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A Note on Citations

When a play is cited in the text, the year of performance followed by that of publication has been added within parentheses, unless both dates coincide. For the rest of the texts, the date given is that of publication. Titles of plays have been modernised, except when they appear as part of a quotation.

Quotations from plays are followed by reference to act, scene and line number/s within brackets, separated by dots (e.g., 2.4.26-29). When there is no line numbering, the page number has been added to the reference (e.g., 2.4, p.41). In the case of multi-volume works, number of volume precedes the reference to act, scene and page/line number (e.g. 1: 2.4, p.41). Prefaces, dedications, prologues and epilogues are cited only by page number.

Quotations from critical texts are referenced by page number. If the work cited has more than one volume, the volume number has been added and separated from the page number by colon (e.g., 2: 65). When several works by the same author are used, they are identified by name of the author and publication year.
1. Introduction

In the last decades there has been an increasing interest in editing Restoration comedies, which has allowed modern readers to fully enjoy these works without the obvious difficulties posed by linguistic or cultural obstacles. Traditionally, both scholars and editors have focused almost exclusively on those comedies produced in two specific periods, either in the 1670s, whose most representative comedies—like Wycherley’s *The Country Wife* (1675) or Etherege’s *The Man of Mode* (1676)—have been repeatedly published in annotated editions, or at the turn of the century, when playwrights such as William Congreve, George Farquhar, John Vanbrugh and Colley Cibber reached their peak, along with a group of female authors who have also attracted considerable critical attention in recent years, such as Delarivier Manley, Mary Pix, Catharine Trotter or Susanna Centlivre.

As might be expected with one of the most distinguished figures of Restoration drama, Congreve has been extensively edited. From *The Complete Works of William Congreve*, edited in 1923 by Montague Summers, to the late D. F. McKenzie’s *The Works of William Congreve* (Oxford University Press, 2011), an exhaustive study of his comedies and his prose works in three volumes and over 2,000 pages. Prior to McKenzie’s, there were many other editions of Congreve, some of them comprising his comic pieces exclusively. Thus, major publishing houses brought out accessible, paperback critical volumes: Alexander Charles Ewald edited Congreve’s *Complete Plays* for The Mermaid Dramabook series (Ernest Benn, 1948/ Hill and Wang, NY, 1956), Anthony G. Henderson edited the comedies for Cambridge University Press (1982) and Eric S. Rump for Penguin (1985). Moreover, three of the comedies have also been issued separately in critical editions: *The Double-Dealer* (1693; 1694) was edited by J. C. Ross for the New Mermaids series (A & C Black, 1981); *Love for Love* (1695), by Emmett L. Avery for the Regents Restoration Drama Series (University of

---

1 Editions of his collected plays were also produced by F.W. Bateson (*Works*, Peter Davies, 1930) and Herbert J. Davis (*Complete Plays*, Chicago University Press, 1967).
Nebraska Press, 1966) and by Malcolm Kelsall, also for New Mermaids (Ernest Benn, 1969; rev. 1999); and *The Way of the World* (1700) by Kathleen M. Lynch for Regents Restoration Drama (University of Nebraska Press, 1965), and twice by Brian Gibbons for New Mermaids (Ernest Benn, 1971 and 1993).

Sir George Farquhar has also attracted the attention of editors: *The Complete Works of George Farquhar* (Nonesuch Press, 1930) was edited by Charles Stonehill, Clarendon Press issued *The Works of George Farquhar* in two volumes (Shirley Strum Kenny 1988), and some years later Oxford selected some of his plays for its World’s Classic series in the volume *The Recruiting Officer and Other Plays* (ed. by William Myers, 1995). Both the Regents Restoration Drama and the New Mermaids Series published individual annotated editions of his two most popular comedies: *The Recruiting Officer* (1706), edited by Michael Shugrue for Regents (1965), and by John Ross for New Mermaids (Ernest Benn, 1977) and later again in a new edition by Tiffany Stern (Methuen, 2007); and *The Beaux’ Stratagem* (1707), edited by Charles N. Fifer for Regents (1977) and by Michael Cordner (Ernest Benn, 1976) and Ann Blake (Methuen 2005) for New Mermaids. Both plays have also appeared in Norman Jeffares’ four-volume collection *Restoration Comedy* (Rowman and Littelfield, 1974) and in David Womersley’s anthology *Restoration Drama: An Anthology* (Blackwell, 2000);^2^ *The Recruiting Officer* was edited by Helen M. Burke for J. Douglas Canfield’s *The Broadview Anthology of Restoration and Early Eighteenth-Century Drama* (Broadview, 2001).

Sir John Vanbrugh has also proved a favourite: The four volumes of *The Complete Works of Sir John Vanbrugh* (Nonesuch Press, 1927) were edited by Bonamy Dobrée and Geoffrey Webb, who compiled all his plays and his work in prose, including his letters. Much more recently, Penguin issued *Sir John Vanbrugh: Four Comedies* (ed. by Michael Cordner, 1989), which included both *The Relapse* (1696; 1697) and *The Provoked Wife* (1697),

---

^2^ Jeffares also included Farquhar’s *The Constant Couple* (1699; 1700) in his collection (Vol. 4).
while Oxford has lately published Brean Hammond’s edition of The Relapse and Other Plays (2011). As in Farquhar’s case, there are several single editions of Vanbrugh’s most popular plays. The Relapse has been edited by Eugene Waith (Bantam Books, 1968), Curt A. Zimansky (Regents Restoration Drama Series, 1970), and Bernard Harris (New Mermaids, 1971; reprinted in 1995). Besides, it was selected for the same three anthologies mentioned above: Jeffares’, Womersley’s and Canfield’s (here, edited by James E. Gill). The Provoked Wife has likewise been presented in individual editions by Curt A. Zimansky (Regents Restoration Drama Series 1970), James L. Smith (New Mermaids, 1974) and Anthony Coleman (The Revels Plays, 1982), and was included by Jeffares in vol. 3 of his Restoration Comedy (1974). Finally, Thomas E. Lowderbaugh edited The Confederacy (1705) for his PhD dissertation at the University of Maryland: “A Critical Edition of Sir John Vanbrugh’s The Confederacy” (1976). Regarding Cibber, Maureen Sullivan edited Colley Cibber. Three Sentimental Comedies (Yale University Press, 1973), which comprised Love’s Last Shift (1696), The Careless Husband (1704; 1705) and The Lady’s Last Stake (1707; 1708). Love’s Last Shift and The Careless Husband were also edited by Jeffares for his collection (vols. 3 and 4, 1974), and the first of these comedies appeared as well in the anthologies compiled by Womersley (2000) and Canfield (2001, ed. by Gary A. Richardson).

In the late 1690s and the first years of the 18th century, a number of female playwrights emerged in the London theatrical scene, following on the footsteps of Aphra Behn: the young woman who calls herself ‘Ariadne,’ Delarivier Manley, Catharine Trotter, Mary Pix and Susanna Centlivre. Prompted by the recent boom of gender studies, many of their plays have been published in annotated editions in the last few decades.³ ‘Ariadne’ had only one play produced, She Ventures and He Wins (1695), which was edited in a collection of works by female playwrights put together by Paddy Lyons and Fidelis Morgan (Dent, 1981). In 1981 the anthology edited by Fidelis Morgan, The Female Wits, was printed by a firm specializing in women’s literature: Virago. From the 1990s, interest spread to mainstream publishers as well.
1991). Manley and Trotter were better known for their tragedies and wrote only one comedy each: *The Lost Lover or The Jealous Husband* (1696) and *Love at a Loss, or, Most Votes Carry It* (1700; 1701), respectively. Both are available, in critical editions, in the collection compiled by Derek Hughes *Eighteenth-Century Women Playwrights, Vol. 2* (Pickering and Chatto, 2001) and Trotter’s found its way too into Canfield’s *Broadview Anthology* (ed. by Roxanne M. Kent-Drury, 2001). As regards Mary Pix, *The Spanish Wives* (1696) was edited as a PhD dissertation by Louise Barbour (University of Yale, 1975), *The Deceiver Deceived* (1697) in vol. 2 of Hughes’s anthology (2001) and *The Beau Defeated; or, the Lucky Younger Brother* (1700) in Lyons and Morgan’s *Female Playwrights* (Dent, 1991). Finally, three of Susannah Centlivre’s comedies have appeared in individual editions by Broadview Press: *The Basset Table* (1705), edited by Jane Milling (2009), *The Wonder: A Woman Keeps a Secret* (1714), by John O’Brien (2004) and *A Bold Stroke for a Wife* (1718) by Nancy Copeland (1995). One more comedy, *The Busy Body* (1709) was included in the volume edited by Lyons and Morgan (Dent, 1991), and all four in vol. 3 of Hughes’s anthology (2001) of female playwrights.

As the survey above shows, there is an ample number of critical editions of comedies produced at the turn of the century. On the contrary, those plays produced in the aftermath of the Glorious revolution are more rarely edited. With a few exceptions, those that are available in critical editions were published as part of larger collections of a given author’s complete works: Shadwell’s four post-Revolution plays in Montague Summers’ *The Complete Works of Thomas Shadwell* (1927), Dryden’s *Amphitryon* (1690) in Summers’ edition of his *Dramatic Works* (1931) and The University of California’s *The Works of John Dryden* (ed. by T. Swedenberg et al., 1956-97); Southerne’s *Sir Anthony Love* (1690; 1691) and *The Wives’ Excuse* (1691; 1692) in Robert Jordan and Harold Love’s *The Works of Thomas Southerne* (Clarendon Press, 1988); and Crowne’s *The English Friar* (1690) in B. J. McMullin’s *The Comedies of John Crowne* (Garland, 1984). However, there are hardly a handful of
individual editions of comedies produced in this period: Shadwell’s *Bury Fair* (1689) was edited by J. C. Ross for Garland (1995); Southerne’s *The Wives’ Excuse* (1691; 1692) and *The Maid’s Last Shift* (1693) by Ralph R. Thornton (Livingston, 1973 and 1978); Durfey’s *Love for Money* (1691) was edited as a PhD dissertation in 1950 (Donald W. Sanville, University of Pennsylvania), *The Richmond Heiress* (1693) was edited by Adam Biswanger (Garland, 1987), and *The Marriage-Hater Matched* (1692) has just been published in a critical edition as part of the ongoing Restoration Comedy Project at the Universidad de Sevilla (Gómez-Lara, Mora and de Pando, 2014). But there are still a good number of plays produced in these crucial years when comedy is exploring new ways that have not been given sufficient consideration. *Greenwich Park* is a clear example.

It is likely that Mountfort’s brilliant acting career eclipsed, to some extent, his contribution to Restoration comedy as a playwright, as his work has not attracted much attention. His works have been reprinted in the Scholars’ Facsimiles series (Miller, 1977), but none of the four plays he composed has ever been published in a critical edition, which is particularly noteworthy in the case of *Greenwich Park*. Mountfort’s last, and best, play lacks not only a scholarly, annotated text, but also a body of commentary discussing it. The only article focusing specifically on the play, Martin Walsh’s “The Significance of William Mountfort’s *Greenwich-Park,*” dates back to 1973; more recently, Brian Corman has approached the play, though only as part of a broader study — *Genre and Generic Change in English Comedy 1660-1710* (1993)— dealing with six representative comedies of the 1690s. Other scholars, like Robert Hume — *The Development of English Drama in the Late Seventeenth Century* — or Derek Hughes — *English Drama, 1660-1700* — have briefly mentioned it within more general studies of Restoration theatre.

---

4 Shadwell’s *The Volunteers* (1692) was also edited in 1930 by D.M. Walmsley, but paired in the same volume with *Epsom Wells* (1672; 1673).
This thesis aims at providing both a critical edition and a comprehensive analysis of *Greenwich Park*, with a double purpose. First, the edition intends to offer a revised, modern-spelling text which will facilitate its understanding by the 21st century reader, along with a corpus of notes which complements the text with valuable information. Second, the analysis unveils the role of Mountfort’s work in the redefinition of comic models after the advent of William and Mary: its ingenious balance between elements taken from both the old, libertine comedy of the 1670s and the new sentimental trend makes it a transitional play which anticipates the comic modes that will triumph the 18th century, and approaches the use of space as an integral element in developing its plot and portraying a specific geopolitical reality in post-Revolution London. Finally, this study examines the use of space in *Greenwich Park* at a twofold level: as an integral element in developing the fabric of the play, since both the settings and the characters are depicted in terms of the dichotomy between public and private space; and as a means of portraying a specific geopolitical reality in post-Revolution London: the physical and moral exodus from the Town and its replacement with the East End.

The present dissertation is organised in several chapters, the first one being this Introduction. Chapter 2 recounts both William Mountfort’s biography and *Greenwich Park*’s stage “life.” On the one hand, different sources (Albert S. Borgman, H. Highfill *et al.*, Deborah Payne Fisk, John Genest, Colley Cibber, etc.) have been considered in order to offer a detailed description of his two-fold career as actor and playwright: his triumphs onstage, not only his individual achievements —particularly in the role of the elegant rake of quality— but also along with his wife, as they became the gay couple *par excellence* in the late 1680s and early 1690s; and lastly his tragic and premature death. On the other hand, *The London Stage* has been essential to draw the stage history of Mountfort’s play and its successful dramatic trajectory, lasting for over fifty years after its first night, in April 1691.
Chapter 3 attempts to place *Greenwich Park* in the social and literary context in which it was produced. It first describes the socio-political scenario succeeding the Glorious Revolution and the impact of the new monarchs on the nation in general, and on the theatre in particular. Next, it presents a concise overview of Restoration comedy to draw its evolution and different categorisations, building on Robert Hume’s analysis of the development of dramatic models. The most relevant pieces in this evolution are singled out and approached to elucidate how they contributed to the genre: first in the early 1660s (James Howard’s *The English Monsieur*, George Etherege’s *The Comical Revenge*), then, as part of the debate between comedy of wits/manners and comedy of humours in the late 1660s (Shadwell’s *The Sullen Lovers* and Etherege’s *She Would if She Could*), to conclude with the rise of the “sex comedy” in the mid-1670s (Etherege’s *The Man of Mode*, William Wycherley’s *The Country Wife* and Durfey’s *A Fond Husband*). This gives way to the debate on the idea of “change” in Restoration comedy, a section which opens by reviewing critical opinions on the issue. The diverse points of view of scholars such as J. H. Smith, A. Scouten, R. Hume, Corman, K. Combe, J. D. Canfield, M. Novak, M. Cordner, or Pat Gill are contrasted in order to establish a framework on which to base the analysis; resulting concepts such as “cynical,” “sentimental,” “exemplary,” “old hard,” “new humane,” “satirical,” or “libertine” comedy are approached and integrated into the debate. The ideas discussed in this section are then applied to Mountfort’s play, examining closely its plot and subplots, its characters and the values endorsed by the poetic justice dispensed in the denouement. The chapter concludes by defining *Greenwich Park* as a transitional play within the thematic and stylistic evolution Restoration comedy underwent in the final decade of the 17th century.

Chapter 4 constitutes the central part of this work: a critical edition of *Greenwich Park*, based on the collation of the three extant editions of the play: the Q (1691), the D1 (1710) and the D2 (1720) texts. The result is a modern-spelling version of the play accessible to a present-day reader who may not be familiar with Early Modern English.
writing conventions, but who wishes to enjoy an entertaining comedy. Besides, the text is conveniently annotated in order to assist the reader when confronted with lexical, historical and cultural references. The edition is preceded by a description of the editorial policy as well as the procedures followed to establish and approach the copy-text.

Chapter 5 builds on the evidence presented in the play-text to analyze the essential role that the concept of space, and the dichotomy between its public and private uses, plays in Greenwich Park. The first section of the chapter determines urban geography as the theoretical framework for the analysis of both public and private spaces in the play; within this general perspective, positivism, humanism and structuralism are approached, and questioned, as conjectural starting points for the discussion. The structuralist paradigm is enriched with the incorporation of the concept of “liminality” and the theories on social space proposed by the French philosopher Henri Lefebvre, thus refining the approach to analyse the urban geography of Early Modern London. The study of the City expansion is complemented with valuable insights from scholars such as John Schofield, Laura Williams and Adam Zucker; the exploration of public and private spaces in the capital is indebted to Vanessa Harding’s enlightening contributions to the field, along with Cynthia Wall’s; the section dealing with gender and display in public spaces turns to William Pritchard’s Outward Appearances (2008).

The final part of Chapter 5 proposes a close reading of the play in order to insert it in the tradition of 17th century topographical comedy —as described by Richard Perkinson and Paul W. Miller (1990)— as well as to articulate a debate around space and class, in the first place, and public and private identities, in the second. The dissertation closes with the main conclusions drawn from the analysis of Mountfort’s Greenwich Park, in Chapter 6, and the list of Works Cited in the course of this study.
2. William Mountfort and *Greenwich Park*

2.1. Mountfort and his Time

When describing William Mountfort’s life—and death, in fact—it is difficult to distinguish between veracity and fictional fabrication concerning certain events. The truth is that little is known about him with absolute certainty, and so, a great deal of the information regarding the actor-playwright is either conjectural or contradictory.

Mountfort was born ca. 1664; the document *Some Account of the Life of Mr. Mountfort* prefacing the 1720 edition of his plays states that his father was “Captain Mountfort, a gentleman of good family in Staffordshire” (iii), where Mountfort apparently would have spent his childhood. None of these facts, however, can be corroborated: Borgman traced several Mountforts and Mountfords living in the mid-17th century, but was unable to ascertain if any of them were related to the actor (11). Gifted for music and dance—“he well understood Musick, could sing very agreeably, and he Danc’d finely,” the *Account* explains (iv)—and “trapped” in “the solitary Amusements of a Rural Life” (iv), young Mountfort set out for London before age 14. There he would find an ideal arena for his abilities: the theatre.

It did not take long for him to become acquainted with the stage world. Soon after his arrival in the capital he became a member of the Duke’s Company at the Dorset Garden Theatre. The four lines allotted to a “Young Mumford” in *The Counterfeits* (a comedy attributed to John Leanerd) in May 1678 were his early theatrical debut, at least officially, since Highfill et al. argue: “He had doubtless been acting unnamed parts before that, and following his first billing he probably continued acting roles that were not named in cast lists” (10: 354). Two years later, he would play the role of Jack the Barber’s boy in *The Revenge; or a Match in Newgate* (1680), a short but significant part as he shared a scene
with two acclaimed comedians of the Duke’s: Thomas Jevon and Anthony Leigh, with whom Mountfort would keep acting from then on.

The merging of the King’s and the Duke’s companies in 1682 would bring new minor roles to Mountfort in the succeeding years, both in new plays, like Alphonso Corso in Dryden and Lee’s *The Duke of Guise* (1682) or Mr. Hartwell in Ravenscroft’s *Dame Dobson* (1683), and in revivals, such as Metellus Cimber in Shakespeare’s *Julius Caesar* (1683?), Master Tallboy and the Lawyer in Brome’s *A Jovial Crew* (1683), or Mr. Nonsense in Brome’s *Northern Lass* (1684). Soon his first important part would arrive: the title character in John Crowne’s *Sir Courtly Nice*, a play whose planned premiere in early February 1685 had to be postponed due to King Charles II’s death. From its opening, on 9 May, the play was a complete success, and Mountfort’s performance a resounding triumph which would be crucial to forge his future reputation on the stage. In the mere seven years of life that lay before him, until his premature death in 1692, Mountfort would become a major figure in London theatre, second only to the legendary Betterton.

Crowne’s remarkable characterisation of Sir Courtly Nice—in the opinion of Albert Borgman, “the second of the three great fops” in late 17th century, after Sir Fopling Flutter and before Sir Novelty Fashion (17)— allowed Mountfort to exhibit all his talents, for which he was amply admired: “Sir Courtly was so nicely Perform’d, that not any succeeding, but Mr. Cyber has Equall’d him,” said John Downes in his *Roscius Anglicanus* (85), and precisely actor Colley Cibber would not spare his appraisal: “In that of Sir Courtly Nice his Excellence was still greater: There his whole Man, Voice, Mien, and Gesture was no longer Monfort, but another Person” (1968: 76).

---

5 The date of the revival of *Julius Caesar* is uncertain. Mountfort’s name appears in the cast given in an edition published in 1684. LS notes that W.W. Greg “saw a copy in which this cast was dated 1681” (325), but that date is impossible. The 1684 cast includes actors like Cardell Goodman or Sarah Cooke, who were originally members of the King’s Company and could not have acted with Mountfort before the fusion of 1682.
Due to his recently gained popularity and his undeniable comic gift, “his Company was desir’d by Persons of the best Figure and Fashion, whom he was sure to Entertain, at the same he Improv’d from them” (Some Acount v). Among them was Lord Chancellor Jeffreys, who particularly enjoyed the actor’s imitations of the most prominent lawyers of his time. The absence of references to Mountfort in the dramatic records during the year 1686 suggests that he may have withdrawn from the stage and lived in Jeffreys’ household for some time. Two sources are normally quoted in relation to these events. First, the Memoirs of Sir John Reresby, where the author provides a lively account of a dinner he attended at Jeffreys’ house on 18 January 1686 and the subsequent entertainments:

After dinner the Chancellor, haveing drunke smartly at dinner (which was his custome) called for one Monfort, a gentleman of his that had been a comedian, an excellent mimick … he acted all the principal lawyers of the age, in their tone of voice, and action or gesture of body; and thus ridiculed not only the lawyers, but the law itselxe. (408)

The second document is more scandalous, an anonymous satire suggesting that the actor would have taken advantage of his familiar standing in the Chancellor’s household to cuckold him, and that Jeffreys would have retaliated in kind:

There’s a story of late
That the Chancellor’s mate
Has been f----d and been f----d by player Mountfort;
Which though false, yet’s as true,
My Lord gave him his due,
For he had a small tilt at his bum for it. (Lord 4: 72)

In the summer of that same year, William Mountfort, who was 22 years old, and Susanna Percival, 19 years old— the most promising of the younger players in the United
Company, in Borgman’s opinion (24)—were married in the parish of St Giles-in-the-Fields, London. Mrs. Mountfort was actually the daughter of a minor actor who joined the Duke’s Company in 1673, and she had been playing secondary roles for both the King’s and the United companies before her matrimony. Some months later, the newly married actors would become passionate lovers onstage, creating one of the most acclaimed and expected romantic couples for the audience in the following years. Their debut took place in Nahum Tate’s adaptation of Fletcher’s *The Island Princess* (1687), which was followed by Behn’s *The Emperor of the Moon* (1687). An excellent cast formed by Leigh, Underhill, Jevon and Mrs. Corey, whom the Mountforts would join in increasingly important roles, contributed to the success of this entertaining farce.

Although not many new tragedies had been written since the creation of the United Company, Mountfort decided to try his hand at the genre and start his career as a playwright with *The Injured Lovers: or, The Ambitious Father* (February 1688) in whose Prologue he made a reference to his recent wedding:

*I’m a Poet, Married, and a Player:

The Greatest of these Curses is the First;

As for the latter two, I know the worst.” [A3]*

The piece was a risky step at the time and certainly it was not well received, partly because of the playwright’s understandable novice style, and partly due to the play’s plot and tone: a mixture of pathos and horror in which nearly all of the main characters are brutally killed,

---


7 Susanna Percival’s name first appeared in two King’s Company productions in the season 1681-1682: *Sir Barnaby Whig* (November 1681) and *The Injured Princess* (March 1682); see LS 302, 307.

8 In this Prologue, Mountfort echoed the words of another popular player-poet, comedian Joe Haines. In the Epilogue to Crowne’s *The Ambitious Statesman* (1679), Haines spoke these lines: “The author doom’d me to be hang’d to Night; /But now I hop’d I should be hanged out right. /For I’ve three plagues no flesh and blood can bear, /I am a Poet, Married, and a Player” (87).
either being stabbed, poisoned or committing suicide. Despite the presence of sentimental elements, like the reconciliation between Dorelanus (played by Mountfort) and Rheusanes (Betterton) and the scruples shown by the King (performed by Williams), the tragic tone prevails and the King proves to be a spiteful character who even rapes the character acted by Mrs. Bracegirdle, Antelina (in revenge, she will poison his wine, which both will drink). Mrs. Barry, finally, impersonated Princess Oryala, in love with Rheusanes, but loved by his friend Dorelanus. Hume attributes the play’s cold reception to the context when it was produced: “Mountfort was unlucky in being a few years ahead of audience taste, for this sort of thing flourished anew in the mid-nineties: *The Royal Mischief* and *Cyrus the Great* are examples already noted” (1976: 364).

As shall be discussed in Chapter 3, the year 1688 implied the beginning of a new socio-political era in England, marked by a rapid succession of crucial events, which Mountfort witnessed first-hand and to which he knew how to adapt. Coincidentally, that same year—which had opened with the premiere of his first work—would mark the beginning of a frantic period of theatrical activity in his life: in a little more than four years, he not only would write three more plays and revise or collaborate in the composition of several more, but he also would perform crucial roles in a number of plays which punctuated the stylistic evolution of Restoration comedy. Mountfort, therefore, contributed to that evolution from his double role as actor and playwright till his death in 1692.9

Although published in March 1697, Mountfort’s second play was *The Life and Death of Doctor Faustus, Made into a Farce* (the title-page adds “With the Humours of Harlequin and

---

9 Borgman explains that Mountfort “was the busiest of the actors in new plays from February, 1688, to the summer of 1691. In that time he had appeared in at least eighteen new parts, all of which were long and two-thirds of which were leading roles. In this same period, Betterton had acted in six new plays, Mrs. Barry in nine, and the principal comedian Leigh in seventeen” (104-05).
Scaramouche”), according to Hume’s hypothesis. Hume dates its premiere in the spring of 1688, with Mountfort still alive and not long after he actually performed in Marlowe’s work, to which his farce is obviously indebted. Mountfort completely removes the tragic tone of the original play and replaces it with farcical materials and physical action mainly through the introduction of two recurrent characters within the commedia dell’arte tradition: Scaramouche and Harlequin. For these roles the playwright wisely cast Anthony Leigh and Thomas Jevon. Besides, he added music and dance episodes to the farce, as he seemed to have announced in the Epilogue to The Injured Lovers, spoken by Jevon:

Pardon but this, and I will pawn my Life,
His next shall match my Devil of a Wife.
We’ll grace it with the Embellishment of Song and Dance. (71)

The result is an excessive combination of magic, machinery and pantomime which culminates the mid-1680s farce boom (Hume 1976: 375). As Holland states:

The practice of farce was essentially one which placed its emphasis on performance. Above all, farce was seen as depending more on the brilliance of particular actors than the skill of the playwright and it is striking how many farces were written by actors turned playwrights (for example Lacy, Jevon, Doggett, and Mountfort). (1979: 122)

---

10 John Genest, on the contrary, considers that The Life and Death of Dr. Faustus actually preceded the composition of The Injur’d Lovers (1: 452). Van Lennep also considers this possibility and ventures that if Faustus was Mountfort’s first work, it “may have appeared as early as 1685-86” (342).
11 “It is possible that the tragedy [Marlowe’s Dr. Faustus] had been revived after the union, with Betterton as Faustus and Mountfort as Mephostophilis, for the names of these actors are written opposite the parts in a copy of the 1663 edition” (Borgman 35).
12 The presence of itinerant Italian actors in London is well documented by Nicoll (249-53), as well as by Boswell (118-25).
13 As Borgman points out, the effectiveness of the farcical scenes in which Leigh and Jevon appeared “must have depended more upon the agility of the actors and the efforts of the ‘machinists’ than upon the lines of the dramatist” (38).
14 Thomas Jevon’s The Devil of a Wife, or, A Comical Transformation had been produced by the United Company in March 1686.
The Life and Death of Dr. Faustus was well received by the audience. It would be revived twice, in 1697 and 1724.

Later that year, Mountfort would appear in Durfey’s A Fool’s Preferment, or The Three Dukes of Dunstable, playing Lyonel, a secondary part through which he proved his vocal skills singing pieces by Purcell. In Shadwell’s The Squire of Alsatia (also produced 1688), Mountfort seized the opportunity to exhibit himself onstage. His masterly creation of Belfond Junior obviously contributed to the extraordinary success of the comedy: it became one the most applauded plays in years, running for thirteenth nights in a row. Mountfort’s triumph in this part consolidated his position in the roster of the United Company, especially in the character-type of the rake, which earned him great acclaim. Belfond Junior, the witty man of honour, initiated the tradition of rakes reformed through marriage to a beautiful and pure lady, in this case Isabella, fittingly played by Mrs. Mountfort.

For almost a year, between May 1688 and spring of 1689, theatrical production stopped due to the religious-political upheaval unleashed in London. King James ordered that a declaration of indulgence must be read in every church on two consecutive Sundays, which provoked the objection of seven bishops; their arrest and trial inevitably inflamed the people. In the summer of 1688, the birth of an heir to King James exacerbated the fears of a perpetuation of Catholicism on the English throne and was the last pretext that his opponents needed to hasten the end of the Stuart monarch’s reign. These events led to William of Orange’s landing at Torbay on November 5 and the deposition of James; William and his wife Mary, King James’s daughter, were crowned on 11 April 1689 at

---

15 Like “If thou wilt give me back my love.” In Southerne’s The Wives Excuse Mountfort also performed songs by Purcell, and for Durfey’s The Marriage-Hater Matched, he even composed a musical piece: “Great Jove Once Made Love like a Bull.”

16 According to Cibber: “He gave the truest Life to what we call the Fine Gentleman; his Spirit shone the brighter for being polish’d with Decency: In Scenes of Gaity, he never broke into the Regard, that was due to the Presence of equal, or superior Characters, tho’ inferior Actors play’d them; he fill’d the Stage … by surpassing them, in true masterly Touches of Nature” (1968: 75).
Westminster as the new monarchs of England, Scotland and Ireland. The “Glorious Revolution” had a deep impact on the theatre and on its audience, as will be analyzed in the following chapter.

Shadwell, a declared Whig, celebrated his brand-new appointment as Poet Laureate with a new play, *Bury Fair* (March 1689), in which the Mountforts were back onstage as the leading couple of lovers: Wildish and Gertrude. The cast comprised the best of the United Company: Leigh, Nokes, Underhill, Mrs. Corey, and Betterton —this time in a surprisingly secondary role. Not long after this premiere, almost the exact same cast met again in James Carlile’s *The Fortune-Hunters, or Two Fools*: Here Mountfort played Young Wealthy and his wife acted Maria, in a plot which inspired him for his *Greenwich Park*.

In mid-October 1689, he delivered “A Prologue spoken by Mr. Mountfort, after he came from the Army and Acted on the Stage” which implies, if those words are true, that he served in the army between April and October 1689, probably in Ireland fighting against King James’s army. Upon his return he acted King Charles IX in Nathaniel Lee’s *The Massacre of Paris* (November 1689), in which was his first performance before Queen Mary, and also Don Antonio in Dryden’s *Don Sebastian* (December 1689). Here his wife acted his lover once more, Morayma in this case, and a cast of their brilliant fellow performers seconded them: Betterton, Leigh, Underhill, Mrs. Barry and Mrs. Bracegirdle.

Early in 1690, Mountfort presented his third play, a tragi-comedy titled *The Successful Strangers*, built on the English translation of Scarron’s novel *Les deux frères rivaux*, to which he added comic business and amusing farcical scenes. Setting the action in Seville allows Mountfort to evoke the Spanish dramatic tradition and introduce honour intrigues and sword-play action, which are balanced with verse dialogue and sentiment elements. The strangers of the title are two brothers, Silvio and Antonio, who have just returned to Spain
after sojourning in England. Mountfort seized the opportunity to use the journey motif to praise the new regime inaugurated in the nation:

FRANCISCO: Pray Sir how thrives that Country you came from?

ANTONIO: Troth Sir, ’tis in a fairer way then ever, the Prince and the People have faith in Each other, and there’s great hopes that Brittain will retreive its long lost glory. (3.1, p.27)

The two male leads were taken by Mountfort himself and Powell, respectively, while the two sisters in love with them, Dorothea and Feliciana, were played by Mrs. Mountfourt and Mrs. Knight. Leigh and Nokes were Don Francisco and Don Lopez, in their traditional comic duo. The play was very well received, the Queen herself attending one of its performances, but the touches of Williamite propaganda would make the actor-playwright the target of scathing Jacobite attacks (Borgman 67).

Apart from writing the prologue and the epilogue for his fellow-actor Powell’s *The Treacherous Brothers* (1690), Mountfort played the Machiavellian villain Menaphon, a new type for him, used as he was to impersonating the witty man of quality. On November 4, on the occasion of King William’s birthday, Behn’s *The Rover* was played in Whitehall before Their Majesties. Mountfort, who had taken possession of the play’s leading role after Smith retired in 1687, presented the king (and the queen, with whom Mountfort was already her favourite actor) with a captivating impersonation of Willmore. Cibber’s praise is eloquent enough:

The agreeable was so natural to him, that ev’en [sic] in that dissolute Character of the Rover he seem’d to wash off the guilt from Vice, and gave it Charms and Merit. For tho’ it may be a Reproach to the Poet, to draw such Characters, not only unpunish’d, but rewarded; the Actor may still be allow’d his due Praise in his excellent Performance. And this is a Distinction which, when this
Comedy was acted at Whitehall, King William’s Queen Mary was pleas’d to make in favour of Monfort, notwithstanding her Disapprobation of the Play. (1968: 75)\textsuperscript{17}

In the autumn of 1690 Southerne premiered his sensational hit \textit{Sir Anthony Love}, where Mountfort would once more take the leading role, Valentine, although in fact the piece was built around Mrs. Mountfort’s part. Her brilliant performance as Lucia, a character who spends most of the play disguised as the Sir Anthony of the title, became one of the most celebrated breeches roles in late 17\textsuperscript{th} century comedy and ended up eclipsing the rest of the cast.\textsuperscript{18} Weber highlights the theatrical prominence the Mountforts reached at the time:

While Mrs. Mountfort had followed Nell Gwynn as the female half of the gay couple, William Mountfort, who during the 1680s had most impressed audiences as the witty rake, had become the new Charles Hart … And in the case of the Mountforts, their status as man and wife emphatically reinforced the expectations created by their stage identities. (163)\textsuperscript{19}

The theatrical season which had just started was a specially demanding one for Mountfort: he performed nine new roles —eight of which were the leading male parts—, wrote his best play, and collaborated in the composition of three other pieces. It is not surprising that, after the triumph of \textit{The Successful Strangers} cemented his reputation as a playwright, his assistance was sought and valued by other authors. Elkanah Settle thanked

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{17} Corman defines Mountford's Willmore, the Rover, as “one of his greatest acting triumphs” (1993: 65).
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{18} Southerne generously commended Mrs. Mountfort: “I am pleased, by way of Thanks, to do her that publick Justice in Print, which some of the best Judges of these Performances, have, in her Praise, already done her, in publick places; that they never saw any part more masterly play’d: and as I made every Line for her, she has mended every Word for me; and by a Gaiety and Air, particular to her Action, turn’d every thing into the Genius of the Character” (1: 171).
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{19} Holland likewise comments that the Mountforts “had re-created the predictive inevitability of union that had been the achievement of Charles Hart and Nell Gwyn twenty years earlier” (145).
\end{flushright}
him “for the Last Scene of my Play which he was so kind to write for me” (A3); the play was *Distressed Innocence* (1691) and, as was only to be expected, Mountfort played the leading male part: General Hormidas. He might also have helped Joseph Harris in *The Mistakes, Or the False Report* (1691), in view of the latter’s words of appreciation for Mountfort: “And here’s a fresh occasion for my gratitude to Mr. Montfort, who in the fifth Act has not only corrected the tediousness by cutting out a whole Scene, but to make the Plot more clear, has put in one of his own, which heightens his own Character, and was very pleasing to the Audience” (Preface). Besides, he performed the part of Ricardo, a sort of Machiavellian figure which echoed Menaphon.

Mountfort may also have had a hand in two plays by John Bancroft. *King Edward the Third, With the Fall of Mortimer, Earl of March*, attributed to Bancroft, was apparently given to Mountfort as a present, after he had opportunely revised it. The Queen attended a performance in February 1691, where she most likely enjoyed Mountfort’s role as Lord Mountacute. This play and *Henry II, King of England; With the Death of Rosamond* (November 1692), likewise attributed to Bancroft, would be included in the 1720 edition of Mountfort’s works, alongside the four plays he had actually written, as the sketch prefacing the pieces states: “To the Four Pieces under his Name … we have annex’d, *King Edward the Third*, and *Henry the Second*; which tho’ not wholly composed by him, it is presum’d he had, at least, a share in fitting them for the Stage, otherwise it cannot be supposed he would have taken the Liberty of Writing Dedications to them” (ii).

His fellow actor George Powell’s attempt at writing a tragedy resulted in *Alphonso, King of Naples* (December 1690), where Mountfort embodied the fated general Cesario. Within days, he would exchange the tragic general for a comic part: in Shadwell’s *The Scourers*, another important play in the evolution of comedy, Mountfort was the witty, extravagant rake Sir William Rant —“reckless in action, but good at heart,” in Borgman’s
fitting words (92). Next, he would take the leading male roles in two consecutive plays by Durfey: Jack Amorous in *Love for Money* (January 1691) and Bussy in *Bussy D'Ambois* (March 1691), an adaptation of Chapman’s play. The following month saw the opening of his comedy *Greenwich Park* (April 1691), in which Mountfort again played the male lead. As Payne Fisk has noted, with this play “the literary ambitions of Mountfort were finally realized.”

Mountfort’s Young Reveller was followed by Mr. Friendall in Southerne’s *The Wives’ Excuse: or, Cuckolds Make Themselves* (December 1691), a play which was received coldly, and by Sir Philip Freewit a month later in Durfey’s *The Marriage-Hater Matched*, a triumphant piece —despite the coordinated attempt of a faction to cry it down on its first night. The rake’s loving match in this comedy, Phoebe, was played by Mrs. Bracegirdle, a dreadful prelude of the terrible events that were to unfold. Ironically, the last characters Mountfort would play in his life were two tragic figures: Cleanthes in Dryden’s *Cleomenes* (February 1692) and Asdrubel in John Crowne’s *Regulus* (June 1692). After that, he would never go back onstage.

Cibber has left us a good description of Mountfort: “Of Person he was “tall, well made, fair, and of an agreeable Aspect: His Voice was clear, full, and melodious: In Tragedy he was the most affecting Lover within my Memory. His Addresses had a resistless Recommendation from the very Tone of his Voice” (Cibber 1968: 74-75). At the peak of his career at only 28 years of age, he undoubtedly had the most brilliant prospects still ahead of him. Mountfort’s path, however, would tragically cross with that of a Captain Hill. Hill, in love with Mrs. Bracegirdle, had approached her several times and been rejected, for which he blamed Mountfort’s charm. Believing the actor to be the only obstacle between him and his love, Hill had manifested on several occasions his intention of killing

---

20 “A number of other roles were played or probably played by Mountfort, though we have no dates for them (and, consequently, they are not all listed in *The London Stage*),” like for instance Sparkish in *The Country Wife*, Palamede in *Marriage à la Mode* (Highfill *et al.* 354-55).
Mountfort, according to some witnesses’ accounts in the trial following the actor’s murder. On 9 December 1692, the Captain and his ill-famed companion Charles, fourth Lord Mohun—who was merely fifteen years old by then—decided to carry out a plan to abduct Mrs. Bracegirdle. They tried to do so at night, near her house, but the cries of the actress asking for help frustrated their plans. Although thwarted, they did not leave, but stayed in the proximity of Mrs. Bracegirdle’s house, walking back and forth while drinking wine supplied by a near tavern. At midnight, Mountfort appeared on the street. Unaware of the events, he was coincidentally passing through the neighborhood on his way home when he was called by Mohun. They embraced and addressed each other respectfully and when asked by Mohun, he denied any knowledge of the foiled kidnapping. Whether Mohun was deliberately distracting him while Hill drew his sword cannot be proved; yet, the evidence suggests that the Captain traitorously thrust his sword into the actor’s breast before he could even draw and defend himself. Hill escaped that same night, apparently to the Isle of Wight and later to Scotland, while Mohun was arrested. Mountfort managed to stagger to his house, where he collapsed in his wife’s arms; he would die some twelve hours later. He was buried on 13 December at St. Clemens Danes, the funeral being attended by a thousand people. Borgman notes: “Royalty was not indifferent at the passing of the player, for the funeral anthem was sung by a group of choristers from Whitehall accompanied by Henry Purcell” (145).

Mohun’s trial was celebrated on 31 January 1693 in the House of Lords. He was “found Not Guilty” by sixty nine lords and guilty by fourteen, and therefore was discharged.21 Although expected, the verdict caused general dissent and consternation in London, including Queen Mary herself, who profoundly lamented what she considered to be a biased process. Although acquitted of Mountfort’s death, succeeding episodes in Mohun’s life were constantly marked by violence, till he and James, fourth Duke of

---

21 An account of the proceedings can be found in The Tryal of Charles Lord Mohun (1693).
Hamilton, met in a duel in which both of them were killed, in 1712 (Borgman 173). Hill, the actual murderer, seems to have had better luck: there is some evidence that he presented a petition to Queen Anne, appealing for a pardon, which he may have received (Borgman 174-75).

The impact of Mountfort’s death on London society was remarkable: John Evelyn, Narcissus Luttrell, Charles Hatton and Robert Harley commented on the trial, and the actor-playwright was dedicated some halting verses, like the anonymous “A Tragical Song: or, Mr. Wil. Montfort, The Famous Actor Un fortunately Kill’d” and Tom Brown’s “The Ladies Lamentation for their Adonis: Or, An Elegy on the Death of Mr. Mountford the Player”; his tragic end even occasioned an anonymous romance titled *The Player’s Tragedy. Or, Fatal Love, A New Novel* (1693), which fictionalised a passionate love between Mountfort and Bracegirdle. Borgman finds it impossible to determine “whether there was any truth in Hill’s belief that Mountfort was a lover of Mrs. Bracegirdle,” although he admits that contemporary gossip linked their names. Holland, on the other hand, argues that the “on-stage pursuit of Bracegirdle/Sightly” by Mountfort’s Mr. Friendall in *The Wives’ Excuse* “becomes part of a theatrical relationship as well as a dramatic one” (1979: 143).

In April 1693 Mrs. Mountfort baptised a girl who had been yet unborn when her father was killed. In January 1694 she married fellow actor John Verbruggen, acting under the name of Mrs. Verbruggen from then on. Apart from the posthumous Mary, and the two other children who died in infancy, the Mountforts had another daughter, named Susanna (born on 27 April 1690), who became an actress under the name of Mrs. Mountfort, although she withdrew from the stage before 1720, according to the “Memoirs” (*Some Account xi*).
2.2. Mountfort’s *Greenwich Park* on the Restoration and 18th Century Stage

*Greenwich Park* was produced at the Drury Lane theatre, possibly in mid-April, 1691. It was entered in *The Term Catalogues* for May 1691 (Arber 2: 360) and advertised in *The London Gazette*, 21-25 May (LS 394). The comedy became a repertory piece and its stage history illustrates the lasting success it enjoyed while it held the stage: in the fifty years between its premiere in 1691 and the last time it was revived on 15 April 1741, *Greenwich Park* was acted on numerous occasions, according to the extant records. The enduring popularity of the comedy accounts for the generalised praise it received since 1691.

Mountfort’s comedy was revived several times during the 17th century. On 16 October 1697 James Brydges noted in his diary that he attended one performance, although he did not seem to have enjoyed it particularly: “I went and look’d in at the Playhouse, Greenwich park being acted. I staid not an act, but went hence to Tom’s Coffeehouse” (LS 487). Similarly, Downes’ *Roscius Anglicanus* includes it within a group of plays—among them, *The Scourers, Love in, and Love of Fashion, Cleomenes, Troilus and Cressida* or *Caesar Borgia*—which were received with indifference (86-87). Yet, despite these two accounts, it is known that this comedy also elicited positive reactions. Charles Gildon, for instance, defined it as “a very pretty Comedy, and has been always received with general Applause” (102), and Genest remarks that “on the whole it is very good play” (2: 13).

Milhous and Hume observe that the comedy “was regularly revived well into the eighteenth century” (Downes 87). Certainly, post-1700 revivals were abundant and much celebrated. After a four-year hiatus, *Greenwich Park* was performed twice in the 1703-04 season: on 22 and 26 April 1704, the first one of them, “at the Desire of several Persons of

---

22 Danchin believes that “the date of first performance, though not known, was probably just after Lent” and argues that the reference to the Long Vacation in the Prologue “may point to a performance somewhat later in the spring or early summer” (5: 403).

23 Unless otherwise indicated, every revival of *Greenwich Park* mentioned here took place at Drury Lane.
Quality,” and on both occasions accompanied with “several Entertainments” of dancing and singing (Milhous and Hume 2001: 163-64). It was also produced on 1 March and 21 December 1705 (Milhous and Hume 2001: 213, 263), and then, on 17 and 20 April, 18 October and 29 December 1708 (Milhous and Hume 2001: 428, 454, 460) under the full title Greenwich Park or, The Merry Citizens. The London Stage records the cast for that year’s productions: “Lord Worthy–Mills; Sir Tho. Reveller–Penkethman; Young Reveller–Cibber; Mr Raison–Johnson; Sasaphras–Bullock; Sir William Thoughtless–Bowen; Bounce–Fairbank; Beau–Pack // Florella–Mrs Oldfield; Violante–Mrs Moore; Dorinda–Mrs Rogers; Mrs Raison–Mrs Knight; Aunt–Mrs Powell” (Milhous and Hume 2001: 428).

There was one more revival on 29 January 1709 (Avery 181).

The play was revived frequently in the next three decades. There is evidence of three performances in “a carefully revised” version in the summer of 1715 (Avery 360), with some changes in the cast, and enhanced with “singing in Italian by Young Bowman, the Country Dialogue of Roger and Dolly by Renton and Mrs. Willis, and dancing by Miss Younger” (Borgman 193). It was acted again on 1 and 15 July “at the desire of several persons of quality” (Avery 361-62). There were four productions the following year (Avery 383, 388, 400, 421), and three more in 1717: one on 11 February “by His Royal Highness’s command” (Avery 436), one on 4 April (Avery 444) and a third one on 27 May, for the benefit of Thomas Durfey, advertised as The Humorous Old Rake; or, Greenwich Park (Avery 452).

Mountfort’s comedy was acted three times in 1718 (Avery 481, 496, 516), once in 1719 (Avery 557), and again three times in 1723 (at the Haymarket). On 13 October 1730 it appeared for the first time in a double bill alongside Charles Coffey’s ballad opera The Beggar’s Wedding, and again two days later, this time together with Henry Carey’s farce The
Contrivances (Scouten 1961: 84-85). In fact, it became frequent to present Greenwich Park in double bills throughout the 1730s.

The performance given on 3 December 1730 was presented for the benefit of Henry Carey and enhanced with musical entertainments and songs, including a dialogue written by Purcell (Scouten 1961: 98). There would one more performance before the end of the year, on 28 December together with Cephalus and Procris (Scouten 1961: 104), and another three in 1731, the second of which, on 12 November 1731, was acted “By their Majesties Command” —who were present at the theatre— followed by Lacy Ryan’s ballad opera The Humours of Billingsgate (Scouten 1961: 132, 168). On 17 December 1731 and 21 October 1732, it was presented with Charles Coffey’s ballad opera The Devil to Pay (Scouten 1961: 177, 239), and on 6 May 1732 with The Lottery (Scouten 1961: 215).

The first revival of 1735, on 10 November, was performed by an almost completely new cast, and presented together with Colombine Courtezan. The cast repeated on the following day, when the play was presented with Harlequin Restored, and given to the Duke of Modena (Scouten 1961: 525). There is evidence of one more production in 1735 (on 27 December, with Colombine Courtezan once more), and two more in 1736, the one on 29 October performed with Harlequin Restored. This would be the last performance of Mountfort’s play at Drury Lane (Scouten 1961: 610).

Greenwich Park’s long stage life was coming to an end: the new venue at Covent Garden would witness its last revivals, all of them —six altogether— in 1741, accompanied by The Royal Chase. Till its last days, though, it continued to appeal to a loyal audience and to enjoy the favour of the Royal Family: on 6 February it was presented “By Command of the Prince and Princess of Wales” (Scouten 1961: 885-87). On 15 April, according to

---

24 Genest also mentions a performance on 10 October 1730 (3: 283).
Borgman, *Greenwich Park* would quit the stage never to come back. In any case, 1741 was the last year when Mountfort’s play was offered. Curiously, it does not seem to have attracted nineteenth nor twentieth century producers and has never been performed since then.

\footnote{Scouten (1961) does not record this performance.}
3. Restoration Comedy and *Greenwich Park*

3.1. The Socio-political Background: The New Monarchs’ Moral Crusade

William III & II and Mary II’s “glorious” accession to the English throne prompted a series of immediate reforms in the kingdom (and in the way it would be ruled from then on) designed for the most part to distance themselves from the previous reigns, particularly Charles II’s. These readjustments can be arranged into two groups: on the one hand, their management of foreign affairs, which represented in Craig Rose’s words “a radical reorientation in England’s foreign policy” (105), and their new domestic administration, on the other.

As regards foreign policy, William’s determination to align England with the coalition of European powers against France —the Grand Alliance— and to involve the country in the long-standing Franco-Dutch conflict was expeditious: literally some weeks after he and Mary were crowned at Westminster on 11 April 1689, the brand new king “led England into a war to curb the overweening ambitions of the King of France” (Rose 61) and to restrain his aggressive territorial goals. This confrontation, known as the *Nine Years’ War*, came to an end with the Treaty of Ryswick (1697), which meant Louis XIV’s recognition of William III & II as king of England and Scotland. However, only a few years later hostilities would resume over the issue of the Spanish succession. Skilled strategist as he was, William foresaw that both Louis XIV and Leopold I, the Holy Roman Emperor, would claim rights to the throne of the childless Spanish monarch Charles II, as they were his closest relatives. William decided therefore “to negotiate with Louis XIV a mutually acceptable settlement of the Spanish question” (Rose 144): the fruit of that negotiation was the signing of two Partition Treaties between both nations.

Nonetheless, despite William’s determined efforts to keep the balance of power in Europe, the War of Spanish Succession (1701-1713) broke out, and France and the Grand
Alliance collided once more. William, at the very conclusion of his reign by then, was however restrained by a Tory-dominated House of Commons unwilling to enter yet another armed conflict (Rose 147), and he did not have the chance to formally declare war: he died on 8 March 1702. Instead, it would be his sister in law, Queen Anne, who did it two months later. King William, in short, proved to be a courageous and confident ruler who steered England’s foreign policy with gritty determination: he did not hesitate to leave the country for extended periods during the military campaigns in the *Nine Years’ War*, and was an active agent within the Grand Alliance, the coalition of countries which confronted the most powerful king of their time, Louis XIV.

William’s resolute attitude beyond England’s borders contrasted with Charles II’s careless policy regarding foreign affairs: during Charles’s reign, the nation was severely defeated in each of the two Anglo-Dutch Wars in which it became involved, allowing the Dutch in addition to remain as the dominant nation in world trade for many years. What’s more, the Second Anglo-Dutch War (1665-1667) ended with the Raid on the Medway, when “a Dutch raiding force under De Ruyter scored a spectacular success when it sailed straight up the river, sank three ships at their moorings and towed two others back to Holland, including the flagship, the *Royal Charles*” (D. Smith 218). The defeat was so humiliating that it would be branded in the English people’s memory for decades as a harsh psychological blow. These events, together with the critical financial situation of the country in contrast to the prodigality of the court, forced the king to sign a peace under the threat of a revolt. Confronted with a Parliament reluctant to fund a significantly debilitated *armada*, Charles II “allied with Versailles because the Bourbons had become a source of secret pension money” (Claydon 153) to finance the costs of the Third Anglo-Dutch War (1672-1674). Nevertheless, he would rather spend it on the costly extravagance of his court. Therefore England, unable to rebuild a strong naval force, faced war with inadequate preparation and merely two years after the conflict broke out the English Parliament
compelled the king to sign a prompt peace treaty once more. In brief, Charles II’s foreign policy was characterised by a hopeless combination of carelessness and ineptitude.

