

- 31 Alfred Jackson (p. 313) notes that Genest gives this number. But see Nicoll op. cit., Handlist, pp. 352-52, and London Stage, and the above list.
- 32 Alfred Jackson. "Rowe's Historical Tragedies". Anglia, LIV (1930), 307-330.
- 33 Alfred Schwartz. "An Example of Eighteenth-Century Pathetic Tragedy: Rowe's Jane Shore". Modern Language Quarterly, XXII (1960), 236-47.
- 34 Nicholas Rowe, The Tragedy of the Lady Jane Gray. For Bernard Lintott, 1715. MM B.3409.

Wed	20	Apr	1715	DL	Tu	12	Nov	1745	DL
Th	21	Apr	1715	DL	Sat	16	Dec	1749	CG
Fri	22	Apr	1715	DL	Mon	18	Dec	1749	CG
Sat	23	Apr	1715	DL	Tu	19	Dec	1749	CG
Mon	25	Apr	1715	DL	Wed	20	Dec	1749	CG
Tu	26	Apr	1715	DL	Th	21	Dec	1749	CG
Wed	27	Apr	1715	DL	Fri	22	Dec	1749	CG
Fri	29	Apr	1715	DL	Sat	23	Dec	1749	CG
Mon	2	May	1715	DL	Fri	5	Jan	1750	CG
Th	12	May	1715	DL	Th	1	Feb	1750	CG
Sat	11	Feb	1716	DL	Th	26	Feb	1750	CG
Th	30	Dec	1731	GF	Tu	1	Jan	1751	CG
Wed	19	Jan	1732	GF	Tu	22	Jan	1751	CG
Tu	21	Mar	1732	GF	Sat	2	Feb	1751	CG
Tu	25	Apr	1732	GF	Tu	9	Apr	1751	CG
Th	5	Oct	1732	GF	Wed	8	May	1751	CG
Fri	27	Oct	1732	GF	Th	6	Feb	1752	DL
Wed	22	Nov	1732	GF	Fri	7	Feb	1752	DL
Wed	19	Sep	1733	GF	Th	12	Oct	1752	CG
Tu	29	Jan	1734	GF	Th	2	Nov	1752	CG
Mon	25	Feb	1734	GF	Th	22	Feb	1753	DL
Fri	11	Oct	1734	GF	Wed	7	May	1755	CG
Sat	8	Feb	1735	GF	Th	11	Dec	1755	CG
Tu	25	Mar	1735	GF	Tu	3	Feb	1756	CG
Th	12	Oct	1738	DL	Fri	15	Oct	1762	DL
Sat	14	Oct	1738	DL	Fri	22	Oct	1762	DL
Mon	16	Oct	1738	DL	Tu	23	Nov	1762	DL
Mon	18	Dec	1738	DL	Fri	7	May	1773	CG
Mon	24	Nov	1740	GF	Wed	11	May	1774	CG
Mon	11	Nov	1745	DL	Fri	9	Dec	1774	CG

35 See Donald B. Clark, "Nicholas Rowe: a Study in the Development of the Pathetic Tragedy". George Washington University... Summaries of Doctoral Dissertations, 1947 & 1948, 11-16, for a fuller treatment of Rowe's sources for Lady Jane Gray.

## CHAPTER VI    THE TRAGEDIES OF GEORGE LILLO

At first glance the tragedies of Nicholas Rowe and George Lillo would seem to be very different, for their best known plays, The Fair Penitent and The London Merchant clearly mark the passage of twenty-eight years, and the change from "middle-flight heroic verse" to mixed levels of prose and verse seems to indicate a radical difference in intention. In Rowe's later work, however, we find the sort of stress upon Christian virtue which Lillo follows up, and in the development of both dramatists there is a change of emphasis from early presentations of evil (exemplified in The Ambitious Step-Mother and The London Merchant) to an attempt to portray the Christian elements of life (as found in Lady Jane Gray and Elmerick). Neither is too successful in his presentation of good, however, and curiously it is for the opposite reason; Lady Jane fails to win our affection because she is too sentimental, and Elmerick because he is too heroic.

Until very recently, with the increase of research activity in this field through the medium of the doctoral dissertation,<sup>1</sup> George Lillo was recognised as an important and even significant dramatist who, at the beginning of the eighteenth century cashed in on the trend towards sentimentalism to write popular tragedies which were eventually responsible for the utter disintegration of the tragedy, or serious play, in England. He was seen as historically interesting but essentially bad artistically.

With this in mind I hope to show in the analysis of The London Merchant and Fatal Curiosity that Lillo is a more sophisticated artist than

has often been thought. Yet at the same time we must be aware that there is something very strange about his dramatic career. He does not really develop as a writer of tragedy, or as a dramatist at all. While Rowe began writing in a conventional contemporary mode and gradually became more unconventional, Lillo begins as an experimenter and essentially remains as one, though his experiments become gradually less vital and innovative. Lillo's first effort for the stage was a ballad opera, Sylvia; or, The Country Burial<sup>2</sup> which was hissed off the stage in 1730 and never gained any popularity. He then suddenly exploded onto the stage with The London Merchant, quite a different sort of play from those usually performed, and achieved immense popularity even though the audience had come prepared to give the play the same fate as his last:

The old ballad of George Barnwell (on which the story was founded) was on this occasion reprinted and many thousands sold in one day. Many gaily-disposed spirits brought the ballad with them to the play, intending to make their pleasant remarks (as some afterwards owned) and ludicrous comparisons between the ancient ditty and the modern play...But the play was very carefully got up, and universally allowed to be well performed... and in general, spoke so much to the heart, that the gay persons before mentioned confessed, they were drawn in to drop their ballads, and pull out their handkerchiefs.<sup>3</sup>

The play received great acclaim and held the stage right through the century, and it is such a sure and innovatory piece that one would expect its author to have had more tradition behind him. What is weak here is set to rights in The Fatal Curiosity, a play which has a very good claim to being the best serious play of the century, and which makes extraordinary progress towards psychological realism. Both plays are Christian in their moral inclinations and both are directed at the bourgeois patrons, so that Lillo's sudden turn of attention to heroic dramas comes as a great surprise. Admittedly Lillo

does not turn right back to the heroics of Dryden, but these plays can be seen as an extension of Rowe's plays, with the sentimental element only slightly more pronounced. The neo-classical "rules" so successfully neglected in the two earlier plays return with rigid strictures in The Christian Hero and the setting distances the audience from the action in the same way as Rowe made his audience "objective" about the placing of Tamerlane, Ulysses, and even Jane Shore. In an attempt to improve on the structural weaknesses of The Christian Hero, Lillo creates a more "correct" play in Elmerick, or Justice Triumphant only to lead himself into grave problems about the subject matter of his play and the relationship between free will and determinism. We thus have two pairs of tragedies with little in common between the pairs, two adaptations (Lillo made an attempt at a patriotic masque called Britannia and Batavia)<sup>4</sup> and two modern versions of plays thought to be by Shakespeare (Arden of Feversham<sup>5</sup> and Marina,<sup>6</sup> a version of Pericles). It is somewhat less strange, perhaps, that Lillo abandoned the successful sort of tragedy exemplified by The London Merchant and Fatal Curiosity when we realise that he soon abandoned all the forms with which he experimented, but it is no less certain that had he continued to perfect a play based on a bourgeois source he might well have achieved something of considerable importance.

Whatever were Lillo's overall intentions as a dramatist, his intentions in his first tragedy, The London Merchant; or, The History of George Barnwell (1731),<sup>7</sup> are clearly set in the Epistle Dedicatory:

If tragic poetry be, as Mr. Dryden has somewhere said, the most excellent and most useful kind of writing, the more extensively useful the moral of any tragedy is, the more excellent that piece must be of its kind.

Lillo defends his practice of setting his play among common people, but acknowledges that historical tragedies can also be useful, and cites Rowe's Tamerlane as his primary example. The Christian concern of the dramatist with the "soul" is also hinted at here:

I have attempted, indeed, to enlarge the province of the graver kind of poetry, and should be glad to see it carried by some abler hand. Plays founded on moral tales in private life may be of admirable use by carrying conviction to the mind with such irresistible force as to engage all the faculties and powers of the soul in the case of virtue by stifling vice in its first principles. They who imagine this to be too much to be attributed to tragedy must be strangers to the energy of that noble species of poetry. (Ibid.)

Lillo's source is no longer in past events which may shed some light on contemporary attitudes and events, but in popular culture - an old, famous ballad. The movement is towards realism, though the source is substantially altered for the purpose of dramatic effectiveness. In the ballad George is a complete rogue, but in the play his good intentions are designed to elicit pity as well as censure.

The London Merchant is a warning to youth to beware of the evils of the world, and like the second version of The Fatal Extravagance it presents a world where evil is intimately bound up with sexual relations. George feels that he has gone beyond the stage of forgiveness when he has finally given in to sexual indulgence with Millwood. At the end of the play Thorowgood makes clear that passion is at the root of George's troubles:

THOROWGOOD (aside)

See there are the bitter fruits of passions detested  
reign and sensual appetites indulged - severe ref-  
lections, penitence, and tears. (V ii, p. 68)<sup>8</sup>

The alternative is the thoroughly Augustan injunction to control guilty passions and be controlled instead by reason. Thorowgood is again the Christian spokesman slightly later in the scene:

Oh, the joy it gives to see a soul formed and prepared  
for Heaven! For this the faithful minister devotes him-  
self to meditation, abstinence, and prayer, shunning the  
vain delights of sensual joys, and daily dies that others  
may live for ever. (V ii, p. 69)

It is his sexual indulgence with Millwood which makes George think that he has gone too far to ask for God's forgiveness so that he goes on instead to commit the worst atrocity of murder. Much more is made of the episode of wavering (symbolic of Christian weakness) which turns into sin and transgression, than is made in The Fatal Extravagance. Where Mitchell is concerned only to work out the effects of ruin on stage, Lillo's concern is much more complex. He sees ruin as primarily sexual, and goes much further than Mitchell's hints that economic ruin is accompanied by problems of a sexual nature.

In The London Merchant Lillo is concerned to present a series of aspects of life and behaviour. He does not show the transitions between one state and another, nor does he show the progressive deterioration of the hero's power of reasoning; the connexions between lust and theft are so close that the author is not interested in showing them. George is unable to control his own destiny, and his fate is determined. This comes across particularly well as Lillo moves from one climax of life to another with virtually no bridges. The crucial point of the play is made when Millwood says in the final scene:<sup>9</sup>

Why name you mercy to a wretch like me? Mercy's beyond  
my hope, almost beyond my wish. I can't repent nor ask

to be forgiven.... This yields no hope. Though mercy  
 may be boundless, yet 'tis free. And I was doomed  
 before the world began to endless pain, and thou to  
 joys eternal.<sup>10</sup>

Yet there are qualifications to this determinism, for the didactic intention means that there must be some free will. Even though it looks as if George was doomed, he could have saved himself by avoiding the lures of sexuality (by "strength of will") and by admitting to himself that he could still hope for his employer's good nature. The irony of Thorowgood expressing his intention of avoiding the catastrophe, immediately after we have witnessed that catastrophe on stage, is that we should recognise the solidity of the hope which the apprentice voluntarily rejected. George's problem is one of lack of trust and faith in his employer and in his friends, and this is as much a class question as a moral one. It is an indictment of contemporary social conditions where the apprentice feels he has no hope, as much as a condemnation of George's weak moral fibre.

The rhyming moral comment at the end of the third act contains within it some of the pathos of the apprentice's helplessness as well as his recognition that he has transgressed:

The rich man thus, in torment and despair,  
 Preferr'd his vain but charitable prayer.  
 The fool, his own soul lost, would fain be wise  
 For other's good, but Heaven his suit denies.  
 By laws and means well known we stand or fall,  
 And one eternal rule remains for all. (III viii, p. 52)

Only in prison does Barnwell obtain faith and recognise that he is among the "Chosen of God" despite his act of murder. Millwood's greatest sin is that she refuses to seek Divine Grace, partly because she will not, and only partly (and hence the paradox) because she is not able to.

Thorowgood is the example of mercy, the quality by which George is finally saved, and the merchant offers mercy to him throughout the play. Once George has been sentenced Lillo can happily drop Thorowgood from the play, because his traits are taken over by the repentant George who, in his final warning to the youths in the audience, brings together mercy and charity as the necessary prerequisites for repentance:

Justice and mercy are in Heaven the same; its utmost severity is mercy to the whole, thereby to cure man's folly and presumption which else would render even infinite mercy vain and ineffectual. Thus justice, in compassion to mankind, cuts off a wretch like me, by one such example to secure thousands from future ruin.

If any youth, like you, in future times,  
 Shall mourn my fate, though he abhors my crimes,...  
 Would gracious Heaven this benefit impart:  
 Never to know my guilt, nor feel my pain.  
 Then must you own you ought not to complain,  
 Since you nor weep, nor shall I die in vain. (V x p. 77)

Divine justice is divine mercy in the end, in this play, and George's fate reconciles the two.

The play is also a defence of the middle-class, substantiating the strong link between capitalism and Protestantism. Thorowgood's social philosophy is the classic example of Protestant mercantilism as he attempts to enhance the status of his own class. As Loftis puts it:

Lillo's treatment of merchant characters was conditioned by his own convictions, largely social, that they possess the dignity requisite for high literary art.<sup>11</sup>

The concern with trade comes out in the Epistle Dedicatory to Sir John Eyles, "Sub-Governor of the South Sea Company":

The proprietors of the South Sea Company, in which are included numbers of persons as considerable for their rank, fortune, and understanding, as any in the kingdom, gave the greatest proof of their confidence in your capacity and probity when they chose you Sub-Governor of their company at a time when their affairs were in the utmost confusion and their properties in the greatest danger.

Thorowgood's apologia for Christian merchants, which opens the third act, is quite unnecessary to the plot, and is a deliberate attempt to glorify the middle-class and its relationship to trade. Of merchandise he says to Trueman:

'Twill be worth your pains to study it as a science, see how it is founded in reason and the nature of things, how it has promoted humanity as it has opened and yet keeps up an intercourse between nations far and remote from one another in situation, customs, and religion; promoting arts, industry, peace and plenty; by mutual benefits diffusing mutual love from pole to pole....

It is the industrious merchant's business to collect the various blessings of each soil and climate and, with the product of the whole, to enrich his native country. (III i, p. 40)

Set against this is Millwood's own philosophy of gaining as much as she can for her own gratification, regardless of cost to other individuals, and without thought to the consequences. She has no concern for the good of any whole at all, and can, perhaps, be seen as the representative of the decayed morality offered by the upper classes, both materialistic and atheist. Her dealings are both irregular and immoral, while the task of the Protestant merchant is to see work as a kind of prayer, not merely as a means of securing his own advantage. For this reason Lillo makes it

clear in his later play, Fatal Curiosity, that Young Wilmot's wealth has been accumulated through his own industry, not through the plundering of the Cornish profiteers. This, then, in Lillo represents a refinement of the merchant-saviour idea of The Fatal Extravagance, where the merchant has gained his wealth by one knows not what means in some obscure and undefined place in the East.

In The London Merchant the bourgeois ethic is not, however, confined to the digressive passages mentioned above, but permeates the whole play. Hence Maria's great sorrow is expressed in characteristically bourgeois terms in her fine speech to Barnwell before he meets his death:

All but this; this dreadful catastrophe virtue herself abhors. To give a holiday to suburb slaves, and, passing, entertain the savage herd, who elbowing each other for a sight, pursue and press upon him like his fate. A mind with piety and resolution armed may smile on death. But public ignominy, everlasting shame (shame, the death of souls, to die a thousand deaths and yet survive even death itself in never-dying infamy), is this to be endured? Can I who live in him and must each hour of my devoted life feel all these woes renewed, can I endure all this? (V ix, p. 77)

Maria is concerned above all with disgrace, and this is one of Lillo's finest moves, for she is now as "placed" as Millwood. She cannot rise above her bourgeois concern with reputation, just as Millwood has lived throughout her life by her upper class conception (perversion) of it. Both of these women are thus undercut, although we need to be well awake to see that Lillo is criticising Maria here, too.

