

ABSTRACT

CARTWRIGHT, CHRISTINA ANN. Colley Cibber and the Negotiation of Mode: Sentiment and Satire in *Love's Last Shift* and *The Non-Juror*. (Under the direction of John D. Morillo.)

The purpose of this thesis is to show that Colley Cibber's works are important to studies of both genre and mode in 17th-and 18th-century British literature. This thesis explores the important lessons that Cibber's negotiation of mode teaches us about Cibber and his influence in the movement toward and away from certain modes (sentimentalism, satire, and comedy). In order to achieve this goal, I look at two different genres – dramatic sentimental comedy and dramatic satire – as they are seen in two works of Cibber: *Love's Last Shift* (1696) and *The Non-Juror* (1717). Scholarship tends to focus on the sentimental comedy of one (*Love's Last Shift*) and the political satire of the other (*The Non-Juror*) without necessarily addressing the presence of both modes in both plays. Both of Cibber's plays contain both modes, and these modes are similar in that they instruct. By examining the changes that occurred across the 21 years between *Love's Last Shift* and *The Non-Juror*, in the areas of both satire and sentimentalism, we are able to understand more about the evolution of certain forms.

In *The Non-Juror* Cibber mimicked the works of famous satirists of his time in an attempt to create a successful play. However, unlike other satirists, Cibber, referring back to the success of *Love's Last Shift*, added an element that made his work distinctive: sentimentalism. The important connection between the two plays is the presence of these two modes – the sentimental and the satirical – because both modes share the idea of instruction. However, one suggests an appeal to feelings of pity and empathy, and a lesson by example; the other suggests an appeal to feelings of shame and, perhaps as a side effect, a

lesson by ridicule. However, Cibber's success comes from his ability to use these two modes to complement each other. This unique mix of two seemingly divergent modes not only suggests changes in the nature of satire at the time, but it also indicates the presence of sentimentalism in a genre different than the usual focus of sentimental studies and at a much earlier date than traditional scholarship has suggested.

**COLLEY CIBBER AND THE NEGOTIATION OF MODE: SENTIMENT AND
SATIRE IN *LOVE'S LAST SHIFT* AND *THE NON-JUROR***

by
CHRISTINA ANN CARTWRIGHT

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
North Carolina State University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts

ENGLISH

Raleigh, North Carolina

2007

APPROVED BY:

Michael Grimwood, Ph.D.

Sharon M. Setzer, Ph.D.

John D. Morillo, Ph.D.
Chair of Advisory Committee

Dedication

To compulsory education and simplicity.

Biography

Christina Ann Cartwright was born and raised in Point Harbor, NC, on the northern coast of the Outer Banks. She has two wonderful parents, Sandy and Thurman; an older brother, Cliff; and a wonderful – albeit huge and a little funny – extended family.

After graduating from Currituck County High School in 2000, Christina attended the University of North Carolina in Wilmington, NC. As an undergraduate she studied English, with a concentration in professional writing, and Psychology, with a concentration in Behavior Analysis. Christina graduated summa cum laude in December 2003 with both University and departmental (Psychology) honors. Her honor's thesis, "Effects of Caffeine on Performance and Acquisition in a Nosepoke Task," was based on experiments performed in the area of psychopharmacology under the direction of Dr. Steven I. Dworkin.

Christina began working toward her MA at NC State University in January 2005. While pursuing her MA, she also earned her NC teaching license for secondary English education.

On June 2, 2007, she will marry her boyfriend of eight years, Matthew Miller, and she will pursue a career that is sure to involve writing and literature.

Acknowledgments

To Dr. John Morillo: Your enthusiasm for Restoration and 18th-century drama and literature helped peak my interest, and your interest in my work helped to keep me motivated. Not everyone would support a thesis about Colley Cibber, but you did in a truly wonderful way. Thank you for your patience, help, and enthusiasm. I walk away from this experience with two key pieces of advice that I will always remember: Be bold and avoid the weenie words.

To Dr. Michael Grimwood & Dr. Sharon Setzer: Thank you for all of your help in the completion and improvement of this thesis.

To my grandfather, Howard Baucom: You have supported my education wholeheartedly and continuously for all of these years, and I'm not sure I'll ever be able to thank you enough.

To my parents, Sandy and Thurman Cartwright: You always told me I was the best – even when I wouldn't believe you. Thank you.

To Dr. Steven I. Dworkin: You saw my potential and gave me the chance to participate in amazing undergraduate research. You helped me prepare for graduate school more than I ever knew.

To my (almost) husband, Matthew Miller: Your patience, rivalry, and unique sense of humor have always helped me strive to succeed. You're my Dottie, and I love you.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction _____	1
2. The Transition to Sentimental Comedy in <i>Love's Last Shift</i> _____	9
3. Mixing Modes in <i>The Non-Juror</i> _____	42
4. Conclusion _____	86
5. Works Cited _____	92

Introduction

Colley Cibber played many roles in his lifetime, both on and off the stage. In addition to being an actor, theatre-manager, and subject of satire, he was a playwright, an autobiographer, and Poet Laureate. As a writer, Cibber was a careful negotiator of genre, often mixing seemingly contradictory modes such as comedy, sentimentalism, and satire within the genres of drama and prose. The purpose of this thesis is to show that a selective investigation of Cibber's works is important to studies of both genre and mode in 17th- and 18th-century British literature.

In this thesis I will explore the important lessons that Cibber's negotiation of mode teaches us about Cibber and his influence on the movement toward and away from certain modes in the years following his work. In order to achieve this goal, I will look at two genres – dramatic sentimental comedy and dramatic satire – as they appear in the works of Cibber.

A. Defining Key Terms

For the purposes of this thesis, certain terms must be defined:

1. Genre and Mode

For my purposes, genre refers to categories for grouping literary works that share common form or techniques. For example, drama, novel, and essay are genres. Mode is a broader categorization than genre. In this thesis, mode will refer to a category of literary types such as romance, satire, comedy, or tragedy that can be found in various genres.

2. Satire

For my purposes, satire will be defined as a highly critical presentation of folly in a humorous manner that attempts to improve audiences through ridicule. Cibber's form of satire is typically Horatian, meaning he "aims to correct by broadly sympathetic laughter" rather than taking the Juvenalian approach of pointing "with contempt and indignation" ("Satire" 464). In this way, Cibber is a satirist attempting "through laughter not so much to tear down as to inspire a remodeling" ("Satire" 464). Brian Corman writes that satire is an attempt "to return his [the target's] humours to their reason, thus alleviating the prevalence of folly about him" (16). According to Claude Rawson, satire was the dominant mode of literary expression in Britain between 1660 and 1750, especially in Restoration drama (xii).

3. Restoration Drama

The term Restoration drama refers to a period in British drama that began with the return of the constitutional monarchy under the rule of Charles II in 1660 and ended after a disputed number of years. Between 1642 and 1660, the public British theatres were closed as a result of Civil War and Puritan control under Oliver Cromwell. Once the theatres reopened, several changes occurred. For the first time British theatres welcomed female actors and female playwrights. Though Restoration drama included comedy, tragedy, heroic drama and tragicomedy, the drama of the Restoration period was mostly comedic, with a focus on rakish aristocratic behavior and wit, money and sex (Womersley vii; "Restoration" 443-44). Much of the comedy of the Restoration was comedy of manners, a realistic, often satirical presentation of stock characters who reflect the fashions and manners of one group with a focus on dialogue and wit over plot ("Comedy" 111).

4. Sentimental Comedy

According to F.W. Bateson, Restoration comedy was cynical, deliberately passionless, and artificial (7). Bateson argues that “‘Sentimentalism’ is the quality which *differentiates* the dramatists of the eighteenth century from those of the Restoration” (11). Sentimentalism is defined as a focus on emotions, with a desire to induce them, and a belief in the goodness of human beings (“Sentimentalism” 478). Sentimental comedy was a form meant to instruct and appeal to audiences through the presentation of emotion and virtue (“Sentimental” 478). Cibber is often credited with writing the first English dramatic sentimental comedy, *Love’s Last Shift*, in 1696. According to B.R.S. Fone, the term sentimental was first applied to drama in 1750. In 1783, Thomas Davies first deemed *Love’s Last Shift* a sentimental comedy in his *Dramatic Miscellanies* (Fone, “*Love’s*” 11, 22): “It is a singular fact in the history of the English Stage that the very first comedy acted after the libertine times of the Restoration, in which any purity of manners, and respect to the honour of the marriage-bed were preserved was Cibber’s *Love’s Last Shift, or the Fool in Fashion*” (qtd. in Senior 38).

According to Maureen Sullivan, sentimental comedy contains three basic elements: “a moral problem that provides the plot, fundamentally good characters who grapple with the problem and solve it in accordance with Christian ethics, and sympathetic emotions that accompany triumph” (xxvii). Similarly, Ernest Bernbaum argues that the drama of sensibility “implied that human nature, when not, as in some cases, already perfect, was perfectible by an appeal to the emotions.... It so represented their conduct as to arouse admiration for their virtues and pity for their sufferings.... it showed them contending against distresses but finally rewarded by morally deserved happiness” (10). To Francis M.

Kavenik, sentimental comedy included showing feelings and consequences, even the negative ones, as a means of presenting new dimensions of life and marriage to audiences (80-81).

Sullivan also recognizes scholars who define sentimental comedy by other characteristics:

Joseph Wood Krutch's characterization of sentimental drama locates its quintessential spirit in audience response – in sharing the joys and sorrows of the characters, in admiring virtue, in believing that it will triumph, and in rejoicing personally when it does.... according to Arthur Sherbo, the sentimental dramatist indulges in 'repetition and prolongation' of the intricacies of the moral dilemma or of the virtues and the sufferings of the characters. Related to this is the 'emphasis and direction' by which the dramatist reiterates certain ideas and plays on certain emotions so that the climax is natural and expected. (xvii)

Bernbaum suggests that the defining characteristic of sentimentalism is a belief in the basic goodness of other human beings. In discussing the emotional effect of *Love's Last Shift* on audiences, Bernbaum writes, "Their enthusiasm, it is important to note, was aroused by the virtues of the characters. To them, the play was an astonishing novelty, not merely because it was a comedy at which they wept, but also because it aroused admiration for persons like themselves" (2).

B. Late 17th - and Early 18th - Century Drama

This thesis focuses on two plays by Cibber from 1696 and 1717. Some scholars define this period as part of the Restoration. For others, it marks the end of the Restoration and the start of 18th-century sentimentalism. This paper will categorize the 21-year period between *Love's Last Shift* and *The Non-Juror* as both Restoration and 18th-century drama because both plays embody characteristics of the two periods.

Many definitions of 18th-century drama focus on the move away from satirical Restoration wit and toward sense and sentimentalism. Bateson argues, “The eighteenth century was... an emasculated reproduction of the Restoration.... The importance of the eighteenth century from this aspect is its discovery, or rediscovery, of what can only be called the social sense” (5). The rise of sentimentalism during this period is often related to Jeremy Collier’s attacks on the stage (Bateson 8). In *A Short View of the Immorality and Profaneness of the English Stage* (1698) Collier wrote, “The business of plays is to recommend virtue and discountenance vice; to show the uncertainty of human greatness, the sudden turns of fate, and the unhappy conclusions of violence and injustice; ‘tis to expose the singularities of pride and fancy, to make folly and falsehood contemptible, and to bring everything that is ill under infamy and neglect” (qtd. in Combe 296-97). Yet others, like William Congreve, citing Aristotle in *Amendments of Mr. Collier's False and Imperfect Citations* (1699), argued that “men are to be laughed out of their vices in comedy; the business of comedy is to delight as well as to instruct; and as vicious people are made ashamed of their follies or faults by seeing them exposed in a ridiculous manner, so are good people at once both warned and diverted at their expense” (qtd. in Combe 297).

In the way Congreve described, certain aspects of the Restoration survived the birth of the sentimental. According to Kirk Combe, “That there was a shift from the satirical to the sentimental in English drama, and in particular comedy, during the period 1660-1710 is unmistakable.” However, Combe suggests that the presence of one mode did not exclude the presence of the other (295). This idea that the two modes were able to coexist is demonstrated in Cibber’s works.

C. Works

Cibber’s two plays are useful in the differentiation of these two genres because scholarship tends to focus on the sentimental comedy of one (*Love’s Last Shift*) and the political satire of the other (*The Non-Juror*) without necessarily addressing the presence of both modes in each play. Combe offers a characterization of the difference: “Whereas satirical comedy, motivated by fundamental beliefs in the corrupt nature of humanity, reveals vice, sentimental comedy, viewing people motivated to ethical behaviour by innate feelings of sympathy towards one another, presents instead behaviour worthy of emulation” (300). Both of Cibber’s plays contain both modes, and these modes are similar in that they both instruct. In truth, they are less different than we first expect, and to understand one enhances understanding of the other.

1. *Love’s Last Shift* (1696)

Motivated by a strong desire to write a successful play and a memorable part for himself, Cibber worked to create a play that would satisfy the demands of a changing audience. In addition, Cibber was unwilling to abandon certain successful aspects of Restoration comedy. The resulting sentimental comedy, *Love’s Last Shift*, is a mixture of

satiric Restoration comedy and sentimentalism that many find awkward. Like other sentimental comedies, *Love's Last Shift* attracts the consistent complaint that the repentance or conversion scenes are improbable (Sullivan xxvii). However, despite the awkward combination of styles, *Love's Last Shift* was highly successful because it offered audiences the humor of the Restoration *and* the high moral ending they desired.

Love's Last Shift is important for several reasons: Despite the differing opinions available regarding Cibber's motivation and intentions, he wrote a play that was popular, and it provides an early example of the sentimentalism that would dominate British literature in the later 18th century. In addition, an examination of changes in the audience composition may give a good indication of where literary and dramatic audiences were headed in the future. What aspects of sentimentalism does he advance in his play? Do these aspects appear in his later work? What does Cibber accomplish with *Love's Last Shift* and how does this work relate to other works in the 18th century?

2. *The Non-Juror* (1717)

In the dedication to King George I at the beginning of *The Non-Juror*, Cibber indicates his desire to prove the importance of the stage by creating a play that diverts and ridicules those people choosing to act against the government. In *An Apology for the Life of Colley Cibber* (1740), Cibber uses the phrase "Satire of Comedy" to describe his intended genre. *The Non-Juror* is generally classified as a political satire and not a sentimental comedy.

Though it is true that *The Non-Juror* contains multiple allusions to the events occurring between the Jacobite Rebellion of 1715 and August 1717, Cibber's decision to create a situation wrought with familiar tensions of the time produced a probable and

effective play that appealed to the passions of the audience. According to Bateson, this sort of audience-character identification is a defining characteristic of eighteenth-century sentimentalism (7-8). Yet, this same focus on political events lends itself well to the satire of *The Non-Juror*. Cibber used the techniques of sentimentalism to create a connection between the audience and the characters, a method that permitted the satirical nature of the play to better evoke ridicule within the audience and provoke change while at the same time reducing the harshness of satire.

I am interested in the movement of sentimentalism throughout the work of Cibber. If *Love's Last Shift* provides "a less satiric portrait of human nature" than most Restoration comedy, then what can be said about Cibber's attempt at dramatic satire? Does this later work still contain aspects of sentimentalism? How has sentimentalism changed? How does Cibber use satire and sentimentalism in *The Non-Juror*? How do these two elements complement or contradict each other? What sentimental, satirical, or comedic elements are consistent across both *The Non-Juror* and *Love's Last Shift*? Do Restoration aspects appear in *The Non-Juror*? How has his work been affected by the satire in the early part of the eighteenth century in works by Alexander Pope, Jonathan Swift, and others? How has his concern with audience changed? And, most importantly, how is Cibber's work with sentimentalism and satire in drama valuable to our understanding of these modes?

The Transition to Sentimental Comedy in *Love's Last Shift*

Cibber's first play, *Love's Last Shift* (1696), is often deemed the first English sentimental comedy because, according to David Womersly, it provides "a less satiric portrait of human nature [than traditional Restoration comedy], in which the virtuous moral affections are more to the fore than appetite and self-interest" (Womersly 554). Most scholarly research on *Love's Last Shift* focuses on the play as a sentimental comedy. However, one unique aspect of *Love's Last Shift* is its hodgepodge of sentimental characteristics and satirical Restoration wit. Womersly is not suggesting that satire is absent from Cibber's sentimental comedy; rather, he calls the play "less satiric." This chapter addresses the tradition of sentimental comedy that Cibber employs in his first play. What are the defining modal qualities in *Love's Last Shift*, both sentimental and satirical, and how do these qualities translate into a lasting impact on later attempts at drama?

Love's Last Shift dramatizes the story of a virtuous wife, Amanda, who attempts to regain her husband, Loveless, after his ten-year absence. Loveless, who left Amanda after only six months of marriage, returns to town with his servant Snap after losing all of his money. Loveless meets a former friend, Young Worthy, who lies and tells him that Amanda is dead. Young Worthy then encourages Amanda to get revenge on Loveless by tricking Loveless into sleeping with her. However, Amanda sees the act as a possible means of regaining her husband. After sleeping with her estranged husband under false pretenses, Amanda reveals herself to Loveless as his faithful wife, and he claims to have changed. The play contains a subplot in which Young Worthy and his brother Elder Worthy are attempting to marry Narcissa and her cousin Hillaria by tricking their father and uncle Sir Wisewoud. The brothers' machinations are occasionally disrupted by Sir Novelty Fashion, the fop who

flirts with all the women but ultimately cares only for himself, and his jealous mistress with the horrible temper, Flareit. In the end, Loveless and Amanda are back together, the Worthy brothers have their wives (and their wives' dowries), Sir Novelty is free of Flareit, and the audience is left with the message that a virtuous love is like a joy of heaven.

In order to better understand the motivation and purpose behind the strange mix of sentiment and satire that constitutes Cibber's first play, it is necessary to examine the context in which Cibber wrote *Love's Last Shift*. The movement of English drama toward a more moral center parallels concerns Collier voiced in his rather notorious *A Short View of the Immorality, and Profaneness of the English Stage*, which attacked Restoration drama for its immoral plots, indecent language, and dangerous ideas. However, Collier's work was not printed until 1698. Thus, there must have been other forces motivating Cibber in the years before *Love's Last Shift* premiered in January 1696.

Cibber joined the Drury Lane Theatre in 1690, but his success as an actor was limited. Though he had 12 roles before he wrote *Love's Last Shift*, including an apparently spectacular performance as Fondlewife in *The Old Bachelor*, Cibber believed that he was not properly appreciated as an actor (Fone 36; Senior 33). According to Dorothy Senior, Cibber was "round-shouldered and insignificant, with a high-pitched, squeaking voice" and a lack of grace and effective elocution (31). Kristina Straub contends that Cibber's physical limitations and lack of audience appeal prevented him from pursuing the part of the romantic hero (269). Cibber supports this suggestion in his *An Apology for the Life of Colley Cibber* (1740) (hereafter referred to as *Apology*): "The first Thing that enters into the Head of a young Actor, is that of being a Heroe: In this Ambition I was soon snubb'd, by the Insufficiency of my Voice" (102).