In terms of domestic affairs, William and Mary likewise sought to erase the Stuart legacy by implementing a new socio-political and moral order. First, by signing the Bill of Rights in 1689 they consented—although somewhat reluctantly—to grant the Parliament a series of prerogatives at the expense of limiting the crown’s share of power, whereas the preceding kings (including Charles I) had featured a long-lasting tradition of discrepancies with the House.26 As Claydon summarises it: “From the moment the Stuarts had come to the throne, they had proved incapable of living peaceably with their legislative assembly” (2002: 51).

Second, and of high relevance for this chapter, was the moral crusade the new monarchs launched throughout the nation.27 If the previous court had been characterised by excess and impiety, William and Mary appeared “as divinely-appointed instruments of reformation” (Rose 203), chosen by God “to turn back the tide of debauchery which had inundated England under the restored monarchy” (Rose 199). Just as Charles had become the epitome of the lack of restraint that dominated the court for almost thirty years, the new monarchs were “placed at the centre of a drive for moral reform” (Claydon 2002: 80).28 Queen Mary emerged as a model of womanly decency and King William showed no interest in the type of glamorous social life associated with his predecessors.29

---

26 On the Bill of Rights and the English Constitution under William and Mary, see Claydon 2002 (chapters 2 and 3) and Rose (chapter 3).
27 In *William III and the Godly Revolution* Tony Claydon offers an exhaustive study on the topic.
28 As David Smith notes, “the promiscuity and bawdiness of Charles’s Court soon became proverbial,” as well as the king’s legendary “sexual prowess” (241). The *Memoirs of the Comte de Gramont* likewise highlights the excesses of the court: “gambling, allied pleasures, and everything else that the taste of a prince naturally addicted to such tender amusements could suggest by the way on luxury and smartness” (Deakin 68).
29 He actually “cut back on royal balls, dances and public dinners” and “went little to the theatre, or other entertainment” (Claydon 2002: 44).
The king’s well-known missive to the Lord Bishop of London was downright from the beginning: “We most earnestly desire and shall endeavour a general reformation of manners of all our subjects” were its first words (4). Certainly, a campaign for such reformation became “a central theme of the Williamite message” (Claydon 2002: 80), and a nearly fanatical zeal for moral purity broke forth after 1689. As a consequence, the first Societies for reformation of manners appeared in London in the following years. The earliest foundation corresponded to one set up in the Tower Hamlets—London’s East End—about 1690, where “shocked by the openness of vice and by the failure of the justices and constables to cope with it, a group of men, a mere four or five by most accounts, met together to find some means of improving the morals of their neighbours” (Bahlman 31). It would be followed by a second society in the Strand, which denounced the “evil example of the last two reigns” (Bahlman 33), and soon enough the idea was spreading through London and beyond, in places like Gloucester, Leicester or Coventry. As Gómez-Lara has pointed out, the Societies employed questionable methods, based on a “regiment” of moderately reliable informers to the magistrates, on a “strategy of exploiting the criminal justice for their aims” (2006: 122) and on their attempts to influence people of authority. Yet, despite the relative success of their endeavours, the impact these Societies had on the nation is indisputable.

As was to be expected, the cleansing effects of the Societies also reached the theatre. Jeremy Collier’s attack on the stage did not arrive unexpectedly, since the Societies to a large extent anticipated his contention. In the years following the new monarchs’

---

30 Queen Mary’s letter to the Middlesex justices (6th July 1691) was equally explicit. On the background to this letter, see Spurr 129.

31 In fact, Gómez-Lara explains that the Societies became “something else than a simple religious group as they borrowed from the political organizations the principles of practical action” (122).

32 Collier’s Short View was published in 1698. Michael Cordner remarks that Collier “was swimming with the tide in mounting an attack on the contemporary drama. The early to mid-1690s produced a rich crop of anti-theatrical invective” (2000: 210), and Kirk Combe points out that “Whatever the
coronation the reformers were already denouncing the spirit of wickedness and vice which had been exhibited, habitually with cynical praise, before an audience. As Gómez-Lara remarks: “If familiar household and playhouses were to be made the antagonist geographies of Virtue and Vice, it is not strange that as early as 1694, the Societies demanded the closing of the theatres. The reasons for doing so were the same that Collier would popularise in his *Short View*: its contagious effects touching profanity and immorality” (126). The Societies proved to be a highly influential force which, coupled with the message emanating from the court, exerted a persuasive pressure on society and its theatrical taste on the one hand, and on dramatists on the other. Indeed, “playwrights began to feel the pressure to align themselves with the values promoted by the new court” and, consequently, “between 1689 and 1694, most of the comedies attempt to accommodate the new ideals on the stage” (Mora and Gómez-Lara 148).

3.2. Restoration Comedy. A Brief Overview

In a now classic study of what is defined as “Restoration drama,” Robert D. Hume has traced its development and evolution, establishing some subgenres within that broader category, such as the Spanish romance-inspired comedy, the serious intrigue comedy, the heroic drama, and the low comedy. Of all these, the latter is the most relevant for the purposes of this chapter, inasmuch as it anticipates the type of comedy analysed here. According to Hume, a possible date for the origins of Restoration comedy—or rather, of some of its defining traits—may be the year 1663, when James Howard’s low comedy *The English Monsieur* was premiered.33 The play is not particularly brilliant in plot construction, Hume affirms, but nonetheless its rakish male lead —Wellbred, “a wild Gentleman” merits of Collier’s particular arguments, their vocalization looks to be part of a wider cultural movement that helped shift comedy away from the satirical and towards the sentimental” (297).

33 Gómez Lara *et al.* observe three main generic groups in the 1660s: romantic, comic, and satirical. They class Howard’s *The English Monsieur* within the second group, in the “comedy à la mode” subgenre, together with plays like, for instance, Dryden’s *Wild Gallant*, Etherege’s *She Would if She Could* or Sedley’s *The Mulberry Garden* (2014: 40-46).
(Dramatis Personae)— and the anti-French subplot, together with its “London setting, the
genial tone, the combination of satire with love intrigues and a duel of wits all suggest
popular comedy to come” (1976: 243).\textsuperscript{34} Certainly, the most significant aspect of Howard’s
play is the introduction of the “gay couple”: a pair of witty, fashionable, upper-class lovers.
This tradition became a \textit{sine qua non} constituent in Restoration comedy since then.\textsuperscript{35}

A year after \textit{The English Monsieur} was produced, and notably influenced by it,
George Etherege made his triumphal entry on London stage with \textit{The Comical Revenge, or,
Love in a Tub}. His masterful blend of formulas that were bound to appeal to contemporary
audiences in a precise, well-balanced work brought him huge success and began to establish
his solid reputation as a playwright and a wit. Etherege takes over Howard’s witty couple
and places their courtship parallel to a serious love plot, indebted to Tuke’s \textit{The Adventures of
Five Hours} in the heroic tone and the sword-play element. The combination of a love
intrigue based on the combat of wit with a solemn love and honour plot brilliantly
introduced by Etherege in his first play would endure, with tonal alterations, until the early
18\textsuperscript{th} century, becoming thus a major feature of Restoration comedy.\textsuperscript{36} To a certain extent,
we might see an echo of the double love plot in the use in many comedies of two male
leads: one of them a wild, extravagant rake like Etherege’s Sir Frederick Frolick, the other a
more constant, sober kind of gallant — the type that Weber calls the “\textit{honnête homme}” — like
Colonel Bruce in \textit{The Comical Revenge}.\textsuperscript{37} Mountfort’s \textit{Greenwich Park} also makes use of this

\textsuperscript{34} Corman uses these and other features to define what he calls “Carolean comedy” (2000: 57-59).
\textsuperscript{35} John Harrington Smith traced the evolution of this formula in \textit{The Gay Couple in Restoration Drama}
(1948). Some decades later, Peter Holland would define the “gay couple” as the “most distinctive
new contribution to comedy of the 1660s, the first new change in the comic form in the
Restoration” (82).
\textsuperscript{36} Sedley’s \textit{Mulberry Garden} (May 1668) is a concomitant instance of this double plot formula.
\textsuperscript{37} For the distinction between the libertine and the \textit{honnête homme}, see Weber 95-97, and
Braverman’s “The Rake’s Progress Revisited: Politics and Comedy in the Restoration.” Examples
of this pairing of the rake and the \textit{honnête homme} in the love plots may be Careless and Lovell in
Ravenscroft’s \textit{The Careless Lovers} (1673), Horner and Harcourt in Wycherley’s \textit{The Country Wife}
(1675), Dorimant and Young Bellair in Etherege’s \textit{The Man of Mode} (1676), Willmore and Belvile in
Behn’s \textit{The Rover} (1677) or Amorous and Merriton in Durfey’s \textit{Love for Money} (1691).
formula: the two main love plots portray the rapacious libertine’s pursuits of Young Reveller balanced with the more restrained sexual behaviour of Lord Worthy —despite his keeping of Dorinda. Although Lord Worthy is as witty as Young Reveller —if only less wild— and, obviously, he is far from Bruce in *The Comical Revenge*, Mountfort is actually adapting the double plot formula inherited from Etherege to the early 1690s. Ironically, though, Young Reveller and Dorinda’s encounters are presented in a melodramatic tone which verges on the sentimental.

Through the Frenchified fop Dufoy, *The Comical Revenge* also carries on the satirical figure of the affected coxcomb —introduced by Howard in the character of Frenchlove— to which Etherege attaches a farcical light plot. Subsequent Restoration comedies would employ both elements with variable emphasis: the satirical fop, like Monsieur de Paris in Wycherley’s *Gentleman Dancing-Master* (1672) or Sir Fopling Flutter in Etherege’s *Man of Mode* (1676), and the farce, like the tricks played on Lorenzo in Porter’s *The Carnival* (1664) or the pranks of characters such as Teague in Sir Robert Howard’s *The Committee* (1662). Finally, the gulling plot —by means of which Sir Nicholas Cully is tricked into marriage with a strumpet, Lucy— would likewise become a favourite comic device for different playwrights. Corman expands on the significance of the gulling figures in these plays: “The gulls in punitive actions lack wit; when older men, especially former Cromwellians, they are relieved of their wives by cuckolding and of their daughters by marriage to town wits; when they are country bumpkins, they are similarly relieved of their intendeds and/or their money by town wits and/or sharpers” (2000: 59).

In the later 1660s low London comedy continues to gain popularity, modified by a decisive change, “a definite move toward the smut and profanity often considered typical of Carolean drama” (Hume 1976: 249). This trait would distinguish it from early productions, considered “remarkably pure and clean, morally speaking” (249). That
“move” would affect first low social level plots, to reach, in the 1670s, the genteel and the upper-class characters through the classic episodes of cuckold, seasoned with more or less explicit sexual references, which will attain its climax in The Country Wife (1675). Perhaps the two most representative London comedies of the late 1660s are Thomas Shadwell’s The Sullen Lovers and Etherege’s second play She Would if She Could, both produced in 1668. Although both are character-based plays which share their London setting and the love intrigues involving attractive, witty couples, each of these works constitutes a very characteristic case of the two different approaches to comedy which were crystallizing by that time: humours on the one hand, and wit or manners on the other.

The dichotomy was triggered by the Dryden-Shadwell dispute and the literary opinions they exchanged through the prefaces, prologues and epilogues to their works, chiefly between 1668 and 1671. Dryden laid emphasis on delight rather than instruction. Thus, in the Preface to An Evening’s Love (1671) he argues that whereas tragedy may attempt to instruct “by example,” that is not the case with comedy: “for the chief end of it is divertisement and delight” (209). He advocates the resort to refined “Courtship, Raillery, and Conversation” (202) and the display of a fashionable society peopled by gentlemen and ladies of wit and quality. This method, hence known as comedy of wit or of manners, was inspired both by the Fletcherian romantic plays of the earlier 17th century, and by the sophisticated French comic models. On the contrary, the comedy of humours was

---

38 Hume considers that after 1660, “the distinction [between low London comedy and romantic comedy] starts to blur badly … when the social level of characters in satiric comedy rises to the point that satiric comedy becomes socially indistinguishable from romantic comedy” (1983: 114). J. Douglas Canfield comments on the aristocratic characters of Restoration comedy: “These Beautiful People of their time reaffirm their right of succession by manifesting the necessary élan to ridicule their opponents, on the one hand, and, on the other, to perpetuate their estates through the good breeding of the gay, insouciant couples who inevitably marry at the end” (2001: 211).

39 Kathleen Lynch affirms that “the main course of development of Restoration comedy had been determined” in She Would if She Could (174); much more recently, Derek Hughes considers this play “to herald a distinctive and dominant mode of Restoration comedy” (1996: 113). The signal importance of Etherege’s comedy was acknowledged in his own time. In the Preface to The Humorists (1671) Shadwell refers to She Would if She Could as “the best Comedy that has been written since the Restauration of the Stage” (Summers 1: 183).
modelled on the Jonsonian depiction of low life, and inherited Jonson’s stress on satire and on humour characters. “Humours” might be defined as characters whose behaviour is dominated by one particular, exaggerated personality trait that makes them ridiculous. The follies or vices of these characters were exposed on the stage as negative examples for the purpose of edifying the audience. As Shadwell announced in the Preface to *The Humorists* (1671): “My design was … to reprehend some of the Vices and Follies of the Age” (Summers 1: 183). Contrary to Dryden’s opinion, Shadwell sees comedy as a genre well suited to moral instruction. He claims: “for the reformation of Fopps and Knaves, I think Comedy most useful, because to render Vices and Fopperies very ridiculous, is much a greater punishment than Tragedy can inflict upon ‘em” (Summers 1: 184).

Nonetheless, even the champions of each cause proved rather inconstant to their own principles. So for instance, Raines and Bevil, the witty male leads in Shadwell’s *Epsom Wells* (1672; 1673), fit accurately within the “fine People of the Play” he loudly despises in the Preface to *The Sullen Lovers*: “the two chief persons are most commonly a Swearing, Drinking, Whoring, Ruffian for a Lover, and an impudent ill-bred tomrig for a Mistress” (Summers 1: 11). Not to mention that *The Sullen Lovers*, in spite of the prominence of the humours characters, displays the courtship plot of two sisters by two young men of quality. Similarly, Brian Corman comments that “though Dryden’s *An Evening’s Love* (also 1668) centres on three courtship intrigues, its action revolves around the duping of a humorous father and rival lover” (2000: 53).

Definitely, in spite of the conflict which might appear *a priori* between these two types of comedy, the tendency in the following years would be to integrate both: “Thus, by the mid-1670s, the playwrights had reached some kind of tacit compromise to blend the comic force of the humour characters with the witty dialogues and the libertine outlook of the comedy of manners” (Gómez-Lara, Mora and de Pando 23). The combination of both
models is not exclusive of the 1670s decade: “By the 1690s, Dryden’s disciple, Congreve, had assimilated the theoretical implications of Dryden’s comic theory in his revised notion of the humour … Congreve’s comedies remain very much in the ‘mixt way’” (Corman 1993: 52).

Apart from the combination of these two comic methods, the 1660s close with a series of features that anticipate what the culmination of the Carolean comedy would be towards the middle of the following decade. Hume summarises these features: an increasing consolidation of French-originated farce (using Molière as the main source) to the detriment of serious satire, a decreasing presence of serious lovers in the romantic plots, and the rise of indecency and low tone (1976: 265). Harold Weber expands on the idea: “the very extravagance of [the rake’s] sexual desire distinguishes him from previous literary types and intimates some of the dangers that lurk within his excess” (13).

The three theatrical seasons comprised in the years 1675 through 1677 constitute Restoration comedy’s “period of glory” (Hume 1976: 300), culminating the trend initiated some years earlier. The audience’s growing taste for sex and farce and its attraction for the wild, extravagant rakes impelled playwrights to stage a panoply of plays where sexual episodes, normally extramarital, were emphasised and where immoral manners were far from being punished. According to Novak, “libertinism in the drama tended to fall into somewhat coarser forms of sexuality —sex for its own sake” (64). Wycherley’s *The Country Wife* (January 1675), Crowne’s *The Country Wit* (prob. March 1675), Etherege’s *The Man of Mode* (March 1676), Shadwell’s *The Virtuoso* (August 1676), Durfey’s *The Fool Turned Critic* (November 1676) and *Madam Fickle* (November 1676), Wycherley’s *The Plain Dealer* (December 1676), Behn’s *The Rover* (March 1677), Durfey’s *A Fond Husband* (May 1677), Dryden’s *The Kind Keeper, or Mr. Limberham* (March 1678) and Otway’s *Friendship in Fashion*
(April 1678) were all part, to a lesser or greater extent, of the “sex boom” of the mid-1670s.\textsuperscript{40}

*The Man of Mode* is, from its title to its dubious resolution, a sort of monument to one of the most emblematic figures of all Restoration drama: Dorimant, the wild, false, cynically predatory rake *par excellence*. Etherege’s final work is built—actually, loosely built on nearly independent episodes—for Dorimant’s personal delectation: he conquers and offends women without restraint nor morality—nor punishment, either—throughout the end of the play, when he apparently agrees to leave London to settle in the country with Harriet: “To be with you I could live there and never set one thought to London” (5.2.136-37). And yet, he does not miss the occasion to suggest another encounter to Bellinda: “’Twas a pleasant one. We must meet again” (5.2.271). This leaves the audience wondering whether his reformation is just another of his machinations. Dorimant, in brief, is too irresistible as to be censured, but too false as to be taken seriously.

If *The Man of Mode* culminates the savage rake type, which will never come back with the same vehemence and impunity, *The Country Wife* is broadly considered the best example of London sex comedy. And Horner, a hedonistic “truewit” (to use Fujimura’s term) who makes his way scene after scene, symbolizing the triumph of wit over folly, of hypocrisy over honesty. Again, like Dorimant, the rake succeeds, leaving behind him a scandalous sisterhood of “ sharers” (5.4.166), co-partners in affairs that are even more sordid and bawdier than Dorimant’s. Also, like Etherege’s protagonist, Horner remains unmarried. Wycherley lays all the emphasis on sexual conquests with no regard whatsoever for the moral implications of Horner’s predatory behaviour nor for his victims. As Corman

\textsuperscript{40} Some critics include actor Thomas Betterton’s *The Amorous Widow* (1670; 1706) as an early precursor of the trend. Maximillian E. Novak observes: “Libertines such as Lovemore in Thomas Betterton’s *The Amorous Widow* (1670) pursue sexual seduction unremittingly throughout the play” (58), and Hume makes it clear: “The boom in sex comedy … began about 1670 with Betterton’s *The Amorous Widow* and escalated by degrees to the flagrant doings of *The Country Wife* and *The Man of Mode* in the middle of the decade” (1983: 107).
concludes, Wycherley identifies and exposes moral issues related to love, jealousy, marriage, adultery, etc. “without offering comfortable solutions or resolutions” (2000: 64).

Hume considers Durfey’s *A Fond Husband* “a key play in determining the directions taken in comedy at the end of 1670s” (1976: 310). With it, the sex boom period virtually closes. Durfey’s greatest success was one of the most influential comedies of the decade. It is documented that King Charles II was present at three of its five first performances (LS 257), and his fondness for the piece was such that he even commanded Dryden to compose a play in the same fashion.41 J. H. Smith repudiated its cynical celebration of adultery as a sort of glamorous social entertainment (1948a: 93); it is at least true that the sex intrigue reigns supreme, for Durfey does not introduce any secondary romantic plot to balance the almost exclusive prominence of the cuckolding story (Hume 1976: 309).42

The sex plays performed between 1675 and 1677 are the type of libertine comedy, flaunting moral propriety, against which William and Mary’s court and society reacted.43 Their iconic champions, Horner and Dorimant, can be used as a mirror against which to measure the succeeding new rakes of the late 1680s and the 1690s. From then on (leaving aside the political hiatus of the late 1670s and early 1680s), Restoration comedy will undergo what has been called “the change.”44

---

41 John A. Vaughn claims that *A Fond Husband* (1677) “was popular enough to have had an influence on subsequent intrigue comedies” like Thomas Otway’s *The Soldier’s Fortune* (1681) or Thomas Shadwell’s *The Volunteers* (1692) (151). Likewise, in one of his letters, John Dryden acknowledged that he wrote *Mr. Limberham* because King Charles II wished him to write a play in the style of *A Fond Husband* (Dearing and Roper 367).

42 For a more detailed analysis of Durfey’s 1690s plays, see Harold Love’s essay “Dryden, Durfey, and the Standard of Comedy” (1973).

43 Hume dates the “disintegration” of the sex comedy in the spring of 1678 and justifies his decision in the failure of four sex comedies by major playwrights: Behn’s *Sir Patient Fancy*, Dryden’s *Mr. Limberham* and Shadwell’s *A True Widow* and Otway’s *Friendship in Fashion* (1983: 107).

44 Within the decade between the burst of the Popish Plot (September 1678) and the Glorious Revolution (November 1688) the political crisis had an inevitable impact on the dramatic productions, which inclined towards satirical farce and politics. Hume refers to the period 1683-1688 as “the years of stasis” (1983: 111).
3.3. “If they think us worth that, they will soon shew the change”: An Approach to the Idea of “the Change in Comedy”

There is a broad consensus among scholars in highlighting the change or evolution that took place in Restoration comedy from the late 1680s onwards. Nonetheless, their opinion seems to be less unanimous on how gradual that shift was or what its aftermath, which has provoked an ongoing controversial debate for decades.

One of the first scholars who developed the idea of “the change” in Restoration comedy was John Harrington Smith, almost seventy years ago. In his influential “Shadwell, the Ladies and the Change in Comedy” (1948b), he argued that the key difference between the comedy which flourished in the 1670s —“cynical” comedy in his words— and the comedy which triumphed after 1700 was related to the playwrights’ method and aim. Thus, he pinpointed a “replacement of the comic method of the Restoration, which featured realism and satire … with a method which put reform first and meant to accomplish it by representing not things as they were but standards as they ought to be, personified in characters who should be examples for imitation by the audience.” He decided to call this the “exemplary” method (24).

Smith considers the years 1688-1689 as the date when the exemplary method became established, rivalling the old mode, and he sees both Shadwell and the female patrons of the theatre (the “ladies” that prologues and epilogues constantly appeal to) as its main instigators. The Squire of Alsatia (1688) became therefore a highly symbolic touchstone for the exemplary comedy, inasmuch as its plot is a reflection of the events occurring in the theatrical circles. In the same way as the virtuous heroine Isabella reforms the rake Belfond Junior through her moral inspiration, so the ladies exerted their influence on their

---

45 The epigraph is taken from Shadwell’s The Scourers (Summers 5: 4.1, p.121). The words are spoken by one of the two heroines, Eugenia, who expresses her confidence that the rakish gallants courting her and Clara will reform in order to be worthy of their love.
contemporary playwrights, contributing to shape their comedies and transform them into exemplary works.\(^\text{46}\)

Smith concludes that “exemplary comedy had thus been solidly founded by the beginning of the last decade of the century … And in the nineties, despite the endeavors of Southerne, Congreve, Vanbrugh, and others to keep the old kind of comedy alive … the influence of the exemplary dramatists and the ladies progressively triumphs” (31). Smith proposes different plays and dates to mark the “triumph” of the new type of comedy: Cibber’s *Love’s Last Shift* (1696), Vanbrugh’s *Aesop* (1697), or Steele’s *The Lying Lover* (1704).

Some twenty years after Smith’s article, Arthur H. Scouten resumed the debate about the change in comedy. Although he shares with his predecessor the acknowledgment of Shadwell’s contribution, Scouten disagrees on the term that can be used to define that new model of comedy. For him, Shadwell is a significant figure whose works “connected him with an entirely different trend of Restoration drama, sentimental comedy” (1966: 65). Smith, on the contrary, had deliberately avoided such terms as “sentimental,” “pity” or “benevolence” (1966: 23).

Besides, Scouten’s essay focuses more on the revival of the old comedy style in the 1690s, which he names “comedy of manners,” than in the arrival of the new model:

At any rate, a second period of the comedy of manners did develop in the final decade of the century … It commenced with the production of Thomas Southerne’s *The Wives Excuse* in December 1691. This satiric play was followed by Congreve’s first three comedies and Vanbrugh’s *The Relapse* and *The Provoked

---

\(^{46}\) According to Smith, the sex comedy of the 1670s struck ladies for its display of free gallantry, its mockery and rejection of matrimony and the lack of any punitive correction on the rakes. *The Country Wife* “elicited their first protest,” followed by *The Plain Dealer* and *Sir Patient Fancy* (27). In the 1680s the ladies gained more influence and advocated for a more prominence of the romantic and sympathetic element in the plays, along with other ingredients such as love constancy, sincerity and a virtuous couple.
Wife … More plays can be added, such as Farquhar’s *Love and a Bottle* and Mountfort’s *Greenwich Park*. (1966: 66)\(^47\)

This resurgence ended with the consolidation of sentimental comedy, for which Scouten proposed almost the same plays that Smith had previously used to date the “triumph” of the exemplary comedy: Cibber’s *Love’s Last Shift* (1696), Congreve’s *The Way of the World* (1700), or Steele’s *The Lying Lover* (1704).

In *The Development of English Drama in the Late Seventeenth Century* (1976), Hume considered that after the disintegration of the “sex boom” and the denouement of the political crisis in the 1680s, comedies split into two types: the “old” hard and the “new” humane comedy, the latter one being equivalent to Smith’s “exemplary” or Scouten’s “sentimental.”\(^48\) Corman prefers to establish a simplified classification of Restoration comedy as a whole into two broader groups, “Carolean” and “Post-Carolean,” disregarding any further differentiation in the post-Revolution theatrical production: “Since there is a noticeable change in comedy after the death of Charles II, the mid-1680s is the favored place to mark the divide. The plays of the earlier period are often called Carolean,” flourishing in the 1660s and the 1670s, while the second group is known as “Post-Carolean” and its most representative plays were premiered after the Glorious Revolution (2000: 57). Kirk Combe identifies an “unmistakeable” shift away “from a predominantly satiric brand of comedy found on the English stage soon after 1660 and towards a great deal of sentimental comedy produced there by the turn of the century and beyond,” although he remarks that the process was not “a changeover in the sense that one type of drama replaced the previous type” (294).

\(^{47}\) Like Smith —and like Hume would later— Scouten (1966) includes authors such as Southerne, Congreve or Vanbrugh as the champions of the old comedy in the 1690s.

\(^{48}\) Hume borrows the concept “humane” comedy from Shirley Strum Kenny (1977).
For Hume (1976: 382), the old comedy was characterised by a satiric and cynical tone descended from the 1670s tradition, with specific contextual alterations.\footnote{In the same line, Combe explains that “satirical comedy” was motivated “by fundamental beliefs in the corrupt nature of humanity” and that consequently it reveals vice (300).} Both Southerne’s and Congreve’s earlier plays — *Sir Anthony Love* (October 1690) and *The Wives’ Excuse* (December 1691), *The Old Bachelor* (March 1693) and *The Double-Dealer* (November 1693) — are among the most illustrative comedies of the old hard style. Derek Hughes, like Scouten first and Hume later, also identifies a renewed interest in resurrecting sex comedy in the early 1690s, although he acknowledges that it was an illusory — and yet acclaimed — impasse: “A few sex comedies (*Sir Anthony Love*, *The Old Batchelour*, and, though it barely counts as comedy, *Amphitryon*) were still being premiered with great success, but there was a widespread disinclination to take risks, and new dramatists (Congreve excepted) were ingenuously confident in the allure of morality” (1996: 340). J. Douglas Canfield disagrees and includes Congreve and Farquhar in what he calls the “sentimental” model, which he defines in socio-political more than in aesthetic terms:

In other words, though critics have tried to keep the comedies of Congreve and Farquhar out of the category sentimental, their comedies belong with those of Shadwell and Colly [sic] Cibber, with the difference being one of degree and not of kind. For sentimental comedy is a term critics use, really, to characterise *bourgeois* comedy, that based upon an ethos of benevolence. (2001: 221-22)

In *Sir Anthony Love* (1690; 1691), Lucia is a female libertine who disguises herself as a man (the title character, Sir Anthony) to pursue her love, Valentine. While the male costume allows Southerne to question conventional concepts of female passivity/agency, it allows Lucia to enjoy the social freedom it provides, to such an extent that she deliberately avoids returning to her real identity. Southerne reflects on Lucia’s determination to retain her male gender privileges and his conclusions are discouraging in what they reveal about
the ethos of the rake, male as well as female. Weber elaborates on it: “While Sir Anthony and Valentine charm us with their frank passion and sophisticated playfulness, they also provide a glimpse of the pleasure they take in aggression and destruction. In doing so they reveal the complex libertine beliefs that lead to the rake’s determination to remain an outsider” (171). At the end of the play, Lucia marries a coxcomb, yet seems willing to continue her rakish life, even if that means luring the now married Valentine into being unfaithful to his wife Florante.50 Surely, the mid-1670s cuckolding plot revives here, Dorimant being replaced by a female rake. In The Wives’ Excuse (1691; 1692), Mrs. Friendall’s marriage to a detestable debauchee, who is even caught committing adultery in the course of the action, ironically leads her to a discouraging resolution: a separation after which she will end up in a position not much better than when the play started, despite her tenacious resistance to Lovemore’s advances throughout the piece. Honour keeps being, if not ridiculed, still penalised. Hume’s adjectives to describe Southerne’s work —“angry,” “ugly,” and “disagreeable” (1976: 387)— are eloquent enough. Congreve’s The Old Bachelor likewise displays a hopeless view of honest love and marriage, and the excessively hard satire offered in plays like The Double-Dealer was “proving increasingly unpalatable for the audience”: while the gentlemen did not find it amusing anymore, the ladies found it no longer acceptable (Hume 1976: 390).

Novak admits the simultaneity of both comic models during some years, but he lays more emphasis on the gradual replacement of the libertine ethos with the sentimental tone:

sentimental comedies and tragedies of sensibility were becoming the popular modes during the 1690s and into the next century. Libertines began to appear in literature as either villains … or as somewhat pathetic figures. Libertinism

50 Lucia’s final words clearly state her cynical resolution to pursue her own desires, at her husband’s expense: “Thus Coxcombs always the best Husbands prove /When we are faulty, and begin to rove, /A sep’rate Maintenance supplies our Love” (1988: 5.7.143-45). For an analysis of Sir Anthony’s libertinism, see also Chernaik 1995: 195-97.
did not die, despite being banished from stage representations, but it had to fight a losing battle against sensibility, the dominant attitude of the eighteenth century. (66)

Alternatively, the new humane style tended to display respect and admiration for the protagonist, giving way to less critical and more sympathetic plays, a model which “is easily extended into the overtly exemplary style” (1976: 382). Hume explains that the new comedy seeks to please “an audience which did not care for the libertine ethic of Carolean sex comedy. This shift in sensibility is symptomatic of a change in general moral climate. The rise of the S.P.C.K., and the outcry of ‘the Ladies’ against smut are warnings of the coming storm” (1976: 381).

Corman concurs with Hume when pointing out the impact of the audience’s sensibility on impelling the theatrical taste into new directions: “The growing demands to reform the theatre, in reaction to the perceived excesses of Carolean society and its comedy, encouraged a number of changes,” like the replacement of the libertine values by a “new set of social virtues that emphasise the importance of honesty, decency, amiability, and integrity” (2000: 65).

This assortment of moral qualities produces more ordinary characters (especially when compared to the exuberant gallery of previous times) that are better accepted by an audience who can easily identify with them. Benevolence replaces wit, and the rake also undergoes a crucial metamorphosis: “The major casualty is the rake. Rakish behavior does not instantly vanish, but its prominence is

---

51 Combe states his opinion in a similar way: “sentimental comedy” presents “people motivated to ethical behavior by innate feelings of sympathy towards one another” and thus they become worthy of emulation (300).

52 The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (S.P.C.K) was founded in 1698 and aimed at furthering Christian education and the publication and dissemination of Christian literature.

53 Other critics likewise highlight the change in the audience from the late 1680s on: “By the turn of the century it seems clear that a distinctly less courtly and more middle- and upper-middle-class playgoer attended the theatre … this new audience wanted to see performed not only the aristocratic productions of the last age, but dramas that reflected their different cultural experiences, tastes and sensibilities as well … Under these changing cultural circumstances we see sentimentality on the increase in English drama” (Combe 299).
reduced… Rakes reform; the rake unreformed by the end of the play is marginalised as an antisocial being” (Corman 2000: 65).  

The reform of the rake will be therefore crucial in the evolution of the late 17th century, a process in which, like Smith and Scouten had done previously, Hume praises Shadwell’s contribution: Shadwell produced four plays between 1688 and 1692 which would open the way to introduce the new humane comedy. Hume defines The Squire of Alsatia as “an attempt to alter the type and tone of the comedies whose elements it freely utilizes” (1976: 87) and highlights that it anticipates Steele’s exemplary method. Bury Fair (1689), The Scourers (1690) and The Volunteers (1692), all by Shadwell, Carlile’s The Fortune-Hunters (1689) and Durfey’s Love for Money (1691) and The Marriage-Hater Matched (1692) are considered plays that prolong the proto-exemplary model introduced by The Squire of Alsatia.  

Pat Gill not only analyses the new rake, but also the new heroine: “As the Restoration comes to an end, the rake-hero becomes the foil of kinder, gentler males who succeed by moral persuasion, and the sharp, seductive heroine succumbs to repentant or innocent distress, or hardens into depravity” (207). In Durfey’s Love for Money, for instance, Mirtilla is considered to embody those virtuous and decorous attitudes that will characterise the sentimental heroine. Angelica in Congreve’s Love for Love, or Fulvia in Durfey’s The Richmond Heiress follow the same pattern. J. H. Smith explained the heroine’s evolution in the following terms: “in the first decade and a half of the love game, heroines had felt sincerity in heroes to be a secondary matter…. [The rake heroes conquered women] not

---

54 Jessica Munns includes the reformation of the rake but also adds other elements to characterize the new humane model: “After 1688, dramas reflected the new political consensus that emerged: rakes reform, ranting heroes become the standby of burlesque, merchants become patriots, not parasites, adultery is treated seriously” (155).

55 “The stage responded to the new climate adapting the dramatic practices that had proved successful over the last three decades to give shape to a model of exemplary comedy that placed the emphasis on the capacity of their rakish protagonists to reform” (Gómez-Lara, Mora and de Pando 25).
because they were sincere, but because they were capable of inspiring love in the woman and had—in addition—wit, intelligence, and personal force” (Smith 1948a: 158).

Halfway between the old and the new comic models, in the last years of the 17th century there is a series of plays which mix elements of both methods. In their incorporation of the ingredients of the humane comedy into the hard comedy tradition of the 1690s, this group represents the last link in the evolution of Restoration comedy before the 18th century. Congreve’s *Love for Love* (1695) portrays several archetypal subplots of the 1670s—including satire, cuckolding and gulling plots—but all remain secondary and none involves the male lead, Valentine, whose libertine life is well buried in the past. He is a sentimental hero tested by Angelica, the model of the new heroine who, as Corman states, cannot be won by “wit and trickery” (86), only by virtue and honest generosity. In *Love’s Last Shift* (1696) there is no trace of cuckolding, as Cibber reminds his audience in the Epilogue; yet, the constant heroine’s husband displays a genuine rakish attitude throughout the play, until he is transformed in a closing scene verging on the melodramatic.56 Vanbrugh’s *The Provoked Wife* (1697) deals with the problems of dysfunctional marriage from a realistic, nearly harsh, perspective, indebted in part to Southerne’s and Congreve’s early 1690s plays.57 The marriage plot involving Lord and Lady Brute is balanced against a sympathetic/romantic love plot, where Bellinda despises wealthier suitors to choose Heartfree, thus trying to avoid a prospective unhappy matrimony like the Brutes’. Hume considers that with these works, by the years 1695-1697 “the ‘hard’ view has given way to the ‘humane’ outlook, positive example is enjoying a rapid rise, and the old comedy is

56 The Epilogue addresses first the “Kind City-Gentlemen o’th’middle Row,” stating that they cannot complain against the author since “There’s not a cuckold made in all his Play” (1973: 84, ll.1-4). The speaker then turns to the gallants in the pit, expressing concern that they might disapprove of the reformation of the rake, which however should please the ladies: “Four Acts for your course Palates were design’d, /But then the Ladies Taste is more refin’d” (1973: 84, ll.19-20).

57 Cordner pinpoints the tendency to expose marital discord onstage in the final decade of the century: “In particular, between 1691 and 1697 four talented dramatists—Southerne, Crowne, Cibber, and Vanbrugh—each wrote about a wife’s reaction to her husband’s infidelity and/or neglect of her in ways quite distinct from any earlier treatment of the same them” (1990: 273).
dead” (1976: 423). The exemplary is therefore firmly consolidated and will prevail well into the 18th century.\textsuperscript{58}

In conclusion, though the debate around the change in comedy is still ongoing, the tendency is to question the notion of the “change” itself—inasmuch as it implies an abrupt substitution of one form for another—and to talk about instead a progressive evolution of the exemplary model, which was consolidating itself at the expense of the old hard comedy.\textsuperscript{59} Hume goes a step further to emphasise a “return” rather than a “change”: “the humane comedy of the 1690s and early 1700 represents a return to the mainstream, a continuation of basic repertory norms—not a sudden change in a new direction” (1983: 114).\textsuperscript{60} The progression which led to the consolidation of the exemplary comedy was largely motivated by extrinsic forces which affected the theatre and conditioned the taste of the audience. Hume dissents from J. H. Smith’s theory of the ladies’ preponderance: although they “clamoured against sex,” Hume affirms, the ladies “did not champion exemplary comedy” (1983: 116), but the impact that the series of socio-political transformations the Glorious Revolution exerted on the nation in general and on the theatre in particular should not be ignored.\textsuperscript{61} Finally, it is likewise noteworthy that in this gradual and—at points—untidy process both styles coexisted and evolved. Owing to its

\textsuperscript{58} The long lasting success of playwrights such as Cibber, Vanbrugh, Congreve and Farquhar “insured that English stage comedy of the eighteenth century would remain the conservative, slowly changing mix of Fletcherian and Jonsonian elements that had formed so effective and resilient a partnership throughout the seventeenth century” (Corman 2000: 69).

\textsuperscript{59} Hume states that “there is less overall change between the norms of 1665 and those of 1705 than is usually assumed” (1983: 115).

\textsuperscript{60} He upholds his hypothesis on the following grounds: “If we look at comedies before 1642, or from 1660s, we will find a very large number indeed which are romantic, sympathetic, humane, or whatever term we are to employ in contrast to hard, or cynical, or libertine … Instead of seeing ‘sympathetic’ treatment of character in the seventies and eighties as signs of the encroachment of exemplary method, I would see it as nothing more than the reassertion of an ongoing mainstream tradition” (Hume 1983: 114-15).

\textsuperscript{61} David Roberts also contests Smith’s view: “The idea of a powerful ‘ladies’ faction is, we have seem, extremely dubious, so we must investigate other sources of pressure in order to make full sense of the new style in comedy” (144).
transitional spirit, *Greenwich Park* represents a very illustrative example of that literary evolution and of that concurrence of styles.

3.4. *Greenwich Park* and “the Change” in Restoration Comedy

*Greenwich Park* is a product of its time. The evolution that Restoration comedy was undergoing in the final decade of the 17th century had a clear influence on Mountfort’s play, on its plot, its resolution and on the portrayal of its characters; it therefore became a transitional play where Mountfort mixed elements of the two prevailing dramatic modes of the 1690s: the old comedy and the exemplary. A number of critics have stressed the author-playwright’s sharp combination of ingredients from both traditions: Martin Walsh, for instance, explains that *Greenwich Park* “was caught between two unequal stools” and defines it as “a very early and significant milestone on the road from witty to sentimental comedy” (39), and Hume includes it in a group of comedies “which fall somewhere between the extreme groups. Some of them are basically old-style hard comedy toned down to suit the Williamite audience; others display a more positive inclination toward the humane, and even the exemplary” (1976: 393).

Mountfort’s play may not be an original work, and yet it is wondrously amusing romantic comedy. Its plot lines are not unusual, nor are they developed in full depth: the action revolves around Young Reveller’s love intrigues with three different women, which provide the opportunity to display different social backgrounds as well. Reveller’s courtship of a lady who is both his social peer and his equal in wit —Florella— is complemented by two love triangles which place Young Reveller in the middle as “the disruptive influence”

---

62 Perkinson considers that Mountfort imitates Shirley’s *Hyde Park* (1632) “in using Greenwich Park to carry on the threads of his plot” and points out that “the night scenes in the third act might have been suggested by those in *Love in a Wood*” (289). For Hughes, James Carlile’s *The Fortune-Hunters* (1689), Crowne’s *The English Friar* (March 1690), and Shadwell’s *The Amorous Bigotte* (1690) were “a shaping influence” upon *Greenwich Park* (1996: 337). And Corman remarks: “Mountfort seems to have been influenced most by plays in which he acted in the few years immediately preceding *Greenwich-Park*” (1993: 64-65). On originality in Restoration drama, see Hume 1976: 134-35.
(Corman 1993: 72): his affair with Mrs. Raison, the citizen’s wife; and his encounters with
the scheming Dorinda, who —unbeknown to Reveller— is his friend Lord Worthy’s kept
mistress. Young Reveller’s three plots are paralleled with two other secondary courtship
intrigues: one of them involves Lord Worthy and Violante —Florella’s sister— and the
other Sir Thomas Reveller and the ladies’ mother, Lady Hazard, who make a rather
uncommon couple of older lovers.

The couple of rakes and the two ladies of quality, their witty repartees and
courtship intrigues introduce in the play the refinement and sophistication of the comedy
of wit, while the humours characterisation is reduced to Sir Thomas Reveller and his
obsession with acting always in contradiction to his son. Mountfort’s play is a transitional
piece between the satiric and sentimental modes, although it tends to lean more towards
the latter, particularly due to the reform of the rake and the preponderance that the
institution of marriage gains; after all, the play closes with three weddings and a
matrimonial reconciliation. Very symbolically, the only characters who are clearly satirised
are those representing Town values: Sir William Thoughtless, Billy Bounce and the Beaux,
all of whom suffer a farcical punishment. Therefore, in general lines, the Fletcherian
elements prevail over the Jonsonian legacy in *Greenwich Park*.

The plot is certainly not *Greenwich Park*’s chief strength. Its characters clearly stand
above it, which is not surprising bearing in mind that Mountfort was one of the leading
actors of his time, and that he cleverly employs the different plot-lines as a vehicle for his
and his formidable cast’s display. His pairing with his wife as Young Reveller and Florella
was much expected and celebrated by the audience, and so was the comic trio formed by
Anthony Leigh, James Nokes and Cave Underhill as Sir Thomas, Mr. Raison and Mr.
Sasaphras. Finally, the charismatic Elizabeth Barry performed Dorinda, by far the most

---

63 Mountfort and his wife Susanna had often been paired together in love intrigues in recent
comedies, such as Carlile’s *The Fortune-Hunters* (1689), Shadwell’s *Bury Fair* (1689) or Southerne’s *Sir
fascinating and complex character —male or female— in the play. The melodramatic tone of her speeches and the verse tirades she is given throughout the play seem designed to exploit the strengths of an actress that had risen to fame playing the passionate heroines in Otway’s tragedies.\textsuperscript{64}

Like the play itself, Young Reveller moves between two worlds: on the one hand, the libertine past of the court of Charles II, whose lifestyle Reveller briefly and nostalgically evokes at the beginning of the play (1.2), and the moderate and virtuous Williamite order, on the other. The Stuart legacy is introduced by both rakes’ post-Cavalier status and ethos, while the new monarchs’ influence can be perceived in those same rakes’ acceptance of the Whiggish citizens. Throughout the play, Young Reveller skilfully crosses from one world to the other, evolving from the wildness which defines him in the Dramatis Personae to his redeeming matrimony to Florella. Furthermore, this emotional conversion Young Reveller undergoes runs parallel to the physical transition from the West to the East of London in the setting and the action of the play, in a symbolic move that leaves behind Carolean values (see Chapter 5).

Young Reveller inherits his predatory chase of women from the rakes of the mid-1670s, although he seems to lack their cynical skepticism, and therefore he is fooled by Dorinda. This touch of naivety both distances Reveller from Dorimant or Horner and humanises him, turning him into a less contemptible character for the post-Revolution audience. Again, he moves halfway between the wild libertine of the sex comedy and the exemplary man of the 18\textsuperscript{th} century Perhaps the most revealing aspect of this rake’s evolution is his sincere answer to Lord Worthy’s rebuke for his cuckolding Mr. Raison:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Anthony Love} (1690). Underhill, Nokes and Leigh had made a star trio of comedians ever since Leigh joined the Duke’s Company in 1673. They acted together in repertory pieces like Shadwell’s \textit{The Virtuoso} (1676), Durfey’s \textit{Madam Fickle} (1676) or Ravenscroft’s \textit{The London Cuckolds} (1681).\textsuperscript{64} On Elizabeth Barry’s acting style and her pivotal role in the change from heroic drama to pathetic tragedy, see Howe 108-28.
\end{quote}
LORD WORTHY: … they [Raison and Sassafras] are the honestest plebeians I ever met with and, as thy father says, George, I wonder thou canst have the heart to cuckold so honest a friend to the bottle as Raison.

YOUNG REVELLER: Faith, my lord, I’ll be ingenuous with you. ’Tis an intrigue of a pretty long standing and, though it be somewhat scandalous to receive more favours from women than one, my necessity has obliged me to comply; for ever since your travels she has been my father. (2.3.6-12)

Young Reveller honestly defines his promiscuity as “scandalous” and explains that it was “necessity” that impelled him to pursue Mrs. Raison. In other words, the unrestrained sexual behavior of the mid-1670s rakes is replaced by a less assertive, even apologetic attitude, much more in consonance with the taste of the play’s audience (to meet the postcarolean demands). Corman talks about a “change” in the character: “the values implicit in Reveller’s exchange with Worthy reveal a marked change from those applied to Reveller’s predecessors of the 1660s and 1670s” (1993: 67). In this evolution, Reveller anticipates the toning down of the rake and the moral integrity that will characterise the male leads in the following years. According to Weber, Congreve’s Mirabell (in The Way of the World, 1700) stands as a good example: “there can be little doubt that Mirabell wishes to fulfill his desires within the acceptable limits of society. Though his attempt to trick Lady Wishfort into an engagement with his servants is surely a dastardly scheme, the play does not suggest that Mirabell takes excessive pleasure in his plots or that he pursues them without regard to their moral implications” (120). Like Young Reveller’s, Mirabell’s “schemes are unpleasant but necessary” (121).65

65 Mirabell, however, can be as cynical and self-serving as the best rakes of the 1670s. He does not hesitate to palm off a former mistress on a man he treats as a friend when he fears she might be pregnant. In 2.2, he explains to Mrs. Fainall that he chose Fainall for her to protect her reputation,
The cuckolding plot allows Mountfort to introduce a portrayal of the Raisons’ marital discord, although not with the depth nor the serious insight of contemporary plays, like *The Wives’ Excuse* or *The Old Bachelor*. In the case of *Greenwich Park*, under the clash between Mr. and Mrs. Raison lies a social conflict, as they originally belong to different strata (he represents the citizens whereas she is a born gentlewoman). At the end of the play, he forgives her affair with Reveller and both the marital disputes and the class conflict are symbolically resolved.

The public settings where the action in *Greenwich Park* unfolds play a crucial role in the development of its different plot lines (see Chapter 5). Hence, an accidental encounter in Deptford Wells places Dorinda in Reveller’s way. His instant infatuation with her makes him vacillate on his future with Florella, so that Dorinda becomes the actual blocking element between the gay couple. In that sense, Sir Thomas Reveller, in spite of his humour, does not represent the traditional father who blocks the gay couple’s union, provoking domestic tension. His opposition to Reveller’s marriage at the end of the play is easily overcome by his son and Florella’s trick of making him believe Reveller is opposed to the union, so that Sir Thomas, in his contrary humour, insists on it (5.3.133-40). Young Reveller’s passion for Dorinda is seemingly honest; as he confesses in a soliloquy: “I begin to fear I’m growing a downright dull, insipid, constant lover!” (3.1.212-13). However, once he possesses her in 4.4, his libertine instinct emerges again. Thus, in the next scene he appears flirting with a masked woman he takes her for Florella, and we see him embracing and even kneeling down to her (5.1.172). Dorinda, also masked, witnesses the events and furiously beats him before leaving the scene exclaiming: “Perdition seize your generation” since Fainall was a man of good credit in the Town, though an interested friend and a false lover. He does weigh the moral implications of his design, but not without cold calculation: “A better man ought not to have been sacrificed to the occasion; a worse had not answered to the purpose” (1971: 2.2.242-44).

66 In a similar aside, Dorimant in *The Man of Mode* states his seemingly honest love for Harriet, pondering on its moral repercussions: “I love her and dare not let her know it; I fear she has an ascendant over me and may revenge the wrongs I have done her sex” (4.1.132-33).
Before the play concludes, Reveller is reconciled to Dorinda and seems to choose her over Florella:

DORINDA: And will you not marry Florella?

YOUNG REVELLER: Buy trouble so dear, when I can have pleasure so cheap?

DORINDA: And you will never?

YOUNG REVELLER: Impossible! I should keep me here ever with thee thus, and scorn thy sex besides.

DORINDA: Oh, take me all then! Thus let us grow and never separate.

(5.3.22-27)

The scene is abruptly interrupted by the third member of this love triangle: Lord Worthy, Dorinda's secret keeper and Reveller's close friend. His *deus ex-machina* entrance onstage is providential for Reveller, since Worthy exposes the real Dorinda to him and to the rest of the characters. The second rake of the play is paralleled to Young Reveller through a formula which was already well-established in Restoration comedy, that is, splitting the rake into two figures: the libertine, later reformed, male lead on the one hand, and the *honnête homme*, on the other. The latter was becoming increasingly more popular in the 1690s, as a concession to the taste of a large part of the audience, and establishes a clear distinction with earlier plays where the two male leads could be equally wild, like Bruce and Longvil in Shadwell's *The Virtuoso* (1676) or Goodvile and Truman in Otway’s *Friendship in Fashion* (1678). Therefore, Young Reveller's excesses are expected to be balanced with the seemingly more restrained sexual behaviour of Lord Worthy. However, Worthy is not a completely “*honnête*” figure from the beginning of the play, for while he disapproves of Reveller’s affair with Mrs. Raison, the audience finds out that he has been secretly keeping Dorinda as a mistress for some years. Worthy, like Reveller and the play in a general sense,
is a transitional character. It is only at the end, through his repentant confession, that he effectively turns into the honest lover and friend he appeared to be: “Ladies, Sir Thomas and gentlemen; I desired your good company to see me take leave of an old acquaintance, being resolved to live a sober, discreet life, and bend my whole thoughts towards this kind lady, I have bid adieu to the only mistress I had” (5.3.73-76).

In terms of poetic justice, Worthy’s confession seems to be enough to clear him of any punitive correction for his immoral behaviour. Likewise, Reveller’s misdemeanours (his simultaneous pursuit of three women and his cuckold two of his friends, a citizen and a gentleman) escape punishment at the end of the play. The cuckold plot with Mrs. Raison is justified by necessity —his father refuses to “let him live like a gentleman” (1.3.152-53)— and his relationship with Dorinda, by his ignorance of her bond with his friend, as Worthy acknowledges: “I’ll tell thee, George. Oh! Had I trusted thee before, thou hadst not wronged me” (5.3.39-40). Thus, Reveller eludes any reproof for his past transgressions and moves into his reformed future through his marriage to Florella. Mora and Gómez-Lara comment on the diverse reformation methods the rake undergoes in the years immediately following the Revolution:

Most of the plays retain this figure but attempt to reform or tone down this character in different ways. Some comedies, like Carlile’s *The Fortune-Hunters* (1689) and Shadwell’s *Bury Fair* (1689), reform the rake through the love of a pure woman and make him happily embrace marriage; in Shadwell’s *The Scourers* (1690) or Mountfort’s *Greenwich Park* (1691), reformed rakes, besides, utter a formal recantation. In Southerne’s *The Wives Excuse* (1691), the rake fails in his designs of seduction, and in Durfey’s *Love for Money* (1691), he is deceived by his mercenary mistress. Smyth’s *Win Her and Take Her* (1691) defines one of the male leads (Loveby) as a rakish character, but he does not
remotely live up to the type. In Shadwell’s *The Volunteers* (1692) and Congreve’s *The Double Dealer* (1693), the ‘men of wit’ no longer embrace or even flirt with rakish values. (149)

Apart from the rake, other stock characters evolve, and reform, in *Greenwich Park*. So, for instance, the affected Mrs. Raison who, partly coerced by Reveller’s prospective marriage with Florella, goes back to her cuckolded husband with a speech verging on the sentimental: “Why, let him go; here, husband, take what you never had till now, my heart; your generosity and good temper, however I have abused it, I’ll strive to deserve it” (5.3.148-50).

