SHADWELL: RESTORATION HUMOURS AND MANNERS

THOMAS SHADWELL:

RESTORATION HUMOURS AND MANNERS

By

WARREN O'ROURKE, B.A.

A Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies

in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Master of Arts

McMaster University

October, 1969

MASTER OF ARTS (1969)
(English)

McMASTER UNIVERSITY
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: Thomas Shadwell: Restoration Humours and Manners

AUTHOR: Warren O'Rourke, B.A.(University of Calcutta)

SUPERVISOR: Dr. R. W. Vince

NUMBER OF PAGES: iv, 62

I should like to acknowledge and express my sincere thanks to Mr. R. E. Morton and especially to Dr. R.W. Vince, both of the English Department, for their constructive criticism and patient assistance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	INTRODUCTION	1
I	COMEDY FOR CORRECTION AND PROFIT	4
II	"MOST EXCELLENT TALENT OF HUMOUR"	13
III	"TO LARD WITH WIT THY HUNGRY EPSOM PROSE"	23
IV	MATURE SHADWELL	32
	CONCLUSION	54
	NOTES TO PAGES 1 TO 55	56
	SHADWELL'S DRAMATIC WORKS	58
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	60

INTRODUCTION

Michael W. Alssid's work, Thomas Shadwell, published in 1967,[1] brought into focus an author who, at a time when considerable interest was being shown in Restoration Comedy -- in both stage revivals and literary criticism -- had been neglected. Up to the time of Alssid's work only two comprehensive studies had been made of Shadwell: the first by Montague Summers in 1927[2] and the second a year later by Albert S. Borgman.[3] References to Shadwell's comic drama, however, had been numerous as critics had turned to examine various aspects of Restoration Comedy. His work had formed a significant part of studies given to such forms of Restoration thought and behaviour as "Libertinism", the "gay couple", "marriage" and "mock marriage", and to such qualities of the drama as continued the development of traditional English comedy or showed the influence of European theatre. Alssid's work incorporates a good deal of the critical thought given to Restoration comedy since Montague Summers and Borgman, but its real

---

[1] Michael W. Alssid, Thomas Shadwell, (New York, 1967).

[2] Thomas Shadwell, The Complete Works of Thomas Shadwell, 5 vols., ed. Montague Summers, (London, 1927). All quotations and references to the texts of Shadwell's plays for the purposes of this study have been made from Montague Summers' edition. For convenience, only the Act and number of page for the many textual references made from the plays have been given, and these are placed where such references are made.

[3] Albert S. Borgman, Thomas Shadwell, His Life and Comedies, (New York, 1928).

usefulness is in the thematic interpretations it makes within the context of individual plays, suggesting for each play the mainspring which keeps the whole satiric apparatus working.

The present study is aimed at a comprehensive view of Shadwell's development. It begins, in Chapter 1, by discussing the dramatist's initial theory of comedy as it is set out in his prefaces to his earliest comedies: The Sullen Lovers and The Humourists. Chapter 2 examines the application of that theory to the two plays mentioned, and establishes Shadwell's position as a writer of "humours". Chapter 3 is given to an analysis of Epsom Wells, the first of Shadwell's plays of manners. This play is something of a turning point in Shadwell's career because in it he emerges from the "pure" humours of the first two plays to include "manners" characteristics. Chapter 4 traces Shadwell's continuation from Epsom Wells as a writer of plays of manners by concentrating on three of his major works: The Virtuoso, A True Widow, and Bury Fair.

The thesis to be presented here is that Shadwell wrote manners comedy from a moral stance that he had developed from a theory of humours comedy and that he had used "manners" elements as he used "humours" -- for correction and profit. The "humours" of The Sullen Lovers and The Humourists are made salutary through satire; the "manners" persons in Epsom Wells are made exemplary by being presented either as objects of satire or as objects to be emulated. When the "manners" characters fail and are humiliated, they are equated with the "humours"; when they succeed, they are elevated and meant to be admired. The exemplification of the "manners" persons is made evident

in the three plays looked at in the final chapter. In these, Shadwell perseveres in correcting harmful "manners" (as well as harmful "humours") while at the same time presenting certain exemplary "manners" characters. The skill with which the "manners" and "humours" elements blend in a general satire for "profit and delight" is an outstanding feature of The Virtuoso, A True Widow, and Bury Fair and marks them as the best and most characteristic of Shadwellian manners plays. In each, "manners" and "humours", in varying degrees, contribute to an overall satire of social deflection from reason and common sense: The Virtuoso attacks the collecting of petty "curiosities", A True Widow condemns "policy", Bury Fair exposes false gentility. In each "manners" and "humours" combine for the didactic purpose of presenting to an audience values that are considered by Shadwell to be morally and socially desirable.

CHAPTER I

COMEDY FOR CORRECTION AND PROFIT

In the Preface to The Humourists (1671), his second comedy and still at the outset of his career as a dramatist, Shadwell casts the poet in the figure of a magistrate (Vol. I, p. 184). Both the poet and the magistrate are obligated in their "concernment to all the Body of Mankind" to suppress "cheats" and "knaveries" because these are "an imposition on all good men". Where the magistrate sentences an offender, the poet, writes Shadwell, makes fops, fools, and delinquents in common sense and good breeding "live to be despised and laugh'd at, which certainly makes more impression on men, than even death can do". There is the implication that the poet's effectiveness in the suppression of offenders is greater than even that of the magistrate, the latter's extremest sentence being less salutary than the derision of laughter.

For Shadwell, magistrate and poet can function meaningfully only in a social context. Both offices require an understanding of, a respect for, and a dedication to the general social good, and it is in relation to that ideal that each and every "correction" or pronouncement has validity. The value of any particular "sentence" depends on the judgment of magistrate or poet, on how ably each has interpreted the needs of society and how each has dealt with the

instance before him so that those needs might best be met.

The "judgment" to which Shadwell gives such prominence is developed at some length in the Prefaces to The Sullen Lovers and The Humourists. At first in defending Jonson against the charge that the Elizabethan had something less than perfect wit -- "Though I have known some of late so insolent to say, that Ben Jonson wrote his best Playes without Wit" (Preface to The Sullen Lovers, p.11) and later in commenting on the attributes of wit (Preface to The Humourists, pp. 185 ff.) -- Shadwell is at some pains to link "wit" with "judgment" (which arrived at "correctness"), and to separate "wit" from "fancy" (which arrived at "mettled Nonsense"). "Fancy", countercharged Shadwell, was most evident in mad men who in their madness entertained ideas that had no correspondence with the world of experience. So men who created fancies without submitting them to the "judgment" of reason and observation were in peril of entertaining notions which had no viable connection with reality and which therefore amounted to "nonsense". "Fancy", therefore, unchecked by "judgment", led, in Shadwell's view, to what was untrue, unnatural and incorrect. To "imitate justice and instruct to life" -- as Shadwell claimed Jonson had done and as he declared his own purpose to be (Preface to The Humourists, p. 188) -- demanded "wit" in the author which was based on a sound judgment of men in their social environment. Only such a judgment enabled "wit", in Shadwell's terms, to perceive that which was true, natural, and correct.

"Wit", then, had for Shadwell a social anchorage which was also a moral one, for it was primarily concerned with judging what was

conducive to or corruptive of the general social welfare. The "wit" of the author and the "judgment" of the magistrate were alike in that both bore the burden of social responsibility and both could and ought to serve the public interest by denouncing that which was publicly damaging.

The form of denouncement, or chastisement, or punishment open to the writer of comedy was, as Shadwell points out, the exposing of the offense to mockery or laughter. Hence the satiric mode. Not only was wit required in the poet for the discernment of truth, it was necessary too in the poet's facility of the expression of it. It is this point that Shadwell makes in his praise of Juvenal:

> If there be no wit in the rendering of Folly ridiculous, or Vice odious, we must accuse Juvenal the best satyrist, and wittiest Man of all Latine writers, for want of it.
> (Preface to The Humourists, p. 189)

The double function of wit in the satirist's portrayal made the work itself a piece of wit, and, of course, that wit could be appreciated by only that part of society which understood the author's wit and recognised the lack of wit in the vices and follies satirised. "I confess", says Shadwell in the preface to his first play, "a Poet ought to do all that he can, decently to please, that so he may instruct". (Preface to The Sullen Lovers, Vol. I, p. 10). "Decently" indicates that moral stance implying social obligation, and "pleasing", as is made explicit here, is justified only in so far as it serves as an instrument for "instructing". Although Shadwell implies that that which pleases may be separate from that which instructs, he also implies that that which truly pleases is that which edifies. To deride

that which was false was, for Shadwell, the particular pleasure provided by the writer of comedy.

The attitude of the stern magistrate pervaded Shadwell's theory of comedy and was based on the assumption that wit as a form of punitive action through satire was the proper foundation for dramatic comedy. The quality of the wit depended on the clarity and universality of the author's vision or judgment and on the sharpness of execution. How well Shadwell performed by his own rules as he went about humiliating and defeating perpetrators of vice and folly will be assessed in the examination of the plays which are to be looked at in this study.

Shadwell's focus on characters whose misguided sets of values made them fit subjects for satire was enunciated simultaneously with his general theory of comedy. He followed Jonson in ascribing to such people "humours", and wrote in the Preface to The Sullen Lovers: "I have endeavour'd to represent variety of Humours. . . which was the practice of Ben Jonson" (Vol. I, p. 10). It might be useful to glance briefly here at Jonson's treatment of humours.

It had been the genius of Jonson to have found for the Elizabethan stage a dramatic means which met the utile/dulce requirements of Horace.[1] He fused the medieval and Elizabethan concept of humours with the type of ridiculous figure of Latin comedy such as the boasting soldier or the peevish guardian. Thus Captain Bobadil (Every Man in His Humour) was a descendant of Pygropolynices (Miles Gloriosus of Plautus) while Demea (Adelphoe of Terence) was ancestor to Morose (Epicene). The humours characters were portrayed in Jonson as having obsessions which swerved unremittingly and drastically away from

common sense and reality and became, as a consequence, socially disruptive and ludicrous. Adam Overdo (Bartholomew Fair) or Morose (Epicene) have idiosyncrasies so pronounced as to amount to maladies, and in the course of the action of the plays these are brought into conflict with the norms of common sense, truth, nature, or reality. Since the social fabric is made whole and cohesive only from the correct interplay of these norms, the humours characters are seen in fact to be threats to social intercourse. By purging the humours characters of their humours or by eliminating the humours characters from society Jonson pointed the way to a healthy or sane society.