Despite his lack of success as an actor prior to *Love's Last Shift*, Cibber did experience mild success as a writer. In 1695 he wrote the Prologue to Aphra Behn's *Abdelazar, or The Moor's Revenge*, but he was not permitted to perform it. Instead, Cibber was forced to watch another actor receive applause for his work (Senior 32). When his various roles did not help Cibber advance as an actor, he decided to try harder, as he says in his *Apology*: "... being of a Temper not easily dishearten'd, I resolv'd to leave nothing unattempted, that might shew me, in some new Rank of Distinction. Having then no other Resource, I was at last reduc'd to write a Character for myself" (118).

In fact, Cibber played the fop, Sir Novelty Fashion, a character who often exhibited metatheatrical qualities. For example, Sir Novelty responds to Sir William's attacks against his character by discussing his plans to write a play:

SIR NOVELTY. ... Therefore, in Vindication of all well-dress'd Gentlemen, I intend to write a Play, where my chiefest Character shall be a *downright English Booby*, that affects to be a Beau, without either Genius or foreign Education, and to call it, in Imitation of another famous Comedy, *He Wou'd if he Cou'd*. (III. ii.218-24, 572)

In other places, Sir Novelty speaks like a playwright outlining a play:

SIR NOVELTY: ... What follows upon that? Opportunity, Impportunity, Resistance, Force, Entreaty, Persisting! – Doubting, Swearing, Lying, – Blushes, Yielding, Victory, Pleasure! – Indifference. (III.i.147-51, 571)

Based on the evidence, it seems that a combination of factors, especially a desire for success, motivated Cibber. As noted above, Cibber admits in his *Apology* to writing the play

in order to create a part for himself, and it is no surprise that Cibber would want his play to be a success. According to Hughes in *English Drama, 1660-1700*, a “widespread tendency to aim at every available target rather than to create a unified work of art” can be detected in Cibber’s works (389), which suggests that Cibber can easily adapt to satire. Kavenik points to the Epilogue of *Love’s Last Shift* and asserts that it reveals Cibber’s overall goal of reaching and pleasing everyone in the audience “from ‘City-gentlemen’ to rakes to ladies” (82). John H. Wilson writes, “He decided, therefore, to write a comedy with a major role tailored to fit his own comic style. Well aware of the slowly changing tastes of his audience, he seems to have decided to please both the moralists and the anti-moralists, to eat his cake and have it too” (191). In fact, in the dedication of *Love’s Last Shift* to Richard Norton of Southwick, a theatrical enthusiast from Hampshire, Cibber writes, “Every Guest is the best Judge of his own Palate; and a Poet ought no more to impose good Sense upon the Galleries, than dull Farce upon the undisputed Judges. I first consider’d who my Guests were, before I prepared my Entertainment” (lines 63-67, 555; Womersley 554). In the Prologue, Cibber writes, “Tis half the Labour of your trifling Age / To fashion you fit Subjects for the Stage” (lines 21-22, 556).

While no one seems to doubt that Cibber was motivated by a desire for success, some do dispute whether or not Cibber meant to reform the stage *in addition* to experiencing success. In two separate articles, Fone disagrees with the idea that Cibber was a moral reformer. “Cibber was not unaware of the value of lewdness. Usefully for the development of sentimental comedy, he knew too, the power of tears.... And it was success, not reformation, that he sought” (“Colley” 41). Wilson is slightly bolder when he writes, “Cibber had no moral convictions... he adopted the new devices of sentimentalism only

because he saw that his audience liked them” (194). The most obvious evidence against this idea is Cibber’s participation in John Vanbrugh’s 1696 play *The Relapse, or Virtue in Danger*. C.R. Kropf argues that *The Relapse* presents the same temptations and problems as *Love’s Last Shift*, but includes wholly different solutions. In doing so, Kropf asserts, Vanbrugh demonstrates the shallow and unrealistic nature of sentimental comedy (196). Thus, Cibber’s performance as Lord Foppington brings his devotion to the idea of sentimental comedy into question. Approaching the issue from a different angle, Senior writes: “Perhaps he was not fully aware himself of what he was doing, though later on he openly professed his desire to reform the stage. Reform came not so much from within as from a changed public conscience, and Cibber – devotee of Opportunity that he was – did but answer, with his sentimental comedies, a general demand” (39).

With these words in mind, it may be prudent to consider Cibber’s stated desire to reform to mean a transformation of the state of the struggling theatre at the time into one of success rather than to change it into a more moral place. As Fone writes, “Cibber was not writing to reform; he was writing to please, and he saw that he must please now, not only the men, but the ladies as well. He was, as I say, desperate for success, and the nearest way he grasped gave us sentimental comedy” (“*Love’s*” 13). To better understand what Cibber was grasping toward, we must explore the nature of the audience during Cibber’s first five years at Drury Lane and the demands being made on the theatre and its actors.

Most Restoration scholars agree that Cibber considered the current climate of potential audiences when he began to write *Love’s Last Shift*. In fact, theatres had been struggling since the 1680s when a reduction in the production of new plays occurred (Hughes 377). Beginning in the 1680s, theatre audiences began to demand more moral plays, a shift

that can be detected in the prologues and epilogues of the period (Scouten & Hume 48): “the moral element in the audience (the Ladies, as they are usually called) was effectively crying down what it regarded as smut in the new plays, but it was failing to support plays overtly presented for its delectation” (Scouten & Hume 55). Kavenik points to a number of factors affecting audiences at the time, including war, succession issues, and changes in the composition of London’s population (65).

A number of events permitted Cibber, an actor, to write a play. According to Derek Hughes, a second theatrical company was formed at the Lincoln’s Field Theatre in London on April 30, 1695, which created an atmosphere of competition that the theatres had not experienced for over 12 years (377). This competition brought an increased demand for new plays because a lack of exclusive control over former works permitted the two companies to perform the same show at the same time. As a result of this demand, the two theatres performed approximately 50 new plays between 1695 and 1697, including *Love’s Last Shift* (Hume 408).

Because the audiences were divided between the two theatrical companies, new forms of entertainment were being employed to attract them, including variety shows with singers, dancers, and jugglers (Hume 381). However, Cibber decided to write a play that was different than previous plays. According to Womersly, *Love’s Last Shift* “... is often associated with the moral backlash against what was perceived as licentiousness of comedies of the preceding twenty years... it is clear that in the main Loveless-Amanda plot of *Love’s Last Shift* Cibber is experimenting with how such material might receive dramatic embodiment” (554). Other scholars agree with Womersly’s assertion. However, the forces that motivated Cibber are in dispute.

Since the time of James II (1685-1688), the monarchy had steadily withdrawn support from the theatres. Wilson points to King William III, who “had not use for the theatres,” as the ally of the moral reformation societies (189). In a 1689 letter, William wrote:

We most earnestly Desire, and shall Endeavour a General Reformation of the Lives and Manners of all Our Subjects, as being that which must Establish Our Throne, and Secure to Our People their Religion, Happiness and Peace, all which seem to be in great Danger at this time, by reason of that overflowing of Vice, which is too Notorious in this as well as other Neighbouring Nations. (qtd. in Sullivan xxxvi)

In 1692, groups called the Societies for the Reformation of Manners formed to combat the perceived overabundance of vulgarity in both dramatic material and society as a whole (Kavenik 68). These groups had the support of Queen Mary, who wrote a letter in 1691 encouraging the enforcement of “those Laws which have been made, and are still in Force against the Prophanation of the Lord’s-Day, Drunkenness, Prophane Swearing and Cursing, and all other Lewd, Enormous, and Disorderly Practices” (qtd. in Sullivan xxxvii). These society members policed performances and reported any infringements of a statute outlawing of blasphemy on the stage that had been created by James I. Comedy seemed to be the most likely genre targeted by these groups (Kavenik 87-88, 71).

According to Robert D. Hume, the loss of court support and the creation of a second theatre company were the most serious factors that changed the theatre in the late 17th-century (13, 406). However, other scholars point to the emergence of a middle class. The ascension of William and Mary and England’s participation in Continental war were followed by a drastic social and economic transformation in London. Many merchants had

earned fortunes during the war, and this redistribution of wealth was felt in the theatre where the merchant class was now part of the audience (Kavenik 66-69). Whereas the comedy throughout the first 30 years of the Restoration that was written by and directed toward the elite was successful, the new middle-class audiences were not accepting of the former wit and immorality (Sullivan xxxiii-xxxiv). As Wilson argues, the theatre found itself facing a steady pressure from a new middle-class. “It had been infiltrated by ladies who loved to linger over tender sentiments... disliked wit and satire – especially at their expense.... They enjoyed the novelty of morality on the stage and wallowed in the luxury of tears” (190-91).

With the rapid growth of a London middle class came a change in the variety and distribution of information. The lapse of the Licensing Act in 1695 opened the door for a flood of unregulated books, pamphlets, and newspapers – and stern reactions to them. These publications contained controversial discourses ranging from pornography to sermons. These new publications also included criticism of both literature and drama that “evolved a set of critical theories, based partly on old and partly on new ideas, which encouraged, and, to some extent, directed the development of a new sentimental and moralizing comic tradition more closely suited than the old to the taste of its generation” (Krutch, “Governmental” 173-74). In his *Apology*, Cibber writes, “But while good Writers are so scarce, and undaunted Criticks so plenty, I am afraid a good Play, and a blazing Star, will be equal Rarities” (56-57).

With this information now available to a larger segment of the population, a more open social discourse was created that traversed former class division. Especially among the middle class, the writings of John Locke were highly popular, and a shift was felt toward an increased importance in social responsibility (Kavenik 66-69). However, Kavenik asserts

that the discussions of responsibility, religion, and morality “were likely to be somewhat altered under a system that actively supported capitalism, materialism, and controlled progress” (105). As society changed in this way, the theatre and its playwrights responded by promoting “a system of values relying on internal verities that are at one with the best interests of the community; morality and social regulation promote the general welfare even at the expense of the individual, but they are also ‘natural,’ reflecting the inherent goodness of humankind” (Kavenik 114).

Linked to these changing audience demands is the idea of homecoming. According to Hughes, this theme of the homecoming was typical of the time because it expressed the sense of stability England was experiencing under the rule of William and Mary (381). “Whereas sex comedy of the early 1690s portrays irremediable dislocation, Cibber follows Shadwell in celebrating the homecoming of the morally, socially, and physically displaced” (Hughes 387). *Love’s Last Shift* explores the concept of homecoming in various forms. Loveless returns home after a ten-year absence. Though when he originally returns he believes his wife, Amanda, is dead, he eventually experiences a homecoming with her. His return to the marriage bed and his choice to return to his marriage mark a reunion or homecoming. Also, Loveless is reunited with his former financial and social status because his return to Amanda (and her inheritance) carries him from his current poverty to a more comfortable existence.

Sullivan points to the end-of-the-century writings of Sir Richard Blackmore as evidence of the middle-class argument against typical Restoration comedy. Of Blackmore, Sullivan writes, “In his opposition to a purely intellectual wit, and his insensitivity to satiric purpose in the comedy of manners, Blackmore illustrates one of the several attitudes that

helped prepare the way for sentimental comedy” (xxxv). As an example, Sullivan includes a letter in which Blackmore writes:

A Poet should imploy all his Judgment and Wit, exhaust all the Riches of his Fancy, and abound in Beautiful and Noble Expression, to divert and entertain others; but then it must be with this Prospect, that he may hereby engage their Attention, insinuate more easily into their Minds, and more effectually convey to them wise Instructions. (qtd. in Sullivan xxxiv-xxxv)

Despite the consensus among scholars that the above factors influenced 17th-century English drama, Arthur H. Scouten and Robert D. Hume disagree that influence can be assigned to a demographic change. They write in their article “‘Restoration Comedy’ and its Audiences, 1660-1776”:

According to longstanding critical dogma, a key transition occurred in the years around 1700, one which saw increasingly bourgeois audiences reject the harsh verities of ‘Restoration comedy’ in favour of the new ‘sentimental’ comedy. The facts are quite different. Audiences continued to support stock plays, but for reasons which we do not pretend to understand completely they damned practically all the *new* plays mounted by both companies. (57)

However, even if scholars cannot pinpoint exactly why audiences were changing in the 1680s and 1690s, they do attribute to audiences the ability to influence theatre. Sullivan writes, “while Cibber’s Epilogue seems to indicate a cavalier treatment of the moral problem in the play and thus to prevent us from seeing in it a whole-hearted acquiescence in the moralists’ demands, it cannot be denied that the play made some response to the censures then abounding” (xli). Scouten and Hume argue that audiences permitted continuous and

obvious lapses from reality within the plays: that “audiences saw *some* relationship between comedy and life seems evident in moral protests from theatre-goers... as early as the 1660s and 1670s” (50). Kavenik writes that “...each company realized its survival would depend on its ability to gauge the temper and attract the notice of fickle theatergoers” (70). In his *Apology*, Cibber writes about the difficulties actors faced with the audience. “’Tis not, sure, *what* we act, but *how* we act what is allotted to us, that speaks our intrinsick Value!... but alas! in personated Life, this is no Rule to the Vulgar! they are apt to think all before them real, and rate the Actor according to his borrow’d Vice, or Virtue” (124-25). Cibber’s careful awareness of the audience appears in the Epilogue of *Love’s Last Shift* where he directly addresses the audience:

NOW, Gallants, for the Author, First, To you
Kind City-Gentlemen o’th ‘middle Row,
He hopes you nothing to his Charge can lay,
There’s not a Cuckold made in all his Play.
Nay, you must own, if you believe your Eyes,
He draws his Pen against your Enemies:
For he declares, to Day, he merely strives
To maul the Beaux – because they maul your Wives.

Now, Sirs, To you whose sole Religion’s Drinking,
Whoring, Roaring, without the Pain of Thinking,
He fears he’s made a Fault you’ll ne’er forgive,
A Crime beyond the Hopes of a Reprieve:
An honest Rake forego the Joys of Life!

His Whores, and Wine! t'Embrace a dull chaste Wife.
Such out-of-fashion Stuff! But then again,
He's lew'd for above four Acts, Gentlemen!
For faith, he knew, when once he'd chang'd his Fortune,
And reform'd his Vice, 'twas time – to drop the Curtain.
Four Acts for your coarse Palates were design'd,
But then the Ladies Taste is more refin'd,
They, for *Amanda's* Sake, will sure be kind.
Pray let this Figure once your Pity move (lines 1-22, 593)

Here Cibber shows his desire to please the audience as a whole by providing comedy, lewdness, and redemption. However, the Epilogue leaves audiences questioning his true message.

Despite the variety of explanations available for the actions of audiences at the end of the 17th century, and the fact that no definitive evidence points to a cause-and-effect relationship between audiences and theatres, there is little doubt that Cibber was listening and responding to the demands. In fact, *Love's Last Shift* carries a theme of variety and its importance in marriage and life. This call for variety on the stage echoes John Dryden in *Essay of Dramatic Poesie* (1668), in which he argues for the legitimacy of a dramatic tradition that was breaking away from the ancient unities for the sake of entertainment and comedy.

Wilson writes that many comic writers of the 1690s were looking for some variety that would attract audiences (188). In this endeavor, Cibber succeeded. According to Fone, between 1696 and 1773, *Love's Last Shift* was performed over 200 times (“Colley” 34). In *Apology*, Cibber argues for more variety in the theatre. He addresses the issue of competing

theatre companies and the production of the same plays again and again. In the section below, Cibber is arguing for variety on the stage, both of new plays and of the performance of older plays (Scouten & Hume 56). Cibber, who played the character of Sir Novelty, is also praising his own play:

HILLARIA. Oh! Mr. *Worthy*, we are admiring Sir *Novelty*, and his new Suit:

Did you ever see so sweet a Fancy? He is as full of Variety as a good Play.

ELDER WORTHY. He's a very pleasant Comedy, indeed, Madam, and drest with a great deal of good Satyr, and no doubt may oblige both the Stage and the Town, especially the Ladies. (II.i.136-443, 565)

Most scholars examining the English plays in the years around 1696 identify various similarities between Cibber and other playwrights. In fact, several scholars argue that Cibber does not deserve the distinction of having written the first sentimental comedy, either because he borrowed heavily from other playwrights or because his play is not actually a sentimental comedy. In an argument supported by Scouten and Hume, Hughes asserts that *Love's Last Shift* is merely a reflection of a well-established trend in English drama at the time rather than a sign of a major shift in comedy. In support of this argument, Hughes addresses the small resurgence of the typical Restoration comedy that begins with *The Relapse* (388-89). Scouten and Hume assert that the absence of more plays like Cibber's at the time suggests that reform comedy was not prospering (59). In fact, Scouten and Hume contend that the shift in audience preference "does not in itself signal a basic shift in taste or morals" (69). Also, Hughes points to two other possible sources for the transformation that would later settle into English drama: three plays that choose a country setting instead of a

city setting and a new generation of female playwrights who were believed to be more sensitive and natural than male playwrights (388-89).

Whether or not *Love's Last Shift* signifies a drastic change in English drama, it was original and influential in its own way. Sullivan recognizes Cibber as the first to give “the plot, characters, language, and attitudes of sentimental comedy” (ix). Senior argues that *Love's Last Shift* was “undoubtedly a step forward in its treatment of fundamental morality, and marked the beginning of a new mode” (40). Many scholars agree that the unique quality of *Love's Last Shift* is the inclusion of Amanda and the psychological manipulation she embodies (Fone, “*Love's*” 12-13; Parnell 216). According to Wilson, “the novelty was in part the depiction of a truly virtuous wife, but even more the treatment of Loveless’s reformation: the dramatic preparation which make it an obligatory scene, and the unrealistic dwelling upon the rake’s repentance and his wife’s happiness at the salvation of the sinner” (193). Like Wilson, Paul E. Parnell argues that the conversion scene is necessary to sentimental comedy, and Parnell argues that Cibber is best known for his contribution of the repentance scene in the mode of dramatic sentimental comedy. “Cibber’s organization of the repentance scene approaches an archetype. There may be precedent in dozens of plays and other works of literature for almost all the ingredients of the repentance scene, but his introduction of psychological manipulation is clearly an innovation that gives this type of scene its typical eighteenth-century form” (216).