The central device of the play is more than a concentration on building emotional tension which will provoke the sympathy and tears of

the audience. Lillo needs the tears to gain the maximum effect from his didactic purpose, but he is not, as has been sometimes suggested, intending his audience to become totally involved with the action of the play, and is constantly reminding them that this is a "representation". The mixture of prose and verse has a specific and deliberate function. Characters are always stepping out of their stage roles to deliver sententiae at the moment when the emotional impact is at its height; this happens far more self-consciously than in The Fatal Extravagance. The technique works best in the murder scene when George suddenly gives his interpretation of his actions as an example to the audience. Lillo does not want us to be so involved with the action that we miss the didactic point, and by doing this he rigorously controls our responses. The result is always to diminish the status of the hero, and by pointing out the weakness of his hero, Lillo in fact increases our desire for identification with him. The movement of the focus is continually in on the hero, sometimes in really close, and then back again into objectivity. This achieves the same sort of effect that we can now recognise in Brechtian drama, where we are involved primarily because we see the relentless undercutting of the hero. This is the reason why the events and scenes are so exaggerated in The London Merchant. We are tempted to think that Lillo was unaware of excesses, but it is hard to read the seduction scene, for example, as anything but delightful comedy. George's naivety is obvious, and we are meant to laugh at his lack of awareness. It is because Lillo did not take George too seriously that he was able to

bring heavy social and ethical considerations to bear. We must be carried away by the bombast of the murder scene, but as the actor becomes the spectator ab extra in the closing rhyming tag, the spectator leaves the world of the play to reflect and judge. The attempts of Thorowgood which immediately follow show well that human volition is unable to cope with the progress of events, which the author sees as determined by fate.

Lillo keeps George and Millwood separated in their crimes; Millwood is wilful while George is the helpless victim. George behaves impeccably at the end, while Millwood conducts herself badly. Had Lillo disclosed Maria's love much earlier in the play the point would have been lost, for George must be shown to be the Christian repentant sinner to contrast with the trapped animal Millwood. George is the battle ground for the war between good and evil, and the personification of abstracts, a heavily used technical device in the play, reminds us of the Morality plays. There are two sides to George, and only after repentance can he find understanding. The audience must sympathise and identify, but it is important that he should not be a fully rounded character.

Because of its Christian basis, The London Merchant cannot be a tragedy in the Aristotelian sense, but like the Mystery and Morality plays, emotions of pity and fear can be aroused to a certain extent. As far as this life is concerned, the death of George is tragic, for his "conversion" would indicate that he was worthy of better conduct and hence a better fate on this earth. The hope offered in the play is of a

non-earthly variety, a characteristic with which Aristotle was not concerned in his delineation of the aspects of tragedy. George repents of his crime, and the fact that he acknowledges the justice of his sentence means that there is hope offered to bourgeois apprentices through faith, which they would not normally be able to find in their daily lives. The didactic message of the play is distinctly conservative, yet the hope of salvation for the individual prefigures the teachings of Wesley and Whitfield which were to have such momentum and effect among the ordinary people - the bourgeoisie and working classes.

The main weakness of the play is Thorowgood, and the lack of irony in the presentation of his character leads to the lack of conflict which occurs from time to time. Thorowgood would have been a logical dramatic choice for the murder victim, but Lillo seems to have had an utterly ideal role in mind for him. The substitution of a non-character, the uncle, as the victim, is on one level unsatisfactory. Yet it is clear that Lillo, unlike Mitchell, wants us to know nothing of the life and personal characteristics of the uncle; he is to be simply a symbol. Hence there is in the play a mixture of psychologically possible people like Millwood and of morality-type characters. This can also be seen as the mixture of two dramatic modes, that of didactic writing and that of sentimental comedy. Millwood is effective, because she evokes a familiar type, because she acts in a predictable way, and because she is concerned with all the accoutrements of day-to-day society living, vanity, self-esteem, and her vision of herself as la femme fatale. Her evil (on the

didactic level) is seen to be caused by three different factors - inherent evil, her own background, and her own bad choices - and this fits in neatly with the dramatist's concern to relate predestination to free will. The question of individual responsibility in a determinate world is strikingly presented, and part of the fascination of the play is that the question is not finally resolved. Millwood and Thorowgood represent the two opposing forces in George's make-up, but the play would have been more effective had Lillo been able to make the merchant as convincing as the temptress.

The most extraordinary section of the play is the final part of the third act, the murder and the scenes leading up to it, where nothing much happens by way of action, but where Lillo builds up an atmosphere of doom and gloom, chiefly by soliloquy. Good use is made of the pathetic fallacy, but the actions of the sun are seen not so much as a reflection of states of mind, but as guides which indicate that Heaven is well aware of what will happen:

A dismal gloom obscures the face of day. Either the sun has slipped behind a cloud, or journeys down the west of Heaven with more than common speed, to avoid the sight of what I'm doomed to act. Since I set forth on this accursed design, where'er I tread, methinks, the solid earth trembles beneath my feet. Yonder limpid stream, whose hoary fall has made a natural cascade, as I passed by, in doleful accents, seemed to murmur, "Murder". The earth, the air, and water seem concerned, but that's not strange. The world is punished and nature feels the shock when Providence permits a good man's fall. (III v, p. 49)

Here again is the mixture of George's mental processes and comments on the situation, and this extraordinary effect is heightened when the uncle

makes his only appearance in the play. He is a purely "atmospheric" character. He is aware of his impending death:

If I were superstitious, I should fear some danger lurked unseen or death were nigh. A heavy melancholy clouds my spirits. My imagination is filled with gashly forms of dreary graves and bodies changed by death, when the pale lengthened visage attracts each weeping eye and fills the musing soul at once with grief and horror, pity and aversion. I will indulge the thought. The wise man prepares himself for death by making it familiar to his mind. (III vi, p. 50)

Because both George and the uncle are aware of what is predestined to happen to them, emotional wallowing intensifies the contrast between the medium and the message, and this results in making the apparently objective statements of the characters about their actions more penetrating, by forcing the audience to take them subjectively. George finally brings himself to the act after much wavering, and melodramtically faints over the body, having delivered a forceful speech which presents the uncle as  
an

Expiring saint! Oh murdered, martyred uncle! Lift up your dying eyes and view your nephew in your murderer. (III vii, p. 51)

Much of this prose section can be broken down into iambic pentameters, and this indicates that though Lillo clearly wanted to write in prose, he found the emotional intensity he required very difficult to portray in anything other than verse. Hence the quality is very uneven, even if the effect of the whole is quite revolutionary.

Elements in the play, however, are much more conventional. The social comedy of manners in the scene between Millwood and Lucy, the

seduction scene and the prison scene all relate to contemporary popular taste in tragedy, and Lillo even panders to the latest trend of music in the theatres, for Genest informs us that in the early performances of the play *Catharine Raftor* (later *Kitty Clive*) entertained the audience; she

had a facetious turn of humour and infinite spirits,  
with a voice and manner, in singing songs of pleasantry,  
peculiar to herself. (III, 231)

But in *The London Merchant* Lillo showed the way in which tragedy could develop, even though few writers followed his guideline. It would seem that tales of common life, having been here introduced into the tragedy, were taken over largely by the novel, while (with the few exceptions dealt with in this chapter) tragedy on the whole continued in the same old way:

*The Tragic Muse*, sublime, delights to show  
Princes distrest, and scenes of royal woe;  
In awful pomp, majestic, to relate  
The fall of nations, or some hero's fate. (Prologue)

Lillo's second domestic tragedy came onto the stage through the enthusiastic support of Fielding, and *Guilt is its Own Punishment, or The Fatal Curiosity*<sup>12</sup> was presented on May 27, 1736 with an afterpiece by Fielding, *Tumble Down Dick, or Phaeton in the Suds*. Lillo's play, though, was only given seven times during 1736 for it could not win the support of the managers of the two theatres royal, but was instead given at Fielding's own Little Theatre in the Haymarket. Thomas Davies blamed the relative failure on the poor taste of the managers:

It is not easy to guess why this excellent piece was not represented at one of the Theatres Royal, as our author's character was by this time well established. It cannot be doubted that Lillo applied to the managers

of the more regular theatres, and had been rejected, so that he was reduced to the necessity of having his play acted at an inferior Play-house, and by persons not so well skilled in their profession as the players of the established theatres.<sup>13</sup>

Fielding, though, soon took the actors and gave them further instruction in the techniques of acting their parts, so that when the play was again presented with Fielding's important and controversial Historical Register for 1736 the play ran for eleven nights and its place was assured in the repertoire for the rest of the century, though it never became as popular as The London Merchant. Part of the reason for this is that it lacks the heavy didactic purpose of its predecessor, and never became a "national institution" as did the story of George Barnwell; it could not be used by employers as an effective deterrent from vice.

Fate is again seen ironically to confound the plans of men as Agnes kills her own son, whose departure to foreign parts she has been intent upon lamenting for the past seven years. The motivation of the characters, however, is rather closer to the dictates of classical drama than those of The London Merchant, being rooted in the tragic flaw of hubris. Religious connotations are brought in, though they are not central to the conduct of the play, because the Wilmots commit the murder through despair. The "rules" are adhered to, and the time span of the action corresponds almost exactly to the time that the audience is in the theatre. The three locations are all confined to Penryn in Cornwall, and violence is avoided on the stage, for Agnes acts as narrator of the murder. Lillo here seems to be to some extent moving away from his previous experiment in form, steering the middle course between the "correct" play and middle-

class presentation.

There are no lengthy dissertations to the audience and very little gratuitous moralising. The pace of the play is rigorously controlled, and the use of verse throughout helps to create an impression of fluidity; the technique of exaggeration and objectifying is largely neglected. The result is that moments of intensity are created and sustained (a sharp contrast in method to The London Merchant) so that one climax can move to another. The verse is a kind of compressed blank verse - not too different from the heightened prose of <sup>some of</sup> the previous play, but clearly intended to be more uniform and to provide greater continuity.

The original story, an anonymous report entitled A Monstrous Murder in Cornwall,<sup>14</sup> is clearly meant as a cautionary tale, and has a religious message which is stated even before the story is told:

The miserable condition of sinful man in sundry examples of these present and of former times should mind us hourly to beg of God preventing grace, lest we fall into temptations of sin and Satan.<sup>15</sup>

If we think that the message of the play is again concerning evil and sin we are surprised that Lillo neglects this feature at the beginning of his play, and is instead concerned to bring in political remarks about the Spaniards, just as unnecessary to his total purpose here as they had been at the beginning of The London Merchant.<sup>16</sup> The action of the play is in this instance a little more unified than in our previous example; the dramatist is following through the history of the fate of a family, first presenting to us their frustrated hopes and their change of fortune, then providing the possible solution to the problem, and finally seeing how fate

thwarts the plans of men. The title is at first odd. One would think that it was Agnes's curiosity that was fatal, for her stolen glance into the casket provokes the disaster. But Lillo seems to be saying that the fault lies with Young Wilmot; he is hoping to revel in the excess of pleasure and over-indulge his sentimentality, and we are meant to suspect his statement that a personal disclosure of his identity would be too much for his parents to bear. His dishonesty undermines his previous seeming-perfection, for, although he has served as the ideal merchant figure outlined by Thorowgood, his fall comes because of personal quirkishness, and a failure to realise the dread of the home situation that he has walked into.

That this is intentional can be seen from the story from which the plot was taken. Not only has Lillo removed the original didactic intention, but he has changed the nature of the main character from a reprobate son who earns his wealth through piracy, to a merchant whose wealth has been accumulated through honest diligence.<sup>17</sup> Young Wilmot has the basic intention of relieving the sad plight of his family, the valid counterpart to Thorowgood's injunction that all trade should enhance the state of the nation in some way. The focus of the play, then, is very clear - we are to focus on the family and the ironically abortive homecoming of the Prodigal Son. Thus the action is both unified and quick, particularly in the third act where the sequence of events is most rapid, and, when the murder has been committed, the play ends at once with no humorous epilogue.

Old Wilmot is presented throughout the play as the old man who had seen better days, but is now miserably poor and unable or unwilling (and here we see the Millwood effect used with great pathos) to do anything except contemplate and dream. He is threatening suicide but lacks the impetus to achieve even this, although his neurotic wife is constantly reminding him of his threats. We have the nature of error and sin presented with more poignancy and more ambivalence than in the case of Millwood's refusal to accept divine grace. The atmosphere of the old man's dreamy misery is finely evoked, and when he is finally provoked into action by his wife, Lillo capitalises on an unusual and striking example of penetrating psychological realism, which undercuts his stature as murderer by playing on grim humour:

OLD WILMOT

Ambition, persecution, and revenge  
 Devour their millions daily, and shall I -  
 But, follow me and see how little cause  
 You had to think there was the least remains  
 Of manhood, pity, mercy, or remorse  
 Left in the savage breast. Going the wrong way.

AGNES                               Where do you go?

The street is that way!

OLD WILMOT                       True! I had forgot.

AGNES

Quite, quite confounded!

OLD WILMOT                       Well, I recover.

I shall find the way. (III i, p. 47)

Wilmot may be old but he is by no means spineless. He falls to a woman's persuasion in the same way that George had to fall to Millwood and in the same way that Adam was seen to fall to Eve. But the old man lashes out at Eustace at the end of the play in an extraordinary way, so

that realism stands opposed to sentimentality and the audience is forced into sympathy in having to admit the humanity of the old man. The power here is enormous:

What whining fool art thou who would'st usurp  
 My sovereign right of grief? Was he thy son?  
 Say! Canst thou show thy hands reeking with blood  
 That flowed through purer channels, from thy loins? (III ii, p. 51)

Lillo makes Eustace's conventional sententiae look absurd against the weight of Old Wilmot's grief, and pious moralising is thus seen to be totally out of place in this sort of situation. The dramatist has broken all the conventions here and has produced immensely impressive theatre, giving the murderer a certain dignity in utter defeat that he never really exhibited before.

Agnes, too, is more original than any of the characters in The London Merchant. She, like Millwood, refuses to bow to circumstances but attempts to keep control of her fate. Her state is determined by experience and she is not a static entity like Thorowgood. She is the sort of character who has an implied past and life outside the play.

Young Wilmot is the springboard but not the central focal point of the play. He is a kind of romantic young man of feeling who is essentially good but endowed with an overactive imagination, whose delight in seeing the reactions of his parents when he reveals himself reminds us of the excesses of the Gothick, and the sort of perversion that Burke seems to have had in mind when writing about the sublime.

The motive for the murder is despair rather than greed - despair because of lack of confidence in the divine scheme which Agnes vocalises in the central act:

The last and most abandoned of our kind,  
 By Heaven and earth neglected and despised,  
 The loathsome grave, that robbed us of our son  
 And all our joys in him, must be our refuge. (II iii, p. 38)

Unable to trust God, Agnes attempts to interpose her all too human will into the plan of destiny, and the disastrous results of this course of action reveal not only that it is impossible for man to escape his ordained fate, but also that such attempts to meddle with the future are in themselves causes for human downfall.

Pride and despair are the crucial factors in the precipitation of the tragedy, for lack of trust in the divine scheme of things can only lead human beings into sin and error. But Lillo makes the play more subtle by presenting Young Wilmot as a character who lacks faith; his "curiosity" is prideful and leads him to meddle with the divine order. So Lillo presents both humility and acceptance of one's ordained lot as necessary to human survival, since they are both concomitants of faith in God and his mercy. One of the keys to the play's meaning is found in the closing lines of the first act:

"We flatter, and torment ourselves, by turns,  
 With what shall never be." Amazing folly!  
 We stand exposed to many unavoidable  
 Calamities and therefore fondly labour  
 T'increase their number and enforce their weight  
 By our fantastic hopes and groundless fears.  
     For one severe distress imposed by Fate,  
     What numbers both tormenting Fear create,  
     Deceived by hope, Ixion-like, we prove  
     Immortal joys and seem to rival Jove.  
     The cloud dissolved, impatient we complain,  
     And pay for fancied bliss substantial pain. (I iii, p. 25)

The sort of hubris exhibited here is not the characteristic of a single tragic protagonist, but can be seen to permeate the whole of the Wilmot

household. But fatalism does not overwhelm the characters, for we can see that each of the three main figures has choices, and all finally fall because they are imbued with guilt and error.