Mrs. Raison is not only Reveller’s keeper, she also becomes, although unintentionally, the instrument through which the rake first met Florella. From then on, he will court her as a socially and economically convenient wife:

YOUNG REVELLER: I have fair hopes on’t, she’s worth fifteen thousand pounds and her sister as much. They are the co-heiresses of Sir Tho[mas] Hazard, a famous merchant that died about two years ago … the money’s their own upon the day of age or marriage … And if I can but secure the inclination, the money comes of course. (2.3.15-20)

As for Florella, her characterisation blends elements from both the sentimental and the hard comedy traditions. On the one hand, she anticipates the virtuous heroine —like Amanda in Cibber’s *Love’s Last Shift* (1696)— for whom the rake reforms, becoming a constant and honest lover, and on the other, she envies those mistresses who enjoy sexual intercourse without the constraints of social decorum: “let us not affect that nicety when we’re alone which we assume in public. I confess I would not go beyond the rules of honour, and yet I cannot help envying those that do when I think they enjoy my lover”
(2.1.14-17). To some extent, her confession echoes the famous scene in *The Country Wife* where the “sister sharers” cynically despise the notion of “reputation”:

LADY FIDGET: Our Reputation? Lord! Why should you not think that we women make use of our Reputation, as you men of yours, only to deceive the world with less suspicion? Our virtue is like the statesman’s religion, the Quaker’s word, the gamester’s oath, and the great man’s honour: but to cheat those that trust us.

SQUEAMISH: And that demureness, coyness, and modesty that you see in our faces in the boxes at plays, is as much a sign of a kind woman, as a vizard-mask in the pit.

DAINTY: For I assure you, women are least masked when they have the velvet vizard on.  (5.4.100-09)⁶⁷

Violante, who is clearly embarrassed by her sister’s speech, represents a complementing female figure to Florella, one that is less wild and outspoken, in consonance with the similarly more restrained Lord Worthy (with whom Reveller couples Violante). As she tells Florella: “if he be so accomplished as your lover has spoke him, as frozen a virgin as I am, I may be melted” (2.1.42-43). This couple offers thus a sober counterpoint to the witty duo of Florella and Reveller, as in Durfey’s *Love for Money*: Young Merriton and Mirtilla provide the virtuous balance to the libertine pair formed by Amorous and Jiltall.

Florella’s outspokenness and agency are also accentuated by Mountfort’s use of a dramatic device that had gained considerable popularity on the Restoration stage, especially

⁶⁷ As Novak observes, “The libertine ladies of the play confess that respectability is merely a mask for their lives of free sexual pleasure. If the women are satirized to an extent, it is only because society and its rules are shown to be a superficial disguise for the animal spirit in human beings” (63).
among the male audience: the breeches part. For a classic, entertaining account of the breeches part, see Wilson (1958): 73-86. See also Prieto-Pablos (2012).

Edward Ravenscroft had used the same device in his comedy The Careless Lovers (1673), where Hillaria dresses as a playful wit to court Careless’s mistresses and lure them away from him (4.1).

In Greenwich Park, Florella and Mrs. Raison don male clothes to court each other in disguise and thus try to make Reveller jealous, and both of them end up approaching a third woman, Dorinda, in a comical inversion of roles. Mountfort also questions gender conventions by diminishing Young Reveller’s virile agency as the action evolves. In the first part of the play, a wild Reveller exhibits himself before nearly any woman he runs into, displaying both boundless energy and irresistible eloquence. He first courts Florella in a brilliant witty repartee; later, at night, he meets with Dorinda in the Park and equally dazzles her, to judge from her response: “By heaven, if he persists I am undone,/His charming tongue will blast my stratagem” (3.1.130-31), she admits in an aside. Finally, he is persuasive enough as to convince Mrs. Raison, who has witnessed the scene with Dorinda, that all was feigned, and to end up having sex with her at his lodgings:

MRS. RAISON: This won’t do, devil, I am so convinced of your baseness that—

YOUNG REVELLER: Pshaw, pox, too much is too much. Prithee, don’t drive the jest so far neither; I can bear, you know by what’s passed, but egad the worm will turn at last. (3.1.263-66)

However, in the last two acts, the character of Reveller loses some of his dramatic force and becomes less and less articulate. In 4.2, Dorinda addresses him peremptorily with unusual imperative sentences —“you must dine with me today” (211-12), “Be in the Park at one of the clock” (214)— while in Act 5 Dorinda, and then a disguised Florella, slap him (5.1.172, 5.2.134). Moreover, at the play’s resolution Reveller’s renowned verbal seduction,
and symbolically his manliness by extension, is literally silenced by Florella, who interrupts him abruptly when Reveller is addressing Mrs. Raison:

YOUNG REVELLER: [Aside to Mrs. Raison] Faith, madam, I have been a great charge to you, and am very happy I can—

FLORELLA: No whispering now the man’s sold; you have had your pennyworths, I’m sure. (5.3.143-46)

Reveller’s private talking with Mrs. Raison may echo Dorimant and Bellinda’s exchange at the end of *The Man of Mode* and open up the possibility of further encounters (see above p.45). Nonetheless, the 1690s rake is merely a toned down copy of his forerunner. While the audience assumes that Dorimant will perpetuate his libertine life, here Florella leaves Reveller no option: she silences him, taking over his authority. Her justification is emphatic enough: “the man's sold.” Therefore, at the end of the play, the wild rake of the first acts (and metaphorically, of the 1670s) is satirically turned into what his conquests have traditionally become for him: a material property, a sort of empty object of exhibition. To some extent, the reformed Reveller anticipates some of Congreve’s prospective chaste, and perhaps too passive, male leads, like Mellefont in *The Double-Dealer* (1693; 1694) and Valentine in *Love for Love* (1695).

Florella is not just the sentimental heroine capable of challenging gender assumptions; she (and her sister) also represent an inversion of social roles: despite their mixed origins —their father was a former Lord Mayor of London and their mother a court laundress— they prove to be archetypical ladies of quality. In the same way as he problematises gender clichés, Mountfort questions social hierarchies and presents a much more dynamic society in his play. This portrayal reflects the changing society of the late 17th century: the Whiggish bourgeoisie was on the ascendancy —backed by the new monarchs— whereas values associated with the gentry and the nobility, which had been
favoured by the previous Stuart kings, were declining. Canfield comments on this: “As the Restoration yields to the Revolution, however, comedies begin to portray a bourgeois morality wherein the superior are so by merit, by good nature” (2001: 211).

The characterization of the citizen is one of the most remarkable aspects of *Greenwich Park* in terms of its representation of social hierarchy: Mr. Raison and Mr. Sassafras have little to do with the erstwhile greedy Puritan of Carolean comedy, who was subjected to merciless ridicule and punished through cuckolding plots. The former citizen’s obsession with work and money making kept him too busy to look after his wife’s pleasure himself, and so she sought satisfaction somewhere else. As Pat Gill explains: “Having sacrificed their ‘natural’ masculine appetites to economic enterprise, businessmen prove themselves to be money-grubbing fools who deserve to be cozened and cuckolded” (203). Unlike them, both Mr. Raison and Mr. Sassafras participate in roaring celebrations side by side with gentlemen like Sir Thomas Reveller, therefore weakening and blurring social distinctions between both classes. These new citizens are welcomed into the social circle of the gentry and participate in their entertainments, as Canfield states: “The new oligarchy justified itself *vis-à-vis* the decadent old (Stuart) aristocracy as it attempted to consolidate power by welcoming *nouveaux riches*” (223). Ironically, it is in fact through the citizens and the aging Sir Thomas that the libertine revels survive in an age when the genuine rakes —Young Reveller and Worthy— are evolving into tame, sentimental figures. Finally, Mr. Raison’s marriage to a gentlewoman “from Covent Garden” (1.1.103) serves as

---

70 On the characterization of the cuckolded citizen in late Stuart drama, see Dawson 27-45. Dawson disagrees with arguments like Canfield’s (1997) that the cuckolding of citizens by gentlemen on the stage is a form of reasserting social hierarchy. He contends instead that the cuckolding of citizens “expressed anxiety about the failure of social structuration, an inability to identify definitively who belonged where and why in the first instance” (44).

71 Sir Thomas Reveller’s steward is more sardonic about the rapprochement between City and Town: “These citizens would feign do something like courtiers, but I find they affect their vices as they do their fashions, never till the gentry are both weary and ashamed of ’em” (1.3.62-64).

72 Hughes (2004) concurs that the play offers a positive portrait of “bourgeois characters,” though he focuses more on Violante and Florella, pointing out that the “witty, beautiful heroines are the daughters of a laundress” in the play (104).
another example of the symbolic union between City and Town. Although Mr. Raison is cuckolded by his wife—who moreover supports Reveller with her husband’s money—he is not publicly humiliated, unlike his unfortunate predecessors, but tolerates his wife’s deceit with a sort of inner, stoic penitence. His sheer good nature, as Mrs. Raison acknowledges, facilitates the marital reconciliation that takes place in the final scene:

MR. RAISON: Come, wife, you had as good live honest, since you find you can’t help it.

MRS. RAISON: … Here, husband, take what you never had till now, my heart; your generosity and good temper, however I have abused it, I'll strive to deserve it.

MR. RAISON: Why, better late than never, Kate. (5.3.147-51)

Influenced by the moral values promoted by new regime, the characterisation of the gentry in the play also undergoes a change. The social evolution of the high class runs parallel to its exodus from the West End of London (see Chapter 5).

Sir Thomas Reveller exemplifies that progression, as he settled in the City after abandoning both the physical and the moral geographies of the Town, which he repudiates in the play. His description of life at “t’other end of the Town” (1.3.184) is an ingenious attack against the Stuart regime: “‘Tis to speak ill of every man, yet be courteous to all men; borrow of most men and pay no man; always at home to their whores and ever abroad to their creditors; to cheat their brothers, debauch their sisters; to be drunk nightly, arrested weekly, beaten monthly, poxed quarterly, live cursedly, die wretchedly, and so be damned to all eternity” (1.3.187-91). The exiled Sir Thomas enjoys the company of his “neighbour” citizens, with whom he roars “mightily,” and thus he prefers courting a citizen’s widow (Florella and Violante’s mother, Lazy Hazard) to a Town gentlewoman.

Corman finds similarities with Durfey’s Love for Money (1691), which is set in Chelsea: “In moving the action out of the City and placing the villanous uncle among the gentry, Durfey joins Mountfort in turning old class stereotypes on their head” (75-76).
In contrast, those members of the gentry who remain in the West End represent the Town values and are precisely the characters who are more harshly satirised in *Greenwich Park*: Sir William Thoughtless, Bully Bounce and the Covent Garden Beaux. Corman notes: “Mountfort’s nod in the direction of the Jacobean city comedy of Jonson, Marston, and Chapman in his ridicule of the mindless insolence and cowardice of Sir William and Bounce and the empty affectations of the beaux allows him to balance his more amiable humours with those of the more traditional, punitive breed” (1993: 72). When they first appear on stage, Sir William and Bully Bounce try to court Florella and Violante in the Park using the brisk, impudent manner of address reminiscent of the language of the would-be rakes of the 1670s:

SIR WILLIAM THOUGHTLESS: … How do you, ladies? Why this melancholy velvet upon such fair complexions? Has the chillness of the waters made the roses on your cheeks to fade, or has their influence rudely pressed upon the tip of your noses and made ’em bleak and sharp?

VIOLANTE: However sharp they have made our noses they have had no effects upon your understanding, for your language is as ridiculous as your person. (4.2.23-28)

Throughout this dialogue Sir William and Bounce show themselves proud of their “raillery” (4.2.31) as they attempt to provoke Violante and Florella into dropping their vizards and showing them their faces. Their arrogance and insolence only exposes their folly, while it also proves that the Town people are no longer the glamorous elite they used to be. The second time they appear, Thoughtless and Bounce dispense with words and merely try to pull the ladies with them (4.2.371-76). In the Restoration comedy of manners, courtship implies a codified process based on witty exchanges and double meanings: if

---

74 In Shadwell’s *Epsom Wells* (1672; 1673), Woodly offers to show Carolina the fashionable “gay brisk way” of courtship. He proceeds by claiming, for instance, that her breath can’t be sweet or her legs straight and trying to kiss her and lift up her petticoats to prove it (2.2.46-75).
replaced by a farcical scene where the would-be wits do not speak, but merely pull the ladies of quality, it reveals their lack of sophistication.

To characterise Dorinda, Mountfort goes beyond the mere portrait of the fallen woman, and uses traits which were traditionally applied to stock male figures, like the citizen or the rake. On the one hand, her perception of moral integrity in mercantile terms—“Morality, thou art unprofitable,” she complains (2.2.53)—links her to the citizen-merchants in the comedies of 1660s and 1670s, who saw the world always through a commercial perspective. On the other hand, she is dishonest, false and inconstant in her love manoeuvrings with Reveller and Worthy, which makes her a genuine she-rake. Her motivation—Worthy will keep her while Reveller will amuse her—replicates the libertine rake’s *modus operandi* with his conquests: a fashionable lady of quality who brings him financial support is combined with the pleasures provided by his mistress.

In her cataloguing of female characters in the comedies of manners, Pat Gill describes a category where Dorinda fits perfectly: “dangerous, devious women [who] use sex as a means to power and money … sexually active hypocrites who scheme, betray, entrap, and deceive” (194-95), very much like the wild rake figure. Weber uses a different term to define a similar dramatic type: “The female libertine imitates her male counterpart on the Restoration stage through her desire to participate in the sexual freedoms usually denied by a social world intent on subordinating the individual to the larger dictates of society” (153). Surely, Dorinda questions the male superiority the play takes for granted: she is intellectually equal or superior to the male leads, to such an extent that her intrigues succeed in manipulating and deceiving both men. Her masculinisation is also perceived through her verbal eloquence, as in the aggressive repartee she maintains with Florella:

DORINDA: "Tis but your leavings, madam, she must have charms indeed that can pretend to raise the siege you’ve laid."
FLORELLA: The fort is of no great consequence nor worth much trouble, when it is willing to yield to such things …

DORINDA: The lady’s silence tells you she’s indifferent; if you stand good to what we have agreed on we’ll seal articles when next we meet; and if this lady’s face has no more charms than her tongue, I dare trust you alone with her, without one jealous pang.

FLORELLA: Pray take your spark with you, madam, for if you should relapse, ’twill save you the trouble of coming back again and being laughed at.

DORINDA: I have so much good nature, madam, that I had rather make you laugh by coming for him again, than weep by taking him from you now.  

(4.2.220-36)

Like Lucia in *Sir Anthony Love*, premiered just months before *Greenwich Park*, Dorinda was sold as a mistress to a wealthy lord; unlike Southerne’s character, however, she usurps the male roles in the action without having to dress like a man.

To conclude, the way in which the play dispenses poetic justice relieves the two rakes of any responsibility for their wrongdoings: Worthy’s confession and Reveller’s reform are rewarded with advantageous matrimony to Violante and Florella, respectively. Despite his fits of humour against his son and his futile approaches to the masked ladies in the Park, Sir Thomas does not seem to deserve further correction and he ends up marrying Lady Hazard, in a likewise good match for him. Mr. and Mrs. Raison are not especially punished either. Though he is slightly ridiculed as a cuckold, and as a coward in the fight scenes both with the beaux and the disguised Florella, he is after all a generous figure who sincerely loves his vain wife and forgives her affair with Reveller. Mr. Sassafras, whose role is actually subordinate to Mr. Raison’s, is a secondary character who duplicates the other citizen’s actions and whose relevance in the action is minor. The Town representatives
suffer the verbal and physical violence of nearly the rest of the cast: a statement that their time is past, and that the East End is not the West End. Their presence onstage is ridiculed and the scenes where they are involved farcical: they end up being expelled from the Park and mocked for their affectation and cowardice. However, the character who suffers the most severe punishment is Dorinda: she ends up publicly humiliated, unmarried and expelled from the stage.\(^5\) Her dishonest machinations to deceive both rakes and her obstruction of the gay couple’s marriage leaves no possibility of comic reconciliation for her: she must be banished from that society she has been trying to corrupt.\(^6\) She proudly abandons the stage, leaving a curse on Violante and a malicious message for Worthy:

\[\text{[To Violante]} \text{ May jealousy unquenchable possess thee; } \\
\text{ May impotence in him still cross thy wishes; } \\
\text{ And may you love still in despite of both. } \\
\text{[To Lord Worthy]} \text{ For thee I have some pleasure in my ruin; } \\
\text{ Thou didst intend, I find, for her to leave me; } \\
\text{ And I have been beforehand with thee, in him. } \\
\text{ And since we both designed to cheat each other, } \\
\text{ It is my pride, though with the loss I’m cursed, } \\
\text{ I had my man and was in falsehood first. (5.3.84-92) }\]

The absence of any moral regrets in her speech reveals not only Dorinda’s wilfulness, but also her strong female agency and her defiance of social rules.

---

5 Pat Gill expands on the exposure of characters like Dorinda: “Restoration comedies of manners domesticate these cunning ladies by unmasking them, by showing them to be merely women and therefore vulnerable to public shame and scorn” (195).

6 For Weber, “Like the male rake, the female rake commands both respect and scorn, admiration and fear; unlike the male rake, however, the female proves difficult to domesticate … her sexual vitality and defiance of male authority create fears that remain unresolved by the conventional resolution of Restoration comedy” (153).

4.1. The Text and the Editorial Policy

Mountfort’s *Greenwich Park* was first published jointly by Joseph Hindmarsh, Richard Bentley and Abel Roper in May 1691 (Arber 2: 360). It was printed quarto format, as was common practice at the time for editions of single plays, and consists of eight and a half gatherings (A–H 4 I 2). Another two editions of the play were printed in duodecimo in the early 18th century: the first of them (D1) was published by George Strahan 1710; the second (D2) was included in a collection of *Six Plays* attributed to Mountfort (see above p.27), published in 1720 by Strahan and Jacob Tonson, though the title page for *Greenwich Park* (Vol. 1) bears the date 1719 and gives the names of Strahan and W. Mears as the stationers for whom it was printed.

The editor’s intention is to provide a critical, but faithful edition of William Mountfort’s *Greenwich Park*. The text offered here will emend the original where necessary or supply missing information, but will do so conservatively: it will endeavour to preserve the language and character of the original text, without attempting to replicate it slavishly in all formal details. It must be taken into consideration that the attempt to offer a close replica of the author’s original is an endeavour framed with a great deal of limitations, beginning with the layout and disposition of the text. As B. J. McMullin notes, in his edition of John Crowne’s comedies: “prose lines will be rarely equivalent, and no subsequent edition could possibly reproduce the minutiae of intra-linear spacing in its copy text … there may be variant states of some of the forms, and that prose may need resetting as verse (and vice versa)” (ix). The present edition will update textual layout and modernise other formal features in an attempt to produce a more approachable text.

The decision to update and modernise formal aspects is one that is inextricably linked to the choice of the potential audience for the text. This edition is not necessarily
intended for an expert philologist audience, but aims at a wider public that may range from undergraduate students to readers interested in the theatre who may wish to have access to this comedy and enjoy its reading, but who might who might “be alienated by the unfamiliar conventions” of Early Modern English writing and printing practices (Hunter 86). In that sense, the aim here is to offer a text of Greenwich Park which will be faithful to the original and retain its flavour, but at the same time be accessible to a 21st century reader. To that end, original spelling, capitalisation, italicisation and, to a certain extent, punctuation will be modernised, seeking thus to remove much of what Hunter calls “the strangeness of an early modern text” (86).

4.1.1. Establishing the Text

The first step is to determine which of the early printed versions is to be considered as the closest to Mountfort’s original text, that is, which one has editorial authority over the others. Of the three extant editions of Greenwich Park (Q, D1, D2), the most authoritative text is Q, as it is the first edition of the play, the one that must have been closer to the original script and the only one to which Mountfort could have had access before printing, for he had already died when the other two were published.77 The copy-text used for this edition is a digital copy of the 1691 quarto (Q) held in the Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery (San Marino, California), catalogued by Wing as M2973 (Fig. 1). This text has been checked against a variant (Wing M2973A) available at the Folger Library, Washington (Fig. 2). Except for minor spelling variations on the title page (e.g. “Bentley” in the Huntington copy and “Bently” in the Folger Library exemplar), both quartos are essentially the same and do not even incorporate corrections of obvious errata.

---

77 We do not know whether Mountfort attempted to supervise the publication of his plays. As Greetham notes, the assumption that “it was the normal practice for authors personally to see all editions of their works through the press” is undocumented in the Renaissance” (333). Still, in the Restoration period some playwrights invite that assumption. Thus, for instance, Dryden complains in the Dedication to The Kind Keeper that the play was printed while he was out of town and he could not, therefore, revise the text as he meant to do (1992: 6).
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The Q text has been collated with the two eighteenth-century editions. Both D1 and D2 follow Q consistently, although both correct errata (e.g., D2: “ornament” for Q: “ornament” in the Epistle Dedicatory, or D1 and D2: “could not” for Q: “could not not” in 4.2.332). In addition, there are a few substantive alterations both in D1 and in D2, probably introduced by the publishers (e.g., the Epistle Dedicatory is lacking in D1, and there are a few significant emendations precisely in the epistle in D2). Those alterations, along with the variations from Q to the other two copies, have been duly recorded in the textual notes. The collation of the three copies of the text provides valuable insight on the stylistic conventions of the early 18th century, more specifically, on the standards of spelling and punctuation and how they had evolved. In both aspects, D1 seems closer to modern conventions than D2, which follows Q more consistently.

4.1.2. Treatment of the Copy-text

When editing the copy-text, a distinction must be made between the text itself and the “paraphernalia,” to use McMullin’s term, i.e., between the words the playwright actually wrote to be performed on-stage, and those elements appearing only in the published form of the text: the title page, the Epistle dedicatory, the Dramatis personae list, act and scene headings, stage directions and speech prefixes (xi). While this edition emends and regularises the paraphernalia to improve uniformity throughout the whole play (for instance, all the names of characters in speech prefixes and stage directions have been standardised, as well as act and scene headings), editorial interpolations in the original text have been reduced to a series of cases explained below.

In his seminal article “The Rationale of the Copy-text,” W. W. Greg proposes to differentiate between the “substantive” readings of the text, “those namely that affect the author’s meaning or the essence of his expression,” and the “accidentals,” which mainly
affect “the formal presentation” of the author’s actual words: spelling, punctuation, capitalisation, italicisation, word-division, and the like (22). Within this category of accidentals, a further distinction must be made: on the one hand, significant accidentals, which are those considered to be meaningful; and, on the other, formal accidentals, which are not. This edition understands spelling and punctuation as significant accidentals, inasmuch as variations in any of the two may imply a change in the intended meaning of the original text. Thus, the spelling of a word may either prevent or provoke ambiguity, like for instance the word “least,” which used to be spelled “least,” or “their” which is sometimes used in Q as the equivalent of Present-Day English “they’re” (as in 2.1.9). Similarly, a given sentence may convey a different sense depending on how it is punctuated. On the contrary, the rest of the accidentals taken into account here (capitalisation, word-division, etc.) are more related to the specific typographical disposition of the text and, since they do not affect meaning, they are defined as formal accidentals.

4.1.2.1. Significant Accidentals

a) Punctuation: The editorial policy aims to preserve the original punctuation and to avoid unnecessary interference, except in those justified cases where clarification is at stake. Changes in punctuation have not been recorded, but silently introduced. It is worth noting that Q’s punctuation is intended to reflect the purpose of the original document, namely, to be performed on-stage, which implies a significant deviation from Present-Day conventions of punctuating a text. The assumption must be that the original punctuation of the play-text obeys rhetorical, instead of expository, purposes: most frequently, commas and semi-colons will mark elocutionary pauses for the actors, even if that punctuation in print would not underline the syntactic structure of the sentence, helping clarify meaning for the reader.
So, for instance, the following speech by Lord Worthy in 4.1: “nor will I ever travel more for knowledge, my utmost study centred still in thee” (3-4). The punctuation of this fragment in the copy-text includes a semi-colon, replaced by a comma in this edition. The justification for that change is that the second sentence is subordinated to the preceding one, and so they should not be split by a semi-colon according to modern punctuation practice. Another example of editorial intervention: “Well, I am the first man that ever was kicked by a woman that was not his wife, sure” (5.2.101-02). The original punctuation of the sentence includes a seemingly rhetorical pause, marked by a comma, which actually splits the defining relative clause from the main sentence: “kicked by a woman, that was not his wife sure,” a punctuation which is not standard today. These two examples of rhetorical punctuation are cases of significant accidentals that are not retained in the present edition, as they may mislead the modern reader.

Except for cases like these, the original punctuation has been retained, even when it merely reflects rhetorical pauses. So for instance, the use of semi-colons instead of full stops has been respected if they do not distort the interpretation of the text. Colons, nevertheless, have been replaced by full stops for clarification purposes. Commas have been added after forms of address and expressions used as invocations or appeals (“well,” “why,” “prithee,” “nay”). The three editions of the play use exclamation and interrogation marks indistinctly, which may lead to confusion on some occasions. In those cases, the use of these marks has been normalised in accordance with modern conventions. Exclamation or interrogation marks have also been added when considered necessary according to the same criterion. Likewise, dashes have been supplied to indicate hesitancy, a meaningful pause, a change of addressee, or an interruption in the character’s utterance. Final double punctuation (e.g., <?> or <!> plus <—>) has also been regularised. Quotations appear between inverted commas instead of in contrasting fonts (e.g., a quotation from *The Rehearsal*
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in 1.2.49-50). Also, all speeches and stage directions are considered to need final punctuation. If none was provided in the original text, it has been added silently.

b) Spelling: Spelling has been silently modernised according to OED usage, as long as it does not imply any substantial change in the form or in the pronunciation of the word (e.g., “sense” has been substituted for “sence” or “satisfy” for “satisfie”). The purpose is to provide the modern reader with an accessible text which keeps its original substance: in that sense, to leave the original spelling untouched might have posed unnecessary obstacles. There are examples of words whose original spelling might mislead the reader, and which have been replaced by their modern equivalents, as they are pronounced either similarly or exactly the same: “trapes” in the original text is replaced by “traipse” in the edition, “farendin” by “farandine,” “landskip” by “landscape,” “gentile” by “genteel.” Proper names have also been modernised (“Calais” for “Callis”).

In terms of morphology, some words, mostly verbs (“durst,” “canst,” “likest,” “writ,” “shalt,” etc.) are kept in the obsolete forms in which they appear in the copy-text, as they are recognisable and do not affect the understanding of the text. Throughout the copy-text, the forms “show” and “shew” (and some variants “shows/shews,” “showing/shewing”) are used indistinctly and so they have been regularised and modernised in the form “show.” Contracted variants have been modernised in the case of past tense and past participle endings and in the case of some modal-verb forms, too (“encourag’d” or “wou’d”), but the original text has been maintained in the rest of contracted forms, especially those involving two or more words (e.g. “for’t,” “of ’em,” “o’the ear,” “take ’em”). Some expressions and their variants (e.g., “egad,” for “i’gad” and “i gad;” “oons” for “ounds”) have been silently modernised and standardised, since their modern spellings do not affect their phonetic rendering.
Elisions have been standardised. E.g., “ere” and “e’re” appear as “e’er” in the edition. Missing apostrophes have been supplied in an attempt to clarify meaning (e.g., “I han’t know her” is replaced by “I ha’n’t known her” in 1.3.32). Abbreviations of words have been expanded and standardised (like “pound” or “pounds” for “l.”) throughout the text. Spacing between words of the copy-text has also been modernised where appropriate (e.g., “some day” is replaced by “someday,” and “my self” by “myself”). When a word accepts both fusion and separation, then the copy-text has been respected. Finally, wrong sorts have been corrected and annotated.

4.1.2.2. Formal Accidentals

Since their influence on meaning is scarce, they have been silently regularised in accordance with modern usage.

a) Capitalisation: Printing practice in the Restoration period tended to capitalise every significant noun of a text, while proper nouns were marked by the use of contrasting fonts. See for instance this excerpt from *Greenwich Park’s Q* (p.3): “A Pox of all Fools that marry poor Gentlewomen, for you wed their whole Family, and entail a Plague upon your Posterity. We’ll go up to Sir Tho. Reveller … The Daughter of a Knight; with a pox! The Honourable Sir Francis Haughty, Brother to the Viscount Blusteror, Baron of Rockey Hills in Scotland!” This edition revises the whole text capitalizing only proper nouns, as the modern rule dictates (see 1.1.95-99). Besides, this edition capitalises the personal pronoun “I”; the first word after a period, in a line of verse and in a stage direction; and titles of nobility followed by a proper noun. Any capitals in a different position than the ones listed above have been silently reduced to lower case. Likewise, the words following semi-colons and colons, as well as dashes, begin in lower case in the edited text, while those words following interrogation and exclamation marks begin with a capital letter. Finally, in order to signal
the geographical and social opposition both words convey, “City” and “Town” are
capitalised when they refer to these two specific areas of London.

b) Word-division: This edition does not necessarily retain the copy-text word
division. So for example, end-of-line hyphens have been avoided, and hyphens between
words have been silently elided, or added, following OED usage (e.g., “plump-faced” in
5.2.128).

c) Contrasting fonts: Contrasting fonts were commonly employed in early texts to
distinguish proper nouns from other capitalised nouns (see the citation from Q, p.3 above),
or to mark foreign terms or quoted words. Today they are still used to indicate foreign
words or titles of literary works, although quotations are usually marked by inverted
commas. The text of this edition, therefore, is entirely in roman type, except for titles or in
the case of foreign words, when italics have been retained (e.g. “probatum est” in 4.2.48) or
silently added. Any other words in italics in the copy-text have been changed to roman
without further comment, including quotations, which will appear between inverted
commas instead.

d) Printing types: The long i <∫> commonly used in 16th-17th printing in initial or
medial position has been replaced by <s> (e.g., “I suppose” for “I ∫uppose” in 1.1.15).
Likewise, <vv> has been regularised to <w> (e.g., “What” for “VVhat” in “What should I
swear?” in 3.1.134, or “I have given him the word” for “VVord” in 3.3.81).

4.1.3. Details of Treatment of the Copy-text

4.1.3.1. Paraphernalia

a) Scene divisions: the present edition follows structural criteria in the arrangement
of the scenes. Accordingly, every scene works as an independent unit marked by the
entrance and exit of characters: the end of a scene takes place when all the characters leave
the stage, even though the location does not vary. Scene headings are centered, in bold and
b) Speech prefixes: The names of characters have been silently standardised and abbreviations expanded. Speech prefixes use block capitals.

c) Stage directions: Following common practice in the editing of dramatic texts, stage directions have been printed in italics. They are usually centered, unless they describe a particular action a character performs ("Drinks," “Reads”) in the middle of his/her statement, in which case they have been incorporated into the speech within parentheses. Editorial insertions are marked in square brackets. Stage directions in this edition always end with a period. The stage direction “Aside” is always placed before the section of the speech it refers to, although its position in the original text may vary. Common abbreviations, such as “Ex:” are expanded as appropriate. Every character's unnoted entrances and exits have been provided. The names of characters in stage directions have been silently standardised and abbreviations expanded.

d) Prefatory material: The present edition follows the copy-text in arranging the prefatory material, except for the Epilogue, which has been moved from the beginning to the end of the play. In the Dramatis Personae list, speaking and not-speaking character not included in the cast of characters in the copy-text has been supplied.

4.1.3.2. Layout of the text:

a) Line numbering: every line of speech in this edition has been numbered, each scene marking a different segment of the work.

b) Prose and verse: The original text of Greenwich Park is written chiefly in prose, but makes use of verse in scenes of heightened emotional tone involving the character of
On a few occasions, lines that fall into the cadence of verse had been printed as prose in the original. In those cases, the text has been reset as verse, the change being recorded in a footnote. For instance, the exchange between Young Reveller and Dorinda in 4.3 is printed as prose in all versions of the original text (Q, D1 and D2), but has been transcribed in verse because most of it seems to fall into a regular metrical pattern of iambic pentameters. This typographical change accommodates the dialogue to the prevailing melodramatic tone of the scene.

4.1.4. Annotation

This edition includes three types of notes: textual, lexical, and explanatory. Textual notes records divergences resulting from the collation of the three copies of the text, deviations from the copy-text which have not been silently added or modified in the modernised text (see “Details of treatment…” above), or relevant editorial interventions in the copy-text. In the lexical notes, or glosses, the editor provides the meaning or brief definitions of a word, either because it is an obsolete word no longer used, or because it is used in a sense considered obsolete or archaic by OED. Finally, explanatory notes provide historical, cultural and literary information to facilitate the understanding of the text and its references.

---

78 On the relationship between the verse tirades and the casting of Elizabeth Barry as Dorinda, see above pp.57-58.
Greenwich Park: A Comedy
Greenwich Park: A Comedy.

Acted at the Theatre Royal, by Their Majesties’ Servants.

Written by William Mountfort.

London:
Printed for J. Hindmarsh at the Golden Ball in Cornhill, R. Bentley in Russell Street in Covent Garden, and A. Roper at the Mitre in Fleet Street. And are to be sold by Randal Taylor near Stationers’ Hall. MDCXCI.

1 J. Hindmarsh at the Golden Ball Joseph Hindmarsh (act. 1671-1696), bookseller and publisher. First established at the Black Bull, in 1685 he moved to the Golden Ball in Cornhill (BBTI; Plomer).

2 Cornhill Cornhill Street, located in what was the highest hill in the City, hosted the signs of some publishers and printers, as well as renowned coffee-houses of the time (LE).

3 R. Bentley Richard Bentley (bap. 1642-1697), bookseller. Since 1659, he was apprenticed to James Magnes, of Russell Street. After Magnes’ death in 1678, Bentley went into partnership with his widow first and with his daughter later. Frequently, Bentley would publish together with other booksellers, sharing the rights of the printed works, as in the case of Greenwich Park (Smolenaars).

4 Russell Street Built in 1630 in Covent Garden, Russell Street was the location where James Magnes’ business was established, which Bentley would keep using throughout his life (LE).

5 Covent Garden Originally the garden of the Abbey of Westminster, after the dissolution of the monasteries in 1535-1540, the land was granted to the earl of Bedford. His successor commissioned Inigo Jones as architect, who created a piazza surrounded by St. Paul’s church and three terraces of tall houses. Since 1670, it was the site of London’s chief fruit and vegetables market, which helped the proliferation of shops and coffee-houses nearby (Cannon 2009; Mills).

6 A. Roper at the Mitre Abel Roper (bap. 1665-1725), bookseller and political writer. His uncle, named also Abel Roper, had been in the publishing business for decades and took him as an apprentice in 1677, although on his death in 1680, the younger Roper was taken on by the printer Christopher Wilkinson. In 1688, Roper established his own business by Middle Temple Gate, from where he would change to the Mitre, Fleet Street, in 1690 (Aitkin).

7 Fleet Street London street which ran from the Fleet river, from which it takes its name, to the Strand. From the early 16th c. it became the haunt of booksellers, writers, and printers (Cannon 1997).

8 Randal Taylor London bookseller, act. 1640-1700. In 1664 he set up his business at St. Martin le Grand and three years later moved to another location near Stationers’ Hall (BBTI).

9 Stationers’ Hall Located near Ludgate Hill, it was the site of the Stationers’ Company in London, formerly used for the registration of books for purposes of copyright (Knowles).
[Epistle Dedicatory]

To the Right Honourable Algernon, earl of Essex, viscount Malden, baron Capel of Hadham, and Lord Lieutenant of the County of Hertford.

My Lord,

The general good character the world gives of your honour and virtues has emboldened me to beg your favourable protection of this comedy. And though it be a hard matter for so young a pretender to escape the industrious ill nature and malice of the Town, yet I shall have this satisfaction that, if they’ll not allow me a judge of poetry, they must of persons and they cannot impartially disapprove of my choice in a patron.

Indifferent authors in most ages have been encouraged and preserved under the clemency of the nobility, in hopes they might be better. But the severity of our wits would have the first plays which are now written equal to the best of Ben Jonson or Shakespeare, and yet they do not show that esteem for their works which they pretend to, or else are not so good judges as they would be thought, when we can see the Town throng to a farce and Hamlet not bring charges. But notwithstanding they will be critics and will scarce give a

0. [Epistle Dedicatory] D1 does not contain the Epistle.

1. Algernon Algernon Capel (1670-1710) was son to Arthur Capel (see note to ll. 24-25), after whose death on 13 July 1683 he succeeded to the titles of 2nd earl of Essex, 3rd baron Capel of Hadham, Hereford, and 2nd viscount Malden, Essex. Algernon served King William III in all his campaigns, which allowed him to earn different military distinctions, like those of Major General and Lieutenant General. In 1691-92, he married Mary, first daughter of Hans William, 1st earl of Portland (Cokayne).


6. so young a pretender Although Mountfort had been performing since he was almost a boy, it was not until 1688 when he wrote his first play, *The Injured Lovers*, just three years prior to Greenwich Park. Hence his self-portrait as an unexperienced playwright.

10. in hopes D2: that.

11. which are now written D2: which are acted. Since D2 was printed in 1720, almost thirty years after Q, it is very likely that its printer decided to change this reference.

11. equal D2: unequal.

11. the best of Ben Jonson or Shakespeare After almost two decades of Puritan domination, the repertory of new plays was rather scarce at the reopening of the theatres in 1660. Thus, the managers approached the pre-Interregnum plays as the material from which to start, either by adapting or by reviving them onstage. Works by Ben Jonson (1572-1637), like *Volpone* (1606; 1607) and *Bartholomew Fair* (1614; 1631), and others by William Shakespeare (1564-1616), such as *Hamlet* (1602; 1603) or *The Tempest* (1611; 1623) were among the most popular ones throughout the whole Restoration period.

10-12. But the severity ... they pretend to This may be an allusion to Dryden (see note to l. 34) who, in his *An Essay of Dramatick Poesie* (1668), lavishly praises Jonson and Shakespeare as the most complete playwrights in English drama and models for later ages. For Dryden, the English language “arrived to its highest perfection” with both figures (17: 56). However, in the *Epilogue to The Conquest of Granada, Part II* (1670; 1672), he changes his position to acclaim first the Restoration English tongue as “more refined and free” (11: 201), and to state later, in *The Defence of the Epilogue* (1672), that “had they [Shakespeare and Ben Jonson] lived now, [they] had doubtlessly written more correctly” (11: 210).

12-14. or else ... not bring charges Mountfort questions the critics’ authority in their attempt
man leave to mend, like the rigid precepts and manner of the most famous master of Westminster, who, though he has bred the greatest men of parts and learning in this age, yet I believe, if the impatience and spirit of his knowledge could have submitted to the slower capacities of his scholars, he might have made many more.

Poetry, I must confess, has ever been my delight, as honour and goodness, your lordship’s. And though I can never expect to be as perfect in the first as you are in the last, I am sure of two good supports from such excellencies and which your lordship never omitted expressing to those who have seeked your protection.

Your early gallantry for the liberty and welfare of your country in so needful a time (and where the small number of volunteers magnifies your lordship’s being one), proves the spirit of your predecessors is left behind them. And though this nation has heartily mourned the loss of one of them, yet the death of a good subject, like that of a good king, is best dispensed with by the public when his virtues shine in his offspring.

I would avoid the censure of flattery and of tiring your lordship with the commendations which you justly deserve, but perhaps may not desire. I have only this to say, that it is not to be doubted, but the spirit which has inspired this noble undertaking of waiting on your prince will merit a providence to preserve your person. And as you will be a credit to his camp, may you return to be an ornament to his court. And as you are the pride of our present young nobility, may you be a pattern for the future. Then I shall wish for the fancy of Mr. Cowley with the judgment of Mr. Dryden to express my sense of your

to establish the taste of the audience. Despite their supposed “esteem” for the works by Shakespeare or Jonson, there were certain farces written in the 1680s, like Edward Ravenscroft’s *The London Cuckolds* (1681; 1682), which were successfully revived onstage season after season, while many revivals of Shakespeare’s or Jonson’s plays did not cover the company’s expenses. According to Judith Milhous, the daily expenses (house rent, taxes, salaries, etc.) in a production in the 1670s moved around £25 (19).

14-15. give a man leave  Allow, permit (OED *leave* n.1c).
15-16. master of Westminster  Richard Busby (1606-1695), headmaster of Westminster School from 1640 until his death, famous for disciplining his pupils by the use of physical punishment. He educated John Dryden, John Locke and Sir Christopher Wren, among other personalities (Knighton).
22. sought  Sought. As Barber notes, in EME “there were many verbs with alternative strong and weak forms in circulation” (175).
23. early gallantry  On 24 May 1691, when he was just twenty-one years old, Capel embarked on the first of a series of military campaigns in Flanders to support King William against the French (Luttrell 2: 233). See note for Prologue, l. 2.
24-25. the spirit of your predecessors … the loss of one of them  Arthur Capel (bap. 1632-1683), 1st earl of Essex, was Algernon’s father. Although he was attached to Charles II, of whose privy council he was a member throughout his entire political career, in 1679 he voted to exclude James from the line of succession, facing the king’s opposition. In 1683 he was accused of insurrection and imprisoned in the Tower. A few days later he was found dead, having apparently committed suicide. Capel was described by his contemporaries as a sober and firm politician (Greaves).
32. ornament  Q: ornament.
34. Mr. Cowley  Abraham Cowley (1618-1667), poet and playwright. His literary legacy is varied and gifted: satires, epic poems, scientific pamphlets in Latin, or comedies. Cowley was much appreciated in his time, to such an extent that after his death, King Charles II even proclaimed that he had not left behind him a better man in England (Lindsay).
34. Mr. Dryden  John Dryden (1631-1700), poet, playwright, critic and translator. A key figure in
worth, but, in the meantime, I humbly entreat your lordship would accept of the hearty well
wishes and perfect (though distant) respect

Of your lordship’s most humble,
obedient, and devoted servant,

William Mountfort.
**Dramatis personae**

**MEN.**

Sir Thomas¹ Reveller, an old wicked lewd knight. Mr. Leigh.²

Mr. Raison, a grocer, both jolly citizens, and companions with Sir Thomas. Mr. Nokes.⁵

Mr. Sassafras,³ a drugster,⁴ both jolly citizens, and companions with Sir Thomas. Mr. Underhill.⁶

Lord⁷ Worthy, a young nobleman newly returned from travel. Mr. Hodgson.⁸

Young Reveller, son to Sir Thomas, a wild young fellow, kept by Mrs. Raison and courts Florella for a wife. Mr. Mountfort.

Sir William⁹ Thoughtless, a foolish knight. Mr. Bowen.¹⁰

---

¹ Thomas   D2: Rhomas.

² Mr. Leigh Q, D1, D2: Mr. Lee. Anthony Leigh (d. 1692), comic actor. In 1673 he joined the Duke's Company, which would be absorbed by the United Company in 1682. Leigh was best known for his roles of peevish and foolish old men, like Sir William in Shadwell's *The Squire of Alsatia* (1688). His character of Father Dominic in Dryden's *The Spanish Friar* (1681) was also most celebrated and actually one of the few surviving portraits of Leigh is one of him in this part. Some years before *Greenwich Park* was produced, Leigh had already played for Mountfort in his farcical adaptation of Marlowe's *Dr. Faustus* (ca. 1688; 1697) as Harlequin (Payne).

³ Mr. Sassafras Q: Mr. Sasaphras.

⁴ drugster D1: druggist.

⁵ Mr. Nokes James Nokes (ca. 1642-1696) was the leading comic performer of his time, together with Leigh, with whom he would play opposite characters regularly. Nokes began his career as a boy actor, and soon he became one of the original members and shareholders of the Duke's Company, along with Thomas Betterton. Some of his most renowned roles were Sir Martin in Dryden's *Sir Martin Mar-All* (1667; 1668), which King Charles II attended no less than nine times, or Old Jorden in *The Citizen Turned Gentleman* by Ravenscroft (Chernaik).

⁶ Mr. Underhill Cave Underhill (1634-1713). His career as an actor lasted for fifty years, throughout which he worked first for the Duke's Company, then for the United, and finally he joined the company founded by Betterton in 1695. He was famous for stupid and eccentric comic characters who were often drunk, like Trincalo in Dryden and Davenant's version of *The Tempest* (1667), which even gained him his nickname (Aistington).

⁷ Lord Q, D2: L.

⁸ Mr. Hodgson John Hodgson (fl. 1689-1741?) was originally a member of the United Company, although he would later enroll with Betterton and others when they broke away to form their own company. Among the characters he performed, Medley in Etherege's *The Man of Mode* (1676), and Heartfree in Vanbrugh's *The Provoked Wife* (1697) may have been the most memorable ones (Highfill).

⁹ Sir William D1, D2: Sir Will.

¹⁰ Mr. Bowen Actor William Bowen (1666-1718) was most likely of Irish origins, for there are records of his acting at the Smock Alley Theatre in Dublin as early as 1683. By the late 1680s he was already in London playing for the United Company, where he would remain until the breakup of the troupe, though he left the city intermittently to perform back in Dublin. His comic characters, like Jeremy in Congreve's *Love for Love* (1695), gained him much popularity (Highfill).
A Beau,11 Mr. Bowman,12

[Beau 1]

[Beau 2]

Bully Bounce,13 Mr. Bright,14

[Steward]

WOMEN.

Dorinda, a private mistress, kept by my Lord Worthy,15 and in love with Young Reveller. Mrs. Barry,16

Florella, (daughters to my Lady Hazard, Florella and Violante, in love with Young Reveller.18 Violante, with the Lord Worthy.19 Mrs. Mountfort,20 Mrs. Lassels.21

11 A Beau Q, D1, D2: A Beaux. A man who gives particular, or excessive, attention to dress, mien, and social etiquette; an exquisite, a fop, a dandy (OED n.1).

12 Mr. Bowman John Bowman (ca. 1660-1739), singer and actor, member of the United Company since its formation in 1682, he then became a sharer in Betterton’s company in 1695. From the 1690s, Bowman developed some fop roles, like Lord Brainless in D’Urfey’s The Marriage-Hater Matched (1692) and Lord Froth in Congreve’s The Double Dealer (1693; 1694). Probably, he was more acknowledged as a singer: Purcell wrote music for him in plays by Dryden and Southerne, and since 1684 he was a member of the private royal music, singing at court for King James II and Queen Mary II (Baldwin).

13 Bully Bounce In the stage directions and the speech prefixes of the three versions of the play, this character appears as “Captain Bounce.” However, this edition maintains his name as given in the Dramatis Personae, for he is better defined as a “bully.”

14 Mr. Bright George Bright (fl. ca. 1677-1707). Like William Bowen, Bright began his acting career at the Smock Alley Theatre in Dublin, in the 1670s. For the United Company he started performing minor roles in the 1680s, to move into more important ones the next decade, like Sir Formal Trifle in the revival of Shadwell’s The Virtuoso (1676) in 1692. Three years later he enlisted in the new troupe Betterton had organized, for whom he would perform until 1705. His specialties were comic dullards, fops, and bouncy servants (Highfill).

15 by my Lord Worthy D1: by Lord Worthy.

16 Mrs. Barry Elizabeth Barry (ca. 1665-1713), actress and theatre manager. Because of her alleged ineptitude to speak lines properly, sing, and dance at the beginning of her career, John Wilmot, earl of Rochester (1647-1680), allegedly bet some friends that he could tutor her into becoming a great actress. Indeed, she became the most brilliant actress in London for decades and, throughout her thirty-year prolific career, she would play witty, comic heroines as well as pathetic characters with the same public recognition. Besides, she took a leading role in the secession from the United Company which resulted in the creation of a new one in 1695, acting as co-manager for some years after (Backscheider).

17 to my Lady Hazard D1: to Lady Hazard.

18 Young Reveller Q, D2: Y. Reveller.

19 with the Lord Worthy Q, D2: with the L. Worthy. D1: with Lord Worthy.

20 Mrs. Mountfort D2: Mrs. Mountf. Susanna Mountfort, née Percival (bap. 1666-1703) was the daughter of a minor actor-manager in the Duke’s Company, Thomas Percival. After her early debut as an actress, she joined the United Company, and for over twenty years she played famous comic roles as well as breeches parts; in fact, Southerne claimed to have written the breeches role in Sir
Mrs. Raison, in love with Young Reveller.  
Lady Hazard.
Aunt to Dorinda.
[Mrs. Raison’s Maid]
[Strange Woman]
Constable, Watch, Masqueraders, [Servants, Waterman, Boy, Fiddlers, Music].

Scene: Greenwich.

Anthony Love (1690; 1691) specifically for her. Once married to Mountfort, they enacted a remarkable “gay couple” onstage; she would keep playing after his sudden death, to become one of London’s most celebrated actresses (Heddon).

21 Mrs. Lassels  Actress and singer (fl. ca. 1690-1697). She was a member of the United Company, for which she played Berenice in D’Urfey’s The Marriage-Hater Matched (1692); in 1695 she joined Betterton and his newly created group (Highfill).

22 Young Reveller  Q, D2: Y. Reveller.

23 Mrs. Knight  Frances Maria Knight (fl. ca. 1682-1724), actress, dancer and singer, she was a member of the United Company, for which she mostly performed secondary roles. After the 1695 split, Knight remained with Christopher Rich which helped her to gain more important roles, particularly as a tragedienne (Highfill).

24 Mrs. Osborn  Margaret Osborn, née Slaughter? (d. 1694?). Data about her life is scarce and confusing; she was mostly cast for minor roles, first in the Duke’s Company and later in the United Company (Highfill).

25 Mrs. Corey  Katherine Corey, née Mitchell (b. ca. 1635) was said to have been one of the first actresses on the Restoration stage. She was famous for her comic supporting roles, especially older women or widows, like Widow Blackacre in Wycherley’s The Plain Dealer (1676; 1677) (Wanko).

26 Greenwich  On the history of this London suburb on the south bank of the Thames and its popularity in the late 17th c., see pp.213-15.
Prologue

With the sad prospect of a long vacation,
The fear of war, and danger of the nation,
Hard we have toiled this winter for new plays,
That we might live in these tumultuous days.
Sad days for us, when war’s loud trumpets sound,
Nothing but beaux and parsons will be found.
Look to’t, you men of battle, of renown,
They’ll claw your ladies off, when you are gone,
Servants for quality, your beaux of sense,
Will’s Coffee-house is the office of intelligence,
And for the masks who hunt the smaller fry,
Their chocolate-house will their wants supply.
Our play presents you with all sorts of men,
From keeping courtier to the horned citizen,
Whose handsome wife brings in the constant gain.
At Greenwich lies the scene, where many a lass
Has been green gowned upon the tender grass.

1. **long vacation**  Summer vacation at the Law-courts and Universities, so called in distinction from the Christmas and Easter vacations (OED). During such periods, the theatrical activity in London also decreased considerably.

2. **The fear … of the nation**  In the course of hostilities with King Louis XIV of France, King William III declared war on 5 May 1689 which would end with the Treaty of Ryswick in September 1697. The main confrontations took part in the Netherlands and the first years of the 1690s were disastrous for William, who needed to persuade a reluctant parliament to support such a costly campaign (Claydon 2008).

3. **Hard we … new plays**  *The London Stage* provides evidence that the 1690-1691 theatrical season was particularly generous in premières, as Mountfort testifies in his Prologue. At least eleven new plays were performed then (*Sir Anthony Love*, *Amphitryon; Distressed Innocence; The Gordian Knot Untied; King Edward the Third; Alphousa King of Naples; The Scourers; The Mistakes; Love for Money; Bussy D’Ambois and Greenwich Park*), and another eight new productions in the 1689-1690 season, as opposed to the average three or four premières per season since the fusion of the two companies (LS, Harbage).

