University of Glasgow

Wells, Heather Carolyn (2018) 'A Play in Our Nation'? Can the drama of late seventeenth-century Scotland be considered as restoration comedy, and are these comedies successful? MPhil(R) thesis.

http://theses.gla.ac.uk/9028/

Copyright and moral rights for this work are retained by the author

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge

This work cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

Enlighten:Theses
http://theses.gla.ac.uk/
theses@gla.ac.uk

‘A Play in Our Nation’?

Can the Drama of Late Seventeenth-Century Scotland be Considered as Restoration Comedy, and Are These Comedies Successful?

Heather Carolyn Wells
MA (Hons)

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the
Degree of Master of Philosophy (Research)

Department of Scottish Literature
School of Critical Studies
College of Arts

The University of Glasgow

April 2018

© Heather Carolyn Wells, April 2018

Abstract

This dissertation seeks to answer the research question 'Can the drama of seventeenth-century Scotland be considered as Restoration comedy, and are these comedies successful?' This question arose after having observed the similarities between late seventeenth-century Scottish drama and English Restoration comedy. The aim is to understand whether the Scottish plays are exactly the same as English Restoration comedies, or whether they have distinctly Scottish features that would prevent them from sharing the genre. Questioning the success of the Scottish comedies was inspired by the fact that modern scholarship usually ignores them, believing that they are poor imitations of English comedy, without giving much attention to their detail. This dissertation examines the plays in their own context and attempts to establish how their contemporary audiences would have responded to the plays, rather than judging them by modern standards as is so often done.

Seventeenth-century Scottish theatre is an understudied area with little existing scholarship, and so the Introduction essentially lays the foundations upon which this study is based. It outlines the socio-political landscape of Scotland during the Restoration period and introduces the three Scottish plays that are the focus of this research: *Marciano; or the Discovery*, by William Clark (1663), *Tarugo's Wiles; or, the Coffee-House*, by Thomas St Serf (1668) and *The Assembly*, by Archibald Pitcairne (1691).

Chapter One and Chapter Two of this dissertation deal with the first part of the research question: can the drama of late seventeenth-century Scotland be considered as Restoration comedy? Chapter One puts the late seventeenth-century Scottish plays into a Scottish context by outlining the theatrical landscape of Scotland before the seventeenth-century. Due to an absence of established theatre in Scotland until the eighteenth century, Scottish public entertainment and theatrical tradition took a variety of forms. This chapter considers how the seventeenth-century Scottish plays have been influenced by these traditions, particularly the moral and didactic elements found in earlier plays including Sir David Lindsay's *Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis* and the anonymous *Philotus*, attempting to establish if elements of these plays are influenced by the Scottish tradition.

Chapter Two compares the Scottish comedies of the seventeenth century with English Restoration comedy to establish what similarities exist between the two. It shows that the royalist views of the playwrights from both countries are displayed through their positive portrayals of the Restoration of Charles II, which is done within the plays through

restoring rightful authorities back to power and portraying socially acceptable marriages to promote the social structures established by the Restoration. It also highlights a number of comic features shared between the Scottish and English plays, especially through the use of placing characters with opposing views together within the plays, and through comic characters such as the fop. These chapters explore whether seventeenth-century Scottish drama does share enough with English Restoration theatre to be considered Restoration comedy in its own right, and if it has a Scottish element that prevents it from being considered purely imitative of English Restoration comedy.

Chapter Three addresses the second part of the research question: are these comedies successful? This chapter considers 'success' in terms of how the plays met the expectations of their authors and audiences. Because so little is known about the authors and the plays themselves, this chapter uses prefaces, prologues and epilogues written by the playwrights to speculate about what they hope their plays would achieve. It also considers what a Restoration audience might have expected and speculates about what the response would have been to these Scottish plays by engaging with what little criticism exists from the Scottish Restoration period, and the few references made to the plays by those who saw them.

This study concludes by arguing that the Scottish Restoration comedies, while sharing similarities with English Restoration comedy, are influenced by Scottish traditions, which justifies their place in the Scottish canon. It acknowledges that study in seventeenth-century Scottish drama is still a new field, and highlights the need for further research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank my supervisors, Dr Theo van Heijnsbergen and Dr Rhona Brown for their encouragement and support over the past year. One of the difficulties of this project was its newness, and the lack of existing material upon which to base my research. Without their advice, helpful pointers on what to read and their generous sharing of knowledge, this would have been an impossible undertaking, and I am grateful for their help.

Thanks are also due to my parents, Alan and Carolyn Wells, for their love, prayers and encouragement this year and always. Not every parent is thrilled when their children decide to live at home almost rent free and pursue a postgraduate degree, thankfully they are the exceptions.

I have been fortunate to have a wide community of family and friends who have supported me this year and I am grateful for each one of them, but a special mention must be given to Cecelia Maxwell, Kathryn Thomson and my Dad for going the extra mile and offering to proof-read my whole dissertation which is a significant undertaking!

Note on the Texts

Some of the plays considered in this dissertation do not have edited or critical editions available, and for that reason it has at times been necessary to study and quote from early prints of the texts. These were accessed using *Early English Books Online*, part of the Historical Texts database, details of which are found in the Bibliography. When quoting from these texts I have made two changes; replacing the long ‘s’ with the modern letterform and in some cases, moving stage directions such as ‘(*aside*)’ within dialogue to make it clearer which parts of speech or characters they apply to. No other changes have been made, and the spellings and grammar of the original texts have been replicated in this dissertation.

Introduction

Laying Foundations for Studying-Seventeenth Century Scottish Drama

Seventeenth-century Scotland is an anomaly when it comes to literary and theatrical production due to the fact that there is very little material known to exist from this period. One of the most common reasons given by scholars for this is the fact that when James VI of Scotland became James I of England and Scotland in 1603, he removed his court from Edinburgh to London. Because the court was Scotland's cultural hub and provided a community for writers and artists, many believe that when this cultural platform was moved to London, Scotland lost much of the creative production that was based at court.[1] There is no doubt that the Scottish literary scene, in which drama is included, had to evolve due to the lack of court culture. Terence Tobin refers to drama as 'a court appendage'[2] that 'with the union of crowns was in eclipse,'[3] and R.D.S Jack highlights that many scholars traditionally considered the seventeenth century as a period of 'assumed bleakness,' an outdated view that holds little regard for the literature that does exist from the time.[4] There was also no established theatre in Scotland until the eighteenth century, which had a direct impact on the writing and production of Scottish drama. As well as the lack of court culture which removed the space (and perhaps also the need) for entertainment through theatre, it is a common view among scholars that religious opposition to plays also had an impact on how they were produced in Scotland.[5] Adrienne Scullion notes that:

> Religious opposition and municipal bureaucracy restricted theater and other public entertainments in Scotland to a significant degree; at least in terms of repertoire and — as so far as may be deduced — personnel, such theater as existed was an extension of the London stage.[6]

Unlike in England where there was a community of playwrights who engaged with each other and each other's work, in Scotland there were no writers who made their living solely as playwrights and therefore the writing community in Scotland did not look the same as

[1] Clare Jackson, *Restoration Scotland 1600-1690: Royalist Politics, Religion and Ideas* (London: Boydell Press, 2002), p.16.
[2] Terence Tobin, 'Popular Entertainment in Seventeenth Century Scotland', *Theatre Notebook*, 23:1 (1968) 46-54 (p.46).
[3] Tobin, 'Popular Entertainment in Seventeenth Century Scotland', p.54.
[4] R.D.S Jack, 'Introduction: Where Stands Scottish Literature Now?', in *The Mercat Anthology of Early Scottish Literature, 1375-1707,* ed. by R.D.S Jack and P.A.T Rozendaal (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 2008) pp.vii-xxxix (p.vii).
[5] Ian Brown, 'Public and Private Performance, 1650-1800', in *The Edinburgh Companion to Scottish Drama*, ed. by Ian Brown (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011), pp.22-41 (p.26).
[6] Adrienne Scullion, '"Forget Scotland": Plays by Scots on the London Stage, 1667-1715, *Comparative Drama*, 31:1 (1997), 105-128 (p.105).

across the border. Whatever the reasons, it is true that Scotland is not known for its theatre or literary production during the seventeenth century. David Reid states:

> We need only compare it with what English writers of the time achieved or what Scottish writers would achieve in the next century to have the meagreness, the backwardness, of the literary culture of the Scottish seventeenth century brought home to us.[7]

This is not an uncommon attitude, and as a result, when seventeenth-century Scottish literature or drama is discussed it all too often has its existence briefly acknowledged before being brushed aside in favour of later Scottish literature or contemporary English works. This is a regular occurrence in discussions of the three known Scottish plays of the seventeenth century; *Marciano; or The Discovery* (1663) by William Clark; *Tarugo's Wiles; or The Coffee-House* (1667) by Thomas St Serf and *The Assembly* (1691) by Archibald Pitcairne. Even at the time, these authors recognised that there was little appetite for Scottish comedy. Clark felt that his play would appear 'as a City-swaggarer in a Country-church, where seldom have been extant,'[8] while Archibald Pitcairne says:

> A play in our nation, where witt so seldom appears, will be gazed upon by some, who doe not understand the nature of the thing, and laughed at by others who think witt and Ingenuity like fine Perriwigs and fashionable Cloths must be fetched from fforraigne places to serve their Caprice or please their humour.[9]

Pitcairne and Clark acknowledge that Scottish theatre in their time is a rarity. Pitcairne adds that those in Scotland will either be unable to understand the play due to its strangeness, while others will refuse to accept that comedy from Scotland will be of any quality compared to that of other countries. This attitude has traditionally found its way into modern scholarship, and only now is enthusiasm for these texts appearing.

All three of these plays were written during the seventeenth century in Scotland, but there is little in the way of scholarship which considers them in any great depth or within this Restoration context. This project's aim is to consider these plays in a more detailed way by asking whether the Restoration period and English influence of Restoration theatre is obvious enough within them that they could be considered as Restoration comedy. The second aim is to understand how successful the plays might have

---

[7] David Reid, 'Introduction', in *The Party-Coloured Mind* (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1982), pp.1-16 (p.1).
[8] William Clark, 'To all Humours', in *Marciano; or The Discovery* (Edinburgh: W.H. Logan, 1871), p.(3), in *Early English Books Online* <https://historicaltexts.jisc.ac.uk> [accessed September 2016].
[9] Archibald Pitcairne, 'The Preface', in *The Phanaticks*, ed. by John MacQueen (Edinburgh: Scottish Text Society, 2012), p.223. **N.B**. MacQueen uses his preferred title *The Phanaticks* for his edited version of *The Assembly*. As most criticism and other editions of the play do not use this title, I have chosen to continue referring to the play as *The Assembly.*

been by considering author intent, audience expectations and responses to the plays. This particular aim was born from the general consensus among scholars that these plays are of lesser quality than English Restoration drama, a consensus which seems to have been arrived at by applying modern standards, rather than by considering what a Restoration audience would have expected from good theatre.

Before delving into these plays, it is important to establish some key foundations upon which the arguments within the rest of this dissertation were built. Firstly, as previously mentioned, the Scottish plays which will be the focus of this dissertation were written in the Restoration period. Although there is complete agreement that the Restoration period began in 1660, with the return of Charles II to the throne of Scotland, England, Wales and Ireland, there is some debate among scholars as to when this period ended. This is not the time and place to engage in such a debate, but it is important to set out a timeframe *for this dissertation* so that there is clarity as to what the phrase 'Restoration period' refers to. The beginning of the Restoration period is characterised by the return of the monarchy, and therefore it is logical to use the reigning monarchs of this period to define the timeframe. When the phrase 'Restoration period' is used in this study, it refers to the period 1660-1689; the Restoration of Charles II to the beginning of the reign of William III and Mary II. This includes the major events that followed the Restoration[10] such as the Popish Plot (1678), the Exclusion Crisis (1679-1681) and the Glorious Revolution (1688-1689), which saw William and Mary ascend to the throne. *The Assembly* (1691) falls outside of this period by two years, however, John MacQueen considers it as a 'late Restoration comedy in the tradition of such English pieces as […] John Crown's *City Politiques* (1683) and *Sir Courtly Nice* (1685), both aimed at Titus Oates and the so-called Popish Plot.'[11] *The Assembly*'s links to the Restoration theatre tradition, as well as its being a response to the new regime under William and Mary make it a relevant text for this study. The play is also considered a significant influence upon eighteenth-century Scottish drama and therefore can be considered as a bridge between the drama of seventeenth and eighteenth-century Scotland. In a study about Scottish Restoration drama, *The Assembly* must be included, firstly because it shares similarities while also being considered as a comment on Restoration drama made by a later play, and secondly because it is the next

[10] For further clarity, use of the phrase 'the Restoration' refers to the actual event of 1660 which brought Charles II back to power, as opposed to the phrase 'the Restoration period' which refers to the time that followed, the timeframe of which is outlined above.
[11] John MacQueen, 'Introduction', in *The Phanaticks*, ed. by John MacQueen (Edinburgh: Scottish Text Society, 2012), pp.ix-lxxi (p.vii).

step in the development of Scottish drama and should be considered in the context of theatre that came before it.

Having established the Restoration period as it pertains to this project, it is necessary to summarise what little information there is about the Scottish plays and their playwrights in order to have a point of reference when discussing them in more depth, especially as so little is known about them in comparison to some other contemporary English plays or writers[12]. The earliest play of the Scottish Restoration period is *Marciano; or, The Discovery* which was written by William Clark and performed in 1663 for the King's High Commissioner to Scotland,[13] John Leslie, the seventh Earl of Rothes.[14] Clark was a Scottish advocate who was debarred for asserting the right of appeal against the Lords of Session in 1674, before the decision was overturned in 1676.[15] W.H Logan also believes Clark to be one of the Clarks of Penicuik, being the son of John Clark who was made Baronet in 1672.[16] If this is the case, Clark was part of a politically significant family in Scotland. In 1685, a lawyer by the name of William Clark published *The Grand Tryal; or, Poetical Exercitations on the Book of Job*, and in the preface states that he wished 'to make atonement for my former wanton excursions on this Art.'[17] This indicates that the author had already written something before, and for whatever reason, felt the need to make amends. This Clark could well be the same author who wrote *Marciano*. Another William Clarke who was living during this period was secretary to General Monck, a key figure in bringing Charles II back to the throne and who had a vast family library.[18] Nancy Maguire seems to believe that this Clarke is the writer of *Marciano,*[19] although she provides no evidence to explain this viewpoint. This William Clarke died in 1666 which would mean that if he was the author of *Marciano,* then the author of *The Grand Tryal* is a different William Clark. This dissertation will work under Logan's assumption that the author of *Marciano* and *The Grand Tryal* is the same person. The play itself has only the

[12] A plot summary of each of these plays can be found in the Appendix.
[13] Bill Findlay, 'Beginnings to 1700', in *A History of Scottish Theatre*, ed. by Bill Findlay (Edinburgh: Polygon, 1997), pp.1-79 (p.63).
[14] Gillian H. MacIntosh, 'Leslie, John, Duke of Rothes (*c.*1630–1681)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004) <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/view/article/16495> [accessed September 2017].
[15] W.H. Logan, 'Introductory Notice', in William Clark, *Marciano; or The Discovery* (Edinburgh: W.H. Logan, 1871), pp.iii-xvi (p.viii), in *Early English Books Online* <https://historicaltexts.jisc.ac.uk> [accessed September 2016]. Logan provides a full account of Clark's life in pp.vii-xi.
[16] Logan, p.x.
[17] William Clark, *The grand Tryal: or, Poetical Exercitations on the Book of Job* (Edinburgh: Andrew Anderson, 1685), p.[5], in *Early English Books Online* [accessed April 2017].
[18]Frances Henderson, 'Clarke, Sir William (1623/4–1666)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford University Press, 2004) <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/view/article/5536> [accessed September 2017].
[19] Nancy Maguire, *Regicide and Restoration*: *English Tragicomedy, 1660-1671* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), p.72.

one recorded performance, and according to the front page of the published version, took place in the Abbey of Holyrood House and was performed by amateurs,[20] rather than a professional theatre company. This would have been a grand venue that perhaps indicates the importance of the High Commissioner's visit, and perhaps even Clark's own reputation.

The next Scottish play of the Restoration period was Thomas St Serf's *Tarugo's Wiles; or The Coffee-House* (1667) which was the first Scottish play to premier on the London Stage and was a translation of a Spanish play called *No Puede Ser* (It Cannot Be), by Agustin Moreto. St Serf added a unique style of prologue and an entire scene of his own creation to the play. It premiered at Lincoln's Inn Fields which was associated with the Duke of York's theatre company[21] in 1667 before being performed in the Tennis Court of Holyrood House in Edinburgh the following year.[22] As with William Clark, the information on Thomas St Serf is limited. It is fairly established that he was the third son of Thomas Sydserff who served as Bishop of both Brechin and Galloway. St Serf served under the Marquis of Montrose during the Civil War, most likely in the campaign of 1644-5.[23] It is also believed that he travelled in Europe with the Marquis from 1646-50,[24] something that is hinted at in the prologue in *Tarugo's Wiles*. In 1659, St Serf published *Selenharia, or, The Government of the World on the Moon: A Comical History*, a translation of the French *L'Autre Monde ou les etats et empire de la lune* (1657) by Cyrano de Bergerac and from 1660-1661 he produced Scotland's first newspaper, *Mercurius Caledonius*. After premiering *Tarugo's Wiles* in London and bringing it back to Scotland, St Serf managed a theatre company in Edinburgh's Canongate,[25] beyond which there is no further established information about him.

The final play upon which this dissertation focuses is *The Assembly*, by Archibald Pitcairne which is dated at around 1691, although it was not published until the early eighteenth century around 1722.[26] There is no recorded performance of the play in Scotland, and it seems to have been relatively unknown until after its publication. The most likely way this play would have been seen is through private circulation among friends and acquaintances of the author and those they passed the manuscript on to. Pitcairne was

[20] Findlay, p.63.
[21] MacQueen, p.xxix
[22] Terence Tobin, *Plays by Scots, 1660-1800* (Iowa: University of Iowa Press, 1974), p.12.
[23] Kevin Gallagher, 'Thomas St. Serf – Biography' in *Mercurius Caledonius – Thomas St. Serf.* <https://mercuriuscaledonius.com/2015/09/21/thomas-st-serf-biography> [accessed January 2017].
[24] Gallagher, 'Thomas St. Serf – Biography'.
[25] Gallagher, 'Thomas St. Serf – Biography'.
[26] MacQueen, p.x.

related to Thomas St Serf through his mother,[27] but there is no information available to suggest they were ever in contact with one another, or how closely related they were. Pitcairne was born in 1652 which means that his early years were spent in the Republican Commonwealth. He went to Edinburgh University in 1668 but due to poor health, ended his studies and moved to France in 1671. It was there he first discovered an interest in medicine, and he returned to Paris in 1675 to study it. Pitcairne was one of the founding Fellows of Edinburgh Royal College of Physicians, but proved to be a controversial figure due to his mathematical and philosophical theories of medicine. His views on the treatment of fevers caused him to be ejected from the college in 1695.[28] One thing all three of these playwrights have in common is that they were all staunch royalists and unafraid to make this known. What information is known about the families of these playwrights indicates that they were all well-connected politically.

The political and religious setting in which these playwrights were writing is complex, however the following summary captures the most significant political and religious debates that are relevant to this study and will be helpful as points of reference in the other chapters. The monarchy was abolished in 1649 when Charles I was executed after a number of years of civil war across England and Scotland. Oliver Cromwell established the Commonwealth state in 1653, the period between this date and the Restoration is known as the Interregnum. In 1658, Cromwell died and his son, Richard, took over as Lord Protectorate of the Commonwealth, but the regime had begun to crumble and Charles II was restored to the throne in 1660.

Throughout the Restoration period, religion and politics were practically inseparable and this caused many complications in society. Under Cromwell, Presbyterians in Scotland had largely been in charge, although there was no national church as had existed under the crown.[29] When Charles II was restored, the Church of Scotland was re-established; however, the king required ministers and other church leaders to swear loyalty to him, something which was not well received by the Scottish Presbyterians, who were unwilling to recognise anyone other than Jesus Christ as head of the national Church. Scottish parliament and law were also restored to what they had been before the Interregnum, but like his father and grandfather before him, Charles II was going to rule from London, which again meant that Scotland was ruled by an absentee monarch,

[27] This, and all other biographical information here can be found in MacQueen, pp. xxviii-xliii.
[28] Anita Guerrini, 'Pitcairne, Archibald (1652–1713)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004) <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/view/article/22320> [accessed June 2017].
[29] MacQueen, p.xvii.

something which did not go unnoticed; 'In Edinburgh, the lack of a royal presence and attendant court culture was certainly bemoaned repeatedly throughout the seventeenth century by Scots of all social rank.'[30] The Church of England was also restored, but it was in a weaker position than it had been before. In England, the national church alienated those who did not want to accept the king as head of the church, although there were also members of the church who had issues with this. In Scotland, those outside Presbyterianism were alienated from the national church. In both cases, practicing Catholics were excluded and persecuted.[31] John MacQueen notes that after the Glorious Revolution of 1688-89 in Scotland 'the Revolution settlement benefited Whigs and Presbyterians, but left Tories (Jacobites) and Episcopalians in a state of perpetual discontent and open to persecution.'[32] Religious differences also affected politics as certain factions of religion held varying views on monarchy. Jackson believes that Scotland was generally in support of the Stuart monarchy, and that a firm belief in the divine right of kings was a characteristically Scottish view.[33] However, this view is restrictive and does not acknowledge the varying religious views that complicated the political allegiances of individual people. Those who subscribed to the divine right of the king believed that God had chosen the particular individual to rule and as a result, rebellion against the king was problematic as it was synonymous with rebellion against the divine. This was difficult in cases of misrule, as those who held this view would have been reluctant to do anything against the king. On the other hand, there were those who held the view that God no longer divinely appointed kings through prophets, as he had done in the Old Testament, which provided the people with a degree of freedom to choose their own monarch.[34] The two views were irreconcilable, and so these two factions were living side by side throughout the British Isles and which faction was pleased was dependent on who was on the throne. When Charles II was restored, those who believed in divine right were delighted, as in their opinion the true king had returned and his bloodline was to continue the royal line. However, the Glorious Revolution brought William III and Mary II to the throne, and while Mary was James's daughter and therefore a Stuart, she and her husband, William of Orange came to the throne after the deposition of James VII. The coming to the throne of William and Mary was more beneficial to those who were anti-Stuart, but as James II had

[30] Jackson, p.16.
[31] John Miller, *The Restoration and the England of Charles II*, 2nd edn (New York: Longman, 1997).
[32] MacQueen, p.xiv.
[33] Jackson, p.46.
[34] Jackson, pp.46-54.

been a Catholic monarch, it was also a victory for the anti-Catholicism that was rife throughout the Restoration period.

When Charles II returned to the throne, Catholics had no freedom to worship. Charles introduced the Declaration of Indulgence in 1672 which provided Catholics, and others who did not subscribe to the theology of the national church, the freedom to worship without persecution.[35] Charles had returned to the throne after a period of significant division in the country, and in order to avoid more conflict was attempting to be as tolerant of different religious and political groups as possible. One thing that united all the factions that have already been considered here was their anti-Catholicism, which was heightened during the Exclusion Crisis of 1679-1681. In 1678, a former Church of England minister named Titus Oates fabricated the Popish Plot, a fictitious conspiracy that claimed there was a Catholic plot to kill Charles II and place his Catholic brother, James, on the throne. This created massive anti-Catholic feeling throughout England and led directly to the Exclusion Crisis where bills were brought forward in parliament to ensure that James, who was Charles's heir presumptive, would not reach the throne. These did not come to fruition, and while the hysteria did die down, and James eventually came to the throne, anti-Catholic feeling remained in the country. This was part of the reason James II was eventually removed from power, along with the worry that he was going to become an absolute monarch.[36]

These are the main politico-religious debates during the Restoration period; they are much more complex than has been portrayed here, but the events summarised were the most significant political events of the period and should be remembered when considering these plays in context. Undertones of this context can be found in all of the plays considered in this study, particularly when authority, or religion are mentioned. After the turmoil and uncertainty of the Civil War and Interregnum, the Restoration of the monarch brought back the social structures from before, and Charles was faced with preserving the monarchy without pushing things so far as to spark another revolution[37] in the face of tension created by so many political and religious views held across the British Isles. Despite the political and religious complexities, the seventeenth century was a period where progress was made in science and discovery. The study of mathematics was a growing field, and figures such as Sir Isaac Newton came to the fore during this period.[38]

---

[35] Miller, p.69.
[36] W. A. Speck, 'James II and VII (1633–1701)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2009)
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/view/article/14593> [accessed August 2017].
[37] Miller, p.91.
[38] MacQueen, p.xxi-xxviii.

In England, the theatres re-opened and a new age of theatre developed, which saw changes in how the stage was used, and the production of brand new plays.[39]

It is against this background that this dissertation aims to consider the Scottish plays of the Restoration period. These plays have received very little scholarly attention, and as a result, there is a scarcity of critical sources that deal with them. One of the challenges of this study has been finding relevant material with which to investigate the research questions. As a result, the present dissertation has to rely on informed speculation at times, English Restoration drama and the political and religious debates of the time in an attempt to find as much information upon which to base tentative conclusions. Conclusions cannot always be based on firm evidence in this study, but in order to improve that state of research the aim of this project is to lay the foundations which will open up doors to further study in seventeenth-century Scottish drama. The focus of this dissertation is Restoration drama, but as the Scottish Restoration plays considered are all forms of comedy, the arguments made here will be focused through the lens of comedy, or in *Marciano'*s case, the comic aspects of the tragicomedy, which means that other genres such as tragedy are not considered in any great detail. This also means that playwrights with Scottish links but living and writing in England, such as Lodowick Carlell (c.1601-1675),[40] have been left out of this project. Unlike the Scottish Restoration playwrights included in this dissertation, Carlell is known to have written more than one play and used a variety of genres, which means that a larger exploration of his work would be required than what would be possible in this dissertation. This, along with the fact that his relationship to Scotland, and contribution to Scottish theatrical tradition would need to be questioned, means that an entire study dedicated to his life and work would be necessary, rather than considering him briefly here.

