M. A. ENGLISH

JEALOUSY IN AN UNPRODUCTIVE SOCIETY: the treatment of jealousy in some characteristic Restoration comedies.

M. S. Keirstead.

CONTENTS

Chapter I

INTRODUCTORY

It was Etherege, appropriately enough, who remarked that

"Wit has, like painting, had her happy flights
And in peculiar ages reach'd her heights."

It is evident from the context that he was thinking of his times as a nadir of wit declined from the zenith "before the flood"; equally evident that he hoped to be one of a few who might raise it to new heights. "Peculiar" meant, of course, for him "specific" rather than "odd, singular or quaint" as it may to us. Yet, with its slightly deteriorated modern meaning, it is just the word for the early Restoration period. The singularities of this period are many and marked. Historians and English scholars have striven to show how many of its historical events and literary productions derive and develop from preceding events and writings, and how continuity of thought and technique underlie apparent breaches with the past, but even when full account has been taken of this work, the Restoration still presents us with an epoch and a body of writing arrestingly different from any other. It is, as Etherege hinted, a peculiar age.

Not least of its literary peculiarities is its treatment of love and relations between the sexes. Much has been written about the Love Game and the "Gay Couple"[1] which form one of the characteristic features of Restoration comedy, but there is one factor in the Love Game of which little notice, if any, has been taken, though it recurrs with striking frequency. This is jealousy. Whenever in early Restoration comedy, the matter of love comes up, jealousy cannot be far behind. This is nothing new, for love and

---

1 - The Gay Couple, John Harrington Smith, Cambridge, 1948.

jealousy were frequently treated together by the précieuses, and the nature of each debated at length by the lovers. What does on examination appear to be novel is the way in which writers of Restoration comedy treat this emotion.

Verbally they sometimes disapprove of jealousy in the traditional manner, giving occasional lip service to the precieuse ideals, but in the handling of action, character and ideas in the realistic comedy which is their real contribution to literature, they betray a contrary attitude. This varies from faint deprecation to positive approval, and in general they hold with Keepwell that "where there is no jealousy, there is no love".[2] The obvious reservation must of course be made that the dramatists themselves, do not necessarily hold these views, but in so far as they are successful artists, holding up their mirror to contemporary society, they reflect them faithfully.

Such an attitude is surely unique in English literature, and difficult to parallel in any. If it exists, it is one of those uncomfortable facts that stick out from our systemization of literary developments and historical processes, inviting investigation. Why did writers of Restoration comedy reflect this way of thinking, or feeling, rather; why not other comic writers? Is it possible, with our present insight into the nature of jealousy, to trace anything in the relations of the sexes in the Restoration period, in their social setting and historical milieu, that is sufficiently peculiar to them to suggest at least a partial explanation? It is these questions that this thesis attempts to examine.

A caveat must be entered against the popular use of the term Restoration Comedy. It has frequently been pointed out that Congreve, often

---

2 - Bellamira, Works of Sir Charles Sedley, Bart. with Memoirs of the Author's Life, Written by an Eminent Hand (London, 1778), p. 191.

regarded as the peak of prosodic perfection in the period, is not a Restoration writer; that Vanbrugh wrote and built in the reign of Queen Anne, and Farquhar also. Historically this blanket term is obviously objectionable. Congreve was, if one wishes to speak in period terms, a Revolutionary writer; the Bloodless Revolution occurred in 1688 and his works first appeared between 1690 and 1700. Vanbrugh is now best known for architectural work, of which the most spectacular example, Blenheim Castle, was conceived as the gift of a grateful people to a successful military leader who had beaten the French for them - a state of affairs quite unthinkable under Charles II. History, certainly, is not literature, and what is an inaccuracy in the one field may be a convenience in the other, but there is much in literary criticism to suggest that the term Restoration Comedy is now doing as much harm as good. The term Comedy of Manners is sufficiently descriptive of the sort of comedy one wishes to denote, and sufficiently general to cover Sedley and Farquhar. Until a better term is agreed upon it will be a convenience to use this for the comedies of Sedley, Etherege, Wycherley, Congreve, Vanbrugh and Farquhar and such parts of Shadwell, Dryden and others as come under it, and keep the expression Restoration Comedy for the work of the dramatists of the first two and a half decades of the Restoration period. Nobody of good sense wants to split hairs for the sake of academic dexterity, but it is perhaps well to be as precise as possible because one inch of inaccuracy that creeps into academic work will readily become an ell of confusion in popular productions.[3]

The significance of the distinction is that the writers who really are in the Restoration period are <u>of</u> it, in a way that Congreve, Vanbrugh and

---

3 - That the danger is real is proved by the recent publication of a collection of comedies called <u>"Restoration Drama from Etherege to Sheridan"</u>.

Farquhar are not. Though the resemblance between the two groups is obvious, and possibly more important than their differences, nevertheless, it is precisely those literary qualities and social developments which distinguish them that are central to this study. The main emphasis therefore falls upon the three writers, Etherege, Sedley and Wycherley, whose young manhood and period of artistic production coincided with the Restoration period proper; that is, from 1660 to about 1685. This is the period when Charles II was in fact "restored" and his court with him, and when he himself endeavoured with patience and subtlety to "restore" an hierarchical and arbitrary regime supported by the theory of the divine right of Kings, and perhaps paralleled and reinforced by the power and sanction of the Roman Catholic Church. During this time the King - still in large part the Prime Mover of government and power in England - was working towards two objectives to which the majority of influential individuals and probably the majority of the nation, were opposed. His reign is in one sense a Cold War continuation of the Civil war. Part of the proof of this lies in the fact that James II, when he openly proclaimed the same ends, lasted only three years. Charles II, by a combination of genuine bonhommie, an assumed levity and a prodigious skill in human manipulation, contrived to conceal them for twenty-five. He concealed them, that is, from most of the people, most of the time, but intelligent observers feared more than they knew and suspected more than was actually true. The effect of this and its significance to the life and literature of the time was to render the conditions of life peculiarly uncertain. The fate of such men as Clarendon and Shaftesbury is well enough known, but perhaps more indicative is the case of John Locke, who felt himself obliged to leave England both in 1675 and 1683, partly because he was Shaftesbury's secretary, and partly because of his work on the Essay on Religious Toleration.

To this matter of security we shall return. Here it will be enough to note that the Bloodless Revolution was followed by the Revolution Settlement, and that both terms have vital meaning. First, there was at last sufficient unanimity of feeling in the country to permit the establishment of a new regime without civil war. Second, the two great issues between Charles and James and their people were settled by parliamentary action. The King was henceforth to govern by the "consent" of his people, and he was to be of the Protestant faith. The claim to arbitrary power, hereditary divine right, and any aspirations towards support from an hierarchical Roman Catholic church were relinquished for ever by the King of England. Finally, a Toleration Act granted the right of worship to Protestant non-conformists, and though religious tests debarred Catholics from office and the universities, they were subject to little persecution. Thus the main issues that had racked England in the seventeenth century were settled and the energies of the people freed to work upon such technical problems as efficient government, sound fiscal policy, naval and military organization, the development of science and its application to the fields of agriculture, industry and medicine. A very large area of human life had been released from the corroding action of fear and uncertainty, and the long and illustrious list of eighteenth century British names from Berkeley to Hume bears witness to the spendour of that liberation.

In the Restoration period proper a most flourishing field of literary production is the drama, as one would expect in a small society revolving around a King and his Royal brother, both fond of the drama and patrons of their respective theatres. The best of that drama is undoubtedly the comedies, and of the comedies the cream is the comedy of manners. It is with this that we are concerned, as it represents the realistic drama of the period. It is impossible to substantiate this statement here, but it may

perhaps be allowed that twentieth century scholarship regards it as proven, and has also succeeded in defining fairly closely the "social mode" of Restoration comedy. Lynch[4], following but refining on Palmer[5], shows that it is non-conformity to this social mode that provides a large part of the comedy effects of the comedy of manners (i.e. the unsuccessful adaptations of half-wits and would-be-wits and ladies of fashion and pleasure to the actual, prevailing social pattern), while a further occasional source of comedy lies in non-conformity to an exterior, non-contemporary and so-to-say commonsensical standard (of which Dorimant and Millament are good examples, deviating as they do from the normal, less artificial pattern of human behaviour obtaining outside their small, closed circle). Thus a double standard of reference is a distinguishing feature of Restoration comedy, and the internal standard must be intimately related to contemporary reality.

Consequently, though the output of Dryden and Mrs. Behn is prodigious, it is for the most part irrelevant for our purpose, because it does not aim consistently at contemporary reality, or the social mode. Mrs. Behn poured out a flood of comedies, but they are romantic not realistic in tone. Her gallants go through the motions but their heart - or rather their head - is not in the "great business" of this age. They are too busy to consider their manner. Far from being in the mode, idle, calculating, concentrated on their status as men of fashion, they are involved in palpitating amours, busy as bees and impulsive as puppies, unselfconcious as

---

4 - Kathleen M. Lynch, The Social Mode of Restoration Comedy, New York, 1926, pp. 5-10.

5 - John Palmer, The Comedy of Manners, London, 1913.

young children. How Etherege must have winced as he watched them cavorting across the boards! What exquisite pain their vulgarity must have occasioned him. Why, his very shoemaker could strike a more modish pose and turn a prettier phrase in a couple of lines[6] than Willmore and Belville in five acts[7].

Similarly with Dryden. When his characters put on the comic Restoration sock they wear it with a difference. Like Mrs. Behn's creations, they are more concerned with the apparatus of their love life than the manner of it. It is not for nothing that many of Mrs. Behn's and Dryden's commedies are set in Spain. Besides their literary borrowings, these writers transferred to some degree an atmosphere and one quite foreign to the contemporary English setting. Their characters give voice to sentiments appropriate perhaps to heroic drama but irreconcilable with realistic comedy. Allardyce Nicoll has remarked that Dryden's lovers show "a certain intensity"[8] that "is more emotional and more real" than the "cynical intellectualism" of Etherege. Perhaps we may go a little further than this, because something emerges that is important to our inquiry. Dryden, for the very reasons that make him the great representative of his age, is not representative of the realistic comedy of the Restoration. It is surely impossible for a sensitive mind to read his first comedy without perceiving that he had no real stomach for the extremes of cynicism and bawdy of the milieu. As a craftsman with a job to do, and a man of moderate means with his living to earn, he perceives them as necessary

---

6 - The Man of Mode, Works of Sir George Etherege, ed. A. Wilson Verity, London, 1888, pp. 253-4.

7 - The Rover, or the Banish'd Cavaliers, Aphra Behn, Works, London, 1915.

8 - History of Restoration Drama, Allardyce Nicoll, Cambridge, 1923, p. 185 and p. 214.

ingredients of successful comedy and proceeds to lay on with a trowel. As a consequence his grossnesses and double-entendres are reminiscent of English musichall at its lowest ebb and amuse no longer, whereas Wycherley with his unfeigned gusto for the ribald can convulse us still with his bull in the china shop. Dryden was born and bred in a puritan milieu and there was nothing in his temperament to militate against his early training and render him sympathique with the cavalier circle, while he was too comprehensive an artist to confine himself to the reflection of a coterie, however influential. This is a salutary reminder that, for all the brilliance, acute observation and elaborate social gyrations that make up the Restoration comedy of manners, it none the less remains a superficial portrait of a small, unrepresentative and ephemeral section of English society. It is a dazzling caricature of an eccentric individual, not a family portrait; a miniature, not a microcosm. Dryden transcended this small though temporarily influential society and dealt for the most part with emotions less corseted by the conventions of his day and ideas of more general concern and greater moment. As compared with Sedley, Etherege and Wycherley, he tells us less of manners but more of man.

Only a very small part, then, of Dryden's comedy is of interest here, and a small part of Shadwell's, since he depicts a much wider society and seldom attempts to hit the social mode with which we are concerned. Our chief interest is the work of Sedley, Etherege and Wycherley. When we have examined their treatment of jealousy, we shall set out what psychology can now tell us about the nature of jealousy and its place in the social environment. We shall then be in a position to refer Restoration views on jealousy to the functioning of Restoration society. Such a reference provides a striking corroboration of the theories of psychology, while psychological theory throws light on some of the dark places of the Restoration.

Chapter II

THE INHERITED ATTITUDE

Most of the realistic comedy of the Restoration proper as we have delimited it is the work of Sedley, Etherege and Wycherley. The first plays of both Sedley and Etherege comprise in addition to the comic plot or plots a further "serious" plot. The plays are written on two distinct levels, ~~the~~ one ~~former~~ that of everyday life in prose, the ~~latter~~ other in verse, in the high-pitched key of heroic drama. The comic sections usually achieve, even in their more extravagant moments, that conviction ~~that~~ which attaches only to the observation of life by an artist with his eye firmly on the object. Since they tell us the most, and most directly, about the attitude of the Restoration gallant towards love and jealousy, they will be our chief concern. Some interesting evidence of a negative kind, however, can be gleaned from the verse sections, and these will be examined first.

One of the most important elements in them, as in the heroic drama proper, derives from the précieuse tradition borrowed from France. Both the manner of its introduction and encouragement in England, and the nature of its central idea indicate the sources of its weakness when transplanted to English soil, and also suggest why neither Sedley nor Etherege took any serious interest in it as a literary genre.

The précieuse vogue began to seep into England in the twenties of the Seventeenth Century with the printing of the first English translation of Honoré d'Urfé's Astrée, that vast pastoral novel which Lanson terms a "handbook of civility", in which Astrée dismisses her lover Celadon on the mere suspicion of infidelity, and again for a venial deception. This work and Clélie by Mlle. Scudéry, with its Carte du Tendre and elaborate refining

on the psychology of love, represent the main interests and aspirations that informed Mme. de Rambouillet's famous chambre bleue, which though flourishing before and after, was in its heyday from 1624-48. Henrietta Maria, Charles I's young bride, acted as a literary link between England and France, where in her girlhood she had acquired a taste for the précieuses.

In 1633 she herself and her ladies played leading roles in The Shepherd's Paradise[1], a Platonic pastoral drama by Walter Montague. This royal impetus helped to start a spate of similar productions in England in drama, prose and verse. Their significance for us is that the underlying ideology is a pseudo-Platonism, and the central doctrine that love ought to be an intellectual and spiritual experience. It is only worthy of its divine origin when it is without physical possession. From this the immediate corollary is that jealousy is the capital sin against love. Thus in D'Avenant's "The Fair Favourite"[2] the Queen's response to the King's seductive addresses is that if his love is "pure and noble"

> "it is too great a treasure to
> "Be made particular and owned by me
> Alone,

and when he observes that her ideas will prove as unpopular as they are novel, she replies tout court

> True love admits no jealousy.

This theme, together with the proper conduct of refined courtship is worked and reworked in fine-drawn quasi-philosophic arguments and elaborate

---

1 - K.M. Lynch, The Social Mode of Restoration Comedy, p. 57.

2 - The Dramatic Works of Sir William D'Avenant, edited by James Maidment and W.H. Logan. Edinburgh and London, 1872-74, Vol. IV, pp. 264-5.

conceits by D'Avenant, Carlell Killigrew and others. As an artistic genre, however, it never received the acceptance in England that it did in France. There it met a basic need, and had a well-defined objective - to purify the language and the relations between the sexes.[3] In England the need was not so great, for her island position and naval power had preserved her from much foreign warfare, and she had not been barbarized by a recent series of civil wars. Further, the passion for refining on the nuances of psychology and for the complete systematization of thought is less native to the English than to the French genius. There were too many Hylases in England eager to laugh preciosity out of countenance. At its best it achieved the artful and charming, and it readily degenerated into verbiage. Consequently when Etherege came to write The Comical Revenge, though he had not strength of mind to avoid this philosophical miasma altogether, it was for him little more than a verbal hangover from a literary debauch. The same thing may be said of Sedley, and in either case the proof is ample.

There is first the fact that each made only one attempt to combine this type of writing with his real métier, that of reflecting the life of his milieu in a realistic manner. Sedley's second play, Bellamira, though lifted bodily from Terence's "Eunuch", had breathed into it the spirit of the Restoration court circle. It is entirely in prose and free from preciosity. Etherege's second play, She Would if the Could, is prose comedy dealing exclusively with the "great business of this town".

---

3 - Jefferson Butler Fletcher, "The Religion of Beauty in Woman and Other Essays on Platonic Love" in Poetry and Society, New York, 1911, p. 172, cited by K. Lynch, op.cit. p. 44.

Further, the 'serious' sections conflict with the comic ones and are inferior in every point of workmanship, plot, characterization and style. From this we may fairly conclude that the authors did not themselves take this part of their work seriously. It is not creative ability that is lacking but artistic integrity.

One need not overstress the weakness of the 'high' plot of Love in a Tub, or the Comical Revenge, since many a good play has been written on a shaky plot; what is significant is that it is weak because of the fatuity of the motivation. Graciana who has been promised in marriage to Colonel Bruce by her father Lord Bevil comes during Bruce's imprisonment by the Protectorate to love Lord Beaufort, and he her. Her sister Aurelia, herself in love with Bruce, tries with more persistance than success to rekindle Graciana's love for Bruce in a spirit of renunciation and heroism notably out of key with Restoration behaviour in artistocratic circles. Lovis, Graciana's brother and Bruce's "dearest friend", feels that the honour of his family requires the original promise of marriage between Bruce and Graciana to be fulfilled. He screws up Bruce's indignation to the sticking place and persuades him he must duel with Beaufort. Seconded by Sir Frederick Frollick, Beaufort arrives at the duelling ground just in time to rescue Bruce and Lovis from death at the hands of a vindictive Puritan. After an exchange of noble sentiments they fight, and Beaufort disarms Bruce and restores his sword. Overcome by gratitude and despising life without Graciana, Bruce falls on the sword, giving himself a serious but not fatal wound. Graciana's reaction to this event is to pretend that she no longer loves Beaufort because he has broken his promise not to fight. Aurelia meanwhile betrays her love for Bruce by weeping over him when the surgeon gives him up and declaring she will not

outlive him. Bruce revives and begins to fall in love with her. Graciana declares she will marry Bruce if he lives, or, if he dies, will herself live a virgin. Happily Bruce's wound heals and Graciana betrays her love to Bruce who is eavesdropping, so that the quartet is straightened out and the claims of honour apparently satisfied. Now this type of plot is not unlike the sort of thing that Corneille used to make masterpieces with; what distinguishes his work from Etherege's (in this particular) is that his characters are consistent; they follow the claims of honour to the bitter and tragic end, setting will above desire in spite of suffering. Even the cursory examination of Etherege's plot that we have given reveals that his characters have no such inner convictions. The slightest persuasion changes their minds; the discovery of a second love is enough to deflect Bruce from the first; Graciana feels no further obligation to marry him when he recovers. There is no inner tension of souls contending whether they shall live or die. Plot movement is fortuitous and hence without moral or intellectual significance. The author does not solicit nor expect our belief.

With Sedley's verse plot in The Mulberry Garden (played in 1668) the case is subtly different. It is weak not so much because it is incredible, or the motivation weak (though it sometimes is), but because it has no raison d'être. Dianna and Althea, daughters of Forecast, a Puritan supporter, love respectively Philander and Eugenio, who are Cavaliers and therefore persona non grata to Forecast. The lovers pine apart, the Cavaliers being in prison. The deus ex machina which brings them together is the reversal of Puritan fortunes through the march on London of General Monk which is the prelude to the reestablishment of the Stuarts. A slight suspense value is

given to the plot by making Horatio, who is loved by Victoria (the daughter of Everyoung, the Cavalier father of both Victoria and Olivia) fall out of love with Victoria and into infatuation with Althea. ~~His~~ Horatio's second change of heart in Act V when he returns to Victoria comes as a shock since at the beginning of Act II Althea's indictment of his behaviour appears to have no effect at all, admirably though the unfortunate girl argues in the best précieuse manner. Perhaps it may be attributed to his having fought on the side of his rival Eugenio against the Puritan soldiers come to arrest Eugenio. Whatever the reason, we are not given it by Sedley and it remains a matter of indifference to us. As a plot, this is a nullity.

Weakness of plot and motivation is accompanied as we have indicated by weakness of style. Few critics would quarrel with the contention that where an artist lavishes his painstaking care, there his real interest lies, and there, save in highly exceptional cases, his excellence. In literature, as in life, where a man's heart is, there his treasure is likely to be also. The contrast between the merits of Etherege and Sedley in their prose and verse sections is fascinating.

