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SHORT TITLES


I

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

I. Introduction

For nearly two centuries scholarly critics have bowed to Dr. Johnson's estimate of *The Orphan*: "Of this play nothing new can easily be said."¹ R. G. Ham, Otway's twentieth-century biographer, finds Dr. Johnson "set down so compact a summary of criticism as almost to defy addition."² In fact, with the exception of Aline M. Taylor's study of the stage reputation of *The Orphan* and *Venice Preserv'd*,³ and two articles in recent years on the latter play, nothing new has been said about any of Otway's works. His plays have received some attention in studies of the Restoration theatre, and in studies of the tragedy as a genre, but detailed literary criticism has for the most part been lacking.

The primary reason for this lack of detailed study is not difficult to ascertain. It lies in the nature of the plays themselves and in changing public taste. Probably the most influential single appraisal of Otway's talent came from Dryden. In the Preface to his translation of Du Fresnoy's *De Arte Graphica* (1695), Dryden wrote:

> I will not defend everything in [Otway's] *Venice Preserv'd*; but I must bear this testimony to his memory, that the passions are truly touched in it, though perhaps there is somewhat to be desired, both in the grounds of them, and in the height and elegance of expression; but nature is there, which is the greatest beauty. ⁴

Otway's mastery of the passions and his frequently faulty expression
are the keynotes in criticism of him for two centuries. Dr. Johnson's remarks on *The Orphan*, for example, continue from the sentence quoted above to say:

[The Orphan's] whole power is upon the affections; for it is not written with much comprehension of thought or elegance of expression. But, if the heart is interested, many other beauties may be wanting, yet not be missed.

And Bonamy Dobrée, in 1929, argued Otway was less interested in character than in "emotions as such." Otway, he continues, "was exploring not man's courage [in Venice Preserv'd] so much as his capacity for feeling, even for self-torture."  

The tone of Dryden's and Johnson's criticism is one of praise. Dobrée's, even out of context, seems less so. "Painting the passions," at least as Otway practiced that art, is no longer a praiseworthy accomplishment. In contrast to Dryden and Johnson, Moody Prior finds the "critical weakness" of *Venice Preserv'd* is that in it everything is subordinate to "painting the passions."  In that play, he writes, "the plot has the possibility of swift and progressive movement, but the final effect is one of over-loaded feeling, almost of stasis."  

We have come full circle, then, in our criticism of the painting of passion as it was practiced in the Restoration.  There can be little question that Prior's estimate of Otway's having "over-loaded" in his treatment of emotion accurately represents our contemporary estimate not only of *Venice Preserv'd*, but of all of Otway's tragedies. Like most, if not all, of Restoration-Eighteenth-Century tragedy,
Otway's tragedies would not succeed on the contemporary stage. In fact, *Venice Preserv'd* dropped from the repertoire of London companies in the first third of the nineteenth century.  

As far as Otway's comedies are concerned I have been unable to locate any praise for them, even during the time they were first written. J. C. Ghosh, the author of the definitive edition of his plays, finds that only *The Souldiers Fortune* ever achieved any degree of popularity. The reasons for this neglect lie, Ghosh argues:

... in the essential fatuousness of his comedies, their dull, featureless, purposeless vacuity. They were not meant to instruct or correct, and they do not entertain.  

I do not plan to argue for a reinstatement of the tragedies or the comedies on today's boards. I do hope, on the other hand, to show that his comedies are not featureless vacuities and that his tragedies can be examined carefully to see in what ways Otway created the effects we call "over-loading" and Dryden called "nature."

Any study of Otway must be largely inductive, as the following pages are. We have no Otavian criticism. Unlike Dryden, Otway did not write critical essays as prefaces and dedications to his work; and unlike Shadwell, his prologues and epilogues are made up largely of contemporary cliché and contemporary satire. Otway apparently expressed himself on the subject of self-appraisal in the Dedication to *The Souldiers Fortune* (1681).

As to the Vindication of this Comedy, between Friends and Acquaintance, I believe it is possible, that as much may be said in its behalf, as heretofore has been said of a great many others: But of all the Apish qualities
about me, I have not that of being fond of my own Issue; nay, I must confess myself a very unnatural Parent, for when it is once brought into the World, E'en let the Brat shift for itself, I say. (Works, II.91)

The rest of this chapter and the chapter following will provide some background for the play analyses which make up the bulk of the dissertation. Whenever possible I have made use of critical opinion contemporary with Otway to throw light on his practice. Dryden's work seems most helpful in this respect. We have no evidence to indicate that Dryden and Otway shared any opinions other than Toryism, but frequently Dryden's theories seem to match Otway's practice, or vice versa. The use of relationships as a structural device has no detailed theory to accompany it, but the practice itself seems to have been shared by Restoration playwrights in general.
NOTES TO SECTION I.


5 Johnson, loc. cit.


8 Prior, op. cit., p. 192.

9 Brewster Rogerson's article, "The Art of Painting the Passions," *JHL*, XIV (1953), 68-94 goes into the tradition and definition of this concept in detail. I am indebted to his discussion for my understanding of it.

10 Taylor, op. cit., p. 231. The last performance of *Venice Preserv'd* at Drury Lane occurred in 1842 (Taylor, p. 235).

II. Sentiment

In one of his rare critical statements, Otway touched on that facet of his work which found so much favor with his contemporaries and has found so much disfavor with us. In the Preface to Don Carlos (1676), Otway speaks of his first play, produced a year earlier, Alcibiades. He then moves on to say a few words about Don Carlos. He will not presume, he says, to admit the praise he has received from some, that this "is the best Heroick Play that has been written of late," but:

this I may valiantly boast of, which the author of the French Berenice has done before me in his Preface to that Play, that it never failed to draw Tears from the Eyes of the Auditors, I mean those whose Souls were capable of so Noble a pleasure.... (Works, I. 174)\(^1\)

Otway's adaptation of Racine's Bérénice (Titus and Berenice) appeared this same year and presumably Racine's remarks lay close to hand, but the French preface is largely concerned with unity of action versus multiplicity of incident. Otway chose to ignore this larger subject and to paraphrase Racine out of context. On this slim evidence, then, we can assume Otway consciously strove to appeal to "so Noble a pleasure." He finds the production of tears in his audience a skill of which he can boast.

The boast, and the language in which it is framed, seem to place Otway in the tradition of sentimental drama. Yet studies of Restoration drama and studies of sentimental drama disagree as to Otway's qualification for this tradition. Dobrée labels him sentimental: "Otway,
indeed, was so much a sentimentalist that sentimentalism almost becomes an admirable quality in his work...."² Bernbaum, in his study of The Drama of Sensibility, on the other hand, excludes Otway from the tradition. He finds Otway to be an author "who a hundred years later would have undoubtedly written dramas of sensibility."³ Arthur Sherbo's study of sentimental drama seems also to separate Otway from the tradition.⁴

The grounds for this disagreement lie in the respective definitions of "sentimental," and not in any fundamental disagreement as to Otway's general characteristics. Nevertheless, the disagreement on Otway's place in the tradition and its grounds need to be established. I believe Otway to be a thoroughly sentimental writer and attempt to indicate throughout the following analyses the devices he uses to achieve sentimental effects.

Dobrée's definition of the sentimental is simple and inclusive. In his discussion, sentimentalism has its roots in the divorce of emotion and the facts which arouse the emotion.⁵ Excessive emotion, then, is sentimental emotion, and Otway was interested in "emotions as such."⁶ (Dobrée nowhere establishes the following, but apparently less emotion than the facts would seem to warrant is not considered sentimental.) Bernbaum's definition is no less simple, but its point of departure is with the underlying assumptions of the work in question rather than with its effects. The drama of sensibility, he says, "exhibited faith in the natural impulses of contemporary
middle-class people." This confidence in natural goodness he finds to be the "mainspring of sentimentalism".\textsuperscript{7}

Shebo has only a few points of disagreement with Bernbaum’s major premises.\textsuperscript{8} One of these is Shebo’s belief that middle-class characters as \textit{dramatis personae} are not essential to the definition:

That the personages on the stage are of exalted position means little when the audience sees a king reunited to his daughter, long thought dead, or when a princess, patiently bearing the cruelties and infidelities of the prince, her husband, is able to bring about his reformation by some signal act of devotion. \textsuperscript{9}

For Shebo the essence of sentimentalism lies in the drama’s purpose; i.e., "to arouse pity for distressed virtue and admiration for innate human goodness."\textsuperscript{10} Any element within the drama which would tend to counteract the desired effect, such as bawdry, or understatement in emotional scenes, destroys the sentimental response and disqualifies the work as sentimental drama. \textsuperscript{11}

The concept of innate human goodness which both Bernbaum and Shebo find essential in sentimental drama is the key to their exclusion of Otway and his contemporaries from the list of authors of dramas of sensibility. In tragedy of sensibility, Bernbaum says, the characters find themselves overwhelmed by "catastrophes for which they were morally not responsible."\textsuperscript{12} On the basis of this distinguishing mark it is difficult to classify Otway’s work. In \textit{Alcibiades} the hero and heroine are not morally responsible for their eventual fall, but on the other hand Otway never pictures human nature as innately good. The responsibility for a "catastrophe" is
always clearly placed, although, as in Alcibiades, it may not rest
with the hero or heroine. In his best plays, as one recent critic
has noted of Venice Preserv'd, Otway presents "a world of ambiva-
lence where good and evil are inextricably mingled and where the
human mind is not always capable of distinguishing between them."\textsuperscript{13}

But it is on the basis of a use of the concept of innate human
goodness alone that Otway can be excluded from the list of senti-
mental playwrights. A list of the characteristics of sentimental
drama as Sherbo defines it includes: the presence of a moral (senten-
tious) element, greater appeal to the emotions than to the intellect,
eschewal of humor and bawdry, repetition and prolongation of emo-
tional scenes, frequent and prolonged appeals to pity, absence of
sub-plots or any other elements which might distract from the senti-
mental purpose, and stress on the fundamental goodness of human
nature. Otway lacks only the last characteristic.

Thus far, of course, the question of chronology has been ig-
nored. Chronologically, Otway's works could only belong to the
general category suggested by R. S. Crane's "genealogy of the man
of feeling."\textsuperscript{14} The concept of innate human goodness, as Crane notes,
flourished "between the seventeen-thirties and the seventeen-nineties
in the sentimental heroes and heroines of countless English novels,
plays, and poems."\textsuperscript{15} Bernbaum's study begins with Cibber's
\textit{Love's Last Shift} in 1696 (eleven years after Otway's death), and Sherbo
notes that the word sentimental occurs first in a dramatic context in
1749. Eric Erämetsä has provided a thorough study of the word sentimental and the vocabulary of sentimentalism, definitely establishing the rise and fall of the vocabulary in the last half of the eighteenth century.

But if Otway lies chronologically and philosophically outside the eighteenth-century type of sentimentalism, what term can be used to classify his appeal to "so Noble a pleasure" as tears? I would suggest that there is a definite value in using different terminology to distinguish between a concentrated appeal to pity (such as Otway's), and the use of a concept of innate human goodness. After all, Hobbes had a definition of pity:

_Griefe, for the Calamity of another, is PITY; and ariseth from the imagination that the like calamity may befall himselfe; and therefore is called also COMPASSION, and in the phrase of this present time a FELLOW-FEELING._

I have chosen to accept Bernbaum's title as chronologically specific in its reference and will limit the use of the term sensibility to works which make use of the innate goodness concept. Sentimental, then, will apply to all those characteristics outlined by Sherbo, excepting innate goodness. Some elements of Otway's sentimentalism need fuller discussion here.
NOTES TO SECTION II.

1 Racine actually says, "je ne peut croire que le public me sache mauvais gré de lui d'avoir donné une tragédie qui a été honorée de tant de larmes..." Later in the Preface he says the audience should "se réservent le plaisir de pleurer et d'être attendris." Oeuvres de Jean Racine, II, 378, in Les Grandes Ecrivains de La France (Paris, 1911).

2 Dobrée, p. 43.

3 Ernest Bernbaum, The Drama of Sensibility (Boston, 1915), p. 57.

4 Arthur Sherbo, English Sentimental Drama (East Lansing, Michigan, 1957), pp. 139-140. Sherbo is not as explicit in his exclusion of Otway as is Bernbaum, but he apparently limits sentimental drama to the latter half of the eighteenth century.

5 Dobrée, p. 92.

6 Dobrée, p. 145.

7 Bernbaum, p. 2.

8 Sherbo, p. 12.

9 Ibid.

10 Sherbo, p. 100.

11 Sherbo, p. 75. This argument, of course, must be taken as applying solely to the audience contemporary with the drama. Our response to sentimental drama today is always one of "antagonistic feelings alien to the sentimental response." Sherbo fails to make this clear.

12 Bernbaum, p. 12.


15 Crane, 206.

16 Sherbo, p. 2. The occurrence is in the Prologue to William Whitehead's The Roman Father.

III. Emotions

In all sentimental drama Sherbo finds the "inevitable presence of false or exaggerated emotion...."\(^1\) The characters of sentimental drama over-emote; that is, they over-react to a situation which seems, in our judgment, to require slight or no emotional response. The determination of "false or exaggerated emotion" is partly subjective and partly objective. The objective aspect is clearest in the realm of the rhetoric of the play. (This aspect will be examined in the next section of this study.) The subjective aspect lies in our contemporary revulsion at prolonged, self-centered emoting.

The Restoration playwright, on the other hand, valued prolonged and highly emotional scenes. Moody Prior argues that despite the critical stress on the Aristotelian concept of plot (action) in Restoration writings, the playwrights were only secondarily interested in action. The plots, he finds, were arranged to "produce the maximum number of dilemmas for the hero...."\(^2\) "In practice," Prior continues, "as far as the heroic play went, the plot was merely a device which produced the condition for emotional and dialectical displays."\(^3\) This analysis is relevant to Otway's domestic tragedies as well as his heroic plays, and the maximum-dilemma dramatic structure in part validates Dobrée's remark that Otway was interested in "emotions as such," rather than character.

Otway and other Restoration playwrights had both audience and critical support for their interest in the emotions. We can assume the
former from the success of the plays, and the latter is well documented. Dryden, in An Essay of Dramatic Poesy (1668), has one of his characters stand uncorrected when he makes the imaging of the passions the primary work of a poetic dramatist. Eugenius argues that the playwright must have his lovers express their love verbally, for to fail in this would show insufficient affection on the part of the lovers, and would at the same time cheat the audience. The audience "watch the movement[of the characters] minds, as much as the changes in their fortune. For the imaging of the first is properly the work of a poet; the latter he borrows of the historian."^4

Dryden is not encouraging the poet-dramatist to picture disembodied emotions. He has not excluded the need for the poet to make use of the historian. In the Preface to Troilus and Cressida (1679) ("The Grounds of Criticism in Tragedy") Dryden makes clear that the poet imitates the manners of men and that the emotions are only one aspect of "manners."

The manners arise from many causes; and are either distinguished by complexion, as choleric and phlegmatic, or by the differences in age and sex, of climates, or quality of the persons, or their present conditions. They are likewise to be gathered from the several virtues, vices, or passions, and many other commonplaces, which a poet must be supposed to have learnt from natural Philosophy, Ethics, and History; all of which, whosoever is ignorant, does not deserve the name of poet. 5

(As Thomas H. Fujimura has pointed out with respect to comedy, a definition of manners such as this makes significant changes in the concept of "comedy of manners."^6 I will have occasion to refer to
Dryden's definition in the next chapter when Wylie Sypher's idea of
the "tragedy of manners" is examined.)

The poet, then, imitates manners, and from manners, Dryden
continues, "the characters of men are derived." Davenant, in the
Preface to Gondibert (1650), is less interested in the portrayal of
particular character than he is in the poetic portrayal of the Aris-
totelian universal. But his emphasis is still on the passions:

...wise poets think it more worthy to seek out truth
in the Passions then to record the truth of Actions,
and practice to describe Mankinde just as we are
perswaded or guided by instinct, not particular per-
sons as they are lifted or levell'd by the force of Fate,
it being nobler to contemplate the general History of
Nature then a selected Diary of Fortune. 8

Both Davenant and Dryden make it clear that it is through a portrait
of passions that the poet communicates the meaningful and the last-
ing in human relationships. The details of age, rank, profession,
and nationality can be conveyed in costume or in a few introductory
words. The chronicling of events themselves, apart from, or without
particular stress upon, the personalities involved is the concern of
the historian.

The matter of heroic tragedy worked an important influence on
the dramatic portrayal of emotions. Although facts of rank, age, and
so forth, could be conveyed quickly, these facts bear heavily on the
kind of emotion these plays convey. Failure to match emotion and
character is a failure of decorum, a literary necessity at least as old
as Aristotle's Poetics:
As in the structure of the plot, so too in the portraiture of character, the poet should always aim either at the necessary or the probable. Thus a person of a given character should speak or act in a given way, by the rule either of necessity or probability.

The heroic tragedy portrayed kings and princes and heroes; therefore it must portray kingly, princely, and heroic emotions. H. T. Swedenberg's history of epic theory in England provides evidence for the identification of the terms *epic* and *heroic* in the Restoration.\(^\text{10}\) Dryden's statement that the heroic play "ought to be an imitation, in little, of an heroic poem" comes to mind immediately.\(^\text{11}\) In the epic-heroic theory Swedenberg notes the critical insistence upon decorum of emotional expression: ". . . the thoughts of the characters, as well as their manners, were held to the requirements of decorum."\(^\text{12}\)

The requirements of decorum are critical commonplace in Restoration criticism. Richard Flecknoe, for example, disapproves of the irreverent treatment sometimes given kings in the plays of Beaumont and Fletcher. These playwrights, he says:

\...were excellent in their kinde, but they often err'd against *Decorum*, seldom representing a valiant man without somewhat of the *Braggadoccio*, nor an honourable woman without somewhat of *Dol Common* in her.\(^\text{13}\)

Jeremy Collier's standards of decorum were set so high with regard to women that he was able to find fault with Otway's *Monimia*, the heroine of *The Orphan*. She makes, he says, "a very improper description," and "to bring women under such misbehavior is violence to their native modesty, and a misrepresentation of their sex."\(^\text{14}\)

In the heroic extreme, passionate speeches are bombastic
rantings. Erich Auerbach has described the effects produced, in French heroic drama of the period, by placing the heroic figure in the foreground and giving a loose to his passions. Auerbach is speaking of Racine's heroes in the following passage, but the description fits Almanzor of Dryden's *The Conquest of Granada* (1670) and other protagonists of the heroic drama. Auerbach says that in the posture of exalted soliloquy (even if surrounded by friends or servants):

...the tragic personage abandons itself to its princely passions. And the most impressive stylistic effects are those in which whole countries, continents, or even the universe appear as spectator, witness, background, or echo of the princely emotion. 15

Otway was noted, even in his own age, for his relative lack of bombast in the heroic mode. But he was capable of writing an heroically impassioned speech of the kind Auerbach describes. Here Alcibiades defies the king's command that Alcibiades and his mistress must part:

...Part! that word would make a Saint despair. Obedience cannot be a virtue here. If so ye Gods ye have such precepts giv'n, That an example would confound your Heaven, You duties beyond your own omnipotence enjoyn; Can you forsake your Heaven, or I leave mine? Till when thus King I'm fix't beyond remove, With all the Cements of an endless love. Kill me, thou yet shall of thy ends despair, My Soul shall wait upon her ev'ry where, Nay I'd not fly to Heav'n till she came there. (IV. 503-513)

The heavens are Alcibiades' standard here, and even death cannot defeat his intent.

Not all of Otway's serious plays are heroic dramas, but those
that are not, while they have a different and less cosmological set of decorums, are both decorous and passionate. Dryden's praise of Otway (part of which was quoted earlier in this chapter) is high praise indeed. Otway possessed the art of displaying the motions of his characters' minds, Dryden says, as "thoroughly as any of the Ancients or Moderns." The degree of praise this conveys can only be understood by placing this criticism in its context. It follows upon a discussion of the passions in painting and in poetry:

To express the passions which are seated in the heart, by outward signs, is one great precept of the painters, and very difficult to perform. In poetry, the same passions and motions of the mind are to be expressed; and in this consists the excellency of that art. 16

Otway, thus, is placed by Dryden in the first poetic ranks.

One element of Dryden's remarks touches on the method of presentation actually used in the Restoration theatre. This is the actors' extensive use of posture and gesture to convey "by outward signs," as in painting, the passions seated in the heart. The doctrine of "painting the passions" Brewster Rogerson has shown to have developed in French art criticism about the middle of the seventeenth century and to have come to England almost immediately.17 The effects of this criticism appear clearly in English art criticism in the eighteenth century, 18 and in eighteenth-century reports of acting techniques ("sculpturesque acting") employed by Betterton and his successors. Restoration plays are full of indications of the kind of "outward sign" the author intended for the actors at highly impassioned
moments, and Otway's indicators of this kind will be discussed during the play analyses.

There is one final point about the treatment of the emotions and its link to the sentimental that should be mentioned. Sherbo insists that the sentimental play is one which "leaves the reader or spectator with the desired emotional effect unmixed by disturb-ingly antagonistic feelings alien to the sentimental response." Sherbo might have cited Dryden here for evidence of Restoration critical approval of this concentration of effect. In "The Grounds of 'criticism in Tragedy" Dryden states that one "necessary rule is, to put nothing into the discourse which may hinder...moving the passions." As examples of this hindering he lists the treatment of two emotions at once, the use of wit out of season (thereby supporting Sherbo's "eschewal or bawdry and humor"), and the use of unfit similes.

The Restoration playwright consciously sought emotional scenes in his capacity as poet, in his attempt to render the pure tragic effect, and in his attempt to give the essential matter of the personalities of his dramatic personae. A number of modern critics find this latter attempt destined to failure. Allardyce Nicoll, for example, finds "these exaggerated emotions...led to a falsification of all psychology. Not one of the heroes, heroines or villains of the exalted tragedy acts rightly." There will be no attempt here to rescue all of the "exalted tragedy" from Nicoll's strictures, but it will be shown that Otway's use of exaggerated emotion does not
falsify all psychology. Exaggerated emotions exaggerate psychology, and the explicitness of the rhetoric tends to over-simplify psychological problems, but the problems themselves are not removed from the realm of the possible. In fact, the long introspective speeches which typify Restoration tragedy indicate a serious, almost clinical, interest in the workings of a character's mind.

Clifford Leech has argued for another adverse result of this concentration on emotions. Otway, he says, "was not concerned with a coherent dramatic structure, but aimed at strenuous emotional exercise." Leech does not explain how or why dramatic structure and emotional exercise are mutually exclusive, but he does point out structural flaws in The Orphan. His remark links generally with Moody Prior's statement that Restoration dramatists structured their plays so as to provide the maximum number of trying moments for the hero. Otway is guilty of frequent disruption of strict plot logic in order to provide an emotional scene or speech. The entire three acts of Titus and Berenice (1676), for example, are concerned with only one problem. There is very little action and the three central characters are made to change their minds numerous times in order to sustain suspense. In Venice Preserv'd events occasionally occur twice; that is, we see the event once as it occurs, and hear it a second time as it is recounted to a non-participant. The second recounting disrupts plot logic and exists for its emotional effect alone. This is, of course, the repetition and prolongation Sherbo finds
characteristic of sentimental drama.

Emotion itself does not make a play sentimental or not sentimental. But the language in which an emotion is conveyed can serve as a distinguishing characteristic. Otway's dramatic rhetoric was highly praised in the eighteenth century. Addison said of him (speaking of Venice Preserv'd):

Otway has followed Nature in the Language of his Tragedy, and therefore shines in the Passionate Parts, more than any of our English poets. As there is something Familiar and Domestick in the Fable of his Tragedy, more than those of any other Poet, he has little Pomp, but great Force in his Expressions. 23

The rhetoric of emotional expression will be considered in the following section.
NOTES TO SECTION III.

1 Sherbo, p. 123.

2 Prior, p. 157.

3 Prior, p. 158.

4 Dryden, Essays, I. 54.

5 Dryden, Essays, I. 214.


7 Dryden, Essays, I. 215.

8 William Davenant, "preface" to Gondibert, Spingarn, II.3.


12 Swedenberg, p. 310.

13 Richard Flecknoe, "A Short Discourse of the English Stage" (1664), Spingarn, II.94.

14 Jeremy Collier, A Short View of the Immorality and Profaneness of the English Stage, from a selection reprinted in Nettleton and Case, p. 392. Collier does not cite the offending passage, but presumably he had in mind something like this description by Monimia of her wedding night, delivered to her brother, Chamont:

Nothing so kind as [Castalio], when in my Arms,
In thousand kisses, tender sighs and joys,
Not to be thought again, the night was wasted;
At dawn of day, he rose and left his Conquest.

(IV. 236-239)


17. Rogerson, op. cit., esp. 71-75. There were "a full set of affective norms for painting" by 1680 in the French Academy of Painting (p. 74).

18. Rogerson cites Johnson's remarks on painting in Rasselas and Hogarth's The Analysis of Beauty.

19. Sherbo, p. 75.


IV. Explicitness

Many commentators on Restoration tragedy have mentioned the quality of the plays which might be generically labelled their "explicitness." Norman Holland has most recently described this quality:

The heroic drama ... emphasizes a crude but scientific psychology: the characters discuss quite transparently their own reactions to the choices and stimuli presented to them by external reality. They are, ad nauseam, motivated. 1

Holland finds a parallel in this explicit discussion of motives to the "first steps the new science was taking." Earlier commentators have linked the seemingly endless debates of heroic tragedy to the influence of French romance or to the influence of Cartesian philosophy. Cecil Deane, in 1931, for example, traced both latter influences on the heroic drama and found both to lead to the kind of dramatic construction in which "the situations are nearly always observed from the outside"; that is, the characters comment, almost objectively, on themselves, each other, and the situation.

The question of the roots of heroic drama is not at issue here, but it is apparent from the work of dramatic historians that heroic drama had no single starting point, and, more importantly here, that several of the influencing factors contain analogues to the explicit motivation and explicit language of heroic (and non-heroic) drama. Kathleen Lynch and Alfred Harbage have examined the influence of the French préciosité tradition as it is found in English Restoration drama, and both note the element of debate found in the tradition. 3
Cartesian philosophy, the new science, neo-platonism, French prose romance, *précosité*, and the plays of Beaumont and Fletcher all show probable influence on the form of Restoration tragedy, and all provide roots for "explicitness." 4

Explicit motivation is most common in the speeches of the protagonist or the villain. The following is by Tissaphernes, one of the villains of *Alcibiades*, and is one of the most prolonged soliloquies in all of Otway's works. This one speech tells a great deal of the plot of the play.

Ungrateful King! thy shallow aymes pursue,
But my brisk Up-start Fav'rite, have at you.
Was it for this my active Youth I spent
In War? and knew no dwelling but a Tent?
Have I for this through Invious Mountains pass't?
Demolish'd Cities, and lay'd Kingdoms wast?

* * * * *
Must [*Alcibiades*] at last tumble my Trophies down?
And revel in the Glorys I have won?
Whilst from my Honours, they me disengage,
With a dull Complement to feeble Age,
What ayles this hardy hand, that yet it shou'd
Tremble at death, or start at reeking blood?

* * * * *
...I fond Youth will try to work thy fall,
Though with my own I crown thy Funeral.
Envy and Malice from your Mansions flie,
Resign your horror and your Snakes to me;
For I'le act mischiefs yet to you unknown;
Nay, you shall all be Saints when I come down.

*(I.271-276, 285-290, 295-300)*

This is an extreme example in terms of length. As the next chapter will show in detail, motivation can be made just as explicit as this long soliloquy of Tissaphernes and still be brief. Marius Junior, for example, in *Caius Marius* (1680), tells something of himself,
his situation, and the play when he exits with the remark, "I'll go and turn a Beggar for my Father" (IV.296).

The foregoing examples have shown explicitness of motive. The following, from Lee's Sophonisba (1675), is a good illustration of explicitness of emotional reaction. Hannibal has just been told Rosalinda is in the company of a young and handsome courtier. He replies to the messenger:

Peace, Harbinger of Fate, with Ravens dwell,
Thy tale at Midnight to the dying tell:
Oh! it has pierc'd me like a poison'd dart,
Which by degrees infects the blood and heart;
And now it higher mounts, divides my head,
Where like a plague its pointed venoms spread.
My brain ten thousand various tortures turn,
Now Agues chill me, and now Fevers burn.
Oh Rosalinda! false ungrateful Maid,
Am I for loss of glory thus repaid?

(II.ii.19-38)  

Examples such as this can be found in the works of any Restoration dramatist. Like the extended treatment of emotion found in these plays, the explicitness of the treatment has led scholars to comment on the unreality of the situations and the characters. B. J.

Pendlebury finds such unreality in Dryden:

The workings of the springs of emotion are too clearly revealed in Dryden's plays. His characters are too logical and consistent; like those of Racine, they are specimens acting under experimental conditions, which would never obtain outside the laboratory of the dramatist's brain.  

In the sentimental drama of the eighteenth century a similar explicitness prevails, and it has led Sherbo to complain: "It is as though grief had to be evinced in audible and unmistakable terms that it
might prove its presence."  

So far the critics and the illustrations have been concerned with explicitness of matter, i.e., with the explicit statement of motivation or of emotion. There is a more basic explicitness involved here, however, and Eugene Waith has, I believe, isolated it perfectly. He is commenting upon a statement by Dryden's Almanzor, but the comment has validity with reference to the passage from Lee.

The combination of explicitness and formality seems fatal. Tossed off informally, without benefit of similes, such comments might pass on the modern stage. If the meaning were intrusted more wholly to the figure of speech...they would pass for more interesting poetry.  

The language of the Restoration drama seems to straddle awkwardly between the poetic and non-poetic, between the figurative and the discursive.

Dale Underwood's study of Etherege contains a chapter entitled "The Comic Language." His remarks on the "non-metaphoric" element of the language are, I believe, as valid for the tragic language as for the comic. Underwood isolates three characteristics of this "non-metaphoric" language. It is "substantive in nature"; that is, verbs do not carry meaning, but nouns and adjectives do. Secondly, the language is non-sensuous; that is, it does not consistently convey the concrete level of experience. Lastly, the language is assertive or indicative in mood. All of these characteristics indicate a "continuous preoccupation with the generalized and schematized level of experience."
This preoccupation will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter, but it would be valuable here to illustrate the non-metaphoric quality of Otway's language. The following speech by Belvidera is full of the "outward signs" which were mentioned in the preceding section. She is confronting her husband, Jaffeir.

Tell me! be just, and tell me
Why dwells that busy Cloud upon thy face?
Why am I made a stranger? why that sigh?
And I not know the Cause? Why when the World
Is wrapt in Rest, why chooses then my Love
To wander up and down in horrid darkness,
Loathing his bed, and these desiring arms?
Why are these Eyes Blood shot, with tedious watching?
Why starts he now? and looks as if he wisht
His Fate were finisht? Tell me, ease my fears;
Lest when we next time meet, I want the power
To search into the sickness of thy Mind,
But talk as wildly then as thou look'st now.

(IV.ii.82-94)

A comparison of this passage with its model, the confrontation of Portia and Brutus in *Julius Caesar* (II.i.234-309) is illuminating. Portia also describes her husband's gestures (237-256), but she is recreating for him, and creating for the audience, a scene which occurred the night before. When she questions Brutus's present behavior (261-302) she does not describe his gestures. Otway's scene, however, is a prolonged stage direction to Jaffeir. We can see every shift in his posture and facial expression. Belvidera speaks as though Jaffeir were not on stage, as though the audience were unable to see him. It is the countless number of scenes of this sort that have led scholars to comment on the analytical quality of this drama. The characters seem to stand apart from themselves and examine
emotion rather than express it. 10

The speech contains a number of abstractions: just (ice), cause, fate, fears, power, mind. The verbs are for the most part unemphatic and unexciting: tell, dwell, know, choose, start, wish, finish, want, talk. Adverbs and adjectives carry all the excitement and the intensity of Belvidera's perplexity: busy cloud, horrid darkness, loathing his bed, desiring arms, and so forth.

The total effect of this kind of language is to destroy the scene as drama. The scene itself conveys nothing. Actions convey nothing. The language identifies, explicitly, every emotion and every nuance of the relationship. Belvidera fears and Jaffier sighs. Not only are we told Jaffier's eyes are bloodshot, but that they are bloodshot from watching, tedious watching, in fact.

Some general characteristics of explicit diction can be outlined briefly. This diction is usually abstract rather than concrete, general rather than particular, and literal rather than figurative. For example, consider this description:

'Tis night: the season when the happy take Repose, and only wretches are awake. (Don Carlos, V.1-2, italics mine)

This couplet could be used in almost any play. There is nothing in the vocabulary or syntax to isolate this night from any other. We are not told of any particular member of the genus "happy" or the genus "wretch." The hour is not narrowed to this particular day, but instead classed with all similar hours into a "season." The description
is explicit in the sense that the appeal to audience emotion is given
the broadest possible base (the "season" night) in order to insure the
proper reaction. The broad appeal is made rather than allowing
audience imagination free play over a few specific details or a strik-
ing metaphor ("Come, civil night, /Thou sober-suited matron, all
in Black" [Romeo and Juliet, III.ii.10-11]). The diction, further, is
assertive and frequently relies on emotionally-charged words: "I am
a Fool, and she has found my Weakness; / She uses me already like
a Slave" (The Orphan, II.307-308).

The form of Belvidera's speech is blank verse, but it can be
more accurately described with the eighteenth-century phrase "numerous
prose." The metaphoric value of the "busy Cloud" is destroyed by
Jaffeir's physical presence. The metaphor becomes simply an ab-
stract way of stating what Belvidera and the audience can see. Jaffeir
seems out of step with the world as he wanders at midnight, but Otway
heaps up illustrations of this, insisting on our recognition of Jaffeir's
distress. He wanders in "horrid darkness, / Loathing his bed, and
[her] desiring arms."

This speech fails, as Waith notes of Almanzor's, to toss off the
remarks without benefit of simile or to entrust the sentiment to figures
of speech. It falls between the poles of poetry and prose. It is not
original here to note the poetic failure of Otway's work. David Hauser
has written that Venice Preserv'd has, in this century, been criticised
for lack of poetic strength and because of Otway's use of language in
the interests of the passions rather than of drama. Very little has been done, on the other hand, to discover in just what way that language fails as poetry. This is a matter for extensive treatment in itself, but it is suggested here that one key to the problem lies in the quality of explicitness. It is this quality, for example, which might support Dobrée's argument that in the comedy The Souldiers Fortune Otway was unable to intellectualize his own soldier's fortune or to project it into art. It is this quality, again, which is implied in John Winterbottom's criticism of Dryden's heroic plays: "Basic themes, such as the love-honor conflict, are never given adequate expression through patterns of imagery." The reasons for this explicitness in Restoration drama are not clear. Explicitness seems to be a perfect example of T. S. Eliot's famous doctrine of the "dissociation of sensibility" which he found to have occurred in the seventeenth century. There is certainly an apparent split between the intellect and the emotions in this drama, but "dissociation of sensibility" is a label for the quality, not an explanation of it.

The requirements of decorum are probably in part responsible -- at least the requirements of decorum as they were understood in the Restoration. The same requirements held during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, the period of the height of English poetic drama. The nature of poetry itself was changing, of course, and the drama reflects the complex change of diction which occurred
in the seventeenth century. The change in dramatic poetry which took place between the time of Shakespeare and the time of Dryden can be seen in non-dramatic poetry as well.

Changing poetic ideals and changing interpretations of decorum do not provide all the answers to the question of explicitness in Restoration drama, but they do provide some obvious clues. Dramatists could hardly toss off dialogue without simile, as Waith suggests, in a period in which Dryden states:

...it is very clear to all who understand poetry, that serious plays ought not to imitate conversation too nearly. If nothing were to be raised above that level the foundation of Poetry would be destroyed. 16

On the other hand, the poetic level of the drama can only be as consistent as the characters portrayed because a King's and a Harlequin's delight are different. 17 The expression of a King's love must be carried in highly poetic language while the love of a clown is expressed probably in prose.

Heroic drama, then, would be the most poetic while comedy would be the least. In practice this was the case. But the middle area between the heroic and the comic has not been described. It is in this middle area that Otway's best known plays are found, and the Restoration critics provided no guide lines for the degree of poetry to be used. In 1711, Addison praised Otway for the naturalness of his language. "As there is something Familiar and Domestick in the Fable of his Tragedy...he has little Pomp, but great Force in his Expressions."18 How much poetry results in "little Pomp, but
great Force''?

As far as I am aware, no critic or poet in the Restoration or the eighteenth century ever faced this problem squarely and offered meaningful answers. The language of "domestic" tragedy was never defined and so remained "less" than heroic and "more" than comic. I believe Sherbo is wrong when he makes the following distinction: "unlike domestic tragedy, sentimental comedy usually selects its characters from the well-to-do upper middle class or from the nobility, and these characters are made to speak 'genteely.'" 19 Domestic tragedy, it is true, frequently has less than noble characters, but there is an effort to make the characters, no matter what their class, speak genteely. Surely a desire of this kind lies behind the pretentious latinate diction of Lillo's The London Merchant (1731). For example, there is no attempt at verisimilitude present when Maria, the merchant's daughter, says to her father: "Sir, I have endeavored not to wrong your well-known generosity by an ill-timed parsimony." 20 Lillo is obviously attempting to present his characters in a manner "less" than heroic, but "more" than comic.

Whatever the ultimate raison d'être for explicitness, it is omnipresent in Restoration tragedy. Explicitness, the "outward signs" usually prefaced by "thus--" which are found in all Restoration tragedy, and the lack of on-stage action combine to produce a narrative effect. Over-loaded feeling, also, as Prior noted, produces an effect of stasis in the drama. There are a number of analogies or
foreshadowings of the novel in Restoration drama, in comedy and tragedy. As has been indicated, abstract and discursive language carries the action of the plays. In addition, the frequent use of the "described scene" (that is, the recounting of a scene which occurred earlier, or occurred off-stage) approaches exposition. If Belvidera's speech, for example, were written in prose, with prose syntax, the analogies with Richardsonian narrative would be obvious. When, in fact, in the following century domestic tragedy and sentimental comedy were written in prose, the similarities between them and the novel were noted by contemporary critics. The London Magazine said of Mrs. Sheridan's The Discovery (1763): "The last act is rather a Richardsonian narration than part of a dramatic action...."\(^{21}\)

Finally, the most important effect of explicitness is found in its contribution to the sentimental. Explicitness is one of the ways in which playwrights prolong an emotional scene. Belvidera's speech is essentially one question, and it has been put in the first two lines. Explicitness also narrows the range of possible emotional response to a scene. One can only pity (or laugh at) Belvidera. And lastly, explicitness links with the characteristic appeal of sentimental drama to the emotions rather than the intellect. In scenes whose language is as explicit as that of Belvidera's, the intellect has nothing to do. There are no ambiguities in the situation.

Although the stress in this section has been placed on the abstract and generalized aspect of "explicitness," it should be noted that the
sentimental need not exclude various uses of the particular (as with simile) and the detailed. Sentimental details like the poor friar's snuff box, the starling, and Mr. Shandy's handkerchief in Sterne's *A Sentimental Journey* (1768), for example, become the focuses of tender associations. A complete discussion of sentimental explicitness would have to take into account such eighteenth-century developments as the sentimental souvenir and the sentimental vocabulary isolated by Erämerin.
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V. Patronage and Retirement

Otway's biography has led a number of critics to lay heavy stress upon those remarks in the plays which relate to patronage, specifically those passages which are bitterly ironic about patrons and preferment. Ham pictures Otway as a gentle spirit whose sensitive nature was bruised by lack of material and emotional success. There is no concrete biographical evidence for this picture of his character. It depends, instead, upon an interpretation of scattered assertions in his plays and a disproportioned stress upon the putative affair with the actress Mrs. Barry.¹ Ham goes so far as to state, "[Otway's] plays are unusually distinct: the hero, forever the man Otway; the heroine, the transfigured image of the woman he loved."² This assessment depends entirely upon one phrase from one letter: "I have languished for seven long tedious Years of desire..."³ It seems reasonable to temper the biographical interpretation of the plays insofar as they relate to Otway's emotional history. The same tempering is necessary with respect to Otway's remarks about preferment.

