

V&R unipress

Representations & Reflections
Studies in Anglophone Literatures and Cultures

Volume 7

Edited by

Uwe Baumann, Marion Gymnich
and Barbara Schmidt-Haberkamp

Gunda Windmüller

Rushing Into Floods

Staging the Sea in Restoration and
Early Eighteenth-Century English Drama

With 2 figures

V&R unipress

Bonn University Press

© V&R unipress GmbH, Göttingen



Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

ISBN 978-3-89971-968-0

ISBN 978-3-86234-968-5 (E-Book)

**Publications of Bonn University Press
are published by V&R unipress GmbH.**

Supported by the Fazit Stiftung.

© Copyright 2012 by V&R unipress GmbH, D-37079 Göttingen

All rights reserved, including those of translation into foreign languages. No part of this work may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, microfilm and recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Cover image: "The Indian Queen" (Anne Bracegirdle) by William Vincent, published by John Smith

© National Portrait Gallery, London

Printing and binding: CPI Buch Bücher.de GmbH, Birkach

Printed in Germany

© V&R unipress GmbH, Göttingen

em Hätze – för Mariechen un Josef

Contents

Acknowledgments	11
List of Plays	13
1. Introduction	15
1.1 From “sceptred isle” to “rushing forests”	15
1.2 A Nation “in an Island”: England’s Maritime Expansion	17
1.3 Coming to Terms with the Sea: From Sea Literature to New Imperial Histories	23
1.4 The Theatre	31
1.5 Staging the Sea	36
1.6 Rushing into Floods as Performance: Colonial Discourses, Imaginative Geography and Collective Identity	40
2. Islands and Shores: Maritime Spaces as Horizons of Difference and Displacement	53
2.1 Geopoetics of Space	53
2.2 <i>The Enchanted Island</i> : Maritime Disaster, Discoveries and Departure	60
2.2.1 Restoration Spectacular and Colonial Setting	60
2.2.2 Prospero’s Dwelling: Authority and Gender Order	68
2.2.3 Shipwreck and Brandy: Colonial Aspirations and Degeneration	82
2.3 <i>A Common-Wealth of Women</i> : From Covent Garden to “Happy Island”	95
2.3.1 Voyage, Shipwreck and Utopia	95
2.3.2 Leaving London for the Sea: Colonial Ambitions	98
2.3.3 The New World as “barren Island”	101

2.3.4 Role Reversals: Amazonian Commonwealth	105
2.4 <i>Love's Victim</i> : "Domestic Virtues" on Foreign Shores	113
2.4.1 Spatial and Historical Displacement	113
2.4.2 Shipwreck and Hostility: Britons Brave the Sea	118
2.4.3 British Virtues versus Gallic Vices	121
2.5 <i>The Successful Pirate</i> : Vicarious Tourism to Madagascar	128
2.5.1 Diminishing Distance: "English Breed" in "Africk's warmest Bed"	128
2.5.2 Pirate Utopia Exposed	131
2.5.3 Imperial "Toy Ambitions": Remorse and Return	136
2.6 Summary: Mapping the Sea	140
3. Staging Sailors: The Sea on Land	143
3.1 Manning the Sea: Mariners as "Third Sort of Persons"	143
3.2 Establishing Otherness: "Plain Talking" and "Sea-Breeding"	158
3.2.1 Setting the Tone: The Case of <i>The Plain Dealer</i>	158
3.2.2 Rough and Boisterous: Restoration Tars	168
3.2.3 Rough, but Lovable: Changes to the Stage Sailor	176
3.2.4 Innocent Tars: "nothing but Riddles on land"	184
3.3 Modelling Mariners: Marriage and Manliness	196
3.3.1 Mariners and Masculinity	196
3.3.2 Rough Tars Incorporated: Rituals and Integration	201
3.3.3 Stage Sailors as Counterparts: "I'll shew you how to manage a Beau"	209
3.3.4 Worthy Tars: Sailors as Role Models	212
3.4 Coda: From Plain Dealer to "Happy Heroes"	223
4. Theatres of Escape: Plots of Difference and Proximity	235
4.1 The Stage as "Emporium": Maritime Expansion and its "Place in the Town"	235
4.2 "Running Away by Water": Fates of Escape and Visions of New Worlds	246
4.2.1 Failed Escapes, Shattered Dreams and Reluctant Returns	246
4.2.2 <i>The Widow Ranter</i> : "Basking Under the Shade"	250
4.2.3 Feathers and Veils: The Lure of the Other	257
4.3 "What wind brought you hither?": Commodifying Desire	265
4.3.1 Matrimonial Refugees	265
4.3.2 "a-husband-hunting into America": <i>Oroonoko's</i> Comic Women	267

4.3.3 “pray heav’n it be English!”: Escape and Return in <i>A Bickerstaff’s Burying</i>	275
4.4 <i>Polly</i> : Reversals and Mimicries	283
4.4.1 “what brought you on this side of the water?”: Encounters and Reunions	283
4.4.2 Planters and Pirates: Colonial Analogies	288
4.4.3 “I am no coward, European!”: Counter-Spectacles	294
4.4.4 <i>Polly</i> ’s Double Vision	298
4.5 Summary	301
5. Conclusion	303
Bibliography	311

Acknowledgments

In the writing of this book I have come to owe much to many. First of all, I would like to thank my supervisor Prof. Dr. Barbara Schmidt-Haberkamp, who not only introduced me to the “bottomless pit” that is the eighteenth century, but who was also a constant source of support and encouragement for this project far above and beyond the call of duty. I would also like to thank Prof. Dr. Rolf Lessenich, who has been a meticulous and careful critic. Additionally, I am very grateful for the generous support of the British Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies as well as the Maria von Linden-Programme at the University of Bonn, who provided me with travel grants, and thus offered me the opportunity to present and discuss my work at several of the society’s annual meetings at St. Hugh’s College, Oxford. I am particularly grateful to the FAZIT-Stiftung for providing me with a generous bursary that contributed toward the publication costs of this book. More personal thanks are due to Joana Stausberg, Marc Petersdorff and Wiebke Kuttner, who sympathised, distracted, reassured and proofread. They are, also, a great joy to be with. My parents’ support throughout it all has been tremendous – they did not only encourage all my academic and not-so academic endeavours, steadfastly caring and supportive, but they also taught me early on to cherish mimicry: Thank you. Thank you.

Lastly, my person-without-whom is Daniel Holder, “I am blessed to stand with you and sing.”

List of Plays

John Dryden / William Davenant, *The Tempest, or The Enchanted Island* (1667)
William Wycherley, *The Plain Dealer* (1676)
Edward Ravenscroft, *King Edgar and Alfreda* (1677)
Thomas D'Urfey, *Sir Barnaby Whigg: or, No Wit like a Woman's* (1681)
Thomas D'Urfey, *A Common-Wealth of Women* (1685)
Nahum Tate, *Cuckolds-Haven: or, an Alderman no Conjurer* (1685)
Aphra Behn, *The Widdow Ranter* (1688 / 1689)
Edward Ravenscroft, *The Canterbury Guests* (1694)
William Congreve, *Love for Love* (1695)
Thomas Southerne, *Oroonoko* (1696)
Charles Gildon, *Love's Victim, or, the Queen of Wales* (1701)
George Farquhar, *Sir Harry Wildair* (1701)
John Dennis, *Gibraltar: or, The Spanish adventure* (1705)
Susanna Centlivre, *The Basset Table* (1705)
Susanna Centlivre, *A Bickerstaff's Burying; or, Work for the Upholders* (1710)
Charles Shadwell, *The Fair Quaker of Deal: or, the humours of the navy* (1710)
Charles Johnson, *The Successful Pyrate* (1712)
John Gay, *Polly* (1729)

1. Introduction

1.1 From “sceptred isle” to “rushing forests”

This royal throne of kings, this sceptred isle [...]
This fortress built by Nature for herself [...]
This precious stone set in the silver sea
(King Richard II, 2.1.40 – 46, c. 1595)

Thy Trees, fair *Windsor!* now shall leave their Woods,
And half thy Forests rush into my Floods,
Bear *Britain's* Thunder, and her Cross display,
To the bright Regions of the rising Day;
Tempt Icy Seas, where scarce the Waters roll,
Where clearer Flames glow round the frozen Pole;
Or under Southern Skies exalt their Sails,
Led by new Stars, and borne by spicy Gales!
(Windsor Forest, 385 – 392, 1713)

Moving from John of Gaunt’s well-known invocation of England as “this sceptred isle”¹ in William Shakespeare’s *King Richard II* to Alexander Pope’s epic poem *Windsor Forest* and its image of forests “rushing into floods” one traces a remarkable shift with regard to England’s representation. From a view of England as a “precious stone”, “set” solitarily in the sea, the image has changed to an invocation of the expansive potential of England’s insularity. The former image invokes the vision of a static “natural fortress” being secured by the “silver sea”, whereas the latter trembles with anticipation of movement and foreign “bright

1 William SHAKESPEARE, *King Richard II*, ed. Andrew Gurr, The New Cambridge Shakespeare (Cambridge: CUP, 2003).

regions”.² Here, the nation’s forests transform into vessels that are set to carry a global vision across the Thames and into the seas that are no longer envisioned as unmoved “silver” waters, but as moving and a promise of curious variety. In both quotes the image of the sea is used to define England and it therefore comes as no surprise that in *Windsor Forest*, a panegyric commemorating the Treaty of Utrecht which helped to establish the nation as the pre-eminent naval force,³ Britain is no longer envisaged in terms of a confined insularity,⁴ but as an expansionist and committed maritime power.

In reading the literary history of British maritime self-fashioning as integral to the conception of Britain itself, the sea becomes a prime literary topos for analysing the emergence of the powerful self-fashioning of the British Empire as “Protestant, commercial, maritime and free”.⁵ The sea is thus understood as the actual space of British expansion as well as an imaginative space for negotiating national identity.⁶

By the time Pope published *Windsor Forest*, the sea had already advanced to a dominant cultural topic – *Kulturthema*⁷ – in Great Britain. This study’s title takes up the metaphor of “rushing into floods”. The impact of the sea is expressed figuratively but also factually in that the occasion of the poem marks the sea as a patriotic and highly political space. Taking its cue from the “rushing forests” this study is concerned with the function of the Restoration and early eighteenth-century theatre in reflecting and rehearsing this development by “staging the sea”. It analyses dramatic representations of maritime spaces, characters and

2 Alexander POPE, “Windsor Forest”, *The Poems of Alexander Pope – A One Volume Edition of The Twickenham Pope*, ed. John Butt (London: Methuen, 1963) 195–210.

3 The Peace of Utrecht ended Great Britain’s involvement in the War of the Spanish Succession and left the nation with the acquisition of Nova Scotia from the French and Minorca and Gibraltar as well as an “Asiento de Negros” from the Spanish – a contract providing Great Britain with 5,000 slaves per annum from West Africa. For a survey of the British acquisitions and the establishment of the nation’s naval power in the wake of the Treaty of Utrecht, see Christopher LLOYD, *The Nation and the Navy: A History of Naval Life and Policy* (London: The Cresset Press, 1954) 88–89.

4 See also Ben Jonson’s *The Masque of Blackness* (1608): “Britannia, this blest Isle / Hath won her ancient dignity and style, / A world divided from the world” (1.123ff), a quote by a Shakespeare-contemporary also strongly emphasizing insularity.

5 David ARMITAGE, *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire* (Cambridge: CUP, 2000) 8.

6 Despite the fact that with the Union of England and Scotland in 1707 “Great Britain” was created, this study will henceforth refer to “England” even after that date, unless referring to “Great Britain” in a more political denomination.

7 Alois Wierlacher coined the term “Kulturthema”, defining it as a topic that gains particular significance for public self-images and world views at a particular time: “ein Thema, das im öffentlichen Selbst- und Weltverständnis einer oder mehrerer Kulturen zu einem bestimmten Zeitpunkt besondere Bedeutung gewinnt”, in: Alois WIERLACHER ed., *Kulturthema Fremdheit: Leitbegriffe und Problemfelder kulturwissenschaftlicher Fremdeheitsforschung*, Beiträge zur Kulturthemenforschung interkultureller Germanistik. In Verbindung mit dem IIK Bayreuth, Vol. I (München: Iudicum, 2001) 33.

plots as cultural performances for disseminating and negotiating cultural identity and cultural difference. Staging the sea in the period under consideration is an important venture in popularising the maritime empire, developing a patriotic self-image and establishing the expansionist destiny of an empire of the sea. Moreover, this study shows how staging the sea can be read as a discursive negotiation of the colonial fears and fantasies, political power and knowledge of the Other ancillary to colonial expansion in the early eighteenth century.

1.2 A Nation “in an Island”: England’s Maritime Expansion

The rhetoric used in one of the central political debates in late seventeenth-century England, concerned with the nation’s “blue-water” policy,⁸ is illustrative of the extent to which England’s origins and destiny were believed to be maritime: “England hath its root in the sea, and a deep root, too”.⁹The influential politician George Savile, Marquis of Halifax, here evokes a historical, even quasi-mythical, idea that very openly advocates the nation’s ancient “roots” as contemporary designation. In putting forward arguments in favour of a “blue-water” policy and claiming that England’s greatness derives from her sea power Savile, in his *Rough Draft of a New Modell at Sea* (1694), thus relies on an image that not only reflects English self-fashioning but also expresses the increasing importance of the sea as England’s medium of political and economic strength.

The enactment of the Navigation Ordinances¹⁰ by the Rump Parliament and the subsequent outbreak of the First Dutch War in 1652 had heralded a “maritime” school of thought¹¹ in English foreign policy that saw the Navy as the prime source of defence for the realm, an outlook that continued after the return of Charles II. “The restoration of 1660 not only left blue-water policy in place but contributed to its enhancement”,¹² naval historian Daniel A. Baugh writes in his

8 The term refers to the increasing maritime accent of English defence policy from the time of the English Civil War on, see. Daniel A. BAUGH, “Great Britain’s ‘Blue-Water’ Policy, 1689–1815”, *The International History Review* 10.1 (1988): 33–58.

9 George Savile HALIFAX, Marquis of, “A Rough Draft of a New Modell at Sea”, *The Works of George Savile, Marquis of Halifax*, Vol. I, ed. Mark N. Brown (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989) 295.

10 The Navigation Ordinances were enacted in 1650 and 1651. The Navigation Ordinances and later Navigation Acts were a series of laws designed to restrict the use of foreign shipping for trade.

11 As opposed to a “continentalist” policy which advocated a stronger focus on land-based armed forces in order to counter the rising influence of French military power upon Western Europe after 1670.

12 Baugh 39.

article on Britain's "blue-water" policy in the long eighteenth century. The sea thus became – quite officially – the medium of the realm's defence as well as its economic drive.¹³ N.A.M. Rodger emphasizes the economic dimension of "sea power", writing that commercial activities played a decisive part in promoting maritime policies: "True English sea-power was profitable; it was the means by which the English nation in general, English seamen and merchants in particular, made their fortunes".¹⁴ In terms of the rhetorical character of English sea-power, however, Rodger also argues that not only political liberty, economic profit and Protestantism,¹⁵ but also a certain nostalgia for past glorious victories¹⁶ played a decisive role in publicly negotiating the concept, tying in to the quasi-mythical belief that England has a "deep root" in the sea.

The belief that the British Empire was an empire of the seas is conventionally said to have its origin in Elizabeth I's reign,¹⁷ when the Queen was said "to have inherited from her sister a situation in which naval and maritime aggression were becoming identified with a heady combination of patriotism, Protestantism, and private profit",¹⁸ thus laying the foundation for a more expansionist and ultimately profitable conception of the Isles. This conception is prominently captured in Sir Walter Raleigh's famous maxim: "Whosoever commands the sea

13 "The English grand strategy [...] was essentially defensive in Europe (and European waters) and aggressive overseas. Overseas aggressiveness was aimed at enlarging the maritime and commercial base of England's naval power while at the same time reducing that of actual or potential enemies", *ibid.* 41.

14 N.A.M. RODGER, "Queen Elizabeth and the Myth of Sea-Power in English History", *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 14 (2004): 153 – 174, 158.

15 This aspect links political liberty and the maritime defence of the realm to the protection from Catholicism and so-called "popery".

16 The much celebrated victory over the Spanish Armada in 1588 provided a long-lasting touchstone for acclaiming English maritime superiority. However, as Ralph Davis points out in his study on the rise of the English shipping industry: "The story of the defeat of the Spanish Armada is gratifying not only to English patriotism but to all who welcome the humbling of the arrogant defiance of the oppressor, the defeat of the great menace by the small, brave victim. The story is a true one, but as its by-product it has produced a myth; the myth of a nation of seafaring Englishmen confronting a Spain of landlubbers, a Spanish fleet manned by soldiers and the conscripted occupants of the country's jails. [...] However, the English so far from being at that time the heirs to generations of seagoers, were newcomers to ocean trade and shipping", Ralph DAVIS, *The Rise of the English Shipping Industry in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (London: Macmillan, 1962) 1. Daniel A. Baugh argues along the same lines: "[O]ne great event (the Armada campaign) and excessive enthusiasm on the part of some naval historians have combined to distort the historical picture", Baugh 39. See also Rodger, "Queen Elizabeth and the Myth of Sea-Power".

17 See Armitage, *The Ideological Origins*, Sebastian J. SOBIECKI, *The Sea and Medieval English Literature* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2008) and N.A.M. RODGER, *Essays in Naval History, from Medieval to Modern* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009).

18 Rodger, "Queen Elizabeth and the Myth of Sea-Power" 39. See also Chapter 3 "Protestantism and Empire: Hakluyt, Purchas and Property" in: Armitage, *The Ideological Origins* 61 – 99.

commands the trade; whosoever commands the trade of the world commands the riches of the world, and commands the world itself”.¹⁹ Raleigh’s reasoning is particularly noteworthy as he draws a stringent relation between power over the sea and power over the world, a corollary directly tied together with the exploitation and commodification of accessible resources.

The particular maritime character of the empire’s self-image, which is being referred to and fuelled by such conceptions, worked as a myth of origins, but indeed also proved persistent “not least because it enshrined an inescapable truth: the British Empire was an empire of the seas, and without the Royal Navy’s mastery of the oceans, it could never have become the global empire upon which the sun never set”.²⁰ This self-fashioning not only relied on an apparently natural disposition for maritime greatness but also helped to distinguish the British Empire from historical examples of ill-fated land-based empires, as Samuel Purchas relates in his continuation of Hakluyt’s *Principal Navigations*: “Hence it is that barbarous Empires have never growne to such glory, though of more Giant-like stature, and large Land-extension, because Learning had not fitted them for sea attempts, nor wisdom furnished them with Navigation”.²¹ In this view, an empire based on navigation also emerges as a more “civil”, that is learned, empire and thus promises to be longer lasting.

By the middle of the seventeenth century, and especially after the Restoration of the Stuart monarchy in England, aspirations to political power and economic expansion became ever more linked with England’s performance as a budding empire of the seas. In fact, in looking again at Savile’s invocation of the English as “Neptune’s Chosen”, one discovers a rhetorical strategy which neatly allies the island’s “natural” disposition with an economic as well as political design:

19 Quoted from R.H. TAWNEY, *Business and Politics under James I* (Cambridge: CUP, 1958) 3.

20 Armitage, *The Ideological Origins* 100. Recently, the history of Britain has been recast as a “naval history”, see N.A.M. RODGER, *The Safeguard of the Sea: A Naval History of Britain, Volume I: 1660 – 1649* (London: Harper Collins, 1997) and his *The Command of the Ocean: A Naval History of Britain, Volume II 1649 – 1815* (London: Allen Lane, 2006).

21 Samuel PURCHAS, *Hakluytus Posthumus or Purchas his pilgrimes. Contayning a history of the world, in sea voyages & lande-travells, by Englishmen & others. Wherein Gods wonders in nature & providence, the actes, arts, varieties, & vanities of men, with a world of the worlds rarities, are by a world of eyewitnesse-authors, related to the world. Some left written by M. Hakluyt at his death. More since added. His also perused & perfected. All examined, abbreviated with discourse. Adorned with pictues and expressed in mapps. In fower parts. Each containing five bookes*, Vol. I (London: by W. Stansby for H. Fetherstone, 1625) 5. Every effort has been made to use modern scholarly editions for dramatic texts and secondary sources, however, a considerable number of texts are only available in their first editions or other editions from the period. I have not modernized the spelling in quotations or corrected any printing mistakes and have not used “sic” to indicate any spelling or printing mistakes – the same applies for modern editions that have not modernized the texts.

The first Article of an Englishman's political creed must be, that he believeth in the Sea; [...] We are in an Island, [...] Our situation hath made greatness abroad by Land Conquests unnatural things to us. [...] for we are to consider we are a very little spot in the map of the world, and made a great figure only by trade, which is the creature of liberty [...] Our situation, our humour, our trade, do all concur to strenghten this argument; so that all other reasons must give a place to such a one as maketh it out that there is no mean between being a free nation and no nation.²²

This extract is worth quoting at length as Savile here ostensibly yokes together key elements of the ideological pattern of the British Empire. He lists England's insularity, the population's "humour" and the nation's corresponding proclivity to trade as essential ingredients of a nation destined for imperial greatness. In appealing to his fellow Englishmen the reminder "We are in an Island" thus emerges as no mere geographical observation, but as patriotic assignment. To be "in an island" here transpires as fateful fortune to compensate for land-mass as trade and liberty – twin bearers of the "free nation" – patriotically teach the English to "believe[...] in the Sea".

The Stuarts indeed followed such views of maritime policy and the passing of additional Navigation Acts further enhanced the expansion of England's transoceanic trade. The dynamic of this maritime expansion was firmly felt within the realm in political, economic and cultural terms. The emergence of key areas of British social experience is essentially linked with the rise of Britain as a maritime – that is imperial and commercial – empire. Nuala Zahedieh notes that the "rapid expansion of England's transoceanic trade in the seventeenth century was undoubtedly one of the factors contributing to the series of changes in the financial world, culminating in what has been described as a 'revolution'".²³ James Walvin, writing about the changes in British domestic demand, further points out the scale and global impact of maritime trade: "As Europeans made maritime contact with distant regions and peoples, they set in train a fundamental recasting of the world itself".²⁴ These fundamental changes, as Walvin's study vividly shows, not only recast the world in impacting indigenous populations, flora and fauna, but also promoted the rise of a commercial society "at home" through the import of e. g. sugar, tea, tobacco and calicoes.

In his study on the English shipping industry Ralph Davis notes that the rapid

22 Halifax, "Rough Draft" in: Halifax 24.

23 Nuala ZAHEDIEH, "Overseas Expansion and Trade in the Seventeenth Century", *The Oxford History of the British Empire Volume I: The Origins of Empire: British Overseas Enterprise to the Close of the Seventeenth Century*, ed. Nicholas Canny (Oxford and New York: OUP, 1998) 398 – 422, 399. For the "financial revolution" Zahedieh mentions see P.G.M. DICKSON, *The Financial Revolution in England: A Study in the Development of Public Credit, 1688 – 1756* (London: Macmillan, 1967).

24 James WALVIN, *Fruits of Empire: Exotic Produce and British Taste, 1660 – 1800* (Houndmills and London: Macmillan, 1997) x.

growth of transoceanic trade, as well as shorter distance trading with Norway and the Baltic, was indeed the basis for the enormous rise in English shipping of the time, noting that at the beginning of the eighteenth century no less than a quarter of London’s population was employed in trades related to the port and the business of shipping. Indeed, “victualling the ships for the long voyages was big business – in 1686 the 300 or so ships clearing London for the American plantations needed provision for over 9,000 men (larger than the population of all but six or seven towns in England) for two or three months”.²⁵ Apart from the labour needed for ship-building and maintenance, the number of quays and wharves also increased by 30 per cent in the 1670s and 1680s.²⁶ This burgeoning trade was an “important stimulant to her [England’s] domestic economy, encouraging export industries, such as sugar refineries, infrastructural developments, such as carriers, and financial services, such as marine insurance”.²⁷

The rise in the commercial sector due to colonial trading was hailed by many contemporary commentators, as William Wood in a reference to Hobbesian ideas of the body politic describes: “Our Foreign Trade is now become the Strength and Riches of the Kingdom [...] and is the living Fountain from whence we draw all our Nourishment: It disperses that Blood and Spirits throughout all the Members, by which the Body Politick subsists”.²⁸ Wood’s assessment in several aspects conforms to Savile’s invocation of a “nation *in an island*”;²⁹ its metaphor of trade as nourishment of the “body politic” once more alludes to the “natural” requirement for transoceanic trade, and links it to political and patriotic features.³⁰ English sea power was thus mostly seen as inherently and necessarily prosperous,³¹ as well as a staple for promoting national identity and the empire as bulwark and symbol of supremacy and benevolence.

25 Zahedieh in: Canny 408.

26 The total tonnage of English merchant shipping in 1629 came to 115,000, in 1689 it had risen to 340,000. For further statistics and figures see Davis, *The Rise of the English Shipping Industry*, as well as Zahedieh in: Canny 398–422. The building of vessels and of the associated infrastructure needed for sailors and workmen required shipwrights, carpenters, blacksmiths, glaziers, carvers, sail-, rope- and instrument-makers as well as pub-owners and storekeepers.

27 Julian HOPKIT, *A Land of Liberty? England 1689–1727* (Oxford: OUP, 2000) 322.

28 William WOOD, *A Survey of Trade. In four Parts* (London: printed by W. Wilkins, for W. Hinchliffe, at Dryden’s Head under the Royal-Exchange, 1718) 4.

29 Emphasis GW.

30 As Joseph ADDISON writes in *The Freeholder*: “Trade is fitted to the Nature of our Country”, *The Freeholder*, ed. James Leheny (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980) 224, see also Daniel DEFOE, *The Complete English Tradesman* (Gloucester: Allan Sutton, 1987) 375.

31 As naval historian Rodger sums up: “Pious, virtuous and blessed by God, English sea-power could not but be prosperous. It might cost money, but that money was in the nature of an investment which would yield a sure return”, in: Rodger, “Queen Elizabeth and the Myth of English Sea-Power” 166.

Despite such overt patronage for maritime expansion, the promotion of transoceanic trade and related economic policies was, however, also contested, especially as England was still not politically stabilized after the Restoration. Julian Hoppit asserts that “contemporaries were struck by the equivocal nature of that empire to England” as “many inhabitants were not English by origin, and [that they] were prey to attack from European competitors, indigenous people, and the natural environment”.³² Furthermore, despite the widespread recognition of the benefits of economic growth, the imminent dangers of accelerated economic progress were also voiced, alongside criticism aiming at the problematic potential of increased consumption.³³ Yet it is important to note for the purpose of this study that in the second half of the seventeenth century the nation was well on its way to becoming an empire of the seas, with all its attendant commercial benefits, political crises, drawbacks and cultural challenges. In pinpointing England’s move from a “sceptred isle” to a nation “rushing into floods” this study thus aims to encompass the diverse political and cultural challenges that such expansionist endeavours generate in order to contextualize the theatrical representations of the sea. The sea had both a material and imaginative influence on metropolitan life. As London and its nodal points were perceived as “World in Epitome”,³⁴ staging the sea became not only a performance of an expanding empire, but a discursive negotiation of collective identity. Kathleen Wilson, in her seminal study *The Island Race: Englishness, Empire and Gender in the Eighteenth Century* (2003), emphasizes this pervading impact the empire of the sea had on the history of British self-fashioning, claiming that it generated “ideas about nationality, race, ethnicity and difference that impacted metropolitan culture and categories of knowledge in profound and quotidian ways”.³⁵

32 Hoppit 243.

33 This aspect becomes apparent in the period’s critiques of consumption that quickly degenerated into disputes over colonial trade; on this aspect and on other aspects concerning controversies over luxury, see Part I “Debates”, Maxine BERG and Elizabeth EGER ed., *Luxury in the Eighteenth Century: Debates, Desires and Delectable Goods* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002).

34 As James Beeverell, a French visitor, described London, James BEEVERELL, *The Pleasures of London*, 1707, trans. W.H. Quarrell (London: Witherby, 1940) 12.

35 Kathleen WILSON, *The Island Race: Englishness, Empire and Gender in the Eighteenth Century* (London and New York: Routledge, 2003) 15.

1.3 Coming to Terms with the Sea: From Sea Literature to New Imperial Histories

The intimate bond between England and the sea so memorably evoked by Savile is pervasive at all levels of English cultural production. In fact, as a literary trope, the union of England and the sea does not seem in need of much annotation: it appears to be the unavoidable destiny of an island-nation. Notwithstanding the historically changing conceptions of the sea – in the contexts of colonisation, modernisation and trade – the sea endurably epitomizes a location and trope for a vast array of literary artefacts. Jonathan Raban opens his anthology, *The Oxford Book of the Sea*, with the assertion that “The sea is one of the most universal symbols in literature”.³⁶ Yet even this extensive claim still seems to almost belittle the vicissitude and pervasiveness of the sea not only as symbol, but as agent, medium and paradigm in literary discourses. This ubiquity becomes apparent when trying to categorize “sea literature”, as Robert Foulke reminds us: “To describe sea literature as a field of study seems a peculiarly inappropriate application of the dead metaphor that separates academic territories”.³⁷ Indeed, the assortment he describes is so varied that trying to categorize sea literature seems an endeavour in vain when one considers the wealth of texts at hand, such as “voyage narratives, tales about sailors afloat and ashore, poems reflecting the impact of the sea on human imagination, [...] autobiographies of captains, journals kept by their wives at sea, [...] accounts of shipwrecks and disasters, [...] chanteys and ballads, and more”.³⁸

Traditionally, most critics concerned with representations of the sea have thus begun their accounts with statements referring to the sea’s apparent characteristics; its “timeless qualities”, its unpredictable nature combined with the hope of mastering the elements, which seems to suggest the sea’s metaphorical and symbolic value for deliberations on human fate and fortune. Blaise Pascal’s “vous êtes embarqué”³⁹ here provides an emblematic image for comprehending human life as a sea-journey,⁴⁰ an observation that Hans Blumenberg summarized in the paradox that “landlubbers” prefer to imaginatively represent their

36 Jonathan RABAN ed., *The Oxford Book of the Sea* (Oxford: OUP, 1992) 1. For a similar anthology see also Tony TANNER ed., *The Oxford Book of Sea Stories* (Oxford: OUP, 1994).

37 Robert FOULKE, *The Sea Voyage Narrative* (London, Routledge, 1997) xii.

38 Ibid. xii.

39 Blaise PASCAL, *Pensées*, 1669, ed. Charles Louandre, Édition Variorum d’Après le Texte du Manuscrit Autographe (Paris: Charpentier, 1854) 230.

40 Whether or not this emblem extends to the suspicion that, as Friedrich Nietzsche suggests in *Die fröhliche Wissenschaft* (1882), we are always already wrecked, see NIETZSCHE, *Das Hauptwerk Band 2* (München: Nymphenburger Verlag, 1990) 559.

overall condition in the world in terms of a sea voyage.⁴¹ The sea, as an element apparently inherently alien and even hostile to human approaches, thus provides a space and medium for imaginative transgressions, be they existential experiences on a more spiritual level or more tangible like military operations, economic endeavours or the “discovery” of unknown lands and peoples. Images of the sea or, relatedly, images of ships and sailors, feature prominently in literature of any kind. Descriptions of storms were basic exercises in the schools of rhetoric in antiquity⁴² and also feature significantly in biblical passages.⁴³ Images of the ship of state, ship of fools and ship of the church are stock allegories of literature to this day and, as John Peck reminds us, the Odyssey itself was the story of a sailor.⁴⁴ This insistent preoccupation with the sea, especially in anglophone literature,⁴⁵ becomes apparent considering the many volumes of British sea fiction and gives an impression of the eclectic variety the literary concern with the sea has produced. Consequently, many literary critics have taken an analytical approach focusing on the symbolic and metaphorical use⁴⁶ of

-
- 41 Hans BLUMENBERG, *Schiffbruch mit Zuschauer: Paradigma einer Daseinsmetapher* (Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1979) 10: “[D]aß der Mensch als Festlandbewesen dennoch das Ganze seines Weltzustandes bevorzugt in den Imaginationen der Seefahrt sich darstellt”. Hartmut Böhme, in his introduction to *Kulturgeschichte des Wassers*, additionally suggests that the ubiquity of symbols of water and the sea can be understood as analogous to the functionality of language, dream and imagination itself: “Die Sprache, der Traum, die Imagination sind nicht autonom menschliche Produktionsmedien, in welchen der stumme Stoff durch bedeutungsverleihende Akte erst kulturelle Signifikanz erhält. Sondern es scheint vielmehr so, daß die Funktionsweisen von Sprache, Traum und Imagination selbst in Analogie zum Wasser begriffen werden können“, Hartmut BÖHME ed., *Kulturgeschichte des Wassers* (Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1988), “Umriß einer Kulturgeschichte des Wassers: Eine Einleitung”, 7–42, 11 f. For this aspect, see also Gaston BACHELARD, *L’Eau et les Rêves, Essai sur L’Imagination de la Matière* (Paris: Librairie José Corti, 1942).
- 42 The classical tradition abounds with descriptions of storm and shipwreck, e.g. writings by Homer, Virgil, Ovid and Seneca, to name but a few. See also Albin LESKY, *Thalahatta: Der Weg der Griechen zum Meer* (Wien: Roher, 1947) and Titus HEYDENREICH, *Tadel und Lob der Seefahrt: Das Nachleben eines antiken Themas in der romanischen Literatur* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1970).
- 43 Maybe most prominently the stilling of the storm in Matthew 8:23–27 and Jesus walking on water in Matthew 14: 22–33.
- 44 John PECK, *Maritime Fiction: Sailors and the Sea in British and American Novels, 1719–1917* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave, 2001) 3.
- 45 Raban cites as examples Geoffrey Chaucer’s fourteenth-century *The Canterbury Tales*, John Milton’s *Paradise Lost* (1667), Daniel Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe* (1719), Samuel Taylor Coleridge’s, *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner* (1789) and William Cowper’s, *The Castway* (1799) amongst others.
- 46 See W.H. AUDEN, *The Enchafed Flood: or The Romantic Iconography of the Sea* (London: Faber and Faber, 1951) and Howard ISHAM, *Image of the Sea: Oceanic Consciousness in the Romantic Century* (New York et.al.: Peter Lang, 2004), for studies of sea-myths and imagery in Victorian literature see Cynthia Fansler BERHMAN, *Victorian Myths of the Sea* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1986) and Iris LOCHBAUM, *Fathoming Metaphors: Meeresbilder in vikto-*

the sea in literary texts or indeed tracing the development of a particular genre in relation to its thematic focus on the sea.⁴⁷ Along with studies concerned with the literary treatment of the sea and the development of a national literature⁴⁸ there has also been considerable scholarly attention to the role of the sea in specific works of literature, most notably in the tradition of Shakespeare's *The Tempest*.⁴⁹

However, shifts in research paradigms and the rise of postcolonial studies have, in the past decades, moved the analytical focus to more historical and political aspects. These shifts have also resulted in a categorical re-conceptualization of the sea itself. The analytical challenge of singling out a "field of study" for sea literature can thus be re-framed as a challenge that also asks: what is the sea? A host of studies published in the last ten years have thus been concerned with a critical re-definition of the sea and the British literary tradition⁵⁰ as well as with a re-conceptualization of critical boundaries between

rianischer Lyrik (Trier: WVT, 2001). With regards to the eighteenth century, see Michael McKeon's reading of images of the sea in John Dryden's *Annus Mirabilis* in: Michael McKEON, *Politics and Poetry in Restoration England: The Case of Dryden's 'Annus Mirabilis'* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1975) especially Chapter 3 "Naval War and Trade" 99–131, and also Philip EDWARDS, *The Story of the Voyage: Sea-Narratives in Eighteenth-Century England* (Cambridge: CUP, 1994) as well as the chapter on "Imperial Fate: The Fable of Torrents and Oceans" in: Laura BROWN, *Fables of Modernity: Literature and Culture in the English Eighteenth Century* (Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 2001) 53–94, where Brown discusses the development of the sea as a national rhetorical topos in eighteenth-century poetry.

- 47 For instance Ernest C. Ross traces the development of the novel in relation to its seabound-narratives, writing that the "recognition of the novel as a definitive literary form and the introduction of the seamen [...] were simultaneous developments" in: Ernest C. Ross, *The Development of the English Sea Novel: From Defoe to Conrad* (Ann Arbor: Edwards Brothers, 1977) 1, and Margaret Cohen in a very recent study traces the specific impact of maritime history on the novel, focusing on the traditions of Great Britain, France and the United States, see Margaret COHEN, *The Novel and the Sea* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton UP, 2010).
- 48 For example Anne TRENEER, *The Sea in English Literature: From Beowulf to Donne* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1926), and Lena Beatrice MORTON, *The Influence of the Sea upon English Poetry: From the Anglo-Saxon Period to the Victorian Period* (New York: Revisionist Press, 1976). For recent studies concerning the sea and American literary development, see Patricia Ann CARLSON ed., *Literature and the Love of the Sea* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1986) and also Klaus BENESCH, Jan-K. ADAMS and Kerstin SCHMIDT eds., *The Sea and the American Imagination* (Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 2004) and Hester BLUM, *The View from the Masthead: Maritime Imaginations and Antebellum American Sea Narratives* (Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 2008). For studies on the English tradition before the Renaissance, see Sobecki.
- 49 For an exemplary publication on *The Tempest's* literary tradition, see Peter HULME and William H. SHERMAN eds., *'The Tempest' and its Travels* (London: Reaktion Books, 2000).
- 50 Bernhard KLEIN ed., *Fictions of the Sea: Critical Perspectives on the Ocean in British Literature and Culture* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002), Jonathan LAMB, *Preserving the Self in the South Seas, 1680–1840* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2001), Cesare CASARINO, *Modernity at Sea: Melville, Marx, Conrad in Crisis* (Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2002) and Anna NEILL, *British Discovery Literature and the Rise of Global Commerce* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002).

history and literature.⁵¹ The emerging broad and political understanding of the sea, the “circum-Atlantic” as described by Joseph Roach, results from an awareness that the sea, or, more precisely, the Atlantic Ocean, has “given way to a network of discrete but related, and inherently polymorphous, socio-political contact zones”.⁵² The concept of a circum-Atlantic world replaces the notion of a “transatlantic” world as it regards the historical results of “Eurocolonial” initiatives as “insufficiently acknowledged cocreations of an oceanic intercultural”⁵³ and thus insists on the centrality of diasporic movements in the histories of the Americas and Africa.

The network-character of transatlantic phenomena such as slavery and African diaspora had already been debated in the first half of the twentieth century by critics such as W.E.B. Du Bois, C.L.R. James and Frantz Fanon.⁵⁴ For a scholarly re-conceptualization of the Atlantic as a contact zone that offers a counter-history to nation-based approaches, however, Paul Gilroy’s seminal study *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* (1993) has been pivotal. Gilroy proposes to take the figure of the ship as a reference point and semiotic agent that produces the various interfaces of the Black Atlantic:

ships were the living means by which the points within that Atlantic world were joined. They were mobile elements that stood for the shifting spaces in between the fixed places that they connected. Accordingly they need to be thought of as cultural and political units rather than abstract embodiments of the triangular trade.⁵⁵

This suggestion thus offers a new way of conceiving the networks created by the ships’ movements, namely to take “the Atlantic as one single, complex unit of analysis in [their] discussions of the modern world and use it to produce an explicitly transnational and intercultural perspective”.⁵⁶

51 Margaret S. CREIGHTON and Lisa NORLING eds., *Iron Men, Wooden Women: Gender and Seafaring in the Atlantic World, 1700–1920* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins UP, 1996), Bernhard KLEIN and Gesa MACKENTHUN eds., *Das Meer als kulturelle Kontaktzone: Räume, Reisende, Repräsentationen* (Konstanz: UVK, 2003), Colin HOWELL and Richard J. TWOMEY eds., *Jack Tar in History: Essays in the History of Maritime Life and Labour* (Fredericton: Acadiensis Press, 1991), Carmen BIRKLE and Nicole WALLER eds., *The Sea is History: Exploring the Atlantic* (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2009).

52 Annalisa OBOE and Anna SCACCHI eds., *Recharting the Black Atlantic: Modern Cultures, Local Communities, Global Connections* (New York and London: Routledge, 2008) 2.

53 Joseph ROACH, *Cities of the Dead: Circum-Atlantic Performance* (New York: Columbia UP, 1996) 5.

54 W.E.B. DUBOIS, *The Suppression of the African Slave-Trade to the United States of America, 1638–1879* (New York: Longmans, 1904), C.L.R. JAMES, *The Black Jacobins, 1938* (London: Allison and Busby, 1980) and Frantz FANON, *The Wretched of the Earth, 1961*, trans. Richard Philcox (New York: Grove Press, 2004).

55 Paul GILROY, *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* (Cambridge/Mass.: Harvard UP 1993) 16 f.

56 Gilroy 15. See also William Boelhower for a discussion of the rise of the circum-Atlantic world as

This novel perspective indeed re-focuses on the Atlantic as an intercultural, in-between space which can thus be analysed on the basis of relationships and connections that did not come into focus before as the new perspective “allows one to identify commonalities of experience in diverse circumstances; it isolates unique characteristics that became visible only in comparisons and contrasts; and it provides the outlines of a vast culture area distinctive in world history”.⁵⁷ Thus, assuming a circum-Atlantic perspective and a corresponding understanding of the sea as not only an imaginative but also a deeply historical and hybrid space further helps to broaden an understanding of sea literature as the object of analysis can be read as a global paradigm.⁵⁸

To rethink the history of modernity in terms of subaltern identities,⁵⁹ as was done by Gilroy, also draws attention to how modernity is materially and discursively constituted throughout the long eighteenth century. On the one hand, “modernity” refers to a range of historical transformations connected with the rise of capitalism, like commercialization, expansion, bureaucratic developments, urbanization, the nation state, the rise of the middle-class and demographic changes. On the other hand, as Rita Felski notes, modernity refers “above all to particular (though often contradictory) experiences of temporality and historical consciousness”.⁶⁰ A reconceptualization of the sea in terms of the

a critical space, William BOELHOWER, “‘I’ll teach you how to flow’: On Figuring out Atlantic Studies”, *Atlantic Studies: Literary, Cultural and Historical Perspectives* 1.1 (2004): 28–48.

57 David ARMITAGE and Michael J. BRADDICK eds., *The British Atlantic World, 1500–1800* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002) xix.

58 See Klein/Mackenthun 5: “Als Forschungsgegenstand ist das Meer *per se* ein globales Paradigma”. Gilroy’s study has not only been influential in cultural studies, but his figurative use of the ship has also helped to foster turns within nautical archaeology, see Fred L. MCGHEE, “Towards a Postcolonial Nautical Archaeology”, *Assemblage* 3 (1998): <http://www.assemblage.group.shef.ac.uk/3/mcghee.htm> (date of access: 20th of April 2012). Additionally, in the wake of the “Black Atlantic”, Atlantic-history has undergone more “colourful” developments, with critics analysing the “Green Atlantic” of Irish dispersal, the “White Atlantic” as a self-reflective area of study and the “Red Atlantic” of capitalism and maritime labour, see Peter LINEBAUGH and Marcus REDIKER, *The Many-Headed Hydra: Sailors, Slaves, Commoners, and the Hidden History of the Revolutionary Atlantic* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins UP, 2000).

59 In respect to gender, see also Rita FELSKE, *The Gender of Modernity* (Cambridge/Mass.: Harvard UP, 1995) and Claudia HONEGGER, *Die Ordnung der Geschlechter: Die Wissenschaften vom Menschen und das Weib 1750–1850* (Frankfurt a.M.: Campus Verlag, 1991).

60 Felski 9. The development of modernity in the long eighteenth century has been described and analysed by a host of writers concerned with a range of different aspects of material, social and economic history. For a few exemplary studies, see John BREWER, *The Sinews of Power: War, Money and the English State, 1688–1783* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1989), David BRION DAVIS, *The Problem of Slavery in Western Culture* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1966) P.J. MARSHALL ed., *The Eighteenth Century, The Oxford History of the British Empire Vol. II* (Oxford: OUP, 1998), Kathleen WILSON, *The Sense of the People: Politics, Culture and Imperialism in England, 1715–1785* (Cambridge: CUP, 1998), Maxine BERG, *The Age of Manufactures: Industry, Innovation, and Work in Britain, 1700–1820* (New York: OUP, 1985)

circum-Atlantic thus also incorporates modern experiences of temporality as well as experiences connected to modern conditions of space, as Anthony Giddens writes:

Modernity increasingly tears space away from place by fostering relations between ‘absent’ others, locationally distant from any given situation of face-to-face interaction. In conditions of modernity [...] locales are thoroughly penetrated by and shaped in terms of social influences quite distant from them.⁶¹

This re-conceptualized understanding of the sea has consequently also highlighted political aspects of the sea’s representations in literature. In this respect the long eighteenth century in particular has attracted scholarly attention as Britain’s rise to an empire of the sea and the prevalence of the sea as a “Kulturthema” during that period generated an array of literary texts evoking a strong connection between the nation and the sea. As *Windsor Forest* suggests, the nation’s “character” is imaginatively tied to the surrounding sea, and a literary appreciation of the sea therefore emerges as a patriotic endeavour. Indeed, patriotism has also come into view as a prime “Kulturthema” of the British long eighteenth century,⁶² and literary representations of the sea have become increasingly analysed in terms of their function for patriotic negotiations in light of this.

Bernhard Klein describes the sea as the “national dream factory”,⁶³ while Laura Brown also claims that in the decade of the 1660s “the sea becomes the national rhetorical element”.⁶⁴ In analysing poetry by John Dryden, Edward Young and Pope – with its recurrent images of the Thames as bearer of English glory, as in *Windsor Forest* for example – Brown links maritime poetic imagery with the overarching project of empire-building: “The expansiveness of this image of the Thames projects the promise of a new style of mercantile imperialism: the world-benevolent mode of English commerce, in which exchange brings prosperity, wealth and civilization wherever it goes”.⁶⁵

and *Luxury and Pleasure in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Oxford: OUP, 2005), John BREWER and Roy PORTER eds., *Consumption and the World of Goods* (London: Routledge, 1993), Jürgen HABERMAS, *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit: Untersuchungen zu einer Kategorie der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft*, 1962 (Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1990), Paul LANGFORD, *A Polite and Commercial People: England 1727–1783* (Oxford: OUP, 1989), Linda COLLEY, *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707–1873* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1992) as well as Walvin and Dickson.

61 Anthony GIDDENS, *The Consequences of Modernity* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990) 18.

62 See for example Colley, *Britons*, Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People* and Birgit NEUMANN, *Die Rhetorik der Nation in britischer Literatur und anderen Medien des 18. Jahrhunderts*, *Studies in English Literary and Cultural History* 39 (Trier: WVT, 2009).

63 Klein 2.

64 Laura BROWN, “Oceans and Floods: Fables of Global Perspective”, *Global Eighteenth Century*, 107–122, 110.

65 Nussbaum, *Global Eighteenth Century* 110. Earl Miner, in a discussion of Dryden’s *Annus*

This emphasis on empire is yet another aspect of the ever-increasing “culturalisation” of historical and literary inquiry, notably amongst eighteenth-century scholars, as the field has in recent decades been enlivened by more theoretically oriented approaches as well as more inclusive conceptions of culture, prominently advocated by Laura Brown and Felicity Nussbaum in their now seminal collection of articles for a “new eighteenth century”.⁶⁶ Their introduction promotes new critical practices and critical pluralism within eighteenth-century studies, a field, they claim, that has relied heavily on appreciative formalist readings and subsequently not only dismissed “specifically historical models of contemporary theory – Marxist, Foucauldian, new historical, or feminist”,⁶⁷ but also served to reject particular areas of study, such as the history of women, popular culture and sexuality. Thus, the authors take on a revisionist role, arguing for a problematization and revision of period, tradition, canon and genre in eighteenth-century literary studies. In the wake of this theoretical re-orientation, the field has indeed experienced something a reviewer of Brown’s *Fables of Modernity* (2001) has compared with being “hit [with] a giant billiard ball” as Brown’s and Nussbaum’s “stroke of genius was to combine the best of what formalism had to offer – close reading and rhetorical analysis – with energetic Marxist, feminist, and materialist theory to show how poetic rhetoric reflected large-scale ideological formations”.⁶⁸ However, this account does not encompass the entirety of the changes, as “new” eighteenth-century critics such

Mirabilis, also argues that the rhetorical “use” of the sea supports a strong link between the sea and empire-building: “Such a faith in knowledge and trade, combined with a vision of progress for the human race, gave England a rationale that was to prove more suitable to the next two centuries than did the union of the cross and sword for Spain”, Earl MINER, “The Wild Man Through the Looking Glass”, in: *The Wild Man Within: an Image in Western Thought from the Renaissance to Romanticism*, ed. Edward Dudley and Maximillian E. Novak (London: U of Pittsburgh Press, 1972) 87–114, 93. For the discourses of empire, merging myths of the “New Rome” and the empire of the seas, see also David S. Shields: “Just as the old Roman imperium justified world dominion by promoting the benefits of the Pax Romana, the New Rome rationalized its empire of the seas by declaring benefits of ‘the Arts of Peace’ resulting from British superintendence of world trade“, David S. SHIELDS, *Oracles of Empire: Poetry, Politics, and Commerce in British America, 1690–1750* (Chicago and London: U of Chicago P, 1990) 16. Or indeed, as Howard D. WEINBROT writes: “By about midway through *Windsor Forest*, then, the poet apparently convinces the ancient deities themselves that they have nothing nobler (lines 33, 234) than the seat of the British crown and the poetry that records its triumphs”, *Britannia’s Issue: The Rise of British Literature from Dryden to Ossian* (Cambridge: CUP, 1993) 286.

66 Felicity NUSSBAUM and Laura BROWN, eds. *The New Eighteenth Century: Theory, Politics, English Literature* (New York: Methuen, 1987), see also Barbara SCHMIDT-HABERKAMP, “Das neue 18. Jahrhundert – ein Forschungsbericht”, *Das achtzehnte Jahrhundert* 22.2 (1998): 195–206.

67 Nussbaum/Brown 2.

68 Blakey VERMEULE, “*Fables of Modernity* review”, *Modern Language Quarterly* 64.4 (2003): 501–505, 501 f.

as Brown are not merely concerned with literature as reflecting ideological formations, but indeed with how literature anticipates and propagates empire. This re-discovery of the significance of empire for the British eighteenth century alongside a new interest in previously neglected texts such as pamphlets, diaries, chapbooks and occasional poetry as well as caricatures, has sparked an array of studies that have, methodologically as well as with regards to content, thoroughly enlivened the field.⁶⁹ In these approaches empire and its transatlantic networks are not just perceived in political and economic structures, but as a cultural project with practices and representations that facilitate and negotiate colonialism and empire-building. At the core of projects writing a “new imperial history” lies the assumption that an analysis of the “archives” of empire should centre on the production of cultural difference and colonial knowledge.⁷⁰

This new analytical focus reflects not only the broader “turn”⁷¹ towards a culturalization in historical and literary studies in general, but is essentially also influenced by the impact of postcolonial theory. On the one hand, postcolonial theory has inspired eighteenth-century studies in its focus on the representations of cultural difference and the relations of power and knowledge. On the other hand, the period has reversely become a focal area for scholars of postcolonial provenance. This development has since given rise to engaged re-readings of eighteenth-century classics such as Daniel Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe*, Jonathan Swift’s *Gulliver’s Travels*, Pope’s *Rape of the Lock*, as well as writings by Thomas Hobbes and John Locke, shifting the analytical focus on literary texts as well as revising the focus on genres and on the canon more generally.⁷² This study

69 See for example Colley, *Britons*, Roach, *Cities of the Dead*, Neil RENNIE, *Far-Fetched Facts: The Literature of Travel and the Idea of the South Seas* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), Clare MIDGLEY ed., *Gender and Imperialism* (Manchester and New York: Manchester UP, 1998), Srinivas ARAVAMUDAN, *Tropicopolitans: Colonialism and Agency, 1688–1804* (Durham and London: Duke UP, 1999), Martin DAUNTON and Rick HALPERN eds., *Empire and Others: British Encounters with Indigenous Peoples, 1600–1850* (London: University College London P, 1999), Eliga H. GOULD, *The Persistence of Empire: British Political Culture in the Age of the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill and London: U of North Carolina P, 2000), Linda COLLEY, *Captives: Britain, Empire and the World, 1600–1850* (London: Jonathan Cape, 2002) and Wilson, *The Island Race*.

70 For this notion, see especially the articles by Tony BALLANTYNE and Catherine HALL in *The British Empire: Themes and Perspectives*, ed. Sarah Stockwell (Oxford: Blackwell, 2008). These critics have put forward a “new imperial history”, centring on the assumptions mentioned above. The approach remains contested, but has undoubtedly influenced the field substantially, see also Kathleen WILSON ed., *A New Imperial History: Culture, Identity and Modernity in Britain and the Empire 1660–1840* (Cambridge: CUP, 2004).

71 See Doris BACHMANN-MEDICK, *Cultural Turns: Neuorientierungen in den Kulturwissenschaften* (Rowohlt: Reinbek bei Hamburg, 2006).

72 For the postcolonial eighteenth century, refer to Daniel CAREY and Lynn FESTA eds., *The Postcolonial Enlightenment: Eighteenth-Century Colonialism and Postcolonial Theory* (Ox-

will thus draw on these developments in literary studies in order to analyse the literary representations of the sea as a profoundly discursive and political space in Restoration and early eighteenth-century dramatic texts.

1.4 The Theatre

The focus on empire and its representation in less prominent genres of the eighteenth-century canon has also rekindled interest in the Restoration and eighteenth-century theatre since “plays enabled the idea, crucial to the formation of Great Britain, that the state of the nation was now contingent upon the state of the empire”.⁷³ With the English nation increasingly coming into contact with new worlds and defining itself in relation to transoceanic networks, the London playhouses offered texts and performances that were contingent upon these changes, as theatres now offered new means of conveying such new worlds: “The London theatre after 1660 was indeed a new world. [...] The introduction of actresses, changeable scenery, and increasingly doses of music, dance, and spectacle quickly made a sharp differentiation from the Caroline theatre closed by the Puritans in 1642”.⁷⁴ This “new world” of London theatres offered by the two patented King’s and Duke’s Companies respectively, who were granted the exclusive commercial rights to stage plays, thus constitutes the exclusive focus for this study.

Traditionally, drama has not been served too well by eighteenth-century critics and can be said to have been treated as a “foster child”⁷⁵ of the field. This critical disregard might be due to the genre’s alleged lack of quality. In 1953 James Lynch described the drama as “almost without exception, [...] no more than mediocre [...] it succeeds neither in fully capturing the spirit of its time nor in generating the power that would make it timeless”.⁷⁶ Whereas Lynch aimed this criticism chiefly at mid-century theatre, theatre critic Robert D. Hume comes to a similar verdict with regard to Restoration comedies: “We must face the unpalatable fact bluntly [...] Most of the comedies need no explication”.⁷⁷

ford: OUP, 2009) and Suvir KAUL, *Eighteenth-Century British Literature and Postcolonial Studies* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2009).

73 Kaul, *Eighteenth-Century British Literature* 57.

74 Robert D. HUME ed., *The London Theatre World, 1660–1800* (Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois UP, 1980) xi.

75 J. Douglas CANFIELD and Deborah C. PAYNE eds., *Cultural Readings of Restoration and Eighteenth-Century English Theater* (Athens and London: U of Georgia P, 1995) 11.

76 James J. LYNCH, *Box, Pit and Gallery: Stage and Society in Johnson’s London* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 1953) vii.

77 Robert D. HUME, “The Multifarious Forms of Eighteenth-Century Comedy”, in: George Winchester Stone, *The Stage and the Page: London’s ‘Whole Show’ in the Eighteenth-Century Theatre* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 1981) 3–32, 26.

According to Hume, the disappointing quantity of modern criticism can be attributed to the poor quality of the plays: “For the most part, these plays are highly effective theatrical vehicles, but they tend to possess little literary depth [...] these plays are usually unproblematical”.⁷⁸ Tied in with this disparaging evaluation is the question of canon formation. Brian Corman ascribes the cumbersome canonization of Restoration or early eighteenth-century dramatists both to the change in theatrical taste on the post-Garrick London stage and to the rise of “English literary history”, which in the nineteenth century established the marginal status of playwrights due to changed literary and moral standards.⁷⁹

A more differentiated scholarship of Restoration and early eighteenth-century theatre was initiated by Montague Summers and Allardyce Nicoll in the early decades of the twentieth century.⁸⁰ This initial attention, however, did not gain in strength until the 1950s,⁸¹ and was sustained by the publication of the five parts of *The London Stage*⁸² in the 1960s, which precipitated research on the stage history of plays and the material circumstances of the period’s playhouses and productions. Mostly, however, critical analysis was devoted to the contribution of single authors such as George Etherege, William Wycherley and William Congreve,⁸³ or it was, as Lisa A. Freeman asserts, supported by a “taxonomic

78 “Theatre History, 1660–1800: Aims, Materials, Methodology”, in: *Players, Playwrights, Playhouses: Investigating Performance, 1660–1800*, ed. Michael Corder and Peter Holland (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007) 9–44, 16.

79 Brian CORMAN, “What is the Canon of English Drama, 1660–1737?”, *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 26.2 (1992/1993): 307–321, 310.

80 For the period under consideration, see especially Montague SUMMERS, *Restoration Comedies* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1921) and *The Restoration Theatre* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1934), Bonamy DOBRÉE, *Restoration Comedy 1660–1720* (Oxford: OUP, 1924) and two parts of Allardyce NICOLL’s six-volume *History of English Drama, 1660–1900*, *Volume I: Restoration Drama 1660–1700* and *Volume II: Early Eighteenth-Century Drama*, published as separate volumes from 1923 on and reissued from 1952–1959.

81 Most notably with the following publications: Thomas H. FUJIMURA, *The Restoration Comedy of Wit* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1952), Dale UNDERWOOD, *Etherege and the Seventeenth-Century Comedy of Manners* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1957) and Norman N. HOLLAND, *The First Modern Comedies: The Significance of Etherege, Wycherley and Congreve* (Cambridge/Mass.: Harvard UP, 1959).

82 The first two parts, covering the period under consideration in this study are: William VAN LENNEP ed., *The London Stage 1660–1800: A Calendar of Plays, Entertainments and Afterpieces together with Casts, Box-Receipts and Contemporary Comment. Compiled from the Playbills, Newspapers and Theatrical Diaries of the Period, Part I: 1660–1700* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1965) and Emmett L. AVERY ed., *The London Stage 1660–1800: A Calendar of Plays, Entertainments and Afterpieces together with casts, Box-Receipts and Contemporary Comment. Compiled from the Playbills, Newspapers and Theatrical Diaries of the Period, Part 2: 1700–1729* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1960).

83 With plays by Dryden, Aphra Behn and George Farquhar also moving into focus, see Robert D. HUME, “Theatre History, 1660–1800” in: Corder/Holland. However, as Hume further

impulse, a sustained effort to divide, subdivide and divide yet again the genres of dramatic production”.⁸⁴

As Hume’s quote about the meagre literary quality of the drama suggests, critical analysis thus focused more on the alleged “literary” elements of play-texts, neglecting or at least largely overlooking issues of material culture, race,⁸⁵ class, gender and other identity markers such as age or religion.⁸⁶ However, as Deborah Payne Fisk asserts:

Over the last two decades our notion of Restoration theatre has broadened considerably [...] scholars have realized the heterogeneity of Restoration theatre: its rich variety of dramatic forms, its innovation in staging and architecture, its complex representations of political and social events, its appeal to people from all walks of life.⁸⁷

In the wake of this recovery there have been several publications making a significant contribution to the revision of the period’s theatre, focusing on the diverse cultural work theatres performed.⁸⁸ The reinvigorated interest in the theatre attests to more general shifts in cultural studies as mentioned above, but is also closely connected to the emerging interest in colonial discourses of the eighteenth century. Criticism has thus shifted to a focus on the national, often patriotic and colonial dimension of drama, increasingly also taking the meshing of colonial imaginings and theatrical representations into account, as Mita Choudhury writes with regard to Samuel Pepys: “his leisure activities and surreptitious dalliances in the theatre allow us to reflect upon the ways in which the imperial consciousness coexists with a desire for the collective experience of the

writes: “Of these hundreds of plays [published in the time] only about twenty-five received more than cursory critical analysis” 15.

84 Lisa A. FREEMAN, *Character’s Theater: Genre and Identity on the Eighteenth-Century English Stage* (Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2002) 2.

85 In its use of the term “race” this study adapts the usage of the term as employed in standard studies in the field, such as Felicity Nussbaum’s *The Limits of the Human: Fictions of Anomaly, Race, and Gender in the Long Eighteenth Century* (2003) or Wilson’s *The Island Race* (2003).

86 This dismissal of plays due to their “quality” can be countered by theatre historian John L. Styan’s useful advice: “the true student of drama will find a bad play to be as exciting as a good one”, John L. STYAN, *The English Stage: A History of Drama and Performance* (Cambridge: CUP, 1996) 6.

87 Deborah PAYNE FISK ed., *The Cambridge Companion to English Restoration Theatre* (Cambridge: CUP, 2000) 15.

88 See J. Douglas CANFIELD, *Tricksters and Estates: On the Ideology of Restoration Comedy* (Lexington: U of Kentucky P, 1997) and *Heroes and States: On the Ideology of Restoration Tragedy* (Lexington: U of Kentucky P, 2000), Bridget ORR, *Empire on the English Stage 1660–1714* (Cambridge: CUP, 2001) Misty G. ANDERSON, *Female Playwrights and Eighteenth-Century Comedy: Negotiating Marriage on the London Stage* (New York: Palgrave, 2002), FREEMAN, *Character’s Theater*, and Matthew J. KINSERVIK, *Disciplining Satire: The Censorship of Satiric Comedy on the Eighteenth-Century Stage* (Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, 2002).

theatre and its self-indulgent and self-validating mechanisms”.⁸⁹ That is, theatre is understood as a crucial cultural site within an emerging empire: “Especially as the theatres expanded outside London and into the colonies, drama was a central cultural event that did not just passively reflect but actively shaped consciousness as England moved from a late feudal to an emergent, nay, a dominant bourgeois imperial power”.⁹⁰

Images of the Other almost obsessively pervade Restoration and early eighteenth-century drama and, as Bridget Orr in her study on *Empire on the English Stage 1660 – 1714* (2001) writes: “This pervasive concern with the staging of cultural contact and conflict is unsurprising given the huge expansion of colonial activity in this period”.⁹¹ The colonial dimension of the theatre is also manifested in the plays’ plots, as many serious plays contained episodes from imperial history⁹² and were staged with exotic settings, such as Dryden’s *The Indian Emperour* (1665) or *Aureng-zebe* (1675), Elkanah Settle’s *The Empress of Morocco* (1673), Aphra Behn’s *Abdelazer* (1676), Mary Pix’s *Ibrahim, the Thirteenth Emperor of the Turks* (1696) or Delarivier Manley’s *The Royal Mischief* (1696), to name but a few. Comic plots, while in general more focused on metropolitan life, are also increasingly being noticed for their colonial dimension, as became apparent in plays featuring merchants, colonial officials, but also French and Spanish characters, such as Dryden’s *An Evening’s Love* (1668), John Caryl’s *Sir Samolon: or, the Cautious Coxcomb* (1671), James Howard’s *The English Monsieur* (1674) or Nicholas Rowe’s *The Biter* (1704). As Kaul sums up the situation:

they [Restoration comedies of manner, traditionally the genre of Restoration drama favoured by scholars, GW] now share critical attention with other comedies from this period like *The Rover* and *The Widow Ranter* [...] which define Englishness in juxtaposition with non-English peoples and places, rather than via the more insular, London-centric practices featured in the more domestic comedy of manners.⁹³

Together with a focus on empire, national identity and colonial aspects, it has been the pervasive impact of the Restoration and early eighteenth-century playhouses as public institutions that has been prominently re-covered in recent decades. “Restoration theater was analogous not to our theater but to our movie houses in its cultural impact”,⁹⁴ eighteenth-century theatre historian J. Douglas Canfield writes. This assessment draws on the fact that theatre performances

89 Mita CHOUDHURY, “Race, Performance and the Silenced ‘Prince of Angola’”, *A Companion to Restoration Drama*, ed. Susan J. Owen (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001) 161 – 176, 165 f.

90 Canfield/Payne 11.

91 Orr 3.

92 See Orr, especially 28 – 60.

93 Kaul, *Eighteenth-Century British Literature* 55.

94 Canfield, *Heroes and States* ix.

were also accessible to the non-reading public and the audiences were made up of a wide range of the population, both aspects maintaining the theatre as a privileged site for the negotiation of ideas and collective identity. Noteworthy for the purpose of this study is also the fact that the composition of the audience also drew heavily upon the naval profession, which might explain the frequency of maritime references on the stage. Emmett L. Avery relates:

It was only natural, of course, that some of Pepys' associates in the Navy Office would accompany him occasionally to the playhouses, for Pepys was a congenial man with a great enthusiasm for the stage; but the range of naval personnel similarly interested was large: commissioners, admirals, captains, clerks, treasurers.⁹⁵

The range of personnel Avery mentions here is also indicative of the social variety that attended theatrical performances.

However, as Payne Fisk (quoted above) states, this appreciation of theatres' audiences has only been recast in the latter decades of the twentieth century. Nicoll's 1950s view in this respect is exemplary, as he declared the Restoration audience to be "thoughtless and depraved",⁹⁶ consisting mainly of courtiers and aristocrats. During the 1960s and 1970s this view was largely revised. Peter Holland, for example, corrects Nicoll's view and claims that theatre-going was very much part of day-to-day living in London: "The real audience was 'informed', made up of regular visitors to the playhouse".⁹⁷ Similar, and more precise, is Harold Love's previous amendment of the "Myth of Restoration Audience":

The underlying vision, though variously expressed, is of an exclusive theatre-going community, composed of roughly equal numbers of whores and time-wasters, which had no significant overlap with the classes who were really getting things done – merchants, lawyers, architects, public servants, Royal Society scientists, university graduates, members of parliament.⁹⁸

95 Emmett L. AVERY, "The Restoration Audience", *Philological Quarterly* 45 (1966): 54–61, 57. Avery goes on: "It is noteworthy, however, that nearly everyone in the higher and lower units of the Navy Office attended the theaters, sometimes frequently; and it is difficult to believe that Pepys' personal delight in the stage, infectious as it undoubtedly was, had such far-reaching influence as to attract so many others as spectators" 58. Avery was one of the first critics to put forward a revised argument concerning the Restoration audience that is still widely accepted today.

96 Nicoll, *A History of English Drama* I 25.

97 Peter HOLLAND, *The Ornament of Action: Text and Performance in Restoration Comedy* (Cambridge: CUP, 1979) 18.

98 Harold LOVE, "The Myth of the Restoration Audience", *Kosmos: A Quarterly Journal of Drama and the Arts of the Theatre* 1(1967): 49–56, 49.

Theatre audiences were of course not confined to classes who “were getting things done”, but also, as Avery points out, contained persons of all ranks and classes.⁹⁹

In terms of spectatorship, the Restoration and early eighteenth-century stage thus constituted a privileged site for political influence as after the rupture of the interregnum Stuart ideology had to be reconstructed and reinstated and the theatre consequently became singled out as a site for (re-)negotiating ideology.¹⁰⁰ Susan J. Owen likens the creation of the Restoration theatre therefore to an “act of state”, comparable to the “creation of the BBC”,¹⁰¹ and Nancy Maguire asserts: “for the first time, those in power promoted a consciously contrived campaign to build a new monarchy and a new culture”.¹⁰² The elevated importance of the theatre as a major cultural and political institution is thus closely linked to its “ideological” value, as Canfield states: “[theatrical genres] constitute[s] a record of the negotiation of ruling-class ideology”.¹⁰³

1.5 Staging the Sea

Considering this interest in empire, colonial discourses and, more particularly, the sea’s ubiquity in eighteenth-century literature on the one hand, and scholarly attention on the period’s drama on the other, it comes as a surprise that plays featuring maritime settings and characters have not received sustained attention. Critical attention, explicitly dealing with the sea as a specific cultural topic in Restoration and eighteenth-century drama, is restricted to three studies dating from the first part of the twentieth century, namely Charles Napier Robinson’s *The British Tar in Fact and Fiction: The Poetry, Pathos, and Humour of the Sailor’s Life* (1909), Harold Francis Watson’s study *The Sailor in English Fiction and Drama, 1550–1800* (1931) with a chapter on “The Sailor in Drama, 1660–1760” and Charles Lee Lewis’s chapter on “English Sea Plays” in his *Books of the Sea: An Introduction to Nautical Literature* (1943).¹⁰⁴ All three authors mainly carry out inventories of naval characters in drama, with Watson being the

99 See Avery, “The Restoration Audience” 61.

100 See Susan J. OWEN, *Restoration Theatre and Crisis* (Oxford: OUP, 1996).

101 Ibid. 11.

102 Ibid. 16 f.

103 Canfield, *Heroes and States* ix. Ideology is here understood as the set of cultural ideas, beliefs, values and power relations that are constructed to legitimate the interest of a ruling group.

104 Charles Napier ROBINSON, *The British Tar in Fact and Fiction: The Poetry, Pathos, and Humour of the Sailor’s Life* (London: Harper and Brothers, 1909), Harold Francis WATSON, *The Sailor in English Fiction and Drama 1550–1800* (New York: Columbia UP, 1931, reprint MAS Press 1966) and Charles Lee LEWIS, *Books of the Sea: An Introduction to Nautical Literature* (Annapolis: United States Naval Institute, 1943).

only critic to undertake a more systematic chronology of “sea plays”. The only recent book-length study on English sea literature that includes a short chapter on sea plays is Peter Krahé’s *Literarische Seestücke: Darstellungen von Meer und Seefahrt in der englischen Literatur des 18. bis 20. Jahrhunderts* (1992),¹⁰⁵ with Barbara Schmidt-Haberkamp’s article “Patriotism and its Discontents in Eighteenth-Century Nautical Plays”¹⁰⁶ being the only current study dealing with sea plays in the eighteenth century.

In terms of categorising sea plays Watson’s study offers a classification that subdivides “sea drama”,¹⁰⁷ or the interchangeably used “nautical drama”,¹⁰⁸ into two categories, the “*Tempest* school” and the “humours school”. He groups “all dramas which present a realistic scene aboard ship, regardless of actual borrowings”¹⁰⁹ amongst the “*Tempest* school” and applies the term “humours school” “to all plays containing a humours captain”.¹¹⁰ Watson’s categorisation leads to a substantial list of plays from the long eighteenth-century repertoire and although he only offers brief analyses of a selection of the listed plays, his canon is valuable to prompt further research. Lewis’ treatment of “English sea plays”,¹¹¹ however, is very brief and incomprehensive, as he only lists a few plays from the time that feature shipwrecks or sailors and overlooks prominent examples – such as Charles Johnson’s *The Successful Pyrate* – stating that the reason for the relative scarcity of sea plays are the difficulties incident to staging maritime scenes.¹¹² Robinson only takes into consideration plays that include the appearance of a sailor, which he labels “dramas with nautical character”.¹¹³ Krahé, equally, does not set up a classificatory divide but states that apart from the notable exception of Shakespeare’s *The Tempest*, “Seestücke”¹¹⁴ are rarely known outside academia due to their dubious literary quality.¹¹⁵ According to

105 Peter KRAHÉ, *Literarische Seestücke: Darstellungen von Meer und Seefahrt in der englischen Literatur des 18. bis 20. Jahrhunderts* (Hamburg: Ernst Kabel Verlag, 1992). Krahé covers only three sea plays, namely Thomas Shadwell’s *The Fair Quaker of Deal*, Tobias Smollett’s *The Reprisal*, and Richard Cumberland’s *The Brothers*. See Krahé 59–62.

106 Barbara SCHMIDT-HABERKAMP, “Patriotism and its Discontents in Eighteenth-Century Nautical Plays”, in: Serge Soupel and Kevin Cope eds., *The Sea in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (New York: AMS, forthcoming).

107 Watson 59.

108 Ibid.75.

109 Ibid. 4.

110 Ibid. 4.

111 Lewis 193.

112 Ibid. 194.

113 Robinson 149.

114 Krahé, however, uses the term “Seestücke” for all literary “seascapes”, thereby using a term that has originally been employed for sea paintings, but which has – in the eighteenth century – also been transferred to literature. See Krahé 10.

115 Ibid. 59 f.

Krahé “nautical drama” as a genre only emerged in the 1830s, after the achievements of the Royal Navy during the Napoleonic Wars had sparked nationwide enthusiasm for seafaring that found its way on the theatrical stages of the time. None of these critics therefore offer an inclusive notion of the sea, but rest their categorization of sea plays as a genre on the appearance of a naval character or the occurrence of a shipwreck or a scene set onboard a ship. Albeit Krahé’s notion of “Seestücke” offers a broader framework for analysing respective plays, the question of genre remains unsolved, as Krahé himself asserts when he denies the tag “nautical drama” to the eighteenth-century plays he discusses.

When applying classifications of sea plays as put forward by Watson and Krahé – such as the appearance of a sailor, a shipwreck, scenes onboard-ship – to Restoration and early eighteenth-century drama one quickly finds oneself at loss as to how prominently such features have to be present, determine the plot and respective characters’ actions in a play in order to make a classification as “sea play” worthwhile and not get stuck with an exercise in critical nit-picking. Moreover, one has to appreciate the fact that a discussion of such plays would be rather restricted by framing them as sea plays, especially considering such cases as Wycherley’s *The Plain Dealer*, a play which is – at least amongst critics – well-known and widely discussed. Therefore this study refrains from categorizing the plays under discussion within a specific genre like “sea drama”, “nautical plays” or “water drama”, as these categories sidetrack concerns that can be of more use in analysing literary engagements with the sea. The selection of plays for analysis is therefore not confined to plays that merely present maritime characters or settings, but by the texts’ representations of the sea as “Kulturthema” in a broader sense. The focus is thus topical and draws on plays that “stage” the sea not only by way of setting, costume, language and action, but through a discursive engagement with the comprehensive aspects that constitute the circum-Atlantic, like slavery, piracy, trade and migration, diaspora, colonialism and colonial power relations.

This analysis under the notion of staging the sea is aimed at going beyond a formalist discussion of literary tradition and instead shedding light on the ways the empire of the sea was imaginatively performed and represented on the period’s stages. For the purposes of this study, the sea therefore has to be understood as a broad and complex cultural and historical phenomenon, not defined by its metaphorical shores, but by its relevance as a medium for colonial expansion in the early eighteenth century. Staging the sea thus takes an encompassing, circum-Atlantic notion of the sea as a basis while conveying this notion to the representations of the sea on stage.

Setting limits to a certain theatrical period within the long eighteenth century in which to analyse the sea’s stage representations, this study will focus on the

Restoration and early eighteenth century, considering plays that premiered from 1660 until 1712¹¹⁶ in London playhouses.¹¹⁷ Traditionally, theatre historians have separated the Restoration period – as the manifest starting point with the re-opening of the theatres after the Interregnum – off from the time after 1688. Of this periodization Payne Fiske writes in the *Cambridge Companion to English Restoration Theatre* that it “makes sense in political terms although less so in theatrical terms” as “Dryden continued to write plays well into the 1690s that share marked affinities with earlier works. [...] Tragedies written and produced in the early eighteenth century also do not seem that far removed from the Restoration. Ending the volume at 1714 strikes a balance between continuity and change”.¹¹⁸ Bonamy Dobrée in his study *Restoration Comedy* (1925) took the time from 1660 – 1720 as period of reference for Restoration theatre, with Nicoll bracketing the time from 1660 – 1700 and the editors of *The London Stage* separating volumes I and II from 1660 – 1700 and 1700 – 1729 respectively. A further critical convention to regard the Restoration (1660 – 1688) and the Revolution era (1688 – 1714) together and to estimate a break somewhere in the early Georgian period, around 1730, also seems to exist.¹¹⁹ James Vinson frames his study of *Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Drama* (1980) from 1660 to the Licensing Act of 1737,¹²⁰ a frame that has also been taken by John Loftis, editor of the Regents Restoration Drama Series, who claims that whilst this frame takes two political events as its boundary marks, “they enclose a period of dramatic history having a coherence of its own in the establishment, development, and disintegration of a tradition”.¹²¹ Canfield’s *Broadview Anthology of Restoration and Early Eighteenth-Century Drama* (2001) also pools three sub-periods together, Restoration (1660 – 1688), Revolution (1688 – 1715) and Early Georgian (1715 – 1737).¹²² This periodization seems very workable as one can convincingly argue that the Theatre Licensing Act¹²³ (1737) has served as a caesura in British theatre history.¹²⁴

116 With one notable exception, John Gay’s *Polly*, which was written in 1728 and not staged until the end of the eighteenth century.

117 Staging the sea as outlined in this study is a metropolitan phenomenon focused on London and the dramatic tradition thus analysed an English tradition.

118 Payne Fisk xvii.

119 Jane MOODY and Daniel O’QUINN eds., *The Cambridge Companion to British Theatre, 1730 – 1830* (Cambridge: CUP, 2007).

120 James VINSON ed., *Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Drama* (London and Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1980).

121 John LOFTIS, *The Politics of Drama in Augustan England* (London: OUP, 1963) v.

122 J. Douglas CANFIELD, *Broadview Anthology of Restoration and Early Eighteenth-Century Drama* (Ontario: Broadview Press, 2001).

123 The Theatre Licensing Act gave the Lord Chamberlain the power to license plays and affirmed Drury Lane and Covent Garden as the only legitimate theatres in England. The Act

However, as is true for any periodization, dates can serve but as artificial boundaries. Therefore the catchment era for this study has been drawn reversely, that is, the end date is not predetermined by a historical event but rather by a change in staging the sea and is thus more loosely located around the end of the Revolution era. The title “Staging the Sea in Restoration and Early Eighteenth-Century English Drama” is hence indicative of a historical time in which representations of the sea abounded on English stages, but also distinguishes itself from the emerging Georgian Period that marked Britain’s establishment as “the greatest seapower in the world”.¹²⁵ From around 1712 onwards there were no new plays staging the sea, even though theatrical representations of the sea continued – a dry spell that lasted until about 1739. Thus it seems that the waning in new plays was caused by a period of calm in terms of naval warfare (1713 – 1739). The subsequent boom in new plays staging the sea coincides with the heightened demand for patriotic displays. Staging the sea from mid-century onwards had indeed changed considerably with representations being much more patriotic and historically concrete as well as being interspersed with music, dances and romance elements. Hence, “Restoration and Early Eighteenth-Century England” will serve as a time-frame for this study, designating a distinct, but not hermetical, period of theatrical activity.

1.6 Rushing into Floods as Performance: Colonial Discourses, Imaginative Geography and Collective Identity

On a theoretical level, highlighting the cultural impact of theatre is closely connected with the all-encompassing notion of culture as performance. This notion exhibits an interdisciplinary pedigree and goes back to John Langshaw Austin’s speech act theory which defines language also as a system of performative utterances, the idea that “to *say* something is to *do* something”.¹²⁶ It also refers to symbolic anthropologists Clifford Geertz and Victor Turner, as well as to the theory of symbolic interaction put forward by sociologist Erving

had a profound and long-lasting influence on dramatic production and was only effectively abolished with the passing of the Theatre Regulation Act of 1843 which put an end to the exclusive rights of patent theatres. For the origin and impact of the Theatre Licensing Act, see Vincent J. LIESENFELD ed., *The Stage and the Licensing Act 1729–1739* (London and New York: Garland, 1981).

124 See for example, Peter THOMSON, *The Cambridge Introduction to English Theatre, 1660–1900* (Cambridge: CUP, 2006).

125 Ian FRIEL, *Maritime History of Britain and Ireland c. 400–2001* (London: The British Museum Press, 2003) 132.

126 John Langshaw AUSTIN, *How to do Things with Words: The William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955*, ed. J. O. Urmson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962) 12.

Goffman.¹²⁷ In applying Michel Foucault's concept of "regulative discourses",¹²⁸ Judith Butler notably deconstructed gender and sexuality as performative, claiming that "identity is performatively constituted by the very 'expressions' that are said to be its results",¹²⁹ thus drawing attention not only to the dynamics of identity, but also to the actual performative acts that sustain or subvert the dominant hold on cultural configurations like gender. In her influential analysis gender is seen as a performative act, coming into existence through performance, "an imitation without an origin".¹³⁰ Gender is, however, not understood as "just" an act, but gender reality "is performative which means, quite simply, that it is real only to the extent that it is performed".¹³¹ Performances can thus be framed as cultural practices that corporeally and textually act out gestures, symbols, ideas and relations that give shape to power structures.¹³² In this, performances are actively shaping social life; they are "not simply reflectors or expressions of culture or even of changing culture but may themselves be active agencies of change, representing the eye by which culture sees itself".¹³³

This "performative turn" within cultural studies has pointed to the interaction and comparability of "off-stage" performativity and theatrical performances themselves. "Theatricality" thus denotes the performative character of social behaviour and interaction and their close relation to the modes of a theatrical performance: "Theatricality as metaphor, or analogy, accommodates the materialist perception that there is a 'playing out' of power relations, a 'masking' of authority, and a 'scenario' of events. In other words, power is spectacle".¹³⁴ More than any other literary genre the drama thus highlights the

127 See Erving GOFFMAN, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (New York, Anchor Books, 1959), Clifford GEERTZ, *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays* (New York: Basic, 1973), Victor TURNER, *From Ritual to Theatre: The Human Seriousness of Play* (New York: PAJ Publications, 1982) and Richard SCHECHNER, "Performance & the Social Sciences: Introduction", *The Drama Review* 17.3 (1973): 3–4.

128 See Michel FOUCAULT, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, 1975, trans. Alan Sheridan (New York: Vintage Books, 1977).

129 Judith BUTLER, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York: Routledge, 1990) 25.

130 Butler, *Gender Trouble* 138.

131 Judith BUTLER, "Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory", *Theatre Journal* 40.4 (1988): 519–531, 527.

132 For these aspects, see also Elin Diamond's introduction to *Performance and Cultural Politics*, ed. Elin Diamond (London and New York: Routledge, 1996) 1–14.

133 Victor TURNER, *The Anthropology of Performance* (New York: PAJ Publications, 1987) 24.

134 Sue-Ellen CASE and Janelle G. REINELT, *The Performance of Power: Theatrical Discourse and Politics* (Iowa City: Iowa UP, 1991) x. For this notion, see also Balme, *The Cambridge Introduction to Theatre Studies*: "on closer inspection it would seem that theatricality and authenticity, far from being opposites, are actually laminated together and should be regarded as variations of the same cultural symptoms: an increasing awareness of the constructedness and mediatedness of so much experience" 91.

performativity of power relations and identities. Identity in this regard emerges as a relational rather than essentialist concept and is hence an inherently performative process, as Stuart Hall – representative for many other post-structuralist identity-theorists – asserts, it is “about questions of using the resources of history, language and culture in the process of becoming rather than being”.¹³⁵ This historical dimension of collective identity is important to note as it is not created “on the spot”, but instead negotiated within a wider temporal framework as well: “[But,] like everything which is historical, they [identities] undergo constant transformation. Far from being eternally fixed in some essentialist past, they are subject to the continuous ‘play’ of history, culture and power”.¹³⁶ In simultaneously staging the self and the Other, through the use of scenery, costumes, make-up as well as gestures, language and corporality, the theatre manifests this procedural character of identity-building: “Identity and difference come into play (and into question) simultaneously and coextensively”.¹³⁷

Maybe most important for theatre studies the influence of New Historicism, with its concentration on “social spectacle” and power rituals, has displaced the focus on essentialisms and opened the field for more deconstructive readings of categories of identity, such as gender, race, class, age and religion. As a Shakespeare scholar prominently placed within theatre and performance studies, Stephen Greenblatt has contributed significantly to the appreciation of plays as “prototypes” of cultural media.¹³⁸ In this light, plays are located at the interface of cultural discourses and can be analyzed in their ability to perform notions of identity and as representations of the ambiguities of colonial expansion.

Against this background, the Restoration and eighteenth-century theatre comes into view for discussions of changing aspects of collective identity and the period’s cultural debates more generally, as Mita Choudhury demands to place the period’s theatre at the centre of such debates:

The coffeehouse, the parlor, and the library provided the space and the ambiance for discussions of etiquette, morality, desire, progress, and decadence – discussions that repeatedly reverted back to the theater, discussions that could not ignore the enormous

135 Stuart HALL, “Who Needs ‘Identity?’”, *Questions of Cultural Identity*, ed. Stuart Hall and Paul Du Gay (London: Sage, 1996) 1–7, 4.

136 Stuart HALL, “Cultural Identity and Diaspora”, *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*, ed. Jonathan Rutherford (London: Lawrence and Wishart) 222–237, 225.

137 Roach, *Cities of the Dead* 6.

138 See Stephen GREENBLATT, *Shakespearean Negotiations: The Circulation of Social Energy in Renaissance England* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 1988) and *Marvellous Possessions: The Wonder of the New World* (Chicago: Chicago UP, 1991).

power of performativity in a culture that was so heavily invested in images of the self bouncing off of, and even shattering Other images.¹³⁹

The notion that theatre and theatrical performances were shaping “consciousness” and identity is also strongly evident in contemporary accounts, as Richard Steele in *Tatler* No. 176 writes: “There is no human invention so aptly calculated for the forming of a free-born people as that of theatre”.¹⁴⁰ This conception of theatre as “calculated”, actively and determinedly “forming” national identities, can in a sense be seen as an expression of culture as performance *avant la lettre*. The plays staging the sea will thus be analysed in terms of their function for disseminating “knowledge” about national distinctiveness and the characteristics of a “free-born people”, as well as in terms of their related function of familiarizing audiences with colonial expansion. Processes of empire-building and colonialism are thus understood not only as political or economic relationships, but also – as Nicholas Thomas writes – “colonialism has always, equally importantly and deeply, been a cultural process”,¹⁴¹ one that was performed and represented on metropolitan stages. For the purpose of this study, “colonialism” is not used in the formula Edward Said developed, that is using “colonialism” for the practice and “imperialism” for the ideological dimension, but the concept is applied as an umbrella term covering post-Renaissance practices and ideologies that tended to the formation of an empire before imperialism as an openly advocated policy did appear.

“Knowledge” functions as a key term in analysing colonial discourses. On the one hand, notions of power and knowledge are linked and on the other hand, knowledge is apprehended as a matter of representation.¹⁴² Representation is here

139 Mita CHOUDHURY, *Interculturalism and Resistance in London Theater, 1660–1800: Identity, Performance, Empire* (Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, 2000) 17.

140 Richard STEELE, *The Tatler*, ed. Donald F. Bond, Vol. II (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987) 424.

141 Nicholas THOMAS, *Colonialism's Culture: Anthropology, Travel, and Government* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1994) 2.

142 The term “discourse” is applied in a Foucauldian sense in this study, namely “as practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak”, Michel FOUCAULT, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, 1969, trans. © Tavistock (London and New York: Routledge, 2002) 54. However, Foucault also emphasizes that discourse is suffused with power, see *Michel Foucault: Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977*, ed. Colin Gordon (Brighton: Harvester Press, 1980), where he maintains the relation between the production of power and the production of knowledge. Foucault delineates a concept of power that is decidedly un-Marxist in that he frames power not only as an instrument of repression, but as a productive “force”, manifest in everyday cultural, social and political practices, see also his *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, 1975, trans. Alan Sheridan (New York: Vintage Books, 1977) and *The History of Sexuality Vol. 1: An Introduction*, 1976, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Vintage Books, 1993). As opposed to Homi Bhabha’s use of “colonial discourse”, this study will employ the plural term “colonial discourses”, emphasizing the fact that “colonial discourse” is not a static or monolithic

deemed a process of “actualizing” ideological concepts, a conceptualization which ties in with the aforementioned performativity of culture, that is, culture as represented: not some expressed presence of things, but a *re*-presentation or creation. This representation, or “playing out” of power structures is also captured in what postcolonial critics have described as “processes of othering”,¹⁴³ the notion that the conception of the self is formed within a dialectical “play”: “out of a dialectic of self and other”,¹⁴⁴ rendering othering a way in which colonial discourses produce the self and the Other. These processes of othering are important as the colonial centre not only “becomes dependent on its others to know itself”,¹⁴⁵ but in that they help to act out and negotiate categories like race, gender and class: “[these categories] are not distinct realms of experience, existing in splendid isolation from each other; nor can they be simply yoked together retrospectively like armatures of Lego. Rather, they come into existence *in and through* relation to each other – if in contradictory and conflictual ways”.¹⁴⁶

In many respects these theatrical terms – performance, play and representation – present the analytical framework within which colonial discourses can be dissected. Said, without focusing on theatrical performances himself, identified that “Orientalism” as a mode of representation is greatly signified by theatricality: “The idea of representation is a theatrical one”,¹⁴⁷ thus describing orientalist discourses as operating in some respects like the staging of a play:

In the depths of this Oriental stage stands a prodigious cultural repertoire whose individual items evoke a fabulously rich world [...] settings, in some cases names only, half-imagined, half-known; monsters, devils, heroes; terrors, pleasures, desires. The European imagination was nourished extensively from this repertoire.¹⁴⁸

Conversely, a theatrical performance itself works with similar strategies as colonial discourses. Scripts mimic, stereotype, reflect and project,¹⁴⁹ while actual performances produce and exhibit masks, costumes, settings, speech-acts, scenes, music, dances and gestures that represent the cultural repertoire of

system, but “may more accurately be described as the name for a series of colonial discourses [...]. This series is marked by internal repetition, but not by all-encompassing totality”, David SPURR, *The Rhetoric of Empire: Colonial Discourse in Journalism, Travel Writing, and Imperial Administration* (Durham: Duke UP, 1993) 1 f.

143 Gayatri Chakravorty SPIVAK, “The Rani of Sirmur: An Essay in Reading the Archives”, *History and Theory* 24.3 (1985): 247–272.

144 Edward SAID, *After the Last Sky: Palestinian Lives*. With photographs by Jean Mohr (New York: Pantheon, 1986) 40.

145 Mary-Louise PRATT, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (London: Routledge, 1992) 4.

146 Anne McCLINTOCK, *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Context* (New York and London: Routledge, 1995) 5.

147 Edward SAID, *Orientalism* (New York: Pantheon, 1978) 63.

148 Said, *Orientalism* 63.

149 See Choudhury 3.

colonial discourses. Therefore theatrical performances can be perceived as feeding into a “system of representation, a regime of truth”¹⁵⁰ or indeed as part of an “apparatus of power”,¹⁵¹ as postcolonial critic Homi Bhabha writes on colonial discourse. To conceive of the importance of performance – both in its literal and its abstract sense – for the formation of colonialism is thus central for an analysis of its discourses.

The Foucauldian terms, “regime of truth” or “apparatus of power”, draw attention to the fact that colonial authority and power are discursively negotiated and are by no means a “given”:

There is nothing mysterious or natural about authority. It is formed, irradiated, disseminated; it is instrumental, it is persuasive; it has status, it establishes canons of taste and value; it is virtually indistinguishable from certain ideas it dignifies as true, and from traditions, perceptions, and judgments it forms, transmits, reproduces.¹⁵²

In this regard, as Said further claims in *Culture and Imperialism*, empires initially depend upon the “*idea of having an empire*”.¹⁵³ In the case of the English empire, this idea very much depended on the nation’s political and economic promotion of the empire of the seas and the creation of a cultural drive for “rushing into floods”. This phrase can thus be framed as a slogan for the representations of the sea in the period under discussion and signifies a metaphor for the nation’s actual maritime expansion.

In the period under consideration, “rushing into floods” not only denotes accelerated overseas expansion, prospering international trade, an infusion of exotic commodities to the domestic market, new riches, the exploration of unknown places, peoples and the information about them. It also speaks of fantasies and fears concerning emigration, travel, sexual escapades, moral downfall, loss of life and bankruptcy, as well as sexual and racial Others. Staging the sea therefore worked to present an “*idea of having an empire*” in order to advertise and test out the values and beliefs that organise colonial discourses and hence ultimately promote the enterprise of empire. In reading the plays that stage the sea within such a colonialist discourse framework this study predicates the reciprocal relationship between colonialism as material practice and colonialism as a set of representations upon which colonial knowledge is maintained. In “rushing into floods”, the burgeoning empire relied on knowledge about far-

150 Homi BHABHA, “The Other Question: Stereotype, Discrimination and the Discourse of Colonialism“, 1992, Homi Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (New York and London: Routledge, 1994) 94–120, 101.

151 Bhabha, “The Other Question”, *The Location of Culture* 100. See also BHABHA, “Signs Taken for Wonders: Questions of Ambivalence and Authority under a Tree outside Delhi, May 1817”, 1985, *The Location of Culture* 108–117.

152 Said, *Orientalism* 19 f.

153 Edward W. SAID, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Knopf, 1993) 11.

away locations and peoples, and as such, colonial discourses appear as fundamentally not disclosing facts, but as performatively imagining their own history and, crucially for an empire of the seas, extending to a performance of geography.¹⁵⁴

Said's notion of "imaginative geography"¹⁵⁵ is imperative in this regard as it points to the way in which space is profoundly involved in history and thus deeply embedded in systems of representation. Adhering to Gaston Bachelard,¹⁵⁶ Said frames the process by which spaces are charged with meaning as a poetical endeavour. Space thus acquires emotional and rational meaning through poetic processes, it is charged with imaginative and figurative values, which create, maintain, as well as make legible an idea of empire that relies on the imagination of its spaces. Imaginative geographies, the staging of the sea, can therefore be analysed as a poetic process; a cultural "doing".¹⁵⁷

The need for an "*idea of having an empire*" and the notion of "imaginative geography" also tie in with patriotic representations and performances that stage England as a "Protestant, commercial, maritime and free"¹⁵⁸ nation "in an Island". In his essay "DissemiNation: Time, narrative and the margins of the modern nation",¹⁵⁹ Bhabha calls to mind the similarities between colonial discourse and national representations, linking the representation of individual identities with the representation of nation as a community. Indeed, as Ernest Gellner in *Nations and Nationalism* (1983) pointed out, nations are fabrications and can be envisaged as "imaginative communities", a term Benedict Anderson coined for his groundbreaking study of the same title.¹⁶⁰ Anderson argues that a nation "is imagined as a *community*, because, regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship".¹⁶¹ In order to conceive such a "deep horizontal comradeship" the nation is imagined and performed, perpetuating the sense that not only do a nation's people belong to a certain "land", a certain space, but that this space is of them. During the long eighteenth century, increasing mobility and colonial expansion stand in close connection with national percep-

154 See Said, *Orientalism* 5.

155 Said, *Orientalism* 71.

156 Gaston BACHELARD's 1957 publication *La Poétique de l'Espace* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1957).

157 See Derek GREGORY, "Palestine and the 'War on Terror'", *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 24.1 (2004): 183–195, 183 f.

158 See Armitage, *The Ideological Origins* 8.

159 Homi BHABHA, "DissemiNation: Time, Narrative and the Margins of the Modern Nation", *The Location of Culture* 199–244.

160 Benedict R. ANDERSON, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1991).

161 Anderson 7.

tions that are generated through an acute engagement with the self and the Other in fictional as well as non-fictional cultural media.¹⁶²

With otherness and “difference” thus being crucial parts of national self-images, it emerges that – to refer back to Bhabha – the act of national performance itself creates a “disjunctive temporality”¹⁶³ that renders the nation ambivalent. The rhetorical strategy that makes up “a nation” can be seen as a double movement of pedagogy and performance:

In the production of the nation as narration there is a split between the continuist, accumulative temporality of the pedagogical, and the repetitious, recursive strategy of the performative. It is through this process of splitting that the conceptual ambivalence of modern society becomes the site of *writing the nation*.¹⁶⁴

That is, pedagogy gives the nation’s people a sense of belonging, while performativity creates a non-identical overload, “a series of fragments, which read speculatively, hint at a story that can never be fully recovered”.¹⁶⁵ As Bhabha puts it: “the performative introduces a temporality of the ‘in-between’”,¹⁶⁶ so that eventually “nation” as

an apparatus of symbolic power, [...] produces a continual slippage of categories, like sexuality, class affiliation, territorial paranoia, or cultural difference in the act of writing the nation. What is displayed in this displacement and repetition of terms is the nation as the measure of the liminality of cultural modernity.¹⁶⁷

In dissecting national and colonialist discourses “liminality” can be seen as a key term as it intercepts the double movement of colonial discourse. On the one hand, the colonised subject is deemed “outside” the coloniser’s culture. On the other hand, distance is reduced, as the production of knowledge about the Other begets the Other inside. The production of knowledge naturally increases the distance as well, since it is to be seen within the framework of power relations. “Mimicry”, as Bhabha terms this central element of double movement, emerges as threatening and disturbing to colonial authority since the ambivalence of mimicry – “almost the same, *but not quite*”¹⁶⁸ – not only splits the discourse but transforms into an uncertainty which “fixes the colonial subject as a ‘partial’

162 For a critical analysis of the connection between British national self-images and othering, see especially Colley, *Britons*, Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People* and Neumann.

163 Homi BHABHA, “The Postcolonial and the Postmodern: The Question of Agency”, 1992, *The Location of Culture*, 245–282, 254.

164 Bhabha, “DissemiNation”, *The Location of Culture* 209.

165 Peter HULME, *Colonial Encounters: Europe and the Native Caribbean, 1492–1797* (London: Methuen, 1986) 21.

166 Bhabha, “DissemiNation”, *The Location of Culture* 212.

167 Ibid. 201.

168 Homi BHABHA, “Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse”, 1987, *The Location of Culture* 121–131, 123.

presence”.¹⁶⁹ In locating a space for ambivalence and resistance within colonial discourse, Bhabha thus positions a space where the binary system of colonisation can be expounded and dismantled. Postulating deconstructive potential for such ambivalent processes is to see that “in the emergence of the interstices – the overlap and displacement of domains of difference – [...] the intersubjective and collective experiences of *nationness*, community interest, or cultural value are negotiated”,¹⁷⁰ but also that new and hybrid signs of identity are initiated. Hence liminality and hybridity are linked, as the liminal “interstitial passage between fixed identifications opens up the possibility of a cultural hybridity that entertains difference without an assumed or imposed hierarchy”.¹⁷¹ However, inasmuch as this more celebratory conception of colonial interstices allows us to account for representational slippages, it is imperative to stress that colonial relations in the eighteenth century were based on highly asymmetrical power-relations. In framing colonial discourses during that period – and beyond – one has to account for ambivalence not so much in terms of giving way to hybridity, but as a by-product of colonial negotiations. That is, colonial negotiations are as much characterised by violence, ridicule and exploitation as by inherent and overt lapses of resistance and ambivalence.

Such “lapses” or “interstices” are by no means mere abstract models or temporal moments, but obtain their analytical value by also designating liminal spaces “proper”, that is, spaces that Mary-Louise Pratt has termed “contact zones”; social spaces where “disparate cultures meet, clash and grapple with each other, often in highly asymmetrical relations of dominance and subordination – like colonialism, slavery or their aftermaths”.¹⁷² In this respect, the sea – here conceived broadly as a space that incorporates not only the actual sea, but implicates adjoining maritime spaces and situations – can analytically be understood as a contact zone. This is especially true because the term has, since its original formulation, been integrated into a much wider concept incorporating manifold engagements which constitute colonial spaces.

However, in order to accommodate the inherent ambivalence of colonial discourses it is important to account for the thresholds and borders pervading this contact zone. The sea, both materially as well as imaginatively, contains numerous borders: those that separate land and sea, ship and water, the known and the unknown. These borders are in many respects crucial to structuring and comprehending – but also to unsettling and disrupting – colonial endeavours. Staging the sea and its attendant phenomena of border-settings and liminal

169 Ibid. 123.

170 Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* 2.

171 Ibid. 5.

172 Pratt 4.

experiences is hence a crucial cultural catalyst in familiarizing audiences with the idea and “realities” of an empire of the sea.

In understanding the sea as the actual and highly political space for English maritime expansion and the stage as a space for the representation and negotiation of that expansion, this study proposes to frame the Restoration and early eighteenth-century stage as an imaginative contact zone – as both its self and its Other. This frame incorporates the notions of “imagined geographies” and “imagined communities”, as well as that of “interstitial passages” that potentially disturb representations. Moreover, in employing Gilroy’s symbol of the ship and thus following “routes” rather than “roots”, this approach defies notions of cultural essentialism. Staging the sea in the period being considered can be seen as a crucial instance of performing collective identity within English society. The phrase “staging the sea” thus relates to the methodological approach since the phrase stresses performativity, emphasising the fact that staging the sea can be seen as an act of cultural “doing” that operated in dramatic texts and on the stage.

This study is neither intended as a history of the sea on stage nor as presenting an all-encompassing survey of the topic. Methodologically relying on colonial discourse analysis, textuality will be the main focus, subjecting the plays under discussion to a close textual reading. On the one hand, this focus on the literary texts of plays is due to the relative lack of visual or testimonial material from actual performances. Furthermore, the nature of eighteenth-century performances itself renders a performance-based analysis in terms of twentieth- and twenty-first century performance theory unfeasible for the present purposes as eighteenth-century dramatic representations were highly disruptive and discontinuous. The playhouses were fully lit and noisy, and the practice of actors frequently stepping out of character¹⁷³ or indeed of members of the audience hissing, shouting, sitting on stage and being part of the performance carried on until the middle of the century.¹⁷⁴ As Freeman claims: “Realism, in either a mimetic or a formal sense, was simply not an objective or even a consideration in

173 Peter Holland notes that the actor-manager Thomas Betterton praised the actress Elizabeth Barry for “staying in role even when she was not acting”, see Holland, *The Ornament of Action* 61.

174 David Garrick, as manager at the Theatre Royal Drury Lane from 1747 until 1776, finally initiated changes in dramatic representations in banning the audience from the stage and darkening the auditorium, thus effectively creating a fourth wall between stage and auditorium. For an analysis of the disruptive character of theatre-audiences, see Judith MILHOUS and Robert D. HUME, *Producible Interpretations: Eight English Plays 1675–1707* (Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois UP, 1985), Kristina STRAUB, *Sexual Suspects: Eighteenth-Century Players and Sexual Ideology* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1992), Freeman, *Character’s Theater* and Peter STALLYBRASS and Allon WHITE, *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1986).

eighteenth-century dramatic representation”.¹⁷⁵ On the other hand, a focus on the scripts is culturally significant as plays were also widely read during the time and members of the audience frequently went back to the source text in order to reconsider the performance. The textual analysis will thus focus on rhetorical figures, characters, settings and plots that represent the sea on stage. At the same time it also concentrates on the representation of categories of identity as well as changes in the sea’s representation.

This study’s primary material is not organised chronologically, but follows a pattern that groups staging the sea into three analytical areas: spaces, characters and plots. In Chapter 2: “Islands and Shores”, plays that feature maritime spaces, such as islands and shores, will be analysed with a focus on how maritime spaces on the stage highlight questions of collective identity. Islands and shores, framed as “horizons of difference and displacement”, function as spatial protagonists in the plays under discussion and emerge as settings for colonial encounters, utopias and liminal experiences. These provide a repertoire for dramatising issues of colonial expansion such as the fear of “going native”, gender reversals and authority or fantasies of lush landscapes, sexual variety and social reversal. The changing semiotics of these spatial representations, from *The Enchanted Island* (1667) to *The Successful Pyrate* (1712), further establish English national identity as superior while also staging distant maritime spaces as increasingly manageable and profitable.

Chapter 3: “Staging Sailors” focuses on a quintessential maritime character, the sailor, discussing the representation of stage sailors in plays that were contemporary favourites, such as *The Plain Dealer* (1676) and *Love for Love* (1695), as well as in plays that are mostly obscured like *King Edgar and Alfreda* (1677) and *Cuckolds-Haven* (1685). The chapter will discuss strategies that presented the sailor as Other figure on stage, arguing that this otherness conveys the profuse entanglement of sailors in colonial discourses. The stage sailor served to discuss notions of Englishness and cultural identity, while also opening up a space for questioning societal norms. Moreover, the representation of the sailor on eighteenth-century stages changes profoundly in the course of the century, a development that will be briefly sketched in the coda to Chapter 3. This development sees the stage sailor increasingly presented not as a rough and boisterous tar, but as a jolly “heart of oak”, whose good looks, entertaining spirit and overt patriotic attitude render the character a favourite in mid- and late eighteenth-century comic operas and musical entertainments.

Chapter 4: “Theatres of Escape” will take specific plots into focus: plots of difference and proximity that express the increasing expansion of the empire and the advancing interconnectedness of the circum-Atlantic. “Escape” thus

175 Freeman 17.

denotes plots of economic as well as social flight from England employing the routes of the sea, while “theatres of escape” also characterize London playhouses themselves as spaces for imaginative escapes to colonial regions. Plays such as *The Widdow Ranter* (1689), *Oroonoko* (1695), and *A Bickerstaff’s Burying* (1710) will be discussed both as archives and as vehicles for fears and fantasies accompanying colonial expansion. The plays’ plots further display the theatricality of colonial acquisition while at the same time signifying theatricality as indicative of the ambivalence of colonial discourses. In the plays under discussion, plots of escape serve to lessen the distance between New and Old World, while also functioning to theatrically control colonial transgression through comic representations, role reversals, blackface and cross-dressing.

2. Islands and Shores: Maritime Spaces as Horizons of Difference and Displacement

2.1 Geopoetics of Space

Envisaging life at sea, the vast ocean and distant shores, most English men and women in the long eighteenth century had to rely on second-hand sources to stimulate their imagination of foreign spaces. The abundance of travel literature across a wide range of genres and media and the respective sketches of foreign peoples and places therein documents this demand for accounts of distant regions and is furthermore constitutive in developing images of difference. During the period under consideration, the ship was the prime means of long-distance travel and colonial exploration: crossing oceans and connecting lands, drawing invisible lines that mapped a world ever more stamped by the “facts” of empire and thereby delineating horizons of difference and displacement that were central in shaping national identity. This intimate connection between land- or seascapes and identity has prominently been absorbed by what is labelled the “spatial turn” in cultural studies.