4. **live**  Survive (OED n.¹ 6a).

5. **beaux**  Q, D2: beaux’s. D1: beaus

6. **Will’s Coffee-house**  Also known as the “Rose Tavern,” situated on Bow Street, Covent Garden. It was kept by Will Unwin, and frequented by authors, wits, and gamblers, and particularly associated with Dryden (Birch and Hooper).

7. **masks**  An allusion to prostitutes, who from the late 1660s on would normally wear masks. See Shadwell’s *The Virtuoso* (1676): “Though I ha’ been often serv’d so by vizard masks in the pit, they are mightily given to’t” (5.4.53-56).

8. **chocolate-house**  Q: chocolet-house. Similarly to coffee-houses, chocolate-houses spread in London in the 17th and the 18th centuries, when this exotic drink became fashionable. One of the most popular was “White’s” in St. James’s (Cannon 2009).

9. **been**  Q, D2: bin.

10. **green gowned**  Given a “green gown”: a throwing of a woman on the grass to kiss her (Canting Crew).
If Flamsteed’s stars would make a true report,  
Our City breed’s much mended by the court.  
What wagers about Mons were lately laid?  
Had all that money to the king been paid,  
It might have saved the tax of each man’s head.  
I heard a shop-keeper not long since swear,  
If England’s old militia had been there,  
We had spoiled the Monsieur’s projects for this year.  
Since they depend so on their own commanders,  
Why weren’t the Royal Regiment sent for Flanders  
With English hearts of oak, and horns well steeled,  
To butt the puny Monsieur from the field?  
But those who threaten him so much, I fear,  
Were they encamped where any foe was near,  
Would wish themselves behind their counters here.

18. Flamsteed’s John Flamsteed (1646-1719), astronomer. Born in Derby, he first visited London in 1670 and was introduced to Jonas Moore, surveyor general of the ordnance, who played a key role in guiding him to become the astronomical observator of the court in 1675. Flamsteed helped to supervise the construction process of the royal observatory in Greenwich, inaugurated a year later, and contributed to its recognition as an institution of international importance as a result of his publications in the Philosophical Transactions (Willmoth).

20. Mons A town in current Southern Belgium, captured by Louis XIV’s army on 8 April 1691, after a nine-month siege.

22. the tax of each man’s head The costs of the war had to be faced by new taxes on people. Despite the disagreement between the Whigs and Tories, parliament finally allowed William the necessary revenue.

24. militia Volunteer armed forces which would be called in times of emergency (Cannon 1997). Right after Britain declared war on France in 1689, a bill was passed precisely to raise a militia which would be sent to the Low Countries (Burnet 25).

25. Monsieur’s Monsieur is a title traditionally given to the second son or the next younger brother of the King of France (Knowles). However, here it may be a generic reference to the French people or army.

27. Royal Regiment The City Royal Regiment of horse. The allusion to the “horns” in the following line points to the traditional comic characterization of the citizen as a cuckold.

28. hearts of oak Fig. Courageous or valorous spirits; also, brave and loyal soldiers (OED 2).
ACT I

Scene I

A grocer's shop.

Enter Mr. Raison, his wife and Servant.

MRS. RAISON: Are all my things carried to the water-side, sirrah?

SERVANT: Yes, madam, and the galley with an awning is ready to carry your ladyship to Greenwich.

[Exit Servant.]

MR. RAISON: A galley! Why a galley, wife?

MRS. RAISON: Because you won't allow me a coach, husband.

MR. RAISON: And because I won’t allow you a coach with two horses, you’ll have a boat with four men?

MRS. RAISON: Yes, a barge with twelve, if I had my will. Must I jolt about in a hackney or traipse afoot like my inferior neighbours? Since you’ll make no distinction of me at land, I’ll make some myself by water.

MR. RAISON: I don’t know what you would have. You go where you please and come when you please; live how you please and do what you please; have money as you please, and yet I can never please you!

MRS. RAISON: Therefore I’ll have those that can.

MR. RAISON: Yes, I suppose you have.

MRS. RAISON: ‘Tis fit I should. Did you not promise me when I married you, I should keep my coach and live like what I was?

---

0. **Scene I** Q: Scene.
1. **sirrah** A term of address used to men or boys, expressing contempt, reprimand, or assumption of authority on the part of the speaker (OED 1a).
2. **galley** A large open row-boat, e.g., one formerly used on the Thames by custom-house officers; also, a large pleasure-boat (OED n. 3).
4-5. **A galley ... coach** As Picard notes, travelling by boat on the Thames was a faster means of transportation in London, rather than crossing the City by coach (64-67). However, Reddaway observes that people of fashion often avoided the river since the wind was likely to turn their hairstyle or wigs into disarray (36, note 1).
8. **hackney** Hackney-coach: a four-wheeled coach kept for hire, drawn by two horses and seated for six persons (OED).
9. **traipse** Q, D2: trapes.
Act 1, Scene 1

MR. RAISON: A beggar.

MRS. RAISON: Did I marry you when I could have had—

MR. RAISON: Nobody else!

MRS. RAISON: The best of quality, but that I credited your protestations. Did you not swear I should outshine the best of all the City, and yet deny me a sneaking one hundred pounds a year for a coach, which almost every tradesman keeps his wife for a twelvemonth, though he break at the year’s end for’t?

MR. RAISON: They deserve it, when their vanity exceeds their ability. You took an oath too, wife, to love, honour, and obey me, but you have taken your own measures for all that; you have a spirit that the devil cannot conquer and a desire that I cannot satisfy. You make me ridiculous wherever you come and seem as if you were ashamed of me.

MRS. RAISON: Since you will not use those methods to gain my love which you know will do’t, I look upon you only as my conveniency.

MR. RAISON: Yes, I have been a conveniency to your whole family. Five hundred pounds your brother had to buy him a company, which was broke in two months; then he set my prentice at dice, cheated him of two hundred pound, which he robbed me of. And three hundred pound your father had to purchase a place at court to keep him from his creditors, which he lost one night at the groom-porter’s, and durst never peep out of Whitehall since. Indeed you are a gentlewoman and have behaved yourself like one; in less than a fortnight after I married you, you ran away with a captain of the guards and I was forced to take you out of his lodgings with a messenger; and you have played me abundance of pretty tricks since, which my love and folly has forgiven. So I have been your father’s bubble and your brother’s cully, the mark of the City, the shame of my own family, and your cuckold and conveniency.

MRS. RAISON: Let me but have a coach, and I’ll live as you’ll have me.

22. sneaking  Mean in appearance or amount; contemptibly poor (OED 3).

36. groom-porter’s  The groom-porter was an officer of the English Royal Household whose principal function was to regulate all matters connected with gaming within the precinct of the court (OED 1). It was common knowledge that gambling took place at his quarters, normally at night. In Shadwell’s A True Widow (1678; 1679) a character states: “I’ll get me a pack of Fox-Dogs, hunt every day, and play at the Groom-porter’s at night” (3: 3, p. 325).

36. durst  dared.

37. Whitehall  London palace located on the north bank of the Thames, across St. James’s Park, and used as a royal residence by some monarchs since Henry VIII. It was a favourite site for Charles II, who had some suites fitted out to meet with his assortment of mistresses; William III, on the contrary, preferred to develop country residences, like Hampton court and Kensington palace, as alternatives (Cannon 1997).

41. bubble  One who may be or is “bubbled,” i.e., befooled, cheated (OED v. 5).

41. cully  Slang or colloq., much in use in the 17th c. One who is cheated or imposed upon; a silly fellow (OED 1).
MR. RAISON: Don't think of a coach, and you will live as I'll have you.

MRS. RAISON: Why, Ingredient, the pothecary, keeps his wife a coach and is not worth half so much as you are; besides you have fined for alderman.

MR. RAISON: Aye, and if I had not fined for fool in giving your relations a thousand pound, you might have had a coach.

MRS. RAISON: Why, I did not advise you to't.

MR. RAISON: Yet would never let me rest till I did it.

MRS. RAISON: Why, let me have a coach and I'll save it in other things. I'll catch cold else every winter and it shall cost you as much in slops, for my clothes are so good and my shoes are so fine I cannot walk a foot.

MR. RAISON: Oh citizens, citizens! How are the times altered since your wives wore high-crowned hats, farandine gowns, red-cloth petticoats, Spanish-leather shoes, and trudged about in pattens. Now your feet must be furnished with a guinea a pair; your milliner's ware from the New Exchange, the Old can't please you; your silks bought in Covent Garden, Paternoster Row has no choice. We are a pretty corporation that

46. Why It can be used interjectionally with different meanings, such as an emphasized call or summons, or as an expression of surprise or impatience (OED 7a, c).

47. fined Paid for specified privilege, or for appointment to an office (OED v.² 7).

47. alderman A member of the Court of Aldermen, a civic governing body of the City of London whose origins go back to the 13th c. From 1377 each ward elected its chief officer for life, a practice which continued until 1975 (LE).

53. slops An outer garment, as a loose jacket, tunic, cassock. It may also refer generally to cheap or inferior garments (OED n.¹ 2a, 5a).

56. high-crowned hats The type of hat normally associated with the citizens' wives.

56. farandine A kind of cloth used in the 17th c., made partly of silk and partly of wool or hair (OED a).

57. guinea A gold coin, worth 20 shillings. It was originally intended for its use in the Guinea trade, hence its name (OED 3a).

58. the New Exchange Built south of the Strand in 1609 by Robert Cecil, it was an arcade grouping some shops which became well-liked by the fashionable public, particularly after the Great Fire when it took over most of the business previously enjoyed by the Royal Exchange. Its proximity to the court also helped to establish its reputation (Beal; LE). In Wycherley's The Country Wife (1675), Mrs. Pinchwife, eager to experience the novelties that London offers, longs to go to the New Exchange (3.1.98-99).

58. the Old The Old Exchange, or the Royal Exchange, in Lombard St., the traditional meeting place for merchants to conduct their business. It was built in 1565 by Thomas Gresham and it hosted small shops of milliners, armourers, apothecaries, goldsmiths, and the like. Destroyed in the Great Fire, it was restored and reopened to merchants in 1669 (LE).

59. Covent Garden See Title page, note 5.

59. Paternoster Row A street or row of houses within the precincts of St. Paul's occupied by paternosters or makers of rosaries as well as mercers, silkmen and lacemen. It was very popular among the nobility and gentry, but after the Great Fire the mercers moved to Covent Garden and its prominence declined (Mills; LE).
are the metropolis of the kingdom, furnish the whole nation, yet cannot please ourselves, like vintners that love to be drunk in other men’s taverns! Well may we decay when our wives, like French mistresses, send our money abroad.

MRS. RAISON: If the times are altered with the wives, so they are with the husbands since they wore slash doublets, short cloaks, and open-kneed breeches, with their own thin lank hair that looked like the fringe of a blanket or the strings of a bunch of leeks. You can now wear the best fashion and richest cloths, swords upon occasion; come drunk to a playhouse; pick up whores at the chocolate-house; be bubbled by sharpers at ordinaries; carry a good face at 'Change, though within a day of breaking; take up three or four thousand pounds under pretence of unexpected bills; whip over to the King’s Bench; bilk your creditors and die with the curse of orphans and widows on ye.

MR. RAISON: I pity them that do so, but women commonly bring 'em to’t.

MRS. RAISON: But not their wives.

MR. RAISON: Their wives or their whores, they are women still. Why, how extravagant that head looks now, what a monument of topknots is there? On my conscience, if the French had landed, the heads of the women might have served for beacons all over the nation.

MRS. RAISON: Well, well, shall I have a coach?

MR. RAISON: Not this year.

MRS. RAISON: Shall I have one the next?

MR. RAISON: I can’t tell.

61. other Q: others.
64. slash doublets Close-fitting body-garments with vertical slits to expose to view a lining or under-garment of a different or contrasting colour (OED n.¹ 3a, 1a). The slash doublets were traditionally worn by men in the Pre-Interregnum London (Nunn 54).
64. short cloaks The cloak ceased to be a fashionable indoor garment from the 1670s on, due to the advent of the coat and vest (Nunn 63).
64. open-kneed breeches This type of breeches became out of fashion in the 1690s, replaced by “the plain close-fitting” ones (Nunn 61). The OED records this as the first time the compound word “open-kneed” was used (OED open adj. S2 a).
67. chocolate-house See note to Prologue, l. 12.
68. ordinaries Hist. An ordinary was an inn, tavern, public house, etc., where meals were provided at a fixed price. Occasionally, the dinner was followed by gambling, hence the term was often used as synonymous with “gambling-house” (OED 12c).
68. 'Change The Old Exchange.
70. King’s Bench King's Bench prison was a debtors’ prison placed in south London which took its name from the court it originally served from the 14th c. (Cannon 1997).
75. topknots Knots or bows of ribbon worn on the top of the heads by ladies towards the end of the 17th c. and in the 18th c. (OED 1).
MRS. RAISON: Nor you won’t give me a positive answer?

MR. RAISON: We'll think on’t.

MRS. RAISON: We'll think on’t, bungler. I long for a coach and I will have a coach, and you may spare it out of claret, you sot; since you can get no children to inherit what you have, I'll spend it and thou shalt never live an easy hour till I have a coach; and so think on’t, thou associate of drunkards, eternal tobacco funker. Must I be contented with a beast that stinks perpetually, sits up till two or three of the clock in the morning, and knows nothing but his bottle sometimes a week together? The world shall know what a bedfellow thou art, that snores all night and art sick in the morning; thou debilitated booby, thou sapless trunk.

Exit.

MR. RAISON: What will become of me? Beat her I can’t, hate her I can’t, turn her away I dare not. If I could complain of her, I must not, for my own reputation suffers in’t; besides, she has such a bloody crew of relations that would murder me if I should do any of these things. A pox of all fools that marry poor gentlewomen, for you wed their whole family and entail a plague upon your posterity. Well, I'll go up to Sir Tho[mas] Reveller, invite him to dinner with two or three more and drink her out of my head. The daughter of a knight, with a pox! The honourable Sir Francis Haughty, brother to the viscount Blusterer, baron of Rocky Hills in Scotland! Well, take warning all by me.

I Robert Raison, grocer,
To have and to hold,
and so, sir,
Took the daughter of a knight from Covent Garden,
I worth ten thousand pounds, she not one farthing.

Exit.

---

84. bungler  An unperforming husband (Canting Crew).
85. spare it out of  Mrs. Raison protests that her husband should spend his money on her coach instead of on his drinking.
85. claret  A name originally given to wines of yellowish or light red colour, as distinguished alike from “red wine” and “white wine”; the contrast with the former ceased about 1600, and it was apparently then used for red wines generally (OED n.² 1).
85. can  D1, D2: can’t.
87. funker  A smoker. Also, a person who blows (tobacco smoke) on a person (OED funk v.¹ 1b).
88. of the clock  D1, D2: a-clock.
93. in’t  D1, D2: in it.
95. A pox of  In various imprecations or exclamations of irritation and impatience (OED I 2a).
102. To have and to hold  A line taken from the marriage vows as they appear in the The Book of Common Prayer.
Scene II

Tower Hill.

Enter at one door the Lord Worthy and Waterman. At the other Young Reveller.

LORD WORTHY: Bring my things out of the boat, and call me a coach.

WATERMAN: Yes, master.

YOUNG REVELLER: I think I have heard that voice, I’m sure I have seen that face.

LORD WORTHY: George Reveller!

Embraces.

YOUNG REVELLER: My Lord Worthy! Welcome ashore. How long has this happy island been blessed with your approach?

LORD WORTHY: Prithee, sweet orator, lay aside thy rhetoric and reserve it for friends of lesser date. I am glad to see thee and take my joy heartily

Embraces.

YOUNG REVELLER: Nothing more acceptable by the pleasure of friendship. But, my lord being so long abroad in the courts of celebrated breeding, I was afraid a hearty English salute might have been too gross for the tender constitution of Italian ceremony.

LORD WORTHY: Why faith, George, there are follies all over the world, but by my long absence and observation, I have studied to despise ’em. I can be courteous without formality; cleanly without vanity; friendly without flattery; free from prodigality, yet generous in what is necessary; honest without partiality, and can be merry with a friend without talking bawdy or divinity.

0. Tower Hill Located near the Tower, it served as a sort of pier for those boat passengers who preferred to disembark and then to re-embark on the other side of the bridge, avoiding thus the violence of the currents among its pillars (Waller 228).

0. Waterman Q, D1, D2: Servant.

2. WATERMAN Q, D1, D2: Water.

7. Prithee Interjection meaning “I pray thee,” “I beg you” (OED).

11-12. Italian ceremony The courtly manners and hedonism of the Italian people were proverbial, as historian James Howell (1594?-1666) observes in his Epistolae Hoelianae (1655). While in Italy, he describes Naples as a place “swelling with all delight, gallantry and wealth … a delicate luxurious city, fuller of true-bred Cavaliers, than any place I saw yet,” and the Neapolitan as “the greatest embracer of pleasure of any other people” (59-60).

15. formality Conformity to established rule. Often in depreciative sense, rigid or merely conventional observance of forms (OED 6).

15. cleanly Pure, innocent. Additionally, it might also refer to an elegant or neat use of language, although the last time the OED records this meaning dates from 1649 (OED adj. 1, 6).
YOUNG REVELLER: Faith, my lord, I can’t match you; if you expect such virtues here, you must e’en keep company by yourself. Why, you’ll be envied by the wise and scorned by the fools, for a true Englishman abhors what he cannot reach and neglects what he can.

LORD WORTHY: Well, George, if thou art as free from these sins as thou wert when I left thee, I shall complete my travels in thy so wished for conversation and repent that my curiosity abroad kept me so long from home.

YOUNG REVELLER: Nay, my lord, I was heartily grieved my fortune would not admit of my accompanying your lordship abroad, but I have been faithful in my correspondence to your four years’ travels and my letters never missed of any passages here that were worth your acceptance.

LORD WORTHY: Dear George, I thank thee for ‘em; and but that I thought I should sooner reach thee than a letter, I had given thee notice of my arrival, for I came in the packet-boat from Calais to Dover, where I took post to Greenwich, shifted myself, and so came hither; and had I not met with you, was going to seek you.

YOUNG REVELLER: I am glad this accident prevented that trouble, I was just going to Greenwich; but if you please, we’ll go back to the ‘Change, pick up an honest fellow or two, and dine at The Rummer in Queen Street, which, though the dearest, is indeed the best accommodated house we can boast of.

LORD WORTHY: What, are all the famous houses about Covent Garden and Charing Cross abolished?

YOUNG REVELLER: Faith, my lord, they are mightily degenerated since Strephon the

---

29. that Not in D1 and D2.
31. packet-boat A boat or ship travelling at regular intervals between two ports, originally for the conveyance of mail, later also of goods and passengers (OED). One of the most usual routes between Britain and the continent was precisely the one connecting Dover to Calais.
31. Calais Q, D2: Callis. Located in northwest France, it was an important port and commercial centre since the Middle Ages.
31. Dover A principal seaport on the coast of the English Channel, and the nearest point to France.
31. took post Travelled using relays of horses (OED n.1 P7). In 1623, still a prince at that time, Charles I travelled to Spain from London by taking posts (Taylor 10-13).
34. the ‘Change In this context, prob. the New Exchange. See note for 1.1.58.
35. The Rummer in Queen Street The Rummer Tavern was placed in this short street in the vicinity of Charing Cross, near the New Exchange. It was burned down in 1750 (LE).
37-38. Charing Cross The area at the junction of the Strand, Whitehall and Cockspur Street, westwards of the City walls. At the death of King Edward I’s wife, Eleanor of Castile, in 1290, he had crosses erected at twelve places where the funeral cortège had rested on its way to Westminster Abbey. Charing Cross was the last one of them (LE).
39. Strephon The pastoral nickname that Aphra Behn gave to John Wilmot in some of her poetic works, including the elegy on his death and the poem “To Mr. Creech … on his excellent translation of Lucretius” (both from her Poems upon Several Occasions, 1684).
wise, the witty, and the gay, and the prince of all company, as well as all hearts, forsook us. Those that are left of that glorious society are retired from the world and mourn the remembrance of their lost companions, that wit and good fellows are as hard to be found as conscience in a jury or honesty in a guardian.

LORD WORTHY: Well, since those golden days cannot be called again, we must make the best of our present insufficiency and be as happy as we can, though not to such perfection. For to tell thee truth, George, we have a very indifferent character abroad and the respect to an Englishman is lessened extremely; our understanding is become a jest by our not knowing what we would have, and the next age must play the fool within its own bounds, for as the Gentleman Usher says in *The Rehearsal*, “for politicians nobody else will take us.”

YOUNG REVELLER: 'Tis a sad truth, my lord, for our distractions, which we might heal, we strive to enlarge, and our misfortunes abroad are occasioned by our follies at home. Our nobility love their ease and pleasure, the gentry are careless and stubborn, the commonalty grumbling and positive, the clergy ambitious and froward, and the mobile mad for an insurrection.

LORD WORTHY: So much for politics. But setting state affairs aside, how does the old gentleman, your father?

YOUNG REVELLER: Why 'tis a tough thief, my lord, he'll bend double before he'll break, and prefers living with his equals below before going to his betters above. He uses me as most parents do their children, who are at vast charge to give 'em the education of gentlemen and, when they're fit for the society of such, starve 'em.

LORD WORTHY: Is he in town?

---

41. that glorious society  Rochester was idealized as the champion of the court wits' *regime de vivre* under Charles II's reign. Germaine Greer points out that after “the Bloodless Revolution the supporters of the king in exile used Rochester as propaganda, portraying him as the incarnation of all that was glamorous in the banished civilization of the Stuarts” (4). For a lively account of the court wits, see Wilson 1948.

41. retired from the world  Prob. alluding to Sir Charles Sedley (bap. 1639-1701), fifth baronet, politician and writer. At the Restoration, he became one of the leading members of the court wits, precisely the “glorious society” that Young Reveller is evoking in contrast to the new regime. Nevertheless, Sedley “was turned to more serious courses” by a couple of events he suffered: the injuries provoked by the collapse of a tennis court in 1681 and a serious illness in 1686. Both experiences made him turn to the church in repentance and leave behind his hedonistic life, retiring from the life of wit and pleasure he had enjoyed previously (Love 2005).

49-50. “for politicians … take us”  From the duke of Buckingham's *The Rehearsal* (1671; 1672). Lord Worthy erroneously attributes the quote to the Gentleman Usher, but it is actually part of a dialogue between two other characters in the play. In the original, the Physician says: “Well, if they heard us whisper, they'll turn us out, and nobody else will take us,” to which Smith answers: “Not for politicians, I dare answer for it” (2.4.62-64).

54. positive  Opinionated, dogmatic (OED adj. 3).

54-55. the mobile  The mob, the common people (OED n.2).

58. tough  Q, D2: tuff.

60. who are at vast charge  Who undergo (great) expense or cost (OED 10e).
YOUNG REVELLER: Aye, my lord, and ten to one but we meet him at 'Change. He’s a jolly spark and loves his whore and his bottle as well as the lowdest of eighteen.

LORD WORTHY: Are our youth so perfect at eighteen, George?

YOUNG REVELLER: Aye, my lord, as our grandfathers were at fifty. Youth now keeps company with age and men with boys. Vice is so much improved within these ten years and madness so pregnant, that within five more our lads at twelve will begin to whore and bear drink as Portuguese women do children, and be past it at five and twenty; they’re downright sots at thirty, drivel on till forty, when, being fit for nothing but hospitals, they expire in a flux and you read in the bill of mortality they died of a fever.

LORD WORTHY: Well, prithee let's be gone, for I long to see some of these whose characters thou hast given.

YOUNG REVELLER: As we go, my lord, we'll call at the old gentleman's lodgings, probably he’s at home; I must inform you, as you go, of his humour, that you may the better know how to manage him. Next have a care you buy not the sight of these sparks too dear, for they'll fasten on you with the least encouragement you give 'em, and they'll worry you with more questions than an old scholar would his son when he comes home from school at Christmas.

LORD WORTHY: O fear not, I love fools as I do a landscape, they’re always best at distance. Tom, bring the things.

Exeunt.
Scene III

[Sir Thomas Reveller's lodgings]

Sir Thomas Reveller dressing himself.

Enter Boy.

BOY: Sir, the Steward has brought his accounts, according to your worship's order.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Bring him in.

[Exit Boy]

I look frowzy this morning; ad, I must leave off this drinking, it will kill me else, for the heat of my body's so violent, it will set the claret within me a boiling and make a hash of my bowels, for Satan. Yet, I look pretty well of my age, too; what a pox, I'm but eight and forty and have lungs as shrill as an eunuch, fa, la, la, la. Ah, that eye, Sir Thomas, that leer of the left eye has broke many a heart, you old rogue; George's eye, son George has the same eye to a T; ah, 'tis a wicked dog at a wench, but a cursed rogue keeps all his whores to himself, he won't let his nown dad come in for a snack; I'm forced to lay on my own maids, and then the coachmen get 'em with child and the whores put 'em upon me. Ad, I must take up, I must take up my life and take down my flesh. I have had twenty coachmen within this ten year and every one of them has left me the illegitimate substance of his brawny ability.

Enter Steward, gives Sir Thomas Reveller the account.

Is this a sincere account of the last three months?

STEWARD: 'Tis both sincere and just.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: It may be so, but 'tis very extravagant: three hogsheads of strong beer drank out in one day by harvest people.

STEWARD: Yes, and please you.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Yes, and vex me, it went thorough 'em as fast as they drank
it, they could never hold so much.

STEWARD: Yes, and make nothing on’t.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: So methinks. Stolen one night five pigs, seven turkeys, nine geese, eleven ducks, thirteen hens, and fifteen dozen of pigeons by the new-raised dragoons; what will they do when they come to be old soldiers? But they’re always in an enemy’s country, though quartered on their own fathers. Spent likewise forty shillings at several times with the overseers, about agreeing for giving security for four maids with child. Maids with child?

STEWARD: Servants, and like you.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Yes, they have served me finely which were left so by the aforesaid soldiers, so what they rob us of in poultry, they give us in bastards, a pretty exchange! Spent at fair Sarah the dairymaid’s crying out, who in her labour laid the child to your worship. Why, you son of a whore, laid it to me! I ha’n’t known her this twelve months.

STEWARD: Sir, she swore—

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Sirrah, she’s a bitch if she swore any such thing and I can satisfy a jury of midwives I have been past it this ten years. A young dragooner, I’ll be hanged else; oons, what an age we live in that the civil powers must keep whores for the military and maintain the children at their own charge! I had a sister but twelve years ago that ran away with a Welsh ensign who made a beggar of her in two years, poxed her the third, was hanged the fourth for a highwayman, and she burnt in Wales for a clipper.

STEWARD: 'Tis a crying shame, sir, that one’s own kindred can’t be safe for them.
Sir Thomas Reveller: It is so, wherefore I will petition that the army may have a certain allowance of strumpets which shall be maintained by the country gentlemen, that we may keep our families and relations for our own use.

Enter Mr. Sassafras.

Mr. Sassafras: Good morrow, Sir Thomas the worshipful, how is it, sir?

Sir Thomas Reveller: Mr. Sassafras the drugster! 'Faith, warm with last night's toping, my head aches and my hand shakes this morning.

Mr. Sassafras: Ah, Sir Thomas, that will be at our years if we drank water; but indeed we roared mightily, were very merry, and bumpered it about cheerfully; ad, my neighbour Raison the grocer was pure and wicked after you left us.

Sir Thomas Reveller: Aye?

Mr. Sassafras: Aye, fackings.


Mr. Sassafras: Why, we were delicious and lewd, and had a mind to play some of your Covent Garden tricks and court diversions. And Mr. Billet the woodmonger goes home very drunk and, like a true gentleman, kicked his wife and went to bed to his maid.

Sir Thomas Reveller: A very good night, 'faith. Steward, depart, this wickedness is too genteel for your capacity.

Steward: Yes, sir, and would become me as ill as your companions. These citizens would feign do something like courtiers, but I find they affect their vices as they do their fashions, never till the gentry are both weary and ashamed of 'em.

Exit Steward. Enter Mr. Raison.

Mr. Raison: Sir Thomas, good day, neighbour Sassafras, the same; well, how is it gentlemen? Pure, bonny, blithe, brisk, gay, jolly, whimsical, what say you? Seasoned

47. "Faith" Used interjectionally. There are other variants in the play like “i’faith” or “in faith” (OED n. 12b).
48. toping Copious drinking (OED tope v.2 1).
50. bumpered Drank bumpers or toasts (OED v.1 c).
51. pure and Truly; entirely (OED adj. 8b).
53. fackings A variation of “fegs,” an unmeaning noun in exclamatory phrases expressing asseveration or astonishment (OED). Also found as “ifackins” in the play.
54-55. of the clock D1: o’clock.
63. their Not in D2.
66. Pure Slang. Good, excellent (OED adj. 8a)
with last night’s wetting for today’s soaking? Does not the spirit of claret shine in your souls and illuminate your faculties, inspiring your understandings fit for fresh wantonness, ha?

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Well said, landlord Raison, the honour of the grocers, i’faith!

MR. SASSAFRAS: And master of the company, you forgot that, Sir Thomas.

MR. RAISON: How now, Sassafras the drugster, old ingredient for claps, infusion for potions, and author of wry faces?

MR. SASSAFRAS: Free from the noose of matrimony, old Spicer of plum porridge, quest-ale, and funeral dead claret!

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: To him, sugar-loaf.

MR. RAISON: Well said, bachelor, old bawdy solitude and single fornication.

MR. SASSAFRAS: Why, thou’rt as brisk—

MR. RAISON: Why? My wife’s gone into the country, I’m lord of all and master of myself.

MR. SASSAFRAS: Till she returns, neighbour Raison.

MR. RAISON: Right, neighbour chip-roots.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Egad, if she were mine, I should be loath to trust her in such public places as thou dost, as Epsom, Islington Wells, and Greenwich Park. And if I were a young fellow, my mouth would so water at her.

MR. RAISON: Like enough. I warrant you there are fellows water at her and it may be

---

73. How now Ellipt. for “How is it now?” Often used interjectionally (OED A 4b).
73. claps Fits of gonorrhea (OED n.2a).
75. spicer A dealer in spices; an apothecary or druggist (OED n.1).
75. plum porridge Hist. A thick soup or porridge containing raisins, currants, spices, etc., often flavoured with brandy, claret, or another liquor and traditionally served at Christmas (OED).
76. quest-ale Ale of a special quality (OED).
84. Egad A euphemistic alteration of the phrase “ah God,” used as a softened oath (OED).
85. Epsom After the therapeutic waters of Epsom, Surrey, were discovered, the village developed into a favourite spa. Samuel Pepys, Nell Gwyn, and Queen Anne’s consort were among its visitors. Shadwell’s comedy Epsom Wells (1672) portrays the loose life of the spa in those times (Hahn and Robins). On spas as propitious meeting places for sexual intrigue, see also Gómez-Lara 2002.
85. Islington Wells The spa grew up round the chalybeate spring discovered in 1684 in Islington, by then a nearby village north of the City to which Londoners liked to walk. Both the medicinal properties of its waters and the gardens, coffee-houses and the dancing and lottery “sheds” which adjoined turned the village into a popular place, although “the upper class elected to give it a miss” (Waller 230).
she thirsts after them; maybe she’s honest or maybe I’m a cuckold. All married men
must stand to their wives’ mercy and if I should be one, I have so much sense as not
to make a noise about what I cannot help, and had rather be a private plague to
myself than a public jest to the world.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Advice to cuckolds, Seneca the Second.

MR. RAISON: Pshaw, pox, if we marry gentlewomen, they’ll play us gentlewomen’s
tricks; we citizens marry them for love and they take us for interest. I wonder at the
impudence of any tradesman to think to keep a gentlewoman to himself.

Sings.

Ye citizens of London
That will have gallant wives,
Ye never would be undone
If you’d marry dames in coifs.
But gentlewomen’s tails
Have got the itch of loving,
And when the fancy once prevails
Their buttocks will be moving.

MR. SASSAFRAS: Ah boys, ifackins, he’s in a rare cu e today, his wife’s absence has new
souled him.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: We will not baulk this good humour.

Where shall we dine?

SERVANT: Sir, there’s my Lord Worthy newly come from travel and my young master
below.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Entreat my lord to approach, but bid your young master
wait below till I send for him.

92. Seneca the Second  Lucius Annaeus Seneca (ca. 4 BC-65 AD), the Younger, or the Second,
for he was the second son of Seneca the Elder and his wife Helvia. His work includes several
tragedies inspired on Greek models, together with essays and philosophical letters. Raison’s
apparent resignation to his wife’s likely infidelity reminds Sir Thomas of Seneca, a professed Stoic.

93. Pshaw  Q: Pshu.

95. Sings  The source of the piece is unknown, although it may be a parody of the song
“Neptunes Raging Fury,” composed by Martin Parker sometime between 1650 and 1665, whose
first line is “You Gentle men of England” (EBBA, RTSA). See also Claude Mitchell Simpson’s The
English Broadside Ballad (768-69).

99. coifs  Q, D1, D2: Quoives.

100. tails  Q, D2: Tales.
MR. SASSAFRAS: Why, what a crooked-tempered knight's this! He will do nothing his son would have him nor suffer him to follow his own desires.

Enter Lord Worthy [and Servant].

LORD WORTHY: Sir Thomas Reveller, may a man be admitted to your embraces after six years' absence?

Embraces.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Heartily glad to see you on my soul, my lord. Pray, be pleased to know my landlord Raison and his neighbour Mr. Sassafras, a drugster, ingenious men both, particular members of the Common Council and in all private affairs consulted for the good of the public.

LORD WORTHY: Seeing 'em in your company is a sufficient testimony of their good parts.

MR. SASSAFRAS: Sir Thomas is pleased to be witty, my lord, but we have some power in this City and should be proud if your lordship had occasion to use it.

MR. RAISON: We are plain men, my lord, but have good credit and can make our friends welcome; we can drink without being exceptious, be merry without state affairs, hate parting when we are good company, abhor knowing how the time goes, therefore nobody carries a watch amongst us.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Pray, my lord, how long have you been in London?

LORD WORTHY: Faith, Sir Thomas, not an hour, and if my good fortune had not thrown me on your son, must have been a wanderer much longer; but he has the strangest fancy, he told me he'd bring me to his father and I could not get him upstairs by any persuasion.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: I sent to him to stay below.

LORD WORTHY: No, Sir Thomas, before I saw your servant he swore he would not come up.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Swore it? I'll make him break his oath or break his neck; Jack, go and bid George come up.

Exit Servant.

120. Common Council In its origins, the Court of Common Council referred to the meeting of members of the commonalty of the City of London. These men, elected by their wards, had come to share the government of the City with the aldermen by the 14th c. In due course, the Common Council assumed most of the duties of the Court of the Aldermen and since the 18th c., it has been the effective governing body of the city; among its prerogatives, the election of the mayor. The Council meets at the Guildhall (LE).

127. exceptious Disposed to make objections; peevish, captious (OED).
MR. RAISON: I suppose he has told your lordship his father’s humour: he’s forced to act by contraries with him; I swear ’tis pity, he’s a fine gentleman and I love him extremely.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: I never knew a cuckold in my life, but was fond of the rogue that made him one.

LORD WORTHY: Why truly, sir, I think nature has been juster to him than his fortune, which I am sorry is not equal to his merit; and all the virtues I could wish myself or in a friend, I find in him.

Enter Servant.

SERVANT: Sir, your son’s gone.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: How, gone!

LORD WORTHY: He’s but gone to Guildhall, he said he’d walk there till I came.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Fetch him, sirrah.

Exit Servant.

MR. RAISON: ’Tis true indeed, my lord, and I am sorry his father won’t let him live like a gentleman.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: What, you’d have him master of my purse as your wife is of yours? As long as the world knows he is a gentleman, what’s matter for his living like one? ’Gad, I know abundance about this Town that live like gentlemen and are ashamed to own their parents.

MR. SASSAFRAS: So far I must side with Sir Thomas, he allows his son to live on the sharp, and that’s like most of the gentlemen of this age.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Come, come, ’tis best pinching ’em in their youth, they’ll the better know how to prize money in their age.

LORD WORTHY: ’Faith, Sir Thomas, that precept seldom takes effect, for a son is apt to run into extravagancies the latter part of his life to make amends for the ill usage of the first, and when pleasure’s in view, consideration’s a foe.

MR. RAISON: Understandingly spoken, my lord; this travelling is an ingenious thing, ’tis

---

146-47. or in Not in D1 and D2.
150. **Guildhall** It was the centre of London civic government, where Lord Mayor and Sheriffs were elected and meetings of the Court of Common Council held. It is placed east of the City, near Grocers’ Hall (LE).
156. *Gad* Used as a substitution for “God” in various phrases, chiefly assertive or exclamatory (OED n. 5 1a).
158-59. on the sharp In a sharp manner, stingily (OED 1a)
pity that there are not half a dozen members of the Common Council sent yearly abroad to learn politics at the expense of the nation.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: What, how to cheat more than you do? Pox, tradesmen's politics consist in lying only and ye need not go out of your parishes to learn that.

LORD WORTHY: But pray, Sir Thomas, how long have you forsook the court and embraced the Order of Cits?

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Why, ever since knavery took place of honesty.

MR. SASSAFRAS: And that's a long time, Sir Thomas.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: I speak in my days, pimp.

MR. RAISON: There's a bob for bachelors, for they're all so.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: There's nothing but whoring and, for whoring, I think we are pretty even with 'em here; but there's gaming and perjury, murder and blasphemy, divinity and hypocrisy, running in people's debts, and borrowing of money. I'll say that for the honour of the City, I have lived here this three years and ha'n't been struck for a guinea by any younger brother among 'em.

MR. SASSAFRAS: He that won't provide for his own son, will scarce lend to an acquaintance.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Peace, bedlam.

MR. RAISON: Pray let him, my lord, he's an admirable satirist.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: 'Tis to speak ill of every man, yet be courteous to all men; borrow of most men and pay no man; always at home to their whores and ever abroad to their creditors; to cheat their brothers, debauch their sisters; to be drunk nightly, arrested weekly, beaten monthly, poxed quarterly, live cursedly, die wretchedly, and so be damned to all eternity.

---

169. ye Not in D1 and D2.
170. Cits Q1: Cit.
175. bob A sharp rebuke, a bitter jest or jibe (OED n.3 2).
180. struck Asked to borrow (money) (OED 75 b).
183. bedlam An inmate of Bethlehem Hospital, London, or of a lunatic asylum, or one fit for such a place, a madman; spec. one of the discharged, but often only half-cured, patients of the former, who were licensed to beg, wearing as a badge a tin plate on their left hand or arm (OED 5).
184. a t'other end of the Town Westminster.
184. thorough-paced Thoroughly trained or accomplished, perfectly skilled (OED 2).
MR. SASSAFRAS: Here’s the spleen of the City, my lord; we can be as sharp upon them as they upon us, sometimes.

LORD WORTHY: Pleasantly described, in faith, Sir Thomas.

*Enter Young Reveller.*

But see your son.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: What was the reason you did not wait on my lord upstairs, sirrah?

YOUNG REVELLER: You sent me word it was your pleasure I should stay below.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: And therefore you went away, jackanapes.

YOUNG REVELLER: I thought it not for your honour I should keep company with footmen.

LORD WORTHY: Nay, Sir Thomas, you must not look upon him now as your son, but a friend of mine and pray be civil to him for my sake.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Sir, for my lord’s sake, you’re very welcome.

*Bows very low.*

YOUNG REVELLER: Nay, good sir.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Why, Tom totty, will neither austerity nor civility please you?

MR. RAISON: Good my lord, take him off, here will be a quarrel else.

LORD WORTHY: Well, Sir Thomas, I’m resolved we’ll dine together, since I did not pay my foy when I left the Town, I’ll pay my welcome to’t.

MR. RAISON: If your lordship pleases, let me give you your welcome; Sir Thomas has promised to dine with me, ’tis my birthday and if you’ll grace it with your presence, I’ll give you a cleanly and hearty entertainment; we’ll have wine in abundance, speak but one at once; wit as it happens and no wives.

LORD WORTHY: Truly, sir, the invitation is indeed alluring.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Come, my lord, be good natured for once and let my landlord have the maidenhead of your arrival.

YOUNG REVELLER: I think, my lord, we can’t do better.

---

206. totty Affectionate diminutive of “tot”; a little child (OED 1).

217. maidenhead The first stage or first fruits of anything (OED n.1 2).
SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Who spoke to you, Jack-sauce? You may dine elsewhere.

LORD WORTHY: Nay, Sir Thomas, you forget he’s my friend.

YOUNG REVELLER: Nay, sir, I ask your pardon for I’m engaged, now I think on’t, at Pontacks, though not with such good company.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Indeed, sir, and now I think on’t, you shall not be engaged at Pontacks.

YOUNG REVELLER: Indeed, sir, but I am.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: I will break your head, if you say that again.

YOUNG REVELLER: Why, sir, my word is passed.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Therefore you shan’t go.

YOUNG REVELLER: Would you have me break my word, sir?

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Break your word, sir! ’Twon’t go for a groat, sir.

MR. SASSAFRAS: That’s your fault, Sir Thomas.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Drugster!

*Stamps his cane on Mr. Sassafras’s toes.*

But I’ll make you break it for having the impudence to engage yourself in anything without advising with me.

YOUNG REVELLER: What, not to dine with a friend, sir!

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: No, sir, not to say your prayers, if I think fit.

MR. RAISON: Let him alone, my lord, there’s no other way of working him.

LORD WORTHY: I know it.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Did you never pray for my death, sirrah? Answer me sincerely: did you never wish me at the devil?

YOUNG REVELLER: I have wished him out of you often, sir.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Out of me! Why, you dog, do I incorporate with the devil?

219. Jack-sauce A saucy or impudent fellow (OED *Jack* n.1 C2 b).

222. Pontacks A fashionable eating-house of the late 17th and early 18th centuries, located in Lombard St., near the Guildhall (Hahn and Robins).

230. sir Not in D1 and D2.
Act 1, Scene 3

MR. RAISON: This is too far. Come, come, Mr. George, you shall dine with me.

YOUNG REVELLER: Indeed, Mr. Raison, I shall lose a guinea if I do, for I left one as a forfeit if I made not my appearance.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Come, come, George; stay George, thou shalt not want for a guinea.

YOUNG REVELLER: Sir?

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: I say thou canst not want for a guinea; my landlord Raison or Mr. Sassafras will lend thee a guinea.

MR. RAISON: What, and the father present!

MR. SASSAFRAS: No, thank you for that.

YOUNG REVELLER: I cannot stay without the guinea.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Why, get you gone and be hanged, you mercenary (As he’s going off). George—

YOUNG REVELLER: Sir?

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Won’t you dine with your cuckold, you fair-faced dog?

YOUNG REVELLER: My cuckold!

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Aye, aye, you leering rogue, my landlord; ah, you’re a sly toad, George.

YOUNG REVELLER: I know nothing on’t, sir.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Why, did you never lie with his wife, smock-face?

YOUNG REVELLER: Not I, sir.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: As you hope to be saved.

YOUNG REVELLER: Nay, sir.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: I’ll knock you down, you cursed dog, if you stand in a lie to me.

Offers to strike him, who offers to go.

LORD WORTHY: Nay fie, Sir Thomas.

262. smock-face A pale and smooth or effeminate face; a person having a face of this description (OED).
Parts him.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: A hardened rascal. Why, whither are you going, sirrah?

YOUNG REVELLER: Out of your presence, sir, that I may not disturb the company.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Stay, sirrah. \[Aside\] I cannot let him go, because he has a mind to’t. —And must you lose a guinea if you stay, sir?

YOUNG REVELLER: Aye, sir, besides the conversation of some pretty women.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Pretty women, sirrah! My lord, we’ll all go and dine with George.

MR. RAISON: Come, Sir Thomas, give him the guinea, I had rather give it him myself than be without his company.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Why then, give it him, if thou likest it so well.

MR. RAISON: Not before you, Sir Thomas.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: I’ll go out of the room.

MR. SASSAFRAS: Ah, hold there.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: I have no gold about me; my lord, will you lend George a guinea?

LORD WORTHY: Aye, sir, twenty, if you say the word.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: No, no, but one, my lord; nay, give it George but one, my lord. \[Aside\] Twenty I must pay him, one he may forget or be ashamed to ask for’t.

MR. RAISON: Come all’s well, and we’ll be rare and merry.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: George, be cheery, I will lay by the authority of a father and dedicate this day to familiarity and good fellowship.

LORD WORTHY: Give me your hand on’t.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: There ’tis, and if I talk like a parent, break my head.

YOUNG REVELLER: There’s mine, sir, I’ll do’t.

MR. SASSAFRAS: Come, my lord, lead the way.

MR. RAISON: Pray do, my lord, and we four will sing a whim extempore, eat an oyster before dinner, and take a whet.

LORD WORTHY: Away with it.
MR. RAISON:  

Sings.

The son’s reconciled, and the father is free;

MR. SASSAFRAS:  
The husband’s at home, and the wife is abroad;

YOUNG REVELLER:  
We’ll empty the cellar, and drink it quite dry;

SIR THOMAS REVELLER:  
But everyman here shall have his full load.

MR. RAISON:  
Confusion to him that’s not true to his friend

MR. SASSAFRAS:  
And hang the dull rogue that shrinks from his wine,

YOUNG REVELLER:  
May all hard-hearted parents and usurers mend

SIR THOMAS REVELLER:  
And may sons at their fathers never repine.

MR. RAISON:  
May all these good wishes increase with our riches,  
But a pox take all wives that e’er wore the breeches.

CHORUS:  
May all, etc.

Exeunt.
ACT II

Scene I

A garden.

Enter Florella and Violante.

FLORELLA: Well, this Young Reveller’s not coming to dinner vexes me.

VIOLANTE: Aye, and had not Mrs. Raison come down this morning, you would have been much more uneasy.

FLORELLA: Why, truly I should have thought ’em together, that’s the wicked truth on’t; but hang him, he has more mistresses to divert himself with. These young fellows that run at all value nobody any longer than they’re with ’em. Well, virtuous women, when once they’re in love, should never let the man stir out of their sight till they’ve made him sure, for we set the devil a-dancing in ’em; and because we won’t comply without matrimony, they meet while they’re eager some kind she that has less grace, which reaps the fruit of our labour.

VIOLANTE: Fie, how you talk!

FLORELLA: Fie, how I talk! Why, you think the same and so does the whole sex.

VIOLANTE: Have you no regard to virtue?

FLORELLA: Yes, as long as virtue has any regard to me. Prithee, let us not affect that nicety when we’re alone which we assume in public. I confess I would not go beyond the rules of honour, and yet I cannot help envying those that do when I think they enjoy my lover.

VIOLANTE: Florella, a lewd satisfaction is but of a short date; and however gay or splendid a miss may appear for the time she triumphs, she falls at last as unpitied as unhappy, for the thoughts in each man that every fool who has money is as acceptable as himself makes the woman as cheap as the pleasure.

FLORELLA: Why, do you believe that none of the women about the Town were ever true to one man?

VIOLANTE: No more than I believe one man is enough for the women about Town. The vanity that first betrayed ’em always pursues ’em. Pride makes more whores than love. Love ne’er made whores, conveniency and lust. Love’s pure and chaste, the beauty of the mind, if so allowed; the beauty of the mind can ne’er abuse the glory of

0. Scene I Q: Scene.
9. they're Q: their.
9. kind In the Restoration period, “kind girl” was a euphemistic expression for a mistress (OED adj. 6).
the soul. They that can sit contented with their being will never use base methods to 
advance it. And I cannot help thinking that she who will be debauched to mend her 
condition, will afterwards lie with any man that can better it.

Enter Boy.

BOY: Here’s a letter from Mr. Reveller to Madam Florella.

[Exit Boy.]

FLORELLA: So, the rascal has sent an excuse, that’s better than nothing.

(Reads.)

“Dear madcap,”—somewhat familiar for a lover of a fortnight’s standing—“I was 
robbed of thy company by the arrival of a friend, my Lord Worthy, who this morning 
came to London being returned from his travels and, waiting on him to my father, 
was kept by the old fellow at dinner. Pray pardon the misfortune, since ’twas not my 
own seeking. I will wait on you this evening in the park, and bid your sister look 
about her, for I will bring my lord, who is as mad to see her as she will be to have 
him when she knows him. So in hopes to cherish you in sickness and in health, I 
remain your obedient, George Reveller.” And thou shalt obey some time, George, for I 
know I must hereafter altogether. D’you hear, sister, how you’re threatened?

VIOLANTE: Oh, forewarned, forarmed; however, if he be so accomplished as your 
lover has spoke him, as frozen a virgin as I am, I may be melted. But when that time 
comes, Florella, I’m resolved, if possible, we’ll be married the same day and bedded 
the same night, that the ignorance of one may not put the experience of the other to 
the blush.

Enter Mrs. Raison.

MRS. RAISON: Your servant, ladies. What, taking the air to digest the fumes of your 
dinner?

VIOLANTE: Anything, madam, to avoid sleeping, which I am mightily given to after 
meals.

MRS. RAISON: ’Tis very unwholesome, indeed, but your mother expects you, for there 
are several ladies come to visit her and she wants your good company to help her to 
entertain ’em.

VIOLANTE: We’ll wait on her, madam; come, sister.

FLORELLA: [Aside to Violante] Stay, I’ll vex her a little first. —Will not young Mr. 
Reveller be here today, madam? He promised to come and play at cards again.

37-38. look about her Be watchful or apprehensive (OED look v. PV2 2).
39. to cherish you in sickness and in health Young Reveller replaces the first part of the 
mariage vow, that is, “to be your faithful partner,” with the verb “to cherish.”
54. on D2: upon.
MRS. RAISON: Why, do you like his company so well, madam?

FLORELLA: No, madam, but I find he does mine; you were the first that introduced him into the family and I was civil to him for your sake, which I find he misinterprets and has sent me a love letter.

MRS. RAISON: A love letter! What was in it? Pray let’s see it.

FLORELLA: ’Twas not worth your reading or my remembering, and I exposed it to the flames the minute I perused it. And though his father makes love to my mother, I have more value for myself than to admit the addresses of one who is a beggar; and so, pray tell him.

MRS. RAISON: I shall, and severely, madam.

FLORELLA: [Aside to Violante] She’s roused. —Will you not walk, madam?

MRS. RAISON: I’ll but gather a few violets and follow you.

VIOLANTE: [Aside to Florella] Fie, why would you fret the poor woman so? You might spare her the use of him, till you purchase him yourself.

FLORELLA: [Aside to Violante] Hang ’em for cut-loaves, as they call ’em; if it were not for the conveniency of such, young fellows would marry faster.

Exeunt Florella and Violante.

MRS. RAISON: Oh, false, base villain! Have I maintained him, kept him even from starving, fed still his pride to keep his figure up, slighted the addresses of great men for him, neglected every duty of a wife, and sacrificed my name, my peace, and all the ornaments of reputation? With him I ran away, c’er scarcely warm within my husband’s arms. Oh, ’twas too short a siege, he won too easily the fort, which had to others seemed impregnable; without an oath I rendered him my heart and in the zeal of love forgot conditions. I had intentions to forget the monster, return to the obedience which I swore, for what I use so ill deserves it not; nay, I had resolved it, had framed myself by mild degrees to leave him. I would have been his friend though still in want and could with ease, I thought, have parted with him.

But that which was indifferent before,
His loving her now makes me covet more.

Exit.
Scene II

[Dorinda's apartment]

Dorinda and her Aunt.

DORINDA: Oh tell me not of honour, what I ought
Of obligation's gratitude to Worthy.
'Tis true, he is the man who first seduced me,
And thou art she who first betrayed me to him.
I then was poor, was ignorant of sin;
So innocent that, had I loved as now,
I could not for the soul of me have told
What 'twas I longed for more than talk and kisses.

AUNT: Well, well, experience has cured those errors
And I suppose you can tell what you long for now.
You know this Young Reveller is your lord's friend,
Who was so fearful of the world's admiring you,
He would not trust him with the knowledge of you.
What can you hope for? If his friend has honour,
He cannot condescend to wrong his love.