In Chapter One, the Scottish Restoration plays are set in their Scottish context. This chapter considers the traces of theatrical traditions that did exist in pre-Restoration Scotland despite the lack of an established, professional theatre, and looks for influences of this in the Scottish Restoration plays. By comparing the Scottish Restoration plays to the two pre-Restoration plays of Scotland that are known to exist (David Lindsay's *Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis,* performed in 1552 and 1554, and the anonymously written *Philotus* from the late sixteenth century) it will become possible to see ways in which the later

[39] Edward A. Langhans, 'The Post-1660 Theatre as Performance Spaces', in *A Companion to Restoration Drama*, ed. by Susan J. Owen (Oxford: Blackwell, 2013), pp.3-18.
[40] Julie Sanders, 'Carlell, Lodowick (1601/2–1675)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004) <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/view/article/4669> [accessed September 2017].

Scottish plays share characteristics with the pre-Restoration plays. This will give an indication of any particularly Scottish elements of the Restoration plays considered in the chapter.

The Scottish Restoration plays do share a number of characteristics with English Restoration theatre, and so Chapter Two will compare the Scottish plays with contemporary English ones, exploring common themes and characteristics. This will give an indication as to how the Scottish playwrights were influenced by the English dramatic tradition. Together, these first two chapters will show that, while the Scottish Restoration plays can be considered Restoration comedy when viewed alongside the plays of Restoration England, there are elements of a Scottish dramatic tradition that are evident, which means they cannot only be considered mere imitations of the English theatre.

Finally, Chapter Three will address the second aim of this study; establishing the success of the Scottish Restoration plays. This chapter will highlight the ways a play can be successful through commercial success and whether or not it meets the author's intentions or the audience's expectations. By taking into account contemporary references to the plays, who the audience for each play was likely to be, prefaces and prologues which revealed the authors' views on the purpose of drama and what a Restoration audience might expect of a good play, this chapter attempts to build a picture of how these plays lived up to the expectations of their audiences and authors. Each play has a very different intended audience, and each author held different views of drama's purpose. As a result, the conjectures and conclusions made within this chapter are highly individual to each play, and the suggestions made about Scottish Restoration drama as a whole are at times, by necessity, somewhat speculative.

This study of seventeenth-century Scottish drama is unique in its consideration of these plays in any great depth. There is a danger that this project could easily become derailed by the numerous other avenues opened in researching material that has been relatively untouched, and so remaining within the confines of the research questions has been important. This focus on Restoration theatre, and comedy in particular, means that there are other aspects of the plays, such as their approaches to gender and family, or a deeper look at religion and politics within the plays, that have had to be put aside. It has been impossible to be all-encompassing, but the hope is that this study has broken the ground and begun to lay foundations for further research into the unexplored field of seventeenth-century Scottish drama, and all it has to offer.

Chapter One

The Plays in a Scottish Context

As discussed in the introduction, the distinct lack of written plays from Scotland before the seventeenth century has in the past informed the view that Scottish theatrical tradition did not exist until the establishment of professional theatre in the eighteenth century. Over the last few decades however, some scholars have pointed out that what would be considered theatrical or dramatic in pre-Restoration Scotland is different to that of the present day. Before considering the Scottish plays of the Restoration period, it is important to examine this theatrical landscape and plays that did exist in Scotland before the seventeenth century to better understand how the seventeenth-century plays fit into this context, and how Scottish tradition influenced them. This chapter considers these early theatrical traditions and two pre-Restoration Scottish plays, *Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis* by Sir David Lindsay (published in1555) and the anonymous *Philotus* (thought to be written in the late sixteenth century) alongside the Scottish Restoration plays[1] and compares the similarities that indicate a Scottish influence on these plays and their playwrights.

Scholars of early modern theatre in Scotland have begun to consider different aspects of theatricality that existed in pre-Restoration Scotland before professional theatre was established. Sarah Carpenter states that:

> Pre-Reformation Scotland abounded with words for theatrical and quasi-theatrical performance: *pageant, sport* and *pastime* are joined by *play, game, farce, guising, mask, procession, clerk play, comedy, tragedy, ludus, riding, entres, dance, interlude, jape, ballade, gest, jousting* and *mumming.* This range of terms might seem to suggest in spite of the lack of texts, not only a rich range of performance practices, but carefully distinguished dramatic genres.[2]

The terms Carpenter highlights include recognisable theatrical genres, but also forms of entertainment which would not be considered theatrical in a twenty-first-century context. What they all have in common is that they are collective activities which have varying degrees of performance and spectatorship. Scottish folk traditions involved a great deal of performance; naming a King and Queen on Mayday, performances of Robin Hood plays and outdoor games are all recorded as having occurred regularly in Scotland,[3] and many of

[1] In this dissertation, the collective term 'pre-Restoration plays' refers to *Ane Satyre* and *Philotus*, while 'Scottish Restoration plays' refers to *Marciano, Tarugo's Wiles* and *The Assembly*.
[2] Sarah Carpenter, 'Scottish Drama Until 1650', in *The Edinburgh Companion to Scottish Drama*, ed. by Ian Brown (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011), pp.6-21 (p.6).
[3] Anna J. Mill, *Mediaeval Plays in Scotland* (New York: Benjamin Blom, 1969).

these activities probably took place outdoors. Performance was a part of more than just the theatrical in early modern Scotland; ceremonial occasions, such as festivals or Saints' days would have performed aspects in addition to the elements of performance in everyday actions:

> Various kinds of activity, while not plays or even ceremonial in the modern sense, were nonetheless theatrical in nature and effect, and […] narrative sources were keen to pass these episodes on to the reader.[4]

People performed their social status through the clothes they wore and how they conducted themselves,[5] and a degree of showmanship would be required for buying and selling. Even facts and accounts of true stories that were recorded in writing were at risk of exaggeration and embellishment. These elements of performativity have survived into present day culture, but in the absence of an established theatre they hold more significance as, in addition to the pageantry of court when it was still present in Scotland, this would have been the only point of reference early modern Scottish society would have had for performance and its purpose.

These folk traditions of Scotland existed long before the Reformation of the Church, but as the Kirk established itself in Scotland, there was a degree of religious opposition to plays. There was also religious and political conflict that resulted in systems of state control that, according to Ian Brown, meant that the plays that did exist in Scotland would more likely have been written for publication rather than performance.[6] However the view that there was a general oppression for drama in seventeenth-century Scotland is one that Brown believes is:

> based on a narrow definition of drama: schools, rural and street drama were clearly lively phenomena. Regular attempts by authorities, religious and secular, to control drama indicate dramatic forms' perceived prevalence and potency.[7]

While there were some attempts by religious and political authorities to restrict some forms of theatre, there was not a mass oppression that restricted all types of dramatic performance. Attempts of censorship or control of any kind do suggest that there was a belief among those in authority that theatre had the power to bring about change in attitudes or social change and therefore there had to be some form of regulation. This is further supported by the fact that the Kirk, while generally being opposed to secular forms

[4] John J. McGavin, *Theatricality and Narrative in Early Modern Scotland* (Hampshire: Ashgate, 2007), p.1.
[5] McGavin, pp.17-19.
[6] Brown, 'Public and Private Performance', p.23.
[7] Brown, 'Public and Private Performance', p.26.

of theatrical performance, actively encouraged the use of plays as teaching material in schools[8]. Lessons could be imparted to students through moral or biblical stories.

A 'Great Tradition approach' to Scottish theatre is not workable when considering the theatrical landscape in Scotland before the seventeenth century, or until an established theatre eventually came into existence in Scotland in the eighteenth century. Instead, drama in Scotland grew from 'a longer and often hidden tradition […] central to the concerns of a much longer and more continuous tradition of theatre and drama in Scotland than is often recognised.'[9] The small number of scripted plays in existence from early modern Scotland should not be interpreted as proof of the absence of all theatrical activity in Scotland at this time, but instead indicates that ideas of performance and drama were based more on folk traditions and collective activity. Therefore, when it comes to considering the plays that do exist from pre-Restoration Scotland, and the Scottish Restoration plays themselves, it is important to keep in mind these folk traditions and fluid interpretations of performance in order to see the ways in which they influence the scripted plays.

When *Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis* and *Philotus* are studied in any depth, it becomes clear that characteristics of these earlier folk traditions of Scottish theatricality can be found within them. The first known performance of *Ane Satyre* took place in Cupar in 1552. The performance occurred outdoors, like much of the folk performances and games in Scotland at the time, and presents episodes of a moral, satirical or even at times, farcical nature. A link between stage and audience is established through the character of Diligence, who addresses the audience directly throughout the play, while characters such as the Pauper and John the Common-weill appear from within the audience to make their way onto the stage, which creates the impression that any audience member could stand up and join the story, rather than having the action confined to a separate world upon the stage. Not only does this draw from aspects of participatory entertainment from earlier Scottish tradition, but the characters within the play frequently break the fourth wall, a technique which is often considered a feature of twentieth-century theatre. A slightly later play, *Philotus* has similar traditions, making use of farce and directly addressing the audience through the character of the Plesant, whose only job is to offer commentary on the action for the audience or reader.[10] Both of these plays were written before the Union of Crowns in 1603, when Scotland had its own court culture with which these playwrights

[8] Brown, 'Public and Private Performance', p.23.
[9] Ian Brown, *Scottish Theatre: Diversity, Language, Continuity* (Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi B.V., 2013), p.9
[10] There is some debate as to whether this play was ever performed. See: M.P. McDairmid, '*Philotus:* A Play of the Scottish Renaissance', *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, 3.3 (1967) 223-235.

could engage. The court was where some of the aforementioned pageants and sports took place, as well as where poetry and readings were performed. There is evidence of a performance at Linlithgow Palace for King James V in 1540 which is believed to be an early version of Lindsay's *Ane Satyre*, [11] and if this is the case, shows that while also drawing from folk traditions, it also is influenced by the characteristics of court culture at the time. Comparing these pre-Restoration plays to the Scottish Restoration plays is a worthwhile endeavour; because both *Ane Satyre* and *Philotus* engage with previous Scottish traditions, understanding how they do this will give an indication as to how the Scottish Restoration plays engage with the same traditions, as well as the pre-Restoration plays. Although the Scottish Restoration plays have more in common with their English counterparts on the surface, some similarities are found between these plays and Scottish literary and theatrical tradition, particularly elements of comedy and a moral nature, which makes them worth investigating in order to establish their place in the Scottish canon.

One of the biggest similarities that the seventeenth-century comedies share with *Ane Satyre* and *Philotus* is their moral nature. *Ane Satyre* is a morality play in its themes, and also in its outcome. The new king of Scotland, known as Rex Humanitas, or King Humanity, has come to the throne and hopes to rule well:

> **REX HUMANITAS**
> O Lord of Lords and King of kingis all,
> Omnipotent of power, Prince but peir,
> [Eterne] ringand in gloir celestiall,
> [Unmaid makar quilk], haifing na mateir,
> Maid in heavin and eird, fyre, air and watter cleir,
> Send me Thy grace with peace perpetuall,
> That I may rewll my realme to Thy pleaseir,
> Syne bring my saull to joy angelicall.[12]

The first words the audience hears from the king are this prayer, which establishes his apprehension as a new ruler and his hope for divine help in reigning well. This prepares the audience for the large part that religion and the church will have in this play. Despite his desire to be a good king, Humanity is quickly led astray by Dame Sensualitie, who distracts him from his duties, while her fellow Vices Dissait (Deceit), Flatterie and Falset (Falsehood) run amok, dressing as virtuous churchmen and ensuring that the real Virtues, embodied in Gude Counsall, Chastitie and Veritie, are kept away from the king. Upon the arrival of Divyne Correctioun, the king is redeemed and repents from the sin of allowing his kingdom to be left in disarray while he enjoyed all that Sensualitie had to offer. The

[11] John Corbett, *Scotnotes: Sir David Lyndsay's A Satire of the Three Estates* (Glasgow: ASLS, 2009), p.13.
[12] Sir David Lindsay, *Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis* ll.78-85, ed. by Roderick Lyall (Edinburgh: Cannongate Classics, 1989), p.3. From now, referred to within the text.

second part of the play comprises of the reformed king gathering his Three Estates (the Merchants, the Nobility and the Church) to a sitting of parliament in order to change the country for the better. Divyne Correction provides guidance and added authority when the corrupt Church refuses to change. While this corruptness is not addressed directly until Part Two of the play, it is hinted at in Part One by Wantonnes, the king's courtier:

> **WANTONNES**
> Beleive ye, Sir, that lecherie be sin?
> Na, trow nocht that! This is my ressoun quhy:
> First at the Romane [court] will ye begin,
> Quilk is the lemand lamp of lechery,
> Quhair Cardinals and Bischops generally
> To luif ladies thay think ane pleasand sport,
> And out of Rome hes baneist Chastity,
> Quha with our Prelats can get na resort.
> (*Ane Satyre,* ll.235-242, p.8)

Wantonnes justifies lechery by stating that those in holy office are also guilty of it, and if those who are supposed to be a moral example are engaging in sexual promiscuity, then he has no qualms about behaving the same way. This mentality is also hinted at in the 'Proclamation of Cupar', a small performance which occurred a few days prior to the main play as a means of advertising it. Small sketch-like episodes were performed involving various characters, including a Cottar who wishes for a divorce from his wife. When asked if he will remarry after his divorce, he replies:

> **COTTER**
> Na, than the dum Divill stik me with an knyfe!
> Quha evir did mary agane, the Feind mot fang thame,
> Bot as the preistis dois ay, stryk in amang thame.
> (*Ane Satyre*, 'The Proclamatioun of Cowpar', ll.52-54, p.166)

In other words, he wishes to do what the churchmen do — satisfy themselves sexually despite not being allowed to marry — which would enable him to be sexually fulfilled without suffering the abuse of another wife. Satire is the perfect tool for this play, as it creates laughter and is highly entertaining, while managing to emphasise the moral point that Lindsay is making: that hypocrisy and corruption are thriving in the lives of those called to be a moral example to the people. In Part Two, a character named John the Common-weill who represents the voice of the common people, draws attention to the financial corruption of the Church, speaking out against large death taxes charged to those who cannot afford them. From beginning to end, Lindsay draws attention to the corruption before resolving it in the conclusion of the play by portraying those in holy office being stripped of their power. There is then a reformation of the rules which ensures new churchmen taking office are under stricter rules and will execute their duties properly.

Lindsay's play makes a clear moral trajectory, starting from a point of corruption at court and in the Church and ending with full reform. There is not a complete resolution though; the appearance of the Fool at the end serves as a reminder to the audience that there will always be folly in the world, and that everyone from king to pauper is subject to it.[13] This in itself can be considered one of the play's moral lessons, while still remaining a satirical portrayal of the country's governance.

Philotus also follows this trajectory. The play sets out the issues it intends to address from the beginning by introducing eighty-year-old Philotus who attempts to persuade fourteen-year-old Emilie to marry him. Because she knows his desire to marry her is simply an attempt to legally satisfy his sexual lust for her, Emilie is clearly uncomfortable with the prospect and refuses him twice. Philotus makes a financial deal with Alberto, Emilie's father, in exchange for her hand in marriage, and so Alberto locks Emilie away until she accepts Philotus' offer. Emilie makes her escape disguised in male clothing with the help of Flavius, a young man who has fallen in love with her. A servant spots Emilie fleeing, and just as her escape is reported to her father and Philotus, her long absent brother, Philerno, returns home. Their likeness is so striking that Philerno is mistaken for his sister in her male disguise. Philerno realises what has happened, but for some reason, decides to maintain the charade, continues to impersonate his sister and 'marries' Philotus. On the wedding night, Philotus is beaten by his new 'wife', and unknowingly sleeps with a prostitute who has been placed in the marriage bed by Philerno in order to maintain his cover. Both of these events are deeply humiliating for Philotus when the truth is out, as is the revelation that he has compromised the moral reputation of his daughter, Brisilla. In order to prevent the appearance that he and Emilie were sharing a bed before the wedding, he sends Emilie (Philerno) to stay in Brisilla's room. When it occurs to him that his unmarried daughter has slept with a man, Philotus is horrified:

> **PHILOTUS**
> Allace I am for ever schamit,
> To be thus in my eild defamit,
> My dochter is not to be blamit,
> For I had all the wyte.
> Auld men is twyse bairnis, I persaif,
> The wisest will in wowing raif,
> I, for my labour, with the laif,
> Am drivin to this dispyte.[14]

[13] Corbett, p.20.
[14] Anonymous, *Philotus*, ll.1241-1248, in *The Mercat Anthology of Early Scottish Literature: 1375-1707,* eds. R.D.S. Jack and P.A.T. Rozendaal (Edinbugh: John Donald Publishers, 2008), pp.390-432 (p.428). From now, referred to within the text.

Until this point, the play has been farcical and light-hearted in its promotion of marriage between young people of similar age, and the idea that young women should not be forced to marry old men they do not love for money and position. However, the compromising of Brisilla as a direct result of her father's actions is a more serious consequence of his lust and greed, adding weight to the message of the play that would not have been possible had it maintained its lighter tone. The seriousness of Brisilla's situation is highlighted by her father's assertion that 'the devil be at the dance!' (*Philotus*, l.1240) which implies that this moral conundrum has elements of a darker spiritual nature. Alberto's eagerness to help resolve the problem by promising that his son, Philerno, will marry Brisilla to save face indicates that they all believe the situation to require Brisilla's redemption; and Philotus' own precautions to ensure he and Emilie were not sexually compromised before their wedding show that this standard of sexual propriety is important to the characters. The issue is resolved quickly due to Philerno's pre-existing desire to marry Brisilla, but this small episode within the play changes the tone and focus from comedic to didactic. The play ends with an address to the audience spoken by Philotus, who takes responsibility for the mistakes he has made and acknowledges his change of heart:

> **PHILOTUS**
> For I my self am authour of my grief—
> That by my calling sould be caryit cleine,
> With youthlie toyis, unto sa greit mischeif.
>
> Gif I had weyit my gravity and age,
> Rememberit als my first and auncient sait,
> I had not sowmit in syk unkyndlie rage,
> For to disgrace mine honour and estait. (*Philotus*, ll.1314-1320)

He finishes his address by admitting that although his behaviour may have offended God, things have been brought about for the best (ll.1325-1330) and warns the audience to let wisdom govern their old age and control their desires so that they do not find themselves in his situation.

Jamie Reid Baxter, among other scholars of the Scottish Renaissance asserts that the source play for *Philotus* is *Gl'Igannati* (1538), an Italian play, the title of which translates into English as *The Deceived*.[15] The play was also source material for Shakespeare's *Twelfth Night* and features fraternal twins mistaken for one another, the female of which has been promised in marriage to an older man against her wishes. It is more sexually explicit than *Philotus* and lacks the moral and didactic features found in the

[15] Jamie Reid Baxter, '*Philotus* — A Play of the Scottish Renaissance' (Unpublished Distance Taught MPhil: The University of Glasgow, 1997), p.5.

Scottish play. This is worth noting, as a moral element can be found in each of the Scottish plays considered in this dissertation. The moral tone of these plays arises from the tradition of using plays as moral lessons within Scottish schools and universities, especially in the late sixteenth century. George Buchanan often wrote plays for his students to perform, although his reputation as a widely-respected poet and academic reached far beyond the confines of his classroom and across Europe.[16] Two of his original works are Latin plays: *Jephthes* (1554) and *Baptistes* (1577). *Jephthes* recounts the events of Judges 11 in which the biblical character Jephtha returns victorious from battle and promises God that he will sacrifice the first thing to meet him on his return home. To his horror, it is his daughter who greets him upon his arrival and Jephtha must reap the consequences of his rash vow. *Baptistes* tells the story of the death of John the Baptist, who displeased Queen Herodias by condemning her marriage to the king, her dead husband's brother. In revenge, she recruits her daughter to dance for the king who in return must give her whatever she asks for. At the prompting of her mother, the girl asks for the head of John on a platter and the king reluctantly agrees. Both plays show the disaster that can befall when a promise is made too quickly.

The clarity of the message in addition to the use of biblical stories indicates the instructive nature of Buchanan's plays and it is this tradition of using plays as didactic material from which *Ane Satyre* and *Philotus* grow. Both *Jephthes* and *Baptistes* are Latin tragedies which provide little chance for reformation or resolution, but when it comes to *Ane Satyre* and *Philotus* which are better identified as comedies, the message of each play is present from the first scenes and carries itself through to the conclusion, where in both cases, matters are reformed and changed for the better. While *Ane Satyre* has a weightier subject matter, and aims to make a political point about the Church and government of Scotland in Lindsay's day, *Philotus* is more comedic by nature and the words of warning at its conclusion are more focused on individuals improving their behaviour rather than the overhaul of how things are done in the nation. Nevertheless, instructive elements applied on an individual level make an impact on other surrounding individuals, and so small changes in behaviour can become edifying for humanity in general.

When it comes to the comedies of seventeenth-century Scotland, much had changed in terms of theatre and written drama. There was still no established theatre in Scotland, but there were some performances of plays, which will be discussed later within the dissertation. Additionally, in comparison to the pre-Restoration Scottish plays, the

[16] Ian D. McFarlane, 'George Buchanan and European Humanism', *Yearbook of English Studies*, 15 (1985), 33-47.

layout of the Scottish Restoration plays is more structured with the separation of acts and scenes and realistic dialogue between characters as opposed to long passages of verse recited by each character. The language of the Scottish Restoration plays also differs from the earlier plays through their use of English instead of Scots.[17] Despite these structural differences, there are still moral elements within these plays which link them to the Scottish theatrical tradition. Although *Tarugo's Wiles* is primarily a play written for entertainment,[18] there are still moral elements in its emphasis of the fact that a woman's will should not be restrained. In Act 1.2 of the play, Liviana and her brother, Patricio, discuss her being locked away from society:

> **PATRICIO** Are you not troubled to be depriv'd of the accustom'd freedom in giving and receiving Visits?
> **LIVIANA** Not at all, since it is your pleasure; but if I thought any of my actions had led you to this severity, I should then be highly perplex'd.
> **PATRICIO** I did it not upon any such account, onely the corruptions of the time urg'd that I should not expose you to the temptations of the world, and since 'tis for the ease of my mind, and preservation of your honour, you ought to be less dissatisfi'd.
> **LIVIANA** Fear not the ease of your mind, if it depend upon the preservation of my honour, for 'tis within my breast can do that better then all your restraints.
> Patricio All the better: (*aside*) yet I'le scarce trust her.[19]

Patricio's wish to keep his sister away from society is unusual. By his own admission, she has done nothing to imply that she needs protected; she does not seem to have been taken advantage of in the past, nor is it suggested her behaviour has been shocking or immoral and needs altered. Secondly, he does not outline what the temptations are that he is protecting her from, and at no point during their exchange does Liviana come across as stupid, dishonourable or vulnerable. Liviana herself is confused as to why her brother takes such an approach to protecting her honour, for in her opinion, she is the best placed person to do that. From the outset, St Serf emphasises that Patricio is in the wrong by having Sophronia refuse to marry him until Liviana is given her freedom:

> **SOPHRONIA** [To Horatio] To be free with you; Patricio is the onely Soveraign of my Soul, and I flatter my self to have a proportionable share in his love: 'Tis long since our Faiths were plighted, but I am resolv'd against marriage so long as he practises this barbarous jealousie against his Sister, who among all the Ladies in Town is reputed the great example of Virtue: Therefore (dear Cousin) I sent for you that we may consult either to dispossess Patricio of this new taken up humour, or find a means to fetch Liviana out of her Prison; That your honourably begun love may be finish'd and haply by the

[17] This is with the exception of *The Assembly* which maintained the use of Scots.
[18] See Chapter Three: Considering the Success of the Scottish Restoration Plays.
[19] Thomas St. Serf, *Tarugo's Wiles; or, the Coffee-House* I.2, (Henry Herringman: London, 1668), p.2 in *Early English Books Online (EEBO)* < https://data.historicaltexts.jisc.ac.uk > [accessed September 2016]. From now, referred to within the text.

> performance of either, Patricio may be convinced of his Error, and I in a capacity to terminate my enjoyment. (*Tarugo*, I.2, pp.3-4)

The outcome of the play is similar to that of *Philotus*, namely that the character at fault is turned into a laughing stock before accepting their error and changing their ways. Tarugo's disguise as a knight named Don Crisanto, who has been cursed with a deadly aversion to women, is so ridiculous, and at times so convenient, that it is incredible that Patricio does not see through the trick. Don Crisanto arrives at the house only moments after a letter, seemingly from Patricio's friend, the Marquess Villana, asks him to take the knight in. Don Crisanto even remarks that he hoped the letter would arrive before him, giving the impression that he expected it to be delayed. While Patricio simply accepts this strange coincidence, the audience is aware that the letter is a forgery, written and sent from Sophronia's house. Don Crisanto's curse also means that when Patricio is with him, he cannot be with Liviana, providing an excellent distraction when Horatio and Sophronia need access to Liviana. In Act 4, Tarugo and Liviana are conversing when Patricio appears, and in order to keep his cover, Tarugo fakes a fit and pretends that he (as Don Crisanto) saw Liviana from the balcony which caused him to fall:

> **TARUGO** Unfortunate Wretch that I am, and more unfortunate in your Friendship! Did not you tell me I should see no Women in your house: I think the Devil either brought me to the Balcony, or the Women to the Garden. — Oh-oh. (*Tarugo*, IV, p.39)

The comedy of these scenes derives from the audience knowing what the real situation is, while Patricio remains clueless. Tarugo exaggerates the severity of his 'fall' and blames the devil for having some involvement, adding further ridiculousness to the situation. The other characters view Tarugo as a quick thinker with creative solutions to each problem he encounters. While the fact that he thinks on his feet cannot be denied and can be admired, the audience is more likely to note how far-fetched Tarugo's ideas are. While the scenes are comical, it is Patricio who is perceived as the fool rather than Tarugo, for although it would be impossible to expect Patricio to guess exactly what is happening, these situations are bizarre enough to at least cause him to question their legitimacy, rather than blindly accepting each event without question which is what actually happens.

