Univerzita Karlova v Praze

Filozofická fakulta

Ústav anglofonních literatur a kultur

Diplomová práce

The Reflection of the Exclusion Crisis (1678–1683) in Contemporary Literature

Reflexe vylučovací krize (1678–1683) v soudobé literatuře

Vedoucí diplomové práce (supervisor):
PhDr. Soňa Nováková, CSc.

Zpracovala (author):
Kristýna Hoblová

Praha, August 2016

Studijní obory (subjects):
Anglofonní literatury a kultury
Učitelství češtiny pro střední školy

Prohlašuji, že jsem tuto diplomovou práci vypracovala samostatně a výhradně s použitím citovaných pramenů, literatury a dalších odborných zdrojů.

(I declare that the following MA thesis is my own work for which I used only the sources and literature mentioned, and that this thesis has not been used in the course of other university studies or in order to acquire the same or another type of diploma.)

V Praze, dne 08/08/2016

…………………………..

Kristýna Hoblová

Acknowledgements

Tímto bych ráda poděkovala vedoucí této diplomové práce, PhDr. Soně Novákové, CSc., za její cenné rady, trpělivost, vstřícnost a inspiraci nejen při tvorbě této práce, ale během celého studia.

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to the supervisor of this thesis, PhDr. Soňa Nováková, CSc., for her invaluable advice, patience, helpful approach and inspiration not only during the formation of this work, but during my whole studies.

Klíčová slova (česky)

Politický diskurz, propaganda, doba restaurace, Stuartovci, toryové, whigové, roajalismus, politické drama, restaurační komedie, vylučovací krize, papeženecké spiknutí, Aphra Behnová, John Dryden, Nathaniel Lee, Thomas Otway, Thomas Shadwell, John Banks

Klíčová slova (anglicky):

Political discourse, propaganda, Restoration period, Stuarts, Tories, Whigs, Royalism, political drama, restauration comedy, Exclusion Crisis, Popish Plot, Aphra Behn, John Dryden, Nathaniel Lee, Thomas Otway, Thomas Shadwell, John Banks

Abstrakt (česky)

Tato literárněhistorická práce se věnuje reflexi vylučovací krize (1678–1683) v soudobé literatuře napříč žánry na základě teorie vzniku veřejné sféry Jürgena Habermase a pochopení ideologie posledních Stuartovců jako poslední výspy aristokratické ideologie v koncepci Michaela McKeona. Vylučovací krize se ukazuje jako doba otřesená hledáním rovnováhy mezi ustupujícím stuartovským viděním světa a ideologií Whigů spojených s rostoucí merkantilní třídou. Interpretace vybraných textů daného období zkoumá tvůrčí proměny politického diskurzu nově vznikajících politických stran whigů a toryů s důrazem na vztahy mezi žánry, jednotlivými autory a politickými ideologiemi.

První kapitola nabízí přehled sociálně-historického kontextu, Habermasovy teorie vzniku veřejné sféry a koncepce aristokratické ideologie Michaela McKeona. Představuje také politickou teorii toryů obhajující svaté právo na trůn Stuartovců za pomoci patriarchální teorie Roberta Filmera, jež se opírá o analogii mezi státem a domácností, a obranu Whigů proti absolutistickým tendencím Stuartovců prosazováním legislativy jako konceptu nadřazeného královským výsadám, stejně jako náboženské spory, které byly součástí těchto politických diskusí.

Následující čtyři kapitoly obsahují detailní rozbory a porovnání vybraných literárních textů ve vztahu k strategiím politického diskurzu daného období. Kapitola 2 ukazuje, jak tragédie Johna Drydena *Oedipus* a *Troilus and Cressida* a tragikomedie *The Spanish Fryar* reflektují krizi zobrazením rozvráceného státu, prosazováním svatého práva králů a kodexu cti jako základu aristokratické ideologie, varováním před politickými frakcemi a vzpourou, ale také kritikou Karla II za pomoci zavedených „zženštilých postav". *Absalom and Achitophel* je využit jako příklad vysoce aktuální satiry z doby reakce Toryů na vylučovací krizi, po oxfordském parlamentu roku 1681, a umožňuje prozkoumat využití typologických vzorů pro stvrzení autority politického textu.

Kapitola 3 se věnuje politické opozici v tragédiích Nathaniela Lee, mezi nimiž *Theodosius* stojí jako ukázka zdrcující kritiky neschopného panovníka a *Caesar Borgia* rozvíjí paralelu mezi sexuální perverzí a politikou k podrytí tendencí Stuartovců k absolutismu a katolicismu. *Lucius Junius Brutus* je pak srovnán s jinou adaptací *Romea a Julie, Caiem Mariem* Thomase Otwaye, abychom ukázali, jak používají a proměňují stejné tropy, motivy a témata pro různé účely.

Jelikož paralela mezi sexuálním chováním a politikou stála v centru politického diskurzu období restaurace, obrací se kapitola 4 k ženským postavám a představuje tři

typické druhy hrdinek využívané specificky pro politické účely: 1. zlá žena jako symbol politické transgrese v *The Female Prelate* Elkanaha Settla, 2. nevinná oběť jako prostředek vyvolání patosu v nově vznikajícím žánru „she-tragedy“ ve hrách Thomase Otwaye (*The Orphan*) či Johna Bankse (*Vertue Betray'd*), 3. moderní protestantka v komediích Thomase Shadwella.

Po rozboru fiktivních ženských postav se kapitola 5 věnuje skutečnému ženskému hlasu Aphry Behnové, jejíž komedie *The Feign'd Curtizans* a tragikomedie *The Young King* ukazují její první reakce na vylučovací krizi a vyrovnávání mezi jejími politickými sympatiemi and vědomím genderových problémů v patriarchálním diskurzu Stuartovců. *The Roundheads* a *The Second Part of The Rover* znamenají útok na ideologii Whigů skrze zesměšnění postav puritánských zbohatlíků. Naopak tyto hry propagují kulturu kavalírských libertinů jako ztělesnění aristokratické cti ve smyslu inherentní vlastnosti. Poslední část této kapitoly ukazuje vévodu z Monmouthu a hraběte ze Shaftesbury jako fascinující veřejné osobnosti, které nejen inspirovaly Johna Drydena k jeho nejslavnější satiře, ale také ovlivnily pastorální poezii Aphry Behnové a její první klíčový román (roman à clef)

Závěrečná kapitola pak zdůrazňuje rozsáhlé intertextové vazby všech zkoumaných textů, jež byly součástí neustálého vyjednávání a vyrovnávání mezi jednotlivými autory a politickými ideologiemi, ale také mezi žánry, druhy diskurzu, tropy a motivy.

Cílem této práce není klasifikovat jednotlivé textu jako "toryovské" nebo "whigovské". Susan J. Owenová ve své studii restaurační divadelní kultury přesvědčivě ukázala, že drama z doby vylučovací krize bylo vždy spíše divadlem protikladů a hry málokdy nesou jednoznačnou politickou zprávu. Stejné tendence vidíme i v poezii a próze. Proto bylo hlavním cílem této práce objevit a vyjasnit způsoby, jakými politické události formovaly veřejný diskurz a jak byly metafory a symboly z politické teorie využívány a proměňovány v literárních dílech.

Abstract (in English):

This work of literary history analyses the reflection of the Exclusion Crisis (1678–1683) in contemporary literature across genres. It is based on the theory of the rise of the public sphere by Jürgen Habermas and on the theory of Michael McKeon, understanding the ideology of the late Stuarts as a last remnant of aristocratic ideology. The Exclusion Crisis is presented here as a period of unsettling negotiations between the declining Stuart ethos and the Whig ideology of the rising mercantile classes. The interpretation of chosen texts

serves to discover creative transformations of the political discourse of the newly emerging political parties of Whigs and Tories, stressing the negotiations between genres, individual authors and political ideologies.

The first chapter offers a brief overview of the socio-historical context, Habermas's theory of the rise of the public sphere and Michael McKeon's conception of aristocratic ideology. It also introduces the Tory political theory defending the Stuart divine right of kings on the basis of Robert Filmer's patriarchal household-state analogy and the Whig defence against absolutist tendencies of the Stuarts through asserting the priority of Law over the Royal Prerogative, as well as the religious issues inherent in these political discussions.

The following four chapters contain detailed analyses and comparisons of the chosen literary texts in relation to the political discursive strategies of the period. Chapter 2 shows how John Dryden's tragedies *Oedipus* and *Troilus and Cressida* and his tragicomedy *The Spanish Fryar* reflect the crisis by staging a disrupted state, promoting the divine right of kings and code of honour as the basis of aristocratic ideology, warning against faction and rebellion, as well as criticizing Charles II through the stock "effeminate" characters. *Absalom and Achitophel* is used as an example of highly topical satire of the Tory reaction period after the Oxford Parliament of 1681, which allows a study of the use of typological example for asserting the authority of a political text.

Chapter 3 addresses the political opposition in the tragedies by Nathaniel Lee, where *Theodosius* is read as a smashing critique of an incompetent monarch and *Caesar Borgia* develops the sexual-political analogy to disqualify Stuarts' tendencies to absolutism and Catholicism. *Lucius Junius Brutus* is then compared to another adaptation of *Romeo and Juliet*, Thomas Otway's *Caius Marius*, to show how they transform the same tropes and topics for different ends.

Since the sexual-political analogy formed the basis of Restoration political discourse, chapter 4 turns to the use of female characters and introduces three types employed specifically for political writing: 1. the vile woman as a symbol of political transgression in Elkanah Settle's *The Female Prelate*, 2. the innocent victim as a means of arousing pathos in the newly appearing she-tragedies by Thomas Otway (*The Orphan*) and John Banks (*Vertue Betray'd*), 3. The modern Protestant woman in Thomas Shadwell's comedies.

After discussing fictional female characters, chapter 5 turns to an actual female voice of Aphra Behn, whose comedy *The Feign'd Curtizans* and tragicomedy *The Young King* show her first reactions to the crisis and negotiation between her political allegiance and

awareness of gender problems inherent in the Stuart patriarchal discourse. *The Roundheads* and *The Second Part of The Rover* represent a direct attack on Whig ideology, embodied in the satirized Puritan upstarts. Instead, the Cavalier libertine ethos is promoted as an epitome of the intrinsic quality of aristocratic honour. The last part of the chapter presents the Duke of Monmouth and the Earl of Shaftesbury as intriguing public figures who not only inspired Dryden for his most famous satire, but also influenced Behn's pastoral poetry and prompted her first roman à clef.

The conclusion then stresses the intertextual nature of all the studied texts, which were engaged in constant negotiations between the individual authors and political ideologies, but also between genres, discourses, tropes and motifs.

The thesis does not aim at classifying individual texts as either "Tory" or "Whig". In her study of Restoration theatrical culture, Susan J. Owen has persuasively argued that the drama of the Exclusion Crisis is rather a drama of contradiction and the plays rarely provide a clear-cut political message. I find a similar tendency also perceptible in both poetry and fiction writing. Therefore, the main objective of the thesis is to clarify and disclose the ways political events shaped public discourse and how the imagery used in political theory was employed and transformed in literary works.

CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION .... - 10 -

1.1 WHY LITERATURE OF THE EXCLUSION CRISIS? .... - 10 -

1.2 WHAT WAS THE EXCLUSION CRISIS? .... - 12 -

1.3 RESTORATION POLITICAL DEBATE .... - 16 -

2 JOHN DRYDEN .... - 21 -

2.1 OEDIPUS: "WE STAND ON RUINS" .... - 22 -

2.2 TROILUS AND CRESSIDA: THE DANGER OF FACTION .... - 30 -

2.3 THE SPANISH FRYAR: A CALL FOR MODERATION AND UNITY .... - 35 -

2.4 ABSALOM AND ACHITOPHEL: TORY OFFENSIVE .... - 41 -

3 NATHANIEL LEE .... - 52 -

3.1 THEODOSIUS AND CAESAR BORGIA: TOO MUCH WEAKNESS, TOO MUCH STRENGTH .... - 52 -

3.2 LUCIUS JUNIUS BRUTUS AND THOMAS OTWAY'S CAIUS MARIUS: ROMAN REPUBLIC REVIVED .... - 62 -

4 FEMALE CHARACTERS IN THE EXCLUSION CRISIS .... - 76 -

4.1 VILE WOMAN AS A SYMBOL OF TRANSGRESSION: TULLA, CATHERINE DE MEDICI, POPE JOAN .... - 79 -

4.2 FEMALE SUFFERING: MEANS OF AROUSING PATHOS IN OTWAY'S THE ORPHAN AND BANKS'S VERTUE BETRAY'D .... - 84 -

4.3 SPACE FOR EMANCIPATION IN THE PLAYS BY THOMAS OTWAY AND THOMAS SHADWELL .... - 93 -

5 APHRA BEHN .... - 101 -

5.1 THE FEIGN'D CURTIZANS AND THE YOUNG KING: THE BEGINNING OF THE CRISIS - 102 -

5.2 THE ROUNDHEADS AND THE SECOND PART OF THE ROVER: STRONG ATTACK ON THE OPPOSITION .... - 108 -

5.3 APHRA BEHN AND THE DUKE OF MONMOUTH .... - 114 -

6 CONCLUSION: CONSTANT NEGOTIATIONS .... - 123 -

7 BIBLIOGRAPHY .... - 126 -

7.1 PRIMARY SOURCES .... - 126 -

7.2 SECONDARY SOURCES .... - 130 -

1 Introduction

1.1 Why literature of the Exclusion Crisis?

Why should we study the Exclusion Crisis of the seventeenth century and its impact on literature and culture in general now, in the twenty-first century? Of course, the Restoration period is nowadays mostly appreciated for its witty, titillating comedies, which leads to a certain tendency not to take the cultural products of the late Stuart era very seriously, all in all, after the masterpiece of Milton's *Paradise Lost* Restoration authors seem to make literature only as a kind of diversion – there are no lasting tragedies, no large epics, no well-known novels and the attempts at these are often rather clumsy adaptations of previous epochs.

However, the aim of this thesis is to show that there is more to the "clumsiness" of the works like Dryden's adaptation of *Oedipus* or *Troilus and Cressida*, not from the perspective of aesthetics, but because of their social engagement and deep concern for their historical context. If a seventeenth-century writer is concerned only with issues specific for a seventeenth-century reader/viewer, it seems as the complete opposite of the cliché about great works that address universal human being. Yet, it is the way Restoration works approach their contextual inspirations that is so intriguing today and helps to understand the functioning of culture in the political context. In British history, the Exclusion Crisis seems to be a turning point: the time of the rise of first political parties and with them the spreading political debate inherent in the rise of what would later be called "the public sphere". It is also the perfect period in history for the study of functioning of propaganda, the tools for shaping public opinion and the ways in which thousands of people can be gripped by religious paranoia, nationalism and xenophobia, if it is carefully nurtured by the media – a fact relevant for every era.

During the Restoration we can see the birth of the first mass media with the appearance of widely spread pamphlets and newspapers, necessarily preceded by the rise in literacy, but from the point of view of literary history it is striking to realize, how far literature was concerned with the political debate of the time. In her study of drama, Judy A. Hayden claimed that "the Restoration theatre was as political as the politics of the court of Charles

II were theatrical",[1] by which she addresses two issues: first, the political engagement of Restoration culture, even highlighted during the escalation of the Exclusion Crisis, where the stage functioned as a platform for political discussion and persuasion, but also the fact that Charles II and his courtiers realized how much their position was dependent on performance. The libertine manners of the Court Wits circle were to a high degree a kind of performance that constituted and confirmed their upper-class status defining them in opposition to the rising middle class and the Puritans of the Interregnum. However, Hayden's description should not be restricted to drama; in the Exclusion Crisis literature, drama, poetry and prose were fully engaged in partisan struggles, which is why this thesis is not restricted to one genre, but rather aims at discerning the common features of political writing across genres in comparison.

The structure of the thesis was built on the concept of "authorial responses" to the deep political crisis, with the aim to analyse the rhetorical strategies employed by authors from different sides of the political spectrum as stock tropes of political writing, as well as their creative transformations in various genres and at different stages of the crisis. The following two chapters will offer a brief introduction into the socio-historical context of the Exclusion Crisis, including Habermas's theory of the rise of the public sphere and its roots in the political debates of late Stuarts. Chapters 2–5 will offer analyses of relevant texts, chosen as a representative set of various approaches to the political debate. Chapter 2 deals with John Dryden as the most important author of the period, employed by the Crown as the Poet Laureate, whose work is firmly based on the concept of the divine right of kingship, but also reflects the crisis in the heroic mode of the Stuart ethos. Next chapter analyses four plays by Nathaniel Lee, whose ambiguous political stance allows for the study of oppositional tropes, especially the use of spectacle of violence and sexual perversity as tropes of political discourse. Restoration political discourse was grounded in the sexual-political analogy in the form of household analogy for the government, but also in the association of sexual misconduct with political transgression; therefore, chapter 4 will focus on female characters specifically created for the promotion of political ideology – vile woman as a symbol of transgression, the innocent victim as a means of arousing pathos and the modern Protestant woman as a symbol of the liberating potential of Whig ideology. Last chapter will then turn from fictional female characters to the most striking

[1] Judy A. Hayden, *Of Love and War: The Political Voice in the Early Plays of Aphra Behn* (Amsterdam, NLD: Editions Rodopi, 2010), p. 1, *EBRARY* <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/cuni/Doc?id=10435995&ppg=166> 20 Feb. 2013.

female author of the Restoration period, Aphra Behn, and show her involvement in the political discussion as a stark Royalist, thus concluding the thesis with a seeming return back to the ideology of John Dryden. However, Behn's work of the Exclusion Crisis was deeply rooted in the Cavalier libertine discourse, although transformed by her treatment of gender issues, so it illuminates different areas of the Stuart ethos than Dryden's plays and poems.

1.2 What was the Exclusion Crisis?

In a general overview of the turbulent history of the seventeenth century in England, the Exclusion Crisis would not stand out in comparison with the revolution of 1641, the Civil War, regicide in 1649, Restoration in 1660 and second revolution in 1688. Seemingly, the Exclusion Crisis did not bring about any substantial historical events. Yet, from the perspective of cultural studies, social theory and the history of ideas this is the period that marked the starting point of the transformation of England into the modern state of next century, the final subversion of absolutist tendencies of the Stuarts. The Parliamentary discussions of 1678–81 brought about the Glorious Revolution several years later.

After his restoration in 1660 Charles II established a court, which had to define itself against the Puritan ideals of the Interregnum and thus followed the French fashion for libertinism. As Susan Staves explains, "Royalist English libertinism like the Earl of Rochester's and Behn's celebrated the authority of nature over that of what it debunked as religious superstition and argued for the value of physical pleasure in present time."[2] Based on the materialism of Thomas Hobbes, although his philosophy was not aimed at advocating sexual liberation,[3] it stood in stark opposition to the Puritan values. In the following two decades, the King surrounded himself with an elite circle of libertine courtiers, the so called Court Wits, a group of artists, politicians and other major social figures, e.g. John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester; George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham, and John Sheffield, Earl of Mulgrave.[4] Thus the Stuart monarchy was associated with their

[2] Susan Staves, "Women and Society," in Derek Hughes and Janet Todd (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Aphra Behn* (Cambridge – Melbourne – New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), p. 20.

[3] As Warren Chernaik stresses, "Libertines like Rochester, a professed disciple, reinterpreted Hobbes, choosing to emphasize certain aspects of his philosophical system and ignore others as it suited them, and in the process – quoting and paraphrasing Hobbes out of context as unscrupulously as his opponents did – transformed arguments intended to prove beyond doubt the absolute necessity for submission to authority into a manifesto of 'the natural liberty of Man'." Warren Chernaik, *Sexual Freedom in Restoration literature* (Cambridge – New York – Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1995), p. 24.

[4] Jeremy W. Webster, *Performing Libertinism in Charles II's Court: Politics, Drama, Sexuality* (Gordonsville, USA: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), p. 21, *EBRARY* <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/cuni/Doc?id=10135505&ppg=21> 13 Jan 2013.

eccentric sexual and social behaviour, which was to a high degree tinted by a sense of public performance reinforcing their status against the Puritan opposition.

The first decade of Charles's reign was characterized by relative cooperation between the Cavalier Parliament and the King, who was a careful politician avoiding large conflicts after the decades of political disturbance.[5] However, the original cooperation gradually worsened, as the members of the Parliament were always sceptical about the Stuarts' tendencies to absolutism and their suspiciously good relationship with the chief English enemy, Louis XIV of France, an absolutist Catholic king, whom many Englishmen saw as "incorrigibly aggressive"[6] and threatening all Protestant countries in Europe. While Charles promoted religious tolerance, the Parliament followed strict politics of religious intolerance towards any religion other than the re-established Church of England.

In the 1670s, the tension started to culminate. In 1672 Charles II issued the Declaration of Indulgence, stressing the necessity of religious tolerance, while maintaining the leading position of the Church of England. To support his position, he needed to win the Third Anglo-Dutch War, in which he allied with France, but it was a financially very demanding failure and he was forced to withdraw the declaration in order to receive funds from the Parliament. Moreover, he was forced to agree with the Test Act in March 1673, thus blocking any non-conformists from public offices. Subsequent resignation of his brother James, the Duke of York, on his post confirmed the widely spread fears of his Catholicism and his marriage to the Catholic princess Mary of Modena "simply added fuel to an already raging fire."[7]

When the Anglo-French army was defeated in the Battle of Texel in the same year, it triggered a wave of anti-French hysteria, supported by the Dutch anti-war propaganda persuading the English of the danger of Anglo-French alliance, Catholicism and absolutism. In this atmosphere the Protestant politicians started worrying about the succession, as Charles II did not have a legitimate heir and refused to get divorced, which meant that his heir presumptive was his Catholic brother.

The religio-political tensions climaxed in 1678 with the revelations of the Popish Plot and the ensuing Exclusion Crisis. In August 1678 Christopher Kirkby, Titus Oates and Israel Tonge reported to the King a supposed conspiracy aiming at his assassination,

---

[5] Martin Kovář, *Stuartovská Anglie* (Praha: Libri, 2001), p. 213. This is the source of all important data in this chapter.
[6] John Miller, *The Restoration and the England of Charles II* (London – New York: Longman, 1997), p. 69
[7] Hayden, p. 159.

French invasion and a massacre of Protestants. Charles II was not convinced, but he agreed to an investigation, because the Duke of York felt it was an attack on him. The case did not attract much attention until Oates testified against Edward Coleman, the secretary of the Duke of York, claiming that he led the conspiracy, and the situation worsened when they found secret letters between Coleman and French Catholics. The suspicious atmosphere was triggered by the discovery of the dead body of Edmund Berry Godfrey, the judge present at Oates's testimony. His death caused widespread panic and anti-Papist[8] hysteria around the City. The King decided to hear Oates's testimony at the end of the year, but it was quickly ended when Oates accused the Queen, Catherine of Braganza, of being involved in the conspiracy.

The whole London was in a state of panic. By November 19 Samuel Pepys worried about "the whole government seeming at this day to remain in such a state of distraction and fear, as no history I believe can parallel".[9] The Parliamentary opposition gladly took over the Popish Plot allegations, especially due to the supposed involvement of the Duke of York. When they attempted to impeach the Earl of Danby, Charles's Lord Treasurer, the King had to dissolve the Parliament after 18 years in January 1679.

To stabilize the situation, Charles II sent James abroad for a few months from March 1679. After many years, there were elections again and the campaign was fierce. There were two opposing groups: the court party, who supported the Crown and generally were associated with land property and the Church of England, against the country party, associated with dissent and London mercantile classes. In this election we can see the roots of Tory and Whig parties arising by the end of the Exclusion Crisis.[10] However, the newly elected Parliament was not favourable towards the King. Charles decided to transform his council and as the Lord President he appointed Anthony Ashley Cooper, 1st Earl of Shaftesbury, the chief representative of the opposition. However, it did not help to stop Shaftesbury's subverting efforts; he enjoyed immense popularity among the dissenters and London merchants and in the name of "public good" he struggled to change the line of

[8] As this thesis is only concerned with the English view of Catholicism during this short political upheaval, where the terms "Popish", "Papist" etc. were commonly used, they are completely interchangeable with "Catholic" for the sake of this work.

[9] A letter cited in Claire Tomalin, *Samuel Pepys: The Unequalled Self* (New York: Vintage Books, 2003), p. 309.

[10] We cannot speak of a partisan organization in the studied period, especially since partisanship was seen as factious and therefore "many MPs, and others, tried to avoid blatant partisanship, which was divisive and destructive of neighbourliness and social harmony" (Miller, p. 70). However, the two "labels" are useful for orientation in the discursive strategies employed by writers on different sides of the scale and thus will be used throughout this thesis, not marking political adherence, but inclinations.

succession and ensure the control of politics by mercantile interests.[11] In April 1679 the opposition passed the Exclusion Bill in the House of Commons, which forbade the succession of a Catholic heir, as well as other demands from Charles as a condition for financial support. In July 1679 Charles dissolved the Parliament again, started to negotiate with French diplomats about subsidies and sent both the Duke of York and the Duke of Monmouth back into exile. Monmouth was Charles's illegitimate son, who enjoyed huge popularity as a possible Protestant heir to the throne, supported by a part of the opposition.

In the autumn 1679, another sham-plot stirred up the political climate – the "Meal-Tub Plot". Thomas Dangerfield accused the opposition of an assassination plan against the Duke of York and his testimony was supported by fake documents found in a "meal-tub" of Elizabeth Cellier, a midwife who had helped many imprisoned Catholics. However, later Dangerfield decided to transfer his accusations to the Catholics, when he explained his false testimony as their plot against the Whigs.

In November 1680 the Exclusion Bill passed for the second time in the House of Commons, but it was discarded by the peers. In January 1681 the King dissolved the Parliament again, but there was no change in the new Parliament, as the Whigs were well organized and had a functioning system of propaganda. As John Miller has noted, the Whig leadesr were not able to evade the royal prerogatives, so they "tried to put pressure on the Lords and the king by mobilising support outside Parliament, through propaganda, petitions and demonstrations".[12] After two failures with the Parliament, Charles II relocated it into royalist Oxford in 1681 and made last attempts at agreement. In March, the third Exclusion Bill was presented in the Parliament, after which the King made a ceremonial speech in the House of Lords, dissolved the Parliament for the last time and for the rest of his life he ruled without the Parliament.

However, this was not the end of the critical years; although Charles had strengthened his position and stopped discussion about the succession, in 1683 he had to face the so called Rye House Plot, a conspiracy of the opposition radicals supporting Monmouth. The revelation of this plot supported anti-Whig moods among the people and eventually helped to confirm the King's position and allowed him the peaceful last years of reign.

[11] Kovář, p. 244.
[12] Miller, p. 73.

1.3 Restoration political debate

The theorist of democracy Jürgen Habermas sees the end of the Stuart era as the turning point in the rise of the public sphere, considering the Stuart discourse of previous decades hegemonic due to the control of press. However, as the force of Whig propaganda during the Exclusion Crisis proves, the press was certainly not under complete control, which accounts for stage either. Although some plays of too much political zeal were banned from the stage, they could be published in print or staged a few months later, when the political crisis passed. The first option was employed for a higher political impact by Thomas Shadwell, when he published *The Lancashire Witches* with the compromising parts deleted by the censor for the stage emphasized in italics, thus making a statement against the Stuart stage control. As Paula McDowell stressed in her revision of Habermas's theory, it was already the explosion of the press in 1640s and outstanding growth in literacy during the century that enhanced the emergence of the public sphere in print.[13]

It seems that already the political discussions of the Exclusion Crisis marked an important stage in the major transformations of English press, which led in the next century to the establishment of the fully evolved political public sphere as a "discursive realm embodied above all in the new political press, a space for critical political exchange".[14] Later revisions of Habermas's thought by feminist critics and theorists of popular culture have shattered the supposed unity of the bourgeois public sphere and have understood its development as a "matter of separate though overlapping 'publics'".[15] The political discussion present in this thesis is not concerned with these "rival" publics, since the authors included were all members of the same social group of writers who could reach the Restoration theatres (Aphra Behn's femininity does not delineate her as a separate voice, as gender issues were subdued in favour of her Toryism in this period).[16] However, the anxiety which the Royalist writers such as John Dryden show over the political force of the "rabble"[17] and the success of Whigs' attempts to use their popular support as a force

[13] Habermas seems to underestimate the extent of growing literacy in England in the period and in his discussion of Stuart ideology is not concerned with the influence of the Interregnum period. While the Stuart supporters certainly attempted to recreate hegemonic discourse, it was not possible. Paula McDowell, *The Women of Grub Street* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), p. 4.

[14] McDowell, p. 7.

[15] McDowell, p. 8.

[16] For the discussion of the political engagement of lower-class women in the Restoration period, see McDowell, chapter 1–4, dealing with women ballad-singers, printers, publishers, booksellers and hawkers.

[17] See in Chapter 2, but also in Aphra Behn's prologue to *The Second Part of the Rover*: "The Rabble 'tis we Court, those powerful things, / Whose voices can impose even Laws on Kings." Aphra Behn, *The Rover, part II* (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1996), unpaginated, *Literature Online* <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:

against the King marks the necessary caution when discarding the influence of lower-classes on Stuart politics.[18]

Nevertheless, by focusing on both royalist and oppositional literature, the texts in this thesis were chosen to challenge Habermas's view that "[u]nder the Stuarts, up to Charles II, literature and art served the representation of the king."[19] His theory of the rise of the public sphere was based on the assumption that "[t]he public sphere in the political realm evolved from the public sphere in the world of letters",[20] in opposition to the medieval system of "representative publicness", the ritualistic display of kingship as supposedly inherent spiritual power and dignity:

> This publicness (or publicity) of representation was not constituted as a social realm, that is, as a public sphere; rather, it was something like a status attribute, if this term may be permitted. In itself the status of manorial lord, on whatever level, was neutral in relation to the criteria of "public" and "private"; but its incumbent represented it publicly. He displayed himself, presented himself as an embodiment of some sort of "higher" power.[21]

While Habermas understood the last decades of the Stuart regime as the last stance of the hegemony of the representative publicness, the Exclusion Crisis shows that there were also contradictory forces, whose origins can be found in the civil wars, which were epitomized for example in the oppositional feasts of Pope-burning processions. It seems therefore, that what accounts for the eighteenth century in Habermas's theory could be applied already to the late Stuarts: "The final form of the representative publicness, reduced to the monarch's court and at the same time receiving greater emphasis, was already an enclave within a society separating itself from the state."[22] Thus, while there was a major part of literature actually made for the representation of Stuart kingship, there appeared a substantial amount of literature that struggled for the opposite. Similarly, Michael McKeon has argued for the dialectical evolvement of aristocratic ideology, based on the concept of honour, into progressive and conservative one in this period, stressing the idea of constant negotiation and mutual influence, rather than linear development.

---

dr:Z000056752:0> 25 July 2016.

[18] Habermas acknowledges the revolting power of popular culture in Bakhtin's understanding presented in *Rabelais and His World* in the prologue to a second edition of his study. Jürgen Habermas. *Strukturální přeměna veřejnosti* (Praha: Filosofia, 2000), p. 16.

[19] Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1991), p. 32.

[20] Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, p. 30–31.

[21] Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, p. 7.

[22] Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, p. 11.

The ideological situation of the Restoration period was quite complicated, though we tend to simplify it into the division of Whig versus Tory. Habermas located the rise of the public sphere into literary and political discussion, but David Zaret has stressed the importance of religion in the process, as there was "a public sphere in religion that cultivated nearly the same critical, rational habits of thought that Habermas locates in the public spheres of politics and letters".[23] The religious conflicts between the Church of England, dissent and Catholicism were a direct impact of the Interregnum and international state of affairs with the threatening France. However, religious debates became part of politics in the traditional sense at the moment when a conflict arose between the King and the Parliament over the religious laws and over his succession. Moreover, Miller adds that at first "there were two axes of politics, one predominantly ideological (religious and political), the other based on 'country' suspicion of the court".[24] As we will see in Thomas Shadwell's plays, the two increasingly seemed to coincide during the Exclusion Crisis with the growing association of the country with the Whigs and their appeal to Protestant tradition and patriotism.

During the Exclusion Crisis, it is indeed possible to speak of two political directions, if not parties – the supporters of the Stuarts' divine right of kingship and the opposition, while both these groups developed distinctive imagery for their propaganda, promotion of their ideology and undermining the opposing discourse. The Stuart courtly ethos was deeply rooted in the representative publicness – both in the traditional sense of kingship as vested by the God unto the body of the King and embodied in the courtly virtues of the code of honour[25] and in the specifically Restoration sense of libertinism as a performance re-affirming the social status of the courtiers. Formal political treatises supporting the Stuarts followed the pre-war tradition of the patriarchal state-household analogy, established already by Aristotle. The analogy was derived from the interpretation of Genesis, in which "God granted dominion of the Earth to Adam and to all kings directly descended from him".[26] When the Exclusion Crisis and Whig propaganda induced the necessity of providing a coherent theory of Stuart kingship, the Tories resorted to the

---

[23] David Zaret, "Religion, Science and Printing in the Public Spheres in Seventeenth-century England," in Craig J. Calhoun (ed.), *Habermas and the Public Sphere* (Cambridge, Mass. – London: MIT Press, 1992), p. 221.
[24] Miller, p. 72.
[25] Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public* Sphere, p. 8.
[26] Rachel Carnell, *Realism, Partisan Politics, and the Rise of the British Novel* (Gordonsville, VA, USA: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), p. 19, *EBRARY* <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/cuni/Doc?id=10150383&ppg=23> 13 June 2016.

publication of Robert Filmer's thirty-year-old treatise *Patriarcha; or the Natural Power of Kings* in 1680, in which he employed the father–king analogy to support the necessity of utmost submission to patriarchal authority, thus promoting passive obedience and the divine right of kingship.[27]

The year after the publication of Filmer's treatise, James Tyrell offered a critique of his arguments in his *Patriarcha non Monarcha*, in which he shows historical precedents of ruling families being constantly overthrown by others, thus pointing to the weakest point in Filmer's theory – the assertion of a line of succession starting with Adam. After the Exclusion Crisis, the Whig claims were expanded and elaborated into the social-contract theory by John Locke.

In her study *Restoration Theatre and Crisis* Susan J. Owen analyses the ways in which the general political theory of both sides was translated into the discourse of politically engaged plays and asserts unconditional loyalty and quietism as the Tory main feature in contrast to the Whig understanding of loyalty as a state which allows advising and criticizing the king in order to improve the state of affairs.[28] Stuart aristocratic ideology, promoted by the Tories, was essentially still medieval in its reliance upon the concept of honour, which, according to McKeon, was both an intrinsic and extrinsic quality – it was a function of ancestry, an inherited characteristic, as well as an "essential and inward property" related to virtue and as such it functioned as "the most fundamental justification for the hierarchical stratification of society by status".[29] Progressive ideology, promoted by the Whig authors at this time, tends to undermine the unity of honour as an inherent quality and hereditary property by dissociating virtue from aristocracy.[30]

The main conflict between the King, supported by Tories, and the House of Commons with the majority of Whigs, was based on the different understanding of the Royal Prerogative and the origin of Law. While the Tories defended Filmerian position of the absolute authority of the monarch as the source of Law, the Whigs argued for the authority

---

[27] Robert Filmer, "Patriarcha; or the Natural Power of Kings". *Online Library of Liberty*. <http://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/filmer-patriarcha-or-the-natural-power-of-kings> 21 July 2016. This father-king analogy was a widely spread discursive tool for the support of the Stuarts, used even by lower-class female publishers, as in Elinor James's *The Case between a Father and his Children*, in which she used her status as a mother as an empowering mode allowing her to plead with the Lord Mayor for obedience to the King. Elinor James. *The CASE between a FATHER and his CHILDREN* (Ann Arbor, MI – Oxford (UK): Text Creation Partnership, 2009), *EEBO* < http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A46612.0001.001?view=toc> 31 July 2016.

[28] Susan J. Owen, *Restoration Theatre and Crisis* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996).

[29] Michael McKeon, *The Origins of the English Novel 1600–1740* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987), p. 131.

[30] McKeon, p. 155.

of the Parliament as the representative of the King's subjects. In 1678, before Oates's revelations, Andrew Marvell published his "An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government in England," a detailed presentation of the parliamentary procedures in 1670s interpreted as a fight against secret Popish conspiracy planning "to change the Lawfull Government of England into an Absolute Tyranny, and to convert the established Protestant Religion into down-right Popery".[31] This document seems to be an epitome of the anti-Catholic paranoia of the Exclusion Crisis, but also of the Whig ideology: unlike the Catholic countries ruled by absolute monarchs, in England "the Subjects retain their proportion in the Legislature; the very meanest Commoner of England is represented in Parliament, and is a party to those Laws by which the Prince is sworn to Govern himself and his people".[32] The formulation clearly suggests the precedence of Law over the monarch, who cannot change it at will as in Filmer's understanding (see p. 68). Moreover, he is subordinated to the juridical power: "in all Cases where the King is concerned, we have our just remedy as against any private person of the neighbourhood, in the Courts of Westminster Hall or in the High Court of Parliament".[33]

Based on the sexual-political analogy and the difference in political ideology of the arising parties, the following chapters will offer analyses of the patterns of political discourse and their creative transformations into aesthetically relevant works. As with the MPs, who were not willing to be publicly partisan at the time, for writers it was not only dangerous due to the censure, but mainly disadvantageous; they had to follow the fashions and moods of their day to earn their living, and thus most of the texts show subtle negotiations between the political, partisan discourse and the creative potential of their genre, author and tradition.

[31] Andrew Marvell, *An account of the growth of popery and arbitrary government in England*… (Ann Arbor, MI – Oxford, UK: Text Creation Partnership, 2003), p. 3, *EEBO* <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A52125.0001.001/1:20?rgn=div1;view=toc> 20 July 2016.

[32] Marvell, p. 3.

[33] Marvell, p. 4.

