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"I wish the stage were as narrow as the wire of a tightrope dancer, so that no incompetent would dare step upon it."

Goethe

"Poetry is the Parent of Superstition."

Thomas Sprat

"In those gay days of wickedness and wit, When Villiers Criticized what Dryden writ, The tragic queen, to please a tasteless crowd, Had learn'd to bellow, rant, and roar so loud, That frighten'd Nature, her best friend before, The blustering beldam's company fore-sware."

Sheridan,
Prologue, The Critic
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INTRODUCTION

The Rehearsal, a play attributed to the Duke of Buckingham, sometime favorite of Charles II, and a group of his literary associates, has been recognized from its first performance as a controversial work and a major achievement in the art of dramatic burlesque. The play was certainly popular with the King and the public theatre audience when it was first performed in 1671. Modern critics, however, have seen fit only to include The Rehearsal in important anthologies and to praise its powers of satirical penetration in their prefaces while, at the same time, avoiding a critical examination of the play. Scanty attention has been given the work in recent years, critics and scholars alike being content with an a priori acceptance of the play's worth without recognizing the need for its further evaluation.

Though the foremost scholars of Restoration drama have drawn attention to the play's fully realized burlesque plot and have claimed it to be the epitome of Restoration dramatic burlesque,¹ yet The Rehearsal still remains, except for a

few noteworthy articles, virtually ignored in modern journals.

Such a condition is inexplicable in the face both of the consistent popularity of the play until the first quarter of the Nineteenth Century and of its influence upon such notable followers of the dramatic burlesque tradition as Fielding, Gay, Henry Carey, Sheridan, and numerous minor playwrights. In spite of The Rehearsal's significance, a basic reconsideration of its position in the development of English burlesque drama of the Seventeenth Century has not been forthcoming. The following chapters identify those unique qualities of Buckingham's burlesque that have contributed to the advancement of burlesque drama in England. Through an examination of previous attempts at stage burlesque in England and a consideration of possible foreign and non-dramatic influences upon the authors of The Rehearsal, it is possible to place the play in historical perspective. The following study has, in that respect, a twofold purpose: first, to draw attention to the importance of the play as a significant advancement in the form of burlesque drama; and, second, to reveal the steady but constant development of that form from its early Elizabethan beginnings until the closing years of the Restoration era. Careful consideration of the development of the burlesque tradition in drama during that period has heretofore been avoided by Twentieth Century scholars. The attention of students of satire and burlesque has focused mainly upon the non-dramatic works of burlesque and satire, allowing for only a cursory appraisal of the
dramatic contribution to that form of literature.\(^2\)

The following chapters employ various definitions and distinguish between "high burlesque" and "low burlesque" as they apply to the various dramas studied.\(^3\) The distinctions between such terms as "satire," "travesty," and "parody" become increasingly significant in the following comparative study of burlesque method in the drama.

Traditionally, scholars have approached *The Rehearsal* from three perspectives. The most common approach has been to treat the play as a collection of specific literary and theatrical allusions to the various dramatic sources of its ridicule. Such scholarship is by nature quantitative and thus is of little value for the formal study of the play: to determine who or what is ridiculed in a piece without considering the form of that ridicule or its dramatic effectiveness is an endeavor that remains incomplete.

Such attention to content as opposed to form was the critical viewpoint of the author of "the original Key" to *The Rehearsal*, which appeared as a Preface to the Briscoe edition of that play in 1704 (seventeen years after the death of Buckingham). Following in that tradition, Edward Arber


\(^3\) The Glossary (pp.240-43) contains definitions of various important terms as they apply to form and technique in burlesque.
reprinted many of the Key's references from the Briscoe edition in 1868 with omissions and a few corrective amendments.\(^4\) In 1914 Montague Summers published his corrected annotated edition, which has remained the authoritative critical reference work on the play. Summers pointed out the many errors that were contained in the original Key and presented his revised, corrected, and augmented Key in which allusions to more than seventy sources from the Restoration drama have been cited. In 1936 Dane Farnsworth Smith devoted an almost equal amount of attention to the content of the play, departing from the Summers method of annotation by listing the specific dramatic and theatrical characteristics of heroic drama that were ridiculed in the play.

In nearly every instance of such investigations, however, little or no consideration has been given to the unifying elements of the play, or to the value and quality of its humor, or even to the effect of specific jokes as theatrical devices. Recently, Peter E. Lewis, recognizing the inadequacy of such scholarship, concentrated on the burlesque techniques used in the play to ridicule heroic drama.\(^5\) His study represented a step toward a critical evaluation of the play as dramatic art, but it stopped short of any overall estimate of the play's value and did not consider the import-


ant and less specific aspects of The Rehearsal's burlesque method. Still less attention has been directed toward the significance of The Rehearsal in relation to the development of the dramatic burlesque form. A study of the play's unique formal and structural qualities and of its influence upon subsequent dramatic burlesques had not previously been attempted.

A second traditional approach for scholars has been to see the play as a personal and literary attack upon Dryden by Buckingham and his close supporters. Such an approach is primarily biographical in nature and leads far afield from considerations of dramatic form. Thus, Samuel Johnson, whose prejudices too often determined his critical evaluations, judged Buckingham's play according to its failure to achieve its object: to drive the heroic drama, particularly the plays of Dryden, from the stage. Johnson dismissed Buckingham as a dilettante whose work paled before the literary genius of Dryden. Similarly negative evaluations persisted into the Nineteenth Century. The George R. Noyes edition of Dryden's dramas also evaluated The Rehearsal as it related to the literary feud between Dryden and Buckingham—a contest that was as much political as it was literary.

The third area of traditional study has considered the elusive and ultimately unresolved problem of the play's authorship. It is apparent that, even in the Restoration period, Buckingham's collaboration was assumed. The tradi-


7 George R. Noyes, ed. Selected Dramas of John Dryden, with an Introduction and Notes (Chicago: Scott, Foresman, 1910).
tionally recognized coauthors were all members of the closely
knit literary and political group that centered around
Buckingham: Thomas Sprat, Martin Clifford, Rochester, and
possibly Samuel Butler. While demonstrable proof for the
kind and degree of writing that may be attributed to each
author is lacking, it is possible to illuminate the unique
comic perspective of the play through an evaluation of the
shared temperaments and the perceptions of that close circle
of friends. To determine the attributes and sensibilities of
the coauthors toward their burlesque target, Dryden and the
heroic drama, it is necessary to examine the two contending
theories of dramatic art during the period, Jonsonian realism
and Dryden's theory of heroic drama. A consideration of the
prevailing theories of comedy and satire during the early
Restoration period is also necessary for a clearer understand­
ing of the comic perspective and conception of the burlesque
form that lies behind the play itself.

Chapter I deals with the development of a burlesque
form for the drama in the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods.
The English experimentation with burlesque culminated with
the first play that was entirely devoted to the burlesquing
of a particular dramatic fare, The Knight of the Burning
Pestle. Other plays of the pre-Restoration period that
contain burlesque scenes were written by Shakespeare, Jonson
(whom Buckingham had met firsthand as a young member of the
royal household at Whitehall), Thomas Peele, Thomas Dekker,
and Richard Brome.
Chapter II consists of an investigation of the development of stage burlesque by examining those forces that contributed to the new critical perspective of burlesque and satire during the Caroline and Commonwealth periods. An analysis of the neoclassic ideals of Buckingham and his circle determines both the reasons for The Rehearsal's attack and the nature of its critical target. Certain significant burlesque plays of the early Restoration period are also considered in the second chapter.

Foreign dramatic influences to be considered in Chapter II are, first of all, Molière, whose profound contribution to Restoration comedy has been acknowledged in the Twentieth Century. Scarron, the great French author whose satirical works introduced the genre "burlesque" to France and subsequently to England, may have helped to foster the climate necessary for the perspicuity and the uncompromising candor that characterized The Rehearsal as a critical work.

The important dramatic predecessors of Buckingham in the Restoration period were William Davenant, whose Playhouse to Be Let is generally considered to be the earliest dramatic burlesque of that period; indeed, his play was written, in large part, during the last months of the Interregnum.  

---


Several non-dramatic influences on the authors of *The Rehearsal* deserve consideration in chapter II. Those include Samuel Butler's *Hudibras*, a political satire that incorporated the Don Quixote theme; Charles Cotton's *Virgile Travestie*, an English adaptation of Scarron's satire of the *Aeneid*; and Dryden's own verse allegory.

The derivation of the word "burlesque," which was introduced into English around 1650, reveals the degree of consciousness of literary and dramatic burlesque that existed during the Restoration. Boileau's theories of burlesque and his versions of Horace popularized a more refined burlesque verse. The increasing importance of burlesque forms during the early Restoration era is examined in Chapter II.

A study of both the dramatic and the non-dramatic influences upon *The Rehearsal* is necessary for a comparison of the conception of dramatic burlesque represented in that burlesque drama with the prevailing conception of burlesque as it had come to be understood in the early and middle Restoration periods. Only when it is possible to determine the state of development of the burlesque genre will it be possible to appreciate the contribution of *The Rehearsal* to the dramatic tradition.

Buckingham's own conception of the neoclassic ideals of the drama influenced his attack upon Dryden, Davenant, and Robert and Henry Howard, at the time the foremost authors of the heroic drama in England. The exact nature and extent
of Buckingham's neoclassical beliefs with regard to the heroic dramas, which dominated the first fifteen years of the Restoration period, are also examined in Chapter II.

The heroic dramas Buckingham wished to ridicule in *The Rehearsal* included tragi-comedies as well as tragedies and were English attempts to follow the French Alexandrine verse tragedies of Corneille and Racine. In spite of the derivative nature of the heroic drama, Dryden and his fellow authors considered their works to be the epitome of the neoclassical ideal in England. Rhymed iambic couplets were, unfortunately, difficult to sustain in English, and the sense of the lines was usually sacrificed for the rhyme scheme. In addition, the huffing manner of the characters, the improbable incidents, and the irrelevant actions of the heroic tragedies strained believability.

Buckingham was a man who enjoyed the absurdities of comedy and never ceased displaying his talent for impersonation before King and company.\(^{11}\) Such biographical considerations, while generally of little help in any study aimed at the evaluation of a play as an effective dramatic work, are nevertheless helpful in determining the reasons for the existence of burlesque drama in the Restoration. It is a significant fact that all of the important examples of burlesque drama during the Restoration period may be categorized as

---

"mock-heroic drama."\textsuperscript{12} Buckingham's play was attacking definite authors and works for a particular reason.

A formal and historical approach to the analysis of \textit{The Rehearsal} itself follows in Chapter III. Buckingham's burlesque is compared with other burlesques; its original contributions are determined; and a final evaluation of the play's dramatic form and its critical perspective, scheme of probability, and levels of reality are examined in relation to its contribution to both the dramatic burlesque tradition and the comedy of manners tradition.

The basic structure of \textit{The Rehearsal} was undoubtedly derived from Beaumont's \textit{The Knight of the Burning Pestle}. The similarities of situation and character are too great to be ignored. This investigation compares and contrasts those two works with the intention of discovering the advancements in burlesque form and technique that Buckingham's play achieved. A consideration of the fundamental differences between the burlesque techniques and the critical perspectives of Beaumont's play and \textit{The Rehearsal} leads to a clearer picture of the nature of the burlesque consciousness during the Restoration period.

Traditional criticism has often dismissed \textit{The Rehearsal} as being either a farce of low burlesque or a scurrilous personal attack,\textsuperscript{13} of value only for its own historical

\textsuperscript{12}See the Glossary for a definition of the term "Mock-heroic."

\textsuperscript{13}Clinton-Baddeley, \textit{The Burlesque Tradition}, p. 31.
moment, but certainly of no lasting concern beyond its immediate circumstances. Such views are the result of a hasty condemnation of a work that should be viewed as a minor masterpiece because of the strength and originality of its burlesque form and because of the ability of its author to create compelling and comprehensible characters who transcend the era in which they were written.

The next chapter (IV) considers the continuing development of burlesque drama following *The Rehearsal*. The success of Buckingham's play doubtless inspired the increasingly outspoken prologues and epilogues that attacked the absurdities of the heroic drama. In addition, a few plays were performed that continued to burlesque that genre. The outstanding playwright of the mock-heroic form after *The Rehearsal's* first performances was Thomas Duffett, whose three works lampooned heroic tragedy and its operatic offspring. The nature of his attack is considered, as well as the particular stage condition—rival theatre companies—that fostered his attacks. The fourth chapter also examines the reasons for the decline of dramatic burlesque after the mid-1670's.
CHAPTER I

THE PRE-RESTORATION PRECEDENT

The history of burlesque drama in England did not begin in the Elizabethan period but may be traced as far back as the Roman mime tradition. For an investigation of the most prominent Baroque traditions, the Medieval period may be recognized as a sufficient starting point. That period was to directly influence the burlesque consciousness in Elizabethan England. The earliest Medieval examples of burlesque and parody were religious in origin.

The Medieval dramatic tradition changed rapidly in Sixteenth Century England. Older, religious-based genres, such as the Morality play, gave way to certain secular forms peculiar to England. During the early Elizabethan period, the Medieval Vice figure of the Interludes and Moralities was transformed into the comic fool or clown, who burlesqued the manners and pretentions of his social superiors. Quarrlesome and haughty, the Vice tempted virtuous characters, but also appeared as a comic gull himself. Nothing was held sacred by the character. As a result, he became the chief

14See Lysander William Cushman's The Devil and the Vice in the English Dramatic Literature Before Shakespeare (Halle: M. Niemeyer, 1900) for a thorough investigation of the Vice figure.
instigator of mockery through farcical parody during the late Medieval period. In the Sixteenth Century Interlude, Like Will to Like, for example, the Vice repeated a mock eulogy to the Devil. Such a willful mockery of witchcraft ritual was typical in Tudor comedy and was always performed by the Vice figure. Shakespeare's allusion in Twelfth Night revealed his familiarity with the tradition: "Old Vice . . . who with dagger of lath, in his rage and wrath, cries ah, ha! to the Devil." The Elizabethan clown figure seemed to have been integrally bound to the earlier dramas of that era. Philip Sidney, so very opposed to the romantic notion of mixing comic and tragic tones in a single play, gave evidence of the ubiquitous nature of the clown character in his complaint that so many dramas mingled kings and clowns "not because the matter so carrieth it, but thrust in the clown by head and shoulders to play a part in majestical matters, with neither decency nor discretion." The Elizabethan notion of burlesque was already present in the clown figure who mocked the manners of his betters through parody.

A second tradition that developed from the religious dramas and literature derived from the Medieval penchant for parody and satire of Church institutions and symbols. The well-preserved manuscripts of Latin parody, written


between the Eleventh and Fifteenth Centuries, mocked the Pope and other high Church officials through parodies of the Gospels, Psalms, and liturgy. The festivities surrounding the Feast of Fools and the election and procession of the Boy Bishop were parodies of a frenzied nature.

Late Medieval England possessed a strong secular tradition of burlesque and parody. The mock-romances of the Fifteenth Century were the inevitable reaction of an increasingly mercantilist society to the dying tradition of the minstrel tales of chivalry. A significant advance in that form was achieved with the advent of Chaucer. The bard's mock-romance, Sir Topas, ridiculed a knight's bourgeois aesthetic in an age when the middle-classes were transforming the feudal social structure. Chaucer's Nun's Priest's Tale is perhaps a better known example of mock-romance.

Chaucer had no immediate literary successor of magnitude who could continue his dry burlesques of knighthood. Certain secular traditions, however, kept the burlesque consciousness alive throughout the Fifteenth and early Sixteenth Centuries. As the necessity for the feudal social structure faded, the chivalrous rituals of knighthood gave way to scurrilous mockery of those ceremonies. Medieval jousts and tournaments became the occasion for elaborate jests. One such

---

mock-tournament, held at the court of James IV, honored an African girl named Ellen More and praised her beauty. A mock-defiance on Ellen's behalf was even sent to the King of France. The English King himself was known to have taken part in that tasteless travesty.19

With the advent of the Sixteenth Century and the Tudor ascendancy, new dramatic genres quickly developed. The English puppet play drew heavily upon the Vice character and often performed condensed parodies of popular contemporary dramas.20 As diminutive counterparts of live actors, the hand and string puppets of Elizabethan fairs and innyards were ideally suited for coarse mockery and parody. Marlowe's Tamberlaine and Massacre at Paris, and Shakespeare's Julius Caesar were probably crudely burlesqued by puppet showmen.21 Puppet theatre in Elizabethan times was considered very low entertainment and no full explanation or written texts remain. The only extant text of scenes from a puppet play of that era was preserved in Jonson's Bartholomew Fair (1614). In that comedy, the well-known classical romance of Hero and Leander was burlesqued along with a more recent play called Damon and Pythias. The puppet heroes of the play were a London apprentice and a Bankside wench. The short play burlesqued

21Ibid., p. 64.
the popularity of the classical romances among the middle classes of London and the "apprentice drama" repertoires of the adult companies. The technique used in the crude playlet was to ridicule its target by the incongruous mixing of heroic ideals with bourgeois pretentions. The use of familiar London place names and common English type-characters added to the incongruous effect. It was quite possible that Jonson recorded the theme and much of the dialogue from actual Jacobean puppet drama.

The tradition of the popular Tudor court entertainment, known as the Disguising, also mocked certain rituals of the feudal age. Mock-battles in which many courtiers took part were popular as festive entertainments. One court Disguising, The Interlude of the Four Elements, involved an assault made by knights upon a castle filled with ladies:

The castle was attacked by eight lords, chief among whom was the King, called Amorus, Nobleness, Youth, etc. These were led on by one dressed in crimson satin adorned with burning flames of gold, who urged the ladies to yield, but was denied by Swine and Disdain. Then, to a great peal of guns, and encouraged by Desire, the knights hurled dates and oranges at the castle, which the ladies defended with rosewater and comfits.

Such small-scale attempts at frivolity appear strikingly similar in form and subject matter to the scenes of mock combat in later Elizabethan and Restoration drama. There is

22 See below, pp. 40-42.

no reason to believe, however, that burlesque was intended in the early Tudor Disguisings, though the convention of using only a handful of combatants to represent an entire army was censured by Sidney and was burlesqued in later times.

The Disguising was replaced by a more sophisticated court entertainment with the emergence of the Masque in Elizabethan times. Outright parody of the romantic story in the main masque may have been the intention of many anti-masques, such as Campion's Masque for Lord Hayes (1607). It is difficult to determine, however, to what extent the grotesque dances of the anti-masque were mocking the lighter, majestic themes of the main masque. Jonson set the conventional form of the Masque in 1609 with The Masque of Queenes, performed with Queen Anne herself in the cast on Twelfth Night. That entertainment marked the acceptance of the anti-masque as an essential element in the Masque structure. Jonson viewed the anti-masque of The Masque of Queenes as a foil to the main masque, intended for contrast and variety more than for forthright parody. Jonson credits Queen Anne with the original suggestion of a contrasting entertainment attached to the masque:

And because Her Majesty . . . had commanded me to think on some dance,

---

24 Sidney, Defence of Poetrie, p. 75.
or show, that might precede hers, and
have the place of a foil, or false
masque . . . Twelve women, in the habit
of bags or witches, sustaining the persons
of Ignorance, Suspicion, Credulity, etc.,
the opposites to good fame, should fill
that place, not as a masque, but a specta-
cle of strangeness.26

Jonson did not consider the anti-masque to be entirely his
own creation. As Enid Welsford pointed out, "The principle
of contrast and variety was latent from the first in Mummings
and Disguisings, and many of the Tudor and a few of the Stuart
masques were wholly grotesque in nature."27 To suggest that
Jonson, or any other writer of Masques, resorted to outright
parody through the dance movements and poetic songs of the anti-
masque is to ignore one important fact: the anti-masque always
preceded the main masque. In The Masque of Queens, for
example, the grotesque anti-masque of the witches' dance was
interrupted by the sudden appearance of Heroic Virtue and the
Queens. Since it would have been impossible to parody a scene
that had not happened yet, the witches' dance must have been
intended only as a low and chaotic contrast to the majestical
splendor of Heroic Virtue.

The idea of contrasting one scene with another had its
precedent in Sidney's popular Arcadia. In that Pastoral poem

26Preface to The Masque of Queens.
27Welsford, The Court Masque, p. 145.
the scenes of country rustics alternated with the scenes of romantic heroes.

The Elizabethan penchant for literary allusion began the revival of Chaucerian burlesque. Instead of narrative poetry, however, the emergent form was the drama. An early example that burlesqued a well-known character type appeared in Sidney's *The Lady of the May* (1578). In that Pastoral the Dotore character was ridiculed. Sidney's learned fool was, however, particularly English. Master Rombus was a rustic schoolteacher of poor financial means. During his long speech he uttered doubtful passages of dog Latin and bragged about his schoolroom discipline:

I am "potentissima domina" a schoolteacher; that is to say, a pedagogue, one not a little versed in the disciplinating of the juvenile fry, wherein to my laud I say it, I use such geometrical proportion, as neither wanted mensuetude nor corruption: for so it is described "Parare subjects, et debellire superbos."²⁸

Sidney's character was strikingly similar to Holofernes in *Love's Labour's Lost*, and both characters' speeches were written as parodies of the strained English prose of John Lyly and his followers: "Now the thunder-thumping Jove transfused his dotes into your excellent formosity, which have, with your resplendent beams, thus segregated the enmity of these ritual animals."²⁹ It was clearly an example of

²⁹Ibid.
literary parody delivered from the stage. Sidney's opposition to the euphuism of Lyly was no disguised secret. Drayton's praise of Sidney revealed an early concern with the correct English usage so necessary for the development of literary parody: "the noble Sidney, with this last, arose that hero for numbers and for prose, that thoroughly paced our language, . . . and did first reduce our tongue from Lyly's writing then in use." 30

George Peele's *Old Wives' Tale* (1592) became possibly the earliest example of a play that consciously depended upon subject matter and dramatic conventions from other plays for its humor. The question whether the play can be considered burlesque has, however, been debated by modern critics. G. K. Hunter denied that the play was ever meant as a satire, pointing out that Peele's use of old folklore myths in the inner play was not unique, indeed, the world of Robin Hood evoked in his *Edward I* was done without satire or condescension. 31 To add to his argument, Hunter observed that the old wife, Madge, who narrated the play-within-a-play, "does not believe in the story any more than the pages [her stage audience] do, or the modern audience." 32 F. E. Schelling's estimation of the play agreed with Hunter's only to a point: "Peele took the elements current in the extravagant heroical romance and treated them humorously,


32 Ibid., p. 45.
not satirically.\textsuperscript{33} Later, however, in the same critical study, he regarded \textit{The Old Wives' Tale} as a parody of the excessive elements in the heroical romance popular throughout the Elizabethan period.\textsuperscript{34}

Leonard Ashley, in his critical study of the works of George Peele, approached the play as "... the first English play to embody literary criticism."\textsuperscript{35} That critic judged Peele's treatment of the subject matter of heroic romance as "tongue in cheek," and suggested that Peele was ridiculing such anonymous works as \textit{The Knight of the Burning Rock}, \textit{The Solitary Knight}, and \textit{Philemon and Philecia}, plays that contained improbable events and miraculous reversals.\textsuperscript{36}

The wide difference of opinion among critics when approaching \textit{The Old Wives' Tale} is in part comprehensible when one considers the common practice of plagiarism among Elizabethan playwrights. Was Peele parroting authors such as Robert Greene, or was he simply stealing some of that writer's material that happened to please audiences? A more plausible explanation of the divergence of opinion, however, lies in the very subtle nature of Peele's humor in the play. The author's primary concern was to entertain a lighthearted audi-


\textsuperscript{34}Ibid., vol. 1, pp. 201-205.


\textsuperscript{36}Ibid., p. 124.
ence, not to ridicule. While certain lines, characters, and situations must be considered outright parody, nevertheless, the play depended upon the improbable juxtaposition of unrelated plotlines and miraculous reversals for its great appeal. The author created a fantasy world of improbable causality, and that was the play's greatest attraction. The fact that Madge, the narrator, interrupted the action of the inner play with the staccato quips of an experienced groundling only served to add to the play's charm. Unlike later burlesque plays, the various characters and their fantastic adventures in Peele's play could gain the audience's sympathy. The play could also quite possibly be performed as an extravagant farce, with little or no sympathy for the characters, but with a great deal of laughter at the ridiculous chain of events. How the play was originally performed has not been preserved. The possibility that at least parts of the play were intended as pleasant nostalgia cannot be ruled out. The situations of the plot and the sentiments and motivations of the characters would have been considered quaintly old-fashioned by a London audience in 1592.

The humor of The Old Wives' Tale has long been recognized as partially dependent upon the play's conscious imitation of the "heroical romance" plays of the 1570's, which continued in vogue throughout the early Jacobean period. The term "heroical romance" was coined by Felix Schelling

---

to distinguish it from other forms, notably the "heroic"
dramas of the early Restoration period. In those early secular plays, the Medieval Morality figure of the Wit had been replaced by the wandering knight in search of his lost lady, as in The Marriage of Wit and Science (1569). The bewildering shift of locale in that genre was illustrated by Common Conditions (c. 1570) where the characters wander over three continents in search of their loves. The fatuous characters and incidents of the heroical romance was evident in Sir Clyomon and Sir Clamydes (c. 1575) where the guardian of a flying serpent in the "forest of marvels" held ladies against their wills with magic spells. The character of the diabolical villain and his fantastic devices to capture and seduce young maidens was such a typical theme of the heroic romance dramas that Peele's use of the basic formula for The Old Wives' Tale was probably intended as a humorous contrast to that genre.

Greene's Orlando Furioso (1592), based upon Ariosto's famous work, included all the stock characters and incredible incidents of previous heroical romances by lesser authors. The crafty villain and the two lovers; the exotic jumble of characters, incidents, and locales; all appear in his play. The Old Wives' Tale contained more allusions to Greene's play (performed earlier the same year) than to any other single source.

If one views the play as a delightful variation on the heroical romance theme, the play has many similarities to A Midsummer Night's Dream. In the latter play, the parody of
certain classical tragedies in the inner play (Pyramus and Thisby) was successfully incorporated into the romantic main plot. The harsh ridicule that might have otherwise resulted was curtailed. Similarly, the fantasy world of The Old Wives' Tale seemed to neutralize any satiric edge.

An analysis of the satiric allusions in the play revealed a surprisingly wide variety of sources for parody. As mentioned above, the romantic dramas of wandering knights and lovelorn ladies were pleasantly ridiculed. The sub-plot of Eumenides and Delia was a typical heroical romance plot. The stock situation of the hysterically distressed Delia, and, the unbelievably noble hero Eumenides, who was willing to give up his beloved for the sake of a semantic misunderstanding, was parodied. The villain of all the plots within the tale was Sacrapant. He was probably modeled after the villain by the same name in Greene's Orlando Furioso. The villain of that play was rejected as a suitor by Angelica and thereafter drove Orlando senseless with jealousy of her. An example of the pit-pleasing marvels, so familiar in the heroical romances, was the "life-index" flame of Sacrapant that was blown out by Venelia in the last scene. That curious element of science fiction was intended to be as ridiculous as it was unnecessary to the various plots.

The huffing language of the heroical romance was

38 Old Wives' Tale, lines 1110-1150.
ridiculed in the opening lines of the two brothers' speeches:

1st Brother: Upon these Chalkie Cliffs of Albion We are arrived now with tedious toil, and compassing the wide world round about to seek our sister, to seek our fair Delia forth,

2nd Brother: O fortune cruel, cruel, & unkind, Unkind in that we cannot find our sister. Our sister hapless in her cruel chance.

The language was awkward and overblown, and was obviously intended as satiric comment, though no exact source for parody has been discovered. There were no other recognizable speeches in the play that burlesqued heroical romance language, and the two brothers gave up their bombastic delivery after the opening lines. The question, why the author saw fit to include only one example of such parody in his play and then resist the temptation to use such an obvious comic device again, may well be asked. A possible explanation is that the opening lines served as a transition from the awkward, forgetful narration of the old wife, Madge, to the actual dialogue spoken by the characters in the inner play. The two brothers are first to enter as participants in Madge's tale. In that case, their overblown language would serve both as a comic contrast to the vernacular of Madge.  

---

39Ibid., lines 162-172.
here some come to tell your tale for you."\(^{40}\) and, as a foreshadowing of the comedy to follow. The latter explanation is the most demonstrable. If it were true, then it adds weight to the contention that Peele's play was intended solely as burlesque. Rather, Peele seemed to have used bombastic language in that instance as a technical and transitional device, and not solely for the sake of burlesque.

Peele may have intended his Induction scene as an answer to Robert Greene's use of the induction scene device in his *James IV* that had appeared two years before.\(^{41}\) In that play there was only the slightest connection between the subject of the Induction scene and the play proper. Peele used the device of the induction (not very common in Elizabethan drama at that time) as if to demonstrate to Greene how a play could be introduced legitimately. The antic scene between Madge and her stage audience formed a logical and coherent transition into the inner play.

The character of Huanebango was intended as a burlesque portrait of Gabriel Harvey (1545?-1630),\(^{42}\) the pedantic friend of Edmund Spencer. Harvey, a scholar of bourgeois origin, dressed and acted vainly, quarreling with everyone in his attempt to gain recognition. He boasted that he was the inventor of English hexameter verse. In addition to Spencer, 

\(^{40}\)Ibid., line 160.


\(^{42}\)Ashley, *George Peele*, p. 136.
Harvey included among his proteges Richard Stanyhurst (1547-?). When Spencer had the good sense to dissociate himself from his friend and former advisor, Stanyhurst remained under Harvey's influence. The latter considered Stanyhurst his worthy disciple in his *Four Letters* (1592). Stanyhurst maintained Harvey's theory that quantity, not accent, should be the guiding principle for English meter, as it had been for Latin. Accordingly, Stanyhurst rendered parts of Virgil into English hexameters. The result was an unfortunate medley of paraphrased lines and unintelligible words forced to fit the meter. His contemporaries did not hesitate to lampoon the new creation. In the Preface to Greene's *Arcadia* (1589), Nash parodied Stanyhurst's Virgil: "Then did he make heaven's vault to bound with rounce, robble, bobble of ruff, raffe, roaring, with thwicke, thwack, thurlerie, bouncing." Peele continued the mockery with his parody of the Harvey-Stanyhurst language in *The Old Wives' Tale*. Huanebango was made to rise out of a well reciting, "Phylyda phylerybos, Pamphyllyda floryda flortos, Dub, dub a dub, bounce quoth the guns, with a sulphurous huffe snuff." The lines were meant to resemble Stanyhurst's Virgil. Huanebango also affects the pedantic neoclassical speech of Harvey in an earlier scene of the play:

[^43](#) The lines were meant to resemble Stanyhurst's *Virgil*. Huanebango also affects the pedantic neoclassical speech of Harvey in an earlier scene of the play:

Now by Mars and Mercury, Jupitor and Janus, 
Sol and Saturnus, Venus and Vesta, Pillas 
and Proserpina, and by the honor of my 
house Polimackeroeplacysus.44

The speech, replete with classical allusions and lengthy words, was strikingly similar to Harvey's return address to his Cambridge students.45 In that speech, simile was added to simile with analogies drawn from numerous classical myths. In addition to Harvey's pedantic tendencies, the character of Huanebango possessed the same pompous egoism that the bourgeois scholar must have exuded. Harvey's habit of self-glorification (he claimed, for instance, that he was the most inspired creator of English poetry) was reflected in Huanebango's conceited vanity: "Truly sweet heart as I seem, about some twenty years, the very April of age." Zantippa's immediate reply to Huanebango's narcissistic boast was the most direct and biting comment of the play, "What a prating ass is this."46 Peele's mockery of Harvey and Stanyhurst was without mercy in a play that otherwise possessed a light and carefree tone. Direct parody, however, was all but avoided again. Only one of Huanebango's hexameters has been identified as Harvey's, and only one other may have been a paraphrased distortion of a line by Stanyhurst.47 It can be assumed, therefore, that

44Ibid., lines 317-320.

45"Gabriel Harvey, Ciceronianus," translated by Clarence A. Forbes University of Nebraska Studies (Nov., 1945):45.

46The Old Wives' Tale, lines 832-834.

Peele was more interested in mocking the character traits of a rival he disliked, than in parodying literary excesses. Peele used the familiar burlesque device of exaggerating the salient weaknesses of the personality ridiculed. Huanebango was well within the tradition of the Miles Gloriosus of Plautus, and the egocentric Rombus of Sidney.

Huanebango was also used to spout examples of poor or simplistic rhyme. As a leading member of that self-conscious group of aristocratic intellectuals, the "university wits," Peele was sensitive to the overly enthusiastic uses of poetry. Huanebango delivered bad feminine rhyme:

O that I might but I may not,
woe to my destiny therefore.
Kiss that I clasp but I cannot,
tell me my destiny wherefore?

There are few indications that Peele extended his mild satire to include the mockery of outmoded or overused stage conventions. Madge's wry forecast just before the entrance of the "Harvest men" was undoubtedly intended as a jibe at that particular theatrical convention, "But soft, who comes here? Oh, these are the harvest men; ten to one they sing a song of mowing." Her suspicions were confirmed when they began to sing their mowing song. The male chorus undoubtedly performed a burlesque harvest song that included ridiculous

48 The Old Wives' Tale, lines 813-814
49 Ibid., lines 302-304.
dancing. Though there is no outside evidence to support the contention, it seems very unlikely that Peele would not have seized the opportunity to mock the convention of irrelevant choral song.

Peele managed to include a surprisingly varied assortment of burlesque techniques and literary parody for his day. The main intention of his play, however, was not burlesque or parody. Rather, the play's dominant characteristic, and the source of its great charm, was the eclectic nature of its tone and subject matter. The numerous, interwoven plots, the carefree progression of the characters through a fantasy world of transformed identities and miraculous reversals, the lyrical language of folklore and the supernatural in contrast to the earthy naturalism of Madge as narrator, created an extremely imaginative Pastoral romance. The overall tone of the play is comic, not satiric or burlesque. Burlesque and parody were used, for the most part, only as clever devices, not in and for themselves. What is more to the point, there was no consistent attempt to burlesque, but instead a rather formless one.

Shakespeare's earliest contribution to parody appeared in Love's Labour's Lost (1594). Quite within the tradition of Sidney and Peele, his Holofernes mocked the classical pedants, foolish in their convoluted rhetoric and vain in their bombast. Generally, however, Shakespeare's satiric tone was so mild in the play that there is some question to what extent
certain passages could be considered actual burlesque. With only a few minor exceptions, the tolerant disposition of the bard prevented the development of biting parody and burlesque in his dramatic works.

One dramatist who was not afraid to use the cutting edge of satire was Jonson. His earliest published play was *Every Man in His Humour* (1598). Jonson regarded the play as his first attempt to write in the classic vein. His brand of comedy was at once more topical and realistic, more down-to-earth, than any previous English comedy. Outright parody and burlesque was always subordinated in the early plays of Jonson to an accurate portrayal of the London milieu with its current fashions and vitality, which was always his primary concern. There were two burlesque characters revealed in the first play, however. The first was of the type that was becoming the most frequent vehicle for burlesque and parody during the Elizabethan period: the pedantic fool. Matthew, a foolish poetaster who stole well-known passages from his fellow wits and called them his own, may have been used as the model for the playwright Bayes in *The Rehearsal*, so close were their personal eccentricities. Matthew parodied familiar lines from Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy*--a play that was considered old-fashioned and awkward by the late 1590's--and

---


from Samuel Daniel, a learned scholar of mediocre poetic ability.\textsuperscript{52}

The other burlesque character of the play, Stephens, the "country gull," entered reading selections from \textit{The Spanish Tragedy}. The recitation provided an excellent opportunity for burlesque declamation of the older stage style.

In addition to the literary pretentions of the two gulls, Jonson's play included parodies of other contemporary bombastic verse. Young Knowells commented with the famous line, "A parody, a parody, with a kind of miraculous gift to make it absurder than it is."\textsuperscript{53} The line was the first conscious proclamation of the power of burlesque and parody in Elizabethan drama.

The next year Shakespeare followed Jonson with a character whose lines of parody may be traced to a definite source. Pistol, the bombastic companion of Falstaff in \textit{Henry IV, Part II}, was given lines that intentionally mocked the more extravagant plays of the Admiral's Men at the Rose Theatre. Pistol was the walking parody of the best actor in Shakespeare's rival company, Edward Alleyn. The latter, who gained his immense popularity through the portrayal of such virile and impassioned parts as Tamberlaine and Hieronymo in \textit{The Spanish Tragedy}, became known for his scenes of intense, emotional outburst. The choleric Pistol, who quoted from \textit{Tamberlaine} and other plays, appeared as an overweening,

\textsuperscript{52}There were numerous hits at the Spanish Tragedy during the late Elizabethan and early Jacobean periods, especially by the boy companies.

