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Preface

To assess the attitude to sentimentality of such an active person as Garrick, who was prominent in many related fields, requires extensive research. The preparations for this study were broad in scope without being intensive in any one of Garrick's fields of endeavour. I have treated Garrick as a letter writer, as an author of prologues and epilogues, as an essayist, as a theatrical manager, and as author, adapter, and collaborator. None of these treatments, however, has been allowed to become either independent or exhaustive. Each activity of Garrick's has been considered only to the degree that it casts light on his position regarding sentimentality.

I have received, in addition to generous and understanding aid from my supervisor John Prudhoe, cooperation and assistance from The University of Edinburgh Library, The National Library of Scotland, The Edinburgh Public Library, The Victoria and Albert Museum, The British Museum, The University of Texas Library, The Texas A & M Library, and The Folger Shakespeare Library. I have quoted from the Forster-Dyce Manuscript Collection of Garrick Correspondence with the permission of The Victoria and Albert Museum, and owe thanks to The Folger Shakespeare Library for photostatic reproductions of paintings and prints in this work.
Chapter I

Backgrounds and Introduction

In the time of Ben Jonson a character possessing "humours", that is, basic individual eccentricities, was a subject for satire. By the end of the eighteenth century William Blake was extolling the magnificence of the "individual energy". Between the times of these two authors, a revolution had taken place in the concepts relating the individual to his society.

Through the Restoration period, he who differed from the accepted norm was ridiculed. Beginning with the eighteenth century this ridicule attenuated progressively until it became, at the opposite extreme, admiration. This revolution in thought laid the basis for sentimentalism which became the dominant new strain in the literature of that century. This movement has been long recognised but only recently analyzed competently. Twentieth century scholars have traced, though admittedly with some bickering and confusion, this movement through the various literary works of the time, particularly novels and plays.

David Garrick had such stature in this period, and was so inextricably connected with other outstanding figures, that he could not be ignored. Surprisingly, though, no conscious attempt has been made to assess his position in regard to this movement. The sound works on Garrick have been limited in approach to either
the purely biographical, or concerned with him strictly as an actor, a personality, or a dramatist. Thus the attitude of the most powerful figure in English Drama for thirty years to the most significant contemporary changes drama was undergoing has been left to surmise or conclusions based on insufficient evidence.

Garrick ruled the theatre for twenty-nine seasons in a more absolute manner than it has ever been ruled before or is likely to be in the future. After the Licensing Act of 1737 only the theatres-royal of Drury Lane and Covent Garden were allowed patents to produce plays during the season from September to April. Although Garrick was joint-patentee with James Lacey, Lacey allowed him a free hand in all negotiations with actors, the choosing of plays, and the running of the actual stage business. Even if the theatres had been equal in importance, Garrick's personal will would have decided fifty-per cent of the London productions for twenty-nine seasons. The theatres, however, were far from equal. Genest echoed the sentiment of majority opinion when he said: "Rich had, like his father, for many years done everything in his power to debauch the public taste—-he relied on his Pantomimes and despised the Actors—his company in consequence was often very weak; and an author for that reason seldom brought a new play to Rich if he could get it
acted at the other theatre." Garrick was judge, then, of much more than half of the output of contemporary dramatists.

In such a position of dominance, it is surprising that any man could have been as moderate in enforcing his will. He put up with extreme cavilling from minor writers and often submitted a play, about which he was in doubt, to an impartial critic for an opinion. He had even more reason to be dogmatic about acting than criticism, for even his severest critics allowed him superiority in that field; yet when he took Thomas King to his home to show him how Lord Ogleby should be acted, and realized that King's interpretation was different from his own, he let him act it as he chose. This is more remarkable when it is noted that this was King's first major role. His acting in the part was a success, and Garrick's only show of feeling was a reminiscence after he retired that he would have liked to have shown the audiences his version of Lord Ogleby. A similar situation occurred during rehearsals of Every Man in His Humour. Woodward's conception of Boabadjl differed from Garrick's, and the manager bowed to the perception of this member of his company. Genest seems to have been quite accurate when he stated that, "Order, decency, and decorum were the first objects which Garrick as Manager kept constantly in his eye---" It was only in acting that Garrick was spectacular, and this
aspect of his career deserves only passing notice here. It has been thoroughly treated in other works. Garrick had too much respect for the acting profession to want to see drama prostituted; yet he had such a keen business eye that he would not annoy his patrons by unmoded zeal in any direction. He gave them music, spectacle, and even Harlequin to keep Drury Lane profitable. At the same time he produced Shakespeare, representative older drama, and such of the contemporary output that was, in his opinion, worth encouraging. It is his attitude toward the new drama that is the first part of this enquiry.