Yet I would argue that Cibber’s lasting contribution is not the repentance scene. In fact, many scholars question the validity of the conversion and the sincerity of Loveless’s words, claiming that he gives no indication throughout the first four acts that he has the capacity or desire to change (Sullivan xxvii). How can Loveless be a rake for four acts and

then suddenly change in Act V? Part of the reason for this doubt is the presence of satiric, bawdy Restoration comedy *in addition to* the sentimental aspects. Sullivan reminds readers: “It is worth remembering too that this, Cibber’s first play, was transitional and experimental, imposing the attitudes of sentimental morality on the materials of Restoration comedy, playing up to the new spirit, but unwilling to relinquish the successes of the past” (xix). Yet this mixture is the most intriguing aspect of Cibber’s work. It is within this difficult conglomeration that we find Cibber attempting to entertain and instruct through the comedic exposure of folly and the touching power of passions. Faced with finicky audiences, Cibber chose to stand in the middle of the transition between Restoration drama and sentimental drama, mixing the satire and the tears to create sentimental comedy.

According to the *Oxford English Dictionary (OED)*, the word “shift” had a variety of meanings at this time, including “to change.” Does the title suggest that love is capable of changing someone or does it suggest that love itself can change? The answer to both questions is yes. Cibber meant for *Love’s Last Shift* to be a source of improvement for the audience. In the Prologue Cibber writes:

... if you damn him, he’s but where he was.
Yet where’s the Reason for the critick Crew,
With killing Blasts, like Winter, to pursue
The tender Plant, that ripens but for you?
Nature, in all her Works, requires Time;
Kindness, and Years, ‘tis makes the Virgin climb,
And shoot, and hasten to the expected Prime;
And then, if untaught Fancy fail to please,

Y'instruct the willing Pupil by Degrees;
By gentle Lessons you your Joys improve,
And mould her awkward Passion into Love.

Ev'n Folly has its Growth: Few Fools are made. (lines 8-19, 555-56)

Initially, it may seem that Cibber is suggesting that a new playwright like himself can't be expected to succeed completely the first time, and critics shouldn't be so harsh. However, a message of instruction also appears in this Prologue: "Y'instruct the willing Pupil by Degrees / By gentle Lessons you your Joys improve" (lines 16-17, 555). In other words, Cibber is suggesting that plays can instruct audiences through the presentation of characters with an honest mixture of virtues and vices (Sullivan xxviii). The Prologue shows that Cibber is possibly working toward sentimentalism in which teaching "gentle Lessons" through example can show people the path to proper behavior.

According to Joseph W. Krutch, this idea relates to the cardinal doctrine of pseudo-classical criticism, a doctrine that states "that the purpose of literature is to teach virtue, and that it does this by showing life not as it is but as it ought to be" (146). Edward Filer suggested "the stage should be reformed... not as Collier would have it, by the abolition of vicious characters, but by rendering the example of such characters instructive by 'a constant proportionate reward of virtue, and punishment of vice'" (qtd. in Krutch, *Comedy* 147). In fact, Cibber does not just present life as it should be but rather chooses to hold a mirror up to the audience. Though he suggests in the Prologue that harsh criticism may not be effective, he does not discount the use of satire. Among other definitions, the *OED* provides the following for "shift": "An entertaining or humorous device; a jest." Though he leans more toward the sentimental, Cibber is also using satiric Restoration wit.

He uses both sentimental and satirical tools in his characterization of Loveless. In the final lines of dialogue, Loveless makes some bold claims regarding the value of his conversion to serve as an example to others:

LOVELESS. 'Twas generously design'd, and all my Life to come shall shew how I approve the Moral. Oh! *Amanda!* once more receive me to thy Arms; and while I am there, let all the World confess my Happiness. By my Example taught, let every Man, whose Fate has bound him to a marry'd Life, beware of letting loose his wild Desires: For if Experience may be allow'd to judge, I must proclaim the Folly of a wandering Passion. The greatest Happiness we can hope of Earth.

And sure the nearest to the Joys above,

Is the chaste Rapture of a virtuous Love. (V.iv.43-55, 593)

Here Loveless is the voice of improvement, suggesting that his mistakes and conversion should serve as an example to cause change in others. This example is effective due to Cibber's careful presentation.

Aparna Gollapudi argues for an interpretation based on performance aspects rather than relying solely on the text. For example, whereas Loveless's words in the beginning of the play suggest his situation is uncomfortable but not life-changing, his clothing and Young Worthy's reaction to him suggest something very different (Gollapudi 10):

YOUNG WORTHY. S'death, what Bully's this! Sir, your Pardon, I don't know you!

LOVELESS. Faith, *Will*, I am a little out of Repairs at present: But I am all that's left of honest *Ned Loveless*.

YOUNG WORTHY. *Loveless!* I am amaz'd! What means this

Metamorphosis! ... But I doubt, Friend, you have bowl'd out of the Green,
have liv'd a little too fast, [*Surveying his Dress.*] like one that has lost all his
ready Money, and are forc'd to be an idle Spectator. (I.i.76-94, 557)

Loveless, who seems to be a typical rake, is presented differently than rakes at the time, though he does sound like them. Loveless's verbal identity is inconsistent with his physical appearance, and his willingness to cling to his old lifestyle is questionable. Later, before the final reform occurs, Loveless changes his clothes and wig. To Gollapudi, this visual change foreshadows the internal change that will come (12). This theory is supported by the fact that the *OED* offers one definition of "shift" as: "to change (one's own or another's clothing; To change one's clothing; to put on fresh clothing, esp. undergarments)."

Loveless's final speech, in which he surveys his past behavior and contemplates his new reform, is enhanced by the change in Loveless's appearance. He now looks like a gentleman, and "the moral transformation is made 'plausible' because it is buttressed by the visual metamorphosis" (Gollapudi 14). To Gollapudi, Loveless serves as an important lesson to the audience. "They are always conscious of Loveless's lewdness as vice, as a pattern of behavior that contributes not to the attractive patina of a fine gentlemen but to disaster and degradation" (11). This description of Cibber's method sounds like satire. And, in fact, it is one of the places in which *Love's Last Shift* employs satire as a form of instruction that Gollapudi suggests is successful due to "identification by antithesis" or "the singling out of specific types of foolishness or villainy to be laughed at or denigrated" (6). The spectators on the stage and in the audience "simultaneously watch, judge and reject the flawed

characters who parade across the boards precisely in order to display themselves” (Gollapudi 6).

In another place, hypocrisy is criticized in a satirical manner that draws attention to the hypocrisy of the audience members judging the characters whose flaws they share:

LOVELESS. ‘Tis very odd, that People should be more ashamed of other’s
Faults, than their own: I never yet could meet with a Man that offered me
Counsel, but had more occasion for it himself.

YOUNG WORTHY. So far you may be in the right: For indeed, good
Counsel is like a home Jest, which every busy Fool is offering to his Fellow,
and yet won’t take it himself.

LOVELESS. Right: – Thus have I known a jolly red-nos’d Parson, at three
o’ the Clock in the Morning, belch out Invectives against late Hours, and
hard Drinking; and a canting hypocritical Sinner protest against Fornication,
when the Rogue was himself just crawling out of a Flux. (I.i.165-79, 558).

The real satire occurs in Act 3, scene 2. According to Gollapudi, this part of the play creates an uneasy relationship between the actors and the audience because they are mixed in both location and action: they are the spectators labeling and judging the other characters as they come on stage. Gollapudi suggests that this “shared spectatorial space not only authorizes Cibber’s protagonists – and his play – by positioning them overtly as social commentators, it also in that moment realigns, the action on the stage so that the actors and the audience are bound together in a community of spectatorship that implies a shared context of values” (5-6). If this shared context is real, then when the characters begin to address the other, less important characters in the play satirically, so does the audience.

NARCISSA. Time enough; why you have no Taste of the true Pleasure of the Park: I'll warrant you hate as much to ridicule others, as to hear your self prais'd: For my part, I think a little harmless Railing's half the Pleasure of one's Life... How can you see such a Medley of human Stuff as are here, without venting your Spleen? (III.ii.124-35, 575)

Many of the characters who are mocked by Hilliaria, Narcissa, Young Worthy, and Elder Worthy are stock Restoration characters; Cibber seems to be mocking an earlier satiric and comic style dominant in Restoration drama when he mocks these characters. However, most of the characters who are doing the mocking are themselves also stereotypical Restoration characters. Young Worthy is the rake marrying for money; Narcissa is the self-centered coquette. One Restoration aspect that Cibber clearly maintained was the use of Theophrastian names for his characters. Narcissa is self-absorbed and jealous; Flareit is feisty and unpredictable; Sir Novelty Fashion is obsessed with clothing, wigs, and other "fashionable" things; Loveless appears in the play with no love – for or from anyone else; and Amanda's name brings to mind amandation, or the act of sending someone away, which is exactly what audiences expect her to do with Loveless. And, Amanda's female servant has no name, and she has no say in the decisions affecting her life, like her marriage to Snap. Having no name suggests she is of no consequence.

By having stock Restoration characters mock other stock Restoration characters, Cibber is inviting the audience to be critical of all stock Restoration characters, thus drawing a sharper contrast between these typical characters and Amanda and Loveless. Amanda seems that much more virtuous in comparison to the other women; Loveless, though a rake,

has a unique experience, and is therefore changed. Gollapudi suggests that Loveless is different from most rakes:

Such characters [as Belfond Sr. in *The Squire of Alsatia* and Blunt in *The Rover*] are the conventional fools and gulls of comedy, and, in visual terms, their lack of economic savvy and the sordid end of their libertine aspirations is satirical in its impact. Loveless, on the other hand, is no mere gull but the protagonist of the main plot in Cibber's play. As a spectacle, Loveless is not merely satirized but *moralized*. What the spectators are offered in the spectacle of the threadbare and undignified Loveless spouting the rake's creed is the simultaneous representation of cause and effect of reckless sexual excess. (11)

Cibber's decision to maintain many of the characteristics of Restoration drama is understandable. Looking for success, Cibber chose to hang on to familiar aspects of Restoration comedy. However, as the Prologue indicates, criticism and wit may not be sufficient tools. Within the play itself, this idea is reinforced:

LOVELESS. But I have a great deal more Wit than I had!

SNAP. Not enough to get your Estate agen [*sic*], or to know where we shall dine to Day. (I.i.123-25, 557)

The fact that Loveless is moralized lends to the sentimental nature of *Love's Last Shift*. It is through the same characters that are satirized that Cibber, through the presentation of emotions, true virtue, and change, is able to present something more than Restoration comedy or satire; Cibber is able to lessen the harshness of the other forms with the sentimental, thus creating a unique play that would come to be known as sentimental

comedy. As shown in his play *The Conscious Lovers* (1722), Richard Steele, like Cibber, believed that “the harsh satiric laughter of rake-driven comedy produces only empty pleasure... and a pleasure that is in reality shameful and destructive...” (Combe 294).

However, many scholars question the validity of Loveless’s conversion and the sincerity of his words, claiming that he gives no indication throughout the first four acts that he has the capacity or desire to change; other sentimental comedies face this same criticism (Sullivan xxvii). Both Fone and Bernbaum argue that Amanda is an important sentimental component that makes Loveless’s conversion probable and realistic:

Benevolence and pity are as important to sentimental comedy... pity is caused by the vision of a good heart, common and unflawed, virtuous by default rather than by act, being acted upon, not by cosmic forces but by the irksome minor immoralities of domestic life. Thus, Amanda becomes the object of pity when her unaided virtue – her good heart – is insulted by the good-natured rakishness of her husband. (Fone, “*Love’s*” 14)

Bernbaum argues that “what is noteworthy in the play, however, is not the moralizing, but the sentimentality, – the characterization of Loveless as good at heart; above all, that of Amanda with her moral scrupulosity and the power of her virtue to triumph through an appeal to pity” (76). Amanda is a move away from the typical Restoration character whose sin is celebrated. In discussing Steele’s *The Conscious Lovers*, Combe argues that “Rather than show us a comedic society of pack hunters featuring the dominant beast, Steele founds his comedy on depictions of virtuous people in distress (but in the end preserved from harm) in order to evoke feelings of pity in his audience as well as an accompanying sensation of moral improvement” (294). Cibber is doing the same thing with Loveless and Amanda.

The character of Amanda serves a dual function: she influences Loveless to change, which suggests to the audience that change through example and the exposure of folly is possible, and she exemplifies the virtuous wife for the audience. This idea is expressed clearly in Amanda's musings:

AMANDA. For tho' my Reason tells me my Design must prosper; yet my Fears say 'twere Happiness too great. – Oh! to reclaim the Man I'm bound by Heaven to Love, to expose the Folly of a roving Mind, in pleasing him with what he seem'd to loath, were such a sweet Revenge for slighted Love, so vast a Triumph of rewarded Constancy, as might persuade the looser part of womankind ev'n to forsake themselves and fall in Love with Virtue.
(III.i.97-107, 571)

When he proposes the plan to trick Loveless, Young Worthy appeals to this idea by suggesting that Amanda can cause Loveless to change through the use of both her virtue and her words. "Who knows but this, with a little submissive Eloquence, may strike him with so great a sense of Shame, as may reform his Thoughts, and fix him yours?" (I.i, 562). Young Worthy pities Amanda: "Poor *Amanda*, thou well deserv'st a better Husband.... And, faith, considering how long a Despair has worn thee, '*Twere Pity now thy Hopes shou'd not succeed; / This new Attempt is Love's Last Shift indeed*' (III.ii.277-78, 576).

The audience also pities Amanda. Throughout the play, Amanda does nothing wrong, and the audience feels her pain; they feel that she deserves happiness after her abandonment and suffering:

HILLARIA. Well, dear *Amanda*, thou art the most constant Wife I ever heard to, not to shake off the Memory of an ill Husband, after eight or ten years

absence; nay, to mourn, for ought you know, for the living too, and such an Husband, that, tho' he were alive, would never thank you for it. Why d'ye persist in such a hopeless Grief?

AMANDA. Because 'tis hopeless! For if he be alive, he is dead to me: His dead Affections, not Virtue's self can e'er retrieve: Wou'd I were with him, tho' in his Grave! (I.i.409-20, 560-61)

The audience sees the suffering, pitiful Amanda, who evokes emotions from the other characters, like Loveless. Even Young Worthy, a rake like Loveless, is unable to permit Amanda to suffer more at the hands of Loveless; she is so pitiable that Young Worthy goes against the traditional rake stereotype to help her. When Amanda hears Young Worthy's proposed plan to get back at Loveless, she is torn between reclaiming her husband and violating the bonds of marriage; she hesitates to participate in the scheme. Amanda faces a moral problem: should she expose herself to the possibility of being hurt by Loveless again and at the same serve as an "accessary to his violating the Bonds of Marriage" (III.i.45, 570).

Amanda's power comes from her ability to affect Loveless emotionally, and she is able to do so in several ways. She worries "For tho' I'm his Wife, yet while he loves me not as such, I encourage an unlawful Passion; and tho' the Act be safe, yet his Intent is criminal" (III.i.46-49, 570). First, she causes him to fall in love with her as a stranger; she makes herself a mystery, and that change grabs Loveless's attention and causes him to become more emotionally invested than he would normally; in a sentimental fashion, she appeals to his passions. Once she has his attention – through mystery and, of course, sex – Amanda successfully prompts Loveless to think and discuss his opinion of virtue honestly. He tells her that he believes that most women are not virtuous; they just don't have desires to tempt

them. However, he admits that he does believe a virtuous woman can exist (V.ii.144-63, 587). Loveless appears to be speaking honestly about virtue to a woman who he *knows*, based on their recent activities, is not a virtuous woman. Amanda has forced Loveless to open himself to her. In this exposed state, Loveless is more likely to be affected by the attack Amanda is about to mount on his emotions:

AMANDA. ... Since then you have allow'd a Woman may be virtuous, –
How will you excuse the Man who leaves the Bosom of a Wife so qualify'd,
for the abandon'd Pleasures of deceitful Prostitutes? ruins her Fortune!
contemns her Counsel! loaths her Bed, and leaves her to the lingering
Miseries of Despair and Love: While, in return of all these Wrongs, she, his
poor forsaken Wife, meditates no Revenge but what her piercing Tears, and
secret Vows to Heav'n for his Conversion, yield her: Yet still loves on, is
constant and unshaken to the last! Can you believe that such a man can live
without the Stings of Conscience! did you ne'er feel the Checks of it? Did
it never, never tell you of your broken Vows?

LOVELESS. That you shou'd ask me this, confounds my Reason: – And yet
your Words are utter'd with such a powerful Accent, they have awaken'd
my Soul, and strike my Thoughts with Horror and Remorse.

Stands in a fix'd Posture.

AMANDA. Then let me strike you nearer, deeper yet: – But arm your Mind
with gentle Pity first, or I am lost for ever.

LOVELESS. I am all Pity, all Faith, Expectation, and confus'd Amazement:
Be kind, be quick, and ease my Wonder.

AMANDA. Look on me well: Revive your dead Remembrance: And oh!
for Pity's sake, [*Kneels.*] hate me not for loving long; faithfully forgive this
innocent Attempt of a despairing Passion, and I shall die in quiet.

LOVELESS. Hah! speak on! *Amazed.*

AMANDA. It will not be! – The Word's too weighty for my faulting
Tongue, and my Soul sinks beneath the fatal Burthen. Oh! –

Falls on the Ground.

LOVELESS. Ha! she faints! Look up, fair Creature! behold a Heart that
bleeds for your Distress, and fain wou'd share the weight of your oppressing
Sorrows! Oh! thou hast ras'd a Thought within me, that shocks my Soul.

AMANDA. 'Tis done! [*rising.*] The Conflict's past, and Heav'n bids me
speak undaunted. Know then, ev'n all the boasted Raptures of your last
Night's Love, you found in your *Amanda's* Arms: – I am your Wife.

(V.ii.169-216, 587)

Amanda's methods are effective: She admits to being his wife and truly virtuous, causing him guilt; she cries, begs, and faints, causing him to pity her; and, in a Christian gesture, she forgives him. This Christian forgiveness would have been important because, as Scouten and Hume suggest, "the one thing that contemporary playwrights and audiences had most in common" was "a shared upbringing and schooling in the basic doctrines and precepts of the Christian religion" (50). She seems truly hurt by Loveless yet she doesn't want to hurt him. And apparently her actions have truly moved Loveless. He is made to feel ashamed, and he chooses to change. However, we must keep in mind that part of Amanda's pardon –

and perhaps Loveless's conversion – is Amanda's willingness to relinquish control of her estate to him.