The “spatial turn” designates a paradigm shift in cultural and social sciences since the 1980s and implies the apprehension of geographical space as a cultural parameter. This methodological reorientation contains several different assumptions, establishing the basic contention that “space” is neither just a container of action nor an a priori given fact of nature, but a category coming into existence through discursive practices. As the category has become “the everywhere of modern thought”,¹⁷⁶ critics not only analyse ways in which particular spaces have impacted history, but reconceptualize space in emphasizing its social constructivist makeup. As Henri Lefebvre writes in his pioneering study *The Production of Space* (1974): “space has now become something more than the theatre, the disinterested stage or setting, of action [...] its role is less and less neutral, more and more active, both as instrument and as goal, as means and as

176 Mike CRANG and Nigel THRIFT eds., *Thinking Space*, Critical Geographies (London: Routledge, 2000) 1.

end”.¹⁷⁷ This reference to the theatre serves to draw attention to the fact that space has to be analysed in terms of its productive and discursive value: “Spatial structure is now seen not merely as a medium through which social life unfolds, but rather as a medium through which social relations are produced and reproduced”.¹⁷⁸

This emphasis on the discursive quality of space also provides a theoretical frame for literary analysis as space is also produced “in” language.¹⁷⁹ The focus on space thus provides an instructive approach to representations of places, environments and landscapes in literature, especially as spatial representations increasingly have come into view for disseminating power relations and collective identity, as Edward Soja writes: “We must be insistently aware of how space can be made to hide consequences from us, how relations of power and discipline are inscribed into the apparently innocent spatiality of social life, how human geographies become filled with politics and ideology”.¹⁸⁰ In terms of literary analysis, the process of writing or staging space can hence be understood as disclosing various structures of power and discipline; these structures draw attention to the hierarchical organization of space that not only unfurls images of the self and the Other, but also highlights connections between imaginative geography and collective identities, like nation and gender.

In this respect, the cultural development of spaces is constitutive in negotiating categories of identity and difference, imaginative geography constituting a whole “universe of representative discourse”¹⁸¹ that establishes the representa-

177 Henri LEFEBVRE, *The Production of Space*, 1974 (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1991) 410 f.

178 Derek GREGORY and John URRY eds., *Social Relations and Spatial Structures* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1985) 3. Foucault’s writings, as well as lecture notes and interviews, have in recent years also been increasingly found instructive in terms of their attention to space, in *Of Other Spaces* he describes the spaces we live in as “a set of relations that delineate sites which are irreducible to one another and absolutely not superposable on one another”, Foucault, “Of Other Spaces”, 1967, trans. Jay Miskowicz, *Diacritics* 16.1 (1986): 22–27, 23, see also his “Questions on Geography”, *Power, Knowledge, Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977*, ed. Colin Gordon (Brighton: Harvester, 1980) 63–77. For recent studies on the spatial turn and its impact on cultural studies, see Hartmut BÖHME ed., *Topographien der Literatur: Deutsche Literatur im transnationalen Kontext* (Stuttgart and Weimar: J.B. Metzler, 2005), Wolfgang HALLET and Birgit NEUMANN eds., *Raum und Bewegung in der Literatur: Die Literaturwissenschaften und der Spatial Turn* (Bielefeld: Transcript, 2009) as well as Roger LÜDEKE, “Ästhetische Räume: Einleitung”, *Raumtheorie: Grundlagentexte aus Philosophie und Kulturwissenschaften*, ed. Jörg Dünne and Stephan Günzel (Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 2006) 451–471.

179 See Bachmann-Medick 310.

180 Edward SOJA, *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Theory* (London: Verso, 1989) 6. See also Michael KEITH and Steve PILE eds., *Place and the Politics of Identity* (London and New York: Routledge, 1993) for a collection of challenging perspectives on identity and space.

181 Said, *Orientalism* 71.

tion of the Other.¹⁸² Michael C. Frank describes imaginative geography thus as “a strategy of identity construction which equates (spatial) distance with (cultural, ethnic, social) difference, associating the non-spatial characteristics of ‘self’ and ‘other’ with particular places”.¹⁸³ Imaginative geography as a representative discourse is hence ascertained through a poetic process that transfers foreign spaces into meaningful relations “here”: “space acquires emotional and rational sense by a kind of poetic process, whereby the vacant or anonymous reaches of distance are converted into meaning for us here”.¹⁸⁴ These spatial representations can be seen as literary processes making sense of colonial power relations¹⁸⁵ as well as disclosing representations of Others that are indispensable for the empire’s sense of itself, as Pratt writes: “Empires create in the imperial center of power an obsessive need to present and re-present its peripheries and its others to itself. It becomes dependent on others to know itself”.¹⁸⁶

In emphasizing power and ideology critics, particularly postcolonial, have politicized the analysis of space,¹⁸⁷ focusing on “mapping”-techniques¹⁸⁸ that serve as an “aesthetic precondition”¹⁸⁹ as well as controlling optic for colonial enterprises. Most notably in times of active “discoveries” of foreign lands, representations of encountered territories merge into “erotics of ravishment”¹⁹⁰ as European men discursively feminize borders when transversing the verges of their known worlds, as McClintock states: “feminization is a first step to appropriation”.¹⁹¹ This ritualistic feminization of the land is tied in with questions

182 It is important to note, however, that culturally spatializing such notions of difference is also a process of poiesis in that the spatialized horizons are metaphorically brought to the front and thus emotionally as well rationally materialize: “So space acquires emotional and rational sense by a kind of poetic process, whereby the vacant or anonymous reaches of distance are converted into meaning for us here”, Said, *Orientalism* 55.

183 Michael C. FRANK, “Imaginative Geography as Travelling Concept: Foucault, Said and the Spatial Turn”, *European Journal of English Studies* 13.1 (2009): 61–77, 71.

184 Said, *Orientalism* 55.

185 The representation of space can also serve to challenge power relations, see Henrietta MOORE, *Space, Text, and Gender: An Anthropological Study of the Marakwet of Kenya* (Cambridge: CUP, 1986).

186 Pratt 4.

187 See Said, *Orientalism* 49–72, Bhabha, “How Newness Enters the World: Postmodern Space, Postcolonial Times and the Trials of Cultural Translation”, *The Location of Culture* 303–337 and Aijaz AHMAD, “The Politics of Literary Postcoloniality”, *Race and Class* 36.3 (1995): 1–20.

188 See David HOWARD, “Cartographies and Visualization”, *A Concise Companion to Postcolonial Literature*, ed. Shirley Chew and David Richards eds. (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010).

189 Christopher B. BALME, “Metaphors of Spectacle: Theatricality, Perception and Performative Encounters in the Pacific”, *Wahrnehmung und Medialität*, Vol. 3 Theatralität, ed. Erika Fischer-Lichte et al. (Tübingen / Basel: Francke, 2001) 215–231.

190 McClintock 22.

191 Ibid. 24. For a book-length study on gender and space in colonial discourses, see Sara MILLS, *Gender and Colonial Space* (Manchester and New York: Manchester UP, 2005), on

of power and discipline as the representation and characterisation of space is part of discursive strategies to map, that is control and organize, “terra incognita”.

The experience of rapid overseas expansion in the long eighteenth century, accompanied by the experience of new and unknown spaces, brought into view horizons of difference and a novel susceptibility to displacement that were effectively “managed” through the establishment of spatial contrasts. As Geoffrey Cubitt states in *Imagining Nations*: “It is through passages between urban and rural, or core and periphery, or metropolis and provinces, that the essence of the nation is circulated”.¹⁹² As we have seen, debates on national identity were very prominent during the period under consideration and these debates were fuelled in many ways by the latent uncertainties attendant to colonial expansion, as well as by internal political, economic and social changes that shaped England on its way to becoming an empire of the sea and a “polite and commercial people”.¹⁹³ In this respect, borders and frontiers become symbolically charged spaces where, as Cubitt asserts: “nationality is checked, and national difference most formally asserted; it is in frontier regions that national belonging, being most at risk, is often most persistently invoked”.¹⁹⁴ Hence, the representation of spatial contrasts, difference and displacements, can be read as part of the empire’s requisite performance of its centre and its peripheries.

As stated previously, the sea as the medium of English expansion and, indeed, the self-fashioning of the English as a people “in an Island”, captures the prominence of maritime spaces in negotiating cultural identity in the long eighteenth century. It thus comes as no surprise that maritime spaces and frontiers, namely islands and shores, gained crucial symbolic eminence in literary representations of the time. This chapter will therefore focus on plays that feature such maritime spaces as islands and shores prominently, arguing that the changing semiotics of these spaces must be understood principally within an emerging colonial dimension, combining issues of self and Other, of individual and collective anxieties and desires, national expansion and empire.

The characteristics of islands and shores as thresholds of difference and displacement also align with the spatial aspects of a theatrical performance. On the one hand, a theatrical performance is realized “in” space: the actual performance space of the stage. On the other hand, a theatre audience is confronted

the social nature of space and its relation to gender generally, see Doreen B. MASSEY, *Space, Place, and Gender* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994).

192 Geoffrey CUBITT ed., *Imagining Nations*, York Studies in Cultural History (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1998) 12.

193 See Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People* 1–8.

194 Cubitt 22. For further conceptual comments on borders, see Geoffrey BENNINGTON, “Postal Politics and the Institution of the Nation”, *Nation and Narration*, ed. Homi Bhabha (London: Routledge, 1990) 121–137.

with spatial semantics derived from the play's text: the setting of the performance. Theatre as "Raumkunst"¹⁹⁵ merges the actual space of the playhouse with performed and invoked spaces staging difference and thereby displacing the audience. In staging the sea, London playhouses thus can be said to give way to a simultaneous experience that highlights the theatre as an integral space for cultural definition. The performance of maritime spaces at once locates these spaces "here", in the theatre, while at the same time performing them as far away and thus drawing attention to the boundaries between "here" and "there". In this regard, one can frame the theatre in Foucault's terms as a "place [...] outside all places", a place which can be located *in realiter*, but which also provides "unreal, virtual" spaces.¹⁹⁶ For Foucault these qualities provide a mirroring-function and move "heterotopias", as he calls these sites, close to utopias; they are indeed not "placeless places", but "realized utopias".¹⁹⁷ The theatre as heterotopia thus emphasizes the boundaries between "here" and "there" and hence functions as a prime mechanism of semiotic individuation, as cultural semiotician Yuri M. Lotman writes: "Every culture begins by dividing the world into 'its own' internal space and 'their' external space".¹⁹⁸ The theatre-stage as space thus accentuates the horizons of difference and displacement represented in the plays under discussion and can be analysed as helping to structure their meaning.¹⁹⁹ In crucial respects, both the theatre and the staging of islands can be said to confront the audience with differing spaces: "It confronts us as a juxtaposition and confluence of the understanding of local *and* global realities, of interior *and* exterior references of meaning, of having *roots* at home while also deploying *routes* away from home".²⁰⁰

Bracketing the analysis of islands and shores as maritime spaces by the conceptual duality of difference and displacement stresses their semiotic function as boundaries and spaces of separation as well as hybridity. This liminal condition designates islands and shores as prime spaces for representations of encounters with alterity, plots of deviance, metamorphosis and utopia. These

195 See Manfred PFISTER, *Das Drama: Theorie und Analyse* (München: Wilhelm Fink, 1977/2001) 339. Pfister cites the early twentieth-century theatre artist Oskar Schlemmer.

196 See Foucault, "Of Other Spaces" 24.

197 Ibid. 24.

198 Yuri M. LOTMAN, *Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture*, trans. Ann Shukman (London and New York: I.B. Tauris, 1990) 131.

199 See Christopher B. BALME, "Chapter 7: Spaces and Spectators", *Decolonizing the Stage: Theatrical Syncretism and Post-Colonial Drama* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999) 227–269. See also Alison FINDLAY who argues that drama as a literary genre offers the most immediate expression of spatial practice, *Playing Spaces in Early Women's Drama* (Cambridge: CUP, 2006).

200 Godfrey BALDACCHINO, "Editorial: Islands – Objects of Representation". *Geografiska Annaler. Series B, Human Geography*. Special Issue: Islands – Objects of Representation 87.4 (2005): 247–251, 248.

aspects have been highlighted by historian and anthropologist Greg Denning in his *Islands and Beaches* (1980), where he conceptualized islands as spaces of duality, integrating the “cultural world” of the island and the “cultural boundaries” of beaches:

‘Islands and Beaches’ is a metaphor for the different ways in which human beings construct their worlds and for the boundaries that they construct between them [...] The islands I speak of are less physical than cultural. They are the islands men and women make by the reality they attribute to their categories, their roles, their institutions, and the beaches they put around them with their definition of ‘we’ and ‘they’.²⁰¹

In this model, the ways in which islands are perceived is part of a performative gesture that helps question and ultimately order a sense of “we” and “they” – that is a sense of identity and alterity. The representation of islands is hence an important part of culturally defining boundaries, as Lotman describes this semiotic act: “This space is ‘ours’, ‘my own’, it is ‘cultured’, ‘safe’, ‘harmoniously organised’ [...] By contrast, ‘their’ space is ‘other’, ‘hostile’, ‘dangerous’, ‘chaotic’.”²⁰²

In this respect, boundedness and limitlessness – sets of qualities with which islands have come to be associated – appear as crucial discursive elements for their dramatic representation on the Restoration and early eighteenth-century stage. Hence, in conceptualizing islands, it is useful to metaphorically position oneself with a view from the masthead: “Land, ho!”, the well-known sailor’s cry, brings forth the view that islands are subjected to from a ship’s perspective. Looked at from the vast and certainly at times seemingly unbounded ocean, islands are rendered spaces of desire: bounded yet promising. The dialectic of boundedness and limitlessness thus discloses several layers of desire, for boundaries and security, as well as for abundance and relief. This dialectic is a prominent feature of literary islands, where island-spaces are evoked as paradisaical, but also as “empty”²⁰³ and in their boundedness also giving way to despair.²⁰⁴ These imagined features of island spaces further render islands as “naturally” Other as these features highlight the boundaries between “here” and “there”, as Roger Moss asserts: “the contrast between home and island is constitutive for all yet to be discovered islands, to subject them to a discursive pre-colonisation”.²⁰⁵ The apparent limitlessness and abundance, as well as the ap-

201 Greg DENNING, *Islands and Beaches: Discourse on a Silent Land, Marquesas 1774–1880* (Honolulu: U of Hawai‘i P, 1980) 3.

202 Lotman 131.

203 See K.R HOWE, *Nature, Culture, and History: The ‘Knowing’ of Oceania* (Honolulu: U of Hawai‘i P, 2000) 10, for notions of islands as “empty” spaces.

204 See e.g. Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe* (1719), Edgar Allan Poe, *The Narrative of Arthur Gordon Pym of Nantucket* (1838) and H.G. Wells, *The Island of Doctor Moreau* (1896).

205 Roger Moss, “Derek Walcott’s *Omeros*: Representing St. Lucia, Re-Presenting Homer“,

parent boundedness and thus manageability of islands, turns these spaces into “natural colonies” that “look like property”.²⁰⁶ The appreciation of islands as metonymies of colonisation is also expressed in numerous accounts of explorers wanting to circumnavigate or climb on the island’s highest point “to take it all in”²⁰⁷ and experience a moment of “monarch-of-all-I-survey”, which translates the act of viewing into a feeling of ownership.²⁰⁸

Islands as loci of imagination are crucial in framing ideas of the Other and the exotic, while at the same time being the actual material spaces of colonial exploration, exploitation and settlement. The projection of property-like features onto these maritime spaces is one way of inscribing power-structures into the land, but viewing islands as empty or potentially paradisaical spaces and set apart from the mainland and the sea also renders them as ideal experimental grounds. There is a long tradition in Western culture to settle not only natural scientific questions within the hermetic space of islands,²⁰⁹ but also philosophical and literary experiments²¹⁰ – the island condition has a remarkably tenacious grip on the Western imagination.²¹¹

The aim of this chapter, however, is not to categorize islands as specific tropes or types as that would certainly degrade the variety of island representations and limit the understanding of island-characteristics. Islands and shores as performed in select Restoration and early eighteenth-century plays, however, will be analysed as sites of discourses that merge utopias and dystopias, fantasies and fears with the social and political actualities of maritime expansion. The horizons of difference and displacement appearing in these plays are expressive of and contribute to the imaginative geography of the developing empire of the sea, while the staging of liminality and hybridity performs a cultural negotiation of self and Other.

All plays under discussion stage maritime spaces through their setting on islands which is both referred to in the theatre as well as in the dramatic space of each play.²¹² Alien and exotic landscapes are displayed and performed, and the

Islands in History and Representation, ed. Rod Edmond and Vanessa Smith (London and New York: Routledge, 2003) 9 – 31, 11.

206 Edmond/Smith 1.

207 T.G. BAUM, “The Fascination of Islands: A Tourist Perspective”, ed. Douglas G. LOCKHART and David Drakakis-Smith, *Island Tourism: Trends and Prospects* (London: Mansell, 1993) 21 – 35, 21.

208 See Pratt 201, who detects these moments of “monarch-of-all-I-survey” in non-fictional travel narratives she analyses.

209 Prominently one can refer to Charles Darwin.

210 For example Thomas More’s *Utopia* (1516).

211 For an outline of this extraordinary persistence of the island condition on Western thought, see John R. GILLIS, *Islands of the Mind: How the Human Imagination Created the Atlantic World* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004).

212 The theatre space is the actual physical space of the performance, whereas dramatic space is “[m]ade up of both textual and performance signs; it is accessible to the reader of the playtext and, differently manifested, to the spectator experiencing the space as constructed

Other is depicted as not only inhabiting, but being “of” the foreign island-space. In this respect islands provide spaces for staging difference, but the heterotopian setting also gives rise to plots of displacement, where desires, anxieties, risks, deviance and cultural clashes are acted out. These displacements are framed in island utopias, where strategies of projection and naturalization name, parcel, designate, other and commodify the space. These performances and the semiotics of space they exhibit not only represent imaginative geographies, but also allow the staging of crises of authority and comic inversion that ultimately function to reconsider English cultural identity.

This chapter will focus on four plays written and performed from 1667 – 1712, namely John Dryden and William Davenant’s 1667 *The Tempest*-adapation (*The Tempest, or The Enchanted Island*), Thomas D’Urfey’s *A Common-Wealth of Women* (1685), Charles Gildon’s *Love’s Victim, or: the Queen of Wales* (1701) and Charles Johnson’s *The Successful Pyrate* (1712). At least two of the four plays under discussion, namely *The Enchanted Island* and *The Successful Pyrate*, were contemporary favourites and enjoyed long runs at the theatre. In each play, the island (or shore)-setting is highlighted in a way that suggests a discussion prominently considering spatial aspects. The aspects and functions of island-space vary and the respective emphasis on the maritime setting differs in all plays, however, in each play the maritime space can be said to determine the action in significant ways. In the following sections the plays will be discussed individually and chronologically, accentuating not only the differences and developments in island representations on the early eighteenth-century stage, but also showing in what ways these representations move from more abstract imaginings of islands to the displaying of concrete history.

2.2 *The Enchanted Island: Maritime Disaster, Discoveries and Departure*

2.2.1 Restoration Spectacular and Colonial Setting

[...] after dinner to the Duke of York’s House to the play, *The Tempest*, which we have often seen; but yet I was pleased again, and shall be again to see it, it is so full of variety; and particularly, this day I took pleasure to learn the [tune of the] Seamans dance-which I have much desire to be perfect in, and have made myself so.²¹³

by the given production“, Gay MCAULEY, *Space in Performance: Making Meaning in the Theatre* (Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1999) 19.

213 Samuel PEPYS, *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, Vol. IX, ed. Robert Latham and William Matthews, (Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 1974) 48.

In this entry from the 3rd of February 1668, just under three months after its premiere at the Duke's Theatre in Lincoln's Inn Fields on the 7th November 1667, diarist Samuel Pepys voices his great delight in the production, which became one of the biggest and longest lasting theatrical hits of the Restoration, its run extending well into the eighteenth century.

With the restoration of the Stuart monarchy in 1660, the time of theatrical eclipse had ended and Charles II granted patents to Thomas Killigrew and William Davenant permitting them to open up theatres – the King's and Duke's Company respectively – and put on plays. However, following an interval of two decades without working playwrights, the Restoration repertoire was heavily stocked with revivals of older plays,²¹⁴ amongst them several plays by William Shakespeare.²¹⁵ As Pepys' praise suggests,²¹⁶ Davenant's and Dryden's *The Tempest*-adaptation (*The Tempest, or The Enchanted Island*)²¹⁷ proved in many respects to “hit the right nerves” with the audience, not only due to it being “full of variety” as Pepys claims, but also, as will be argued in this chapter, because in the island-setting the play offered a suitable locus for negotiations of English political and cultural identity within the context of colonial expansion and the period's debates about sovereignty.

The Enchanted Island was indeed the most popular play on the Restoration stage,²¹⁸ between 1660 and 1700 no other play was more often revived and, as

214 The word “revival” glosses over the fact that most plays were adapted and changed considerably to cater for Restoration audiences' taste, a practice heavily criticized by nineteenth- and early twentieth-century critics. For an exemplary study on Shakespeare adaptations, see Hazelton SPENCER, *Shakespeare Improved: The Restoration Versions in Quarto and on the Stage* (Cambridge/Mass.: Harvard UP, 1927) and Frederick KILBOURNE, *Alterations and Adaptations of Shakespeare* (Boston: The Poet Lore Company, 1906). For a general account on the motives of Restoration adapters, see Nancy Klein MAGUIRE, *Regicide and Restoration: English Tragicomedy, 1660 – 1671* (Cambridge: CUP, 1992).

215 E.g. Davenant's *Macbeth* adaptation (1661), interspersed with songs, and Nahum Tate's infamous *The History of King Lear* (1681), with its happy ending, to give just two prominent examples. For an account of Shakespeare adaptations of the time, see Katherine West SCHELL, *The Taste of the Town- Shakespearian Comedy and the Early Eighteenth-Century Theater* (Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, 2003), and Don-John DUGAS, *Marketing the Bard: Shakespeare in Performance and Print 1660 – 1740* (Columbia and London: U of Missouri P, 2006).

216 The diarist went to see the play eight times in total.

217 Henceforth, I will refer to the adaptation as *The Enchanted Island* and Shakespeare's play as *The Tempest*. All citations from *The Enchanted Island* refer to the edition published in London in 1670, quoted from John DRYDEN, *The Tempest, or The Enchanted Island*, in *The Works of John Dryden*, Vol. X, ed. Maximilian E. Novak (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: U of California P, 1970) 2 – 103. References for quotations are given in the form “I. i, 1”, the first number represents the act, the second number the scene and the third number the line.

218 Its popularity being so great that the rival King's Company staged a dramatic lampoon in 1674 with Thomas Duffet's *The Mock Tempest, or The Enchanted Castle*, substituting the tempest with a riot in a brothel and the island with Bridewell prison. Referring to *The Mock Tempest*'s staging, theatre bibliographer Gerard Langbaine wrote: “The Design of this Play

both Pepys' commentaries and numerous other contemporary references suggest, more or less everyone was familiar with it.²¹⁹ Davenant's and Dryden's version remained in the repertoire until 1769²²⁰ and as the staging of an operatic version of the play in 1674 by Thomas Shadwell also suggests, the play's mélange of spectacle and music, exotic characters and settings provided for a sensual experience that secured a long-lasting success with generations of theatre-goers.²²¹ However, as the title page of the play's first edition denotes, Shakespeare – whose original plot was adhered to in Dryden's preface – was not as yet a celebrated name, so it was consequently omitted. As Barbara A. Murray argues, the reworkings of Shakespeare's plays in the period were mainly "driven by new-stage production techniques that enhanced immediate visual impact, and [...] this was reinforced by a developing theoretical prescription for the coherently visual in poetic imagery".²²²

The introduction of changeable scenery in the theatres and the appearance of professional actresses on the stage figured as paramount innovations necessitating scenic and dramaturgical responses by Restoration theatre managers if the staged plays were to be successful. Consequently, spectators did not weigh adaptations against the originals, but reviewed the productions as part of the theatrical repertoire on offer:

Aside from providing a plot suitable for these additions, the two adaptations of *The Tempest* had little to do with Shakespeare per se, and were ultimately connected to and

was to draw the Town from the Duke's Theatre, who for a considerable time had frequented that admirable reviv'd Comedy called The Tempest. [...] This Mock Opera was writ on purpose [...] to spoil the Duke's House, which, as has been before observ'd, was the more frequented than the King's." Gerard Langbaine, *An account of the English dramattick poets, or, Some observations and remarks on the lives and writings of all those that have publish'd either comedies, tragedies, tragi-comedies, pastorals, masques, interludes, farces or opera's in the English tongue* (Oxford: Printed by L.L. for George West and Henry Clements, 1691) 177 f.

219 See Katherine Eisaman MAUS, "Arcadia Lost: Politics and Revision in the Restoration *Tempest*", *Renaissance Drama* 13 (1982): 189–209, 189.

220 Christine Dymkowski as well as Stephen Orgel even suggest that the Restoration adaptations of *The Tempest* held the stage until the mid-nineteenth century, with Orgel claiming that the Restoration versions, in one form or another, held the stage until William Charles Macready produced Shakespeare's version (with some additions) at Covent Garden in 1868. Christine DYMKOWSKI ed., *The Tempest: Shakespeare in Production* (Cambridge: CUP, 2000) and *The Oxford Shakespeare: The Tempest*, ed. Stephen ORGEL (Oxford: OUP, 1987). See also Patrick M. MURPHY ed., *The Tempest: Critical Essays* (New York and London: Routledge, 2001) 10.

221 For an account of the multimedia elements of the production, see Judith MILHOUS, "Chapter 2: The Multimedia Spectacular on the Restoration Stage", *British Theatre and the Other Arts*, ed. Shirley Strum Kenny (Washington: Folger Books, 1984) 41–66.

222 Barbara A. MURRAY ed., *Shakespeare Adaptations from the Restoration: Five Plays* (Madison/Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2005) 17.

shaped by events in the entertainment climate – foreign competition, developments in theatrical facilities, rival theatre offerings, injections of music and dance.²²³

The importance of aural and visual varieties can thus be said to be the main driving force behind Shadwell's operatic version. However, Montague Summers' estimation that the Shadwell opera was entirely based on *The Enchanted Island*²²⁴ has to be somewhat amended, as the operatic version offers added songs and dances and slightly differing scenic arrangements and transpositions, but most importantly the opera in its printed form abounds with descriptions of elaborate scenic extravagance,²²⁵ giving us a clue to changes in contemporary penchants for entertainment.

Indeed, the maritime setting and action of *The Enchanted Island* – provided by the shipwreck – proved to be another component for the play's success as the popularity of similar shipwreck-plots attests. Just two months before the opening night of *The Enchanted Island*, the King's Company staged another Renaissance-adaptation with *The Storm*,²²⁶ a reworking of John Fletcher's and Philip Massinger's *The Sea Voyage* (1622), which was itself adapted by Thomas D'Urfey in his 1685 *A Common-Wealth of Women* (see Chapter 2.3).²²⁷

The spectacular value of *The Tempest*'s infamous shipwreck-scene (I. i) was consequently increased by Dryden and Davenant in that they mounted it with nautical instructions and almost doubled it in length. Crucially, Dryden also rearranged and adapted Shakespeare's material to a new plot.²²⁸ According to

223 Murray, *Shakespeare Adaptations* 71. See also KENNY, *British Theatre and the Other Arts*: "The excitement of exhilarating theatrical effects was thoroughly exploited by playwrights and managers. Flying, disappearing, and other magical feats were greatly appreciated by audiences, who also enjoyed the 'special effects' created by instantaneous changes of elaborate scenery in plain view" 18.

224 Montague SUMMERS, *Shakespeare Adaptations: 'The Tempest', 'The Mock Tempest', and 'King Lear'* (Boston: Small, Maynard & Company, 1922): "It will suffice to say that the main differentiation of the operatic version lies in the terminal masque of *Neptune and Amphitrite*" xliii.

225 Which included the repeated appearance of Prospero's "spirits" up "in the air", putting the new stage facility of flying-machines into good use.

226 Pepys went to see both plays and after having attended a performance of *The Storm* with his wife he subsumes the experience: "we went to see *The Storme*; which we did, but without much pleasure, it being but a mean play compared with *The Tempest* at the Duke of York's", 25.3.1668, *Diary* Vol. VIII. *The Storme* was not republished and the playtext available through Eighteenth-Century Collections Online offers only very slight changes to the original, Renaissance, version of the play. Instead, D'Urfey's *A Common-Wealth of Women* will be analysed, a play which offers a more considerable reworking of *The Sea Voyage*.

227 The overall popularity of narratives and adventures from distant parts of the globe was even heightened that year by the unusual frequency of real storms at sea, resulting in huge losses of commercial vessels. See George R. GUFFEY, "Politics, Weather, and the Contemporary Reception of the Davenant and Dryden *Tempest*", *Restoration* 8 (1984) 1–9.

228 For a minute disposition of the material from *The Tempest*, see Maus, Barbara A. MURRAY,

Stephen Orgel, editor of the *The Tempest's* Oxford edition (1987), Dryden's version includes less than a third of Shakespeare's text. Most notable is, according to Candy B. K. Schille, the "island's [peculiarly female] population explosion",²²⁹ in the addition of Dorinda, younger sister to Miranda, Sycorax, sister to Caliban, as well as Hippolito, "a Man who had never seen a Woman" (Preface, p. 4), a character designated to be played by an actress. However, the basic framework of *The Tempest's* plot remains; the play's action is initiated by a shipwreck raised by Prospero, "right Duke of Millain", scheming to revenge his forced exile on the island and contriving to couple his daughters Miranda and Dorinda with Ferdinand, Alonzo's son,²³⁰ and Hippolito, heir of the dukedom of Mantua and his ward, respectively. The unfolding action is divided into a high and low plot, the high plot consisting of Prospero's struggles with pairing his two unruly daughters with the rightful heir and exerting his revenge on the noblemen scattered around the island by his loyal servant Ariel. The low plot consists of a farcical representation of the mariners who, increased in number, and, teaming up with Caliban and his monstrous sister Sycorax, aim to found "a new Plantation" (II, iii, 60). Ultimately, the mariners' endeavours fail shamefully and the two couples – Dorinda and Hippolito, Miranda and Ferdinand – manage to overcome their initial difficulties resulting from the island-raised adolescents' innocence and, in restoring everyone to their rightful status, the island – without the spirits, Caliban and Sycorax – is deserted. Dryden himself praised the addition of a "man who has never seen a woman" (Hippolito) as an "excellent contrivance" (Preface) on Davenant's part, as, by increasing the number of couples, the play receives a different balance. However, the analysis that follows will not focus on variations on Shakespeare's play but solely on the Restoration version, whose subtitle – *The Enchanted Island* – also noticeably stresses the play's maritime setting rather than the maritime "event".

The history of critical approaches to the Dryden/Davenant play largely consists of evaluations regarding its relation to *The Tempest*. The period's neo-classical critics mostly found fault with the play's ornate handling of probability, rendering verisimilitude implausible and violating French neoclassical ideals by its permissive mingling of tragic and comic elements,²³¹ whereas later Romantic

Restoration Shakespeare: Viewing the Voice (Madison/Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2001) as well as Sandra CLARK ed., *Shakespeare Made Fit: Restoration Adaptations of Shakespeare* (London: J.M. Dent, 1997).

229 Candy B.K. SCHILLE, "Man Hungry": Reconsidering Threats to Colonial and Patriarchal Order in Dryden and Davenant's *The Tempest*", *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 48.4 (2006): 273 – 270, 274.

230 Shakespeare's Alonso, King of Naples becomes Alonzo, Duke of Savoy and usurper of the dukedom of Mantua in the adaptation.

231 See Nicholas ROWE, *The Works of Mr. William Shakepear in six volumes. ADORN'D with*

critics found fault with the play's establishment of formal divides, which renders the dramaturgy "unnatural".²³² Early twentieth-century critics have argued along similar lines, ultimately judging the play as blemishing Shakespeare's legacy, as Hazelton Spencer hyperbolically states: "Gone is the noble serenity that makes us eager to regard *The Tempest* as Shakespeare's farewell message to the world; in its place we have a licentious farce. Everything that the authors lay their hands on is defiled".²³³ In accordance with more general developments in literary criticism throughout the last century, appraisals of *The Enchanted Island* have become more benevolent as the century progressed. Maximillian E. Novak, editor of *The Works of John Dryden*, re-values the play's relation to Shakespeare: "Once we accept that Dryden and Davenant have created a tragicomedy in the Restoration mode, we can appreciate just how good some of their verse is".²³⁴ Indeed, critical attention in the last thirty odd years has released itself from a focus on Shakespeare-reception and has turned to the text of *The Enchanted Island* in terms of its value for analysing questions of sovereignty and its relation to Restoration politics. Pivotal in this respect is Katherine Eisaman Maus' seminal interpretation of the play's redefinition of the limits and uses of sovereignty, focusing on the power relations within the play and the connections to post-Restoration debates of authority.²³⁵ This focus on the representation of patriarchal authority has more recently been complemented by examining the erotic elements of the play provided by the addition of characters. Michael Dobson has presented an exemplary analysis, suggesting that questions of political power within *The Enchanted Island* are displaced onto a gender discourse and questions of the proper socialization of sexuality.²³⁶ Additionally, the increasing esteem for postcolonial paradigms has sparked re-readings of *The Tempest* and consequently the Dryden/Davenant play, pointing to the play's

CUTS Revis'd and Corrected, with an Account of the Life and Writings of the Author, (London: Printed for Jacob Tonfon, within Grays-Inn Gate, next Grays-Inn Lane, 1709) 264.

232 See Murray, *Restoration Shakespeare* 71.

233 Spencer 203.

234 Novak, *The Works of John Dryden* 343.

235 For a similar approach see Eckhard AUBERLEN, "The *Tempest* and the Concerns of the Restoration Court: A Study of *The Enchanted Island* and the Operatic *Tempest*", *Restoration: Studies in English Literary Culture, 1660–1700* 15.2 (1991): 71–88 and Matthew H. WIKANDER, "The Duke my Fathers Wrack': The Innocence of the Restoration *Tempest*", *Shakespeare Survey* 43 (1991): 91–98 for an analytical focus on the play's negotiations of post-Restoration anxieties.

236 Michael DOBSON, "Remember/First To Possess His Books': The Appropriation of *The Tempest*, 1700–1800", *Shakespeare Survey* 43 (1991): 99–107. On aspects of gender and socialization of sexuality, see also Jocelyn POWELL, *Restoration Theatre Production* (London and Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984) and Barbara A. MURRAY, "Transgressing Nature's Law': Representations of Women and the Adapted Version of *The Tempest*, 1667", *Literature & History* 12.1 (2003): 19–40.

colonial dimension.²³⁷ Bridget Orr and Heidi Hutner have read the play in terms of its representation and establishment of gender order and the representation of “native”²³⁸ women, linking these issues to anxieties surrounding colonial expansion.²³⁹ Monika Fludernik writes that Dryden’s text “yields even more useful material [than *The Tempest*] for the currently popular ‘postcolonial’ reading”,²⁴⁰ claiming that Dryden is indeed much “more critical of colonialism than the Shakespearean original”.²⁴¹ Fludernik further argues that the colonial dimension is not just outlined by Prospero’s attempts to rule *per se*, but “it is only through the circumstances of Prospero’s rule, on an island where he displaces the native and not-so-native populations, that issues of *colonial* rather than merely political power emerge”.²⁴²

In focusing on the function of the island as a *colonial* space, this chapter will analyse the ways in which colonial expansion and ensuing questions of authority and gender order, political stability, race and anxieties associated with travel by sea are being reworked by the theatrical performance of actions ensuing from the quintessential maritime disaster staged in the play, namely a shipwreck. Through the vivid representation of the shipwreck and the subsequent exploration of the island-setting the unknown space of the island is being imaginatively mapped and thus rendered more manageable. As Hutner has shown for

237 For appraisals of the colonial features of the play, see a.o. Alden T. VAUGHAN and Virginia Mason VAUGHAN, *Shakespeare’s Caliban: A Cultural History* (Cambridge: CUP, 1991), Peter HULME and William H. SHERMAN eds., *‘The Tempest’ and Its Travels*, (London: Reaktion Books, 2000) and Chantal ZABUS, *Tempests after Shakespeare* (New York and Houndmills: Palgrave, 2002).

238 Colonialist texts are replete with characterizations portending to “natives”, “savages” or “monsters” in naming the indigenous population. In *The Enchanted Island* the term “native” is not used, however. Caliban and Sycorax are referred to as “monsters” and “savages”. In this chapter, the term “native” is thus employed – even if it is not explicitly used in the text – in order to reflect the pejorative usage of the term and to draw attention to the fact that “native” does not necessarily refer to the indigenous population, as Caliban and Sycorax are not indigenous to the island, but indicates that both characters are identified with the foreign land and the term thereby works as a symbol for the New World. This usage of the term will apply for the rest of this study.

239 Orr, *Empire on the Stage* and Heidi HUTNER, *Colonial Women: Race and Culture in Stuart Drama* (Oxford: OUP, 2001). For a discussion of the performance of gender and discourses of sovereignty, see also Virginia RICHTER, “Shakespear’s honour’d dust: Neubeginn und Wiederholung in Drydens und Davenants *Tempest*-Bearbeitung” in: Roger Lüdeke and Virginia Richter, *Theater im Aufbruch: Das europäische Drama der Frühen Neuzeit*, Theatron, Studien zur Geschichte und Theorie der dramatischen Künste, Vol. 53 (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2008) 181 – 198.

240 Monika FLUDERNIK, “Noble Savages and Calibans: Dryden and Colonial Discourse”, *Dryden and the World of Neoclassicism*, SECL Vol. 17., ed. Wolfgang Görttschacher and Holger Klein (Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag, 2001) 273 – 288.

241 Fludernik, “Noble Savages and Calibans”, in: Görttschacher/Klein 274.

242 Ibid. 285.

colonial drama of the seventeenth century in general, “In the stage performance, one could view the sights and hear the sounds of English distillations of the New World, marry the native princess, possess her people and land, and gain enormous wealth and power, all without leaving the comforts of the theater”.²⁴³ These colonial performances thus render the stage a medium of transport to foreign and exotic locales as well as an exotic locale itself, turning theatrical entertainments into instances for vicarious tourism, as Roach writes: “Vicarious tourism occurs when the commodified experience of a local event substitutes for the direct experience of a remote destination”.²⁴⁴

In the play, the island is divided into two parts: Prospero’s dwelling and a “barren”²⁴⁵ part, the respective parts being the locus for the high and low plot of the dramatic action. In framing performances of difference and displacement within these opposing parts, colonial spaces are performatively absorbed and thereby controlled. Additionally, in representing these spaces within the setting of a playhouse, the heterotopian aspect of the theatre performance is heightened as the spatial frame of the stage and the performative frame of the play-acting are emphasized throughout.

In emphasizing the safe and local setting of the theatre, *The Enchanted Island* – like the other plays discussed in this chapter – crafts a “fiction of representational truth”²⁴⁶ which underwrites the drama’s representations. As Hans Blumenberg has argued, the theatrical representation of maritime disaster serves to increase the audience’s fascination with the stage action as the spectators are on safe ground.²⁴⁷ At the same time, the play also includes elements that subvert an ideal colonial order and thus function “as both performance and conflict – as fiction and substance – in historical transformations of language and culture”.²⁴⁸ In simultaneously presenting colonial spaces as controllable as well as troublingly hybrid, the Restoration play’s text emerges as an instance of this control as well as a criticism of colonial expansion and frameworks of sovereignty, rendering the theatre a site of contestation amid shifting paradigms.

243 Hutner, *Colonial Women* 17.

244 Joseph R. ROACH, “Chapter 6: *The Enchanted Island*: Vicarious Tourism in Restoration Adaptations of *The Tempest*”, *The Tempest and its Travels*, ed. Hulme and Sherman, 60–77, 62.

245 See Stephano’s description of the island-space as “barren” (II. ii, 43).

246 Hutner, *Colonial Women* 17.

247 “Nur weil der Zuschauer auf festem Grund steht, fasziniert ihn das verhängnisvolle Schauspiel auf dem Meere”, Blumenberg 39.

248 Robert MARKLEY, *Two-Edg’d Weapons: Style and Ideology in the Comedies of Etherege, Wycherley and Congreve* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988) 26 f.

2.2.2 Prospero's Dwelling: Authority and Gender Order

The 1670 edition of *The Enchanted Island* unfortunately gives us only scant indications as to the actual staging of the different island spaces. It becomes clear that Prospero and his wards dwell somewhere not too far from the island's coastline²⁴⁹ and that Hippolito is assigned a "cave" in which he lives. On Prospero's orders, the ship's crew is dispersed across the island by Ariel: "In Troops I have dispers'd them round this Isle. The Duke's Son I have landed by himself, whom I have left warming the air with sighs, in an odde angle of the Isle [...] The Mariners are all under hatches stow'd" (I. ii, 133 – 143). Even though this allocation of characters to specific sites of the island – with Prospero's dwelling being the "safe" site as opposed to the "odde angle" the ship's passengers are subjected to – gives the reader a faint idea as to how these sites might have been presented, the precise nature of the stage design remains obscured.

In tackling this issue, critics have often referred to the play's operatic version, staged in 1674 at the Duke's Theatre, its elaborate stage settings being an extraordinary rich resource for visualizing the play's performance. Certainly, we cannot unfailingly assume that the opera provides a trustworthy account of the stage setting for the Dryden/Davenant production as it has been described by theatre prompter John Downes as "having all New in it".²⁵⁰ However, the design of the frontispiece for the operatic version is noteworthy, as it effectively highlights the contrast between the peaceful and secure stage setting and the turmoil and danger presented in the unfolding dramatic action.

[The] Frontispiece is a noble Arch, supported by large wreathed Columns of the Corinthian Order; the wreathing of the Columns are beautifi'd with Roses wound round them, and several Cupids flying about them. On the Cornice, just over the Capitals, sits on either side a Figure, with a Trumpet in one hand, and a Palm in the other, representing Fame. A little farther on the same Cornice, on each side of a Compass-pediment, lie a Lion and a Unicorn, the Supporters of the Royal Arms of

249 Dorinda watches the shipwreck from a rock: "From yonder Rock / As I my Eyes cast down upon the Seas" (I. ii, 295 f).

250 The full account goes as follows: "*The Tempest, or the Inchanted Island*, made into an Opera by Mr. Shadwell, having all New in it; as Scenes, machines; particularly, one Scene Painted with *Myriads of Ariel Spirits*; and another flying away, with a Table Furnisht out with Fruits, Sweet meats, and all sorts of Viands; just when Duke Trinculo and His Companions, were going to Dinner; all things perform'd in it so Admirably well, that not any succeeding Opera got more Money", John DOWNES, *Roscius Anglicanus*, 1709, ed. Judith Milhouse and Robert D. Hume (London: The Society for Theatre Research, 1987) 34 f. John EVELYN also comments on the appeal of the improved stagecraft: "to see the new machines for the intended scenes, which were indeede very costly and magnificent", 26th July 1671, *The Diary of John Evelyn*, Vol. III, ed. E.S. De Beer (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955) 583.

England. In the middle of the Arch are several Angels, holdings the Kings Arms, as if they were placing them in the midst of that Compass-pediment.²⁵¹

The description of this frontispiece is worth quoting at length, as – like Jocelyn Powell remarked – the depiction of the Royal Coat of Arms can be regarded as “framing the performance with a gesture of royal deference”,²⁵² an important gesture not only in terms of endorsing the performance, but also a signet of appropriation in regard to the “distant parts” showcased on stage. The well-ordered iconography of the frontispiece furthermore belies the action of the very first scene of the production, as the description goes on:

Behind this is the Scene, which represents a thick Cloudy Sky, a very Rocky Coast, and a Tempestuous Sea in perpetual Agitation. This Tempest [...] has many dreadful Objects in it, as Several Spirits in horrid shapes flying down amongst the Sailers, then rising and crossing in the Air. And when the Ship is sinking, the whole House is darken'd, and a shower of Fire falls upon'em. This is accompanied with Lightning, and several Claps of Thunder, to the end of the Storm.²⁵³

Though this scene was not staged quite as elaborately in the Dryden/Davenant-production, the staging of the shipwreck was certainly attempted in a similar manner, emphasizing the force of the tempest with cries and drumbeats. In the operatic Tempest the apparent eternal stability of the Royal House of England – as indicated in the design of the frontispiece – is contradicted by the chaos and danger of nature's forces. On the one hand, the risks of naval endeavours are being pictorially appeased by the “royal” framing of the dramatic action, but on the other hand, the political events of the last thirty odd years serve to sow seeds of doubt as to the omnipotence of the Stuarts in the face of frenzied danger. Thus, as Maus points out, this contrastive frontispiece also serves to enforce potential subversive elements of the dramatic action:

[...] the frontispiece is also (like the prologue celebrating Shakespeare) a marginal, nostalgic element, subverted by the action at center stage. The frame can seem not more true or reliable than the dramatic fiction, but less – a sort of *de post facto* window

251 All quotes from the operatic version from Thomas SHADWELL, *The Complete Works of Thomas Shadwell*, Vol. II, ed. Montague Summers (London: The Fortune Press, 1927) 193–270, 199. The frontispiece is the proscenium arch of the stage, both concealing the machinery of the playhouse and masking the side-entrances of the stage to the audience.

252 Powell 62.

253 Restoration theatre managers were acclaimed for their ingenuity, every effort was undertaken to create a theatre of illusion as managers overran their budgets to invest in intricate scenery and lavish costumes. On Restoration staging see also Jean I. MARSDEN, “Spectacle, Horror, and Pathos”, *Cambridge Companion to Restoration Theatre*, ed. Deborah Payne Fisk (Cambridge: CUP, 2000) 174–190 and Colin VISSER, “Scenery and Technical Design”, *The London Theatre World, 1660–1800*, ed. Robert D. Hume (Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois UP, 1980) 66–118.

dressing which unfortunately stresses just those analogies it was apparently designed to defeat.²⁵⁴

As much as the threatening vivacity of the shipwreck-scene arouses the audience's awareness of the danger of naval enterprises, the subsequent scene with Prospero and his daughters, set in Prospero's dwelling, serves to becalm the preceding maritime turmoil as it provides a safe distance to the shipwreck-scene.²⁵⁵

Ever since Maus analysed the play in terms of its redefinition of the limits and uses of sovereignty, many critics have picked up this argument, focusing on the play's references to rightful monarchical succession as well as on its equation of just authority with gender order.²⁵⁶ Aside from these intra-textual concerns with sovereignty, *The Enchanted Island* as a play is firmly set within a context of monarchical legitimation and sovereignty. As Paula R. Backscheider has argued in her *Spectacular Politics: Theatrical Power and Mass Culture in Early Modern England* (1993), "[in the Restoration] perhaps of prime significance was the establishment of a dominant ideology of monarchy".²⁵⁷ Far from seamlessly "restoring" monarchical sovereignty, the Restoration was a politically troubled period in this respect, as the execution of Charles I and the Civil War had profoundly damaged trust in models of absolutist patriarchal sovereignty, as promoted by e.g. political theorist Robert Filmer.²⁵⁸ In symbolically reclaiming the nation's history through, for example, his coronation spectacle, Charles II intended to reintegrate the English people into the kingdom emotionally: "In times of revolutionary change, a nation feels a strong need to justify actions and to unify opinion. In the case of the Restoration, expressions of this need tended at first to consolidate support for the king and to establish the monarchy on his terms".²⁵⁹ In granting patents to two theatre companies the King himself was thus indirectly as well as directly involved in influencing and controlling the "emotional reintegration" of the English through theatrical performances, establishing the playhouses as bastions against Puritan killjoys.²⁶⁰ Despite this political disposition of Restoration theatre, the performances were no undiluted

254 Powell 208.

255 As Dorinda can observe the shipwreck from a "pointed Rock" (I. ii, 2).

256 See Dobson, Orr and Richter in: Lüdeke/Richter.

257 Paula R. BACKSCHEIDER, *Spectacular Politics: Theatrical Power and Mass Culture in Early Modern England* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1993) 1.

258 For an account of the "troubled" Restoration period, see Gerald MACLEAN ed., *Culture and Society in the Stuart Restoration: Literature, Drama, History* (Cambridge: CUP, 1995) as well as Richard BRAVERMAN, *Plots and Counterplots: Sexual Politics and the Body Politics in English Literature, 1660–1730* (Cambridge: CUP, 1993).

259 Backscheider 22.

260 For a discussion of the ways drama of the time intervened in political processes, see Owen, *Restoration Theatre*.

acts of monarchical propaganda, but – as Susan J. Owen points out – acts of reconstruction: “In the divided society of the 1660s, in which Stuart ideology had to be reconstructed and reinstated after the rupture of the interregnum, the royalist heroic play represents an attempt to paper over ideological cracks. It is an attempt which, in its very artifice, reveals the constructed nature of late Stuart ideology”.²⁶¹

In the plays under discussion in this chapter these attempts are substantially tied in with the maritime spaces that are being depicted, thus extending questions of sovereignty to a colonial dimension. In setting *The Enchanted Island* on a distant – and unspecified – island and, moreover, in showing how a “natural” and “innocent” upbringing can threaten the socialization of sexuality in terms of a patriarchal order, the play reinforces issues of sovereignty in the face of colonial expansion with questions of gender order.²⁶² In associating the unruly women of the play with their specific colonial location, thus feminizing the colonial space, the execution of patriarchal authority over women is also being presented as a claim of authority over the colonial project itself. In this regard the patriarchal order can be read allegorically as a victory of English men over the feminized Others. Furthermore, the colonial island-setting gives rise to questions regarding the suitable source of patriarchal authority, as Prospero’s authority is being challenged in the play, thus mirroring challenges to patriarchal authority within English society of the time.²⁶³ And although most critics have drawn on the fact that the political debate in *The Enchanted Island* is being played out in the burlesque action of the low plot,²⁶⁴ the action of the high plot can be read as quintessential for challenging issues of sovereignty in the play.

An analysis of the scenes set in and around Prospero’s dwelling and involving him, his daughters and ward as well as – later – Ferdinand, reveals the ways in which the association of the characters with the spaces they inhabit serves to highlight aspects of sovereignty. Just as the frontispiece – at least as far as we know in the operatic version – frames and contrasts with the frightful shipwreck-action of the first scene, the second scene (I. ii), featuring Prospero and Miranda, again contrasts with the established spatial context: “PROSPERO: Miranda! where’s your Sister?” (I. ii, 1). Upon entering the stage Prospero immediately has

261 Owen, *Companion to Restoration Drama* 19.

262 See Orr: “That narrativization does not simply rehearse philosophical myths of origin but identifies patriarchal domination as constitutive of any civilized society, making out colonial and exotic locales where such domination is threatened as barbarously in need of reform” 191.

263 E.g. Susan Staves has argued that the Civil War and the execution of Charles I had damaged the faith in the patriarchal model, see Susan STAVES, *Player’s Scepters: Fictions of Authority in the Restoration* (Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1979).

264 See Maus and John BISHOP, “‘The Ordinary course of Nature’: Authority in the Restoration *Tempest*”, *Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Theatre Research* 13.1 (1998): 54 – 69.

to acknowledge his lack of control over his daughter and the subsequent perception of his character is hence affected by this amusing lack of control. The opening of the scene also characterizes the women as unruly and thus also points back to the theatrical frame, as Prospero's characterization embodies that of the frustrated father found in Restoration comedies, one familiar to the audience. This association with the world of the theatre, and thus the association with the Stuart court, is further developed in the scene. Prospero discloses the secret of her upbringing to Miranda²⁶⁵ and in talking about his brother's "evil Nature" he exclaims: "He did believe/ He was indeed the Duke, because he then did execute the out/ward face of Sovereignty. [...] To have no screen between the part he plaid, and /whom he plaid it for" (I. ii, 63 – 68). Here, Prospero directly alludes to the problematic character of role-play and in subsequently conversing with Ariel about the whereabouts of the cast-aways, it is further established that Prospero indeed functions as a sort of stage-manager: ordering and instructing the characters as to their whereabouts, entrances and exits.²⁶⁶ He further relates that it was him, who was responsible for "peopling" the island, since upon being cast on its shores the island "was [...] /save for two Brats, which she [Sycorax, Caliban's mother] did / Litter here, the brutish Caliban, and his twin Sister, Two freckl'd-hag-born Whelps /not honour'd with A humane shape" (I. i, 203 – 206).

However, this authority, presented as natural due to the superiority of Prospero's "humane shape", is challenged by Caliban: "this Island's mine by Sycorax my /Mother, which thou took'st from me. [...] I first was mine / own Lord; and here thou stay'st me in this hard Rock, whiles /hou dost keep from me the rest o'th' Island" (I. ii, 252 – 262). Caliban here addresses a quintessential debate concerning the rightful possession of land; the right of "discovery" versus inheritance.²⁶⁷ But Prospero sweeps aside these objections, claiming that Caliban's attempted violation of his daughters has outdone all claims to freedom and boundless roaming of the isle. This reassurance of his authorial status over the native of the island is, however, once more weakened as the plot unfolds, as Prospero's inability to determine his wards' "exploration" of forbidden zones of the island, and thus of the other sex, becomes apparent.

Prospero has designed a "cave" for Hippolito, where he lives screened from the two sisters.²⁶⁸ However, as Prospero sets out to bring together the couples he

265 As yet omitting all mentioning of Hippolito.

266 "Come away my Spirit: I am ready now, approach / My Ariel, Come" (I. i, 106 – 7) and "Slave! Caliban! thou Earth thou, speak" (I. i, 235).

267 Caliban's status as native is, however, not straightforward as it is imparted that his mother was from Algiers and only banished on the island.

268 This design is visually very neatly invoked in the description of the operatic version, Prospero's habitation is "compos'd of three Walks of Cypress-trees, each Side-walk leads to a Cave, in one of which Prospero keeps his Daughters, in the other Hippolito", Shadwell 203.

hopes for, his design is thwarted again by his daughters' unruly and transgressive behaviour. In releasing Hippolito from the restriction of his cave and bringing him to his very own cell to instruct him in the dangers of the female sex (II. iv), it already dawns on Prospero that his carefully devised island-architecture is being shattered: "I hope he will not stir beyond his limits, / For hitherto he hath been all obedience: / The Planets seem to smile on my designs, / And yet there is one sullen cloud behind; I would it were disperst" (II. iv, 84–88). His daughters then immediately enter the stage, giving bodily expression to their father's "sullen cloud", "PROSPERO: How, my daughters! I thought I had instructed / Them enough" (II. iv, 89–90). Again, Prospero's alleged omnipotence as magician and spatial marshal is disturbed by the lack of control over the whereabouts of his female offspring. He now has to persuade them not to enter Hippolito's den and so he sets about vividly downgrading the male sex: "All that you can imagine ill is there, / The curled Lyon, and the rugged Bear Are not so dreadful as that man" (II. iv, 96–98).

However, his warnings are challenged by Miranda's reasoning: "But you have told me, Sir, you are a man; / And yet you are not dreadful" (II. iv, 101–102). "PROSPERO: I child! but I am a tame man; old men are tame / By Nature, but all the dangers lies in a wild / Young man" (II. iv, 103–105). Here, the father has to in a sense debunk his own potency in acknowledging that his days of wildness are past.²⁶⁹ Consequentially, after he has left the scene, Miranda ventures out and proposes that the two sisters try and at least catch a glimpse of the dreaded creature. Once more, the exotic locale of the scene is crossed with a reference to what is stock behaviour in Restoration comedies: "DORINDA: I find it in my / Nature, because my Father has forbidden me" (II. iv, 132–133). At the same time as female behaviour is familiarized, its potential unruliness again poses a threat to Prospero's plans and he has to concede that he can only further moderate the match-making when he instructs his daughter in societal customs of courtship: "Since you will venture, / I charge you bear your self reserv'dly to him, / Let him not dare to touch your naked hand, / But keep at distance from him. MIRANDA: This is hard. PROSPERO: It is the way to make him love you more; / He will despise you if you grow too kind" (III. i, 131–137). In having lost control over the – gendered – spaces of the island, Prospero's apparent sovereignty has been scaled down to mere behavioural instructions, which are, however, met with scepticism on Dorinda's part: "I hope you have not couzen'd me agen" (III. i, 143). Hence, the magician's power over his own habitat is

269 Depicting Prospero as a hapless and helpless father is also advancing the libertine sexual comedy of the play highly popular at the time, see Thomas H. FUJIMURA, *The Restoration Comedy of Wit* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1952).

contested by the two female characters, and only thanks to Ariel his designs for the other part of the island remain intact.

The spirit has followed Prospero's order and confined the Duke, his brother and their followers: "In the Lime-Grove which weather-fends your Cell; Within that Circuit up and down they wander, / But cannot stir one step beyond their compass" (III. i, 159–161). The mariners are also safely confined in their designated place, Prospero being insistent that they remain so. However, in organising the second pairing, that of Ferdinand and Miranda, Prospero yet again meets with a youth who challenges his sovereignty as, by now, Miranda is only too willing to team with her love-interest and thus take sides (III. v).

In trying to make the courtship "uneasie" (III. v, 40) for the lovers, Prospero meets with firm resistance by the younger characters and has to learn that his interferences with "nature" are in vain: "FERDINAND: AS SOON as thou may'st divide the waters / When thou strik'st 'em, which pursue thy bootless blow, / And meet when 'tis past" (III. v, 98–100). In thus questioning Prospero's control, Ferdinand provokes Prospero to refer to the theatrical frame: "PROSPERO: Go practise your Philosophy within, / And if you are the same you speak your self, / Bear your afflictions like a Prince. – That Door / Shews you your Lodging" (III. v, 101–104). Here, the reality of the stage is directly invoked over the characters' heads as Ferdinand is told to go back-stage and rehearse his part. So in regard to the actual space of the performance, the stage, Prospero remains in charge, but the display and strength of the young couples' passions has seriously flawed his authority over his dramatic habitat.

As the play draws to a conclusion, Prospero's sovereignty is further undermined by his misjudgement of his ward's sexual nature. With Prospero ordering Ferdinand and Hippolito together into a cave disaster unfolds, as Hippolito challenges Ferdinand so as to have the right to have all women. Despite Ferdinand's "fatal" wounding of Hippolito in a duel,²⁷⁰ Ferdinand is shown to be the only male character capable of properly socializing Hippolito's boundless sexuality. Both characters defy the other's right to have "their" woman,²⁷¹ and in thus associating the women with property, Ferdinand acts out an imperial gesture of territorial appropriation: "Pray, do not see her, she was / Mine first;

270 Laura J. Rosenthal even suggests that the duel can be read as a fight of men against women: "The swordfight itself can be read by the audience as a battle between men over women but also as the equally violent defeat of a character whose name recalls the Amazon queen Hippolita. This displaced defeat of female sexuality becomes the play's dramatic climax", Laura J. ROSENTHAL, "Reading Masks: The Actress and the Spectatrix in Restoration Shakespeare", *Broken Boundaries: Women and Feminism in Restoration Drama*, ed. Katherine M. Quinsey (Lexington: U of Kentucky P, 1996) 201–218, 208.

271 With Ferdinand arguing for a monogamous relationship to Miranda, Hippolito claims the right to possess all women.

you have no right to her” (IV. I, 286–287). Hippolito, however, maintains his “right”, so Ferdinand now attempts to actively “civilize” Hippolito’s conduct in that he proposes a duel that is to establish the rightful “conqueror” of the – female – isle. “FERDINAND: He who first draws blood,/Or who can take the others Weapon from him, / Shall be acknowledg’d as the Conqueror,/ And both the Women shall be his” (IV. i, 329–332).

Hippolito is equally oblivious to the courtly customs of duelling as to customs of courtship, so he has to be instructed in the course of a duel: “FERDINAND: You must stand thus, and push against me, While I push at you, till one of us fall dead” (IV. i, 312–313). As Hippolito is a breeches-part, Ferdinand’s instructions here appear as blurring as well as exploiting the boundaries between the character’s gender and the gender of the actress playing the part. On a textual level, Ferdinand is talking about the rules of a duel, while on a performative level, quite obvious to the audience, who is aware of the actresses’ gender, he is suggesting the movements of sexual intercourse. In framing the duel like a symbolic deflowering of the adversary in establishing the winner as: “He who first draws blood”, Ferdinand – as the “real” male character – can upfront secure his “success”. As soon as Hippolito is wounded and bleeds, Ferdinand draws attention to this “natural” weakness of Hippolito: “Believe your blood” (IV. iii, 10). In the following dialogue, the bleeding is presented as part of the symbolic cosmos of menstruation, Hippolito faints – apparently dies – and Prospero is incensed with Ferdinand who has ruined his plans.

However, in physically challenging and, in a way, exposing Hippolito, Ferdinand has outrun Prospero’s sovereignty in that he not only drew attention to the real “nature” of Hippolito’s character, but also initiated this wild “woman-as-land”²⁷² to the course of proper, monogamous sexuality. Prospero’s sovereignty – even as stage-manager of his own plot – is increasingly in a state of dissolution; in helplessly facing this, he asks for revenge and Ferdinand’s death: “Here I am plac’d by Heav’n, here I am Prince, / Though you have disposess’d me of my Millain” (IV. iii, 148–149). He increasingly realises his lack of control even over his self-made domain and reacts with a gesture of tyrannical almightiness: “Your Ferdinand shall dye, / And I in bitterness have sent for you / To have the sudden

272 With the employment of “woman-as-land” the analysis follows Hutner who, in her discussion of *The Enchanted Island*, reverses the metaphor of “land-as-woman” as deployed by Annette KOLODNY, *The Lay of the Land: Metaphors as Experience and History in American Life and Letters* (Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1975). Kolodny argues that throughout American literature the prevailing metaphor for landscape has been “land-as-woman”, for a similar notion see also McClintock and Louise MONTROSE, “The Work of Gender in the Discourse of Discovery”, *Representations* 33 (1991): 1–41. Hippolito’s connection to the land is also highlighted through the cave he inhabits, as the cave as a natural structure links him to the land, see Lennard J. DAVIS, “Known Unknown Locations: The Ideology of Novelistic Landscape in ‘Robinson Crusoe’”, *Sociocriticism* (1987): 87–113.

joy of seeing him alive, / And then the greater grief to see him dye” (IV. iii, 150 – 153, to Alonso). His crackling authority is henceforth targeted by one of his daughters, who tries to reason him into a pardon: “MIRANDA: Now I can hold no longer; I must speak. / Though I am loth to disobey you, Sir, / Be not so cruel to the man I love, / Or be so kind to let me suffer with him” (IV. iii, 179 – 182). In the following scene she even engages him in a judiciary argument of sorts:

MIRANDA: Grant him at least some respite for my sake.
 PROSPERO: I by deferring Justice should incense the Deity
 Against my self and you.
 MIRANDA: Yet I have hear you say, The Powers above are slow
 In punishing; and shou’d not you resemble them?
 [...]
 MIRANDA: Do you condemn him for shedding blood?
 PROSPERO: Why do you ask that question? you know I do.
 MIRANDA: Then you must be condemn’d for shedding his,
 And he who condemns you, must dye for shedding
 Yours, and that’s the way at last to leave none living.
 PROSPERO: The Argument is weak, but I want time
 To let you see your errorrs; retire and, if you love him,
 Pray for him.
 [...]
 MIRANDA: If that be so, then all men may declare their
 Enemies in fault; and Pow’r without the Sword
 Of Justice, will presume to punish what e’re
 It calls a crime (V. i, 5 – 30).

Miranda, who “ne’re endeavour’d to know more” (I. ii, 19) than what her father had conveyed to her, here highlights Prospero’s failing sovereignty and his vain attempts at its restoration. In arguing back, Miranda directly establishes the discourse of sovereignty in the dialogue of the high plot and challenges Prospero, both as father and duke and – semiotically – as a representative of the theatre.²⁷³ And even though the play ends just as Prospero designed it to,²⁷⁴ Hippolito’s “rescue” and the subsequent cure of his insatiability are enforced by first Ariel and then Miranda, not Prospero himself (V. i and ii). Despite the fact that Prospero’s patriarchal authority is maintained by the giving away of his daughters in marriage, his share in the match-making seems marginal in the end. Prospero as a father figure has thus proven to be rather anachronistic, as clear-cut performances of sovereignty are withheld in the play.²⁷⁵

273 See Richter in: Lüdeke/Richter.

274 Namely with the coupling of Miranda and Ferdinand, Dorinda and Hippolito, and everyone’s reinstatement to their rightful social standing.

275 See Hutner, *Colonial Women* and Richter in: Lüdeke/Richter, as well as Maus, who argues that the loss of patriarchal authority is never fully restored in the play.

Prospero's authority is challenged from differing directions and these challenges are incrementally tied in with his loss of ability to control the space of the island, as he is failing to control and educate the peoples of his land. In this, his character contrasts with that of Ferdinand, who has physically "conquered" and ultimately "tamed" the shores foreign to him in his treatment of Hippolito and Miranda as "women-as-land". Moreover, as Hutner points out, the "slippage of signs"²⁷⁶ in the play is substantial, and both Prospero's performative linkage to a theatre person and the allusions to the person of Charles II himself promote a blurring of clear-cut sovereignty. Prospero's repeated references to the theatrical frame of the play's actions present him as both being to an extent responsible for administering the fictional explorations of the island and – in a more inclusive gesture – referring to the royal patronage, thus also referring to the English monarchy's potential maritime explorations.

The reference to Charles II must have been rather obvious to the contemporary audience, not in the character of the hapless Prospero but the sexually proactive Hippolito.²⁷⁷ No cast list of the play survives, however, Summers has argued that Hippolito was most likely played by Moll Davis, one of the King's mistresses of the time.²⁷⁸ The additional reference would not have been lost on the gossip-mongering audience, but was, however, in many senses concealed by the casting of an actress for the part. The "slippage of signs" thus created – by having Prospero match a real-life woman behaving like a "wild man" on stage – is an inviting nod to the audience to muse on the sovereignty of the monarch's own identity and thus blurs the idea and conception of power relations. Of course, as becomes especially prominent in the character of Hippolito, questions of gender and sexuality play an important part in discussing such challenges as they cannot be separated from questions of patriarchal authority. The representations of gender in *The Enchanted Island* are substantially complex and slippery, so in order to draw attention to the interpenetrating discourses of race and gender as enforced by the island's native Sycorax, the analysis will first concentrate on the "non-native" women inhabiting the safe part of the isle.

The Enchanted Island abounds with double entendres resulting from the sisters' and Hippolito's "innocence".²⁷⁹ The sisters constantly misunderstand

276 Hutner, *Colonial Women* 54.

277 See e. g. Pepys' diary in July 1667, the King "was governed by his lust and women and rogues about him", *Diary*, Vol. VIII. On the effects of the King's prurient conduct, see James Grantham TURNER: "Pepys and the Private Parts of Monarchy" in MacLean 95 – 110. There was also widespread gossip surrounding the King's "unnatural effeminacy", see Pepys' entries in June/July that same year.

278 See John Harold WILSON, *All the King's Ladies: Actresses of the Restoration* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1958).

279 *The Enchanted Island* was not the only play of that year exploring the natural state of female

their father's warnings as to the dangerous nature of men and believe themselves able to fend off their advances: "DORINDA: But Father, I would stroak 'em and make 'em gentle, / Then sure they would not hurt me" (II. iv, 109–110). Prospero's warnings take place over the characters' heads, but the audience is, of course, fully aware of the sexual nature of the sisters' lines: "MIRANDA: And if I can but scape with life, I had rather be in pain / nine Months, as my Father threatn'd, than lose my longing" (II. iv, 140–141). It becomes clear that the women as well as their bodies have to be controlled and ultimately subordinated to reinforce patriarchal authority.²⁸⁰ But in acting within an apparently "natural" and thus "innocent" frame the women's "natural" inclination as to their gendered position is shown as being disposed to heterosexuality and ready for carrying out their societal duty through motherhood. Both Miranda and Dorinda are not prelapsarian as they are both socialised and articulate, but their passion is as yet unsocialized as they also hint at incestuous yearnings: "MIRANDA: No, sure, you see my Father is a man, and yet / He does us good. I would he were not old. DORINDA: Methinks indeed it would be finer, if we two / Had two young Fathers" (I. ii, 322–325). Women's sexuality is presented as in need of channelling, and at the same time the women's bodies emerge as prized commodities as they promise reproduction: "DORINDA: pray, Sister, let you / and I look up and down one day, to find some little ones for us / to play with" (I. ii, 334–336).

The female body is commodified in more than one respect in the play. Ever since the advent of actresses on the Restoration stage and the corresponding possibilities of revealing and showcasing female bodies on stage,²⁸¹ not to mention the general association of actresses with being available for pleasure,²⁸² the performative exploitation of the actresses' bodies emerges as a common feature of stage productions. Pepys' diary gives numerous instances as to the audience's curiosity of meeting the real-life personas of stage characters in the backstage Green Room.²⁸³ This titillating interplay between reality and fiction is

innocence, see also Dryden's *The Feigned Innocence or, Sir Martin Mar-all* and the revival of John Suckling's 1638 play *The Goblins*.

280 For accounts on how women were essentialised as naturally chaste and subordinate, see Kathryn SHEVELOW, *Women and Print Culture: the Construction of Femininity in the Early Periodical* (London and New York: Routledge, 1989) and Vivien JONES ed., *Women in the Eighteenth-Century: Constructions of Femininity* (London and New York: Routledge, 1990).

281 John Harold Wilson has argued that the main reason for the popularity of breeches-parts was for the display of "shapely legs". He calculated that 89 out of 375 plays between 1660 and 1700 had roles for women dressed as men, see John Harold Wilson 73–86.

282 "In short, 'actress' and 'whore' were effectively synonymous" John Harold Wilson 21. For a discussion of the exploitation of actresses, see Elizabeth HOWE, *The First English Actresses: Women and Drama 1660–1700* (Cambridge: CUP; 1992), for more varied accounts see Quinsey.

283 See January 1667, 14.7. and 26.8., 26.10. 1667 in Pepys, *The Diary of Samuel Pepys* Vol. VIII.

also addressed in Dryden's prologue to the play: "Let none expect in the last Act to find, / Her Sex transform'd from man to Woman-kind. / What e're she was before the Play began, / All you shall see of her is perfect man. / Or if your fancy will be farther led, / To find her Woman, it must be abed" (7). Unusually, Hippolito's "real" gender is not to be revealed within the course of the play,²⁸⁴ but it is advertised for inspection once the play has ended. So in more than one respect, the play puts forward the idea that sexual identity is being created through encounters:²⁸⁵ the sisters come to understand their womanhood in encountering men, and the audience is able to experience both an instance of vicarious tourism in witnessing these encounters, and checking on the identities themselves "abed" (see Prologue). In this, male spectators are titillated and targeted, and the actress as well as the spectatrix are bound within an objectified as well as voyeuristic gaze.

Pivotal to the representation of women in *The Enchanted Island*, however, is their semiotic association with the land they inhabit. Both sisters are characterised as inherently wayward; they cast aside their father's warnings just to satisfy their passion: "DORINDA: Though I dye for't, I must have th'other peep" (II. v, 33). The presentation of the space of the island as giving way to female unruliness is thus part of a colonial gesture that feminizes terra incognita.²⁸⁶ As Carolyn Merchant has argued, in the early modern period nature became increasingly understood as being wild and disordered, giving way to an analogous understanding of the disorder of the New World and native women. This notion can be directly linked to strategies of exploitation, as Hutner declares: "The ideological construction of both woman and nature as chaotic and savage justified English economic motivations for the exploitation of the land and people of the New World".²⁸⁷ Indeed, as the plot of *The Enchanted Island* shows, the two sisters function as emblems of the disorder of yet-to-be colonised spaces, and male authority over these spaces accordingly has to be established through the repression of this female "wildness". Prospero's inability to control his daughters' wildness contrasts with Ferdinand rising to the job to successfully "civilise" the women, thus obtaining male authority over the space. However, the character of Hippolito and, more importantly, the role of Hippolito being a breeches-part, complicates and questions this civilizing mission.

Just as Miranda and Dorinda are presented as readily submitting to monogamous heterosexuality, Hippolito himself proves to be the quintessential

284 John Harold Wilson calculated that out of the 89 plays with breeches parts, only 14 were designed for actresses actually playing men's parts and not disguised women.

285 For the argument that the idea of encounter is tied to the making of identity, see Hulme/Sherman, *The Tempest' and Its Travels*.

286 Kolodny and McClintock.

287 Hutner, *Colonial Women* 6.

“wild man”,²⁸⁸ as he outright refuses to settle with the notion of monogamy. On meeting Ferdinand, and just after he has learnt of the existence of a sister to Dorinda, he calls out: “I know I’m made for twenty hundred Women” (IV. i, 273). Ferdinand’s subsequent persuasion is spoken in vain, as Hippolito dismisses all notions of “private property” in favour of his own inclinations: “In honour then of truth, I must Declare that I do love, and I will see your woman” (IV. i, 291 – 292). As previously explored, Ferdinand has to physically enforce his “right” to Miranda’s person and body in a duel staged in a clear analogy to sexual penetration. In the course of the duel he wounds the gullible Hippolito and thus on one level defeats – or “castrates” – the fictional male character as well as hinting at the real-life female body of the actress in a reference to its menstruation on another level. Orr relates this “symbolic castration” to the utopian element of the play, claiming that the act “ends the masculine fantasies of a new world of untrammelled libidinality and political freedom”.²⁸⁹ In as much as the character of Hippolito can be said to be quoting libertine arguments against monogamy,²⁹⁰ the fact that the character is both by way of announcement – as in the prologue – as well as by double-play exposed as female, “releasing” him of his passions is, however, more an act of satirically taming female unruliness than celebrating libertine demands.²⁹¹

The character’s “real” gender is further reinforced in Ariel’s application of the herbal remedy he has procured in order to revive Hippolito, as Murray relates: “All three of these plants were regarded as medicinally beneficial in many ailments but the only property shared by garlic, myrrh and valerian in Culpeper is that of ‘procuring the woman’s courses’ or menstruation, and it is by this that role and actress are here differentiated”.²⁹² The slippery allocation of gender in the play is once again enforced when Prospero, upon Ariel’s recommendation, orders Miranda to take Hippolito’s wrapped-up sword to his bedside. Upon realising that Hippolito is still not quite converted to monogamy, as the character announces: “Yet I find that if you please I can still love a little” (V, ii, 64), the following dialogue between the two enfolds:

288 For the contemporary fascination with the “wild man”, see Edward DUDLEY and Maximilian E. NOVAK eds., *The Wild Man Within: An Image in Western Thought from the Renaissance to Romanticism* (London: U of Pittsburgh P, 1972).

289 Orr 191.

290 See Novak, *The Works of Dryden* 369.

291 Murray writes: “If Dorinda’s part reassuringly illustrates that there is no such thing as virtuous female innocence anyway, Hippolito’s is exploited to assure a libertine court that the notion of platonic love itself is indeed ridiculous”, “Transgressing Nature’s Law” 28. However, as Quinsey asserts, although libertinism supposedly celebrates a freer expression of sexuality, it is yet just another manifestation of patriarchal authoritarian structures.

292 Murray, “Transgressing Nature’s Law” 32.

HIPPOLITO: O my wound pains me.

MIRNADA: I am come to ease you. [She unwraps the Sword.

HIPPOLITO: Alas! I feel the cold air come to me,
My wound shoots worse than ever.

[She wipes and anoints the Sword.

MIRANDA: Does it still grieve you?

HIPPOLITO: Now methinks there's something laid just upon it.

MIRANDA: Do you find no ease?

HIPPOLITO: Yes, yes, upon the sudden all the pain

Is leaving me, sweet Heaven now I am eas'd! (V. ii, 66–74).

Even though the herbal remedy is here shown as easing Hippolito's pain, on a performative level the scene presents an act of male masturbation, as Miranda holds and wipes the symbolic sword, which finally "upon the sudden" relieves Hippolito. On a dramaturgical level, Hippolito remains male – as he is about to be married to Dorinda and accept his dukedom – but on a performative level, his gender remains ambivalent. This ambivalence is also present in a preceding act where, again in a gesture to the theatrical frame, Hippolito informs Dorinda that he himself is unsure about his identity: "I was *inform'd* I am a man" (II. v, 53, emphasis GW). In this regard Hutner argues that these representational "slippages" are indicative of the male fear that wildness – in land as in women – cannot be completely controlled. The representation of such ambivalent gender performances can hence be read as reproducing colonial anxieties of gender reversal, sexual ambivalence and wildness.²⁹³

Roach further argues that the representational dichotomy of a breeches-part is always present in performance: "What remains physically present to the spectators in the theater is the natural body of the performer [...] This dichotomy provokes a constant alternation of attention from actor to role, from vulnerable body to enduring memory, in which, at any moment one or the other ought to be forgotten but cannot be".²⁹⁴ This "constant alternation" renders Hippolito not only a sexual hybrid, but a hybrid in terms of his origin as well. Despite the character being of noble, European birth, his wildness also renders him a native of the distant shores. Hippolito's performance, alternating between woman-as-land, wild man and European noble is hence expressive of a double desire: to claim authority over women and natives *and* to possess the exotic locale.²⁹⁵ However, this performance not only claims, but also questions authority, as the presented mimicry not only "ruptures"

293 For instances of an extensive anxiety concerning the nature of women in the late seventeenth century, see Merchant.

294 Roach, *Cities of the Dead* 82.

295 Rebecca WEAVER-HIGHTOWER claims that one strategy to naturalize colonialism was to connect the right to authority over colonial landscape with the right over "one's own flesh" in literary representations of islands, see *Empire Islands: Castaways, Cannibals, and Fantasies of Conquest* (Minneapolis and London: U of Minnesota P, 2007) xiv.

discourse,²⁹⁶ but transforms it “into an uncertainty which fixes the colonial subject as a ‘partial’ presence”.²⁹⁷ Mimicry, as Bhabha writes, appears as “resemblance and menace”, “Its threat [...] comes from the prodigious and strategic production of conflictual, fantastic, discriminatory ‘identity effects’ in the play of power that is elusive because it hides no essence, no ‘itself’”.²⁹⁸ The desire for a reformed Other is expressed through the repeated “representational slippages” in *The Enchanted Island*, and these slippages can thus be read as expressive both of concerns over colonial authority and as compensatory representations. In relation to the staging of the sea, these hybrid enactments – of both liminal spaces and hybrid characters – emerge as crucial cultural performances of identity and difference within an emerging maritime empire.

2.2.3 Shipwreck and Brandy: Colonial Aspirations and Degeneration

In *The Enchanted Island*, the shipboard-setting and tempest at the beginning of the play’s action have established the sea as a liminal and dangerous space, as a threat to life, destroying property, as separating the characters and overturning hierarchies amongst the crew. Furthermore, the characters find themselves in an inherently alien and inhospitable setting, allowing the audience observe not only the shipwreck, but the dangers of an unknown location from a safe distance. The unfamiliarity and awkwardness of the crew’s situation is further performed when the noblemen,²⁹⁹ after Gonzalo’s heartfelt outcry at the end of the first scene: “now would I give ten thousand Furlongs of Sea for one Acre of barren ground” (I. i, 106–107), find themselves in a literally “barren” place.³⁰⁰ The noblemen are confronted with a severe contrast to their own local circumstances, and this harshness incites immediate repentance on their part:

ALONZO: [...] And when I, too ambitious, took by force anothers right; the we lost Ferdinand, then forfeited our Navy to this Tempest.

ANTONIO: Indeed we first broke our truce with Heav’n;
You to the waves and Infant Prince expos’d,
And on the waves have lost an only Son;
I did usurp my Brother’s fertile lands, and now
Am cast upon this desert Isle.

296 Bhabha, “Of Mimicry and Man”, *The Location of Culture* 123.

297 Ibid. 123.

298 Ibid. 128 f.

299 The mariners and noblemen are dispersed to different parts of the “wild island”. The three noblemen – Alonzo, Antonio and Gonzalo – and the mariners – Stephano, Mustacho, Trinicalo and Ventoso (with attendants).

300 See Stephano’s description of the part of the island as “barren Island” (II. iii, 43).

GONZALO: These, Sir, 'tis true, were crimes of a black Dye,
 But both of you have made amends to Heav'n,
 By your late Voyage into Portugal,
 Where, in defence of Christianity,
 Your valour has repuls'd the Moors of Spain (II. i, 18–30).

Guilt-ridden, the nobles and their attendants are now confined to an alien space that therefore increases their longing to be transported to a safer place. Additionally, they are haunted by Prospero's enchantments, "swift voices flying by my Ear, and groans / Of lamenting Ghosts" (II. i, 40–41, Alonso). The part of the island they occupy is described as a hazardous anti-Cockaigne, with no provisions, comfort or inviting scenery: "ALONZO: I pull'd a Tree, and Blood pursu'd my hand. O Hea- / ven! deliver me from this dire place, and all the after actions of / my life shall mark my penitence and my bounty" (II. i, 42–44). The island here not only appears as barren, but as dangerous and untouchable. In terms of the spatial politics of the play, the "barren Island" thus contrasts sharply with the action staged in Prospero's habitat, and in terms of evoking the actual space of the island, the scenes set in the "dire part" are also substantially more explicit. The "barren" nature of this part of the island is both evoked in the diegetic space the noblemen describe, and in the mimetic space depicted on stage, where there are no provisions, only savage natives.

In terms of the characters cast on the "dire part", the noblemen are presented as penitent and regretting their former mistakes. In further eliminating Sebastian from *The Enchanted Island* and exchanging the kings of the play with dukes, Dryden and Davenant have greatly diminished the subversive potency of the scenes with the noblemen and thus moved aspects prominently challenging authority to the low plot featuring the mariners. As much as the scenes depicting the noblemen are devoid of political controversy,³⁰¹ the scenes showcasing the mariners explicitly address issues of government and authority. The function of the island-setting as an imaginative testing ground for resolving political tensions draws on an extensive tradition,³⁰² but especially at a time when England expanded into North America, the Caribbean and the East Indies, giving rise to political and legal issues surrounding such expansion,³⁰³ the spaces of the New World became testing grounds for resolving frictions within English society. As Orr has remarked, English drama of the time abounded with colonial or Oriental

301 See Maus.

302 For the function of island-settings in the employ of Amazonian societies, see Page DuBois, *Centaurs and Amazons: Women and the Pre-History of the Great Chain of Being* (Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1982).

303 For a discussion of such political and legal issues, see Anthony Pagden, *Lords of All the World: Ideologies of Empire in Spain, Britain and France c.1500-c.1800* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1998).

settings, negotiating issues of sovereignty vis-à-vis societies apparently characterised by despotism and polygamy.³⁰⁴

In the case of *The Enchanted Island*, the island-setting is furthermore tied to a special genre: utopia.³⁰⁵ Again, Orr indicates that the frequency of utopian writing in the seventeenth century is directly attached to the burgeoning colonial activities of the time,³⁰⁶ and the attendant increasing curiosity about and knowledge of the New World through trade and other commerce. Contemporary dramatic utopias³⁰⁷ also put forward issues of cultural identity that are negotiated in alien colonial settings.³⁰⁸ In highlighting the island-setting, the scenes taking place in the “barren part” prepare the ground for enactments of political discussions and questions of authority. However, as has been noted by several critics, the real political discussion in *The Enchanted Island* takes place in the low plot.³⁰⁹ And as Schille has remarked, through Dryden/Davenant’s strict separation of high and low plot and the subsequent displacement of most direct political issues to the lower plot, the playwrights also downgrade the potential subversiveness of such issues.³¹⁰ John Bishop argues in a similar vein: “Those figures worthy of heroic tragedy – the dukes – are denied a plot that can produce it, while the plot that contains the subject matter of tragedy – namely, a contest for sovereignty – is foisted onto comic characters who cannot plausibly enact it”.³¹¹

In looking at the mariners’ exploits of the “barren” part of the island, this chapter aims to show how the mariners can be understood as colonisers by proxy. In focusing on the spatial qualities of the island and their relation to the

304 See Orr 61–96 and also Neumann 209–218.

305 For an exemplary account of the functions and developments of utopian writing, see Roland SHAER, Gregory CLAEYS and Lyman Tower SARGENT eds., *Utopia: The Search for the Ideal Society in the Western World* (New York: OUP, 2000).

306 For a further discussion of this argument, see David FAUSSETT, *Writing the New World: Imaginary Voyages and Utopias of the Great Southern Land* (Syracuse/NY: Syracuse UP, 1993). See also J.C. DAVIS, *Utopia and the Ideal Society: A Study of English Utopian Writing 1516–1700* (Cambridge: CUP, 1981).

307 Next to *The Enchanted Island*, there are several more plays of the period drawing on the utopian tradition, e.g. John Weston, *The Amazon Queen: or, the Amours of Thalestris to Alexander the Great* (1667), Edward Howard, *The Womens Conquest* (1670) and *The Six Days Adventure or the New Utopia* (1671), Thomas D’Urfey, *A Common-Wealth of Women* (1685), Charles Hopkins, *Friendship Improv’d: or, the Female Warrior* (1700), Peter Motteux, *Thomyris, Queen of Scythia* and Charles Johnson, *The Successful Pirate* (1712). For a discussion of D’Urfey’s and Johnson’s play, see subchapters 3. and 5. in this chapter.

308 Orr further claims that these plays are “to some extent [...] theatrical analogues of those Hobbesian and Lockean philosophical myths about the state of nature and the origins of society” 191.

309 See Maus, Schille and Richter in: Lüdeke/Richter.

310 See Schille 276.

311 Bishop 60.

mariners' activities, this chapter illustrates how the maritime space of the island serves as an explicit colonial location, a space not only providing a safe setting for the staging of political conflicts, but also a space where the anxieties surrounding colonial exploits are acted out. This "safe setting" can be understood in a double-sense here: on the one hand, the setting is fictionally "bracketed" through the fictional distance of the "enchanted island" to England, and on the other hand the audience as vicarious tourists can witness the political turmoil within the "safe" setting of the playhouse, thus emphasizing the heterotopian quality of the theatre. Additionally, the representation of the island's natives reinforces the colonial character of the spatial politics of the play.

The shipwreck-scene and the "barren" island-space can be understood as successive loci in *The Enchanted Island*. The shipwreck has not only literally released the mariners from their workplace but, in doing so, has also overturned social hierarchies as the mariners are now located in a place void of closely controlled discipline but – contrary to the nobles – with shipborne-provisions: "The Runlet of Brandy was a loving Runlet, and floated / after us out of pure pity" (II. iii, 1–2, Ventoso). In supplying the mariners with alcohol and reassuring them of their solitude on the island, the shipwreck has acted as a catalyst for their consequential buoyant behaviour.³¹² But after their initial excitement the mariners come to realise that indeed "all is barren in this Isle: here we may lye at hull till the Wind / blow Nore and by South, e're we can cry *a Sail, a Sail* at sight of / a white Apron" (II. iii, 43–45, Stephano). Here, Stephano establishes a connection with the space's barrenness and the lack of women on the island, an obvious reference to the other part of the island, where women are "plenty" and willing. Fludernik has also argued that the lack of provisions on the island – the only "treasure" being the cask of liquor the mariners could save from the shipwreck – can be read as an instance of criticism of colonialism, as it portrays the colonial space not as abundant, but dull and lacking.³¹³

However, the "barren" island also constitutes new possibilities for the mariners' actions, as Ventoso reminds the others: "This Isle's our own, that's our comfort, for the Duke, / the Prince, and all their train are perished" (II. iii, 46–47). The space thus gives rise to colonial fantasies of rule and possession, but also accentuates related anxieties, as Mustacho chips in: "Our Ship is sunk, and we can never get home agen: we must e'en turn Salvages, and the next that catches his fellow may eat him" (II. iii, 48–50). The mariners propose to avert the danger of starvation through cannibalism and the danger of going native through

312 Bishop notes that the mariners' drunkenness can also be seen as a way of restraining the lower plot's political chaos, see 62.

313 See Fludernik in: Görtschacher / Klein 283.

“civilized” behaviour and the proposal of a political union: “VENTOSO: No, no, let us have a Government; for if we live well / and orderly, Heav’n will drive the Shipwracks ashore to make / us all rich, therefore let us carry good Consciences, and not eat / one another” (II. iii, 51–54). But in proposing political union, Ventoso at the same time sets “government” up as a front for economic exploitation of their situation, he goes on: “I am a free Subject in a new Plantation” (II. iii, 60), thus drawing attention to a specific colonial meaning of their ambitions.³¹⁴ The “barren” island-setting here frames and, in fact, endorses the mariners’ colonial aspirations as the alleged “emptiness” of the space is taken as not only legitimizing, but also promoting exploitation: “MUSTACHO: Oh Trin-calo we are all made, the / Island’s empty; all’s our own, Boy” (II. iii, 112–113). This view of the island as “terra nullius” again invokes the moment of “monarch-of-all-I-survey” as the act of viewing an apparently “empty” space is presented as legitimizing appropriation and ownership.³¹⁵

However, the initial idea of averting savagery and maintaining civilization through “government” soon turns awry as the mariners embark on a grossly satirist enactment of political discussion.

STEPHANO: Whoever eats any of my subjects, I’ll break out his Teeth with my Scepter: for I was Master at Sea, and will be Duke on Land: you Mustacho have been my Mate, and shall be my Vice-Roy.

VENTOSO: When you are Duke you may chose your Vice-Roy; but I am a free Subject in a new Plantation, and will have no Duke without my voice. So fill me the other soop.
STEPHANO whispering: Ventoso, dost thou hear? I will advance thee, prithee give me thy voice.

VENTOSO: I’ll have no whisperings to corrupt the Election; and to show that I have no private ends, I declare aloud that I will be Vice-Roy, or I’ll keep my voice for myself.
MUSTACHO: Stephano, hear me, I will speak for the people, because there are few, or rather none in the Isle to speak for themselves. [...] well, you may take their silence for consent.

VENTOSO: You speak for the people, Mustacho? I’ll speak for ‘em, and declare generally with one voice, one word and all; that there shall be no Vice-Roy but the Duke, unless I be he.

MUSTACHO: You declare for the people, who never saw your face! Cold Iron shall decide it. [Both draw.]

STEPHANO: Hold, loving Subjects: we will have no Civil war during our Reign: I do hereby appoint you both to be my Vice-Roys over the whole Island.

BOTH: Agreed! agreed! (II. iii, 55–82).

314 Wikander argues that Dryden and Davenant greatly expand the colonial meaning of the mariners’ scenes in contrast to Shakespeare and claims that in *The Enchanted Island*, the word “plantation” takes on a specific colonial meaning, see 94. See also Weaver-Hightower who states that “plantation” is a specific colonial term 11.

315 See also Weaver-Hightower 14–24.

The mariners here perform a carnivalesque version of political land seizure, with everyone not only exhibiting the desire to be “king” themselves, but also claiming – mock – concerns for the “peoples” will. The island is thus performed as an “empty” space, its alleged “emptiness” provoking cravings for colonial appropriation as well as giving rise to transgressive social behaviour which overturns formerly established hierarchies.

In several ways the mariners’ argument also quotes the history of the interregnum,³¹⁶ thus deflating the low-class mariners’ political aspirations in satirizing the architects of the English mid-century revolution.³¹⁷ Hutner accordingly claims that the mariners’ plot explores the cultural anxieties concerning the execution of Charles I and the insecurities of contemporary Restoration politics.³¹⁸ Further, the mariners’ controversy refers to populist debates surrounding contemporary political theories³¹⁹ and ultimately, as Virginia Richter asserts, this controversy not only ridicules anti-monarchical stances, but a whole array of political discourse.³²⁰ The mariners’ attempts to legitimize their newly acquired statuses further go as far as decoding their positions on ship to their positions within their “government” – “for I was master at sea and will be duke on land” – but, with the subsequent appearance of the drunken boatswain Trincalo, the fragile political set-up is shaken even further:

TRINCALO: I say this Island shall be under Trincalo, or it shall be a Common-wealth; and so my Bottle is my Buckler, and so I draw my Sword. [Draws.]

VENTOSO: Ah, Trincalo; I thought thou hadst had more grace,
Than to rebel against thy old Master,
And thy two lawful Vice-Roys.

[...]

TRINCALO: I’ll have no Laws.

VENTOSO: Then Civil-War begins. [Ventoso. Mustacho. draw.]

STEPHANO: Hold, hold, I’le have no blood shed,
My Subjects are but few: let him make a rebellion
By himself; and a Rebel, I Duke Stephano declare him:
Vice-Roys, come away (II. iii, 131 – 145).

Trincalo’s unwillingness to align himself with the government implants civil discord within the mariners’ “dukedom” and further challenges the mariners’ reasoning in regard to the legitimacy of their actions. Similar to Ferdinand’s and

316 See Bishop.

317 See Steven N. ZWICKER, *Politics and Language in Dryden’s Poetry: The Arts of Disguise* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1984).

318 See Hutner xx.

319 See Earl MINER, “The Wild Man Through the Looking Glass”, in: Dudley/Novak 87 – 114.

320 “Die Satire zielt jedoch nicht exklusiv gegen anti-absolutistische Positionen, z.B. die Hobbes’sche Vertragsidee; vielmehr werden alle Arten von politischem Diskurs durch den Kakao gezogen”, Richter in: Lüdeke/Richter 189 f.

Hippolito's debate over the right of possessing women, in encountering Sycorax, who is "the Heir of all this Isle" (III. iii, 7), Trincalo now maintains a novel claim to rule, namely through his alliance with the native. By marrying Sycorax: "I'll lay claim to this Island by Alliance" (III. iii, 222), he mirrors Caliban's own claim to the island: "this Island's mine by *Sycorax* my / Mother" (I. ii, 252 – 253). Even though the mariners overtly engage in judiciary arguments about sovereignty, the mariners' burlesque can thus be read not so much as debunking discourses of sovereignty,³²¹ but as a dystopian version of colonial exploitation. As much as the plot clearly refers to political crises of English history, the reference to the theatrical frame by the palpable "role-acting" of the mariners – as "duke" and "vice-roy" – attenuates the evocation of the Civil War and instead emphasizes the colonial nature of their (un)rule. The space of the island here enforces the colonial aspect of the plot through the threat of possible sexual and bodily degeneration and hence suggests a "taming" of the "wild man inside" through the establishment of a political system, as Schille notes: "the obvious colonizers are the sailors".³²² The displacement of such fears and expectations onto the "barren" part of the island allows for an enactment of colonial fantasies while at the same time questioning these fantasies through the chaotic and transgressive nature of their performance.

The colonial aspects of *The Enchanted Island* are further highlighted in presenting the space of the "barren" part as inhabited by Caliban and Sycorax as natives of the island. Just as Trincalo is left alone on the stage he encounters Caliban, immediately recognizable in his subordinate status by carrying "*wood upon his back*" (stage direction II. iii). Trincalo hence quickly comes to realize the – literally – spectacular potential of the native, describing him as a savage-like and monstrous creature:

What have we here, a man, or a fish?
 This is some Monster of the Isle; were I in England,
 As once I was, and had him painted,
 Not a Holy-day fool there would give me
 Six-pence for the sight of him; well, if I could make
 Him tame, he were a present for an Emperour (II. iii, 160 – 165).

Caliban's "savage" nature is thus instantly established, with Trincalo further downgrading Caliban in forcing alcohol down his throat. After having had his first sip and feeling the effects of the brandy, Caliban is presented as readily compliant to Trincalo's wishes: "I'll shew thee every fertile inch i'th' Isle, and kiss thy / foot: I prithee be my God, and let me drink" (II. iii, 185 – 186).³²³ Caliban

321 See Bishop.

322 Schille 281.

323 So instead of marketing him, he merely enslaves the native.

readily anticipates his inferior status as he is presented as a simple and submissive character. The actor no doubt underlined this with an exaggerated performance and, as Fludernik writes: “Dryden and Davenant therefore employ a typically colonial scenario in which the natives naively welcome the European explorers and help them survive only to be later enslaved by means of the very know-how they have first given their guests”.³²⁴ Thus, the unflattering characterisation of the mariners, or Trincalo in this case, is even outdone by the representation of the “savage’s” ignorance: “CALIBAN: did’st thou not drop from Heaven?” (II. iii, 182, to Trincalo). Caliban further promises to “shew thee the best Springs, I’le pluck thee Berries, / I’le fish for thee, and get thee wood enough [...] I prithee let me bring thee where Crabs grow, / And I with my long Nails will dig thee Pig-nuts” (II. iii, 188 – 194). The native hence presents himself as truly indigenous to the space of the island, not only in terms of his knowledge of the space and its flora and fauna, but also in terms of his bodily endowment. This presentation of Caliban, as has been remarked by Fludernik, is very much a re-writing of the native, as Dryden and Davenant portray him with a much stronger “colonial emphasis”³²⁵ than Shakespeare, and also show him as more of a wild brute than he appeared in *The Tempest*.³²⁶ In *The Enchanted Island*, Caliban is pitched against the “noble savage” Hippolito and the part is even, as Dobson claims, “in effect rewritten as a potentially unruly woman by the provision of a sister, Sycorax”.³²⁷ However, this chapter will propose that instead of mainly “rewriting” the native as a woman, a discourse of savagery is enforced: not only by the overt association of the “barren” part with the natives, but also by combining the topos of female licentiousness with the discourse of savagery, thus glossing over the appropriation, commodification and ultimately exploitation of the female native.³²⁸

Trincalo, who has entered the scene “with a great bottle, half drunk” (stage direction II. iii), recognizes the chance to exploit the native instantly and questions Caliban about any “kin in this Island” (II, iii, 199). Caliban himself, caught in his servile mood and hoping for “freedom”³²⁹ from Prospero, immediately obeys and even offers his sister to Trincalo: “Say my King, shall I call her to thee?” (II. iii, 105). Interestingly, Trincalo is the only character called “king” in

324 Fludernik in: Görttschacher / Klein 282.

325 Ibid. 283.

326 Notably, Prospero’s declaration in *The Tempest*: “this thing of darkness I / acknowledge mine” (5.1.274–275) is not taken up in *The Enchanted Island*, indicating a stronger emphasis on his brutish character in the Dryden / Davenant-play.

327 Dobson 100.

328 See Orr 201.

329 In offering his services to Trincalo, Caliban discards Prospero: “Farewel, old Master, farewel, farewel. [...] *Ban, Ban, Cackaliban. / Has a new Master, get a new man. / Heigh-day, Freedom, freedom!*” (II. iii, 210.216).

the play, as the nobles are mere “dukes”, thus Trincalo’s subsequent “dramatic hero’s fall” is ironically increased. The mariner, having just rejected his fellow sailors’ pretensions to rule the island, now tries to obtain power himself by marrying Sycorax and thus establishing a hereditary claim to rule: “Monster, I say thy Sister shall be my Spouse” (II. iii, 223). When he finally meets her, however, Trincalo encounters his future spouse just as Prospero had earlier described her, as a: “freckel’d-hag-born Whelp not honour’d with / A humane shape” (I. ii, 205–206).³³⁰ Caliban before had already hinted at his sister’s “savage” nature: “I left her clambring up a hollow Oak, / And plucking thence the dropping Honey-Combs” (II. iii, 203–204). Just as her brother, Sycorax is thus presented as wilderness itself and hence a character “of the land”, living in and of the space she inhabits and thus physically blending in with the wild part of the island.

This topos of woman-as-land is further advanced by Trincalo who admits that “*Trincalos*, like other wise men, have anciently us’d to marry for / Estate more than for beauty” (III. iii, 8–9). Here, the mariner in a comic key adheres to the spatial aspects of a union with the native, namely the transfer of “estate” through marriage. In some respects, Sycorax and the space she inhabits are thus woven together, her body – the commodity that is being traded in marriage – is represented as part of the land, while the land itself is thus feminized. This feminization of the land is once more an ambivalent representation, as it appears as “both a *poetics* of ambivalence and a *politics* of violence”.³³¹

Sycorax is further portrayed as “a lecherous idiot”,³³² lewd and uncivilized, promising Trincalo a great quantity of offspring: “thou shalt get me twenty *Sycoraxes*; / and I’ll get thee twenty *Calibans*” (III. iii, 41–42). This representation indeed exhibits parallels between woman and native, as Helen Carr distinguishes two formal uses of this analogy: “Firstly, through the explicit metaphor of sexual possession, whether rape, or seduction or marriage. Secondly, more obliquely and metonymically, through the way in which, in the language of colonialism, non-Europeans occupy the same symbolic space as

330 Prospero himself claims Sycorax – the mother – came from “Argiers”. J. Douglas Canfield argues that Sycorax is a composite of Irish, African, and Indian females and hence a composite of “European male wish fulfilment” which is first indulged in and then discarded, *Heroes and States* 141.

331 McClintock 28. For the practice of representing women’s bodies as maps, see also Karen HARVEY: “These descriptions could convey sameness or difference, passivity or activity. The constant, however, was the stress on women’s fertility: whether treacherous places or pleasing vistas, female bodies as landscapes were always potentially productive”, *Reading Sex in the Eighteenth Century: Bodies and Gender in English Erotic Culture* (Cambridge: CUP, 2004) 116.

332 Hutner, *Colonial Women* 53.

women”.³³³ That is, they are represented as part of nature – part of the island in this case –, not of culture, thus giving way to an ambivalent representation, either as childlike, passive and ready to be governed, as Caliban is presented, or as dangerous, sexually aberrant and animal-like, in Sycorax’s case.³³⁴ It thus becomes obvious that mating with the native will not “civilize”, but instead extrapolate the savage pedigree. The woman-as-land has to be tamed as her sexual forwardness is comically throwing Trincalo off his guard: “fair Maids must not be too forward” (III. iii, 50). The ensuing dialogue is also indicative of a substantial amount of stage action, implying Sycorax’s insatiable lust and Trincalo’s self-inflicted debasement: “TRINCALO: [...] for if she be thus/flippant in her Water, what will she be in her Wine?” (III. iii, 56–57). This “wild” performance also once more parallels the action of the “barren” part with the action taking place in Prospero’s habitat, as it establishes a vivid contrast between the unruly native woman and the unruly, yet noble and attractive Hippolito.

Trincalo’s and Sycorax’s wooing phase is then interrupted by the appearance of the other mariners who propose a peace treaty, but Trincalo is adamant in defending his new claim to the island:

To this I answer, that having in the face of the world
Espous’d the lawful Inheritrix of this Island,
Queen Blouze the first, and having homage done me,
By this hectoring Spark her Brother, from these two
I claim a lawful Title to this Island (III. iii, 118–122).

Trincalo’s claim to the island is thus laid in a farcical manner as the scene shows a drunken mariner introducing two equally drunk and moreover “savagely” presented creatures as part of the island’s royalty. Both “coloniser” and “colonized” are here exhibiting the deleterious effects of their contact. Fludernik has observed that Dryden and Davenant trace the results of colonial contact “by outlining how the colonisers corrupt the natives and the natives corrupt the colonisers”.³³⁵ The female native is yet further presented as unpredictable and aberrant in her reaction to the other mariners: “May I not marry that other King and his two subjects/to help you anights?” (III. iii, 154–155, to Trincalo). In presenting her sexuality as boundless, the play picks up on another common

333 Helen CARR, “Woman/Indian: ‘The American’ and His Others”, *Europe and Its Others Vol II: Proceedings of the Essex Conference on the Sociology of Literature*, ed. Francis Barker et al. (Colchester: U of Essex P, 1985) 46–60, 50.

334 As Carr writes: “Either they are ripe for government, passive, child-like, unsophisticated, needing leadership and guidance, described always in terms of lack – no initiative, no intellectual powers, no perseverance; or, on the other hand, they are outside society, dangerous, treacherous, emotional, inconstant, wild, threatening, fickle, sexually aberrant, irrational, near animal, lascivious, disruptive, evil, unpredictable” 50.

335 Fludernik in: Görtschacher/Klein 286.

stereotype of eighteenth-century colonial discourses, the portrayal of native women as sexual predators.³³⁶ This characterization also poses a threat to Trincalo's authority as Sycorax is presented as potential sexual partner for the other mariners.

In the next scene with the mariners (IV. ii), they propose a truce to Trincalo, and Stephano says about Sycorax: "I long to have a Rowse to her Graces health, and to the / *Haunse* in *Kelder*, or rather Haddock in *Kelder*, for I guess it / will be half fish" (IV. ii, 24 – 26). Stephano here addresses anxieties concerning sexual contact with the native woman, a scenario that envisages hybrid and "unnatural" offspring. These fears concerning native sexuality are further enhanced by Trincalo who confides in Stephano that he has caught the siblings engaged in incestuous deeds: "I found her an hour ago under / an Elder-tree, upon a sweet Bed of Nettles, singing Tory, Rory, / and Ranthum, Scantum, with her own natural Brother"³³⁷ (IV. ii, 107 – 109). Again, Trincalo's lines inscribe the natives into the very space of the island as it frames their actions directly with the flora of the island: "under an Elder-tree, upon a sweet Bed of Nettles". These explicit actions: "STEPHANO: O Jew! make love in her own Tribe?" (IV. ii, 110), are, however, not detaining Stephano from further pursuing Sycorax: "STEPHANO: wilt thou / leave him, and thou shalt be my Princess?" (IV. ii, 132 – 133). The mariner thus proves to have gone native as not even the alleged incestuous relationship of Sycorax and Caliban can prevent him from further pursuing the native woman whose character is here presented as framed by an axis of desire for her land and a loathing of her sexuality.

The ensuing argument amongst the mariners nevertheless puts a stop to Stephano's pursuit of the native woman. They start fighting, exit the scene and are only "driven on" again by Ariel in the ultimate scene of the play (stage direction V. ii). The mariners are reunited with the nobles, their superiors, and present themselves as instantly repentant, renouncing their own claims to rule: "TRINCALO: What, more Dukes yet, I must resign my Dukedom, / But 'tis no matter, I was almost starv'd in't" (V. ii, 205 – 206). In leaving the "barren" part the mariners also abandon their transgressive behaviour and additionally downgrade the island in pointing out its lack of provisions: "Here's nothing but wild Sallads without Oyl or vinegar" (V. ii, 207). The would-be-colonialists finally acknowledge the lack of refinery and civilization on the island and their formerly pronounced appreciation of the "empty" space of the island turns into a real-

336 See Felicity A. NUSSBAUM, *The Brink of All We Hate: English Satires on Women 1660–1750* (Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1984).