Etherege pitches his tone so far above his real sentiments that he falls into bathos with the greatest of ease. This is Amelia relating to Lovis how Graciana fell in love with Bruce:

> When you were forced to end, I did proceed
> And with success the catching fire did feed,
> Till noble Beaufort, one unlucky day,
> A visit to our family did pay..... [4]

---

4 - Love in a Tub, p. 61

This is Beaufort and Graciana when she protects him from Bruce's attack by throwing her arms round him:

> Beaufort Braciana, let me go, my heart wants room.
>
> Grac. My arms till now were n'er thought troublesome.[5]

and this Letitia, to Graciana:

> Had you less beauteous been, you'd known less care;
> Ladies are happiest moderately fair.[6]

It is curious to reflect that the same ear had criticised the rise and fall of those periods and of these:-

> Loveit The man who loves above his quality does not suffer more from the insolent impertinence of his mistress than the woman who loves above her understanding does from the arrogant presumptions of her friend,[7]
>
> Medley .. Pretty pouting lips, with a little moisture ever hanging on them, that look like the Provence rose fresh on the bush, ere the morning sun has quite drawn up the dew ..[8]

In short, when Etherege has his eye on something that he is interested in, like a woman's mouth, he can paint it to the life, and can express in admirable prose any idea with which he is truly conversant. By his own admission Etherege "less passionately desire(d) to be esteemed a poet than to be thought the most humble, most obedient and most faithful servant of H.R.H. the Duchess of (York)" and declared "it will not grieve me much if I show more zeal than skill".[9] This was indeed fortunate.

---

5 - Op. cit., p. 64.

6 - Op. cit., p. 105. Etherege himself evidently felt that this line did not do justice to the thought. He tried it over again but improved it hardly at all in The Imperfect Enjoyment (Works, p. 399).

7 - The Man of Mode, Works, p. 348.

8 - Op. cit., p. 248.

9 - Dedication to The Man of Mode, Works, p. 239.

If it be objected that he uses the word "poet" where we should say "dramatist", since The Man of Mode is entirely in prose, one can only point out that in that case his sincerity is even less to be admired than his verse, since his prose writing in that play is among the finest in the language, and no one without taking much thought and some practice achieves such delicacy, precision, balance and ease. The affectation of throwing off pleasing trifles in one's moments of leisure between the real business of the age, preferably at a precociously early age, was one to which the Restoration courtier-wit was particularly given. It was part of his modishness, part of his pose, that nothing had any value worth passionate application except the business of existing in a fashionable manner, but it need not for a moment mislead literary judgment.

Sedley's work is even more interesting from this point of view, because Sedley had the poetic faculty. In The Mulberry Garden, as we have noted, he does not have bombastic plot to support. His muse is pedestrian; never becomes airborne; on the other hand, she seldom comes the croppers that Etherege's does. Easily one of the worst couplets in the play is Althea's

> Could once my soul of a base thought allow,
> He that believes me false, should find me so[10]

and it is bad because the thought behind it is absurd. It is instructive to use Arnold's touchstone criterion on two sets of Sedley's lines;

> But, fair Althea, you were much to blame,
> With your own breath to blow a hopeless flame;
> Ah! had you to its childhood been severe,
> As now to its full growth you cruel are,
> 'T had dy'd with half that pain it now must bear.....[11]

---

10 - The Mulberry Garden, Works, p. 87.

11 - Ibid, p. 56.

and

> Not Celia, that I juster am
> Or better than the rest,
> For I would change each Hour like them,
> Were not my Heart at rest.[12]

The first is Horatio in the Mulberry Garden speaking his contrived piece to the female juvenile lead; the second is Sedley writing to his mistress from the heart. When Sedley had a flash of poetic insight he could convey it in poetry. In The Mulberry Garden he contents himself with a mediocre standard of performance because he did not suppose for a moment that he was conveying any important communication to his hearers.

It is worth noting here Wycherley's use of verse in a secondary plot in The Plain Dealer. A small part of the romantic plot turning on Fidelia's impersonation of a youth is cast in verse; verse blank in name as in nature. It is not easy to discover why he used it at all, nor why he confines it to the soliloquies of Fidelia and Manly, since it contains a minimum of thought and no poetic quality. The point is not very important; possibly the verse is intended to mark the genuine nature of Fidelia's emotion, and Manly's equally genuine flash of self-knowledge[13] as something apart from the social mode which is the main concern of the play. In Wycherley's case we have no grounds for inferring that he thought his Fidelia plot inferior or her sentiments exaggerated, however unfashionable they might be. Wycherley though easily the least gifted poet of the Sedley, Etherege, Wycherley trio, was serious about his verses. The story of their polishing at Pope's hands is too well

---

12 - Sedley, Miscellaneous Works, London, 1702. p. 11

13 - The Plain Dealer, William Wycherley, edited by W.C. Ward, London, 1900, p. 428.

known and too pitiful to bear repetition, but it supports the view that when Wycherley used verse he meant it to be taken seriously in spite of his protestations to the contrary. Furtunately for our purposes, the Fidelia verse sections contribute little to the subject of jealousy save to indicate a vague aspiration for a life remote from "this bright world of artful beauties".[14]

Further, we can discover in the text of both the first plays of Etherege and Sedley more than one case where the author plainly betrays his attitude towards his "high" plot. Perhaps both the most amusing and conclusive is Sir Frederick Frollick's interposition in the duelling scene in Love in a Tub. This is the incident that follows the duel already described. Bruce has fallen upon his sword, despairing of life without Graciana. His friend Lovis immediately prepares to follow his example out of pure friendship. Exclaiming

> He does his blood for a lost mistress spend
> And shall not I bleed for so brave a friend?

he "offers to fall on his sword but is hindered by Sir Frederick" who observes in good plain prose "Forbear sir, the frolic's not to go round, as I take it".[15] When an author cuts the ground from under his own heroics like this it is clear that they are spurious, and without doubt Etherege knew as well as we do that his casting Sir Frederick as a cousin to Lord Beaufort was a violation not only of biological probability but of artistic principle.

Sedley is even more facetious at the expense of his serious characters in The Mulberry Garden. Victoria is uncomfortably situated with

---

14 - Op. cit., p. 392

15 - Love in a Tub, Works, p. 77.

a footing in both plots, and in one and the same scene alternates verse with prose according to whether she is thinking "serious" thoughts or not. The effect is artistically disastrous, but it leaves us in no doubt of Sedley's attitude. In Act I scene 3, Olivia abruptly asks Victoria what she would give to see Horatio, and Victoria who has hitherto conversed in prose in a normal manner immediately states that

> To see Horatio, as I knew him once,
> I would all other happiness renounce;
> But he is now another's, and my aim
> Is not to nourish, but to starve my flame....
> Althea's slave, let false Horatio live,
> Whilst I for freedom, not for empire strive.[16]

If Sedley had wished to win credence for Victoria's views and our participation on the same level of discourse, he would certainly have given Olivia at least a dignified couplet in response. Instead, Olivia, putting her own and our point of view into a nutshell, replies

> Fye sister, leave this riming at least.[17]

Of the comedies we have to consider in detail, there is only one other with any verse plot on a level conflicting with the rest of the play. This is in Vanbrugh's "Relapse" which was not produced till 1696, some thirty-two years after Love in a Tub and twenty-eight years after The Mulberry Garden. The virtuous sentiments that Vanbrugh dressed in verse are so blatantly at variance with the tone and intention of the work as a whole that it would be superfluous to recapitulate the arguments against their validity. They furnish but one of the many instances of the capital weakness of Vanbrugh that restricts him as an artist to the second rank: his failure to achieve a literary person-

---

16 - The Mulberry Garden, Works, p. 43-44

17 - Op.cit., p. 44.

ality. He is a great improviser; an adapter; a grabber of other mens' ideas and techniques, which he does not take the trouble to weld into an homogenous whole; a snapper-up of unconsidered trifles; the Autolycus of the Restoration drama.

The Relapse verse plot give us, however, not echoes of old précieuse themes, but touches of the sentimental and moral note that has been swelling up in literature for some time. The appeal is not to a divine or ideal pattern as inpiration, but to reason as a guide: Amelia will excuse Loveless (a most significant choice of name, from our point of view) in youth because of the "plea of Nature", but now

> Reason, well digested into thought,
> Has pointed out the course he ought to run;
> If now he strays,
> 'Twould be as weak and mean in me to pardon
> As it has been in him to offend..... [18]

We have suggested that this verse plot, or rather series of versified sections, conflicts with the trend of the comedy as a whole. This is true; but in a different sense from that in which it is true of the earlier plays. It is not in Vanbrugh's case that he does not believe what he says; like his characters, he appears to believe the moral things he says when he says them, but he also believes that the majority in the social groups he depicts do not act according to these beliefs. He presents us with two undigested and unrelated lumps of human experiance and leaves us to make the best of them and reconcile them as we may. Consequently he reflects in a most interesting way a society in the process of changing its values.

---

18 - The Relapse; or Virtue in Danger, Sir John Vanbrugh, Edited by A.E.H. Swaen, London 1896, p. 181.

Keeping Vanbrugh apart, then, we may say that for the writers of realistic Restoration comedy the verse sections were old bottles that would not hold their new and acid wine. They forced into them only ideas in which they did not believe and characters they did not respect.

With a warranted cynicism then we may examine what the verse plots have to contribute to the topic of jealousy. We have already noticed the altruism of Aurelia in Love in a Tub. She is so far above jealousy as to be inhuman. She presses messages from Bruce, whom she loves in suffering silence, on her rival Graciana and fans her "flame"; is prepared to die since she cannot have her lover. When Bruce at last announces that his heart has "become Aurelia's due", she even goes so far as to say she wishes she had wooed Graciana successfully for him. Nor is Colonel Bruce jealous when he returns from imprisonment and has broken to him gently the bad news of Graciana's faithlessness. He "would not willingly his love suspect", and when fully informed, admits that it was Graciana's pity not her love that inclined her to accept his addresses. It is only the efforts of Lovis his friend that inflame him sufficiently to make him claim Graciana and challenge Beaufort, and even then it is the thought of honour rather than the impulse of jealousy that really moves him. True, he leaves Beaufort in Graciana's arms and calls this

> that happy state
> Which does provoke my fury and my hate[19]

but this is obviously a weakminded young man talking himself into a state of mind. He can only be persuaded to strip off for the duel by his opponent

---

19 - Love in a Tub, Works, p. 65.

who urges him to

> think on the beauteous Graciana's eyes;
> 'Tis I have robb'd thee of that glorious prize[20]

Even then his motive is honour, not jealousy - "my scrupulous honour must obey my flame". After he is wounded, Graciana offers him her hand if he lives and a vow of virginity if he dies, but far from jumping at the offer he points out that it is excessive, and when pronounced out of danger he declines.

In The Mulberry Garden, Victoria behaves with equal nobility (in the verse sections) showing no jealousy of Althea her successful rival. The only character who betrays any jealous feeling is Eugenio. He, as soon as he hears a rumour that Althea is married to, or about to marry, Horatio, believes the worst, and feels justified in doing so. As he says

> Sure my Althea cannot disapprove
> these fears that spring but from excess of love:
> Of love and courage none can too much have.[21]

But Philander his friend makes the orthodox précieuse rebuttal:

> Courage, when brutal, ceases to be brave,
> And love, grown jealous, can no merit have.[22]

Argument and counter-argument are developed in the traditional precieuse manner.

> Eug. A higher mark of love there cannot be
> We doubt no lover whom we jealous see.
> Phil. So fevers are of life sure proofs we know,
> And yet our lives they often overthrow:
> Diseases, though well cur'd, our bodies mar,
> And fears, although remov'd, our loves impair:
> True love, like health, should no disorder know[23]

---

20 - Op. Cit., p. 75

21 - The Mulberry Garden, Works, p. 66.

22 - Op. Cit., p. 66.

23 - Ibid.

This is the well established précieuse doctrine that jealousy is a disease; the "canker of true love" as Carliell called it.[24] It is not only a doctrinal but a literary echo from Suckling's Brennoralt,[25] that play compact of Platonic argument which, in Pepys' words, "hath been always mightily cried up".[26] For us, the interesting thing is that Eugenio is silenced. He is "happy.. to have a friend so full of temper while I rave". He renounces his impulse to rush off and fight his rival Horatio, because his public appearance would endanger the Royalist cause. For the moment the Corneillian code of honour and the précieuse code of purity discipline him. He breaks out again, however, and goes disguised as a Roundhead soldier to confront Althea with his fears. He is querulous rather than jealous.

> I not your virtue, but my fate accuse,
> Which still does me with highest rigour use.[27]

At this moment Horatio arrives on the scene together with some genuine Roundhead soldiers come to arrest Eugenio. Horatio, far from indulging any jealous impulse to abet his rival's capture, fights to rescue him.

Philander, the chief proponent in the play of the Platonic ideal, has one "jealous pang" when Diana, disguised as a boy, lets fall a ring he had given her as his promised bride. Diana, revealing herself, rebukes him severely for his jealous impulse to attack her.

---

24 - The Deserving Favourite, A Tragi-comedy. Reprinted by Chas. H. Gray in Lodowick Carliell, pp. 70-262, Chicago, 1905, p. 147.

25 - Brennoralt. The Poems, Plays and Other Remains of Sir John Suckling, ed. W. Carew Hazlitt. London, 1892, 2 vols. Vol. II, p. 119 cited by K. Lynch, op.cit., pp. 126-7.

26 - The Diary of Samuel Pepys, edited by Henry B. Wheatley, London 1893-1899, 9 vols. VII p. 258.

27 - The Mulberry Garden, Works, p. 88.

How can I hope a lasting friendship, where
So light appearance brings so mean a fear?[28]

He retorts by interpreting her visit to his hiding-place as proof of her doubts of his faith in love. This clever if sophistical riposte leads Diana to drop hastily the subject of her own action and to approve his. This enables Philander to rebuke her by implication while tendering a compliment:

Look on thyself and measure thence my love.[29]

Thus he firmly restates the central value of the précieuses - the beauty of the beloved and her worth and the confidence of lovers in one another - and recovers his moral footing. The whole passage is verbal preciosity, an ingenious exercise of the mental faculties with, in this case, a minimum of reference to real feelings.

The attitude towards jealousy indicated in these sections will be shown in the next chapter to be in conflict with the real attitude of Restoration society as expressed in its realistic comedy. In the latter only a trace of the inherited view remains, namely, that jealousy is an unbecoming quality to appear in a man of mode.

For the précieuse, jealousy is the mark of an immoral or imperfect lover; in Restoration comedy and society it is the mark of the unfashionable man. The pleasing irony of the matter is that while a rational basis can be and was worked out for the précieuse view, the view of Restoration society (which rather preened itself on a cool rationality) involves an internal logical contradiction which may have been a cause both of the disintegration of the comic structure and at a more fundamental level of the disintegration of the society itself. The Restoration man of mode could not last long if he defied the inner logic of human development.

---

28 - Op. Cit. p. 96

29 - Ibid.

Chapter III

THE CONTEMPORARY ATTITUDE

Even when we come to observe what Sedley, Etherege and Wycherley have to say about jealousy in their realistic comedy, we have to avoid the naivete of taking them, or rather their characters, at their word. They always had a pose to maintain which must be understood. The realism of Restoration society was artificiality; that is to say, the Court set up in London a standard of superficial manners and, above all, manner. This in effect substituted an artistic code of behaviour for a moral code. Moral criteria derived from a coherent philosophy of living are lacking. What philosophical outlook there is may be summarized by Sedley's Song,

> Since wine, love, music, perfect are,
> Let's banish ev'ry doubt and care;
> This night is ours, and we'll enjoy,
> Tomorrow shall not now destroy.[1]

This is the eat, - drink - for - tomorrow-we-die attitude that characterized the Jews before Sennacherib's attack, the Florentines of Boccaccio's day before the onslaught of the plague, the English in Heartbreak House before the outbreak of the first World War. It is the attitude compact of defiance and despair that usually appears when life is felt to be in great uncertainty.

The code of manners imposed in Restoration society seems to have stemmed from the feeling that no interest a man pursued was of sufficient importance to justify his getting emotionally involved in it, whether religion, work or love. The only exception was attachment to the King's person and service, where even belief in the Divine Right of Kings was not too exacting a requirement. Hence the only virtues really recognized

---

1 - A Song, Works, Vol. II, p. 24.

as such were loyalty (to the King) and physical courage, since active defence of such loyalty might again prove necessary. The beau idéal was a courtier with sufficient means to permit of idleness; sufficient connection to allow of personal attendance on the King; sufficient grace of wit and person to render him attractive to men and women of like kidney, and a constitution adequate to withstand debauch. His positive effort was directed at wit - saying a good thing better than it had been said before - and his negative effort to avoiding the appearance of caring for anything except the superficial marks of a wit, dress, deportment, and above all, manner. Sir Fopling is the perfect caricature of this figure, Dorimant its apotheosis, and Horner its reductio ad absurdum.

Obviously then, if the manner if correct, a man who loves will not be jealous. As Lady Flippanta exclaims, "That a wit should be jealous; that a wit should be jealous! There's never a brisk fellow in the town, though no wit, Heaven knows, but thinks too well of himself, to think ill of his wife or mistress. Now, that a wit should lessen his opinion of himself; for shame!"[2]

Jealousy is taboo because it argues a poor valuation of oneself as a man of mode and, as a minor corollary, devalues the object of possession. Further it implies fear, and is therefore unacceptable. As Vincent says to Valentine, "Your idle fears will turn to shame; for jealousy is the basest cowardice".[3]

---

2 - Love in a Wood, Wycherley, Works, p. 76.

3 - Op. cit. p. 112

This was the attitude that the wit was supposed to maintain. In practice, as we shall see, he almost never did. Instead we find in the plays an almost obsessive interest in jealousy; it occurs with remarkable frequency as a theme; it is regarded as an invariable accompaniment of love, and ultimately set up as a criterion of love.

Love in a Tub is one of the few plays to be considered that does not use jealousy as a theme. The high plot we have already noted; of the other three, one is the slapstick revenge of Betty on Dufoy; another Sir Frederick's wooing of the merry widow, Mrs. Rich - one of the earliest examples of the "Love Game" - and another is the "gull" theme involving Wheedle and Palmer's efforts to cheat Sir Nicholas Cully out of his money. Four years later Etherege had focussed his attention and doctored up his construction. She Would if She Could is not "the mixture as before" but a concentrated essence, distilled from various elements in the "great business of this town", namely, the pursuit of gallantry in the fashionable manner. Courtal and Freeman are young men of mode in search of "lucky adventure", not being at the start of the play in "so desperate a condition as to have a good opinion of marriage". In the Mulberry Garden, however, they meet Gatty and Ariana, two young ladies with whom "it is useless to treat of anything under that". They are obliged, "forgetting all shame, to become constant". This is the Love Game section proper, but the main interest centres in Lady Cookwood in her desperate though unavailing efforts to live up to the social mode and conduct a successful and secret affair with Courtal. The plot is kept in motion by jealousy and the play filled with its repercussions on different characters. Lady Cockwood

"loves" Courtal and is fantastically jealous of him, pursuing him with as much vigour and hopefulness as he employs in evading her. As she herself says "a lady cannot be too jealous of her servant's love this faithless and inconstant age".[4] As soon as she suspects Gatty and Ariana of being more interesting than herself to Courtal and Freeman, she writes two notes purporting to come from them to the two young men. These are designed to spoil their flirtation and to corroborate her suspicions. When Courtal accepts the assignation she had offered in Gatty's name, and fails to keep his promise to her, her jealous fury is such that she accuses him to her husband of making "a foul attempt upon (her) honour". She also pretends both affection and ~~therefore~~ jealousy of her husband Sir Oliver, because after one of his drunken sprees he is overwhelmed by contrition and willing to stay at home wearing his "penitential suit" of black, which allows Lady Cockwood the more freedom for her own pursuit of pleasure.

Sir Oliver himself, when sober, is henpecked but bored by his wife; when drunk, he escapes to wenching and wild companions like Sir Joslin Jolly. He is fool enough to believe her scrupulous of her honour, and by a curious quirk of character, actually attempts when drunk to revenge his wife's honour upon Courtal. One of the climactic scenes is set at the Bear Inn, where Gatty and Ariana and Lady Cockwood come with Courtal and Freeman, only to find that Sir Joslin has persuaded Sir Oliver to steal out in his penitential suit so that they may both "solace themselves with a fresh girl or two". It is Lady Cockwood's combination of jealousy and hypocrisy that makes us anticipate so much fun from the inevitable discovery;

---

4 - She Would if She Could, Etherege, Works, p. 189.

like Ariana we feel sure that "now we shall have admirable sport, what with her fear and jealousy"[5] and none of us is disappointed.