Patricio's foolishness is apparent throughout the play. Liviana tells her brother that she does not need to be locked up, Sophronia refuses to marry him until he releases his sister and even Horatio confronts him about his treatment of Liviana; but Patricio continues in his course of action without considering that everyone around him is questioning his behaviour which ordinarily may signal to him that he is in error. Sophronia

believes marrying someone with views as extreme as those held by Patricio would be inadvisable:

> **SOPHRONIA** O most unfortunate wretch that I am! my love is great, and yet my sorrow is greater: Oh, oh! —If Vertuous *Liviana* thus be us'd, his wife must needs expect to be abus'd. Oh, Oh! (*Tarugo* II.1, p.8)

Her plan to help deceive Patricio in order to save Liviana is her last attempt to convince her fiancé that his views are misinformed. If he does not realise this, her future marriage is at risk as she is unwilling to compromise her freedom by marrying him. The end of the play sees Sophronia once more confronting Patricio about his views, while Horatio and Liviana are hidden in the closet:

> **SOPHRONIA** Do you continue in the same opinion, of the facility in keeping a Woman from her humour?
> **PATRICIO** As yet I know nothing to convince me.
> **SOPHRONIA** Will no less then a demonstration of the contrary satisfie you?
> **PATRICIO** No, Madam.
> **SOPHRONIA** I warrant you, you think your self Cock-sure of *Liviana's* being at home.
> **PATRICIO** What else?
> **SOPHRONIA** Come out; Advance my new marry'd Couple; if you be not now fitted with a demonstration, I'le trouble my self no more to find one. (*Tarugo* V.2, p.53)

At this point, Horatio and Liviana reveal themselves as a married couple. That they were in the closet for such a short time with no officiant in the closet to carry out the ceremony raises doubt about whether they are actually married at this point. While this plot hole may raise questions among the audience, it is enough to convince Patricio that he is unable to control his sister's free will, or that of any woman, and to admit that he was wrong. Horatio speaks the final line of the play before the epilogue, and reiterates the lesson that Patricio has learned and that the audience should be aware of too: 'In this there's nothing new, onely you see a fresh experience of the impossibility of restraining a Womans Will.' (*Tarugo* V.2, p.54) It is perhaps unnecessary for St Serf to state it quite so plainly at the end of the play, especially since the plot clearly points towards this conclusion. Like *Philotus*, the moral element of this play encourages change on a personal level for the good of humanity, rather than reform on a national or political scale. It lacks the serious tone that Brisilla's situation brings to *Philotus*, however Horatio's final lines emphasise the point so strongly that although the play may have intended to entertain more than teach, it does leave the audience with something to ponder at the end of the play.

Marciano has a similar theme running through both the comic plot and the tragic plot with regards to marrying for love, and giving women freedom of choice. While in

prison, and with a death sentence hanging over both Marciano and herself, Arabella still frequently refuses the advances of Borasco, the head of the rebel army, despite the fact that she could preserve her own life by accepting him. In this way, Clark emphasises the importance of love over a marriage of convenience, as Arabella chooses to keep her death sentence, rather than give up Marciano. Arabella is rewarded for this choice through her eventual reunion and marriage to Marciano. Sisters Chrysolina and Marionetta also have to make the choice of marrying for position and convenience or marrying men of slightly lower social stature with a better chance of love. This will be discussed later within this chapter, but for now it is enough to say that when Chrysolina and Marionetta eventually do realise that they have a better chance of happiness with Leonardo and Cassio, they reject the riches and social position of Pantaloni and Becabunga, again a subtle indication that Clark is promoting marriage for love over anything else. Clark's most obvious moral message within *Marciano*, however, is reflected in the tragic plot, which tells of a civil war which has unseated the rightful Duke from power. The return of the Duke and the victory of his army, led by Marciano, at the conclusion of the play is symbolic of the Restoration of Charles II to the throne, and it is through this plot that Clark's staunchly royalist views are revealed. The royalist aspect of *Marciano*, and its didactic elements, are discussed at length later, but these small examples show that the moral themes so often found in Scottish literary and theatrical tradition are just as evident in the play, and the didactic nature of this play and the others from seventeenth-century Scotland are one of the most obvious ways in which they can be linked to Scottish theatrical tradition.

The Scottish plays addressed in this chapter are all primarily comedies, with the exception of *Marciano* which identifies as a tragi-comedy. However, before considering them in the light of English Restoration comedy, it is important to investigate ways in which they relate to the comedy used in Scottish drama. It should be noted here that while the features of comedy that are discussed below are found in many theatrical traditions, not just that of Scotland and England, the fact that they are found in Scottish theatrical tradition at all shows that the Scottish playwrights would not have had to look for comic inspiration beyond Scotland, as they will have had to do with other aspects of their playwriting. Bakhtin's theories of medieval laughter are useful when considering the relationship between these Scottish Restoration plays and the wider Scottish theatrical tradition. When talking about renaissance laughter, he says:

> Let us stress once more that for the Renaissance […] the characteristic trait of laughter was precisely the recognition of its positive, regenerating, creative meaning […] The antique tradition has an essential meaning for the Renaissance, which offered an apology of the literary tradition of laughter and

> brought it into the sphere of humanist ideas. As to the aesthetic practice of Renaissance laughter, it is first of all determined by the traditions of the medieval culture of folk humour.[20]

Bakhtin believed that folk culture and humour was a crucial part of laughter in the Medieval and Renaissance periods and that laughter itself had power rather than simply being a response. The Renaissance saw the development of humanist ideas which were borne from a concern for the world and humanity and Bakhtin says here that laughter brought literature into that sphere of thought. He emphasises the fact that medieval folk culture considered laughter in a different way to later cultures, and this is because they were willing to hold what could be considered opposite ideas within their own humanist ideologies. Robert Anchor sums this up in a more straightforward way when he says:

> Bakhtin suggests that late medieval man also lived simultaneously in two worlds, defined by a series of oppositions: sacred/profane, virtue/vice, official/unofficial, social hierarchy/utopian equality, Latin/vernacular, classical-normative/carnival-grotesque.[21]

Folk culture, as has already been discussed here, should not be brushed aside as irrelevant when it comes to Scottish theatrical tradition, because before the plays considered here, these folk traditions, some of which were found in court, were all that existed within this tradition. The Scottish Restoration plays have elements of this tradition within them, because they are influenced by the comedy of the pre-Restoration plays, which are themselves influenced by this medieval folk and court culture. There are some common aspects that are shared between the seventeenth-century comedies and the pre-Restoration plays, one of which is the idea of ridicule and the ridiculous, particularly in *Tarugo's Wiles* and *Philotus.*

Elder Olson defines ridicule as:

> a particular kind of *depreciation*. We cannot ridicule someone by showing that he is extremely *good* or *better* than most, or even *ordinary*; we must show that he is inferior, either to the ordinary, or at least inferior to what has been thought or claimed about him, by himself or others.[22]

In the case of *Tarugo's Wiles*, Patricio is often forced to defend his view that a woman's will can be controlled, however, he also remains confident in his ability to prove it:

> **SOPHRONIA** Why Sir, is there anything more certain then shut up a Woman against her will, but like a fire of Coals cover'd with earth, which (though it burns not clear) yet vents its heat in smoak, and in the end with violent flames

[20] Mikhail Bakhtin, *Rabelais and His World*, trans. By Helene Iswolsky (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984), p.71.
[21] Robert Anchor, 'Bakhtin's Truths of Laughter', *CLIO*, 14:3 (1985), 237-257 (p.244).
[22] Elder Olson, *The Theory of Comedy* (London: Indiana University Press, 1968), p.12.

> breaks through the cloddy goal [gaol?] that smother'd its natural course.
> **PATRICIO** Madam, I know you have a store of Philosophy to maintain Paradoxes; therefore I'le avoid to reason with you upon the Argument, for I am sure that watchful authority overthrows all hazards of that kind.
> […]
> By Heaven's, they are deceived that think a womans wit can overcome my Care. (*Tarugo* II.2, pp.7-8)

It is obvious that his restriction of Liviana's freedom does not come from the desire to see his sister unhappy, but to do what he believes is best for his family. When he is challenged by Alberto, he responds: 'Methinks you being a Kinsman, as well as servant, ought to have greater regard of my Sisters — Honour' (*Tarugo*, II.1, p.6) and shortly after, when discussing the situation with Sophronia, he says, 'Liviana is my Charge, and her will I preserve' (*Tarugo,* II.2, p.8). Patricio may be the legal head of the family, but he has also appointed himself as protector of the family name, and ensuring Liviana's reputation is not sullied through improper behaviour or relationships is part of the responsibility he has created for himself. Liviana does not need her brother to make sure her reputation is protected, she is capable of doing so herself, but Patricio's flawed reasoning and sense of responsibility indicate the principles that he intends to live by and his inability to meet them is what makes him 'inferior' in the sense that Olson describes. His numerous failures and gullibility when faced with the deception of other characters are what make him the object of the audience's ridicule. Similarly, in *Philotus,* this is highlighted by the inferiority of Philotus when compared with Flavius as a suitable husband for Emilie. The main contrast between the two is that Flavius is youthful and passionate and full of life, while Philotus is aged, frail and lustful. Although Philotus and Alberto, Emilie's father, are unaware of Flavius's existence until the end of the play, the audience is aware that the two have run away together. That a perverse old man who is merely interested in the young woman for sexual gratification believes that he is a more appropriate husband for her than Flavius is laughable. The superiority of youth over age is emphasised in two ways: first is the suitability of a younger man as a husband for Emilie, and second is the physical superiority which is highlighted when Philotus is beaten by a much stronger Philerno. Both result in the humiliation of Philotus and make him an object of ridicule.

When it comes to comedy in general, Andrew Stott describes it as:

> a type of drama that uses stock characters in scenarios that require some kind of problem to be resolved. These plays end happily, often concluding with a communal celebration like a feast or a marriage, and the characters generally managed to resolve their differences without anyone being killed.[23]

[23] Andrew Stott, *Comedy*, 2nd edn. (Oxon: Routledge, 2014), p.1.

While this is a generic and slightly over-simplified statement, it does highlight the general arc of the Scottish plays in question. *Ane Satyre* ends with the reformation of society for the good of the common man and *Philotus*, *Marciano*, and *Tarugo's Wiles* all end in satisfactory marriages and celebration of one kind or another. Stott also outlines a number of devices and forms of characters found in comedy, including slapstick or physical comedy and characters who take on the role of tricksters.

Physical comedy is a large part of the Scottish theatrical tradition, and in terms of the pre-Restoration plays, there are a number of instances of physical or slapstick comedy. *Ane Satyre* contains a scene during the 'Proclamation of Cupar' in which a Cottar shows interest in the play, but is dragged home by his wife who beats him and tells him she will attend the play herself while he remains at home and milks the cattle (*Ane Satyre,* 'The Proclamatioun of Cowpar', ll.64-94). This little episode portraying a browbeaten husband and an overbearing wife is also found in *Philotus,* when Philotus is beaten by Philerno who is disguised as his new 'wife', and appears again in *Tarugo's Wiles* in the coffee-house scene, during which an enraged wife finds her husband and insists he returns home:

> **BAKER'S WIFE** O! you are a fine man indeed! to leave the Government of the oven now when 'tis cramm'd with the *English Consull's* pastry, to me that's the weaker vessel, besides the looking after four small Children, and all forsooth to be thought wiser then your neighbours by drinking the abominable liquor of Infadels! […] (*The Baker plucks his wife away*).
> (*Tarugo* III.1, p.23)

Unlike the other two plays, the husband is not beaten by his wife, but there is implied physical comedy in the stage directions as the Baker 'plucks' his wife from the scene. Although it is hard to surmise exactly what this may look like on stage, it is unlikely to be a sinister movement, but rather the hasty action of an embarrassed husband who has made his wife angry and wishes to remove them both from the shop before there is a further outburst. In another comedic moment, the Baker's friend decides that he too will go home in order that his wife does not come looking for him in similar fashion. The coffee-house scene also contains a slapstick style episode at its conclusion in which some Reformadoes get themselves into an argument over the truth of one of their colleague's battle experiences:

> **1 REFORMADO** Did ever any hear a Son of a Whore talk so ignorantly?
> **2 REFORMADO** Take heed who you call Son of a Whore.
> **1 REFORMADO** Where's the danger?
> **2 REFORMADO** Here's the danger.
> *He throws a dish of coffee in his face and so they fight*
> **4 REFORMADO** I cannot but laugh at this impudent Rogue in calling the Redoubt a Field of plough'd ground, for when this Battle he speaks of was

> fought, it was the latter end of *March* when the Corn was so high that we ambuscado'd our Cavall'ry.
> **COUNTRY GENTLEMAN** Nay, friend, if he be not righter in Military Art, then you in the observation of your Corn, I believe all your stories alike — (*They fight*). (*Tarugo* III, p.27)

The coffee master is forced to intervene and the breaking up of the fight sees all the customers leave the shop, before the master wonders aloud whether it is worth his time maintaining his coffee business. By this point in the play, Act 3 has become more of a comic interlude, rather than directly relating to the plot – without this scene, the events of the play would remain unaffected. *Ane Satyre* contains a real interlude between Part One and Two in which there are also aspects of physical comedy which does not appear in either of the main parts. One of the three comic episodes involves the Pardoner granting a divorce to an unhappy couple if they kiss one another's bare buttocks:

> **PARDONER**
> To part sen ye are baith content,
> I sall yow part incontinent,
> Bot ye mon do command.
> My will and finall sentence is:
> Ilke ane of you uthers arss[is] kis.
> Slip doun your hois. Me thinkis the carle is glaikit!
> Set thou not be, howbeit scho kisse and slaik it!
> *Heir sall scho kis his arsse with silence.*
> Lift up hir clais; kis hir hoill with your hart.
> **SOWTAR**
> I pray yow, Sir, forbid hir for to fart!
> *Heir sall the Carle kis hir arsse with silence.* (ll.2174-2183)

Both the coffee-house fight and this divorce scene are farcical and are examples of physical comedy in the sense that the humour derives from the stage directions; for the audience to find these episodes comical, they must be accompanied by the movement of the actors. Stage directions occur so rarely in these plays that when they are present it should be assumed that they are important and must be given attention. Their presence as aides to physical comedy implies the importance the playwrights placed on it being executed a certain way, rather than letting the performers assume the physicality of the comedy from the dialogue. There is a graver element within this comic episode however, as the symbolism of kissing buttocks has medieval connotations of making a deal with the devil, bringing in a theological element to the farce.

Tricksters are comic characters that can be found in all of the plays that have been considered thus far, and their activity often involves disguises. The three vices in *Ane Satyre* — Falset, Dissait and Flatterie — disguise themselves as virtues to cause mayhem in the kingdom of Scotland. Philerno is unwittingly mistaken for his sister, Emilie,

however his effort to maintain this impression and cause mischief is entirely his own decision. Tarugo disguises himself as Liviana's tailor to gain access to her, assumes the guise of a coffee server to evade arrest and finally poses as Don Crisanto and infiltrates Patricio's home in order to allow Liviana to escape. Tricksters are found in folk-tales, classical and religious narratives, but also in Restoration theatre from England. J. Douglas Canfield discusses the numerous types of trickster that can be found in Restoration comedy, and argues that Restoration comedy is generally about the preservation of estates and keeping social order,[24] and in some Restoration comedy, tricksters either bring this about through their trickery, or are foiled in their work and brought back into the social structure they tried to upset, although there will always be exceptions to this. With regards to tricksters in pre-Restoration theatre in general, and not just that of Scotland, Stott argues that they are a disruptive force, existing to contradict or challenge established beliefs and rules within the world of the play.[25] With regard to the Scottish plays, the tricksters found in them serve a number of functions. In the case of *Marciano,* Cassio and Leonardo take the role of tricksters and use it for their own personal gain. The same can be said for the characters of Will, Frank and Violetta in *The Assembly*, while in *Tarugo's Wiles*, Tarugo uses his role as trickster to help get Liviana away from her imprisonment in her own home, and to restore a sense of order to the lives of the other characters in the play.

In *Marciano,* Cassio and Leonardo trick Pantaloni and Becabunga into a situation where they reveal how unsuitable they are as husbands for Marionetta and Chrysolina, to whom they are practically engaged. Cassio and Leonardo challenge the other two men to a duel over the sisters, but they are too frightened to fight. Upon hearing this, Cassio and Leonardo get them to sign a declaration which states they are cowards and would not fight for their supposed lovers, and much to the horror of Pantaloni and Becabunga, pass this on to the women. By the time they arrive to try and redeem themselves, it is already too late, and realising that they have no chance at redemption, the truth comes out:

> **PANTALONI** Tush, these are all but stories, Madam, I was but jesting with [Cassio and Leonardo] when I did it.
> **MARIONETTA** Sir, I will hear no excuse.
> […]
> **CHRYSOLINA** This will not do it, Sir, you have renounced us, and therefore—
> **BECABUNGA** Nay hold, Madam, we were but in jest.
> **PANTALONI** And then they forced us to do it.
> […]
> **CHRYSOLINA** No more, Sir, get you gone, henceforth I disclaim you.

[24] J. Douglas Canfield, *Tricksters and Estates: On the Ideology of Restoration Comedy* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1997).
[25] Stott, p.53.

> **PANTALONI** And I you too, d'you see; I care no more for you, Mistris, than you do for me: I am as good a Gentleman as your self; and if you were not a woman I would tell you more of my mind.
> **BECABUNGA** I knew it would alwayes come to this at length, I vow; I think you Gentle-women do nothing but entertain us with vain hopes for a while, then cast us off.[26]

Every excuse offered by the men is rejected by Marionetta and Chrysolina, and they part ways as Pantaloni reveals he never really loved Chrysolina anyway, while Becabunga tries to blame the women for leading them on, rather than admitting that he is at fault. While on the surface, Pantaloni and Becabunga seemed like desirable matches for the women due to their elevated social status and large fortunes, the trickery of Cassio and Leonardo, who want to pursue Marionetta and Chrysolina themselves, reveals the other men as shallow and who are seeking marriage because their families require it. They are looking for socially appropriate marriages, rather than love. While Cassio and Leonardo do disrupt this social order slightly by ruining two potential marriages that would have been socially acceptable and maintained the bloodline of both Becabunga and Pantaloni's families, they do not disrupt it entirely; although they are not on the same social level as these men, Cassio and Leonardo are at least of the same class as Chrysolina and Marionetta. This is indicated by the presence of all four characters in court at the conclusion of the play. While the tricksters have disrupted the socially optimal match for the girls, they are still reasonably well matched and, by the end of the play, happier with their chosen options for husbands than they initially would have been. While the trickery has worked out positively for Marionetta and Chrysolina, it was orchestrated by Cassio and Leonardo for purely selfish reasons. That being said, the social order is still maintained in this play, which is further emphasised by the restoration of the Duke to his rightful place at the end.

The situation is similar in *The Assembly*, in that two young Episcopalians, Will and Frank, use trickery to access Laura and Violetta, who are under the guardianship of their devoutly Presbyterian aunt. As with *Marciano*, the tricksters are working for their own personal gain, but the difference lies in the fact that Violetta is the mind behind the deception while Will and Frank merely carry it out. Will and Frank are unable to call on the sisters because they are Episcopalians and the girls' aunt will only associate with Presbyterians. Violetta and Will decide that he and Frank will disguise themselves as Presbyterian ministers visiting from Holland and avail themselves of the Old Lady's hospitality. The plan is a success and they sneak away to marry in secret. In Act 5, the

[26] William Clark, *Marciano; or The Discovery* V.2 (Edinburgh: W.H. Logan, 1871), pp.59-60, in *Early English Books Online* <https://historicaltexts.jisc.ac.uk> [accessed September 2016]. From now, referred to within the text.

revelation that her daughter, Rachel, is to marry the family minister due to being six months pregnant with his child, accompanied with the news that her nieces have married two Episcopalians without her knowledge is too much for the Old Lady:

> **SOLOMON** [...] I think it Convenient that [James Wordie] marie your daughter, Mrs Rachel, for I fear ther hes bein foul play. But marriag will make all ods evene.
> **OLD LADY** What, my daughter marrie a dominie! She sha'not.
> **SOLOMON** Then, Madam, to be plaine, she's with Child and it must be so.
> **OLD LADY** What hear? Is my daughter deboshed, my family abused?
> (*She weeps*)
> […]
> *Enter Will and ffrank leading Violetta & Laura, undisguised*
> **OLD LADY** Wher have you bein, Nieces, and wher ar the two ministers
> **VIOLETTA** Heir they ar, Madam. They have Cheated us & causd us mary them.
> **OLD LADY** Are you married then, without my Consent? I'm cheated under that godly disguise – O horrid!
> […]
> O hynous, abuseing the Ambassadors of Christ and the presbyterian religion at my house! Gett you gone, you impertinent Jads! Let me sie your face no more! *Exit old Ladie*.[27]

Maintaining a strict Presbyterian household has not resulted in her daughter and nieces living the godly lifestyle and making appropriate marriages that the Old Lady hoped they would; instead, the standards she expected of her family have led to rebellion. The deception she has experienced at the hands of her family is, in her eyes, a rejection of the values and beliefs she has taught them and encouraged them to live by. The perception that her strict principles are in the best interests of her nieces is questioned due to the fact that, despite their aunt's disapproval of them, the only thing that can be held against Will and Frank is their religion, while the Presbyterian men in the play are portrayed as restrictive, ridiculous and inappropriate matches for the women. Once more, the trickery on show in *The Assembly* is to serve a personal gain, and while it does disrupt the social norms of the characters in the play, this is portrayed as a good thing, because Pitcairne portrays these Presbyterian social norms in a negative light.

A brief word should be given to the trickery of Tarugo in *Tarugo's Wiles.* Tarugo's tricks are one of the main sources of comedy in the play, but unlike the tricksters already discussed in this chapter, Tarugo's deception is used to free Liviana from a restrictive environment. Not only is his trickery in the service of others, but Tarugo also brings about a return to social normality, where Liviana is given her freedom and is able to marry

[27] Archibald Pitcairne, *The Phanaticks*, ed. John MacQueen (Edinburgh: The Scottish Text Society, 2012), p.67-69. From now, referred to within the text.

Horatio, while Patricio is forced to admit that his behaviour was abnormal and wrong. With regards to tricksters in Scottish comedy of the seventeenth century, their purpose has changed within the plays when compared with *Ane Satyre* and *Philotus.* The tricksters in *Ane Satyre* cause chaos for noble characters and have to be foiled in order for peace to resume, whereas Philerno's trickery in *Philotus* hinders the truth and causes confusion for longer than necessary. Although both sets of tricksters in these pre-Restoration Scottish plays get a great deal of enjoyment out of their mischief, there is not much else to gain personally from their behaviour. By the seventeenth century, this had developed into characters using trickery for very obvious personal gain in *Marciano* and *The Assembly*, but in both cases, there is still a return to normality, for the changes brought about by trickery are hailed as the correct outcome. *Tarugo's Wiles* is the exception, as Tarugo uses his deception purely to bring back the order that has been disrupted by Patricio's behaviour, and does not gain any profit from his actions. The presence of tricksters in comedy is not specific to Scottish drama or English drama, but their presence in both indicates that the Scottish playwrights of the seventeenth century will have had a vast number of tricksters to draw inspiration from.

Physical comedy and the presence of tricksters are only two examples of a number of comic features found in Scottish drama from before and during the seventeenth century. Although not confined to the Scottish tradition alone, the fact that Scottish drama of the sixteenth century contains these features means that while Scottish Restoration playwrights looked to England for inspiration, there were examples of comedy at work in Scottish theatrical tradition which could also have provided material on which they could model their own plays. Satire is one of the main tools used in *Ane Satyre* to make a wider moral point and call for reform. Echoes of this can be found in *The Assembly*, as the behaviours of characters such as Rachel are so often at odds with their pious words that the satire used by Pitcairne makes a mockery of their hypocrisy, alerting the audience or reader to it. Italian and Latin drama find their way into Scottish tradition through George Buchanan and *Philotus*, in which we see Scottish writers incorporating morality into the already-existing stories. Characters designed to be mocked appear in the pre-Restoration plays and the Scottish Restoration plays, particularly the characters of Philotus and Patricio, who come to realise their mistakes through their eventual humiliation or being outsmarted, all while the audience laughs at them. The presence of characters as tricksters in all five plays is noteworthy, as is the fact they function differently from play to play, as it emphasises the flexibility of this character type, as well as indicating the vast number of sources from which playwrights of seventeenth-century Scotland could have drawn inspiration. In

Scottish Restoration plays, some of the characters perform deception for personal gain as in the case of *Marciano* and *The Assembly*, while still bringing about a return to desired order, while in *Tarugo's Wiles*, Tarugo's trickery brings about order without his gaining personally.

By comparing the seventeenth-century comedies of Scotland with the existing theatrical landscape and plays that came before, it is possible to conclude that the Scottish Restoration plays follow the more rigid structure of English and European plays, split into acts and scenes with a distinct separation of audience and stage, unlike *Ane Satyre* and *Philotus* where some characters engaged directly with the audience. Yet there are a number of shared elements between the Scottish plays of the Restoration and those that came before, particularly the idea of what makes an appropriate marriage, and the failure of characters to restrict a woman's will, all of which are evident in some form or another in these plays. The use of plays to present a moral message for the audience is still evident in the seventeenth-century comedies, albeit in a subtler fashion than Buchanan's plays, for example. Those who experienced theatre in Scotland during this period would have been accustomed to a didactic element of performances; therefore, it is reasonable to suppose that they might have detected challenges to particular behaviours or world views and interpreted them as lessons to be learned from the play. Similar comedic episodes between the pre-Restoration Scottish plays and the plays of the seventeenth-century show that the latter did engage with the existing theatrical traditions in Scotland to an extent, although whether this was a conscious decision on the part of the playwrights cannot be certain. What is certain is that these Scottish plays are not an isolated phenomenon in terms of Scottish tradition; there is enough of a Scottish element within them to include them as part of the Scottish literary and theatrical canon.

Chapter Two

Scottish Restoration Comedy in an English Context

Due to the deficiency of contemporary material, it has been necessary to consider the plays and theatrical traditions that came before the seventeenth century in order to place the Scottish Restoration comedies in a Scottish context. However, when considering them in an English context, there are more plays existing from the English Restoration period with which they can be compared. While older traditions of English theatre should be acknowledged, there is not the same need to draw on them because the English Restoration period has sufficient variety for this discussion. The best way to consider Scottish Restoration comedy with regards to English Restoration theatre is by direct comparison. This will show the shared values and themes within them, as well as highlighting differences to reveal that elements of the Scottish plays are unique. Such a comparison will also raise questions as to whether these differences are due to the inexperience of Scottish playwrights, or the influence of Scottish tradition.