DORINDA: He knows me not, nor nothing of my being.

AUNT: You will be known in time, and then consider
What the event will be of such a breach.
My lord can ne'er forgive so foul a crime
And in the heat of vengeance both may fall;
You then will wish you had kept the worst of 'em.

DORINDA: Impertinent, thou prattlest for thy interest
And seest no further than my ill-got pension;
When vice grows ancient, it grows mercenary.

AUNT: Well, well, I was believed in the days of your stepmother, when you sat with your
needle in your hand from morning till night, with a short meal a day, whilst all her
own children took place of you. I then was appealed to and my advice was acceptable.

DORINDA: It was my poverty that gave thee credit;
Temptation in affliction seldom fails.
Freedom was first proposed and first inclined to;
Then wealth, which made that freedom relish better.
My vanity was eager of the bait
And thou with art didst play it to my liking.
Fools, when they find their master's weaknesses,

27. took place took precedence (OED place P1e [c]).
29. thee Q, D1, D2: the.
Are eloquent in flattering their errors.
The wise that would correct them are thought fools.
I loved the purchase, but I curst the price;
My pride, not inclination, did undo me.

AUNT: But now your inclination will, I find.
What is it you propose in following Reveller?
The man must live on you, you can’t on him,
Nor will your stock maintain your follies long;
Can’t you take one without forsaking t’other?
Keep both and I'll side with you.
Let Reveller his absent hours supply,
But let the other’s gold still make you easy.

DORINDA: Thou art a worthy wicked counsellor!
Sin when it shows good nature is excusable;
My treachery must thrive by treachery.
I know the act I am about is base,
But that serves little when I cannot help it.
Morality, thou art unprofitable;
When once our souls are prejudiced to reason,
Affection helps the most decrepit sense
And reconciles impossibilities.

AUNT: Do you stand to my proposal?

DORINDA: Oh, anything to feed my hopes;
These four years to the world I’ve lived a nun,
Conversed with nought but books and thy dull self,
And use at last made solitude most easy.
But, oh, that fatal morning be accursed,
"Twas yesterday, would some disease had stopped me,
Fond of a sight, I forced thee to the Wells,
And criticised upon a crowd of fools;
Each fop buzzed in a road of talk his folly
And, being masked, I was obliged to hear 'em.
I laughed at the insipid chatterers,
And was diverted with variety.

AUNT: Till Reveller approached?

DORINDA: ’Tis true.
I love my weakness, though I blush to own it.

37. them are D2: them that are.
65. the Wells The play refers to these springs as Deptford Wells, but they are probably the Sydenham Wells, in Lewisham, discovered in the 1640s. They were commonly known as Dulwich Wells (Peter 72). John Evelyn visited them in September 1675 and noted that they were “much frequented in summer time” (Dobson 2: 106). See also Hembry 101.
67. road String of words; a range of thought or discourse (OED n. 7a).
That Reveller! Why was he made so lovely?
Not but I could have stood the charms of person,
Had he not backed his beauty with his tongue.
I was a stranger too to conversation,
But reading, which informed me that the rest
Were fustian souls, uneducated blockheads,
Proved Reveller had art with wondrous sense.
His words fell easy, soft, not starched with method,
Nor was his language cramped with unknown terms.
His arguments genteelly conquered mine,
And when he found me silent, urged ’em strongest.

AUNT: Why would you go? I persuaded you against it.

DORINDA: Thou didst,
But ’twas an evil itch that would not hear thee.

AUNT: ’Tis strange! You have the sense o’th’ ill, yet cannot shun it;
Judge equally the benefit and loss,
Take in the cooling draught of temperance,
And weigh impartially, ere ’tis too late.
You that can argue thus the right and wrong,
If you’d endeavour, sure might make good choice!

DORINDA: Oh, thou mistakest, the weighing it confounds us.
It is in love, as ’tis with factious writers,
Who state and answer everything themselves;
That side seems fairest which they most affect.

AUNT: Well, well, since it cannot be helped, you must have the man, and there’s an end on’t.

DORINDA: I must, I will, by heaven, I have him now,
I feel the panter throbbing at my heart
And hugged by every artery about it.

AUNT: Still let’s be merry and wise, as the saying is.
What will you do about my Lord Worthy?
He has sent you a letter here, but you won’t see it; he says he will be down tonight.

DORINDA: Give it me.
“Dear, dear Dorinda,” —dear and dull, but come, let’s on— “this morning I came from Dover to Greenwich, where my treasure was but unknown to me; in the pursuit on’t I have lost such precious hours as nothing but thyself can make amends for. They told me, where I use to direct my letters for you, how you were disposed of, and had not Y[oung] Reveller hindered me, I had been with you as soon as this. But at night expect a longing lover, to whom Dorinda is the dearest object. Worthy.”

AUNT: Well, and who could write prettier? Or indeed, who is prettier? I don’t think you have mended your choice. He’s young and handsome, rich and noble; the other has nothing but his wits to live on.

DORINDA: Tonight! Why, Reveller meets me tonight! Nor will I miss the appointment for ten lords.

AUNT: Why, you don’t mind what I say to you?

DORINDA: Disturb me not. What’s to be done?

AUNT: Why, what are you thinking of?

DORINDA: How to avoid this Worthy.

AUNT: Mercy on me now, heaven forbid!

DORINDA: Do you forbid his coming, or I go.

AUNT: Go, whither?

DORINDA: Anywhither, madness ne’er wants a place.

AUNT: What will become of us? Consider.

DORINDA: Perish consider! I have cursed all thoughts but those which favour love and Reveller.

AUNT: Well then, he shall be put off. I’ll tell him that you went to London to see for some letters just before his came, which is probable enough, and so missed each other; and that you being fearful of the water, would scarce venture to come home tonight. But, says I, “when she hears of your coming, her love will do anything.” Then, after you have discoursed with Reveller, you may come in as from London, which will the more and more endear him to you.

DORINDA: Do as thou wilt and tell me on’t hereafter.

AUNT: Sure you might hear what’s for your own good, one would think.

106. Reads D2: Read.
125. Anywhither To or towards any place (OED).
DORINDA: Talk but of Reveller, and I'll listen calmly;  
   My soul shall dwell on the enticing tale  
   And I'll be stupidly in love with silence;  
   No passion ever, ever equalled mine.  
   But, oh, my Reveller! Be thou as kind,  
   What harmony will be in both our souls!  
   Whilst trembling sighs bedew the willing lips,  
   And every squeeze still closer than the former.  
   Oh, ecstasy!  
   But hold, keep down my joy, it were a crime  
   That I should lose myself before my time.  

Exeunt.

Scene III

The Park.

Enter Young Reveller and Lord Worthy.

YOUNG REVELLER: This coming by water has refreshed us mightily. 'Sdeath, the old fellows drank like Germans.

LORD WORTHY: Or like women with child, it had no operation with 'em. I was pretty far gone when we took boat, but the air has somewhat settled me.

YOUNG REVELLER: How did you like the entertainment, my lord?

LORD WORTHY: Much better than I thought I should; they are the honestest plebeians I ever met with and, as thy father says, George, I wonder thou canst have the heart to cuckold so honest a friend to the bottle as Raison.

YOUNG REVELLER: Faith, my lord, I'll be ingenuous with you. 'Tis an intrigue of a pretty long standing and, though it be somewhat scandalous to receive more favours from women than one, my necessity has obliged me to comply; for ever since your travels she has been my father.

---

147. **Exeunt** Not in D1.

0. **The Park** Greenwich Park.

1. **'Sdeath** A euphemistic abbreviation of “God’s death” used in oaths and asseverations (OED).

2. **drank like Germans** German people were notorious for their unrestrained drinking, as some English proverbs state: “Three things are ill-handled: birds in boys’ hands, young men in old men’s hands, and wine in Germans’ hands” (Tilley T209).

3. **Or like women with child** Pregnant women were advised to drink a glass of sage ale every morning to strengthen the womb, as the renowned London midwife Mrs. Jane Sharp recommended in her childbirth manual (Picard 46).

4. **far gone** Extremely drunk (OED go v. 48f).
LORD WORTHY: Thy old man has used thee scurvily, truly, but this amour with Florella, as thou talkest of it, if it succeeds, will put it out of his power to wrong thee.

YOUNG REVELLER: I have fair hopes on’t, she’s worth fifteen thousand pounds and her sister as much. They are the co-heiresses of Sir Tho[mas] Hazard, a famous merchant that died about two years ago. Their mother-in-law, my Lady Hazard, did order it so as to be their guardian, but the money’s their own upon the day of age or marriage, nor is there any scurvy proviso of the mother’s liking, and so forth. And if I can but secure the inclination, the money comes of course.

LORD WORTHY: How came you acquainted?

YOUNG REVELLER: Why, you must know, my old man has made love to the mother this six months. She has twelve hundred pounds a year for her life, which her husband gave her not as a jointure, but generously when he died, which with my father’s two thousand pounds per annum, will put ’em into a condition of living without being obliged to relations. But indeed, Mrs. Raison was the person who first presented me to the family, for she boards in the same house with ’em.

LORD WORTHY: And thou hast well rewarded her. I wonder at the humour of women, that can’t have a handsome young fellow without the vanity of showing him; had she never brought you into better company, then her own discretion had kept what her folly has lost.

YOUNG REVELLER: I think both sexes are equally to blame in that point, and especially husbands that carry their handsome wives to all the public places about Town, as if men married for the approbation of the world and not their own liking. Now, when I drink, I make use of my own palate; when I buy anything, my own opinion’s my guide and not the persuasions of the seller.

LORD WORTHY: But, George, you’d take it ill to put on a new suit and have the Town damn your fancy. Every man loves to hear his choice commended and a rarity in any kind will be shown by the owner, out of the pride of his particular possessing it.

YOUNG REVELLER: Why truly there is something in that, my lord. But I had rather keep my money in my pocket than, by exposing my stock, give sharpers opportunity of borrowing it.

LORD WORTHY: But see, George, petticoats!

13. with    D2: with with.
17. mother-in-law    Stepmother.
24. jointure    The provision made in marriage settlements for the support of the wife in the event of the husband’s death. As defined by Sir Edward Coke, the great authority on English law in the 17th c., a jointure is “a competent livelihood of freehold for the wife, of lands and tenements; to take effect, in profit or possession, presently after the death of the husband; for the life of the wife at least” (Blackstone 2: 137).
25. pounds    Q, D2: pound
36. persuasions    D1: persuasion.
Enter Violante and Florella masked.

YOUNG REVELLER: The right, I hope. I know you, madam, by that vicious turn of your head and side leer.

FLORELLA: Indeed, sir!

YOUNG REVELLER: Yes, indeed, sir, my lord. Madam, you know what I writ in my letter. Pray, unmask ladies that my lord may be satisfied I spoke truth, for I have given ye beautiful characters.

FLORELLA: I think an honest face need not blush, though somewhat homely. Come, sister, let 'em see the worst of us, lest my lord should think us uglier than we are. I think our faces are clean.

They unmask.

YOUNG REVELLER: Little charmer!

LORD WORTHY: If my friend, madam, bought his curiosity as dearly as I shall purchase mine, he’s in a languishing condition, I assure you.

VIOLANTE: Soft and fair, my lord; you are an artist, I find, that can love as fiddlers play, at first sight.

LORD WORTHY: Love, as it’s unaccountable, is irresistible.

There must be a beginning, why not now?
A laziness in liking is insipid.
Nor would you prize the lightning of your eyes
If it were slow in giving us the wound.
That flint is best that fires at first stroke.
Such fierce-born sparks, if they not take effect,
Proves that which should receive ’em is in fault
And makes the striker peevish.

VIOLANTE: The fire that kindles quickest, burns too fast;
What boils too fierce ne’er strengthens, but decays;
The simmering, though slow, is still the stronger.

LORD WORTHY: No method, sure, can be allowed in love.

Prudence and passion never were allied.
The flame which reason rules has interest in’t.
What’s raised by art is still maintained by cunning.
The naked looseness of the soul is best
And that which shows most madness, owns most love.

VIOLANTE: I find you are experienced in’t, my lord,

47. writ  wrote.

49. characters  Detailed reports of a person’s qualities (OED n. 14a)
And are a bowler in the green of love;  
Can lie i’th’way or hit the heart at pleasure.  
I am a stranger to my bias yet,  
Nor is it fit my weakness should be challenged  
By one who knows the ground and all its rubs.

LORD WORTHY: The game which I propose I’m sure to lose at;  
The most unknowing of your sex in that  
Will quickly learn and baffle the instructor.

VIOLANTE: My lord, you go too far, I’ll hear no more.

FLORELLA: So, his wit has made him too familiar and she has done with him. What can you say now that’s pleasant and modest? I know ’tis a restraint upon your capacity to talk civilly and well, but if you don’t, I shall follow my sister.

YOUNG REVELLER: As you say, madam, lewdness is most easy, especially to those who abhor virtuous company; but I, who am naturally addicted to goodness, can bear a subject as pious as the priests of our times.

FLORELLA: So, your vice will peep in spite of your tiffany virtue. But, d’hear, talk to me of nothing but love and manage it so that I may believe you. Nay, honest love too, mark that, sir!

YOUNG REVELLER: That latter obligation is somewhat heavy. Prithee, let’s talk of other love, though we shall act none; the thoughts of a miss has oftentimes relished a wife.

FLORELLA: Indeed, sir! Is your stomach so queasy? Methinks you might swallow the bitter pill of matrimony when so sweet a bit as fifteen thousand pounds is to follow.

YOUNG REVELLER: Faith, child, I bear a conscience and had rather serve thee for nothing than take so unreasonable a price for my labour.

FLORELLA: Truth is, I don’t know whether you’ll deserve it and I think I had better keep my money than run the hazard of so uncertain a purchase.

YOUNG REVELLER: Pox on’t, thou hast too much wit for a wife. Besides, I suppose you have such a villainous constitution as to expect me all to yourself.

FLORELLA: I leave that to your own discretion, but if you should play me foul, may you only think at the same time I am serving you the same sauce, and go on as well as you can.

---

76-81. I find you ... all its rubs Violante draws on a metaphor on the game of bowling to restrain Lord Worthy’s approach. She complains that he is a skilled lover (“bowler”) who knows the ground (“green”) and its unevenness (“rubs”) and who can easily steer the bowl (i.e., the thrust of love) or make it hit. Violante, on the other hand, is so unfamiliar with love (or bowling) that she does not know how she will react (“my bias”) when pushed.

81. rubs Unevenness of the ground which impedes or diverts a bowl (OED n.1 2a).

92. tiffany Fig. Transparent (OED 2d).
Act 2, Scene 3

YOUNG REVELLER: As you say, when a man can't trust his servants at home, he can take but little pleasure abroad. I find I shall be undone, in spite of my aversion to wedlock. Well, my lord, will your fort accept of proposals or is it stubborn against articles?

LORD WORTHY: Faith, George, somewhat peremptory and much upon resistance.

FLORELLA: Why, my lord, I thought you travellers had the knack of taking hearts.

LORD WORTHY: I had of keeping one, till I saw your sister, madam.

VIOLANTE: I desire consideration, my lord; the surrender's of consequence, it being the inlet to my eternal peace or disquiet.

FLORELLA: Aye, aye, give her time, my lord, as much as she will; the more you offer, the less she'll accept, so much I know of my sex.

VIOLANTE: Thank you, sister; but men are not so scarce that we need run mad for 'em.

LORD WORTHY: But you may, if the war continues, for ought I know; you'll wish you had taken a whole man hereafter. If the prophecy comes to pass, you'll be very indifferently fed when one man is a mess for seven of you.

VIOLANTE: Methinks you young gentlemen, Mr. Reveller, should go and serve your country. 'Tis a shame to make love when there's honour in view.

YOUNG REVELLER: Thank you, madam, but if you could persuade my father to go in my room, you would much more oblige me.

VIOLANTE: He's old.

YOUNG REVELLER: The fitter to be knocked on the head. Young fellows get the king soldiers. Drones that have lost their stings are useless.

LORD WORTHY: I find these ladies would be courted like those in romances; we must kill monsters for 'em.

YOUNG REVELLER: Thank heaven, we are not so hard put to't as the Romans were

110. articles Normally in pl.: terms, conditions, as in a peace treaty (OED 3b).

111. the war By the time the play was premiered, William III was facing two war scenarios: the fight for the Netherlands against France (see Prologue) and the Irish conflict. Although he successfully occupied Dublin on 2 July 1690, just some months after his landing in the island, the situation was far from resolving easily: while the king had to return to Britain in September, his commanders went on with the campaign for much of 1691 and had to offer very generous terms for surrender (Claydon 2008).

131-32. I find these ladies … for 'em A romance is a medieval narrative, first written in verse and later in prose, that relates fantastic adventures of idealized characters in enchanted settings. Frequently, the heroic knight would slaughter a dragon or a like monster in his quest to rescue a distressed damsel, hence Lord Worthy’s parody (Baldick).
with the Sabines; we need not fight for women in this age.

FLORELLA: Not if all be so free as the lady in the mask was yesterday morning at the Wells, Mr. Reveller.

YOUNG REVELLER: Jealousy’s a sign of love, child, I am glad to see it. Why faith, ’twas a likely soul and a woman of sense, for she railed at matrimony damnably.

LORD WORTHY: Well, George, I as much envy thy happiness as I mistrust my own; my lady has no pity.

VIOLANTE: As much as you care for, my lord, or becomes me. You have rallied enough now, I suppose, which was the utmost end of your conversation. Do I colour, sister?

FLORELLA: A little guilty about the eyes.

YOUNG REVELLER: Come, ladies, will you honour us so far as to play at cards with you this evening? My old fellow’s with your mother and we’ll pretend a visit to her. I have often talked to my lady of my lord and she’ll be proud of a nobleman for her son-in-law, though you are so indifferent to him for a husband.

A noise of music.

VIOLANTE: Ad’s my life, here’s your father, my lady, Mr. Raison, and abundance more with music!

Enter Sir Thomas Reveller, Lady Hazard, Mrs. Raison, Mr. Sassafras, Mr. Raison, and Fiddlers.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Come, my lady, ’tis pity such an evening should be lost within doors.

LADY HAZARD: Look, yonder are my daughters, Sir Thomas, with your son and another gentleman!

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Ad so, my Lord Worthy! The flower of Europe, madam. Ad, if he takes a liking to your daughter we shall have a glorious son-in-law. George, my lord, your lordship’s humble servant; pray be pleased to know my Lady Hazard, the mother of these girls and, in all likelihood, of election to be the partaker of my flesh and blood.

LORD WORTHY: You much honour me, Sir Thomas, and I wish my interest there were

---

134. the Sabines  The Sabine were an ancient people of the central Apennines in Italy, incorporated into the Roman state in the 3rd c. BC. Seeking to provide wives for his men of the new settlement of Rome, Romulus invited the neighboring Sabine women to a spectacle and then kidnapped them, resulting in a war. This ended when the women threw themselves and their children between the armies of their fathers and of their husbands to stop them, concluding in a reconciliation (Knowles).

135-36. the Wells  Deptford Wells. See note to 2.2.65.

148. Ad’s my life  A colloquial variation of “God save my life” (OED ad n.2 2).
equal to yours here.

VIOLANTE: If he goes on as he begins, he may get the start of ’em.

LADY HAZARD: Your lordship has so noble a character that were I a stranger to your quality, the fame of your virtues would recommend you alone; nor would I willingly call her friend or relation that could refuse such goodness.

LORD WORTHY: I humbly thank your ladyship.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Very well, faith, very well said of both sides and so much for complements. Come neighbour Sassafras, landlord Raison, bear up, sirs; what a pox, dozed, stupefied, humdrum! Wine used to have another operation.

MR. RAISON: Pox on’t, I’m sorry we left off drinking. Prithee, let’s to’t again. I don’t care for women’s company.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Why, was it not thy own proposal to come down to Greenwich to sup with thy spouse and be merry with this good company?

MR. RAISON: Truth is, I was but half drunk when I had a mind to my spouse, I find since the last bottle I am incapable.

YOUNG REVELLER: (To Mrs. Raison) I am sorry your husband’s in such a condition, madam.

MRS. RAISON: I am more sorry you’re in such company, sir. I have not only a beast for a husband, but a villain for a lover.

YOUNG REVELLER: Madam!

MRS. RAISON: Rascal!

YOUNG REVELLER: Your servant.

FLORELLA: What, are you angry, Mrs. Raison?

MRS. RAISON: A little troubled he should make my husband such a sot, madam.

FLORELLA: Such things will be. You may repair the lady’s loss, Mr. Reveller.

YOUNG REVELLER: I wish I might, madam, for I was always inclined to help the afflicted.

MR. SASSAFRAS: Come, what do we do here, Sir Thomas? A pox of these petticoats, they spoil more company than e’er they created; let’s have some wine and cold chickens, go upon Flamsteed’s leads, and huzza to the neighbouring counties.

175. husband’s D2: rusband’s.

189. go upon Flamsteed’s leads The sheets or strips of lead used to cover a roof were used as a sort of terrace upon which people could walk and take fresh air. “Flamsteed’s leads” here refers
MR. RAISON: Aye, aye, let’s huzza, let’s huzza.

YOUNG REVELLER: Nay faith, Mr. Raison, since you have fiddles we’ll have a dance and what you will.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Why, you impudent rascal, how come you to speak of a dance before I thought on’t?

YOUNG REVELLER: You forget, Sir Thomas, what we shook hands about.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Gadso, I beg thy pardon, George; come then, let’s have a dance.

MR. SASSAFRAS: Hang dancing, Sir Thomas, ’twill put us all into a sweat and make the air unpleasant.

LADY HAZARD: I think we had better dance at home, for we shall have the whole Town here gaping at us.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Agreed, then we’ll first to supper and then for a rubbers at scampering. My lord, we must desire your good company.

LADY HAZARD: By all means.

LORD WORTHY: ’Tis a blessing I have prayed for.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Lead on then. George, handle your mother-in-law and I’ll take water-wagtail; my lord, here’s yours; Sas[safras], take Mrs. Raison and let the husband bring up the rear.

Mr. Raison stumbles on Florella.

FLORELLA: He had better lead the way, that he mayn’t fall upon us.

MR. RAISON: I think I ought to go first as being the only married person among you. Besides, as I’m a cuckold, I’m a single man in this company. Fiddlers, play “Buffcoat,” la, la, la.

---

196. Gadso  A variant of “catso,” from the Italian “cazzo,” used as an exclamation (OED).
197. rubbers  An additional turn or spell at something (OED n.2 2b).
198. scampering  Running or going hastily from place to place (OED v.2).
199. water-wagtail  A small bird so called for the characteristic wagging motion of the tail. Fig. a familiar epithet applied to a man or a young woman; in this case, Florella (OED 1a, 3a).
200. “Buffcoat”  Raison asks the fiddlers to play to the tune of “The Buff-Coat Hath No Fellow,” a popular melody for a country dance recorded in John Playford’s The Dancing Master, publ. 1670 (149).
Act 2, Scene 3

FLORELLA: Well said, Mr. Raison. (To Mrs. Raison) Madam, bear up, your husband’s good company.

MRS. RAISON: [Aside] What means this devil?

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Come, away with it, la, la, la.

Exeunt singing and the music playing.
**ACT III**

**Scene I**

*The Park.*

*The moon shining. Enter Dorinda and Aunt.*

DORINDA: Has not the clock struck eleven yet?

AUNT: No, but 'tis very near it; I'll in and wait my lord's coming.

[Exit Aunt.]

DORINDA: Oh, Reveller! Thou'rt slow or I'm in haste!

Love should be still beforehand with the time,
For 'tis a thief that often robs our joys.
How tedious are the moments of my longing,
Whilst Worthy, at a year's end, comes too fast!
Yet such a slave I am to my impatience
That, for one early minute with my love,
I'd meet an hour sooner what I hate.

Enter Young Reveller drunk, followed by Mrs. Raison's Maid.

YOUNG REVELLER: 'Tis a fine moonshiny night, much ado I have stole from my company and much ado I have to manage my footing, three bumpers more had rendered me incapable of crawling; now for this mistress, it is the prettiest wittiest thing I ever met with. Shine out, thou pale-faced bawd to midnight wooers! Blush if thou canst to make thy flame more cheerful, for I will do a deed, if she will let me, shall make thy cheeks glow, little luna, and wish, instead of lighting the world, thou wert in her condition of peopling it. Oh, there's man's meat already! [To Dorinda] Has thy blood, child, any sympathetical motion towards mine? If you expect a lover, tell me! If not, leave the place for one that does! There's a convenient pond at the lower end, if thou'rt in a despairing condition.

DORINDA: 'Twere hard to be drowned so near a good harbour, would not that flesh and blood you talk of fling out a rope to save me?

YOUNG REVELLER: [Aside] Oh, 'tis the devil, I know the instrument by the sound. — Well, madam, I know not whether you'll esteem it a favour, but I have left wit and wine, women and wealth, to show how much I am your humble servant.

MAID: (Aside) 'Tis as my mistress Raison suspected, and I'll acquaint her instantly.
DORINDA: Well, sir, and I have neglected my repose, ventured catching cold, and run
the hazard of a parent's fury to bid you welcome.

YOUNG REVELLER: So far we are upon the square, but how must I accost you? Shall
we chat easy and naturally without the cant of romance and ridiculous whining, or
must I open my heroical budget for extravagant raptures?

DORINDA: Keep it shut, I beseech you, sir, for as I desire no lies, I expect no flights; let
our expressions be cordial, whether they prove effectual or no. [Aside] What a
condition the knave's in! Now cunning, help me.

YOUNG REVELLER: Why then, as I hope to be saved, and that's a presumption—

DORINDA: Hold, sir, I must give you some cautions. In the first place, I am a maid,
therefore talk decently; in the next place, I am honourable, therefore talk respectfully;
and thirdly, I am and will be honest, therefore talk virtuously.

YOUNG REVELLER: [Aside] Oh, lord! What company hast thou betrayed me into?
Virtuously and honest! The very words have made me sober. If I were dying of a
hiccup, the surprise of a thumb-ring would destroy it.

DORINDA: I'll try you, sir.
(Aside) For if I yield, I lose him after it.
It is the pride of man with oaths to win us
And then with scorn he boasts his treacherous conquest.
Why should I for the joys of one poor night
Create the plague of doting ever after? —
All men despise what's given too willingly.

YOUNG REVELLER: Child, I find we shall do no great matters,
I wish thee and thy honesty a good night's rest,
Such a cold couple can get nothing but agues sure.

Goddess of wisdom and beauty, help me,
Pour all the guiles and graces of my sex
Into my face and soul but for an hour.
Diana, from thy freezing icicles
Of uninstructed harmless chastity,
Send to his wanton blood one drop to cool it
That I may catch him in the bonds of honour,

29. **upon the square**  Upon terms of equality with another (OED square adj. 12c).
31. **without the cant ... raptures**  A sarcastic reference to the high-flown language mostly used
in the Restoration heroic plays based on romances, like Dryden's.
41. **thumb-ring**  A ring formerly worn on the thumb (OED a).
56. **Diana**  Roman goddess of virginity and hunting; her attributes are precisely a golden bow
and arrows. Therefore, Dorinda begs her to shoot Young Reveller one of her arrows (“freezing
icicles”) to bestow on him some of her chastity.
And never more expose myself to lewdness.
—Then will you go, sir?

_She pulls him, and looks amorously._

YOUNG REVELLER: _[Aside]_ Why, what a charming look the baggage gave me! —Not if you talk within compass; I am pretty good natured and can pass by what’s said upon condition you don’t relapse. For look you, child, honour is as great a check to love as fear of being discovered is when we’re acting it.

DORINDA: But how can you esteem what comes so cheap?
When there’s no tie, where’s the security?
You have a treacherous notion in your minds,
Which, on the least occasion, you improve
Believing if we are seduced by one,
By the same rule we may be kind to all.
But marriage binds us by a sacred oath
And reputation checks all lawless thoughts.

YOUNG REVELLER: Look you, madam, my mother made me swear upon her death-bed I never should be bound for anybody.

DORINDA: _[Aside]_ Though I know the rogue lies, yet he pleases me. —But as great an enemy as your mother was to wedlock, she was married to your father, sure.

YOUNG REVELLER: _[Aside]_ If I thought ’twould anyways add to the making her a whore, I’d confess myself the son of one. —Why, child, I think there was some such hugger-mugger business, but that was to preserve an estate from going out of the family; ’twas a kind of an incestuous match, for they were sisters’ children. But interest, interest; now mine’s a love free from all such design. Our fancies shan’t be palled with cares of wealth, of cuckoldom, or chargeable posterity.

DORINDA: But nothing can be constant out of wedlock.

YOUNG REVELLER: No, nor in’t neither, scarce, to my knowledge. Wedlock may cover a sin, but ’twill never prevent one; and we have such an itch to be gadding when we’re confined. Had our first parents never been forbid, they had never been curious. What makes men love eating abroad when they may have it so much better and cheaper at home, only because it is home?

---

62. _baggage_ Woman of disreputable or immoral life; strumpet. Also used playfully as a familiar term of address (OED n. 6, 7).
63. _within compass_ With moderation (OED n.1 2).
64. _you_ D1: ye.
65. _an_ Not in D1.
66. _palled_ Weakened, diminished (OED v.1 1b).
67. _chargeable posterity_ A euphemistic allusion to their offspring, emphasizing the financial cost it would entail.
68. _to be gadding_ To go wandering in desire, leaving the true path (OED v.2 2).
69. _it is home_ D2: it is at home.
DORINDA: Suppose you should gain credit,  
Would you forever love and never leave me?  
Would you not covet still variety  
And seek out some fresh mistress to deceive?

YOUNG REVELLER: Not I, by heavens;  
Thou hast charms sufficient to secure a heart,  
Thy wit's unimitable, thy beauty matchless;  
Nature was in thy composition lavish.  
Would Jove create a mistress for himself,  
He'd choose thy mould to cast her in.

DORINDA: [Aside] Blessed moment, he grows sober.

YOUNG REVELLER: Think what a glorious pride will swell my soul  
When I possess what none beside can purchase.  
Thy generosity will oblige my faith  
And I must shame myself in wronging thee.  
What fool would run the hazard of a change  
When he's secured of certain happiness?

DORINDA: [Aside] Now woman. —Oh, you flatter!  
This heat of love comes from the zeal of lust.  
No passion can be lasting that's so eager,  
And when you've pleased yourself and ruined me,  
You will forget as fast as you invented.

YOUNG REVELLER: Desire can ne'er forget what it must feed on;  
Like jealous piety, I'll have the figure  
Drawn of the saint I worship to prevent it,  
And to thy shrine such hearty offerings pay  
As no methodical dull wife can merit.

DORINDA: [Aside] Then I've another game to play.  
Heat, heat his blood, instead of cooling it,  
That I may work his eager hopes to love,  
Then act a virtue which shall tie him faster.

YOUNG REVELLER: Our joys shall be irregular, but often,  
Despising a domestic decency;  
And when we faint with emulating fondness,  
As two hot combatants wearied, not beaten,  
Whose violence has dried and choked their lungs,  
Creep to some spring to reinstate their spirits,
I from thy lips will take such verdure in
As shall relieve my droopy droughty soul
And make me fiercer for the next engagement.

DORINDA: [Aside] By heaven, if he persists I am undone,
His charming tongue will blast my stratagem—
And will ye swear? But what avails men’s oaths,
Forgot when the occasion’s passed which urged ’em?

YOUNG REVELLER: What should I swear?

DORINDA: Swear that you'll never marry whilst I live,
For that's the rock our yielding sex still splits on.
You to the generous mistress curse the snare,
But when you’re tired, make use on’t to avoid her.

YOUNG REVELLER: May poverty and jealousy attend me
The minute I prove false.
Come, let's retire and wind ourselves in bliss,
Tangle our souls in ecstasies unknown,
And drop into confusion by consent.
[Aside] By heaven, I'm fired, her every touch distracts me,
So overeager am I to possess her,
I fear the fierceness will destroy the power.

DORINDA: And will you ever love me?

YOUNG REVELLER: Can I love heaven, prosperity, or content?
Oh, do not drill me thus! But take me to thee,
Smother me in thy arms with kind convulsions,
And hug me to the utmost verge of bliss.

DORINDA: Stand off, base villain! Thou beastly part of man!
Thou glowing satyr got by some rank devil!
Go to the stews, vile thing, and make thy choice!
Take pleasure and diseases both at once
And scatter ’em through all the strumpet-tribe.
I loathe thee for this wicked supposition.
And all the noble notions in my soul,
Which crowded with a fondness to prefer thee,
I here dismiss and in their room admit
As base thoughts of thee as thy intended practice!

YOUNG REVELLER: Stay, madam; what an apoplexy's here in the midst of health? You can but try me sure and think this way to work me to a higher value for you.

127-28. I from thy lips ... droughty soul The freshness (“verdure” OED 4a) Young Reveller finds in Dorinda's lips through her kisses will allow his droughty soul to refresh.

132. ye D1: you.

136. splits D1, D2: split.

149. drill Lead, allure, entice (OED v.1 3).
DORINDA: Touch me not, monster! If thou dost, I'll call for help;  
I feared thy treachery and have it near me.  
Because I tried thee with a seeming kindness,  
Could'st thou believe so poor of me to yield  
On a first conference? Had I really doted,  
So much I hate thy low esteem of me,  
That thou’rt as much my scorn as once my liking.

YOUNG REVELLER: Yet stay, madam! [Aside] By heaven, I cannot leave her!  
There’s something from her which has touched me nearly. —  
Stay, madam!  
And since I have committed such a crime,  
Let me gain pardon though I lose your favour.  
For mild discretion tells me I’m to blame  
And all those charms, which when my blood was warm  
Enticed me to a lewd imagination,  
Now strike a reverence upon my soul.  
’Twas cursed wine! That spirit of assurance  
And introducer of all lawless thoughts  
That bred the mischief. I now am temperate,  
Shame has destroyed the vice and I am honest.

DORINDA: [Aside] Oh happy management! —  
How can I trust what has so lately wronged me?  
If I forgive you and you again relapse,  
I am alone in fault.

YOUNG REVELLER: By heaven I am as calm as a Platonic.  
Thy glorious virtue has increased that flame  
Which after its lascivious heat had ended.  
Propose a remedy to heal this breach  
And like expiring mortals, fond of life,  
I’ll take in anything that gives me hopes.

Enter Aunt and whispers Dorinda.

DORINDA: No more, I’m called. Keep steady in this faith  
And you shall hear soon from me.

YOUNG REVELLER: Will you not tell me when? That being full of the expecting bliss,  
I may some comfort purchase with the knowledge that every tedious hour that falls  
away I have an enemy the less.

189. as calm as a Platonic  
In a general sense, a Platonic, as a follower of the views of the  
Greek philosopher Plato (ca. 428-347 BC), is confined to theories instead of practical action. In  
terms of love or friendship, the person seeks a spiritual rather than a physical affection (Stevenson).  
Queen Henrietta (1600-1666), Charles I’s wife, was very fond of this ideal approach to love and  
imposed it as fashionable at the court, as plays like Davenant’s The Platonic Lovers (1635; 1636)  
prove. Later on, this view would be rejected and parodied as outmoded under Charles II’s reign.

194. called  
D1: glad.
DORINDA: Tomorrow at the Wells, but be gone.

YOUNG REVELLER: I cannot leave you.

DORINDA: Nay, offer not to watch me, but convince me of your love by your obedience and you shall know tomorrow what I am.

YOUNG REVELLER: Thou dearest, thou first I ever truly loved, adieu.

Exit.

DORINDA: Thanks to my prosperous art, I think I have thee. Now to my interest; how dull is all that’s coming, how dear was all that’s past! Yet I must seem to covet what I’d shun; Oh, what a curse ’tis when for filthy gain we affect a pleasure in a real pain.

Exit Dorinda [and Aunt].

Re-enter Young Reveller.

YOUNG REVELLER: What the devil ails me! Or does the devil govern me? My blood’s quite altered and those loose desires, which never liked but for conveniency, are changed to real passion; my wanton drunkenness turned to a sober admiration and I begin to fear I’m growing a downright dull, insipid, constant lover! Oh, for some kind she to allay this mighty fever, that I may snub this damned honest inclination before it gets the better of me.

Enter Mrs. Raison masked, in a scarf.

Satan, I thank thee, here’s a petticoat I’m sure! I find wickedness will not be kicked out this night and my constitution returns to its rambling custom. Madam!

MRS. RAISON: Sir.

YOUNG REVELLER: What cruel accident can be the occasion of this solitary travelling so late?

MRS. RAISON: Why, sir, I am come to look after a lost lover who, parting from me in a sullen humour, I fear has hanged himself.

YOUNG REVELLER: No, no, child, never trouble thy head about that, those Roman gallantries are expired; but if thou would’st be thoroughly revenged on him for leaving thee, take up with me. I bear a tender conscience to all distressed damsels and keep a particular fund for acts of charity.
Act 3, Scene 1

MRS. RAISON: Should all the distressed damsels come to you for relief, I believe you’d shut up your exchequer quickly.

YOUNG REVELLER: Look you, madam, I am not the first banker that has broke when his bills have come too thick upon him.

MRS. RAISON: Say you so, sir?

Unmasks.

YOUNG REVELLER: Mrs. Raison!

MRS. RAISON: To your amazement, ungrateful, perjured villain!

YOUNG REVELLER: [Aside] Oh, I find what this will come to and, thanks to my unknown mistress, am pretty well provided for a reconcilement. —What means this fury, madam?

MRS. RAISON: Devil, canst thou ask that question? The lady you have had so long should know the meaning, could I find her out.

YOUNG REVELLER: [Aside] Now for a good face to a bad cause. —I suppose, if you’d examine into’t, you might easily find her out.

MRS. RAISON: What says the beast?

YOUNG REVELLER: I do confess I am somewhat brutified, but I have so much humanity left to remember I tipped you the wink when I left you and you leered, as much as to say “I'll follow you.”

MRS. RAISON: Was ever such impudence!

YOUNG REVELLER: Was ever such forgetfulness! Why, what the devil, because I am drunk d’you think I’ve lost my senses? Did you not come presently after me, masked? And have you not been bantering me this hour with a pretence I did not know you, though I called you by your name and hinted some particulars of our familiarity? And did you not turn short from me at the upper end of the walk and run from me, and now here I have met you again?

MRS. RAISON: This is beyond all patience!

YOUNG REVELLER: I’m sure I have shown a great deal in bearing what I speak of; and but I was thoroughly convinced it was you, and only a trick to try me, I would no more have sauntered after you than an old courtier would have followed a statesman out of favour.

239. **Now for … a bad cause** Similar to the proverb “To set a good face on a bad matter” (Tilley F17).

254. **thoroughly** D1: thoroughly.

254. **convinced** Q: convin’d.
MRS. RAISON: Distraction! Did you not address to me as a fresh woman?

YOUNG REVELLER: Aye, that was when you used me like a fresh man; trick for trick, child, that's all. And since you have had your humour, come along and let me have mine.

MRS. RAISON: And do you think I'll be satisfied thus?

YOUNG REVELLER: No, no, I'll satisfy you better.

MRS. RAISON: This won't do, devil, I am so convinced of your baseness that—

YOUNG REVELLER: Pshaw, pox, too much is too much. Prithee, don't drive the jest so far neither; I can bear, you know by what's passed, but egad the worm will turn at last.

MRS. RAISON: [Aside] 'Tis a folly to talk to him in this condition, I'll take the morning to school him in; perhaps it might be some midnight jilt watching for prey, like a polecat in a warren, and my approach might frighten her away.

YOUNG REVELLER: Come, come, child.

MRS. RAISON: Whither, what d’you mean?

YOUNG REVELLER: How silly that is; where's your husband?

MRS. RAISON: Why, your father and he with the druggist are all gone a rambling into the Town. I expect none of my wedlock monster this night.

YOUNG REVELLER: [Aside] That's as much as to say I must take care of her. —Well, we'll to my lodging, you may get in early enough unseen the back-way, as you use to do.

MRS. RAISON: My maid will take off that; but I shall catch my death here standing so long in the dew.

YOUNG REVELLER: We'll go, my dear. [Aside] Claret, I worship thee!

At last the injured termagant's grown civil,
A drunken impudence can outface the devil.

Exeunt.
Scene II

Continues the Park.

Enter Sir Thomas Reveller, Mr. Raison, Mr. Sassafras drunk,
Singing, with Music, and Servants with wine.

ALL:

Sing.

There’s nothing like a brimmer
To make the heart full glad;
It cheers the soul,
Inspires all,
The drunk are never sad.

MR. RAISON: Sir Thomas, let’s outoar thunder, be lewder than atheists, outswear a
gamester at the loss of his last stake, outdrink a cook i’th’ dog days, be saucier than
kept whores to their cullies, and prouder than constables at midnight.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Let’s be as conceited as City wits, vainer than City wives,
fonder than City husbands, and as great strangers to our old acquaintance, wherever
we meet ’em, as a new made sheriff to his next neighbour.

MR. SASSAFRAS: Let’s be frolicsome as counsellors’ clerks and as awkward as their
masters, make as much of our whores as presbyters
in private, value discretion no
more than our young nobility. Let’s commit murder that we may be company for
gentlemen, and stalk as stately as a foot captain when he marches through the City at
the head of his myrmidons to relieve at the Tower.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Till, by affecting what we are not capable of, we become as
ridiculous as a dancing judge.

MR. RAISON: Well said, Sir Thomas, but where’s this son of yours?

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Hang him, rogue, he’s stole home to some whore, I warrant
him.

MR. RAISON: A pox take all whores, say I.

MR. SASSAFRAS: Thou hast reason, poor cuckold. ’Tis a heavenly moonshiny night.

0. Scene II Q: Scene. D1, D2: Scene IV.
7. th’ dog days The hottest part of the summer (OED 1).
8. cullies Men who are cheated or imposed upon; e.g. by sharpers, strumpets, etc. (OED n. 1).
13. presbyters Elders in the Presbyterian Church (OED 1c).
16. myrmidons Members of a gang or army adhering to a particular leader. The origin of the
name goes back to Homer’s Iliad, for this was the name of the warlike people living in ancient
Thessaly, whom Achilles led to the siege of Troy (OED 1, 3).
20. he’s D1: he has.
Some wine, rogues.

Servants fill wine.

Enter Constable and Watch

CONSTABLE: Stand!

MR. RAISON: And that’s as much as we can.

CONSTABLE: Who are ye?

MR. SASSAFRAS: Drunkards, rich fellows, and not overwise.

CONSTABLE: Oh, Sir Thomas and Mr. Raison, good morrow to you gentlemen; you’re upon the frolic, I see. Rest ye merry, gentlemen; pray do no mischief and be as jovial as you please.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Nay, drink the king’s health, Mr. Constable.

CONSTABLE: If ye please, gentlemen; come, sirs, heaven bless him

Drinks.

WATCH: Mayn’t we pledge ye, masters?

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: No, vermin, no. There’s money to swill malt with [gives them a few coins]; claret’s as much out of your element as good manners beyond your understanding.

ALL WATCH: Bless ye, masters.

Exeunt Constable and Watch.

MR. SASSAFRAS: This constable has more sense than ever I met with in any of his tribe; some rogues now would have provoked a quarrel, only for the conveniency of their watchmen’s stealing hats and periwigs, and so forth.

24. Constable and Watch In Restoration London, there was no organised police force as such. Instead, some local authorities like the King’s Messengers or the City Marshals acted as the forces of law. At parish level, the constables and the watchmen did their best to impose authority, although their low salaries did not encourage them sufficiently (Picard 233-34).

30. ye D1: you.

41. watchmen’s D1: watchmen.

39-41. This constable … and so forth Constable and watchmen were always suspected of corrupt activities, which made them the target of satirical attacks like Edward Ward’s in his Vulgus Britannicus (1710): “Watchmen … Break their own Lanthorns in the Scuffle,/ To have a fair Pretence to Ruffle” (VII, 70-73); or “The Constables now rang’d their Wards,/ To collect Mony for their Guards,/ And huff’d and strutted at the Doors/ Of all their Poor Parishioners” (IX, 13-16).
SIR THOMAS REVELLER: The watch of Covent Garden would no more have missed such an opportunity than a thief would slipping into a house when the door’s open.

MR. RAISON: There is one of those watchmen they say is a terrible fellow, pray who is he?

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Why, he’s a midnight rakehell driver that has cracked more skulls than ever pavior thumped flints; there’s not a scourer of any reputation whose facetious noodle has not had the honour of being dubbed with his quarterstaff; he was never in the right and yet always gets the better; he will sit you up three hours after his time to watch for prey and use you the worse for not coming sooner; and being an ill-looked fellow, he has a pension from the church-wardens for being bull-beggar to all the froward children in the parish.

MR. RAISON: A most notable description. But your son, Sir Thomas?

MR. SASSAFRAS: Aye, your son.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Let’s go and disturb the dog, and drown him in pint glasses.

MR. SASSAFRAS: Agreed, agreed. Play, cats-guts and rosin.

Exeunt singing “There’s nothing like a Brimmer.”

Scene III

Young Reveller’s lodging.

Enter Mrs. Raison.

MRS. RAISON: Well, Mr. Reveller, you’re a wicked man; and were it not more cut of a motherly affection that you might come to no harm in your drink, than any inclination or desire I have to your person, I swear I would not have come with you.

——

47. scourer In the 17th and 18th centuries, one who made practice of roistering through the streets at night, beating the watch, breaking windows, etc.; a roar (OED n.2 2).

51. ill-looked Ugly (OED).

51-52. bull-beggar Bull-bear: a spectre, bogy; an object of groundless terror (OED).

56. cats-guts D1: cat-guts. Material used for the strings of some musical instruments, made of the dried twisted intestines of sheep or horses. Since the early 18th c., the word began to be used in a figurative sense to refer to “violin” (OED catgut n. 1, 2).

56. rosin A kind of resin used for treating the bows of stringed instruments in order to increase the friction (OED n. 1a; Stevenson). A similar expression joining “cats-guts” and “rosin” can be found in Dryden’s Amphitryon (1690): “What, with Cats-guts and Rosin! This Sol-la is but a lamentable, empty sound” (3.1.549-50).

0. Scene III Q: Scene. D1, D2: Scene V

0. lodging D1: lodgings.
YOUNG REVELLER: *(Aside)* This will be the cant when she rises in the morning; she never was with me in her life, but she told me 'twas to keep me from ill women.

MRS. RAISON: But I hope you are somewhat come to yourself now?

YOUNG REVELLER: I shall be, child, when my vapours are expelled. The night’s much wasted; come, we lose time.

*A noise of music, Sir Thomas Reveller, and the rest singing without. Enter Servant.*

MRS. RAISON: Heavens, what noise is that? 'Tis your father’s voice and my monster’s!

SERVANT: Sir, your father’s just coming up with Mr. Raison and several others.

YOUNG REVELLER: Go, get you in, lock the door, and go to bed. I'll send 'em away, I warrant you.

MRS. RAISON: Don’t drink no more, dear George, you'll be senseless if you do.

YOUNG REVELLER: Don’t fear it.

*Puts her in.*

*Enter Sir Thomas Reveller, Mr. Sassafras, Mr. Raison, Music, Servants with wine, etc.*

SIR THOMAS REVELLER:

*Sings*

A pox of the rogue that sneaks from his wine
And runs to a daggle-tailed whore;
May nature be drowsy and balk his design,
Or may he ne’er drink any more.

How now, rogue, how now, skulker, what, leave your old dad for a whore? I never served your grandfather so, sirrah!

YOUNG REVELLER: Indeed, sir, you were too hard for me. If I had drank any more, I should have forgot the duty of a son and have used you saucily.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Why, that’s like most of the sons of this age; when we’re old they’re the only young fellows will keep company with us, and it’s against their wills too. Only the respect of what we’ll leave ’em obliges a little, so we’re forced to wink at their wickedness to keep our own in countenance.

MR. RAISON: Aye, Sir Thomas, the greatest seducers of children nowadays are the

---

4. *Aside* Not in Q.
11. ’em D1: them.
16. daggle-tailed Having the skirts splashed by being trailed over wet ground (OED).
21. drank drunk. See note for 1.3.17.
parents; the fathers for the sons and the mothers for the daughters.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: And who are the greatest seducers of wives, old race of ginger?

MR. SASSAFRAS: Bachelors, Sir Thomas, illustrious and free bachelors.

MR. RAISON: Not of thy age, drugster; thou’rt as dry as the ingredients of thy trade and hast no more moisture in thee than a potato.

MR. SASSAFRAS: Well, had I any children, they should never go to a playhouse nor to church.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Why so?

MR. SASSAFRAS: Because they go to learn wickedness at the one and hypocrisy, how to dissemble it, at the other.

YOUNG REVELLER: Aye, but you may learn good at both if you'll make a right construction.

MR. SASSAFRAS: Yes, you may be sober in a tavern if they'll bring you no wine; but where there’s object, there’s temptation, and where there’s temptation, there’s desire, and where there’s desire, there’s uneasiness, and where there’s uneasiness, there’s impatience to be cured, and when there’s impatience to be cured, adultery or fornication’s the only remedy; so the devil in the end’s your physician.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Well said, Sassafras, and since the clergy on all sides are so fickle, I think that laity wisest that believes none of ’em; and now we are talking of church affairs, where’s your whore, you dog?

YOUNG REVELLER: Whore, sir?

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Aye, sIRRah, I’m sure you would not have run away if there had not been a whore in the case. Therefore, I'm resolved I will see her and if I like her, I'll be better acquainted with her.

MR. RAISON: Why, Sir Thomas, suppose your son had a woman with him, would you have so little grace as to commit incest?

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Incest! That’s a jest! For most of the younger brothers about Town are kept by their father’s whores, and I say I will see her.

YOUNG REVELLER: Nay, pray sir, you’ll disturb—

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Aye, therefore I’ll do’t.

39-40. if you’ll make a right construction If you will interpret it in the right way (OED construction 8b).

46. Sassafras Q, D2: Sas.
YOUNG REVELLER: But, sir, he is not well.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: He, what he, sirrah?

YOUNG REVELLER: Why sir, my Lord Worthy’s chaplain, who being in want of a lodging for this night is within, in my bed. He’s a grave sober man, sir, and you’ll fright him out of his wits.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: How, a sober fellow and a nobleman’s chaplain? He’s at board wages then, for where they command the cellar the butler’s never idle, and I will see this miracle.

YOUNG REVELLER: Nay, pray sir. Mr. Raison and Mr. Sassafras, I conjure you by the worth and honour of citizens, stand by me and keep my father out, or I am ruined forever.

MR. RAISON: Yes, George, you shall find we citizens have honour and worth. Come, Sir Thomas, here’s a bumper to you.

MR. SASSAFRAS: Agreed. Sir Thomas, your inclinations.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: They’re in his bedchamber, here’s her health. (Drinks)

Offers to go in, Mr. Raison holds him.

MR. RAISON: You shan’t go in.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Gad, but I will.

MR. SASSAFRAS: Faith, but you shan’t.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: By the hectors of Covent Garden.

MR. RAISON: By the members of Grocers’ Hall.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Why, is not the whore as free for me as for him?

MR. RAISON: Sir, I have given him the word of a citizen to stand by him and my punto will not allow me to violate the honour of my corporation.

---

63. fright D1, D2: frighten.
65. board wages Wages allowed to servants to keep themselves in victual (OED).
65. butler’s D1, D2: butler is.
74. upon the square Upon terms of equality (OED square adj, 12c).
78. hectors Used frequently in the second half of the 17th c. to refer to a set of disorderly young men who infested the streets of London (OED n. 2).
79. Grocers’ Hall The first hall of the guild of grocers opened in 1428 in the eastern area of the City; it was destroyed by the Great Fire and consequently rebuilt in 1668-69 (LE).
81. punto A nicety of behaviour, ceremony or honour (OED n.1 1a).
SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Why, you cuckoldy dog, it may be your own wife for ought you know.

MR. RAISON: I care not if it were my mother and he were getting an heir to disinherit me, he shall not be interrupted; and though I am as it were dead drunk, yet I will stand by him, I say I will stand by him.

Falls down.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: So suddenly fell the Walls of Jericho and Joshua plundered the town.

YOUNG REVELLER: Mr. Sassafras!