Lillo depends heavily upon irony for his effect, and this greatly intensifies the emotional impact of the final scene. Maria's Song, in itself a conventional interpolation, is intended to create irony and to lead the audience to expect the final outcome so that they can concentrate on the flaws leading to the downfall:

Dear cause of all my pain,  
 On the wide stormy main  
 Thou wast preserved in vain,  
                                   Though still adored.  
 Had'st thou died there unseen,  
 My blasted eyes had been  
 Saved from the horrid'st scene  
                                   Maid ever deplored. (I ii, p. 13)

This serves to form, at least in retrospect, a comment on the futility of the aspirations of the characters at the outset of the play. The irony is a great influence on the German writers at the end of the eighteenth century with the advent of the Schicksalstragödie.<sup>18</sup> There is much to appeal to the German writers in this play which is drenched in a gloomy atmosphere and hints of the supernatural. The actual violence is off-stage but the extreme intensity of the emotions generated in the play was bound to appeal - more so, perhaps, than The London Merchant, which is usually seen as the forerunner of this foreign brand of writing.

It seems to be almost straight after the tremendous reception of The London Merchant that Lillo begins to turn his attention to the conventional type of tragedy in England, for his play The Christian Hero (1735)<sup>19</sup> is the next tragedy to appear. Even before the experiment with bourgeois

characters is followed up with the appearance of Fatal Curiosity Lillo is clearly aware that he ought to place himself in the main line tradition of writers of tragedy. Indeed The Christian Hero is the most old-fashioned type of tragedy to appear for over a decade, and there is little doubt that many of its features are deliberate imitations of the form which was popular in the very early years of the eighteenth century. The story is that of George Castriot, usually known as Scanderbeg, a topic which allows Lillo to make an obvious and very clear contrast between heathen Turks and the Christian Scaderbeg. The contrast throughout the play, however, is always less convincing than its author would have liked it to be, simply because the main character is very flat; his conduct appears to be ruled by principle, but his espousal of Christian virtue remains utterly unconvincing, partly because the dénouement is so forced. Everything works out fine in the end for the hero, but the reader feels that he is not really worth all this good fortune. Lillo had an idea, therefore, but technically the play is unable to give it sufficient justification in terms of character development and psychological interest. I think that it is clear that Lillo had a serious intention. He did want to convey the political philosophy that public good cannot at any time be sacrificed to personal benefit, even if that is the benefit of a king. Much of the impact of the play, though, depends on its treatment of romantic love, and these two strands are in the end incompatible. We become rather more interested in love than in affairs of state. In fact Lillo debases the potentially noble struggle between freedom and tyranny to the level of mere amorous intrigue.

We are straight away reminded of 1700 tragedies when The Christian

Hero opens with a song addressed to Hellena, "on a Sofa in a Melancholy Posture". With mention in the opening stage direction of mutes, eunuchs, dancers and singers, together with this theme of the love-languishing maiden, we are forced away from any feelings of the representation of reality, such as was present in the two Lillo plays already discussed, and back into the world of far-away hyperbolic structures which characterised the plays of the Middle Eastern seraglios. The play begins with the sentimental picture of the women, and it is they who fill in the background details of the situation for us.

Extremes of emotions are also presented when Amasie enters. We are left in no doubt that he is a conventional stage villain as he says

Soul poisoning Envy, eldest born of Hell,  
 Thou Sin of Devils, and their Torment too.  
 To what Contempt, what Mis'ry hast thou brought Me?  
 Ill tim'd Reflection! - I shall still succeed -  
 Love and Ambition, Hatred and Revenge -  
 There's not a Wish my restless Soul has form'd,  
 But shall be quickly crown'd. (I i, p. 13)

This villain figure is thus amply provided with all the clichés we should expect, but Lillo makes the effect even more crass because Amasie comes forward to deliver this speech and then retires until the emperor, Amurath, has had time to introduce himself to the audience. It is clear that the religious overtones in the above speech are significant, with mention of "Hell" and "Sin of Devils". The author then proceeds to bring to mind Miltonic echoes when he has Amasie go on to say

Sure, 'tis much harder to attain Perfection  
 In Ill, than to be truly Good. (Ibid.)

It is interesting to note that Lillo chooses Milton as one of the authors

to whom he alludes, just as did Rowe when he was writing about questions of evil at the beginning of the century. Here, though, the echoes do not have quite the same weight of implication or connotation as did Rowe's echoes.

The first part of Act I is devoted to showing how the heathens argue amongst themselves and are unsure of the course they ought to pursue. When the recently captured Christians enter Lillo gives them the dominant part; they are beaten in battle, but have the power of moral and religious right on their side in argument. Aranthes chastises Amurath for his heathen presumption:

Presumptuous Man!  
 Shall finite Knowledge tax eternal Wisdom?  
 Or shameless Guilt dare, with invidious Eyes,  
 To search the Spots in Purity itself,  
 And call impartial Justice to Account?  
 Impious and vain. (I i, p. 16)

Significantly Aranthes refers back to the fall of the angels from heaven, and compares these heathens to them. The intention of the act is serious debate about crucial moral issues and religious opinions, but the argument is so stilted, and the language so lacking in persuasive rhetorical power, that the passages seem merely verbose and pretentious.

If debate is the keynote of the first act it is even more obvious at the beginning of Act II. The scene opens on the two parties, the Turks and the Christians, ranged on either side of the stage. Instead of the action of battle which we might expect, Scanderbeg moves forward from his soldiers and condemns his opponents. There is here a power missing from the earlier speeches and he finishes with splendid bravado:

Whene'er I think upon thy monst'rous Crimes -  
 O Reposio! Stanissa! Constantine!  
 My slaughter'd Brothers, whose dear Blood still cries  
 Aloud to Heaven; - Your Wrongs shall find Redress.  
 Justice, defer'd, deals forth the heavier Blow. (II i, p. 24)

The debate takes up most of the act but Lillo is forced at the end to break away from it in order to have some kind of progression in terms of plot.

Mahomet, the son of Amurath, is anxious to have a sexual relationship with Althea, but this arouses Scanderbeg's anger even further. Amasie delights in mischief, and tells Mahomet that Althea is full of scruples, a "haughty Christian... Chaste as its Precepts, most severely virtuous" (II i, p. 29).

Amasie is commissioned to secure Althea for Mahomet and at the end of the act the latter proclaims, with all the stale rhetoric of the drama of the first few years of the century:

My Blood's on Fire, and I will quench the Flame,  
 Tho' universal Ruin shou'd insue.  
 By Heaven I will; I'll plunge in Seas of Bliss,  
 And with repeated Draughts of Cordial Love,  
 Expell the raging Fever from my Veins. (Ibid.)

In Act III Amasie tries to persuade Scanderbeg to give up Althea but he will not and cannot. Amasie tries to ingratiate himself with his former master, but the scene is so formal and so slow moving that it loses its intended force. Scanderbeg does not in fact say that he will trust the villain, though we suspect he falls easily into the trap the hypocrite had laid for him, misled by love. The central part of the play is poor. Scanderbeg holds positions but is unconvincing. He has ideals but is not intelligent. Lillo seems to be suggesting that love is a trap for the well-intentioned, an old enough theme, but he does not convince us with any force. At the end of the act Scanderbeg is reunited with Althea, and he

shows his flaw quite clearly:

O Althea!  
 Tho' Heav'n must be obey'd, something is due  
 To vertuous Love. (III i, pp. 38-9)

The difference between Scanderbeg and the heathens is that the hero does not in the end put self first. He is able to follow what he sees to be the will of heaven and he leaves his beloved.

A simple confusion of identity is set up in Act IV. The Vizier knows that Scanderbeg is to see Althea, but when we see someone visiting her it is Mahomet, dressed like Scanderbeg. Althea rails about having been deceived, and here again Lillo has moved back to the early part of the century for his stock patterns. Amurath and the Vizier enter expecting to see Scanderbeg trying to rape Althea, and are utterly amazed to find Mahomet instead. The second half of the act is also structured on disguise. Hellena and Cleora are disguised as Christian soldiers going to Scanderbeg's camp. Hellena's love for the hero, outlined in the first scene of the play, has almost been forgotten, but it returns here to add pathos to the play. Hellena is wounded before she arrives at the camp. She tells Scanderbeg of the plot to assassinate him, admits her love for him, and dies from the wound she has received. We cannot help here being reminded of Rowe's use of the same pattern in The Ambitious Step-Mother, where the hero was warned of danger by the woman in love with him, but whom he did not love. Rowe was able to sustain our interest and engage our sympathy even in that imperfect play because the woman was characterised to a certain extent. Here Hellena is merely a technical device. She neither elicits the pathos intended nor engages our interest. Thus the complication in the love of

the hero is removed before the final act opens. Hellena's death is not tragic because we do not care about her, and Scanderbeg's reactions are similarly unmemorable.

Our attention returns to battle and debate in Act V. The truce has been broken, and first Scanderbeg, then Amurath, soliloquises at length. Amurath's army has been routed and he shouts for more revenge:

The Royal Brute, tho' in the Hunter's Toils,  
Pierc'd with a thousand Wounds is still a Lion;  
Dreadful in Death and dang'rous to the last. (V iii, p. 68)

Althea rejoins her father, Arantes, and they decide to die together. This is prevented, though, by Scanderbeg's arrival; he is reunited with Althea, and she with her father in a very sentimental yet at the same time stilted way:

Aran: My Child too! --- My Althea!  
Alth: O my Father!  
Aran: Compleat Felicity!  
Alth: O dangerous Bliss! (Weeps) (V iv, p. 72)

This simplistic solution to the hero's problems follows those plays of the early part of the century which ended happily. It is in tune with the author's intention that the end should be happy; indeed, the play is meant to celebrate the victory of those with Christian ideas, morals and beliefs over the heathen Turks, but there is no psychological complexity or dramatic validity to make it convincing. Now that Scanderbeg's problems are all over Althea attempts to paint him as a hero with the "greatness of Soul" with which he was characterised before we knew him in the first act. Scanderbeg too tries to show once again his humanitarian and Christian ideas:

Sound a Retreat; since none resist, let War,  
And Slaughter cease. It grieves the Soul to think  
The Crimes of One shou'd cost Mankind so dear. (V iv, p. 73)

The villain is commanded to death and he dies, like a villain of a 1700 tragedy, threatening more revenge. At the very end of the play Lillo includes a brief scene which emphasises freedom, justice, mercy, and the power of the Almighty. Scanderbeg exclaims:

For this alone was Government ordain'd;  
 And Kings are Gods on Earth but while, like Gods,  
 They do no ill, but reign to bless Mankind. (V [v], p. 76)

This scene is included to enforce the didactic intentions and aims of the play, but they are not really brought out dramatically through the action. It is strange that an author who wrote so convincingly about moral questions in a complex vein in his earlier play should so lose his grip on dramatic complexity. The reason is, I think, quite simple. Here Lillo slavishly follows a form long dead, a form belonging essentially to 1700-1710, and one which even then did not lend itself to profundity. Thus when ideas are to be the core of the play, they fit in poorly with the established patterns by which the genre is known. In the same way that throughout the play the conventional patterns (the love sick maiden, the villain with the odd scruple, the disguise misfiring) do not fuse perfectly with the thoughts which are intended to be expressed, so at the end of the play the author adds a conventional rhyming tag which explains what he had hoped to put across in the play rather than what he actually achieved:

May proud, relentless Amurath's Misfortunes  
 Teach future Monarchs to avoid his Crimes.  
 Th'impious Prince, who does all Laws disown,  
 Yet claims from Heaven a Right to hold his Throne,  
 Blasphemes that Power, which righteous Kings obey;  
 For Justice and Mercy bound ev'n th'Almighty Sway. (Ibid.)

The Christian Hero is thus a failure, in the study as well as on the eighteenth

century stage. A poor imitation of a long since decayed form, it shows its author striving to write in an established mode which has little relevance to the 1730s.

Lillo's last play, Elmerick; or, Justice Triumphant (1740)<sup>20</sup> is a more successful and more interesting play than The Christian Hero because both plot and language are more sophisticated.

Lillo attempts to engage the audience's sympathy and emotions from the outset where he emphasises the domestic nature of the situation; Ismena begins the play outlining the immense satisfaction she feels from the love and company of her husband:

My lord, my husband! when I count with transport  
Thy amiable virtues, when I think  
How fair a treatment I possess in thee,  
I'm lost in scenes of soft bewild'ring bliss. (I i, p. 11)

The family nature of the situation is then further emphasised when Ismena speaks at length to her father, Bathori, and it is at this point that Lillo reveals the details significant for the conduct of the plot - that Elmerick has been in a pastoral sort of retirement, but has come back from it in order to assist the state in a moment of crisis. He is thus idealised by the stock pattern of his association with the country, and his distaste for court affairs is implied. Because he has come back to the court despite this distaste, we are to feel even more sympathy for him, and are supposed also to identify with his clear virtue. Bathori, though, is no mere mouthpiece of praise for the central character; although he recognises Elmerick's virtue in assisting the state, he also makes criticisms

of the policies which Elmerick has inherited and has therefore to approve. The king intends to go to Palestine, and Bathori condemns this purpose; calling the venture a

rash, romantick war,  
 Begot by hot-brain'd bigots, and fomented  
 By the intrigue of proud, designing priests.  
 All ages have their madness, this is ours. (I i, p. 13)

Elmerick is thus idealised, or at any rate praised highly, but Bathori can criticise his supposed support of the Palestine expedition as well as praise his patriotism. At the end of the opening scene Lillo outlines two sorts of danger for Elmerick: that resulting from political intrigue and that resulting from the sexual desires of Conrade, Queen Matilda's brother, for Ismena. For the second scene Lillo turns to the king in council with Elmerick and his other advisers. Here are long speeches full of heightened rhetoric, but we gain a corrective view of Elmerick, one which allows us to change somewhat our feelings of him as a paragon. He praises the king in very lavish tones and the king rightly dismisses this as flattery. Similarly Bathori, who has criticised the king in the first scene behind the king's back, praises him extravagantly when confronted with him.

The picture is further complicated when in the third scene Mathilda, also sees the proposed expedition as "holy madness". She complains that the king has neglected her, and we see that he cannot even bring himself to give her a convincing "last embrace". Matilda thinks of present enjoyment while the king thinks of future glory. This is a traditional enough pattern in the tragedy of the century but rarely has it been put more clearly. She seems to be a warm personality because of her desire

for love and for sexual satisfaction while he, idealistic and apparently thinking primarily of the state, appears haughty, distant and alienated. Thus at the end of the first act there are no clear rights and wrongs; Elmerick, the king and all the other characters are undercut as ideals. Even Ismena is undercut although we do not realise this until later. Bathori suggested that she would be better away from the polluting atmosphere of the court, but she did nothing about this, and remained; later we realise that had she been sensible she would have stayed out of trouble and returned to the country.

In Act II Lillo again matches scenes furthering the plot with scenes of a domestic and sentimental nature. The queen is in love with Elmerick but he is blind to it. Conrade arrives at the court and, after a scene of reconciliation between brother and sister, he shows his lust for Ismena. Conrade attempts to press himself upon Ismena but she fends him off.

Act III is devoted to trickery on the part of Matilda and Conrade. Matilda knows that Elmerick is not to be lured easily, but she sets up an elaborate trick. Elmerick is summoned, she tells him of her love, he is confused, and then Conrade enters and charges him with seduction and ravishment. Matilda, of course, pretends that Elmerick has attempted to assault her, and asks Conrade to avenge Elmerick's "rudeness" and the "vile indignity" of having to hasten to his declarations of love. She turns into a full scale villain, reminding us of Rowe's Ambitious Step-Mother, and she is delighted when a fight develops between the two men:

Most exquisite! Legions of plagues and curses!  
 Has Heaven nor Hell no vengeance in reserve,  
 No bolts to strike, no lightning to consume  
 This overbearing traitor; who has dar'd  
 To talk of wrongs. (III i p. 43)

Matilda, then, seems to be a stock villain, but then Lillo makes her show some sort of pity for Ismena!