Here, in this contradicting place, Cibber's mixture of satire and sentimentalism stumbles. The audience wonders if Cibber is being satirical about marriage at this point. The aware audience member will remember that Amanda's inheritance has been mentioned at least twice in the play. In one place, Amanda tells Loveless that her uncle "dy'd, and left me in full Possession of two thousand Pounds a Year, which I now cannot offer as a Gift, because my Duty, and your lawful Right, makes you the undisputed Master of it" (V.ii.276-80, 588). So, is Cibber mocking Loveless's conversion? The evidence in the play seems to suggest otherwise. Before Amanda explicitly tells Loveless about her inheritance, he tells her, "For almost ten long Years depriv'd thee of my Love, and ruin'd all thy Fortune! But I will labour, dig, beg, or starve to give new Proofs of my unfeign'd Affection" (V.ii.262-66, 588). Thus, it appears that Loveless's conversion is sincere, and his change in financial standing is just a benefit. In fact, after receiving the news of his new wealth, Loveless exclaims, "How have I labour'd for my own undoing, while, in despite of all my Follies, kind Heav'n resolv'd my Happiness!" (V.ii.281-83, 588). This exclamation includes references to both the sentimentalism of the play; Loveless is being forgiven for his follies (which satire works to resolve) and rewarded for his efforts.

In contrast, Snap's marriage *is* motivated by money. In act 4, scene 4, Amanda's servant tricks Loveless's servant Snap. As a means of refusing his drunken advances, the woman tricks Snap into falling into the cellar in the dark. Yet Snap is able to pull the woman in with him, and the assumption is that he rapes her. In act 5, scene 3, Amanda demands that Loveless do something to save the woman's reputation, and Loveless orders Snap to marry

the woman. Snap's response is a disturbing look at one man's opinion of marriage: "Marry her! O Lord, Sir, after I have lain with her? Why, Sir! how the Devil can you think a Man can have any Stomach to his Dinner, after he has had three or four Slices off the Spit?" (V.iii.163-66, 590). Snap only agrees to marry the woman after Loveless informs him that he will be paid for doing so. In a way somewhat similar to the bed trick, Snap's rape turns out to be of his own wife. As he puts it, he and Loveless were "robbing our own Orchards" (V.iii.181.590). Both Loveless and Snap participate in sexual acts, and they are both rewarded. However, Loveless seems to change and see the money as a reward; Snap is only motivated by the money, and his character represents a satirical look at marriage that, in some ways, undermines the value of the reunion of Loveless and Amanda. How much does Loveless value marriage if he is willing to force it on someone like Snap? However, little attention is actually given to the servant marriage, and their situation may not have seemed important because they were of a lower class.

Toward the end of the play, Elder Worthy suggests that Amanda serves as an example to "persuade all constant Wives ne'er to repine at unrewarded Virtue" (V.iii.42-44, 589). Yet her methods of influencing Loveless are similar to the ones Flareit employs when she is trying to trick Sir Novelty. First, Flareit dresses in a mask and pretends to be Narcissa. Then, after revealing her true identity to Sir Novelty and realizing his lack of affection for her, she says in an aside, "I know he loves me; and I'll pierce him to the Quick: I have yet a surer way to fool him" (IV.i.80-82, 577) by which she means the tears she quickly employs against him (577-78). Having Flareit, the unvirtuous woman, use tactics similar to Amanda's undermines the value of Amanda's actions. This presentation of tears and emotions suggests that they are simply weapons. However, the difference between the two women and their use

of these methods is seen in the different motivations and outcomes: Amanda is motivated by virtue; Flareit by anger. Loveless changes, and Amanda is happy. Sir Novelty is not affected by Flareit and her tricks, and she tries to kill him. In the same way that Loveless serves as an example to audience members, the encounter between Sir Novelty and Flareit shows the dangers of lewdness. When her attack is thwarted, Flareit is overcome with anger and yells, “Death and Vengeance, am I become his Sport! He’s pleas’d, and smiles to see me rage the more! But he shall find no Fiend in Hell can match the Fury of a disappointed Woman!” (IV.iii.134-38, 578). Thus, the contrast between Amanda and Flareit shows both the value and danger of emotion. The lesson is that tears and emotions can be wielded by anyone but are effective only for the sincere.

According to both Fone and Gollapudi, evidence throughout the play predicts and supports Loveless’s final conversion (21, 12). Fone argues that the theme of repentance and the tone of sentimental morality are presented in the first scene and can be detected throughout *Love’s Last Shift*. “The intention of the opening lines is to appeal to pity.... The remaining acts move into more and more unabashed sentimentality until the justly celebrated last act of reformation may indeed move us all to honest tears” (Fone, “*Love’s*” 21-22). For example, in the first few lines of his dialogue, Snap says he weeps when he thinks of their situation (556). In the Prologue, Cibber mentions “awkward Passion” and much of the focus in sentimental works is on passions, their effects, and the attempts to control them. This tone of sentimentality is exemplified in the words and passions of Amanda and Loveless.

However, the presence of this sentimental idea of useful passions is questioned by the other characters in a way that could undermine the power of Amanda and Loveless. Throughout the play passions, such as love, and reason conflict, a tension which was

characteristic of the British culture at the time. Elder Worthy, in love with Hillaria, struggles with the contrast between passion and reason, and he suggests that passion is a foolish weakness related to marriage and love. Elder Worthy says, “True! a Fool recommends himself to your Sex, and that’s the reason men of common Sense live unmarried” (II.i.173-75, 566). And Narcissa exclaims, “My Passion! When did you hear me acknowledge any? If I thought you cou’d believe me guilty of such a Weakness, tho’ after I had marry’d you, I woul’d never look you in the Face” (V.ii.124-28, 584).

In fact, Sir William and Flareit provide comedic relief when they are overwhelmed by their anger, which Elder Worthy calls “monstrous” (V.iii.247-48, 591). Flareit attempts to stab Sir Novelty, and Sir William responds angrily when he finds that he has been fooled:

SIR WILLIAM. But now I have Reason on my side, I will indulge my Indignation most immoderately: I must confess, I have not Patience to wait the slow Redress of a tedious Law-Suit; therefore, am resolv’d to right myself the nearest way; – Draw, draw, Sir: You must not enjoy my five thousand Pounds, tho’ I fling as much more after it, in procuring a Pardon for killing you... I’ll tear him, I’ll broil him, and eat him! a Rogue! a Dog! a cursed Dog! a cut-throat, murdering Dog! (V.iii.236-47, 591)

Yet, in the end, love seems to be the victor, and as a result so is virtue. In a departure from the dominant format of the play, perhaps as a result of the need for variety on the stage, Cibber introduces Fame, Reason, Honour, Love, and Marriage in personified, singing forms to provide entertainment (or diversion) for the celebrating couples:

REASON.

Cease, cease, fond Fools, your empty Noise,

*And follow not such idle Joys:
Love gives you but a short-liv'd Bliss,
But I bestow immortal Happiness.*

LOVE.

*Rebellious Reason, talk no more;
Of all my Slaves, I thee abhor...
In spite of Reason, Love shall live and reign*

...

LOVE.

*Where first I promis'd thee a happy Life,
There thou shalt find it in a virtuous Wife.*

LOVE and FAME.

*Go home, unhappy Wretch, and mourn
For all thy guilty Passions past;
Where thou shalt those Joys return,*

Which shall for ever, ever last. (V.iv.6-42, 592)

As the title suggests, the play focuses on the last attempt or resort of love, and love is triumphant in Cibber's play. As the Prologue suggests, "By gentle Lessons you your Joys improve / And mould her awkward Passion into Love" (lines 17-18, 555). The awkward passions of lust, greed, jealousy, and anger have been molded into love in the form of marriage, which Young Worthy at one point calls a medicine to "purge out my wild Humours" (I.i.194-97, 558). Satire has shown the dangers of certain behaviors, and sentimentalism has shown the audience the value of virtue and love.

There is one place where there is a definite move away from the traditional lewd of Restoration comedy and toward sentimentalism. The “bed trick” that Amanda employs against Loveless differs from the form found in the works of Shakespeare and Restoration playwrights. Typically, the “bed trick” involved the placement of an undesired woman into the bed of an unsuspecting man. For example, in Shakespeare’s *All’s Well That Ends Well*, Diana lures Bertram to bed, and then the Helena, who Bertram does not want to sleep with, sneaks into the bed in order to force Bertram to marry her (“Bed”). Though Amanda must fool Loveless in order to sleep with him, she does not actually switch places with another woman; Loveless simply thinks she is someone else. However, the aspect of this scene that distinguishes *Love’s Last Shift* is the fact that Loveless sleeps with his wife. Unlike other plays, *Love’s Last Shift*’s bed trick involves legally-sanctioned sex between a married couple. Thus, what has formerly been a comedic ploy that furthered plot and undermined certain values has been altered to teach a lesson and to reinforce the idea of virtuous marriage.

Despite a difference of opinions regarding Cibber’s motivation, intentions, and success as a writer, three conclusions seem reasonable: 1) Cibber was motivated by his own desire for success as an actor, and he wrote a comedic part for himself that best suited his acting abilities; 2) Cibber wrote a play with consideration for the fickle audiences of the 1690s whose influence on the struggling theatre-scene is undeniable if not wholly understandable; and 3) Cibber wrote a successful play, and both its satiric and sentimental elements influenced the drama that followed it.

In “An Essay on the Theater; or, a Comparison Between Laughing and Sentimental Comedy” (1772), Oliver Goldsmith discusses the shift from satirical to sentimental comedy in the later 18th century:

[A] new species of Dramatic Composition has been introduced under the name of *Sentimental Comedy*, in which the virtues of Private Life are exhibited, rather than the Vices exposed; and the Distresses, rather than the Faults of Mankind, make our interest in the piece... If [the characters] happen to have Faults or Foibles, the Spectator is taught not only to pardon, but to applaud them, in consideration of the goodness of their hearts; so that Folly, instead of being ridiculed, is commended, and the Comedy aims at touching our Passions without the power of being truly pathetic. (qtd. in Kavenik 188-89)

Goldsmith is indicating the loss of the satirical. However, as indicated by the presence of Restoration characteristics within the play and its sequel, Vanbrugh's *The Relapse* (1696), *Love's Last Shift* does not mark the end of Restoration comedy or satire. Certain aspects of Cibber's style persist into the 18th century: a careful consideration of audience taste, a focus on passions, a repentance scene, and a mix of modes to better instruct his audiences. The mix of sentimentalism and satire in *Love's Last Shift* also appear in *The Non-Juror* (1717), where the two modes function together to enhance the effects of each.

Mixing Modes in *The Non-Juror*

After King George I went to see Cibber's *The Non-Juror* in 1717, he added a dedication:

Your comedians Sir, are an unhappy society, whom some severe heads think wholly useless, and others dangerous to the young and innocent: This comedy is therefore an attempt to remove that prejudice, and to shew, what honest and laudable uses may be made of the *Theatre*, when its performances keep close to the true purposes of its institution: That it may be necessary to divert the fallen and disaffected from busying their brains to disturb the happiness of the government, which (for want of proper amusements) they often into wild and seditious schemes to reform: And it may likewise make those very follies the ridicule and diversion even of those that committed them. (263; Boas 95)

In his *Apology* in 1740, Cibber gives a name to his form of “ridicule and diversion” – satire. In the dedication Cibber seems to be suggesting that his purpose is that of satire – to ridicule and, perhaps, remedy the follies of the seditious. What is interesting for this thesis is Cibber's suggestion that he is going to do so through a form of distraction that will prove the worth of both comedy and the stage by focusing on current political events, as he explains in *Apology*:

About this Time Jacobitism had lately exerted itself, by the most unprovoked Rebellion, that our Histories have handed down to us, since the *Norman* Conquest: I therefore thought that to set the Authors, and Principles of that desperate Folly in a fair Light, by allowing the mistaken Consciences of some of their best Excuse, and by making the artful Pretenders to a Conscience, as

ridiculous, as they were ungratefully wicked, was a Subject fit for the honest Satire of Comedy... (282)

Both Dudley H. Miles and Rodney L. Hayley suggest that the success of *The Non-Juror* is a result of the play's political satire (281; 201). Cibber's contemporaries, including obscure John Breval and the famous Alexander Pope, agreed that the satire was dominant, if not necessarily effective. Though it is true that *The Non-Juror* contains multiple allusions to the events occurring between the Jacobite Rebellion of 1715 and its performance in August 1717, which lends to the play's satirical nature, Cibber's decision to create a situation wrought with familiar tensions of the time produced a probable and effective play that appealed to romantic conventions often independent of the audience's political opinions of the recent uprising. In fact, the careful mixture of sentimental comedy and political satire is what resulted in the play's success. In *The Non-Juror*, Cibber uses the techniques of sentimentalism to create a connection between the audience and the characters, much as he does so directly between Amanda and her audience in *Love's Last Shift*. In *The Non-Juror*, this method permits the satirical nature of the play to better evoke ridicule and change within the audience.

Having already pioneered sentimentalism in drama, Cibber attempts in *The Non-Juror* an even more difficult and daring new hybrid genre. This chapter aims to explore Cibber's attempt to balance the satiric exposure of vice with the sentimental desire for repentance, forgiveness, and reform. In a play that is already a loose translation of Molière's biting *Tartuffe*, Cibber begins with echoes of Swiftian satire, targets Pope's popularity in the middle, then turns toward making sentimentalism and Restoration humor, the main

ingredients in *Love's Last Shift*, capable of softening topical political and religious satire without destroying its ability to promote reform.

For his satire, Cibber chose a familiar story: a father, Sir John, decides to give his reluctant daughter's hand to an older man, Dr. Wolf. The twist, however, is that Dr. Wolf is a Roman Catholic clergyman who participated in the 1715 Jacobite rebellion. With his false patriotism and suspicious religious devotion, Dr. Wolf has fooled Sir John into giving him control over both his fortune and his daughter's future. Yet Dr. Wolf is not interested in marrying Maria, the playful, self-proclaimed coquette whom Sir John had previously promised to a man named Heartly; Dr. Wolf wants Lady Woodvil, Sir John's wife. Lady Woodvil, Heartly, Maria, Colonel Woodvil (Sir John's son), and Charles (Dr. Wolf's servant) work to expose the deceptive Dr. Wolf and to save Sir John. After failed attempts, Dr. Wolf is exposed by both Colonel Woodvil – who provides written proof that Dr. Wolf is a Catholic – and Lady Woodvil – who encourages Dr. Wolf to express his true feelings to her while a hidden Sir John watches. Maria and Charles save Sir John from giving his fortune to Dr. Wolf. After realizing the destruction Dr. Wolf brings to any family he touches, Charles decides to confess to his participation in the 1715 rebellion (under the encouragement of Dr. Wolf) to Maria and show her the unsigned contract between Sir John and Dr. Wolf. Maria has the document altered, thus guaranteeing her brother's inheritance and her future marriage to Heartly. Heartly and Colonel Woodvil secure a pardon for Charles and reunite him with his estranged father. In the end, Sir John realizes his mistake and asks for forgiveness as Dr. Wolf is led away.

As I have suggested, one important aspect of *The Non-Juror* is its reliance on actual events for the setting and plot of the play. In the Epilogue, Cibber acknowledges his use of

current events when he writes, “How wild, how frantic is the vain essay / That builds on modern politics a play” (357). Cibber chose a title and plot that audience members would automatically understand. Due to the social tensions of the time, the plot of *The Non-Juror* would have seemed both probable and frightening, and therefore possible for people to relate to it. This identification between audience and play is, as Bateson suggests, an important characteristic of 18th-century sentimentalism (8). In addition, I would argue that this connection between the audience and the characters enhances both the sentimental and satirical aspects of the play.

Relying heavily on the events between the Rebellion of 1715 and August 1717, Cibber was able to create a play containing multiple allusions to the political tensions that existed in England. For example, Cibber depended on the audience to relate to the feelings of deceit experienced by Sir John. Many audience members at the time would be able to relate to this deceit – at least hypothetically – because they had recently experienced the threat of rebellion and lurking papists, or Nonjurors. At this time in Britain, many believed that all non-juring citizens, those refusing to swear the oath declaring their allegiance to the Anglican Church and recognizing the sovereignty of William and Mary after the Bloodless Revolution, were potential Jacobites, or Tory royalists who remained loyal to the exiled Catholic James III (the Old Pretender) (Willcox and Arnstein 8-9). Nonjurors, linked to Catholicism and any Tory or Jacobite rebellion against the Hanoverian throne and Whig government, were thus considered indirectly responsible for the Rebellion of 1715.

With the ascension of the house of Hanover (with George I in 1714), the Whig party regained control of the government. In 1715, a group of Jacobites organized a rebellion in Scotland to restore the Stuart line to the throne. Following the quelling of this rebellion in

1716, the Whig government tried and at times executed those implicated in the rebellion. At the same time, Tory protests were exploding across England on significant dates like the Old Pretender's birthday and the anniversary of the restoration of Charles II to the throne. However, in 1717, events turned in favor of the Whig party. The Old Pretender was expelled from Avignon, removing the fear of a threatening coalition between France and James III, and France pledged not to create a canal at Mardyke, reducing the threat of the French navy (Miles 282-87). As a product of these events, many of which Cibber mentions in the play, anti-Jacobite, anti-Catholic, and, by association, anti-Nonjuror sentiment was strong in England. According to Miles, Cibber refers to these events in *The Non-Juror* – the reassuring events of the summer of 1717, the underhanded rebellion of Jacobite Nonjurors, and the Whig government's attempts to punish (and pardon) the rebels (288). The 1716 and 1717 trials of the rebels would have planted in the minds of the audience the possibility of traitors within their midst. In addition, the audience members could cheer with the servants at the arrest of Dr. Wolf and appreciate Colonel Woodvil's efforts to expose the treacherous Nonjuror.

It's also important to note the character of Charles, a fictional participant in the 1715 rebellion who is forgiven in the play. According to Bateson, "The sentimental dramatists, by once again making comedy a mirror of life, had necessarily brought into it the moral laws which govern life" (9). In choosing to use the Jacobite rebellion of 1715 as Charles's crime, Cibber was able to do two things: he was able to hold up the mirror Bateson refers to by creating an obvious connection to a real-life situation – because some participants were forgiven – and he is able to further his own plot in doing so. Miles writes:

The act of grace was indispensable to Cibber's plot.... To be able to foil the villain, Charles had to be made a former pupil of Dr. Wolf and a Preston rebel, in order that he might be familiar with the hypocrite's part in the rebellion. After these signal services, the audience of course would demand that he be saved, yet this could be accomplished only by an act of royal clemency... the identification was rather obvious. It is just possible that the lengthy description of the reconciliation between father and son in Act IV was taken by many as a transcript of the actual reconciliation of the preceding September [of Lord Charles Murray]. (289-90)

Cibber's dedication of *The Non-Juror* to King George I earned him £200 (Boas 95). His alignment with Whig politicians earned him patronage, (a few) friends in journalism, and a position 13 years later as Poet Laureate (McKinney 9; Ennis 228). Another benefit of choosing this familiar topic is that Cibber, who was attempting to rebuke the attacks against the stage and gain royal support, chose a topic that could not be condemned by his critics or those of the theater. If, as Miles suggests, "hostility against Nonjurors was seen as a criterion of loyalty" (296) in the early 1700s, then the theatre which attacks Nonjurors is not only useful in the protection of the throne but cannot be considered immoral or inappropriate by critics. For example, in his *A Complete Key to the Non-Juror*, Breval, though highly critical of Cibber's style and (alleged) plagiarism, wrote, "The second *Act*, has indeed some Merit in it, as it exposes the general Enemies of the Government; but to confine it to the *Non-jurors* merely, was very kind in the Author" (21). Thus, animosity toward the Nonjurors in the wake of the 1715 Rebellion provided Cibber with a prime satiric target and an enthusiastic audience. According to Frederick S. Boas, 18th-century drama often contained a "strong

undercurrent of national spirit, sometimes taking the form of political propaganda.... Time after time, often under some thin disguise, the eighteenth-century dramatists represented Britain as the champion of freedom against, in their eyes, two enslaving forces, the French monarchy and the Roman Catholic Church” (viii).