The central source of material supporting a biographical-fictional link with respect to preferment is the comedy The Souldiers Fortune. Otway was commissioned an ensign in 1678 and served in Flanders. He returned to England in the following year. The Epilogue to Caius Marius (1680) refers to his recent soldiering:

...our Poet, when this Play was made, Had nought but Drums and Trumpets in his head.
H'had banish'd Poetry and all her Charms,
And needs the Fool would be a Man at Arms.

* * * * *

...now is he Cashier'd, [who] will fairly venture
To give him ready Money for's Debenture?
Therefore when he receiv'd that Fatall Doom,
This Play came forth, in hopes his Friends would come
To help a poor Disbanded Souldier home.

Otway is obviously making the age-old plea to patriotism for favor
toward his play.

The Souldiers Fortune appeared in 1681. Two of the central
figures, Beaugard and Courtine, like Otway, are recently disbanded
soldiers. They find the world "so throng'd, and cram'd with Knaves
and Fools, that an honest man can hardly get a living in it" (I.6-8).
They have come home to "be Loyal, and now...as Loyally starve for
it" (I.12-13). Bonamy Dobrée has found this play to be:

...a terrible comedy of disillusion, recording the
struggles of a man whose hopes and faith are seared
with a white-hot iron, and who therefore can see
mankind only as something dispicable and vile. 4

It is impossible to support this interpretation from the play
itself. Otway has seized upon a topic with which he is familiar and
uses it to establish his characters and start the action moving.

Beaugard and Courtine are out at the pocket and somewhat anxious
to find a meal ticket, preferably a female one. The fact of their
recent disbanding is far less important in the play as a whole than
their poverty and handsome young bachelorhood. They are stock
figures in Restoration comedy. They could, for the purposes of the
plot in barest outline, be younger brothers, like Young Fashion of
Vanbrugh's *The Relapse* (1696), or Aimwell of Farquhar's *The Beaux Stratagem* (1707), or simply penniless young men like those of Otway's *The Cheats of Scapin* (1676). There is, it is true, some satire of redcoats running throughout the play, mostly from the husband of Beaugard's mistress, and, in the first two acts, considerable stress on the lack of preferment for merit. From the third act on, merit and preferment disappear almost entirely from the dialogue. In Act four, the sole allusion to preferment is the following by Courtine: "Friends, Beaugard, faithful hearty Friends, things as hard to meet with as preferment..." (IV.22-24). In the fifth Act, merit has degenerated to: "there are no honest Fellows living but Whoremasters" (V.631-632).

At no time in Otway's work does preferment become a thematic issue by itself. It is, instead, part of the larger topic of satire of contemporary society. As such, it is no more important an element in the plays than satire of jealous husbands, greedy tradesmen, arranged marriages, or flattering, hypocritical courtiers. All of these topics occur and recur in the comedies. *The Souldiers Fortune* may be the best of Otway's comedies, but the reasons for its quality lie elsewhere than in its possible biographical background.

As far as Otway's personal preferment is concerned, we have very little information. His dedications went to illustrious patrons like Charles Sackville (Lord Buckhurst, Earl of Dorset and Middlesex), the Duke of York, and John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester. With Rochester, Otway had a falling out of some kind, and in the Earl's *Session of the*
Poets (published anonymously in 1677) Otway is viciously satirized.

In the Prologue to Caius Marius Otway makes the archetypal appeal of the neo-classical poets:

In ages past, (when will those Times renew?)
When Empires flourisht, so did Poets too.
When Great Augustus the World's Empire held,
Horace and Ovid's happy verse excell'd.

(The pinnacle of allusions to Augustan Rome as a parallel to England is of course Pope's Epistle to Augustus [1737]). Otway's appeals for patronage went unanswered; or, at least we know from the welter of stories about his death that he died impoverished. Dr. Johnson's generalized summary of Otway's relationship to patronage seems to be as accurate as the facts permit. Otway, Johnson says, "appears, by some of his verses, to have been a zealous royalist, and had what was in those times the common reward of loyalty—he died neglected."5

Complaints of the lack of preferment and satire of sneaking, fawning courtiers tend to blend into one another, in Otway and in the works of others. But the satire of the situation at court is a sign of a larger, more important theme in Otway's works. This is the theme whose tradition has been given the title of "The Happy Man" by Maren-Sofie Røstvig. Røstvig's important study of the "happy man," the retirement theme in English poetry, treats Otway's verse, but not his plays. The theme, however, recurs also frequently in the plays.

Røstvig provides the general background which seems to suit Otway's use of the theme. The joys of retirement are never given extended treatment by Otway except in the "Epistle to R[ichard] D[uke]."
Instead, Otway tends to use retirement as the happy but impossible alternative to a character's present worldly power. This tendency is especially true, of course, in those plays in which the characters are of princely rank, although it also appears in *Venice Preserv'd*. The use in *The Orphan* is more complex, and will receive extended treatment later. For the bulk of the plays, the joys of retirement serve as a contrast to the difficulties the characters endure. Røstvig finds this contrast common in late seventeenth-century poets.

When public office becomes associated with ignominious dependence, greatness with incessant toil and absence of privacy, ambition with insecurity, company with noisy corruption, and business with a greed that defeats its own purpose, then the time is ripe to renounce all those things and return to a state of nature conceived as simple, quiet, and innocent. 6

This is a perfect picture of Acasto, the father of the rival brothers of *The Orphan*. He is identified in this way at the very beginning of the play. His servants are discussing him and one explains why he left the court:

Had he not reason? When for what he had born,  
Long, hard, and faithful Towl, he might have claim'd  
Places in Honour, and employment high;  
A huffing shining flat'ring cringing Coward,  
A Canker-worm of Peace was rais'd above him.  
(I.20-24)

Acasto has remained loyal to the king, but he has removed himself to the country and a situation which he hoped to be able always to claim:

"Thus happy, who would envy pompous pow'r, / The luxury of Courts, or wealth of Cities?" (II.108-109). His sons, however, are restive in the country and wish to seek glory in the king's service. Acasto
gives them an ugly picture of such service:

Who merit ought indeed to rise i' th' world,
But no wise man that's honest should expect.
What man of sense would rack his generous mind,
To practice all the base Formalities
And forms of business, force a grave starcht' face,
When he's a very Libertine in's heart?
Seem not to know this or that man in publick,
When privately perhaps they meet together,
And lay the Scene of some brave Fellows Ruin?
Such things are done----

(II.37-46)

His sons, as will be shown, misunderstand him in this and other matters.

Acasto and retirement in *The Orphan* are parts of a larger theme which will be discussed in the analysis of that play.

Acasto has attempted to put the ideals of retirement into practice. For the majority of Otway's characters, however, retirement is only a dream. For the Roman Emperor Titus, for example, the happy man serves to contrast with his own unhappy state. His comparison is long, self-pitying, and, coming at this point in the play, sentimental:

For who by Greatness e'r did happy grow?
None but the heavy Slave is truly so,
Who travels all his life in one dull road,
And drudging on in quiet, loves his load;
Seeking no farther than the needs of Life,
Knows what's his own, and so exempt from strife,
And cherishes his homely careful wife;
Lives by the Clod, and thinks of nothing higher;
Has all, because he cannot much desire.
Had I been born so low, I had been blest,
Of what I love, without controul possest;
Never had Honour or Ambition known,
Nor ever to be great, and been undone.

*(Titus and Berenice*, III.224-236)

Similar use of the retirement idea will be shown in *Caius Marius*
and _Venice Preserv'd._

In his non-dramatic verse Otway stresses the gracious, easy aspect of retirement. Røstvig's example of the non-dramatic stress is from Otway's translation of the sixteenth ode of the second book of Horace:

> For me a little Cell I chuse,
> Fit for my mind, fit for my muse,
> Which soft content does Best adorn,
> Shunning the Knaves and Fools I scorn.

Otway's emphasis is on the happy life possible in the country, both in the plays and non-dramatic verse, never on isolated or meditative retirement. The "Cell" of the passage just quoted is in his source. In the epistle to Duke the more representative picture of the happy country life (like Acasto's) of "cool delight and innocence" is shown. He and his friend "midst a Thousand pleasures waste the day."

Acasto's anti-flattery, anti-faction sentiments are part of the general tradition of the "happy man" in its satiric elements, as are the anti-marriage for money, anti-exploitation of capital in trade, sentiments that recur in the comedies. All of these themes, in fact, are anti-Whig politically, and would be expected in the playwright who pilloried Shaftesbury as Antonio (and Renault) in _Venice Preserv'd._
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VI. Comic-Tragic Analogues

Restoration comedy has, in this century, become famous rather than infamous for its wit and its freedom. The work of the five best-known comic playwrights, Wycherley, Etherege, Congreve, Vanbrugh, Farquhar, is anthologized and prepared for a popular market. The plays of these authors are successful on today's stage, in college theatres, and off-Broadway. The serious drama of the Restoration, on the other hand, is neither read nor performed. It is repellent to popular taste, and few readers of The Way of the World are aware of The Mourning Bride.

"The serious counterpart of Restoration comedy," Alan Downer says in his history of British drama, "is so utterly different that it is difficult to believe they were intended for the same theater and audiences." Downer finds in this period, depending on the play, "the same actor, the same audience...apparently accepting and believing a totally different set of ethical values." The Restoration audience was limited in numbers and included, primarily, only those with the leisure to attend a performance that began in the afternoon and who had none of the Commonwealth distrust of the stage. Allardyce Nicoll points out that the union of the two existing dramatic companies in 1682 "was really the result of financial failure, and no one appears to have been inconvenienced because only one playhouse was open." The idea of such a relatively small group of people changing their ideas of virtue and ethical values every other day, or every three
days, or even every other week, is hard to accept, and many scholars, including Downer, have attempted to find analogues between the tragedy and the comedy which shared the same stage.

Downer suggests the importance of women, with their influence and motivation of both heroic protagonists and rakes, creates an affinity between the two forms of drama. Love motivates the hero and the rake alike, it is true, but Downer's discussion does not indicate in what way this motivation differs from, say, Lady Macbeth's influence, or that of Rosalind over Orlando.

The most common suggestion concerning the apparent lack of analogy between comedy and tragedy is that the former mirrors the reality of the age while the latter mirrors the ideals of the age. Ham, for example, has made this suggestion in connection with Otway; the world of the tragedies was a world he dreamed, but the world of the comedies was the world he saw. It is literary cliché to say Restoration comedy "shows us probably as clearly as anything the peculiar temper of the age." The same critic, Nicoll, finds the tragedy "...the true child of the enervation that had come over England. The age was debilitated: it was distinctly unheroic: and yet it was not so cynical as to throw over entirely the inculcation of heroism."

Nicoll says the "heroic play is like a Tale of a Land of No-where."

Dobrée's comments link remarks noted so far. He, too, sees the central importance of love in the serious drama as a key to its interpretation, but he reads the presence of overpowering love as an
attempt on the part of the age to find an absolute, some ideal to grasp and hold in an age otherwise barren of ideals. The serious drama is thus, in Dobrée's opinion, "romantic"; i.e., unwilling to accept man as he actually is, and thereby analogous to the comedy of the period by being its absolute opposite.

The question of the similarities and differences between Restoration comedy and tragedy is too large a subject to be treated fully here, but some further suggestions as to their similarities of technique might be mentioned. History is on the side of those who argue for the comedy as a mirror of the society, or part of it, while the tragedy is largely fabulous. A parallel between Dorimant and the Earl of Rochester is more easily seen than one between Don Carlos or Almanzor and General Monk. The matter is further complicated by the Restoration version of fairly rigid standards for the two genres. It would be a contradiction in terms for a tragedy to have a rake, or worse, a businessman, as its protagonist. It is instructive, I think, to recall that the title of the play the citizens of Beaumont's The Knight of the Burning Pestle are to see is entitled "The London Merchant."

The genre of tragedy demanded an admirable protagonist, whether such could be found in contemporary society or not.

In terms of the rhetoric of Restoration drama one parallel of comedy and tragedy has already been suggested. The tragic vocabulary shows a similar pattern to that discovered in comedy by Underwood; that is, it is abstract, non-sensuous, assertive, and preoccupied with
the generalized level of experience. Further, there is an interesting similarity in the comic and tragic use of simile. Metaphor is rarely used in Restoration drama, and when it is employed it is seldom made a prime method for the communication of theme. Similes, on the other hand, are employed continually. In comedy, the simile is one of the basic devices of witty speeches; in tragedy, simile is basic to the attempt to give dignity and significance to an event or an emotion.

There is considerable range in comic simile, corresponding, as it were, to the categories witty, witwoud, and witless. It is with witwouds that the comic simile is most obvious, and Congreve provides the best example. Mistress Millamant, Witwoud, and Mincing enter to Mirabell and Mrs. Fainall:

_Mira._ Here she comes, if faith, full sail, with her fan spread and her streamers out, and a shoal of fools for tenders.—Ha, no, I cry her mercy! _Mrs. Fain._ I see but one poor empty sculler; and he tows her woman after him. _Mira._ You seem to be unattended, madam. You used to have the beau monde throng after you; and a flock of gay fine perukes hovering round you. _Wit._ Like moths about a candle.—I had like to have lost my comparison for want of breath. _Milla._ Oh, I have denied myself airs today. I have walked as fast through the crowd—- _Wit._ As a favorite in disgrace; and with as few followers. _Milla._ Dear Mr. Witwoud, truce with your similitudes; for I am as sick of 'em—- _Wit._ As a physician of good air.—I cannot help it, madam, though 'tis against myself. 9

In this passage Witwoud's similitudes contrast with the initial metaphors of Mirabell and Mrs. Fainall, but neither Mirabell or Millamant avoid the similitude. In this dialogue Witwoud is beating Millamant
to the punch. "Sententious Mirabell" frequently voices his maxims in this form, e.g., "I say that a man may as soon make a friend by his wit, or fortune by his honesty, as win a woman with plain dealing and sincerity" (II.i.520-522). Millamant says, a few lines later, with tongue in cheek, "I'll be melancholy, as melancholy as a watch light."

The simile used in tragedy would probably have been traced by the playwrights to the Homeric simile for justification, and not to any contemporary fashion. Nevertheless, the tragedy of the period contains as many similitudes as the comedy. Almanzor takes leave of Almahide with the words:

Farewell, my Almahide!
Life of itself will go, now thou art gone,
Like flies in winter, when they lose the sun. 10
(V.iii.115-117)

Banks' Queen Elizabeth uses similes in her frequent asides:

Thus the charm'd Pilot listening to the Syrens,
Lets his rich Vessel split upon a Rock,
And loses both his Life and Wealth together. 11

Otway's guilty lovers Polydore and Monimia see a similarity between their situation and that of Eden. Polydore says:

...then thus let's go together
Full of our guilt, distracted where to roam,
Like the first Wretched Pair expell'd their Paradise.
(IV.447-449)

It should be noted that the simile functions as part of the explicitness that marks the Restoration tragedy. It is the most obvious, most self-conscious, of figures. The repeated like- and as- constructions
draw attention to the act of comparing.

There is another function of comparison noted by Underwood. In some cases the language approaches metaphor by the complexity of the comparison. In The Souldiers Fortune, for example, Courtine complains: "'Tis as unreasonable to expect a man of Sense should be prefer'd, as 'tis to think a Hector can be stout, a Priest religious, a fair Woman chast, or a pardon'd Rebel loyal" (II.371-274). The comparison is between kinds of ironic "unreasonableness," since everyone expects a priest to be religious and so forth. But the grouping of promoted men, fair women, priests, brave soldiers, and repentent rebels in a category of hypocrites is a statement condemnatory of the entire society: something is rotten in the state of England. The simile in tragedy can function metaphorically as well. The lines from The Orphan (concerning Eden) provide an excellent example and will be discussed later.

There is one further element of the rhetoric which might be mentioned as illustrating an analogy between the genres. This is the extensive use of epithet. At times, in both genres, epithet is a euphemism for name-calling. In Otway's Friendship in Fashion (1678), for example, Lady Squeamish labels Sir Noble Clumsy, "Beast! Bruit! Barbarian! Sot!" (V.223). But frequently these epithets can be as revealing, rhetorically, as more subtle figures of speech or as important action. Malagene, in the same play, says Goodvile is "a very honest Fellow as can be" (I.123). As the play
progresses, we learn more about the kind of man Malagene calls "honest." As the meaning of honest as Malagene uses it shifts, so does our understanding of Goodvile.

The same complexity of epithet can occur in tragedy. Epithet is most frequently a device of definition. It is a label, and as such, it can reveal something of both the object and the labeller. It acts in two directions. In *Venice Preserv'd* an important example of this action occurs. For the conspirators themselves, including Jaffeir and Pierre, their group is made up of "men / Fit to disturb the Peace of the World, / And rule it when it's wildest" (II.185-187). On the other hand, to Belvidera the conspirators are "hired Slaves, Bravoes, and Common stabbers, / Nose-slitters, Ally-lurking Villains!" (III.ii.162-163). There is much more involved here than simple name-calling. It is essential to Jaffeir to determine which, if either, of these descriptions is accurate. Is he involved with a revolution based on valuable principles, or simply part of a group of self-interested villains?

Apart from the rhetoric of Restoration drama I believe there is one important area in which the two genres are revealed as products of the same culture. Underwood has clearly shown that whatever the particular variety of libertinism projected by the protagonist of a given comedy, libertinisms all show this similarity: "individual fulfillment and social order were pictured in perpetual opposition."¹³ Society, for instance, requires marriage; the rake
wants only sexual fulfillment. In fact, the double standard for men and women is at the root of Restoration comedy. In terms of the double standard alone there is a striking similarity between the villain of Restoration tragedy and the rake of the comedy. For example, the following speech by Don John of Otway's *Don Carlos* might be the platform from which Dorimant, or Horner, or Otway's Goodvile, operate:

> How vainly would dull Moralists Impose
> Limits on Love, whose Nature brooks no Laws:
> Love is a God, and like a God should be
> Inconstant: With unbounded liberty
> Rove as he list.---

(III.1-5)

Don John is a special type of villain, however. His villainy does not extend to the state, or even to malice toward any of society. He is anti-social only in the sexual realm. A complete villain in the Machiavelli-Iago-Hobbes tradition does not act as a parallel to the rake. He does, on the other hand, fit the pattern of contrast between individual fulfillment and society. Tissaphernes is Otway's outstanding example of this type. His villainy is expressed in explicitly anti-social terms. Speeches like the following have led scholars to associate the sentiment with Hobbes, although it fits within the more general tradition of the Machiavellian.

> Conscience! a trick of State, found out by those
> That wanted power to support their Laws;
> A bug-bear name to startle fools; but we
> That know the weakness of the fallacie,
> Know better how to use what nature gave.
> That Soul's no Soul which to it self's a slave.
Who anything for Conscience sake deny,  
Do nothing else but give themselves the lye.  
(Alcibiades, III.354-361)

Tissaphernes might have railed against conscience as a trick of priests, or a hoax of cowards, but his emphasis here and elsewhere is political. His arguments share with those of Don John the quality of arguing for unlimited self-interest. Within the structure of the play as a whole, his arguments stand as destructive of all the values upheld by the protagonists. And it should be noted that the language here is almost totally abstract.

I do not wish to present Tissaphernes as an archetype of Restoration villains. Villainy stems from as many causes as there are individuals and situations. Tissaphernes is an old general who sees his honors being usurped by a younger man. Dryden's villaness Lyndaraxa of The Conquest of Granada is consumed by a desire for power. The evil counsellor Rustan of Orrery's Mustapha is greedy for power and personal gain. The Countess of Nottingham in Banks's The Unhappy Favorite is a woman scorned. Restoration villains do operate, generally, in a world which they view as artificially constructed. Repeatedly in soliloquies they express their frustration with man-made institutions such as the family or the state. The Restoration world picture, in other words, does not see the various societal structures of this world as a microcosm reflecting the macrocosmic pattern. It frequently views man's nature as having been constrained artificially by socially sanctioned customs. The
protagonists, it should be clarified, do not expound upon artificial customs as an evil to be done away with. They nearly always find their personal desires in conflict with social demands, but they never go very far to question the assumptions upon which the social order is based. They have a tendency to accept social order because it is, because it exists. They do not have a set of beliefs, either expressed or implied, with which to argue rationally with the villains. If the protagonist shows anti-social tendencies one of the effects of the play's conclusion is to show these impulses corrected or overcome.

The most recent scholarly investigations of Dryden's tragedies have shown the prevalence of this pattern in his plays. John A. Winterbottom sees a pattern in Dryden's tragedies "away from the hero as social iconoclast toward the hero as embodiment of a social ideal." Winterbottom traces this movement clearly in the career of Almanzor of The Conquest of Granada, Parts I and II. Eugene M. Waith has traced the Herculean hero from the beginning of his career to the Restoration and the hero's appearance in the plays of Dryden. His conclusions are the same as those of Winterbottom. The court of Henrietta-Maria and her influence led to the development, Waith shows, "of a gentlemanly hero who did not rage unduly and whose desire for glory and greatness could be formulated in a way acceptable to society." The typical hero for the early eighteenth century he believes to be Cato, rather than Hercules. "The growing sense of
civic responsibility which found persuasive advocates in Addison and Steele demanded unequivocal self-sacrifice of the hero."¹⁸

The movement of a hero like Almanzor from self-interest to a more acceptable role as a functioning member of society is an obvious parallel to the pattern of Restoration comedy in which the rake, like Dorimant, seems to be moving toward marriage and sexual fidelity.¹⁹ But Dryden's Almanzor is somewhat unusual in Restoration tragedy. He is much more self-interested (albeit nobly) than the generality of Restoration protagonists. Otway's Alcibiades, or Don Carlos, Banks's Earl of Essex or Duke of Norfolk, Orrery's Mustapha, are not Herculean figures. Their problem is more domestic in the sense that they are forced to choose between their roles as friends or lovers and their roles in a political or familial situation. The choice of role and relationship is the subject of the next chapter.
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II

STRUCTURAL AND OTHER USES OF A CHARACTER'S MULTIPLE ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS

When like some panting, ho'ring Dove,
I for my Bliss contend,
And plead the Cause of eager Love,
She coldly calls me Friend...
("The Complaint," Works, II.471)

In a famous scene in Dryden's All For Love (1677), Antony is confronted by his wife, Octavia, and their children. They have come to Egypt to woo Antony back to them and to Rome. With Octavia are the Roman General Ventidius and Antony's friend Dolabella. Antony is not convinced by Octavia's argument. He explains himself: "I can ne'er be conquered but by love: / And you do all for duty" (III.i.316-317). Octavia appears to have caught the accuracy of Antony's evaluation, and she turns from logic to emotions as the basis for her argument. She appeals to Antony's pity until he becomes hesitant and uncertain and then she turns to her children:

Oct. Go to him, children, go:
Kneel to him, take him by the hand, speak to him;
For you may speak, and he may own you too,
Without a blush; and so he cannot all
His children: go, I say, and pull him to me,
And pull him to yourselves, from that bad woman.
You, Agrippa, hang upon his arms;
And you, Antonia, clasp about his waist:
If he will shake you off, if he will dash you
Against the pavement, you must bear it, children;
For you are mine, and I was born to suffer.
(The children go to him, etc.)

Vent. Was ever sight so moving?--Emperor!
Dolla. Friend!
Oct.  Husband!
Both Child.  Father!
Antony.  I am vanquished; take me, Octavia; take me, children; share me all.

(III.i.351-364)

As grotesque as this scene is to modern taste, it is central to the action of the play and obviously intended to be a highly emotional confrontation.

The sentimental elements of the scene are evident in the use of the children (who otherwise play no role in the drama), the explicit repetitiveness of Octavia's instruction to the children, Octavia's self-pity in the last line of her speech, and the pitiful tableau of the great soldier draped with his pleading children. The intention, had there been any doubt, is provided by Ventidius's, "Was ever sight so moving?"

Apart from the emotional impact of the scene, Antony is confronted here with the conflict that forms the central problem of the play. He must choose between Rome, and all it stands for, and Egypt, and all it stands for. He must choose between Octavia and Cleopatra, between being a member of the Triumvirate and being a paramour, between duty and love. In this scene he is immediately confronted with only one of his two alternatives. Octavia does nothing to call to mind the seductive Cleopatra other than the snide "that bad woman," and only hints at another side to him with her remark about his inability to acknowledge all his children without a blush. She wants him to be mindful of Rome alone, and his role as a Roman. And as
a Roman, Antony is emperor, friend, husband, father. 3

As Cleopatra's lover Antony fulfills none of these roles. He can be a friend, of course, but not Dolabella's friend. The bald list of roles which he is being urged to fill is itself a sentimental device. It is an appeal to Antony's emotions as it recalls to him his responsibilities and his family, and it appeals to the audience's emotions as it calls to mind the relationship of father to children, husband to wife, friend to friend.

Elsewhere in this play Antony's choice of roles is presented and commented on by the other characters. Alexas, Cleopatra's eunuch, remarks that despite Antony's present melancholy and lethargy, "the plainness, fierceness, rugged virtue / Of an old true-stamped Roman lives in him" (I.i.106-107). In contrast, the General Ventidius sees only the present lethargy: "I tell thee, eunuch, she hath quite unmanned him" (I.i.174). Antony is aware of his un-Roman position as Cleopatra's lover: "I have lost my reason, have disgraced / The name of soldier, with inglorious ease" (I.i.293-294). He must, then, choose whether to regain the "name" of soldier or throw in all for love and a world well lost. As the confrontation scene with Octavia makes clear, he must select the role he will play.

The problem facing the Restoration comic hero is not of this nature. Instead, he inhabits a world in which appearances belie reality and his problem is to be continually aware of what characters really are, that is, what they are underneath their appearance. Once
he has determined the real nature of those with whom he is in contact he adjusts his behavior accordingly. *The Way of the World* opens with Fainall and Mirabell leaving their gaming. They fall to discussing their amours. Superficially, the two men seem identical types; they are *bon-vivants* of the Restoration mode. Many characters in the play take them as identical types, but eventual discovery and the working out of the plot to the satisfaction of comic requirements depend upon Mirabell's knowledge that Fainall and he are not alike. Mirabell, as Mrs. Fainall says, is a "cautious friend" (V.i.624), but her husband is "as false as hell" (V.i.169).  

Manly, of Wycherley's *The Plain Dealer* (1676), prides himself on his open, blunt honesty. But he is shown to have fallen prey to a woman who, while apparently as open and honest as himself, is in reality "a mercenary whore" (V.ii.149). She has found the task of fooling him an easy one because, she explains, "he who distrusts most the world, trusts most to himself, and is but the most easily deceived because he thinks he can't be deceived" (IV.ii.249-251). Olivia (the woman who has ensnared Manly) has, however, played too many roles. She has used too many different appearances. She is revealed at the moment she is confronted with a number of persons, at the same time, all of whom know a different Olivia (V.iii). She is no longer able to maintain her multitude of disguises.

The dupes and fools of Restoration comedy are the most obviously clumsy maintainers of appearance. In this category are
characters like Sir Fopling Flutter, a man of "great acquired follies"; Lord Foppington, "a man whom nature has made no fool, [but who is] very industrious to pass for an ass," and Lady Wishfort, whose maid announces: "Your ladyship has frowned a little too rashly, indeed, madam. There are some cracks discernable in the white varnish." Characters such as these are obviously unnatural in their behavior, or, in Restoration terms, uneasy. They are so obviously not what they attempt to appear that they pose no problems of appearance and reality for the protagonist or for the audience. They function as clowns.

Restoration tragedies make very little use of the appearance versus reality theme. Ordinarily the two are not seen as disparate elements, but as one. The characters wear their hearts on their sleeves. Almanzor says:

My heart's so plain
That men on every passing thought may look,
Like fishes gliding in a crystal brook;
When troubled most, it does the bottom show;
'Tis weedless all above, and rockless all below.

(The Conquest of Granada, Pt. I., IV.i.43-47)

Appearances, in fact, are used continually as certain signs of reality. In Belvidera's speech (quoted in the last chapter) Jaffier's appearance is used as a perfect mirror of his changing passions. The villains of Restoration tragedy may make use of false appearances, but they seldom succeed in deceiving any but a small number of the dramatis personae. Their disguises are important to the action, however, and they must be exposed. Nevertheless, it does not
seem possible to transfer the following remarks by Norman Holland
from comedy, where he shows them to be valid, to tragedy:

...the outer appearance of a thing or person and
its inner nature are shown to be separate, indeed,
inconsistent, and this division is seen as usually
true, not an aberration that the action of the play
corrects. 9

As was mentioned in the final section of the last chapter, there are
occasional parallels, such as this one, between the villains of the
tragedy and the general outlook of the comedy of the Restoration.

In many Restoration tragedies the structure of the plot and
the problems it presents to the protagonists seem to depend on a
choice of roles. The choice is, furthermore, normally a moral
one; that is, the characters must decide which role, which relation-
ship, is of greater value. Shall I be Cleopatra's lover or a Roman
general and conqueror of the world? Which is more important:
father or lover, mistress or parent, wife or friend? There are
endless varieties of this kind of choice. Characters are faced with
decisions of a complex, personal nature. Shall I be a good son or
a good husband? These choices are not a matter of selecting appear-
ances. The protagonists are perfectly capable of fulfilling either
role without in the least disguising their real natures. Something
exterior to them prevents their accepting both roles simultaneously
or they are prevented from breaking down the horns of their dilemma
by something within them—usually the system of values which pro-
vides the standard by which all choices are made.
The mention of a "standard" seems to indicate that we are moving in the direction of that definition of Restoration tragedy which finds its distinguishing characteristic to be the presentation of conflicts of love and honor. But this concept is, I believe, both too vague and too sweeping to be of much value in a detailed understanding of Restoration tragedy. For example, cannot *Antony and Cleopatra* be read as a conflict of love and honor, or *The London Merchant*, or *The Conscious Lovers*? In the latter play, Bevil Junior explains his unwillingness to declare or prosecute his love for Indiana:

> My tender obligations to my father have laid so inviolable a restraint upon my conduct that till I have his consent to speak I am determined, on that subject to be dumb forever.

Obviously, Bevil Junior's sense of honor is in conflict with his love. He has chosen to accept the dictates of honor, but he has not ceased to love.

Even if the conflict of love and honor is broadly applicable to any number of plays, it need not be for that reason less applicable to Restoration tragedy. Nevertheless, there are a number of other conflicts which might be abstracted from Restoration plays and shown to be as pervasive as love against honor. There are repeated conflicts of nature and custom, of passion and reason, of Epicureanism and Stoicism. If love and honor are defined so as to include these other dichotomies, as they frequently are, then it is valid to ask what play does not show such a conflict? Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex* is, at least on one level, the conflict of Oedipus's duty toward Thebes
and his personal, familial, happiness. Arthur Miller's Death of a 
Salesman can be read as the portrait of a man whose love for his 
family blinds his vision of the honorable and whose resultant dis-
honor costs him the love which he sought. The tendency to broaden 
the categories of love-honor conflict is obvious in this remark by 
Norman Holland concerning the tragedy of the period:

The good people were sharply divided from the bad. 
The plots tended to be very schematic, melodramatic 
conflicts between love (i.e., desire) and honor 
(i.e., political, military, or domestic responsibilities). 

If, on the other hand, love and honor are narrowly defined, then a 
distinction must be made between the kind of conflict shown in the 
Phraartes-Clarona plot of John Crowne's The Destruction of 
Jerusalem (in two parts, 1677), based as it is on "atheistic" lust 
and "Judaic" vows of religious chastity, and that of Venice Preserv'd, 
based as it is on a concept of a just state and duty to one's wife. 

Sharp division such as love-honor or desire-duty are no doubt 
due in part to the sense of schism that has been noted in late seven-
teenth-century thought, e.g., Eliot's dissociation of sensibility, or 
the widening gap between faith and reason, or the Cartesian dualism 
of mind and body. But apart from the complex of motives which 
lie behind the expression of such divisions, we must take into account, 
I think, the failure of Restoration playwrights to exhibit the art that 
hides art. Whatever the raison d'être of sharp dichotomies in these 
tragedies, their presence is made explicit. In speech after speech,
in prefaces and translations, in titles and in satires, Restoration playwrights state their use of sharp divisions in the most explicit and abstract language. Davenant entitled a play, *Love and Honour* (1634). The Dedication to the reader of the English translation of de Scudery's *Artamène, ou le Grand Cyrus* (1653) contains the statement:

If you ask what the Subject is: 'Tis the Height of Prowess, intermixed with Virtuous and Heroic Love; Consequently the Language Lofty, and becoming the Grandeur of the Illustrious Personages that speak.... There is not anything to provoke a Blush from the most modest Virgin; while Love and Honour are in seeming Contention, which shall best instruct the willing ear with most Delight. 14

The Countess of Essex in Banks' *The Unhappy Favorite* (1681) states:

"Ambition, that's the highest way to Woe, / Cruel Ambition, Love's 15
Eternal Foe." Mustapha, of the Earl of Orrery's play of that name (1665), explains: "...Who would with a Fæther be in strife? / Rather than duty lose, I'll lose my life." 16 Massinissa, in Lee's *Sophonisba* (1675) faces this choice:

But could I then this wretched life endure?
Without her live? it's fatal to refuse,
And glory ruins me if love I chuse. 17

Finally, Volcius, in the play within the play of *The Rehearsal* (1675), sits debating before pulling on his boots:

My legs, the emblem of my various thought,
Show to what distraction I am brought.
Sometimes with stubborn honor, like this boot,
My mind is guarded, and resolv'd to do't:
Sometimes, again, that very mind, by love
Disarmed, like the other leg does prove.
Shall I to Honor or to Love give way? 18

(III.v.93-99)

The explicitness of Restoration drama was stressed in the last chapter. The abstract and explicit rhetoric of these plays must of necessity make the conflicts seem schematic and obvious. The rhetoric in its abstractness also contributes to the apparent interest in the generalized level of experience rather than the individual or particularized. Shakespeare's Antony must also choose between love and honor, but his ruminations on his problem are not expressed in the abstract and discursive language of the burlesque king Volcius. There is no need for the reader or the audience of Restoration drama to ponder the conflict motivating the protagonist. It is made as clear as Almanzor's thoughts: "fishes gliding in a crystal brook."

The conflicts of the abstractions love and honor, or nature and custom, or Epicureanism and Stoicism, are embodied, no less clearly, in the choice of roles so frequently presented the tragic protagonists. Choice of role, like the conflict of love and honor, is not limited to the Restoration era. Hamlet, for example, is painfully conscious of relationships and the need to establish them clearly as to their respective values. His language is, on occasion, as explicit as anything in Restoration drama. Here he replies to his mother's inquiry if he has forgotten her:

No, by the rood, not so:
You are the Queen, your husband's brother's wife;
And--would it were not so--you are my mother 19

(III.iv.14-16)
But, unlike Restoration drama, Hamlet contains relatively few passages of this kind, and the passages which do occur are never prolonged. These three lines are terse and meaningful.

The complex of relationships in Otway's Caius Marius, on the other hand, are dwelt upon at length. They are drawn out until the play can be read as having been structured on the interplay and establishment of relationships. For example, in the following scene Lavinia, wife of Marius Junior, comes upon her father-in-law, alone and near delirium after he has been banished from Rome. Lavinia finds her name carved in a tree:

Lav. My Marius should not be far hence.
Mar. What art Thou That dar'st to name that wretched Creature Marius?
Lav. Do not be angry, Sir, what e're thou art; I am a poor unhappy Woman, driven By fortune to pursue my banish'd Lord.
Mar. By thy dissembling Tone thou shouldst be Woman, And Roman too.
Lav. Indeed I am.
Mar. A Roman?
If thou art so, be gone, lest Rage with strength Assist my Vengeance, and I rise and kill thee.
Lav. My Father, is it you?
Mar. Now thou art Woman; For Lies are in thee, I? am I thy Father? I ne'r was yet so curst; none of thy Sex E're sprung from me. My Offspring all are Males, The Nobler sort of Beast's entitl'd Men.
Lav. I am your daughter, if your Son's my Lord, Have you ne'r heard Lavinia's name in Rome, That wedded with the Son of Marius?
Mar. Hah!
Art thou that fond, that kind and doting thing, That left her Father for a banisht Husband? Come near--- And let me bless thee.

(IV.315-335)
Caius Marius makes use, in part, of the Romeo and Juliet plot. Marius's family and Lavinia's are political rivals, and, in this scene, Marius's blessing marks a complete change in his attitude toward Lavinia. He calls having female children a "curse," but Lavinia at this moment has brought him the food and water that he needs. Marius ruled Rome, but banished he calls himself a "creature."

The question, "What art Thou?" is thematic to the entire play. It applies to Marius Junior and his unwillingness to forgo Lavinia or become a false son to his father. It applies to Marius: is he a traitor and a tyrant, as Lavinia's father maintains, or the ruler best for Rome? And in this small scene it applies directly to Lavinia, that "thing" that "left her Father for a banisht Husband."

One factor of Restoration plots contributes largely to this extensive use of relationship as structure; i.e., the small cast of characters. Many plays center about a small familial group and an even smaller group of outsiders who may be rivals or friends. The princely rank of these protagonists gives the drama an additional dimension. The family group is also the state, or a major factor in the health of the state. Thus, double roles are produced: a given figure can be both father and king, or son and prince, or mother and queen. Erich Auerbach has outlined this phenomenon with respect to seventeenth-century French drama, and his remarks are valid for English Restoration tragedies of this type:

In all these plays the good or evil of the state is
exclusively dependent upon the moral qualities of the monarch, who either controls his passions and puts his omnipotence at the service of virtue and hence of the common weal, or succumbs to his passions and allows the flatterers in his entourage to mislead and support him in his evil desires. His omnipotence is never challenged, encounters no resistance; and all the factual problems and obstacles which in the reality of life oppose both good and evil wills are completely disregarded. 20

This description fits even Venice Preserv'd (a play whose domestic elements receive primary consideration in most criticism), with the exception that the state rulers are not unopposed, and in no way considered omnipotent. Auerbach's description can be seen, in fact, to be analogous to a type of historicism which is frequently applied to the Restoration and to other eras. The moral health of the state reflecting the moral health of the ruler is an obvious description of that view of the late seventeenth century which finds the courts of Charles II and James II and their attendant coterie of wits to be symbolic of the attitudes and beliefs of the high society of the period. 21

Some caution is again needed when applying this moralistic view of the political situation to Restoration drama exclusively. It can be seen to be valid in most drama centering upon the small familial unit which contains the state rulers. Oedipus's "sickness," his illicit and immoral relationship with his mother and his murder of his father, are mirrored directly in the plague which consumes Thebes. The "something" which is rotten in the state of Denmark is at least in part the relationship of Gertrude and Claudius. It is
again the explicitness and single-minded repetition of this kind of structure which sets Restoration drama apart.

If tragedy is understood to present the lives of noble characters (understood in a political as well as moral sense), what type of problem could give rise to tragic tension? One obvious type would be that which served to fragment the unity of the central group through a conflict of interests or of relationships. Aristotle (in *Poetics*, XIV.4) stated that the "situations to be looked for by the poet" were those in which "the tragic incident occurs between those who are near or dear to one another—if, for example, a brother kills, or intends to kill, a brother, a son his father, a mother her son, a son his mother, or any other deed of the kind is done." An incident of this kind can be provoked by ambition or greed in those out of power (for example, the prince), or by the love of father and son for the same woman.

Dryden's *Aureng-Zebe* presents an aging emperor who has four sons, Darah, Sujah, Morat, and Aureng-Zebe. Darah is the eldest and Morat his only son by his present wife, Nourmahal. State law decrees that the rule descend to the eldest son and that younger sons be killed. When news reaches the emperor's sons of his impending death, three of them converge on the capital with their forces, anxious to seize power. Aureng-Zebe comes, anxious only to be of service to the Emperor and the Empire and to preserve peace. Nourmahal wants to obtain preferment for her son. The plot is further complicated by the Emperor's love for Indamora, a captive
Queen. His rivals in his love are his faithful counselor Arimant, Aureng-Zebe, and later, Morat.