337 In act IV, when the sisters quarrel after Ferdinand has injured Hippolito, Miranda and Dorinda say: "MIRANDA: Sister, I'll never sleep with you agen. DORINDA: I'll never more meet in a Bed with you" (IV. iii, 251 f). This dialogue could thus be read as a brief reflection of the incestuous actions in the barren part.

ization of its bareness and to a re-establishment of their class positions and a voyage back to their “home”-land.

Caliban has also reassessed his situation and realizes that the mariners are “Drunkards” (V. ii, 232), but Sycorax seems to be loyal to her promises and begs Trincalo to take her with him: “T’le to Sea with thee, and keep thee warm in thy Cabin” (V. ii, 250). Trincalo meets this proposal with bitter, but for the audience humorous, irony: “No my dainty Dy-dapper, you have a tender constitu- / tion, and will be sick a Ship-board. You are partly Fish and may / swim after me. I wish you a good Voyage” (V. ii, 251 – 253). Ultimately, the wild native woman is thus rejected and once more bound to the land that she inhabits.³³⁸ The anxieties she has aroused are thus safely – spatially – suppressed within the fiction of the play, while they are also contained within the theatrical frame of the performance: the play ends within the next 13 lines and Prospero, in the last line, rhetorically pulls the curtain on the play: “and ever flourish the *Enchanted Isle*” (V. ii, 266). Sycorax is safely left on the island, whose past and future are never envisaged in the play. Finally, patriarchal authority has reinstalled itself over the discarded body of the native woman.

Locus and action of *The Enchanted Island* are, as we have seen, in many and intricate ways intertwined. Initiated by shipwreck, the maritime disaster *per se*, the play’s action is fuelled by the characters’ drive to and from the restrictions as well as possibilities offered by the maritime setting of the island. In visually presenting a “wild” and foreign space, peopled by “innocent” youths and brutish “savages” and explored by errant sailors, the play offers a scenario that depicts the fantasies and fears of colonial expansion.

The depiction of the maritime space and its characters gives rise to encounters that control as well as challenge aspects of sovereignty, gender, age, class and race. Notably the woman-as-land metaphor – associating the native woman with the colonial island-setting – provides a touchstone in discursively negotiating issues of cultural identity. The staging of the unruliness and wildness of the island is thus crucial in performatively stabilizing and reinstating male dominance and class distinctions.³³⁹ However, the play also stages representational slippages to a high degree, not only through the portrayal of transgressive behaviour, but also through the continuous questioning of the character’s identities. Allocations of authority as well as allocations of gender are regularly undermined. Even though the play ends with the restoration of patriarchal order, the continuous slippages in representation are indicative of an underlying host

338 In referring to *The Tempest* and *The Life and Astonishing Adventures of John Daniel*, Weaver-Hightower suggests that the leaving-behind of the “monster” perhaps prefigures “the colonial use of the island as prison (like Robbin Island, Van Dieman’s Land, Norfolk Island, and Alcatraz) for the worst transgressors of empire” 158.

339 See Miner in: Dudley/Novak.

of colonial phobias, of “resemblance” as well as “menace”.³⁴⁰ As Hutner relates concerning the problematic enactment of native women: “the impossibility of playing the other woman without slippage, without irony, without oscillation of identity, reflects and reproduces a whole host of social fears about interracial contact, empire building, slavery, and the mistreatment of Native American and African peoples”.³⁴¹ Moreover, this slippage crucially complicates categories of gender and race as the representation of the colonial subject is reproduced as ambivalent and it therefore only ever appears as partial: “incomplete” and “virtual”.³⁴²

Incessantly referring to the theatrical frame is a further feature that unsettles the play’s enactments, destabilizing the representations on stage. Although the characters’ gestures to the theatrical frame function as a reminder of the safety and legitimacy of the stage’s performance – through tagging the play as fictional as well as under royal protection – these gestures at the same time underline the extent to which the play was intrinsically embedded in contemporary English society and thus suggest ambiguities within this community. In this respect Richter states that the long-lasting success of *The Enchanted Island* and its equivocal presentation of a sovereign might testify to the audience’s “mixed feelings” towards their King.³⁴³

The colonial enterprise itself also appears as ambivalent and, as Fludernik has it, “not worth the trouble”.³⁴⁴ The characters are presented as ultimately being only too willing to leave the island which has not yielded anything worth taking but only presented “trouble” to them, an aspect that underscores the play’s latent criticism of the colonial project.

340 See Bhabha, “Of Mimicry and Man”, *The Location of Culture* 127.

341 Hutner, *Colonial Women* 17.

342 See Bhabha, “Of Mimicry and Man”, *The Location of Culture* 123.

343 “Die Restaurationsfassung von *The Tempest*, die den Neubeginn der Dynastie feiern will, verweist somit schon auf ihr Ende. Der langanhaltende Erfolg der Fassung zeugt vielleicht davon, daß gerade die mehrdeutige, alles andere als glanzvolle Herrscherfigur die ‘gemischten Gefühle’ des Publikums gegenüber dem König recht gut traf“, Richter in: Lüdeke/Richter 197.

344 Fludernik in: Görttschacher/Klein 283.

2.3 A *Common-Wealth of Women*: From Covent Garden to “Happy Island”

2.3.1 Voyage, Shipwreck and Utopia

In November 1685, at the time *A Common-Wealth of Women* was licensed, the audience’s “mixed feelings” towards their monarch had indeed increased. With the turmoil of the Exclusion Crisis (1683) not long past and the Monmouth Rebellion following the death of Charles II just over, James II’s authority was severely afflicted. It therefore comes as no surprise that Tory playwrights fortified their efforts in dramatizing the importance of harmony and patriarchal figures.³⁴⁵ Plays depicting shipwreck-scenes also still enjoyed great popularity. And with *A Common-Wealth of Women* playwright Thomas D’Urfey put forward yet another play on the *Tempest*-theme, containing a shipwreck-scene and dramatizing issues of order and authority. D’Urfey’s play is a close adaptation of John Fletcher and Philip Massinger’s late Jacobean *The Sea Voyage* (1622), which was itself highly influenced by *The Tempest* as well as real-life shipwreck-accounts. *A Common-Wealth of Women* is a five-act comedy and, as Robert D. Hume remarks with disdain, D’Urfey attempts “to sniff out popular taste”,³⁴⁶ combining farce and foolery to a romantic plot. Unfortunately we cannot be too sure about the play’s initial reception. *The London Stage* gives just one date of performance,³⁴⁷ but concerning the frequency of performances *The London Stage* is no reliable source. However, we know with certainty that the play was revived at the beginning of the eighteenth century proper, in 1702, 1707, 1708 and 1710, so considering the popularity of other shipwreck-plays we can assume that the play was fairly successful and, additionally, was being circulated in print.

Generically, as Orr points out, the play exhibits “an odd mélange, drawing on intrigue comedy as well as the voyage and utopian traditions deployed by *The Tempest*”,³⁴⁸ putting forward a satiric portrayal of gendered and colonial identities and – ultimately – emphasizing the importance of a patriarchal figure. In contrast to the other plays under discussion in this chapter, and also digressing from *The Sea Voyage*, the play does not open with a shipwreck-scene or with an island-setting, but instead confronts the audience with a highly familiar space: Covent Garden. Aminta and Captain Marine are conducting a secret rendezvous, with Aminta telling her lover the string of events that brought her to this place.

345 See Owen, *Restoration Theatre and Crisis*, and John M. WALLACE, “Otway’s Caius Marius and the Exclusion Crisis”, *Modern Philology* 85.4 (1988): 363–372.

346 Robert D. HUME, *The Development of English Drama in the Late Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976) 370.

347 The 16th of November 1685, the date of the premiere.

348 Orr 201.

She is the daughter of Don Sebastian, a noble Portuguese and “Governour of several large Plantations in the Happy Islands [...] so rich that he might vie with Princes” (I. i, 2).³⁴⁹ However, their peaceful colonial existence was disturbed by the arrival of a gang of French pirates. Trying to save the family treasure, Don Sebastian and his son Nicusa took off with the family’s fortune and, out of revenge, the female members of the family are captured by the pirates and – sparing Aminta herself – left on a desert island. La Mure, head of the pirates, brought Aminta to London and now keeps her in strict confinement at his side. In being promised Aminta’s hand in marriage as well as – possibly – a great fortune if he finds her family, Marine then abducts the girl from La Mure and, taking off with his Lieutenant Du Pier and Boldsprite, the ship’s Master, they head out to sea. The group are additionally accompanied by “Three wild Fellows of the Town, that Ramble to Sea, and desert their Wives” (*Dramatis Personae*). At sea they encounter a tempest, which forces them to land on a desert island.

Upon arrival they are met by what they first fear to be “wandering shadows” (II. ii, 17 Marine): Sebastian and Nicusa, who have so far endured a miserable and wretched life on the barren island. Unrecognized, they impart to the ship’s company their miserable fate and, showing them their gold and jewels, warn the fresh arrivals not to fight over it, as their former “Negro-Slaves”³⁵⁰ (II. ii, 19) tried to run away with the treasure, but ended up shipwrecked and dead. Soon, however, the two Portuguese men realize that their warnings have been spoken in vain and decide to make a surreptitious escape with the English ship. Thus, the English find themselves alone and increasingly starved on the desert island. Marine subsequently sets out to get help and establish whether the “noise of Hunters” (II. ii, 18) Nicusa had claimed to have heard over a rocky boundary in another part of the island had come from human settlers in the other area. In reaching the other part of the island, Marine discovers an Amazonian commonwealth set in a pastoral setting on the “beautiful” part of the island. The women have vowed to never engage with men and instead rule by themselves, but their already budding dissent with this arrangement increases once they set eyes on the new arrival. Marine’s promise to take them to the other part where more men are waiting sets a small revolt in motion, at the end of which the Protectress Roselia gives in and promises each woman a man, to be kept a month. The match-making, however, is complicated by the fact that Clarinda, Roselia’s eldest daughter, falls in love with Marine and just as she is being informed that

349 All quotes from *A Common-Wealth of Women* are from the first London edition: Thomas D’URFHEY, *A Common-Wealth of Women* (London: Printed for R. Bentley and J. Hindmarsh, 1686), quotes are given with act and a scene-number – where given – and page-number of the edition.

350 NB: Through the premature disappearance of the so-called negro slaves the play is purged of all natives.

Marine is already promised to Aminta, the Amazons spot the treasure and, realizing it to be their lost family-gold, imprison the English. Meanwhile, La Mure has tracked down Sebastian and Nicusa and has arrived on the island to reclaim Aminta; confronted with the pirate, the Portuguese family comes to realize one another’s identities and the wronged Englishmen are set free. The play thus ends with a restoration of patriarchal authority: “ROSELIA: For times are alter’d now, so is the Government, / Whilst my *Sebastian* lives: ‘Tis he must rule it” (V. ii, 55) as well as the official sanctioning of Marine’s and Aminta’s marriage: “MARINE: And I all joys that Crown a happy life, / Possessing my *Aminta* for my Wife” (V. ii, 55).

As this brief summary shows, similar to *The Enchanted Island’s* setting, *A Common-Wealth of Women* depicts the space of an island divided in a “barren” and “beautiful” part. Both parts are gendered as they are not only each inhabited by just one gender, but their spatial representation is, moreover, associated with male and female attributes respectively. The locus of the island – the alluded to “Happy Islands” in Aminta’s tale and the visually depicted island – is staged as an imaginative reservoir for dramatizing the facets of colonial expansion: dreams of fortune, images of a New World, the reversal of gender order, dangers of destructive greed and sexual plenty. *A Common-Wealth of Women* represents four different spaces: London, the sea, the barren island and the beautiful part, each space representing a setting for enactments of different levels of colonial expectations and anxieties. However, as the plot stages a sea voyage from London to the literal “Happy Island”, each space is also presented as interpenetrating the subsequent locus and so, ultimately, serves as to correct the characters’ errant ways as well as being a dramatic reminder of the potential gains and losses at stake.³⁵¹

Thus, D’Urfey’s play attaches various functions to the differing maritime settings. On the one hand, the play has a quasi-subversive function in that it presents colonial anxieties like the fear of material losses, bodily harm, fears of wildness as well as going native, fears that are conveyed through the dystopian and utopian set-ups on both island-spaces. On the other hand, the play has a complicit function in that it solves these anxieties through emphasizing patriarchy and sanctioning heteronormative sexuality.³⁵² Ultimately, the dystopian

351 On voyaging as a “teaching effort”, see Birkle / Waller: “Traveling meant in the Middle Ages and far into the Baroque not just moving from one spot to another, with adventures galore, but was part of a teaching effort. These were exemplary ethical journeys that led to damnation or salvation. Space is thus not just a physical, natural ‘real’ phenomenon but becomes also psychological; it forms an intrinsic part of a foreign world and is part of theologically defined ethical structures” 83 f.

352 “Heteronormativity” refers to the normative power of heterosexuality in society and politics, as Samuel A. CHAMBERS and Terrell CARVER write: “Heteronormativity constructs

representations of the performance are thus dissolved and integrated into a utopian “happy island/happy end”.

In dividing the analysis into three parts, this chapter aims to structurally separate the different spaces of the play and extract the dominant dramaturgical and functional characteristics of each depicted space, trying to emphasize the interrelatedness of each locus, and therefore showing how the dramatization of such maritime spaces promotes aspects of English colonial endeavours.

2.3.2 Leaving London for the Sea: Colonial Ambitions

The scenes of the first act, set in London, all suggest transitional characteristics. The individual scenes are divided between a scene set in “Covent-Garden” and the inside of a tavern, yet in all scenes the actions and dialogues centre on the characters’ impending escape by sea. In various ways, the characters voice their individual desires and expectations for their maritime flight which, especially for the three town “blades”, results in a satirical presentation of the colonial wayfarers. In voicing their colonial fantasies, the characters anticipate colonial spaces while at the same time also characterize metropolitan attitudes towards colonial flight with the display of their greed and misogyny.

Aminta, in relating her life-story to Marine, paints a picture of colonial success, fortune and harmony: “I told you that *Don Sebastian* was my Father. A gene- / rous *Portuguese*; of Noble House, and Nature, and Governour of / several large Plantations in the Happy Islands; his Industry and Care / made him so rich, that he might vie with Princes; so stor’d he was / with Friends and Gifts of Fortune” (I. i, 2). However, her joyful life on the “Happy Islands” is eventually shattered by foreign pirates and male egoism: “My Father, in his distress, willing to save his Treasure, with / the help of my Brother, and a Party of Negro Slaves, secretly Con- / vey’d his Plate, Money, and Jewels into a small Vessel, and put to Sea, / with design- to return, when they were gone, and comfort us with / his Fortune and Policy” (I. i, 2).

Here, the French are negatively portrayed as the foremost evil freebooters of

not only the natural domain of heterosexual practices and relations, but also the attendant realm of denigrated or despised sexualities, relationship forms and identities – particularly homosexuality and other putative threats to ‘the family’, *Judith Butler and Political Theory: Troubling Politics* (London and New York: Routledge, 2008) 121. The concept was initially developed in BUTLER, *Gender Trouble*. See also Judith BUTLER, *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of ‘Sex’* (New York: Routledge, 1993), Michel FOUCAULT, *The History of Sexuality Vol.1: An Introduction*, 1976, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Vintage Books), David T. EVANS, *Sexual Citizenship: The Material Construction of Sexualities* (London: Routledge, 1993) and Anne FAUSTO-STERLING, *Sexing the Body: Gender Politicized and the Construction of Sexuality* (New York: Basic Books, 2000).

the sea, yet the Portuguese woman’s description is also ambivalent as the Portuguese men have acted irresponsibly and left their female relatives to be punished in their place: “AMINTA: [...] for the loss of my Father’s Treasure, he [La Mure] leaves / my sighing Mother and a little Sister alone and comfortless upon a / wild and barren Island” (I. i, 2). The English captain thus appoints himself to make amends and free Aminta from her French captivity: “I have a Ship lies ready in the Port, / Laden and fit to sail, the wind stands fair too, / In her P’le place my Love, and free her from / The hated bondage of her Cursed Jaylor” (I. i, 3). In proposing to liberate Aminta, Marine circumscribes the woman as a commodity he can “place” as cargo within his vessel. He further goes on to suggest the space of the sea as a haven of liberty, thus expressing a fondness for roaming the sea that is a generic marker for maritime characters: “Rather endure a Storm in all its frights and dangers, than / live to be enslav’d to Villany” (I. i, 3). This inclination to maritime endeavours is further developed in the next scene, when Marine, meeting up with his lieutenant and ship’s master, delineates his plan for the sea voyage.

Du Pier, his aptly named lieutenant, is presented as a quintessential mariner as his inclination for life at sea is shown as corresponding to his contempt for life on land and the place of the town: “Pox / o’ this Dirty part of the World, a Man only fowls his Lianen / here, and draws Air amongst a rout of Rebels – I am clearly for / the Watry Element: And had rather Converse with *Dolphins, Whales / and Porpices*, than our Natives” (I. i, 4). His boisterous behaviour is also indicative of his “watry” inclinations, rendering him unfit for a prolonged stay on dry land. However, as much as the sea is here constructed as a social alternative to a corrupted life at land, the consequent conjunction with “business” draws attention to the less than charitable nature of their adventure:

MARINE: Ha, ha, ha. But hark you, Lieutenant, a word with thee; I must require thy assistance in a business tonight.

DU PIER: Require – Command, dear Captain! Pox of requirings and requests – your Ear – is there a Man or a Woman in the Case?

MARINE: A Woman, *Du Pier!* an angel-Woman! a Fortune too, and Young as the Rose-bud – beautiful as the Blushing Morning; and as willing as my self (I. i, 4).

This evaluation of Aminta as cargo, both in reference to her body *and* her financial assets, is further established in the scene as Marine refers to her as “my fair Prize” (I. i, 5) and joyfully exclaims: “This Fortune-stealing is a blessed business, is it not?” (I. I, 5). These repeated descriptions of Aminta as a commodity, a “fair prize” and “fortune”, on the one hand, endorse what Claude Lévi-Strauss has described as the production of women as objects of exchange and

property,³⁵³ while on the other hand, the woman's objectification offers a rationale and strategy for reclaiming lost male authority over the woman.³⁵⁴ As Barry Reay has noted for early modern England: "Women were objects possessed, legally or illegally, by men. It is significant, that 'commodity' was a common word for women's genitals, that 'tenure' was used to indicate sexual possession, and that adultery and rape were considered theft".³⁵⁵ Marine's representation of Aminta as "prize" and his willingness to engage in the "business" of rescuing her in this context appear as not only sexually motivated but also as motivated by economic aspects, thus linking the Captain's voyage unswervingly to aspects of expansion.

Apart from Marine's orders, the ship's crew further rejoices at Du Pier's proposal to take "three or four young Blades" (I. i, 5) with them. Apparently married to "ill Wives" (I. i, 5) these men are equally desirous of taking the sea as an escape-route from town. In accepting these passengers, Marine thus invites representatives of the town that subsequently prove to be complete opposites of the mariners' own "manly" selves and serve not only to comically contrast with the mariners, but also to represent the space of the town, the "town-breed", on ship.³⁵⁶

Franville, Frugal and Hazard, the three tellingly named town "blades", are first presented in a tavern, plotting and fantasizing about their colonial enterprise. Their representation is highly ironic and reminiscent of the mariners' scenes in *The Enchanted Island*. Like in the Dryden/Davenant-play, the audience witnesses the plotting of a small-scale political utopia projected onto the New World:

FRANVILLE: Let's hear the Oath once more. Come, *Frugal* – my Merchant Royal; thou shalt be Speaker. Silence.

FRUGAL: First we have sworn to take a Ramble to Sea for three years, and during that Term, we have oblig'd our selves never to converse with our Wives, kiss our Wives, nor remember our Wives.

353 See Claude LÉVI-STRAUSS, *The Elementary Structures of Kinship*, 1949, trans. James Harle Bell, John Richard von Sturmer and Rodney Needham (Boston: Beacon Press, 1969) 480 f and Lévi-Strauss, *Structural Anthropology*, 1958, trans. Claire Jacobson and Brooke Grundfest Schoepf (New York: Doubleday, 1967) 60–63.

354 See in a different context, Laura J. Rosenthal, *Playwrights and Plagiarists in Early Modern England* (Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1996) 203. Rosenthal also draws attention to the fact that such objectifications of the female body in drama work both on stage and implicitly in the audience.

355 Barry REAY, *Popular Cultures in England 1150–1750* (London and New York: Longman, 1998) 20. See also Jacqueline EALES, *Women in Early Modern England, 1500–1700* (London: UCL Press, 1998).

356 "Do – if they are of the Town-breed, they may prove very / good Diversion for us" (Marine I, i, 5).

FRANVILLE: No, nor Children, but let them stay at home, keep Lent,
and chew the Cud (I. i, 6).

The three townspeople here reveal a substantial level of male irresponsibility in discarding their wives and children, but their dialogue also presents them as comic versions of colonial adventurers as their motivations for “rambling” the Sea make obvious. Franville is thus presented as a modish fop, as his wife “grudges/ me my Dress, and Garniture [...] But I’ll be reveng’d for her, for I have/ prepar’d a Wardrobe, that shall outshine the Sun in the new World, / where we are going” (I. i, 6), Frugal is a greedy usurer, eager to “seek some other / Countrey; where I will live, grow rich, and plant a Colony” (I. i, 7), and Hazard is shown to be a misogynist gambler: “I hate a Woman heartily. [...] If I can but draw ‘em in [his bale of dice] to play in the new World, where / we are going – I am made for ever. Well, Fortune for me, there/lyes all my hopes” (I. i, 7). In thus disclosing the characters’ fantasies, their colonial ambitions are being ironically criticized. The repeatedly evoked New World appears as a space for deviance and greed, while the planned escape of the townspeople further mirrors the irresponsible flight of Sebastian and Nicusa. The New World, however, still appears as a utopia of sorts, as an “empty” space in many respects, where colonies can be readily “planted” and fortunes and freedom are awaiting.

2.3.3 The New World as “barren Island”

The first act closes with Du Pier’s line: “I think the Coast is clear” (I, ii, 10), a remark that is immediately countered by the beginning of the next act: “A *Tempestuous Sea. Thunder and Lightning*” (II, i, scene). This visual and aural display of the disparity between town and sea serves to performatively separate the spaces, but it also establishes the sea as a risky and unpredictable space. Though the sea as a space has hitherto been evoked as a route to freedom by the characters, the “tempestuous sea” presented here defies appropriation, and the tempest is shown as destroying the very objects that were meant to be easing success in the New World.

BOLDSprite: Throw out the Lading, it must all over-board.

BOATSWAIN: It clears to Sea ward, Master: Heave out there: Let’s lighten her! all the Meat and the Cakes. We are all gone else. That we may find her Leaks, and hold her up.

FRUGAL: Must my goods over, too? Kind, honest Master:

Why, here lies all my Money – the Money I have rak’d by

Usury,

Usury, to buy new Lands and Mannors in new Countreys. – I have been these 20 years a raising.

DU PIER: Over with it.

[...]

FRANVILLE: Will you throw away my Lordship, that I sold, to buy me a fine Wardrobe – For pity’s sake, be favourable to my fine Wardrobe,

DU PIER: Over with it – I love to see a Lordship sink. My Friend, you left no Wood upon’t, to buoy it up, you might have sav’d it else.

HAZARD: For my part, I have nothing of weight, but my Prayer-Book: And that, I am resolv’d, shall not burden the Ship. There ‘tis – (II. i, 13).

This passage is worth quoting at length as it shows how the maritime disaster reveals the motives behind the sea voyage; the three town “blades” not only “confess” their criminal deeds, show themselves as ignorant and in many ways unfit for such a journey, but also as only assuming a fake piety. Their dishonourable motives are further contrasted with the honesty and fearlessness of the mariners, who do not care about worldly possessions or authority – that includes spiritual authority, as they superstitiously “stow” away the chaplain below deck - but instead work hard to get everyone safe on land.

However, the tempest and subsequent shipwreck prove to have only presaged the hardships awaiting the crew on land. The scene changes to “a Barren Island”, exhibiting two “savagely drest” (II. ii, 13) men, Sebastian and Nicusa, who then recount their miseries, giving a grim account of the place:

SEBASTIAN: Sad indeed: where nothing is but Rocks and Barrenness,
Hunger and Cold – Here’s no Vineyards
To cheer the Heart of Man: Nor Chrystal Rivers,
After his Labour, to refresh his Body;
If he be Feeble, nothing to restore him,
But Heav’nly Hopes: Nature, that made those Remedies,
Dares not come here, nor look on our Distresses,
For fear she turn Wild, like the place, and Barren (II. ii, 14).

This account of the barren island is suggestive of Mustapho’s summary of his island-experiences in *The Enchanted Island*, where he exclaimed: “Here’s nothing but wild Sallads without Oyl or vinegar” (V. ii, 207), as it also addresses the perceived lack of “culture” within the space. Sebastian recounts how “civilization” (“no Vineyards”) is missing on the island, but interestingly he further claims that “nature” is missing as well: “Nature [...] dares not come here”. His account genders the island-space as he refers to Nature as “she” and also draws attention to the literal and metaphorical “bareness” of the space, but it also provides a view of nature that sees “her” in danger of “turning wild”, “like the place”. This fear is remarkable as it frames nature thus as *not* wild, or *not* native, but as potentially corruptible through the “barren” space the two men inhabit.

The castaways’ hopes for relief and rescue are sustained by their spotting of “The Arms of England”, watching brave Marine rescuing Aminta from the sea

and finally approaching their island. The hopes for an "arrival" of civilization are, however, soon dashed as upon arrival the townspeople engage the ship's crew in an argument over the lost money and clothes, upon which Du Pier offers to draw and only Aminta manages to calm the row between the men. Aminta's performance as arbitrator thus reflects Sebastian's gendered account of the island, as it is Aminta as woman who calms the dispute amongst the men. The performance of the townspeople, however, counters the hope for "civilized" behaviour as their overt performance as town fops, with their love of luxury and effeminacy, indeed proves to parallel, not refine, the "wildness" of the island.

The subsequent encounter of the "savagely drest" islanders with the shipwrecked characters is first enacted like a stereotypical encounter between colonisers and natives, drawing on the confusion on the mariners' part: "MARINE: Ha! in the name of wonder, what have we here? / Are they humane Creatures? DU PIER: I have heard of Sea-Calves. [...] SEBASTIAN: We are Men as you are, onely our Miseries make us seem / Monsters" (II. ii, 17). However, the dichotomy which is being drawn in this dialogue, between the ship's crew and the apparent "sea calves" or "monsters" on the island, is in the following shattered and even reverted to an extent, as the barren island as a space indeed provokes the new arrivals to go native themselves.

Sebastian and Nicusa relate their miserable fate in due course and, begging for the English to rescue them, offer their golden treasure as compensation: "SEBASTIAN: Look you, that plough the Sea, for wealth and pleasure, / That out-run Day and Night with your Ambitions: / Look on those heaps, remove 'em, view 'em fully" (II. ii, 19). The townspeople thus apprehend the "heaps" of treasure they were looking for in the New World right before them and so – despite the explicit warning from the Portuguese men – they are overwhelmed by greed and start quarreling with the ship's crew once more. Sebastian and Nicusa use the opportunity of this distraction and take off with the ship, leaving the crew facing the prospect of starvation on the barren island. Without means of escape, the castaways are thus themselves left on the island as the spatial characteristics of the island, its "wildness" and "bareness", have in a way "rubbed off" and compelled them to go native. Additionally, the greed and lust for the treasure can thus be read as causing the dispute amongst the crew, and as wealth and fortune have before been presented as ultimate goals of colonial endeavours, the valence of colonial ambitions per se is symbolically debunked as, literally, one cannot eat gold.

This aspect is further developed when Marine eventually leaves the barren part to look out for help and the three "blades" along with the ship's surgeon – now unsupervised – represent an ultimate instance of going native in their attempt to slaughter and eat Aminta: "HAZARD: she's young and tidy – on my Consci-/ence she'll eat delicately, just like young Pork; a little leaner:

your/Opinion, Surgeon?” (III. ii, 33). This scene displays quite explicitly the objectification of the woman as well as reinforces the representational split of the island in gendered spaces. The “male” attributes of the island are enhanced in presenting Aminta in mortal danger and as unable to defend herself against the “rough” and “wild” characteristics of the island.³⁵⁷ The “rhetoric of violence”³⁵⁸ played out against Aminta’s body defines her as object and thus fortifies the social construction of gender as it also fixes the men as “wild” aggressors.

Furthermore, the proposed cannibalism evokes very explicitly the spectre of the wild man within, showing the townspeople as – almost – fatalistically having gone native and thus performing a crucial set of fears and anxieties concerning colonialism.³⁵⁹ In dramaturgically combining the barren island with the performance of colonial anxieties, the colonial project itself is thus challenged. Or, as Hutner suggests, singling out the representation of the townspeople, D’Urfey – like Fletcher in *The Sea Voyage* – here insinuates that greed, featuring as the “unlawful desire of the grasping middle-class”, drives Englishmen to go native.³⁶⁰ Important to note, however, is that materialism itself is not at all denigrated. Not only are the mariners also presented as striving for “fortune” across the sea (act I), but the final scene of the play eventually establishes a literally “golden” New World as not only achievable, but frames it as a happy ending. Hence, historically in a phase of early colonialism, material motivations are shown as key driving forces in maritime endeavours, while these motivations are at the same time disciplined in presenting their downside as dangerously close to “civilization’s” worst fears.

The sea-setting, as well as the gendered space of the island, hence put forward a very ambivalent outlook on colonial endeavours. The townspeople’s greed, their irresponsibility as husbands and fathers as well as their general misogyny, culminating in the near devouring of the only woman left in the barren island, are presented as ultimately corrupting maritime enterprises.

357 See Jean I. Marsden for a discussion of attempted rape in drama, enactments that also – as she argues – split gender into extremes of male activity and female passivity: Jean I. MARSDEN, *Fatal Desire: Women, Sexuality, and the English Stage 1660–1720* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2006) 39–60.

358 See Teresa DE LAURETIS, *Technologies of Gender: Essays on Theory, Film, and Fiction* (Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1987) 45.

359 See Weaver-Hightower 91–128 for an examination of cannibalism in island-narratives, see also Francis BARKER, Peter HULME and Margaret IVERSEN eds., *Cannibalism and the Colonial World, Cultural Margins* (Cambridge: CUP, 1998) 1–39 for an overview of the range of fears attached to cannibalism within colonial discourses.

360 Hutner, *Colonial Women* 61.

2.3.4 Role Reversals: Amazonian Commonwealth

The hazards of the barren part of the island are, however, contrasted by the first scene set in the “grotto”, which takes place between Marine leaving the barren part and the “cannibal”-scene with the townspeople.

Scene draws off, and discovers a Grotto, and Rosy Bower, plac'd in the midst of a pleasant Country. And Roselia seated high, with Clarinda, Hippolita, Julietta, Menalippe, Aglaura, Ariadne, Clito, and other Ladies, all drest in Amazonian habits, plac'd about her (III. ii, 22).

The way the scene is described once more presents the island as a highly gendered space; not only is the grotto inhabited only by female characters, the landscape is furthermore presented as “pleasant”, with the “rosy bower” indicating that the grotto – in contrast to the barren part – combines both “culture” and “nature”. The island thus emerges as a split place, divided by boundaries that – in Anne McClintock’s terms – are “ritualistically feminized” in the process of discovery.³⁶¹ Significantly, the island-space is also presented in terms of a Western/European aesthetic which frames the space and thus also renders the space controllable in Said’s sense as it is made to look like a stage.³⁶² The grotto-setting thus vividly highlights how space is a form of representation as it evokes a “cultural repertoire”³⁶³ that serves to dramatize distance as well as proximity. The presentation of the scene also contrasts starkly with the barren part as the “pleasant” and idyllic landscape at first glance indicates a peaceful and resourceful habitat. Evidently, “nature” did not absent itself from this part of the island, which is also peopled with singing women, suggesting a peaceful ethos.

The pastoral scenery, however, is flawed as the women sitting in the grotto are “drest in Amazonian Habits”,³⁶⁴ signalling that the apparent serenity of the setting is illusive as it is ruptured by the representation of martial women. Further, the lyrics to the song the women chant convey quite another sense of “lack” that is prevalent in the grotto:

2.
Here are no false Men pursuing
Youth or Beauty to its Ruine
Murmuring sighs, like Turtles Cooing;
Nor the bitter Sweets of Wooing.

³⁶¹ See McClintock 24.

³⁶² See Said, *Orientalism* 63.

³⁶³ Ibid. 63.

³⁶⁴ An Amazonian regime being essentially a regime run by women. According to John Harold Wilson the “Amazonian habit” probably consisted of helmets and knee-length tunics, thus undoubtedly “a sight to behold” for the audience, as Wilson coyly suggests, see John Harold Wilson 102.

Liberty's the Soul of Living,
Liberty's the Soul of Living.

[...]

4.
But how vain are Hopes or Sorrows,
Pensive Nights, or sighing Morrows
Love's a prey, not destin'd for us.
All our Quivers want their Arrows.
There's no Liberty like Loving,
There's no Liberty like Loving (III. ii, 23).

The setting thus presents a “bitter sweet” utopia as the lushness of the grotto and the “liberty” to enjoy the space is pervaded with “vain hopes” for love. The women’s abstinent life is self-inflicted and holds the promise of – emotional as well as bodily – liberty, but at the same time it is sexually and emotionally frustrating as “true” liberty for women can only be achieved in “loving”. The grotto, as well as the women representing the space, is thus shown as defying the apparent idyll that is set up initially, and in living abstinely and autonomously the Amazons embody a sexual inversion that further characterizes the “female” space of the island.³⁶⁵ In her study on Amazons, Julie Wheelwright writes: “Sexual inversion as a widespread form of cultural play in literature, in art, and in festivity has served to disrupt and ultimately to clarify often fluid or evolving concepts of sexual difference”.³⁶⁶ In gendering the island-spaces and staging a commonwealth of women, the play thus ultimately puts forward a clarification of the gender-roles in playing out their reversals.

Even though the grotto, at first sight, has been presented as an idyllic place, promising relief for the starving Marine and a peaceful contrast to the quarrelling townspeople on the barren part – “a garden rather than a jungle”³⁶⁷ – the Arcadian image is further spoiled by Roselia’s accusatory declamation:

They say that Women are not fit to govern,
Betray their weakness, and their want of knowledge:
For what Perfection is there in the Male,
That is not in the Female: Grant, their Composure stronger,

365 As “Amazon” worked as a negative characterization of women, see Ina SCHABERT, *Englische Literaturgeschichte: Eine neue Darstellung aus der Sicht der Geschlechterforschung* (Stuttgart: Alfred Kröner Verlag, 1997) 235–246.

366 Julie WHEELWRIGHT, *Amazons and Military Maids: Women Who Dressed as Men in the Pursuit of Life, Liberty and Happiness* (London: Pandora Press, 1989) 7. For a study of the cultural history of Amazons, see Page DuBois, *Centaur and Amazons: Women and the Pre-History of the Great Chain of Being* (Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1982).

367 Hutner, *Colonial Women* 62.

Their Bodies Courser, and more fit for Wars,
 [...]

I cannot yet Conceive, why this shou'd bind us
 To be their Slaves; our Souls are Male as theirs;
 [...]

I say, altho' we have not
 Challeng'd a Sovereignty in Arts and Arms;
 And writ our selves Imperial, hath bin
 Mens Tyranny, and our Modesty – not defects,
 Or want of judgment: Blest then be the hour
 That threw me in on this Shore, inhabited by Warlike Women,
 That keep me in Subjection: And by them, chosen to rule:
 Where, since I lost Sebastian, and Nicusa;
 My Husband and dear Son, by those French Pyrates;
 All others of their sex have met my hate (III. ii, 23 – 24).

The arguments put forward in this long speech of 19 lines are intended to strengthen and sustain the commonwealth of women, questioning male domination and suggesting that women are indeed also “fit to govern”. However, Roselia’s proto-feminist arguments interestingly reinscribe gendered conventions that frame women as “modest” and emotional. Notably, towards the end of her speech Roselia reverts to her own life-story and frames her deviance as head of an all-female commonwealth with a reference to her personal betrayal by “French Pyrates”. The speech not only rhetorically defends female “characteristics”, but also conveys these same characteristics, as the commonwealth is apparently held together only through Roselia’s personal grudge against “all others of their sex”. In response to her speech, the other Amazons thus voice their discontent with Roselia’s rule, their criticism targeting her on a personal level: “JULIETTA: Because she’s Old, she thinks every one has as little Occa- / sion for a Husband, as her self: But she’s mistaken in me, I can as- / sure Her” (III. ii, 24). In explaining Roselia’s rejection of men by her age – which both suggests a waning sexual interest and a waning of her reproductive capabilities – Julietta also implies that the younger women like her are still bodily desirous of male company.

Additionally, Roselia’s undemocratic appointment of an heiress in her own daughter Clarinda not only stresses her selfish ambitions, but spotlights her aptitude to arbitrary government and her likeness to the disdained *roi soleil*: “HIPPOLITA: She behaves her self, as if she were immortal, / Or as the Sun, or she had equal Influence, / And did oblige the World with mutual Blessings” (III. ii, 25). Roselia’s commonwealth is thus politically blemished while, at the same time, her strict confinement of the women also appears as oppressing the Amazons’ bodily yearnings: “JULIETTA: I have no liking to this single

solitary / Life; nor do I love hunting other Creatures so well, but I had as / lieve be hunted my self" (III. ii, 25).

The imposed abstinence of their existence is henceforth challenged by the other Amazons who, in quite overt references to the theatrical frame, convey detailed knowledge of women's position in society. "HIPPOLITA: Would I were a Whore upon a good account. JULIETTA: Or I either: Oh little *England's* a sweet place for this pur- / pose, the Whores have as much respect there as the Women of / Quality. ARIADNE: And more than their Wives, I hear, a thousand times" (III. ii, 25). The Amazons perform stereotypical female banter and, in referring to "whores", their dialogue transcends the fictional space of the performance and points to the "whores" in the audience as well as to their status as real-life-actresses.

The further course of the scene, especially the appearance of Marine, additionally fortifies the Amazons' inclinations towards the male sex, despite the fact that they are first shown to be torn between their own inclinations and their taught apprehensions: "ARIADNE: By all that's good, a man: shall I shoot him" (III. ii, 26). Approaching the unknown "beast" (III. ii, 26), the Amazons are represented in a very similar manner to Miranda and Dorinda in *The Enchanted Island*, as their responses are characterized by "innocence", provoking sexual double entendres.³⁶⁸ Crucially though, the women are shown as having an instant attraction to the man, they feel physically attracted to Marine and have an instinctive drive to motherhood. The commonwealth of women, which at first has been staged as a deviant endeavour, is thus eventually presented as a female collective that displays gendered conventions and stereotypes. These stereotypes, that are notably also part of stock comic representations of women on the Restoration stage, are furthermore underlined with another intertextual reference to *The Enchanted Island*. When Roselia discovers her disobedient subjects and Marine she exclaims: "Have I not taught the / The falsehood, and the perjuries of men?" (III. ii, 28). Just like Prospero, the elder character is shown as having lost the hold over the sexually awakened young women and as her parental deed is thus symbolically over, she can – again, like Prospero – only revert to supervise the match-making.

The Amazons are portrayed as sexually starved and, having set their sights on Marine, they discuss whether he alone can cater for their needs: "ROSELIA: Can this weak Ship-wrack'd wretch supply you all? HIPPOLITA: Not together, indeed. MENALIPPE: No – but by Times, and Turns, he may, for ought I know" (III. ii, 29). This conversion from martial Amazons to lustful women once more comically emphasizes the women's status. The representation is further underlined when Roselia announces: "Each one shall choose a Husband, and enjoy / His company

368 See *The Enchanted Island*, I, ii, 320 – 342.

a Month; but that expir'd, / You shall no more come near 'em: If you prove fruitful, / The Males you shall return to them, the Females / We will reserve our selves" (III. ii, 29). The grotto, at first presented as a space solely for women, is thus opened up for men who are not only invited into the space to enjoy the company of women, but find that the space itself is offered up, as Clarinda offers Marine to "shew you the pleasant Groves and Springs, and Grotto's, / and you shall eat and drink with us" (III. ii, 30). The gendered space of the grotto, the land itself as well as the women-as-land, are thus presented for appropriation and consumption.

Although the barren part visually opposes the pastoral and fertile female space, the action of the scene set in the grotto in many ways parallels the plot set in the barren part. Even though both men and women are prompted to act by differing motivations – the townspeople by greed whereas the women are initially united out of bare necessity – both depictions of a "new World" fail as they are thwarted by the townspeople going native and the women as lacking sexual counterparts. The next act (IV) consequently unites the two strands of the plot as the boundaries that had previously – spatially – separated them are crossed. The scene is still set in the grotto,³⁶⁹ with one of the Amazons singing a song, which once more reifies the notion of woman-as-land and woman-as-colonial-product:

When she smiles, you may discover
Golden Coasts, and wealthy Bliss;
But her Frowns throw back each Lover
To Cold Green land, where we freeze.
Men may see the Glittering Shore,
But ne're deserve, to reach the Ore (IV. ii, 35).

This stanza not only recounts the aforementioned appropriation and commodification of women, but also acts as dramaturgical indicator that indeed, the figural "promised land" is yet not to be reached smoothly. In the following the Amazons display another comical version of their alleged "innocence"³⁷⁰ in bantering about each other's future husbands. This presentation is yet again evocative of not only *The Enchanted Island* and Miranda's and Dorinda's arguments, but of women's dialogues in Restoration comedy in general. The final encounter with the men is staged in a similar respect as the women suffer a "reality shock" upon meeting their prospective mates: "ROSELIA: Oh Heavens! are these the jewels you run mad for? These / Jack-a-Lents! these shrivel'd poor

369 In the meantime the French pirate La Mure has landed on the shores of the barren part, looking out for Aminta and her kidnappers. However, this subplot only comes to a conclusion in the very last scene.

370 "HIPPOLITA: I long to make a Fool of/a Man strangely" (IV. ii, 36).

stufft Eel-skins!” (IV. ii, 38). This comical reference to the theatrical frame – and the theatre’s power to guild appearances – again unhinges the action of the play from its “foreign shores” and reminds the audience of the play’s actual setting.

Yet, a smooth union of the sexes is thwarted once more as Roselia discovers the Portuguese treasure and, believing the ship’s crew to be pirates, commands their imprisonment. The drawing of the final scene subsequently reveals another reversal of gender roles: “SCENE II. *Discovers Franvile washing in a Tub, Hazard sowing, and Surgeon spinning, with Waiters looking over them with Whips* (V. ii, 46)”.³⁷¹ Without a doubt, this scene delights the audience as, ironically, the near-cannibals and run-away-husbands do indeed find themselves in a “new World” but one quite contrary to their original vision. The role reversal they are subjected to, however, provokes direct repentance: “HAZARD: Come, come, few know the goodness of Wives, till they / want ‘em. Ah would I were at home, I’d ne’re throw a main agen, / but live sober, and sing Psalms” (V. ii, 46). Despite these protestations, however, their traditional male role as master of the house remains ambivalent as their feminization has seemingly advanced: “SURGEON: Oh, gads bud – I have spun a fair thread” (V. ii, 46). Moreover, the entry of the last of the town-blades once more stages – albeit with a lighter touch – the danger of wildness and going native on the island: “*Enter Frugal, with a Monkey in’s arms, follow’d by Julietta, who is fondling him*” (V. ii, 48). This scene not only bodily associates man with animal, but also frames him as a mere pet of woman, rendering his disgrace ultimate: “JULIETTA: Sirrah – Carry the dear creature to the River side, and let / him drink – do’t quickly – must I spur you on, you dull Drone... [*Strikes him*” (V. ii, 48). Frugal’s colonial expectations and the reality of the “new World” could not be further apart: the blades have literally gone native, not only in their own near cannibalistic actions, but also in their treatment within this “new World”.³⁷²

This difference between expectation and reality is mirrored in the Amazons’ dialogue as well, as their hopes in the other sex have equally suffered shipwreck.

ARIADNE: What betwixt fear, and love, they do their Duty:

But for my part, I begin to distaste the mercenary Rogues.

MENALIPPE: They say they are Gentlemen: But they prove Mungrels.

[...]

ARIADNE: How do thine suffer, Juliet?

JULIETTA: Faith, like Boys: They are fearful in all Fortunes – when I

371 Earl Miner observes that this scene “no doubt owes something to ancient legends of the service of Hercules to Omphale, Queen of Lydia. As so often with comedy, a threat is defined in realism and in display, and the same means otherwise combined finally reduce the threat and bring a reconciliation with the customary world of the audience”, in: Dudley/Novak 101.

372 Additionally, one could claim that in presenting these men as doing women’s work, women’s work – femininity – itself is associated with “wildness”.

smile, they kneel, and beg to have that Face Continued – And
 like poor Dogs, adore the ground I go on [...]
 Frisk up and down, and skip about like Apes;
 And for a drop of Wine, be whipt like Hackney's.
 I can saddle 'em, ride 'em – do what I will with 'em (V. ii, 50).

The men are described not only as "rogue" and "mercenary", but as fearful, subordinate and resembling "poor Dogs" as well as "Apes", thus resembling the monkey Frugal has to carry. But yet again, this challenge to the sexes' relationship is averted as Clarinda's outbreak of hatred³⁷³ towards the men reminds the other Amazons of their good fortune in having them: "MENALIPPE: For my part really, I'll be mutiny if I have not mine freed / to night" (V. ii, 50).

Finally, however, Sebastian, Nicusa and their pirate-captors are approaching and, in an absolute gesture of male submission, the two Portuguese men allow themselves to be enslaved by the Amazons, just so they can escape the doom that awaits them in piratical captivity. Eventually though their providence is at long last revealed and the play's plot speeds to a conclusion as the family is reunited and even the town-blades are restored to liberty "as if in / your own Nation" (V. ii, 54, Roselia). All previously voiced discontents with the other sex are reverted as Roselia in no time regains her role as "belonging" (V. ii, 55) to Sebastian and even offers Du Pier a woman: "Take her, she's thine; she's rich, but a / little foppish" (V. ii, 55). The pirates are taken to prison and Marine is given Aminta's hand in marriage. Notably though, even though Roselia acknowledges her role as "possession" of Sebastian and, in her last lines, abdicates from her role as Amazonian protectress – "For times are alter'd now, so is the Government, / Whilst my *Sebastian* lives: 'tis he must rule it" (V. ii, 55) –, the character's performance indicates that she remains in charge. Not only is Sebastian – the lawful head of family – overall rather reticent in the last scene, it is Roselia who gives Aminta's hand to Marine, and only then does Sebastian authorize the union: "Which thus I ratify – Captain, she's thine –" (V. ii, 54). And indeed, after the group is joined by the mariners and the town-blades, Sebastian only utters one more line: "ROSELIA: Oh my *Sebastian*! I have miracles to tell / thee, how I came hither to the Womens Common-Wealth: How / chosen Protectress! it is a Tale bears full variety. SEBASTIAN: And so does mine, which we'll recount at leisure" (V. ii, 55). Thus the formal change of government on the island is attenuated by the lingering assurance that the woman has not cast off all of her former role. But importantly, the actual "commonwealth" stays in place as

373 She has been made aware of the fact that her love-interest Marine and his alleged sister Aminta are in fact "Cabin-Mates" (V. ii, 49) and she is thus eager to follow her mother's initial orders and kill the men.

the island remains seat of the “alter’d Government” and the restoration of the formerly disrupted gender order on the “Happy Island” is confirmed.

A *Common-wealth of Women* thus offers, despite the similarities to the more abstract colonial references in *The Enchanted Island*, a more concrete staging of colonial discourses. In D’Urfey’s play, the island-space as the ultimate goal of the characters’ colonial ambitions – lust for gold and freedom – is explicitly voiced as the play embroils the characters’ endeavours in an intricate web of complications that ultimately serve to correct their straying. The characters’ faults are explicitly referred to and named. The town-blades exhibit male domestic irresponsibility and blinding greed, which is on the one hand paralleled, and finally remedied by the encounter with the Amazons, while on the other hand the colonial ambitions are lastly satisfied as the golden treasure remains with the ship’s crew.

However, the fact that “all joys that Crown a happy life” (V. ii, 55, Marine) are “possessing Aminta for my Wife” (last line) is also reminding the audience that life’s ultimate goal should be the preservation and continuation of private harmony and a heteronormative order. The colonial spaces of the island, its two opposing parts, have only merged when male misogyny and female hubris have been amended. D’Urfey here presents male faults as rather tangible, the presented male irresponsibility and flight from domestic duties relate to the general change in perception of male sovereignty, but are also suggestive of the issues surrounding the failure of Charles II to provide a male heir.³⁷⁴ But the play presents this issue not as malfunction of the father (in Sebastian’s case), but points to the aptitude of the “son” (Marine), who becomes the ideological carrier of male duty.³⁷⁵ Even though the return of the father figure at the end re-establishes harmony, he is presented as the least active character in the play, and the other characters have managed to heal the divisions that rivened them on their own account.

In placing colonial anxieties and ambitions *on* the sea and the catchment area of the aptly named “Happy Island”, the play hyperbolically displaces English cultural identity on a space which, set-up as colonial projection zone, is eventually confirmed in that the plot irons out the divisions and presents family harmony. In acting out colonial and patriarchal fears, of going native and losing authority, both sexes parallel the other’s faults and hence figuratively both spaces of the island are shown as lacking. The final amendment of the characters’ unruliness and wildness overcomes and undoes the rifts within the island. The

374 Thus anticipating what Michael McKeon sees as the crisis of patriarchalism in the Restoration, Michael McKEON, “Historicizing Patriarchy: The Emergence of Gender Difference in England, 1660 – 1760”, *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 28.3 (1995): 295 – 322.

375 Susan J. OWEN, “Restoration Drama and Politics: An Overview”, *Companion to Restoration Drama* 126 – 139, 135.

commodification of the women in the last scene, where they are assigned and subordinated to husbands, finally re-establishes authority over the female bodies. The characters have been reunited and positioned properly and the colonial project of venturing out to sea in search of a "new World" without social rifts and inversions is presented as successful. In re-negotiating social positions expansion thus can be promoted, as the sexual inversion ultimately works to clarify sexual and social differences.

2.4 Love's Victim: "Domestic Virtues" on Foreign Shores

2.4.1 Spatial and Historical Displacement

It was that memorable day, in the first Summer of the late War, when our Navy ingag'd the Dutch: a day wherein the two most mighty and best appointed Fleets which any age had ever seen, disputed the command of the greater half of the Globe, the commerce of Nations, and the riches of the Universe.³⁷⁶

Just as their country is battling over "the command of the greater half of the Globe", that is colonial access right and profits, the dialogue's four speakers Eugenius, Crites, Lisideius and Neander withdraw to a less obtrusive place to discuss – after they have noticed the "happy noise" of the English victory – how to measure civilization's progress. With reassuring maritime and economic success in the background, "dramatic poeise" is singled out as case study in comparing the ancient art to the modern.

In 1668, John Dryden had published his *Essay on Dramatick Poesie* and, interestingly, the dialogue that makes up the treatise is set against the background of naval warfare and colonial endeavours, thus mirroring England's advancements on the international stage with a comparative balance in the area of cultural production, or to be more precise: the theatre. Celebrating the "Empire of Wit" initiated by the returning Stuarts, Dryden chains the literary debate with questions of the state of the nation as a whole and thus impresses it with patriotism. This linkage is exemplary for debates over literature in the Restoration, as critics were not only apt to make historical comparisons to the empires of antiquity, but also set English literary achievements apart from French neo-classicist contemporaries.³⁷⁷ Dryden's evocation of the "Empire of

376 JOHN DRYDEN, *The Works of John Dryden: Prose 1668 – 1691, An Essay of Dramatick Poesie and Shorter Works*, Vol. XVII, ed. Samuel Holt Monk (Berkeley et al.: U of California P, 1971) 3–81, 8.

377 For an analysis of the importance of national aspects in the period's debates on cultural production and the emerging stress on English "liberty", see René WELLEK, *The Rise of English Literary History*, 1941 (New York et al.: McGraw-Hill, 1966) 14–144. For a con-

Wit” and the Stuarts as its patrons, is hence indicative of the increasing poise the English had in their overall might as a people, and also points to the proliferating view that the empire of the deep was on its way to follow that of the ancient empires.³⁷⁸ The notion of *translatio studii*, the “light of learning” moving westwards, further enhanced the idea that the English empire was forging ahead not only politically, but also culturally.³⁷⁹ The English stage is hence pitted against French playwrights especially, with Dryden in his “Essay” as well as Thomas Rymer in his *Short View of Tragedy* (1692) ascertaining England’s leading position and dubbing French drama inane and bland, contrasting it to English “manly” and “lively” spectacles, being “a testament to the vigor of the nation and its people”.³⁸⁰

Many plays of the time accommodated these notions, thus dramatically pitting the English against representatives from other nations.³⁸¹ In idealizing English characters and degrading foreigners through cultural (hetero-) stereotyping, cultural borders as negative foils are drawn, and space is hence becoming crucial in negotiating and expressing cultural identity. As has been shown in the preceding subchapters, English cultural identity was in drama negotiated through the depiction of cultural Others, but crucially also through the representation of borders and maritime / colonial spaces.³⁸²

At the beginning of the eighteenth century proper, London theatre audiences were indeed attuned to scenes from “barbarous Corners”, as “forraign Baubles” (see below) not only flooded the markets in the shape of colonial products such as tobacco, tea, coffee and sugar,³⁸³ but also loomed large on the stage in the form of foreign settings, costumes and characters. Thomas Betterton, actor-manager

textual survey of English Neoclassicism and the Augustan Age, see *The New Cambridge History of English Literature, 1660–1780*, Vol. III, ed. John RICHETTI (Cambridge: CUP, 2005) and Paul BAINES, *The Long Eighteenth Century* (London: Hodder Arnold, 2004).

378 In their rise.

379 For this aspect refer to the English version of the French “Querelle des Anciens et des Modernes”, in England mainly debated amongst William Temple, Richard Bentley and William Wotton, the quarrel, however, never reached a similar impact to that across the Channel. See Howard D. WEINBROT, *Eighteenth-Century Satire: Essays on Texts and Contexts from Dryden to Peter Pindar* (Cambridge: CUP, 1988) 101–103.

380 Jean I. MARSDEN, “Spectacle, Horror, and Pathos”, *The Cambridge Companion to English Restoration Theatre*, ed. Deborah Payne Fisk (Cambridge: CUP, 2000) 174–190, 174.

381 See Chapter 2.2 and 2.3. Laura Brown calls the heroic drama of the Restoration a “genre of cultural alterity”. For other plays dramatizing cultural alterity, see e.g. Davenant’s *The Siege of Rhodes* Part I and II (printed 1656 and 1663 respectively), Dryden’s *The Indian Emperour* (1665) and *Aureng-zebe* (1675), Elkanah Settle’s *The Empress of Morocco* (1673) and *The Conquest of China* (1675), Aphra Behn’s *Abdelazer* (1676), Mary Pix’ *Ibrahim, the Thirteenth Emperor of the Turks* (1696) as well as Delarivier Manley’s *The Royal Mischief* (1696).

382 The intrinsic link of maritime spaces and drama, or: colonial enterprise and cultural production, is also fashioned in the quoted extract from “An Essay in Dramatick Poesie”.

383 See Walvin.

of the Theatre at Lincoln's Inn Fields, remarks in the prologue to *Love's Victim* how "Domestic virtues" were challenged in the wake of colonial expansion and international conflict, the Nine Years' War and the War of the Spanish Succession:³⁸⁴

Each barbarous Corner of the Earth they've [the poets] sought
 And from each barbarous Corner Heroes brought.
 From India tawny Braves, and Blacks from Guinny;
 Secure with forraign Baubles still to Win ye.
 Our Vent'rous Poet makes a bold Essay
 To show Domestic Virtue here to day,
 And draw a generous Nation in a play (The Prologue).³⁸⁵

In lamenting dramatists' propensity to set their plays in "distant China, and remote Japan" (Prologue), so "they have sung all Countries but their own" (Prologue), Betterton takes up on a debate that is reminiscent of Dryden's commemoration of the "Empire of Wit", but also again refers to the vital connection between national character and cultural production. In his "Preface to *Rapin*" (1674), Thomas Rymer had already set the tone for critics of overt foreignness on the stage. Referring to Davenant's 1650 epic *Gondibert*, he writes: "One design of the Epick Poets before [Davenant] was to adorn their own Country, there finding their Heroes and Patterns of Virtue [...] but this Poet steers a different course, his Heroes are all Foreigners: He cultivates a Country that is nothing akin to him".³⁸⁶ Charles Gildon takes up this criticism and extends it in the Preface to his *Love's Victim*:

To avoid this Sin against the Manners, I have chose persons of our own Clime, Natives of the same Country, we now inhabit, and who therefore cou'd differ from us only in things, that depend meerly on Customes and Religion. [...] It was the custom of the Ancient Poets of Greece (the Mother of the Drama, as well as of all other polite Learning) to Celebrate their own Country [...] Our Poets on the contrary here, I know not why bent their Thoughts, and prostituted their Inventions to give Every Country Heroes but their own, as if Virtue were not of English Growth. And from this Fault in the choice our Poets, make of Foreign Heroes, they derive their general offence against the

384 The War of the Grand Alliance – or Nine Years' War – from 1688 – 1697 and the War of the Spanish Succession, from 1701 – 1714, were the two major international conflicts of the time.

385 Orr claims that the Prologue was written by Betterton – however, in the actual edition it says: "Written by a Friend, and spoke by Mr. Betterton". All quotes from *Love's Victim* from its first printed edition, 1701. Charles GILDON, *Love's Victim, or, the Queen of Wales* (London: printed by M. Bennet for Richard Parker and George Strahan, 1701). References for quotations are given in the form "I. i, 1", the first number represents the act, the second number the scene and the third number the page.

386 Thomas RYMER, *The Critical Works of Thomas Rymer*, ed. Curt A. Zimansky (New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1956) 5 f.

Manners, of which too many of our authors are guilty, while they confound ours with those of the most Distant and different Climate. This the ancient Poets not only avoided by Domestic Fables but had this farther advantage from it, that the Manners of their Dramatic Persons being the same, with those of the Audience, their Examples were more moving and instructive (The Preface).

This extract is worth quoting in length as Gildon here not only legitimizes the play's plot in referring to the Ancients and puts forward a celebration of the manifest virtues of the English, but also – in drawing “domestic” characters – wants to engage the audience “instructively” to return to English qualities. The plot “is partly Fiction, and partly built on the 8th Book of Cæsar’s Comentaries” (Preface), however, the heroine and hero of the play, “our Aborigines”, are Welsh and the scene is Bayonne, a coastal town in Aquitaine, France. Gildon thus not only displaces British characters spatially, but also historically in setting the play about 1800 years in the past. Important to note is also that in depicting a Welsh royal couple, Gildon incorporates Welshness into British cultural identity at an early stage of British colonialism.

The plot shows Alboina,³⁸⁷ Queen of Wales and wife of Rhesus, confined to a temple in Bayonne, where she and her two children – Manselia, her daughter, and Tyrelius, her son – have been admitted after a shipwreck landed the party at the Bayonne coast. This charitable deed soon turned awry, as the King of Bayonne has fallen in love with her and now pursues her recklessly. The Queen of Bayonne is thus bridled with rage and, in teaming up with her father Dumnacus – King of the Andes in Gaul, who is taking refuge from the Romans with his son-in-law – is plotting to kill Alboina. However, the virtuous Queen is safe as long as she stays within the confines of the Temple. And, just as the plotting of the Queen and her father against the French King progresses, Rhesus – Alboina’s husband and brave Briton – arrives, shipwrecked himself, but on the way to rescue his family. In trying to escape, Alboina claims Rhesus’ death and asks for a sea-burial of his body in order to be able to make a flight via the sea. The plan, however, goes wrong when two “Princes of the blood” arrive and innocently express their joy at seeing their King alive. Again, Alboina is confined to the temple and just as the people of Bayonne start a revolt against their King, Rhesus manages to escape and, joining the approaching British fleet, takes up arms against Bayonne. Under false pretences, the Queen – her plotting father has been killed by the King in the meantime – forces Alboina to drink a gauntlet of poison. Believing to be saving her children’s lives, Alboina succumbs, but has to learn that the Queen has herself taken a liking to Rhesus, intending to seduce him once Alboina is dead.

³⁸⁷ In the text the character is named “Guinoenda”, however, Gildon mentions at the end of the preface that on stage the character was called “Alboina” and that the typo could not be corrected in time with the printer. Hence, I will be referring to the actual “stage name”.

This plan is upset by the approaching Rhesus, who has killed the French King in a duel and now wants to rescue his family. Realizing that Rhesus will forever stay faithful to his wife, the French Queen kills herself and Rhesus – holding his dying wife – swears revenge for this horrid deed.

The play, which was staged at Lincoln's Inn Fields Theatre, featured two of the most prominent actresses of the time, namely Anne Bracegirdle and Elizabeth Barry. *Love's Victim* matches British naval strength and "domestic virtues" with references to the Roman past and hence draws on analogies to the Roman Empire, which has long since served as the pre-eminent model for empire per se.³⁸⁸ As Howard Erskine-Hill has remarked, especially after the Glorious Revolution in 1688, the elitist identification with the Romans presents a dominant marker in the development of English imperial ideology.³⁸⁹ Indeed, after 1688, a substantial number of plays, particularly plays depicting critical moments in the Roman Empire's history,³⁹⁰ emphasized the bond with the ancient empire. However, especially after the Glorious Revolution, playwrights increasingly bridged the evocation of Roman history with England's own ancient past,³⁹¹ hence expressing an increasing confidence in the burgeoning empire of the deep.³⁹²

Love's Victim is, in several respects, expanding the focus on maritime space in early eighteenth-century drama as, in Gildon's play, questions of cultural identity are both spatially and historically displaced. But in portending so vigorously, by way of preface and prologue as well as content, the "Britishness" of the characters and their setting against a European Other, *Love's Victim* as a play renders English imperial ambitions and aspirations much more tangible. Gildon's play also stands out as it is the only play discussed in this chapter not set on

388 See Pagden, *Lords of All the World*, for the prevalence of this model for European aspirants to imperial status.

389 See Howard ERSKINE-HILL, *The Augustan Idea in English Literature* (London: Edward Arnold, 1983). The nature of this identification has been challenged by critics, however, with Howard D. Weinbrot arguing that the *Pax Britannica* was more actively defined against the *Pax Romana*, see Weinbrot, *Britannia's Issue* 237–275, 354.

390 Plays with Roman settings before 1688 include e.g. the various Shakespeare renditions of the Restoration, see John Dryden, *All for Love* (1677), which was based on *Anthony and Cleopatra*, Nahum Tate's *Coriolanus* (1682) and Edward Ravenscroft's *Titus Andronicus* (1687). See also Nathaniel Lee's *Lucius Junius Brutus* (acted 1671) and Dryden's *Tyrannick Love* (1669).

391 See Charles Hopkins, *Boadicea, Queen of Britain* (1697), but also Edward Ravenscroft's 1677 play *King Edgar and Alfreda* (see Chapter 3).

392 On the reasons why the ancient British past was only really dramatically evoked after 1688, Orr writes: "Despite the effusions of patriotic enthusiasm, the distant British past was too ideologically fraught with republican valences to serve readily as a subject, while the emergent Oceanic empire was difficult to map onto traditional models of empire, about whose contemporary forms, as we have seen, many in the political nation felt profound misgivings" 258.

an island, but on the “shore” of Bayonne. Correspondingly, the play also does not so much draw on liminality and border crossings, but presents fortress identities, focusing on the “domestic virtues” of the Britons. The representation of maritime space and ancient history can thus be said to serve as a form of myth of origins the emerging empire of the deep can draw on. As Geoffrey Cubitt claims for nineteenth-century heroic histories, these myths of origins were crucial in negotiating cultural identity as they “performed significant groundwork for later nationalist historiographies, establishing points of narrative departure, suggesting narrative framework [...] and promoting the basic notion of historically transmitted common identity”.³⁹³

2.4.2 Shipwreck and Hostility: Britons Brave the Sea

As has been explicated in Chapter 1, the sea is ubiquitous in eighteenth-century literature; and the semiotics of the sea – to make a brazen use of the simile – seems indeed like a vast and deep ocean. This is especially the case when the sea is invoked with regard to England as a flourishing maritime empire. Indeed, as Brown has shown, it serves as *locus classicus* for contemplating the fears and hopes of a society rapidly altered by exchange and commerce.³⁹⁴ The sea as political and economic space of expansion becomes the scene for culturally advancing an image suiting English maritime expansion. England’s increasing global presence therefore elicited an increasing imaginative and rhetorical engagement with distant shores. This engagement did not stop short of musings on the physical engagement with the maritime world, but expanded it to meta-physical reflections. Images of tempests and shipwrecks pervaded literature and the fine arts, with tempests evoked as resonant symbols and metaphors for the uncertainties of human existence.³⁹⁵ The evocation of maritime disasters is thus initiative of a whole range of sea images that implicitly comment on the fickle nature of fate and fortune. As Sobecki has shown, these metaphorical musings are functional in setting up an imaginary glossing of the sea’s inherent otherness as well as vain attempts at ruling it:

Awe, fear and admiration for the sea are merely permutations of human responses to the sea’s greatness and grandeur, simultaneously conveying its categorial alterity and

393 Cubitt 9.

394 See Brown, *Fables of Modernity* 55.

395 See Laurence Otto GOEDDE, *Tempest and Shipwreck in Dutch and Flemish Art: Convention, Rhetoric and Interpretation* (University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1989) for an account of the period’s visual portrayals of shipwrecks and tempests.

the resulting incapability of human societies to control it, as well as the futility of all such efforts, enshrined in Xerxes' quixotic whipping of the sea.³⁹⁶

In *Love's Victim* the image of the sea as a physical as well as metaphysical space for fear and fate is moreover increasingly utilized to determine Britishness.³⁹⁷ In fearing, but also braving the sea, the Britons are shown as having a special relationship to the encircling main. In metaphysically applying this imagery, playwrights give narrative credence to the maritime fate of the island nation.

Love's Victim is suffused with images of fear and fate – in some ways similar to the two previously discussed plays. The ocean here is time and again evoked as a space of disaster, but also of hope, as the space where rescue might come from. The play is not set on an island, however, the confinement of the temple dramaturgically functions in a similar way as the "confined" island-spaces in the two other plays. The rhetorical presence of the sea also imbues all five acts of the tragedy, drawing constant attention to the play's setting. In the first act, the horrors of a tempestuous sea are described. Dumnacus and a druid devoted to him, recall their nightly dreams:

DRUID: Oh! as I coasted the insulted shoar,
 A thousand hideous Portents cross'd the road.
 Fantastic Armies here, as routed fled,
 And from the beetling Cliffs, plung'd in the Flood;
 Their rising Billows overlook'd the Shoar,
 And held th' impending Deluge in the Air,
 'Till, with a dismal Roar they bounded back,
 As 'twere to take a yet more fierce Career,
 Yet still unable to o'releap the Fence,
 Foaming, and furious at the fatal Check,
 They dash'd a Ship to pieces on the Rock;
 I heard the horrid Crash, and then the Cries,
 And lamentable Groans of drowning Men.

DUMNACUS: Dreams, Dreams, of Fear, come come, they kill your hopes (I. i, 3 f).

As much as this extract vividly relates the merciless movements of the sea and human powerlessness in the face of it, the Gaulic King's offhand reaction not only foreshadows the play's plot, but also depicts him and his kin as irreverent to the maritime space. As much as the sea has caused dismay for the Britons, they are portrayed as the only people actively engaging with the sea and furthermore showing awareness of its dangers. In this, the play establishes a metaphysical complicity with the Britons and the watery element. The literal immobility of the

³⁹⁶ Sobecki 7.

³⁹⁷ As the play itself only ever refers to "Britons" and moreover represents a Welsh Royal couple, this chapter will also apply the term "British" or "Britons" as opposed to "English".

French in this respect is furthered when Dumnacus presents himself as adamant to the young Welsh princes' pledging: "Your Tears, and Prayr's are like the Winds, and Waves, / That blow, and dash in vain against the Rocks, / Unmov'd I stand; and unrelenting fixt, / In what I have resolv'd" (II. i, 13).

By contrast, the Britons appreciate the sea's dangers: "RHEBUS: When in the stormy flood I strove for life / And with the Billows made unequal War; [...] My Friends, that in their Monarchs cause forsook / The blest Retreats of Cambria, for the Toyls, / And various hazards of th' inclement Deep" (III. i, 18). This account is rendered more positive when Rhesus finally encounters his wife and children: "O thrice happy Shipwreck!" (III. i, 19). In these lines, Rhesus draws a direct connection from the maritime dangers to the shores the sea encircles: Cambria is being presented as a peaceful retreat, whereas the French coast appears as "inhospitable" (III. i, 21, Alboina). The Briton accepts the perils of the sea,³⁹⁸ but also acknowledges Cambria as a "safe port" he can fall back on, and the final appearance of the British fleet (V. i, 36) indeed in a way represents the safety of his home-shores. These representations show the space of the land as transcending the sea, as the Britons finally land in Bayonne, but the space of the land is also shown as reflecting the characteristics of its inhabitants, as the French shore is ever more performed as hostile and wild: "*enter Morganius and Vau-nutius just escap'd the Wreck.* VAUNUTIUS: On what strange Country has the Ocean thrown us? MORGANIUS: We've wander'd long among the craggy Cliffs, / Bewilder'd in the Night, and pathless Rocks" (IV. i, 31). Thus, once more, the foreign space is presented as dangerous and barren.

In mastering the sea, the Britons display a technical advance and, in metaphysically acknowledging the might of Neptune, the Britons are also spiritually bound to the sea as they appear in union with the forces of nature. Upon their capture, the French King orders his captain to sacrifice the Britons to Neptune: "KING: Captain conduct these *Britains* to the Altar / Of injur'd *Neptune*, for they are his due, / There strike their Heads off, and appease the God" (IV. i, 32). The Britons, however, prove to be Neptune's Chosen as the sacrifice is averted, while they are also presented as rising above the petty invocations of fate by the French: "ALBOINA: The Shrubs below thee may thy Tempest fear, / I move above thee in too high a Sphere. / Survey beneath me thy vain Storm of Soul, / And smile to see thy mimic Thunders roll" (V. i, 42, to the Queen).

So, ultimately, the individual battles and collective challenges the sea posed have been embraced by the Britons and they have thus proven fit for physical and metaphysical encounters that characterize maritime endeavours. The play hence

398 Rhesus, in recounting his journey: "The Seas grew high, and swell'd into a storm, / Dispers'd our Fleet, and dash'd my Ship to pieces, / Where perish'd all the Heroes of our Country, / [...] only I escap'd / A poor, a naked, helpless, shipwreck'd Man" (III. i, 20).

not only links the Britons' fate with the sea by way of plot but, in presenting the Britons as mastering the element, *Love's Victim* suggests that the sea's categorial alterity can, at least to an extent, be overcome.

2.4.3 British Virtues versus Gallic Vices

In the prologue to *Love's Victim*, Betterton claims that the play will "*show Domestic Virtue [...] And draw a generous Nation*" (Prologue), thus declaring explicitly that this night's theatrical spectacle embraces a patriotic task: in portraying "domestic virtues", "foreign" characteristics are held at bay and, in a more overlapping gesture, "domestic virtues" are fortified. In *Love's Victim* British "Aborigines" (Preface) are hence pitted against Gauls, their virtues set against the foreigners' vices, and so ultimately – as the play is set in an imperial context – "domestic virtues" are performed as essential "imperial mentalities".³⁹⁹

Just as we have seen in the other plays under discussion, gender – and sanctioned gendered/sexual decorum – is an elemental marker in negotiating imperial mentalities. As the maritime space is inscribed with fears and fantasies of colonialism, such as gender reversal or reversed sexual behaviour, the staging of the woman as subordinate reinforces male, imperial authority. In *Love's Victim* the figure of the woman is dramaturgically split: the "domestic" female can appear as virtuous, whereas fears of wildness and "masculine" appropriation are "locked" in the other woman of the play. Gildon's play thus undertakes a rather specific definition of virtuous female behaviour, which can – in a next step – be seen as an extensive act to redefine social roles in general.⁴⁰⁰

The demarcation procedures at work in *Love's Victim* are aimed at Britain's "most immediate Other",⁴⁰¹ the French. As Eliga Gould has shown, almost every foreign initiative between the Glorious Revolution and the battle of Waterloo was not only undertaken in protection of the country's imperial standing, but mostly aimed against France's competing imperial interests.⁴⁰² It therefore comes as no

399 J.A. Mangan coined this phrase, using it as title for his volume that collects essays analysing the educational processes of cultural socialization into the British Empire, J.A. MANGAN ed., *Making Imperial Mentalities: Socialisation and British Imperialism* (Manchester and New York: Manchester UP, 1990). The phrase is used here as it captures the informal aspects of imperial or colonial acculturation as well as highlighting the problem of maintaining cultural identities.

400 See Jones: "In a period of major political and economic change, definitions of 'women' and 'femininity' played a crucial part in a wider redefinition of social categories and social roles" 7.

401 Choudhury 26.

402 The Nine Years' War and the War of the Spanish Succession. J.G.A. Pocock writes on this relationship more generally: "Each major step in the consolidation of the archipelago under

surprise that the French were dramatically singled out as a foil for patriotic and imperial self-construction.

In the first scene of the play, Dumnacus complains about his son-in-law and the French King's mistreatment of his daughter, and although the exiled King himself appears as corrupt and tyrannical in the course of the plot, his criticism sets the tone for the King's appearance – he is “by foolish pride of Empire blind” (I. i, 2), and so his subjects, “the People by Opression rous'd” (I. i, 3). Both men further debate the French King's character flaws and thereby also paint a picture of a miserable country, whose subjects are revolting, as their monarch is blinded by imperial ambitions and is further constrained by his illicit – as he is married – love to another woman. At this stage of the play, the two main vices of imperial rulers are singled out: ambition and lust. The French King's portrayal is further sharpened when set in contrast to the image Alboina draws of her husband Rhesus, who is not only “the greatest Hero of that [Cambria] Nation” (I. i, 4), but also a virtuous private man:

For he wou'd weep to see me die; wou'd feel
 Ea[ch] Pang of mine, wou'd suffer all my Pains;
 Be tortur'd with my Agonys, and die
 almost with me ! for tho' in Battle fierce
 And dauntless as the God of War in danger;
 Yet he is soft, and tender in his Love,
 As Woman, in her first, and Virgin fires.
 Full of compassion, and unweari'd Truth;
 The best of Husbands, Friends, of Kings, and Fathers (I. i, 6).

Neither of the Kings have so far appeared on stage, but their characters have already been distinctly marked off from each other. Rhesus, the British King, is depicted as the quintessential virtuous ruler as his public appearance matches his private virtues and yet, what is more, his personal tenderness does not detract from his might as warlord.

Just as the character of Rhesus combines a whole array of honourable traits in his person, vices are shared between the French King and Dumnacus, his father-in-law and exiled King of Andes. Trying to lure Alboina out of the temple to kill her and her children and thus making way for his and his daughter's ambitions, Dumnacus is confronted with a well-meaning Druid, who challenges him:

a single parliamentary monarchy – 1689, 1701, 1745, and 1801 – was undertaken in the context of one or other of the wars with France”, “The Limits and Divisions of British History: In Search of the Unknown Subject”, *The American Historical Review* 87.2 (1982): 311 – 336, 329. Of course, Pocock's claim also applies for the assertion of British power overseas, see Bernard BAILLYN and Philip D. MORGAN eds., *Strangers within the Realm: Cultural Margins of the First British Empire* (Chapel Hill and London: U of North Carolina P, 1991) 1 – 20.

Nay threat not me, [...]

For thou it was,
Engag'd the *Gauls* first to fall out with *Rome*;
Rang'd her confederate Pow'r's beneath the Banner
And then fled from 'em – taught them all to flie;
And sunk the Pow'r, and Liberty of *Gaul*,
oh! that we still shou'd for so vile a Cause
Thus sacrifice our lives and fortunes!
Who for that War thy own Ambition rais'd
Alone without one Wound, or Scratch art come (II. i, 16).

Again, the "foolish pride" of Empire is blamed, and Dumnacus portrayed not only as overly ambitious, but as a cowardly traitor, sacrificing his subjects without risking his own life. His cowardice is further enhanced when the Druid orders him to release Alboina, who Dumnacus has fettered: "DRUID: I will myself unbind the Queen./Ha! did you think you'd bound an Ox, or Lion?" (II. i, 17). Dumnacus' fear of the woman shows him not only to be particularly poor-spirited, but also hints at the fact that indeed, "barbarous customs" can be challenged by apparently "weaker" characters, as the young Cambrian Prince exclaims at the end of the act: "Let not my Youth your Confidence destroy/The *Gauls* must find Terror, in a *British Boy*" (II. i, 17).

The discrepancy between the two nations is finally *acted* out, when the French King and Rhesus meet and the King orders his guards to sacrifice the Britons at Neptune's altar (IV. i). Alboina thereupon embraces Rhesus and the French King, spiteful of the conjugal love, decides to spare the Cambrian King:

Ha! it shall be so – no thou shalt not die yet,
But live to see my Nuptial Rites perform'd,
See the fair Bride conducted to my Bed
And to my Arms surrender all her Sweets;
See me dissolve Raptures on her Bosom,
And in those Tortures die (IV. i, 32).

The French King here threatens to rape Alboina⁴⁰³ and thus lays not only claim to Rhesus' wife, but figuratively threatens to possess the Queen-as-land. The battle

403 Jean I. Marsden claims that (attempted) rape-scenes in Restoration plays do not only present a frightening vision of gender relations, but also expose the problem of voyeurism and the female spectator, she writes: "Seemingly directed towards an audience assumed to be male, the scenes of rape presented uncomfortable options for the women who made up part of the Restoration audience. [...] They objectify women, visually as objects of desire and symbolically as commodities. As a result, these women are victims many times over: of the rapist who immediately threatens them; of the social construction of gender that defines the female as passive and submissive, thus effectively eliminating active resistance; and finally as victims of the audience's desire", "Rape, Voyeurism, and the Restoration Stage", *Broken Boundaries*, ed. Katherine M. Quinsey, 185–200, 195.

over a woman here symbolically extends the female body and appears as menace not only to her husband, but as menace to Rhesus as sovereign. The woman is objectified and coded as a commodity, so even though the prospective crime itself has a sexual motivation, it is presented as a crime against property.⁴⁰⁴

At the same time, the French King's – literally – boundless passion is denying him his right to rule, as Alboina points out: "Reason shou'd arm your Virtue 'gainst your Passion. KING: Not when my Passions founded on my Reason" (IV. i, 33). The King's character set-up is thus shown as basically flawed and the ensuing action indicates his downfall as he is informed of the approaching rebels. In the final act the two Kings encounter each other again. This time they meet on eye level as Rhesus is no more restricted by guards and instead accompanied by fellow Britons. The ensuing dialogue, and the following duel, put the historical reference to the Romans to remarkable use:

RHESUS: Dar'st thou thus provoke me?

KING: Why not? provoke thee?

What Terrors do'st thou fancy, that thou wear'st?

In mortal Duel I have vanquish'd *Romans*,

In League with Fortune, and the partial Gods, –

How can I then fear thee?

RHESUS: Come boast no more what thou hast done but do,

What e'r with *Romans* thou hast done, thou dar'st not

Attaque a *British* King (V. i, 40).

Rhesus, representative of the Britons, here firmly historicizes the Romans: the victories over the Roman Empire are in the past and the Britons appear as the new and mightier challenge. This hierarchical status is further maintained when Rhesus, manly bidding his "fellow Soldiers" to not intervene in his "private Wrongs" and assist him in the duel, kills the French King: "RHESUS: So perish all the foes of Britain! / Now, my brave friends, advance we to the Temple / There from the Gods the dear Reward to gain" (V. i, 41). This scene vividly stages the rise of a British ruler to imperial valour: in first rhetorically casting aside the Romans and then physically beating their vanquishers, the British King resolutely establishes his leadership-claim in the present. However, his wife Alboina, the "dear reward", has been forced to drink a deadly poison in the meantime. Her death, witnessed by Rhesus and her two children, thus appears as even more tragic. Rhesus is highly distressed at her death and the crushing of his hopes for familial harmony at first seem to diminish his victory, but in a next step, the sadness of Alboina's death functions as emotional reinforcement of the British

404 For similar depictions of rape in Restoration plays, see Dryden's *Amphitryon* (1690) and John Crowne's *Caligula* (1698) –, where male characters justify their sexual crimes with ownership-claims.

virtues. The young British prince, after his father has been led off the stage, addresses his fellow Britons – on stage and in a stage-overriding gesture, also the audience –: “Come on my *Britans* –/Unsheathe your Swords, and with wide-wasting fury,/ Fly to revenge your Queen, as *Britains* shou’d;/ As *Britains* will when ever *Gaul* shall wrong them” (V. ii, 49). Alboina’s death here gives meaning to the future fight against the Gauls, but the speech also displaces the plot time-wise, as Tyrelius gestures not only to the audience, but also to the present political situation, where the French are indeed thought of as “wronging” Britons again.

In evoking a myth of origins, *Love's Victim* presents Alboina as an archetypal Queen and mother, whose maternal virtues are displayed as exemplary for British femininity. Just as Rhesus is dramaturgically opposed to the two French Kings, Alboina is juxtaposed to the Queen of Bayonne. Alboina was cast with Anne Bracegirdle, an actress famous for her “virtuous” lifestyle and theatrical pathos. Known as the “Romantick Virgin”,⁴⁰⁵ Bracegirdle was also considered as the model of English Beauty.⁴⁰⁶ The French Queen was played by Elizabeth Barry, an actress renowned for her “credible” portrayal of evil and tragic roles.⁴⁰⁷ These prominent casting decisions highlight the contrasting characters and are also an important indicator for the style in which the respective characters were acted.

Just like her husband, the Cambrian Queen exhibits “domestic virtues” that are relevant both for her private and public self. She is portrayed as a loving and tender wife, but also as a caring and sacrificial mother, both to her children and to her country. The Queen of Bayonne by contrast functions as host to a variety of vices that mark her out as immodest and base. Like her husband she is ruled by ambition and egoistic motives. In the first act, in explaining to the Queen why the French King had lost interest in her, Alboina points out these flaws:

The Insolence of your uneasie Pride,
Your daily Boasts of your paternal Grandeur,
With your Contempt of his; your hourly Contests
Have made his heart grow weary of your Sway.
And catch the least Appearance of more ease.
If you’d regain it, you must teach your Tongue
The humble Arts of fond, tender Wife;

405 See Alois M. NAGLER, *A Source Book in Theatrical History* (New York: Dover, 1959) 228 – 230. Nagler also cites an anonymous theatre critic of the time who described Bracegirdle as such: “She was of a lovely Height, with dark-brown Hair and Eyebrows, black sparkling Eyes, and a fresh blusky Complexion; and, whenever she exerted herself, had an involuntary Flushing in her Breast, Neck and Face, [...] never making an Exit, but that she left the Audience in an Imitation of her pleasant Countenance“ 229.

406 See Charles GILDON, *A Comparison between the two Stages, 1702*, ed. Staring Bailey Wells (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1942) 126.

407 See Nagler 227.

Banish your Pride, assume a pleasing Temper,
 These are the Philtres to preserve Heart;
 When froward Beauty but disgusts the wise,
 Not Form, but Virtue makes a lasting Love (I. i, 8).

The range of womanly faults in the Queen is considerable; she is described – and no doubt was accordingly portrayed – as a neglectful, imperious woman, bordering on the monstrous. In lightly casting aside all notions of European civilization – “ALBOINA: I act by Reason, Justice, and Religion. QUEEN: Your *Cambrian* Notions are no Rules to us. ALBOINA: Base things, in every Climate are the same” (I. i, 8) – she moreover wilfully sets herself apart from “civil society” and also characterizes Bayonne itself as a dangerous and uncivil space.

The insolence of the royal couple of Bayonne is furthermore acted out in act IV, where the married couple meet and a gender war ensues:

KING: [...] O! worst of Women! for in that's contain'd
 The Sum of every thing, that's infamous.
 [...]
 Lull'd by thy Charms, I lay in passive Slumbers
 And to my foolish Love betray'd my Pow'r;
 ???⁴⁰⁸ to a frenzy, let your Will
 Dispose my Favours, and o're-rule my Laws.
 [...]
 KING: No more – you've sure forgot your life is in my Pow'r.
 QUEEN: No, you base perjurd King, I've not forgot it:
 I know your Power too well: – the *Gallic* Laws
 Give Men o're Wives a Pow'r Unjust, as Great,
 Nay more, I know thy Impotence of Mind
 Unable to resist the Lust of Vengeance;
 Ev'n to thy Ruin thou'st pursue my Life (IV. i, 26 f).

The scene abounds with display of mutual contempt and hence presents a representational antidote to the Cambrian couple's enactments of conjugal bliss and devotion. Both King and Queen exhibit most “barbarous” vices, incrementally associated with tyrannical rule, namely disregard for “base notions”, lust for glory and revenge, blind ambitions, in short: the “foolish pride” of empire. In juxtaposing the Gallic and British couple, the play drastically mills out the “domestic virtues” of the British. At the same time as the personal pitfalls of imperial ambition are performed, virtuous behaviour is shown as rewarding both personal *and* public life. The Gallic couple is presented as being incapable of differentiating between the private and public realm – “foolish pride” over-

408 The word is unreadable.

rules their behaviour everywhere – whereas the British couple displays virtues as part of their public as well as their private characters.

In *Love's Victim*, Gildon conducts a double displacement of the plot: the action is set almost 1800 years in the past and the scene is set in a coastal town in France. However, in exhibiting "domestic" heroes in the play and in furthermore referencing British ancient history and relating it to the history of the Roman Empire, the plot is also firmly positioned in the present in that it refers to contemporary political struggles. The historical displacement, as we have seen, is both suggestive of a myth of origins and – albeit slightly encrypted – laying a claim to Britain's imperial status as successors to the Romans.

The foreign coastal space depicted in the play also has a twofold function. On the one hand, the dangerous shore is described as "strange", with "craggy Cliffs" and "pathless Rocks" (IV. i, 31), as the spatial equivalent to its barbarous denizens. Corporately, nature, the inhabitants and the nearby sea comprise an awkward and dangerous space which serves to draw a border to the virtuous Britons and the "safe haven" that is Cambria. On the other hand, however, in steadily displaying their "domestic virtues", the British transcend the foreign shore. Rhesus and his fellow soldiers manage to both take over the land and to renew his claim to the woman-as-land, Alboina, and their mutual offspring. At the beginning of act V the French King is informed that the British fleet has landed: "MESSENGER: [...] The British Fleet all anchor'd in our Port, / This by the *Cambrian* Pris'ners was discover'd; / Who from the Ramparts leapt into the Sea, / Swam all aboard, with loud Applause were welcom'd, / And then, with fury, *Rhesus* led his Men / To shore" (V. i, 36 f). From then on, the Britons – Neptune's Chosen – invade the foreign shore, both spatially and morally, as their virtuous example impresses the French King's subjects. And in a final act of possession, Rhesus is – albeit only for a short while – reunited with his wife, the "dear reward" which has escaped the fate of being "possessed" by the French.

Ultimately, the plot's double displacement underscores the Briton's ambitions to an empire of the sea, both in historical reference and in a display of appropriation. Maintaining and enforcing "domestic virtues" in the face of otherness has been presented to "move" and "instruct" the audience. *Love's Victim* has thus expanded England's claim to the sea through putting forward much more concrete points of historical and spatial reference, as well as perpetuating the claim through a spiritual perception of the sea as well.

2.5 *The Successful Pyrate: Vicarious Tourism to Madagascar*

2.5.1 Diminishing Distance: “English Breed” in “Africk’s warmest Bed”

In *Love’s Victim*, Gildon took pains to draw “domestic” characters on the stage, assailing playwrights who staged their plots in “*Each barbarous Corner of the Earth*” (Prologue). A decade on, Charles Johnson offers a play that not only stages “domestic” comic characters, but displaces these characters to a “Corner of the Earth” that requires the audience to engage in vicarious tourism to a distant island:

Without the Toil the distant World you see,
 And view all Nature in Epitome –
 This Stage has long with home-bred Fops been cloy’d,
 And ev’ry shining Coxcomb here enjoy’d:
 Our Author, therefore, willing to delight,
 Begs Leave – t’import a Fool or two to Night;
 While young remov’d to Africk’s warmest Bed
 Transplanted Slips of the true English breed.
 Then – When our Musick bids the Curtain rise,
 And shows the shadow’d Landskip to your Eyes,
 Let powerful Fancy your weak Faith beguile,
 Believe your selves in Madagascar’s Isle.
 Behold the Men and Manners of the Place,
 We’ll make your Passage easie cross the Seas:
 The Curtain – in three Hours, will drop again,
 And set you – safely down – in Drury-Lane (Prologue).⁴⁰⁹

The speaker here promotes a suspension of disbelief as a prerequisite for enjoying the performance, and invites the audience to observe “true English breed” in a foreign and exotic setting with the reassuring surety to only imaginatively leave Covent Garden. The play is marked off from representations of “home-bred fops” and “shining coxcombs” and promises to present an illusory setting as the audience will be set again “safely” in Drury-Lane. The prologue thus not only presents the island-setting as particularly noteworthy, but also draws the attention to the exact locale of the play’s action, namely Madagascar. Johnson’s *The Successful Pyrate*, which premiered on the 7th of November 1712⁴¹⁰

409 All quotes from the play’s second London edition, Charles JOHNSON, *The Successful Pyrate. A Play. As it is Acted at the Theatre-Royal in Drury-Lane by Her Majesty’s Servants* (London: Printed for Bernard Lintott, at the Cross-Keys, between the two Temple-Gates in Fleetstreet, 1713), the play’s title will be shortened to “SP”. References for quotations are given in the form “I. i, 1”, the first number represents the act, the second number the scene and the third number the page.

410 *The London Stage* further gives four more performance dates: 8th, 10th, 11th of November and

at the Theatre Royal in Drury Lane, presents a dramatic displacement that offers a much more concrete setting than *The Enchanted Island* or *A Common-Wealth of Women* and whose setting on Madagascar additionally relates the play's plot to events at the time of its first staging and not, as *Love's Victim*, to past histories.

At the beginning of the eighteenth century, this specific island had attracted a lot of attention from the – reading – public. The vast island, set 200 miles west of Africa and east of India, set “between the unknown and the exotic”,⁴¹¹ had not only been an ill-fated spot of numerous English shipwrecks of the time, but was also the locality for the establishment of pirate communities. Piracy, on the one hand, posed a severe economic and political threat to the emerging British nation state, but on the other hand, it was a topic that satisfied contemporary audiences⁴¹² hunger for adventurous tales of rebellion, treasure hunting and life at sea. For Britain and the other European maritime powers, the success and increasing geographical expansion of piracy had developed into a fully fledged threat to imperial and economic endeavours, and places like Madagascar – “an entrepôt for booty” – had turned into “a nightmarish model of a place they could not control”.⁴¹³

As the sea was perceived as a remote place full of dangers, shipwreck and invasion, a potential path to unknown lands full of “monstrous” creatures and barbarity, the figure of the pirate as threat to already dangerous maritime endeavours thus even increased the sense of apprehension and otherness that surrounded the sea. In this context, the image of the pirate came to be closely related to the space he occupied, a space that – still – seemed highly uncontrollable, but on whose safeguarding the colonial state increasingly depended. Yet, in a dialectic of fear and admiration, pirates aroused fascination and it therefore comes as no surprise that this fascination would be targeted on the stage. In 1709, three years before *The Successful Pyrate* was staged, *The Life and Adventures of Captain John Avery Famous English Pirate, (rais'd from a Cabin-Boy, to a King) now in Possession of Madagascar* by Adrian van Broeck⁴¹⁴ was published and proved to be a considerable success. The publication relates the life story of John Avery – or Henry Every in other accounts of the time – in

on December 16th of the same year, which indicates that the play was favourably received by the audience.

411 Hans TURLEY, *Rum, Sodomy, and the Lash: Piracy, Sexuality, and Masculine Identity* (New York and London: New York UP, 1999) 69.

412 That is newspaper readers, theatre audiences and people attending the frequent pirate-hangings at the Execution Dock in Wapping.

413 Marcus REDIKER, *Villains of All Nations: Atlantic Pirates in the Golden Age* (London and New York: Verso, 2004) 31.

414 Adrian VAN BROECK, *The life and adventures of Capt. John Avery, the famous English pirate, (rais'd from a cabin-boy, to a king) now in possession of Madagascar[...]* (London: printed and sold by J. Baker, at the Black-Row in Pater-Noster-Row, 1709).

elaborate detail, musing on the pirate's motivations, recounting personal setbacks and giving a – purportedly – truthful account of the inner workings of a pirate community. This portrayal indeed characterizes Avery as a rather heroic character and furthermore extensively describes the space of the island Madagascar itself, relating accounts of its native inhabitants, flora and fauna.

This fictional account aside, there is scant evidence of the exact biographical details of Avery's life. The only instance that is reported, which van Broeck also mentions, is Avery's plundering of one of the Great Mogul's vessels in 1695, an attack that caused considerable diplomatic consternation and posed significant problems for the East India Company's trade with the Great Mogul. However, several other life-accounts, amongst them Daniel Defoe's *The King of Pirates*⁴¹⁵ (1719), had fuelled the notoriety of Avery, prompting Johnson⁴¹⁶ to turn Avery into the protagonist of a tragicomedy ambiguously entitled *The Successful Pyrate*.

The play is set on Madagascar, where Arviragus rules as sovereign over a pirate commonwealth. The pirates manage to capture a shipwrecked vessel with an Indian princess on board and joyfully distribute the booty, as well as the women, amongst themselves. Arviragus, however, falls in love with the princess, Zaida, and intends to marry her, hoping to eventually found an "imperial race" with the native. But Zaida is already secretly betrothed to Aranes, an Omrah of her train. De Sale, Arviragus' disloyal Lieutenant has in the meantime started to plot an overthrow of the "pirate-king" and his malevolent suggestions induce Arviragus to send orders to kill Aranes. In an off-stage fight, Aranes is then reportedly killed and Arviragus, confronted with Zaida's sorrow, is deeply repentant. However, as De Sale and his fellow incompetent plotters are apprehended and put to trial, it is revealed that Aranes is alive as his friend Alvares was killed instead. The couple is reunited and Arviragus, upon finding Aranes' lost bracelet, understands the young man to be his own son and hence resigns from his kingdom, handing it over to the young couple and returning to England.

The Successful Pyrate thus offers a setting and plot that very specifically highlight maritime spaces and maritime incidents. The play has a specific, geographically locatable setting and the plot refers to a real-life character and

415 The full title of the novel is: "The King of Pirates, Being an Account of the Famous Enterprises of Captain Avery, the Mock king of Madagascar, with his rambles and piracies, wherein all the sham accounts formerly published of him are detected. In two letters from himself: one during his stay at Madagascar, and one since his escape from thence". Captain Avery (1653 – 1696) was also the model for Defoe's *Captain Singleton* (1720).

416 Not to be confused with the pseudonym of the author – Captain Charles Johnson – of *A General History of the Robberies and Murders of the most notorious Pyrates* (1724). The playwright Johnson was a friend of the theatre manager Robert Wilks and, one year previously, had a huge success with his *The Wife's Relief, or, The Husband's Cure*, which in 1711 was performed at least ten times and was in print for the next two decades.

events that had factually occurred in the recent past, around 15 years prior to the play's premiere. Both space and time are concretised and the issues at stake are no longer displaced in historical past, but firmly planted within contemporary news. The play marks a significant stage in the development of staging the sea and the theatrical representation of island-spaces as its overt reference to actual places and events is indicative of a growing familiarization with issues surrounding maritime expansion and colonial maintenance.

Furthermore, the prologue highlights the increasing interconnection of the circum-Atlantic in that it announces to present "English breed" and far-away locations, while at the same time keeping the audience "safe" inside a metropolitan playhouse. The relation to the sea and distant colonial locations is thus dramatically expressed and the impact of far-away events on the colonial centre referred to. Despite the play's ambiguous title and the representation of a subversive plot depicting a pirate commonwealth, the execution of the plot itself, however, works at regulating the subversive potential by a representational control of the island as space. The following analysis will hence focus on the play's representation of the pirate-utopia, performances of authority and the play's implicit critique of imperialism.⁴¹⁷

2.5.2 Pirate Utopia Exposed

Contrary to *The Enchanted Island* and *Love's Victim*, *The Successful Pyrate's* first scene is set neither in a barely touched pastoral island-setting nor in a rough and wild landscape, but presents a "fine Country" – as well as a port and ships – in the background, presenting a "civil", indeed even commercial space: "SCENE *the Port of Laurentia, Ships in the Harbour, and a fine Country in the Prospect*" (I. i). The setting is thus already honing in on the "foreign" space and scaling down the difference between England and Madagascar as the scene is not presented as an exotic or even "empty" space. The characters and their representation henceforth, however, suggest a foreign setting, but these representations are also characterized with references to London and thus the setting is additionally familiarized by way of dialogue and the characters' depiction.

The pirate-community goes on to be presented as a utopian set-up in several respects. On the one hand, the "successful pyrate" himself is characterized with reference to his independent and deviant spirit, while on the other hand, the island's pirate-community is presented as not only expressive of colonial fantasies of riches and freedom, but also as pervaded by other, destructive, enactments of social deviance.

⁴¹⁷ See Chapter 4 for a discussion of the play considering the notion of "Theatres of Escape".

Arviragus is characterized as a self-made sovereign of a pirate commonwealth, a man who “declared War upon Mankind, renounc’d the Rights he was born /to as a Member of Society, and fixt himself here on his own pro-/per Basis, which how well he has maintain’d, be this fair Island,/of which he is sole Monarch, my Evidence” (I. i, 3, Boreal, Arviragus’ admiral). Once more, the appropriation of the island-space is achieved through representing an act of colonisation as natural. Arviragus is presented as “sole monarch” over a “fair island” he has obtained through a gesture Pratt has termed “monarch-of-all-I-survey”,⁴¹⁸ one which gives him authority over the island which is now “his own proper basis”.⁴¹⁹ In this respect, his latinized name – from Avery to Arviragus – can also be read as a way to underscore his claim to authority following the style of names from ancient empires.

Arviragus has also gathered round him a group of pirates and other socially deviant characters, like mercantile and matrimonial refugees, and declared himself King, offering to his subjects equal share of any booty in return for their loyalty. However, as the plot evolves this set-up is challenged, as not only the motives of several of the pirates are presented as ridiculous – most notably the matrimonial refugees, who have run away from their London wives – but the “commonwealth” itself increasingly turns out to be not so much a political alternative to life as “members of society”, but as merely a union for amassing “women and gold”.

Enter Jollyboy. JOLLYBOY: New, News, my Boys of Mettle, my Lads of Oak, / and Canvas, there’s a Sail brought in worth an Empire’s Ran- / som--Women and Gold Boys, Plenty of both – -the only / two valuable Blessings of Life are arriv’d in *Laurentia*, and land – ing this Minute (I. i, 6).

This prospect at first appears as indeed a “blessing”, as it matches the vision of the peasant utopia – the Land of Cockayne – where work had been abolished, goods fairly distributed and social distinctions flattened⁴²⁰ and also as it appears as a colonial utopia where an “empire’s ransom” is – more or less literally – simply washed ashore. The abundance of “women and gold” Jollyboy mentions is actually staged in the next act, where the Indian women are lined up to be allotted to the pirates and their representation as commodities is framed like a slave-auction:

Enter Jollyboy, Piraquo, Tulip; and on the other side, several Women, Lydia and Lesbia; a Laurentian Boy, in the native Habit, with a Jar filled with Balls of Wax for Lots.

418 See Pratt 201 and also Weaver-Hightower 1 – 42.

419 Emphasis GW.

420 See Rediker, *Villains of All Nations* 62.

JOLLYBOY: Hah, my Golden Hearts, my merry Boys, Children / of Joy and Pleasure, a gracious Prince, a bounteous Sovereign, / he has chosen out the finest Women in the Island for you; and / Heaven and you know 'tis but thinly peopled with Petticoats- yet further, he has order'd me to pay 2000 Gold Ducats a Head / for every Wife drawn by Lot amongst you (II. i, 14).

Here, the women's representation as "finest women in the island" and, furthermore, them being offered as available to the pirates is performing the island-setting as a space for colonial fantasies that centre on sexual abundance. Arviragus here appears as "gracious Prince" who liberally "supplies" his subjects with women the island has been lacking so far. The very theatrical staging of the scene, with the exotic women on one side and the pirates on the other, portrays the island as an oriental setting as the space indeed appears as a "stage" confining, and indeed commodifying, the Other women.

However, this exotic scene, as much as it at first glance appears as a desirous male fantasy, is systematically debunked in the following as the tableaux' overt references to colonial spaces – the "boy in the native Habit" (II. i, 14), the "veiled" women (I. ii, 10) – are crossed with references to the theatrical frame and the space of the metropolis itself. First, the ensuing "wife raffle" provokes the tellingly named Chicane to complain about its lack of legal formalities:

Ay, but things are not done in Form, not Legally, Admiral – There shou'd have issu'd out a Writ *de Uxore Capiendâ*, with a Precept to the Sheriff, and a *Fi.Fa.* annex'd, to have levy'd the Bodies of the several beautiful Women, &c. and have brought'em before us such a Day *apud le Guild-Hall in le Pall' Royal'* (II. i, 13).

Chicane's objections not only reference London – "le Guild-Hall in le Pall' Royal'" –, but the ironic portrayal of the legal profession also refers to the theatrical frame in hinting at a long-established tradition of mocking lawyers on stage.⁴²¹ Secondly, some of the pirates are shown as being reluctant to succumb to matrimony. "PIRAQUO: 'Tis an imposition upon the Free Subject. JOLLYBOY: What, man? We must mend the Breed, we must pro-/vide for Posterity" (II. i, 14). Piraquo is presented as a quintessential town-fop, a stock character on Restoration and early eighteenth-century stages, thus not only again referencing the theatrical frame, but also portraying the pirate-commonwealth as unable to "mend the breed", that is to create a lasting commonwealth through procreation. The utopian set-up is hence revealed to be sifted by all-too-familiar characters for theatre audiences, namely petty lawyers and town-fops. Moreover, in the course of the "raffle" it is uncovered that two of the

421 Such portrayals go back to e.g. Ben Jonson's *Volpone* (printed 1607). For an account of Restoration satire on lawyers, see Juan A. PRIETO-PABLOS, "Ignoramus, The Woman Turned Bully, and Restoration Satire on the Common Lawyer", *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900* 48.3 (2008): 523–546.

“Indian women”, Lydia and Lesbia, are the “very Identical, Numerical *London*” (II. i, 15 Piraquo) wives of Piraquo and Tulip. This comical meeting of the matrimonial refugees with their wives abridges the spatial distance between “Africk’s *warmest Bed*” (Prologue) and London. The island-space is, on the one hand, populated by theatrically familiar characters, and on the other hand the space of the sea appears as increasingly peopled and small as it brings people together against all odds. In this respect, *The Successful Pyrate* reflects the chance meetings presented in *A Common-Wealth of Women* as all these instances display the sea as a condensed space where established travel and trade routes facilitate meetings and re-meetings of colonial travellers.

The reunion of the matrimonial refugees with their “London wives” not only lessens the notional distance to Madagascar, but also debunks the imperial dreams of the pirates as they are presented as comical and foolish, unable to “mend the breed” or even overcome questions of justice. The comic depiction of the pirate-community and their utopian aspirations is further enforced in the third act, where the “lowest” – with regard to social standing – pirate characters debate a social uprising of their own.

Herring, Shark, Porpoise, Codshead “and several Mob” (III. i, 37) are already by name recognizable as naval subworkers and engage in a riotous and carnivalesque “uproar” against the imposition of wives on them: “OMNES: Huzza! Liberty and Property, Property and Liberty, / Huzzah!” (III. i, 37). In an enactment reminiscent of the mariners’ “commonwealth” in *The Enchanted Island*, the pirates here joyfully endorse “liberty and property” as the most manifest features of pirate communities,⁴²² but their uproar is uncovered as mere drunken revelry:

HERRING: Be happy, and be drunk, you Dogs; for we will have no
Arbitrary Wives to controul our Commands.

CODSHEAD: No, no, one and all we’ll not be marry’d
[...]

HERRING: I’ll be a Slave to nothing but Sack, I’ll be marry’d to a
Pipe of Canary, and drink my Wife dry. –

*When I dye, let me have
I a hogshead my Grave,
And fill it with racy Canary;
Then ye Jollyboys come,
Drink and roar round my Tomb,
I’ll make all the Good-fellows merry* (III. i, 37 f).⁴²³

422 See Rediker, “Chapter 3: Who Will Go “A Pyrating?”” 38–59 and “Chapter 4: The New Government of the Ship”, *Villains of All Nations* 50–82.

423 The lines in italics were probably sung by all.

In exclaiming their aversion against “arbitrary wives”, and thus replacing the more political request against “arbitrary government”, the pirates’ motivations are here exposed as petty and driven by intoxication. Just like their fellow pirates Tulip and Piraquo, these sailors are averse to matrimony and their inebriated exclamations and singing shows the pirate community as merely based on drunken revelry, not some superior political or social motive. Drunkenness here, like in *The Enchanted Island*, is one device to foretell the transience of their maelstrom.

Herring then goes on to cry out: “Look ye, this is no Rebellion, but an Uproar, and I am Lord / of Misrule” (III. i, 38), demonstrating that they do not have any specific political purpose in view, but simply enjoy commotion. This scene can be read as a hyperbolic version of the mariners’ scenes in *The Enchanted Island*,⁴²⁴ where the characters’ political utopia was equally spurred on by alcohol and also equally short-lived. The pirates’ “uproar” is thus quickly dissolved by the approaching Boreal and Richardo, Captain of the Guards, who demands: “The King commands you instantly depart, / Each to your several house, and cease your Riot” (III. i, 40). The pirates instantly obey and retreat, while Boreal shouts after them: “You must have Wives, my Friends, to keep you at home, / and preserve your little Heads from being perplext with Poli- / ticks” (III. i, 40). Boreal’s patronizing remark and his comical order – “You must have Wives” – further ridicules the pirates’ meagre political determination.