2 John Dryden

The image of John Dryden as the author we know today would probably never have come into existence, had it not been for the Exclusion Crisis. For his whole life his work was deeply interconnected with the Stuart monarchy and its ideological basis and offers nowadays great material for the study of pro-Stuart discourse, providing a wide range of approaches from straightforward propaganda to a careful critique of the Stuart regime, though never averting from the basic standpoint of the divine right of kings. Though he attained the post of Poet Laureate already in 1668 and Historiographer Royal in 1670, it was the Exclusion Crisis that triggered his main creative forces and brought about his most famous satirical works such as *Absalom and Achitophel* (1681). However, it is not only in satirical poetry that we can see Dryden's positioning in the Exclusion Crisis – during the whole period, the stage functioned as a sensitive litmus paper reacting to the changes in its public and thus from the very first moments of the development of Popish Plot scare Dryden's prologues, epilogues and whole plays help to understand the reaction of theatre to recent revelations and political development.

If we consider the whole range of Dryden's writing around the year 1680, the texts are clearly divided into several groups that correlate with the progress of the Exclusion Crisis. At the beginning there are two tragedies that represent the last attempts for a play in a heroic mode, both of them developing ancient plots (*Oedipus*, performed 1678, published March 1679; *Troilus and Cressida*, perf. and pub. 1679). Next year, as the political and social disturbance peaked, the Whigs seemed to gain dominance and theatres were suffering of lower attendance, Dryden attempted a tragicomedy of a more popular approach, building the comic subplot on the common dislike towards Catholic priests (*The Spanish Fryar*, per. 1 November 1680, pub. 1681). This play, like *Oedipus*, has caused much confusion regarding Dryden's political stance, since it deals with tropes typical for Whig authors – satire on Papists, false priests, tyranny. This is the more striking in comparison with the next group of texts that came with the Royalists' recovery in the next two years – this was the period of Dryden's greatest achievements in satirical writing (*Absalom and Achitophel*, November 1681; *The Medal*, March 1682).

Although, as David Hopkins stresses, Dryden had to earn his living by his pen and thus his texts seem to be always inspired by current events, "his 'topical' writing is seldom merely topical: events and personalities of the moment habitually trigger in the poet's mind larger thoughts and speculations about nature and humanity. Conversely, Dryden's wider

reflections are given constant point and specificity by being applied to his own life and times."[1] The range of Dryden's writing during the Exclusion Crisis is striking – and often puzzling in terms of political interpretation. Apart from shorter pieces of panegyrics, almost no texts offer themselves for a simple interpretation in the binary opposition of Whig × Tory or Exclusionists × Royalists, which it is useful to understand rather as a scale that helps to analyse the discourse carefully weighing each aspect of the opposition separately, positioning itself differently regarding each topic of political discussion of the day in a sensitive reaction to the atmosphere in the public, in the audience and at the Court and Parliament. There are only two topoi that are typical for all of the mentioned Dryden's texts – the Filmerian representation of the King as a patriarchal figure, the foregrounding ethos of the Stuart dynasty, and the crowd that is dangerous, easily manipulated and needs proper guidance.

2.1 Oedipus: "we stand on ruins"

Their Treat is what your Pallats relish most,
Charm! Song! and Show! a Murder and a Ghost!
We know not what you can desire or hope,
To please you more, but burning of a Pope.[2]

The political upheaval and widespread anxiety of the first months after Titus Oates's allegations of the Popish Plot were not favourable conditions for the theatres, yet Dryden's *Oedipus*, on which he collaborated with Nathaniel Lee, was a surprising success – it ran for ten days at Dorset Garden. Dryden joined for this play with an author famous for spectacular scenes of horror, and thus there is everything a theatre-goer may wish of a spectacle: sex, violence, dreadful scenes of suffering, ghosts, great kings and great villains. At the time when most people were rather concerned with pamphlets, trials, murders and Pope-burning processions, it was necessary to attract attention, as the quotation from the epilogue shows at the beginning of this chapter. Odai Johnson describes the Pope-burning pageants as "Whig theater […] that sought by performative strategies to politicize the crowd as a stable subject of the Whig Party […] a propagandized extension

[1] David Hopkins, *John Dryden* (Tavistock, GBR: Writers and their Work, 2004), p. 2, *EBRARY* <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/cuni/detail.action?docID=10723900> 24 April 2016.
[2] John Dryden, "Epilogue," in *Oedipus* (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1994), unpaginated, *Literature Online* <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:dr:Z000074982:0&rft.accountid=35514> 30 March 2016. Throughout the whole thesis, a full bibliographic detail will be given upon the first appearance of each primary text. In all following cases, basic information will be given parenthetically, the act, scene, line number and page (if these are available).

of the Whig party",[3] which means that the processions in the City became a straightforward rival to the prevalently Tory theatres, as Dryden acknowledges.

There has been some discussion about the dates of performance of *Oedipus*, which is of importance for the interpretations that analyse direct correspondences between the play and the Popish Plot.[4] In any case, the authors' reaction would have to be truly fast. Nevertheless, even if the play is not read as a direct response to Oates's revelation, it offers a major commentary on the atmosphere of last months of 1678.

The play opens with an image of devastation – dead bodies are lying in the streets of Thebes, dying sick people shuffle across the stage, some of them fainting and falling down. A scene that would in the last decades of the seventeenth century instantly evoke the memory of the Great Plague of 1666. The city, both people and nature, are standing on the verge of destruction, in Alcander's words:

> Methinks we stand on Ruines; Nature shakes
> About us; and the Universal Frame
> So loose, that it but wants another push
> To leap from off its Hindges. (I, i, 1–4, p. 1)

A description that must have strongly resonated not only with the past memories but also with the present moment of fright caused by the Popish Plot.

Making an adaptation of Sophocles' play about the crisis of fatherhood and tragic guilt on the part of the king seems as a confusing step for a Royalist writer, such as Dryden was. Nevertheless, while the theme of royal guilt, fate and impending catastrophe was highly topical and attracted the audience, there is a visible effort to transform the original interpretation of individual characters so as to calm down the turbulent situation. From the very beginning, Restoration *Oedipus* radically differs from the Greek play; after the evocation of terror about the present decay, the play introduces two major opposing characters that seem to be even more important to the interpretation of this play than Oedipus himself. Creon, Jocasta's brother, is represented as a repulsive character, both physically and psychically, whose chief aim is to marry his own niece, Eurydice, and

---

[3] Odai Johnson, *Rehearsing the Revolution: Radical Performance, Radical Politics in the English Restoration* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2000), p. 14.

[4] See for example the study of Anna Battigelli, who focused on a detailed analysis of the correspondences between the play and Popish Plot. This is based on the understanding of the Popish Plot as fiction not completely dissimilar from literature. In her understanding, both *Oedipus* and the Popish Plot are fictions which "portrayed the divine scourging of a polity for its failure to identify and resolve past crimes". Anna Battigelli, "Two Dramas of the Return of the Repressed: Dryden and Lee's Oedipus and the Popish Plot," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 75.1 (March 2012), p. 1, *JSTOR* <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/hlq.2012.75.1.1> 1 March 2016.

replace Oedipus on the throne. For his goal he is willing to use any tools available, without scruples about incest, rabble-rousing, manipulation and lying. He is the epitome of a covetous politician with no honour code. It is striking, in what degree his description reminds the reader of the Earl of Shaftesbury, later chief leader of the Exclusionists, whose physical deformity[5] was used against him in many anti-Whig texts, of which the most memorable portrait was put by Dryden into *Absalom and Achitophel*. When refusing Creon's proposals, Eurydice describes him as a "poyson to my eyes", a person physically utterly repelling: "Nature her self start back when thou wert born; / And cry'd, the work's not mine" (I, i, 160–1, p. 5). And although Creon responds to these offenses by stressing the power of his soul ("to revenge / Her bugled work she stampt my mind more fair: […] so he informed / This ill-shap'd body with a daring soul: / And making less than man, he made me more." I, i, 174–80, p. 5–6), yet in solitude, he admits correspondence between his looks and character: "My body opens inward to my soul, / And lets in day to make my Vices seen / By all discerning eyes, but the blind vulgar." (I, i, 209–11, p. 6)

This sentence addresses not only Creon's inner corruption, but mainly the chief support in his subversive activities – the "vulgar crowd" whom he lures to rebellion and whom he can easily deceive. One of the reasons why the Exclusion Crisis escalated to such a degree was that this was not only a crisis on the political level; the citizens of London played a major role in the proceedings since the very beginning, the general Popish Plot scare united huge numbers of people under the influence of the Exclusionists, which Dryden was fully aware of, as we can see in the epilogue. Indeed, the crowd became an important political entity, as Odai Johnson shows: "The idea of the rabble as a political entity was a coercive construct designed to publicly demonstrate against the king the City of London's popular support of Exclusion."[6] However, public upheaval caused another fear in the rest – fear of the year 1641 repeating, fear of a civil war. Towards the end of *Oedipus* Haemon reminds us of the regicide that stood at the beginning of years of confusion not only in the fictional Thebes, but also in the Interregnum England: "how sacred ought / Kings lives be held / when but the death of one / demands an Empire's blood for

[5] He was small, apparently squint-eyed, and after a complicated surgery of an abscess, his wound in chest was kept opened for many years with a silver pipe inserted to drain away the liquid. As W. K. Thomas mentions, by 1681 "at the age of 60, he was, as a result of constant ill-health, bent over almost double, hobbling and limping, clinging on to life by sheer will power". W. K. Thomas, *The Crafting of Absalom and Achitophel: Dryden's Pen for a Party* (Waterloo, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1978), p. 49, *Google Books* <https://books.google.cz/books?id=Z60ZyrmYznIC&pg=PA49&dq=anthony+ashley+cooper+silver+pipe&hh=cs&sa=X&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=anthony%20ashley%20cooper%20silver%20pipe&f=false> 25 June 2016.

[6] Johnson, p. 14.

expiation?" (V, i, 437–9, p. 77). This was a tool which the Royalists could easily use for their own goals – in a number of plays and poems from the time of Exclusion Crisis the crowd is represented as an imminent danger, always on the verge of rebellion that would cause chaos, civil war and destruction.[7] Moreover, unlike the Sophocles' original, where according to Candy B. K. Schille "the Theban chorus are almost unshakably loyal to their king",[8] the crowd in the Restoration *Oedipus* is truly showed as "vulgar": easily manipulated, naïve and thoughtless. Creon is fully aware of this and it is impossible to call his dealing with the crowd otherwise than a straightforward propaganda, when he sends his supporters Alcander and Diocles to change the public opinion in his favour:

> […] You insinuate
> Kind thoughts of me into the multitude;
> Lay load upon the Court; gull 'em with freedom;
> And you shall see 'em toss their Tails, and gad,
> As if the Breese had stung 'em. (I, i, 113–7, p. 4)

Freedom here is an almost meaningless advertisement catchword, as Creon would never become a democratic ruler. In a similar way he misuses the citizens' patriotism, which disqualifies Oedipus on the throne as a stranger (in the same way as James's Catholicism did). The crowd is blind, as they do not see Creon's wicked intentions, stupid ("Think twice! I ne're thought twice in all my life: / That's double work." I, i, 252–3, p. 8), and dangerous.

Instead of a direct focus on the basis of the ancient plot, the exposition of *Oedipus* thus associates the decrepit state of Thebes with a scheming politician strongly reminding of Shaftesbury and with the representation of the crowd as a volatile, unreliable, yet influential force in politics. These two negatives need to be balanced by a positive subject, which is introduced in the character of blind Tiresias, who enters the scene to contradict Creon's manipulative discourse and guide the crowd back to their proper stance. Tiresias comes as a character of authority, wise and able to communicate with the Gods, and warns the crowd that rebellion is not a solution of the situation:

> All justified, and yet all guilty;
> Were every mans false dealing brought to light,
> His Envy, Malice, Lying, Perjuries,
> His Weights and Measures, th'other mans Extortions,
> With what Face could you tell offended Heav'n

---

[7] See Thomas Otway's *Caius Marius* or Nahum Tate's *The Ingratitude of a Commonwealth*.

[8] Candy B. K. Schille, "At the Crossroads: Gendered Desire, Political Occasion, and Dryden and Lee's *Oedipus*," *Papers on Language & Literature* 40.3 (Summer 2004), p. 309, *EBSCO* <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsglr&an=edsgcl.122815798&scope=site> 1 March 2016.

You had not sinn'd […]
And yet, as if all these were less than nothing,
You add Rebellion to 'em; impious Thebans!
Have you not sworn before the Gods to serve
And to obey this Oedipus, your King
By publick voice elected; answer me,
If this be true! (I, i, 306–19, p. 9)

They had elected Oedipus as their king, the choice had been approved by the Gods through Oedipus's victory over the Sphinx ("Heav'n authoriz'd it by his success" I, i, 358, p. 10) and thus they cannot meddle with the government and break their oath of loyalty. The situation is thus described as analogous to that of Charles's restoration, reminds the English of their welcoming their King as a saviour twenty years ago and of the pledge of loyalty to him. Moreover, it is futile to blame the Other, be it Oedipus as a stranger or Catholics, for their own misery.

There is no way in which the people should interfere with the royalty, because the status quo is the safest of all options available. *Oedipus* is thoroughly concerned with the impossibility of predicting the consequences of actions; it thus stresses the feature present already in the original plot – the hero acts, but is unable to fight against the fate, because he does not see – metaphorically during the whole play and literally at the end. Eyes, blindness, limited sight form a uniting metaphor of the whole play – Oedipus who blinds himself at the end is only the culmination; there is also blind Tiresias, who sees more than the others, yet even to him the truth is revealed only gradually, there are strange visions, which confuse more than explain, and all these metaphoric instruments support the final moral of the play: "Let none, tho' ne're so Vertuous, great and High, / Be judg'd entirely blest before they Dye."[9] (V, i, 499–500, p. 78) Our understanding of a situation is never complete and therefore we should not interfere with the Divine Providence – a message essentially supporting the quietism of the Royalists by stressing that the subjects should not intervene in the government, since they cannot see the consequences of their own actions. That is why Tiresias always cautions the Thebans not to judge prematurely:

But how can Finite measure Infinite?
Reason! alas, it does not know it self![10]

---

[9] Similar idea is later repeated in *Absalom and Achitophel*: "But life can never be sincerely blest; / Heaven punishes the bad, and proves the best." John Dryden, "Absalom and Achitophel," *The works of John Dryden*, 43–4, *Literature Online* <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:po:Z300342801:3&rft.accountid=35514> 10 March 2016.

[10] Notice the apparent resemblance to the influential "A Satyr against Reason and Mankind" by Earl of Rochester and his concept of "Reason, which fifty times for one does err". John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester,

Yet Man, vain Man, wou'd with this short-lin'd Plummet,
Fathom the vast Abysse of Heav'nly justice.
What ever is, is in it's causes just;
Since all things are by Fate. But pur-blind Man
Sees but a part o'th' Chain; the nearest links;
His eyes not carrying to that equal Beam
That poises all above. (III, i, 283–91, p. 37)

A very similar moral was inscribed by Dryden into the adaptation of Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida*, where even the title suggests the limitations of human understanding, as the subtitle of the play was *Truth Found too Late*.

The status quo is defended in the play also by its strict adherence to social order and strict class division. According to Owen, in *Oedipus* "social distance is one of the stable referents in the midst of darkness and difficulty".[11] While Creon demolishes social order by his familiarity with the common crowd, the main characters of the play are presented as noble heroes – both living kings, Oedipus and Adrastus, are admirable characters, brave warriors, and although political enemies, they understand each other more than their subjects, they are "brothers of war" connected by the code of honour, last remnant of the Stuart romantic ideology based on the representative publicness, embodied in the courtly virtues inherent in the body of the monarch. While Oedipus spends the whole play searching for the truth and Adrastus sacrifices his honour by taking the blame for Lajus's murder on himself in the name of love, Creon describes his conscience as "my Slave, my Drudge, my supple Glove, / My upper garment, to put on, throw off, / As I think best". (III, i, 212–4, p. 35) There are two worlds contrasted here: the idealized realm of romance and courtly, noble heroes against the calculating world of ambitious politicians.

Oedipus indeed seems to be an outstanding heroic figure among the rest of Restoration plays of the time, which is especially striking since essentially he is the cause of the Theban plague. Yet even the angry ghost of Lajus describes his noble character:

Some kinder pow'r, too weak for destiny,
Took pity, and indu'd his new form'd Mass
With Temperance, Justice, Prudence, Fortitude,
And every Kingly virtue: but in vain. (III, i, 414–7, p. 40)

Moreover, even the topic of his incest itself is being downplayed in some passages. While there are sensational sexual passages between Jocasta and Oedipus, he is always

"A Satyr against Reason and Mankind," <https://andromeda.rutgers.edu/~jlynch/Texts/mankind.html> 24 Apr 2016.

[11] Susan J. Owen, *Restoration Theatre and Crisis*, p. 207.

represented as a strict opponent of incest, which emphasizes the ignorance of his own guilt. While Jocasta is shown as a sensual woman, Oedipus's love for her is rather chaste:

> […] yet, mighty Love!
> I never offer'd to obey thy Laws,
> But an unusual chillness came upon me;
> An unknown hand still check'd my forward joy,
> dash'd me with blushed, tho' no light was near:
> That ev'n the Act became violation. (II, i, 304–9, p. 25)

The King in *Oedipus* is a character fully cast in the heroic mode and attracts compassion from the viewers. As Dryden explains in the introduction to *Troilus and Cressida*, his theory of tragedy was derived from the Aristotelian concept of catharsis that attempts to "rectify or purge our passions, fear and pity".[12] The experience of deep terror and pity in the face of misfortune of the noble character abates the pride of the viewer and moves him or her to be helpful and compassionate. However, "it is absolutely necessary to make a man virtuous, if we desire he should be pity'd: We lament not, but detest a wicked man, we are glad when we behold his crimes are punish'd, and that Poetical justice is done upon him."[13] The King in *Oedipus* is therefore a character entirely virtuous, though by deep misfortune he had become the cause of his nation's suffering – a situation analogous to Charles's paradoxical attempt to solve the rift in his nation while supporting his Catholic brother's right of succession. The play does not bring a solution to this, yet by its stress on loyalty and positive portrayal of the King it shows where the proper allegiance lies.

This is emphasized by the parallel structure of the tragedy: the criminal love of Oedipus and Jocasta is compared to another incestuous relationship: the love triangle Creon – Eurydice – Adrastus, where the incest is prevented by romantic love of the princess and Adrastus. While the viewer of the play is quickly led to despise Creon, the two lovers are noble characters deserving pity for their misery, there is no sin they would personally commit, and yet they are doomed to suffer and die. Susan J. Owen interprets the addition of the second royal love-story as a means of exculpation of Oedipus's impropriety by arousing "a general sympathy for royal love beset by religious restrictions".[14] However, it is not so much religious, as rather ideological restriction – in the discourse of the play and of Royalist ideology their story could never be resolved by a happy ending, as their

---

[12] John Dryden, "The Grounds of Criticism in Tragedy," in *Troilus and Cressida* (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1994), unpaginated, *Literature Online* <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:dr:Z000074908:0&rft.accountid=35514> 20 March 2016.
[13] Dryden, "The Grounds of Criticism in Tragedy," unpaginated,
[14] Owen, *Restoration Theatre and Crisis*, p. 205.

relationship was based on a fatal flaw – a broken oath. Jocasta's vow to her brother determines the life of Eurydice who has broken it by the denial of Creon and a vow is sacred without exceptions in the Royalist discourse, as the oath of allegiance is the foregrounding principle of loyalty.

The power of Lee's spectacular scenes of terror[15] thus enhances the quietist moral of this play concerned with maintaining the status quo, warning against rebellion and public upheaval and stressing the importance of loyalty to the King in any circumstances. Battigelli shows that Dryden's explanation of the Aristotelian theory of tragedy "makes clear that resurrecting Sophocles's play – which was Aristotle's key example of catharsis – was intended to allow pity and fear to effect an emotional and cognitive rebalancing that might abate the hysteria gripping the nation."[16] Yet, the inevitable bloody ending, which was not caused by any of the before-mentioned things that Oedipus warned against but by an inner discrepancy of the King's situation itself, shows that the Stuart ethos of aristocratic ideology is ultimately failing – as Owen has stressed, there is a striking lack of any positive values: "vitiated kingship is better than rebellion, though it still causes a plague".[17] Thus at the outset of the Exclusion crisis, the authors wrote one of the last heroic tragedies which strongly parallels the coming failure of the Stuart reign itself, though "the authors are straining every nerve to affirm the threatened social order".[18] However, threatened by the force of scheming politicians manipulating public opinion, the traditional values of representative publicness cannot survive. Only Anna Battigelli offers an explanation of the disastrous finale of the tragedy that would be in accord with the Royalist idea of quietism – it works through the sudden realization of the fictional character of the staged play:

> So extravagant is the drama in the fifth act of *Oedipus* that audience members might conclude that Charles's problems were mild by contrast with those of Oedipus. After all, Charles's defense of his brother's claim to succession, though unpalatable to some, was entirely legal. He was no regicide. His sexual energies, however transgressive, involved no incest. Having obliquely suggested parallels between Oedipus and Charles, Dryden and Lee conclude the play by measuring the distance between the two kings.[19]

---

[15] Robert Hume claims that "Lee's participation is probably responsible for some of the play's excesses, but also for its high emotional temperature. By himself, Dryden tends to be slightly frigid, his designedly emotional scenes too obviously calculated." Robert D. Hume. *The Development of English Drama in the Late Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), p. 325.
[16] Battigelli, p. 4.
[17] Owen, *Restoration Theatre and Crisis*, p. 207.
[18] Owen, *Restoration Theatre and Crisis*, p. 207.
[19] Battigelli, p. 23.

2.2 *Troilus and Cressida*: the danger of faction

The quiet of the Nation must be secur'd; and mutual trust, betwixt Prince and people be renew'd[20]

During the time of writing *Oedipus*, the situation in London was rather confusing, which may be one of the reasons for refraining from a direct commentary on the present situation. However, next year Dryden and other Royalist writers were already pointing to the fictional character of the whole Popish Plot. In his dedication to *The Kind Keeper* (printed 1679; dated 1680), Dryden apologized for "the printing of a play at so unseasonable a time, when the great plot of the nation, like one of Pharaoh's lean kind, has devoured its younger brethren of the stage".[21] By that date, he was prepared to describe Oates's allegations directly as a danger to the nation. And thus plotting and faction have become major topics of Tory plays, while keeping the emphasis on the divine authority of the king.

Dryden's adaptation of Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida* is not a highly topical play in its direct allusions, yet the message is clear: the subtitle (*Truth Found too Late*), as mentioned above, shows the engagement of the transformed titular plot line with the limitations of human reason and understanding, thus warning against premature actions – or, in line with Tory quietism, against any action that would concern the kingship at all. The misunderstanding is emphasized in the adaptation, as Dryden made Cressida as a virtuous heroine and the whole tragedy was based on Troilus's false accusations, unlike Shakespeare, whose sceptical plot was constructed around actual treason. Apart from that, as Susan J. Owen stresses, Dryden has altered Shakespeare's original focus and emphasized the king's sovereignty, which can be demanded by force when necessary.[22] This is why the play opens with the Greek council of war; instead of Shakespeare's opening with Troilus and Pandarus discussing Cressida, Dryden approaches the audience right at the beginning with Ulysses' speech on the reasons of their failure so far. Although he takes over substantial part of Shakespeare's original famous speech on "degree", by omitting a large part of the monologue and slight changes, he makes it more topical and more attacking:

---

[20] John Dryden, "TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE ROBERT EARL OF Sunderland, Principall Secretary of State, One of His Majesties most Honourable Privy Council, &c.," in *Troilus and Cressida*, unpaginated.
[21] John Dryden, "TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE JOHN Lord VAUGHAN , &c.," in *The Kind Keeper; or, Mr. Limberham* (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1997), unpaginated, *Literature Online* <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:dr:Z000074746:0&rft.accountid=35514> 20 March 2016.
[22] Owen, *Restoration Theatre and Crisis*, p. 126–127.

The observance due to rule has been neglected;
Observe how many Grecian Tents stand void
Upon this plain; so many hollow factions:
or when the General is not like the Hive
To whom the Foragers should all repair,
What Hony can our empty Combs expect?
O when Supremacy of Kings is shaken,
What can succeed […]
Then every thing resolves to brutal force
And headlong force is led by hoodwink'd will,
For wild Ambition, like a ravenous Woolf,
Must make an universal prey of all,
And last devour it self. (I, i, 33–49, p. 2)

The first six lines of this quotation follow Shakespeare rather closely, but with the mention of the King, Dryden diverts from the main part of the original, which continues with an elaborate representation of "degree" as the basis of order in society at all levels:

How could communities,
Degrees in schools, and brotherhoods in cities,
Peaceful commerce from dividable shores,
The primogenity and due of birth,
Prerogative of age, crowns, scepters, laurels,
But by degree, stand in authentic place? (I, iii, 103–8)[23]

While Shakespeare addresses the necessity of order and harmony through the maintaining of social hierarchy, including the authority of age, Dryden reinterprets the monologue in order to support the Royal cause of his time – the necessity of absolute submission to the King. Considering the prominence of this speech at the very beginning of the play, it is clear that the general warning of *Oedipus* has been concentrated – not only the king has to be obeyed for the nation to achieve anything, the current disrupted state of both the Greeks and English is triggered by the division into individual factions, which can only lead to violence, since they are not ruled by anything but a pure personal ambition – this is a straightforward critique of the politicized English situation broken down into many different religious and political groups promoting their own aims. And the cure is obvious as well: the situation would be corrected only by the due respect to the sovereign who can lead the nation out of its crisis like the queen of a hive. Again, the threat of a violent war is emerging from the political divisions embodied in the Greek warriors who prioritize their own interests before the common goal – represented by Achilles and Ajax, who "is grown

---

[23] William Shakespeare, "Troilus and Cressida," in *Tragedies II* (London: David Campbell Publishers, 1993), p. 125.

self-will'd […], keeps a Table too, makes Factious Feasts, Rails on our State of War" (I, i, 94–6, p. 3).

On the other side of the war field there is the same fight against the king's sovereignty, only this time the patriarchal authority of Priam is stressed: Troilus has to give up his beloved, because it is his father's and king's order. Moreover, too much dependence on a woman is a weakness criticized in almost all subplots of the play: It is not only Troilus who has to learn his lesson and give up Cressida, when the King orders, but Hector endangers his heroic status when listening to his wife's superstitious warnings (though they prove to be true), Achilles' disobedience to the king is caused by his oath to Polixena that he would not fight and the whole war started because of Paris's enchantment by Hellen.

The priority of obedience to the King here is clear, yet the argument becomes rather double-edged in the context of Restoration literature, carrying the message of necessary absolute submission to the monarch and criticizing the actual monarch at the same time: in the play, men have to overcome the emotional bonds to their lovers in order to put their state into order, thus enhancing the regal sovereignty; however, showing heroes weakened by their dependence on women carried clear reference to the King during the Exclusion Crisis, because one of the chief points in criticism of Charles II was "effeminacy" – not so much in the meaning of having feminine qualities, although certain passivity and submission is associated with the term too, suggesting Charles's "failure to be 'man' enough to square up to Louis XIV militarily",[24] but mainly in the meaning of too much dependence on women: the King was famed for many mistresses and he was thought to be under too much influence from his Catholic mistress, Louise de Kérouaille, the Duchess of Portsmouth, associated with two evils – France and Papism.[25] In the play, Priam describes his son Paris as "one besotted on effeminate joys" (I, i, 45, p. 11) and the same accusation comes on the Greek side against Achilles, when Patroclus decides to fight: "A woman impudent and mannish grown / Is not more loath'd than an effeminate man, / In time of

[24] Owen, *Restoration Theatre and Crisis*, p. 8.

[25] However, Charles II's association with effeminacy in terms of too much dependence on his mistresses was a common trope even before the Exclusion Crisis, famously employed by the Earl of Rochester ("His Sceptter and his Prick are of a Length, / And she may sway the one, who plays with th'other"), but also by John Oldham in his *Sardanapalus*, where he shows the King to neglect his royal duties: "Restless Ambition ne'r Usurpt thy Mind, […] With wiser choice, thy Judgment plac'd aright / In C-t its noble Innocent delight: / C-t was the Star that rul'd thy Fate, / C-t thy sole Bus'ness, and Affair of State, / And C-t the only Field to make thee Great: / C-t thy whole life's fair Center was, whither did bend / All thy Designs, and all thy Lines of Empire tend". John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester, ["A Satire on Charles II"], in *The Poems* (1984), *Literature Online* <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:po:Z200538361:2&rft.accountid=35514> 15 June 2016. John Oldham, "Sardanapalus: Ode," *Poetrynook* <http://poetrynook.com/poem/sardanapalus-ode> 15 June 2016.

action" (IV, ii, 38–40, p. 45). Effeminacy in the Restoration meaning of "subordination to unruly passions and excessive preoccupation with women"[26] was associated with Charles II in both oppositional and Tory texts, which means that these notes can be viewed as little critical bites at the King of England whose behaviour had often led to such accusations, or maybe warning: the King deserves obedience, but his love life does not suit the heroic status that is necessary to maintain the Stuart monarchy – being a prince demands sacrifices like the one Troilus has to make.

Already in *Oedipus* there was a great stress on the burdens of kings – seeing the terrible fate of Oedipus, Eurydice wished to get rid of the chains of royal descent and live a quiet life in poverty: "'Tis true a Crown seems dreadful, and I wish / That you and I, more lowly plac'd, might pass / Our softer hours in humble Cells away." (III, i, 93–5, p. 68) In *Troilus and Cressida* the warriors fight against these bonds fiercely and yet their code of honour forces them to submit, in Hector's words, for "the Publick". If we saw vulgar crowd in *Oedipus* represented by comical fools, Troilus's speech about the public shows a downright hatred:

> And what are they that I shou'd give up her
> To make them happy? let me tel you Brother,
> The publick, is the Lees of vulgar slaves:
> Slaves, with minds of slaves: so born, so bred:
> Yet such as these united in a herd
> Are call'd the publique: Millions of such Cyphers
> Make up the publique sum: an Egles life
> Is worth a world of Crows: are Princes made
> For such as these, who, were one Soul extracted
> From all their beings, cou'd not raise a Man. (III, ii, 321–30, p. 36)

Hector, who is the more admirable character throughout the whole play, answers in defence of the public, yet his argument does not abate any of the disturbing features of Troilus's speech: the strict class division, worthlessness of people of lower birth, vulgarity and mindlessness of the crowd. Hector argues for the necessity of taking care of the people in order to keep them happy to serve: "Even those who serve have their expectances; / Degrees of happines, which they must share, / Or they'll refuse to serve us." (III, ii, 335–7, p. 36–7) This is a rather cynical explanation of the grounds of monarchy reminding us strongly of the feudal system: The king takes care of the people and gives them protection in exchange for their servitude and loyalty; and while it may sound harsh to a modern reader, both Dryden's adapted plays from the beginning stages of the Exclusion Crisis

[26] Owen, *Restoration Theatre and Crisis*, 165.

emphasize that this is a burden for the king, who needs to sacrifice his personal desires and take care of his nation first – an instruction and exculpation for Charles at the same time.

This is why Dryden had to change the overall message of the original – Shakespeare made the story of Troilus and Cressida into "a piece of anti-militarist propaganda if ever there was one"[27] through utter debasement of the warrior heroes: "There are 'heroes', but heroism degenerates into squalid thuggery."[28] Even Hector and Achilles are represented as vain cut-throats, as Hector first kills a Greek in order to get his beautiful armour and then he is butchered by Achilles' soldiers.[29] Dryden, following his theory of tragedy explained in the previous chapter needed an exemplary hero to embody the noble code of honour as the foregrounding ethos of the Stuarts' reign – Troilus was "guilty" of his love-sickness and therefore Dryden stripped Hector of his faults from the original and transformed him into the tragic, heroic figure of the play, who sacrifices himself for his city.

Achilles' proud machinations stand in complete opposition to Hector's noble character and thus he induces the final Ulysses' monologue, which points at those false politicians, who in the name of public good pursue their private ambitions and disrupt the monarchy; obedience and loyalty are the forces that can lead the country out of its crisis:

> While publique good was urg'd for private ends,
> And those thought Patriots, who distub'd it most;
> Then like the headstrong horses of the Sun,
> That light which shou'd have cheer'd the World, consum'd it:
> Now peacefull order has resum'd the reynes,
> Old time looks young, and Nature seems renew'd:
> Then, since from hombred Factions ruine springs,
> Let Subjects learn obedience to their King. (V, ii, 328–37, p. 69)

The reference to the factious politicians of the Exclusion Crisis is clear, as well as Dryden's stance in view of the recent events. *Troilus and Cressida* stages a direct attack on the oppositional politicians, who for their private ambition disrupt the state. The solution of the situation is also straightforward – the necessary unconditional loyalty and submission to the King. The violence of the play and Ulysses' machinations even show adherence to Machiavellian political theory of power.[30]

[27] Christopher Morris, "Shakespeare's Politics," *The Historical Journal* 8.3 (1965), p. 296, *JSTOR* <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3020428> 30 April 2016.

[28] Tony Tanner, "Introduction," in William Shakespeare, *Tragedies II* (London: David Campbell Publishers, 1993), p. xxii.

[29] The destabilization of the heroic mode is one of the reasons for the generic confusion around this play, which has been interpreted both as a tragedy and bitter comedy. Martin Hilský, *Shakespeare a jeviště svět* (Praha: Academia, 2010), p. 276–8.

[30] See chapter 3.1 for Nathaniel Lee's subversion of the Machiavellian political theory.

2.3 *The Spanish Fryar*: a call for moderation and unity

But ev'n your Follies and Debauches change
With such a Whirl, the Poets of your age
Are tyr'd, and cannot score 'em on the Stage[31]

Both the tragedies of ancient plots reflected a period of confusion, disruption, and anxiety of the first years of the Exclusion Crisis. However, by 1680 the Whigs had already gained ascendancy over the Royalists.[32] On 1 November 1680, Dryden's play was staged which has caused much critical discussion, as it abandoned the rampant Royalist discourse of previous plays and its comical subplot was wholly based on a critique of religious hypocrisy among Catholic priests, not to speak of the highly generous treatment of the usurper of the crown. Moreover, the printed version was published in the second week of March 1681, during the excitement created by the elections for the Oxford Parliament and it was dedicated to John Holies, Lord Haughton, from a famous Whiggish family.[33] In the dedication, Dryden stresses its Protestant zeal: "in recommending a Protestant play to a Protestant patron, as I do myself an honor, so I do your noble family a right, who have been always eminent in the support and favor of our religion and liberties."[34]

Thus Dryden wrote a play that would by its anti-Catholic comic plot appeal to the majority of the Protestant audience, dedicated it to a Whig prominent, and yet the play is a natural sequel to the tragedies of previous seasons – once again Dryden attempted a play that enhances loyalty, ineptitude of hasty action and the divine right of the kings, though at the same time the court of Charles II does not escape a great deal of criticism. This is achieved by creating characters that are far from black and white – with most of the

---

[31] John Dryden, "Prologue," in *The Spanish Fryar* (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1994), unpaginated, *Literature Online* <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:dr:Z000074860:0&rft.accountid=35514> 10 June 2016.

[32] Owen describes the hopelessness of Charles's situation: "The French Ambassador agreed that 'the King's brother could only be saved by a miracle'. A series of prosecutions for seditious libel in the summer had failed to silence Opposition pamphleteers. The second Exclusion Bill passed overwhelmingly in the Commons. The Lords threw it out, but this was not as reassuring for Charles as it might seem. The bishops, the majority of peers created since 1661 and officers of state voted against the Bill, but 'The peers with titles created before the Civil War were almost evenly divided'. Halifax's famous speech warning that James might start a civil war if the Bill passed could hardly be construed as positively supportive of the heir to the throne. The Commons showed their intransigence and their confidence by voting for the removal of Halifax and the impeachment of several ministers, judges and provincial Tories, and for the repeal of the principal Act against dissenters. They warned that no supply would be voted until Exclusion had passed." Susan J. Owen, "The Politics of John Dryden's *The Spanish Fryar; or, the Double Discovery*," *English* 43 (1994), p. 106, *Oxford Journals* <http://english.oxfordjournals.org> 3 May 2016.

[33] As Owen mentions, the political stance of the play was still more unclear for the advertisement of the publication of the play, which was in the Whig newspaper, *The True Protestant Mercury*. Owen, "The Politics of John Dryden's *The Spanish Fryar; or, the Double Discovery*," p. 98.

[34] Villiers, George (ed.), *Selected Dramas of John Dryden: With the Rehearsal*, reprint (London: Forgotten Books, 2013), p. 310–1.

characters of this play it is difficult to charge them as positive or negative, with two exceptions: the common enemy of both Tories and Whigs, apolitical friar Domingo, who is a hypocritical greedy liar, willing to twist every part of his religious code in order to gain some money, and the romantic hero – the legitimate king Sancho, who actually does not appear on the stage and is only talked about. This however enables the character to become a mythical faultless figure, a divine sufferer, who patiently waits in the prison, retains all the glory of the true kings and at the end of the play is expected to descend from the mythological space to the Court, forgive all sinners and regain his legitimate power thanks not to any political machinations, but the Divine Providence in accordance with Filmer's myth of divine concern for the preservation of kingship (in *Absalom and Achitophel* king David's intervention against the rebellion is rendered in a very similar mythical representation). This was a very apt representation of royalty at the moment when Charles was under much criticism from his supporters for the lack of strong political action.

Kingship is not a result of political machination; it is a destiny, therefore the descriptions of Sancho, as well as the characterization of his secret son Torrismond show royalty as a set of inborn qualities. It is only Torrismond who is able to defeat the moors and the king retains his majesty even in the prison and shows admirable generosity and paternal love for his country:

> The good old King majestick in his Bonds,
> And 'midst his Griefs most venerably great: (III, ii, 189–90, p. 41)
> […]
> He was so true a Father of his Countrey,
> To thank me for defending ev'n his Foes,
> Because they were his Subjects. (III, ii, 212–4, p. 42)

If the viewer is presented with such an amiable representation of kingship, there can be no discussion about where the true loyalty should lie.