Poor Ismena!  
 To be so plac'd by fate, that love or vengeance  
 Cou'd find no passage to the stubborn breast  
 Of Elmerick but through thy breaking heart. (III i, p. 45)

She is fully aware that she broke Ismena's heart deliberately, and that she tricked Elmerick, but at the same time she shows just that touch of humanity which prevents her being merely a puppet.

Another interesting touch of Lillo's is that the queen does not perform her treachery by herself. She involves two innocent people to carry out her plan, her maid Xenomira and Xenomira's lover, Belus. In the 1700 plays minor characters so used are merely instruments of their masters' wills, but not so here. Belus is shown at the beginning of Act IV lamenting the fact that he has been made "the tool of some vile purpose" (IV i, p. 46), and thus we are left with the feeling that Belus is to play some further part in the drama.

Ismena is raped by Conrade; we do not see the scene but Bathori meets his daughter at the beginning of Act IV and treats her most tenderly. He does not collapse with anger or grief; he attempts to do something about it and so, despite his age, confronts Conrade. The queen separates the two men and here Lillo brings in some lords who insist that the judge of the whole situation must be Elmerick, now in charge of affairs in the absence

of the king. It is at this point in the play that Lillo does some surprising things.

Elmerick condemns the queen. He reacts not with fury but with justice. Ismena tells him that only her religion prevented her suicide after the rape (another indication of the sentimentality of the play) and he acts rationally:

Alike remote from rashness and from fear  
I'll trace this hellish mystery to its source,  
And deal to each, with an inflexible  
And equal hand, the portion they deserve. (IV ii, pp. 57-8)

Elmerick threatens the queen with justice and she is astonished that he dare do such a thing. Not only dare he do it, however, but he goes on, oblivious to the several excuses that she tries to make. She tells him that she has sent Conrade to accuse him to her husband but even this makes no difference:

Enter the Executioners. While they prepare to struggle with her, she speaks.... They pull her into the Recess in the back Scene, and strangle her. (V i, p. 62)

The impact of this on stage must have been tremendous. Elmerick has up to this point seemed to personify justice, but this act is simply horrific. It is perhaps because Lillo loses control that he goes on to present a most remarkable interchange. Belus announces

The Queen is Dead!  
Elmerick: She is, and by my sentence.  
Have I done ought unjust?  
Belus: I dare not say it,  
Yet stand astonished at the rigorous deed. (V i, p. 63)

Belus seems to represent the voice of ordinary mortals. After all it was he who was misled by the queen, and it was he who was shocked that he had

been so badly treated. Nevertheless he dare not and cannot express the horror he feels at this absolute exhibition of justice. Elmerick's justice is so absolute that it seems like villainy; one dare not speak out against it. It is a moment where the audience is shocked into making some decision about the morality of Elmerick's action. This is further emphasised at the end of the play, for the king returns, demands to know what has happened and is forced ultimately to exonerate Elmerick. We are left feeling uneasy about this whole conduct, and it may be that this is Lillo's intention.

The final outcome is very contrived, and the way characters associated with error and evil make their confessions strikes us as remarkable. What is most important, however, is that the king finally accepts Elmerick's version of the events when he is faced with written evidence in the form of a letter given to him by Belus and Xenomira. In the end the appeal is to the ordinary people, the servants, and not the court characters. This suggests that ultimate wisdom about moral issues lies not in the courtly characters, although they are the ones who govern, but in ordinary people. In the end, then, the appeal is to democracy, to the "common voice" and in this Lillo has moved a long way from the court view of 1700.

In the end Ismena dies, Elmerick laments her death, Conrade confesses all his faults and commits suicide, and Elmerick's stature is confirmed, yet despite all this the audience is left uneasy.

In several instances Lillo recalls a Greek pattern; he uses a messenger to describe Ismena's death; he appeals to an authority outside the play; he builds up considerable suspense before the final moral outcome

is clarified. Elmerick is a very formal, old-fashioned, stereotype revenge play based on sexual motivations, and only somewhat modified by the desire for audience emotion and sentimentality, for the first three and a half acts. Then tension is built up because it is not known how the returning king will react, and in the end the surrogate monarch's power to punish the guilty, even though the guilty person may be a queen, is confirmed. In the rigour of its moral resolution Lillo makes us question the application of abstract morality. Whether this is done consciously or unconsciously we cannot know, but one thing is certain; although he starts from a conventional stereotype plot he modifies it tremendously, and shows that even though he abandoned the moral complexity of The London Merchant he was still fascinated by moral questions and by the nature of good and evil right up until his death.

### Notes

- 1 The best of these is Frederick E. DeBoer's "George Lillo", University of Wisconsin, 1968.
- 2 Sylvia; or, The Country Burial. An Opera. London, 1731. C S721.d.70.48<sup>1</sup>.
- 3 Theophilus Cibber, Lives of the Poets III, 339. Also quoted in The London Merchant Ed. William H. McBurney, p. x.
- 4 Britannia and Batavia. A Masque. Written on the marriage of the Princess Royal with his Highness the Prince of Orange. London, 1740. BM 11775.c.64.
- 5 Arden of Feversham. An historical tragedy. London, 1762. BM 11777.a.41.
- 6 Marina.<sup>5</sup> Taken from Pericles, Prince of Tyre. London, 1738. C S721.d.70.21<sup>5</sup>.
- 7 George Lillo. The London Merchant; or, The History of George Barnwell.  
For J. Gray, and sold by J. Roberts, 1731. C S721.d.70.65.

Tu	22	June	1731	DL	Fri	1	Oct	1731	GF
Wed	30	June	1731	DL	Mon	4	Oct	1731	GF
Fri	2	July	1731	DL	Sat	16	Oct	1731	DL
Tu	6	July	1731	DL	Sat	23	Oct	1731	DL
Fri	9	July	1731	DL	Th	28	Oct	1731	DL
Tu	13	July	1731	DL	Fri	29	Oct	1731	DL
Fri	16	July	1731	DL	Wed	10	Nov	1731	GF
Tu	20	July	1731	DL	Th	11	Nov	1731	DL
Fri	23	July	1731	DL	Mon	29	Nov	1731	GF
Tu	27	July	1731	DL	Th	9	Dec	1731	DL
Fri	30	July	1731	DL	Fri	10	Dec	1731	GF
Tu	3	Aug	1731	DL	Mon	27	Dec	1731	GF
Wed	11	Aug	1731	DL	Th	13	Jan	1732	GF
Fri	13	Aug	1731	DL	Th	20	Jan	1732	DL
Mon	16	Aug	1731	DL	Tu	15	Feb	1732	GF
Fri	20	Aug	1731	DL	Mon	10	Apr	1732	DL
Th	26	Aug	1731	BF	Th	13	Apr	1732	GF
Wed	8	Sep	1731	SF	Wed	17	May	1732	DL
Mon	27	Sep	1731	GF	Mon	22	May	1732	LIF
Wed	29	Sep	1731	GF	Mon	29	May	1732	DL

Th	1	June	1732	HAY	Tu	11	Dec	1744	GF
Mon	21	Aug	1732	DL	Th	17	Jan	1745	GF
Mon	16	Oct	1732	GF	Mon	25	Nov	1745	GF
Th	26	Oct	1732	DL	Tu	10	Dec	1745	GF
Th	28	Dec	1732	GF	Tu	11	Feb	1746	GF
Sat	6	Jan	1733	GF	Th	6	Nov	1746	SOU
Mon	26	Mar	1733	HAY	Th	13	Nov	1746	GF
Tu	7	Aug	1733	CG	Mon	2	Feb	1747	GF
Fri	10	Aug	1733	CG	Th	19	Feb	1747	GF
Fri	17	Aug	1733	CG	Fri	28	Aug	1747	SM MF
Wed	10	Oct	1733	DL	Tu	14	June	1748	JS
Fri	19	Oct	1733	GF	Mon	31	Oct	1748	JS
Wed	26	Dec	1733	HAY	Th	29	Dec	1748	NWC
Mon	22	Apr	1734	JS	Mon	8	May	1749	DL
Fri	24	May	1734	JS	Fri	15	Sep	1749	SF
Mon	17	June	1734	HAY	Fri	22	Sep	1749	DL
Th	22	Aug	1734	HAY	Sat	23	Sep	1749	DL
Sat	22	Feb	1735	GF	Sat	30	Sep	1749	DL
Tu	3	June	1735	YB	Tu	31	Oct	1749	DL
Tu	1	July	1735	DL	Tu	26	Dec	1749	DL
Fri	1	Aug	1735	LIF	Tu	26	Dec	1749	CG
Wed	1	Oct	1735	YB	Mon	8	Jan	1750	BB
Wed	8	Oct	1735	GF	Th	15	Feb	1750	DL
Fri	26	Dec	1735	DL	Tu	8	May	1750	DL
Mon	1	Mar	1736	GF	Tu	18	Sep	1750	DL
Fri	9	Apr	1736	LIF	Th	20	Sep	1750	DL
Mon	26	Apr	1736	HAY	Th	27	Jan	1751	DL
Mon	8	Nov	1736	LIF	Tu	14	May	1751	DL
Tu	8	Feb	1737	LIF	Th	26	Dec	1751	DL
Wed	22	June	1737	LIF	Mon	20	Nov	1752	NW LS
Fri	23	May	1740	CG	Wed	26	Dec	1753	DL
Wed	29	Oct	1740	GF	Th	1	Jan	1756	DL
Fri	7	Nov	1740	CG	Tu	20	Jan	1756	DL
Sat	28	Feb	1741	GF	Th	13	May	1756	DL
Th	4	June	1741	DL	Mon	23	May	1757	DL
Th	2	Oct	1741	GF	Mon	15	May	1758	DL
Mon	9	Nov	1741	JS	Sat	6	Jan	1759	DL
Tu	8	Dec	1741	GF	Mon	31	Dec	1759	DL
Tu	23	Mar	1742	GF	Tu	13	May	1760	DL
Mon	27	Sep	1742	SOU	Mon	25	May	1761	DL
Mon	8	Nov	1742	JS	Fri	6	Nov	1761	DL
Wed	23	Mar	1743	HAY	Mon	28	Dec	1761	DL
Sat	1	Oct	1743	DL	Tu	17	May	1763	DL
Tu	27	Dec	1743	DL	Mon	26	Dec	1764	DL
Wed	16	May	1744	DL	Tu	1	Jan	1765	DL
Wed	6	June	1744	MF	Mon	8	Apr	1755	DL

Sat	28	Sep	1765	DL	Fri	6	June	1777	DL
Tu	1	Oct	1765	DL	Mon	30	June	1777	CHR
Mon	7	Oct	1765	DL	Fri	26	Dec	1777	DL
Mon	21	Oct	1765	DL	Mon	5	Jan	1778	CG
Mon	18	Nov	1765	DL	Th	21	May	1778	DL
Th	26	Dec	1765	DL	Tu	9	June	1778	CHR
Tu	13	May	1766	DL	Mon	9	Nov	1778	DL
Mon	1	June	1767	DL	Mon	4	Jan	1779	CG
Fri	23	Oct	1767	DL	Tu	28	Dec	1779	DL
Mon	26	Oct	1767	CG	Mon	27	Mar	1780	CII
Mon	9	Nov	1767	CG	Th	9	Nov	1780	DL
Sat	26	Dec	1767	DL	Mon	9	Apr	1781	CII
Mon	18	Jan	1768	CG	Sat	12	May	1781	DL
Mon	2	May	1768	CG	Fri	9	Nov	1781	CG
Mon	23	May	1768	CG	Wed	26	Dec	1781	CG
Fri	23	Sep	1768	DL	Wed	29	May	1782	DL
Wed	9	Nov	1768	CG	Mon	21	Apr	1783	DL
Mon	9	Jan	1769	CG	Fri	26	Dec	1783	CG
Mon	10	Apr	1769	CG	Mon	29	Dec	1783	CG
Wed	17	May	1769	CG	Wed	14	May	1784	DL
Mon	22	May	1769	CG	Mon	27	Dec	1784	CG
Mon	25	Sep	1769	CG	Wed	9	Nov	1785	DL
Th	9	Nov	1769	DL	Mon	26	Dec	1785	CG
Tu	26	Dec	1769	DL	Tu	26	Dec	1786	DL
Mon	29	Jan	1770	CG	Mon	12	Feb	1787	DL
Th	10	May	1770	CG	Mon	30	May	1787	DL
Mon	28	May	1770	DL	Tu	25	Sep	1787	DL
Mon	4	June	1770	DL	Fri	9	Nov	1787	DL
Mon	1	Oct	1770	CG	Th	27	Dec	1787	DL
Mon	22	Oct	1770	CG	Mon	24	Mar	1788	DL
Fri	9	Nov	1770	CG	Sat	20	Sep	1788	DL
Wed	26	Dec	1770	CG	Wed	10	June	1789	DL
Th	18	Apr	1771	CG	Mon	7	Dec	1789	DL
Mon	20	May	1771	DL	Mon	28	Nov	1796	DL
Mon	27	May	1771	CG	Wed	30	Nov	1796	DL
Mon	30	Sep	1771	CG	Fri	2	Dec	1796	DL
Sat	9	Nov	1771	CG	Wed	7	Dec	1796	DL
Fri	3	Jan	1772	CG	Mon	12	Dec	1796	DL
Mon	20	Apr	1772	CG	Mon	19	Dec	1796	DL
Mon	9	Nov	1772	DL	Mon	26	Dec	1796	DL
Sat	26	Dec	1772	DL	Mon	9	Jan	1797	DL
Fri	28	May	1773	CG	Tu	31	Jan	1797	DL
Mon	27	Dec	1773	CG	Fri	17	Feb	1797	DL
Sat	28	May	1774	DL	Mon	17	Apr	1797	DL
Mon	26	Sep	1774	CG	Th	9	Nov	1797	DL
Mon	2	Jan	1775	CG	Mon	26	Nov	1798	DL
Mon	23	Oct	1775	CG	Mon	17	Dec	1798	DL
Tu	26	Dec	1775	DL	Mon	14	Jan	1799	DL
Fri	17	May	1776	DL	Th	26	Dec	1799	DL
Fri	11	Oct	1776	CHR	Mon	14	Apr	1800	DL

- 8 The references are to the modern edition ed. William H. McBurney, London: Edward Arnold, 1965.
- 9 This scene was added in the fifth edition with the "Advertisement" which shows that it was part of Lillo's original intention. See McBurney, Appendix B, pp. 83-85.
- 10 McBurney, Appendix B "Scene the Last", p. 84.
- 11 John Loftis, Comedy and Society from Congreve to Fielding. Stanford University Press, 1958, p. 2.

12 George Lillo. Fatal Curiosity. A true tragedy of three Acts. For John Gray, 1737. C S721.d.70.65.

Th 27 May 1736 HAY\*

\* "Daily Advertiser 28 May: Last Night... Guilt is its own Punishment... was acted... with the greatest Applause that has been shewn to any Tragedy for many Years. The Scenes of Distress were so artfully work'd up, and so well perform'd, that there scarce remain'd a dry Eye among the Spectators at the Representation; and during the Scene preceding the Catastrophe, an attentive Silence possess'd the whole House, more expressive of an universal Approbation than the loudest Applause" (London Stage III, 588).