As a means of addressing familiar politics and concerns, Cibber chose to adapt a play with which many theatre-goers at the time might have been familiar. In *Apology* Cibber writes, “I borrow’d the *Tartuffe* of Molière, and turn’d him into a modern *Nonjuror*” (282). Would English audiences in 1717 be familiar with *Tartuffe* (1664)? According to *The London Stage*, *Tartuffe* had been performed three times in London between 1669 and 1687, but did not reappear again until June 1718 when it experienced a brief resurgence at Lincoln’s Inn Fields Theatre (578-79). According to John Wilcox, many Restoration dramatists borrowed from Molière; Wilcox cites Gerard Langbaine who in 1691 reported that at least 25 Restoration period plays contained materials from Molière’s works (1). Therefore, Cibber was continuing a Restoration tradition of borrowing from Molière, and Molière’s style, if not the exact plot, would have been familiar. In addition, the familiarity of audiences with the work of Molière may not have been dependent on the stage as his works were also available in print.

Though *The Non-Juror* and *Tartuffe* do not include identical characters, the basic storyline is the same: a father, duped into association with a self-serving villain, tells his daughter that she must marry the villain. The girl resists, and she works with others to improve her situation and eventually expose the treachery. In both stories, the villain (Tartuffe or Dr. Wolf), a religious man whose scheme to gain control over the money and family of a rich man for his own evil purposes, is foiled.

One key fact about Cibber's choice to adapt a French play was the association at the time between Roman Catholicism and the French in the minds of the English (McKinney 9-10). This association with an unacceptable religion could have harmed the success of *The Non-Juror*; however, it also may have heightened the understanding and anxiety of the audience. A French play would make them think of the French, Catholics, and, in turn, homegrown Nonjurors.

Within his adaptation of *Tartuffe*, Cibber made changes that created a play more realistic and acceptable to 18th-century English audiences. First, *Tartuffe* is a comedy of manners that contains stock characters such as Tartuffe, the trickster or insincere flatterer. Though Dr. Wolf is in many ways a one-dimensional, stock-comedy character, he represented a frightening reality to 18th-century audiences. As Cibber explains in *Apology*, "Upon the Hypocrisy of the *French* Character, I ingrafted a stronger Wickedness, that of an *English* Popish Priest, lurking under the Doctrine of our own Church, to raise his Fortune, upon the ruin of a worthy Gentleman, whom his dissembled Sanctity had seduc'd into the treasonable Cause of a *Roman Catholick* Out-law" (282). As Kate McKinney suggests, "In *The Non-Juror*, Tartuffe becomes Dr. Wolf. 'The Doctor,' as the other characters call him, represents an evil that is much more palpable and much less slapstick than the buffoon Tartuffe" (5). Dr. Wolf, discovered to be a Catholic priest in disguise, is judged by both the audience and other characters. The simultaneous discovery of Dr. Wolf's villainy and anxiety over his actions is an experience shared by the audience and the characters. In the past, Cibber had played the vain, selfish, scheming fop of his plays such as Sir Novelty in *Love's Last Shift* (1696) and Longville in *Women's Wit* (1697). In the original productions of

The Non-Juror, Cibber played Dr. Wolf, which created within the audience an immediate understanding of the type of character Dr. Wolf might be.

Cibber changed the language of *Tartuffe* significantly, choosing to present a play with prose dialogue rather than rhyming couplets. Though some critics may argue that Cibber didn't write couplets simply because he couldn't, they would be incorrect in ignoring stronger motives for his choice of form. As McKinney suggests, this change was important for audiences of the time because it increased the accessibility of the play (3). Hughes points to a "widespread tendency to aim at every available target rather than to create a unified work of art" in Cibber's works (389), and, assuming Hughes is correct, Cibber would want his play to be as accessible as possible for a large audience. Interestingly, in 1711, Joseph Addison, co-founder and contributor to *The Spectator*, wrote, "I am therefore very much offended when I see a Play in Rhyme, which is ... absurd in *English*.... I prefer a noble Sentiment that is depressed in homely Language, infinitely before a vulgar one that is blown up with all the Sound and Energy of Expression" (*Spectator* 39). Though Addison was referring to tragedies specifically, his comments nevertheless influenced the acceptance of couplets in English drama (McKinney 2). And, since *The Non-Juror* explores a situation that could have tragic effects for England – that is, the overthrow of the government by a Catholic king and his followers – it makes sense that Cibber would respect the comments made by Addison, a highly popular Whig writer of the time, and avoid writing in rhyming couplets. However, Cibber also chose to adapt the French dramatic form, a format that Addison respected and praised for its unity of action (*Spectator* 42; McKinney 10).

But Cibber relied on more than one familiar text in creating *The Non-Juror*. First, he quotes Horace's *Epistles* in Latin on the title page. Translated, the piece states, "Divine

Laverna [Goddess of thieves], grant me safe disguise; / Let me seem just and upright in men's eyes; / Shed night upon my crimes, a glamour o'er my lies" (1.16.56-62). In other places, Cibber chose to follow the examples of two of the most popular satirists of the 18th century – Swift and Pope. Those attentive audience members familiar with *Tale of a Tub*, *Rape of the Locke*, *Eloisa to Abelard*, and Pope's translation of Homer's *Iliad* would recognize the references – whether satirical or not – to these works, and the play therefore becomes more topical and realistic to them. Such a connection between the audience and the play's characters is important not only for the success of the sentimental aspects but for the satirical as well. If a play has any hope of moving the audience – to tears, to shame, to change – the connection must be present. In addition, Cibber is able to increase the credibility of his play by demonstrating his knowledge of other, perhaps more respected, works, and he is able to more effectively create the necessary images and send the desired messages through his use of Swift's and Pope's works.

In writing a satire, Cibber chose to follow in the footsteps of Swift and produce a satirical piece that targeted an array of vices. In the dedication to *The Non-Juror* Cibber suggests that he wants to “divert the fallen and disaffected from busying their brains to disturb the happiness of the government” (263). This suggestion echoes Swift's prose satire *A Tale of a Tub* (1704). In “The Preface” Swift writes:

The Wits of the present Age being so very numerous and penetrating, it seems, the Grandees of *Church* and *State* begin to fall under horrible Apprehensions, lest these Gentlemen during the Intervals of a long Peace, should find leisure to pick Holes in the weak sides of Religion and Government. To prevent which, there has been much Thought employed of

late upon certain Projects for taking off the Force and Edge of those formidable Enquirers, from canvassing and reasoning upon such delicate Points.... To this End, at a Grand Committee, some Days ago, this important Discovery was made by a certain curious and refined Observer; That Sea-men have a Custom when they meet a *Whale*, to fling him out an empty *Tub* by way of Amusement, to divert him from laying violent Hands upon the Ship... in order to prevent these *Leviathans* from tossing and sporting with the *Commonwealth* (which it self is too apt to *fluctuate*) they should be diverted from that Game by *a Tale of a Tub*. (374-75)

Both Swift and Cibber discuss the use of performance to divert and amuse for the sake of the government.

In *A Tale of a Tub* Swift satirizes the issues of religious excess, enthusiasm, and pride. Though it would be easy to suggest that *The Non-Juror* is satirizing only Catholics, it would be incorrect to do so. In fact, the play questions religious zeal of any sort, as seen in a conversation between Sir John and Colonel Woodvil in which Sir John questions the religious zeal of Mr. Heartly and Colonel Woodvil:

COLONEL WOODVIL. [*Aside.*] Oh! give me temper, heav'n! this vile non-juring zealot! What poisonous principles has he swell'd him with! – Well, Sir, since you don't think it proper to argue upon this subject, I'll wave it too: but, if I may ask it without offense, are these your only reasons for discountenancing Mr. *Heartly*'s address to my sister?

SIR JOHN. These! Are they not flagrant? Would you have me marry my daughter to a Pagan? For so he is, and all of you, 'till you are regularly

Christians. In short, Son, expect to inherit no estate of mine, unless you resolve to come into the pale of the church, of which I profess myself a member. (Act I, 268)

In a conversation between Colonel Woodvil, Lady Woodvil, and Maria, the (false) religious zeal of Dr. Wolf is mocked:

COLONEL WOODVIL. What subtle fetch can he have in being really in love with your ladyship, and at the same time making such a bustle to marry my sister?

MARIA. Truly one would not suspect him to be so termagant: I fancy the gentleman might have his hands full of one of us.

COLONEL WOODVIL. And yet his zeal pretends to be so shock'd at all indecent amours, that in the country he us'd to make the maids lock up the turkey-cocks every *Saturday* night, for fear they should gallant the hens on a *Sunday*. (Act II, 289-90)

Perhaps even more important than religious zeal is the idea of religious hypocrisy, a main point in both *The Non-Juror* and the play from which it was adapted: Molière's *Tartuffe; Or, The Hypocrite (Tartuffe ou L'Imposteur)*, a play about the religious hypocrite named Tartuffe. In 1717 many English audiences would consider a Nonjuror such as the character of Dr. Wolf a hypocrite for espousing beliefs and behaviors he does not follow.

Another similarity between *A Tale of a Tub* and *The Non-Juror* is the distrustful treatment of scientific enquiry. Whereas Swift attacks scientific enquiry for attempting to explain religious mysteries that would be better left alone (Rawson 151), Cibber's characters again and again demonstrate the faulty logic of trusting one's senses. As the hypocrisy of Dr.

Wolf demonstrates, words cannot always be trusted; sometimes, when the person is a good actor, even actions cannot be trusted. However, *The Non-Juror* also contains numerous episodes that suggest that one's sense of sight, of empirical observation, cannot be trusted despite the characters' tendencies to believe that it can be.

In an attempt to expose Dr. Wolf's devious desires toward Lady Woodvil, Colonel Woodvil encourages his father, Sir John, to spy on an interaction between the pair:

COLONEL WOODVIL. Sir, let your eyes convince you.

SIR JOHN. They do, that yours, Sir, have deceiv'd you; all this I knew of.

COLONEL WOODVIL. How, Sir!

SIR JOHN. Observe and be convinc'd. (Act III, 312)

After spotting the spying pair, Dr. Wolf once again pretends to be a pious man who is in love with Maria. Upon observing this behavior, Sir John demands an apology from Colonel Woodvil:

SIR JOHN. Audacious monster! were not your own senses evidence against your frontless accusation? (Act III, 314)

Yet it is also through Sir John's sense of sight that the true nature of Dr. Wolf is finally revealed:

LADY WOODVIL. Come, Sir, suspend your wonder, respite your belief ev'n of this, till grosser evidence convinces you: Suppose I here, before your face, should let you see his villainy, make him repeat his odious love to me, at once throw off his mask, and shew the barefac'd traitor.

SIR JOHN. Is it possible? Make me but witness of that fact, and I shall soon accuse myself, and own my folly equal to his bareness.... (Act V, 342)

In fact, Sir John hides under a table and watches as Lady Woodvil encourages Dr. Wolf to profess his love to her. Upon seeing this display of Dr. Wolf's true character, Sir John finally believes his wife's accusations.

In addition to criticizing the Nonjurors, the Catholics, the Tories, and the Jacobites, Cibber, like Swift, was criticizing zeal in other forms and other audience members too. Dr. Wolf is zealous in his greed and Sir John in his religion. Both men, when powered by their zeal, make poor decisions. When signing the form that gives Dr. Wolf control over Sir John's estate and daughter, both men are too excited to even read the form:

MARIA. And all pass'd without the least suspicion?

CHARLES. Sir *John* sign'd it with such earnestness, and the Doctor receiv'd it with such a seeming reluctance, that neither had the curiosity to examine a line of it. (Act IV, 318)

This misreading – or non-reading – by Sir John and Dr. Wolf also relates to Swift's *A Tale of a Tub*. A major theme throughout Swift's 1704 work is that of misreading texts. Expanding on that idea, much of *The Non-Juror* explores the danger of misreading people and their true intentions. For example, Sir John completely misreads Dr. Wolf. However, this misreading is the product of Dr. Wolf's machinations to mislead Sir John. This concept of mistrust links back to the sentimental idea of trusting actions over words.

The similarities between the issues addressed in Swift's *A Tale of a Tub* and Cibber's *The Non-Juror* are significant for two reasons. One, Cibber's decision to focus on the same issues as a master of satire like Swift suggests his awareness of Swift's work, as well as other satires, and it suggests his desire to write a satire of his own. Though Cibber does not acknowledge Swift in his writing, he does at least have a similar understanding of the

Horatian purpose of satire to “divert” as well as instruct. However, unlike Swift’s Juvenalian *A Tale of a Tub*, Cibber’s *The Non-Juror* contains sentimental aspects that helped to soften the harshness of the satire. Second, Cibber chose a religious topic that attacked a group it was acceptable to attack; Swift satirized with a much broader brush. In fact, *A Tale of a Tub* was negatively received by the Church of England as an attempt to undermine the church (Rawson 81). Yet *The Non-Juror* was well-received and successful. According to *The London Stage*, *The Non-Juror* was performed 85 times between 1717 and 1785 (156).

Pope, whom Cibber attacks several times throughout *The Non-Juror*, was greatly influenced by Swift. According to Rawson, Pope’s *The Dunciad* (1728/1743) was “indebted to the *Tale*, abetted by Swift, and dedicated to him [Swift]” (78). Yet if Swift had offered some positive models for Cibber, it was within *The Dunciad* (1743) that Pope instead attacked Cibber, naming him the King of Dunces, a move that has helped create the negative perception of Cibber that has, in many cases, lasted over 250 years (Viator & Burling 13). As importantly, according to Maynard Mack, the 1743 *Dunciad* continues to respond, 26 years later, to what Pope saw as attacks on himself in *The Non-Juror*. This “propaganda comedy” was crucial in “shaping Pope’s estimate of Cibber for the rest of his life,” one summarized by Mack as “Literary Toad Eater Extraordinary to the Hanoverian regime” (775-77). In addition to being able to use Pope’s work to create a connection with the audience, Cibber was able to attack the Catholic satirist, who also happened to be the son of a Nonjuror and a Nonjuror himself. According to William M. Peterson, the trouble between Cibber and Pope began in January 1717 when Pope wrote lines that forced Cibber, as a character in the play *Three Hours After Marriage*, to satirize himself as someone who lacks the ability to write creative, witty, unique plays (332-33). In effect, Pope accuses Cibber of plagiarism and

amateurish writing. Perhaps in response to Pope's actions, Cibber refers to Pope at least three times in *The Non-Juror* (Hayley 187).

The first reference to Pope appears in the Prologue of *The Non-Juror*. Written by the Whig playwright and friend of Pope, Nicholas Rowe, the Prologue states, "We mean to souse old Satan and the Pope / They've no relations here, nor friends, we hope" (265). Though the reference to "the Pope" could, of course, be referring to Pope Clement XI or any Catholic in general, it could also be a reference to Alexander Pope. This assertion is supported by the other references to Pope in the play (Hayley 187).

The second reference to Pope comes in the form of direct quotation of his work. In Act I, Maria is reading from a book when Heartly enters the room. In fact, she is reading from Pope's *Rape of the Locke*, and she reads a section aloud on stage in which the female protagonist Belinda is preparing for her afternoon adventure. The selected section may simply be Cibber using Belinda and Pope's attitude toward her frivolous behavior to create a picture of Maria as frivolous – perhaps because she reads Pope's works. Cibber could be suggesting that only silly girls read Pope (Peterson 334). According to Peterson, "The irony consists, of course, in quoting Pope, who had been often attacked for his Catholicism and placed 'among the Jacobites,' in a play which violently inveighs against both" (334). However, it is possible that Cibber's decision to use a familiar work such as *Rape of the Locke* is a method of creating a connection between the audience and the characters in the play by having them read the same texts. Maria, in reading an actual, familiar text, seems more realistic. Also, people in the audience who had read Pope's work would be able to see the connection between Maria and Belinda.

Colonel Woodvil's description of Maria's courting behavior as a card game harkens back to the card game Ombre played in *Rape of the Locke*:

COLONEL WOODVIL. No, but as a stander by, I often see more of the game than you do: Don't you know she is naturally a coquette? And a coquette's play with a serious lover, is like a back-game at table, all open at first; she'll make you twenty blots – and you – spare none, take them all up, to be sure, while she – gains points upon you: So that when you eagerly expect to end the game on your side, slap – as you were, she whips up your man, she's fortified, and you are in a worse condition, than when you begun with her – Upon which, you know of course, you curse your fortune, and she laughs at you. (Act I, 276-77)

In much the same way that Pope mocks the overrated seriousness of everyday activities in Canto III of *Rape of the Locke*, Cibber uses Maria to criticize the seriousness of Heartly.

The third reference to Pope appears in Act II. When Charles enters the room, Maria is reading Pope's translation of Homer's *Illiad*, the third volume of which had appeared in June of 1717 (Peterson 334-35). In his *Remarks upon Mr Pope's Translation of Homer*, John Dennis mocks Pope's translation, claiming he had "undertaken to translate *Homer* from *Greek*, of which he does not know one word, into *English*, which he understand almost as little" (qtd. in Barnard 126). In addition, Dennis criticizes Pope's *Illiad* translation, claiming it contained hidden Catholic and Jacobite doctrine (Barnard 126). In *The Non-Juror*, Cibber also criticizes Pope's translation, suggesting, like many others at the time, that Pope's translation was the "ladies' *Illiad*" because it did not require the reader (or the translator!) to be an educated person fluent in Greek:

MARIA. O! your servant, Mr. *Charles* – Here take this odious *Homer*, and lay him up again, he tires me. How could the blind wretch make such a horrid fuss about a fine woman, for so many volumes together, and give us no account of her amours? You have read him I suppose in *Greek*, Mr. *Charles*.

CHARLES. Not lately, madam.

MARIA. But do you so violently admire him now?