\textsuperscript{53}M. Seymour-Smith ed., Act V, sc. i, p. 124.
frustrated actor. His lines were the very stuff of burlesque:

I'll see her damned first, to Pluto's damned lake, by his hand, to the infernal deep, with Erebus and tortures vile also. Hold hook and line, say I. Down, down, dogs: down fators!54

Pistol's part in the play was small, but he was given a larger part after the death of Falstaff in Henry V, performed the following year. Pistol as frustrated actor gave way to Pistol as Miles Gloriosus. Shakespeare's brief stab at the rival Rose Theatre may have been partially inspired by Jonson's Matthew in Every Man in His Humour. Shakespeare was known to have taken a part in that play himself and was well acquainted with the piece. Matthew, like Pistol after him, parodied lines from plays performed by Alleyn at the Rose.

Jonson was creating the English comedy of manners throughout the late Elizabethan period. His second work, Every Man Out of His Humour (1599) again presented familiar London character types with their fashionable pursuits. Macilente and Saviolina mocked the current obsession with "arcadian" poetry inspired by Sidney's poem.

In Cynthia's Revels, the last of the playwright's "comical satires," Act V contained a contest mocking the Medieval tournament. The various courtiers, all well-known

54Henry IV, Part II, Act II, sc. iv, lines 169-172.
Elizabethan court personages, competed with one another by making elaborate rhetorical speeches of compliment. Mercury and Crites, mere servants, joined in the competition with exaggerated speeches of praise and eventually won the contest. Mercury's speeches were bombastic parodies of the florid language of various contemporary courtiers. Jonson revived the Fifteenth Century mock-tournament in the same scene with Amorphus's bill of defiance, which was a parody of the challenge made at public trials of skill.\[55\]

Shakespeare's Hamlet (1600) contained the famous Gonzago piece of Act III, sc. ii. The short inner play was written in crude rhyming couplets with extended speeches of bombast typical of the early Elizabethan secular drama. Shakespeare skillfully used the archaic style of the play, and what must have been the burlesqued histrionics of the players, as a device to hide the true intentions of Hamlet's play: The crude performance functioned as bate—a "mouse-trap"—for the unsuspecting Claudius. Even though the Gonzago play was not written solely for the sake of burlesque, the scene represented the longest parody Shakespeare attempted.

The trilogy of plays that comprise the Parnassus group, The Journey to Parnassus, and The Return to Parnassus, Parts I and II, were written and performed at Cambridge University over the course of four years (1597-1601). All three

\[55\] Cynthia's Revels, Act V, sc. ii.
plays were loose in structure, with little attempt to maintain a coherent plot. They were, in fact, satirical revues, performed by, and for, a close group of intellectuals. As might be expected, the playwrights of the public theatres were frequently their victims. Some of those authors, notably Shakespeare and Jonson, were lauded by the collegians, though with a degree of condescension. In one instance, Gullio parodied lines from *Venus and Adonis*, which were followed by Ingenioso's sarcastic reply, "We shall have nothing but pure Shakespeare and shreds of poetrie that he hath gathered at the theatres!" Other poets and playwrights praised or taken to task in the Parnassus plays were Spencer, Constable, John Marston, Marlowe, and Chaucer. The extent of their criticism revealed a sophisticated standard of literary excellence, but the plays as a whole are satire only, not burlesque. The young student actors confined themselves, for the most part, to critical commentary, not distorted imitation. Except for the scenes with Kemp and Burbage, there was no attempt to impersonate well-known figures. One wonders why those two members of the Lord Chamberlain's Men were included in the trilogy at all. The possibility exists that the two stagers were played by Kemp and Burbage themselves, for a surprise guest appearance, but that was unlikely. Their dialogue commented on the faults of the Cambridge student actors and their student playwrights who "smell too much of

---

56 *The Return to Parnassus, I, Act III, sc. i, lines 1007-1009.*
the writer Ovid."

As public theatre actors, Kemp and Burbage appeared preoccupied with profits, yet their mercenary natures were offset by the sincere enthusiasm with which they advised Studioso and Philomusus on the art of acting. The character Kemp gave an extended lecture on the subject that must have parodied the real Kemp's tendency to digress into parables. The scenes with the two actors might have chronicled an actual visit of those two professionals to Cambridge.

Histriomastix (1599), amended by John Marston from earlier plays, included a scene that burlesqued lines from Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida. In Marston's rewritten version, Crysoganus functioned as the author and chorus of the play at the same time. He criticized the action of the play as it progressed. Marston may have gotten his idea from his close friend, Jonson. Asper in Every Man Out of His, Crites in Cynthia's Revels, and Horace in The Poetaster (1601) all functioned as authors commenting on their works. The appearance of the author in a play seems to have been the invention of Jonson. The device allowed Jonson to ridicule the author himself, or, to ridicule others through the author. The latter method was used in The Poetaster, when

57 Ibid., Act IV, sc. iii, line 1807.
58 Ibid., Act III, sc. iii, lines 1846-1870.
Horace (Jonson himself) forced Crispinus (Marston) to vomit forth his peculiar style of dramatic verse. Dekker (The character of Demetrius) was portrayed as a mercenary author of poor ability who would lampoon anybody for money.

Dekker and Marston's reply was *Satiromastix*. While Jonson had parodied lines by old-fashioned playwrights, such as Peele and Kyd (Act III, sc. 1 of *The Poetaster*), as well as his contemporary enemies, Marston and Dekker concentrated their attack upon Jonson. The resulting lampoon was severe and personal. Their Horace possessed all the weaknesses of his model, Jonson. In the final scene, Horace was given a "trussing" and sent on his way. Though both plays were the chief weapons in the notorious "war of the theatres," neither play was intended solely as burlesque. Jonson's play contained another plot, and Dekker's play was simply the Horace-Jonson lampoon tacked onto the tragic subject of William Rufus and Sir Walter Tirral.

During the last years of Elizabeth's reign, the parody of older dramatic styles was at its height. Jonson's parody of such styles in *The Poetaster* (quite familiar in every respect to the extended parody in Hamlet mentioned above, p. 34) added nothing new to that tradition.\(^59\)

Jonson's later, more mature plays clearly showed his preoccupation with the comedy of manners. Sir Politick Would-Be and his wife in *Volpone* (1605) were ridiculous imitations of the rising middle class citizens involved in

\(^{59}\) *Kitchen, Survey of Burlesque and Parody*, p. 57.
politics. Jonson never seemed to tire of his comic
tHEME: the social climber who falls under the crafty spell
of a charlatan. 60

Volpone's long-winded mountebank's speech parodied
the medical salesman pitch of the day. The speech, however,
like much of Volpone, went beyond burlesque to become a scath­
ing indictment of all those who, like Volpone, would be ruled
by greed. In effect, the parody of the mountebank speech
was turned in upon itself to attack the person creating the
parody.

In Batholomew Fair (1614), Jonson's comedy of manners
attained the level of naturalism. Every detail of the character
and environment of Jacobean London was vividly portrayed, from
the greasy pig's booth, to the conversations of "vapours."
Well-known character types were ridiculed in the play (Zeal­
of-the-Land Busy and Bartholomew Cokes were splendid examples)
and their language and mannerisms had elements of burlesque
about them. Burlesque of individuals, classes, and older
rhetorical styles was certainly intended, but Jonson always
went beyond burlesque in the play to point out the faults
common to all mankind. Certain parts of the play, of course,
had no burlesque intention. The play was more concerned with
the journey of the characters into and out of the sensuous
world of the fair where all superficial dreams came true.

Jonson's inclusion of the puppet show that burlesqued Damon

---

60 Ibid., p. 53.
and Pythias (an old tragedy in the classic vein), as well as other plays, has been discussed above.61

Growing out of the rivalry between the older public theatres and the growing popularity of the private theatres at the turn of the Century were a number of dramas that included burlesque scenes. Kyd's The Spanish Tragedy was a favorite target for the boy companies. The old tragedy was mocked not only for its excessive use of rhetoric, but also for its outmoded use of spectacle, such as the appearance of Andrea's ghost. Plays like the anonymous Wily Beguiled, The First Part of Hieronimo, Marston's Antonio and Mellida, and Lording Barry's Ram Alley contained scenes parodying that dated tragedy. The First Part of Hieronimo (published in 1605 but probably performed earlier) has been recognized as a full-length burlesque departure from the outmoded tragedy. In that play the author used the diminutive size of the boy actors to mock the exalted passions of the characters.62

The boy companies were ideally suited for parody, not only because the new breed of playwrights who wrote for them were conscious of the excesses of the public theatre drama, but because the nature of child acting lent itself to a facile burlesque of adult acting.

Beaumont's The Knight of the Burning Pestle, performed

61 See above, p. 15.

at Blackfriars in 1607 by the Children of the Queen's Revels, was by far the most fully developed burlesque drama up to that time. Nearly every character and incident in the play was intended to burlesque or parody various sources. Beaumont, writing for a boy's company, satirized the dramatic fare of the adult companies. As such, The Knight was a late product of the burlesque fashion that had swept the boy companies at the turn of the Century. In Beaumont's play the Citizen (a middle class tradesman) and his Wife literally took the place of the court gallants who sat upon the stages of the public theatres. That theatrical metaphor was brilliant, for, just as the Citizen and his Wife usurped the seats of the aristocrats, so also was their taste a naive imitation of the aristocrat's courtly aesthetic.

The ultimate butt of Beaumont's play was the fashion for what might be called "apprentice drama" among the London middle class audiences. In addition, the reading of Medieval romances by the Elizabethan bourgeoisie was also ridiculed. The play Beaumont chose to mock more than any other was Heywood's Four Prentices of London: With the Conquest of Granada (c. 1600). In that play, all the excesses and weaknesses of the apprentice dramas were emphasized. Heywood himself seemed to have apologized for his early attempt at drama in the prefatory Epistle published fifteen years after the first performance: he wrote the play "... in the infancy of
judgement in this kind of poetry and my first pract-

cice." In the apprentice dramas, a son of the middle class, usually an apprentice or young tradesman, took the place of the young aristocrat to become the romantic hero who went on great and noble adventures. In Heywood's play, a group of such apprentices journeyed to fight the Saracens in heathen Spain. Four apprentice-knights agreed to carry the arms of their respective trades on their battle ensigns. The scene was turned to ridicule in Beaumont's play when Ralph, the young apprentice to the Citizen who was chosen by the latter to play the hero in the rehearsed play, chose as his coat of arms the emblem of the grocer's trade: the pestle. The title "Knight of the Burning Pestle" thus became Ralph's stage name. Beaumont ridiculed the pretensions of the middle class with the title. "Burning pestle" clearly suggested venereal disease (burning phallus).

The contrived sentiments of chauvanistic patriotism and unrealistic romance, familiar to apprentice drama, was emphasized in Heywood's play. The playwright seemed entirely serious in his development of the ideal of democratic valourism through the superficial portrayal of virtues in his heroic tradesmen. Beaumont burlesqued the whole idea in scenes such as Act I, sc. iii, when Ralph proclaimed his intention to uphold Christian supremacy by denying his love

---

for Pompiona because she was a heathen. Ralph delivered the flowery speech with a forked arrow through his head. Heywood, catering to his public audience of apprentices, upheld three ideals (wish-fulfillments?) in his play: 1.) the versatility and prowess of the London tradesmen; 2.) the fineness of English democracy; and 3.) the triumph of Christianity over Islam. The latter was achieved at the expense of the Persian Caliphates, who appeared as evil and insecure cowards.

Beaumont's mockery of the self-indulgent pride of the tradesmen audiences reached its extremes when, at the Citizen's urging, Ralph concluded his adventures by performing a May dance in a maylord costume with the following speech:

My name is Ralph, by due descent though not ignoble I, Yet far inferior to the stock of gracious grocery; and by the common council of my fellows in the Strand, With gilded staff and crossed scarf, the May-lord here I stand.63

The superficial nobility of the tradesmen-knights in the apprentice dramas and the aristocratic pretensions of the middle-class audience were mocked with true Aristophanic vitality. Ralph became no more than a ridiculous puppet catering to the naive tastes of the Citizen and his Wife throughout the play.

The plot of Ralph and his adventures as the Knight of the Burning Pestle was no doubt modeled after a similar

63The Knight of the Burning Pestle, Act IV, sc. v.; hereinafter all footnotes to the play will refer to the Andrew Gurr ed. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968).
subplot in Dekker's famous comedy, *The Shoemaker's Holiday* (c. 1602). In that comedy of London tradesmen, the son of an earl was forced to become a tradesman while wooing his lady. More to the point, however, was the vivid portrayal of Simon Eyre and his wife who were the models for the Citizen and his wife in Beaumont's play. Their apprentice, also named Ralph, was forced to conquer lands for the King and returned home crippled, but safe, much to the satisfaction of Simon and his wife.

Of the two plays rehearsed simultaneously in *The Knight*, the second concerned Jasper and his beloved Luce. Jasper, also an apprentice, won the hand of his master's daughter. The Jasper-Luce love affair was the only part of the play with romantic, not burlesque, sentiments. The burlesque continued, however, in the portrayal of Jasper's father, Merrithought, and his wife. As the loud and drunken father who was constantly hounded by his wife, he broke the bourgeois ideal of paternal respectability. The plot became an inversion of the "prodigal son" theme, common to such earlier dramas as *Nice Wanton* (1560), *The Disobedient Child* (before 1560), *The London Prodigal* (1605), and *Eastward Ho* (1605). In Beaumont's play the father, not the son, became the prodigal who actually wished his son all the pleasure in the world. Throughout the Jasper-Luce subplot (called the London Merchant in the play), middle-class merchant morality was mocked. The miserly nature of the Merchant (Luce's father) was revealed in his refusal to spend
much on her wedding\textsuperscript{64} and in his mercenary attitude towards Luce's marriage. Beaumont's Merchant was quite unlike the flattering portraits of his counterpart in the apprentice drama. Instead of exuding virtue and democracy, he was revealed to be cowardly and superstitious when frightened by Jasper's mock ghost.\textsuperscript{65} The figure of the upstanding Merchant, so common in the apprentice dramas, was given his final degradation in Beaumont's play when he was forced to sing a humiliating song for Old Merrithought.\textsuperscript{66}

The middle-class theatre audience was ridiculed further in the characters of the Wife and the Citizen. As the stage audience, they practically coerced the boy stage manager into changing the play intended for rehearsal to include the fatuous adventures of their apprentice, Ralph. Both the Citizen and his Wife demanded that their tastes be satisfied with the naive effrontery common to the nouveau riche. Beaumont was undoubtedly mocking the tedious practice of changing the repertoire at the last minute to please the fickle nature of the public theatre crowds.\textsuperscript{67}

The Wife brilliantly portrayed the qualities of the naive theatre patron who knows what she wants. She was, for example, unable to comprehend the romantic convention of time lapses

\textsuperscript{64}Act V, sc. i, lines 1-3.
\textsuperscript{65}Act V, sc. i.
\textsuperscript{66}Act V, sc. iii, lines 70-80.
As a doting mother-protector, the Wife gave Ralph "licoras" to aid his voice for the huffing scene that followed, interrupting the rehearsal as she did so. For all her ridiculous traits, the Wife was revealed as a sympathetic character nonetheless. Her sentimentality overcame her when she was charmed by the young boy actors. Her tongue was not hesitant to strike, however, when she interrupted the rehearsal to give Merrithought a sermon on middle-class values of respectability:

I had not thought in truth, Mr. Merrithought, that a man of your age and discretion (as I may say) being a gentleman, and therefore known by your gentle conditions, could have used so little respect to the condition of his wife: for your wife is your own flesh, the staff of your age, your yoke-fellow, with whose help you draw through the mire of this transitory world: Nay, she's your own ribbe.

The Wife possessed the simplistic wonderment of those unacquainted with geography or foreign life styles. She fantasized, for instance, that the King of Cracovia's house ought to be covered with a black velvet interior.

Beaumont's burlesque was doubtless given greater scope under the influence of the newly translated edition of Cervantes's *Don Quixote* by Shelton, published in 1612, but
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known to have been in wide circulation in manuscript form before that date. Beaumont was undoubtedly familiar with the work. Both writers were satirizing the same kind of literature—in Cervantes's case, the Peninsular romance literature of knight errants on endless quests. Certain scenes in Ralph's plot closely paralleled incidents in *Don Quixote*, most obviously the scene of burlesque farce in the barber shop. Ralph even mistook Mrs. Merrithought for a maiden in distress, just as Don Quixote mistook the tavern wench for his lady. The similarity went not much further, however. As it has been recognized, Beaumont was more concerned with mocking the taste for bourgeois heroism among the merchant classes of London than he was with mocking the outmoded ideals of chivalry.

For all its great variety and scope, Beaumont's play proved to be a less popular draw, even before the private audiences who presumably would have appreciated such a comprehensive burlesque of the public theatre's repertoire. The play was not revived until 1635-36, and then it managed to attract an audience so large that it was demanded at court as well. In addition, parts of the play were performed as a droll during the Interregnum, and the play was revived in 1661 and 1662 in its complete form. Thereafter the burlesque proved a popular success with Restoration audiences.
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With the exception of a few plays by Jonson, the later Jacobean and the Caroline periods suffered from a dearth of fully conscious burlesque drama and parody. In Jonson's *New From the New World Discovered in the Moon* (1620), news agencies of the day were mocked, and snatches of yellow journalism were read off. Jonson came closest to the drama of social criticism with that play. Actual burlesque and parody, however, are limited to a few lines.

It has been argued that Richard Brome's *The Love-Sick Court*, once thought to be merely Brome's capitulation to the popular success of the courtier drama of Charles I's reign, was actually not an imitation of platonic love romances, but rather a burlesque of such dramas. R. J. Kaufmann has pointed out that Brome was for years opposed to the overuse of language and sentiment in drama, and therefore would not have written a play that embodied such excesses unless he intended to ridicule the form. The neoplatonic, or "proto-heroic" love dramas of the 1630's had as their theme love vs. honor and were characterized by idealized chastity, excessive chivalry, and long-winded speeches.

The title of Brome's play was totally unlike the accepted titles for such dramas and suggested burlesque intent. Furthermore, the comic subplot, paralleling the main plot, depicts the identical actions of their two masters in the main plot.

---

who are also engaged to one girl. The potentially burlesque situation of the two aristocratic twins, who, as rival suitors, are so chivalrous that neither will agree to take the lady and so deny the other's honor, is extended when each suitor actually reverts to self-denigration—an action that immediately sets their lady in favor of the self-denigrator. Brome also adds as a burlesque technique the undramatic and rhetorical use of language common to the courtier romances. The two twins, given an ultimatum by the King himself that the choice of suitor must be made immediately, instead of hurrying off to their lady, begin long-winded and ostentatious disquisitions on the nature of love and friendship.

If it was true that Brome's play was in fact a burlesque of the sentiments of preciosity inherent in the neoplatonic drama performed during the years before the Puritan accession, then Brome anticipated Buckingham's mockery of the rhetorical language and precious sentiments that characterized the heroic dramas of the Restoration period.

Certain general patterns and tendencies can be identified in a retrospective view of the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods. Burlesque as a sub-genre of comedy was not discovered all at once and adapted as a fully developed form to English tastes. Rather, the development of burlesque drama occurred very gradually over a long period of time and in various forms. Dramatic contrast in character and situation was evident in the Masque tradition and in Sidney's influential poem, Arcadia. The earliest Elizabethan secular burlesques
attempted parodies of contemporary literary figures whose language was fashionable, but, in the opinion of the burlesque writers, excessive. Sidney and Peele, among others, were noted for their lampoons of such fashionable writers. Sidney's use of parody and burlesque characterization in The Lady of the May marked the beginning of a literary consciousness that continued to develop through the efforts of Peele, Shakespeare, Jonson, Marston, Dekker, and the Cambridge student revue writers, as well as others. Burlesque of theatrical tastes and of stage conventions began with the rivalry between the public and the private theatres in London, in which the boy companies were particularly suited for the production of shortened burlesque versions of public theatre plays.

The private boy companies took advantage of the diminutive size of their boy actors to burlesque the strutting heroes and the bombastic language of the adult theatre repertoire. The puppet show burlesques of that period practiced the same burlesque technique by using still smaller versions of the adult heroes (the puppets) for their burlesque skits. Both theatrical traditions might have influenced each other in the use of that visual burlesque device.

The important invention of the author in a play was Jonson's contribution to burlesque drama. The character of the pompous playwright or poet became a type-character of burlesque, particularly after the "war of the theatres" between 1601 and 1603. Burlesque scenes became more numerous
during that famous stage rivalry, which developed from the reemergence of the boy companies beginning in 1599.

Though Peele's *The Old Wives' Tale* was a surprisingly well developed burlesque play for its early date and, though it contained several burlesque techniques, the fantasy world of that quaint Pastoral tended to neutralize its satiric edge. The same may be said of Shakespeare's similar attempt in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. Beaumont's *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* was the first fully conscious burlesque play in England, but even his ambitious attempt contained scenes of straightforward romance. It may be concluded, therefore, that the pre-Restoration period produced no dramatic pieces that were completely burlesque in tone and in subject. Rather, the plays of that period always included other elements to insure their success.

The use of stage audiences occurred quite frequently in plays with many burlesque elements and may be considered a characteristic tendency in the development of English burlesque drama. In addition to the stage audiences who comment on, narrate, interrupt or dictate the stage action in *The Old Wives' Tale* and *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, stage audiences were present in *Every Man Out of His Humour*, *Cynthia's Revels*, and *The Staple of News* (1626), the last a play of Jonson's that mocked men of fashion. Besides the complete plays, particular burlesque scenes in other plays managed to include onlookers who commented upon the performances. Those
scenes included the Gonzago scene of Act III, sc. ii, Hamlet; the Pyramus and Thisby scene of Act V, sc. i, A Midsummer Night's Dream; an identical scene in Histriomastix by Marston, thought to be modeled after the Midsummer Night's Dream scene; the puppet play scene in Bartholomew Fair, and others.

The use of the learned fool character became quite common in early Elizabethan burlesque scenes. Sidney's Rombus, Peele's Huanebango, Jonson's Clove in Every Man Out of His Humour, and Holofernes in Love's Labour's Lost all parodied lines by real or fictional foolish pedants. Jonson's stock character of the author was a further step in the development of burlesque ridicule, and it may have been derived from the earlier figure of the foolish pedant. Brome's mild burlesque on the fashion for preciosity in the court and Cavalier drama of Charles I's reign anticipated the Restoration's attempts to use heroic and neoplatonic ideals as subject matter for burlesque, but The Love-Sick Court was not followed by more ambitious attempts in the Caroline period. In order to develop further, burlesque drama would need a public imbued with a greater critical awareness of the standards of drama. The Restoration period would bring with it a conscious reappraisal of such standards to the theatre world of London.
CHAPTER II

THE EMERGENCE OF BURLESQUE DRAMA: 1642-1671

The literary form that came to be known as burlesque originated in Italy during the Sixteenth Century. Writers of the caliber of Pulci and Ariosto wrote successful mock epics such as Mad Roland. The genre did not become fully defined, however, until Berni de Lamprecchio (1497-1535) discovered its full potentialities. In his Burlesque Rhyme and in his parody of Boiardo's Orlando Inamorato, Berni created the standard for various imitations in Italy. The Berni formula soon became known as "bernesque poetry" and subsequently gained great popularity. Such poems may be described as half burlesque and half satire, originally inspired by roman satire. The great French burlesque writer, Paul Scarron, probably derived his idea for Virgil Travesty while visiting Rome soon after Lalli, a Bernesque poet, had published his Eneide Travestita (1633). Scarron's Typhon (1644), however, became the first burlesque poem introduced into France. The poem parodied the blind respect for classical antiquity common in Baroque France. In the poem

the Olympic gods appeared as gross giants talking in
lower-class Parisian dialects—a burlesque device common
in Elizabethan and Jacobean comedy.  

Scarron became the first French writer consciously to
imitate the burlesque form with any degree of popularity. With
Scarron, the burlesque tradition received its fully developed
French character. When he entered the theatre world of Paris
in 1645, the influence of the Spanish romances and plays had
already affected the French drama. The Spanish authors, simi-
larly influenced by Bernesque poetry, added the farcical elements
from their tradition of the novel. All the great French writers
at that time, including Scarron, were familiar with Cervantes's
*Don Quixote*, the great satire on chivalry. The best-known
Spanish playwright in France after Calderon and Lope de Vega
was Francisco Rojas. Francisco introduced burlesque scenes
into his comedies. His original creation of Moscon, the valet,
became the model for Scarron's famous character, Jodelet.  

Scarron soon became the most popular playwright in France
before 1650, after Corneille. His *Jodelet ou le Maitre Valet*
(written 1643, published 1645) secured his reputation in the
Paris theatre. The play was actually a comic adaptation of
Rojas's *Donde Hay Agravios No Hay Celos y Amo Criado*.  

---
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version made the play less romantic and added to it parodies of contemporary French tragic verse. The character of Jodelet became the most popular type-character in French comedy. From Scarron's model of Jodelet can be traced Beaumarchais's Figaro. Jodelet became a character who was uniquely French, though based originally on a Spanish character, and who laid the foundation for the development of burlesque elements in the drama:

Jodelet is not an Italian zanni, as are Mascarille and Scapin of Molière, ... Jodelet is a gracioso Spaniard, that is to say, he represents a violent contrast to the heroic sentiments of the other characters, the vulgar philosophy of self-interest and egotism, not without spirit, but with a lack of absolute courage and no dignity of any sort; the valet, in the Spanish theatre, is almost always opposed to his master, prose beside poetry, reality beside the ideal, Sancho Panza beside the hidalgo of La Mancha.

Jodelet's contrast to the heroic manners of his master burlesqued the romantic ideals of the Spanish novel tradition. Scarron's play had the effect of elevating French comedy to the ranks of tragedy:

... he had almost accomplished a revolution in our theatre by introducing buffooneries in a standard play of five acts and in verse, and in lifting farce from the trestle stage where it had been relegated to the same stage where The Cid was acclaimed.

---
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As the valet type-character, Jodelet was introduced to England during the first years of the Restoration. His cowardliness and greed became familiar elements in the later English comedy of manners. Davenant's *The Man's the Master* (1668), for example, was almost a direct translation of Scarron's play.  

Scarron's *Don Japhet* (1652) further developed the burlesque elements that appeared in Jodelet. Japhet became the "burlesque hero" of the play, who consciously opposed himself to the *outré* sentiments of tragedy and romance. By so doing, he became a parody of nobility, courage, and romantic love. As a servant story, Jodelet's plot was a little intrigue separated from the main plotline, though intended to contrast with it. Japhet, however, was the main character of his play. His conscious scorn for the heroic ideals of the Spanish romance was intended as the chief comic interest in the play. Don Japhet affected the cavalier hero's mannerisms and aesthetic, but laughed at the heroic ideals of good taste:

Don Japhet: What is your name?

La Baille: I am called Alonzo, Gil, Glas, Pedro, Ramon.

Don Japhet: So many Chistening names?

La Baille: That many, yes.

---


Don Japhet: My dear friend, one could suspect you of having more than one father! 87

As a conscious parody of the ever-popular Spanish romance literature of the Seventeenth Century, Don Japhet was quite successful. Scarron, always eager to exploit to the fullest a popular formula, used the burlesque device of parodying heroic or aristocratic figures by having a country bumpkin masquerade as a nobleman and so affect the manners and speech of his betters. 88

Scarron’s influence upon Molière was prodigious. The latter revived Don Japhet several times for Louis XIV after 1660. In Les Precieuses Ridicules Molière’s character of the Vicomte de Jodelet was clearly intended as a Jodelet type. Molière went so far as to hire the same actor for the part of Jodelet that Scarron had originally used. Scarron’s Jodelet was performed over thirty times after 1659 by Molière’s troupe, even after the vogue for Spanish romance ebbed in France. 89

In spite of those obvious influences from Scarron, Molière’s contribution to burlesque drama was unique and quite significant in its own right. The great comic writer had, however, another major influence to draw upon. That influence
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came from Italy into France in the form of the farcical antics of the Commedia dell'Arte troupes. The troupes were greatly successful in Paris, especially before the young Louis XIV. Cardinal Mazarin, who understood little of French literature, was also entertained by the new Italian comedy. The comic characters and plots Molière borrowed from the Commedia have been recognized.

Molière also began to experiment with techniques for critical commentary from the stage. In *Les Precieuses Ridicules* (1659), Molière used the original contrivance of allowing a literary pretender to read and to compliment his own verses on stage:

Mascarille: Do you not find the thought well expressed in the time? "Stop thief! . . . and then, as though one cried out very loud: "stop, stop, stop, stop, stop, stop, thief!"
Then, all at once, like a person out of breath: "stop thief!"

Magdelon: This is to understand the perfection of things, the quintessence, the perfection of perfections. . . .

Cathos: I never met with anything so vivid.

Mascarille: Everything I do comes to me naturally; it is unstudied.90

Mascarille's conceit and excessive vanity, his willingness to demonstrate his literary talents to others, closely resembled the supercilious character of Bayes in *The Rehearsal*. Buckingham was in Paris in 1661 on one of his many diplomatic and
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romantic expeditions, and may perhaps have seen a performance of the play. He would have had ample opportunity to view the play, for Molière was quite fond of his one-act (he played the part of Mascarille himself), and no less than fifty performances of the play were given between 1659 and 1661. The theme of Molière's comedy, a comment of the preciosity and affected intellectualism of the French society of Louis XIV, was in many ways similar to the ridicule of English taste for overblown sentiment and affected language in Buckingham's play.

In The Versailles Rehearsal (1663), a play rehearsal was reenacted in which Molière played himself defending his own plays. The piece pleaded for the rival company at the Hotel de Bourgogne to abstain from personal attacks against his wife in their plays. D. F. Smith believed that the rehearsal device used in that play established a vehicle for future dramatic burlesque and parody. The basic similarities between The Rehearsal and Molière's piece were, however, very slight. Moliere's rehearsed play was not intended to be the object of ridicule. Indeed, there was no parody in the play as a whole. Buckingham's play, on the other hand, relied upon the ridiculous extravagances of its rehearsed inner play for the comic effect.
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Earlier in 1663, Molière had expressed the opinion in *The Critique of the School for Wives* that learned playwrights had their own eccentricities, which transcend those of any fop or man-of-mode. Pursuing the thought, Molière suggested that, if their characters were put on the stage, the playwrights' vanities would appear even more ridiculous than the fops'. Molière's thought may well have influenced the creation of Buckingham's Bayes, who was the epitome of the eccentric playwright. It is possible that Buckingham may have read or heard Molière's conjecture, for he began writing the first drafts of *The Rehearsal* soon after the premiere of Molière's play.

Another chief influence in French burlesque drama was Nicolas Boileau (1636-1711). He became known to his contemporaries primarily as a neoclassic theorist. In an age of restricted rules for dramatic form, he upheld a position of moderation and "good sense." Though not considered an outstanding poet, his talent as a versifier was considerable. He began the publication of his *Satires I-VII* in 1666, which was followed by other satiric works in the succeeding years. Boileau, as Scarron before him, was conscious of the excessive bombast and the unrealistic ideals contained in the popular Spanish romances of his day. His *Dialogue des Heros de Romans* (c. 1665) ridiculed the heroic romances. The work, however, was not printed until 1713 to avoid offending Mlle. de Scudery, at that time
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the most lauded romance writer in France. Boileau helped to keep heroic burlesque and parody fashionable during the formative years of the 1660's, when England was still dependent upon French trends in drama. He introduced a more refined mock-heroic genre in 1674, when *Le Lutrin*, a burlesque poem in six cantos, was published. Boileau's direct influence on Buckingham and his circle will be discussed below.

The French direction in burlesque poetry and mock-heroic drama found immediate imitators and adapters in England. Scarron's *Virgil Travesty* was followed by a flock of imitators who attempted travesties of Roman authors such as Lucan and Ovid. In England, Charles Cotton's *Scarronides: or Virgile Travesty* appeared in 1664. The extended poem was written in rhymed hexameters—a verse form that would typify subsequent burlesque literature in the early Restoration. Cotton's work was influenced by Scarron's plays and poems, which were written in Alexandrine verse. In the 1664 edition of Cotton's work, the title was followed by the explanation, "A mock poem. Being the first Book of *Virgile Aeneis* in English, burlesque." Cotton's use of Scarron's name in his title revealed the great reputation of the French lampooner in England. Cotton's version,

---


however, had a uniquely English character to it and was
generally coarser and less subtle than Scarron's original:

This Aeolus, as Stories tell us,
Could backwards blow like a Smiths Bellows;
A Day, a Week, a Month together,
And by his farting, make foul weather:
Blow Men, and Trees, and Houses down;
Great Ships, and almost Fishes down;
He was, in fine, the loudest of farters:
Yet could command his hinder quarters,
Correct his tail, and only blow.
If there occasion were, or so.98

As a Royalist, Cotton has spent the Interregnum in exile
on the Continent. He became impressed by the great popularity
of the new genre burlesque and waited until the Restoration to
head his own English burlesque movement.99 The English followers
of Cotton generally turned away from literary criticism, how­
ever, and confined their subject matter to personal or political
ridicule.

With the advent of the Restoration, France's infatuation
for burlesque verse waned. Boileau himself had recognized the
need to abandon the exhausted form:

In scorn of good sense, impudent burlesque
deceived the eyes first, pleased by its novelty

But the court, finally disabused with regard to
this style, disdained the easy extravagance of
its senses.100
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The situation was not the same in England. There an entirely new approach had been discovered. William Daven­
ant’s comedy, *The Playhouse to Be Let*, was acted in 1663 at Lincoln’s Inn Fields. Actually, the play was a collection of one-act playlets tied together by the ruling idea of the first act. The play’s last act has been called “the earliest bur­
lesque dramatic piece in the English language.” However true the statement, the play was unique for several reasons. Premiering in 1663, it actually predated Cotton’s *Virgile Tra­
vesty* and Butler’s influential *Hudibras*. With the exception of the first and last acts, Davenant wrote all of the playlets during the Interregnum, under Cromwell’s aegis. The first performance of one of the acts, “The Cruelty of the Spaniards in Peru,” was produced in 1658 at the Cockpit in London. The performance was allowed by Cromwell, it was said, because of the Lord Protector’s intense hatred for the Spaniards. Another act of the play, “The History of Sir Francis Drake,” was performed in 1659 at the Cockpit, presumably because it contained the theme of Spanish colonial policies and because it contained “Instrumental and Vocal Musick,” and was therefore allowed.

The plot of Davenant’s comedy is simple. A London

---
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playhouse is to be rented out during the Summer months to anyone who appears with a potentially lucrative production. Four applicants appear in the first act to rent the theatre. The decision is then made to rent the theatre to the group with the most theatrically effective performance. The next four acts are devoted to the various audition pieces, allowing one act apiece to the applicants.

Davenant certainly had not intended to initiate the fashion in England for burlesque drama and parody. Rather, he was merely incorporating various shorter plays from the Interregnum into the five-act structure in hope of attracting the public to the Duke's Company for the performance of a new play. The burlesque element in the play was confined almost entirely to the last act, called the "tragedy-travesty" scene. Act Two, an English adaptation of Sganarelle (originally written by Molière in 1660), relied almost entirely upon Davenant's inferior attempt to translate Molière's humor, with the dubious addition of French accents by the actors. The third act, "Sir Francis Drake," must be viewed as a patriotic piece that nevertheless attempted snatches of humor. The fourth act, "The Cruelty of the Spaniards in Peru," retained the hypocritical tone of moral superiority felt by the English toward the Spanish. Despite the absence of burlesque in the first four acts, Davenant's first act of The Playhouse to Be Let did contain elements of satire. There the author ridiculed the Restoration audience's taste for novelty and the resulting instability of
the acting companies. The acute awareness of England's dependence upon French dramatic taste also became the object of ridicule:

Monsieur: De vise nation bi for tings heroique,
And de fantastique, vor de farce!

Tire Woman: I like not that these French pardon-
neuy moys should make so bold with old
England.

House Keeper: Peace woman! We'll let the house,
and get money.105

Davenant thus attempted a bit of familiar theatre gossip from backstage, a trifle cynical perhaps, but not burlesque. The fifth act, on the other hand, was an outright burlesque of rhymed classical tragedy. The latter form had recently been imported from France. Davenant, conscious of the excesses of the new classical tragedy, (a form that he himself had helped to introduce into England) wrote a short play that burlesqued Mrs. Katherine Philips's Pompey. The tragedy of Mrs. Philips was a translation from Corneille and had been acted in 1662-63 in Dublin with great success. When the play was performed at Dorset Gardens, it was followed by Davenant's one-act burlesque. The fifth act took the Antony and Cleopatra story in Pompey, greatly shortened it, and retained the heroic rhyme as
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burlesque rhyme. Predating Virgile Travesty and Hudibras, it marked the first use of burlesque rhyme in the Restoration. Rhyme had been used, of course, in brief scenes of parody by the Elizabethan and Jacobean playwrights, most notably in The Knight of the Burning Pestle and in the Pyramus and Thisby play of A Midsummer Night's Dream. Davenant, however, was far more conscious of the specific object of his ridicule than were his predecessors. Burlesque and parody as genres in their own right were newly recognized in the play:

Poet: You must have something of a newer stamp to make your Coin current. Love and honour are esteemed but by the Antiquaries now. You should set up with that which is more new; What think you of romances travestie?

Player: Explain yourself!