That Shadwell understood well the practice of Jonsonian humours may be ascertained from his own definition:

> A Humour is the Biasse of the Mind
> By which, with Violence, 'tis one way inclined.
> It makes our actions lean on one side still;
> And, in all changes, that way bends the Will.
> (Epilogue to The Humourists, Vol. I, p. 254)

"Biasse", "Violence", "lean", "still", and "bends" all indicate a state of unbalance caused by obsession. The overall impression is that of being caught and held in a contortion that defies common sense and nature. Shadwell takes care to emphasize that a humour is never a congenital defect, but a pernicious condition which men adopt from the human weaknesses of intellect and pride:

> I must confess it were ill nature . . . to fall upon the natural imperfections of men, as of Lunaticks, Ideots, or men born monstrous. But these can never be made the proper subject of a Satyr, but the affected vanities, and the artificial fopperies of men, which . . . they take pains to acquire, are the proper subject of a Satyr.
> (Preface to The Humourists, Vol. I, p. 184)

The irony of purposefully pursuing unnecessary follies that only inflict pain, when dramatised on stage, provokes an amusement that is also a warning. Shadwell's art was to nourish the humours in the way weed-killer is used to force the weeds to flourish extravagantly and thus kill themselves. The destruction or suppression of the weeds (humours) secured that social equilibrium which Suzanne Langer discusses as the rhythm of comedy,[2] while the spectacle of the ironic suffering and defeat of the humours characters gave a "removed" audience that sense of security and superiority that Al Capp identifies as essential to the comic spirit.[3] The more the audience "appreciated" the humour, the clearer they saw the unreasonable and unnatural course to which it drove its possessor. In this way, humours characters, by their example as social misfits, were exhibited as offenders upon whom the magistrate-poet passed judgment.

It has been noted that in defending the comedy of humours Shadwell attacked the "new" comedy of "manners" of which "fancy" was an important characteristic. Because of this attack, coupled with his insistence on humours in the tradition of Jonson as the true art of comedy, and the large part humours play in his own work, Shadwell is generally thought of primarily or solely as an author of humours comedy. It is something of a surprise to the reader who accepts Shadwell's criticisms of comedy without measuring them against his plays to read Professor Saintsbury's statement that it is to Shadwell rather than Etherege that "the fatherhood of seventeenth-and-eighteenth century comedy of manners" ought to be ascribed.[4] The difficulty with labels like "humours" and "manners" is of course that they render exclusive and

Now it must have been obvious to Shadwell, as it has been to commentators since,[5] that in relating characters to social standards, manners comedy no less than humours comedy was following the lead of Jonson. Truewit in Epicene, for example, was clearly a prototype of the cool, fashionable wit who establishes what is socially acceptable largely by outwitting the false wits and would-be wits who are socially unacceptable. If the separation of Jonsonian and manners comedy had been for Shadwell utter and complete, it would have been impossible for him to have written as he did of Etherege's play She Wou'd if She Cou'd (1668) that it was "the best Comedy that has been written since the Restauration of the Stage" (Preface to The Humourists, Vol. I, p. 183). While it is possible that Shadwell might allow in Etherege what he would censure in Dryden, it is much more likely that Shadwell differentiated between manners plays that were in his view immoral or perverted -- which meant to please but not to instruct -- and manners plays that were not. Moreover, since it was Shadwell's aim to write comedy for correction and profit, it would be natural for him to take the comedy that he considered was being misused and to correct it. There was, it is to be assumed, some risk for Shadwell to employ the very manners elements that he had so vehemently denounced, but the presentations of such manners plays as Etherege's The Man of Mode and Wycherley's The Gentleman Dancing-Master in 1672, by authors he admired, and the knowledge that though he was using the "means" of manners comedy, he was employing them to an end consistent with his own theory of comedy, must have have persuaded Shadwell to modify the strict use of humours which characterizes his first two plays and to

attempt a combination of manners and humours elements in which both, by "correction", would serve the purpose of public usefulness. So it was that in 1672 there appeared a play by Shadwell which by the introduction of the wit-gallant and the love-game signalled his beginning as a writer of manners comedy. The play was Epsom Wells.

Epsom Wells was crucial to Shadwell's development in a number of ways: it tested his abilities to combine humours and manners modes and to write witty dialogue in the "fancy" style while maintaining, in spite of changes to his early purer humours style inevitably brought about by the inclusion of manners characteristics, the moral or social stance he had set out as the proper attitude of the comic poet. The effort of giving to "manners" liveliness the exemplary and didactic seriousness of "humours" was done at some expense, as will be seen, to manners comedy; but once it was accomplished, it became a channel for Shadwell to use in all his more ambitious plays. Epsom Wells is Shadwell's starting point for the reformation of the Restoration rake, turning him away from self-indulgence and impelling him toward social and moral responsibility.

In The Virtuoso, A True Widow, and Bury Fair, the plays in which Shadwell finds his fullest range, both humours and manners elements are utilised in an overall intrigue and an overall satire so that both kinds of comedy in their particular Shadwellian combination teach the audience the value of wit and judgment and the necessity for common sense and reason.

CHAPTER II

"MOST EXCELLENT TALENT OF HUMOUR"

The Spectator's favourable if somewhat limited assessment of Shadwell's art quoted in the heading of this chapter (Steele, No. 141) came, of course, after the author's death and was made probably from a consideration of all his work though it ~~applies~~ was applied specifically to parts of The Lancashire Witches. Since Shadwell created scores of humours characters, there was plenty of material for the critic to base his observation on. It is neither necessary nor desirable to examine the entire bulk of material that constitutes Shadwell's work with humours. What is proposed here is to analyse his first two plays which, as has been indicated, rigorously applied those principles of humours comedy enunciated in the prefaces to the plays. In doing so it will be possible to frame some general outlines of Shadwellian humours. In later chapters attention will be drawn to the use of humours elements in specially selected plays.

The Sullen Lovers (1668) has a balancing subtitle from the "low" plot, The Impertinents. Stanford and Emilia, paired in moroseness and melancholy, are one of the two sets of lovers, while the host of blocking characters -- those that come between the lovers -- are the Impertinents. The lovers, Stanford and Emilia, have humours which render them unsociable: they so loathe the society which infringes on

their privacy with never ending and conceited demands that Stanford wants to isolate himself on a deserted island while Emilia thinks of retiring to a nunnery. The Impertinents are known by humours which make social nuisances -- the vain glory of Ninny the poet, the familiarity in his relationships with others of Huffe, the know-all censoriousness of Sir Positive-at-All, and the précieuse pose of Lady Vaine -- their unsociability becomes more unbearable as they intrude more and more into the affairs of the lovers.

There is something to be admired in Stanford and Emilia despite their humours: they crave a society free of trivial and dishonest impertinence. This naiveté, not without its charm since it leads to both openness and frankness in all their relationships, has to be unlearnt or made practical. Their inability to compromise with the actual impertinent society is their real stumbling block and they are helped to overcome this with the help of a second pair of lovers, Lovel and Carolina, who teach them to dissemble sufficiently to outwit the Impertinents and to arrive at marriage. Thus two despairing persons come to some sort of gratification in an imperfect world. By the correction of their humours, Stanford and Emilia prove not to be the thorough sullen haters of the world that they first affected to be.

There is nothing to be admired and much to be ridiculed in the incorrigible humours of the Impertinents. The violence of their egoistic delusions that they attempt to pass off as their real selves brings them into incessant conflict with each other and with good taste and decency. In scene after scene their humours jostle and crowd in an extravagant parade of affectation and folly, the audience all the

while mocking the disparity they perceive between what the humours characters are and what they pretend to be. Almost any action in this play may be cited as typical. The one given below takes place early in the play, interrupting the discussion Stanford and Lovel have been having about the impertinencies that are forced on them by others.

Roger (Stanford's man) O Sir! here's Poet Ninny.

Stanf. I ha' nam'd the Devil, and see I have rais'd him.

Ninn. Mr. Lovel, Your humble Servant.
. . . . . .
But dear Mr. Stanford, I am infinitely troubled,
That that unmannerly Raskal shou'd come and disturb
Us just now: But you know, Sir, we cannot help the
Impertinence of foolish Idle Fellowes.

Stanf. No, no! you have convinced me sufficiently of that.
. . . . . .
(enter Woodcock)

Wood. Dear Ninny, Ah, dear Lovel: Ah my dear Jack
Stanford, I am the happiest Man in thy Friendship
of any Man's upon Earth (Kisses them all) . . .
Kiss me agen dear Heart.

Stanf. Now Lovel, Have I reason or not?

Lov. That you have to laugh; this is my recreation . . . .
(Act I, p. 22)

The dialogue, having quickly established the ironic method of exposure of the Impertinents and also the difference in the attitudes of Stanford and Lovel, goes on to reveal the Impertinents in action:

Wood. Well! that's an Excellent Coppy of
Verses of thine, Dear Ninny. Come on Jack,
Thou shalt hear 'em.

Stanf. Hell and Damnation! (Offers to go out)

Ninn. Hold, hold; You shall hear.
Your sad indifference ---(Look you Sir, 'tis upon a
Lady that is indifferent in her Carriage tow'rd me)
Your sad indifference ---(I am confident this

Will please you, here are many thoughts I was happy in
And the choice of words not unpleasant, which you
Know is the greatest matter of all) - Your sad indiffer-
ence
So wounds ---(Look you, you shall find as much
Soul and Force, and Spirit, and Flame in this, as
ever you
Saw in your Life.)

Wood. Come, Jack, hear't, it is a most admirable piece.

Stanf. Now Lovel, What think you? (Lovel laughs)
Gentlemen, I have Extraordinary Business,
I must leave you.

(Act I, p. 22)

The reader might have anticipated that Stanford did stay, ringed around by the unabashed Ninny and Woodcock and the laughing Lovel, and did hear Ninny's execrable poem together with all the interruptions, and then listened to Woodcock's opinion of it as "a great flight". The scene as a whole poses the question that the play seems to ask and answer: How may a man exist in a world of insistent fools? The answer comes partly through Lovel and partly through Emilia -- whom Stanford finds attractive in her honesty and good sense and with whom he combines in repulsing the Impertinents. It seems to be that fools are to be endured, for there is no getting rid of them. They are not insufferable if they are treated as objects of amusement. There are wise and good people too, though they are vastly outnumbered. A man, then, must learn to put up with folly not by declamation and despair, but by an ironic objectivity, and he may, by wise choice, ally himself with a partner and with friends who, having wit and understanding, will help him secure a quiet happiness beyond the harrassment of the impertinents of the world.