CHARLES. The criticks say he has his beauties, madam. But *Ovid* has been always my favourite. (Act II, 297-98)

In addition to this reference to Pope's *Illiad* functioning as a criticism of Pope, it also works to characterize both Maria and Charles. Maria is a silly woman whose interest lies in the "amours" of a woman; she wants a romance novel rather than an epic. Charles's admiration of Ovid indicates that he too prefers love over war, and this characterization of him prepares the audience for his display of emotions and his plea for forgiveness.

A fourth reference to Pope is made by Dr. Wolf when he is speaking to Lady Woodvil about his passions while Sir John watches from under a table (Peterson 335). With each reference to Pope or his works, the character is in possession of a book. Dr. Wolf enters the room with a book:

DR. WOLF. ...You, madam, were the subject of my solitary thoughts, I take in all the little aids I can to guard my frailty, and truly I have receiv'd great consolation from an unfortunate example here before me.

LADY WOODVIL. Pray of what kind, Sir?

DR. WOLF. I had just dipt into poor Eloisa's passion for Abelard: It is

indeed a piteous conflict! How terrible! How penitent a sense she shews of guilty pleasures past, and fruitless pains to shut them from her memory.

LADY WOODVIL. I have read her story, Sir.

DR. WOLF. Is it not pitiful?

LADY WOODVIL. A heart of stone might feel for her.

DR. WOLF. O! think then, what I endure for you, such are my pains.... (Act V, 343)

The poem Dr. Wolf refers to is Pope's *Eloisa to Abelard*, which was published in 1717 and chronicles the illicit love between the two Catholic title characters (Peterson 335). As Peterson suggests, "This attempt to justify illicit love by a depraved and traitorous non-juror is adroit irony, particularly felicitous as a return thrust to the satire of Cibber in *Three Hours after Marriage*" (335). Cibber is able to attack Pope simply by associating him with the character of Dr. Wolf. If Pope's poem is thought highly of by a person like Dr. Wolf, then it must not be a very good or worthwhile poem. As Hayley suggests, "Pope's writings are seen as required reading in a household given over to malice and treason" (187). Also, Wolf's fondness for reading Pope, Cibber implies, leads him to mislead others.

In addition, Cibber's use of certain words suggests that he was mocking the quality of Pope's poem. For example, Dr. Wolf describes *Eloisa to Abelard* as an "unfortunate example," which could refer to the situation within the poem, or, perhaps, the poor quality of the poem. Dr. Wolf uses the words "terrible" and "pitiful" to describe the events in the poem, but, again, these words could also be descriptions of the poem itself. Finally, Dr. Wolf reminds Lady Woodvil to consider "what I *endure* for you, such are my *pains*" (italics mine). He is comparing his own suffering to that of the two Catholics Eloisa and Abelard (which is

surprising since in the poem Abelard is castrated!); however, if the poem were poorly written and difficult to read, it would cause him to suffer pain to read it.

Finally, Cibber takes one last jab at Pope in the Epilogue in a more indirect manner:

As for the critics, those, he owns may tease him,
Because he never took such pains to please them,
In time, place, action, rules by which old wits
Made plays, as – dames do puddings, by receipts:
But hopes again ev'n rebels cannot say,
Tho' vanquisht, they're insulted in his play (357)

Cibber perceived Pope as a critic of his wit and ability, and he addressed Pope as both a critic and a rebel before Pope could criticize the play. This comment on critics in the Epilogue may also have been directed at Collier, suggesting that Cibber believed his play was not open to Collier's judgment because it worked toward the aid of the government, attacked "rebels," and did not cause insult.

Cibber was smart to choose a topic that could not be attacked, and his addition of sentimentalism and Restoration humor softened the harsh nature of satire. However, Cibber failed to protect himself from criticism. According to Leonard R.N. Ashley, Cibber's righteous stance was interpreted by many as an opportunistic move, and he was accused of plagiarism (45). According to John Loftis, "the play excoriated the Jacobites with a jingoistic fury.... As he himself observed, the subject of the play was its protection. No one could take issue with its theme, though critics could and did maintain that he violated propriety by using religious zeal as a subject for dramatic satire...." (72).

Two direct responses to *The Non-Juror* came from Pope in *The Plot Discover'd; Or, A Clue to the Comedy of the Non-Juror* and Breval in *A Complete Key to The Non-Juror*, written under the pseudonym Joseph Gay. The most important fact about these responses is that both Pope and Breval recognized and defined *The Non-Juror* as a satire – if only satirically. After hearing that the play contained references to him, and perhaps due to his connection with the attacked Jacobite community, Pope decided to see *The Non-Juror* in 1717 (Hayley 187). In his response, Pope justifies his interest in the play by claiming that he is writing per a request from the Poet Laureate, Nicholas Rowe, and claims, “perhaps there never was a Piece of fine *Drama-Theological Satire*, the true Scope of which has been less understood” (6). Pope is arguing that the play does not attack Jacobites. Rather, *The Non-Juror* is a satire of Whigs (Peterson 335). Despite the fact that Wolf is supposed to be a continental Catholic in disguise, Pope argues that he is actually a Presbyterian bishop, a move that linked Dr. Wolf to the religion of the ruling party, the Whigs: “...*Wolf* in the Stile of *Ecclesiastical Allegory* constantly signifies the *Presbyterian Party*” (8-9).

Mockingly, Pope suggests that Cibber’s form of satire is more “refined” because it fools the audience into thinking that they aren’t the ones being satirized at all. Cibber’s satire is so refined because it makes the audience think he is talking about the *opposite* of whom he is discussing. In fact, those people who are most judgmental of the characters are the ones being satirized. As Pope ironically suggests at the beginning, “I am at a Loss which to admire most... the insensibility of those whom the Satire is *really Aim’d at*, or the ignorant Rage of those *disaffected Jacobite Wretches* who cry out when they are not hurt” (5-6). Pope is mocking Cibber’s satire by suggesting that it is too obvious to be effective. Mack argues that Pope is suggesting Cibber is representing the primary response to the rebels as merciful,

when in fact the royal response was harsh (775-77). The work ends with one last jab at Cibber's writing style: "the Author tho' questionless a great master of Stile, puts *bad English* into the mouths of most of his Peronsages" (23).

Breval provides a list of the characters and their real-life counterparts, minus the full names (25), and he includes a three-page list of authors, including Pope, from whom Breval believes Cibber has plagiarized, titled "A faithful Catalogue of Authors made Use of by Mr. Cibber in his Play of the *Non-Juror*" (26-28). A significant portion of Breval's *A Complete Key to The Non-Juror* compares and contrasts the plot and characters from Molière's *Tartuffe* and Cibber's *The Non-Juror*. In Breval's opinion, Molière creates a realistic situation whereas Cibber does not provide enough explanation or background to his audience (17). Breval addresses the changes Cibber makes in Molière's characters, but he does not discuss the significance of these changes in detail. Breval asserts that Cibber gives Sir John "a Title to justify his folly" (11). Cibber's characterization benefits his play because he gives his characters respectability based on their positions. However, it is important to note that a title does not necessarily mean that a person is respectable and capable of justifying his mistakes. During the course of *The Non-Juror*, Dr. Wolf receives a title. However, his folly is still exposed, and he is still arrested in the end.

What is most important about Breval's key for the purposes of this thesis is his analysis of Cibber's satire. Breval begins his key by discussing the idea set forth in Earl of Shaftsbury's *Essay Upon Enthusiasm* that the most effective means of correction is not physical punishment but rather "Wit and Satire, Fare and Ridicule, Play-House and Puppet-Show" (6). However, Breval does not think that Cibber, whom he accuses of significant and repeated plagiarism, is an effective satirist:

[Cibber] thinks Burlesque and Droll, proper Weapons to encounter those formidable Enemies the *Non-Jurors*. . . . I wish Mr. Cibber Joy of his attempt, but am hugely afraid, that his Pen is not only an Improper, but will prove a very unsuccessful Adversary against *Schismatics* [*sic*], and be very far from lessening the Number of the *Non-Jurors*, unless the Old Gentleman [Sir John] in his own Play may pass for a Convert. Mirth, Laughter, and Noise, are as different things from *Conviction*, as Demonstration is from Fiction. And tho' it may please the World and the *Non-Jurors* too, to see a pretend one of their sect expos'd in the Person of *Colley Cibber*, yet it is no matter of Conviction to the Real and Sincere ones. (7-8)

Breval is pointing directly to Sir John, whose improbable conversion, Breval suggests, ruins the effectiveness of the satire. This argument is reminiscent of the criticism regarding the conversion of Loveless in *Love's Last Shift*. Though both Pope and Breval treat *The Non-Juror* as a satire, neither commented on the aspect that reached beyond the satire and back to *Love's Last Shift* – sentimentalism.

As discussed in the previous chapter, social changes occurred in the late 17th and early 18th centuries that significantly influenced the composition of the theatre audience, therefore changing the demands placed on playwrights to create more plays of a sentimental nature. *The Spectator*, a daily publication produced by Joseph Addison and Richard Steele between 1711 and 1714, focused on literature and manners, often making suggestions about the proper conduct of life (“Spectator”). This type of “reform” publication was popular at the time, and it influenced all areas of life, including drama. It would have also influenced audience expectations that literature and drama instruct. Audiences would have expected the

characters to recognize their flaws and change. The theatre and its playwrights, including Cibber, responded to this rapid growth of a London middle-class and to the change in demands. As McKinney writes, “*The Non-Juror* represents a new British genre designed to instruct. The characters, then, must have flaws that are corrected in the course of the play: Maria learns to be serious, Mr. Woodvil sees the error of his ways, Heartly is cured of jealousy, Charles is forgiven his Jacobite past, and everyone is married” (8). And, perhaps most important, Dr. Wolf is exposed and Charles *and* Sir John are forgiven.

This idea of reform is one that helps to define *The Non-Juror* as a sentimental play. In defining sentimental drama, Bateson writes of “people confronted with the same problems... paralysed by the same weaknesses, redeemed by the same generousities” (7-8). Kavenik refers to a focus on “the best interests of the community; morality and social regulation promote the general welfare even at the expense of the individual, but they are also ‘natural,’ reflecting the inherent goodness of humankind” (114). The reforms that occur within *The Non-Juror* center on a moral problem, as does the whole play, a focus that makes the play sentimental.

Most characters in the play – Maria, Colonel Woodvil, Lady Woodvil, and Charles – face a moral issue that is embodied in the dishonest and misleading character of Dr. Wolf. Alone and together, these characters struggle with the decision and ability to expose Dr. Wolf’s lies and treachery. The presence of a moral problem can be found in either satirical or sentimental works. However, *The Non-Juror* has a sentimental flavor because, despite the risks involved for each individual character, all of them choose the (somewhat) virtuous path; both the struggle and the moral choice can create a sentimental situation in which the audience feels for the struggling characters.

Driven by the need to save Sir John from Dr. Wolf, Colonel Woodvil and Lady Woodvil work together to expose Dr. Wolf's affinity for Lady Woodvil and his aversion to Maria. Lady Woodvil, out of love for her husband, must participate in a task that makes her uncomfortable and exposes her to the possible wrath and loss of her husband:

COLONEL WOODVIL. Nay, then 'tis time indeed his eyes were open'd; and give me leave to say, madam, 'tis only in your power to save not only me, but ev'en my father too from ruin.... Why, if this fellow (which I am sure of)

is really in love with you, give him a fair opportunity to declare himself, and leave me to make my advantage of it.

LADY WOODVIL. I apprehend you – I am loth to do a wrong thing – (Act II, 290)

Despite Lady Woodvil's resistance against doing anything wrong (290) and her hesitation to "play a treacherous part" (309), she agrees to the meeting with Dr. Wolf. Her willingness to participate in such an activity shows her desire to save her husband regardless of the discomfort it causes her.

Colonel Woodvil encourages his father, Sir John, to witness the exposure of Dr. Wolf's conniving ways. However, Dr. Wolf sees Sir John and quickly changes back into the pious, Maria-loving man Sir John expects. In light of his father's angry response, Colonel Woodvil faces a difficult choice – beg for Dr. Wolf's forgiveness or lose his claim to his father's wealth:

COLONEL WOODVIL. I scorn the imputation, Sir, and with the same repeated honesty avow (howe'er his cunning may have chang'd

appearances) that you are still deceiv'd, that all I told you, Sir, was true, these eyes, these ears were witnesses of his audacious love, without mention of my sister's name, directly, plainly, grosly [*sic*] tending to abuse the honour of your bed.

SIR JOHN. Audacious monster! ... either submit and ask his pardon for this wrong.... Or this instant leave my sight, my house, my family for ever.

...

COLONEL WOODVIL. No, Sir, though I would hazard life to save you from the ruin he misleads you to; could die to reconcile my duty to your favour; yet on the terms that villain offers, 'tis merit to refuse it; I glory in the disgrace your errors give me.... (Act III, 314-15)

Colonel Woodvil's defiant refusal to beg the forgiveness of Dr. Wolf shows the strength of his allegiance to his father. Colonel Woodvil chooses to maintain his own honor and to strive to restore the dignity of his father, even though he knows he will face difficulties. (However, Colonel Woodvil is not necessarily motivated by completely honorable intentions: he has a strong desire not to lose his own claim to Sir John's estate (Act I, 270).)

Charles, Dr. Wolf's assistant, also faces a difficult decision: Should he expose Dr. Wolf if it means exposing himself as a traitor too? Motivated by a desire to inform Maria of the soon-to-be signed paperwork that will grant Maria's hand and Sir John's land to Dr. Wolf, and by his feelings for her and his hatred of Dr. Wolf, Charles tells Maria of his (and Dr. Wolf's) past participation in the Jacobite rebellion of 1715. One of the most interesting aspects of the moral issue facing the characters – the exposure of Dr. Wolf – is the reform and forgiveness that occur.

Often, dramatic satire exposes the ignorance and mistakes of a person or action and does not soften this criticism with a happy resolution; the lesson is and should be hard. If one of the goals of satire is to provoke change through ridicule, *The Non-Juror* functions as a dramatic satire in its presentation of the character Dr. Wolf. Jean B. Kern writes, “The satirist’s interest in characters who illustrate the particular thus leads him to create exaggerated, grotesque characters who are types or one-dimensional.... The grotesque character’s words and acts are the satirist’s method of picking out the ridiculous and irrational – exaggeration for a purpose” (13). In *The Non-Juror*, Dr. Wolf functions as *the* Nonjuror, and he is the villain. Boas describes Wolf as “a hypocritical adherent of the lost Stuart cause” (91).

Dr. Wolf is the epitome of the Nonjurors at their worst. As Ashley notes: “Nonjurors were not ordinarily traitors, for they did not advocate violent rebellion, but Dr. Wolf is no dissenting Protestant: he is a papist spy.... he visits the Continent, he is clearly trying to put the Old Pretender back on the throne” (46-47). Like the worst stereotypical Nonjuror, Dr. Wolf does not pray for the royal family (Act I, 279). In addition, Dr. Wolf gives hints of his traitorous Nonjuror qualities in the first act when he says, “The time’s now yours, but mine may come... power may perhaps change its hands” (Act I, 279-80). When Colonel Woodvil exposes Dr. Wolf, he shows that Wolf, like the stereotypical Nonjuror, is Catholic: “Here are affidavits in my hand that prove him under his disguise a lurking emissary of *Rome*, that he is actually a priest in *Popish* orders, and has several times been seen as such, to officiate public mass in the church of *Notre Dame*” (Act V, 353). Ashley describes the success of Cibber’s characterization of Dr. Wolf: “Dr. Wolf has a lean and hungry look, is more dangerous, less outwardly demanding, more insidious, verging on melodrama.... When we hear of his

connection with the Rebellion of 1715, we are not surprised. When we see his downfall, we are not unhappy” (47). Even Dr. Wolf’s age, 49, would perhaps bring to the mind of the audience (and the king) the start of the events of 1649, including the beheading of King Charles I and the conversion of England from a monarchy to a republic; All of these depictions suggest that Dr. Wolf is linked to negative political upheaval.

However, if Cibber succeeded in creating an atmosphere in which some audience members related to the characters and cheered for their success against the villainous Dr. Wolf, he also succeeded in creating an atmosphere of shame for those who could relate to Dr. Wolf or Sir John. By creating a connection between the audience and the characters, between reality and the actions in the play, Cibber is able to teach a lesson against nonjuring.

Despite this lesson, *The Non-Juror* concludes with a happy ending: the villain is overcome, and the lovers are united. Yet this happy ending does not necessarily undermine the criticism voiced by the play. Those who helped to undermine the working of the Nonjuror are rewarded. Even with the happy ending, the ignorance, mistakes, and the *wrongness* of Dr. Wolf is shown. He is someone who, despite his continuously devious efforts, claims to be “outwitted by a brainless girl” (Act V, 354). Dr. Wolf is punished, but the other characters are able to show that people do have goodness within them.

In addition, Cibber was able to show that forgiveness and reform are possible. Forgiveness is an important aspect of the sentimental play. If one of the goals of a sentimental play is to instruct the audience how to act, then Cibber is able to use this play to encourage his audience either to repent their evil, traitorous ways or to forgive those who have the courage to admit their mistakes. This same idea is evident in the character of Sir John.

All of these characters are working to open Sir John's eyes, to show him the true nature of Dr. Wolf. Despite Sir John's resistance to the efforts of the other characters, he is a forgivable character. According to Fone, "In sentimental comedy pity is caused by the vision of a good heart, common and unflawed, virtuous by default rather than by act, being acted upon, not by cosmic forces but by irksome minor immoralities of domestic life" ("*Love's*" 14). Sir John is not considered malicious; the other characters in the play describe him as a victim of Dr. Wolf:

COLONEL WOODVIL. So--- Well said doctor! 'tis he, I'm sure has blown this fire. What horrid hands is this poor family fallen into? and how the tratyor [*sic*] seems to triumph in his power? How little is my father like himself? by nature, open, just, and generous, but this vile hypocrite drives his weak passions like the wind, and I foresee at last, will sash him on his ruin. (Act II, 283)

LADY WOODVIL. Ay, but that's the charm, that first got him into Sir John's heart; who, good man, is himself, I am sure, sincere, however now misguided. 'Twas not so much his principles of government, as his well-painted piety; his seeming self-denial, resignation, patience, and humble outside, that gave him first so warm a lodging in his bosom. (Act III, 289)

In case the descriptions other characters provide of Sir John aren't enough to convince the audience that Sir John is a good man, Cibber provides a view of the interaction between Sir John and Dr. Wolf in Act II that shows the gullibility of Sir John and the deceitfulness of Dr. Wolf. After he fools Sir John into permitting him to spend time with

Lady Woodvil, who is Dr. Wolf's actual love interest, Dr. Wolf expresses his amazement at his ease in fooling Sir John:

DR. WOLF. Ha! ha! What noble harvests have been reaped from bigotted [*sic*] credulity, nor ever was a better instance of it. Would it not make one smile; that is should ever enter into the brains of this man (who can in other points distinguish like a man) that a Protestant church can never be secure, till it has a Popish prince to defend it? (Act II, 295-96)

The final exposure of Dr. Wolf shows Sir John his mistake. At the end of the play, Sir John's ignorance and gullibility are exposed. As he stands before the whole cast he comments, "I see your eyes are all upon me, expecting from that vile traitor's practices, some voluntary instance of my heart's conversion" (Act V, 355). This "conversion" could be seen as one toward the negative, an acceptance of the nonjuring ways despite the exposure of Dr. Wolf, or one to the side of his children now that he knows the truth about Dr. Wolf. However, what seems to be most important is the shame that associated with Sir John. He is standing before the crowd and being forced to declare his beliefs, admit his mistakes, and explain himself. Sir John seems to recognize the shame of his situation when he says, "Let it suffice, I see my errors with a conscious shame; but hope, when I am justly weigh'd, you'll find those errors rose but from a docile heart, not disinclin'd to truth, but fatally misled by false appearances" (Act V, 355).