Poet: The garments of our fathers you must wear. The wrong side outwards, and in time it may become a fashion. . . . You shall present the actions of the heroes, which are the chiefest theme of tragedy, in verse burlesque. 107

The Player and the Poet continue to discuss burlesque as the latest literary device from France. Actually, the fifth act was Davenant's first original play in seventeen years and became by far the most popular act of the play. As Howard S. Collins has pointed out, the Antony and Cleopatra skit was quite similar in both length and tone, to the droll entertainments of the Interregnum. That scene, therefore, cannot be considered a


mere imitation of contemporary French burlesque fare, but rather was motivated by, and, in part, formulated in the English dramatic tradition.

Davenant used the familiar burlesque device of articulating heroic actions and sentiments through the mouths of mundane characters:

Eunich: A cruel wight, whose name is Mark Anthony, 
So hard of heart that it is held all boney, 
Is here arrived for the love of our black Gypsy, 
On Cleopatra he has cast a sheep's eye, 
And to Julius Caesar too, with many a stout tarpauling. 
Landed with him and comes a Caterwawling. 109

The distance between the intended heroic sentiments and the commonplace style of the actors' speeches—made even greater by the frequent use of near-rhyme that forced the actors to distort the sound and add to the comic effect—was the main burlesque device in the play.

The short skit had vitality and, for the early Restoration audience, even novelty. Davenant's technique of mocking higher sentiments through the interjection of the commonplace and the familiar was, however, well within the native English tradition: Beaumont's mockery of the pretentions of the bourgeois romantic heroes in The Knight of the Burning Pestle, Shakespeare's
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clumsy tradesmen who imitate classical heroes, even
Jonson's puppet show in *Bartholomew Fair*, all used similar
approaches.

Davenant's heroic couplet act was performed frequently
after 1663 as a separate piece,\textsuperscript{110} attesting to its popularity.
The play, however, had no immediate imitators, neither as an
example of dramatic burlesque, nor as a serious attack upon the
budding heroic drama. There were factions within the Restoration
court society, however, who were aware of the excesses of
the heroic form and wished to censure it. Pepys recorded, for
example, that Sedley cracked jokes about the heroic sentiments
in Orrery's *The General*.\textsuperscript{111} The Preface to Edward Howard's
*The Usurper* (1667) criticized the use of heroic rhyme and
dances.\textsuperscript{112} There is evidence of a lost burlesque of Dryden's
*The Secret Love: or, The Maiden Queen* (1669-1670).\textsuperscript{113} Thomas
Shadwell's *The Sullen Lovers* (1668) contained the famous Sir
Positive At-All, who was commonly recognized as a fully de­
veloped burlesque portrait of Sir Robert Howard, who had formerly
been mocked in the character of Bilboa in Buckingham's first
version of *The Rehearsal*.\textsuperscript{114} Finally, a split between the main
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proponent of rhyme verse in drama, Dryden, and his chief ally, Sir Robert Howard, arose when the latter questioned the suitability of rhyme for tragedy.\textsuperscript{115}

By far the most significant faction opposed to the heroic drama, however, was the Duke of Buckingham's circle. The Duke had planned an abortive attempt to sabotage the performance of an heroic drama by Henry Howard called \textit{The United Kingdoms} (performed 1663, but never published), and barely managed to escape the theatre with his life.\textsuperscript{116} Rather than continue the dangerous policy of heckling the performance, Buckingham decided instead to write a play that would ridicule the absurdities of Howard's play. Buckingham's original play, now lost, was written between 1663 and 1664, and may very well have been influenced, or at least inspired, by \textit{The Playhouse to Be Let}. The latter play premiered the same year as Howard's play. Robert Howard, Henry's brother, was, as the best-known writer of heroic dramas at the time, the Duke's main object of ridicule.

The first version was never performed because of the plague and fire of 1665 and 1666. After theatrical activities were resumed in the city, the Duke was embroiled in political matters and ignored the theatre world for a period. By 1670, when Dryden succeeded Davenant as Poet Laureate of England, he was known as the outstanding apologist for the heroic drama.

\textsuperscript{115}See below, p. 90.
\textsuperscript{116}Anonymous, "The Publisher to the Reader," \textit{The Rehearsal} (London: Briscoe, 1704), pp. xi-xii.
When Buckingham resumed his attack upon the genre, Dryden's preeminent position became the object of attack. The Duke's new version, called *The Rehearsal*, opened on December 7, 1671, and had as its main character Bayes—a name that obviously referred to the figurative bay leaves of Dryden's Laureateship.

Little can be determined about the direct sources of influence for Buckingham's play. The Duke and the other members of his circle were doubtless familiar with Davenant's popular burlesque, especially since it supported their distaste for the heroic form. Buckingham may well have been inspired by *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, a play that had several similarities to *The Rehearsal*, with regard to both technique and structure.117 Beaumont's play was performed as a droll during the Interregnum, and the entire play was revived in 1661. Later, in the same decade, a new prologue was added to the play, spoken to great applause on the London stage until 1682.118

Buckingham, who left only a few scanty indications of his own theory of dramatic form, nevertheless was a recognized admirer of Ben Jonson's plays and was a supporter of a modified neoclassicism. Jonson was the most popular and respected playwright during the Restoration period. Killigrew's company in particular actively promoted his comedies and tragedies at the King's Theatre. As the dramatist who had captured the truest

117 See Chapter III, pp. 136-143 for a comparison of the two plays.

portrayal of human nature on the stage, Jonson was universally acclaimed, even by Dryden. 119

In a period when most of the serious dramas were sentimental and excessive imports from France, Jonson's comedy of humours appeared as down-to-earth realism. Thomas Shadwell, in his Preface to The Sullen Lovers (1668), proclaimed,

I have endeavoured to represent variety of Humours ... which was the practice of Ben Jonson, whom I think all dramatic Poets ought to imitate, though none are like to come near; he being the only person that appears to me to have made perfect Representation of human life. 120

The naturalistic coloring of Jonson's characters— their elemental drives and psychological weaknesses— was viewed as the most truthful picture of human life.

If Shadwell was the most outspoken upholder of the Jonsonian standard, Buckingham became the most powerful impresario of the movement. He, together with Lord Dorset, financed a revival of Jonson's Cataline, His Conspiracy that was intended as the standard of excellence to which all Restoration tragedy should conform. 121 Though successful with both King and public, the production failed in its presumed attempt to drive the heroic drama from the stage.


121 Nicoll, History of Restoration Drama, pp. 280-81.
Failing twice in his effort to subvert the heroic drama, Buckingham might have viewed his burlesque play as the final effort to root out the unrealistic elements of Restoration tragedy. Certainly, Buckingham and his collaborators took time (from 1663 to 1671) to complete their burlesque.

The Duke of Buckingham was quite notorious as a rake and political intriguer whose early childhood friendship with the King did not prevent him from making love to Charles's mistresses. "Bucks" was talented also "in turning into ridicule whatever was ridiculous in other people, and in taking them off, even in their presence, without them perceiving it."122

The Duke apparently used his considerable histrionic abilities to help train the actor, John Lacy, who played the original Bayes. According to the anonymous source reported in the Briscoe edition of the play, Bucks taught Lacy many subtle idiosyncrasies of Dryden's behavior for the play.

Buckingham's ability went beyond mere mimicry, however. He was educated at Cambridge with the future Charles II and toured Italy, France, and the Low Countries extensively before and after the Restoration. In Rome, during his exile (1646), Buckingham may have witnessed the satires of the great sculptor, architect, and playwright, Bernini, who at that time was in his most influential period. Bernini's famous Commedia play,

---

Due Teatri, in which a painted audience faced the real audience, could have suggested new theatrical possibilities to the Duke. As mentioned previously, Buckingham was no doubt also familiar with Molière's plays, and the writings of Molière's mentor, Scarron. The Duke was a cosmopolitan and well-read nobleman. He was considered to be,

A Person of a great Deal of Natural Wit and Ingenuity, and of excellent judgement, particularly in matters of this Nature (i.e., burlesque drama); his forward Genius was improved by a liberal Education, and the Conversation of the greatest Personages in his time.

Buckingham's admiration for Jonson was well-known. Doubt must be cast, however, on the source that claimed the Duke had known Jonson personally as a child in the Court of Charles I. Though it was true that the Duke was raised in the Whitehall Palace complex by the King's own family, the reporter that assured his public that the Duke knew Jonson, "being thirteen years old when he died," was in error: Buckingham was only nine, not thirteen, when Jonson died. However, the Duke may well have appreciated "the Company of Actors at Black-Fryars, whom he always admir'd." Thus, Buckingham may have had a faint glimmer of the original performances of the plays

---


125 Ibid., p. ix.
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of Jonson and his followers.

The dramatic ideal of Buckingham and his circle was not merely the Jonsonian comedy of humours transferred to the Restoration stage. Generally, the courtly theatre audiences and the cultivated (though uncouth) coffeehouse groups of gentlemen envisioned their own age as somewhat more refined than either the Elizabethan or the Jacobean ages of their grandfathers. What was valued at least as much as the realism of Jonson was the ability to portray eloquence of conversation in a language more simplified and neoclassical. In a word, what was valued was the ability to express "wit." That term was quite popular in Restoration days. Boyle defined the word in 1665 as,

The nimble and acceptable Faculty of the Mind, Whereby some men have a readiness, a subtilty [sic] in conceiving things, and a quickness, and neatness, in expressing them, all which the custom of speaking comprehends under the name of Wit.127

Dryden, believing he had incorporated the age's true version of wit in his heroic plays, gave the following definition in his Apology For Heroic Poetry and Poetic License:

The definition of Wit . . . is only this: that it is a property of Thoughts and Words; or in other terms, Thought and Words, elegantly adopted to the subject.128


Pope's famous definition of 1709 put it succinctly, "True Wit is Nature to advantage dress'd, What oft was thought, but ne'er so well express'd."\(^{129}\)

Of all previous playwrights, Dryden, whose opinion must be considered a reflection of the taste of his own age, appreciated Beaumont and Fletcher more than Shakespeare in one respect: they,

\[\ldots\] understood and imitated the conversation of gentlemen much better; whose wild debaucheries and quickness of wit in repartees, no poet before them could paint as they have done.\(^{130}\)

The popular court opinion was perhaps best expressed by John Dunton in 1691:

We require better bred fools than our forefathers were contented with, for the Merry Miller or Cobler wou'd make excellent sport at the Red-Bull or Globe, whereas nothing will down with us now under Lawyers Clerk, or a Country Gentleman.\(^{131}\)

Buckingham and his circle, motivated by both the realism of Jonson's character portrayal and the neoclassical desire for eloquence and simplicity of language, had their own ideals of wit. Buckingham found Dryden's rhymed verse in his heroic


dramas a violation of good wit. In a short poem sardonically called "Upon the Monument," the Duke quoted a famous line from Dryden's heroic play, *The Conquest of Granada* (1670), "For as old Selin was not mov'd by thee, neither will I by Selin's Daughter be." Buckingham simply commented by quoting a well-known, absurd jumble of alliteration:

A Py, a Pudding, a Pudding a Py,  
A Py for me, and a Pudding for thee,  
A Pudding for me, and a Py for thee,  
And a Pudding-Py for thee and me.\(^{132}\)

That bit of doggerel was a pure burlesque of Dryden's awkward antithesis. It also revealed Buckingham's astute observation and condemnation of any language distortion created for the sake of rhyme. Since Dryden's heroic dramas used rhymed couplets completely, Buckingham's quip must have been intended to drive deep. The Duke further revealed his outrage at the numerous dull and witless fops and hangers-on whose published outpourings were an unfortunate product of the age. The Duke was not averse to personal insult and even vulgarity when attacking a transgressor. One unfortunate victim was Sir Carr Scroope, a pretentious wit on the outer fringes of the Court, whom Buckingham addressed in,

*A Familiar Epistle to Mr. Julian, Secretary to the Muses*

Thou Common-shore of this Poetick Town,  
Where all our excrements of Wit are thrown,

For Sonnet, Satyr, Bawdry, Blasphemy are emptied and disburdened all on thee: The Coll'rick Wight, untrussing in a rage, Finds thee, and leaves thee his load upon thy page.133

Buckingham's attitude toward Dryden was just as uncompromising: "Less art thou helpt by Dryden's Bed-rid Age, That Drone has left his sting upon the stage."134 As the recognized leader of the heroic drama faction that included Davenant and the Howards, Dryden became Buckingham's main target. The Duke attacked Dryden's poor financial situation, ". . . that's a Mark that Dryden ne'er could hit. He lives upon his pension, not his wit."135

With his close, younger friend, John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester, Buckingham composed A Satyr Upon the Follies of the Men of the Age, a poem that revealed the two men's conception of what the drama should strive for:

When Shakespeare, Johnson [sic], Fletcher Rul'd the Stage,
They took so bold a Freedom with the Age,
That there were scarce a Knave, or Fool in Town
Of any Note, but had his picture shown;
And (without doubt) tho' some it may offend,
Nothing helps more than satyr to amend Ill manners, or is trulier Virtues Friend: Princes may Laws ordain, Priests gravely Preach,
But Poets more successfully will teach. . . .

133Ibid., 2:221.
134Ibid., "A Familiar Epistle to Julian . . .", 2:222.
135Ibid., "A Consolatory Epistle to Captain Julian, the Muses Newsmonger in His Confinement," 1:141.
So when a Vice ridiculous is made,
Our Neighbors keeps us from growing bad.

The thought was neoclassical, quite within the traditional comic theory advocated by Philip Sidney and Ben Jonson. The two Restoration noblemen doubtless saw their own "Satyr," The Rehearsal, as a comedy that would both entertain and teach through the ridiculous imitation of the "Vices" in heroic drama.

Rochester and Buckingham may have had The Rehearsal in mind when they wrote a satirical poem chronicling various heroic and comic playwrights and their ambitious attempts to capture for themselves the bay leaves of the Laureateship. The form of the satire was directly influenced by Boileau's satires, "In the head of the Gamy, John Dryden appear'd, that ancient Grave Wit so long lov'd and fear'd." In another satiric attack, Buckingham and Rochester acknowledged their debt to "Monsieur Boleau" for their imitation of his style. The extended poem was a broad satire that mentioned several passages from various current plays. Among the latter were Dryden's heroic play, The Indian Emperor, performed some years previous to his The Conquest of Granada, and plays by Shadwell and Settle. The satiric attacks, written in imitation of Boileau, all used rhymed couplets. The verses were parodies, a device that was

---
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139 Ibid., Timon, a Satyr, in Imitation of Monsieur Boleau Upon Several Passages in Some New Plays Then Acted Upon the Stage, 1:179.
so essential for the humor in *The Rehearsal*.

Unlike Rochester, whose name was never mentioned in any of the earliest references to the collaborators of *The Rehearsal*, Samuel Butler was, from an early reliable account, a contributor to the burlesque play. As early as 1664, Butler had used rhymed couplets to ridicule Dryden's heroic dialogue. His mock dialogue poem, *Repartees Between Cat and Fuss at a Caterwawling*, burlesqued conversations in Dryden's *The Rival Ladies* (performed the same year as the publication of Butler's poem). The attack revealed an early, conscious attempt on the part of an English critic to mock heroic dialogue. *The Rival Ladies* was Dryden's first play written in rhymed couplets, or "heroic verse," and was one of the first non-musical plays of the Restoration to use that verse form. Butler's dialogue parody was replete with artificially imposed syllogisms and convoluted reasoning that was quite unnecessary for the mundane love situation between the two characters. The similarities between the dialogue and the situation in *Repartees* and the Prince Prettyman scenes in *The Rehearsal* were striking. It was possible that Butler became the chief contributor of the overblown love rhetoric for such scenes in that play.

Butler was considered an isolated critic in an age when men eagerly sought alliances in the hope that such cliques would protect them from literary vendetta. He was, however,

---

universally recognized as a friendly ally of the Bucking
ingham circle, though the facts of Butler's life remain
cloaked in obscurity.

Butler attacked Dryden for his dependence upon foreign
sources for his dramatic material. Referring to the Laureate's
imitation of French and Spanish drama, he quipped, "He [Dryden]
complayned of B[en] Johnson for stealing 40 scenees out of
Plautus [in Dryden's Essay of Dramatic Poesy]. Set a thief to
find a thief." Butler was reacting to Dryden's habit of
one-sided criticism of Jonson and Shakespeare, which continued
to be an unattractive feature of the latter's prose criticism,
especially in The Defence of the Epilogue and An Essay of Heroic
Plays (both published, 1672).

Butler became the most influential satirist in England
with the publication of his monumental Hudibras (1664), a bur-
lesque poem of political significance that incorporated the
Don Quixote theme. The poem was written in octosyllabic, or
four-stress, rhyming couplets. That particular verse form
had originally come from France in Chaucer's time, but had
never been used extensively with burlesque intent. Butler
probably adopted the form in mock imitation of the contem-
porary French romances. By temperament opposed to the elevated
sentiments and improbable reversals characteristic of the romance-
novels, Butler was further aggravated by the foreign origins
of that literature. Behind his xenophobia, however, was a
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sincere dissatisfaction with the pretentions of the French importations as they were adapted by his fellow countrymen.

"Hudibrastic verse" was imitated quite frequently after the poem's first publication, for the most part, by political pamphleteers opposing themselves to, or supporting, the High Anglican position of Church dominance in England. Elements of burlesque appeared in the poem, notably in the Rump parliament scene, but Butler's intention was not to ridicule a certain literary style, or even to support a defined political position. Rather, the author wished to go beyond such particular criticism to show the human faults common to all mankind.

Butler's satiric form was itself influenced by the vogue for political burlesque verse made popular during the upheaval of the Fronde in Paris (1640's). Hudibras went beyond both foreign and domestic originators, however, and encompassed a wider view of man than could be attempted by mere political attack.

No source is available that described the nature and extent of Butler's collaboration on The Rehearsal. It can only be acknowledged that Butler's dramatic sensibilities were closely allied with those of Buckingham's circle and that his poetic attacks upon the dialogue of heroic drama (Repartees Between Cat and Puss at a Caterwawling) were similar in both style and tone to scenes from The Rehearsal as well as to the satiric attacks of Buckingham and Rochester. Unlike the latter two noblemen, however, Butler was not directly influenced by the personal satires of Boileau, since the majority of his
burlesques and satires are written before the first publication of the Frenchman’s satires.\textsuperscript{143} Butler was quite clearly against the reliance upon foreign dramatic fare as was evident in his Satire on Our Ridiculous Imitation of the French, and Upon Critics Who Judge of Modern Plays Precisely By the Rules of the Ancients.\textsuperscript{144} The author doubtless had Dryden in mind when he accused "our English plagaries" of the dogmatic imitation of Corneille and the "virtuosi Tuscans."\textsuperscript{145} In the same work, Butler restated his condemnation of Dryden's habit of one-sided comparisons with previous English playwrights:

\begin{quote}
Of witty Beaumont’s poetry, and Fletcher’s, 
Who for a few misprisions of wit, 
Are charged by those who ten times worse commit; 
And please more than the best that pedants write.\textsuperscript{146}
\end{quote}

The short character sketch entitled "The Play-writer" (no date) revealed Butler's opinion of the fashionable playwright of the early Restoration period. The similarity of his view in that prose work with the view expressed in The Rehearsal was quite evident. The vocabulary in both works showed a close similarity.\textsuperscript{147} Though Butler did not mention a specific dramatist in the short description, he was undoubtedly referring to his traditional literary victim and the most popular dramatist of

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{143}Boileau's Satires I-VII were published in France in 1666, and his Dialogue des Héros de Romans was published in 1665.  
\textsuperscript{144}The Poets of Great Britain, ed. by Robert Anderson 12 vols. (Edinburgh: Mundell & Son, 1792), 5:627-628.  
\textsuperscript{145}Ibid., 5:628.  
\textsuperscript{146}Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{147}Samuel Butler, Characters, ed. by Charles W. Daves (Cleveland: Case Western Reserve University Press, 1970), p. 162.
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Butler's "literary master" of the satiric joke has been identified as John Cleveland. There was doubtless a "close personal intimacy between them." Cleveland has been described as the first English satirist for his personal attacks in iambic pentameter rhyming couplets that set the standard for political satire. After 1640, when Cleveland was writing his political satires, censorship policies in England were greatly relaxed until the overthrow of the monarchy. In such a tolerant atmosphere, he was allowed to write his personal and topical attacks with almost complete freedom. Cleveland was not a dramatist, though he had written a burlesque sketch during his honorary appointment as "father" of the Cambridge Revels (an undergraduate tradition at the University for years). His sketch was popular for its clever punning on his honorary title as father to the undergraduates. The piece was quite sophomoric, and was more a revue than a drama, appealing primarily to a close clique of collegians. Cleveland's satiric poems were similar both in tone and style to Butler's famous burlesques. In his use of rhymed couplets, however, Cleveland did not rely upon burlesque or parody for ridicule, as did Butler.

About Buckingham's second recognized collaborator far more is known. Martin (Mat) Clifford, whose lifetime friend-
ship with Buckingham had begun while both men were undergraduates at Cambridge (1640-1643), was an enthusiastic member of the Duke's literary clique. Clifford's attacks on Dryden, written in letter form and circulated as transcripts in coffeehouses during the time of the premiere of *The Rehearsal* (1671-1672), were quite well-known to the wits.\textsuperscript{151}

Vicious and unmerciful by temperament, Clifford became a harsh ridiculer whose language was at times unjustified. His critical observations on Dryden's heroic dramas were, however, quite in line with present-day (1975) critical opinion. In one circulated letter, Clifford compared Almanzor, the hero of *The Conquest of Granada* (1670), with Shakespeare's Ancient Pistol. The latter character was a would-be gallant who fancied himself a bombastic actor in the style of Edward Allyn.\textsuperscript{152}

Clifford continued in that letter,

\begin{quote}
But the four sons of Ammon, the three bold Beachams, the four London Prentices, Tamberlain, the Scythian Shepherds, . . . or any raging Turk at the Red-Bull and Fortune, might as well have been urged by you as a pattern of your Almanzor, as the Achilles in Homer; but then our laureate had not passed for so learned a man he desires his learned admirers should esteem him.\textsuperscript{153}
\end{quote}

Clifford was responding to Dryden's argument in *An Essay of Heroic Poetry*, prefaced to the 1672 edition of *The Conquest of Granada*.\textsuperscript{151}


\textsuperscript{152} See Chapter I, pp. 32-33.

Granada, in which Dryden compared Almanzor to Achilles and other classical heroes. In that essay, Dryden made the bold claim that his heroic character, even more than contemporary French heroic characters, adhered to "patterns of exact virtue."

Most of the heroic dramas, including all of Dryden's until 1675, treated the idealized purity of heroic love, a conception of heroism derived largely from Mlle. de Scudery's French romance novels and similar forms of popular literature. Clifford was not objecting to the moralizing stance of such dramas. Rather, he attempted to point out Dryden's failure to achieve his goal: the portrayal of characters of superior moral attainment. Clifford could only find Dryden's heroic characters, Almanzor specifically, ridiculous and bombastic.

A principle source for Dryden's neoclassical theory was Corneille's Discourses, which were prefixed to the latter's collected dramas in 1660. Clifford accused Dryden of pilfering from "Monsieur Hedelin, Mesnardiere, and Corneille." Dryden's critic was not only exasperated by the Laureate's dependence upon French playwrights and theorists, he was also annoyed by Dryden's overuse of similar character types and plot formulas.

---
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that appeared in all the Laureate's heroic plays. He accused Dryden of "stealing from himself."158

Clifford's criticism of the extravagant language in Dryden's heroic dramas was quite detailed. In his Notes Upon Mr. Dryden's Poems. In Four Letters (circulated circa 1672), he demanded to know the meaning of Dryden's simile in The Conquest of Granada, "The brave Almanzor Who like a Tempest that out-rides the Wind." Clifford's comment was characteristically sardonic:

The sense of it to my weak and shallow Understanding, is, a Tempest that out-rides it self: And if it be so, pray resolve me whether you be not cozen'd with the sound, and never took the pains to examine the sense of your own Verses. (emphasis Clifford's)

It was the same concern for good taste and suitable metaphor that was expressed in The Rehearsal.

Similar voices were raised against Dryden's heroic dramas, including one Richard Leigh, a university student turned actor for the Duke's Company.159 The third known collaborator on The Rehearsal, Thomas Sprat, was, like his close friend, Clifford, an enthusiastic member of Buckingham's circle. Sprat, also university educated, had been recommended to Buckingham by Abraham Cowley and soon became the Duke's private chaplin.160 Sprat was considered a first-rate poet as well as a scholar in his day. In 1663 he was elected Fellow of the Royal Society,

159 Ibid., p. 133.
for which he subsequently wrote a history. In his Preface to The Works of Abraham Cowley, Sprat mentioned that Buckingham had been his and Cowley's patron in the arts. Sprat collaborated with Clifford on several satiric attacks against Dryden. "Sprat and Mat" were known also to have assisted Settle in composing his Absalom Senior, or Achitophel Transpros'd, which was a satiric reply to Dryden's poem, Absalom and Achitophel. A chief source of inspiration for Buckingham and most of his collaborators was Abraham Cowley. Cowley was considered by his age to be the greatest living poet of England, Milton included. Sprat considered Cowley his literary father, and was quite influenced, he admitted, by his mentor's "pindaric verse." More than any other English poet, Cowley anticipated and prepared the standards for refined language and "Wit" in conversation valued so much by Restoration taste. Sir John Denham's eulogy on Cowley's death reflected the prevailing critical viewpoint of his day:

Old mother wit and nature gave Shakespeare and Fletcher all they had, In Spencer and in Jonson art of a slower nature got the start, But both in him [Cowley] so equal are, None knows which bears the happiest share.

---
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An eyewitness reported that, on his deathbed, the Earl of Rochester observed that "Boileau among the French and Cowley among the English Wits were those he admired the most." Buckingham, always willing to finance writers he admired, had generously given Cowley a fine residence on the Thames for his retirement. The Duke also paid for Cowley's monument at Westminster Abbey, where the bard was buried. The Latin epitaph, written in hexameters, was probably contributed by Sprat. The latter, writing to Clifford, eulogized his mentor in an account of his life that was prefaced to the 1668 edition of Cowley's Works.

Cowley, whose work has generally paled before Milton and Dryden's in recent times, was the head of the so-called "metaphysical poets." That school was known for its elaborate use of metaphor and for its cavalier ethos. The young Buckingham had looked upon Cowley as his master at Cambridge. There Cowley produced a satiric play, The Guardian, which was acted before Charles I in 1642 by student actors. Buckingham himself may well have been in the cast. During the Interregnum, the play was revived, and in the early Restoration it was acted as The Cutter of Coleman Street. Cambridge had long been inclined toward satiric revues and even dramatic parody (The
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Journey to Parnassus trilogy, for example), but Cowley's play also proved to be commercially successful before the London audiences. Buckingham may have been originally inclined toward dramatic composition under the suggestion of Cowley.

The Earl of Rochester's name went unmentioned in most early commentaries on The Rehearsal. Nevertheless, Rochester undoubtedly had more than just a sympathetic interest in that burlesque drama. John Wilmot, 2nd Earl of Rochester (1647-1680) met Buckingham in 1667. They remained close friends until Rochester's premature death brought on by excessive drinking. Though twenty years his junior, Rochester quickly gained reputation as a profligate and notorious libertine that surpassed that of Buckingham. Rochester was given to "a violent love of passion, and a disposition to extravagant mirth." He was anything but dull-witted, however, for he was known as much for his excellent wit and repartee as for his debauchery. Etherege, a long-time drinking companion of the Earl, modeled his famous urbane character Dorimant in The Man of Mode after the attractive and witty young nobleman. Rochester was also in touch with the prevailing literary trends in Paris. His debt to the French satirist Boileau has been discussed.

The young gallant actively corresponded with the admired French-
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As were Clifford and Sprat, Rochester was indignant towards Dryden for the latter's arrogant presumption. In his Epilogue to The Conquest of Granada, II (1670) and in The Defence of the Epilogue to The Conquest of Granada (1672), Dryden persisted in his critical method of unfair comparison of his own dramatic genius with that of Shakespeare, Jonson, and Fletcher. The result of such comparisons was to proclaim the virtues of Dryden's heroic drama at the expense of all previous English drama. Rochester's reply to The Defence and the Epilogue to The Conquest of Granada, II was direct and characteristically sarcastic. The Earl used the rhyming couplets that were employed by Boileau and, by 1672, many English satiric poets, such as Sir John Denham and Edmund Waller:

But does not Dryden find even Jonson dull?
Beaumont and Fletcher incorrect and full
Of lewd lines, as he calls them? Shakespeare's style
Still and affected? To his own, the while
Allowing all the justice that his pride
So arrogantly had to these denied.
And may I not have leave impartially
To search and censure Dryden's works, and try
If those gross faults, his choice pen doth commit,
Proceed from want of judgement, or of wit?
Or if his lumpish fancy doth refuse
Spirit and grace to his loose slattern muse?
Five hundred verses, every morning writ,
Prove him no more a poet than a wit.173


Rochester found Dryden's boastful claims of superiority contradicted by an awkward style of dialogue and an improbable system of causality in his heroic plays. The portrait of Dryden as a vain and egocentric Poet Laureate preoccupied with his own qualities as a dramatist became the character attributes of Bayes, the playwright ridiculed in *The Rehearsal*.

John Dryden began his career as a dramatic theorist with his *Essay of Dramatic Poesy* (1668). The work was written as a reply to Sir Robert Howard's Preface to his *Four New Plays* (published, 1665), which questioned the suitability of rhymed couplets for the drama. Howard, who originally introduced Dryden to the heroic drama form, had not envisioned the emergence of rhymed couplet tragedy as the critical standard and arbiter of taste, as interpreted by Dryden. Dryden's *Essay*, then, was intended to defend the heroic form of the drama in the highly critical atmosphere of Baroque London. He opened his critical work by comparing English drama to its French counterpart, using the neoclassical theories of Corneille, Jonson, Heinsius, and others as a standard. He regarded Jonson's plays as the most "regular" among the English, according to the neoclassical standard, and considered Jonson a playwright who possessed the "pattern of a perfect play." Jonson appealed

---
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to Dryden's unique form of neoclassicism. The Jacobean was "the most learned and judicious writer which any theatre ever had."\(^{177}\) Comparing Jonson to Shakespeare, Dryden admitted,

> I must acknowledge him the more correct poet, but Shakespeare the greater wit. Shakespeare was the Homer, or Father of our dramatic Poets; Johnson [sic] was the Virgil, the pattern of elaborate writing; I admire him, but I love Shakespeare.\(^{178}\)

For Dryden, Jonson set the standard for effective dramatic composition. His characters were intended to ridicule human weaknesses and follies, an intention that was quite within the neoclassic tradition advocated by Buckingham and Rochester. By contrast, Shakespeare was considered to be less concerned with exhibiting the common faults of the Age. He was looked upon as naturally talented, but unaware of the neoclassical standards originally established in England by Philip Sidney in *The Defence of Poetrie* (1587). Jonson, however, became the first dramatist to recognize Sidney's theories and to reevaluate his predecessor's concepts in his *Discoveries* (written, c. 1620's). Dryden, and every other concerned critic of the Restoration drama, eagerly read Jonson's essays. Dryden paid Jonson perhaps the greatest compliment by observing that, "Something of Art was wanting to the drama till he came."\(^{179}\)

He ascribed to Jonson the original theories that were considered most relevant to the Restoration age:

\(^{177}\text{Ibid.}, \ p. \ 58.\)

\(^{178}\text{Ibid.}\)

\(^{179}\text{Ibid.}, \ p. \ 57.\)
To conclude of him, as he has given us the most correct Plays, so in the precepts that he has laid down in his Discoveries, we have as many and profitable Rules for perfecting the Stage as any wherewith the French can furnish us.

Having established English (as opposed to foreign) precedents for his heroic form, Dryden turned his attention in the Essay to Howard's argument against rhyme in drama. Dryden's argument used the dialectical form, Crites representing Howard's viewpoint:

In our own language we see Ben Johnson confining himself to what ought to be said, even in the liberty of blank verse; and yet Corneille, the most judicious of French Poets, is still varying the same sense an hundred ways, and dwelling eternally on the same subject, though confined to Rhyme.

Dryden thus conceded the limitations of rhymed couplets for thought and style in dialogue. Neander, however, representing Dryden's view, summarily answered the charge:

Playes where the subject and characters are great, and the plot unmixed with mirth, which might ally or divert these concernments which are produced, Rhyme is there as natural, and more effectual, than blank verse.

Dryden further justified the use of rhyme by proposing that it is no more removed from "natural" discourse than is blank Verse. The main point for his defense of rhyme for drama

---
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depended upon a superior poet who could make even rhymed couplets and triplets seem natural and appropriate in conversation. Such an argument forced Dryden to maintain an egotistical stance toward his own abilities as a playwright. In his eyes he was one of the few poets with the ability to make even the rhymed dialogue seem natural and flowing.

Dryden's position in the Essay, though a professed neoclassical belief, was nevertheless unique. Instead of displaying an enthusiasm for the French neoclassical drama, he carefully avoided overt praise of that school. His attitude toward the strict rules of French neoclassical drama was ambivalent: he respected them, but found them lacking. He conceded the English dependence upon French dramatic theory, recognizing that "Corneille and some other Frenchmen reformed their Theatre (which before was as much below ours as it now surpasses it and the rest of Europe)." Later on in the Essay, however, he seemed to retract that evaluation:

... we have many plays of ours as regular as any of theirs [the French]; and which besides have more variety of Plot and Character; And second, that in most of the irregular plays of Shakespeare or Fletcher ... there is a more masculine fancy and greater spirit in the writing, than there is in any of the French.

Dryden seemed to have regarded the French drama as superior in theory (the obedience to the rules of neoclassical form),

---
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but the English he regarded as generally better in the creation of original material no matter how "irregular" the result.

In Dryden's *Defence of the Essay of Dramatic Poesy*, written the same year as the *Essay* (1668) to answer countercharges by Robert Howard, Dryden further supported the strict adherence to the unities of time and place that was advocated by the French neoclassicists. He also reaffirmed the use of rhymed couplets. In the *Defence*, Dryden acknowledged the chief sources for his theories: "derived from the authority of Aristotle and Horace, and from the rules and examples of Ben Johnson and Corneille." The latter Dryden had already mentioned frequently, with familiar quotations from the great Frenchman's theoretical works, in the *Essay*.

Four years after the *Defence*, Dryden, who had been appointed Poet Laureate of England in 1670 to succeed Davenant, began to modify his position concerning the standards for heroic drama. In his *Essay of Heroic Plays*, prefixed to an edition of *The Conquest of Granada I, II* (1672), he had turned full circle in his view of the function of poetic dialogue in heroic Drama:
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But it is very clear to all those who understand poetry, that serious plays ought not to imitate conversation too nearly. If nothing were to be raised above that level, the foundation of poetry would be destroyed. 190

It was evident that Dryden had abandoned his earlier claim in the Essay that rhymed verse could and ought to be as "natural" as blank verse dialogue. Whereas, in the Essay, Dryden sought the natural flow of realistic dialogue as his standard, in the Essay of Heroic Plays, on the contrary, he advocated a form that no longer attempted verisimilitude in dialogue. In the latter essay, he maintained that the heroic drama should attempt "a farther liberty of fancy, and of drawing all things as far above the ordinary proportion of the stage, as that is beyond the common words and actions of human life." 191 It was possible that Dryden, overreacting to The Rehearsal's initial success with the public, felt defensive about his argument as it had been presented in the earlier Essay of Dramatic Poesy. Instead of defending his dubious argument that attempted to prove that rhymed couplets were as natural for discourse as blank verse or prose, he abandoned the claim. It was more likely, however, that Dryden had envisioned a more exalted form of heroic drama before the premiere of The Rehearsal (December 7, 1671). In the Epilogue to The Conquest of Granada (1670), Dryden had already shown his preference for the "refined"
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language of his own age. Such a view was quite common in the Restoration.  

Dryden, however, seemed to boast excessively of his superior language in the Epilogue:

They who have best succeeded on the stage,  
Have still conform'd their genius to their age.  
Thus did Jonson mechanick humour show,  
When men were dull, and conversation slow,  
Then comedy was faultless, but twas coarse.

Once again, Dryden was contrasting his work with his predecessors' and was adopting a superior stance. His concern, in the Epilogue, for an exalted heroic drama of "love and honor" was already apparent: "If love and honour now are higher raised,  
'Tis not the poet, but the age is praised."  

Dryden's heroic drama was thus seen by him to be the fitting expression for the more "refined" age of the Restoration. The newly crowned laureate assumed a defensive position toward his heroic form:

Yet, though you judge (as sure the critics will)  
That some before him [the author] writ with greater skill,  
In this one praise he has their fame surpass'd,  
To please an age more gallant than the last.