The humours of Ninny and Woodcock, however, pale into

insignificance beside that of Sir Positive, who in one man is all men. In the passage below he subdues the other two -- who were bound to cross each other in their intolerant egoisms -- and takes over the scene:

> Sir Pos. Hold Woodcock! why shou'd you disparage
> Poet Ninny. He's a man of admirable Parts,
> and as cunning a fellow, between
> you and I Stanford, I believe he's a Jesuite,
> but I'm sure he is a Jansenist.
>
> Wood. He a Jesuite, that understands neither Greek
> nor Latine?
>
> Sir Pos. Now he talks of that Stanford, I'll tele [sic] thee
> what a Master I am of those Languages; I have
> found out in the Progress of my Study, I must
> confess with some diligence, four and twenty
> Greek and Latin words for Black Puddens and
> Sausages.
>
> Wood. (still bristling against Ninny) Think to huff me?
> I cou'd show you a matter of 200 wounds I
> got when I was a Volunteer aboard the Cambridge,
> Dear Heart, wou'd make you swoon to look upon
> 'em.
>
> Sir Pos. Cambridge, well, that Cambridge is a good
> ship, and do you know, Stanford, that I
> understand a ship Better than any thing in
> the World?
>
> (Act IV, p. 70)

From linguist and architect of ships Sir Positive goes on within the space of a few lines to claim that he is also an art critic -- "Let me see, H.H. -- Oh Deare! Hans Holbin, here are Stroakes, here's Mastery" --and undaunted when he is informed that he has mistook (mistaken) the initials of a sign painter named Humphrey Hobson, he immediately boasts of his running -- "why I have run sixty miles in a day by a Ladies Coach, that I fell in love withall in the streets" -- of his understanding of mathematics, of his playing upon the cittern -- "You talke of a Cittern before me? when I invented the Instrument" -- of his

ability to cheat at dice, of his prowess at leger-de-main, of his reputation as a statesman -- "who was bob'd at Ostend, ha, ha" -- and of his skill at rope dancing. As Lovel says, "Hey, from a States-man to a Rope Dancer, What a leap was there?" (Act IV, pp. 70-73). Sir Positive is all the affectations that weak and foolish men adopt in the vain hope of being thought distinguished. Through him, the satire is extended to embrace all seekers of reputation.

Sir Positive is awarded the crowning mockery of taking in marriage a pregnant whore, Lady Vaine. On discovering what she is, Sir Positive, still determined never to be wrong or second to anyone, declares that he is better off than Stanford or Lovel, for while he knows what he is getting in a wife they are not absolutely certain about Emilia and Carolina. An uncertain world, yes, but not for that reason a world in which to replace sanity and reason with humour and folly.

The pathological need for making the world over in their own image is what rises to mock the humours characters. Their egomanias lead to humiliating exposure, and their deserts measure the gulf between their aspirations and their achievements. Thus Ninny and Woodcock, would-be lovers of Emilia, are both eventually duped by her, though each persists in believing he must be the favoured one even in the act of being foiled. It is a suitable irony that the persons who would come between the lovers are turned in fact into the instruments of bringing them together.

The humours in this play cut across social classes, affecting both high and low plots, and give to their possessors an imbalance in

thrust
themselves which, into the world's coming and going, threatens social stability. In the correction and condemnation of the humours characters Shadwell exercises those magisterial powers that he saw as the poet's task and duty.

The Humourists (1671), Shadwell's next play, also utilised a group of impertinents. They, too, in the manner of the humours characters of the first play, affect virtues and abilities that they do not have. Their incompetence is satirically explored and exposed; they are outwitted in all their designs; their aspirations, especially in love, are shattered; ironically, they become the instruments of bringing together the persons they have kept apart by their impertinence; they are, finally, mere subject matter for derision. The pattern of dealing with humours characters common to both The Sullen Lovers and The Humourists is followed in all the comedies of Shadwell, the portraying of humours "old" or "new" being, for him an essential dramatic means of the writer of comedy. What gives the humours technique of Shadwell fresh interest is his "finding out" of new humours -- the world having so great a supply of follies and vices -- though his creative powers were not so great that he could avoid repetition. In The Humourists, Drybob and Brisk are too like Ninny and Woodcock to be worth examination, but Crazy, whose humour it is to pursue all women and who is in stupid rivalry with Drybob and Brisk for the hand of Theodosia (another Carolina), is drawn with originality and vitality.

Crazy's humour is depicted figuratively as a disease -- the pox -- from which he does indeed suffer literally. It is the result

of his indiscriminate amours. His humour thereby acquires a strong sense of communicative blight which reinforces the notion of the social malignancy of the humour. He brings into the play Striker and Friske, prostitutes who vamp him and who consequently seek their own contamination. They are drawn from a stratum of society to which Shadwell was to return frequently, almost always with telling effect, and with a harshness reminiscent of Jonson's portrayal of such as Doll Common. Crazy also brings into the play Pullin, the French surgeon (formerly barber), who, as he practises his specialty of treating victims of the pox, contributes to the impression of a contaminated society and of the pain humours cause.

A humours character central to the structure of the play is Lady Loveyouth. Her name tells her humour. As guardian to Theodosia and admirer of Raymund -- a gentleman of wit and honour and obvious mate for Theodosia -- the characters are drawn to her house where nearly all the action takes place. The lovers, helped by Sir Richard Loveyouth -- who turns up after he had been thought to be dead -- and the servant, Bridget, outwit both impertinent guardian and suitors and close in marriage.

The Humourists as a portrayal of human vanity and stupidity is much more biting than The Sullen Lovers. The harshness which marks the characterization of Striker and Friske invades the whole satire as the infection of humours, particularly that of Crazy, threatens to obstruct and destroy the household of the Loveyouths, which is itself society in microcosm. Lady Loveyouth, upon being tricked by Raymund, determines to marry Crazy, so that all society from Madam Striker to

Lady Loveyouth is in danger of becoming diseased. These impertinents are as dangerous as they are amusing, reminding one of the severity with which "fools" and "knaves" are described in the preface to The Sullen Lovers, as "Common Enemies" "prejudicial to all Societies they live in" who "ought no more to be suffer'd amongst us, then wild beasts: for no corrections that can be laid upon 'em are of power to reforme 'em".

The language of The Humourists also has a cauterizing strength not to be found in The Sullen Lovers. Where Shadwell had relied on rapidity, range, and incongruity in the earlier play -- as in the pretended expertise of Sir Positive -- here the disease images bear a virulence that goes beyond naming or cataloguing. Raymund mocks the pox-ridden Crazy as a Knight Errant who suffers for women more than any man in Christendom (Act I, p. 194), and his sally to have a Red Cross set on Crazy's door because the latter is not fit to go loose carries in the figure a repugnance that is hardly amusing. Drybob's writing, at least in intention, is not the innocuous rubbish of Ninny. He threatens to do away with Crazy by "writing his (Crazy's) head off" and breaking his heart with "Reperties" (Act II, p. 206). Theodosia, in repelling her unwanted suitors, also cuts them in a way unknown to Emilia and Carolina. To Brisk, who greets her with "Ah my Queen Regent, I salute the hem of your Garment", she replies, "I cannot without a blush, allow the humility of your address" (Act III, p. 222). Because disease needs strong prescriptives for cure, the lovers rebel against the authority of Lady Loveyouth, an act later made respectable by the resurrected Sir Richard. The Humourists depicts a disturbed

society and Shadwell lashes satirically at the humours characters in it as the causes of the disturbance.

What emerges from The Sullen Lovers and The Humourists is first, Shadwell's talent for portraying humours characters in collision with each other and with society at large as they pester, provoke, and pervert good sense and normal social communication; and second, Shadwell's urging the audience by the use of satire toward some form of wisdom and morality. As Shadwell turned to exploit the environments of town and country in his search for new humours, he produced an astonishing variety of representations of human folly and delusion and satirized each in such a way that the audience would recognise humours contagions among themselves and be led away from them toward his own evaluations of correct wit and judgment.

CHAPTER III

"TO LARD WITH WIT THY HUNGRY EPSOM PROSE"

Perhaps it is Dryden's grudging and spiteful reference to Shadwell's Epsom Wells (1672)[1] -- from which the title to this chapter is taken -- that has given rise to the classification of the work as a "wit" play, as though Shadwell's other plays had no wit. Alssid also uses the term, which he justifies as meaning for Shadwell the highlighting of the "clever characters" and the keeping of the "humours characters in minor, secondary positions".[2] Clodpate is hardly a "secondary character", and what is most noticeable about the "clever characters" is not so much their prominence as their similarity -- the closest Shadwell was ever to come -- to the libertine rake-heroes of the most widely known "wit comedies" or "manners comedies" of the Restoration. It is the presence of the anti-marriage repartée and attitudes of the "gay couples" which justifies the term "wit", and only then if "wit" is equated with "manners". Actually, there are vital differences between the manners play, Shadwell style, of which Epsom Wells is an example and the manners plays of the great Restoration dramatists; but it is not yet time to discuss those differences.

What must first strike the student of Shadwell is the fact that the manners quality of the play is there at all. What, we may wonder,

happened to the theory of humours comedy that Shadwell had expounded such a short while earlier? As the hedonism of the wit-gallants is given scope, it may well seem that Shadwell had drastically changed his standards of wit and judgment and had been won over to the pursuit of freedom and pleasure. The "fine" people are most un-Jonsonian and might have come out of The Wild Goose Chase or The Witty Fair One or any manners type comedy from the time of the later Stuarts. To understand how Shadwell was able to incorporate manners elements into his theory of comedy and yoke them with humours elements, it is necessary to look closely at Epsom Wells.

Epsom Wells pictures the sort of society that is associated in our own time with places like Las Vegas or Reno -- divorce and all. The people visiting the Wells are temporary residents out for relaxation and enjoyment. The opening scene reveals a group of women "taking the waters", a practice spoken of in the play as the "washing down" of the physical effects of loose living. Mrs. Woodly, a central figure in the complications arising out of adultery, has a prominent place in the scene. Eyeing them and waiting to hawk at them are the young men of the place. The overall atmosphere is one in which normal moral inhibitions are discarded and in which men and women are tempted to give free reign to the pursuit of pleasure. The result is that the freedom afforded by Epsom is often misused and leads, all too frequently, to unhappy liasons and broken marriage.