Most comic and significant is Courtal's share in all this. He considers Lady Cockwood "so foolishly fond and troublesome, that no man above sixteen is able to endure her", and has long wearied of their intrigue. He has, however, "still carried it so like a gentleman that she has not had the least suspicion of unkindness".[6] Yet he cannot quite relinquish his conquest, and even when falling in love with Gatty, he is opposed to Freeman's taking over the reversion of Lady Courtal. His reason is illuminating. "I should never have consented to that, Frank; though I am a little restiff at present, I am not such a jade but I should strain if another rode against me; I have e'er now liked nothing in a woman that I have loved at last in spite, only because another had a mind to her".[7] Freeman answers Lady Cockwood's summons nonetheless, pretending an appointment with a lawyer to divert Courtal's suspicions. Courtal, however, arrives unexpectedly, and Lady Cockwood hides both men from Sir Oliver in a closet. Freeman explains to Courtal that he concealed his visit from Courtal lest his "peevish jealousy" should "destroy the design he (Freeman) had of getting an opportunity to clear (themselves) to the young ladies"[8] - a rather skilful double-play in the Love Game.

Not only does the plot turn on jealousy, but the people in it have the subject constantly in mind and on their lips. Sir Oliver complains

---

5 - Op. cit. p. 172

6 - Op. cit. p. 130

7 - Op. cit. p. 202

8 - Op. cit. p. 227

of his wife's passion and jealousy. "Above all, that damned fiend, jealousy, does so possess these passionate lovers".[9] She complains of his. When upbraiding him at the Bear she urges her own self-denial of recreation abroad "in complying with thy base jealousy".[10] Gatty, when she wishes to rebuke her sister for bemoaning the loss of the country, exclaims, "Speak but one grave word more, and it shall be my daily prayers thou may'st have a jealous husband".[11]

Courtall and Freeman meet the girls venturing masked in the Mulberry Garden and when Ariana twits them with being bound for the company of ladies, Courtal observes to Freeman, "on my conscience they love us and begin to grow jealous already".[12]

Gatty and Ariana make them swear they will not speak to any other women before they keep a second appointment with Gatty and Ariana, and Ariana declares this is "not that we are jealous, but because we would not have you tired with the impertinent converation of our sex".[13]

When at the Bear, Sir Oliver wonderingly inquires "how the devil came (the ladies) to find us out here?", Courtal replies, "no blood-hound draws so sure as a jealous woman".[14] Lady Courtal, when she is planning to lay bare Courtal's duplicity, even feels obliged to assure her own servant Sentry that she "has conquered her affection and.....it is not jealousy has been my counsellor in this".[15]

---

9 - Op. cit. p. 126

10- Op. cit. 184

11- Op. cit. p. 136

12- Op. cit. p. 144

13- Ibid.

14- Op. cit. p. 187

15- Op. cit. p. 191

When Gatty and Ariana try to explain to themselves the mystery of the two identical letters received by Courtal and Freeman, purporting to come from them, Ariana's first thought is that "it looks more like the malice or jealousy of a woman than the design of two witty men",[16] and the only reason they hesitate to decide it to be "a fetch of her ladyship's" is that "if she were jealous of Mr. Courtal she would not be jealous of Mr. Freeman too; they both pretend to have received letters".[17]

The plot is wound up, Sir Oliver and Lady Cockwood reconciled, the Love Game concluded in victory for the ladies, the weddings to be performed after a month of probation on the lovers' part. Even at this moment, the last word Courtal finds to say to Gatty is, "Madam, expectation makes me almost as restless as jealousy".[18]

In the decade between She Would if She Could and The Man of Mode Etherege still further matured his talents, and in the latter play his clear, hard, incurious mind reflects a brilliant and unwavering image of his environment. Plot there is none to speak of; merely a succession of scenes showing Dorimant getting off with the old and on with the new mistress, and at last in love with Harriet. Our interest is caught and held by the rapid dialogue, pithy and true to type and time, the characters which are sketched in lightly but firmly and the wealth of living detail from the horror of the orangewoman's appearance to the smell of Sir Fopling's gloves. These are the parts, but the whole has a unity of atmosphere which derives

---

16 - Op. cit. p. 222.

17 - Ibid.

18 - Op. cit. p. 234.

from the personality of Dorimant, that "devil (who) has something of the angel yet undefaced in him".[19] It is really he and not Sir Fopling who is the Man of Mode, for in him Etherege perfects his portrait of the Restoration wit engaged in the Love Game. Though apparently no critic has seen fit to acknowledge the fact, it is Dorimant's sexual fascination that lends intensity to a play that would be singularly flat without it. Far less good-humoured and high-spirited than Sir Frederick Frollick, more articulate, witty and self-possessed than Courtal, Dorimant is in fact the Restoration lover par excellence. Conscious of his own social value, he is supremely successful because he does not or does not appear to care whether he is so or not, and one suspects the marked sadism in his character makes its appeal to the streak of masochism not uncommonly found in women.

The plot, what there is of it, moves on the theme of jealousy. Belinda, to help Dorimant get rid of Loveit, a mistress of whom he is tired, plans "artificially (to) raise her jealousy to such a height" that she will start a quarrel and thereby give Dorimant a modish pretext to break with her. This Belinda readily does by describing how she has seen Dorimant entertaining a mask at the play. Dorimant caps the scene by pretending that he himself is indignant at Loveit's kindly reception of Sir Fopling Flutter. Loveit knows "this jealousy's a mere pretence, a cursed trick of your devising; I know you".[20] She herself is so jealous that she is described by Medley as "the most passionate in her love, and the most

---

19 - The Man of Mode, Sir George Etherege, J.M. Dent & Sons, Everyman Edition, p. 452.

20 - Op. cit. p. 457.

extravagant in her jealousy of any woman I ever heard of".[21]

Dorimant insinuates to Sir Fopling that Loveit welcomes his addresses and then contrives to be in the Mall to observe her meeting with Sir Fopling. Loveit counters by pretending complaisance to Sir Fopling. As she remarks, "'Twill make him uneasy, though he does not care for me; I know the effects of jealousy on men of his proud temper.... 'Tis the strongest cordial we can give to dying love, it often brings it back when there's no sign of life remaining".[22] The scene in the Mall is both comic and significant.

> Medley. You have tempted her with too luscious a bait; she bites at the coxcomb.
>
> Dor. She cannot fall from loving me to that?
>
> Med. You begin to be jealous in earnest.
>
> Dor. Of one I do not love?
>
> Med. You did love her.
>
> Dor. The fit has long been over.
>
> Med. But I have known men fall into dangerous relapses when they have found a woman inclining to another.
>
> Dor. (to himself) He guesses the secret of my heart! I am concerned, but dare not show it lest Belinda should mistrust all I have done to gain her.
>
> Bel. (aside) I have watched his look, and find no alteration there; did he love her, some signs of jealousy would have appeared.[23]

Love is a possession; like any other 'economic' good, it can acquire a

---

21 - Op. cit. p. 441.

22 - Op. cit. p. 473.

23 - Op. cit. p. 475.

scarcity value; one is not jealous when one is not in love, but by implication, if not by inference, one will certainly be jealous if one is in love. This is the core of the love-jealousy situation in Restoration comedy.

Dorimant's self-control is sufficient to deceive Belinda, but not Medley. Dorimant says "it were unreasonable to desire (you) not to laugh at me", but adds pitifully, "but pray do not expose me to the town this day or two".[24] The hitherto vulnerable Dorimant realizes that he has for once fallen short of the social mode. He has betrayed jealousy, and jealousy is to be deprecated because it reveals that he has failed of a complete conquest. One of Restoration society's most formidable sanctions - laughter - comes upon him. His discomfiture is made complete by the witty Harriet's conquest of him.

By employing Dorimant's own technique of reculer pour mieux sauter, a blend of teasing and provocative sang-froid, she draws him on from admiration to interest, and from interest to passion. So complete is her victory that she is even able to hold out for some feeling on his part. Only "when (his) love's grown strong enough to make (him) bear being laughed at" will she give him leave to "trouble her with advances of love". She does indeed have "an ascendant" over him, and as he says, "may revenge the wrongs (he) has done her sex".[25] He declares at last that he will open his heart and receive (her) where none yet did ever enter".[26]

---

24 - Op. cit. p. 476.

25 - Op. cit. p. 480.

26 - Op. cit. p. 502.

In spite of these protestations Dorimant insists on Loveit snubbing Sir Fopling, to give him, Dorimant, "public satisfaction for the wrong" he thinks Loveit has done him. She sees it as a "shameless thing" designed to save his vanity, but does it. Facesaving and modish to the last, Dorimant explains to Bellair, "You wed a woman, I a good estate",[27] and to Loveit that he takes a wife to repair the ruins of his estate, though in fact the "pangs of love" are upon him, and his "soul has quite given up her liberty".[28]

For our purposes The Man of Mode demonstrates exactly what Restoration society thought its attitude towards love-and-jealousy ought to be, and at the same time reveals how impossible of attainment this was. We may safely conclude that in the field of seduction what Dorimant could not do cannot be done.

In Sir Charles Sedley's first play The Mulberry Garden the main comic interest of the prose section arises from situations more typical of Elizabethan than Restoration realistic comedy: the cudgelling of the Puritan Forecast, his wooing of the mock widow. There is a good deal of incident but not much of love and not much of jealousy. What little there is of the Love Game is motivated, as Jack Wildish expressly declares, by jealousy. No sooner is he charmed by Olivia than he determines to eliminate the competition of Estridge and Modish. "Methinks", he says, as he prepares to expose their false pretensions to Olivia and Victoria, "love and jealousy come too quick upon a man in one day".[29]

---

27 - Op. cit. 491.

28 - Op. cit. p. 508.

29 - The Mulberry Garden, Works, p. 76.

Olivia's first expressed thought for avenging herself on Estridge (and for drawing on Wildish into the bargain) is, "Would that I were married to Estridge that I might plague him soundly.....tumble my own handkerchief to make him jealous.....fold up all manner of paper like love letters and burn 'em just as he comes into the room".[30] Wildish promptly comes up to expectations, offering matrimony with himself as the perfect revenge on Estridge, and this, after a pretty passage of verbal coquetry on both sides, Olivia accepts.

Bellamira Sedley's second play is an adaptation of Terence's "Eunuch". The plot is accordingly a "given". Since rape affords little room for the niceties of the Love Game, there is not much jealousy motivation here. Keepwell, however, admits himself" as full of jealousy as an egg is full of meat"[31] vis-à-vis his mistress Bellamira, the beautiful, celebrated and clever courtesan. Bellamira at the opening of the play is anxious to get Keepwell out of the way so that she may induce Dangerfield (one of Keepwell's many rivals for her favours) to restore Isabella, Bellamira's long-lost sister, to her. She pretends to renounce the whole project since Keepwell is jealous, which makes the foolish fellow more willing, and she completes her oblique persuasion by declaring her fear that Keepwell, being "both brave and jealous", might kill the quarrelsome Dangerfield and so be lost to her forever. When Keepwell returns from the country, Merryman his friend and Cunningham tease him with accounts of Bellamira's infidelities until he is in a frenzy "toss'd....between the billows of love

---

30 - Op. cit. p. 100.

31 - Bellamira, Works, p. 115.

and jealousy", his tenuous courage almost stiffened to the duelling point. When they have tormented him sufficiently, they restore his confidence in Bellamira with equal ease. Keepwell is, as Eustace says, "the top culley of the town"; the portrait of an infatuated man-about-town with not enough wit to be jealous when he has reason. It should be noted that Keepwell is not a typical Restoration comic "hero" of the charming, penniless variety, but an eldest son being cheated out of his money in a manner more characteristic of Elizabethan comic effects, and he does not aim consistently at the social mode. The play as a whole, however, remains contemporary in tone. Eustace's retort to Silence the maid, when she rejects his dishonourable advances, strikes the note.

> Sil. If I must be ruin'd, I'll be ruin'd in an honest way.
>
> Eus. A woman ruin'd in an honest way is the vilest, contemptiblest thing imaginable: give me a woman ruin'd with a coach and six horses, a house in the Mall, fine equipage!" [32]

Consequently, as we should expect, what references there are to jealousy fit the contemporary pattern.

Smoothly advises Dangerfield to fan any jealousy Bellamira may feel for Isabella.

> Sm. 'Twill make her mad.
>
> Dan. Ay, if she lov'd me.[33]

Thisbe rallies Cunningham and he instantly concludes she is jealous of his other acquaintance, and despite her rebuffs "is vain enough to think

---

32 - Op. cit. p. 173.

33 - Op. cit. p. 142.

all this a mere jealousy".[34] When Dangerfield is utterly exposed as a coward and toady and Bellamira calls upon Keepwell to observe what "a fellow he was to be jealous of", he replies, "where there is no jealousy, there is no love".[35]

With Wycherley we come to the latest and the greatest of the writers of realistic comedy in the Restoration period. Love in a Wood, probably produced in 1671 (though he claimed to have written it in 1659 at the age of nineteen), is his first play, and like Etherege's and Sedley's first productions it is over-stuffed with themes and incidents. A vestigial trace of the high verse plot lingers in the Valentine-Christina theme. There is no verse, but Christina and Vincent voice some moral sentiments that conflict with the contemporary realism of the Dapperwit scenes and the Gripe-Joiner-Crossbite intrigue much as Lord Beaumont and Graciana conflict with Sir Frederick and the Widow.

The motivation of the Valentine-Christina and Lydia-Ranger plot is again jealousy. Valentine has fought a duel with Lord Clerimont (because he was jealous of Christina's love for Valentine) and having wounded him critically, has been obliged to flee to France. He arrives in England unexpectedly early, only to be himself consumed by jealousy lest Christina really had reciprocated Clerimont's passion. It is he who goes to the core of the problem of jealousy, exclaiming, "Would any could secure me her!"[36] Vincent his friend tries to reassure him with proofs of Christina's virtue

---

34 - Op. cit. p. 149.

35 - Op. cit. p. 191.

36 - Wycherley, Works, p. 51.

and love, her retreat into seclusion, her putting on of mourning, her incessant inquiries for news of Valentine, constantly putting the modish view of jealousy, "There is no punishment great enough for jealousy - but jealousy";[37] "Jealousy is the basest cowardice".[38]

Colour is given to Valentine's groundless suspicions by an incident in St. James' Park at night. Lydia, in love with Ranger and jealous of him, dressed like Christina in mourning, goes with Lady Flippanta to the Park to spy on Ranger. He sees her, thinks he recognizes her, and follows her to Christina's house, where Christina hides her and confronts Ranger. Ranger, though he recognizes at once that this is not the woman he followed, is far too gallant to admit his mistake but proceeds to capitalize on it and make love to Christina. He relates the incident to Vincent and Valentine. Vincent instantly concludes there must be some "gross mistake", while Valentine suspects the worst, and resigns himself to insomnia, observing

> Hunger, Revenge, to sleep are petty foes,
> But only Death the jealous eye can close.[39]

Lydia, also filled with jealous suspicion of Christina and Ranger, writes Ranger "a letter in Christina's name desiring to meet him". Ranger arranges that Christina (actually Lydia) shall be brought in a chair, not to his own, but to Vincent's lodging. Meanwhile Christina herself goes to Vincent's lodging to see if Valentine has in fact arrived from abroad, as she has heard. Valentine, despite reassurance that Christina has never been at

---

37 - Op. cit. p. 112.

38 - Op. cit. p. 51.

39 - Op. cit. p. 54.

the Park, is still suspicious, and even Vincent admits that "to be jealous and not inquisitive is as hard as to love extremely and not be something jealous".[40]

While Ranger hurries out to get a parson, Christina comes in, and the crisscross of misunderstandings is as complete as it is tiresome. Valentine will not believe Christina's personal protestations of the facts and flings out, declaring his stay might cause jealousy to Christina's lover. Christina's reaction is interesting. She exclaims "Is this that generous, good Valentine? Who has disguised him so?"[41] and bursts into tears, the first genuine tears that have been shed in Restoration comedy, and though they do not affect Valentine they incline Vincent to think her innocent. "Her tongue and eyes, together with the flood that swells 'em, do vindicate her heart".[42]

When she confronts Ranger in the Park to persuade him to put matters right with her lover, she talks in a serious vein and breaks down once more. This time her tears and the facts dissolve the jealous fears of Valentine (who has been eaves-dropping) and he claims her for his own, soliciting her excuses by declaring with some complacency that "the jealous, like the drunkard, has his punishment with his offence".[43] Ranger and Lydia are reconciled in a lighter and more modish mood, finding that "when we are giddy, 'tis time to stand still".[44]

---

40 - Op. cit. p. 90.

41 - Op. cit. p. 91.

42 - Ibid.

43 - Op. cit. 116.

44 - Op. cit. p. 100.

Lydia and Ranger are in the mode; they are the typical "gay couple". Christina and Valentine are not. It is interesting that Wycherley has no central heroine who conforms to the social mode in the way that Millamant and Harriet do, not even Hippolita, who comes nearest. Alithea is too serious and sensible, too much a social "norm" like Molière's Elvire; Olivia (who in any case is hardly a heroine) is too crassly absorbed in the pursuit of men and money to have any manner; Fidelia is romantic. The social mode cramped Wycherley, as is abundantly evident from his plays; he lashes as often as he laughs at the crying age; he conforms to it himself only with effort, and for his heroines he is never content with an elaborated Lydia. Hippolita is obviously nearest his heart, and as we shall see, he explicitly sets her outside the mode, because she declares her love and works for it and gives it at last with a minimum of coquetry. It is not simply that the note of sentiment creeps in with Fidelia's and Christiana's tears, so that the critic on the alert to discover tendencies may point to early suggestions of the larmoyante vogue; it is rather that feelings other than those the Restoration comic writers habitually allowed themselves to reflect were for ever breaking through Wycherley's artistic restraint.

For the rest the play yields little of the Love Game or jealousy, though Lady Flippanta, the widow who decries marriage and sets her cap at every man she meets, has a good deal to say on the subject. Because she is anxious to think every one in love with her, she pretends they must be jealous. Even Dapperwit, who insults her grossly, she pardons, since "people always, when they grow jealous, grow rude"; she can pardon because "it proceeds from love certainly".[45] Her song for Sir Simon against

---

45 - Op. cit. p. 27.

marriage begins

> A spouse I do hate,
> For either she's false or she's jealous...[46]

which conveys the recurrent idea. Valentine rests his case at the end of the play by telling Christina that "jealousy sure is much more pardonable before marriage than after it"[47] and that marriage "will put (him) out of all (his) fears".[48] Ranger, inappropriately enough, is given a moral tag to end the play:

> The end of marriage now is liberty,
> And two are bound to set each other free.[49]

It would be absurd to try to extract any profound thinking about the freedom of the individual and its relationship to jealousy from this couplet. It conveys little more than the Pauline dictum that it is better to marry than to burn. Taken together with a number of other remarks on the subject, however, and with the body of Wycherley's work, it does indicate that Wycherley was aware that jealousy was a manifestation of fear of losing possession of a person (whether wife, mistress, daughter, husband, lover or son) and that it operates by restricting the freedom of that object. He saw and makes his audience see such restrictions as a violation of the human personality. It is what Kant defined as treating an individual as a means to an end, and not as an end; the insight is the same in the philosopher and the artist.

We see it worked out in the father-daughter relationship in

---

46 - Op. cit. p. 30.

47 - Op. cit. p. 123.

48 - Ibid.

49 - Ibid.

The Gentleman Dancing-Master Wycherley's second play. This is a slight, diverting comedy based on an episode in Calderon's comedy El Maestro de Danzar. Its pivotal point in Wycherley's version is not the merry intrigue between Hippolita and Gerrard but the character of Hippolita's father Don Diego or Mr. James Formal. He is an "old rich Spanish merchant newly returned home, much affected with the habit and custom of Spain"[50] among other habits, that of severely restricting the freedom of unmarried daughters. "In Spain, he is honourable enough that is jealous".[51] Don Diego declares himself "grave, grum and jealous as any Spaniard breathing".[52] Accordingly he keeps his daughter cooped up with his sister Mrs. Caution and Prue her maid, and plans to marry her in three days' time to Paris her cousin. It is resentment of this choice of a husband as well as the fact that Paris is an ugly, ill contrived, freakish fool"[53] that determines Hippolita to find herself a man to her taste. The same spirit makes her defy her aunt and declare that her husband one day "if he be not a fool....would rather be obliged to me for my virtue than to you, since, at long run, he must, whether he will or no".[54] (Althea echoes this in The Country Wife with her "women and fortune are truest still to those that trust 'em",[55] and her words sum up the idea that gives unity to that play). Gerrard reinforces the point in The Gentleman Dancing-Master:

---

50 - The Gentleman Dancing-Master, Wycherley, Plays p. 130.