From the first publication of his Essay of Dramatic Poesy to the Essay of Heroic Plays, Dryden became more extreme in his view of the values the heroic drama should embody. His unflattering habit of comparing himself and his drama to previous

---
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dramatic authors and their ages became more pronounced after his succession to the Laureateship in 1670. Dryden's egocentricity, as evidenced in the Epilogue to his most popular heroic play, soon raised critical reaction. The Laureate responded in the following year (1672) with his *Defence of the Epilogue to the Conquest of Granada*. In that work Dryden continued, with even greater enthusiasm, his already unpopular comparisons. By attempting to demonstrate his improvement of the language of drama, he took on the dubious task of discrediting Shakespeare's language: "Never did any author precipitate himself from such heights of thought to so low expressions, as he often does."\(^{196}\) Dryden also criticized Jonson for a coarse and narrow use of language:

> when at any time he aimed at wit in a stricter sense, that is, sharpness of conceit, he was forced either to borrow from the ancients, . . . or, when he trusted himself alone, often fell into meanness of expression.\(^{197}\)

In a seeming act of kindness to Jonson and Shakespeare, Dryden attributed their limitations to the coarseness of their age, not to their individual abilities as playwrights.\(^{198}\) It has already been pointed out that Dryden's unbalanced comparisons sprang not entirely from his own estimation of the Elizabethans. The common belief prevailed that the Restoration coterie of
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court wits and solid, middle-class Puritan literati conversed in a language at once more refined and simplified than their forefathers had. To his credit it must be noted that Dryden also considered other writers of his era to be superior in refined language and wit to their Elizabethan counterparts. Even the mediocre, in his view, made better use of their language because their age was generally more refined. Dryden even went so far as to credit Buckingham's version of Fletcher's *The Chances* (1665), as superior in eloquent conversation (wit) to the original.\(^{199}\) The Laureate, not unlike other English neoclassicists, valued aristocratic conversation and heroic passions. He cited Mercutio, Truewit (from Jonson's *The Silent Woman*), and Fletcher's Don John as inferior attempts to portray courtly manners.\(^{200}\) With supreme disregard for the ability of those authors to create characters of unmatched realism and humanity, Dryden dismissed those characters because "their wit was not that of gentlemen; there was ever somewhat that was ill-bred and clownish in it, and which confessed the conversation of the authors."\(^{201}\)

Dryden continued his *Defence* with an evaluation of the drama of his own age in terms of its ability to express "gallantry."\(^{202}\) At that point he felt constrained to answer older critics who favored the plays at "Black-Fryars" in days past. To such a group Buckingham was doubtless sympathetic.\(^{203}\) Dryden retorted complacently to that group, "In short, they [the older
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critics] were unlucky to have been bred in an unpolished age, and more unlucky to live to a refined one."\textsuperscript{204}

As a middle-class poet laureate, Dryden could have expected at least the disrespect of such noblemen as Buckingham. As the laureate who sought to establish himself as a superior to Jonson, Shakespeare, Beaumont and Fletcher, perhaps even Corneille, however, Dryden was vulnerable to attack. Samuel Johnson in the next century commented on Dryden's unfortunate critical method of comparison, "but his purpose being to exalt himself by the comparison he shews faults distinctly, and only praises excellence in his predecessors in general terms."\textsuperscript{205}

Just as Dryden's view of heroic dialogue changed from the standard of verisimilitude to that of an exalted form, removed from ordinary life, so also did his view of stage spectacle change. In his \textit{Essay of Dramatic Poesy}, he argued for a more neoclassical approach toward spectacle:

\begin{quote}
\ldots the French avoid the tumult, to which we are subject in England, by representing duells, battells, and the like; which renders our stage too like the theatres were they fight Prizes. For what is more ridiculous than to represent an army with a drum and five men behind it.\textsuperscript{206}
\end{quote}

Dryden was merely restating Corneille's view of decorum—all violence should be excluded from the stage. Such a view must

\begin{footnotes}
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\end{footnotes}
not have been much different from the views of The Rehearsal collaborators. The convention of two-man armies and the absurdities that often resulted on the stage was ridiculed in that play (Act V, sc. 1). Buckingham and his associates no doubt found stage fights and blood, as they were customarily portrayed upon the Restoration stage, as ridiculous as Dryden in his Essay found them. The Duke may have been originally turned against stage combats from his reading of Jonson and Sidney, the latter of whom was first in England to censure the use of a few men to represent an entire army. In effect, Dryden was upholding verisimilitude by demanding the exclusion of such scenes from the stage. In the Essay of Heroic Plays, however, Dryden reversed himself. In that essay, the use of stage battles was justified on the grounds that such spectacles aid the audience's imagination: "These warlike instruments, and even the representations of fighting upon the stage, are no more than necessary to produce the effects of an heroic play; that is, to raise the imagination of the audience."

Dryden expanded his new position by demanding that the playwright ought "to endeavor an absolute dominion over the minds of the spectators; for, tho' our fancy will contribute to its own deceit, yet a writer ought to help its operation." Referring to the use of supernatural representations in heroic drama, Dryden observed that "an heroic poet is not tied to a
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bare representation of what is true, or exceedingly pro-
bable; but that he may let himself loose to visionary ob-
jects... not to be comprehended by knowledge."210

Dryden was thus moving away from Jonsonian realism in
both his view of stage spectacle and in his attitudes toward
exalted characterization and rhymed speech. That change took
place from shortly before his succession to the Laureateship
to after the success of his heroic play, The Conquest of Granada.

Buckingham and his collaborators railed at Dryden's posi-
tion in public places as well as in private correspondence.
The object of The Rehearsal's attack, however, was not merely
the dramatic theories of Dryden. The tradition of heroic drama,
as it had developed from 1660 to about 1677, was at least as
much attacked in the play.

Dryden, and, indeed, all the heroic playwrights, consciously
borrowed the plots, characters, and, to some extent, the senti-
ments, of the romance novels of Mlle. de Scudery and other
French authors. Those romances were in turn borrowed from the
Spanish romances of the early Seventeenth Century. The domestic
influences on the heroic drama form were equally strong, however.
Modern critics have pointed out the heroic drama's debt to the
adventure plays made popular by Beaumont and Fletcher in the
Jacobean period.211 Both forms relied upon exotic characters
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"whose fate involved that of the state." Both forms also created two-dimensional characters for the sake of dramatic pathos and spectacle. Certain stock characters were familiar to both forms—the bombastic hero of "ingovernable passion," for example, and the "evil woman of high authority." Though it would hardly have been admitted at the time, both forms sacrificed a true moral viewpoint in their attempt to achieve aristocratic refinement.

Contemporary Restoration observers were quite conscious of Beaumont and Fletcher's influence on the heroic dramas of their age. Writing in 1664, Richard Flecknoe stated, "Beaumont and Fletcher first writ in the Heroic way, upon whom Suckling and others endeavored to refine again [sic]." Other, purely literary influences upon the heroic drama has been acknowledged. There was little doubt that Dryden and others were influenced by the abstruse imagery and the cavalier sentiments of the "metaphysical poets." mentioned above. The precious sentiments of non-physical love expressed by the "Platonic cult" that was popular in the closing years of Charles I's reign have been identified as influential upon character motivation in the heroic dramas. Such cavalier dramas as Davenant's pre-Common-

---

wealth The Platonic Lovers (1636) and Love and Honour (1649) reflected the sentiments of preciosity. George Cartwright's The Heroick Lovers (printed, 1661) was written in rhyme and included the bombastic rhetoric associated with the heroic drama. The similarities of theme and subject matter between the pre-Commonwealth cavalier dramas and the later heroic dramas was quite evident. Robert Howard's The Indian Queen (1663-1664), for example, was considered the first in a long line of heroic dramas, but its situation—two friends who were rivals for the same love—was identical to Brome's cavalier drama, The Love-Sick Court.

The metaphysical poets doubtless had a considerable influence on the popular genre of the cavalier drama. Among those poets, the most revered was Abraham Cowley. He wrote chiefly in rhymed couplets, which had come into fashion in England at the time. Samuel Johnson dubbed the school the "metaphysical poets" because of their often extravagant imagery and unnecessary hyperbole. One example from Cowley's Knowledge will suffice:

The sacred tree midst the fair orchard grew;
The Phoenix Truth did on it rest,
And built his perfumed nest,
That right Porphyrian tree, which did true
logick shew.

Each leaf did learned notions give,
And the apples were demonstrative:
So clear their color and divine,
The very shade they cast did other lights
coutshine.
The similarities between Cowley's couplets and the rhymed dialogue of heroic characters was obvious. Cowley was admired by all Restoration writers and consciously imitated, especially by Dryden. The fact that Cowley was Buckingham's intellectual mentor at Cambridge and became a chief beneficiary of the Duke's literary patronage supports the conclusion that Buckingham and his group were not averse to eloquent language but rather fought the excessive use of it in the drama. Cowley, after all, had confined his elaborate imagery to lyric poetry and the epic.

The heroic drama was given its name by Dryden, who, in the *Essay of Heroic Plays*, claimed that his heroic plays were, and ought to be modeled after heroic poetry, "and consequently, that love and valor ought to be the subject of it." Dryden was by no means the originator of the dramatic form of heroic poetry, however. Roger Boyle, the First Earl of Orrery, was the principle apologist for the new form during the first three years of the Restoration. In his dedication to *The Rival Ladies* (1664), Dryden acknowledged his debt to Orrery for the Earl's revival of the heroic couplet.

In the face of the popular emergence of the heroic drama, accompanied by the outspoken pretentions of Dryden as chief apologist for the movement, other Restoration critics found their own standards to defend. The authors of *The Rehearsal* upheld the prevailing French critical standards of "Nature, Reason, and good Sense," advocated by the influential Boileau and others. They called to mind the standards of restraint, verisimilitude,

real-life characterization, and natural dialogue that Dryden had abandoned.218

Only a few years after the premiere of The Rehearsal, the period of the most intense critical fire, Dryden began to change his view of heroic drama once again. In his Aureng-Zebe (1676), the last heroic play Dryden wrote, the hero was portrayed as a temperate, not a passionate man. The earlier, exalted passion and pride of the heroic figures was missing in Aureng-Zebe.219 The character Morat in that play had all the marks of heroic virtue traditional in heroic drama, with the accompanying desire for personal glory, but he was portrayed as a villain, not as a hero. Dryden was clearly supplanting the traditional heroic morality with a more melodramatic statement. The stock themes of heroic drama—love-vs.-honor, with both lovers displaying their noblest qualities for the sake of their mutual love for one another—Dryden abandoned. A less heroic, more bourgeois ethos was evident in Dryden's subsequent plays. As Arthur C. Kirsch has made clear, "Pity and the capacity for tears had begun to supersede the union of private and public pride as the credentials of heroism."220

Dryden's dialogue became correspondingly less exalted in Aureng-Zebe than in his previous heroic dramas. As Samuel John-
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son observed, "The personages are imperial; but the dialogue is often domestick, and therefore susceptible of sentiments accommodated to familiar incidents." In the same way, Dryden's view of the love-vs.-honor theme was changed significantly. A more sceptical view of romantic love was evident in the play: "Honour, which only does the name advance, Is the mere raving madness of romance." In the Prologue to Aureng-Zebe, written in 1675, Dryden confessed that he was "weary of his long-loved mistress, Rhyme." In the same Prologue, he retracted his earlier superior stance and admitted that those dramatists he had formerly found inferior, such as Shakespeare, were far better at dramatic dialogue than he. Dryden's humility revealed his awareness of the suitability of rhyme for the less exalted theme of Aureng-Zebe. Rhyme became more a hindrance than a heightening device: "Passion's too fierce to be in Fetters bound, and Nature flies from Rhyme like Enchanted Ground." In 1679 Dryden completely disavowed rhymed heroic drama in his Preface to Troilus and Cressida and, in his Dedication to The Spanish Fryar (1681), he restated his rejection.

Some significant conclusions can be drawn from the above investigation of the emergence of the burlesque form in the early Restoration period and from the increased vulnerability of Dryden.
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as a critical target. The influences of several foreign authors were of major importance in the instigation of a new burlesque consciousness in England. Scarron gained fame by parodying the romantic sentiments of the popular Spanish novel. His servant characters consciously parodied the manners and speech of their social betters. During the 1650's, Molière continued Scarron's satiric thrust at overblown sentiments and preciosity \textit{(Les Precieuses Ridicules)}. He was greatly influenced by Scarron's "Jodelet" type-character as a parody of such sentiments. Buckingham and his collaborators may well have been influenced by Molière's character Mascarelle, who possessed many characteristics similar to Bilboa \textit{(the vain author in the original version of The Rehearsal)} and to Bayes. The preciosity that was ridiculed by Molière and the pretentious sentiments of Dryden that inspired Buckingham's attack were similar in their neglect of reason and moderation. Molière's original conceit that the fashionable playwright could become an object worthy of ridicule may have inspired the young Buckingham, who began writing \textit{The Rehearsal} the same year that Molière's idea was first spoken from the stage \textit{(in La Critique de la Ecole de Femmes)}.

Charles Cotton began the English adaptation of French classical burlesque in 1664 with \textit{Scarronides}. The parody was written in rhymed hexameters and gave rise to numerous imitators of that verse form. Boileau's satire and theory influenced Buckingham and Rochester's own satiric attacks in rhymed couplets. Boileau may have been in both men's minds when they contributed the burlesque poetry to the 1671 version of \textit{The Rehearsal}.
The fifth act of Davenant's *The Playhouse to Be Let* revealed an awareness of the French vogue for burlesque verse, but the actual parody in that condensed version of a contemporary rhymed classical tragedy was a much influenced by the native English practice of using short comic skits during the Commonwealth period. Davenant also had the rhymed parodies of Shakespeare, Jonson, and Beaumont to draw upon.

Buckingham was doubtless familiar with Davenant's burlesque when he began his first version of *The Rehearsal*, which was completed within a year of Davenant's premiere. In circulated letters and poems, the Duke and his supporters expressed their dislike for the presumptuous comparisons in Dryden's critical essays and for his insistence upon rhymed dialogue for heroic drama. Buckingham, for one, actively supported a revival of Jonson's *Cataline, His Conspiracy* in 1668 as an answer to the new heroic drama movement. Rochester, Clifford, and Butler parodied or otherwise criticized the overblown sentiments of the heroic characters and their tendency to deliver complicated, metaphorical arguments to express their passions (*Cat and Puss At a Caterwawling*). At least two members of the circle, Butler and Clifford, disliked Dryden's dogmatic adherence to the French neoclassicists' theories. Other critics, both from inside and outside the circle, objected to the unheroic motivations of such characters as Almanzor.

The attackers of Dryden had no reason to question the fundamental neoclassical assumptions of his *Essay of Dramatic*
Poesy. Both Dryden and his attackers valued the refined and eloquent conversation (wit) uttered by "gallant" characters who expressed aristocratic sentiments. At the same time, they demanded a greater psychological depth and realism as best represented by the Jonsonian comedy-of-humours characters. No member of Buckingham's circle criticized the underlying ethos of the heroic drama: the portrayal of noble characters who suffer as a result of a conflict between love and honor. In the early criticism until 1670, Dryden was mocked not because he upheld that ethos, but because he could not attain such an ideal as a writer.226 The Rehearsal was a play that did not attack the accepted heroic sentiments of the day. Rather, the burlesque sought to reveal the great contrast between such an ideal and the actual nature of the plays as staged in the English theatre.

As Dryden's view of the heroic drama developed, it no longer sought verisimilitude in stage spectacle, dialogue, or character. The Jonsonian ideal of realism gave way to the concept of an exalted drama removed from reality. The shift in viewpoint motivated a more intense attack upon Dryden. Buckingham's circle criticized the bombastic use of rhyme, the incongruous songs and dances, and the unbelievable reversals of plot common to Dryden's mature heroic drama. The Rehearsal, together with private and public letters and parodies of that period, pleaded for a return to the older ideal of Jonsonian realism.

226 See Thomas Shadwell's Preface to The Sullen Lovers (1668) for a contemporary's typical opinion of the extravagances of the heroic form as staged in the English theatre.
In their satiric poems, Buckingham and Rochester revealed their Jonsinian view of the purpose of comedy: to instruct and reform through delightful mockery. That traditional neoclassical concept was the motivating factor behind The Rehearsal. In spite of the play's success, the heroic drama remained popular on the London boards until Dryden's decision to depart from the extreme theoretical position that had motivated his most mature heroic plays signaled the end of the genre. Beginning with Aureng-Zebe (1675), bourgeois sentiments began to replace the former aristocratic outlook of the heroic plays. Dryden seemed to have been the first to anticipate the sentimental comedy and domestic tragedy of the Eighteenth Century. He recognized the unsuitability of rhyme for such plays and openly admitted that he had exhausted the possibilities of that form. Other characteristics of the love-vs.-honor theme, such as the uncompromising nature of the characters and their aristocratic independence from practical concerns, were later abandoned by Dryden. His attitudes toward Shakespeare, Jonson, and other Elizabethans succumbed to humble admiration.
CHAPTER III

THE REHEARSAL AS BURLESQUE ART

Just as the Elizabethan period had brought with it a new critical awareness of the standards of poetic language, which helped to motivate the introduction of stage parody, so the new critical perspective of the Restoration period was to allow for the full development of the burlesque form. Such a perspective was brought about by a new emphasis during that period upon scientific verification and standards of evaluation, which had begun in England by the middle of the Seventeenth Century.

As a Fellow of the newly chartered Royal Society, Thomas Sprat viewed the rapid development of scientific study in optimistic terms. The appearance of new methods of knowledge and scientific discovery permeated every aspect of thought in Baroque Europe. In that dawning Age of Reason, Man's new faith in his rational faculties revealed a critical awareness and confidence unknown to earlier ages. With the return of the monarchy to England in 1660, the progress of rationalistic thought was accelerated. Scientific verification was believed, by the enthusiastic, to be the final solution to man's perennial quest to discover the true nature of reality. Sprat's attitude toward non-scientific forms of human endeavor was significantly
shaped by his naive faith in the new rationalism. His most famous work, *The History of the Royal Society* (1667), was to become recognized as a typical example of anti-poetic rationalism. Speaking of the new philosophy, Abraham Cowley, in the introductory poem to Sprat's history, pointed out the inadequacy of poetry to express the new science and learning: "With the Desserts of Poetry they fed him [philosophy], Instead of solid meats t'increase his force." One primary responsibility of the new age, according to Sprat, was to replace eloquent metaphor and refined language with a straightforward, substantive style. Comparing the French Academy to the Royal Society, he observed,

that as they [the French Academy] undertook the advancement of the Elegance of Speech, so it became their History to have some resemblance to their enterprize: Whereas, the intention of ours, being not the artifice of words, but a bare knowledge of things.

Such a changed view of poetry and rhetoric demanded from the drama realistic characters and true-to-life dialogue—an aesthetic position that was recognized as Jonsonian by many Restoration critics of the drama. Such a view was counter to the direction in which Dryden was moving in his heroic dramas and in his theoretical pronouncements (See Chapter II, pp. 93-94). For the children of the new rationalism and science, Dryden's dramatic works, which


intended to exalt rather than to describe reality, could not be considered to be worthy of attention. Eloquence for its own sake was considered a vain pursuit.

The Epilogue to *The Rehearsal* describes the qualities of the new drama that should replace the heroic form:

Therefore, for ours and for the Kingdom's peace, May this prodigious way of writing cease. Let's have, at least, once in our lives, a time When we may hear some Reason, not all Rhyme: We have these ten years felt its influence; Pray let this prove a year of Prose and Sense.

The forced rhyme of the last couplet underscores the serious intent of Buckingham's play.\(^{229}\)

The "Old Stager" of the Publisher's Preface to the Briscoe edition of *The Rehearsal* (1704) states, in Jonsonian theoretical terms, the purpose of the "farce":

Our Author endeavour'd by Writing, to expose the Follies of these New-fashion'd Plays in their proper Colours, and to set them in so clear a light, that the people might be able to discover what trash it was, of which they were so fond.\(^{230}\)

All poetic fancy and literary excess is to be held up to ridicule in favor of a more exacting approach to reality. Buckingham begins that conscious attack by introducing Johnson, a character who becomes the play's *raisonneur* upholding the neoclassical norms of "Reason, Nature, Art, and Wit" (Prologue). Unlike

---

\(^{229}\) Hereinafter only Buckingham's name will be used when considering the author of *The Rehearsal*.

other raisonneurs (e.g., Moliere's Cleante and Philante), however, Buckingham's character does not deliver long speeches of advice or detailed, syllogistic arguments. Instead, Johnson deliberately encourages Bayes with short quips and cryptic remarks. By so doing, Johnson fulfills his function as a raison-neur not through his powers of rhetorical reasoning, but through his laconic irony:

Bayes: I have written, Mr. Johnson, ... a whole cart-load of things, every whit as good as this, and yet, I vow to gad, these insolent Rascals [his actors] have turn'd 'em all back upon my hands again.

Johnson: Strange fellows indeed. (Act II, sc. ii)

The character of Johnson is presented as a brilliant counterpose to the florid and prolix style of the heroic drama and to the high and boastful manner of its author, Bayes. Buckingham's dramatic sense allows Bayes to demonstrate the follies of the genre he represents by giving Johnson an essentially defensive role. Smith, the other member of the stage audience, is the uninformed country neophyte who quickly learns, through the actions of Bayes and the absurdities of his rehearsed heroic dramas, the follies of "the new kind of Wits" (Act I, sc. i). Unlike his urbane friend, Johnson, Smith soon becomes indignant with Bayes. His loud objections are quickly quelled, however, by Johnson, who possesses the presence of mind to allow Bayes ample opportunity to expose his many shortcomings. It is a tribute to Buckingham's ability as a dramatist that the two characters of his stage audience are developed to such a fine
degree and consistency with relatively few lines of dialogue.

The author of The Rehearsal is quite sincere in his stated intention to expose the follies of a particular dramatic genre. There seems to have been no economic or competitive motivation for his attack. Unlike later Restoration attempts at dramatic burlesque, the rivalry of theatre companies had not been a motivating factor behind the creation of The Rehearsal. The plays that are parodied or otherwise alluded to in the burlesque had premiered more often than not at the Theatre Royal itself. The play that Buckingham most burlesques, The Conquest of Granada, had been premiered by the King's Company at the Theatre Royal (December, 1670). Furthermore, Dryden himself was a shareholder in that theatre company. He had agreed to write three plays annually for the King's Company under contract. From 1663 (The Wild Gallant) until 1678, the agreement was kept in force. Dryden was, therefore, a major contributor to that company's repertoire during the period the Rehearsal held the boards. Financially, it would have been profitable for the King's Company to encourage Dryden's heroic dramas, and, conversely, it would not have been to their financial advantage to discourage them. Some of the same actors who had appeared in Dryden's most popular heroic dramas took roles in The Rehearsal, in effect mocking themselves. In producing the burlesque,

the King's Company was willing to risk its own economic well-being in the hope of altering its audience's taste.

The chief character of the play, Bayes, can only be understood as a composite of several different theatrical personalities. He apparently possesses certain of the mannerisms and character traits of William Davenant, Robert and Edward Howard, John Dryden, and perhaps other authors of the day. To say that a dramatic character possesses traits identified with several real personages is also to say, however, that that stage character's identity cannot be limited to any one real person. Bayes is intended to represent "the new kind of Wits" who "scorn to imitate Nature" (Act I, sc. 1). He is to some extent, then, a generalized abstraction, possessing characteristics typical of the fashionable playwrights of the day.

Character identity in a drama is not a simple matter, however, especially in burlesque drama. There were moments in the original performances of The Rehearsal when the Restoration audiences undoubtedly saw a generalized Bayes give way to Bayes as Dryden. Buckingham reportedly trained John Lacy to imitate the nuances of Dryden's mannerisms, and the instances in the play when Bayes attempts to read his characters' speeches while coaching his actors must have appeared a ridiculous exaggeration of Dryden's poor reading ability. As Robert Bell later pointed out, "Dryden was notoriously a bad reader, and had a hesitating and tedious delivery, which, skillfully imitated in lines of surpassing fury and extravagance, must have produced an irresistible effect upon the audience."232

Dryden's conversational ability was also found wanting in his own day. He was described by his associates as "low and dull," while his humor was judged "saturnine and reserved." Bayes's convoluted explanation of his plot and his inability to make himself understood burlesques Dryden's notoriously poor talent for oral expression (Act I, sc. ii). Speaking of himself, Bayes mentions, very obtusely, that his acquaintances "begin to give it out that I am dull" (Act I, sc. ii). The foolish playwright reveals his poor communicative powers in his egocentric preoccupations and in his complete obliviousness to the irony of Johnson:

Bayes: Well, Gentlemen, I dare be bold to say, without vanity, I'll show you something here that's very ridiculous, I gad.

Johnson: Sir, that we do not doubt of.

Bayes: Pray, Sir, let's sit down. (Act I, sc. ii)

A lasting quality of The Rehearsal is the non-particular levels of its incidents and characters. Though Bayes could be taken as any one of several different historical figures, his weaknesses are so understandably human that they remain relevant to succeeding ages. The character Bayes could have been performed as a vicious attack upon Dryden's personality. It could also have been acted in a tone closer to good-natured mockery. There are a few hints from the play that reveal the serious intention of the original attack against Dryden. When Bayes

\[233\text{Ker ed., Essay of John Dryden, 2:116.}\]
When Bayes exits the stage, for instance, Smith comments, "Fox on't but there's no Pleasure in him: he's too gross a fool to be laughed at" (Act I, sc. ii). Later, Smith swears, "Now, the Devil take thee Bayes for a silly, confident, unnatural, fulsome Rogue" (Act III, sc. v). Such remarks picture Bayes's character in a ridiculous light. The original intent of The Rehearsal had been to portray Bayes as a vainglorious fop with very little sympathy towards him. John Lacy, who was described by his contemporaries as a "low comedian." He had been a famous actor, admired by Charles II, and had played such roles as Sir Politic Would-Be in Volpone and Tartuffe in Melbourne's Tartuffe—the former an eccentric know-it-all role and the latter a pompous rascal role. The selection of Lacy for the original role of Bayes probably indicates that the role was meant to be performed as the character-type Lacy had come to be identified with: a character that commanded very little sympathy from the audience.

Dryden avoided reference to The Rehearsal for several years after its initial performance. When he finally responded to the play, his remarks remained incidental or cryptic. It is not known how Dryden responded to the play's initial attack.

---


In any case, Buckingham limited his attack upon Dryden's personal character. One historical fact in particular supports the view that perhaps the 1671 version of the burlesque was not performed as a harsh attack upon Dryden. Mrs. Reeves, the actress who played Amaryllis in the original production of 1671, was known to be the mistress of Dryden during that period and had played Esperansa in *The Conquest of Granada* two years before. It is hard to imagine that she would have allowed herself to act in a play that took a vicious stab at her lover. Significantly, the prolonged dialogue section added to the 1673 version of the play (Act I, sc. ii) abuses Dryden's relationship with the actress and is, incidentally, the only distasteful section in the final version. Under such circumstances, Mrs. Reeves could not possibly have tolerated an attack in a play in which she herself participated. The cast list of the 1673 production has unfortunately been lost, but Amaryllis was undoubtedly played by another actress.

Bayes's bragging about his virility and masculine charm in the added section of dialogue perhaps mocks Dryden's lack of magnetism and personable qualities. Bayes's fatuous description of his courtship activities and his ineffectual punning on sexual allusions is a common characteristic of the Restoration man-of-mode character.

Bayes as a composite character takes on many attributes created to express the dichotomy between the high pretentions of the heroic drama's theory and the actual mercenary motivations that had been inspired by the genre's success with the early
Restoration audiences. Bayes is revealed as a charlatan whose overweening dilettantism cannot hide his desire for popular success:

I am not like other persons; they care not what becomes of their things, so they can get money for 'em: now . . . when I write, if it be not just as it should be, in every circumstance, to every particular . . . I am not able to endure it, I am not myself. I'm out of my wits, and all that, I'm the strangest person in the whole world. What care I for money? I gad, I write for fame and reputation. (Act III, sc. ii)

In the following act, however, Bayes contradicts the artistic ideals professed in that speech: "A man must live: and if you don't thus pitch upon some new device . . . you'll never do it (Act IV, sc. i). Bayes is egocentric enough to consider himself above the common taste of the crowd. As a fashionable playwright of the new school, he must constantly invent scenes of new sensational devices and unexpected twists in the plot line to hold an audience's attention.

Bayes holds forth his theory of the new drama: "... for the chief Art of Poetry is to elevate your expectations, and then bring you off some extraordinary way" (Act IV, sc. i). Such statements reveal the tendency to incorporate irrelevant scenes of supernatural occult ritual and fantastic dances into the heroic dramas. In such scenes, the Jonsonian theory of instruction through entertainment is sacrificed for a drama of hedonistic sensationalism. Dryden had to defend the use of fantastic dances and scenes against of violence against critics in his Essay of Heroic Plays (See Chapter II, pp. 99-101).
Perhaps Bayes's pronouncements allowing such scenes is intended as a loose parody of lines similar to the following from that essay:

an heroic poet is not ited to a bare representation of what is true or exceedingly probable; but that he may let himself loose to visionary objects, and to the representation of such things, as may give him a freer scope for imagination.  

Buckingham's norm, Johnson, admonishes Smith at their first meeting of the new trends taken by the heroic playwrights: 
"[such authors] scorn to imitate Nature; but are given altogether to elevate and surprise" (Act I, sc. i). Johnson describes the erosion of the Jonsonian neoclassical realism brought about by the imposition of a dramatic form less dependent on true-life sources. Bayes later boldly acknowledges just that fact to his two critical on-lookers: "I despise your Johnson [sic], and Beaumont, that borrow'd all they writ from Nature: I am for fetching it purely out of my own fancy, I" (Act II, sc. i). The statement is a direct allusion to Dryden's egocentric comparisons in the Epilogue to The Conquest of Granada, II and in his later prose criticism (See Chapter II, pp. 95-98).

Buckingham carefully creates a portrait of a charlatan playwright whose pompous conceit closely links him with Dryden's theoretical position as chief apologist for the heroic drama. Unlike Molière's famous charlatan, Tartuffe, however, Bayes

remains throughout the play unaware of his nefarious and hypocritical posture. Bayes is clearly intended to be a character ridiculed for his stupidities; he is not a cunning opportunist who presents a threat to either the stage audience or to other characters. He never commits his outrageous aesthetic indecorums intentionally, but, rather, out of sheer ignorance and ineptitude. His hypocrisy is blatant, but unplanned. Bayes is capable of discoursing on the highest purposes of poetry and drama, but he appears obtuse and simplistic where matters of dramatic sensibility are concerned. In Act V, for example, when Smith asks Bayes how he intends to remove the dead bodies from the stage after Drawcansir's phenomenal massacre, he replies, "upon their legs: how else should they go off? Why do you think the people here do not know they are not dead?" (Act V, sc. i)

Even the foolish playwright's plagiarism is acknowledged with a naive pride of achievement: "when I have anything to invent . . . I have . . . all that Persius, Montaigne, Seneca's Tragedies, Horace, Juvenal, Claudian, Pliny, Plutarch's Lives . . . have ever thought on the subject; and so, in a trice, by leaving out a few words, or putting in other of my own, the business is done" (Act I, sc. i).

As an innocuous hypocrite, Bayes is completely within the tradition of the Restoration fop or man-of-mode character, who is essentially a fool, not a rascal or villain. In that respect, The Rehearsal may be looked upon as a comedy of manners. Like the Restoration fops of Wycherley and Etherege, Bayes is
greatly deluded by his personal accomplishments: "No man yet e'er the Sun shone upon, has parts sufficient to furnish out a stage, except it be with the help of these my Rules" (Act I, sc. i). His insistent and dogmatic stance toward his rules mocks Dryden's own posture as the self-appointed arbiter of dramatic taste in the early Restoration period (See Chapter II, pp. 90-101).

Bayes's Table-Book, wherein are contained every familiar quotation from the great authors of the past (Act I, sc. i), ridicules Dryden's fundamentalist stance in his *Essay of Dramatic Poesy* where the latter borrows from Scaliger (attributing the material to Aristotle) almost word for word the formal divisions of a play, the unities, the concept of decorum, and other neoclassic tenets. Bayes's plagiarism also ridicules in a more general way the heroic drama's dependence upon classical subjects and Continental romance stories for their plots. Dryden was continually charged with plagiarism before and after the premiere of *The Rehearsal*. Shadwell, in his Preface to *The Sullen Lovers* (1668), mentioned Dryden's unjust criticism of Jonson in his *Essay of Dramatic Poesy* and described Dryden as one of the worst of the covert plagiarists "who by continual thieving reckon their stolen goods their own." Shadwell's resentment of Dryden continued until, in his Preface to *The Humourists* (1671), he reacted to Dryden's low estimation of Elizabethan dramatists by championing the cause of Jonson. Langbaine, in his *Account of the English Dramatic Poets* (1691), spared no ink in his
attack upon Dryden as plagiarist. In The Rehearsal, Bayes seems to be aware of no wrongdoing in his blatantly plagiaristic method of "transversing" and "transprosing" (Act I, sc. i) and in his "Table-Book" method of overhearing conversations of wit at the coffeehouses and then calling them his own. With all the confidence of a Restoration man-of-mode, Bayes denies all his most obvious faults: "I tread upon no man's heels; but make my flight upon my own wings, I assure you" (Act III, sc. i).

The frequent complaints about theatre critics voiced by Bayes (Act II, sc. ii; Act I, sc. ii, for example) are doubtless intended to reflect Dryden's own defensive attitude toward the critics of the heroic drama as expressed in his Preface to The Conquest of Granada, II (1670) and in other polemical writings. Bayes is always eager to out-think and out-guess the tastes of his critics at the expense of his aesthetic integrity. The bristling posture of Bayes takes towards the critics of his new brand of playwriting results in his desire to silence all his detractors:

'Tis a crust, a lasting crust for your Rogue Critics... I would fain see the proudest of 'em all but dare to nibble at this; I gad, if they do, this shall rub their gums for 'em. (Act II, sc. ii)

Dryden's Epilogue to The Conquest of Granada, II reveals the highly critical atmosphere in which the play was originally

received. The audience was sharply divided in its allegiance. At the first performance of The Rehearsal, there was also present a sharply divided audience:

the friends of the Earl of Orrery, of Sir Robert Howard and his brothers, and other men of rank who had produced heroic plays, were loud and furious in the opposition. But, as usually happens, the party who laughed, got the advantage over that which was angry and finally drew the audience to their side.238

Buckingham's foolish playwright reflects Dryden's pompous opinion of his own dramatic abilities throughout the play. Dryden had claimed that he possessed, as a dramatic poet, the ability to make even rhymed couplets seem as natural as blank-verse dialogue (See Chapter II, pp. 89-90). Buckingham has Bayes speak Dryden's opinion of his own achievements: "I never yet saw any one could write, but myself" (Act IV, sc. ii). Commenting on his own dialogue, Bayes boasts, "That single line, I gad, is worth all that my brother Poets ever writ" (Act IV, sc. ii).

Dryden's critical preference for the use of rhyme over prose in drama becomes Bayes's critical stance also: "The subjects too great for prose" (Act IV, sc. ii). The Rehearsal burlesques the use of rhymed heroic dialogue in mundane and practical conversations:

First King: Here, take five Ginneys for those warlike men.

Second King: And here's five more; that makes just ten. (Act V, sc. i)

Dryden was aware of the absurdities of such dialogue in his heroic plays and responds to that particular criticism in both his *Essay of Dramatic Poesy* and in his *Defence of the Essay of Dramatic Poesy*. In his most popular heroic plays, however, Dryden does not succeed in eliminating the use of elevated language in commonplace conversation.

As a Restoration fool, Bayes lacks the literary sense to stem his enthusiasm for the use of elaborate argumentative metaphor and simile typical of heroic drama. His speeches are often rife with mixed metaphors and pedantic similes. The quite original burlesque device of having the author call out the technical elements of form while his dialogue is being read is effective: "Antithesis"; "Simile!" (Act IV, sc. ii) Bayes is demonstrating the heroic drama's unfortunate attention to the technical achievements of language (all too often mistaken for true wit) at the expense of meaning.

During many other moments in the play, Bayes's attitudes and sensibilities closely resemble the dramatic theories of Dryden and the attributes of the heroic drama. Buckingham's foolish playwright, who possesses the character of a preoccupied pedant, is nevertheless always eager to cater to the most commonplace tastes for the sake of momentary popularity. Such a portrait is specific enough to be a clear impersonation of Dryden. It is also, however, general enough to represent the follies of any man foolishly un pursuit of fame.

Much of the criticism in *The Rehearsal* follows closely the prevailing view of the coffeehouse critics of the day.
Several minor critics had criticized Almanzor, the hero of *The Conquest of Granada* (See Chapter II, pp. 83-84). Those critics, apparently upholding the traditional ethos of the heroic drama, had questioned the character motivations of Almanzor, who had appeared to them to be too carnal and cynical for a tragic hero. It is true that Dryden's hero seems to have a new, more critical view of the heroic ideals of love and honor. Certain of his remarks reflect that viewpoint: "And what is honour, but a love well hid?" (Act V, sc. iii) "Praise is the pay of heaven for doing good: But love's the best return for flesh and blood" (Act IV, sc. iii). A key ingredient in the heroic formula is missing in Almanzor: the value placed upon platonic love and the resultant restraining effect such a value has upon the passions. Dryden had responded to the critics in his *Essay of Heroic Plays* by devoting the last half of that essay to answering the charge that Almanzor is "one great exception that is made to the play."^239^ According to Dryden in that essay, the critics had attacked his hero for 1.) performing impossibilities and 2.) acting on impulse rather than on honor and wisdom, as a tragic hero should. Dryden then justifies his hero's actions by likening Almanzor to Homer's Achilles, who is the epitome of the heroic figure. Achilles also displays petty, almost childish emotions, Dryden argues, when he refuses to fight alongside his comrades because he has been denied his war booty. Dryden also likens Almanzor and Achilles in the second

^239^Noyes ed., *Selected Dramas of John Dryden*, p. 11.
part of the play itself, written before the Essay of Heroic Plays: "The fierce Almanzor will obey the Queen. I found him, like Achilles on the shore, Pensive, complaining much, but threatening more" (Act II, sc. iii).