However, the simple equation of the true king – true loyalty is complicated by the introduction of a usurper, who is not a detestable ambitious traitor like Creon in *Oedipus*, but a beautiful Queen beloved by the lawful heir to the throne. Creon would have his counterpart in *The Spanish Fryar* in Bertran, an ambitious suitor of Leonora, who is craving for the Crown – however, this is a play of moderation and compromise, and thus Bertran is not treated by Dryden as fiercely as Creon in *Oedipus*; in the end he becomes the tool of Providence when he reveals that he did not murder the King. When he is negatively described as a double-faced courtier, as he "has been taught the Arts of Court, / To guild a Face with Smiles; and leer a man to ruin" (I, i, 192–3, p. 6), it is a critique that can be

applied to the politicians of both rivalling parties, the scheming Parliamentarians as well as the courtiers of Charles II.

Although the play clearly disqualifies Bertran from any right to the throne, it is different with the current usurper, Leonora, as she has inherited her title from her father, who had actually put the true king into prison. Leonora is beautiful and highly ambiguous character – though she is plotting the murder of the king, it is accounted for by her no-win situation – she is tied by the promise of her father to Bertran, she is surrounded by scheming politicians, the inherited title makes her essentially criminal, the king in the prison is a constant danger and she is in love with the Royalist Torrismond. Right after sending Bertran to kill the King, she is shown to change her opinion, which later works as an extenuation, though she is mainly saved by Bertran's restraint from action.

Leonora has no right to the throne, yet the play does not promote a Royalist intervention. Loyalty to the true King is not shown as an absolute value as in the previous plays, it has its downside in a too hasty action. Though a stark Royalist, Raymond is definitely not represented as a completely positive character in the play. Though he is loyal to the true King, he raises his son like Phorbas in *Oedipus* and he is shown as a good wise man with strict morale, his zeal for the overthrow of Leonora and his raising of an army of citizens, or rather a rabble – "vile blaspheming Rout" (V, i, 175, p. 69) – is strongly criticized, as he makes these steps without the consent of the lawful heir, Torrismond. It is essentially as bad as rebellion, though on the part of a stark Royalist, as Torrismond makes clear: "How darst thou serve thy King against his Will? […] I'll punish thee By Heaven, I will, as I wou'd punish Rebels Thou stubborn loyal Man." (V, ii, 29–38, p. 72)

According to Duane Coltharp, "[w]here Raymond goes wrong is in trying to force the pace of history, to bring about by violence a restoration of the true line which will come about more mysteriously, surprisingly and satisfactorily through the workings of Providence, as 'Heaven makes Princes its peculiar Care'."[35] The only one in the play who promotes ruthless action is Bertran:

> Mercy is good; a very good dull Vertue;
> But Kings mistake its timing and are mild,
> When mainly Courage bids 'em be severe;
> Better be cruel once than anxious ever. (II, ii, 140–3, p. 40)

[35] Duane Coltharp, "Radical Royalism: strategy and ambivalence in Dryden's tragicomedies," *Philological Quarterly* 78.4 (Fall 1999), unpaginated, *EZPROXY*, <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?authtype=shib&custid=s1240919&direct=true&db=edsglr&AN=edsgcl.72610897&site=eds-live&scope=site&lang=cs> 3 May 2016.

The happy end of the play is only provided by the fact that he does not act on his words and does not actually murder the king, thus showing that such conception is essentially wrong and advocating Charles's inactivity. On the whole the play shows that too much zeal can be dangerous on both sides – the Royalist as well as the Parliamentarian, which can be interpreted as a quietist message again. It is far safer to restrain from criticism and action than to meddle with things transcending the common human law. As a result, the play seems to promote non-resistance even to a usurper, which might seem incongruous with Charles's position as the saviour of the nation who put an end to the disruption of the Interregnum, yet it is in accordance even with the patriarchal theory of Filmer. Coltharp has pointed out the relation of Dryden's play to the history of non-resistance theory:

> Generations of Anglican parishioners had learned, from such sources as 'An Exhortation to Obedience' and 'An Homily against Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion' in the Elizabethan Book of Homilies, that every sovereign, even a wicked and tyrannical one, is authorized by the will of God, and that no subject, however wise or virtuous, is entitled to resist the reigning sovereign. Though designed to serve the interests of hereditary monarchs, the doctrine of non-resistance eventually enabled countless Englishmen to justify their submission to the Commonwealth and then to the Protectorate, governments whose very existence could be seen as evidence of God's permissive will.[36]

Even the radical Royalist Filmer defended obedience to a usurper in things lawful and indifferent in his *Directions for Obedience to Government in Dangerous or Doubtful Times* (1652), though there is a difference in degree of loyalty between the usurper and the legitimate monarch, as the usurpers only have a "qualified right"[37] to the throne and "some things are indifferent for a lawful superior, which are not indifferent, but unlawful to a usurper to enjoin".[38] In *Patriarcha* Filmer makes no difference between the various means of gaining power, as "it is still the manner of the government by supreme power that makes them properly Kings, and not the means of obtaining their crowns."[39] Of course, after 1649 he had to be much more cautious in granting the right to reign to anyone firmly established on the throne, therefore Coltharp mentions that the Stuart supporters had to employ the concept of tyranny, which equates to Filmer's things unlawful which require resistance. The same discourse is applied in *The Spanish Fryar* and though there is

[36] Coltharp, unpaginated.
[37] Robert Filmer, "Directions for Obedience to Government in Dangerous or Doubtful Times," in *Observations concerning the original and various forms of government…* (London: R.R.C. – Thomas Axe, f1696), p. 161, *EEBO* <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A41307.0001.001?view=toc> 3 May 2016.
[38] Filmer, "Directions for Obedience…", p. 163.
[39] Filmer, "Patriarcha", p. 100.

a usurper on the throne, zealous resistance by Raymond threatens to cause too much disruption, which is why Torrismond advocates non-resistance:

> When from the Conquerour we hold our Lives,
> We yield our selves his Subjects from that hour:
> For mutual Benefits make mutual Ties.
> […]
> Kings Titles commonly begin by Force,
> Which Time wears off and mellows into Right:
> So Power, which in one Age is Tyranny,
> Is ripn'd in the next to true Succession (IV, ii, 313–25, p. 60–61)

Nevertheless, there is a careful differentiating between the beautiful queen Leonora and the tyrannical tendencies of Bertran which would be unacceptable (Queen: You place such Arbitrary Power in Kings, / That I much fear, if I should make you one, / You'll make your self a Tyrant IV, ii, 74–6, p. 54).

In the end, the court plot is resolved by two main factors – the survival of the king and reliance on his forgiveness ("So mercifull a King did never live; / Loth to revenge, and easie to forgive" V, ii, 448–9, p. 83) and Torrismond's marriage with Leonora which redeems her past sins; by re-establishing proper family bonds (marriage and revelation of the father–son relationship), unity is achieved both in the family and state. Mirroring of this final unity is one of the features that help to make connections between the two subplots in *The Spanish Fryar*. As in *Oedipus* there are two love triangles that are plagued by a fatal flaw, caused by unknown blood relations: Sancho–Torrismond–Leonora is a set of relationships disrupted by Leonora's usurpation and Torrismond's unknown descent, while the rakish plot of Lorenzo's suiting Elvira married to a dull greedy husband proves to be utterly immoral due to its incestuous character – it is revealed that Elvira is his sister. If Lorenzo is compared to the flamboyant rakes of pre-crisis years such as Willmore in Behn's *The Rover* (1678), the epitomes of the light-hearted Restoration court, the negative treatment of the character stands out. Although Lorenzo appears as a much more appealing character than the jealous husband, his suiting of Elvira is entirely ruthless, he conspires with a Papist and unknowingly attempts to seduce his own sister. This renders his actions in the end entirely abhorrent, which again shows the inadequacy of irresponsible disruption of the social order – dull marriage seems eventually as the better option than incestuous lover, which makes the family unified again.

The emphasis that the play puts on the unity of family and thus on social order at the end reflects the much needed unity of the state. Following the Filmerian state–family

analogy, in order to re-establish the harmony in the state, it is necessary to restrain from all plotting and political machinations: there is a reflection of the Popish Plot in the accusation of Gomez of being involved in a plot to murder the king, which is entirely made up by the corrupt policemen. Instead of faction, all parties need to restore the original bonds and cooperate in due loyalty to the father of the family – the legitimate king. If this does not happen, Torrismond adds a warning of what happens if the king is murdered:

> O, never, never, shall it be forgotten;
> High Heaven will not forget it, after Ages
> Shall with a fearfull Curse remember ours;
> And Bloud shall never leave the Nation more! (III, ii, 272–5, p. 43)

The Spanish Fryar thus opens with a very similar situation of a decaying state as the previous tragedies – the city is endangered by outside enemies due to the inner disruptions. Yet, while the first two plays struggled to put blame on the factions and they staggered in violent images of death and dilapidation in warning against upcoming dangers, the season of Whig ascendancy induced Dryden to create a play of a much more complying nature – the play retains the warnings against rabble-rousing and hasty action, but also offers a set of positive values – love, moderation, loyalty and Protestantism, which could be seen as the hidden family bond that connects both Tories and Whigs, as the dedication to a prominent Whig shows; Owen describes *The Spanish Fryar* as a play "celebrating compromise, forgiveness, marriage, moderation and good humour. Rather than political uncertainty, it may well have been the opposite which led the Laureate to grasp the danger of civil war and to seek a new direction towards values which might heal rather than exacerbate the breach in the nation."[40] There is not only a critique of those opposing Dryden's political views: while *Troilus and Cressida* was aimed against all kinds of faction and the kings remained blameless, *The Spanish Fryar* does not refrain from a mild criticism of Charles II. His association with the rakish characters, established by a number of previous Restoration plays and poems, is here used to stress that he is far from the ideal mythological Sancho, though the criticism is carefully aimed at the faults in his private body, what Pedro in the play calls "Smock-loyalty" (II, i, 31, p. 16), rather than the public body of the King, whose compliance, compromising and mercy are praised by comparison and the rest of his ideal qualities remain as a kind of instruction for the actual monarch.

[40] Owen, "The Politics of John Dryden's *The Spanish Fryar; or, the Double Discovery*," p. 104.

2.4 *Absalom and Achitophel*: Tory offensive

> *Henceforth a series of new time began,*
> *The mighty years in long procession ran;*
> *Once more the godlike David was restored,*
> *And willing nations knew their lawful lord.*
> (1028–31)

In the autumn 1681 Dryden published a satire that was to become the epitome of Restoration political literature in general and of the Exclusion Crisis specifically – *Absalom and Achitophel*.[41] While in *The Spanish Fryar* we have analysed a play celebrating compromise at the time of Whig ascendancy, only a few months after the publication of the play, the situation changed completely. Charles II succeeded in negotiating subsidies from France for staying neutral in the French-Dutch conflict and thus was able to dissolve the Parliament and have Shaftesbury arrested for treason – he was accused of planning a rebellion to install Charles's illegitimate son, the Duke of Monmouth, on the throne. Unlike the legitimate heir, Monmouth was a Protestant with great popularity among the English. Shaftesbury's trial took place on 24 November 1681 and though he was acquitted by a jury nominated by the Whig sheriffs, the opposition was vanquished – mainly because Charles was now able to reign until his death without summoning the Parliament. This radical change in the political situation was strongly supported by Tory propaganda to diminish the popularity of the Exclusionist movement and Dryden's poem was an important part of this, as it was specifically written to discredit Shaftesbury shortly before his trial.

This means we are approaching a text coming from a completely different genre and completely different situation than the previous ones. While the tragedies warned against upcoming threats and the tragicomedy attempted a harmonious solution for both sides, the satire comes triumphantly as a coup de grace for the opposition and firmly restores the King's stable position. How much does the discourse change then? The analyses of previous plays have discerned certain patterns of tropes that form the core of Dryden's political discourse – mainly the patriarchal representation of kingship based on Filmerian ideology, constant warnings against rabble-rousing to secure a fixed social hierarchy, critique of political faction and a mild criticism of Charles II and his private life that causes the accusations of effeminacy. How is then this pattern employed or transformed in the famous satire?

---

[41] Since *The Second Part of Absalom and Achitophel* was mainly written by another hand, this chapter will focus solely on Dryden's first part.

Absalom and Achitophel is based on the typological correspondence between contemporary events and the biblical story of Absalom's revolt against his father King David, which comes from the Second Book of Samuel in the Old Testament. When David's renowned advisor, Achitophel, joins Absalom's rebellion, another advisor, Hushai, becomes a double agent and gives Absalom advice that actually helps David. When Achitophel realises that the rebellion is doomed to fail, he commits suicide. Absalom is killed (against David's wish) after getting caught by his hair in the thick branches of a great oak, which causes David strong grief.

The typological analogy of the poem interpreted the Whig campaign as a rebellion against the King rather than a movement protecting the country against the Catholic heir, with stable reference of King David to Charles II, Absalom to the Duke of Monmouth and Achitophel to Shaftesbury.[42] The translation of a current political debate into the typological narrative proves to be an important tool in interpreting the issues concerned. While reality may be always a matter of discussion, according to Paul Hammond, "a typological narrative carries with it little or no liberty of interpretation, for the private voice of the reader cannot speak against the quasi-divine voice of the typology".[43] Through allowing only one interpretation of the text, the author controls the interpretation of events as well, which is one of the reasons for the wide usage of classical examples and biblical typology in the political discourse of the time. Examples were a means to impose certain interpretation on contemporary events and also a tool for asserting authority of the text. This was applied by Dryden and Lee already in *Oedipus*, where they used a widely-known classical example, but transformed the emphasis put on individual parts of the plot and characterization of the protagonists, so that it suited their political message. Similarly, in *Absalom and Achitophel* the plot is overshadowed by the importance of individual characterization. Although the poem offers an extensive allegory of English history in the history of the Jewish state, major part of the text is formed by individual characterization

---

[42] The typological parallel between Charles II and King David was a stable trope used by Dryden already upon the King's restoration in the celebratory poem *Astrea Redux*, where he based the analogy on their both spending important part of their lives in exile: "Thus banish'd David spent abroad his time, / When to be Gods Anointed was his Crime, / And when restor'd, made his proud Neighbours rue" (79–81). John Dryden, "Astrea Redux," in *The Poems of John Dryden* (1913), *Bartleby* <http://www.bartleby.com/204/2.html> 27 June 2016.

[43] Paul Hammond, *John Dryden: A Literary Life* (London: Macmillan, 1991), p. 97–98.

of each protagonist, showing a "gallery" of Whig villains and Tory heroes, as well as the seductive process of Achitophel's luring Absalom into rebellion.[44]

The clear analogy between king David and Charles is established immediately by the opening lines of the poem, which feature a playful interpretation of his widely criticized sexual life, showing monogamy as a hypocritical religious rule introduced by the generally hated priests, as the plot takes place "In pious times, ere priestcraft did begin, / Before polygamy was made a sin" (1–2). In imitation of the Genesis and creation of the world and man, the King conceives a number of children, only the Queen remains barren:

> Then Israel's monarch after heaven's own heart,
> His vigorous warmth did variously impart
> To wives and slaves; and, wide as his command,
> Scattered his Maker's image through the land.
> Michal, of royal blood, the crown did wear,
> A soil ungrateful to the tiller's care (7–12).

While we can say that the Exclusion Crisis was a crisis of fatherhood and Charles was criticized for irresponsible conception of a number of illegitimate children, David's vigour in procreation represents him as the good father to the country both in the literal and symbolic meaning. It mustn't be forgotten that fatherhood/patriarchy had been an essential part of the Royalist discourse over several decades – already in his poem celebrating Charles's coronation Dryden had used the father–king analogy in biblical history: "When empire first from families did spring / Then every father govern'd as a king."[45] Unfortunately, here the fatherhood is endangered by a barren queen.

However, still the king as a good father takes care of his illegitimate children, especially the "so beautiful, so brave" (18) Absalom. Thus the Duke of Monmouth is introduced in a very positive manner: he is brave, beautiful, a great warrior (23–24) and lover (26), wholly beloved by his father and king ("With secret joy indulgent David viewed / His youthful image in his son renewed" 31–32), who was unfortunately blinded by his indulgence in Absalom: "What faults he had, ---for who from faults is free? / His father could not, or he would not see." (35–36)

[44] *Absalom and Achitophel* features a great number of characters, which represent real-life prominent protagonists of the political scene of the Exclusion Crisis. It is not the aim of this work to analyse the correspondences in detail, rather it will focus on the means Dryden uses for the satirical characterization and transformations of the political discourse of Restoration.

[45] The same idea forms the basis of Filmerian patriarchal theory of kingship. John Dryden, "To His Sacred Majesty. A Panegyric on his Coronation," *The Poetical Works of John Dryden, Volume 1* (London: Bell and Daldy, 1850), p. 29, *Google Books*, <http://books.google.cz/books?id=RZIOAAAAQAAJ&printsec=frontcover&hl=cs#v=onepage&q&f=false> 10 May 2016.

The children of the indulgent father become spoilt and misbehave – Dryden offers a critique of the English and especially of the City of London, which formed the core supporting power for the Exclusionists – the whole nation is described as always discontented:

> a headstrong, moody, murmuring race,
> As ever tried the extent and stretch of grace;
> God's pampered people, whom, debauched with ease,
> No king could govern, nor no God could please (45–48)

Moreover, Dryden reminds them that it was the people who originally established David on the throne, thus reflecting the time of Restoration (59–60), although the Jews in the poem are inclined to get rid of their monarch very easily, reflecting the whole history of seventeenth century in England: "once in twenty years their scribes record, / By natural instinct they change their lord" (218–19). Yet, the majority was shown as moderate, knew "the value of a peaceful reign" and "curst the memory of civil wars" (70–74), so there was a harmony in the state supported by the king's diplomatic mildness (75–78). However, this balance is disrupted by factions and plotting: "Plots, true or false, are necessary things, / To raise up commonwealths, and ruin kings." (83–84) The Popish Plot is shown as a "nation's curse", induced by misrepresentation, which the public easily accepted without proper information, which is a common feature of the crowd in all Dryden's texts, as we have seen in the previous plays:

> From hence began that plot, the nation's curse;
> Bad in itself, but represented worse;
> Raised in extremes, and in extremes decried;
> With oaths affirmed, with dying vows denied;
> Not weighed nor winnowed by the multitude,
> But swallowed in the mass, unchewed and crude. (108–113)

Dryden does not go as far as denouncing its truth completely at this moment, but is careful in weighing the validity of information ("Some truth there was, but dashed and brewed with lies, / To please the fools, and puzzle all the wise." 114–115). If the plot was real, it had failed, yet had disastrous consequences in arousing factions, which threat the government (135–141). Such disrupted state (remember the plague in Thebes) forms the best conditions for rebellion and thus the Creon of Jews appears in the character of "the false Achitophel":

> A name to all succeeding ages curst:
> For close designs, and crooked counsels fit;
> Sagacious, bold, and turbulent of wit;

Restless, unfixed in principles and place;
In power unpleased, impatient of disgrace; (151–155)

If Dryden pointed out in his preface "To the Reader" that he had made the poem more moderate "by rebating the Satyre (where Justice would allow it), from carrying too sharp an Edge",[46] apparently with the Earl of Shaftesbury Justice did not allow forbearance. Achitophel becomes the tool of Satan, the Miltonic[47] seducer, which is an analogy that is established already in the preface, where Absalom's temptation is likened to that of Adam: "'tis no more a wonder that he withstood not the temptations of Achitophel, than it was for Adam not to have resisted the two Devils, the Serpent and the Woman."[48] Later, when Dryden asserts no ill feelings towards Achitophel, he uses an analogy with the Devil himself, which does not make his assertion very credible: "I have not so much as an uncharitable Wish against Achitophel, but am content to be Accus'd of a good natur'd Errour; and to hope with Origen, that the Devil himself may, at last, be sav'd."[49] This is an excellent rhetorical strategy, where the seeming praise covers the devil-analogy.

Indeed, in the description of his previous career as a judge, Achitophel is praised and his great potential is asserted as the "daring pilot in extremity / Pleased with the danger, when the waves went high" (159–60), yet like Milton's Satan, he is an example of a fallen genius:

He sought the storms; but, for a calm unfit,
Would steer too nigh the sands, to boast his wit.
Great wits are sure to madness near allied,
And thin partitions do their bounds divide (161–4)

The analogy is completed in the description of his temptation of Absalom as venom ("Him he attempts with studied arts to please, / And sheds his venom in such words as these" 228–9) and in his metaphor of ripe fruits which must be gathered: "thy fruit must be / Or gathered ripe, or rot upon the tree" (250–1).[50]

---

[46] John Dryden, "To the reader," unpaginated, <https://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/d/dryden/john/absalom_and_achitophel/preface.html> 1 Aug 2016.

[47] Although politically completely opposing, Dryden's work shows constant negotiation with Milton, which culminated in 1674 with his adaption of *Paradise Lost* for the stage in *State of Innocence*, which changed the genre, verse form and transformed Satan into a distinctly Cromwellian character.

[48] Dryden, "To the reader," unpaginated.

[49] Dryden, "To the reader," unpaginated.

[50] Dryden employed the parallel between Shaftesbury and Satan also in his next satire, *The Medal*, written after Shaftesbury's acquittal and Whig celebration of this victory by casting a special medal: "Five daies he sate, for every cast and look; / Four more than God to finish Adam took. / But who can tell what Essence Angels are. / Or how long Heav'n was making Lucifer?" (18–21). John Dryden, "The Medal," in *The Works of John Dryden* (1882–1892), *Literature Online* <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:po:Z300342807:3&rft.accountid

In his ambitious meddling with the state Achitophel endangered public safety and by weakening the state exposed it to its enemies (176–177) and all this in the name of public good: “So easy still it proves in factious times, / With public zeal to cancel private crimes” (180–1). Like Creon, Achitophel is generally on very good terms with the public and his eloquent rhetoric is a great tool for manipulation of the crowd: “Weak arguments! which yet, he knew full well, / Were strong with people easy to rebel” (214–15). And like Creon, his body is deformed and ugly: “A fiery soul, which, working out its way, / Fretted the pigmy-body to decay, / And o'er-informed the tenement of clay.” (156–8) Paul Hammond has noticed how much attention in the characterization is paid to the physical bodies of the enemy: “In paying so much attention to the unruly and grotesque bodies of the Whig leaders, Dryden is implicitly contrasting them with the sacred person of the King.”[51] Body forms an essential part of the Tory imagery based on the medieval concept of the King’s two bodies[52] – the private body, allowing for criticism of Charles’s sexual life, and the body politic, into which divine power enters on his accession to the throne; thus body is also the vehicle for enhancing the difference between the King and his enemies. The rather coarse tool of showing the physical distortions of his enemies is not used only against Shaftesbury, but also against other Dryden’s opponents; he employed it for example in the lines that he contributed to *The Second Part of Absalom and Achitophel*, which attacked the dramatist Thomas Shadwell, who was a stark defender of Shaftesbury and Whig politics, by way of his corpulent body: “Monstrous mass of foul corrupted matter, / As all the Devils had spew’d to make the batter” (462–5).[53]

Kirk Combe has analysed the character of Achitophel from the perspective of carnivalesque elements in the poem and has pointed out the workings of the satiric element in the characterization, where the demonizing element is supported by the comical one. Shaftesbury is depicted as Achitophel

=35514> 15 May 2016.

[51] Hammond, p. 101.

[52] Ernst H. Kantorowicz, *Dvě těla krále: studie z dějin středověké politické teologie* (Praha: Argo, 2014).

[53] Nahum Tate, *The Second Part of Absalom and Achitophel* (1682), *Literature Online* <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:po:Z200633382:2&rft.accountid=35514> 10 March 2016. A little more sophisticated use of Shadwell’s figure can be found in Dryden’s satire focused entirely on the discredit of Shadwell, *MacFlecknoe*, in the image of him floating in a ceremony on a barge on Thames, where his corpulent body becomes a metaphor of his pride and pretance: “Swell'd with the pride of thy celestial charge; / And big with hymn” (40–1). John Dryden, “Mac-Flecknoe: A Satire Against Thomas Shadwell,” in *The works of John Dryden* (1882-1892), p. 443, *Literature Online* <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:po:Z200342880:2&rft.accountid=35514> 15 May 2016.

> […] rabble-rousing against David and, only somewhat more subtly, as Satan rebelling against God. Likening him as well to a carnival mock king directing innovative tumult against established order not only amplifies the civic warning issued by the poem but, significantly, serves to trivialize Shaftesbury while at the same time demonizing him. That is to say, Shaftesbury is made to appear both crazed—someone to whom we should pay no attention—and apocalyptic—but nonetheless, someone whom we cannot afford to ignore.[54]

With Absalom it is different – while arrested Shaftesbury was the prime Tory enemy, Duke of Monmouth was still of royal blood and not completely fallen into disfavour with Charles II. Therefore, he was not so violently abused in the satire, which attempted to put most of the blame on the political figures like Shaftesbury or Duke of Buckingham (Zimri) and Absalom was originally characterized as a misled young man who is a victim of Achitophel's lures ("The ambitious youth, too covetous of fame, / Too full of angel's metal in his frame, / Unwarily was led from virtue's ways" 309–11). This is stressed by Dryden already in his preface: "David himself, coud not be more tender of the Young-man's Life, than I woud be of his Reputation."[55] Moreover, Achitophel misuses his positive qualities to convince Absalom to the rebellion, when he argues against David in the name of public good:

> 'tis the general cry,
> Religion, commonwealth, and liberty.
> If you, as champion of the public good,
> Add to their arms a chief of royal blood (291–4)

Though the future rebellious leader, Absalom is the speaker who develops most coherent defence of David and brings the most valid arguments against rebellion in his discussion with Achitophel. This serves two purposes – first, the rebellion is disqualified by its own leader, which makes it entirely pointless; and second, it functions as an apology for Absalom who shows the awareness of his duties as a son and a subject. In his defence monologue, he describes David as a monarch of "unquestioned right", defender of faith, good, just and law-abiding. Moreover, "heaven by wonders has espoused his cause" (317–20). We can see then that the King's divine right is promoted again, as well as his mild nature and forgiveness: "What millions has he pardoned of his foes, / Whom just revenge did to his wrath expose!" (323–4). His mildness promotes him as a great monarch and

[54] Kirk Combe, "Shaftesbury and Monmouth as Lords of Misrule: Dryden and Menippean Transformations," *The Eighteenth Century* 45.3 (2004), p. 238, *EBCOhost* <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?authtype=shib&custid=s1240919&direct=true&dd=edsglr&AN=edsgcl.143341235&site=eds-live&scope=site&lang=cs> 15 March 2016.
[55] Dryden, "To the reader," unpaginated.

makes any kind of rebellion lawless, since he is not an oppressing tyrant – thus what was seen as one of Charles's greatest faults becomes the chief attribute of the biblical King. The same accounts for the Duke of York, who is praised by Absalom as the one who is "secure of native right, / Of every royal virtue stands possest" (354–355). He underlines his courage, loyalty, fame and mercy (357–9). While James was indeed renowned for military success, the last item would be more of a wish: Charles was known as a diplomatic king who aims for the compromise, but a great part of the Exclusion movement was induced by the fear that James would not be as mild a king as his brother. The difference between the two royal brothers is what Achitophel employs to disprove Absalom's arguments – he interprets David's kindness as fear of his brother:

> Perhaps his fear his kindness may control.
> He fears his brother, though he loves his son,
> For plighted vows too late to be undone.
> If so, by force he wishes to be gained;
> Like woman's lechery to seem constrained.
> Doubt not; but, when he most affects the frown,
> Commit a pleasing rape upon the crown. (468–74)

The inherently political process of persuasion is translated in Achitophel's rhetoric into a complex web of sexual imagery – Achitophel approaches the beautiful youth as a perverting force, seducing him like a woman to adopt the rebellious cause against his father. However, in order to succeed in this essentially emasculating process, Achitophel needs to present it as empowering, to put Absalom into the discursive position of the seducer. Therefore, he employs the supposed effeminacy of king David to suggest the idea that the weak King deserves, or even wishes, to be subdued and though the act itself may be violent, the result will redeem it as a "pleasing" experience. Although this might seem as a very radical metaphor, similar sexual analogies were a stock tool of political writing of the Restoration – as in *Oedipus*, incest was often symbolically used to represent the disrupted state of the society, political situation or individual people and rape would often refer to the violence of rebellion if used by the Tories, or function as the mark of arbitrary power and tyranny for the Whigs. Dryden lets his vile politician transform the Tory association of "rape on the Crown" with rebellion into a basically positive experience to emphasize the power of persuasive rhetoric that is Achitophel's main political weapon. He even succeeds in convincing Absalom that the emasculating submission to Achitophel's will is actually a kind of empowering transformation.

When finally convinced by Achitophel, Absalom addresses the crowd to gain popularity, relying on the typical reproaches against Charles II: he is "careless of his fame; / And, bribed with petty sums of foreign gold, / Is grown in Bathsheba's embraces old" (708–710) – referring to Charles's close dealings with France and the before-mentioned dependence in his Catholic mistress, the Duchess of Portsmouth. Concerning the money, the accusation of bribery stands in stark contrast with the resolution of the Parliament to allow the King no money, until he is obedient ("The thrifty sanhedrim shall keep him poor" 390), so there was not much choice left for him.

Although Dryden was indeed more careful in his denouncement of Monmouth, still after the original seducing part, he becomes the leader of the rebellion – he is the one who lures the crowd: "Misled by false promise and now among the Whig faithful in the politicized carnival square, Absalom as the seduced transforms into the active seducer. His behavior and his words are those of a charismatic and politically motivated trickster." [56]

Thus *Absalom and Achitophel* shows a whole gallery of the present-day prominent characters of the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis, mostly the opponents of the Stuarts and a few supporters. It is a deeply personal satire based on characterization of each person mainly by their qualities, rather than deeds, and it uses a variety of stock features that the Tories usually attributed their opponents: Thus the Duke of Buckingham (Zimri) is shown basically as a pathetic dilettante who tries something new all the time, but does nothing well, and who can only think in extremes ("every Man, with him, was God or Devil" 558), which is a common feature with Achitophel as the "daring Pilot". This quality figures the factious politicians as overly ambitious and unfit for the promoted moderation.

The sheriff of London Slingsby Bethel (Shimei) is a typical fanatical Whig – from his youth he is a religious hypocrite who hates the king:

> Shimei, ---whose youth did early promise bring
> Of zeal to God, and hatred to his king, ---
> Did wisely from expensive sins refrain,
> And never broke the Sabbath but for gain (585–8)

Such description is surprisingly close to Domingo in *The Spanish Fryar* – he is a religious hypocrite, though this time it is a Puritan, willing to sacrifice his religion for money. Moreover, he is easily bribed and disrupts the workings of justice:

> If any durst his Factious Friends accuse,
> He pact a Jury of dissenting Jews:

[56] Combe, p. 241.

Whose fellow-feeling, in the godly Cause,
Would free the suffring Saint from Humane Laws.
For Laws are only made to Punish those,
Who serve the King, and to protect his Foes. (606–11)

This is what actually happened at Shaftesbury's trial, as he was acquitted by a jury full of Whig supporters, appointed by the sheriff.

At this point in the poem, the reader is ready to accept that the scheming politicians are able to do anything to achieve their goal and thus the original caution in relation to the truth of the Popish Plot can be abandoned – in the character of Titus Oates (Corah) we see a ruthless plotter who can make up anything to suit his own purposes:

His memory, miraculously great,
Could plots, exceeding man's belief, repeat;
Which therefore cannot be accounted lies,
For human wit could never such devise. (650–3)

After disarming the enemies by a personal satire, the narrator disclaims the ideas on which Achitophel's rebellion was based: that is mainly the inherent right of the nation to dethrone their monarch, if they are dissatisfied. This right is deduced from the theory of social contract. Dryden opposes such idea, as thus the kings would be "slaves to those whom they command, / And tenants to their people's pleasure" (775–6). However, the main argument is derived from the danger of the crowd, prone to making mistakes, holding the power and from consequent anarchy, which endangers the property and rights of everyone:

If they may give and take whene'er they please,
Not kings alone, the Godhead's images,
But government itself, at length must fall
To nature's state, where all have right to all. (791–4)

By this moment the reader should be fully convinced, either by the arguments or by the abhorrence of opposition leaders, of validity of the monarchy as it stands, with the legitimate King. The only step that is missing is the correction of before-mentioned David's faults. Therefore, David awakens from his seeming lethargy, or rather loses his patience, and utters a final monologue, which resolves everything back to the previous social order. He explains his long inactivity as mercy and forgiveness in patriarchal terms: "So much the father did the king assuage" (942) and presents himself as a fearless manly ruler ready to enforce the order, although still leaving space for repentance on the part of the rebels:

Kings are the public pillars of the state,
Born to sustain and prop the nation's weight:

> If my young Samson will pretend a call
> To shake the column, let him share the fall:
> But oh, that yet he would repent and live!
> How easy 'tis for parents to forgive! (953–8)

After which God proved his support for the legitimate King by thundering and "Once more the godlike David was restored, / And willing nations knew their lawful lord" (1030–1), which again creates a parallel between the end of the Exclusion Crisis and the Restoration of 1660, as we have seen before.

Unlike the original biblical story, where the conflict is taken to its due end of defeating the enemies, Dryden chose to stop at the moment without resolution in deeds or punishment, although the previous text seems to promise a conflict between the opposing forces of Achitophel and David. According to Laura Braun,

> […] the truncation results not from the artfulness of the work itself but from the incongruity between contemporary events and biblical history. David's conflict with Absalom leads to actual usurpation, open battle, and Absalom's death; Charles's leads to the political maneuverings of the Oxford Parliament.[57]

In the prefac,e Dryden addresses the same issue and essentially gives the same explanation – first, he did not want to show Absalom suffer as in the biblical source; and second, he is not an "inventor", but the "historian", thus making a claim for objectiveness and moderation. However, as we have seen, the poem is far from objective, the text is an exemplary piece of Tory partisan writing employing almost all the tropes and themes that the Royalist supporters could use. Dryden did not write a piece of history (if that is possible), but a rhetorical device supporting the divine right of the Stuart brothers. By the end of the poem, the enemies were destroyed, the "proper" version of political theory was argued and therefore there was no reason for a continuation – not mentioning that the sudden appearance of the King and quick re-establishment of harmony was fully in accordance with the mythological representation of the divine body of the King under the protection of Providence.

[57] Laura Braun, "The Ideology of Restoration Poetic Form: John Dryden," *PMLA* 97.3 (May, 1982), p. 402, *JSTOR* <http://www.jstor.org/stable/462230> 7 June 2016.

3 Nathaniel Lee

In the chapter on *Oedipus* we have seen one of the results of a surprising collaboration of the Poet Laureate John Dryden and Nathaniel Lee, the author of the play which Susan Owen has described as “the most obviously oppositional play of the entire crisis”[1] – *Lucius Junius Brutus*. For a comparison of their approaches, which might even make clearer some of the inherent ambiguities discovered in the political reading of *Oedipus*, the following text will analyse Lee’s major plays of the Exclusion crisis.

During the critical years, Lee wrote several plays: *Theodosius, or the Force of Love* and *Caesar Borgia* (both acted 1680), *The Massacre of Paris* (written about this time but not published until 1690), *The Princess of Cleve* (1681) – an adaptation of Madame de La Fayett’s 1678 novel, *Lucius Junius Brutus; Father of His Country* (acted 1681), and *The Duke of Guise*, again in collaboration with Dryden (1683). From the perspective of political engagement, the plays concerned with the dominant character of a ruler will be most descriptive of the use of historical examples in what is nearest on the Restoration stage to oppositional writing. As the problematic interpretation of some of these plays will demonstrate, it is necessary to be cautious when applying the label “oppositional” – the authors inclined to the Whig side were still dependent on the staging of their plays and reception of the audience, which means that the texts carefully negotiate between what would be acceptable to the public and to the Court.

3.1 *Theodosius* and *Caesar Borgia:* too much weakness, too much strength

Talk no more on't; but do, Sir, do.
(IV, i, 218, p. 46)[2]

Like *Oedipus*, the two plays acted at the height of the crisis, 1680, are concerned with vitiated kingship; each of them offers a study of a different kind of flaw in the character of the ruler. However, while in *Oedipus* we have seen a struggle to mitigate King’s vice by promoting his noble personality and unintentional character of his sins, Lee’s later plays show a far lesser degree of the will to excuse royal faults.

Theodosius is a tragedy inspired by Eastern Roman Emperor Theodosius II, who ruled in the fifth century and was succeeded by general Marcian after the marriage to

[1] Owen, *Restoration Theatre and Crisis*, p. 253.

[2] Nathaniel Lee, *Caesar Borgia* (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1994), *Literature Online* <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_sid=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:dr:Z000096325:0&rft.accountid=35514> 10 April 2016.

Theodosius' sister Pulcheria. In Lee's play, Theodosius is ultimately failing as the leader of his country. The play opens with his decision to enter a monastery as a devout Christian of the early stages of the rising Church. His monastic life, induced by a hopeless love to an unknown beauty, is postponed by the arrival of his closest friend, Persian Prince Varanes. It is revealed that they are both in love with the same woman, Athenais, daughter of their tutor Leontine, which outlines the basic conflict between love and friendship in the plot, complicated by honour, duty and oaths.

Nevertheless, the political significance of this play is aroused by the representation of the King. His obsession with his beloved makes him negligent in the affairs of the state. The effeminacy of the King, his preoccupation with and dependence on his mistress, disclosed in a rather forbearing manner in Dryden, is here shown as the principal cause of state troubles. Moreover, Theodosius has a number of effeminate qualities:

> You know that Theodosius is compos'd
> Of all the softness that should make a Woman,
> Judgment almost like Fear fore-runs his Actions;
> And he will poise an Injury so long,
> As if he had rather pardon than revenge it. (I, i, 52–6, p. 2–3)[3]

Though Leontine uses the cautious word "almost", this is not a characteristic expected of a Royal figure. Theodosius is mild, merciful, devout, but mainly melancholic and passive. Even in his love it is by chance that he meets Athenais, otherwise he would spend his whole life just pining for the unknown beauty. Such passivity is brought to an extreme in his government, as he lets his sister rule instead of him and signs anything she gives him, including the death order for his beloved Athenais, which shows his utter negligence of the state affairs.