MR. SASSAFRAS: Hold there, Sir Thomas, I stand in the gap and like the Bashaw of Buda will die in defending the place.

Mr. Sassafras draws Young Reveller’s sword and stands between the door and Sir Thomas Reveller.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Why, what a pox, have we got a hydra? No sooner one head down but another sprouts up? Why, dare you fight?

MR. SASSAFRAS: Dare! ‘Oons draw, come, for the pass, yours or mine.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: And hast thou really courage?

Draws.

MR. SASSAFRAS: Have you a heart, sir? Try if I can hit it; come on, sir, come on.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Nay, if thou’rt so hot upon fighting, thou’rt no citizen I’m sure; and considering how captains and laced coats have been admired by

88-89. So suddenly fell ... plundered the town  Jericho is an ancient city set in the west bank of the river Jordan. According to the Old Testament, Yahweh requested Moses to appoint his successor as a leader of Israel, and Moses chose Joshua. He led the Israelite invasion of Canaan and captured Jericho, whose walls fell down all of a sudden as his people blew their trumpets: “So the people shouted, and the trumpets were blown. As soon as the people heard the sound of the trumpets, they raised a great shout, and the wall fell down flat” (Jos 15: 20).

91-92. Bashaw ... the place  Bashaw is the earlier form of the Turkish title Pasha, which refers to an officer of high rank, like a military commander or a provincial governor (OED n. 1a). In the Battle of Buda (1686), the Holy Empire’s army defeated the Ottomans, whose Pasha at that time was Abdurrahman Abdi Arnavut (b. 1616). According to some chronicles, he died heroically in the resistance of the city, despite his advanced age. This defeat meant the end of the Turkish rule in Buda, where they had remained since the siege of 1541.

93. hydra  Mythological many-headed serpent of the marshes of Lerna, whose heads grew again as fast as they were cut off. It was slaughtered by Hercules in the first of his Twelve Labours.

98. thou’rt  D1, D2: thou art.

98. thou’rt  D1, D2: thou art.
shopkeepers’ wives, thou may’st be the hasty offspring of an afternoon’s recreation in Moorfields.

MR. SASSAFRAS: Come, come, will you tilt for this lady?

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: No, I shan’t do like the fools nowadays; tilt for a whore I don’t know. *(Puts up)* Come, sirrah, since I must not see her, though I am sure it is Raison’s wife.

MR. RAISON: I care not, I’ll stand by him.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: What liquor have you? Have you any cherry, sirrah? Cherry, the comfort of midnight.

YOUNG REVELLER: Yes, sir.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Fetch it then; three beer glasses of cherry, sirrah.

*[Exit Servant]*

MR. SASSAFRAS: Aye, now you say something

*Puts up.*

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: He had as good let me see her, for I’ll debilitate him so with brandy, he shall be useless to her.

*Enter Servant with three large glasses of cherry-brandy.*

Hold, let me taste ’em all to know if the rogue has not palmed something else for his master. *(Tastes)* Sincere and spiritual, a concealed body and yet a considerable body too. Come, to the memory of our poor brother departed.

MR. SASSAFRAS: Agreed.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: So, now George, fall to your lady, and if the brandy does its part, I think thou wilt falter in thine.

MR. SASSAFRAS: Take care of the good man, George, for the good woman’s sake.

YOUNG REVELLER: I warrant you; ten thousand thanks.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Sirrah, remember this when I have a wench. *[To the Music]* Strike up,

101. Moorfields Literally, “field in the moor or marshland,” which originally referred to the marshy ground north of the City Wall which also gives name to Moorgate and Moor Lane. The moor was drained in 1527 and the field became an open space used for gardens, pastures, quarrying, skating, the dog houses of the City’s common hunt, and other recreational activities *(Dobson and Wells).*

107. cherry Cherry-brandy.
[Sings]
A pox of the rogue that runs, etc.

Exeunt Sir Thomas Reveller, Mr. Sassafras and Music.

YOUNG REVELLER: Now to the female; if fear has not killed her. Sirrah, draw Raison into your room and take care he peeps not out in the morning till all’s safe.

Each whoremaster his cuckold thus o’erpowers,
We make ’em drunk and then their wives are ours.

Servant takes up Mr. Raison, who all the while cries “I’ll stand by him.”

Exeunt.
ACT IV

Scene I

Dorinda’s apartment.

Enter Lord Worthy and Dorinda.

LORD WORTHY: My dear Dorinda, darling of my senses, how sweet is love after so long an absence; my hours have been as troublesome without thee as they have been delighted in being with thee; nor will I ever travel more for knowledge, my utmost study centred still in thee; I have wandered like a child without my guide, followed the notion of improving arts, when I had left my natural genius here.

DORINDA: My lord, you know you are welcome to these arms, but if the separation was so tedious to you, who’ve had such vast variety of countries and of courts, of all that’s worthy the pursuit of fancy, think how uneasy has been my solitude. No object, entertainment, or acquaintance, nothing diverting to deceive the time, my prospect limited, my measures fixed, nothing but lectures from a peevish aunt; nay, had I not been blessed with constant letters, which satisfied me that my lord was safe, I must have sunk beneath the sad restraint.

LORD WORTHY: I’ll study how to recompense thy patience, the generous compliance thou hast shown in thy submission to my jealous love (the dread of losing thee inflicted it); but I’m united now for ever here, nor will I e’er torment thee more with absence; great nature’s utmost curiosity can never match Dorinda’s full perfections.

DORINDA: (Aside) Oh, tedious raptures and insipid eloquence. —Be constant to your words and I am happy, but you were saying you must go to London.

LORD WORTHY: My love—

DORINDA: I say, if you do go to London do not stay long; may I expect you back at dinner?

LORD WORTHY: I have accounts to settle, bills to receive, things to look after that belong to thee, some presents.

DORINDA: Presents, alas! You’re all I covet.

LORD WORTHY: No, my delight, I have brought o’er some toys, some silks, and points; still what I saw that might adorn my love, I picked up by degrees in travelling, to let you know you never was from hence.

DORINDA: But be sure you come at night.

7. who’ve D1, D2: who have.
9. or D1, D2: of.
10. measures Plans, courses of action (OED n. 19a).
24. you’re D1, D2: you are.
Act 4, Scene 1

LORD WORTHY: Will the night come, think'st thou I could stay from thee? But I'll not leave thee yet.

DORINDA: Nay, then you'll be so late you'll not come home; the earlier you are there, the sooner you'll be here.

LORD WORTHY: And won't you take it ill I leave you?

DORINDA: Unkind suspicion! Can I pretend to love and be displeased at ought is for my lord's conveniency?

LORD WORTHY: Blessings upon thee, adieu then for a while.

DORINDA: Be sure you think upon me.

LORD WORTHY: My soul is useless when not employed on thee, my life.

DORINDA: My heart’s devotion.

LORD WORTHY: I cannot stir whilst I behold thee.

DORINDA: You shall not stay to prejudice your business.

She seems to hug him, and all the while drives him towards the door.

LORD WORTHY: At night, my love, betimes.

DORINDA: Forget not.

LORD WORTHY: I warrant you.

Exit Lord Worthy.

DORINDA: He's gone and all this day is mine. Within there, Aunt.

Enter Aunt.

AUNT: What 's, my lord gone?

DORINDA: To London, put on your hood and scarf, and get me mine; 'tis a fine morning, I'll to the Wells.

AUNT: And will you still pursue this Reveller? You will repent.

DORINDA: Peace, manage for thy own ends; I'm resolved. If you'll stay at home, you may. Who waits? Get the chariot ready.

AUNT: Well, heaven direct all for the best.

DORINDA: Thus the gallant is by the mistress ruled,

Whilst by some other lover she is fooled.
AUNT: What will this come to? Here is nothing but destruction to be looked for. In fine, I'll e'en tell the gentleman downright who and what she is, better he should have her anyway than marry her, for the treason must out, and then she's undone, he can never forgive her; nay, what's worse, I shall be turned a starving, I can't work, and we ancient gentlewomen that live upon the sins of our relations are very ill-qualified to get a penny in the fear of grace. Well, take warning by me, good dames, for it is not only an ill thing in being accessory to the debauching your kindred, but it is a provoking thing to see young girls partake of what we cannot.

Exit.

Scene II

A garden; in the middle, Deptford Wells.

Enter several as drinking the waters, Florella and Violante [masked].

FLORELLA: Well, I am satisfied, my roving-rascal Reveller and Mrs. Raison have been together this night, I watched her stealing in this morning at five a clock, and I do not know of any other lover she has here about.

VIOLANTE: I suppose my lord and he have not separated whatever adventure they've had; well, I wish I had not seen him.

FLORELLA: Why so? You must have somebody, and why not him? He's a pretty gentleman, and besides a lord, and that, you know, goes a great way with a merchant's daughter; most of our young nobility by the extravagance of their fathers are left very inconsiderable in their fortunes; so their quality being necessitated for money, and our citizens ambitious of honour, many a title has been kept up by the pride of a tradesman, who never values what he gives for a nobleman to his son-in-law.

VIOLANTE: 'Tis true, and interest is so absolute and poverty so pressing, that a tailor who can but get a considerable estate, need not despair of seeing his daughter die a countess.

FLORELLA: Well, Sir Thomas has told us what passed between him and his son last night, our shifting of clothes may conceal us, and I am resolved to tease him and all the fools that talk to me this morning, as far as the spleen of a jealous mistress can reach.

---

56. **downright**  Definitely, plainly (OED adv. 3).
0. **Deptford Wells**  Prob. Lewisham Wells; see note to 2.2.65.
14. **die**  D1: dying.
16. **us**  D1: me.
VIOLANTE: Agreed, we shall have variety of game presently, the coxcombs thicken already.

Enter Sir William Thoughtless and Bully Bounce.

SIR WILLIAM THOUGHTLESS: Bounce, come along, ha! A brace of tight lasses yonder, let’s make up to ’em. —How do you, ladies? Why this melancholy velvet upon such fair complexions? Has the chillness of the waters made the roses on your cheeks to fade, or has their influence rudely pressed upon the tip of your noses and made ’em bleak and sharp?

VIOLANTE: However sharp they have made our noses they have had no effects upon your understanding, for your language is as ridiculous as your person.

BULLY BOUNCE: Prithee, Sir William, let’s seek some other game, these have better tongues than our usual acquaintance.

SIR WILLIAM THOUGHTLESS: No gad, my stock of raillery’s not out yet.

VIOLANTE: I believe you may put it all into a sentence, and not be out of breath with the delivery.

SIR WILLIAM THOUGHTLESS: Why gad, I love to talk with vizards mightily, for we have the privilege of railing as much as we please.

FLORELLA: Without running the danger of being beaten for it.

SIR WILLIAM THOUGHTLESS: Why, pull off your mask and I’ll be civil.

VIOLANTE: If I were sure the sight of my face would frighten you away, I would.

SIR WILLIAM THOUGHTLESS: Why, you don’t know but it may, I have known many a pleasant tongue belong to a damnable ugly face.

VIOLANTE: I see a very indifferent face that belongs to a foolish tongue.

FLORELLA: So we have the pleasure of being convinced and leaving your worship in doubt.

SIR WILLIAM THOUGHTLESS: Damn me, I believe you’re ancient, your features are expired and your face is in mourning for ’em.

BULLY BOUNCE: Well said, knight, my dear Sir William Thoughtless! Oons, if she answers that, I’ll allow her a wit.

---

22. tight  Neat in appearance; neatly and carefully dressed (OED adj. 4a).
33. the  D2: a.
VIOLANTE: Or you’d be allowed no sponger; is he your probatum est, bound to flatter a fool or dine with the servants?

SIR WILLIAM THOUGHTLESS: Answer me to what I reparteed upon your mask, and gad take me I’ll kiss you.

VIOLANTE: No, I wear it on purpose to keep flies from my face.

SIR WILLIAM THOUGHTLESS: Flies, madam? Why, I am a knight.

VIOLANTE: The best excuse in the world for a blockhead; tell but your title beforehand, Sir Knight, and nobody will be surprised with your conversation.

SIR WILLIAM THOUGHTLESS: [Aside to Bully Bounce] I must go now, Bounce, my wit’s quite gone; I have but one thing more to say.

BULLY BOUNCE: Ease yourself, and let’s depart.

SIR WILLIAM THOUGHTLESS: Gad, I believe for all your fine clothes you’re but servant-maids in your ladies’ apparel.

FLORELLA: That’s the constant cant of the chits at the chocolate-house, where, as they receive favours from nothing but chambermaids and trulls, they abuse all that are above ’em; how long have you haunted that nursery of fools?

SIR WILLIAM THOUGHTLESS: Ever since it was the rendezvous for whores. [Aside] That was a smart one, faith. —And if I have not seen thee there, I’m sure I shall, child. Come, Bounce.

[Exit Sir William Thoughtless]

BULLY BOUNCE: Bye, bulkers.

VIOLANTE: Bye, bully.

BULLY BOUNCE: 'Sdeath, if your lover were here, he should find—

VIOLANTE: None of you I’m sure, but yonder he comes.

Enter at the upper end of the stage Young Reveller and Lord Worthy.

BULLY BOUNCE: Let him follow me if he dare.

VIOLANTE: He can’t spare so much time, sir, I believe, but if you’ll stay a minute—

48. probatum est Lat. “it has been proved.” Hence, used as a formula of approval, or to indicate a proven truth (OED).

61. cant A pet phrase or trick of words (OED n.3 5b).

65. thee Not in Q.

67. bulkers Prostitutes (OED n.).
ACT 4, SCENE 2

BULLY BOUNCE: I? Damme, I'll wait for no man.

Exit singing.

FLORELLA: Look you, sister, yonder comes our sparks, my lover looks a little heavy for want of sleep; prithee, let's slip into the crowd and observe what female flag they'll first strike to.

Exit.

LORD WORTHY: Faith, George, this was a narrow escape; had the old fellow satisfied his curiosity, you had been in a scurvy condition.

YOUNG REVELLER: Thanks to the kind husband and drugster my credit is yet safe, but see, here comes the old gentleman with my two champions.

Enter Sir Thomas Reveller with Mr. Raison and Mr. Sassafras

MR. RAISON: Well, I protest, Sir Thomas, there's no living with you at this rate, ad's heartlikins, two more such nights would kill me outright, my constitution will never bear it.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Then I'd never bear such a constitution.

When I can drink no more I hope to die,
For without drink life's a dull property.

LORD WORTHY: Sir Thomas, good morrow.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Ah, my Lord Worthy, gad take me, you're a flincher, though. You served us somewhat basely last night; faith, I am sorry to see a young nobleman that has no dependence on the government, sip like a minister of state that has his fortunes to make out on't.

LORD WORTHY: Really, Sir Thomas, you must excuse me; I was so weary riding post that I could not help it, but I'll make amends speedily.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: But here's a dog that left us too, sirrah, sirrah, somebody stayed out till six this morning; pray, my lord, where did your chaplain lie last night?

LORD WORTHY: Chaplain, Sir Thomas? I have none.

73. Damme  A shortening of “damn me,” normally used as an imprecation (OED int. 1).
73. wait  D1: stay.
76. Exeunt  Q, D1, D2: Exit.
80. with  Not in Q and D2.
81-82. ad's heartlikins  “God's heart” (OED ad n.2 1).
88. flincher  One who passes the bottle, i.e., who abstains from drinking (OED 2).
94. here's  D1: her's.
SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Ha! George, good boy George, oh pretty George!

Sings.

At Westminster a sight was known,
The like was never heard,
A judge that never wore a gown,
And a bishop without a beard.

Oh, rare George. Why, sirrah, you cursed villain, what do you think will become of your soul, sirrah, to stand in such a lie to your own father, and lay your sins upon the church, you dog, as if they had not enough to answer for of their own?

MR. SASSAFRAS: Pray, my lord, take him off.

LORD WORTHY: Well, Sir Thomas, tonight I give a ball or a sort of a masquerade at my Lady Hazard’s, and will fetch up lost time. I must only go up to London on some urgent business, and will be with you in the evening without fail; gentlemen, till then your servant.

MR. SASSAFRAS and MR. RAISON: We'll prepare for you, my lord.

[Exit Lord Worthy.]

Enter at one side of the stage Dorinda and Aunt; at the other Florella and Violante, Mrs. Raison [the three of them masked], etc.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Why, what an abundance of whore’s flesh is here! Landlord and drugster, let’s have a brush with ’em, I am hot-headed and can talk smartly.

MR. RAISON: I feel the spirit of scandal a little provoking in me too.

MR. SASSAFRAS:

[Sings.]

Let us join, and combine,
We’ll make ’em repine,
As satire so fine,
Our wit shall outshine
Their faces divine
And we’ll sing the praise,
The praise of good wine.

DORINDA: That’s Reveller and his father; what women are they? They’re making up, I think my Lady Hazard’s daughters, let us observe.

97. Sings Sir Thomas sings adapting the lines from the ballad “The Westminster Wedding: or, Trick for Trick,” (1664-1703?) whose opening stanza goes as follows: “At Westminster was such a Match/ the like was never known/ A Whore that was painted and patch’d/ did meet with a French-man alone” (EBBA).

107. fetch up Make up (OED fetch up v. 6).
YOUNG REVELLER: Ladies—

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: [To Young Reveller] Jackanapes, after me’s manners, sirrah! Why what, will you engross the women both at home and abroad?

YOUNG REVELLER: Nay, sir, here’s more game, there’s no occasion for confinement in this place.

Going.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Rogue, I will make you stay here, and if you speak with any woman till I have done with her, I'll break your head.

VIOLANTE: Is this gentleman your tutor, sir, that he bears so strict a hand over you?

YOUNG REVELLER: He is my father, madam, as to the begetting me; but an utter stranger as to the maintenance of me.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: He was my son, madam, when he was in his virtuous teens, but since the devil has stamped him one and twenty, alas-a-day, he has out-sinned me like an elder brother.

YOUNG REVELLER: I may out-sin you like an elder brother, but as to estate I'm sure I'm the younger.

VIOLANTE: What, is the gentleman of age, and worth nothing, sir?

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: There’s a thousand such gentlemen about this town, madam. [To Young Reveller] Why what, sirrah, would you have my estate before I’m dead? —When I’m dead he shall have all, madam, I can’t live much above forty years longer.

FLORELLA: And then he'll be as much past the pleasure of enjoying it as you are now that have it.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: I past the pleasure? Ad’s heartlikins, if you dare venture, you shall find I can play on tabor and fife still, madam.

MR. RAISON: Old instruments are a long time a-tuning, madam.

VIOLANTE: D’you speak for yourself or the gentleman, sir?

MR. SASSAFRAS: Prithee, stand by, married man; what says your ladyship to me, madam?

VIOLANTE: You, sir? Why, who are you?

MR. SASSAFRAS: Who am I, madam? A reverend alderman of the City of London.

VIOLANTE: What, one that lends money upon acts of parliament, manages juries in your ward, and snacks with the sheriff, give courtiers credit in hopes of getting
employments, bribe Common-Council men, cheat orphans, and sponge dinners all
the year round at my Lord Mayor’s table?

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Well whistled, blackbird. [Aside] A notable baggage, and a
whore by her wit. —Child, if thou likest me, I will disinherit my son and settle all
upon thee.

VIOLANTE: Faith, Sir Thomas, that would be a sure way to settle all upon your son, for
I like him so well I should give him every groat.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Pox on me for a fool to make love, and this young dog
present. Get you gone, you rogue, don’t dangle after me thus, you booby; are you not
able to walk alone and be hanged? Get you gone and be hanged.

Dorinda beckons Young Reveller.

FLORELLA: Observe him, sister, with that woman whom I will have dogged, ’tis the
same he talked with yesterday. —But, Sir Thomas, I hear you are to be married to my
Lady Hazard, and methinks this is not a very good sign of living virtuously.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Aye, madam, I may marry her, but may love none but you.

FLORELLA: But, Sir Thomas, pray let us observe your son.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Hang him, rogue, an inconstant dog, a faithless villain.

MRS. RAISON: [Aside] So those are Florella and Violante, but who is that my false
villain’s so hot upon?

MR. RAISON: Prithee, let us make up to yonder woman, I find these are too hard for us.

MR. SASSAFRAS: Thou mayst if thou wilt, but egad I’ll speak no more to the sex.

MR. RAISON: Pray, if a man may be so bold, what come you here for?

MRS. RAISON: Not to talk with fools.

MR. SASSAFRAS: Prithee, Raison, let’s give over making love; ad’s heart, a citizen
making love is as ridiculous as a parson making legs; I’ll go to the coffee-room,
smoke a pipe, and drink a glass of mum.

MR. RAISON: Agreed, where like true tradesmen we’ll seem politic, though we know
nothing.

Exit Mr. Sassafras and Mr. Raison

155. **sponge** Get something from others in a parasitic manner (OED v. 9b).

172. **villain’s** D1: villain is

178. **making legs** Bowing (OED leg n. 4).

179. **mum** A kind of beer brewed from wheat malt and flavoured with aromatic herbs (OED
n.3).
YOUNG REVELLER: (To Dorinda) This is a happiness I could not expect.

DORINDA: I'm sure you don't deserve it, I find all women are welcome to you.

YOUNG REVELLER: Only to pass away the time with, madam; men may divert themselves with several women, but only one can make ’em truly happy.

DORINDA: And how many of those ones have you said this to?

YOUNG REVELLER: As I never was really in love till now, I never had occasion for the expression before.

DORINDA: Do you not know those women you talked to?

YOUNG REVELLER: No.

DORINDA: Your love is blind indeed when only a strange Petticoat can cheat you of your mistress.

YOUNG REVELLER: Upon honour I know ’em not.

DORINDA: They’re my Lady Hazard’s daughters.

YOUNG REVELLER: Indeed!

DORINDA: Nay, this is overacted.

YOUNG REVELLER: By heaven and earth I know ’em not.

DORINDA: The youngest I hear is the ruler of your affections.

YOUNG REVELLER: I must confess, madam, till I saw you I had a hankering that way. She has a very considerable fortune, which in my circumstances was very prevailing.

DORINDA: Besides their father was Lord Mayor of London, their mother I hear was a court-laundress, and being given to blab betrayed the intrigue of a great man to his wife, and was cashiered, but having purchased an interest for former service, got Hazard knighted, and married him.

YOUNG REVELLER: You are better acquainted with the family than I am.

DORINDA: But fifteen thousand pounds makes amends for all faults in parentage, and the children are as acceptable as the best born.

YOUNG REVELLER: Faith, madam, so far I must justify ’em, that they deserve better

193. know D1, D2: knew.
197. know D1, D2: knew.
203. purchased Gained, obtained (OED v. 4a).
203. interest Influence due to personal connections (OED n. 6).
families, for their accomplishments will give ’em titles without their fortunes to noble blood, nor would the most honourable blush to own ’em.

DORINDA: You speak like a man of honour, sir, but we are observed; you must dine with me today.

YOUNG REVELLER: Blessings upon you.

DORINDA: Be in the Park at one of the clock, I’ll send to you.

YOUNG REVELLER: Must you go soon?

DORINDA: Immediately, they’re making up to us; I suppose I have raised the lady’s jealousy, and she has a mind to have a fling at me.

FLORELLA: Why how now, Mr. Reveller, you’re the favourite of our whole sex, I find the lady’s inclining.

DORINDA: ’Tis but your leavings, madam, she must have charms indeed that can pretend to raise the siege you’ve laid.

FLORELLA: The fort is of no great consequence nor worth much trouble, when it is willing to yield to such things.

DORINDA: (Aside) That’s Florella, I’m sure, I know it by that despicable speech; I’ll fret her more, I love as much as she, am equally malicious, and will try the wit she’s famed for.

YOUNG REVELLER: Faith, ladies I’m not stubborn, the fairest in conditions I give up to, and she who thinks best of me now may have me.

DORINDA: The lady’s silence tells you she’s indifferent; if you stand good to what we have agreed on we’ll seal articles when next we meet; and if this lady’s face has no more charms than her tongue, I dare trust you alone with her, without one jealous pang.

FLORELLA: Pray take your spark with you, madam, for if you should relapse, ’twill save you the trouble of coming back again and being laughed at.

DORINDA: I have so much good nature, madam, that I had rather make you laugh by coming for him again, than weep by taking him from you now.

VIOLANTE: Mr. Reveller, take the lady home with you for shame, and put on clean linen both; ’tis mightily sullied with last night’s rambling.

DORINDA: ’Tis whiter now than ever your mother washed, and finer than ever her children wore when the father was Lord Mayor and made ’em ride in his pageants to save charges.

214. of the clock D1: o’clock.
217. a fling A passing attack; a sarcastic remark (OED n. 2a b).
Exit Dorinda [and Aunt.]

FLORELLA: [Aside] Devil, does she know us?

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: [Aside] A tight baggage, by the sons of Apollo. —Now, madam, I hope I may go down with you.

VIOLANTE: I'll ask my mother, Sir Thomas.

Unmasks.

FLORELLA: And I'll tell Florella how constant you are.

Unmasks to Young Reveller.

YOUNG REVELLER: Oh, your servant, d'you think I did not know you?

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: [Aside] Here's fine work.

VIOLANTE: Oh yes, and so did your father.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Now impudence, egad, and so I did, kitlings, and rallied accordingly, did not I, George? [Aside to Young Reveller] Lie lustily, you dog, and I'll be familiar with you for a fortnight.

YOUNG REVELLER: Why, Sir Thomas told me of you, lad ies, saw when you came out, and we set you accordingly.

FLORELLA: This will not do, sweet Mr. Sly, therefore follow your damsel, and trouble me no more.

VIOLANTE: Is this the lady that was with you last night when Mr. Raison stood sentinel to secure the pass from your father?

FLORELLA: Good man, we saw the wife come in this morning, and he following an hour after, and begging pardon for his staying out so wickedly, but said it was to preserve a lady from the sight of Sir Thomas, who would have forced her from his son.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Well said, wagtails.

YOUNG REVELLER: Well, madam, then you see there are those that will be less shy of their persons and not so severe with their tongues.

FLORELLA: And the fittest for your purpose.

Enter Several Women [masked], Sir William Thoughtless,

246. And Not in D2.

265. so severe Q. D1: too severe. D2: to serve.
Bull Bounce, two Beaux, etc.

YOUNG REVELLER: Well, madam, if I have but patience, I find here’s encouragement for chapmen of my nature. When you celebrated beauties are gone, I may have hopes among some of the ordinary sort.

FLORELLA: Yes, you may make love as the poor go to market; when the choice is bought up, you’ll have the better pennyworth in the fragments.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Sirrah, sirrah, she’s too hard for you, give over while you’re well, for she’ll make as great an ass of thee at board, as she would of me in bed.

YOUNG REVELLER: In language and in love the females are always too hard for us, they will have the last blow, but I’ll leave you to take up the cudgels.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: No, hold there, sirrah, if they make so little of you, they’ll make nothing of me presently.

FLORELLA: Well said, Sir Thomas, don’t let him go.

YOUNG REVELLER: Madam, I have an appointment.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Therefore you shan’t go, you dog.

YOUNG REVELLER: Sir, there is an old saying: “never spoil sport,” and so forth.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: I know it, rogue, I know it; but I am like rivals: when one is despised, let him do all he can to hinder the other.

VIOLANTE: Ad’s me, Sir Thomas, yonder’s some London sparks come down this morning, some City things, and Covent Garden beaux, pray let’s rally a little with ’em.

FLORELLA: Aye, but let Sir Thomas and his son be within call, for they say your beaux, when they cannot talk with a woman, are apt to beat ’em.

YOUNG REVELLER: Not when they’ve a man with ’em; indeed when they’re alone they’re like hackney-coachmen, if they won’t come to their terms they’ll unrig ’em.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: How d’you, miss? Do you come to take the waters in hopes of being fruitful, or to destroy some unlawful conception?

---

266. **two Beaux** Q, D1, D2: two or three Beaux.

273. **an ass of ... in bed** “Bed and board” were two of the symbols of matrimony, as the formula used for legal separation states: “Divorce from bed and board.” Sir Thomas draws on this imagery to recommend Young Reveller not to get married.

275. **to take up the cudgels** To engage in a vigorous contest or debate (OED *cudgel* n. 2).

284. **Ad’s me** A euphemisitic variant of “Gods me,” meaning “God save me” (OED *ad* n.2 2).

284. **yonder’s some London sparks** The singular verb form in this type of structures was not uncommon in EME.

289. **unrig** Undress (OED 2a).
MASK: Neither, I came to satisfy my sight with Sir Thomas Reveller.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: With me, child? Egad I’m a noun-substantive, and am to be seen, felt, heard or understood; prithee child, let’s walk off a little, and be better informed of each other.

Sir Thomas Reveller and Mask goes to the upper end of the stage,
Mrs. Raison takes Young Reveller aside, the Beaux come down to Florella and Violante.

BEAU 1: Madam, will you please to eat some sweetmeats? They’ll expel the wind and take off the coldness of the waters.

VIOLANTE: I thank you, sir, but I never drink any.

BEAU 1: The better hopes for a lover, if your spirits are not chilled; madam, I should be happy to be warm in such comfortable inclinations as your ladyship is able to bless me with.

VIOLANTE: Indeed, sir, my inclinations are as comfortless as the waters you speak of, for I’m troubled with a fit of the spleen, and desire to be in private.

BEAU 1: I should be accessory to your disquiet to encourage your melancholy by leaving you, and there—

VIOLANTE: You will be accessory to your being ill-used if you encourage your impertinence.

BEAU 1: Ah, madam, we lovers and pilgrims in the devotion of the fair sex, must bear much more, the fiercer you are at first in your indignation, the fonder you are at last of an assignation.

BEAU 2: Rot her, let her depart, she’ll follow us anon.

VIOLANTE: For what, your charity? Let me alone till that time comes, and you’ll oblige me.

SIR WILLIAM THOUGHTLESS: (To Florella) Madam, madam, this will not pass upon me.

FLORELLA: No, sir, nor you upon me, I told you my mind before.

SIR WILLIAM THOUGHTLESS: Pshaw, pox, I know thee well enough; come, come, unmask, and let’s be familiar as we have been.

293-94. I’m a noun-substantive … or understood  A Short Introduction of Grammar by William Lily (1468?-1522) was the most widely used grammar textbook in England, and it was constantly reprinted since its publication in 1513. Sir Thomas quotes the definition of noun in Lily’s Grammar: “the name of a thing that may be seen, felt, heard, or understood” (1673: n.p.).

295. Sir Thomas … goes  Another example of the use of a singular verb form with a subject in plural.

168
FLORELLA: What, d’you take me for one of the orange wenches at the playhouse, that fasten upon every fool they meet with?

VIOLANTE: And disturb the rest of the audience with their nauseous impudent behaviour.

BEAU 2: I protest I think the ladies are somewhat in the right of that, those creatures are very ignominious, and I see ’em encouraged by great persons, and I think it a scandalous object to see quality condescend to be familiar with the spawn of a costermonger.

FLORELLA: Do you use the playhouse much, sir?

BEAU 2: Out of gratitude to the ladies, madam, who are pleased to bestow many favours on me by the way of ogle, fan, the language of the fingers; I am mightily envied by the men, and have observed that whenever there is any jest in a play relating to a neat, cleanly slender, well-shaped man, the whole audience have turned upon me, and maliciously ridiculed the perfections they could not attain to.

SIR WILLIAM THOUGHTLESS: Pox o’ this puppy, madam.

FLORELLA: [Aside to Violante] Nay, pray, sister, let’s humour this fool and seem fond of him.

VIOLANTE: Aye, sir, there are abundance of those envious fellows who are in their hearts as much beaux as the most eminent, and only rail at others because they are not liked themselves.

BEAU 2: There are so, madam, but ’tis a harder thing to be a beaux than they imagine.

VIOLANTE: Pray, sir, what are the ingredients, I beseech you, which accomplish so fine a person?

BEAU 2: Oh, your servant, dear madam. Why, in the first place, he must have a very white hand; if it be not so by nature, he must make it so by art, and he must be constantly taking snuff or picking his teeth.

VIOLANTE: Before or after dinner, sir?

BEAU 2: No matter which, it is not that there is occasion for picking his teeth, but it gives an opportunity of showing the beauty of the skin; he must avoid all wine for fear of pimples; he ought to have a mighty sweet breath, but that very few beaux have, they ruin ’em all with cassia; he must keep in upon windy days, never miss

332. could not Q: could not not.

349. cassia Q, D1, D2: Cashaw. An inferior kind of cinnamon, thicker and less delicate in flavour (OED n. 1a). “Casha” is an alternative spelling for “cassia.” See for instance Samuel Pordage (1633-1691?) in Mundorum Explicatio (1661): “Not all the Spices of Arabia,/ Aloes, nor Casha” (261).
Covent Garden prayer, and if he receives visits in bed he must lie in his periwig.

FLORELLA: And pray, sir—

SIR WILLIAM THOUGHTLESS: Gad take me, madam, I knew a beaux once that fluxed for a complexion.

VIOLANTE: But how d’you pass away the time?

BEAU 2: Why, madam, it never lies heavy on our hands, we have hourly so many billet-doux from ladies, that we are almost worked off our legs; you never saw a beaux with a full leg. But really now and then the knavish wits at Will’s Coffee-house will direct letters for us as from women, appoint a meeting too, and make us sit sometimes in a hackney-coach six or seven hours in the cold, and the devil of any soul comes near us.

SIR WILLIAM THOUGHTLESS: Pshaw, pox o’ these beaux, they’re damned poor rogues, the little stock they have goes all to periwig-makers and washer-women; come, child, let’s to The Ship, where we’ll have a rich dinner, fiddles, and mirth in abundance.

FLORELLA: Sir, I thank you, but I like this company much better.

SIR WILLIAM THOUGHTLESS: Why, they have not wherewithal to make thee drink, child, they’re as penniless as a Jew on his Sabbath; come along, lasses, I’ll provide ye—

FLORELLA: No rudeness, sir.

BEAU 2: Pray, sir, desist.

SIR WILLIAM THOUGHTLESS: Damn me, not I.

Pulling Florella.

VIOLANTE: What insolence is this?

BULLY BOUNCE: Be civil, or I shall unrig.

---

350. **Covent Garden prayer** St. Paul’s Church, Covent Garden, is often mentioned in the literature of the period as a fashionable place of rendezvous and a meeting-point to initiate love intrigues. The church had been designed by Inigo Jones in the early 1630s as part of the Covent Garden development (LE).

355-56. **billet-doux** Love-letter (OED).

356. **worked off our legs** Worked to exhaustion (OED leg n. 2e).

357. **Will’s Coffee-house** A popular coffee-house among the wits. See note to Prologue, l. 10.

363. **The Ship** The Ship and Whale, a tavern near Greenwich. It was originally called The Ship, but the name extended when a whale was seen in the Thames (Dunkling).

373. **I shall unrig** I will take your mask off.
Pulling Violante.

SIR WILLIAM THOUGHTLESS: Nay, nay, come along.
FLORELLA: Fools!

Beaux pull.

SIR WILLIAM THOUGHTLESS: Jilt, this shan’t do.
BEAU 2: If you dare go out, sir.
SIR WILLIAM THOUGHTLESS: I shall with this lady—
VIOLANTE: Mr. Reveller!
YOUNG REVELLER: Nay, gentlemen, be not boisterous to so tender a sex, but let ’em go.

Strikes Bully Bounce’s arm.

BULLY BOUNCE: Oons, what d’you mean?
YOUNG REVELLER: I’ll tell you, rascals; come, beaux, fools, and bullies, seek for company that’s fitting for you.

Strikes all their arms off from the ladies.

SIR WILLIAM THOUGHTLESS: ’Sdeath, shall I draw, Bounce?
BULLY BOUNCE: Do, ’tis but retiring, I warrant he shan’t hurt us.
BEAU 2: Sir, this affront—
YOUNG REVELLER: Asses!
SIR WILLIAM THOUGHTLESS: You’re a son of a whore.

They all draw upon Young Reveller, the women run out crying: “Murder!”

Enter Sir Thomas Reveller, Mr. Sassafras, and Mr. Raison.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: What’s here, four upon one? Courage, George, rascals!
MR. SASSAFRAS: For the honour of the Twelve Companies!

---

376. Tricking whore (Canting Crew).
378. wish Q, D1, D2: wish. Prob. an erratum.
391. The City Livery Companies were organizations of craft guilds which developed in the City of London during the Middle Ages; some of them have continued their professional activity up to the present. The Great Twelve Companies refer to those twelve
Beat 'em off, Mr. Raison gets behind Mr. Sassafras and fights over his head. [Exeunt.]

Re-enter Sir Thomas Reveller, Mr. Sassafras, and Mr. Raison.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: 'Sdeath, the rogues' heels are as nimble as their tongues.

MR. SASSAFRAS: Beaux, d'you call 'em? I have bounced one of 'em, I have made his head ring, I warrant him. I wonder at the impudence of these fellows that would engross all the women to themselves, and dare not look a man in the face.

MR. RAISON: We should have fine work this summer if our fleet were manned with such.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Pshaw, pox, these are bastard beaux, counsellors' clerks kept by their mistresses, and palmed upon us at Epsom, and these places for gentlemen; I know abundance of very honest hearty fellows they call beaux, who, setting by their blind side of being a little over-neat, will be drunk with their friends, fight for their friends, pimp for their friends, and do what friends ought to do. But these are scoundrels, awkward things of your chocolate-house that depend upon ordinaries, and go to twelve with a charitable man at the groom-porter's, beaux today and beggars tomorrow, for whose coming into the world no man e'er rejoiced, or for whose going out any will ever grieve.

MR. SASSAFRAS: I have seen these spruce tits look as scornfully and as sour upon a plain dressed country-gentleman as a grumbletonian upon a clergyman that has taken the oaths. But, neighbour Raison, what made you keep so behind me all the fray, and push me forward?

MR. RAISON: Why, in case you had been run thorough, I had been ready to have carried you off in my arms.

MR. SASSAFRAS: A pox o' your civility, but 'tis much better as 'tis.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: But come, let's after these baggages to dinner, where, if occasion be, you must vouch for me.

———

which became outstandingly important among the rest (LE).

396-97. **We should ... with such** Another reference to the new campaign against the French troops in Flanders. See note to Prologue, l. 2.

404. **go to twelve** D1, D2: go at twelve. Join in with an equal share.

407. **tits** Girls, young women (OED n.3 2a).

407. **as** Not in D2.

408. **grumbletonian** In the later part of the 17th c., a contemptuous designation applied to the members of the so-called “Country party” in English politics (OED).

409. **the oaths** After the Glorious Revolution, all office-holders, MPs and clergy were required to take the oaths for the new monarchs, William III and Mary II. Those who refused were called non-jurors, and deprived of their offices.

413. **A pox o’** D1: a pox of.
MR. SASSAFRAS: In what?

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Why, that I knew Florella and Violante for all their masks.

MR. SASSAFRAS: Why, were those they you talked to?

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Aye, egad, stand by me, or the mother will give me over else, can you swear heartily?

MR. RAISON: Are we not tradesmen, what a question’s that to a shopkeeper?

*Exeunt.*

**Scene III**

*The Park.*

*Enter Young Reveller.*

YOUNG REVELLER: I am punctual to my time, 'tis just one by the sun-dial. If this lady should convince me she is honest, and has a fortune, I might be fool enough to love her in good earnest; and that would be a rascally trick to Florella; she has youth, wit, beauty and money; this has youth, more wit, and beauty, and may have more money. Aye, but Florella was my first mistress; well, but this is my first love, I only like the other as yet; pox on’t, I'll not trouble myself with the punto of the matter, let the stars take their course and fortune use her pleasure.

*Enter Aunt.*

AUNT: Mr. Reveller.

YOUNG REVELLER: Here, my little Peter of paradise, may I enter?

AUNT: Follow me.

YOUNG REVELLER: Till I'm weary on so good an errand.

*Exit Aunt and Young Reveller.*

9. **my little Peter of paradise** The Aunt acts as the keeper of the gate of Dorinda’s apartment, which is “paradise” for Young Reveller.

11. **on D2: of.**
Scene IV

[Scene opens.]

Dorinda’s apartment.

DORINDA: Now to my lover. This intrigue ’twixt him and Florella I would fain break off, I have considered and weighed everything, and, upon second thoughts, promise myself more security and satisfaction in Reveller as a lover than a husband, for howsoever fond he may seem, nay, even to marriage, when I am known as I must be, nothing but destruction can be my reward; however, I'll so order it that he shall think the conquest worth his labour, and fancy he’s the only victor here.

Enter Aunt and Young Reveller.

Are you not much surprised, sir, at my boldness? Will not my freedom make me less esteemed? Men ought to woo.

YOUNG REVELLER: They do so always when they are encouraged,
But where they are approved and know it not,
They cannot justly sure be thought the worse of.
Errors of ignorance are most excusable,
Fools often fancy all that sees ’em loves,
But prudent men their imperfections know,
And give no way to such self-flattery.

DORINDA: But men too often, when they think they are liked,
Affect a negligence of what esteems ’em:
You’re naturally vain without occasion,
But on the least advantage most intolerable;
Many pretend to favours ne’er received,
Others regardless seem when we strike first.
So fickle and so foolish are your sex,
’Tis more for vanity than love you court,
Nothing so wretched till we give you credit,
Nor nothing more uneasy till you’ve told it.

YOUNG REVELLER: Such follies are, but such ne’er entered here;
I of a contrary temper am.
Enjoyment is the least of my affection,
Though ’tis the crown of all alone, ’tis worthless:
Were heaven as easy gained as it is wished for,
The blessing scarce would tempt us from this world.
Improving fancy, constant conversation,
Frequent addresses fed with courteous hope
Makes me uneasy till I am possessed,
But when possessed, then my impatience comes,
Then I am eager to increase my joys,
And still the last breeds appetite for more.

1. fain Willingly (OED adv. 1a).
DORINDA: [Aside] How charmingly he talks. —Well, you have cunningly excused yourself. [To Servant within] Bring dinner in. —Come, sir, sit down there opposite, that with full pleasure we may view each other.

YOUNG REVELLER: My eye will have the greatest banquet, madam.

DORINDA: Your ear too shall be entertained.

Enter Servants with dinner. An entertainment of Music.

Come, sir, you seem uneasy.

YOUNG REVELLER: Blast not my entertainment with that thought, madam, my senses are all charmed with such perfection, they’re crowding which shall be first gratified.

DORINDA: [To Servant] Some wine. —Come, sir, health to that sense which is your favourite.

YOUNG REVELLER: This distance starves it, madam.

AUNT: Sir, with my niece’s leave, I’ll change places with you (Change seats). [To Servant] Give me some wine. —Come, sir, to the delicious prosperity of your emergent inclinations.

[Drinks.]

YOUNG REVELLER: Nay, fill it, madam, ’tis the lady’s health.

[Drinks.]

AUNT: Here is enough, sir.

YOUNG REVELLER: I beseech you.

AUNT: Nay, pray, sir.

YOUNG REVELLER: Your pardon, madam, please yourself.

AUNT: Well, that kind word has wrought upon me; I hate to be imposed on. Come then, since it is left to me, a little more. Up with it now; we women can never have too much of a good thing, come niece, your health [Drinks].

YOUNG REVELLER: Up with it full as my love, come madam, to your wishes satisfaction [Drinks].

DORINDA: And to a good understanding betwixt yours and mine.

YOUNG REVELLER: [Aside] Cunning and sweetly hinted; pluck up a spirit, you dog, take t’other bumper and be saucy.

DORINDA: [To Music] Sing the Scotch song I love so.
Song.

Now, sir, if you please we'll retire to another apartment, for this is littered.

YOUNG REVELLER: [Aside] Heaven grant she may have faith to believe, and charity to relieve, or I'm a dead man; for I like her to madness; this retiring carries somewhat of the face of a bedchamber in’t, she has a rare sleepy eye which they say seldom fails; if she have any comfortable waters, I'll drink her into compliance.

DORINDA: Your hand, sir.

YOUNG REVELLER: My heart's in your own, madam.

DORINDA: I fear my ruin.

But oh, with such a bait I am drawn in,

It may excuse though not forgive the sin.

Exit Dorinda and Young Reveller.

AUNT: Now all's well and my fears are over, and sure none can blame my discretion in this point; 'tis true, 'tis not altogether so honest as I could wish it, but the prudent part of it is good, and I am secured from the thoughts of being undone, which of necessity I must have been any other way, and she had better have two gallants than none.

Pardon my frailty, since upon the score
Of self-security I increase her store,
"Tis to preserve him whom she had before.

[Scene closes.]
ACT V

Scene I

[Lady Hazard’s lodgings.]

Enter Florella in boy’s clothes, Violante in a masquerading habit.

VIOLANTE: Thou art a mad girl to transform thyself thus from one sex to another.

FLORELLA: Well, were I a man I should be a very wicked fellow, there’s such an air and freedom belongs to breeches, to what our dull and dragging petticoats allow of, that, ad’s heartlikins, I fancy myself of the masculine gender and am for ravishing the first woman I meet; prithee, let me try upon thee, ’tis the fashion now to begin with relations.

VIOLANTE: Well said, madcap, thou makest a very pretty rakehell, and I could almost wish thee capable of being a husband that I might have the honour of taking down your presumptuous spirit.

FLORELLA: Thus accoutred will I court Mrs. Raison, and try if the lady be constant to my inconstant rogue, or whether she’s for making the most of her time. I fancy she’s a right bred City-dame, fond of every young fellow that can tender her ready money upon her counter.

VIOLANTE: If you can but manage the man’s part well, ne’er fear it.

FLORELLA: All but part of the man I am pretty well provided for; I can huff, and be saucy, be troublesome in rumbling their clothes, and talk a great while, seem to be familiar and force whispers, drop out an affected oath and take snuff, stare till my eyes are as stiff as my cravat-string, laugh only at my own jests, and be only the jest of the company, and these are the greatest materials of the fools that make love nowadays; then I will ogle, tip, and leer with either court or City fop from the Jews’ synagogue to St. Anne’s church in Soho, or St. James’s in Jermyn Street. Well, I’m sure to be

3. to breeches D1: to the breeches.

20. the Jews’ synagogue A small temple established by Sephardim in Creechurch Lane, near Mitre Street. The first Jews returning to London after their long exile began to arrive in the 1650s, once Cromwell recalled them because of their valued financial expertise. Pepys attended the synagogue in October 1663 (LE).

21. St. Anne’s church Built in 1677-86 to the designs of either Wren or William Talman, on a plot in what was then the countryside of Soho fields. It was consecrated on 21 March 1686 by Bishop Henry Compton and dedicated to Saint Anne, as Compton had been tutor to Princess Anne before she became queen (LE).

21. Soho In 1536, King Henry VIII used this farmland between Westminster and the West End to create a park for Whitehall Palace. In the 1670s and 1680s buildings progressed rapidly (LE).

21. St. James’s St. James’s Piccadilly, a parish church designed by Wren in 1674 and consecrated ten years later (LE).

21. Jermyn street Completed in the early 1680s as part of the crown land granted to Henry Jermyn, earl of Albany, in the fields to the north-east of St. James’s Palace (LE).
diverted, but our company increases.

Enter Mrs. Raison in man’s clothes, several others, Lady Hazard, Lord Worthy, Sir Thomas Reveller, Mr. Sassafras, Mr. Raison, etc.

MRS. RAISON: Now for the ladies, ’tis youth and beauty, not sense and breeding, conquers nowadays; I think I’m a pretty man whate’er I am for a woman; and this beardless boy may have as good success with the fair sex, as if I had been a page in a particular family, and destined from my childhood for a comfort to my lady’s old age. I must find out Florella whom I will court with such an eagerness, that if she seems inclining, I’ll make young Reveller curse her from his heart, and think her easy to each fop’s addresses.

MR. RAISON: I wonder which is my wife among all these, Sir Thomas.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: I don’t know which is thy wife, but I believe any of ’em may be thy whore upon a good occasion; I never saw such confusion of Babel.

MR. RAISON: My lamb is among ’em, that’s certain, but I know no more how to distinguish her than a shepherd a stray sheep that’s mixed with another flock.

MR. SASSAFRAS: This is a heavenly life, Sir Thomas, we lead, sitting up all night, and being sick all day, disturbing all men, and abusing all women; loving all mischief, and hating all good; affecting of lewdness when you know you’re incapable, this will bring you to the devil in time, old knight.

MR. RAISON: Aye, and thee, and I, if we do not reform, Sassafras, I’m afraid shall sweat in those everlasting hummums with him.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: No, pox, thou hast a proverb on thy side; thy spouse will save thy soul in spite of thy teeth.

MR. RAISON: All in good time, your worship’s coming into the noose, my Lady Hazard may give me an opportunity of returning your jest, for they say merchants’ widows are as good at it as tradesmen’s wives.

MR. SASSAFRAS: I’faith, Sir Thomas, you are to blame I think, considering your age and what a brisk son you have, to think of matrimony, you’ll not only bob her of her jointure, but cheat her expectations.

22. Mr. Sassafras, Mr. Raison  Q: Sas and Raison.
24. whate’er  D1: whatever.
39. Sassafras  Q, D2: Sas.
40. hummums  Turkish baths. “The Hummums” was an Oriental bathing establishment set in Covent Garden in 1631 (OED).
42. in spite of thy teeth  Notwithstanding your opposition (OED tooth n. P2).
46. I’faith  D1: ’faith.
47. bob her of  Cheat her out of (OED v.1 lb).
47-48. bob ... jointure  Marriage settlements often stipulated that a widow would forfeit her jointure in the event of remarriage. On jointure see note for 2.3.24.
SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Good lack, d’ye hear the bachelor? Prithee, old cracker of other men’s pipkins, trouble thy head with thy own abilities, and distrust not mine. Gadsookers, I am a boy to thee yet, thou shavings of hart’s horn and ivory.

Enter Young Reveller.

YOUNG REVELLER:

[Sings.]

Caelia was coy and hard to win,
With artful cunning played the virgin’s part,
But when she once had tried the sin,
She hugged the charming tingling dart,
Cried: “Nearer dearest to my heart:
Thou’rt lord of all within.”

Oh what a luscious feast of love I’ve had! The unexpected conquest raised the joy; full of desire and trembling with my doubts, I lay half-satisfied, then half-destroyed she cried: “Oh, do not, do not ruin me.” Weakly she struggled till she seemed quite tired, then fainting sighed: “Do, force me, villain, do.” I took the yielding moment in its prime, and sent my expiring soul to seek for hers.

FLORELLA: So, there’s Reveller, but I can’t find out this Mrs. Raison, I’m sure she is among ’em; I have a trick to play her, and would no more be disappointed in my mischief, than she would in her man.

MRS. RAISON: What can become of this Florella? There’s my villain whom I will plague with jealousy, if possible, as much as he has tortured me.

LORD WORTHY: Dear George, your late she-company has mourned for you.

YOUNG REVELLER: Oh, friend! Such an adventure, such joy, such delight, such unspeakable pleasure, incomprehensible transport; imagination cannot reach it, fancy draw it, nature match it, the world value it, art improve it.

LORD WORTHY: What the devil, art thou mad?

YOUNG REVELLER: Mad, aye; and so would you, had you been where I have; seen what I have; felt, heard and understood what I have; thou hadst been in the uppermost region by this time.

LORD WORTHY: Dear George, what is it?

YOUNG REVELLER: I’ll tell you when my soul’s cool enough for my tongue to relate it; at present, reflection’s so vast in my thoughts, it stifles my speech, being above its

49. lack Prob. a variant of “alack,” an interjection used to express grief or surprise (OED int. 1).
49. d’ye D1: d’dye.
51. Gadsookers Godsookers, a combination of “God’s” and a second element which is meaningless or corrupt. Used as an oath to express surprise or asseveration (OED).
expression.

FLORELLA: Some fair lady, I suppose, sir.

YOUNG REVELLER: You may suppose, sir, but ask no questions as you value your nose, sir.

FLORELLA: Did the lady you dined with entertain you kindly, sir?

YOUNG REVELLER: Look you, sweetheart, I gave thee a caution about questions; such familiarity at first sight is not agreeable to my constitution, therefore keep thy tongue within compass, lest my feet go beyond measure.

FLORELLA: [Aside] I won’t provoke the rogue, lest he should be as good as his word, and force me to discover myself. Where the devil is this dried fig of his?

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Sirrah, sirrah, where have you been till this time?