For many members of the Restoration audience, Almanzor's rash actions and seeming disregard for the moral dictates of honor and restraint, as they were perceived at that time, violated the heroic ideal. In The Rehearsal, Almanzor (represented by the character Drawcansir) appears as a great bully-boy, whose rash actions gain for him whatever he desires:

Drawcansir: You shall not know how long I here will stay; But you shall know I'll take my Boles away. (Snatches the Boles out of the King's hands, and drinks them off.)

Smith: But, Mr. Bayes, is that modest and gent?
Bayes: No, I gad, Sir, but it's great.
King Usher: Though, Brother, this grum stranger be a Clown, He'll leave us, sure, a little to gulp down.

Drawcansir: Who e'er to gulp one drop of this dares think I'll stare away his very pow'r to drink.

(The two Kings sneak off the stage.)

I drink, I huff, I strut, look big and stare; And all this I can do, because I dare. (Act IV, sc. i)

Buckingham is clearly inspired by such coffeehouse critics as Richard Leigh and Martin Clifford, who had attacked the character of Almanzor. In that respect, The Rehearsal is actually supporting the traditional heroic ethic against the innovations of
Dryden. Such a burlesque attack remains consistent with "Nature and Reason," however, because Drawcansir appears ridiculous not by virtue of his pedestrian desires and roughneck ways, but because such desires are treated in an exalted manner and thereby become pretentious.

The structural form of The Rehearsal closely follows the English tradition for burlesque plays. The "induction scene" device is used by Buckingham to introduce the stage audience and to establish the critical framework of the rehearsed inner play. In that respect, The Rehearsal varies not at all from The Knight of the Burning Pestle, The Old Wives' Tale, and The Playhouse to Be Let. Peter Lewis's recent claim that Buckingham derived the structure of his burlesque form from L'Impromptu de Versailles (1663) cannot be supported; there is no stage audience in Molière's simple one-act play and no necessity to introduce an outside critical element. The actual presence of a critical consciousness viewing the inner play seems to be a necessity in all English burlesque dramas, from the Pyramus and Thisby playlet in A Midsummer Night's Dream to The Rehearsal. Structurally, then, The Rehearsal adds nothing new to the English burlesque tradition.

Those English burlesque plays that had been revived or had premiered during the early years of the Restoration period come closest in structure, subject matter, and purpose to The

---

Rehearsal. Davenant's *The Playhouse to Be Let* (1663) represented the most conscious attempt to parody a specific dramatic work until that time. There are doubtless more lines of rhymed parody in its fifth act than in the entire play of *The Rehearsal*. Davenant's last act is clearly intended as burlesque. The Players comments at the end of the play, "Such a sad coil was ne'er before in London." The fifth act parody depends upon a familiarity with Katherine Philips's *Pompey* for its full appreciation (See Chapter II, pp. 66-67). The language, character motivations, and plot structure of Davenant's fifth act was intentionally opposed to the central action of Mrs. Philips's rhymed classical tragedy. In contrast to Buckingham's burlesque, however, there was no overt attack in Davenant's act upon the original author (Corneille) nor upon the translator (Mrs. Philips). The tone of the fifth act is generally good natured and uncritical. It is significant that the stage audience does not interject comments between the lines of dialogue during the fifth-act burlesque. With the absence of an outside critical commentary, such as is present in *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* and *The Rehearsal*, there is no vehicle for serious criticism in Davenant's act.

Davenant may have intended his short travesty to be a lighthearted stab at the recently popular French drama as represented by Corneille. The only fully expressed critical opinion of drama in *The Playhouse* is an incidental colloquy between the Poet and the Player in the first act. They complain of the heaviness of French tragedy with its long speeches:
Player: The French convey their arguments too much in dialogue: their speeches are too long.

Poet: Indeed, such single length in their debates Bears some resemblance with that famous duel . . . that began at daybreak and ended at Sun-setting.

Corneille's Pompée made no attempt to resist the French drama's penchant for lengthy speeches, and Mrs. Philips's translation was quite faithful to the original in that regard. Indeed, her translation is careful, but dull and uninspired, though the play was acted with considerable success in the Restoration period.\(^{241}\) Davenant's burlesque was not intended to attack the incipient rhymed-tragedy form. There is no consistent critical position in his motley collection of acts. Davenant apparently was chiefly concerned with the commercial success of the play. His characters express their opinions on several topical matters, but such remarks do not go beyond the level of incidental theatre gossip.

The fifth act of The Playhouse is a condensation and inversion of the original plotline of Pompey. Excluding one previous burlesque play (Beaumont's The Knight of the Burning Pestle), Davenant's play is the first to use the inversion technique in English burlesque drama. Previously, to burlesque certain plays or genres, the playwright had simply exaggerated or distorted the sentiments, deeds, or plot structure for a ludicrous effect. In so doing, he created a style inappropriate for its subject matter; the result was a ridiculous parody of the target drama. In Davenant's fifth act, however, the main

action of his target plays is actually inverted: Cornelia succumbs after Antonio's facetious request to find her another husband; Cleopatra, far from challenging her brother Ptolemy for the sake of her own life and Caesar's, is content to skip off to the local alehouse where all is forgotten; Caesar, whose breath—not his words—is the strongest in Africa, does not even consider executing Ptolemy; instead of appearing as the villain of the play, Ptolemy becomes the leader of the other mock-heroes on their way to the local alehouse. Caesar, Antonio, Cleopatra, and Cornelia dismiss Pompey's memory and thereby avoid the question of revenge on Ptolemy:

Caesar: Proud Pompey, whom now we never shall lack more,
Came in at a gate, sneakt out at a back door:
Great was the mortal, a long rock-a-hoop too,
But down he did fall, whom all men did stoop to.
Yet fortune has done but what has become her;
In winter w'are hay and grass in the Summer.

The motivations of the characters and their resultant actions are completely inverted from the actions and motivations of the target play.

The degree of inversion in Davenant's fifth act was quite new to the English burlesque and represented a higher level of technical achievement. Nowhere in Elizabethan or Jacobean burlesque was the inversion device used to such advantage. The only partial exception was the prodigal son subplot in Beaumont's The Knight of the Burning Pestle (See Chapter I, pp. 46-47), a play that represented the furthest development of the burlesque drama in the pre-Restoration period.
The inversion device—a complete alteration in the main actions and character motivations of the original target play—fitted Davenant's own definition of burlesque (delivered by the Poet in the fifth act of The Playhouse) almost on the literal level: "The garments of our fathers you must wear The wrong side outwards." Davenant's fifth act not only changed the characters' speeches and sensibilities, which had been the standard method of creating burlesque in previous dramas, but also went beyond that mode to change their basic actions and motivations. Buckingham, whose The Rehearsal premiered eight years after Davenant's play, was to incorporate the inversion device used by his predecessors and to go one step further by creating a play of multiple inversion elements (See below, pp. 161-62).

Davenant's fifth act (called the "Tragedy Travesty" in the play) had originally been intended as a separate one-act play to be performed at the conclusion of Mrs. Philips's Pompey. Langbaine reported having seen Pompey acted at the Duke's Theatre in the early Summer of 1663, "and at the end was acted that Farce printed in the fifth act of The Playhouse to Be Let." It is therefore clear that the fifth act had originally been acted separately at Davenant's theatre before the premiere of The Playhouse, since the latter was first performed late in the Summer of 1663. The fact that it had been acted separately after the performance of Pompey accounts for the lighthearted and

---

uncritical tone of the one-act burlesque.

Many of the elements from the earlier periods are incorporated into *The Playhouse to Be Let*. Contemporary slang, awkward language, mixed metaphors, and faulty or inappropriate reasoning—elements so familiar to the Elizabethan and Jacobean stage parody tradition—are prominent in Davenant's play. The fifth act also contains bawdy jokes and intimations that are characteristic of both Elizabethan comedy and the comedy of manners of the later Restoration period. By contrast, *The Rehearsal* depends far less upon scatological suggestions for its humor; rather, it retains a more consistent focus upon its stated purpose: to ridicule a certain dramatic form.

Unlike *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, Davenant's short burlesque is almost completely parodic, that is, burlesque derived from the diction element of the drama. There is little or no visual humor involved, no ridiculous or excessive scenic effects, and nothing beyond the most basic theatrical images. The brief dumb show and dance of gypsies that preceded the fifth act probably had not been originally intended as a mockery of the theatrical machinery employed in Mrs. Philips's play, since the Player calls for "the burlesquers" only after the dance and dumbshow are completed. By contrast, *The Rehearsal* employs several theatrical elements to achieve its burlesque.

*Mrs. Philips's Pompey* is certainly a labored and obtuse version of Corneille's play. Her translated couplets border on the comic: "Antonius: Her looks and language with such ease subdue, If I were Caesar, I should love her too" (*Pompey*, Act III,
sc. iii). If Davenant had intended to point out the awkward style and the resultant inadequacy of the characters’ sentiments as expressed through the language of Mrs. Philips’s play, he would have had no difficulty finding lines worthy of parody in her play. Instead, his parody was uncritical and depended more upon an incongruous mixing of familiar slang and ignoble sentiments delivered in a forced style than upon a critical demonstration of the absurdities of a particular dramatic form. If Davenant had an overall point to his burlesque, it was to reveal the fickle nature of the early Restoration public, which continually demanded new dramatic ideas from foreign as well as from domestic sources:

Player: Well, my dear fantastic friends of London, who love novelty, and would scorn to look even on the moon, but that she changes often and becomes new; I hope we shall please you now. (Act I)

The most fully developed burlesque play of the pre-Commonwealth period, Beaumont’s The Knight of the Burning Pestle, was revived soon after the Restoration of the monarchy (See Chapter I, p. 49). The version of the play that was revived between 1666 and 1671 contained a new Prologue and Epilogue. The Epilogue (originally spoken by Nell Gwyn) seems to imply that a burlesque of Dryden’s Secret Love; or, The Maiden Queen (1666-67) had been incorporated into Beaumont’s play:

The Prologue durst not tell, before ’twas seen, The Plot we had to swinge The Maiden Queen. For had we, then, discovered our intent, The fop, who writ it, had not giv’n consent.243

Because that version of the play is extant, there is no way to judge the degree or nature of the burlesque suggested in the Epilogue. Buckingham himself may have been inspired by that inverted burlesque to choose Dryden as his target. It would not have been impossible for the Duke to have written the burlesque skit himself. If that were to have been the case, however, it would have been extremely doubtful that such a version would have gone unmentioned in the records of the day. What is significant, however, is the fact that Beaumont's play was used to burlesque or parody a Restoration drama, which had been written by so popular a playwright as Dryden.

Both The Knight of the Burning Pestle and The Rehearsal ridicule definite genres; in addition, both genres that are ridiculed derived from the similar traditions. Beaumont's play, which had originally intended to mock the taste for "apprentice drama" among the Jacobean bourgeoisie (See Chapter I, pp. 43-45), parodies Spanish romances that had been translated or adapted into English apprentice plays. A typical example of such a Spanish romance is Esperio de Caballerias, translated into English as The Mirror of Knighthood (1602). The tradition of the Spanish romance had led to the French romantic novel tradition and to the French tragic drama. The English in turn borrowed from the French tragedy and the Spanish romance traditions to formulate their own heroic drama tradition (See Chapter II, pp.101-02. Both Beaumont's and Buckingham's plays burlesque certain similar moral presuppositions.
The Knight and The Rehearsal show similarities of structure as well as subject matter. The first act of both plays begins with the final dress rehearsal of a play to be performed in the same playhouse. The rehearsal device had been used before in Elizabethan drama (e.g., A Midsummer Night's Dream, Hamlet), but The Knight is the first play to sustain the rehearsed inner play through five acts. In both The Knight and The Rehearsal, the rehearsal of the inner play lasts five acts; in addition, each play contains a stage audience that interjects comments on the inner play throughout. Furthermore, each stage audience makes aesthetic judgments upon its experiences of the rehearsed performance. Finally, both burlesques use several different techniques for their parody.

The similarities between the two plays are numerous, but they extend only to a point. In Beaumont's play, the stage audience controls the actions of the rehearsed play through its dictates to the performers. Because they create their own play as they view it, the Citizen and his Wife in The Knight become the principle objects of ridicule. The stage audience in that play is, in effect, the author of the inner play. As in Jonson's Poetaster, the author is mocked. The inanity and naiveté of the rehearsed play, as it is created by the stage audience in The Knight, reflects the tastes of that audience. The Citizen and his Wife, as the stage audience, represent the bourgeois taste that is the play's main object of ridicule.
In *The Rehearsal*, on the other hand, the stage audience becomes a group of passive spectators who fall victim (willingly, on the part of Johnson, and unwillingly, on the part of Smith) to the rehearsed play's outspoken author, Bayes. As the dictatorial dramatist and director, it is Bayes, not the stage audience, who controls the action of the inner play.

Because the stage audiences in *The Knight* and *The Rehearsal* function differently, two fundamentally different approaches are followed. In Beaumont's play, there is no norm, or critical consciousness, that functions as a dramatic force in the play, since the stage audience is itself part of the object of ridicule. The Citizen and his Wife do not represent a critical presence in the play, because their prejudices are on display in the rehearsed play, which they create. When they voice their objections to certain actions of the inner play, they either have the action changed, or their critical opinions themselves become objects of ridicule (See Chapter I, pp. 47-48). Their apprentice, Rafe, reveals that he is an extension of the Wife and Citizen's prejudices through his actions within the rehearsed play as well as in his own objections, which he voices whenever he steps out of character. Rafe's complaint, for example, that the gallants of his generation use too much foul language in their everyday discourse is a typical bourgeois judgment (Act I, sc. iii).

Both the Citizen and his Wife misinterpret the "London Merchant" subplot of the rehearsed play. They favor the cowardly and hypocritical Humphrey to Jasper (Act II, sc. vi) and dis-
like Jasper's wholly justified deceit of his parents.

While the stage audience of *The Knight* reveals its ignorance through its misinterpretation of scenes, the stage audience of *The Rehearsal*, on the other hand, is quite aware of the faults of the rehearsed play it is watching. The two members of the stage audience in Buckingham's burlesque represent an actual second audience to the extent that they are no more responsible for the inner play they are viewing than is the real audience. Johnson and Smith become spectators of a play that has been created by another and that they have not seen before; accordingly, their critical remarks appear to represent the unprejudiced norm of "Reason, Nature, Art, and Wit."

The result of *The Rehearsal*’s original approach to the stage audience device is to provide the play with a critical norm, which is represented by two characters of the outer play who are not involved in the rehearsed inner play. Such a dissociation allows Johnson and Smith to function as disinterested critics; hence, their presence gives a greater critical perspective on the antics of Bayes.

The variety of verse form used as parody in Beaumont's play is in contrast to the single rhymed couplet and triplet form used by Buckingham. *The Knight* is not concerned about pillorying a particular verse form as such; therefore, Beaumont is freer to use whatever verse form he wishes for the various dramatic situation in the play. The Humphrey and Luce scenes, for example, are in rhyming couplets; Rafe's May lord speech is in outmoded "fourteeners"—rhymed couplets of fourteen syllables; other scenes are in blank verse or prose. Beaumont
always has his stage audience speak in prose, as does Buckingham, to add greater contrast to the dialogue of the rehearsed play and to portray the stage audience as part of the everyday, popular reality of London. The various levels of reality within both burlesques show a progression from the verisimilitude of the stage audiences to the highest flights of fancy within the inner plays.

In *The Rehearsal* the critical target is more narrowly defined and, hence, only the verse form that is identified with the heroic drama--heroic verse--is used for parody. Perhaps because of its greater critical concentration, *The Rehearsal* is more successful as parody than is *The Knight*. The former contains many more examples of concise parody, even though the actual number of parodic lines in its rehearsed play are far fewer than those of the rehearsed play of *The Knight*. There is less critical awareness of parody in Beaumont's burlesque partially because many verse lines are not intended as parody in its inner play (the dialogue between Humphrey and the Merchant, Act I, sc. ii; or the Jasper-Luce love scenes, Act III, sc. i and Act IV, sc. iv, for example).

There is a far greater awareness of mockery through direct parody among the stage audience and the real audience in Buckingham's burlesque. *The Rehearsal* is in that way able to maintain a sharp critical perspective throughout with no digression or interruption. The non-burlesque elements in Beaumont's play tend to neutralize the burlesque intentions of that play. Beaumont resorts to the conventional sentiments of pathos in moments of the Jasper-Luce love plot (See Chapter
I, p. 47). Jasper's prayer for his love becomes lyrical in a scene where the tone is clearly intended to arouse the real audience's romantic sentiments:

Sleep, Sleep, and quiet rest crown thy sweet thoughts:
Keep from her fair blood distempers, startings, Horrors, and fearful shapes; let all her charms Be joys, and chaste delights, embraces, wishes, And such new pleasures as the ravished soul Gives to the sense. (Act III, sc. i)

Such moments in the play approach pure romance, especially when Luce laments the supposed death of Jasper (Act IV, sc. iv). Even the Wife and Citizen are treated as sympathetic characters. For all her prejudices, the Wife possesses a naive compassion and an earthy sentimentality that makes her a positive figure. Indeed, Beaumont's portrait of the Wife is not at all shallow; her character is perhaps the greatest achievement of that play. Beaumont's burlesque tone in The Knight goes so far and then turns into compassion.

The Rehearsal contains far less general social and topical commentary than does The Knight. In Beaumont's play, for example, the character of the Wife represents an entire social class as well as a particular type of theatre patron. Though her bourgeois tastes and prejudices enliven the play, other social and topical allusions have very little relation to the critical intent of the play. Such critical digressions as the Host's satirical portrait of the typical Jacobean barber (Act III, sc. ii) were never allowed to fog the issue in Buckingham's play. The Knight contains almost as much
social and topical commentary as it does theatrical and dramatic criticism. In contrast to the more general critical approach taken in Beaumont's play, The Rehearsal criticizes only a certain dramatic genre and, by extension, the fatuous literary and theatrical values and mercenary motivations of that genre's representative playwright. Though the Bayes character may always be viewed as a relevant embodiment of certain human weaknesses, he also represents a definite social type of the early Restoration period. Buckingham's play has social implications only to the extent that it originally sought to criticize a group of recognized individuals within a particular society. That group was quite small, however, and the society to which it belonged was the theatregoing elite of the Court. The critical world of The Rehearsal revolves completely around aesthetic matters; what little there is in the way of social commentary is incidental.

The Rehearsal achieves a far more consistent and conscious critical position in its burlesque than does any previous English burlesque play. Its position is maintained without deviation or interruption of the critical concentration. The Old Wives' Tale, The Knight of the Burning Pestle, and The Rehearsal are all distinctive as dramas that place their major emphasis on burlesque. The Rehearsal is the only one of the three to remain a consistent burlesque drama throughout. By confining its burlesque and parody to a specific and limited target, its critical penetration is increased. In no previous burlesque drama was the audience's expectations so controlled.
Unlike *The Playhouse to Be Let*, both *The Knight* and *The Rehearsal* contain many examples of visual burlesque. In the original production of Beaumont's play, the adult cast in the role of Rafe was much larger than the boy actors playing the other roles. Rafe's size is exploited for visual humor. Th incongruous effect derived from using both full-size adults and half-grown boys in the same cast is the identical burlesque device that had been used in *The First Play of Hieronomo* (See Chapter I, p. 42). Rafe, appearing with his Dwarf, elicits the following cry from Mrs. Merrithought: "O Michael, we are betray'd, we are betray'd. Here be Gyants, flie boy, flie boy flie" (Act II, sc. ii). Another purely visual element that contributes to the burlesque is the incongruous effect of having Rafe appear with a forked arrow through his head while delivering a soliloquy. Both *The Rehearsal* and *The Knight* incorporate similar kinds of visual and theatrical images for a burlesque effect. In both plays, for instance, mock battles of past dramatic productions are ridiculed (*The Knight*, Act IV, sc. i; and *The Rehearsal*, Act V, sc. i). Both Rafe's company of sad-sacks (Act V, sc. ii) and Bayes's hobbyhorse soldiers (Act V, sc. i) take full advantage of stage spectacle and costume to create a visual burlesque.

Of the two plays, *The Rehearsal* makes more frequent use of the visual element. Buckingham's burlesque exhibits a complete freedom to employ both visual and aural elements. Not

---

As Gurr has pointed out, that particular theatrical image is meant to ridicule a scene in *The True Tragedy of Richard, Duke of York* (1595), which contains the following stage direction: "Enter Clifford wounded with arrow in his neck."
only are there more relevant stage directions in Buck-
ingham's play, but the added aspect of Bayes's mobility within the rehearsed play also contributes to the spectacle and farce. More than any previous burlesque character in England, Bayes is allowed to interfere with the action of the inner play. He literally steps into the action of the rehearsed play on several occasions: to add emphasis to his directorial commands; to demonstrate certain histrionic movements; to accompany the actors in their declamations; and so on. With each attempted interference, Bayes performs some damaging or superficial action, which adds to the ridiculousness of his rehearsed play. In most instances, his interference results in a visual image, as when he takes an unexpected pratfall and breaks his nose.

Unlike any previous English dramatist, Buckingham systematically drew upon many different plays to express his dislike for a certain tendency he had observed in the mainstream of early Restoration drama. The Rehearsal reflects the maturity of burlesque as a dramatic form in England. D. F. Smith has observed,

as an essay on practical dramaturgy, derived like The Poetics of Aristotle from the observation of a large number of plays, the composition of Buckingham's is without English precedent.245

The play's concentrated attack is unmitigated and uncompromised. Much of its unique power derives not only from

245Dane Farnsworth Smith, Plays About the Theatre in England, p. 13.
its particular structural and critical devices and from the freedom with which it draws upon various sources for ridicule but also from what might be described as the clarity and undisguised candor of its tone. The Rehearsal certainly reflects the bold confidence and initiative that Buckingham must have possessed as a great political figure and as a recognized leader of a powerful literary faction. The Duke certainly was not constrained by anyone in the theatre world of London to mitigate his attack in any manner. The resulting liberty of expression he achieves in his burlesque is surpassed only perhaps by Aristophanes.

To acknowledge The Rehearsal's critical perspicuity does not, however, explain the value of the play as a dramatic work or the mastery of its literary genius, Buckingham. In order to answer the question of the play's dramatic worth, a closer analysis of the play is necessary. It is truly to Buckingham's credit that he achieves the frankness and freedom of outlook in his burlesque without ever becoming arrogant or forceful. The dramatic creation of the characters of Johnson and Smith partially accounts for the play's tone. Their criticisms of the rehearsed play are most persuasive as norms precisely because they do not attempt to defend any position; instead, they show their true reactions to Bayes's pronouncements and demonstrations without resorting to counterarguments or to verbal vendetta (Smith is restrained from such rhetorical replies almost immediately by Johnson and never makes the attempt again, Act I, sc. ii). Not only does the passive behavior of
the two critical onlookers make Bayes and his heroic play seem even more ridiculous and excessive by contrast (See above, pp. 138-139), but it has the second function of preventing the critical tone of the author, Buckingham, from ever becoming authoritarian or vengeful. The danger that Buckingham's own critical opinions will also fall victim to parody or, at least, to negative reaction in his play is thus eliminated. The truism that the best argument is tolerance accurately describes the critical presence of the stage audience in that play.

In the Twentieth Century, serious formal criticism of The Rehearsal has concerned itself with the analysis of burlesque technique in the play. The work can certainly be approached from such a perspective because The Rehearsal remains a consistent burlesque throughout. Peter E. Lewis has analyzed the burlesque devices in the play by dividing them into three general categories: verbal burlesque, situational burlesque, and visual burlesque. Mr. Lewis's observations are very helpful in demonstrating the variety and scope of the parody and burlesque techniques; however, further observations both of a particular and of a more general kind are necessary.

The character Bayes, whose composite personality becomes the main butt of the play, has certain motivations that are completely absurd and are not intended to imitate the flaws

---

of particular real-life personalities; rather, they are created to show aspects of the heroic drama that are sheer nonsense. A typical example occurs when Smith questions the wisdom of allowing stage characters to whisper lines of dialogue to each other unheard by the audience:

Smith: Well, Sir, but pray why call this whispering?

Bayes: Why, Sir, (besides that it is new, as I told you before) because they are supposed to be politicians; and matters of state ought not to be divulg'd. (Act II, sc. 1)

The specific intention of that sequence is to ridicule similar whispering scenes in early Restoration dramas and to further reveal the exaggerated importance of novelty in such dramas; however, Bayes's second excuse is pure comic nonsense, which is based upon no historical figure's remark. Bayes is simply a composite of the recognized attributes of certain historical personages, but he also possesses a life of his own; that is, he is made up of unique and entirely believable attributes and motivations created specifically for his stage personality.

Bayes is also used at times as a convenient mouthpiece to support the critical views of Buckingham. He is allowed, for instance, to ridicule certain stage practices: Bayes's disparaging comment on the "fat spirits" in Davenant and Dryden's 1667 production of The Tempest (Act II, sc. v); and his reference to the awkward dancing of the Angels in Davenant's 1668 production of Henry VIII (Act II, sc. v). At no moment in the burlesque, however, is Bayes allowed to get the upper hand in
an argument.

The character of Bayes is a wholly integrated personality; even though he possesses many attributes that originally had been intended to represent well-known personages, he remains a fully developed character. Accordingly, it is possible to appreciate the character's many whims and weaknesses without ever having known any of the real personalities imitated. Indeed, it is possible to enjoy and understand Bayes today (1975) with only the barest knowledge of the historical period.

There are a few actions and character elements in the play that were originally used in the 1663-64 version of *The Rehearsal* and were retained in the final (1673) version. Many of those original character facets and comic bits have lost their original significance. The original allusion to Davenant's deformed nose, for instance, which the former Laureate had covered with a brown patch, is used in the final version as merely a comic pratfall resulting from Bayes's exuberance while demonstrating his choreography to his incorrigible actors (Act II, sc. v). It is plausible that Buckingham had retained that short farcical action in the final version out of sheer indolence, but such a theory would be inconsistent with the great care and thought that he had previously taken with most of the play. More possibly, Buckingham had still counted upon his 1673 audience's recognition of the deceased Laureate. In either case, the brown paper device is a less successful attempt at burlesque and has little relevance beyond the early Restoration period. The brown paper device seems only gratuitous today.
The Rehearsal's use of actors to comment on the script that they are rehearsing represents an original approach for burlesque commentary. Their candid observations on the author-director's play introduces a second critical perspective that is actualized on the stage. The device of having actors comment upon the play they are performing is an original contribution to English burlesque. Shakespeare's "rude mechanicals," the naive players in A Midsummer Night's Dream, are themselves a comment on the numerous amateur strollers of the day. Furthermore, the rustic actors make no aesthetic judgments upon the play they rehearse. Rafe has much to complain about during his rehearsal in The Knight of the Burning Pestle, but his moral disgust and bourgeois sensibilities are intended to be ridiculed. At no time does he correctly judge a scene, qua scene, in which he appears, but rather he merely parrots the sentiments of the Citizen and his Wife. Throughout The Rehearsal, Bayes has trouble keeping his actors under control. In the first act, the cast members, alone on the stage, express their bewilderment over the script they are about to rehearse and assume an entirely mercenary position toward performing it: "so it gets us money, 'tis no great matter" (Act I, sc. ii). They soon rebel by becoming apathetic. The First and Second Soldier, for instance, refuse to dance to Bayes's choreography; instead, they dance their own steps and exeunt (Act II, sc. v). The rebellion of the entire cast occurs in Act V, however, when they all leave the playhouse after becoming disgusted with Bayes's nonsensical ending to the play (Act V, sc. i).
Throughout the play, Bayes must constantly badger and scold his actors for their recalcitrance. The First Player, who argues with his fellow actors in the first act in support of the new kind of playwriting Bayes represents (Act I, sc. ii), willingly submits to the latter's vagaries. Near the end of the play, however, he finally balks at the idea of promoting the rehearsed play any further and agrees with the Second Player that they all should abandon Bayes's play (Act V, sc. i). The incidental dialogue of the players thus contributes a second, entirely distinct evaluation of Bayes's heroic play. The practical criticism of the players points out the whimsicality of the heroic drama in purely theatrical terms. Their viewpoint is derived from their unique backstage orientation.

The Rehearsal thus contains two critical perspectives: the stage audience's viewpoint, as represented by Smith and Johnson; and, the backstage view, as represented by the players. Both critical views finally conclude that the new kind of playwriting should be abandoned. The Rehearsal adds strength to its critical position by showing two different critical orientations in agreement against the heroic drama. The opinion of the two sources gains further credibility by arriving at their conclusions only after first experiencing their object of judgment, Bayes's heroic play, and by then arriving at unprejudiced conclusions. Much of the effectiveness of Buckingham's burlesque depends upon the brilliant use of verbal wit and the superior inventive power of its language. "Transverse" and "transprose," for example, are both nonce words that originated in The Rehearsal (Act I, sc. i). Bayes uses those two neologisms to add
respectability to his plagiarism. The reckless abandon with which he attacks the English language by changing the meaning of words to suit his own convoluted logic reflects the free-wheeling word usage in his rehearsed play.

With the exception of a few independent readings by Bayes, the rehearsed play contains all the parodic verse in The Rehearsal. Buckingham uses a variety of methods to achieve his parody. The obvious reference to Falstaff's line in Henry IV, Part I (Act II, sc. iv), delivered in the Prologue to The Rehearsal, describes the main purpose of parody in the play: "There, strutting heroes, with a grim-fac'd train, Shall brave the Gods, in King Cambyses' vein." Falstaff's original reference in Henry IV is to the old Tudor play, Cambyses, and is mean to describe the overblown sentiments and awkward language that had been characteristic of that type of play. Buckingham uses the phrase for the same meaning, but there is doubtless also a further allusion to Settle's Cambyses, which had been performed in January, 1671 at Lincoln's Inn Fields. The immediacy of Buckingham's attack is thus apparent even in the Prologue, with its double allusion.

Nearly all the sources of Buckingham's parodies are plays that had been performed within eight years of The Rehearsal's premiere. The nature of the parodies are quite varied, however. Many of the identifiable ones are so indirect that they must be considered wholly original rewordings of the target passages. The tag couplet of the two Brentford Kings, for instance, (Act II, sc. ii) is a clever rephrasing of two
lines in Act IV, sc. iii of Orrery's Mustapha (1665),
where Mustapha and Zanger exeunt embracing:

Second King: The, spite of Fate, we'll thus
combined stand
And, like true brothers, walk still
hand in hand.
(Exeunt Reges)

Mustapha: To ours alone the perfect praise is due
At once of being friends and rivals too.
(They exeunt embracing)

Buckingham's loose paraphrases consider the dramatic situation
as well as the meaning and sound of the verse dialogue. Such
a method makes for a striking burlesque of the original source
and provides more creative enjoyment. Buckingham understood
that, in the burlesque art, audience enjoyment derives as much
from the cleverness and ingenuity of the burlesque techniques
as it does from the truth of its ridicule.

Many other parodies in The Rehearsal are not changed at
all from the original source but are delivered word-for-word,
without additions or deletions. In such parodies, the passage
quoted is made ridiculous by the theatrical context in which it
is placed. The mockery of lines from Act I of Dryden's The Wild
Gallant (1663), for example, is achieved by interjecting Bayes's
pompous remarks about the brilliance of every comic line. Bayes's
overkill destroys the original comic effect of Dryden's mediocre
scene. Thus, Buckingham uses the parodic device of ridiculing
his verse target by overpraising it.
The Rehearsal also contains many fine direct parodies of heroic verse dialogue. Drawcansir's lines that are delivered after he has chased the two usurping kings off the stage, for example, are a boastful assertion of his heroic virtues: "I drink, I huff, I strut, look big and stare; And all this I can do because I dare" (Act IV, sc. i). A comparison of that couplet to the original target couplet of Almanzor delivered in Act II, sc. iii of The Conquest of Granada, II ("Spite of myself I'll stay, fight, love, despair; And I can do all this, because I dare") demonstrates that, though the syntax, grammar, and sound of both sets of couplets are quite similar, the meaning of the lines is entirely different. Buckingham's couplet is not a mere exaggeration or distortion of Dryden's original meaning. The parodist instead is more interested in summarizing the essence of Dryden's stage hero and of the heroic drama's tragic hero in general. Buckingham is able to comment aphoristically on the entire heroic genre in those two lines. His sophistication as a parodist far surpasses that of Davenant. With fewer lines of actual parody than The Playhouse To Be Let, Buckingham's burlesque manages to incorporate several more imaginative modes of parody.

The longer, more direct parodies in The Rehearsal are generally aimed at the latest and most successful of the heroic dramas staged in London (circa 1670). Buckingham had known that such passages would be more likely to be recognized by his audience. The "Boar and Sow" parody, for example, (Act I, sc. ii) is one of the most memorable direct parodies in the play. Its
obvious source is a lyrical passage from The Conquest of Granada, II, Act V. Another long direct parody ridicules Berenice's speech from Tyrannic Love (premiere, 1669), Act III. Bayes's parody mocks the preciosity of heroic sentiments and the unfortunate tendency to include inappropriate and mixed metaphors in the love laments of many heroic dramas:

Since death my earthy part will thus remove,
I'll come a humblebee to your chaste love.
With silent wings I'll follow you, dear couz;
Or else, before you, in the sunbeams buzz.
And when to melancholy groves you come,
An airy ghost, you'll know me by my hum;
For sound, being air, a ghost does well become.

(Act IV, sc. i)

Encouraged by Smith and Johnson, Bayes continues his recitation on a humblebee's journey through the various organs of the body of its sleeping lover. The absurd poetic image of a humblebee carrying its human lover on its back is a cogent parody of Berenice's speech. The Rehearsal includes many other parodies that mock extravagant metaphor in the heroic dramas. The use of elaborate metaphorical imagery in those dramas has been greatly influenced by the "metaphysical" poetry of the Caroline period (See Chapter II, pp. 103-104). Buckingham had Bayes take his metaphorical images to such extremes that even the rustic Smith becomes offended:

Prettyman: I'll sooner have a passion for a whale;
In whose vast balk, tho' store of oil
doeth lie,
We find more shape, more beauty in a fly.
Smith: That's uncivil, i'gad.

Bayes: Yes, but as far a fetch'd fancy, tho', i'gad, as ever you saw. (Act IV, sc. ii)

Even a cursory reading of an heroic drama by Dryden or another dramatist will reveal many examples of metaphorical imagery that border on parody. The following example from The Conquest of Granada, II concerns the power of love:

Zulema: 'Tis like a fire within a furnace pent;
I smothered it, and kept it long from vent;
But, fed with looks, and blown with sighs so fast,
It broke a passage through my lips at last. (Act IV, sc. iii)

The view that likened romantic love to a threatening fire had been a common enough simile in heroic verse to inspire Buckingham to include an argument between Prince Prettyman and Volsius in which each hero boasts that his own love passion burns at a hotter temperature than the other's (Act IV, sc. ii). Metaphor is piled onto metaphor in that scene until the imagery becomes grotesque. Neither Beaumont nor Davenant gives so much attention to parodic imagery as Buckingham does in the Prettyman-Volsius scene. Only the latter dramatist is capable of depicting two heroes who compete with one another solely on the level of metaphorical imagery.

In a similar way, The Rehearsal ridicules the argumentative verse characteristic of the love-vs.-honor theme of heroic plays (See Chapter II, p. 105). Volsius's fatuous description of his mental struggle between "Honour" and "Love" is a typical example from the play (Act III, sc. ii). His description of the
psychological struggle of his mind between the two concepts descends into slapstick humor as he hops off the stage unable to decide whether to put both boots on or leave them both off. The Gentleman-Usher's pedantic syllogism (Act II, sc. iv) elicits an ironic quip from Smith:

Gentleman-Usher: As to the when; you say just now: so that is answer'd. Then, for what; why, that answers itself: for what could they hear, but what we talk'd of? So that, naturally, and of necessity, we come to the last question, videlicet, whether they hear or no?

Smith: This is a very wise scene, Mr. Bayes.

Bayes's fondness for argumentative dialogue and trivial ratio-
cination is summarized in his admission, "Reasoning: I gad, I love reasoning in verse" (Act IV, sc. ii).