On the other hand, Varanes is his direct opposite, "[s]o Fiery fierce, that those who view him nearly / May see his haughty Soul still mounting in his Face" (I, i, 58–9, p. 3). Though he is an exotic figure outside the Christian world, his persistent suiting of Athenais and revulsion to marriage make him next of kin to the typical rogues of Restoration comedies. Unlike the melancholy of Theodosius, his emotions are fierce and strong: "[…] who, Athenais, that is toss'd / With such tempestuous tydes of love as I, / Can steer a steady course?" (I, i, 136–8, p. 4). Yet again, he is an example of effeminacy in the more masculine manner – his preoccupation with a woman does not serve him right as a future

[3] Nathaniel Lee, *Theodosius* (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1994), *Literature Online* <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:dr:Z000096515:0&rft.accountid=35514> 10 April 2016.

King, moreover he is proud, “infidel” and a kind of poseur. At first, he refuses to marry Athenais, as he could not marry someone without the right pedigree, though it is him at the same time who suggests to Theodosius the romantic escape from the plague of royalty:

> For, 'tis resolv'd, we will be Kings no more:
> We'll fly all Courts, and Love shall be our guide;
> Love that's more worth than all the World beside.
> Princes are barr'd the liberty to roam,
> The fetter'd mind still languishes at home;
> In golden Bands she treads the thoughtful round,
> Business and Cares eternally abound. (I, i, 392–8, p. 10)

Nathaniel Lee uses the common trope of Royalist writers, who stress the burden of royalty, but the speaker is not a character that would attract sympathy – his royalty is not a plague for him and he is always very proud of his descent, the whole speech betrays itself as an empty pretence. For Theodosius his royal duties truly seem a burden, but that does not arouse much pity either – it rather proves him an incompetent monarch.

The pair of Royal friends thus represents two poles of the same negative view of the Stuart ethos characterized by libertine figures of Charles’s court, problematic religious faith, enslavement to women and negligence of Royal duties in the government. As a counterpart, Lee introduces the character of general Marcian – a strongly masculine Roman warrior who marries Pulcheria at the end and thus succeeds Theodosius on the throne. In opposition to the Christian and Oriental ideology represented by the two Princes, he is a proud inheritor of Roman values, as Pulcheria, slightly disapprovingly from her Christian perspective, says:

> Old Rome at every glance looks through his Eyes,
> And kindles the Beholders: Some sharp Atomes
> Run through his Frame, which I could wish were out.
> He sickens at the softness of the Emperour,
> And speaks too freely of our Female Court;
> Then sighs, comparing it with what Rome was. (II, i, 13–18, p. 11)

Marcian’s worth as a dramatic character is proved by his military success, which establishes his right for later criticism of the state. His aversion to the Court full of fops reflects the mistrust to Charles’s Restoration Court apparent in many Whig texts. He describes the courtiers as “gilded Flies / That buz about the Court” (II, i, 32, p. 11) and stresses their lack of merit, empty show of clothes and manners and their inverted value system in comparison to the heroic deeds of warriors, though they might have been laughed at for their lack of fashion:

Yet ev'n this Man,
That fought so bravely in his Country's Cause,
This excellent Man this Morning in the Presence,
Did I see wrong'd before the Emperour,
Scorn'd and despis'd because he could not cringe,
Nor plant his Feet as some of them could do. (II, i, 74–9, p. 12)

At the time when Charles II was criticized for his lack of strong action in international affairs and there were calls for a war against France, Lee presents a hero who promoted Roman military values and defies Christian humility and meekness:

I am not of their Principle, that take
A wrong; so far from bearing with a Foe,
I would strike first, like old Rome; I wou'd forth,
Elbow the neighbouring Nations round about,
Invade, enlarge my Empire to the bounds
Of the too narrow Universe. (II, i, 106–11, p. 13)

He is patriotic and wants to fight for the glory of his country, yet despite the rather violent image of invading other states he does not seem to have tyrannical inclinations in the inner state affairs. Rather he adheres to a code of military honour, where a person's worth is measured by his achievements and deeds, as we have seen in the controversy with Court life. Such understanding of honour seems to subvert the Stuart ideology of aristocratic honour as an inborn, hereditary quality. Furthermore, as the loyalty of his soldiers shows, he has a natural ability for leadership; when he is deprived of his function, his subordinate Lucius affirms their loyalty to him and tempts Marcian to even more:

You are and shall be still our General:
Say but the Word, I'll fill the Hippodrome
With Squadrons that shall make the Emp'ror tremble;
We'll fire the Court about his Ears.
Methinks like Junius Brutus I have watcht
An Opportunity, and now it comes!
Few words and I are Friends; but, noble Marcian,
If yet thou art not more than General,
E'er dead of Night, say Lucius is a Coward. (II, i, 244–252, p. 16)

This rebellious offer suggesting the possibility of a coup d'état is rejected by Marcian. Despite his reservations concerning the King, his honour would not allow him to break his pledge of loyalty. This, however, does not qualify the play as Royalist, or rather as Tory. Both Tories and Whigs claimed to be loyal subjects to the King – the difference was in their understanding of loyalty. While in Tory plays the authors struggle to convincingly represent quietism, the theory in which the subjects should never meddle into the affairs of the state without exceptions and not regarding the qualities of the King, as we have seen in

Oedipus, Whigs represented themselves as loyal subjects who for the good of the state and the King are allowed to offer advice and correct eventual Royal mistakes,[4] which is the conception of loyalty that Marcian accepts:

> Methinks the Ghosts of the great Theodosius,
> And thundering Constantine appear before me:
> They charge me as a Soldier to chastise him,
> To lash him with keen words from lazy Love,
> And shew him how they trod the paths of honour. (IV, i, 136–40, p. 38)

Therefore, he approaches the Emperor with an eloquent and truly offending speech to rouse him from his passivity and amorous problems and make him the true ruler again. In the speech, Lee used another typical Tory trope when Marcian reminds the negligent Emperor of his function as the "Father of his Country" and evokes a horrid scene of despairing Constantinople after Theodosius' death – patriarchal structure of the state is not understood as an excuse for total subjection of the people, but rather as a great responsibility for the King, which Theodosius needs to be reminded of by Marcian. Though the Emperor is angry with him, Marcian would continue in his chastising, as he is bound to as a truly loyal subject in the Whig understanding – he is the Roman-healer of Theodosius' vices and faults:

> I would be heard in spight of all your Thunder:
> O pow'r of Guilt, you fear to stand the Test
> Which Vertue brings; like Sores your Vices shake
> Before this Roman-healer. But, by the Gods,
> Before I go I'll rip the Malady,
> And let the Venom flow before your Eyes.
> […] if you give the sway
> To other Hands, and your poor Subjects suffer,
> Your negligence to them is as the Cause. (IV, ii, 55–71, p. 40)

The Emperor is responsible for his subjects and needs to be aroused from his negligence and passivity into true action. The deformity of the ruler is emphasized by his love of theatre and acting compared to the military deeds that are necessary in reality, not on the stage, which might be interpreted as a hint on Charles's well-known love of theatre: "A pretty Player, one that can act a Heroe, / And never be one." (IV, ii, 102–3, p. 41)

At the same time, despite the harsh critique of Theodosius/Charles, the critic is careful not to become a rebel; the strength of his loyalty is tested, when Marcian disarms Theodosius in a fight and gains the power to get rid of the incapable King:

[4] Owen, *Restoration Theatre and Crisis*, p. 200.

O temper! temper me! ye gracious Gods!
Give to my Hand forbearance, to my Heart
Its constant Loyalty! I would but shake him,
Rouze him a little from this death of Honour,
And shew him what he should be. (IV, ii, 171–5, p. 42)

Richard L. Brown has noted, that not even Marcian is the ideal hero in the play, he also needs to learn a lesson and that is to supress some traits of the rampant Restoration heroism of the rogues; his introductory railing about the vile Court shows him in a state of uncontrolled emotional outburst, which allies him to the two Princes.[5] Through the test of his self-restrain in the dialogue turned into fight with Theodosius, he learns to supress his egoistical emotional outrage and reaches a new type of heroic stature – stoic heroism untainted by rage and love-sickness. He resists the temptation to kill Theodosius and only proves his negligence by showing him the death warrant for his beloved Athenais, which the King had unknowingly signed without reading. It is Marcian then who represents the heroic figure in this play, not the two monarchs. He has gained military merit, is active, bound by an honour-code and ultimately loyal, though it is apparent that he would be a much better monarch than the actual one, which is eventually proved by his succession on the throne when Theodosius retires to the monastery. The construction of this play is intriguing in its use of a virtuous, loyal, seemingly Tory hero for the purpose of rather Whig inclination, as the resulting impression of the spectator is the utter incapability of the effeminate monarch strongly suggesting Charles II. This is not to claim that the fictional Emperor is a direct representative of the real King, but rather that in judging the fictional character on the stage, the viewer would inevitably compare it with the character of Charles II as represented by the discourse surrounding him – pamphlets, plays, poetry – and inevitably find some similar negative traits in both.

However, we cannot speak in terms of a one-to-one correspondence as in later romans-à-clef, the connection between the fictional and real figure is much looser. That is the reason why Lee could in the same season produce a play with a royal character almost contrary to Theodosius and yet negatively reflecting on the same real King – *Caesar Borgia; Son of Pope Alexander the Sixth: a Tragedy*. If *Theodosius* addresses the issue of a weak, passive King, *Caesar Borgia* opens questions of absolutism and tyranny, epitomized in the

[5] Richard. L. Brown, "Heroics satirized by 'mad. Nat. Lee'," *Papers on Language & Literature* 19.4 (Fall 1983), p. 389, *EBSCOhost* <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?authtype=shib&custid=s1240919&direct=true&db=a9h&AN=7730177&site=eds-live&scope=site&lang=cs> 10 March 2016.

characters of Borgia and his chief advisor Machiavel. It is inspired by the historical figure of Cesare Borgia (1475–1507), whose fight for power was a major inspiration for *The Prince* by Machiavelli and who indeed was an illegitimate son of the Pope. His story and the admiration that Machiavelli expressed for his violent reign inspired Lee to create a play based on a harsh critique of the corrupted Catholic Church and absolutist tendencies.

In accordance with the popular hatred of Papists in 1680, the opening lines of the play show a deep corruption of the Church – Cardinal Ascanio Sforza is sending Machiavel a bribe in order to gain his loyalty. Moreover, he is one of the twelve cardinals appointed by the Pope at once chiefly for money and he is a "fine effeminate Villain, bred in Brothels, / Senseless, illiterate, the Jear of Rome" (I, i, 13–4, p. 1). The representative of the Church is a lecherous drunkard, shown moreover to have bisexual inclinations: "the night succeeding his Creation, / […] he got drunk, and kiss'd the Prelates round / For joy" (I, i, 22–4, p. 1). This is not an exceptional case in the Church, every member in the play is shown as corrupted, willing to bribe and murder, including the Pope – not only does he have an illegitimate son, but also "nothing tickles the present Pope like Gold" (I, i, 183, p. 5). For the representation of the utter perverseness of the holy institution of a Pope, Lee employs the trope of incest between the Pope, his daughter Lucrece and her brothers Borgia and Gandia:

> The famous Lucrece, who can charm her Father
> In all the heat of Excommunications,
> When he throws Bulls, like Thunderbolts about him;
> She like a Venus to his angry Jove:
> Moves with incestuous Fires, folds her white arm
> About his chafing Neck, strokes his black Beard,
> And smooths his furrow'd Cheeks to dimpled smiles;
> The Brothers too enjoy'd her. (I, i, 270–7, p. 7)

The basic outline of the plot is very similar to *Theodosius* – two close Princes (this time it is Borgia and his brother the Duke of Gandia) are in love with the same woman, Bellamira. As in the previous play, she loves not the titular hero, but his opponent, this time nevertheless she submits to the marriage. Yet, Borgia's jealousy, fostered by Machiavel's clever machinations, leads him to the final murder of both his wife and her lover, though she is innocent. While Theodosius suffered, but let his future wife to talk to her lover in privacy, Borgia is his opposite, actively seeking for the truth and revenge.

Borgia's characteristic is not very amiable since the very beginning; he is introduced by Machiavel as the perfect personality for his plan to create a monarch of the Roman tyrant

type: he is a bastard conceived by a priest and a nun and moreover there was the slight hint of incestuous relationship to Lucrece. Both his personal and political life are marked out in the play by inclinations to tyranny – to get rid of his political opponents he is planning to poison them (which is the final cause of his accidental death), in his amours he is resolved to seduce Bellamira at all costs ("I'll plunge, or perish, or enjoy her" I, i, 607, p. 15) and is finally convinced to murder her and his brother for revenge. Furthermore, his opponents describe him as a known rapist:

> He forc'd her in a Wood, nay in a Ditch,
> As I am credibly inform'd by those
> That heard her squeak, in a Dry-Ditch deflowr'd her!
> Add yet to this, my Lords, How, when the French,
> At sacking of a Town, broke open Nunnerie,
> He truss'd at least 40 the pretty'st Rogues,
> The tenderst quaking things! never broke up!
> All spotless Maids, like Buds ne're blown upon,
> Nor touch d even with the tip of any Finger,
> And kept 'em for his Letchery. (I, i, 310–9, p.8)

This might be accounted for as a lampoon spread by Borgia's political enemies, yet later when his emotions are fuelled by Machiavel's remarks, Borgia himself presents a powerful blasphemous picture of a rape in a temple:

> No, Machiavel; she must be mine or dye;
> Should she for refuge to the Temple flie!
> I'd after her; there, if she scorns my flame,
> To the dumb Saints I will my Vows proclaim;
> And in their view resolve the glorious game:
> Upon the Golden Shrines I'll lay her head,
> And ev'n the Altar make my Bridal Bed (I, i, 627–33, p. 15)

In perusing such detailed evocations of sexual perversity in the tyrannical figure, Lee develops the frequent analogy that was made by Restoration writers between sexual and political discourse, which we have seen in the treatment of incest by Dryden. The analogy between a rape and tyranny was a stock figure in Whig political writing.[6] Moreover, the concept of tyranny in the play is further subverted by Bellamira's father who forces her to marry the detestable Borgia regardless of her wishes; as Borgia's opponents say, "'tis Impious, / Against all Right of Nature, Law of Reason, / To act the Tyrant o're a Daughters will" (I, i, 304–6, p. 8), which is a very strong argument against the Filmerian patriarchal state–family analogy. Indeed, as far as Borgia is tyrannical in his political and love life,

[6] Employed in Settle's *Pope Joan*, as will be shown in chapter 4.1, in Shadwell's *The Libertine* and elsewhere. Most famously, rape was associated with the Roman tyranny of Tarquins, as chapter 3.2 will show on Lee's tragedy *Lucius Junius Brutus*.

Orsino, Bellamira's father, is his adequate counterpart in the family, as he forces his daughter to marry Borgia in a terrifying, damning monologue, promising to plague her even after his own death in the form of a ghost. Bellamira's obedience to the patriarchal figure, which would be promoted by Tory political thought, is here subverted by the contempt that Orsino's monologue invokes in the viewer and pity felt for the female character:

> Ah! how have I deserv'd this cruel usage?
> Did ever Daughter yet obey like me?
> Not she who in the Dungeon fed her Father
> With her own Milk, and by her Piety
> Sav'd him from Death, can match my rigorous Vertue;
> For I have done much more: torn off my Breasts,
> My Breasts, my very Heart, and flung it from me,
> To feed the Tyrant Duty with my blood. (II, i, 45–52, p. 16–17)

However, there are some positive traits in Borgia's character too: he is active, strong, decisive, the inheritor of "manly confidence and Roman virtue" (I, i, 581, p. 14), and shows inclinations to mercy. When he first discovers Bellamira's love for the Duke of Gandia, he reacts in a noble way and forgives them, which leads Gandia to exclaim that "one so Noble sure this World contains not" (II, i, 196, p. 20). It is only in his later discussion with Machiavel that his rage is aroused and though he claims that his mercy had only been pretended, the text does not ascertain which version is true – there is a viable possibility that his rage was only aroused later by Machiavel's smart manipulation. Thus the fatal flaw of Borgia's is not his strength or fierce temperament, but rather his dependence on Machiavel: "Thou art my Oracle, my Heaven, my Genius, / And, as some God, shalt guide me through the World." (I, i, 591–2, p. 14) Although Borgia is represented as the chief tyrant and villain, Machiavel is the puppeteer who insinuates dark thoughts into Borgia's mind and is the scheming politician who actually makes things happen. He has chosen Borgia as the toy which he would change into the ruler of his liking:

> So have I form'd in more than Brass or Marble,
> The Deaths of those whom I intend to hush.
> O, Cæsar Borgia! such a Name and Nature!
> That is my second self; a Machiavel!
> A Prince! who, by the vigor of this brain,
> Shall rise to the old height of Roman Tyrants. (I, i, 85–90, p. 3)

By his qualities, Machiavel reminds the reader of Creon in *Oedipus* – he is ambitious, scheming and eloquent, yet where Creon was criticized for his opposition to the rightful monarch and rabble-rousing, Machiavel is the supporter of a tyrant and arbitrary rule. However, as in *Theodosius*, love seems to be an obstacle to proper reign in Machiavel's understanding; he strongly disapproves of Borgia's amorous attempts which distract the Prince from his political achievements, as his comment on Bellamira shows: "Wit and Beauty threatn'd in her, / With all the subtlest graces, that might lull / Stubborn ambition to inglorious rest." (I, i, 139–41, p. 4) Machiavel, the promoter of absolutist power, is here celebrating ambition, which was associated with Whig leaders by Dryden. Nevertheless, Bellamira poses a great threat for Machiavel's plans with Borgia:

> He is my Champion-prince, Italian Tyrant,
> Not form'd to languish in a Womans Arms.
> Oh---'tis a fault, were I so fram'd for greatness,
> E're I would amble in a Female Court,
> And cringe, and skip, and play the Ladies Cripple (I, i, 211–5, p. 6)

Machiavel's strategy then is ingenious – instead of convincing Borgia to relinquish his amours, he inflames him and carefully stages Bellamira's and Gandia's meetings to trigger Borgia's unjustified jealousy. Whenever Borgia starts pining or ruminating, he forces him into rash action, until both enemies to Machiavel's political plans are murdered: Bellamira who posed a threat by distracting Borgia and the Duke of Gandia who was a political rival, as he was more popular with the Pope.

The two plays thus both make use of the line of famous historical tyrants: Borgia describes himself as the descendant of a long line of ancient tyrants:

> As Pyrrhus, daub'd in Murder at the Altar;
> As Tullia, driving through her Fathers Bowels;
> As Cæsar Butchers in the Capitol;
> As Nero bathing in his Mothers Womb;
> With all succeeding Tyrants down to ours.
> Lords of the Inquisition, black Contrivers
> Of Princes Deaths, and Heads of Massacres (IV, i, 221–7, p.)

Marcian, on the other hand, invokes the memory of Nero in his rousing monologue to show Theodosius that though Nero was a villain and tyrant, at least he made some notable steps and was active in his reign (IV, ii, 69–112, p. 40–1). While *Theodosius* represented a danger of weak kingdom, of effeminacy and indecision, *Caesar Borgia* focused on the danger coming from the other side – the threat of Popish ambition and arbitrary rule equated with tyranny, which was often stressed as a real danger in case of the Duke of

York's succession. After the death of Gandia, Bellamira's final accusation of Borgia turns attention to his hypocritical Catholic ranks and compares the Pope to the Biblical snake:

> Thou Priest, Archbishop, Cardinal, and Duke,
> Thou that hast run through all Religous Orders,
> And with a form of Vertue cloak'd thy horrors!
> Thou proper Son of that old cursed Serpent,
> Who daubs the holy Chair with Blood and Murders (V, i, 133–7, p. 56)

At the end, the apocalyptic final speech before Borgia's death, in which he promises to plague the world for a long time, leaves the viewer of the play with a feeling of horror over the cruel deeds and Popish political machinations, which leads even Machiavel to admit in the final lines of the play that "No Power is safe, nor no Religion good, / Whose Principles of growth are laid in Blood" (V, ii, 389–90, p. 69), thus subverting the traditional understanding of Machiavellian politics as based on "indifference to the use of immoral means for political purposes and the belief that government depends largely on force and craft".[7] The reader simply has to appreciate the irony of this play being dedicated to Philip, the Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery, who was known for his fits of violent rage, condemned for several murders and nowadays is thought by some historians to be one of the chief figures in the outburst of the Popish Plot scare, as he might have been the murderer of Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey.

3.2 *Lucius Junius Brutus* and Thomas Otway's *Caius Marius*: Roman republic revived

> *[...] For now's the time,*
> *To shake the Building of the Tyrant down.*
> *As from Night's Womb the glorious Day breaks forth.*
> *And seems to kindle from the setting Stars:*
> *So from the blackness of young Tarquin 's Crime*
> *And Fornace of his Lust, the virtuous Soul*
> *Of Junius Brutus catches bright occasion,*
> *I see the Pillars of his Kingdom totter*[8]
>
> (I, i, p. 8)

Machiavelli must have been a challenging author for Nathaniel Lee. We have discussed *Caesar Borgia*, the play based on the utterly Machiavellian concept of absolutist reign, yet even Lee's most intriguing tragedy – *Lucius Junius Brutus; Father of his country* – is connected to Machiavelli's texts, though concerned with the seeming opposite, the

[7] George H. Sabine – Thomas L. Thorson, *A History of Political Theory* (New York: Dryden Press, 1989), p. 317.
[8] Nathaniel Lee, *Lucius Junius Brutus* (London: Richard Tonson – Iacob Tonson, 1681), *EEBO* <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A49928.0001.001?rgn=main;view=fulltext> 17 March 2016.

establishment of the Roman Republic. As George H. Sabine and Thomas L. Thorson emphasize, the popular image of Machiavelli is mainly based on *The Prince*, his text concerned with the current situation of sixteenth-century Italy, which is focused on the "political and military measures" to hold power, which he "divorces […] almost wholly from religious, moral, and social considerations".[9] However, in his *Discourses on the First Ten Books of Titus Livius* Machiavelli shows "genuine enthusiasm for popular government of the sort exemplified in the Roman Republic".[10] Both Lee's play and Machiavelli's text are among other concerned with the necessary measures that precede the establishment of a republic, which can be violent or painful, yet necessary:

> […] when the form of government has been changed, whether from a republic to a tyranny or a tyranny to a republic, it is in all cases essential that exemplary action be taken against those who are hostile to the new state of affairs. He who establishes a tyranny and does not kill 'Brutus', and he who establishes a democratic regime and does not kill 'the Sons of Brutus' will not last long.[11]

Nathaniel Lee was aware of Machiavelli's interpretation of Brutus's action as a necessary means for the preservation of the new republic and commented on it in his dedication to the Earl of Dorset:

> I must acknowledge, however I have behaved myself in drawing, nothing ever presented itself to my fancy with that solid pleasure as Brutus did in sacrificing his sons. Before I read Machiavel's notes upon the place, I concluded it the greatest action that was ever seen throughout all ages on the greatest occasion.[12]

Lucius Junius Brutus was performed in December 1680, but banned after only a few performances upon the order of the Lord Chamberlain, as there have been found "very Scandalous Expressions & Reflections upon ye Government".[13] This was not the only play which caused Nathaniel Lee problems – his *The Massacre of Paris* was written around the year 1680, but first staged only after the Revolution in 1689. Moreover, the anti-Catholic propaganda cannot be doubted in most of his plays, yet there is much critical discussion of his political stance in relation to the Stuarts, monarchy and republicanism, *Lucius Junius*

---

[9] Sabine – Thorson, p. 318.
[10] Sabine – Thorson, p. 318.
[11] Niccolò Machiavelli, *The Discourses of Niccolò Machiavelli*, translated by Leslie J. Walker (Oxon – New York: Routledge, 1975), unpaginated. *Google Books* <https://books.google.cz/books?id=bUL_AQAAQBAJ &pg=PT75&dq=discourses+of+machiavelli&hl=cs&ss=X&ved=0ahUKEwj13r2AzprNAhWCWBQKHUD2 BIAQ6AEIGzAA#v=onepage&q=sons%20of%20brubru&f=false> 17 March 2016.
[12] Lee, *Lucius Junius Brutus*, page unnumbered.
[13] Quoted in John Loftis, "Introduction," in *Lucius Junius Brutus* (Lincoln: University of Nebrasca Press, 1967), p. xii. *Google Books* <https://books.google.cz/books?id=6WQN2zHjlCUC&lpg=PR1&dq=loftis%20 lucius%20junius%20brutus&hl=cs&pg=PP1#v=onepage&q=loftis%20lucius%20junius%20brutus&f=false> 17 March 2016

Brutus being the most intriguing play concerning its political interpretation. While its editor, John Loftis, has described the play as a "celebration of constitutionalism"[14] and Susan J. Owen as the most radical play of the Exclusion Crisis, as cited above, there have appeared interpretations which show the play as rather ambiguous, or indeed negative towards the Commonwealth.[15] As Victoria Hayne stresses, the interpretative difficulties arise from the discrepancy between the eloquent political rhetoric of the play damning tyrannical monarchy and promoting republicanism and the emotional reactions of the spectator/reader to the horrid scene of Brutus's sons Tiberius and Titus being killed, as the subplot of the lovers Titus and Teraminta invites for sympathy and emotional engagement; in the final scene "Brutus's words invoke peace and calm, but the audience sees him surrounded by bloodied bodies".[16] Indeed, Brutus in Lee's play is not a pleasant character; the reader must rather feel a mixture of awe, horror and admiration for his incredible, almost superhuman resolve ("Thou would'st have thought, such was his Majesty, / That the Gods Lightned from his awful eyes, / And Thunder'd from his tongue." I, i, p. 27) and dedication to his political principles, enhanced by Titus's death speech, in which he celebrates his father/judge:

> What happiness has Life to equal this?
> By all the Gods I would not live again;
> For what can Jove, or all the Gods give more:
> To fall thus Crown'd with Virtu's fullest Charms,
> And dye thus blest, in such a Father's arms? (V, ii, p. 71)

In order to interpret the play's political rhetorical strategies, it will be useful to compare it with Thomas Otway's tragedy *Caius Marius*, performed probably in September of the previous season 1679. As both the tragedies are adaptations of *Romeo and Juliet*, Nathaniel Lee's play can be seen as a reaction to Otway's Royalist play. Due to the same source there is of course a resemblance in the plots – both the plays stage a very similar conflict between two generations, between young lovers and their fathers, between private,

---

[14] Loftis, p. xiv.
[15] For example, the psychoanalytical interpretation in David M. Vieth, "Psychological Myth as Tragedy: Nathaniel Lee's *Lucius Junius Brutus*," *HLQ* 39.1 (November 1975): 57–76, *JSTOR* <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3816787> 11 May 2016; or Victoria Hayne, "'All Language Then is Vile': The Theatrical Critique of Political Rhetoric in Nathaniel Lee's 'Lucius Junius Brutus'," *ELH* 63.2 (Summer, 1996), p. 337–365, *JSTOR* <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30030224> 11 May 2016.
Moreover, the historical example of the expulsion of Tarquins was used in political writing by both sides during the Exclusion Crisis. For example, in 1679 there appeared a pamphlet calling for the exclusion of James signed anonymously as "Junius Brutus". On the other hand, the Tories republished the texts by Robert Filmer, where he re-interprets the expulsion of Tarquins and stresses the unlawfulness of punishing the father for the sin of his son (after Sextus's rape of Lucrece). For more reference see Victoria Hayne, p. 340–2.
[16] Victoria Hayne, p. 357.

emotional life and public, political duties. Moreover, both the tragedies employ a Roman Republican historical material. Strikingly, where Otway uses the historical figure of Gaius Marius, who stood at the beginning of the civil wars that finally led to the abolishment of the republic and subsequent establishment of the Roman Empire, Lee turned his attention to the very first moment of the Roman Republic – the banishment of tyrannical Tarquins and establishment of the republic. It follows then that despite many common traits in the tragedies, their opposing value system (presupposing *Lucius Junius Brutus* as an oppositional play) will cause major difference in the perusal of set tropes of Restoration tragedies, as well as tropes of political writing: the characterization of a paternal figure, the conflict between love and duty transcending the individual, the right of the people to interfere with the government, banishment, religion, mob and violence/danger of a civil war.

Already the opening lines of the plays show a striking difference: Otway presents his play as inherently political, as he opens it with the popular Whig catchword "Liberty!" shouted from behind the scene by the Roman crowd and politicians, among others Metellus and Cinna, discussing the decrepit state of Roman politics, as

> Voices are sold in Rome:
> And yet we boast of Liberty. Just Gods!
> That Guardians of an Empire should be chosen
> By the lewd noise of Licentious Rout!
> The sturdiest Drinker makes the Ablest Statesman.[17] (I, i, 23–27, p. 2)

Even from these few lines, the reader is directed to the Tory interpretation of the play, as the majority of theatre-goers would share the distrust of the mob and popular government, although as we later find out through the characterization of Metellus and Caius Marius, Otway did not draw his characters as simple epitomes of Tory or Whig.

By contrast, Nathaniel Lee has chosen a completely different strategy and opened his play with a love-scene between Titus and Teraminta (unfortunately the daughter of Tarquin), who discuss the upcoming pleasures of their marriage and wedding night when they are interrupted by Titus's father Brutus who expresses his political objections to the relationship in a rather coarse sexual language (I, i, p. 3–4). Victoria Hayne argues that the "dramatic sequence […] encourages the audience to enjoy and sympathize with Titus's

[17] Thomas Otway, *Caius Marius* (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1994), *Literature Online* <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:dr:Z000108225:0&rft.accountid=35514> 11 May 2016.

lyrical evocation of marital sexuality before presenting Brutus's objection”[18] and J. M. Armistead describes Titus and Teraminta as “the most virtuous and attractive characters”,[19] which would support the negative reading of Brutus’s character. It is indeed almost unavoidable to become emotionally involved in the love story, especially if the viewer knows the original Shakespeare’s play and expects a disaster awaiting the couple, yet it is important to realize that the play’s first lines are preceded by a prologue, in this case written by a different author (Mr. Duke), which prevented full sympathy with Titus by an emphatic critique of excessive influence of women over men in their private life, as well as in politics and culture. If the viewer is first dared to “Find me one man of sence in all your roll, / Whom some one Woman has not made a fool,”[20] and right after that shown Titus in an affective scene with Teraminta, the love relationship becomes rather conspicuous, which is the basis for the later elaborated conflict of emotions versus ideals.

After the exposition, the titular characters are introduced as the obstacle to the young lovers and the political situation is complicated. In Otway’s tragedy, Caius Marius is first criticized by his political opponents as a “base-born hot-brain'd Plebeian Tyrant” (I, i, 137, p. 4) and the nobility promote Sylla as his opponent for the consulship. The patricians are afraid of Caius Marius, as he threatens the set governmental structures by his popularity among the people, by his disregard for the patricians and hiring slaves into his army, as later expressed by Sylla: “Thou, who hast opprest / Her Senate, made thy self by force a Consul, / Set free her Slaves, and arm'd 'em 'gainst her Laws.” (III, i, 380–2, p. 34) Metellus and his companions are replaced on the stage by Caius Marius himself, who criticizes back and describes the patricians as “Rome’s Daemons” (I, i, 175, p. 5) and evokes Macbethian witches as a comparison to them:

Like Witches in ill weather, in this Storm
And Tempest of the State they meet in Corners,
And urge Destruction higher: for this end
Th' have rais'd their Imp, their dear Familiar Sylla,
To cross my way, and stop my tide of Glory. (I, i, 176–80, p. 5)

As in Shakespeare, neither of the opposing sides is thus presented as more positive. On the one hand there is the nobility led by Metellus, who disregard the opinions of the people and want to choose the consul based on his noble birth, but are also scheming and

[18] Hayne, p. 344.
[19] J. M. Armistead, “The Tragicomic Design of *Lucius Junius Brutus*: Madness as Providential Therapy,” *Papers on Language* 15 (1979), p. 38. *EBSCOhost* <http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/login.aspx?authtype=shib&custid=s1240919&profile=eds> 9 June 2016.
[20] Page unnumbered.

manipulating. On the other hand, there is Caius Marius, who offers a self-representation of a Rome's devoted servant, yet his vocabulary is too burdened with "ambition", "Glory" and struggle for power and he is willing to use violence to keep in the centre of power. Thus when Sylla is welcomed by the people and pronounced the consul, Caius Marius fights him, is defeated and banished from Rome as a tyrant, only to return later and start a terrible massacre to regain power. This would suit very easily the Tory reading – a Whig leader, supported by the mob, resembling Dryden's Creon, turns out to be a violent tyrant who begins a civil war and massacre. However, as his opponents do not seem as a better choice, was the original banishment justifiable? That must have been an intriguing question at the height of the Exclusion Crisis, with the Duke of York in exile and the Exclusion Bill being repeatedly debated in the Parliament. Of course, it is not possible to read Caius Marius as a fictional representation of the Duke of York, yet the topic of banishment would have had strong resonances and provoke parallels, which is one of the reasons John M. Wallace states for the frequent adaptations of Shakespeare's plays during the Crisis.[21] There are several arguments against Marius's banishment – it is enhanced by the fickle mob, always untrustworthy, caused by his scheming political opponents, it is undeserved as he had done great military service to Rome and finally it induces the massacre upon his return. There is a parallel between the play's banishment and contemporary discussions of the exclusion, in which James's previous military merit was often mentioned, as well as the danger of his possible violent response to the exclusion that might lead to a civil war, epitomized in the declaration of Secretary Coventry from May 11, 1679: "Think, by putting the Duke of York by, in the Succession, what you will intail upon your posterity! You will put him upon desperate and irrecoverable Counsels."[22]

Lee's treatment of banishment is the complete opposite; the overthrow of Tarquin is fully justified by his lewd Court manners and tyranny, epitomized in the rape of Lucrece committed by his son Sextus and her suicide. The rape of Lucrece interpreted as the trigger for the overthrow of Tarquins' tyranny was a set historical example, used also by Shakespeare in his poem *The Rape of Lucrese*, but transformed by Lee to enhance the role of Brutus in the symbolic transformation of Lucrece's suicide into a political act. In Shakespeare's version, Tarquin's guilt seems much more personal and the noblemen present at Lucrece's death mainly swear revenge for her assault; in Lee's play it is Brutus

---

[21] John M. Wallace, "Otway's 'Caius Marius' and the Exclusion Crisis," *Modern Philology* 85.4 (May, 1988), pp. 363–372, *JSTOR* <http://www.jstor.org/stable/438346> 6 June 2016.
[22] For more references to the topic see John M. Wallace, p. 368–369.

who first understands the political potential of her suicide and asks the present men for an oath of revenge in a speech stressing the political dimension of the situation:

> Now joyn your hands with mine, and swear, swear all,
> By this chast Blood, chast ere the Royal Villain
> Mixt his foul Spirits with the spotless Mass,
> Swear, and let all the Gods be witnesses,
> That you with me will drive proud Tarquin out,
> His Wife, th'Imperial Fury, and her Sons,
> […]
> Swear from this time never to suffer them,
> Nor any other King to Reign in Rome. (I, i, p. 13)[23]

He employs the subverting power of sexual rape for the republican aims, thus perusing the typical Whig association of sexual perversion with political tyranny and absolutist tendencies stressed in Brutus' critical speech about Tarquin's arbitrary government:

> Invading Fundamental Right and Justice,
> Breaking the ancient Customs, Statutes, Laws,
> With positive pow'r, and Arbitrary Lust;
> And those Affairs which were before dispatch'd
> In public by the Fathers, now are forc'd
> To his own Palace, there to be determin'd
> As he, and his Portentous Council please. (I, i, p. 19)

The opposition of arbitrary government and law, understood as the principle that stands above the ruler and therefore cannot be evaded by him, forms the core of Brutus's political thinking, as well as the basis of Whig political theory. As Michael McKeon mentions, "[f]or several decades the opponents of royal prerogative had been elaborating their own version of 'body political' through the common-law argument of the 'ancient constitution" and Parliament's immemorial existence."[24]

Unlike Caius Marius, Tarquin does not appear on the stage, which makes his status as the mythological tyrant unquestionable in the same way as Sancho in Dryden's *The Spanish Fryar* was the idealized, mythological King. As for the danger of a civil war,

---

[23] Compare with Shakespeare's speech, which also invokes Roman values, but does not employ the revolutionary, republican discourse of Lee's monologue: "Now, by the Capitol that we adore, / And by this chaste blood so unjustly stained / By heaven's fair sun that breeds the fat earth's store, / By all our country rights in Rome maintained / And by chaste Lucrece' soul that late complained / Her wrongs to us, and by this bloody knife, / We will revenge the death of this true wife!" William Shakespeare, "The Rape of Lucrece," in *The works of William Shakespeare* (1863-1866), 1835–41, *Literature Online* <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:po:Z500846382:5&rft.accountid=35514> 4 Aug 2016.

[24] McKeon, p. 179. The Royalists opposed by the precedence of the monarch, as Filmer asserts in *Patriarcha*, where he promoted utter "Dependency and Subjection of the Common Law to the Soveraign Prince, the same may be said as well of all Statute Laws; for the King is the sole immediate Author, Corrector, and Moderator of them also". Filmer, "Patriarcha", p. 115.

Tarquin's supporters indeed embark on an attempt to undermine the new republic with a strategy copying the Popish Plot ("a very Plot upon the Court" I, i, p. 6), but their practices are so detestable that this is a fight worth fighting for the Roman Republic.