Fri 28 May 1736 HAY	Tu 3 Mar 1741 GF
Sat 29 May 1736 HAY	Mon 22 Nov 1742 JS
Mon 31 May 1736 HAY	Th 4 Sep 1755 HAY
Tu 1 June 1736 HAY	Sat 29 June 1782 HAY**
Wed 2 June 1736 HAY	Mon 1 July 1782 HAY
Mon 21 June 1736 HAY	Wed 3 July 1782 HAY
Mon 21 Mar 1737 HAY	Fri 5 July 1782 HAY
Tu 22 Mar 1737 HAY	Mon 8 July 1782 HAY
Th 24 Mar 1737 HAY	Wed 10 July 1782 HAY
Sat 26 Mar 1737 HAY	Fri 12 July 1782 HAY
Mon 28 Mar 1737 HAY	Th 18 July 1782 HAY
Tu 29 Mar 1737 HAY	Wed 31 July 1782 HAY
Th 31 Mar 1737 HAY	Th 8 Aug 1782 HAY
Sat 2 Apr 1737 HAY	Mon 19 Aug 1782 HAY
Mon 11 Apr 1737 HAY	Th 17 June 1784 HAY
Tu 12 Apr 1737 HAY	Tu 6 July 1784 HAY
Mon 2 May 1737 HAY	Th 29 July 1786 HAY
Sat 14 Feb 1741 GF	Mon 1 May 1797 DL
Tu 17 Feb 1741 GF	Sat 6 May 1797 DL

\*\*The performances in 1782 are of the revision of Fatal Curiosity by George Colman.

- 13 The Works of Mr. George Lillo: with Some Account of his Life. London:  
Printed for T. Davies, 1775, I, xvi.  
Also reprinted in McBurney, pp. x-xi.
- 14 Reprinted with publication history and notes in McBurney, pp. 55-58.  
The report originally dates from 1618, and the text McBurney  
quotes is taken from the first edition of A Compleat History of  
the Lives and Reigns of Mary, Queen of Scotland, And of Her Son  
and Successor, James the Sixth, King of Scotland. By William  
Sanderson, Esq. London, 1656, pp. 462-465.
- 15 Ibid., McBurney, p. 56.
- 16 Fatal Curiosity, I i, 11.30-47 (pp. 7-8) compare The London Merchant,  
I i, 11.31-43 (p. 11).
- 17 This is a change from the Restoration tragedy stereotype in the new  
glorification of the middle, merchant, class. Compare the old  
merchant and seafaring similes in many contemporary tragedies.
- 18 German term meaning "Tragedy of Destiny". See G.H. Nettleton,  
English Drama of the Restoration and Eighteenth Century. New  
York: MacMillan, 1932, p. 208.
- 19 George Lillo, The Christian Hero. For John Gray, 1735. BM 643.g.16(10).  
Pagination irregular: 9-40, 49-76.  
Mon 13 Jan 1733 DL                      Wed 15 Jan 1733 DL  
Tu 14 Jan 1733 DL                        Th 16 Jan 1733 DL
- 20 George Lillo, Elmerick; or, Justice Triumphant. For John Gray, 1740.  
C S721.d.70.7<sup>o</sup>  
Sat 23 Feb 1740 DL                      Th 28 Feb 1740 DL  
Mon 25 Feb 1740 DL                      Mon 3 Mar 1740 DL  
Tu 26 Feb 1740 DL

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Primary Sources

- Addison, Joseph. Cato. For J. Tonson, 1713. MM B.3331.
- Ashton, Robert. The Battle of Aughrim; or, The Fall of Monsieur St. Ruth. Dublin: by S. Powell, for Richard Morris, 1728. E.
- Banks, John. The Albion Queens; or, The Death of Mary Queen of Scotland. For Richard Wellington, [1704]. BM 644.g.3.
- . Cyrus the Great; or, The Tragedy of Love. For Richard Bentley, 1696. C Syn.6.68.27<sup>2</sup>.
- . The Island Queens. For R. Bentley, 1684. BM 81.c.11(4).
- . The Unhappy Favourite; or, The Earl of Essex. For Richard Bentley, and Mary Magnes, 1682. BM 840.g.32.
- Barford, Richard. The Virgin Queen. Dublin: by A. Rhames, for R. Gunne, 1728. BM 640.h.35(5).
- Beaumont, Francis and John Fletcher. Bonduca. For J. T., and sold by J. Brown, 1718. BM 1346.d.6.
- . "The False One" in The British Drama, I, Part I. London: By William Miller; Edinburgh: by James Ballantyne, 1804.
- . "The Loyal Subject" in Fifty Comedies and Tragedies, pp. 255-80. By J. Macock for John Martyn, Henry Herringman, Richard Marriot, 1679. C Y.7.5.
- . The Loyal Subject; or, The Faithful General. For H. N., and sold by W. Keble, [1700?]. BM 841.d.5.
- . "A Wife for a Month; a Tragi-Comedy" in Fifty Comedies and Tragedies, pp. 469-89. For John Martyn, Henry Herringman, Richard Marriot, 1679. C Y.7.5.
- Beckingham, Charles. The Tragedy of King Henry IV of France. For E. Curll, T. Jauncy, A. Bettsworth, and J. Brotherton, 1720. BM 1346.f.10(4).

- . Scipio Africanus. For W. Mears, J. Browne, and F. Clay, 1718.  
BM 162.c.8.
- [Bellers, Fettiplace]. Injur'd Innocence. For J. Brindley, 1732. BM 161.  
g.35.
- [Betterton, Thomas]. The Roman Actor. For W. Mears, and D. Brown, W.  
Chetwood, and J. Woodman, S. Chapman, 1722. BM 643.c.43.
- . A Tragedy of Hamlet Prince of Denmark. For Rich. Wellington,  
and E. Rumball, 1703. Dfo Mpt.
- Biddle, Thomas. A Poem on the Birth of the Young Prince... To Which is Added,  
Augustus, a Tragedy. For S. Baker, 1717. CSmH Mpt.
- [Bond, William]. The Tuscan Treaty; or, Tarquin's Overthrow. Written by  
a gentleman lately deceased, revised and altered by W. Bond Esq.  
for J. Watson, 1733. C 5721.d.70.46<sup>2</sup>.
- Boyer, Abel. Achilles; or, Iphigenia in Aulis. Tho. Bennett, 1700.  
LVAf 6976<sup>2</sup>.
- Brady, Nicholas. The Rape; or, The Innocent Impostors. For R. Bentley,  
1692. BM 644.g.22.
- Brereton, Thomas. Esther; or, Faith Triumphant. For J. Tonson, 1715.  
BM 642.b.1.
- Brooke, Henry. Gustavus Vasa, the Deliverer of His Country. For R. Dodsley,  
1739. C 5721.d.70.12<sup>10</sup>.
- [Brown, Anthony]. The Fatal Retirement. For T. Osborn, 1739. C 5721.d.  
70.7<sup>4</sup>.
- [Browne, Moses]. Polidus; or, Distress'd Love. Printed in the Year 1723.  
BM 162.c.24.
- Buckingham, John Sheffield. "Julius Caesar Altered" in The Works. 2 vols.  
For John Barber, 1723. C Rel.f.1.a.38-9.
- . "Marcus Brutus" in The Works. 2 vols. For John Barber, 1723.  
C Rel.f.1.a.38-9.
- [Bullock, Christopher]. The Traytor. Reviv'd with several alterations.  
For W. Chetwood, and J. Peele, 1718. BM 11773.b.15.
- Centlivre, Susanna. The Cruel Gift. For E. Curll, and A. Bettesworth,  
1717. BM 11777.a.20.
- . The Perjur'd Husband; or, The Adventures of Venice. Written by  
S. Carroll. For Bennet Banbury, 1700. BM 644.g.27.

- Cibber, Colley. Caesar in Aegypt. For John Watts, 1725. C S721.d.70.47<sup>4</sup>.
- [-----]. Cinna's Conspiracy. For Bernard Lintott, 1713 E.
- . The Tragical History of King Richard III. For B. Lintott... and A. Bettesworth, [1700]. BM 11764.f.7.
- . Perolla and Izadora. For Bernard Lintott, 1706. BM 11778.g.40.
- . Xerxes. By John Nutt, 1699. LVaf 6976<sup>30</sup>.
- . "Ximena; or, The Heroick Daughter" in Plays II. For B. Lintot, W. Mears, and W. Chetwood, 1721. C S721.b.72.4.
- Cibber, Theophilus. An Historical Tragedy of the Civil Wars in the Reign of King Henry VI. For J. Walthoe Jun., W. Chetwood, and J. Stagg, [c. 1722]. BM 11777.b.5(2).
- Congreve, William. Mourning Bride. For Jacob Tonson, 1697. BM 1343.i.37.
- Cooke, Thomas. The Mournful Nuptials; or, Love the Cure of All Woes. For T. Cooper, 1739. C S721.d.70.73.
- . Love the Cause and Cure of Grief; or, The Innocent Murderer. For R. Francklin, 1744. BM 642.i.5(6).
- Corneille, Pierre. Le Cid. Augustin Courbée, Paris, 1637. BM 11737.ff. 35(1).
- . Cinna, ou la clémence d'Auguste. Imprimé aux dépens de l'auteur; se vendent chez Toussaninet Quinet, Paris, 1643. BM C.34.i.7.
- . La Mort de Pompée. Antione de Sommanville; Augustin Courbée, Paris, 1644. BM C.34.i.10.
- Courtney Earl of Devonshire; or, The Troubles of the Princess Elizabeth. Comprehending a great part of the Reign of Queen Mary, with the Death of Jane Gray. For Nicholas Cox [c.1705]. CSmH.
- Crowne, John. Caligula. By J. Orme, for R. Wellington, 1698. C. U\*.5.128(D).
- . Henry the Sixth. The Second Part. Or the Misery of the Civil War. For R. Bentley, and M. Magnes, 1681. BM 161.h.48.
- Darcy, James. Love and Ambition. Dublin, printed; London, reprinted for J. Roberts, 1732. BM 161.i.1.
- Davenant, William and John Dryden [?]. The Tragedy of Julius Caesar; With the Death of Brutus and Cassius. For J. Tonson, 1719. BPL 113702.

- Dennis, John. Appius and Virginia. For Bernard Lintott, [1709]. BM 841.  
c.10(1).
- . The Invader of His Country; or, The Fatal Resentment. For J.  
Pemberton, and J. Watts, 1720. C S721.d.70.43<sup>2</sup>.
- . Iphigenia. For Richard Parker, 1700. BM 643.i.19(4).
- . Liberty Asserted. For George Strahan, and Bernard Lintott, 1704.  
BM 841.c.6(3).
- . Rinaldo and Armida. For Jacob Tonson, 1699. BM 83.b.12(1).
- Duncombe, William. Junius Brutus. Printed and sold by J. Roberts, 1735.  
BM 11775.f.12.
- D'Urfey, Thomas. The Famous History of the Rise and Fall of Massaniello.  
For John Nutt, 1700. LVAd 3387.
- . The Famous History and Fall of Massainello [sic]; or, A Fisherman  
a Prince. The Second Part. For John Nutt, 1699. LVAd 3388.
- . "The Grecian Heroine; or, The Fate of Tyranny" in New Opera's,  
with Comical Stories, and Poems, On Several Occasions. For William  
Chetwood, 1721. O.
- The Faithful General. Written by a young lady. For Richard Wellington,  
1706. O.
- The Fatal Discovery; or, Love in Ruines. By J. Orme, for R. Wellington,  
1698. LVAd 3680.
- The Fatal Secret; or, The Rival Brothers. Printed and sold by Ben Bragg,  
1704. LVAd 8242.
- Fenton, Elijah. Mariamne. For the Company of Booksellers, [c. 1720].
- . ----- . For J. Tonson, 1723. C S721.d.70.12<sup>9</sup>.
- Filmer, Edward. "The Unfortunate Couple" in Peter Motteux, Novelty. Every  
Act a Play. For Rich. Parker, and Peter Buck, 1697. BM 11774.f.18.
- . The Unnatural Brother. By J. Orme, for Richard Wilkin, 1697.  
C Syn.6.68.50<sup>9</sup>.
- Frowde, Philip. Fall of Saguntum. For J. Crockatt, and T. Wood, 1727.  
C S721.d.70.20<sup>5</sup>.
- . Philotas. For A. Millar, 1731. C S721.d.70.48<sup>5</sup>.

- [Fyfe, Alexander]. The Royal Martyr, King Charles I. An Opera. [Edinburgh].  
Printed in the Year 1705. C U\*.5.157<sup>2</sup>(D).
- . ----- . A Tragedy. Printed in the Year 1709, and are to be  
sold by John Morphew. C U\*.5.157<sup>1</sup>(D).
- Gay, John. The Captives. For J. Tonson, 1724. MM B.376.
- Gildon, Charles. Love's Victim; or, The Queen of Wales. By M. Bennet, for  
Richard Parker, and George Strahan, 1701. BM 841.d.9(5).
- . The Patriot; or, The Italian Conspiracy. For William Davis, and  
George Strahan, 1703. LVAd 4035.
- . Phaeton; or, The Fatal Divorce. For Abel Roper, 1698. BM 644.  
h.38.
- . The Roman Bride's Revenge. For John Sturton, 1697. BM 644.e.12.
- Goring, Charles. Irene; or, The Fair Greek. For John Bayley, 1708. LVaf  
6976<sup>14</sup>.
- Gould, Robert. Innocence Distress'd; or, The Royal Penitents. For T. Longman,  
and sold by J. Roberts, 1737. C S721.d.70.22<sup>2</sup>.
- . The Rival Sisters; or, The Violence of Love. For Richard Bently,  
Francis Saunders, and James Knapton, 1696. BM 161.i.71.
- Griffin, Benjamin. Injur'd Virtue; or, The Virgin Martyr. For Jonas Browne,  
and J. Richardson, 1714. BM 162.c.59.
- Hatchett, William. The Fall of Mortimer. For J. Millan, 1731. BM 1346.e.43.
- [-----]. The Rival Father; or, The Death of Achilles. For William Mears  
and Thomas Corbett, 1730. BM 163.k.53.
- Havard, William. King Charles the First. An historical tragedy. Written  
in imitation of Shakespear. For J. Watts, 1737. C S721.d.70.64.
- . ----- . For Harrison and Co., and sold, likewise, by J. Wenman,  
1779. MM Disbd.
- . Scanderbeg. For J. Watts, 1773. BM 83.a.33(1).
- Haywood, Eliza. The Fair Captive. For T. Jauncy, and H. Cole, 1721. BM  
162.h.18.

- . Frederick, Duke of Brunswick-Lunenburg. For W. Mears, J. Brindley, 1729. BM 643.e.1.
- Hewitt, John. The Fair Rivals. Bath: by J. Lyons, 1729 CSmH.
- . The Fatal Falsehood; or, Distress'd Innocence. For T. Worrall, [1734]. C S721.d.70.46<sup>B</sup>.
- Higsons, Bevil. The Generous Conqueror; or, The Timely Discovery. For S. Briscoe, 1702. BM 162.h.29.
- Hill, Aaron. Alzira. For John Osborn, 1736. BM 11775.f.6.
- . Athelwold. For L. Gilliver, 1731.
- . ----- . Dublin: by S. Powell, for Abraham Bradley, 1732. BM 11774.aaa.20(1).
- . Elfrid; or, The Fair Inconstant. For Bernard Lintott, and Egbert Sanger, [1710]. LVAf 6976<sup>9</sup>.
- . The Fatal Vision; or, The Fall of Siam. For Edw. Nutt [1716]. O.
- . King Henry the Fifth; or, The Conquest of France by the English. For W. Chetwood, and J. Watts, 1723. BM 11765.aaa.30(1).
- . The Tragedy of Zara. For J. Watts, 1736. BM 11774.e.3(1).
- Honesty in Distress but Reliev'd by No Party. [A Chapbook]. [London? 1770?] BM 11621.e.3(21).
- Hopkins, Charles. Boadicea, Queen of Britain. For Jacob Tonson, 1697. C Syn.6.68.35<sup>C</sup>.
- . Friendship Improv'd; or, The Female Warrior. For J. Tonson, 1700. C Syn.6.68.35<sup>D</sup>.
- . Neglected Virtue; or, The Unhappy Conqueror. For Henry Rhodes, Richard Parker, Sam. Briscoe, 1696. BM 643.d.67.
- . Pyrrhus, King of Epirus.<sup>1</sup> For Samuel Briscoe, Peter Buck, and Daniel Dring, 1695. C Syn.6.68.35<sup>1</sup>.
- Houdart de la Motte, Antoine. Les Oeuvres de Théâtre. Paris: Chez Gregoire Dupuis, 1730. BM 241.g.19.
- . Romulus. Paris: G. Dupuis, 1722.
- Hughes, John. Hamlet, Prince of Denmark. A Tragedy. By J. Derby for M. Wellington, 1718. CSmH Mfilm.