Though Sir John's explanation seems weak, the fact a change could be brought about by the group reinforces the idea of acting against the traitor. However, Sir John's response to the shame does not include an admission of his mistake or guilt; rather, he places blame on Dr. Wolf and attempts to show his fault is one that shouldn't be judged too harshly. This

response shows the strength and the danger of the Nonjurors, with the suggestion that they can deceive even the best of people. If Sir John should be forgiven, Cibber is suggesting that people should (and can) learn to change their traitorous ways now, lest they face exposure and punishment like Dr. Wolf – the sentimentalist approach. Cibber gives little information about the future of Sir John. Colonel Woodvil’s comment – “Whoever knows your private life, must think you, Sir, in this sincere” (Act V, 355) – permits the possibility that Sir John still faces more judgment and perhaps punishment. However, the comments of Lady Woodvil and the recent pardon of Charles suggest that Sir John will be forgiven for his actions.

Charles, Dr. Wolf’s servant, is forgiven for his participation in Jacobite activities. Like Sir John, Charles expresses seemingly sincere regret and provides a justification for his actions:

CHARLES. I can’t disown the guilt – but since the royal mercy has been
refus’d to none that frankly have confess’d with penitence their crime
(which from my heart I most sincerely do) in that is all my hope – My youth
and education’s all th’ excuse I plead; if they deserve no pity, I am
determin’d to throw off my disguise, and bow me to the hand of justice.

(Act II, 300)

It’s important to note that both Sir John and Charles are prepared to be punished for their mistakes; they don’t expect an easy forgiveness. Cibber’s first play, *Love’s Last Shift*, is often criticized due to Loveless’s unexpected and seemingly unmediated conversion and his lack of explanation for his change. In *The Non-Juror* Cibber attempts to remedy his past mistakes by having Sir John and Charles admit and explain their actions. As in *Love’s Last*

Shift, there seems to be a happy ending for the converts, and their suffering is restricted to a sufficient amount of guilt.

According to Parnell, the repentance scene is considered pivotal to the sentimental comedy (205-06). “It is important, nevertheless, that for both plots the business of reformation has been the focus for the whole action; and for the hero, the reformation is presumed permanent.... faults are forgotten at the moment of repentance, provided that the repentance is asserted to be permanent” (Parnell 209-12). *The Non-Juror* contains this repentance scene but presents it in the cases of both Charles and Sir John in Act V. One aspect of the repentance scene and of the play as a whole that makes it believable is the passions that appear justified and acceptable to the audience. These emotions connect the audience and the characters by making characters seem realistic in that they are imperfect – just like the members of the audience. And this presence of passion is not necessarily seen as negative – if controlled properly. It is only in zealous extravagance and lack of control that emotions are a problem.

According to Gollapudi, Cibber is masterful at creating dramatic situations in which the audience identifies with the characters. In Act 3, scene 2 of *Love’s Last Shift*, Cibber joins the audience and characters in judging and dismissing the stock Restoration characters in favor of those characters who better fit the “sentimental” stereotype (Gollapudi 4-6). It is here within *Love’s Last Shift* that Cibber is experimenting with satire, calling critical attention to the Restoration play and the character types even he relies on as a playwright *and* as an actor. In discussing *The Non-Juror*, Ashley writes, “The tone of it is Cibberian – Barker calls it ‘his own spurious conception of gentility’ – even to the touches of sentimentalism designed to ‘coerce’ the passions” (47). This coercion of anger, anxiety, and

even relief is Cibber's method of creating a connection between the audience and the stage, a step toward inspiring change that is complemented by Cibber's use of satire.

The main character in whom emotion is shown to be damaging is Sir John, who laments his "blinded passions" permitting him to fall for Dr. Wolf's wicked ploy (Act V, 347). In other places, Sir John discusses that passion in the form of tears:

DR. WOLF. Alas! Sir, I can only boast an honest heart; my power is weak, I can only assist them with my prayers and zealous wishes; or if I had been serviceable, have not you, Sir, overpaid me? Your daughter, Sir, the fair *Maria*, is a reward no merit can pretend to.

SIR JOHN. Nay, good my lord, this tender gratitude confounds me – O! this insensible girl – Pray excuse me - [Weeps.]

DR. WOLF. You seem concerne'd, pray what's amiss?

SIR JOHN. That I should be the father of so blind a child. Alas! She slights from the blessing I propos'd, she sees you not, my lord, with my fond eyes... (Act II, 295)

The most significant sign of what will be called sentimentalism is the presence of tears because it is an undeniable and moving presentation of emotion that effectively conveys the characters' feelings to the audience. "Usefully for the development of sentimental comedy, he [Cibber] knew too, the power of tears" (Fone, "Colley" 41). And, tears often beget tears. In the case of Sir John, the tears are significant because they help to portray Sir John as a caring person who is being fooled rather than as a heartless, scheming traitor like Dr. Wolf. These tears also show the power of Dr. Wolf to effectively fool Sir John into misbehavior. Tears are also powerful when used by Maria. One of the first places that Sir

John begins to believe the truth about Dr. Wolf is when he sees Maria's tears. They move him to say, "I am counfounded! those tears cannot be counterfeit, nor can this be true" (Act V, 341). Much as he later relies on a weeping Sir John, Cibber relies on the tears of Amanda to cause and validate the reformation of Loveless *and* move the audience by evoking pity and emotion from them in *Love's Last Shift*.

Other passions, such as anger, seem to be crucial in driving the characters in *The Non-Juror*. Many of the characters act out of anger because they feel cheated, betrayed, or slandered. In Act I Dr. Wolf's taunts drive Colonel Woodvil is driven to the brink of physical violence, and he grabs Dr. Wolf's collar and shakes him (280). However, Colonel Woodvil is immediately ashamed for showing his emotion. He tells Heartly, "I ask your pardon, *Frank*, I am asham'd that such a wretch could move me so" (Act I, 280). However, though Colonel Woodvil was unable to hide his emotions, he still had the self-control not to harm Dr. Wolf. A key difference between the anger present in *The Non-Juror* and that in other satires is the presence of self-control. This distinction is important because it permits the characters to be realistically emotional without being flawed because of it. Similarly, we see Sir John react angrily toward Dr. Wolf in Act V, but Sir John's anger is restricted to speech. He does not resort to physical violence because he is above such things, and a show of physical violence from Sir John would undermine his forthcoming pardon.

Another dominant passion is the jealousy between Maria and Heartly. Unlike *Love's Last Shift*, which places jealousy in the heart of the female characters Narcissa and Flareit, *The Non-Juror* shows the presence and pain of jealousy in a man:

HEARTLY. ... I have an open artless heart, that cannot bear disguises, but
when 'tis griev'd in spite of me, 'twill shew it – Pray pardon me – But when

I am told you went out in the utmost hurry with some writings to a lawyer, and took the doctor's own servant with you, ev'n in the very hour your father had propos'd him as your husband! Good heaven! what am I to think? Can I, must I suppose my senses have failed me? If I have eyes, have ears, and have a heart, must it be still a crime to think I see, and hear – Yet by my torments feel I love. (Act III, 305)

Heartly is a character whose emotions are placed in the open for everyone to see. He expresses anger at Dr. Wolf, frustration and jealousy with Maria, trust with Colonel Woodvil, and compassion with Charles. The jealousy and concern Heartly shows for Maria are interpreted as love, yet she pushes for his trust, eventually gaining it in the end. Throughout their interactions, Maria expresses a desire for Heartly to show less reason and more emotion:

MARIA. And can you blame her, when 'tis at the same time a proof of the poor man's passion, and her power?

HEARTLY. So that you think the greatest compliment a lover can make his mistress, is to give up his reason to her!

MARIA. Certainly; for what have your lordly sex to boast of but your understanding? And till that's entirely surrendered to her discretion, while the least sentiment holds out against her, a woman must be downright vain to think conquest completed [*sic*]. (Act I, 274)

In the Epilogue, Cibber writes, "Thus to the Fair that may be wrong inclin'd, / He hopes to *Charles's* passions will be kind" (357) – as if he expects people not to be accepting of these displays of emotion. Much like Heartly, Charles is very open with his emotions.

For example, when Charles receives a letter from his estranged father, he tells Maria that “It would be rudeness to trouble you with the tender thoughts this must give a heart oblig’d like mine” (Act IV, 322). Later, Heartly provides Maria with a description of the reunion of Charles and his father:

Where two such tender passions meet, words had but faintly spoke them. The son conducted to the door, with sudden fear stopt short, and bursting into sighs, o’er-charg’d with shame, and joy, had almost fainted in my arms; the father, touch’d with his concern, mov’d forward with a kindly smile to meet him.... At length with streaming eyes, and faltering tongue, he begged his blessing, and his pardon.... (Act IV, 331-32)

This scene that Heartly recalls for Maria is the first scene that really matches the typical expectations for sentimentalism in that it contains weeping and forgiveness. It is from this description and earlier ones that Charles is presented to the audience as a forgivable character. He was young and foolish when he chose to follow Dr. Wolf. Now, he has shown that he is full of remorse for his actions. His tears, though shown to the audience through the words of Heartly, tell us that he is being honest; he has truly changed. The choice to have Heartly describe the emotional interaction between father and son is surely purposeful: Both Heartly and Charles have exposed their emotions during the play, and they are therefore believable characters.

One of the most intriguing aspects of *The Non-Juror* is Cibber’s return to his roots in Restoration drama. Cibber envisioned his play as more than just a satire. In *Apology* Cibber refers to the topic of *The Non-Juror* as “a Subject fit for the honest Satire of Comedy” (282). Lending to the success of the sentimental and politically satirical aspects of *The Non-Juror*

was the return to certain Restoration techniques, which relied on an honest, satirical look at culture and manners. Cibber's experience with satire came from his experience with Restoration drama. According to Bateson, "The callousness and cynicism of the Restoration, tending always to satirical caricature, had disappeared, and a certain freshness and humour had taken their place. It is this humour and this freshness which are at the heart of eighteenth-century comedy" (13). However, Cibber relied on Restoration traditions to create a sentimental comedy with satire; he made a play that was both critical and forgiving all at once.

Though many argue that Cibber's first play, *Love's Last Shift*, written toward the end of the Restoration period, is different from many Restoration plays, it nevertheless contained several standard Restoration characteristics. Cibber, aware of the requirements for a successful play, avoided the danger of creating a play that would alienate the different aspects of his audience. He provided the comedy and satire of the Restoration with a sentimental ending. As Fone suggests of *Love's Last Shift*, "The audience was Cibber's instrument; he recognized their desire for lewdness, but he sensed a new temper as well.... it is a small tribute to Cibber's sense of the changing temper of his audience to see that he recognized it" ("*Love's*" 12). According to Ashley, the same can be said of *The Non-Juror*: "Cibber had done much more to make this a popular, partisan play than to translate Molière. He went back to early Restoration drama, which put a distinct emphasis on contemporary political affairs, but he gave everything his own particular touch" (46).

Much of the plot of *The Non-Juror* is similar to plays from the Restoration period: a young girl is being forced by her father to marry an undesirable, perhaps older man, despite her objections, and she has secret meetings with the man she truly wishes to marry. Cibber's

choice to adapt a Molière play is also fairly typical according to Wilcox and Langbaine (1). The plot contains scheming, lying, and a big discovery in the final act. In *The Non-Juror*, the big revelations come from Sir John hiding under a table and spying, which is a common stage trick in Restoration drama that is used earlier in *Love's Last Shift* with Snap. *The Non-Juror* employs the Restoration habit of using asides to create dramatic irony, and the use of masks is employed – if only in one instance (Act II, 298, 302).

Also, like many Restoration plays, *The Non-Juror* focuses on books or papers as sources of information, entertainment, and/or confusion. In three different scenes, characters come on stage carrying books that are either the topic of conversation or are read aloud. In *The Non-Juror*, all three instances of characters carrying books are used to attack Pope. Also, Maria's main scheme is to prevent her father from signing the paper that gives Dr. Wolf control of her father's estate and her future. She and Charles work together to change the text and have Dr. Wolf and Sir John sign the paper without recognizing the change that, in the end, saves the family from ruin.

No character embodies Restoration characteristics more than the self-proclaimed coquette Maria, whose playful courting style, love of sad stories, dislike of seriousness, and bold behavior toward her father are reminiscent of other female Restoration characters. As she so boldly tells her father:

MARIA. Lord Sir! how you talk? you don't consider people's temper: I don't say my lady is not in the right; but then you know, *Papa*, she's a prude, and I am a coquette: she becomes her character very well, I don't deny it, and I hope you see every thing I do is a consistent with mine: Your wise folks may lay down what rules they please; but 'tis constitution that

governs us all, and you can no more bring me, Sir, to endure a man of forty-nine, than you can persuade my lady to dance in a church to the organ. (Act II, 287)

As in many Restoration plays, the characters' names are Theophrastian, immediately indicating qualities of the characters to the audience. For example, the man who is in love with Maria and driven by his love and jealousy is Mr. Frank Heartly; Charles, who turns out to be a true gentleman, has the last name Trueman; and Dr. Wolf's name indicates a sneaky beast who might attack at any time. The satirical caricature of the Restoration is present in *The Non-Juror* in the character of Dr. Wolf, who functions as a conglomeration of Nonjuror, Jacobite, and Catholic stereotypes. In addition, Dr. Wolf's truly licentious behavior toward Maria and Lady Woodvil is reminiscent of the Restoration rake, the character Cibber often created and portrayed.

Yet the most important aspect of this return to Restoration comedy is Cibber's choice to mix it with satire and sentimentalism. It is within this mixture that Cibber is able to create something wholly new and, perhaps most important to Cibber, successful. As mentioned before, *The London Stage* cites 85 performances of *The Non-Juror* between 1717 and 1785 (156). Though we must be cautious of Pope's true intentions and tone, in his letter to Rowe he writes, "I Entirely agree with you, That there has not of late appear'd in Publick, a more *exquisite Piece of Satire*, than the Comedy call'd the *Non-juror*; or that better deserv'd the Distinction that was shown it, not only by your Self, as His Majesty's Laureat, but by all the Loyal Party in general" (5-6).

It is noteworthy that Cibber never calls his play a sentimental comedy. (This absence of this term is understandable since the term was not used in 1717.) However, Cibber does

comment on his use of certain sentimental aspects when he writes in the Epilogue, “Thus to the Fair that may be wrong inclin’d, / He hopes to *Charles’s* passions will be kind” (357). I assert that Cibber chose to focus on the satirical and comedic aspects of his play for two main reasons. First, satire and comedy were both common forms at the time that people would recognize and accept. In fact, it was considered laudable to be able to write either form successfully, though perhaps less so for comedy. Second, to admit to writing a play that he hoped would draw in audiences and influence them based on emotion or passion might seem both weak and manipulative. It would appear that Cibber was relying on emotion rather than reason, and reason certainly had a more positive reputation at the time. For someone who was attempting to quiet critics and “shew, what honest and laudable uses may be made of the *Theatre,*” satire, more than comedy or sentimentalism, was the proper tool (Cibber 263).

Cibber’s experience with sentimentalism and comedy was certainly more extensive than his experience with satire. In fact, one of the main differences between *The Non-Juror* and *Love’s Last Shift* is the extent and type of satire. *Love’s Last Shift* briefly flirts with the idea of satire in that it contains a bit of critical commentary on current habits and preferences when he has his characters judge and dismiss stock Restoration characters in favor of those characters who better fit the “sentimental” stereotype in Act 3, scene 2 (Gollapudi 4-6). Cibber seems to be calling attention to the conventions of the Restoration play and the preferences of the audiences. However, the extent to which this commentary is meant to provoke change is questionable. The Epilogue provides the only evidence. To the city-gentlemen, Cibber writes, “He draws his Pen against your Enemies / For he declares, to Day, he merely strives / To maul the Beaux – because they maul your Wives” (593). This section of the Epilogue suggests that the play was an attack against rakes like Sir Novelty Fashion.

However, though Fashion is often mocked throughout the play, he isn't punished. And, the Epilogue offers the possibility that Cibber might be mocking the city-gentlemen:

Now, Sirs, To you whose sole Religion's Drinking,
Whoring, Roaring, without the Pain of Thinking,
He fears he's made a Fault you'll ne'er forgive,
A Crime beyond the Hopes of a Reprieve:
An honest Rake forego the Joys of Life!
His Whores, and Wine! t'Embrace a dull chaste Wife.
Such out-of-fashion Stuff! But then again,
He's lew'd for above four Acts, Gentlemen!
For faith, he knew, when once he'd chang'd his Fortune,
And reform'd his Vice, 'twas time – to drop the Curtain.
Four Acts for your coarse Palates were design'd ... (593)

It's difficult to determine exactly who Cibber might be attacking because, as I and others have suggested, Cibber was never one to alienate an audience member (unless that person was Pope). What's important is that Cibber is, at least to some extent, experimenting with satire, and the satire present in *The Non-Juror* is an evolution of that original experimentation. In *The Non-Juror* Cibber focuses most of his attention on political satire, but he also shows a familiarity with other forms of satire, as seen in his familiarity with the works of Molière, Swift, and Pope.