Thus, unlike *Caius Marius*, in *Lucius Junius Brutus* the overthrow of the King and necessary violence are justified by his crimes, as well as the suppression of the pro-Tarquin plot, though Brutus is careful to stress the condition of only necessary violence: Tarquin is to be banished from Rome, but not physically hurt:

> I intreat you,
> Oh worthy Romans, take me with you still:
> Drive Tullia out, and all of Tarquin 's Race;
> Expel 'em without Damage to their persons,
> Tho not without reproach. (II, i, p. 20)

It has been mentioned that the play is full of spectacular violent scenes, which has been used as an argument for its anti-Revolutionary interpretation, as the viewer must necessarily be repelled by the vision. Nevertheless, it is important to realize that in terms of physical violence there are three climactic scenes that mark the structure of the play: 1. the impulse for the revolution – the rape of Lucrece and her subsequent suicide in front of her gathered family, a scene representing the tyranny of Tarquins, 2. counterrevolution – invoking a Catholic mass with crucified human sacrifices burning alive and human blood drunk by the Royalists, a scene demonizing Papists and Tarquin's Royalist supporters, 3. sacrifice for the revolution – the execution of Brutus's sons for their counterrevolutionary acts, presented as a necessary self-sacrifice of Titus who was forced into supporting Tarquin despite his convictions through blackmail perusing his love for Teraminta. Out of these three, only the second scene shows death as perverse, meaningless and unnecessary and cannot be justified by the language of strict impersonal law. Though the viewers feel horror in all the scenes, the first and last are expected by everyone familiar with the original story and represented in rather traditional terms – death of Lucrece as the final symbol of the perversity of the monarchy and trigger for the revolution, which gives her suicide transcending power ("For from this Spark a Lightning shall arise / That must e're Night purge all the Roman Air" I, i, p. 9), and the execution of Brutus's son as a necessary foundation of the new republic on firm law that cannot accept exceptions on individual basis, as expressed by Titus himself: "I hope the glorious Liberty of Rome, / Thus water'd by the blood of both your Sons, / Will get Imperial growth and flourish long" V, ii, p. 71). In the only meaningful Royalist speech in the play, which is uttered by

Tiberius, monarchy is praised as a power transcending the law, in which individual approach is possible:

> Remember this in short. A King is one
> To whom you may complain when you are wrong'd;
> The Throne lies open in your way for Justice:
> You may be angry, and may be forgiven.
> There's room for favor, and for benefit,
> Where Friends and Enemies may come together,
> Have present hearing, present composition,
> Without recourse to the Litigious Laws;
> Laws that are cruel, deaf, inexorable,
> That cast the Vile and Noble altogether;
> Where, if you should exceed the bounds of Order,
> There is no pardon: O, 'tis dangerous,
> To have all Actions judg'd by rigorous Law. (II, i, p. 14)

In the final scene, Titus's death shows this as a basis for nepotism and constitutes general law as a power above the individual. Only the second scene of violent spectacle is not inherent in the original plot and therefore marks the play's specifics. Tellingly, it is an utterly repelling image, in which priests mimic the Catholic mass in an inhuman ceremony to support the Royalist cause, while we also see the Royalists drinking human blood. The means that Royalists are willing to use are in a striking contrast to the pre-caution Brutus had taken of Tarquins' lives.

Unlike Lee's spectacle of horror and final death transcending individual life through attestation of the political values of the new republic, *Caius Marius* is in the first half rooted in the traditional romance discourse of honour proven in a battle, as represented by Marius junior when he regains his father's trust by brave military deeds after being accused of effeminate dependence on Lavinia. In the second half, after the banishment, Caius Marius returns to Rome to stage a massacre of revenge, as a result of the decisions of political factions. His violence is only driven by a desire for revenge and power and affects even innocent children, thus showing the monstrosity of a civil war, which cannot be justified by any transcending cause. The same accounts for the death of the couple of lovers, in which Otway followed the Shakespearian original very closely and in the same way presents their death as a tragic coincidence, in which they kill themselves for love, only secondarily reflecting part of the guilt on the society in general, which had built obstacles to their relationship, thus adhering to the romance topos of love suicide and reflecting upon the negative outcomes of political faction in general.

This is probably the most important point in which Lee diverts away from Shakespeare – stressing the political dimension is common in both *Caius Marius* and *Lucius Junius Brutus*, but Lee has fundamentally changed the tragic death of the lovers. As we have seen in the prologue, love is not celebrated as an idealized value in itself in this play. The exposition of the love-story is very similar in the plays – both Titus and Marius junior are accused of effeminate love-sickness by their powerful politically engaged fathers (Titus is called a "degenerate Boy" by Brutus in I, i, p. 7) and they attempt to prove their worth to the paternal figure: in Otway's play this is achieved by military success and *Caius Marius* eventually approves of Lavinia. However, Lee's conflict is much deeper than the rather personal arguments between the two fathers in *Caius Marius*; the Brutus–Tarquin opposition is based on a fundamental difference in political values and ideals. The opposition between absolutist monarchy and republic is unbridgeable and therefore although Brutus praises Teraminta's character, the marriage cannot last and Titus dies not as an unhappy lover, but to offer a final prove of his admiration for his father's political mission.

It follows from the original generational conflict that patriarchal structure plays important roles in both the plays, as fathers are stated as the primary objection to their children's love and the lovers have to solve the conflict between the duty of obedience to their fathers and their love. In *Caius Marius*, Marius junior regains his father's trust by fighting his enemies, but Lavinia's conflict with her father is not solved, which leads to the final tragic death. However, since the young lovers are characters fully worth of empathy, the fathers are shown as ultimately failing in their parental functions, which leads to death of their children, as the final regretting speech of Caius Marius proves:

> My Son, how cam'st thou by this wretched End?
> We might have all bin Friends, and in one House
> Enjoy'd the Blessings of eternal Peace.
> But oh! my cruel Nature has undone me. (V, i, 502–5, p. 65)

Their failure in the private fatherhood then disqualifies both Metellus and Caius Marius from the public function of a patriarch/politician. This, however, should not suggest that the original banishment of Caius Marius was a right step for the Roman people, as the inadequacy of him as the patriarchal figure was triggered by this decision, by the ingratitude for his previous service, a trope often invoked in Royalist plays (epitomized in Nahum Tate's *The Ingratitude of the Commonwealth*), as Caius Marius stresses:

> If I am he that led Rome 's Armies out,
> Spent all 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, i, 183–8, p. 5)

Indeed, the volatile mob, which forgets to whom Rome should be grateful for its glory in *Caius Marius*, strongly resembles the people in *Oedipus*, changing their favourites every little while according to what they offer, not reflecting the past merit of Marius, who might even have become a proper patriarchal figure, had it not been for the ingratitude of the City. As we have seen with the warnings about James, Otway shows the results of such subversion of the rights of the patriarch in the later massacre. Ingratitude was not a trope restricted to fictional texts, as the memory of Restoration was invoked in all Royalist texts with the aim to remind Londoners of their proper allegiance – thus Charles II was represented as the saviour from Cromwell's tyranny and James's military career was emphasized. Ingratitude was a common topic of plays, poems, even sermons, as Edward Pelling's sermon from 1683 shows:

> Ingratitude, though it be the Basest and most Odious Sin, yet 'tis the Great and Epidemical Guilt of this Nation; […] What have we learnt from this Days Mercy, but to fling Invectives at the Papists (though, I confess, the greatest Invectives cannot be too much?) what other use have many made of the King's Restauration, but This onely, to try whether they could Rout him again out of his Kingdome, or dispatch him quite out of the World?[25]

In a different way, Lee has employed the patriarchal conception of politics typical for the Stuart ideology in order to support the oppositional cause, as the subtitle "Father of his Country" suggests. Lee derives from the family–state analogy, but complicates it by a structure of oppositions. There is the basic pattern of fatherhood in body politic of Tarquin as the King/father of his country in an analogy to his body corporeal, as he is also the father of Sextus and Teraminta. As the rape of Lucrece and complaints of his subjects about Sextus's lewd behaviour show, he is failing as the paternal figure and does not show enough authority or willingness to restrain his son. This private inadequacy strongly affects the political state of Rome and thus shows his failure in the public patriarchal function too, which justifies his overthrow. It must be noted, that while in *Theodosius* the failing King

[25] Edward Pelling, *A Sermon Preached Before the Lord Mayor and Court of Aldermen, at St. Mary…* (Will. Abington next the Wonder Tavern in Ludgate-street, 1683), *Googe Books* <https://books.google.cz/books?id=oEM7AQAAMAAJ&dq=/Edward+Pelling,+A+Sermon+Preached+beforb+the+Lord+Mayor&hl=cs&source=gbs_navlinks_s> 6 June 2016.

still retained the obedience of his subjects, *Lucius Junius Brutus* justifies an exchange of the patriarch if he fails in his function. Instead, a new pattern is promoted: Brutus is in a similar position, as his political public role stands in opposition to his sons' needs, one of them is a stark Royalist and the second one marries Tarquin's daughter. There is one striking difference; Brutus exerts his power over his sons and retains authority, at least with Titus, represented as the nobler of the two brothers. Titus always shows admiration for his father and his resolve. The real test of patriarchal analogy comes with the arousing conflict between Brutus's public role as the leader of the new republic and his private role as a father. What makes him the true "Father and Redeemer of thy Country" is sacrificing his private fatherhood – in the final execution Brutus suppresses his individuality, even his body corporeal, as it is described through bodily imagery as "Sacrifycing of my Bowels", for the "public good", his progeny for the safe future of the republic in which he strongly believes, which is what all the other characters begging him for mercy do not understand. They appeal to Brutus as a man and father, but he acts as the public figure, terrible and inhuman though it may seem.[26] Thus *Lucius Junius Brutus* represents Roman republican virtue as based on the prioritizing of the public good over private concerns of family, love and friendship. Stuart ideology of the two King's bodies also shows this inherent split in the politician, but while Lee lets Brutus sacrifice his metaphorical private body for the public one, Tories employ the divine power of the public body of the King for exculpation of the sins of his private body, as we have seen in *Oedipus*.

Lucius Junius Brutus thus replaces his corporeal, erring children with the people of Rome, who are shown in the play in a much more favourable light than in *Caius Marius*. Though Lee sticks to the tradition of farcical representation of the crowd, led by Vinditius, identified by John Loftis as a comical rendering of Titus Oates,[27] the crowd differs significantly from all the plays that have been discussed so far – though not being noble and very smart, they are not volatile and they express stable political opinions, supporting the overthrow of the tyrant and establishment of the republic. They cannot be cheaply bought for a little entertainment as the mobs in Royalist plays often are when their authors

[26] In Roman history, there are two men carrying the name of "Brutus", who share a strikingly same fate of the rather controversial symbols of fight between imperial and republican values through violent deeds. In *Julius Caesar*, Shakespeare used the second Brutus for the representation of the same crucial "split between public and private man." However, while Lee's Brutus is an epitome of resolve and his deed seems an awful, yet selfless sacrifice of the private body, Shakespeare's Brutus is a deeply ambiguous character, "with himself at war" (I, ii, 46) from the very beginning. His positioning as the public saviour seems to be rather a pose for justification of the murder. Tanner, p.xxxix.

[27] John Loftis, xvi.

want to criticize the Whig popular events like Pope-burning processions. Moreover, there is the opposite of the ingratitude of Roman people in *Caius Marius*: in Lee's play, Lucius Junius Brutus is praised appropriately for his deeds:

> O Brutus, as a God, we all survey thee;
> Let then the Gratitude we should express
> Be lost in Admiration. Well we know
> Virtue like thine, so fierce, so like the Gods,
> That more than thou presents we could not bear,
> Looks with disdain on Ceremonious honors;
> Therefore accept in short the thanks of Rome (II, i, p. 20–1)

When Brutus is accused of exceeding familiarity with the mob, a Tory reproach for Whigs we have seen in several plays, Brutus argues for the necessity of cooperation with the people to prevent tumult:

> Consul, in what is right, I will indulge 'em:
> And much I think 'tis better so to do,
> Than see 'em run in Tumults through the Streets,
> Forming Cabals, Plotting against the Senate (III, ii, p. 35)

This is a very similar argument to the one that Hector used in Dryden's *Troilus and Cressida* to convince Troilus about the necessity of his involvement in the war, which shows a certain amount of affiliation between Dryden's heroic mode and Lee's version of Whig policy – despite their appeal for greater role of the Parliament in the government, Whig ideology was still essentially rooted in the aristocratic ideology and was retaining strict class divisions.

It seems that like Dryden's plays, Thomas Otway's political discourse in *Caius Marius* is troubled by a lack of positive example – it stages the negatives and criticizes the flaws of his age on both Whig and Tory political sides, stressing the necessity of gratitude, the dangers following disruptions of the status quo like a banishment, but does not come with any stable replacement, on which to build better social structures. After reading the harsh critique of incompetent or flawed royal figures in *Caesar Borgia* and *Theodosius*, it seems that Nathaniel Lee has embarked on the opposite mission – replacing the worn out heroic mode of the Restoration rogue plays and heroic drama with a new discourse of heroism based on the Roman Republican values of impersonal law, activity, resolution and transcending the individual for the society through self-restraint. Both Marcian and Titus had to learn a lesson of great self-restraint during the plays. In the first acts of *Theodosius* Marcian rages over the bad state of his country, but he gradually learns to subdue emotions, thus overcoming the only flaw common to both him and Theodosius. For Titus,

Lucius Junius Brutus represents the ultimate example of self-restrain, as he had spent decades pretending to be mad, only waiting for the right occasion, and there is nothing that could avert him from his political aim including the necessary execution of his own sons. As Richard E. Brown stresses: "Brutus achieves his goals through a strength that includes massive self-control, he is a master of appropriate public gestures, regardless of what they cost him as a private individual, and he possesses a fine ear for nuances of diction that create a proper disposition of soul."[28] Brutus is careful to show that he is not a superhuman without emotions, sufferings and passions, but unlike the tyrannical Tarquins who were driven by their lust, Brutus would not let his emotions lead him astray. He is the utter opposite of effeminacy; therefore, in the scene after the death of Lucrece he reproaches her husband Collatinus for unmanly tears, when there is time for activity:

> What now? at your laments? your puling Sighs?
> And Womans drops? Shall these quit scores for blood?
> For Chastity, for Rome, and violated Honor?
> Now, by the Gods, my Soul disdains your tears (I, i, p. 13)

It follows from the analysis that most of the play is concerned rather with the character of Brutus, as Lee's excited description in the dedication shows, than with a detailed rendering of the republican political system. Yet, it renders a strong political message – it justifies necessary steps in case the ruler should evade the law and it shows the wanted qualities of a leader of the country: a stoic hero driven by a stable set of values transcending the individual as opposed to the affective heroism of Restoration plays epitomized in the Romeo and Juliet love-plot: Titus of the first acts is the hero of a no longer desired state of politics. It would not be useful to attempt labelling the play as either Tory or Whig, the way out of the crisis is not through faction and party but through activity, strength and self-restraint, which might even explain the surprising dedication of this radical play to Charles Sackville, Earl of Dorset, who was a member of Charles's government, but during the whole critical times he always represented himself as rather neutral in the partisan politics, as his poem from ca. 1681 shows:

> After thinking this fortnight of Whig and of Tory,
> This to me is the long and the short of the story:
> They are all fools and knaves, and they keep up this pother
> On both sides, designing to cheat one another.[29]

---

[28] Brown, p. 392

[29] Charles Sackville, "My Opinion," in Alan Rudrum – Joseph Black – Holly Faith Nelson (eds.), *The Broadview Anthology of Seventeenth Century Verse* (New York – Peterborough – Rozelle: Broadview Press, 2001), p. 444.

4 Female characters in the Exclusion Crisis

All the texts which we have discussed so far were chiefly concerned with various kinds of male heroes, whose in-depth characterization or psychological development represented their political leanings, while female characters served prevalently as supporting tools for the characterization of the male hero through his love-life and family constellations, enhancing or softening the political consequences of the play. Thus we have shown how Jocasta was used in *Oedipus* as a vehicle for adopting greater part of Oedipus' guilt through her lascivious representation, several female characters from Teraminta in *Lucius Junius Brutus* to Cressida served as objects of the hero's excessive passion, which was criticized by the plays in reference to the effeminacy of Charles II, or functioned as victims of the hero's tyrannical tendencies as Bellamira in *Caesar Borgia*, underscoring the potential threat of Stuart absolutism. On the other hand, there was also Pulcheria, an active heroine who took over the control of the state in *Theodosius* instead of her incompetent brother and was the chief trigger of Marcian's growth into the true monarch, as his military prowess needed to be polished by the lesson in self-restraint, provided by Pulcheria's decision to banish him. Nevertheless, despite her activity, she thus assumes the role of a reflector of Theodosius's weakness and Marcian's flaws, which allies her with all the other female characters mentioned. However, even as such reflectors, their role in the plays' political messages is essential and it becomes even more so in other texts of the Exclusion Crisis, which marks the period of a major change in the dramatization of women with the rise of the so-called she-tragedy. This chapter is therefore going to provide an overview of the functioning of the female characters in texts of our studied period in relation to the political discourse.

Since the Restoration period saw the rise of first major women writers, even the first professional female playwright Aphra Behn, and at the same time offered a radical rearrangement of the representation of sexual relationships in the libertine ethos, the period has attracted much attention of the feminist critics assessing the position of women in Restoration society and culture. It seems that there are at least two contradictory strands in the representation of women: on the one hand, there is the traditional stress on female chastity and virtue related to the property value of marriage summarized by Angeline Goreau:

> The principle of chastity was reinforced by the patriarchal, primogenital system of inheritance and by the idea, then law, that men had absolute property in women.

> Since the aristocracy's chief means of consolidating and perpetuating its power was through marriage, the 'honour' of its ladies acquired a property value […] a deflowered heiress could be disinherited, since her maidenhead was an essential part of her dowry and she had deprived her father of the possibility of 'selling' her to a husband whose family line she would carry on."[1]

On the other hand, the libertine ethos of unrestrained sexuality called for extramarital sexuality mocking the insistence on chastity as excessive puritanism; thus the figure of a jealous cuckold has become a stock means for satirizing the Whig Cits,[2] while the libertine/rake characters were associated primarily with the court, which meant that attacks on libertinism, such as Shadwell's *The Libertine* (1675) or *The Woman-Captain* (1680), "were seen as having the force of political opposition".[3] However, neither the imposition of chastity, nor the appeal for sexual liberation proved as liberating in terms of the actual positioning of women in Restoration society:

> Although this new sexual freedom celebrated by Rochester applied in theory to both sexes, in practice it was a highly dangerous game for women to play. It was widely accepted that a woman's beauty did not last for long, and for women who did not become wives the only alternative was to become a mistress, from which it was a short step to becoming a whore. Although the wits urged women to throw off old-fashioned ideas about modesty and chastity, they also, illogically, heaped abuse on women who did. Women known to be sexually active – even the King's mistress – were targets of vicious satires by male poets.[4]

Such misogynistic libertine poetry was epitomized in the works of the most famous Restoration libertine – John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester, whose texts often showed deep disdain for women, including total rejection: "Love a woman? You're an ass."[5] Moreover, in Rochester's poetry love is often shown as a kind of degrading labour.

Even this would be enough to account for the variety in representation of female characters of the Restoration, yet during the Exclusion Crisis it was further complicated by the role that actual women played in the real historical events. We have seen in the texts discussed a constant dissolution of the border between what we would in the modern sense understand as the private and public sphere, constant mingling of sexual and state politics,

---

[1] Angeline Goreau, *Reconstructing Aphra* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980), p. 37.
[2] Edward Ravencroft's 1681 comedy *The London Cuckolds*, in which three older London citizens marry and are cuckolded, is a typical example of the association between Puritanism, Whiggery and the city of London in opposition to the libertinism of the Court.
[3] Owen, *Restoration Theatre and Crisis*, p. 107.
[4] W. R. Owens – Lizbeth Goodman, *Shakespeare, Aphra Behn and the Canon* (London – New York: Routledge – The Open University, 1996), p. 145.
[5] John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester, "Song," in *The Poems* (Basil Blackwell, 1984), *Literature Online.* <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:po:Z200538317:2&rft.accountid=35514> 15 June 2016.

embodied in the treatment of the body of the King. And it is not only a question of fictional representation: Charles II's sexual life was seen as a direct influence on the government. Not only was the Exclusion Crisis grounded in the problem of succession, as the Queen was unable to conceive a legitimate heir, unlike several of the King's mistresses, but also the women around Charles were seen as a dangerous influence, especially the Catholic Queen and his Catholic mistress Duchess of Portsmouth, which led to the frequent reprimand for effeminacy in the Exclusion Crisis texts.[6] The Queen was even implicated in Oates's allegations of the Popish Plot, when he claimed that if the original plan failed, the Queen's Catholic physician, Sir George Wakeman, was to poison the King with the consent of the Queen. Moreover, even Mary of Modena, the Duchess of York, was drawn in the political turmoil after the discovery of the treasonous correspondence between her secretary, Sir Edward Colman, and the French court.

In literature therefore women were represented in a wide range of textual roles; the most common was the objectified mirroring function discussed at the beginning of this chapter, enhanced by the equation of sexual potency with political power, as Jessica Munns shows: "Authority was reinscribed as sexual acts – rapes in tragedies and seduction in comedies – turning female bodies into a territory, often implicitly in England, to be possessed and controlled."[7] However, there are several types of female characters emerging during the Exclusion Crisis as a new paradigm: the demonized woman as a symbol of subversion, the sentimental victim arousing pathos, the chaste wife as a member of the exemplary couple and the modern Protestant woman.

---

[6] However, effeminacy was not used only as the attribute of Charles II; Otway subverts this association in *Venice Preserv'd*, as he shows the representative of the Venetian Republican regime, senator Antonio, as a sado-masochist cringing before his mistress.

[7] Munns, Jessica, "Change, skepticism, and uncertainty," in Deborah Payne Fisk (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to English Restoration Theatre* (Cambridge – New York – Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 145.

4.1 Vile woman as a symbol of transgression: Tulla, Catherine de Medici, Pope Joan

Farewel thou Royal rank Church Whore, farewel,
Live and reign on, yes hot Inchantress live
Romes universal Teeming, Fruitful Prostitute:
Brood on Romes cursed Chair, brood like a hatching Basilisk:
Entail thy Lust t'a thousand Generations,
And warm the Nest for all thy bloody Successors[8]
(I, 511–6, p. 70)

In Lee's *Lucius Junius Brutus* there are four major female characters: Lucrecia, who is the symbolic victim of Tarquins' tyranny, Teraminta, the love-object of Titus and a tool for blackmailing him, Sempronia who begs Brutus for mercy for their sons, thus representing sheer emotion as opposed to the voice of reason and law, and Tulla, the empress, who is not present on the stage, yet she is the evil planner of blackmailing Titus into the treason against his father. In fact, the play directly accuses Tarquin's son of the rape of Lucrece, Tarquin's court of moral and legal corruption and Tarquin's wife is shown as the vile leader of the anti-revolutionary plot, but Tarquin himself is only guilty of letting all this happen in the first place. The actual evil qualities and deeds are reserved for the female character standing behind the ruler, his wife, which is not really exceptional strategy in the Exclusion Crisis texts. Perusing the character of a corrupt vile woman is a stock trope for representing subversion or transgression on both sides of the political spectrum. Apart from Tulla, there are two major examples of Catholic vile women: Catherine de Medici in Lee's *The Massacre of Paris* and the notorious Popess, employed in Elkanah Settle's anti-Papist *The Female Prelate* (per. 1680) as a symbol of utter corruption of the Catholic Church.[9]

---

[8] Elkanah Settle, *The Female Prelate* (London: W. Cademan ..., 1680), *EEBO* <http://name.umdl.umich.edu/A59312.0001.001> 10 May 2016.

[9] In the Royalist discourse there are also some striking examples of the use of a vile female figure, such as Sultain's hypocritical ambitious mother and tyrannical sister in Whitaker's *The Conspiracy*. Otway's satirical poem "The poet's complaint of his muse, or, a satyr against libells a poem" shows Libel engendered by a revolting Presbyterian witch. Moreover, according to Harry M. Solomon's interpretation, Shaftesbury was the father. (See Harry M. Solomon, "The Rhetoric of 'Redressing Grievances': Court Propaganda as the Hermeneutical Key to Venice Preserv'd," *ELH* 53.2 (Summer, 1986), p. 291, *JSTOR* <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2873258> 19 June 2016.) Thomas D'Urfey reverses the typical Whig accusation of effeminacy of the King in the Preface to *The Royalist* by associating feminine qualities with Titus Oates, who is likened to a quarrelsome woman: "we know that he's as sly and inveterate as wrong'd Women are, and in some points agrees exactly with their humours; for as they are bitter and revengeful, so is he." Thomas D'Urfey, *The Royalist* (London: Ios. Hindmarsh at the Sign of the Black-Bull near the Royal-Exchange in Cornhill, 1682), *EEBO* <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A37013.0001.001/1:2?rgn=div1;view=fulltext> 13 June 2016.

The Massacre of Paris uses the parallel between sixteenth-century French religious wars and English contemporary situation, showing a weak Catholic king Charles manipulated into the massacre of Huguenots by his vile Queen Mother. *The Female Prelate* is exceptional in that it puts the evil woman into the centre of events and offers an in-depth analysis of the character. The play took up the legend of Pope Joan, a cross-dressing woman who was appointed the Pope in the Middle Ages. Elkanah Settle was a stark Whig supporter and was even hired to design the Pope-burning pageant of 1680. The pageants were extremely popular yearly events on Queen Elizabeth's Ascension Day or on the anniversary of the Gun-powder plot, which manifested popular support for the anti-Catholic movement, associated with Whig politics. During the Restoration the tradition was re-established in 1673, at the time of the first outbreak of anxiety over Stuart Catholicism after the revelations of the Test Act.[10] The number of Tory critical hints about the populism and rabble-rousing of Whigs was evoked by the immense popularity of these events; according to Ross Petrakos, there were as many as two hundred thousand Londoners present during the Pope-burning pageant in 1679. Railing against Papists was the fashion of the period, yet it is important not to divorce religious anguish from its political consequences. *The Female Prelate* is not only anti-Catholic but also oppositional play and the pageants were not just a sort of popular entertainment and religious festival, but rather political demonstrations of the popular support for Whigs. This is underscored by the fact that after the Glorious Revolution there was no need for such demonstrations and the tradition of Pope-burning was abandoned after 1688.

Tellingly, Settle provided his play with a fervent Protestant dedication to the Earl of Shaftesbury, in which he praises him as "his Soveraign's best Subject, and his Countries truest and faithfullest Champion". He scorns the "flattering and mercenary service" of quietist courtiers and sees Shaftesbury's will to openly criticize the monarch as the only legitimate political approach, for "Kings are sometimes but Men". Moreover, Settle subverts the usual association of Whiggery and faction by transmitting it to the Papists and stresses Protestant religion as the founding and preserving concept of the English state: "our Establisht Religion is our true Palladium; and whilst that is preserved, we are invincible, unhurt by all the Hostility of the world".[11]

---

[10] Ross Petrakos, "'A Pattern for Princes to Live by': Popery and Elizabethan History During England's Exclusion Crisis, 1679–1681," *American, British and Canadian Studies Journal* 25.1, p. 132–154, *DE GRUYTER* <http://www.degruyter.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/view/j/abcsj> 27 June 2016.

[11] Settle, *The Female Prelate*, dedication unpaginated.

The basic propagandistic concept of the play is to show Roman Church as utterly corrupt and entirely detached from the principles of true Christianity, the same approach that Lee used in *Caesar Borgia*, but taking it a step further, as Settle put into the position of the tyrannical Pope a monstrous cross-dressing female, thus associating the Church with transgression and linking the Pope with the devil. The plots of both plays are based on the tragic death of an innocent couple, destroyed by the lust of the tyrant. However, *Caesar Borgia* offered an enclosed Roman world in which there was no place for a positive example and the tragedy was inevitable because of the inherent corruption in Catholic society. In *The Female Prelate* Settle uses a counter to the perversity of the Roman world in introducing an innocent Protestant couple from outside – the Duke of Saxony freshly married to Angeline, a typical example of the exemplary Protestant couple, linked by the Duchess's name to heavenly ideals and devoid of any excesses of libertinism or tyranny. Similarly, in *The Massacre of Paris* Admiral and his wife Atramont function as an exemplary married couple – Protestant, faithful, loving, yet not to the level of effeminacy – and they stand in contrast to the decadent sexuality of the Catholic villain Guise and his mistress.[12]

If we see Pope Joan as a symbol of Popish corruption, it must be noted that although she is primarily characterized by her cross-dressing, it is her excessive, perverse sexuality that is shown as the leading flaw in her character. Cross-dressing, a fairly popular means of showing the actress's legs on stage during the Restoration period,[13] is not the basis of her corruption, as the appearance of another female character in male clothes shows. Despite cross-dressing, Amaran, Joan's page, is shown as a chaste girl who is abhorred by the Popess's deeds. The problem in Joanna's case arises in her mind, excessive education and lust. Of course, we only know her history through her own rendering, yet there is no given reason for mistrust of her story. In her youth, she is shown as an ideal of romance:

My Quality Noble, and my Fortunes ample,
My Beauty dazling; and to crown all these,
My Soul was brighter than the Shrine that held it.

[12] Susan J. Owen, "Drama and political crisis," in Deborah Payne Fisk (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to English Restoration Theatre* (Cambridge – New York – Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 168. Similar use of the exemplary couple can be found in *The Conspiracy* and *The Ingratitude of the Commonwealth*. See also Owen, *Restoration Theatre and Crisis*, p. 162–3.

[13] Cross-dressing was fashionable especially in comedies as a means of empowering the female character, see for example Shadwell's *The Woman-Captain*. It was also employed by Tories in D'Urfey's *The Royalist*, where Philipa fights alongside Kinglove in the Battle of Worcester. An important difference between the individual cases lies in the fact that in the traditionally Royalist D'Urfey's play, cross-dressing is not a pleasure, but a sacrifice for the woman.

Heaven gave me those prodigious depths of knowledge,
That infinite Mass of Sense (III, p. 26)

The problematic nature of her unusual intelligence is, however, shown in her understanding of learning. She studied all kinds of science, until she was able to "Dispute on both sides, and on both sides vanquish." (III, p. 26) Settle thus shows mistrust of traditional scholastic learning for the ability in rhetoric and disputation, which enables the speaker to defend any position regardless of the concept of truth. Such excessive education in the classical disciplines, unusual for women in the seventeenth century, was accompanied by another suspicious trait in her character: "Who yields to Love, makes but vain man her Lord: / And I who had studied all the greater Globe. / Scorn'd to be Vassal to the lesser world." (III, p. 26) At this moment, the real flaw in Joan is discerned, as the pride in her learning makes her dismissive of men and the fear of the loss of female autonomy drives her to celibacy, a concept highly mistrusted by the Protestants, especially for women.[14] Thus she proceeds from avowed virginity to the status of the Whore of Babylon,[15] as her sexuality is aroused by the Duke of Saxony (father), whom she murders out of jealousy. During the play she falls in love with his son, which borders on incest, and she unleashes "th'unnatural Monster" (III, p. 32) of her lust in a complicated double rape that she accomplishes with her former lover Lorenzo, so that she spends the night with the Duke and Lorenzo with the Duchess, while they innocently believe they are in the arms of each other.

However, *The Female Prelate* surpasses mere denunciation of Catholicism through the spectacle of perversity. In *Lucius Junius Brutus* we have seen the Whig concept of law as an impersonal ideal transgressing the individual, including the sovereign, while Settle presents popery as a threat to the law. According to George W. Whiting,

> [t]he play has two aims: in general, to illustrate the degradation of the papacy; and, specifically, to denounce that alleged principle of Catholicism which makes loyalty

[14] Craig M. Rustici discusses the "suspicions concerning the Catholic glorification of life-long virginity" in the seventeenth-century literature. Craig M. Rustici, "Gender, Disguise, and Usurpation: The Female Prelate and the Popish Successor", *Modern Philology* 98.2 (2000), p. 289–91, *EBSCOhost* <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?authtype=shib&custid=s1240919&direct=true&db=edsjsr&AN=edsjsr.438936&site=eds-live&scope=site&lang=cs> 25 May 2016.

[15] According to Allison Shell, the Whore of Babylon was "the most powerful anti-Catholic icon of all", representing the "perennial threat" it posed to "one's spiritual chastity". Allison Shell, *Catholicism, Controversy and the English Literary Imagination, 1558–1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 31, *Google Books* <https://books.google.cz/books?id=BIniAzE12iQC&printsec=frontcover&dq=shell+catholicism&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjolPCx3qfOAhWF7xQKHUfvC1EQ6AEIHTAA#v=onepage&q=shell%20catholicism&f=false> 30 July 2016.

to the church more binding than loyalty to the nation and which condones and even rewards the murder of heretic rulers […].[16]

Papists are dangerous not because of inherent villainy, though that is stressed in the characterization too, but for the arbitrariness of power substantiated in the priority of the Church over secular governments, thus threatening the sovereignty of the states. Settle thus closely follows Andrew Marvell's argument from his "An Account of the Growth of Popery…", in which he demonizes Catholicism and the Pope as an arbitrary power over national sovereignty:

> […] his Power is Absolute, and his Decrees Infallible. That he can change the very nature of things, making what is Just to be Unjust, and what is Vice to be Virtue. That all Laws are in the Cabinet of his Breast. That he can Dispence with the new Testment to the great injury of the Divels. That he is still Monarch of this World, and that he can dispose of Kingdoms and Empires as he pleases.[17]

In the play, the arbitrariness of power in the Roman Church is staged through the failure of legal charges that Duke of Saxony issues against Joan. He is shown in the first act to naively trust the justice of the Church, as he decides to use legal steps instead of the direct Cavalier revenge through a duel, when he recognizes in Joan the murderer of his father:

> Consider too I am in a Christian World;
> The Court of Rome, the Head and Spring of Justice.
> A Ponyard and a Sword are Arms too bright:
> A Scaffold and an Axe shall do me right. (I, p. 5)

Of course, the naivety of his trust is disclosed promptly when, ironically, the Cardinals unite against the Protestant enemy and as a reward for the murder of a heretic they elect Joan/John as the Pope. At the end of Act I, Saxony realizes the principal flaw in Roman political power: "Pope is the King, and Monarch but the name." (I, p. 19)

Settle's play is thus not only concerned with a religious debate about the evils of Popish Church embodied in the transgressing, sexually perverse female character, it is mainly a politically engaged text denunciating the Church as a subverting political power, which thus offers harsh arguments against the succession of the Duke of York, who must be viewed as a threat, because for Catholics the power of Vatican precedes the sovereignty of the state and its law.

---

[16] George W. Whiting, "Political Satire in London Stage Plays, 1680-83," *Modern Philology* 28.1 (Aug. 1930), p. 33, *JSTOR* <http://www.jstor.org/stable/433232> 10 May 2016.
[17] Marvell, p. 8.

4.2 Female suffering: means of arousing pathos in Otway's *The Orphan* and Banks's *Vertue Betray'd*

Who 'tis would to the fatherless be kind.
To whose protection might I safely go?[18]

The political upheaval of the Exclusion Crisis brought about a substantial change on the Restoration stage with heroic plays coming out of fashion as the representation of an old value system and a vogue for tragedies appearing instead in relation to the general anxiety. However, even in the tragedy itself we can discern a shift with regard to the treatment of female characters. As we have seen in Dryden and Lee, the traditional heroic values were deeply problematized by the failing Stuart ethos and that allowed the heroine to come out of the shade. In general, we can speak of a growing prominence of women in drama, connected to the leaning towards affective understanding of tragedy. As Allardyce Nicoll shows, with love becoming the predominant theme of tragedies, the position of heroines was changing:

> In the Elizabethan world tragedy had been predominantly masculine, the hero at the centre of the play and all attention focused on him. When love became so popular a theme, the heroine rapidly grew more prominent; […] the fashion for pathos favoured the heroine; towards the end of the century we reach the 'she-tragedy' where the hero has almost completely vanished and a woman dominates the entire action.[19]

In the Exclusion Crisis, such plays would be for example those by Thomas Otway and John Banks, standing on the opposite sides of the political spectrum. In their tragedies with strong political messages they have employed a suffering heroine in order to support the rationale of their texts with the emotional impact of pathos. While Settle offered a spectacle of horror over female transgression, Otway and Banks perused the contrary means of affecting the softer emotions like compassion in their spectators. In his description of the development of Restoration tragedy, Christopher J. Wheatley claims that

> the absence of personal responsibility and the increasing importance of emotional expression as the reason for tragedy leads to a shift in the sphere and topics of tragedy from the public to the private. Affairs of state are replaced by affairs of heart. While one strand of Restoration tragedy followed Horatian criteria in emphasizing a morally instructive plot, another emphasized the affective nature of tragedy,

[18] Thomas Otway, "Epilogue," in *The Orphan* (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1994), *Literature Online* <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:dr:Z000108292:0&rft.accountid=35514> 28 July 2016.
[19] Allardyce Nicoll, *British Drama* (London: Harap, 1978), p. 115.

implicit in Aristotle's observations about an audience's emotional response to tragedy.[20]

In the texts of the Exclusion Crisis we can discern both the strands mingling – even in the prototypical tragedy of the affairs of state like *Oedipus* we have seen Dryden's shift towards the private in the focus on the two love relationships, Oedipus's incestuous one and Eurydice's exemplary one. However, the private and the public coexist in constant dialectical relationship in the play and cannot be entirely separated, as the characters negotiate between their private emotional lives and their public roles and duties. The same accounts for the plays of the Exclusion Crisis which seem already to move towards the private.