YOUNG REVELLER: About some urgent business of my own, sir.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Of the devil’s, you dog, the flesh and the spirit. Oons, sirrah, what is the meaning I can’t whore and drink with you?

YOUNG REVELLER: There is a natural infirmity, sir, allied to fifty-nine, which in cases of this matter, do bear a debilitated influence over the frigiditated circumstances of halting inclination, which being pre-engaged to a foregoing want of power, renders the faculties incapable of exerting those necessary ingredients which commonly are required in the eager occurrences of predominant desire—

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Why, you rodomontading, canting, bantering, sputtering—

Offers to strike him.

LORD WORTHY: Hold, hold, Sir Thomas.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Why, the rogue’s a-bantering of me, spitting out his superfluous bombast, and ridiculing my understanding, as if his father was liable to his nonsensical raillery. Get out of the house, sirrah!

ALL: Nay, hold, Sir Thomas, not so.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: I have lived to a fine age, a fine time I mean indeed. Sirrah, get you out.

LADY HAZARD: Nay, Sir Thomas, let me intercede.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Why, ’tis a shame, madam, what an impudent son-in-law will

88. dried fig Something valueless or contemptible (OED fig n.1 4a).
94. frigiditated Prob. a variant or a corruption of the verb “frigidate,” meaning “to make frigid” (OED).
he be to your ladyship, when 'tis such an insolent rascal to his own father.

LADY HAZARD: I warrant you, sir.

YOUNG REVELLER: [To Sir Thomas Reveller] Hark, you sir, lay by your mustiness, or my lady shall know how brisk your worship was at the Wells to all the masks you met with.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: [To Young Reveller] Dog rogue, shall she so? Well, I won’t disturb the company now, but another time—

Winks at his son, and puts his finger on his nose.

LADY HAZARD: Come, come, a dance.

ALL: Aye, a dance, a dance.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Gadso, it’s break o’day. Come on then, strike up now, rogue, I’ll frigiditate you.

Cuts a caper.

Enter Dorinda and Aunt [masked].

DORINDA: My fears are true, and he is false as hell.

AUNT: What could you expect less from such a wild fellow?

DORINDA: Peace, mischief! Inconstant villain, altered in an hour. Are all those charms which ecstasied his senses, Those melting joys his life could scarce dispense with, When all his spirits with excess of bliss Lay gasping as in fits struggling for vent, As if his soul had sickened with the pleasure, And nature could not bear the vast delight?

AUNT: Come, will you go home, now you’re satisfied?

DORINDA: There’s Worthy, and Violante, whom he spoke of, That is Florella, whom he’s coupled with; I’ll stay and watch a little, though I burst.

LORD WORTHY: Oh, here’s more company. Ladies, will you dance?

DORINDA: Not yet, sir, if you please.

LORD WORTHY: Your time’s your own.

110. mustiness Ill humour (OED n. 2).
116. it's D1: 'tis.
117. Cuts a caper Dances in a frolicsome way (OED caper n.2 b)
DORINDA: [Aside] Why, there’s another villain, whom though I love not, I hate to think another should get from me.

_Dance. All the time of dancing, Sir Thomas Reveller calls to his son: “About George, there’s frigiditate for you!”_

LADY HAZARD: Hold, Sir Thomas, I swear you’ll kill us all; there is no dancing with you.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Aye, madam, here’s a true English heart for you, uncorrupted with the gross luxuries of the age, a plain well-bred north-country tit, that shall tire forty of these barbary colts, and break their backs, gad take me.

MRS. RAISON: Sure that must be Florella, I’ll try her.

_Goes up to Dorinda._

FLORELLA: Certainly that must be the woman Reveller talked to at the Wells, ’tis just her shape and air; I'll bear up to her and try her inclinations.

_Goes up to Dorinda._

VIOLANTE: Well, my lord, I'll take into consideration what you say, and if your inclinations be as honourable as your language—

LORD WORTHY: Else, curse me from the blessing I desire.

YOUNG REVELLER: [Aside] This must be Florella. —[To a masked woman] Come, why so froward, little madcap? Do you think it possible to disguise yourself from so zealous a lover?

WOMAN: [Aside] I don’t know who he takes me for, but I'll humour his supposition for sport sake.

DORINDA: Confusion, how fond he is!

_A banquet of sweetmeats._

FLORELLA: (To Dorinda) Madam, what makes your ladyship keep so far from the company, will you not make one at the collation?

MRS. RAISON: Sir, I had the honour to speak first to this lady, and desire you would make your addresses elsewhere.

DORINDA: Fools!

_All this while Young Reveller and the strange Woman are toying together, and Dorinda is looking at ’em uneasy._

138. _tit_ Lad, young man (OED n. 2b).

151. _banquet_ Course of sweetmeats, fruit, and wine, served either as a separate entertainment, or as a continuation of the principal meal (OED n. 3a).
Act 5, Scene 1

FLORELLA: Sir, I hope my civility, though not so early as yours, is no affront to the fair lady, and till she tells me I'm troublesome I shall follow my own will.

_Both take Dorinda by the hand._

DORINDA: Oh, how the poppets toy! Distraction!

Nay, gentlemen, I never admit suitors;
I don’t know—

FLORELLA: [Aside] I think I can’t be discovered. —Madam, to show how much I esteem your favour, I'll conceal nothing from you.

_Unmasks._

MRS. RAISON: A pretty youth, madam, I scorn to be outdone.

_Unmasks._

FLORELLA: I discovered first, sir, and now, sir, I am as much beforehand with you in point of good breeding, as you were with me in your approaches.

AUNT: By the pleasures I have passed, a couple of sweet youths. Can’t you divert yourself with these?

DORINDA: I hate ’em both.

AUNT: Well, would I had the worst of ’em.

MRS. RAISON: Madam, I'll tell you—

FLORELLA: I'll acquaint your ladyship—

_Young Reveller hugging the strange Woman, and making several ridiculous postures, kneels down to her; Dorinda comes up, and gives him a box on the ear._

DORINDA: By hell, I cannot bear it.

FLORELLA: Heyday!

DORINDA: Villain and traitor!

YOUNG REVELLER: Is the frolic to go round, madam?

DORINDA: (To Florella and Mrs. Raison) If you’ve honour, protect me.

FLORELLA: [Aside] This is lucky, ’tis she I’m sure.

MRS. RAISON: [Aside] This is some rival. —Madam, my service.

172. _on_ Q, D2: _of._
DORINDA: Both, gentlemen.

They clap their hands upon their swords, and nod at Young Reveler.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Madam, can I serve you?

DORINDA: Perdition seize your generation.

Exeunt Florella, Dorinda and Mrs. Raison.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: And the devil take your inclination. —Why, what’s the meaning of this, George?

YOUNG REVELLER: Indeed I know not, sir, some frolic upon a wager I suppose.

LORD WORTHY: George, I’d speak with you. [Aside] My blood is chilled o’th’ sudden; sure, that could not be Dorinda.

YOUNG REVELLER: I’ll wait on you.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Come, ladies, faith, we’ll have no bedtime yet, let’s into the next room, there’s a fresh entertainment.

Exeunt.

Scene II

Park.

Enter Dorinda, Florella, and Mrs. Raison, Aunt following.

DORINDA: Now, as you’re men of honour, I entreat you’d leave me to myself.

MRS. RAISON: Aye, pray sir, depart; the lady would be in private.

FLORELLA: That’s what I would be with the lady, sir. Come, madam, we’re a couple of likely young fellows, take your choice, and he you approve of the other shall give way to.

DORINDA: Nay, gentlemen, ’tis late.

FLORELLA: Early, by this hand, madam, the sun’s just breaking; come, take one of us into

---

182. and Not in Q and D2.
190. entertainment Hospitable provision for the wants of a guest, especially for the table (OED n. 11b).
0. Park Not in D1.
184
your livery, and see how heartily we'll earn our wages.

DORINDA: I have no business for you.

FLORELLA: [Aside] If she knew me rightly, she’d swear it.

MRS. RAISON: Sir, methinks you might perceive by the lady’s uneasiness, she would willingly have you gone.

FLORELLA: And methinks, sir, you might perceive by my uneasiness, I’d have you gone.

MRS. RAISON: Not till the lady pronounces, sir.

FLORELLA: Not, sir?

MRS. RAISON: Not, damn me, d’you think I’ll be browbeaten?

FLORELLA: [Aside] Ha! By heavens, Mrs. Raison, that awkward huff and stamp betrayed it; I might have looked long enough for her in petticoats; ah! I'll swagger lustily, now I know my man. —Look you, sir, either desist, or I'll make you the first dead carcass this day’s sun shall breed maggots in.

MRS. RAISON: [Aside] Bear up, Raison, and be not daunted, he’s too well dressed to love fighting, and too much like a courtier to have any courage. —Sir.

FLORELLA: Well, sir—

*Lay their hands on swords.*

DORINDA: Nay, no quarrelling, gentlemen, to end the dispute since it must be so, let me go in here to my lodgings, and I'll send for the man I like best in half an hour.

FLORELLA: Upon honour?

DORINDA: My hand on’t.

MRS. RAISON: And me, madam.

DORINDA: There, sir, each of you has a hand, but he that has my heart shall be resolved immediately.

FLORELLA: We depend on’t.

DORINDA: As I hope to be satisfied in the embraces of my choice—

FLORELLA: [Aside] Swear by something else, your expectations may halt else.

8. into your livery As part of her liveried retainers or servants of her household (OED livery n. 3b).

23. on swords D1: on their swords.
DORINDA: [Aside] Oh, Reveller! Thou hell and heaven, thou plague and pleasure, come rid me of these coxcombs!

Exeunt Dorinda and Aunt.

FLORELLA: [Aside] Now will I bully this she-spark, and revenge myself on her, for Reveller’s kindness to her. Oh, for the impudence of a true-bred page, and the management of an old soldier! —Sir, being jealous of my destiny concerning this lady, and being likewise so struck with her eyes and conversation that my heart cannot bear the loss of her, should she unluckily pitch upon you, I am resolved to try who most deserves her by the merit of his sword, and not her choice. Therefore, draw, sir.

MRS. RAISON: [Aside] Ad’s life, what will become of me now? —Draw, sir?

FLORELLA: Draw, sir! Aye draw, sir; damn me, d’you think to browbeat me?

MRS. RAISON: [Aside] ’Tis a pretty fellow, and I could put him to a better employment than running me quite through. —Sir, I don’t think it worth fighting for, till we know her inclinations, if they claim you, there’s no occasion for it, and if it be me—

FLORELLA: That if’s impossible; for he that dare but think so damned a lie, and so forth—

MRS. RAISON: [Aside] I never saw such a little fury; I must tame him in my own sex, for I find this will never do.

FLORELLA: Draw, sir.

MRS. RAISON: Pray, sir—

FLORELLA: Rot you!

Drives Mrs. Raison about the stage.

MRS. RAISON: How, sir?

FLORELLA: Burn you!

MRS. RAISON: Dear sir!

FLORELLA: Sink you!

MRS. RAISON: Stay, sir.

FLORELLA: Damn you!

---

35. and  Not in Q and D2.
42. Ad's life  A variation of “God’s life.”
47. That if's impossible  Florella implies that the hypothesis that Dorinda should prefer Mrs. Raison is impossible.

FLORELLA: Roast, fry and fricassee, chop, slice and mince your soul into atoms!

MRS. RAISON: Hold, sir, I am a woman.

*Kneels.*

FLORELLA: This shall not save you.

MRS. RAISON: My name’s Raison, my husband keeps a grocer’s shop at the Stocks Market, and here he comes to justify it.

FLORELLA: Rise, madam.

*Enter Raison.*

MR. RAISON: I could not find out my wife, but there was a woman ordered me to come into the Park, and said, she’d follow me.

FLORELLA: [Aside] I am resolved to thrash him a little, for I’m sure he’s a coward. —Sir, do you know this lady?

MR. RAISON: Lady, sir? What, a lady in breeches?

FLORELLA: Aye, sir, she says, she is your wife; this lady in breeches.

MR. RAISON: Nay, ’tis no great wonder, for she always wore ’em since I had her.

MRS. RAISON: Oh, dear Raison! I disguised myself thus for the masquerade; and making love to a lady out of waggery, this gentleman has drawn upon me.

FLORELLA: Aye, sir, and I don’t know but, by her impertinence, I’ve lost the lady forever; therefore, I will have satisfaction.

MR. RAISON: Why, sir; my wife’s excellent at giving everybody satisfaction but me.

FLORELLA: No quibbling, sir; but take her sword and do me justice.

MR. RAISON: I, sir? Why, I’m no fighting man, sir.

FLORELLA: No fighting man, sir?

MR. RAISON: No, sir, I can pay those that fight, and that’s as much as was ever required from a citizen.

---

64. My name’s D1: My name is.

64-65. the Stocks Market Founded in the 13th c. by the Lord Mayor on the site of the present Mansion House, in the eastern area of the City. During the 15th c., the Stocks became firmly established as a fish and flesh market, and after the Great Fire, it also offered fruit, vegetables and other articles (LE).
FLORELLA: Not fight, and an officer in the Royal Regiment!

MR. RAISON: Why, that’s only ornament, sir, it was never designed for use; but if we would fight, we have taken an oath not to strike a blow out of our own Walls.

FLORELLA: If you won’t fight, sir I must have the satisfaction of kicking you; thus sir, thus sir.

*Kicks him.*

MR. RAISON: It may be a satisfaction to you, sir, but little or none to your humble servant.

MRS. RAISON: Nay, sir, if you have any value for a woman, let me entreat for him.

FLORELLA: Well, madam, to show I am a man of honour, for your sake, I will forbear him.

MR. RAISON: [Aside] Aye, but she let him kick me first.

FLORELLA: And now Mrs. Florella has had her frolic as well as your ladyship.

MRS. RAISON: Florella! I had some suspicions of that effeminate face indeed.

MR. RAISON: [Aside] Confusion, how shall I be laughed at! —[To Florella] I thank you, madam, for the maidenhead of your bullyship.

FLORELLA: Come, Mr. Raison, you’re ne’er the worse man, and I’ll make you ample satisfaction, for I’ll marry Mr. Reveller, and then you may keep your spouse to yourself.

MR. RAISON: Well, I am the first man that ever was kicked by a woman that was not his wife, sure.

Enter Lord Worthy and Young Reveller.

FLORELLA: Here comes Reveller and my Lord Worthy, I’ll have a frolic with him too, you’ll stand by me, Mr. Raison.

MR. RAISON: Not if he kicks like your ladyship.

LORD WORTHY: And your first acquaintance with this woman was at the Wells?

YOUNG REVELLER: The very morning before you came to town.

LORD WORTHY: [Aside] Hell, and confusion; oh, damned jilt! —Methinks your conquest was very easy, considering the character you give of her beauty and conversation, that

---

84. Royal Regiment See note to Prologue, l. 27.
86. our own Walls The limits of the jurisdiction of the citizens were the City Walls.
98. of Not in Q.
in three days you should bring her to compliance.

FLORELLA: They’re discoursing about a mistress, I think, Mr. Raison; pray, stand aside a little and observe.

YOUNG REVELLER: Faith, what she saw in me, I cannot tell; our familiarity was somewhat hasty I confess; not but I could have stayed a twelve month, so I had been sure at the end of those joys she gave last night.

LORD WORTHY: [Aside] Damnation on the artful whore. Now I reflect, methought to me her love was all affected, and her embraces which she seemed with bashfulness to give, proceeded from uneasiness; by heaven. —Do you not know her?

YOUNG REVELLER: The name she told me was Dorinda. I do believe she is of some fashion, and debauched by some nobleman or other, and kept here for security of not being known.

LORD WORTHY: [Aside] Legion of devils burst her cankered heart-strings!

YOUNG REVELLER: She hurried me away about nine a clock out of her back door. I suppose the spark was come, for one of her scouts came and whispered her. It was a hearty well-wisher to St. Valentine’s day, for she coupled us as lovingly and as securely, as if she had been to have had me herself; I think she called her Aunt. It was the wholesomest looked dame.

LORD WORTHY: [Aside] Oh, true bred, plump-faced bawd. —Then Florella is quite laid aside?

YOUNG REVELLER: No, my lord, that I design for my constant habitation; this is only a lodging by the by, to divert myself with whenever I’m uneasy at home.

LORD WORTHY: And you’re going now to her?

YOUNG REVELLER: If I can gain admittance.

FLORELLA: I’ll have a brush with you first, Reveller; you’re a son of a whore.

She strikes him. He lays hand on his sword.

MR. RAISON: Oh fie, draw upon a woman!

YOUNG REVELLER: What, my little madcap in breeches!

FLORELLA: Hearing your father resolved not to give you a groat, and in despair you had got a commission to go to the wars, Mrs. Raison and I come to offer ourselves as volunteers.

YOUNG REVELLER: Mrs. Raison, a couple of amiable supporters; faith, Alcibiades

140. Alcibiades Athenian statesman, orator and general (ca. 450 BC- 404BC). He had a reputation not only for his courage and beauty, but also for his unruly behaviour and for consorting with courtesans.
never regaled himself with two tighter lasses. [Aside to Lord Worthy] My lord, will you take ’em aside a little, till I step in to this Dorinda; for I am very impatient to know the meaning of that box o’the ear.

LORD WORTHY: [Aside] A friendly request truly, but I shall alter your joys speedily. — Ladies, pray walk this way a little?

MRS. RAISON: Mr. Reveller, won’t you?

YOUNG REVELLER: I’ll but correct my watch by the sun-dial, and—

LORD WORTHY: Let him alone, madam.

Exit Young Reveller.

FLORELLA: So, he’s gone to his mistress, I’m sure.

MRS. RAISON: What, the lady that gave him the box o’the ear?

MR. RAISON: Gad, I believe the whole sex are turned kickers and cuffers.

LORD WORTHY: The same, madam; [to Florella] and if you’ll promise me to use your interest to your sister to pardon me in some things I have erred in, I’ll not only restore you Mr. Reveller wholly to yourself, but entertain you with an unexpected piece of diversion.

FLORELLA: I do not know what you mean; but in anything that’s honourable, your lordship may command me.

LORD WORTHY: I ask no more, madam.

FLORELLA: Heyday! Here’s Sir Thomas and my lady, with fiddles. ’Tis a mad old knight; my mother will never recover the fatigue of this night’s disorder.

Enter Sir Thomas Reveller, Lady Hazard, Violante, Mr. Sassafras, and Music.

LADY HAZARD: For heaven’s sake, Sir Thomas, give over your frolic; I am so sick and untoward, pray let me and my children go to rest.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Not till night, faith, madam, and then not much rest neither; for I am resolved we’ll dance to a priest, and be made flesh and blood out of hand.

LADY HAZARD: How, Sir Thomas?

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Even so, my lady; it must be done, and no time so fitting as

151. kickers and cuffers A cuffer is a boxer, or fighter (OED n.1 a). There may be an allusion to Kick and Cuff, the pair of bullies in Shadwell’s popular comedy Epsom Wells (1672; 1673).

162. untoward Disinclined. OED records the last use of the word with this meaning in 1665 (OED adj. 1a).
now we are in a good humour, therefore let’s nick it; widows, when they’re heated, must be kept stirring.

LADY HAZARD: Oh fie, Sir Thomas! It requires consideration.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Consideration in matrimony! Nay then, I’ll be hanged if any man ever weighed the state of marriage seriously, and entered into’t afterwards; I’ll be bound to answer for my father’s sins.

FLORELLA: I wonder then, Sir Thomas, you that have proved it once will venture upon it again.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Why, how now, you little smock-faced dog, a pretty boy, faith; sirrah, sirrah, if you were in Italy—

FLORELLA: Nay, nay; but answer me as I’m in England.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Why, because I’m sure I can’t have a worse wife than I had before; and I would try if there be any better.

MRS. RAISON: Then I find you marry more for the experiment, than for any comfort the lady’s to have of you.

FLORELLA: Therefore if I might advise my mother—

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Thy mother—

MR. RAISON: Florella, and my wife, Sir Thomas, not being loose enough in their own habits, have chose one to be lewd in with less scandal.

FLORELLA: [Aside to Mr. Raison] Good sugar-loaf, none of your censures; you know the length of my foot.

MR. RAISON: [To Florella] Yes, and the breadth, I thank you.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Ah, my little squirrel turned hector!

LADY HAZARD: Florella, I wonder at your frailty, to commit such an absurdity in discretion, by giving yourself up to—

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Nothing but a harmless frolic, madam; I beseech your ladyship not to construe it worse than it is.

167. nick Grasp an opportunity, take advantage of a situation (OED v.2 9).

175-76. a pretty boy … if you were in Italy Some accounts of trips to Italy describe the alleged attraction that Italian men felt for young boys. See for instance Jean Dumont’s comment in A New Voyage to the Levant: “they [the Venetians] wou’d rather chuse a Boy … than the most Amiable Girl in the World. This is the predominant Vice of the Nation, with which they are so miserably intoxicated” (406).

185. chose A variant form of the past participle of choose, very common in the late 17th and 18th centuries. See note for 1.3.7.
VIOLANTE: Well, my lord, you have behaved yourself so like a man of honour in this discovery of your mistress, that it shall no way turn to your prejudice in my esteem.

LORD WORTHY: Heaven make me capable of deserving so much goodness.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: But where’s George, what’s become of that rogue?

LORD WORTHY: Sir Thomas, I have a favour to beg of you and this good company; pray ask no questions, but follow me into this house; I have a key here commands it.

LADY HAZARD: What should this mean?

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Faith, I know not; but let’s follow him.

FLORELLA: Now Vulcan and Venus will be caught in a net.

MRS. RAISON: [Aside] Some comfort, I shall know who this rival is. —Come, husband.

MR. RAISON: Aye, wife, where you please.

Exit.

Scene III

[Scene opens]

Dorinda’s apartment, Young Reveller following of her.

YOUNG REVELLER: Can nothing appease you?

DORINDA: Ungrateful villain! Was the prize so poor, It could not merit one night’s constancy? Oh! Curse upon my folly which betrayed me, Which gave such hasty credit to thy oaths. My generosity overcame discretion, And I’m despised for being kind too soon.

YOUNG REVELLER: [Aside] Conscience, give way a little. —Madam, by heavens, I went straight home; nay, was in bed when my father came and pulled me out, and forced me...

202. Vulcan … in a net An erroneous reference to the account of Venus’ infidelity to her husband Vulcan. In his Metamorphoses, Ovid (43 BC-ca. 17 AD) relates that Vulcan, being suspicious of Venus, created an invisible net to catch her and Mars together in bed and expose them to ridicule (Sandys 4.203-28). The substitution of Vulcan for Mars also appears in a play called The Carnival (1664) by Thomas Porter. In Act 3, Don Lorenzo explains to some other characters that they will enjoy a masque about “How Vulcan and Venus were catcht in a Net together by the cunning of that Cuckoldy Rogue Mars” (p. 34).

0. Scene III Q: SCENE
to go with him.

DORINDA: By hell, 'tis false; you went straight thither, I had you dogged.

YOUNG REVELLER: [Aside] So, that won't do then. —Why then, in short, I should have been pulled out of my bed if I had not gone, and 'twas better as 'twas.

DORINDA: Why, did you not swear to me, you would not see Florella last night?

YOUNG REVELLER: The devil take me, if I know I did. I fancied several for her, but as I hope to be reconciled to you, I did not to my knowledge see her; and to make you amends, I won't see her this week.

DORINDA: You'd sooner hang yourself.

YOUNG REVELLER: Nay, if you won't believe—

DORINDA: I have believed too much, and you have promised more than you can keep.

YOUNG REVELLER: By the dear joys possessed, I will be faithful.

DORINDA: And will you not marry Florella?

YOUNG REVELLER: Buy trouble so dear, when I can have pleasure so cheap?

DORINDA: And you will never?

YOUNG REVELLER: Impossible! I should keep me here ever with thee thus, and scorn thy sex besides.

DORINDA: Oh, take me all then! Thus let us grow and never separate.

_Embaces._

LORD WORTHY: (Within) By heaven, a shriek destroys thee, down!

_Enter Lord Worthy, his sword drawn, and forcing the Aunt upon her knees._

Bawd, down!

DORINDA: Destruction, thou art come!

YOUNG REVELLER: My lord!

_Young Reveller draws._

LORD WORTHY: Put up, George; here's my aim.

_Runs at Dorinda._

YOUNG REVELLER: Honour forbid that, and a man so near.
Act 5, Scene 3

Holds him.

LORD WORTHY: I thank thee, my passion was too violent. What canst thou say, perfidious hellish jilt?

DORINDA: I am struck o’th’ sudden, and have nought t o help me; where art thou, cunning, thou devil at a pinch, canst thou be backward when a woman wants thee?

YOUNG REVELLER: The meaning of all this?

LORD WORTHY: I’ll tell thee, George. Oh! Had I trusted thee before, thou hadst not wronged me.

DORINDA: Or had I cautioned him, thou hadst not known it. Curse on my folly.

LORD WORTHY: This lady that has been thy whore, was once my mistress; this reverend matron sold her to me; her father was an ancient servant in our family, and dying, left her with this widowed aunt, whose cursed avarice betrayed her to me. In short, I had her for five hundred pounds for I did love her (to my shame I own it) above the world. ’Tis six years since, in which time her ladyship has somewhat weakened my estate; for as I had no wish above her love, I had no power above her wish; all she commanded, and she has well repaid me; thy ignorance, and my breach of friendship in not trusting thee, makes thee unblameable; but she sure’s doubly damned, to wrong me with the only man she knew my friend.

YOUNG REVELLER: By heavens, it staggers me, and I could wish—

LORD WORTHY: It is too late, forget her as I shall, and we shall be much happier. [To Aunt] What sayst thou, bawd, is’t true what I have said?

DORINDA: Aye, let her speak; I’ll stand to what she says.

LORD WORTHY: Say, it is true?

AUNT: Yes.

DORINDA: Convulsions choke thee.

AUNT: But as I hope to die out of an almshouse, ’twas all against my will; but she threatened to run away and leave me to beg if I did not comply, and being old and uncapable of getting bread in any other employment, I thought it better to wink at her fornication, than starve through her indignation.

YOUNG REVELLER: Madam, this has a face—

DORINDA: So has an ass, confusion on ye all.

Is going.

41. known Q: know.
63. ye D1, D2: you.
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LORD WORTHY: Nay, not so fast, good madam, we'll part with witness, though we met with none. Sir Thomas, will you enter?

Enter Sir Thomas Reveller, Mr. Sassafras, Violante, Lady Hazard, Florella, Mrs. Raison, Mr. Raison, etc.

DORINDA: Must I then be derided? Poor insulter!

YOUNG REVELLER: No, let her go, my lord.

LORD WORTHY: Nay, George, dispute it not; by hell, I'll have some revenge.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Why, what are we to do here, is there any conveyance we must be witnesses to?

YOUNG REVELLER: Yes, here has been a conveyance, only a damned mistake in the drawing it up.

LORD WORTHY: Ladies, Sir Thomas and gentlemen; I desired your good company to see me take leave of an old acquaintance, being resolved to live a sober, discreet life, and bend my whole thoughts towards this kind lady, I have bid adieu to the only mistress I had, whom by the way, Sir Thomas, your son has rid me of.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: How, my son!

LORD WORTHY: I'll tell you more hereafter. Madam, you may retire, I have ended my triumph.

DORINDA: That's she that has undone me, I could have worked him yet for all this mischief; but there's a fortune and a face too powerful.

VIOLANTE: Is this the lady that was so very severe upon our parents? I suppose you'll wash all at home now, madam.

DORINDA: [To Violante] May jealousy unquenchable possess thee; May impotence in him still cross thy wishes; And may you love still in despite of both. [To Lord Worthy] For thee I have some pleasure in my ruin; Thou didst intend, I find, for her to leave me; And I have been beforehand with thee, in him. And since we both designed to cheat each other, It is my pride, though with the loss I'm cursed, I had my man and was in falsehood first.

Exit

69. conveyance The written document by means of which a transference of property is effected (OED n. 7b).

73. desired D1: desire.

92. I had … first Not in Q.
SIR THOMAS REVELLER: “I had my man and was in falsehood first”— A notable baggage, by the pleasures of whoring. But what a pox, I’m still in the dark here.

YOUNG REVELLER: You shall know all anon, sir. [Aside to Florella] Now madam, for our design with the old gentleman: if I seem to be fond of it, I certainly lose it. [Aside to Lord Worthy] My lord, assist her.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Faith, widow, we will to church, and there’s an end on’t.

FLORELLA: Of love? Indeed it may probably enter the church, but seldom comes out. Madam, I have a request to your ladyship, you’re showing a very good example with Sir Thomas, and really, I have a mind to follow it with his son, but he’s so very perverse towards matrimony, that without some assistance of the good company my single interest will never prevail.

MRS. RAISON: [Aside] What do I hear?

LADY HAZARD: Why truly, Florella, I have no averse exceptions to the gentleman, if his father be willing.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Willing? Aye, madam, with all my heart. [To Young Reveller] Fifteen thousand pounds, you dog, and you not worth a groat.

YOUNG REVELLER: I thank you, sir, but I value my freedom above all fortune.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: You dog, you have been free ever since you were born, and I’ll make you draw now with your father.

LORD WORTHY: Aye, aye, ’tis time to leave off rambling, George; so much beauty and fifteen thousand pounds.

YOUNG REVELLER: My lord, had I wherewithal to settle a jointure upon the lady equal to her portion, something might be said; but I have so much regard to my own honour, to take a wife who shall twit me hereafter with what she brought me.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Twit you, jackanapes? What need you value her twitting, when the money is in your own hands? When wives twit, husbands may whore with a safe conscience, hang-dog.

LORD WORTHY: No, but Sir Thomas shall take the fifteen thousand pounds and settle two thousand pounds a year on you, and make a jointure equal.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Pshaw, ne’er trouble your head, my lord, I warrant you I’ll be a loving father to ’em.

YOUNG REVELLER: As a Jew to his child that had married a Christian; sir, if you would

100. you're Q: your
101. he's D1: he is.
115-16. to my own ... a wife D2: to my own honour, not to take a wife.
give me fifty thousand pounds, I would not marry.

MRS. RAISON: [Aside] Oh! He has some honour left I find.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: You would not marry, rogue?

YOUNG REVELLER: No, sir.

MR. RAISON: Come, pray, Mr. Reveller, be persuaded.

MRS. RAISON: What have you to do to persuade him to marry?

MR. RAISON: Because I'd willingly have him have a wife of his own to make use of, that he mayn't borrow of his neighbour's.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: And you won't marry?

YOUNG REVELLER: No. Pray, sir, don't trouble me.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: You dog, you shall marry, and I'll stand to what my lord proposed, but I'll make you marry. I'll have the writings drawn presently, and if you refuse, I'll go to church in a pet, marry in a passion, get a son in a fury, and disinherit you, you dog.

YOUNG REVELLER: Well, sir, to avoid the curse of disobedience, I will submit. [Aside] Nothing but my seeming averse could have wrought this.

FLORELLA: I thank you, good people, though I fear I shall repent it.

MRS. RAISON: [Aside to Young Reveller] And will you be such a villain?

YOUNG REVELLER: [Aside to Mrs. Raison] Faith, madam, I have been a great charge to you, and am very happy I can—

FLORELLA: No whispering now the man's sold; you have had your pennyworths, I'm sure.

MR. RAISON: Come, wife, you had as good live honest, since you find you can't help it.

MRS. RAISON: Why, let him go; here, husband, take what you never had till now, my heart; your generosity and good temper, however I have abused it, I'll strive to deserve it.

MR. RAISON: Why, better late than never, Kate.

131-32. Because I'd ... his neighbour's An allusion to the tenth commandment, whose full text reads: “Thou shall not covet your neighbour's house. Thou shall not covet your neighbour's wife, or his manservant or maidservant, his ox or donkey, or anything that belongs to your neighbour” (Exo 20: 17).

136. writings D2: writing.

137. in a pet Offended, slighted (OED n.3).
LORD WORTHY: And madam, may I hope?

VIOLANTE: My lord, you may; my sister and I shall take some time first, when my lady’s fixed with her consent—

LADY HAZARD: His lordship has it; but pray, where’s Mr. Sassafras?

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Dismal drunk in bed by this time, I left him upon it at three this morning. Come, widow, I find we shall be the only pair this day then, and be not frightened.

It dreadful seems to those who wed at first,
But we who’ve tried it once can guess the worst.

YOUNG REVELLER:
And may all contradicting fathers know
Their sons, by me, may teach ’em what to do.

FINIS.
Epilogue

Well, sirs, is’t peace or war, that you declare?
I am ready armed, so is my second here.
If you’re displeased with what you’ve seen tonight,
Behind Southampton House we’ll do you right.
Who is’t dares draw ’gainst me and Mrs. Knight?
Be kind, gallants, if you can mercy show,
Press not the plant which of itself does bow.
Ladies, your goodness is our best support,
The men must like the play, if you are for’t;
And sure the vizards will not cry it down,
Since our intrigues resemble still their own,
Here all your coquette tricks to th’ life are shown.
Will you take us to answer your desires?
We look like two kind keeping country squires.
You’ll say we are chits, too slight and little made,
You’ll scarce find larger in this age, egad.
For such a pygmy race are now come up,
They’re but half sprouted, like a second crop.
The fathers’ sins are in their offspring shown,
And each now puny chit’s an elder son.
Nature disowns the slender half-got race,
Every lath-carcass, with his small pig’s face,
By art endeavours nature to outdo,
And since he can’t pass for a man’s, a beaux.
If such as these your favour, ladies, find,
To Knight and me, as pages, pray be kind.

0. Epilogue  Spoken by Mrs. Mountfort, in boy’s clothes. In Q, it was printed after the Prologue.
2. my second here  Mrs. Knight, the actress playing Mrs. Raison.
4. Southampton House  A residence built in about 1657 for Thomas Wriothesley, 4th earl of Southampton on the east side of Chancery Lane (LE). According to Strype, there was “a curious Garden behind which lieth open to the Fields” (4: 84), which could have been used by duelists.
5. draw  Possibly with sexual innuendo: of a penis, drawn like a sword or dagger (G. Williams).
15. chits  Children, babies. Gen. used of young people in contempt. Also, the shoot of corn from the end of the grain (Johnson).
20. chit’s  D2: chits’s.
24. And since ... a beaux  To satisfy the syllabic requirements of the iambic pentameter, Mountfort forces the ellipsis of the subject of “is a beaux” and splits that verb from its complement, placing a comma between both elements. The original punctuation of the line complicates its proper reading, which should be: “And since he can’t pass for a man, he is a beau.”
5. The Rhetorics of Space in *Greenwich Park*

Leaving aside the major reforms that William and Mary undertook once they ascended the throne (see Chapter 3 above), the new monarchs made another significant gesture to mark the beginning of the new reign, and to represent both a new philosophy for governing England and a new moral attitude for their subjects: they abandoned Whitehall Palace, Charles II’s and James II’s main royal residence, and moved to Kensington Palace. Subsequently, the Town —the area extending between Whitehall and the West End of the City, that was favoured by the ‘people of quality’ in the 1660s and 1670s— continued its steady decline and ended up losing its predominance in favour of the East End. The symbolic *locus* of the Restoration libertine ethos had just been physically and emotionally dismantled.

Replacing the site that had hosted the previous court’s notorious debauchery by a new, untainted palace —William and Mary were the first monarchs to ever reside in Kensington— far enough from the orbit of the Town, was a highly symbolical manoeuvre: a decision that conveys a revealing message about the use and operation of space by the new monarchs. In fact, the analysis of particular uses of space and the repercussions of those uses at a socio-political level is highly relevant when approaching *Greenwich Park*. Mountfort’s play, beyond its obvious categorization as a topographical comedy (see below p.226), is certainly a comedy where space —either public or private, semi-public or semi-private— performs a crucial role, and the study of how that space is occupied, recreated and also questioned offers enriching conclusions. The public and the private spaces where the play is set coexist and intermingle, provoking both cooperation and tension between them. In other words, the setting (and by extension, the concept of space) is fundamental in *Greenwich Park*.  
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5.1. Theoretical Perspectives

In order to consider these questions concerning the concept of space (and more particularly, the public versus private sphere dichotomy) from a theoretical approach, the field of urban geography constitutes a significant starting point. In *Cities in Space, City as Place* (1997) reputed geographers David T. Herbert and Colin J. Thomas offer an introduction to this discipline, its scope and purposes, and they also trace its evolution since urban geography started to be understood as an independent area of inquiry within geography, back in the 1940s. In a broad sense, for Herbert and Thomas “to study urban geography is to study environments and phenomena significant to our everyday lives” (v). The discipline comprises a series of minor branches which approach those “environments and phenomena” much more specifically: urban settlement, for example, studies the spatial distributions of towns and cities (1) and locational analysis focuses on the “ideas of systems and networks and the wider processes of urbanization” (v), to name just two instances. Likewise, the authors explain that “human geography contains a variety of perspectives and paradigms which demonstrate that there are many ways of looking at the city” and establish a “trilogy” formed by positivism, humanism and structuralism as the principal theoretical paradigms for an initial approach to studies on space (10). As a matter of fact, these three critical frameworks constitute the starting point for the discussion on public versus private space presented in this chapter.

In urban geography, positivism would be articulated as spatial analysis, that is, “the study of human activities which result from the operation of universal processes of decision-making” (10) and it would be characterised by its focus on general laws rather than exceptional cases, as well as by its statistical and quantitative approach (11). Spatial analysis relies on a traditional scientific methodology based on observation: the empirical evidence resulting from it is processed statistically to establish a set of laws which are used
to make predictions. Herbert and Thomas provide an example of spatial analysis research carried out by a group of US-based geographers in the city of Seattle. Their field of study was the flow of goods and people in a period of time along with the motivation for such flows. The methodology was “strongly mathematical” since the authors adopted “statistical procedures to present their morphological and associational laws and to test their notion about the economic rationality of men” (11). Their conclusion was clear: the stimuli for those flows were economical as people “reacted to the various costs of moving from one place to another by keeping them at a minimum” (11). From deductions like the one above, spatial analysts aim to determine the absolute or scientific laws which, in their view, govern human use of space and the behaviour of individuals.

However, the use of positivism to scrutinise and predict human behaviour eventually became problematic, and both the methodology and the conclusions would be questioned, as Herbert and Thomas note: “the discipline in practice was centrally concerned with exceptionalism” (11) as the establishment of general laws implied numerous difficulties; likewise, spatial analysis “became more scientific with greater use of symbolic language and the formulation of mathematical models” resulting in more sophisticated analyses which however “remained descriptive” (12), with scarce or no practical application. Therefore, a hypothetical attempt to classify space as public or private according to a positivist perspective would conclude in an excessively rigid, though systematic, division.

The strictures of positivism and “its tendency to ignore human agency” (Herbert and Thomas 14) provoked a reaction that led to the emergence of humanism, a perspective that intended to place people at the heart of the analyses. In like manner, humanistic geography positioned individuals as the central figure in the configuration of cities rather than “anonymous components of models or laws” (14). Concepts such as
human awareness and human consciousness replaced the scientific, statistical and quantitative hallmarks of positivism. Accordingly, humanistic geographers aimed at understanding “the ways in which groups developed shared meanings and the intersubjectivity which imbued places with special values” (14), since it is human experiences and decisions what determines the classification of a particular type of space.

The last component of this triad of theoretical paradigms is structuralism, which originated as a linguistics discipline. In its view, the elements of a language acquire meaning not as the result of a connection between words and things, but as parts of a system of relations among words themselves: each element signifies by marking a difference, a distinction within a system of opposites and contrasts. As Ferdinand de Saussure explained: “Language is a system of interdependent terms in which the value of each term results solely from the simultaneous presence of the others” (Rivkin 83). In extending the structuralist framework to other phenomena beyond language, some other theorists tried to prove that almost any human practice could be reduced to a system of conventions based on oppositions (or a “grammar,” using a linguistic term). So for instance, Roland Barthes used the structuralist methodology to examine the language of garments, by means of which he unveiled the underlying system of conventions of such an ordinary routine as getting dressed; or Vladimir Propp, who dissected the Russian fairy tales in a grammar formed by thirty one functions. In anthropology, Claude Levi-Strauss likewise adopted a structuralist stance in order to seek “the system of differences underlying a particular human practice” (Selden et al. 70) when analyzing myths, rites and kinship structures.

Similarly, these structuralist principles may be applied to urban geography, and more specifically, to the definition of public and private spaces. The first assumption is that the study must approach their description in terms of relations between both
concepts, rather than of their character as single entities, as Herbert and Thomas state when explaining the significance of structuralism applied to urban geography: “Relationships among component parts are more significant than the individual parts themselves” (12). The definition may be thus simplified as follows: a space is public inasmuch as it is not private, and vice versa. The next step will be to reduce this dichotomy “public” versus “private” into a system of binary oppositions, like the ones which form the basic linguistic units. In other words: to find the grammar underlying that pair of concepts. Hence, notions like “visible,” “social” or “open” may be paired under the idea of public space while, on the other hand, “hidden,” “domestic” or “close” would be related to the concept of private space. To sum up, the contrast between both is what precisely underpins their characterization: the concept of public space can be defined as such only when it is inserted in a system of oppositions with its contrasting pair of private space.

Nonetheless, as the discussion deepens, it seems obvious that a structuralist approach, although a practical starting point, may end up being too simplistic. Consequently, it does not suffice to comprehend the much more complex relation between the concepts of public and private space. Neither of them can be so categorically defined (and opposed to each other), as there exist evident areas of common contact between them, a “liminal” space where their signification and ramifications intermingle, creating spaces of semi-public and semi-private nature.

The concept of liminality was first used in the field of anthropology by Arnold van Genepp in *Rites de Passage* (1909). In his analysis of rituals he stated that some specific types of rites, namely those related to the passages through the cycle of life or of nature, are formed by a three-fold chronological structure: preliminal (separation), liminal (transition) and postliminal rites (incorporation). The sequence of the rite starts when the
individual leaves his previous identity behind, “separating” himself from it, and concludes once he is re-incorporated into the group with a new identity. It is during the middle stage when the initiand’s identity is actually subject to change as part of the process of the rite: it implies “an actual passing through the threshold that marks the boundary between two phases” (Szakolczai 141). Throughout the liminal stage, the individual is temporarily trapped in the middle of a process by means of which he is leaving his past identity and gaining his new one. He remains between two states of being: his symbolical death and his new life. In time, the use of the notion of liminality broadened and from the 1970s on it started to be applied to different fields. In the Catholic religion, for instance, Purgatory is considered a liminal realm, while in the field of sociological studies, liminality has been used to describe specific minority groups, like illegal immigrants or people of mixed ethnicity; similarly, teenagers can be categorised as a liminal group, as they are traversing a stage of being between childhood and adulthood.

When analyzing the spatial dimension of a specific concept, like in this case the binomial public versus private, liminality offers interesting insights. As it was claimed above, public and private spaces cannot be completely delimited from each other, for they share a liminal area between both: a space neither entirely public nor private which may be labeled as semi-public or semi-private, and whose analysis in the socio-political context where Greenwich Park is set will be particularly relevant.

In 1974 French philosopher and sociologist Henri Lefebvre published The Production of Space, a seminal work on the concept of “social space” which has deeply influenced modern urban theory ever since. Considered one of the most noteworthy scholars on the concept of space and on the physical and mental construction of that notion, Lefebvre approaches social space as a reality “related methodologically and theoretically to three general concepts: form, structure, function” (147). In doing so, he is
ultimately considering it like any “organism,” to use his own words, as well as raising the perception of space to a more relevant category. His discussion on the dichotomy public versus private brings in relevant ideas which can be applied to this analysis. He was one of the first critics to envision what was, and is still today, an essential notion to understand urban space theory, namely, the relationship between public and private spaces, which he considered fundamental: “today the global picture includes both these aspects, along with their relationship, and partial analyses, whether formal, functional or structural, must take this into account” (159). His conclusion on the binomial was unequivocal and somehow reminiscent of the structuralist starting point which opened this analysis: “Private space is distinct from, but always connected with, public space” (166).

Nonetheless, Lefebvre does not reduce social space merely to public and private spheres. In his study on the geometrical structure of the Asian traditional towns—which would be subsequently applied to his analysis of Western urban space—he contemplates “three interacting and interwoven levels of space: the public or global, the private, and the mixed (mediating or intermediary) levels” (387). Lefebvre distinguishes three categories: $G$ (for “global”) represents “the level of the system which has the broadest extension, namely the ‘public’ level of temples, palaces and political and administrative buildings”; $P$ (for “private”) symbolises “the level of residence and the places set aside for it, such as houses, apartments, and so on”; and finally $M$ (for “mixed”) stands for intermediate spaces, likes arteries, transitional areas, avenues or squares (155), equivalent to the liminal area mentioned above. Lefebvre goes a step further to establish that any of these three levels can at the same time be sub-divided into succeeding public, private and mixed spaces (labeled in lowercase $g$, $p$, and $m$ to make a distinction). Therefore, a given private realm ($P$) subsumes strictly private areas ($p$), like those rooms destined for retreat and sleep, public spaces ($g$), such as reception areas and family living-spaces, and sections which can be considered partly private and partly public ($m$), as for instance the entrances...
or the thresholds. Similarly, category $G$ “may be subdivided into interior spaces open to the public and the closed headquarters of institutions, into accessible itineraries and places reserved for notables, priests, princes and leaders” (155). Lefebvre concludes: “Similar considerations apply for each element of the system. Each location, at each level, has its characteristic traits: open or closed, low or high, symmetrical or asymmetrical” (156).

Influenced by his Marxist ideology, Lefebvre articulates the delimitation of that social space in terms of both political and economical power relationships: “It is the state—public, and hence political, authority— that does the arranging and classifying. Operationalism of this kind actually conflates ‘public’ space with the ‘private’ space of the hegemonic class, or fraction of a class, that in the last analysis retains and maintains private ownership of the land and of the other means of production” (375).

Michel Foucault also approached the notion of space in some of his works, like “Des Espace Autres,” a lecture he delivered to a group of architects in 1967 (it would be translated into English as “Of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias” in 1984). He emphasises the relevance of the concept of space in the contemporary world, stating that, while the 19th century was the era of history, “the present epoch will perhaps be above all the epoch of space.” He traces back the evolution of the notion of space in history, starting from the Middle Ages. In this period he finds a “hierarchic ensemble of places” originated around religion which led into oppositions such as “sacred” versus “profane places,” or “protected” versus “open, exposed places.” Foucault believes that the corresponding modern day oppositions, like “public and private space” or “social and family space,” are just an evolution of those medieval dichotomies since they “are still nurtured by the hidden presence of the sacred” (2). In the world of early modern London where Greenwich Park is set, that distinction is not so much related to religion as it is to
monarchy, since it was the institution which regulated not only the public, but also the private space to some extent.

5.2. The Urban Geography of Early Modern London

Studies of the urban geography of early modern London inevitably look back to sixteenth-century historian John Stow. His *Survey of London* (1598) offered a comprehensive view of the City, including detailed descriptions of each ward, its most distinctive buildings, their history, and an account of the activities and customs of Londoners. As Vanessa Harding (2004) has observed, Stow’s *Survey* is based on three themes: religious life in post-Reformation London, civic and business morality, and the importance of space to the experience of the city (435). In her discussion of the latter point, Harding offers a valuable survey of recent work on this notion and underlines the increasing interest in that area of study: “An awareness of the importance of space, and of the physical fabric of the city, to its inhabitants, seems now to be well ingrained. All the recent collections of essays on early modern London contain the word ‘space’ in one or more of their chapter-headings or divisions” (2004: 444), she explains.1 The experience of space in a comedy that foregrounds location from the very beginning, like Mountfort’s *Greenwich Park*, is indeed a topic that deserves scrutiny. The analysis must begin with a review of the spatial distribution of London at the time the play opened and of the radical transformation undergone by the metropolis in the course of the 17th century. This description will then serve as the basis for a consideration of the uses of space in early modern London and, finally, of the way in which those uses shape the interactions between the characters in *Greenwich Park* and configure Mountfort’s response to the changing socio-political conditions of his time.

1 Harding’s article “Recent Perspectives on Early Modern London” is relevant as an introduction to several studies of the topic based on an array of different theoretical paradigms, as she claims: “what is new in the discussion of space is mostly the use of new ideas or categories of analysis — theories of spatial practice, gender, modernity” (2004: 447).
5.2.1. The Expansion of London in the 17th Century: From the West End to Greenwich

The major change in early modern London’s geographical physiognomy, and consequently in its use of public and private spaces, was prompted by the enormous increase of population the city witnessed throughout the whole 17th century. The subsequent demand for space provoked an unprecedented expansion of the capital which redefined its spatial structure and had a profound impact on its social fabric. As Gregory and Urry have argued, spatial structure is “not merely an arena in which social life unfolds, but rather . . . a medium through which social relations are produced and reproduced” (3). Indeed, the frantic urban development of 17th century London accentuated social differentiations and imposed what we might call, to borrow Laura Williams term, a kind of “social zoning” (193). As Harding remarks: “While the medieval mix of rich and poor was never wholly eliminated, and almost all areas continued to include dwellings, and inhabitants, of several different kinds, the expansion of early modern London led to a new social topography, and a clearer east/west and centre/suburbs opposition” (2001: 131).

John Schofield has summarised London topography at the beginning of the 17th century in the following terms: “In outline by 1600, the West End functioned as a political and cultural focus around Westminster; financial and legal services were concentrated in the Fleet Street suburb and the City; and beyond to the east lay an area of industrial activity” (297). Throughout the century, London extended the built-up area on its fringes in two directions: an “outward sprawl” (Harding 2002: 566) northwards and westwards of the City walls first (beginning in the 1610s), and eastwards some decades later.

The expansion to the west was prompted by the gentry’s need for fresh places outside the City walls and had the Court at Westminster as the central pole of attraction. As Adam Zucker explains, in the late 1620s and early 1630s “a social and topographical reorganization of urban space” took place in London: many families of the nobility and
gentry started to spend their winters and early springs in the capital attracted by markets for “land, marriage, legal services and luxury goods” (106). The old City, however, could hardly offer suitable spaces to meet the demands for accommodation of the higher classes. It was characterised by hectic overcrowding and unsanitary conditions, “a claustrophobic, smoky, contagious urban atmosphere” with problems like “close streets and houses, human and animal waste disposal, spread of disease, and smoke pollution from the burning of sea coal,” as Laura Williams describes it (193). The citizen environment was known for this deprived and chaotic scramble of packed streets where open spaces and clear, flowing air were scarce. The gentry, instead, were used to the grander building standards and the open spaces of their country manors.

The undeveloped area to the west, between the City of London and Westminster, afforded these green open spaces. It also offered the additional benefit of proximity to the Court. The West End thus became the ideal location to erect the London residences of the gentry. In a few years, the site underwent a radical transformation and turned from arable land into an innovative urban centre. As Williams argues, the creation of open spaces was the key factor in the conception of this new development: “The more spacious, open feel to the building developments of the West End was enhanced by the laying out of squares, as landowners and developers identified and exploited the kudos of open space to contrast with the densely packed courts and alleys of poor-man’s London” (190). The most emblematic landmark of this process was the building of Covent Garden. Construction began in 1634 under the auspices of 4th earl of Bedford, who commissioned Inigo Jones to lay out the plans for the development of the area. Jones produced a

---

2 Restoration comedies attest to this association of London with the pollution caused by mineral coal fires. In Shadwell’s *Epsom Wells* (1672, 1673), one of the characters describes the capital as “that place of sin and sea-coal” (1.1.186-87). Lady Galliard, in Behn’s *The City Heiress* (1682), speaks derisively of a “City garden, where we walk to take the fresh Air of the Sea-coal-smoke” (2.2.142-43). A young girl in Tate’s *Cuckolds’ Haven* (1685) longs to be married to be taken away “from the scent of Sea-coal, and the hearing of Bow-Bell” (1.3, p.11).
revolutionary design: a central piazza in the Italian style, surrounded by rows of fine porticoed houses designed to host the gentry.