The first delusion to be dispensed with, is that he produced little contemporary material. "Thus, before 1760 twenty-seven new plays and seventeen important revivals were produced; while after 1760 forty-eight new plays and only eight important revivals are found," More than twice as many new plays appeared at Drury Lane under his management, than at Covent Garden over the same span of years.

One other preliminary point should also be clarified. Both Thomas Davies' *Life of Garrick* and Macqueen-Pope's *Theatre-Royal, Drury Lane* perpetuate the myth that Garrick produced the first English sentimental comedy when he presented Hugh Kelly's *False Delicacy* in 1768. Any serious reader in the period would know that he was robbed of this doubtful honour by Colley Cibber,
Sir John Vanbrugh, and Sir Richard Steele over half a century be-
fore.

It would be wrong to anticipate revelations in Garrick's
critical opinions. Dougal MacMillan sums up his excellent
article, "Garrick as Critic", by saying that with all his ex-
cellence as an actor and practical theatre man, Garrick was
hardly a critic. His critical opinions are not of interest
and value in themselves, but only as they were the guide to
thirty years of English drama. His opinions, certainly, are
not to be over-revered because of Garrick's position; yet their
influence should be carefully noted. Even less should Garrick's
position make one disregard his opinions as being those of a
player and not a scholar. He read widely in the works of drama-
tists of all periods and owned the largest library of dramatic
texts (2,687 volumes) in England. George Steevens and Edward
Capell, among other critics of note, respected and often asked
for his thoughts concerning early plays. It has been fashionable
to remember Garrick as he who butchered Shakespeare without
remembering that one of the most atrocious alterations was made
by the Professor of Poetry at Oxford in 1759, and that Dr.
Johnson, despite his occasional failure to appreciate Shakes-
perian revivals, said to Stockdale, "he (Garrick) deserves every-
thing he has aquired for having seized the very soul of Shakes-
peare; for having embodied it in himself; and for having extended
Garrick's background is middle-class. He had neither the affluence of Cumberland nor the poverty of Murphy, Johnson, or Goldsmith. Although Dr. Johnson said of him that "he began the world with a great hunger for money; the son of a half-pay officer, bred in a family whose study was to make fourpence do as much as others made fourpence-halfpenny do," he had inherited a thousand pounds from his uncle and was engaged in a prosperous wine business until he deserted it to exercise his passion for the theatre. This passion is evidenced almost ad nauseam by youthful stories of his performing The Recruiting Officer in Lichfield and of his being put on the dinner table to recite speeches in the home of his uncle in Lisbon. His education, although sound enough, including one year under Dr. Johnson, was hardly the equal of the Westminster and Oxford background of Cumberland.

His London life sounds like that of a typical sentimental hero. He lived with the lusty Peg Woffington for a time, and perhaps also with Mrs. Giber; but upon his marriage he reformed and never left his wife for so long as twenty-four hours. From his provincial background one would deduce that he would be among the least likely to condone a licentious stage; yet the pioneer of natural acting would hardly be satisfied with the vapid, colourless characters so common in sentimental
drama. Garrick's choice was never the easy one of the dramatist who cared nothing for morals, nor of the moralist who cared little for the drama. He would have liked his Restoration plays reformed without being emasculated. As a moderate he can be attacked by the violent vanguard of both factions.

Sentimental comedy began as a distinct form in the late seventeenth century. During most of the following century it was a subject of contention. After Sheridan the sentimental became the norm of contemporary comedy in England until late into the nineteenth century. It still exists as the "family play" in the theatre today. One must bear in mind that, for purposes of period comparison, the cinema audiences must be considered as part of the twentieth century audience, or an unfair impression will be given concerning the sophistication of twentieth century audiences. Eighteenth century theatre had to satisfy everyone who had the leisure, the wherewithal, and the inclination to sit through a "performance". The code of Will Hay, formed not by any government instigation but by request of the American film producers, is in fact a manifesto of sentimentality. It ensures that the cinematic villain is always punished, that virtue always triumphs over vice, and that vice is always painted with an unpleasant countenance. This shows that the middle-class morality that produced sentimental comedy is a
live force, not something that must be reconstructed from the pages of social histories.