The stability of the pirate-community is put to a further test when De Sale is shown as plotting an overthrow of Arviragus. In act IV the plotters congregate and – contrary to Herring and his comrades – De Sale, Jollyboy, Piraquo, Chicane and Tulip set out to debate a new political model, not just an “uproar”:

JOLLYBOY: No, no, not at all my Jolly-Heart, my Boy of Pleasure, we are all five to be Rulers, to have an equal share in the Government – What is that hard Word you call it, *Piraquo*?
 PIRAQUO: A *Pentarche* – The Model is all new, a Foundation upon which no Government on Earth was ever built before – I know ‘twill prove auspicious (IV. ii, 44 f).

By the difficulty in even naming the undertaking, the political durability of this “pentarche” is immediately rendered hollow. Further, in a somewhat different take on the reluctance of the pirates to get married, Jollyboy’s homoerotic undertones suggest a different reason than merely the refusal to be ruled by wives for their refusal.⁴²⁵

The plotting is quickly halted once more with the arrival of Boreal, “Guards

424 *The Enchanted Island* was performed throughout the year 1712, so audiences were likely to pick up on such references.

425 See Turley for a discussion of sodomy and piracy in the eighteenth century.

and Soldiers”, who seize the conspirators and Boreal again mocks their “new model of government”: “No Faith, we have Evidence enough without you, and/five, you know, Sir *Gaudy*, make the best Company in the/World” (IV. ii, 47). In a final shift, the “pentarche” is then unmasked as theatrical play. As the plotters are lead off stage, Tulip complains: “You are a dirty Clown, refuse a Man in Affliction a So-/liloquy – ” (IV. ii, 47). This reference to the theatrical frame and play-acting not only serves to downgrade the seriousness of the pirates’ political ideas, but also again draws attention to the actual locale of the play’s action, thus also downscaling the spatial distance between Madagascar and the playhouse. In this regard one can argue that *The Successful Pyrate’s* staging of colonial fantasies through the depiction of a pirate-community simultaneously serves to debunk the very fantasies it gives rise to.

The representation of the island of Madagascar and its pirate-community thus eventually works to scale down the spatial distance between the exotic and foreign island and the metropolis and thus ultimately renders the unknown space more manageable. Furthermore, the ironic presentation of the characters, the appearance of the “London wives” as well as the repeated gesturing to the theatrical frame all serve to – in form and content – expose the colonial utopia as merely drunken and incompetent “uproars”.

2.5.3 Imperial “Toy Ambitions”: Remorse and Return

The fragile state of the pirate-community is most prominently captured in the character of the “successful pyrate” himself. Being the “sovereign” of Madagascar, the character of Arviragus is designed to be the focal point of discussions of authority within the play and is also ultimately answerable to the actual “success” of his enterprise. As the island’s autonomy as colonial screen is undermined by the continuous “surfacing” of the metropolis, the link between Madagascar and London is further established in that the majority of the pirates are presented as refugees of one sort or another, with Arviragus indeed being the first one:

BOREAL: [...] He commanded a Fire-ship in the *Dutch Wars*
 [...] Well, Sir, he return’d, and as the
 Reward of his Gallantry, he was broke, and made incapable
 of ever serving more–
 [...] He call’d a Coward by his proper Name, and
 beat him to prove it – Well, to add to this grateful Return,
 he found his Friend had entirely den’y his Trust, had cheated
 him of his Estate, and was marry’d to his Mistress [...]
 Thus spighted at this World, he sought a new one,

the pirate's empire. Arviragus refers to historical examples of empires where "titles" were bestowed by power and thus, he reasons, "power" can also yield "place", a corollary that sanctions his rule over the island. His claim to the space of the island, his empire, does not rely on "a long line of lazy ancestors", but derives from "power" and "laws". This "civil right" distinguishes his rule from that of a "tyrant". However, the pirate-king's claims to empire are now changing as he himself wants to establish a "mighty nation", a "race of kings", with Zaida. Aranes points to this novel claim in calling the pirate-king an "invader", and indeed, in conceiving the princess as land, both in physically desiring to "invade" her and in figuratively laying a claim to the land through reproduction with her, Arviragus attempts to legitimise his role through appropriation of the female native as land. The pirate's ambitions exceed his foremost established "private" empire and turn imperial with Aranes opposing the King's imperial presumptions and declaring the joys of a "private" empire: "Extended Empire, Freedom, Life and Love, / Live all within the Circle of her Arms!" (II. ii, 23). Arviragus reacts obstinately, demands Aranes' arrest and proclaims: "Here she shall blaze like our warm *Eastern Sun*, / The Royal Partner of my Bed and Throne" (II. ii, 24). In commodifying and appropriating the Indian woman, willingly ignoring her conjugal bonds with Aranes and rising above his sovereignty, Arviragus' authority is damaged as it now principally rests on his ability to exert "power" over the land.

In the course of the next act Aranes gets another chance to meet Zaida; amidst mutual displays of their affection, Aranes cries out to "ye Rulers of the World", claiming that "'Tis not [...] in Power, / In Wealth, nor all the glittering Train of Pride, / To give the Mind true Happiness, 'tis Love, / 'Tis mutual Love and Virtue" (III. i, 32). The young Omrah thus once more challenges Arviragus' imperial aspirations and in adjuring the joys of "love" and "virtue" he also indirectly discloses a way of retreat for the King. Aranes eventually turns out to be Arviragus' own son,⁴²⁶ so it is that the young Omrah's alleged death presses hard on the King, stirring an emotional response that makes Arviragus himself question his own authority: "How comes it, Soldier, / That now I feel an inmate Foe who shakes me?" (V. i, 56, to Boreal). Upon having to decide whether the conspirators round De Sale shall be killed, Arviragus is finally hit with the outrage of his presumptions:

Ha, ha, what Right? what Royalty's in me?
 Death! who must Die? what, must my Fellow-Creatures,
 because they bravely wou'd no longer bear
 A single Person's overweening Pride,

426 Turley gets it wrong in his book as he writes that Zaida is Arviragus' daughter; there is no other edition of the play available which could account for this mistake.

And Power usurp'd: What, must they die for this?
 Oh! *Boreal*, I am sick of my own Folly,
 the gaudy Bubble breaks, this Toy Ambition
 is idler than a feverish Dream, or Infant's Wish (V. i, 57).

Finally, Arviragus thus faces his “toy ambition”, realizing that his “power” had been “usurp'd” and stemmed from his private “pride”. In further realizing Aranes to be his son, he announces his retreat from Madagascar. Arviragus subsequently renounces all authority over the island, offering it to Aranes and Zaida, who “without a Crime [can] enjoy my Throne” (V. i, 61). In characterizing his rule of the island thus as criminal and unlawful, Arviragus invests the “power” to rule in the Indian couple and announces to recoil to his own native shores: “such strong Desires mov'd me to taste again / the Sweets of native Air” (V. i, 61). Ultimately thus, Arviragus' imperial project is presented as a failure and England can welcome back the former pirate-king as a private man.

The English public's fascination with Madagascar, and the pirate communities that dwelled on the island, highlights an array of fantasies and fears surrounding colonial expansion. On the one hand, such pirate-communities offered small-scale promises of wealth and liberty, whereas on the other hand piracy threatened the English colonial project substantially. Hence, the existence of islands such as Madagascar – and their literary representation – is expressive of the underlying danger of imperial and maritime endeavours as it highlights their distance to institutions of social control and discipline. The dramatic representation of such island-spaces then serves to simulate control over these far-away locations. The potential subversiveness of the representation of a “*successful pyrate*”⁴²⁷ in Johnson's play is, however, curtailed through the community's representation. In scaling down the spatial distance between Madagascar and London – through formally framing the play with theatrical gestures and with regards to content displaying very “metropolitan” characters – the foreign shore is theatrically invaded and the imperial ambitions of its inhabitants are systematically debunked. The “successful pyrate” repents, as not only his ultimate conquest of the “land” is denied, but the lure of domestic air eventually prevails and leaves behind a reverence for more traditional authority.⁴²⁸

427 Emphasis GW.

428 See Orr 209.

2.6 Summary: Mapping the Sea

As the theatrical representation of maritime spaces has shown, islands and shores functioned as quintessential loci in negotiating and shaping British cultural identity within the Restoration and early eighteenth century. These “mappings” serve to control and organize the unknown spaces of the maritime world, while the presentation and re-presentation of the empire’s peripheries serves to generate a “sense of itself” for the empire.⁴²⁹ The depiction of maritime spaces in the plays discussed in this chapter performs colonial anxieties and ambitions, the fears and risks of sea-faring and discovery, the lure of riches and hopes of plenitude as an important part of culturally defining boundaries.

In opening up horizons of difference and displacement, the representation of islands emphasizes categories of identity and alterity, and through the semanticization of maritime spaces, colonial discourses ultimately confine and control aspects of deviance, metamorphosis and liminality that are being fuelled by the initial displacement. In performatively projecting such aspects, categories of gender, race, class and age are negotiated and imaginative geographies of the emerging empire of the seas are performatively mapped.

These “mappings” turn theatrical entertainments to instances of vicarious tourism as they not only render the stage a medium of transport to foreign locales, but present the stage itself as an exotic locale. The playhouse thus appears as a “safe setting” for respective representations as the exotic settings are bracketed through the distance between London and the depicted islands. As colonial spaces are presented as controllable as well as disturbingly Other, the plays emerge as instances of control and criticism of colonial endeavours, highlighting the theatre as a site of negotiation for these shifting paradigms.

The changing semiotics of island/shore-representations within these plays further suggests increasing ideological work towards the “concretization” of maritime expansion. *The Enchanted Island* presents a historically as well as spatially indeterminate setting with the characters’ final leaving of the island underscoring the ambivalent and critical representation of colonial enterprises. *A Common-Wealth of Women*, which equally presents the island-setting as a divided space, attaches various functions to the two island-parts. On the one hand, the play depicts colonial anxieties like the fear of wildness and going native, while on the other hand, the play suspends anxieties in emphasizing patriarchal authority and presenting maritime endeavours as ultimately profitable. *The Enchanted Island* and *A Common-Wealth of Women* thus present islands as rather “empty spaces”, spaces with hardly any history where settlement and appropriation are barely contested.

429 See Pratt 4.

Love's Victim and *The Successful Pyrate* present maritime spaces as not "empty", but as peopled, historically and geographically specific. *Love's Victim* offers a spatially as well as historically traceable setting, and the play's temporal displacement and its confrontation of the Britons and the French offers patriotic references that are pivotal in the text's negotiation of cultural borders and fortress identities. Lastly, *The Successful Pyrate* emerged out of contemporary accounts of a concrete island-setting and is thus indicative of a growing familiarization with issues of maritime expansion and colonial maintenance. The play further highlights the mounting interconnectedness of the circum-Atlantic, presenting Madagascar as a neuralgic point of cultural contact within the space of the sea.

In representing colonial anxieties and ambitions, all these plays demonstrate a conflicted negotiation of aspects of sovereignty, gender and race within an emerging colonial society. In references to the theatrical frame, but also in the increasing suffusion of the plays' plots with contemporary metropolitan life, the primordial inconceivability of the vast sea is compensated and discursively redressed. The empire of the deep is hence promoted in that British cultural identity is ultimately shown as being superior and advantageous and in that maritime spaces are presented as not only progressively more part of the realm, but also as increasingly manageable, and ultimately, profitable.

3. Staging Sailors: The Sea on Land

3.1 Manning the Sea: Mariners as “Third Sort of Persons”

Sailing near the English south coast in 1754 on his way to Lisbon, Henry Fielding noted:

Hence, moreover, will appear the very resemblance between the sea-faring men of all ages and nations; and here perhaps may be established the truth and justice of that observation, which will occur oftener than once in this voyage, that all human flesh is not the same flesh, but that there is one kind of flesh of landmen, and another of seamen.⁴³⁰

According to the English writer, seamen are thus a separate species of humans, acutely characterised by the element that sets them apart from the rest of mankind. This categorization, Fielding asserts, is based on first-hand observations he made during his travels; an observation apparently so striking that the biblical assertion of human flesh as of “one kind”, has to be qualified.⁴³¹ This difference, however, is no mere anthropological constant, but is also echoed in the spaces seamen inhabit. John Fielding, Henry’s half-brother, described London’s port districts Rotherhithe and Wapping as places “chiefly inhabited by sailors, [where] a man would be apt to suspect himself in another country. Their manner of living, speaking, acting, dressing and behaving, are so very peculiar to themselves”.⁴³² Seamen, in these accounts, emerge as Other; they are inherently

430 Henry FIELDING, “The Journal of a Voyage to Lisbon”, *The Journal of a Voyage to Lisbon, Shamela, and Occasional Writings*, Martin C. Battestin ed., The Wesleyan Edition of the Works of Henry Fielding (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2008) 514 – 660, 627. The entry is from Sunday, July 21st. Fielding is on his way to an anchor of Berry Head/Devon, at the point of the south shore of Torbay, where he is delayed.

431 “For not all flesh is the same, but there is one kind for humans, another for animals, another for birds, and another for fish”, Corinthians 15.39.

432 John FIELDING, *A brief description of the cities of London and Westminster, the public buildings, palaces, gardens, squares, &c. with an alphabetical list of all the streets, squares, courts, lanes and alleys, &c. within the bills of mortality. To which are added, Some proper*

different from “landsmen”, not just “in flesh”, but in an array of behavioural features that mark off on their surroundings and so constitute an other space, almost like “another country.” Taken together, the Fieldings’ observations cast seamen as categorically different, a difference from landsmen that indeed seems to be made for theatrical display, as they are “speaking, acting, dressing and behaving, [...] so very peculiar to themselves”.

In this sense, this chapter will direct the focus on aforementioned strategies that represented the sailor not only literally, but also figuratively different on the Restoration and early eighteenth-century stage⁴³³ – a difference conveying the profuse entanglement of sailors in colonial discourses and, as such, embodying the cultural dialectics of Self/Other. This difference is situated within a discursive framework of understanding mariners as anthropologically distinct. In order to unfold this framework, this subchapter will draw on an array of literary as well as political texts that by example illustrate the mariner’s increasing economic importance, the distinctiveness of the maritime profession as well as the corresponding distinctiveness of mariners as Other: violent, deviant and boisterous men. As one example, the debate surrounding the suitable manning of the vessels of the Royal Navy will be considered as it provides a fitting framework for analysing the theatrical representation of mariners on the period’s stages. The respective stage sailor⁴³⁴ can be analysed as a key figure in negotiating Englishness and collective identity. His representation as a liminal character not only affects some of the period’s most prominent issues, such as maritime expansion, trade and defence, but his representation is also mounted in colonial discourses, employing a “regime of truth” which produces the sailor as Other, “yet entirely knowable and visible”.⁴³⁵

The sailor’s obvious aptness for the histrionic art is nothing new to the eighteenth century but was already realized in Renaissance Drama, where the number of stage sailors denotes a cultural concern with aspects of trade and travel.⁴³⁶ However, the representation of sailors as innately alien undergoes a

cautions to the Merchants, Tradesmen, and Shop-Keepers; Journeymen, Apprentices, Porters, Errand Boys, Book-Keepers, and Inn-Keepers; also very necessary for every Person going to London either on Business or Pleasure. By Sir John Fielding, One of his Majesty’s Justices of the Peace for the Counties of Middlesex, Essex, and Surry, and for the City and Liberty of Westminster (London: printed for J. WILKIE, No. 71, in St. Paul’s Church-Yard, 1776) xv.

433 Even though the quotes by Henry and John Fielding stem from later dates, they both are representative even for Restoration and early eighteenth-century attitudes towards mariners.

434 Henceforth the terms “sailor”, “mariner” and “seaman” will be employed interchangeably. Mariners on stage will be termed “stage sailors”, whereas – where appropriate – they will also be referred to as “tars” or “hearts of oak”.

435 Bhabha, “The Other Question”, *The Location of Culture* 101.

436 Thomas L. BERGER, William C. BRADFORD and Sidney L. SONDERGARD, *An Index of Characters in Early Modern English Drama: Printed Plays, 1500 – 1660*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge:

remarkable change during the course of the long eighteenth century, not least due to their increasing importance for a burgeoning empire of the sea. In this respect, the period’s accounts describing seamen as being of “one kind” are significant in that they sketch the representative framework within which these maritime characters have to be understood. The Fieldings’ descriptions of seamen thus accommodate a discourse surrounding the naval profession that oscillated between establishing the difference of seamen while at the same time negotiating their Englishness.

In reference to the seamen’s anthropological difference, claims insisting on the constancy of this characteristic stand out. Like the elder Fielding, who stressed the fact that his observation holds true for “all ages and nations”, seventeenth-century Presbyterian clergyman John Flavel authorizes his assertions with quoting the sixth-century Scythian philosopher Anarchasis, elaborating that “seamen are, as it were, a third sort of persons, to be numbered neither with the living nor the dead; their lives hanging continually in suspense before them”.⁴³⁷ Flavel’s *Navigation Spiritualized: or, A New Compass for Seamen* (1671) moved through at least 9 editions until the end of the eighteenth century and was printed throughout Great Britain as well as the American colonies. This popular publication and spiritual manual not only draws on apparently timeless facts, but here circumscribes the difference of seamen not so much in terms of behavioural features, but in terms of their environment and the imminent danger of their profession. Flavel goes on: “It is a gallant thing to be able to carry a ship richly laden round the world; but it is much more gallant to carry a soul”.⁴³⁸ Clearly, according to the author, the innate suspense of a risky profession calls for special spiritual guidance. This need for guidance, however, is also motivated by the fact that working on ships meant that the crew was for an extended period removed from regular instances of social authority and regulation, like church and family, and thus Flavel’s call for special spiritual guidance also mirrors respective anxieties of Christian authorities in this context.⁴³⁹

The risk involved in travel by sea, the “defiance of God(s)” implicated in this

CUP, 1998) identify 24 mariners in Tudor and Stuart plays, nearly as many as kings and queens together (26). Additionally they count 40 travellers and 105 merchants, another indication as to the cultural concern with economic expansion, of which the aptly named Fortune and Globe theatres are also witness. See also Robert Ralston CAWLEY, *Unpathed Waters: Studies in the Influence of the Voyagers on Elizabethan Literature* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1940).

437 John FLAVEL, “Navigation Spiritualized”, *The Works of John Flavel* Vol. 5, first republished by W. Baynes and Son, 1820 (London: The Banner of Truth Trust, London, 1968) 206.

438 Ibid. 209.

439 For this aspect, see Peter LINEBAUGH and Marcus REDIKER, *The Many-Headed Hydra: Sailors, Slaves, Commoners, and the Hidden History of the Revolutionary Atlantic* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2000) 143–174 and Timo HEIMERDINGER, *Der Seemann: Ein Berufsstand und seine kulturelle Inszenierung, 1844–2003* (Köln: Böhlau, 2005) 79–82.

brazen endeavour has, since antiquity, been subject of theological contestations,⁴⁴⁰ yet in Flavel's account the notion reverberates that carrying "riches" around the world might serve as a substitute for tending to the soul. In this, *Navigation Spiritualized* indeed addresses a highly contemporary issue as increase in trade and numerous military engagements saw the number of seamen treble from the time of the Restoration until the beginning of the eighteenth century. Indeed, to an ever larger extent, "navigation" came to be associated with trade, commerce and consumption. During the period considered, England developed into the world's leading trading nation and triumphant maritime power. "Navigation" thus proved to be the powerhouse of said development. And mariners, as Robinson in an early twentieth-century account of *The British Tar in Fact and Fiction* (1909) euphemistically enthuses, "opened up fresh regions in their quest for the riches of distant lands, and their knocking at the gates of the treasure house of the world".⁴⁴¹ The economic significance of maritime trade as a source of imports and exports, employment and profit was huge⁴⁴² – seamen were certainly crucial figures in the development of mercantile capitalism and colonialism and their association with trade was thus also part of their public perception. One of the most popular seventeenth-century street songs, *Neptune's raging fury*,⁴⁴³ maintains this connection cheerily: "Our merchants will employ us, / To fetch them wealth I know: / Then to be bold, work for gold, / When the stormy winds doe blow".⁴⁴⁴ These lines plainly allude to the role seamen played in the early years of empire: placed very much at the forefront of colonial endeavours, seamen bore the brunt in this dangerous profession in order to

440 For studies on the ambivalent appraisal of the sea in antiquity, see Lesky and Heydenreich.

441 Robinson 49.

442 See Jeremy BLACK and Philip WOODFINE eds., *The British Navy and the Use of Naval Power in the Eighteenth Century* (Leicester: Leicester UP, 1988) 7, who also draw upon the importance of naval power in securing trade. In the eighteenth century Britain probably had the highest proportion of gross national product and employment linked to foreign trade of the major European power. For the importance of maritime trade and the development of the city of London, see the Museum of London at the Docklands <http://www.museumindocklands.org.uk/English/>. For historical accounts of English or later British naval mastery and trade, see also G. J. MARCUS, *Heart of Oak: A Survey of British Sea Power in the Georgian Era* (London: OUP, 1975), Paul M. KENNEDY, *The Rise and Fall of British Naval Mastery* (London: Allen Lane Penguin Books, 1976) and Sari R. HORNSTEIN, *The Restoration Navy and English Foreign Trade, 1674–1688: A Study in the Peacetime Use of Sea Power*, Studies in Naval History (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1991)

443 J. P., *Neptunes raging fury, or, The gallant sea-mens sufferings. Being a relation of their perils and dangers, and of the extraordinary hazards they undergo in their noble adventures. Together with their undaunted valor, and rare constancy, in all their extremities. And the manner of their rejoicing on shore at their return home. To the tune of, When the stormy windes doe blow* (London: Printed by T. Mabb, for Ric. Burton, at the Horse-shoe in Smith-field, between 1650 and 1665).

444 J.P. unpaginated.

“fetch them wealth”. As Peter Linebaugh and Marcus Rediker have shown, mariners were amongst the mobile workers who were responsible for the rise of the modern, global economy. In this regard, they term the seamen’s workplace a “machine of empire”⁴⁴⁵ as, by 1700, the ship can be seen as the prime engine of capitalism and commerce.

The notion of ships as “machines”, mariners hence being the “operators” of these machines, is complicated by the inherent risk and uncertainty surrounding maritime endeavours. The frequency of shipwrecks and other disasters at sea⁴⁴⁶ was widely acknowledged and can be said to account for the suspicion that there is a “third sort of persons” apparently callous towards the jeopardy their lives are in. The concluding line of shipman William Funnell’s account of an expedition with Captain Dampier gives a remarkable indication as to the existential extremes the seafaring profession faced: “And on the 26th of April, 1706. after many Dangers both by Sea and Land, we happily arrived in England; being but eighteen out of one hundred and eighty-three which went out with us”.⁴⁴⁷ But evidently mariners were also perceived as a “sort” motivated by prospects of gain and adventure, as Flavel hinted at and as the chant for “then be bold, work for gold” quoted above suggests. This often evoked lure of the sea is famously exposed in the opening passages of one of the most famous literary works of the eighteenth century: “[My father] told me it was men of desperate fortunes on one hand, or of aspiring, superior fortunes on the other, who went abroad upon adventures, to rise by enterprise, and make themselves famous in undertakings of a nature out of the common road”.⁴⁴⁸ England’s trade and Navy relied profoundly on such men with “aspiring” or “desperate” fortunes, not just in terms of manpower, but also as in particular the Royal Navy attracted at-

445 Linebaugh / Rediker 150.

446 For the frequency of maritime disasters and their accounts in captains’ and sailors’ journals of the time, see Turley 14–18.

447 William FUNNELL, *A voyage round the world. Containing an account of Captain Dampier’s expedition into the South-Seas in the ship St George, in the years 1703 and 1704* [...] (London: Printed by W. Botham, for James Knapton at the Crown in St. Paul’s Church yard, 1707) 300.

448 Daniel DEFOE, *Robinson Crusoe*, 1719 (London et al.: Penguin, 1994) 8 f. Barnaby SLUSH, a “Sea-Cook”, also condemns the mercenary attitude of higher-ranking mariners, writing: “he [GW: a commander or officer] will, by an imbred bent of Soul, embrace the Charge, not for the Dignity, but the Profit of it; as containing whole Boat loads of pretty Ways and Means, to the fetching in agen his Purchase Money. [...] his precious Thoughts, are almost entirely taken up, with the Ingenious, Learned, and becoming Attempts, of making a Penny of every Body”, Barnaby SLUSH, *The Navy Royal: or a sea-cook turn’d projector. Containing a few thoughts, about manning our ships of war with the best of sailors, without violences, and in the most pleasing manner: According to the Fourth Article of a late Proposal, Publish’d by our Worthy Chaplain of Her Majesty’s Ship the Lyme* (London: Printed for B. Bragge, at the Raven in Pater-Noster-Row, 1709) 94.

tention as a key player in maintaining England's politics and expansion, and so the Navy's mariners – their character and treatment – moved into focus.

In this respect, it is remarkable how seamen came to be cast so thoroughly as a “third sort of persons”. Despite the fact that the hardships and risks of a life working at sea were generally acknowledged, the “brotherhood of peril”,⁴⁴⁹ as naval literary historian Robinson termed seamen, was also always associated with ambiguity and dubiousness. In his satirical review of *The Wooden World*⁴⁵⁰ (1707), Edward Ward dissects the personnel of a ship of war, caustically remarking that the ship as “the Sovereign of the Aquatick Globe”⁴⁵¹ might as well be understood as “the *New-Bridewell* of the Nation”, or – maybe – even worse: “Old *Nick's* Academy, where the seven liberal Sciences of Swearing, Drinking, Thieving, Whoring, Killing, Cozening, and Backbiting, are taught to full Perfection”.⁴⁵² Despite the mocking character of Ward's account, the stipulation of seamen as idle and brutal is very much in line with a host of writings that also present the otherness of mariners.⁴⁵³ Notably, this very otherness is also alleged to be almost beyond reform, as in the words of Defoe: “'Tis their way to be violent in all their motions [...] they swear violently, whore violently, drink punch violently, spend their money when they have it violently [...] in short they are violent fellows and ought to be encouraged to go to sea”.⁴⁵⁴ Defoe here suggests that ships can serve as floating spaces to lock away disagreeable fellows. This quote not quite indicates that “going to sea” can amend errant and violent ways, but in a sense Defoe here already proposes a function for ships that colonies were later to fulfil, namely that of “storehouse” for convicts. The association of mariners with deviance was common – a few decades later, Samuel Johnson cast a more casual remark as to the wit of mariners: “No man will be a sailor who has contrivance enough to get himself into a jail; for being in a ship is being in a jail, with the chance of being drowned”.⁴⁵⁵ Even though Johnson's comment shows a level of sympathy for the destitution of life on sea, it also leaves little doubt regarding the esteem of mariners as they appear as fools not quite

449 Robinson 43.

450 Edward WARD, *The wooden world dissected, in the characters of* 1. A ship of war. 2. A sea-captain. 3. A Sea-Lieutenant. 4. A Sea-Chaplain. 5. The Master of a Ship of War. 6. The Purser. 7. The Surgeon. 8. The Gunner. 9. The Carpenter. 10. The Boatswain. 11. A Sea-Cook. 12. A Midshipman. 13. The Captain's Steward. 14. A Sailor, &c, *By a lover of the mathematicks* (London : printed by H. Meere, and sold by B. Bragge, in Pater-Noster-Row, 1707).

451 Ward, *The Wooden World* 2.

452 Ibid. 2.

453 See Linebaugh/Rediker as well as J.D. Davies, *Gentlemen and Tarpaulins* and N.A.M. RODGER, *Essays in Naval History, from Medieval to Modern* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009).

454 Quoted in Peter EARLE, *Sailors: English Merchant Seamen 1650 – 1775* (London: Methuen, 1998) 13.

455 Quoted in James BOSWELL, *The Life of Samuel Johnson*, 1791 (London et al.: Penguin, 1979) 86.

calculating enough to prefer a life in prison on land. In pointing to the miserable conditions onboard, however, Johnson touches upon a seventeenth-century debate that included the harsh conditions in the naval service and which can be said to be decisive in thrashing out the otherness of mariners and, moreover, in initially fixating the “violent” character of seamen, prominently displayed on the Restoration stage.

The Royal Navy was a crucial and prominent institution in Restoration England, one also hotly debated not least because Oliver Cromwell had been a victorious naval leader and so the losses of the 1660s were quickly associated with the changed manning – and management – of the fleet. The central role the Navy played in economic and military aspects has been richly documented,⁴⁵⁶ but its centrality as a subject for spectacle and support for royal restoration is equally prominent. Howard Erskine-Hill mentions the example of the spectacle of the Royal Entry in 1661 where sailors were singing as part of a special entertainment outside East India House. He writes that the spectacle “In aptly exotic imagery [it] defied the rivalry of Holland and Spain, and anticipated the theme of the arch of Cornhill, which was a Naval Arch [which was] dominated by a great picture showing Charles I with the Prince of Wales viewing their ship ‘The Sovereign of the Sea’”.⁴⁵⁷ The Lord Mayor’s Pageants⁴⁵⁸ of the period also provide apt examples of celebrations of the Navy’s worth and significance for England. Celebrations of the Navy’s esteem continued on after the Glorious Revolution, again tied in with celebrations of the royals, as in – to give just one example – Thomas D’Urfey’s *A Pindarick poem on the Royal Navy, Most humbly Dedicated to Their August Majesties, K. William and Q. Mary* (1691)⁴⁵⁹ in which the poet conjures England’s maritime pre-eminence. And George Savile in another rhetorical play on the use of the term “nourishment”,⁴⁶⁰ called the Navy “life and Soule of the Government”⁴⁶¹ adjuring the Navy as one of the central agencies of

456 See Black/Woodfine as well as Steve PINCUS, *1688: The First Modern Revolution* (New Haven: Yale UP, 2009).

457 See Erskine-Hill 214–218, 217.

458 The Lord Mayor’s Shows also celebrate the capital as an emblem for a trading and colonising nation as in “London’s Resurrection” a song describes London as a city “Into whose lap is daily hurl’d / The various treasures of the World”, see Thomas JORDAN, *London’s resurrection to joy and triumph expressed in sundry shews, shapes, scenes, speeches and songs in parts celebrious to the much-meriting magistrate Sir George Waterman, knight, Lord Mayor of the city of London : at the peculiar and proper expences of the worshipful Company of Skinners / written by Tho. Jordan* (London: Printed by Henry Brome at the Gun in S. Paul’s Church-yard, 1671)7. See Owen, *Restoration Theatre and Crisis* 275–99 for a reading of these shows.

459 See Weinbrot, *Britannia’s Issue* 354. See also the “Painted Hall” at the Royal Naval College in Greenwich, which also testifies to the glorification of British maritime power.

460 See Chapter 1, p. 6.

461 Savile, *The Works* 298.

the state. The Navy thus was very much part of public discourses codifying England's fate and fortune with naval endeavours ideally, imaginatively and on very practical levels. The Navy was indeed very much present in English life, as it was "at once the largest spending department of the state, the largest industrial concern in the country, a floating community that could be as large as many a town or country community".⁴⁶² With these economic factors in mind, it comes as no surprise that the recruitment process of the nation's vessels turned out to be a core-issue of political discussion in the late seventeenth century.

The increasing service and reliance on the naval workforce was closely tied in with developments that promoted the professionalization of seamen,⁴⁶³ and the debates surrounding the state of the Navy after the Restoration swiftly focused on its manpower as the debauchery of English sea captains was singled out as the reason for England's naval decline. Samuel Pepys, as Clerk of the Acts to the Navy Board,⁴⁶⁴ was prominently placed to account for the state of the Navy, claiming that it was "in a very bad condition",⁴⁶⁵ a condition that was to become obvious in the string of defeats the naval forces suffered in the 1660s against the Dutch.⁴⁶⁶ The Navy Charles II succeeded to was very much a Cromwellian formation. In order to ensure loyalty within the fleet, the Stuarts launched out into replacing interregnum officers with men with cavalier loyalties. However, a considerable number of tars⁴⁶⁷ were still engaged as to divert the threat of poor morale amongst the seamen, thus the two groups of officers came to exemplify the different approaches to the recruitment of English seamen.⁴⁶⁸ The so-called tars

462 Davies 15. However, naval officers suffered a comparatively low income, only from 1700 on did their financial situation improve, see Geoffrey HOLMES, *Augustan England: Professions, State and Society, 1680 – 1730* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1982) 274 – 287.

463 For the development of a self-image of the naval profession, see Norbert ELIAS, "Studies on the Genesis of the Naval Profession", *The British Journal of Sociology* 1 (1950): 291 – 30, Peter KEMP, *The British Sailor: A Social History of the Lower Deck* (London: JM Dent & Sons, 1970) and Robert E. GLASS, "The Image of the Sea Officer in English Literature, 1660 – 1714", *Albion* 26.4 (1994): 583 – 599.

464 Pepys held this position from 1660 until 1673. From 1673 – 1679 and again from 1684 – 1689 he was Chief Secretary to the Admiralty.

465 Pepys, *Diary* Vol. I, 3.7. 1660.

466 Most prominently the defeat in the biggest sea battle of the Second Anglo-Dutch War (1695 – 1697), the so called Four Days Battle (1.–4. June 1666 in the Julian calendar or 11.–14. June in Gregorian calendar), as well as the Battle of the Medway (June 1667), see Frank L. Fox, *A Distant Storm: The Four Days' Battle of 1666*, (Rotherfield: Press of Sail, 1996).

467 The term "tar" is a shortened version of "tarpaulin", a piece of canvas washed over with tar and as such a piece of clothing used by seamen: as a cover during the night, or during rain, protection against the wind and the sun, the "tar" eventually became the sobriquet of seamen. Important to note is that in terming the seaman "tar", the seaman's proximity to the maritime world is emphasized as this sobriquet denotes the seaman as even corporally part of the ship.

468 The debate notably circled around the recruitment of officers, not lower-ranking mates.

were officers who had mounted from the lower deck, said to be brutal, bluff and uncouth, yet expert seamen: courageous, sober and assiduous. In general, a commissioned officer of the Navy was classified as a tar if he had come into the Navy either as an officer’s servant or seaman or had worked in the merchant service. Gentleman captains⁴⁶⁹ on the other hand, were supposed to be corrupt, lazy and drunken, with little or no knowledge of navigation and so their return to the naval service and employment by the Stuarts was regarded not only as an obstacle for seamanship, but – as Robert Glass points out: “a symbol of the corruption and decadence of the restored monarchy”.⁴⁷⁰ In this regard, the apparently decadent gentlemen of the Navy are by-proxy agents in a wider debate circling around the lifestyle and political capabilities of the newly restored Stuart court.⁴⁷¹ Even loyal Stuart secretary Pepys noted down his fondness for tars, writing he preferred “the old plain sea-captains [...] that would make their ships swim with blood, though they could not make legs as captains nowadays can”.⁴⁷² For Pepys, the manning of the fleet was also a question of balancing two differing capacities, the ability to fight and the ability to bow – thus suggesting that noble qualities or behaviour alone would not do in a Navy that was entangled in violent conflicts across Europe.

A year later, after the disaster of the Medway,⁴⁷³ Pepys further hints at the seeming fighting efficiency of tars, writing how “everyone doth nowadays reflect upon Oliver and commend him, so brave things he did and made all the neighbour princes fear him”.⁴⁷⁴ The lack of tars was thus perceived to be responsible for the loss of influence of the English Navy and the worrying advance of the power of immediate adversaries such as the Dutch and the French; certainly not by “everyone” as Pepys claims, but indeed many writers publishing their views on the issue in contemporary pamphlets nostalgically looked back to the Commonwealth.⁴⁷⁵ In this view, the tars – stout, brave and competent – were

469 The term “gentleman” in this context not necessarily connoted a man with regard to his higher social status, but applied to men from a variety of backgrounds.

470 Glass 585.

471 See J.D. DAVIES, “The Navy, Parliament and Political Crisis in the Reign of Charles II”, *The Historical Journal* 36.2 (1993): 271–288 and the introduction to Savile, *The Works* by Mark N. Brown for a useful summary of the debate.

472 Pepys, *Diary* Vol. VII, 10.6.66.

473 The Battle or Raid of the Medway was the worst defeat of the Royal Navy at the time and led to an end of the war and a peace negotiation favourable for the Dutch, see Rodger, *The Command of the Ocean*.

474 Pepys, *Diary* Vol. VIII, 12.7. 67.

475 For this aspect refer to the anonymous tract *The present condition of the English Navy set forth in a dialogue betwixt young Fudg of the Admiralty, and Capt. Steerwell, on Oliverian Commander* (London: printer unreadable, 1702) and also Richard Gibson, an associate of Pepys’, as quoted in Samuel PEPYS, *Private Correspondences and Miscellaneous Papers of Samuel Pepys, 1679–1703*, ed. J.R. Tanner, Vol. I (London: Bell, 1926) 118–125.

much preferable to the “Coachmen, Footmen, and the Relations and Friends, and sometimes Stallions and Bastards of lewd Women, who had Interest at Court; or other mean and dissolute Persons”.⁴⁷⁶ Crucial for this stance, again, was the notion that England is “in an Island” and that national glory and wealth were a matter of uncovering the naval core of the land, both in terms of spirit and men: “Nature has assign’d us an Island, and kind Providence furnish’d us with Materials to build Ships, and with Men of able Bodies and stout Hearts to man them”.⁴⁷⁷ Such opinions testify to the fact that the “manning of the machines of empire” certainly was an elementary, and as such contested, issue, touching on aspects as allusive as powerful, like the character of “stout Hearts” or the preference of vigour over manners. At the same time, the treatment of the mariners was also touchstone for patriotic sentiments, in that their management was made an example of the “rightful” esteem of English liberty, as the anonymous author of *Remarks upon the Navy* (1700) claims: “the Abuses of the Seamen are the highest Violation of *Magna Charta*, and the Rights and Liberties of *English Men*”.⁴⁷⁸

However, the amplitude and broad-brush quality of opinion-laden commentaries in diverse pamphlets as to the proper character of seamen, their importance for national advancement and defence of England, did little to help draw a more differentiated image. The representation of mariners as extremes of character, as alien and Other prevailed and playwrights and theatre impresarios duly had a field day, picking up, playing with – and cashing in – on these impressions. The Restoration stage spawned very popular images of the tar that, matched with similar depictions in Restoration and Augustan prose literature, redeemed such popular Theophrastian sketches.⁴⁷⁹ Robinson and Watson, both writing in the first half of the twentieth century on the “British Tar” and “Sailor in English Fiction” respectively, both provide a contemporary overview of the mariner’s stage representation.

Robinson, historian and himself commander of a ship, provided an account of literary mariners that is heavily tinged with patriotic sentiments, or, to quote his follower Watson: “the general impression made [...] is that the mariner must always be a noble fellow because, if he is not a noble fellow, he is not a mariner”.⁴⁸⁰ This verdict already suggests that the esteem of sailors at the cusp of

476 ANON. *An inquiry into the causes of our naval miscarriages: with Some Thoughts on the Interest of this Nation as to a Naval War, and of the only true Way of Manning the fleet. The second edition* (London: Printed in the Year 1707) 13.

477 ANON., *An inquiry into the causes of our naval miscarriages* iii.

478 ANON., *Remarks upon the Navy* (London: s.n., 1700) unpaginated.

479 See Christopher LLOYD, *The British Seaman 1200 – 1860: A Social Survey* (London: Collins, 1968).

480 Watson 1.

Britain’s “imperial century”⁴⁸¹ was very different from that at the outset of the imperial project. Robinson presents a highly essentialist image of the mariner: “Our subject being the personality of the British seaman, and its impression upon the national literature”.⁴⁸² In analysing stage representations of sailors, Robinson sets out to first assemble “the personality of the British seaman” from a variety of textual artefacts in order to then reconcile this image with stage sailors. His study is therefore very much motivated by patriotic concerns as Robinson solely draws upon very flattering accounts of sailors, while also emphasizing that “the stage sailor and the nautical play are British products, home-grown”.⁴⁸³ The author thus not only appropriates the sailor himself as an *essentially* British character, but beyond that distinguishes the development of theatre history as part of Britain’s emerging nation. He writes: “We have discovered traits in his character and features in his environment which should distinguish him among his fellows when the dramatic instinct of the nation blossoms and bears fruit”.⁴⁸⁴ His enthusiastic celebration of the British sailor⁴⁸⁵ and the character’s “impression” on national literature not only chronicles the emergence of the nation, but indeed reinforces the nation’s – literary – relation to the sea. This method of approach limits Robinson insofar as seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century stage sailors did not easily fit the picture Robinson has in mind. He complains: “the dramatic writers as a rule were little inspired by the gallant actions and thrilling experiences of the sailors”.⁴⁸⁶ Watson, writing 20 years later, justly criticises Robinson’s method and sets out to offer a more comprehensible overview which is less concerned with the “personality” of real-life sailors, but with literary representations. In regard to the stage, Watson singles out the “heart of oak”, a “boisterous, hard drinking, brave, and loyal seaman”⁴⁸⁷ as a prototype for dramatic representations. According to Watson, this “heart of oak” originates from the “humours tradition” deriving from Ben Jonson and his successors, with the “humours captain” being a thoroughly despicable officer, presented against a background of landsmen as a subject for contempt and mirth”.⁴⁸⁸ In reference to the Restoration stage, Watson states that the “plain dealer tradition” adjusted the humours captain, with the “plain

481 For that expression see Ronald HYAM, *Britain’s Imperial Century 1815–1914: A Study of Empire and Expansion* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002).

482 Robinson 41.

483 Ibid. xiii.

484 Ibid. 160.

485 “Gaiety and joyousness of disposition, a temperament prone to sentiment and romance, and a nature not seldom inclined to quaint unconventionality were developed in him, and largeness of heart and tolerance of mind were elements in his personality”, Ibid. 45.

486 Robinson 185.

487 Watson 3.

488 Ibid. 3.

dealer” priding himself upon his bluntness, honesty and bad manners: “He is usually a captain in rank, and is represented as rude, boisterous, amorous, and inclined to drink and fight on any occasion”.⁴⁸⁹

The bluff tars and plain dealers as mentioned by Watson did indeed thrive on the Restoration stage. In all plays under consideration in this chapter, stage sailors are presented as rough and unruly, fitting satiric butts for comic satire that exploits the mariner’s alleged ineptness in society, which is particularly developed in his relation to women. As Glass writes in a more recent account: “His bluff manner, colourful speech, and ignorance of social custom provided a ready-made comic character, an innocent to serve as a foil to the more sophisticated characters surrounding him”.⁴⁹⁰ This representation, as popularized and established through William Wycherley’s eponymous “Plain Dealer”, can be read within a colonial discourse framework. In stressing the stage sailors’ liminality and otherness, the study at hand provides an account moving beyond a “humours character”, which is a label most critics stress when considering naval characters of the time,⁴⁹¹ but instead analyses the character in terms of his stereotypical representation within colonial discourses. The stage sailor’s representation includes “an ‘other’ knowledge – a knowledge that is arrested and fetishistic and circulates through colonial discourse as that limited form of otherness”⁴⁹² in order to articulate forms of difference and employ a “regime of truth”.⁴⁹³ As the quotes above – from Fielding and Flavel to Johnson – illustrate, seamen were in several respects represented as persons “apart”: liminal characters displaying ambivalent or even downright opposing sentiments to people on land in terms of dress, language, manners, habits and religion. This literary image, prominently put on show on the theatrical stage of the time, can be understood as a discursive representation embodying the increasing presence of the sea in English society of the time. In framing London and its theatre stages as cultural contact zones, and thus as colonial “territory” themselves, the seaman’s representation as an “internal” other can be seen as essential for negotiations of colonialism at the outset of the imperial project.

With England’s accelerating trade, the corresponding maritime activities and the increasing visibility of foreign commodities, international visitors, lan-

489 Ibid. 139.

490 Glass 592.

491 See Orr 214.

492 Bhabha, “The Other Question”, *The Location of Culture* 111.

493 In this respect, it is crucial to analyse the stage sailor as a stereotype constructed through colonial discourses, as Bhabha emphasizes: “In order to understand the productivity of colonial power it is crucial to construct its regime of truth, not to subject its representations to a normalizing judgement”, *ibid.* 96.

guages and tales from distant regions,⁴⁹⁴ the contact zone widens and the metropolis itself can be analysed with this concept. Furthermore, the theatre can also be grasped as a contact zone on a more immediate level as the performative representation of colonial facets and characters offered a heightened sense of the international dynamism of London. The immediacy of theatrical performance encouraged playwrights to stage characters and scenes that depict the vital connection between the metropolis and events far away.⁴⁹⁵ So the awareness of being part of a proliferating empire, enhancing the “*idea of having an empire*”,⁴⁹⁶ was intensified. In this respect, mariners present archetypal *Grenzgänger* between the contact zones and thus can be analysed in terms of their liminal positioning within the production of colonial knowledge and, as such, the staging of sailors can be perceived as indeed staging the sea on land. The stage sailors’ otherness thus intercepts the ambivalence of colonial discourses: on the one hand, mariners are deemed “outside, a “third sort of persons” of not the “same flesh”, but on the other hand their representation on the stage bears them “inside” and visible as well. Foucault thought of “the Other” as “that which, for a given culture, is at once interior and foreign”,⁴⁹⁷ thus understanding the “inside” as a fold of the “outside”, an image he vividly illustrates with the example of the Renaissance madman who is put to sea in his boat: “he is put in the interior of the exterior, and inversely. A highly symbolic position [...] Confined on the ship, from which there is no escape, the madman is delivered to [...] that great uncertainty external to everything”.⁴⁹⁸ This imagery of interior and exterior is not accidentally employed in a maritime context as Foucault further states that “water and madness have long been linked in the dreams of European man”.⁴⁹⁹ For the purposes of the present study it is particularly useful to draw on the observation that the mariner as a character sailing between land and sea indeed occupies a “highly symbolic position” in that he can be read as embodying the interior and the exterior of a society. It follows that representations of the sailor on stage can be analysed in terms of this liminal position and of the stage sailor’s corresponding staging as an alien and sometimes hybrid character. Liminality

494 For an account of the expansion of English shipping, most notably visible in London, see Ralph Davis: “The frequenter of the Thames waterside may well have observed, over these twenty-eight years [GW: 1660–1688], a continuous increase, even a doubling, in the numbers of big ocean-going vessels and the timber traders which towered above their fellows in the river” 16.

495 See Kaul, *Eighteenth-Century British Literature* 57.

496 Said, *Culture and Imperialism* 11.

497 Michel FOUCAULT, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*, 1966, trans. © Tavistock / Routledge (London and New York: Routledge, 2002) xxvi.

498 Michel FOUCAULT, *Madness and Civilization*, 1961, trans. Jonathan Murphy and Jean Khalfa (London: Routledge, 2001) 9.

499 Foucault, *Madness and Civilization* 9.

and hybridity thus work together as they open “interstitial passages” – interstices that are characterized by the differences emerging in contact zones – where “new signs of identity” are negotiated.⁵⁰⁰ The mariner’s staged otherness functions in several regards and, despite the stressed “ready-made”⁵⁰¹ and stock characteristics of the mostly minor naval characters in Restoration and early eighteenth-century drama, mariners can be analysed as crucial figures for staging such interstitial passages as well as configuring new signs of identity within a developing colonial society. In this respect, the mariner as a character on the comic stage is particularly relevant because comedy can be grasped as a genre particularly occupied not with individual motivations, but with collective correlations: “comedy is a social form that turns not to the individual psyche and its struggles but to the social order itself”.⁵⁰²

The stereotypical representation of the sailor as Other also bears an array of cultural information in that stereotypes, as Jane Tompkins identifies, are “the instantly recognizable representatives of overlapping racial, sexual, national, ethnic, economic, social, political, and religious categories”.⁵⁰³ And as Bhabha has shown, stereotyping works to consolidate images of otherness, effecting both a consolidation of the collective self’s self-reassurance and destabilising this very identity.⁵⁰⁴ Indeed, as the pallet of quotes at the beginning of this chapter demonstrates, characterizations of seamen touch on a considerable amount of diverse categories – gender, nationality, class, religion and politics – and notably drama as a genre works specifically well in generating and displaying such historically situated identities like gender, class and nation, among others.

At a time when social change prompted the renegotiation of gender relations, masculinity, and notably Englishness, and so set off re-negotiations of cultural ideals⁵⁰⁵ and new notions of civility, the mariner as other “man” was a key figure in the play of gender and class dynamics and the specific distinctions that

500 See Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* 2.

501 See Glass 592.

502 Misty G. ANDERSON, *Female Playwrights and Eighteenth-Century Comedy: Negotiating Marriage on the London Stage* (New York: Palgrave, 2002) 41. See also Foucault for the notion that comedy can serve a more critical function in his discussion of “parrhesia”, Michel FOUCAULT, *Fearless Speech*, 1983, trans. and ed. Joseph Pearson, Foreign Agents Series (Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2001) 12–20.

503 Jane TOMPKINS, *Sensational Designs: The Cultural Work of American Fiction 1790–1860* (Oxford: OUP, 1985) xvi.

504 See Bhabha, “The Other Question”, *The Location of Culture* 94–97.

505 For late seventeenth-century replacement of e.g. the warrior as cultural ideal, see J.G.A. Pocock, *Virtue, Commerce and History: Essays on Political Thought, Chiefly in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge: CUP, 1985) 37–50 and for more recent assessments of this claim, see Lawrence KLEIN, *Shaftesbury and the Culture of Politeness: Moral Discourse and Cultural Politics in Early Eighteenth-Century England* (Cambridge: CUP, 1994) and Orr 215.

circumscribed an *English* civility. As the debates surrounding the appropriate behaviour of mariners – to fight or to bow – have shown, reconsidering English manliness in the face of colonial expansion with dangers of effeminacy and exoticism lurking, was a process that involved several confrontations. The theatre permeated these confrontations considerably as the anonymous author of the 1700 pamphlet *Remarks upon the Navy* exemplarily shows. In complaining about the lack of competent commanders, he blames “our Beau Commanders, the Sir *Courtlys* of the Sea”⁵⁰⁶ and thus characterizes inept mariners with the eponymous “hero” of a Restoration play.⁵⁰⁷ London’s theatres thus have to be understood as vital spaces for the production of the otherness of sailors – their cultural identity resting both in a liminal as well as an imaginary sphere.⁵⁰⁸

This chapter is divided into three parts. The following subchapter, “Establishing Otherness” (3.2), will analyse how the stage sailor’s otherness was established, converging on the aspects of othering that deemed stage sailors apart from, different and outside from their surrounding characters and environment, thus indicating the different overlapping categories at play. In this respect, Wycherley’s *The Plain Dealer* did not just give its name to the “plain dealer”-tradition of the Restoration stage, but was also highly influential in coining a representational shorthand for the depiction of sailors on stage. In accounting for the otherness of stage sailors, two aspects become particularly noteworthy: whereas social ineptness – understood in terms of “awkwardness” as well as reluctance – can be said to be an overarching feature of all these characters, the cause for the mariners’ otherness is presented as potentially twofold. On the one hand, tars are portrayed as either Other by way of their profession or even conscious choice, but on the other hand there is a tendency to expose mariners as pre-social men of sorts, “wild”, yet “innocent” – a tendency that reveals the mariner’s association with colonial spaces. “Modelling Mariners” (3.3) will extend the focus on the stage sailor’s liminality and alterity to the character’s dramatic reintegration into land-based society. As will be shown, stage sailors served not only as liminal characters that were reintegrated into society by way of marriage, but the characters also served as foils for other, less “manly” characters. Finally they emerged as increasingly less troubling and alien, but more as worthy exemplars of English masculinity. The subchapter will close with a discussion of Thomas Shadwell’s *The Fair Quaker of Deal*, a play which stages a naval captain who is portrayed as attractive, valorous and benevolent, por-

506 Anon., *Remarks upon the Navy* 15.

507 John Crowne, *Sir Courtly Nice or, it cannot be* 1685.

508 As indeed sailors not only moved in liminal regions, but were thus effectively removed from their contemporaries’ access: “Superficially familiar, the seaman remained to his contemporaries profoundly strange. They knew him only on land, out of his element”, Rodger, *Wooden World* 15.

traying this mariner as embodying patriotic virtues. Concluding, in the coda to this chapter, the stage sailor's development from rough and "plain dealing" tar to the "hearty heroes" of mid- to late eighteenth-century theatricals will be outlined. Stage sailors are more and more presented as quintessentially English and overtly patriotic characters, whose disposition for entertainment renders them not only popular characters for the stage, but whose representation as jolly and honest also functions to gloss over some serious social and political issues. Stage sailors are still portrayed as Other, however, the stress on the characters' patriotism also appropriates the "hearts of oak" as they emerge as happily compliant with their part in defending and enlarging the empire, a development that also testifies to the characters becoming increasingly bourgeois.

3.2 Establishing Otherness: "Plain Talking" and "Sea-Breeding"

3.2.1 Setting the Tone: The Case of *The Plain Dealer*

William Wycherley's *The Plain Dealer* premiered on the 11th of December 1676 at the Theatre Royal in Drury Lane and was one of the great theatrical hits of the Restoration stage. Ready for a second printed edition before the year was out, it subsequently went through seven editions until 1700. On the stage, *The Plain Dealer* was of course equally prominent, the play was performed at least 66 times until 1737. However, critics have not been unanimous as to the quality of the play, their evaluations differing mostly on the eponymous character of Manly, the Plain Dealer himself.

Dryden, alongside John Dennis a great admirer of the play, claimed *The Plain Dealer* to be "one of the most bold, most general, and most useful satires, which has ever been presented on the English theatre".⁵⁰⁹ In defining the comedy as a satire, however, Dryden purports a frame that later critics of the play have found cumbersome and which is regarded as one instance of the "universal critical disagreement"⁵¹⁰ that *The Plain Dealer* has yielded. Indeed, much twentieth-century criticism⁵¹¹ did engage in discussing what the play actually is: an English

509 John DRYDEN, "The Author's Apology for Heroic Poetry and Poetic Licence" (1677), *Essays of John Dryden: Volume I*, ed. W.P. Ker (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926) 178–191, 182.

510 Derek HUGHES, "The Plain Dealer – A Reappraisal", *Modern Language Quarterly* 43.4 (1982): 315–336.

511 See Thomas H. FUJIMURA, *The Restoration Comedy of Wit* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1952) 149–153, Norman N. HOLLAND, *The First Modern Comedies: The Significance of Etherege, Wycherley, and Congreve* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1959) 96–113, K.M. ROGERS, "Fatal Inconsistency: Wycherley and 'The Plain Dealer'", *English Literary History* 28 (1961): 148–162, Rose ZIMBARDO, *Wycherley's Drama: A Link in the Development of English Satire* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1965) 98–143, Ian DONALDSON, "'Tables Turned': 'The Plain Dealer'",

version of Molière's *Le Misanthrope*,⁵¹² "a satire that celebrates satire's limitations",⁵¹³ but "not a moral satire".⁵¹⁴ As Ronald Berman concludes: "We are hardly sure whether *The Plain Dealer* is satire, so hidden are its standards. And we wonder whether it is comedy".⁵¹⁵ The strongest critical disagreement in this respect engages the question of whether Manly, the play's plain dealer, is the object or the subject of the satire, whether he can be perceived as "plain-speaking truetype" or "madman".⁵¹⁶ For the most part, the disagreement stems from the fact that, like many Restoration comedies, Wycherley's play surveys an individual reaction to flawed surroundings but, in the case of *The Plain Dealer*, the play "spends as much time laying bare its hero's inconsistencies as it does attacking those of society".⁵¹⁷ In view of this, as A.M. Friedson points out, the audience's judgment of the play relies on the reception of Manly: "Their feeling as to where the satire of the play is directed – whether at the society, the protagonist, or both – will depend on their attitude toward Manly".⁵¹⁸ Derek Hughes locates the "universal critical disagreement" on the play consequently in the character's "refusal" to be contained within a single category, as critics variously construed him as "a dupe, a hypocrite, and a moral paragon",⁵¹⁹ a many-faceted

Essays in Criticism 17 (1967): 304–21 and Virginia OGDEN BIRDSALL, *Wild Civility: The English Comic Spirit on the Restoration Stage* (Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1970) 157–77.

512 See Fujimura and Shepherd, who in fact perceive several references to Molière in *The Plain Dealer*, not only *Le Misanthrope*, but also *L'École des Femmes*, *Les Fâcheux* and *Les Précieuses Ridicules*, James L. SHEPHERD III., "Molière and Wycherley's 'Plain Dealer': Further Observations", *The South Central Bulletin* 23.4 (1963): 37–40.

513 Robert MARKLEY, "Drama, Character, and Irony: Kierkegaard and Wycherley's 'The Plain Dealer'" in: Ronald Schleifer and Robert Markley eds., *Kierkegaard and Literature: Irony, Repetition, and Criticism* (Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1984) 138–163, 140.

514 Ann Carey Parshall MESSENGER, *The Comedy of William Wycherley: A Critical Reading of the Plays with Special Emphasis on 'The Plain Dealer'* (Ann Arbor Michigan: University Microfilms, 1965) x.

515 Ronald BERMAN, "Wycherley's Unheroic Society", *English Literary History* 51.3 (1984): 465–478, 465.

516 Anthony KAUFMAN, "Idealization, Disillusion, and Narcissistic Rage in Wycherley's 'The Plain Dealer'", *Criticism* 21.2 (1979): 119–133. Judith Milhous and Robert D. Hume even claim that since there is no satisfactory reading of Manly available, all further critical attempts are destined to fail, Judith MILHOUS and Robert D. HUME, *Producible Interpretations: Eight English plays 1675–1701* (Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois UP, 1985) 20–24.

517 Markley in: Schleifer/Markley 141. In recent studies, however, these inconsistencies are increasingly seen as signs of complexity rather than dramatical failure, see Robert MARKLEY, "Introduction: Rethinking Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Drama", *Comparative Drama* 42.1 (2008): 1–6 and Holland, *The Ornament of Action* 170–203.

518 A.M. FRIEDSON, "Wycherley and Molière: Satirical Point of View in 'The Plain Dealer'", *Modern Philology* 64.3 (1967): 189–197, 189.

519 William WYCHERLEY, *The Plain Dealer*, ed. Leo Hughes, Regents Restoration Drama Series (London: Edward Arnold, 1967) Introduction, xv.

hero whose “brusque honesty and impatient aggressiveness”⁵²⁰ complicate a straightforward categorization.⁵²¹ As Helen Burke points out, the tendency to analyse the play primarily in terms of character, and the ensuing “disagreements” about its nature are due to the marked critical paradigm shift centring on the manliness of its hero: “The reification of the experience of the (male) subject that is characteristic of this tradition has led to a preoccupation with the character of Manly, the ‘Plain Dealer’ of the play’s title, a preoccupation that translates into the desire to establish Manly’s psychological and ethical motives”.⁵²²

The framing of Manly as a “humours character” provides a different approach to the character’s analysis. Alexander H. Chorney, in a 1950 essay on “Wycherley’s Manly Reinterpreted”, takes on Watson’s previously cited estimation of casting Manly as the starting point of a Restoration “plain dealer”- tradition. He writes: “Manly is neither a misanthropist, serious, nor philosophic character, but a humours one”.⁵²³ In terms of a definition, he states that the humours-characters “is a disgruntled and unsociable fellow, at war with the conventions of his society [...] he diverges from the norm and is therefore ridiculous, eccentric, unafraid of appearing singular”.⁵²⁴ This definition of a humours-character within the Jonsonian tradition certainly applies to the Plain Dealer, a character – as Leo Hughes writes in his introduction to the play – “in whose makeup a quirk of personality dominated”.⁵²⁵ Yet, in order to analyse the stage sailor’s function within a colonial discourse framework, it is necessary to transcend the humours-notion and instead focus on the textual, dramaturgical and performative markers that denote him as Other, explicitly with regard to his maritime attachments. That is to read the stage sailor’s “humour” as an articulation of difference, as deeming the stage sailor an outsider, “diverging from the norm”, appearing “ridiculous” and “eccentric” while at the same time bearing the character “inside” through his theatrical representation and the corresponding staging of the sea. In analysing the stereotypical representations of the stage sailor thus “[a]s the telegraphic expression of complex clusters of value”⁵²⁶ that

520 Ibid. 334.

521 For an overview of different critical positions on Manly, see W. R. CHADWICK, *The Four Plays of William Wycherley: A Study of the Development of a Dramatist* (The Hague: Mouton, 1975) and Hughes, “The Plain Dealer”.

522 Helen BURKE, “‘Law-Suits,’ ‘Love-Suits,’ and the Family Property”, in: Canfield/Payne, 89-113, 89.

523 Alexander H. CHORNEY, “Wycherley’s Manly Reinterpreted”, in Lily Bess CAMPBELL, *Essays: Critical and Historical Dedicated to Lily B. Campbell by Members of the Departments of the University of California* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 1950) 161 – 172, 161.

524 Ibid. 162.

525 *The Plain Dealer*, Introduction xv.

526 Tompkins xvi.

serve to reconsider as well as consolidate images of alterity, one can read these representations as effecting English collective identity while also providing a perspective for critique of the staged society. In order to analytically break down Wycherley’s *Plain Dealer*, the focus will be confined to individual aspects of the character and the treatments of them within the context of the play. While trying to avoid too limited readings and not to overlook previous critical assessments, “Establishing Otherness” (3.2) will focus on the strategies of othering within *The Plain Dealer* that specifically concern the maritime character.

The play’s title character is Captain Manly, a sea captain questioning and condemning the motives and behaviour of all his surrounding characters, with the exception of his love-interest Olivia and Vernish, an old friend. However, the *Plain Dealer* is betrayed by both Olivia and Vernish. So, eager for revenge, Manly instructs his helpmeet Fidelia – a breeches role – to seduce Olivia. But the cover blows eventually and Manly not only finally gains a wife in the tellingly named Fidelia as well as a trusty friend in Freeman, but also Fidelia’s sizeable fortune. The *Plain Dealer*’s otherness is established even before the first act commences. The prologue,⁵²⁷ spoken by the eponymous character himself, starts as follows: “I, the Plain dealer, am to act today./And my rough part begins before the play”⁵²⁸ (PD, Prologue, 1 – 2). The audience thus gets prepared for the character’s ensuing representation as a “rough part” indicating that he stands apart from the other characters. His part is thus singled out:

I, only, act a part like none of you;
 And yet, you’ll say, it is a fool’s part, too:
 An honest man, who, like you, never winks
 At faults; but, unlike you, speaks what he thinks:
 The only fool who ne’er found patron yet;
 For truth is now a fault, as well as wit (PD, Prologue, 40 – 45).

In his audience address, the *Plain Dealer* not only circumscribes his own role but allocates a role to the audience, people who – according to him – do “not speak what they think”. The character thus not only sets himself apart from the society on stage, but from the audience as well. In calling himself “fool”, the *Plain Dealer* additionally refers to a character which traditionally enjoys jester’s licence and

527 See Laura MORROW, “Phenomenological Psychology and Comic Form in ‘The Plain Dealer’”, *Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Theatre Research*, 3.2 (1988): 1 – 10. Prologue and epistle dedicatory, as Laura Morrow and Robert Markley have pointed out, are additional texts where Wycherley marks the “moral schizophrenia” (Morrow 7) of the play, on the one hand attacking vices – as a satirist – and on the other hand indicating his own immersion in vice through his “being-in-the-world”.

528 Henceforth, I will shorten the title of the play to “PD”. References for quotations are given in the form “I, 1”, the first number represents the act, the second number the line. Only acts IV and V are divided into scenes, references for quotations are thus given in the form “I.i, 1”.

he thus not only frames his character's reception, but also refers to the fact that he is playing a "part", thus disrupting the boundaries between character and actor, enhancing the fictional nature of this part. In highlighting the special part he plays, the Plain Dealer not only engages in a customary address to the audience,⁵²⁹ but in linking his self-professed "rough part" as a mariner to his "foolish" part as an actor, he also tags the stage sailor prominently, as the fools' dramatic function is traditionally to shift the hub from the fictional to the audience's "reality". The stage sailor as fool emerges as having a double perspective – the fool's perspective emphasizes the character's capacity to transcend the boundaries between the stage and the "reality" of the audience, while the mariner's perspective provides the character with an outsider's perspective on landlubbers more generally.

The Plain Dealer's "rough part" is thus also linked to his maritime provenance. The additional description provided for the printed edition states: "MANLY, of an honest, surly, nice humor, supposed first in the time of the Dutch War to have procured the command of a ship, out of honor, not interest, and choosing a sea life only to avoid the world" (PD, *The Persons*, 1 – 5). In light of the dialogue with which the play sets out, two features stand out. The Plain Dealer is not only a topical character in his linkage to the recent Dutch War,⁵³⁰ but the connection that is drawn between Manly's propensity of a life at sea and him wanting to "avoid the world" visibly imprints his "rough part" with a maritime temper. As one of the sailors accompanying their captain states in regard to Manly: "he sunk the value of five or six thousand pounds of his own with / which he was to settle himself somewhere in the Indies, / [...], for he was resolved never to / return again for England" (PD, I, 111 – 16). Manly's attempted maritime flight is a remarkable feature as it not only correlates the sea with the character's hopes for an "avoidance of the world", but also with hopes for colonial profits, thus framing the sea as the foremost colonial and economic space. This aspect is additionally enhanced through numerous references to "trade" within the play as Richard Kroll counted 28 pointed references to trade and mercantile power in the play's text.⁵³¹ The connection to the sea is further enhanced performatively as Manly and Lord Plausible, entering the first scene, are followed by "two Sailors behind" (PD, I, stage direction). The two sailors provide an additional performance of the sea as they constitute a visual tableau that frames Manly's own

529 Prologues served to ask the audience for a sympathetic, open reception, they set the tone of the play and also at times served to ridicule the other company.

530 Wycherley here refers to the Third Dutch War, a distinctly unpopular and costly military campaign against the Dutch starting in 1672 and ending with the Second Peace of Westminster in 1674.

531 See Richard KROLL, *Restoration Drama and 'the Circle of Commerce': Tragicomedy, Politics and Trade in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge: CUP, 2007) 231.

performance as a maritime character. Their presence on stage highlights Manly’s provenance and his profession as captain while the two sailors also have a choric function in that they from time to time comment on Manly’s qualities, while also providing comical background information, and thus – in Markley’s words – help in “laying bare [the] hero’s inconsistencies”.⁵³²

Manly himself sets out to give an account of the motivations for his “avoidance of the world”, namely his dislike of social customs and ceremonies:

Tell not me, my good Lord Plausible, of your decorums,
supercilious forms, and slavish ceremonies; your little tricks,
which you the spaniels of the world do daily over and over
for and to one another; not out of love or duty, but your
servile fear (PD, I, 1–5).

Whereas John Fielding, representative of other landlubbers, had wondered at the behaviour of sailors, which was to him, “so very peculiar to themselves” (s.a.), Manly here reversely expresses a disgust at the “ceremonies” practiced “on land”. Ceremonies or social conventions are here presented as utterly drained from meaning, they are “slavish” in that they are motivated by fear, but also in that they are performed almost mechanically. With this critique, Manly sets himself apart from “ceremonial” society and proclaims his independence from such ceremonies as a matter of principle: “But I’ll have no leading-strings. I can walk alone. / I hate a harness, and will not tug on in a faction, kissing my / leader behind, that another slave may do the like to me” (PD, I, 9–11). In suggesting that ceremonies are “slavish” and thus opposed to his valuation of independence, the Plain Dealer criticizes society’s ways as well as at the same time exempting himself from this “performance”. In Manly’s terms, to “be general” (PD, I, 14) is joint in with the charge of pretence as the use of “decorums, / supercilious forms, and slavish ceremonies” (PD, I, 1 f) are forms of concealment and disguise. This accentuation of “decorums” and “ceremonies” can be read as a twofold gesture to the theatrical frame. On the one hand, it draws attention to the “act” of “playing” as such, but on the other hand it also refers to and turns on many Restoration – literary as well as social – standards as the discrepancy between social standards and the actual behaviour of fashionable society mentioned by Manly is one of the most common themes of Restoration dramatic satires in general. In this respect, it becomes particularly noteworthy that Wycherley’s play places a maritime character in opposition to society⁵³³ as the liminal perspective provided by the stage sailor serves to enforce the character’s reproaches against it.

⁵³² Markley in: Schleifer / Markley 141.

⁵³³ Kroll also observes that in *The Plain Dealer*, similar to Aphra Behn’s *The Rover* and Dry-

Being independent of society and thus differing from landlubbers is further crucially tied in with the notion of honesty, as Manly declares to Plausible: “With your pardon, my no friend, I will not, as you do, / whisper my hatred or my scorn, call a man fool or knave by / signs or mouths over his shoulder whilst you have him in / your arms” (PD, I, 17 – 20). Manly deems honesty and bluntness as being incompatible with sociable behaviour as allegedly practiced by his “no friend”. Despite the fact that Manly himself in the course of the play proves to behave inconsistently with regard to these attributes, it is important to note that “honesty” and “bluntness” provide key representational characteristics of stage sailors and thus provide a framework for analysing the characters’ representations. Honesty, as evoked by Manly, is closely associated with a disregard for manners and “ceremonies” and is also connected to the character’s maritime provenance, “sea-breeding” which is opposed to ceremonial society. Manly himself emphasises this presentation, asserting: “I, that am an unmannerly sea fellow” (PD, I, 44). With this claim, the otherness of the character as “sea fellow” is clearly signposted as his “honest” behaviour is opposed to the “mannerly” conduct of landlubbers.⁵³⁴ In this respect, the Plain Dealer’s telling name is a sort of linguistic container for worthy properties that set him apart from his mannerly and effeminate surroundings, as Aspasia Velissariou argues:

Manly is supposed to impersonate ‘manliness’, a category that, to him, inherently contains indisputable properties such as valor, truth and plain dealing. His anger at ‘effeminate’ men like Plausible and Novel, more than simple outrage at unnatural confusion of separate categories, is essentially a self-righteous confirmation of his own manliness.⁵³⁵

In enumerating a list of characters he despises, Manly further articulates forms of gendered difference that serve to construct his own persona within the discourse of the play: “I cannot / wish well to pimps, flatterers, detractors, and cowards, stiff / nodding knaves, and supple, pliant, kissing fools” (PD, I, 232-34). Rhetorically, Manly not only reproaches Plausible and Freeman with the discrepancy between “reality” and “appearance”, but also relates his aversion of society to his liminal realm of experience:

den’s *All for Love*, which were both performed the following season, Wycherley’s play “asks how an individual cast up from the sea might alter the economy of landlubbers” 231.

534 Additionally, the Captain is also marked as a tar rather than a gentleman captain, as one of the two sailors ironically suggests at the end of the scene: “On my conscience then, Jack, that’s the reason our bully / tar sunk our ship: not only that the Dutch might not have / her, but that the courtiers, who laugh at wooden legs, might / not make her prize” (PD, I, 98-101, First Sailor).

535 Aspasia VELISSARIOU, “Gender and Circulation of Money and Desire in Wycherley’s ‘The Plain Dealer’”, *Restoration: Studies in English Literary Culture, 1660–1700*, 18.1 (1994): 27-36, 33.

Therefore I rather chose to go where honest,
 downright barbarity is professed, where men devour one
 another like generous hungry lions and tigers, not like croco-
 diles, where they think the devil white, of our complexion,
 and I am already so far an Indian (PD, I, 616–20).

In claiming to prefer a life amongst “barbarians”, where the bleak prospects of being are at least openly professed, Manly holds up the mirror to an audience that habitually comprehends itself as the supreme exponent of human existence. In these lines, Manly quite explicitly points to the colonial aspect of his profession, employing his liminal status as mariner to expand on his criticism of society to another level. Manly not only assails and rejects the ceremonies and flattery of the staged London society he encounters but, in alluding to a “barbarous” place, the character surmounts this criticism in opposing English society to a downright alien place. Reading this passage abstractly is to understand Manly’s reference to the “barbarous” place as more than a criticism of the staged society, but also as a charge against metropolitan society itself. The marshalling of exotic animals, like lions, tigers and crocodiles, also configures the mariner’s liminal realm of experience quite tangibly with established stereotypes of travellers going native,⁵³⁶ thus furthering the stage sailor’s otherness while, at the same time, providing for an angle of critique as Manly claims to rather consciously choose this other place to a life of “flattery” in London.

The specific representation of the Plain Dealer as seaman is most prominently displayed in act II, where representatives of fashionable society reflect back on Manly and point out his characteristics as “unmannerly sea fellow”. Despite the fact that Manly’s performance throughout almost the whole play is framed by the two sailors and is hence continuously part of staging the sea, his encounter of Olivia and her acquaintances further serves to single out certain features that represent his maritime derivation. The maritime characteristics of the character’s representation are enacted through a process of gestures and utterances I term “theatrical pointing”. This term does not refer to a Brechtian “*gestus* of showing”⁵³⁷ – that is certain devices that frame or mark off a certain bit of the performance – but the term is here used to label a gesture that highlights theatrically presentable features of a character in order to maintain and enforce the corresponding performance, typifying references that are supposed to establish the character as a certain type. Upon hearing that Manly has returned from sea Olivia points to the Plain Dealer’s maritime features:

536 For a genealogy of the myth of the “wild man”, a man who has gone native, see Hayden White, “The Forms of Wildernes: Archaeology of an Idea” in: Dudley/Novak 3–38.

537 Nor do I want to refer to the mid-eighteenth-century habit of “pointing”, that is detaching a speech from the action of a play and delivering it directly and if wished for, repeatedly, to the audience.

[...] shall I be pestered
 again with his boisterous sea love, have my alcove smell like
 a cabin, my chamber perfumed with his tarpaulin Branden-
 burgh, and hear volleys of brandy sighs enough to make a
 fog in one's room. Foh! I hate a lover that smells like
 Thames Street! (PD, II, 529 – 534).

Here, Olivia not only points to stereotypical features of seamen – their boisterous behaviour, smell and love of alcohol –, but names aspects that are particularly apt for theatrical display, namely loud voice, dress and even “brandy sighs”, highlighting the distinct features where Manly differs from fashionable society. Novel, the foppish character of the play, further underscores Olivia's lamentations, complaining: “Gad, these sea captains make nothing of/dressing” (PD, II, 580 f) and Olivia, after finally encountering Manly, once more enhances the mariner's otherness, ironically claiming: “Then, that noble lionlike mien of yours, that soldierlike, / weather-beaten complexion, and that manly roughness of/your voice, how can they otherwise than charm us women, /who hate ef-feminacy!” (PD, II, 606 – 09). These utterances circumscribe the image of the tar theatrically; he smells, dresses carelessly, carries a boisterous expression as well as a tanned figure and speaks roughly. So while the character's own behaviour and exclamations have served to establish his blunt honesty, the theatrical pointing to the mariner's traits and physiognomy serves as an additional performative feature that marks his otherness on stage and fixes the stereotypical presentation of the character.

The representation of Olivia and her acquaintances further serves to underscore the Plain Dealer's charges against fashionable society as Olivia and Novel are not only presented as dishonest in their statements, but their overt play-acting to achieve favourable impressions additionally sets them apart from Manly as a character pretending to “act a part like none of you” (Prologue), that is an honest part. Olivia's first scene is in this respect predominant, as she has been hailed by Manly as the epitome of honesty: “I can never doubt her truth and constancy” (PD, I, 600), so her subsequent display of inconstancy and complaisance is remarkable.

ELIZA (her cousin): [...] Let's see –
 first, what d'ye think of dressing and fine clothing?
 OLIVIA: Dressing! Fie, fie, 'tis my aversion. But come hither, you
 dowdy [to her maid, Lettice], methinks you might have opened this toure better.
 O hideous! I cannot suffer it! D'ye see how't sits?
 ELIZA: Well enough, cousin, if dressing be your aversion.
 OLIVIA: 'Tis so, and for variety of rich clothes, they are more my
 aversion.

LETTICE: Ay, 'tis because your ladyship wears them too long, for indeed a gown, like a gallant, grows one's aversion by having too much of it (PD, II, 26–36).

The dialogue goes on for another 450 lines – until Manly enters – comically demonstrating how Olivia contradicts almost every of her previous utterances in order to keep up a favourable image of herself. And so, as Markley asserts accordingly:

The more Olivia declares her ‘aversion’ to fashion, wit, men, and the Court, the more hypocritical and grotesque she appears. Hers is, in one sense, a repetitious and fruitless quest to master the contradictions unleashed by her dissembling: passionate woman, dispassionate manipulator.⁵³⁸

This effect is heightened upon the Plain Dealer's arrival. Manly, now feeling rejected by Olivia, turns his “rough part” against Novel, one of Olivia's attendant admirers:

Then, madam, for this gentle piece of courtesy,
this man of tame honor, what could you find in him? Was
it his languishing affected tone? His mannerly look? His
secondhand flattery, the refuse of the playhouse tiring
rooms? Or his slavish obsequiousness in watching at the
door of your box at the playhouse for your hand to your
chair? Or his jaunty way of playing with your fan? Or was
it the gunpowder spot on his hand or the jewel in his ear
that purchased you heart? (PD, II, 587–596).

These highly ironic lines not only theatrically point out Novel's foppery and evidently un-“manly” looks, but also – again – draw attention to the discrepancy between “affected tone”, “flattery” and “intrinsic worth”. Manly here draws attention to the pretence of Novel not only by theatrically pointing out his contradictory appearance and manners – as opposed to the image Novel and Olivia create –, but in mentioning the playhouse and hence the literal environment of the stage-action, he once more transcends the fictional nature of the play and projects his criticism towards the audience. And so, if Manly be read as an ironic character, Wycherley can be said to hold up a mirror for his audience, where “what they see are funhouse distortions of their self-perceptions”⁵³⁹ – an observation that seems to account for the initial audience's mixed reactions to the play.⁵⁴⁰

538 Markley in: Schleifer / Markley 152.

539 Ibid. 154.

540 As John Dennis reports: “And when upon the first representations of the Plain Dealer, the Town, as The Authour has often told me, appeared Doubtfull what Judgment to Form of it; the foremention'd gentlemen [GW: The Merry Gang] by their loud approbation of it, gave it

In many ways, *The Plain Dealer* can be said to have been a model for other dramatic representations of mariners. The following subchapters will thus explicate other examples of how the mariner's liminal position on the stage was achieved and maintained in the period under consideration. Maritime characters enjoyed a great popularity in Restoration and early eighteenth-century London and as *The Plain Dealer* continued to be such a success, it comes as no surprise that playwrights took on several of the ready-made characteristics that rendered the stage sailor such a recognizable character. Most prominent in this respect were the sailors that were developed within the plain dealer-tradition, honest, rough and boisterous tars, to varying degrees at odds with their social surroundings and environment. In all cases, however, the tar did not – like in the *Plain Dealer's* case – feature in a major role, but served as a minor character within a variety of comedies.

3.2.2 Rough and Boisterous: Restoration Tars

One of the most prominent stage sailors in a minor part was Captain Porpuss in Thomas D'Urfey's play *Sir Barnaby Whigg: or, No Wit like a Woman's*,⁵⁴¹ a political satire on the Whig party that was staged in 1681 at the Theatre Royal by the King's Company. Written soon after the Exclusion Crisis, the play contains several love intrigues set against a background of plots and schemes that offer copious opportunities to ridicule the Whigs. Without further dwelling on the play's plot, however, the analysis will hereafter only draw a picture of the maritime character's role within the play. Just like Manly, Captain Porpuss, "A blunt Tarpawlin, Captain, and one that uses his Sea-phrases and terms upon all occasions" (BW, *Dramatis Personae*, not paginated), is distinguished by his honesty, bluff behaviour and discomfort with societal rules. Like in *The Plain Dealer* these aspects are innately linked in that honesty, or "plain talking", works as a reciprocal device. On the one hand, the plain talking tar sets himself in opposition to society through his famed honesty. On the other hand, this trait further alienates him from civil society in that it only reinforces his otherness.

Captain Porpuss is, right from the outset of the play, distinctly marked as "seaman", after having just finished a dance together with the other, both male

both a sudden and a lasting reputation", John DENNIS, *The Critical Works of John Dennis*, Vol. II, 1711 – 1729, ed. Edward Niles Hooker (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1943) 277.

541 Henceforth, I will quote from the play shortening its title to "BW" and giving act-number, followed by page-number. References for quotations are given in the form "I, 1", the first number represents the act, the second number the page. Thomas D'URFEY, *Sir Barnaby Whigg: or, No Wit like a Woman's. A Comedy. As it is Acted by their Majesties Servants at the Theatre-Royal* (London: Printed by A.G. and J.P. for Joseph Hindmarsh, at the Black Bull in Cornhil, 1681).

and female, characters, Porpuss showcases his social ineptness as well as his proverbial sea-breeding by clumsily trying to woo Winifred, a “young Welsh jilt” (BW, *Dramatis Personae*, unpaginated).

CAPTAIN: [...] Put does her preaths

and her pelly’s Ferk, ferk, ferk so much, does her say?

WINIFRED: – Pish, this is Simplicity’s, look you, and Impertinencies. I pray you forbear, Captains.

CAPTAIN: – Diddle, Diddle, Diddle, she has a Tongue as glib as an Eel; but no matter, she is Amsterdam built, and by Mars I love her for her Dutch Bottom.

BENEDICK: – Look! he has frighted her away already [...] (BW, I, 2).

Porpuss here not only exhibits a stammer and a pronunciation problem – “preaths” instead of “breaths”, “pelly” instead of “belly” –, but also a propensity for “sea language”, which even extends to his evaluation of Winifred solely in terms of her – ship-shaped – build. Porpuss’ contact with the female character is therefore spoiled by his sea-breeding, while his ineffective watch over his own wife Livia – who is flirting with Sir Walter – serves as another proof of his incapacity to socially engage with the other sex. His presence is further found to be disagreeable by all other characters as the sea captain displays a violent temper and, in openly proclaiming his knowledge of the maritime world, he additionally draws attention to his liminal status:

(to Sir Walter) [...] Come, what a Devil have you seen of the World, Sir? I have stood and fac’d both frigid and torrid Zones, plough’d upon the Bosphorus like a Molehill, kindled a Torch in the Sun, shot both the Gulfs of Venice and Florida, and seen the Navel of the World, you Scoundrel (BW, I, 4).

But Porpuss’ attempts at emphasizing his virility and worldliness, his expertise in and of colonial zones, are merely shrugged off by his company:

TOWNLY: – Ha, ha, ha, a pleasant humour, y’faith.

SIR WALTER: – Prithee Captain leave this blustering: Gad thou hast got so many Damn’d cramp, hard Sea-words, they are enough to fright an honest Country gentleman out of the Company.

[...]

SIR WALTER: – A Tarpawlin, a rude Sea fellow, you must not mind him, man (BW, I, 4).

Sir Walter and Townly hereafter resume their “civil” conversation, leaving out Porpuss whose use of “sea words” excludes him from the company. The Captain’s sea language is thus not only responsible for his social exclusion, but is also rendered comical and ridiculed. Yet, the Captain is soon called on again, as Sir Walter wishes for some *divertissement* and calls on the Captain, as a “sea fellow” said to be familiar with entertainments of the chanting kind. But again, Porpuss’ understanding of sociable and civil entertainment proves to be unrefined and

ignorant. He dismisses opera, calling characters from English opera, like Phillis, Celia and Chloris, “Whores” and “Strumpets” (BW, I, 5), and exclaims: “Why now/a Storm, a Sea-fight, or such a Song wou’d delight a man” (BW, I, 5). His violent temper is thus asserted and even aggravated in that the memories of his life on sea now trigger off lines of recounting “frolics” he had experienced amidst “Jolly bowls of Punch” on his “brave Ship” (BW, I, 5), the *Success*. Notably, his rude language subsides and he reveals tender feelings – as well as the ability to express them elaborately – for his vessel and the life on sea. The way he sets out to talk about his ship uncovers an aptitude for sophisticated language that he formerly was not able to express towards a woman or other land-based company: “ah how she / wou’d scud in the Winds Eye, and have made the Sea foam again after a Broad- / side: by *Mars* I never think of her loss, but the pearly Dew falls from my Eyes” (BW, I, 5). Waxing lyrical about his former vessel in this manner, and thus attaching his feelings to objects and occasions the landlubbers cannot understand, reinforces the impression that the mariner cherishes a set of values on his own. The ensuing song, “Blow, Boreas, Blow”,⁵⁴² where sailors declare their indifference to tempests: “We’ll drink and defy the mad spirits that fly / From the deep to the sky, / And sing whilst loud thunder does bellow” additionally serves to not only evoke the space of the sea, but also to again maintain mariners as “third sort of persons” as they seem careless in the face of mortal danger.

The discrepancy between Porpuß’ linguistic capabilities in regards to praising the *Success* and his lack of tact and understanding with regards to courting women is further enhanced when it becomes plain that “sea talking” is in fact the only conversational topic he seems confident with:

SIR WALTER: – Come, let’s have t’other Dance, the Ladies are not warm yet. [Dance.

CAPTAIN: – Come, now let’s talk of Shipping: Dean has built a brave Frigot, they say.

SIR WALTER:- Prithee Tarr shew none of thy Sea-breeding now: Dancing is a gentile quality, which you Sea-Sharks understand not (BW, III. ii, 27).

Once more, Porpuß is put in his place – like a child he is informed that his “sea-breeding” does not suffice to understand “gentile” pastimes and thus he is marginalised as – contrary to a child – his “breeding” is already accomplished. In the course of the play, Porpuß’ single-mindedness and lack of social understanding almost see him cheated on by his wife and a cross-dressed Townly. Porpuß, not seeing through the masquerade, sets out to impress the “ladies”: “I

542 The song was set to tune by Henry Purcell, the lyrics not included in the script. The quote is thus from Henry PURCELL, *Henry Purcell’s Operas: The Complete Texts*, ed. Michael Burden (Oxford: OUP, 2000).

cannot prate, nor complement / nor chatter fragments of Damn’d Poetry, not I. – But you will have a taste / of my skill, you shall” (BW, IV. ii, 42). The stage sailor explicitly refers to his lack of knowledge of polite topics of conversation while also dismissing “damn’d poetry” and instead offering an instance of his sea-breeding. What follows is a highly erratic enumeration of – at least to land-lubbers – meaningless compass inscriptions that leave the “ladies” startled and serves to once more enhance the mariner’s otherness as it almost seems that he is speaking in a foreign or “savage” tongue.⁵⁴³

As the play draws to a close, Porpuss finally suspects that he is being cuckolded and – alongside Sir Walter, who has suffered a similar fate and now wants to retreat to the country – the Captain declares to leave, not only London society, but England itself:

CAPTAIN: – And i’le to Sea agen, I and my Jolly Crew.

LIVIA: – Whores and all, Sir?

CAPTAIN: – Yes, Buttock, Whores and all; there will I Conquer some flourishing Island, where I will plant a Colony, live out the rest of my days merrily, and defie the Devil and Fortune (BW, V. ii, 61).

The stage sailor thus ties up to his initial appraisal of “frigid and torrid zones” and declares the ultimate colonialist’s ambition of conquering an island, planting a colony and living happily ever after to be his next ambition.⁵⁴⁴ Once more, the character is associated with the colonial space of the sea and his final declaration of leave serves to emphasize the mariner’s inability to fit into metropolitan society. Porpuss from then on remains mute – as the only character on the last page of the play’s text – suggesting that his flight from society has already set in.

Sir Barnaby Whigg offers a striking example of the ways the seaman’s otherness is constructed, and which linguistic and performative strategies were deemed in order to literally render him “outside”. In this regard, language is of vital importance. As stated in the dramatis personae, Porpuss uses “Sea-phrases and terms upon all occassions” – his parlance thus being a crucial performative marker of his provenance and otherness. Porpuss is, however, just one example

543 In order to better envision the length and tediousness of Porpuss’ lines, and its effect on the audience, I quote the entire “speech”, eight lines in all: “Nore, Nore and by East, Nore, Nore-East, Nore-East and by Nore, / Nore-East: Nore-East and by East, East, Nore-East, East and by Nore, East: / East and by Sou, Sou-East, sou-East and by East, Sou-East: Sou-East and / by Sou, Sou, Sou-East, Sou and by East: Sou, Sou and by West, Sou, Sou-West, / Sou-West and by Sou, Sou-West: Sou-West and by West, West, Sou-West; / West and by Sou, West: West and by Nore, West, Nore-West, Nore-West and / by West, Nore-West: Nore-West and by Nore, Nore, Nore-West, Nore and / by West, Nore” (BW, IV. ii, 42 f).

544 These ambitions were also voiced by the mariners in *The Enchanted Island* and *The Successful Pyrate* as well as the town-blades in *A Common-Wealth of Women*.

of how stage sailors were linguistically portrayed as Other. To varying degrees, all stage sailors talk in naval terms, this parlance generally consisting of technical terminology and – again to varying degrees – a further concoction of terms establishing a symbolic interrelation between the sailor and the sea. Mostly, we find – as with Porpuss – analogies or metaphors employed by the mariner to denigrate or appreciate landlubbers, such as with Porpuss when describing a woman: “she has a Tongue as glib as an Eel; but no / matter, she is *Amsterdam* built, and by *Mars* I love her for her *Dutch* Bottom” (BW, I, 2). On the one hand, this frequency of maritime terms indicates the extent to which naval parlance had already entered public discourse, but on the other hand “sea-phrases” also serve several significant performative effects. The linguistic evocation of the sea produced a heightened representativeness and evocation of the space of the sea, but it also served comic purposes⁵⁴⁵ in provoking misunderstandings and double entendres. Naval terms, and an often-times related carelessness in terms of pronunciation, further served to establish and clarify social differences, thus also fixing the stage sailor in his lower social position. The sailor’s idiosyncratic language hence assured the character’s impact as a stereotype as it diminishes out any individual traits. The distinctive linguistic modality of stage sailor’s talk thus served to identify and confine the character’s liminality, as Greg Denning explicates:

The precise, terse, unequivocal language by which seamen controlled their ‘wooden world’ was thought to be incongruous and laughable on land. Otherness, like the grotesque – like natives, as we shall see – is often controlled by a joke. Sailors were managed in their distinctiveness by a satirical tolerance of their language.⁵⁴⁶

According to Denning, the “satirical tolerance”, or in the case of the theatre, satirical display of a maritime-tinged language was part of the “management” of the sailor’s otherness. Indeed, the production of stereotyped notions of how sailors talk is very similar to how foreigners’ talk was represented⁵⁴⁷ and as such effectually can be said to have caused ridicule and oppression, maintaining the

545 Edward Ward, in *The London Spy*, had already capitalized on the idiosyncrasy of sailor’s talk. Ward overhears sailors talking in a tavern and uses the opportunity to lampoon them, rendering their language just about incomprehensible. See Edward WARD, *The London Spy*, ed. Paul Hyland from the Fourth Edition of 1709 (East Lansing: Colleagues Press, 1993).

546 Greg DENNING, *Mr Bligh’s Bad Language: Passion, Power and Theatre on the Bounty* (Cambridge: CUP, 1992) 56.

547 See Neumann 233, who also claims that the ridicule provoked by theatrical representations of foreigners’ talk serves to reaffirm the audiences’ own norms. Neumann thus refers to David BIRCH, *The Language of Drama* (Basingstoke, London: Macmillan, 1991) who asserts that the cause of the audience’s laughter is the deviation from the norm: “What we are involved in here is the production of stereotyped notions of how other, non-English people talk. But not simply as an example of humorous foreigner-talk, but as striking examples of one culture oppressing another by ridicule” 121.

character's otherness. As Bhabha has explicated, stereotyping is a semiotic activity which is achieved through the construction of certain signs that have to be continuously repeated in order to become fixed.⁵⁴⁸ In respect to *Sir Barnaby Rudge* one can state that as the play thrives on such pre-set presentations of maritime quirks, these stereotypical features of the Other performatively enhance the control the "land-society" holds over the mariner. However, the mariners' language can also be said to be instrumental in defying control as it provokes misunderstandings and incomprehension, thus also providing a space for ambivalence within the discourse.

Porpuss' declaration to leave England in order to seek colonialist fortunes is a prominent motif in many plays of the time,⁵⁴⁹ also be found, and severely ridiculed, in a farce by Nahum Tate, entitled *Cuckolds-Haven: or, An Alderman No Conjurer*.⁵⁵⁰ The play is an adaptation of *Eastward Ho!*,⁵⁵¹ a Jacobean era stage play by George Chapman, Ben Jonson and John Marston. The farce,⁵⁵² which premiered in 1685 at the Queen's Theatre in Dorset Garden, depicts Touchstone, an Alderman who has great difficulties in marrying off his two daughters. In trying to secure a good match for Girtred, Touchstone falls for a fraud who, along with the bawd Security, a sea captain called Seagull and the dowry, tries to elope to the West Indies. Suffering shipwreck in East London, the traitors are arrested. As this brief and abbreviated synopsis suggests, *Cuckolds-Haven* presents rather concrete references to the possibilities and dangers of colonial flight. Within the first two scenes of the play, a frame for colonial endeavours is depicted, in that the usurer and bawd Security as well as Alderman Touchstone engage in a lengthy discussion about finances and risks. Security exclaims: "The Merchant says, Traffick is subject to Incer- / tainty and Loss; let them keep their Goods on dry Land with a Vengeance" (CH, I. ii, 6). In drawing attention to the element of risk in maritime endeavours, Security not only hints at the more abstract fleetingness of projects thought to be safe, but also alludes to the character of seamen as "third sort of persons", characters willing to risk everything for the chance of profit. In fact, the play refers to several other motives that mark out colonial endeavours: a thirst for luxury, the wish to fly from matrimonial commitments, the prospect of adventures, treasure, wine, women and freedom.

548 See Bhabha, "The Other Question", *The Location of Culture* 96 f, 101.

549 See Chapter 4: Theatres of Escape.

550 Quoting from the play, the play's title will be shortened to "CH". Nahum TATE, *Cuckolds-Haven: or, an Alderman no Conjurer. A Farce. Acted at the Queen's Theatre in Dorset Garden* (London: Printed for J.H. and are to be sold by Edward Poole, next door to the Fleece Tavern in Cornhil, 1685). References for quotations are given in the form "I. i, 1", the first number represents the act, the second number the scene and the third number the page.

551 The play was printed in 1605.

552 The London Stage only lists one performance of the play, June 1st.

Thus the background that motivates the attempted sea-journey in the play is exemplified by greed, deviance, voraciousness, but also a more positive connotation of freedom.

The sea captain, as well as his crew, come to performatively epitomize this deviance in the play and the stage sailors' representation again maintains a distinctive otherness that is – in this case – achieved mainly through their spatial depiction on stage. In II. ii, Captain Seagull and his crew are shown together for the first time in a scene set in a tavern. In presenting the mariners within one of their apparent “natural” habitats on land, theatrical pointing is achieved through the scene's setting. The tavern serves to mark a place that performatively captures the otherness of the mariners as the scene presents drink and drunken men, all about to embark on an endeavour with airs of carelessness, irreligion and greed. The sailors are, similar to the mariners in *The Enchanted Island* as well as *The Successful Pyrate*, presented as socially deviant, referring to their Captain as “noble” (CH, II. ii, 23), thus indicating that they have a social value system of their own. Their thirst for alcohol is further presented as proverbially bottomless: “DRAWER: You shall have all things you wish, Sir: wil't please you to have/more Wine? CAPTAIN SEAGULL: Without measure, Slave; whether we drink it or no, spill it/and draw more” (CH, II. ii, 23). Corresponding to their increasing alcohol levels, the sailors enquire about the prospects that await them in their colony and Seagull expounds a list that apparently ticks all the right boxes:

SEAGULL: Vast endless Mines: for so much Copper as I carry thither,
I will have thrice the weight in Gold. They hinge their Doors with it,
and barr their Windows.

[...]

2 SAILOR: And is it a pleasant Countrey, Captain?

SEAGULL: AS ever the Sun shin'd on; you have Autumn, Winter, Spring,
Summer there, all without any change of Seasons, and that you'd wonder at.

1 SAILOR: And what Government, good Captain?

SEAGULL: You shall live free there without Sergeants, Lawyers, or Intel-
ligencers; you may be an Alderman, without being a Scavenger; attain
any Office, without 'Prenticeship; you may come to Preferment, without
being a Pimp; to Riches and Fortune enough and have never the more Vil-
lany nor the less Wit. In a word, you will have no more Law than Con-
science, and not so much of either (CH, II. ii, 23 f).

This dialogue is worth quoting at length as it neatly displays a whole scope of motivations that identify mariners as colonial adventurers, but also as it evokes features that were associated with piracy – and, as such, deviancy – namely the quest to “live free” without social control. Apart from referencing the “standard” colonial fantasies, like riches, the abundance of sexual partners and “pleasant”

landscapes, the sailors here add a twist to their own characterization in that they seemingly also prefer “governments” where they do not have to be industrious or disciplined. However, the lingering expectations are immediately dashed in the next scene which presents a counter-point to the tavern setting. The scene is set at Cuckolds-Point, a place on the River Thames in East London. Here, the crew is shown as shipwrecked: “*Enter Sir Petronell, Quick-Silver, and Sea-gull, in Fisherman’s Cloths and Nets wrapt about them*” (CH, III. i, 31). This stage direction gives a vivid idea of the great comic effect this appearance must have had on the audience. Right after painting such exaggerated hopes of exotic lands, the boat’s crew has firmly run aground. The comic effect of their fish-net “costumes” is further enhanced in that not only are the sailors still drunk, but the Captain also believes they have landed in France: “I tell ye, Sirs, for all this we are gotten to the Coast of *Nor-/mandy*, I know it by the Elevation of the Pole [...] this is nothing with us Sailors: I have been Drown’d forty / times in my Life, before now“ (CH, III. i, 31). In terms of theatrical representation, the sailors and their passengers are thus thoroughly ridiculed and de-constructed. They have been portrayed as petty run-aways, profoundly lacking in skill and discipline. Dressed in fishermen’s nets, they and their colonial aspirations seem to be only fit for presenting them as a laughing stock.

However, the dramatic representation of stage sailors as deviant, socially troublesome and inherently alien undergoes a shift towards the end of the seventeenth century. Despite the fact that the stage sailor’s otherness is maintained, plain dealing is increasingly presented as a behavioural quaintness that does not exclude mariners from land-based society, but which can also be incorporated into the dramatic action. Hence, stage sailors are ever more presented as being part of the staged society, not foremost disturbing, but even gradually enriching the dramatic action. In this respect, George Farquhar’s 1701 play *Sir Harry Wildair: Being the Sequel of the Trip to the Jubilee*,⁵⁵³ provides a neat example of how sea-breeding increasingly served as a bemusing rather than unsettling device and, as a discussion of the sea captain in Susanna Centlivre’s *The Basset Table*, as well as John Dennis’ *Gibraltar* will show, stage sailors gradually changed from being portrayed as advancing merely their own agenda to bearers of communal values.

553 In due course shortened to “HW”. George FARQUHAR, *Sir Harry Wildair: being the sequel of The trip to the Jubilee. A comedy. As is acted at the Theatre-Royal in Drury-Lane, by His Majesty’s servants* (London: Printed for James Knapton, at the Sign of the Crown in St. Paul’s Church Yard, 1701). References for quotations are given in the form “I, 1”, the first number represents the act, the second number the page.

3.2.3 Rough, but Lovable: Changes to the Stage Sailor

Farquhar's comedy *Sir Harry Wildair* premiered in 1701 at the Theatre Royal in Drury Lane, starring Robert Wilks as the eponymous character. The play was designed to be a continuation of the hugely successful *The Constant Couple, or: a Trip to the Jubilee* from 1699. The play did not meet the success of its forerunner, but with at least 4 shows in the year of its production, another revival of 5 shows in the 1730s and at least two printed editions the play was certainly no failure with the public.

Farquhar again focused on the amusing character of Sir Harry Wildair as the play's main attraction, with the plot centring on Colonel Standard and Wildair and their respective wives. Standard is newly married and unsure of the virtuousness of his betrothed, whereas Sir Harry believes himself to be widowed. After several doubts about and trials of Standard's wife's virtue, Sir Harry's "dead" wife turns up and both men can reconcile with their spouses. Captain Fireball, Standard's brother freshly returned from sea, features as the sea captain – alongside his servant Shark – and his main characteristic is, as his name suggests, his eruptive nature that shows itself upon almost every occasion. Without further ado, Fireball repeatedly offers to settle conflicts by force – upon hearing of rumours that are spread about his sister-in-law, he promises Standard to: "Why then, I'gad, Brother it shall be so, I'll be back again to *White's*,/ and whoever dares mutter scandal of my Brother and Sister, I'll dash his/ Ratesia in's Face, and call him a Lyar [Going]" (HW, I, 2). And again, in act III, discussing the alleged infidelity of his sister-in-law, Fireball keeps on suggesting violence to settle the matter: "Why, stab him, stab him now. [...] 'Sdeath, Sir, can't you kick and cuff? – Kick one. [...] Let him come, let him come; I'll shew you how to manage a/ Beau presently. [...] I'll knock him down for Diversion" (HW, III, 22). However, despite these exclamations and the additional threat to press "Beau" Clincher "aboard the *Belzebub*" (HW, IV, 30), the sea captain remains a character who generates sympathy. The audience can easily side with him and his standards, while the target of Fireball's scorn is moreover presented as ridiculous, a vain and smug Beau contrasting strongly with the virility of Fireball.

The change in stage sailor's representations is further attended by a shift in the stress on honesty. Honesty, as proclaimed by Wycherley's Plain Dealer, is increasingly less pronounced in the stage sailor's portrayal; instead it is the lack of manners that foremost distinguishes the mariner's representations. In always readily associating the mariner's otherness in regards to social behaviour with his sea-breeding, the difference between him and landlubbers is effectually lessened as his otherness is explained away merely with his lack of education and not seen as a dislike of society. In *Sir Harry Wildair*, this changed perspective is established by Fireball and his brother, "FIREBALL: [...] We Seamen speak plain,

Brother. STANDARD: You Seamen are like your Element, always Tempestuous, too/ruffling to handle a fine Lady" (HW, I, 2). The stage sailor here does not proclaim an aversion to society, his "plain speaking" is not put forward as an antidote to society, but it is presented as effected by his working environment. On another level, Standard's reference to the treatment of "a fine lady" also cites the mariner's stereotypical inaptness of engaging with women. However, as Fireball is opposed to other male characters, the beaus Clincher and Banter, his own behaviour towards women is also associated with a certain kind of masculinity, which becomes particularly pronounced when set against such "beauish" characters. In this respect, his "tempestuous" treatment of women is not only presented as part of his sea-breeding, but also acquires a more gendered quality in that it appears as a model opposed to the beaus. This opposition is drawn upon in the play's representation of Standard's wife and her admiration of both Clincher and Beau Banter.

Lady Lurewell, Standard's wife, shows herself to be in awe of Clincher, ready to fall for his "French Follies" and, with her exaggerated behavioural standards, she therefore readily rejects Fireball:

Sir, I shall not be at leisure to entertain a Person of his Wapping

Education, I can assure you. –

[...]

Sir, I have some business with my Woman; You may entertain your Sea-monster by your self; you may command a Dish of Pork and Pease, with a bowl of Punch, I suppose; and so, Sir, much good may do you (HW, II, 14).

Even though Lady Lurewell here draws on ready stereotypes that ridicule "persons of Wapping education" and therefore serve to downgrade the character, her account of the stage sailor is subsequently countered by Fireball's performance. When Fireball enters, he shows himself unconcerned as to this rejection by her:

[...] I hate these Family-Dinners,

where a Man's oblig'd to, O Lard, Madam! No Apology, dear Sir. –

'Tis very good indeed, Madam. – For your self, dear Madam. –

Where between the rub'd Floor under foot, the China in one Corner, and the Glasses in another, a Man can't make two strides without hazard of his Life. [...]

Hang your Family-Dinners; Come along with me (HW, II, 14).

This scene not only provides Fireball with the chance of setting the Lady's invocation into perspective, but he also in a way controls the scene *as performance* in that he mimics respectable society and offers an alternative that the audience can certainly identify with. In a way, Fireball also reverses Lady Lurewell's mockery as he himself derides her cherished social gathering. The

mariner thus emerges as a model for behaviour, and notably gendered behaviour, that can seem as a viable contrast to overtly stylized or effeminate conduct. As Beau Banter enters the scene, he quickly also becomes a target for Fireball's mockery:

BANTER: [...] I can dance a Minuet, court a Mistriss, play at Picket, or make a Paroli, [...] In short, Sir, in spite of the University, I'm a pretty Gentleman, – Coll. Where's your Wife?

FIREBALL: [Mimicking him] In spite of the University I'm a pretty Gentleman. – Then, Coll. Where's your Wife – Hark ye, young Plato, Whether wou'd you have, your Nose slit, or your Ears cut? (HW, II, 15).

Important to note is that Beau Banter was played by an actress in the original cast. In thus gendering the performance by way of casting and, furthermore, in presenting Fireball as mimicking and mocking the other character, Fireball's performance of manliness is not only set against the Beau, but also privileged in terms of the actor's "real" gender. In *Sir Harry Wildair* therefore, the stage sailor still evidently exhibits his sea-breeding and rough manners, but instead of being the object of ridicule himself, the maritime character here himself ridicules other characters in a way that is likely to amuse the audience. The attribution of comic capabilities can be said to empower the stage sailor in this respect, however, the oppositional nature of this ridicule also still fixes the sailor in a certain form of otherness. The presentation of the stage sailor as a proactive character in terms of entertainment in this way replaces the rough tars that were presented as mere objects of mockery and launches a presentation of stage sailors – most notably in the second half of the century – that is increasingly exemplified by the character's propensity for "jolly" and light-hearted entertainment.