In *The Laughing Tradition: Stage Comedy in Garrick's Day*, Richard Bevis asserts that *The Non-Juror* is *sui generi* because true dramatic satire didn't appear until 1728 and “no ‘sentimental’ comedy is so preoccupied with religious and political issues vital to the

state and currently controversial” (7-9). However, as I have argued throughout this thesis, Cibber relied on sentimentalism and aspects of Restoration drama to lessen the harshness of satire. Cibber was successful in doing so by creating characters who are, with the exception of Dr. Wolf, likeable. They have realistic emotions and flaws, and they satisfied the audience’s desire for sympathy and empathy. It is in the creation of Charles that Cibber is most successful. Charles functions as Dr. Wolf’s counterpart in that he gives hope to the audience by showing that not all Jacobites, Catholics, Nonjurors, or traitors are irredeemable monsters. Like Sir John, Charles was duped by Dr. Wolf. However, Charles’s involvement is more extensive, and his decision to change, despite the more serious consequences, is therefore more significant. And, perhaps most important is the fact that Charles is forgiven. The play ends with the assumption that Sir John is forgiven and the knowledge that Charles has been. With Charles, Cibber is sending the message that reform and forgiveness are possible – for those who, unlike Dr. Wolf, seek them. In creating Charles, Cibber is able to provide the sentimental counterbalance to the Restoration and satirical caricature that is Dr. Wolf. Charles makes Dr. Wolf seem more realistic and sinister because he provides a perspective into prior acts and their consequences. Charles’s expression of emotion and his forgiveness in no way undermine the satire directed at Nonjurors; rather, his suffering at the hands of one makes the criticism that much harsher.

Ashley suggests that Cibber was introducing a didactic tone (46) that can be described as either satire or sentimentalism. Both forms work toward instruction and change; their methods, however, are often different. Cibber was able to mix the two and provide two lessons at once: change and forgiveness. The combination of these two genres is both unique and risky. In 1717, satire was commonly found in prose and poetry, but less in drama.

Dramatic sentimental comedy was also prevalent, often found in the works of Cibber himself. Audiences would, most likely, not have expected the combination of the two genres in one play at the time. However, Cibber's decision to combine sentimental comedy and satire worked to increase the success of the play and to advance the common purpose of both genres – to do more than merely entertain the audience. Both sentimental and satirical drama work to instruct the audience members about how to (or how not to) behave. It should come as no surprise that Cibber, always aware of his audience, chose to and was able to combine two genres that had one common purpose and use them to strengthen the effect of each.

It is this mix that makes *The Non-Juror* an interesting play in the study of these two modes. The closest form that existed was Restoration drama or comedies of manners. Yet these forms often lacked sentimentalism. The presence of sentimentalism is important. Even within the genre of drama, Cibber is ahead of Steele's *The Conscious Lovers* (1722), and his choice to mix the modes is unique. Cibber is doing something different in *The Non-Juror*: he is using one mode to increase the effectiveness and success of another. Despite its obscurity and its author's reputation this play is significant for an understanding of the evolution of both satire and sentimentalism in English drama and beyond.

One link between *The Non-Juror* and later sentimentalism is found in the scene of forgiveness between Charles and his father. This scene involves the reunion and pardon between two *men*, a father and a son, who weep over each other and over the mercy of another man, King George. However, Cibber's top-down model of forgiveness differs from later versions in the sentimental tradition. The model of sentiment and morals in *The Non-Juror* is the King's mercy and clemency for the rebels. (As mentioned before, Mack argues that this is an inaccurate representation of the ruthless punishment Jacobites and Nonjurors

experiences at the hands of George I (775-77). Charles and Sir John are forgiven by their friends because they are forgiven by the king. This same model influences Maria to pardon Heartly because, as the play puts it, “great souls feel a kind of honest glory in forgiving” (Act IV, 332). However, much of the sentimentalism later in the century draws its ideals of fine feeling from the low and poor. As in the sentimentalist works of the 1760s and 1770s, such as Henry Mackenzie’s *The Man of Feeling*, sentimentalism comes via a man (or men).

Conclusion

Though the quality of Cibber's work has been questioned, these plays are nevertheless undeniably valuable to the study of mode for several reasons. In *The Non-Juror* Cibber mimicked the works of famous satirists of his time in an attempt to create a successful play. However, unlike other satirists, Cibber, referring back to the success of *Love's Last Shift*, added an element that made his work successful: sentimentalism. The important connection between the two plays is the presence in both of these two modes – the sentimental and the satirical – because both modes share the idea of instruction. However, the methods of instruction are significantly different. One suggests an appeal to feelings of pity and empathy, and a lesson by example; the other suggests an appeal to feelings of shame and, perhaps as a side effect, a lesson by ridicule. In both plays these two modes are combined in a manner that is somewhat disjointed. However, Cibber's success comes from his ability to use these two modes to complement each other. This unique mix of two seemingly divergent modes not only suggests changes in the nature of satire at the time, but it also indicates the presence of sentimentalism much earlier than traditional scholarship has suggested.

Gollapudi calls *Love's Last Shift* “a significant milestone in the history of drama not only because it heralds the introduction of more insistently sentimental or moral elements in comedy but also because it engages with the problem of translating morality into spectacle” (15). Similarly, *The Non-Juror* works to put morality before the audience, and it is in this play that Cibber is more successful in doing so. Not only does he create several virtuous characters instead of just one, but he also presents multiple acts of conversion and forgiveness. Many of the aspects of sentimentalism in *The Non-Juror* are present in *Love's*

Last Shift, suggesting that though Cibber's methods have changed over the years he still finds certain tools useful. The two plays rely on the use of tears and exposed emotion to move the audience and other characters; both plays end with forgiveness and reform, though the methods to the pardons are rather different; both contain Restoration aspects, though there are fewer in *The Non-Juror*; and many of the characters in *The Non-Juror* face a moral problem, whereas only Amanda seems to face one in *Love's Last Shift*.

In addition, both plays contain satire. The satirical Restoration wit of *Love's Last Shift* is more humorous and universal than the specific and serious political and professional satire present in *The Non-Juror*. Yet satire exists in each play despite the sentimentalism, reinforcing the idea that the two modes are not necessarily conflicting or canceling.

This same mixture of mode that occurs in Cibber's works happens in later works. An example is George Colman's *The Jealous Wife* (1761), which Kavenik asserts "carefully balances its satire and sentiment, shifting comic ground so as to center the forces of rational sensibility over the appeal of those controlled by their passions and appetites" (183). Furthermore, Kavenik argues that the comedies between 1747 and 1779 were "combinations of satire and sensibility without the sexual excesses of Carolean comedy" (181). Boas supports this assertion: "The immoral wit of Restoration comedy, battered by the powerful attack of Jeremy Collier, yields place, though not fully, to the sentimentalism of Steele and his followers. This, in its turn, becoming stereotyped, meets with the satire which reaches its peak in [the comedy of manners] *The School for Scandal* [by Richard Brinsley Sheridan (1777)]" (vii).

In addition, Cibber's habit of borrowing from other genres – prose and poetic – and his modification of those genres to create a play suggest the important interaction between

the three genres and support the assertion that drama could very well have influenced prose, especially the emerging genre of the novel. Cibber's inclusion of other genres in his dramatic form – in the presence within the plays of books and knowledge of other works – suggests that he recognized the importance of other works on the audience, himself, and his work. The extent of the influence of Cibber's work on the sentimental novels that appear in England in the second half of the 18th century is difficult to assess. However, it's possible that the novel that dominated the later 18th century can be linked back to Cibber's attempt to mix two instructional forms. In 1740 Samuel Richardson wrote *Pamela, Or Virtue Rewarded*, an epistolary novel that initially began as a conduct book. As a conduct book, *Pamela* was intended to entertain and instruct, much like Cibber's plays. J.M. Stedmond argues that Laurence Sterne's *Tristram Shandy* (1759) is greatly influenced by the satirical works of Swift and Pope, criticizing similar targets but with a tone "manifestly different from that of *A Tale of a Tub* – far less biting, much more good-humored" (53). Like Cibber, Sterne returned to the works of former successful satirists to create a new genre that was a mixture of and improvement on the old.

No one denies that interaction occurs across generic or modal boundaries; however, it is easy to dismiss certain works based on their artistic quality, their authors, or their difficulty in categorization. I recommend that Cibber's work not be overlooked in studies of genre or mode during the 17th and 18th centuries because of these problems. Rather, we should embrace the opportunistic and audience-aware Cibber. By examining the changes that occurred across the 21 years between *Love's Last Shift* and *The Non-Juror*, both in satire and in sentimentalism, we are able to understand more about the evolution of certain forms, an evolution that occurs even in the most questionable plays.

Future Studies

This thesis is by no means an exhaustive study of Cibber and genre/mode. More work could be done with each play. An area I find especially interesting is the treatment of gender and passions, specifically in *The Non-Juror*, where women appear to be less affected by their emotions than men. Also, religion is treated significantly differently between *Love's Last Shift* and *The Non-Juror*, and an exploration of these differences and the treatment of religion during the different time periods would provide an intriguing study.

However, in terms of genre and mode, three main areas of Cibber's work that deserve exploration in the future in order to better understand Cibber's influence:

1. *An Apology for the Life of Colley Cibber* (1740)

Though never praised for its style or structure, Cibber's *Apology* is generally considered important for three main reasons: One, it provides a comprehensive and unique historical catalogue of British theatre in the early eighteenth century; two, it had a productive effect on other writers. For example, Henry Fielding parodies Cibber's *Apology* in his satirical work *Shamela: An Apology for the Life of Mrs. Shamela Andrews* (1741). Similar in title and prologue structure, *Shamela* supposedly was written by the fictitious Mr. Conny Keyber, an obvious allusion to Cibber. And, finally, *Apology* is an important means of understanding Cibber's other works as he viewed them, including his motivations and justifications for choices in mode. In addition, *Apology* serves not only as an early example of the autobiographical genre, but it further explores the interest in the inner life to which Cibber gives attention in his drama.

The questions to consider in an exploration of *Apology* include: How does the genre of autobiography relate to the 18th-century novel? Are the same sentimental ideas in *Love's*

Last Shift and *The Non-Juror* present in *Apology*? Are the same satiric and comedic ideas present? Cibber was aware of audience and the need to alter performance in his drama. What happens to the idea of performance and drama as Cibber shifts genre to prose and autobiography?

2. Poetry (1730-1757)

Cibber served as the British Poet Laureate for twenty-seven years. During this time, he wrote only one play, his autobiography, and, of course, several poems. An examination of Cibber's poetry will provide an additional look at the evolution of sentimentalism, comedy, and satire as well as his apparent understanding of audience and performance as he moves into yet another genre.

3. Adaptation: *Richard III* (1700) & *Papal Tyranny in the Reign of King John* (1745)

Cibber's *The Non-Juror* is an adaptation of Molière's *Tartuffe*. In addition to this foreign adaptation, Cibber also adapted two of Shakespeare's plays: *Richard III* and *King John* (as *Papal Tyranny in the Reign of King John*). Unlike *Tartuffe*, Shakespeare's plays were already available in English. So, why did Cibber choose to adapt them? What changes were made? An examination of the changes Cibber made in Shakespeare's plays may provide an interesting look at his use of sentimentalism, comedy, and satire – if he added these elements to the originals or altered the existing form. Such an examination may also provide more information about Cibber's understanding of audience and performance. For example, though it was written in 1736, *King John* was not performed until 1745, when Cibber suspected that his political, anti-Catholic play would be well received thanks to the 1745 Jacobite Rebellion (Ashley 15-16).

Thanks in large part to Pope, Cibber is often dismissed as an opportunistic and untalented dunce. However, as I hope this thesis has shown, he is more than a dunce – though he probably would not have denied being opportunistic. Cibber’s mixture of satire and sentiment serves as a reminder that literature does not necessarily observe clear boundaries based on time, mode, or genre, and future modal and generic studies of 17th- and 18th-century British literature should take into account the importance of Cibber’s work as an example of a transitional time when neither satire nor sentimentalism reigned.

Works Cited

- Addison, Joseph. *Spectator*. No. 39, 14 April 1711. *The Spectator Project*. Ed. Joseph Chaves. 2003. State U of New Jersey at Rutgers. 3 Nov. 2006.
<<http://tabula.rutgers.edu/spectator/index.html>>.
- . *Spectator*. No. 42, 18 April 1711. *The Spectator Project*. Ed. Joseph Chaves. 2003. State U of New Jersey at Rutgers. 3 Nov. 2006.
<<http://tabula.rutgers.edu/spectator/index.html>>.
- Ashley, Leonard R.N. *Colley Cibber*. Boston: Twayne, 1989.
- Barnard, John, ed. *Alexander Pope: The Critical Heritage*. London: Routledge, 1995.
124-27.
- Bateson, F.W. *English Comic Drama: 1700-1750*. New York: Russell & Russell, 1963.
- “Bed Trick.” Royal Shakespeare Company. 23 March 2007.
<<http://www.rsc.org.uk/allswell/teachers/bed.html>>.
- Bernbaum, Ernest. *The Drama of Sensibility: A Sketch of the History of English Sentimental Comedy and Domestic Tragedy, 1696-1780*. Gloucester, MA: Harvard UP, 1915.
- Boas, Frederick S. *An Introduction to Eighteenth-Century Drama: 1700-1780*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1953.
- Breval, John Durant. *A Complete Key to the Non-Juror*. In *On Literary Farces: 1715-1733*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1974.
- Cibber, Colley. *An Apology for the Life of Colley Cibber*. Ed. B.R.S. Fone. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1968.
- . *Love's Last Shift*. In *Restoration Drama: An Anthology*. Ed. David Womersley. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2000. 553-93.

---. *The Non-Juror*. New York: AMS Press, 1966. 261-358.

Combe, Kirk. "Rakes, Wives, and Merchants: Shifts from the Satirical to the Sentimental."

In *A Companion to Restoration Drama*. Ed. Susan J. Owen. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2001. 291-308.

"Comedy of Manners." In *A Handbook to Literature*. 10th ed. Eds. William Harmon and Hugh Holman. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson, 2006. 111.

Corman, Brian. *Genre and Generic Change in English Comedy, 1600-1710*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1993.

Dryden, John. *Essay of Dramatic Poesie*. Ed. Jack Lynch. 10 Feb. 2007.

<<http://newark.rutgers.edu/~jlynch/Texts//drampoet.html>>.

Fone, B.R.S. "Colley Cibber's *Love's Last Shift* and Sentimental Comedy." *Restoration and 18th-Century Theatre Research* 7 (1968). 33-43.

---. "Love's Last Shift and Sentimental Comedy." *Restoration and 18th-Century Theatre Research* 9 (1970). 11-23.

Gollapudi, Aparna. "Seeing is Believing: Performing Reform in Colley Cibber's *Love's Last Shift*." *Restoration and 18th Century Theatre Research* 19 (June 2006). 1-21.

Hayley, Rodney L. "Pope, Cibber, and A Clue to the Comedy of the Non-Juror." *Studies in Philology* 76 (1979): 182-201.

Horace. *Epistles* 1.16. Trans. John Conington. 19 Dec. 2005. 26 Feb. 2007.

<http://laudatortemporisacti.blogspot.com/2005_12_01_archive.html>.

Hughes, Derek. *English Drama: 1660-1700*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.

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

- Index to The London Stage: 1660-1800*. Eds. Ben Ross Schneider, Jr., William Van Lennep, Emmett L. Avery, Arthur H. Scouten, George Winchester Stone, Jr., and Charles Beecher Hogan. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP, 1979.
- Kavenik, Frances M. *British Drama, 1660-1779: A Critical History*. New York: Twayne, 1995.
- Kern, Jean B. *Dramatic Satire in the Age of Walpole: 1720-1750*. Iowa City: Iowa State UP, 1976.
- Kropf, C.R. "The Relapse and The Sentimental Mask." *Journal of Narrative Technique* (1971). 193-99.
- Krutch, Joseph Wood. *Comedy and Conscience After the Restoration*. New York: Columbia UP, 1961.
- . "Governmental Attempts to Regulate the Stage after the Jeremy Collier Controversy." *PMLA* 38.1 (1923): 153-74.
- Mack, Maynard. *Alexander Pope: A Life*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1985.
- McKinney, Kate. "'A Frenchman and a Priest! I won't be seen in his Company': Cultural Influence, Politics, and Social Context in Molière's *Tartuffe* and Cibber's *The Non-Juror*." North Carolina State University, 2005.
- Miles, Dudley H. "The Political Satire of 'The Non-Juror.'" *Modern Philology* 13.5 (1915): 281-304.
- Parnell, Paul E. "The Etiquette of the Sentimental Repentance Scene, 1688-96." *Papers on Language and Literature* 14 (1978): 205-17.
- Peterson, William M. "Pope and Cibber's *The Non-Juror*." *Modern Language Notes* 70.5 (1955): 332-35.

- Pope, Alexander. *The Plot Discovered; Or, A Clue to the Comedy of the Non-Juror*.
 London: Printed for E. Curl, 1718. NCSU Microfilm.
- Rawson, Claude. *Satire and Sentiment: 1660-1830*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.
- “Restoration.” In *A Handbook to Literature*. 10th ed. Eds. William Harmon and
 Hugh Holman. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson, 2006. 443-44.
- “Satire.” In *A Handbook to Literature*. 10th ed. Eds. William Harmon and Hugh Holman.
 Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson, 2006. 464-66.
- Scouten, Arthur H. and Robert D. Hume. “‘Restoration Comedy’ and its Audiences, 1660-
 1776.” *The Yearbook of English Studies* 10 (1980): 45-69.
- Senior, Dorothy. *The Life and Times of Colley Cibber*. New York: Rae D. Henkle Co., Inc.,
 1938.
- “Sentimental Comedy.” In *A Handbook to Literature*. 10th ed. Eds. William Harmon and
 Hugh Holman. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson, 2006. 477-78.
- “Sentimentalism.” In *A Handbook to Literature*. 10th ed. Eds. William Harmon and
 Hugh Holman. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson, 2006. 478.
- “Shift.” *Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford UP. 13 Feb. 2007.
 <<http://www.lib.ncsu.edu>>.
- “Spectator Project.” Montclair State University. 16 Feb. 2006. 3 Nov. 2006.
 <<http://meta.montclair.edu/spectator/>>.
- Straub, Kristina. “Actors and Homophobia.” In *Cultural Readings of Restoration and
 Eighteenth-Century English Theatre*. Ed. J. Douglas Canfield & Deborah C. Payne.
 Athens: U of Georgia P, 1995. 169-94.
- Sullivan, Maureen, ed. Preface and Introduction. *Colley Cibber: Three Sentimental*

- Comedies*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1973.
- Swift, Jonathan. *A Tale of a Tub*. In *British Literature: 1640-1789*. Ed. Robert Demaria, Jr. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001. 369-425.
- Viator, Timothy J., and Burling, William J., eds. *The Plays of Colley Cibber: Volume 1*. London: Associated UP, 2001. 11-38.
- Wilcox, John. *The Relation of Molière to Restoration Comedy*. New York: Benjamin Blom, Columbia UP, 1938.
- Willcox, William B., and Arnstein, Walter L., eds. *The Age of Aristocracy: 1688-1830*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 2001.
- Wilson, John Harold. *A Preface to Restoration Drama*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1968.
- Womersley, David, ed. *Restoration Drama: An Anthology*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2000. 553-93.