To bring the subject of sentimentality into proper focus, the drama prior to Garrick's period of management must be examined. It naturally falls into two divisions, Restoration drama and early sentimental drama.

It is not enough to say that Restoration drama was the natural reaction of a society that had had its most innocent pleasures curtailed under the Puritan rule of Cromwell and his saints. Professor Heldt admits this general relaxing of restraint and goes further: "Still, the impetus of the anti-puritanical reaction must not be overrated. For the people at large had no great part in it; if it had been otherwise, England could hardly have risen out of so deep a slough. But on the whole the people were satisfied to have their maypoles and plum pudding restored to them; and the depth of degradation was restricted to those who had suffered most during the Commonwealth: the Court-party. And even among their numbers there were some few who were free from the general taint; the names of Clarendon and Evelyn may be mentioned here. But for the greater part Whitehall and its immediate surroundings presented a revolting spectacle, the like of which has seldom been witnessed in Europe." So Restoration drama, as the hackneyed phrase goes, held the mirror to Charles II's court revels and intrigues. Neither the models nor the
audience remained static long. Charles II died at the age of fifty-five and William and Mary were hardly appropriate leaders of Bachanalian soirees.

This type of drama with its accent on wit, indecency, immorality, and immodesty became a cogent force only to those remaining cavaliers of Charles II's stamp. To the rest of society it was either artificial, esoteric, or downright wicked. Those who considered it wicked were its most outspoken opponents and a short calendar of their activities will show the extent of their attacks.

1. "In 1689 William (III) sent a circular letter to all the bishops, commanding them to preach against such forms of immorality as dicing, swearing, drinking, and the keeping of courtesans, and earnestly exhorting them to exercise with the utmost vigour their ecclesiastical prerogative, wherever it touched questions of morality."

2. Tillotson called the plays of his day (perhaps prior to 1690) "intolerable, and not fit to be permitted in a civilised, much less in a Christian nation."

3. In 1691 the Religious Societies became the Societies
10.

for the Reformation of Manners.

4. In 1691 James Wright in his Country Conversation protested against the contemporary stage.

5. Sir Richard Blackmore in 1695 with his preface to the epic Prince Arthur took a position similar to Wright.

6. In 1698 Queen Anne published a Royal Proclamation "for preventing and punishing Immorality and Prophaneness."

7. Two weeks after this proclamation appeared "A Short View of the Immorality and Prophaneness of the English Stage, together with the Sense of Antiquity upon the Argument" by Jeremy Collier.

No Restoration dramatists or spokesmen for them ever made an adequate defence against the "Short View". Dryden, probably the wisest, admitted the error of his ways. Krutch says that "he (Collier) produced Sentimental Comedy not more than Rousseau produced the French Revolution; but like Rousseau he made a movement articulate."

The close connection that the theatre had enjoyed with the Court came to a close with the Glorious Revolution, and the necessity of satisfying a general theatre-going public was born. Attempting to satisfy a court may be a precarious thing, becau
the whims of monarchs are legend; but the caprice of the individual can never match the multiplied caprice latent in the general public. The theatre in the eighteenth century was not universal, but it was fashionable for both the nobility and the public at large.

Its being fashionable was no doubt both a hindrance and a help to the managers trying to enlarge the appeal of the drama. No doubt parties that went to the theatre to be seen, rather than to see, to originate bon mots rather than receive them, did not make for a critically alert audience. But the business man or fop who was brought to the theatre, by whatever cause, could neglect the drama less as a force than he who hardly knew of its existence.

"The interest in drama now became more widespread. A new trading class had arisen and was taking its place alongside the older aristocracy. The court no longer formed the entire focus of public attention, and with this fundamental alteration from Stuart days, numerous changes are to be witnessed in the theatre and in the plays written for the theatre. The whole of sentimentalism and of the bourgeois tragedy is, of course, to be associated with the rise of the middle classes---"11. Both Puritanism and Merchantilism were freeing the individual from old responsibilities and fixing approval upon individual aggressiveness and
personal integrity. Unlike the cavalier group, the middle class had nothing to fear from non-conformity in any field and saw no reason to stigmatise eccentricities.