- . The Siege of Damascus. For John Watts, 1720. BM 643.g.12(10).
- . ----- . For J. W., and sold by Samuel Chapman, 1721. C S721.d.72.28.
- [Hunt, William]. Fall of Tarquin. York: by John White, 1713. BM 11775.b.41.
- Hurst, Robert. The Roman Maid. For George Strahan, 1725. C S721.d.70.12<sup>10</sup>.
- Jacob, Hildebrande. The Fatal Constancy. For J. Tonson, 1723. BM 7720.c.51.
- Jeffreys, George. Edwin. By T.\* Woodward, J. Walthoe, J. Peele, and T. Wood, 1724. C S721.d.70.12<sup>7</sup>.
- . Merope. Printed and sold by J. Roberts, T. Cox, and T. Woodward, 1731. BM 162.h.62.
- Johnson, Charles. Caelia; or, The Pergur'd Lover. J. Watts, 1733. BM 643.g.14(7).
- . The Force of Friendship. For Egbert Sanger, 1710. BM 161.i.13.
- . Love and Liberty. For Bernard Lintott, 1709. BM 162.i.16.
- . The Tragedy of Medaea. For R. Francklin, 1731. BM 162.i.19.
- . Sultanness. By W. Wilkins, for J. Browne, W. Hinchliffe, J. Walthoe Jun., 1717. BM 162.i.22.
- . Victim. Printed and sold by Ferd. Burleigh, 1714. BM 11775.b.46.
- Johnson, Henry. Romulus. For S. Billingsley, and sold by J. Roberts, A. Dodd, C. King, J. Noon, and J. Billingsley, 1724. BM 11740.bb.25(21).
- Killigrew, Henry. Pallantus and Eudora. For John Hardesty, 1653. C Sel. 3.162<sup>38</sup>.
- Lansdowne, George Granville. The British Enchanters; or, No Magick Like Love. For Jacob Tonson, 1706. BM Huth 109.
- . Heroick Love. For F. Saunders, H. Playford, and B. Tooke, 1698. C. Syn.6.69.49<sup>3</sup>
- Lee, Nathaniel. Lucius Junius Brutus, Father of His Country. For R. Tonson, and J. Tonson, 1681. BM 644.h.59.
- . ----- . Ed. John Loftis. London: Edward Arnold, 1968.
- Lewis, David. Philip of Macedon. By J. Watts, and sold by J. Roberts. 1727. C Hib.7.727.16.

- Lillo, George. Arden of Feversham. An historical tragedy. London, 1762.  
BM 11777.a.41.
- . Britannia and Batavia. A Masque. Written on the marriage of  
the Princess Royal with his Highness the Prince of Orange. London,  
1740. BM 11775.c.64.
- . The Christian Hero. For John Gray, 1735. C S721.d.70.14<sup>4</sup>.
- . Dramatic Works. 2 vols. London, 1810, C Nn.16.179.
- . Elmerick; or, Justice Triumphant. For John Gray, 1740. C S721.  
d.70.7<sup>6</sup>.
- . Fatal Curiosity. A True Tragedy of three Acts. For John Gray,  
1737.
- . ----- . Ed. William H. McBurney. London: Edward Arnold, 1967.
- . The London Merchant; or, The History of George Barnwell. For  
J. Gray and sold by J. Roberts, 1731. C S721.d.73.33.
- . ----- . Ed. William H. McBurney. London: Edward Arnold, 1965.
- . Marina. Taken from Pericles, Prince of Tyre. London, 1738.  
C S721.d.70.21<sup>5</sup>.
- . Sylvia; or, The Country Burial. An Opera. London, 1731. C S721.d.  
70.48<sup>1</sup>.
- Madden, Samuel. Themistocles, the Lover of His Country. For R. King, 1729.  
C S721.d.70.23<sup>7</sup>
- Maffei, Francesco Scipione. La Meropa. Terza edizione purgata [by L. Riccobini].  
Venezia, 1714. BM 638.c.23(2).
- . ----- . Napoli: Nella Stamperia di Felice Mosca, 1721. BM  
638.d.32.
- . Merope. Translated by Mr Ayre. London, 1740. BM 1342.k.32.
- Majesty Misd; or, The Overthrow of Evil Ministers. Printed and sold by  
J. Dormer, 1734. C S721.d.73.30.
- Mallet, David. Eurydice. For A. Millar, 1731. C S721.d.70.48<sup>8</sup>.
- . Mustapha. For A. Millar, 1739. C S721.d.70.21<sup>9</sup>.
- [Manley, Mary de la Rivière]. Almyna; or, The Arabian Vow. For William  
Turner, and Egbert Sanger, 1707. BM 83.a.2(3).

- . Lucius, the First Christian King of Britain. For John Barber, 1717.  
BM 841.c.9(5).
- [-----]. The Royal Mischief. For R. Bentley, F. Saunders, and J. Knapton,  
1696. BM 841.c.5(8).
- Marsh, Charles. Amasis, King of Egypt. For Charles Marsh, 1731. C S721.d.70.21<sup>3</sup>.
- [Martyr, Benjamin]. Timoleon. For J. Watts, 1730. C S721.d.70.23<sup>6</sup>.
- Massinger, Philip. The Roman Actor. By B.A., and T.F., for Robert Allot,  
1629. BM Ashley 1117.
- and Thomas Dekker. The Virgin Martir. By B.A., 1651. BM Ashley  
1112.
- and Nathan Field. The Fatal Dowry. Ed. T.A. Dunn. Edinburgh: Oliver  
& Boyd, 1969.
- Maxwell, John. The Faithful Pair; or, Virtue in Distress. York: by Thomas  
Gent, 1740. BM 1346.e.45.
- Mitchell, Joseph. The Fatal Extravagance. For J. Millan, and sold by J.  
Stagg, and N. Blandford, 1726. BM 162.d.40.
- . "The Fatal Extravagance" in Aaron Hill, The Dramatic Works. 2  
vols. For T. Lowndes, 1760. BM 83.b.7-8.
- Moore, Thomas. Mangora, King of the Timbusians. For W. Harvey, and E. Nutt,  
1718. BM 841.d.11(5).
- Motteux, Peter Anthony. Beauty in Distress. For Daniel Brown, and Rich.  
Parker, 1698. C Acton.b.sel.48<sup>8</sup>.
- Mottley, John. Antiochus. For T. Harbin, W. Meadows, J. Peel, and J. Graves,  
1721. BM 80.c.23(2).
- . The Imperial Captives. For T. Jauncy, W. Meadows, and J. Roberts,  
1720. BM 11775.f.27.
- Mountfort, William. King Edward the Third, with the Fall of Mortimer, Earl  
of March. London, 1691. BM 644.f.17.
- . Zelmane; or, The Corinthian Queen. For William Turner, and sold  
by John Nutt, 1705. BM 1174.d.1(9).
- [Norton, Richard]. Pausanias, the Betrayer of His Country. For Abel Roper,  
E. Wilkinson, and Roger Clavell. 1696. BM 644.h.71.
- Oldmixon, John. The Governor of Cyprus. By R. Tookey, for Rich. Parker,  
1703. BM 83.a.4(3).

- Orrery, Roger Boyle. Altemira. For John Nutt, 1702. E Bute 406.
- . The Dramatic Works. 2 vols. R. Dodsley, 1739. BM 80.c.19-20;  
E Al a.1.
- . ----- . 2 vols. Ed. William Smith Clark II. Cambridge: Harvard  
University Press, 1937.
- Otway, Thomas [?]. Heroick Friendship. For W. Mears, and R. King, 1719.  
C Syn.6.68.38<sup>4</sup>.
- . The Orphan. Printed for R. Bentley, and S. Magnes, 1680. BM  
641.h.32.
- Owen, Robert. Hypermnestra; or, Love in Tears. For Bernard Lintott, 1703.  
BM 841.c.8.
- Ozell, John. trans. The Cid; or, The Heroick Daughter. London, 1714.  
BM 162.e.26.
- . Two Tragedies (Britannicus, Alexander the Great). London, 1714.  
BM 11775.b.2(5).
- [Paterson, William]. Arminius. For A. Millar, 1740. BM 162.k.56.
- Philips, Ambrose. The Briton. B. Lintot, 1722. C S721.d.70.12<sup>3</sup>
- . ----- . 3rd edition. For T. Woodward, J. Walthoe, Jun., and  
J. Peele, 1725. MM Disbd.
- . The Distrest Mother. For S. Buckley, and J. Tonson, 1712. BM  
841.d.11(4).
- . Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester. Printed, and sold by J. Roberts  
1723. C S721.d.70.12<sup>2</sup>.
- Philips, William. Belisarius. Printed and sold by T. Woodward, J. Walthoe,  
and J. Peele, 1724. BM 162.k.65.
- . Hibernia Freed. For Jonah Bowyer, 1722. BM 162.k.66.
- . The Revengeful Queen. For P. Buck, 1698. LVaf 6976<sup>22</sup>.
- [Phillips, R]. Fatal Inconstancy; or, The Unhappy Rescue. By R.P., for  
the Author, 1701. BM 162.k.53.
- Pix, Mary Griffith. The Conquest of Spain. For Richard Wellington, 1705.  
BM 841.e.6.
- . The Czar of Muscovy. For Bernard Lintot, 1701. BM 83.b.9(6).
- . The Double Distress. For R. Wellington, and B. Bernard Lintott,  
1701. LVAd.

- . The False Friend; or, The Fate of Disobedience. For Richard Basset, 1699. BM 83.b.10(3).
- . Ibrahim, the Thirteenth Emperour of the Turks. For John Harding, and Richard Wilkin, 1696. BM 83.b.9.(2).
- . Queen Catharine; or, The Ruines of Love. For William Turner, and Richard Basset, 1698. BM 841.d.10.
- Powell, George. Bonduca; or, The British Heroine. For Richard Bentley, 1696. BM 643.d.8.
- Racine, Jean. Andromache. Thomas Iolly, Paris, 1668. BM C.97.aa.18.
- . Athalie, tragédie tirée de l'Ecriture Sainte. D. Thierry, Paris, 1691. BM C.41.1.19(2).
- . Bajazet. P. le Monnier, Paris, 1672. BM C 34.a.27.
- . "Bajazet" in Oeuvres, II. A. Londres: J. Tonson, and J. Watts, 1723. C 7735.b.1.
- . Esther, tragédie tirée de l'Ecriture Sainte. Paris, 1689. BM 640.k.9(1).
- . ----- . Ed. George Saintsbury. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1866.
- . Iphigénie. C. Barbin, Paris, 1675. BM C.34.a.41.
- . Phèdre & Hippolyte. J. Ribou, Paris, 1677. BM C.34.a.42.
- . La Thébayde, ou les Frères ennemies. G. Quinet, Paris, 1664. BM C.47.a.9.
- [Ralph, James]. The Fall of the Earl of Essex. For W. Meadows, and S. Billingsley, 1731. BM 642.h.28(2).
- The Rape. For J. Roberts, 1730. BM 164.i.10.
- Ravenscroft, Edward. The Italian Husband. For Isaac Cleave, 1698. BMB1. c.16(6).
- The Fatal Secret; or, The Rival Brothers. Printed and sold by Ben. Bragge, 1704. LVAd 8242.
- Robe, Mrs J. The Fatal Legacy. For E. Symons, J. Roberts, and A. Dodd, 1723. O.
- Rowe, Nicholas. The Ambitious Step-Mother. For Peter Buck, 1701. C Acton. b.sel.45<sup>10</sup>.
- . ----- . 2nd. edition. For R. Wellington, and Thomas Osborne, 1702. MM B.3351.

- . The Fair Penitent. For Jacob Tonson, 1703. C Acton,b.sel.45<sup>12</sup>.
- . ----- . Ed. Malcolm Goldstein. London: Edward Arnold, 1969.
- . The Tragedy of Jane Shore. For Bernard Lintott, [1714]. MM B.3328.
- . The Tragedy of the Lady Jane Gray. For Bernard Lintott, 1715.  
MM B.3409.
- . The Royal Convert. For Jacob Tonson, 1708.
- . ----- . 2nd edition rev. For Jacob Tonson, 1714. MM B.4296.
- . Tamerlane. For Jacob Tonson, 1702. C Syn.6.68.39<sup>1</sup>.
- . ----- . Ed. Landon C. Burns Jr. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1966.
- . Three Plays. Ed. J.R. Sutherland. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929.
- . Ulysses. For Jacob Tonson, 1706. MM B.3332.
- Rowley, William. All's Lost by Lust. By Thomas Harper, 1633. BM 644.c.13.
- Savage, Richard. The Tragedy of Sir Thomas Overbury. For Samuel Chapman, 1724. C S721.d.70.12<sup>B</sup>.
- . "Sir Thomas Overbury" in Works. 2 vols. For T. Evans, 1775.  
MM 4355-7.
- [Scott, Thomas]. The Unhappy Kindness; or, A Fruitless Revenge. For H. Rhodes, S. Briscoe, and R. Parker, 1697. BM 81.c.17(2).
- Sedley, Charles. "Beauty the Conqueror; or, The Death of Marc Antony" in Miscellaneous Works. Printed and sold by J. Nutt, 1702. LVAd 8808.
- . The Poetical and Dramatic Works. Ed. Vivian de Sola Pinto. 2 vols. London: Constable, 1928.
- . "The Tyrant King of Crete" in The Works. In Prose and Verse. 2 vols. For S. Briscoe, and sold by T. Bickerton, 1722. C7720.d.387-8.
- Sewell, George. The Tragedy of King Richard I. King of England. For G. Sewell, 1728. BM 163.h.62.
- . The Tragedy of Sir Walter Raleigh. For John Pemberton, and John Watts, 1719. BM 1346.c.16.
- Shadwell, Charles. "Rotherick O'Connor" in Five New Plays. For A. Bettsworth, and sold by J. Graves, 1720. C S721.d.72.1.

- Shakespeare, William. The Complete Works. Ed. Peter Alexander. Collins: London and Glasgow, 1951.
- Shirley, James. The Maides Revenge. Printed for William Cooke, 1639. BM Ashley 1715.
- . The Traytor. For William Cooke, 1635. BM C.12.f.16(1).
- Shirley, William. The Parricide; or, Innocence in Distress. For J. Watts, 1739. C S721.d.70.21<sup>1</sup>.
- [Shuckburgh, Charles]. Antiochus. For J. Shuckburgh, 1740. BM 163.k.34.
- Smith, Edmund. Phaedra and Hippolitus. For Bernard Lintott, [1709]. C Acton.b.sel.48<sup>4</sup>.
- Smith, Henry. The Princess of Parma. For Joseph Wilde, 1699. LVAf 6976<sup>21</sup>.
- "Socrates Triumphant; or, The Danger of Being Wise in a Commonwealth of Fools" in Military and Other Poems upon Several Occasions. By an Officer of the Army. For the Author, and sold by J. Browne, 1716. O.
- Southerne, Thomas. The Fate of Capua. For Benjamin Tooke, 1700. BM 644.i.57.
- . Oroonoko. For H. Playford, B. Tooke, and S. Buckley, 1696. BM 644.i.56.
- . "The Spartan Dame" in The Works, II. For J. Tonson, B. Tooke, M. Wellington, and W. Chetwood, 1721. MM B.1170.
- Sterling, James. The Parricide. For John Walthoe, 1736. BM 163.i.48.
- . The Rival Generals. For A. Bettesworth, 1722. BM 163.i.47.
- Sturmy, John. Love and Duty; or, The Distress'd Bride. For W. Chetwood, 1722. BM 82.c.15(1).
- . Sesostris; or, Royalty in Disguise. For J. Crockatt, 1728. BM 11775.f.39.
- Tate, Nahum. Injur'd Love; or, The Cruel Husband. For Richard Wellington, 1707. E H.27.c.3(11).
- . Macbeth. Edinburgh: By T. and W. Ruddiman for Alan Ramsay, 1731. BPL
- Theobald, Lewis. The Fatal Secret. For J. Watts, and sold by W. Feales, 1735. BM 162.e.13.