A further aspect that indicates a change in the discursive representation of the stage sailor is the steady appearance of references to the national relevance of his employment. Whereas, apart from *The Plain Dealer* where the aspect is not particularly drawn upon, preceding plays did not mention the national aspect of mariners' commands, in *Sir Harry Wildair* the national facet of maritime endeavours is called upon. In the play, this is achieved in a twofold manner. On the one hand, Fireball and his brother Standard repeatedly declare their hatred of the French and Spanish and on the other hand Fireball time and again vindicates the Royal Navy. After Clincher refused to drink brandy with Fireball, the Captain exclaims: "Brandy! You Dog, abuse Brandy! Flat Treason against the Navy- / Royal – Sirrah, I'll teach you to abuse the Fleet" (HW, IV, 29). Despite the ironic character of these lines through Fireball's emotional reaction to brandy "abuse", it is important to note that in mentioning the Royal Navy, the stage sailor is also associated with the nation itself, and therefore allied with a sense of

patriotism. The stage sailor is not only related to England and Englishness, but Englishness is reciprocally related with a certain kind of manliness that contrasts with the superficial and effeminate performances of the sailor's antagonists.

In Susanna Centlivre's 1705 comedy *The Basset Table*,⁵⁵⁴ like *Sir Harry Wildair* a playwright's attempt to continue with the success of a similar themed play,⁵⁵⁵ this aspect of Englishness is further adjusted. *The Basset Table* opened at Drury Lane on the 20th of November 1705, with the comedy initially running through 4 performances. Even though the play could not meet with the success of *The Gamester*, there is a reprint noted for 1706, suggesting a second outing in the season of that year. The play's plot is centred around the basset table of a young and wealthy widow called Lady Reveller, with the events split in three subplots: Lord Worthy trying to woo Lady Reveller and reform her gambling ways, a second gambling plot revolving around the pains of a citizen with his obsessively gambling wife and a third plot where Sir Richard Plainman, Lady Reveller's uncle, tries to compel his scientifically inclined daughter Valeria into marrying a naval officer called Captain Hearty. Valeria, however, has plans of her own and is in love with Ensign Lovely who, with the help of Hearty, eventually tricks Sir Richard into believing he himself is a naval captain and therefore gains Valeria's hand in marriage.

Once more, the stage sailor is only a minor character within the overall dramaturgy of the play, nevertheless the character of Hearty confirms the changing qualities of stage sailors considerably. The maritime character is still presented as Other, once more through theatrical pointing, but the presentation is so very defined that Hearty himself "mocks" this stereotype and is not prepared to take it fully on. Moreover, despite pronounced theatrical pointing to the mariner's otherness, it becomes apparent that the character himself fits gradually less into a pattern that maintains his otherness. Hearty, in some respects, does not "act the part" and, as his name suggests, the mariner is presented as a good-natured character that eventually even serves as a social agent of sorts, helping Lovely and Valeria to their match. As in *Sir Harry Wildair*, this presentation adjusts the increasing involvement of the maritime character in the entertainment of the play, rendering him a positive character, yet, it also reaffirms his status as an outsider, in that his peculiarities appear as intrinsic and thus fixed to his persona.

Upon first hearing that Sir Richard awaits a sea captain to match him with

554 The play's title will be shortened to "BT" in quotes. Susanna CENTLIVRE, *The Basset Table*, ed. Jane Milling, Broadview Editions (Peterborough: Broadview Press, 2009). References for quotations are given in the form "I, 1", the first number represents the act, the second number the page.

555 *The Basset Table* being a companion piece to Centlivre's huge hit of the same year *The Gamester* (February 1705).

Valeria, Lady Reveller sneers at this undertaking, sketching a vivid picture of the stereotypical tediousness that lies ahead of the mariner's future in-laws:

LADY REVELLER: What the Sea Captain, Uncle? Faugh, I hate the smell of Pitch and Tarr; one that can Entertain one with nothing but Fire and Smoak, Larboard and Starboard, and t'other bowl of Punch, ha, ha, ha.

ALPVIEW [her servant]: And for every fault that she [Valeria] commits he'll condemn her /
to the Bilboes, ha, ha.

LADY REVELLER: I fancy my Cousin's Philosophy, and the Captain's Courageous Bluster, will make Angelick Harmony.

SIR RICHARD PLAINMAN: Yes, Madam, sweeter Harmony than your Sept & Leva Fops, Rakes, and Gamesters; give me the Man that serves my Country, that preserves both my Estate and my Life- Oh, the glorious Name of a Soldier; if I were Young, I'd go my self in Person, but as it is -

ALPVIEW: You'll send your Daughter -(BT, I, 51 f).

Notwithstanding the witty repartees on the women's part, Sir Richard's defence of "the Man that serves my Country" has a countering effect on the women's jokes, as he draws attention to the mariner's value that lies beyond fleeting social entertainment and fashions and hence sets him off from "Fops, Rakes, and Gamesters". However, the stereotypical characterisation Lady Reveller gives, with the formulaic trinity of "smell", "sea talk" and "punch", is at first performatively approved by Hearty's own statements. Entering the stage alongside Sir Richard, the two men say:

SIR RICHARD PLAINMAN: Sir, I like the Relation you have given me of your Naval Expedition, your Discourse speaks you a Man fit for the Sea.

CAPTAIN HEARTY: You had it without a flourish, Sir Richard my Word is this, I hate the French, Love a handsome Woman, and a Bowl of Punch.

VALERIA: Very Blunt (BT, II, 67).

This first introduction is significant as Sir Richard explicitly refers to the otherness or distinctiveness a "Man fit for the Sea" has to procure, and Hearty readily fits the image in attesting to yet another formulaic trinity of maritime self-assertion, "anti-French", "love for women" and "punch". This reciprocal assurance, performed without a beat, is topped off with Valeria's sly remark "very blunt" – a remark which can also be read as an ironic comment on the clichéd⁵⁵⁶ nature of the exchange.

556 See Bhabha, who argues that the fixity of stereotypes – "We always already know that blacks

Hearty's performance and his treatment by Lady Reveller has, up to this point of the play, asserted the stereotypical presentation of a socially inept blunt tar. The ensuing dialogue, however, shows that Captain Hearty is no stage sailor ensnared in his maritime cosmos, but has social antennae for the peculiarities of the family he is supposed to become a member of. Upon realizing Valeria's passion for scientific enquiries and experiments – indeed a much more eccentric trait in a woman than the love for punch and brawling in a man could ever be in the early eighteenth century – he quickly distances himself from the family: "By *Neptune*, this is a kind of whimsical / Family" (BT, II, 69). In the course of the scene, Lady Reveller again rehearses her formulaic notions of a mariner's passions:

I am for the practick, can listen all Day, to hear
 you talk of Fire, substantial Fire, Rear and Front, and Line
 of Battle- admire a Seaman, hate the *French*-love a Bowl
 of Punch? Oh, nothing so agreeable as your Conversation,
 nothing so jaunty as a Sea Captain (BT, II, 70).

But once more Hearty sounds out the mocking tone of Lady Reveller's lines and professes in an aside: "She's Mad too, I suppose, but / I'll humour her a little" (BT, II, 70). In this respect, Hearty – similar to Captain Fireball in *Sir Harry Wildair* – refuses to be an object of humouring and takes initiative in order to "humour her a little" himself. To an extent, Hearty's initiative has thus a reflective quality. In *The Basset Table*, the characters talking about – or talking with – the stage sailor depict him in a highly stereotypical way. In actively taking part in the dramatic action, through the "humouring" of Lady Reveller and his match-making, Captain Hearty in a way defies the clichéd pattern of his portrayal. The stereotypical notion of a "blunt tar" as put forward by Lady Reveller thus emerges not as essence of the character, but as a habit that can be reiterated and taken on by other characters as well. This aspect is performed in act IV, where Ensign Lovely enters the stage "drest like a Tar" (BT, IV, 92), and is advised by Sir James: "look big, / and Bluster for your Country – describe the *Vigo*⁵⁵⁷ Business – / publick News will furnish you with that, and I'll engage the / Success" (BT, IV, 92). Ensign Lovely here very effectively impersonates a tar in taking on the dress and overtly patriotic manner of a mariner. Correspondingly, he impresses Sir Richard with "sea talk": "Courage, Honesty, / and Plain-dealing

are licentious, Asiatics duplicitous" – and the fact that "the *same old* stories of the Negro's animality, the Coolie's inscrutability or the stupidity of the Irish *must* be told (compulsively) again and afresh", also render stereotypes clichéd, "The Other Question", *The Location of Culture* 109, 111.

557 The Battle of Vigo (1702) was one of the first skirmishes of the War of the Spanish Succession, a profitable success for the English as they were able to capture much of the Spanish treasure fleet.

Truth, is the Learning of our Element” (BT, IV, 93), “I am Rough and Storm-like in my Temper, / unacquainted with the Effeminacy of Courts” (BT, IV, 94). Plain talking is here drained of its original meaning as the sailor’s repertoire is here used to trick Sir Richard and not “plainly” speak the truth. Plain dealing no longer serves as an antidote to a dishonest society, but is channelled into a feature of masquerade. The plain dealing aspect of the stage sailor and his inherent incompatibility with land-based society is therefore contested in *The Basset Table* as Captain Hearty emerges as a sympathetic match-maker as well as an engaged man of social entertainment who actively takes part in the play’s main social action, the gambling.⁵⁵⁸ Honesty, as quintessential characteristic of stage sailors, thus undergoes a shift in representation as it is no longer framed as an a-social feature, but is appropriated for a more sympathetic and engaged portrayal of mariners.

This change is also attended by a gradually more pronounced association of stage sailors with the patriotic aspect of their employment and a display of their Englishness. In this respect, *Gibraltar, or: the Spanish adventure*⁵⁵⁹ by John Dennis offers a case in point as the play stages a vivid representation of stage sailors as quintessentially *English* characters. *Gibraltar* premiered in 1705 at the theatre in Drury Lane and went through at least three performances within the year. The play is set in a village in the neighbourhood of Gibraltar; the main action of the plot involves two English colonels trying to win two young Spanish ladies by way of a set of elaborate intrigues. In *Gibraltar*, English mariners are once more characterized with their purported honesty, indeed the word “honest” becomes an oft-quoted side name for the maritime character Porpus. Fetcher, servant to one of the English colonels, says about him: “he’s honest, Trusty, and true as heart of / Oak, I’gad” (GB, IV, 43). Interestingly, this is the first time the metaphor “heart of oak” is used in the plays under discussion, drawing attention to the fact that ever more, the positive aspects of honesty are brought to the fore as opposed to its restraint on sociability. In the same vein, the representation of mariners in *Gibraltar* also emphasizes their Englishness. In praising the mariners’ valour and trustworthiness, the Captain exclaims: “The Shoar / confines the Sea, but not our Seamen’s Valour” (GB, V, 61). Mariners here emerge as bearers as well as propagators of English values, a portrayal that deems the characters as exemplary models for representing their nation within the

558 Albeit the fact that he – as a nod to his tempestuous temper – swears repeatedly and storms off at one point, it is significant that he re-enters the scene within no time.

559 Shortened to “GB” in quotes. John DENNIS, *Gibraltar: or, The Spanish adventure, A comedy. As it was acted at the Theatre in Drury-Lane* (London: Printed for Wm. Turner, at the Angel at Lincolns-Inn Back-Gate and Sold by J. Nutt, near Stationer’s-Hall, 1705). References for quotations are given in the form “I, 1”, the first number represents the act, the second number the page.

contact zone of the sea. In this respect, the mariners are also set against less favourable examples of their profession as Porpus voices criticism against some of his superiors: "I am no Wordy-Man [...] do you see, a / Man of Words and not of Deeds, Words are but Wind, and / some of our Bully Captains are all Wind" (GB, IV, 44). Here, the stage sailor's plain talking appears as a valuable feature as it exposes "bully captains" talk as "all wind", thus framing plain talking mariners as substantially more desirable than "bully captains".

The play also concludes with a tableau reaffirming the value of tars and moreover celebrating their Englishness. Right towards the end, the Captain announces: "A jolly Crew of our victorious Tars, whom with some / Musick I have brought to rejoice with us upon this happy Oc- / casion" (GB, V, 61). The play is subsequently brought to a close with an "entertainment", "A Dialogue between an *English* Mariner, and a *Spanish* Shepherdess" (GB, V, 69). Evoking a pastoral scene, this "dialogue" consists of the English mariner ever more fiercely wooing the shepherdess and ends with the following stage directions: "As he sings and attacks her with the more Fury, she resists with the more Faintness, till at last she makes no Resistance at all, and then sings the last line twice, kissing him" (GB, V, 70). This encounter can be read as both a literal and a programmatic demonstration of English mariners' qualities. The staged "battle" ends in victory, the mariner has gained not only possession but affection from the shepherdess and, in another play on the woman-as-land metaphor, possession of Spain/Gibraltar itself. In rounding up this enactment, a "chorus of tars to a dance" appears, singing:

In the soft Field of Love; or the rough Field of War,
There's no resisting an English Tar,
When we're at Sea, we the Tempest out-roar,
And we can thunder too, when we're on Shoar,
There's no resisting an English Tar,
Witness impregnable Gibraltar (GB, V, 70).

Here, the English tar appears as very different to earlier versions – like in *Sir Barnaby Whigg* or *Cuckolds-Haven* – where the character was presented as rude, rough and unattractive to women. In *Gibraltar*, stage sailors thus come into view not only as *English* characters, but their musical performance and representation as successful romantic conquerors indicates a notable shift from rough "plain dealers" to "jolly tars" (GB, V, 61).

3.2.4 Innocent Tars: “nothing but Riddles on land”

The representation of stage sailors as Other also involved aspects that can be more directly linked with discourses establishing notions of the “wild” or “natural” man. This more overt colonial association with the tar’s pedigree is significant in so far as it works to represent mariners as indeed not only “sea bred”, but “sea born”. This differentiation further allows for the possibility to “civilize” the stage sailor as his difficulties with land-based society arise from his ignorance of its customs, not an aversion of it. In this respect, the stage once more comes into view as cultural contact zone as stage sailors appear as liminal characters that are as yet unknowledgeable of “civil” society. The representation of stage sailors as ignorant of social customs thus accompanies dramatic representations like in *The Plain Dealer*, *Sir Barnaby Whigg* and *Sir Harry Wildair*, where mariners were presented as knowledgeable in social ceremonies, but as critical and even disgusted by them. In terms of dramatic representation this portrayal as “innocent” characters serves dramaturgical purposes as it affords numerous comical instances, but it also serves to “civilize” and thus incorporate these liminal characters into metropolitan society.

Edward Ravenscroft’s tragicomedy entitled *King Edgar and Alfreda*⁵⁶⁰ offers a representative portrayal of an “innocent” stage sailor. The play premiered in 1677 and, in that season, went through two performances as well as two print editions. The play’s main plot is centred on King Edgar⁵⁶¹ and his love for Alfreda, which is complicated by their respective spouses. The play has two side-plots, one involving Alfreda’s brother, an Admiral, in love with Matilda and the other a sea captain by the name of Durzo, to be matched with Hillaria. Durzo’s lines are packed with naval references, as with the other plays under discussion, his instant attribute is his language, which abounds with numerous references to his life on-board. In this way, he is set instantly apart from the other characters and the story of his derivation and upbringing further emphasize the liminality of the character. Aldernald, his Admiral, introduces him to the court: “A stout Souldier tho a blunt Courtier, / He was born in a ship, and never was / Five miles on shoar in his life; / He scarce knows any thing of Land affairs / Beyond a Sea port Town or Haven” (KE, I, 11). In presenting Durzo as a “stout Souldier tho a blunt Courtier”, Ravenscroft alludes to mariners’ stereotypical bluntness and

560 The title will be shortened in quotes to “KE”. Edward RAVENSCROFT, *King Edgar and Alfreda a tragi-comedy: acted at the Theatre-Royal* (London: Printed for M. Turner near Turn-Style in Holbourn, 1677). References for quotations are given in the form “I. i, 1”, the first number represents the act, the second number the scene – where given – and the third number the page.

561 There was another play on King Edgar issued that year, namely Thomas Rymer’s *Edgar, or the English Monarch*.

roughness, however, Durzo's subsequent presentation frames his social ineptness and otherness not in terms of disregard for society, but as actual ignorance of its customs. After having met the King, Oswald – a "Gentleman of the Court" and Hillaria's brother – is set to accompany Durzo to the wardrobe:

OSWOLD: Come Captain, now wee'l have you to the Wardrobe.
 Durzo: What place is that? do they fight or drink there?
 OSWOLD: 'Tis one of his Majesties Store-houses,
 You must be new rigg'd Captain,
 The Ladies won't like the smell of pitch and tar (KE, I, 11).

Durzo's utter ignorance as to the customs at court put the sailor's disposition to comic use because Oswald not only refers to Durzo's dress and smell, but belittles him in adopting sea-language so that Durzo, who appears to only understand "fight or drink", might understand him. Contrary to other stage sailors though, Durzo does not refuse to comply with or even ridicule customs of dressing and fashion, but simply has never heard of them before. Oswald thus treats Durzo like a child: in adjusting his language to the sailor's vocabulary, he tries to convince Durzo of the benefit of a change of clothes: "The Ladies won't like the smell of pitch and tar". Durzo here presents an alternative draft of the "plain dealer"; instead of mocking or dismissing social ceremonies, Durzo does not even comprehend "land affairs" as he is portrayed as yet lacking the language required. In act II – the consecutive scene to the one quoted before – his lack of comprehension is further exhibited when conversing with Aldernald about the latter's love to Matilda:

DURZO: What mean you, Admiral?
 ALDERNALD: I mean the Princess.
 DURZO: She's a woman.
 ALDERNALD: Something sure much finer.
 DURZO: Why, Admiral? a woman's the finest thing
 I ever saw, except a Canon mounted,
 And a ship under sail, but now I talk
 Of ships, wou'd I were aboard agen.
 ALDERNALD: Why Captain?
 DURZO: There I should understand what yosay.
 As I am a living man, you speak nothing
 But Riddles on land – Why Admiral
 What means this glorious tincture,
 Resplendent Deity, Beauteaus Shapes,
 Forms, Angels, and the Devil and all.
 What's all this to the Princess, I am a shark if I can
 Guess at your meaning. 'Sbud I say she's a woman (KE, I, 12).

In quoting the Admiral's preceding appraisal of Matilda, Durzo emphasizes the contrast between the poetical language of Aldernald and his own limited understanding: "Sbud I say she's a woman". Even though he thus reveals his own instance of plain talking, the key issue is his lack of understanding as, to him, life on land seems full of "riddles" and his question "What *mean* you, Admiral?"⁵⁶² appears as a serious cry for help. This impression is expanded when Durzo is actually introduced to the "Beauteous Shapes" he has been told about. Oswald picks the Captain up from his conversation with Aldernald, stating: "I'll bring him amongst the Ladies anon. ALDERNALD: His Company will be good divertimento" (KE, II, 14). Again, Durzo is handled like a child or even some exotic curiosity, apparently providing the sort of "entertainment" one could expect from the showcasing of a strange creature. For the audience, this encounter with women features as a next step in Durzo's "shock treatment" on land, bound to impart numerous instances of unwilling double entendres and faux pas. Henceforth, the presentation of Durzo's bodily reactions is essential for his portrayal as a "wild" and innocent man.

Reminiscent of Sycorax's reaction to alcohol in *The Enchanted Island*, Hippolito, Dorinda and Miranda's responses to the other sex as well as the Amazons' reaction towards men in *A Common-Wealth of Women*, Durzo in the following is overwhelmed by hitherto unknown passions. Indeed, he does not even "know" how to express himself: "Know? I know nothing./ But Nature is at war within me:/ My Brain's revers'd, all, all my Senses on the Rack" (KE, III, 35). Not having words, he retorts to conveying the bodily effects of his state and is duly diagnosed: "this should be Love" (KE, Alicia, III, 35). His bodily and emotional reactions to the sighting of women highly confuse Durzo who has hitherto only been accustomed to an all-male environment. The stage sailor is presented as almost literally "discovering" the land and female landlubbers, and his immediate passion for the female characters moreover register Durzo as a heterosexual male: "DURZO: When/I am spoken to, I am thinking of Ladies, my/Wits and Senses are gone a rambling" (KE, IV, 42). This representation as "innocent" in many ways differs from the portrayal of plain dealers as the mariner is here not presented as self-assured and independent, but as emotional and confused and hence in need of guidance. The awakened emotions and sexuality of the sailor also highlight the character's time on sea as a situation bereft of heterosexual encounters and thus can be read as an attempt to re-present the character as a sexually interested, heterosexual male.

This representation of a stage sailor, anchored in discourses of discovery and colonization, is taken up again in Ravenscroft's last comedy *The Canterbury*

562 Emphasis GW.

*Guests, or: the Bargain Broken.*⁵⁶³ The play was staged by the United Company at the Theatre Royal in 1694 and starred such promising – they were to become more famous – actors such as Cave Underhill as Sir Barnaby and John Verbruggen as Lovell. *The Canterbury Guests*, however, was no entirely new play as Ravenscroft had furnished out the plot with scenes from earlier pieces of his own, such as *King Edgar and Alfreda*, where he takes “Durzo” from. The play is set in Canterbury,⁵⁶⁴ where Alderman Furr intends to marry his daughter to an older man, Sir Barnaby Bluff. His daughter Jacinta as well as his niece Hillaria resist his plans and finally find love as well as marriage with the young Lovell and his friend Careless respectively. Careless⁵⁶⁵ is just back from an extended period at sea and is accompanied by Durzo, who is eventually matched with Lovell’s sister Arabella.

The character of Durzo, like his namesake in *King Edgar and Alfreda*, is presented as foreign to “land affairs”. Only ever having experienced life at sea, he now finds himself at loss on land: “I can walk so all about/ my Frigat, Fore and Aft, in my sleep, between Decks, or above/ Deck, and return into my Cabin without waking, but here I am/ forced to have a Pilot to steer me broad awake”⁵⁶⁶ (CG, II. viii, 6–9). Life on sea is opposed to life on land, which in Durzo’s words almost appears as a foreign and alien country. In this respect, Durzo himself appears as inherently foreign and is henceforth presented like an exotic curiosity, with the other characters drawing the audience’s attention to his otherness:

LOVELL: A brave Sea Captain – Stout and Blunt – he was Born in a Ship,
and scarce knows anything of Land Affairs.

HILLARIA: He looks as ruff as a Storm.

ARABELLA: I like him well; he looks as if fighting was his business.

JACINTA: He’s not very curious in his Dress (CG, II. viii, 14–18).

Durzo is described in a very stereotypical manner as the two women point out his “ruff” appearance and dress. However, it is remarkable to note that his appearance does not put off the female characters, but indeed attracts Arabella

563 The play’s title will be shortened to “CG” in quotes. Edward RAVENSCROFT, *The Careless Lovers’ and ‘The Canterbury Guests’: A Critical Old-Spelling Edition*, ed. Edmund S. Henry (New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1987). References for quotations are given in the form “I. i, 1”, the first number represents the act, the second the scene and the third the line.

564 See John LOFTIS, *The Politics of Drama in Augustan England* (London: OUP, 1963) on the relation of urban comedy and the rural landscape.

565 Careless is indeed an example of a run-away gentleman: “CARELESS: [I] went a Voluntier to Sea, aboard one of the King’s Frigats;/ when our Fleet return’d I went aboard the French, then the/ Dutch, and so from one Fleet to another, till I touch’d upon most of the known Coasts the Christian World Trafficks/ to. By this time I hope my Estate is disincumber’d, and I/ am free in the World” (CG, I.iv, 12–17).

566 This quote appears in *King Edgar and Alfreda* as well.

to him, as she exclaims to “like him well”. Contrary to stage sailors like Seagull, Fireball and Porpuss, he is presented as a potential love-interest; there is no “sea-breeding” frightening women away, but Durzo emerges as boisterous yet innocent as he simply “scarce knows anything of Land Affairs”. The stage sailor is represented not as averse to polite and civil society, but as a character that requires guidance: “a pilot to steer me broad awake”. In this sense, it comes as no surprise that a female character is taking on the role of “pilot” as Durzo’s awakened passion for Arabella serves to initiate the stage sailor into land-based society. Similar to the plot in *King Edgar and Alfreda*, Durzo subsequently suffers from – to him – inexplicable bodily reactions, which are later diagnosed as love: “DURZO: I have a wild Fire in my Veins, my blood is a / circulating flame, it spouts against the upper Region of my / Brain, like a tempestuous Hurricane” (CG, IV. iii, 3 – 5). Once more, “love” acts as a device initiating the stage sailor’s admission as well as familiarization into society as the character eventually comes to comprehend his feelings and is matched with his love-interest Arabella. Contrary to the more a-social blunt tars from other plays mentioned, Durzo’s initial innocence compensates for his liminal position to an extent as it is overcome in his final – marital – incorporation into society.

In terms of comic effect, however, the stage sailor’s otherness is maintained as it functions to expose ridicule in other characters. Almost reminiscent of a child unconsciously hitting the mark in a conversation with adults, Durzo draws laughter from the other characters as he exposes the ridiculous Sir Barnaby, who converses solely in proverbs: “SIR BARNABY: Captain, You need not be so Crusty, you are not so hard bak’d. DURZO: That’s a Land term, now, that I don’t understand” (CG, V. vi, 136 f). As Edmund S. Henry, modern-day editor of the play, has commented: “Durzo is basically a naïf, a fact which makes his unconscious double entendres and his rudely awakened sexuality the more dramatically ironic, and compelling”.⁵⁶⁷ This observation is certainly valid in theatrical terms as Durzo’s naiveté is without a doubt driving forth a great part of the humour of the play. However, in analysing the stage sailor’s representation within a colonial discourse framework, it becomes apparent that the “dramatically compelling” aspects of Durzo’s characterization can be read as embedded in discourses of colonization and are thus only insufficiently grasped by the term “naïf”,⁵⁶⁸ as they are crucial features in the character’s dramatic civilization.

In analysing stage sailors that are designed not as rejecting society, but pre-

⁵⁶⁷ Introduction liii.

⁵⁶⁸ NB: Robinson writes about Durzo: “The blunt sailor, with little knowledge of fashions, unaccustomed to the ladies, and bewildered by the ways of society, makes many laughable faux pas, but his transparent honesty, his brave and handsome bearing, his tact and his good looks, bring him success in the end” 187 f. This is yet another instance of Robinson’s white-washing of sailors, as there is no mentioning of “good looks” in the play.

sented as more innocent, “natural” “presocial”⁵⁶⁹ characters, considering Ben Legend from William Congreve’s *Love for Love*⁵⁷⁰ (1695) provides an apt conclusion to this chapter as the character not only combines many facets of an “innocent” tar, but also shares several features with Wycherley’s Plain Dealer as his character also serves to provide a critical perspective on land-based society. *Love for Love* was the opening attraction for Thomas Betterton’s new company at the theatre in Lincoln’s Inn Fields, with an all-star cast – Betterton himself acting as Valentine, Anne Bracegirdle as Angelica, Cave Underhill as Sir Sampson Legend and Elizabeth Barry as Mrs. Frail – performing in the play’s initial run which lasted for thirteen consecutive days and went on to be Congreve’s most successful piece for the stage.⁵⁷¹ What can be said to have had a great share in the comedy’s success was the performance of Thomas Dogget as Ben Legend, the stage sailor. In his *Essay on Acting*⁵⁷² (1744), David Garrick refers to the actor and his preparation for the part: “The late celebrated Mr. *Dogget*, before he perform’d the Character of *Ben*, in *Love for Love*, took Lodgings in *Wapping*, and gather’d thence a *Nosegay* for the whole Town”.⁵⁷³ Dogget’s preparation for his part is indeed noteworthy as it not only anticipates a twentieth-century method of acting,⁵⁷⁴ but also suggests that his interpretation of mariners’ behaviour was highly distinct and recognizable to the audience. In general, theatrical performances of stage sailors drew on distinct markers that tagged the characters with their maritime provenance such as “sea language” and a particular way of pronunciation as the shortening of many words in the play-texts indicate.⁵⁷⁵ Stage sailors were also dressed for their parts in sea breeches and probably loose-fitting shirts. It can also be assumed that many actors underscored their performance with special gestures and body language, for example an unsteady way

569 Holland 110.

570 William CONGREVE, *Love for Love*, ed. Emmett L. Avery, Regents Restoration Drama Series (London: Edward Arnold, 1966) xvii. The play’s title will be shortened to “LL” in quotes. References for quotations are given in the form “I. i, 1”, the first number represents the act, the second number the scene and the third number the line.

571 As Charles GILDON asserted, indeed the “Work of a popular author; but that was not all, the Town was engag’d in its favour”, *A Comparison between the two Stages* x.

572 David Garrick, *An essay on acting: in which will be consider’d the mimical behaviour of a certain fashionable faulty actor, and the Laudableness of such unmannerly, as well as inhumane Proceedings. To which will be added, a short criticism on his acting Macbeth* (London: Printed for W. BICKERTON, at the *Gazette*, in the *Temple Exchange*, near the *Inner Temple Gate, Fleet-Street*, 1744).

573 Garrick 10.

574 Namely the so-called “method acting”, acting techniques that were developed by the “Group Theatre” in New York in the 1930s and advanced and popularized by Lee Strasberg. One method acting-technique is asking actors to go to the zoo and study and try to embody and channel the performance of a certain animal as closely as possible.

575 “And” shortened to “an” etc.

of walking. Mariners were not only said to be drunkards, but their problem of walking on land was often mentioned. However, Dogget's approach to his part unveils an even more distinct understanding of sailors as his "taking lodgings" in Wapping can be viewed as a liminal endeavour. In temporarily living amongst mariners, the actor deliberately puts himself in "another country", where the inhabitants' "manner of living, speaking, acting, dressing and behaving, are so very peculiar to themselves", as John Fielding described the port district Wapping. In endorsing the resulting performance, the theatre collective – both actor and audience – applaud and confirm the notion of seamen as a "third sort of persons" and thus also maintain the fixity of this stereotype.

In respect to the play itself, the stage sailor Ben is a minor part within a complicated series of courtships and intended marriages. On "its highest level of sophistication",⁵⁷⁶ as Avery writes, the plot centres on Valentine's pursuit of Angelica. Valentine has somewhat overstretched his airy lifestyle and is now threatened by his father Sir Sampson, who agrees to settle Valentine's debts only if he signs over his share of the property to his brother Ben, just returned from sea. To avoid this settlement and to stir the – so far apparently – disinterested Angelica to love him, Valentine feigns madness. On another level, Ben is set to marry Miss Prue, a young country-girl, who has under the tutelage of Tattle become a self-styled "lady of the town" and is accordingly repulsed by Ben's naval mannerisms. These courtships are further convoluted in that Mrs. Frail – quite unlike her name would suggest – first tries to pursue Valentine and then Ben who she dumps eventually. Tattle, as well as Sir Sampson as *senex amans*, woo Angelica and both eventually believe that she will marry them. Mrs. Frail and Tattle are, however, tricked and wedded to each other, while Angelica abandons Sir Sampson, punishing him for his unfatherly treatment of Valentine and instead agrees to marry the cured "madman". The play's finale is thus thwarted with both cheerful and ironic conclusions, eventually rewarding the characters that, as Angelica tells Valentine, have "done dissembling now" (LL, V. xii, 535). In many ways, *Love for Love* is the quintessential comedy of manners, combining many ingredients that made up a theatrical success of the time, as Arthur H. Scouten praises: "This is the best acting play [...] youth and age in conflict, contrasts between city and country ways, questions of debts and inheritances, conversations between master and servant, intrigues and marriages, deceits and witty conversations".⁵⁷⁷ And, as one might add, a "realistically" performed stage sailor, whose special mannerisms also delighted the audiences.

576 Avery in: Congreve, *Love for Love* xii.

577 SCOUTEN in: John Loftis, Richard Southern, Marion Jones and A.H. Scouten, *The Revels History of Drama in English: Volume V 1660 – 1750* (London: Methuen, 1976) 41 f.

Ben occupies a liminal position throughout *Love for Love* as his "plain dealing" approach to social encounters is presented as rather good-natured, marked by a willingness to engage, but he also continuously fails at being admitted into society. Once more, the character is marked out by his excessive use of nautical terms and imagery; he cannot phrase a point without reference to the sea: "Nay, mistress, I'm / not for dropping anchor here. About ship, i'faith. (*Kisses* / Mrs. Frail.) Nay, and you too, my little cockboat-so. / (*Kisses* Miss Prue)" (LL, III, vi, 242-244). His language is thus characterised by, as Avery criticizes, "an artificial reliance on a single motif",⁵⁷⁸ however, Ben thus appears not as frightfully martial, like both Durzo-parts in Ravenscroft's plays, but rather amusing as his forthright kissing of both women shows. His idiom thus serves a comic function, but it is also indicative of the mariner's communication problems on land, as Robert D. Hume observes: "His nautical jargon is funny in itself, as is his complete innocence of the ways of the London world".⁵⁷⁹ Jargon and "innocence" are interlinked, his language denotes his liminality while his corresponding "innocence" is exposed and comically exploited. Ben's aversion to society is thus no pre-condition of his stage appearance, but rather something he develops while on stage. Yet his reluctance to the society he encounters is of the same outlook and provenance as Manly's in *The Plain Dealer*. Similarly to Wycherley's play, Congreve introduces this theme in the prologue, spoken by Mr. Betterton in the original cast:

Since the *Plain Dealer*'s scenes of manly rage,
Not one has dared to lash this crying age.
This time the poet owns the bold essay,
Yet hopes there's no ill manners in his play (LL, Prologue, 39–42).

In referring to another play, Congreve links Ben's stage portrayal with the Plain Dealer of Wycherley's play, indexing his own piece in a theatrical tradition and also indicating that he is about to "lash this crying age". The intertextual character of this reference not only refers to *The Plain Dealer*, but also to an extent breaks with the tradition as it announces to adjust the "scenes of manly rage". The prologue thus anticipates the play's repeated references to the institution of the theatre and its canon. In witty verbal sparring right at the beginning of the play, Valentine and his servant Jeremy discuss the prospects of writing a play for the stage:

JEREMY: Sir, it's impossible- I may die with you, starve with you, or
be damned with your works; but to live even three days, the

578 Avery in: Congreve, *Love for Love* xv.

579 Hume, *The Development of English Drama* 108.

life of a play, I no more expect it, than to be canonized for
a Muse after my decease (LL, I. i, 67–70).

The possibility for Valentine to become a playwright is henceforth comically discarded; the dialogue not only functions as an exposé to Valentine's sorry financial situation, but it also serves to penetrate the play's action with a reminder of the theatrical frame. This direction is further elaborated in that – up to Ben's emergence in act III – it is established that most of the characters in the play thrive on pretence and charades and thus are particularly engaged in double play. Most notably, Tattle – “a half-witted beau, vain of his amours, yet valuing himself for secrecy” (*Dramatis Personae*) – is a character obsessed with his impression on others, his ingenuous vanity thus representative of the “crying age” mentioned in the play's prologue. Tattle perpetually tries to administer his own social standing: “I am yours—that is,/when you speak well of me” (LL, I. x, 334f, to Scandal, Valentine's friend), but he is also – at times – consciously aware of the value of his promises: “Why then, as I hope to be saved, I believe a woman only/oblige a man to secrecy that she may have the pleasure of/telling herself” (LL, I. x, 415–417). In relation to Ben, however, Tattle's influence on Miss Prue, a “silly, awkward country girl” (*Dramatis Personae*) is decisive. Tattle makes advances towards the girl, “teaching” her the customs of affairs: “O fie, Miss, you must not kiss and tell” (LL, II. x, 469) and letting her in on the rules “well-bred persons” have to follow:

MISS PRUE: Why, must I tell a lie then.

TATTLE: Yes, if you would be well-bred. All well-bred persons lie.

Besides, you are a woman; you must never speak what you
think (LL, II. xi, 546–549).

Tattle is, in this way, instructing the country girl in the manners of the town, thus preparing the ground for her subsequent rejection of Ben, a person she promptly perceives to be not part of the “well-bred” sort she now fashions herself as. What is remarkable in this scene is that Miss Prue first reacts quite naturally to her desires. Only when Tattle, as a character preoccupied with affectation, teaches her to mask her desires, does she adopt the way of the polite town. Ben, upon entering the stage, acts as performative antidote to these “half-witted beaus” and pretentious “well-bred persons”. The stage sailor promptly establishes that he is not a man of many words, leaving tales about his long lasting sea-journeys to the following line: “Ay, ay, been! Been far enough, an that be all” (LL, III. vi, 248).⁵⁸⁰ Ben thus ascertains that he is not prepared to play along and his subsequent plain dealing approach to Miss Prue backfires. “MISS PRUE: I don't know what to say

580 See Susanne MÜHLEISEN, “I've crossed the ocean/I've lost my tongue”: von Sprachbanden und Sprachbrüchen auf hoher See”, in: Klein/Mackenthun 301–317.

Thus the play's female characters are mainly responsible for othering Ben, abusing him and denying him any social integration. It is not so much a display of rough or martial behaviour – like in *Sir Barnaby Rudge* or *Sir Harry Wildair* – that the women draw upon but a more general aversion to the stage sailor's profession: "great lubberly tarpaulin" (Miss Foresight, LL, II. x, 504), "filthy creature, that smells of pitch and tar" (LL II. x, 507 f, Mrs. Frail), "sea-calf" (LL, III. viii, 368 f, Miss Prue), "stinking tar-barrel" (LL, III. vii, 380, Miss Prue). All these depictions indicate that what is rejected is not so much a display of sea-breeding, but the body of the mariner itself. Ben is only described in terms of creatural features – filth and smell – and also only ever referred to, not as "man", but as "thing": "tarpaulin",⁵⁸³ "creature", "calf" and "tar-barrel". This procedure is again followed by Mrs. Frail who rejects Ben with the following lines:

O see me no more, for thou wert born amongst rocks,
suckled by whales, cradled in a tempest, and whistled to by
winds; and thou art come forth with fins and scales, and
three rows of teeth, a most outrageous fish of prey (LL, IV. xiii, 345 – 348).

The image Mrs. Frail draws is quite literally that of a hybrid – in rejecting Ben she accordingly indicates that a union with him would not only be not "species-appropriate", but even bestial. Punctuating her verdict she goes on to call him "monster" (LL, IV. xiii, 352) as well as "porpoise" (LL, IV. xiii, 376) and, after Ben has left irritated and repelled by her conduct, saying: "Mayhap you may holla after me when I won't / come too" (LL, IV. xiii, 384 f), Mrs. Frail laughs out loud: "Ha, ha, ha, no doubt on't. – (Sings.) *My true love is gone / to sea-*" (LL, IV. xiii, 386 f).

The mariner's marginalisation and social exclusion pursued by Mrs. Frail – and motivated by her own scheming – are, however, countered by Ben's docile and honest behaviour that stands in stark contrast to her descriptions of him as "monster". The stage sailor has continuously been described and decried as a stereotypical Other through numerous references to his apparent bodily difference: "filthy", "lubberly", "stinking". Thus, the character has been construed, as Bhabha contests with regard to the object of colonial discourse, as a "degenerate type" on the basis of his bodily otherness.⁵⁸⁴ Additionally, Thomas Dogget's acting in the play's first production no doubt emphasized the stage sailor's difference from landlubbers. However, Ben's part in many ways counters these accusations as the character is not only contrasted with the scheming and dishonest "town-people", but also as he is portrayed as innocent and good-natured. Congreve's stage sailor thus proves to be no "monster", but a comic

583 Even though tarpaulin is a synonym for mariner, it nonetheless depicts a thing.

584 See Bhabha, "The Other Question", *The Location of Culture* 101.

character: he is being laughed at, yet his part evokes a positive response, not only through his honesty, but his naive indulgence for his profession. In act III Ben sings a song about a sailor and right after the end of the song, he exclaims: "we sailors can dance sometimes, as well as/other folks (Whistles.)" (LL, III. xv, 701 f) and other seamen enter the stage and begin a dance, concluded by Ben with the line: "We're merry folk, we sailors; we han't much to care for" (LL, III.xv, 706). His propensity for song and entertainment not only once more marks him out as a sailor and evokes the space of the sea on stage, it also underlines the stage sailor's sociability and his dramaturgical value in providing entertainment for the audience. His performance thus stands in stark contrast to Mrs. Frail's accusations as it cushions her charge of "monstrosity" and thus to an extent relativizes and outweighs the stage sailor's otherness.

Similar to Manly in *The Plain Dealer*, Ben Legend's liminal position serves to frame the ailment of the "crying age" (Prologue) that is eventually penalized in the play. As Avery writes in his introduction to *Love for Love*: "In general, those who are without pretense win their coveted goals or emerge undamaged; those who live by pretense and do not reform suffer for their folly".⁵⁸⁵ Ben's liminal position as mariner and the character's stress on honesty and plain dealing serve to highlight his discontent with land-based society. Stage sailors in the "plain dealer"- tradition can thus be said to have afforded a double perspective on the play's action. On the one hand, their insistence on honesty and plain speaking served to expose other character's dishonesty, while it also referenced the theatrical frame and thus implicitly extended the critique to the audience, "this crying age". On the other hand, the stage sailors' representation as Other, as liminal characters, provided for an "outsiders'" perspective more generally.

Stage sailors were dramatically presented as Other through a variety of techniques. Their liminal position was emphasized through a semiotic invocation of the space of the sea and the characters themselves appeared as rough, boisterous, socially deviant or innocent and socially inept. "Sea language", dress, gestures and theatrical pointing served to reiterate and maintain the stereotype of tars as "third sort of persons", while this stereotypical representation also at times emerged as a cliché. During the period considered, stage sailors were also gradually presented not only as objects of ridicule and entertainment, but also as actively humorous, generating entertainment in and of themselves. This change is attended by the mariners' increasing representation as *English* characters, providing a model for Englishness as well as a certain kind of manliness.

585 Avery in: Congreve, *Love for Love* xiv.

3.3 Modelling Mariners: Marriage and Manliness

3.3.1 Mariners and Masculinity

The stage sailor's proverbial plain dealing and honesty can be said to be one aspect of his character that, in the course of the century to follow, was to become *de rigueur* for English seamen, singling them out as a particularly popular embodiment of patriotic virtues. However, the steady change in the representation of sailors – from rough tars to jolly patriots⁵⁸⁶ – involved rituals and dramaturgical patterns that not only eventually contributed to other more positive aspects of the sailor's image, but also employed the character to reconsider more general cultural ideals. As has been shown in the preceding subchapter, stage sailors as liminal characters added a disturbing element to society. Their otherness was, however, not only embodied by their rough manners but by their literally liminal status as characters that had travelled to “frigid and torrid zones” (BW, I, 4). Their rough behaviour marked them as Other, literally “off” the sea, and their discomfort and unease with social customs indicated their surplus of sea-breeding. Yet, in some of the plays under discussion, like *The Plain Dealer*, *King Edgar and Alfreda*, *The Canterbury Guests* and Shadwell's *The Fair Quaker of Deal* – as will be shown later in this chapter – the stage sailors quite evidently eventually join land-based society, notably through marriage.⁵⁸⁷ This eventual espousal is the apex of a process the respective stage sailors were submitted to, a process that involved their rendering fit for polite, land-based society.

In this context, it is analytically helpful to think of these processes as rituals that serve to integrate the sailors into society and that thus convey a pattern that characterizes colonial discourses. Rituals serve to initiate and accompany the “danger [that] lies in transitional states”,⁵⁸⁸ as structural anthropologist Mary Douglas has shown, and can thus be linked to a pattern of colonial ritual described by McClintock:

the dangers represented by liminal people are managed by rituals that separate the marginal ones from their old status, segregating them for a time and then publicly declaring their entry into the new status. Colonial discourse repeatedly rehearses this pattern – dangerous marginality, segregation, reintegration.⁵⁸⁹

586 See 3. 4 for a sketch of this change.

587 Which also suggests that they will propagate.

588 Mary DOUGLAS, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*, 1966 (New York: Routledge, 2002) 119.

589 McClintock 25.

As will be shown in this chapter, seamen can indeed be grouped among such “liminal people”, dramaturgically “rehearsing” a pattern of colonial ritual. In this regard the term ritual is not merely used to describe a process of confining otherness and reintegration, but the acts involved in these rituals served also to “coach” mariners into a certain form of heteronormative manliness that served as foil for discussing new cultural ideals and manliness on a broader scale.⁵⁹⁰ As has been explored in the introductory part to this chapter, “manning the machines of empire” was a crucial discursive task markedly at the onset of the empire of the deep. Thus, the integration and corresponding incorporation of mariners as one of the foremost “agents of empire” also has to be understood as an exemplary representation, as Christa Knellwolf King and Margarete Rubik argue in regard to imperial fantasies: “[they are] not simply discursive constructs but narratives projecting certain types of agents and activities”.⁵⁹¹ In this sense, “staging sailors” can be perceived as a performative projection of certain aspects of manliness and Englishness as well as an exemplary re-integration to society by way of marriage.

As feminist scholars have long maintained,⁵⁹² gender is a relational and organisational category, not just socially, but historically constructed,⁵⁹³ which must hence “be perpetually achieved, asserted and renegotiated”.⁵⁹⁴ With regards to the historical construction of gender in the eighteenth century, historians have argued that the social changes in Restoration England triggered a

590 “Manliness” or “manly” were crucial terms in the period and denoted: “moral or cultural as well as physical facets of being a man”, see John TOSH, *Manliness and Masculinities in Nineteenth-Century Britain: Essays on Gender, Family and Empire* (Edinburgh: Pearson, 2005) 73. Samuel Johnson defined “manly” as “Manlike; becoming a man; firm; brave; stout; undaunted; undismayed”, JOHNSON, *A Dictionary of the English Language, 1755*, Vol. II, *Anglistica & Americana* (Hildesheim: Georg Ohns, 1968) unpaginated.

591 Christa KNELLWOLF KING and Margarete RUBIK eds., *Stories of Empire: Narrative Strategies for the Legitimation of an Imperial World Order* (Trier: WVT, 2009) 2.

592 See Joan W. SCOTT, “Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis”, *The American Historical Review* 91.5 (1986): 1053–1975 and Judith BUTLER, *Gender Trouble* for the most influential studies in this regard, see also Gisela BOCK, “Women’s History and Gender History. Aspects of an International Debate“ in: Sue MORGAN ed. *The Feminist History Reader* (London et al: Routledge, 2006) 104–115.

593 For some recent discussions of gender in eighteenth-century studies, see, among others, Kristina STRAUB, *Sexual Suspects: Eighteenth-Century Players and Sexual Ideology* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1992), Anthony FLETCHER, *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England 1500–1800* (New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1995), Michael McKEON, “Historicizing Patriarchy: The Emergence of Gender Difference in England, 1660–1760”, *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 28.3 (1995): 295–322, see also Robert B. SHOEMAKER, *Gender in English Society: The Emergence of Separate Spheres?* (London and New York: Longman, 1998) and Thomas A. KING, *The Gendering of Men, 1600–1750, Volume I: The English Phallus* (Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 2004).

594 Michael ROPER and John TOSH eds., *Manful Assertions: Masculinities in Britain since 1800* (London and New York: Routledge, 1991) 18.

renegotiation of gender relations that can be said to have established the modern system of gender difference. Michael McKeon in this respect refers to early modern disenchantments with aristocratic ideology,⁵⁹⁵ Restoration changes to marriage laws, the emergence of modern divisions of labour, class formations and changing working patterns in the wake of capitalist transformation as crucial changes historically specific to the modern era.⁵⁹⁶ In McKeon's seminal account, the modern system of gender difference implies the belief "that there are not one but two sexes; that they are biologically distinct and therefore incommensurable; and that they are defined not by behavior, which is variable, but by nature, which is not".⁵⁹⁷ This is not to say that gender difference is only established in England in the modern era, but "that only with the modern system of sexuality – of sex and gender difference – is 'gender' sufficiently separated out as a category from 'sex' (from that which it defines itself against) to take on the familiar, differential function it performs in modern culture".⁵⁹⁸

Concerning the changes that established this differentiation, Anthony Fletcher, in his seminal study *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England 1500–1800* (1995), argued that "the crisis of the English civil war and its aftermath was far from simply a political crisis. The interregnum shook the confidence of Englishmen in their control of social and gender order to the roots".⁵⁹⁹ However, not only the Interregnum as a comprehensive crisis, but also the subsequent large-scale changes that converged on late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century society, such as enclosures, the disappearance of small independent farmers, migration to cities, urbanization, decline of craft production, loss of occupational autonomy, political enfranchisement and increasing colonial activities provoked a renegotiation of gender relations.⁶⁰⁰ This renegotiation notably found expression in an emergent public discourse on the nature of masculinity conveyed by an array of advice and conduct manuals, providing a varied and contested set of categories centred around conceptions of masculinity as well as femininity.⁶⁰¹ Roughly, one can claim that these contest-

595 McKeon defines aristocratic ideology as a "set of related beliefs that birth makes worth, that the interests of the family are identified with those of its head, and that among the gentry, honor and property are to be transmitted patrimonially and primogeniturally, through the male line", "Historicizing Patriarchy" 297.

596 Ibid. 298–300.

597 Ibid. 301.

598 Ibid. 301.

599 Fletcher 283.

600 See Michael S. KIMMEL, "The Contemporary 'Crisis' of Masculinity in Historical Perspective" in: Harry Brod ed., *The Making of Masculinities: The New Men's Studies* (Boston: Allen & Unwin, 1987) 121–153, 124–126.

601 In stressing the plurality of concepts of masculinity, I follow recent re-evaluations of masculinity of the period that have stressed the diversity of male roles, see Andrew P.

ations circled around concerns over a too strong display of “roughness of behaviour”⁶⁰² in men, but maybe more prominent was the anxiety over effeminacy.⁶⁰³ Effeminacy – in an eighteenth-century context – denotes a complex of values and customs that portended a “failed” masculinity:

men who fell short of the ideal of “manly religion”, men who, using slander, were thought to adopt a female vice, men who showed an excessive devotion to the ideals of politeness, men who acted immaturely or frivolously, and men who emulated not just women, but the French. All were labelled effeminate, though this had nothing to do with their sexual behaviour.⁶⁰⁴

Effeminacy therefore suggests a neglect of traditional “male” roles, a concern that was prompted by the effects of the social changes mentioned.⁶⁰⁵ As Michael S. Kimmel explicates, urbanization was said to “feminize[s] men, removing them from the land (the source of productive labor, and hence diligence and masculine discipline) and exposing [them] to the effete life of the fop”.⁶⁰⁶

The discontent with urbanization here implies more than a mere “exposure”

WILLIAMS ED., *The Image of Manhood in Early Modern Literature: Viewing the Male* (Westport: Greenwood, 1999) xii. For the importance of advice and conduct manuals for the reformation of masculinity see G.J. BARKER-BENFIELD, *The Culture of Sensibility: Sex and Society in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992) 55 – 61 and for an analysis of the so-called “rise of politeness” as a demarcation of admissible manly behaviour, see Philip CARTER, *Men and the Emergence of Polite Society, Britain 1660 – 1800* (Harlow: Longman, 2001) 53 – 87 and Klein, *Shaftesbury*.

602 Tim HITCHCOCK and Michèle COHEN eds., *English Masculinities 1660 – 1800* (London and New York: Longman, 1999) 50.

603 For this aspect, see Felicity A. NUSSBAUM, *The Brink of All We Hate: English Satires on Women 1660 – 1750* (Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1984), Barker-Benfield 104 – 153, Michèle COHEN, *Fashioning Masculinity: National Identity and Language in the Eighteenth Century* (London and New York: Routledge, 1996), see also Straub, and Julia EPSTEIN and Kristina STRAUB eds., *Body Guards: The Cultural Politics of Gender Ambiguity* (New York and London: Routledge, 1991).

604 Hitchcock/Cohen 5. Philip CARTER, “An ‘effeminate’ or ‘efficient’ nation? Masculinity and eighteenth-century Social Documentary”, *Textual Practice* 11.3 (1997): 19 – 29 attests to this as he argues that the figure of the effeminate fop was strongly associated with heterosexuality rather than homosexuality, with fops being ridiculed for vanity, excessive or affected refinement and, at times, failed heterosexuality. For the debate whether a “homosexual role” developed in the late seventeenth- and eighteenth-century, see Mary MCINTOSH, “The Homosexual Role”, *Social Problems* 16 (1968): 182 – 192 and Randolph TRUMBACH, “London’s Sodomites: Homosexual Behaviour and Western Culture in the Eighteenth Century”, *Journal of Social History* I (1977): 1 – 33.

605 As Barker-Benfield contests: “A persistent and fundamental concern was the meaning of changed manners for manhood, traditionally bound up with classical or warrior ideals. The ‘degeneracy’ to which the rise of the ‘monied interest’ and the decline of the citizen-soldier was believed to lead had a gender-specific dimension, expressed in the widespread use of the term ‘effeminacy’” 104.

606 Michael S. KIMMEL, *The History of Men: Essays on the History of American and British Masculinities* (Albany: State U of New York P, 2005) 194.

to fops, but indeed hints at a whole way of life that increasingly characterizes London – and other cities –, namely the effects of mercantilism, over-seas trade and colonialism. Satirical representations of fops were hence prompted by a cluster of different motives, chiefly the ostentation of vanity and fear of infiltration through a love of exotic and foreign produce, as well as lingering class tensions. In respect to masculinity itself, however, the notion of effeminacy complicates a comprehension of gender relations as it discloses that not only women, but also effeminate men were constructed as men's Other. Prominently, effeminate men were represented on the theatrical stage of the time as fops.⁶⁰⁷ Fops, like Novel in *The Plain Dealer* or Tattle in *Love for Love*, embodied a dilemma already raised in the previous subchapter, namely the overt display and insistence on fashion and “manners”. Such characteristics were readily associated with a lack of not only manliness, but indeed worthiness in general, as Norman Holland writes. In becoming polite one “risked forfeiting one's identity as English and as man becoming ‘all outside, no inside’”.⁶⁰⁸ In this regard, foppery is not just a theatrical convention, but a historical phenomenon, drawing heavily on changing attitudes about what an English masculine ideal should be.⁶⁰⁹ Collective identity was thence mediated on the stage in dramaturgically confronting characters “all outside”, with self-professed “all inside”, “plain dealing” characters. At the same time, masculinity as exhibited by the stage sailors, rough-hewn and unruly, was also adjusted and polished. Part of this ritualistic polishing in a general sense was the belief that conversation with women could provide this refinement, as indeed – with regard to mariners – the prolonged all-male company on ships was said to be responsible for the roughness of the character. In drama, the polishing of the sailor's character itself

607 The OED defines a fop thus: “1. a) A Foolish person, a fool. b) Applied to a girl. 2. A conceited person, a pretender to wit, wisdom, or accomplishments; a coxcomb, ‘prig’, 3. One who is foolishly attentive to and vain of his appearance, dress or manners, a dandy, an exquisite”. OED, Second Edition, 1989, online version June 2011. <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/72746> (date of access: 12th of July 2011). Popular stage fops were Thomas Shadwell's Woodcock in *The Sullen Lovers* (1668) and Briske in *The Humourists* (1670), Wycherley's Dapperwit in *Love in a Wood* (1671) and Monsieur de Paris in his *The Gentleman Dancing-Master* (1672), George Etherege's *The Man of Mode, or Sir Foppling Flutter* (1676), Crowne's already mentioned Sir Courtly Nice (1685), Congreve's Lord Froth in his *The Double-Dealer* (1693) as well as Colley Cibber's Sir Novelty Fashion in *Love's Last Shift* (1696), to give a few prominent examples. For a very useful essay on fops, see Susan Staves, “A Few Kind Words for the Fop”, *Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900* 22.3. (1982): 413–428. For other “sympathetic” accounts, see Dale Underwood, *Etherege and the Seventeenth-Century Comedy of Manners*, Yale Studies in English Vol. 135 (New Haven: Yale UP, 1957) 145–157 and Ben Ross Schneider Jr., *The Ethos of Restoration Comedy* (Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1971): 114–121.

608 Holland, *The First Modern Comedies* 102.

609 See Staves, “A Few Kind Words” 414.

was crucially achieved by rituals that stimulated an eventual celebratory consent to matrimony and thus features as integration of the liminal character into land-based society. The following analysis focuses on two functions of stage sailors, namely the way stage sailors' roughness was ritualistically polished in order to incorporate these liminal characters into society and the way stage sailors served as foils for contrasting other, more effeminate, male characters. The concluding analysis of Shadwell's *The Fair Quaker of Deal* will show how a stage sailor thus emerged as a particularly "worthy" and manly character, serving as a role model not only for other mariners, but Englishmen in general.

3.3.2 Rough Tars Incorporated: Rituals and Integration

In *The Plain Dealer*, both aspects – Manly's own ritualistic reintegration along with that of confrontation with foppish characters – work hand in hand. Right at the outset of the play, Manly's social marginality is established. Just back from sea, he announces distaste for "decorums" and "ceremonies", rejecting Freeman's offer of friendship and thus unhinging himself from society. Freeman, however, tries to reconcile Manly with society, not only trying to excite self-awareness in Manly: "the world thinks you madman, a/brutal" (PD, I, 276 f), but also in suggesting that plain dealing indeed is not always appropriate: "Your are for plain dealing, I find. But /against your particular notions I have the practice of the /whole world" (PD, I, 294–296). The Plain Dealer dismisses Freeman's plea, claiming that the people he detests⁶¹⁰ are but caught in a "preposterous huddle of ceremony [...] whilst they can hardly hold their solemn /false countenances" (PD, I, 305 f).⁶¹¹

Henceforth, in act II, the opposites to the rough Plain Dealer enter the stage, Mr. Novel: "a pert, railing coxcomb and an admirer of novelties" (PD, The Persons), and Lord Plausible: "a ceremonious, supple, commending coxcomb" (PD, The Persons). As mentioned before, Olivia contradicts all her utterances within an instant, first condemning, then praising both men upon their subsequent arrival. She first denigrates Novel:

D' ye think then I
would admit such a coxcomb as he is, who rather than not
rail will rail at the dead whom none speak ill of, and rather
than not flatter will flatter the poets of the age [...] (PD, II, 125–128, to Eliza).

610 See *The Plain Dealer* (I, 232–42): "I cannot /wish well to pimps flatterers, detractors, and cowards, stiff /nodding knaves, and supple, pliant, kissing fools".

611 With Freeman, however, responding: "Well, they understand the world" (PD, I, 308).

But as soon as the “coxcomb” has made his entrance, she joins Novel in his favourite pastime, railing: “NOVEL: I beg your pardon, madam, I cannot stay in any place/where I’m not allowed a little Christian liberty of railing” (PD, II, 264 f). The same course of action takes place when Lord Plausible is finally announced. “OLIVIA: An eternal blabber, and makes no more use of his ears than/a man that sits at a play by his mistress or on fop-corner” (PD, II, 259 f). The three of them together then rail at mutual acquaintances, giving a counter-performance to the idea that conversation with women is straightforwardly positive⁶¹² and also attesting to their “preposterous huddle of ceremony” and “false countenances” that the Plain Dealer had previously expressed a great aversion to. Their mutually enhancing raillery in this scene in effect further downgrades these male characters, as Freeman describes them upon entering the scene as “fluttering parrots of the town, apes and echoes of/men only” (PD, II, 488 f). What constitutes “echoes of men” is further depicted when Novel, after being addressed by Manly over his careful attire, lays open his approach to fashion:

NOVEL: But let me tell you, sir, a man by his dress as much
as by anything shows his wit and judgment, nay, and his courage too.

FREEMAN: How his courage, Mr. Novel?

NOVEL: Why, for example, by red breeches, tucked-up hair or
peruke, a greasy broad belt, and nowadays a short sword (PD, II, 581 – 586).

Evidently, Novel is here presented as a categorical fop, “all outside, no inside”, but as yet Olivia and the two “coxcombs” prevail performatively over Manly since together they mock the Plain Dealer’s “brutal love” (Olivia, PD, II, 507). In mockingly contrasting Manly’s appearance with more effeminate men, Olivia initiates a performative segregation of Manly, as he is rendered the butt of jokes:

And then, that captain-like carelessness in your dress, but
especially your scarf. ‘Twas just such another, only a little
higher tied, made me in love with my tailor as he passed by
my window the last training day, for we women adore a
martial man (PD, II, 612 – 616).

Performatively, this is a crucial scene as here Manly is properly singled out on a stage mostly occupied by “adversaries”. What is more, the other characters laugh at him, thus duly enforcing the isolation of a character that refuses to take part in any social game.

However, Novel and Plausible, as well as Olivia herself, are subsequently

612 This ties in with what Kimmel has described as the negative effects of urbanization, which also relates to women’s perceived status in cities: “Of course, the charge that ‘the city’ exposes men to the life of the fop is also a charge against women’s increased ‘liberation’ in the city, city-life turning them into wanton, lustful wenches”, Kimmel 136.

beaten at their own game. Each of the characters' scheming backfires, and the two men eventually end up humbled by the discovery that both were taken in by Olivia. And Olivia herself is not only humiliated by her attempted cuckolding with a cross-dressed Fidelity, but also loses the riches she had taken from Manly. The Plain Dealer, however, is reintegrated into society. Not only is he reintegrated theatrically – on stage – as he, Freeman and Fidelity triumphantly speak the last lines, but he also expresses his reconciliation with “the world”:

Nay, now, madam, you have taken from me all power of making you any compliment on my part, for I was going to tell you that for your sake only I would quit the unknown pleasure of a retirement and stay in this ill world of ours still, though odious to me [...]
But if I should tell you now all this, and that your virtue [...]
had now reconciled me to it [the world] (PD, V. iii, 161 – 169).

Manly here, for the first time, considers society a “world of *ours*”,⁶¹³ a world he has learned to value thanks to a woman's virtue, one that provides him not just with a partner, but a considerable fortune as well – his return is doubled.⁶¹⁴ As Manly's own worth is rewarded, the two fops are left in theatrical limbo. Both “coxcombs” not only failed in terms of manly appearance and behaviour, but neither could even secure a match and are thus – in contrast to Manly and Freeman – the sexual failures of the play, mere “echoes of men”.⁶¹⁵ Manly, however, has proven himself indeed “manly” and the marriage to Fidelity finally reconciles him with the world.

In the other four plays under discussion in this subchapter, this double function of the stage sailor is split. In Ravenscroft's plays, *Kind Edgar and Alfredda* and *The Canterbury Guests*, the respective stage sailor is presented as going through a ritual process which eventually not only “models” him into the

613 Emphasis GW.

614 In fact, it is increased in more than just two ways, as he also finally acknowledges Freeman his friend: “Nay, if thou art a plain dealer too, give me thy hand, for now I'll say I am thy friend indeed” (PD, V.iii,174ff).

615 However, Manly's reconciliation with the world of the town (PD, V, 515) can also be read as an ideological gesture of restoration, as J. Douglas Canfield points out: “[the reconciliation] is not intended to be psychologically realistic; it is symbolic of the restoration of Stuart ideology, that the aristocratic men of ‘intrinsic worth’ (I, 394) deserve to rule and deserve unquestioning loyalty”, J. Douglas CANFIELD, *Tricksters and Estates: On the Ideology of Restoration Comedy* (Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1997) 138. In this regard one can also claim that Manly's “victory” is no question of his virtue, but of his virtù – hence, according to Canfield, the play suggests a subversiveness: “The lingering question of the play is how long can the Court party and its hired guns, among them the playwrights, hold the Restoration compromise together” 139.

land-based society, but also matches him to a spouse. In *Sir Harry Wildair* and *Love for Love*, the stage sailors are not ritualistically admitted into society, but the characters' representation acts as a foil for a contrastive manliness.

As has been shown with regard to Ravenscroft's plays, the mariner's ritualistic acceptance to society involved aspects of dress, manners and the assent to a heteronormative relationship. In Ravenscroft's plays, all these aspects are neatly organized along a typical Restoration love-chase. Here, both tars are from the outset accepted in society, but the ritualistic dialectic of rejection, change and reintegration is still acted out in the courting of their respective love-interests. In both plays Durzo is first made to go to the wardrobe to receive new clothes and thus render him presentable: "OSWOLD: [...] you must be new rigg'd Captain, / The Ladies won't like the smell of pitch and tar" (KE, I, 11). This outward change, witnessed by the audience, is followed by Durzo's familiarization with the other sex.

DURZO: But what do you do with these Ladies here?

OSWOLD: We Court, Complement, and Gallant 'em.

DURZO: What is that Courting'em? (KE, II, 18).

Durzo not only lacks knowledge of the customs of courting, but indeed seems to lack a heteronormative drive, as he does not seem to be able to respond with an inclination towards just one woman, after Oswald told him to "have a Mistress":

DURZO: Must I, which of 'em?

OSWOLD: Her you like best.

DURZO: Why I like 'em all.

OSWOLD: You must appropriate but one (KE, II, 18).

In this scene of the second act, Oswald takes on the role of a mentor, guiding Durzo through the stages of courting. However, Durzo is – as the quote above suggests – not only in need of "polishing", but also has to be briefed physically: both in regard to the "quality" of a woman, but also in his own carnal response to the other sex: "DURZO: [...] But how may a man know a handsome Woman? OSWOLD: I le give you the description of my Mistress / For a Pattern to choose one by" (KE, I, 18). The way Durzo has to be instructed here is indeed reminiscent of the way Hippolito in *The Enchanted Island* was instructed by Ferdinand, and the character of Durzo thus appears as part of a discourse surrounding liminal and "innocent" characters. When he finally understands Oswald's appraisals, his awakened sexuality is sealed with corporal pleasure:

DURZO: Me thinks I see this fair Creature;

Yes. and touch her too: Oh how fine it is

To stroak such Limbs!

OSWOLD: Yes, Captain, very fine: Beauty I see will soften
And polish you (KE, II, 19).

Oswold here contests that, if not exactly women's conversation, certainly women's company will "soften" and "polish" the mariner's rustic manners, ultimately rendering him fit for social acceptance, if only Durzo remembers his advice: "By the Laws of Love you must, as I told you, Court her, / And win her fairly; you must get her good will" (KE, II, 20). Subsequently, in act III, Durzo's attempts at getting Hillaria's "good will" are exposed. Durzo is alone on stage with Hillaria and his martial behaviour thus stands in stark contrast to Hillaria's display of tenderness. The ensuing love-chase can be said to incite the stage sailor's ritual admittance into society, which is in this case closely linked with his meeting and courting of a woman. Durzo more or less immediately sets out to woo Hillaria with recounting details of the battles he has fought, oblivious to Hillaria's comment: "I love not danger, any thing but killing" (KE, III, 37), but as he is immersed in his own narrative he eventually frightens her off. This scene serves to performatively – again – establish the sailor's marginality as he appears as wild and unable to adjust to his new surroundings.

Notably, his subsequent reformation is not a complete turn-around, but merely a "polishing" of his ways. Matilda assures Hillaria that Durzo will be able to amend his martial manner for her sake,⁶¹⁶ but Hillaria insists on keeping Durzo's unique spirit, "HILLARIA: No, let him still retain his valour, / But not o'reshoot himself in his Complements, / And express his Love in such terrible Rhetorick" (KE, III, 39). Here, the stage sailor's plain talking and rough honesty are singled out as desirable features in men. It is only the "rhetorick" that needs "polishing", Durzo himself in this account appears as the opposite to a foppish creature as he is presented as not concerned with his outward appearance, but described as full of valour. This stress on the stage sailor's valour and plain dealing, as opposed to refined flattery, is also expressed by Durzo himself: "I know not how to court you in a Silken phrase, / But in down-right Reality I will do't" (KE, III, 39).

Despite Durzo's protestation, however, now that his otherness has been so visibly established in his courting of Hillaria he is isolated from the object of his desire. In the next act (IV), the stage sailor again represents his martial and hot-tempered attitude, as he exclaims: "Now I am in one of my Fits" (KE, IV, 42). Oswald, and in an attempt of "polishing" the mariner, even uses military rhetoric:

616 "MATILDA: Hillaria, admit him agen into your Service, / He will forget he is a Soldier, and turn Courtier for your sake" (KE, III, 39).

OSWOLD: But, Captain, you should first have parlied,
 And demanded satisfaction fairly.
 Did you think to take her heart by storm,
 As men do towns?
 DURZO: It was more like a Soldier.
 OSWOLD: But not like a Lover. Love is a gentle Passion-
 Here she comes, you had best Steer a new course (KE, IV, 49).

In this, Oswald takes up Hillaria's insistence on Durzo's "valour" as he firmly keeps his own language within the martial realm so that Durzo is able to understand him. Oswald thus does not intend to re-educate the sea captain, or impair his martial manner, but suggests that Durzo could do with separating his passions. "Love is a gentle Passion", Oswald advises, thus indicating that Durzo should by all means "retain his valour" and passion, but "steer" a more gentle course in the private realm of love. When Hillaria sends Durzo a letter⁶¹⁷ with which she breaks off their relationship: "My roaring Boy, I can love no longer at your fierce rate [...]" (KE, V, 55). Durzo finally experiences the necessity of differentiating between his passions himself:

DURZO: Sure I have seem'd more terrible,
 When with this Sword I have lopt off limbs,
 Strew'd the Decks with Carcasses, turn'd Fleets
 To floating Hospitals, sent Navies to their Ports
 To cut down Masts, and hew the Timber of their
 Shattered Vessels into wooden Legs and Crutches,
 To underprop the Criples they brought home.
 Love, hast thou disarm'd my Looks of Manhood? (KE, V, 56).

In recounting martial occurrences and thus evoking the harshness and danger of naval battles, Durzo wonders how "love" could be so strong as to "disarm" him. What is more, despite the testimonials to his strong, martial masculinity, "love" seems to have indeed "chopped off" his "Looks of Manhood", which is, however, – as the further course of the plot suggests – only ever complete with love. Hillaria then admits that the letter was just part of a plot to help Durzo reconcile his martial nature with love, and consequently promises to marry him: "You now with Triumph in Love's Ocean steer, / Calm is the Sea, and from all Pirates clear" (KE, V, 58). Her wording indicates that Durzo's reintegration has not been accomplished to the disadvantage of his valour, as with "triumph" he can now actively regain the "steering" of his vessel. Hence, the mariner's reformed and polished "manhood" is rewarded on a private level, but his valour is also recompensed in that the King promotes him: "To reward your merit, and

617 The letter, again, confirms Durzo's liminal status, as he cannot read it: "The Sea breeds Soldiers, but not Scholars" (KE, V, 55).

promote / Your Love, we make you our Rear-Admiral” (KE, V, 71). So in a final gesture of uniting both Durzo’s “love” and his “merit”, the King secures Durzo’s and Hillaria’s future and thus also caters for possible offspring.

Agreement to matrimony as the dramatic finale of the mariner’s reintegration into land-based society is also displayed in Ravenscroft’s second play under discussion, albeit in *The Canterbury Guests* the course of social reintegration is divided between two characters. In the play, the character of “Durzo” as the “blunt Sea-captain” is revived, but – as previously cited – there is another naval character in Careless, a gentleman who has roamed the seas to elope from his debts and now professes to be “free in the World” (CG, I. iv, 17). This character embodies a typical representative of the Restoration wit, though in this case with a naval leaning, as the recounting of his maritime adventures illustrates. The play’s action centres on bringing Careless and Hillaria, his female “match”, to a union; a conclusion dramaturgically complicated by Careless’ insistence on personal freedom: “I’ll keep my Soul free, as the Bird that flies i’th’ Air, / And ne’er Love one, till I of all the rest despair” (CG, I. viii, 19 f, to his friend Lovell). Careless’ and Hillaria’s union is hence complicated through the character’s unwillingness to commit, whereas the other couple of the play – Lovell and Jacinta – are both willing, yet they first have to block Jacinta’s father’s plans. Lovell functions as a counterweight to Careless as he is a firm advocate of matrimony: “Marriage is honourable and safe” (CG, I. iv, 81). Careless, however, refuses this safety, claiming that: “Nothing choaks Love like the Surety of / Possession: Love is an excellent Meat, but Marriage an ill / Sauce” (CG, I. iv, 84ff). Yet, along with the other characters, Careless eventually succumbs to the “ill Sauce” he claims marriage to be as – similarly to Durzo – he is “tricked” into his feelings, or a realization of his feelings, by a woman.

Durzo himself, like his namesake in *King Edgar and Alfreda*, undergoes a physical as well as emotional transformation that eventually leads to his betrothal to Arabella. Like in Ravenscroft’s earlier play, the otherness of the character is singled out and he first has to go through a sartorial conversion, “LOVELL: I must carry you to a Ward-robe” (CG, II. viii, 23). Upon this change, Durzo’s familiarization with the other sex is complicated as, again, the stage sailor lacks proficiency in treating and behaving towards women. But escalating the presentation in *King Edgar and Alfreda*, the mariner in this play additionally has to go through a bodily instruction in order to develop hetero/sexual⁶¹⁸ sensations as such. In trying to introduce the Captain to Arabella, Lovell takes on the role of an experienced mentor, exemplifying his account of the beauty of

618 In breaking up the word with a slash, I would like to draw attention to the fact that I here mean both: “heterosexual” as well as “sexual”. Not only has the mariner no previous inclination towards the other sex, he seems to even lack a developed sexual orientation as such.

female bodies not just verbally in describing female anatomy in naval terms, but also physically in that he asks Durzo to touch the woman:

LOVELL: Breasts hard and round, their motions pant beholders Hearts
 into an extasie; they rise and fall like Waves blown up by
 gentle Winds. – Do but lay your hand here, Captain. (Durzo touches Arabella's Breasts.)
 DURZO: O, O, feel here! (Durzo pulls Lovell's hand to his breast.) (CG, II. viii, 54–57).

By way of “meat inspection”, the audience thus witnesses Durzo's sexual awakening – upon touching the female body, the spark literally passes over from breast to breast and it can be observed that, once again: “Beauty, I see, will soften and polish him” (CG, Hillaria, II. viii, 67). Once more, the scene intertextually relates to *The Enchanted Island* where Hippolito as well as Miranda and Dorinda experience similar sexual “awakenings”. The further course of Durzo's ritualistic reintegration follows the same pattern – and very similar dialogue – as in *King Edgar and Alfreda*. Durzo has to learn to complete his rough character with an understanding of the course of “love”, a course that is to follow consent rather than mere martial “taking”: “LOVELL: You must get her good Will, Captain” (CG, II. viii, 84). In *The Canterbury Guests*, however, Durzo can follow another character's example as the commitment-phobic Careless is tricked, by a Hillaria in breeches, to admit his love for her and thus eventually agrees to marry her. So Durzo, on the one hand, is being rendered compliant the hard way through Arabella's pretended rejection, on the other hand, however, he can act as “dinghy” to Careless' course of action, “DURZO: I'll observe what course you steer, I'll sail in your Wake” (CG, III. v, 144). In terms of action though, Durzo does not subsequently act differently to his namesake in *King Edgar and Alfreda*, so in claiming to learn a lesson from Careless, both characters are simply tied together in their general realization that “the Tempestuous Sea of Matrimony” (CG, Durzo, V. viii, 103) is a “necessary” tradeoff. “CARELESS: Were not the use and conversation of Women absolutely / necessary for Mankind, I would forswear the whole Sex” (CG, IV. i, 3 f).

Both of Ravenscroft's plays accordingly present matrimony as both a conciliatory and “necessary” move to accomplish. The stage sailor – after a verbal as well as physical instruction – surmounts his isolation and enters society fully in that he adjusts his roughness to create space for a female companion and, eventually, a family. So in these plays a rough and plain dealing masculinity is displayed as well as being celebrated in parts. Manly and both Durzos attain a social standing within land-based society that is inherently intertwined with their commitment to a heteronormative relationship, thus in parts absorbing and commemorating the overt plain dealing manliness of the mariners. But there are other examples where the stage sailor's bluntness is not actually incorporated into the fabric of the play's conclusion by way of marriage, but where

the sailor's bluntness functions as a contrast – and corrective – to other male characters' blatant foppishness.

3.3.3 Stage Sailors as Counterparts: "I'll shew you how to manage a Beau"

In *Love for Love* the sailor Ben is, in many respects, the opposite of the other male characters in the play – good-hearted, honest but also naive, he is repelled by the society he encounters and eventually announces he will go to sea again. Most poignantly, the "half-witted Beau" Tattle appears as the sailor's opposite. Ben's stage appearance is decidedly less "rough" as that of the other stage sailors previously discussed as his attitude towards women is rather civil compared to some of his fictional comrades; he says to Miss Prue: "Come, I'll haul a chair; there, an you please to sit, I'll sit/by you" (LL, III, 316 f). But as his father, Sir Sampson, exclaims, Ben "wants/a little polishing" (LL, III, 277 f), so Miss Prue readily picks up on Ben's apparent lack of manners and compares him to Tattle:

Well, and there's a handsome gentleman, and a fine gentleman, and a sweet gentleman, that was here that loves me, and I love him ; and if he sees you speak to me any more, he'll trash your jacket for you, you great sea-calf (LL, III, 365 – 369).

Of course, Miss Prue's protestations of love to vain and corrupting Tattle have a very comic effect on the audience. As the spectators know, the declarations of love will not stand the test of time as Tattle has so obviously manipulated the unsophisticated country-bumpkin that is Miss Prue. So, in openly preferring Tattle to Ben, the former's lack of honest steadfastness as well as manly vigour is highlighted, as Ben answers:

What, do you mean that fair-weather spark that was here just now? Will he trash my jacket? Let'n- let'n. But an he comes near me, mayhap I may giv'n a salt eel for's supper,⁶¹⁹ for all that (LL, III, 370 – 372).

Despite the fact that no direct confrontation between the two men is staged, from thence on Ben's honesty ever resonates when Tattle is concerned. The beau, after been asked whether he loves Miss Prue, shrugs the young girl off: "O pox, that was yesterday, miss; that was a great while ago,/ child. I have been asleep since, slept a whole night, and did/not so much as dream of the matter" (LL, V, 210-212). Tattle's "fair-weather" attitude thus stands in stark contrast to Ben's steadfastness and plain dealing. As Miss Prue has been portrayed as a very

⁶¹⁹ Possible meaning: to throw him overboard.

gullible, but also – with respect to Ben – arrogant character, sympathy with the girl's fate is dramaturgically withheld, especially as Tattle also receives his just deserts. The beau had been made to believe that Angelica was about to marry him, instead he and the equally tricked Mrs. Frail are betrothed: "TATTLE: I never liked anybody less in my life. Poor woman! / Gad, I'm sorry for her too, for I have no reason to hate her / neither, but I believe I should lead her a damned sort of life" (LL, V, 412 – 14). Hence, the foppish character's philandering is punished in the end, his foppery having been – partly – exposed by the stage sailor whose plain dealing contrasts markedly with Tattle's behaviour.

Fireball in *Sir Harry Wildair* appears as another stage sailor whose presentation vividly contrasts with the effeminate conduct of other male characters. As mentioned before, Fireball – a rough and fierce sea captain – is portrayed as highly unmannerly, yet his mockery of other characters assures him the final say in gaining the audience's sympathy. In Farquhar's play there are three male characters that flaunt effeminate characteristics and their association with the – at the onset – promiscuous and overly fashionable Lady Lurewell further enhances their lack of masculine valour. Lady Lurewell is shown as a character preoccupied with style, fashion and luxury, and she is consequently averse to encountering Fireball. At the beginning of act II, two of her chambermaids further describe her character:

1. CHAMBERMAID: Are all things set in order? The Toilet fix'd, the Bottles and Combs put in form, and the Chocolate ready?
2. CHAMBERMAID: 'Tis no great matter whether they be right or not; for right or wrong we shall be sure of our Lecture; I wish, for my part, that my time were out (HW, II, 10 f).

This obsession with luxurious commodities and vanity, alongside her malevolence, draws a very unfavourable image of Lady Lurewell, so dramaturgically it comes as no surprise that she attracts men that are equally vested. Beau-Banter is portrayed as the first of her male acquaintances, and – as has been shown before – Banter's steady emphasis on his university education, clearly intended to downgrade the mariner, backfires when Fireball mimics him and thus renders him ridiculous. The second fop amongst Lady Lurewell's acquaintances is the French "Monsieur", Marquis. Upon winning at cards, the Marquis converses with Lady Lurewell, musing on his fortune:

Madam, I have tought dat Fortune be one blind Bich Why shou'd Fortune be kinder to de Anglis Chevalier dan to de France Marquis? Ave I not de bon Grace? Ave I not de Personage? ave I not de understanding? can de English Chevalier dance better dan I? can de Anglis Chevalier fence better dan I? (HW, III, 20).

Marquis' entire stage portrayal is a display of his laughableness, not least due to his strong French accent. A Frenchman claiming to be on par with an English "Chevalier" is a sure proof of his being quite the contrary and, thus, his encounter with Fireball an inevitable clash of characters.⁶²⁰ When Fireball and Standard enter the scene, Fireball believes the Marquis to be courting his brother's wife, thus he shouts out: "Hah! Look! look! Look ye there, Brother! See how they Coc-/quet it! Oh! There's a look! there's a Simper! there's a Squeeze for/you! Ay, now the Marquis' at it. *Mon ceur, masoy, pardie, allons*" (HW, III, 21). Once again, the stage sailor mocks the foppish character, highlighting his exaggerated manners and language and thus widening the performative gap between him and the beau. The theatrical climax of this opposition, however, is achieved in a very corporal clash between Fireball and the third beau of the play, Clincher. Upon hearing of Clincher's arrival, the mariner exclaims: "Let him come, let him come; I'll shew you how to manage a/Beau presently" (HW, III, 22). This violent announcement serves as notice of Fireball's following actions. In *Sir Harry Wildair*, the two contrasting versions of men are not merely opposed to each other, but Fireball – and his sailors – are given the stage to physically demonstrate their dominance. The conflict between the two characters climaxes when Fireball presses Clincher for his thoughts on "trade, Religion and Liberties". In telling Clincher that the succession – after the Spanish King's death – is settled "upon a Prince of *France*", the following dialogue ensues:

FIREBALL: Burn the Succession, Sir. I won't drink it- What! Drink Confusion to our Trade, Religion and Liberties!

CLINCHER: Ay, by all means. – As for Trade, d'ye see? I'm a Gentleman, and hate it mortally. These Tradesmen are the most impudent Fellows we have, and spoil all our good Manners. What have we to do with Trade?

FIREBALL: A trim Politician truly! –And what do you think of our Religion, Pray?

CLINCHER: Hi, hi, hi – Religion! – And what has a Gentleman to do with Religion pray? – And to hear a Sea-Captain talk of Religion! That's Pleasant, Faith.

FIREBALL: And have you regard to our Liberties, Sir?

CLINCHER: Pshaw! Liberties! That's a Jest. We Beaux shall have liberty to Whore and Drink in any Government, and that's all we care for (HW, III, 29).

This dialogue provides the audience with a display of Clincher's opportunistic manliness which is built upon a firm advocacy of personal benefit and a dis-

620 On this aspect, see Charles A. KNIGHT, "The Images of Nations in Eighteenth-Century Satire", *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 22.4 (1989): 489–511.

regard for English priorities. But most poignantly enraging for Fireball is Clincher's "abuse" of the English institution closest to the mariner's heart: "Brandy! You Dog, abuse Brandy! Flat Treason against the Navy- / Royal – Sirrah, I'll teach you to abuse the Fleet" (HW, IV, 29). Without much ado, Fireball hence orders his servant Shark to "Get Three or Four of the Ship's Crew, and Press this Fellow aboard the / *Belzebub*" (HW, IV, 30). The pressing is, however, only a pretence; during the next scene set in Lady Lurewell's apartment, Clincher – tied to a chair – is hurled in by Shark and another sailor. Parley, Lady Lurewell's servant, begs to know on whose orders they act:

SHARK: Every Body, Sawce-Box. – And for the present here's my Master;
and if you have any thing to say to him, there he is for ye. [*Lugs Clincher out of the Chair, and throws him upon the Floor.*] Steer away, Tom. [*Exeunt.* (HW, IV, 35).

The mariners have acted together to not only give proof of their independent masculinity – "PARLEY: Who is your Master, Impudence? SHARK: Every Body, Sawce-Box" –, but have also given a collective performance of their esteem of gentlemen. Clincher remains taciturn during the remainder of his stage presence and is, about 75 lines later, carried off the stage.⁶²¹ In so thoroughly undermining the character's self-determination and exposing him to ridicule in that manner, his independent masculinity is performatively destroyed: Clincher is literally underfoot. In this regard, the mariners appear as corrective agents in two respects: first as alternative models for a proactive and patriotic manliness, second as entertaining characters, providing comic action for the stage. In *Sir Harry Wildair*, without going into greater detail as to the other plots where the eponymous character Sir Harry plays a decisive role, all beaux are theatrically damaged by the stage sailors: ridiculed, abused and exposed. The mariner appears as a proactive character, slowly emerging as a positive model for vigour and valour, a development exemplarily illustrated by a play discussed in the following subchapter.

3.3.4 Worthy Tars: Sailors as Role Models

This subchapter, an analysis of Charles Shadwell's⁶²² *The Fair Quaker of Deal: or, the humours of the navy*⁶²³ functions both to sum up some of the textual and theatrical means to other sailors and to give an outlook on the changing dis-

621 Staves writes that, aside from their obsession with appearance: "Fops are delicate", "A Few Kind Words" 414. Thus in not responding with violence himself, Clincher shows his "delicacy" as well as provides a further enraging momentum for Fireball with his frustrating non-reaction.

622 Charles Shadwell, son of late seventeenth-century poet and playwright Thomas Shadwell,

courses of representing mariners. Shadwell's comedy represents the theatrical scope of stage sailors in a very compact form and also marks a crucial passage in the changing characterisation of seamen at the beginning of the eighteenth century. In many respects, *The Fair Quaker of Deal*, even though it is not set on board ship, can be regarded as a quintessential "naval play" as it is set in Deal,⁶²⁴ the play's male protagonists are all related to the Navy, and the plot eventually discloses an ideal model both for sea captains and the naval force in general. Shadwell presents the different "humours of the navy", explicitly seizing on debates surrounding the manning of the Navy – tars vs. gentlemen – and thus carves out a vision of an ultimate model for the maritime profession. Interlinked with other subplots of "reformation", the reform of the Navy is shown to be both a fundamental endeavour and a venture transcending the importance of the naval force in that the reformation appears as a model for the whole of society.

The comedy premiered on the 25th of February 1710 at the Theatre Royal in Drury Lane and was staged at least 19 times in its first season alone, making it a remarkable theatrical success. As previously cited, the play ascribes major roles to maritime characters and stage sailors are – to varying extents – involved in all scenes of the play. The action unfolds with Captain Worthy and his crew docking at Deal, where Worthy meets his friend Rovewell, "a Gentleman of Fortune, and true Lover of the Officers of the Navy" (FQ, *Dramatis Personae*), to whom Worthy reports that his sea-journey had been pestered by the presence of his commodore Flip, a "most illiterate Wappineer-Tar"⁶²⁵ and Mizen, "a sinical Sea-Fop".⁶²⁶ It is further revealed that Worthy and Rovewell are courting the "Fair Quaker of Deal", Dorcas Zeal, and Belinda – "a Woman of Fortune" – respectively. However, their courtship is complicated by Dorcas' piety and Belinda's insistence on personal freedom. Additionally, the two men find out that Mizen intends to abduct Dorcas, so they set out a plan to reform both Mizen and Flip and at the same time helping two "whores of the town", Jenny Private and

could draw on personal experiences of the armed forces – as he served in Portugal – as well as on "maritime issues" in his appointment as supervisor of the excise in Kent, where Deal is set.

623 Charles SHADWELL, *The Fair Quaker of Deal: or, the humours of the Navy. A comedy, as it is acted at the Theatre-Royal in Drury-Lane* (London: Printed for James Knapton at the Crown in St. Paul's Church-yard, Bernard Lintott at the Cross-Keys, between the two Temple-Gates, in Fleet-Street, and Jonas Browne at the Black-Swan without Temple-bar, 1715). All quotes are from the play's second edition as the first edition is largely unreadable. The play's title will be shortened to "FQ" in quotes, all quotes indicate first the act, then the page-number, where given the scene-number is indicated as well.

624 Deal is a coastal town, a few miles north of Dover.

625 "Flip, The Commadore, a most illiterate Wappineer-Tar, hates the Gentlemen of the Navy, gets drunk with his Boats-crew, and values himself upon the brutish Management of the Navy" (FQ, *Dramatis Personae*).

626 "Mizen, a sinical Sea-Fop, a mighty Reformer of the Navy, keeps a Visiting-Day, and is Flip's Opposite" (FQ, *Dramatis Personae*).

Jiltup, to a new course of life. In the meantime, however, Dorcas' jealous sister Arabella enacts a scheme to prevent her sister's marriage to Worthy, dressing up as a young Quaker to attempt to woo Dorcas instead, but the plan is exposed and eventually both the Fair Quaker and Belinda happily give in to the marriage proposals. Flip and Mizen have, meanwhile, been tricked into marrying Jenny and Jiltup and as they find out their mistake, Worthy promises to relieve them from their bonds if they only agree to amend their errant ways as well as provide financially for the two women so that they can start leading honourable lives.

As Shadwell sets out in the prologue to the play, "reformation" is indeed a key objective in his design for the stage:

In early Times when Plays were first in fashion,
The Bus'ness of the Stage was Reformation;
The well-wrought Scene for publick Good design'd,
With imitable Virtue fill'd the Mind,
And lash'd the growing Follies of Mankind (FQ, Prologue, 13).

As the plot indicates, the reformation of the Navy is perceived as "publick Good" and the character of Worthy demonstrates that "imitable Virtue" can indeed be vested with a stage sailor. The prominence of the Navy thus carried forward is further highlighted with the performative overture of the first scene, with the stage direction reading: "*Enter Worthy as from on Board, Cockswoin and Crew following*" (FQ, I, 19). This not only introduces the main personnel of the play, but also thematically frames the action as the entry of mariners here establishes the sea as topical. What is more, the ensuing lines at once convey and establish Worthy's literally "worthy" and patriotic character. He exclaims: "So, thank Heaven, I have at last / reach'd my native Land" (FQ, I, 19). Worthy thus appears as different from other stage sailors, whose unease at "walking on land" is proverbial. Shadwell's sea captain is skilled on sea *and* on land and exhibits his worth in promptly taking care of his crew, who jointly express their thanks: "ALL SAILORS: Thank your Noble Honour, huzza, huz- / za" (FQ, I, 20). In greeting Rovewell, Worthy henceforth gives an account of his voyage, his report having an expository function in terms of the play's notion and accomplishment of reformation as well as acting out a first confrontation of the "humours of the navy".

Why, faith, Rovewell, my Voyage was attended
with little Pleasure, being generally confin'd to the barba-
rous Conversation of Flip my Commodore, a most obsti-
nate, positive, ignorant Wappineer-Tar; in short, he has
been my eternal Plague.
[...] to make me completely wretched, Beau
Mizen was the third Man; a Sea-Fop, of all Creatures,
the most ridiculous (FQ, I, 20).

In the Captain's description, Flip appears as a stereotypical version of the rude tar, barbarous and ignorant, and Worthy's sketch no doubt evoked familiar images of boisterous, smelling and unmannerly stage sailors in the audience. In being called a "sea-Fop", Mizen, on the other hand, offers an equally recognizable image as Shadwell here not only refers to the well publicized debate on "gentleman captains" and their shortcomings, but also calls forth a distinctive literary and theatrical character in describing him as "Beau" and "Fop". Ahead of Flip's and Mizen's appearance on stage, Rovewell and Worthy extrapolate on the Navy's humours, and Rovewell, characterising Deal, observes:

[...] This, is a monstrous
Place for Wickedness! Fornication flourishes more here
than in any Sea-Port of Europe. You Gentlemen of the
Navy are great Encouragers of Sin, and traffick mightily in
that sort of Merchandize;⁶²⁷ and for your Mony receive as
lasting French diseases here, as any you can meet with in
Covent-Garden, or the Mediterranean (FQ, I, 20).

To, Rovewell the "Gentlemen of the Navy" are responsible in encouraging vicious behaviour amongst their crews. What is more, mariners here appear not only as having an affinity for fornication, but above all "trafficking" in "that sort of Merchandize", that is spreading and advancing it. The captain agrees, consenting that "the Marine Race/are a debauch'd Generation" (FQ, I, 21), with Rovewell concluding: "'Tis a strange thing that People that face Death so / near, and so often, should have no Thoughts of saving / their Souls" (FQ, I, 21). In a jibe to Flavel's "spiritual sailing", Rovewell textually sketches the dramatic task that lies ahead of the two reformers of debauchery and Flip's and Mizen's subsequent entry furthermore gives a striking performance of the "humours" of the Navy and thus highlights the need for reform. With the "Wappineer-Tar" and the "Sea-fop" entering the stage, the audience is provided with a kind of re-enactment of the recent sea-journey,⁶²⁸ both characters performatively attesting to the captain's appraisal.

With the characters being so opposed to one another they naturally display great dislike for each other. In aiming at Flip's roughness and his own dislike of unrefined smells, Mizen wonders: "will nothing please you but / what stinks of Tar and Tobacco?" (FQ, I, 24). Flip, on the other hand, points to Mizen's apparent

627 In associating mariners with "that sort of Merchandize", the character is firmly placed within a culture of excess and consumption. See Bernard MANDEVILLE, *The Fable of the Bees*, 1705, ed. Phillip Harth (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1970): "Where Six or Seven Thousand Sailors arrive at once, as it often happens at Amsterdam, that have seen none but their own Sex for many months together, how is it suppos'd that honest Women should walk the Streets unmolested, if there were no Harlots to be had at reasonable prices?" 127 f.

628 "WORTHY: This has been the continual Diversion of our / Voyage" (FQ, I, 24).

lack of substance: “no Animal is so ridiculous as a Mon-/key, except it be his charming Imitator, a Beau” (FQ, I, 25). Both mariners reside at the opposite ends of the spectrum and thus embody the extremes of character constituting the debate on tar versus gentleman captains. The debate is even directly referred to, as Flip professes: “Noble, a Pox of Nobility, I say; the best Com-/madores that ever went between two Ends of a Ship, had / not a drop of Nobility in ‘em, thank Heaven” (FQ, I, 22). To Flip, nobility is incapacitating the naval force. Rovewell seizes upon this view: “Then you still value your self for being a Brute, / and think Ignorance a great Qualification for a Sea- / Captain?” (FQ, I, 22). Flip does not respond directly to this rhetorical question, but redirects it to an account what he values himself *not* to be:

I value my self for not being a Coxcomb; that
is what you call a Gentleman Captain; which is a new
name for our Sea-Fops, who forsooth, must wear white
Linen, have Field Beds, lie in Holland Sheets, and
load their Noddles with thirty Ounces of Whores Hair,
which makes ‘em hate the sight of an Enemy, for fear
Bullets and Gun-Powder shou’d spoil the Beau Wigg,
and lac’d Jacket (FQ, I, 22).

Flip here offers a neat summary not just of Mizen’s portrayal in the play, but outlines a general view of foppish “coxcombs” who, to him, are tantamount with “what you call a Gentleman Captain”. The main facets of “Sea-Fops” are hence their unconditional compliance to fashion and a corresponding lack of toughness and martial valour. In this, Flip turns the tables: in denigrating his opposite he sharpens and accentuates his own positive features. Yet, despite the brutish air he displays, his Captain detects a temperament in Flip that matches the pair of attributes that discursively circumscribe seamen, namely honesty and bravery. “WORTHY: Come, leave railing, my good Commadore; I / believe thou art Honest and Brave; but wanting Sense / and good Manners” (FQ, I, 22). Like in most other plays previously discussed, the coupling of “honest and brave” here appears as an idiosyncratic feature of seamen, yet – and again like other stage sailors – a distinctive lack of “breeding”, or “sense and good manners”, masks the worth of the mariner.

It follows that Flip is not only contrasted to Mizen, but is also – unlike Mizen – shown amongst his crew of sailors, thus the play not only puts forward a more comprehensive image of “Wappineer-Tars”, but also highlights the need for reform in view of the sheer quantity of rough mariners. In act III – “scene with sailors”- Flip and a bunch of sailors have gathered to drink, with Flip being the instigator for the drunken revelry. The 1.Sailor is reluctant:

1. SAILOR: Why, I'm married, sir, and must lie with my Wife to-night, which I have not done this eighteen Months.

FLIP: You Rogue, can't you get drunk first, and lie with her afterwards?

1. SAILOR: Ay, Sir, but my ill quality is, when I get drunk, I beat my Wife immoderately, and kick her out of Doors; which I will not willingly do the first Night (FQ, III, 54).

This dialogue touches upon several aspects characterizing the sailor's lot, propensity for drink and violence, as well as their unique living conditions on land. In presenting mariners on land forever pursuing physical pleasure – in taverns, brothels or indeed at home – the lack of refinement in these characters is highlighted.⁶²⁹ Noticeably, however, the mariners are once more not represented actually undertaking their labour, but their working environment is absent from the representation. N.A.M. Rodger commented on this absence in pictorial representations of the time, claiming that:

It is striking that almost all the prints of sailors show them in their flamboyant shore-going rig, never in their working clothes, nor at work. The shipboard world in which officers and men spent their active lives was probably less well-known to men of education than the remote countries described in the travel books then so popular, or the remote ages on whose history they had been brought up.⁶³⁰

In displaying the sea-side tavern as the natural land-habitat of mariners, they are additionally associated with consumption as their carnal presence is linked with excessive tendencies. But, despite the strong display of negative attributes that characterize the sailors, the scene also offers an idea of the hard working and disciplining conditions common mariners are subjected to, as the sailors subsequently complain about the bilboes, asking that they be thrown overboard:

3. SAILOR: Thank your Monsterousness; the Bilboes, an't like your Wonderfulness, is a great Stumbling-block in the way of a Sailor's Agility; to have our Heels land-lock'd when we have Sea-room enough, is worse than to run a-shore where there's no Land (FQ, III, 55).

The 3. Sailor here describes his dislike of naval disciplining devices in “sea terms”, thus once more highlighting the linguistic otherness of sailors, but also indicating how restrained the life on board ships is. As a whole the scene,

629 In only ever pursuing physical pleasure, the mariner's estrangement from civility, e.g. the arts, is shown – a depiction reminiscent of Captain Porpuss in *Sir Barnaby Whigg*, who dismisses characters from English opera (BW, I, 5).

630 Rodger, *Wooden World* 15.

however, maintains a portrayal of sailors as brutish and violent, as one sailor further suggests: “we shall beat the Mayor and Corporation, and / drown the Constable; or shall we ravish all the Women / we meet with, and unwind the Houses?” (FQ, III, 56, 6. Sailor), and another sailor accounting for this divertissement: “for we have no dispect of Per- / sons” (FQ, III, 57, 4. Sailor). Again, these lines not only attest to the vicious disposition of mariners and their unruly ideas of leisure activities, but also to their incompetence of – or one could say, “dispect” for – the English language.

The representation of the “Wappineer-Tars” is eventually rounded off with the portrayal of Flip courting his prospective wife, Jiltup. Similar to other depictions of stage sailors’ treatment of women,⁶³¹ Flip only converses with Jiltup in “sea language” as he promises her to “stick as close / to you as carv’d Work to a Ship’s Stern” (FQ, IV, 66). In proposing to take the attendant “Priest” – Flip’s own lieutenant Cribidge, who is in on the plan – on board as well, it becomes obvious what kind of diversion lies ahead of the priest and the woman:

[...] and if you’ll give your self the
trouble of coming on board my Ship, you shall have your
Skull and Guts fill’d so full of Brandy and Salt-Beef, and
your Ears so alarm’d with Drums, Trumpets, Huzzas, and
Guns, that you’ll be as drunk in half an hour, as you
were at the wetting of your Commission (FQ, IV, 66).

In talking of “Skull and Guts”, “Drums, Trumpets, Huzzas, and Guns”, Flip conveys a disposition that is not only a stereotypical fixture of “Wappineer-Tars”, but in the play also works as foil in comparison to Mizen’s portrayal.

In the first scene, when both Flip and Mizen enter the stage for the first time, they together act out Worthy’s previous description of them, but they also – by way of theatrical pointing – mutually draw attention to their assessment of the respective other: “FLIP: ‘Tis a Water-Beau; one Water-Spaniel is worth / fifty of such fair-weather Fops; do but observe him now, / oh monstrous!” (FQ, I, 23). The audience then witnesses Mizen’s follies:

(to his Cockswain): Go you to the Perfumers, buy me a Gallon of
Orange-Flower-Water, and a Pint of Jessamin-Oil [...]
and tell the Purser, I am resolv’d every Man
on Board my Ship shall have a clean white Shirt at his
Charge. *Tuesday* next is my Visiting-Day; and I design
to let the World see how much I have reform’d the
Navy (FQ, I, 24).

631 See both plays by Ravenscroft, as well as *Sir Barnaby Whigg*.

In playing on the theme of reform, Shadwell here ironically portrays a model-image for a reformed Navy. Mizen indeed appears as very different from the brutish tar Flip, but embodies a reform that has backfired as the need for manners in the naval force here capsizes into a comical vision of a crew of perfumed fops. Mizen hence appears as a stereotypical version of an effeminate fop obsessed with exotic and luxurious commodities. His call for dressing sailors with “clean white shirts” further appears as an ironic reference to other theatrical efforts of “rigging” mariners.⁶³² Moreover, he explicitly states the agenda of his reform attempt in forthrightly proclaiming: “We imitate the Ladies as near as we can” (FQ, I, 27). In this, Mizen emerges as quintessentially effeminate, an impression that is enhanced in the additional outline of his agenda: “I put fine Sentences into the Mouths of our Sailors, / deriv’d from the Manliness of the Italian, and the Soft- / ness of the French” (FQ, I, 27). His mention of “manliness” is of course perfectly ridiculous in the context of the play. Not only does his own character openly dwell in “unmanly” pastimes such as perfume and fashion, but citing Italians or – much worse – the French as models for desired manliness is outright laughable for an eighteenth-century London audience. So his generally honourable call for an advancement of manners collapses into a pathetic effort, additionally appearing as purely commercial as his constant stress to “buy” and “consume” attests to:

MIZEN: [...] I’ll get an Order for removing them from Wapping into the Pall-mall: and instead of frequenting Punch, musick, and Bawdy-Houses; the Chocolate-Houses, Eating-Houses, and fine Taverns shall be oblig’d to receive them (FQ, I, 28).

Mizen’s reform-agenda is shown to have no substance, none of the improvements of “sense and good manners” Worthy called for, but mere superficial changes to dress and consumption. This effect is strengthened when Mizen, in act II, explicates his understanding of “sense and good manners”, announcing that he wants to make the Navy “one of the greatest Navies in the / Universe” (FQ, II, Scene “A Bowl of Punch”, 43).

SIR PLEASANT:⁶³³ Why, Sir, ‘tis that already.
MIZEN: Ay, but Sir Charles, I don’t mean a fighting Navy, for that’s the least part of our business: I am for a polite Navy: – That is, a Navy full of Sense and good Manners; a Navy of proper, handsome, well-drest Fellows; that when it appears abroad, may be the Wonder

632 As for example the mockery of Manly in *The Plain Dealer* as well as the new “rigging” of the Durzo characters in Ravenscroft’s plays.

633 Sir Worthy’s Lieutenant.

of the World, for glittering, shining Coats, powder'd Whigs, Snuff-Boxes, and fashionable Airs (FQ, II, Scene "A Bowl of Punch", 43 f).

Sir Pleasant's laconic remark as to the greatness of the British Navy stops short of Mizen's vision of it. The "Sea-Fop" depicts a "polite" Navy that appears not just as a result of his own fundamental misapprehension of the force's function – "I don't mean a fighting Navy" – but also as the exaggerated version of "good manners": sailors in "glittering, shining coats" and "fashionable airs", undoubtedly with no minds to attend to their actual maritime profession.⁶³⁴ Therefore both mariners stand for extremes in need of reformation, with Mizen additionally proving to be avaricious as he plans to abduct the wealthy Fair Quaker: "I whip her into my Boat, carry her on Board, / marry her, lie with her, the come ashore and demand / her Fortune" (FQ, I, 28). Henceforth, Worthy's plan is set into motion, he and Rovewell scheme a "charitable / Design" (FQ, Rovewell, I, 29) in order to "a little mortify him, but not / ruin him" (FQ, Rovewell, I, 29) and so eventually procure a "proper" reform of the Navy's most extreme cases. As has become clear, however, Flip and Mizen only stand in for apparently more general problems within the naval force as both characters are designed to embody the extremes of the "tar versus gentleman"-debate. Shadwell here brings together issues that not only concern this debate, but that also encompass the social standing and welfare of mariners, drawing attention to a more profound set of problems besetting the naval force.

At the beginning of act II these social problems are explicitly mentioned as three mariners – Sir Pleasant, Lieutenant Cribidge and Lieutenant Easy – critically debate their various roles on board, with Cribidge saying to Easy:

most of you stay ashore till all the Mony's gone, and then you come aboard, and expect to mess with us: Who must find fresh Provisions for you?

Pleasant: We often flight them for their Poverty indeed; but hang it, what a strange want of Mercury do we young Fellows shew, to have been a ten Months Voyage, safely return'd, and landed two hours, without having been among the Females! (FQ, II, 35).

The mariner not only exhibits awareness of the problems faced on board, but also highlights the remarkable circumstances of their lives among an all-male crew. In a way, this relation thus serves to account for the mariners' boisterous

634 Rovewell cuts this vision short, however, with a vivid indication as to the longevity of Mizen's reform. "ROVEWELL: Why, if thou shouldst offer this to an old Cap-/tan of the Navy, he'd bring thee to a Court-Martial, and / break thee for being crazy" (FQ, II, Scene "A Bowl of Punch", 44).

behaviour, “drink” is offered as compensation for their tough fortune, and also joyfully asserted:

Let’s drink away our dismal Storms and Cares,
 Those slavish Hardships that a Sailor bears:
 Whilst proud Britannia may securely boast,
 She safely sleeps whilst we secure her Coast⁶³⁵ (FQ, II, 37).

In these lines, the necessity for a “fighting” – as opposed to a “polite” – Navy is once again highlighted, with the mariners appearing as quintessential figures for the safety of the nation. The necessity for a truly reformed Navy is evidenced along with the need for social welfare and, accordingly, Worthy emerges as the ideal representative of the force, as attested by his lieutenant, “PLEASANT: [...] thank Heaven my Capt- / tain has another way of Management; with the affable, easy / and genteel Air he gains Applause from all”⁶³⁶ (FQ, II, 34). In the further course of the scene Worthy states his agenda and code of conduct: “I ne’er allow my Purser to oppress the / Men; nor will I keep a whole Ship’s Crew miserable, to make one Man rich” (FQ, II, 46). Worthy can hence be seen as a captain caring for the whole of his crew, turning against individual personal gain, but also introducing new methods of leadership that shall secure both the nation’s interests and the social and physical wellbeing of the sailors.