The first point of comparison to make between the Scottish and English Restoration plays is to consider how they use the restoration of order within their plots to reflect the return to the throne of Charles II, and to promote the preservation of the social structure that this brought about. J. Douglas Canfield argues that Restoration drama fits the official discourse of English Restoration ideology which involved a strong belief in the natural right of the English aristocracy to rule.[1] He refers to Restoration comedy as 'social comedy' because it socialises threats to the ruling class, for example, competing class and religious difference, and attempts to preserve and maintain that authority through the portrayal of socially approved institutions like marriage.[2] The monarchist views reflected in these plays are unsurprising, as the restoration of the crown and the reopening of the theatres were synonymous with one another, and theatre was a royally sanctioned pastime.[3] Susan J. Owen writes: 'The Restoration of 1660 is portrayed as turning the world the right way up and restoring property to those whose natural superiority entitles them to possess it.'[4] This correction of the world is seen in a number of plays from the Restoration. In Aphra Behn's *The Amorous Prince; or The Curious Husband* (1671), the plot becomes so

[1] Canfield, *Tricksters and Estates*.
[2] Canfield, *Tricksters and Estates,* pp.1-2.
[3] Robert D. Hume, 'Jeremy Collier and the Future of the London Theatre in 1698', in *Studies in Philology,* 96:4 (1999), 480-511 (p.488).
[4] Susan J. Owen, 'Restoration Drama and Politics: An Overview', in *A Companion to Restoration Drama*, ed. by Susan J. Owen (Oxford: Blackwell, 2008), pp.126-139 (p.127).

complicated that restoring order in the final scene is a significant task. The play has two distinct plots, both of which involve numerous occasions of disruption and trickery that affect the hitherto peaceful existence of the characters. The first plot introduces Prince Frederick and his friend, Curtius. Frederick has slept with, and promised to marry, a young woman named Cloris, who, unbeknown to him, is Curtius's younger sister. He has kept her existence a secret in order to protect her from the corruption of court. Curtius wishes to marry Laura, but when the prince meets her and falls in love with her, he persuades Laura's father to make her marry him instead. Curtius is furious that the woman he loves has been forced to be with Frederick against her wishes, and that his naïve younger sister has been sexually compromised, so he writes a note to Cloris, warning her about the Prince's infidelity. Disguising herself as a male courtier, she makes her way to court to investigate for herself. She becomes a trusted servant of Frederick and discovers his womanising and unfaithfulness. Curtius is informed that Cloris is missing and presumed dead and in his grief for his sister, and his fury at losing Laura as his future wife, he plots Frederick's death. In doing so, Curtius is not only planning to kill a friend, but is directly threatening the line of succession, as Frederick is legally next in line to become Duke.

Meanwhile, the second plotline tells of Antonio, who suspects his wife of having an affair. He enlists the help of his friend Alberto, asking him to woo his wife, believing that if she falls for Alberto and agrees to an affair with him, she is guilty of other affairs too. Antonio's wife, Clarina, and his sister, Ismena, are aware of this plan. For some reason, Alberto has only met Ismena, but believed her to be Clarina, and because the women look alike, they decide to switch roles to teach Antonio a lesson about his jealousy. Ismena poses as Clarina allowing Alberto to woo her and soon they are in love, which Antonio discovers. Alberto plans to move away to allow his friend's marriage to repair itself, but Antonio suggests that he introduce Alberto to his sister Ismena first, in the hope that he could learn to love her. The final scene combines the two plots and brings all the characters together to restore order to their situations. Curtius, posing as a Greek merchant, reveals his true identity and the fact that Cloris was his sister. He asks Frederick to kill him, believing he has nothing to live for if Cloris is dead and he cannot marry Laura. Frederick is remorseful, especially because he believes Cloris is dead and he cannot reverse his actions. However, Laura and Cloris reveal themselves as part of Curtius's entourage, for, having discovered Curtius's plot to kill the prince, Antonio and Alberto enlisted the help of Laura, Cloris, Ismena, Isabella and Clarina to help prevent it. Clarina unmasks herself and Alberto realises that this is not the woman he has been wooing, at which point Ismena

explains the truth. The play concludes with Antonio and Clarina restored to one another and marriages between Ismena and Alberto; Frederick and Cloris; and Curtius and Laura.

The restoration of order is a key principle of comedy in general, and not unique to the Restoration period. However, the political environment in which these plays were being written brings a significance to the themes of restoration and social order within the plays from this period. There are two occasions within *The Amorous Prince* where the restoration of order can be interpreted as symbolic of the real Restoration period. The first is through the marriages of the characters in the final scene and the reconciliation of Antonio and Clarina. Before the conclusion of the play, each individual relationship, or potential relationship faces some form of threat which causes escalating disruption. Antonio and Clarina's marriage is threatened by his jealousy and then by Alberto falling in love with Clarina. Curtius and Laura's potential marriage becomes threatened when Frederick decides that as prince, he has the right to be with Laura because he wants to. Cloris's chance of marrying Frederick is lessened due to his unfaithfulness to her, and his belief that she is of no social standing which would make her an unsuitable wife for the prince. The resolutions to each of these threats bring about social and domestic order once more, particularly with regards to Frederick and Cloris. Frederick is filled with remorse when he learns that Cloris is Curtius's sister and therefore was a woman of honourable family:

> **CURTIUS** She was my Sister, Frederick […]
> Yes, think of it well,
> A Lady of as pure and noble blood,
> As that of the Duke thy Father,
> Till you, bad man, infected it;
> —Say should I Murther you for this base action;
> Would you not call it a true Sacrifice?
> And would not Heaven and Earth forgive it too?
> **FREDERICK** No, had I known that she had been thy Sister,
> I had receiv'd her as a gift from Heaven,
> And so I would do still.[5]

Although Frederick had initially given his word that he would marry Cloris at the beginning of the play, his actions show that he was never serious about this offer. At this point, Frederick believed Cloris to be a country woman of no importance, but when he realises that she is his social equal, he becomes open to the idea of marrying her. Cloris has been faithful to Frederick from the beginning, even when she discovers the truth about his womanising and lack of respect for her. The political context of the Restoration means that

[5] Aphra Behn, *The Amorous Prince* V.3 in *The Works of Aphra Behn: Volume 5: The Plays 1671-1677*, ed. Janet Todd (London: William Pickering, 1996), pp.83-156 (p.149).

the faithfulness of Cloris can be read as representative of the faithfulness of monarchist supporters, particularly as there was still political unrest and uncertainty beyond 1660. Order returns to their situation through Frederick's decision to marry her, and the fact he only agrees to do so when he realises that she is of appropriate social class and sister of his friend emphasises the priority of maintaining the royal or aristocratic bloodline through socially equal marriages. Frederick's remorse comes from the damage he has done to an honourable family name, rather than to Cloris herself, and it is hard to believe that had she really been of a lower class that he would have married her. Even so, the fact that Frederick does keep his promise brings the events of their plot full circle and restores their relationship to where it began, despite facing a number of obstacles throughout the play. Now that order is restored to Cloris and Frederick's situation, this removes Frederick's interference between Laura and Curtius, giving them freedom to marry. Alberto's fear that he has fallen in love with a married woman is resolved through the revelation that Ismena has been posing as Clarina, which means that Alberto can actually be with the woman he loves. Antonio's suspicion of his wife has been a threat to their marriage but this too is returned to order when Antonio takes full responsibility for his actions.

Restoration of social order is clearly represented by all of these romantic pairings. However, the play's most unusual couple, Lorenzo and Isabella, requires further exploration in order to see how their relationship fits this theme. Lorenzo is Laura's brother, and spends the majority of his time in the play trying to meet and woo Clarina. Isabella, Clarina's companion, is in love with Lorenzo, and while pretending to help Lorenzo in his endeavours, tries to win him over for herself. When all the other couples have been reunited at the end of the play, Isabella claims Lorenzo as her husband, which he is not pleased with:

> **ISABELLA** And now, Sir, I have come to claim a husband here.
> **FREDERICK** Name him, and take him.
> **ISABELLA** Lorenzo, Sir.
> **LORENZO** Of all cheats, commend me to a waiting Gentlewoman:
> I her Husband!
> **ANTONIO** I am a witness to that truth.[6]
> **FREDERICK** 'Tis plain against you; come you must be honest.
> **LORENZO** Will you compel me to't against my will? Oh tyranny, consider I am a man of quality and fortune.
> **ISABELLA** As for my qualities, you know I have sufficient,
> And fortune, thanks to your bounty, considerable too.
> **FREDERICK** No matter, he has enough for both.
> (*The Amorous Prince* V.3, p. 154)

[6] In Act 4.4, to explain to Antonio why he was found in his house, Lorenzo claimed that he was married to Isabella and was visiting her.

Isabella is marrying above her social class, as is emphasised by Lorenzo's reference to her as 'a waiting Gentlewoman', and Isabella and Frederick's comments about his fortune being large enough to care for them both. Not only is this marriage socially uneven, but it is one-sided with regards to love. When Lorenzo resignedly accepts the idea of marrying Isabella, he freely admits that he does not love her:

> **LORENZO** Come Isabella, since the Prince commands it;
> I do not love thee, but yet I'le not forswear it;
> Since a greater miracle then that is wrought;
> And that's my Marrying thee:
> Well, 'tis well thou art none of the most beautiful,
> I should swear the Prince had some designs on thee else.
> (*The Amorous Prince* V.3 p.154)

Despite the fact that Lorenzo does not write off the possibility of ever falling in love with Isabella, the beginning of their relationship is not based upon a mutual love, which contrasts with the relationships of the other characters. Each of the other characters not only ends up with a partner whom they love, but they are also well matched in terms of social class which makes them acceptable marriages. Lorenzo's desire to be with Clarina presents one of the threats to Clarina and Alberto's marriage, and if it occurred, would disrupt the restoration of order that the play is attempting to bring about. Lorenzo and Isabella's marriage marks an end to Lorenzo's pursuit of Clarina and while it is mismatched with regards to social class and the couple's love for one another, it is portrayed as acceptable because it is morally right that Lorenzo ends up with Isabella, rather than ruining Clarina and Alberto's marriage. Isabella may not be the ideal candidate for Lorenzo's wife with her lack of social standing, but she is infinitely better than an already married woman. The fact that Frederick urges Lorenzo to marry her, and that he eventually agrees also hints at the idea that any marriage is better than no marriage when it comes to producing an heir. Overall, the ending of *The Amorous Prince* promotes the preservation of the aristocracy by matching socially equal couples, or, as in the case of Lorenzo and Isabella, with a marriage that is more morally acceptable. The play prioritises both social and moral order over love. These relationships face disruption throughout the play but their resolutions bring order which can be interpreted as symbolic of the prosperity of a restored monarchy in Britain after the confusions and complications of the Civil Wars and Interregnum period.

The second way in which *The Amorous Prince* shows a restoration of order that fits with the socio-political priorities of royalist playwrights can be found in Curtius's plot to kill Frederick. As the son of the Duke, Frederick is next in line to inherit ruling authority and so Curtius is not only threatening the life of the man who has ruined his sister's

reputation and stolen his lover, but also the crown itself. Earlier in the play, Curtius discovers the prince making advances towards Laura, who has drawn a dagger to protect herself. Unfortunately, Frederick is also armed, and when Curtius arrives, he draws his sword to protect her:

> **FREDERICK** Traytor, dost draw upon thy Prince?
> **CURTIUS** Your Pardon Sir, I meant it on a Ravisher.
> A foul misguided Villain.
> One that scarce merits the brave name of Man.
> One that betrays his friend, forsakes his Wife;
> And would commit a Rape upon my Mistress.
> (*The Amorous Prince*, III.1, p.117).

Curtius makes the distinction between the role of prince and the shocking behaviour of Frederick, however, this distinction does not really exist as Frederick is only able to carry out such acts because he has the authority to ruin those who challenge him. Throughout the play, he behaves immorally and those around him excuse the behaviour because he is the prince. At one point, Cloris even believes his role as prince means he is incapable of breaking his promises to her (I.1, p.90). Frederick abuses his authority throughout the play, but the graver sin is Curtius's attempt to kill him as this would directly upset the line of succession. Curtius's actions ultimately bring Frederick to the realisation that he has behaved immorally, and the prince reforms. This goes to show that Curtius is not wrong to challenge Frederick, but the attempt upon his life is what is problematic. The foil of Curtius's plot to kill Frederick becomes another endorsement for the restored monarchy of the 1660s and the social order which monarchists believed it brought, however, Frederick's reform after being convinced to change by Curtius is also an indication that those in authority should be held accountable for their actions. This is reflective of the debate that was occurring throughout the Restoration period, which questioned how much absolute power a monarch should possess, and how to prevent an abuse of that power.[7]

The Scottish Restoration plays have a similar pattern when it comes to representing restored order through marriages. However, in *Marciano,* William Clark goes one step further, explicitly stating his monarchist views throughout both plots of the play. The events are set in Italy during what seems to be a period of civil war where the Duke of Florence has been unseated from power. Marciano is the Duke's General and his loyalty remains with the Duke because he believes that those in power are there by political or legal right:

[7] Miller, p.73.

MARCIANO But, I perceive
The main designe of this preposterous war,
Love and ambition muzles humane souls;
So that when private Subjects covet honour
And power, their lawfull Prince must quit his Throne.
No matter for what reason, since they mean
Some reformation; as if private preferment
Were inconsistent with all Monarchy. (*Marciano* I.3, pp.3-4)

Marciano notes that the ordinary people have a desire to exercise power themselves and so rise up against their prince. His objection is that the population which is against the Duke insists on reform that would provide them with more options as to who ruled them, and more power for themselves. Marciano's words here indicate that he does not believe that personal choice is 'inconsistent' with monarchy, but he does make the point that the 'lawfull Prince' has been forced to step aside, implying that he believes power is the legal right of those in authority. This idea of legal authority is extended into the first scenes of the comic plot, where in discussion of the unexpected defeat of the Duke, Cassio and Leonardo express their feelings on the matter:

CASSIO —Sad—trust me tis most sad, but, prithee, who shall be Duke now do'st think, when they have rejected him, who by law of inheritance was their lawfull Prince.
LEONARDO Why—thou—if thou bee'st weary of thy life; for a Prince now a dayes must raign no longer then his Subjects please his government — men now begin to act real Tragedies. (*Marciano* I.4, p.4).

This exchange is intended as a joke among the men as to who will take over from the Duke and what qualities they believe a good ruler should have. However, their true views of monarchy and authority are made clear, echoing those of Marciano. Bringing the law of inheritance into their discussion indicates that they believe that the heir to the throne deserves legal protection. Leonardo's statement indicates his view that a prince will only remain in authority as long as he can keep his subjects happy, and his reference to men acting 'real Tragedies' implies that he does not believe such a system can end happily for their society. Marciano further drives this point when he later states:

MARCIANO Well, you will
come all to taste of your own vintage yet;
So I believe: for, never yet, rebellion
Escap'd unpunished
[…]
Solus. When men begin to quarrel with their Prince,
No wonder if they crush their fellow Subjects. (*Marciano* III.6, p.41)

Marciano believes that rebellion against authority will always be thwarted. The reference to ordinary people speaking out against the monarch and then turning against one another

in the process indicates Marciano's view that chaos is caused when those with the legal right of authority are challenged.

Marciano concludes with the return of the Duke of Florence to his rightful seat of power and the defeat of the rebel armies against him. Marciano is rewarded for his loyalty by being made Commissioner of his home region and the Duke gives his blessing for his marriage to Arabella who has proved her love for Marciano by travelling to him and helping him escape imprisonment. At the beginning of the play, Marciano reveals that he had attempted to court Arabella but when he was not encouraged, had given up hope. Arabella's attempt to rescue Marciano allows the audience to witness their reconciliation, and, how they endure obstacles such as Marciano being sentenced to execution and the general of the rebels, Borasco, promising Arabella protection if she will agree to be with him rather than Marciano. Not only does the defeat of the rebel armies bring the Duke of Florence back to power and a return to peace for the people of Italy, but it also removes the main threats to Arabella and Marciano's happiness. They are able to marry without the hindrance of a rival lover or the weight of law upon Marciano. The comic plot of *Marciano* is resolved earlier than the tragic plot.

As outlined in the previous chapter, Chrysolina and Marionetta choose Leonardo and Cassio as lovers when it is revealed that their initial choices, Becabunga and Pantaloni, were not romantically interested in them and were instead bowing to familial and social pressure to find appropriate wives. What is different about this particular choice in comparison to the other plays examined here is that, while love has been argued as the main cause for the marriages, they have also been the most socially appropriate. Chrysolina and Marionetta are the only characters so far who have chosen love *over* advantageous marriages. The play portrays this as a wise decision; once they have accepted Leonardo and Cassio, they are confident in the qualities of their chosen lovers and are portrayed as happier for it:

> **CASSIO** Madam, my resolution was alwayes unfeigned to serve you: your coy refusal diminished nothing of my affection, but did rather incite me the more to love you.
> **MARIONETTA** I did alwayes esteem my self honoured in your love, Sir, though the capricious humours of my self-seeking friends did countermand my desires.
> **LEONARDO** [to Chrysolina] Nay then, unspotted beauty, answer those gracious obligations to your self: it passes the activity of my invention: I have alwayes been your devout admirer; but now I am so much bound to love you, that although my affection should super-erogat, yet I can plead no merits.
> **CHRYSOLINA** Sir, your merits have made conquest of my affections.
> (*Marciano* V.4, p.64)

Leonardo and Cassio are not considered the best option for the sisters; Chrysolina remarks that 'our friends cannot endure them' (*Marciano*, II.4, p.23) while also noting the wealth and estates of Pantaloni and Becabunga as the main reason for their attraction to them. In comparison to Becabunga and Pantaloni, Leonardo and Cassio are less advantaged in terms of finance and social standing, but they are by no means commoners, which is evidenced by the fact that they accompany Chrysolina and Marionetta to court at the close of the play and their description in the Dramatis Personae as 'two noble Gentlemen of quality.'

Clark's message to the audience is explicit: subjects should not oppose their monarch if they wish to live in peace and prosperity. The choice made by Chrysolina and Marionetta not to pursue the most advantageous marriage does not initially seem to symbolise a restoration of social order, but it is still relevant to Clark's wider argument. Throughout the play, Leonardo and Cassio have been portrayed as the best matches for the sisters, and this is clearest when comparing how each pair of men react to rejection. In Act 2.4, when Cassio and Leonardo sneak into their house, Marionetta and Chrysolina make it exceptionally clear that they are not interested. The general tone of this scene is light-hearted, but the words spoken by the men are still loving and heartfelt:

> **CASSIO** (*To Marionetta*) Farewell, then, cruel beauty, but do not imagine such a harsh repulse will stop the current of my boundless love; absence shall never prove so fatal: but while my breath shall demonstrate that I live, this heart, this speech and this hand shall demonstrate that I love you. Farewell bright star of my fancy.
> **LEONARDO** (*To Chrysolina*) Such a fair Lady cannot be so cruel, I will not take this answer as a repulse, but rather construe it the most favourable way. Farewell, time, I hope, shall melt the severity of your resolutions.
> (*Marciano* II.4, p.23)

The men simply acknowledge their love for the sisters and leave. On the other hand, when Becabunga and Pantaloni are rejected in Act 5.2, Pantaloni becomes harsh and unkind, while Becabunga is sorrier over losing his wedding clothes than his future bride:

> **PANTALONI** Mistris, shall I tell you, there are more Ladies in Florence then you that will be blyth of me yet; and so long as I have money in store, I am sure to have Mistresses in store.
> **CHRYSOLINA** Are you so, Sir?
> […]
> **PANTALONI** Peugh — Farewell; I believe you are the greatest fool of the two Madam Chrysolina, call they you.
> **BECABUNGA** I protest, Pantaloni, I am very sorry for the loss of this bony Lady though. O! how my father will chide me now: for he had given Manduco orders to provide my Wedding-cloaths and now all's blown up.
> (*Marciano* V.2, p.60)

There is a stark contrast between the two sets of men, and while Leonardo and Cassio do deliberately sabotage the potential relationships between the sisters and Pantaloni and Becabunga, they are constantly portrayed as the more honourable men, and therefore the better option for Marionetta and Chrysolina. The conclusion of the play implies that the sisters will ultimately be happier with their chosen partners, and this domestic bliss adds to the overall atmosphere of peace and prosperity that has returned to their land with the Duke. This image is yet again designed to be a parallel between the society portrayed in the play and Restoration society.

Both of these plays reflect the monarchist views of their playwrights, endorsing the Restoration as the best way to preserve peace and prosperity, while implying that the monarch still has the responsibility to rule well and not to abuse their authority. They also justify the aristocratic classes as having all the authority and encourage its preservation by having characters marry within their social classes which would preserve family bloodlines within the line of succession, both in terms of the royal family and members of the nobility:

> One might say of classical occidental comedy that it puts the right couple to bed at the end. […] Aristocracies must reproduce themselves as the rightful class to rule, and thus they must control reproduction so couples with the right breeding, both literally and metaphorically, inherit the estate.[8]

This is evident in the plays already considered, but also within other Restoration comedies – including the Scottish ones. While *Marciano* is the most explicit, both *The Assembly* and *Tarugo's Wiles* also have plots which revolve around the world being disrupted and then restored to normality by the close of the play. The endorsement of the ruling class and the restored monarchy is a shared priority between both English and Scottish Restoration comedy, and the plays which survive from the Restoration period in Scotland did have royalist writers, whose political affiliations are revealed in their writing, as seen in *Marciano.* The royalist characteristics are not confined to Scottish plays of this period. In 1660, George MacKenzie of Rosenhaugh published an early Scottish novel called *Aretina; or, The Serious Romance*. A number of genres are combined within this romance, and, like the third act of *Tarugo's Wiles*, which appears as a random insertion in the play, the third book of *Aretina* is 'a thinly veiled allegorical account of the recent civil wars'[9] in Scotland and England in the middle of a narrative that is set in Egypt and Persia. Like the Scottish

[8] J. Douglas Canfield, 'Restoration Comedy', in *A Companion to Restoration Drama*, ed. by Susan J. Owen (Oxford: Blackwell, 2008), pp.211-227 (p.211).
[9] Clare Jackson, 'Mackenzie, Sir George, of Rosehaugh (1636/1638–1691)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2007) <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/view/article/17579> [accessed September 2017].

playwrights considered in this dissertation, MacKenzie was a staunch royalist, but his support of Charles II and James II aligned him with a particular kind of royalism – he supported the Stuarts and therefore was not pleased when William III and Mary II ascended to the throne. This serves to highlight that not only was the literary and theatrical output from Scotland in this period reflecting the social and political atmosphere of the time, but that royalism was not a straightforward position. There were different views of how a monarch should rule, and as Scotland and England moved beyond the Glorious Revolution, when William and Mary came to the throne, royalists who had supported the Stuarts found their political views at odds with the monarch. So, while monarchism and support for the Restoration is evident through the restoration of order displayed in the plays discussed thus far, it should be remembered that royalist views held by those in the Restoration period, and moving beyond the Glorious Revolution, were not straightforward.

Comparing the portrayal of certain types of common characters within Scottish and English Restoration comedy is another effective way to consider the ways in which the drama of the two nations is similar. One feature of Restoration comedy is the satirising of opposing political views. A way in which this is done is through placing stereotypes, a common type of stock character found in comedy,[10] of two contrasting views in direct conflict within a play. In Archibald Pitcairne's *The Assembly*, and *Sir Courtly Nice; or It Cannot Be* (1685) by John Crowne, both playwrights introduce a pair of opposing characters who are the exact opposite of one another, and use them for comic effect. In *The Assembly*, these characters take the form of two newsmongers; Novell, who is a Jacobite and therefore supporter of the Stuart monarchy, and Visioner, who is a Whig whose allegiance lies with William of Orange. They are introduced to the audience in Act 1.1, where they bring news to Will and Frank of the war in France. While they argue over their differing information, Will reveals in an aside that they are both mistaken:

> **VISIONER** [To Frank] Sir, yow cane resolve me if the King is to be conjunct Emperour — (*re-enter Novell*)
> **NOVELL** Conjunct, say you? He will be sole Imperour or nothing. I'le pawn myn ears he beis at the gates of Vienna ere a monthe.
> **VISIONER** I ask you pardon, I beleve he intends to be at the gates of Paris first.
> **NOVELL** Yes, I know he is already at Versaills.
> **WILL (***aside*) These two Gentlemen ar in a Mutuall mistack. We must keep them there, I'faith, for if they discover another, they will putt fyre in the house. (*The Assembly*, I.1, p.10)

[10] Stott, p.41.

The argument continues between the two beyond this point, with both Novell and Visioner believing that their opinions on the matter are the most reasonable. At this moment, it has not been made clear that they are from opposing political views, and only when the argument makes a reference to the Prince of Wales do the two realise they support different kings:

> **VISIONER** What child?
> **NOVELL** The prince of Wales – i'Gad, what othr?
> **VISIONER** The prince of Wales! A Shittne bastard! A meer Imposture!
> **NOVELL** Are you ther, you Rottne Phanatick, you! (*The Assembly* I.1, p.11)

The irony of two newsmongers not having the correct information on the whereabouts of the king is comical, but it also highlights how their views bias the information they receive and disseminate. At this point in the play, there is a sense that they are enjoying the back and forth of friendly disagreement. This exchange of insults harks back to the tradition of flyting, which was a popular public form of entertainment in Scotland during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, when poets would publicly insult one another, normally in verse. Once political allegiances are declared however, things turn nasty and insults are thrown. Both use nicknames when referring to the other's king, with Visioner referring to James VII & II as 'King Jamie' while Novell calls William 'King Willie'. While not necessarily derogatory or offensive, it is a comical way to show the other man's lack of respect for his political opponents. The scene concludes when Novell boxes Visioner's ears and chases him off stage. In his commentary on this scene, John MacQueen notes that Visioner and Novell exist 'to keep the conflict of Jacobite with Williamite, under almost every aspect, prominent throughout the play.'[11] The arguments the characters make are established views of their respective ideologies and each makes their case; however, the manner in which the argument began and the inability of Will and Frank to prevent it once it begins, adds humour to the scene. Novell and Visioner become blind to their surroundings in the heat of their argument, so much so that when they exit the stage, they have forgotten that Will and Frank are even there and leave without acknowledging them. This moment of comedy is also combined with a specific emphasis upon a political debate that was occurring within Scottish and English society. The writing of *The Assembly* has been dated to about 1691, which was within a few years of the Glorious Revolution, therefore the tension shown between two characters with such differing political views in this play was reflecting a current and relevant issue.

[11] MacQueen, p.97.