51 - Op. cit. p. 155.

52 -

53 - Op. cit. p. 132.

54 - Op. cit. 139.

55 - The Country Wife, Dent's Restoration Plays, p 159.

> The wary fool is by his care betrayed,
> As cuckolds by their jealousy are made.[56]

He himself is stirred to jealousy when Paris informs him that he, Paris, is about to marry Hippolita, and Gerrard's ready to fight on it. Paris, however, refuses combat. He is such a blockhead that he tries to conform to two conflicting standards of behaviour. Almost in the same breath he says, "let me see the man can get my mistress from me, jarni! But he that loves must seem a little jealous",[57] and then, "there are some who say, jealousy is no more to be hid than a cough;- but it should never be discovered in me, if I had it, because it is not French at all - ventre bleu!"[58] Perhaps he hoped to reconcile the French and English, the précieuse and the realistic in his ineffable person. In any case, like Sparkish in The Country Wife, he is too much a fool to recognize when his possession may be threatened and too cowardly to resent it when it is. When his discomfiture is completed by the marriage of Gerrard and Hippolita he relinquishes matrimony for the honourable institution of keeping, and even Flirt enjoins him that he must never be jealous of the servants he is to provide her with.

Hippolita laughs at her lover in his mistake. "How! my surly, huffing, jealous, senseless, saucy master?"[59] After disabusing him, she teases him a little more by suggesting she may make him jealous again and calls it "plain dealing", adding "few women would have said so much".[60]

---

56 - The Gentleman Dancing-Master, p. 192.

57 - Op. cit. p. 137.

58 - Ibid.

59 - Op. cit. p. 223.

60 - Op. cit. p. 224.

"None," replies Gerrard, but those who would delight in a husband's jealousy, as the proof of his love and her honour".[61] To this, she retorts with spirit, "I differ from you in one point; for a husband's jealousy, which cunning men would pass upon their wives for a compliment, is the worst can be made 'em; for indeed, ... it is an affront to their honour ... so that upon the whole matter I conclude, jealousy in a gallant is humble true love, and the height of respect, and only an undervaluing of himself to overvalue her; but in a husband 'tis arrant sauciness, cowardice, and ill-breeding, and not to be suffered".[62] Whether Hippolita beneath her bantering tone is really relinquishing the contemporary mode and supporting a somewhat more complex and ethical view of the love-jealousy relation, or whether she is merely laying the first line of defence for the more successful conduct of the Love Game after and outside marriage, Wycherley gives us but a hint. In the epilogue he does "frankly own

> The character to be unnatural;
> Hippolita is not like you at all.[63]

If so, we may fairly conclude that since she differs from Gerrard, his interpretation of jealousy is the prevailing one - which is what we have been trying to show.

The whole matter is presented in dramatic form in The Country Wife produced in 1675. Ideas and incidents are borrowed from Molière's

---

61 - Ibid.

62 - Op. cit. p. 125.

63 - Op. cit. p. 242.

L'Ecole des Femmes (and L'Ecole des Maris) but the intention and achievement of the two dramatists are unlike. In each there is a study of a pathologically jealous man (Arnolphe and Pinchwife) but Wycherley seems to have set out to treat the subject exhaustively with almost a clinical touch. Three or four variations on the jealousy theme are so carefully interwoven that the play is a model of construction. Its closeness of fibre gives it unsurpassed dramatic impact; at the same time it is crammed with vivacity and wit and characters richly various and sharply satirized. To many it represents the masterpiece of the comedy of manners, not excepting The Way of the World, and is undeniably the peak of Wycherley's achievement. It is not without significance that he should have summoned up his forces to their full height for the treatment of this topic of jealousy in relation to love, for it lies at the core of Restoration comedy intrigue.

The Sparkish theme is obvious enough. He is the would-be wit trying and failing to sustain the current pose. "Why", he exclaims, "D'ye think I'll seem to be jealous like a country bumpkin?"[64] Actually, as Wycherley plainly reveals, Sparkish not only can and does feel jealousy, but he has no affection for Althea as a person with which he might try to justify it. He is too self-centred to take her to the theatre himself, leaving this to his rival Harcourt, because if he sat in the box with her he would be thought "no judge but of trimmings".[65] He does not object to a rival, even and especially after marriage; it will be "as good sauce as

---

64 - The Country Wife, Wycherley, Dent's Restoration Plays, p. 100.

65 - Op. cit. p. 102.

an orange to veal".[66] Even Horner, whose standards of taste are not exacting, finds this sets his teeth on edge and calls him a "damned rogue".[67]

At the first indication of possible guilt in Alithea, Sparkish assumes the worst on the mere word of Pinchwife. He reviles Alithea in the coarsest terms, admitting he never had any passion for her till now, for now he hates her. What pains him is his loss of face. "Could you find no easy country fool to abuse," he cries, "none but me, a gentleman of wit and pleasure about the town,"[68] His jealousy does not arise even from the rather base fear of losing a desired person, but from the even baser fear of losing social status by the loss of a potentially desirable "good" - the loss of a great wit's company would have cost him an equal pang for similar reasons.

The Alithea-Harcourt theme oscillates about the social mode. Alithea is willing to marry Sparkish because of his "want of jealousy which men of wit seldom want".[69] Her motive is not single, however. Her affection is not for Sparkish but for the freedom he represents. "Jealousy in a husband" she exclaims, "Heaven defend me from it ! it begets a thousand plagues to a poor woman, the loss of her honour, her quiet....nay, what's as bad almost, the loss of this town, that is, she's sent into the country, which is the last ill-usage of a husband to a wife, I think".[70]

Harcourt plays an interesting if slightly inconsistent part.

---

66 - Op. cit. p. 140.

67 - Ibid.

68 - Op. cit. p. 149.

69 - Op. cit. p. 124.

70 - Ibid.

Through most of the action he represents the typical Restoration gallant. But he reinforces his claims as a suitor by pointing out that Alithea has no obligation to Sparkish, as she seems to think, since she never had his love. "He wants, you see, jealousy, the only infallible sign of it".[71] This is the real orthodoxy of Restoration Comedy. Alithea, however, counters with heresy. "Love," she declares, "proceeds from esteem; he cannot distrust my virtue".[72] This, of course, if allowed to develop, would disrupt the comic mode altogether, and Wycherley hastily gets rid of it by making Alithea add, "besides, he loves me or he would not marry me",[73] which enables Harcourt to step back into the mode and be witty at her expense. Sparkish once takes on the moral tone: "that I am not jealous is a sign you are virtuous"[74] (to Alithea) and (to Harcourt) "I have that noble value for her that I cannot be jealous of her".[75] This is merely Sparkish paying the homage virtue owes to vice and Wycherley giving an extra twist to his comic effect by reference to the secondary external standard of human behaviour. The passage is really one of spirited and witty gallantry addressed to Alithea by Harcourt under Sparkish's nose.

When Alithea comes under suspicion and Sparkish believes her guilty of going to Horner's rooms, Alithea naturally finds it easy enough to break off the match with Sparkish, and her first emotion is fear lest

---

71 - Op. cit. p. 100.

72 - Ibid.

73 - Ibid.

74 - Op. cit. p. 115.

75 - Op. cit. p. 116.

the mock-marriage performed by Harcourt dressed up as a parson should have been real. Her inclination to Harcourt is confirmed by his absolute confidence in her innocence. "Madam," he declares, "have no trouble, you shall now see 'tis possible for me to love too without being jealous; I will not only believe your innocence myself but make all the world believe it".[76] Harcourt achieves the social mode with a flourish, but Wycherley immediately throws the absurdity of the mode and the code that accompanies it into vivid relief by his next few lines.

> Har. Horner, I must now be concerned for this lady's honour.
>
> Hor. And I must be concerned for a lady's honour too.
>
> Har. This lady has her honour and I will protect it.
>
> Hor. My lady (Margery Pinchwife) has not her honour, but has given it me to keep and I will preserve it.
>
> Har. I understand you not.
>
> Hor. I would not have you.
>
> Mrs. P. (peeping in behind) What's the matter with 'em all?[77]

Lucy the servant lies them all out of the imbroglio, and Margery's visit in disguise to Horner is put down to "the usual innocent revenge on a husband's jealousy".[78]

These are comparatively subsidiary themes. It is Horner who holds the guiding thread to this labyrinth of jealousy. Through him Wycherley achieves the reductio ad absurdum of the Restoration comic mode.

---

76 - Op. cit. p. 156.

77 - Op. cit. p. 156.

78 - Op. cit. p. 160.

It is Horner's distinction to have perceived the basic contradiction involved in the Love Game as played in Restoration comedy, namely, that a society cannot at one and the same time pursue exclusive possession in love and also avoid the stigma of jealousy. Nothing can guarantee security of possession (because, as we shall see from the nature of jealousy, it is an unattainable fiction) and the moment security is threatened or thought to be threatened, jealousy arises. Moreover, since in this small society the same men are pursuing the same women, insecurity and jealousy are inevitable complements of the chase. Horner concludes that he can rebut this dilemma by getting possession without appearing to do. He therefore puts it about through his physician that he is "an arrant French capon". This "good design" yields him all and more than the success he desires with the Fidgets, the Squeamishes, and Margery Pinchwife, and even "brings him off safe"[79] in the end.

Horner sees through every social sham and turns most of them to his own purposes. With women "'Tis scandal they would avoid, not men".[80] His "good design" takes care of this difficulty. With men, very often, their business is of more consequence to them than their womenfolk; if all suspicion of motives is removed, Horner is welcome to husbands as an escort for wives whom they wish to neglect without the appearance of doing so. Sir Jasper is delighted with Horner after his disability is made known "who before would not be acquainted with (him) out of jealousy".[81]

---

79 - Op. cit. p. 159.

80 - Op. cit. p. 88.

81 - Ibid.

Horner probably suspects that Pinchwife's case is pathological ("why, thou are mad with jealousy"),[82] but he takes full advantage of it just the same. He sees what it is grounded in, Pinchwife's personal frustration and inadequacy; makes him admit that he "only married to keep a whore to (himself) because "the jades would jilt (him)".[83]

Horner himself betrays no trace of jealousy. Like Casanova he seems to have mastered the art of giving and taking satisfaction without giving or taking offence. One woman is as good as another to him. "Ceremony is love and eating is as ridiculous as in fighting: falling on briskly is all should be done on those occasions".[84] It is not possession that interests him but the satisfaction of appetite; in other words, his is a physiological need and not that mental craving to dominate that enslaves most of the Restoration gallants. He is by nature resistant to the social mode and by ingenuity he circumvents it. His only concession to it and our only laugh at his expense is his acknowledgment that he must not "tell" on Margery. Wycherley, as we have noted, makes this obligation exquisitely ridiculous.

Nobody would claim for Horner that he was a man of sensitivity or moral feeling, but it is worth recognizing that he is no more of a cad than his competitors. He is merely more successful. One might even add on his behalf that, assuming some Restoration beauty could have lured or tricked him into marriage, he would have been a far better matrimonial risk than

---

82 - Op. cit. p. 139.

83 - Op. cit. p. 94.

84 - Op. cit. p. 152.

Courtal, Dorimant or Valentine with their pathologically jealous tendencies. To the devil his due: it is Horner who says "methinks wit is more necessary than beauty, and I think no woman ugly that has it, and no handsome woman agreeable without it".[85]

Finally there is Pinchwife. He is central to the play and through his relations with his wife gives to it its title and its main plot movement. Artistically, however, he tends to dwarf the rest of the comedy. His character is drawn in such detail and to such depth that he repeatedly shocks us by contrast with the superficial creatures who surround him. He is like some figure by Hogarth introduced into a Cobean cartoon. He has little or nothing to do with the social mode. Contemporary reality means little to him; he has given up the unequal struggle to conform, even in appearance, and, as the play progresses, lives more and more intensely in that private world that the jealous create to avoid any examination of and struggle with the reality of their relations with others.

At the start he has tried to conceal from his town acquaintance his marriage to an ignorant, stupid but beautiful country girl. Wit in a wife he thinks good for "nothing but to make a man a cuckold".[86] He is full of the fear and expectation of infidelity-hence his precautions. Through Horner and the others we get a good indication of the grounds of his fear; his "grumness of countenance", his "slovenliness of habit",[87] his age, which he tries to reduce from forty-nine to forty,[88] his inability

---

85 - Op. cit. p. 90.

86 - Op. cit. p. 94.

87 - Op. cit. p. 92.

88 - Op. cit. p. 93.

to keep a woman to himself.

He follows the well-recognized clinical pattern of jealous behaviour with paranoid tendencies. He keeps his wife up close; forbids her to wear her best gown; will not have her sit among the gentry at the play; in his obsession with the temptations of the town that might make her betray him, he reveals them all to her. That his is the possessive love attitude that aims at complete possession and dominance, his very words betray: "Let me go look to my freehold".[89]

He takes his wife to see the town dressed in boys clothes, which gives Dorimant and Harcourt the opportunity to torment him by praising Margery's beauty and kissing her. He makes her go over and over again the account of her brief visit to Horner and dictates a letter for her to send to Horner repudiating his "nauseous kisses and embraces";[90] at every turn he prefigures his coming betrayal. In action he might be drawn from a psychologist's casebook. Margery is afraid lest, if her husband see her real letter to Horner, Pinchwife may come home and "pinch her or kill her squirrel".[91] He threatens her with a penknife, "I will stab out those eyes that cause my mischief",[92] and with a sword.[93] At the last he "offers to draw upon his wife",[94] and when Horner intervenes, upon him, crying

---

89 - Op. cit. p. 102.

90 - Op. cit. p. 130.

91 - Op. cit. p. 138.

92 - Op. cit. p. 130.

93 - Op. cit. p. 142.

94 - Op. cit. p. 157.

"You then shall go first, 'tis all one to me".[95] His psychotic tendencies have developed into mania, and it is rather by theatrical convention than psychological probability that he is permitted to relapse into sanity at the final curtain.

When we come to know this play and appreciate its wealth of wit and creative abundance, it is odd to recall Lord Macaulay's verdict, pronounced in 1849: "the only thing original about Wycherley, the only thing which he could furnish from his own mind in inexhaustible abundance, was profligacy".[96]

Wycherley's last play The Plain Dealer uses jealousy as a mobile of plot and dramtic interest towards the end, but in a manner which is as implicit as it was explicit in The Country Wife - and, indeed, in all the other comedies considered. There are only two overt references to jealousy. One of them is thrown off by Vernish when he is uncertain whether or not his wife Olivia has been betraying him with Manly. He exclaims, "I am distracted more with doubt than jealousy"[97] and proceeds immediately to plan detection and revenge. Vernish, however, is merely a man "of extraordinary merit in villainy", as Manly says. It is self-interest that attaches him to Olivia and he really exhibits neither love nor jealousy. Manly has a violent but unacknowledged jealousy of Olivia, and when he discovers her

---

95 - Ibid.

96 - T.B. Macaulay, "Comic Dramatists of the Restoration" in Critical and Historical Essays, London, 1909, 2 Vols.

97 - The Plain Dealer, Wycherley, Plays, p. 495.

betrayal of him he curses her fluently and comprehensively; When he comes to curse her love he cries, "And the curse of scorn, jealousy, or despair on your love!"[98] Because of the rather special nature of the jealousy interest in this play we shall examine it in the following chapter in connection with the consideration of the jealousy emotion.

We have now examined the attitude towards jealousy of three writers of realistic Restoration comedy; Etherege and Wycherley, the two most eminent, and Sedley, a typical figure. It is only possible to indicate briefly that Shadwell and Dryden show precisely the same pattern of ideas when they write comedy in the social mode.

Dryden's Marriage a la Mode produced in 1673 is one of the very few in which he aims at the contemporary tone, and even here he confines it to one section only, the other being heroic verse drama. Rhodophil is tired of Doralice his wife and pursues Melantha whom his friend Palamede is about to marry, while Palamede makes love to Doralice. Doralice is a charming and accomplished flirt but unlike most Restoration ladies in her situation she does not appear ever seriously to intend to deceive her husband. She admits "it would anger me, if (Rhodophil) should love Melantha"[99] and that she has a "strange temptation to make him jealous in revenge"[100]. When Rhodophil and Palamede are about to come to blows

---

98 - Op. cit. p. 419.

99 - Marriage a la Mode, Selected Plays of Dryden, Mermaid Series with Introduction by George Saintsbury, p. 258.

100 - Op. cit. p. 389.

in jealous anger over the discovery of their respective intentions to betray one another, Doralice intervenes.

> Dor. But you can neither of you be jealous of what you love not.
>
> Rho. Faith, I am jealous, and this makes me partly suspect that I love you better than I thought.
>
> Dor. Pish! A mere jealousy of honour.[101]

Being reassured that it is genuine jealousy of love, she is well satisfied.

> Dor. Then I have found my account in raising your jealousy. O! 'tis the most delicate sharp sauce to a cloyed stomach; it will give you a new edge, Rhodophil.[102]

The quartet resigns itself to the status quo and there is no cuckoldry. The moral situation may be better than in Wycherley, but the tone is more depraved. Doralice's commendation of jealousy is precisely what, when Sparkish uttered it, set Horner's teeth on edge, and to see a revival of the comedy is to confirm one in the judgment that Dryden was unable to write to the social mode without forcing his wit. He was not in tune with it sufficiently to allow him to be lightheartedly amusing as he can be in his romantic comedies.

Shadwell's most lasting work is in the field of low life rather than high life comedy, but he wrote a great many plays combining the two. They start with mediocre approximation to the social mode and move progressively away from it towards realism in low life and a sentimental, moral and rational tone in fashionable scenes. The Sullen Lovers, his first

---

101 - Op. cit. p. 323.

102 - Op. cit. p. 324.

play produced in 1668, runs fairly true to type. Caroline appears to have a jealousy for Lovel in relation to Lady Vaine and Lovel promptly exclaims, "This jealousy makes me believe you love me".[103] Even Stanford manages to extract a jealousy from Emilia's failure to rebuff the fools who intrude upon them.

Profiting by Etherege's She Would if She Could, Shadwell rang the changes on the Lady Cockwood situation over and over again; she appears as Mrs. Woodly in Epsom Wells (1672) Lady Gimcrack in The Virtuoso (1776) and Mrs. Hackwell in The Volunteers (1792). As in Etherege, the love-jealousy duality keeps the plot in motion, and the two emotions constantly appear in verbal juxtaposition. At the height of the complicated intrigue of Epsom Wells Lucia says, "'tis probably Woodly has done this for love and jealousy of Carolina and his wife for love and jealousy of Bevil".[104] In The Virtuoso Sir Formal Trifle is described by Longvil as "a rival so conceited of his own parts that he can never be jealous of others".[105] But when Bruce and Longvil "transplant" their loves for Clarinda and Miranda because the ladies reciprocate their affection, though for the wrong individuals, we realize that we are moving away from reality towards romantic farce.

---

103 - The Sullen Lovers, Thomas Shadwell, The Complete Works, London 1927, 5 Vols. Vol. I. p. 28.

104 - Epsom Wells, Thomas Shadwell, op. cit. Vol. II, p. 139.

105 - The Virtuoso, Thomas Shadwell, Works, Vol. III, p. 107.

Indeed the only other comedy with any pretension to the mode is The Volunteers which was played sixteen years later and is a reversion to the type of Shadwell's early work. Here too, the mode is vitiated when Mrs. Hackwell is unmasked at the end before everyone amid expressions of disapprobation.

Jealousy is treated in some of the intervening work but the moral censor is always present to condemn people like Mrs. Termagent in The Squire of Alsatia of 1688, and even in Bury Fair, though jealousy over Gertrude provokes Wildish and Bellamy to a duel, they embrace afterwards and "proceed like men of reason".[106]

Shadwell's work is less interesting for itself than as a commentary on the work of the more brilliant writers of realistic Restoration comedy. It indicates how the social mode was gradually broken down by the joint attack of heart and head. The sentimental and moral impulses of men and the rational estimate of their necessities imperceptibly but irreparably sapped the foundations of that private structure that Restoration society built for itself upon the sands of self-sufficiency. To this Restoration version of the Ivory Tower we can now turn our attention.

---

106 - Bury Fair, Thomas Shadwell, Works, Vol. V, p. 349.