In format, The Rehearsal's final version probably had been influenced more by the native English tradition of the induction scene than by any single foreign source, including Molière. The development of the induction scene device can be traced from The Old Wives' Tale through The Knight of the Burning Pestle and The Playhouse to Be Let to The Rehearsal. An induction scene is used in such a burlesque to establish in its first act the stage audience and critical situation for the rehearsed inner play that occupies the remainder of the acts. The real-life situation of the Johnson-Smith conversa-
tion, with its colloquialisms and topicalities establishes a scheme of probability through the chance meeting with Bayes to the invitation of the latter for the two critics to view the
playwright's work first hand. The real audience is thus better able to accept the farcical happenings of the inner play. Buckingham was no doubt familiar with the plot structures of both *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* and *The Playhouse to Be Let* (See above, pp. 135-136). The Duke handled his induction scene well, creating a smooth transition from the largely expository scene between Johnson and Smith, through the accidental meeting of Bayes on the street, to the beginning of the rehearsed play. With Beaumont's play as a precedent, Buckingham creates a smooth transition from stage audience to burlesqued play, an achievement that had begun with Peels (See Chapter I, p. 30). *The Rehearsal's* first act begins as a familiar comedy of manners between two Restoration gentlemen, who then proceed to turn the conversation to the dramatic situation in London. Johnson's general observations and his prophetic remark that the popular "new way" of playwriting should be abandoned moves without digression to the meeting with Bayes. The latter's subsequent offer to demonstrate to his two acquaintances the virtues of his new play leads directly to the burlesque situation of *The Rehearsal*, which begins in Act I, sc. ii, when Bayes takes them to the playhouse for his rehearsal.

All three of the main characters of the play, Johnson, Smith, and Bayes, are revealed in the play's first act as representative types of the early Restoration theatre world. Johnson, whose urbanity and blasé manner typify the city gentleman critics of that day serves to distinguish him from the blunter, more impetuous temperament of the country critic, Smith, immedia-
ately recognizes Bayes as one of the "new kind of critics."

Much of the dialogue in *The Rehearsal* is the concise dialogue and repartee characteristic of the best in high comedy. Johnson and Smith's double entendres are numerous and epitomize the Restoration's conception of wit as eloquent but simplified conversation. After the Prologue with Thunder and Lightning, Bayes puns, "There's no more. 'Tis but a flash of a Prologue: a Droll." The flippant Smith tops his puns, however, with his glib reply, "Yes, 'Tis short indeed; but very terrible" (Act I, sc. ii). Bayes uses several aphorisms to express his bold, poetic license. To Smith's objection that his rehearsed play violates the unity of action, Bayes retorts, "What a Devil is the Plot good for, but to bring in fine things?" (Act III, sc. i)

Brilliant dialogue is also used to express Bayes's warped sense of dramatic form and his braggadocio manner. The foolish dramatist's proclamations are quite striking:

Smith: I see, Sir, you have a several design for every scene.

Bayes: I, that's my way of writing; and so Sir, I can dispatch you a whole Play, before another man, I gad, can make an end of his Plot.

Finally, language is also used in the burlesque as indirect parody of the prose style in Dryden's dramatic criticism. Bayes declares, "... for the chief Art of Poetry is to elevate your expectations, and then bring you off some extra-
ordinary way" (Act IV, sc. i). Such proclamations are close in style and tone to the *Essay of Dramatic Poesy*, *The Defence of the Essay of Dramatic Poesy*, *An Essay of Heroic Plays*, and other prose works. Dryden's presumption that he should establish the rules for effective tragedy in the Restoration period is directly caricatured in Bayes's officious statements (See Chapter II, pp. 90-95).

Bayes's endeavor as a stage director demonstrates yet another burlesque device: faulty criticism. Throughout the play, the heroic playwright consistently blunders by giving ridiculous directorial commands to his actors. He gives a wrong line reading (Act V, sc. ii); he scolds actors for misinterpreting his ambiguous scenes (Act III, sc. iv); and he insists upon giving unnecessary coaching (Act V, sc. ii). Bayes goes so far as to introduce effeminate speech and mannerisms for the sake of their novelty (Act II, sc. ii). Bayes as director also insists upon creating powerful dramatic scenes through the sheer weight of numbers: "... your Heroic Verse, never sounds so well, but when the Stage is full" (Act IV, sc. i).

The critical remarks of the actors are reciprocated by Bayes's frequently expressed dislike of stage actors who balk at his directorial commands:

Rude! Ay. I gad, they are the rudest, uncivil-est persons, and all that, in the whole world, I gad ... I have written, Mr. Johnson, I do believe, a whole cart-load of things, every whit as good as this and yet, I vow to gad, these insolent Rascals have turned 'em all back upon my hands again. (Act II, sc. ii)
Bayes's temperamental outbursts against his actors do not appear to ridicule Dryden, who, as was commonly known, did not maintain his quota of three plays per year for which he had been under contract to provide Killigrew's company (See above, p. 115). Bayes's low opinion of his actors may originally have been intended to josh Richard Flecknoe, whose Preface to The Demoiselles a la Mode (1667) rails against specific actors who had refused to stage his play.

The Rehearsal's incorporation of visual images for burlesque effect demonstrates a fully developed awareness of the limits of such elements. In no previous burlesque were hand properties used so well, or so completely, for comic effect. "The Buckler made of Cheese," the helmet that reveals a pie, and the wine that suddenly pours out the end of a battle lance (Act IV, sc. i), were burlesques of the use of similar surprise devices in early Restoration plays. Buckingham called for a cloud machine (a stage machine that the Restoration audience must have associated with the early opera tradition of Davenant's Commonwealth plays and the Continental emphasis on scenic spectacle) upon which were to sit "green Frog" fiddlers wearing green tights (Act V, sc. i). The use of such phantasmagoria undoubtedly appeared ridiculous to those critics of the early Restoration who adhered to the Jonsonian ideal of realism.

Buckingham uses familiar place names in the Volsius scenes to achieve an incongruous effect. By juxtaposing the familiar and common next to the exalted ideals of Volsius's heroic scenes, the heroic actions become grotesque. Volscius's
army is concealed in Knightsbridge (Act III, sc. v); the
twin monarchs are the Kings of Brentford (a small, suburban
town near London); and the stage armies are made up of the
"Acton musketeers," the "Chelsea cuirassiers," and the "Putney
piques" (Act III, sc. v). The use of familiar names for locale
also has been used as a burlesque technique in the puppet play
of Bartholomew Fair (See Chapter I, p. 20), in The Knight of the

In one of Bayes's self-indulgent laments, he complains
of the penchant for novelty among his early Restoration audi­
ences:

Why, faith, a man must live; and if you don't,
thus, pitch upon some new device, I gad, you'll
never do it, for this Age . . . is somewhat hard
to please.   (Act IV, sc. i)

The same complaint is the theme of The Playhouse to Be Let
(See above, p. 135). Both burlesque plays, for all their
differences, are in part motivated by a common desire to rid
their age of the seemingly irresistible taste for novelty in
the theatre.

The Rehearsal contains not one, but several inversion
devices (See above, pp. 132-133). The character of Drawcansir,
for example, is an inversion of its target character, Dryden's
Almanzor. Drawcansir lacks all the high ideals of Almanzor; he
is, as Bayes describes him, "a fierce Hero that frights his Mis­
tress, snubs his Kings, baffles Armies, and does what he will,
without regard for numbers, good manners, or justice" (Act IV,
sc. i). To Smith's objection that heroic figures possess great humanity and justice, Bayes replies, "I prefer that one quality of singly beating of whole Armies above all moral virtues put together" (Act IV, sc. i). Drawcansir reveals his motivations when he willfully bullies the two usurping kings and drinks their wine (Act IV, sc. i). That farcical scene shows the complete motivational change from the target situation in The Conquest of Granada, II (Act II, sc. iii), where Almanzor, motivated by heroic and platonic ideals of valor, elects to stay and fight on behalf of his beloved, knowing full well that his love will never be requited.

In Buckingham's burlesque, the inversion device is most often used in purposely non sequitur dialogue scenes of Bayes's inner play, which demonstrate the irrelevant and incredulous reversals and discoveries found in many heroic dramas. The inversions occur when character motivations and plotlines are suddenly denied or completely reversed, as, for instance, when Volscius graciously acknowledges Prettyman's privilege to speak first before the two usurping kings (Act V, sc. i). Prettyman reciprocates the courtesy by asking that Volscius first be heard. The latter's non sequitur reply reverses his first claim that Prettyman is privileged to speak by asserting that Amaryllis alone should have the honor of speaking first. To judge from Bayes's interjected comment, the heroic author justifies the inconsistency only because it allows Amaryllis (played by Dryden's mistress, Anne Reeves) a chance to declaim.
In the fourth act, another inversion occurs when the funeral for Lardella suddenly is transformed into a Banquet feast after the sudden appearance of Pallas (Act IV, sc. i). The mourners quickly change from lugubrious lamentations to spirited revelry as they dance in celebration of the banquet.

Other scenes of the inner play are completely alogical. The repetitious inanities of the Fisherman's conversation with Amaryllis is a complete reversal of the typical interrogation scenes in such plays as The Slighted Maid (1663), Act III and Marriage a la Mode, Act I.247

Bayes himself as a hypocrite is an inversion of Dryden's neoclassic ideals for the drama. In spite of his strict dramatic rules," Bayes is anxious to outdo all the eccentricities of the heroic drama to make a name for himself. The absolute disregard for the neoclassic rules is revealed when Bayes insists, for instance, that he will outdo his fellow playwrights by writing a play with no plot at all (Act II, sc. iii).

This study's historical and formal approach to the analysis of The Rehearsal has yielded perspectives that reveal many new conclusions. While it is possible that other, less significant conclusions may be drawn from the evidence in the above study, the following summary will highlight the more significant findings of the present chapter.

247 The absurd interrogation scene between Amaryllis and the Fisherman is a burlesque device that has been repeated in the Twentieth Century by the Dadaist playwrights, who sought to ridicule the tradition of the well-made play with inane and repetitious stychomythia. See, for example, Tristan Tzara's The Gas Heart (1923).
Opposed to the heroic sentiment in the early Restoration period was a desire to simplify and to clarify language by the elimination of poetic metaphor and versification. For Buckingham, prose became identified with "Sense" in the drama. The forced and artificial nature of the rhymed heroic couplet was ridiculed in The Rehearsal for the purpose of establishing a more exacting approach to his perception of reality in the drama.

Buckingham's raisonneur, Johnson, is distinctive for his laconic and defensive demeanor throughout the burlesque. As such, he counterposes the excessive qualities of the heroic drama and the extreme posturing of Bayes. In the play, Bayes is allowed to demonstrate to an unprejudiced stage audience the absurdities and the strength of his heroic form; the result is that Buckingham's credibility and the strength of his attack is increased among the members of the real audience. The sincerity of The Rehearsal's critical position must have been further increased by the non-competitive motivations of its original supporters. Different plays are criticized not on the basis of their original performing organization (the King's Company or the Duke's Company), but by virtue of their particular dramatic weaknesses.

Though the burlesque character of Bayes is a composite of several well-known theatre personalities of the early Restoration, Buckingham succeeds in creating a wholly integrated stage personality, whose boastful manner and aphoristic conceits mark him as a comedy of manners man-of-mode. Even though the original
production of The Rehearsal was intended to portray Bayes as an unsympathetic fop character, his motivations are understandable enough to appeal to later ages.

Bayes's ineffectual bragging about his relationship with Anne Reeves, the actress, is not meant to be an expose of the amorous entanglements of Dryden, as some critics have believed; on the contrary, Bayes's sophomoric attitude toward his relationship with ladies is meant to mock Dryden's lack of magnetism and personable qualities. Bayes's fatuous bragging about his sexual prowess is, of course, an outstanding feature of the Restoration man-of-mode character.

Bayes's hypocrisy and his pliable attitude before the demands of popular taste is meant as a direct attack upon Dryden's theoretical position as spokesman for the heroic drama. Dryden's unfavorable habit of comparing himself to Jonson and Shakespeare is reflected in Bayes's disdain for the older playwrights. As a typical example of the new dramatist, Bayes is a comic villain insofar as he poses a threat to the standards of realistic drama. He is, however, unaware of his threatening position (unlike Tartuffe) and therefore must be viewed as more of an innocuous fool (as is the Restoration man-of-mode) than as a rascal. Instead of a man of the theatre, Bayes is portrayed as a pedantic playwright who attempts to write dramas from outside the theatre through the application of rules and formulas. The reference to Dryden is apparent, since Dryden was attacked at the time as much for his theoretical writings as for his drama.
Like the Restoration man-of-mode, Bayes is very much deluded by his personal limitations and strives above all to follow the latest fashion in order to demonstrate his superior personal abilities that he affects. In Bayes's case, the latest fashions of the drama are followed. Also in the man-of-mode tradition is the foolish playwright's vociferous defense against his own detractors. Bayes's frequent complaints about his critics closely parallel Dryden's own literary defenses against the numerous critics of the heroic drama.

Many of the particular critical opinions and sensibilities of Bayes caricature the dramatic theories of Dryden as they were perceived during the early Restoration. Some of the critical views of *The Rehearsal* no doubt followed similar views held by the coffeehouse critics, such as Martin Clifford and Richard Leigh; the burlesque portrait of Almanzor is a case in point.

*The Rehearsal* owes its structural form (the induction scene and the establishment of a stage audience) to the English burlesque drama tradition and not to the Continental tradition. Davenant's fifth act of *The Playhouse to Be Let* had introduced into England the first fully conscious attempt to burlesque the language and ethos of a particular play. With the absence of an actualized stage audience, however, there is little in the way of critical perspective in Davenant's act. The use of burlesque characters whose motivations are completely changed from those of the target characters represents a further advancement in the art of dramatic burlesque. The inversion device
required an audience that is sophisticated enough to comprehend readily the less obvious relation between the changed motivations and actions of the burlesque dramas and the original character attributes of the target drama.

Both The Rehearsal and The Knight of the Burning Pestle use the rehearsal situation for their burlesque—a well-established tradition in English burlesque—and both plays use critical audiences that interject comments during the performance of the inner play. The Rehearsal's stage audience functions as the norm of the play, however, whereas the stage audience of The Knight controls the rehearsed play and thereby becomes itself the object of ridicule. The critical perspective is much keener in Buckingham's play because of the unprejudiced nature of its stage audience, which has no control over, or attachment to, the inner play it criticizes. In addition, the verisimilitude of the stage audience in both plays functions differently. In Beaumont's play, the prose dialogue and working-class London regionalisms of the Citizen and his Wife do not serve to add credibility to their critical position; on the contrary, their simplicity of expression and commonsense approach to aesthetic matters is a burlesque of the bourgeois taste of Jacobean London. In The Rehearsal the succinct prose commentary of the two critics, Johnson and Smith, serves as a contrast to the excessive language of Bayes and his heroic drama. The much more natural use of language in the Johnson-Smith dialogue between the acts of Bayes's rehearsed play is substantive and economical, but never provincial.
Unlike any previous English burlesque drama, The Rehearsal's burlesque intent remains constant and consistent throughout. The focus of its attack is always concentrated upon aesthetic matters—though indirectly at times through the Bayes caricature of Dryden and other heroic authors—and never upon other, more general social concerns.

Much of The Rehearsal's freer use of visual elements is accomplished through the mobility of Bayes as author-director. His ability to step into and out of the action of the inner play results almost always in a visual and aural burlesque image.

There are several aspects of Bayes's character that have no historical basis, but are instead included to embody sheer burlesque nonsense or to comment critically upon heroic dramas in general. Still other aspects of Bayes's personality are intended to allude to heroic playwrights who were probably caricatured in the earliest version of the burlesque (1663-64).

Far more than any previous English play, The Rehearsal systematically attacked what its author believed to be the dramatic foibles of its day. Critical references to the weaknesses in early Restoration drama appeared in almost every line of Buckingham's play.

The accurate presentation of the actors' point of view was a unique contribution of The Rehearsal to the development of burlesque drama: the actors' rehearsal experience with Bayes leads them to concur with the stage audience's viewpoint by the end of the play, lending further weight to Buckingham's attack.
Buckingham revealed his brilliant use of words and his power of invention in the first act in his depiction of the license with which Bayes created new words and destroyed word meaning to suit his own pliable nature. The Rehearsal incorporated several methods of parody: direct and indirect parody; parody of the dramatic and theatrical situation of its target play as well as of the poetic imagery of its target verses; and the exact duplication of the original target lines, which become parody only after they were made to seem ridiculous by outside comment (the mockery of lines from Act I of Dryden's The Wild Gallant, for example). Buckingham was a far better parodist than Davenant or Beaumont because he could epitomize certain heroic characters or dramatic attributes in many of his best parodic couplets.

Buckingham's use of the induction scene resulted in a smooth transition from the critical background of the outer play to the burlesque action of the inner play. Buckingham had cleverly ended his burlesqued inner play with the walkout of both the stage audience and the rehearsal cast, thus precluding an opportunity for Bayes to complete his inner play.

The extent of The Rehearsal's critical penetration into the nature of heroic drama is evidenced by the comprehensive scope of its ridicule. Several heroic tendencies, such as ratiocination in verse, and platonic metaphors, are ridiculed frequently. The Rehearsal maintains an equally comprehensive scrutiny of the staging practices of heroic plays through the fatuous activity of Bayes as director.
Buckingham's burlesque exhibits a high comic style in its flippant dialogue and its witty repartee. Johnson and Smith maintain a consistently sharp ironic edge to their commentary. Their dry humor is typical of the best in Restoration comedy of manners. Bayes's aphorisms are particularly memorable in spite of—or perhaps because of—his essentially foolish personality. His epigrams and many of his theoretical pronouncements take the form of indirect prose parody of Dryden's essay style.

Bayes's faulty directorial criticism is another burlesque device used effectively. His erroneous directives to the actors are variations of the burlesque device in Beaumont's *The Knight*, where the Citizen and his Wife reveal their naive taste through their directorial commands to Rafe and the boy actors.

The use of familiar and mundane place names in heroic context is a common device for creating burlesque through incongruity. *The Rehearsal* uses the device in several scenes with Volscius's army.

The inversion device is used in *The Rehearsal* to parody or caricature certain character motivations and dialogue conversations in the target plays by completely changing their original intention. That less obvious form of burlesque goes beyond the mere debasement or exaggeration of heroic sentiments (such as the insertion of local place names or the use of rustic slang to express noble sentiments, as in Rafe's scenes in *The Knight*) to ridicule through the alteration of the dramatic situation itself.
The Rehearsal inspired a host of subsequent burlesque works, both in the theatre and in private verse lampoons, within a few years of its initial success. The following chapter discusses the dramatic nature of the more successful stage burlesques of the mid-Restoration period.
CHAPTER IV


During the 1670's in England, satiric attack and personal lampoon appeared at an accelerated rate. The second decade of the Restoration period was rife with self-conscious critical perspective and aesthetic precepts. Sir William Soame and John Dryden's version of Boileau's Art of Poetry described the abundance of burlesque and lampoon, both in poetry and in the drama, with disdain. In Dryden's case, his low opinion of the proliferation of petty pamphlets of personal slander, which characterized the mid-Restoration period, was at least partially motivated by his own victimization at the hands of his literary detractors. Many of the critical attacks were aimed against Dryden's insistence upon the use of rhyme in tragedy. The Dryden-Howard controversy of the 1660's gave way to a rash of new attacks disfavoring the heroic rhyme. Unlike the considerate Howard, however, the new attackers were less than discrete. Shadwell continued his rivalry with Dryden in a series of anti-rhyme arguments in his Prologues and Epilogues. Shadwell's Epilogue to The Miser (1676) attacked the heroic rhymed couplet dialogue; his Epilogue to The Virtuoso (1676) criticized the heroic tragedy form itself. Ravenscraft's Preface to The Careless Lovers (1673) was directed against all "sieges and
operas"—probably a direct attack on Settle's opera, *The Empress of Morocco* (1674), but also an indirect criticism of all rhymed spectacle.

Non-dramatic criticism of rhymed drama also appeared in abundance during the 1670's and 1680's. Typical of the latter was the Earl of Mulgrave's rhymed attack upon heroic plays:

> Figures of Speech, which Poets think so fine,  
> Art's needless Varnish to make Nature shine,  
> Are all but Paint upon a beauteous Face,  
> And in Description only claim a place.  
> Or else like Bells eternally they Chime,  
> Men dye in Simile and live in "rime."  

Rhyme was clearly seen in that poem as descriptive of all "Sense" in poetry and, in addition, it was deliberately obscurant.

The use of rhyme was by no means the chief motivating force behind the rising popularity of critical attack upon heroic drama. Indeed, aesthetic judgment in general was only one of several subjects of satirical criticism during the period. Much of the cause for the attacks was doubtless attributable to the court wit's inclination toward personal vendetta and outright bullying of those who were lower on the social chain. The epitome of the court nobleman in that regard was John Wilmot, the Earl of Rochester. After being awarded for his father's service to Charles II during the Commonwealth period, Rochester became one of the "merry Gang," which was...

---


a group on intimate terms with the King and which included Buckingham, Dorset, Etherege, Charles Sidney, and Thomas Killigrew. The group became notorious for its bawdy conversation and its wild escapades, which oftentimes took the form of practical jokes against the King himself.250

Rochester soon gained an additional reputation as a skillful lampooner of the meanest sort and was banished from the court on several occasions for lampoons against the King and his royal mistresses.251 Rochester also devoted considerable attention to his lampoons and aesthetic evaluations of playwrights, particularly Dryden and Otway, both of whom he had abandoned out of a jealous dissatisfaction with their literary success. As a poet laureate of middle-class origin, Dryden quite often had to suffer the slings of such noblemen as Rochester with little hope of counterattack. In An Essay of Satyr (1679), written jointly by the Earl of Mulgrave and Dryden, a few lines were devoted to the belittling of Rochester's character. Soon after its publication, Dryden was severely battered in a nocturnal assault by a gang of hoodlums near Covent Garden. Among court circles at the time, it was commonly felt that Rochester had instigated the attack.252


251 A short four-line barb against Nell Gwyn is a particularly crass example that has survived for posterity: "Written Under Nelly's Picture," quoted in the Introduction to Sodom, p. xxvii.

Personal lampoon was not confined to the higher nobility, however. Middle-class playwrights warred amongst themselves with just as much passion. Dryden, Crowne, and Shadwell wrote *Notes and Observations on the "Empress of Morocco"; or, Some Few Erratas to Be Printed Instead of the Sculptures with the Second edition of That Play* (1674). In that attack against Settle, Dryden descended to the level of Martin Clifford in his sophomoric raillery. Settle's counterattack to that lampoon was a pamphlet entitled, *Notes and Observations on the "Empress of Morocco" revised with Some Few Erratas; To Be Printed Instead of the Postscript With the Next Edition of the "Conquest of Granada"* (1674), which proved to be an equally uninspired backlash against his trio of detractors.

The literary infighting continued into the 1680's, far beyond the point at which lampoon and burlesque had ceased in the theatre. Dryden's famous *MacFlecknoe*, the brilliant burlesque poem against Shadwell (who had fallen out with Dryden once again), was written just before the decade of the '80's. In that poem, Shadwell was fulsomely praised as the worthy successor to Richard Flecknoe (d. 1687), an Irish poet whose name had become associated with bad poetry. The poem was high burlesque, written in rhymed couplets. Ironically, Dryden was motivated by Shadwell's pretentious claim to be the worthy successor—"son"—of Jonson. Dryden, of course, had been attacked in *The Rehearsal* for his own pretentious estimate of himself as chief apologist for the heroic form, which he had believed at the time to be the only form suitable for the Restoration Age (See Chapter III, pp. 165-166).
The appearance of The Rehearsal in 1671 marked the beginning of a halcyon age of playhouse critics. Never before in English stage history had one play caused such long-lasting controversy or created a greater polarity of critical opinion among its audience members. Amateur dramatic criticism became a pasttime of the fashionable young men of the mid- Restoration period. Several plays written soon after the Rehearsal’s premiere alluded to the new vogue for criticism in the playhouses. Thomas D’Urfey’s The Fool Turn’d Critick (1676) concerns a bourgeois young man who attempts to gain entrance into the court society through his arrogance and bluster as a theatre critic. Sir Hercules Buffoon: or, The Poetical Squire was performed in September, 1684, as a posthumous drama by the original Bayes of The Rehearsal, the actor, John Lacy. Sir Hercules’s chief desire is to become a wit in the beau monde by criticizing plays. Wycherley’s famous The Country Wife (1675) includes the man-of-mode character, Sparkish, who deludes himself into thinking he can outwit the playwrights at the theatres. The Rehearsal’s contribution to the Restoration comedy of manners was precisely the introduction of such dilettantes to the stage. The above three plays, no doubt inspired by Buckingham’s portrait of the foolish dramatist who sacrifices aesthetic integrity for dramatic fashions, document the emphasis placed upon dramatic criticism as a fashionable pursuit during the 1670’s and 1680’s.

253 Dane Farnsworth Smith, in her study of neoclassicism considers The Rehearsal to be the first play to fully acknowledge the presence of the amateur critics. See Chapter II of her The Critics in the Audiences of the London Theatres From Buckingham to Sheridan: A Study of Neo-Classicism in the Playhouse, 1671-1779 (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press).
Shadwell, always eager to take offense, derided the rowdy young theatre critics of his age, who "at sixteen forsooth, set up for Men of the Town," in Act III of his *The Virtuoso*. In *A True Widow*, a comedy by the same author, the dialogue between young Maggot and several audience members in Act III ridiculed the highly impressionable nature of the playhouse critics.

Though the severity of most of the satiric attacks and personal lampoons derived partially from the ambience of the captious playhouse critics and the unmitigated license of the higher noblemen of the period, other factors also contributed to that severity. The genre of satire itself was used as a particularly rancourous form of attack by the English of the mid-Seventeenth Century. Though the French critic Casaubon had shown the etymology of the word "satire" from the Latin *satura*, the English continued to confuse the Greek *satyr* as a literary form with their own satiric tradition. Keeping what they imagined to be the original tone of the Greek satyr play in mind, the English wrote "satyrs" that were closer to lampoons than French satires. John Peter has remarked, "Undoubtedly it was the satire-satyr muddle that did most to persuade English satirists that their poems could be barbarously phrased."\(^{254}\)

The harsh tone of English verse satire began to change only with the introduction of Boileau's more refined satires

to England during the 1670's. Rochester and Butler, to name only two, translated the Frenchman's most refined satiric couplets into English during that decade (See Chapter II, pp. 77-8).

The older notion of satire continued in vogue, however, throughout the mid- and late-Restoration periods. Though Quintilian had claimed more than fifteen hundred years previous to that era that satire had been a wholly Roman invention (Satura guidem tota nostra est), Dryden for one did not recognize the derivations of satyrus and satura until his Discourse of Satire (1693). He briefly apologizes for the misspelling (Satyr) in the first publication of that work, "which having not considered at the first, I thought it not worth correcting afterwards."²⁵⁵

Another object of satiric ridicule was the fashion for theatrical entertainment during the mid-Restoration period, at which time an increasingly larger proportion of middle-class citizens began to patronize the two major theatres and the nurseries in London. Robert Gould's The Playhouse: A Satyr is one example of such topical satires.

Still another major subject for the satirist's pen was political criticism and ridicule. Political satire became especially prominent after 1675 and reached its level of greatest intensity during the political unrest that followed the Popish plot scare and the Exclusion Act controversy (1678-1679). During a period of perhaps five years, the political lampoon

completely overshadowed all other forms of satiric criticism.

Political pamphleteers had published their views extensively throughout the Restoration. Butler's *Hudibras* had inspired an entire generation of satiric pamphlets supporting either the monarchists or the Whigs (See Chapter II, pp. 80-81). Andrew Marvell had distributed no less than eighteen political satires concerning Charles II's reign even before the advent of the Popish plot.

After 1678, England became sharply divided between Whig and Tory factions. Aesthetic concerns were transformed into political controversy almost overnight. Dryden, who had willingly involved himself in aesthetic quarrels, supported the Tory cause as vehemently as he had once upheld the use of rhyme in dramas a few years earlier. As Historiographer Royal as well as Poet Laureate, Dryden became, by necessity as well as by choice, a propagandist in support of Charles II and against the Whig opposition. The chief political figures who were against Dryden and the Tory cause were Buckingham, his longtime enemy of the literary sphere, and the Earl of Shaftesbury.

During the conspiracy trial of Shaftesbury, Dryden wrote his famous satiric poem, *Absalom and Achitophel* (1681), which urged both the city and the jury to find Shaftesbury guilty. The publication of that satire incited a series of heated

---

256 For a concise survey of the Popish plot scare, including Dryden's role in it, and the political consequences during those years, see George Wasserman's account, in *John Dryden* (New York: Twayne, 1964), pp. 27-31.
counterattacks—also in rhymed couplets—the form for burlesque verse used by Boileau. The satires attacked Dryden's Tory sentiments and supported the Whig cause, but the political attacks became inseparable from the aesthetic judgments. Settle's Absalom Senior (1682), Political Reflections on a Late Poem Entitled "Absalom and Achitophel" (1681, attributed to Buckingham because of stylistic associations), and Azaria and Hushai (1682), by Samuel Portage, all used Biblical allegories (in imitation of Dryden's poem) for their satiric attacks. It was an age known for its Biblical allegory, as Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress, published the year of the Popish plot, testifies. Each of Dryden's detractors, however, also included aesthetic judgments against Dryden's career as a poet and dramatist.

After Shaftesbury's acquittal, largely the result of the trial's middle-class venue, Dryden responded with another political satire, The Medall (1682), "A Satyr Against Sedition." The poem was a brilliant satiric expose of the acquittal of Shaftesbury and of his adherents' decision to commemorate the occasion by striking a medal in honor of the Earl. Shadwell, who had become the literary enemy of Dryden, counterattacked with The Medall of John Bayes: A Satyr Against Folly and Knavery (1682): "How long shall I endure, without reply, to hear this Bayes, this Hackney-railer lie?" Shadwell's rhyming poem was vicious, identifying Dryden with the most excessive qualities of the fatuous playwright in The Rehearsal. The following scurrilous allusion to Dryden's relationship with Anne Reeves
from the poem supports the theory that The Rehearsal's allusion to the Laureate's lovemaking was ironic and not to be taken at face value (See Chapter III, p. 165):

He boasts of Vice (which he did ne'er commit)
Calls himself Whoremaster and Sodomite;
Commends Reeve's Arse, and says she Buggers well,
And silly Lies of vitious Pranks does tell.

The severity of Shadwell's personal lampoon motivated Dryden's publication of MacFlecknoe, which had probably been written around 1678, but had remained unpublished. MacFlecknoe was a mock-heroic poem dedicated to "T. S." as a sterility example of literary mediocrity.

In all of the above political satires and lampoons, the high burlesque method was used effectively to ridicule political opponents. Personages from the Bible, for example, were used to represent well-known figures from the political arena (in Dryden's Absalom and Achitophel, for example, Absalom represented James, Duke of Monmouth, the Protestant pretender to the throne, and Achitophel represented Shaftesbury as the crafty advisor to James).

The preoccupation with political affairs during those years greatly altered the nature of burlesque and personal criticism in the theatre. The political upheaval of the late 1670's and the 1680's sobered the comparatively frivolous theatrical and dramatic criticism that was characteristic of the years immediately preceding it. Playwrights and production companies all abandoned commentary of the burlesque sort.
Political factionalism took the place of burlesque imitation of individuals. Dryden, for example, began his satiric attacks on his political enemies in the Epilogue to *Troilus and Cressida* (1679), in his Dedication of *The Kind Keeper* (1679), and in certain dialogue passages in *The Spanish Friar* (1680). The Laureate's *Vindication of "The Duke of Guise"* (1683) answered Whig criticism of the play by that name, which Dryden had written with Nathaniel Lee. Every public theatre playwright of the time had ample opportunity to use the stage as a rostrum for political expression. Dryden wryly commented in his Prologue to Thomas Southerne's *The Loyal Brother* (1682) that the dramatic criticism of the coffeehouses and playhouses had been augmented by an equally vicious new group of Whig critics:

Poets, like Lawful Monarchs, rul'd the Stage,
Til Critics, like damn'd Whiggs, debauched our Age.
Mark how they jump: Critics would regulate
Our theatres, and Whiggs reform our State:
Both pretend love, and both (Plague rot 'em) hate.

In the microcosmic world of the Restoration theatre, political criticism did not fully replace artistic criticism, but, rather, often became inseparable from it; Shadwell was attacked as a dull poet because he was opposed to Dryden's political views, and, for his Tory sentiments, Dryden suffered Shadwell's scurrility.

Between the premiere of *The Rehearsal* and the political frenzy of the late 1670's, several English plays were directly influenced by *The Rehearsal* 's thorough exploration of the burlesque form. The first of those was *The Reformation*, a comedy
written by Joseph Arrowsmith, which premiered in the
Spring or Summer of 1673 at the Duke's Theatre. Almost
nothing is known about the author, except that he was born
in 1617, received his Master of Arts degree from Cambridge
in 1670, and joined the ministry around 1675. Downes lists
the play with the following comment, "Written by a Master of
Arts in Cambridge." Arrowsmith's comedy is noted primarily
for its speeches against heroic tragedy, which appear in Act
IV, sc. i; however, other portions of the play also deserve
attention for their burlesque attributes.

The Prologue of The Reformation clearly indicates that
the author opposed heroic drama and considered rhymed dialogue
in drama contrary to sense:

He [the author] has not left us Room for
Gaudy Scene;
Which uses to amuse you for a time,
Whilst Non-sence safely glides away in Rime.

He was for plodding in the Ancient way:
Yet he would if this did not please our Friends,
In Rime and Non-Sence strive to make amends.
If we procur'd Noise, Clothes, Scenes, Songs and Dance,
His Siege, or Conquest he can have from France.

The last line clearly refers to Davenant's The Siege of Rhodes
(recognized as the first rhymed heroic play at that time) and
to Dryden's The Conquest of Granada, I, II. Both plays were


amply ridiculed in *The Rehearsal*. Arrowsmith had the same objects of ridicule in mind for his plays as did the authors of *The Rehearsal*. *The Reformation* was, however, far from a fully realized burlesque play. Arrowsmith had merely inserted what he must have discerned would be at the time a sure selling point for his otherwise completely non-satiric comedy set in Italy. In spite of their derivative nature, the sections of the play devoted to heroic criticism are quite witty.

Arrowsmith's comedy has a Venetian locale and Italian characters and depends upon many wry references to English fashions and life styles for its humor. Much of the humor also derives from a scatological bravura akin to the best of Wycherley and Etherege:

Leandro: . . . but are they so free in England as you pretend?

Pedro: Freer than you can think it. 'Tis mortal sin not to know what's what at fifteen.

Antonio: Fifteen! They have lost time at that age; a Maidenhead at thirteen is as great a rarity in the country as a wolf;

(Act II, sc. i)

The play's burlesque element owes much to Buckingham's success the year before. Antonio and Pedro ask Pisauro to encourage the Tutor (the English character in the play) into his "old humour," which is his poetic arrogance and conceit. The passive role of the three Italian courtiers as stage audience and their amusing quips, ignored by the Tutor, are quite similar to the attitude of Smith and Johnson as stage audience. Johnson and Smith also assume a passive role toward Bayes, who entertains
them with his vagaries (See Chapter III, pp. 138-139).

The Tutor's impudent judgment of his own abilities as a dramatist is clearly borrowed from The Rehearsal's caricature of Dryden through the character of Bayes:

Tutor: . . . we have some three or four, as Fletcher, Johnson, Shakespeare, Davenant, that have scribbled themselves into the bulk of follies and are admired to [sic], but ne'er knew the laws of heroick or dramatick poesy, nor faith to write true English neither. (Act IV, sc. i)

The speech reflects Dryden's unfortunate method of comparing himself with previous poets, which became the object of so much assault in The Rehearsal.

Like Smith and Johnson, Pedro and Antonio deliberately encourage the Tutor to display his foolish conceit with their ironic comments:

Antonio: . . . I hope Sir your heroick play goes on.

Tutor: As fast as a piece of that exactness can. I'll only leave a pattern to the world for the succeeding ages and have done.

Pedro: Oh Sir you'll wrong the world.

Tutor: No faith Sir I grow weary of applause. (Act IV, sc. i)

The contradictory views of the Tutor toward the public acclaim are so close to Bayes's portrait in The Rehearsal that it may have been the intention of Arrowsmith to ridicule Dryden's position as apologist for the heroic drama just as Buckingham had done. There is no evidence that Arrowsmith had ever read
Dryden's dramatic theories or had ever seen his heroic
dramas, but it is doubtful that he had not. Clearly, however,
the young dramatist was familiar with Buckingham's burlesque.

The extent to which the characters talk about the Tutor's
old humour indicates that Dryden was the particular personage
the Tutor was meant to represent:

Leandro: That's the English man, I warrant, that
pretends so much to Poetry and breeding, and
censures all the old Authors, with as much
Authority as if he had been their School-
master. (Act II, sc. i)

Dryden's presumptuous claim as the upholder of the standards
of Restoration drama and his low opinion of the literary deve-
lopment of the Elizabethan age can only be the satiric intention
of Leandro's speech.