One of the distinguishing elements of sentimental drama is supposed to be the happy ending. Although it is true that sentimental comedy did emphasise the moral close, comedy of all periods has had it. What changed was not a dramatic technique, but an audience interpretation of what constitutes a moral character. One of the points of Collier’s Short View was that Restoration dramatists were rewarding vice in their characters. Professor Heldt has dealt with this accusation in his article, and has concluded that “If it is clear to us that Ranger, Mirabel, Heartfree, Sir Harry Wildair are characters which no young spark in the pit, to put it mildly, need be ashamed to resemble, then Collier’s assertion that vicious persons are rewarded at once falls to the ground. Considered in the light of, not late 17th century morality, but that of a certain part of 17th century society, by whom and for whom these plays were written, the characters mentioned just now are, to say the least, not immoral. And there can be no objection to their being rewarded in the end. In Restoration comedy the Good are rewarded and the Wicked are punished though their notions of good and bad are
The notable failure of all of the moralistic attacks on Restoration comedy was their failure to note the difference between matter that was indecent and offensive to all but the most abandoned, and matter that was immoral only to the professional moralist or the particularly sensitive. The primary difference between eighteenth century comedy and that of the Restoration lies in the handling of the second of these. Dramatists writing in the eighteenth century, who would flagrantly violate generally-held moral beliefs, would have been insulting their patron no less than if Wycherly had tried to preach against marital infidelity while Charles II sat in the audience. Drama requires a larger patronage than any other literary form for its very existence. It demands the patronage of either a limited group of powerful, wealthy people (an aristocracy), or the support of society whose members are neither wealthy nor powerful individually, but are so en masse.

It has been seen that the earlier dramatists ridiculed specific types representing social evil because they felt, like Pope, that general satire was usually futile. The justification of comedy had been, since Elizabethan times, that it exposed evil to ridicule. Regardless of the degree to which the specific author actually assumed the responsibility of this moral purpose,
it was the justification for his writing. At the turn of the century the influence of Descartes and Hobbes' thoughts on laughter became strong. They had concluded that laughter caused by ridicule was the product of base feelings, spleen or pride.

The response to this attack against laughter induced by satire took two directions, each of which can be represented by one of the authors of The Spectator. Addison joined with Hobbes in attacking this type of laughter but praised what he called "amiable laughter." That a person could laugh at the "humours" of a character and remain amiable toward him was a new concept. It became the hallmark of satire in The Spectator. Sir Roger de Coverly's singularities aroused laughter, but as Spectator No. 2 pointed out, his singularities proceeded from his good sense. Fielding and Sterne later used this same kind of satire in their novels. It is not so much the basic eccentricities, but instead the situations arising from those eccentricities that form the humour of Tom Jones and Tristram Shandy.

Sir Richard Steele, the co-author of the Spectator, turned his back on laughter altogether, and formulated his idea of a joy too profound for laughter as the basis for comedy. This idea, in spite of being villified by the criticism of John Dennis, was received so enthusiastically by portions of the audiences that
it was obvious that it satisfied an existing, growing demand. Sentimentality may be defined as an emphasis on, and an admiration for, a highly self-conscious benevolence. The identifying characteristics of sentimental comedy soon became painfully sensitive characters who suffered greatly before poetic justice brought them the happiness they were assured by the sentimental code. For these noble characters to catch sufficiently at the heatstrings of an audience, it was necessary for them to soliloquize frequently concerning the sufferings to which their delicate natures were being subjected. This had the adverse effect of slowing down the pace of the comedy, sometimes to a near standstill. The most valid objection to the form was that its characters were languid and devoid of spirit, that they often stepped out of character to deliver moral pronouncements, and that they were designed from an abstract model of purity bearing little relation to reality. Its strength lay in the fact that it was appealing to an age which prided itself on refinement and to an unsophisticated middle-class which respected virtue and welcomed appeals to its emotions.

Granting that sentimentality had its origins in extremely early times, there is little doubt that Colley Cibber's Love's Last Shift was the first sentimental comedy. It was first produced in January, 1696, and has in it introspection, and an appeal to the awakening humanism of the age. Cibber painted
not only the nights of debauchery, but also filled in the remorseful mornings-after. Loveless, the rake, had deserted his wife, Amanda, to lead a profligate life. Through the contrivance of friends, his wife is introduced to him as a tart; he sleeps with her and awakens to a sense of shame at the defilement he has practised. Amanda, of course, forgives him. Davies excels himself in his description of the effect this first sentimental comedy had on its audience. "The Joy of unexpected reconciliation, from Loveless's remorse and penitence, spread such an uncommon rapture of pleasure in the audience, that never were spectators more happy in easing their minds by uncommon and repeated plaudits. The honest tears, shed by the audience at this interview, conveyed a strong reproach to our licentious poets, and was to Cibber the highest mark of honour."18.