Into this "hunting ground" come Rains and Bevil, the men of wit and honour in the play, who pride themselves, in the full blown hedonism of the Restoration, on the abundant "stock of health"

(Act I, p. 108) from which they are willing to draw at every opportunity. Bevil says of one of his mistresses "she's a damn'd Wife, but a very good Mistress" (Act I, p. 109) and rationalizes his way out of the predicament of conducting an affair with the wife of a friend by expostulating, "Gad it's impossible to be a man of honour in these Cases. But my intrigue with her began before my Friendship with him, and so I made a friend of my Cuckold, and not a Cuckold of my friend" (Act I, p. 109). It is also Bevil who proclaims, "I think a Man has no excuse for himself that visits a Woman without design of lying with her one way or other" (Act I, p. 117). Rains is no less promiscuous. In their pursuit of "quarry" they encounter Lucia and Carolina and proceed to court them in their usual libidinous way. The girls are the new, high-spirited type of woman, determined on freedom and pleasure, and they encourage the men by arranging meetings with them. But these women are very much aware that freedom is beset with difficulties and has to be well understood if it is to be enjoyed. Their skill at controlling the wits without stifling them is brought out in such a dialogue as occurs between Lucia and Rains:

> Lucia. I am as hard to be fixt as you. I love liberty as well as any of ye.
>
> Rains. Say you so? Faith let's make use on't.
>
> Lucia. Not the lewd liberty you mean. Come, to divert us better, go a little further, and try the Eccho . . .
>
> Rains. 'Tis a fine Eccho, but, Madam -
> (Act III, pp. 146-147)

Rains gets neither more nor less than an "eccho".

The couples in Epsom Wells are undoubtedly Restoration manners

characters, and when it is considered that they are only the first of many such Shadwell lovers, it will be seen that Saintsbury's association of Shadwell with manners comedy was not as far off the mark as it might have at first appeared. But there is an important difference also, which becomes apparent as the play unfolds. Bevil and Rains, still indulging themselves on the side, grow to admire Lucia and Carolina. Bevil calls Lucia "foolishly honest" and eventually he, like Rains, offers to barter freedom in exchange for marriage. Marriage as a social good and a virtue is almost forced on the play, a design which Shadwell voices in the Epilogue:

> . . . 'tis a fine way they [other authors] write;
> They please the wicked Wenchers of the Age,
> And scoff at civil Husbands on the Stage:
> To th' great decay of Children in the Nation,
> They laugh poor Matrimony out of fashion.
> A young man dares not marry now for shame,
> He is afraid of losing his good name.
> . . . . . .
> Therefore, for Heavens sake, take the first occasion,
> And marry all of you for th' good of the Nation.
> Gallants, leave your lewd whoring and take Wives,
> Repent for shame your Covent-Garden lives:
> (Epilogue, p. 182)

The obligation of marriage which Shadwell lays on Epsom Wells was consistent with the moral purpose he had in writing comedy, but it is in marked contrast to the insistence of the best writers of Restoration comedy that the pursuit of freedom and pleasure was the only valid basis of marriage.

In Epsom Wells social responsibility or unadaptibility is not confined to the humours characters: unreclaimed rakes are as great nuisances and are as surely "sentenced". Woodly and his wife, who are among the "fine" persons of the play, but who are lovers of licence

rather than liberty, are exposed to each other as unfaithful in spite of all their precaution not to be discovered. Woodly has the added humiliation of being defeated by Bevil in a duel which Mrs. Woodly had urged her husband to in order, ironically, to be revenged on her lover.

The Woodlys as a pair are meant to contrast with the other pairs, Rains and Lucia, and Bevil and Carolina. The distrust and hopelessness of the one affair is designed to emphasize the trust and hope of the others. Certainly, the depths of bitterness to which Woodly descends -- he says of his wife, "Would she were a whore. I would know what to do with her" (Act II, p. 131) -- is unlikely to be the attitude of Lucia and Carolina's reformed rakes; but there is no evidence of trust and hope in their impending marriages. The engagement "contracts" are entered into very cautiously by the ladies involved:

> Rains. Madam, since we cannot agree upon better terms, let me claim your Promise, and admit me for your Servant.
>
> Luc. I do receive you upon tryal.
>
> Caro. And I upon your good behaviour: I think you have gone far enough in one day.
>
> (Act V, p. 181)

Rains and Bevil are sure that the marriages, forced on by the scandal of their association with the ladies upon the new terms, will soon take place; and that is the happy ending of the affairs of these lovers. The "forcing" on which Rains and Bevil rely is no more convincing or pleasant than the marrying "for th' good of the Nation". The reader is left with the impression that Shadwell has used the love-game to enable him to say that the game is morally and socially acceptable only when it ends in marriage. The wit and judgment of the lovers, rather than being free, is under this moral and social restraint. The love-game has become the

means for a reproof of whoring and wenching.

The theme of the misuse of freedom is reinforced by the two low plots. The marriages of the Biskets and Fribbles, London cits, have been threatened by the unfaithfulness of the wives -- no doubt affected by the "natural" ways of Epsom, but also brought on by the foolishness of the husbands, one of whom tries to control his wife by pampering and the other by severity -- till the husbands decide to have their wives back "not one jot the worse" and in the expectation of "vast damages" that they hope to be awarded by "a good substantial Jury of all married men" (Act V, p. 179). Clodpate, a country Justice of the Peace who hates anything to do with the city of London, becomes easy prey to a London prostitute who feigns to love the country and hate London. Hoisted on his own petard because of his humour, he too, by misalliance reinforces the theme of the misuse of freedom.

Clodpate is in many ways the most interesting character of Epsom Wells. It is he who brings the plots together in his roles of acquaintance of Rains and Bevil, of suitor to Lucia and Carolina, and Mrs. Jilt, the London prostitute, of the Justice who has to deal with Kick and Cuff, the two sharpers who are brought before him on the complaints of Bisket and Fribble for making "assaults" "in most unseemly manner" upon the bodies of their wives. Clodpate's fate, as has been suggested, underscores the theme of the play. Perhaps most important of all is the consideration of Clodpate as the humours character of the play, the real comic strength to which the manners elements were fused.

Clodpate, whose humour is described in a note by Shadwell as

"a public spirited, politick, discontented Fop, an immoderate Hater of London, and a Lover of the Country above measure, a hearty true English coxcomb" (Dramatis Personae, p. 201) struts and roars about Epsom in the belief that he is cutting an impressive figure among the various social levels of that health, or "natural", resort. Thrown with the wits, his narrowness and conceit are quickly made apparent. Among his list of London "immoralities" he includes the "dust in Hide-park" and "Sea-coal". His obsession for damning the city is given the direct lie by the sophisticated ease of manner and the good sense which the wits exhibit, products of the social intercourse provided by the city. Sarcastically the wits lead Clodpate on:

> Rains. But what important Service do you do your country?
>
> Clod. 'SBud, I -- why, I am Justice of Quorum in Sussex . . . I make the Surveyors mend the Highways; I cause Rogues to be whipt for breaking fences or pilling trees, especially if they be my own; I swear Constables, and the like.
>
> Bevil. But is this all?
>
> Clod. No: I call Over-seers for the Poor to an account . . . (then follows a number of insignificant offices ending with the remarkable) and make people bury in Flannel, to encourage the Woolen Manufacture, which never a Justice of Peace in England does but I.
> (Act I, pp. 111-112)

How hard Clodpate works at his own importance and what a repetition and swelling there is to that final "but I"!

With Lucia and Carolina, Clodpate is used for mirth as each passes him to the other in a game of playful annoyance, but he is the inevitable captive of the first woman who can praise the country and

revile London, and that turns out to be Mrs. Jilt, a London whore. He promises her "you shall milk and make Hay as much as you will" as he listens to her misfortunes about being confined to London. His having to pay money to be released from the ceremony that he learns too late is a mock marriage is a comic nemesis for his reluctance to spend any money which might benefit a Londoner or an admirer of the city. He pays in full for his niggardly taking back the ten shillings he gave the "Fidler" who sang in praise of the country but who then revealed his pride of being born and bred in the city. Clodpate retrieved his ten shillings on the pretence he would make it a guinea (Act III, p. 140).

With Kick and Cuff he blusters in his petty authority, but is deflated when, for all his threats, Cuff says, "Mr. Justice, you are a Coxcomb; and I shall find a time to cut your Nose." To which Kick adds, "And I will make bold to piss upon your Worship." (Act V, p. 178).

The scene in which Clodpate runs in terror from spooks in the cemetery -- to which he has been directed for a supposed assignation with one of the ladies -- breaks into broad farce at Clodpate's expense, and establishes definitely his ridiculousness. Here, perhaps, is focussed the impression made over and over again that Clodpate, obsessed by his humour, is utterly incompetent, utterly unlike the image he thinks he presents.

The blending of Clodpate with the "high" life of Epsom on the one hand and the "low" life on the other in a realistic and lively portrayal of the well-known resort was no small accomplishment for the dramatist. Charles II was present at the first performance and the play was acted at Whitehall by request. It must have been a hit with public

audiences for two of the various casts, Mrs. Moor and Pinkethman, to have chosen it for their benefits.[3] Montague Summers singles out the part of Clodpate by quoting Cibber's comment on the performance of the role by Underhill: "In the coarse, rustic humour of Justice Clodpate in Epsom Wells he was a delightful brute." (Note on "Theatrical History", p. 99). The new direction in which Shadwell turned the manners play had worked; henceforward he became confident in "teaching" wit and judgment by a judicious and satirical mingling of rakes (to be reformed) and bold young ladies (with positive views about virtue), and humours or low life personalities. In Epsom Wells the general satire on the "unnatural" approaches to marriage had given the play cohesion and depth, and it is perhaps that aspect of the play which earns for it the term "wit".

The world of Epsom Wells is still fundamentally that of the early plays: it is a world to be corrected and purged. Only in this world, as well as humours characters to be laughed at, there are gay couples to be led toward marriage through the proper disciplining of natural inclinations.

CHAPTER IV

MATURE SHADWELL

Epsom Wells marked an important stage in Shadwell's development: from this point all his ambitious plays with the exception of The Squire of Alsatia were those in which the overall satire, the strength and continued presence of which has led to Shadwell's being compared with Wycherley, was successfully conveyed through a combination of mannners and humours elements; or, to put it another way, through the peculiar Shadwellian shaping of the manners mode to a general corrective purpose. The three plays that are considered here to represent Shadwell's best and most mature work are The Virtuoso (1676), A True Widow (1678), and Bury Fair (1689).