In Act 5.1 of *The Assembly*, Visioner and Novell are reunited and once more an argument ensues. Again, the points they make indicate their deeply held principles and beliefs and they make references to a number of philosophies, mathematical theories and speak at times in Latin, indicating that they are well educated men. But as the debate progresses, their language becomes infantile and the insults become personal instead of an academic discussion with which the spectator (either reading or watching the play) can engage. Visioner calls Novell a 'puny Torrie' and 'Malignant newsmonger', while Novell refers to Visioner as a 'rottne Whyg.' At the end of the scene, the argument has become venomous; and once more Novell physically beats Visioner. Unlike the earlier scene, this does not seem so comical as the action is repeated and severe; the stage directions indicate than Novell '*Kiks him agane and again*' [sic] (p.60). It is significant that Novell ends up with the upper hand in the argument, and the physical victory over Visioner, because Pitcairne was a vocal Jacobite himself. Clement M. Eyler notes that it is not unusual for playwrights to declare their political allegiances within their drama,[12] and although Novell and Visioner both appear as exaggerated versions of people who hold those political views, the fact that the Jacobite Novell receives 'victory' is a subtle indication of where Pitcairne's views lay and indicates that he is not willing to air Whig views in his play without some consequence.

John MacQueen's aforementioned commentary on Novell and Visioner suggests that these characters were modelled on Hothead and Testimony from Crowne's *Sir Courtly Nice.* The opposing religious views of these characters are also cause for numerous comedic moments within the play. At this point it should be noted that *Sir Courtly Nice* and *Tarugo's Wiles* share the same source play: *No Puede Ser* by Agustin Moreto (1661), which means that some of the elements of the plots are strikingly similar. Like Patricio, Bellguard wishes to protect his sister, Leonora from the corruption of society, and so keeps her housebound. He employs Hothead, a rampant hater of all things Presbyterian, and Testimony, a devout Presbyterian phanatick, to live in the house and act as spies against his sister. Leonora explains to her friend Violante that these two men 'will agree in nothing but one anothers Confusion'[13] and their constant arguing becomes inconvenient for the other characters, while remaining comical for the audience. In Act 1.1 we are introduced to Hothead shortly after he has discovered he must live with a Presbyterian. Testimony

[12] Clement M. Eyler, 'Drama as a Political Instrument', *Peabody Journal of Education*, 42:5 (1965), 259-270 (p.260).
[13] John Crowne, *Sir Courtly Nice* I (London: R. Wellington, 1703), p.3, in *Early English Books Online* <link here> [accessed February 2017].

arrives and immediately they begin to argue, however at times it seems that Testimony has the advantage, knowing just what to say to infuriate Hothead:

> **HOTHEAD** What then? I'm for the Church, Sirrah. But you are against the Church, and against the Ministers, Sirrah.
> **TESTIMONY** I cannot be Edified by 'em, they are formal, weak, ignorant poor Souls — Lord help 'em — poor Souls!
> **HOTHEAD** Ignorant? You're an impudent Rascal to call Men o' their Learning Ignorant; there's not one in a Hundred of 'em, but has taken all his Degrees at Oxford, and is a Doctor, you Sot you.
> **TESTIMONY** What signifies Oxford? Can't we be sav'd unles we go to Oxford? (*Sir Courtly Nice* I, p.4)

There does seem to be an element of enjoyment for the two in living with someone they so vehemently disagree with and dislike. So much so, that their loud arguments and concern with everyone else's religion prevent them from doing the job they are tasked with. Instead of spying on Leonora and ensuring she does not behave improperly, they do not notice that she is being aided in planning her escape by her lover Farewel and his friend Crack. When Crack appears at the house disguised as a tailor in order to pass on a message to Leonora, the two grill him about his religious beliefs when he explains that he trained in France:

> **TESTIMONY** In France? Then Friend I believe you are a Papist.
> **HOTHEAD** Sirrah, I believe you are a Presbyterian.
> **TESTIMONY** Friend, if you be a Papist I'll ha' you before a Justice.
> **HOTHEAD** Sirrah, if you be a Presbyterian, I'll kick you down Stairs.
> **TESTIMONY** What are you friend?
> **HOTHEAD** Ay, what are you Sirrah?
> **CRACK** What am I? why, I am a Taylor, I think the Men are mad.
> (*Sir Courtly Nice* II, p.18)

Hothead and Testimony are right to be suspicious of Crack, he is only posing as a tailor and is not really who he claims to be. However, their obsession with religion blinds them to the real problem, and they make such a scene that Leonora's aunt throws them out of the room. This clears the way for Leonora to receive her message as Hothead and Testimony fail in their primary task. Bellguard's hope for his sister is that he will be able to marry her to Sir Courtly Nice, a rich knight of great standing. On one occasion, Sir Courtly Nice calls upon the family. Testimony is asked to answer the door and reports to Bellguard that there is a man there who wishes to court Leonora, but that he is sure he is an untrustworthy Catholic, while Hothead believes that a 'Rogue' is at the door, creating a comical back and forth between the two about whether 'Popery' or 'Roguery' awaits entry. Bellguard is mortified to discover that Sir Courtly has been kept waiting outside for an inappropriate length of time. Once more, the mistrust Hothead and Testimony hold against one another, and those with different religions from them prevents them from doing their jobs and

embarrassed Bellguard who wishes to appear as a good host and appropriate option for a future brother-in-law. Hothead and Testimony are ridiculous characters who provide much of the comedy within the play; but this comedy comes with a political edge, as their political and religious prejudices colour every aspect of their outlook on life and hamper their ability to do the job they are employed to do.

The placing of characters as opposing pairs in these plays provides moments of comedy, but they also portray religious differences that were significant issues in Restoration Britain. Divisions in Britain at this time formed over ideologies and religious ideas; Jacobites, Whigs, Tories, Episcopalians, Catholics and Presbyterians were all resident in British countries and disagreed amongst themselves.[14] The above-mentioned plays were published within ten years of when the Exclusion Crisis occurred in 1679-1681. Charles II had attempted to bridge the gap with Catholic worshippers and bring about some leniency and freedom for them to worship without being prosecuted, but the crisis resulted in Charles II being forced to temper his toleration for Catholicism and furthered anti-Catholic feeling throughout Britain. [15] These of course were significant and serious issues within Restoration society, and Miller argues that it was only the freshness of the civil wars of the 1640s in the memories of the people that prevented a similar outcome.[16] With these political and religious ideologies causing such tension off-stage, it makes sense that the playwrights would choose to engage with them. By turning comic characters into caricatures of those who hold such extreme political views, the playwrights engage with the political debate of their time without necessarily being seen to make it a main focus of their plays. In *Sir Courtly Nice*, the portrayal of these characters is kept light-hearted; Hothead and Testimony are clearly intended as comic characters who unintentionally foil Bellguard's intended actions regarding his sister's marriage. Questions could be raised as to whether Crowne is advocating for a reasonable middle ground when it comes to holding such views and ideologies. He had close ties to Charles II and James II[17] which would indicate his political loyalties lay with them, however, after William came to the throne, his literary work seemed to indicate a switch of loyalty from the Stuarts to the new monarch.[18] Whatever the views he wishes to convey in the play, Crowne manages to maintain Hothead and Testimony as a device for comedy. In comparison, while Novell and

[14] Jackson, *Restoration Scotland*, pp.40-41.
[15] Miller, pp.70-73.
[16] Miller, p.73.
[17] Arthur F. White, *John Crowne: His Life and Dramatic Works* (Cleveland: Western Reserve University Press, 1922).
[18] Beth S. Neman, 'Crowne, John (*bap.* 1641, *d.* 1712)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, 2004)
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/view/article/6832> [accessed August 2017].

Visioner are humorous characters in *The Assembly*, their interactions soon take the form of slander and physical violence, losing their comic edge. The final scene in which they appear sees Novel act out of genuine hatred towards Visioner. Unlike his English counterpart, Pitcairne seems unable to resist allowing his characters to portray an element of his own views, and therefore loses the comic quality of their portrayal towards the end of *The Assembly*.

Another common character that features heavily in Restoration comedy is the fop. The portrayal and defining characteristics of fops upon the Restoration stage changed and developed throughout the Restoration period, and therefore providing a concrete definition of what a fop is can be difficult. What is clear is that the term 'fop' is generally derogatory:

> The animus may be rooted in a temporary situation or reflect a mood or a chronic hostility of opposed camps — city-country, youth-age, rake-moralist. The drama itself may support or deny the term. Yet there is not lexical chaos.[19]

As pointed out by Heilman here, chaos is not created by this lack of ability to properly define the fop, or the reasons that may cause ill-feeling towards them, but they are a figure of ridicule and share some common characteristics among themselves. Heilman explains that fops are generally known for a 'gad-about-town persona'[20] while Susan Staves notes that they are often fashion-conscious and concerned with appearances while also being sensitive about how others consider them.[21] The 'ill-feeling' towards fops is not meant to be as strong as hatred or anger, in fact, as comic characters, fops were very popular with audiences and with actors,[22] but they are not characters with whom the audience would identify or wish to emulate in reality and were 'legitimate objects of ridicule'[23]. *Sir Courtly Nice* is named after its resident fop, who is deliberately portrayed as ridiculous by Crowne. The introduction of Sir Courtly to the audience hints at his sensitivity to how others think of him through his desire to be thought of as a gentleman:

> **SIR COURTLY** Compliance is the very thing of a Gentleman, The thing that shews a Gentleman. Wherever I go, all the World cries, That's a Gentleman, my life on't a Gentleman; and when ye'ave said a Gentleman, you have said all.
> **SERVANT** Is there nothing else belongs to a Gentleman?
> **SIR COURTLY** Yes, *bon mine*, fine hands and a Mouth well furnished—
> **SERVANT** With fine language —
> **SIR COURTLY** Fine Teeth you sot; fine Language belongs to Pedants and poor Fellows that live by their Wits. Men of Quality are above Wit. 'Tis true,

[19] Robert B. Heilman, 'Some Fops and Some Versions of Foppery', *ELH*, 49:2 (1982), 363-395 (p.364).
[20] Heilman, p.373.
[21] Susan Staves, 'A Few Kind Words for the Fop', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 22:3 (1982), 413-428 (pp. 414-415).
[22] Staves, p.416.
[23] Staves, p.413.

> for our diversion sometimes we write, but we ne'er regard Wit. I write, but I never writ any Wit.
> **SERVANT** How then Sir?
> **SIR COURTLY** *I* write like a Gentleman, soft and easie.
> (*Sir Courtly Nice* III, p.22)

Sir Courtly lives by a set of standards by which he defines gentlemanly living, and it is a point of pride to him that people call him a gentleman when they refer to him. His conversation shows that Sir Courtly lives up to the characterisation of a fop obsessed with appearance. When the servant asks him what other aspects a gentleman should have, he replies with a phrase that is presumably meant to be the French 'bonne mine', which translates into English as 'looking good.' Sir Courtly believes a gentleman should have a good figure and look after his appearance, and it is this concern with how he looks that eventually becomes Sir Courtly's downfall. In Act 5, Sir Courtly and Leonora are introduced for the first time, but he becomes distracted during the conversation when he catches sight of himself in the mirror. Leonora chooses this moment to make her escape, and soon Sir Courtly is joined by Leonora's aunt, who has also been recruited by Bellguard to ensure that Leonora is kept in the house and the marriage to Sir Courtly Nice goes ahead. The aunt herself has harboured a romantic inclination towards Sir Courtly and confusion occurs when Sir Courtly asks for the aunt's blessing to marry Leonora, only for the aunt to misinterpret him and assume he is proposing to her. The end of the play reveals that Sir Courtly has indeed mistakenly married the aunt who appeared veiled at their wedding, and only discovers the error when it is too late. Sir Courtly finds himself in an unsatisfactory situation as a consequence of his obsession with his appearance and his lack of wit. His gazing into the mirror is the first distraction that leads to Leonora being able to sneak away which leaves him alone in the company of the aunt. His appearance is his first priority as a gentleman, and he scorns those who use their wits to make a living, as seen in the above quote. However, his own lack of wit[24] means he is unable to detect Leonora's true feelings for him, or realise that there has been a misunderstanding between him and her aunt that needs clarified before leaping into marriage. Despite this, many characters within the play consider Sir Courtly to be an accomplished gentleman who would make a good match for Leonora, something which Staves notes is not uncommon in Restoration comedy:

> In the better Restoration comedy of manners, exceptionally intelligent characters can see how absurd the fop is, but contemporary society is generally represented as accepting fops as men of mode.[25]

[24] By which I mean general common sense and an ability to read one's situation and act accordingly.
[25] Staves, p.418.

Only Leonora and her friends who support her marriage to Farewel are able to see the ways in which Sir Courtly would not be an appropriate match for her. His lack of intelligence is not considered an obstacle by Bellguard or anyone of his mind. However, Sir Courtly is portrayed as the object of ridicule in the play which makes it clear to the audience that they also must consider him a poor candidate for Leonora's husband.

Sir Courtly Nice is arguably a textbook English Restoration fop, yet such characters exist in Scottish Restoration comedy too, particularly in *Marciano* which brings us a fop in the form of Becabunga. He and his old friend Pantaloni are reunited when they happen to call upon Marionetta and Chrysolina at the same time. Their talk immediately turns to appearances and clothing:

> **PANTALONI** Signor Becabunga — welcome to Town in good faith —Yow are very gallant. {*Surveys Bec. Cloathes.*}
> **BECABUNGA** — It is my winter suite, Sir, it cost my Father a good deal of money, more than the price of ten bolls of wheat, or barley, I warrand you.
> (*Marciano* II.2, p.18)

This discussion, which later hints at their hunting habits, indicates that the two live lavish lifestyles. Fops concerned with their appearances need the financial means to maintain it, and this early conversation provides the audience with an initial indication that Becabunga is indeed foppish. His lack of wit is also evident throughout the play. His first meeting with the sisters is disastrous due to his inability to repeat the helpful phrases his tutor Manduco is prompting him to use:

> **BECABUNGA** Protest, Ladyes, I am your humble servant.
> **MANDUCO** (*Prompts him behind his back*) As before, *nam caelum non animum mutat.*
> **BECABUNGA** As before, *nam caelos non animus mutat.*
> **MANDUCO** You are wrong — Say — I did long vehemently to see you — as one in child-bed.
> **BECABUNGA** I did long vehemently to see you in child-bed.
> (*Marciano* II.2, p.15)

Becabunga is easily confused by Manduco and as a result does not make as good a first impression as he had perhaps hoped. These situations make both Sir Courtly and Manduco victims of language being misinterpreted, a common feature of comedy. Later in the play, when faced with having to duel for Marionetta he once more shows his lack of intelligence:

> **BECABUNGA** Sir, I am to be married shortly, now if I should chance to be kill'd (as who knows but I may) you know then Sir, I cannot be marryed; why? Because I shall be dead, that's a good reason Sir.
> (*Marciano* IV.6, p.51)

His over explanation of the reason he would be unable to marry if he lost the duel shows a lack of wit that could assess that Leonardo already understands the implications of losing a duel why Becabunga could not marry if he failed. Both of these situations encourage the audience to laugh at Becabunga. As with Sir Courtly Nice and with fops in general, Becabunga is justifiably comical through his lack of intelligence and general ridiculousness.

Both Becabunga and Sir Courtly can be identified as fops through their behaviour at the close of the plays in the following way:

> Even though they have been exposed as idiots and deprived of the girl, the narcissism and complacency of these fops is usually strong enough to prevent their suffering which is in itself pleasing, since we are then able to enjoy the joke of their complaisancy [sic] to the end and since we are in any case grateful to them for the amusement they have provided.[26]

When deprived of Chrysolina and Marionetta, both Pantaloni and Becabunga claim that they were never in love anyway and that they were only marrying because their families expected it. Becabunga's biggest regret is in fact that his father had begun to organise his wedding clothes for him, and now they will no longer be required (Act V.2, p.60), which again speaks to the fashion obsession that is so common among fops. They eventually accept their rejection and move on. Sir Courtly is also not heartbroken at the idea of losing Leonora and is instead incredulous that he has married an old woman, and simply calls for his carriage, leaving the aunt to decide what she would like to do, refusing to take responsibility for her. This farcical joke also serves to highlight the lack of commitment and self-centeredness which are central to the character of the fop. In these scenes, the nastier side of the fops is shown through Becabunga's rudeness to Marionetta and Sir Courtly's abandonment of the aunt. However, these behaviours are still more comical than anything else and as Staves comments, the audience is left amused and entertained by their foppishness. The examples of Becabunga and Sir Courtly are just two examples of many fops which appear throughout Restoration comedy. Although the term 'fop' is hard to define completely, the characters are designed to be humorous and not taken too seriously. In the case of both these plays, the fops adhere to a number of common features identified in fops, and there does not seem to be any difference between how the Scottish and English plays use or portray their fops, making the lessons taught by fops a universal one.

Comparing Scottish and English Restoration comedy reveals that on a technical level, there are certainly no striking differences between the two with regards to form or

[26] Staves, p.422.

style. Playwrights from both nations use their work to support the restored monarchy which is not surprising considering their royalist values. By the time *The Assembly* was written, the restored Charles II was no longer on the throne and Pitcairne fundamentally disagreed with the new regime of William III. Although his Jacobite views match those of the other Scottish playwrights of the seventeenth century, the absence of a Stuart monarch when Pitcairne was writing means that he can appear against the monarchy while William remained ruler. This gives *The Assembly* a unique perspective of the political climate in Scotland after both the Restoration and the Glorious Revolution, giving it a degree of hindsight that *Marciano* and *Tarugo's Wiles* cannot have.

Common characters are used to comic effect in similar ways which indicates that Scottish and English playwrights were similarly influenced. This is further evidenced by the fact that *Sir Courtly Nice* and *Tarugo's Wiles* were both taken from the same Spanish source play. All three plays revolve around a brother who imprisons his sister to protect her chastity. The role of Tarugo in *No Puede Ser* is directly copied into *Tarugo's Wiles*, and in *Sir Courtly Nice* through the character of Crack. All three versions of the sister have a lover whom they are attempting to marry, while the older brother in each case tries to arrange a marriage to a more appropriate suitor. The importance of this suitor to the plot varies from play to play; he is practically irrelevant in *No Puede Ser* and in *Tarugo's Wiles*, while in the form of Sir Courtly Nice he becomes the titular character who provides much of the humour for the play. This use of common characters and similar source material suggests that Scottish playwrights were drawing inspiration directly from English theatre tradition and used similar European materials. While it does seem that Scottish playwrights used English theatre tradition to influence their plays, there is no indication that they sought to introduce any aspects of Scottish theatre tradition to an English audience or English playwrights. Adrienne Scullion takes the view that there is no difference between Scottish and English Restoration drama when she refers to Scottish dramatists of the time saying, 'the codes of representation which these writers employed were fully Anglocentric'[27] and that they 'made no attempt to develop or display a particularly Scottish sensibility.'[28] On first glance, this seems to be the case. *Marciano* and *Tarugo's Wiles*, although by Scottish playwrights, are written in English, indicating that an English audience was the target of these plays.[29] *The Assembly* is once more an exception,

[27] Scullion, p.105.
[28] Scullion, p.105.
[29] This will be considered further in the next chapter.

as in manuscript form, it exists in varying degrees of Scots and English,[30] and all indications point to a Scottish audience for this play.

Despite the similarities, there are subtle differences between the Scottish and English plays. Restoring order is a feature of both countries' plays, but certainly with *Marciano,* the comparison with the English civil wars, and a plot which heavily features a lawful ruler dethroned and returned to power makes Clark's royalist views conspicuous. Not only this, but this monarchist view is portrayed as a lesson or moral to be imparted to the audience. This is a feature which is obvious in *Tarugo's Wiles* too, the final lines of the play are addressed to the audience by Horatio: 'In this there is nothing new, onely you see a fresh experience of the impossibility of restraining a Womans Will.' (*Tarugo's Wiles*, V.2, p.54.) This makes it clear what the intention of this play is; the audience are meant to be reminded that controlling women is not possible. While *Sir Courtly Nice* ends in a similar vein, there is a difference to the way the message is delivered. While Horatio directly addresses the audience, *Sir Courtly Nice* concludes with Bellguard in a moment of self-reflection, considering the lesson that he has learned from the events he has just been a part of:

> **BELLGUARD** I am not convinced, Vertue is a Womans only guard. If she be base Metal, to think by Chymistry, to turn her into Gold,
> *Is a vain dream of what we never see,*
> *And I'll proclaim to all — it cannot be.* (*Sir Courtly Nice* V, p.63)

The difference between the way in which these two plays convey their moral message is important. It is clear that Bellguard is the character who has to reform in *Sir Courtly Nice,* and by having him on stage at the close of the play, reflecting on what he has learned, the audience can observe the moral lesson of the play without necessarily having to infer it as a direction to themselves. When it comes to both *Marciano* and *Tarugo's Wiles*, however, the audience are left in no doubt as to what they are to infer from the plays. *Marciano*'s royalist message is practically preached to them, while *Tarugo's Wiles* gives the closing words to Horatio, the character who has been crucial in the role of teaching the lesson to Patricio, who emphasises the message for the audience's benefit. *The Assembly* is slightly different as it contains more satirical comedy than the other two Scottish plays. However, the negative portrayal of the Presbyterian characters, who are based upon real-life Presbyterians who would have been recognisable to those who engaged with the play, sets up the message of the play at its conclusion. These characters are satirised and portrayed as hypocritical and thoroughly dislikeable and it is clear that these characters are not to be

[30] MacQueen, p.ix-xi.

imitated. The Scottish Restoration plays all have some form of lesson that becomes clear by the end of the play and indicates to the audience that they are to take this lesson on board. The English plays are much more light-hearted and spend more time engaging with the comedy rather than driving home the message, which allows the audience to leave and infer their own lesson, or to simply be entertained.

Terence Tobin notes that the Scottish plays of the 1660s that were performed in Scotland were 'without exception didactic.'[31] Both *Marciano* and *Tarugo's Wiles* portray varying lessons to their audience. Loyalty to the monarch is a key theme within Clark's play, while marriage based on love is a key aspect of both. When it comes to entertainment value, the English Restoration plays are much more successful in creating laughter and comedy within their plays. The Scottish plays do manage to include amusing elements, but the comedy is not always as easy or obvious as in their English counterparts. The lack of active performances of theatre in Scotland before the Restoration certainly indicates that these Scottish playwrights were inexperienced in writing for the stage. Scullion is correct to say that there is no deliberate attempt by these Scottish playwrights to distinguish their drama from that of the English, but that is not to say that there is no difference between them. As the previous chapter highlighted, the didactic nature of these plays shows that the Scottish playwrights had engaged with theatre and performance traditions in Scotland from before the Restoration, where plays were used as teaching material. It is this moralistic feature found in all three of the Scottish Restoration plays that differentiates them from their contemporary English comedies. This difference is contributed to by the Scottish moral tradition within literature of the time and through the inexperience of writers who were trying to engage with theatre, despite it being unfamiliar territory. The Scottish plays of the seventeenth-century can be considered as Restoration comedies due to their structure, form and style. The themes found within them are common elements of English Restoration comedy. However, the Scottish characteristics that are very obviously present are the product of writers who were influenced by traditions on both sides of the border, and therefore they cannot simply be written off as sub-par imitations of English Restoration theatre.

[31] Terence Tobin, 'Popular Entertainment in Seventeenth Century Scotland',p.47.

Chapter Three

Considering the Success of the Scottish Restoration Plays

A good way to measure the success of a play is to consider its commercial success as well as what the author's intentions and audience expectations are, and whether these have been met appropriately. Useful questions to consider in evaluating this would be whether the author was hoping to simply provide entertainment for the audience or trying to promote a certain world-view or ideology, and what audiences hoped to gain from the play; entertainment alone, or social and political commentary? With regards to the plays of the Scottish Restoration, there is so little contemporary material to provide information about the plays, playwrights and audiences that it is practically impossible to answer these questions with any certainty, meaning that when it comes to finding answers there is a reliance on informed speculation. This chapter will consider what little *is* known about these plays, their writers and their audiences and attempt to find some indication as to what the authors intended to achieve with their work, who the intended audiences were and what they expected from each play, to gain a sense of how successful these plays were. To do this, prologues, epilogues and prefaces to the plays will be used, as well as what is already known about each of the playwrights' views on theatre in order to build a picture of what their intentions for the plays may have been. Ascertaining who the intended audience was for each play will take into account the language each play was written in, and where it was performed, or, in the case of *The Assembly*, who was likely to have access to the manuscript. By considering cultural attitudes to theatre in Scotland and England, and examining what few responses to the Scottish plays are in existence, it will be possible to speculate about what audience expectations of these plays might have been and whether the plays met them. Of course, all seventeenth-century Scottish drama considered in this dissertation is comedy and so this chapter will be biased towards Restoration comedy in general over other genres. Through considering these aspects of Restoration Scottish drama, it has become clear that there is no one general Restoration audience and that instead, each play whether Scottish or English caters for its own specific audiences, with each individual author holding different intentions for their work. Despite this, it is still important that the Scottish Restoration plays are considered in the light of these questions as this opens avenues for further research for these plays beyond this study.

Establishing who the intended audiences of Scottish Restoration drama were provides a starting point for considering both author intentions and audience expectations for these plays. *Marciano*, the earliest of the three Scottish Restoration plays, was written

and performed in Edinburgh for a visiting English Commissioner.[1] Because the play seems to have been written for this specific visit, the English delegation were the motivation for the play. However, there will also have undoubtedly been Scots in the audience and while the entertainment of the English guests may have been the priority, the audience was likely to have been of mixed nationality. *Tarugo's Wiles* was the first Scottish play to have an English premiere when it was performed in London in 1667, which indicates that St Serf's audience was also English. Although the play is set entirely in Spain, St Serf goes to great lengths to ensure that the English audience find plenty to relate to within the play by making numerous references to England and Englishness. Tarugo is the English friend of the Spanish Horatio, and his nationality is repeatedly mentioned and made synonymous with 'otherness'. In the opening scene, Horatio tells Tarugo: 'you'l soon recover the gravity of our Spanish conversation, which I perceive you have altogether cast off for the English way of freedom' (*Tarugo* I.1, p.2). Horatio has outlined a difference between Spanish and English culture which he believes can be stamped out of Tarugo. In the following scene, Tarugo attempts to seduce Sophronia's maid, Stanlia, much to her disgust. Sophronia explains Tarugo's behaviour away by saying: 'but don't you know the English humour, with which he hath been so lately accustomed, is not really so dangerous as it seems' (*Tarugo* I.2, p.4). These references to England seem derogatory, however Harold Love suggests that the Restoration audience in England enjoyed humour that verged on the 'near-insult'[2] which means that these references were perhaps made in fun. Either way, the English audience are constantly reminded of their national identity through the conversation of the characters in the play. St Serf's effort to include English culture in a Spanish setting and emphasise Tarugo's Englishness is one of the play's weaknesses due to its disruption of the plot. The references are often jarring - the most obvious example of this being the coffee-house scene of Act 3 which takes the entirety of the act and adds nothing to the plot. Coffee-houses were growing in popularity throughout London at the time[3] and St Serf tries to capture the variety of political views and social classes that would have been found there. The scene has no effect whatsoever on the overall outcome of the play, and it can be assumed its purpose is to serve as an attempt to reflect the London culture in a way that the English audience would recognise and relate to. St Serf's references to England and English culture are unnecessary additions to the plot of the play. That being said, the coffee-house scene in particular is a comical episode within the play,

[1] Findlay, p.63.
[2] Harold Love, 'Who Were the Restoration Audience?', *The Yearbook of English Studies*, 10 (1980), 21-44 (p.25).
[3] Juan A. Prieto-Pablos, 'Coffee-Houses and Restoration Drama', in *Theatre and Culture in Early Modern England 1650-1737: From Leviathan to Licensing Act*, ed. by Catie Gill (Surrey: Ashgate, 2010), pp.51-74.

and while it does not fit properly within the plot, it does provide a comic interlude. The scene's presence indicates that St Serf intended an English audience to relate to and enjoy this play. His additional efforts to highlight his own otherness as a Scottish writer, especially within the prologue of the play, suggests that he was perhaps harbouring an insecurity about being a Scottish playwright bringing a play to an English audience, and wanted to do as much as possible to ensure they would understand and relate to it.