Chapter IV

JEALOUSY AND RESTORATION SOCIETY

The Restoration comedy we have been examining shows three peculiarities: it invariably associates love with jealousy; typically it regards jealousy as a criterion or invariable concomitant of love; it betrays a preoccupation with the jealousy-love situation that verges on obsession. Looking both forward and back in time from the Restoration, one discerns ~~there seems to be~~ no other period in English literature when any one of these statements could legitimately be made about comedy or drama in general. When one considers the prodigious number of plays dealing wholly or in part with love and then the comparatively small proportion of these that also deal with jealousy, the Restoration association of the two emotions appears remarkable. When one further tries to find any body of work where jealousy is regarded as both inevitable and useful, if not indeed admirable, as a sort of thermometer of the emotional temperature, Restoration comedy begins to look unique.

It is not that jealousy is commonly treated as abnormal. The usual Elizabethan attitude, for example, is expressed by the King in "The Maid's Tragedy" when he speaks to Evadne of Amintor's reaction to the knowledge that his bride is the King's mistress:

> What could he do
> ..... But ruin thee for ever, if he had not killed thee?
> He could not bear it thus: he is as we,
> Or any other wronged man. [1]

Actually when Evadne repents, Amintor forgives. He feels the jealous impulse but overcomes it.

---

1 - The Maid's Tragedy, Beaumont & Fletcher, Eight Famous Elizabethan Plays, New York, 1932, p. 380

Similarly Frankford the deceived husband in Heywood's "Woman Killed with Kindness" is slow to believe ill, not having the jealousy disposition to a marked degree. He trusts his wife and his friend "in both their loves I am so confident" [2] but when proof is plain he, too, feels the impulse to violent revenge, and only the chance intervention of a maid stays him from physical violence. A moment's calm is enough to restore him to reason and he is content to kill his wife with the kindness of banishment.

Roughly speaking the typical attitude seems to be that jealousy will arise when the security of the lover is threatened and will produce an impulse to revenge, but it can and ought to be restrained. Further comparisons of the treatment of jealousy with Restoration handling may be illuminating, but they can be more readily and more profitably made if we first set out what is known about the nature of jealousy itself, or rather of the jealous personality.

In the very word jealousy, the semantic and psychological are meshed. It is used in two senses: as a bad feeling experienced when one does not possess the advantages that another person has, i.e., rivalry jealousy; and as an attachment or zeal for someone or something, i.e., jealousy-zeal, as in "jealous of one's reputation". Etymologically these senses have fused. The "Lord Thy God" who "is a jealous God", is in the Vulgate "Deus Zelotes". Romanized by the suffix "osus" and deriving the "j" from "jal" or "coq", the cock being a jealousy symbol, He becomes the jealous God of the Bible, proscribing all rival gods under pain of punishment to the

---

2 - A Woman Killed with Kindness, Thomas Heywood, Eight Famous Elizabethan Plays, New York, 1932, p. 168.

third and fourth generation.[3]

Part of the work of LaGache in his book "La Jalousie Amoureuse" is to demonstrate that at the origin of jealousy there is a hunger which is insatiable, either because reality is refused to it, or because the monstrous intensity of the craving does not permit of its being assuaged. The question then arises as to what is its connection with love.

It is a matter of personal experience or observation or both that love may exist without jealousy. This fact is at the bottom of our feeling of resistance to the Restoration view. On the other hand, it is certainly true that jealousy cannot exist without love. Both the précieuses lovers and the Restoration ones are always getting tangled up in sophistical arguments on this point. In fact, more than one kind of love is being talked about. LaGache, following Pichon, distinguishes three main forms of love: one, amour-communion, the other two amour-captif and amour-oblatif, which we may render as possessive love and oblative love. His analysis is confined to sexual love.

Possessive love, as the name indicates, is that which aims at total and exclusive possession of the object of love; it implies jealousy; always comprises the anticipation of possible frustration. The jealous man, impelled by the drive for total possession, sets up an "ideal" or fiction impossible of attainment, since under the best conditions the object of love never presents itself in toto, but only by aspects; that is, there is always much left over of the loved object which the possessive lover feels he cannot "have".[4] There may be in addition deliberate withdrawal of love or

---

3 - From a "Special study on Jealousy in Romance Languages" by Margot Cryzwacz, cited by Daniel LaGache in La Jalousie Amoureuse, Paris, 1947, in 3 vols. Vol. II p. 6.

4 - La Jalousie Amoureuse, Daniel LaGache, Vol. II, p. 60.

rejection on the object's part or even a rival introduced into the situation. Consequently jealous love is an unremitting conflict with reality: the opposition of the jealous lover's fiction of "ideal" possession and the real fact of the impossibility of its attainment.

We have tried to show that Horner perceived the contradiction in the social mode (the impossibility of combining non-jealousy with possessive love) and dodged its social inconveniences. It may be added that the Love Game itself is a euphuism for the Sex War. The battle dress of Restoration society is elegant; the attacks, retreats, skirmishes and bombardments are conducted in form; the language of negotiation and surrender is witty and refined, but the activity is aggression and the object conquest. It would be difficult to find a considerable passage on the subject in Restoration comedy where the vocabulary does not draw heavily on the military.[5]

Further, possessive love tends to treat the object as a thing, hence the occurrence of jealousy towards other non-human objects which are seen as potential rivals - such is Pinchwife's jealousy of Margery's squirrel.

Oblative love is the same type of relationship, but here the lover aims at self-absorption or immolation to the beloved. This excludes the possibility of jealousy. There is an element of this type in the précieuse insistance on the lover's subjection to the will of his mistress.

Love-communion differs from these two types of love relationship in that it recognizes the "otherness" of the partner, or, in everyday

---

5 - This of course does not mean that we are called upon to pass adverse judgment on the players in the Love Game and reintroduce the sour moral note that bedevilled the criticism of Restoration comedy for so long. On the contrary, the contrast between the elegance of their pretensions and the crudity of their purposes heightens the comic effect.

language, the individuality and hence value of the person loving and the person loved. It envisages not simply the loved object but the whole love relation of which the lovers are each only a part. Such a love is no more "ideal" and no less "ideal" than possessive love; both are "ideal" in the sense that they represent a way of thinking about a situation. Neither is it any less real a love than the others. It is different. It excludes the possibility of jealousy. (To some extent the précieuse conception of love was like this, but it was vitiated by overpitching its claims. Love Communion has sexual love as one of its elements. The précieuse tried to expel this element as far as possible. To this particular form of wishful thinking the Restoration court circle provided a not unsalutory and certainly inevitable reaction.

Clinical observation of the onset of jealousy supports the view that it is not the presence of a rival that is basic to jealousy but an anterior sense of frustration and dissatisfaction. The idea that one is not loved is considerably more important than the idea that the beloved loves someone else [6] - clearly what ails Valentine in "Love in a Wood".

This is borne out by the fact that the struggle of the jealous man with the world characteristically takes the form of a struggle against the partner, rather than against the rival. Thus Manly in the Plain Dealer easily deals with Vernish, the agent of his betrayal, in a few contemptuous words. It is to Olivia that his vengeance is directed; she had

---

6 - Op. cit. Vol. II pp. 41-2.

been his one star shining in a naughty world and proves not to have loved him as he thought.

The typical representation of the partner by the jealous is as something which will fulfil his impossible aspirations. This may take various forms, sometimes erotomania, quite often idealization. This is certainly Manly's manner of representing his partner to himself, though his "ideal" is an unusual one, i.e., the complete misanthropist. In addition to possessing incomparable beauty, she alone "is all truth, and hates the lying, masking, daubing world as I do: for which I love her and for which I think she dislikes not me". [7]

His discovery of Olivia's treachery appears to his reason as a release from the slavery of self-deception. He has "been made prize by love, who like a pirate, takes you by spreading false colours". [8]

Olivia herself is acute enough to see what her hold upon him could be. "I knew he loved his own singular moroseness so well, as to dote upon any copy of it; wherefore I feigned a hatred to the world too". [9]

It is interesting to notice that in this matter Manly is like Othello. Idealization of the partner appears to be Othello's manner of representing Desdemona. His words are plain:

---

7 - The Plain Dealer, William Wycherley, Plays, p. 393.

8 - Op. cit. p. 419.

9 - Op. cit. p. 471.

> But there, where I have garnered up my heart,
> Where either I must live or bear no life;
> The fountain from the which my current runs
> Or else dries up; to be discarded thence! [10]

Indeed, he deifies her; envisages her as the source of his life.

The jealous have a personal world that differs from the personal world that we all have with ourselves at the nub in that the structure is impaired by the fixed idea. The jealous man concentrates with passion on the objects of jealous love which we have noted, domination and possession. The more he concentrates on these unreal objects, the more indifferent he becomes to the values and obligations of practical life, until total absorption in the unreal conflict renders him wholly indifferent to reality. Hence Pinchwife's indifference to the opinion of his associates and the possible consequences of his acts; hence Othello's otherwise astounding dismissal of the real world:

> Farewell content!
> Farewell the plumed troop, and the big wars
> That make ambition virtue! O, farewell!
> ..... Farewell! Othello's occupation's gone! [11]

To understand fully the role of jealousy in society we need also to have a clear idea of non-jealous love, or <u>amour-communion</u>. LaGache indicates its place: "inversement, celui qui s'affranchit de l'envoûtement jaloux se détourne de l'agression: il ... cherche à dépasser le conflit dans la recherche de la vérité, la création de valeurs, la construction d'une communauté. La description de l'expérience jalouse ouvre ainsi la voie à une compréhension plus vaste de l'existence de l'homme parmi les hommes". [12]

---

10 - <u>Othello</u>, Act IV. Sc. 2. l. 56-9

11 - <u>Othello</u>, Act III. Sc. 3. l. 349-358.

12 - LaGache, Op. cit. Vol. II. p. 350.

Amour-communion is what Fromm calls productive love.[13] He acknowledges his debt to Freud's theory of the development of the libido but develops and extends it as a theory of productive loving and thinking, a normative theory of productive living. Productiveness is "man's ability to use his powers and to realize the potentialities inherent in him".[14] It is not "power over", but "power to", or potency. "Where potency is lacking, man's relatedness to the world is perverted into a desire to dominate, to exert power over others as though they were things .... Domination springs from impotence .."[15]

"To love a person productively implies to care for and to feel responsible for his life ... the growth and development of all his human powers",[16] but care and responsibility are blind if not guided by respect for and knowledge of the person's individuality, that is, by looking at him and knowing him as he uniquely is. Such a love is an activity, an expression of productiveness. It is rooted in the capacity to love. Further this capacity to love one person cannot be separated from the love for "man". Since to love one person productively means to be "related to his human core, to him as representing mankind".[17]

---

13 - Man for Himself, Erich Fromm, New York, 1947.

14 - Op. cit. p. 84.

15 - Op. cit. p. 88.

16 - Op. cit. p. 100.

17.- Op. cit. p. 101.

Also, (and here the divergence from Freud is complete) to be able to love others, one must be able to love oneself. [18] This is the grain of truth in the Restoration attitude, so characteristic of the wits and would-be wits, Dorimant, Sparkish, Valentine et. al. that they must not appear jealous, for that would imply self-deprecation. Since they so signally fail to avoid jealousy in practice, it may be concluded that they did not in fact value themselves very highly; that they did not love themselves or anybody else very much, because they could not.

"When power is used productively the world is not merely perceived, reproductively, but conceived generatively, by enlivening and recreating this material through ... one's own mental and emotional powers". [19] This is Aristotle's "activity of the soul which follows or implies a rational principle"; it is Spinoza's "By virtue and power I understand the same thing", or Goethe's "Creative Power". The concensus of thought among many of the greatest minds is remarkable, and Fromm is quick to point it out.

He draws the conclusion that from the very nature of man it follows that "the power to act creates a need to use this power and that the failure to use it results in dysfunction and unhappiness". Psychological evidence strongly supports this view, since the "neurosis is the result of a conflict between man's inherent powers and those forces which block the development" [20] and neurosis can be cured when the conflict can be resolved.

---

18 - Fromm points out that a logical fallacy is involved in saying that self love and love for others are incompatible, since "I" and another are both human beings and there can be no concept of man in which "I" am not included. He reinforces his view from psycho-analytic experience with neurotic "unselfishness", where the cure is effected, not by curing the symptoms complained of, such as fatigue, depression, failure in love relationships, etc., but by curing the "unselfishness" which is the chief symptom and the mask of the patient's self-centredness and hostility to life.

19 - Op. cit. p. 88. This is roughly the distinction between the realist and the interpretive attitude, Etherege having predominently the former, and Wycherley the latter.

20 - Op. cit. p. 220.

If we relate the work of LaGache and Fromm (and a detailed examination shows how closely related their thinking is), we have a pattern roughly like this: jealousy when it develops into a consistent mode of behaviour is neurotic. Neurosis arises from blocks to man's effort to be potent. Therefore in a society where the blocks are many and powerful, neuroses will tend to appear and the jealous neurosis among them. The greater the preoccupation with the activity of sex relations to the exclusion of other activities, the more the neurosis is likely to take the form of jealousy.

We can now examine Restoration society, or rather that small section of it, the court circle and its satelites, with which we are concerned, and form an idea of how well or ill it fits our psychological structure. The homogeneity of the social group that wrote the plays and went to see them and was represented in them has often been remarked. It may be useful then to consider together some of the characteristics of the society depicted in the plays and of the "real" society described by historians. The display of the jealousy disposition has already been illustrated from the plays. If anyone for a moment supposes that the Restoration writers of comedy stressed the jealousy-love aspect of the comic mode because it afforded an easy means of getting comic effect (when individuals showed lack of adaptation to it) he has only to read the Memoirs of the Count Grammont to rediscover that truth can be stronger than fiction. Antony Hamilton knew the court circle intimately and his purported memoirs of the Count [21] display precisely the same preoccupation with gallantry and the love-jealousy theme as the plays. A good deal of nonsense has been written about the enlightened manner in which Restoration society kept itself above the mean emotion of jealousy. Charles II

---

21 - Memoirs of the Court of Charles the Second, Count Grammont, London, 1859.

is a favourite instance. In fact Charles was not of a particularly jealous nature; he indulged appetite rather than a passion for possession. He was jealous enough, however, to banish the Duke of Richmond for his connection with Miss Stewart, and interestingly enough Frances Stewart, whose beauty is commemorated in the Brittania of the English coinage, was said by many to have been the only woman Charles "loved" and the woman for whom he planned to divorce his queen. [22] Lady Castlemaine, despite the freedom she expected for herself, was bitterly jealous of Charles. She was suspected by contemporaries of giving jalop to Mary Davis, a dancer who caught the King's attention, and she most probably betrayed Miss Stewart to him; [23] she made frequent and noisy scenes. [24] The Duchess of York was said to have poisoned Lady Denham to prevent her becoming the Duke's mistress. Wycherley's wife is reputed to have watched him so closely that he was only permitted to drink at a tavern opposite their house, [25] and it is a fact that Lady Etherege did not take her husband's resounding affair with Julia of Ratisbon in a spirit attuned to the social mode. Etherege wrote her a very nasty letter on the subject.[26] The period is disfigured by duels provoked by jealousy; that between Jermyn and Howard is merely one of the more notorious.[27] The evidence in the diaries and memoirs of the time is colourful and convincing.

The next most striking feature of Restoration society is the idleness of its members. Not only do they do nothing but pursue the great business of the town, but they despise anyone who does do anything. Courtal

---

22 - Memoirs of the Count Grammont, p. 117, p. 313, p. 315.

23 - Pepys' Diary, Jan. 14th, 1666-7.

24 - Memoirs of Count Grammont, p. 250-1, pp. 310-312.

25 - Related by Lord Macaulay in his Essay on the Comic Dramatists of the Restoration.

26 - The Letter Book.

27 - Memoirs of Count Grammont, p. 120.

is so far gone that he even hates the "fatigue" of finding out likely mistresses.[28] Harcourt is reputed to hate marriage "as much as business or bad wine".[29] All the gallants are idle and most without any visible means of support. It is only the social pariahs who "do" - the Sir Olivers, Sir Jaspers and Gripes. Business of any kind, especially the business of the city, is anathema. Cheapside is the enemy; the symbol of all that is hostile to the elegant isolation of the mode; compact of Whiggery and Dissent, it is consciously or unconsciously perceived as the threat to the existence of the mode and the existence of the society that maintains the mode.

This hostility is easy enough to understand and even to sympathize with, but it extended to almost all other forms of participation in human affairs, whether ecclesiastical, governmental, naval, legal or military. Every play we have considered, when it mentions the church or its members, breathes a spirit of contempt, with no exceptions made in favour of episcopalians - indeed the private chaplain of the Church of England is the most despised of all as he was in fact the most degraded in status. In reality "ecclesiastical life does not appear to have attracted a high proportion of men from old or distinguished families".[30]

The law is not well regarded. This was perhaps a somewhat more justifiable disdain. Judges who had formerly held office under the Commonwealth "during good behaviour", had their tenure restricted at the Restoration to "durante bene placito" - or for the duration of the King's good pleasure. Wycherley, Etherege and Sedley all had first hand acquaintance with

---

28 - She Would if She Could, Works, p. 122.

29 - The Country Wife, Wycherley, Restoration Plays, p. 99.

30 - England in the Reign of Charles II, David Ogg, Oxford, 1934, 2 Vols. Vol. I. p. 135.

the Middle Temple and Wycherley has given us in excoriating terms his view of its products in Act II of The Plain Dealer. "It was under the later Stuarts," Ogg says, "that the English Bench reached its lowest depths."[31]

The army did not appeal. Horror of a standing army was nearly universal after the Civil War. The militia, however, drew on the society we are describing and Sedley was a typical officer. When the Dutch sailed up the Medway and could almost certainly have bombarded London from London Bridge had they chosen to - at this time, June 13th, 1667, Sedley was probably on a party with Nell Gwynne and Lord Buckhurst at Epsom,[32] and he certainly does not seem to have taken any steps against the danger of invasion, as he was still there in August.

The navy evoked a little more response, partly because the Duke of York's devotion had rendered it attractive, and partly because of its tradition of heroic exploit under Elizabeth and Cromwell. It was, however, merely the part-time services of dangerous amateurs that society afforded, the "gentlemen captains" whom Pepys deplored. Men like Buckingham might be given command of a ship and men like Brouncker entrusted with orders.[33] Wycherley served in one or other of the Dutch Wars, probably the Second, and it is fascinating to see how his experience cracks the veneer of the mode. Manly abuses his sailor servants but gives them his last twenty pounds in the world,[34] justifying it to Freeman by saying, "Wouldst have the poor, honest

---

31 - Op. cit. p. 135.

32 - Sir Charles Sedley, V. de Sola Pinto, London, 1927, p. 104.

33 - The former was rated the worst of all the "gentlemen captains", Ogg tells us, andBrouncker, who was the Duke of York's secretary and favourite, was responsible for the escape of the Dutch fleet in the Second Dutch war. The Duke gave orders for swift pursuit and went to bed: Brouncker later issued orders, purporting to come from his master, to shorten sail.

34 - The Plain Dealer, Wycherley, op. cit. p. 450

brave fellows want?"[35] He carries over the same incongruous note of pity and approbation to a veteran of the Civil Wars; tells Oldfox to "go look out the fellow I saw just now here, that walks with his sword and stockings out at heels, ... Go to him, poor fellow; he is fasting, and has not yet the happiness this morning to stink of brandy and tobacco ..."[36]

There was some participation in diplomatic and governmental service, but typically it was spasmodic and incompetent. Painstaking and sustained service is the exceptional contribution of men like Halifax and the Duke of Ormand. Palmer speaks of the artistic satisfaction Etherege took in composing a good dispatch. This was very well, but with it went a profound scorn for the task of politics. "The business of the diet is only fit to entertain those insects in politics who crawl under the trees in St. James' Park",[37] he wrote in 1687. Had Etherege studied with more interest the activities of those political insects he might have had a keener insight into the realities of the English political situation and been spared his ignominious flight to Paris when his Royal master abruptly vacated the English throne some fourteen months later.

This attitude towards human affairs was not compensated for by a productive participation in art or science. There was some dilettante verse and playing on the guitar and dabbling in chemical experiment, but apart from the comedies and some poetry from Sedley and Rochester this society offers little to compare with the court productions of the Elizabethan or

---

35 - Ibid.

36 - Op. cit. p. 445.

37 - The Letter Book, Etherege, October 1687.

even the Jacobean period. The comedies, it may be objected, are justification enough for any society. But the attempt is not to indict the society but to show what it was like; three or four outstanding dramatists are not a society. This Restoration social group lived unproductively. Its idleness is not the cultivated leisure of aristocracy but the inculcated lethargy of obsolescence.