The Squire of Alsatia (1688), though in his own time Shadwell's most successful play[1] and the one made fairly well known for its Alsatian scenes,[2] has been omitted from this group because in it Shadwell returned full blast to the portrayal of humours and put in it little or nothing of manners comedy. The play has tremendous gusto, a power that Shadwell had first indicated in the early humours plays and in the character of Clodpate, but the heavy condemnation of an illiberal education which thematically binds the lively scenes has not the effectiveness of the satires which permeate the three plays selected for discussion here.

The Virtuoso, in the person of its main character after whom the play is named, is at its most obvious a ridiculing of the pseudo-scientist who studies curiosities for twenty years -- for Sir Nicholas Gimcrack it was "the sevéral sorts of spiders" -- but who does not trouble himself to observe "the Wisdom, Policies, and Customs" of people because such a study is "below" him (Act III, p. 142). The application of the satire to members of the then new Royal Society gave it, of course, all the more relish. The stupidity of directing enquiries without regard for the real and practical in life is illustrated vividly in the scene in which Sir Nicholas, seen in his laboratory with his swimming master, is engaged in a swimming lesson. His theory of swimming is based on the assumption that the man who would swim best would be he who could swim like a frog. There is a frog in a jar of water in the laboratory and Sir Nicholas is attached to the animal by a string which is round the frog's waist. As the animal moves, so in imitation does the scientific man. He is sure that by this means he will master the "watery science". Asked if he has ever tried it in the water, he replies, "No, Sir; but I swim most exquisitely on Land." He goes on to say that he hates water and will content himself "with the speculative part of Swimming" (Act II, pp. 125-127).

Sir Nicholas' real incompetence is also brought out in his language and in his relationships with others in the play. After his bit of exercise he tries to impress some visitors to his laboratory with this piece of scientific jargon:

> Let me rest a little to respire. So it is wonderful, my noble Friend, to observe the agility of this pretty Animal, which, notwithstanding I impede its motion,

> by the detention of this Filum or Thred within my teeth, which makes a ligature about its loins, and though by many sudden stops I cause the Animal sometimes to sink or immerge, yet with indefatigable activity it rises, and keeps almost its whole body upon the superficies of this humid element.
>
> (Act II, p. 126)

Sir Nicholas' preoccupation with the trivia that he tries to pass off as true learning is echoed and made more ludicrous by the rhetorical flourishes of his friend and admirer, Sir Formal Trifle. Sir Formal's comment on the Virtuoso's proposition that he will add the mastery of flying to that of swimming and proceed to the moon is:

> Nay doubtless, Sir, if you proceed in those swift gradations you have hitherto prosper'd in, there will be no difficulty in the noble Enterprize, which is devoutly to be effligated by all ingenious Persons since the intelligence of that Lunary World wou'd be of infinite advantage to us, in the improvement of our Politicks.
>
> (Act II, p. 126)

These two by their language are meant to be recognised for the pompous ~~charlatans~~ pretenders in false learning that they really are.

The same inability to perform anything practical is brought out in Sir Nicholas' love and financial affairs. He loses both his mistress and his wife as well as the control of the estates of his nieces and the inheritance of his uncle, Snarl. He is a laughing stock as, deserted by all, he comforts himself that now he will be able to study "for use" in the confidence that he "will presently find out the Philosopher's Stone" (Act V, p. 180). ~~In humiliation and defeat the fate of Sir~~ Sir Nicholas' In the case Nicholas is repeated by that of Sir Formal. The latter is beaten by the "amorous coxcomb", Sir Samuel Hearty, in a riotous scene in which he tried to seduce Sir Samuel under the impression that Sir Samuel,

disguised, was a woman. The attempted rape of brutality by oratory is a telling satire on the ways of folly, and it is in such scenes as this that Shadwell approaches Swift. Sir Formal is also beaten by a mob of labourers who resent one of Sir Nicholas' rumoured scientific discoveries when he goes out to placate them in the belief that his oratory would overpower them. In addition, he is foiled and derided by the ladies, Clarinda and Miranda. By their embarrassing failure and helplessness Sir Nicholas and Sir Formal are made examples and warnings of folly.

Sir Samuel Hearty is still another type of misguided "humour", who thinks that the use of "nonsensical By-words" constitutes wit. In the hope of seeing Miranda at the house of Sir Nicholas he asks Bruce and Longvil, the rake-heroes, "Now you are invited, let me wait on you in a Livery for one of your Footmen. I have forty several Periwigs for these Intrigue's and bus'nesses: 'gad if you will, whip, slap-dash -- I'll bring this bus'ness about as round as a Hoop." (Act I, p. 112). Sir Samuel as a boisterous lover of farce and horseplay is a type of humours character that Shadwell often reproduced. He, too, is tricked by the ladies and held up to scorn.

The forms of false or unreal wit or learning ---to which may be added Snarl's obsession with the last age which, according to him, had all the good qualities that the present age lacked -- are contrasted with the wit and learning admired by the libertines, Bruce and Longvil. Their assessment of Lucretius as the "profound Oracle of Wit and Sence" able to reconcile "Philosophy with Verse" show them to be seekers for a poise and imperturbability worthy of men of reason (Act I, p. 105).

Such an objectivity and neutrality it is not in the nature of man to achieve; so Bruce and Longvil content themselves with fleering at the fashion mongers and enthusiasts who make a great ado about life and with making their "private pleasure" (Act I, p. 107) their main concern. It is in this state of mind that their "curiosity" in Miranda and Clarinda begins. Now Bruce and Longvil are a contrast with the humours characters because they have a regard for true wit and "nature" that the others do not, and yet subtly they are like the virtuoso in being led by their curiosity wherever it chanced, without their being able to fix on anything "real" or "practical" which would give to their lives a motive and a purpose. The formula Shadwell then employs is the same as that which he used in Epsom Wells: the rakes are won over by the cleverness and honesty, sprightliness and modesty of the young ladies to such an extent that each gives up the lady of his choice in order to suit the preferences of the ladies and just so that he might be married to one of them. Here is repeated that forcing of marriage as a moral solution and necessity which takes out all the fizz of the love-game.

A depleted love-game, however, did not in Shadwell mean a flat play. The humours characters are lively, as has been suggested, and the theme of false and true wit subtly combines the manners and humours elements. But there is more to the satire of The Virtuoso that does not seem to have been noted.

The Virtuoso himself is interestingly used to extend the satire on phony science to phony religion as well. Bruce, commenting on Sir Nicholas, says, "No Phanatick that has lost his Wits in Revelation, is so mad as this Fool" (Act V, p. 165). This simile is only part of the

religious aura that envelopes the Virtuoso. His mission is to instruct mankind; he has a "flock", one of whom "bleats" his thanks; he goes into a courtyard to cure the lame and the sick; and, strikingly, he cures "mad men" by transfusions of sheep's blood, while to the sick he administers "Bills" which they are to swallow. Sir Nicholas talks of "light" from decaying matter -- "I my self have read a Geneva Bible by a Leg of Pork" (Act V, p. 164) -- as "the finest Light in the World". His "Stentrophonical Tube", he anticipates, will throw parsons out of work and declares that the nation would then be better off because the displaced parsons could be more usefully employed in the making of woolen cloth or fishing nets.

The satiric association of science and religion intermixed with the various other satires already observed gives to this play a verve which represents Shadwell at his best. The dialogue, for instance, of the temptation scene between Lady Gimcrack and Bruce is good enough to recall the Miss Prue-Tattle seduction scene in Congreve's Love for Love. Lady Gimcrack makes the opening:

> L. Gim. Lord, Sir, that you should take me to be in jest! I swear I am in earnest, and were I not sure of my Honour, that never fail'd me in a doubtful occasion, I would not give you this opportunity of tempting my frailty; not but that my virtuous inclinations are equal with any Ladies: but there is a prodigious Witchcraft in opportunity. But honour does much, yet opportunity is a great thing, I swear a great thing.
>
> Bruce. Ay, Madam, if we use it when it offers itself.
>
> L. Gim. How Sir! ne'r hope for't! ne'r think on't! I would not for all the World I protest. Let not such thoughts of me enter into your head. My honour will protect me . . .
> . . . . . .

Should we now retire into that cool Grotto for refreshment, the censorious world might think it strange; but honour will preserve me. Honour's a rare thing, I swear, I defie temptation.

Bruce. You'll not give a man leave to trouble you with much. I have not observ'd that Grotto; shall I wait on you to survey it.

L. Gim. Ay, Sir, with all my heart to survey that; but if you have any wicked intentions, I'll swear you'll move me prodigiously. If your intentions be dishonourable, you'll provoke me strangely.

Bruce. Try me, Madam.

L. Gim. Hold! hold! have a care what you do. I will not try if you be not sure of your Honour. I'll not venture, I protest.

Bruce. What ever you are of mine, you are sure of your own.

L. Gim. Right, that will defend me. Now tempt what you will though we go in, nay, though we shut the door too: I fear nothing; it's all one to me as long as I have my Honour about me. Come.
(Act III, pp. 135-136)

False love, false science, false religion, false learning, and false honour are all entertainingly and crushingly dealt with in a play which exposes and punishes the "con" artists who would substitute a false light for the light of good sense and reason. One could wish for an author of our own time who would show in comic perspective those biologists and physicists who are tempted to see themselves as designers of brave new worlds.

Central to the structure of The Virtuoso are the young ladies Clarinda and Miranda. Bruce and Longvil revolve round them, and Lady Gimcrack in pursuit of the wits comes into collision course with all of them. With her, because he is the guardian of the young ladies, comes

Sir Nicholas, and he, through the activities of his wife, is cuckolded by Bruce and Longvil. Also in orbit round Clarinda and Miranda are Sir Samuel and Sir Formal, so complicating the entire system. While the centre of the galaxy is stationary -- to risk one further analogy -- the persons in motion round them are manipulated in a series of characteristic stances toward humiliation and mockery. The creator of this comic universe is the satirical administrator of wit and judgment.

A True Widow (1678), Shadwell writes in his dedication to Sir Charles Sedley, roused "the Anger of a great many, who thought themselves concerned in the Satyr".[1] That public reaction is not surprising because in this play, more than in any other he wrote, Shadwell directed his satire with a withering objectivity and impartiality at both the manners and humours pretenders of the town. Persons of policy, on the make, are found in both sorts of pretenders; both types exercise deception and are equal frauds. Together they make up the social world, the "true" world, of which the "true" widow is a perfect example.