In order to differentiate it from the City and the Court, the newly-developed area came to be known as the Town although, as Zucker observes, it was not “simply a place” but “a socio-political form” that “materialised in bodily comportment, in a mannerly expression, in sophisticated relationships to commercial practices and, most pressingly of all, in lived urban spaces, such as the Covent Garden piazza” (107). Certainly, the piazza was in many ways the physical embodiment of the idea of the Town or, in Zucker’s words, “the entry point into the conceptual space of the Town” and its refinement (109). Nonetheless, the exclusiveness sought by the wealthy residents collided with the obvious public character of an open square: a piazza built in the Italian fashion was something unique in early modern England and it rapidly attracted Londoners from different social classes. They were drawn to Covent Garden by curiosity and business opportunities, since an entertainment industry (theatres, taverns, brothels, a vegetable market, etc.) soon spread in the proximities of the piazza. According to Zucker, these “elements of commerce, it seems, of labor in the literal sense of the word, interfered with the ways in which certain residents of the imagined space of the Town conceived of their own leisured place in the city” (117). The multiplicity of social classes intermingling in public space of Covent Garden led to a loss of the sophistication with which the site was originally conceived, and by the late 1670s their wealthy occupants began to look for other locations for their residences and entertainment.

If the West End was designed from the start as a genteel area, east of the City a burgeoning industry revolving around maritime activities, shipbuilding and warehousing had developed steadily since the early 16th century, when Henry VIII established the first Royal Dockyards in Deptford. The king’s decision turned the village into a crucial base of
the English naval exploration and trade, and the nearby suburbs downstream of Blackwell, Wapping and Ratcliffe into thriving harbours from where international voyages would depart. As Schofield points out, the shipbuilding industry both favoured and “mixed with residential development in the expansion of the East End” (315). In the second half of the 17th century, new impulse for the expansion of London both west and east was given by the disaster of the Great Fire of London in 1666. As T. F. Reddaway notes, “with four-fifths of its area burnt, it [the City] had to watch its citizens acquiring leases of suburban properties, setting up shops in the Strand, or moving down the river to the havens of Wapping and Deptford” (47).

Neighbouring Greenwich, however, developed in a very different way. Originally a Saxon fishing village on the south bank of the Thames called Grenevic—literally “green village”—Greenwich has always been related to court and nobility. A manor built in its vicinity had already been used as a royal residence as early as the year 1300. In 1417, King Henry V granted it and the nearby estate to his uncle, the Duke of Gloucester, who not only rebuilt it into a palace named Placentia, but also enclosed the estate into a park, inaugurating thus the fondness of English royalty for both the manor and its natural landscape (Willey 195). Influenced by the establishment of a royal residence in the site, the nobility and the gentry were also drawn to Greenwich. Thus, a number of manors built in the village in 11th and 12th centuries would be granted or sold to them as residences—like West-Combe and Spittle-Combe—and eventually also some villas adjoining the west side of Greenwich Park, such as Chesterfield House (Lysons).

Subsequent monarchs would enlarge the palace and make it a favourite site in the vicinity of London, among them Henry VIII, who was born there. The king celebrated his marriage with Katherine of Aragon in the palace, which in time would become one of the principal sites of the festivities for which his court was celebrated—including the first
masquerade ever seen in England, in 1515. His daughters Mary and Elizabeth were also born at Greenwich; the latter kept court in Placentia and especially enjoyed the entertainments which were celebrated in her honour in Greenwich Park in 1559. In the early 17th century, James I granted the palace to his wife Anne of Denmark, who started the building of the so called Queen’s House; it would be completed by Inigo Jones in 1635 for Queen Henrietta Maria, Charles I’s wife, but fell into decay during the Civil War (Willey 206).

After the Republican hiatus, under Charles II’s reign the palace and the park came again into the hands of the Crown. The king’s intervention would be decisive for the site: he laid out the present design of Greenwich Park, working on plans commissioned from famous landscape architect André Le Notre (Lysons). Pepys was impressed with the result, as he recorded in his diary: “the King hath planted trees and made steps in the hill up to the Castle, which is very magnificent” (11th April, 1662). Charles also sponsored the creation of the National Observatory on the hill of the park in 1676 and decided to pull the old palace down and build a glorious new one on its site. However, only one wing of the project was completed and no other progress was made until William and Mary’s accession to the throne (Lysons).³

The advent of William and Mary accelerated the decline of the Town, as the new monarchs launched a moral campaign against the debauchery of the previous regime and its iconic sites (see above pp.37-39). The geographical and emotional use of space was strategically exerted by William and Mary in their attempt to bury Charles’s legacy: from the late 1680s onwards the East End emerged as a fresh, uncorrupted alternative to the decaying west, from where even the Court had fled to Kensington. After all, places like Deptford and Greenwich offered this fashionable society the essential settings they had

³ The new monarchs projected an asylum for seamen and Sir Christopher Wren was appointed to build the Hospital of the Royal Navy using the unfinished palace of Greenwich. It first opened to pensioners in 1705 (Willey 207).
discovered in the West End some decades earlier: charming parks, gardens, and landscaped urban space, along with the admired wells of the area.

Examining the urban expansion of London in the 17th century, Harding concludes: “By 1680, ‘London’ had stretched east and west into a continuous and shapeless metropolis … extensive suburbs in central and east Southwark had begun to mirror the suburban spread on the north bank” (2001: 118). The importance acquired by the East End suburbs is reflected in their population increase: in the 1660s and 1670s Deptford (6,600 inhabitants) was one of the only five towns in South-East England with a population over 5,000—Oxford (9,000) and Canterbury (7,500) were among the others—and that its neighbouring Greenwich counted nearly 3,000 inhabitants, an equally remarkable number at the time (Chalklin 57).

5.2.2. The Experience of the City: Public and Private Spaces in Early Modern London

In order to analyse the opposition public versus private space specifically in early modern London, Vanessa Harding’s work is indispensable. In her essay “Space, Property and Propriety in Urban England” (2002), Harding builds on Lefebvre’s theory of urban space, applying it to an English context and, more specifically, to the history of London. Like Lefebvre, Harding highlights the intimate connection between the public and private space: “the urban public was physically shaped by the private spaces that surrounded and confined it, and the definition of one was dialectically related to the definition of the other” (2002: 549). Likewise, she also identifies a “marginal zone” (2002: 561) between both spaces, equivalent to Lefebvre’s “mixed” or “intermediate” areas: “‘Where did the public space end and private space begin?’ she asks (2002: 560). In addition, she introduces an interesting modulation in the debate, namely, the degree of “publicness” within public spaces, and of “privateness” within private spaces, as she asserts that “not all public spaces were equally public” (2002: 561).
In terms of the interaction between both notions, Harding describes them as “agents” immersed in a constant conflict: “Private uses invaded the public space, and the public interest restrained private owners’ freedom to act on, and modify, the space they considered their own” (2002: 550). That restraint was articulated through proclamations, like those issued by Charles I on building which, “in their attempts to standardise construction, go as far as to restrict the size, price and times of manufacture for bricks” (Zucker 113), or by royal regulations, like those forbidding shopkeepers “to set up stallboards or low overhanging signs in front of the property” (2002: 561).

Cynthia Wall dissects the notions of loss and rebuilding in post-Great Fire London from the perspective of cultural studies in *The Literary and Cultural Spaces of Restoration London* (1998). She articulates the second part of her work around a dichotomy which is quite significant for the purposes of this discussion: the narratives of public spaces (for instance, parks and shops) and the narrative of private spaces (houses and churches). Concerning the former topic, Wall points out that one of the central consequences of the Great Fire in terms of the experience of space in the City was the destruction of London’s “markers of public life,” which had to be reconstructed physically and symbolically since then: “The public structures that had marked differences and ordered social, political, economic and religious space had been consumed: the ‘public sphere’ itself need redefining as well as rebuilding” (148). But it was not only the notion of public space that needed to be reformulated: the changes experienced by London in the 17th century also affected the concept of private space.

---

4 As Picard notes, counters in the City “were not supposed to project more than 30 inches. If the upper part of the shutter was to form a roof over the open front, it had to clear 9 feet from the pavement, to enable riders on horseback to pass under it safely” (139).

5 As Wall notes, “private” is “not a self-evident category” (182). Although she concedes that the church is “most intuitively a public marker”, she points out that churches, as they appear in Restoration drama “masquerade as sexual spaces, as the sites for private intrigue” (183).
For Wall, “Restoration London was, in its social spheres, a place of parks, and in its economic expansion, a place of trade” (149). In other words, London of leisure —the Town— and London of business —the City— had their genuine public spaces: parks on the one hand, shops on the other, and both of them “caught new cultural and literal attention after the Fire” (149). Wall’s distinction inevitably places class at the heart of the analysis, pointing to the different ways in which the citizens and the gentry relate to the use of urban space. In general terms, while the gentry typically took their leisure in public places, the citizens tend to be associated with the use of private (or at least semi-private) spaces. However, clear-cut divisions do not apply easily. Public and private uses of space frequently overlap and classes intermingle at different levels.

Besides urban developments like Covent Garden, the higher classes in Restoration London could resort for their leisure to the public spaces of parks. Charles II re-opened private royal parks as green spaces for public amusement. Recreation, however, was not the only goal. After the Puritan constraints of the Cromwellian regime, a vogue for public display rose at the Restoration, with Charles II at the centre of that phenomenon. The king envisioned the possibilities of the park as a sort of “public stage on which to demonstrate his royal authority” (Pritchard 130) and thus many accounts portray him “moving freely among his subjects there,” where he made “himself visible and accessible” (131). The example set by the monarch was widely imitated. If the king enjoyed appearing and making himself “visible” in public places, the nobility and the gentry would pursue the opportunities to put themselves on display, too. Apart from providing a clean, idyllic retreat from the urban area within the walls, the newly-open public parks of the Town, as much as its fashionable squares, worked as a sort of stage where people went to watch others and to display themselves, in a sort of coded exhibition which could only take place in open, refined locations —the opposite to what the City and its citizens represented.
The dichotomy public/private applied to the political and social meanings of the park also generates interesting insights. The king’s decision of restoring both St. James’s and Hyde Park as public parks clashed with the restricted character with which these parks first originated: “The social ideal of the French garden … is the orderly, formal, regulated exhibition of the best people,” while “London parks were places where the best people were shown, but not as exclusively or with such regimentation as in Paris” (Pritchard 118). Moreover, as Wall observes, both the space of the park and its dramatic representation changed during the Restoration period: “The public spaces of the parks became more and more ‘public’ —that is, open to and inhabited by a wider swath of classes, not just the highest and lowest” (163). Indeed, there was an opening of the public parks to embrace not only the gentry (the main consumers of leisure) and the lower class that catered to their needs (as they usually established “a service industry” in the vicinity to supply food, drink and sex) but also and most importantly: the citizens. In other words, the private parks of London, originally restricted to royalty and the “best people,” evolved into public arena where social classes mixed and intermingled freely.

As opposed to the Town, the old City boasted few open spaces for leisure. Other than Moorfields and Lincoln’s Inn Fields, both outside the City walls, there were no ample green areas available for the citizens. The intramural public places were conceived for business (like the Old Exchange and the Stock market) or politics and administration (like the Guildhall), but not for amusement. The spaces more readily available for recreation in the City were of a semi-public nature: taverns and ale-houses. In the second half of the century the citizens would find their leisure “retreat” in a purely City-born

---

6 Moorfields, moreover, had an unsavoury reputation. In *Greenwich Park*, Sir Thomas mocks Sassafras’ readiness to wield a sword alluding to the illicit sexual encounters that the area had a reputation for: “Nay, if thou’rt so hot upon fighting, thou’rt no citizen I’m sure; and considering how captains and laced coats have been admired by shopkeepers’ wives, thou may’st be the hasty offspring of an afternoon’s recreation in Moorfields” (3.3.98-101).
institution: coffee-houses, whose nature was neither entirely public nor private, as by this time they normally held some restricted spaces which allowed greater privacy for certain costumers.7

The commercial activity of the inhabitants of the City was also played out in an environment that combined public and private uses. Thus, Harding comments on the “liminal” dimension of the City’s most representative public sites, like “the marketplace and high street” and on the double purpose they shared: public on the one hand, for they were “spacious areas common to the citizens and townspeople” where processions and pageants were normally celebrated (2002: 561), and private on the other, as “a wide range of private meetings and business dealings were sanctioned there” (2002: 561). Likewise in the shop, the archetypal domain of the citizen, Wall perceives the simultaneous coexistence of both spheres: “They are in some ways peculiar places, sites of overlap between public and private worlds, where private needs are publicly met, or public business is privately transacted…. Shops traditionally combined domestic and commercial spaces within one structure” (167-68). Like the typical citizen’s, Mr. Raison’s property in the play actually merges both public uses —his shop on the ground floor— and private —his lodgings and Sir Thos’s above— proving that, in terms of space, too solid categorizations are inapplicable.

Sir Thomas and Mr Raison’s living arrangements are illustrative of the changes imposed on the habits of Londoners and on their use of the different types of space by the spiralling population increase in the 17th century. Harding notes that the population expansion accelerated the demand for space and prompted the subdivision of blocks of ownership into smaller occupancy units (2002: 565). The scarcity of accommodation inflated prices and forced new arrangements: “the enlarged population had to be

7 Although in its original constitution the “typical coffee-house consisted of one single room (not several separate or private rooms, like the tavern),” by the 1680s its design evolved to contain one or more single rooms, resembling “traditional English tavern spaces” (Prieto-Pablos 2010: 57, 69).
accommodated in ways that challenged assumptions about the relationship of houses, households, and families. Large houses came to be occupied by numerous tenants, each with a single room, or even sharing rooms” (Harding 2002: 567). While many Londoners could not afford to live independently and had to resort to subletting, others like Sassafras made private space a marketable commodity. As Harding points out, this is a situation in which “notions of privacy and private space are bound to change” (2002: 566).

The constant subdivision of space in the City implied smaller units for living, as well as less room for yards and gardens. Consequently, “their occupants relied more on the public space for amenities, and on semipublic institutions like taverns and alehouses for food, drink, sociability. Early modern city dwellers may have been on the street more than their recent predecessors” (Harding 2002: 566). Act 1, scene 3 of Greenwich Park proves so. Mr. Raison and Mr. Sassafras meet with Sir Thomas in his lodgings and they cheerfully recollect their previous night’s celebrations in the streets of London. Furthermore, at the end of the act the company decides to go out to commemorate Mr. Raison’s birthday, to which they invite Lord Worthy and Young Reveller. As Harding observes, social gatherings and celebrations within the City were rarely held in private residences; instead, they took place outside in public, or semipublic, spaces. Things were different beyond the City walls, though: in the suburbs and villages the “idea of public space, of common access and entitlement was much weaker … than in the center” (2002: 566), and although people obviously spent time on the street and other public locations, they still preserved a certain sense of privacy. Likewise, in the new East and West Ends there were not only much “better building standards” (2002: 566), but also more room to build larger private dwelling places than the chaotic jerry-built units of the City. In fact, the masked ball which closes the play is held in Lady Hazard’s lodgings, in Greenwich.
5.2.3. Public Spaces, Display and Gender

Under the paradigm of gender studies, Will Pritchard’s *Outward Appearances: The Female Exterior in Restoration London* (2008) approaches the presence and representation of women in notable public places of Restoration London —such as the playhouses, the parks or the New Exchange— and reaches relevant conclusions for the debate on public versus private posed in this chapter. In his study of the female display in the theatre (both as part of the cast and as part of the audience), Pritchard points out that “the playhouse intentionally confounded distinctions between authentic and counterfeit, legible and unknowable, and public and private” (82).

In the case of the actress and the effect her display provoked in the audience, Pritchard describes it as “the actress/role confusion”: the spectators merged the character of the actress in her real life with that of the role she was performing, identifying her with the stage characters she represented. A sort of equation was assumed between her public exposition as an actress and the privacy of her own life. Besides, there was a relatively obvious consequence of the actresses’ exposure in the theatrical performances: they were the locus of male voyeurism, and by extension, they turned into the object of male desire. In consonance with this female lure, the association between actress and prostitute was inevitable on the Restoration stage: “a Restoration audience found it doubly easy to equate the actress with prostitute: her job demanded that she present her body, feign desire, and display this divided female identity; her profession required that she regenerate, possess, and sell a series of provisional selves” (Lowenthal 114).

A somehow similar phenomenon occurred right across the stage. The female spectator blended her private nature as an individual watcher of a play with her public

---

8 A classic study of the interface between actor and role can be found in Peter Holland’s *The Ornament of Action* (1979). The representation of women in the theatre and the position of the actress as the target of the male gaze are discussed by Jean Marsden, *Fatal Desire: Women, Sexuality, and the English Stage, 1660-1720* (2006).
display within the audience: she went to the playhouse to watch and to be watched. Women in the audience were, much like the actresses, sexual objects watched— and desired— by the male spectator. In turn, they acted out their part seeking to control the image they project; in Pritchard’s words: “The female playgoer is transformed into an actress who needs to register visibly … the nature of her character” (104). Vanbrugh’s *The Provoked Wife* introduces an amusing dialogue in 3.3 in which two women comment on their awareness of the male gaze upon them in the playhouse and discuss their strategies for self-display:

**LADY BRUTE:** Why then, I confess that I love to sit in the forefront of a box. For if one sits behind, there’s two acts gone perhaps before one’s found out. And when I am there, if I perceive the men whispering and looking upon me, you must know I cannot for my life forbear thinking they talk to my advantage. And that sets a thousand little tickling vanities on foot—

**BELLINDA:** Just my case for all the world; but go on.

**LADY BRUTE:** I watch with impatience for the next jest in the play, that I may laugh and show my white teeth. If the poet has been dull, and the jest be long a-coming, I pretend to whisper one to my friend, and from thence fall into a little short discourse, in which I take occasion to shew my face in all humours, brisk, pleased, serious, melancholy, languishing. Not that what we say to one another causes any of these alterations, but— (3.3.54–67)⁹

Lady Brute and Bellinda confess to practicing facial expressions in front of their mirrors in preparation for their act at the playhouse (3.3.72–77), but female display in public places

---

⁹ In *Greenwich Park*, Mr. Sassafras also reflects on the dangers of female display in public places: “had I any children, they should never go to a playhouse nor to church. . . . because they go to learn wickedness at the one and hypocrisy, how to dissemble it, at the other” (3.3.34–38).
inevitably generates anxiety as the ribald tone of many comedies clashes with accepted notions of modesty:

BELLINDA: . . . But my glass and I could never yet agree what face I should make when they come blurt out with a nasty thing in a play. For all the men presently look upon the women, that’s certain; so laugh we must not, though our stays burst for’t, because that’s telling truth, and owning we understand the jest. And to look serious is so dull, when the whole house is a laughing.

LADY BRUTE: Besides, that looking serious, does really betray our knowledge in the matter, as much as laughing with the company would do. For if we did not understand the thing, we should naturally do like other people.

BELLINDA: For my part I always take that occasion to blow my nose.

(3.3.77-89)

In order to “safeguard female innocence by shielding women from a play’s jests or a spectator’s gaze” (Pritchard 106), women could resort to wearing vizard masks in the playhouse. The fashion originated in the reign of Charles I, but proved equally popular after the Restoration. Pepys provides a useful account regarding it:

At noon to the Exchange and so home to dinner, and abroad with my wife by water to the Royall Theatre; and there saw “The Committee,” a merry but indifferent play, only Lacey’s part, an Irish footman, is beyond imagination. Here I saw my Lord Falconbridge, and his Lady, my Lady Mary Cromwell, who looks as well as I have known her, and well clad; but when the House began to fill she put on her vizard, and so kept it on all the play; which of late is become a great fashion among the ladies, which hides their whole face. So
to the Exchange, to buy things with my wife; among others, a vizard for
herself. (12th June 1663)

To some extent, vizards helped women to protect their privacy when they appeared in
public places. Yet, even though the mask preserved anonymity, it piqued male curiosity at
the same time, since “it served as a provocation as well as a prohibition” (Pritchard 107).
The ambivalent function of the mask satisfied those “women who wished to provoke male
curiosity and appetite, and thus masks began to be closely associated with prostitutes”
(107). The Prologue to Greenwich Park identifies masks and prostitutes and portrays them
plying their trade in semi-public spaces: “And for the masks who hunt the smaller fry,
/Their chocolate-house will their wants supply” (11-12).

Public display of women was not exclusive to the playhouse, though: they were
openly visible in the most recognised Restoration parks, such as St. James's and Hyde
Park. In the same way as Covent Garden piazza attracted abundant visitors and commerce
opportunities proliferated in the vicinity, the park started to be perceived not only as a
place of pleasure, but also of business, as Pritchard explains, “taken one way, this might
imply prostitution: women selling themselves as at a market, making a business of men’s
sexual pleasure. Construed more innocently, it simply means that the park was one site
where courtship took place” (123). Either as a prostitute or as an elegant lady, the display
of women in the park roused male desire, as in the playhouse. Yet, this public exposure to
other men's gaze may also have provoked anxiety in their husbands or lovers, as this
excerpt from Greenwich Park proves. As Mr. Raison informs his friends that his wife is
gone to Greenwich, Sir Thomas Reveller sternly warns him: “Egad, if she [Mrs. Raison]
were mine, I should be loath to trust her in such public places as thou dost, as Epsom,
Islington Wells, and Greenwich Park. And if I were a young fellow, my mouth would so
water at her” (1.3.84-86). This anxiety explains that even very close friends such as
Reveller and Worthy should try to hide their mistresses from each other, as is the case with Dorinda. In fact, their lack of mutual trust is the circumstance which eventually will trigger her cheating on both.

Perhaps influenced by the fashion in the playhouses, the presence of masked women became gradually more recurrent in the park. The wearing of vizards sought to preserve privacy in the public sphere, but it also favoured the inversion of social roles: “Just as some women used masks and coaches to appear greater than they were, the queen and others used them to escape their noble identities” (Pritchard 137). Women participated in a game of fake and real appearances, of mistaken public identities and concealed private drives. In Etherege’s *She Would if She Could* (2.1) Ariana and Gatty don vizards to walk in the Mulberry Garden, and in Wycherley’s *Love in a Wood* women use masks to pursue their intrigues in St James’s Park and the Old Pall Mall. In 4.2 of *Greenwich Park* Florella and Violante on the one hand, and Mrs. Raison on the other, enter masked onstage with intent to spy on Young Reveller while keeping their faces concealed. However “despite the civil uses it served, the mask was more often depicted as a badge of cunning rather than of modesty,” and thus, the equation masked woman/prostitute developed unsurprisingly (Pritchard 129). Florella is aware that their vizards will attract men immediately: “our shifting of clothes may conceal us, and I am resolved to tease him and all the fools that talk to me this morning, as far as the spleen of a jealous mistress can reach,” she says (4.2.17-19). Indeed, they are immediately approached by Sir William Thoughtless and his comrade: “Bounce, come along, ha! A brace of tight lasses yonder, let’s make up to ’em.” (4.2.2-23).

Pritchard concludes his discussion outlining some of the reasons why the park proved to be such a useful setting for Restoration dramatists. First, “it was an open, public location” where characters from different social classes could meet or run into each
other (141); also, the strolls at night and the fashion for masks among women “abetted
the inevitable mistaken identities” (141); and finally, by using the park as a setting, the
playwright is provided with an opportunity to portray London life (141). A man of theatre
as he was, Montfourt understood the dramatic possibilities that the park offered and
decided to set his play in one of the green spaces that was replacing the former
fashionable ones of the Town: Greenwich Park.

5.3. Greenwich Park and the Genre of Topographical Comedy

By setting his play in an actual, recognizable location, and by giving the setting
such preeminence, Montfort inserts his work in the tradition of topographical comedy, a
genre that makes location the chief centre of interest in the play. According to Richard
Perkinson, the defining trait of this dramatic form —and the source of its appeal— is
precisely that it “brings into literature the life of some actual, specific place” and displays
“the manners of the people who frequent those places or the intrigues for which the
localities were thought characteristic” (270), therefore portraying plots and characters
both expected and recognizable to the spectators. Perkinson’s view of the genre has been
refined, among others, by Adam Zucker, who analyses the interaction between comic
form and space in the early modern comedy.10 For Zucker, the interest of comedies set in
fashionable, recognizable locations goes beyond mere “topographical mimeticism” (20).
As he argues, the representation of place is more than “a show-business trick designed
mainly to inspire and manipulate the pleasure of recognition in the audience” (20).
Though he does not deny the pleasure that audiences would derive from the recreation of

---

10 Zucker relies on spatial practice theories to observe how the notion of “wit” was created within
specific places, like Windsor Forest (in Shakespeare’s The Merry Wives of Windsor), Covent Garden
or Hyde Park (in Caroline comedy) and how those real scenarios participated in the articulation of
that notion in drama. Although his work does not analyse comedies beyond the 1630s, it provides
a particularly interesting study of Covent Garden and of its implication in those Town comedies
set in the newly-built piazza, some of whose conclusions may also be applied to the Restoration
comic genre.
familiar sites, he argues that the depiction of genteel manners in fashionable locations “opened up spaces of political inquiry” from which the audience might “critique the monarchy” (20-21), question genteel mores or the socio-political changes unfolding around them.

The tradition of topographical comedy had been inaugurated on the English stage nearly one century earlier with popular comedies set in the City of London like by Dekker and Webster’s *Westward Ho* (1604) and *Northward Ho* (1605), and had gloriously continued with pieces like Jonson’s *Bartholomew Fair* (1615). In the 1630s, topographical comedy moved west. A series of three plays produced in 1632 (Nabbes’s *Covent Garden*, Brome’s *The Weeding of Covent Garden* and Shirley’s *Hyde Park*) are all set in the Town, which by then was becoming the new area of power and influence in London. After the Restoration, playwrights continued to exploit the possibilities offered by the genre and decided to take their characters out of the privacy of the drawing-room to place them in public parks and green spaces of the Town, like Wycherley’s *St. James’s Park, or Love in a Wood* (1671) and J.D.’s *The Mall* (1674).

As Cynthia Wall has observed, while the Elizabethan and Jacobean comedies “featured the City” (between 1580 and 1642 there were over one hundred plays set in London), Restoration comedy “would run from the City” (153), and use instead locations in the Town and its archetypal sites: Covent Garden, Pall Mall or the New Exchange. Parks also became a recurrent setting, especially after the Great Fire. Iconic playwrights —Etherege, Wycherley, Shadwell, Congreve— set some of their plays in the “untouched (if not old) spaces of St. James’s Park and Hyde Park,” which represented “a retreat into the

---

11 Covent Garden was a favourite location for comedies produced especially in the 1660s and 1670s, for instance James Howard’s *The English Monsieur* (1663, 1674), Dryden’s *Sir Martin Mar-All* (1667; 1668), Ravenscroft’s *The Careless Lovers* (1673), Wycherley’s *The Country Wife* (1675), Durfey’s *Madam Fickle* (1676; 1677) or Behn’s *The Tow Fop* (1676; 1677). Pall Mall is used as the setting for a scene in Crowne’s *The Country Wit* (1675) and the New Exchange in *She Would if She Could* (1668) and *The Country Wife*. 
known, the secure, the green spaces of uninterrupted social life” (Wall 149). Besides the two large royal parks, the Mulberry Garden, the Spring Garden, or the Mall offered the dramatists additional green spaces to serve as the background for the encounters and adventures of their characters.

Nonetheless, as noted above, after Charles II’s death “the public parks in general slipped into what some perceived as a steady social decline” (Wall 166), and upon William and Mary’s arrival three years later the Town was definitely abandoned by the fashionable high class and the court. The noble past of Greenwich, its long-standing connection with the nobility and gentry and the manor houses to be found in the area attracted numerous “exiled” Town people who sought to recover their former exclusivity in leisure and residence. In terms of recreation, too, Deptford Wells and Greenwich Park were coming into vogue for Londoners at the end of the century, gradually supplanting other spas such as Epsom and Islington, and the Town parks, like St. James’s and Hyde Park. But along with the nobility and the gentry, at the end of the 17th century the flourishing citizens were also drawn to the East End, if not to be established permanently in the vicinity, at least to intermingle with its distinguished new occupants and to enjoy the pleasures that the park, the wells and the rest of the place offered. Hence, in the London at and after William and Mary’s accession, three key geopolitical phenomena were taking place almost

---

12 St James’s Park is a prominent location in Wycherley’s *Love in a Wood* (1671, 1672), Shadwell’s *The Scourers* (1691), Congreve’s *The Old Bachelor* (1693) and *The Way of the World* (1700), while Etherege’s *The Man of Mode* (1676) places a scene in the northern walk of the Park, the Mall. Hyde Park is often mentioned in Restoration comedies as a recreational site, though not so often used as a setting.

13 Sedley’s *The Mulberry Garden* (1668) is set in the eponymous space, while Etherege’s *She Would if She Could* (1668) locates part of the action in both the Mulberry Garden and the Spring Garden. J.D.’s *The Mall* and Otway’s *Friendship in Fashion* (1677) have this walk as their chief setting.

14 In addition to his taste for the theatre and the parks, Charles II, especially in the early years of his reign, had initiated the vogue for spas: “many people (the aristocracy and the gentry, and also to a certain extent the London citizenry) developed a special taste for springs delivering mineral or thermal water… Such resorts were commonly known as “spas” (Prieto-Pablos et al., xliii). On spas and their literary representation in the Restoration period, see Gómez-Lara 2002.
simultaneously: the physical and moral exodus from the Town, the consolidation of Greenwich and the East End, and the emergence of the revalued citizens.

Mountfort, like his contemporaries, was a witness to those social and geographical relocations and realised that the best scenario to portray them was precisely Greenwich and its Park. In his comedy, members of the higher classes such as Lady Hazard reside in the area. Like other “people of quality,” she presumably abandoned the Town to settle in the East End with her daughters. In addition, Young Reveller also lodges in Greenwich, kept by Mrs. Raison, while Dorinda and her aunt dwell in Deptford, at Lord Worthy’s costly expense, to name a few examples of East End inhabitants in the play. As a matter of fact, Mountfort’s play does not contain a single scene set in the Town. Acts 2 to 5 take place in Greenwich or Deptford and, even though Act 1 is set in the City, that is in fact a temporary setting the characters transit as they repair towards the East End. As the play opens, Mrs. Raison is leaving the City for Greenwich:

MRS. RAISON: Are all my things carried to the water-side, sirrah?

SERVANT: Yes, madam, and the galley with an awning is ready to carry your ladyship to Greenwich. (1.1.1-2)

In scene 2, Young Reveller is merely passing through the City on his way to the East End when he runs into Lord Worthy at Tower Hill. He suggests they celebrate their encounter in the New Exchange area: “I was just going to Greenwich; but if you please, we’ll go back to the ’Change, pick up an honest fellow or two, and dine at The Rummer in Queen Street” (1.2.33-35). When Lord Worthy asks about the “famous houses about Covent Garden and Charing Cross,” Reveller’s response is almost elegiac:

15 Despite her past as a court-laundress or the fact that her husband used to be Lord Mayor of London (4.2.201-02), Lady Hazard is a current member of the higher classes and her daughters a suitable matrimonial target for the male leads in the play.
Faith, my lord, they are mightily degenerated since Strephon the wise, the witty, and the gay, and the prince of all company, as well as all hearts, forsook us. Those that are left of that glorious society are retired from the world and mourn the remembrance of their lost companions. (1.2.37-42)\textsuperscript{16}

Mountfort uses this accidental encounter as an excuse for a symbolical farewell to the Town, both physically and emotionally.

The final scene of Act 1 takes place in Sir Thos’s lodgings in the City. Once more, the setting is significant as it represents a decisive geopolitical change that is taking place at the time: the gentry (Sir Thomas) are moving away from the West End and some of them are settling in the intramural area. Accordingly, the City and its dwellers are portrayed from a more respectable and positive perspective as the century draws to a close. This will facilitate the social rapprochement between the gentlemen and citizens which is depicted in the play.

5.3.1. Space and Class in \textit{Greenwich Park}

The eastward relocation of the spaces for leisure ran parallel to another two processes of reconfiguration which involved the City—at an urban physical level—and the citizen—in a socio-political dimension. As the century unfolded, playwrights moderated the traditional harsh characterization of both, to such an extent that in the early 1700s the City recovered part of the role it used to play in the Pre-Restoration City comedy. In regard to the citizens, they “were becoming richer, more powerful, more upwardly mobile, and more frequent theatre-goers. Drama shifted from mocking the Cits to essentially inviting them in” (Wall 163). This statement accurately describes the

\textsuperscript{16} The association of the death of Strephon—the Earl of Rochester (see note to 1.2.39)—with the decline of the Town underlines the identification between this area of London and the debauchery of the court of Charles II. The disappearance of the Court Wits and the advent of the new regime had put an end to the former splendour of Covent Garden and the surrounding area.
situation of the two citizen characters in *Greenwich Park*: Mr. Raison and Mr. Sassafras, particularly the former. As noted above (pp.71-72) the citizen was no longer the Restoration comedy greedy, gullible puritan, constantly mocked and severely punished throughout the play. On the contrary, although at times he is still partly ridiculed (he keeps on being cuckolded, for instance) the citizen is now depicted in a less prejudiced and more tolerant manner: Raison and Sassafras may be coxcombs, like Sir Thomas, but the three of them are good natured and their foibles are treated indulgently. The caricature of the citizen has given way to a more respectable portrayal of a middle class whose social and economic prominence was beyond doubt.

*Greenwich Park*, in fact, depicts a process of assimilation between the gentry and the wealthy citizens. The evolution in the characterization of the citizen is articulated at different levels in the play. He remains committed to the public service of his fellow citizens through the Common Council, as Sir Thomas notes when introducing Raison and Sassafras to Lord Worthy: “Pray, be pleased to know my landlord Raison and his neighbour Mr. Sassafras, a drugster, ingenious men both, particular members of the Common Council and in all private affairs consulted for the good of the public” (1.3.118-21). Both characters are defined by their money-making occupations and by their association with the governing body of the City. But the play soon makes clear that both aim at mimicking the lifestyle of the gentry, beginning with their external appearance and the activities they engage in for recreation. Mrs. Raison makes this clear when she rebukes her husband: “You can now wear the best fashion and richest clothes, swords upon occasion; come drunk to a playhouse; pick up whores at the chocolate-house; be bubbled by sharpers at ordinaries” (1.1.66-68).

The assimilation of the citizens to the higher classes is made possible since Mr. Raison and Mr. Sassafras have wealth and, more importantly, free time to spend it.
Actually, leisure time has always been a more relevant social marker than wealth itself to differentiate the gentry from the rest of the social strata. The two citizens in Greenwich Park spend more time in roaring than in business. As a matter of fact, there is scarce reference to their commercial activities, and their portrait resembles more that of a rakish figure than the conventional City tradesman or merchant. As the conversation between Sassafras and Sir Thomas in Act 1 shows, the citizens surpass the gentlemen in debauchery:

MR. SASSAFRAS: Ah, Sir Thomas . . . indeed we roared mightily, were very merry, and bumpered it about cheerfully; ad, my neighbour Raison the grocer was pure and wicked after you left us.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Aye!

MR. SASSAFRAS: Aye, fackings.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Why, prithee? What did you? For I went home at nine of the clock.

MR. SASSAFRAS: Why, we were delicious and lewd, and had a mind to play some of your Covent Garden tricks and court diversions. And Mr. Billet the woodmonger goes home very drunk and, like a true gentleman, kicked his wife and went to bed to his maid. (1.3.49-59)

Raison and Sassafras, together with the other characters in the play, choose for their recreation the green areas east of London, which fulfilled the same function as the West End locations they were trying to replace: they were spaces of public and open display where the fashionable high class enjoyed their leisure, where they intermingled with their peers, where they went, in conclusion, both to see others and parade themselves. In Mountfort’s play there are a number of references to the idea of public
exhibition in the Park, for instance when Sir Thomas Reveller approaches a masked lady as he rambles near Deptford Wells:

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: How d’you, miss? Do you come to take the waters in hopes of being fruitful, or to destroy some unlawful conception?

MASK: Neither, I came to satisfy my sight with Sir Thomas Reveller.

SIR THOMAS REVELLER: With me, child? Egad I’m a noun-substantive, and am to be seen, felt, heard or understood. (4.2.290-94)

Besides the purpose of self-display, which is promptly recognised by the Mask in her reply to Sir Thomas, the open space of the park afforded ample opportunity for assignations or chance encounters which might lead to the courtship game. Sir Thomas quickly moves in that direction in his conversation with the Mask: “prithee child, let’s walk off a little, and be better informed of each other” (4.2.294-95). However, the public nature of the space is not without risk, as encounters are open to the scrutiny of other strollers. Thus, when Dorinda in a middle of a repartee with Young Reveller realises they are too exposed in the park, she compels him to meet her somewhere else: “You speak like a man of honour, sir, but we are observed; you must dine with me today” (4.2.211-12).

However, whereas gentlemen and ladies were at ease in the open and sophisticated spaces where they could enjoy their leisure as they exhibited themselves, citizens were better used to the closed, private spaces of the urban milieu. In a public and fashionable space like Greenwich Park in the play, citizens are partly out of their depth and often end up being ridiculed.\(^{17}\) When Mr. Raison and Mr. Sassafras try to approach the gay ladies in 4.2, they are punished as poor connoisseurs of the courtship code in a park:

---

\(^{17}\) As Dawson notes, “If there is a single, defining trait in the characterization of the citizen in Restoration comedy it is that he is portrayed as socially maladroit and out of place” (30).
VIOLANTE: You, sir? Why, who are you?

MR. SASSAFRAS: Who am I, madam? A reverend alderman of the City of London.

VIOLANTE: What, one that lends money upon acts of parliament, manages juries in your ward, and snacks with the sheriff, give courtiers credit in hopes of getting employments, bribe Common-Council men, cheat orphans, and sponge dinners all the year round at my Lord Mayor’s table? (4.2.151-56)

The citizens finally acknowledge that they are out of their depth attempting to engage in refined courtship in a public park. Mr. Sassafras then suggests they both return to their environment: the City and the safe, familiar semi-privacy of the coffee-room and tavern: “Prithee, Raison, let’s give over making love; ad’s heart, a citizen making love is as ridiculous as a parson making legs; I’ll go to the coffee-room, smoke a pipe, and drink a glass of mum” (4.2.177-79).

It is not strange then that the citizen duo should become the stronger defenders of privacy in Greenwich Park. The scene in Young Reveller’s lodgings is quite illustrative: the rake is about to spend the night with Mrs. Raison but suddenly Sir Thomas Reveller bursts in accompanied by Mr. Raison and Mr. Sassafras. Young Reveller begs them for help —“Nay, pray sir. Mr. Raison and Mr. Sassafras, I conjure you by the worth and honour of citizens, stand by me and keep my father out” (3.3.67-68)— and the two citizens, despite their drunkenness, prevent Sir Thomas from invading his son’s private space/room. The obvious irony is that in his zeal for preserving Young Reveller’s privacy, Mr. Raison is in fact allowing the rake to assault his own, for it his wife who is in Reveller’s chamber. Mountfort satirises the citizens’ obsession through Sir Thos’s sharp, and prophetic, warning and Mr. Raison’s reply:
SIR THOMAS REVELLER: Why, you cuckoldy dog, it may be your own wife for ought you know.

MR. RAISON: I care not if it were my mother and he were getting an heir to disinherit me, he shall not be interrupted; and though I am as it were dead drunk, yet I will stand by him, I say I will stand by him. (3.3.83-87)

This interaction between the two spheres, the public and the private, is recurrent throughout the play: at times in the form of coexistence, and on other occasions as a conflict in which one of them attempts to invade the other, like in the excerpt above, or in the final scene in Dorinda’s house (see below p.238-39).

Mrs. Raison’s interest is opposed to her husband’s: she wishes to replace the privacy of the City for the company and sophistication of Greenwich and its fashionable dwellers. The fact that she is a gentlewoman by birth may explain her fascination for exposing herself in public to “outshine the best of all the City” (1.1.22). When her husband reproaches her expense in keeping a galley rowed by four men, she retorts: “Yes, a barge with twelve, if I had my will. Must I jolt about in a hackney or traipse afoot like my inferior neighbours? Since you’ll make no distinction of me at land, I’ll make some myself by water” (1.1.8-10). Yet, her inability to distinguish properly between public and private spheres makes her lose Young Reveller to Florella, as his conversation with Lord Worthy reveals:

YOUNG REVELLER: . . . But indeed, Mrs. Raison was the person who first presented me to the family, for she boards in the same house with ’em.

LORD WORTHY: And thou hast well rewarded her. I wonder at the humour of women, that can’t have a handsome young fellow without the vanity of showing him. Had she never brought you into better
company, then her own discretion had kept what her folly has lost.

(2.3.26-31)

5.3.2. Public and Private Identities

The public-private tension also surfaces in the interactions among characters, who are persistently trapped between the external facade they want to project and their private lives and intentions. Mr. Raison, for example, suspects that his wife is cuckolding him, although he prefers to cope with that in private rather than repudiate her and consequently expose himself to everyone’s mockery: “All married men must stand to their wives’ mercy and if I should be one, I have so much sense as not to make a noise about what I cannot help, and had rather be a private plague to myself than a public jest to the world.” (1.3.88-91). In the case of Young Reveller, he pretends to live like a gentleman when in reality Mrs. Raison is keeping him, as his humorous father denies him the means to get by in the higher social levels: “As long as the world knows he is a gentleman, what’s matter for his living like one?” (1.3.155-56), Sir Thomas grumbles.

Feigning is not exclusive of the male characters in Greenwich Park: although impelled by different motivations, women in the play likewise move between their outer appearances, which they display in the public spaces, and their real inclinations, or private identities. In a shockingly forthright introduction speech, Florella complains, to her sister’s wonder, of the constraints that “the rules of honour” impose upon virtuous gentlewomen such as they are, while those women with “less grace” have open access to the enjoyments of male company:

FLORELLA: … Hang him, he has more mistresses to divert himself with.

These young fellows that run at all value nobody any longer than they’re with ’em. Well, virtuous women, when once they’re in love, should never let the man stir out of their sight till they’ve made him
sure, for we set the devil a-dancing in 'em; and because we won’t comply without matrimony, they meet while they’re eager some kind she that has less grace, which reaps the fruit of our labour.

VIOLANTE: Fie, how you talk!

FLORELLA: Fie, how I talk! Why, you think the same and so does the whole sex.

VIOLANTE: Have you no regard to virtue?

FLORELLA: Yes, as long as virtue has any regard to me. Prithee, let us not affect that nicety when we’re alone which we assume in public. (2.1.5-15)

Besides, they both conceal their actual social origin, although Dorinda seems to know it well enough. When Florella attempts to disparage her character pointing to the rumpled state of her gown, Dorinda strikes back with a vengeance: “‘Tis whiter now than ever your mother washed, and finer than ever her children wore when the father was Lord Mayor and made ’em ride in his pageants to save charges.” Florella’s astonishment shows that the barb has hit home: “Devil, does she know us?” (4.2.239-42).

Nonetheless, Dorinda is not a model of ingenuousness, either. Her background as a servant’s daughter is much more discreditable in terms of social class, although she manages to keep it hidden from the rest of the characters, except logically from her keeper, Lord Worthy. Maintained by this character, Dorinda has been living with her aunt in the secluded space of her house: “These four years to the world I’ve lived a nun” (2.2.59). When she leaves that safe, private environment and enters the public space of

18 Dorinda tells Young Reveller: “Their father was Lord Mayor of London, their mother I hear was a court-laundress, and being given to blab betrayed the intrigue of a great man to his wife, and was cashiered, but having purchased an interest for former service, got Hazard knighted, and married him” (4.2.201-04).
Deptford Wells, she accesses the scenario-stage of open display that public parks constituted. There, she presents herself dressed as a woman “of quality” and both sees —“Fond of a sight, I forced thee to the Wells” (2.2.65)— and is seen. Once Young Reveller meets her, he mistakes her real identity and becomes so infatuated that he considers replacing Florella with Dorinda: “If this lady should convince me she is honest, and has a fortune, I might be fool enough to love her in good earnest; and that would be a rascally trick to Florella; she has youth, wit, beauty and money; this has youth, more wit, and beauty, and may have more money” (4.3.1-4).

Dorinda’s disguise of her real identity gives her a crucial role in the play: she becomes the blocking element of the love plot between Young Reveller and Florella. Unlike many Restoration comedies, where the parental figure represented the obstacle for the gay couple’s marriage, Mountfort grants a woman that function. When left alone onstage, Reveller confesses the depth of his passion for Dorinda: “By heaven, I cannot leave her! / There’s something from her which has touched me nearly” (3.1.171-72). He even admits that, contrary to his rakish inclinations, he may feel prone to love constancy: “What the devil ails me! Or does the devil govern me? My blood’s quite altered and those loose desires, which never liked but for conveniency, are changed to real passion; my wanton drunkenness turned to a sober admiration and I begin to fear I’m growing a downright dull, insipid, constant lover!” (3.1.210-13).

In the same way as the citizens are unable to completely adapt to classy public settings —for which they end up being penalised— Dorinda is out of her milieu when she leaves her house. Even though her machinations succeed at the beginning, at the end of the play she will be severely punished for invading the public space disguising her identity. Symbolically, whereas the play’s main conflict arises in a public place, such as the Wells at Deptford, it is resolved in Dorinda’s private space. What is more, just as Dorinda
performed an invasion from a private to a public sphere, the play concludes with a public intrusion on a private property: all the main characters burst into her lodgings, turning the place into a sort of stage where they act as spectators/witnesses of her anagnorisis. It is Lord Worthy, out of revenge, who unveils his former mistress’ identity, provoking her fall and humiliation: “Nay, not so fast, good madam, we’ll part with witness, though we met with none. Sir Thomas, will you enter?” (5.3.64-65).

The uses of public and private spaces thus play a central role in Mountfort’s comedy, but not only by framing and defining the love intrigues conducted by the characters. The setting of the park, in the East End, also conveys Mountfort’s response to the new monarchs’ social and moral reforms. To the recognizable portrait of a contemporary place and the people who frequented it, topographical comedies normally couple a reflection on the society they expose onstage —the best example perhaps being Bartholomew Fair. In his comparison between Jacobean and Caroline topographical comedies, Paul W. Miller (1990) presents a couple of interesting observations. First, while the Jacobean comedies “assert the viability of the established order,” in his view the Caroline ones “generally point up, through the role assigned the gentry in them, the need for a restructuring of power in Charles’s England” (347-48). Extending this reflection to the late 17th century, it may be argued that Greenwich Park welcomes the new regime by rejecting, with nostalgia to some degree, the old days of Charles II’s court. Secondly, Miller reflects on the type of social clash portrayed in each of the two types of comedies he analyses: “the Jacobean examples are much more concerned with conflicts between citizens and gentry than are their Caroline counterparts” where “though the jockeying for power between citizens and gentry continues … the main thrust of conflict is between the gentry and the Court” (349). Greenwich Park, on the other hand, represents the new social reality of the late 17th century; consequently, more than class conflict, the play provides class reconciliation between citizens and gentry. Lastly, the setting also illustrates the
evolution of this subgenre to adapt to geographical and socio-political fluctuations. Thus, topographical comedy moves from the urban setting of the City in the Jacobean period to the “attractive suburban areas like the newly built residences of Covent Garden” in the Caroline and Carolean ages. After the advent of William and Mary, *Greenwich Park* replaces the decadent Town of the 1680s with the fresh fashionable East End of the late 17th century.
6. Conclusions

The critical edition of *Greenwich Park* is the core and the main object of the present dissertation. The modern-spelling text and its annotation seek to make accessible an amusing Restoration comedy which has been unfairly ignored by scholars. The purpose, in short, is to offer a modern reader broadly defined—from the student to the theatre-lover—the necessary tools to facilitate the pleasure of reading this piece. But along with the revised text, this work provides also a thorough analysis of two key concepts which give *Greenwich Park* much of its distinctive character. On the one hand, the way in which the comedy articulates processes of evolution and transition on several, interrelated levels: literary models, social mores, geopolitical displacement and moral values. On the other hand, the way in which it exposes the tensions between the notions of the public and the private.

Mountfort’s play moves between two worlds in a constant progress which takes place in different spheres. Firstly, at a literary level, *Greenwich Park* occupies a transitional space between the old hard comedy and the new humane comedy of the early 1690s, blending elements from both traditions. Mountfort creates a remarkable gallery of characters and situations drawn halfway between both comic forms, so that the archetypical satiric elements in *Greenwich Park* evolve, without fully crystalizing, into the sentimental mode. The particular version the play offers of the “rake’s progress” is a good example: in spite of his initial misdemeanours, Young Reveller does not completely scorn moral principles and is sincerely reformed at the end, progressing from vice to constant love and marriage, while Lord Worthy is likewise a character in process, halfway to the expected figure of the *bonhôte homme*. In other words, none of these rakes are still the

---

19 Corman summarises it very accurately: “Mountfort has sufficiently softened both the wit and the humour, that is, both the sympathetic and the punitive, so that he points the way to the more thoroughly homogenised blend of the eighteenth century” (1993: 73).
sentimental male lead to be found in later plays, but their construction is clearly channelled in that direction. Florella, on the other hand, anticipates the exemplary heroine, but her private scorn for virtue and social propriety proves that she still has a longer way ahead of her. In like manner, the citizen in Greenwich Park is neither the covetous old Puritan of the 1660s and 1670s, nor the turn-of-the-century powerful merchant who is able to control the circle of women under his authority and confront the rake —like Mr. Rich in Mary Pix’s The Beau Defeated (1700). Thus, although Mr. Raison is cuckolded, his characterization is much more benevolent than in previous years. As a consequence, the involution of the gentry runs parallel to the evolution of the citizen: while the Whiggish bourgeoisie gradually replaces the Stuart aristocracy as the new thriving social class, the high-class representatives of the Town substitute for the citizens as the new coxcombs, becoming the butt of the ridiculing punishment. In fact, the marginal satiric element in Mountfort’s play is precisely aimed at them.

Secondly, the concept of evolution is also formulated on a moral level: the new monarchs’ campaign against vice and corruption had an obvious impact on their nation and their subjects. Thus, whereas the previous regime had glamourised debauchery and excess, Englishmen were exhorted to progress from these excesses to a more sober Williamite order, founded on a reformed and virtuous society. This moral transition, which can be perceived in the theatre in the changes in the audience’s taste, accounts for the transformations that the post-Revolution drama undertook and is displayed in embryo form in Greenwich Park.

And thirdly, this emotional reconfiguration of characters and values finds its equivalent in the physical domain in the symbolic change of setting which is crucial to the construction of the play. In a thematic evolution which ran parallel to the succeeding expansions of the metropolitan area of London in the course of the 17th century, the setting
of the comedies moved from the City first—in the Elizabethan and Jacobean period—to the Town at the time of the Stuart Restoration, to the desertion of this area after Charles II’s death and upon King William and Queen Mary’s accession to the throne. By establishing Greenwich Park and Deptford Wells as alternative locations for his comedy, Mountfort portrays a series of geopolitical realities which were taking place then, like the relocation of London’s new elite area on the East End. That physical transition eastwards is manifest from the very beginning of the play: the play opens with Mrs. Raison getting ready to leave the City for Greenwich and, in the following scene, Young Reveller appears onstage also heading eastwards when he runs into Lord Worthy. The uncorrupted green spaces in the East End replace St James’s and Hyde Park as the sites where the character’s enjoy their leisure, display themselves and intermingle with each other.

The second fundamental question in the analysis of the play is the interaction between the public and the private spheres, which are shown sometimes in well-balanced coexistence and in mutual conflict on some other occasions. This dichotomy is reproduced at a twofold level in *Greenwich Park*: the physical one and the psychological. Applying the discussion to the physical sphere offers a revealing conclusion, which was partly anticipated by the theoretical paradigms used for this study: a too rigid distinction between the domain of the public and the domain of the private is unfeasible, as their close connection produces common areas where both coexist and become diluted at the same time. The incursion of the private sphere into the public—as in the case of Mr. Raison’s shop, invaded by the privacy of his and Sir Thomas’s lodgings—is contested by the opposite phenomenon, for instance when Dorinda’s house is “assaulted” by the rest of the characters at resolution of the play. Finally, the public-private conflict also operates at a psychological level, as it is instrumental in defining the characters’ identities. *Greenwich Park* builds on the types of space the characters transit and the socio-political use they make of it.
to help delineate the different dramatic types and makes comic capital of the tensions that surface between public appearances and private lives.
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