When we recall the childhood of most of the rather young men who were the core of, and set the tone for, this society, we may also recall LaGache's findings: jealousy is marked by an anterior sense of frustration; the idea of not being loved is considerably more important than the idea that the beloved loves someone ales; the affective basis of jealousy is anxiety, due to the emptiness of not being satisfied. Typically these men and women had spent their formative years abroad in a nomadic existence, moving with the court. Often they lost one or both their parents and lacked the disciplines and affections of home life. Most lost part or all of their estates by the sequestrations and taxes of the Commonwealth.[38] The pivot of their existence and their allegiance was an exiled King who was nineteen when his father was executed and his mother reduced to dependent misery. Clarendon describes the result: "Parents had no authority over their children nor children any obedience or submission to their parents;" but "everyone did that which was good in his own eyes".[39]

---

38 - It is interesting to note the difference between Sedley and Wycherley. The Sedley family, though they escaped lightly because they had a foot in both camps, paid a "tax" of £375; Lady Sedley was held for some days in London, and part of her land in Linconshire was seized, according to Pinto in Sir Charles Sedley, pp. 31-5. Wycherley's father, on the other hand, profited by the Civil War; he was steward to the Marquis of Winchester and when the Marquis' estate was sequestered in 1651 Daniel Wycherley borrowed £30,000 to buy it back, taking over the stewardship for life. Wycherley did not come by birth and breeding to the charmed circle, but by his talent.

39 - The Life of Edward, Earl of Clarendon, etc. Oxford, 1857, I. p. 305.

With this heredity and early environment they returned to a society marked "with a taint of a peculiar and of a most malignant kind".[40] Macaulay's flamboyant exaggerations have been toned down by later and more precise historians, but his purple patch on the political tone of Restoration society, though it has since been corroborated and supplemented by other scholars, has been surpassed by none. "In the course of a few years," he writes, "they had seen the ecclesiastical and civil polity of their country repeatedly changed. They had seen an Episcopal Church persecuting Puritans, a Puritan Church persecuting Episcopalians, ... They had seen hereditary Monarchy abolished and restored. They had seen the Long Parliament thrice supreme in the state, and thrice dissolved amidst the curses and laughter of millions. .... They had seen a new representative system devised, tried and abandoned. ... They had seen great masses of property violently transferred from Cavaliers to Roundheads, and from Roundheads back to Cavaliers. One who in such an age is determined to attain civil greatness must renounce all thought of consistency..... A statesman so trained .... has no faith in any doctrine, no zeal for any cause .... no reverence for prescription .... no hope of improvement".[41] What Macauley says of the political tone is equally applicable to the tone of society, for the same reasons.

Nor did this environment improve. It was almost as though fate itself was hammering home the futility of any productive effort. Physical disaster, war, political and religious agitations made life both lurid and uncertain. The Plague struck London in 1665 in the middle of the second Dutch War and the Court removed to Salisbury and Oxford. It was a poor man's disease and society survived unscathed, but one out of every seven people died

---

40 - History of England, Lord Macauley, London, 1889, Vol. I. p. 89.

41 - Op. cit. p. 90.

in the city of London in 1665. It had scarcely disappeared in the provinces by autumn of the following year when the Great Fire destroyed the greater part of medieval London. The Plague might be an Act of God, but the hand of the Papist was seen in the Fire, and signs and portents such as these prepared men's minds for the frightful fabrications of the Popish Plot.[42]

The political atmosphere was unhealthy. The body politic passed through a series of agitations, and the Plot was only the crisis of a febrile condition. Clarendon was banished in 1667 as the scapegoat for the unsatisfactory conduct of the war, when he was in fact odious to the King for promoting Miss Stewart's marriage, to the Commons as a restraint upon their liberty, and to Charles' personal favourites as a rival for power. The Cabal (five of these personal councillors) followed, and they are associated with the two secret treaties of Dover, which are perhaps the low-water mark of English diplomatic negotiation. Both were secret and one was bogus. The bogus one was kept secret from the people because it arranged for Louis of France to give £300,000 in exchange for English help in attacking the Dutch by sea, (and the people were rapidly coming round to the now traditional view of English interests vis-à-vis the lowland coast of Europe and towards Catholic powers). The real treaty was kept secret from everyone except Clifford, a Catholic, and Arlington, a crypto-Catholic, and a very few others whom Charles could trust. This was because it provided for Charles to declare himself and his country submissive to the Catholic faith at the earliest feasible date - in return for another £200,000. The horrid truth was suppressed but horrifying rumours filled the vaccuum.

Great men, both Whig and Tory, were executed on perjured

---

42 - England in the Reign of Charles II, Ogg, Vol. I. p. 307

evidence, sometimes sworn to by the same discredited informers, Stafford for an unproven part in the Popish Plot, Sidney and Russell for unproven complicity in the Rye House Plot. And all the time the fundamental struggle between King and Commons went on, now turning on the use of the prerogative, now on the direction of policy, but always basically a struggle for control of money and power.

The religious issue added to the climate of uncertainty and fear. Men's minds were exercised by questions as to whether Charles was a Roman Catholic; whether James would marry a Catholic; and if he should succeed to the throne. Charles II's Declaration of Indulgence of 1672 (aimed at lightening the penalties on Roman Catholics) was withdrawn in the following year, and the Test Act took its place, revealing that the Duke of York was indeed a Catholic. In such circumstances it was easy enough for Shaftesbury to believe he might promote the Popish Plot as a means of bringing himself to power and the Duke of Monmouth to the throne. But the scheme recoiled upon Shaftesbury and the Whigs; he fled the country, and the Bill to exclude the Duke of York from the throne was defeated.

Over and above all these tangible troubles was a further source of distress for the society. At a time when the people of England were for the most part deeply religious and passionately interested in the doctrinal and political organization of their beliefs, society was without belief in the existence of God. Nor had it the Voltairean sagacity to perceive the necessity of inventing one. It had no faith; neither the irrational faith based on submission to non-rational authority, nor that rational faith which is based on productive intellectual and emotional activity, on which all scientific hypothesis must ultimately rest, any enduring political or social organization,

and the very ability of an individual to make a promise, secure in the faith that he has a continuing self that will be able to fulfil his pledge. The nearest approach it made to faith was devotion to the King. Etherege read the Hind and the Panther and wrote "I shall never turn my religion, which teaches me to be always obedient and faithful to the King my master".[43] It is scarcely comfortable to contemplate a society with a weakness so like our own. Fromm has said of twentieth century society "Our moral problem is man's indifference to himself. .... We have made ourselves into instruments for purposes outside ourselves, ... we experience and treat ourselves as commodities ... our own powers have become alienated from ourselves. We have become things and our neighbors have become things. The result is that we feel powerless and despise ourselves for our impotence. Since we do not trust our own power, we have no faith in man, no faith in ourselves or in what our own powers can create".[44] He could have written in like terms with equal justice of Restoration society.

In an environment, then, of physical disaster and political and religious uncertainty and without a sustaining faith in God or man, Restoration society grew old without growing up. It did not try to grapple with a life that was, in all conscience, difficult enough, but to elude it. Its object was to maintain its own existence without participating in any other. For this the basic necessity, as for Charles himself, was money. Money would buy a "place", and a "place" once legitimately obtained by purchase, was regarded as a sort of "freehold", a property only to be forfeited in case of the most flagrant misdemeanour,[45] a seventeenth century concept offering no

---

43 - Quoted by Palmer in The Comedy of Manners, p. 41

44 - Man for Himself, Erich Fromm, p. 248.

45 - The Reign of Charles II, Ogg, Vol. I. p. 115.

difficulty to a Canadian accustomed to the idea of political patronage.

The personal and, so-to-speak, class situation of Restoration society made money extremely difficult to come by. We have noted that the typical courtier had lost all or part of his estates. This situation was aggravated by what we should call a rising Cost of Living index due to the expansion of trade, colonial development, the prosperity of the woolen, cotton and linen industries, the rising price of corn. Further, the English system of primo-geniture and entailing of estates meant that all male members of a family but one had to find other sources than inherited landed property with which to support themselves. These factors combined to make it increasingly difficult for them to buy places, while at the same time they rendered it progressively easier for the rising class of capitalists and financiers to outbid them.

Only a few solutions were possible. They might enter the professions or join in the sordid pursuits of the grazier, the merchant or the capitalist-employer. This, as we have seen, they for a time refused to do. The estrangement between the business classes and the landed gentry was never complete, but at this time it was nearly so.[46]

One alternative was to avert one's gaze and marry into the despised milieu; another was to shut one's eyes completely to reality and save one's personal fortunes by marrying a wealthy heiress to a landed estate. This was the favoured solution, and the whole process is dramatized in Restoration comedy: the exclusion of reality, the deliberate neglect of "productive" living; the resulting concentration on distractions among which love-making stood first; the effort to achieve a dominance in the love relation that would both further divert one's attention from reality and also

---

46 - Religion and the Rise of Capitalism, R.H. Tawney, Penguin Edition, p. 209.

compensate for the loss of power in the real world.

Over and over again we meet the same character, the impoverished gallant in search of a landed heiress. We cannot be sure whether or not Sir Frederick Frollick was out-at-heel - we only surmise he may have been, since it did not seem implausible that the bailiffs should be after him,[47] but we do know that the widow was Rich. Courtal rather prides himself on his and Freemen's marriage being only a "penance for (their) own sins", since "most families are a wedding behindhand in the world, which makes so many young men fooled into wives, to pay their fathers' debts".[48] It is, as he says, "a pretty country coat, madam, with a handsome parcel of land, and other necessaries belonging to't, may tempt us."[49] Dorimant weds "a good estate",[50] taking an heiress "to repair the ruins of (his) estate that needs it".[51] Lionel in Bellamira is a younger son contracted to a rich goldsmith's wife, and his marriage to Isabella is made feasible only by his elder brother's generosity. Christina of Love in a Wood is a rich heiress, Hippolita a rich old merchant's daughter with £1200 a year. Alithea in The Country Wife is wealthy. Harcourt says Sparkish covets his mistress, not loves her, because she has a fortune.[52] Fidelia is the only daughter of a gentleman with £2,000 a year, which supplies the competence that Manly has thrown away on Olivia.[53]

---

47 - Love in a Tub, Etherege, Works, p. 93-4.

48 - She Would if She Could, Etherege, Op. cit., p. 229.

49 - Ibid.

50 - The Man of Mode, Etherege, Op. cit., p. 341.

51 - Op. cit. p. 366.

52 - The Country Wife, Wycherley, Plays, p. 272.

53 - The Plain Dealer, Wycherley, Plays, p. 506.

The obverse of all this fortune hunting is the malicious joy repeatedly extracted by Restoration comedy from marrying an unmodish member of society to a woman with no money or no reputation or neither - Estridge to a maid, Wheedle and Grace, Palmer and Jenny, Sir Nicholas and Lucy, Gripe and Lucy.

Marriage was in fact regarded as a lottery, not in the facetious sense sometimes heard today, but as lotteries themselves were regarded, legitimate and normal ways of trying to make one's way. Speculation was a "perfectly normal characteristic" of life in an age when there was no confidence in public loans, no national Bank and an extremely high rate of risk on capital invested in the trading companies;[54] and the speculation of a fortunate marriage was an equally normal notion for young men with little confidence in their own powers to acquire money and land. It is scarcely necessary to point out that speculation in this sense and of this kind is the nec plus ultra of unproductive living.

Yet this group we are describing lived, moved and had its being at the apex of a society that was quick with new, momentous and fascinating beginnings; England was rich in great activities and great men. This is a period when government pried into every corner of human activity, regulating even a baker's sales to not more than "thirteen to the dozen"; when the foundations of England's colonial empire were being laid by the trading companies; when the "domestic system" was beginning to develop into the beginnings of modern "capitalism"; when a start was made on the problem of organizing the fiscal system of a modern state by the appropriation of supplies to defined objects; when the first general theory of taxation was formulated

---

54 - Ogg, Op. cit., Vol. I. p. 110 and p. 112.

by Sir William Petty; when the first attempts were made to train a naval officer class by statutory changes and the foundation of Christ's Hospital. It is the period of the first popular history (Clarendon's); of the recognition of medicine, surgery, chemistry, physics and astronomy as each individual sciences with distinctive aims and methods, but having in common as a condition of their growth freedom of investigation and experiment; of the foundation of the Royal Society; in an age when Bunyan was writing, Milton working on Paradise Lost and Regained and Marvell belabouring corruption; the age of Purcell and Pepys, Hervey and Boyle, Locke and the peerless Newton.

It is impossible to accept Palmer's appraisal of this period. In his elucidation of the peculiar qualities and contribution of Etherege, Palmer repeatedly confuses Restoration society with English society as a whole. He observes that "the comedies of Etherege are the natural product of an age for which life was an accepted pageant, incuriously observed, uncritically accepted .... He gracefully encountered the one problem which his generation acutely recognized", i.e., that of form. "Style was the man. There was form: and there was bad form. ... Etherege found a form for the spirit of his age wherein lies his unquestionable merit".[55] This is not just a verbal confusion between "age" and "generation". He makes the point precisely when he says that "There was never in English history a time when the conscience of society was more at ease, when precept and practice were so clearly connected", and he makes a good deal of the "noble idleness of the mind" which determined the quality and temper of Restoration society.[56] Magnificent as is Palmer's feeling for the essential quality of Restoration

---

55 - The Comedy of Manners, John Palmer, London, 1913, p. 91

56 - Op. cit. pp. 36-7.

literature, his sense of history is defective; he confuses the whole with the part; the tone of a group with the spirit of an age. It is precisely this distinction, and the relation between Restoration society in the limited sense in which we have used the term and English society as a whole, that we have tried to illuminate - not merely because the historical perspective is important itself, but because it renders keener our appreciation of its greatest work, the comedies, and more perceptive our apprehension of the overtones of its remarkable wit. The members of this society were always elegant, usually brilliant and witty, and sometimes gay; they had a keen eye for surface detail and a superb sense of style, but their warmest admirer could not call them either "productive" or healthy, in the sense that they formed an active part of a well-functioning social organism. Health has been brilliantly defined as "the margin of tolerance to the infidelities of the milieu".[57] It would seem that Restoration society had dangerously narrowed this margin, preferring to cope with the imagined or actual treacheries of the Love Game than to grapple with the real infidelities of a wider human environment; that their jealousy neurosis was the nemesis of their elected way of life.

---

57 - "Essai sur quelques problemes concernant le normal et le pathologique", Canguilhem, Strasburg, 1943, quoted by LaGache in La Jalousie Amoureuse, Vol. II, p. 320.

Chapter V

AFTER THE 'REVOLUTION'

If there is some such relation as we have suggested between the jealousy-love emotion and society, we should expect to find [redacted] changes in one accompanying changes in the other. It is a matter of historical record that society became steadily more "productive" during the reigns of William and Mary, Queen Anne and George I. Developments were as slow as they were complex; it is only possible here to indicate how various pressures broke in upon the isolated and impotent society we have been examining, compelling it to accept a choice between participation and extinction.

The general nature and significance of the "Bloodless Revolution" have already been indicated.[1] Primarily it was a political revolution, but it gave impetus to religious and social changes which in the long run profoundly modified English life and which began immediately to influence the society we are considering. To begin with, Court society in the sense that Restoration courtiers had understood it, withered. The King ceased to be the pivot of their interest as he was no longer the god of their idolatry.[2] No one could make a faith out of service to a King who was merely the husband of the daughter of the "legitimate" monarch, the appointee of the

---

1 - PP. 5-6.

2 - The society was, of course, composed of the landed aristocracy, the Tories being supported by roughly half the landed gentry and the squirearchy and "the lowest sort of people". The "middle sort of men" tended to be Dissenters and Whigs; they represented the monied interests and had their strongest support in the clothing and trading towns. See Tawney, op.cit. Chap. IV, and G.M. Trevelyan, History of England, Chapters VI and VII.

British Parliament and the selection of a political party; who was a foreigner speaking English with a heavy Dutch accent and having more than his share of Dutch phlegm; who owed his position on the English throne rather to the complaisance of his wife than to the Stuart blood running in his veins; who suffered from asthma and was soon obliged to move his court from Whitehall to Hampton Court where the air was purer. Macauley has dramatized the picture: "A solitary sentinel paced the grass grown pavement before that door which had once been too narrow for the opposite streams of entering and departing courtiers".[3]

Not only did the Crown and court lose much of their glamour but the King ceased to be the first fountain of favour and the court the channel through which its profitable waters flowed; the ante-rooms of ministers began to fill up with supplicants as the King's chambers emptied - a reference to Swift's Journal will show how much more time he spent in the latter than the former.

This was a reflection of the shifts in political and monetary power that were taking place. These were complicated in operation, but they had two main consequences for the group we are interested in: immediately they rendered the demands of reality outside the court society ever more obvious and menacing, and ultimately they tended to tranquillize and stabilize the political and religious situation.

Although the great majority of Tories supported the installation of William, it was the Whigs who were the prime movers in bringing him to the throne, and they who had preponderance of power for the next quarter

---

3 - T. B. Macauldy, Op. cit. p. 683.

century. As we have noted, they were for the most part composed of the monied class with a large admixture of landed gentry. It was therefore as natural as it was desirable that a strong connection should be built up between the King's Ministers and the City, government and business. A new system of government borrowing on long loan was instituted; the principal lenders were Whigs and they were organized in the Bank of England in 1694. Thus the King was grappled to the Whig's heart with hoops of gold, for a Jacobite restoration would mean, among other disasters, the repudiation of Whig endebtedness. "London and its leaders" as Trevelyan says, "were once more hand-in-glove with government, as in the days of Burleigh and Gresham".[4]

These developments drove home to all the members of the landed aristocracy who were capable of learning, the necessity of action if they were to survive. The lesson was reinforced by the new fortunes being made every year through the East India Company; society saw "new County families founded every year"[5] on the spoils of the East. An ostrich policy of isolation and impotence was impossible if they were to retain their power and influence, and they proceeded to send their sons into business and to marry their daughters into Cheapside with ever-increasing assiduity, with the result that "Georgian England was to astonish foreign observers, like Voltaire and Montesquieu, as the Paradise of the bourgeoisie, in which the prosperous merchant shouldered easily aside the impoverished bearers

---

4 - G. M. Trevelyan, op. cit. p. 490.

5 - G. M. Trevelyan, op. cit. p. 491.

of aristocratic names".[6]

The religious situation was also transformed. The Toleration Bill of 1689 (though it firmly repudiated the idea that purely theological error ought not to be subject to civil punishment) ended a hundred years of persecution of non-conformity. Since the class rapidly rising to wealth and power was composed for the most part of Dissenters, whose independent spirit accorded with and actually inspired their vigorous application to business, it had become apparent to others than the Dissenters themselves that the economic prosperity of the country was bound up with freedom of worship; that free enterprise might involve the free conscience.[7] Further, the Whig Dissenters were not in a position, had they wished, to persecute the Anglican Church, since the Tory party far exceeded them in numbers, as they surpassed the Tories in tenure of power and office.

The numerical preponderance of the Tories was offset by the split in the Tory party. Some hankered and worked for James, and on his death, for the Pretender; some were more opposed to Catholicism than they were in favour of direct succession. This rendered the balance of the Whig and Tory parties so even that vicious political revenges became impolitic - an important amelioration in the political atmosphere.

Improvement was further aided by the development of the party system. Long before any set of constitutional conventions had been established on collective responsibility and cabinet government, the Whigs

---

6 - R. H. Tawney, op. cit. p. 208.

7 - R.H. Tawney, op. cit. p. 205.

and Tories had begun to form easily recognizable groups with distinguishable points of view, and to develop a sense of loyalty to the party. This also was an important advance over the irresponsible and erratic activities of personal advisers to the King which had characterized the Stuart administrations. William III assisted the process. He was by nature a man of moderation and judicial habit, and he was at pains to appoint ministers of unimpeachable honour from both parties.[8]

Similarly the prestige of the Bench was raised by the appointment of judges of the highest merit who ceased to be removable at the Royal pleasure. Finally, foreign policy conducted by William himself was now brought and kept in line with the real interests of the nation and with popular feeling; France was the enemy and Holland the ally rather than the commercial rival. Nothing is more striking than the readiness with which Parliament voted to its protégé William sums far in excess of those it had begrudged to its opponent Charles II for the prosecution of wars which the country for the most part approved.