To Lady Cheatly, from whose widowed condition the play draws its title, come all the characters of the play. The "manners" or "wit" or "fine" gentlemen -- Bellamour and Stanmore -- come as admirers of the Widow's two daughters, Isabella and Gartrude. Bellamour and Isabella, as a pair, are contrasted and compared with Stanmore and Gartrude, but both sets are contrasted with yet another pair of "fine" persons -- Carlos and Theodosia. Carlos, too, is drawn to Lady Cheatly's because Theodosia as her relative lives there. The manners group as a whole is distinguished from the "humours" group which also comes to Lady Cheatly's

by the fact that they, unlike the humours group, are not interested in gaining from the financial speculations of the widow, though she has a business view of them. The humours characters definitely interested in money are Lady Cheatly's Puritan brother, Lump, whose strictness in morals is matched only by his devotion to the making of profitable investments; Old Maggot, "a Lover of Business", who sees in Lady Cheatly a fortune to be gained by the simple act of marriage; the Steward to Lady Cheatly, who tries to blackmail the Widow into marriage by taking advantage of his inside information of almost all her fraudulent practices; and Prig, "a most noisie Jockey", who thinks of nothing but sport and gambling and looks on the Widow as a sure thing. These money grubbers are the natural victims of Lady Cheatly and she makes all but her brother -- perhaps his combination of piety and exploitation is too formidable for any society -- pay for their mistake in thinking of making use of her for their own interests.

As if the complications of the plot were not already too much, there are two more humours characters, Young Maggot and Selfish, who vie for the attention of one of the young ladies and thus cross the "fine" persons.

Out of this very complex comic world comes a satirical and paradoxical polarizing and equating of the "manners" and "humours" centres of the play, symbolized respectively -- and in the "humours" world jointly -- by the marriage and money markets. Stanmore and Bellamour come to the market as libertines, to purchase as much pleasure as they can at the least expense to themselves. Stanmore declares from the beginning that he has no design on Gartrude's fortune -- one that

exists only as a rumour based on a general false impression of Lady Cheatly's wealth -- but that he aims "Only at her person". He gets what he desires and cackles at the end of the play to Carlos and Bellamour, "now make the most of your Matrimonial Bonds; I have done my Business without them" (Act V, p. 362). But Stanmore has a bad bargain. In the process of his pursuit he has had to endure the mortification of witnessing Gartrude's encouragement of the stupid Selfish, who, to Stanmore's knowledge, has also had access to the foolishly compliant Gartrude. Also, he has lost his honour by having been ignominiously defeated by Carlos in a duel while acting as a second to the same despicable Selfish. Like Horner, he succeeds by deception only to emerge with nothing himself.

Bellamour's initial intentions are like those of Stanmore, only he is prepared to pay more in the way of "keeping" for the superior Isabella. He says he "aimes but at fornication" with Isabella and commences his courting of her with an offer of "Coaches and Clothes" if she will consent to be "kept", a condition he excuses on the grounds of "present custom" and his personal aversion to "a long journey" (Act III, p. 319). With spirit and sense quite unlike Gartrude, Isabella spurns the offer of Bellamour who, as his admiration for her increases, changes his offer to a proposal of marriage and is accepted. It is noteworthy that Isabella reveals to Bellamour her real financial state: "I'll not deceive you: Whatever my Mother makes, I have no Portion, nor was ever troubled with the thought of it till now" (Act V, p. 359). This moment of exposure and seeming weakness, when duplicities are removed, creates the possibility of happy and meaningful "marketing".

Carlos is a "fine" person, but is in no way a rake. An appearance of the rake is imposed on him though, by the command of the one woman to whom he gives his serious attention -- Theodosia. Similarly, Theodosia, though she loves Carlos from the very beginning, continually "tests" him and puts him off. She enjoys his courting too much to exchange it prematurely for marriage. She says to him that were she to consent to marriage "then the Game were up betwixt us, and there were no more to do but to pay the stakes, and then to something else" (Act II, p. 311). In that pronouncement there is a touch of Millamant in The Way of the World, a determination to face life realistically and critically, not heroically or romantically. Carlos and Theodosia are emphatically not a Restoration manners gay couple: Theodosia encourages Carlos to court elsewhere; Carlos resents having to court anyone but Theodosia. These two persons also practise a form of deceit -- Carlos courts where his heart is not merely to humour Theodosia, while she pretends not to be sure of her affections for him -- but they are aware that they are conjuring illusions and are not the dupes of their own deceptions. In a fraudulent world, they seem to say, one must bargain sensibly and honourably, but not naively, and one must learn to use deceits for self-protection and for personal happiness. They also are not "true", but in an entirely different way from that in which the frauds are not "true". This shrewd and practical attitude for dealing with the world might be considered akin to that magisterial judgment of wit that was discussed in relation to Shadwell's theory of comedy.

Gartrude is involved in the "humours" action of the play also by her affair with Selfish -- which, by the way, equates Stanmore and

Selfish in a rather devasting way -- and by her eventual alliance with Young Maggot. The main complication of the "humours" centre, however, concerns Lady Cheatly round whom clusters the group who are on the look-out for a quick fortune. They plead with her to act for them and are deservedly cheated by her. Without going into a description of the means by which each of these easy profit seekers becomes a victim of his own greed, it may be said that the humours characters in the money market balance the manners characters in the marriage market. Those who would deceive others and do not learn that policy and duplicity of a self-deluding kind do not work are laughed at by the audience, which is, of course, the same as being punished by the author. Lady Cheatly braves out her exposure because she is a better cheat than those who tried to use her; but her prospective marriage with Old Maggot, as much as Old Maggot deserves it, is also a humiliating come-down for Lady Cheatly. The money market is not a place for any sort of delusion, contrived or unconscious. The "fine" gentlemen of the play are not caught in the financial web because they shun the public and ostentatious making and talking of money that attracts the more vulgar and grasping to the home of Lady Cheatly. Theodosia and Carlos, one of the happy couples, are not concerned with money; and Isabella, as has been noted, informs Bellamour of her lack of a "Portion" and her honesty in making her position known becomes one of the bases for the other happy marriage between Bellamour and her.

The marriage market and the money market or the combination of both is a wide snare, perhaps accounting for the "many" who "thought themselves concerned in the Satyr". And the insidiousness of the market mentality brought out Shadwell's satiric powers. In the following

scene Lady Busie, a confidante of Lady Cheatly, advises Isabella how to receive the overtures of Bellamour:

L. Busie Now there is a certain Lord, whom my Lady has mentioned to you.

Isab. A Lord? a Beast, and one that would make me as bad as himself.

. . . . . .

L. Busie Be not so forward, all things have two faces -- do not look upon the wrong one -- Go to -- You are a fine young Lady, and are brought by your Lady Mother to Town, the General Mart for Beauty. Well -- you would be so setled [sic] in the World, as to have a certain Fond [fund] , whereon you may rely, which in Age may secure you from Contempt -- Good.

Isab. I hope I shall have enough to keep me honest.

L. Busie Nay, Heaven forbid I should persuade you to be dishonest: Vertue is a rare thing, a heavenly thing. But I say still, be mindful of the main -- alass a Woman is a solitary, helpless Creature without a Man, God knows -- good -- how may this Man be had in Marriage say you? -- very well -- if you could get a fine Gentleman with Money enough, but alas! those do not Marry, they have left it off. The Customes of the World change in all Ages.

Isab. In ours for the worse.

L. Busie Very well said, -- but [illegible] yet the wisest must obey 'em as they change, -- do you conceive, Madam. --

Isab. Yes I do conceive you to be doing a very Reverend Office. (aside)

. . . . . .

L. Busie Now I say since Custom has so run down Wedlock, what remains? but that we should make use of the next thing to it -- good -- Nay, not but that Vertue is a rare thing, -- Heaven forbid I should detract from that; -- But, I say, the main point is to be respected, a good deal of Money, there's the point. --

. . . . . .

the next thing to Marriage, is being kind to a noble Lord . . . and if good terms be

made, and you be well settled in the world.

Isab. That would be settled out of the World: for I should never dare to show my face again.

(Act II, pp. 303-304)

Isabella apprehends the realities which constitute social intercourse and is not deceived by false appearances nor committed to deluding others by practising appearance. The image she wishes for herself is one related to her actual self, not a reflection of an illusion.

The satire of A True Widow is hard hitting and wide, and has the merit of subtlety. Its condemnation is carried through dramatic action which is revealing without being expository. The handling of theme and plot, the blend of humours and manners elements, the forcefulness and comprehensiveness of the satire may well make this play the crowning achievement of Shadwell. Nor has this analysis done justice to Shadwell's use of language in the play or the remarkable way in which Snarl, Prig, and Old Maggot, to name a few, are sources of information on the contemporary scene. Likewise, the play within the play found in Act IV, which presents to the audience a picture of itself as it sits in the playhouse, the various ventures of the money lenders, and the social aspects of "keeping" and mock marriage are of of interest historically. It is, however, in the welding together of crass commercialism and unscrupulous exploitation of the senses that the play, while maintaining Shadwell's moral position, may claim to be considered an important work of Restoration comedy.

The final play to be examined in this study as an example of Shadwell's fully developed comedy is Bury Fair (1689). Two plays,

however, which have some bearing on Bury Fair will be glanced at first.

In The Lancashire Witches (1681) Shadwell brought into the open as he had not done before his religious and political satire. He was in full hue and cry, Titus Oates style, after Popish plotters and chose to launch his attack through the satirical portrait of an Irish priest, Tegue O'Divelly, who is referred to in the Dramatis Personae as "loathsome" and "profane", and who is brought into an unholy and audacious sexual union with Mother Demdike, a witch and agent of the Devil. Shadwell is unfortunately so biased in his attack that he comes out as a sort of Reverend Ian Paisley: his methods make him as bad if not worse than the perpetrators of the follies and vices he attacks. Shadwell also brings Church and witchcraft together in the ritual and ceremony of the witches, in the form of parodies of the Church mass. A black buck goat is the object of their veneration, which they approach "arses before faces" and whose behind they kiss as the highlight of the "service". The parallel between superstition in the witches and faith in priests and relics reduces both to absurd mumbo jumbo.

Tegue was not Shadwell's only target. Smerk, as a priest of the Established Anglican Church who expresses anti-Presbyterian and anti-Parliamentary sentiments, and who is so far influenced by Roman Catholicism as to discredit the Titus Oates allegations and to tolerate the possibility of a Catholic succession, is severely mauled.

Tegue and Smerk are opposed and bested by Sir Edward Harcourt, a believer in common sense, honesty, and parliament. He is the first of Shadwell's father figures who, instead of being the natural enemy of the gay couples, and as such objects to be overcome, are used to

exemplify wit and judgment.