The complexity of relationships here is apparent, and Dryden uses the language of role and relationship at central moments to make clear the tensions in the central characters. The Emperor says in a message to Indamora, "I'm a father, but a lover too; / Much to my son, more to myself I owe" (I.i.p. 284). His attitude toward Aureng-Zebe has changed because of his love for Indamora, and when Aureng-Zebe expresses his devotion to the Emperor and Empire, the Emperor replies:

Knew you what shame your kind expressions bring, 
You would, in pity, spare a wretched king.
Zebe. A king! you rob me, sir, of half my due; 
You have a dearer name,--a father too.
Emp. I had that name.
Zebe. What have I said or done, 
That I no longer must be called your son? 
'Tis in that name, Heaven knows, I glory more, 
Than that of Prince, or that of conqueror.
(I.i.p. 285)

Aureng-Zebe is perfectly aware of the exact type of tension he is undergoing. He speaks of it in terms of role: "I to a son's and lover's praise aspire, / And must fulfill the parts which both require" (I.i.p. 289). As long as the Emperor loves Indamora, Aureng-Zebe cannot fulfill both "parts."

Morat presumes to two roles as well, those of lover and of emperor. He woos Indamora by offering his superior qualities in both roles:

I, in Morat, the best of lovers bring.
For one, forsaken both in earth and heaven,
Your kinder stars a nobler choice have given:
My father, while I please, a king appears;
His power more declining than his years.
An emperor and lover, but in show;
But you, in me, have youth and fortune too.

(III.i.p. 317)

Eugene Waith has examined this play and the different kinds of
"heroism" displayed in Aureng-Zebe and Morat. He finds Morat
fulfills the requirements of the Herculean tradition in large part,
but in the pattern of the play as a whole (which ends with Aureng-Zebe
and Indamora united in love and power) "the compelling picture of
the hero [Morat] lying at Indamora's feet gives way to a tableaux
of orderly family relationships." 23

The Earl of Orrery's Mustapha (1665) has a plot similar to
that of Aureng-Zebe. Solyman, the Turkish conqueror, has two
sons, Mustapha and Zanger. The latter is his son by his present
wife, Roxolana. Both sons love the recently conquered Queen of
Hungary. Roxolana is anxious for her son's succession to power,
impossible under Turkish law while Mustapha lives. In this play,
however, orderly family relationships break down under the strain
of divided relationships. The key to the final tragedy lies in the firm
bond of friendship between Zanger and Mustapha. The latter says:

Sure, my dear Zanger, those who heretofore
The envy'd Crown of this Great Empire wore,
Ne'er knew the charms which Friendship do attend,
Or in a Brother never had a Friend. 24
(I.197-200)

Despite the rivalry implied by their mutual love for the Hungarian
Queen and despite the machinations of Zanger's mother intended to insure his accession to power, the brothers' vows of friendship prove the strongest bond among the mixed relationships presented in the play. Both men die rather than dishonor Solyman or their friendship. Solyman, at the play's end, laments: "Friendship and Cruelty alike have done; / For each of them has robb'd me of a Son" (V. 394-395).

The Hungarian Queen, however, is placed in the most awkward role. She is beholden to Roxolana for the safety of the infant heir to the Hungarian throne. To maintain this she is urged by Roxolana to encourage Mustapha's suit. To admit love for either prince would anger Solyman, and, in any case, she is a Christian and they are Mohammedan. Her advisor, a Cardinal, is less concerned with religion than with the Hungarian state, and he favors any relationship which will insure the safety of the infant heir. As she explains, this tangle of relationships has left her in a labyrinth:

Without a Clue I'm in a lab'rynth left:
And where even Hope is of her Eyes bereft.
With Noble [Zanger Mustapha] contends
They strive as Rivals and they yield as Friends:
I injure one if I the other chuse;
And keeping either I the Sultan lose.
Flying from both I from my refuge run;
And by my staying shall destroy my Son.
Then for their false Religion I eschew,
Though I have found their Virtue ever true.
And when Religion sends my thoughts above,
This Card'nal calls them down and talks of Love.

(III. 546-558)

There is no possible peaceful solution to the Queen's dilemma. She
is released from this tension of relationships only when matters come to a head in Solyman's court, and Mustapha and Zanger die. Zanger's last request, granted by Solyman, is that the Hungarian Queen and her son be allowed to rule their realm.

One effect of the explicit vocabulary of relationship is sentimental, as was mentioned in connection with the scene from *All For Love*. The pity of the audience is sought as they see inexorable forces destroy friendship or family or love. Mustapha goes to his final confrontation with the angry Solyman with this admonition to Zanger:

"Farewel! the duty of a Son retain. / You'll hear your Brother, and your Friend is slain" (IV.410-411). The affecting power of this vocabulary is noted by Thomas Rymer in his criticism of Beaumont and Fletcher's *Maid's Tragedy* in *The Tragedies of the Last Age Consider'd* (1678). Rymer objects to the unnecessarily explicit scene in which Amintor tells Melantius that the latter's sister has been mistress to the King. Rymer suggests:

Some broken speeches, as your Sister, the King her honour, or the like, might have sufficed; and the Brother should have been left to guess and paraphrase the broad meaning. But Amintor harps upon the string out of time itself. 25

Alfred Harbage has provided a phrase which seems apt as a description of speeches which lament conflict of relationship or loyalty.

Such speeches in French prose romance and Cavalier drama he has termed, "sighs of ethical perplexity."26

Wylie Sypher's *Four Stages of Renaissance Style* touches on the
seventeenth-century use of relationship such as I have described.

He links it with the traditional conflict of love and honor.

The characters in Corneille, Dryden, and Otway do not experience the will as a felt impulse but rather as a need to comply with a formula of "love" and "honor" which makes passion and duty a ritual performed by an elite. 27

In Sypher's view, the elite is made up of both the characters represented in the play and the audience. These two groups know all the rules of love and honor. As a result, when such a coterie drama develops, "the dramatic problem is reduced to one question: What is the correct attitude or posture, and what is the condition under which one assumes that attitude?"28 Sypher has labeled such drama: "tragedy of manners."29

This chapter has made clear, hopefully, the validity of the concept of choice of role or relationship as structurally important in the dramatic tension of these plays. But Sypher's idea of an elite whose "grandiose social conventions" are disguised as "moral imperatives" seems extremely oversimplified. 30 Choice of role in these plays is always dependent upon ethical or moral imperatives, if only those which are implied in such blood relationships as father and son. [Cultural anthropologists, of whom perhaps Sypher is a type, make a convincing case for all "moral imperatives" being in essence reflections of social needs, but Sypher seems to imply this is not the usual case.] The Queen of Hungary is not debating the attitude society demands of her, but rather the attitude she must assume in order to
satisfy state, religious, and personal emotional demands.

The choice of attitude or role usually occurs without benefit of clear-cut moral or social codes. The Hungarian Queen's Christianity is little more than vague religiosity; her only Christian attitude is a distrust of the heathen, and, even at that, she is attracted by the virtue of the Turkish princes. Nevertheless, her religious belief is offered as a source of conflict in her position. She is faced with a value judgment, not a judgment of etiquette. Similar value judgments are required in nearly every choice situation. Which is more valuable, if a choice must be made, a father or a wife, a brother or a mistress, a kingdom or a friend?

Social conventions do not provide clear-cut answers in these cases any more than do the vague religious beliefs of the Jews of Crowne's The Destruction of Jerusalem or the Christian's of Lee's Theodosius. Lewis N. Chase noted in 1903 that in the English heroic play "anything that implies the existence of a code or 'Rules of Honour' is rarely spoken of, and never in a manner to attract, much less compel, attention." If the Restoration elite had a formula of love and honor the plays seem to indicate time and again that it fails completely to provide a guide by which to select the proper attitude or posture required in a crucial situation. Sypher is correct that the plays often reduce to the question of what is the proper attitude in a given situation, but he fails to note that the tragedies imply this ultimate question has no morally or socially acceptable answer.
Similarly, the phrase "tragedy of manners" must be tempered so as to reflect the full meaning of manner to the Restoration. In the context of his study, Sypher implies that manners are the equivalent of social graces, artificial and faddish. Thomas H. Fujimura has explained, in connection with the parallel notion of "comedy of manners," that manners as the seventeenth century used the term meant ethos or character—"the underlying motives and causes of human action." Dryden's definition of manners (quoted in full on page 14, supra) makes this meaning clear. In summary Dryden says, "from the manners, the characters of men are derived," and character is "that which distinguishes one man from another."

Tragedy of manners, then, must convey more than a notion of social etiquette. The problems and conflicts which this drama involves, although presented in a repetitive, abstract, and explicit rhetoric, are in reality attempts at conveying complex and difficult human problems. They are problems of the virtues, vices, and passions, and are problems which are the concern also of science (or psychology), ethics, and history. Ideally, or theoretically, this is the concern of Restoration drama. If that drama fails to present these problems as passionate, immediate, and important problems, then the failure lies in the mode of presentation, and not in the nature of the problems themselves. The question of the respective values, for example, of a brother and a mistress, from the point of view of a given character in a given situation, could be matter for drama in
any era, and, in and of itself, has no effect on the success or failure of the resulting drama as a work of art.

The Restoration drama has been criticised for the lack of character development most plays display. The characters are presented in full bloom and their choices and decisions are rarely based on newly gathered understanding. In terms of Francis Fergusson's "tragic rhythm of action" -- Purpose, Passion, and Perception -- Restoration characters for the most part lack the latter. They come to an ethical crossroads and are destroyed by it or overcome it, but rarely does the outcome depend on insight gained through suffering. There are exceptions to this general statement. Almanzor of The Conquest of Granada does achieve Perception--insight into the nature of the universe and his role in it. Otway's Jaffeir also comes to a new understanding of the world about him, and the characters of The Orphan, less clearly, seem to have obtained something like Perception through Passion.

Otway at his best makes it clear that the choice of relationship or role faced by his protagonists is not as clear and simple as it might appear. Jaffeir is faced with a choice between his friendship for Pierre and his love for Belvidera, but, ethically, these two relationships are not poles. Jaffeir's choice is not between good and evil, or even between more and less good. Pierre and Belvidera each represent a complex of good and evil and choice between them has less implied in its very nature. Jaffeir cannot gain by choice
and he cannot avoid the horns of his dilemma.

The necessity of choice of role and the impossibility of choosing successfully is one of the central complicating devices of Restoration tragedy. Examples have been given from Aureng-Zebe and Mustapha. Banks's *The Unhappy Favorite, or The Earl of Essex* (1681) provides a final example. Queen Elizabeth is faced with an impasse in this play. Her roles as woman and as Queen conflict with regard to Essex. As a woman she pities and perhaps loves him; as a Queen she must condemn him to the Tower. She fears an interview with him because she knows the interview will bring these two antagonistic roles into closest conflict. In the moments before he arrives she advises herself: "Now now support thy Royalty, / And hold thy Greatness firm; but oh, how heavy / A Load is State where the Free Mind's disturb'd!" (II. p. 18). At the moment of reflection after his imprisonment she reveals her divided emotions in an aside:

He is going, I, but whether? To his Tryal,
To be Condemn'd perhaps, and then to dye;
If so, what Mercy hast thou shew'd in that!
Pity and Pardon! Poor Amends for Life!
If those be well, a Crocodile is blameless
That weeps for Pity, yet devours his Prey.
And dare not I do more for Essex, I
That am a Woman, and in Woman-kind
Pitty's their Nature; therefore I'm resolv'd
It shall be in's own Power to Save his Life.

(IV. p. 52)

Not all Restoration tragedy makes extensive use of relationship and role as a structural device. In Banks's play, for example, it is only the Queen who suffers divided loyalties. Otway, however,
seems to have seized upon this as one effective device to convey dramatic tensions in nearly all his plays, including the comedies. In several of the less familiar plays I have provided a schematic diagram of the relationships among the play's central characters. The diagrams may help make clearer the complex relationships and help thread the way through such expostulations as these:

\[
\text{my hopes were crost,}
\text{When in your Lover I a Brother lost.}
\] 
\((\text{Alcibiades, II.15-16})\)

\[
\text{Father! and King! both names bear mighty sence:}
\text{Yet sure there's something too in Son, and Prince.}
\] 
\((\text{Don Carlos, IV.16-17})\)

\[
\text{When-e're had I a Friend, that was not Polydore's,}
\text{Or Polydore a Foe, that was not mine?}
\] 
\((\text{The Orphan, V.366-367})\)
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ALCIBIADES (1675)

1. Relationships --

Otway's first play, Alcibiades, contains the conventional
<stressed>drāmagitis personae</stressed> of the heroic plays: "the emperor of a remote
land, the ever-virtuous hero with a 'swelled mind,' the rival villain,
the dazzlingly virtuous heroine, and the pseudo-royal villainess."¹
Briefly, the story concerns the Athenian general Alcibiades, who,
banished from Athens because of an act of sacrilege against the
gods, offers his services to the King of Sparta. His beloved Timandra,
together with his sister, Draxilla, follows him to Sparta, where
Alcibiades and Timandra are married. Alcibiades' victories over
the Athenians win him the favor of the Spartan King, the lust of the
Spartan Queen, the hate of Tissaphernes (the old Spartan general),
and the friendship of Patroclus, Tissaphernes' son. Tissaphernes
accuses Alcibiades of treason to the King, who has Alcibiades im-
prisoned. The Queen, desperate to obtain Alcibiades' love, kills
the King to obtain power and places the blame upon Tissaphernes.
The Queen then poisons Timandra. Alcibiades kills himself in grief,
and the Queen kills herself to avoid punishment "by formal law."²

The relationships among these characters are more complex
than this brief plot outline would indicate (see the diagram at the end
of the chapter). Alcibiades' chief political enemy in Athens, Theramnes,
is also in love with Timandra, as is the Spartan King. Tissaphernes'
son, Patroclus, falls in love with Alcibiades' sister, Draxilla. The most important relationships, in terms of the plot as a whole, however, are those which center about two triangles. One is that involving Alcibiades, Timandra, and the Spartan Queen. The other involves Alcibiades, Tissaphernes, and Patroclus.

The three figures involved in the first triangle do not undergo conflicts of equal intensity. Timandra does not have to make a choice of roles. She apparently has no strong ties to Athens either of family or politics, and in Sparta she is absorbed entirely in her love for Alcibiades. Threatened by the Queen with immediate death unless she quit her claim to Alcibiades she can exclaim: "Quit him! no never whilst I here have breath; / He's mine in spight of cruelty or death" (V.341-342). The Queen herself is only slightly more concerned with the possible conflict between her love for Alcibiades and her position as Queen. Her maid asks: "Madam, is it not a cruel thing, /T'abuse a husband and kind King?" (II.155-156). The Queen replies with a device which will be discussed later in the chapter. She defines husband so as to make abuse of such a figure impossible:

Dull Girle, thou knowst not what a Husband is.
Alas, they never reach the height of bliss,
But ignorantly with Love's Magick play,
Till they raise Spirits they want pow'r to lay.
(II.157-160)

The sexual joke in this definition is a key to the Queen's character.
She is totally sexually self-interested. She has defined husband so as to remove that relationship from possible conflict with her interests, and her only allusion to her husband's role as King is submerged in
a physical description of Alcibiades: "Such killing Ayres in each part
of him move, / His Brow darts Majesty, and his Eye Love"
(II.163-164).

It is in Alcibiades that conflict of relationship is centered.
He is not interested in the Queen, but he is conscious, as Timandra is
not, of the Queen's political position and power. The Queen's lust
presents him with an impossible choice: "What's to be done, which
way shall I conclude? / I must abuse my King, or must be rude"
(IV.20-21). He attempts to avoid the conflict by suggesting a new
relationship to the Queen. "I'll love you," he says, "as the Sister
of my blood" (IV.86). The Queen, as would be expected, rejects this
immediately. She expresses her rejection again through definition,
with her intense physical interest clearly expressed in the final
simile:

A Sister's love's a lean insipid bliss,
So little we can hardly name what 'tis.
Where is the transport, estasie, delight?
'Tis like thin meat to a sharp appetite.

(IV. 87-90)

Alcibiades suggests a Platonic love, "free from the dull clogs of
sense" (IV.122), which the Queen ignores completely. She leaves
him with the ominous statement: "A Rival and a King, I may remove"
(IV.138). Alcibiades, finally, has no way in which to satisfy both
the demands of the Queen and his love for Timandra. He chooses
to be faithful to Timandra, rejecting the Queen's offer of the Spartan
throne: "though Emp'rour of the World I were, / I'd turn a beggar to
recovery of Timandra" (V. 407-408).

Alcibiades is unwittingly the center of another conflict. He has won the admiration and friendship of Patroclus, the son of the Spartan general Tissaphernes. Tissaphernes is violently ambitious, and, though an old man, he vows revenge when Alcibiades (that "brisk Up-start Fav'rite") supplants him as commander-in-chief of the Spartan forces. He is further enraged to see his son and Alcibiades such fast friends. In one impassioned scene, Tissaphernes attempts to bring Patroclus (who knows nothing of his father's villainy) to hatred of Alcibiades by making this hatred an expression of filial piety.

Tiss. D'you understand, Patroclus, what y'ave done? Have you consider'd that you are my Son? Pat. Sir, 'tis a title I am proud of.---
Tiss. How can you then descend to things so base, That blot my Glory, and my Name deface? Whilst thus your blinded folly so adores The only Traytor that my soul abhors.

(III. 191-197)

Patroclus is astounded to learn of his father's hatred of Alcibiades, and argues their friendship is such that if he were to kill Alcibiades it would be "self-murder." "Piercing his Breast," Patroclus tells Tissaphernes, "I stab m'own image there" (III. 224). Patroclus pleads that he be excused from such hatred:

By all th'endearments of a filial love,
And if that charm cannot your pity move,
By my dear Mothers ghost, whose dying pray'r
Bequeath'd me her chief treasure to your care,
This unjust cruel enmity lay down,
And do not in his friend destroy your Son.

(III. 237-242)
Tissaphernes is adamant, demanding that Patroclus carry out his wishes or, "ne're presume to call me Father more" (III.251). Patroclus is forced, then, to choose between father and friend, and he chooses friend. "I'll dye for him," he tells Tissaphernes, "but scorn to live for you" (III.260). Tissaphernes sees he cannot corrupt his son and so laughs off the incident as a test of his son's constancy.

Alcibiades could be analyzed, in terms of plot, so as to stress the obvious conflicts of filial love and friendship, or marital love and duty, or analyzed as a homily of the dangers of unchecked passions (including ambition). By stressing the use of conflict of relationships (here in two key triangles) I do not mean to imply, here or in other analyses, that this is the only structural device used by Otway. Furthermore, these scenes in which the vocabulary of relationship is used extensively function not only to provide dramatic tensions and motives for action (i.e., as structural devices), but also as opportunities for the playwright to provide highly emotional dialogue. The appeal to pity in Patroclus's plea (delivered kneeling) is obvious. The reference to "dear Mothers ghost" and her "dying prayer" is made consciously by Patroclus as an emotional counter. If filial love does not move Tissaphernes' pity, perhaps recalling marital love to him will. Sentimental prolongation is also evident in the scene between father and son, taking up as it does, one-fourth of the third act. 4
The complex stresses of the relationships described in the play are relaxed and resolved through the deaths of the major characters (the King and Queen, Alcibiades, Timandra, Tissaphernes) and a proposed union between Patroclus and Alcibiades' sister, Draxilla. This marriage would unite Alcibiades' family and Tissaphernes', and would act, further, as a re-establishment of the virtues embodied in Alcibiades and Timandra. Patroclus's nobility of character is illustrated in the devotion to the ideals of friendship he shows when opposing his father. Draxilla is an equally devoted friend. She tells Timandra:

I'm only something by being yours;  
Since equally with yours, my hopes were crosst,  
When in your Lover I a Brother lost.  

(II.14-16)

Draxilla is the most sententious of the characters. She has few lines in the play, but they all tend to such moralisms as: "To our worst Enemies our Tears we owe" (II.28), and "Good deeds their worth and value have from hence, / They are their own Glory are and Recompence" (III.169-170). As the play ends Patroclus has been made King of Sparta, and, although he finds the situation ironic—he has the crown but "[his] Friends, [his] Mistress, and [his] Father, lost!" (V.530)—he has sent for Draxilla and their marriage will help create a new, moral, orderly state.

2. Flames--Fetters--Flight--

The following discussion of the use of imagery concerning flames,
fetters, and flight is primarily a study of Otwayian apprenticeship and his conscious striving for the "poetic." Otway uses these stock images to convey important meanings, and he uses them extensively. Yet, in his next play, *Don Carlos*, these images disappear entirely. Otway apparently tried one traditionally well-received rhetorical pattern, mastered it or grew tired of it, and discarded it for a new pattern in his next play.

Moody Prior has noted the repetitious use of *flame* and *fire* as nearly synonymous with *love* in Restoration drama. These images function, Prior says, as "appropriate elevating devices," and are used irrespective of persons or events.⁵ The words *flame* and *fire*, properly modified, can indicate any degree of love from friendly affection to intense lust. Timandra asks Theramnes, Alcibiades' political rival in Athens, "What flame or duty can you owe to me?" Theramnes replies, "Next what the Holy to the Deity, / When they for blessings at the Altars move: / 'Tis Adoration, Madam, joyn'd with Love" (I.99-102). In contrast to this holy love, the Queen of Sparta's love is intensely sexual: "I'm all over flame," she says, "in ev'ry part I burn" (II.143). In the marriage ceremony performed over Timandra and Alcibiades they are said to "flame so nobly" (II.230).

As the play develops, the metaphoric quality of the flame-love comparison is lost through repetition. As Otway rings the changes on this figure it becomes dead metaphor, and nearly every human relationship is described in these terms. Theramnes has a friend named
Polyndus (he disappears from the plot after the first scene of the first Act) who vows to share Theramnes' fortunes in the struggle with Alcibiades. He will, he tells Theramnes, "Revenge, or fall a Victim to your Flame," i.e., a victim to the actions inspired by Theramnes' love (I.187). When Theramnes is captured in battle by Alcibiades and brought before the Spartan King, he scorns the mercy shown him, boldly declares his love for Timandra, and vows revenge on Alcibiades. All this the King calls, "hot frenzy" (III.113). Patroclus uses a flame image to describe his "friendship" for his father when the two become reconciled after the argument over Alcibiades: "After this shock our friendship's more secure, / As gold try'd in the fire comes forth more pure" (III.286-287).

The analogy between the ties of love and chains is as traditional as that between fire and love. When Timandra rejects Theramnes' suit he apostrophizes: "Heavens, can she at those Chains she gave me scoff!" (I.145). He is, he protests, a "fetter'd Captive" of Timandra's: "The more I strive, the faster I am bound" (I.152-153). The King of Sparta acknowledges Timandra's powers as he tells her, "Madam, to your eyes must Conquest bow, / Who are your Slaves no other Fetters know" (III.120). Paradoxically, love acts to free those physically chained, and so the King (believing Alcibiades a traitor) has Alcibiades and Timandra separated: "For fetters would be blessings were she there" (IV.490).

Otway uses the chaining or fettering image for political
situations as well as those of love. The King of Sparta feels his cause is just, and if it triumphs, "No more shall Greece her Fetters wear" (I.196). The King’s power is shown in his having "Vanquish’d Emp’rors, Fetter’d Kings" (III.25). Alcibiades, however, is aware, because of his complex and difficult relationship with the Queen, that power can place chains in two directions. "Greatness," he says, is "gaudy torment of our Souls, / The wise mans fetter, and the range of fools!" (IV.142).

Unlike the flame imagery, Otway has narrowed the applicability of the imagery of chains and slavery to the two realms of love and politics. In addition, this imagery is associated throughout the play with Theramnes in particular. He serves to bring together both areas of applicability. As has been noted, he pictures himself as fettered by Timandra. He is the Athenian general and is captured, enslaved as it were, by Alcibiades in combat (III.38). Theramnes’ scorn toward Alcibiades in the King’s presence results in his being bound in actual chains (III.114). In this situation he finds his love of Timandra no longer acts to bind him, but rather, he says, "I can't want freedom, for I'll think of her" (III.118). The climax of this association of Theramnes and fetters comes in a soliloquy by Theramnes, delivered while chained in a darkened tent.

How sweet a quietude's in fetters found!
That it seems almost freedom to be bound.
Though thus confined, my agile thoughts may fly
Through all the Region of variety.  
Here in a trice I can the World run O're,  
And finish whole years labours in an hour.  
But oh my Mistress, my Timandra, lost!  
That is the only bitterness I taste.  
This outward fetter but my Body chains,  
But that the freedom of my Soul detains.  

(III.292-301)

After this, Tissaphernes comes to him with a plot to ravish Timandra and kill Alcibiades. He frees Theramnes (his body and his lusts, in Theramnes' image), but nearly sends him to damnation. Theramnes dies having sought and received forgiveness from Timandra (IV.226-237).

The most pervasive imagery of the play is concerned with rising and falling. There is an obvious and important link between this imagery and the others noted so far. Theramnes, for example, links the imagery of flame and the idea of ascension. His love is "an enliv'ning and transporting fire, / Whose flames encrease, and still are piercing higher" (I.107-108). In his soliloquy just quoted he also provides a paradoxical connection between being "confined" and being able to "fly" with his thoughts. The major use of the rising and falling imagery, however, is in parallel with the fortunes of the major characters.

Alcibiades' first action in the play, reported secondhand, is to violently "tumble down" an image of Jove after a Bacchanal (I.5-8). This drunken act is seized upon by Theramnes as a means to have Alcibiades banished from Athens. Timandra fears that this means her "hopes are dash't and ruin'd in their height" (I.34), but events prove otherwise as Alcibiades goes to Sparta and is raised to favor
and position. The Spartan King explains his choice of leaders to Alcibiades:

By your success the Athenian greatness rose,  
Your courage scatter'd their insulting Foes;  
And from that height to which by you th'are grown,  
'Tis your success alone must throw 'em down.  
(I.231-234)

Although Alcibiades does throw down the Athenians, his initial action does not develop as a symbol for the general course of his career. The original act of sacrilege is referred to only once thereafter (II.90-91) at a moment Alcibiades fears the gods may be angry with him and have punished him by the death of Timandra. She is not dead, and the sacrilegious act is forgotten. 6

From the point of view of the action of the whole play, it is Tissaphernes who is associated with working falls. His ambition is thwarted by Alcibiades and in soliloquy he asks, "Must he at last tumble my Trophies down, / And revel in the Glories I have won?" (I.285-286). He vows revenge: "I fond Youth will try to work thy fall, / Though with my own I Crown thy Funeral" (I.295-296). With the background of this imagery in mind there is full dramatic irony in Tissaphernes' hopeful statement: "then must the Crown descend on me" (II.208). Alcibiades is not ambitious for the crown, as Tissaphernes is, but he is conscious of the glory he has won.

Alcibiades, also in soliloquy, echoes Tissaphernes as he forsees his "Trophies all thrown down agen, / By the base passions of a lustful Queen" (IV.7-8).
The rise and fall of fortunes affects all of the characters. Alcibiades is accused of treason by Tissaphernes, but he makes a moving statement of his innocence. The King believes the statement is hypocrisy: "Thus Traytors in their fall are like the Sun, / Who still looks fairest at his going down" (IV.428-429). As the King moves to have Alcibiades imprisoned the Queen sees the act as prefigurative. In soliloquy she speaks as though addressing the King: "In this beginning of his fall th'ast shown / But the imperfect figure of thy own" (IV.545-546). The final scenes of the play provide a kind of cosmic rise and fall of the forces of good and evil. Alcibiades wildly hopes that Timandra may survive the poison she has been given, but then he recognizes that she is "gone too far: / Yonder she Mounts, triumphant Spirit stay: / See where the Angels bear her Soul away!" (V.473-475). In contrast to Timandra's triumphant ascent, the Spartan Queen stabs herself and proclaims: "Thus I descend below to a reward. / I shall be Queen of fate: the furies there / For me a glorious Crown of Snakes prepare" (V.510-512).

The imagery of flame, of fetters, and of rise and fall contribute to an impression of flux as the medium of political action and personal relationships. From the moment of Alcibiades' first iconoclasm until the final paradoxical fall and simultaneous rise of Alcibiades and Timandra, the characters attempt to stabilize their relationships and fulfill their desires. The imagery and the use of the vocabulary of relationships both suggest that any ultimately successful stable
pattern which at the same time allows for fulfillment of self-interest is perhaps impossible of attainment. The last moments of the play suggest that the marriage of Patroclus and Draxilla might establish such stability, but, at the same time, the marriage is not achieved as the play ends, and stability remains a hope. In any case, the play definitely argues that it is in the area of politics that any viable moral pattern must be established.

3. Politics--

Otway's political ideals, insofar as they can be abstracted from this and other plays, are unoriginal and unimaginatively expressed. The ideal state, the plays suggest, is one controlled by a strong monarch (or other single central figure) whose self-control and concern for the well-being of his subjects guarantees a healthful political and moral climate. The chief threats to a ruler of this kind are his own passions and the dark policies and factions of those in his entourage.

Faction and the self-interest which inspires faction, lead to chaos:

In States those monstrous many-headed pow'rs Of private int'rest publick good devours. 'Tis true, when in their hands a rule they gain, They know to use that pow'r, not maintain; Like Pyrats in a Fleet, a while they may Seem dreadful; but when by some juster force Oppos'd-- Each his own safety seeks, and shrinks away. (III, 17-24)
As the Spartan forces triumph over those of Athens the King explains his power in an image which carries almost all allusions to politics, good and evil:

Thus must proud States submit when Monarchs claim:
They govern in a rude disorder'd frame,
As Stars in a dim Senate rule the Night,
But vanish at the Suns more Potent light.

(III.9-12)

The monarch is a source of light; his influence is beneficial, "dispensing its kind influence on all" (I.224). In contrast, Tissaphernes, who swears "in the name of Pluto" (III.339), works toward "dark ends" (III.318). The Queen of Sparta, who dies with the words, "Now noble Charon! hoyse up Sayl for hell" (V.514), works from the pattern of a "black design" (V.503). Theramnes vows vengeance to Alcibiades: "By all despairs dark arts thy fall design, / Till in thy blood I write Timandra mine" (III.103-104).

As the forces of darkness and deceit work in the play, Otway makes use of two stage devices to point up the encroaching evil and its effects. The first is the appearance of the ghost of Theramnes to Tissaphernes. The ghost announces he has come:

From deepest horror of eternal night,
Where Souls in everlasting torments groan,
Where howling fiends lye chain'd, and there's no light,
But thickest darkness covers everyone.

(V.7-10)

He warns Tissaphernes: "'Twere fit that thy repentence soon begin" (V.13), and, although Tissaphernes scoffs at such superstition, when the time comes for him to kill the King he finds (echoing
Hamlet), "There is in majesty a secret charm, / That puts a fetter on a Traytors arm" (V.141-142), and he cannot do it.

The second device is a masque, representing a dream of Timandra's. The masque affords an opportunity for Otway to make use of stage machinery and spectacle—the scene changes from the inside of a tent to Elysium; a "glorious Temple appears in the Ayr, where the Spirits of the happy are seated"—but the spirits of the masque use the darkness and light imagery to contrast the situation in Sparta to that Timandra will experience after death.

Round about this place we range,
And it's gloomy darkness change,
To a bright delightful Grove,
A proper Scene for happy love.
(V.266-269)

The spirits only momentarily "disperse the black Clouds that are here" (V.265). The Queen of Sparta enters as Timandra awakens and at the end of this scene there is nearly perfect darkness with the Queen, Timandra, and Alcibiades all dead. The play concludes, as has been mentioned, with a hint of future order, but the "black horrours" of Tissaphernes' soul and the Queen's lust have left Patroclus ruler of Athens at such cost that he finds the crown "but the shadow of a happiness" (V.535). The imagery of light and darkness works throughout the play to make a sharp distinction between the healthful and the sick state, and the clash of the forces of light and darkness leaves behind the "shadow" situation of new hope obtained at a terrible expense of life.
4. Villainous Definition--

Norman Holland has described a rhetorical device in Restoration comedy which he calls the "right-way--wrong-way simile." This is a form of irony in which a rhetorical figure functions on two levels. For example, in Otway's *The Souldiers Fortune* Sir Jolly Jumble is described as "the glory of the age" (II.1). Sir Jolly is a drunkard, a pimp, and possibly homosexual. On one level, then, the satire rests with the word *glory*, an impossible estimate of Sir Jolly's worth. On the other hand, the description makes a comment on the age as well--in an age of universal pimping Sir Jolly is the glory.

Restoration tragedy does not provide an exact parallel to the right-way--wrong-way figure, but there is an analogous device which relies upon definitions. The use of villainous definitions is not unique to the Restoration. Rather, it is part of a tradition associated with Iago. Iago continually redefines words as he establishes his point of view in the other characters of the tragedy: "...honor is an essence that's not seen. / They have it very oft that have it not" (IV.1.16-17). The Restoration villains use this device of redefinition extensively. There is rarely a "right-way" definition provided to go with the "wrong-way" redefinition of the villain, but there is no need for one. The playwright can rely on the audience's own definitions to provide the standard by which the villainous redefinition must be judged.
The mention of an abstract virtue in the presence of villainy is almost sure to bring forth a scoffing redefinition. Timandra rejects Theramnes and recommends, "'Tis Patience best befits a gallant breast." "Patience!" Theramnes replies, "What's that? the Mistress of tame Fools, / That can in nothing else employ their souls" (I.167-168).

As Tissaphernes and the Spartan Queen redefine words to suit themselves they are in part acting from expediency. They must argue in this way in order to break down the arguments of their opponents. Patroclus is astounded to discover his father's hatred of Alcibiades partly because Patroclus does not recognize court dissimulation. He asks his father:

Was't not your love that did our friendship joyn? Did not your kind embraces second mine? Tissaphernes! Love! and kindness! What are these? The outward varnish that our hearts disguise. Hast thou so long with Courts conversant been, The various turns of power and greatness seen, And hast thou not this mistery yet found, Always to smile in's face we mean to wound? (III.211-218)

When Theramnes is a little reluctant to follow Tissaphernes' suggested plan of rape and murder he asks that they act swiftly:

"Something like Conscience else may all defeat, / You know Sir I'm but a raw villain yet." Tissaphernes supplies the needed salve:

"Conscience! a trick of State, found out by those / That wanted power to support their Laws" (III.352-355). The Queen's definitions of husband and a sister's love have already been noted in the
discussion of relationships within this play.

Expediency dictates this type of argument in part, but the villainous definitions also function to define villainy. As concepts such as patience, virtue, love are defined so as to move them completely away from their normal denotations, the villains are obviously destroying the foundations on which the moral order rests. Tissaphernes tells Patroclus to "do as becomes your Vertue and my Son" (III.226). Vertue, in this command, means that standard which allows willful murder for reasons of ambition, and son is one who kills at his father's command. (Patroclus does go on to act as becomes his vertue, but vertue defined the "right-way." ) The sharp dichotomies of this tragedy are not superficial. Villainous definition provides a foundation, an outlook on life, which supports a world of its own. There are two worlds portrayed in the play just as there are two definitions of virtue, or patience, or conscience. They are the worlds which are separated by the distinctions implied in the opposition of light and darkness, freedom and fetters, ascent and descent.

The two worlds of villainy and goodness have ideals which are superficially the same, just as their vocabularies are the same. Both, for example, admire the "great" or "noble" soul. The distinction between the two worlds comes through as members of each elaborate on the "great soul." Early in the play, Alcibiades is banished from Athens and leaves without a word to Timandra.
She feels he has left her, but Draxilla offers another suggestion:

Madam, if he be gone, 'tis to obtain
A nobler lustre, and return again:
Think you his great soul could with patience see
His rifl'd Honours heap'd on's Enemy;
And not his Rage have grown to that excess,
As must have ruin'd all your happiness?
But he withdrew, and like a Zealous Hermit did forgoe
Those little Toys, to gain a Heav'n in you.

(I.51-58)

In contrast to the great soul who ascetically withdraws in order to gain greater glory, the great soul admired by the Spartan Queen is one whose glory is of the flesh. She asks:

Give me the Soul that's large and unconfin'd;
Free as the Ayr, and boundless as the Wind:
Nature was then in her first excellence,
When undisturb'd with puny Conscience,
Mans Sacrifice was pleasure, his God, sence.

(II.185-189)

In these two passages definition and redefinition, employing the same vocabulary, provide an excellent example of the neat division of good and evil presented in the play. The villains and the heroes inhabit the same world, employ the same vocabulary, and make use of the same appearances, but their differences are fundamental. The division into good and evil groups is perhaps too neat in this play, with the polarities carefully marked by such imagery of extremes as fetters and freedom, light and dark. It is not until The Orphan and Venice Preserv'd that such sharp divisions begin to break down and it becomes difficult to separate the right way and the wrong way.

5. Sentimental Forms--
Otway felt he could "boast" that he had the talent "to draw
Tears from the Eyes of the Auditors, at least from those whose
Souls were capable of so Noble a pleasure." Scenes in which
characters are torn between divergent roles were sure to produce
this noble pleasure, especially if reference could be made to mother-
love and dying prayers as Patroclus does to Tissaphernes (III.239-
242). The tension of relationships can produce emotions other than
pity (as, for example, when Timandra boldly denies the Spartan
Queen [V.323-326]), but reference to the distresses attendant upon
place and power are obvious appeals to sympathy. Timandra ex-
plains:

...had I naked to the World been left,
Of Honour, and its gaudy Plumes bereft:
Yet all these I with gladness could resign,
So Alcibiades had still been mine.

(I.45-48)

Even the Spartan Queen feels the discomfort of place without satis-
faction. In a typical use of definition she seems to echo Timandra:

Majesty! what's that?
Th' Ill-natur'd pageant mockery of fate;
When her ungrateful sportive pow'r she'd show,
Raising us high---
To barr us of the benefits below.

(II.144-148)

Alcibiades also laments in this vein, wishing for the happy life of
humble contentment:

Why was I not born to a common fate,
Free from the glorious troubles of the great,
So in some humble Cell my years have spent,
Blest with a private peaceable content?
The vulgar mortal feels not fortunes harms,
The highest structures still are shook with storms.
(IV.9-14)

Laments of this kind are fairly frequent in the play, and coming
as they do from those who have power and place, they are repeti-
tious examples of self-pity.

One common sentimental device is the repetition of an emo-
tional scene—once in action and the second time in retelling.
Alcibiades is without such double scenes, but a variation of this
technique does occur. Timandra wants to test Alcibiades' devotion
after she has followed him to Sparta and so rather than confront
him, she stands back hidden while Draxilla tells Alcibiades that
Timandra died of grief at his leaving. "Relate," Alcibiades says,
"oh quickly, is my Princess well?" Draxilla's reply is twenty-
three lines long—a vivid, prolonged narrative of the supposed fatal
night. The last part of this described scene will illustrate the tone
and method of the whole.

Sometimes she started, then stood still and talkt:
Anon, repeat some short and pithy pray'r;
Agen grow wild, and tear her preitious hair;
Till having so wrought sorrow to that height,
That her soul grew too tender for the weight:
E're I my courage could collect to go,
And give a hinderance to the fatall blow,
She with her Dager stab'd her self, and said,
Thus dy'd Timandra that unhappy Maid.
(II.79-87)

There is no dramatic purpose in this long description other than its
affective power. The event described did not occur and in a few
lines Timandra reveals herself and the lovers are reconciled. It
is an example of Otway's use of what Moody Prior calls, "sad
vignettes," short scenes which delay the progress of the action
momentarily to present a kind of emotional tableau.

Eric Erämetsä has written, "the most typical sentimental
stylistic device seems to be hyperbole, of which several types
occur." Otway repeatedly makes use of a type I think could
be called the sentimental absolute. These expressions are absolute
in the sense that they are positive and peremptory and also that they
are attempts to convey ultimate extremes. The term was suggested
by the following example. Alcibiades is speaking to Patroclus:

In gallantry you are so absolute,
That I grow faint, and flag in the pursuit.
Yet that return accept in silence here,
Which is so great 'twill no expression bear.