Thus society - or rather that social group with which we are concerned - was goaded out of its isolation by the menace of extinction and lured out by the prospect of even greater wealth than it had been able in former days to derive from land or "place", and the situation into which it emerged was one which tended increasingly towards stability, both political and religious. The moral tone improved pari passu with the increasing impact of the non-conformist conscience and the ethical preoccupations of

---

8 - T. B. Macaulay, op. cit. p. 661-6.

the middle classes. It must, however, be repeated, that these changes were as intermittent as they were significant.

Even in the immediate court circle the social change was gradual. The personal influence of the new King and his wife was such as to repress the open pursuit of sexual pleasure outside marriage. Mary was devout and decorous, and William, though he occasionally found his pleasures in unorthodox places, took them with the sadness befitting a new-made Englishman. The habitual repression of external impropriety merged only very slowly into a real modification of behaviour. What did happen was simply that the moral impulses of the bulk of the people and particularly of the middle classes became increasingly influential. There was vigorous criticism of "society," the court, and the stage, which had been so long the particular protégé of the court circle. As Krutch has shown, Collier's onslaught (1698) in his "Short View of the Immorality and Profaneness of the Stage" was merely the spearhead of an attack which had been long preparing, and any success it appeared to achieve was due to other influences as much as to his own.[9] If, when he sounded his trumpet, part of the walls of Jericho fell down, it was not so much that his blast was irresistible or well-directed as that the foundations were already weakened, and what he doubtless took to be the work of the Lord was, as we have seen, in large part the achievement of Mammon.

As with society, so with literature, change came slowly. The dramatic work of the period shows subtle and gradual modifications of social attitudes, including that towards the love-jealousy emotion. There is no sharp break with the past, as none could be expected, but there are signs

---

9 - Comedy and Conscience after the Restoration, J. W. Krutch, 1924.

of a shifting and widening of interest, a change of emphasis, a lessening of concentration on the love-jealousy emotion and on the aggressive activities of possessive love.

Congreve's work is the first we have to consider and it is worth noting that he was not born until ten years after the Restoration, came of age, and completed his literary work in William and Mary's reign. His father had been a distinguished Royalist, but had settled in Ireland at the Restoration, so that Congreve as a youth was removed both in time and place from Restoration society.

His first play the Old Bachelor produced in 1693 has three plots or themes and only one of them is motivated by jealousy. Vainlove is a lover who only wants a woman as long as she appears unwilling to have him. Silvia, a neglected mistress of his, knowing his disposition, writes a letter to him in his lady Araminta's name, betraying an eagerness for Vainlove's affection which Silvia knows is calculated to disgust Vainlove. This operates as a temporary setback to Vainlove and Araminta's relations, but Araminta is soon able to restore Vainlove's approval by her vigorous declaration that "she has not erred in one favorable thought of mankind". Vainlove has a touch of the jealousy disposition; Araminta declares to Sir Joseph Wittol when she wants to get rid of him because she sees Vainlove coming, that Vainlove is "one that will be jealous to find me in discourse with you".[10] The interest of the Vainlove-Araminta relationship is subtly different, however, from that between Valentine and Christina, or between Ranger and Lydia, or between Dorimant and Harriet or Dorimant and Loveit. It is their comicality that is emphasized rather than their love relationship. Congreve

---

10 - The Old Bachelor, William Congreve, The Mermaid Series, London. p. 62.

declares his mood and intention with the opening scene of his dramatic career, when he makes Bellmour say, "Wit, be my faculty, and pleasure my occupation!"[11] It is "the buffoonery of one scene of address, a lover, set out with all his equipage and appurtenances"[12] that delights Congreve, as it does Belinda. Belinda laughs constantly at Vainlove and at Araminta too. "An ass - which is so like your Vainlove! - Lord, I have seen an ass look so chagrin, ha! ha! ha! (You must pardon me, I can't help laughing)... could you but see with my eyes...."[13] And again, "Mr. Vainlove looks as if he durst not approach.... I swear he looks so very simply, ha! ha! ha! Well, a lover in the state of separation from his mistress is like a body without a soul".[14] As for Belinda and Bellmour, they play the Love Game with charm and propriety with no element of jealousy introduced.

The rest of the play and the greater part by far turns on the courting and mock marriage of Heartwell the Old Bachelor to Silvia and the comic interplay between Bluffe, Sir Joseph and Sharper. There is a wealth of witty conversation introduced for its own sake, pages of discussion on the progress of a love affair or the proper conduct of the chase, without any reference to jealousy except that to Fondlewife.

Fondlewife is described by Vainlove as "much addicted to jealousy, but more to fondness; so that he's often jealous without a cause, he's as often satisfied without reason".[15] Fondlewife differs subtly in an interesting

---

11 - Op. cit. p. 10.

12 - Op. cit. p. 29.

13 - Ibid.

14 - Op. cit. p. 63.

15 - Op. cit. p. 12.

way from previous jealous types. He is depicted as a "humour" or character interesting for himself, rather than as someone trying unsuccessfully to conform to any social mode. As Congreve himself claims, "any man that has a Humour is under no restraint, or fear of giving it vent".[16] He even suggests that the abundance of Humours in the English is probably due to "the great Freedom, Privilege and Liberty" that they enjoy. Not only is Fondlewife a personality with his own idiosyncracies, who does not strive to pretend in a modish manner that he is not jealous; he indulges in self-examination. "Tell me, Isaac, why are thee jealous? Why art thee distrustful of the wife of thy bosom? because she is young and vigorous, and I am old and impotent. Then, why didst thee marry, Isaac? because she was beautiful and tempting, and because I was obstinate and doting..... and will not that which tempted thee, also tempt others?" There is all the difference in the world between this faintly pathetic calculation of undesirable probabilities and the real jealousy disposition. Fondlewife has no urge to dominate; he is uxorious. Admittedly he feels inadequate, but he is in fact physically inadequate. If we compare him with Sir Oliver Cockwood the difference in handling is apparent.

Silvia, on the other hand, is a character who runs true to previous form; the "name of rival fires (her) blood". She could curse Araminta and Vainlove both; exclaims, "eternal jealousy attend her love and disappointment meet his!"[17] Silvia, we may note, is already on the fringe of the Love Game interest of the play.

What we have, then, in this first play of Congreve's, is a good deal

---

16 - "Letter concerning Humour in Comedy" to Mr. Denis, in Comedies by William Congreve", The World's Classics, p. 11.

of the Restoration mode, a little of the real jealousy disposition in Silvia and Vainlove, and some shifts of emphasis that may foreshadow a coming change, a greater wealth of incident and character quite independent of jealousy interest, a greater insistence on the comicality of the lovers and less on their possessive relation; a jealous "humour" viewed in a different light.

In The Double Dealer played in the following year some indications have taken form. Lady Touchwood has the jealousy disposition; she is more violent than Loveit, and her jealousy of Mellefont is the pivot of the melodrama which runs side by side with realistic comedy in this play. What distinguishes her from her predecessors, male and female, is the manner in which Congreve presents her as entirely detestable. For the first time we are invited to disapprove unreservedly of an exhibition of jealousy in action.

There seems every reason to believe what Congreve says in his epistle dedicatory to Charles Montague about this play, namely, that he "designed the moral first, and to that moral .. invented the fable".[18]

Throughout, Lady Touchwood is portrayed as a sentient, immoral human being, not as a deviation from the mode. She has a "violent passion" for Mellefont, has "fire in (her) temper, passions in (her) soul". She does not attempt to conceal it and gain Mellefont in the oblique manner of the mode but tries seduction of the crudest sort. She does not flay Maskwell in elegant phrases, as Loveit did Dorimant, when she realizes that he has been using her to further his own designs, but goes to the heart of the matter in ranting, turgid, jerky exclamations. "Shame and distraction! I cannot bear it. Oh! what woman can bear to be a property? To be kindled

---

18 - Epistle Dedicatory to The Double Dealer, Congreve, op. cit. p. 99.

to a flame, only to light him to another's arms!"[19] She even threatens Maskwell with a dagger and bursts into tears when he outfaces her. "Too well," she cries, "thou knowest my jealous soul could never bear uncertainty."[20] Not only does Lady Touchwood talk a good deal about her soul, but Mellefont also sounds a moral note. He rejects her advances and says, "I pleaded honour and nearness of blood to my uncle."[21] One cannot imagine Courtal being so nice, and Dorimant would certainly have regarded the entire intrigue as a tissue of painful solecisms.

In short, the jealousy disposition is displayed and used for plot motivation, but it is treated throughout as a Bad Thing, and when at the final curtain poetic justice is meted out to all, the audience is allowed to feel certain that Lady Touchwood will come to a Bad End.

Indeed Lady Plyant provides us - in the scene where she misinterprets Mellefont's remarks as a declaration of passion - with the only example in this play of jealousy à la mode. "Though I know you don't love Cynthia", she says, "only as a blind to your passion for me, yet it will make me jealous! No, no, I can't be jealous, for I must not love you - therefore don't hope, - but don't despair neither."[22] This is the mode, but it stands alone. Even Lord Plyant, discovering his lady's intended infidelity, wears his horns with a difference. He is not like any other character we have so far encountered in Restoration comedy in his reaction to cuckoldry. He does not talk about honour or jealousy or revenge or his social standing; he oozes

---

19 - Op. cit. p. 176.

20 - Op. cit. p. 183.

21 - Op. cit. p. 108.

22 - Op. cit. p. 128.

self-pity. "Have I for this been pinioned night after night for three years past? Have I been swathed in blankets till I have been even deprived of motion?.....O my Lady Plyant, you were chaste as ice, but you are melted now, and false as water! - . if it were not for Providence, sure, poor Sir Paul, thy heart would break."[23] Sir Paul is a figure of fun, but he is a figure of pathos, too; not a modish sufferer of the possessive sort, but a victim of oblative love.

There is one other reference to the modish view of jealousy in the play (besides that of Lady Plyant); this is Maskwell's explanation of how he discovered that Lady Touchwood was in love with her nephew. "I quickly found it;" he says, "an argument that I loved; for with that art you veiled your passion, 'twas imperceptible to all but jealous eyes".[24]

A remarkable change has come over the central loving couple of the play. They are in love and admit it from the start, and even themselves find the novelty of the thing a trifle embarrassing. Cynthia is afraid it will never come to a match "because we are both willing; we each of us strive to reach the goal. I swear it never does well when the parties are so agreed."[25] To this Mellefont replies, "Hum, 'gad I believe there's something in't; - marriage is the game that we hunt..."[26] What a change is here! The language is that of the Nimrods of the Restoration, but the spirit is William and Mary. Compare it with Courtal and Freeman when they are seeking to make the

---

23 - Op. cit. p. 162.

24 - Op. cit. p. 115.

25 - Op. cit. p. 150.

26 - Ibid.

acquaintenance of Gatty and Ariana:

> Free. What do we here idling in the Mulberry Garden?.....
>
> Court. Now art thou as mad upon this trail as if we were upon a hot scent.
>
> Free. Since we know the bush, why do we not start the game?[27]

Courtal and Freeman, like the rest of their tribe, are out for conquest and possession; Cynthia and Mellefont are in love, "love, love, downright, very villainous love".[28] Indeed, they are so far gone from moderation and the mode that they are prepared to elope if needs must without much money, with a "pox o' fortune, portion, settlements, and jointures!"[29]

They discuss the Love Game that they play.

> Cyn. (Tis an odd game we're going to play at.....I find it's like cards: if either of us have a good hand, it is accident of fortune.
>
> Mel. No, marriage is rather like a game at bowls; Fortune indeed makes the match,..... but the game depends entirely upon judgment.
>
> Cyn. Still it is a game, and consequently one of us must be a loser.
>
> Mel. Not at all; only a friendly trial of skill, and the winnings to be laid out in an entertainment.[30]

Let us turn back and listen to Dorimant and Harriet, also engaged in play.

> Dor. You were talking of play, madam; pray what may be your stint?
>
> Har. A little harmless discourse in public walks, or at most an appointment in a box barefaced at the playhouse; you are for masks and private meetings where women engage for all they are worth, I hear.

---

27 - She Would if She Could, Etherege, Works, p. 138.

28 - The Double Dealer, Congreve, Plays, p. 150.

29 - Op. cit. p. 151.

30 - Op. cit. pp. 122-123.

Dor. I have been used to deep play, but I can make one at small game when I like my gamester well.

Har. And be so unconcerned you'll ha' no pleasure in it.

Dor. Where there is a considerable sum to be won the hope of drawing people in makes every trifle considerable.

Har. The sordidness of men's natures, I know, makes 'em willing to flatter and comply with the rich, though they are sure never to be the better for 'em.

Dor. 'Tis in their power to do us good, and we despair not but at some time or other they may be willing.

Har. To men who have fared on this town like you, 'twould be a great mortification to live on hope; could you keep a Lent for a mistress?

Dor. In expectation of a happy Easter, and though time be very precious, think forty days well lost to gain your favour.

Har. Mr. Bellair! let us walk, 'tis time to leave him; men grow dull when they begin to be particular.

Dor. You're mistaken, flattery will not ensue, though I know you're greedy of the praises of the whole Mall. [31]

Dorimant and Harriet are pitted against one another in a contest for supremacy; Cynthia and Mellefont play partners in an exhibition game.

In Love for Love produced in 1695, a year after The Double Dealer, jealousy has vanished altogether as plot motivation, and appears only as part of Foresight's make-up. The central couple are not avowedly in love like Cynthia and Mellefont; Angelica claims she "never had concern enough to ask (herself) the question"[32] even her pretended decision to marry Valentine's father cannot give the seasonad

---

31 - The Man of Mode, Etherege, Works, pp. 303-4.

32 - Love for Love, Congreve, Plays, p. 240.

playgoer a moment's concern about the final outcome. What it does effect is a display of moral sentiments, Valentine renouncing his inheritance, Angelica declaring herself unworthy of "so generous and faithful a passion" and rounding on Sir Sampson with a moral exhortation, and finally a declaration by the lovers of mutual affection. Angelica says that her coldness is now going to "turn to an extreme fondness" and Valentine intends "to dote to that immoderate degree, that (her) fondness shall never distinguish itself enough to be taken notice of."

Foresight is jealous, as we have said, and well he may be with a wife as brazen as his, but his fears are open and confessed; they serve merely to give Angelica and Sir Sampson opportunity for some witty teasing. His jealousy disposition, like that of Fondlewife, is treated for its "humour" value and not as an aspect of the social mode.

If these three comedies were all, it would be tempting to conclude that Congreve had greatly modified the treatment of the Love Game and the Jealousy-love emotion. There is much less emphasis on the latter and, save for The Old Bachelor, none in the case of the central lovers, the Love Game is handled with a great profusion of wit and with an urbane amusement which notably distinguishes Congreve both from Etherege's acid derision and Wycherley's impassioned disgust. This much is true, but society, though changing, had not undergone any radical alteration since Restoration days, and neither had Congreve's vision of it.

With the Way of the World which followed two years later, in 1700, Congreve produced a play from which all material extraneous to the mode has

---

33 - Op. cit. p. 305.

been eliminated; it is the mode, the whole mode and - almost - nothing but the mode. It is as though he had set out to sum up an era. The whole gay world is there: the wits among whom Mirabell reigns supreme; the would-be wits; the jealous elderly women and the jealous young women of fashion; the schemers and the betrayers; the country cousin and the servants apeing and using their betters; and the gayest of all the gay couples that sparkle in the pages of Restoration comedy, the imcomparable Millamant and Mirabel. With the mode, jealousy comes into its own again as the motive of action and the mobile of character. It is Mrs. Marwood's passion for Mirabell and her jealousy of him and Mrs. Fainall and Millamant that causes her to betray Mirabel's device of making his servant Waitwell impersonate Sir Roland and make love to Lady Wishfort. It is because Fainall is jealous of Mrs. Marwood that he is quick to detect her feeling for Mirabel. They are indeed a well-matched pair, Fainall and Mrs. Marwood, and the quarrel scene between them in Act II scene I is one of the most penetrating, perfect and painful in the language. Fainall accuses her and Mrs. Fainall of their "mutual jealousies of one another (which) have made you clash 'till you have both struck fire".[34] He voices the typical Restoration view: "If yet you loved, you could forgive a jealousy".[35] Earlier he had been at pains to declare to Mirabel "Faith, I am not jealous".[36] When he learns that his wife had been Mirabel's mistress before her marriage he is furious but soon adopts the correct attitude: "My wife has played the jade with me - well, that's over too - I never loved her,

---

34 - The Way of the World, Congreve, op. cit. p. 339.

35 - Op. cit. p. 340.

36 - Op. cit. p. 323.

of if I had, why that would have been over too by this time - Jealous of her I cannot be, for I am certain; so there's an end of jealousy".[37] He finally declares he'll be jealous of Mrs. Marwood no more; "Let husbands be jealous; but let the lover still believe ... but let husbands' doubts convert to endless jealousy". He sums up the mode again with a couplet,

> All husbands must, or pain, or shame, endure;[38]
> The wise too jealous are, fools too secure.

He has among his generous supply of weaknesses the jealousy disposition; (Mirabel remarks on his "tyranny of temper" which caused his wife to protect her fortune from him)[39] but Fainall strives to conceal it in accordance with the mode.

Mrs. Marwood is like him. She does her best to prevent Mirabel's marriage with Millamant, and to Millamant she is as malicious as her situation permits. When she declares to Mrs. Fainall that if she "could find one that loved (her) very well, and would be thoroughly sensible of ill usage," she would marry him and seek to "have him ever to continue upon the rack of fear and jealousy",[40] it is not difficult to believe her, and we know that she has Mirabel in mind as she speaks. The intensity of her feeling for him is in proportion to her jealous impulse to revenge; she blushes when he is named, cannot keep from talking about him, nor stay away from her successful rival Millamant; she is even willing "that all shall come out" about the intrigue between her and Fainall if she can obstruct Mirabel's marriage.

---

37 - Op. cit. p. 371.

38 - Op. cit. p. 372.

39 - Op. cit. p. 409.

40 - Op. cit. p. 337.

Even Lady Wishfort and Waitwell (disguised as Sir Rowland), as they enact their caricature of the Love Game, echo the modish view of jealousy. Waitwell pretends, when he sees the handwriting on the letter to Lady Wishfort from Mrs. Marwood, that it is that of a man - "somebody whose throat must be cut". This is merely a happy thought to save the situation, but Lady Wishfort is delighted with the notion. "Nay, Sir Rowland," she says, "since you give me a proof of your passion by your jealousy, I promise you I'll make a return, by a frank communication - You shall see it .. Look you here".[41]

If this were all we might well feel that "plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose". There are, however, other elements in the comedy. The central lovers are, once again, avowedly in love. Mirabel knows himself "for a discerning man, somewhat too passionate a lover; for (he) like(s) her with all her faults; nay, like(s) her for her faults".[42] He is past pretending:

> Millamant What would you give, that you could help loving me?
>
> Mirabel I would give something that you did not know, I could not help it.[43]

As a coquette Millamant is more than adept, she is an artist; she enjoys to the full her power over Mirabel, but when the famous "proviso" scene is over and she has given her hand, she says to her friend Mrs. Fainall, "Well, if Mirabel should not make a good husband, I am a lost thing; for I find I love him violently".[44] Nowhere in realistic Restoration comedy can one

---

41 - Op. cit. p. 390.

42 - Op. cit. p. 324.

43 - Op. cit. p. 348.

44 - Op. cit. p. 382.

find wholehearted avowals like this; in the central couple at least possessive love has yielded places to love-communion; they are absorbed, not in conquest, but in love, "love, very villainous love". The wit is as brilliant as ever, even more dazzling from Congreve's pen, but it illuminates a changed relationship. A short exchange between Fainall and Mirabel highlights the difference.

> Fain. Are you jealous as often as you see Witwoud entertained by Millamant?
>
> Mir. Of her understanding I am, if not of her person.[45]

Then there is the character of Mrs. Fainall which presents us with something we have not encountered in Restoration comedy. She is a discarded mistress and one who still retains much affection for Mirabel. Not only is she not actively jealous but she does all she can to promote his marriage to Millamant; she speaks to him with kindliness and he to her; most striking of all, she is a genuine friend to Millamant, urging her to accept Mirabel and receiving Millament's confession of love when he is gone. Her reaction is tinged only with the mildest irritation: "if you doubt him, you had best take up with Sir Wilfull".[46] Perhaps Belinda of The Man of Mode might have been like this, though one doubts it; Etherege only sketched her in, an insubstantial figure, and we shall never know. For the rest, the discarded mistresses of Restoration comedy are modelled on Loveit with her jealous furies and intrigue. Mrs. Fainall has also "loved without bounds" but, not being a possessive attachment, love has dwindled into affection and not into a revengeful bitterness.