Marciano was aimed at a mixed English and Scottish audience at a Scottish performance and *Tarugo's Wiles* was written for an English audience based in England, but *The Assembly* is unique in the sense that it is a Scottish play, written and set in Scotland, and appears to be targeted at a Scottish audience. The language of the play has elements of Scots and the plot is set in Edinburgh. The religious aspects of the play are also distinctly Scottish and satirise a number of well-known Scottish Presbyterians from the time, all of which would have been best understood and appreciated by a Scottish audience rather than an English one. *The Assembly* also differs from the other two Scottish Restoration plays in terms of enactment, for there is no record of any public performance of *The Assembly* ever having taken place; it is assumed that the play circulated in manuscript form among Scots.[4] John MacQueen suggests that the existence of private theatres across Scotland and England is evidence that there was probably a 'surreptitious performance' of the play in Edinburgh at some point.[5] This is the most likely way in which *The Assembly* would have reached its intended audience, but despite this, MacQueen believes that this play was written with the stage in mind:

> Direction and plot in *The Phanaticks* imply considerable familiarity with the work of earlier dramatists. Correspondingly, the action fits with what is known of the Restoration theatre […] When the play was written, the stage, apparently, was very much in the authors'[6] minds.[7]

While this may be the case, it is hard to imagine that Pitcairne would have expected a larger, public performance of the play to occur in Edinburgh or elsewhere in Scotland due to the lack of theatre production and the play's anti-Presbyterian nature. Because of the seemingly small, Scottish circulation of the play in manuscript form, an English audience

[4] Ian Brown, 'Public and Private Performance'p.28.
[5] MacQueen, p.lxii.
[6] In the introduction to his edition of *The Assembly/Phanaticks,* MacQueen makes the case for his belief that Pitcairne wrote the play with two other authors, whom he suggests are David Gregorie and Sir Bertram Stott. There is not enough time or space to actively engage with this discussion here, and so for simplicity's sake I have and will continue to refer to Pitcairne as the author of this play.
[7] MacQueen, p.lxi-lxii.

was unlikely to engage with the play, nor would they be likely to appreciate it due to its subject matter.

It is obvious that there is no one kind of audience that was intended for these plays, as each one caters for a distinct and very different type. Terence Tobin is accurate when he makes the point that:

> Scots rarely intended their plays for Scottish theatrical production. […] In a period when a successful drama was synonymous with a London premiere, the more able writers submitted manuscripts to England.[8]

Even though produced in Scotland, *Marciano* was performed for a visiting English delegation, and so would aim to provide entertainment that was both familiar and relatable for them, as well as the Scots present in the audience. *Tarugo's Wiles* was probably written and performed for an English audience because it made the most financial sense for St Serf:

> Individuals ambitious of a career in the [sic] drama had to travel south — perhaps picking up work with the provincial companies scattered across England or travelling on to London where a rich professional theater [sic] was flourishing.[9]

Terence Tobin's record of plays performed in Scotland during the Restoration period shows that when plays were performed in Scotland, they tended to be the biggest successes of the English theatres rather than original Scottish productions.[10] There does not seem to have been the same taste for drama in Scotland as there was in England, and the account books of Sir John Foulis of Ravelston show that going to the theatre was expensive;[11] suggesting that Scottish audiences of plays were limited to those wealthy enough to pay to attend. Although English audiences were generally from affluent households too and theatre-going was what Harold Love refers to as a 'minority pastime',[12] English theatre exposed plays to bigger audiences thanks to a larger number of theatres showing plays which ran for more than one performance. As a result, *Tarugo's Wiles* was exposed to a much wider audience than that of *Marciano* or *The Assembly*. While *Tarugo's Wiles* and *Marciano* are obviously intended for English audiences, it is harder to establish who the intended audience of *The Assembly* were due to its small circulation and little reference to it in contemporary material from the time, but the content of the play itself suggests that it would have been most appreciated by a Scottish, anti-Presbyterian audience.

---

[8] Tobin, *Plays by Scots*, p.105.
[9] Scullion, p.105.
[10] Terence Tobin, 'Popular Entertainment in Seventeenth Century Scotland', pp.46-54.
[11] Brown, 'Public and Private Performance', p.27.
[12] Love, p.38.

The next logical step in establishing the success of the Scottish Restoration comedies is to consider what the authors hoped to achieve through writing their plays, but just as there is no generic audience at which the Scottish plays were targeted, the intentions the authors had for these plays also seem to be varied. The lack of contemporary material written by the playwrights or their peers about these plays also makes it difficult to know what the authors' intentions were for the plays, but using the evidence that does exist, namely prologues and prefaces of the plays, will provide some information that allows speculation about what these authors really wanted their work to achieve. William Clark's lengthy preface written at the beginning of the published version of *Marciano* gives plenty of detail which makes it easier to speculate about his intent for his play. In the preface, he makes a number of assertions about the state of drama in Scotland, and what he believes the purpose of comedy and other forms of drama is. Clark declares that the theatrical landscape in Scotland is practically barren and that therefore his play will appear 'in a Country, where the cold air of mens affections nips such buds in their very infancy' (*Marciano* p.(3)). Here, Clark hints at the hostile environment in which theatre in Scotland was restricted by 'religious opposition and municipal bureaucracy.'[13] He proceeds to make his case against the critics of theatre, explaining that:

> The use which may be reaped of playes is so evident, that unless a man mistrust his very senses, he cannot but confesse, that to see, in a well acted Tragedy, the fatal ends of such as commit notorious murders, rapins, and other licentious vices represented, would terrifie any man whatsoever from attempting the like. In a Comedy, where ordinarily the paltry vices of the age, such as the Court-vanity and prodigality, the City covetousness, or the Country-simplicity, &c. are extraordinarily taxed, many are deterred from what formerly they hugg'd, seeing their darling crime exposed on a publick Stage to the mockerie of the world […] Besides, Playes incite the youth to imitate the virtuous actions of their Predecessors. (*Marciano* p.(4))

Clark firmly believes that when immoral behaviour is exhibited on the stage, the guilty characters are to be made a mockery of in order to discourage imitation. He argues that audience members who are guilty of the same behaviour, or share the undesirable characteristics of those on stage, will recognise these (albeit exaggerated) reflections of themselves and that witnessing the treatment of such characters will be a motivation for personal reform.

Clark's strong words in the preface to the play give comic characters such as Pantaloni, Becabunga and Manduco a new dimension. These three characters in particular are shown to be ridiculous in a number of ways. Becabunga is unable to do much without

[13] Scullion, p.105.

the help or approval of his tutor, Manduco. Not only is this a factor in the disastrous wooing attempt in Act 2.2 (see Chapter One), but it is further emphasised in Act 3.4, where Becabunga chooses to write Marionetta a letter and have Manduco deliver it, rather than visit her himself. In Act 5.2, Becabunga expresses his reliance upon Manduco on two occasions. When it becomes clear that Marionetta and Chrysolina are going to reject their two initial suitors in favour of Leonardo and Cassio, Becabunga exclaims 'Oh! If Manduco were here to plead for me now' (*Marc.* V.2, p.59) and when Pantaloni decides they should get revenge of Leonardo and Cassio, Becabunga is only willing to help if they wait on Manduco:

> **PANTALONI** Let us think now to be revenged on them villains, Cassio and Leonardo: the first time I meet any of them, I will cut the tongue out of their heads that they shall never talk more.
> **BECABUNGA** I, so will I too: but we must have Manduco with us then, for he will make them stand in awe of him. (*Marciano* V.2, pp.60-61)

Becabunga's reluctance to enter into situations where he will be hurt or embarrassed could simply be due to shyness or modesty, something Manduco himself tries to convince Marionetta is the case in Act 3.4 when he claims 'the youth is endued with pudicity: he cannot be his own buccinator, or Trumpetter of his own fame.' (pp.36-37) However, Becabunga's willingness to ask Manduco to face these things in his place highlights his cowardice and selfishness. Pantaloni's ridiculousness is shown through his lack of independence; he has been persuaded to find himself a wife due to pressure from his mother. In Act 1, he mentions to Marionetta and Chrysolina that his mother wishes him to find a wife, before admitting to Becabunga that his mother 'will have me woo [Chrysolina] whether I will or not' (*Marciano*. I.6, p.18). This highlights Pantaloni's own cowardice, for he refuses to stand up to his mother, and although by the end of the play he has lost out on the opportunity to marry Chrysolina, he indicates that he never really wished to marry her in the first place, and the impression given is that he is angrier over his own humiliation and weakness rather than the loss of a potential wife.

The silliness of these characters and their behaviour is what makes them worthy of ridicule, and this is emphasised by the fact that they are unaware that their behaviour is so ridiculous. Manduco is the perfect example of someone who is ignorant of their own obnoxious behaviour and this makes him a wonderfully comic character. Manduco is rude, believes himself superior to most of the other characters and generally becomes more of a hindrance than a help to the efforts of Pantaloni and Becabunga. When Becabunga first attempts to speak to Marionetta on his own and without the prompting of Manduco, the tutor manages to disrupt proceedings:

BECABUNGA Why — I think, you are silent, Madam.
MARIONETTA I love not to prate Sir.
BECABUNGA Nor I either.
MANDUCO Nay, so long as he was under my *ferula*; I did labour to coerce in him that loquacious verbosity, or rather verbosious loquacity, with which most part of the perverse temporary adolescency is contaminate, for I hate garrulity, as I am facundious, I do.
BECABUNGA I vow, Madam, you are very bony, since I see you last […]
Manduco takes a pype of tobacco
MANDUCO I hope this does not offend you, Madam.
CHRYSOLINA Not at all, Sir.
MANDUCO I should be loath to offend any man, but I am without ceremony.
Smoakes in Chrys. face. Smoakes in Mar. face. (*Marciano* II.2, pp.15-16)

After blowing smoke all over the sisters, Manduco proceeds to perform a sonnet of his own writing before deciding that he and Chrysolina should leave Marionetta and Becabunga on their own for a little while:

MANDUCO But heark you, Madam, I beleeve 'tis now time wee shou'd leave them to their private confabulation.
CHRYSOLINA Yes Sir, with all my heart. (*Marciano.* II.2, p.17)

Of course, throughout this whole episode, the two characters who should have the opportunity to speak most, Becabunga and Marionetta, are unable to do so as Manduco keeps bringing the conversation back to himself and behaves rudely. Chrysolina's whole-hearted response to Manduco's decision to leave the couple alone suggests her relief that her sister can be left to court her suitor in peace without the interference of Manduco. Manduco's incompetence is further emphasised through Becabunga's misplaced trust that his tutor will help them fight Cassio and Leonardo. When faced with the prospect of ambushing Cassio and Leonardo in Act 5, Becabunga flees leaving Pantaloni and Manduco to face them alone. The comedy of this scene derives from the fact that the dialogue is actually the conversation between Cassio, Leonardo, Marionetta and Chrysolina about their new relationships, while the visual action is a scuffle between Pantaloni, who is also trying to flee, and Manduco who is attempting to stop him. The conversing characters do not reference the other two who are clearly in crisis, and carry on their conversation until Pantaloni has escaped Manduco's desperate clutches and leaves him alone. Leonardo and Cassio threaten Manduco, at which point he too runs away. Becabunga and Pantaloni are too cowardly to avenge themselves on Cassio and Leonardo, and their mistaken confidence in Manduco's bravery and abilities leaves them even more humiliated than they were when the women rejected them.

These episodes are all part of the comic plot of *Marciano*, and the comedy is developed through the behaviour of the characters rather than by what they say. These

behaviours exhibited by Manduco, Pantaloni and Becabunga, while comical, also highlight their flaws of character, in particular their pride, arrogance and cowardice. The play makes a mockery of them by turning them into targets of the audience's laughter and ridicule and rewards their behaviour with failure; Pantaloni and Becabunga are rejected by the women they had hoped to marry, while Manduco is reduced to drunkenness and eventually must flee from Cassio and Leonardo, two men whom he had initially considered himself superior to, which adds further humiliation to his already bruised ego. The humiliation and mockery of characters who have obvious flaws in their personalities is commonly used in many forms of comedy, and in *Marciano* it is used successfully to create some of the most comical moments of the play. But when placed in the context of Clark's preface, it then becomes clear that these episodes are supposed to do more than simply entertain. It would seem that Clark believed that exposing undesirable characteristics to the laughter of a theatre audience gave them the opportunity to recognise these traits within themselves and remedy them after seeing how others reacted to what was displayed on stage. Manduco, Pantaloni and Becabunga are there to be laughed at, but also learned from. In the preface Clark expresses his belief that drama is a tool that can be used for instruction so clearly, that *Marciano* cannot be understood as simply an entertainment piece. He expects a play to provoke a reaction from those whose behaviour are displayed on stage as something to be ridiculed. He recognises that theatre is:

> dissonant to the pedantry of this age, who vote down the use of Stage-playes (as they call them) for no other reason, but because in them, such pilfering stinkards as themselves are often discovered in their own colours; so ridiculous in their imperious behaviour, that none save them selves (whose innate stupidity doth much excuse their impudence) cannot but see it and abhor it (*Marciano*, p.(5)).

Clark argues that some of those against drama in Scotland at the time are only against it because it makes a mockery of them. He argues that everyone else is able to recognise such behaviours and understand that they are not to be imitated. The author's intention for the play is to elicit a response from his audience as they engage with it, rather than observe passively.

Unlike Clark, Thomas St Serf is not as explicit about his intentions for *Tarugo's Wiles*, but the prologue to the play does provide some clues. It takes the form of a conversation between characters, an unusual form of prologue in Restoration drama, which often saw prologues delivered in the form of short poems, addressed directly to the

audience.[14] St Serf's prologue instead gives the audience the chance to observe a discussion between a Gentleman, a Player (actor) and someone posing as a servant of St Serf[15] about what makes a successful play:

> **GENTLEMAN** Who is the author of this new play?
> **POET'S SERVANT** He's a Stranger, and my Master.
> **GENTLEMAN** He must be a bold Stranger indeed that will venture his reputation to the Censures of our Criticks.
> **POET'S SERVANT** Heaven forbid that any honest mans reputation shou'd depend upon the making of a Play; But I must tell you Sir, he had never ventur'd if he had not seen the Wit of the times so easily acquired.
> **GENTLEMAN** But why is modern wit so easily acquired.
> **POET'S SERVANT** Because a Trivolino, or a Skaramuchio that's dextrous at making of mouths will sooner raise a Clap then a high flown Fancy.
> **PLAYER** All the better for us if that be true, for we shall have new Playes come on like fresh Herring and Mackarell, all the year about; (*aside*) so that our Wits shall never be out of Season. (*Tarugo,* The Prologue, p.[iv])

St Serf establishes his Scottish background by having the Servant emphasise that he is a stranger to the country and to the ways of writing for the English stage, but also that he is eager to fit in. The Gentleman expresses admiration at the boldness of a foreign author exposing his work to the audience of a different culture and customs. St Serf also uses the prologue to warn against staking an honest man's reputation on his ability to write a play which implies that he does not wish to be judged on this single attempt. St Serf published *Selenharia, or, The Government of the World on the Moon: A Comical History* (1659) which was a translation of the French *L'Autre Monde ou les etats et empire de la lune* (1657) by Cyrano de Bergerac, and he edited Scotland's first newspaper *Mercurius Caledonius* which ran for twelve issues in 1661; and so, it is understandable that he would not wish to be defined by one play alone, especially if it failed to be as successful as he wished. The Gentleman's praise for the author's boldness (which of course was written by the author himself) and the request that the audience do not judge him on this one play alone serves as a reminder to the audience to be gracious in their response and, as mentioned previously in this chapter, perhaps indicates a degree of insecurity on St Serf's part about exposing his writing to an English audience. Despite the fact he may be a stranger to England and this is his first play, St Serf makes it clear in the prologue that he has some familiarity with the theatre by referencing the fact that he has seen plays acted upon the stage, and by having his characters discuss the merits of good comedy he shows the audience that he knows a little bit about what they are hoping for from his work. When

[14] Diana Solomon, *Prologues and Epilogues of Restoration Theatre: Gender and Comedy, Performance and Print* (Plymouth, UK: University of Delaware Press, 2013).
[15] It is unclear whether the servant is portrayed by an actor, or is actually a real servant of St Serf.

the Gentleman outlines the positive attributes of good comedy, the Servant admits that this new play does not have many of them:

> **GENTLEMAN** But Friend, you are in a monstrous errour; for if your Masters Play be not provided with requisite Materials, both he and it will be condemned to the Nursery.
> **POET'S SERVANT** I pray what do you reckon them Sir?
> **GENTLEMAN** The Plot must be new, the Language easie, the Fancies intelligible and the Comical part so delicately enterwoven, that both laughter and delight may each of them enjoy their proportions.
> **POET'S SERVANT** I have heard my Master say, that since the restauration of the Stage, he has seen all you had said represented to perfection, and yet blown upon with disdain.
> **GENTLEMEN** That's only by the young sucking fry of Wits; But tell me, has your Masters Play the qualifications I told you of.
> **POET'S SERVANT** Not one of them, for the plot is like all others of the time; *viz.* A new Toot out of an old Horn; and in regard he saw small things so acceptable, he has club'd his Trifle with the rest, in the hopes that it will prove less considerable then any that's gone before, and consequently expects a better approbation. (*Tarugo,* The Prologue, p.[iv])

This response is comical because the Servant has already gone to some lengths to convince everyone of St Serf's ability as a playwright despite his inexperience, before admitting that the play has none of the exciting elements of successful theatre. The Gentleman's description of a good play, like his compliment to St Serf's boldness, are words written by St Serf which shows he knows what makes a good play. But the description of what the Gentleman thinks should be a successful play and the Servant's response also give an indication of what St Serf's intentions were for his play. The Gentleman's view of theatre only makes reference to entertainment, not moral instruction, and he does not give any indication that he expects to leave the theatre challenged to reform himself in any way. There is no suggestion that the audience will receive any moral instruction from the play. All of this serves as a sign that St Serf wants his audience to enjoy the play and be entertained by it, but that making a moral or political statement is not his priority. This is reiterated in the Epilogue when it addresses St Serf's audience:

> And for his Friends above in the exalted Stalls, he expects the best from them, since he has complimented them with a Monkey and a Jigge. All the Clap he expects from you is, not to be hist, and say with an indifferent Grimasse, 'tis well enough for a Novice (*Tarugo*, 'Epilogue' p.55)

St Serf wishes his friends in the audience to applaud because he provided them with a scene in Act 2.2 in which a monkey and a servant girl dance during a gathering of Patricio's family servants. This is another scene in which there seems to be no purpose for it other than to entertain the audience. Whether the epilogue is referring to a personal request from friends of St Serf's to include something like this in the play, or whether the

reference to his 'Friends' is a general address to the whole audience, it seems that St Serf's biggest hope for the play is that it is enjoyed; there is no mention of a desire that the audience will change their worldview or behaviour as a result of the play, again implying that entertainment is the priority.

The prologue continues its discussion by addressing the play's lack of rhyme. The Gentleman is a little disappointed and hopes there will at least be a rhyming prologue, showing that he is unaware he is actually taking part in the prologue. The Servant dismisses the idea of a rhyming prologue and says he will instead deliver a Harangue to the audience. At this point, a character described in the stage directions as 'A true Poet, and Friend of the Author'[16] enters the stage, dismisses the Servant after chastising him for being too bold, and delivers the much awaited and more traditional lines of verse that serve as the opening to the play:

> **POET** Forbear Sirrha, you are a sawcy Serving-man; your Master will not be pleas'd at this boldness of yours with this Company. I say be gone with your Jack-Pudding Speech, least the Audience take it for a Directory, and so choak their expectations of the Play.
>
> Ladies and Gentlemen,
> *You'r too well bred not to be kind to day,*
> *Since 'tis a Stranger that presents the Play:*
> *Stranger to our Language, Learning and Ryme;*
> *He sayes, to witt too; and 'tis his first time.*
> *No boldness in our Prologue shall appear*
> *You, but too frequently meet that elsewhere:*
> *We onely your Divertisment intend,*
> *'Cause on your Goodness all our hopes depend.* (*Tarugo*, The Prologue, p.[v])

Here, St Serf references all that is important from the preceding dialogue and brings it together. He once more emphasises that he is not a native Englishman and even suggests that this affects his command of the English language. Additionally, his unfamiliarity with English rhyme and learning traditions will, he believes, require some patience from the English audience. The final two lines of this short poem are the closest thing to evidence of St Serf's intentions for *Tarugo's Wiles*. He claims that the purpose of the play is only to entertain the audience because it is on their willingness to pay and watch the play that will provide the income for himself as well as the theatre and actors. Playwrights often earned the profits from the third night of a play's performance,[17] and so enough goodwill and

[16] The impact of this entrance would only be possible if the Poet was in fact a real writer whom the audience could recognise instantly. I believe this to be the case because the identity is only implied in the stage directions and not to the audience, thus relying on their knowledge of who this person was. Unfortunately, there is currently nothing to identify who this 'true Poet' and friend of St Serf was.

[17] Susan J. Owen, *Perspectives on Restoration Drama* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), p.4.

demand from the audiences for three nights was important. It is significant to note that before delivering the rhyming prologue, the Poet dismisses the Servant telling him that he should not deliver his chosen speech lest the audiences take it as 'directory.' St Serf does not want the audience interpreting part of the prologue as instructive. The Poet's verse requests the acceptance and approval for the play, but it does not demand it, and voices St Serf's hope that they are entertained by what they see. The prologue itself is entertaining thanks to its comical moments that are enabled by its unusual structure and this sets the tone for the rest of the play.

Tarugo's Wiles is arguably the opposite of *Marciano* when it comes to the authors' intentions. *Marciano* is a play that succeeds in entertaining the audience, but Clark makes it very clear that there is a moral message for the audience to apply to themselves. The prologue of *Tarugo's Wiles* is the closest thing that exists to an explanation of St Serf's intentions for the play; its emphasis on entertainment is clear and it attempts to gain the audience's support by trying to elicit sympathy and understanding for a foreign playwright away from his own country. The Poet's assertion that the audience should not take direction from anything the Servant has said could be taken as a subtle hint that the play itself should not be understood as instructive. These points are again addressed in the epilogue of *Tarugo's Wiles* which once more asks the audience to be generous and avoids the idea of the play inspiring moral reform amongst its audience members. There is also the possibility that neglecting to mention the moral aspects of drama is a deliberate move by St Serf, in the hopes that the audience members may detect these elements of the play without being pushed, and therefore may be more likely to pay attention to them. As discussed in the previous chapter, there is a moral element that can be found in all of the Scottish Restoration plays which comes through, and *Tarugo's Wiles* is no exception. Patricio serves as the character who is left looking the most ridiculous at the end of the play, and subsequently is the character most in need of moral reform. Before he is rewarded by Sophronia finally agreeing to marry him, he undergoes a significant change of heart by admitting his error of judgement in taking his sister's freedom from her in the name of honour. Horatio's address to the audience at the end of the play draws attention to the lesson that Patricio has learned: 'In this there's nothing new, onely you see a fresh experience of the impossibility of restraining a Woman's Will.' (*Tarugo* V.2, p.54) Although Horatio does not tell the audience that they need to take heed of this, he has reiterated the message of the play and drawing the audience's attention to it. St Serf may not have wanted the audience to leave convicted of their own defects, but the play still shares the moralistic tone of *Marciano* and the pre-Restoration Scottish plays. There is of

course no solid evidence that St Serf felt this way about his play, and the evidence presented here could also be taken as an indication St Serf was simply trying to be subtler in conveying his play's message than Clark in *Marciano*, and hoping to impart it without the audience feeling as if they were being lectured on their behaviour. Either way, the emphasis of the prologue and epilogue is that the audience should enjoy the play rather than expect to be challenged on their socio-political views.

The Assembly also has a lengthy preface in which Pitcairne explains the context for the play. He voices his opposition to the Presbyterian church and discusses which characters included in the play are based upon which real Presbyterian figures. The preface closes by stating:

> Our designe in this Essay is fully to Represent the Vilanie and follie of the Phanaticks soe when they are in Sober mood They may Seriously reflect on them and Repent for what is past and make ane mends for the future if it be possible. Or else that the Civil Government may be awakened and Rouzed to ridd us of the Impertinencie and Tyrannie of this Gang, who Inguriously treat all good and learned men and are enemies to Humane Society itself. […] In Short Reader If thow take halfe alse much pleasure in reading [the play] as we did in writing it Thow will naithor think thy money nor paine ill bestowed. (*The Assembly*, The Preface, p.231).