(III.142-145)

These exaggerated statements are a type of explicitness, and imply
poetic failure; that is, they suggest that the poet has conceived an
emotion raised to a high pitch, and yet he is unable to convey this
emotion except by confessing the inability to express it. For ex-
ample, when Alcibiades learns Timandra is not dead (as Draxilla
had reported her to be) he says, "The Joy's too mighty for me to
receive; / This was the greatest bliss Heav'n had to give"
(II.103-104). This exclamation may be acceptable as an expression
of Alcibiades' extreme delight, but it relies on the explicit statement
of extremes--"too mighty," "greatest"--and the sure-fire emotional
word heaven.
The combination of the emotional token such as heaven or an abstraction such as misery and the superlative or comparative degree of the adjective structure the bulk of Otway's sentimental absolutes:

Not new-made mothers to their infants bear
A firmer passion or a tend'rer care.

(IV.70-71)

Then to all hopes of happiness adieu,
Since my chief bliss I've lost in losing you.

(IV.132-133)

Imagine ev'ry form of misery;
And when y'ave summed up all, then look on me.

(IV.255-256)

What is't that a faithless Woman will not do!
Henceforth all Loyalty and love farewell.

(V.155-156)

These expressions exist for the moment. They seldom carry important meaning for the play as a whole. The reference to "new-made mothers" for example, is made by Alcibiades to the Spartan Queen. He is verbally fencing with her, trying to put off her lustful intentions. He has, in fact, no such emotion for her. Here, just as in his suggestion of a brother-sister relationship between them, he is attempting to temper her emotions with softer ones. These expressions function as do the sad vignettes, i.e., for their momentary emotional effectiveness.

Alcibiades exhibits all the characteristics of sentimental drama, with the distinction noted earlier--there is no assumption of fundamental human goodness. The Queen of Sparta and Tissaphernes die totally unrepentant and unredeemed. Tissaphernes'
last words expound his "religion": "leave nothing ill undone" (V.243).

The other characteristics of the sentimental are present: a moral
element (particularly in the speeches of Draxilla), greater appeal
to the emotions than the intellect (achieved primarily by the ex-
plicit rhetoric), eschewal of humor, repetition and prolongation of
emotional scenes, frequent appeals to pity, and the absence of sub-
plots or elements that might distract from the sentimental purpose.
THE PATTERN OF RELATIONSHIPS

Queen of Sparta  ───────  King of Sparta
                     │
                     └───┘
                        Alcibiades  ───────  Timandra

Tissaphernes
(Spartan General)

Patroclus  ───────  Draxilla

Theramnes
(Athenian General)

Love (or lust)  ───────

Marriage  ────┐

Blood Relation  ───────

Friendship  ────────
NOTES TO CHAPTER III


2 Otway's major source for the play is Plutarch's life of Alcibiades. Otway's use of his source, here and in every play, is extremely eclectic. Timandra, for example, is only one of Alcibiades' many mistresses, in Plutarch's account, but she is the one with whom he is living when he is killed for political reasons. Tissaphernes, in Plutarch, is the military commander for the King of Persia, not the King of Sparta, and, in Plutarch, Alcibiades has a child by the wife of the Spartan King. (I have used the "Dryden" translation of Plutarch's Lives of the Noble Greeks and Romans, revised by Arthur Hugh Clough, [N.Y., Modern Library, n.d.]).

3 Tissaphernes reveals his character and jealousy completely in the soliloquy quoted in Chapter I, "Explicitness."

4 The scene covers 96 of 421 lines.

5 The Language of Tragedy, p. 171.

6 Otway found the story of the drunken iconoclasm in Plutarch, where it is recounted as having been used (apparently without justification) by Alcibiades' political enemies to have him stripped of command in Athens.

7 Otway's political point of view is hardly unique. It can be paralleled in the plays of Dryden, Banks, Southerne, Orrery, and Lee among his contemporaries.

8 The First Modern Comedies, p. 80.

9 Preface to Don Carlos, Works, I.174.

10 See also IV.141-146, IV.294-295, V.110-125 (a song), V.407-408, V.536-537 (the last lines of the play).

11 The Language of Tragedy, p. 190. Prior is speaking of scenes of this kind in Venice Preserv'd.

IV

DON CARLOS (1675)

1. Familial Relationships--

Don Carlos has a plot which has some similarities with that of Othello. A crafty villain brings the man he serves to a height of jealousy concerning a totally virtuous wife. Otway's variations on this "Othello" plot are typical of his use of complex relationships. Don Carlos is heir to the Spanish throne, now occupied by King Philip. The Queen, a young Frenchwoman, had been promised to Don Carlos until French political expedience and Philip's growing desire made it more profitable for her to be married to the King. Carlos and the Queen remain in love, but both acknowledge the claims of her marriage and their love remains honorable. Rui-Gomez, an intimate servant of the King's, stirs the King to jealousy of Don Carlos and the Queen, prompted partly by desire for power, and partly by the desire to satisfy the demands of his wife, the Duchess of Eboli. The Duchess' lust had been directed to the King, unsuccessfully, and she is presently involved in an affair with the King's bastard brother, Don John of Austria. Her attention turn to Don Carlos, and his refusal of her favor helps precipitate the final catastrophe. The jealous King has both Carlos and the Queen killed. Rui-Gomez stabs the adulterate Eboli and the King dispatches Rui-Gomez.

The line of action is more compressed in time than was true of Alcibiades. The triangle created by the love of father and son
for the same woman exists as the play opens and the rank of these characters produces the double roles of Father-King, Son-Prince, Mistress (or wife)-Queen. The stresses produced by the antagonistic relationships pervade the entire play, and, unlike the key scenes structured on the language of familial relationship found in Alcibiades, Don Carlos makes use of this language and its emotional connotations throughout. Like Alcibiades, the strain of antagonistic roles effects some characters involved in the triangular situation more than others. The Queen, for the most part, accepts her place as the wife of King Philip. She tells Carlos:

"My Heart and Faith become your Fathers right, / All other passions I must now forget" (II.247-248). She does not manage to forget her earlier love, but she at no time indicates a willingness to act in a manner dishonorable to her role as Queen.

Don Carlos feels the pinch of divided roles from the outset. In outline, his attitudes toward the demands of the father-son relationship move from tension to rejection to acceptance. As the play opens, he is questioning the degree of validity of his relationship to his father and his king. He tempts himself with a villainous definition such as was used in Alcibiades.

Curse! What's obedience? a false Notion made
By Priests, who when they found old Cheats decay'd,
By such new Arts kept up declining Trade.
A Father oh! --

(I.14-17)

Obedience, Carlos recognizes instantly, is not a "cheat," but he
cannot, as the King suggests, let his "Father's happiness" be his (I.57). The Queen was once "Decreed" to Carlos and his love leads him to see the King as a rival, rather than as a parent. Carlos's friend and confidant the Marquis of Posa warns him: "You should correct desires that drive you on, / Beyond that duty which becomes a Son" (II.315).

At first Carlos fought only his own desires, but as the play progresses, the King is driven to jealousy and Carlos is himself in the double role of son and rival. He is warned, again by Posa:

The King, the King your Fathers jealous grown;
Forgetting her, his Queen, or you his Son.
(III.194-195)

As the King "forgets" that Carlos is his son and begins to think of him as a rival and perhaps a traitor, the King and Prince confront each other and Carlos, in an attempt to save the Queen from his father's jealous anger, places himself in the line of fire: "First look on me whom once you called your Son: / A Title I was alwaies proud to own" (III.287-288). Carlos harps on this relationship, hoping to temper the King's anger and make him aware of the extent to which his jealousy has alienated him from normal paternal affection. He addresses the King: "Father, if I may dare to call you so, / Since now I doubt if I'm your Son or no..." (III.309-310). And, a few lines later, he recalls what it was like when they were truly father and son:

Time was that we were smil'd on by our fate,
You not Unjust, nor I unfortunate.
Then, then, I was your Son and you were glad
To hear my early praise was talk't abroad.
(III.317-320)

The King is temporarily mollified by Carlos and the Queen, but his
jealousy is aroused soon again.

Carlos reacts differently to this renewed anger and his father's
stronger steps against him. Whereas he had protested his devotion
in the scene just noted, Carlos's mind turns now to the rights his own
role carries: "Father! and King! both names bear mighty sence: /
Yet sure there's something too in Son, and Prince" (IV.16-17).

Consciousness of the injuries done him and his prerogatives as
Prince and son grow in Carlos, and when the King moves to have him
made prisoner (Rui-Gomez has led the King to believe Carlos wants
power), Carlos rejects the father-son relationship completely:

A prisoner! what new game of Fate's begun?
Henceforth be ever curst the name of Son:
Since I must be a Slave because I'm one.
Duty! to whom? He's not my Father: no:
Back with the orders to the Tyrant go,
Tell him his Fury drives too much one way;
I'm weary on't, and can no more obey. 1
(IV.159-165)

This angry rejection is the low point of the father-son relationship
from Carlos's position. Later in the long fourth Act he is able to
ask his father: "Behold me as your poor unhappy Son" (IV.459). He
has acted as he has, he tells the King, only "when you forgot a
Father's Love, and quite / Depriv'd me of a Sons and Princes right"
(IV.500-501). Carlos and the King are not brought into accord until
Carlos is dying, but Carlos never again rejects the relationship
between them. Dying, Carlos can even admit that little guilt
which is his: "I was a wicked Son, Indeed I was; / Rebel to yours
as well as Duties Laws" (V.406-407).

The pattern of tension-rejection-acceptance in the father-son
relationship is fulfilled by Don Carlos. The King's pattern, though
similar, is slightly different. As the play opens the King is free
of doubt or suspicion and extremely happy in his new bride. He hopes
that Carlos will share his happiness (I.56-57). As Rui-Gomez works
on his jealousy, the King begins to distrust Carlos and the Queen.
The King's use of the language of family relationship is extremely
limited in the first four Acts. His jealousy has, as Carlos tells him,
blinded his sense of the father-son relationship. When the King does
mention it, his emphasis falls on the putative affair of Carlos and
the Queen, and not on his relationship to either: "A Queen and Son's
Incest! dismal thought!" (III.27). It is always other characters who
bring the relationship to his attention. Rui-Gomez, in his Iago-like
hints and stifled musings, will say, "I'm thinking what it is to have
a Son..." (IV.266). Posa, stabbed by Rui-Gomez at the King's
command, tries to tell the King of the virtue of Carlos and the Queen.
His last words, "be mindful of your Queen and Son" (IV.428), serve
only to aggravate the King who is already too mindful of the pair.

The irony of Posa's words as the King understands them lies
in the word "your." The Queen is not his, he believes, and Carlos
does not act as his son. The extent to which his passion has taken
him is revealed in two important scenes. In the first of these the King revokes his relationship to Carlos in an especially crude way. Carlos has begged (provoking the same unconscious irony that Posa had) that the King not spill that "blood which is [his] own," i.e., Carlos's. The King replies:

Yes! When my blood grows tainted I ne'er doubt
But for my health 'tis good to let it out:
But thine's a stranger like thy soul to me,
Or else be curs't thy Mother's memory:
And doubly curst be that unhappy night,
In which I purchased torment with delight.

(IV.461-466)

Carlos is moved by this slight to his mother to momentarily renounce "all rights of blood," but his sense of duty prevails and he acknowledges the King to be his "Father still." The King, however, is not satisfied, and plans a revenge upon the Queen which he feels diabolically suitable. He arranges for the murder of Carlos and the slow poisoning of the Queen. He will appear to her as she dies, disguised as Carlos. The plans are carried out, but the Queen recognizes him immediately.

"Too well she knew him not to find the cheat," the King says, revealing for the last time his own blindness. He is oblivious of the fact that it is himself the Queen knows too well not to find the cheat (V.123). The revenge he planned to "Glut [his] rage," is a failure, and, moreover, unworthy of him. His revenge, the Queen tells him, was "much fitter for a Woman than a King" (V.174).

Philip soon learns the truth of the scheming of Rui-Gomez and Eboli and his proper emotions pour back in him. He sends hurried
word to Carlos of a "Father's pénitence" (V.322), believes himself "no more [Carlos's] Father, but the worst of slaves" (V.346) as the result of his passion, and pleads that Carlos hear his "wretched Father sue" (V.353): "My Love, My Carlos, I'm thy Father, speak!" (V.462). Carlos and the Queen die and the King goes mad, aware of his failure as father, as husband, and as King:

...King! it is too little; I'll be more
I tell thee: Nero was an Emperour,
He kill'd his Mother; but I've that out-done,
Murder'd a Loyal Wife, and Guiltless Son.
(V.476-479)

The King's madness here would prefigure the collapse of the state he leads, but he had earlier provided for this (though at the time he was expressing no more than his hatred for Carlos). He made his half-brother, Don John, "Heir of Spain, and [his] adopted Son" (V.80).

The sudden reiteration of the word "father" by the King in the final scene of the play is a proper reflector of his new and grievous knowledge of the role he should have played throughout, but the repetition is also a typical Otwayan sentimental device. Philip is no longer a king or an injured husband but a bereaved father, and his speeches harp on it. He is now the center of sympathy, the piteous object, as he seeks forgiveness from the Queen and his son. Through the first four Acts, on the other hand, sympathy had centered on Don Carlos and the intimate language of relationships ran through his speeches. Relatively little dialogue is allotted the Queen herself--
she stands as a selfless object of love or desire—but her dying explanations to the King contain the language of relationship. "Not your own Daughter could have loved you more," she tells him, revealing her constant affection for him and at the same time placing them in different generations, a fact the king had ignored in his selfish love (V.154). The action of Don Carlos is in part structured on an investigation of the relationship of father and son and the responsibilities of both roles. Simultaneously, the highly emotional connotations of these roles are used to provide the maximum emotional affectiveness.

The vocabulary of relationships can be neutral of emotional value. The Duchess of Eboli, for example, is simply identifying two men when she says, "Neglected! Scorned! by Father and by Son" (IV.101). She has suffered a double affront which seems somehow more intense because of the relationship between the two men, but none of the usual emotional connotations of the terms father and son are present. Further, in a closed society such as the play presents, one would expect salutations and simple address to include "father" and "son." Nevertheless, these last pages have indicated that the use of this vocabulary is consciously arranged: The relative lack of emphasis by the King on the role of father until the final scene, for example; or the shifting value of "son" as Don Carlos is a tormented son, then no son at all, and finally a devoted and forgiving son. Don John, as another example, is the illegitimate half-brother
of the King, yet this information is not revealed until the fourth Act although Don John appears from the beginning of the second Act. It is not until Don Carlos's fortunes are at a low point and Otway has made full use of Don John as an Edmund-like misanthrope,² that Don John takes Carlos's side. He does this by redefining relationships as he talks with Carlos:

    The King your Father is my Brother, true,
    But I see more that's like myself in you.
    Freeborn I am, and not on him depend:
    Oblig'd to none but whom I call my friend.
    And if that Title you think fit to bear,
    Accept the confirmation of it here.

    (IV.137-142)

The words "The King your Father is my Brother" give the first mention of the relationship between Don John and the King. The brothers had been in conversation earlier, but Otway did not make use of the relationship until the meeting with Carlos. Otway saved it up, as it were, until it could be used to the greatest advantage. Here as in his other plays, Otway is in command of the possibilities of the familial situation he presents. The situation does not dictate vocabulary to him.

2. Seeing is Believing--

    Don Carlos is a play of mistaken appearances, and like others with this theme, much depends on seeing, i.e., perceiving. The Duchess of Eboli and Rui-Gomez plot to raise the King's jealousy by presenting him with circumstantial evidence of the affair between
Carlos and the Queen. Eboli sends Gomez to the lovers to,

Watch every look, each quick, and subtle glance,
Then we'll from all produce such Circumstance
As shall the King's new Jealousie advance.
(I.203-204)

There are so many lines, images, and actions in this play which
depend upon sight and the related contrast of light and dark that
this one mode of perception seems to be the only source of know-
ledge. (In The Orphan similar concentration on the sense of
hearing occurs.) The repetitive use of the sense of sight as a means
of knowledge is complicated and mixed with the frequent use of the
courtly love tradition that love passes between the eyes of the
lovers: "That glance seems as it sent his heart to her" (III.351). 3

Another complicating factor is the extensive use of gesture in the
play, usually that associated with "whining love." 4 Carlos on his
knees to the Queen will ask, "Was I ne'r in this posture seen before?"
(II.230). The use of gesture, the powerful eyes of lovers, and the
sense of sight as the major epistemological channel all blend in the
language of the play into close associations. All three come to-
together, for example, in a scene in which the King learns from Rui-
Gomez that Carlos and the Queen "gaz'd" at one another, but "'twas
not very long" (II.134). The King replies, "why a Soul in less time
flyes / To Heaven: and they have changed theirs at their Eyes"
(II.137-138). Thus a gesture observed by Rui-Gomez is interpreted
by the King as an obvious proof of love.

The epistemological use of sight and seeing centers in the King.
He, like Othello, demands "ocular proof." The King and Othello exhibit a pseudo-rational desire for evidence; they ask for proof in the form of data (the observable, testable), while their actions depend instead upon emotions alone. The King demands: "Lead me where I may their Incest see" (II.71). He is not asking for evidence, obviously, but for corroboration. He is already emotionally certain of the incest, but he would appease his reason. Ironically, the King feels his perception is "clearer" now that he is suspicious. As a result, he can be duped by Gomez's device of seeming to mean more than he says. Here Gomez protests no ill-meaning in his reports:

Rui. Good Heaven forbid that I should ever dare
To Question Virtue in a Queen so fair.
Though she her Eyes cast on her Glorious Son,
Men oft see Treasures and yet covet none.

King. Think not to blind me with dark Ironies,
The Truth disguis'd in Obscure Contraries
No, I will trace his windings; All her dark
And subtlest paths, Each little Action mark.

(II.168-175)

Despite the bold claim of ability to trace dark windings of action, the King is befuddled by his emotions. The Queen enters at the word mark, and the King is strongly disturbed:

Ha! here! oh let me turn away my Eyes.
For all around she'll her bright beams display:
Should I to gaze on the wild Meteor stay,
'Spight of my self I shall be led astray.

(II.177-180)

He is, of course, led astray in spite of himself, but not through the influence of the Queen.
Before the King realizes he "was Curs’t, and blindly led astray" (V.417), he pursues evidence, either first- or second-hand, until he is convinced of the guilt of Don Carlos and the Queen. He waits, he explains, "'Till to my eyes my wrongs themselves display" (IV.317). Letters discovered on Posa's body, for example, seem to implicate the Prince in treason, and the King is almost jubilant: "See Gomez! practices against my crown" (IV.433). A few lines later he finds Don Carlos and the Queen talking together:

Look my incestuous Son and Wife appear!
See Gomez, how she languishes and dyes,
'Sdeath! There are very pulses in her eyes.

(IV.450-452)

When enough instances of this sort have combined to convince him, the King plans the revenge mentioned earlier. He will visit the dying Queen disguised as his son. But, importantly, the facts of her death and his masquerade are not sufficient. Instead, he arranges a kind of final tableau—one that will satisfy his sight as well as his revenge. He gives orders to Eboli:

Go: that my vengeance I may finish quite,
'Twould be imperfect should I lose the sight.
But to contrive that I may not be known,
And she may still mistake me for my Son:
Remove all Lights but that which may suffice
To let her see me scorn her when she dies.

(V.33-38)

In this tableau he hopes to glut his rage, "and smiling see her dye" (IV.659).

The event of her death occurs, but his satisfaction is altogether
missing. He has, he says, "been Curs't and blindly led astray."
Furthermore, there is little satisfaction in dealing justice to Rui-
Gomez. Once earlier in the play he had turned on Gomez, who
immediately hid behind the potential split between appearance and
reality:

Your Queen and Son may yet be innocent,
I know but what they did, not what they meant.

(III.118-119)

There is validity in Rui-Gomez's plea. Neither he, nor the King,
knows what was meant. In the same way there is some validity in
Gomez's final protestation of innocence. He can truthfully say to
the King, "You sent me as a Spy upon the Prince" (V.279). In a
final irony of this language of sight as a mode of knowledge, Carlos
is brought before the King, moribund, "supported between two, and
bleeding." Don John turns to Philip and says, "See Sir, your Son"
(V.343). The King, while he insisted that his sight be satisfied, had
been blind throughout. He regains his sight, his ability to perceive
clearly, only to be shown his dying son.

Rui-Gomez suffers an ironic form of poetic justice within the
pattern of sight and perception. All the while he is bringing the King
to believe the Queen is an adultress, his own wife, the Duchess of
Eboli, is cuckolding him with Don John and attempting to do the same
with Don Carlos. Gomez is unaware of this until a scene in which
he is leading the King to the Queen's apartment, supposedly to show
the final proof of the Queen's adultery. On the way to the apartment
they discover Don John and Eboli in an embrace. The King exclaims:

Why that's our Brother Austria!
Rui.  And my Wife!
Embracing close; Whilst I was busy grown
In others ruines, here I've met my own.

(IV.442-444)

Gomez is the deceiver deceived. It should be noted that the usual explicitness of language is present in this scene, leaving no doubt as to the fitness of Gomez's "ruine."

Although Alcibiades and Don Carlos show similarities in the use of relationships, other aspects of the plays are radically different. References to love, for example, were conveyed in Alcibiades with the traditional metaphors of flame and fetters. These metaphors are almost completely absent from Don Carlos. Instead, in Don Carlos love is described largely with the language of the eyes. Don John, wooing Eboli, leaves her with a final glance—"Thus sends his Soul in wishes from his eyes" (II.72). The King wants to escape the "bright beams" cast by the Queen (II.178), and talks to her of the time "when first [he] saw, and lov'd [her] tempting eye" (III.267). He says to her:

Oh turn away those Basilisks thy Eyes,
Th' Infection's fatal, and who sees 'em, dyes.

(III.380-381)

Don Carlos explains to the Queen that it is impossible he should not love her:

What stupid Animal could senseless lye,
Quicken'd by beams from that Illustrous eye!

(IV.82-83)
Otway has not variegated his language, but he does appear to have experimented with it in these two early plays. In fact, in the full-length serious plays before *Venice Preserv'd* he seems to have caught on to some new image or device and used it as fully as possible for one play and then rejected it, or suppressed its importance in the plays which follow. In *Caius Marius* numerous animal images appear, only to disappear in *The Orphan*. In the latter play, speech as a means to knowledge is given the kind of single-minded stress that sight receives in *Don Carlos*. *Venice Preserv'd* is his most poetic play in the sense that no single pattern of language seems to dominate it, while at the same time a number of diverse patterns are employed.

3. Gesture—

In *Don Carlos* Otway made use of gesture and that quality of "standing apartness" which scholars have noticed in Restoration drama. The characters refer to themselves and to each other in a manner suitable to narrative; that is, they discuss each other's actions as though there were no audience physically present, capable of visually recording and interpreting action and gesture. In one form of this "objectivity" (keeping in mind that references to gesture are, in part, simply stage directions) the function is apparently to clarify the import of a gesture or a glance. Eboli says to Don John, "Your looks speak danger" (II.51). In the last Act of the play Eboli has been stabbed by Gomez, and she pleads
with Don John that Gomez be taken from her sight: "He smiles and mocks me, waiting for my soul: / See how his glaring fiery Eyeballs rowl" (V.252-253). The King enters at one point and Gomez says, "See where he comes with fury in his Eyes" (II.105). An analogous use of this objective commentary is its use to provoke explanation: "What makes you look so wildly? -- why d'you start?" (III.474). A further use is that which intensifies the affective value of a gesture or expression: "Do, take full view of your tall able slave, / Look hard; it is the last y'are like to have" (IV.526-527). The characters, in this way, provide a type of running commentary on their actions and even their postures. Carlos kneels to the Queen and she says, "Nay this strange Ceremony pray give o'er." He replies, "Was I n'er in this posture seen before?" (II.229-230).

The unconsciously ludicrous capstone of gesture and simultaneous commentary comes in the last Act. Don Carlos, his veins cut and poisoned, and the Queen, also poisoned, sink from their chairs and kneel to the King:

Thus with the remains of life we kneel, 
May you be ever free from all that's ill.  
(V.421-422)

This example is somewhat extreme in its strenuous appeal to pity, but the effect of this commentary, when it is used as extensively as it is in this play, is always of this kind if not of this degree.

A comment on a visible gesture or facial expression is a form of explicitness—the action is not permitted to stand the test of
interpretation alone. It is also a sentimental form in that it draws
added attention to an already emotional fact of the play. When Don
Carlos and the Queen sink to their knees they are making a gesture
of affection which must be moving to a sympathetic audience, but
Otway adds an explicit restatement of the action. No opportunity
for emotional appeal is slighted.

4. Fate--

One other aspect of this play might be mentioned. The dying
Carlos says to his father:

Alas! 'tis fate has been to blame, not You,
Who only Honours dictates did pursue.
(V.404-408)

As a statement of fact this couplet is manifestly false. The King is
very much to blame and recourse to fate and honour would be
cowardly and dishonest. But the King does not seek to avoid his
responsibility. Just before he goes mad he warns Don John to
"above all beware of Jealousie. / It was the dreadful Curse that
ruin'd me" (V.488-489). The action of the play substantiates the
King's judgment as to the cause of the disasters. Carlos's state-
ment about fate might be explained as an attempt to sooth his father's
obvious anguish, but there are other references to fate in the play
which might suggest that Otway saw this force operating in the
events which took place.

Carlos laments: "How are we bandied up and down by Fate, / By so much more unhappy as w'are great" (I.136).
He recalls to the Queen "how fate seem'd kindly to ordain, / That once you should be mine" (II.234-235), and she echoes this later as she says, "How foul a game was play'd us by our Fate!" (III.453). But the Queen had told him earlier in this Act that "Fortune's a Mistriss that's with Caution kind, / Knows that the constant merit her alone" (III.223-224). The concept of Fortune rewarding the meritorious and the concept of fate bandying men up and down are in complete opposition. The NED's first definition of fate is:

The principle, power, or agency by which, according to certain philosophical and popular systems of belief, all events, or some events in particular, are unalterably predetermined from eternity.

This definition, if it is analogous to the one Otway is employing, makes the philosophical structure of the play confused and incoherent. In every instance in which fate is employed in this play, however, the philosophical concept of predetermined actions or events is only vaguely present. Don Carlos and the Queen are not lamenting their lack of freedom to direct their future, although this thought is present in the background, but rather they are lamenting what "has become of a person or thing" (the NED's fourth definition of fate, the first example for which is dated 1768-1774).

We are not privy to Otway's definition of fate, of course, but I would suggest that the play justifies a reading of the term as a convenient abstraction which can be held responsible for a moment of anguish for which the characters themselves feel guiltless.
This reading is possible even when the characters are not, in fact, guiltless. The King says, "My Fates unhappy Engines plot my fall" (III.96), but we, as audience, know that it is not an abstract force which is unalterably determining the events of his life, and he comes to acknowledge this himself. Still, the King at this moment believes all the world is working against him and his blame quite naturally falls on fate. The play does not justify a reading of the action as a constant and thoroughgoing working out of the vagaries of fate.

I do not mean to be raising false problems here, but rather to be approaching the problem of responsibility through reference to a force which would remove responsibility from all the characters if it were seen to be a controlling force of the action. The references to fate always occur at highly emotional moments and apply only to those moments. The King, as has been established, is blind to the meaning of the events around him at the time he blames his "Fates unhappy Engines." The problem of his responsibility is met squarely as he admits guilt, seeks forgiveness from his wife and son, warns Don John of the passion which wrought the final destruction, and finally collapses under the full knowledge of the carnage which he brought about.

This reading at least establishes a reasonable consistency to the philosophical substructure of the play and shows Otway to a degree responsible in his use of these ideas. He was working in a tradition which, as Kathleen Lynch has pointed out, showed fate,
or the stars, or heaven's decree, behind and intimately concerned
with every true love, and further, the allusions to fate are to some
extent verisimilar. Fate and the gods are convenient scapegoats
in any age.
THE PATTERN OF RELATIONSHIPS

Don John ———— King Philip ———— Queen

| Don Carlos |

| Duchess of Eboli ——— Rui-Gomez |

Love (or lust) ———

Marriage ———

Blood Relation ———
NOTES TO CHAPTER IV

1 In a somewhat parallel situation in Aphra Behn's Abdelazer; or The Moor's Revenge (1677), a Spanish Prince Philip rejects his mother, the Queen, for her adultery. The language of relationship is used extensively.

Philip. ...You have abus'd my Royal Father,
For such a Sin the basest of your Slaves
Wou'd blush to call you Mother.
Queen. What means my Son?
Philip. Son! by Heav'n, I scorn the Title.


2 Don John, like Edmund, is an illegitimate son. He has two soliloquies, opening the second and third Acts, which contain sentiments reminiscent of Edmund's soliloquy to Nature and the "plague of custom" (King Lear, I.ii.1-22). Don John's soliloquy at the opening of Act II begins, "Why should dull Law rule Nature?" and that opening Act III begins, "How vainly would dull Moralists impose / Limits on Love...." Otway makes no use of the potential irony of an "unnatural" son taking Nature as his goddess, and Don John is less a villain than he is a libertine. When he tires of Eboli his eyes turn elsewhere, prompting Eboli to do the same and to comment, "I'm as much a Libertine as He" (IV.242). Don John is a disciple of "appetite" in his relations with Eboli, but he has other ideals (honor and, ironically, the value of "blood") which he finds in Don Carlos. He has only a minor role, but the crown would fall to him if the King fails to recover from his madness. Don John has the last words of the play and there reveals that the passionate events that have just occurred have led him to alter his ideals:

No more in Loves Enervate charms I'le ly,
Shaking off softness, to the Camp I'le fly;
Where Thirst of Fame the active Hero warms,
And what I've lost in Peace, regain in Arms.

3 Thus Chaucer's Troilus falls in love with Criseyde as her glance falls on him in church. Troilus had thought himself impervious to love, Chaucer says:

And scorned hem that Loves peynes dryen,
Was full unwar that Love hadde his dwellynge
Withinne the subtile stremes of hir yen;
That sodeynly him thoughte he felte dyen,
Right with hire look, the spirit in his herte.


4 David S. Berkeley, "The Art of 'Whining' Love," SP, LI (1955), 478-496, has given this term to that apparently formalized ritual of gesture, attitude, and posture in which the romantic lover (i.e., one acting in the manner of the heroes of French romance) externalized his feelings (pp. 481-484). The gestures included frequent kneeling before the beloved ("dying") and the whoining eloquence included frequent adoration of the beloved as a goddess or a saint.

5 Othello, III.iii.360.

6 The 1676 edition (that followed by Ghosh) reads Sun. My emendation is that of the second (1679) edition.

7 The use of the flame metaphor seems restricted in this play to the obviously hyperbolic or mock-serious use by the lecherous Eboli. The King, for example, is eager for his wedding night and says to the Queen: "Hence to Love's secret Temples let's retire, / There on his altars kindle the Am'rous fire" (I.44-45). Eboli, on the other hand, feigns putting off Don John with, "will nothing then Quench your unruly flame?" (II.37). The one exception to the hyperbolic or mock-serious use comes in an admonition from the Queen to Carlos that he keep his "flame...pure" (II.296).

8 See Chapter I, section IV, "Explicitness."

9 The Social Mode of Restoration Comedy, p. 60.

10 The non-philosophical use of fate can be illustrated in Alcibiades as well. The typical definition seems to involve the outcome of any event, successful or not; that is, fate means "what has become of a person or thing." Timandra uses it in this way when she scorns Theramnes' attempt to capitalize upon Alcibiades' banishment—"As if my love were ballanc't by his Fate," she says (I.134). Theramnes feels her scorn and begs that she "stay and pity a poor Lovers Fate" (I.143). He, in turn, scorns his captor Alcibiades: "though I am your Prisoner, I hate / To hear your pride upbraid me with my Fate" (III.80-81). In the following couplet Theramnes uses fate to indicate a goal he had set for himself (i.e., Timandra's love) as he muses on the rejection he
has suffered and the failure of his scheme to banish Alcibiades and thereby usurp his love: "Thus my mistaking Policy out-run's / My Fate; and I'm by my own Plots undone" (I.163-164). This couplet is perhaps the most self-explanatory example of the non-philosophical use of this term.
I. *Titus and Berenice*

In late 1676 Otway presented two plays, a three-act tragedy and a three-act comedy, for a single night's entertainment. The tragedy was an adaptation of Racine's *Bérénice* and the comedy an adaptation of Molière's *Les Fourberies de Scapin*. The tragedy, *Titus and Berenice*, would give evidence of a contemporary French analogue even if the source were not as well known as it is. The cast is very small (three central figures with one servant each), and the unities of time and action are observed. Action in the physical sense is almost entirely absent.

As the emotional history of Titus and Berenice the play presents a single problem in the form of a necessary choice to be made by Titus. He must choose between his responsibility to Rome and his love, between being an emperor or a lover. Titus had, during his conquest of the middle east, fallen in love with Berenice, the Queen of Palestine. She accompanied him on his return to Rome, and at the time of the play she expects soon to be married to Titus. Antiochus, King of Comagene, accompanied the pair to Rome. He had long been in love with Berenice, and after having been defeated in love and war with Titus he has become the Roman's friend. Soon after Titus returns to Rome his father dies and Titus becomes
Emperor. This event brings the pressure of a Roman law (which he had hoped in some way to avoid) upon him. The law forbids acknowledgement of monarchy in Rome, including the marriage of a Roman ruler and a foreign Queen. Titus finally, with Berenice's help, decides to obey the law. Berenice returns to Palestine and Antiochus to Comagene.

Clearly, any interest the play might have to an audience must stem mainly from the emotions of Titus, Berenice, and Antiochus. The lack of any other interests has led Malcolm Elwin to condemn the play's "academic frigidity and lack of action." The complete concentration upon emotions as a source of dramatic interest, however, indicates that Otway strove for effects other than frigidity. In the portrayal of emotions Elwin's criticism applies most accurately to the character Antiochus. His position in the scheme of things is made clear in the first scene of the first Act, and it does not change. Berenice cannot return his love and his continued presence in Rome can only mean continued suffering on his part.

He tells Berenice at one point that he will leave Rome:

I fly from Titus, that unlucky Name,  
A name which ev'ry Moment you repeat,  
Whilst my poor heart lies bleeding at your feet.  
Farewel! Oh be not at my Ravings griev'd.  
When of my death the news shall be receiv'd,  
Remember why I di'd, and what I liv'd---  
(I.i.142-147)

He does not leave Rome, however, and Berenice does not turn to accept his love. He has, then, only one emotion, and he is frozen
in it. Antiochus rarely "raves" after this scene, but his presence serves little purpose but to show us his "poor heart."

Titus, on the other hand, is caught in a triangular situation. There are two rivals for him: Berenice and Rome. In one respect, Titus is Rome. As his companion Paulinus says to him:

You in your birth for Empire were design'd,  
And to that purpose Heav'n did frame your mind;  
Fate in that day wise providence did shew,  
Fixing the destiny of Rome in you.

(I.ii.80-83)

As the supreme ruler of Rome, Titus and his actions and decisions are Rome's; but as an individual, Titus finds Rome makes demands upon him as a mistress might. He is a fledgling emperor and marriage to Berenice is illegal; therefore, as he describes it:

Rome, my new Conduct now observes: 'twould be  
Both ominous to her, and mean in me,  
If in my Dawn of power to clear my way  
To happiness, I should her Laws destroy.

(I.ii.86-89)

The feminine pronoun for the state reinforces the effect of making the relationship between Titus and Rome personal and emotional—on a par with that between Titus and Berenice. Those around Berenice speak of Rome in this way as well. Berenice's maid tells her: "Rome beholds you but with jealous eyes" (I.i.157), and Antiochus, delivering the news of banishment which Titus feared to deliver in person, explains:

A Queen suspected to Romans Empire grows.  
And Titus cannot with her laws dispence,  
For therefore 'tis you must be banisht hence.

(II.216-218)
Although Titus makes his decision to obey the law early in the play (I.ii.73), he is unable to tell Berenice this personally at first, and when at last he does, he is unwilling to part with her until she understands his motives. She believes he no longer loves her, and it is not until he attempts suicide ("a way by more than one great Roman shown" [III.424]) that she accepts both his love and his decision.

I have said that this play presents Titus in a choice situation--will he accept Berenice or Rome? This description of the play might be modified somewhat by saying that it presents a decision upon a decision, and is, as a result, as attenuated as that modification implies. Titus decides to "part forever from her eyes" in the first Act (I.ii.73). The action of the play is then narrowed to the presentation of his anguish concerning announcement, fulfillment, and consequences of this decision. His inability to reconcile his decision with his desires is, by itself, a narrow subject for emotional drama, but Otway maintains emotional suspense by means of shifting the point of view. Berenice remains unaware of the decision until the second Act, and refuses to accept it until the third. Titus makes his decision, attempts to tell her of it, sends Antiochus with the message, and finally tells her himself. The sequential order of these actions is broken by interweaving scenes. The single problem of the play is viewed differently by the three central characters, and by manipulating the scenes in which they appear Otway maintains a degree of suspense. For example, Act I, scene 1 centers about
Antiochus, his confidant Arasces, and a brief interview with Berenice; I.ii presents Titus and his confidant Paulinus, with Berenice appearing briefly at the end of the scene; Act II involves first Titus and Antiochus and then Antiochus and Berenice.

Within a scene Otway has several techniques for maintaining the action without halting it altogether. In an early confrontation of Titus and Berenice, for example, Titus attempts to tell her of his decision. He first protests his continuing love:

...my heart (since I must speak)
Was ne'r more full of Love or half so like to break.
Ber. What?
Tit. Alas!
Ber. Proceed.
Tit. The Empire Rome---
Ber. Well.
Tit. Oh, the dismal secret will not come---
Away Paulinus, e're I'm quite undone.
My Speech forsakes me and my heart's all stone.

(I.ii.186-190)

Titus has Antiochus bear the news of his decision to Berenice and, as a result, she attributes the unbelievable news to a device on Antiochus's part to abuse her heart and betray his friend (II.205-234). The problem remains unsolved.

The entire play is thus an excellent example of the qualities of prolongation evidenced by sentimental drama. The basic elements of the choice and a tentative decision have been described in the first two hundred and forty-six lines of the play. The remainder depicts the emotions attendant upon putting the decision into effect. We are even aware of Titus's divided emotions about the decision and
Antiochus's frustrated love by line two-hundred and forty-seven. Berenice's reactions to the decision are the only new emotions of the second and third Acts.

Politically, the play adds nothing to the stock ideas and ideals presented in the two plays previously considered. A plot outline of Titus and Berenice would indicate that Titus, unlike the King of Sparta in Alcibiades and King Philip of Don Carlos, is a good king; that is, he checks his personal desires for the greater good of the state. In a totally indefensible reversal, to be considered in a moment, however, Otway destroys this picture. Until this moment is reached and the play ends, Titus undergoes the almost ritual initiation of the monarch of heroic drama—he learns the manifold disadvantages of place and power. In the eyes of others, as he assumes the empire, "The Universe is his, and he is [Berenice's]" (I.i.4). His confidant Paulinus tells him, "Love or not love, Sir, all is in your power" (I.ii.32), but Titus questions this immediately:

> Now they have rais'd me to the Imperial Throne,
> Where on my head continual cares will fall,
> Will they deny me what may sweeten all?  
> (I.ii.43-45)

He learns quickly the distinction between his role in the state and his personal desires:

> Lord of the World, my Empire wide does flow,
> I can make Kings, and can depose 'em too.
> The stubborn'est hearts must to my power bow down,
> And yet I am not Master of my own.  
> (II.92-95)

He is clearly aware of the nature of the problem he faces.
But Otway does not allow this moment to stand alone. The action of the play has been shown to exemplify the sentimental device of prolongation; Titus's dual interests of state and self exemplify the device of repetition. Each restatement of his divided interest is at the same time a statement of the anguish this position causes him, and each restatement becomes increasingly self-pitying as it recalls his earlier protests in the same vein. His rule without Berenice cannot be happy, he says:

Mourning at court, and more exiled than she,  
My Reign but a long Banishment shall be,  
From all those Joys that wait on Pomp and Power.  
(II.120-122)

And later, recognizing his lack of imperial action, he cries, "The golden days where are they to be found, / So much expected, when this head was Crown'd" (III.59-60). The most prolonged passage of this type is that quoted in the first chapter of this study in which Titus states: "who by Greatness e'r did happy grow? / None but the heavy Slave is truly so" (III.224-225).  