In The Squire of Alsatia (1688) there is another and similar father figure; he is Sir Edward Belfond. Shadwell's description of Sir Edward is that he is one who:

> lives single with ease and pleasure, reasonable and virtuously. A man of great humanity and gentleness and compassion towards mankind; well read in good Books, possessed with all Gentlemanlike qualities.
> (Dramatis Personae, p. 206)

The qualities of these older wise figures and of the religious and political satires come to a kind of fruition in Bury Fair.

There is a lot of fine sentiment in the "high" plot of Bury Fair. Bellamy and Wildish, the heroes, are firm friends who, unknown to each other, have come to Bury to court the same woman, Gertrude. They must, as far as it is possible for them, solve this difficult problem amicably and honourably. Gertrude is also in the delicate position of having to reject one or both of the men: courses that would be both be unpleasant to her. Also, there is a second woman -- fortunately -- who, disguised, serves Bellamy as a man-servant, and who is too modest to make her inclinations known.

Bellamy and Wildish never have anything but marriage in mind; from first to last they are serious lovers. Any love-game that occurs comes from Gertrude's holding off. Wildish has, indeed, a name appropriate for a wit-gallant; but his wildness, as far as the action of the play is concerned, no matter what may be supposed of him in other times, is not that of the rake. He deliberately dissociates himself from the title of "wit" and on being called one he retorts:

> What, do you call me Names? I had as lieve be call'd

> Pick-pocket, as a Wit. A Wit is always a Merry, Idle, Waggish Fellow, of no Understanding: Parts indeed he has, but he had better be without 'em . . . your Wit will either neglect all Opportunities for Pleasure, or if he brings his business into a hopeful way, he will laugh at, or draw his Wit upon some great Man or other, and spoil all.
> (Act I, p. 229)

Here, expressed more clearly than has been noted elsewhere in this study, is Shadwell's conception of the wit-gallant in terms of social activity and social obligation; yet, there is no doubt that Wildish is the direct descendant of Rains or Bevil, Longvil or Bruce. Bellamy is even further from the "wit" notion of the manners type than is Wildish. It is in him that the qualities remarked of the wise father figures appear. He is decisively not a hedonist. He argues -- at too great length -- that the best life for a man of sense is a gentleman's life in the country. He prides himself on his self-discipline:

> I will no more suffer my appetites to master me, than Fire and Water . . . And I must always think a Man a Slave, till he has Conquer'd himself: for my part, I had almost as lieve be in subjection to another's Appetites, as to my own.
> (Act III, p. 309)

He denounces the libertine activities of the town-gallant with such barbs as, "He that Debauches private Women, is a Knave, and injures others: And he that uses publick ones, is a Fool, and hurts himself" (Act III, p. 309). Bellamy's attack is still that of Shadwell's in the Preface to The Sullen Lovers in which he described the manners hero as a "Swearing, Drinking, Whoring Ruffian".

Gertrude is the step-daughter of Lady Fantast, who, with her own daughter, as their names imply, are affected creatures, ready to be

pulled down and mocked. They affect French manners and sprinkle their conversation with French words and phrases. This is one way of their knowing that they are not as others men are. They also pride themselves on their intellectual and cultural achievements: they pretend to know and practise all refinements of thought and behaviour and take every opportunity to point out the defects of the vulgar and of Gertrude, whose forthrightness they consider to be tactless and unpolished.

The wildness of Wildish comes out in his scheme for taking the Fantasts down, and in doing so he becomes involved in a social responsibility which, because of the association it rouses, reaches beyond the immediate plot of the play. This dimension of Wildish and of the plot for humiliating the Fantasts seems to have been missed by commentators. Wildish transforms the barber La Roche into the French Count de Cheveux in the assumption that the Fantasts, blinded by their affected admiration of all things French and because of their own real lack of social grace, would not see through the sham and would be brought to reveal the falseness of their tastes and learning. The scheme seems at first to be no more than a bit of wild playfulness, but once started the burlesque acquires political overtones which the audience of the day would scarcely have missed. These overtones, as will be seen, add to the general satire on values which lead to harmful attachments and harmful loyalties.

That matter for the play should partly have been drawn from recent political events is not surprising. How strongly Shadwell felt concerning the Glorious Revolution which brought William of Orange to England in the November of 1688 may be judged from the dedication of

Bury Fair made to the Earl of Dorset:

> I never could Recant in the worst of Times, when my Ruine was design'd, and my Life was sought, and for near Ten years I was kept from the exercise of that Profession which had afforded me a competent Subsistence, and surely I shall not now do it, when there is a Liberty of speaking Common Sence, which tho' not long since forbidden, is now grown Current.
> (Dedication of Bury Fair, p. 294)

The "speaking of Common Sence" in Bury Fair included, not unexpectedly, the satirical exposure of persons who had supported political suppression. Thus the Fantasts and their hangers-on in their championing of the false Count de Cheveux are reviled as adherents to a cause not to be borne by men of reason and dignity.

La Roche is an imposter, or to be more exact, having been set in motion by Wildish for the express purpose of belittling the wrong-headed, snobbish, and affected Fantasts -- both mother and daughter -- he becomes an imposter by deciding to break his "compact" with Wildish by attempting to marry Mrs. Fantast. This usurpation is not to be borne.

Meanwhile, La Roche gradually develops an usurper complex which is conveyed in terms that invite political parallel. Wildish says of him: "The Rogue talks, as if he were of the Blood Royal", to which Bellamy pointedly adds: "Yes, like the next Successor" (Act II, p. 328). The reference to James II seems plain. And of what does the Pretender talk? Of the greatness of the French King who, unlike his English counterpart, is not under law and parliament, and who has the absolute power to send for a head when he pleases. In the same vein La Roche as the Count Cheveux refers to the common people as "peasants",

McMASTER UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

"slaves", and "dogs" -- the cultured breeding of the Fantasts leads them to use the term "canaille" -- and recommends that their punishment for striking a gentleman should be that two or three thousand of them should suffer death for the offence (Act I, pp. 327-328). The reply of Wildish: "how much greater is ours, who is a King of Men, and Free Men" sets out the Whig position that government rests on the consent of those governed, and that a healthy government depends on the loyalty of subjects who are free to act in honesty and common sense. What Shadwell is stipulating is the pride of Englishmen in their political rights through parliament, and the abhorrence of Englishmen for any form of political system which suppresses those rights. James II was, of course, thought to favour a form of monarchy independent of parliament and therefore seems to be the image Cheveux admires and Wildish finds repugnant.

Seen in this way, La Roche is much more than a Du Foy figure (Etherege: The Comical Revenge) and Bury Fair becomes a celebration of the Glorious Revolution and an assertion of the Englishman of the time to be governed by a compact with his sovereign, which was to be based on the sure foundation of the integrity and common sense of the governed.

The idea of choosing by the use of one's wit and understanding the person whom one is to compact with is repeated in the love plot of Bury Fair. Bellamy says to Gertrude, "Others, but rule the Body; you the Mind" and a large part of the play bears out his tribute. She sees through La Roche and the Fantasts because she will not allow appearances to pass for plain speech and plain dealing. Her unadorned language is in sharp contrast with that of the Fantasts. (La Roche's

Frenchified speech, by the way, is a symbol also of folly and perversion.) It is in her behaviour with Bellamy and Wildish most of all that she represents honesty and reason. In contrast with the coquettish ways of Mrs. Fantast, she says, while waiting for Bellamy, whom she had been instructed by her father to meet:

> How I hate this kind of Fooling! A woman never makes so silly a Figure, as when she is to look demurely, and stand to be made love to.

and upon Bellamy's entrance she boldly makes her situation known to him:

> . . . indeed,it makes me smile to think of a grave Mother, or, for want of her, a wise Father, putting a Daughter into a Room, like a Hare out of a Basket, and letting him loose; that is, to act the part of a Lover before Marriage, and never think of it afterward. Then is she either to frown, be peevish, or sullen, and make no answers, or very scurvy ones; or else to blush, hold down her Head, tell the Sticks, and play with her Fan, and say, I have no thoughts of Marriage, I am too young, 'tis time enough.
>
> (Act III, pp. 338-339)

It was no doubt in the anticipation of such a spirit that Bellamy had said in Act II (p. 323), "I own no Government, but yours". To think of the love-game as a finding of the wisest and best "ruler" is to realise how far Shadwell has pushed that aspect of the manners play away from "bawdy" and "profaneness".

Gertrude shows the same wit and discipline in dealing with Wildish, the man she is attracted to. To his protestation of,

> So, Madam, you have my Heart; 'tis flown, I cou'd not hold it: look to it, and make much on't, and see that it comes to no Damage; I shall require it whole, and safe,

she, aware of his reputation (by name?), answers,

> 'Tis a light one, and always ready to whistle off at any Game; and as ready to be lur'd back again: but, if I have it, I'll use it so, it shall be glad to be gone.
>
> (Act II, p. 323)

The truth of the matter is that the love-game is no longer important for itself. Is Bellamy better off or worse when the second woman appears, to whom, on hearing of her faithful service to him, he quickly transfers his affection? The love-game has become a tool borrowed from manners comedy to be exhibited properly corrected, for profit and delight, but mostly profit.

Bury Fair is a fair, a world, in which human values are to be bid for. Shadwell presumes to teach his audience the wit and judgment necessary to bid profitably.

CONCLUSION

The development of an important aspect of Shadwell's art has been the subject of this study. It is by no means exhaustive. For one thing, Shadwell wrote comedies not considered here, and also tragedies and opera-plays. For another, his historical importance as a commentator ~~of~~ on his own times, as one who read correctly the social and political trends and as a playwright reflected the moral and, in his later plays, the sentimental tastes of the public has scarcely been touched. Neither have the influences on Shadwell, other than Jonson, been looked at nor the relation of Shadwell to our own times. It is hoped, however, that the attempt to show that Shadwell, while keeping to the theories of humours and of comedy that he had developed at the beginning of his career as a dramatist, adapted manners comedy and changed it sufficiently to make his own brand of manners a clear and firm element of Restoration comedy.

Alssid is not alone in warning readers not to compare Shadwell with the other greater names of Restoration comedy, a warning meant to keep readers from expecting from Shadwell the same sort of comedy that Etherege, Wycherley and Congreve wrote, and thereby to miss the contribution to Restoration comedy that Shadwell had to make. To permit the wit-gallants and the love-game to disappear under Shadwell's sweeping, corrective hand without some kind of protest, however, is too much to expect.