The alleged plagiaristic tendencies of the Tutor parallel
the common charge brought against Dryden by his contemporaries
(See Chapter II, pp. 80-82, and Chapter III, pp. 150-151):

Antonio: Sometimes he pretends to Plays too,
and then he damns French, Spanish, and
Italian in a wind, yet steals out of the
very worst of them. He would be thought
to have a little kindness for an author
or two of his own Nation, but will be sure
to ruin their reputation too, with some
exception or other, before he leaves them.
(Act II, sc. i)

Dryden's financial position is also apparently mocked, as it had
been in The Rehearsal and in several verse lampoons: "Antonio:
... all he had to subsist on, was confidence, and the favor
of two or three fops" (Act II, sc. i). Antonio's vindictive
comment is so personal as to suggest that Arrowsmith did in fact have a particular author of the London theatre world in mind. The Tutor's exit line, which ends the second act, indicates that at least part of Arrowsmith's intention was to document the fiercely competitive situation that he himself must have faced as a novice playwright in Restoration London:

Tutor: In England, where each writer shares the stakes, the gains are small, and one the other breaks. But here alone without control I rule, His trade can't fail that's Tutor to a fool.

In Act IV, sc. i, Arrowsmith has borrowed perhaps the most obvious burlesque device from The Rehearsal. The Italian gallants ask the Tutor to explicate the laws whereby he has attained dramatic "perfection." The Tutor then proceeds to outline his maxims for successful heroic drama composition, just as Bayes had explained his rules for popular playwriting in Act I, sc. i of The Rehearsal. Though the device is exactly the same, Arrowsmith's intention is to ridicule only the attributes of heroic drama without personal allusion to a particular dramatist. The effect of Bayes's self-indulgent description of his heroic method is to ridicule the personality of Dryden. The Tutor's precepts are all quite similar in both their style and viewpoint to the numerous maxims of Bayes. Arrowsmith, for example, ridicules stage combat and spectacle through the Tutor: "... let a play's content always be some warlike action; you can't imagine what a grace of Drums and Trumpet give a Play."
The use of several kings in the same play is also mocked (recalling the twin Kings of Brentford and the two usurping Kings in *The Rehearsal*) by the Tutor's insistence upon their use to gain more popularity; characters that are unsuited to the action of a play are ridiculed by the Tutor's stubborn insistence upon their use; finally, the Tutor's flippant attitude toward the love-vs.-honor theme in heroic dramas is ridiculed:

You must always have two Ladies in Love With one man, or two men in love with one woman; if you make them father and son, . . . 'twill do the better. There you know is opportunity for love and honour and Fighting, and all that.

The Tutor's recommendations for successful playwriting compare exactly with the callous and mercenary attitudes of Bayes toward his own heroic themes (See Act I, sc. ii of *The Rehearsal*). In both instances the desire for fame and popular success belies the high-minded precepts of the quackish playwright.

The Tutor's recommendations for the ideal heroic protagonist is an exact description of Drawcansir as the burlesque caricature of Dryden's Almanzor (See Chapter III, pp. 161-162):

Tutor: Then Sire you must have a hero that shall fight With all the world; yes i'gad, and beat them too, and half the gods into the bargain if the occasion serves. (Act IV, sc. i)

Buckingham had portrayed Drawcansir as a brute with superhuman strength and prowess. Almanzor in Act V defeats an entire stage army by slaying them all on cue.
The Tutor's pliable pandering to the dictates of popular taste has no limits. He even uses religion to count on a sure box-office draw:

But give me leave and mark it for infallible, in all you write reflect upon religion and the Clergy; you can't imagine how it tickles, you shall have the Gallants get those verses all by heart, and fill their letters with them to their country friends. (Act I, sc. i)

The Tutor's exploitation of religion and the reference to its popular acceptance is perhaps a minor attempt at social criticism made by an author destined for the clergy.

The frequent reliance upon ghost and supernatural scenes and occult rituals in heroic drama also receives satiric mention through the Tutor's stern admonition to "be sure to raise a dancing singing ghost or two" (Act IV, sc. i). The use of the stage ghost as a burlesque device came into actual use in Duffett's burlesque works and would become a standard burlesque element in Eighteenth Century burlesques (The Rehearsal contained no ghost scenes).

Other aspect of heroic drama that the Tutor does not fail to mention are the use of rhyme as a sure method of finishing an otherwise senseless scene; and, the reliance upon violence in heroic drama, "kill enough at the end of the play." After the Tutor's lengthy disquisition on successful heroic dramaturgy, his stage audience becomes weary of his effrontery, just as Smith and Johnson become tired of Bayes's hypocritical posturings. Both stage audiences find themselves the victims of their own
devising. The comments of the Italian courtiers to one another exactly corresponds to Smith and Johnson’s interchanges: "Pisauro: (Aside) Aint’t you weary? Pedro: No prithee let him run on."

After his discourse on tragedy, the Tutor turns to his prescriptions for writing effective comedy. He proudly admits that he picks "a scene here and a scene there" from French comedy to enliven his own comic works. Arrowsmith was ridiculing those English authors (Davenant, Shadwell, Dryden, to name a few) who often relied upon French comedy for their inspiration. The English insistence upon the use of double entendres and scatological suggestions in their comedy is also proudly sanctioned by the Tutor. He then simplistically distinguished between successful comedy and successful tragedy: comedy is "but saving alive and marrying those that you would kill in tragedy, and you have done," The kinship of the Tutor’s precepts to the simplistic aphorisms of Bayes is quite apparent.

The Tutor’s final advice, which he calls his "great Arcanum," is to distribute his play to a favorite of the Court and, by asking her judgment on the play, so flatter her that she will spread the word on the true value of the play. Such worldly advice undoubtedly mocks the subservient nature of professional writers, who were forced in the Restoration period to write lengthy dedications to their prospective patrons. Dryden himself shamelessly observed that formality.

The Tutor describes his own method of gaining greater audience support for his plays by shaking a few hands at the
coffeehouses. Both the Tutor and Bayes follow "rules" for effective drama. The Tutor's rules and Bayes's commonplace book reveal their systematic and pedantic approach to their art. The Tutor, like Bayes, even goes so far as to name his rules according to their priority. Both stage playwrights are the direct descendents of the foolish pedant character of Elizabethan burlesque drama (See Chapter I, pp. 23-24).

The Tutor's exaggerated estimation of himself as chief theorist for the new age, which demands the heroic form as its highest literary expression, is evident when he mentions more than once his desire to make "a pattern for the world so long deceived in their opinion of wit and language" (Act IV, sc. i). Out of desperation, Pedro asks Pisauro to persuade the Tutor to keep his rules for the Preface to his next play--a possible glance off Dryden's practice of defending his theories in his own Prefaces and Epilogues (See the Epilogue to The Conquest of Granada, II and others). Arrowsmith all but calls out Dryden's name when the Tutor gives out the titles of his unfinished heroic dramas: "The Siege of Rhodes," and "The Conquest of Flanders" (Act IV, sc. i).

At the end of Act V, Antonio demands, for the resolution of the play, the "Reforming of Mounsieur Tutor." The Englishman is given the ultimatum of either renouncing his interest in "the Society"--a clear reference to the Royal Society, of which Dryden was a member--or of relinquishing his "pretense to Poetry, and acquaintance with the Muses." Antonio then reveals one other choice through which the Tutor may redeem
himself: "to produce a Play which shall have nothing
in't borrowed nor improbable, nor profane, nor bawdy."
To that the Tutor replies wryly that such a play would undoubtedly succeed on the English stage solely because of its originality and believability.

In the Epilogue to *The Reformation*, Arrowsmith gives a vivid description of a typical session of critics in a coffeehouse after a play. He pleads that his audience ignore the hypocritical author-critics who damn everything "that's not their own."

In Act II, sc. ii, the Tutor instructs his charge on how to gain respect and reputation as a self-styled critic of the playhouse. His advice has the effect of pure satire—not burlesque—and is a continuation of Bayes's preoccupation with the audience critics. In that scene, the Tutor is not ridiculed as a caricature of a particular dramatist, nor is he meant to represent the excessive attitudes of the heroic drama in general. Arrowsmith allows the Tutor to become a critic through his wry commentary on the vainglorious critics who plague all Restoration authors.

The scenes with the Tutor are only partially burlesque, when they are burlesque at all. There is never any parody of heroic verses, nor is there any reenactment of stage movement or spectacle as there is in *The Rehearsal*. Visual and situational burlesque is never used in *The Reformation*. Arrowsmith was satisfied with merely describing the objects of his criticism and only used burlesque when the Tutor became a caricature of
the dramatic practices and theories of Dryden and other heroic playwrights.

To understand the burlesque intention of Thomas Duffett's three burlesques, which followed one another in comparatively rapid succession, a brief consideration of the theatrical situation in London at the time is necessary. Unlike *The Playhouse to Be Let*, *The Rehearsal*, and *The Reformation*, Duffett's burlesques were written, much as *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* had been, to ridicule the theatrical fare of the rival playhouse and thereby attract its audience. Duffett's company, the King's at the Theatre Royal, had been losing patrons to the Duke of York's Company for several years. That situation was partially caused by the opening of the splendid new theatre at Dorset Gardens on November 9, 1671, for the Duke's Company. To add to the problems of the King's Company, the Theatre Royal at Bridges Street (Drury Lane) burnt down in January, 1672, forcing the company to reopen its smaller and comparatively ill-equipped theatre at Lincoln's Inn Fields. It was not until March of 1674 that the new Drury Lane Theatre (probably designed by Christopher Wren) was opened by the King's Company as a worthy rival of Dorset Gardens. In the meantime, however, the Duke's Company took full advantage of their splendid facility by producing Elkanah Settle's *The Empress of Morocco* (July, 1673). Settle's opera was one of the most extravagant productions of the time, depending heavily upon lavish spectacle and choreography for its appeal. The short burlesque play of the same name was Duffett's first attempt and was probably
produced at Lincoln's Inn Fields in the late Summer or Fall of the same year. It had as its intention the mockery of several theatrical and dramatic elements in Settle's popular opera. In addition, the burlesque play included a short scene in mock imitation of the witches' scene in the Duke's Compnay production of Macbeth, which was probably performed in early August, 1673. The objects of Duffett's burlesque were thus fresh in his audience's memory.

Duffett's satiric technique was essentially low burlesque, that is, ridicule derived from the debasement of heroic actions, often lewd in nature, sometimes called "travesty." DiLorenzo has pointed out that Duffett merely applied the low burlesque style of Cotton's Scarronides (See Chapter II, pp. 63-64) to the drama. Such an evaluation is far too general for accuracy. The Rehearsal and The Playhouse to Be Let, for that matter, can also be classified as low burlesque, though Buckingham's play lacks the crudity of Cotton's poem. Of the important burlesque plays discussed so far, only Beaumont's The Knight of the Burning Pestle can be described as having high burlesque elements.

Since Langbaine called Duffett "a Wit of the third Rate," critics have been largely unimpressed by his burlesque dramas. Further consideration of the dramatist is necessary, however. Duffett's burlesque dramas reveal a progressive development so much so that Psyche Debauched, the last of his three bur-

lesques, is a mature and brilliant work in comparison with his first burlesque, *The Empress of Morocco*.

In every respect, *The Empress of Morocco* burlesque shows signs of the undeveloped and awkward work of a novice playwright. Duffett seems to have been unable to grasp the full intention of his burlesque. He included extraneous characters and actions, which had no parallel to their target scenes. Just as Davenant had added two characters to Act V of *The Playhouse* (Antony and Cleopatra), so Duffett added several minor characters and songs to his burlesque, apparently to round out his choral numbers. Though his play confines itself, for the most part, to a travesty of Settle's play, it includes a few allusions to other plays. The Prologue, for example, uses a close parody of line sung by the singing ghost in Mrs. Philips's Pompey (end of Act III). Perhaps Duffett was inspired by Davenant's travesty of that play to include his own parody.

Duffett's *The Empress of Morocco* relies upon the use of local and mundane place names for its locale. It also changes the characters' names to low-born English surnames and changes their aristocratic pastimes into manual occupations in its parodies:

Hamet Alhaz: Great Sir, your Hector Hamet's coming:
From Car-men and stout Butchers thrumming
At Bankside on billows tossing.

A short comparison of the above lines with Settle's original from Act II, sc. i, of his opera reveals Duffett's unique burlesque style—somewhat colloquial, even obscurant—and may
account for his facile dismissal as a man of low wit by his critics:

Hamet Alhaz: To day as I the wheat-field stood in The sky was altered on a suddain, And looked as thick as hasty pudding: For lo! behold the Aiery Region Had water in't to drown a Legion.

Duffett's use of common professions for his heroic characters is reminiscent of the rude mechanicals scenes of A Midsummer Night's Dream, and of the puppet play in Bartholomew Fair. However, whereas the latter two burlesques attempted high bur­lesque by exalting trivial and mundane actions and characters, Duffett and Davenant (The Playhouse) used the same kind of imagery for a low burlesque effect, which debases the heroic actions: the Ghost of Duffett's Prologue is from Tuttle Fields—a pauper's graveyard where bodies were heaped in times of plague. Muly Labas is a "Corn-cutter," that is, a remover of foot corns; and Muly Hamet is a "Dray-man" and hardly an heroic figure in his personal attributes. The intentions of Duffett's characters (like Davenant's) revolve around liquor and women and seldom rise above that level. Both Duffett's and Davenant's characters easily digress to other, more frivolous concerns (women and liquor, for instance) when they are momentarily prevented from achieving their nobler goals. They always ignore the heroic restrictions placed upon them and avoid the inevitable commit­ment that heroic actions entail. Duffett's songs in praise of liquor, for example, parallel the songs in Settle's opera (Act II, sc. i) that praise the virtues of loyalty. In much
the same manner, Davenant’s merry heroes from *The Playhouse* dance off to a local alehouse at the end of the play (See Chapter II, p. 132).

The burlesque approaches of Duffett and Davenant show further similarities in that they both offer no point of view toward the objects of their ridicule, but instead are given to sheer burlesque exuberance. In his *Empress of Morocco*, Duffett only wished to mock his rival’s serious opera and did not present an alternative view, as Buckingham did in *The Rehearsal*.

In spite of the immaturity and lack of direction of *The Empress of Morocco* burlesque, the play is significant in the history of burlesque drama as the most fully realized dramatization of the low-character device. Davenant’s burlesque characters were high-born courtiers, who nevertheless possessed commonplace motivations. Duffett’s burlesque characters, on the contrary, are working-class, given over to the pastimes of their class stereotype—drinking and womanizing. The characters of *The Empress of Morocco* are more obviously debased and reveal a far greater contrast between themselves and the high motivations of their target characters than Davenant’s burlesque characters demonstrate in comparison to their target characters.

Duffett chose at random particular scenes to burlesque from his target drama. Perhaps he had in mind to choose the most easily identifiable scenes for his audience. Such a technique was also used by Davenant in his condensation of *Pompey*. The numerous similarities between *The Empress of Morocco* burlesque and Act V of *The Playhouse to Be Let* suggests
a degree of influence by Davenant's drama on Duffett.

No other evidence exists, however, that would support such an influence other than the points of comparison in the two dramas themselves.

In great contrast to Arrowsmith's comedy, performed the same year, Duffett's burlesque of Settle's opera relies heavily upon its visual burlesque. Duffett was clearly inspired by the great variety and degree of visual burlesque devices used by Buckingham in *The Rehearsal*. Some of the visual burlesque devices used in Duffett's play are easily recognized as borrowings from Buckingham's play. Thunder and Lightning as human figures, for example, appeared originally to do their dance during Bayes's Prologue in *The Rehearsal* (Act I, sc. ii).

Duffett also apparently borrowed the intention of *The Rehearsal* authors as it had been set forth in the Prologue of that play. Duffett uses his Prologue also to state the intention of his burlesque:

So when this Plot quite purg'd of Ale is,
And in such dress we mean to shew it,
In spite of our damn'd Fustian Poet [Settle].

That neoclassical view of the purpose of satire and comedy (i.e., to instruct through humorous entertainment) had originally been voiced in England by Jonson and Sidney and further advocated during the Restoration by Buckingham and others (See Chapter II, p. 76). The stylistic similarities of Duffett's lines and Buckingham's Prologue is quite apparent. Buckingham had also stated his desire to reveal the inanities of his target drama
through a mock imitation:

But if, by my endeavors, you grow wise,
And what you once so prais'd, shall now despise;
Then I'll cry out, swell'd with Poetic rage,
'Tis I, John Lacy [the actor playing Bayes],
have reform'd your Stage.

Duffett's Prologue, however, was completely independent of the rest of his burlesque in its critical perspective. As mentioned above, there was no attempt to demonstrate the dramatic inanities of his target drama in the burlesque itself. No framing device was necessary in The Empress of Morocco burlesque as there had been in The Rehearsal, because Duffett had no critical view to defend in contrast to the vagaries of the burlesqued actions.

Duffett's next burlesque was stage the year after his burlesque of Settle's opera and was somewhat longer (almost the average length of a Restoration tragedy) and more ambitious than its predecessor. Once again, Duffett's target was a specific Duke's Company production. Between September and November, 1674, an operatic version of the Davenant-Dryden play, The Tempest: or, The Enchanted Island, was produced with great acclaim at Dorset Gardens. Duffett's response, produced at the recently opened Theatre Royal, was entitled The Mock-Tempest (probably performed in November, 1674). The stage rivalry had by that time become widely known by Restoration contemporaries. Langbaine states that "This play was to draw the Town from the Duke's Theatre, who for a considerable time had frequented that admirable reviv'd Comedy, The Tempest."260

260 Langbaine, English Dramatic Poets, p. 177.
In November, 1667, the Davenant-Dryden version of *The Tempest* had been produced at Lincoln's Inn Fields. The comedy was published in 1670 with a Preface by Dryden. Their version of Shakespeare's play proved very popular and was to hold the boards until the Nineteenth Century. It was perhaps the most popular play of the Restoration, appealing as it did to a wide audience with its mixture of tragic and comic elements and its emphasis upon spectacle. In his Preface to the play, Dryden stated that Davenant had originally conceived the "excellent contrivance" of adding a man who had not seen a woman before as a compliment to Miranda's own ignorance of men. Dryden further credited his Laureate predecessor with the addition of the several sailor scenes.

In his Preface to *Albion and Albanius* (1685), Dryden mentioned his and Davenant's *The Tempest* in an attempt to define Restoration opera:

> Their Tempest which is a Tragedy mixed with Opera; or a Drama written in Blank Verse adorn'd with scenes, Machines, Songs: and Dances . . . It cannot properly be call'd a Play, because the action of it is supposed to be conducted sometimes by supernatural Means, or Magick; nor an Opera, because the Story of it is not sung.

Little seems to have been required to alter the Davenant-Dryden version into an "Opera," as defined by Dryden. New songs, choreography and spectacular scenic effects were introduced, such as the splendid "masque of Neptune." The operatic version, by Shadwell, proved equally popular to the

---

audiences at Dorset Gardens. There was a consistent attempt to retain as much of the Davenant-Dryden dialogue as possible. Shadwell's operatic version was published in 1674 and was so close to the original version, at least in its printed form, that confusion persisted until the Twentieth Century concerning its authorship.

Duffett's burlesque version opens with the "tempest" scene changed from the familiar shipboard locale to a London bawdy house, which is being besieged by irate citizens and gallants. Stephania, the madam of the house, commands her bawds in their tactical maneuvers against the mob outside, who parallel the tempestuous raging of the sea in The Tempest. The ship of that scene has become the bawdy house, which must be defended from the raging apprentices and dissatisfied customers in the streets below.

The earthiness and haughty pride of Stephania in the face of the male onslaught in the streets is not without its cynical side. She comments sardonically after she is warned to abandon her house or suffer arrest, "name not me. The Justices, and Jailers, are my very good friends, and Customers" (Act I, sc. i). Duffett manages to include social commentary in such lines and at moments, for example, when the bawds search around their house to find objects to throw at the mob below: "Fill the old Justice's greazy Night-Cap with the Rosary beads the Friar pawn'd here but last Night, and down with 'em" (Act I, sc. i). The door is reenforced with "the Constable's staffe that lay here last Night." In such ways,
Duffett confronts his audience with social hypocrisy in a manner more allied with Gay's *The Beggar's Opera* and the works of Fielding than with Seventeenth Century drama.

Duffett's piece is clearly burlesque in form and intention. There are many elements in *The Mock-Tempest*, however, that are effective comic additions with no basis in burlesque. The excited Miranda's false exit after forgetting to curtsey to her father, for example, happens after she has been told that a husband is awaiting her (*Act II, sc. i*).

In *The Mock-Tempest*, Duffett has developed a burlesque approach that is somewhat more indirect than the approaches of Buckingham or Davenant. He uses a somewhat looser imitation of his target scenes at times than his predecessors do. Several scenes from the play are burlesque only to the extent that they are written with a mere suggestion of the target scenes' dramatic situations. Each of those scenes is a burlesque departure from the original target situation. The Miranda and Dorinda scenes, for instance, digress into conversations wherein the two daughters speculate on the pleasures and hazards of having a husband in London. Their repartees are witty and urbane in spite of their supposed naivete. Such incongruity clearly adds to the burlesque humor of the scenes; the dialogue itself is as caustic and as amoral as the conversations of Wycherley's damsels:

Dorinda: No Sister, no I'll tell you what, You should be a Citizens Wife pray, and so I should be a Lord looky', and I should come in a Golden-Coach and be your Husbands
Customer. . . . So I should meet you at the Playhouse, and say Madam looky' 'tis a thousand pitties such a glazing Diamond of beauty should be the Slave of a dull Mechanick Cit and cry what de'e lack?

Such comedy-of-manners elements in the burlesque scenes combine with Duffett's social topicality to make The Mock-Tempest a unique addition to the English burlesque tradition.

Duffett uses the technique of ironic reference to his target play quite effectively. Ariel's description of the bawds' desperate leaps from the bawdy house windows to escape the rabble makes use of the ironic simile; "like Sailors from a sinking ship" (Act I, sc. i1). The reference is clearly to the shipboard scene of The Tempest. Numerous ironic references throughout the play serve as clever touches of humor. The parallel situations allow such a burlesque device. There are also several allusions to the rival playhouse, "Prospero: Then do as I command, but make haste lest the Conjurers of T'other House steal the Invention—thous knowest they snatch at all Ingenious Tricks" (Act IV, sc. i); "Sir Punchanello did that at the Playhouse" (Act IV, sc. i). Such comments, which violate aesthetic distance by reference to real situations outside the play are not new to drama—Shakespeare, Jonson, and Buckingham had used that method often—but Duffett's use of them as relevant comments in dialogue situations reveals his mastery of the burlesque form.

At times, Duffett seems to yield to the melancholia of Shakespeare's fantasy, or at least of its Davenant-Dryden version.
Duffett on those occasions abandons his burlesque perspective and allows his characters to become contemplative. Prospero reflects,

> Long sleeps and pleasures follow ev'ry Novice:  
> But plots and cares perplex men of office.  
> Ye Gods!  
> More blest are men of mean and low condition,  
> Than Bridewell-keeper is, or sage Magician.  
> (Act IV, sc. i)

Duffett did not rely exclusively upon the Shadwell opera version for his parody. Several of the parodic lines mock dialogue from the Davenant-Dryden version that do not appear in the operatic version.\(^{262}\) Apparently, the earlier version was as familiar to the audiences of 1674, and to Duffett as well, as the operatic version of that same year.

Whereas, in his *The Empress of Morocco*, Duffett had used common laboring characters and London place names to replace the heroic characters and settings of Settle's play, in *The Mock-Tempest*, the burlesque writer successfully created a familiar London milieu in which the characters are more significantly bound. Ariel, for example, becomes a rooftop jumper and street-side confidence man under the orders of Prospero, who is himself a Volpone-like urban swindler. Indeed, Duffett's urban realism in the burlesque is reminiscent of the best of Jonsonian naturalism. Stephanie's nostalgic speech on her misfortunes in Act III, sc. i, is a poignant and true-to-life reflection:

\(^{262}\)See the Annotation for lines 10-11, Act IV, sc. iii, p. 131 in the DiLorenzo ed., *Three Burlesque Plays of Thomas Duffett*. 
When I walked the Streets, the Shop-keepers bow'd, the Prentices Wink'd; if five or six Gallants stood in the way, Lord what rustling and cringing was there to Madam Stephania?

She continues to lament the loss of her business, which "was the whole takke of the Town, but all was kept secret, not a word mention'd unless 'twere in some Coffee-house, or the Street." Duffett's compassion for the downtrodden of London reveals itself only briefly in certain scenes. Nevertheless, the tone and subject matter of such scenes was rare in an era when the most amoral and exclusive comedy of manners held the stage next to the most exalted and exotic tragedy.

Printed copies of the mock-libretto for Duffett's burlesque were probably distributed to audience members at a set price as they entered the Theatre Royal. The venture was intended to make additional money and to imitate the Dorset Gardens practice of selling a pamphlet called Songs and Masques in "The Tempest" to its audience. The latter libretto has been recognized as the first libretto of its kind printed in England. If that is true, then Duffett's mock version of the libretto was perhaps the second of its kind in England.

In addition to his other original contributions, Duffett includes the curious character of Quakero, who takes the place


of Shakespeare's Ferdinand in his burlesque. The Quaker character, like the Puritan of the Elizabethan period, is ridiculed for his hypocrisy and specious piety. Tormented by Ariel's verbal assaults, Quakero turns the other cheek by condemning the insolent errand boy with sanctimonious threats:

I will Padlock my lips with Patience, and set the Porter of Peevishness at the Wicket of my Mouth, who shall knock thee down with the silver head of saving-gablleness which is on the long Cane of Conscientious Reproof: So that thou shalt no more enter into the Meeting House of my heart. (Act V, sc. i)

Quakero's extraordinary language has no counterpart in The Tempest of Shakespeare or of Davenant and Dryden. It is simply a burlesque of the peculiar style of the Quaker Meeting House preachers of Duffett's day. The attack is raucous and completely one-sided, with no attempt to develop Quakero's character further.

With The Mock-Tempest, Duffett had moved toward a comedy-of-manners realism through the successful integration of his burlesque characters with the London milieu. By so doing, he widened his satiric perspective to include social and perhaps even political criticism. His invention of the bawdy house besieged as a burlesque parallel to the tempest scene of The Tempest was sheer inventive brilliance. In his portrait of such characters as Stephania and Quakero, Duffett seemed to be moving toward a revival of Jonsonian realism.
In February, 1673, Shadwell's *Psyche* was successfully performed at the Duke's Company. Duffett's burlesque, *Psyche Debauched*, appeared in August of that year at the Theatre Royal. Duffett's intention was exactly what it had been for his two previous burlesques: to ridicule the rival company's current success. Langbaine observed later, "This Mock Opera was writ on purpose to Ridicule Mr. Shadwell's *Psyche*, and to spoil the Duke's House, which, as has been before observed, was then more frequented than the King's." 265

Shadwell's version was based on the French tragedy-ballet *Psyche*, which had been performed in 1671. Molière had written the first act, and the first scenes of the second and third acts. The remainder of the piece had been written by Corneille and the music composed by Quinault. Shadwell's libretto was enhanced by Thomas Betterton's careful and detailed study of the French version, which the actor had viewed in France. Betterton further supervised the premiere production, attempting to apply what he had learned of French mise-en-scene. The Duke's Company production became a major effort. A famous Italian Maestro was employed to compose the music, and the famous St. Andree of Paris choreographed the dances. Downes has described the result,

dances; this Opera was splendidly set out, especially in scenes; the charge of which amounted to about 800 pounds.266

The production was to introduce the French standards of dance and spectacle into England. The play became the most awaited production of its time. It had been talked of months in advance of its opening. James Vernon mentioned the production in a letter, "The Duke's house are preparing an Opera and great machines. They have dansers sic out of France, and St. Andre comes over with them."267

The Court wits, however, were against Shadwell and Betterton's elaborate extravaganza and expressed their enmity through such caustic attacks as Rochester's Epilogue for Sir Francis Fane's Love in the Dark: or, The Man of Business (Theatre Royal, April, 1675):

Now to Machines, and a dull Mark you run,
We find that Wit's the monster you would shun,
And by my troth tis most discretely done;
For since with Vice and Folly Wit is fed, Throghout Mercy 'tis, most of you are not dead.

Rochester continues in that Prologue to ridicule the foreign importations of choreographers, dancers, and singers. The slur against "Merry Andrew Dances" must refer to St. Andree. That Prologue, incidentally, was spoken by Joe Haines, the actor who was to play Psyche's mock counterpart in Duffett's play later that year.

266Downes, Roscius Anglicanus, pp. 35-36.
Duffett's burlesque thus gained the support of an important faction within the Court. The play's stance against the importation of foreign performers and the comparatively extravagant production given by Betterton had been the same position that had been upheld by The Rehearsal supporters.

Duffett did not make a virtue of necessity in his condemnation of the emphasis placed on spectacle at the Duke's Theatre. Only his burlesque of The Empress of Morocco had been performed in the older and smaller Lincoln's Inn Fields theatre. Both The Mock-Tempest and Psyche Debauched were performed in the new Theatre Royal designed as the rival facility of Dorset Gardens. The new theatre was at least as well-equipped for stage spectacle as was the Dorset Gardens theatre, built three years before. 268

In Psyche Debauched, Duffett continues to move further away from pure burlesque by shifting emphasis away from the exact imitation of the target drama's action. Duffett uses an inversion of situations in his play to allow himself more imaginative freedom. The last act of his target drama, Psyche, for example, is mocked by transforming it into a London prison scene in his burlesque. Thus Duffett continues his inversion of locales, originally used in its most successful form in the bawdy house scene of The Mock-Tempest.

The characters of *Psyche Debauched* show less dependence upon being exact imitations of their counterparts in *Psyche*. They are closer to being original creations, thereby giving the burlesque a low comedy character at times. Duffett resorts to the burlesque device of having his leading ladies played by male actors in *Psyche Debauched* as he had done in his two previous burlesques. That practice is a somewhat cruder form of burlesque caricature, representing a facile method of mockery. One of the unusual features of the casting for *Psyche Debauched*, however, was the fact that two of the male roles, King Theander and Prince Nicholas, were played by women.

Duffett's Prologue includes several literary and theatrical allusions, including the following to the Kings of Brentford and the funeral scene in *The Rehearsal*: "Dread Kings of Brentford! leave Lardella's Herse [sic], Psyches despairing Lovers steal your verse." Duffett is announcing himself, in a jocular manner, as the successor to Buckingham's burlesque work.

Duffett's third burlesque reveals his greater facility with the burlesque form. He handles burlesque allusions much more adroitly than he had before. The parody songs of *Psyche Debauched*, for example, seem much more relevant to the developing plot and actually progress the dramatic action. The songs are also much more apparent in their burlesque intention, with the result that they make many more ironic stabs at the rival Company's target opera than Duffett's previous burlesque songs.
Second Priest: James Waylor, Pope Joan,
      Wat Tyler, Mall Cutpurs, Chocorelly.

Chorus: Help our Opera, because 'tis very silly.
       (Act II, sc. ii)

The greater freedom from exact burlesque imitation allows
Duffett to make a more overt comment upon Restoration life
styles in Psyche Debauched. In contrast to The Rehearsal,
which contains a tight focus upon its burlesque target, Duffett's
characters in his last burlesque are allowed to comment upon
non-aesthetic matters. Bruine observes, for instance, that
"Every Publick assembly looks like a Picture of the Creation
before man was made, fill'd with variety of Creatures, that
show all Horns and Tails" (Act II, sc. i). The worldly wise
Wosset comments, "your Gentleman stands as much now for the
privilege of keeping a Miss after Marriage, as a Woman with a
Portion does for a Jointure . . . we live in a loving Age"
(Act II, sc. i).

Certain scenes have no burlesque intent, but seem to have
been written entirely as low comedy of the rough-and-tumble
sort. The antics of Redstreak and her husband in Act III, sc.
iii, for example, are quite Jonsonian and reveal a naturalistic
color in their exposé of human folly. Duffett's considerable
ability to portray the everyday life of his time is evident in
his equally fine creation of the rural background and demeanor
of Gammer Redstreak (a kind of rural version of Stephania in
The Mock-Tempest). Jeffry and Wishing-Chair say of her,
Jeffry: . . . here's a Packing-Penny. She
comes to wish for a Famine that Corn
may sell dear.

Wishing-Chair: Or a foul disease on those that
Robb'd her Hen-roost. (Act III, sc. iii)

Many of Duffett's women burlesque the Platonic senti­
mentality of the tragic heroine through their frank admission
of sexual desires. Mother Redstreak wishes, for example, that
she be granted "a new Husband every time I change my Apron."
As a result of their candor, there is a strength and dignity
behind many of Duffett's women. The most admirable female
characters, however, are the older ones, who have experienced
the joys of love, and, who, as a result, do not appear naive
or fatuous. Beaumont's portrait of the Citizen's Wife (See
Chapter I, pp. 48-49) is the same view of such women, who,
though ridiculed by the author, are admired by him also.

Duffett has followed The Rehearsal's example in his use
of stage properties for burlesque. The "wishing-Chair," for
example, and the various obsolete musical instruments used by
the dancers in Psyche Debauched may have been inspired by the
"doublet made of cheese," and the lance full of wine in The
Rehearsal.

Duffett uses the mock-ghost device for the first time
in Psyche Debauched. There are no less than four ghosts in
his burlesque: King Andrew's ghost rises from the stage and
sings (Act IV, sc. iii); the ghost head of Redstreak appears,
says her piece, and then ascends into the air (Act V, sc. i);
and finally, the two ghosts, Phillip and Nicolas, appear to
describe the carnal delights and the surrealistic landscape of Elysium (Act V, sc. i).

In the prison scene of Act V, the two Princes, Phillip and Nicolas, are tried by the Court of Rogues and their attendants for the alleged murder of Redstreak. The scene is perhaps the burlesque inspiration for Gay's *The Beggar's Opera*. There is the same bawdy familiarity among the criminals and outcasts in the prison that appears later in Gay's burlesque.

Duffett's final burlesque mocks the extravagant metaphor and the artificial modes of expression of heroic love dialogues, just as *The Rehearsal* had done before. In Act III, sc. ii, for instance, Bruine says to None-so-Fair (the latter damsel played by a man),

> And with that pretty thing thou givest to me,  
> I'le burn its Tail, that it may fly from me.

> None: Oh take it then! Oh catch it quickly,  
> Staying with me 'tis grown so sickly,  
> It melts too fast, unless your help withstands,  
> Oh now it tingles at my fingers ends,  
> 'Tis gone, 'tis gone, run, fetch it back again:  
> Oh I shall die unless thou givest me thine.

Duffett's highly scatological intimations mock the platonic metaphors of heroic drama, which veiled its sexual basis in obscure imagery.

Many of Duffett's mock love laments were undoubtedly inspired by the frequent use of such ridicule in *The Rehearsal*. None-so-Fair's lines about being eaten by Bruine as Cupid (Act III, sc. ii) are similar to the Humblebee's extended metaphor of flying through its lover's body (*The Rehearsal*,
Act IV, sc. i).

The incongruous mixture of heroic actions and dialogue with the mundane London environment is openly acknowledged through the ironic commentary of the 1st and 2nd Drawers:

None-so-Fair: I am a Princess of King Andrews stock in sooth—
Right Valiant Knights spare my Honour,
And do what you please, but use your Victory with discretion, for Fortunes Wheel is still turning—

1st Drawer: Knights Honour and Fortune, 'gad she's mad.
2nd Drawer: Didst find any Honour about her?
1st Drawer: No, no Honour—if women have any such thing, they hide it so cunningly that none can find it. (Act IV, sc. iii)

The two Drawers, taking the tragic heroine for an insane vagrant, run for a constable. Meanwhile, None-so-Fair continues to lament her abandonment by the Prince. The complete incongruity of her exalted posturing and elevated speech amidst the streets of London is a brilliant use of the familiar and low to debase the precious sentiments of heroic drama. The Drawers finally return with constables and urge her to repeat her heroic talk to demonstrate her insanity to the constables:

1st Drawer: Princess, so hoe Princess!
If you have ought to say dear Crack,
be short, Black Guard won't stay.

None: Oh well a day! I must away to Pluto's Court.
Oh state of Greatness variable!
Oh luck of Princess miserable!
(Act IV, sc. iii)
In that scene and others, Duffett has surpassed the low burlesque method of all previous English dramas. Instead of merely juxtaposing commonplace names and dialogue next to heroic language, Duffett creates a realistic Restoration street scene into which he places an heroic stage heroine. The result must be very nearly what would have happened in real life—the authorities arrive to arrest the person for disturbing the peace.