Despite these complaints, Titus appears to make his decision on rational and unselfish grounds. The banishment of Berenice is not done to satisfy the people (they are "rude," with "Salvage natures" and capable of "rude affronts" [III.168, 220, 336]), but with the understanding of the kind of anarchy any other decision would seem to justify. "Shall I dare plead the Laws that break 'em first?" he asks (III.131). As the play ends, however, and Berenice has agreed to leave willingly, Otway has Titus make the
following vow (not in Racine):

Now... let Rome of her great Emp'ror boast.
Since they themselves have taught me cruelty,
I'le try how much a Tyrant I can be.
Henceforth all thoughts of pitty I'le disown,
And with my arms the Universe ore-run;
Rob'd of my Love, through ruins purchase fame,
And make the world's [sic] as wretched as I am.

(III.473-479)

This essentially self-pitying declaration of vengeance is inexplicable. If Titus were willing to be a despot he might have kept Berenice despite the law. These are the last words of the play, and they contradict everything which has gone before. They show Titus to be cruel rather than pitiable, and therefore cannot have been included to draw our sympathy to him. The source provides no clue, since this speech is Otway's addition. One possible solution is to view the play as a statement of profound political pessimism. There will be tyrants, oblivious to the population as a whole, no matter what. But this pessimism is contradicted in other plays, and, moreover, gives perhaps too much political emphasis to a play whose primary concern is the portrayal of emotion. It might be this primary concern, in fact, which produced the complete inconsistency of political viewpoint.

A few additional elements of this play might be mentioned before moving to the comic half of this night's entertainment. Gesture is used in the manner described in the last chapter. It is used both to clarify and to seek clarification of emotions. Berenice asks Titus to reveal his thoughts and at the same time she describes him
with the lines: "whence this surprise? / You seem confus'd and turn
away your eyes. / Nothing but trouble in your face I find" (I.ii. 168-
170). The final scene of the play makes extensive use of stock
gesture: the outward signs of inner emotion. As the characters
kneel, rise, and embrace each other they provide a kind of panto-
mime accompaniment to the emotions conveyed in their speeches.

For example, here Titus and Berenice reaffirm their love:

    Tit. Hence, ye perplexing cares that clog a brain,
    Whilst struck with extasie, I here fall down.            Kneels.
    Thus at your feet a happy prostrate laid,
    I'm much more blest than if the world I swaid.
    Ber. Now the blest Berenice enough has seen:
    I thought your love had quite extinguisht been.          Kneels.
    (III.436-441)

Berenice in this last speech calls herself "blest Berenice."

Epithets of this kind have been used in all the plays considered
thus far, and in these plays the epithets lack the complexity with
which they are used in some of the later comedies and tragedies.
They are an explicit factor in the language of a play in that they are
essentially labels, sometimes self-expressive (as Berenice's above)
and sometimes descriptive. Earlier in the play she calls herself
"sad Berenice" (III.177) and "a wretched Queen" (II.175). When the
epithet is descriptive and antagonistic the figure is immediately
associated, even out of context, with sentimental drama and with
melodrama. Antiochus cries, "Oh Berenice, remorseless cruel
fair!" (II.237), and she later angrily calls Titus, "ungrateful perjur'd
Man" (III.183). It might be noted that these epithets are periphrases
structured in the manner of those associated with eighteenth-century "poetic diction." Generic noun and qualifying adjective are the bases of "remorseless cruel fair," just as they are of "finny tribe."
In both instances it is the quality of studied circumlocution in these phrases which makes them unnatural (especially in a highly emotional situation) to the modern ear.

Finally, this play provides evidence of the repetitious nature of some of Otway's plots and characters. This repetitiveness is true throughout Restoration serious plays of this type, but Otway's plays can serve to make the point themselves. In each of the three plays considered to this point, the cast consists of a monarch and those about him. To the extent that the problems confronting these characters are similar, so their speeches and their emotions are similar. Some of the reasons for this stereotyping have been considered earlier in the discussion of the demands made on the playwright by the genre. Only one example of the parallels between these plays will be added here. Compare Titus's speech on his inability to master his own heart (p. 137 above) with the following lament by King Philip:

What's all my Glory? all my Pomp? how poor Is fading greatness, or how vain is pow'r? Where all the mighty Conquests I have seen? I who o're Nations have Victorious been, Now cannot quell one little Foe within.  

(Don Carlos, II.109-113)

Stock set speeches of this kind are present even in those plays in which Otway broke away from the heroic and turned to the domestic
for his subject matter.

II. The Cheats of Scapin

If the unities of Titus and Berenice suggest a possible contemporary French analogue, the neat balance and opposition of older and younger generations, the use of a wily slave, and the "rise" of a mistress to the position of wife in The Cheats of Scapin suggest an analogue in Terence. Otway's source was Molière's Les Fourberies de Scapin (1671); Molière's source was Terence's Phormio. The Cheats of Scapin shows no direct influence of the Latin play, but, rather, it stands as the play Otway least changed from his immediate source. Otway condensed Molière's play, and changed the satiric emphasis slightly, but he did not transmute the material into his own peculiar forms, even when Les Fourberies offered what we might now suspect to be a perfect suggestion for Otwayian manipulation.

In Otway's play, two friends, Thrifty and Gripe, return from separate business trips to discover their sons (Octavian and Leander respectively) have married, without parental consent, girls of unknown parentage, and, more importantly, girls of no dowry. The girls turn out to be the daughters of Thrifty and Gripe and the young men have married each other's sister. The opportunity here for complex use of familial relationships is immediately apparent, but Otway chose instead to follow Molière's emphasis on the fathers and their manipulation by the servant, Scapin. The comic mixups possible with two fathers, two sons, and two daughters are the only rationale
for these pairs; there is nothing in terms of character to differentiate the fathers, or the sons, or the daughters. The names Thrifty and Gripe (a miser or a usurer) are synonymous, and Otway does nothing to distinguish the two men.

It is with Thrifty and Gripe that one might expect Otway to make use of his penchant for familial relations as a dramatic device. The French play (following Terence) contains one important scene from which Otway might have developed some comic distinction between the types of father the two men represented (possibly in the manner of Terence's Adelphoe). Géronte of Molière's farce is triumphing sententiously over Argante. Géronte knows of Argante's son's marriage, but not that of his own son. He suggests that the failure of one's son to act rightly is due to a failure by the father to provide the proper education:

Géronte. ...L'éducation des enfants est une chose à quoi il faut s'attacher fortement.
Argante. Sans doute. A quel propos cela?
Géronte. A propos de ce que les mauvais déportements des jeunes viennent le plus souvent de la mauvaise éducation que leurs pères leur donnent.
* * * * *
Si vous aviez, en brave père, bien morigéné votre fils, il ne vous aurait pas joué le tour qu'il vous a fait.

Argante knows what has happened to his friend's son, and he throws the words back: "et si ce fils que vous avez, en brave père, si bien morigéné, avait fait pis encore que le mien? eh?" 5

Otway's use of his source in this passage is typical of his general method throughout. Like Molière, he does not follow up
the potential contrast in methods of education; his only change is to reduce Molière's scene in length by almost half. Otway's version of this scene is, in part, as follows:

Gripe. In troth, Sir, I'll tell you what I say to you, The Education of Children after the getting of e'm, ought to be the nearest Concern of a Father: And had you tutored your Son with that Care and Duty incumbent on you, he never could so slightly have forfeited his.

Thrifty. Sir, to return you a Sentence for your Sentence. Those that are so quick to Censure and condemn the Conduct of others, ought first to take Care that all be well at home.

(II.6-14)

Otway's condensation of Molière is his most obvious adaptive device. Another type of change is more interesting as an example of variation in comic emphasis.

Both The Cheats of Scapin and Les Fourberies de Scapin emphasize the characters who work to prevent the happiness of the young lovers rather than the discoveries and reconciliations of the lovers themselves, and thus both exhibit clearly the general form, in Northrop Frye's terms, of comic satire or realism rather than romantic comedy. Otway's play differs from Molière's only in detail—he adds no major characters or scenes—but the changes tend to be of a type. Otway's satiric emphasis tends to be concentrated against trade in any form. That is, he makes use of any opportunity to snipe at purely materialistic values, whether in the form of miserliness (as with the fathers), or graft, or greedy lawyers, or forced marriages for profit. Scapin, the crafty parasite, is the central figure of both plays; in both he explains his craft and the
contrast in explanations illustrates Otway's slight shift in emphasis from his source. Molière's Scapin says (in response to praise):

A vous dire la vérité, il y a peu de choses qui me soient impossibles, quand je m'en veux mêler. J'ai sans doute reçu du Ciel un génie assez beau pour toutes les fabriques de ces gentillesses d'esprit, de ces galanteries ingénieuses à qui le vulgaire ignorant donne le nom de fourberies; et je puis dire, sans vanité, qu'on n'a guère vu d'homme qui fut plus habile ouvrier de ressorts et d'intrigues, qui ait acquis plus de gloire que moi dans ces noble métier, mais ma foi! le mérite est trop maltraité aujourd'hui, et j'ai renonce à toutes choses depuis certain chagrin d'une affaire qui m'arriva.

(I.ii)

Otway's Scapin is more terse.

I can cheat upon occasion; but Cheating is now grown an ill trade; yet Heav'n be thank'd, there were never more Cullies and Fools; but the great Rooks and Cheats allow'd by publick Authority, ruin such little Under-traders as I am.

Molière's Scapin is elegantly involved in the "noble métier" provided by "toute les fabriques de ces gentillesses d'esprit"; Otway's Scapin is bluntly a "cheat," but suffering by the competition in cheating on a grand scale allowed by "publick Authority." This heavy-handed directness is an obvious change showing Otway's hand, and the equation of cheating and trade is the central ironic theme of his play.

Scapin makes the equation of cheating and trade clear repeatedly. He explains to the girls, Lucia and Clara, that his "business is, in short, like that of all other men of business, diligently contriving how to play the Knave and Cheat, to get an honest Livelyhood" (III.68-70). In the world of business there are no moral values, and thus Scapin unparadoxically "cheats" to make an "honest Livelyhood." Cheating
is the way of this world, and as Scapin explains further, "Your Men of Wit are good for nothing, dull, lazy, restive Snails; 'tis your undertaking, impudent, pushing Fool, that commands his Fortune" (III.81-83).

Thrifty and Gripe represent the world of trade and their monomaniacal names reflect their characters. Thrifty is lucid about his moral position as he explains his distress concerning his son's marriage: "a man may be as frail and as wicked as he please, if it cost him nothing" (I.201-203). The bulk of the play (following Molière) concerns Scapin's reconciliation of fathers and sons, and the major comic scenes center about Scapin's successful accomplishment of the nearly impossible task of separating Thrifty and Gripe from their money. The covetous fathers carry the trade-cheating theme throughout, but specific occupations receive the satiric lash in occasional dialogue. The traditional comic picture of avaricious legal procedure contains, in this passage, a clear example of the lack of morals exhibited by trade. Scapin is explaining why Thrifty should avoid the law:

I am sure if you go to Law you do not consider the Appeals, Degrees of Jurisdiction, the intricate proceedings, the Knaveries, the Craving of so many Ravenous Animals that will prey upon you; Villainous Harpies! Promoters, Tipstaves, and the like; none of which but will puff away the clearest right in the World for a Bribe....

(II.319-324)

Scapin gets two hundred pounds from Gripe by telling him that his son has been kidnapped by Pirates. Gripe is not anxious to pay
the ransom, and suggests taking the law against the Pirates. Scapin replies: "Oh law! [a] Warrant in the open Sea! d'ye think Pyrates are Fooles?" (II.435-436). Pirat. . are not fools, obviously; they are successful businessmen. Scapin explains further: "Tarpawlins are a sort of People that understand Money, though they have no great acquaintance with Sence" (II.458-460).

Otway's satire touches other matters (Thrifty does not care if his sins are revealed in court: "let 'em tell of my whoring, 'tis the fashion"[II.353-355]), but business and trade are the preponderate subjects. Even the sons, who do all for love, reveal a willingness to partake of the business pattern if they must. When Leander asks Scapin, "Will you promise to mind my business?" (II.157), he is referring to his need of two hundred pounds to extricate his wife from debt. Leander knows Scapin will cheat to get it, and he even acquiesces in Scapin's plan to cheat Gripe in order to obtain the money.

The Cheats of Scapin is Otway's least original play; i.e., it is the least transformed from its source, but it was very successful. 8 Otway's next play was his first full-length comedy and the subject matter of his satire extends beyond the area of trade alone.
NOTES TO CHAPTER V

1. Works, I. 42. All bibliographical information, dates of performance, dates of publication, are from the introductory material and notes in this edition.


7. Otway makes use of the comic device of the national or regional humor in a scene in which Gripe hides in a sack and is beaten by Scapin. Scapin pretends to protect him from Gripe's "son-in-law," but instead plays several bullies himself in order to administer a beating. In Molière, Scapin changes his voice ad-lib, the stage directions suggesting only the dialect of Gascony. Otway makes extensive use of dialects. His Scapin assumes the inflection and vocabulary of a Welchman, a Lancashireman, an Irishman, a seaman, and the mixed French-English of a Frenchman.

8. Ghosh cites Genest's record of eight revivals of the farce from 1708 to 1812 (Works, I.42), but the calendar of The London Stage: 1660-1800 (Parts 2, 3, 4) lists forty revivals from 1700-1776.
VI

FRIENDSHIP IN FASHION (1678)

1. Friendship--

Many of the familiar elements of Restoration comedy are present in this play: the cuckolded husband, gallant and sophisticated young men, affected fops, and a ridiculously lecherous old woman. Ham has rather vaguely described Friendship in Fashion as a "testament of cynicism and poverty."¹ Otway was probably poor at this time, but Ham has confused satire with cynicism and totally ignored the values which clearly underlie the major theme of friendship in the play. Maynard Mack has said, "Satire...asserts the validity and necessity of norms, systematic values, and meanings that are contained in recognizable codes."² The positive values which underlie a given satire may not receive a discursive exposition in the satire itself and must in that case be abstracted or reduced from it. The ideal of friendship which can, in this way, be abstracted from Friendship in Fashion is in no way startling or original, but neither is it cynical.

The plot is one of complicated intrigues involving, briefly, three "friends": Truman, Valentine, and Goodvile. Goodvile is married, but he has been conducting an affair with his cousin, Victoria. She finds herself in need of a husband immediately, a role Goodvile cannot fulfill. He has therefore promoted love between Victoria and Truman. He explains to Victoria: "I have made him my Friend, and I hope he will deserve it, by doing thee that justice which I am incapable of" (II. 141-143). Before
exploring further Goodvile's concept of friendship and its uses, it should be noted that the play provides a kind of burlesque analogue to the friendships of the major characters through the action involving Malagene, another cousin of Goodvile's, and his friends. Malagene, the fops Caper and Saunter, and the foolish Lady Squeamish are all great pretenders to "acquaintance" with the fashionable world and its members. Their method of forming and holding friendships is clearly illustrated in this scene involving Malagene, Sir Noble Clumsy (Lady Squeamish's cousin), and Truman. Malagene's company is not welcome at Goodvile's home, and he has been accused of lack of manners. Malagene turns to Sir Noble, whom he has never before seen:

Malagene. This noble Knight shall be security for my good behavior. Wilt thou not Knight? Sir Noble. Sir, you are a person altogether a stranger to me; and I have sworn never to be bound for any man.
Truman. Oh but Sir Noble, you are oblig'd in honor to serve a Gentleman and your friend.
Sir Noble. Say you so, Sir? obliged in honor? I am satisfied. Sir, this Gentleman is my Friend and Acquaintance, and whatever he says I'll stand to.
(II. 460-468)

The pretenders have no basis upon which they build friendships. They lay claim to friendships with individuals whom they have never seen, and the friendships formed with those with whom they are in contact has no real meaning. Malagene explains his friendship with Caper and Saunter: "'Tis true, I contracted an acquaintance with 'em, I know not how; and now and then when I am out of humour, love to laugh at and abuse 'em for an hour or two" (I. 217-220). The relationships among the fops will be examined in more detail in the next section of this chapter.
It is enough to note here that their meaningless friendships provide a part of the larger theme, primarily in contrast with the true friendship of Truman and Valentine and the mixed values of Goodville's friendships.

Goodville has used his friendship with Truman to promote a marriage for Victoria. He is anxious that the marriage take place and his adultery thereby remain secret. He asks his friend, "Truman, is Victoria kind? I question not your friendship in the matter, but trust the honour of my Family in your hands" (III. 22-24). Such trust would be possible between friends, but the statement gains ironic meaning when Truman learns the real reason for Goodville's interest and, partly for revenge, partly for the pleasure of it, cuckold Goodville. The honor of Goodville's family becomes literally something in Truman's hands.

When Valentine learns Goodville's intentions, he understates his reaction: "I must confess, it something surprises me; he might have found out a fitter person to put his Mistress upon than his Friend" (III. 40-42). Valentine's reactions grow more vivid: "There is not such another Hypocrite in the World: He never made Love but to delude, nor Friendship but for his ends:—Even his own Kinswoman, and charge Victoria he has long since corrupted, and now would put her on his best friend Truman for a wife" (III. 528-532). Obviously Valentine and Truman are far from cynics about friendship. Goodville is not quite a cynic about the relationship, either. Rather, he subordinates it to the even greater claim of his pleasure. Victoria is disturbed by his plan to foist her off on Truman and in defense of his actions Goodville defines a friend for her:
A Friend is a thing I love to eat and drink and laugh withall: Nay more, I would on good occasion lose my life for my Friend; but not my pleasure.

(III. 467-470)

This epicurean statement is at odds with the standards of friendship demanded by Truman and Valentine. As Valentine states: "This worthy Person [Goodvile], for his honesty and sobriety, would have made a very good Dutch Burgomaster: But he is as damnable an English Friend and Gentleman as one could wish to meet withal" (III. 676-680). Truman eventually confronts Goodvile with the Victoria plot, provoking this protest from Goodvile:

Goody. But dear Jack Truman, thou art my Friend.
Truman. You would have made me believe so indeed; but the daubing was too coarse, and the Artificiall Face too plain:—One would have thought Sir, that you who keep a generall Decoy here for Fools and Coxcombs, might have found one to have recompenced a Cast Mistress withall, and not have indeavour'd the betraying the Honour of a Gentleman and your Friend.

(IV. 256-263)

Goodvile's artificial face is discovered relatively early in the play, first by one individual and then another. Mrs. Goodvile's suspicions are told to Truman who tells Valentine who tells his beloved, Camilla. Soon everyone knows the truth of the situation and Goodvile is exposed. The completeness of his exposure is paradoxically, but graphically, expressed in the final moments of the play. In an attempt to obtain revenge on his wife, Goodvile pretends to leave for the country and then returns disguised, hoping to catch his wife with Truman. The others learn of the plan, however, and in the final scene his disguise, rather than hiding him, reveals him (V. 474-485).
Goodvile's pretended friendship for Truman provides, ironically, the means for his own dishonor. Mrs. Goodvile explains to her maid Lettice:

Oh, if I would ever consent to wrong my Husband (which Heav'n forbid, Lettice!) it should be, to choose, with his Friend. For such a one has a double Obligation to secrecy, as well for his own Honour as mine.

(II. 58-61)

It is not for these reasons alone that Mrs. Goodvile and Truman conduct their affair, but this reasoning apparently first inspires her thoughts in this direction. As the play ends, Goodvile salvages as much of his reputation as he can, and in order to do this he is forced to invert his original plans. He must beg Truman: "if thou hast enjoyed her [Mrs. Goodvile], I beg thee keep it close, and if it be possible let us yet be friends"

(V. 735-736). Goodvile has been cuckolded by the man he would have made a cuckold by marriage. He again needs Truman's friendship, but now in order to disguise Truman's affair, not his own.

Fashionable friendship, i.e., friendship for ulterior purposes, is the major satiric object of the play. The moralistic proverb applied by Goodvile at the conclusion—"Marriage and Hanging go by Destinie"

(V. 778)—has nothing to do with the "moral" revealed by the action. This other moral is embodied in Goodvile's fate—perfect poetic justice for an offender against true friendship. There are other relationships between the characters which provide comedy of less than thematic importance, and these are the subject of the next section.
2. Comic Relationships--

The first words of the play set the immediate tone of the comic intrigue to follow and establish that fluidity of possible relationships between the characters which is a mark of comedy. Truman has received a billet from an unknown lady. She was, he asks his servant, "In a Vizor say you?" (I.1). Mrs. Goodvile's vizor is a sign of her caution; she reveals herself to Truman at the moment she sees fit.

This early successful use of a mask contrasts with Goodvile's later unsuccessful use of the same disguise. The mask can be seen to represent the fluidity of relationships in that, as a disguise, it disguises an individual's relationships to others (e.g., as a wife, or a cousin, or a friend) as well as his features. Truman, for example, debates the possible identity of the masked lady:

Well, this can be no other than some Stanch Vertue of 35 that is just now fallen under the Temptation, or what is as bad, one of those Cautious Dealers that never venture but in Masquerade, when they are sure to be wondrous kind, tho' they discover no more to a Lover than he has just occasion to make use of.

(I.11-16)

In a sense Mrs. Goodvile, when disguised, is simply a woman--free from personality, reputation, and personal and familial relationships. When Truman learns she is the author of the billet he must justify his future actions by standards other than those governing an unknown woman and a young man.

He reassesses his reactions in an aside as he first realizes her authorship: "Well, Madam Goodvile, if any mischief comes on't, 'tis
your own fault, not mine. I did not strike first, and there's an end
on't" (II. 510-513). Mrs. Goodvile, as was mentioned earlier, had
given as an excuse for her willingness to become involved with Truman
his friendship with Goodvile and his probable resultant desire for
secrecy in any affair with her. Goodvile himself unconsciously en-
courages the affair between his wife and Truman as the result of his
own desire for freedom. The first four Acts of the play center about
a party at Goodvile's and various mixups which occur in his garden the
night of the party. At the party Goodvile banteringly suggests to his
wife that they abrogate their marriage in order to enjoy the evening
more fully: "My dear, you and I are to be no more Man and Wife this
day, but be as indifferent, and take as little notice one of another, as
we may chance to do seven years hence" (II. 255-258). She agrees.
Goodvile has badly underestimated his wife, believing her a creature
of "Credulous Innocence" (II. 165), and although he is aware of the
freedom this "divorce" gives him, he fails to recognize the equal free-
dom given her.

Multiple assignations are arranged for the dark garden that even-
ing, including one between Truman and Mrs. Goodvile. Goodvile's
"divorce" gives added meaning to Truman's anticipatory soliloquy at
the end of the third Act: "E're yet two hours are past, his Wife's my
own" (III. 698-699). Finally, though Truman is truly fond of Mrs.
Goodvile, and willing to take her husband's place in bed, his willingness
to assume Goodvile's relationship to her has its limits. Truman is an
epicure of sorts himself and as a result, as he tells Mrs. Goodvile, "There is nothing I'd not wish to be, except the very Husband himself, rather than lose you" (IV. 462-464). Truman draws the line at being the "very Husband" which would be admitting their relationship in a public and formal way. They have managed their affair so well and so secretly that Goodvile is forced to ask that if it took place, it be kept secret (V. 735).

Early in the first Act, Goodvile, Truman, and Valentine are discussing Malagene. Goodvile ruefully admits, "'Tis true indeed he is some relation to me, but 'tis such a lying Varlet, there is no induring of him" (I. 41-42). There is a definite relationship between Goodvile and Malagene over and beyond their cousinship. Goodvile is a mixed character, as his name implies, and he does have some good qualities. But his use of his friends is analogous to Malagene and his friendships. Goodvile explains Malagene further:

...he is as impudent as he is troublesom; as there is no Company so ill but hee'll keep, so there is none so good but hee'll pretend to. If he has ever seen you once, hee'll be sure of you: and if he knows where you are, he's no more to be kept out of your Room, then you can keep him out of your Debt.

(I. 50-55)

Malagene uses his friends to get money ("Prithee lend me two Guinneys till next time I see thee, Child" [I. 267-268]); Goodvile uses his friends to cover his amours. Malagene and Goodvile have parallel attitudes toward blood relationships as well. Mrs. Goodvile tells Lettice that she suspects her husband and Victoria. Lettice objects:
Why, she is your near Kinswoman and lives here in the house with you, besides he would never dishonour his own Family surely.

Mrs. Goody. You are a Fool, Lettice, the nearness of blood is the least thing considered. Besides, as I have heard, 'tis almost the onely way Relations care to be kind to one another now a days.

(II. 47-53)

Goodville's epicureanism abrogates all relationships (which distinguishes his type from Truman's, which values friendship), while Malagene, on the other hand, loves no man or woman and his attitude toward family is no different from his attitude toward anyone else. His love of scandal leads him to tell Goodville that Mrs. Goodville is having an affair with Truman. (He hints at it in this speech, and then reveals it completely for ten guineas later.)

...I think my dear Kinswoman has maul'd you to some purpose; I'le say this for her, she has the true blood of the Malagene's in her: To lol dara lal, &c.

Goody. What is't you mean Fool? Be plain, and unfold your self.

Malag. Why you must know Frank, having a particular esteem for my Family, (the nearest Relation of which, I would go Fifty Miles to see hang'd) I do think her as very a--But no more, --Mum dear Heart, Mum, I say.

(IV. 556-564)

Kinship then, like friendship, has no real meaning for the cousins, Malagene and Goodville.

Malagene is, however, a great pretender to friendship, intimacy, and trust. His conversation is full of references to his acquaintance like the following: "Why, coming out of Chatolins last Night, (where it has cost me a Guinney-Club, with a Right Honourable or two of this Kingdom, which shall be nameless)..." (I. 161-163), or, "faith, I shou'd meet my Lord ---- at Court tonight: besides, I haven't been in
the Drawing Room these three days; the Company will wonder what's become of me" (I.348-350). Lady Squeamish is his equal in these pretensions. She believes:

...there is not a person in the world understands the Intrigues of the Court better than my self: I am the general Confidant of the Drawing Room, and know the loves of all the people of quality in Town.

(I.453-456)

In the first Act, Malagene and Lady Squeamish are associated with key words: Malagene's is "company"; Lady Squeamish's is "Intrigue." The kind of company these characters actually do keep will be examined in the next section in more detail, but within the physical action of the play, Malagene and Lady Squeamish are seen constantly in the company of Caper and Saunter. The names of these fops are self-explanatory, but they describe themselves in response to Sir Noble's questions.

Sir Noble. But do you never drink?
Caper. No, Sir Noble, that is not my Providence you know: I mind Dancing altogether.
Sir Noble. Nor you? can't you drink, hah?
Saunter. No, I make love and sing to Ladies.
Sir Noble. Whores to my knowledge, errant rank common Whores.

(III.214-221)

Even the doltish Sir Noble knows the real quality of the company kept by Caper and Saunter. There is so little substance to the group surrounding Lady Squeamish that they approach being without a distinguishing sex; at least they are capable of providing their own company. This group goes to dinner, for example, with the following parody of real couples:
Lady S. Mr. Caper your hand; Oh, dear Mr. Saunter, how shall I divide my self--I'lle swear, I am strangely at a loss--Mr. Malagene, you must be Mr. Saunter's Mistress I think at present.

Malagene. With all my heart, Madam, --Sweet Mr. Saunter, your hand: I swear you are a charming Creature, and your Courtship is as extraordinary as your Voice.

--Let me die, and I vow I must have t'other Song after Dinner, for I am very humoursom and very whimsical I think; ha, ha.

(I. 516-524)

The comic relationships examined thus far have been for the most part meaningless relationships. Malagene professes friendship with men and women with whom he has no real acquaintance; Lady Squeamish affects intimacy in court circles; Goodvile misuses his friends and relations, and the entire cast pretends the affair between Mrs. Goodvile and Truman never happened. One final relationship is a meaningful one, illuminating in several directions. Victoria, Goodvile's cousin and cast mistress, marries Sir Noble. Lady Squeamish is delighted with the match, and announces to Goodvile:

Dear Mr. Goodvile be pleas'd to give my Kinsman Sir Noble, Joy: He has done himself the Honour to marry your Cousin Victoria, whom now I must be proud to call my Relation, since she has accepted of the Title of my Lady Clumsy.

(V. 755-759)

It is painfully appropriate that Victoria become Lady Clumsy. In contrast to the secret affair of Truman and Mrs. Goodvile, or the completely virtuous match between Valentine and Camilla, Victoria has managed her affair with Goodvile clumsily; the affair is public knowledge and she is pregnant. Light is simultaneously thrown on Lady Squeamish by this speech since she finds this marriage to be an "honour" for Sir Noble and
something of which she must be proud.

Otway's use of relationship in this comedy is more thorough-going than in any of the others. The comic and satiric relationships are analogous to the tragic relationships in that the positive values underlying both genres are the same, especially those of friendship and marriage. The one exception is the affair between Truman and Mrs. Goodville. There is nothing in the play to indicate this affair is to be considered immoral, unjust, or unfortunate. Goodville apparently deserved this treatment, and may have learned his lesson from it.

3. Comic Definition and Epithet--

The vocabulary and descriptive adjectives used by the pretenders are the same as those of the persons of quality and it is only as the play develops that the meaning, or lack of meaning, in the speech of the pretenders becomes clear. We have seen one example of this in the use of friend and acquaintance. These terms imply one thing for Valentine, another for Goodville, and still a third thing for Malagene. The most obvious further examples of shifting values within the vocabulary are the references to persons of "quality" by Malagene, Caper, and Saunter. Truman clarifies this pretense neatly: "I never came near these giddy intriguing Blockheads, but they were talking of Love and Ladies; nor ever met with a hackney stripping Whore that did not know 'em" (III. 230-233). He turns down an invitation from Caper to join three or four of "the finest Ladies" for the same reason. "You know my temper," he tells Caper; "I shall be boisterous and mistake 'em for Whores, though if they be of
your Acquaintance, I know they must be of Quality" (IV. 370-372).

Malagene's sense of honor reveals the hollow values of the pretenders.

He is disturbed that Sir Noble refuses to pursue the ladies with him:

"What a rascal this Knight is? I have known as worthy a person as him-
self a Pimp, and one that thought it no blemish to his honour neither"
(II. 540-542).

The fine ladies and persons of honor with whom the pretenders
are acquainted turn out to be whores and pimps, and in the following
speech, Malagene explains the kind of "honest fellows" that are his
friends.

I have promised to meet Two or Three hearty old Souls
to Morrow at dinner, to swear and Drink, and talk Baudy
and Treason together for an hour or Two, they are all
Atheists, and very honest Fellows.

(IV. 638-641)

The pretenders live in a world of inverted values, but in one instance
Malagene's assessment of character is positive and negative in the
same moment. He is bullied and bribed by Goodvile to reveal what he
knows. He tells Goodvile: "Truman has put the Cuckold upon you;
Valentine has been Pimp in the business; and the Devil take me if I don't
think my self the honestest Fellow amongst you" (IV. 615-617). Malagene
has been honest in the sense that he took no part in the multiple assigna-
tions the evening of the party and in that at this moment he is speaking
the truth. On the other hand, in a coterie of "honest" fellows who swear,
drink, talk bawdy and treason, and profess atheism, Malagene is also
the "honestest."
Epithets like "honest" develop into defining devices as their true denotations become clear. They reveal something about the nature of the speaker as well as something of the figure or situation under discussion. The descriptive names like Lady Clumsy and Caper function in the same way. Straightforward definition, however, like Goodvile's definition of friend quoted on page 152 above, is a frequent comic device and analogous, as mentioned in the chapter on Alcibiades, to the "villainous definition" used in tragedy. Malagene defines his personal concept of wit, for example. A legless beggar approached him for charity, he explains, and "I showed my parts I think; for I tript up both his wooden Legs, and walkt off gravely about my business" (III. 85-87). Malagene could not have chosen a better example to show his "parts."

A more obvious form of definition is used by Truman to explain his libertine attitude toward marriage to Mrs. Goodvile:

Marriages indeed should be repair'd to as commonly Nunneries are, for handsome retreats and conveniences, not for Prisons, where those that cannot live without 'em may be safe, yet sometimes venture too abroad a little.

(III. 373-377)

Goodvile, courting Camilla, explains, "the name of a Wife to a man in love is worse than cold water in a Fever" (III. 462-463), and tells Mrs. Goodvile, "A Wife after a Year, like a Garment that has been worn too long, hangs loose and awkwardly on a Man, and grows a Scandal to him that wears it" (IV. 657-659). The unhappy Victoria defines love as "Unhappy Woman's Curse, and Men's slight Game to pass their idle time at" (V. 2-3).
Definitions of this kind, like epithets, do more than define the term being described. They also tell something about the individual making the definition. Goodville is hampered by his marriage; Victoria has had an unhappy experience in love, and Truman is not anxious to become a "very Husband." To return to the beginning of this chapter, it is clear how Goodville's definition of a friend helps illustrate his character, and more generally, how the entire play operates to define, if not inculcate, the validity and value of a traditional and moral concept of friendship. Hopefully, Ghosh's statement that Otway's comedies are "featureless, purposeless vacuities" can be laid aside.

I would like to make one final remark about the intrigue plot of this play, and Otway's handling of it. Most of the major characters arrange assignations in the garden for the evening of the Goodviles' party. Goodville believes he is to meet Camilla, although she has no plans to carry the meeting through. Lady Squeamish has overheard Camilla telling Valentine about this meeting, and Lady Squeamish plans to take Camilla's place and thereby gain revenge on Valentine, an old lover. The stage is thus set for an assignation between Goodville and Lady Squeamish. At the other end of the garden, Truman and Mrs. Goodville meet. As Valentine says, "There are Affairs to be carry'd on to Night which the least Accident may interrupt" (III. 555-557). Nothing does interrupt the complex coupling and pairing in the dark. The action remains on a comic level as Goodville is deservedly cuckolded by Truman and has revealed his own decayed tastes: "Have I been mumbling an
Old Kite all this while instead of my Young Partridge? a Pox o' my depraved palate that could distinguish no better" (IV. 122-124). But it is interesting to note, with this scene in mind, the validity of Aline Mackenzie Taylor's observation that the triple confusion of The Orphan is basically a comic device. 6 Disguised pairings and substitutions occur in the dark in The Orphan, much as they do here, but with very different results.
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1  Otway and Lee, p. 98.


3  E.g., I. 85, I. 190, I. 198, I. 264, I. 286, I. 300, I. 350.

4  E.g., I. 386, I. 432, I. 437, I. 420.

5  Camilla is described as having "wit and virtue, and each with as little affectation as the other" (III. 250-251). Neither she nor Valentine act in the least ignobly and as the play ends they have been married. Ham's judgment that the comedies "in contrast to Otway's tragedy, there was not a single decent woman--at least for long" (Otway and Lee, p. 105) is without foundation. Other virtuous women are Lucia and Clara of The Cheats of Scapin, Sylvia of The Souldiers Fortune and The Atheist, and Porcia of The Atheist.

6  Next to Shakespeare, p. 10.
Caius Marius is a play with two plots: one recounts the fall of Marius, the other recounts the tragic love of Marius Junior. If the title of the play indicates the intended primary emphasis, then the Marius Junior story can be considered a sub-plot, but the allocation of lines and scenes is fairly evenly balanced between Marius and Marius Junior. More importantly, despite the extensive use of role and relationship in the play, the two plots are not essentially connected. Marius Junior's support of his father's cause in the political struggle is never shown to be an essential factor in the history and fall of Caius Marius, and, further, Caius Marius's relatively easy acquiescence after his son's marriage to the daughter of his chief political opponent makes the Montague-Capulet feud of Marius and Metellus seem less meaningful than the difficulties it creates for the young lovers would indicate.

Otway cheerfully acknowledged his debt to Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet for the Marius Junior plot, explaining in the Prologue: "Amidst this baser Dross you'll see Shakespeare's play shine Most beautiful, amazing, and Divine." Marius Junior and Lavinia provide a balcony scene, an aubade scene, and a slight variation on the final scene at Juliet's "tomb." For the Caius Marius plot Otway went to Plutarch. Otway's use of the Marius story is much less straightforward
than his use of Shakespeare. Even if the Restoration audience can be presumed to have Plutarch's account familiarly in mind, Otway's Marius and Plutarch's Marius are not the same. Today's reader, without Plutarch's account in mind, would have considerable difficulty with vague allusions, but even more difficulty with Otway's portrait of Marius's character.

The difficulty is radical; that is, we do not know if Marius is a good man, an evil man, or a man of mixed moral character. We do not know if he tells us the truth, if his opponents (Metellus, Cinna, Sylla) tell us the truth, or if anyone tells us the truth. Reading Plutarch does not help. Ghosh and Ham have both indicated, moreover, the probable allegory of Whig and Tory politics presented in the struggle of Marius and Metellus, but neither critic indicates which party, if either, Otway criticized or praised. A careful reading of the play reveals, I believe, that he praised neither Whig nor Tory, Marius or Metellus, but instead, politically, the play makes a confused and awkward plea for order and reason and peace.

1. Caius Marius as a History Play, and Its Moral--

Rome is in a condition of political unrest, split by factions and disorder. Metellus opens the play with an objective description of this chaos. "When will the Tut'lar Gods of Rome awake," he asks:

To fix the Order of our wayward State
That we may once more know each other; know
Th' extent of Laws, Prerogatives and Dues;
The Bounds of Rules and Magistracy; who
Ought first to govern, and who must obey?

(I. 1-6)
The action of the play supports this estimate of the current situation, but the responsibility for it is not clear. We are given two evenly-matched opinions.

Metellus, Cinna, and the other Senators (all noblemen) are disturbed by the increasing political power of the populace, "the giddy Multitude," who can be bought and sold. The "licentious Rout" never consider "who 'tis best deserves, / But who Feasts highest to obtain their Suffrage" (I. 26-27). The senators place the blame for this condition on Marius, a man of plebeian stock, who depends for his position on the voice of the public. They are enraged that a man like Marius:

Born in the outmost Cottages of Arpos,
And foster'd in a Corner, should by Bribes,
By Covetousness, and all the hatefull means
Of working Pride, advance his little Fate
So high, to vaunt it o're the Lords of Rome!

(I. 61-65)

They resolve "to check this Havocker, / That with his Kennell of the Rabble hunts / Our Senate into Holes, and frights our Laws" (I. 119-121).

A few lines later Caius Marius enters and puts a rhetorical question to his retinue:

If I am he that led Rome's Armies out,
Spent my years in Toil and cruel War,
Chill'd my warm Youth in cold and winter Camps,
Till I brought settled Peace and Plenty home,
Made her the Court and Envy of the world;
Why does she use me thus?

(I. 173-178)

Marius considers himself to have been countless times the savior and protector of Rome, but Metellus calls him a "base-born hot-brain'd
Plebian Tyrant" (I.139). Metellus and his friends consider themselves
"Such as are fit to fill the seat of Pow'r" (I.14); but Marius Junior
calls them:

...lazy Droans that feed on others Labours, 
And fatten with the fruits they never toil'd for; 
Old gouty Senators of crude Minds and Brains, 
That always are fermenting Mischief up, 
And style their private Malice publick Safety....
(I.179-183)

The audience receives these antagonistic opinions in the first few
hundred lines of the play. Metellus and his party have the first word;
Marius and his party then enter and rebut. The structure of this Act
indicates Marius is being called to the bar of audience opinion. Fur-
ther, this debate must be decided in order that Rome be relieved of
strife.

As a matter of practical Roman politics the debate between
Marius and Metellus will be decided by superiority of military power,
and, in any case, the population as a whole is shown to be emotional,
irrational, cowardly, greedy, and incapable of making a decision
on the basis of merit were the choice theirs. Marius seeks his sev-
enth consulship from the people, claiming he has not "made a Party
in the Senate" to enslave them (II.432-434), arguing their common
interests based on his lack of noble rank, showing the wounds he re-
ceived in their service, and proclaiming himself a "Lover of their
Liberties and Laws, / ...Rights and Privledges" (II.437-438). The
people shout their approval. Metellus then addresses them and
argues "Oppression, Tyranny, Avarice and Pride" are Marius's qualities, and that they should vote him into power only if they "are mad for Slavery" (II.448-464). The people shout, "No Marius!"