The central situation in Cibber's most important comedies is always the same. There are differences of detail but the problem, the reconciliation of a couple who have drifted apart, and the solution, to forgive and forget, do not change. This is Cibber's principal contribution to sentimental comedy.19.

Colley Cibber was such a complex person that critics have since debated whether his sentimentality was the result of business acumen or sincere feeling. At any rate his plays were
far from being pure representatives of the form which was later to dominate the stage. He had such a shrewd eye for the box-office, that he added sufficient low humour and luscious dialogue to make his works palatable to anachronistic cavaliers and hypocritical puritans.

Chronologically the next sentimental comedy was Vanbrugh's *Aesop* produced in 1697. The prologue indicates its nature.

"Gallants! We never yet produced a play
With greater fear than this we act today;
Barren of all the graces of the stage,
Barren of all that entertains this age,
No hero, no romance, no plot, no show,
No rape, no bawdy, no intrigue, no beau;
There's nothing, in't with which we used to please ye:
With downright dull instructions we're to tease ye:
The stage turns pulpit and the world's so fickle,
The playhouse in a whim turns conventicle."²⁰

The plot concerns the efforts of Euphonia to evade the old husband, her father, Learchus, has chosen for her and to marry instead the handsome gallant, Doramee. This was an adaptation of Beusalut's *Esope a la Ville*, and Waterhouse points out that most of the sentiment came from the French original.²¹

Sir Richard Steele began his career as a playwright with
The Funeral; or, Grief-la-Mode in 1701. His sentimentality, although present in this slight work revolving around a man pretending to be dead in order to see through the sham of those around him, was mixed with, and dominated by, elements of more traditional types of comedy. In 1703 was produced his The Lying Lover; or, The Ladies Friendship which was profoundly sentimental and toward the end almost tragic. This comedy was ahead of its time and gained only limited success. Steele collaborated with Addison on his next comedy, The Tender Husband, and the result was on the whole non-sentimental. Not until 1722 did Steele's sentimental masterpiece appear. In that year was produced The Conscious Lovers, a high water mark of sentimentality. This was a huge success and was original except for the parts of Tom and Phillis with which Cibber helped. These two comic parts relieved the dullness of the rest of the play and became extremely popular. Thomas Wilkes described this addition in his discussion of the play. "Sir Richard Steele, who was certainly the chastest of our Comic Writers, was resolved, in The Conscious Lovers, to give a pure specimen of genteel Comedy; to raise an elegant and correct edifice, wherein none of those irregular pilasters, which he called the disgrace of the Drama, should be seen; no characters beneath those of polite life. When he read this piece to the
managers, they dozed over the perusal, and in the end unanimously condemned it, as being too moral and serious for an English audience, and having in it not one laughing line.' Gibber put in Tom and Fallow and it played.}\(^{22}\).

Professor Waterhouse calls this a landmark in English drama. The Lying Lover, because of its piety, failed to become popular in 1703; yet the even more didactic play, The Conscious Lovers, enjoyed tremendous success in 1722. During the intervening twenty years the public had grown strongly in favour of sentimentality.\(^{23}\).

By using the catalogue of early eighteenth century plays compiled by Barnbaum and amending it, one can arrive at an approximation of the number of sentimental comedies appearing at any given time. Before 1710 were produced Gibber's Love's Last Shift and The Lady's Last Stake, Steele's The Lying Lover, Estcourt's The Fair Example, and Mrs. Centlivre's The Cenodox and The Bassett-Table. After these, but before 1726, were Steele's The Conscious Lovers, Addison's The Drummer, the Gibber-Vanbrugh The Provok'd Husband, Charles Johnson's The Masquerade, Taverner's The Artful Wife, and Shadwell's Irish Hospitality. From this time until Garrick assumed the management at Drury Lane, eight more were produced, Lillo's Silvia, Theophilous Gibber's The Lover, Kelly's The Married Philosopher, Popple's
The Lady's Revenge and The Double Deceit, Jacob's The Prodigal Reform'd, Davies' Pamela, and James Miller's Art and Nature. Although the classification of some of these items is highly controversial, one can get from this list a picture of approximately twenty predominately sentimental comedies appearing over a span of fifty years. This was enough to make the genre no longer a novelty, but a force with which to be contended. It was not, however, enough to dominate the stage at this time.