Otway's *The Orphan* is a play enclosed spatially into a country private house pointedly divorced from the public political life, as Acasto, the father of the family, has retreated from the court. Yet even this shift from the public of the court towards the private space of a family house represents in this play a specific political gesture of rejecting the court as a corrupt space. Such a rejection of the political sphere is ultimately criticized as the primary cause for the tragic outcome of the play. Acasto's primary characterization in the play is rendered through his negative relationship to the court, which he has abandoned with hurt feelings, as he had not been properly rewarded for his service. Although "the world has not / a truer Souldier, or a better Subject" (I, 12–13, p. 1), it is in the very first lines of the play that we learn how strange it is that "this severity / Should still reign pow'rful in Acasto 's mind, / To hate the Court where he / Was bred and liv'd / All Honours heap'd on him that Pow'r cou'd give." (I, 1–5, p. 1) While he rhetorically retains an admiring approach to the King, he incessantly rails against the corruption of the courtiers ("If thou hast flatt'ry in thy Nature, out with't, / Or send it to a Court, for there 'twill thrive." II, 18–19, p. 12) and forbids his sons to attend the court or military service: "avoid the politick, the factious Fool" (III, 82, p. 25). Laurie P. Morrow has analysed the paternal relationship between Acasto, his sons and his adopted daughter Monimia and tracked the origin of Polydore's and Castalio's problematic love-deeds in their father's seclusion from the political scene: "When Acasto in his escapism transforms himself into the absolute monarch of his own

[20] Christopher J. Wheatley, "Tragedy," in Deborah Payne Fisk (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to English Restoration Theatre* (Cambridge – New York – Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 75.

little kingdom and his sons, analogously, into rival courtiers, the intrigue and corruption generated far exceed that of the court he has abandoned."[21]

With employment limited to hunting on the premises, Castalio and Polydore direct their energies into seducing Monimia, an orphan brought up by Acasto as their sister. From the very beginning, the two brothers strikingly differ in their approaches to the possible love-relationship, neither of which seems healthy. While Castalio is pining, very emotionally involved, as he claims that "Love raigns a very Tyrant in my heart." (I, 153, p. 5) and keeps his approaching marriage to Monimia a secret, Polydore is an epitome of cynical libertinism: "She should not cheat me of my Freedom" (I, 183, p. 6). He describes his ideal of love-life in the analogy with a "lusty Bull", who can freely enjoy sex without emotional bonding: "The lusty Bull ranges through all the Field, / And from the Herd singling his Female out, / Enjoyes her, and abandons her at Will." (I, 397–399, p. 11) In this and other references to the animal world in the play, Otway "explores the conflict between human beings' animal and rational qualities",[22] thus evoking Hobbesian idea of natural beastliness of people, restricted only by the force of reason. Though Polydore's description of free love seems attractive, the final outcome of the tragic plot shows the preference of rational being. Thinking that his brother was successful in seducing Monimia, Polydore stole in Monimia's bedchamber on her wedding night and thus committed the fatal act of incest.

While Monimia is an innocent victim, Castalio does not prove a much better lover than his libertine brother. His constant jealousy and bursts of outrage against his wife make it almost impossible to prevent the fatal misunderstanding; at the end of Act III he even pronounces an elaborate monologue showing women as the origin of evil since the beginning of world:

> I'd leave the world for him that hates a Woman.
> Woman the Fountain of all Humane Frailty!
> What mighty Ills have not been done by Woman?
> Who was't betray'd the Capitol? a Woman.
> Who lost Mark Anthony the World? a Woman.
> Who was the cause of a long ten years War,
> And laid at last Old-Troy in Ashes? Woman.
> Destructive, damnable, deceitful, Woman.
> Woman to Man first as a Blessing giv'n,
> When Innocence and Love were in their prime,

[21] Laurie P. Morrow, "Chastity and Castration in Otway's 'The Orphan'," *South Central Review* 2.4 (Winter, 1985), p. 27, *JSTOR* <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3189269> 19 June 2016.
[22] Munns, p. 151.

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 Tempations lewdly she inclin'd
Her Soul, and for an Apple damn'd Mankind. (III, 639–654, p. 40)

Thus, over the course of play, the original difference between the attitude of the two brothers to women diminishes, until in Act V Castalio pronounces a monologue on the freedom of animals very similar to Polydore's bull speech, demeaning even the idea of incest:

See where the Deer trot after one another,
Male, Female, Father, Daughter, Mother, Son,
Brother and Sister mingled all together;
No discontent they know, but in delightful
Wildness and freedom, pleasant Springs, fresh Herbage,
Calm Harbours, lusty health and innocence
Enjoy their portion; If they see a man
How will they turn together all and gaze
Upon the Monster---
Once in a Season too they taste of Love:
Only the Beast of Reason is its Slave,
And in that Folly drudges all the year. (V, 17–28, p. 55)

If we consider the role of Monimia in the plot, she does not actually get much more space than heroines in the previous tragedies. However, it is her misfortune that attracts most compassion from the viewer and arouses pathos and horror. She is an essentially passive victim of the events driven by misguided men and her only decisive step is in the final self-poisoning. Although she realizes that marriage is "a weight of Cares" (IV, 74, p. 42) for a woman, she is constant and faithful, even to the degree of blessing her husband and wishing him to find happiness with his future new bride in her death speech. Monimia's suffering thus attracts attention towards the deformity in the inner circle of enclosed family. She, as a fatherless and therefore unprotected victim, invites pity and focuses the play on the flaw in Acasto's sons, which Laurie P. Morrow has detected in the political isolation. Such interpretation is supported by the appearance of the only uncorrupted male character in *The Orphan* – Monimia's brother who serves his King in the army. It follows then that the current crisis in the political scene cannot be solved by seclusion from the court and railing against the corrupt state of affairs, but rather by political engagement. Therefore, *The Orphan* can be interpreted as a Tory critique of the division between the court and country associated with Whigs.

Separating oneself from the political family proves to be as malignant as being an orphan, an essentially dangerous condition, as the epilogue (quoted at the beginning of this chapter) stresses.

Monimia in *The Orphan* does not get much space to speak, even less to act; the Whig John Banks, described by Susan J. Owen as “the master of the sentimental in this period”,[23] gave his heroine a greater volume of space for expression, but not much more for activity. *Vertue Betray’d* (per. March 1682) is a play staged in the season of Tory reaction to the crisis and therefore it does not feature a direct attack at the royalists. The prologue claims that the play “meddles not with either Whig or Tory”[24] and fights against the two-camp mentality in English politics by evoking the memory of the War of Roses. The same call for harmony and the end of turmoil was repeated in Dryden’s prologue to Banks’s *Unhappy Favourite*, specifically written for the occasion of a royal visit to the play, in which he compares the King’s and Queen’s coming to the theatre to the first appearance of the dove at Noah’s Ark and wishes for peace and quiet instead of constant changes and political upheaval, also remembering the failure of the Civil war:

> Must England still the Scene of Changes be,
> Tost and Tempestuous like our Ambient Sea? […]
> Oh let it be enough that once we fell,
> And every Heart conspire with every Tongue,
> Still to have such a King, and this King Long.[25]

And yet, the play thus introduced is an affective tragedy of English history, staging the death of Anne Boleyn as an innocent victim of the machinations of her political enemies of Catholic and tyrannical inclinations. According to Owen “Anna becomes a sentimentalized, suffering heroine who stands for love in opposition to *realpolitik*.”[26] The play openly addresses the issue of constant balancing of the private and the public, which Laurie P. Morrow has discerned in the interpretation of *The Orphan*. *Vertue Betray’d* shows constant mingling of politics and sentiment. Like Monimia, Anna is an entirely virtuous and amiable heroine (“so Innocent, so Chaste, and Pure” IV, 433, p. 57), who is

[23] Owen, “Drama and political crisis,” p. 171.
[24] John Banks, “Prologue,” in *Vertue Betray’d* (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1994), unpaginated, *Literature Online* <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:dr:Z000055695:0&rft.accountid=35514> 20 June 2016.
[25] John Dryden, “Prologue to the Earl of Essex,” in *The Works of John Dryden* (1882–1892), 18–34, *Literature Online* <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:po:Z300342860:3&rft.accountid=35514> 20 June 2016.
[26] Owen, “Drama and political crisis,” p. 171.

tricked into the marriage to Henry VIII by lies of her brother Rochford, Northumberland and the Cardinal Wolsey, although she is in love with Piercy. In the plot her only role is to pronounce monologues on the hardships of her fate and untangle the threads of scheming around her after she finds out that Piercy is not married as she was told before the consent to her marriage.

Christopher J. Wheatley stresses the passivity in her characterization, as the play "treats Anna Bullen as a political football, kicked around between Cardinal Wolsey and the Duke of Northumberland, and ultimately as a Protestant martyr".[27] This is what makes the play so politically involved – Anna Bullen is not only a suffering heroine, she is the mother of Elizabeth I and the victim of the papist villainous Cardinal together with Elizabeth Blunt, a ruthless former mistress of the King, who is resolved to ruin Anna. Blunt rather reminds the reader of Lee's Machiavel when she organizes a meeting between Anna and Piercy, so that the King's jealous suspicions were confirmed. She is Anna's complete opposite: while Anna never showed even the slightest wish for power and "the Crystal Virtue of a Soul […] still she holds far dearer than a Crown" (IV, 129–30, p. 49), all Blunt's actions are driven by her ambition. The king's mistress, a role of high political impact in the Exclusion Crisis, is thus shown as a monstrous vile woman of Pope Joan's kinship, as Wolsey stresses: "Revenge! Thou greatest Deity on Earth! / And Woman's Wit the greatest of thy Council." (V, 24–5, p. 62). The depravity of Wolsey and Blunt is emphasized in Piercy's analogy between the pair and the serpent and Eve in the Paradise, while Anna is elevated above the human beings, thus associated with heavenly powers, which promotes the idea of her as a Protestant martyr:

> Thou fatal Woman Thou! And Serpent Thou!
> But whose sole Malice (oh that Heav'n should let it!)
> A greater innocence this Day is fallen,
> Than ever blest the Walks of Paradise. (V, 60–66, p. 63)

Nevertheless, the King is not excused either; although most of the guilt falls upon the heads of the factious courtiers and cardinals, Henry VIII is not entirely blameless. He shows genuine horror over the idea of a second, this time unjustified, divorce suggested by Wolsey (II, 210, p. 20), yet he is convinced too easily of Anna's infidelity. As a true monarch he should be able to discern the machinations of his courtiers, which actually he semi-consciously admits in the second analogy between the Cardinal and the biblical serpent:

---

[27] Wheatley, p. 78.

Why didst thou infect my Breast,
And with venomous Tongue deceive me, worse
Than the old serpent that in Paradise
Betray'd the first of Mankind with a Bait?
So thou, lurking and hid amidst the Charms
Of Seymour's rare and unsuspected Beauties,
Sungst me her Praises in such tempting Words,
That I with ravisht Ears swallow'd the sound,
And never saw the Sting I suckt in after." (II, 139–147, p. 18)

Nevertheless, although his speech shows an understanding of the subversive potential of Wolsey's intentions, he does not act upon this, believes the accusations against Anna and lets Wolsey drive the events towards the execution. Moreover, his tyranny is shown by the intended forced marriage of Anna's beloved Piercy and Diana: "The King! What would the Tyrant be a God? / To take upon him to dispose of Hearts!" (III, 446–7, p. 41–2) Anna is aware of the fatal guilt lying on the King for his first divorce and although innocent, she takes her share of responsibility: "Punish not me, I sought not to be Queen; / But Henry's Guilt amidst my Pomp is weigh'd, / And makes my Crown sit heavy on my Head" (I, 494–6, p. 14) Also, she is aware of the approaching fate, which will make her suffer similarly to the preceding Queen, once "the Janus face of the King's inconstancy" (III, 364, p. 39) reappears. The tyranny of Henry is then mirrored in the father–son relationship of Northumberland and Piercy, as the father forces his son to obey the King's command in marriage. Although Henry VIII is not the chief villain in the play, which would be dangerous for the writer, his representation reflects negatively some faults typical for Charles II, showing the monarch's tendency to absolutism as well as too much reliance on false advisors, which mirrors the general distrust for the King's leading politicians such as Lord Danby.

Like other Whig texts, the play leans on strong patriotic values: it employs a prototypical English heroine in opposition to the Papist villainy, evoking the common enemy of both sides of the political spectrum of the Exclusion Crisis and attempting to provide a set of common values in Protestantism and patriotism. The prologue makes use of the setting of the play in England, rather unusual among all the plays ranging from the Orient to Rome: "No country has Men braver than your own / his Hero's all to England are confined." Moreover, in the play Anna is repeatedly evoked as an English idol both by her enemies, "These eyes saw the bright English Sun Eclipsed" (V, 9, p. 62), and by her admirers who described her as "England's falling Star" (V, 398, p. 72). Banks thus creates a play taking up similar topics as Shakespeare's *Henry VIII*, but slightly shifts the

perspective – his political aims needed to create a Protestant national heroine, therefore he put Anna into the centre of action and presented Catherine as sulking, not able of graceful forgiveness.

If the political discourse of the play was not topical enough so far, this is changed in the affecting scene of Anna parting with her daughter, the future Queen Elizabeth I, in which she describes visionary future:

> […] Thou, little Child,
> Shalt live to see thy Mother's Wrongs o're paid
> In many blessings on thy Womans State.
> From this dark Calumny, in which I set,
> As in a Cloud; thou, like a Star, shalt rise,
> And awe the Southern World: That holy Tyrant,
> Who binds all Europe with the Yoak of Conscience,
> Holding his Feet upon the Necks of Kings;
> Thou shalt destroy, and quite unloose his Bonds,
> And lay the Monster trembling at thy Feet.
> When this shall come to pass, the World shall see
> Thy Mothers Innocence reviv'd in thee. (V, 447–58, p. 74)

Elizabeth is shown here as a great Protestant monarch rescuing Europe from the evil hands of the Pope who rules over lawful kings, thus addressing the same issue as *The Female Prelate*. Shakespeare's *Henry VIII* offered a very similar monologue about the future glory under the reign of Elizabeth (V, v, 34–56), but, strikingly, he does not employ religious motives; his monologue shows Elizabeth as the great monarch ensuring peace for her people, but does not specify the enemy, whereas Banks attaches greater value to her Protestantism and sovereignty in face of the Popish threat. Moreover, in enhancing the Elizabethan history, John Banks employs a frequent motive of Whig criticism of Charles, who is failing in comparison to Elizabeth represented as a defender of the Protestant faith and a monarch leaning on popular support.[28] Indeed, in 1680 Roger North describes the celebration of Elizabeth Day with the Pope-burning pageant around the statue of Queen Elizabeth, a demonstration of her idealization: "somebody had set her out like a heathen idol" and she looked like "a deity that like the Goddess Pallas stood as the object of the solemn sacrifice about to be made".[29] The representation of Anna's execution as a sacrifice

---

[28] Owen, "Drama and political crisis," p. 171. Christopher Ross Petrakos explains the political significance of Elizabethan precedence in leaning on the Parliamentary right of the change of royal succession through the 1571 Treason Act commonly referred to as 13. Eliz Cap. 1.: "This statute made the Queen and parliament the executor of the succession and gave the Queen enormous discretion in altering the succession through Parliamentary statute. It also made it treason to 'hold and affirm or maintain' that it is not in parliament's power to 'limit and bind the crown of this realm and the descent, limitation, inheritance'." Petrakos, p. 135.
[29] Quoted in Petrakos, p. 133.

redeemed by future Elizabeth's political achievements thus closely links the pathetic private sorrow of her love for Piercy with the public political sphere for which she suffers and ascertains her status as a martyr, while the affective power of the play is enhanced by the stress on feminine innocence both in Anna and her daughter who shall overcome the limitations imposed on women. In comparison with Lee's plays, which also peruse suffering heroines and spectacle arranged for deep emotions, there is a striking lack of masculine values in Bank's sentimentality. All characters representing masculinity prove to be flawed in some way and the only positive male character, Piercy, seems to show a striking lack of masculine resolve. As Wheatley mentions, "the distinction between male and female is collapsed in order to elevate the personal; many of the speeches of Anna and Piercy could equally well be spoken by the other."[30]

In *The Orphan* the rejection of politics was shown as subverting the basic values of family, while in *Vertue Betray'd* Anna is represented as a victim of her political status, which she realizes very quickly after entering the political sphere through marriage:

> What am I then a Prisoner to be guarded?
> Has then a Throne cost me so dear a Price,
> As forfeit of my Liberty of Thinking?
> Do Princes barter for their Crowns their Freedoms?" (I, 287–290, p. 9)

Thus the play effectively stages the conflict between the private, affective nature of femininity, as represented in sentimental she-tragedies, and the public, political sphere, which repudiates emotional engagement.[31] There is a constant negotiation between the private body and the public role of the representatives of the state, which Anna finds in the conflict between her love and duty:

> For shou'd I listen but a Moment more,
> The strength of Hercules were not enough
> To draw me hence, so unruly is my Body,
> And my unwilling Soul so loth to part. (IV, 209–13, p. 51)

According to Wheatley, during the Restoration period "[a]ffective tragedy combines with the innocence of the protagonist to create 'private' tragedy."[32] If we consider the two tragedies of innocent, passive heroines in this light, it seems that through the spectacle of female suffering in political discourse, Otway and Banks have merged the private and

---

[30] Wheatley, p. 78.
[31] The same conflict is further dramatized in Banks's other Elizabethan drama, *The Unhappy Favourite* (1682), in which he studies the conflict between Elizabeth's secret love for the Earl of Essex and her political duty to act upon the advice of her government who charge him with treason.
[32] Wheatley, p. 78.

public differentiation in tragedy, which means that in this case, paradoxically, the more intensive engagement of drama with the public politics led to the rise of private tragedy.

4.3 Space for emancipation in the plays by Thomas Otway and Thomas Shadwell

It seems to be the right of an English Woman to Hector her own Husband; and faith, I'll have him under my Command now.[33]
(III, p. 39)

We have so far focused predominantly on tragedy with two extreme contrary types of female characters – the vile woman and the innocent sentimental victim. This, of course, does not encompass the whole spectrum of female characters in Restoration writing. In a close connection to comedy, a third type of heroine appears which could be called the modern Protestant woman. Tragedy with its focus on the male hero or on the pathos of female suffering did not allow much space for female activity, except for functioning as an obstacle to male heroism, although we could see some rudiments in Lee's Pulcheria, whose actions in supporting the failing king and his successor seem as a transitional stage between the passive victimization and fully evolved activity.

In Otway's *Venice Preserv'd* (1682), Belvidera gains a similar role, as she convinces Jaffeir to prevent the bloodshed of a rebellion, to which he had sworn allegiance. The political reading of the play is confusing, since the two main tragic heroes are the would-be rebels, who want to overthrow the legitimate government of senators. A clear-cut political propaganda would demand a positive and a negative side, but as in *Caius Marius*, where both the enemies shared part of the guilt, Otway is not so simplistic. Indeed, it seems that while the play criticizes the corruption of the senators, represented by the farcical Antonio, enslaved by his courtesan Aquilina, and tyrannical greedy Priuli, the father of Belvidera, the rebels with their thirst for blood and factious sectarianism do not seem as a viable option. In the space thus negatively outlined, Belvidera strives to find the right way.

The whole play thematises the property value of women, which Angeline Goreau stressed in her description of Restoration women. What Derek Hughes has denoted as the "use of women as currency in the maintenance of male relationships"[34] is emphasized in the mirroring structure of parallels between Jaffeir with his wife Belvidera and his best

[33] Thomas Shadwell, *The Woman-Captain* (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1997), *Literature Online* <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:dr:Z000118178:0> 20 June 2016.

[34] Derek Hughes, "Human Sacrifice on the Restoration Stage: The Case of *Venice Preserv'd*," *Philological Quarterly* 88.4 (Fall 2009), p. 378, *EBSCO* <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?authtype=shib&custid=s1240919&direct=true&db=edsglr&AN=edseds.253628107&site=eds-live&scope=site&lang=cs> 20 June 2016.

friend Pierre with the courtesan Aquilina. Aquilina acknowledges sex as an object of financial transaction in her relationship to the foolish senator Antonio and when she denounces him, she sacrifices her income for the libertine Pierre:

> I loath and scorn that Fool thou mean'st, as much
> Or more than thou can'st; But the Beast has Gold
> That makes him necessary: Power too,
> To qualifie my Character, and poise me
> Equal with peevish Virtue, that beholds
> My Liberty with Envy: In their Hearts
> Are loose as I am; But an ugly Power
> Sits in their Faces, and frights Pleasures from 'em. (II, ii, 12–19, p. 12)[35]

Aquilina stresses the hypocrisy of married women who are not in a substantially different position from hers, which seems proved in the condition of Belvidera who starts in the seemingly more privileged state of a legitimate wife but is treated as an object of financial transaction without the freedom of choice. Her father's reprimands to Jaffeir for their secret marriage are driven by the financial loss it meant for him; as Michael DePorte has noted, "the way Priuli repeatedly describes Jaffeir as a thief who has stolen Belvidera makes him sound a lot like Shylock bemoaning the loss of Jessica, he chiefly laments her as a lost possession."[36] Even Jaffeir, though in love, represents their relationship in terms of monetary exchange, e.g. when he describes the scene, in which he saved her from drowning and their relationship began: "For her Life she paid me with her self" (I, i, 51, p. 2). His discourse thus renders her devotion as an act of the same kind as Aquilina's offer of her services. The treatment of Belvidera as an object of transaction peaks, when her husband uses her as a pledge of his loyalty to the rebellion. Derek Hughes concludes that "Belvidera's sexual payment is quite unlike Aquilina's, but these manifestations of sexuality are described in the same terminology, and according to the same mental model. The prototype of monetary exchange is that of bodies: hence the imaginative association of prostitution and sacrifice."[37]

However, Belvidera succeeds in overcoming this kind of objectification, when she actually intervenes into the political activity of her husband and convinces him to betray his friends to prevent the rebellion. The turning point, which paradoxically empowers her,

---

[35] Thomas Otway, *Venice Preserv'd* (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1994), *Literature Online* <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:dr:Z000108336:0&rft.accountid=35514> 20 June 2016.

[36] Michael DePorte, "Otway and the Straits of Venice," *Papers on Language & Literature* 18.3 (Summer 1982), p. 246, *EBSCOhost* <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?authtype=shib&custid=s1240919&direct=true&db=a9h&AN=7729772&site=eds-live&scope=site&lang=cs> 20 June 2016.

[37] Hughes, p. 372.

is the attempted rape that she suffers from Raymond and which she uses to change her husband's mind, thus transforming the idea of a sacrifice in the rape of Lucrece. The striking difference between the two uses of rape as a trope of sexual as well as political perversion lies in the approach of the women. While in Lee's play Lucrece only later demonstratively commits suicide to prove the chastity of her soul, Belvidera protects herself by shouting, which scares Raymond away, and later she derives political changes from the climactic point. She opens the second scene of the third act with a desperate exclamation: "I'm Sacrific'd! I am sold! betray'd to shame!" (III, ii, 128, p. 28). However, she elevates the meaning of the sacrifice by using it as an argument with Jaffeir. To achieve this, she needs to convince him of her worth, for which she evokes the example of Brutus trusting Porcia and asks Jaffeir to overcome his sexually based prejudice: "Look not upon me as I am, a Woman" (III, ii, 119, p. 31) Though he later calls her a "traitress" when he regrets his decision, she seems to be the voice of reason and ethics. Harry M. Solomon has noted how the play associates Pierre with night and hell in opposition to the chaste Belvidera:

> The contrast between a satanic Pierre tempting his friend to sin and an angelic Belvidera calling Jaffeir to redemption through confession is vivid. Act 2 abounds in references to the 'hellish' midnight meeting of conspirators and, more specifically, to Pierre as Satan. Given money by his friend, Jaffeir exclaims: 'I but half wished To see the Devil, and he's here already. Well! What must this buy, rebellion, murder, treason? Tell me which way I must be damned for this.'[38]

Belvidera, on the other hand, is associated with the heavenly ideals by Jaffeir, before he is won over by Pierre's reasoning:

> Oh Woman! lovely Woman! Nature made thee
> To temper Man: We had been Brutes without you,
> Angels are Painted fair, to look like you;
> There's in you all that we believe of Heav'n,
> Amazing Brightness, Purity and Truth,
> Eternal Joy, and everlasting Love. (I, i, 365–70, p. 10)

Belvidera's actions are governed by two major principles, the love for her husband and patriarchal duty of obedience to the father, respectively the lawful government. When the two clash, she chooses to guide her husband on to the right path of civic obedience instead of rebellion. However, the tragic outcome of this play shows that the social order of the Tory tragedy is not ready for what we would call female emancipation.

[38] Solomon, p. 296.

Strikingly, it is different in the discourse of some Whig comedies, especially in Thomas Shadwell's plays, which feature prominent female characters who actively subvert the patriarchal system associated with the Stuarts. Both *The Lancashire Witches* (1682) and *The Woman-Captain* (1680) present women who successfully rebel against the dominance either of a father or a husband. Susan Owen explains this fact as promoting political values since "Whigs sometimes present women's liberties as an advantage of English Protestantism",[39] thus putting it in contrast to the Stuart aristocratic ideology based on the traditional hierarchy in the family.

In the earlier comedy, *The Woman-Captain*, performed at the height of the Exclusion Crisis, Shadwell offers a harsh critique of the fashionable libertine fops, "illiterate and degenerous Youth",[40] embodied in Sir Humphrey, as he inherits his estate from a decent country gentleman and spends his whole fortune in drinking and whoring with friends who turn their backs on him after he goes bankrupt. The decadence of the libertines in the play, associated of course with the Court, is emphasized when they attempt to rape an unknown woman on the street (III, p. 29). The second plot-line seems more intriguing, since it features another cross-dressing female figure, this time as a means of empowerment for the defeat of patriarchal authority. Mrs. Gripe is married to an extremely mean and jealous older husband, who keeps her in her room as in a jail, until she decides to fight for more freedom, which she repeatedly stresses as the right of every subject in England: "I will have the liberty of a She-Subject of England" (I, p.11), "I'll make you know the right of an English Woman before I have done" (II, p. 22). She reprimands Mr. Gripe for not fulfilling his marital duties properly, as he can act neither as a husband, nor a father: "Thou didst promise to be a Father to me; thou canst not be a Husband, and wilt not be a Father – but a cruel Tyrant." (II., p. 21) In *The Woman-Captain*, a Whiggish play, tyranny is certainly a sufficient reason for the disruption of status quo and transgressing the due obedience to her husband and therefore Mrs. Gripe dresses as her brother and tortures her husband until he agrees to give her enough allowance to live separately, with the final verses warning husbands against subduing their wives to improper treatment: "Now all ye Husbands, let me Warn ye! / If you'd preserve your Honours, or your Lives; / Ne're dare be Tyrants o're your Lawful Wives." (V, p. 72). The comedy is thus formed against two basic messages –

[39] Owen, *Restoration Theatre and Crisis*, p. 173.

[40] Thomas Shadwell, "TO HENRY Lord OGLE, SON to his GRACE HENRY Duke of NEWCASTLE, &c." in *The Woman-Captain*, p. unnumbered.

utter corruption of the libertine fops associated with Charles's court and the vindication of subverting tyranny, embodied in the fight of a wife against her husband.

The Lancashire Witches is a play which reverses the model of Tory comedy, especially in terms of religion. Tory dramatists often mocked Puritans for religious hypocrisy, self-interest and changeability, which Shadwell in contrast associates with the Catholic priest Tegue, who is an utterly comical figure associated with the devil through his surname O'Divelly. In his introductory word "To the Reader", Shadwell explains the character as a personal satire of Kelly, "one of the Murderers of Sir Edmond-Bury Godfrey".[41] Even more controversial seems to be the character of Smerk, an Anglican priest with Catholic leanings, "whose fanatical anti-Puritanism mirrors the anti-popery which is satirized in Tory comedies";[42] he even denies the existence of a Popish Plot and instead attributes it to the Presbyterians (III, p. 35). Nevertheless, in his preface Shadwell defends his play as directed only against Papists, not the Church of England and attacks his critics for secret Papist leanings.

However, apart from attacks on Catholicism and crypto-Catholicism, the Tory ideology is subverted also in the appearance of two young women, Theodosia and Isabella, forced into unwelcome marriages by their fathers. Like Belvidera in *Venice Preserv'd* they decide to get married secretly to two gentlemen of their own choice, Bellfort and Doubty. The striking difference lies in the result of their disobedience. While in Otway's play the conflict between the newly-weds and Belvidera's father eventually leads to attempted rebellion and the death of the young couple, Shadwell shows the women's right for freedom of choice in marriage much more favourably. Firstly, the husbands intended for them by their parents are represented as rather worthless, certainly not very attractive partners for life: Harfort is "A Clownish, sordid, Country Fool, that loves nothing but drinking Ale, and Country Sports" and Sir Timothy Shacklehead is "a very pert, confident, simple Fellow",[43] utterly scorned by his fiancée. The parents had chosen them for reasons of property and neighbourhood, without considering their actual relationships. It must be noted that their own choice seems to be much more reasonable, as their new husbands are

---

[41] Thomas Shadwell, "To the Reader," *The Lancashire Witches* (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1997), p. unnumbered, *English Prose Drama Full-Text Database* <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:dr:Z000117983:0> 3 May 2016.
[42] Owen, "Drama and political crisis," p. 162.
[43] Thomas Shadwell, "Dramatis Personae," in *The Lancashire Witches*, p. unnumbered.

both country gentlemen "of good Estates, well bred, and of good Sense".[44] Thus it is clear, that the discourse of the play justifies Isabella and her friend in breaking their parents' orders and defending their "liberty of choice" (IV, p. 49), which Isabella presents as a privilege of Protestant women in England:

> Isabella: Well, we are resolved never to Marry where we are designed, that's certain. For my part I am a free English woman, and will stand up for my Liberty, and Property of Choice.
> Theodosia: And Faith, Girl, Ile be a mutineer on thy side; I hate the imposition of a Husband, 'tis as bad as Popery. (I, p. 7)

However, the harmony that marks the ending of the play is only achieved thanks to Sir Edward, Isabella's father, who is presented as an exemplary country gentleman in the course of the whole plot. As Susan J. Owen puts it, "Sir Edward's manly vigour stands out against the political supiness, foppery, and cowardice of the papists and their apologists."[45] Unlike the Tory image of their Whig opponents, Sir Edward is not a religious fanatic, but rather moderate, as he shows in his scepticism about the witch-hunts that his visitors start on his premises. He is loyal to the King, generous and moderate in his religion, as well as politics:

> We serve a Prince renown'd for Grace and Mercy,
> Abhorring ways of Blood and Cruelty;
> Whose Glory will, for this, last to all Ages.
> Him Heaven preserve long quiet in his Throne.
> I will have no such violent Sons of Thunder,
> I will have moderation in my House. (I, 102–7, p. 3–4)

His daughter, Isabella, is aware of the worth of her father and pays him due respect, although in the question of marriage she finds it necessary to evade his orders: "Oh hard fate! / That I must disobey so good a Father" (I, 191–2, p. 5–6). As in the speech on choice in marriage, Shadwell stresses the patriotism of the play, in which Sir Edward describes himself as an ideal of Whig gentleman: "I am a true English-man, I love the Princes Rights and Peoples Liberties, and will defend 'em both with the last penny in my purse, and the last drop in my veins, and dare defy the witless Plots of Papists."[46] (III, p. 30) Such description is the complete opposite of the fashionable Court fops bred in France (of

[44] Shadwell, "Dramatis Personae," in *The Lancashire Witches*, p. unnumbered.
[45] Owen, *Restoration Theatre and Crisis*, p. 166.
[46] The political significance of the characterization is underscored by the fact that this speech had to be originally deleted from the play due to censure. In his publication in print, Thomas Shadwell has marked all the expressions that had to be deleted for the stage in italics.

course, there is no mention of the reasons for the popularity of French manners among the courtiers who spent much time in exile): “But our New-fashion'd Gentry love the French too well to fight against 'em; they are bred abroad without knowing any thing of our Constitution, and come home tainted with Foppery, slavish Principles, and Popish Religion.” (III, p. 29) Moreover, to support the idealization of patriotic Protestantism, the celebration of Elizabethan tradition is evoked as an ideal in contrast to the corrupted state of England under the Stuarts:

> Methinks you represent to us the Golden days of Queen Elizabeth, such sure were our Gentry then; now they are grown Servile Apes to Forreign customes, they leave off Hospitality, for which we were famous all over Europe, and turn Servants to Board-wages. (III, p. 29)

Sir Edward’s good treatment of his servants is praised as a quality of true English gentleman. We have seen in several Tory plays the constant fear of social disorder, of the collapse of the class system, embodied in the rabble-rousers. Shadwell’s moderate Whig comedy asserts a harmonious social order, in which the country aristocrat takes care of his servants, who know their proper place in the hierarchy and do not represent any danger: “These honest men are the strength and sinnews of our Country; such men as these are uncorrupted, and while they stand to us we fear no Papists, nor French invasion; this day we will be merry together.” (V, p. 73) Therefore the play opens with a discussion of Sir Edward and Smerk, in which the aristocrat tells the priest of his right position in the social hierarchy, which is not above the gentry. While Elkanah Settle showed Papists as dangerous because of their notion of the precedence of religion over civil government, Shadwell shares the same concept by promoting moderate Protestantism as the opposite ideology, where religion does not interfere with the government.

It follows that as an idealized gentleman Sir Edward will approach his daughter’s marriage in the proper way, which indeed happens, when he realizes the worth of his new son-in-law and blesses their wedding as a positive example for the less forgiving parents of Theodosia. However, it seems a little exaggerated when Owen interprets the ending of the play as a promotion of a “non-patriarchal family”,[47] as the father’s authority is never truly questioned. On the contrary, Sir Edward’s forbearance makes him even more reverent and confirms his natural authority in his household, which is not based on absolutist power, but on mutual trust between the father, his children and servants, thus showing that in the Filmerian patriarchal model of a family there is the same amount of responsibility on both

[47] Owen, *Restoration Theatre and Crisis*, p. 165.

sides and it demands a mature, decent ruler able to listen to his subjects. At the time of the Tory reaction, Shadwell offers a play aiming at consensus and moderation, promoting forbearance in the monarch and patriotism, tradition and anti-Catholicism as values that could re-unite the political antagonists, while the liberated women function as a feature subverting the absolutist patriarchal ideology of the Stuarts.

5 Aphra Behn

But England has a nobler task for you,
Not to tame Beasts but the brute Whigs subdue.
A thing which yet the Pulpit cou'd not do.
Your satyr must the Factious Age reclaim.[1]

Aphra Behn is remembered as the first female professional writer, one of the mothers of female writing and at the same time the second most prolific writer of the Restoration period after John Dryden. Like him, she was an ardent Tory, always writing in support of the Royalist cause. It follows that the Exclusion Crisis marked an important turning point in her career, which generally proceeded from drama of the 1670s and early 1680s to the dominance of fiction and poetry with the decline of the Court Wits' cultural impact after the death of Charles II.

Behn's work was deeply rooted in the Cavalier, libertine culture of the Stuart court, which means that her position as a woman writer embedded in an inherently misogynist discourse makes her treatment of the set tropes and characterization of Tory writing very intriguing, as she negotiates between the gender issues at stake in her texts and the necessity of current engagement with the political issues of the day. Susan J. Owen has therefore focused on discerning the patterns of topicality in Behn's treatment of libertinism and noticed how Behn measures out her gender critique of the libertine ethos according to the necessity of urgent support for the throne.[2] Thus while *The Rover; or, The Banish't Cavaliers* (1677) was fully engaged with the exploration of libertinism and the role of women in its discourse,[3] *The Roundheads; or, The Good Old Cause* of 1681, the time of Tory reaction to the Exclusion Crisis, was completely devoid of any deeper discussion of gender issues, focusing primarily on the attack on the opponents of the Crown.

---

[1] Panegyrics to Behn by an unknown author. Quoted in Hero Chalmers, *Royalist Women Writers, 1650-1689* (Oxford, GBR: Oxford University Press, UK, 2004), p. 157, *EBRARY* <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/cuni/Doc?id=10263660&ppg=170> 22 Jul. 2016.

[2] See Susan J. Owen, "Behn's dramatic response to Restoration politics," in Derek Hughes and Janet Todd (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Aphra Behn* (Cambridge – Melbourne – New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), p. 68–82.

[3] Helen M. Burke has analysed *The Rover* regarding its treatment of the Stuart Cavalier myth in comparison with the source play by Thomas Kiligrew, *Thomaso; or, The Wanderer*, a play glorifying the patriarchal Cavalier myth. In Burke's interpretation, Behn's play should be read as a scrutinizing parody, rather than a celebration of the rake, as it offers a "less than flattering view of her triumphant cavalier hero". Helen M. Burke, "The Cavalier Myth in *The Rover*," in Derek Hughes and Janet Todd (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Aphra Behn* (Cambridge – Melbourne – New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), p. 122.

5.1 The Feign'd Curtizans and *The Young King*: the beginning of the crisis

While the major part of 1670s was a period marked by high fashion for sex comedies, with the master works of the genre such as Wycherley's *The Country Wife*, Dryden's *Marriage à la mode* or Betterton's *The Amorous Widow*, with the political crisis of 1678/9 sex comedies suddenly fell out of favour with the public after a series of failed comedies of the type in the previous season.[4] Strikingly, there was only one comedy staged in the season of 1678/79 and that was Aphra Behn's *The Feign'd Curtizans*, a play performed very shortly after the Popish Plot revelations, which could be seen as a transitional work between the sex comedies and the coming revival of political city comedies of early Restoration focused on the satire of Puritans and upstarts, epitomized by Behn's *The Roundheads*.