As this debate between Metellus and Marius continues through the play it becomes increasingly apparent that there is no evidence to support a choice between them. Marius has spent his life in the military service of Rome, but on the other hand he states that he has done everything to the end that he become "Great, unequalled, and alone" (I.436). This supports the argument that he is personally ambitious, yet when he is accused of tyranny by Sylla (Metellus's candidate for the consulship), Marius turns to the people:

Hear this ye Romans, and then judge my Wrongs.
Have I opprest you? have I forc'd your Laws?
Am I a Tyrant? I, whom ye have rais'd,
For my true Service to what I am?

(III.370-373)

Neither the populace nor Sylla answer these questions. In the final moments of the play, in the presence of his dead son and the dying Lavinia, Marius says, "my cruel Nature has undone me" (V.468), yet, though there is certainly cruelty in his nature (revealed especially in a scene of slaughter as he and Cinna enter Rome[V.155-248]), he is capable of compassion (V.233-235, and his forgiveness of Lavinia), and he is evidently correct when he accuses the senators:

Ye can be humble when Affliction galls ye:
And with that Cheat at any time ye think
To charm a generous Mind, though ye have wrong'd it.
False are your safeties when indulg'd by Pow'r:
For soon ye fatten and grow able Traitors..

(V.187-191)
The senators have turned against Marius not because he is a tyrant but because he is no longer necessary as a military leader. He is undone, then, not by cruelty alone, but by a number of converging factors—peace in the Empire, senatorial ambition, the fickleness of the populace, his advanced age, and the presence of a number of able younger military leaders like Cinna and Sylla.

Otway's recent experience as a disbanded soldier may have given extra emphasis to remarks like Marius's:

When Fears are on [men], then their kindest Wishes
And best Rewards attend the gallant Warrior:
But Dangers vanish, infamous neglect,
Ill Usage and Reproach are all his portion.
(V.69-72)

On a larger scale, however, the play is concerned not with the proper evaluation of soldiers, but with the elemental political need for peace and order. The play is neither pro-Marius nor pro-Metellus, but anti-faction. The debate between Marius and Metellus is rationally insoluble because neither of them offer what the nation needs. And, I believe, Otway is suggesting the nation is England as well as Rome. In 1679 the tensions produced by the Popish Plot were at full strength; the Whigs had won a sweeping victory in a parliamentary election only to have it almost immediately dissolved by Charles; Monmouth's popularity had risen to the point that Charles exiled him to Holland, and a second Whig parliament was elected. At the time the play was produced, Charles was ill. What his recovery might mean to the country is alluded to in Otway's flattering Prologue, lightly disguised in banter
about critics and poets:

Oh! when will He and Poetry return?
When shall we there again behold him sit
'Midst shining Boxes and a Courtly Pit.

When that blest Day (quick may it come) appears,
His Cares once banisht, and his Nation's Fears,
The joyfull Muses on their Hills shall sing
Triumphant Songs of Britain's happy King.
Plenty and Peace shall flourish in our Isle,
And all things like the English Beauty smile.

(ll. 36-45)

In and of itself the Prologue might be traditional flattery, though there would be some question as to the validity of linking poetry and "Nation's Fears," "Plenty and Peace." As the Prologue to Caius Marius, these lines provide analogous sentiments to the play itself with respect to fear and to plenty and peace.

The picture of Rome's disorder, the need to fix "th' extent of Laws, Prerogatives and Dues" argued by Metellus in the lines which open the play, are confirmed by the rest of the play. Marius also recognizes the result of the intestine struggle:

Horrour, Confusion, and inverted Order,
Vast Desolation, Slaughter, Death and Ruine
Must have their Courses e're this Ferment settle.

(II.506-508)

Marius feels he must act in this situation as would Jove—with "Thunder."

Force alone does not guarantee peace and plenty, as Marius comes to realize, and the play fails to provide a meaningful alternative. It describes only the goal of politics: a stable, ordered, system of government. A strong central ruler is implied in the praise of Scipio expressed by Metellus as the play opens:
...he who with temperate poise
Knew how to guide the People's Liberty
In its full bounds, nor did the Nobles wrong.
(I.9-11)

But this ruler must check, or have checked, his personal ambition.

The results of ambition are clear to clowns and kings alike. A herdsman on Marius's estate says, "These 'Bitious folk make more stir in the world than a thousand men" (IV.207-208), and Marius makes a homily of his own action:

Be warn'd by me, ye Great ones, how y'embroil
Your Country's Peace, and dip your Hands in Slaughter.
Ambition is a Lust that's never quencht,
Grows more enflam'd and madder by Enjoyment.
(V.477-480)

The anti-ambition sentiment marks Caius Marius, as clearly as any other element of the play, as a product of the tradition of history plays in English drama. 3 It is a homily of intestine strife in a tradition as old as Gorboduc (1561), and its lesson on the evils of ambition can be paralleled in a political morality play like Skelton's Magnificence (1519). But several factors deny the effective development of Caius Marius as an historical homily. The political theme is, it will be recalled, only half of the play; the remainder, the tragic love of Marius Junior and Lavinia, is interspersed in the "history and fall." Neither plot, tragic or historic, is subordinate to the other and it is difficult to undergo catharsis and instruction, as it were, at the same time. In addition, the need for order and stability is implied rather than explicit. The continuing debate between Marius and Metellus is presented in such a way as to arouse anticipation that the
debate will be resolved. Attention is focused on the attempt to decide whether Marius is or is not a tyrant and thus led away from the fact that whether he is or not is less important than the inverted order and destruction that results from the debate. Marius's sententious statement that great ones should be warned by his actions how they embroil their country's peace comes as a shock. If this is what the play meant, the moral that its action carried, then why are we left in doubt as to whether he was criminally ambitious? The play fails to present a discernable idea, and like Book IV of Gulliver's Travels the question arises as to whether the author was in favor of the Houyhnhnms or an outside party such as the Portuguese Captain. In any case, we can determine that the political part of the play argues against disorder and destruction and in favor of order, stability, and peace. The debate between the factions is never really resolved. As the play ends, Metellus is dead, Sylla's forces are entering the city, and Marius stands forlornly by the bodies of his son and daughter-in-law. Innocent people have been slaughtered and the young lovers destroyed—all to no apparent end other than the implied condemnation of factions, however, and the audience must draw that conclusion itself.

Caius Marius adds nothing to the political ideals Otway has implied in the plays thus far considered. It does, however, stand as an interesting analogue to the political situation in Venice Preserv'd. The latter also involves the struggle of two factions,
neither of which is politically or morally satisfactory. Venice.

Preserv'd makes this clash of ignorant armies more dramatically effective, however, by making use of a figure, Jaffeir, with whom the audience can identify. Jaffeir is, at first and last, neither a senator nor a rebel, and as he struggles to decide which force he will ally himself with he becomes an object of sympathy for the audience. In this way the need to properly evaluate the factions leaves the audience and is assumed by Jaffeir. The audience lacks this kind of surrogate in Caius Marius, and the political confusion is dissatisfying rather than moving.

2. Roles and Relationships--

Theoretically, Marius Junior might have provided a surrogate for the audience. His attitude toward the factions is complicated by his love for Lavinia, Metellus's daughter, just as Jaffeir's attitude in Venice Preserv'd is complicated by his friendship for Pierre and his love for his wife, Belvidera. But Marius Junior is never shown to be in doubt in the political struggle. Politically his allegiance is totally with his father. Emotionally, on the other hand, he faces a choice. His allegiance in this respect is torn between Lavinia and his father; in terms of role, he must choose between being a son and being a lover.

It is in these terms that Marius seeks his son's active support:

...if thou art Man and Roman
If thou hast Vertue in thee, or canst prize
Thy Father's Honour, scorn her like a Slave.
Hell! love her? Dam her; there's Metellus in her.
In every Line of her bewitching Face,
There's a Resemblance tells whose Brood she came of.
I'd rather see thee in a Brothel trapt,
And basely wedded to a Ruffian's whore,
Then thou shouldst think to taint my generous Bloud
With the base Puddle of that o're-fed Gown-man.
(I.308-317)

Marius sees his son's responsibility in terms of the political conflict.

This is Marius's first concern and it should be his son's. Marius Junior's lack of action provokes Marius to say, "Inglorious Boy, behold my Face no more, / Till thou'st done something worthy of my name" (I.412-413). Marius never urges Marius Junior with the value and desirability of their cause; instead his arguments follow the line of the duties of a son. Marius Junior salutes Marius with,

"My Father," and Marius replies:

Call me by some other Name:
Disgrace me not: I'm Marius;
And surely Marius has small right in Thee.
Would Sylla's Soul were thine, and thine were his,
That he, as Thou hast done, now Glory calls,
Might run for shelter to a Woman's Arms,
And hide him in her Bosome like a Babe.
(III.197-203)

At this moment Marius Junior confesses he has married Lavinia and Marius banishes him: "Go farthest from me, get thee to Metellus, / Fall on thy Knees, and henceforth call him Parent" (III.221-222).

This command is quickly forgotten as Marius Junior makes it clear that he has no desire to leave his father.

These scenes between father and son fail in their purpose if that purpose is to effect an essential bond between the two plots of
the play. Marius Junior at one point sends a challenge for personal combat to Sylla, which is refused. Other than this instance, there is no indication that his support is essential in any way to the success or failure of Marius's plans. These scenes do function in that part of the play which concerns Lavinia and Marius Junior. They form one point of tension for Marius Junior.

Parallel moments, though briefer and less frequent, occur for Lavinia. Metellus, for political reasons, wants her to marry Sylla, but his appeal is to her familial emotions: "Consider, Child, my Hopes are all in Thee" (II.79). When she appears reluctant to accept this proferred husband, she, like Marius Junior, is threatened with banishment: "If thou art mine," Metellus tells her, "resolve upon Compliance, / Or think no more to rest beneath my Roofs" (II.137-138). When she confesses her love for another man whom she will not name, Metellus curses her:

From this hour
Curst be thy Purposes, most curst thy Love.
And if thou marry'st, in thy Wedding-night
May all the Curses of an injur'd Parent
Fall thick, and blast the Blessings of thy Bed.
(II.165-169)

(This curse provides another analogue to Venice Preserv'd; in much these same terms Belvidera is cursed by her father.) Lavinia is disinterested in the political situation, showing even less involvement than young Marius. Otway carefully parallels the family milieu of both lovers, equating the stresses they suffer and the consequent strength of their love.
Both Lavinia and Marius Junior plead similar excuses for their unfortunate love. Marius Junior tells his father:

You'd have me hate her. Can my Nature change?
Create me o're agen...and I may be
That haughty Master of my self you'd have me.
(I.336-338)

His love is such that he would have to be someone other than himself to forgo it. Lavinia, too, is not "that haughty Master" of herself that Metellus wishes. Threatened with banishment she asks her father:

Must I, your poor Lavinia, bear all this
Because I am not Mistress of my Heart,
Or cannot love according to your liking?
(II.156-158)

The young lovers are in a sense helpless in their love, overpowered by it, and thus Otway has carefully provided a background for such Shakespearean borrowings as Lavinia's balcony apostrophe:

What's in a Name? that which we call a Rose,
By any other name wou'd smell as sweet.
So Marius, were he not Marius call'd
Be still as dear to my desiring Eyes,
Without that title, Marius, lose thy Name,
And for that Name, which is no part of Thee
Take all Lavinia.

(II.275-281)

Young Marius, as a lover, has lost, for Lavinia at least, all those evil attributes her father assigns the Marius. For her he is not, as Metellus has called him, some "hated offspring" (I.126), but is instead her "Lord," her "Husband, Friend" (IV.100).

In the long scene in the country, quoted at some length in Chapter II, Marius Senior and Lavinia are reconciled. He accepts
her new role and calls her "daughter." "Will you then call me Daughter? will you own it?" she exclaims (IV.349). This readjustment of relationships, Marius's acceptance of his daughter-in-law as that, rather than as the "base puddle of that o're-fed Gown-man," provides the most meaningful link between the two plots of the play. Metellus's hatred for Marius has not diminished, Lavinia's plea to him: "Consider still I am your Daughter" (IV.499), goes unrecognized and he insists she will marry Sylla. As a result of this stubbornness she takes a drug which places her in a sleep which seems like death, and this leads to the confusion in her "tomb" and the eventual death of the lovers. Their deaths are not the responsibility of Marius, nor of Metellus, but of the quarrel between them. Their deaths function as the most moving example of the results of faction and disorder. The orderly pattern of relationships is destroyed entirely when Lavinia points to Marius Junior's body and cries out to Marius, "See where he lies, your and my onely Joy," and then stabs herself with the "Sword yet reeking with [her] Father's Gore" which she tears from Marius's hand. Marius, in the tentative manner which marks the handling of the theme of disorder in this play, is left standing aghast at this destruction, and, looking down at Marius Junior's body, he asks:

My Son, how cam'ist by this wretched End? We might have all bin Friends, and in one House Enjoy'd the Blessings of eternal Peace.

(V.465-467)
It was, I believe, this "might have been" which was intended as the major theme of the play. The ideals of friendship, of peace, and the social stability which allows "all" to live in "one House," provide the standards against which the chaotic action is to be judged.

3. The Sentimental--

One of the characteristics of sentimental drama outlined by Sherbo fails the test of this play. Sentimental drama, Sherbo claims, avoided bawdry as provocative of a response alien to the sentimental response. 4 Charles Shattuck, in a review of Sherbo's study, questioned this conclusion and suggested that the phenomenon of the disappearance of bawdry from English drama near the beginning of the eighteenth century was due to a shift in social fashions which found bawdry unacceptable. 5 In any case, Caius Marius illustrates that bawdry and the sentimental need not be mutually exclusive.

Lavinia and Marius Junior provide the focus for the majority of the sentimental scenes, and associated with Lavinia is her nurse, a bawdy, loquacious old woman. The temper of the Nurse's dialogue can be briefly illustrated with this anecdote borrowed nearly verbatim from Shakespeare (Romeo and Juliet, I.iii.36-48). She tells Metellus, as part of a round-about answer to a question he put to her, how Lavinia as a child, having just learned to walk, fell while running and injured her forehead:
...then my Husband [the Nurse says] (Peace be with him, he was a merry man) took up the Baggage. Ay, quoth he, dost thou fall upon thy Face? thou wilt fall backward when thou hast more wit; wilt thou not, Vinny? and by my fackings, the pretty Chit left Crying, and said, Ay....
(II.47-51)

The presence of jokes from the Nurse in no way lessens the effect of the sentimental scenes. The imagined scene, for example, one in which a character describes an event which might be happening elsewhere at the moment, or may happen in the future, is used several times. A few lines after this anecdote by the Nurse one such scene appears. Lavinia is threatened with banishment by her father and she conjures up a vision of what this banishment would entail.

Will you then quite cast off your poor Lavinia?
And turn me like a Vagrant out of Doors,
To wander up and down the streets of Rome,
And beg my bread with sorrow? Can I bear
The proud and hard Revilings of a Slave,
Fat with his Master's plenty, when I ask
A little Pity for my pinching Wants?
Shall I endure the cold, wet, windy Night
To seek a shelter under dripping Eves,
A Porch my Bed, a Threshold for my Pillow,
Shiv'ring and starv'd for want of warmth and food,
Swell'd with my Sighs, and almost choak'd with Tears?
(II.142-153)

The distended self-pity of this description results from the combination of graphic detail and abstraction. The piteable minatures of Lavinia trying to escape the elements and begging for scraps are created with repetitive detail (cold, wet, windy) and with the abstract nouns which are common in the sentimental vocabulary (revilings, plenty, pity, wants, warmth, food, sighs, tears). The
most striking quality of this imagined scene is its exaggeration. It seems artificial in the sense that its length, detail, and vocabulary seem to be consciously constructed by Lavinia, consciously heightened to an extreme in order to dissuade Metellus. This conscious exaggeration appears frequently in similar scenes. Metellus later threatens to send her by force, if need be, to Sylla. She replies, "Do, bind me, kill me, rack these Lims: I'll bear it" (IV.498). She proceeds to construct another scene, this time of the sufferings she would willingly undergo to avoid infidelity to young Marius:

Oh! bid me leap (rather than go to Sylla)  
From off the Battlements of any Tow'r,  
Or walk in Thievish ways, or bid me lurk  
Where Serpents are, chain me with roaring Bears;  
Or hide me nightly in a Charnell-house  
O're-cover'd quite with Dead mens rattling Bones,  
With reeky Shanks, and yellow chapless Sculls;  
Or bid me go into a new-made Grave,  
And hide me with a Dead man in his Shrowd.  
(IV.505-513)

And, had there been any doubt as to the meaning of these heaped-up examples, Lavinia explicitly identifies them as, "Things that to hear but told have made me tremble" (IV.514).

These scenes are intended to increase the intensity of our sympathy for "poor Lavinia," as she calls herself (II.156). The scenes in which Marius rejects his son and refuses the name father function the same way for Marius Junior. But Otway also produces sentimental moments for their own sake, independent of association with the central characters. The chief moment of this kind in Caius Marius occurs as Marius and Cinna enter Rome with force near the
end of the play. They are making Rome appear a "noisome House of slaughter," butchering "Matrons with Infants in their Arms" (V.158-159). Otway produces here a "sad vignette," involving an old man and his just-orphaned grandson. These two characters alone, without supporting dialogue, would be sentimental figures in this situation, and they are an example of a type of sentimental elaboration. We are shown not simply a child, but an orphaned child, one who has just seen his mother and father killed. His only protection is his grandfather, but the old man is incapable of protecting him: "Decrepit Age benums my weary Lims," he says, "I can't resist, nor fly" (V.171-172). The boy is thus left to his own devices, and we have been given elaborate reasons for pitying him. He thinks the soldiers will not come after them, but if they do he tells his grandfather:

I'll fall upon my Knees and beg your Life.
I am a very little harmless Boy;
And when I cry, and talk, and hang about 'em.
They'll pity sure my Tears, and grant me all.

(V.174-177)

These four lines alone form an imagined scene, and like Lavinia's, they show a peculiar self-consciousness on the part of the speaker. When the child confronts Marius and solicits mercy for his grandfather, his speech exhibits these characteristics once again:

For my sake spare his Life. I have no Friend
But him to guard my tender years from Wrongs.
When he is dead, what will become of me,
A poor and helpless Orphan, naked left
To all the Ills of the wide faithless world?

(V.215-219)
This last speech provides an interesting link between Caius Marius and Otway's next play, The Orphan. The child's sentimentally rhetorical question receives one possible answer in The Orphan as Otway explores what happened to one poor and helpless orphan. The potential in this next play for endless variations on such mechanical devices as the imagined scene and the piteous figures who appear for a moment and then disappear again, are great, yet Otway uses them sparingly. He constructs, instead, a convincing and unified drama of the domestic type which is associated with him and identified as his chief contribution to the changes which were occurring in English drama. Caius Marius is a blend of heroic drama, history play, and modified Shakespearean tragedy. The Orphan attempts the middle way between the heroic and the comic which contemporary genre criticism left open.
NOTES TO CHAPTER VII

1 Otway and Lee, pp. 121-122; Works, I.46, Ham thinks Otway was neither Whig nor Tory at this time (p. 122). In the next year (1680), however, Otway's long poem, The Poet's Complaint of His Muse (Works, II.405-426) appeared; Ham recognizes this as a strong Tory statement, one of considerable importance until Absalom and Achitophel (1681) overshadowed it. On the basis of Caius Marius alone it is not possible to determine Otway's political affiliation. The increased use of contemporary politics from 1679 to 1682 in Otway's work parallels a trend which the Whig-Tory conflicts surrounding Titus Oates and succession inspired in most of the literature of the period.

2 This second Whig Parliament was elected a month after the play was first performed. The play is dated by Ghosh late August or early September, 1679, by an allusion to Charles's illness in the Prologue (see text) (Works, I.45). See Trevelyan, George Macaulay, England Under the Stuarts (London, 1949), pp. 318-334.

3 I am making use of Irving Ribner's distinction that the history play's purpose was "not to present truth about the past for its own sake; it was to use the past for didactic purposes..." (The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare [Princeton, 1957], p. 10).


VIII

THE ORPHAN (1680)

Aline Mackenzie Taylor's "essay in the history of dramatic taste," Next to Shakespeare, provides a summary of the criticism of The Orphan.¹ Most of this criticism, after Dr. Johnson's back-handed compliment to Otway's ability to touch the heart,² has been adverse. The play has been attacked for improbable plotting, confused characterization, and a "morbid moral tone."³ Mrs. Taylor has also suggested that the ideas expressed by most of the major characters seem to clash, and, therefore, "it is difficult to find a single point of view from which these characters can be seen in relation to the main action."⁴ Significantly, neither the criticism surveyed by Mrs. Taylor nor her own analysis, treats the play as an imaginative verbal creation. Through an examination of the rhetoric of the play the missing single point of view emerges, and with it, the answers to some of the more perplexing problems of plotting and characterization.

1. The Paradise Lost Motif--

Allusions to Eden and the loss of Eden appear throughout the play, especially at key moments of the action. As these allusions accumulate they provide a background for the action, putting it in a definite perspective and providing the point of view from which the characters and their diverse ideas and interrelations can be seen
to form a meaningful whole. The plot, briefly, involves twin brothers, Polydore and Castalio, who are in love with Monimia, an orphan raised with them by their father, Acasto. Monimia is the daughter of Acasto's late friend, Chamont, and she has a brother, also named Chamont, who has just returned from military service. Castalio and Polydore mutually acknowledge their interest in Monimia, but Castalio does not reveal that he has, in fact, succeeded in his suit, and that (later in the play) he and Monimia are married. Polydore overhears what he believes to be an assignation between the couple (really a plan to celebrate their wedding night) and, by delaying Castalio, takes his place in Monimia's bed. The substitution is revealed; Monimia dies of shame and the brothers take their own lives.

The story takes place, it may be remembered, in a kind of paradise, artificially constructed by Acasto. His motives for living apart from society are not religious, but they are moral. He is escaping, hopefully, the false, hypocritical world of the court and the camp. He seeks the life of the "happy man" of Røstvig's study. His retreat is such that at one glad moment he exclaims, "Thus happy, who would envy pompous pow'r, / The luxury of Courts or wealth of Cities?" (II.108-109). The young Chamont thanks Acasto for bringing the orphaned Monimia, like a "tender Flower" into Acasto's "own fair Garden, / Where the Sun always shines" (IV.287-288). The sun does not always shine in this garden, but before any shadow passes over the lovers Castalio finds his surroundings transformed by Monimia, and tells her so:
Where am I! Surely Paradise is round me!
Sweets planted by the hand of Heaven grow here,
And every sense is full of thy Perfection.

(II.401-403)

Polydore makes the first clear allusion to the Eden situation

as he attempts to woo Monimia:

Man, when created
At first alone, long wander'd up and down,
Forlorn, and silent as his Vassal Beasts;
But when a Heav'n born Maid, like you, appear'd,
Strange pleasures fill'd his eyes, and fir'd his heart,
Unloos'd his Tongue, and his first talk was Love.

(I.306-311) 6

(Polydore's references to silence and talk are part of another large
theme to be discussed later.) Monimia replies by continuing his
allusion, but checking his intent with a reminder that this is the
post-lapsarian world:

The first created pair, indeed were blest;
They were the only Objects of each other;
Therefore he Courted her, and her alone;
But in this peopled World of Beauty, where
There's roving Room, where you may Court, and ruin
A thousand more, why need you talk to me?

(I.312-316)

Polydore's interest in Monimia is a libertine's interest, and he had
already answered her question: "Who can behold such Beauty, and
be silent?" (I.305).

Castalio has hidden his success with Monimia from his brother,
but hopes Polydore will forgive him: "he'll sure forgive / This first
Transgression of a wretched Friend / Betray'd to Love and all its
little follies" (II.317-319). It is this first transgression, Castalio's
silence, that causes the confusion which helps precipitate the final
catastrophe. Polydore does forgive him, but only when it is too late to undo the mistaken events of the "wedding night." That night Polydore has taken Castalio's place in Monimia's bed and Castalio is denied entrance. Castalio throws himself to the grass outside the bedroom and curses "the Sex." He curses "Woman the Fountainhead of all Humane Frailty" and mentions Cleopatra and Helen (III.580). Then:

Woman to Man first as a Blessing giv'n,
When Innocence and Love were in their prime,
Happy a while in Paradise they lay,
But quickly Woman long'd to go astray,
Some foolish new Adventure needs must prove,
And the first Devil she saw she chang'd her Love,
To his Temptations lewdly she inclin'd,
Her Soul, and for an Apple damn'd Mankind.
(III.587-594)

But Monimia, unlike Eve, was not inclining to temptation. She spent the night with Polydore believing him to be her husband. Yet Monimia comes to see another parallel between herself and Eve. Polydore reveals the substitution and the couple debate their future action. Polydore suggests they kill their child, should there be one, but Monimia refuses. She believes the child should: "become a thing / More wretched than its Parents, to be branded / With all our Infamy, and Curse its Birth" (IV.444-446). Polydore agrees:

That's well contriv'd! then thus let's go together
Full of our guilt, distracted where to roam,
Like the first Wretched Pair expell'd their Paradise.
(IV.447-449)

With this background in mind there is heavy irony in the song sung by the still-ignorant Castalio which opens the last Act of the play:
"Come, all ye Youths, whose Hearts e're bled / By cruel Beauties Pride" (V.1-2), and further irony in his baffled questioning of Polydore later:

...wilt thou now,
For the first Fault, abandon, and forsake me,
Leave me amidst Afflictions to my self,
Plung'd in the gulf of grief and none to help me?
(V.368-371)

The Orphan is obviously not an allegorical replaying of the fall from Eden. Castalio is not Adam, Monimia is not Eve, and Polydore is not Satan. While, for example, Castalio and Monimia are man and wife, it is Polydore and Monimia who find themselves like the "first Wretched Pair." The carefully developed allusions, though, especially those which come at the conclusion of the important third and fourth Acts, stress that this is the post-lapsarian world, a "peopled world" in which men must be in contact with one another and where the responsibility for any and all judgments rests with them. The struggle to assess responsibility will be discussed in more detail later, but it is clear even in Monimia's decision to allow her child to live that the characters acknowledge their guilt, the responsibility for their "first Fault." The Paradise Lost motif provides a background against which the drama is played. The motif helps universalize, generalize, the action by providing a perspective much the way the seventeenth-century "perspective," the telescope, might. That is, the central characters are brought forward while behind them, clearly in the background, is the archetypal human sin.
Although *The Orphan* can be read in a part as a working out of the traditional "the wages of sin is death," it is a mistake, I think, to read the play as a sermon. There are brief references to "Everlasting pains," and "th'Eternal Justice" in the last Act (V.419-420), but the central emphasis of the play is not eschatological. Otway's focus is unrelentingly on this life, the "peopled world." Like *Caius Marius* and *Venice Preserv'd*, *The Orphan* exhibits a world where choices and decisions must be made, and yet the means of assessing what little evidence there is are tragically weak. In the world of confused appearances in *Don Carlos* these means were largely visual; in *The Orphan* the means to the knowledge of the characters of men and their actions are largely oral.

2. "Why need you talk to me?"--

Just as Acasto's retreat provides the setting for the Paradise Lost motif of *The Orphan*, one of his stringent ideals provides the setting for the thematic use of speech in the play. The phrase which quickly becomes associated with Acasto is carried in his rebuff to Castalio's gentle praise: "No flattery, Boy! an honest man can't live by't" (II.15). Acasto's violent distaste for "flattery" is part of his distaste of court and court society; he identifies flattery with hypocrisy and deceit. He advises his sons to:

Avoid the politik, the factious Fool,
The busie, buzzing, talking, hard'n'd Knave;
The quaint, smooth Rogue, that sins against his Reason;
Calls sawcy loud Suspicion, publick Zeal,
And Mutiny the Dictates of his spirit.

(III.79-83)

To misname things as the factious fool does is more than political chicanery; it is a sin against reason. Man's reason is his discriminating power, and Acasto would have his sons "study Arts and Men: / Learn how to value Merits though in Rags," rather go to court where flattery is "next to mony current" (II.71-72, 20). Acasto's ideals with regard to speaking are identical with those expressed thirteen years earlier by Bishop Sprat for the Royal Society. Sprat also found the current use of "ornaments of speaking" to be "in open defiance against reason." Acasto encourages the Society's ideal of "a close, naked, natural way of speaking" as he chastizes Chamont:

Ye talk to me in Parables, Chamont,
You may have known that I'm no wordy man,
Fine Speeches are the Instruments of Knaves
Or Fools, that use 'em, when they want good sense;
But honesty
Needs no Disguise or Ornament: Be plain.

(IV.303-308)

Acasto's paradisical retreat was formed to embody his ideals—the ideals of "no wordy man." Although Acasto has been known to "wanton" in the praise of the King, "speak things of him might Charm the Ears of envy," he denies these extravagances in any other type of discourse. Yet others fail to maintain these ideals and the paradise is destroyed by confused speech, by riddles, and by silence.

The substitution in Monimia's bed was effected because her room is next to Acasto's and in arranging the meeting for that night Monimia
said to Castalio: "...speak not the least word; for if you should, /
'Tis surely heard and all will be betray'd" (III.304-305). Ironically, it is the silence which betrays her.

In the first interview between Polydore and Monimia, already quoted, Polydore says that desire first taught men speech (I.309-311). Polydore apparently has the "Arts of fine persuasian" (I.191), but as a libertine the need for elaborate courtship grates upon him.

"Who'd be that sordid foolish thing call'd man," he asks:

To cringe thus, fawn, and flatter for a pleasure,
Which Beasts enjoy so very much above him?
The lusty Bull ranges through all the Field,
And from the Herd singling his Female out,
Enjoyes her, and abandons her at Will.
(I.362-367)

Non-bestial man must speak, and speech can be beautiful. Monimia, for example, likes to hear Castalio woo. "Charm me with the Musick of thy Tongue," she asks; "I'm ne're so blest as when I hear thy vows, / And listen to the Language of thy Heart" (II.398-400). For the most part, however, the language of the heart is spoken of as something to be feared, as part of the larger category of flattery. It is, of course, flattery which was part of the serpent's means of wooing Eve.

Monimia and Acasto's daughter, Serina, both fear the flattery of wooing because they know it can conceal the attitude which Polydore expresses. Men, Monimia tells a page, are "for flattery and deceit renown'd"; they seek "'Tundo poor Maids and make our ruin easie" (I.226, 229).

Serina asks Monimia if Chamont is one of those false men Monomia had told her "will flatter, feign, and make an Art of love" (II.105),
and Chamont warns Monimia:

Trust not a man; we are by Nature false,  
Dissembling, subtle, cruel, and unconstant:  
When a Man talks of Love, with caution trust him;  
But if he swears, he'll certainly deceive thee.  
(II.288-291)  13

Chamont is an interesting figure within this discussion of flattery  
and no-flattery, silence and speech. While his inordinate jealousy  
of Monimia's honor leads him to reiterate this distrust of men while  
wooing, his own behavior while wooing Serina disproves his own  
maxim. He is honest, straight-forward, kind, and constant.

The range of possible discourse can be considered as a scale,  
with silence at one extreme, lying at the other, and Acasto's ideal  
of plainness midway between. Acasto's greatest fear is of the liar  
(or the flatterer), but the play demonstrates that his fear is concen-  
trated on the wrong end of the scale. The same thing is true of the  
feminine fear of wooing. Flattery does not cause the catastrophes  
of the play--silence does. The climactic action, the wedding night  
substitution, occurs in silence, as we have seen, but the substitution  
is only the climax and logical result of a series of silences; that is,  
the substitution occurs as the result of confusion caused by a number  
of secrets and bits of concealed information.

Very early in the play Castalio and Polydore discuss Monimia  
and their attitudes toward her. Polydore asks Castalio: "...shew  
your heart as naked in this point, / As you would purge you of your  
sins to Heaven" (I.120-121). Castalio does not admit his love, but
says to Polydore: "Trust me, and let me know thy Loves success, / That I may ever after stifle mine" (I.192-193). Both brothers, then, ask the other to be open. But neither brother is until too late. (The reasons for their silences will be discussed in the next part of this chapter.) Castalio justifies concealing his marriage as "the onely thing [he] e're Hid from [Polydore's] knowledge" (II.316-317). It is this secret that Castalio calls his "first Transgression." Chamont does not know of the secret wedding, and until he forces the priest to "unfold this Riddle" he believes Monimia has been seduced (III.211). The secret wedding leads Castalio, through his silence, to mislead his brother. He asks Polydore to refrain from courting Monimia, but does not explain why. He lamely says, "I have wond'rous Reasons on my side, / That would perswade thee, were they known" (III.240-241). Castalio replies:

Then speak 'em  
What are they? Came ye to her Window here  
To learn 'em now? Castalio, have a care;  
Use honest dealing with your Friend and Brother.  
(III.341-344)

Polydore is finally convinced his brother has not been honest, and so deliberately sets a trap to delay Castalio and then takes his place in what Polydore believes is an assignation. He encourages the page to lie to Castalio and then muses: "Well said, Polydore; / Dissemble with thy Brother" (III.394-395). Monimia herself does not realize the substitution has occurred, but this is one piece of information which is quickly revealed. Polydore is too proud of his
triumph and tells her of it. Monimia faints upon hearing this revelation and Polydore regrets his pride: "a curse / Upon my vanity that could not keep / The secret of my happiness in silence" (IV.396-398). This revelation to Monimia is the last bit of disclosed information until Castalio is told of the substitution near the conclusion. Before Castalio is told, Polydore questions him, in effect bringing Castalio to acknowledge his error and its effects in a catastrophe he does not yet comprehend. Polydore asks, "didst thou e're conceal thy thoughts from Polydore?" (V.336). Castalio admits that he has concealed the marriage, and "to conceal it from thee was much a fault" (V.350). "A fault!" Polydore exclaims, "when thou hast heard / The Tale I'll tell, what wilt thou call it then?" (V.351-352). Polydore is correct, if anticlimactic, as he tells Castalio:

Hadst thou, Castalio, us'd me like a Friend,  
This ne're had happen'd; hadst thou let me know  
Thy Marriage, we had all now met in Joy.  
(V.431-433)

In this "peopled world" men must communicate in order to live together. The play suggests that in no other way can man exercise his reason and thereby act reasonably. At either end of the scale mentioned earlier communication breaks down: in silence (or by keeping secrets) at one end of the scale and by disguised speech (confusingly "ornamented" or deliberately misleading) at the other. Lack of communication led to Polydore's trick, and, I will suggest later, supplied the motive of Castalio's reticence towards his brother.
Failure after failure in communication occurs in the play. No one follows Acasto's admonition to "be plain," and, as a result, the characters rely on overheard, partially overheard, or second-hand information. The questions "what does this mean?" and "what did they say?" occur repeatedly. Nearly every character turns to every other and pleads, "tell me," inform me." This motif of insistent questioning, pleading for information, is established in the first interview between Castalio and Polydore as they ask each other to show their hearts "naked," and continues in the next scene as Monimia interrogates the page. She asks, concerning the brothers, "sometimes at least, have they not talkt of me?" (I. 332). The page admits they have, but is reluctant to reveal the conversations since "Boys must be whipt that tell their Masters secrets." Monimia bribes the information from him, just as Polydore later bribes him to watch Castalio:

If he should chance to meet Monimia, make
Just observation of each word and action;
Pass not one circumstance without remark:
Sir, 'Tis your office, do't and bring me word.

{II. 321-324}

When the page returns, Polydore asks: "Express it to me all / In words may make me think I saw it too" (III. 1-2). The questioning continues throughout the play as the characters struggle to understand one another and the apparently incoherent situation. Finally, Acasto, largely ignorant of all the events, enters to discover Monimia dead, and Polydore dying. "Tell me," he says, "I beg you, tell me the sad cause / Of all this ruin" (V. 490-491).
One of the causes is the failure to communicate. Words and speech are the major means of communication, yet in the largest sense the characters are not seeking words, but understanding, or love, or justice, or forgiveness. The breakdown of communication is symptomatic of a breakdown of intercourse between men. Thematically, The Orphan uses speech as a metaphor much the way Caius Marius uses factions, and both plays leave us with the argument that everything which holds men apart, destroys union, is evil. Castalio makes this explicit for The Orphan as he erupts in insane anger and asks Chamont to join him in the following curse:

Confusion and disorder seize the World,
To spoyle all trust and converse amongst men;
'Twixt Families engender endless fewds,
In Countries needless fears, in Cities factions,
In States Rebellion, and in Churches Schism:
Till all things move against the course of Nature;
Till Form's dissolv'd, the Chain of Causes broken,
And the Originals of Being lost.

(V. 502-509)

This sweeping curse moves from disorder in trust and conversation to disorder in the Great Chain of Being and gives the metaphoric theme of the breakdown of communication the same kind of universal significance given the play by the Paradise Lost motif. Just as Castalio's "first fault!" is analogous to the Fall and thereby analogous to all fault, sin, or error, the disordered communication of the play is analogous to disordered reason (of which speech is a manifestation) and disorder on a cosmic scale.

Castalio's curse provides a kind of capsule summary of the
subjects used in Otway's tragedies. "Cities factions" occur in Caius
Marius and in Alcibiades; "endless frowds" within families occur in
Alcibiades, Don Carlos, Caius Marius, and The Orphan; "needless
fears" in the Rome of Titus and Berenice, and disorder of converse in
The Orphan. Without suggesting any thematic development within
Otway's plays when considered chronologically, it is still meaningful
to note that all these themes are combined, in careful balance, in
Venice Preserv'd.

The central concern of The Orphan, its insistence on the need
for man to communicate with man plainly, openly, constantly, would
be belied in the plotting of the play itself if the criticism of the plotting
and the character motivation which has been leveled against it were
allowed to stand.

3. Problems of Plotting and Some Possible Solutions--

Aline Taylor has outlined three major plot difficulties in The
Orphan: "the doubtful improbability of the central situation; the appar-
ently unsatisfactory motivation of Castalia in concealing his marriage...;
and the inconstancy in the character of Polydore, namely, his libertinism
and his suicide." To these three difficulties should be added Clifford
Leech's argument that, speaking of Acasto, "neither [his] illness nor
recovery is linked to the main happenings of the play," and J. C.
Ghosh's assessment: "Old Acasto is in a veritable dotage. He is feeble,
platitudinous, incoherent."
The improbability of the central situation is a specious problem. The plot, borrowed from a narrative entitled "The History of Brandon," a chapter in English Adventures (1676) by "A Person of Honour" (tentatively identified as Roger Boyle, Earl of Orrery), requires no more vigorous suspension of disbelief than King Lear or Oedipus or any of a number of other 'improbable' but nevertheless effective tragedies. There is no universally accepted standard of probability, i.e., whether an action might actually occur, but the question of such probability has always been of less importance than the question of whether the action is effective for an audience. Mrs. Taylor's stage history of the play abundantly illustrates that The Orphan was effective theatrically for more than a century.

The remaining problems center about three figures: Castalio, Polydore, and Acasto. Clifford Leech's objection to the actions of the latter can be disposed of immediately. Acasto falls ill at dinner the day Castalio and Monimia are secretly married. His illness is not severe, but he is an old man and the others are concerned. Acasto explains his sudden weakness:

Support me, give me Air, I'll yet recover, 'Twas but a slip decaying Nature made, For she grows weary near her Journeys end. (III. 43-45)

Castalio suggests that he rest, and Acasto agrees: "Yes, I'll to Bed; old men must humour weakness" (III. 149). Since his room is next to Monimia's, this illness is absolutely essential to the plot; it forces
Monimia and Castalio to arrange their wedding-night in such a way as to leave Acasto undisturbed, both to prevent discovery and out of concern for his health. His recovery the next day is in no way unusual since his illness was not severe.