The play is supposed to be entertaining, but its main way of providing entertainment is through making mockery of real people and their beliefs. The preface makes it clear that these Presbyterian figures are not to be used as examples of moral behaviour in reality. Throughout the play they are shown to be thoroughly dislikeable characters whose immorality and hypocrisy is obvious. The fact that *The Assembly* is also a satire makes a difference as to how the author's intention is interpreted. The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines satire as a work of art 'which uses humour, irony, exaggeration, or ridicule to expose and criticize prevailing immorality or foolishness, especially as a form of social or political commentary.' The use of satire as political or social commentary is key to establishing what Pitcairne's intention was. If he had intended to simply entertain, he could have written a fictional tale similar to that of *Marciano* or *Tarugo's Wiles* and rejected the political and religious elements that are so prevalent in his play. However, he uses *The Assembly* to comment on what he perceives as the immorality of a particular part of society and the very fact he chooses to make such comment shows that Pitcairne did not intend *The Assembly* to be only used as entertainment. Pitcairne highlights this immorality by showing the most pious characters of the Presbyterian group at their worst. At the beginning of the play, Rachel and Wordie discuss her pregnancy which highlights their hypocrisy:

> **RACHEL** I'le come to your Chamber about 12 or 1. My two wanton Cusins, Violetta & Laura, begine to suspect my being with child. They would be glad of this to task me with, for many a fair Lectur have I read to them against the scandalous custome of the speaking of men & looking over the windows at them.
> **WORDIE** They shall know nothing of it. We must - now part. I must go heir what the Comittie does today. So expects you according to your promise. (*Kisses*)
> **RACHEL** Yow never knew me faill you. I ever hated lying. It's a most damnable sin.
> **WORDIE** Indeed. It's a most vyle sin. (*The Assembly* I.2, p.14)

Not only is Rachel holding her cousins to a higher standard than herself, but she also promises that she would never lie to Wordie because lying is such a terrible sin. They both agree to this, despite the fact that by concealing their pregnancy until after they can get married, they are lying to everyone around them. The irony is comical, but it also highlights their hypocrisy. Another example of hypocrisy is found in the character of Solomon Cherrytrees who is a respected preacher, but who has numerous extramarital affairs. In Act 3.2, he unsuccessfully tries to seduce Laura after invading her bedroom while she is dressing, in order to correct her views on communion. Laura challenges his behaviour and threatens to expose him if he attempts to seduce her again:

> **LAURA** I warne you, no more of your Cant. I'le pardon quhat's past, but in tyme comeing if I hear on word of beds, bear brests and sweets of Love & such Gibberish that becoms your wry mouth as ill as that fair wig does your monkie face I'le reveal all and Spoyle yor trade, Instead of a mortified sant & preacher of the Gospell of Christ, a most prophane Lustfull and Impudent Villane. (*The Assembly* III.2, p.38)

Solomon values his reputation too much to allow it to be spoiled by the truth, and so leaves Laura alone. Both scenes highlight the two personas that the immoral characters have – their private, sinful personas, and their public, pious personas that they are desperate to maintain. While the play is not prescriptive and does not insist that the audience interpret it in a certain way, it does highlight immoral behaviour and the implication is that the audience will need to make their own judgment as to how they react to the play and its message, which is to avoid being like the hypocritical characters portrayed.

In all three cases, there is little evidence of the true intentions of the authors for these Scottish plays. But engaging with additional writings such as prefaces and prologues and not just the plays themselves allows some speculation as to what the intentions of the authors were. While the conclusions made in this chapter about author intentions are speculative, they come from the words of the authors themselves in their own works and this gives them some merit. Clark is specific about his intentions and uses the content of *Marciano* to drive his point and emphasise the need to reject the characteristics found in

his comic characters, as well as using his play to reinforce his royalist viewpoint through the words of Marciano. In 1685, Clark published *The Grand Tryal: or, Poetical Excercitations on the Book of Job* in which he sets out a number of his thoughts on the biblical book of Job. Clark acknowledges in the preface to *The Grand Tryal* that while he is best known for secular material, he believes that everyone should have an interest in biblical matters.[18] This interest in texts used for teaching and personal improvement shows that Clark was didactically minded when it came to his writing and so his work should be considered to have a moral element within it. The prologue of *Tarugo's Wiles* suggests that entertainment was the priority for St Serf, but the play itself is influenced by the traditions of Scottish literature and pre-Restoration Scottish theatre by conveying a message. *The Assembly* can be read as a social commentary which indicates that the play was intended as more than just entertainment, and while it does not demand a particular action or behaviour from its audience, the comments upon society and the immorality of certain Presbyterians implies that the author wishes to make the audience aware of this and to decide how to act for themselves.

While speculating about the intended audiences for these plays, and what the intentions of each author were when writing them, some thought should be given to what the audiences themselves would have expected when engaging with the plays. Unfortunately, as is becoming a recurring theme in this chapter, there is little existing evidence to allow for any concrete conclusions; but by once more examining what material is in existence, there are some conjectures that can be made about audience expectations for the Scottish Restoration plays. Because it has been possible to establish that *Marciano* and *Tarugo's Wiles* were intended for English audiences, it is logical to consider what an English Restoration audience generally expected when they went to the theatre, and apply these expectations to both Scottish plays. With regards to *The Assembly*, considering the audiences who would have engaged with the play through reading or private performances and what they would have expected from theatre or drama will perhaps give some indication of whether it succeeds in meeting these expectations.

Two important scholars who have carried out significant study of Restoration theatre audiences are Robert D. Hume and Harold Love; their work provides a generally balanced view the nature of Restoration audiences. Until the twentieth century, there was a common misconception that the Restoration theatre audiences were rowdy and bawdy: 'Scholars hostile to risqué comedy have tended to [suppose] that debauched courtiers

[18] William Clark, *The Grand Tryal,* p.[3].

feasted upon fictionalized accounts of their own misdeeds.'[19] This is not necessarily the case however, as descriptions of Restoration audiences that scholars and critics used were found in the prologues and epilogues of the plays themselves. This is problematic because in Restoration theatre, prologues and epilogues could be satirical in tone and were therefore presenting an exaggerated version of the audience.[20] It should be also noted that prologues and epilogues were designed to curry favour with the audience in order to improve the reputation of the play, bring in more audiences and increase financial income for the theatre company and playwright.[21] Just as prologues and epilogues can give an indication of the authors' intentions for their works, the same can be said for how much they reveal about their audiences. The prologues and epilogues do not portray accurate representations of audiences, for as Hume points out, it would be unlikely that an audience would find a faithful portrayal of themselves entertaining.[22] The idea of the immoral Restoration audiences is also fed from a modern emphasis on plays which feature strong sexual comedy, such as William Wycherley's *The Country Wife* (1675) and *The Plain Dealer* (1676) among others.[23] However, as Hume also points out, this is merely one genre of play that was produced in the Restoration period, and he argues that just as there was a variety of styles of play, there was also a variety of tastes among audience members, resulting in differences between which plays they enjoyed. [24] In addition to this, theatre-going was not a mass entertainment, and while there is little to indicate that it was so expensive that lower classes were alienated, the audiences did not seem to contain a large sample from every class, leading earlier scholars to conclude that it was a largely middle and upper-class activity.[25] From this brief consideration of the Restoration audience, it is already clear that there was no stereotype of a Restoration theatre-goer that can be taken as representative of the whole population, either in class or taste. However, there was a faction of society which actively campaigned for moral reform in the theatre. One of the loudest voices among this faction was Jeremy Collier, a clergyman whose pamphlet *A Short View of the Immorality and Profaneness of the English Stage*, first published in 1698, outlines his issues with the morality (or lack of) portrayed in Restoration theatre. While Collier was writing at a later period than many of the Restoration plays considered in this

[19] Arthur H. Scouten and Robert D. Hume, 'Restoration Comedy and Its Audiences, 1660-1776', *The Yearbook of English Studies,* 10 (1980), 45-69 (p.45).
[20] Love, pp.23-24.
[21] Robert D. Hume, 'The Theory of Comedy in the Restoration', *Modern Philology*, 70:4 (1973), 302-318 (p.313); Love, p.23.
[22] Hume, 'Theory of Comedy', p.313.
[23] Robert D. Hume, 'Jeremy Collier and the Future of the London Theatre in 1698', *Studies in Philology*, 96:4 (1999), 480-511.
[24] Hume, 'Collier and the London Theatre', p.509.
[25] Love, pp.36-38.

dissertation, he is an important voice to consider because there is such a lack of voices responding to theatre, especially Scottish theatre, in the 1660s. One of Collier's biggest problems was the absence of poetic justice in the plays; he firmly believed that immoral behaviour should be punished at the end of a play. He objected to the fact that the language used to describe immoral behaviours such as adultery was given warmer terms:

> I have ventured to change the Terms of Mistress and Lover, for others some what more Plain, but much more Proper. […] As Good and Evil are different in Themselves, so they ought to be differently Mark'd. To confound them in Speech, is the way to confound them in Practise. Ill Qualities ought to have ill Names, to prevent their being catching.[26]

Not only were names of immoral behaviours made to sound more acceptable on the Restoration stage, but Collier believed that the portrayal of female characters in particular was improper, and that women's honour should be protected.[27] This is particularly interesting where plays like *Sir Courtly Nice* and *Tarugo's Wiles* are concerned, as they address the very issue of women's honour. While both Collier and these plays agree that a woman's honour should be protected, there is disagreement about who is responsible for this. Collier believes that playwrights should be protecting women by writing them appropriate parts, and by remembering that women are in their audiences, whereas the premises of *Tarugo's Wiles* and *Sir Courtly Nice* are that it should be the women themselves who protect their honour. Those who try and protect the honour of the women are the characters who end up mocked and humiliated at the end of the plays. This provides a glimpse of just how different Collier and the playwrights were in terms of their views and moral principles, one of the reasons for which may be the few decades between the plays considered in this dissertation and when Collier was writing. Collier was objecting to theatre from as early as the 1670s, which was built upon the foundations of the 1660s when the theatres re-opened. Collier's other problems with the Restoration stage were that clergymen and the Bible were made a mockery of and that immoral behaviour was rewarded in a lot of the plays. Examples of both can be found in plays that have already been considered in this dissertation. *Sir Courtly Nice* makes a mockery of Hothead and Testimony, who, although not explicitly clergy, do represent two prominent theological schools of thought from the time. They are exaggerated stereotypes of their kind and are designed to be used for comic purposes by Crowne, rather than engaging with their beliefs in a respectful debate which could have been done if he wished to. With regard to characters being rewarded for immoral behaviours, one of the most obvious examples of

[26] Jeremy Collier, *A Short View of the Immorality and Profaneness of the English Stage*, with prefatory notes by Yuji Keneko (London: Routledge, 1996), p.A4-A5.
[27] Collier, p.9.

the Restoration stage where this occurs, and one which Collier himself cites, is William Wycherley's *The Country Wife.*

The Country Wife introduces the character of Horner, a man who makes it known that due to a venereal disease he has become impotent. This gains him a degree of trust among married men who allow their wives to be left alone with him. These women quickly realise that the rumours about Horner are false and they take great delight in cuckolding their husbands with Horner. In the famous 'china scene' of Act 4.3, the cuckolding of Sir Jaspar Fidget occurs practically in his presence, as Lady Fidget and Horner pretend to look at china collections in Horner's room. Sir Jaspar stands in the next room and speaks to his wife through the closed door, unaware that his words carry significant double entendre which alerts the audience to what is really happening. At the end of the play, there is no poetic justice for Horner, or the women with whom he has had sexual encounters. Instead, their ignorant husbands are made out to be the fools, and in the final act, the stage directions include a 'dance of cuckolds':

> Wycherley finds the perfect metaphor in the image of the cuckold: within the highly theatrical culture of his day, Wycherley shows an intricate dance of those who have their faith in meaning betrayed because meaning is only a façade, an intricate, empty masque.[28]

The closing action of the play, with the cuckolded men watching completely unaware that their wives have been unfaithful to them, makes a mockery of their supposedly happy marriages and destroys all symbolism of faithfulness and security that their marriages are meant to bring them. Gelineau's modern reading of the play argues that this is Wycherley's way of making a mockery of England itself, and its fundamentally dishonest society,[29] but this is certainly not how Collier read the play. Instead, he was horrified by the lack of propriety shown by these characters and disappointed that there was no retribution for their immorality. Collier is only one, loud voice in the area of Restoration theatre reform, but there were others who sought the moral reform of the theatre including societies for the Reform of Manners, the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge; drama critics such as Thomas Rymer and John Dennis who were anxious to improve the moral tone of English drama, and theatre abolitionists, some of whom were Puritan dissenters who were against the theatre because it was a favourite pastime of many of the monarchs of the Restoration period and early eighteenth century.[30] Collier was not alone in his desire for

[28] David Gelineau, '*The Country Wife:* Dance of the Cuckolds', *Comparative Drama*, 48:3 (2014), 277-330 (p.278).
[29] Gelineau, p.278.
[30] Hume, 'Collier and the London Theatre', p.488.

reform, but as has previously been mentioned, modern views of Collier have been shaped by the fact that there has been a bigger focus on Restoration sex comedy and less of a focus on the less sexually explicit comedies that were in existence at the time. That being said, Collier succeeded in upsetting the playwrights with his accusations, so much so that a number of defences of stage and drama were written, including William Congreve's *Amendments of Mr Collier's False and Imperfect Citations* (1698), and the anonymously written *The Stage Acquitted: Being a Full Answer to Mr Collier and Other Enemies of the Drama* (1699), both of which aimed to address Collier's objections and justify the aims and purposes of the theatre. Hume believes that Collier's objections to theatre got such a strong reaction from the playwrights for one of two reasons; either they were concerned that the theatres would become even more censored and restricted as a result of moral reforms, or they were suffering from guilty consciences. Either way, Hume argues that the defences were weaker than Collier's well researched work.[31]

Collier and the other reformers show that there was a call for moral reform in the theatres, but Hume believes that the majority of these reformers most likely never visited the theatre, instead making their judgements on plays based upon their reputations, or by reading them rather than seeing them performed.[32] Those who actually attended the theatre regularly had a wide variety of taste and so not all Restoration audience members would have enjoyed an outrageous sex comedy, while others would not have appreciated a tragedy or a tamer comedy. It is therefore difficult to establish exactly what English audiences expected in general from the Restoration theatre, but it is safe to assume that since theatre had already been used as entertainment in England for many years before the Restoration period, English audiences went to the theatre expecting primarily to be entertained, with those seeking reform less likely to visit the theatre anyway. By taking the speculations about author intent and audience expectations made thus far in this chapter, and applying them to the Scottish plays of the Restoration period, it will be possible to further speculate about the success of the Scottish Restoration plays and consider if the supposed expectations and intentions were met.

William Clark's convictions, outlined in his preface to *Marciano*, that drama is a tool for upholding moral behaviour would presumably have pleased Jeremy Collier. The immorality of Manduco, Pantaloni and Becabunga faces a form of poetic justice at the end of the play. Although not guilty of heinous crimes, they are cowardly, proud and vain and the justice they encounter reflects this. The vanity and pride of Becabunga and Pantaloni is

[31] Hume, 'Collier and the London Theatre', p.496.
[32] Hume, 'Collier and the London Theatre', p.506.

knocked when they are rejected as suitors by Marionetta and Chrysolina in favour of Cassio and Leonardo. Their cowardice is highlighted in their attempts to flee instead of fighting for themselves. Pantaloni, Becabunga and Manduco all face humiliation and the laughter of the audience as punishment for their flaws. However, when it comes to the second plot of *Marciano,* there is a more serious tone and therefore a more serious poetic justice accompanies this. Borasco is portrayed as the true villain of the play, for he is the leader of the rebel army. Clark's royalist sympathies are shown here as it is made very clear that the rebel army is the wrong side to stand with in this civil war. Borasco is shown to have little value or principle, he does nothing to prevent Marciano being sentenced to death, and tries to manipulate Arabella into marriage by promising her protection if she agrees to be with him. Borasco is one of the biggest threats to the happiness of Marciano and Arabella as a couple and everything he does is motivated by the selfish desire of having Arabella as his wife, or defeating the Duke by removing Marciano, one of his prominent Generals. Poetic justice is brought about for Borasco in two ways. First, the escape of Marciano and Arabella from the heavily guarded environment in which they are kept is a humiliation for Borasco; a prominent General being unable to restrain a high-profile prisoner is a poor reflection on his abilities. Secondly, the crushing of the rebel forces upon the Duke's return ultimately leads to Borasco having to flee, highlighting the dangers of misplaced loyalty. Instead of a glorious victory and what would undoubtedly have been a prominent position in the new government, Borasco will be unable to return to Florence now that the Duke has been restored to power.

There are many didactic moments throughout *Marciano* with regards to the three comic characters highlighting flaws of human nature, while Borasco is used to show the consequences of rebelling against the lawful rule of those in authority. Marciano's monologues within the play remind the audience of the consequences of a kingdom that rejects its monarch and of the divisive nature of civil war. This emphasises Clark's own royalist views and gives him the opportunity to share his message in a context that he believed was an effective way of delivering it. The reaction of the audience to *Marciano* is impossible to ascertain for certain, as there is no written record of responses to the performance. The published version of the play states on its cover that it was 'Acted with great applause, before His Majesties high Commissioner, and others of the Nobility, at the Abby of Holyroud house, on St John's night.' It is hard to know exactly whether the play was applauded as enthusiastically as the title page suggests, or if this is biased exaggeration. However, the fact that the play was applauded at all, and then printed, shows that the audience received it favourably. The English delegation watching the play would

probably have expected nothing more than entertainment, which *Marciano* certainly provides. Bill Findlay notes that:

> The to-ing and fro-ing of the interrelationships that make up the action is deftly handled, the characterisation is assured and individualised, and the dialogue and situations are successfully funny.[33]

All the characters in this play are well constructed with their actions and dialogue fitting their personalities. This creates plenty of successfully comic moments, and although the double plot line can sometimes hamper character development in the tragic plot, where characters like Arabella and Marciano at times appear two-dimensional and less developed, there is still enough in those moments to engage the audience throughout the play. The plot is generally well constructed and maintains consistency and flow without any obvious gaps to cause confusion. An English audience would have had their expectations of entertainment met by *Marciano*, but there were Scots in the audience too. The title page of the play describes the audience as nobility, and those educated in Scotland would probably have come across drama used as didactic material, perhaps making them more likely to engage with the moral aspects of the play as well as being entertained by it. Whether Scottish or English, the nobility in the audience were likely to have shared Clark's monarchist views and would have related to the political position laid out by the play, especially since the Restoration of the crown would ensure their legacies and properties which would have been less safe during the Interregnum. In terms of measuring the success of *Marciano* by audience expectations and author intentions, Clark created a play that effectively expressed his views, while still being entertaining. An audience that expected either entertainment or moral lessons, or even both, would most likely have been satisfied by what *Marciano* offered.

When it comes to *Tarugo's Wiles*, speculating about how it achieves the aims of the author and meets the expectations of the audience is more difficult. If the play is considered as being intended to entertain alone, it seems that the play does not entirely achieve this. The plot is difficult to follow at times, and while this is also a feature of *No Puede Ser*,[34] St Serf further complicates it by his addition of the coffee-house scene. His characters are not as clearly defined as they could be and the plot leaves too much for the audience to work out for themselves due to inconsistencies within the plot. A particular example of inconsistency is the fact that Liviana and Horatio are often referred to as

[33] Findlay, p.66.
[34] A plot summary of *No Puede Ser* can be found in: Arthur F. White, *John Crowne: His Life and Dramatic Works* (Cleveland: Western Reserve University Press, 1922), pp.141-142. Unfortunately, it has been impossible to find an English translation of this play.

having had a past romance. In Act 1.1, Horatio comments on Liviana's beauty when Tarugo asks what he thinks of her, and later in Act 1.2, Horatio reveals his true feelings:

> **HORATIO** The Lady Liviana, whom you so lately magnifi'd (though at that time I conceal'd my passion) yet she is the Onely object of my Love; I have reason to believe her kindness to me is reciprocal; but for the present her Brothers Tyrannous restraint interrupts the Honourable Fruition that's design'd by us both. (*Tarugo* I.4, p.4)

However, when they finally come together in Act 4, Horatio mistakes the maid, Locura, to be Liviana:

> **LOCURA** They are gone Horatio, you may come out.
> **HORATIO** Yes, Madam, to prostrate myself at your feet.
> **LOCURA** You'r mistaken, I am not Liviana.
> **HORATIO** Who, then? (*Tarugo* IV, p.38)

A logical assumption would be that if Liviana and Horatio have a romantic history, or even a close friendship, he would know what she looks like. This questions the legitimacy of their relationship before the opening of the play, and therefore also raises doubt about the ability of St Serf to maintain a consistent plot. Another area of the plot which causes confusion is with regards to Liviana's picture of Horatio. When Tarugo first brings her news of Horatio and Sophronia's plan to free her in Act 2.2, he brings her a picture of Horatio as proof of his love for her. The next time we hear of the picture is in Act 4, when Patricio appears at Sophronia's house in a rage, and upon seeing Horatio says: 'Oh here he is, when I view the Picture I am confirm'd; 'Tis none else but Don Horatio's! Oh Hell and Damnation' (*Tarugo* IV, p.29). Patricio does not mention the picture to the other characters though, and so from this one line, the audience is left to infer that somehow, Patricio has found the picture. This is confirmed in the next scene as Liviana and Locura stage an argument, to make it sound like Locura found the picture while going to church and subsequently lost it, in an attempt to make it seem like the picture was not in Liviana's possession:

> **LIVIANA** This same naughty wench here, Locura, as we were yesterday coming from the Chappel, found a Gentleman's Picture: when she came home, shewing it me, I chid her for taking it up, and presently order'd her to burn it, and now forsooth she tells me it's lost; which I look upon as a shift that she may keep it.
> […]
> **PATRICIO** Ha! Liviana, this is your cunning; because you see me careful in the preservation of your honour, you think by this Artifice to abuse me; but all will not do. (*Tarugo* IV.4, p.31)

Although this scene confirms the fact that Patricio has found Liviana's picture of Horatio, there is no information as to how he found it, or why finding the picture automatically

suggests to him that Liviana is hiding a secret affair. Unlike in *Sir Courtly Nice*, where this scenario is well explained and makes sense, the audience is left to speculate the circumstances of Patricio finding the picture which causes confusion rather than adding any sort of tension or excitement to the plot.

In terms of audience reaction to the play, *Tarugo's Wiles* failed to impress Samuel Pepys who called it 'the most ridiculous, insipid play that ever I saw in my life,'[35] however there are no other known reviews of the play to support or contest Pepys's view. The play obviously had some level of notoriety though, as Wycherley refers to it in *The Country Wife* when some of his characters are looking to buy copies of a play:

> **MRS PINCHWIFE** Pray, have you any ballads? Give me sixpenny worth?
> **CLASP** We have no ballads.
> **MRS PINCHWIFE** The give me *Covent Garden Drollery* and a play or two…Oh, here's *Tarugo's Wiles* and *The Slighted Maiden*. I'll have them.[36]

This passing reference makes no comment of the quality or reception of the play, but the audience would clearly have recognised the title, and it is likely that those who saw *The Country Wife* would have understood whether *Tarugo's Wiles* was being referred to in a positive or negative light, although it is impossible to tell when looking at this reference from a twenty-first century perspective. From a modern perspective, Adrienne Scullion suggests that *Tarugo's Wiles* was a respectable first attempt at a drama by an inexperienced Scottish playwright bringing their work to a long-established English stage.[37]

The Assembly's lack of recorded performance, and the fact that it was not published until 1722 means that there is no way of knowing how it would have been received by a seventeenth-century audience. All that can be said about this play's audience is that they were most likely Scottish and shared similar political and religious views to Pitcairne and would probably have appreciated the satire with which he portrayed the political and religious landscape of late seventeenth-century Scotland. To speculate any more than this would be irresponsible as there is such a lack of evidence surrounding the performance and reception of this play.

In terms of commercial success, none of these Scottish Restoration plays gained massive popularity. After *Marciano*'s initial performance, there is no other record of it being revived, and though *Tarugo's Wiles* received a Scottish premiere in Edinburgh, there

[35] Samuel Pepys, '15 October 1667', in *The Diary of Samuel Pepys: Complete Edition,* ed. by Steven Algieri (Kindle Edition: ebookworms.co.uk, 2011).
[36] William Wycherley, *The Country Wife* III.2, ed. by John Dixon Hunt (London: Ernest Benn Ltd, 1973), p.56.
[37] Scullion, p.110.

are no further records of it being performed. This is in contrast to English Restoration plays such as *Sir Courtly Nice* which was popular and had multiple performances throughout the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.[38] William Clark is the only author of the Scottish playwrights who explicitly states what he believed the purpose of drama to be and so is the only one who can be considered to have achieved his goals. So little information is provided by Pitcairne and St Serf about what they believed the purpose of drama to be and what they hoped their plays would achieve that there is no way to know for certain whether their plays were successful when using these markers. The same can be said for audience expectations of all three plays; the Restoration audience was so varied that it is hard to establish what they would consider a successful play, especially as there is little by way of written or recorded responses to the plays considered in this chapter. However, in a country where there was little public theatrical activity or production in the seventeenth-century, these Scottish playwrights still actively engaged with English Restoration theatre culture; their plays display a working knowledge of how the stage worked and some understanding of what might be expected by an audience. The plays may not have been commercial successes or praised as exceptional examples of theatre, and the inexperience of the writers is evident at times, however their very existence demonstrates that the Scottish seventeenth century was not a total theatrical or literary wasteland as has so often been assumed in the past. Whether or not they were popular with audiences or critics, the plays of seventeenth-century Scotland are significant and worthy of research because they existed at a time when professional theatre in Scotland was yet to be established, which in itself is a type of success.

[38] White, p.139.

Conclusion

Opening Avenues for Research within Seventeenth-Century Scottish Drama.

This dissertation sets out to investigate one research question in two parts: the first asked whether the Scottish drama of the seventeenth century could be considered as Restoration comedy, and the second asked if these Scottish comedies were successful. After comparing the Scottish plays to English Restoration comedy, it is possible to conclude that the Scottish plays are similar enough to also be considered as Restoration comedy. The structure of all three Scottish plays is closer to that of Restoration theatre than previously existing Scottish drama, while there are also a significant number of shared characteristics on the level of content. One of the biggest shared characteristics is the way that they symbolise the Restoration of Charles II, or at least use drama to promote and uphold the social order and structures that returned to prevalence after the Restoration. The use of similar comic characters such as fops and opposing stereotypes who serve the same kind of purpose within both Scottish and English plays of this period also highlight their likenesses. This is particularly true for opposing stereotypical characters who are used to highlight the religious and political debate of Restoration society. These similarities, among others, make it clear that the Scottish plays of the seventeenth century were heavily influenced by English Restoration comedy, so much so that they take the form of Restoration comedy themselves.