In *The Feign'd Curtizans* Behn has coupled the revival of the 1660s comedy with "a celebration of upper-class good taste across national boundaries"[5] represented by the Cavalier characters of the moral Harry Fillamour and the eventually reformed rake Galliard. At the same time, the witty heroines of the play, as well as the metatexts (dedication, prologue, epilogue) show a concern with the role of women in the historical changes that were taking place and their position within the Cavalier discourse. The play was dedicated to Nell Gwyn, the ex-actress and mistress of Charles II, who was often compared to the Duchess of Portsmouth as the more popular one for her Protestant and English origin. The semantic importance of dedicating this comedy to a woman renown for her sexual "service" to the King is reinforced by the prologue, spoken by Mrs. Currer, presumably also a courtesan. Two years later it was customary to doubt the truth value of the Popish Plot allegations, yet a few months after the revelations, at the high point of the anti-Catholic paranoia, there were very few who would dare to doubt Titus Oates's story in public. Strikingly, Aphra Behn opens her first play of 1679 with an explicit parallel between the fictional plots on the stage and the political plotting that has been taking place in the previous months:

> The devil take this cursed plotting Age,
> 'T has ruin'd all our Plots upon the Stage;
> Suspicions, New Elections, Jealousies,
> Fresh Informations, New discoveries,
> Do so employ the busie fearful Town,
> Our honest calling here is useless grown;

[4] Owen, "Behn's dramatic response to Restoration politics," p. 69.
[5] Owen, "Behn's dramatic response to Restoration politics," p. 69–70.

Each fool turns Politician now, and wears
A formal face, and talks of State-affairs;[6]

Apart from a lament on the low attendance at the theatres, there is a strong sense of the inappropriate involvement of all kinds of people in politics, in keeping with the exclusive upper-class character of Tory political agenda, while there is an evident satirical smirk over the "suspicions" and "new discoveries". The parallel between the two kinds of plot is further developed by the simile between wit, the primary quality of Restoration drama, and the feared and hated Jesuits: "But Wit as if 'twere Jesuiticall, / Is an abomination to ye all". As we have seen in the previous plays, it was quite customary for Restoration plays to be set in Continental Europe and Behn's prologue openly admits the political engagement of the setting, when she ironically denigrates the play because of the setting in Rome: "This must be damn'd, the Plot is laid in Rome". Of course, it would not in reality be a reason for unpopularity among the Restoration audience, for whom setting in different parts of Italy would be quite usual.[7] The satirical mode of the whole prologue shows the rhetorical strategy of this exclamation: it is a means of actually asserting the political relevance of the play, including its setting, and also, since it should be expected that the viewer will not damn but enjoy the play in the end, the prologue discards prejudiced criticism based on religion by showing the irrelevance of the Roman setting. It also makes a clear-cut connection between the political tumult of the day and Puritan morality, as the speaker admonishes the audience for their hypocritical moralizing:

And piously pretend, these are not days,
For keeping Mistresses and seeing Plays.
Who says this Age a Reformation wants,
When Betty Currer's Lovers all turn Saints?
In vain alas I flatter, swear, and vow,
You'l scarce do any thing for Charity now:
[…]
Who wou'd have thought such hellish times to've seen,
When I shou'd be neglected at eighteen?
That Youth and Beauty shou'd be quite undone,
A Pox upon the Whore of Babylon.

As we have seen in chapter 4.1, the Whore of Babylon was a standard referent for the Catholic Church, which Behn uses for the complete subversion of the supposed Popish Plot

[6] Aphra Behn, "Prologue," in *The Feign'd Curtizans* (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1996), unpaginated, *Literature Online* <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:dr:Z000056600:0&rft.accountid=35514> 24 Jul 2016.
[7] Note that John Banks makes an important political message out of the English setting of his Elizabethan plays, see chapter 4.2.

by casting it as mere competition for playwrights and whores, not a serious political subject. Thus Alison Shell has noted that the prologue "accomplishes three things: anti-Whig criticism and diminution of the Popish Plot, both characteristics of literary Toryism, and something far less common, debunking the Catholic threat altogether."[8] It is necessary to emphasize the striking exceptionality of this fact, as even the most ardent Tories like John Dryden were very careful at this point not to stir the turbulent emotions associated with Catholicism, as has been noted in the analyses of Dryden's work which stressed the danger of premature conclusions, but never actually opposed the concept of Catholic threat itself. Even the Tory plays that denied the Popish Plot were careful not to legitimize Popery as such in order to avoid accusations of crypto-Catholicism.

Aphra Behn seems to disregard such fears completely. Her play is set in Rome and stages the life of upper classes of the Italian city as a noble space of romance, visited and celebrated by the two before-mentioned English Cavaliers, Fillamore and Galliard, whose friendship with Italian gallants and love for Italian heroines shows the value of Cavalier ethos that connects upper classes across national boundaries through their shared code of honour, wit and charm (thus enhancing the value of the representative publicness of aristocracy). This dimension of the main, romantic plot is enhanced by the comical subplot of Sir Signall Buffoon and his tutor Mr. Tickletext, epitomes of the boorishness of new mercantile upstarts and religious hypocrisy. Buffoon is a young man, whose father was „a fellow, who having the good Fortune to be much a fool and knave, had the attendant blessing of getting an Estate of some eight thousand a year, with this Coxcomb to inherit it; who (to agrandize the Name and Family of the *Buffoons*) was made a Knight" (I, i, p. 5).The comical fool is thus from the beginning introduced as the opposite of the noble cavaliers of hereditary titles; his father is a typical representative of the newly arising mercantile class, who after gaining enough money (presumably seized from Royalists during the Interregnum) would gain some minor knighthood in exchange for financial support of the Crown.[9] The young knight is characterized by affectation and pretence, as he

---

[8] Alison Shell, "Popish Plots: *The Feign'd Curtizans* in context," in Janet Todd (ed.), *Aphra Behn Studies* (Cambridge – New York – Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 36.

[9] The same case was satirized in Shadwell's *The Lancashire Witches*:

> Sir Tim.: Besides, I gave Thirty Guinnies for the Sword I was Knighted with to one of his Nobles, for the King did not draw his own Sword upon me.
> Isab.: Do you abuse the Nobility? would a Nobleman sell you a Sword?
> Sir Tim.: Yes that they will, sell that or any thing else at Court. (I, p. 6)

Shadwell uses the scene to criticize the degradation of aristocratic values and mark the discrepancy between the pretence of hereditary nobility to embody a certain complex of inherent qualities and the actual number of titles that were given for financial services to the Crown. Behn, on the other hand, satirizes the middle-class

tries to reach towards the ethos of the true gentlemen: he is fascinated with the sound of Italian language, insists on calling his English servant Giovanni instead of his ordinary name John Pepper (I, ii, p. 8) and when he is told that "no Man lives here without his Inamorata", the "very word has so fir'd him, that he's resolv'd to have an Inamorata, whatever it cost him" (I, i, p. 5).

However, his father, as the proto-typical Puritan upstart, to prevent "the eminent danger that young Travellers are in of being perverted to Popery", sent his son travelling with a chaplain, Mr. Tickletext, "as errant a block-head as a man wou'd wish to hear Preach" (I, i, p. 5). The tutor/chaplain is the epitome of Puritan hypocrisy and philistinism: his lack of cultural awareness and appreciation for fine art is represented by his denigration of the renowned churches of Rome, as he understands the precious paintings inside as "Superstition, idolatrous, and flat Popery" (I, ii, p. 12). By letting the English gentleman Fillamore show him the "Error, that persuades [him] that harmless Pictures are idolatrous" (I, ii, p. 12), Behn essentially attacks one of the basic points in the Protestant denouncement of Catholic Church as an arbitrary argument. The foolish Tickletext is explicitly shown as a representative of the typical English Puritan: "we have thousands of these in England that go loose about the streets, and pass with us for as sober discreet religious Persons, as a man shall wish to talk nonsense withal…" (IV, i, p. 45). Moreover, he rails against the surrounding Popery in this "Romish Heathenish Country" (V, i, p. 67) and loose morals, yet he attempts to seduce one of the presumed courtesans of the play. To his pupil he pretends utter disgust over the idea of a courtesan, which is associated with his anti-Popery by Buffoon: "Now my Tuter's up, ha ha ha, ---and ever is when one names a whore; be pacifi'd man, be pacifi'd, I know thou hat'st 'em worse than beads or holy-water." (I, ii, p. 8)

Nevertheless, this play, dedicated to the King's mistress, subverts any attempts at moral condemnation of professional courtesans by showing them as charming and irresistible, even for Tickletext, and at the same strategically barring any real courtesan from appearance in the plot. In *The Rover* Aphra Behn had already addressed the issue of courtesans by introducing Angellica Bianca, whose very name discards any moralistic criticism, yet the social, as well as literary, conventions would not allow for a fully emancipated representation of the courtesan, it must be the chaste heroine who marries Wilmore, not Angellica, despite her positive representation, such are the rules of

upstarts who think that nobility can be sold or bought, thus enhancing aristocracy as inherent, hereditary quality.

romance.[10] The plot of *The Feign'd Curtizans* offers a loophole – by presenting chaste heroines pretending to be courtesans, Behn can stage the charm that such "inamoratas" have for the heroes and show their profession as an empowering tool for women: the disguise allows Marcella and Cornelia, the sisters who elope in order to avoid a forced marriage and enclosure in a nunnery, to move across the social scope of Rome thanks to economic self-sufficiency, converse freely with men of their choice and thus drive their lovers towards marriage (Cornelia and Galliard) or test their faithfulness (Marcella and Fillamore).[11] Moreover, in the discussion over the morality of sex for money between Galliard and Fillamore, Galliard stresses the stigmatizing nature of denomination: "Love is Love, where ever beauty is, / Nor can the name of whore, make beauty less" (III, i, p. 29). By the final revelation of their chastity, the moral dilemma inherent in staging a courtesan character was eschewed, which denigrated (Whiggish) Puritan railings against the loose morals of the Stuart court, promoted the libertine Cavalier ethos without showing its darker side lurking in *The Rover* and allowed for the strong association of Whiggish anti-popery and patriotism with Puritan sexual hypocrisy, folly, pretension, philistinism, and low-class money-grubbing. Instead, a set of upper-class romance values of the Stuart Cavalier ethos was promoted as transcending Whiggish nationalism and allowing unity over borders.

As it became clear that the political crisis wouldn't just pass quickly and the house of Commons made first attempts to pass the Exclusion Bill, Aphra Behn cast gender issues away for some time and later in 1679 one of her first plays was finally staged – *The Young King* (she probably started work on this play already in 1674, but it was produced only after the outbreak of the Exclusion Crisis[12]). It fitted in the re-appearing vogue for tragi-comedies used by Dryden for his *The Spanish Fryar*. *The Young King* is a play fully

[10] Even in Behn's 1680 comedy *The Revenge*, in which the comical strongly overrides romance, the courtesan character Corina gets married at the end, yet not to the main hero, her lover, who arranges a marriage for her after finding a more suitable bride. Otherwise the play follows the example of *The Feign'd Curtizans* very closely in introducing the farcical character of a middle-class merchant who is ridiculously anti-popish, nosy and credulous.

[11] It must be noted that where Thomas Shadwell presented the liberty of choice in marriage as the privilege of modern Protestant English women, for Aphra Behn economic limitations are still the predominant force of restriction, which means that empowerment is available only to the upper class women of considerable wealth. In *The Rover*, Florinda explicitly states that her freedom of choice is connected to her privileged social status: "and how near soever my Father thinks I am to marrying that hated Object, I shall let him see, I understand better, what's due to my Beauty, Birth and Fortune, and more to my Soul, than to obey those unjust Commands". Aphra Behn, *The Rover* (Cambridge: Penguin Classics, 2011), I, i, unpaginated, *Literature Online* <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:dr:Z001599565:0> 27 Jul 2016.

[12] Mary Ann O'Donnell, "Chronology," in Derek Hughes and Janet Todd (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Aphra Behn* (Cambridge – Melbourne – New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), p. xii–xv.

engaged in the fight against exclusion, for which it even peruses female transgression as a symbolic tool for the representation of political subversion in the same way as we have seen in the previous chapter.

In the prologue, Behn continues her effort from *The Feign'd Curtizans* and attacks her audience for their meaningless nationalism, whose typical symptom would be hatred of all French products,[13] and religious hypocrisy, which seems to represent the primary force behind the political crisis for her:

> Your dull Forefathers first did conquer France:
> Whilst they have sent us in revenge for these,
> Their Women, Wine, Religion, and Disease.
> Yet for Religion, it's not much will down,
> In this ungirt, unblest, and mutinous Town.
> Nay, I dare swear, not one of you in Seven,
> E're had the impudence to hope for Heaven.[14]

The plot of the play is built upon a parallel with the current attempt at the exclusion of the Duke of York. As the subtitle "The Mistake" shows, the play studies the consequences of an important wrong political decision: Queen's exiling of the heir to the throne, her son Orsames, because of a bad prophecy foretelling his tyranny. The result is disastrous: Orsames, growing up in exile and seclusion, is unable of functioning in society, as he attempts to rape any female object around him regardless of family bonds, moreover he has no knowledge of political realities. Gender relations in general are employed in the play to represent the decrepit state of the kingdom and Aphra Behn has submitted her female characters to the political message, as they are representatives of the corrupted situation in the state. The Queen makes the fatal mistake of believing in prophecies, so she trains her daughter Cleomena in regal accomplishments, such as war strategy, instead of her son. Cleomena thus grows up into a sort of Amazonian, a transgression that needs to be corrected through her final submission to Thersander in marriage. The parallel between Orsames and James in the play is obvious, as it discards the concept of exclusion based on the fear that a Catholic king would necessarily become a tyrant. Moreover, the ineptitude of Orsames enforces the idea often used by Royalists, who excused the faults perceived in

---

[13] Similarly, in *The Revenge*, the foolish vintner Dashit is satirized for his distrust of quality French wines. The oppositional writers would offer the contrary strategy through the critique of indulgence in fashionable foreign goods, as well as mistresses, associated with the Stuarts. Thus Thomas Shadwell opens his *The Woman-Captain* with the satirical portrayal of Sir Humphrey Scattergood's obsession with foreign cooks, meals and wines.

[14] Aphra Behn, „Prologue," in *The Young King* (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1994), unpaginated, *Literature Online* <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:dr:Z000056842:0> 25 July 2016.

the royal brothers by their enforced exile during the formative years of their lives – their personality flaws need to be attributed primarily to the fatal mistake of the Interregnum. The message of the play is therefore clear: the "superstitious errour" (V, iv, p. 62) of mingling with the proper line of succession based on apprehension about the future rule of the heir must be avoided at all costs. At the point of high political crisis Aphra Behn put forward the partisan needs, used female cross-dressing as a symbol of the unnatural state of affairs and associated sexual inversion and unnatural motherhood with political exclusion, thus emphasizing that Charles II cannot exclude his brother – it would be an unnatural break of family bonds. The final scene of the play, in which Scythia and Dacia finish their war through the marriage of Cleomena and Thersander, pleads for harmony and unity that should overcome nationalism and country differences: "The God of Love o'recomes the God of War." (V, iv, p. 63) Thus both the plays end up on the same note of a plea for peace, international harmony and debasement of nationalism based on the ethos of honour common to the noble members of all nations.

5.2 *The Roundheads* and *The Second Part of The Rover*: strong attack on the opposition

I would to Heaven ye had been all Whiggs for me:
Whilst Honest Tory Fools abroad do Roame,
Whigg Lovers Slay and Plot, and Love at Home.[15]

We have shown on the example of John Dryden that even the staunchest Tory writers seemed rather temperate in the season 1680/81, the time of Whig ascendancy, when he staged *The Spanish Fryar*, a compromise between anti-Catholicism of the Whigs and the call for harmony and reconciliation with the opponents. With Aphra Behn it seems more complicated; in the season before the Oxford Parliament *The Second Part of The Rover* was staged, which Susan J. Owen interprets as the strongest critique of the libertine ethos, although other critics, such as Alison Shell, offer contrary reading of admiration for the main libertine hero. This is not only a question of minor interpretative difficulties in establishing the degree of irony in Behn's treatment of Wilmore – in Behn's work characterization is the chief means of political commentary and the reading of the libertine thus wholly changes the political interpretation. Although Behn is one of the main proponents of the Cavalier ethos in drama, her attitude towards libertinism was ambivalent.

[15] Aphra Behn, "A PROLOGUE By Mrs. Behn to her New PLAY, CALLED Like Father, like Son, OR THE Mistaken Brothers," (1682), 20–21, *Literature online*, <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:po:Z200276588:2> 28 Jul 2016.

Whereas W. R. Owens claims that "Behn, a friend of Rochester's and a great admirer of his wit and skill as a poet, was a bold proponent of the ideal of sexual freedom, for both women and men",[16] her plays always show the limitations that are imposed on women by the ethos, the necessity of financial security, as well as the inconstancy of the libertines that threatens women. Thus for example in *The second part of The Rover*, Willmore is a charming character, yet he sees his objects of passion as interchangeable, so when he meets two women in the dark, he exclaims "no matter which, so I am sure of one" (IV, ii, p. 51). However, he is still a character admired by his companions and charming to all women, so it seems reasonable to follow the simple interpretation offered by the dedication added to the play upon publication later in 1681, at the time when the Parliament had already been dissolved, the beginning of Tory reaction period.

At the time when her most fervent Tory play, *The Roundheads*, was performed, she published *The Second Part of The Rover* with a dedication to the Duke of York, in which she celebrates his patience in the voluntary exile during the Exclusion Crisis and draws parallels between him and her Cavalier character Wilmore, the rover in the sense of sexual inconstancy as well as the uprooted existence of a Royalist in exile: "allow him, Royal Sir, a shelter and protection, who was driven from his Native Country with You, forc'd as You were, to fight for his Bread in a strange Land, and suffer'd with You all the Ills of Poverty, War and Banishment, and still pursues Your Fortunes".[17] James's chief characteristics in the dedication are "Loyalty and True Obedience" both to the king and to the people, the complete opposite of the leanings to tyranny and violence stressed by the opposition. Moreover, typically for Tory writing, the dedication emphasizes the parallels between the present political crisis and 1640s, when she identifies the "seeming sanctifi'd Faction" of the Commonwealth with the "again gathering Faction" of the Exclusion Crisis. The correspondence between the Duke of York and Willmore, the Cavalier of the play, should suggest rather positive reading of the character, despite certain reservations towards the libertine ethos expressed in the play.

It is not surprising then at this point of history that both the plays refresh the memory of the Commonwealth – they are set during the Interregnum, *The Roundheads* in London, *The Rover II* in Madrid, both satirize Puritan middle-class upstarts and they both feature Cavalier heroes as the typical representatives of outcast Royalists – impoverished, uprooted from their homes and politically powerless, which they recompense by sexual

---

[16] Owens – Goodman, p. 145.

[17] Aphra Behn, "TO HIS Royal Highness THE DUKE, &c.," in *The Rover, part II*, unpaginated.

empowerment through cuckolding the Commonwealth politicians and great sexual conquests; as Melinda S. Zook explains, "the royalist rake has a control in the sexual sphere which is denied to him in the political sphere".[18] In comparison with the first part of *The Rover*, in the second part Willmore's political engagement was made more profound, since he gained military merit as the "Noble Captain" (I, i, p. 2). However, he remains the Cavalier figure with only two concerns in life – women and service to the true King.[19] Since in his exile he cannot do much more for the latter than to assert his constant loyalty, he puts all his energy into seducing women, this time primarily the courtesan La Nuche, who prefers her dull, yet paying customers at first. Willmore – "Brave, handsom, gay, and all that Women doat on" (II, i, p. 26) – is the epitome of all Restoration rakes, typical of most Behn's texts, which Melinda S. Zook explains as the symbol of liberty:

> The cultured male aristocrat, inhabitant of a Hobbesian world without limits, seemed to exemplify personal freedom for Behn: he was free from want (as she was not); free from customary inhibition (as women were not); and above petty nationalism and religious fanaticism. He was witty, manipulative, martial, handsome, almost always a sexual predator. But most importantly, he was a free, generous spirit, bound only by his allegiance to the traditional aristocratic code of honour and loyalty.[20]

Such Cavalier ethos is essentially upper-class, as it disregards all economic concerns as narrow-minded and stands in opposition to the middle-class struggle to gain property. This is the reason for Willmore's repulsion over the idea of paying for the sexual services of La Nuche; he expects to seduce her by his Cavalier charm and seeing his sexual conquest as economic transaction is shown as degrading, inappropriate for a Cavalier, only good for the political Puritans: "Let the sly States-man, who Jilts the Commonwealth with his grave Politiques, pay for the sin that he may doat in secret; let the brisk fool Inch out his scanted sense with a large pursemore eloquent than he: but tell not me of rates who bring a Heart, Youth, Vigor, and a Tongue to sing the praise of every single pleasure thou shalt give me." (II, i, p. 18) La Nuche thus stands in the centre of a conflict typical for the Tory–Whig discussion: the conflict between the concerns of the newly rising mercantile class, inherent in La Nuche's necessity of economic independence, and the essentially romantic Stuart ethos of honour, epitomized in the wanderer without money, whose ideals of honour and loyalty transcend earthbound necessities of economic security. In that view there is

---

[18] Melinda S. Zook, "The political poetry of Aphra Behn," in Derek Hughes and Janet Todd (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Aphra Behn* (Cambridge, GBR: Cambridge University Press, 2004), p. 73.
[19] Compare McKeon's characteristic of the actual Cavalier army: "In the ranks of the Royalist army, to be sure, the figure of the Cavalier was perpetuating an anachronistic model of personal honor and fealty to the feudal overlord, adumbrated by a pseudoreligious worship of the national monarch." McKeon, 186.
[20] Zook, p. 49.

a strong symbolic load in the scene in Act 5, in which the movement stops and like on a painting La Nuche ruminates over the choice she has: "What shall I do? Here's powerful Interest prostrate at my feet, Glory, and all that vanity can boast; – But there – Love unadorn'd, no covering but his Wings, No Wealth, but a full Quiver to do mischiefs" (V, i, p. 68). Her choice of a lover, either the mercantile rich one or the poor Cavalier, is the choice of life-style and ideals, the choice between the romance of ideal love without economic concerns and the earthbound practical relationship. Moreover, this time it is not a question of marriage: in the final scene, La Nuche decides that she "o're the habitable World will follow [Willmore], and live and starve by turns as fortune pleases" without "the formal foppery of Marriage" (V, iv, p. 81). As Helen M. Burke explains, "[h]er decision […] is dictated by the ideological need to show the restoration of a political and social economy based on the bond of honour rather than on contract."[21] However, the difficulty of La Nuche's decision and the feeling of threat that awaits her in her future with Willmore support Hero Chalmer's claim that Behn's drama often

> questions the notion that libertine sexual conduct provides an equally satisfactory means of expressing Tory loyalties for men and women alike. This is frequently triggered by a highly developed consciousness of women's economic predicaments and of the often vexed interface between economic exigencies and political affiliations.[22]

By letting La Nuche choose the Cavalier instead of economic security promoted by her bawd Petronella, who warns La Nuche against the danger of getting old without financial resources (IV, i, p. 60), Behn has sacrificed her heroine's future to the romance ideology.

In the comical subplot of this play we see the opposite of Willmore's refusal of monetary exchange for love – Ned Blunt, an English country gentleman, and Nicholas Fetherfool, his friend, try to marry two "Lady Monsters" (I, i, p. 8), a giant and her dwarf sister, who are "worth a hundred thousand pounds a piece" (I, i, p. 6). Though it seems striking that a woman writer of proto-feminist leanings would employ the characters of female deformity, they come to have a manifold function in the text. Mainly, they are the tools for denigration of the country fops who are, contrary to Willmore, obsessed with money in so far that they are trying to seduce someone who seems a monster to them. Eventually, the two women are shown with much more dignity than the men around them. Moreover, it is necessary to read the appearance of female deformity on stage in the

[21] Burke, p. 131.
[22] Chalmers, p. 152.

context of the previous chapter and the frequent use of female monstrosity as a political trope of the opposition like in Settle's *The Female Prelate*. Indeed, in the prologue the political context of these characters is stated: "we've Monsters too, / Which far exceed your City Pope for show". The reference to Pope-burning processions notes another important factor: where all Whig texts, and even many Tory ones, work with the monstrosity of Papists, Behn explicitly avoids this by making her monsters Jewish in the Catholic surrounding, thus stressing the arbitrary nature of judging by religion.[23]

If *The Rover II* offered mainly an idealistic rendering of the Cavalier ethos, the second play of the season focused on a direct attack on the enemy. In *The Roundheads; or, The Good Old Cause*, an adaptation of John Tatham's *The Rump*, Behn wrote her most ardent Tory comedy, based on the criticism of Commonwealth Puritans as a parallel to the Exclusionists of 1681. The play is set shortly before the Restoration, so it ends with the harmonious moment of the Cavalier victory. There are again two typical charming dispossessed Cavalier figures, Loveless and Freeman, who are trying to seduce the wives of two competing Puritan leaders, Lady Lambert and Lady Desbro. Right at the beginning Lady Desbro, a Royalist in her heart, emphasizes the sexual empowerment of the Cavaliers as a recompense for their political and economic dispossession, when she speaks about the Puritan politicians: "I never heard of any one o't' other Party ever gain'd a Heart; and indeed, Madam, 'tis just Revenge, our Husbands make Slaves of them, and they kill all their Wives."[24] Indeed, while the Cavaliers are the epitomes of charm, good nature and wit, the Puritans are only shown as licentious, greedy and craving for power and property, which they had stolen from the Royalists.

Moreover, the decrepit state of public affairs and illegitimacy of the Commonwealth is again emphasized by the role of women; Behn has omitted gender issues and employed the stock characters of a shrew and an upstart woman. The latter is exemplified in Cromwell's widow, who keeps referring to her relatives as "our Royal Family" (V, ii, 53, p. 49), and the former in Lady Lambert, whose ambition is the chief drive behind her husband's

---

[23] Pope Joan as the symbol of female transgression was intriguing for Aphra Behn as a woman attempting to succeed in male environment, e.g. in the prologue to *Sir Patient Fancy*, a play preceding the Popish Plot scare, she used a parallel between female playwrights and Pope Joan: "even the Women, now, pretend to reign, / Defend us from a Poet Joan again." Aphra Behn, *Sir Patient Fancy* (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1996), *Literature online* <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:dr:Z000056777:0> 25 July 2016.

[24] Aphra Behn, *The Roundheads* (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1996), *Literature online* <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:dr:Z000056706:0> 25 July 2016.

political success. It is only her capacity for love and the charm of the Cavaliers that eventually teach her the common sense and proper submissiveness. The inadequacy of Puritan women's political engagement is satirized in the grotesque depiction of the Interregnum "Council of Ladies", mocked by the masked men present among the arguing women. As Susan J. Owen has noted, in this play "the gender transgression reinforces the social presumption, typifying a world upside-down."[25]

However, there is also the opposite of the satirized Puritan women: Lady Desbro is a Royalist, though she is married to a Puritan upstart, and she is a very powerful heroine. Although she is in love with Freeman, she refuses to cheat her husband, as she adheres to a female code of honour, which presents virtue as the primary token of the loyalty to the King. She cannot break the vow to her hated husband in order to prove the validity of her allegiance to the King: "No, I'm true to my Allegiance still, true to my King and Honour. Suspect my Loyalty when I lose my Virtue" (IV, i, 48–50, p. 33). Through the characterization thus Behn employs traditional royalist discourse, when she equates honour and virtue with loyalty and rebellion with women out of place.

Although we could see an effort to represent women as fully evolved characters rather than simplified objects of romantic quest in Behn's plays of the 1670s, with the oncoming political crisis, it is clear that gender issues were put and female empowerment was subjugated to the prevalence of Stuart patriarchal mode; though women show considerable force for action in actively changing their fate, the endings of the plays restore the "proper" order of female submissiveness. With John Dryden we have seen a certain kind of frustration, in which there was no set of pro-active values that could be promoted instead of simple defence of the status quo and railing against the rebellious opposition. For Behn, the set of positive values was found in the mode of Stuart romance: "Behn's politics were ultimately about celebrating a 'golden age': a bygone era, epitomized by the roving cavalier, freed from the tyrannies of custom and his by elite social status to do as he pleased."[26]

---

[25] Susan J. Owen, "Behn's dramatic response to Restoration politics," p. 69.
[26] Zook, p. 48.

5.3 Aphra Behn and the Duke of Monmouth

Treason, rebellion and murder,
are far from the paths that lead to glory,
which are as distant as hell from heaven.[27]

Surprisingly, in Aphra Behn's political writing from the period of Charles II's reign there are not many texts actually celebrating the royal figure, which could be attributed to the ambivalent relationship she had to the King due to financial problems.[28] While in John Dryden's work there is a constant reappearance of the patriarchal, idealistic image of the King (e. g. Sancho or David), Behn always celebrated the elite, "young, gay, hansome, witty, rich"[29] male circle surrounding the monarch, which represented to her the glory of the Cavalier culture based on the code of honour and nobility, free of economic concerns.

As we have seen in the dedication of *The Second Part of The Rover*, it was James who represented for her the ideal masculine hero, which conviction she retained in her poetry even after 1688. However, before the culmination of the Exclusion Crisis, there was one member of the Court admired by all sides of the political spectrum, Charles's illegitimate son, the Duke of Monmouth, a promising young courtier who overestimated his chances, as has been shown in *Absalom and Achitophel*. Yet before his attempt at rebellion he was highly popular both with the King and the subjects, which is reflected in Behn's pastoral odes devoted to him. She closely followed his political career: according to Melinda S. Zook, she used his character at least in five poems, in the prologue to *Romulus and Hersilina* and in her first roman à clef, *Love-letters Between a Nobleman and His Sister*. Of course, with the development of the Exclusion Crisis her approach to the Duke underwent substantial transformation. At first, the young Duke seemed to have the potential to become the epitome of a Cavalier. In 1661 he was presented to the King and according to Zook, "[t]he 'astonishing beauty' of the boy's 'outward form' was immediately commented upon along with his surprising lack of mental ability. […] Monmouth was graceful; he danced in court masques."[30] Moreover, in the 1670s he proved to be a brave soldier in the Dutch war and a passionate lover, as reflected in Behn's first poem about Monmouth – "Song to a Scottish tune", which first appeared in *The Covent*

---

[27] Aphra Behn, *Love-Letters Between a Nobleman and His Sister*, unpaginated, *Project Gutenberg* <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/8409/8409-h/8409-h.htm> 28 July 2016.
[28] See Zook, p. 49.
[29] Aphra Behn, *The False Count* (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1996), 2.1.25, p. 16, *Literature Online*, <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:dr:Z000056579:0> 27 July 2016.
[30] Zook, p. 51.

Garden Drolery in 1672. Its folkloric pastoral mode reflected the fact that “Scotland was remote enough to be imagined as a kind of Arcadia, a place of quiet and simple pleasures, and the perfect setting for the pastoral idyll.”[31] Furthermore, Monmouth was easily associated with Scotland not only for his chosen surname Scott, but also because he was made the Duke of Buccleuch. The pastoral idyll shows “young Jemmy” as the epitome of a gay lover, he is the “gayest swain”, irresistible to the lyrical subject fashioned as a modest shepherdess:

> Jemmy every grace displayed,
> Which were enough I trow,
> To conquer any princely maid
> So did he me, I vow. [32]

However, the light, gleeful tone of the song changes in the last stanza, where the dark outside world threatens the enclosed paradise-like space: “But now for Jemmy must I mourn, / Who to the wars must go”. While in the 1672 upon the first publication, this sudden ending would have clear reference to Monmouth’s departure for the Dutch war, after the re-publication in the middle of the Exclusion Crisis, the mourning assumes much more negative connotations of the ruin through Monmouth’s political engagement.

In 1680, Duke of Monmouth’s popularity was already widespread and the idea that he would be a more adequate heir to the throne for his religion became popular, which made him a threat to the Stuart cause, especially for Behn who always stood firmly behind the Duke of York. In her “A Paraphrase of Oenone to Paris” (1680) she made an adaptation of the Ovidian lament of the nymph Oenone over Paris’s leaving. Notably, Behn has shifted the focus of the lament, so that the jealousy of Helen was rather marginalized in the first half of the poem and it is Paris’s new-found ambition, after he realizes he is the King’s son, that destroys the pastoral peace of their simple love.

> To thee I write, mine, while a Shepherd's Swain,
> But now a Prince, that Title you disdain.
> Oh fatal Pomp, that cou'd so soon divide
> What Love, and all our sacred Vows had ty'd![33]

However, as in John Dryden’s *Absalom and Achitophel*, where Absalom is led astray by his cunning advisor whose persuasive tactic is rendered in highly sexual terms of

[31] Zook, p. 52.
[32] Aphra Behn, “Song,” *Oroonoko and Other Writings*, ed. Paul Salzman (Oxford, GBR: Oxford University Press, 1998), p. 217-218.
[33] Aphra Behn, “A PARAPHRASE On Ovid 's Epistle of OENONE to PARIS,” *Poems on several occasions* (1684), 3–6, *Literature Online* <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:po:Z300276584:3> 28 Jul 2016.

seduction, Behn also does not represent Paris as the chief actor of his betrayal of the pastoral idyll:

But now the wisely Grave, who Love despise,
(Themselves past hope) do busily advise.
Whisper Renown, and Glory in thy Ear,
Language which Lovers fright, and Swains ne'er hear.
For Troy they cry! these Shepherds Weeds lay down,
Change Crooks for Scepters! Garlands for a Crown! (152–157)

It is therefore not out of his own decision or because of love for Helen that Paris leaves Oenone; in Behn's version he is corrupted by old politicians who betray the idealistic world of romance for politics. As Zook stresses, "[f]or Behn, it was a matter of sexual politics. Old men, no longer sexually attractive or capable, occupy themselves with corrupting the young and vigorous, whom they envy".[34] An interpretation consistent with the sexual-political analogy present in all Exclusion Crisis texts and mainly with the analogy of seduction employed also in Dryden's discourse of the following year.

In 1681, the year of publication of Dryden's portrayal of Monmouth in *Absalom and Achitophel*, Behn published a broadside ballad "Song, To a New Scotch Tune" featuring young Jemmy again. Now the political discord enters the poem fully and the song is an elegy for the ruin of the "Lad, / Of Royal Birth and Breeding, / With ev'ry Beauty Clad".[35] Regarding the pastoral mode and rendition of Monmouth's character, the poem has an A x B x A x B structure, where the picture offered by the stanzas A is subverted in the revelations of stanzas B. It consists of 4 stanzas, where the first is copying the pastoral mode of the first Scottish song, young Jemmy is introduced as a delightful young swain, a sort of pastoral Cavalier. The second stanza discloses certain discord in the idyll of the first one, when the sincerity of the pastoral ideal is questioned:

In Jemmy 's Powerful Eyes,
Young Gods of Love are playing,
And on his Face there lies
A Thousand Smiles betraying. (9–12)

The third stanza returns back to the positive representation, this time showing Jemmy as the darling of all people, thus reflecting on the popularity of Monmouth

The Pride of all the Youths he was,
The Glory of the Groves,

[34] Zook, p. 52
[35] Aphra Behn, "SONG. To a New Scotch Tune," in *Poems on several occasions* (1684), 1–3, *Literature Online* <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:po:Z300276580:3&rft.accountid=35514> 28 July 2016.

The Joy of ev'ry tender Lass:
The Theam of all our Loves. (21–24)

The last stanza finally fully opens up the topic of political ruin by "ambition" (24) foreboded in the betraying smiles, which cannot be trusted:

The Busie Fopps of State
Have ruin'd his Condition.
For Glittering Hopes he'as left the Shade,
His Peaceful Hours are gone:
By flattering Knaves and Fools betray'd,
Poor Jemmy is undone. (27–32)

For all its difference in genre, the poem's shaping of political reality is very similar to Dryden's. Where he showed Monmouth as seduced – almost in sexual terms – by Shaftesbury, Behn also presented Monmouth as yielding to the influence of other politicians (the reference to the Whig leader would be obvious, though Behn is not as personal as Dryden). His foolish ambition, envisioned in the "glittering hopes" led the promising youth astray and ruined the pastoral idyllic space of the beginning of the poem. With the death of the Earl of Rochester and the disappointment in Monmouth, it is therefore only the Duke of York who remained for Behn as the ideal of the Stuart Cavalier, which is why in the same year, in the dedication to *The Second Part of The Rover*, she promotes his loyalty to the King as "a noble Example for the busie and hot Mutineers of this Age misled by Youth, false Ambition",[36] where the misled youth could be no other than the Duke of Monmouth.

Unfortunately, with the 1681 trial, where he was acquitted, Monmouth's political ambitions did not end. He was implicated in the Rye House Plot in 1683, on 12 July 1683 he was indicted for high treason, later banished from the Court and by January 1684 he went abroad with his political reputation destructed.[37]

Yet even at this time, writers had to be careful of their zeal; in 1683 Aphra Behn, together with the actress who spoke it, were taken into custody and questioned after the staging of *Romulus and Hersilia* with Behn's fervent epilogue railing against the treasonable Whigs.[38] It was spoken by Tarpeia, a ruined "unhappy Maid, / By Fortune, and by faithless Love betray'd."[39] Right from the beginning she develops a parallel between the

[36] Behn, "TO HIS Royal Highness THE DUKE, &c.," in *The Rover, part II*, unpaginated.
[37] Zook, p. 54.
[38] Zook, p. 53.
[39] Aphra Behn, "Epilogue," in *Romulus and Hersilia*, unpaginated, *EEBO* <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A62347.0001.001/1:5?rgn=div1;view=fulltext> 25 July 2016.

sexual ruin and political rebellion: “Love! like Ambition, makes us Rebels too”, with the unforgivable sin of “Rebelling 'gainst a King and Father first.” While Tarpeia solved her moral failure with a suicide, she rails against those who seem willing to excuse the most formidable crime of “Treason 'gainst the KING and State” as a mere “petty Crime”. Although she does not address Monmouth openly, the association of the treason against King and father and the Duke would be fairly established at this point of the political crisis. Therefore, Tarpeia rejects any compassion or excuse by those who only saw Monmouth’s failure as a failed political chance: “But may that Ghost in quiet never rest, / Who thinks it self with Traytors Praises blest.” Apparently, in 1683 it was too early for such open condemnation of the King’s son, who would still be patronized and hence the problems Behn encountered. In his reaction to Dryden and Lee’s *The Duke of Guise* the King accentuated that although he was “dissatisfied and angry with the duke of Monmouth, yet he is not willing that others should abuse him.”[40]

In 1684, after Monmouth’s departure, the situation was changed and he fell out of favour completely. Thus Behn could publish her last poem about this unfortunate figure of the Exclusion Crisis, “Silvio's Complaint: a Song, to a Fine Scotch Tune”. This is a lament of definitive political failure, in which Silvio, “A Noble Youth but all Forlorn”, cries over his misfortune brought about by his own ambition. Each stanza regrets his mistake and ruminates over the lost joys of pastoral idyll with a refrain slightly transformed in each stanza, yet always conveying the foregrounding idea: “'Twere better I's was nere Born, / Ere wisht to be a King.”[41] This time, he is not excused by the speaker, as it is his own lament; nevertheless, he tries to put blame upon others:

> But Curst be yon Tall Oak,
> And Old Thirsis be accurst:
> There I first my peace forsook,
> There I learnt Ambition first.
> Such Glorious Songs of Hero's Crown'd,
> The Restless Swain woud Sing:
> My Soul unknown desires found,
> And Languisht to be King. (41–48)

[40] Zook, p. 53.