Clearly there can be no Dorimant and Harriet or Mirabel and Millamant in Shadwell. These couples set their rational minds the supreme task of using the world, their society, and each other as an extension of their own freedom and for their own pleasure, without losing their regard for each other or their respect for themselves. Their marriage bed is the most complete bed of union which it is possible for conscious solitudes to achieve. This miraculous fulfilment (possible only for a two hours duration on stage?) represents an attainment Shadwell never reached. Similarly, Horner in The Country Wife represents more completely than any of Shadwell's false wits or egocentric humours characters ever do the man who, by misusing the freedom and pleasure of which he is capable as a social being cuts himself off from love and happiness. Shadwell aimed at stability, not ecstasy, and in doing so he might have gained the more limited success of transferred to the stage those attitudes to freedom which came out of the struggles over the Act of Settlement and flourished with the accession of William and Mary.

NOTES TO PAGES 1 TO 55

Chapter I

[1]Horace, Ars Poetica, 11. 343-344: "Omne tulit punctum, qui miscuit utile dulce / Lectorem delectando, paritere monendo." Loeb translation: "He has won every vote who has blended profit and pleasure, at once delighting and instructing the reader."

[2]Suzanne Langer, "The Comic Rhythm", in Comedy: Meaning and Form, ed. R.W. Corrigan, (New York, 1965), pp. 119 ff.

[3]Al Capp, "The Comedy of Charlie Chaplin", in Comedy: Meaning and Form, ed. R.W. Corrigan, (New York, 1965), pp. 129 ff.

[4]Albert S. Borgman, Thomas Shadwell, His Life and Comedies, (New York, 1928), p. 116.

[5]John Wilcox, The Relation of Molière to Restoration Comedy, (New York, 1938), p. 192. The argument presented is that Jonson "anticipated the social philosophy, the character types and the dramatic principles out of which the comedy of manners was molded".

Chapter III

[1]John Dryden, The Poems of John Dryden, ed. James Kinsley, (Oxford, 1958), I, 11. 163-164.

[2]Michael W. Alssid, Thomas Shadwell, (New York, 1967), p. 58.

[3]Thomas Shadwell, The Complete Works of Thomas Shadwell, 5 vols., ed. Montague Summers, (London, 1927), A note on the "Theatrical History" of Epsom Wells, p. 100.

Chapter IV

[1]Thomas Shadwell, The Complete Works of Thomas Shadwell, 5 vols., ed. Montague Summers, (London, 1927), p. 197. A note on the "Theatrical History" of The Squire of Alsatia records that the play "from the first proved so extraordinarily successful that it thronged the theatre for thirteen days together, no usual run, but a triumph that passed into a tradition."

[2]Albert S. Borgman, Thomas Shadwell, His Life and Comedies, (New York, 1928), p. 214. Borgman points out that in The Squire of Alsatia Shadwell is most specific and uses the following illustration: "The George Tavern, in which Shadwell lays some of his Alsatian scenes, was, according to Joseph Moser, an actual place, not only the temple of dissipation and debauchery; but also a house containing under its ample roof the recesses of contrivance and fraud, the nests of perjury, and the apartments of prostitution." The use of the Alsatian scenes by Sir Walter Scott in his novel The Fortunes of Nigel is well known.

[3]Thomas Shadwell, The Complete Works of Thomas Shadwell, 5 vols., ed. Montague Summers, (London, 1927), p. 294. In Shadwell's Dedication of Bury Fair addressed to the Earl of Dorset and Middlesex he attacks "the Doctrine of Passive Obedience and Non-resistance" and insists on the "obligation" "to Self-defence". In the same place he refers to the present time -- in contrast to that which it has replaced -- as a time "when there is a Liberty of speaking Common Sence". In the Epilogue of the play he refers to King William as "the Soveraign Author of our good" and to the revolution by which he succeeded to the throne as "this Glorious Change".

SHADWELL'S DRAMATIC WORKS

The place and date of first performance are as recorded in the Calendar of Plays in The London Stage, Part I, 1660-1700, ed. William Van Lennep, (Carbondale, 1965).

The Sullen Lovers, Theatre in Lincoln's Inn Fields, 2 May 1668.

The Royal Shepherdess, Theatre in Lincoln's Inn Fields, 25 February 1669.

The Humourists, Theatre in Lincoln's Inn Fields, 10 December 1670.

The Miser, The (first) Drury Lane Theatre, January 1672.

Epsom Wells, Dorset Garden Theatre, 2 December 1672.

The Tempest, or The Enchanted Island, Dorset Garden Theatre, 30 April 1674.

Psyche, Dorset Garden Theatre, 27 February 1675.

The Libertine, Dorset Garden Theatre, 12 June 1675.

The Virtuoso, Dorset Garden Theatre, 25 May 1676.

The History of Timon of Athens, Dorset Garden Theatre, January 1678.

A True Widow, Dorset Garden Theatre, 21 March 1678.

The Woman Captain, Dorset Garden Theatre, September 1679.

The Lancashire Witches, Dorset Garden Theatre, September 1681.

The Squire of Alsatia, The (second) Drury Lane Theatre, 3 May 1688.

Bury Fair, The (second) Drury Lane Theatre, April 1689.

The Amorous Bigotte, The (second) Drury Lane Theatre, March 1690.

The Scowrers, The (second) Drury Lane Theatre, December 1690.

The Volunteers, The (second) Drury Lane Theatre, November 1692.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alssid, Michael W. Thomas Shadwell. New York: Twayne, 1967.

Barish, Jonas A. Ben Jonson and the Language of Prose Comedy. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960.

Bateson, F.W. "L.C. Knights and Restoration Comedy", Restoration Drama: Modern Essays in Criticism. Edited by John Loftis. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966, 22-31.

Borgman, Albert S. Thomas Shadwell, His Life and Comedies. New York: New York University Press, 1928.

Bredvold, Louis I. The Intellectual Milieu of John Dryden. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1956.

Brett-Smith, H.F.B. "Sir George Etherege", Restoration Drama: Modern Essays in Criticism. Edited by John Loftis. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966, 44-56.

Capp, Al. "The Comedy of Charlie Chaplin", Comedy: Meaning and Form. Edited by Robert W. Corrigan. San Francisco: Chandler, 1965, 219-229.

Cunningham, John E. Restoration Drama. London: Evans Brothers, 1966.

Davis, Joe Lee. The Sons of Ben. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1967.

de Sola Pinto, V. Enthusiast in Wit. London: Western Printing Services, 1962.

Dobrée, Bonamy. "Restoration Comedy: Drama and Values", Comedy: Plays, Theory and Criticism. Edited by Marvin Felheim. New York:Harcourt Brace and World, 1962, 202-205.

Enck, John J. Jonson and the Comic Truth. Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1957.

Fujimura, Thomas H. The Restoration Comedy of Wit. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952.

Harris, Bernard. "The Dialect of Those Fantastic Times", Restoration Theatre: Stratford-Upon-Avon Studies, 6. Edited by John Russel Brown and Bernard Harris. London: Edward Arnold, 1965, 11-40.

Holland, Norman N. The First Modern Comedies. Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press, 1959.

Hughes, Leo. A Century of English Farce. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1956.

Knights, L.C. "The Reality and the Myth", Restoration Drama: Modern Essays in Criticism. Edited by John Loftis. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966, 3-21.

Krutch, J.W. Comedy and Conscience After the Restoration. New York: Columbia University Press, 1949.

Langer, Suzanne. "The Comic Rhythm", Comedy: Meaning and Form. Edited by Robert W. Corrigan. San Francisco: Chandler, 1965.

Lynch, Kathleen M. The Social Mode of Restoration Comedy. New York: Macmillan, 1926.

Montgomery, Guy. "The Challenge of Restoration Comedy", Essays in Criticism. University of California Publications in English. 1, 1929, 135-151.

Nicoll, Allardyce. A History of Restoration Drama, 1660-1700. Cambridge: University Press, 1955.

Ogg, David. England in the Reign of Charles II. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1934.

Palmer, J. The Comedy of Manners. New York: Russel and Russel, 1913.

Parnell, Paul E. "The Sentimental Mask", Restoration Drama: Modern Essays in Criticism. Edited by John Loftis. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966, 285-297.

Perry, Henry Ten Eyck. The Comic Spirit in Restoration Drama. New York: Russel and Russel, 1962.

Powell, Jocelyn. "George Etherege and the Form of Comedy", Restoration Theatre: Stratford-Upon-Avon Studies, 6. Edited by John Russel Brown and Bernard Harris. London: Edward Arnold, 1965, 43-69.

Righter, Anne. "William Wycherley", Restoration Theatre: Statford-Upon-Avon Studies, 6. Edited by John Russel Brown and Bernard Harris. London: Edward Arnold, 1965, 71-91.

Shadwell, Thomas. The Complete Works of Thomas Shadwell. Edited by Montague Summers. London: The Fortune Press, 1927.

Shadwell, Thomas. The Virtuoso. Edited by Marjorie Hope Nicholson and David Stuart Rodes. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1966.

Sharrock, Roger. "Modes of Satire", Restoration Theatre: Stratford-Upon-Avon Studies, 6. Edited by John Russel Brown and Bernard Harris. London: Edward Arnold, 1965, 109-132.

Smith, John Harrington. The Gay Couple in Restoration Comedy. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1948.

---------. "Shadwell, the Ladies, and the Change in Comedy", Modern Philology, XLVI, (1948-49), 22-33. ~~Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 22-33.~~

Suckling, Norman. "Molière and English Restoration Comedy", Restoration Theatre: Stratford-Upon-Avon Studies, 6. Edited by John Russel Brown and Bernard Harris. London: Edward Arnold, 1965, 93-107.

Summers, Montague. "Introduction" to The Complete Works of Thomas Shadwell. Edited by Montague Summers. London: The Fortune Press, 1927, xvii-cclxiv.

Sypher, Wylie. "The Meanings of Comedy", Comedy: Meaning and Form. Edited by Robert W. Corrigan. San Francisco: Chandler, 1965, 18-60.

Underwood, Dale. "The Comic Values -- The Man of Mode", Restoration Drama: Modern Essays in Criticism. Edited by John Loftis. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966, 57-81.

Van Lennep, William, ed. The London Stage. Part 1, 1660-1700. Illinois: Illinois University Press, 1965.

Wilcox, John. The Relation of Molière to Restoration Comedy. New York: Columbia University Press, 1938.

Wilkinson, D.R.M. The Comedy of Habit. Leiden: Universitaire Pers, 1964.

Willey, Basil. The Seventeenth Century Background. New York: Doubleday, 1934.