Garrick began his managerial career at a time when the future of comedy seemed in doubt, at a time when the sentimental and traditional types were vying for leadership.

There are several explanations for the heterogeneous nature of theatrical representations through the mid-eighteenth century. One is, of course, that on an ideological plane the forces of humanism and romanticism were to challenge seriously the strongholds of absolutism and privilege. Another is that there was a gulf between dramatic theory and practice, resulting in a certain confusion on the part of most comic dramatists. This led to the comedies of mixed nature, such as Hugh Kelly's. A third more direct influence lay in the large mixed audiences of the time. London audiences combined such diverse elements as gentlemen beaux, merchant princes, penniless writers, critics, impressionable apprentices, fashionable ladies, and bawds. The entire lower floors and boxes were a contrast to the servants and
and representatives of the lower classes in the upper gallery.

The size and nature of the audiences can be partially realized by noting the tremendous popularity of the theatre. Arthur Murphy makes two telling remarks on this subject in his biography of Garrick. He says that theatres engrossed the minds of men to such a degree, "that it may now be said, that there existed in England a fourth estate, Kings, Lords, and Commons, and Drury-Lane playhouse"\(^{21}\) and further that theatre-going had become the "favourite amusement of all degrees and ranks throughout the city of Westminster".\(^{25}\) Mrs. Boscowen said, in her diary, "—as to plays, Mr. Garrick is so crowded that I have no chance of seeing him, but when some charitable body provides a place and invites me to it."\(^{26}\) One of Walpole's letters in 1763 records the fact that "at present all the boxes are taken for a month",\(^{27}\) and Garrick's correspondence includes numerous requests for help in getting seats.

When Dr. Thomas Campbell visited London in 1755, he felt both obliged and inclined to visit the playhouse. His comments also serve to point this previously noted popularity. On March 13, 1775, he recorded the following description of his evening.

"Dined alone — having refused an invitation from Mr. Boyd — in order to see Garrick. And I saw him — which I could not have done if I had stayed half an hour longer; the pit being full at
the first rush—". Earlier that same week he had written, "I went to see Garrick in Lusignan—the House was full by five (an hour before the curtain)—tho' David appears but in one act."29

The Drury Lane prompter's diary records exceptional crowds. One such was for Powell's benefit performance of Othello in 1764. "This night was one of the greatest overflows that ever was known. The Crowd was so great it prevented the Ladies from coming to their Places in the Boxes till near seven o'clock."30 During this season the doors were opened at four in the afternoon. Another abnormally large audience is described in Garrick's last season on a night he played Lear. "The Crowd were at the Doors by two o'clock, there never was a greater overflow."31. These crowds gathering at two faced a three hour wait for the doors to open and an additional hour before the play began.

It is obvious that crowds of this magnitude represented not a class, but a cross-section of the entire city. While statistics regarding the make-up of these audiences are non-existent, contemporary descriptions abound. Prologues and epilogues, institutions of the times, were often addressed to various parts of the audiences, and they give an indication of the sort of people seated there. Miles Peter Andrews described
the Side-boxes:

"Then the Side-boxes, what delightful Rows!
Peers, Poets, Nabobs, Jews, and Prentice Beaux." — Jephson, emphasizing the feminine pulchritude there, said,

"This beauteous circle, friends to Polish'd Verse,
Admires soft sentiments in language terse."

When analyzing their taste, Garrick said it was for "Ragouts of wit".