[41] Aphra Behn, “Silvio's Complaint: a SONG,” in *Poems on several occasions* (1684), 7–8, *Literature Online* <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:po:Z300276560:3> 28 July 2016.

According to Zook, the oak bears a reference to Charles II, as he was associated with the tree after his escape in the Battle of Worcester 1651 by hiding in the crown of an oak.[42] The identity of the seducing Old Thirsis would be of course clear, Shaftesbury as the old politician ruining the noble young man is a persistent image in a number of political texts concerning Monmouth during his life-time.

However, this was not the end of Behn's engagement with the Duke of Monmouth and the Rye House Plot. After the Exclusion Crisis, Behn's focus has turned from the predominance of drama towards fiction. Between 1684 and 1687 she published her first popular epistolary prose in three parts, *Love-Letters Between a Nobleman and His Sister*. It was a roman à clef based on the events of the Rye House Plot, the Monmouth rebellion of 1685 and the love affair of Lord Grey of Warke with his sister-in-law, Lady Henrietta Berkeley. Lord Grey was implicated in Monmouth's rebellion and already after the death of Charles II, he was "outlawed for high treason, in conspiring the death of the late king."[43] Unlike Monmouth, he escaped execution.

As Paul Salzman has noted, in moving from drama to the chronique scandaleuse, Behn was definitely influenced by the declining state of theatres after their merger, but also by "the vogue for fashionable French forms of prose fiction, and by the associated fascination with fiction as a means for representing current scandals."[44] Therefore she created a plot set during the Huguenot rising in France (as in Dryden's *The Duke of Guise*), where the main plot-line is based on historical allegory and represents the events of the Monmouth rebellion and Lord Grey's escape to Netherlands with his lover, impersonated by Philander and Sylvia.[45] In the later parts, after the peak of Monmouth's rebellion, he appears in Behn's novel as prince Cesario. The fictional prince bears a strong resemblance to the Duke of Monmouth: he is a son of the King, leading a rebellion against his father and he enjoys great popularity and seems a perfect gentleman at first, when described by Philander:

> Cesario, whom the envying world in spite of prejudice must own, has irresistible charms, that godlike form, that sweetness in his face, that softness in his eyes and

[42] Zook, p. 54.
[43] Thomas Jones Howell – William Cobbett – David Jardine, *A Complete Collection of State Trials and Proceedings for High Treason and Other Crimes and Misdemeanors from the Earliest Period to the Year 1783: 1680-88* (T. C. Hansard for Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, 1816), p. 1091, *Google Books* <https://books.google.cz/books?id=rBkwAAAAYAAJ&printsec=frontcover&hl=cs&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false> 30 March 2013.
[44] Paul Salzman, *Reading Early Modern Women's Writing* (Oxford, GBR: Oxford University Press, 2006), p. 216.
[45] See more in Paul Salzman or Patrick Parrinder.

> delicate mouth; and every beauty besides, that women dote on, and men envy: that lovely composition of man and angel! with the addition of his eternal youth and illustrious birth, was formed by heaven and nature for universal conquest![46]

There is a striking similarity between this characterization and the description of the Cavalier Willmore from *The Rover, part II*, which underscores the original image of Monmouth as the true Cavalier. However, as the plot develops, Cesario is characterized more profoundly and the flaws in his character resurface, though from the beginning there is a suspicion in Sylvia's relationship to Cesario, who has seduced her sister Myrtilla, "a yet unspotted maid, fit to produce a race of glorious heroes". To create a closer correspondence between the fictional character and the real person, Behn has perused Monmouth's well-known belief in astrology and superstitions.[47] Cesario is characterized by his appeal to black magic: "he calls up the very devils from hell to his aid, and there is no man famed for necromancy, to whom he does not apply himself." Even this short piece of description shows the marked difference between Monmouth's representation of the previous years and this text, published after his rebellion. While in all the texts of 1678–1684 of both Behn and Dryden, there was always an effort to find excuses for his political behaviour, in *Love-letters* he is fully condemned and appears as a ridiculous character willing to employ even diabolic powers, cowardly and utterly dependent on his mistress. No longer is it "juster to lament him than accuse."[48]

However, the novel's political engagement is more profound than simple personal satire; from the beginning the text employs the fairly typical analogy between sexual and political corruption. Philander and Sylvia's incestuous relationship is a mirror reflecting Philander's rebellious political involvement. This analogy is outspoken and even the characters themselves are aware of this, especially Sylvia at the beginning of her relationship with Philander, when she can be read as the voice of the still uncorrupted (this later changes as her transformation into a ruined libertine takes place). At this moment she complains to Philander that his love is "huddled up confusedly with your graver business of State, and almost lost in the ambitious crowd," thus reflecting the close connection between his sexual affair and political engagement.

Sylvia is the proponent of loyalty in the same terms of virtue as Lady Desbro in *The Roundheads*: "what generous maid would not suspect his vows to a mistress, who breaks

---

[46] Aphra Behn, *Love-Letters Between a Nobleman and His Sister*, unpaginated.

[47] Susan Wiseman, *Conspiracy and Virtue: women, writing, and politics in seventeenth century England* (Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), p. 355.

[48] Dryden, "Absalom and Achitophel," 486.

’em with his prince and master!” Political loyalty is thus equated with sexual faithfulness and honour. In her study *Conspiracy and Virtue*, Susan Wiseman compared Behn’s *Love-letters* with other female nonfictional works written in opposition, like memoirs and collections of letters by Anne Halkett and Rachel Russell, and she realized that “some of the literary practices which attempted to justify political conspiracy by grounding it in personal virtue and— in Halkett’s text more importantly— seek to use political loyalty to underwrite sexual misconduct.”[49] For the lack of other means of justification, these oppositional texts employ personal virtue as a guarantee of political virtue. Aphra Behn’s epistolary novel could therefore be interpreted as a subversion of these authentication techniques in autobiographical writing, as she shows how they attempted to sustain conspiracy through asserting personal virtue of the protagonists. By offering the reader an insight into these techniques in fictional letters of a conspirator, she draws attention to the disruption between words, pretensions to virtue and actual conduct in fiction, and thus to the essentially fictional character of texts like Puritan memoirs or letters.

However, Behn develops the sexual-political analogy even further when she employs the classical examples of Roman emperors so often used in the drama we have analysed in previous chapters. Twice in the novel Philander compares himself to a Roman emperor, always in reference to his mistress. Firstly, when he seduces Sylvia he pretends to put aside his political interest and compares himself to the ill-famed Nero:

> No, were the nation sinking, the great senate of the world confounded, our glorious designs betrayed and ruined, and the vast city all in flames; like Nero, unconcerned, I would sing my everlasting song of love to Sylvia; which no time or fortune shall untune.

Secondly, when he abandons Sylvia and describes his first encounter with Calista he employs the myth of Lucretia: “Just such I fancied famed Lucretia was, when Tarquin first beheld her; nor was the royal ravisher more inflamed than I, or readier for the encounter.” While Lee in *Lucius Junius Brutus* used the myth of Lucretia to show the tyrannical tendencies of the monarch, Aphra Behn twice draws a parallel between a Roman tyrant and the Whig rebel, while the King is innocent and free of all tyrannical tendencies: “what has the King, our good, our gracious monarch, done to *Philander*? […] Who has he oppress’d? Where play’d the tyrant or the ravisher?” In contrast to Philander associated with tyranny, the King is represented as the God-like figure of Dryden’s texts: “one continued miracle;

[49] Wiseman, p. 320.

all good, all gracious, calm and merciful: and this good, this god-like King, is mark'd out for slaughter, […] on whose awful face 'tis impossible to look without the reverence wherewith one would behold a god!"

Apparently Behn reverts the typical accusations of the opposition: instead of the King, she associates effeminacy with Cesario, completely subjugated to his ugly mistress Hermione, and Philander, who seduces Sylvia and then abandons her. Moreover, she disclaims the very basis of the religious Huguenot rising and shows it as driven by ambition of its proponents, rather than by religious beliefs. Philander admits to Sylvia that the League against the King is "a party so opposite to all laws of nature, religion, humanity, and common gratitude" and he only joined them for his own profit "What man of tolerable pride and ambition can be unconcerned, and not put himself into a posture of catching, when a diadem shall be thrown among the crowd?"

Thus the novel is full of corrupted characters stressing the hypocrisy standing behind all rebellious attempts against the true King. The only noble hero of the text would be Octavio, a Cavalier devoid of the compromising libertinism, whose love to Sylvia seems invincible and therefore he decides to retire to a monastery after her treason. Thus, in this fiction Behn has completely abandoned the libertine ethos of the Cavaliers from *The Rover*. Sexual misconduct was fully associated with political subversion and the nobility was equated with virtue in Octavio, showing the aristocratic status as a set of inherent qualities. On the other hand, in the character of Octavio's relative Sebastian, Aphra Behn also reflected the hypocrisy behind Puritan railings about chastity. Sebastian is one of the leading politicians in the Netherlands and he criticizes Octavio for his immorality in the adulterous relationship to Sylvia, but as soon as he meets Sylvia, he falls for her too and forgets all his moral constraints. According to Patrick Parrinder, his "main function in the novel is to show the corruption and imposture of official justice, which appears irrevocably tarnished beside the personal honour of the aristocratic cavalier ready at all times to stake his life on his sword."[50]

Thus the novel returns to the basis of the Stuart ethos; it follows Dryden's *The Spanish Fryar* in the representation of inherent royal power represented by the victimized King's body and promotes the Cavalier ethics based on personal honour as retained in all Behn's work and embodied in the noble Octavio.

---

[50] Patrick Parrinder, *Nation and Novel: The English Novel from Its Origins to the Present Day* (Oxford, GBR: Oxford University Press, UK, 2006), p. 64, *EBRARY* <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/cuni/Doc?id=10177943&ppg=63> 20 July 2016.

6 Conclusion: constant negotiations

Politics and literary interpretation – can the combination be justified? The aim of the preceding chapters was to show the relevance of political interpretation for Restoration literature, as it not only reflects socio-historical processes of the period, but mainly enriches the interpretation itself. As the permanent value of the satirical achievement in *Absalom and Achitophel* proves, the tropes and narrative shaping employed by the individual authors for the commentary of their present allow even modern readers to appreciate the subtle negotiations inherent in their writing. Thus, David Hopkins's defense of Dryden's political writing applies to all the authors discussed in this thesis: "'topical' writing is seldom merely topical: events and personalities of the moment habitually trigger in the poet's mind larger thoughts and speculations about nature and humanity."[1]

From reading our chosen texts, the Exclusion Crisis emerges as an essentially unstable historical period, on the verges of great changes, yet inhibited by a struggle to retain the status quo carefully nurtured in the previous twenty years of Stuart rule. Michael McKeon and Jürgen Habermas abstracted from their readings macro-narratives of substantial socio-historical transformations taking place in the seventeenth century; close-reading of the Exclusion Crisis texts provides the micro-narratives of constant negotiations that brought the transformation into being. Each of the previous chapters was focused on a different author or groups of authors; they often employed very similar tropes and very similar material, yet each of the works forms a specific discourse of its own, in a constant intertextual dialogue – we can thus discern constant negotiation at all levels of cultural and socio-political phenomena, ranging from the macro-historical negotiation between aristocratic, progressive and conservative ideology of Michael McKeon, representative publicness against the rise of the public sphere in Habermas's interpretation or the Tory and Whig conflict of the patriarchal, absolutist conception of kingship against the newly rising social-contract theory. The same dialectical process is taking place in the sphere of literary and political discourse and the realization of the individual cases of negotiation sheds light on the over-all process of transformation.

Nevertheless, the analysis of our studied texts strongly negates all attempts at simplifying reading of Restoration politics in the binary oppositions just presented. It is necessary to view them as a complex set of scales on which individual authors would

[1] Hopkins, p. 2.

position themselves differently at different moments. Thus, although Thomas Shadwell promotes Whig ideology and politics and supports Shaftesbury, he still retains the concept of representative publicness. His smashing critique of the degradation of libertine aristocracy in *The Woman-Captain* is counter-balanced by his promotion of the English Protestant country gentleman as the guarantee of tradition and continuity in *The Lancashire Witches*. Dryden's study of vitiated kingship in *Oedipus* was followed by the idealization of the divine nature of the public body of monarch in *The Spanish Fryar* and *Absalom and Achitophel*, Lee moved from the debasement of rebellion in *Oedipus* to the justification of revolution by tyranny and back to the debasement in *The Duke of Guise*, Aphra Behn's work shows ever-present conflict between her Tory political allegiance and her awareness of gender inequality.

Moreover, the comparative nature of this thesis allowed us to find constant intertextual negotiations between genres as well as between authors. Dryden's and Lee's tragedies represented the disruption of the state through vitiated kingship, symbolized by the tropes of sexual perversion (incest in *Oedipus*, rape in *Caesar Borgia* and *Lucius Junius Brutus*), but they ultimately differed in the narrative solution – where Dryden's tragedies desperately attempted to retain the status quo by asserting our ultimate epistemological inadequacy which prevents any understanding of consequences of our deeds and thus disqualifies any attempts at revolution or political faction, Lee found a way out of the inhibiting situation through a return to the classical republican values of ancient Rome, thus promoting the idea of impersonal Law that transcends our individual existence and to which everyone, including the monarch, is subjugated, a set of values that overcome the quietism and loyalty of the Royalists. At the same time, he retains the opposition between the private and public body of the King which stood at the core of Tory ideology: *Lucius Junius Brutus* acts as the true monarch when he sacrifices his private body symbolized by his beloved son for the body public of the future republic, something Charles was not willing to do. Therefore, while Dryden's work is a typical example of Restoration tragedy as "a desperate reactionary attempt after the English Civil War to reinscribe feudal, aristocratic, monarchical ideology,"[2] Lee seems to be moving forward to embrace a different, more progressive set of values.

Aphra Behn and Dryden stood on the same side of the political spectrum, yet their works could not be more different – Behn as a conscious female author could never adopt

[2] J. Douglas Canfield, *Heroes and States: On the Ideology of Restoration tragedy* (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 2000), p. 1.

the same Filmerian patriarchal understanding of kingship as Dryden and thus where Dryden shows unconditional loyalty to the idealized king (Sancho, David), she promotes a version of Tory ideology based on the Cavalier principle of personal, aristocratic honour and loyalty as personal integrity. However, similarly to Dryden, in her plays the world of aristocratic ideology seems to be fatally threatened by the rising middle classes, which she satirizes as upstarts trying to achieve aristocratic status through public performance and material wealth, but unable to accommodate the intrinsic code of honour. The sense of threat to the Stuart ethos that was embodied in the Duke of Monmouth also led the two authors to distinctly different reactions. Where Dryden attacks through his ingenious satire and crushes the Royal enemy, Behn's pastorals show regret at the ruin of a promising Cavalier who could have been an embodiment and thus continuation of her version of Tory ideology which seems inevitably in decay. However, even during the crisis, Behn's text also negotiate the position of women in the theatrical discourse: her two Jewish monsters subvert Settle's use of female monstrosity as a symbol of political transgression. Ironically, her heroines' undermining of patriarchy allies her with the Whig Thomas Shadwell who promotes English Protestant tradition as a liberating space for women, whereas Otway shows the world of Stuart patriarchy as unprepared for female emancipation. It would be possible to continue with the list for long, including negotiations over the power of the rabble and Whig popular support, the idea of honour as inherited or acquired virtue, questions of religion, anti-Catholicism, propaganda and paranoia; they should all arise as points of conflict from the analyses in the preceding chapters.

Moreover, we have seen negotiations of genre: heroic plays replaced by increasingly private tragedy, engendered in the she-tragedy, the rise of roman à clef as a tool of political writing, mutual influence between sex comedies and the political city comedy etc.; and turning back to the macro-narrative, we have also seen negotiations between historical epochs, between the present discourse, tradition and history in the extensive use of adaptation and appropriation of historical examples, Shakespeare's plays as well as typological examples from the Bible. The complex layering of negotiations makes the texts we have been discussing so complex that it undermines Dryden's complaint about the tragic impact of the Exclusion Crisis on theatres: "Discords and plots, which have undone our age / With the same ruin have o'erwhelmed the stage". On the contrary, the turbulent historical and political changes and social tensions seem to have truly triggered creative forces of Restoration authors.

7 Bibliography

7.1 Primary sources

Banks, John. *Vertue Betray'd*. Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1994. *Literature Online*. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:dr:Z000055695:0&rft.accountid=35514> 20 June 2016.

Behn, Aphra. "A PARAPHRASE On Ovid 's Epistle of OENONE to PARIS." In: *Poems on several occasions* (1684). *Literature Online*. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:po:Z300276584:3> 28 July 2016.

— "A PROLOGUE By Mrs. Behn to her New PLAY, CALLED Like Father, like Son, OR THE Mistaken Brothers." *Literature Online*. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:po:Z200276588:2> 28 July 2016.

— "Epilogue." In: *Romulus and Hersilia*. Unpaginated. *EEBO*. <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A62347.0001.001/1:5?rgn=div1;view=fulltext> 25 July 2016.

— *Love-Letters Between a Nobleman and His Sister*. *Project Gutenberg*. <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/8409/8409-h/8409-h.htm> 28 July 2016.

— "Silvio's Complaint: a SONG." In: *Poems on several occasions* (1684). *Literature Online*. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:po:Z300276560:3> 28 July 2016.

— *Sir Patient Fancy*. Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1996. *Literature Online*. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:dr:Z000056777:0> 25 July 2016.

— "Song." *Oroonoko and Other Writings*. Ed. Paul Salzman. Oxford, GBR: Oxford University Press, 1998, p. 217-218.

— "SONG. To a New Scotch Tune." In: *Poems on several occasions* (1684*). Literature Online*. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:po:Z300276580:3&rft.accountid=35514> 28 July 2016.

— *The False Count*. Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1996. *Literature Online*. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:dr:Z000056579:0> 27 July 2016.

— *The Feign'd Curtizans*. Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1996. *Literature Online*. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:dr:Z000056600:0&rft.accountid=35514> 24 Jul 2016.

— *The Roundheads*. Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1996. *Literature Online*. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:dr:Z000056706:0> 25 July 2016.

— *The Rover*. Cambridge: Penguin Classics, 2011. *Literature Online*. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:dr:Z001599565:0> 27 July 2016.

— *The Rover, part II*. Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1996. *Literature Online*. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:dr:Z000056752:0> 25 July 2016.

— *The Young King*. Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1994. *Literature Online*. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:dr:Z000056842:0> 25 July 2016.

Dryden, John. “Absalom and Achitophel,” *The works of John Dryden*, 43–4, *Literature Online* <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:po:Z300342801:3&rft.accountid=35514> 10 March 2016.

— “Astrea Redux.” In: *The Poems of John Dryden* (1913). *Bartleby*. <http://www.bartleby.com/204/2.html> 27 June 2016.

— “Mac-Flecknoe: A Satire Against Thomas Shadwell.” In: *The works of John Dryden* (1882-1892). *Literature Online*. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:po:Z200342880:2&rft.accountid=35514> 15 May 2016.

— *Oedipus*. Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1994. *Literature Online*. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:dr:Z000074982:0&rft.accountid=35514> 30 March 2016.

— “Prologue to the Earl of Essex.” In: *The Works of John Dryden* (1882–1892). *Literature Online*. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:po:Z300342860:3&rft.accountid=35514> 20 June 2016.

— *Selected Dramas of John Dryden: With the Rehearsal*. Ed. George Villiers. Reprint. London: Forgotten Books, 2013.

— *The Kind Keeper; or, Mr. Limberham*. Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1997. *Literature Online* <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:dr:Z000074746:0&rft.accountid=35514> 20 March 2016.

— “The Medal.” In: *The Works of John Dryden* (1882–1892). *Literature Online*. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:po:Z300342807:3&rft.accountid=35514> 15 May 2016.

— “To His Sacred Majesty. A Panegyric on his Coronation.” In: *The Poetical Works of John Dryden, Volume 1*. London: Bell and Daldy, 1850. *Google Books*. <http://books.google.cz/books?id=RZIOAAAAQAAJ&printsec=frontcover&hl=cs#v=onepage&q&f=false> 10 May 2016.

— “To the reader,” unpaginated, <https://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/d/dryden/john/absalom_and_achitophel/preface.html> 1 Aug 2016.

D’Urfey, Thomas. *The Royalist*. London: Ios. Hindmarsh at the Sign of the Black-Bull near the Royal-Exchange in Cornhill, 1682. *EEBO*. <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A37013.0001.001/1:2?rgn=div1;view=fulltext> 13 June 2016.

Filmer, Robert. *Observations concerning the original and various forms of government…* London: Printed for R.R.C. and are to be sold by Thomas Axe…, 1696. *EEBO*. <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A41307.0001.001?view=toc> 3 May 2016.

— “Patriarcha; or the Natural Power of Kings”. *Online Library of Liberty*. <http://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/filmer-patriarcha-or-the-natural-power-of-kings> 21 July 2016.

Howell, T. J. – Cobbett, W. – Jardine, D. *A Complete Collection of State Trials and Proceedings for High Treason and Other Crimes and Misdemeanors from the Earliest Period to the Year 1783: 1680-88*. T. C. Hansard for Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, 1816. *Google Books*. <https://books.google.cz/books?id=rBkwAAAAYAAJ&printsec=frontcover&hl=cs&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false> 30 March 2013.

James, Elinor. *The CASE between a FATHER and his CHILDREN*. Ann Arbor, MI – Oxford (UK): Text Creation Partnership, 2009. *EEBO* <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A46612.0001.001?view=toc > 31 July 2016.

Lee, Nathaniel. *Caesar Borgia*. Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1994. *Literature Online*. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:dr:Z000096325:0&rft.accountid=35514> 10 April 2016.

— *Lucius Junius Brutus*. London: Richard Tonson – Iacob Tonson, 1681. *EEBO*. <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A49928.0001.001?rgn=main;view=fulltext > 17 March 2016.

— *Theodosius*. Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1994. *Literature Online*. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:dr:Z000096515:0&rft.accountid=35514> 10 April 2016.

Machiavelli, Niccolò. *The Discourses of Niccolò Machiavelli.* Translated by Leslie J. Walker. Oxon – New York: Routledge, 1975. *Google Books*. <https://books.google.cz/books?id=bUL_AQAAQBAJ&pg=PT75&dq=discourses+of+machiavelli&hl=cs&ss=X&ved=0ahUKEwj13r2AzprNAhWCWBQKHUD2BIAQ6AEIGzAA#v=onepage&q=sons%20of%20brubru&f=false> 17 March 2016.

Marvell, Andrew. *An account of the growth of popery and arbitrary government in England…* Ann Arbor, MI – Oxford (UK): Text Creation Partnership, 2003. *EEBO*. <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A52125.0001.001/1:20?rgn=div1;view=toc> 20 July 2016.

Oldham, John. "Sardanapalus: Ode." *Poetrynook*. <http://poetrynook.com/poem/sardanapalus-ode> 15 June 2016.

Otway, Thomas. *Caius Marius*. Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1994. *Literature Online*. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:dr:Z000108225:0&rft.accountid=35514> 11 May 2016.

— *The Orphan*. Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1994. *Literature Online*. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:dr:Z000108292:0&rft.accountid=35514> 28 July 2016.

— *Venice Preserv'd*. Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1994. *Literature Online*. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:dr:Z000108336:0&rft.accountid=35514> 20 June 2016.

Pelling, Edward. *A Sermon Preached Before the Lord Mayor and Court of Aldermen, at St. Mary…* Will. Abington next the Wonder Tavern in Ludgate-street, 1683. *Googe Books*. <https://books.google.cz/books?id=oEM7AQAAMAAJ&dq=/Edward+Pelling,+A+Sermon+Preached+beforb+the+Lord+Mayor&hl=cs&source=gbs_navlinks_s> 6 June 2016.

Sackville, Charles. "My Opinion." In: Alan Rudrum – Joseph Black – Holly Faith Nelson (eds.). *The Broadview Anthology of Seventeenth Century Verse*. New York – Peterborough – Rozelle: Broadview Press, 2001, p. 444.

Settle, Elkanah. *The Female Prelate*. London: W. Cademan..., 1680). *EEBO*. <http://name.umdl.umich.edu/A59312.0001.001> 10 May 2016.

Shadwell, Thomas. *The Lancashire Witches*. Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1997. *English Prose Drama Full-Text Database* <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xr i:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:dr:Z000117983:0> 3 May 2016.

— *The Woman-Captain*. Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1997. *Literature Online*. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:dr:Z000118178:0> 20 June 2016.

Shakespeare, William. "Julius Caesar." In: *Tragedies II.* London: David Campbell Publishers, 1993, p. 247–351.

— "The Rape of Lucrece." In: *The works of William Shakespeare* (1863-1866). *Literature Online*. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:po:Z500846382:5&rft.accountid=35514> 4 Aug 2016

— "Troilus and Cressida." In: *Tragedies II.* London: David Campbell Publishers, 1993, p. 103–246.

Tate, Nahum. *The Second Part of Absalom and Achitophel*. 1682. *Literature Online*. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:po:Z200633382:2&rft.accountid=35514> 10 March 2016.

Wilmot, John, Earl of Rochester. "A Satyr against Reason and Mankind." <https://andromeda.rutgers.edu/~jlynch/Texts/mankind.html> 24 Apr 2016.

— ["A Satire on Charles II"]. In: *The Poems* (1984). *Literature Online* <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:po:Z200538361:2&rft.accountid=35514> 15 June 2016.

— "Song." In: *The Poems*. Basil Blackwell, 1984. *Literature Online.* <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:po:Z200538317:2&rft.accountid=35514> 15 June 2016.

7.2 Secondary sources

Armistead, J. M. "The Tragicomic Design of *Lucius Junius Brutus*: Madness as Providential Therapy." *Papers on Language* 15 (1979), p. 38. *EBSCOhost*. <http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/login.aspx?authtype=shib&custid=s1240919&profile=eds> 9 June 2016.

Battigelli, Anna. "Two Dramas of the Return of the Repressed: Dryden and Lee's Oedipus and the Popish Plot." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 75.1 (March 2012). *JSTOR*. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/hlq.2012.75.1.1> 1 March 2016.

Braun, Laura. "The Ideology of Restoration Poetic Form: John Dryden." *PMLA* 97.3 (May, 1982), p. 395–407. *JSTOR*. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/462230> 7 June 2016.

Brown, Richard. L. "Heroics satirized by 'mad. Nat. Lee'." *Papers on Language & Literature* 19.4 (Fall 1983), p. 385–401, *EBSCOhost*. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?authtype=shib&custid=s1240919&direct=true&db=a9h&AN=7730177&site=eds-live&scope=site&lang=cs> 10 March 2016.

Burke, Helen M. "The Cavalier Myth in *The Rover*." In: Derek Hughes and Janet Todd (eds.). *The Cambridge Companion to Aphra Behn*. Cambridge – Melbourne – New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004, p. 118–34.

Canfield, J. Douglas. *Heroes and States: On the Ideology of Restoration Tragedy*. Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 2000.

Chalmers, Hero. *Royalist Women Writers, 1650-1689*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004). *EBRARY*. <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/cuni/Doc?id=10263660&ppg=170> 22 July 2016.

Chernaik, Warren. *Sexual Freedom in Restoration literature*. Cambridge – New York – Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Coltharp, Duane. “Radical Royalism: strategy and ambivalence in Dryden's tragicomedies.” *Philological Quarterly* 78.4 (Fall 1999). *EZPROXY*. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?authtype=shib&custid=s1240919&direct=true&db=edsglr&AN=edsgcl.72610897&site=eds-live&scope=site&lang=cs> 3 May 2016.

Combe, Kirk. “Shaftesbury and Monmouth as Lords of Misrule: Dryden and Menippean Transformations.” *The Eighteenth Century* 45.3 (2004), p. 231–248. *EBCOhost*. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?authtype=shib&custid=s1240919&direct=true&dd=edsglr&AN=edsgcl.143341235&site=eds-live&scope=site&lang=cs> 15 March 2016.

DePorte, Michael. “Otway and the Straits of Venice.” *Papers on Language & Literature* 18.3 (Summer 1982), p. 245–57, *EBSCOhost*. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?authtype=shib&custid=s1240919&direct=true&db=a9h&AN=7729772&site=eds-live&scope=site&lang=cs> 20 June 2016.

Goreau, Angeline. *Reconstructing Aphra*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980.

Jürgen Habermas. *Strukturální přeměna veřejnosti*. Praha: Filosofia, 2000.

— *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1991.

Hammond, Paul. *John Dryden: A Literary Life*. London: Macmillan, 1991.

Hayden, Judy A. *Of Love and War: The political Voice in the Early Plays of Aphra Behn*. Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi, 2010. *Ebrary*. <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/cuni/Doc?id=10435995&ppg=166> 20 March 2016.

Hayne, Victoria. “‘All Language Then is Vile’: The Theatrical Critique of Political Rhetoric in Nathaniel Lee’s ‘Lucius Junius Brutus’.” *ELH* 63.2 (Summer, 1996), p. 337–365. *JSTOR*. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30030224> 11 May 2016.

Hilský, Martin. *Shakespeare a jeviště svět*. Praha: Academia, 2010.

Hopkins, David. *John Dryden*. Tavistock, GBR: Writers and their Work, 2004. *ProQuest ebrary* <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/cuni/detail.action?docID=10723900> 24 April 2016.

Hughes, Derek. “Human Sacrifice on the Restoration Stage: The Case of *Venice Preserv’d*.” *Philological Quarterly* 88.4 (Fall 2009), p. 365–84. *EBSCOhost*. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?authtype=shib&custid=s1240919&direct=true&db=edsglr&AN=edseds.253628107&site=eds-live&scope=site&lang=cs> 20 June 2016

Hume, Robert D. *The Development of English Drama in the Late Seventeenth Century*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.

Johnson, Odai. *Rehearsing the Revolution: Radical Performance, Radical Politics in the English Restoration*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2000.

Kantorowicz, Ernst H. *Dvě těla krále: studie z dějin středověké politické teologie*. Praha: Argo, 2014.

Kovář, Martin. *Anglie posledních Stuartovců 1658-1714*. Praha: Karolinum, 1998.

— *Stuartovská Anglie*. Praha: Libri, 2001.

Loftis, John. "Introduction." In: *Lucius Junius Brutus*. Lincoln: University of Nebrasca Press, 1967, p. xi–xxiv. *Google Books*. <https://books.google.cz/books?id=6WQN2zHjlCUC&lpg=PR1&dq=loftis%20lucius%20junius%20brutus&hl=cs&pg=PP1#v=onepage&q=loftis%20lucius%20junius%20brutus&f=false> 17 March 2016

McDowell, Paula. *The Women of Grub Street*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.

McKeon, Michael. *The Origins of the English Novel 1600–1740*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987.

Miller, John. *The Restoration and the England of Charles II*. London – New York: Longman, 1997.

Morris, Christopher. "Shakespeare's Politics." *The Historical Journal* 8.3 (1965), p. 293–308. *JSTOR*. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3020428> 30 April 2016.

Morrow, Laurie P. "Chastity and Castration in Otway's 'The Orphan'." *South Central Review* 2.4 (Winter, 1985), p. 17–30. *JSTOR*. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3189269> 19 June 2016.

Munns, Jessica. "Change, skepticism, and uncertainty." In: Deborah Payne Fisk (ed.). *The Cambridge Companion to English Restoration Theatre*. Cambridge – New York – Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2000, p. 142–157.

Nicoll, Allardyce. *British Drama*. London: Harap, 1978.

O'Donnell, Mary Ann. "Chronology." In: Derek Hughes – Janet Todd (eds.). *The Cambridge Companion to Aphra Behn*. Cambridge – Melbourne – New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004, p. xi–xxii.

Owen, Susan J. "Behn's dramatic response to Restoration politics." In: Derek Hughes – Janet Todd (eds.). *The Cambridge Companion to Aphra Behn*. Cambridge – Melbourne – New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004, p. 68–82.

— "Drama and political crisis." In: Deborah Payne Fisk (ed.). *The Cambridge Companion to English Restoration Theatre*. Cambridge – New York – Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2000, p. 158–173.

— *Restoration Theatre and Crisis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

— "The Politics of John Dryden's *The Spanish Fryar; or, the Double Discovery*." *English* 43 (1994), p. 97–113. *Oxford Journals*. <http://english.oxfordjournals.org> 3 May 2016.

Owens, W. R. – Goodman, Lizbeth. *Shakespeare, Aphra Behn and the Canon*. London – New York: Routledge – The Open University, 1996.

Parrinder, Patrick. *Nation and Novel: The English Novel from Its Origins to the Present Day*. Oxford, GBR: Oxford University Press, UK, 2006. *EBRARY*. <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/cuni/Doc?id=10177943&ppg=63> 20 July 2016.

Petrakos, Ross. "'A Pattern for Princes to Live by': Popery and Elizabethan History During England's Exclusion Crisis, 1679–1681." *American, British and Canadian Studies Journal* 25.1, p. 132–154. *DE GRUYTER*. <http://www.degruyter.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/view/j/abcsj> 27 June 2016.

Rustici, Craig M. "Gender, Disguise, and Usurpation: The Female Prelate and the Popish Successor." *Modern Philology* 98.2 (2000), p. 271–298. *EBSCOhost*. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?authtype=shib&custid=s1240919&direct=true&db=edsjsr&AN=edsjsr.438936&site=eds-live&scope=site&lang=cs> 25 May 2016.

Sabine, George H. –Thorson, Thomas L. *A History of Political Theory*. New York: Dryden Press, 1989.

Salzman, Paul. *Reading Early Modern Women's Writing*. Oxford, GBR: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Schille, Candy B. K. "At the Crossroads: Gendered Desire, Political Occasion, and Dryden and Lee's Oedipus." *Papers on Language & Literature* 40.3 (Summer 2004). *EBSCO*. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsglr&an=edsgcl.122815798&scope=site> 1 March 2016.

Shell, Alison. *Catholicism, Controversy and the English Literary Imagination, 1558–1660*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. *Google Books*. <https://books.google.cz/books?id=BIniAzE12iQC&printsec=frontcover&dq=shell+catholicism&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjolPCx3qfOAhWF7xQKHUfvC1EQ6AEIHTAA#v=onepage&q=shell%20catholicism&f=false> 30 July 2016.

— "Popish Plots: *The Feign'd Curtizans* in context." In Janet Todd (ed.). *Aphra Behn Studies*. Cambridge – New York – Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1996, p. 30–49.

Solomon, Harry M. "The Rhetoric of 'Redressing Grievances': Court Propaganda as the Hermeneutical Key to Venice Preserv'd." *ELH* 53.2 (Summer, 1986), p. 289–310. *JSTOR*. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2873258> 19 June 2016.

Staves, Susan. "Women and Society." In Derek Hughes and Janet Todd (eds.). *The Cambridge Companion to Aphra Behn*. Cambridge – Melbourne – New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004. 12–28.

Tanner, Tony. "Introduction." In: William Shakespeare. *Tragedies II*. London: David Campbell Publishers, 1993, p. xi–cxi.

Thomas, W. K. *The Crafting of Absalom and Achitophel: Dryden's Pen for a Party*. Waterloo, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1978. *Google Books*. <https://books.google.cz/books?id=Z60ZyrmYznIC&pg=PA49&dq=anthony+ashley+cooper+silver+pipe&hh=cs&sa=X&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=anthony%20ashley%20cooper%20silver%20pipe&f=false> 25 June 2016.

Tomalin, Claire. *Samuel Pepys: The Unequalled Self*. New York: Vintage Books, 2003.

Vieth, David M. "Psychological Myth as Tragedy: Nathaniel Lee's *Lucius Junius Brutus*." *HLQ* 39.1 (November 1975), p. 57–76. *JSTOR*. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3816787> 11 May 2016

Wallace, John M. "Otway's 'Caius Marius' and the Exclusion Crisis." *Modern Philology* 85.4 (May, 1988), pp. 363–372. *JSTOR*. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/438346> 6 June 2016.

Webster, Jeremy W. *Performing Libertinism in Charles II's Court: Politics, Drama, Sexuality*. Gordonsville, VA, USA: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. *Ebrary*. <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/cuni/Doc?id=10135505&ppg=21> 30 Jan 2016.

Wheatley, Christopher J. "Tragedy." In: Deborah Payne Fisk (ed.). *The Cambridge Companion to English Restoration Theatre*. Cambridge – New York – Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2000, p. 70–85.

Whiting, George W. "Political Satire in London Stage Plays, 1680-83." *Modern Philology* 28.1 (Aug. 1930), p. 29–43. *JSTOR*. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/433232> 10 May 2016.

Wiseman, Susan. *Conspiracy and Virtue: women, writing, and politics in seventeenth century England*. Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Zaret, David. "Religion, Science and Printing in the Public Spheres in Seventeenth-century England." In: Craig J. Calhoun (ed.). *Habermas and the Public Sphere*. Cambridge (Mass.) – London: MIT Press, 1992.

Zook, Melinda S. "The political poetry of Aphra Behn." In: Derek Hughes – Janet Todd (eds.). *The Cambridge Companion to Aphra Behn*. Cambridge, GBR: Cambridge University Press, 2004, p. 46–67.