INDENT [the Purser]: Ay, Sir, but all People have regard to the Methods of the Navy.

WORTHY: Why yes, Purser, I own you may plead Custom for abundance of Villainies committed in the Navy: but we have now got Men of Honour at the Helm, who will not suffer Rogues to go unpunish’d (FQ, II, 47).

As mentioned at the beginning of this subchapter, the eventual reformation of Flip and Mizen as examples of a more general reformation of the Navy is garnered through their mock marriage to Jenny and Jiltup. In the other of the play’s plots, “reformation” also looms large as all three women – Dorcas, Belinda and Arabella – exhibit character traits that render their respective marriages impossible. Dorcas, the Fair Quaker, is excessively pious, Belinda too proud and independent – “I don’t know, but one time or another, when / I am in a very maggotty Humour, I may marry the Crea- / ture” (FQ, II, 42) – and Arabella malicious and jealous. Eventually, the women – more or less voluntarily – give up their resistance to matrimony and, just as they enter married life, Flip and Mizen are relieved of it. Worthy, upon hearing of the two men’s distress, asks: “what will

635 I take it that this stanza is being sung by Cribidge and Pleasant right before their exit.

636 This appraisal is seconded by the other lieutenant, Easy, who states that: “’tis only the Brutes of the Navy that we Marine / Officers disagree with” (FQ, II, 35), thus adjusting the picture of the Navy and drawing attention to the fact that “not all is bad”.

you say to me, if I release you, knock / off your Chains, and free you both from Slavery?" (FQ, V, 77). After both have promised to "make two honest Women" of their "wives" (FQ, V, Worthy, 78), they are indeed released by Worthy and both have a new found disposition to reform and change their lives. The reformation of the two mariners acts as dramaturgical counterpart to the reformation of the women,⁶³⁷ which not only emotionally fortifies the play's happy conclusion, but also strengthens it in that reformation thus appears as a common good. As Worthy explicates his pedagogical approach, it was: "Not to ruin you, but to reform you" (FQ, V, 78), and the reformation has thoroughly worked as both Flip and Mizzen⁶³⁸ pledge to change their ways:

FLIP: Ay, and my own Conversion too. Henceforward I'll keep such honest fellows as thee Company, cast off my old dull rascally Conversation, and learn good Sense and Manners.

[...]

MIZEN: Nay, dear Worthy, take one new Convert more; for from this Hour I'll play the effeminate Fool no more; but bear the Face of a Man like thee, strip my Fop-Cabin of all my China Baubles, Toys for Girls, and shew my self a true Hero for my Glorious Queen (FQ, V, 80).

As both mariners imply, reformation here is a matter of choice and performance: both choose to "cast off", "strip" or cease to "play" their old roles and henceforth stick to the role model of Worthy that will render them "true Heroes" full of "good Sense and Manners". So one can argue that in *The Fair Quaker of Deal* the stage sailor comes into his own: a "true hero", whose service to the nation is not only acknowledged, but whose character is also rendered a matter of performance itself. In a way the stage sailor, as he ultimately emerges at the end of the play, thus appears as a "staged sailor", an ideal character whose performance for Britannia requires him to "bear the Face of a Man" and reciprocally translates this image to a model for the whole nation. In dramatically presenting stereotypical images of mariners Shadwell expounds these images as "staged" as the mariners eventually show themselves capable of acting differently, while at the same time the mariners also emerge as role models for the Navy, and thus the nation. In this regard, *The Fair Quaker of Deal* marks a decisive passage in the shifting discourses of representing seamen in the long eighteenth century. In imposing a patriotic frame for the play and in portraying a truly "worthy" captain, who is outright attractive and epitomizes manly valour as well as

637 Not only do all women consent to marriage, the Fair Quaker also renounces her religion in the end.

638 As well as the newly virtuous "whores".

manners, Shadwell heralds the notion that seamen are increasingly less “men apart”, but rather men embodying “imitable Virtue” (FQ, Prologue, 13).

3.4 Coda: From Plain Dealer to “Happy Heroes”

The popular representations of plain dealers, rough tars and worthy mariners in the Restoration and early eighteenth-century theatre attest to the increasing visibility of and role played by the sea in English society. As “Staging Sailors” has shown, the representation of sailors as Other can then be analysed in terms of the characters’ liminal status as “sea-bred” and “third sort of persons”. Mariners are “at once interior and foreign”,⁶³⁹ they are deemed “outside” and presented as apart from society, while the theatrical representation bears them “inside” and visible at the same time. These stereotypical stagings also serve to reconsider new signs of identity in that the characters’ roughness and plain dealing honesty is either polished or taken as exemplary for a certain form of manliness as well as patriotism. In that respect the representations change during the period considered in that mariners are increasingly presented not as simply a-social, but as rough yet sociable characters that stand out due to their honesty and valour and thus emerge as role models for a certain English manliness. These developments advance further in the second half of the eighteenth century, when staging the sea changes profoundly and the plain dealers of the Restoration stage⁶⁴⁰ are accompanied by “happy heroes”,⁶⁴¹ characters that stand out due to their patriotic attitude but are also presented as overtly jolly, yet also passive and unthinking.

As mentioned before, the waning in new plays staging the sea from around 1712 onwards seems to be caused by a period of calm in naval warfare which lasted until 1739. With the outbreak of the War of Jenkins’ Ear⁶⁴² – a military dispute with Spain sparked by the amputation of a naval captain’s ear, no less – new maritime themed theatricals are staged, presenting an abundance of jolly tars waging war on the Spanish, as well as the French, with theatrical means. The Theatre Licensing Act of 1737, which had given way to more “disengaged theatre”,⁶⁴³ furthered representations of the stage sailor – a soldier on leave in most cases – that display the character as a jovial and overtly patriotic Englishman.

639 Foucault, *The Order of Things* xxvi.

640 As e.g. *The Plain Dealer* and *Love for Love* continued to be staged.

641 The phrase is used in a play by George Alexander STEVENS, *The trip to Portsmouth; a comic sketch of one act, with songs* (London: Printed for T. WALLER, in Fleet-Street; T. BECKET, in the Strand; and G. ROBINSON, in Pater-noster-Row, 1773) 26. The play’s title shortened to “TP”, there are no act-divisions so references are given in only providing the page-number.

642 The war lasted from 1739–1748.

643 Thomson 117.

Stage sailors increasingly appeared in comic operas⁶⁴⁴ and other musical entertainments that presented the characters as patriotic heroes in times of war, especially in connection to naval conflicts such as the War of Jenkins' Ear and the Seven Years War from 1756 – 1763. The resulting popularity of the stage sailor already foreshadows the immense popularity of burlesque and comic nautical operas in the wake of the Napoleonic wars, theatrical spectacles that also exhibited contesting perceptions on Britain's imperial expansion. David Worrall – in his manuscript “*Britannia in Full Glory at Spithead: Imperial Ideology and Local Dissent in Theatrical Representations of Naval Conflict*”⁶⁴⁵ – claims that:

Despite determinedly loyalist titles appearing on the playbills, many of the preludes, pantomimes, interludes and the other types of entertainment ancillary to the main and afterpieces of Georgian programmes managed to promote patriotism yet within a context putting dissent on display.⁶⁴⁶

The naval mutinies at Spithead in 1797 also found expression on the contemporary stages,⁶⁴⁷ thus also testifying to the potential problem of the sailor's patriotic appropriation as the character is shown turning against patriotic commands.

This coda will, however, only sketch the representations of stage sailors from 1739 up to the beginning of the French Revolutionary Wars as this historical frame provides a contiguous development of the stage sailor's representation. This development will be sketched on the basis of several plays, entertainments and afterpieces that exemplarily stage “happy heroes”, singling out aspects of the representation that concern the mariners' patriotic value and their jolly and entertaining character rather than being concerned with developments of staging the sea more generally.⁶⁴⁸ Stage sailors are increasingly less presented as

644 See Watson 188.

645 I would like to thank the author for making available this chapter. “*Britannia in Full Glory at Spithead*” will be part of David Worrall's forthcoming publication: *Theatrical Intelligence: Eighteenth-Century British Theatre and Social Assemblage Theory*.

646 Worrall, “*Britannia in Full Glory*” in: Worrall, *Theatrical Intelligence* 1.

647 See Russell 114.

648 Up to the year 1790, all in all 21 new plays, operas, masques or other entertainments featuring stage sailors could be located in *The London Stage* as well as in *Eighteenth-Century Collections Online*: Edward Phillips, *Briton's strike home: or, the sailor's rehearsal* (1739), Anon., *The bravo turn'd bully; or, the depredators* (1740), Anon., *The sailor's opera: or, a trip to Jamaica* (1745), David Mallet/James Thomson, *Britannia* (1755), Tobias Smollett, *The Reprisal: or, the Tars of old England* (1757), Isaac Bickerstaff, *Thomas and Sally: or, the sailor's return* (1761), George Colman, *The Jealous Wife* (1761), Arthur Murphy, *The Old Maid* (1761), Richard Cumberland, *The Brothers* (1767), Thomas Boulton, *The Sailor's Farewell; or, the guinea outfit* (1768), Elizabeth Griffith, *The School for Rakes* (1769), George Alexander Stevens, *The trip to Portsmouth* (1773), Samuel Foote, *A trip to Calais* (1775), Thomas Francklin, *The Contract* (1776), Charles Dibdin's *The Touchstone, or, Harlequin Traveller* (1779), Edward Neville, *Plymouth in an Uproar* (1779), Frederick Pilon, *Illumi-*

socially awkward or downright liminal characters, but their Englishness is strongly accentuated. Their Englishness is not only presented in terms of the mariners’ self-professed patriotism, honesty and love of liberty, but also in that the characters are presented in opposition to Spaniards or Frenchmen. The stage sailors are further heroicized in that their patriotic devotion as “hearts of oak” becomes the foremost attribute of their representation, contrasting the honest and liberty-loving English mariners starkly with perfidious and cowardly European Others. This emphasis on patriotism is evident in all the plays under discussion, attesting to the increased praise of English values in times of military conflicts with other European nations. Also, the stage sailors’ patriotic character is increasingly linked to the sailors’ proverbial and almost intrinsic honesty. Honesty is presented not as a disturbing element of the character, as in plays such as *The Plain Dealer*, *Love for Love* or *Sir Barnaby Whigg*, but as an endearing feature of the character that is an inherent part of his Englishness. This representation as honest and liberty-loving also serves to countermand the mariners’ lower-class position as, contrary to the stage sailors of the Restoration, the stage sailors in the latter half of the century are seldom captains or officers of rank, but mostly common sailors. In line with this change, stage sailors are also mostly presented not on their own, but as part of a group of mariners, thus highlighting the group identity of the profession. This development also testifies to the increasing tendency of stage sailors to be shown as middle-class characters.

Furthermore, the characters are also – as part of their staging in musical entertainments – presented as jolly, light-hearted and entertaining. Whereas Restoration and early eighteenth-century stage sailors were portrayed as socially awkward, alienating others with their ideas of social entertainment, the “happy heroes” are portrayed as thoroughly enjoyable and entertaining characters. However, this aspect also contributes to the sailors’ presentation as passive and unthinking. The mariners’ joyful attitude, love of entertainment and diversion precludes more subversive insights than the a-social plain dealers of the Restoration voiced. In relation to this development, Dening claims that: “Georgian England invented the jolly, simple, incongruous tar. The more the country became dependent on the exploitation of the seamen’s brilliant skills, the more sure it became that seamen were ‘children’ – improvident, intemperate, profligate”.⁶⁴⁹

nation: or, the Glazier’s Conspiracy (1779), Miles Peter Andrews, *Fire and Water!* (1780), John Dent, *The Candidate* (1782), Dent, *Too civil by half* (1783) and Pilon, *The Fair American* (1785).

649 Dening, *Mr. Bligh’s Bad Language* 56. It has to be noted, however, that the “jolly tar” Dening mentions was a representation very much stemming from and also confined to the theatre. Sailors’ representation in other literary genres differed, for a study on the different representation of the theme of e. g. impressment in novels, see Daniel James ENNIS, *Enter the*

Indeed, the theatrical representations of sailors during the Georgian period considered are characterized by a concentration on the sailors' jolly mood and love of light-hearted pastimes. The overt performance of the sailors' carelessness and joyfulness serves to shun aspects that particularly affected mariners from lower classes, such as pressing into the Navy, exploitation in war-times and subsequent unemployment.

Mariners are also increasingly presented not as individual role models, such as Worthy in *The Fair Quaker of Deal*, who was singled out as a particular "worthy" exemplar of a mariner, but the profession of seamen on the whole is heroicized. This feature becomes especially noticeable in the stage sailors' figurative as well as symbolical denomination as "hearts of oak". As "hearts of oak" stage sailors are closely tied not only to England's identity as a nation whose forests "rush into floods" but also to the actual substance of their workplace. Accompanied by an increasingly jingoistic representation of European Others, the stage sailor is performatively incorporated into the nation's self-image as "ruler of the waves". The term itself was made popular through a song written by Garrick for the opera *Harlequin's Invasion*⁶⁵⁰ (1759) and is – to this day – the official march and "signature tune" of the Royal Navy. The chorus goes as follows:

Heart of oak are our ships, jolly tars are our men,
we always are ready; Steady, boys, steady!
We'll fight and we'll conquer again and again.

The metaphor here works as an appropriating figure as it denotes both the building material of ships as well as, on a more abstract level, the heart of the nation. The stage sailor as an integrative figure is, in this respect, part of a more general change in theatrical representations, as the sea is also increasingly more incorporated into the representational framework of the stage and so staging the sea takes on a more literal meaning. Plays featuring sailors are no longer mainly set in London, but mariners are now exclusively presented in coastal towns or on board ships. Edward Phillips' farce *Britons, strike home: or, the Sailor's Rehearsal* (1739)⁶⁵¹ is a case in point as the play is actually set on board ship: "*the Great Cabbin on board the St. Joseph, one of the Caracca Ships taken from the Span-*

Press-Gang: Naval Impressment in Eighteenth-Century British Literature (Cranbury: Associated University Presses, 2002).

650 David GARRICK, *The Plays of David Garrick: Garrick's Own Plays, 1748–1766*, Vol. I, ed. Harry William Pedicord and Fredrick Louis Bergmann (Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1980) 199–227.

651 The farce was acted at the Theatre Royal, all quotations from the play's first edition, the play's title will be shortened to "BR" in quotations followed by the page-number. Edward PHILLIPS, *Britons, Strike Home: or, the Sailor's Rehearsal A farce. As it is acted at the Theatre-Royal, by His Majesty's servants, With the musick pref'd to each song* (London: Printed for J. WATTS at the Printing-Office in Wild-Court near Lincoln's-Inn Fields, 1739).

iards” (BR, 1). This scene not only actually stages the space of a ship, thus drawing the space of the sea nearer to the audience, but also stages the conflict with the Spanish, showcasing the actual venue of maritime encounters and conflicts. What is more, the second scene of the play offers a striking tableau in which “a great number of Sailors” (BR, I, 8) “come forward singing the Last Part of the Tune, To the Hundreds of Drury, &c. as they come down the Stage” (BR, I, 8). Here, the theatre is literally invaded as the stage sailors take over, vocally and musically establishing their parts in the action of the play as well as soldiers in the military conflict with the Spanish. However, the actual nature of the work is glossed over as the sailors do not appear as fighting or working on ship, but are solely presented as engaged in entertaining pastimes, thus reassuring the audience that there is nothing important at risk.⁶⁵²

Whereas before, stage sailors were very rarely⁶⁵³ represented “at work” or even within their professional space, after 1739 we find numerous instances of plays and entertainments set – at least in part – on board a vessel. This change is partly due to improved technical means in staging ships and water,⁶⁵⁴ but it is also linked to the structure of the plays themselves as farces and musical entertainments offer shorter and more discontinuous plots, leaving more room for improvisation. Furthermore, ship-settings allowed for exciting stagings of tempests and dangerous, treacherous ocean passages. The anonymous *The Sailor’s Opera: or, a Trip to Jamaica*⁶⁵⁵ (1745) is for the most part set on board a ship, with the comic opera staging a sea-journey to Jamaica, including scenes with “*Ships at Sea, a Storm, Thunder and Lightning*” (SO, V.i, 36) – thus presenting the audience with a very vivid tableau for armchair-travelling and very graphic scenes of maritime dangers which made for thrilling entertainment. Tobias Smollett’s dramatic effort, *The Reprisal: or, the Tars of Old England*⁶⁵⁶ (1757) is also set on board an enemy ship, a French vessel “*lying at anchor*

652 See Thomson who states that in Isaac Bickerstaff’s libretto to *Thomas and Sally* (1760) the Seven Years War is “entirely peripheral” and the opera thus “resists the pull of its latent themes – the ‘pressing’ into the Navy of agricultural labourers with the consequent disruption of families, socio-sexual exploitation in times of war, the threat of unemployment for returning combatants” 118.

653 The only other plays set in part on board ship are *The Enchanted Island, A Common-Wealth of Women* and *Cuckolds-Haven*.

654 For the introduction and use of water tanks for naval spectacles – as early as 1753 in Sadler’s Wells Theatre – in the mid- to late eighteenth-century, see Derek FORBES, “Water Drama”, in: David Bradby, Louis James and Bernard Sharratt eds., *Performance and Politics in Popular Drama: Aspects of Popular Entertainment in Theatre, Film and Television 1800–1976* (Cambridge: CUP, 1980) 91–108.

655 ANON., *The sailor’s opera: or, a trip to Jamaica* (London: Printed for the AUTHOR, 1745), quoted as “SO” followed by act-, scene- and page-number.

656 Tobias SMOLLETT, *The Reprisal: or, the Tars of Old England. A Comedy of two acts, as it is*

on the coast of Normandy” (TR, 5).⁶⁵⁷ The setting on board an enemy ship is not only once more staging the imminent dangers of maritime endeavours, but also offers a way in which British characters can be contrasted with European Others and eventually prove their supremacy in all things maritime. The increasing scenic representation of the sea is also reflected in scenes where the sea, or the sea-side, is presented as a site for labour as, for example, shown in the comic opera *Fire and Water*.⁶⁵⁸ (1780) by Miles Peter Andrews, which opens with a scene exhibiting: “A View of Portsmouth Dock; the Flat Scene representing Ships on the Stocks; Artificers at Work in their various Employments” (FW, I. i, 5). Interestingly, the scene does not present mariners at work, but artificers, a scene that thus also attests to the ever-growing economic importance of ship-building and maritime trade. The space of the sea is also staged as a mythical space providing a frame and call for the nation’s destiny. In this regard, both James Thomson’s and David Mallet’s masques, *Alfred* (1740) as well as *Britannia*⁶⁵⁹ (1755), provide prominent examples. *Britannia* opens thus: “On one hand a rocky coast; woods and fields on the other: the whole terminated by a view of the ocean. BRITANNIA is seen reclining against a cliff” (BA, 1). This scene very emphatically grounds the audience’s identity as Britannia’s subjects amidst a “coast” and “woods and fields”, thus scenically highlighting the nation as being “in an Island”, as well as appealing to the nation’s connection to the Roman Empire in the figure of Britannia.

The advancing pictorial as well as dramaturgical representation of the actual space of the sea is accompanied by a change in the stage sailor’s portrayal, one that increasingly employs the mariner as a character for entertainment. Whereas in most plays discussed in “Staging Sailors”, the sailor’s entertainment value rests upon the character’s social awkwardness and sea-breeding, which provided comic situations and double entendres, in the latter half of the century the stage sailor is brought “this” side of funny by being presented as a jolly tar, forever willing to entertain with a song and a dance.⁶⁶⁰ Almost all plays featuring sailors

performed at the Theatre Royal in Drury-Lane (London: Printed for R. BALDWIN, in Paternoster-Row, 1757).

657 For a thorough analysis of *The Reprisal*, especially in terms of the play evoking both patriotic sentiments as well as national anxieties, see Schmidt-Haberkamp, “Patriotism and its Discontents”.

658 Miles Peter ANDREWS, *Fire and water! A comic opera: in two acts. Performed at the Theatre-Royal in the Hay-Market* (London: Printed for T. CADELL, in the Strand, 1780), quoted as “FW”, giving act-, scene- and page-number.

659 David MALLET, *The Plays of David Mallet*, ed. Felicity Nussbaum (New York and London: Garland, 1980).

In citations the title will be shortened to “BA”, followed by the page-number.

660 This development is additionally attended with the publication of numerous sailor-songs. These songs were reproduced in chapbooks and were thus widely spread, reaching beyond

in the latter half of the century are musical pieces, comic operas or plays interspersed with songs and it is always the sailors that offer the entertainment. In this regard, *Britons strike home* is an outstanding example as it not only includes several sailors’ songs, but actually stages a play-within-a-play as the naval crew is instructed to perform “a little diversion”, “a little piece of Drollery” (BR, Captain Briton, 2):

LIUTENANT MEANWELL: They are preparing to appear, according to the variety of Characters they are to assume; some are got into the Spanish Sailors Dresses, and with the Habit of the Dons are affecting their grave solemnity; others, who are to remain as English Tarrs, are humming over the Chorus of an English Ballad (BR, 4).

This “diversion” not only establishes the maritime characters’ disposition to entertain, but also claims a representational authority over the Spanish, at once maintaining the authority – as the English tars will “win” the diversion – while at the same time downgrading the adversaries through a comical enactment. Additionally, the diversion involves a young woman called Kitty appearing in the character of America, who is given “an English Lover; and as I [Captain Briton], under the Character of an English Sea-Captain, represent Great Britain, you [Kitty] may be as kind to me as you think/proper” (BR, 5). The play thus codifies the stage sailor as representative of the nation; the mariner is not at odds with land-based society but serves as its vanguard. However, in abstracting the actual warfare on the level of a “diversion” and a mock-fight over a young woman, the mariners’ importance for the nation’s advancement and well-being is downplayed: he is depicted as standing at the forefront of empire, yet the actual hard labour on-board ship is dramaturgically translated into a jolly “drollery”.

As has already been observed in this chapter, mariners were cast as “third sort of persons” in part due to their careless attitude to risk, danger and religion. This attitude is realized in the mariners’ portrayal through their proclivity for taverns, drink and sexual pleasure. This representation as e.g. showcased in *Sir Barnaby Whigg*, *Cuckolds-Haven*, *The Fair Quaker of Deal*, as well as in *The Enchanted Island*, becomes an almost mandatory performative feature in the second half of the eighteenth century. The stereotypical duo of drink and pleasure-seeking, coupled with an imprudent approach to money, is evoked – with minor alterations – in almost every play. As has already been mentioned with regard to the tavern or the public house as setting – as in *Cuckolds-Haven* and *The Fair Quaker of Deal* – these places are one way of performatively establishing the mariner’s habitat on vacation, and in many plays the setting is also

the actual theatre audiences. A large number of the most popular patriotic anthems, such as “Rule Britannia”, “Britons Strike Home”, “Hearts of Oak”, also stemmed from the theatre.

Fel- /low: (hiccups) Damn my Heart if he an’t” (SO, II. i, 8). In one of the first scenes in Edward Neville’s *Plymouth in an Uproar*,⁶⁶³ both stage sailors appear the like, “PIPES: Hiccup-why, you’ve got your beer on/board, with a witness. [...] BEN: Hiccup- For a drink of grog, you lubber –” (PU, I, 3). And – again in *The Sailor’s Opera* – the audience even witnesses a prolonged display of the act of drinking itself as the sailor’s favourite pastime: “While Harry sings, Trincalo takes the Cann, and drinks a long Time” (SO, I, ii, 9). This enactment is accompanied by a song:

Come my Lads let’s be gay,
Let no Man here look surly
But be merry while we may
And drink Success to the Shirley;
Thus evr’y Day and evr’y Night
We spend in Pleasure and Delight,
Free from Envy Care and Spight
While we sail in the Shirley (SO, I. ii, 9).

Here, the sailor’s devotion to both alcohol and his own fatuousness are coupled as the characters appear as careless⁶⁶⁴ and simple. One of the last airs in *The Sailor’s Opera* further emphasizes this image: “Come lets be merry while we may [...] And when you find,/Your almost blind,/Then to your Cabbin roll” (SO, Air 25, 41). These songs indicate that mariners are very often drunk and thus insinuate not only the imprudence of sailors, but also imply that their professional lives do not require much care or attention. So the equation of sailors with their drink – in *Plymouth in an Uproar*, Ben exclaims: “but I’ll sooner /part with my life than my liquor” (PU, 5) – not only serves to disparage the characters, but the apparent absence of work moreover denies mariners their professional status and dismisses the hardships a life on board presents. In stressing the sailor’s pleasure-seeking character the destitutions of a life at sea are glossed over and pressing social issues of the time, such as the need for a reform of the Navy and its recruitment methods, the lack of social benefits for sailors and unemployment in peace-time, are omitted.

Taken together, these representations thus serve to belittle and even disen-

663 Edward NEVILLE, *Plymouth in an Uproar; A Musical Farce, As it is performed at the Theatre-Royal in Covent-Garden. The Music composed by Mr. Dibdin* (London: Printed for G. KEARSLEY, N°47, Fleet-Street, 1779). The play’s title will be shortened to “PU”, References for quotations are given in the form “I. i, 1”, the first number represents the act and the second number the page.

664 As e.g. in *Plymouth in an Uproar*, where sailor Ben opens the play thus: “BEN: We on the present hour relying,/Think not of future nor of past” (PU 1), see also the 6th stanza in a song in *A Trip to Portsmouth*, where sailors sing: “What’s got at sea, we spend on shore,/With sweethearts, or our wives;- /And Then, my boys, hoist sailor for more;/ Thus passes Sailors lives” (TP 28).

franchise sailors – they are portrayed as a jolly and an often drunken lot. The actual danger and risk of their profession, the hard labour involved in sailing and the problematic social circumstances they face when back on land, are thus left out. The sailors' heroicization through the continuous stress on their honesty, love for liberty and Englishness in this respect not only serves to draft a model of patriotic virtue, but also hails the sailors' apparent selflessness in defending the realm and can therefore be said to compensate for the sailors' belittling representation in other respects. In this regard, Hearty in George Alexander Stevens' *The Trip to Portsmouth*, fittingly summarizes the sailor's representation:

[...] There they are; the happy heroes of the present moment. There is something so truly original in the character of English seamen, so hearty, so disinterested, which is not to be met with in any other kingdom (TP, 26).

On the one hand, mariners are here praised as "heroes", as "truly" English and exceeding other nations' seamen, but on the other hand the constant reiteration of the mariners' "truly original" characters as "happy heroes" serves to downplay and gloss over the martial and dangerous aspects of the maritime profession. This appropriation extends to a portrayal of the sailor as a special class of people. Sailors are no longer cast in a negative or deprecatory way as "third sort of persons", but their "original" character singles them out as especially important for the nation's well-being. With regards to this aspect, Lieutenant Meanwell in *Britons Strike Home* claims: "They are the Sons of Liberty, Sir John. SIR JOHN: And the best Defence of it; the landed / Gentlemen of this Isle wou'd make but an ill Figure / without 'em" (BS, 11). In opposing the mariners to "landed Gentleman" their special status is appreciated and the profession is singled out as a particularly patriotic one. However, the sailors' heroicization, coupled with praise for the sailors' special social status as "sons of liberty", here also serves to reinforce sailors' willingness to make sacrifices in the name of the nation. Theatres thus put forward images of sailors "as a class of men outside the social order, and thus as individuals not only best suited but also most obliged to forfeit their rights as British subjects for the good of the empire".⁶⁶⁵

The representations as happy heroes and the heart of oak metaphor thus, on the one hand, function to paint the mariners as heroes – they are no longer outright cast as Other, as "third sort of persons", but symbolically become part of the nation. On the other hand, however, the stereotypical presentation of mariners as happy heroes, jolly, entertaining, honest and apt for drink, also functions to control as well as appropriate the mariners' alterity as it glosses over

665 Ennis 78.

many of the social, political and economic aspects that affect the maritime profession, especially in times of frequent warfare. The happy heroes of the mid-to late eighteenth-century stages, however, proved to be very popular characters and their increasing staging,⁶⁶⁶ especially in the first decades of the nineteenth century, not only has a part in the characters’ increasingly bourgeois and sentimental portrayal, but also in their continuing presence in the British cultural repertoire.

⁶⁶⁶ See Jim DAVIS, “British Bravery, or Tars Triumphant: Images of the British Navy in Nautical Melodrama”, *New Theatre Quarterly* 4 (1988): 122–143, Moody, *Illegitimate Theatre* and David WORRALL, *Theatric Revolutions: Drama, Censorship, and Romantic Period Subcultures 1773–1832* (Oxford: OUP, 2006).

4. Theatres of Escape: Plots of Difference and Proximity

4.1 The Stage as “Emporium”: Maritime Expansion and its “Place in the Town”

In Joseph Addison’s well-known description of the Royal Exchange in *The Spectator* No. 69 the author not only boasts excitement and pride at the manifestations of London’s status as “*Emporium* for the whole Earth”, enabling him “to hear Disputes adjusted between an Inhabitant of *Japan* and an Alderman of *London*, or to see a Subject of the *Great Mogul* entering into a League with one of the *Czar of Muscovy*”, but the text also conveys a sense of gratitude in having a “Place in the Town”, where one is reminded that “whilst we enjoy the remotest Products of the North and South, we are free from those Extremities of Weather which give them Birth”.⁶⁶⁷

In many respects, the period’s theatre also represented such a “Place in the Town” where the audience could observe alien and exotic settings, peoples, manners and costumes without having to trade in the playhouse for the discomfort and danger of a sea-journey. Staging the sea in this respect can be seen as one of the theatrical contributions to the representation of the expanding empire of the deep. In analytically organising the different aspects and agents of this staging, this study has focused on maritime spaces, islands and shores (Chapter 2), as sites for encounters and transformations – as well as utopias / dystopias – and on mariners (Chapter 3) as the prime stage personnel of maritime expansion and colonial maintenance. But staging the sea also involved specific plots and spectacles that can be said to express the increasing interconnectedness of the empire and that can be collected under the term “theatres of escape”. “Theatres of escape” is thus meant to present those plots

667 *The Spectator*, No.69 – Saturday, May 19, 1711 in: Erin Mackie ed., *The Commerce of Everyday Life: Selections from THE TATLER and THE SPECTATOR*, Bedford Cultural Editions (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin’s, 1998) 203–206.

and spectacles⁶⁶⁸ specifically engendered by maritime endeavours: plots and spectacles that can be characterized by an initial momentum of escape, such as piracy, flight from debt, fortune-seeking and “a-husband-hunting”⁶⁶⁹ in the colonies. Escape here does not merely denote escape from repression or detention, but has a more general meaning as it circumscribes a whole host of social, financial and economic motives that prompt characters to leave the British Isles and try to settle and find a fulfilling life elsewhere. The motif of emigration and that of remigration, here subsumed under the term “plots of escape”, serves to discuss aspects of difference and transgression which London, or the London stage, as “*Emporium* for the whole Earth”, materially and discursively generated. Theatres of escape and rushing into floods act as a more general cultural drive here, also pointing to the innate tensions of colonial expansion which meander between the apprehension of “economic boon and cultural miasma”.⁶⁷⁰ In this, plots of escape have to be understood as dramaturgical means to evoke transportation and present the interconnectedness of the circum-Atlantic, while the term theatres of escape also denotes the playhouses itself as “Places in the Town” where audiences could vicariously escape to far-away places. Finally, theatres of escape also display the theatricality of colonial acquisition while, at the same time, signifying this theatricality as expressive of the ambivalence of colonial hegemony, which renders them a site for identity and change,⁶⁷¹ difference and proximity.

With regard to this intercultural aspect of the London theatre, Choudhury claims that “the theater was the most effective venue for disavowing distance and denying displacement”,⁶⁷² highlighting the aptitude of the histrionic art to apply strategies of colonial discourses,⁶⁷³ but also emphasizing the interconnectedness and fluidity of the different spaces performed: “It is not the case that discursive material is transmitted intact between existing, fully formed discursive spaces

668 With “plot” this chapter denotes the narrative relation within a play, and “spectacle” refers to a scene regarded for its visual impact, see Erika FISCHER-LICHTE, Doris KOLESCH and Matthias WARSTAT ed. *Metzler Lexikon Theatertheorie* (Stuttgart and Weimar: J.B. Metzler, 2005) 136 and 305 f.

669 The expression is a quote from Thomas Southerne’s *Oroonoko*, where two of the female characters set out to go “a-husband-hunting in America” (I.i, 4), see 4.3.2.

670 As Kathleen Wilson describes the contemporary apprehension of the West Indies, Wilson, *The Island Race* 130. On the public and semi-public debates concerning colonial strategies and expectations and Britain’s foreign policy, see Jeremy BLACK, *Debating Foreign Policy in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011).

671 On this “conflictual economy of colonial discourse”, see Bhabha, “Of Mimicry and Man” 122.

672 Choudhury 32.

673 That is the “‘inscription and articulation of culture’s hybridity’ in the written and unwritten, voiced and silenced, visible and invisible dimensions of theatrical culture”, Choudhury 18.

which act as donors or hosts. Whole domains are constructed in interconnection with each other”.⁶⁷⁴ In interweaving local and global issues, theatres of escape reveal what Tillman W. Nechtman has termed a “geographic paradox”,⁶⁷⁵ one alarmingly felt by Robinson Crusoe upon discovering another person’s footprint on his island: “That single pedestrian impression braided his domestic world and his imperial project – two things he had previously understood to be distinct from one another – into a simultaneous narrative”.⁶⁷⁶ In another play on the coinage of empire and globalization and on Addison’s synecdoche, one could thus label the playhouse itself an “*Emporium* for the whole Earth”, or, as Nussbaum claims, a “kind of simulacrum [...] which itself became an atlas of England’s imperial world”.⁶⁷⁷

The plays under discussion in this chapter not only reveal a growing realization of the “simultaneous narratives” empire gives rise to,⁶⁷⁸ but also ascertain theatres of escape as performances for managing these narratives. In this regard, and more specifically, the plots and spectacles under discussion can be understood as archives as well as vehicles for fears and fantasies surrounding maritime expansion. Theatres of escape discuss categories of difference as shifting sets of categories that had to be performed in order to be recognized or, as Judith Butler maintains with regard to the “structuring presence of alterity in the very formulation of the ‘I’”, identifications which had to be “constantly marshalled, consolidated, retrenched, contested, and, on occasion, forced to give way”.⁶⁷⁹ The performance of difference is vital for the formulation and negotiation of the self in that it functions to familiarize the metropolitan population of empire with its colonial subjects. In this respect, my argument parallels Mary L. Pratt’s thesis on the function of European travel writing which, as she argues, served to give readers “a sense of ownership, entitlement and familiarity with respect to the distant parts of the world that were being explored, invaded, invested in, and colonized”.⁶⁸⁰ In applying this argument to play-texts one can thus claim that staging the sea also served to give audiences a “sense of familiarity” with the empire of the sea, collective identity can hence be said to be created through a performative interplay of difference and familiarity. This interplay of difference and proximity was acted out in several plots of maritime escape. Besides the

674 Stallybrass/White 61.

675 Tillman W. NECHTMAN, *Nabobs: Empire and Identity in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Cambridge: CUP, 2010) 3.

676 Nechtman 3.

677 Nussbaum, *The Global Eighteenth Century*, Introduction, 13.

678 A simultaneity also understood by Addison, who fancies himself “like the old Philosopher”, “a Citizen of the World”, in: Mackie 204.

679 Butler, *Bodies that Matter* 16.

680 Pratt 3.

geographical displacement staged in these plots, they also involved highly theatrical aspects of transgression: carnivalesque role reversals, cross-dressing and blackface.⁶⁸¹ This theatricality served to convey the hybrid nature of the maritime contact zone, and the attendant colonial mimicries can be analysed as discursive operations which draw attention to the ambivalence of colonial hierarchies, stabilizing, but also disrupting authority.⁶⁸²

The analysis of theatres of escape will be subdivided into three parts. The following subchapter will focus on plots of transgression as well as spectacles of the body as part of theatres of escape. Transgression, understood as that of actual geographical borders and that of traditions, decorum, social rank and legality, is an aspect that can be found in plays featuring plots of piracy, runaways and new colonial types such as plantation owners or slave holders. In a complementary analysis, the subchapter will also shift the focus to plays that display spectacles of Other bodies, representations that *produce* and focus in on the Other.⁶⁸³ Chapter 4.3, “What wind brought you hither?” will subsequently centre on plays that feature a specific type of escapist, namely characters that can be termed matrimonial refugees. These male characters can be found in a host of plays, all eager to employ the sea as an escape route *from* matrimonial duties and as an escape *to* financial gain, exotic pleasures and sexual variety. Matrimonial escape is comically punished in respective plays, the characters are shown as eventually unable to really escape as the centre’s reach is presented as extending to the most remote locations. In another complementary section, aspects of commodification will be analysed. Commodification here serves as a shibboleth for plays that feature specifically female escapists, namely characters that can be termed husband-hunters, in plots that not only maintain a close link between women and commerce, but that also exhibit the interconnectedness of the economic zone that joins London, the Med and the West Indies via the sea. The representation of new economic relations via women’s bodies serves to reify women’s marginal status, and also functions to appropriate female bodies as commodities and locations for desires and fears in the colonial context.⁶⁸⁴ Finally, in 4.4, “*Polly*: Reversals and Mimicries”, the focus will shift to a play that, strictly speaking, lies outside the catchment era of this study, John Gay’s comic opera *Polly* (1729). However,

681 For a study on the theatre history of staging blackface in England, see Anthony Gerard BARTHELEMY, *Black Face, Maligned Race: The Representation of Blacks in English Drama from Shakespeare to Southerne* (Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State UP, 1987).

682 See Bhabha, “Of Mimicry and Man”, *The Location of Culture* 126.

683 See Bhabha: “colonial discourse produces the colonised as a social reality”, “The Other Question”, *The Location of Culture* 101.

684 In the following, this introductory subchapter will only specifically focus on merchants, planters and pirates as characters featuring in the theatres of escape and not on husband-hunting women or slaves, because issues of gender and race pervade this whole study.

the opera does feature quintessential plots of maritime escape in its pooling of pirates, nouveau riches and run-aways, and also serves as a coda of sorts in that the play’s representation of a Caribbean colonial community stages colonial mimicries that disclose as well as disrupt colonial authority.

As already explored in Chapter 2, the initial drive of colonization is an outward move, going beyond the confines of a “sceptred isle”, shifting boundaries and exploring spaces or locations for expansion and ultimately even resettlement. These foreign locations, as well as peoples seeking these spaces,⁶⁸⁵ were treated suspiciously as movements across the sea were also accompanied by threats of danger and degeneracy. Indeed, as Wilson writes in regard to the cultural repute of the West Indies, foreign and exotic locations served “a Janus-faced function”: “attractive to travelers, playwrights, philosophers and naturalists as well as merchants and planters as outposts of New World exoticism and its mastery, the islands presented a theater of savagery and conquest, adventure and economic enterprise”.⁶⁸⁶ In this respect, colonial locations in general also underwent dual perceptions with regard to the valuation of their actual land and territory. On the one hand, as Richard Hakluyt had prominently suggested in his 1584 *A Discourse concerning Western Planting*, colonies were to serve as outcast-territory,⁶⁸⁷ as a “desirable outlet” for England’s overpopulation before the period of 1660,⁶⁸⁸ or as Dryden wrote about the “fools” in his play’s audience in the prologue to *Cleomenes, or the Spartan Hero* (1692): “Let ‘em go People Ireland, where there’s need / Of such new Planters to repair their Breed; / Or to Virginia or Jamaica steer”.⁶⁸⁹ On the other hand, colonial locations served as exotic settings that aroused fantasies of escape and conquest. Restoration and early eighteenth-century drama thus abounded with exotic settings. Plays such as Elkanah Settle’s

685 See Flavel’s notion of “third sort of persons”, discussed in Chapter 3. However, the notion of the dangerous sea also spotlights colonial merchants as ambivalent figures, as Ian K. Steele notes: “were members of the colonial elite daredevils driven by vanity and greed? Or the seamen?”, see Ian K. STEELE, *The English Atlantic 1675–1740: An Exploration of Communication and Community* (Oxford: OUP, 1986) 12.

686 Wilson, *Island Race* 129.

687 For an analysis of the importance of migration for the success of England’s first overseas empire with a special focus on the first decades of the seventeenth century, see Alison GAMES, *Migration and the Origin of the English Atlantic World* (Cambridge/Mass. and London: Harvard UP, 1999).

688 See Richard B. SHERIDAN, *Sugar and Slavery: An Economic History of the British West Indies* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1973): “it was widely believed that England suffered from overpopulation and that colonies provided a desirable outlet” 7.

689 See Dryden, *The Works of John Dryden, Vol. XVI, Plays: King Author [sic!], Cleomenes, Love Triumphant, Contributions to the Pilgrim*, ed. Vinton A. Dearing (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: U of California P, 1996), the esteem for such “fools” is furthered in the prologue which goes on: “But have a care of some French Privateer; / For if they should become the Prize of Battle, / They’ll take ‘em Black and White for Irish Cattle” (13–18).

The Conquest of China by the Tartars (1676), Dryden's *Aureng-zebe* (1675) or Delariviere Manley's *Almyna; or the Arabian Vow* (1706), set in China, India and "Arabia" respectively, offered numerous ways to visually as well as ethnographically⁶⁹⁰ travel the sea and, at least imaginatively, escape the metropolis. The following focus will, however, be on plays that offer plots of escape that feature solely English characters and which are not historically displaced, but instead are contemporary, depicting routes inherently connected with the economic growth and attendant maritime expansion. The theatres of escape as analysed in this chapter are thus much more tangibly connected to the development and opportunities offered by the rise of mercantile capitalism. This development not only makes foreign spaces accessible through the exploration of new routes and lands, and thus expands the empire horizontally, but also expands it vertically in that mercantile capitalism spurred novel ways of social advancement, profession and transportation.

"It is said of England, by way of distinction, and we all value ourselves upon it, that it is a trading country",⁶⁹¹ Defoe asserts in his *The Complete English Tradesman* (1726). Fine-tuning his appraisal, he goes on to state that "the rising greatness of the British nation is not owing to war and conquests, to enlarging its dominion by the sword, or subjecting the people of other countries to our power; but it is all owing to trade".⁶⁹² Never mind the naive or, better, ignorant assertion that England as a trading country did not coerce through violence or power, Defoe's estimation as to the character of England's "rising greatness" integrates a crucial development, namely the increasing prominence of overseas trade. The financial revolution of the 1690s, with the foundation of the Bank of England (1694), the Board of Trade and Plantations (1697) and an array of monopolist trading companies⁶⁹³ not only severed the financial predominance of freehold property towards the end of the seventeenth century – all the while creating new opportunities for social improvement –, but it also established a powerful consensus on the "universal benefits of economic expansion and of an energetic, wide-ranging but incomplete ideological hegemony"⁶⁹⁴ in the late seventeenth- and early eighteenth century.⁶⁹⁵ Certainly, as Rediker vividly illustrates this

690 E.g. with the depiction of foreign costume or blackface, see Dietrich KREIDT, *Exotische Figuren und Motive im Europäischen Theater*, Ausstellungskatalog Exotische Welten, Europäische Phantasien (Stuttgart: Edition Cantz, 1987).

691 Daniel DEFOE, *The Complete English Tradesman*, 1726 (Gloucester: Allan Sutton Publ., 1987) Chapter XXII.

692 Ibid. Chapter XXV.

693 Like the United East India Company and other chartered companies.

694 Brown, *Ends of Empire* 3.

695 For an interdisciplinary study of the development of the "homo oeconomicus", see Laurenz VOLKMANN, *Homo Oeconomicus: Studien zur Modellierung eines neuen Menschenbilds in*

development, economic expansion was tantamount with maritime trade: “English trade routes constituted the arteries of the imperial body between 1650 and 1750. [...] These pulsing routes, stretching from one port city to the next, were the material elementary structures of the empire”.⁶⁹⁶ And, as James Walvin plainly asserts, the “material benefits of dominance over distant places and peoples [...] were there for all to see”.⁶⁹⁷

However, as much as the newly risen merchant class was perceived as successful global players,⁶⁹⁸ and as much as merchants were thus glorified as promoters of wealth and progress,⁶⁹⁹ economic expansion equally underwent an ambivalent social and cultural assessment. As David Dabydeen shows on the basis of Hogarth’s series of paintings *A Rake’s Progress*,⁷⁰⁰ merchants and the alleged progress created by trade were also targeted as its opposite, namely decline and disease. In plate 8, “In the Madhouse” (Figure 1), the last of the series, one can detect a drawing on the wall showing the figure of Britannia, as well as a ship, a canon and a geographical diagram, with all of these images being understood, as Dabydeen explains, as – ironic – “emblems of the imperialistic culture that has caused Rakewell’s degradation: his father after all had got his money, the money that destroys Rakewell, from India bonds, the value of which depended on the profits arising from the exploitation of ‘savages’”.⁷⁰¹

The ambivalence in the appraisal of mercantile outcomes is also closely tied in with an ambivalent estimate of consumer goods and colonial produce. In the drama of the period, as we have seen, characters overacting their esteem of such produce, like Mizen in *The Fair Quaker of Deal* or Banter in *Sir Harry Wildair*, are singled out and ridiculed. But, and this aspect emphasizes the interconnectedness of local and global degradation, characters associated with colonial departures and escapes are not only related to effeminacy or savagery, but are also

der englischen Literatur vom Mittelalter bis zum 18. Jahrhundert (Heidelberg: Winter, 2003).

696 Rediker, *Between the Devil and the Deep Blue Sea* 21.

697 Walvin 187.

698 See Rediker, who claims that the early English merchant was a “pivotal figure in the consolidation of power during the early rise of capitalism”, *Between the Devil and the Deep Blue Sea* 21.

699 See John McVEAGH, *Tradefull Merchants: The Portrayal of the Capitalist in Literature*, (London, Boston and Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981). For dramatic representations of merchants, see e.g. Dryden’s *Amboyna, or the Cruelties of the Dutch to the English Merchants* (1673), Crowne’s *Sir Courtly Nice, or it cannot be* (1685), Nicholas Rowe’s *The Biter* (1705) and Centlivre’s *A Bold Stroke for a Wife* (1717).

700 The series was published in 1735.

701 David DABYDEEN, *Hogarth’s Blacks: Images of Blacks in Eighteenth Century English Art* [sic!] (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1987) 99. For an account of the different apprehensions of colonial import, see also Sheridan, Chapter 1.3 “The Tropic Empire: The Colonial Debate”, 5–10.



William Hogarth, *A Rake's Progress*, plate 8, a print 1735, © The Trustees of the British Museum

presented as exhibiting the decay and corruption of the metropolis,⁷⁰² indicating that theatres of escape are as much spectacles of the Other as of the self and thus also served as instances for critical reflection.

The degeneracy of colonial escapees said to capsize English values and civility was prominently attached to planters, persons that represented neuralgic figures of the “oceanic interculture”⁷⁰³ and made up the expanded social and economic sphere of the empire. Planters were increasingly perceived as persons of a suspect social origin, but nonetheless growing wealthy and thus influential, as Wilson explicates:

By the eighteenth century, when the lethal but fabulously profitable combination of sugar and slaves had become entrenched in plantation monoculture, the islands attracted the younger sons, older daughters and otherwise disadvantaged offspring of the

702 As, for example, the town-blades presented in *A Common-Wealth of Women*.

703 Roach 5. In many ways this formulation is indebted to Paul Gilroy's historical extension of the cultural horizons in his study of *The Black Atlantic*, as has been explicated in Chapter 1.

British Isles who sought to acquire status or fortunes, usually with the hopes of returning ‘home’ remade.⁷⁰⁴

The apprehension of returned planters as “conspicuous figure[s]”⁷⁰⁵ is also characteristic of the antagonisms and rising tensions between a mainly aristocratic elite and an increasingly financially powerful class of colonial merchants.⁷⁰⁶ Notwithstanding the substantial colonial investments of great parts of the aristocracy, the aristocratic class sought to distance itself from the merchant classes, a distancing which in turn, as Wilson aptly shows with regard to the case of Admiral Vernon,⁷⁰⁷ led to an increasing ill feeling against the aristocracy.

In this respect, merchants and planters provide models for vertical as well as horizontal escapism in terms of both transportation and social advancement. As much as these both fictional and real characters were ambiguously represented, the pirate, as the quintessential escapist, functioned as the most prominent “cultural mechanism”⁷⁰⁸ of negotiating concepts of desire and deviance in the circum-Atlantic:

Go tell the King of England,
go tell him this from me,
If he reign King of all the Land,
I will reign King at Sea.⁷⁰⁹

This stanza from a mid seventeenth-century ballad,⁷¹⁰ recounting the life of pirate-captain Ward, not only poses an affront to the English monarch, but also discloses the pirate’s self-image. In appointing himself “King”, the pirate confronts the space of the sea, where he deems himself ruler, with the space of “the Land”. The pirate thus implicates that not only is the maritime sphere exempt from the English monarch’s rule, but the sea consequently offers a space for social and political utopias. This aspect, as we have seen, encapsulates fantasies dramatized in such plays as *The Enchanted Island, A Common-Wealth of Women*

704 Wilson, *The Island Race* 130. For these aspects of plantation culture, see also Games and Sheridan.

705 “The West Indian who returned to Great Britain to live on the profits of his slave-manned plantation was a conspicuous figure in the 18th century. He acquired a reputation for hospitality, conspicuous consumption, and slavish imitation of the landed aristocracy. Not infrequently he was the butt of ridicule”, Sheridan 12 f.

706 See Colley, *Britons* and Newman.

707 Wilson, *The Sense of the People* 140–143.

708 For this term, see Claire JOWITT, *The Culture of Piracy, 1580–1630: English Literature and Seaborne Crime* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010) 1–17.

709 ANON. *The famous sea-fight between Captain Ward and the Rain-bow* (London: Printed for F. Coles, in Vine-street, near Hatton-Garden, 1650).

710 The ballad was popular and sung at least until the mid-nineteenth century, in EEBO and ECCO one finds editions ranging from 1650 until 1780, published in London, Northampton and Glasgow.

or *The Successful Pyrate*, which staged visions of social reversal and exotic affluence.

However, contrary to the incompetent characters in Johnson's play, pirates posed real-life hazards to the maritime order. The "Golden Age of Piracy",⁷¹¹ as the period from roughly 1660 – 1730 is called, presented numerous challenges to the state authorities. Piracy not only threatened the backbone of naval authorities in that it offered an alternative to the submissive discipline on-board ships,⁷¹² whilst challenging royal authority in devising laws and even setting up whole independent settler communities, but it most damagingly constituted a "crime against mercantile property".⁷¹³ In his study on merchant seamen and pirates, *Between the Devil and the Deep Blue Sea* (1987), Rediker describes English maritime trade routes as "the arteries of the imperial body".⁷¹⁴ In maintaining this image, the importance of an uninterrupted flow of trade on these routes becomes obvious. In this regard, pirates come into view as primarily responsible for disrupting the flow of trade and so derailing economic growth and profits, as Robert C. Ritchie writes. When "the merchant community expanded, it looked upon the world with different eyes: it prized order and regularity because they enhanced profits; disorder interrupted the regular flow of trade".⁷¹⁵ Accordingly, piracy was politically constructed as a crime,⁷¹⁶ and the "piratical subject", as Turley specifies the figure,⁷¹⁷ was construed as violent Other outside of civil society.⁷¹⁸ In many respects the "piratical subject" thus also turned into a highly ideological label and functioned, as Rediker claims in his seminal study on the subject, "as the maritime equivalent of the barbarian".⁷¹⁹

In many ways, pirates not only stand as epitomes of escape, but also embody the simultaneity of the colonial narratives they were part of. While pirates were

711 See e.g. Joel H. BAER, ed. *British Piracy in the Golden Age: History and Interpretation, 1660 – 1730*, Vol.1. (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007).

712 See Rediker for an engaged analysis of aspects concerning pirates' revolt against naval discipline, *Villains of All Nations*, especially Chapter 2 "The Political Arithmetic of Piracy" 19 – 37.

713 Rediker, *Villains of All Nations* 5.

714 Rediker, *Between the Devil and the Deep-Blue Sea* 21.

715 Robert C. RITCHIE, *Captain Kidd and the War against the Pirates* (Cambridge/Mass. and London: Harvard UP, 1986) 128.

716 See Joel H. Baer x.

717 See Turley, especially 36, 41 – 43.

718 For aspects of violence in representations of pirates, see Oliver LINDNER, 'Matters of Blood': *Defoe and the Culture of Violence* (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2010) especially 173 – 186.

719 Rediker, *Villains of All Nations* 174. The pirate construed as "hostis humani generis" also tends to obscure the scope of the figure's importance as a symbol for the concentration of the maritime world. For piracy's importance as a cultural mechanism in the early modern period, see Jowitt.

acting, capturing and plundering on faraway floating stages, the metropolitan public eagerly followed their fortunes and eventually witnessed the pirates’ hangings locally, outside The Pelican⁷²⁰ in London’s district of Wapping. Piracy was one of the most popular contemporary newspaper topics – pirates’ dying speeches were fervently anticipated and the confessions and biographies of the most notorious figures often ran through several editions.⁷²¹ Similar to the figure of the merchant and the planter, the pirate thus personifies the interconnectedness of the empire of the deep as the figure connects not only different cultures,⁷²² but also routes and regions. The pirate stands for political and economic deviance and transgression, suspending the brazen disciplinary rules of the maritime community and eventually soaring up to defy notions of property and legality.⁷²³ And, as the lines from the ballad quoted above suggest, pirates self-fashioning as social climbers added to their representational appeal, a self-fashioning that was – with at times great connoisseurship of effective staging – enforced with their use of expensive clothes and accessories: “They delighted in such brilliant costumes because in Europe the use of luxury fabrics was confined by law to the upper classes. On the peripheries of empire they could indulge themselves and flaunt sumptuary legislation”.⁷²⁴ As the pirates’ own aptitude for the histrionic art suggests, the figure’s discursive representation was characterised by a pallet of features that encoded the figure’s ambivalence and also provoked rather ambivalent portrayals.⁷²⁵ Pirates thus can be analysed as powerful figures who initiated plots and spectacles of escape that were – considering the character’s remarkable theatrical suitability – well matched for dramatic performance.

This chapter will discuss these different figures of escape which exemplify plots of transgression and prompt spectacles of the body that serve to performatively negotiate the empire’s metropolitan subjects.⁷²⁶ Parts of these theatres of escape are also exemplified by other characters, mostly women, who avail the options of maritime escape as they go “a-husband-hunting” in the

720 The hangings in Wapping took place outside The Pelican, the pub also being called The Devil’s Tavern at the time – the venue is still there and is now called The Prospect of Whitby.

721 There are numerous records on EEBO, ECCO as well as in the Public Records Office regarding pirate news, trials and hangings.

722 Pirate-communities were not exclusively British, about a quarter of a crew stemmed from North America and the West Indies, see Rediker, *Villains of All Nations* 52.

723 But, as Turley proposes in his study on piracy and masculine identity, pirates can also be seen as sexually transgressive as their representations oscillate between hypermasculine portrayals and the highlighting of homoerotic features in an all-male community, see Turley 2.

724 Ritchie 114.

725 As has already been shown in the discussion of Arviragus in *The Successful Pyrate*, see Chapter 2.5.

726 For the notion of a “domestic subject” of empire, see John M. MacKENZIE, *Orientalism: History, Theory and the Arts* (Manchester and New York: Manchester UP, 1995) 21.

colonies. The portrayal of these women mirrors a discourse in a set of texts about colonial life depicting such Englishwomen as licentious⁷²⁷ and commodified, while it also mirrors a discourse concerned with the analogous treatment of women and slaves, with slaves representing, despite one memorable exception, a silent crowd on the metropolitan stages.

4.2 “Running Away by Water”: Fates of Escape and Visions of New Worlds

4.2.1 Failed Escapes, Shattered Dreams and Reluctant Returns

As we have seen with regard to the figure of the mariner, representations of persons setting out to sail and roam the world were, to various degrees, tinged with ambivalence and the lurking notion that a certain degree of personal deviance underscored such endeavours. The theatrical representations of the characters’ motivations and the dangers of “running away by water”⁷²⁸ oscillated between staging theatres of escape as expeditions to failure or as expeditions requiring disciplining treatments or personal overhauls along with varying degrees of repentance. “Running away by water” – as a variation of rushing into floods – performed in the plots under discussion is subjected to regulation while, at the same time, it also disseminates knowledge about the dangers and benefits of colonial flight and, as such, about the colonial project per se.

In terms of motivation and eventual dramatic fate, *Sir Barnaby Rigg* and *Cuckolds-Haven* provide memorable and highly comical instances of failed escape plots and dreams. In both plays, the escape-fantasies centre on the default triad of colonial promise: conquering and appropriating some exotic space, taking advantage of local produce,⁷²⁹ and ultimately establishing oneself for good

727 See Margaret FERGUSON, Chapter 5: “News from the New World: Miscegenous Romance in Aphra Behn’s *Oroonoko* and *The Widow Ranter*”, 151–189, 158 f in: David Lee Miller, Sharon O’Dair and Harold Weber eds., *The Production of English Renaissance Culture* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1994). For this gendered colonial discourse see also David Brion DAVIS, *The Problem of Slavery in Western Culture* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1966) 277. See also Wycherley’s epistle dedicatory to *The Plain Dealer*: “For a comic poet and a lady of your profession make most of the other sort, and the stage and your houses, like our plantations, are propagated by the least nice women” (PD, Epistle Dedicatory, 111–114).

728 The title of this subchapter refers to a remark from *Cuckolds-Haven*, where the Alderman fears that his wife has “run away by Water” (CW, II, 28). “Running away by Water” thus takes up this cue and extends it to a broader phenomenon.

729 “Produce” is in this respect a rather euphemistic term as it not only designates actually produced commodities, but the plunder of resources, such as gold and jewels, as well as sexual exploitation of natives.

in the New World. This is explicitly spelled out by the Captain in *Sir Barnaby Whigg*: “And I’le to Sea agen, I and my Jolly Crew [...] there will I Conquer some flourishing / Island, where I will plant a Colony, live out the rest of my days merrily, and / defie the Devil and Fortune” (BW, V. ii, 61). However, his plan is set in a dubious light as the character is represented as aberrant, lewd and socially inept, as well as cozening his wife with whores, and eventually his announced departure is neither staged nor referred to again in the remaining dramatic unravelling of the play. As we have seen, the moral and social baseness of some maritime escapists is also arrestingly portrayed in *Cuckolds-Haven*. Here the plotting of the escape is tellingly set in a tavern, where Captain Seagull and his sailors get drunk and attempt to arrange their escape. Here, the Captain projects the sailors’ dreams onto the New World they are about to embark to: endless riches and fortune, no government and social control (II. iii). Yet the crew’s dreams of global fortune are locally shattered in that the crew, alongside the other deceitful characters, frauds and run-away women, shipwreck in East London. With fisher-nets draped around their bodies, the crew is subsequently exposed to performative ridicule as their appearance not only portends their utter incompetence, but also quite literally nets their bodies and thus offers them up for intra-textual punishment⁷³⁰ as well as the laughter of the audience.

Another notable example of the on-stage disciplining of characters who “Ramble to Sea” (CW, *Dramatis Personae*) is presented in D’Urfey’s *A Commonwealth of Women*, which has already been discussed in Chapter 2.3. In this play, the escape itself is initially successful, at least in so far as the crew lands in the New World. Their journey is halted by a shipwreck which strands the crew on a desert island. In D’Urfey’s play, the motivations for escape of the three “wild Fellows of the Town” (CW, *Dramatis Personae*) is shown as more complex and varied as in the other plays just mentioned. The default triad mentioned above is here expanded⁷³¹ to a sexual deviance that encompasses not only the flight from their spouses, but also the longing for a more fashionable approach to dress, as the initial discussion of the plan unveils:

FRUGAL: First we have sworn to take a Ramble to Sea for three years,
and during that Term, we have oblig’d our selves never to con-
verse with our Wives, kiss our Wives, nor remember our Wives (CW, I, 6).

Franville goes on to add to his excitement the following remark: “I have / prepar’d a Wardrobe, that shall outshine the Sun in the new World, / where we are going” (CW, I, 7), indicating that the “new World” for him not only promises a bright

730 As they are hence easily caught by the authorities (CH, III).

731 Frugal expresses the triad the following, he does: “intend to seek some other / Countrey; where I will live, grow rich, and plant a Colony” (CW, I, 7).

place, but also a place for indulging in his – secret – passions. Just as the expectations are portrayed as more varied in this play, so the reasons for their failure are more specifically depicted. As already shown in Chapter 2, the lust for gold and the Portuguese treasure is presented as initiating the ill fate of the three “blades of the town”. Their New World-dreams are correspondingly debunked in that their final possession of the golden treasure very graphically contrasts with their lack of provisions:

FRANVILE: When I was speaking of happiness: I was thinking what a pleasure my Dogs had, when I kept House at Home – they had a Store-House, a Store-House of most blessed Bones, and Crusts: hard and happy Crusts (CW, III, 31).

Franvile’s reminiscing about the comforts of his home in England here take on a comical note – his pet appearing as a happy creature in having access to “blessed Bones, and Crusts” his former master now utterly lacks. This talk of provisions, bones and crusts, triggers a plot that establishes the runaways as characters falling victim to savagery as their dialogue now unveils alarming fantasies. Alongside the ship’s surgeon, the three men debate killing and eating Aminta, the only woman left with them.⁷³² This scheme presents the characters as “barbarous Men!” (CW, Aminta, III, 33), while also highlighting the quick deterioration of civility the men are falling prey to. After first bemoaning the lack of any trimmings or at least some salt for seasoning, the Surgeon exclaims: “Let’s kill her any way, and kill her quickly; that we may / go to supper” (CW, III, 32). In presenting the men as cannibals,⁷³³ only just prevented from their culinary deed by Manly’s return, the escaped English are not just associated with savagery and absolute alterity, but in fact – as Kirsten Guest points out about the trope of cannibalism – their representation as cannibals can be read “as a symbol of the permeability, or instability”⁷³⁴ of boundaries between the self and the Other. The chain of events leading up to this scene shows the escaping characters as deviant and greedy, but this scene presents the characters’ attempted cannibalism as demonstration of the permeability of order and the easy collapse of civility within a colonial environment. However, the threatened order is stabilized again as the characters’ intentions are subsequently severely punished in that they are performatively downgraded and stripped off their autonomy, both as men and as characters. Yet, *A Common-Wealth of Women* does not present forays into the

732 In this respect one could also discuss whether the eating of the only remaining female can be seen as an act of competitive masculinity or plain reproductive foolishness.

733 For an analysis of the theme of cannibalism, see Francis BARKER, Peter HULME and Margaret IVERSEN, *Cannibalism and the Colonial World* (Cambridge: CUP, 1998).

734 Kristen GUEST ed. *Eating their Words: Cannibalism and the Boundaries of Cultural Identity* (Albany: State U of New York P, 2001) 2.

New World as basically doomed, as the island eventually emerges as indeed offering a vision of colonial abundance: endless provisions, lush landscapes and willing female inhabitants.⁷³⁵ As has already been examined in the previous discussion of the play, the crew's continuance on the island indicates that colonial dreams can – despite threats of transgression and savagery – be satisfied in the New World.

The performative disciplining of the transgressive town-blades in D'Urfey's play portrays an extreme case of the chastising of transgression. Conversely, Johnson's play *The Successful Pyrate*, albeit neither putting forward an unequivocal redemption of colonial alternatives, works in more subtle ways to discipline transgression. The play's eponymous character, the successful pirate Arviragus, is portrayed rather ambiguously. The title of the play already suggests a more ambivalent presentation of Arviragus' identity and, as has been shown before, the presentation includes accounts of his virtue and leadership-skills as well as his more problematic and egocentric features. This ambivalent presentation sets him apart from the more straightforward comic as well as savage characterization of Franville, Frugal and Hazard. Arviragus' eventual downfall and his dramaturgical repentance are also, as in D'Urfey's play, initiated by a plot involving a female character. The pirate falls for an Indian princess and his passion for the woman's body thus in a way parallels the town-blades falling for the culinary appeal of Aminta's body. In both plays, the lure of the Other body incorporates the characters into a discourse of colonialism that equates the falling for a female – native – body⁷³⁶ with degeneration and savagery.

On another level, Arviragus' transgressions and the respective dramaturgical disciplining of his overt ambitions are complemented by the transgressive nature of the rest of the pirate-community. The plots involving the other pirates continuously commemorate the foreign setting's proximity to the metropolis in that it depicts the pirates as escaped metropolitan "mimic men". The pirates are portrayed as mimicking fashionable society in London and together stage a court-trial that underlines their metropolitan ambitions and re-self-fashioning as judges and lawyers in Madagascar. These comic re-representations⁷³⁷ serve to

735 Of course, the representation of the Amazonian commonwealth is complicated in the play, see 2. 3.

736 Aminta in *A Common-Wealth of Women* is not indigenous or native to the very island the play is set on, but she is still a foreign woman and – as has been shown in 2.3 – her character is in many respects associated with the foreign space of the island.

737 Re-representation and re-self-fashioning points to the fact that the characters did not simply engage in self-fashioning, but engaged in a re-modelling of their identities in a colonial environment that offered such opportunities that were not to be had in England, see e. g. *The Successful Pyrate* where Boreal claims that Tulip, after he had been betrayed by an alleged "Dutchess" (SP, I, i, 4) and realized "that his Credit in old/England had given up

lessen the distance between New and Old World, but they also function to theatrically control colonial transgression in that they offer the characters up for ridicule.

As these examples convey, colonial spaces materially as well as discursively functioned as screens for colonial fantasies like the amassing of wealth, the pursuit of social ambitions as well as the escape *from* and escape *to* women's bodies. Colonial spaces additionally provided – imaginative and real – locations for escapes from penal action, debt and other discomforts of English life that also serve to refashion the escapees' metropolitan identities. In this respect, Aphra Behn's *The Widdow Ranter, or, The History of Bacon in Virginia* provides an outstanding example as the play offers numerous examples of colonial re-representations and renewals.

4.2.2 *The Widdow Ranter*: “Basking Under the Shade”

Behn's tragicomedy – one staged posthumously⁷³⁸ – is set in colonial Virginia⁷³⁹ and recounts Bacon's rebellion of 1676, depicting both actual historical events and an alteration⁷⁴⁰ for dramatic purposes. Nathaniel Bacon fights the “Indians” without commission from the colonial council which is thus forced to treat his actions as rebellion. Additionally, the council is persuaded by two of its cowardly members, Whimsey and Whiff, that Bacon is merely pursuing his love for the Indian Queen Semernia in his actions, aiming to kill her husband Cavernio. Bacon is subsequently prosecuted, but the populace riots and, as the councillors proceed to fight Bacon, the Indians attack and Bacon, now leading the troops, retaliates, killing Cavernio. After further skirmishes with remnants of the Indian fugitives, Bacon accidentally killing the cross-dressed Semernia, the rebel kills himself upon thinking that his and his men's case is lost. Just as he is breathing his last, however, his men claim victory and Colonel Wellman, the deputy governor, takes action in declaring to relieve the council of its unvirtuous members, replacing them with honourable men. The play concludes with a series of

the last Gasp”, so “he wisely projected to / transport himself, with a Cargo of Essence, Snuff and Powder, / to the West Indies” (SP I. i, 4 f).

738 The play was probably written in 1688, first performed in 1689 and published a year later.

739 For the resemblance of the colony of Virginia and “old England”, see Jack GREENE, *Pursuits of Happiness: The Social Development of Early Modern British Colonies and the Formation of American Culture* (Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1988), Chapter 4.

740 Or distortion as Hutner claims, see Hutner, *Colonial Women* 99. For possible sources of the play see Janet Todd's preface to *The Widdow Ranter* 287–292, Charles L. BATTEN JR., “The Source of Aphra Behn's *The Widow Ranter*”, *Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Theatre Research* 13 (1974): 12–18 and Wilber Henry WARD, “Mrs. Behn's *The Widow Ranter*: Historical Sources”, *South Atlantic Bulletin*, 41.4 (1976): 94–98.

marriages including – amongst others – that between the new general Daring to the wealthy Widdow Ranter. As order is thus restored, Timerous Cornet, one of the relieved council members, happily exclaims: “I’le to my old Trade again, bask/ under the shade of my own Tobacco, and Drink my Punch in Peace” (WR, V. v, 396 f).⁷⁴¹

This vision of an English planter, living merrily in the New World, is an apt image for the themes I want to single out in my reading of *The Widdow Ranter*. The play is, to a great extent, populated with colonial officials and military leaders that are, as George Jenkins⁷⁴² explicates in the epistle dedicatory, characters “such only as our *Newgate* afforded” (WR, Epistle Dedicatory, 36). In this Behn not only represents another host of transgressive and deviant colonial escapists, but ultimately promotes the colonial project as the play finally closes with a fairly idyllic – at least from a planter’s perspective – vision. The disturbing potential of the deviant, cowardly and drunken characters is at last averted as order is eventually restored and the threats generated by the drunken rabble are contained through the other, more honourable, English characters, as well as through the play’s comic re-representations that function to reduce potential threats by presenting them as comic. Further, as will be shown subsequently in “Feathers and Veils: The Lure of the Other”, the play also puts forward spectacles of the Other body that reinscribe colonial discourses in that they develop the racial and sexual difference of the object of desire and derision⁷⁴³ and insinuate the dangers of going native and miscegenation.

The Widdow Ranter premiered on the 20th of November 1690 at the Theatre Royal in Drury Lane and there are, to date, no records of a subsequent showing. According to one of its modern editors, the play’s initial lack of success⁷⁴⁴ can be attributed to the “indifferent performers”, “unfitted for the part” so that “it would seem that the casting was done on purpose perversely and malignly to damn the play”.⁷⁴⁵ Up until recent years the play equally did not fare too well with critics. However, the growing interest in Behn’s oeuvre as well as the ever developing concern with colonial aspects of early modern literature produced an

741 All quotations from Aphra BEHN, *The Works of Aphra Behn, Vol. 7: The Plays 1682–1696*, ed. Janet Todd (London: William Pickering, 1996). References for quotations are given in the form “I. i, 1”, the first number represents the act, the second number the scene and the third number the line.

742 The epistle dedicatory is merely signed “G.J.”, Todd suggests these initials stand for George Jenkins, see her introduction to the play, 287.

743 See Bhabha, “The Other Question”, *The Location of Culture* 96.

744 *The Index to the London Stage* records only one performance, but there are records of two contemporary editions in EEBO.

745 Montague SUMMERS, “Introduction”, in: Aphra Behn, *The Works of Aphra Behn, Vol. IV (Sir Patient Fancy, The Amorous Prince, The Widow Ranter, The Younger Brother)*, ed. Montague Summers, 1915, reprint (New York: Phaeton Press, 1967) 219.

array of readings focusing on the play's political comment as well as its representation of interracial contact.⁷⁴⁶ Colonial drama, especially Oriental and Spanish colonial drama,⁷⁴⁷ was a favourite with the period's audiences. Notably Dryden, who contributed the prologue to Behn's play, portrayed heroic colonial endeavours in his plays *The Indian Queen* (1664, a collaboration with Robert Howard), *The Indian Emperour* (1665) and *Amboyna* (1673). These plays, unlike *The Widdow Ranter*, are temporally removed and do not depict – with the exception of *Amboyna* – English characters. In her last play, Behn – herself having been to the colony of Surinam – thus took on a prominent topic, not just in a more general thematic regard, but in her choice of setting. As mentioned in the introductory section to “Theatres of Escape”, debates on the nature of colonial (merchant) adventurers were highly visible in English public discourse⁷⁴⁸ and Virginia is, in this regard, conspicuous. Karen Ordahl Kupperman even suggests that an association with Virginia could almost be used as an insult as it evoked images of self-interested and greedy colonials.⁷⁴⁹ And, with contemporary authority, the colony's governor William Berkeley noted that: “None but those of the meanest quality and corruptest lives”⁷⁵⁰ go to Virginia.

Behn very much thrives on this opinion, pooling together a group of transported criminals and drunken up-starts who represent a substantial part of Virginian colonial society. However, as previously stated, Virginia – in *The Widdow Ranter* – is also peopled with more honourable men, English escapists that eventually serve to ensure by way of marriage that Virginia is “People'd with a well-/born Race” (WR, I.i, 105 f, Friendly). Upon his arrival from England

746 See HUTNER, *Rereading Aphra Behn: History, Theory, and Criticism* (Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1993), Ferguson in: Miller/O'Dair/Weber, Margo HENDRICKS, “Civility, Barbarism, and Aphra Behn's *The Widow Ranter*”, in: Margo HENDRICKS and Patricia PARKER eds. *Women, 'Race,' and Writing in the Early Modern Period* (London and New York: Routledge, 1994), 225–239. For the relationship between white and native women and aspects of ethnic difference, see Hutner, “Aphra Behn's *The Widow Ranter*” in: Hutner, *Colonial Women* 89–106, Roach 125–130, Jacqueline PEARSON, “Slave Princes and Lady Monsters: Gender and Ethnic Difference in the Work of Aphra Behn” in: Janet Todd ed., *Aphra Behn Studies* (Cambridge: CUP, 1996) 219–234. For an analysis of the play's political imbrications, see Aspasia VELISSARIOU, “'Tis Pity That When Laws Are Faulty They Should Not Be Mended or Abolish'd: Authority, Legitimation, and Honor in Aphra Behn's *The Widdow Ranter*”, *Papers on Language and Literature*, 38.2 (2002): 137–166.

747 As in plays such as Settle's *Ibrahim the Illustrious Bassa* (1676), Mary Pix' *Ibrahim the Thirteenth Emperor of the Turks* (1695–96) and Dryden's *The Conquest of Granada* (1670) and his *Don Sebastian* (1690), to name but a few.

748 See Black, *Debating Foreign Policy*, esp. “Chapter 5: The New Age of War, 1689–1714” 83–98.

749 See Karen Ordahl KUPPERMAN, “Presentment of Civility: English Reading of American Self-Presentation in the Early Years of Colonization”, *The William and Mary Quarterly* 54.1 (1997): 193–228.

750 William BERKELEY, *A Discourse and View of Virginia*, 1663, ed. Thomas R. Stewart (Norwalk: William H. Smith Jr., 1914) 3.

Hazard meets Friendly, an old friend from England, and recounts his reasons for shipping over to the American colony:

Why (faith) Ill Company, and that common Vice of the Town,
Gaming, [...]
[...] My Elder Brother an Errant Jew, had
neither Friendship nor Honour enough to Support me, but at last was
mollified by perswasions and the hopes of being for ever rid of me, sent
me hither with a small Cargo to seek my fortune,– (WR, I. i, 39–45).

Hazard, a so-called “younger brother”,⁷⁵¹ presents his flight from England not as initiated by colonial fantasies of riches and fortune, but rather spurred by the limited social options his crushing debts had left him with: “I had rather starve abroad than /live Pitty’d and dispised at home” (WR, I. i, 52 f). His arrival in Virginia, marked at first glance with an air of desperation, is subsequently presented as a stroke of luck as his old acquaintance Friendly ensures Hazard that Virginia offers plenty opportunities for “well-born” people:

This Country wants nothing but to be People’d with a well-
born Race, to make it one of the best Collonies in the World, but for want
of a Governour we are Ruled by a Councill, some of which have been
perhaps transported Criminals, who having Acquired great Estates are
now become your Honour, and Right Worshipful, and Possess all Places
of Authority; there are amongst ‘em some honest Gentlemen, who now
begin to take upon ‘em, and manage Affairs as they ought to be (WR, I. i, 105–111).

Friendly here presents Hazard with a model for the future claiming that only “well-born” people are needed to render Virginia “one of the best Collonies in the World”. This vision is hampered by his concession that Virginia has become haven for criminal runaways and social up-starts, characters likely to interfere with and hinder an efficient colonial administration. In order to “manage affairs as they ought to be” and counter the malign influence of the social upstarts, Friendly proposes to install the newcomer into the colonial society in matching Hazard – as well as himself – with two rich women.⁷⁵² Hazard is supposed to pass off as a kinsman of Madame Surelove’s wealthy husband in order to be received in the woman’s house. The disguise Hazard subsequently dons,⁷⁵³ or more precisely: the refashioning of his identity he undertakes, is a prominent theme within the colonial staging(s) of *The Widdow Ranter*. As previously cited, the-

751 “FRIENDLY: He was a *Lester-shire* younger Brother, came over with a /small fortune, which his Industry has increas’d to a thousand pounds a/year, and he is now Colonel *John Surelove*, and one of the Councill” (WR, I.i, 139–141).

752 “For if thou canst not Marry her, thou mayst lye with /her, (and Gad) a Younger Brother may pick out a Pritty Livelyhood here/ that way” (WR, I.i, 76–78).

753 It is important to note that he never clarifies his identity as opposed to the two cross-dressing women who both eventually renounce their disguise.

atres of escape offer numerous instances of re-representations of the self: as pirate-king, conqueror or as a social restart in the colonies. Certainly, these role reversals and pretences are in many ways intrinsic to drama as Restoration plays were well stocked with cross-dressing characters and theatrical disguises. The employment of these theatrical conventions in *The Widdow Ranter* can be said to highlight the interconnectedness and proximity of the actual space of the stage, the London playhouse, to the dramatic space of the plot, Virginia, while these re-representations and role reversals also emphasize the hybridity, the transcultural and in-between aspect, of the colonial space.

Behn's portrayal of the "transported Criminals", who now all fashion themselves as more elevated social characters, further enhances the colony's hybridity and also serves as a low-life counter-part to the honourable alternative for colonial administration as suggested by Friendly. The subsequent scene invokes an alarming impression of the way the colonial society is managed as the characters' English backgrounds and their Virginian authority convey a reversal of the English order of almost carnivalesque proportions.⁷⁵⁴ The characters all carry telling names – Dullman, Timerous, Boozer and Dunce – and are, as is by and by revealed, of dubious derivation. Dunce is "fled from England" (WR, *Dramatis Personae*), used to be a farrier and now acts as chaplain to the governour. Timerous, like Boozer now a Justice of the Peace, used to be a "broken Excise-Man" (WR, *Flirt*, I. i, 195), Boozer a "common Pick-pocket" (Dullman, I. i, 205) and Captain Dullman, outraged at these disclosures, exclaims:

[...] They say too, that I was a Tinker, and running
the Country, robb'd a Gentlemans House there, was put into *Newgate*, got
a reprieve after Condemnation, and was Transported hither (WR, I. i, 202 – 204).

On the one hand, these disclosures denote that the biographies of the maritime escapees are expression of common stereotypes vested around the English in the colonies,⁷⁵⁵ while on the other hand they also perform the colony as a space where identities are unstable,⁷⁵⁶ but can be reclaimed⁷⁵⁷ and refashioned.

754 For an article focussing on Behn's exploration of authority in *The Widdow Ranter*, notably connected to the political turmoil in seventeenth-century England, see Shannon Ross, "The *Widdow Ranter*: Old World, New World: Exploring an Era's Authority Paradigms", in: Mary Ann O'DONNELL and Bernard DHUICY eds., *Aphra Behn (1640–1689): Le Modèle Européen – Actes du colloque tenu en Sorbonne 7–9 juillet 2003* (Entreveaux: Bilingua GA Editions, 2005) 81–90. Ross argues that "Behn is concerned with representing the ideological heart of England's instability" 84.

755 Pulsipher notes that Defoe's *Moll Flanders* also contains references to this stereotype, as Moll declares her astonishment at the way criminals rise to prominence in the New World, Jenny Hale PULSIPHER, "The *Widdow Ranter* and Royalist Culture in Colonial Virginia", *Early American Literature* 39.1 (2004): 46–66, 49.

756 The instability of identities is spotlighted by a dialogue between a "boy" and the Widdow

Apart from these aspects, the drunken and rogue assortment of English escapists also indicates a worrying proximity of the colonial English to savagery. In presenting these characters in such an illicit and unfavourable, indeed dangerous way, Behn, as Hendricks writes, stirs up “a desire for a central figure to reaffirm the distance between the English and the ‘savages,’ as current English behavior seems dangerously close to denying any ‘difference’”.⁷⁵⁸ In framing the English escapists as the savages of the play,⁷⁵⁹ one can also expand Hendricks’ analysis and claim that the staging of the English as savages here also functions to enforce the colonial project as their threatening potential serves as a rationale for the other English characters. In putting forward the English gentlemen and “younger sons of the Gentry” as able to administratively not only hold together but also help the colony to prosper, Behn insinuates that a certain noble English masculinity is capable of curtailing not only Indian, but English difference.⁷⁶⁰ *The Widdow Ranter* in this respect works in two ways: the difference and transgressions of the English savage characters are dramaturgically restrained and countered by the more honourable English characters while their re-representations and hybridity are ultimately mitigated in highlighting the theatrical nature of the performance.

The plots and scenes involving these characters are vivid theatrical displays of the increasing interconnectedness of the different maritime spaces; of the colonies and the British Isles. In II.ii, set in the Widdow Ranter’s hall, the stage directions suggest a vibrant scene of colonial hybridity:

Enter the Bag-piper, Playing before a great Boule of Punch, carryed
between two Negro’s, a Highlander Dancing after it; the Widdow

Ranter at Lady Surelove’s house: “BOY: Who are you pray, forsooth? / RANTER: Why, you Son of a *Baboone*, don’t you know me? BOY: No Madam, I came over but in the last Ship. RANTER: What, from *Newgate* or *Bridewell*?” (WR, I.iii, 7 – 10). This dialogue conveys that conventional markers of social identity are diluted in the colony, however, as Ranter implies, once again playing on the stereotype of colonists, it might be a safe bet to assume that fellow colonists are criminals.

757 As Mrs. Flirt claims to be from a noble family, her social status only devastated by the English Civil War: “For I my self am a Gentlewoman; my Father was a Barronet, but / undone in the late Rebellion – and I am fain to keep an Ordinary now, / Heaven help me” (WR, I. i, 187 – 189). The idea of re-fashioning identities is also strongly apparent in *The Successful Pyrate*.

758 Hendricks in: Hendricks / Parker 230.

759 Elliott Visconsi even suggests that they are expression of Behn’s “deep and hostile antipathy towards the English national character”, Elliott VISCONSI, “A Degenerate Race: English Barbarism in Aphra Behn’s *Oroonoko* and *The Widow Ranter*”, *English Literary History* 69.3 (2002): 673 – 701, 673. More explicitly, Visconsi writes, “Behn’s position is that the nation’s inability to tolerate the Stuart line [...] is a result of a barbarous national character which prefers violence and personal independence to the merry and moral prudence of kingly government” 673.

760 See Hendricks in: Hendricks / Parker 230.

Ranter led by Timerous, Chrisante by Dullman; Mrs. Flirt and Friendly, all dancing after it; they place it on the Table (WR, II. ii).

This scene, bringing together a bagpiper, colonial produce, slaves and a host of more or less reputable English colonists, notably expresses the aforementioned “Janus-faced function” of colonial spaces. On the one hand, the scene stages images of economic success and social climbing deriving from colonial trade and plantation economy, but on the other hand it depicts the cultural miasmas of running away by water as the staged hybridity is not only far removed from notions of English nobility, but also intimates a strong disavowal of difference. However, this disavowal and the deviant potential of the scene are comically mitigated in due course as Timerous and Dullman bring themselves to appraise their colony:

TIMEROUS: [...] I look upon
Virginia to be the happiest part of the World, gad Zoors,- why, there’s
England - ‘tis nothing to’t,- [...]

 Judge you what a Condition poor *England* is in: for my part I look upon’t
 as a lost Nation gads zoors (WR, II. ii, 71 – 73, 89 f).

Timerous’ appraisal of Virginia comically complements Friendly’s earlier assessment of Virginia as potentially the “best Colony in the World”, but it also acts as a warning to the cultural reach of the savage colonists, as Dullman proposes a counter-civilizing mission of sorts:

[...] we have men here of great Experience and Ability-
 now I would have as many sent into *England* as would supply all places,
 and Offices [...] their young Gentry should
 all Travell hither for breeding, and to learn the misteries of State (WR, II. ii, 93–96).

Similar to the drunken plotting of the sailors in *Cuckolds-Haven*, or the utopian fantasies of the mariners and pirates in *The Enchanted Island* and *The Successful Pyrate*, the colonists’ proposed reversal of order is eventually performatively debunked. A further stage direction indicates that the colonists engage in drunken revelry: “[*They drink about*]” (WR, II. ii, 65), and so suggests that the characters can correspondingly be dismissed as serious threats as they are vividly presented as instances of comic dramatic stereotypes. The theatrical nature of their disavowal is thus spotlighted and their threatening potential is not so much an expression of colonial dissolution but, as Visconsi argues, rather “represent[s] local warnings”⁷⁶¹ aimed at the “barbarians [...] in England”.⁷⁶² This performative reflection of the metropolis also once more highlights the increasing interconnection and condensation of the maritime contact zone. In

761 Visconsi 697.

762 Ibid. 697.

this regard, the theatricality of the play – its reversals and renewals, transgressions, masks and pretence – also functions to portray the New World as a comic space in which hybridity and otherness can be voiced, while at the same time the theatricality also serves to lessen the distance between the Old and the New World.

As mentioned before, the disorder of the colony is ultimately dissolved as the honourable English characters not only establish conjugal bonds amongst the colonists, but they also discipline the rabble. Wellman, the Deputy Governor, ends the play with giving a conciliatory and indeed prosperous outlook on Virginia's future:

Come, my brave Youths, let all your Forces meet,
To make this Country Happy, Rich and great;
Let scanted *Europe* see that we enjoy
Safer Repose, and larger Worlds than they (WR, V. v, 398 – 401).

The threatening discord amongst the colonists is thus curtailed and the future of Virginia cast in a positive light: the administration is to be manned with English "Gentlemen of Sence and Honour" (WR, V.v, 390, Wellman) and the colonists can enjoy "Safer Repose, and Larger Worlds". Finally the New World is characterized by renewals, novel opportunities and comic benevolence, offering a pleasant space for "basking under the shade".

4.2.3 Feathers and Veils: The Lure of the Other

The escape-plots mentioned so far are all, to various extents, dramaturgically disciplined within the plays' action, either by way of showing their failure, ridiculing their driving forces, evoking repentance or committing them to the supervision of more honourable characters. This subchapter will expand on a concomitant plot; namely plots that feature the performance of Other bodies and reiterate an analogous pattern: the colonists are impressed by the lure of the bodies, fall in love, but eventually have to realize that their passion is fatal and thus the plots end either with death or a return to England. These plots reinforce colonial discourses in that they performatively develop the otherness of the objects of desire, and subsequently portray the dangers of miscegenation and going native. The plays under discussion here, *The Widdow Ranter* and *The Successful Pyrate*, can be said to engage in pre-emptive discourses of disciplining colonists in that the fetishization of Other bodies anticipates fears and fantasies

of miscegenation⁷⁶³ and eventually these desires are dramaturgically punished and corrected.

In *The Widdow Ranter* it is the rebel Bacon who falls for the native woman and, as the other characters indicate, it is his unfortunate passion that eventually leads to his – and the Indians’ – downfall. As Hutner argues, Bacon’s “desire for the native woman and her land is devastating and uncontrollable”⁷⁶⁴ and, as such, subject to dramatic failure. The nature of Bacon’s passion for the Indian Queen is dramaturgically contrasted with the nature of the other English characters’ outlook on love and marriage. Both men and women pursue partners of their own racial provenance and their courtship is characterised by rational and economic deliberations. Friendly, instructing Hazard in his romantic options in Virginia, assures his friend: “Why thou art Young and Handsome; She Young and Desiring; / ‘twere easy to make her Love thee; and if the old Gentleman chance to / dye, you Guess the rest, you are no Fool” (WR, I. i, 71 – 73). Here, the relationship between the sexes is framed as underlying very matter-of-fact calculations; the rhetoric of trade used to describe these relations not only characterizes the colony, but also sets them apart from any imprudent passions. In this regard, the Widdow Ranter further points out the colonial gain to be had in Virginia: “we rich / Widdows are the best Commodity this Country affords, I’le tell you that” (WR, I. iii, 83 f to Hazard).

Bacon’s passion for Semernia, however, follows an entirely different route as, according to Friendly, it is result of the character’s emotional volatility and egocentric ambitions: “This Thirst of Glory cherisht by Sullen Melancholly, I believe / was the first Motive that made him in Love with the young *Indian-Queen*” (WR, I. i, 122 f). Like Arviragus in *The Successful Pyrate*, Bacon’s personality is presented as extraordinary – he is generally esteemed,⁷⁶⁵ but his predisposition to “Glory” makes the character fall prey to the lure of the Other. Bacon is much too prone to give in to his egocentricity, which is most markedly expressed in his passion for the married Indian woman Semernia. This egocentricity is cause for his downfall as it does not provide a source of security: “the individual, driven solely by egocentric desire, and refusing to abide any external authority, is a profoundly unstable source of authority. The models of

763 See Laura BROWN, “The Romance of Empire: *Oroonoko* and the Trade in Slaves”, in: Nussbaum/Brown, *The New Eighteenth Century* 41–61 as well as Ferguson in: Miller/O’Dair/Weber and Winthrop D. Jordan on the history of miscegenation laws, Winthrop D. JORDAN, *White over Black: American Attitudes toward the Negro, 1550–1812* (Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1968) 70 f.

764 Hutner, *Colonial Women* 100.

765 “FRIENDLY: a Man indeed above the Common Rank, / by Nature Generous, Brave, Resolv’d and Daring” (WR I. i, 113 f).

authority in this system offer only tyranny or chaos".⁷⁶⁶ Sharon Ross here describes the set of problems involved with Bacon's individualism, but this "model of authority" as outcome of egocentric ambition is equally presented in *A Successful Pyrate*, where Arviragus' imperial desires are similarly projected as leading to "tyranny or chaos". The characters' egocentric ambitions are, as mentioned before, theatrically interlinked with the lure of the Other in the shape of Zaida in Johnson's play and Semernia in *The Widow Ranter*.

The otherness of the native woman in Behn's play is at first not staged offensively; her exotic portrayal is rather achieved through instances of mimicry, with these mimic stagings eventually serving to epitomize the otherness of the character. In II.i, Bacon first encounters the Indian royal couple: "*Discovers the Indian King and Queen sitting in State, with Guards of Indians, Men and Women attending: to them Bacon richly dress'd*" (WR, II. i). At the first glance this scene does not put forward an overtly exotic tableau. The composition of the scene as indicated by the stage direction is rather conventional, the ensuing dialogue presents the Indians as decidedly civil and the classical sounding names of the Indian Royal couple further promote associations with the "noble savage".⁷⁶⁷ In this respect, Hendricks notes that the portended civility of the Indians instead works to emphasize their difference as their representation "maps a central paradox of the concept of civility: the more the native becomes assimilated, the more her / his alienness becomes culturally reified".⁷⁶⁸ The further course of the scene then already portends this alterity as it becomes clear that the mutual passion Bacon and Semernia develop is caused by the corporally manifested otherness the glossed over civility cannot eradicate: "QUEEN: The more I gaze upon this English Stranger, the more Confusion / struggles in my Soul [...] I shall fall such a Victim to his Eyes"⁷⁶⁹ (WR, II. i, 38 – 42).

The ultimate visualization of the Indians', and most notably Semernia's, alterity is subsequently staged as part of a more engaging tableau that includes the woman's whole tribe and, hence, highlights the otherness and difference of the Indians. As part of this spectacle it once again shows that the aforementioned paradox or ambivalence of the notion of difference indeed works to discursively strengthen it, as Bhabha writes: "For it is the force of ambivalence that gives the colonial stereotype its currency: ensures its repeatability in changing historical discursive conjunctures; informs its strategies of individuation and margin-

766 Ross in: O'Donnell/Dhuicy 84.

767 See Pulsipher who writes that the Indians in *The Widow Ranter* seem "the epitome of the noble savage then prominent in English literary and popular thought" 45.

768 Hendricks in: Hendricks/Parker 227.

769 Semernia here already foreshadows the fate of their budding love as indeed, she will "fall victim to his Eyes" as Bacon will accidentally kill her in the course of the play.

alization".⁷⁷⁰ Just before the battle with the English the Indians stage an oracle-scene, in which Cavernio tries to ascertain the battle's outcome, with the scene presented as follows:

A Temple, with an Indian God placed upon it, Priests and Priestesses attending;
Enter Indian King on one side attended by Indian Men,
the Queen Enters on the other with Women, all bow to the Idol, and
divide on each side of the Stage,
then the Musick playing lowder, the Priest[s] and Priestesses Dance about the
Idol, with ridiculous Postures, and crying
(as for Incantations.) Thrice repeated,
Agah Yerkin, Agah Boah, Sulen Tawarapah, Sulen Tawarapah (WR, IV. i).

This scene offers a field-day for staging as it proffers an array of theatrical means: music, dance, song, fake exotic language and costumes could all be employed to performatively overwrite earlier performances of mimicry. The oriental set-up touches on multiple aspects of otherness and duly serves to also rank Bacon's love for Semernia within a context of downright otherness. The scene's staging reproduces powerful stereotypes of barbarism and paganism functioning to reinforce the difference between civility and the conduct of the Indians and thus reinforces the objective of colonial discourse which, as Bhabha writes, is "to construe the colonized as a population of degenerate types on the basis of racial origin, in order to justify conquest and to establish systems of administration and instruction".⁷⁷¹

With regards to the visualization of the staging, Roach speculates that the well-known image of the actress Anne Bracegirdle as an "Indian Queen"⁷⁷² (Figure 2, p. 262) might depict her not as the character in Dryden's play of the same title, but as Semernia.⁷⁷³ Roach argues that the dramatic representation perpetuates the exotic stereotype of the image and, in this regard, the "miscegenistic lushness of this particular staging raises the level of ritual expectancy in anticipation of the predictably catastrophic consequences of erotic

770 Bhabha, "The Other Question", *The Location of Culture* 95.

771 Ibid. 101. See also Hendricks in: Hendricks/Parker 233.

772 "Anne Bracegirdle as The Indian Queen". Behn had brought back from a journey to South America an assortment of feathers and other native specimen: "and I [Behn] gave 'em to the King's Theatre, and it was the Dress of the Indian Queen, infinitely admired by Persons of Quality, and was unimitable", in: Aphra BEHN, *Oroonoko*, 1688, ed. Lore Metzger (New York: Norton, 1973) 2. The making and use of this costume thus also portends to the material interconnectedness of the circum-Atlantic, while it also testifies to the audiences' passion for exotic spectacle and exotic habit or produce in general.

773 See Roach 125. The Fitzwilliam Museum in Cambridge also maintains this attribution, see <http://www.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/dept/pdp/portraitofthemoth/Bracegirdle.html> (date of access: 15th of July 2011).

encounters among red, black, and white peoples".⁷⁷⁴ It is important to note that this explicit dramatization of otherness neither attenuates nor nullifies Bhabha's argument in relation to the ambivalence of the colonial stereotype as the ambivalence vested in it is at once an object of desire *and* derision.⁷⁷⁵ This *mélange* of pleasure and disgust characterizes a colonial consciousness that is, as Keith Sandiford writes in a different context, being "tossed back and forth across circum-Atlantic domains of possibility",⁷⁷⁶ demanding an articulation of sexual and racial difference.

Semernia is, it follows, not only presented as racial Other, but she is additionally presented as transgressive in terms of her gender, as she disguises herself as a male Indian in order to find Bacon: "*drest like an Indian Man, with a Bow in her hand and Quiver at her Back*" (WR, V. iii). This costuming suggests a sexual transgression that also evokes dangerous echoes of violent and rebellious Amazons. Just as Roach claims that Bacon's passion for the Indian Queen encodes fears of interracial contact, Hutner suggests that it is the cross-dressing that registers "contemporary anxieties about the problem of racial amalgamation and miscegenation".⁷⁷⁷ In this regard, Hutner argues, Semernia's dramatic fate can be said to capture three aspects: the impossibility of escaping one's racial identity, the suggestion that playing an Indian is as dangerous for an actress as going native in real-life and/or that playing the Other is an impossibility *per se*.⁷⁷⁸ In a parallel breakdown, one could argue that Bacon's suicide indicates similar facets, namely the impossibility or danger of going native and the danger of transgressing borders of race and colonial authority. Notably, Bacon himself executes his punishment and the character's dying words, oozing a heightened compassionate appeal, voice his errors and cast a warning to other colonists: "never let Ambition – Love – or Interest make / you forget as I have done – your Duty – and Allegiance" (WR, to Daring, V. iv, 307 f).⁷⁷⁹ As previously

774 Roach 126.

775 See Bhabha, "The Other Question", *The Location of Culture* 96.

776 Keith SANDIFORD, "Envisioning the Colonial Body: the Fair, the Carnavalesque and the Grotesque" in: Geoff Quilley and Kay Dian Kriz eds., *An Economy of Colour: Visual Culture and the Atlantic World, 1660 – 1830* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2003) 15–35, 28.

777 Hutner, *Colonial Women* 105. For a more general argument concerning cross-dressing and related anxieties, see Marjorie GARBER, *Vested Interests: Cross-Dressing and Cultural Anxiety* (New York: Routledge, 1992) as well as Rudolf M. DEKKER and Lotte C. VAN DE POL, *The Tradition of Female Transvestism in Early Modern Europe* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989) for a historical survey.

778 See Hutner, *Colonial Women* 105 f.

779 In referring to contemporary stereotypes of American women as being particularly aggressive sexually, Hendricks argues that Semernia "in an instance of form(al) mediation [...] displaces the unmarried upper-class English woman as the object of upper-class masculine erotic desire" 234. In this regard, Semernia's death can be understood as dramatically functional in that her body "has channeled male interest until the Eng-



“The Indian Queen” (Anne Bracegirdle) by William Vincent, published by John Smith
 © National Portrait Gallery, London

explored, Bacon’s fate is comparable to the transgressions and egocentric desires the pirate-king Arviragus stands for. Both Bacon’s and Arviragus’ honour and bravery are acknowledged by other characters, but only to contrast these characteristics with the force of their downfall, which is in both cases dramaturgically instigated by the appearance of the native woman. The sequence of

lishwomen can be safely engaged or wedded” 235. For this aspect, see Karen Ordahl KUPPERMAN, *Settling With the Indians: The Meeting of English and Indian Cultures in America, 1580–1640* (Totowa, N.J.: Rowman and Littlefield, 1980) 59.

their respective demise follows comparable patterns, they come to view the body of the Other woman, passionately fall in love and hence trigger a string of fatal incidents, ultimately leading – in both cases – to repentance on their part.

Like in *The Widdow Ranter*, the oriental display of the Indians in Johnson’s play is also suffused with satiric and comic aspects: not only are Zaida’s female attendants eventually discovered as runaway London wives, but Tulip, the pirate-master of ceremonies, renders the presentation of the Indian captives rather ridiculous:

SCENE Changes to the Inside of the Palace: Enter on one side two or three Omrah’s and other Men Captives: And at the upper End of the Stage, Alvarez and Aranes: On the other side Morulla, Mariana, Lesbia, Lydia, Semanthe, and Zayda, all veil’d; and Tulip busily disposing them in Order (SP, I, 7).

This initial display of the captives evokes and echoes exotic notions of Indian women as the male and female bodies are being separated and the women are veiled. But the scene’s focus comically diverts from the captives’ representation to the piratical character Tulip and his obsession with ordering the captives: “Sir, you’ll infinitely oblige me, if you’ll move one Step / forward – so, there Madam-Diametrically opposite to that / Gentleman” (SP, I, 10). In Tulip’s portrayal, Johnson stages a character frantically mimicking metropolitan polite society: on the one hand, this portrayal serves to satirize the pirates, as it points to their petty enthusiasm for royal ceremony, while on the other hand Tulip’s mimicry once more points to the repeated (re-)enactments of mimicries the colonial space gives rise to.

The otherness of the captured women is emphasized in due course through their bodily representation which is scenically achieved through another orientalist spectacle, namely the unveiling of the women. Zaida’s bodily presence here bears a similar effect on Arviragus as Semernia had on Bacon. Immediately upon casting a gaze upon her, the pirate-king exclaims to his lieutenant:

De Sale, I never saw so fair a Creature;
There’s a bewitching Softness in her Eyes;
She sinks into my Soul – I have her here;
Why did you suffer all this Flood of Light
To burst at once upon me! ‘twas too much,
I sho u’d have fall’n obliquely – (SP, I, 10).

Arviragus openly confesses the force of his passions and it becomes clear that the Indian woman’s body has such a bewitching force on the pirate that he changes his conduct profoundly.⁷⁸⁰ His passion for Zaida and the lure of her body are

⁷⁸⁰ He is spellbound, he for example immediately asks his men to set all captives free: “Be every Captive free” (SP, I, 11).

presented as so strong that Arviragus even explicitly envisions the creation of a miscegenated race – he sees her as “Imperial Maid, to found a Race of Kings, / To be the Mother of a mighty Nation” (SP, I, 11). His imperial ambitions are complicated in so far as his passion first enlivens but then also dampens his aspirations to empire, as Zaida’s body seems to already contain the aspects he is longing for: “Extended Empire, Freedom, Life and Love, / Live all within the Circle of her Arms!” (SP, II, 23). Like this, the Indian woman – as body – is shown as having an almost exhausting ability: the passion drains Arviragus of his rational judgment and formerly praised sense of honour, the pirate-king is overcome by his obsession and thus senses his ruin:

this Indian Maid undoes me, [...]
 All the large Honours, Glory, power, Fame,
 And countless Wealth, which I a private Man
 Snatch’d from the lazy Hand of Chance, to deck
 My Brows with ever-living Lawrels, fade,
 They fall – O Shame to Arms! A Woman’s Martyr! (SP, II, 26).

The impact of the woman’s body and the corresponding desire for the land the body stands for finally overhaul Arviragus’ transgressive colonial ambitions and the outcome of his fatal orders⁷⁸¹ dramaturgically functions to make him realize the tyrannical nature of his ambitions. The pirate-king eventually renounces his authority and repents as he is “sick of my own Folly [...] this Toy Ambition” (SP, V, 57) and declares to “resign all Power and earthly Rule: / The gaudy Tinsel of ill-taught Ambition” (SP, V, 61). The spectacle of the native woman’s body thus can be said to have triggered a plot that not only worked to reinforce fears of miscegenation, but also functioned to dramaturgically discipline the transgression at the heart of the pirate’s theatre of escape. Arviragus quits “Imperial Sway” and wants to “die a private Man, / As I was born” (SP, V, 61), renouncing the danger of “tyranny and chaos” his egocentric ambition posed. In further announcing to return to Britain, the character additionally projects the homeland as a safe haven for its sailing subjects and overtly ambitious escapees.

The colonial plots analysed in this subchapter exhibit the instability and permeability of borders, both in terms of the instability of the self as well as in terms of the permeability of social and geographical borders. Difference and transgressions are staged through comic re-representations, role reversals, cross-dressing and carnivalesque aspects, elements that can be subsumed under the umbrella heading of theatricality. The plots of escape and the theatricality of the action work together to ascertain the increasing interconnectedness of the maritime zone and to control and appropriate the colonial transgressions

781 The death of Alvarez, his son’s best and loyal friend.

through familiarity and laughter. In theatrically maintaining this reciprocity between the metropolis and the colonial spaces, between the conventions of London stages and the image of the sea as a stage, the local and the global are linked up so that the sea as an *English* domain is eventually promoted. Additionally, these plots also circle around race as a “floating signifier”⁷⁸² and on romantic liaisons between English and native women that emerge, as Roach writes, “in representation only to disappear”.⁷⁸³ The performances of difference not only display the ambivalence of colonial desire, but also familiarize the audiences with maritime contact zones.

The next subchapter will again focus on plots of escape, those that also thrive on and work through such liaisons; however, the chapter is also aimed at complementing the male characters of escape with female plots of maritime getaway. These plots overtly emphasize the mercantile factors of New World-relations and thus display and negotiate colonial desires – for bodies and commodities, for bodies *as* commodities – as being part of dramas of the sea.

4.3 “What wind brought you hither?”: Commodifying Desire

4.3.1 Matrimonial Refugees

Fantasies of escape involved desires that were projected onto the New World – riches, freedom, exotic landscapes, sexual partners – as well as motives that were more intimately linked with the situation that was to be escaped from, namely the escapee’s personal state of affairs in England. In this regard, several aspects stand out. Chief among these is the simple act of leaving England behind and undertaking the dangers of a sea-journey for the possibility to be able to re-fashion one’s identity, in terms of social standing but also in terms of personal preferences. In *The Widow Ranter*, the transported criminals were able to perform a social turn-around, from despised criminals to – at least in title – respectful citizens. The pirate Arviragus in *The Successful Pyrate* even ennobled his standing and proclaimed himself king, a social rise depicted at a time coloured by the real-life dramas of the famous pirate John Avery.

In other respects, the flight-from-home motif also promised more personal and individual liberations, namely the freedom from societal control and the perceived limitations of a marital life. In *A Common-Wealth of Women*, Franville dreams of leaving his wife as he is tired of having to compete with her for clothes

782 See Stuart HALL, “What is This ‘Black’ in Black Popular Culture? (Rethinking Race)”, *Social Justice* 20.1 – 2 (1993): 104–114, 111.