Ghosh's misvaluation of Acasto's condition—"feeble, platitudinous, incoherent"—is revealing. Acasto is one of Otway's most subtly developed characters and Ghosh's remarks indicate a misunderstanding of Acasto, which is shared by Castalio and Polydore. Acasto has apparently repeatedly expressed the powerful reasons for his retreat from court and camp (see II. 20-30, 36-46), yet his sons believe he left court because of slights he suffered personally, and not for any larger reasons. Polydore tells Castalio: "Our Father / Has ta'ne himself a surfeit of the World, / And cries it is not safe that we should taste it" (I. 107-109). Acasto warns them of the lack of preferment for merit that is typical of the court and of the hypocrisy and deceit which flourish there. When he concludes, Castalio admits that Acasto's wrongs justify his complaints, but wonders that Acasto refuses to allow his sons, who have never suffered disgrace at court, to seek their fortunes there. Acasto replies:

Go to, y'are Fools, and know me not, I've learnt Long since to bear, revenge, or scorn my wrongs, According to the value of the doer.

(II. 52-53)

Acasto is right; his sons do not understand him. They do not show at any time that they understand the ideals which he defends. When
Acasto allows Chamont to court Serina he also issues warning that Chamont should avoid (when married) the wanton whose beauty, endearments, and virtue are all false. Monimia asks Polydore aside if he is listening, and Polydore replies off-handedly: "Yes, my fair Monitor, old men always talk thus" (III. 136). Acasto's sardonic remarks are frequently misunderstood. He fails to follow his own ideal of plainness in only one respect, but that failure is significant. Ghosh, for example, supports his accusation of incoherence with the following evidence: Acasto "cherishes the dearest memory of his wife, yet gives the following advice to his children: 'Let Marriage be the last mad thing ye do!" (Works, I. 52). Acasto does indeed give that advice, but Ghosh has missed, as I believe it is suggested Castalio and Polydore also miss, the heavy irony with which this advice is given. Acasto is advising the young people who surround him when he becomes ill. The context of his advice on marriage is that of a bitter picture of contemporary society:

Be very careful how ye make new Friends,  
Men read not Morals now, 'twas a Custom,  
But all are to their Fathers Vices born:  
And in their Mothers Ignorance are bred.  
Let Marriage be the last mad thing ye doe,  
For all the Sins and Follies of the past.  
If you have children, never give them knowledge  
'Twill spoil their Fortune, Fools are all the fashion.  
(III. 84-91)

These few lines from a long speech are enough to clearly establish the tone. Clearly, that is, for us, but not for Castalio or Polydore.
Acasto's frequent irony is his fatal lapse from plainness.

The play suggests, then, that it is in part this misunderstanding, another failure of communication, which prompts Castalio to conceal his marriage. He is afraid of Acasto's reaction. The priest who married the young couple tells Chamont of this fear when the latter asks why the marriage is secret. The priest says he is reluctant to reveal it, "not knowing what reception it may find / With old Acasto" (III. 250-251).

Castalio keeps his love secret from Polydore partly from a knowledge of Polydore's character, and partly from his fear that the love would be revealed abroad. Castalio tells Monimia he knows Polydore is "precipitate and rash," and fears that if Polydore knew of their love he might "in Rage" betray them (II. 358-362).

Castalio is partly correct about Polydore; as long as the latter believes Castalio and Monimia are conducting an affair Polydore's reaction is one of jealous rage. Polydore hears the "assignation" and reveals in soliloquy that he has long been jealous of Castalio and that at this moment he hopes:

...for a means...how to Counterplot
And disappoint this happy Elder Brother.
In everything we do, or undertake,
He soars above me, mount what height I can,
And keeps the start he got of me in Birth.

(III. 370-374)

In the last Act, Polydore explains to Castalio that he had been "enrag'd to think / Thou hadst out-done me in successful Love" (V. 435-436).

Castalio, then, has several reasons for concealing his marriage. He
is mistaken in his belief that Acasto opposes marriage, or even this particular marriage, and Polydore (it will be shown) would have acted differently had he known it was marriage that was involved. Nevertheless, Castalio does have reasons for his silence.

The problem created by Polydore's inconstancy, his libertinism and his suicide, is, I believe, easily solved. Polydore is a libertine; he had dallied with the page's sister (III. 12-14) and vows to possess Monimia: "by my Great Soul, / M'Ambitious Soul that languishes to glory, / I'll have her yet!! (III. 15-17). He fails to recognize that Monimia may prefer Castalio, and wonders if Castalio has supplanted him "by some foul play" (III. 20). His sibling jealousy of Castalio has already been mentioned, and when he does give Castalio an opportunity to reveal his success, Castalio keeps it secret (III. 336-337).

With this background it has seemed inconsistent when Polydore runs on his brother's sword at the end of the play. Mrs. Taylor has suggested that the sacramental view of marriage may have inspired this action. The breach of a sacramentally viewed marriage may have reinforced Polydore's revulsion, but another aspect of his rape is explicitly mentioned. Monimia reveals the full meaning of his action in the following scene:

Mon. I'm his Wife.
Poly. What says Monimia! hah!
Mon. Speak that again.
Poly. I am Castalio's Wife.
Mon. His marry'd wedded Wife?
Poly. Yester-dayes Sun
Mon. Saw it perform'd.
Poly. Then I have enjoy'd
Mon. My Brother's Wife.

(IV. 416-420)
It is clearly one thing in Polydore's mind to enjoy his brother's mistress and quite another to enjoy his brother's wife. As he tells Castalio:

Poly. I've stain'd thy Bed, thy spotless Marriage Joys
Have been Pollut'd by thy Brother's Lust.
Cast. By thee!
Poly. By me last night the horrid deed
Was done; when all things slept, but Rage, and Incest,
(IV. 410-413)

Although the distinction may be theologically invalid, Polydore obviously distinguishes between the degree of evil represented by fornication and incest. His revulsion and resultant suicide are due to his consciousness of the guilt of incest. He shows no sign of remorse at having slept with Monimia until she reveals her true relationship to Castalio. Until that moment Polydore thought himself "Rich" because "in possession of [her] Sweetness" (IV. 413-414). The apparent inconsistency of Polydore's libertinism and suicide is completely paralleled by his different attitudes towards an affair with a single, beautiful, available young woman and incest.

The Orphan is one of Otway's most carefully constructed plays. The famous criticism that all this bother might have been avoided with "a farthing rush-light" is slightly misdirected. A candle would have prevented Polydore's deception, but it would not have illuminated the entire situation. What was needed was a word. If Acasto had been plainer, Castalio would not have concealed the marriage; had Castalio not concealed the marriage, Polydore would not have taken his place in Monimia's bed. Polydore admits his guilt to Castalio—"Th'are not the
Gods, 'tis Polydore has wrong'd thee" (V. 409)--but all share the guilt to the degree that they participated in the breakdown of communication. In a world which demands a "close, naked, natural way of speaking" they have all 'sinned' and they all suffer.
NOTES TO CHAPTER VIII

1
Next to Shakespeare, pp. 8-9.

2
Dr. Johnson's remarks are quoted above on pp. 1-2.

3
Next to Shakespeare, p. 9.

4
Next to Shakespeare, p. 12.

5
Acasto and the beatus vir theme are examined in some detail
in Ch. 1, section V, "Retirement and Patronage."

6
This does not accord with Milton's Paradise Lost in which Adam
speaks before the creation of Eve. It does, however, parallel a
Miltonic incident (Paradise Lost, VIII, 489-510). Otway's verse shows
no direct borrowing from Milton's poem, but other parallels of inci-
dent and idea indicate a familiarity with Milton. Charles F. McClumpha
in his edition of the play noted "echoes of Miltonic thought and utterance"
which he felt were used in a "search for higher flights of poetic feeling"
(The Orphan and Venice Preserved [Boston, 1908], p. 135). All
citations from Milton are from Merritt Y. Hughes' edition, John Milton,

7
Cf. Paradise Lost, X, 845-906.

8
Cf. Paradise Lost, X, 974-991.

9
Quoted from excerpts of The History of the Royal Society
(2nd Part, Section xx, "Their Manner of Discourse") reprinted in
English Prose of the Seventeenth Century ed. Roberta F. Brinkley
(N.Y., 1951), pp. 883, 884.

10
11
The serpent-Satan is called to mind in this connection. Eve wonders at his ability to speak, a talent given only to man (Paradise Lost, IX. 554-566). Eve's failure to immediately distrust the serpent on these grounds was debated in the exegetical tradition and held to be a serious fault, one of 'presumption' in not asking Adam who knew the natures of animals (Arnold Williams, The Common Expositor [Chapel Hill, 1948], pp. 119-120).

12
E.g., Paradise Lost, IX. 532-548.

13
The Biblical account of the Fall describes the serpent as "more subtil than any beast of the field" (Genesis 3:1).

14
Other examples of the reiterated questions are: II. 216-218; II. 267-268; III. 204; III. 244-245; III. 273; III. 408-410; III. 457-458; IV. 106-107; IV. 136; IV. 165; IV. 355; IV. 371-372; IV. 393-394; IV. 410; V. 60-64; V. 232; V. 358; V. 418; V. 429-430.

15
Next to Shakespeare, p. 9.

16

17
Works, I. 52.

18

19
Next to Shakespeare, pp. 21-23.

20
Quoted in Taylor, Next to Shakespeare, p. 9.
IX

THE SOULDIERS FORTUNE (1680)

1. Comic Communication--

Speech and its use and mis-use are as central to the affairs of The Souldiers Fortune as they are to The Orphan. In both plays a moral lesson on the need for communication and understanding between men can be abstracted. The consequences of lack of communication, on the other hand, differ between the plays as catastrophe differs from cuckoldry, or as highly serious drama differs from comedy. The imperfect communication of The Orphan destroys a family and destroys a love; the imperfect communication of The Souldiers Fortune threatens to prevent an adulterous affair and leads to the creation of a cuckold.

The story of The Souldiers Fortune concerns two young soldiers, Beaugard and Courtine, who have recently been disbanded and find themselves home from the wars out at the pocket and lacking in prospects. Beaugard becomes involved, through the good services of Sir Jolly Jumble, with Lady Davy Dunce, whom Beaugard knew in earlier days as Clarinda. After considerable effort and confusion, Beaugard succeeds in cuckoldning Sir Davy. Courtine, meanwhile, has met a young heiress, Sylvia, a cousin of the Dunces. They marry.

Lady Dunce instigates the affair with Beaugard with the help, first, of her neighbor Sir Jolly ("Pimp Master-General to London and Middlesex"), and, next, of her unwitting husband. Sir Jolly has informed Beaugard
of an admirer and obtained Beaugard's portrait for her. Beaugard is surprised, then, to find Sir Davy returning the portrait to him with word that Lady Dunce has revealed Beaugard's intentions. Sir Davy is in tears of joy, he tells Beaugard:

...to think how happy I am in a sincere faithful and loving Yoke-fellow; she charg'd me to tell you in the bargain, that she is sufficiently satisfied of the most secret wishes of your heart.

(II. 189-193)

Sir Davy is too dull to note the ambiguity of the last statement and Beaugard does not know Sir Davy well enough to suspect that it might be ambiguous. Furthermore, Sir Davy was supposed to give Beaugard a ring (a gift of Lady Dunce's but returned as though it had been a gift of Beaugard's to her) with the message: "as thou likest this usage, she hopes to have thy custom again" (II. 635-636). Sir Davy forgot to return the ring and thus Beaugard and Lady Dunce are at cross purposes when they first meet, Beaugard believing she has jilted him. The matter is straightened out, but Lady Dunce upbraids her husband for this mistake: "what scandalous interpretation think you must [Beaugard] make of my retaining any trifle of his sent me on so dishonourable terms?" (III. 222-224).

Interpretation is the key word in the last quotation and it is the key to the continuing use of Sir Davy by Beaugard and Lady Dunce. In their first encounter Sir Davy failed to communicate all of his message, and, as a result, Beaugard failed to understand Lady Dunce. Once Beaugard realizes the technique, he too uses Sir Davy:
Beau. ...I beseech you tell her, that you have made a Convert of me, and that I am so sensible of my insolent behavior towards her--

Sir D. Very well, I shall do it.

Beau. That 'tis impossible I shall ever be at peace with my self till I find some way to make her reparation.

Sir D. Very good, ha, ha, ha.

Beau. And that if ever she find me guilty of the like offence again--

Sir D. No Sir, you had not best, but proceed, ha, ha, ha.

Beau. Let her banish all good opinion of me for ever.

(II. 637-647)

Sir Davy repeats the message to see if he has gotten it correctly:

"you shall never be at rest, till you have satisfi'd my Lady" (II. 664-665).

Beaugard agrees that he has the gist of it.

Beaugard nearly misunderstands Lady Dunce once again when she sends a letter by way of Sir Davy. Sir Davy believes the letter was given to her by Beaugard, and agrees to return it with her message that she has too just an estimate of Sir Davy's worth not to value Beaugard's addresses as they deserve (III. 290-293). Beaugard is about to reject the letter as not in his handwriting when he recognizes that the handwriting is hers. The letter begins: "I doubt not but this Letter will surprise you...but reflect upon the manner of conveighing it to your hand as kindly as you can"(III. 384-387). The danger of ambiguity and double-entendre as a means of communication is that the potential for misunderstanding is as well developed in such devices as is the potential for understanding. Communication between Lady Dunce and Beaugard begins on unstable grounds for this reason. Beaugard comes to recognize the technique and thereby establishes their communication on firm grounds. He brings the affair to a successful conclusion.
Sir Davy never comes to an awareness of potential ambiguity in speech or in relationships between people. He worries constantly about becoming a cuckold, but does not recognize any middle ground between cuckold and no-cuckold. He constantly takes the possibility for the practice, as in his excited response to Sir Jolly's report that he has just seen Lady Dunce speaking with a young man:

... Young fellow! --my Wife making sport with a young fellow! Oh Lord! here are doings! here are vagaries! I'll run mad, I'll climb Bow Steeple presently, bestride the Dragon, and preach Cuckoldom to the whole City.

(III. 119-123)

Sir Davy is unable to discriminate between the appearance and the reality, the potential and the practice, the subtle and the straightforward. Sir Jolly, Beaugard, and Lady Dunce convince him that he has mortally wounded Beaugard and that the only possible method of reviving him is to put him in a warm bed. Sir Davy, in this scene, is too terrified to see through Beaugard's trick, too obtuse to realize the potential danger of his wife and Beaugard in the same room alone, and so unaware of the subtleties of language that he commands his wife:

Prithee do so much as try thy skill, there may be life in him yet, take him to thy Chamber, put him into thy own bed, and try what thou canst do with him; prithee do, if thou canst but find motion in him, all may be well yet....

(IV. 630-634)

This double-entendre is a well-worn comic device and in part simply reflects the humor of a man named Dunce. It serves here, in addition, to contrast Sir Davy with Beaugard and Lady Dunce who handle the
the language with the skill to recognize not only the hidden meaning of such statements, but to use these meanings to convey primary meanings.

All three characters, Beaugard, Sir Davy, and Lady Dunce, contrast further with Sylvia and Courtine. The latter couple speak to each other using still different rhetorical devices. The following is the start of their first reported conversation:

_Sylv._ Take my word Sir, you had better give this business over, I tell you there's nothing in the World turns my Stomach so much as the man, that man that makes Love to me. I never saw one of your Sex in my life make love, but he lookt so like an Ass all the while, that I blusht for him.

_Court._ I am afraid your Ladyship then is one of those dangerous Creatures they call She-wits, who are always so mightily taken with admiring themselves, that nothing else is worthy their notice.

_(II. 258-267)_

This banter is couched in terms that are nearly the opposite of what each speaker intends them to mean. It is effective communication nevertheless because both Courtine and Sylvia are witty enough to control their own speech and understand another's. This backward banter characterizes their dialogue. Both admit their fondness in asides opening the Third Act; then they begin again:

_Court._ 'Tis a very hard Case, that you have resolv'd not to let me be quiet.

_Sylv._ 'Tis very unreasonably done of you, Sir, to haunt me up and down everywhere at this scandalous rate, the world will think we are acquainted shortly.

_Court._ But, Madam, I shall fairly take more care of my Reputation, and from this time forward shun and avoid you most watchfully.

_(III. 10-17)_
They carry on a courtship with complete success in this odd
dialogue and finally decide to marry. Their approach to the subject
is typically oblique, but this time, rather than talk in the backward
idiom, they manage the entire discussion in extended metaphor.
(Courtine had arrived drunk at Sylvia's the night before and awoke to
find she had tied him to a chair.)

Court. Why Child, would'st be so uncharitable to tie up
a poor Jade to an empty Rack in thy Stable, when he
knows where to go elsewhere and get Provinder enough?
Sylv. Any musty Provender, I find, will serve your turn,
so you have it but cheap, or at another mans charges.
Court. No Child, I had rather my Ox should graze in a
Field of my own, than live hide-bound upon the Common,
or run the hazzard of being Pounded every day for
Trespasses.
Sylv. Truly all things consider'd, 'tis great pity so
good a Husband-man as you should want a Farm to cultivate.

(V. 116-126)

This figure is continued for forty-three more lines, and, after a proviso
scene, Courtine agrees to become a "Tenant" on her "Farm:"

The wits, the witwouds, and the witlesses of this play are differ-
entiated by their dress, their understanding, their actions, and also by
their degree of skill with spoken English. The full range from wit to
witless is not described; most of the emphasis falls on the affairs of
Beaugard and Courtine, on the witty end of the scale. There is only
one truly witless character, a supernumerary named Frisk ("a young
fellow affectedly drest" [stage direction, II. 333] ). Frisk has only
one line and it makes no sense whatever: "Mademoisel Sylvia! sincerely
as I hope to be sav'd, the Devil take me, Dam me Madam, who's that?"
(II. 335-336). Sir Davy is obviously more meaningful in his speech than
is Frisk, but his dullness allows the other major characters to use him as an unwitting messenger. Beaugard twice nearly destroys his communication with Lady Dunce by mistaking her devices. The second time he catches his mistake in time: "What a Dog was I! forty to one but I had play'd the Fool, and spoil'd all again" (III, 337-379). Those characters that never play the fool (Lady Dunce, Courtine, and Sylvia) avoid that role through conscientious control of their own speech and a quick grasp of the speech of others.

2. Comic Roles--

The pattern of comic roles is like that of the complex relationships among tragic characters in that so long as a character maintains a single role with its attendant single group of demands and privileges, his part in any action is fairly clearly defined. Once a character finds himself, or places himself, in more than one role, then the potential for conflicting demands increases. If Alcibiades had been emotionally unattached, for example, he would not have faced any difficulty in dealing with the Queen of Sparta's lust for him. If Don Carlos had not fallen in love with the Queen he would have had no conflict of his roles as lover, as son, and as prince. If Titus were simply a Roman general his love for Berenice would not arouse Rome's jealousy.

The potential for successful maintainence of more than one role is considerably larger in comedy than in tragedy, and the penalties for failure to maintain multiple roles are correspondingly less severe.
Lady Dunce is perfectly successful at being both wife and mistress, and Courtine's failure to harmonize his love for Sylvia and his ideals as a rake results only in marriage. Courtine sees himself falling in love and recognizes the difficulties this presents: "...now must I love her still, tho I know I am a Blockhead for't, and she'll use me like a block-head too, if I don't prevent her: what's to be done? I'll have three Whores a day, to keep Love out of my head" (II. 340-344).

Sir Jolly is the most interesting specimen of perseverance with a single role—in this instance, that of pimp. He is a ludicrous figure, apparently bisexual with a strong penchant for voyeurism (I. 261-264, II. 30-41), but he makes no effort to hide his own oddities and he has enough cleverness to manage his affairs so as to bring them off successfully. He is called "Papa" by the prostitutes of his acquaintance, but this is not another role; it is simply a definition of the one he maintains. When Beaugard has misunderstood Lady Dunce's message and refuses to accompany Sir Jolly to meet her, Sir Jolly, (in what may be a parody of Iago's words on this subject in Othello [II. iii. 266-271, III. iii. 155-161]) takes the refusal as a personal affront: "Take away my Reputation and take away my Life; I shall be disgrac't for ever"

(II. 473-474). He continues:

...but you shall find you have wrong'd me, and wrong'd a sweet Lady, and a fine Lady: --I shall never be trusted again! never have employment more! I shall dye of the Spleen.

(II. 476-478)
Sir Jolly is referring, of course, to his reputation as a pandar.

His longest rant in this vein occurs when Courtine hints that he will marry Sylvia with Sir Jolly's help. Sir Jolly refuses:

I'll have nothing to do in it, I won't be seen in the business of Matrimony; make me a match-maker? a filthy Marriage Broker, Sir I scorn, I know better things; look you Friend, to carry her a Letter for you or so, upon good Terms, though it be in a Church I'll deliver it, or when the business is come to an issue, if I may bring you handsomely together, and so forth, I'll serve thee with all my Soul; and thank thee into the bargain; thank thee heartily dear Rogue, I will you little Cock-sparrow, faith and troth I will; but no Matrimony Friend, I'll have nothing to do with Matrimony; 'tis a damn'd invention worse than Monopoly, and a destroyer of civil correspondence.

(IV. 177-189)

Lady Dunce manages to be a wife to Sir Davy and mistress to Beaugard by defining her marriage in such a way as to invalidate its claims upon her. She tells Sylvia:

I never was married to that Engine we have been talking of, my parents indeed made me say something to him after a Priest once, but my heart went not along with my tongue, I minded not what it was....

(I. 437-440)

Lady Dunce had no say in her marriage and finds no reason to be obliged to a bargain she had no part of. She is willing to take part in the kind of world Sir Jolly describes—one in which "civil correspondence" is a synonym for fornication. Her husband is fit only to be a "Gentleman-Usher for Ceremonies sake": "...heretofore indeed 'twas a fulsome fashion, to ly o' nights with a Husband; but the worlds improv'd and Customs altered" (I. 396-397, 392-394). She and Beaugard bring off their affair with such success that she is able to improve her lot in
marriage. At the end of the play Beaugard commands Sir Davy:

...as you tender your future credit, take this wrong'd
Lady home, and use her handsomly, use her like my
Mistress, Sir, do you mark me, that when we think fit
to meet again, I hear no complaint of you; this must
be done Friend.

(V. 694-698)

In this way Lady Dunce remains married but gains all the prerogatives
of a mistress.

Sir Davy is enmeshed in a number of roles. Many of them are
artificial and are dropped as easily as they were assumed, but the
action of the play forces him to accept, with a show of willingness, the
single role of cuckold. Before obtaining the horns, Sir Davy is des-
cribed as "one of those Fools ... that are led by the Nose by Knaves
to rail against the King and the Government, and is mightily fond of
being thought of a party" (I. 462-464). Sir Davy may be a supporter of
faction part of the time, but the moment he is physically threatened he
cries, "I'm a free-born Subject of England, and there are Laws, look
you, there are Laws" (II. 156-157). He trades upon his title and re-
veals his lack of sophistication concerning the language as he unbraids
Beaugard: "Do you consider my name is Sir Davy Dunce, that I have
the most vertuous Wife living? Do you consider that?" (III. 364-366).

Sir Davy is also ambitious. As a part of a trick to get him out
of the house, Beaugard's servant pretends to come from the Lord Mayor
with an invitation to Sir Davy for dinner. "I shall certainly be a great
Man, " Sir Davy says (III. 438-439). When he believes himself guilty
of the murder of Beaugard he laments: "'tis very hard so good a
common-Wealths-man should be brought to ride in a Cart at last"
(V. 428-430), but he hits upon a scheme to put the blame upon Sir Jolly.
Beaugard's "body" is moved into Sir Jolly's house next door. Sir Davy
then calls the watch and tells them of the murder:

I'm sorry to tell it you Mr. Constable, for I am
afraid it will look but scurvily on his side;
though I am a Justice o' Peace Gentlemen, and am bound
by my Oath to take notice of it; I can't help it.
(V. 553-556)

While Sir Davy takes on the roles of partisan, free-born subject,
minor nobility, great man, loyal common-wealth's-man, and justice
of the peace, the other characters view him simply as "the Cuckold
Elect" (II. 45). Sir Davy's pretensions to power and position are
placed in proper perspective as Lady Dunce makes use of him as an
"Engine" and Beaugard uses him as a "delicate instrument." "To make
her old jealous Coxcomb pimp for me himself," Beaugard says, "I
think 'tis as worthy an employment as such a noble Consort can be put
to" (II. 683-685), All Sir Davy's roles collapse when he is confronted
with proof of his wife's affair in the presence of the other characters.
She asks if he can forgive her this one "misfortune," and he replies,
"Madam, in one word, I am thy Lady-ships most humble Servant and
Cuckold, Sir Davy Dunce Kt., Living in Covent-Garden" (V. 702-704).
He has no choice but to accept the only role for which he is fit.

Sir Davy's roles also point to a broader range of satiric targets,
foibles in society at large, aimed at here as in much Restoration comedy.
Sir Davy is a *type* of the anti-government partisan and laughter directed at him is directed at the entire class. The *Souldiers Fortune* has no peculiar originality in its satiric targets. A hired cut-throat, for example, says that he does not have a trade, but instead "professes" murder: "'tis a Gentleman's Divertisement" (IV. 245-263). Times are hard in his business, however:

> In peaceable times a man may eat and drink comfortably upon't, a private Murder done handsomely is worth Money: but now that the Nation's unsettled, there are so many general undertakers, that 'tis grown almost a Monopoly, you may have a man Murder'd almost for little or nothing and no Body e'r know who did it neither. (IV. 258-263)

Beaugard and Courtine's lack of preferment leads them to considerable railing, and Otway makes use of this device for broad satiric commentary. In one scene, otherwise unconnected with the action, Beaugard and Courtine comment on a number of passing men. Beaugard notices one, for example:

> There, there's another of my acquaintance, he was my Fathers Footman not long since, and has pimp't for me oftener than he pray'd for himself; that good quality recommended him to a noble mans service, which together with flattering, fawning, lying, spying and informing, has rais'd him to an employment of trust and reputation, though the Rogue can't write his Name, nor read his neck Verse, if he had occasion. (II. 363-370)

The *Souldiers Fortune* has no claims to extraordinary significance, then, on the basis of its satiric matter or manner. The carefully worked out structural motifs of speech and role attest, however, to Otway's craftsmanship, and this play is perhaps Otway's best comedy
both in terms of its humor and in terms of its construction.

A character's multiple roles in tragedy are frequently a focus for audience sympathy. As Don Carlos struggles to harmonize his emotions and responsibilities as a son and as a lover, for example, the audience can be expected to experience compassion for him in both these roles. Comic roles, such as have been discussed, serve an analogous function as they focus audience laughter. The audience, for example, is not laughing simply at Sir Davy's presumption to several roles; they are laughing as well at many of these roles themselves and at Sir Davy for assuming them. Supporters of anti-king and government parties are worthy of satire, Otway says, no matter who they are, and, simultaneously anti-king and government partisans are worthy of satire because they are like Sir Davy. In his next play, *Venice Preserv'd*, Otway developed the tragic potential of complex roles and relationships to its fullest. In *Venice Preserv'd* he adds a further complication by giving his protagonist a conflict of sympathetic roles, husband and friend, which are at the same time coupled to antipathetic roles associated with corruption in the existing government and rebellion against it. Jaffier must make a choice, but neither possibility can bring repose.
NOTES TO CHAPTER IX

1

The subject of preferment in this play has been discussed further in Chapter I, section V.
1. Politics in Venice--

William H. McBurney has suggested that the title of this play indicates that the political action is to be considered comic rather than tragic: Venice is threatened by internal rebellion, but, when all is done, it escapes this danger unharmed. But the comic, happy ending, aspect of the title is ambiguous and ironic. The title is as mixed in its meanings as the political situation is, and as mixed as the character of the man who acts as Venice's preserver. Jaffeir's wife pictures a statue raised in his honor bearing the inscription: "Remember him that prop'd the fall of Venice" (IV. 13). Jaffeir interprets the preservation differently:

Rather, remember him, who after all
The sacred Bonds of Oaths and holier Friendship,
In fond compassion to a Womans tears
Forgot his Manhood, Vertue, truth and Honour,
To sacrifice the Bosom that reliev'd him.

(IV. 14-18)

These antagonistic evaluations of the act of preservation and the antagonistic meanings simultaneously present in the title can only be understood in terms of what it is that has been preserved and what that preservation cost.

Venice is ruled, one citizen testifies, by a group of "Domestick spoilers," Senators who:
Cheat the deluded people with a shew
Of Liberty, which yet they ne'r may taste of;
They say, by them our hands are free from Fetters,
Yet whom they please they lay in basest bonds;
Bring whom they please to Infamy and Sorrow;
Drive us like Wracks down the rough Tide of Power,
Whilst no hold's left to save us from Destruction.
(I. 154-160)

Jaffier's friend, Pierre, finds the Venetians, "have neither safety,
Unity, nor Peace, / For the foundation's lost of Common Good" (I. 210-211). The laws are corrupted by those in power and the "Publick Stock's a Beggar" (II. 265). The army and the navy are in a state of decay, the nobility bankrupt, and the Senate "Factious, giddy, and divided" (II. 267-270). We are shown two Senators in some detail:

Priuli, cruel and proud, and Antonio, a lecherous, masochistic fool.

Opposed to the Senators are a clandestine group of rebels. These men picture themselves "Fit to disturb the Peace of all the World, / And rule it when its wildest," and "separated by the Choice of Providence / From the gross heap of Mankind" (II. 185-186, 224-225).

As the play progresses we find them to be not saviors, but an "assembly all made up of Wretches / That look as Hell had drawn 'em into League" (III. ii. 99-100). They do not plan the salvation of Venice through the destruction of tyranny, oppression, and avarice (III. iii. 366-367), but instead plan a "Spectacle of horrour" with wholesale rapine, murder, and disorder (III. ii. 374-382). Thus Venice loses no matter who wins in the struggle between the Senate and the rebels. The Senators are tyrants and the rebels opportunists.
The parallel of the political situation in Venice Preserv'd and Caius Marius has been noted in the discussion of the latter. In both we are presented with an intolerable state of present affairs and an untenable alternative. In these terms the irony of preservation is obvious. Venice is saved from the rebels, but it is saved for the Senators. I have suggested that Caius Marius carries a political lesson for Restoration England in its Roman history. Venice Preserv'd has, similarly, been recognized as a partial political allegory of the contemporary English furor surrounding the Popish Plot and the growing partisanship of Whig and Tory. The difficulty raised by this allegory is similar to the difficulties raised in an attempt to evaluate the lesson of Caius Marius. Both plays are more strongly anti-faction than they are pro-Tory. Pierre does not speak of partisan matters when he bemoans the lack of safety, unity, and peace, or when he laments the corruption of the law (the foundation of "Common Good"). Furthermore, Pierre is allied with the rebels which would make him, in the allegory, a Whig, and yet it was the Tories who saw the law warped by city judges and knights of the post. Again, it would be a luke-warm Tory in that period of violent partisanship who described the "Stores / Of general safety" like this:

Empty Magazines,
Tatter'd Fleet, a murmuring unpaid Army,
Bankrupt Nobility, a harrass Commonality,
A Factious, giddy, and divided Senate.

(II. 266-270)

It may be that Otway deliberately described the factions as two sides of the same bad coin to avoid censorship, but the Prologue makes his position in the Whig and Tory conflict unambiguously clear:
In these distracted times, when each man dreads
The bloody stratagem of busie heads;
When we have fear'd three years we know not what,
Till Witnesses begin to die o' th' rot,
What made our Poet meddle with a Plot?

(11. 1-5)²

Mrs. Taylor has suggested another reason for the repulsive political factions of the play:

All sympathy becomes divorced from the political opponents and rests with the three principals, in their misfortunes representative of the respectable, peaceable part of the nation, who are caught in the circumstances produced by a gigantic fraud and forced into courses of action that they would never have taken if left to their own devices. ³

This interpretation is correct insofar as the redirection of sympathy toward the protagonists is concerned; Jaffir becomes the surrogate for the audience in the political milieu. Mrs. Taylor's interpretation goes on, however, to suggest that the political situation is somehow an unnecessary complication. In another passage she makes this explicit:

"In Venice Preserv'd political issues are treated as merely an extension of Jaffir's domestic concerns." ⁴ The play does not support this argument. Jaffir's domestic concerns (and Pierre's, for that matter) are in part the result of the political situation. Jaffir's father-in-law, Priuli, can deny assistance to his daughter and her husband as a Venetian citizen. As a Senator, Priuli can, and does, turn them out of house and home (I. 235-237). Pierre loses Aquilina to a Senator with "privilege" and not to an old and wealthy fellow-citizen. Both men are forced into the political struggle, it is true, but it becomes an integral part of their difficulties. Politics intrude on their domestic concerns and cause them
to accept roles in the political struggle. These political roles in turn cause further domestic concern.

2. Role and Relationship--

Jaffeir is forced by his father-in-law's actions to an awareness of the universal disorder in Venice--"Where Brothers, Friends, and Fathers all are false" (I. 253). He finds sympathy from Pierre who also suffers the misused prerogatives of a Senator. Pierre has been active with the rebels whom he promises Jaffeir will find to be "better Friends" (II. 132). When Pierre offers him freedom from "base Priuli's Tyranny" (II. 161), Jaffeir joins the rebels, promising his sword to their service against the Senate, "tho [it] meet a Father there" (II. 327). With this promise he becomes Pierre's "Honour's Brother" (II. 420). Jaffeir accepts the new role of rebel and a new closeness to Pierre almost blindly. He boasts to Belvidera that the group has vowed to cut the throats of the entire Senate:

He amongst us
That spares his Father, Brother, or his Friend,
Is damn'd.

(III. ii. 141-143)

Jaffeir at this moment does not recognize the grotesque inconsistency of joining a group dedicated to the destruction of brother, father, and friend because of a desire for revenge against a society in which brother, father, and friend are false.

His rebellion is inspired in large part by his sense of the sufferings endured by Belvidera. He tells Pierre:
Ah Pierre! I have a Heart, that could have born
The roughest Wrong my Fortune could have done me:
But when I think what Belvidera feels,
I own my self a Coward ....

(I. 270-274)

But, ironically, it is his relationship to Belvidera, his feeling for her,
that ultimately acts against his part in the rebellion. She presents him
with two facts in order to dissuade him from the conspiracy. First,
she is astounded that he would consider raising his hand against Priuli:

Murder my Father! tho his Cruel Nature
Has persecuted me to my undoing,
Driven me to basest wants; Can I behold him
With smiles of Vengeance, butcher'd in his Age?

(III. ii. 154-157)

Because Priuli is Belvidera's father as well as a Senator, Jaffeur's
roles as rebel and husband begin to conflict. Belvidera adds a second
fact: Renault, the rebel leader, has attempted to rape her. With this
revelation she destroys Jaffeur's faith in the conspirators, men he thought
were "honest as the Nature / Of Man first made, e're Fraud and Vice
were fashions" (III. ii. 168-169). The man with whom Jaffeur intrusted
his wife's virtue has betrayed it, and he has only one remaining tie with
the rebels--his friendship for Pierre.

Jaffeur, urged on by Belvidera, agrees to reveal the plot to the
Senate, but he feels the revelation is a betrayal. Belvidera attempts to
quiet this reluctance by forcing him, in the following dialogue, to eval-
uate his conflicting relationships:

Jaf. .... lead me to the place where I'm to say
This bitter Lesson, where I must betray
My truth, my vertue, constancy and friends;
Must I betray my friends? Ah take me quickly,
Secure me well before that thought's renew'd;
If I relapse once more, all's lost for ever.
Bel. Hast thou a friend more dear than Belvidera?
Jaf. No, th'art my Soul it self ....

(IV. 73-80)

Jaffeir thus makes an ultimate value judgment, placing his relationship to Belvidera above all others. He speaks to the Senate as one who is willing to renounce one role and take up another:

You see here before you,
The sworn and Covenanted foe of Venice.
But use me as my dealings may deserve
And I may prove a friend.

(IV. 144-147)

Once Jaffeir becomes the friend of the Senate, of course, he ceases to be Pierre's friend. He redefines his relationship to Pierre in answer to the latter's question:

Pierre. ...these Reverend Tyrants [the Senate], Jaffeir,
Call us Traitors, art thou one, my Brother?
Jaf. To thee I am the falsest, veryest slave
That e're betray'd a generous trusting friend,
And gave up honour to be sure of ruine.

(IV. 252-256)

Pierre acts as Jaffeir expected—he turns away from Jaffeir and says, "I know thee not" (IV. 289). Pierre denies that the man before him could be his "once lov'd, valu'd friend" (IV. 294). By his revelation to the Senate, Jaffeir loses the man he calls his "father, friend, preserver" (IV. 376), and this loss in turn forces him away from Belvidera momentarily. He calls her a "Traitress" (IV. 295); that is, a traitress to him, not to Venice. Jaffeir never fully renounces his ties to Belvidera, however, and in his farewell to her he calls up another aspect of their relationship:
We have a Child, as yet a tender Infant.
Be a kind Mother to him when I am gone,
Breed him in vertue and the paths of Honour,
But never let him know his father's story.

(V. 335-338)

Primarily, as McBurney notes, Jaffear and Belvidera are treated as
though they were lovers, and references to their child occur only a
sentimentally heightened moments. The reference to their parenthood
in this final dialogue gives additional completeness to the farewell, as
though he were summing up all of their relationships. He leaves her
to answer Pierre's call: "Heav'n knows I want a Friend" (V. 429). He
plays a final role as Pierre's friend by killing him; he preserves
Pierre's honor by destroying his life.

This terse summary of Jaffear's shifting roles reveals a concise,
logical, and necessary progression. Otway is sparing in his use of the
language of relationship as far as Jaffear is concerned. (The sentimental
use of Belvidera's relationships will be discussed later.) Jaffear is
torn between two roles--friend and lover--each of which has a political
affiliation--rebel and Senate. He does not switch from one allegiance
to the other, but, instead, moves in a developing pattern from the
moment Priuli evicts him until the moment he stabs Pierre and then
takes his own life. Malcolm Elwin described Jaffear as "not merely
the creature of circumstance, kicked and cuffed by cruel fortune, but
an innocent idealist, turned out into the world ill-equipped to bear the
buffets of cruel humanity."6 The degree of Jaffear's idealism is hard
to assess. He trusts the rebels because he trusts Pierre. His trust
is incautious and perhaps naive, but he has no reason to doubt the intentions or evaluations of his friend. Jaffeir is not quite as incautious with the Senators, but he is again naive. He obtains their solemn oaths to preserve the rebels before he reveals the plot (IV. 163-174). The Senators deceive him as the rebels have, a deception he might have expected, but he has taken all the steps to prevent deception of which he is capable.

When Jaffeir learns the truth about the rebels and is forced to choose between them and Belvidera, he chooses Belvidera and never completely wavers from that choice. He suffers no discernable regret at having betrayed the rebels, but he is tortured by his betrayal of Pierre for whom his affections have never changed. Once he chooses Belvidera as his dearest "friend," he must act as he does. Jaffeir is simultaneously a traitor and a preserver, a traitor to his friend and a preserver of Venice. Belvidera is likewise both traitor and preserver; she is a traitor to Jaffeir and a preserver of Venice. Pierre plays both these roles as well: once, as a soldier, he preserved Venice (V. 232-245), but he dies as a traitor to it.

The play thus moves through a continuing redefinition of roles. Pierre, it will be recalled, introduced the rebels to Jaffeir as his "better Friends." Yet Jaffeir comes in time to offer to be a friend to the Senate, a result of his decision that Belvidera is his best friend. Rebels become preservers and preservers become rebels. Yet, ironically in this world of shifting relationships, it is constancy which brings
about the tragic action. David R. Hauser has accurately described the
ambiguous world of mixed good and evil which Venice Preserv'd pre-
sents, but I believe he is mistaken when he isolates the rebel leader
Renault's statement, "Irregular Man's ne're constant, never certain"
(II. 207), as Otway's judgment of human psychology. 7

We have already seen how Jaffeir moves (if hesitantly) toward
revelation of the plot once he has accepted the primacy of his relation-
ship to Belvidera. The final act of friendship for Pierre is inspired
by his oath to right, however partially, the wrong done Pierre. "I
have sworn, Belvidera," Jaffeir says to her (V. 303). Jaffeir's con-
stancy to this oath is a unique act in a play full of broken oaths. 8

Jaffeir's constancy brings about the betrayal of the conspirators (and
the preservation of Venice), Pierre's death, his own death, and
Belvidera's madness and death. Jaffeir's constancy is not easily
achieved; he undergoes agonies of self-incrimination which spring from
uncertainty and undergoes agonies which result from the inconstancy of
others. Nevertheless, his final actions reveal the insufficiency of
Renault's judgment, and they reveal the real potential for constancy
which is in some men.