Perhaps most striking of all is the difference of tone in the love scenes between Mirabel and Millamant. The old competitive spirit has given

---

45 - Op. cit. p. 323.

46 - Op. cit. p. 382.

place to an interplay of delicate wit which gives piquancy to a mutual affection.

Congreve's comedy is complex, partly because his mind was so, and partly because it is the comedy of transition. Much of the Restoration mode remains, even as society, though changing, remained much as before, but new elements emerge and new emphasis is given to the old. The preservation of the mode is no doubt the greater because Congreve was a traditionalist at heart; one who studied the old models and reworked them with loving care. He is somewhat of a playwright's playwright; his writing smells faintly "of the lamp"; it is not surprising that he is more concerned to give perfect expression to a completed social phase than to find a form for interpreting one that was struggling awkwardly into existence.

By far the most significant change from our point of view is Congreve's treatment of his lovers. In all except his first play they show a mutual affection which is far removed from the possessive, competitive, jealous sort, typical of Restoration lovers. They have love-communion, and their conversation, for all its wit, is infused with enough tenderness to distinguish them instantly from any of their immediate predecessors in realistic Restoration comedy.

Again, characters like Lord Plyant and Mrs. Fainall make their appearance, who show variations on the traditional Restoration reaction to faithlessness; their love, too, is of a different kind. Finally, Congreve makes one attempt to hold up to odium the jealousy disposition itself, as depicted in Lady Touchwood.

It was, we have suggested, the introduction of moral considerations, of a reasoning attitude towards oneself and one's relations to others, that ultimately broke down the mode of Restoration comedy, as it broke down the

isolation of the society on which it was modelled. In the comedies of Vanbrugh the process is plainly visible. As early as 1693, a year after Love for Love, his first play The Relapse was produced. Characters in The Relapse have a good deal to say about jealousy, but it is obvious that what prompted Vanbrugh to write the play (as a retort to Cibber's Love's Last Shift) was not a desire to depict the jealousy of a betrayed wife but a wish to give vent to a double detestation; first, for the idea that the demands of the flesh are all evil and ought to be repressed, and second, for the hypocrisy or folly of pretending that they could in all cases be resisted by a sentimental yearning after purity. Vanbrugh was no Puritan, any more than he was a Cavalier; he was a sturdy, fullblooded, second generation Dutchman whose father had done well in trade, and his whole nature cried out against those "debauches in piety" that he saw some members of society giving way to.

He depicts Amanda throughout as a deceived wife who fears that her husband will relapse into infidelity. She says in the traditional manner that "(her) fears are founded on (her) love", but in fact they derive from a knowledge of Loveless' disposition; like Bellmour he is a "cormorant in love" with the notable difference that Bellmour retained the modish amoral attitude, while Loveless occasionally probes his conscience like an aching tooth. He is in love with his wife but wants Berinthia -

> I would sacrifice my life to serve her. (Amanda)
> Yet hold - If laying down my life
> Be demonstration of my love,
> What is't I feel in favour of Berinthis? [47]

---

47 - The Relapse or Virtue in Danger, Sir John Vanbrugh, London, 1896, p. 116.

He gets Berinthia with the greatest of ease and apparently forgets the matter as promptly, for when Lord Foppington suggests he might be interested in Lady Foppington he retorts, "You need not fear, sir, I'm too fond of my own wife, to have the least inclination for yours".[48]

Amanda like her husband shows no trace of possessive love or the jealousy disposition. She talks about it with Berinthia and regards it as a matter of moment:

> "Ber. And so you are jealous? Is that all?
>
> Aman. That all! Is jealousy then nothing?[49]

The thought of her unknown rival angers her and she exclaims, "I really believe she's so ugly, she'd cure me of my jealousy",[50] but this is nothing more than the normal human reaction. When she is at the height of her indignation, knowing her husband unfaithful and being herself subjected to the full exercise of Worthy's powers of seduction, she resists him, though she likes him well enough. She exclaims, "Then save me, Virtue, and the glory's thine!" and, being saved, attributes her triumph to "the sovereignty (which) is in the mind" and can overcome desire.[51] One could hardly be more free from the vengeful impulses of the jealousy disposition, nor further from the social mode of the Restoration. Even Worthy, who had thought that "the way to bring (Amanda) to an intrigue is to make her jealous of her husband in a wrong place",[52] is now moved to self-examination and confesses "When truth's extorted from us, then we own the robe of virtue is a graceful habit".[53]

---

48 - Op. cit. p. 189.

49 - Op. cit. p. 125.

50 - Op. cit. p. 172.

51 - Op. cit. p. 185.

52 - Op. cit. p. 122.

53 - Op. cit. p. 185.

What this comedy yields is not the mode but snatches of it, set in an atmosphere of moralizing and sentimentalizing, and its appeal as comedy is much less that of a portrayal of fashionable life than that of a series of highspirited, rollicking scenes, centered for the most part on Lord Foppington and his younger brother and Hoyden and her father. The conventional Restoration attitudes, the new moral indignation and Vanbrugh's personal flair for comic effect are perfectly illustrated in the scene where Lord Foppington makes his addresses to Amanda:

> Lord Fop. (To Loveless) Ned, you must not be so jealous now as to listen.
>
> Lov. Not I, my lord; I'm too fashionable a husband to pry into the secrets of my wife.
>
> Lord Fop. (to Aman. Squeezing her hand) I am in love with you to desperation, strike me speechless.
>
> Aman. (giving him a box on the ear). Then thus I return your passion - an impudent fool!
>
> Lord Fop. Gad's curse, madam, I'm a peer of the realm.
>
> Lov. Hey; what the devil, do you affront my wife, sir? Nay then - (They draw and fight. The women run shrieking for help).[54]

The Provoked Wife produced in the following year comes closer to the Restoration mode. What little plot there is is kept in motion by Lady Fanciful's jealousy of Heartfree and Belinda. Lady Fanciful is the female counterpart of Lord Foppington, a caricature of the woman of fashion; piqued by Heartfree's rudeness and disdain and his penchant for Belinda, she discovers to Lord Brute Lady Brute's and Belinda's meeting with Constant and Heartfree. Lord Brute staggers home from his drunken party to discover the

---

54 - Op. cit. p. 97.

gallants in his lady's closet. His reaction is a mixture of alcoholic dignity, coarse abuse and maudlin self-pity; one is impelled to contrast him with Sir Frederick Frollick who contrived to be modish even when suffering from the effects of a night's dissipation.[55] Indeed, Sir John really has neither love nor jealousy for his wife; there is but one thing, as he remarks, that "he loathes beyond her, that's fighting".[56] He does, however, make use of the conventional phrases of the mode. Drinking with Constant and Heartfree he coughs and remarks, "If I had love enough to be jealous, I should take this for an ill omen".[57] When his cowardice prevails upon him to swallow the injury he believes his wife has done him he declares, "I have never observed anything in my wife's course of life to back me in my jealousy of her; but jealousy's a mark of love, so she need not trouble her head about it, as long as I make no more words on't".[58]

What we find in this play is rather like what we discovered in the early plays of Etherege and Sedley, a convention of behaviour and language retained - in this case that of the Restoration mode - but set side by side with a conflicting and ultimately destructive set of values, those moral considerations which were excluded from Restoration comedy and which were to prove destructive to its comic spirit. Thus Heartfree inveighs

---

55 - Love in a Tub, Etherege, op. cit. pp. 9-11.

56 - The Provoked Wife, Vanbrugh, op. cit. p. 207.

57 - Op. cit. p. 243.

58 - Op. cit. p. 309.

against marriage and women and tries to play the reluctant gallant with Belinda - he "loves (her) even to matrimony itself - almost, egad!" - but he also discusses the matter earnestly with Constant and concludes that "to be capable of loving one, doubtless is better than to possess a thousand",[59] while Constant, instead of advising him to "rake on as (he) do(es)", observes that "tho' marriage be a lottery, in which there are a wondrous many blanks; yet there is one inestimable lot, in which the only heaven on earth is written".[60] All this (and other discussions between the gallants and between Belinda and Lady Brute) reflects a growing tendency to permit reason and feeling for the separate existence of others to intrude on the earlier pursuit of individual power to dominate in the love relation. Already Heartfree shows signs of a personality split between two modes of existence, a development which, as we shall see, Farquar carried to its logical conclusion by sharing the conflicting elements between two characters.

These two plays and the fragment "A Journey to London" exhaust Vanbrugh's original work; the rest are adaptations and translations from Dancourt and Molière. It is interesting to note that in The Confederacy (an adaptation from Dancourt's Les Bourgeoises à la Mode) the two wives, instead of being jealous of one another, turn to their own profit the fact that their husbands are endeavouring each to seduce the woman who is not his wife; as Clarissa says, they are "not much tortur'd with jealousy". The Epilogue even draws attention to "a useful hint" that wives "might take":

> Single, we found we nothing could obtain;
> We join our force - and we subdu'd our men.[61]

---

59 - Op. cit. p. 305.

60 - Ibid.

61 - Op. cit. p. 437.

Nothing could be more sweetly reasonable or less like the Restoration mode. A Journey to London would have been absorbingly interesting for our purposes had it been completed, because it is a rustic comedy combined with a domestic problem play, and the problem turns on what to do with a wife who misbehaves. Lord Loverule discusses the matter soberly with Sir Charles, and the trend of the talk suggests that Lady Arabella is going to be turned out of doors. The salient fact is that Lord Loverule emphatically disapproves of his wife's "exposing herself and (him)"; it is breach of decorum and not jealousy that troubles him, and he and Sir Charles agree that what men long for is "a woman fit to make a wife of: (who) cou'd .. make a home easy to her partner, by letting him find there a cheerful companion, an agreeable intimate, a useful assistant, a faithful friend, and (in its time, perhaps) a tender mother".[62] "Intimate", "friend", "assistant", these are the words we turn to when talking about love-communion; in the vocabulary of possessive love they have no place. In fact there is not in Vanbrugh's own work any instance of thoroughgoing possessive love and the jealousy disposition, with the exception of Lady Fanciful; instead there are repeated discussions of the nature of love and marriage and a disposition to weigh moral values. In short, reason has intruded on the "splendid isolation" of the mode, and self-examination and an examination of the self in relation to other selves are rapidly disintegrating the mode and, sadly enough, dissipating the splendours of its wit.

In one sense this disintegration is complete in Farquhar's comedies. They abound in fashionable figures who pursue the opposite sex, but their pursuit is a boisterous chase after the pleasures of the flesh, not the calculated conduct of a sexual enterprise which is intended to satisfy

---

62 - Journey to London, op. cit. p. 476.

primarily a mental craving for domination and only secondarily a physical need. Consequently jealousy as a persistent mode of feeling is nowhere to be found; there are only occasional instances of the jealous impulse, such as Colonel Standard's against Sir Harry Wildair over the favours of Lady Lurewell. He talks about his "jealous, piercing eyes" and voices the sentiment that "jealousy.. is as much the effect of love as (his) easiness in being satisfied".[63] The very phrasing of the remark shows the difference between his disposition and, let us say, that of Dorimant. He is indeed easily satisfied, by Sir Harry's assurances, by his own persistent inclination to think well of Lady Lurewell and "believe in spite of common fame", and finally his goodwill is rewarded by the discovery that Lady Lurewell is the mistress of his youth, and he prepares to marry her with every expression of satisfaction. The only use made of jealousy is as a plot device of a purely adventitious sort: to try to induce Young Mirabel to declare his love to Oriana in The Inconstant; to keep Lucinda and Lovewell from declaring their affection until the last act of Love and a Bottle, and to perform the same service in The Twin Rivals for Trueman and Aurelia. As a mode of feeling and an inevitable accompaniment and criterion of love, jealousy has gone. Gone too is the possessive love of which we saw so much in Restoration comedy. Love in Farquhar is of two sorts: gallantry of the earthy sort we have already noted, and love which evidently aims at being love-communion. The first sort inspires the comic intrigue and highspirited and sometimes witty dialogue, the other satisfies the demands of the conscience of the

---

63 - The Constant Couple; or A Trip to the Jubilee, George Farquhar, Dramatic Works, London, 1892, 2 Vols. Vol. I. p. 182.

increasingly bourgeois audience. Farquhar hit upon the handy device of having in most of his comedies a representative of each type: Roebuck has Lovewell as his alter ego; Wildair has Standard; Archer has Aimwell; Richmore has Trueman. Richmore's fate provides a fitting close to the whole matter of the love relation in this period: he is prevailed upon by the reasonings of his friend to marry his neglected mistress Clelia on the grounds that "if promises from man to man have force, why not from man to woman? Their very weakness is the charter of their power, and they should not be injured because they can't return it".[64] The claims of reason and emotion can scarcely be pitched higher. Richmore listens, concurs, and dwindles into a husband. If we doubted before, we can no longer; the Man of Mode is dead and the Man of Principle has stepped into his shoes. The beau and the rake, reformed or not, persist throughout succeeding generations and doubtless will be with us to the end of time, but the Man of Mode, with his possessive passion, his drive for domination and his ceaseless jealousies, has departed from the English stage, apparently never to return.

With him seems to have departed a quality of wit never achieved before or since; for brilliance, variety and exuberance it has no counterpart in the language; the Man of Mode and the highest wit came to their zenith and declined together. It is tempting to speculate that this may have happened because the conditions necessary for their existence are much the same. Both appear to depend on the manipulation of the mind rather than on the use of the reason; on the exercise of intellect almost in vacuo. It would appear to be a criterion of wit that it delight the mind without wholly

---

64 - The Twin Rivals, Op. cit. p. 104.

satisfying the reason. It is, in essence, partial. To achieve its effect, wit must isolate a part of experience and never contemplate a situation as an imagined whole. Rochester, alluding to Charles II's numerous family of illegitimate children, once said to his master's face, "Sire, you are the father of your people". One can imagine Rochester's sentiments if someone had observed that actually Charles was the sovereign of his people and the father of the Duke of Monmouth.

We have suggested throughout that the Man of Mode is able to exist because he uses his intellect on a few aspects of experience, detached from reality as a whole; he conforms to a mode of life which could not stand the comprehensive scrutiny of reason and could be achieved only by aloofness from society as a whole. Hence the "splendid isolation" of the mode, its splendour residing in elegance of deportment, gaiety of spirit, and brilliance of wit, and its isolation foreshadowing its decay. If we return to the point where we began, Etherege's lines seem even more felicitious than they appeared at first:

> Wit has, like painting, had her happy flights
> And in peculiar ages reach'd her heights.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Dramatic Texts

BEHN, APHRA. The Works of Aphra Behn, ed. Montagu Summers. London, 1915.
CONGREVE, WILLIAM. The Plays of Congreve, Mermaid Series, London.
DRYDEN, JOHN. The Works of John Dryden, ed. Sir Walter Scott, revised and corrected by George Saintsbury. Edinburgh, 1882-93. 8 vols.
ETHEREGE, Sir GEORGE. The Works of Sir George Etherege, ed. by A. Wilson Verity, London, 1888.
FARQUHAR, GEORGE. The Dramatic Works of George Farquhar, ed. by A. C. Ewald. London, 1892. 2 vols.
MOLIERE, JEAN BAPTISTE POQUELIN DE. Oeuvres, Paris, 1876.
SEDLEY, Sir CHARLES. The Works of Sir Charles Sedley, Bart. with Memoirs of the Author's Life, Written by an Eminent Hand, London, 1778.
SHADWELL, THOMAS. The Complete Works of Thomas Shadwell, ed. by Montagu Summers. London 1927, 2 vols.
VANBRUGH, Sir JOHN. The Complete Works, ed. by B. Dobree. London, 1927-8
WYCHERLEY, WILLIAM. Plays, Mermaid Series, ed. by W.C.Ward, London, 1900

B. Biographical and Critical Works.

BELJAME, ALEXANDRE. Le public et les Hommes de lettres en Angleterre au Dixhuitieme Siecle. Paris, 1881.
BERNBAUM, E. The Drama of Sentiment, N.Y. 1920.
BERGSON, HENRI. Le Rire. Paris, 1920
COLLIER, JEREMY. A Short View of the Immorality and Profaneness of the English Stage, London, 1699.
CONGREVE, W. Letter to Dennis, in Comedies by William Congreve, World's Classics, London, 1949.
CONNELY, WILLARD. Brawny Wycherley, New York and London, 1930.
CIBBER, COLLEY, An Apology for the Life of Mr. Colley Cibber written by himself, London, 1822.
DOBREE, BONAMY. Restoration Comedy, 1660-1720. Oxford, 1924.
ed. Introductions to English Literature, London1938.4 vols.
ETHEREGE, Sir GEORGE. The Letter Book.
EVELYN, JOHN. The Diary of John Evelyn, ed. fromthe original MSS. by William Bray, Washington and London,1901.2 vols.
GOSSE, Sir EDMUND. Life of William Congreve, Great Writer Series, London, 1888.
Seventeenth Century Studies, London, 1879
HAZLITT, WILLIAM. Lectures on the English Comic Writers, Everymans Library.
HUNT, LEIGH. ed. Dramatic Works of Wycherley, Congreve, Vanbrugh and Farquhar, with biographical and critical notices, London and New York, 1866.
KRUTCH, JOSEPH WOOD. Comedy and Conscience after the Restoration, New York, 1924.
PINTO, V. de SOLA."The English Renaissance" in Introductions to English Literature, ed. B. Dobree, London, 1938, Vol. 2

LAMB, CHARLES. Essays of Elia, Everymans Library.
LYNCH, KATHLEEN M. The Social Mode in Restoration Comedy, New York, 1926
MACAULAY, THOMAS BABBINGTON. Critical and Historical Essays, London, 1909, 2 vols.
MEREDITH, GEORGE. Essay on Comedy and the Uses of the Comic Spirit, London, 1910.
NETTLETON, GEORGE HENRY. English Drama of the Restoration and the Eighteenth Century, New York, 1914.
NICOLL, ALLARDYCE. A History of Restoration Drama, Cambridge, 1923.
PERRY. H. TEN EYCK. The Comic Spirit in Restoration Drama, New Haven and London, 1925.
ROYNOLD, GONZAGUE de, Le Dixhuitieme Siecle, Editions de L'Arbre, Montreal, 1944.
SCHELLING, FELIX E. "The Restoration Drama" (K) in Cambridge History of English Literature, ed. A.W.Ward and A.R.Waller, Vol. 8. pp. 115-145, Cambridge, 1912.
SMITH, JOHN HARRINGTON. The Gay Couple in Restoration Comedy, Cambridge, 1948.
SWIFT, JONATHAN. Journal to Stella, Everymans Library.
THACKERAY, WILLIAM MAKEPEACE. The English Humourists, London, 1851.
WARD, ADOLPHUS WILLIAM. "Dryden" in Cambridge History of English Literature, ed. A.W.Ward and A.R. Waller, Vol. 8. pp. 1-57. Cambridge, 1912.
WHIBLEY, CHARLES. "The Restoration Drama" (II) in Cambridge History of English Literature, ed. A.W.Ward and A.R.Waller, Vol. 8. pp. 146-177. Cambridge, 1912.
WILCOX, JOHN. The Relation of Moliere to Restoration Comedy, New York, 1938.

6. Works on Political & Social History and Psychology.

ASHTON, WILLIAM. Social Life in the Reign of Queen Anne, London, 1883.
BURNET, GILBERT, History of His Own Time ... Oxford, 1823.
EVELYN. JOHN. The Diary of John Evelyn. ed. from the Original MSS. by William Bray. Washington and London, 1901.
FEILING, KEITH. England under the Tudors and Stuarts, Home University Library.
FROMM, ERICH. Man for Himself, New York, 1947.
HAMILTON, ANTHONY. Memoirs of the Court of Charles II, by the Count Grammont. London, 1859.
LAGACHE, DANIEL. La Jalousie Amoureuse, Paris, 1947, 2 Vols.
LUTTRELL, NARCISSUS. A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs .. Oxford, 1857. 6 Vols.
MACAULAY, THOMAS BABBINGTON. History of England, London, 1889. 2 vols.
OGG, DAVID. England in the Reign of Charles II. Oxford, 1934. 2 vols.
PEPYS, SAMUEL. Diary, ed. Henry B. Wheatley, London, 1893. 9 vols.
TAWNEY, RICHARD HENRY. Religion and the Rise of Capitalism, Pelican Books.
TREVELYAN, GEORGE MACAULAY. History of England, London, 1926.
TURBERVILLE, ARTHUR STANLEY. The House of Lords in the Reign of William III, Oxford Historical and Literary Studies, Oxford, 1913. Vol. 3.