783 Roach 159.

and fineries. The three men declare their hatred of matrimony, nay of woman-kind, in concert: “FRANVILE: Hell, I see we are all fixt, and of one mind: And resolve / to forget and despise that Vexatious and Impertinent Sex” (CW, I, 7). As we have seen, this resolution is deeply rued by the three characters during the course of the play as their landing amongst an Amazonian commonwealth leads to their situation worsening considerably. A comparable fate befalls some of the pirates in Johnson’s play as Piraquo, Tulip, Jolliboy, Boreal and Chicane, while drawing lots for allocating the supposedly Indian women, recover their “very Iden- / tical, Numerical London wives” (SP, I, 15, Tulip). The ensuing display of shock and antipathy is mutual – Tulip enumerates his losses and cries out: “Adieu my Liberty, my Peace, indolent Joys, and sweet / Repose – Ye Happy Hours of Love and soft Desire – Adieu” (SP, I, 15), whereas Piraquo’s wife Lydia, manifestly a matrimonial refugee herself exclaims: “Have we ran 3000 Miles from each other to meet in this / Centre? [...] I am Husband-sick to Death” (SP, I, 15). Here the sea appears not only literally as contact zone, but also as an increasingly condensed space, offering neuralgic centres of contact that – in this case painfully – ascertain the interconnectedness of the empire. Yet, the effect of this reunion is primarily comic as the obvious aversion between the spouses not only draws on comic standards, but is acted out with full force:

PIRAQUO: You are the only Woman I wou’d have shunn’d.

LYDIA: You are the only Man I would have avoided.

[...]

PIRAQUO: Agreed.

LYDIA: To disagree.

PIRAQUO: Eternally.

LYDIA: For ever (SP, I, 16).

On the one hand, this dialogue reverses and mocks the marriage ceremony, whilst on the other hand ironically suggesting that the spouses might have something in common after all. However, the agreement between the two characters here masks the fact that men’s and women’s options in the New World, as well as their reasons for maritime endeavours, were substantially different and unequal and, as such, the staging of these theatres of escape necessitated plots that substantially dwelled on and negotiated gender differences.

The two plays singled out for discussion in this subchapter, Thomas Southerne’s tragicomedy *Oroonoko* (1696) and Centlivre’s farce *A Bickerstaff’s Burying* (1710), both feature plots that depict women having left England by way of sea for mercenary reasons, that is: finding a husband. Both plots thus encode desires and fears attendant to maritime cultural and economic expansion and, in commodifying female characters, the plots serve to reify gender differences and provide discursive performances of economic and cultural appropriation.

4.3.2 “a-husband-hunting into America”: *Oroonoko*’s Comic Women

Aphra Behn’s novella *Oroonoko; or, the Royal Slave* (1688) has attracted enormous critical attention in recent decades, not least as a result of the text being framed as paradigm for British colonialist discourse,⁷⁸⁴ with recent critical consideration, as Srinivas Aravamudan claims, that “bordered on the obsessional”.⁷⁸⁵ Ancillary to Behn’s novella,⁷⁸⁶ the text’s theatrical adaptation by Thomas Southerne (1696) has recently also been critically spotlighted as an extrapolation of Behn’s work.⁷⁸⁷ While scholarship on the play abounds, a certain scholarly lacuna remains; none of the studies cited yet focus on the special maritime story-line of the husband-hunting which is the focus of this chapter.

The focus on Southerne’s adaptation is certainly also prompted by the contemporary popularity of the play – *Oroonoko* counts as the second most frequently produced play in British eighteenth-century theatre, appearing on stage every season from its premiere in 1696 until 1801.⁷⁸⁸ Many of the alterations introduced by Southerne have lately been scholarly documented, and apart from the remarkable “whitening”⁷⁸⁹ of Imoinda, his introduction of a comic sub-plot has also been analytically explored.⁷⁹⁰ Southerne’s split plot settles neatly into a

784 See Moira FERGUSON, “*Oroonoko*: Birth of a Paradigm”, *New Literary History* 23.2 (1992): 339–359.

785 Aravamudan 29.

786 For discussions of Behn’s novella with a focus on colonialist discourse and issues of slavery, see Laura BROWN, “The Romance of Empire: *Oroonoko* and the Trade in Slaves” in: Nussbaum/Brown, *The New Eighteenth Century* 41–61, Susan Z. ANDRADE, “White Skin, Black Masks: Colonialism and the Sexual Politics of *Oroonoko*”, *Cultural Critique* 27.0 (1994): 189–214, Gary GAUTIER, “Slavery and the Fashioning of Race in *Oroonoko*, *Robinson Crusoe*, and *Equiano’s Life*”, *The Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation* 42.2 (2001) 161–179, Susan B. IWANISZIW ed., *Troping ‘Oroonoko’ from Behn to Bandele* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004) and Chi-ming YANG’s article for a recent look at the presence of various global locations, here Asia, in Behn’s novella: “Asia Out of Place: The Aesthetics of Incorruptibility in Behn’s *Oroonoko*”, *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 42.1 (2008): 235–253.

787 Ann Messenger, Chapter 2: “Novel into Play: Aphra Behn and Thomas Southerne”, in Ann MESSENGER, *His and Hers: Essays in Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Literature* (Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1986) 41–70, offers an account of the generic contrasts between the novel and the play.

788 Critical attention is also indisputably affected by the play’s thematic linkage to anti-slavery sentiments, one that was developed in the play’s late eighteenth-century alteration *The Prince of Angola* by John Ferriar. For analyses of this play see Mita CHOUDHURY, “Race, Performance, and the Silenced Prince of Angola” in: Susan J. Owen ed., *A Companion to Restoration Drama* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001) 161–176 and Nussbaum, *Limits of the Human*, who also refers to John Hawkesworth’s 1759 *Oroonoko*. Both adaptations omit the comic subplot.

789 See Nussbaum, *Limits of the Human*, especially “Chapter 6: Black women: why Imoinda turns white” 151–188. The character of Imoinda was changed from a native, in Behn’s novella, to a British character in Southerne’s play.

790 See for example Mary VERMILLION, “Buried Heroism: Critique of Female Authorship in

tragic and a comic resolution, with the cuckolding and cross-dressing farce of the subplot giving the play a specific Restoration touch.⁷⁹¹ On the relation between the two plots the play's modern-day editors, Maximillian Novak and David Stuart Rodes, write that although "the tragic and comic actions do not impinge on each other in any direct way, it is the strongly worked cross-cutting or juxtaposition of the two which gives Southerne's play its scope and dramatic impact".⁷⁹² The juxtaposition raised by the editors is located in the two plots' dramatic negotiation of thematic dualities, namely European / "Barbarian" and Slave / Woman.

The following analysis will be confined to the comic sub-plot of the play. On the one hand, this analytical limitation allows for the overall thematic focus of this study as I contend that the comic plot specifically stages issues of maritime nature. In this case, a plot of husband-hunting across the sea invites comparison as the focus of this chapter. On the other hand, and this is concerning the general argument regarding theatres of escape, the representations of new economic relations via women's bodies and dramaturgical fates can be seen to be acting out fantasies and fears that are central to maritime expansion at the onset of the empire of the sea, that is desires of physical – bodily and geographic – along with those of cultural appropriation, anxieties of gender role reversals and savagery.

In brief, the comic plot presents Charlotte and Lucy Welldon, two sisters just arrived in Surinam, to go "a-husband-hunting into America" (O, I, i, 4). Charlotte appears in breeches and claims to be the male cousin of a rich planter who has just passed away. In this disguise, the wealthy Widow Lackitt falls for Charlotte.⁷⁹³ Welldon subsequently pretends to respond favourably to the

Southerne's adaptation of Behn's *Oroonoko*", *Restoration: Studies in English Literary Culture 1600 – 1700* 16.1 (1992): 28 – 37, who argues for a transformation of Behn's narrator into the play's cross-dressed character Charlotte Welldon, and Nussbaum, *Limits of the Human* 151 – 188 for an accomplished analysis of the "whitening" of Imoinda. For an analysis of the issue of slavery and race, see Kaul, "Reading Literary Symptoms: Colonial Pathologies and the *Oroonoko* Fictions of Behn, Southerne, and Hawkesworth", *Eighteenth-Century Life* 18.3 (1994): 80 – 96 and Diana JAHER, "The Paradoxes of Slavery in Thomas Southerne's *Oroonoko*", *Comparative Drama* 42.1 (2008): 51 – 71, see Julia A. RICH, "Heroic Tragedy in Southerne's *Oroonoko* (1695): An Approach to a Split-Plot Tragicomedy", *Philological Quarterly* 62.2 (1983): 187 – 200, for a more conservative account considering dramatic conventions of the time.

791 For Restoration models of divided or split plots, see Laura S. BROWN, "The Divided Plot: Tragicomic Form in the Restoration", *English Literary History* 47.1 (1980): 67 – 79.

792 "Introduction" in: Thomas SOUTHERNE, *Oroonoko*, eds. Maximillian E. Novak and David Stuart Rodes (London: Edward Arnold, 1976) xli. All quotations from the play from this edition, the play's title will be shortened to "O" in quotes. References for quotations are given in the form "I. i, 1", the first number represents the act, the second number the scene and the third number the line.

793 Henceforth, Charlotte Welldon will be referred to as "Welldon" while the character is in disguise and as "Charlotte" once she has unmasked herself.

Widow's advances and thus swindles her into marrying her dim-witted son Daniel to Lucy so that “he” can then marry the Widow. However, by convincing Jack Stanmore to stand in during the wedding-night, Weldon evades exposure and in the meantime manages to attract Jack's cousin, the affluent planter Stanmore, to the picture of her “cousin”. Eventually, Weldon un.masks herself and instead of her pretended cousin promises to marry Stanmore. Having secured a match for her sister Lucy, a match for Jack Stanmore in the Widow and one for herself, while additionally having tricked the Widow of a small fortune, the “a-husband-hunting” in America is deemed a success.⁷⁹⁴

The main plot centres around the captured “Royal Slave” Oroonoko, who is leading a slave-revolt to get away from his captors and freeing his wife Imoinda. The revolt fails and thus Oroonoko eventually kills his wife and unborn child, as well as himself. As cited previously, Novak and Rodes detect structural similarities between the action of the subplot and of the main-plot, writing of the “clear parallel between the institution of slavery and the institution of marriage”,⁷⁹⁵ with the authors even claiming that the representation of slaves and women as commodities can be read as critical social commentary. This estimation is shared by Jacqueline Pearson, who hails the character of Charlotte Weldon as “one of the most challenging and subversive presentations of women in the period”.⁷⁹⁶ However, the analysis here aims to show that the play's portrayal of women as commodities does not make for a subversive commentary on a patriarchal system – and as such distinguishes the American colonies as spaces for subversion –, but in fact reifies the status quo as exemplified back “home” in Europe. Despite the plot's proto-feminist appeal, the dramatic action does not explicate its options but, as Kaul writes, the subplot only “registers the varying possibilities and stresses of colonialism, but within a dramatic convention that allows those tensions to be distanced, laughed at, and in the comic conclusion, reconciled”.⁷⁹⁷

The dramatic action unfolds in medias res, with Lucy and Weldon appearing on stage, having just landed from their journey:

794 Hawkesworth and Ferriar deemed the split-plot action cumbersome and distracting from the main action, they both thus elided it in their alterations. In this regard Kaul argues that Hawkesworth's removal of the subplot: “is best read as a repression of the socio-economics of the plantation economy”, “Reading Literary Symptoms” 91.

795 Southerne, *Oroonoko*, “Introduction” xxii.

796 Jacqueline PEARSON, *The Prostituted Muse: Images of Women Dramatists 1642–1737* (Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1988) 145. Kristina BROSS and Kathryn RUMMELL challenge this appraisal in their “Cast-Mistresses: The Widow Figure in *Oroonoko*”, arguing that an analysis of all the female characters in the sub-plot – most notably the Widow – will reveal that the subordinate status of women is in fact endorsed in the play, in: Iwanisziw, *Troping 'Oroonoko'* 59–82.

797 Kaul, “Reading Literary Symptoms” 91.

LUCY: What will this come to? What can it end in? You have persuaded me to leave dear England, and dearer London, the place of the world most worth living in, to follow you a-husband-hunting into America. I thought husbands grew in these plantations.

WELLDON: Why so they do, as thick as oranges, ripening one under another. Week after week they drop into some woman's mouth (O, I, i, 1–8).

It becomes immediately obvious that the two women have not embarked on a leisurely voyage, but have a clear goal in mind that will probably – despite Welldon's reassurance –leave them in dire straits. The ensuing dialogue confirms the Welldons' comic fate: rejected by the young men of London, who “did not think us worth having” (O, I, i, 21 f, Welldon), they took their fate in their own hands. Welldon thus displays an astute sense of women's precarious social status: “Women in London are /like the rich silks; they are out of fashion a great while /before they wear out” (O, I, i, 23–25), they sink “lower and lower in their value /till they come to the broker at last” (O, I, i, 29 f), and so age is also introduced as a category that defines and validates woman's identity. In these estimations Welldon here equates a woman's worth with a product's value, applying a rhetoric of trade and business that foregrounds the mercenary aspects of a social system, the commercialization of human relations and its gendered injustice, which she also comically extends to an erotic commodification of men. In a retaliatory nod to men as “oranges”, Welldon refers back to London: “Attracting these men lewdly when orange-women in Covent Garden were considered harlots, a woman has to signal her sexual availability, ‘spreading [her] Apron in expectation.’ But the audience knows that the joke rebounds on the women”.⁷⁹⁸ In talking of a “stock of beauty” (O, I, i, 41) lying in “unprofitable hands” (O, I, i, 42), Welldon further leads over to the pragmatic considerations that induced their maritime escape. She asks Lucy: “For your part, what /trade could you set up in?” (O, I, i, 73 f). Of course, the answer is obvious as Welldon goes on: “I persuaded you to bring / your person for a venture to the Indies” (O, I, i, 91 f). Welldon's expository comments explain that the women's ventures result from an extremely mercenary approach to life as it amounts to them displaying their bodies – “your person”- within a new and undeveloped market; female bodies work as assets and as such dramaturgically compare to the display of African bodies in the ensuing scene.

⁷⁹⁸ See Aravamudan who also notes that the fantasy of men as “oranges” could be “perhaps a hit at the new Dutch immigrants who had arrived with William of Orange” 51.

Welldon herself, however, is disguised as a man,⁷⁹⁹ and in another perceptive appreciation of gender relations she observes that their venture thus has already improved their condition considerably: “We live in repu- / tation, have the best acquaintance of the place; and we / shall see our account in’t, I warrant you” (O, I, i, 98-100).⁸⁰⁰ Welldon’s talk of business, prizes, brokers and trade is henceforth complemented by the Widow Lackitt’s entry. Quickly after making acquaintance with Welldon and his sister Lucy, the audience is compelled to realize that the Widow is a disagreeable and lusty character as she makes advances towards the cross-dressed Welldon: “But if I am to be tempted, / it must be with a young man, I promise you” (O, I, i, 144 f) and “Well, I like that name of yours / exceedingly, Mr. Welldon” (O, I, i, 174 f). It is interesting to note that Welldon is thus deemed “young” when in male habit, whereas as a woman she was esteemed too old for the marriage-market back in London. In conversing with Welldon in this way and thus proving man-hungry and flirtatious, the Widow conforms to a popular Restoration stereotype⁸⁰¹ and makes for easy prey for the economically cunning Welldon. When Stanmore joins them, Welldon learns about the Widow’s huge fortune⁸⁰² and Stanmore provides the audience also with a scathing account of the Widow’s mercenary character: “She has no conscience / in a corner, a very Jew in a bargain, and would cir- / cumcise you to get more of you” (O, I, i, 226 – 228). The dubious ethics he mentions, however, in some ways correspond with the mercenary schemes of the Welldon-sisters, and it becomes apparent that women’s agency in this capitalistic system is not only questionable but precarious, as the Widow herself exclaims that as a single woman she is “left in a great deal of business, and busi- / ness must be followed or lost. I have several stocks and / plantations upon my hands” (O, I, i, 215 – 217). The scene thus establishes, by way of specific rhetoric, the female characters’ appropriation of market mechanisms and the workings of the colonial society. The women’s lack of enduring agency is, moreover, reinforced at the end of the scene, where the landing of a vessel performatively connects the two plots:

799 It is also worth noting that Welldon is disguised as yet another “younger brother”. The play thus once more refers to the stereotype of colonies as places where socially disadvantaged people ventured.

800 In IV, Welldon again contrasts the differing economic options of men and women: “Theirs [men] is a trading estate that lives upon / credit and increases by removing it out of one bank / into another” (O, IV, i, 57 – 59), whereas women can “venture / our fortunes abroad on such rotten security that the / principal and interest, nay, very often our persons, are / in danger” (O, IV, i, 62 – 65).

801 See Barbara J. TODD, “The Remarrying Widow: A Stereotype Reconsidered”, in: Mary Prior, *Women in English Society 1500 – 1800* (London and New York: Routledge, 1985) 54 – 92 and Bross / Rummell in: Iwanisziw, *‘Troping’ Oroonoko*.

802 Stanmore advising “him” to pursue the lusty Widow is reminiscent of the first scene of *The Widow Ranter*, where Friendly urges Hazard to pursue the wealthy Madam Surelove.

WELLDON: What ship is this?

STANMORE: A rover, a buccaneer, a trader in slaves. That's the commodity we deal in, you know (O, I, i, 280–282).

Following the unloading and distribution of the ship's cargo, Widow Lackitt and several other planters start heckling the captain of the slave vessel, discontent with the lot of slaves they were assigned,⁸⁰³ thus pursuing the theme Welldon has initiated with "his" market-based rhetoric. However, to refer back to Novak/Rodes as well as Pearson's estimation of this thematic linkage: the white women of the play are portrayed as explicitly seeking and trading in their marriages, partly scheming and "pimping" (O, V, i, 85, Charlotte) to achieve their goals, they all eagerly welcome their matrimonial status, quite contrary to the slaves.⁸⁰⁴ And as Kristina Bross and Kathryn Rummell rightfully object, the comic plot not so much suggests that it is the marriage market itself which promotes and maintains the inferior position of women, but the plot's critique aims at "the similar treatment as chattel of white women before marriage and of Africans in slavery".⁸⁰⁵ In the same vein, Laura J. Rosenthal argues that the "point, then, belongs less to feminism than to an argument for racial privilege" as the Welldons are not simply women, but white women.⁸⁰⁶ The alleged subversiveness of the structural similarities between slave- and spouse-trading hence turn out to be rather conservative endorsements and reflections of the business conduct in marriage affairs as effected in London.⁸⁰⁷ Southerne "analogize[s] marriage and slavery as affectionate and erotic institutions of ownership".⁸⁰⁸ Additionally, this analogy also works to separate the two plots via their contrasting generic endings – and this separation can indeed be said to function in stipulating the status quo: "Economic success- and colonial success – are linked to parody; colonial failure – and economic failure – are linked to senti-

803 "FIRST PLANTER: I have all men in mine. Pray, Captain, let the men and / women be mingled together, for procreation sake, and / the good of the plantation" (O, I, ii, 14–16).

804 Widow Lackitt's shock at discovering that she bedded the "wrong" husband does not annul her initial enthusiasm for marriage.

805 Bross/Rummell in: Iwanisziw, *'Troping' Oroonoko* 66.

806 Laura J. ROSENTHAL, "Owning Oroonoko: Behn, Southerne, and the Contingencies of Property", in: Iwanisziw, *Troping 'Oroonoko'* 83–107. This argument is underscored by Aravamudan's reading, he writes: "The notable absence of a black woman in Southerne's text should alert us to the limits of the analogical use of slavery in the advancement of a metropolitan agenda of women's rights" 57.

807 For a discussion of the mirroring of Restoration society in Behn's novella, see George GUFFEY, "Aphra Behn's *Oroonoko*: Occasion and Accomplishment", in: George Guffey and Andrew Wright, *Two English Novelists: Aphra Behn and Anthony Trollope*, Papers read at a Clark Library Seminar, May 11, 1974, William Andrews Clark Memorial Library (Los Angeles: UC California P 1975) 3–41.

808 Rosenthal in: Iwanisziw, *'Troping' Oroonoko* 96.

mental loss and tragedy and the inability to separate commodification from affect”.⁸⁰⁹

In the course of the play the audience’s laughter is further provoked in a stinging satire on Widow Lackitt, which singles the character out as the comic butt of the play’s jokes⁸¹⁰ as well as ridiculing her as woman on a more general level. Welldon and Lackitt meet at the Widow’s house to discuss the marriage of Lucy to the Widow’s prodigal son Daniel. Welldon, in an attempt to eventually fast-track “his” own wedding to Lackitt, pretends to already be married, but at the same time offers a solution to this obstacle:

WELLDON: I have a friend in England that I will write to, to poison my wife, and then I can marry you with a good conscience. If you love me, as you say you do, you’ll consent to that, I’m sure (O, III. iii, 42–45).

The outrageousness of this proposal is only exceeded by Lackitt’s answer: “And will he do it, do you think?” (O, III. iii, 46). Notwithstanding the sympathetic portrayal of Welldon/Charlotte,⁸¹¹ Lackitt’s ruthlessness impairs the representation of the female gender. Both women are representationally tied together, not only in their analogous assessment of the market economy around them, but dramaturgically in that Charlotte’s profits eventually are won at the expense of Lackitt’s personal and financial integrity. The Widow not only loses money, her marital status and hence her social and financial independence, but she is also sexually abused and might even be pregnant with Jack Stanmore’s child and so marriage to him stands as the only option available.

Both Charlotte and Lackitt reclaim economic agency, Charlotte – as Welldon – assumes the role of a father for her sister Lucy and Lackitt not only manages her slaves, but manages and “trades in” her step-son Daniel. However, this agency only eventually benefits Charlotte and can only be exercised as long as she is disguised as a man, once she un.masks herself she gives up her money to Stanmore, just as Lackitt before has turned her money over to Welldon. Lackitt’s insistence on her economic agency is ridiculed and she is eventually performatively punished for her “lack” of manliness, a fate Charlotte escapes as she was signified as man throughout most of the play. Hence, women’s options in the New World are not presented as instigating independence, but Southerne’s

809 Aravamudan 68.

810 The audience is all the time aware of the fact that Charlotte is cross-dressed as Welldon, hence the Widow’s courting of the “young man” is pronounced in its foolishness, as Rosenthal writes: “Charlotte’s return to femininity [...] exposes the widow as a foolish, lascivious dupe caught by humiliating swindle”, in: Iwanisziw, *Troping’ Oroonoko* 96.

811 Her sister Lucy, however, is presented throughout as rather dim-witted, this portrayal being enforced by her marriage to the even more loutish character of Daniel.

portrayal suggests that going “a-husband-hunting” in the colonies is subject to the same conservative yet precarious standards of female body politics than back at the outset of the journey. The desires underlining these theatres of escape are thus not only commodified, but women’s transgression of maritime spaces are also revalued via these performances of accumulation and deprivation.

These performances are dramaturgically emphasized in that the action of the main plot eventually converges with the cast of the subplot. On the one hand, as Nussbaum notes, Welldon’s unmasking as Charlotte and her announcement of betrothal to Stanmore reintegrates the transgressive female character into society and thus instigates Oroonoko’s fate, as he now becomes dispensable.⁸¹² On the other hand, transgression is bodily fetishized in the “black” body of the actor playing Oroonoko. In scene V.iii, Blanford, Stanmore, Lackitt and Charlotte discover Oroonoko: “upon his back, his legs and arms stretched out, and chained to the ground” (O, V. iii, stage direction). Subsequently they all unbind him and help him stand up, vowing to not be responsible for his treatment by the governor. It is important to note how this almost pornographic display of the black body echoes the commodification of the other transgressive – that is masked – bodies of the play, and how it finally leads to a closure on the transgressions that destabilized the characters’ identities. Oroonoko, on stage a white man masked as a black man, and Charlotte, on stage for the most part a woman dressed as a man, performatively put forward the instability of character and serve to emphasize issues of the New World: slavery, miscegenation, appropriation and exploitation. In dramatically disposing of the black Oroonoko in the killing of his body, and in reintegrating the actress’ body into a proper “female” performance, the fears and uncertainties of the colony are controlled. In this sense, Southerne’s drama can even be said to perpetuate aspects of Behn’s novella, since it reveals, as Kaul writes of her narrative, “a canny sense of the cultural contexts and political functions of sexual violence, as it emphasizes the troubling coincidence of desire and exploitation in the workings of the colony”.⁸¹³

These “workings of the colony”, dramatically exemplified through the commodification and appropriation of female and black characters, are attenuated finally in the epilogue⁸¹⁴ to the play, spoken by the actress playing Charlotte. In

812 See Nussbaum: “But once Charlotte is safely reintegrated into the colonial society and betrothed to Stanmore (rather than paired in breeches with Widow Lackitt), the bond between black and white men is broken, and Oroonoko becomes conveniently dispensable”, *Limits of the Human* 175. As such, the character of Oroonoko can be said to have suffered a similar fate as Semernia in *The Widdow Ranter*.

813 Kaul, “Reading Literary Symptoms” 88.

814 The epilogue was written by William Congreve. Vermillion argues that in *Oroonoko*, Southerne undermines and parodies Behn’s contention of literary authority, in this respect, she

the play's initial run this was the actress Susanna Verbruggen, wife of the actor John Verbruggen, cast as Oroonoko in the play. In comparing the men, the “errant-knights” (O, Epilogue, 139) and the “ladies-errant” (O, Epilogue, 12) who venture abroad, she exclaims: “To lands of monsters and fierce beasts they go, / We to those islands where rich husbands grow” (O, Epilogue, 16 f). Here, the speaker ties the plots of “errant” voyaging back in with the familiarity of English matrimonial stereotypes: “If they're of English growth, they'll bear't with patience, / But save us from a spouse of Oroonoko's nations!” (O, Epilogue, 19 f). With this light-hearted treatment of the play's marital tragedy the performance's troubling depictions of the “workings of the colony” are cloaked, and the “errant” desires reimported to the stage and exposed to the containment of the audience's applause. Further, the epilogue again portends another aspect of the play: in rhetorically sending English men to the “lands of monsters”, which is to the land of “horned monsters”, namely cuckolds, Susanna Verbruggen also plays with her real-life persona as the wife of the actor performing Oroonoko. With this concluding performance she insinuates that desire for a black body can certainly be read as undercurrent to the “a-husband-hunting into America”, a fantasy that in its apparent oscillation of colonial desires for the racial Other was but ideologically contained within Southerne's fiction.

4.3.3 “pray heav'n it be English!": Escape and Return in *A Bickerstaff's Burying*

Centlivre's farce *A Bickerstaff's Burying; or, Work for the Upholders*,⁸¹⁵ which premiered at Drury Lane in 1710, also stages a plot of “a-husband-hunting”. The play launches a performance of new economic relations via the commodified body of an Englishwoman and, while foregrounding the staging of the sea, Centlivre relates to several aspects of colonial discourses that are destabilized in the course of the play, as Barbara Schmidt-Haberkamp points out: “the seemingly uncomplicated East/West binary opposition in *A Bickerstaff's Burying* with its explicit hierarchization is destabilized on occasion; as a result, it renders

writes: “Both Congreve's epilogue and Southerne's play confine woman's reputation to the strictly sexual and implicitly ridicule Behn's own ‘errant’ reputation” 36.

815 All quotations from the play's London edition, *A Bickerstaff's Burying; or, Work for the Upholders. A Farce; As it was Acted at the Theatre in the Hay-Market by Her Majesty's Sworn Servants* (London: Printed for BERNARD LINTOTT, at the Cross-Keys, between the Two Temple Gates, in Fleet-street, 1710). The play's title will be shortened to “BB” in quotes, followed by the indication of the scene and page-number. *The Index to the London Stage* lists the play as having been performed at Drury Lane, while the printed edition lists the Theatre in the Haymarket.

the patriotic sentiment advanced in the play ambivalent and subverts contemporary theatregoers' fondness for oriental gazing".⁸¹⁶

The play's plot derives from one of Sinbad's stories from *The Arabian Nights* and, especially through the representational framing of its opening scene, can be classified as a "continuation of the Tempest school",⁸¹⁷ as Watson states in his study. As mentioned before, the play's main plot circles around marriage for mercenary reasons as it depicts Lady Mezro, formerly Mrs. Take-it, an Englishwoman who, escaping from London to find a rich husband abroad, is shipwrecked on the isle of Corgar where she became betrothed to the local Emir. The play's action unfolds with the shipwreck of an English vessel. The ship's Captain and Lady Mezro turn out to be old acquaintances and Lady Mezro, utterly relieved to have encountered English men, relates her story to the Captain. Despite the riches she possesses and her elevated social status – she is "one of the greatest Women upon the Place" (BB, i,) – her life is miserable as custom has it that the widow or widower is to be buried alive with their deceased spouse and she is thus kept in constant fear and subjection by her husband's feigned illnesses. Lady Mezro has instructed her husband's niece Isabinda – the daughter of an English woman – to place stock in the superiority of all things English, and so Mezro and the Captain, who has taken to Isabinda, concoct a plan to gather as many riches as possible and then kidnap the two women. Mezro feigns her own death and is carried off in her coffin – the Emir, though relieved as he could escape the island's burial custom, is left swearing at the shore, abjuring matrimony forever.

As this brief synopsis indicates, echoing and repeating are important strategies of the play. All in all there are three shipwrecks that are either staged or referred to, and, as such, Centlivre very much puts forward the sea as a space for the dramatic action. The highlighting of maritime issues is equally enhanced by the piece's intertextual references to *The Tempest*, references that are visually and sequentially stressed in the first scene, as well as in Isabinda's semblance to Miranda. The play's opening scene catered for the visual delight of an audience coveting for extravagant and exotic presentations: "A working Sea seen at a Distance, with the Appearance of a Head of a Ship bulging against a Rock: Mermaids rise and sing: Thunder and Lightning: Then the Scene shuts" (BB, i, 1). This vivid depiction of a "working Sea" here also functions to thematically instate the sea as a space for risk and danger, but also, as the subsequent safe landing suggests, as a space for cultural contact and enticing prospects as the appearance of the "Mermaids" indicates.

The farce is divided into four scenes, with the first expository scene launching the othering-techniques of the play, portraying the two women as mercenary

816 Schmidt-Haberkamp, "Patriotism and its Discontents" 5.

817 Watson 148.

and establishing the topic as central to the entertainment. Both women are on stage, observing the shipwreck, both desperate for the ship to be of English provenance: “LADY MEZRO: pray Heav’n it be English!” (BB, i, 1). Lady Mezro and Isabinda are veiled, so their longing for a rescue corresponds directly to their habitat as it suggests some sort of confinement on the island. Speaking a line very much reminiscent of Miranda’s innocent longings, Isabinda responds to her aunt’s prayers: “then I shall see the fine Men you have / so often talk’d of, Aunt” (BB, i, 1), and the young woman subsequently also specifies her desire for the English: “I hate this Isle of *Corgar*, and all its barbarous Laws, since you have inform’d me of / those of Great Britain” (BB, i, 2). This utterance already puts her admiration of the English into perspective as she apparently only started hating her native island after she has learned of Great Britain. In terms of performance, her anticipation of the “fine Men” is, however, a much stronger and indeed humorous mitigation of her longing: sailors enter the stage and the contemporary audience was certainly well aware of the difference between “fine Men” and English sailors.⁸¹⁸ The Captain and his sailors consequently conform to stereotypical representations of stage sailors in their talking of “wenches” and frequent use of nautical terms and phrases.

In portraying an English crew just landed on an unknown island somewhere in the New World and their subsequent manners of exploration, the scene not only puts forward evident discourses of otherness, but also conveys the commodifying strategies at the core of their endeavour.

CAPTAIN: [...] I can’t imagine what this Island produces!

BOATSWAIN: Monsters, I think; for they stare as if they never had any Commerce with Mankind, or ever saw a Ship in their Lives.

CAPTAIN: I question if ever they did, and wish it had not been our Fortune to have improv’d their Knowledge.

FIRST SAILOR: I wish so too; I hate making strange Land: Who the Devil knows where to find a Wench now? [...]

FIRST SAILOR: what the Devil do you think I’ll come into a strange Land, and not examine what Commodity it produces? (BB, i, 2).

The crew’s discussion explicitly emphasizes issues of commerce, produce and commodities; in his quest for a “wench”, the First Sailor also establishes his regard for women as commodities being “produced” by the land. Hence, the expectation for the “strange Land” is already confined to its economic value and the options of appropriation. In this respect, the depreciatory estimation of the

818 See Chapter 3 of this study.

island works to authorize the appropriation: in waiting for a sign of the local authorities, the Captain merely expects to be brought: “to a King sitting under / a Palm-tree” (BB, i, 3).

Upon this, Mezro and Isabinda disclose their identities and again, as we have observed on numerous occasions, the maritime world proves to be a rather condensed space: “CAPTAIN: Ha! Mrs. *Take-it!* Why what Wind blew you/hither?” (BB, i, 3). Mezro goes on to recount her fate claiming, that the reason that drew her to the island, was indeed of the same nature as the Captain’s occasion. Both were bound to “Madderas”,⁸¹⁹ pursuing business, in Mezro’s case: “To get a Husband; you know few Women/go there but to make their Fortunes” (BB, i, 4). Mezro explicitly recounts her sea-journey’s mercenary background, while at the same time positions herself within a tradition of husband hunting and fortune seeking.⁸²⁰ The character also again draws on the dangerous aspects of such endeavours, vividly reporting the shipwreck:

After three Days tempestuous Weather, having lost our Main-mast, and all our Tackle, expecting nothing but Death, when by a sudden gust our Vessel was driven upon yon dreadful Rock, which split her into a thousand Pieces, and only I by Providence was sav’d (BB, i, 4).

Interestingly, Mezro offers a technically rather precise account of the shipwreck, thus not only once more invoking the maritime aspects of the play, but also affirming the fears attendant to such voyages. Her fate, as she presents it, was worsened by her admission into the Cosgarian⁸²¹ society. Despite the fact that she has access to a huge fortune and is socially esteemed, she cannot enjoy what she initially was looking for, as her husband is not only as “ugly as a Baboon” (BB, i,) but presents a whole kaleidoscope of otherness and disagreeableness:

He’s as jealous as a *Spaniard*, as barbarous as a Turk, and as ill-natur’d as an old Woman; and I hate him as heartily as one Beauty does another; yet fear him as much as you Merchant-Men do a *French* Privateer (BB, i, 5 f).

Mezro opens up clear dichotomies between the men of England and her husband, whom she describes as incorporating a whole bouquet of stereotypes that interestingly all derive from stereotypical characteristics of other Europeans and not of colonial provenance. This dichotomy is enforced and, in fact, exceeded by

819 Probably referring to present-day Nicaragua, where the English had a protectorate. The play is not very precise in its geographical indications, offering a rather hybrid mixture of Arabian cultural aspects – Emir, Alla, Sinbad – and references to the “Indies” as well as “Madderas”.

820 A character trait that is already suggested by her telling original name “Mrs. Take-it”.

821 The island is called “Corgar”, the adjective “Cosgarian” in the play, see iii, 19.

the women’s explanation of the island’s “barbarous Custom” (BB, i, 4, Isabinda),⁸²² one the Captain describes as “Unheard of Barbarity!” (BB, i, 7). This revelation henceforth impacts on the English men’s hopeful “acquisition” of wenches, most notably the Captain’s court-ship of Isabinda. Again, this relation is framed as a market-transaction, with Mezro hawking Isabinda as if she was up for sale:

LADY MEZRO: [...] She’s my Husband’s Niece, the best humour’d Woman in the World; and for her Beauty, let that speak for it self, (turns up her Vail) so, I see by your Eyes you like her.
[...]
She’s the only handsome one in it [the island], I promise you; her Mother was English, and cast hither by such another Accident as my self (BB, i, 8).

Isabinda presents a similar sense of business as she, after Mezro has left in a hurry to attend her sick husband, takes the negotiations in her own hands and strikes a deal with the Captain: “With all my Heart, there’s my Hand upon it; we / have no time for Courtship; I’ll meet you here again in / an Hour” (BB, i, 8). Thus Isabinda trades herself in for the escape from the “barbarous customs” in Corgar, performing a comic reversal of the “a-husband-hunting”-plot: instead of being satisfied with the riches and fortunes abroad, the English women detest the “State of Matrimony” (BB, i, 8, Isabinda) on the island and long for the “fine Men” of England. As mentioned before, Isabinda’s notion of “fine Men” is, however, performatively countered by the appearance of a bunch of English sailors,⁸²³ rendering her appraisal rather dubious and comical.

Similarly, the men’s estimation of the “barbarous customs” casts an ambivalent light on the alleged moral superiority of the English as it shows them assessing it solely in terms of profits. After he has learnt of the island’s laws, the Captain muses: “If it were the Custom all over the World, we / young Fellows should live deliciously; Women would be / as plenty as Blackberries” (BB, i, 8), so he soon realizes that the shipwreck might indeed be profitable after all: “Now if I can but handsomly carry off these Wo- / men, their Jewels will turn to better Account than an / *East-India* Voyage” (BB, i, 8).

The following two scenes, both featuring Cosgarian natives, together serve to update the discourses of despotism and colonialism instigated in the expository

822 Notably, the custom was “first ordain’d from frequent Poysoning here” (BB, i, 7, Isabinda), another indication of the “barbarous” and “deplorable” state of matrimony in Corgar.

823 The sailor’s portrayal as indeed anything but “fine men” is further acted out when the First Sailor is mocked by his comrades because of his dirty hammock and clothes, as well as the shape of his nose and legs (BB, i, 9).

scene, yet both scenes also undercut these discourses in several ways. In scene ii, Lady Mezro is shown with her ill husband, “weeping by him” (BB, stage direction):

LADY MEZRO: Why was I cast upon this Shoar? Curse on these glittering Bawbles, whose bewitching Lustre cheats us of true Happiness. (*tears of her Jewels*) A Thirst of Riches drew me from that Land where Widow-hood is happy – to die within a loathsome Dungeon, unpitied and forlorn (BB, ii, 12).

The English woman is portrayed as repenting her decision to leave the safe shore of her native land, the lure of riches has been her downfall and, like the shipwrecked crew in *A Common-Wealth of Women*, she realizes that riches are of no worth within a “Dungeon”. The safety and contentment in England – the “Land where Widow-hood is happy” – is performatively furthered in the Emir’s representation as a despot. This representation conforms to stereotypes of Arab males as he is associated with lust and sensuality.⁸²⁴ Additionally, Lady Mezro repeats her aforementioned claims, dehumanizing her husband in comparing him to animals: “your Breath’s ready to strike one down, and your Beard’s as rough as a Hedge-hog” (BB, ii, 15). Further, the Emir’s reaction towards Lady Mezro’s illness reveals him as not only hypocritical,⁸²⁵ but as cowardly, tearful and therefore effeminized. Upon being informed by Isabinda that Lady Mezro has passed away, he finally repents and wails:

[...] I confess I did but counter-
feit – Oh Alla, (kneels) pardon my Deceit, and give
me back her Life, and let her cuckold me with every thing
she meets [...]
I never will be jealous more!
[...] Oh forgive me, Niece, for I truly repent: alas!
I did it only to keep her in Subjection.⁸²⁶
[...] (bursts out again into Tears) (BB, ii, 17 f).

However, this portrayal is subverted by also providing ambivalent perspectives on the English woman. Within the comic attitude of the play the couple at times appear as a formulaic and conventional English couple, with the man stereotypically having to beg his wife for intimacies:

824 He kisses her repeatedly and sets out to send the servants away “winking at her” (BB, ii, 14).

825 Above all deferring his religious duties.

826 This utterance is a nod to English women’s renowned independence.

LADY MEZRO: Occasion! What Occasions have People of your
Age for Life, but to pray –
EMIR: Have Women in your Country no other Business
for their Husbands, my Dear?
LADY: No –
EMIR: Humph! That was the Reason you left it, I
doubt – (BB, ii, 15).

The Emir offers comic and critical perspectives on his marriage that ring true when extrapolated to English society and that accordingly also privilege him with a sort of insider’s perspective. His enactment of a frustrated husband aligned well with contemporary comic stereotypes and certainly would have provoked appreciative laughter from the audience. For a brief moment the “barbarous” character is thus comically incorporated as the nature of his conjugal fate succinctly overrides his otherness and points to his fortune as husband and man.

The English characters’ mercenary attitude is further exposed when the Captain, Lady Mezro and Isabinda finally gather together for their escape, “ISABINDA: I have pack’d up all your Jewels, and every thing / of Value” (BB, ii, 18). It thus becomes increasingly obvious that the English are not interested in any relations exceeding their business of – literally – gathering riches as much as they can carry. In this regard, the ensuing scene (iii) not only performatively once more illustrates the single-mindedness of the English, but also yet again paints an equivocal picture of their conduct, destabilizing the basic dichotomies presented in the play. Scene iii opens with “A Cosgarian Lady, dragging in the first Sailor” (BB, iii, 19) – again, this performance plays with a role reversal between the sexes, showing the native woman to be the proactive character, in command of the sailor. However, the following dialogue puts their conventional roles into place again as it becomes clear that the Cosgarian Lady tries to tempt the sailor to stick to his word and stay with her on the island. The sailor’s disavowal is another act on the theme of marriage – to him the island’s customs suggest a deep committal to one’s spouse and he accordingly justifies his lack of commitment with his own native customs: “That’s a Mistake, d’ye see; for of all the WO-/men in the World we care the least for our Wives, in my / Country” (BB, iii, 19). His refusal to take the woman with him subsequently not only mediates a neglectful attitude of him as an English husband, but also presents him as a coward and ruffian:

LADY: Faint-hearted Wretch! Take me with you,
then, to your World.
FIRST SAILOR: Look ye, I’ll have nothing to do with you at
all; nad there’s your Answer; and if you offer to stop me,
I shall make use of my Cat of Nine Tails, in troth I shall.
Zounds! I never had such an Aversion for a Woman in
my Life [exit Sailor. (BB, iii, 20).

The leaving behind of the native woman registers another reference to the Dryden/Davenant-version of *The Tempest*, where Sycorax' begging equally proved unsuccessful. In *A Bickerstaff's Burying*, the native character insists on her apparent right and so eventually is not only able to secure her escape from the island, but her arguments also disclose more ambivalent outlooks on the English men's attitude, "LADY: Stay. Cannot Gold and Jewels tempt you?" (BB, iii, 19). In echoing the English sailor's assessment of the Cosgarians as "Monsters" (BB, i, 2) at the outset of the play, the Lady here reverses the perspective and claims:

Sure this is some Sea-Monster, it cannot be a
Man, and Proof against Gold and Jewels.
The European's God is Gold, we Indians say,
Then dare they fly from that to which they pray! (BB, iii, 20).

The subsequent entry of the Second Sailor then gives performative credit to her allegations as the character muses whether to just kill the Lady and run away with her property: "Now have I a Mind to knock / her Brains out, and carry off her Jewels" (BB, iii, 20) – "a Whistle within" (BB, iii, 20 f), however, announces the ship's impending departure and, pressured for time, the sailor's love for "your rare glist'ning Stones" (BB, iii, 20) and the Lady's suggestion to "bear me hence, and I will load thee with / Wealth enough to buy thy Country" (BB, iii, 21) for the time being evades the character's violence and they both escape.

Thus the destabilized correlations between the English and the inhabitants of the isle of Corgar are finally counteracted with the English characters' profitable escape. In initially presenting the "a-husband-hunting" of Lady Mezro as demonstration of the female character's mercenary nature and, in conjoining her portrayal with a representation of the other greedy English characters, the farce renders conjugal relations as a commodity. Subsequently, binary oppositions between English / "barbarian" are destabilized as the ambivalent portrayal offers unexpected perspectives on conjugal relations in England. Isabinda's assessment of "the deplorable State of Matrimony in our Country" (BB, i, 8) is hence counterbalanced with the Captain's earlier claim that "Women hate their Husbands all the World over" (BB, i, 6). However, the concluding lucrative escape of the English crew works, as Schmidt-Haberkamp writes, "to put temporarily destabilized oppositions into place again".⁸²⁷ The possibilities of intercultural contact, even the commonalities of different cultures, are hence solely tested in regard to their mercenary aspects: the "barbarian" is but confined and left on the island's shore.⁸²⁸

The plays under discussion in this chapter, framing plots of maritime escape and

827 Schmidt-Haberkamp, "Patriotism and its Discontents" 6.

828 The Emir (iv); the escaped Cosgarian lady awaits a more dubious fate, as the sailor only claims to: "I'll venture to swing in a Hammock with you for / once" (BB, iii, 21).

female “a-husband-hunting” in the colonies, employ gendered plots to register a commodification of the female characters. Desires of riches, fortune, freedom of sexual choice and fears of danger, loss and miscegenation, are acted out via the women’s bodies. Their theatres of escape, evoking potentially troubling representations of role reversal, intraracial marriage and hybridity are eventually appropriated in scenarios of “white” romance and return to England. All white women in *Oroonoko* are eventually married to white English men, and in *A Bickerstaff’s Burying* the hybrid character Isabinda has proven herself to be English at heart – and is hence “white” – with her enthusiasm for the nation’s sailors and her espousal to the English Captain. The sea, staged as a potential space for role-reversal and for the refashioning of identities, here also functions to close in on transgressive characters and figuratively “haul them inboard”. Additionally, the threatening potential of the black men as Other is diminished in that Oroonoko is bodily exposed and then shown killing his off-spring and himself, whereas the Emir is striped off his possessions and left a comic figure at his island’s shore.

As the British Empire expands, English vessels are shown as literally – and English customs as figuratively – securing the nation’s control of the sea. Theatres of maritime escape function not only to – theatrically – establish the sea as an ever more interconnected space of cultural contact, but also to ascertain the command the English claimed over “their” sea.

4.4 Polly: Reversals and Mimicries

4.4.1 “what brought you on this side of the water?”: Encounters and Reunions

My dear Lucy – My dear Polly- Whatsoever hath past between us is now at an end.– If you are fond of marrying again, the best Advice I can give you, is to Ship yourselves off for the West-Indies, where you’ll have a fair chance of getting a Husband a-piece; or by good Luck, two or three, as you like best.

John Gay, *The Beggar’s Opera*,⁸²⁹ III. xv, 1 – 6

Just before his scheduled execution, the convicted highwayman Macheath advises his two wives to embark on a sea-journey and seek their fortune abroad. The character here not only hands out more immediate advice to Lucy and Polly, but also – on a more general level – portends an escape to the colonies as opportunity to mend one’s fortune and, according to inclination, even more than that. The suggestion that two of John Gay’s characters from his hugely

829 John GAY, *The Poetical Works of John Gay: Including ‘Polly’, ‘The Beggar’s Opera’ and Selections from other Dramatic Work*, ed. G. C. Faber (1923, repr. New York: Russell & Russell, 1969).

popular *The Beggar's Opera* (1728) should transport themselves out of Newgate into the West Indies here once more points to the increasing mobility – geographically as well as socially – the circum-Atlantic offered for characters from widely varying backgrounds. In *The Beggar's Opera's* follow-up *Polly* (1729) we can hence trace lineages of the Atlantic world in its fictional characters who have escaped their London stages to re-enact their fortunes in the Caribbean. In *Polly*, Gay dramatizes the dialectic of empire as his play serves to show how the colonies are influenced by, but also influence and mirror, the metropolitan centre.

The impact of the colonies on the metropolitan centre was felt by many contemporary Londoners, amongst them Gay himself, who had lost considerable amounts of money in the so-called “South Sea Bubble” of 1720, a failed investment that might have moved him to continue *The Beggar's Opera's* scathing anti-capitalist satire in *Polly*. However, alerted by *The Beggar's Opera's* popularity, Gay's new ballad opera⁸³⁰ was officially banned by the Lord Chamberlain on the 12th of December 1728, just before rehearsals at the Lincoln's Inn Fields Theatre were about to begin. Gay himself denied any charges of “slander and calumny against particular great persons” (P, Preface) and insisted that “I am as loyal a subject and as firmly attach'd to the present happy establishment as any of those who have the greatest places or pensions” (P, Preface).⁸³¹ The ban

830 In secondary literature on *Polly*, the ballad opera is repeatedly referred to as “play”, this study thus adopts this practice. See e.g. Rob Canfield, Robert G. Dryden and Patricia Meyer Spacks.

831 For commentary on the customs of censorship with a focus on *The Beggar's Opera*, see Matthew J. KINSERVIK, *Disciplining Satire: The Censorship of Satiric Comedy on the Eighteenth-Century London Stage* (Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, 2002). With regards to Gay's defence of the play, Calhoun Winton remarks that there was certainly some element of “honi soit qui mal y pense” in Gay's denials, see WINTON, *John Gay and the London Theatre* (Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1993) 133. For explanations of the political innuendo in *Polly*, see Bertrand A. GOLDFAR, *Walpole and the Wits: The Relation of Politics to Literature, 1722–1742* (Lincoln and London: U of Nebraska P, 1976) 81–83. W.E. Schultz further suggests that the play's ban probably depended not so much on the actual content, but on the fact “that the report of a new play bearing Gay's name [...] was unfit for the comfort of Walpole's circle” in: William Eben SCHULTZ, *Gay's 'Beggar's Opera': Its Contents, History, and Influence* (1923, repr. New York: Russell and Russell, 1967) 213. However, as Dianne Dugaw rightfully asserts, the contemporary perception of the play is clearly at odds with modern readings of it as “innocent politically” as Patricia Meyer Spacks described it, see SPACKS, *John Gay* (New York: Twayne, 1965) 159, Dugaw further claims that “Polly had importance both as satire and as theatre, striking a chord in its own which modern criticism has yet to hear”, in: DUGAW, *Warrior Women and Popular Balladry 1650–1850* (Cambridge: CUP, 1989), “Chapter 8: The Female Warrior, Gay's *Polly*, and the Heroic Ideal” 191–211. This assessment is in line with Vincent J. Liesenfeld's claim that *Polly* indeed was a very politically provocative play as Gay, “moved the new play squarely into matters of the most delicate foreign policy involving conflicting claims to the West Indies and the Americas” in: Liesenfeld xii.

consequently prompted the public's curiosity and as Gay went ahead with the publication of the play,⁸³² the publisher sold about 10.500 copies in the year following its publication,⁸³³ about ten times the usual press run.⁸³⁴ Ironically though, for a play featuring pirates, Gay's profits would have been noticeably higher had the notoriety of *Polly* not tempted several pirate-editions of the play.⁸³⁵ *Polly* then only made it to the stage in 1777, in an altered version by George Colman the Elder at the Little Haymarket.⁸³⁶

The play's plot follows Polly who, taking Macheath's advice, travels to the West Indies, searching for her love, the transported highwayman from *The Beggars' Opera*. With her money stolen en route, Polly disembarks destitute, and open to the intervention from her old acquaintance Mrs. Trapes, hires herself out as a servant to the colonial official and plantation owner Mr. Ducat. However, Ducat's and Trapes' deal actually leads to Polly being sold to Ducat as a prostitute. But Polly, portrayed as distressed but virtuous, manages to escape her fate with the help of Mrs. Ducat, who lends her clothes to disguise herself as a young man. In search for Macheath who, as she has learned in the meantime, is roaming the Indies as pirate, Polly falls into the hands of a pirate-gang. Amidst the commotion following a slave-revolt and pirate attack on the plantations, a young Indian prince named Cawwawkee is captured by the pirates and, together with the cross-dressed Polly, who could convince the prince of "his" virtue, they manage to bribe some of the pirates and escape, joining the Indians and English in their fight against the pirates. The pirates' captain Morano is, unbeknown to any character other than his wife Jenny Diver, meanwhile disclosed as the escapee Macheath in blackface. While the Indians – with Cawwawkee and Polly – continue to successfully fight back the pirates who are split amongst themselves and discuss mutiny, Macheath/Morano is finally captured and sentenced to death. The fighting being over, Polly discloses her female identity and eventually realizes that it was she herself who captured Macheath, but a final encounter is precluded as Morano has already been executed. Cawwawkee is impressed with

832 Which was eventually published on the 5th of April 1729.

833 See Joan Hildreth OWEN, "Polly and the Choice of Virtue", *Bulletin of the New York Public Library* 77 (1974): 393–406, 393.

834 See Winton 133.

835 See James R. SUTHERLAND, "Polly among the Pirates", *Modern Humanities Research Association* 37 (1942): 291–303, 291

836 On this particular staging, see Peter P. REED, "Conquer or Die: Staging Circum-Atlantic Revolt in *Polly* and *Three Fingered Jack*", *Theatre Journal* 59.2 (2007): 241–258, for further commentary on the stage history of the play, see Schultz 208–220, as well as Sutherland, Spacks 147–148, William Henry IRVING, *John Gay: Favourite of the Wits* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1962). For the music, see Winton 143 and A.E.H. Swan, "The Airs and Tunes of John Gay's *Polly*", *Anglia* 60 (1936): 403–22 and on the songs and country dances in *Polly*, see Dianne DUGAW, "Chapter 8: Country Dancing and the Politics of Empire in *Polly*" 197–215 in: Dugaw, 'Deep Play'.

Polly's virtuous conduct and, taken by her recently discovered female charms, he proposes to her, yet Polly asks for "a decent time to / my sorrows" (P, III.xv, 39 f) and the play ends with a dance celebrating the Indians' victory.

Gay's *Polly*, as Rob Canfield writes, "counters the ideality of Italian Opera and the heroic tragedy of Restoration drama".⁸³⁷ Playing with the romance motif⁸³⁸ the plot features already established characters from *The Beggar's Opera*, but also adopts characters from pirate pamphlets and popular stories such as Charles Johnson's *The General History of Pirates*, most notably the account of the lives of two female pirates, Anne Bonny and Mary Read.⁸³⁹ With regards to its critical assessment *Polly* found far less renown than its famous forerunner, with critics dismissing the play for its alleged lack of "*The Beggar's Opera's* buoyance and brilliance".⁸⁴⁰ Patricia Meyer Spacks exemplifies the earlier scholarly dismissal of the play, calling *Polly* a "literary [...] fiasco" and "failure".⁸⁴¹ More recent critics, however, have acknowledged Gay's extension of his earlier satire, as Rob Canfield attests the play "a more subversive satire upon British imperialism and its driving capitalist duplicities, attendant hypocrisies, and Creole mimics",⁸⁴² and Dianne Dugaw writes that in *Polly* Gay sets out "anatomizing

837 Rob CANFIELD, "Something's Mizzzen: Anne Bonny, Mary Read, *Polly*, and Female Counter-Roles on the Imperialist Stage", *South Atlantic Review* (2001): 45 – 63, 49.

838 Dugaw further notes that in "turning inside out" this popular motif, "Gay employed the ballad heroine to call into question those twin structural and thematic poles of the ballad motif [...] the Female Warrior motif, by reversing the roles simultaneously expose[s] the seams of the ideal", *Warrior Women*, 191.

839 See Chapter 6: "The Women Pirates: Anne Bonny and Mary Read" 103 – 126, in Rediker, *Villains of all Nations*. See also the Charles Johnson's biographical account of the lives of these two women in: Charles JOHNSON, *A General History of the Robberies and Murders of the Most Notorious Pirates*, 1724, ed. David Cordingly (Guilford: The Lyons Press, 2002).

840 Winton 139. See also Irving, who calls Polly an "ordinary sentimental heroine", claiming "there is nothing fresh about it" 270. This assessment is also voiced by a German critic of the play, Horst Hühne, who claims the play to be sentimental, overly moralistic and theatrically ineffective: "Polly ist ein ganz und gar sentimentales, fast nur aus Moralpredigt bestehendes, durchaus bühnenunwirksames Stück", Horst HÖHNE, "Die Fortsetzung der *Beggar's Opera: Polly* (1728)" in: Uwe Böker, Ines Detmers and Anna-Christina Giovannopolous eds., *John Gay's 'The Beggar's Opera' 1728–2004: Adaptations and Re-Writings*, International Forschungen zur Allg. und Vergl. Literaturwissenschaft 105 (Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2006) 127 – 146, 128.

841 Spacks 159 f. Spacks goes on to dismiss Macheath's blackface-role as merely a "convenient symbol" for the character's criminal personality, an appraisal that blatantly overlooks – and in fact reinscribes – the alleged symbol's racial implications.

842 Rob Canfield 46. Refer to Dugaw, *Warrior Women* for an exploration of the female warrior motif in the play and Joan Hildreth Owen, who reads the play's leitmotif as being one of "moral choice" and the balance between "Indian democracy versus malevolent European colonialism" 403. See also Norman SIMMS, "War and Peace in John Gay's *Polly*: Literal, Figurative and Cynical", *Centre D'Études du XVIIIe Siècle de L'Université de la Sorbonne: Guerres et Paix: La Grand Bretagne aux XVIIIe Siècle* 2 (1998): 281 – 291.

[...] colonialism as a single failed ethos”.⁸⁴³ “*Polly: Reversals and Mimicries*” argues that *Polly* can indeed be read as a continuation of the theatres of escape discussed so far because the play maintains the performative exploration of spaces, spectacles and roles of the nascent maritime empire, but also employs the medium’s distinctiveness to highlight theatricality of race, gender, class and age in its use of masks, costumes, settings and songs. *Polly* shows the empire to be immersed in aspects of acquisition, appropriation and exploitation while also questioning British colonial endeavours.

This subchapter will first broadly survey the play’s establishment of dramaturgical and performative lineages that serve to foreground the West Indies as a site embedded in and invested with aspects of the metropolis. In “Planters and Pirates” (4.4.2) the focus will then shift towards the scathing representation of the English colonists and the pirates as their dramaturgical equivalent, and in “I am no coward, European!” (4.4.3) the virtuous Indians and Polly herself will be analysed in terms of their roles in the counter-spectacles to British colonial conduct the play stages. The final subchapter will put forward an analysis of *Polly* that dwells on the play’s “double vision”: even though the play closes with an affirmation of colonial authority and an affirmative bourgeois gesture in Polly’s and Cawwawkee’s romance, Gay’s vivid depictions of role reversals, counter-spectacles and mimicries in fact also connote resistance to colonial authority as the theatricality of the action defies totalizing discourses. Hence, *Polly*’s staged mimicries draw attention to and problematize signs of cultural priority, as its menacing “double vision” not only presents the ambivalence of colonial discourse, but also fractures its authority.⁸⁴⁴

The opera’s setting in the West Indies⁸⁴⁵ transports the fictional characters as well as the audience into the Caribbean. *Polly* thus provides exotic entertainment while at the same time transcribing the colonial setting with the lineages and relations of the metropolis. The quote heading this subchapter, Mrs. Trapes crying out: “Bless my eye-sight! what do I see! I am in a dream, or it is / Miss Polly Peachum! mercy upon me. Child, what brought you on this / side of the water?” (P, I, iv, 1–3),⁸⁴⁶ again intones the familiar recognition in so many maritime encounters that maintains the conjoining potential and the increasing denseness of the sea as cultural contact zone. The British Atlantic here appears as a small

843 Dugaw, *Warrior Women* 198.

844 Bhabha, “Of Mimicry and Man”, *The Location of Culture* 126.

845 This setting is visually portrayed in II and III, both acts scenically present “The View of an Indian Country” and “The Indian Camp”, respectively.

846 Quoted from John GAY, *The Poetical Works of John Gay: Including ‘Polly’, ‘The Beggar’s Opera’ and Selections from other Dramatic Work*, ed. by G.C. Faber (1923, repr., New York: Russell & Russell, 1969). All quotes from the opera will be indicated by a “P”, followed by act and scene-number and the lines.

world, providing the stage for Polly's escape that was spurned by a – slightly different – “a-husband-hunting” as Polly's reply makes clear: “Love, Madam, and the misfortunes of our family” (P, I. iv, 4). Polly's search for her run-away husband Macheath is complicated by the dangers of voyaging, as Polly complains: “my chest was broke open at sea, and /I am now a wretched vagabond expos'd to hunger and want” (P, I. v, 66 f). Once more the sea is presented as having a levelling function and here contributes to the profit-oriented Mrs. Trapes' advantage. The portrayal of Ducat and Trapes, both represented as avaricious and immoral characters, not only serves to establish the satire's objective and as such provides a continuation of Gay's earlier attack, but it also inscribes the colonial setting with “transported” metropolitan vices and hence establishes the analogy between the English planters and pirates and so, more generally, that of the English characters' conduct with that of the British Empire by way of synecdoche, as it suggests an equation between the empire's subjects and the empire per se.

4.4.2 Planters and Pirates: Colonial Analogies

In *Polly*, Gay affirms the simultaneity of mercenary ambitions within the British maritime world in transposing the country gentleman and the highwayman from London to the West Indies while correspondingly exploring “the nascent roles of these English subjects – both merchant and lower class – as fortune hunters in the colonies”.⁸⁴⁷ The beginning of the play introduces the audience⁸⁴⁸ to the affinity of these ambitions as well as to lower-class characters that escaped the metropolis in order to explore their fortune in the colonies. In I. i Mrs. Trapes, the tally-woman known from *The Beggar's Opera*, and the aptly-named Mr. Ducat, introduced as a “wealthy, very wealthy” (P, I. i, 5, Trapes) plantation owner, discuss and negotiate their respective aspirations: “Though you were born and bred and live in the Indies, as you /are a subject of Britain you shou'd live up to our customs” (P, I. i, 1 f). Mrs. Trapes tries to underscore the necessity of spending – and indeed wanting more – money as part of customary, even fashionable social conduct: “'Tis genteel to be in debt, Your luxury should / distinguish you from the vulgar” (P, I. i, 8 f). It soon turns out that Mrs. Trapes' profession echoes her occupation back in London – she now resorts to trading in people and tries to persuade the wealthy planter to require “superfluities” (P, I. I xx) and purchase a young woman from her. In a satirical vein,

847 Robert G. DRYDEN, “John Gay's *Polly*: Unmasking Pirates and Fortune Hunters in the West Indies”, *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 34.4 (2001): 539 – 557, 540.

848 As it was written for the stage, I will refer to audience, not readership.

tying in with the corruption of *The Beggar's Opera*, Trapes hails profit-making and profit-maximization as ultimate motives that should override any honourable objectives: "Air I. Morals and honesty leave to the poor, / As they do at London" (P, I, i, x). In this respect, the colonies offered her an ideal forum in which to engage in her business as the character exclaims she has shipped to the Indies "to mend my fortune to / the Plantations" (P, I, i, 24 f). Mrs. Trapes' recommendations and her hiring out as a slave trader thus accentuate the "anything-goes" mentality at the heart of the colonial endeavours as portrayed in the opera, while also launching the intimate connection of the mercantile system and the slave trade. The play thus – comparable to *Oroonoko* – reveals "the ugly truth behind bourgeois imperialism",⁸⁴⁹ as J. Douglas Canfield writes, and Gay offers a perspective on colonial merchants that is very much comparable to the conduct and ethics of pirates.⁸⁵⁰ The "ugly truth" sustaining colonial practices of slavery is openly discussed between Trapes and Ducat:

DUCAT: [...] why, I could

have half a dozen negro princesses for the price.

TRAPES: But sure you cannot expect to buy a fine handsome christian at that rate. You are not us'd to see such goods on this side of the water. For the women [the English], like cloaths, are all tarnish'd and half worn out before they are sent hither (P, I, vi, 21 – 26).

The slave market emerges as an industry fed by notions that objectify the female body in terms of colour, age and chastity, once more insinuating that the colonies are a space for destitute women who were no longer in line with the metropolitan market as they are "half worn out". Trapes goes on to solicit her business, informing Ducat that, contrary to the usual "half worn out" women, she has now "a fresh / cargo of ladies just arriv'd: no body alive shall set eyes upon 'em till you have / provided your self" (P, I, i, 52 f) and, surpassing this promotion, she adds: "We are not here, I must tell you, as we are at London, where we can have / fresh goods every week by the waggon" (P, I, i, 78 f). The connection between the colonies and London here is maintained purely with reference to economic aspects, namely the availability of commodities and the merchant's return on sales: "If I had her at London, such a lady would / be sufficient to make my fortune" (P, I, i, 83 f). Trapes' cunning greediness and the

849 J. Douglas Canfield ed., *The Broadview Anthology of Restoration and Early Eighteenth-Century Drama* (Ontario et al.: Broadview Press, 2001) xvii.

850 In this regard, Gay was one of the first English writers to present merchants in an unfavourable light, see John McVEAGH, *Tradefull Merchants: The Portrayal of the Capitalist in Literature* (London, Boston and Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981) 53 – 82, but see also Edward Ward's description of the London stock exchange, giving a far less celebratory account than e. g. Addison: Edward WARD, "The Royal Exchange (From The London Spy)" in: Mackie 246 – 257.

hyperbolically presented commodification of women also work to highlight the immorality of colonial traders. In I. iii, the ship's arrival is reported and, reminiscent of the slave-ship's arrival in *Oroonoko*, Trapes' reaction – "are all the ladies safely landed?" (P, I. iii, 1) – once more emphasizes her values as her real worry is not for the "ladies' safety", but for the unspoiled off-loading of "fresh cargo". Mentioning the ship's arrival also evokes the trope of the ship as a site for circulation and movement, dramaturgically but also materially conjoining the maritime world and accomplishing new colonial realities for the characters. Once Polly is handed over to Ducat, she soon comes to realize the extent of her new colonial reality as a commodified and enslaved woman,⁸⁵¹ her new status further circumscribed by Ducat who informs the reluctant woman that the pursuit of her self-interest will be helpful in advancing her position: "if you rightly consult your own interest, as every body/now-a-days does, you may make your self perfectly easy" (P, I. xi, 2 f). Ducat promotes female bodily self-abandonment as a route to success and, as Polly insists on her virtue, the only option available to her is yet another instance of self-abandonment: namely her disguise in breeches. Donning the habit of a male is presented as the only feasible route to retain her bodily integrity, while at the same time disguising it.

With regards to the representation of the English colonists, the ensuing pirate attack not only serves to complement the satirical portrayal of Ducat as it opposes his cowardly reaction⁸⁵² to that of the bravely fighting Indians, but it also functions to relate the colonists' fraudulent business ethics and practices with the heinous conduct of pirates. As Robert G. Dryden writes, Gay "entertains the [...] radical notion that England's relentless acts of colonial appropriation are acts of piracy".⁸⁵³ In delving into the popular theme of piracy, *Polly* henceforth portrays the outlaw ethics of the pirate-crew as very similar to the legality of mercenary performances. The representation of the pirates as rogue maritime characters also registers issues of class and racial transgressions within the Atlantic world that function to advance the play's mimic impulses and the play's theatricality.

851 In I.xi both Trapes and Ducat inspect Polly through an open door, without Polly being aware of this. During this inspection Ducat calls Polly's eyes her "fortune" (I, I.xi, 4) and her body his "property" (P, I.xi, 51), thus updating the character's body as a commodity for the audience to see as well as voyeuristically mirroring the inspection of slaves.

852 The Indians "are all in arms, according to their alliance", Ducat himself eschews fighting, in line with his servant's utterance: "DAMARIS: But you are too rich to have courage. You should fight by/ deputy" (P, I.xii, 23 f).

853 Robert G. Dryden 543. This connection was not that farfetched in early eighteenth-century discourse, as writers such as John Esquemeling in his widely read and circulated account *The Buccaneers of America* (English translation 1684) indeed had suggested analogies to merchants' practices, see John ESQUEMELING, *The Buccaneers of America: In the Original English translation of 1684* (New York: Cosimo Classics, 2007).

The pirates' representation in *Polly* exhibits familiar features of stage pirates or of other low-life escapees or castaways: hardly the most cunning characters they display ambitions that well surmount their logistic and intellectual capacities. Similar to the pirate-gang in *The Successful Pyrate*, the sailors' crew in *The Enchanted Island* and *Cuckolds-Haven*, Capstern, Hacker, Culverin, Laguerre and Cutlace, all furnished with maritime names, hail the prospects of enormous financial gains, but are also at odds as to the allocation of these profits. On one level, their antics parallel the greedy and cavalier attitude of the English merchants, on another level, the pirates' tales of their respective careers points to the lower class-background of their current profession. Laguerre professes to have grown from being first a footman, then a pimp, to finally a "man of quality" (P, II. ii, 35) and Capstern claims to have been "ambitious / too of a gentleman's profession, and turn'd gamester" (P, II. ii, 45 f). Just as Gay satirically depicts the immorality of a colonial merchant and a female slave-trader with regards to the apparent fashionable exemplar set for them in the higher regions of London society, the pirates' ambitions are here also shown to have been fostered in England. Like the colonial society of transported criminals in *The Widdow Ranter* Gay's pirate crew has been cast on a new stage to continue and indeed try to outdo their inchoate business. The colonies are thus portrayed as not only collecting ponds for transgressive and deviant characters, but also as locations where such inclinations can prosper.

The pirates, again similar to the (re)self-fashioning techniques in Behn's play, now revel in the possibilities of social climbing, as Hacker declares: "I had always a genius for ambition. Birth and education cannot / keep it under. Our profession is great, brothers. What can be more heroic / than to have declar'd war with the whole world?" (P, II. ii, 20 – 22). In this regard the pirates' portrayal infuses their transgression of social boundaries with that of spatial boundaries as both acts here seem mutually dependent: "CAPSTERN: So I also own my rank in / the world to transportation" (P, II. ii, 47 f). Captained by a black man, Morano, the pirates are presented as a motley crew of criminals whose sole aim is to acquire funds to furnish "pleasures" and "extravagancies". Their aspirations not only shake class boundaries, but also transcend notions of national and spatial boundaries as they believe to be able to take on the "whole world":

HACKER: [...] And then – the kingdom

of Mexico shall be mine. My lot shall be the kingdom of Mexico.

CAPSTERN: Who talks of Mexico? [All rise.] I'll never give it up. If you outlive me, brother, and I dye without heirs, I'll leave it to you for a legacy. I hope now you are satisfy'd. I have set my heart upon it, and no body shall dispute it with me.

LAGUERRE: The island of Cuba, methinks, brother, might satisfy any reasonable man.

CULVERIN: That I had allotted for you. Mexico shall not be parted with without my consent, captain Morano to be sure will choose Peru; that's the country of gold, and all your great men love gold. Mexico hath only silver, nothing but silver. Governor of Cartagena, brother, is a pretty snug employment. That I shall not dispute with you.

CAPSTERN: Death, Sir, – I shall not part with Mexico so easily.

HACKER: Nor I.

CULVERIN: Nor I.

LAGUERRE: Nor I.

CULVERIN: Nor I.

HACKER: Draw then, and let the survivor take it. [They fight. (P, II, ii, 79–97).

This argument is worth quoting at length as the crew here acts out several aspects of their self-image that can be read as a microcosmic enactment of a colonising *modus operandi*. As much as the argument starts off with the pirates, most notably Hacker, displaying an air of greatness in their imperial allocation of whole lands, the heated course of the argument, its violent conclusion and the indiscriminate declaration of war on the “whole world” highlight the farcical quality of the pirates’ aspirations. On one level, the crew clearly take on and appropriate rhetorical gestures that are reminiscent of high politics and thus mock the procedural manners of political negotiations. The pirates here, similar to the mock governments staged in *The Enchanted Island* and *The Successful Pirate*, bask in their momentarily elevated social status and casually distribute whole countries and “snug employments” amongst themselves. On another level, this distribution also discloses not only information of respective countries seemingly only based on hearsay, but moreover reduces these countries – a substantial chunk of South and Central America – to their natural resources. Apart from providing “snug employment” and titles, the countries’ estimation is only assessed in terms of their value, gold and silver. Apart from their mutual obsession with Mexico, the pirates also display no real preference for a specific booty, but each wants to ensure that their share is considerable. Despite their repeated affirmations of brotherhood the crew falls into violence and hence puts a performative halt – “let the survivor take it” – to the illusion of equal distribution. Thus, on several levels, Gay stages a miniature version of colonialism as acts of colonial appropriation and exploitation are disguised as tumultuous pirate-talk. The pirate-gang seems to view the “whole world” as a self-service reservoir for their gusto and in equating their behaviour to that of the English colonial official and Mrs. Trapes, who both command over human cargo as the pirates rhetorically command over countries, Gay not only accommodates a critique of the superior instances of colonial administration, but subjects both agents and attitudes to a scathing ridicule. This equation is further articulated in Hacker’s deliberations on the fight against the English colonists and the Indians’

role in it: “Who knows but they may side with us? / May-hap they may like our tyranny better” (P, I, ii, 128 f). Indeed, if these representations of colonial authorities are anything to go by, Gay presents them as being of no real alternative.

However, as much as these colonial agents are satirically exposed, their representation also suggests that colonial activities are deeply invested in and surrounded with acts of transgression and theatricality. In aiming at the “whole world”, the characters put on an array of masks – commander, “brother”, black man – and their endeavours are thus inextricably linked with aspects of theatricality that spotlight the instability of their roles and identities. Polly’s subsequent discovery by the pirates reinforces this theatricality as the female character appears in breeches. In putting on the male clothes given to her by Mrs. Ducat, Polly reassures herself: “With the habit, / I must put on the courage and resolution of a man” (P, II, i, 1 f) – this resolution highlights the performative aspects of the part and draws attention to the instabilities of identity, that is of gender – and in the pirates’ case, class – boundaries. These boundaries are presented as porous: acting man here appears as being man. Like the pirates, and like the transgressive characters in *The Widdow Ranter*, the character of Polly seems to insinuate that the colonies serve as a literal stage for self-fashioning: anything goes. *Polly* thus provides a spectacle of maritime expansion that offers the colonies as stages and the stage as its representation. Literally, the West Indies appear as a “theatrical stage affixed to Europe”,⁸⁵⁴ with English escapees reinventing and re-enacting their European selves in order to meet their ends. Said’s metaphor of theatre can here be applied to illuminate how the colonial consciousness can be subverted through theatrical mimicry and performances of hybridity.

Polly subsequently awakens from her sleep, and as she becomes aware of the pirates, her situation offers an ironic reversal of the “o brave new world”-motif in plays such as *The Enchanted Island* or Isabinda’s sighting of the English sailors in *A Bickerstaff’s Burying*. Her discovery by the pirates in this respect provides a first textual and performative instance of mockery as her putting on the role of a novice pirate serves to satirize and ultimately thwart the pirates’ ambitions. The cross-dressed character henceforth pretends to be in awe of the pirates, “those brave spirits, those *Alexanders*, that shall soon by conquest / be in possession of the *Indies*” (P, II, ii, 106 f). Polly not only scorns at the pirates’ ability to “conquest” but also mocks their masculinity. The character enforces the satire by simply mirroring the pirates’ proclamations: “I came / on purpose to join you, to rob the world by way of retaliation. An open war / with the whole world is brave and honourable” (P, II, v, 15 – 17). In mimicking the pirates, Polly also offers up heroism as a matter of theatrical play, as Dugaw points out: “This notion of play

854 Said, *Orientalism* 63.

sets up in the motif an essentially ironic usurpation of male heroism which – like the heroine’s commandeering of gender codes in general – exposes its basis in convention and thus destabilizes it”.⁸⁵⁵

Within the presented pirate-community Polly’s assertions are consequentially lauded, however, the “open war” soon turns on itself as the pirates’ fantasies of omnipotence become entrapped in internal divisions. In several ways the pirates’ excessive desires are portrayed as causing their downfall, both in terms of their overt imperial ambitions and in terms of their more home-bound aspirations. Hacker and his men will subsequently go on to decide to mutiny and try to run off with an Indian treasure, Morano and his English wife Jenny are presented as equally self-centred, with Morano being portrayed as lusty and Jenny as nursing her very own hopes of advancement: “Rob the crew, and steal/off to *England*. Believe me, Captain, you will be rich enough to be respected / by your neighbours” (P, II. iii, 45–47). Jenny’s dream is highly contrastive to the pirates’ imperial ambitions as she here suggests a return to England and the start of a respectable existence. But her betrothal to a black pirate undercuts these petit bourgeois ambitions, Morano’s disguise has – as will be shown in “*Polly’s Double Vision*” – inextricably bound the character to the hybrid space of the colony and thus forestalled his return. The pirates are subsequently not only mocked by Polly’s comments regarding their profession, but Gay’s caustic attack on the colonists’ self-fashioning as mighty and superior is further developed in contrasting it with the counter-roles that Polly and the Caribbean prince Cawwawkee act out.

4.4.3 “I am no coward, European!”: Counter-Spectacles

As established at the outset, Gay’s satire of the English colonists is not only achieved in drawing an analogy between the merchants and the pirates, but also in contrasting each group with the native inhabitants of the island. In II. viii the captured prince Cawwawkee is brought before the assembled pirates and the evolving dialogue once more portrays the pirates’ world as farcically distorted. Here, the native “brute” Cawwawkee (P, II. viii, 54, Capstern) appears as the enlightened and virtuous insider, while the pirate-crew voices its disapproval of the Indian’s lack of “civilizing” (P, II. viii, 33 f). The ridiculous note of the pirates’ “civilizing” mission is set right at the outset where Vanderbluff exclaims: “We must beat civilizing into ‘em, to make ‘em capable of common / society, and common conversation” (P, II. viii, 33 f). Not only is a criminal character clearly poorly placed to instruct in the ways of “common society”, but the “beating in”

⁸⁵⁵ Dugaw, *Warrior Women* 193.

of civilization also appears as – euphemistically put – counterproductive and, as such, lends it a comic edge. Cawwawkee, conversely, is presented as an overtly virtuous and well-mannered young man, disgusted with the barbarian English: “What, betray my friends! I am no coward, European!” (P, II. viii, 46). The pirates henceforth try to ascertain the whereabouts of some – supposedly – hidden treasure from the prince, even threatening him with torture, and his refusal to cooperate makes them think about out loud on the blessings of their own, apparently more civil, upbringing:

JENNY: We have reason to be thankful for our good education. How ignorant is mankind without it!

CAPSTERN: I wonder to hear the brute speak.

LAGUERRE: They would make a shew of him in England.

[...]

CAPSTERN: But how can you expect any thing else from a creature, who hath never seen a civiliz'd country? Which way should he know mankind?

JENNY: Since they are made like us, to be sure, were they in England they might be taught (P, II. viii, 52 – 60).

The pirates' representation is thus laughable on many levels: Jenny, a transported criminal, who in the previous scene had urged Morano to run away with the treasure to a more comfortable life back in England, now fashions herself as not only having enjoyed a “good education” herself, but also acts almost like a merciful missionary: “Without doubt, education and example can do much” (P, II. viii, 64). Laguerre and Capstern find fault with Cawwawkee's apparently savage nature, calling him “creature” and “brute”. In doing so, however, they only refer to themselves as their now well-established brutish manners indicate. In addition, Laguerre's reference – “They would make a shew of him” –, which suggests that Cawwawkee would be exhibited for public entertainment in England, ironically rebounds since public trials and hangings of *pirates* brought back from the colonies were indeed very popular “shewings” in England. Dramaturgically this scene works to instigate Cawwawkee's and Polly's countering performances in that it not only widens the gap between the pirates and Cawwawkee as the noble savage, but also in that it initiates the teaming up of Polly with the Indian: a cross-dressed woman from Newgate and a captured Caribbean prince. On the one hand, this teaming up introduces the romance motif to the plot, on the other hand, it stages a hybridity that henceforth serves to advance the action as well as functions to characterize the colony on a more general level.

Polly and Cawwawkee are imprisoned together, with the prince now taking an almost ethnographic interest in the European, just as before the pirates had surveyed him in terms of his “civilizing”.

CAWWAWKEE: To be oppress'd by an European implies merit. Yet you are an European. Are you fools? Do you believe one another? Sure speech can be of no use among you.
 [...] You are
 ashamed of your hearts, you can lie. How can you bear to look into yourselves?
 (P, II. xi, 3–8).

Cawwawkee is portrayed as being startled by the discovery of a virtuous European, echoing Capstern's surprise that "the brute can speak". Cawwawkee turns the observation round and wonders what use speech can have when it only provides for lies. In talking of "Europeans" – rather than English – the Indian is not only comically presented as indeed taking on the role of a European discovering the Indians or Americans, but the lack of differentiation here also comments on European practices of colonial discovery. The Indian character then sings an air, disclosing his belief in and cherish of virtue and honesty, capacities he denies the Europeans: "Virtue's treasure / Is a pleasure, Cheerful even amid distress" (P, II.xi, Air XLVII, T'amo tanto, 20–23). Polly joins in and both characters repeat the air, alternating the lines. Apart from Jenny's and Morano's duet in II.iii, Air XXX, this is the only duet of the opera, Cawwawkee performatively turning out to be Polly's counterpart in that the joint presentation of the song serves to coalesce their intimacy; on several levels the characters are thus literally in tune. Joan Hildreth Owen labelled this union "an aristocracy of naïveté",⁸⁵⁶ with the orphan Polly having escaped from "civilized" hypocrisy to team up with "natural man".⁸⁵⁷ However, this "aristocracy of naïveté", as much as it presents the two characters' esteem of virtue in unison, henceforth also functions to deepen the binary oppositions Gay draws in the play.

The following act (III) is set in the Indian Camp, where the Indian King Pohetohee, Ducat and their respective attendants discuss their further line of approach to fight the pirates. Here Pohetohee's questioning of Ducat resonates in his son's interrogation of Polly: "ПОХЕТОХЕЕ: Are you a man? [...] And have you no spirit to defend it?" (P, III. i, 9–15). Once more, Ducat proves a very incompetent colonial official⁸⁵⁸ as he not only shows cowardice, but also explains his reluctance with economic reasons: "Sir, fighting is not our business; we pay others for fighting; and yet 'tis/well known we had rather part with our lives than our money" (P, III. i, 13 f). Yet again, the Indian character is left to wonder at

856 Joan Hildreth Owen 404.

857 Ibid. 404.

858 His incompetency is reminiscent of the mismanagement portrayed in Behn's *The Widdow Ranter* and *Oroonoko*, see Richard FROHOCK, "Violence and Awe: the Foundations of Government in Aphra Behn's New World Settings" *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 8.4 (1996): 437–52.

the priorities of the European: “How different are your notions from ours! We think virtue, honour, /and courage as essential to man as his limbs, or senses [...] How custom can degrade nature!” (P, III. i, 23 – 26). The blatant discrepancy between the natives and the “civilized” Europeans also emphasizes Polly’s special role within the play as Cawwawkee in the following scene – almost patronizingly – assures his father: “For this youth, I will be answerable. Like a gem found in rubbish, /he appears the brighter among these his country men” (P, III. ii, 12 f).

The Indians here appear, as Winton writes, as “a group of noble noble savages”⁸⁵⁹ – however, Winton does not note that this exaggerated performance connotes another instance of colonial mimicry. The exaggerated performance of virtue and honour by the Indians creates a performative excess that serves to destabilize colonial authority as mimicry turns into mockery: “The ‘mimic man’ takes up the metropolitan desire to hear the strains of its own voice – to witness the duplication of its own authority – but he then rearticulates that desire as parody”.⁸⁶⁰ As much as Gay reinforces the binary opposition between the two groups through the trope of the noble savage,⁸⁶¹ the opposition is eventually straightened out to an extent: after the slaves have helped to fight the pirates, they are all sent back to their plantations by Pohotohee.⁸⁶² Neither side thus appreciates the slaves for anything other than their economic worth: “In this sense, there are no ‘good guys’ in Gay’s representation of colonization. Both the force of empire and the resistance to empire are equally imperial in their greed for ownership of lands, wealth, and domination of peoples”.⁸⁶³ In this the West Indies emerge as a site for “opportunistic scavengers” and “fortune hunters”⁸⁶⁴ as well as mimic “noble noble savages” that but eventually work together to reintegrate and maintain the balance of power. However, the play’s repeated reversals and mimicries also complicate the power structures of colonial authority. In a final step thus, the following subchapter will focus more closely on the play’s (theatrical) double vision and its implications for a critique of colonial ideology.

859 Winton 137.

860 Graham HUGGAN, “A Tale of Two Parrots: Walcott, Rhys, and the Uses of Colonial Mimicry”, *Contemporary Literature* 35.4 (1994): 643–660, 645.

861 See Robert G. Dryden 541.

862 It is important to note that the slaves are not kinsman of Poehotohee, but – as was customary – Africans who were forcefully shipped to work in the Caribbean plantations.

863 Robert G. Dryden 551.

864 Ibid. 541.

4.4.4 *Polly's Double Vision*

As the revolting slaves are once more confined and brought back to the plantations, the blackface pirate-captain Morano is executed and Polly takes off her disguise and considers a union with the Caribbean prince. *Polly's* ending has startled critics, not least because the play's action has so diligently taunted and frustrated conventions, as Dianne Dugaw summarises: "If Gay recognized the need for a point of reference altogether outside the European ethos he so devastatingly dismantled, he nonetheless could not quite imagine a voice for that perspective",⁸⁶⁵ and, most notably, the play does not contain a single non-European female voice. Despite Dugaw and J. Douglas Canfield still perceiving utopian elements in *Polly's* ending,⁸⁶⁶ archetypal topoi of English imperialism are eventually reinscribed, as Rob Canfield suggests: "Rather than a thorough subversion of the symptoms of social disease of bourgeois mimicry and its systems of imperialism [Gay] offers a rather bourgeois solution, ultimately rooted in the notion of the noble savage and enacted upon the virtuous Body Politic".⁸⁶⁷ In this reading *Polly* is seen as in fact assuming a final counter-role, one that "undoes Gay's satire and reinscribes the figures of the Other and the European Self".⁸⁶⁸ However, the ending could also be viewed as not an emphatic reassertion but a resigned gesture, as Dryden writes: "Gay's conclusion does not speak optimistically for the continued progress of colonization or the resistance to that project. And Gay is right [...]".⁸⁶⁹ Both critics refer to aspects of mimicry and masks the play puts forward and hence centre their assertions on the performance of the underlying (essentialist) dialectic of centre and colony. Rob Canfield states that *Polly* does not escape the "dialectic as its mimetic center between mastery and slavery",⁸⁷⁰ whereas Dryden dwells on the figure of the blackface-character Morano. Morano, Dryden claims, "is no longer disguised as a black pirate; he has become a black pirate".⁸⁷¹ As such the character can be said to conflate numerous colonial identities – escaped criminal, black man, pirate – and so, referring to Bhabha, the character can be said to provide "disturbance" in

865 Dugaw, *Warrior Women* 211.

866 Dugaw, on the conclusion of the play, states that the characters are "exiting into a Third World of hopeful – if vaguely conceived – Otherness, Gay's boyclad Female Warrior and her play flee altogether the deplorable bonds of a failed European culture", *ibid.* 211.

867 Rob Canfield 57. Norman Simms argues along similar lines, writing that "Gay allows no room for a dark cynical conceit to undermine that authoritative Leviathan, though his comic opera seems to permit a brief holiday in the West Indies from its most oppressive pressures" 290.

868 Rob Canfield 57.

869 Robert G. Dryden 551.

870 Rob Canfield 48.

871 Robert G. Dryden 541. See also Barthelemy.

the representation of empire, his death eventually locking “him into an *in-between space* permanently”.⁸⁷² In evaluating *Polly*’s representations of resistance, however, an appraisal focusing on the blackface-disguise or on the bourgeois conclusion falls short of considering the medium’s very own mimetic impulses, namely the power of theatrical representation as such. Hence this chapter proposes that, despite the play’s dramaturgical accommodation of resistance through the bourgeois and colonial happy ending,⁸⁷³ *Polly*’s excessive staging of colonial mimicries offers the West Indies as a hybrid and mimic space, thus in fact exhibiting a double vision that both accommodates and resists colonial discourses.

As has become clear, Gay’s opera is structured around an array of reversals that not only depend on a reversal in character, e. g. pirates / convicts hailing the benefits of education, but that are also theatrically performed, namely through costume, make-up and gestures. Almost every character in the play is presented as miming and indeed mimicking: Polly, daughter of a convicted bandit, wife to a convicted criminal and run away from London’s low life, engaged in a plot dwelling on the romance motif and for the most part dressed as a young man, is portrayed as defender – in fact, the personification – of bourgeois virtues. Mr. Ducat, unscrupulous plantation owner in the West Indies, aspires to bourgeois customs and fashions in his imitation of a metropolitan life. The pirates mimic colonial explorers, aspiring governors and kings, as well as preservers of English education; the Indians overtake even the most virtuous character Polly in their insistence on values, appearing as “noble noble savages” and thus parodies of authority. Finally, the English convict-escapee dons blackface and dreams of imperial might. These performances emphasize the notion that identities are unstable and are only ever partially given and multifaceted. The theatres of escape as staged in the Caribbean here once more bring together notions of the “Black” as well as the “Red” Atlantic as its cross-dressed, socially and racially transgressive characters can be said to “yield[s] a course of lessons as to the instability and mutability of identities which are always unfinished, always being remade”.⁸⁷⁴

The characters’ mimicries hence challenge the representations that serve to define them; Cawwawkee’s resemblance to a civilized and virtuous prince, Morano’s disguise as a black pirate which not even Polly sees through – he even dies in this disguise, and Polly’s effective enacting of a man and warrior⁸⁷⁵ are all theatrical reminders of the unstable foundations of identity. Thus *Polly*’s

872 Ibid. 551.

873 Ducat remains secure, Morano dies, Polly and Cawwawkee stand before a possible romantic “alliance”. The colonial order is restored and maintained.

874 Gilroy xi.

875 As it is her that manages to capture Morano.

mimicries, in Bhabha's words, are reminders that "Mimicry conceals no presence or identity behind a mask",⁸⁷⁶ but they also serve to "spook" the audience as the "double vision" of mimicry not only reveals the ambivalence of colonial discourse, but breaks its authority.⁸⁷⁷ In *Polly* it is the English colonists that turn out to be the brutes and not some racialized and savage Others, as these Others appear in fact as mock-versions of the most cherished metropolitan virtues. *Polly's* representations can thus also be said to "shatter" *Polly's* ending as the mimicry's mockery and the representation of difference poses a problem to the very colonial authority the play dramaturgically reinscribes at the end.⁸⁷⁸

In *Polly's* theatres of escape, the West Indies – the maritime world – comes into view as a colonial stage, both in its representation of Atlantic lineages and in its staging of Creole mimicries. However, the staging of the sea here offers a double vision in that identities are questioned, mocked and destabilized. The medium's mimetic possibilities draw attention to the ambivalence of colonial discourses as mimicry and menace appear as its twin poles. In this respect it is curiously apt that Bhabha also resorts to theatrical metaphors at the end of his essay "Of Mimicry and Man": "And in that other scene of colonial power, where history turns to farce and presence to 'a part', can be seen the twin figures of narcissism and paranoia that repeat furiously, uncontrollably".⁸⁷⁹ In fact, staging the sea – as a representational doing – here not only troubles the representation as such, but the sea as invoked in *Polly* itself turns out as a double space, full of "narcissim" and "paranoia":

Woman's like the flatt'ring ocean,
 Who her pathless ways can find?
 Every blast directs her motion
 Now she's angry, now she's kind.

What a fool's the vent'rous lover,,
 Whirl'd and toss'd by every wind!
 Can the bark the port recover
 When the silly Pilot's blind?

(P, II. ii, Air XXVI. Ton humeur est Catharine, 68 – 75, Hacker).

876 Bhabha, "Of Mimicry and Man", *The Location of Culture* 126.

877 Ibid. 126 as already quoted.

878 See Bhabha: "The question of the representation of difference is therefore always also a problem of authority", *ibid.* 128.

879 Ibid. 131.

4.5 Summary

As this chapter has shown, in staging the sea London theatres can be framed as metropolitan spaces offering an “*Emporium* for the whole Earth” – entertaining the audience in its performances of maritime endeavours that transported the cast to exotic and far-away locations. The theatres of escape involving plots and spectacles of maritime endeavours can be understood as archives as well as vehicles for fantasies and fears attendant England’s colonial expansion. These plots both involved flights *from* the metropolis – as run-away husbands, convicts and criminals – as well as flights *towards* the colonies, looking for marriage, fortune, new identities, and even romance in *Polly*’s case.

Plots of escape as discussed in this chapter engaged an array of characters, English men and women as criminals, merchants, planters and fortune-hunters and Indian characters as princes and queens – as well as nameless and nationless slaves – that served to performatively refashion colonial identities, to perform and discipline colonial bodies by way of marriage, death, repentance or return to England, as well as to reinforce colonial discourses in developing otherness. In this regard, the staging of theatres of escape not only disseminated knowledge about the ever condensing space of England’s maritime reach and hence functioned to familiarize the metropolitan subjects of empire with the sea as cultural contact zone, but it also staged the sea as a screen for colonial desires and anxieties – narcissism and paranoia, in Bhabha’s terms. “Now she’s angry, now she’s kind” – the fourth line from the song quoted at the end of the last subchapter in this respect alludes to the ambivalent attitudes towards the budding empire, while the equation of woman and sea is also expressive of the gendering of colonial discourses. Theatres of escape have been shown to reify women’s subordinate status, most notably through the performative appropriation of women’s bodies as commodities. Additionally, the comic re-representations of maritime escapees – both male and female – help to subdue threatening transgressions as the comedy helps to lessen distance and control difference.

In placing the space of the sea at the forefront, playwrights lessened and maintained, stabilized as well as de-stabilized the distance between London stages and maritime decks. The space of the sea is presented as containing numerous neuralgic points of contact as well as lineages that establish the increasing reach – both materially as well as discursively – of the empire. The staging of difference – through hybridity and mimicry, the merging and refashioning of identities, the wearing of masks and the donning of habits –, however, also reveals a double vision that challenges totalizing discourses with their

own partiality.⁸⁸⁰ Just as the sea is presented as a – female – Janus-faced space, so the plots of maritime escape dramaturgically and performatively parallel the desires and anxieties associated with colonial expansion: desire for riches, land and bodies, the commodification of bodies, but also going native, miscegenation, savagery and the chaos following piratical authority. In this regard, these plots and spectacles staged spatial, as well as sexual, racial and social transgressions that touched on categories increasingly becoming modern, that is developing into their modern form in the course of the long eighteenth century.

880 Ibid. 127.

5. Conclusion

In this study staging the sea has been presented as a literary enterprise linking the sea as a material entity and cultural topos with the performative means of the Restoration and early eighteenth-century theatre. In this respect, staging the sea has been put forward as a discursive negotiation of the fears and fantasies, “narcissism and paranoia”, power and knowledge of a maritime empire in the making.

The contrast of a static image of England as a “sceptred isle” as evoked in *Richard II* to the bustling vision of “forests rushing into floods” in *Windsor Forest* serves to illustrate a historical change from viewing the sea as confining English insularity to an expansionist notion of the main. The past decades have also seen a critical change in scholarship as the sea is increasingly understood in its historical dimension, developing the notion of a circum-Atlantic “oceanic interculture”.⁸⁸¹ This concept of the sea along the lines of Gilroy’s “Black Atlantic” draws attention to “the circulation of ideas and activists as well as the movement of key cultural artefacts”,⁸⁸² that is focusing on the sea as a single unit of analysis⁸⁸³ in order to expand its cultural horizons, highlighting dark currents as well as floating forests. The sea is thus conceptualized widely as the actual and political space of England’s colonial expansion as well as a broad imaginary space for discursively negotiating this development.

The theatrical history of staging the sea can be read as part of England’s self-fashioning as an empire of the deep, emphasizing the nation as “in an island” and relating a rationale for maritime expansion. Particularly during the Restoration, where political stability was precarious and the benefits of international commerce, consumption and cultural contacts highly contested, the theatre served as a medium for disseminating knowledge about the widened contact zone and its peoples, as well as promoting the nations’ colonial project. England’s in-

881 Roach x.

882 Gilroy 4.

883 See Gilroy 15.

tensifying cultural contact with Other peoples evoked contestations and performances of difference, subjecting collective identity “to the continuous ‘play’ of history, culture and power”,⁸⁸⁴ thus creating metropolitan subjects of empire.

Categories such as race, gender, religion, age and class are being acted out discursively, with the discourses bringing forth these categories manifesting colonialism as profitable, exciting and rewarding, as well as at times violent, comic and dangerous. This ambivalent representation is furthermore closely tied in with the dramatic genre on a more concrete level. Theatricality offers numerous modes in representing the Other as well as in spotlighting ambivalence through the performance of spaces, histories, plots, role reversals, carnivalesque, cross-dressing, masks and costumes. These modes provide the analytical framework for reading staging the sea as a performance of colonial discourses. The rushing into floods which presides over this study is hence a diversified image for the spaces, movements, plots and peoples involved with English maritime endeavours. In order to organize the enquiry this study is divided into three parts, concentrating on spaces, characters, and plots respectively.

The “Horizons of Difference and Displacement”, as performed in the plays under discussion, can be said to map spaces that are constitutive in negotiating categories of the self and the Other as these “imaginative geographies”⁸⁸⁵ served to represent, question, organize as well as control the terra incognita of the circum-Atlantic. The changing semiotics of these represented maritime spaces are crucially tied in with the colonial dimension of the performances. Islands and shores emerge as thresholds of difference and displacement and thereby collude significantly with the spatial characteristics of the playhouse itself. The theatricality of the plays points to the theatrical frame of the dramatic action – the playhouse itself – thus referencing royal patronage and achieving a gesture of safety and appropriation, while at the same time the evocation of the theatrical frame also unsettles the performance as it mirrors ambiguities within contemporary English society. The structural duality of islands and shores, their boundedness and limitlessness, further renders these spaces ideal screens for dramatic utopias as they provide an imaginative reservoir for dramatizing issues of colonial expansion: dreams of fortune, reversal of gender order, deviance, exotic encounters, metamorphosis and liminality.

In *The Enchanted Island*, the depiction of the island and its characters raises encounters that control as well as challenge facets of sovereignty, gender, race, class and age. The play hence generates ideas concerning the changing demands of a colonial society and brings questions of collective identity to the forefront.

884 Hall, “Cultural Identity and Diaspora” 225.

885 Said, *Orientalism* 71.

The play's representation of patriarchal authority serves to control the female characters while also feminizing the colonized, and thus claims authority over the colonial project itself. The play, however, also features slippages in its representation of authority, indicating the ambivalence at the centre of colonial discourses. *A Common-Wealth of Women*, equally, is structured on binary island spaces, a feature that underlines the functions of the play. On the one hand, the play holds a quasi-subversive function in that it presents colonial anxieties of deprivation, cannibalism and gender reversal through the dystopian setting of the island. On the other hand, it has a complicit function in that it resolves these anxieties through re-representations of patriarchy that ultimately render the island a space for colonial harmony. The other two plays under discussion indicate a move from more abstract imaginings of maritime spaces to the display of more concrete histories and settings. *Love's Victim* in this respect puts forward a myth of origins in its representation of ancient English history. The liminality of the sea is highlighted in Gildon's play as borders are problematized in the plot's idealization of the English and degradation of foreign characters. The play, however, eventually expands England's claim to the sea in providing concrete points of historical and spatial reference as well as through emphasizing this claim through the Englishmen's more spiritual approach to the sea. *The Successful Pyrate* also presents more concretized spaces and characters, even firmly placing the play's action within contemporary news. The play is thus scaling down the distance between Madagascar and the metropolis both in its plots of piratical deviance and in its gesturing towards the theatrical frame. The foreign island is thus imaginatively invaded and the deviant and utopian schemes of its inhabitants are theatrically debunked.

In the plays under discussion one can detect strategies of naming, parcelling, gendering and processes of commodification that serve to delineate maritime spaces and its inhabitants. The changing semiotics of these strategies further promote the empire of the deep as English collective identity is presented as superior and the foreign islands and shores are presented as not only progressively more becoming part of the realm, but also as becoming increasingly manageable, and also profitable.

The analysis of stage sailors moved the focus from maritime spaces to the personnel "manning the machines of empire" and their dramatic representation. Seamen were crucial figures in the development of mercantile capitalism and England's colonial expansion, yet contemporary accounts depict seamen as "third sort of persons", as inherently Other and set apart from landmen and the population in the colonies alike. This otherness as represented in contemporary literary texts conveys the prolific entanglement of seamen in colonial discourses as their representation in many ways mirrors the dialectics of self and Other. The sailors' discursive representation embodies the double movement of colonial

discourses. On the one hand, they are rendered Other, but on the other hand their performance on stage also renders them visible and knowable⁸⁸⁶ and so sailors serve as liminal characters that convey the ambivalence of colonial discourses. This framing of stage sailors as Others postulates a framing of the metropolitan theatre-stages as contact zones: in theatrically evoking the space of the sea through the sailor – his dress, language, manners – metropolitan audiences were brought face-to-face with liminal characters that had both faced “frigid and torrid zones”.⁸⁸⁷ In plays such as *The Plain Dealer*, *Sir Barnaby Whigg*, *Cuckolds-Haven* and *Love for Love*, the sailor – mostly a minor character – was staged as Other both textually as well as by way of performance. Sailors were presented as honest, blunt and plain dealing characters, speaking what they thought and exhibiting disregard to the customs of polite society. Their difference from the other characters on stage was further highlighted in their performance as actors playing sailors were dressed the part, often gesturing and walking as if on deck, said to “smell of pitch and tar” and sometimes additionally set in their apparently natural habitat on land, in a tavern. Sailors also increasingly functioned as key figures in performing issues of gender and civility, as sailors served as models, like in *The Fair Quaker of Deal*, and foils, as for example in *Sir Harry Wildair* or *Love for Love*, for reconsidering manliness and heteronormativity. However, the characters not only served as figures for performing notions of cultural identity, but their plain dealing also opened up a space for questioning societal norms and their difference thus also served a more subversive function.

In the course of the period considered, stage sailors’ representations ever more displayed the characters as effecting comic performances of their own accounts, as has been shown with regard to plays such as *Sir Harry Wildair* and *The Basset Table*. These plays, alongside others such as *King Edgar* and *Alfreda* and most prominently *The Fair Quaker of Deal*, additionally incorporated patriotic elements into the sailor’s performance. These developments advanced further in the second half of the eighteenth century in that sailors were increasingly presented as “happy heroes”, characters whose overt jolliness, honesty and Englishness served to heroicize mariners, but also served to gloss over problematic political and social issues regarding the maritime profession and Britain’s frequent warfare.

In analysing theatres of escape, the focus moved from sailors to particular plots and spectacles that convey the ever increasing geographical widening of the maritime empire as well as the increasing social mobility attendant mercantile capitalism. The term theatres of escape thus denotes the theatre as an actual “Place in the Town” as well as a dramaturgical means of evoking trans-

886 See Bhabha, “The Other Question”, *The Location of Culture* 101.

887 BW I, 4.

portation and exhibiting the interconnectedness of the circum-Atlantic. These plots of escape display the theatricality of colonial acquisition while they simultaneously signify theatricality as being indicative of the ambivalence of colonial discourses. Hence, they can be understood as archives as well as vehicles for the attendant fears and fantasies of maritime expansion. Escape with regards to the plays under discussion is understood as economic as well as social flight employing the routes of the sea. In plays such as *A Common-Wealth of Women*, *The Widdow Ranter* and *The Successful Pyrate* one finds comic re-representations that serve to lessen the distance between Old and New World, while also functioning to theatrically control colonial transgressions in that the escapees are derided. Additionally, theatres of escape represent the New World as a space where identities are unstable, but can be reclaimed and refashioned. In concomitant plots, performances of bodies signifying the Other present the dangers of going native, establishing and reconsidering difference and thus expanding colonial domination discursively. The sea appears as – literally – a contact zone as well as a condensed space, especially in relation to plots that depict theatres of escape in gendered formats, with matrimonial refugees and husband-hunters. Plays like *Oroonoko* and *A Bickerstaff's Burying* encode fantasies and fears that function to manage maritime cultural as well as economic expansion through the commodification of female characters.

Lastly, John Gay's *Polly* can be read as a continuation of the theatres of escape in that the ballad opera not only sustains the performative exploration of spaces and spectacles of the nascent empire, but places a prominent focus on the theatricality of categories like gender, race, age and class. *Polly* presents the empire as immersed in aspects of appropriation and exploration and thus questions its role in the colonies. The play's recurring role reversals and mimicries complicate colonial authority and offer a "double vision" that not only disturbs the representation, but also evokes the sea as a double space, full of "narcissism and paranoia".⁸⁸⁸

This study has presented rushing into floods as a material and imaginative endeavour, with theatrical representations that were momentous for the development of individual and collective identities, difference and modernity in the early eighteenth century. The connection between land and sea as highlighted by Pope's modified phrase "rushing into floods" thereby served to methodologically, as well as contextually, emphasize the fluid and unstable nature of identity and difference, especially in the early years of empire. In this respect, "rushing into floods" underscores Gilroy's model of a Black Atlantic culture as the readings put forward in this study not only suggest that the sea is a vital set and setting for discursive negotiations of Englishness and difference, but also take

888 Bhabha, "Of Mimicry and Man", *The Location of Culture* 131.

into account the fluid characteristics of culture itself, as Gilroy succinctly put it: “Culture doesn’t just sort of go on hold when you get on a slave ship and then resume when you get to the other side”.⁸⁸⁹

Staging the sea undergoes several important changes as the century progresses. The Theatre Licensing Act of 1737 and increased naval warfare and international conflicts⁸⁹⁰ profoundly influenced the nature of theatrical entertainments, rendering performances more topical, but also resulting in an increase of comic operas, musical pieces, farces and short preludes that engage with staging the sea. Before “nautical drama” eventually developed into an identifiable genre in the 1820s, staging the sea in the latter half of the eighteenth century very much testified to the importance of the theatre for the development of nationalism, especially in times of the French Revolution which is marked by a rise in nautical plays.⁸⁹¹ Increasingly visual aspects were emphasized and historical re-enactments of maritime battles were staged. This development can be depicted in the work of Philip James de Loutherbourg, an English artist well known for his theatre set designs. De Loutherbourg’s career at the theatre commenced in 1773 when he painted the scenes for a revision of Mallet’s *Alfred* starring Garrick as Alfred at Drury Lane. The masque puts forward the eponymous hero as embodiment and symbol of English historical and future magnitude and De Loutherbourg’s prospect for the final scene visually enhances the nation’s self-fashioning as “Protestant, commercial, maritime and free”⁸⁹²: “Here is seen the ocean in prospect, and ships sailing along. Two boats land their crews. One sailor sings the following Ode: afterwhich, the rest join lively dance”.⁸⁹³ The sailors then commence singing Thomas Arne’s “Rule Britannia”, emphatically highlighting England’s status as a prosperous and free “Blest isle” not only “rushing into floods”, but indeed “ruling the waves”.

De Loutherbourg also shaped representations of far-away maritime spaces, as in his designs for John O’Keefe’s *Omai; or: a Trip ‘round the World* (1785).⁸⁹⁴ The pantomime is loosely based on Omai, a Tahitian royal travelling to Europe with

889 Tommie SHELBY, “Cosmopolitanism, Blackness, and Utopia: A Conversation with Paul Gilroy”, *Transition* 98 (2008): 116–135, 121. See also Said’s *Culture and Imperialism* on the idea that cultures are in constant flux: “all cultures are involved in one another, none is single and pure, all are hybrid, heterogeneous, extraordinarily differentiated, and unmonolithic” xxv.