The developing roles of this play form only one pattern of action.
Other motifs and symbols provide additional patterns, reinforcing and
filling-out Otway's portrait of an ambiguous and uncertain world in
which the virtue of constancy can bring about catastrophe.
3. Patterns of Action—

Jaffeir's dagger serves as one locus of shifting values. It parallels the course of Jaffeir's changing allegiances, denoting at first a pledge of honor to the rebels (II. 393-395), then a "dreadful dower" as Belvidera reveals the attempted rape (III. ii. 68), and finally the instrument whereby Jaffeir effects a reconciliation with Pierre and a restitution of his lost sense of honor. McBurney has noted that the only constant value of the ubiquitous dagger is negative—"that of potential or real destructiveness." This negative value is nonetheless appropriate in that destruction of Pierre and Jaffeir is a gesture of friendship and honor, just as in this play betrayal is an act of preservation and constancy a virtue which brings about catastrophe. Pierre calls it a "worthless pledge" when he discovers Jaffeir has betrayed him, yet in the closing moments Pierre finds it a more fit "Engine" for a soldier's death than to be "expos'd a common Carcass on a Wheel" (IV. 362, V. 447).

The pattern delimited by the values associated with the dagger is paralleled by a pattern formed around a number of symbolic embraces. The embrace is used by the conspirators, including Pierre, as a sign of acceptance and comradeship. Pierre embraces Jaffeir when Jaffeir agrees to join the conspirators (II. 182), and Bedamar of the rebels welcomes Jaffeir to the group in this way: "I must embrace him" (II. 340). Bedamar, with unconscious irony, tells an Englishman in the group, "'Tis thy Nations Glory, / To hugg that Foe that
offers brave Alliance" (II. 235-236).

Renault's cool cynicism allows him to penetrate the potential ambiguity of meaning present in the embraces. He makes the gesture himself on occasion, but his terse comment is, "I never lov'd these huggers" (II. 342). Renault apparently recognizes that an embrace is not an unshakeable pledge of faith, and, further, that an embrace can become a stab in the back. Jaffeir has become so embroiled in the conspiracy that he and Belvidera speak of an embrace, the comfort of encircling arms, as a thing of the past and a gesture at this time of forgiveness. Jaffeir crawls to Belvidera after Pierre has scorned him:

Oh Belvidera! I'm the wretchedst creature
E're crawl'd on earth; now if thou hast Vertue, help me,
Take me into thy Armes, and speak the words of peace
To my divided Soul, that wars within me,
And raises every Sense to my confusion;
By Heav'n I am tottering on the very brink
Of Peace; and thou art all the hold I've left.

(IV. 403-409)

Even this embrace between lovers has mixed meanings. Jaffeir reaches out to her for comfort, for stability and peace, and she tells him "everlasting comfort's in thy armes" (IV. 480). Yet at the moment of her words Jaffeir is remembering his pledge to the conspirators and his hand is on his dagger. Their embrace nearly becomes murder.

One pattern of action is less ambiguous in its meanings but is more pervasive than the dagger and the embraces. This is a sweeping movement from cursing to blessing which encompasses the entire play. The play opens with Priuli's curse of Jaffeir and Belvidera. He tells Jaffeir:
May all your Joys in her prove false like mine;  
A sterile Fortune and a barren Bed,  
Attend you both: Continual discord make  
Your Days and Nights bitter and grievous: Still  
May the hard hand of a vexatious Need  
Oppress and grind you ....  

(I. 52-57)

The play ends with Jaffeir's dying instructions to an attendant:

Sir, I have a Wife, bear this in safety to her,  
A token that with my dying breath I blest her,  
And the dear little Infant left behind me.  

(V. 475-477) 13

Jaffeir and Belvidera live under Priuli's curse and the "curse" of the Senate. Jaffeir's frustration and desire for revenge lead him to seek a more effective weapon that his own curses:

...Curses stick not: Could I kill with Cursing,  
By Heav'n I know not thirty Heads in Venice  
Should not be blasted; Senators should rot  
Like Dogs on Dunghills; but their Wives and Daughters  
Dye of their own diseases. Oh for a Curse  
To kill with!

(II. 118-123) 14

Pierre replies, "Daggers, Daggers, are much better!" Jaffeir takes up his dagger and thus begins that pattern of action.

The large number of vows and broken oaths which critics have noticed in Venice Preserv'd are part of the pattern of cursing and blessing in that oaths (like daggers and embraces) are sought out as a means of realizing the curses of the conspirators and as a means of removing the curse of the Senate. 15 Jaffeir vows to keep the secrets Pierre utters (II. 137) and swears to live and die with Pierre (II. 306). This last oath is the only one which is kept of all the oaths given and received in the play. We have already seen that Jaffeir requires an
oath of the Senators at the moment at which he breaks his own oath to the conspirators. Perhaps as meaningful, for the whole play, as his own kept oath is Jaffeir's refusal to accept or ask an oath from Belvidera. He asks her not to betray him and she asks if she should swear. He replies, "No: do not swear: I would not violate / Thy tender Nature with so rude a Bond" (III. ii. 134-135). Ironically, Jaffeir feels he knows her well enough to render an oath unnecessary. Indeed, she does not betray him: she brings him to betray himself. She says that she has studied and learned from him his constancy, courage, and truth (III. ii. 123), and compares herself to Brutus's Portia (III. ii. 61-67, 113-117). But Belvidera fails to come up to this standard (IV. 391). Her primary allegiance is to her father, not to her husband, and it is too late when she finally calls her husband's foes the "faithless Senators" (IV. 463).

Once the broken oaths, the worthless pledges, and the empty embraces bring about the collapse of the political plot and erase any possible correction of wrongs done the principal characters, these characters begin to seek each other out and beg forgiveness. Every major character is solicited for forgiveness, for blessing. In very religious language Jaffeir seeks forgiveness from Pierre:

...look upon me with an eye of mercy,
With pity and with charity behold me;
Shut not thy heart against a friend's repentence,
But as there dwells a God-like nature in thee,
Listen with mildness to my supplications.

(IV. 282-286)
Pierre refuses him here, but later grants his forgiveness (V. 436).

Belvidera seeks Jaffeur's "Mercy" (IV. 396), and in his last interview with her Jaffeur admits "Man ne're was bless'd, / Since the first pair met, as I have been" (V. 270-271). "Then sure," Belvidera says, "you will not curse me." "No," Jaffeur says, "I'll bless thee" (V. 272).

Belvidera goes to Priuli to beg for "Pity and Forgiveness," and "one kind blessing" (V. 36, 66). Priuli is touched by her story and asks her, in his turn, "Canst thou forgive me all my follies past?" (V. 115).

In the peculiar and secular redemptive process which the play describes it is thematically appropriate and extraordinarily moving when Belvidera, now insane, curses herself and the universe:

Curst be my days, and doubly curst my nights,
Which I must now mourn out in widdow'd tears;
Blasted by every herb and fruit and tree,
Curst be the rain that falls upon the earth,
And may the general Curse reach man and beast;
Oh give me daggers, fire or water,
How I could bleed, how burn, how drown the waves
Buzzing and booming round my sinking head,
Till I descended to the peacefull bottome! 16
(V. 349-357)

She is Jaffeur's greatest blessing, but she, like Jaffeur, has lost her peace. They have lost the quiet, the calm, and the order of existence free from curses.

Nearly every pattern of action that has been described appears in two consecutive, perfectly paralleled scenes which open the last Act. The first is that in which Belvidera seeks Priuli's forgiveness for her- self and Jaffeur and Priuli's intervention in the Senate to prevent the execution of the conspirators. She begs him:
...send me not with curses
Down to my grave, afford me one kind blessing
Before we part: just take me in your armes
And recommend me with a prayer to Heaven,
(V. 65-68)

Belvidera seeks an embrace of forgiveness and pardon for herself and
for Jaffeer. In this way, too, she seeks Priuli's favor to save the
"promis'd lives" of Jaffeer's "dear friends" (V. 110-111). In contrast,
the courtesan Aquilina seeks pardon for the conspirators from her lover
Antonio in another manner. She forces him to his knees with a dagger
(V. 175). He has, Aquilina tells him, "help'd to destroy my peace, and
I'll have vengeance" (V. 184). She, like Jaffeer and Belvidera, has lost
her peace, and in a cruel parody of the embrace of forgiveness sought
by Belvidera, she forces the masochistic Antonio to her feet, to "swear
that [her] Love shall live" (V. 201).

In these two scenes, parallel in intention but obverse in method,
appear the dagger, the embrace, the oath, and the quest for forgiveness.
The perfect balance of these scenes would seem to suggest a test of the
two methods, the two means to the same end, but, like the opposition
of Senate and conspirators, friendship and love, neither method succeeds.
The play suggests, in the largest terms, that alternatives of this kind
are impossible of reconciliation. The opposition of Senator and rebel,
friendship and love, are, of course, false oppositions by definition.
Both political alternatives are evil; both emotional alternatives are good.
Evil opposes evil and good, good, only when they are mixed as they are
in this play. Jaffeer is faced with impossible alternatives and there is
no hint of a way around the horns of this dilemma. Renault, again, provides a summary statement of this phenomena. He tells the conspirators:

...Let's call to mind, my dearest Friends,
That there's nothing pure upon the Earth,
That the most valu'd things have most allays.

(III. ii. 383-385)

Jaffier's actions disproved Renault's earlier generalization, "Irregular Man's ne're constant, never certain," but there is nothing to qualify the statement "there's nothing pure upon the Earth." It was possible in Caius Marius to suggest the play might be read as an antifaction statement and as a plea for peace and order. Venice Preserv'd might be read in the same way, but the evidence is weaker and the struggle for peace seems more hopeless. The final actions—the blessing and forgiveness, the proof of possible constancy, the reaffirmation of honor—do not stand as disproof of Renault's picture of alloyed nature. Instead, Venice Preserv'd presents a carefully crafted picture of a world in which preservation is also betrayal, constancy yields catastrophe, those who curse can also bless, and those who are honorable are also dishonorable. There is nothing pure upon this earth.

4. Sentimental Devices--

Venice Preserv'd provides examples of every sentimental device described heretofore in this study. The sentimental use of relationships is extensive. An extended example occurs as Jaffier pleads with Pierre to recognize him as his friend and accept the freedom Jaffier thinks the Senate has promised (IV. 274-374). Another example is
provided in the scene between Belvidera and Priuli. She enters to him with the words:

He's there, my father, my inhuman father,
That, for three years, has left an only child
Expos'd to all the outrages of Fate.

(V. 19-20)

As she pleads with him she stresses their relationship again and again, calling up at one point the memory of her dead mother (much as Patroclus did to Tissaphernes in Alcibiades). She is, she tells Priuli:

...your daughter, by a mother
Vertuous and noble, faithful to your honour,
Obedient to your will, kind to your wishes,
Dear to your arms; by all the joys she gave you,
When in her blooming years she was your treasure,
Look kindly on me....

(V. 39-44)

Belvidera says she is about to die, and asks that when she does she be laid by the dear ashes of her "tender mother" (V. 71). Priuli, of course, succumbs to this appeal and promises he will "henceforth be indeed a father" (V. 116). It should be noted that Belvidera's mother had not before been mentioned, and thus this appeal seems excessively forced. Belvidera's emotions seem planned rather than spontaneous.

Described scenes are also employed. An interesting aspect of this device is that it is nearly always used to move not only the audience but also one or more of the characters of the play itself. This double emotional effect need not be sentimental in intention or result. For example, Pierre describes to Jaffeur "The sons of public Rapine... destroying" his household in order to arouse Jaffeur's anger, not his
pity (I. 232-249). In the following description the emotion sought is
pity and the events described are improbable and over-detailed.

Jaffier tells Belvidera they are facing "Want! worldly Want!"

Can't thou bear Cold and Hunger? Can these Limbs,
Fram'd for the tender Offices of Love,
Endure the bitter Gripe of smarting Poverty?
When banish'd by our miseries abroad,
(As suddenly we shall be) to seek out
(In some far Climate where our Names are strangers)
For charitable succor; wilt thou then,
When in a Bed of straw we shrink together,
And the bleak winds shall whistle round our heads;
Wilt thou then talk thus to me?

(I. 360-369)

Belvidera describes to Jaffier the assault made on her by Renault,
and, later, when Jaffier seems to flag in his intent to face the Senate,
she prods him with the picture she has described: "Last night, my
Love!" she says. Jaffier replies:

Name, name it not again.
It shows a beastly Image to my fancy,
Will wake me into madness.

(IV. 32-34)

In this last exchange the use of the described scene to move one of
the characters toward some desired reaction is plain. The phrase
"last night" recalls this scene, of course, to the audience as well.

The device of the twice-told scene is also used. We see an
event occur once in action, and hear the scene described, usually at
length, later. The detail and vocabulary used in this way as Jaffier
tells Belvidera of Pierre's rebuff produces one of Otway's most un-
pleasant scenes. Mrs. Taylor says Jaffier's "self-abasement is
almost pathological." Jaffier says, in part:
With eyes o'rfloving and a bleeding heart,
Humbling myself almost beneath my nature,
At his feet I kneel'd, and su'd for mercy,
Forgetting all our friendship, all the dearness,
In which w' have liv'd so many years together,
With a reproachfull hand, he dash'd a blow,
He struck me, Belvidera, by Heaven, he struck me,
Buffeted, call'd me Traitor, Villain, Coward.

(IV. 440-447) 18

The twice-told scene is a variant of the described scene and as such it frequently has the function of arousing a specific response in the listening character. Belvidera describes to Priuli Jaffeir's attempt on her life in order to arouse his sympathy:

Think you saw what pass'd at our last parting;
Think you beheld him like a raging lion,
Pacing the earth and tearing up his steps,
Fate in his eyes, and roaring with the pain
Of burning fury; think you saw one hand
Fix't on my throat, while the extended other
Grasp'd a keen threatening dagger.

(V. 94-100)

Belvidera's eagerness for her narrative to be vivid is shown not only in the trite image of the lion, but also in her repeated urging of Priuli to use his imagination--"think you."

McBurney has commented in some detail on the solicitation of pity in the audience through the repetition of emotionally-charged words. Fortune or fate is referred to, he finds, forty-nine times, and heart mentioned eighty-four times. 19 To this might be added the explicit references to pity. These occur as early as the second Act, e.g., Belvidera's plea to Jaffeir: "Don't, prithee don't in poverty forsake me.

/ But pity the sad heart, that's torn with parting" (II. 415-416). The
word pity occurs with increasing frequency in the last two Acts, accompanying the appeals for forgiveness. Jaffeir begs Pierre, for example, "With pity and Charity behold me" (IV. 283), and Belvidera makes one "last tryal of a father's pity" (V. 106). The use of the sentimental absolute might be classed, finally, with the use of emotionally-charged words since it too appeals to the extra emotion expected from an extreme statement of distress. "There's not a wretch," Jaffeir says, "that lives on common Charity / But's happier than me" (I. 97-98). Pierre bids a gruff goodbye to Aquilina and she cries, "Must we ne're meet again! Embrace no more! / Is Love so soon and utterly forgotten!" (II. 60-61).

I have chosen to discuss Otway's plays in chronological order so as to avoid any possible false emphasis or false sense of development which might arise from another system of ordering. It is difficult, however, and possibly wrong-headed, to ignore the importance of Venice Preserv'd in the canon. The Orphan is a more concise, controlled, and intense play, but Venice Preserv'd clearly exhibits many of Otway's most frequent devices, structures, and themes. It makes both structural and sentimental use of a character's multiple roles and relationships; it exhibits his most frequent sentimental devices; it explores the chaos on every level which results from political instability and disorder, and it concentrates every element to its effect on the characters. This latter quality can be illustrated with the secular anathema and forgiveness of this play. The Christian vocabulary is used--heaven, hell, mercy, charity, repentence, supplication--but it is directed from one man to
another. "Shut not thy heart," Jaffeir says, not to God, but to Pierre. Otway's ability to concentrate attention on the emotional effects on the characters of every element of the drama—the political events, the tug of antagonistic relationships and roles, the rhetoric—produces highly emotional drama which, in turn, sympathetically affects the audience. If the audience is receptive to the effects produced in them, then Otway is praised for his ability to truly touch the passions (as Dryden), to interest the heart (as Dr. Johnson), and to "shine" in the "Passionate Parts" of his tragedy (as Addison). If the audience is antagonistically effected by the emotions of the play, then Otway is said to be less interested in characters than in "emotions as such" (as Dobrée), and found to have a critical weakness in his penchant for subordinating everything to "painting the passions" (as Prior).
NOTES TO CHAPTER X

1 "Otway's Tragic Muse Debauched: Sensuality in *Venice Preserv'd, " *JEGP*, LXVIII(1959), 387.

2 The Prologue is printed in italics, which I have omitted.

3 *Next to Shakespeare*, p. 58. See also John Loftis, *The Politics of Drama in Augustan England* (Oxford, 1963), p. 19. Loftis also points out the lack of true allegory in the political material (pp. 18-19).

4 *Next to Shakespeare*, p. 67.

5 "Otway's Tragic Muse Debauched," 392.


7 "Otway Preserved: Theme and Form in *Venice Preserv'd, " *SP*, LV(1958), 485-488.

8 The importance of the oaths will be discussed in the next section of this chapter.

9 Mrs. Taylor describes the use of the dagger in detail: *Next to Shakespeare*, pp. 60-64.

10 "Otway's Tragic Muse Debauched," 389.

11 McBurney totals thirty embraces in the play and argues they form a more important set of symbolic actions than the broken oaths to be discussed later ("Otway's Tragic Muse Debauched," 392).

12 The conspirators embrace frequently; see III. 292; III. 343.
This "Token" is perhaps his dagger. This is Mrs. Taylor's suggestion and it would be a dramatically effective gesture. See Next to Shakespeare, p. 64n.

Jaffeir's blindness in his frustration is clearly indicated here again. His desire for revenge in this speech ironically includes his own wife—a Senator's daughter.

David Hauser discusses the oaths in some detail, "Otway Preserved," 484-485.

The device of the final curse was used in The Orphan as Castalio asks the heavens to rend apart the "Chain of Causes" (V. 502-509). Jaffeir, in this play, is also given a curse of this type (occurring before his final blessing of Belvidera):

Final destruction seize on all the world;
Bend down, ye Heavens, and shutting round this earth,
Crush the Vile Globe into its first confusion....

(V. 219-221)

Clifford Leech condemns such twice-told scenes as serious plot faults since the action itself is of sufficient scope to render such filler unnecessary. He points out, by way of softening his condemnation, that Shakespeare uses the same device with Edgar at the end of King Lear ("Restoration Tragedy: A Reconsideration," 112). The Shakespearean analogues apart, Otway's use of this device serves two "necessary" functions—the plot function of inspiring a certain response in a character and the artistic function of moving the audience.

"Otway's Tragic Muse Debauched," 391, 393.

See also IV. 507; V. 27; V. 52; V. 71; V. 241; V. 320. This is not an exhaustive list.
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THE ATHEIST: OR,
THE SECOND PART OF THE SOULDIERS FORTUNE (1683)

1. A Restoration Romance---

The Atheist has very little connection with The Soldiers Fortune. Courtine and Sylvia appear again, but neither has the easy, witty charm of his namesake. Beaugard is again the central figure, and he is the same man. That is, both Beaugards are handsome, successful rakes. The time is a year after the first play, and Courtine has had such a fill of married life that he flees the country and comes to visit Beaugard and London. Beaugard is involved in an affair with an unknown lady, whom he learns is a widow and virtually imprisoned by relatives who are hoping to arrange a profitable second marriage for her. After some complex adventures involving multiple disguises, nighttime confusion, and several fights, Beaugard asserts his claim to the widow, Porcia, and marrys her.

The main action, that involving Beaugard and Porcia, is based in part upon the story told in the ninth chapter of Scarron's Roman Comique---"The Invisible Mistress." Scarron's story describes Princess Porcia's test of her lover's fidelity. Otway added the evil guardians, and thus, his plot in outline describes the rescue of a maiden imprisoned by cruel villains. Otway's major change from his source is that his characters themselves recognize a parallel between their actions and the exploits of a medieval romance. "Look on me as a Lady in distress, Captain,"
Porcia says to Beaugard, "and by the Honour of a Soldier consider on some way for my deliverance" (II. 154-156). Beaugard picks up the analogy and explains to Daredevil (the atheist of the title) the adventure he and Courtine have planned for the evening:

...after Supper we have resolv'd to storm a certain Enchanted Castle, where I apprehend a fair Lady newly enter'd into League with an honest Friend of thine, call'd my self, is kept a Pris'ner, by an old, ill-natur'd, snarling Dog in a Manger, her Guardian, (II. 484-489)

In The Atheist, unlike Scarron's interpolated narrative, the romance metaphor is pervasive.¹ Porcia has Beaugard and Daredevil seized at one point and brought, blindfolded, to her house. She has provided mute negro servants, an attendant dwarf, and decorated the rooms to which she brings the men so that when their blindfolds are removed Daredevil exclaims, "why we are in a Palace, Man, prithee look about thee a little" (III. 574). When the servants appear Beaugard admits, "we are certainly enchanted" (III. 593).² Beaugard likes the atmosphere of this adventure, and when the dwarf tells him they have been brought there by winged horses and are now confined in "A Chrystal Castle built by Enchantment in a Land unknown to any but the fair one that Commands it" (III. 640-641), he willingly submits to whatever may befall.³

This scene is interrupted by Porcia's guardians, and these enchanted scenes do not reappear. The romance metaphor is used, however, to describe more than the Beaugard-Porcia plot alone.
Beaugard tells a masked woman (Porcia's friend, Lucrece) that she should not enter the "Lists" of love "upon unequal Terms, with that Black Armour upon your Face, that makes you look as dreadfully as the Black Knight in a Romance" (II. 316-318). Beaugard, Courtine, and Porcia use the metaphor lightly; they amuse themselves with the parallel of their actions and those of the knightly heroes. Porcia's guardians are being sarcastic in their only use of this figure. They reverse the analogical pattern of the play as a whole as they identify Beaugard as the evil figure controlling Porcia. They vow: "we'll storm your Fortress, / Enchanted Lady, though your Gyant guard it" (III. 564-565).

The awareness of the mock-romantic mood shown by the principal characters is clearest when Courtine is described by Porcia as "the Quixot of the Country" (II. 106). Courtine gaily adapts the metaphor for himself (without the allusion to Cervantes) as he courts a masked woman. She asks his identity and he replies, "E'en a wandering Knight, that have forsaken my Castle in the Country, and am come to Town for my Preferment truly" (III. 458-460). The action of the play is comic and the characters are aware of that. Most of the last Act is taken up with Beaugard's attempt to rescue Porcia once and for all. The action occurs at night, and is composed of a series of confused mix-ups resulting from shifting disguises and crossed-purposes. Porcia says, "This shall, in after Story, be call'd, Captain Beaugard's beseiging of the Widow" (V. 447-448). There is "Nothing but Knight-Errantry
stirring," this evening, and Courtine is so frustrated by his wife that he is "very much inclined to succor any distressed Damsel that wants a Companion to pass away a tedious Night withall" (V. 693-694). The action is never allowed to approach the serious. At the conclusion of the evening's adventures, Beaugard has Porcia in his power. Her guardian Theodoret threatens suicide, but Beaugard stops him: "Nay, hold, Sir, none of that neither: This Design was not laid for a Tragedy" (V. 956-957).

Scarron intrudes his own satiric comments in his narrative, itself a sober love story, and thereby maintains the narrative on a comic level. Otway does not have that device in the dramatic mode and uses, instead, the continuing banter about knights and enchanted ladies. The allusions to romance prevent Porcia's imprisonment from ever seeming a serious obstacle to be overcome, and prevents any grave threat from appearing to thwart Beaugard's rise to "Lord Paramount of this Castle" (V. 751).

2. The Atheist—

The figure described in the title is a Jonsonian humor, and, though ubiquitous, does not serve as the focal point of a fully developed satiric theme. He is exhibited as an "Original" (I. 344). Daredevil is, Beaugard says:

...a Cheat, that would have you of the opinion that he believes neither Heav'n nor Hell, and yet never feels so much as an Ague-fit, but he's afraid of being damn'd.

(I. 339-342)
Daredevil describes himself in materialistic, naturalistic terms.

In response to Courtine's question as to what religion he is,

Daredevil replies:

Of the Religion of the Inner-Temple, the Common-Law Religion; I believe in the Law, trust in the Law, enjoy what I have by the Law: For if such a Religious Gentleman as you are get Fifty pounds into my Debt, I may go to Church and pray till my Heart akes, but the Law must make you pay me at last.

(II, 381-386)

He is, however, as Beaugard described him, a "faux Athiest" (II, 360).

The moment he is slightly wounded in a scuffle he pleads with Beaugard's father: "If you have any Charity, procure me some Conscientious Godly Divine to unburden my self of my iniquity to" (V, 668-670).

The first Act includes dialogue between Beaugard and his father concerning religion. Beaugard describes his religious beliefs in this way: "I am of the Religion of my Country, hate Persecution and Penance, love Conformity, which is going to Church once a Month, well enough, [and] resolve to make this transitory Life as pleasant and delightful as I can" (I, 94-99). We learn later in this Act that Beaugard has met his new love at church. There, he says, she "watch'd her Opportunity, and poach'd me up for the service of Satan" (I, 426-427). This material sets the scene for the entrance of Daredevil and seems to promise a continuing thread of satire directed at contemporary religious practices and the vogue of fashionable "atheism." Daredevil states, for example, that poets "are most of 'em my Disciples in their Hearts, and now and then stand up for the Truth manfully" (II, 482-483). But
this theme is not developed, and Daredevil remains a minor character.

3. Role and Relationship—

Two comic roles are given extended treatment in *The Atheist*: those of husband and father. Courtine is the focus of some tired comedy about the trials and tribulations of a husband. Beaugard sympathizes ("Alas, poor Husband!") with such accounts from Courtine as this: "By the vertue of Matrimony and long Cohabitation, we are grown so really One Flesh, that I have no more Inclination to hers, than to eat a piece of my own" (I. 232-236).

Courtine's marital state is his distinguishing characteristic in this play, his humor. Lucrece is introduced to him and exclaims, "Courtine! Bless us for ever! What, the Man that's married!" (II. 324-325). Beaugard refuses to help him gain a new footing in London's female society until he transforms himself into the man he used to be:

Appear once more like Courtine the Gay, the Witty, and Unbounded, with Joy in thy Face, and Love in thy Blood, Money in thy Pockets, and good Cloaths on thy Back; and then I'll try to give thee a Recipe that may purge those foul Humours Matrimony has bred in thee, and fit thee to relish the Sins of thy Youth again. (I. 262-268)

Courtine makes an attempt to take up his old role as bon vivant, but the attempt is a comic failure. He approaches his disguised wife, believing her to be a young woman looking for adventure (III. 454-495); he attempts to carry on an affair with another young lady, only to have
her give birth to a child "just in the middle of [their] good Understanding together" and point to him as the father (IV. 469-475), and he nearly climbs into bed with Daredevil in a darkened room (V. 697-731).

The scenes involving Courtine and Sylvia provide examples of the pre-1696 type of confrontation between a virtuous and long-suffering wife and a rakish husband. Sylvia makes an emotional appeal (in blank verse) to his sense of virtue, and he gives a mocking reply.

_Sylv._ Is this the recompense of all my love?
_Did I bestow my Fortune on thy Wants,
Humble my self to be thy Dove-like Wife?
And is this all I'm worth?--
Court._ Wealth is a great
_Provocative to am'rous heat;
For what is worth in any thing
But so much Money as 'twill bring?
_Hudibras,_ Part the 2d. _Canto_ the First, (III. 500-508)

Courtine does not repent here, or in the fifth Act. His vagaries finally break down Sylvia's patience, and when he is accused of being the father of the bastard child she screams at him: "Thou Devil!--
_Thou treach'rous, faithless, perjur'd Wretch! Thou Husband!"

(IV. 540-541). _Husband_ is the worst epithet she can bestow. Otway leaves the Courtine-Sylvia story unfinished and the comic use made of Courtine throughout suggests that the husband-figure is a burlesque one by definition, even if the husband is young, handsome, and clever.

_Beaugard_ and his father are at odds over marriage as well. Beaugard opens the play with, "Sir, I say, and say again, No Matrimony; I'll not be noos'd" (I. 1-2). Beaugard's father is not truly interested in a marriage for his son; he is using this method of parental insistence
for extortion. Beaugard explains:

Now he has no way to squeeze me out of Contribution, but by taking up his Fatherly Authority, and offering to put the Penal Law call'd Marriage in execution. (L. 182-185)

Beaugard has been bequeathed two thousand pounds annually by an Uncle, a man, he points out to his father, who never married (L. 63-67).

Beaugard gives his father one hundred guineas and asks, "Now who the Devil would marry?"

Father. No body that has half an ounce of Brains in his Noodle: The ungodly good-natur'd Rogue is in the right on't.

Beau. So, here's your Father for you now! (L. 111-116)

Beaugard's father insists that money is the basis of any filial relationship, and when Beaugard refuses to advance any more guineas, the father takes up sides with Porcia's guardian, Theodoret, and Theodoret's friend, Gratian. They ask if he has considered fully that Porcia is his son's mistress, and the father replies, "So much the better still; I'll swinge her the stoutlier, for alienating his Affections from his natural father" (IV. 48-49). As for encountering his son:

Still better and better, and better for that very reason; for I would swinge him too with much fatherly Discipline, and teach him the Duty which a Son, with a great deal of Money, ows an honest old Daddy, that has none. (IV. 52-56)

The distinction between the comic and tragic use of role and relationship is pointed up by the "duty" a son owes his father here--money--and the duty a son owes his father in Alcibiades--murder.
When an encounter does arise, the father offers to take Beaugard's side for an additional hundred guineas, but Beaugard refuses. Eventually, Beaugard's father begins to enjoy the romantic adventures of his son and comes to admire Porcia to the degree that he declares:

I am sensible I have been a Rebel: wherefore, if my Liege Son and Heir have recruited his Power, and be once more up in Arms, Loyalty and Natural Affection, Friends, will work. I must pronounce for Prince Jacky; and here I resolve to defend his Territories.

(V. 330-335)

Father and son eventually come to an agreement. Beaugard says, "Look you, Sir: Though you have been a very ungracious Father, upon condition that you'll promise to leave off Gaming, and stick to your Whoring and Drinking, I will treat with you" (V. 1022-1025). Beaugard thus fulfills his duty as a son; he settles a permanent yearly sum upon his father.

The Atheist is a disjointed comedy. The character Lucrece, Porcia's friend, is taken from a minor character in Le Roman Comique. Otway expands her role, but she is not integral to the action. She has been rebuffed by Beaugard, and her desire for revenge motivates her actions in the last Act as she adds to the confusion in the garden and inside Porcia's house. But Lucrece disappears from the play suddenly and without explanation. Daredevil the atheist, likewise, provides occasional comedy but is inessential to the main "romantic" adventures. The motivation of Theodoret's misogyny (III. 370-385) is never explained, and his dialogue on this subject stands out as an artificially inserted satiric aside. The only sign of Otway's usual capability in structuring his plays is provided by the romance metaphor and the way it serves to
lighten a potentially serious story of the liberation of a beautiful damsel from evil captors.
NOTES TO CHAPTER XI

1

Scarron's entire novel is, of course, as the title indicates, mock-romantic, but the "Histoire de l'Amante Invisible" itself is not burlesque. Scarron's intrusive comments are used to maintain, lightly, the comic tone. For example, Scarron describes the actions of the hero, Don Carlos, in the strange apartments in which he finds himself:

S'il eût été de l'humeur de dom Quichotte, il eût trouvé la de quoi s'en donner jusqu'aux gardes, et il se fût cru pour les moins Esplandir ou Amadis; mais notre Espagnol ne s'en émut non plus que s'il eût été en son hôtellerie ou auberge.

(Le Roman Comique [Paris, Librairie Garnier Frerers, n.d.], p. 34.)

2

Scarron describes the apartment this way: "la salle était la plus manifique du monde, et, si vous voulez, aussi bien meublée que quelques appartements de nos romans ..." (Le Roman Comique, p. 34).

3

Don Carlos is asked by a servant "s'il aurait pour agréable de voir la maitresse du palais enchanté" (Le Roman Comique, p. 36). (Footnotes 1-3 contain the only "romantic" references of Scarron's narrative.)

4

Scarron also comments on the church assignation: "On profane les églises en ces pays-là aussi bien qu'au notre, et la temple de Dieu sert de rendez-vous aux godelureaux et aux coquettes, à la honte de ceux qui ont la maudite ambition d'achalander leurs églises et de s'oter la pratique les uns aux autres ..." (Le Roman Comique, p. 26).
CONCLUSION: SOME REMARKS ON THE MIDDLE WAY

Otway's domestic tragedies, *The Orphan* and *Venice Preserv'd*, are neither heroic nor comic; in terms of Restoration genre criticism they belong to the middle area between these two extremes, an area which had no rules and no defined tradition, an area, in fact, that was without a name. The term "domestic tragedy" reflects the namelessness, the lack of definition behind this middle area. Domestic, by genre definition, must refer to comedy; tragedy, by genre definition, must involve catastrophes which befall the non-domestic. Domestic tragedy is, then, like a mermaid—half one species, half another. There was no body of critical thought on this middle area in Otway's time, nor did one develop in the century which followed. Goldsmith, for example, in his famous rebuke of sentimental comedy (1772), finds only two types of drama possible: "If we apply to authorities," he writes, "all the great masters in the dramatic art have but one opinion. Their rule is, that as a tragedy displays the calamities of the great, so comedy should excite our laughter by ridiculously exhibiting the follies of the lower part of mankind."¹ Goldsmith wants a clear distinction between comedy and tragedy and his opinion of any mixture of the two is scornful. He mentions in passing "what Voltaire humorously calls a tradesman's tragedy."² There is humor in the very name.

Voltaire's term is significant and affords one clue to Otway's work in the middle area. Otway wrote no tradesman's tragedy. There are
no merchants in *The Orphan* and *Venice Preserv'd*, and his plays never came under the scorn assigned the "low" subject matter of the novels of the eighteenth century. One immediately apparent facet of Otway's method is the linkage between his heroic and non-heroic tragedies. The same rhetorical devices are used and the same themes explored. The most apparent distinction between the forms is the reduced social and political status of the domestic protagonists. It is this difference in status, of course, which is the traditional mark of the domestic, but my point here is that this is the only immediately recognizeable mark of the division as far as Otway's plays are concerned. Otway stepped into the gulf which divided tragedy and comedy as they were then understood, but it was a very gingerly step. He kept as close to the established rules and regulations of tragedy as he could.

Even in the matter of status one can see the narrowness of the dividing line between *Venice Preserv'd* and *Don Carlos*. In the latter (or *Alcibiades*, or *Titus and Berenice*, or *Caius Marius*) the political health of the state is essentially and immediately tied to the fortunes of the protagonists. Don Carlos, to a large extent, is the state. This essential and immediate connection is missing in *Venice Preserv'd*, but Jaffeur is in a position to effect radically the political milieu. In *The Orphan* the political health of the state is out of the picture just as the physical court and camp are at a distance from Acasto's retreat. Nevertheless, Acasto is Alcibiades in retirement. Acasto is:
... of a Family
Ancient and Noble as the Empire holds,
The Honours he has gain'd are justly his;
He purchas'd them in War; thrice he led
An Army against the Rebels, and as often
Return'd with Victory; the world has not
A truer Souldier, or a better Subject.
(I. 6-12)

The dividing line in political status is narrow, but it is significant.
The removal of the immediate political involvment results in intense
concentration on more personal, more domestic, emotions. The Orphan
is the most radically non-heroic in this way. Acasto's retreat, his
paradise, is figurative of the distance between national concerns and
the concerns of a small, isolated community. This concentration on
domestic emotions provides one part of the dramatic history which links
Otway to Rowe, to Lillo, to John Home. Another part of this history is
the use by these playwrights of a common system of sentimental devices
and structures.

But the point I wish to make in this conclusion is that the potential
for serious drama from the middle area between tragedy and comedy,
as the Restoration defined them, is enormous: it involves every social
class below the nobility. But in practice, the serious drama in this area
retains as many of the characteristics of tragedy as is possible. Otway's
domestic tragedies are only slightly different in emphasis and technique
from his heroic tragedies. The probable reasons for the similarities
between the two forms are fairly clear. An individual must be socially
and politically valuable before what he thinks and what he feels can be
considered seriously or sympathized with. Otway and his contemporaries were not yet ready to listen to Steele's Mr. Sealand explain: "we merchants are a species of gentry that have grown into the world this last century and are as honorable, and almost as useful, as you landed folks that have always thought yourselves so much above us."

Mr. Sealand is on the defensive in 1722. In 1682 he would not have been given the opportunity to speak seriously for any reason. The forty-year gap is not enough to make the merchant altogether acceptable, and Goldsmith's scorn indicates he was not universally accepted even thirty years after Steele. It is questionable, in fact, whether the middle area has even today been accepted as a potential for tragedy. The critical debate concerning *Death of a Salesman* is a case in point. The parallel between Arthur Miller and Otway is interesting because it reveals one universal of the practice of creating serious drama from the middle area. In every instance the form of tragedy, its distinguishing character, and the subject matter (the characters and ideals from the middle area) are defined so as to bring them in line with one another and thus, with the exception noted below, the poles of tragedy and comedy grow closer together while at the same time nothing comes between them. Acasto and Jaffeir are as close to heroic characters as they can come. George Lillo defends his *London Merchant* by defining tragedy as an instrument of good and then stating: "If princes, etc., were alone liable to misfortunes arising from vice or weakness in themselves or others, there would be good reason for confining the characters
in tragedy to those of superior rank; but, since the contrary is evident, nothing can be more reasonable than to proportion the remedy to the disease. Arthur Miller defends his play: "I believe that the common man is as apt a subject for tragedy in its highest sense as kings were." Lillo and Miller are not inventing a new genre.

Otway provided no critical defense of his practice in the domestic area, but as the play analyses show, his divergence from orthodoxy of form was slight. In the next century new philosophical and social concepts of man began to gain strength and the numbers and types of men whose emotions, thoughts, and actions could be tragically or sentimentally expressed in literary form increased. The methods of dramatic expression used in the next century were similar to those we have seen employed by Otway, but in the next century the middle area between comedy and tragedy was smaller in size as new definitions of man and new definitions of tragedy attempted to expand the realm of the tragic. In addition, the eighteenth century added a new genre, one unknown to Otway, to fill the middle area—sentimental comedy. Otway did not invent a new genre for the drama but he did provide two examples of how a playwright might explore an undeveloped area and still remain within touch of the traditions and ideals of English drama.
NOTES TO CHAPTER XII

1
"An Essay on the Theatre; or, A Comparison Between Laughing and Sentimental Comedy," in Nettleton and Case, p. 761. Goldsmith notes the hybrid nature of this sentimental or weeping comedy; he calls it a "mulish production" (p. 762)

2
"An Essay on the Theatre," p. 762. It was Goldsmith who declared Otway, "next to Shakespeare, the greatest genius England has produced in tragedy," The Bee No. 8, 24 November 1759, quoted in Next to Shakespeare, p. 3.

3
The Conscious Lovers (IV. ii. 59-63) as edited in Nettleton and Case. John Lofts has described the new acceptance of the wealthy merchant as "gentry" in the early eighteenth century in his study, Comedy and Society from Congreve to Fielding (Stanford, 1959).

4
Dedication to The London Merchant, p. 601, as edited in Nettleton and Case.
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