Several different factors influenced the seating of the boxes. A seat there normally cost five shillings; this price was prohibitive to the lower classes. A box had the unique privilege, at that time, of being bookable, although individual seats in it were not. This was an encouragement to those who valued their time and those who disdained waiting for a performance to begin. Occupants of all but the green boxes could be seen both from above and below. This made them extremely desirable for those who came to be seen. All the boxes had the characteristic in common with boxes today, of being poor seats from which to observe stage action. The intent playgoer who desired to observe the performance carefully sat in the pit. Two other advantages offered by the boxes were comparative privacy and freedom from the jostling common in the pit and galleries.
Madame Roxana Ternagant (pseudonym for Bonnel Thornton) said, "I entered the right hand stage box; a general whisper went around the house; every eye was fixt on my person, tho' Barry was in one of the most tender and pathetic parts of Othello. Presently after, the Music struck up: the men of fashion in the boxes leer'd towards me with a smile of approbation; the pretty dear creatures flutter'd their fans at me: ---"35. The anonymous author of A Guide to the Stage said, "I am going to introduce the ladies into the theatre, whom I beg leave to usher with all possible delicacy into the Side-boxes; unless perhaps they take a fancy to pass away the time en deshabille in a green box."36. Roger Pickering discussed these same ladies with less deference. "My Respect to the two brightest, and which is more, fairest Female Circles in any Theatre extant, makes me hesitate to mention what Prejudice the Drama receives from the Boxes. It must, undoubtedly, be from Inadvertency, that the Ladies carry on their conversation loud enough to be heard by a great Part of the Pit; and, in the Boxes nearest the Stage, by the Actors themselves."37. That the attention of occupants of the boxes to the stage left much to be desired is evident from the following description of the methods employed by Sylvia and Mirabelle, two fictitious sisters in a green box, to attract attention. "Thus if
Sylvia by some lucky remark has engag'd her circle, Mirabelle will let fall her handkerchief into the Pit, which never fails to draw the eyes of the whole audience upon her; but she does not triumph long, before her sister calls out aloud to an acquaintance in an opposite box, and becomes the object of everyone's admiration; till the aspiring Mirabelle, after a seeming attention to the play, bursts out into a loud and unexpected laughter that wrests the laurel from Sylvia's brow. By these and like acts, I have known the ambitious fair to have been as much taken notice of as the players themselves during the whole series of a performance.\textsuperscript{38} This same tract points out that all of the boxes were not occupied by fashionable belles and beaux. "I shall have nothing to say to the front-boxes; they have been ceded by a custom immemorial to the citizens, and their allies, the insipid and melancholy."\textsuperscript{39} The side boxes were so much the fashion that on the night Johnson's tragedy Irene was produced, he appeared there resplendent in a scarlet waistcoat with rich gold lace, prepared to play the part of a successful dramatist.\textsuperscript{40} 

Next in price to the boxes were seats in the pit. Robert Jophson described it thus, "the stern Pit all ornament disdains and loves deep Pathos and sublimier strains."\textsuperscript{41}
Garrick told the pit, "You relish satire." Most reports tend to agree that by this time the pit had declined since Restoration days. Although people of the calibre of Boswell, Dr. Johnson, Dr. Campbell, and Charles Churchill still sat there, a steady influx of apprentices and rowdies had done much to lower its prestige. A Guide to the Stage mentions "—the pit, which indeed seems to have been strangely neglected of late; and tho' it still continues to the scene of action during the first nights of a new play, it comes even then far short of its pristine vigour." Pickering is violent on the subject of the pit. "And what can I say to the Pit; the Grand Academy of Theatrical Science. One would expect from this Area of Criticism, which several Men of Fortune frequent, good Manners, mutual accommodation as to Room, and a silent Attention to what is going forward upon the Stage. But the Breeding of Porters, and the Silence of Fishwomen, is superior to what I have sometimes, observed in this Part of the Theatre. Crowding, jostling, and disputing aloud, wrangling may even quarreling are frequent; and as a Circle will necessarily be gathered upon such impertinent Occasions, the Drama, suffers greatly in its Representation, from these Disorders."

The first gallery with its two shilling seats seemed to differ from the upper gallery only in degree. It was a little
more polite. The author of *A Guide to the Stage* tells the ladies, "If any, for the sake of humour, have a mind to mob it in the first gallery, they are at liberty." Mrs. Termagant related that "the city gallants of the first gallery perus'd me with a stare of astonishment." Carrick told them, "Your taste is humour, and high season'd joke," and Jephson said, "The middle order, free from critick pride, takes genuine nature for their faithful guide."

In the upper gallery can be seen the biggest change since the Restoration. What had formerly been nothing more than a footman's gallery furnishing accommodation for those servants who had earlier held seats for their masters elsewhere in the theatre was now an area rapidly assuming greater importance. Many of Garrick's prologues and epilogues, as will be seen in Chapter III, were directed here. Garrick's modern fine gentleman in his dramatic satire, *Lethe* tells how enraged the gallery becomes at the attention-attracting antics of the beaux. It was from the gallery that came the fusillades of fruit when an actor displeased, but it was also primarily the gallery that curbed the worst excesses of the gentlemen. The prompter's diary at Drury Lane records that on February 3, 1775, "Captain Roper and another Gentleman came in drunk, and kept such a noise in the Boxes, that the Pit and Gallery besented it. A
great Hubub ensued." But Roger Pickering shows his own class intolerance by his comment on the gallery. "But what interrupting Insolence do we meet with from the Galleries almost during the whole Performance! Insolence! that nothing but the Military and Peace Officer can correct."