890 The War of Jenkin’s Ear and the Austrian Succession (1739–1748), The Seven Years War (1756–1768) and the American War of Independence (1775–1783).

891 See Marc Baer who examines the importance of metropolitan performances for the rise of nationalism in the period and for the rise of “water drama”, see Derek FORBES, “Water Drama” in *Bradby/James/Sharat* 91–108.

892 Armitage, *The Ideological Origins* 8.

893 Mallet 63.

894 The music was composed by William Shield and the pantomime first performed at Covent Garden.

James Cook on the return of his second voyage of discovery. For the painting of the scenes, De Loucherbourg drew on sketches by John Webber, an artist who had served on the HMS *Resolution* during Cook's third voyage of discovery. In creating such visual tableaux, late eighteenth-century London playhouses employed maritime settings to represent identity and otherness and theatrically control and authorize the different colonial spaces of the empire. With regards to the increase in naval conflicts, Moody and Russell, in their works on *Illegitimate Theatre in London, 1770 – 1840* and *The Theatres of War: Performance, Politics, and Society, 1793 – 1815* respectively, refer to the rise of naval "theatres of war", either in plays depicting contemporary naval battles or even miniature re-enactments of battles on sea.⁸⁹⁵ Moreover, contemporary theatres also served as venues for acting out ambivalent attitudes towards the armed forces: "Civilian society needed their heroicized images of Robin, William, and Bowsprit not only as a means of shaping the character of the navy but also because they themselves needed to establish a belief in the forces that were defending them".⁸⁹⁶

However, naval theatres of war also served to perform local dissent as David Worrall has shown with regards to some naval preludes, pantomimes and interludes in the late eighteenth-century Georgian theatre.⁸⁹⁷ Plays such as *Nootka Sound; Or, Britain Prepar'd* (1790), Drury Lane's *The Glorious First Day of June* (1794), commemorating the triumphant Atlantic naval battle of that date, or Covent Garden's *Love and Honour; or, Britannia in Full Glory at Spithead* (1794) not only promoted patriotism, but also present a context where imperial ideologies are contested. These plays, as Worrall shows by example, depict a sense of anti-patriotism in English life that appears "within the dramas as a normal aspect of public life ready to be seamlessly included into theatrical commentary on Britain's imperial conflicts and the progress of war with France".⁸⁹⁸

Certainly, these patriotic discontents in late eighteenth-century naval spectacles offer valuable clues for further research, especially as the sailor's image in the wake of the naval mutinies at Spithead and Nore (1797) and his patriotic

895 Like the staged battles at Sadler's Wells in 1801 as well as Charles Dibdin's *The Siege of Gibraltar* (1804) at the same theatre.

896 Russell 105 f.

897 Worrall, "Britannia in Full Glory at Spithead" in: Worrall, *Theatrical Intelligence*.

898 Ibid. 40. Theatrical stagings of dissent were however not confined to the naval enactments Worrall refers to, but can already be found in several plays staged during the war for America, such Tom King's pageant *The Prophecy; or, Queen Elizabeth at Tilbury* (1779) or Frederick Pilon's *The Invasion; or, a Trip to Brighthelmstone* (1778) – plays that highlighted as well as mocked England's naval and military vulnerability. For patriotic dissent in the theatres, see also Robert W. JONES, "Sheridan and the Theatre of Patriotism: Staging Dissent during the War for America", *Eighteenth-Century Life* 26.1 (2002): 24–45.

loyalty were publicly questioned.⁸⁹⁹ Additionally, the late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century theatres also saw a host of naval plays featuring blackface, e.g. John Cartwright Cross' *The Surrender of Trinidad; or, Safe Moor'd at Last* (1797) and Mark Lonsdale's *Naval Triumph: or the Wars of Old England* (1794), and cross-dressed characters, for example in the anonymous *The female volunteer, or, the Dawning of peace* (1801). These plays – along with other plays featuring sailors and pirates, as, for example, Charles Dibdin's *The Touchstone, or, Harlequin Traveller* (1779) – have to date neither been subsumed or discussed within a framework stipulating their maritime nature, nor have they been analysed within a postcolonial framework. Hence, these late eighteenth-century performances of staging the sea offer copious material for scholars interested in the historical development of colonial discourses and for bridging the gap between the early eighteenth century and the fully developed nautical dramas of the 1820s and 1830s. In this regard, further analysis of naval performances can also track discursive changes that endorsed England's self-fashioning from “rushing into floods” to a self-assured “ruler of the main”.

Finally, in more general terms, as postcolonial, transnational and trans-cultural paradigms within literary studies have paved the way for the recognition of the sea's importance for social, economic and cultural histories, innovative readings of the sea as a lively contact zone and interest in oceanic regions and maritime aspects of empire-building will be likely to continue to flourish. This will especially be the case as postcolonial categories of analysis prove productive in analysing spaces and encounters in the emerging empire, as the incorporation of the “postcolonial eighteenth century”⁹⁰⁰ in literary studies attests.

899 For this aspect see Russell, Chapter 5 “Riotous Assemblies: the Army and the Navy in the Theatre” 95–121, and Jim DAVIS, “British Bravery, or Tars Triumphant: Images of the British Navy in Nautical Melodrama”, *New Theatre Quarterly* 4 (1988): 122–143.

900 See Carey / Festa.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Modern editions

- ADDISON, Joseph, *The Freeholder*, ed. James Leheny, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980.
- BEEVERELL, James, *The Pleasures of London*, 1707, trans. W.H. Quarrell, London: With-
erby, 1940.
- BEHN, Aphra, *The Works of Aphra Behn, Vol. IV (Sir Patient Fancy, The Amorous Prince,
The Widow Ranter, The Younger Brother)*, ed. by Montague Summers, 1915, New York:
Phaeton Press, 1967.
- , *The Works of Aphra Behn, Vol. 7: The Plays 1682–1696*, ed. Janet Todd, London:
Pickering, 1996.
- , *Oroonoko*, 1688, ed. Lore Metzger, New York: Norton, 1973.
- BERKELEY, William, *A Discourse and View of Virginia*, 1663, ed. Thomas R. Stewart,
Norwalk: William H. Smith Jr., 1914.
- BOSWELL, James, *The Life of Samuel Johnson*, 1791, London et al.: Penguin, 1979.
- CENTLIVRE, Susanna, *The Basset Table*, 1705, ed. Jane Milling, Peterborough: Broadview
Press, 2009.
- CONGREVE, William, *The Complete Works of William Congreve, Vol. II: Double Dealer, Love
for Love, Mourning Bride*, ed. Montague Summers, London: The Nonesuch Press, 1923.
- , *Love for Love*, 1695 ed. Emmett L. Avery, Regents Restoration Drama Series, London:
Edward Arnold, 1966.
- DEFOE, Daniel, *Robinson Crusoe*, 1719, London et al: Penguin, 1994.
- , *The Complete English Tradesman*, 1726, Gloucester: Allan Sutton Publ., 1987.
- DENNIS, John, *The Critical Works of John Dennis, Vol. II, 1711–1729*, ed. by Edward Niles
Hooker, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1943.
- DOWNES, John, *Roscius Anglicanus*, 1708, ed. Judith Milhouse and Robert D. Hume,
London: The Society for Theatre Research, 1987.
- DRYDEN, John, *Essays of John Dryden: Volume I*, ed. W.P. Ker, Oxford: Clarendon Press,
1926.
- , *The Works of John Dryden: Plays (The Tempest, Tyrannick Love, An Evening's Love)*,
Vol. X, ed. Maximillian E. Novak, Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: U of California P,
1970.

- , *The Works of John Dryden: Prose 1668 – 1691, An Essay of Dramatick Poesie and Shorter Works*, Vol. XVII, ed. Samuel Holt Monk, Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: U of California P, 1971.
- , *The Works of John Dryden: Plays (King Author [sic!], Cleomenes, Love Triumphant, Contributions to the Pilgrim)*, Vol. XVI, ed. Vinton E. Dearing, Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: U of California P, 1996.
- ESQUEMELING, John, *The Buccaneers of America: In the Original English Translation of 1684*, New York: Cosimo Classics, 2007.
- EVELYN, John, *The Diary of John Evelyn*, Vol. III, ed. E.S. De Beer, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.
- FIELDING, Henry, *The Journal of a Voyage to Lisbon, Shamela, and Occasional Writings*, ed. Martin C. Battestin (with the late Sheridan W. Baker Jr. and Hugh Amory), The Wesleyan Edition of the Works of Henry Fielding, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2008.
- FLAVEL, John, *The Works of John Flavel*, Vol. 5, first republished by W. Baynes and Son 1820, London: Reprinted by The Banner of Truth Trust, 1968.
- GARRICK, David, *The Plays of David Garrick: Garrick's Own Plays, 1748 – 1766*, Vol. I, ed. Harry William Pedicord and Fredrick Louis Bergmann, Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois UP, 1980.
- GAY, John, *The Poetical Works of John Gay: Including 'Polly', 'The Beggar's Opera' and Selections from other Dramatic Work*, ed. G.C. Faber, 1923 repr. New York: Russell & Russell, 1969.
- GILDON, Charles, *A Comparison between the two Stages*, 1702, ed. Staring Bailey Wells, Princeton: Princeton UP, 1942.
- HALIFAX, George Savile, Marquis of, *The Works of George Savile, Marquis of Halifax*, Vol. I, ed. Mark N. Brown, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.
- JOHNSON, Charles, *A General History of the Robberies and Murders of the Most Notorious Pirates, 1724*, ed. David Cordingly, Guilford: The Lyons Press, 2002.
- JOHNSON, Samuel, *A Dictionary of the English Language, 1755*, Vol. II, Anglistica & Americana, Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1968.
- JONSON, Ben, *Ben Jonson: Complete Masques*, ed. Stephen Orgel, New Haven: Yale UP, 1969.
- MALLET, David, *The Plays of David Mallet*, ed. Felicity Nussbaum, New York and London: Garland, 1980.
- MANDEVILLE, Bernard, *The Fable of the Bees*, 1705, ed. Phillip Harth, Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1970.
- MURPHY, Arthur, *The Life of David Garrick*, Vol. 1, Dublin: Brett Smith, 1801.
- NIETZSCHE, Friedrich, *Das Hauptwerk*, Vol. 2, München: Nymphenburger Verlag, 1990.
- PASCAL, Blaise, *Pensées*, 1669, ed. Charles Louandre, Édition Variorum d'Après le Texte du Manuscrit Autographe, Paris: Charpentier, 1854.
- PEPYS, Samuel, *Private Correspondences and Miscellaneous Papers of Samuel Pepys, 1679 – 1703*, Vol. 1, ed. J.R. Tanner, London: Bell, 1926.
- , *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, ed. Robert Latham and William Matthews, 11 vols., Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 1970 – 1983.
- POPE, Alexander, *The Poems of Alexander Pope: A one-volume edition of the Twickenham text with selected annotations*, ed. John Butt, London: Methuen, 1963.

- PURCELL, Henry, *Henry Purcell's Operas: The Complete Texts*, ed. Michael Burden, Oxford: OUP, 2000.
- RAVENS-CROFT, Edward, *'The Careless Lovers' and 'The Canterbury Guests': A Critical Old-Spelling Edition*, ed. Edmund S. Henry, New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1987.
- RYMER, Thomas, *The Critical Works of Thomas Rymer*, ed. Curt A. Zimansky, New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1956.
- SHADWELL, Thomas, *The Complete Works of Thomas Shadwell*, Vol. II, ed. Montague Summers, London: The Fortune Press, 1927.
- SHAKESPEARE, William, *King Richard II*, c. 1595, ed. Andrew Gurr, The New Cambridge Shakespeare, Cambridge: CUP, 2003.
- , *The Tempest*, c.1610, ed. Stephen Orgel, The Oxford Shakespeare, Oxford: OUP, 1987.
- SOUTHERNE, Thomas, *Oroonoko*, eds. Maximillian E. Novak and David Stuart Rodes, London: Edward Arnold, 1976.
- STEELE, Richard, *The Tatler*, Vol. II, ed. Donald F. Bond, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.
- WARD, Edward, *The London Spy*, ed. Paul Hyland from the Fourth Edition of 1709, East Lansing: Colleagues Press, 1993.
- WYCHERLEY, William, *The Plain Dealer*, ed. Leo Hughes, Regents Restoration Drama Series, London: Edward Arnold, 1967.

First English editions

- ANDREWS, Miles Peter, *Fire and water! A comic opera: in two acts. Performed at the Theatre-Royal in the Hay-Market*, London: Printed for T. CADELL, in the Strand, 1780.
- ANON., *The famous sea-fight between Captain Ward and the Rain-bow*, London: Printed for F. Coles, in *Vine-street*, near *Hatton-Garden*, 1650.
- ANON., *Remarks upon the navy*, London: s.n., 1700.
- ANON., *The present condition of the English navy set forth in a dialogue betwixt young Fudg of the Admiralty, and Capt. Steerwell, on Oliverian Commander*, London (printer unreadable), 1702.
- ANON., *A comparison between the two stages, with an examen of The generous conqueror; and some critical remarks on The funeral, or Griefalamode, The false friend, Tamerlane and others. In dialogue*, London: Printed in the year 1702.
- ANON., *An inquiry into the causes of our naval miscarriages: with Some Thoughts on the Interest of this Nation as to a Naval War, and of the only true Way of Manning the fleet. The second edition*, London: Printed in the Year 1707.
- ANON., *The bravo turn'd bully; or, the depredators. A Dramatic Entertainment. Founded on some late Transactions in America*, London: Printed for, and sold by J. Purser in *White-Fryars*, near *Fleet-Street*; and by the Booksellers and Pamphlet-sellers of *London* and *Westminster*, 1740.
- ANON., *The sailor's opera: or, a trip to Jamaica*, London: Printed for the AUTHOR, 1745.
- BICKERSTAFF, Isaac, *Thomas and Sally: or, the sailor's return. A musical entertainment. As it is performed at the Theatre Royal in Covent-Garden. The music composed by Doctor*

- Arne, London: Printed for J. KEARLSY, at the Golden Lion, in Ludgate-Street; and J. COOTE, at the King's Arms, in Pater-noster Row, 1761.
- BOULTON, Thomas, *The Sailor's farewell; or, the guinea outfit. A comedy, in three acts*, Liverpool: Printed for the Author, 1768.
- CENTLIVRE, Susanna, *A Bickerstaff's Burying; or, Work for the Upholders. A Farce; As it was Acted at the Theatre in the Hay-Market by Her Majesty's Sworn Servants*, London: Printed for BERNARD LINTOTT, at the Cross-Keys, between the Two Temple Gates, in Fleet-street, 1710.
- DENNIS, John, *Gibraltar: or, The Spanish adventure, A comedy. As it was acted at the Theatre in Drury-Lane*, London: Printed for Wm. Turner, at the Angel at Lincolns-Inn Back-Gate and Sold by J. Nutt, near Stationer's-Hall, 1705.
- D'URFEY, Thomas, *A Common-Wealth of Women*, London: Printed for R. Bentley and J. Hindmarsh, 1686.
- , *Sir Barnaby Whigg: or, No Wit like a Woman's. A Comedy. As it is Acted by their Majesties Servants at the Theatre-Royal*, London: Printed by A.G. and J.P. for Joseph Hindmarsh, at the Black Bull in Cornhil, 1681.
- FARQUHAR, George, *Sir Harry Wildair: being the sequel of The trip to the Jubilee. A comedy. As is acted at the Theatre-Royal in Drury-Lane, by His Majesty's servants*, London: Printed for James Knapton, at the Sign of the Crown in St. Paul's Church Yard, 1701.
- FIELDING, John, *A brief description of the cities of London and Westminster, the public buildings, palaces, gardens, squares, &c. with an alphabetical list of all the streets, squares, courts, lanes and alleys, &c. within the bills of mortality. To which are added, Some proper cautions to the Merchants, Tradesmen, and Shop-Keepers; Journeymen, Apprentices, Porters, Errand Boys, Book-Keepers, and Inn-Keepers; also very necessary for every Person going to London either on Business or Pleasure. By Sir John Fielding, One of his Majesty's Justices of the Peace for the Counties of Middlesex, Essex, and Surry, and for the City and Liberty of Westminster*, London: printed for J. WILKIE, No. 71, in St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1776.
- FUNNELL, William, *A voyage round the world. Containing an account of Captain Dampier's expedition into the South-Seas in the ship St George, in the years 1703 and 1704 [...]*, London: Printed by W. Botham, for James Knapton at the Crown in St. Paul's Church yard, 1707.
- GARRICK, David, *An essay on acting: in which will be consider'd the mimical behaviour of a certain fashionable faulty actor, and the Laudableness of such unmannerly, as well as inhumane Proceedings. To which will be added, a short criticism on his acting Macbeth*, London: Printed for W. BICKERTON, at the Gazette, in the Temple Exchange, near the Inner Temple Gate, Fleet-Street, 1744.
- GILDON, Charles, *Love's Victim, or, the Queen of Wales*, London: printed by M. Bennet for Richard Parker and George Strahan, 1701.
- JOHNSON, Charles, *The Successful Pyrate. A play. As it is acted at the Theatre-Royal in Drury-Lane. By Her Majesty's servants*, London: Printed for Bernard Lintott, at the Crose-Keys, between the Two-Temple-Gates in Fleetstreet, 1713.
- J. P., *Neptunes raging fury, or, The gallant sea-mens sufferings. Being a relation of their perils and dangers, and of the extraordinary hazards they undergo in their noble adventures. Together with their undaunted valor, and rare constancy, in all their extremities. And the manner of their rejoycing on shore at their return home. To the tune*

- of, *When the stormy windes doe blow*, London: Printed by T. Mabb, for Ric. Burton, at the Horse-shoe in Smith-field, between 1650 and 1665.
- JORDAN, Thomas, *London's resurrection to joy and triumph expressed in sundry shews, shapes, scenes, speeches and songs in parts celebrious to the much-meriting magistrate Sir George Waterman, knight, Lord Mayor of the city of London : at the peculiar and proper expences of the worshipful Company of Skinners /written by Tho. Jordan*, London: Printed by Henry Brome at the Gun in S. Paul's Church-yard, 1671.
- , *The triumphs of London performed on Friday, Octob. 29, 1675, for the entertainment of the Right Honourable and truly noble pattern of prudence and loyalty, Sir Joseph Sheldon, Kt., Lord Mayor of the city of London : containing a true description of the several pageants, with the speeches spoken on each pageant : together with several songs sung at this solemnity : all set forth at the proper costs and charges of the worshipful company of drapers /designed and composed by Tho. Jordan*, London : Printed by J. Macock for John Playford, and are sold at his Shop near the Temple-Church, 1675.
- LANGBAIN, Gerard, *An account of the English dramattick poets, or, Some observations and remarks on the lives and writings of all those that have publish'd either comedies, tragedies, tragi-comedies, pastorals, masques, interludes, farces or opera's in the English tongue*, Oxford: Printed by L.L. for George West and Henry Clements, 1691.
- MALLET, David, *Britannia: a masque. Acted at the Theatre-Royal in Drury-Lane*, London: Printed for A. Millar, 1755.
- NEVILLE, Edward, *Plymouth in an Uproar; A Musical Farce, As it is performed at the Theatre-Royal in Covent-Garden. The Music composed by Mr. Dibdin*, London: Printed for G. KEARSLEY, N^o47, Fleet-Street, 1779.
- PHILLIPS, Edward, *Britons, strike home: or, the sailor's rehearsal. A farce. As it is acted at the Theatre-Royal, by His Majesty's servants, With the musick prefix'd to each song*, London: printed for J. Watts at the Printing-Office in Wild-Court near Lincoln's-Inn Fields, 1739.
- PURCHAS, Samuel, *Hakluytus Posthumus or Purchas his pilgrimes. Contayning a history of the world, in sea voyages & lande-travells, by Englishmen & others. Wherein Gods wonders in nature & providence, the actes, arts, varieties, & vanities of men, with a world of the worlds rarities, are by a world of eywitnesses-authors, related to the world. Some left written by M. Hakluyt at his death. More since added. His also perused & perfected. All examined, abreviated with discourse. Adorned with pictues and expressed in mapps. In fower parts. Each containing five bookes*, London: by W. Stansby for H. Fetherstone, 1625.
- RAVENSROFT, Edward, *King Edgar and Alfreda a tragi-comedy: acted at the Theatre-Royal*, London: Printed for M. Turner near Turn-Style in Holbourn, 1677.
- SHADWELL, Charles, *The Fair Quaker of Deal: or, the humours of the navy. A comedy, as it is acted at the Theatre-Royal in Drury-Lane*, London: Printed for James Knapton at the Crown in St.Paul's Church-yard, Bernard Lintott at the Cross-Keys, between the two Temple-Gates, in Fleet- Street, and Jonas Browne at the Black-Swan without Temple-bar, 1715.
- SLUSH, Barnaby, *The navy Royal: or a sea-cook turn'd projector. Containing a few thoughts, about manning our ships of war with the best of sailors, without violences, and in the most pleasing manner: According to the Fourth Article of a late Proposal, Publish'd by*

- our *Worthy Chaplain of Her Majesty's Ship the Lyme*, London: Printed for B. Bragge, at the Raven in Pater-Noster-Row, 1709.
- SMOLLETT, Tobias, *The Reprisal: or, the Tars of Old England. A Comedy of two acts, as it is performed at the Theatre Royal in Drury-Lane*, London: Printed for R. BALDWIN, in Paternoster-Row, 1757.
- STEVENS, George Alexander, *The trip to Portsmouth; a comic sketch of one act, with songs*, London: Printed for T. WALLER, in *Fleet-Stret*; T. BECKET, in the *Strand*; and G. ROBINSON, in *Pater-noster-Row*, 1773.
- TATE, Nahum, *Cuckolds-Haven: or, an Alderman no Conjurer. A Farce. Acted at the Queen's Theatre in Dorset Garden*, London: Printed for J.H. and are to be sold by Edward Poole, next door to the *Fleece Tavern* in Cornhil, 1685.
- VAN BROECK, Adrian, *The life and adventures of Capt. John Avery, the famous English pirate, (rais'd from a cabbin-boy, to a king) now in possession of Madagascar[...]*, London: printed and sold by J. Baker, at the Black-Row in Pater-Noster-Row, 1709.
- WARD, Edward, *The wooden world dissected, in the characters of 1. A ship of war. 2. A sea-captain. 3. A Sea-Lieutenant. 4. A Sea-Chaplain. 5. The Master of a Ship of War. 6. The Purser. 7. The Surgeon. 8. The Gunner. 9. The Carpenter. 10. The Boatswain. 11. A Sea-Cook. 12. A Midshipman. 13. The Captain's Steward. 14. A Sailor, &c, By a lover of the mathematicks*, London: printed by H. Meere, and sold by B. Bragge, in Pater-Noster-Row, 1707.
- WOOD, William, *A Survey of Trade. In four Parts*. London: printed by W. Wilkins, for W. Hinchliffe, at Dryden's Head under the Royal-Exchange, 1718.

Secondary Sources

- AGNEW, Jean-Christoph, *Worlds Apart: The Market and the Theater in Anglo-American Thought, 1550 – 1750*, Cambridge: CUP, 1986.
- AHMAD, Aijaz, "The Politics of Literary Postcoloniality", *Race and Class* 36.3 (1995): 1 – 20.
- ANDERSON, Benedict R., *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London: Verso, 1991.
- ANDERSON, Misty G., *Female Playwrights and Eighteenth-Century Comedy: Negotiating Marriage on the London Stage*, New York: Palgrave, 2002.
- ANDRADE, Susan Z., "White Skin, Black Masks: Colonialism and the Sexual Politics of Oroonoko", *Cultural Critique* 27.0 (1994): 189 – 214.
- ARAVAMUNDAN, Srinivas, *Tropicopolitans: Colonialism and Agency, 1688 – 1804*, Post-contemporary Interventions, Durham and London: Duke UP, 1999.
- ARMITAGE, David, *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire*, Cambridge: CUP, 2000.
- , "The Red Atlantic", *Reviews in American History: A Quarterly Journal of Criticism* 29.4 (2001): 479 – 486.
- ARMITAGE, David und Michael J. BRADDICK eds., *The British Atlantic World, 1500 – 1800*, Houndmills, Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.
- AUBERLEN, Eckhard, "The *Tempest* and the Concerns of the Restoration Court: A Study of *The Enchanted Island* and the Operatic *Tempest*", *Restoration: Studies in English Literary Culture, 1660 – 1700* 15.2 (1991): 71 – 88.

- AUDEN, W.H., *The Enchafèd Flood: or The Romantic Iconography of the Sea*, London: Faber and Faber, 1951.
- AUSTIN, John Langshaw, *How to do Things with Words: The William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955*, ed. J. O. Urmson, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.
- AVERY, Emmett L. ed., *The London Stage 1660 – 1800: A Calendar of Plays, Entertainments and Afterpieces together with casts, Box-Recepits and Contemporary Comment. Compiled from the Playbills, Newspapers and Theatrical Diaries of the Period, Part 2: 1700 – 1729*, Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois UP, 1960.
- , “The Restoration Audience”, *Philological Quarterly* 45 (1966): 54 – 61.
- BABCOCK, William H., *Legendary Islands of the Atlantic: A Study in Medieval Geography*, 1922, Plainview: Books for Libraries Press, 1975.
- BACHELARD, Gaston, *L’Eau et les Rêves, essai sur l’imagination de la matière*, Paris: Librairie José Corti, 1942.
- , *La Poétique de l’Espace*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1957.
- BACHMANN-MEDICK, Doris, *Cultural Turns: Neuorientierungen in den Kulturwissenschaften*, Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt Verlag, 2006.
- BACKSCHEIDER, Paula, *Spectacular Politics: Theatrical Power and Mass Culture in Early Modern England*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1993.
- BAER, Joel H. ed., *British Piracy in the Golden Age: History and Interpretation, 1660 – 1730*, Vol. 1, London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007.
- BAER, Marc, *Theatre and Disorder in Late Georgian London*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.
- BAILYN, Bernard and Philip D. MORGAN eds., *Strangers within the Realm: Cultural Margins of the First British Empire*, Chapel Hill and London: U of North Carolina P, 1991.
- BAINES, Paul, *The Long Eighteenth Century*, London: Hodder Arnold, 2004.
- BALDACCHINO, Godfrey, “Editorial: Islands – Objects of Representation”, *Geografiska Annaler. Series B, Human Geography*, Special Issue: Islands – Objects of Representation 87.4 (2005): 247 – 251.
- BALLASTER, Ros, *Fabulous Orients: Fictions of the East in England 1662–1785*, Oxford: OUP, 2005.
- BALME, Christopher B., “Staging the Pacific: Framing Authenticity in Performances for Tourists at the Polynesian Cultural Center”, *Theatre Journal* 50 (1998): 53 – 70.
- , *Decolonizing the Stage: Theatrical Syncretism and Post-Colonial Drama*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.
- ed., *Das Theater der Anderen: Alterität und Theater zwischen Antike und Gegenwart*, Mainzer Forschungen zu Drama und Theater Vol. 26., Tübingen: A.Francke Verlag, 2001.
- , *The Cambridge Introduction to Theatre Studies*, Cambridge: CUP, 2008.
- BARISH, Jonas, *The Anti-theatrical Prejudice*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 1981.
- BARKER, Francis et al. eds., *Europe and Its Others Vol 1 and 2: Proceedings of the Essex Conference on the Sociology of Literature*, Colchester: University of Essex, 1985.
- BARKER, Francis, Peter HULME and Margaret IVERSEN eds., *Cannibalism and the Colonial World*, Cultural Margins, Cambridge: CUP, 1998.

- BARKER-BENFIELD, G.J., *The Culture of Sensibility: Sex and Society in Eighteenth-Century Britain*, Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992.
- BARRINGER, Tim, Geoff QUILLEY and Douglas FORDHAM eds., *Art and the British Empire*, Manchester and New York: Manchester UP, 2007.
- BARTHELEMY, Anthony Gerard, *Black Face, Maligned Race: The Representation of Blacks in English Drama from Shakespeare to Southerne*, Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State UP, 1987.
- BATTEN, Charles L. Jr., "The Source of Aphra Behn's *The Widow Ranter*", *Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Theatre Research* 13 (1974): 12–18.
- BAUGH, Daniel A., "Great Britain's 'Blue-Water' Policy, 1689–1815", *The International History Review* 10.1 (1988): 33–58.
- BELSEY, Catherine, *Culture and the Real: Theorizing Cultural Criticism*, New Accents Series, London: Routledge, 2005.
- BENDER, John, *Imagining the Penitentiary: Fiction and the Architecture of Mind in Eighteenth-Century England*, Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1987.
- BENESCH, Klaus, Jan-K ADAMS and Kerstin SCHMIDT eds., *The Sea and the American Imagination*, Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 2004.
- BERG, Maxine and Elizabeth EGER eds., *Luxury in the Eighteenth Century: Debates, Desires and Delectable Goods*, Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002.
- BERG, Maxine, *The Age of Manufactures: Industry, Innovation, and Work in Britain, 1700–1820*, New York: OUP, 1985.
- , *Luxury and Pleasure in Eighteenth-Century Britain*, Oxford: OUP, 2005.
- BERGER, Thomas L., William C. BRADFORD, and Sidney L. SONDERGARD, *An Index of Characters in Early Modern English Drama: Printed Plays, 1500–1660*, Second Edition, Cambridge: CUP, 1998.
- BERMAN, Ronald, "Wycherley's Unheroic Society", *English Literary History* 51.3 (1984): 465–478.
- BEVIS, Richard W., *English Drama: Restoration and Eighteenth Century, 1660–1789*, London and New York: Longman, 1988.
- BHABHA, Homi ed., *Nation and Narration*, London: Routledge, 1990.
- , *The Location of Culture*, New York: Routledge, 1994.
- BIRCH, David, *The Language of Drama*, Basingstoke and London: Macmillan, 1991.
- BIRKLE, Carmen and Nicole WALLER eds., *'The Sea is History': Exploring the Atlantic*, Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2009.
- BISHOP, John, "'The Ordinary course of Nature': Authority in the Restoration Tempest", *Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Theatre Research* 13.1 (1998): 54–69.
- BLACK, Jeremy and Philip WOODFINE eds., *The British Navy and the Use of Naval Power in the Eighteenth Century*, Leicester: Leicester UP, 1988.
- BLACK, Jeremy, *Debating Foreign Policy in Eighteenth-Century Britain*, Farnham: Ashgate, 2011.
- BLOOM, Harold ed., *John Gays's 'The Beggar's Opera'*, Modern Critical Interpretations, New York, New Haven and Philadelphia: Chelsea House Publishers, 1988.
- BLUM, Hester, *The View from the Masthead: Maritime Imaginations and Antebellum American Sea Narratives*, Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 2008.
- BLUMENBERG, Hans, *Schiffbruch mit Zuschauer: Paradigma einer Daseinsmetapher*, Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp, 1979.

- BÖHME, Hartmut ed., *Kulturgeschichte des Wassers*, Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1988.
- , ed., *Topographien der Literatur: Deutsche Literatur im transnationalen Kontext*, Stuttgart und Weimar: Verlag J.B. Metzler, 2005.
- BÖKER, Uwe, Ines DETMERS and Anna-Christina GIOVANOPOLOUS eds., *John Gay's 'The Beggar's Opera' 1728 – 2004: Adaptations and Re-Writings*, Internationale Forschungen zur Allg. und Vergl. Literaturwissenschaft 105, Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2006.
- BOELHOWER, William, "I'll teach you how to flow: On Figuring out Atlantic Studies", *Atlantic Studies: Literary, Cultural and Historical Perspectives* 1.1 (2004): 28–48.
- , "The Rise of the New Atlantic Studies Matrix", *American Literary History* 20.1 (2008): 83–101.
- BOUCÉ, Paul-Gabriel ed., *Sexuality in Eighteenth-Century Britain*, Manchester: Manchester UP, 1982.
- BRADBY, David, Louis JAMES and Bernard SHARRATT eds., *Performance and Politics in Popular Drama: Aspects of Popular Entertainment in Theatre, Film and Television 1800–1976*. Cambridge: CUP, 1980.
- BRATTON, Jacky, *New Readings in Theatre History*, Cambridge: CUP, 2003.
- BRAVERMAN, Richard, "Libertines and Parasites", *Restoration: Studies in English Literary Culture, 1660–1700*, 11.2 (1987): 73–86.
- , *Plots and Counterplots: Sexual Politics and the Body Politic in English Literature, 1660–1730*, Cambridge: CUP, 1993.
- BREWER, John, *The Sinews of Power: War, Money and the English State, 1688–1783*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1989.
- BREWER John and Roy PORTER eds., *Consumption and the World of Goods*, London: Routledge, 1993.
- BROD, Harry ed., *The Making of Masculinities: The New Men's Studies*, Boston: Allen & Unwin, 1987.
- BROECHELER, Kirsten, *Seereisen in der englischsprachigen Romanliteratur vom 18. bis 20. Jahrhundert: Eine Untersuchung der Themen Meer, Schiff und Seefahrt unter besonderer Berücksichtigung räumlicher Aspekte*, Frankfurt a. M.: Peter Lang Europäischer Verlag der Wissenschaften, 1998.
- BROWN, Laura, "The Divided Plot: Tragicomic Form in the Restoration", *English Literary History* 47.1 (1980): 67–79.
- , *English Dramatic Form, 1160–1760: An Essay in Generic History*, New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1981.
- , *Ends of Empire: Women and Ideology in Early Eighteenth-Century English Literature*, Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1993.
- , *Fables of Modernity: Literature and Culture in the English Eighteenth Century*, Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 2001.
- BRUSTER, Douglas, "Local *Tempest*: Shakespeare and the Work of the Early Modern Playhouse", *The Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 25.1 (1995): 33–53.
- BURKE, Helen M., *Rioutous Performances: The Struggle for Hegemony in the Irish Theater, 1712–1784*, Notre Dame: U of Notre Dame P, 2003.
- BURNS, Edward, *Restoration Comedy: Crises of Desire and Identity*, Basingstoke and London: Macmillan, 1987.

- BURNS, Elizabeth, *Theatricality: A Study of Convention in the Theatre and in Social Life*, London: Longman, 1972.
- BUTLER, Judith, "Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory", *Theatre Journal* 40.4 (1988): 519–531
- , *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, New York, Routledge, 1990.
- , *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of 'Sex'*, New York: Routledge, 1993.
- CAIN, P.J. and A.G. HOPKINS, *British Imperialism: Innovation and Expansion 1688–1914*, London and New York: Longman, 1993.
- CAINES, Michael, *Major Voices: Eighteenth-Century Women Playwrights*, London: The Toby Press, 2004.
- CAMPBELL, Lily Bess, *Essays: Critical and Historical Dedicated to Lily B. Campbell by Members of the Departments of the University of California*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 1950.
- CANFIELD, Rob, "Something's Mizzen: Anne Bonny, Mary Read, Polly, and Female Counter-Roles on the Imperialist Stage", *South Atlantic Review* (2001): 45–63.
- CANFIELD, J. Douglas und Deborah C. PAYNE eds., *Cultural Readings of Restoration and Eighteenth-Century English Theater*, Athens and London: U of Georgia P, 1995.
- CANFIELD, J. Douglas, *Tricksters and Estates: On the Ideology of Restoration Comedy*, Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1997.
- , *Heroes and States: On the Ideology of Restoration Tragedy*, Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 2000.
- , ed. *The Broadview Anthology of Restoration and Early Eighteenth-Century Drama*, Ontario et al.: Broadview Press, 2001.
- , "Theater of the Long Eighteenth Century and Its Cultural Work Revisioned", *British Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 36.3 (2003): 423–428.
- CANNY, Nicholas ed., *The Oxford History of the British Empire Volume I: The Origins of Empire: British Overseas Enterprise to the Close of the Seventeenth Century*, Oxford and New York: OUP, 1998.
- CAREY, Daniel and Lynn FESTA eds., *The Postcolonial Enlightenment: Eighteenth-Century Colonialism and Postcolonial Theory*, Oxford: OUP, 2009.
- CARLSON, Marvin, *Theories of the Theatre: A Historical and Critical Survey, from the Greeks to the Present*, Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1984.
- CARLSON, Patricia Ann ed., *Literature and Lore of the Sea*, Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1986.
- CARTER, Philip, "An 'effeminate' or 'efficient' Nation? Masculinity and Eighteenth-Century Social Documentary", *Textual Practice* 11.3 (1997): 19–29.
- , *Men and the Emergence of Polite Society, Britain 1660–1800*, Harlow: Longman, 2001.
- CASE, Sue-Ellen and Janelle G. REINELT eds., *The Performance of Power: Theatrical Discourse and Politics*, Iowa City: U of Iowa P, 1991.
- CASTLE, Terry, *Masquerade and Civilization: The Carnavalesque in Eighteenth-Century Culture and Fiction*, Stanford: Stanford UP, 1986.
- CAWLEY, Robert Ralston, *Unpathe'd Waters: Studies in the Influence of the Voyagers on Elizabethan Literature*, Princeton: Princeton UP, 1940.
- CASARINO, Cesare, *Modernity at Sea: Melville, Marx, Conrad in Crisis*, Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2002.
- CHADWICK, W.R., *The Four Plays of William Wycherley: a Study of the Development of a Dramatist*, The Hague: Mouton, 1975.

- CHAMBERS, Samuel A. and Terrell CARVER, *Judith Butler and Political Theory: Troubling Politics*, London and New York: Routledge, 2008.
- CHARTIER, Roger, *Publishing Drama in Early Modern Europe*, The Panizzi Lectures 1998, London: The British Library, 1999.
- CHATTERJEE, Partha, *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World: a Derivative Discourse?*, Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1986.
- CHEW, Shirley and David RICHARDS eds., *A Concise Companion to Postcolonial Literature*, Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
- CHOUDHURY, Mita, *Interculturalism and Resistance in the London Theater, 1660–1800: Identity, Performance, Empire*, Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, 2000.
- CLARK, Sandra ed., *Shakespeare Made Fit: Restoration Adaptations of Shakespeare*, London: J.M. Dent, 1997.
- CLEMENTS, Colin Campbell ed., *Sea Plays: One-Act Plays in Reprint, 1925*, New York: Great Neck, 1979.
- CLINTON- BADDELEY, V.C., *The Burlesque Tradition in the English Theatre after 1660*, London: Methuen, 1952.
- COHEN, Margaret, *The Novel and the Sea*, Princeton and Oxford: Princeton UP, 2010.
- COHEN, Michèle, *Fashioning Masculinity: National Identity and Language in the Eighteenth Century*, London and New York: Routledge, 1996.
- COLLEY, Linda, *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707–1837*, New Haven: Yale UP, 1992.
- , "Britishness and Otherness. An Argument", *Albion* 31 (1992): 61–77.
- , *Captives: Britain, Empire and the World, 1600–1850*, London: Jonathan Cape, 2002.
- COLLS, Robert, *Identity of England*, Oxford: OUP, 2002.
- COPELAND, Nancy, *Staging Gender in Behn and Centlivre: Women's Comedy and the Theatre*, Studies in Performance and Early Modern Drama, Ashgate: Aldershot, 2004.
- CORDINGLY, David, *Marine Painting in England 1700–1900*, London, Studio Vista, 1974.
- , *Life among the Pirates: The Romance and the Reality*, London: Little, Brown and Company, 1995.
- , *Ships and Seascapes: an Introduction to Maritime Prints, Drawings and Watercolours*, London: Philip Wilson Publishers, 1997.
- , *Heroines and Harlots: Women at Sea in the Great Age of Sail*, London: Macmillan, 2001.
- CORDNER, Michael and Peter HOLLAND eds., *Players, Playwrights, Playhouses: Investigating Performance, 1660–1800*, Redefining British Theatre History Series, Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- CORMAN, Brian, "What is the Canon of English Drama, 1660–1737?", *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 26.2 (1992–1993): 307–321.
- CRANG, Mike and Nigel THRIFT eds., *Thinking Space*, Cultural Geographies, London: Routledge, 2000.
- CREIGHTON, Margaret S. and Lisa NORLING ed., *Iron Men, Wooden Women: Gender and Seafaring in the Atlantic World, 1700–1920*, Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins UP, 1996.
- CUBITT, Geoffrey ed., *Imagining Nations*, York Studies in Cultural History, Manchester: Manchester UP, 1998.
- DABYDEEN, David, *Hogarth's Blacks: Images of Blacks in Eighteenth Century English Art [sic!]*, Manchester: Manchester UP, 1987.

- DAUNTON, Martin and Rick HALPERN, eds., *Empire and Others: British Encounters with Indigenous Peoples, 1600 – 1850*, London: University College London P, 1999.
- DAVIES, J.D., *Gentlemen and Tarpaulins: The Officers and Men of the Restoration Navy*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.
- , “The Navy, Parliament and Political Crisis in the Reign of Charles II”, *The Historical Journal* 36.2 (1993): 271 – 288
- DAVIS, David Brion, *The Problem of Slavery in Western Culture*, Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1966.
- DAVIS, J.C., *Utopia and the Ideal Society: A Study of English Utopian Writing 1516 – 1700*, Cambridge: CUP, 1981.
- DAVIS, Jim, “British Bravery, or Tars Triumphant: Images of the British Navy in Nautical Melodrama”, *New Theatre Quarterly* 4 (1988): 122 – 143.
- DAVIS, Lennard J., “Known Unknown Locations: The Ideology of Novelistic Landscape in ‘Robinson Crusoe’”, *Sociocriticism* (1987): 87 – 113.
- DAVIS, Ralph, *The Rise of the English Shipping Industry in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, London: Macmillan, 1962.
- DAYAN, Joan, “Paul Gilroy’s Slaves, Ships, and Routes: The Middle Passage as Metaphor”, *Research in African Literatures* 27.4 (1996): 7 – 14.
- DEKKER, Rudolf M. and Lotte C. VAN DE POL, *The Tradition of Female Transvestism in Early Modern Europe*, New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1989.
- DE LAURETIS, Teresa, *Technologies of Gender: Essays on Theory, Film, and Fiction*, Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1987.
- DENING, Greg, *Islands and Beaches: Discourse on a Silent Land, Marquesas 1774 – 1880*, Honolulu: U of Hawai’i P, 1980.
- , *Mr Bligh’s Bad Language: Passion, Power and Theatre on the Bounty*, Cambridge: CUP, 1992.
- DIAMOND, Elin ed., *Performance and Cultural Politics*, London and New York: Routledge, 1996.
- DICKSON, P.G.M., *The Financial Revolution in England: A Study in the Development of Public Credit, 1688 – 1756*, London: Macmillan, 1967.
- DOBRÉE, Bonamy, *Restoration Comedy 1660 – 1720*, Oxford: OUP, 1924.
- DOBSON, Michael, “‘Remember/First To Possess His Books’: The Appropriation of *The Tempest*, 1700 – 1800”, *Shakespeare Survey* 43 (1991): 99 – 107.
- DONALDSON, Ian, “Tables Turned: *The Plain Dealer*”, *Essays in Criticism* 17 (1967): 304 – 321.
- DOUGLAS, Mary, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*, 1966, New York: Routledge, 2002.
- DRYDEN, Robert G., “John Gay’s *Polly*: Unmasking Pirates and Fortune Hunters in the West Indies”, *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 34.4 (2001): 539 – 557.
- DUBOIS, Page, *Centaurs and Amazons: Women and the Pre-History of the Great Chain of Being*, Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1982.
- DUBOIS, W.E.B., *The Suppression of the African Slave-Trade to the United States of America, 1638 – 1870*, New York: Longmans, 1904.
- DUDLEY, Edward and Maximilian E. NOVAK eds., *The Wild Man Within: An Image in Western Thought from the Renaissance to Romanticism*, London: U of Pittsburgh P, 1972.
- DÜNNE, Jörg and Stephan GÜNDEL eds., *Raumtheorie: Grundlagentexte aus Philosophie und Kulturwissenschaften*, Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp 2006.

- DUFFY, Michael, *The English Satirical Print 1600–1832: The Englishman and the Foreigner*, Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1986.
- DUGAS, Don-John, *Marketing the Bard: Shakespeare in Performance and Print 1660–1740*, Columbia and London: U of Missouri P, 2006.
- DUGAW, Dianne, *Warrior Women and Popular Balladry 1650–1850*, Cambridge: CUP, 1989.
- , *‘Deep Play’: John Gay and the Invention of Modernity*, Newark: U of Delaware P, 2001.
- DYMKOWSKI, Christine ed., *The Tempest: Shakespeare in Production*, Cambridge: CUP, 2000.
- EALIS, Jacqueline, *Women in Early Modern England, 1500–1700*, London: UCL Press, 1998.
- EARLE, Peter, *Sailors: English Merchant Seamen 1650–1775*, London: Methuen, 1998.
- EDMOND, Rod and Vanessa SMITH eds., *Islands in History and Representation*, London and New York: Routledge, 2003.
- EDWARDS, Philip, *The Story of the Voyage: Sea-narratives in Eighteenth-Century England*, Cambridge: CUP, 1994.
- ELIAS, Norbert, “Studies on the Genesis of the Naval Profession”, *The British Journal of Sociology* I (1950): 291–301.
- ELLINGSON, Ter, *The Myth of the Noble Savage*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 2001.
- ENNIS, Daniel James, *Enter the Press-Gang: Naval Impressionment in Eighteenth-Century British Literature*, Cranbury: Associated University Presses, 2002.
- EPSTEIN, Julia and Kristina STRAUB eds., *Body Guards: The Cultural Politics of Gender Ambiguity*, New York and London: Routledge, 1991.
- ERSKINE-HILL, Howard, *The Augustan Idea in English Literature*, London: Edward Arnold, 1983.
- EVANS, David T., *Sexual Citizenship: The Material Construction of Sexuality*, London: Routledge, 1993.
- FANON, Frantz, *The Wretched of the Earth*, 1961, trans. Richard Philcox, New York: Grove Press, 2004.
- FANSLER BEHRMAN, Cynthia, *Victorian Myths of the Sea*, Athens: U of Ohio P, 1977.
- FAUSSETT, David, *Writing the New World: Imaginary Voyages and Utopias of the Great Southern Land*, Syracuse/NY: Syracuse UP, 1993.
- , *Images of the Antipodes in the Eighteenth Century: A Study in Stereotyping*, Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1995.
- FAUSTO-STERLING, Anne, *Sexing the Body: Gender Politicized and the Construction of Sexuality*, New York: Basic Books, 2000.
- FELSKI, Rita, *The Gender of Modernity*, Cambridge/Mass. and London: Harvard UP, 1995.
- FERGUSON, Moira, “Oroonoko: Birth of a Paradigm”, *New Literary History* 23.2 (1992): 339–359.
- FINCH, G.J., “Hawkesworth’s Adaptation of Southerne’s *Oroonoko*”, *Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Theatre Research* 16.1 (1977): 41–43.
- FINDLAY, Alison, *Playing Spaces in Early Women’s Drama*, Cambridge: CUP, 2006.
- FISCHER-LICHTE, Erika et al., *Wahrnehmung und Medialität, Theatralität* Vol. 3, Tübingen und Basel: Francke, 2001.

- FISCHER-LICHTE, Erika, Doris KOLESCH and Matthias WARSTAT ed., *Metzler Lexikon Theatertheorie*, Stuttgart and Weimar: J.B. Metzler, 2005.
- FLATMAN, Joe, "Cultural Biographies, Cognitive Landscapes and Dirty Old Bits of Boat: 'Theory' in Maritime Archaeology", *The International Journal of Nautical Archaeology* 32.2 (2003): 143–157.
- FLETCHER, Anthony, *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England 1500–1800*, New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1995.
- FLUDERNIK, Monika and Ruth NESTVOLD eds., *Das 18. Jahrhundert*, Literatur, Imagination, Realität Vol. 17, Trier: WVT, 1998.
- , "Cross-Mirrorings of Alterity: The Colonial Scenario and its Psychological Legacy", *ARIEL*, 30 (1999): 29–62.
- FOSTER, Gavin, "Ignoring *The Tempest*: Pepys, Dryden, and the Politics of Spectating in 1667", *Huntington Library Quarterly* 63.1/2 (2000): 5–22.
- FOUCAULT, Michel, *Madness and Civilization*, 1961, trans. Jonathan Murphy and Jean Khalfa, London: Routledge, 2001.
- , *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*, 1966, trans. copyright Tavistock/Routledge, London and New York: Routledge, 2002.
- , "Of Other Spaces", 1967, trans. Jay Miskowicz, *Diacritics* 16.1 (1986): 22–27.
- , *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, 1969, trans. copyright Tavistock, London and New York: Routledge, 2002.
- , *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, 1975, trans. Alan Sheridan, New York: Vintage Books, 1977.
- , *The History of Sexuality Vol. 1: An Introduction*, 1976, trans. Robert Hurley, New York: Vintage Books, 1993.
- , *Fearless Speech*, 1983, trans. and ed. Joseph Pearson, Foreign Agents Series, Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2001.
- , *Die Heterotopien – Les hétérotopies: Der utopische Körper le corps utopique. Zwei Radiovoträge*, trans. Michael Bischoff, Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp, 2005.
- FOULKE, Robert, *The Sea Voyage Narrative*, London: Routledge, 1997.
- FOX, Frank L., *A Distant Storm: The Four Days' Battle of 1666*, Rotherfield: Press of Sail, 1996.
- FREEMAN, Lisa A., *Character's Theater: Genre and Identity on the Eighteenth-Century English Stage*, Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2002.
- FRIEDSON, A.M., "Wycherley and Molière: Satirical Point of View in *The Plain Dealer*", *Modern Philology* 64.3 (1967): 189–197.
- FRIEL, Ian, *Maritime History of Britain and Ireland c. 400–2001*, London: The British Museum Press, 2003.
- FROHOCK, Richard, "Violence and Awe: the Foundations of Government in Aphra Behn's New World Settings", *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 8.4 (1996): 437–52.
- FUCHS, Barbara, "Conquering Islands: Contextualising *The Tempest*", *Shakespeare Quarterly* 48 (1997): 45–62.
- FUJIMURA, Thomas H., *The Restoration Comedy of Wit*, Princeton: Princeton UP, 1952.
- GAGEN, Jean Elisabeth, *The New Woman. Her Emergence in English Drama 1600–1730*, New York: Twayne Publishers, 1954.
- GAMES, Alison, *Migration and the Origin of the English Atlantic World*, Cambridge/Mass. and London: Harvard UP, 1999.

- GARBER, Marjorie, *Vested Interests: Cross-Dressing and Cultural Anxiety*, New York: Routledge, 1992.
- GAUTIER, Gary, "Slavery and the Fashioning of Race in *Oroonoko*, *Robinson Crusoe*, and Equiano's *Life*", *The Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation* 42.2 (2001): 161–179.
- GEERTZ, Clifford, *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*, New York: Basic, 1973.
- GELLNER, Ernest, *Nations and Nationalism*, New Perspectives on the Past Series, Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1983.
- GIDDENS, Anthony, *The Consequences of Modernity*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990.
- GILBERT, Albert N., "Buggery and the British Navy, 1700–1861", *Journal of Social History*, 10.1 (1976): 72–98.
- GILLIS, John R., *Island of the Mind: How the Human Imagination Created the Atlantic World*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
- GILROY, Paul, *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*, Cambridge/Mass.: Harvard UP, 1993.
- GLASS, Robert E., "The Image of the Sea Officer in English Literature, 1660–1714", *Albion* 26.4 (1994): 583–599.
- GOEDDE, Laurence Otto, *Tempest and Shipwreck in Dutch and Flemish Art: Convention, Rhetoric, and Interpretation*, University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1989.
- GÖRTSCHACHER, Wolfgang and Holger KLEIN eds. *Dryden and the World of Neoclassicism*, SECL Studies in English and Comparative Literature Vol. 17, Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag, 2001.
- GORDON, Colin, *Michel Foucault: Power, Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977*, Brighton: Harvester Press, 1980.
- GOFFMAN, Erving, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, New York: Anchor Books, 1959.
- GOLDGAR, Bertrand A., *Walpole and the Wits: The Relation of Politics to Literature, 1722–1742*, Lincoln and London: U of Nebraska P, 1976.
- GOULD, Eliga H., *The Persistence of Empire: British Political Culture in the Age of the American Revolution*, Chapel Hill and London: U of North Carolina P, 2000.
- GRAY, Charles Harold, *Theatrical Criticism in London to 1795, 1931*, New York: Benjamin Blom, 1964.
- GREENBLATT, Stephen, *Shakespearean Negotiations: The Circulation of Social Energy in Renaissance England*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 1988.
- , *Marvellous Possessions: The Wonder of the New World*, Chicago: Chicago UP, 1991.
- GREENE, Jack, *Pursuits of Happiness: The Social Development of Early Modern British Colonies and the Formation of American Culture*, Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1988.
- GREGORY, Derek and John URRY eds., *Social Relations and Spatial Structures*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1985.
- GREGORY, Derek, "Palestine and the 'War on Terror'", *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 24.1 (2004): 183–195.
- GUEST, Kristen ed., *Eating their Words: Cannibalism and the Boundaries of Cultural Identity*, Albany: State U of New York P, 2001.
- GUFFEY, George and Andrew WRIGHT, *Two English Novelists: Aphra Behn and Anthony Trollope*, Papers read at a Clark Library Seminar, May 11, 1974, William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, Los Angeles: U of California P, 1975.

- GUFFEY, George R., "Politics, Weather, and the Contemporary Reception of the Davenant and Dryden *Tempest*", *Restoration* 8 (1984): 1–9.
- GUILHAMET, Leon, *The Sincere Ideal: Studies on Sincerity in Eighteenth-Century English Literature*, Montreal and London: McGill-Queen's UP, 1974.
- HABERMAS, Jürgen, *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit: Untersuchungen zu einer Kategorie der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft*, 1962, Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1990.
- HADFIELD, Andrew, *Literature, Travel, and Colonial Writing in the English Renaissance 1545–1625*, Oxford: OUP, 1998.
- HAGGERTY, George E., "'The Queen was not shav'd yet': Edward Kynaston and the Re-gendering of the Restoration Stage", *The Eighteenth Century* 50.4 (2009): 309–326.
- HALL, Catherine ed., *Cultures of Empire: A Reader*, Colonizers in Britain and the Empire in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries, Manchester: Manchester UP, 2000.
- HALL, Stuart, "New Ethnicities' Black Film, British Cinema", ICA Documents 7, London: Institute of Contemporary Arts, 1989.
- , "What is This 'Black' in Black Popular Culture? (Rethinking Race)", *Social Justice* 20.1–2 (1993): 104–114.
- HALL, Stuart, David HELD and Tony MCGREW eds., *Modernity and its Futures*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992.
- HALL, Stuart and Paul DU GAY eds., *Questions of Cultural Identity*, London: Sage, 1996.
- HALLET, Wolfgang and Birgit NEUMANN eds., *Raum und Bewegung in der Literatur: Die Literaturwissenschaften und der Spatial Turn*, Bielefeld: transcript, 2009.
- HAMMOND, Brean S., *Professional Imaginative Writing in England, 1670–1740: 'Hackney for Bread'*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
- HARRIS, Tim, *Politics under the Later Stuarts: Party Conflict in a Divided Society, 1660–1715*, Studies in Modern History, London: Longman, 1993.
- HARVEY, David, *Spaces of Hope*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2000.
- , *Cosmopolitanism and the Geographies of Freedom*, New York: Columbia UP, 2009.
- HARVEY, Karen, *Reading Sex in the Eighteenth Century: Bodies and Gender in English Erotic Culture*, Cambridge: CUP, 2004.
- HEIMERDINGER, Timo, *Der Seemann: Ein Berufsstand und seine kulturelle Inszenierung (1844–2003)*, Köln: Böhlau, 2005.
- HENDRICKS, Margo and Patricia PARKER eds., *Women, 'Race', and Writing in the Early Modern Period*, London and New York: Routledge, 1994.
- HEYDENREICH, Titus, *Tadel und Lob der Seefahrt. Das Nachleben eines antiken Themas in der romanischen Literatur*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1970.
- HILL, Bridget, *Women, Work, and Sexual Politics in Eighteenth-Century England*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989.
- HILL, Christopher, *Liberty Against the Law: Some Seventeenth-Century Controversies*, London: Allen Lane The Penguin Press, 1996.
- HITCHCOCK, Tim and Michèle COHEN eds., *English Masculinities 1660–1800*, London and New York: Longman, 1999.
- HOLLAND, Norman N., *The First Modern Comedies: The Significance of Etherege, Wycherley, and Congreve*, Cambridge/Mass.: Harvard UP, 1959.
- HOLLAND, Peter, *The Ornament of Action: Text and Performance in Restoration Comedy*, Cambridge: CUP, 1979.

- HOLMES, Geoffrey, *Augustan England: Professions, State and Society, 1680 – 1730*, London: George Allen and Unwin, 1982.
- HONEGGER, Claudia, *Die Ordnung der Geschlechter: Die Wissenschaften vom Menschen und das Weib 1750 – 1850*, Frankfurt a.M.: campus Verlag, 1991.
- HOOVER, Helene Maxwell, "Dryden's and Shadwell's *Tempest*", *Huntington Library Quarterly* 6.2 (1943): 224 – 228.
- HOPKIT, Julian, *A Land of Liberty? England 1689 – 1727*, Oxford: OUP, 2000.
- HORNSTEIN, Sari R., *The Restoration Navy and English Foreign Trade, 1674 – 1688: A Study in the Peacetime Use of Sea Power*, Studies in Naval History, Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1991.
- HOTSON, Leslie, *The Commonwealth and Restoration Stage*, 1928, New York: Russell & Russell Inc., 1962.
- HOWE, Elizabeth, *The First English Actresses: Women and Drama 1660 – 1700*, Cambridge: CUP, 1992.
- HOWE, K.R., *Nature, Culture, and History: the 'Knowing' of Oceania*, Honolulu: U of Hawai'i P, 2000.
- HOWELL, Colin and Richard J. TWOMEY eds., *Jack Tar in History: Essays in the History of Maritime Life and Labour*, Fredericton: Acadiensis Press, 1991.
- HUGGAN, Graham, "A Tale of Two Parrots: Walcott, Rhys, and the Uses of Colonial Mimicry", *Contemporary Literature* 35.4 (1994): 643 – 660.
- HUGHES, Derek, "Providential Justice and English Comedy 1660 – 1700: A Review of the External Evidence", *The Modern Language Review* 81.2 (1986): 273 – 292.
- , "The Plain Dealer – A Reappraisal", *Modern Language Quarterly* 43.4 (1982): 315 – 336.
- HUGHES, Leo, *The Drama's Patrons: A Study of the Eighteenth-Century London Audience*, Austin and London: U of Texas P, 1971.
- HUDSON, Nicholas, "From 'Nation' to 'Race': The Origin of Racial Classification in Eighteenth-Century Thought", *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 29 (1996): 247 – 264.
- , "'Britons Never Will be Slaves': National Myth, Conservatism, and the Beginnings of British Antislavery", *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 34.4. (2001): 559 – 576.
- HULME, Peter, *Colonial Encounters: Europe and the Native Caribbean, 1492 – 1797*, London: Methuen, 1986.
- HULME, Peter and Ludmilla JORDANOVA eds., *The Enlightenment and its Shadows*, London: Routledge, 1990.
- HULME, Peter and William H. SHERMAN eds., *'The Tempest' and Its Travels*, London: Reaktion Books, 2000.
- HULME, Peter and Tim YOUNGS eds., *The Cambridge Companion to Travel Writing*, Cambridge: CUP, 2002.
- HUME, Robert D., *The Development of English Drama in the late Seventeenth Century*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.
- , ed., *The London Theatre World, 1660 – 1800*, Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois UP, 1980.
- HUNTER, J. Paul, *Before Novels: The Cultural Contexts of Eighteenth-Century English Fiction*, New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1990.
- HUTNER, Heidi ed., *Rereading Aphra Behn: History, Theory, and Criticism*, Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1993.
- HUTNER, Heidi, *Colonial Women: Race and Culture in Stuart Drama*, Oxford: OUP, 2001.

- HYAM, Ronald, *Britain's Imperial Century 1815 – 1914: A Study of Empire and Expansion*, London: Palgrave and Macmillan, 2002.
- IRVING, William Henry, *John Gay: Favourite of the Wits*, New York: Russell & Russell, 1962.
- ISHAM, Howard, *Image of the Sea: Oceanic Consciousness in the Romantic Century*, New York et.al.: Peter Lang, 2004.
- IWANISZIW, Susan B. ed., *Troping 'Oroonoko' from Behn to Bandele*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.
- , ed., *Oroonoko: Adaptations and Offshoots*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.
- JAHER, Diana, "The Paradoxes of Slavery in Thomas Southerne's *Oroonoko*", *Comparative Drama* 42.1 (2008): 51 – 71.
- JAMES, C.L.R., *The Black Jacobins*, 1938, London: Allison and Busby, 1980.
- JONES, Robert W., "Sheridan and the Theatre of Patriotism: Staging Dissent during the War of America", *Eighteenth-Century Life* 26.1 (2002): 24 – 45.
- JONES, Vivien ed., *Women in the Eighteenth Century: Constructions of Femininity*, London and New York: Routledge, 1990.
- JORDAN, Winthrop D., *White over Black: American Attitudes toward the Negro, 1550 – 1812*, Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1968.
- JOWITT, Claire, *Voyage Drama and Gender Politics 1589 – 1642: Real and Imagined Worlds*, Manchester: Manchester UP, 2003.
- , *The Culture of Piracy, 1580 – 1630: English Literature and Seaborne Crime*, Farnham: Ashgate, 2010.
- KAUFMAN, Anthony, "Idealization, Disillusion, and Narcissistic Rage in Wycherley's *The Plain Dealer*", *Criticism* 21.2 (1979): 119 – 133.
- KAUL, Suvir, "Reading Literary Symptoms: Colonial Pathologies and the *Oroonoko* Fictions of Behn, Southerne, and Hawkesworth", *Eighteenth-Century Life* 18 (1994): 80 – 96.
- , *Eighteenth-Century British Literature and Postcolonial Studies*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2009.
- KAVERNIK, Frances M., *British Drama, 1660 – 1779: A Critical History*, New York: Twayne, 1995.
- KEITH, Michael and Steve PILE eds., *Place and the Politics of Identity*, London and New York: Routledge, 1993.
- KEMP, Peter, *The British Sailor: A Social History of the Lower Deck*, London: JM Dent & Sons, 1970.
- KENNEDY, Paul M., *The Rise and Fall of British Naval Mastery*, London: Allen Lane-Penguin Books, 1976.
- KENNY, Shirley Strum, "Theatrical Warfare 1695 – 1710", *Theatre Notebook: A Journal of the History and Technique of the British Theatre* 27 (1973): 130 – 145.
- , ed. *British Theatre and the Other Arts, 1660 – 1800*, Washington: Folger Books, 1984.
- KIDD, Colin, *British Identities before Nationalism: Ethnicity and Nationhood in the Atlantic World, 1600 – 1800*, Cambridge: CUP, 1999.
- KILBOURNE, Frederick W., *Alterations and Adaptations of Shakespeare*, Boston: The Poet Lore Company, 1906.
- KING, Thomas A., *The Gendering of Men, 1600 – 1750, Volume I: The English Phallus*, Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 2004.
- KINNEY, Arthur F. ed., *A Companion to Renaissance Drama*, Oxford: Blackwell, 2002.

- KINSERVIK, Matthew J., *Disciplining Satire: The Censorship of Satiric Comedy on the Eighteenth-Century London Stage*, Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, 2002.
- KLEIN, Bernhard ed., *Fictions of the Sea: Critical Perspectives on the Ocean in British Literature and Culture*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002.
- KLEIN, Bernhard und Gesa MACKENTHUN eds., *Das Meer als kulturelle Kontaktzone: Räume, Reisende, Repräsentationen*, Konstanz: UVK Verlagsgesellschaft, 2003.
- KLEIN, Lawrence, *Shaftesbury and the Culture of Politeness: Moral Discourse and Cultural Politics in Early Eighteenth-Century England*, Cambridge: CUP, 1994.
- KNAPP, Jeffrey, *An Empire Nowhere: England, America, and Literature from 'Utopia' to 'The Tempest'*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 1992.
- KNELLWOLF KING, Christa and Margarete RUBIK eds., *Stories of Empire: Narrative Strategies for the Legitimation of an Imperial World Order*, Trier: WVT, 2009.
- KNIGHT, Charles A., "The Images of Nations in Eighteenth-Century Satire", *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 22.4 (1989): 489–511.
- KOLODNY, Annette, *The Lay of The Land: Metaphors as Experience and History in American Life and Letters*, Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1975.
- KRAHÉ, Peter, *Literarische Seestücke: Darstellungen von Meer und Seefahrt in der englischen Literatur des 18. Bis 20. Jahrhunderts*, Hamburg: Deutsches Schiffahrtsmuseum und Ernst Kabel Verlag, 1992.
- KREIDT, Dietrich, *Exotische Figuren und Motive im Europäischen Theater*, Ausstellungskatalog Exotische Welten, Europäische Phantasien, Stuttgart: Edition Cantz, 1987.
- KROLL, Richard, *Restoration Drama and 'The Circle of Commerce': Tragicomedy, Politics and Trade in the Seventeenth Century*, Cambridge: CUP, 2007.
- KUMAR, Krishnan, *The Making of English National Identity*, Cambridge: CUP, 2003.
- KUPPERMAN, Karen Ordahl, "Presentment of Civility: English Reading of American Self-Presentation in the Early Years of Colonization", *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 54.1 (1997): 193–228.
- , *Settling With the Indians: The Meeting of English and Indian Cultures in America, 1580–1640*, Totowa: Rowman and Littlefield, 1980.
- LACQUEUR, Thomas, *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud*, Cambridge/Mass. and London: Harvard UP, 1990.
- LAMB, Jonathan, *Preserving the Self in the South Seas, 1680–1840*, Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2001.
- , "Eye-Witnessing in the South Seas", *Eighteenth-Century: Theory and Interpretation* 38.3 (1997): 201–112.
- LANGFORD, Paul, *A Polite and Commercial People: England 1727–1783*, Oxford: OUP, 1989.
- , *The Eighteenth Century 1688–1815*, Oxford: OUP, 2002.
- LANGHANS, E.A., "Players and Playhouses 1695–1710 and their Effect on English Comedy", *The Theatre Annual* 29 (1973): 28–39.
- LEFEBVRE, Henri, *The Production of Space*, 1974, trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- LESKY, Albin, *Thalatta: Der Weg der Griechen zum Meer*, Wien: Roher, 1947.
- LÉVI-STRAUSS, Claude, *Structural Anthropology*, 1958, trans. Claire Jacobson and Brooke Grundfest Schoepf, New York: Doubleday, 1967.

- , *The Elementary Structures of Kinship*, 1949, trans. James Harle Bell, John Richard von Sturmer and Rodney Needham, Boston: Beacon Press, 1969.
- LEVINE, Philippa ed., *The Oxford History of the British Empire- Companion Series: Gender and Empire*, Oxford: OUP, 2004.
- LEWIS, Charles Lee, *Books of the Sea: An Introduction to Nautical Literature*, Annapolis: United States Naval Institute, 1943.
- LIESENFELD, Vincent J. ed., *The Stage and the Licensing Act 1729–1739*, London and New York: Garland, 1981.
- LINDNER, Oliver, *'Matters of Blood': Defoe and the Culture of Violence*, Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2010.
- LINEBAUGH, Peter and Marcus REDIKER, *The Many-Headed Hydra: Sailors, Slaves, Commoners, and the Hidden History of the Revolutionary Atlantic*, Boston: Beacon Press, 2000.
- LLOYD, Christopher, *The Nation and the Navy: A History of Naval Life and Policy*, London: The Cresset Press, 1954.
- , *The British Seaman 1200–1860: A Social Survey*, London: Collins, 1968.
- LOCHBAUM, Iris, *Fathoming Metaphors: Meeresbilder in viktorianischer Lyrik*, Trier: WVT, 2001.
- LOCKHART, Douglas G. and David DRAKAKIS-SMITH eds., *Island Tourism: Trends and Prospects*, London: Mansell, 1993.
- LOFTIS, John, Richard SOUTHERN, Marion JONES and A.H. SCOUTEN, *The Revels History of Drama in English: Volume V 1660–1750*, London: Methuen, 1976.
- LÖW, Martina, Silke STEETS and Sergej STOETZER, *Einführung in die Stadt- und Raumsoziologie*, Second Edition, Opladen and Farmington Hills: Verlag Barbara Budrich, 2008.
- LOFTIS, John, *The Politics of Drama in Augustan England*, London: OUP, 1963.
- LOTMAN, Yuri M., *Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture*, trans. Ann Shukman, London and New York: I.B. Tauris, 1990.
- LOVE, Harold, "The Myth of the Restoration Audience", *Kosmos: A Quarterly Journal of Drama and the Arts of the Theatre* 1 (1967): 49–56.
- LÜDEKE, Roger and Virginia RICHTER, *Theater im Aufbruch: Das europäische Drama der Frühen Neuzeit*, Theatron, Studien zur Geschichte und Theorie der dramatischen Künste Vol. 53, Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2008.
- LYNCH, James J., *Box, Pit and Gallery: Stage and Society in Johnson's London*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 1953.
- MACKENZIE, John M., *Orientalism: History, Theory and the Arts*, Manchester and New York: Manchester UP, 1995.
- MACKIE, Erin ed., *The Commerce of Everyday Life: Selections from THE TATLER and THE SPECTATOR*, Bedford Cultural Editions, Boston: Bedford/St.Martin's, 1998.
- MACLEAN, Gerald ed., *Culture and Society in the Stuart Restoration: Literature, Drama, History*, Cambridge: CUP, 1995.
- MAGUIRE, Nancy, *Regicide and Restoration: English Tragicomedy, 1660–1671*, Cambridge: CUP, 1992.
- MANDLER, Peter, *The English National Character: The History of an Idea from Edmund Burke to Tony Blair*, New Haven and London: Yale UP, 2006.

- MANGAN, J.A. ed., *Making Imperial Mentalities: Socialisation and British Imperialism*, Manchester and New York: Manchester UP, 1990.
- MANUEL, Frank E. and Fritzie P. MANUEL, *Utopian Thought in the Western World*, Cambridge: CUP, 1979.
- MARCUS, G.J., *Heart of Oak: A Survey of British Sea Power in the Georgian Era*, London: OUP, 1975.
- MARKLEY, Robert, *Two-Edg'd Weapons: Style and Ideology in the Comedies of Etherege, Wycherley and Congreve*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.
- , "Introduction: Rethinking Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Drama", *Comparative Drama* 42.1 (Spring 2008): 1–6.
- MARSDEN, Jean I., *Fatal Desire: Women, Sexuality, and the English Stage 1660–1720*, Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2006.
- , "Performing the West Indies: Comedy, Feeling, and British Identity", *Comparative Drama* 42.1 (2008): 73–88.
- MARSHALL, David, *The Figure of Theater: Shaftesbury, Defoe, Adam Smith and George Eliot*, New York: Columbia UP, 1986.
- MARSHALL, P.J., "Empire and Authority in the Later Eighteenth Century", *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* XV (1987): 115–120.
- , ed., *The Eighteenth Century, The Oxford History of the British Empire Vol. II*, Oxford: OUP, 1998.
- MARSHALL, Tristan, "The *Tempest* and the British Imperium in 1611", *The Historical Journal* 41.2 (1998): 375–400.
- MARSHALL, W. Gerald, "Wycherley's Drama of Madness: *The Plain Dealer*", *Philological Quarterly* 59.1 (1980): 26–37.
- MASON, Peter, *Deconstructing America: Representations of the Other*, London: Routledge, 1990.
- MASSEY, Doreen B., *Space, Place, and Gender*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994.
- MAUS, Katherine Eisaman, "Arcadia Lost: Politics and Revision in the Restoration *Tempest*", *Renaissance Drama* 13 (1982): 189–209.
- MCAULEY, Gay, *Space in Performance: Making Meaning in the Theatre*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1999.
- MCCLINTOCK, Anne, *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Context*, New York and London: Routledge, 1995.
- MCCORMACK, Matthew, *The Independent Man: Citizenship and Gender Politics in Georgian England*, Manchester: Manchester UP, 2005.
- , ed., *Public Men: Masculinity and Politics in Modern Britain*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- MCGHEE, Fred L., "Towards a Postcolonial Nautical Archaeology", *Assemblage* 3 (1998): <http://www.assemblage.group.shef.ac.uk/3/3mcghee.htm> (date of access: 20th of April 2012).
- MCINTOSH, Mary, "The Homosexual Role", *Social Problems* 16 (1968): 182–192.
- MCKEON, Michael, *Politics and Poetry in Restoration England: The Case of Dryden's 'Annus Mirabilis'*, Cambridge/Mass.: Harvard UP, 1975.
- , *The Secret History of Domesticity: Public, Private, and the Division of Knowledge*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2005.

- , "Historicizing Patriarchy: The Emergence of Gender Difference in England, 1660–1760", *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 28.3 (1995): 295–322.
- MCVEAGH, John, *Tradefull Merchants: The Portrayal of the Capitalist in Literature*, London, Boston and Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981.
- MENGEL, Ewald, *Der englische Roman des 18. Jahrhunderts: Eine Einführung in seine Klassiker*, Tübingen: Stauffenberg Verlag, 1997.
- MERCHANT, Carolyn, *The Death of Nature: Women, Ecology and the Scientific Revolution*, San Francisco: Harper, 1980.
- MESSENGER, Ann Carey Parshall, *The Comedy of William Wycherley: A Critical Reading of the Plays with Special Emphasis on 'The Plain Dealer'*, Ann Arbor Michigan: University Microfilms, 1965.
- MESSENGER, Ann, *His and Hers: Essays in Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Literature*, Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1986.
- MIDGLEY, Clare ed., *Gender and Imperialism*, Manchester and New York: Manchester UP, 1998.
- MILHOUS, Judith and Robert D. HUME, *Producible Interpretations: Eight English Plays 1675–1707*, Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois UP, 1985.
- MILLER, David Lee, Sharon O'DAIR and Harold WEBER eds., *The Production of English Renaissance Culture*, Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1994.
- MILLS, Sara, *Gender and Colonial Space*, Manchester and New York: Manchester UP, 2005.
- MONTROSE, Louise, "The Work of Gender in the Discourse of Discovery", *Representations* 33 (1991): 1–41.
- MOODY, Jane, *Illegitimate Theatre in London, 1770–1840*, Cambridge: CUP, 2000.
- MOODY, Jane and Daniel O'QUINN, *The Cambridge Companion to British Theatre, 1730–1830*, Cambridge: CUP, 2007.
- MOORE, Henrietta, *Space, Text, and Gender: An Anthropological Study of the Marakwet of Kenya*, Cambridge: CUP, 1986.
- MORGAN, Peter E, "A Subject to Redress: Ideology and the Cross-Dressed Heroine in Aphra Behn's *The Widow Ranter*", *Eighteenth-Century Women: Studies in their Lives, Work and Culture* 2 (2002): 23–41.
- MORGAN, Sue ed., *The Feminist History Reader*, London et al.: Routledge, 2006.
- MORROW, Laura, "Phenomenological Psychology and Comic Form in *The Plain Dealer*", *Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Theatre Research* 3.2 (1988): 1–10.
- MORTON, Lena Beatrice, *The Influence of the Sea upon English Poetry: From the Anglo-Saxon Period to the Victorian Period*, New York: Revisionist Press, 1976.
- MÜLLENBROCK, Heinz-Joachim, "Literatur als Politik: zur Funktion imperialistischer Lyrik im viktorianischen England", *Anglia* 110 (1992): 119–142.
- MÜLLENBROCK, Heinz-Joachim and Eberhard SPÄTH, *Literatur des 18. Jahrhunderts*, Düsseldorf: August Bagel Verlag, 1977.
- MURPHY, Patrick M. ed., *The Tempest: Critical Essays*, New York and London: Routledge, 2001.
- MURRAY, Barbara A., *Restoration Shakespeare: Viewing the Voice*, Madison/Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2001.
- , "Transgressing Nature's Law? Representations of Women and the Adapted Version of *The Tempest*, 1667", *Literature and History Third Series* 12.1 (2003): 19–40.

- ed., *Shakespeare Adaptations from the Restoration: Five Plays*, Madison/Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2005.
- MURRAY, Timothy, *Theatrical Legitimation: Allegories of Genius in Seventeenth-Century England and France*, New York and Oxford: OUP, 1987.
- NAGLER, Alois M., *A Source Book in Theatrical History*, New York: Dover, 1959.
- NECHTMAN, Tillman W., *Nabobs: Empire and Identity in Eighteenth-Century Britain*, Cambridge: CUP, 2010.
- NEILL, Anna, *British Discovery Literature and the Rise of Global Commerce*, Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002.
- NELSON, Bonnie and Catherine BURROUGHS eds., *Teaching British Women Playwrights of the Restoration and Eighteenth Century*, New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 2010.
- NEUMANN, Birgit and Frederik TYGSTRUP, *Travelling Concepts in English Studies*, European Journal of English Studies, Vol. 13, No.1, Oxford: Routledge, Taylor & Francis, 2009.
- NEUMANN, Birgit, *Die Rhetorik der Nation in britischer Literatur und anderen Medien des 18. Jahrhunderts*, Trier: WVT, 2009.
- NEWMAN, Gerald, *The Rise of English Nationalism: A Cultural History 1740–1830*, New York: St Martin's Press, 1997.
- NICOLL, Allardyce, *A History of English Drama 1660–1900: Volume I Restoration Drama 1660–1700*, Fourth Revised Edition, Cambridge: CUP, 1952.
- , *A History of English Drama 1660–1900: Volume II Early Eighteenth-Century Drama*, Third Revised Edition, Cambridge: CUP, 1952.
- NORRIS, Edward T., "A Possible Origin of Congreve's Sailor Ben", *Modern Language Notes* 49.5 (1934): 334–335.
- NÜNNING, Ansgar, "Historicizing British Cultural Studies: Patriotic Xenophobia and the Rhetoric of National Character in Eighteenth-Century British Literature", *Journal for the Study of British Cultures* 1 (2002): 69–94.
- NÜNNING, Vera, "From 'honour' to 'honest': The Invention of the (Superiority of the) Middling Ranks in Eighteenth-Century England", *Journal for the Study of British Cultures* 2.1 (1995): 19–41.
- NUSSBAUM, Felicity A., *The Brink of All We Hate: English Satires on Women 1660–1750*, Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1984.
- NUSSBAUM, Felicity and Laura BROWN eds., *The New Eighteenth Century: Theory, Politics, English Literature*, New York: Methuen, 1987.
- NUSSBAUM, Felicity, ed., *The Global Eighteenth Century*, Baltimore and London, Johns Hopkins UP, 2003.
- , *The Limits of the Human: Fictions of Anomaly, Race, and Gender in the Long Eighteenth Century*, Cambridge: CUP, 2003.
- OBOE, Annalisa and Anna SCACCHI eds., *Recharting the Black Atlantic: Modern Cultures, Local Communities, Global Connections*, Routledge Research in Atlantic Studies, New York and London: Routledge, 2008.
- O'BRIEN, John, *Harlequin Britain: Pantomime and Entertainment, 1690–1760*, Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins UP, 2004.
- O'DONNELL, Mary Ann and Bernard DHUICY eds., *Aphra Behn (1640–1689): Le Modèle*

- Européen – Actes du colloque tenu en Sorbonne 7–9 juillet 2003*, Entreveaux: Bilingua GA Editions, 2005.
- OGBORN, Miles and Charles W.J. WITHERS eds., *Georgian Geographies: Essays on Space, Place and Landscape in the Eighteenth Century*, Manchester and New York: Manchester UP, 2004.
- OGDEN, Virginia Birdsall, *Wild Civility: The English Comic Spirit on the Restoration Stage*, Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1970.
- ORR, Bridget, *Empire on the English Stage 1660–1714*, Cambridge: CUP, 2001.
- OWEN, Joan Hildreth, “Polly and the Choice of Virtue”, *Bulletin of the New York Public Library* 77 (1974): 393–406.
- OWEN, Susan J., *Restoration Theatre and Crisis*, Oxford: OUP, 1996.
- ed., *A Companion to Restoration Drama*, Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2001.
- PAGDEN, Anthony, *European Encounters with the New World: From Renaissance to Romanticism*, New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1993.
- , *Lords of all the World: Ideologies of Empire in Spain, Britain and France c.1500--c.1800*, New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1995.
- , *Peoples and Empires*, London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2001.
- PARRY, Benita, “Problems in Current Theories of Colonial Discourse”, *The Oxford Literary Review* 9 (1987): 27–58.
- PASK, Kevin, “Caliban’s Masque”, *English Literary History* 70.3 (2003): 739–756.
- PATEMAN, Carole, *The Sexual Contract*, Stanford: Stanford UP, 1988.
- PAYNE FISK, Deborah ed., *The Cambridge Companion to English Restoration Theatre*, Cambridge: CUP, 2000.
- PEARSON, Jacqueline, *The Prostituted Muse: Images of Women Dramatists 1642–1737*, Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1988.
- PECK, John, *Maritime Fiction: Sailors and the Sea in British and American Novels, 1719–1917*, Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan 2001.
- PEDICORD, Harry William, *The Theatrical Public in the Time of Garrick*, Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois UP, 1954.
- PINCUS, Steve, *1688: The First Modern Revolution*, New Haven: Yale UP, 2009.
- PFISTER, Manfred, *Das Drama: Theorie und Analyse*, 1977, München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 2001.
- POCOCK, J.G.A., “The Limits and Divisions of British History: In Search of the Unknown Subject”, *American Historical Review* 87 (1982): 311–363.
- , *Virtue, Commerce and History: Essays on Political Thought, Chiefly in the Eighteenth Century*, Cambridge: CUP, 1985.
- , *Barbarism and Religion Vol. 4: Barbarians, Savages and Empires*, Cambridge: CUP, 2005.
- PORTER, Roy, *English Society in the Eighteenth Century*, London: Penguin, 1988.
- POWELL, Jocelyn, *Restoration Theatre Production*, London and Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984.
- PRATT, Mary-Louise, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*, 1992, Second Edition, London: Routledge, 2008.
- PRENTICE, Rina, *A Celebration of the Sea: The Decorative Art Collections of the National Maritime Museum*, London: National Maritime Museum, 1994.

- PRIETO-PABLOS, Juan A., "Ignoramus, *The Woman Turned Bully*, and Restoration Satire on the Common Lawyer", *Studies in English Literature 1500 – 1900* 48.3 (2008): 523 – 546.
- PRIOR, Mary ed., *Women in English Society 1500 – 1800*, London and New York: Routledge, 1985.
- PULSIPHER, Jenny Hale, "The Widow Ranter and Royalist Culture in Colonial Virginia", *Early American Literature*, 39.1 (2004): 41 – 66.
- QUILLEY, Geoff and Kay Dian KRIZ eds., *An Economy of Colour: Visual Culture and the Atlantic World, 1660 – 1830*, Manchester and New York: Manchester UP, 2003.
- QUINSEY, Katherine M. ed., *Broken Boundaries: Women and Feminism in Restoration Drama*, Lexington: U of Kentucky P, 1996.
- RABAN, Jonathan ed., *The Oxford Book of the Sea*, Oxford: OUP, 1992.
- REAY, Barry, *Popular Cultures in England 1150 – 1750*, London and New York: Longman, 1998.
- REDIKER, Marcus, *Between the Devil and the Deep-Blue Sea: Merchant Seamen, Pirates, and the Anglo-American Maritime World, 1700 – 1750*, Cambridge: CUP, 1987.
- , *Villains of All Nations: Atlantic Pirates in the Golden Age*, London and New York: Verso, 2004.
- REED, Peter P., "Conquer or Die: Staging Circum-Atlantic Revolt in *Polly* and *Three Fingerd Jack*", *Theatre Journal* 59.2 (2007): 241 – 258.
- REICHER, Stephen and Nick HOPKINS eds., *Self and Nation: Categorization, Contestation and Mobilization*, London et al.: Sage, 2001.
- REINELT, Janelle G. and Joseph R. ROACH eds., *Critical Theory and Performance*, Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1992.
- RENNIE, Neil, *Far-Fetched Facts: The Literature of Travel and the Idea of the South Seas*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- RICE, Alan, *Radical Narratives of the Black Atlantic*, London and New York: Continuum, 2003.
- RICH, Julia, "Heroic Tragedy in Southerne's *Oroonoko* (1695): An Approach to a Split-plot Tragicomedy", *Philological Quarterly* 62.2 (1983): 187 – 200.
- RICHARDS, David, *Masks of Difference: Cultural Representations in Literature, Anthropology and Art*, Cambridge: CUP, 1994.
- RICHARDS, Jeffrey H. *Drama, Theatre, and Identity in the American New Republic*, Cambridge: CUP, 2005.
- RICHARDSON, John, "John Gay and Slavery," *The Modern Language Review* 97.1 (2002):15 – 25.
- RICHETTI, John ed., *The New Cambridge History of English Literature, 1660 – 1780*, Vol. III, Cambridge: CUP, 2005.
- RICE, E.E. ed., *The Sea and History*, Phoenix Mill/Stroud: Sutton, 1996.
- RIGGINS, Stephen Harold, *The Language and Politics of Exclusion: Others in Discourse*, Thousand Oaks: Sage, 1997.
- RITCHIE, Robert C., *Captain Kidd and the War against the Pirates*, Cambridge/Mass. and London: Harvard UP, 1986.
- ROACH, Joseph, *Cities of the Dead: Circum-Atlantic Performance*, New York: Columbia UP, 1996.
- ROBINSON, Charles Napier, *The British Tar in Fact and Fiction: The Poetry, Pathos, and Humour of the Sailor's Life*, London: Harper and Brothers, 1909.

- RODGER, N.A.M. *The Wooden World: An Anatomy of the Georgian Navy*, London: Collins, 1986.
- , *The Safeguard of the Sea, a Naval History of Britain, Volume I 1660 – 1649*, London: Harper Collins Publishers, 1997.
- , "Queen Elizabeth and the myth of sea-power in English history", *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 14 (2004): 153 – 174.
- , *The Command of the Ocean: A Naval History of Britain 1649—1815*, London: Allen Lane, 2006.
- , *Essays in Naval History, from Medieval to Modern*, Farnham: Ashgate, 2009.
- ROGERS, K.M., "Fatal Inconsistency: Wycherley and The Plain Dealer", *English Literary History* 28 (1961): 148 – 162.
- ROPER, Michael and John TOSH eds., *Manful Assertions: Masculinities in Britain since 1800*, London and New York: Routledge, 1991.
- ROSENTHAL, Laura J., *Playwrights and Plagiarists in Early Modern England*, Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1996.
- ROSS, Ernest C., *The Development of the English Sea Novel: From Defoe to Conrad*, Ann Arbor, Michigan: Edwards Brothers, 1977.
- ROTHSTEIN, Eric and Frances M. KAVENIK, *The Designs of Carolean Comedy*, Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois UP, 1988.
- RUDOLPH, Julia ed., *History and Nation*, Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, 2006.
- RÜGER, Jan, *The Great Naval Game: Britain and Germany in the Age of Empire*, Cambridge: CUP, 2007.
- RUNYAN, Timothy J. ed., *Ships, Seafaring and Society: Essays in Maritime History*, Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1987.
- RUSSELL, Gillian, *The Theatres of War: Performance, Politics, and Society, 1793 – 1815*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- RUTHERFORD, Jonathan ed., *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1990.
- SAID, Edward W., *Orientalism*, New York: Pantheon, 1978.
- , *Culture and Imperialism*, New York: Knopf, 1993.
- , *After the Last Sky: Palestinian Lives*, with photographs by Jean Mohr, New York: Pantheon, 1986.
- SALVAGGIO, Ruth, *Enlightened Absence: Neoclassical Configurations of the Feminine*, Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1988.
- SCAMMELL, Geoffrey V., *Ships, Ocean and Empire: Studies in European Maritime and Colonial History, 1400 – 1750*, Aldershot: Variorum, 1995.
- SCHABERT, Ina, *Englische Literaturgeschichte: Eine neue Darstellung aus der Sicht der Geschlechterforschung*, Stuttgart: Alfred Kröner Verlag, 1997.
- SCHECHNER, Richard, "Performance & the Social Sciences: Introduction", *The Drama Review* 17.3 (1973): 3 – 4.
- SCHEIL WEST, Katherine, *The Taste of the Town: Shakespearian Comedy and the Early Eighteenth-Century Theater*, Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, 2003.
- SCHICK, Irvin Cemil, *The Erotic Margin: Sexuality and Spatiality in Alteritist Discourse*, London and New York: Verso, 1999.
- SCHILLE, Candy B.K., "'Man Hungry': Reconsidering Threats to Colonial and Patriarchal

- Order in Dryden and Davenant's *The Tempest*", *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 48.4 (2006): 273 – 290.
- SCHLEIFER, Ronald and Robert MARKLEY eds., *Kierkegaard and Literature: Irony, Repetition, and Criticism*, Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1984.
- SCHMIDT-HABERKAMP, Barbara, "Das neue 18. Jahrhundert – ein Forschungsbericht", *Das achtzehnte Jahrhundert* 22.2 (1998): 195 – 206.
- , "Patriotism and its Discontents in Eighteenth-Century Nautical Plays", in: Serge Soupel and Kevin Cope eds., *The Sea in Eighteenth-Century Britain*, New York: AMS, forthcoming.
- SCHNEIDER, Ben Ross Jr., *The Ethos of Restoration Comedy*, Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1957.
- , (compiled with an intro) *Index to The London Stage 1660 – 1800*, ed. by William van Lennep, Emmett L. Avery, Arthur H. Scouten, George Winchester Stone Jr., Charles Beecher Hogan, Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois UP, 1979.
- SCHULTZ, William Eben, *Gay's 'Beggar's Opera': Its Contents, History and Influence*, 1923, New York: Russell and Russell, 1967.
- SCHWARZ, Bill ed., *The Expansion of England: Race, Ethnicity and Cultural History*, London and New York: Routledge, 1996.
- SCHÖßLER, Franziska, *Literaturwissenschaft als Kulturwissenschaft, eine Einführung*, Tübingen and Basel: A. Francke Verlag, 2006.
- SCOTT, Joan W., "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis", *The American Historical Review* 91.5 (1986): 1053 – 1075.
- SELDEN, John, *Of the Dominion, or, Ownership of the Sea*, New York: Arno Press, 1972.
- SENELICK, Laurence ed., *National Theatre in Northern and Eastern Europe, 1746 – 1900*, Cambridge: CUP, 1991.
- SHAER, Roland, Gregory CLAEYS and Lyman Tower SARGENT eds., *Utopia: The Search for the Ideal Society in the Western World*, New York: OUP, 2000.
- SHARPE, Kevin, *Criticism and Compliment: The Politics of Literature in the England of Charles I*, Cambridge: CUP, 1987.
- SHARPE, Kevin and Steven N. ZWICKER eds., *Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England*, Cambridge: CUP 2003.
- SHELBY, Tommie, "Cosmopolitanism, Blackness, and Utopia: A Conversation with Paul Gilroy", *Transition* 98 (2008): 116 – 135.
- SHEPHERD, James L. III. "Molière and Wycherley's 'Plain Dealer': Further Observations", *The South Central Bulletin* 23.4 (1963): 37 – 40.
- SHERIDAN, Richard B., *Sugar and Slavery: An Economic History of the British West Indies*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1973.
- SHERMAN, Sandra, "Manly, Manliness, and Friendship in *The Plain Dealer*", *Restoration: Studies in English Literary Culture, 1660 – 1700* 20.1 (1996): 18 – 30.
- SHEVELOW, Kathryn, *Women and Print Culture: The Construction of Femininity in the Early Periodical*, London and New York: Routledge, 1989.
- SHIELDS, David S., *Oracles of Empire: Poetry, Politics, and Commerce in British America, 1690 – 1750*, Chicago and London: U of Chicago P, 1990.
- SHOEMAKER, Robert B., *Gender in English Society: The Emergence of Separate Spheres?*, London and New York: Longman, 1998.
- SHYLLON, Folarin, *Black People in Britain 1555 – 1833*, London, New York, Ibadan: OUP, 1977.

- SIMMS, Norman, "War and Peace in John Gay's *Polly*: Literal, Figurative and Cynical", *Centre D'Études du XVIIIe Siècle de L'Université de la Sorbonne: Guerres et Paix: La Grand Bretagne aux XVIIIe Siècle* 2 (1998): 281 – 291.
- SINFIELD, Alan, *Faultlines: Cultural Materialism and the Politics of Dissident Reading*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 1992.
- SKURA, Meredith, "Discourse and the Individual: the Case of Colonialism in *The Tempest*", *Shakespeare Quarterly* 40 (1989): 42 – 69.
- SMITH, Bernard, *European Vision and the South Pacific*, 1960, Second Edition, New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1989.
- SOBECKI, Sebastian J., *The Sea and Medieval English Literature*, Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2008.
- SOJA, Edward, *Postmodern Geographies, The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*, London: Verso, 1989.
- SOUTHERN, Richard, *Changeable Scenery: its Origin and Development in the British Theatre*, London: Faber and Faber, 1952.
- SPACKS, Patricia Meyer, *John Gay*, Twayne's English Authors Series 22, New York: Twayne, 1965.
- SPENCER, Hazelton, *Shakespeare Improved: The Restoration Versions in Quarto and on the Stage*, Cambridge/Mass.: Harvard UP: 1927.
- SPIVAK, Gayatri Chakravorty, "The Rani of Sirmur: An Essay in Reading the Archives", *History and Theory* 24.3 (1985): 247 – 272.
- SPURR, David, *The Rhetoric of Empire: Colonial Discourse in Journalism, Travel Writing, and Imperial Administration*, Durham: Duke UP, 1993.
- STALLYBRASS, Peter and Allon WHITE, *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression*, Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1986.
- STAVES, Susan, *Players' Scepters: Fictions of Authority in the Restoration*, Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1979.
- , "A Few Kind Words for the Fop", *Studies in English Literature, 1500 – 1900* 22.3 (1982): 413 – 428.
- STEELE, Ian K., *The English Atlantic 1675 – 1740, An Exploration of Communication and Community*, Oxford: OUP, 1986.
- STEIN, Roger B., *Seascape and the American Imagination*, New York: Clarkson N Potter in Association with the Whitney Museum of American Art, 1975.
- STOCKWELL, Sarah ed., *The British Empire: Themes and Perspectives*, Oxford: Blackwell, 2008.
- STONE, Lawrence ed., *An Imperial State at War: Britain from 1689 to 1815*, London and New York: Routledge, 1994.
- STONE, George Winchester, *The Stage and the Page: London's 'Whole Show' in the Eighteenth-Century Theatre*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 1981.
- STRATMANN, Gerd and Manfred BUSCHMEIER eds., *Neue Lesarten, neue Wirklichkeiten: Zur Wiederentdeckung des 18. Jahrhunderts durch die Anglistik*, Symposium zu Ehren von Ulrich Suerbaum – Bochum, 6. Februar 1992, Trier: WVT, 1992.
- STRAUB, Kristina, *Sexual Suspects: Eighteenth-Century Players and Sexual Ideology*, Princeton: Princeton UP, 1992.
- STYAN, John L., *The English Stage: a History of Drama and Performance*, Cambridge: CUP, 1996.

- SUMMERS, Montague, *Restoration Comedies*, London: Jonathan Cape- Eleven Gower Street, 1921.
- , *Shakespeare Adaptations: The Tempest, The Mock Tempest, and King Lear*, Boston: Small, Maynard & Company, 1922.
- , *The Restoration Theatre*, 1934, New York: Humanities Press, 1964.
- SUTHERLAND, James R., "Polly among the Pirates", *Modern Humanities Research Association* 37 (1942): 291–303.
- SWAN, A.E.H., "The Airs and Tunes of John Gay's *Polly*", *Anglia* 60 (1936): 403–22.
- TANNER, Tony ed., *The Oxford Book of Sea Stories*, Oxford: OUP, 1994.
- TAWNEY, R.H., *Business and Politics under James I*, Cambridge: CUP, 1958.
- THOMAS, Nicholas, *Colonialism's Culture: Anthropology, Travel, and Government*, Princeton: Princeton UP, 1994.
- THOMSON, Peter, *The Cambridge Introduction to English Theatre, 1660–1900*, Cambridge: CUP, 2006.
- TIFFIN, Chris and Alan LAWSON, *De-Scribing Empire: Post-colonialism and Textuality*, London and New York: Routledge, 1994.
- TODD, Janet ed., *Aphra Behn Studies*, Cambridge: CUP, 1996.
- , *The Secret Life of Aphra Behn*, London: Andre Deutsch, 1996.
- TOMPKINS, Jane, *Sensational Designs: The Cultural Work of American Fiction 1790–1860*, Oxford: OUP, 1985.
- TOSH, John, *Manliness and Masculinities in Nineteenth-Century Britain: Essays on Gender, Family and Empire*, Edinburgh: Pearson, 2005.
- TRENEER, Anne, *The Sea in English Literature: From Beowulf to Donne*, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1926.
- TRUMBACH, Randolph, "London's Sodomites: Homosexual Behaviour and Western Culture in the Eighteenth Century", *Journal of Social History* I (1977): 1–33.
- TURLEY, Hans, *Rum, Sodomy, and the Lash: Piracy, Sexuality, and Masculine Identity*, New York and London: New York UP, 1999.
- TURNER, Victor, *The Forest of Symbols: Aspects of Ndembu Ritual*, Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1967.
- , *From Ritual to Theatre: The Human Seriousness of Play*, New York: PAJ Publications, 1982.
- , *The Anthropology of Performance*, New York: PAJ Publications, 1987.
- UNDERWOOD, Dale, *Etherege and the Seventeenth-Century Comedy of Manners*, Yale Studies in English Vol. 135, New Haven: Yale UP, 1957.
- VAN LENNEP, William ed., *The London Stage 1660–1800: A Calendar of Plays, Entertainments and Afterpieces together with Casts, Box-Receipts and Contemporary Comment. Compiled from the Playbills, Newspapers and Theatrical Diaries of the Period*, Part I: 1660–1700, Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois UP, 1965.
- VAUGHAN, Alden T. and Virginia Mason VAUGHAN, *Shakespeare's Caliban: A Cultural History*, Cambridge: CUP, 1991.
- VELISSARIOU, Aspasia, "Gender and Circulation of Money and Desire in Wycherley's *The Plain Dealer*", *Restoration: Studies in English Literary Culture, 1660–1700* 18.1 (1994): 27–36.
- , "'Tis Pity That When Laws Are Faulty They Should Not Be Mended or Abolish't: Authority, Legitimation, and Honor in Aphra Behn's *The Widdow Ranter*", *Papers on Language and Literature* 38.2 (2002): 137–166.

- , "Love for Love: Patriarchal Politics versus Love", *Restoration: Studies in English Literary Culture, 1660–1700* 30.2 (2006): 39–55.
- VERMEULE, Blakey, "Fables of Modernity review", *Modern Language Quarterly* 64.4. (2003): 501–505.
- VERMILLION, Mary, "Buried Heroism: Critique of Female Authorship in Southerne's Adaptation of Behn's *Oroonoko*", *Restoration: Studies in English Literary Culture, 1660–1700* 16.1 (1992): 28–37.
- VERNON, P.F., "Marriage of Convenience and the Moral Code of Restoration Comedy", *Essays in Criticism: A Quarterly Journal of Literary Criticism* 12 (1962): 370–387.
- VINSON, James ed., *Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Drama*, London and Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1980.
- VISCONSI, Elliott, "A Degenerate Race: English Barbarism in Aphra Behn's *Oroonoko* and *The Widow Ranter*", *English Literary History* 69.3 (2002): 673–701.
- VOLKMANN, Laurenz, *Homo oeconomicus, Studien zur Modellierung eines neuen Menschenbilds in der englischen Literatur vom Mittelalter bis zum 18. Jahrhundert*, Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2003.
- WALLACE, John M., "Otway's *Caius Marius* and the Exclusion Crisis", *Modern Philology* 85.4 (1988): 363–372.
- WALVIN, James, *Fruits of Empire: Exotic Produce and British Taste, 1660–1800*, Houndmills and London: Macmillan, 1997.
- WARD, Wilber Henry, "Mrs. Behn's *The Widow Ranter*: Historical Sources", *South Atlantic Bulletin* 41.4 (1976): 94–98.
- WATSON, Harold Francis, *The Sailor in English Fiction and Drama 1550–1800*, 1931, New York: AMS Press, 1966.
- WEAVER-HIGHTOWER, Rebecca, *Empire Islands: Castaways, Cannibals, and Fantasies of Conquest*, Minneapolis and London: U of Minnesota P, 2007.
- WEBER, Harold, *The Restoration Rake-Hero: Transformations in Sexual Understanding in Seventeenth-Century England*, Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1986.
- WEIBUST, Knut, *Deep Sea Sailors: A Study in Maritime Ethnology*, Stockholm: Norstedt & Söner, 1969.
- WEINBAUM, Batya, *Islands of Women and Amazons: Representations and Realities*, Austin: U of Texas P, 1999.
- WEINBROT, Howard D., *Eighteenth-Century Satire: Texts and Contexts from Dryden to Peter Pindar*, Cambridge: CUP, 1988.
- , *Britannia's Issue: The Rise of British Literature from Dryden to Ossian*, Cambridge: CUP, 1993.
- WELLEK, René, *The Rise of English Literary History*, 1941, New York et al.: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
- WENDE, Peter, *Grossbritannien 1500–2000*, Oldenbourg Grundriss der Geschichte Vol. 32, München: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 2001.
- WIERLACHER, Alois ed., *Kulturthema Fremdheit: Leitbegriffe und Problemfelder kulturwissenschaftlicher Fremdheitsforschung*, Beiträge zur Kulturthemenforschung interkultureller Germanistik Vol. I, München: Iudicum, 2001.
- WHEELWRIGHT, Julie, *Amazons and Military Maids: Women Who Dressed as Men in the Pursuit of Life, Liberty and Happiness*, London: Pandora Press, 1989.
- WIKANDER, Matthew H., "The Duke my Father's Wrack: the Innocence of the Restoration

- Tempest*”, *Shakespeare Survey: An Annual Survey of Shakespeare Studies and Production* 43 (1991): 91–98.
- WILLIAMS, Andrew P. ed, *The Image of Manhood in Early Modern Literature: Viewing the Male*, Westport: Greenwood, 1999.
- WILSON, Kathleen, “Citizenship, Empire, and Modernity in the English Provinces, c.1720–1790”, *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 29.1 (1995): 69–96.
- , *The Sense of the People: Politics, Culture and Imperialism in England, 1715–1785*, Cambridge: CUP, 1998.
- , *The Island Race: Englishness, Empire and Gender in the Eighteenth Century*, London and New York: Routledge, 2003.
- ed., *A new Imperial History: Culture, Identity and Modernity in Britain and the Empire 1660–1840*, Cambridge: CUP, 2004.
- WILSON, John Harold, *All the King’s Ladies: Actresses of the Restoration*, Chicago: U of Chicago, 1958.
- WINN, James Anderson, *John Dryden and His World*, New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1987.
- WINTON, Calhoun, *John Gay and the London Theatre*, Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1993.
- WORRALL, David, *Theatric Revolution: Drama, Censorship, and Romantic Period Subcultures 1773–1832*. Oxford: OUP, 2006.
- , *The Politics of Romantic Theatricality 1787–1832: The Road to the Stage*, Houndmills/Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2007.
- , *Theatrical Intelligence: Eighteenth-Century British Theatre and Social Assemblage Theory* (forthcoming).
- WORTHEN, William B., *Modern Drama and the Rhetoric of Theatre*, Berkeley, Los Angeles and Oxford: U of California P, 1992.
- YANG, Chi-ming, “Asia Out of Place: The Aesthetics of Incorruptibility in Behn’s *Oroonoko*”, *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 42.1 (2008): 235–253.
- YOUNG, Robert J.C., *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race*, London: Routledge, 1995.
- ZABUS, Chantal, *Tempests after Shakespeare*, New York and Houndmills: Palgrave, 2002.
- ZAPF, Hubert, *Literatur als kulturelle Ökologie: Zur kulturellen Funktion imaginativer Texte an Beispielen des amerikanischen Romans*, Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2002.
- ZIMBARDO, Rose, *Wycherley’s Drama: A Link in the Development of English Satire*, New Haven: Yale UP, 1965.
- ZWICKER, Steven N., *Politics and Language in Dryden’s Poetry: The Arts of Disguise*, Princeton: Princeton UP, 1984.
- ed., *The Cambridge Companion to English Literature 1650–1740*, Cambridge: CUP, 1998.

herausgegeben von

Uwe Baumann, Marion Gymnich und Barbara Schmidt-Haberkamp

Band 1: Marion Gymnich / Norbert Lennartz (Hg.)

The Pleasures and Horrors of Eating

The Cultural History of Eating in Anglophone Literature

2010. 464 Seiten, gebunden

ISBN 978-3-89971-775-4

Band 2: Katrin Althans

Darkness Subverted

Aboriginal Gothic in Black Australian Literature and Film

2010. 224 Seiten, gebunden

ISBN 978-3-89971-768-6

Band 3: Imke Pannen

When the bad bleeds

Mantic Elements in English Renaissance Revenge Tragedy

2010. 337 Seiten, gebunden

ISBN 978-3-89971-640-5

Band 4: Marion Gymnich / Kathrin Ruhl / Klaus Scheunemann (Hg.)

Gendered (Re)Visions. Constructions of Gender in Audiovisual Media

2010. 270 Seiten, gebunden

ISBN 978-3-89971-662-7

Band 5: Julia Apitzsch

Whoever Controls Your Eyeballs Runs the World

Visualisierung von Kunst und Gewalt im Werk von Don DeLillo

2011. 522 Seiten mit 9 Abbildungen, gebunden

ISBN 978-3-89971-849-2

Band 6: Gisliind Rohwer-Happe

Unreliable Narration im dramatischen Monolog des Viktorianismus

Konzepte und Funktionen

2011. 301 Seiten, gebunden

ISBN 978-3-89971-899-7

V&R unipress

Leseproben und weitere Informationen unter www.vr-unipress.de

Email: info@vr-unipress.de | Tel.: +49 (0)551 / 50 84-301 | Fax: +49 (0)551 / 50 84-333