Another burlesque drama from that period deserves critical attention. Rochester's notorious Sodom: or, The Quintessence of Debauchery was probably written between 1675 and 1680, the year of the author's death. The play first went into print in 1684, in Antwerp, but apparently remained unpublished thereafter. It was not until 1879 that copies fell into the hands of a Pisanus Fraxi, an English publisher of erotica and curiosa. Fraxi has claimed that Sodom had been performed before the Court of Charles II, and that women had also been in attendance. There is no indication that a public performance of the play was ever given. If Charles and his Court had been entertained by the piece, their enjoyment would have derived from guessing whom the various characters meant to represent. As mentioned above (See p. 174), Rochester had gained a not uncertain reputation as a lampooner of his friends and enemies alike. It is possible that the King of Sodom had originally intended to represent Charles himself.
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The merry monarch had certainly abandoned his Queen on numerous occasions, as does the King of Sodom, for younger mistresses. Rochester would not have felt inhibited about writing such a dramatic lampoon, since he had written equally vulgar verse lampoons against Nell Gwyn and other royal favorites.²⁷⁰

The play concerns the royal court of Sodom where the King has decided to leave his wife's bed for other, more pleasurable lovemaking. The Queen is likewise dissatisfied with her husband's neglect and has decided to give herself fully to her favorite general of the army (the avoidance of a double standard is to the play's credit). There is little in the way of recognizable satire in Sodom; the various characters possess only the distinguishing characteristics that their stage names suggest. There seems to be little or no attempt to imitate the speech and mannerisms of any historical figure; no attempt is made to differentiate the style or vocabulary of any characters beyond the most general considerations.

In its joyous preoccupation with sexual fantasy, however, Sodom occasionally becomes an honest expression of a world unmarred by social restrictions: "Come try again, 'twill gratify your Pain. Whilst you enjoy what half the world restrain" (Act III, sc. 1).

The play cannot be considered a true satire, because it is almost completely lacking in moral viewpoint. Flux's

²⁷⁰ See the four-line poem, "Written Under Nelly's Picture," in Sodom, p. xxvii.
warning to the King at the end of the play to abandon his boys and return to women cannot be considered as a moral condemnation by the author (who was himself an admitted bisexual), because Flux's admonishment has completely practical motivations: the increase in venereal disease is thought by Flux to be due to homosexual relations. Nor is the appearance of the Queen's ghost at the end of the play intended as a lesson for all those who would become profligates. Though she has died of venereal disease and sternly admonishes the King against his further dalliance, the King merely dismisses all the supernatural occurrences with a flippant remark, and, indeed, revels in his own condemnation:

Let heaven descend, and set the world on fire--
We to some darker cavern will retire.

(Fire, brimstone, a cloud of smoke rises.)

Could the King's proud stance in the face of damnation be a distant glance off Milton's *Paradise Lost*, which was published in 1667?

The play is written in rhymed couplets of iambic pentameter (though the rhyme scheme is frequently inconsistent). It is the same verse form used in *The Rehearsal* and was undoubt edly meant to some degree to mock the highly idealized language and sentiments of the heroic drama and opera. The burlesque intent of *Sodom* is overshadowed by the play's fundamentally pornographic preoccupation. There is no parody implicit because the characters' speeches are all of similar style.
Perhaps the most distinctive burlesque element in Rochester's lampoon occurs in the last act, when the supernatural spectacle of fire, brimstone, and demons appears on the stage. The cloud machine, the "horrid apparitions," and the assorted shrieks and groans appear as a mock-occult scene from an heroic drama or even as a mock-inferno scene from a morality play. The absolute incongruity of the moralistic rhetoric of Flux, the righteous condemnation of the female ghost, and the frenetic dances and songs of the Demons with the amoral tone of the first four and one half acts can be taken, in fact, as a mockery of the moral endings of certain dramas. Rochester was perhaps hitting as much at the indignation of the Quaker and Puritan population toward the amorous Court of Charles as he was at the preciosity and contrivance of the Restoration drama.

In a few instances, Sodom comes close to indirect parody of the heroic penchant for preciosity and restraint in love passion. The conversation between the Queen and the General of the Army seems to be a travesty of the love dialogues and laments of heroic drama:

Buggeranthos: If Kings are God on Earth, their Queen may claim of Goddess, an unsurping Name.

Cuntigratia: And fate in him must great perfection show Whose Tarse can please a deity below.  

(Act V, sc. 1)

The proper nouns and imagery are distinctively classical in
form, as is proper for the background of an heroic drama:

Cuntigratia: This modesty doth ill in you appear
Whose virtues are to dare and not to fear;
Whose arms the strength of Mars alone can prove,
Whose Bollocks like a Twin of worlds contains
These minions of delight in every vein,
This and much more, Lord General is due
to those perfections, which are all in you
(Act IV, sc. i).

There is little doubt that Rochester clearly intended a parody of heroic dialogue from the popular drama of his day.

After the success of Duffett's last play, the mood in England changed from vibrant stage burlesque to more serious concerns. The change has partly been explained as the result of the sobering effect of pressing political issues. Another explanation for the absence of dramatic burlesque during the remainder of the Restoration period lies in the increased dissatisfaction with the burlesque genre in the form in which it had developed. With the publication in English of Boileau's Le Lutrin (The Lectern), written in 1674, burlesque verse began to assume a higher, more refined—and, hence, more respectable—form. The Lectern, praised by Dryden for its successful blending of dignity with satiric bite, inspired the Laureate to write his three elevated burlesque poems, Absalom and Achitophel, MacFlecknoe, and The Medall.271 Indeed, Dryden translated Boileau's Art of Poetry in 1683.

Perhaps a valid theory for the almost complete abandonment of stage burlesque until the Augustan age may be deduced from the increased emphasis that had been placed upon a more refined and balanced satiric style, which began in the latter half of the 1670's. Such a new conception of burlesque precluded the broad comic by-play and the raucous parody that had come to be associated with stage burlesque. A few lines from *Absalom and Achitophel* will demonstrate the lofty course satiric attack had taken:

```
Surrounded thus with Frybeds of every sort,
Deluded Absalom [James, Duke of Monmouth] forsakes the Court
Impatient of high hopes, urg'd with renown,
And Fir'd with near possession of a Crown:
The admiring Crowd are dazled with surprize,
And on his goodly person feed their eyes:
His Joy conceal'd, he sets himself to show;
On each side bowing popularly low.
(Lines 682-689)
```

The blase mentality that had enjoyed stage burlesque in the 1660's and '70's was superseded by a taste for elevated verse in the style of Boileau and Dryden. Ridicule of a harsher and more direct sort found its outlet in the religious hatred of the period. Ridicule through imitation was apparent in the pope-burnings and in the processionals of mock-Catholic clergy.

With Dryden as Laureate arbitrating, men of literature during the late Restoration period looked down upon the burlesque plays of the early 1670's. *The Mock-Tempest*, for example, was castigated by Sir William Soame and Dryden in the translation of Boileau's *Art of Poetry*:
The dullest Scribblers some Admirers found,
And The Mock Tempest was a while renown'd:
But this low stuff the Town at last despis'd;
And scorn'd the Folly that they once had pris'd.

(Lines 89-92)

The poem goes on to advise its readers on the use of burlesque for the future, "And let Burlesque in Ballads be employ'd; Yet noisy Bumbast carefully avoid" (Lines 97-98).

In his Discourse Concerning the Original and Progress of Satire (1693), Dryden gave final consideration to satire and burlesque. He regards satire in that essay as a "species of heroic poetry." Both the origin and intent of the heroic form were among the highest and noblest of all literary form to Dryden. Accordingly, Dryden justified his refusal to answer the personal attacks against him in The Rehearsal: as "Lamponers" (that is, men who write solely to insult their fellow men with no idea to instruct or reform on general principles), authors such as Buckingham could make no lasting contribution to mankind. Such authors, according to Dryden, were, in fact, dangerous to the public:

Some witty Men may perhaps succeed to their Designs, and mixing sence with Malice blast the Reputation of the most Innocent amongst Men, and the most Virtuous amongst Women.  

The lampoon was considered "unlawful" in the Discourse because "we have no moral right on the reputation of other men."  

---

273 Ibid., p. 78.
274 Ibid., p. 79.
Dryden had, throughout most of his literary career, considered satire a constructive, not a destructive form. The satirist is "no more an Enemy to the Offendour, than the Physician to the Patient, when he prescribes harsh Remedies to an inveterate Disease."^275

As early as his Preface to An Evening's Love (1671), Dryden had set limits to which burlesque and satire could go in their criticism:

Neither was it more allowable in him [Jonson], than it is on our present poets, to represent the follies of particular persons; . . . Parcere personis, dicere de vitiis,* is the rule of plays.

It may well be questioned whether Dryden practiced what he so earnestly preached (consider MacFlecknoe and The Medall). In any case, he stood for a less vibrant, more refined burlesque form that would have been almost impossible to translate onto the stage. Indeed, it was not to have been attempted with success during the remainder of the Restoration period.

This study has identified several significant developments that determined the course of burlesque drama after the appearance of The Rehearsal. The middle and late Restoration period brought an increased interest in satire and criticism, but, after 1675, a decidedly decreased interest in dramatic burlesque was also apparent. The political and religious difficulties of the late 1670's and the 1680's partially contributed to the dearth of burlesque ridicule. Burlesque drama,

^275Preface, "To the Reader," Absalom and Achitophel.

*"Spare individuals, expose vice."
which had traditionally confined its criticism to aesthetic matters, even in the Elizabethan and Jacobean period, was overshadowed by more sobering concerns.

The more refined burlesque verse of Boileau gave that poetic form a new character and theoretical base, which quickly dated the older, more vibrant and colloquial form of English burlesque drama. Writers of the 1680's and '90's regarded the efforts of the stage burlesques in the 1670's as crude and unserious works. The more refined and balanced burlesque form had no basis in the theatre but remained strictly poetic and non-dramatic in nature.

Arrowsmith's The Reformation was clearly influenced by The Rehearsal in both its critical perspective—with Dryden and the heroic drama as its targets—and its technique and vocabulary. The burlesque situation of Act IV, sc. i, for instance, is a duplicate of the stage audience-stage author relationship in The Rehearsal. Though Arrowsmith simply borrowed the outward form and situation of Buckingham's burlesque, he achieved his burlesque largely through descriptive means, relying very little upon character interaction, visual and situational burlesque, or parody. Other plays from the 1670's documented the rise in popularity of the amateur playhouse and coffeehouse critics with their increased concern—no matter how insipid—for a theoretical evaluation of the drama.

Duffett's three burlesques were more colloquial in both style and subject and yet broader in their perspective than previous burlesque dramas. There was a clear progression.
in Duffett's dramas from an awkward burlesque imitation
of the target drama in *The Empress of Morocco* to a sophisti-
cated awareness of such advanced burlesque techniques as para-
allel scenes and burlesque departures from the target drama in
*The Mock-Tempest* and *Psyche Debauched*. Duffett also revealed
a greater awareness of burlesque irony and was able to handle
burlesque allusions more adroitly than previous burlesque
authors (excluding Buckingham). Duffett combined in his bur-
lesque surprisingly well developed portraits of real-life London
characters reminiscent of Jonson's humours characters. Duffett
brilliantly reproduced the atmosphere and tempo of urbane life
in both *Psyche Debauched* and *The Mock-Tempest*. Such realistic
scenes burlesque the heroic sentiments of their target dramas
through the burlesque effect of incongruity. The witty and
urbane dialogue of both burlesques also created an incongruous
effect that ridiculed the target scenes (the Miranda-Dorinda
scenes, for example). Duffett thus moved away from pure bur-
lesque by widening his critical perspective to include social
comment and even scenes of lyrical melancholia (Prospero) and
compassion (Stephania's lament).

*Rochester's Sodom*, was certainly a cynical work, though
at times it became a joyous celebration of sexual pleasure.
Burlesque appeared in the inflated love laments of heroic drama
that were transformed into bawdy explicitness (the scenes
between the Queen and her General, for example). Other bur-
lesque elements included the overdone divine retribution scene
at the end of the play, which probably was intended to ridicule
similar scenes in heroic drama (perhaps it was even intended to ridicule Lucifer's proud defiance of God in Milton's *Paradise Lost*). It perhaps was also intended to ridicule the contrived and moralizing endings of many plays of the period. The mock imitation of particular personages of the Court may also possibly have been intended by Rochester.

After the decade of the 1670's, stage burlesque all but disappeared. Ironically, the worthy successors of the very men who dismissed burlesque drama during the Restoration were to be responsible for its revival in the early Eighteenth Century (e.g., Pope, Gay, Fielding). The unique qualities of vibrant enthusiasm, scathing ridicule, and crude explicitness coupled with the desire to reform the aesthetic sensibilities of its audiences will always remain as distinctive attributes of the Restoration burlesque drama.
CONCLUSION

Burlesque drama developed gradually and in various forms and traditions, both theatrical and non-theatrical. Dramatic contrast in character and situation appeared in the Masque tradition and in such poems as Sidney's *Arcadia*. Sidney and Peele both wrote stage pieces that attempted to parody literary figures whose theories of poetry and writing styles were thought excessive. Their efforts marked the beginnings of literary burlesque in England and led to similar attempts by Shakespeare, Jonson, Marston, Dekker, and the Cambridge student revue writers. Burlesque of theatrical fashions and stage conventions began with the rivalry between the public adult companies and the private boy companies in London. Both the boy's companies and the puppet-show burlesques of the period mocked their targets through a favorite device of counterposing their diminutive size against the full-grown adult actors. The resulting incongruity led to a basic low-burlesque effect of ridicule.

Jonson contributed the important device of depicting the author in a play, which may have been derived from the earlier burlesque figure of the foolish pedant. The pompous playwright or poet thereafter remained a type-character of burlesque drama throughout the Seventeenth and the Eighteenth
Centuries. Both Peele's *Old Wives' Tale* and Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (the rude mechanicals scenes) burlesqued stage practices (Peele's play was surprisingly well-developed for its early date), but the fantasy world of both those pastoral romances tended to neutralize their satiric tone.

Beaumont's *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* was the first fully conscious burlesque play in England, but it contained other elements to insure its popularity. The pre-Restoration period produced not a single dramatic piece that was completely burlesque in tone and subject.

A characteristic tendency of English burlesque drama was the use of a stage audience viewing either a rehearsal or an audition of a drama. Such stage audiences were present in nearly every significant burlesque play of both the Elizabethan and the Jacobean periods. The stage-audience device allows greater critical perspective through the establishment of multiple levels of reality. The stage audiences of pre-Restoration burlesque assumed various relationships with the inner plays they viewed: they commented on the action, narrated segments of the action, interrupted the action, or even determined the action through directorial commands.

Richard Brome's mild burlesque on the fashion for preciosity of the Caroline period anticipated the Restoration attempts to mock heroic and platonic ideals in the drama. Burlesque as a form remained out of fashion during the remainder of the Caroline and Commonwealth periods, however.
Foreign influence was of central importance to the reemergence of a burlesque consciousness in England. Scarron and then Molière attacked the penchant for overblown expression of sentiments and preciosity in the popular French dramas and novels of their day. Molière's _Mascarelle_ (Les Precieuses Ridicules) was a vainglorious author, hungry for notoriety, and may have influenced Buckingham's creation of Bilboa and Bayes of _The Rehearsal_.

The popularity of Boileau's theories of satire and his satirical verses increased the popularity of burlesque in England, while Cotton's _Scarronides_ marked the full acceptance of burlesque verse in England. The parody in Davenant's _The Playhouse to Be Let_, however, was probably as much influenced by the native English tradition of performing short, humorous versions of full-length dramas during the Commonwealth period. Davenant also had the rhymed parodies and structural devices of the English pre-Restoration drama to draw upon.

Buckingham and his co-authors became dissatisfied with aspects of Dryden's dramatic theories and his habit of comparing himself to such predecessors as Shakespeare and Jonson. As early as 1663 (_Cat and Puss at a Caterwawling_), Samuel Butler attacked heroic dialogue through burlesque. Buckingham's circle was disheartened (as Molière had been a few years before) by the preciosity and other excesses of the popular dramatic fare of their day. The authors of _The Rehearsal_ supported the neoclassical view of the drama as it had been expressed through the theories and the works of Jonson and Sidney. It was an
essentially conservative and isolationist outlook: English drama should return to the realism of Jonson's comedy of humours and abandon its slavish imitation of French drama. Buckingham's group also demanded, however, the same refinement of language and noble expression of sentiments that Dryden assumed in his theories. Dryden was attacked at first not for his neoclassical theories (mostly derived from Corneille and Scaliger) but for his inability to achieve such ideals in his heroic plays. The Rehearsal sought to reveal the contradiction between the theoretical assumptions of the heroic dramas and the actual nature of those dramas as they were performed in the London theatres of the 1660's and '70's.

As Dryden began to argue for an exalted drama that was removed from reality and as he abandoned verisimilitude as a neoclassical ideal, his critics intensified their attack upon him. They urged a return to "sense" and believable incidents and characterization. Buckingham expressed his neoclassical conception of the purpose of satire and comedy in his satiric poems and in the Prologue to The Rehearsal: all comedy should instruct through delightful entertainment and ridicule. He hoped that by making his audience aware of the inanities of the heroic form, it would consciously reject such dramas in favor of more true-to-life dramatic fare. In place of heroic sentiment, The Rehearsal demanded a simplified and clear language through the elimination of elaborate metaphor and versification. Rhyme was constantly opposed to sense in The Rehearsal as well as in many of the pamphlets of the day.
Buckingham strengthened his critical position by allowing his stage audience to remain essentially passive in the face of the erratic actions and the confused thought of Bayes. In effect, the stage audience is put into the same position as the real audience, and its comments give expression to the unprejudiced views of the real audience. Smith and Johnson's disinterest make them unique members of a burlesque stage audience.

Unlike most burlesque plays of the Seventeenth Century, The Rehearsal expressed the ideals of its author in condemning its burlesque target. It was not written to slight another company's dramatic fare; its concern was entirely aesthetic and not financial.

The character of Bayes remains a unique and wholly integrated stage personality in spite of his multiple identity as a burlesque composite of several historical figures. He is as much a comedy-of-manners character as he is a burlesque imitation. As a comedy-of-manners fop, he represents a generalized abstraction of a particular weakness in Restoration literary society: the tendency to abandon truth in drama and poetry for the sake of fashionable excesses. Bayes is also non-particular enough to be understandable to later ages. The multiplicity of Bayes's character reveals the complexity of burlesque characterization. It is a unique attribute of stage burlesque that character identities can change completely from moment to moment. Bayes as a generalized abstraction gives way to Bayes as Dryden and even to Bayes as comedy-of-manners fop. Such
continual metamorphoses are possible only in the broadest comedy and farce where character identity is not always dependent upon real-life probabilities. In burlesque, the imitation of the mannerisms of recognizable individuals demands the use of character metamorphosis.

The intended references to Dryden in *The Rehearsal* are far more numerous and varied in nature than has been previously recognized by critics of the play. Dryden is systematically attacked on several different levels. His personal life is attacked: his penury, his social ineptitude, his ineffectual approach as a lover, and even his poor ability at oral interpretation. His dramatic theory is ridiculed: his insistence upon rhyme, his pretentious comparisons, and his heroic characterizations. Dryden's theatrical sensibilities are also mocked, such as his taste for elaborate dances and spectacle, and his bombastic line readings. Even Dryden's frequent complaints against his critics are ridiculed in Bayes's unfounded suspicions. *The Rehearsal* 's critical position expressed the viewpoint of numerous coffeehouse critics of the day.

*The Rehearsal* was more influenced by the native English burlesque tradition with regard to structural form (the induction scene, the stage audience, and the use of an inner play or framing device) than by foreign traditions. Davenant's *Playhouse* prepared the way in the Restoration period by burlesquing for the first time in England the diction and ethos of a single play.

*The Rehearsal* 's use of burlesque characters whose moti-
vations are changed from those of the target characters represented a further advancement in the art of dramatic burlesque. Such an approach required its audience to comprehend the less obvious relationship between the changed motivations and actions of the burlesque drama and the original character attributes of the target drama.

The Rehearsal was the first drama in English to retain its burlesque intention throughout the play. The play not only remained an uninterrupted burlesque, but it also concentrated entirely upon aesthetic concerns (though indirectly at times through the Bayes caricature of Dryden and other heroic authors).

Bayes, as a foolish author, has far more mobility than previous stage authors possess. He is allowed to leave and enter the inner play's action at will, a device that increases the possibilities of visual and aural burlesque. Indeed, the central importance and focus upon Bayes in The Rehearsal represents a singularly conscious attempt to ridicule an author on the stage and has perhaps only been equalled since that time by Sheridan's The Critic.

Buckingham depicted the actors' point of view in his burlesque and, by so doing, has added a new critical dimension to stage burlesque. Sham actors and amateurs had been ridiculed on the stage before (e.g., A Midsummer Night's Dream), but their backstage viewpoint was not allowed the degree of expression Buckingham afforded it.

The Rehearsal is also distinguished by its several methods of parody: direct and indirect parody; parody of the
dramatic and theatrical situation of its target play and of its poetic imagery; and the exact duplication of the original target lines, which become parody only after they are made to seem ridiculous by outside commentary. Buckingham revealed his superiority to Davenant and Beaumont as a parodist through his ability to epitomize certain attributes of heroic characters in his best parodic couplets.

The Rehearsal exhibits a high comedy style in its flippant dialogue and its witty repartee. Johnson and Smith both maintain a consistently sharp ironic edge to their commentary. Their dry humor is typical of the best in Restoration comedy of manners. Buckingham's ability to create cogent aphorisms brilliantly suited to the character of Bayes further reveals his superior handling of dramatic language. Bayes's aphorisms and homilies are particularly memorable because, as much as in spite of, his foolish personality.

The burlesque device of faulty criticism, used previously in The Knight of the Burning Pestle, where the Citizen and his Wife reveal their naive sensibilities through their aesthetic evaluations and directorial commands, is quite effective in The Rehearsal, where Bayes's faulty directorial criticism reveals his theatrical vagaries. The typical English burlesque device of using familiar and mundane place names, character names, and occupations to achieve a burlesque effect through incongruity is also used in certain scenes of The Rehearsal.
Interest in satire and criticism increased in the theatre immediately following *The Rehearsal*’s success. After 1675, however, stage burlesque and parody markedly decreased because of the political and religious imbroglios of the late 1670’s and the 1680’s. The changing aesthetic tastes of the middle- and late-Restoration period also contributed to the demise of stage burlesque. Boileau’s theories of refined burlesque verse motivated a changed view of the value of stage burlesque. Dryden was not alone in his low opinion of the stage burlesque of the 1670’s.

The burlesque situation of Act IV, sc. i of *The Reformation* was an exact copy of the stage audience-stage author relationship of *The Rehearsal*. Both in its critical perspective and in its technique and diction, Arrowsmith’s comedy was clearly dependent upon *The Rehearsal*. *The Reformation*, however, accomplished its burlesque largely through descriptive means, with very little attempt at character interaction, visual and situation burlesque, or parody. Arrowsmith apparently decided merely to add what he discerned as popular topicality into his play by creating the Bayes-like character of the Tutor, who holds forth on the ideals of heroic drama. Arrowsmith doubtless intended to ridicule Dryden.

Other plays of the 1670’s documented the rising popularity of the amateur critics of the playhouses and coffeehouses. *The Rehearsal* itself not only was a reflection of the rise in popularity of dramatic criticism among the theatregoing public (a vogue that continued to well beyond Sheridan’s time), but
also was a motivation for an even more intense critical consciousness among the London playgoers.

Duffett's three burlesques were more colloquial than *The Rehearsal* with regard to diction, character motivation, and dramatic situation and milieu, but they were also broader and less explicit in their critical perspectives. Duffett was greatly underrated in his own day and remains largely ignored to this day (1975). Duffett's dramas reveal a clear progressive development. The author learned rather quickly from his first, shorter attempt at burlesque (*The Empress of Morocco*), and his last two burlesques revealed a far greater sophistication of technique and a more confident delineation of character. His ability to create naturalistic portraits of urban characters and rural travelers to London was quite within the Jonsonian tradition of realism. The accurate depiction of the atmosphere and tempo of London life in the Restoration period that animated both *Psyche Debauched* and *The Mock-Tempest* reveals creative insight. Indeed, Duffett's compassion for the working-class of London men and women goes beyond the sympathy Beaumont shows for the Citizen and his Wife. Duffett's sympathetic perception of the life around him was unique in the elitist world of the Restoration theatre.

The broad perspective of Duffett's burlesque approach also allowed for witty scenes and the urbane conversations of the rising London middle-class. Duffett's representations of both the lower-class characters and the middle-class aspirants of his day (the latter in the rude comedy-of-manners
tradition) were used to create the burlesque technique of incongruity. Duffet thus moved away from pure burlesque imitation by widening his critical perspective to include scenes of social commentary (e.g., Stephania's lament over the loss of her business) and scenes of lyrical compassion (Prospero's resignation speech).

Duffett's broad perspective was achieved through such advanced burlesque techniques as parallel scenes and burlesque departures from the original target drama. Duffett's mastery of burlesque allusions and his keen awareness of burlesque irony could have been achieved only after The Rehearsal had introduced its fully realized burlesque form to the Restoration theatre.

Rochester's Sodom was cynical, prurient, and at times quite honest, but it also included burlesque elements. Its inflated love laments and classical settings and actions imply a mock-heroic intention. Other burlesque scenes include the divine retribution ending of the play, which no doubt ridiculed similar fantastic and supernatural stage effects in heroic dramas. The use of a ridiculous stage ghost, perhaps inspired by Duffett's original use of that burlesque device in the English theatre, must also have been intended as broad mockery. Possibly certain members of Charles's Court were intended to be ridiculed (Charles himself as the King of Sodom, for example), but the diction and mannerisms of the characters appear too much the same to have been intended as burlesque portraits of individuals.
The probable burlesque intent of Rochester's *Sodom* was to ridicule several dramatic and theatrical conventions he deemed excessive. Rochester was a close literary and personal ally of Buckingham and may have intended his scatological play as a continuation of their anti-heroic campaign.

The Seventeenth Century tradition of stage burlesque and parody began in the Elizabethan period with an incipient awareness of literary and linguistic standards. The same intention to burlesque and parody particular individuals as representatives of a poetic theory or movement underlayed Sidney's *The Lady of the May* and Buckingham's *The Rehearsal*.

As the Seventeenth Century progressed, the critical standards for literary expression continued to rise. As the demands for a more refined and elevated dramatic form increased—most obviously in the Caroline and the Restoration periods—so also did the critical standards of drama rise. In the Restoration period the peculiar result was that both realism and refinement were expected in the same dramatic form. The heroic drama of the early Restoration found itself caught between both those demands and failed to achieve a form that could harmonize their seemingly antithetical attributes. Dryden eventually abandoned all claims to verisimilitude in his heroic dramas by positing instead the necessity for a drama removed from reality. Rhyme became an exalted mode of expression that was not intended to be merely an imitation of real life.

Dryden's great theoretical essays on poetry and the drama and his preeminence as literary leader in the mid-Restoration
period created a target (unprecedented in English literary history) for the most thoughtful and premeditated assault on a literary figure until that time, *The Rehearsal*. Buckingham's burlesque recognized the self-contradictory and irreconcilable characteristics of the heroic drama and attacked those very weaknesses. The dichotomy between real life and exalted expression became the theme of that burlesque. Bayes spouted elevated theories, but demanded common, even insipid, solutions in his rehearsed play. His characters mouthed heroic virtues, but either groveled in the mire of their pathological drives or else ranted in egocentric verbal displays. *The Rehearsal's* authors had observed Dryden's move away from a drama rooted in Jonsonian realism and consequently lashed out at his pretentious claims through their depiction of Bayes's characteristics of arrogance and lack of perception of theatrical reality. The degree of critical polarity that developed during the 1670's as a result of the dispute between the realists and the advocates of heroic drama was not to be equalled again in England for a hundred years. *The Rehearsal* also represented a concerted counterreaction to the dominating position of continental drama, which had transformed the English theatre and drama into a derivative form since the 1630's.

The structural similarities of English burlesque drama during the periods under study was quite strong. The induction scene of Peele developed into a framing device by which the characters of the outer play could view the characters and situations of the inner play. The framing device allowed a
critical perspective to be actualized on the stage. The result was a play of multiple levels of reality in which the aesthetic distance experienced by the members of the stage audience either merged with that of the real audience (as in *The Rehearsal*) or became opposed to it (as in *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*). In the latter case, the real author intended to ridicule his stage audience by making it an object of ridicule, whereas, in the former case, the stage audience became the agent of ridicule.

A progressive development in the nature of parody and burlesque imitation occurred between the Elizabethan and Restoration periods. Burlesque drama became less literal and more figurative in its methods of ridicule as the Seventeenth Century progressed. By containing scenes with allusions to several different plays, it was possible for *The Rehearsal* to ridicule a like number of theatrical conventions. In that way burlesque ridicule became more complex as well as more abstracted from the original target action. Duffett's use of parallel scenes, which ridiculed target dramas but had a life of their own, and his comic departures from pure burlesque imitation revealed English burlesque at its most figurative and non-literal. Such burlesques necessitated an audience that was sophisticated enough to comprehend the subtle irony and the less obvious comparisons to the target dramas that were intended by the author. The advantage to the burlesque author was that it allowed him far greater freedom and scope in the creation of burlesque actions.
All burlesque drama involves in one sense a conscious comparison of the burlesque actions to those of the original target. The Rehearsal was by far the most ambitious attempt at such a comparison in the Seventeenth Century. It was written as a systematic attempt to reveal the weaknesses of the popular dramatic fare of its day. Buckingham never allowed his audience to forget, even in scenes of the most hilarious farce, the comparison he was making in his burlesque imitation. Viewed in that way, The Rehearsal, rather than being a frivolous work, was the most serious and critically perceptive drama of the Restoration stage.
Burlesque: A sub-genre of satire that "consists in the use or imitation of serious matter or manner, made amusing by the creation of an incongruity between style and subject" (Richmond Pugh Bond, *English Burlesque Poetry, 1700-1750*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932, p. 3). Burlesque attempts to criticize or ridicule through conscious imitation of a person or style. Burlesque may be either dramatic or non-dramatic and includes two distinctive manifestations:

- **low burlesque**: "treats an elevated subject in a trivial manner" (Worcester, *Art of Satire*, p. 48).

- **high burlesque**: "treats a trivial subject in an elevated manner" (Worcester, *Art of Satire*, p. 48).

While high burlesque creates incongruity through the elevation of a subject in a manner inappropriate to its mundane or frivolous concerns, low burlesque "invites the reader to compare its subject with what is base and sordid" (Worcester, *Art of Satire*, p. 46). Contrary to Clinton-Baddeley's remark that "Burlesque is laughter for laughter's sake: and it is not often antagonistic" (The Burlesque Tradition, p. 8), burlesque can and often is serious in its concern for reform. The tendency is for burlesque to remain merely imitative and thereby to avoid a clearly defined critical statement: "Burlesque is imitative... yet the imitation goes no deeper than surface and form. Unless the author has skill in creating original incidents, the work is likely to drag" (Worcester, *Art of Satire*, p. 44). Nearly all critical burlesques contain elements that are not purely imitative but which serve as critical commentary, usually through rational argument.

**Burlesque departures**: Includes any burlesque device used to elaborate or to change the literal burlesque imitation of the target. Such departures may not have an entirely critical basis but may be intended as merely lighthearted imitations or as nostalgia pieces.
Invective: A direct verbal attack upon a person, literary style, or theory. Invective may actually name the object or its criticism. It is direct rebuke without the necessity for imitation or subtle irony.

Inversion device: A burlesque departure wherein the actions and characters of the target work are inverted (i.e., reversed) in the burlesque action. The Merrithought-Jasper scenes of The Knight of the Burning Pestle, for example, are an inversion of the numerous prodigal son plots they ridicule. Merrithought, the father, is the prodigal, while Jasper, the son, appears as the virtuous one. Thus, their roles are completely reversed for burlesque effect.

Lampoon: A form of personal invective that may be particularly severe in tone. Lampoon is often the most malevolent form of attack, but may include devices to camouflage (however slightly) its direct attack, such as allegory or high burlesque imitation.

Mock-heroic: Often used to refer only to high burlesque imitations of heroic verse or drama, the term is used in the above study to refer to any burlesque form that mocks heroic drama or verse of the Restoration period.

Parallel scenes: A burlesque departure used most frequently as a device by Thomas Duffett, wherein the scenes are original in their subject matter and in their specificities of characterization but are intended to ridicule their target scenes through the identification of certain characters and actions of the burlesque scenes with the target scenes. The bawdy house scene of The Mock-Tempest, for example, is a parallel of the storm scene in Act I of The Tempest.

Parody: "The high burlesque of a particular work (or author) achieved by applying the style of that work (or author) to a less worthy subject (or author)" (John D. Jump, Burlesque, London: Methuen, 1972, p. 2). Parody is the most literal of the sub-genres of satire because it usually achieves its ridicule through the use of a specific paraphrase of a target passage.

Satire: A broad term that includes all other sub-genres in this Glossary. David Worcester has described the form in appropriately general terms: "The content of satire is criticism" (The Art of Satire, p. 16). Johnson's Dictionary has defined satire as "a poem in which wickedness or folly is censured." The moralizing aspect of
satire has been expressed in Defoe's Preface to his The True Born Gentleman, "the end of satyr is Reformation."
The target of satire may be specific or general, and divine or human. The satirist is dissatisfied with the status quo and wishes to influence a change in opinion or attitude through his work of art. Satire ranges from the most direct verbal attack (invective and lampoon, for example) to the most indirect and subtle use of irony. Satire is usually confined to a comic and humorous tone, though it may also include dramatic and tragic irony. As Arthur Pollard has said, "The best satire, that which is surest in tone, is that which is surest in values" (Satire, London: Methuen, 1970, p. 3).

Travesty: "The low burlesque of a particular work achieved by treating the subject of that work in an aggressively familiar style" (Jump, Burlesque, p. 2). An example would be Hero played by a milkmaid and Leander played by a cobbler.
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources:


― The Rehearsal, As It Is Acted At the Theatre Royal. 3rd. ed. London: Thomas Dring, 1675.

― The Rehearsal. 13th. ed. With a Key, or Critical View of the Authors and Their Writings Exposed in This Play. London: W. Feales, 1735.


Harvey, Gabriel. "Gabriel Harvey, Ciceronianus," Translated by Clarence A. Forbes. The University of Nebraska Studies. November, 1945: 45-56.


Sodom: or, The Quintessence of Debauchery.


Secondary Sources:


Considers The Knight of the Burning Pestle as an attack upon the bourgeois tastes of its day. The author is more concerned with the overall development of Beaumont and Fletcher as playwrights than with burlesque elements in their work.
An examination of the literary development of Peele with a brief consideration of The Old Wives' Tale as popular romance.

A twentieth Century enthusiastic response to The Rehearsal as burlesque art. Calls for a reconsideration of the play as a major work of the Restoration period.

A biography that maintains a general focus, considering all aspects of Buckingham's life.

The most complete biography, taking a general view of the subject's life, but devoting more attention to Villier's dramatic writings than the other biographies.

Contains a general consideration of the background of the "war between the theatres" and Jonson's contribution to it.

Discusses the new mood of scientific discovery in the Restoration period.

Devotes approximately ten pages to the burlesque plays of Davenant, Buckingham, and Duffett.

This biography of father and son contains an extended bibliography.
Contains background and evaluations of The Playhouse to Be Let and mentions the droll tradition of the Commonwealth period.

A description of the dance parodied in The Rehearsal of the Brentford Kings.

Discusses the burlesque character of the Renaissance figure of the Vice in English religious and secular drama of the Sixteenth Century.

Davies, Thomas. Dramatic Miscellanies, 1783-84. 3 vols. London: Thomas Davies, 1783-84.
Contains his criticism of The Rehearsal. Davies's view was typical of the low estimation of Buckingham's work in the Eighteenth Century.

Includes a discussion of the critical opinion of the early Restoration period and a chapter devoted to the anti-rhyme prose and verse of that period.

Connects plays like Eastward Ho and Nice Wanton with the burlesque of the prodigal son theme in Beaumont's play.

Well-known theatre catalogue of the Restoration period in a Twentieth Century edition. Mentions important productions of burlesques and often makes succinct evaluations of them.

Volume 1 acknowledges The Knight of the Burning Pestle as the forerunner of later burlesque drama.
Includes an extended discussion of the nature of satiric forms and defines such terms as "high" and "low" burlesque.

Author suggests that Peele may have originally intended his use of the induction scene to be an answer to Greene's poor use of the same structural device in *James IV*.

A general consideration of the dramatic development of the coauthors.

Evaluates the significance of Scarron to French literature and characterizes his life and his natural inclination towards burlesque.

Relates the evidence for authorship of *The Rehearsal*, the authors ridiculed in that burlesque, and the story of Buckingham's coaching of Lacy for the part of Bayes.

Introduction examines the background and theatre conditions that led to Beaumont's burlesque attack upon middle-class taste and the public theatre fare of the Jacobean period. The Notes contain references to specific plays attacked or mocked by Beaumont.

Considers Shakespearean productions and their burlesques after the Davenant-Dryden production of Shakespeare's *The Tempest*.
Mentions several mock-romantic bourgeois predecessors of this burlesque.

Examines the Restoration penchant for caustic attack in the literature of that era. Mainly concerns the writings of Wycherley and Dryden.

Illuminates the rivalry between the Duke's and the King's Companies and the conscious attempt to parody the melodies and the lyrics of The Tempest in the Mock-Tempest.

Traces the incipient development of Elizabethan drama in the works of Lyly and Peele. The Old Wives' Tale is considered as an early attempt at comic romance.
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