- . The Perfidious Brother. Printed and sold by Jonas Brown, 1715.  
LVAf 6976.
- . The Persian Princess; or, The Royal Villain. For Jonas Brown,  
1715. BM 162.e.11.
- . The Tragedy of King Richard the Second. For G. Strahan, W. Mears,  
T. Meighan, B. Barker, and Sold by J. Morphew, 1720. BM 642.d.27(2).
- Thomson, James. Agamemnon. Printed for, and sold by A. Millar, 1738. MM  
B.2408.
- . Edward and Eleonora. For the Author, and sold by A. Millar, 1739.  
C S721.d.70.7<sup>c</sup>.
- . Sophonisba. For A. Millar, 1730. C 721.c.73.1.
- Tolson, Francis. The Earl of Warwick; or, British Exile. For B. Lintott,  
W. Mears, F. Peele, A. Bettsworth, and W. Chetwood, 1719. BM 163.i.66.
- [Tracy, John]. Periander. For J. Watts, 1731. C S721.d.70.48<sup>7</sup>.
- [Trapp, Joseph]. Abra-Mule; or, Love and Empire. For Jacob Tonson, 1704.  
BM 841.c.6(4).
- . The Tragedy of King Saul. For Henry Playford, and sold by John  
Nutt, 1703. BM 162.l.6.
- [Trotter, Catharine Cockburn]. Agnes de Castro. For H. Rhodes, R. Parker,  
S. Briscoe, 1696. BM 644.i.65.
- [-----]. Fatal Friendship. For Francis Saunders, 1698. BM 644.i.66.
- [-----]. The Revolution of Sweden. For James Knapton, and George Strahan,  
1706. BM 841.d.9(6).
- [-----]. The Unhappy Penitent. For William Turner, and John Nutt, 1701.  
BM 81.c.13(3).
- The Unfortunate Dutchess of Malfy; or, The Unnatural Brothers. For H. N.,  
and are to be sold by J. Morphew, 1708. BM 644.i.77.
- The Unnatural Mother. The Scene in the Kingdom of Siam. Written by a Young  
Lady. By J. O., for R. Basset, 1698. BM 163.k.69.
- Vanella. For D. Ashburn, 1736. E.
- Voltaire, François Marie Arouet de. Alzire, ou les Américains. J.B.C. Bauche:  
Paris, 1736. BM 640.e.20(2).

- . Le Brutus. Je. Fr. Jossé: Paris, 1731. BM 640.e.19(1).
- . Le Zayre. J.-B. Bauche: Paris, 1733. BM 640.e.19(2).
- Walker, William. Victorious Love. For Ralph Smith, 1698. BM 83.a.6(1).
- Wandesford, Osborne Sidney. Fatal Love; or, The Degenerate Brother. For T. Worrall, 1730. BM 163.k.12.
- [Ward, Edward]. Honesty in Distress, but Reliev'd by No Party. Printed and are to be sold by B. Bragge, 1705. BM 11778.c.15.
- Webster, John. The Dutchess of Malfy. For D. N., and T. C., and are to be sold by Simon Neale, 1678. BM 163.k.65.
- . The Unfortunate Dutchess of Malfy; or, The Unnatural Brothers. For H. N., and are to be sold by J. Morpew, 1708. BM 644.i.71.
- . The White Devil; or, The Tragedy of Paulo Giordano, Ursini, Duke of Brachiano, With The Life and Death of Vittoria Corombona, the famous Venetian Curtizan. For Hugh Perry, 1631. E H.28.e.2(3).
- . The White Devil; or, Vittoria Corombona, a Lady of Venice. By G. Miller for John Playfere, and William Croke, 1665. BM 644.f.76.
- [West, Richard]. Hecuba. By W. Wilkins, and sold by J. Peele, and N. Blandford, 1726. BM 841.c.10(2).
- Whincop, Thomas. Scanderbeg; or, Love and Liberty, a Tragedy. To which are added a list of all the Dramatic Authors with some Account of their lives; and of all the dramatic pieces published in the English language, to the year 1747. [Ed. M. Whincop]. London, 1747. BM 82.e.23.
- Winchelsea, Anne Finch. "Aristomenes" in Miscellany Poems on Several Occasions. For J. B., and sold by Benj. Tooke, William Taylor, and James Round, 1713. LVAd 10644.
- Wiseman, Jane Holt. Antiochus the Great; or, The Fatal Relapse. For William Turner, and Richard Basset, 1702. BM 163.k.23.
- Young, Edward. Busiris, King of Egypt. For J. Tonson, 1719. BM 11643.c.24(2).
- . ----- . 2nd. edition. For J. Tonson, 1722. C S721.d.72.30.
- . Revenge. For W. Chetwood, and S. Chapman, 1721. C XXIII.16.31<sup>1</sup>.

Secondary Sources

- Adamian, Paul Serop. "Eighteenth-Century English Domestic Tragedy: A World of Woe". PhD Claremont Graduate School & University Center, 1968.
- Alden, Raymond H. "The Development of the Use of Prose in the English Drama 1600-1800". Modern Philology 7 (1909), 1-22.
- Anderson, Paul Bunyan. "Mistress Delarivière Manley's Biography". Modern Philology 33 (1936), 261-78.
- Appleton, William W. Beaumont and Fletcher: A Critical Study. London: Geo. Allen & Unwin; Fair Lawn N.J., Essential Books, 1956.
- Ashley, Leonard R.N. Colley Cibber. Twayne Publishers Inc: New York, 1965.
- Ashley, Maurice. The Stuarts in Love. MacMillan: New York, 1964.
- Atkins, Stuart. "Addison's Cato: I i 47-53". Philological Quarterly 21 (1942), 430-33.
- Avery, Emmett L. "The Dublin Stage 1736-7". Notes & Queries 200 (1955), 61-5.
- . Ed. The London Stage. Part 2. 2 vols. Southern Illinois University Press, 1960.
- . "The Popularity of The Mourning Bride in the London Theaters in the Eighteenth Century". Research Studies of the State College of Washington 9 (1941), 115-6.
- . "The Première of The Mourning Bride". Modern Language Notes 57 (1942), 55-7.
- . "The Restoration Audience". Philological Quarterly 45 (1966), 54-61.
- . "A Royal Wedding Royally Confounded". Western Humanities Review 10 (1956), 153-64.
- . "Some New Prologues and Epilogues 1704-1708". Studies in English Literature 1500-1900 5 (1965), 455-67.
- Baker, David Erskine. Biographia Dramatica, or a Companion to the Playhouse. 2 vols. Dublin, 1782.
- Bartley, J.O. "The Gaelic Language in English Plays". Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland 80 (1950), 29-35.

- Bastian, J.M. "James Ralph's Second Adaptation from John Banks". Huntington Library Quarterly 25 (1962), 181-8.
- Bear, A.S. "Criticism and Social Change: The Case of Restoration Drama". Komos 2 (1969), 23-31.
- Behrend, Alfred. Nicholas Rowe als Dramatiker. Leipzig, 1907.
- Bennett, Gilbert. "Conventions of the Stage Villain". Anglo-Welsh Review 14 (1964), 92-102.
- Berkeley, David S. "The Art of 'Whining' Love". Studies in Philology 52 (1955), 478-96.
- . "Some Notes on Probability in Restoration Drama". Notes & Queries 200 (1955), 237-9, 342-4, 432.
- Betterton, Thomas. History of the English Stage. 2 vols. London, 1741.
- Boas, F.S. An Introduction to Eighteenth-Century Drama. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953.
- Boddy, Margaret. "Tonson's 'Loss of Rowe'". Notes & Queries 13 (1966), 213-4.
- Borgwardt, Paul. The Royal Convert von Nicholas Rowe 1707. Rostock: Wirtt Winterberg's Buchdruckerei, 1909.
- Bowers, Fredson. "The Variant Sheets in John Banks's Cyrus the Great 1699". Studies in Bibliography 4 (1951-2), 174-82.
- Brashear, John H. and Lucy Brashear. "Economic Theory Reflected in George Lillo's The London Merchant". Appalachian State University Faculty Publications 66 (1969). 49-53.
- Bremmer, G. "Millwood, Lady Milford and Maria Stuart". German Life and Letters 9 (1957), 41-8.
- Broadus, E.K. The Laureateship. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1921.
- Brown, F. Andrew. "Shakespeare and English Drama in the German Popular Journals 1717-59". Kentucky Foreign Language Quarterly 12 (1965), 13-27.
- Bryan, Adolphus J. "Humphrey Duke of Gloucester: A Study in Eighteenth-Century Adaptation" in Studies for William A. Reed. Ed. Nathaniel M. Coffee and Thomas A. Kirby. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1940, pp. 221-236.

- Buckroyd, Peter. "Nicholas Rowe and His Neglected Tragedies". Unpub. M.A. dissertation, McMaster University, 1970.
- . "An Anti-Methodist Epilogue". Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society 39 (Part 2, 1973), 44-7.
- . "More Children in Tragedy, 1695-1750". Restoration & 18th Century Theatre Research 12 (1973), 49-51.
- Buding, W. Untersüchungen über 'Jane Shore'. Rostock, 1908.
- Bunning, Eduard. Nicholas Rowe's 'Tamerlane' 1702. Rostock, 1908.
- Burgess, C.F. "'Fatal Curiosity' in Berkshire". Notes & Queries 17 (1970), 92-3.
- . "Further Notes for a Biography of George Lillo". Philological Quarterly 46 (1967), 424-8.
- . "Lillo, sans Barnwell, or the Playwright Revisited". Modern Philology 65 (1968), 5-29.
- Burns, Landon C. Jr. "Three Views of King Henry V". Drama Survey 1 (1962), 278-300.
- . "The Tragedies of Nicholas Rowe". Unpub. Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1966.
- Campbell, Hilbert H. "'A Defence of the New Sophonisba'". Notes & Queries 17 (1970), 300.
- Carracciolo, Peter. "Dryden and the Antony and Cleopatra of Sir Charles Sedley". English Studies (Anglo-American Supplement) 1969, 1-lv.
- Carson, Herbert L. "The Play That Would Not Die: George Lillo's The London Merchant". Quarterly Journal of Speech 49 (1963), 287-94.
- Carter, Herbert. "The Women Dramatists of the Restoration". Bookman's Journal 13 (1925), 91-7.
- Case, Arthur E. "Aaron Hill and Thomson's Sophonisba". Modern Language Notes 42 (1927), 175-6.
- Chancellor, E. Beresford. The Lives of the Rakes, II. The Restoration Rakes. London: Philip Allen, 1924.
- C[hapman], R.W. "Brooke's Gustavus Vasa". Review of English Studies 1 (1925), 460-1.
- . ----- . Review of English Studies 2 (1926), 99.

- Charlton, H.B. "Buckingham's Adaptation of 'Julius Caesar' and a Note in the 'Spectator'". Modern Language Review 16 (1921), 171-2.
- Chetwood, W.R. The British Theatre. Dublin, 1750.
- Cibber, Colley. An Apology for the Life of Colley Cibber. 3 vols. London, 1750.
- Cibber, Theophilus. The Lives of the Poets of Great Britain and Ireland to the Time of Dean Swift. 3 vols. London, 1753.
- Clark, A.F.B. Boileau and the French Classical Critics in England (1660-1830). Paris, 1925.
- Clark, Donald B. "An Eighteenth-Century Adaptation of Massinger". Modern Language Quarterly 13 (1952), 239-52.
- . "Nicholas Rowe: a Study in the Development of the Pathetic Tragedy". George Washington University... Summaries of Doctoral Dissertations, 1947 and 1948, pp. 11-16.
- . "The Source and Characterization of Nicholas Rowe's Tamerlane". Modern Language Notes 65 (1950), 145-52.
- Clark, Thomas Blake. Oriental England: A Study of Oriental Influences in Eighteenth-Century England as Reflected in the Drama. Shanghai: Kelly & Walsh, 1939.
- Clark, William S. "Restoration Prompt Notes and Stage Practices". Modern Language Notes 51 (1936), 226-30.
- Cohen, Michael M. "Providence and Constraint in Two Lillo Tragedies". English Studies 52 (1971), 231-6.
- "Congreve". Notes & Queries 155 (1928), 236.
- Crawford, J.P. Wickersham. "On the Relations of Congreve's Mourning Bride to Racine's Bajazet". Modern Language Notes 19 (1904), 193-4.
- DeBoer, Frederick Eugene. "George Lillo". Unpub. PhD dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1968.
- Dennis, John. Critical Works. Ed. E.N. Hooker. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1939-43.
- Devlin, James J. "The Albion Queens by John Banks: A Critical Edition". Unpub. PhD dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1958.

- . "The Dramatis Personae and the Dating of John Banks The Albion Queens". Notes & Queries 10 (1963), 213-5.
- Dibdin, Charles. A Complete History of the English Stage. 5 vols. London, [1797-1800].
- Dobree, Bonamy. English Literature in the Early Eighteenth-Century 1700-1740. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959.
- Dobson, Austin. "Aaron Hill". The National Review 63 (1914), 443-460.
- Doran, Dr. Annals of the English Stage. 3 vols. London: John C. Nimmo, 1888.
- Downes, Roscius Anglicanus. London, 1708. Ed. Montague Summers. Fortune Press: London, 1928.
- Dunkin, Paul S. "The Authorship of The Fatal Extravagance". Modern Language Notes 60 (1945), 328-30.
- Dussinger, John A. "Richardson and Johnson: Critical Agreement on Rowe's The Fair Penitent". English Studies 49 (1968), 45-7.
- . "Richardson's Tragic Muse". Philological Quarterly 46 (1967), 18-33.
- Eade, J.C. "Pope and Rowe: A Side-Light on Ault". Notes & Queries 16 (1969), 339-40.
- Eddison, Robert. "Topless in Jerusalem". Theatre Notebook 22 (1967), 24-7.
- Edmunds, J.M. "An Example of Early Sentimentalism". Modern Language Notes 48 (1933), 94-7.
- Elwood, John R. "The Stage Career of Eliza Haywood". Theatre Survey 5 (1964), 107-116.
- Erskine-Hill, Edward. "Augustans on Augustanism: England 1665-1759". Renaissance and Modern Studies 11 (1967), 55-83.
- Evardson, Hans. Mrs Centlivre's Drama 'The Cruel Gift' und seine Quellen. Kiel, H. Fiencke, 1912.
- Fletcher, J.B. "Herod in the Drama". Studies in Philology 19 (1922), 292-316.
- Genest, John. An Historical Account of the English Stage. 10 vols. Bath, 1832. Reprinted Burt Franklin: New York, 1964.