However, the Scottish plays cannot be considered as total imitations of English Restoration drama due to the fact that they have elements which can be traced to the Scottish theatrical tradition from before the Restoration. Although there was no established theatre in Scotland until the eighteenth century, there were elements of performance which could be found in everyday life, in court culture, and in folk celebrations and events. These traditions found their way into two of Scotland's earliest versions of scripted theatre: *Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis* and *Philotus.* The seventeenth-century Scottish plays share the comic nature of these plays, which is further emphasised by their shared use of farce, slapstick comedy and characters who become the objects of ridicule. Something which the Scottish pre-Restoration and Restoration plays share is their strong moral nature, and all of these plays have didactic elements which can be traced back to generally didactic emphases of early modern Scottish writing, particularly also in plays like *Ane Satyre* and *Philotus*. These similarities, although they may be minor, are enough to show that Scottish

Restoration plays were influenced by the Scottish literary and theatrical cultures and therefore cannot be considered solely as imitations of English drama. The evidence suggests that the playwrights engaged with the traditions on both sides of the border to create their plays, and therefore these plays can arguably still be considered as part of the Scottish tradition.

Trying to establish the success of the Scottish Restoration plays is somewhat problematic. It is impossible to arrive at a general conclusion, as each play seems to have had a different purpose, and been aimed at a different target audience. Based on the material that exists from the Restoration period, there is little to suggest that audiences or critics lauded the plays, and this is supported by the fact that these plays did not enjoy much attention beyond their initial runs, if they were performed at all. However, these Scottish plays all show a sound knowledge of stage and theatre which is impressive considering that seventeenth-century Scotland is considered to have been a generally hostile environment for theatre. The fact that these Scottish plays existed at all can be considered a form of success.

A significant portion of this dissertation is based upon new research, and seventeenth-century Scottish drama is quite unchartered territory. As a result, the research questions for this project have served to narrow the focus to the theme of Restoration theatre, through the lens of comedy. There is still much to be gained from further study into the Scottish plays as comedies, but there are also new avenues for research and further questions that have constantly arisen throughout the research process for this dissertation. The field of seventeenth-century Scottish drama would therefore benefit from more research, especially that which might consider the portrayal of women; themes of marriage and family; further discussion of the political and religious climate in which these plays were being written; and the European influences upon these Scottish plays. As this growing list of potential areas for research in this field indicates, there is still much to be discovered within these seventeenth-century Scottish plays, and it is no longer acceptable to consider these plays as irrelevant or with little to offer. Instead, they must be acknowledged as part of Scottish dramatic tradition and the literary canon, and given the attention that this warrants them.

Appendix

Plot Summaries of the Scottish Plays

Marciano; or, The Discovery – William Clark (1663)

After the Duke of Florence is defeated in battle his general, Marciano, is captured by Borasco, the Captain of the rebels. Back in Florence, Arabella hears of the Duke's defeat and fears for Marciano's safety, regretting that she did not encourage his attempts to woo her. She decides to rescue him and tell him how she really feels. News of the defeat has also reached two men named Cassio and Leonardo, and while concerned, they are more worried about finding wives. They decide to visit Chrysolina and her sister, Marionetta, only to discover they are being courted by Pantaloni and Becabunga – two very rich young men. They are aided by Becabunga's ridiculous tutor, Manduco, who is pompous and overbearing and makes life difficult for the courting couples with his lack of tact. Despite the obvious flaws in Pantaloni and Becabunga, the girls encourage them as they know marriage to men of their calibre would meet the approval of their friends and family.

Meanwhile, Arabella has also been captured by Borasco, but as he has developed a romantic interest in her, she is given the freedom to go where she pleases as long as she returns each evening, enabling her to visit Marciano. When she receives the news that Marciano is to be executed, she and his friend, Strenuo, plot an escape plan.

Undeterred by the competition, Cassio and Leonardo intend to pursue the sisters, and come up with a plan to cause mischief. Becabunga proposes to Marionetta and is accepted, while Chrysolina asks for more time to think about Pantaloni's proposal. Cassio befriends Pantaloni and persuades him that Leonardo and Becabunga are conspiring to ruin Chrysolina's relationship with him in order that Leonardo can marry her instead. He persuades him to write a challenge to Becabunga, while Leonardo encourages Becabunga to prepare for such a fight.

Marciano is informed of the escape plan, but is unwilling to go without Arabella lest she be accused of aiding him and executed. She persuades him to go ahead and that with the freedom Borasco affords her, she will be able to wander away from the prison during the day and escape. He agrees, but after he is gone, his fears are realised and Arabella is sentenced to death.

Leonardo has to force Becabunga to go and meet Pantaloni's challenge, promising to step in and fight if it gets too much. Pantaloni is also terrified and neither is willing to

enter a duel. Cassio and Leonardo make them sign a document in they are forced to admit their cowardice in refusing to fight for the women. After Cassio and Leonardo leave, Becabunga and Pantaloni realise they have been tricked. A monologue by Borasco reveals that Arabella has somehow escaped prison, that the rebel armies have been defeated and that the Duke of Florence has returned to power. Marciano makes it to Pisa, where he gets word of the Duke's return and Arabella's escape and safe arrival in Florence.

Pantaloni and Becabunga try to plead their case with Marionetta and Chrysolina, but they are not interested, especially as Cassio and Leonardo have won them over. They become aggressive and claim they never loved the women. They vow to get revenge on Cassio and Leonardo and fetch Manduco to help them. However, when they see Cassio and Leonardo in the distance with Marionetta and Chrysolina they become terrified all over again and flee one by one.

The final scenes are of the characters from the tragic plot, with the comic characters merely observers of the action. The Duke of Florence returns with pomp and circumstance. Arabella accepts Marciano's proposal of marriage and he is promoted to Commissioner of his home region as a reward for his loyalty.

Tarugo's Wiles; or the Coffee-House – Thomas St Serf (1668)

In order to protect her from the temptations of the world that may ruin her honour, Don Patricio has decided to keep his sister, Liviana, house-bound and out of society. This is greeted with disgust from both herself and Patricio's fiancée, Sophronia, who refuses to let their wedding go ahead until Patricio realises his stupidity. As this technique is proving unsuccessful, she enlists the help of her relative, Don Horatio, who also happens to be in love with Liviana, and his friend Tarugo.

Tarugo visits Liviana disguised as a Tailor to establish whether she loves Horatio. It transpires that she does and would be willing to marry him. Patricio decides to arrange a wedding for her with a friend of his, Don Roderigo. While visiting a coffee-house, Tarugo is happened upon by some of the soldiers looking for him and so switches clothes with one of the servers in order to throw them off. When the danger has passed, Tarugo returns to Horatio and Sophronia, while various customers get caught up in arguments and cause a fight.

For the next phase of the plan, Tarugo disguises himself as a nobleman named Don Crisanto, and poses as an acquaintance of Patricio's old friend, the Marquess Villana. After

forging and sending a letter from the Marquess which requests that Patricio give Don Crisanto accommodation for a time, Tarugo makes his way to the house just as Patricio receives the letter. Although surprised, he welcomes Don Crisanto willingly. 'Don Crisanto' explains that he was cursed in childhood and cannot look upon a woman without experiencing painful and life-threatening fits. Patricio assures him that will not be an issue as his sister and her maid are in remote lodgings within the house.

As Don Crisanto, Tarugo takes Patricio out to the garden when they hear fighting in the street (staged by Horatio). While they run out to help, Horatio sneaks into the garden. Tarugo and Patricio return, and part ways for the night. Tarugo and Liviana greet Horatio, but Tarugo drops his sword causing Patricio and his servants to run out to see what the noise is. Horatio hides himself and Tarugo feigns a fit, claiming that (as Don Crisanto) he saw Liviana walking and fell from the balcony. They carry him away and leave Horatio and Liviana to declare their love to one another.

By morning, Patricio has informed his sister of his plans for her marriage to Roderigo, and horrified, she pleads with Sophronia to help her. Roderigo and Patricio arrive at the house and Patricio asks Sophronia to witness the marriage. She agrees, but asks if they will accompany her home for an errand first. In the meantime, Tarugo and Horatio smuggle Liviana out in disguise before her brother's return. Just as they are leaving, they meet Roderigo and Patricio returning. Horatio claims the disguised woman is his relative, and asks Patricio to help escort her to Sophronia's house. On their arrival, Sophronia allows time for Horatio and Liviana to hide in her closet, before she calls Patricio back to the house. She confronts him about his methods of preserving woman's honour, but he persists in his view, saying that unless he sees proof that it does not work, he will remain stubborn. Sophronia calls Horatio and Liviana out of the closet, revealing they are newly married. Patricio admits his error of judgement. Sophronia finally feels able to marry him and the play ends with a reminder that it is impossible to contain a woman's wit.

The Assembly – Archibald Pitcairne (1691)

Two young, Episcopalian men named Will and Frank are reunited at the opening of the play. Frank has been travelling and tells Will about the war in France, while Will sets the political scene in Scotland. Two newsmongers named Novell and Visioner enter the scene, but because Novell is a Jacobite and Visioner is a Presbyterian Whig, their news accounts

differ based on their bias. The newsmongers come to blows while Will and Frank leave in search of some female company.

Meanwhile, Master James Wordie, a young minister, is at the house of the Old Lady, reading the Bible with her and her daughter, Rachel. When she leaves the room, Rachel and Wordie discuss the fact that she is six months pregnant and their need to marry quickly in order to avoid a scandal. Wordie reveals that he has enlisted the help of Mr Solomon Cherrytrees, a fellow Presbyterian, to conduct the marriage. Solomon believes that if they act quickly, they will be able to spread the news that the couple were married in secret before Rachel became pregnant. Laura and Violetta, who are Rachel's cousins and who are under the guardianship of the Old Lady, invite her, Rachel and Wordie to join them at church. A conversation between Laura and Violetta reveals that they find the Presbyterian lifestyle too restrictive and are making plans to escape from under their aunt's authority.

The first introduction to the Committee – a group of Presbyterian leaders - shows the Moderator giving a long lecture. Lord Huffie is also introduced for the first time as a ridiculous character who wants to be part of the Committee and does what he can to keep on their good side. That evening, Lord Huffie is hassled at home by some Merchants who claim he owes them money. Most of the scenes involving the Committee contain little plot action, and instead serve to highlight the hypocrisy of the Presbyterian characters.

Will and Frank have found themselves at the same church as Violetta, Laura, Rachel and Wordie. Violetta has caught Will's eye during the service, and so he attempts to charm the Old Lady in order to gain her approval. He poses as a man of Presbyterian belief and manages to avoid raising the suspicions of the Old Lady. Will and Violetta arrange to meet at a separate location, where Will declares his love and says that he will marry Violetta in order to help her escape her aunt's house. She accepts this proposal willingly. Violetta masterminds a plan in which Will must appear at the Old Lady's house disguised as young Presbyterian preacher from Holland in need of hospitality.

Mr Solomon is visiting the Old Lady, who asks him to discuss communion with Laura and clarify her views on the subject. Solomon goes to her room and walks in while she is changing and rather than giving her privacy, he proceeds to lecture her on sexual conduct and morality, before unsuccessfully attempting to seduce her. Laura threatens to reveal his true, lecherous nature if he does not leave her alone. He does so, deciding that it is also prudent to tell her aunt that Laura will not need correction.

Violetta brings her sister to meet Will and Frank. Laura is won over by Frank, and makes him agree to join Will in the plot to help the girls escape. The action jumps to Lord Huffie's house where he has had a huntsman and two dogs arrested for not adhering to his hunting rules. A servant points out that the dogs are unable to follow established rules on hunting, but Huffie insists on their arrest anyway. Novell and Visioner make another appearance, they are still arguing over their theological and political differences, and the scene ends in violence.

Will and Frank arrive at the Old Lady's house in disguise. She welcomes them with open arms and, much to their dismay, invites one of them to deliver a small sermon. Laura saves the situation by suggesting the sermon should be taken from the writings of St Peter, as it is his holy day. At the mention of a Saint's day, the Old Lady faints. The young people escape the house and are married in secret. Mr Solomon arrives and tells the Old Lady that Rachel and Wordie should be married, revealing the truth about her pregnancy. Laura and Violetta return to their aunt's house with their new husbands, and the Old Lady is given more unpleasant news upon the revelation that the girls deceived her and have married Episcopalians, for whom she has a particular distaste.

The play ends with another Committee meeting, in which a Captain brings a letter from the King expressing his wish to reinforce the authority of the crown over the church. The Presbyterian committee take issue with this and promise that they will not submit to such a ruling. They exit singing an excerpt from Psalm 109 which can be interpreted as condemnation of the King:

> *Set Thou the wicked over him*
> *And upon his ryght hand*
> *Give Thou his Cruel Enimie,*
> *E'n Satan, leave to stand.*
> *And when be The(e) he shall be judgd,*
> *Let him Condemned be*
> *And let his prayar be turned to sin,*
> *When he shall call on Thee.* (Act 5.3, ll.201-208)

Bibliography

Primary Texts:

Anon., *Philotus*, in *The Mercat Anthology of Early Scottish Literature 1375-1707*, ed. by R.D.S Jack and P.A.T Rozendaal (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 2008), pp.390-432.

Anon., *The Stage Acquitted. Being a Full Answer to Mr Collier, and the Other Enemies of the Drama*, with Prefatory Notes by Yuji Kaneko (London: Routledge, 1996).

Behn, A., *The Amorous Prince*, in *The Works of Aphra Behn Volume 5: The Plays 1671-1677*, ed. by Janet Todd (London: William Pickering, 1996), pp.83-156.

Clark, W., *Marciano; or The Discovery* (Edinburgh: W.H. Logan, 1871), in *Early English Books Online* <https://historicaltexts.jisc.ac.uk> [accessed September 2016].

——— *The grand Tryal: or, Poetical Exercitations on the Book of Job* (Edinburgh: Andrew Anderson, 1685), in *Early English Books Online* <https://historicaltexts.jisc.ac.uk> [accessed April 2017].

Collier, J., *A Short View of the Immorality, and Profaneness of the English Stage,* with Prefatory Notes by Yuji Keneko (London: Routledge, 1996).

Congreve, W., *Amendments of Mr. Collier's False and Imperfect Citations*, with Prefatory Notes by Yuji Kaneko (London: Routledge, 1996).

Crowne, J., *Sir Courtly Nice: or, It Cannot Be* (London: R. Wellington, 1703), in *Early English Books Online* <https://historicaltexts.jisc.ac.uk> [accessed March 2017].

Howard, R., *The Committee; or, The Faithful Irishman* (London: printed for Jacob Tonson, 1735), in *Early English Books Online* <https://historicaltexts.jisc.ac.uk> [accessed April 2017].

Jonson, B., *Epicene*, in *The Alchemist and Other Plays*, ed. by Gordon Campbell (Oxford: Oxford World Classics, 2008), pp.119-210.

Lindsay, D., *Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis,* ed. by Roderick Lyall (Edinburgh: Canongate Classics, 1989).

Pepys, S., '15 October 1667', in *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*: *Complete Edition*, ed. by Steven Algieri (Kindle Edition: ebookworms.co.uk, 2011).

Pitcairne, A., *The Assembly*, ed. by Terence Tobin (Indiana: Purdue University Studies, 1972).

Pitcairne, A., *The Phanaticks (The Assembly),* ed. by John MacQueen (Edinburgh: Scottish Text Society, 2012).

St. Serf, T., *Tarugo's Wiles; or, the coffee-house* (Edinburgh: Henry Herringman, 1668), in *Early English Books Online* <https://historicaltexts.jisc.ac.uk > [accessed September 2016].

Wycherley, W., *The Country Wife,* ed. by John Dixon Hunt (London: Ernest Benn Ltd, 1973).

Secondary Texts:

Anchor, R., 'Bakhtin's Truths of Laughter', *CLIO,* 14:3 (1985), 237-257.

Bakhtin, M., *Rabelais and His World,* trans. by Helene Iswolsky (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984).

Baxter, J.R., 'Philotus – a Play of the Scottish Renaissance' (Unpublished Distance Taught MPhil: University of Glasgow, 1997).

Bradford Hughes, C., 'Introduction', in *John Crowne's Sir Courtly Nice: A Critical Edition* (The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1966), pp.9-54.

Brown, I., 'Public and Private Performance: 1650-1800', in *The Edinburgh Companion to Scottish Drama,* ed. by Ian Brown (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011), pp.22-40.

——— *Scottish Theatre: Diversity, Language, Continuity* (Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi B.V., 2013).

Butler, M., 'Ben Jonson's Catholicism', *The Ben Johnson Journal,* 19:2 (2012), 190-216.

Cameron, A., 'Theatre in Scotland 1660-1800', in *The History of Scottish Literature: Volume 2 1660-1800,* ed. by Andrew Hook (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1987), pp.191-208.

Canfield, J.D., *Tricksters and Estates: On the Ideology of Restoration Comedy* (Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1997).

——— 'Restoration Comedy', in *A Companion to Restoration Comedy,* ed. by Susan J. Owen (Oxford: Blackwell, 2013), pp.211-227.

Carpenter, S., 'Scottish Drama Until 1650', in *The Edinburgh Companion to Scottish Drama,* ed. by Ian Brown (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011), pp.6-21.

Corbett, J., *Sir David Lyndsay's A Satire of the Three Estates* (Glasgow: ASLS, 2009).

Curtin, A., 'Dumb Reading: The Noise of the Mute in Ben Jonson's *Epicene*', *Comparative Drama*, 43:1 (2009), 45-62.

Dynes, W.R., 'The Trickster Figure in Jacobean City Comedy', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 33:2 (1993), 365-384.

Evans, J.E. and D. Boebel, *Broken Boundaries: Women and Feminism in Restoration Drama* ed. by Katherine Quinsey (Boulder, CO: The University Press of Kentucky, 1996).

Eyler, C.M., 'Drama as a Political Instrument (1679-1685)', *Peabody Journal of Education*, 42:5 (1965), 259-270.

Findlay, B., 'Beginnings to 1700', in *A History of the Scottish Theatre,* ed. by Bill Findlay (Edinburgh: Polygon, 1997), pp.1-79.

Gale, R., 'William Clerke's *Marciano* and Restoration Scotland', *Restoration and Eighteenth Century Theatre Research*, 8:2 (1983), 57-72.

Gallagher, K., 'Thomas St Serf — Biography', in *Mercurius Caledonius – Thomas St. Serf,* <https://mercuriuscaledonius.com/2015/09/21/thomas-st-serf-biography> [accessed Janurary 2017].

Gelineau, D., '*The Country Wife*, Dance of the Cuckolds,' *Comparative Drama,* 48:3 (2014), 277-330.

Gill, C. ed., *Theatre and Culture in Early Modern England, 1650-1737: from Leviathan to Licensing Act* (Surrey: Ashgate, 2010).

Guerrini, A., 'Pitcairne, Archibald (1652-1713)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004) <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/view/article/22320> [accessed June 2017].

Harol, C., '1688: Literature, Politics and the Long Restoration', *Restoration: Studies in English Literary Culture, 1660-1700,* 39:1 (2015), 5-16.

Heilman, R.B., 'Some Fops and Some Versions of Foppery', *ELH*, 49:2 (1982), 363-395.

Henderson, F., 'Clarke, Sir William (1623/4–1666)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography,* (Oxford University Press, 2004) <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/view/article/5536> [accessed September 2017].

Hume, R.D., ‘Theory of Comedy in the Restoration’ *Modern Philology*, 70:4 (1973), 302-318.

——— ‘Jeremy Collier and the Future of London Theatre in 1698’, *Modern Philology*, 96:4 (1999), 480-511.

Hyland, P., ‘The Performance of Disguise’, *Early Theatre*, 5:1 (2002), 77-83.

Jack, R.D.S., ‘Introduction: Where Stands Scottish Literature Now?’, in *The Mercat Anthology of Early Scottish Literature 1375-1707*, ed. by R.D.S Jack and P.A.T Rozendaal (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 2008), pp.vii-xxxix.

Jackson, C., *Restoration Scotland: 1660-1690: Royalist Politics, Religion and Ideas* (London: Boydell Press, 2002).

——— ‘Mackenzie, Sir George, of Rosehaugh (1636/1638–1691)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2007) <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/view/article/17579> [accessed September 2017].

Langhans, E.A., ‘The Post-1660 Theatre as Performance Spaces’, in *A Companion to Restoration Drama*, ed. by Susan J. Owen (Oxford: Blackwell, 2013), pp.3-18.

Leggat, A., *English Stage Comedy 1490-1990: Five Centuries of a Genre* (London: Routledge, 1998).

Logan, W.H., ‘Introductory Notice’, in William Clark, *Marciano; or The Discovery* (Edinburgh: W.H. Logan, 1871), pp.iii-xvi.

Love, H., ‘Who Were the Restoration Audience?’, *The Yearbook of English Studies*, 10 (1980), 21-44.

MacIntosh, G.H., ‘Leslie, John, Duke of Rothes (c.1630-1681)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004) <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/view/article/16495> [accessed September 2017].

——— *The Scottish Parliament Under Charles II, 1660-1685* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007).

MacQueen, J., ‘Introduction’, in *The Phanaticks*, ed. by John MacQueen (Edinburgh: Scottish Text Society, 2012), pp.ix-lxxi.

Maguire, N., *Regicide and Restoration*: *English Tragicomedy, 1660-1671* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

Maidment, J. and W.H. Logan, eds., 'Prefatory Memoir', in *The Dramatic Works of John Crowne Volume 1*(Edinburgh: William Paterson, 1873/4), pp.i-xviii.

McDiarmid, M.P., '*Philotus:* A Play of the Scottish Renaissance', *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, 3:3 (1967), 223-235.

McFarlane, I.D., 'George Buchanan and European Humanism', *The Yearbook of English Studies*, 15 Anglo-French Literary Relations Special (1985), 33-47.

McGavin, J.J., *Theatricality and Narrative in Medieval and Early Modern Scotland* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007).

Merchant, W.M., *Comedy* (London: Methuen, 1972).

Miles, D., 'Morals of the Restoration', *The Sewanee Review*, 24:1 (1916), 105-114.

Mill, A.J., *Mediaeval Plays in Scotland* (New York: Benjamin Blom, 1969).

Miller, J., *The Restoration and the England of Charles II*, 2nd edn (New York: Longman, 1997).

Neman, B.S., 'Crowne, John (*bap.* 1641, *d.* 1712)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, 2004) <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/view/article/6832> [accessed August 2017].

Oliver, K.M., '"I will write Whore with this Penknife in your Face": Female Amatory Letters, the Body, and Violence in Wycherley's *The Country Wife*', *Restoration: Studies in English Literary Culture 1660-1700*, 38:1 (2014), 41-60.

Olson, E., *The Theory of Comedy* (London: Indiana University Press, 1968).

Owen, S.J., *Perspectives on Restoration Drama* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002).

——— 'Restoration Drama and Politics: An Overview', in *A Companion to Restoration Drama*, ed. by Susan J. Owens (Oxford: Blackwell, 2013), pp.126-139.

Prieto-Pablos, J.A., 'Coffee-Houses and Restoration Drama', in *Theatre and Culture in Early Modern England 1650-1737: From Leviathan to Licensing Act*, ed. by Catie Gill (Surrey: Ashgate, 2010), pp.51-74.

Reid, D., 'Introduction', in *The Party-Coloured Mind* (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1982), pp.1-16.

——— ‘Rule and Misrule in David Lindsay’s *Thrie Estaitis* and Pitcairne’s *Assembly*’, *Scottish Literary Journal*, 11:2 (1984), 5-24.

Riera, J.B., ‘The Adaptation of Seventeenth-Century Spanish Drama to the English Stage During the Restoration Period: The Case of Calderón’, in *Theatre and Culture in Early Modern England 1650-1737: From Leviathan to Licensing Act*, ed. by Catie Gill (Surrey: Ashgate, 2010), pp.107-118.

Roberts. D., *Restoration Plays and Players: An Introduction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

Sanchez, R., ‘“Things like truths, well feigned”: Mimesis and Secrecy in Ben Johnson’s *Epicoene*’, *Comparative Drama*, 40:3 (2006), 313-336.

Sanders, J., ‘Carlell, Lodowick (1601/2–1675)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004) <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/view/article/4669> [accessed September 2017].

Scouten, A.H., and Robert D. Hume, ‘“Restoration Comedy” and Its Audiences’, *The Yearbook of English Studies*, 10 (1980), 45-69.

Scullion, A., ‘“Forget Scotland”: Plays by Scots on the London Stage, 1667-1715’, *Comparative Drama*, 31:1 (1997), 105-128.

Shephard, D., ed., *Bakhtin: Carnival and Other Subjects: Selected Papers from the Fifth International Bakhtin Conference, University of Manchester, July 1991* (Atlanta: Rodopi, 1993).

Solomon, D., *Prologues and Epilogues of Restoration Theatre: Gender and Comedy, Performance and Print* (Plymouth, UK: University of Delaware Press, 2013).

Speck, W.A., ‘James II and VII (1633–1701)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2009) <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/view/article/14593> [accessed August 2017].

Staves, S., ‘A Few Kind Words for the Fop’, *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 22:3 (1982), 413-428.

Stott, A., *Comedy*, 2nd edn (Oxford: Routledge, 2014).

Summers, M., ed., *Restoration Comedies: The Parsons Wedding, The London Cuckolds, & Sir Courtly Nice, or It Cannot Be* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1922) pp.xii-xlvi.

Symonds, D.A., ‘Death, Birth and Marriage in Early Modern Scotland’, in *A History of Everyday Life in Scotland 1600-1800*, ed. by Elizabeth A. Foyster and Christopher Whatley (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009), pp.83-107.

Symons, J., ‘Restoration Comedy (Reconsiderations II)’, *The Kenyon Review*, 7:2 (1945), 185-197.

Thouret, C., ‘Between Jest and Earnest: Ironical Defenses of Theatre in Seventeenth-century England and France’, *Restoration and Eighteenth Century Theatre Research*, 29:1 (2014), 35-55.

Tobin, T., ‘Popular Entertainment in Seventeenth Century Scotland’, *Theatre Notebook*, 23:1 (1968), 46-54.

——— ‘Plays Presented in Scotland 1660-1700’, *Restoration and Eighteenth Century Theatre Research*, 12:1 (1973), 51-53 and concluded on 59.

——— *Plays by Scots, 1660-1800* (Iowa: University of Iowa Press, 1974).

Weber, H., ‘Horner and his “Women of Honour”: The Dinner Party in *The Country Wife*’, *Modern Language Quarterly*, 43:2 (1982), 107-120.

Wedgewood, C.V., ‘Anglo-Scottish Relations, 1603-40’, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 32 (1950), 31-48.

White, A.F., *John Crowne: His Life and Dramatic Works* (Cleveland: Western Reserve University Press, 1922).

Whiting, G.W., ‘Political Satire in London Stage Plays, 1680-83’, *Modern Philology*, 28:1 (1930), 29-43.