- Goldstein, Malcolm. "Pathos and Personality in the Tragedies of Nicholas Rowe" in English Writers of the Eighteenth Century: Essays in Honour of James Lowry Clifford. Ed. John H. Middendorf. New York: Columbia University Press, 1971. Pp. 172-85.
- Grack, W. Studien über die dramatische Behandlung der Geschichte von Herodes und Mariamme in der englischen und deutschen Literatur. Königsberg, 1901.
- Griffith, R.H. "Early Editions of Lillo's 'London Merchant'". University of Texas Studies in English 15 (1935), 23-7.
- Halliwell [-Phillipps], J.O. A Brief Description of the Ancient and Modern Manuscripts Preserved in the Public Library, Plymouth: To which are added some Fragments of Early Literature Hitherto Unpublished. Plymouth, 1855.
- Halsband, Robert. "Addison's Cato and Lady Mary Wortley Montagu". PMLA 65 (1950), 1122-29.
- Harbage, Alfred. Annals of English Drama 975-1700. Revised S. Shoenbaum. London: Methuen, 1964.
- Harlan, Earl. Elijah Fenton 1683-1730. Philadelphia, 1937.
- Haun, Eugene. "John Dennis's 'Rinaldo and Armida' Confused with Handel's 'Rinaldo'". Notes and Queries 199 (1954), 249-50.
- Havens, Raymond Dexter. "Sentimentality in The London Merchant". ELH 12 (1945), 183-87.
- Hegnauer, Adolphe G. Der Einfluss von Addison's 'Cato' die dramatische Literatur England's und des Sentiments in der 1. Hälfte des 18 Jahrhunderts. Hamburg: M. Lange, 1912.
- Herrick, Marvin T. "Joseph Trapp and the Aristotelian Catharsis". Modern Language Notes 41 (1926), 158-163.
- Herrmann, Adolf. Colley Cibber's Tragicömedie, Ximena or the Heroic Daughter, und ihr verhalten zu Corneille's Cid. PhD University of Kiel, 1908.
- Hilde, Alfred. Die dramatische behandlung der ruckker des Odysseus bei Nicholas Rowe, Robert Bridges und Stephen Phillips. Königsberg, 1903.
- Hnatko, Eugene. "The Failure of Eighteenth-Century Tragedy". Studies in English Literature 1500-1900 11 (1971), 459-68.

- Hogan, Charles Beecker. Ed. The London Stage. Part 5. 3 vols. Southern Illinois University Press, 1968.
- Hook, Lucyle. Ed. The Female Wits. Augustan Reprint (124). Los Angeles: Clark Memorial Library: U.C.L.A., 1967.
- Hooker, Edward N. "Charles Johnson's 'The Force of Friendship and Love in a Chest': A Note in Tragi-Comedy and Licensing in 1710". Studies in Philology 34 (1937), 407-11.
- Hotson, Leslie. The Commonwealth and Restoration Stage. Cambridge: Mass., 1928.
- Hudson, William Henry. A Quiet Corner in a Library. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1915.
- Hughes, Leo. The Drama's Patrons: A Study of the Eighteenth Century London Audience. University of Texas Press: Austin & London, 1971.
- . "Trick upon Trick; or, Methodism Display'd". Texas Studies in English 29 (1950), 151-61.
- Ingram, William Henry. "Greek Drama and the Augustan Stage: Dennis, Theobald, Thomson". Unpub. PhD dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1966.
- . "Theobald, Rowe, Jackson: Whose Ajax?" The Library Chronicle 31 (1965), 91-6.
- Intze, Ottokar. Nicholas Rowe. Leipzig, 1910.
- Jackson, Alfred. "Rowe's Historical Tragedies". Anglia 54 (1930), 307-330.
- Jackson, Allan S. "Little Known Theatrical Prints of the Eighteenth Century". Theatre Notebook 22 (1968), 113-6.
- Jackson, Wallace. "Dryden's Emperor and Lillo's Merchant: The Relevant Bases of Action". Modern Language Quarterly 26 (1965), 536-44.
- J[ennings], R[ichard]. "Ibsen and Congreve". Spectator 135 (Nov 28 1925), 967.
- Jerrold, Walter, and Clare Jerrold. Five Queer Women. New York: London: Brentano, 1929.
- Joseph, Bertram L. "Lewis Theobald and Webster". Comparative Literature Studies 17-18 (1945), 29-31.
- Kalson, Albert E. "The Chronicles in Cibber's Richard III". Studies in English Literature 1500-1900 3 (1963), 253-67.
- Kaufman, Paul. "The Reading of Plays in the Eighteenth Century". Bulletin of the New York Public Library 23 (1969), 562-80.

- Gaul, R.K. "What Theobald Did to Webster". Indian Journal of English Studies 2 (1961), 138-44.
- Gearful, Frank J. "The Nature of Tragedy in Rowe's The Fair Penitent". Papers in Language and Literature 2 (1966), 351-60.
- . "The Rhetoric of Augustan Tragedy". PhD University of Wisconsin, 1966.
- Gelsall, M.M. "The Meaning of Addison's Cato". Review of English Studies 17 (1966), 149-62.
- Genion, Alonzo Williams. "The Influence of Criticism upon English Tragedy 1700-50". PhD Duke University, 1963.
- Gern, Jean B. "The Fate of James Thomson's Edward and Eleonora". Modern Language Notes 52 (1937), 500-502.
- . "James Thomson's Revisions of Agamemnon". Philological Quarterly 45 (1966), 289-303.
- Gies, Paul Philemon. "The Authorship of The Fatal Extravagance". Washington State College Research Studies 13 (1945), 155-8; 14 (1946), 88.
- Gleitz, Philip Rex. "Nicholas Rowe: Developer of the Drama of Sympathy". Unpub. PhD dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1967.
- Gonigsberg, Ira. "The Dramatic Background of Richardson's Plots and Characters". PMLA 83 (1968), 42-53.
- Goppe, K. Das Verhältnis von Cibber's 'Papal Tyranny in the Reign of King John' en Shakespeare's 'King John'. Halle, 1902.
- Goughans, Edward A. "Three Early Eighteenth Century Manuscript Promptbooks". Modern Philology 65 (1967), 114-29.
- Lawrence, W.J. "Music and Song in the Eighteenth Century Theatre". The Musical Quarterly 2 (1916), 67-75.
- Leech, Clifford. "The Political Disloyalty of Thomas Southerne". Modern Language Review 28 (1933), 421-30.
- Leitz, Hermann. John Dennis. Sein Leben und seine Werke. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der englischen Literatur in Zeitalter der Königin Anna. Halle a. S.: Verlag von Max Niemeyer, 1913.
- Lovine, George R. "Henry Fielding's 'Defence' of the Stage Licensing Act". English Language Notes 2 (1965), 193-6.
- Moftis, John. Comedy and Society from Congreve to Fielding. Stanford University Press, 1958.

- . "The Eighteenth-Century Beginnings of Modern Drama". Emory University Quarterly 7 (1951), 225-36.
- . "The London Theatres in Early Eighteenth-Century Politics". Huntington Library Quarterly 18 (1955), 365-93.
- . The Politics of Drama in Augustan England. Oxford University Press, 1963.
- ve, Harold. "The Myth of the Restoration Audience". Komos 1 (1967), 49-56.
- ynch, J.J. Box, Pit and Gallery. University of California Press: Berkeley & Los Angeles, 1953.
- cAleer, John J. "Colley Cibber -- Shakespeare's Adapter". Shakespeare Newsletter 11 (Dec 1961), 42.
- cBurney, William H. "What Lillo Read: A Speculation". Huntington Library Quarterly 29 (1966), 275-86.
- cKillop, Alan D. "Thomson and the Licensers of the Stage". Philological Quarterly 37 (1958), 448-53.
- cManaway, James G. "Richard II at Covent Garden". Shakespeare Quarterly 15 (1964), 161-75.
- . "Unrecorded Performances in London about 1700". Theatre Notebook 19 (1964-5), 68-70.
- acrocordato, Alexandre. "La Critique Anglaise et la Fonction de la Tragédie (1660-1720)". Etudes Anglaises 14 (1961), 10-24.
- . La Critique Classique en Angleterre de la Restauration à la Mort de Joseph Addison. Paris: M. Didier, 1964.
- argill, Lewis M. "Poetic Justice: The Dilemma of the Early Creators of Sentimental Tragedy". Washington State College Research Studies 25 (1957), 24-32.
- arks, Jeanette Augustus. English Pastoral Drama from the Restoration to the Date of the Publication of the Lyrical Ballads. London: Methuen, 1908.
- axwell, Baldwin. "Notes on Charles Hopkins's Boadicea". Review of English Studies 4 (1928), 79-83.
- erchant, W. Moelwyn. "Shakespeare 'Made Fit'". Restoration Theatre. Ed. John Russell Brown and Bernard Harris (Stratford-upon-Avon Studies 6). London: Edward Arnold, 1965, pp. 195-219.
- itchell, Lewis D. "Command Performances During the Reign of Queen Anne". Theatre Notebook 24 (1970), 111-117.

- More, Don D. John Webster and His Critics 1617-1964. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1966.
- More, John Robert. "Hughes's Source for The Siege of Damascus". Huntington Library Quarterly 21 (1958), 362-6.
- Oran, Berna. "The Source of Joseph Trapp's Abra-Mule". Modern Language Review 53 (1958), 81-3.
- Ortel, Leon. James Thomson, sa vie et ses oeuvres. Paris, 1895.
- Organ, Edmund S. "Puritan Hostility to the Theatre". Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society 110 (1966), 340-47.
- Quirk, Kenneth. "Three Shakespeare Adaptations". Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society Proceedings: Literary and Historical Section 8 (1959), 233-40.
- Reedham, Gwenddyn B. "Mary de la Rivière Manley, Tory Defender". Huntington Library Quarterly 12 (1949), 253-88.
- Settleton, G.H. English Drama of the Restoration and Eighteenth Century. New York: MacMillan, 1932.
- Nichols, John. Literary Anecdotes. 9 vols. London, 1812-15.
- Nicoll, Allardyce. A History of English Drama 1600-1900, Vols I, II. Cambridge University Press, 1967, 1969.
- Polak, F.E. Die bürgerlichen Züge in Addison's 'Cato'. Berlin: Funk, 1940.
- Polte, Fred O. Early Middle Class Drama 1696-1774. New York University Ottendorfer Memorial Series of Germanic Monographs 19. Lancaster Pa: Lancaster Press, 1935.
- Porris, E.T. "The Italian Source for Ravenscroft's Italian Husband". Review of English Studies 10 (1934), 202-205.
- Quiliver, Thomas Edward. "The 'Merope' of George Jeffreys as a Source for Voltaire's 'Merope'". University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature 12 No. 4 (Nov 1927). Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1927.
- Quinn, Paul E. "The Distrest Mother, Ambrose Philips' Moralistic Play". Comparative Literature 11 (1959), 111-123.
- "The Sentimental Mask". PMLA 78 (1963), 529-35.
- Plumb, J.H. Sir Robert Walpole: The King's Minister. London: Cresset Press, 1960.

- . "A Dunce Objects to Pope's Dictatorship". Huntington Library Quarterly 14 (1950-51), 203-207.
- ingh, Amrih. "The Argument on Poetic Justice (Addison versus Dennis)". Indian Journal of English Studies 3 (1962), 61-77.
- pence, Joseph. Anecdotes. London, 1820.
- pencer, Christopher. "A Word for Tate's King Lear". Studies in English Literature 1500-1900 3 (1963), 241-51.
- . Ed. Four Restoration Adaptations of Shakespeare. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1965.
- pencer, Hazelton. "Tate and The White Devil". ELH 1 (1934), 235-49.
- prague, Arthur Colby. Beaumont and Fletcher on the Restoration Stage. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1926, 1965.
- . "A New Scene in Colley Cibber's Richard III". Modern Language Notes 42 (1927), 29-32.
- tahl, Ludwig. Nicholas Rowe's drama 'The Ambitious Step-Mother.' 1700. Rostock, 1909.
- talling, Donald Langhorne. "From Dryden to Lillo: The Course of English Tragedy 1660-1731". Unpub. PhD dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, 1969.
- tarr, Herbert W. "Notes on David Mallet". Notes & Queries 178 (1940), 277-8.
- . "Sources of David Mallet's Mustapha, a Tragedy". Notes & Queries 181 (1941), 285-7.
- toll, Elmer Edgar. "Literature and Life Again", PMLA 47 (1932), 283-302.
- tone, George Winchester. Ed. The London Stage 1660-1800. Part 4. 3 vols. Southern Illinois University Press, 1962.
- stratman, Carl Joseph, CSV. A Bibliography of English Printed Tragedy 1565-1900. Southern Illinois University Press: Carbondale and Edwardsville, 1966.
- . Ed. Bibliography of Restoration & 18th Century Theatre Research 1900-1968. Southern Illinois University Press, 1971.
- . Checklist of English Dramatic Periodicals 1720-1960. New York Public Library, 1962.
- . Ed. Restoration & 18th Century Research Bibliography 1961-8. Whiston Publishing Co.: Troy, New York, 1969.

- . "A Survey of the Bodleian Library's Holdings in the Field of English Printed Tragedy". Bodleian Library Record 7 (1964), 133-43.
- . "Unrecorded Editions of Addison's Cato, Published before 1756". Theatre Notebook 15 (1961), 102.
- mmers, Montague. "Orrery's 'The Tragedy of Zoroastres'". Modern Language Review 12 (1917), 24-32.
- . The Playhouse of Pepys. London: Kegan Paul, French, Trubner, 1935.
- . The Restoration Theatre. London, 1934.
- . A Bibliography of Restoration Drama. London: Fortune Press, [1935].
- eatre Miscellany; Six Pieces Connected with the 17th Century Stage. Augustan Reprint Society. Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1953.
- orp, Willard. "A Key to Rowe's Tamerlane". Journal of English and Germanic Philology 39 (1940), 124-7.
- alency, Maurice J. The Tragedies of Herod and Mariamne. New York: Columbia University Press, 1940.
- an Lennep, William. Ed. The London Stage 1660-1800. Part 1. Southern Illinois University Press, 1965.
- oisine, J. "Corneille et Racine en Angleterre au dix-huitième siècle". Revue de Littérature Comparée 22 (1948), 161-75.
- ade, Ira O. "Middle Class Philosophies, Middle-class Philosophy in the Drama of the Eighteenth Century". Modern Philology 26 (1928), 215-9.
- mith, Eugene M. Ideas of Greatness: Heroic Drama in England. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1971.
- ann, Louis. "The Oriental in Restoration Drama". Studies in Language and literature 2 (1918), 163-86.
- allwarth, George E. "George Lillo and the Finger-Wagging Drama". Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society. Literary and Historical Section 14 (part 3: 1970), 75-97.
- eatley, Katharine E. "Andromache as the 'Distrest Mother'". Romanic Review 39 (1948), 3-21.
- . Racine and English Classicism. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1956.

- . "The Relation of Edmund Smith's Phaedra and Hippolitus to Racine's Phedre and Bajazet". Romanic Review 37 (1946), 307-28.
- icher, George Frisbie. The Life and Romances of Mrs Eliza Haywood. New York: Columbia University Press, 1915.
- iting, George W. "Rowe's Debt to Paradise Lost". Modern Philology 32 (1935), 271-9.
- cker, C.V. Edward Young and the Fear of Death; A Study in Romantic Melancholy. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1952.
- ilkins, A.N. "John Dennis and Poetic Justice". Notes & Queries 202 (1957), 421-4.
- . "John Dennis on Love As a Tragical Passion". Notes & Queries 203 (1958), 369-98, 417-9.
- . "Pope and 'Appius'". Notes & Queries 7 (1960), 292-4.
- . "A Prologue by John Dennis". Notes & Queries 200 (1955), 525-6.
- . "Tragedy and 'The True Politicks'". Notes & Queries 6 (1959), 390-94.
- illiams, Aubrey. "The 'Just Decrees of Heav'n' and Congreve's Mourning Bride" in Congreve Consider'd. Los Angeles: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, U.C.L.A., 1971, pp. 1-12.
- illiams, Stanley. "English Sentimental. Drama from Steele to Cumberland". Sewanee Review 33 (1925), 405-426.
- ilson, John Harold. The Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Restoration Drama. Ohio State University Press, 1928. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1967.
- oods, Charles B. "Captain B-'s Play". Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature 15 (1933), 243-55.
- right, Herbert G. "Henry Brooke's 'Gustavus Vasa'". Modern Language Review 14 (1919), 173-82.
- . "Henry Brooke's 'Gustavus Vasa' : a Correction". Modern Language Review 15 (1920), 304.
- right, Rose Abel. The Political Play of the Restoration. Montasano (Washington), 1916.
- yman, Lindley, A. "The Tradition of the Formal Meditation in Rowe's The Fair Penitent". Philological Quarterly 42 (1963), 412-16.
- aitvogel, Albert. Addison's Cato. Eine geschichtliche und dramatische

Quellen unter suchung. Münster, 1936.