The eighteenth century had many stage disturbances, but they all had cause. There was little or no destructiveness or violence per se. The audiences felt a great share in the theatre. Indeed, they had one, for a magistrate's decision in 1738 stated "that the public had a legal right to manifest their dislike to any play or actor; and that the judicature of the pit had been acquiesced in, time immemorial." As has been seen, the gallery was assuming a good share of the pit's traditional power.

Under Garrick's management the theatre experienced several riots, but in each case the audience felt it was acting within its rights. The Chinese Festival Riot in 1755 was directed against Garrick's importation of what were thought to be French dancers, just prior to the beginning of the Seven Years War. There was another outburst of violence when Garrick attempted to end the time-honoured tradition of admitting patrons after the third act of a play for half price. This attempted reform of his crystallized the resentment already felt for his
earlier move to restrict gentlemen from sitting on the stage. With the exception of these two instances, all the violence in the theatre was a result of the public's being displeased by an actor or a playwright. Political strife was the cause for Hugh Kelly's *A Word to the Wise* being damned. He was known to be a writer for the unpopular court favourite, Lord Bute. Moral indignation was the reason for the extreme disapproval shown Isaac Bickerstaffe's *The Wedding Ring*. Bickerstaffe suffered the same ostracism that was later to fall to Oscar Wilde's lot. Only Dibdin's convincing untruth, that he was the author of the piece, prevented a riot on that occasion.

Unfortunately most of the writing on the subject of audiences was done by interested parties. Unsuccessful dramatists, particularly, tended to be prolific in their over-emphasis of audience boorishness and the difficulty a play had in getting heard. Understandably the most disinterested and valuable report on conditions before the footlights comes from a German visitor to England, Johann Wilhelm von Archenholz, whose sincerity inspires confidence. "The uproar of the common people in the theatre before the curtain rises is simply frightful. A foreigner, unfamiliar with such outbursts of freedom, imagines he is facing a field of battle on which the combatants are ready to break one another's necks. But fights are extremely
rare. The common people in the galleries, where the din is greatest, are simply bent on making noise to pass the time, and since several hundred people are crowded together who have no conception of decorum, but so much the more of personal liberty, the disorder is only natural. Before going to the theatre, one fills one's pockets with oranges, which serve the double purpose of refreshment and entertainment—. But the peels are often hurled by the occupants of the gallery into the pit, or they land there if they miss the proscenium, at which they are usually aimed—. They are so heaped up by the time for the curtain to rise that a servant must enter with a broom. But when the play begins, all noise and bombardment ceases, unless some especial provocation gives rise to further disturbances; and one is bound to admire the quiet attentiveness of such an estimable folk.52.

There is an abundance of further evidence to substantiate the assertion that the middle and lower classes re-entered the theatre in the eighteenth century. Sir John Hawkins, Tory Magistrate of Middlesex, opposed the erection of Goodman's Fields Theatre because "the merchants of London found it was a temptation to idleness and pleasure that their clerks could not resist."53. Even in Scotland which was comparatively barren theatrically, the middle class was embracing the stage.
An official church document admits that "To enumerate how many Servants, Apprentices, and Students in different Branches of Literature, in this City and Suburbs, have been seduced from their proper Business, by attending the Stage, would be a painful, disagreeable Task."^*^1

An article by a merchant in Hoke's Miscellany in 1733 expanded this concern over the apprentice's interest in the drama and specified the harm in it. The author felt that merchants in plays got little respect and often served only as objects of ridicule for dashing wits. He further felt that what moral was present in the usual play was too subtle for an unsophisticated audience to grasp. Here he agreed with Sir Richard Steele's earlier dictum, "Whatever Vices are represented upon the stage, they ought to be so marked and branded by the poet as not to appear laudable nor amiable in the person who is tainted with them".55^*^2

It took the middle classes only a few more decades to ban subtlety from the stage than it had previously taken them to get the afterpieces they demanded. It is no coincidence that the two outstanding attributes of eighteenth century theatre, sentimentality and spectacle, both suit the untrained intellect. Pantomime, farce, and comic opera in the form of regularly scheduled afterpieces began at Lincoln's Inn Fields about 1720.
A comparison of receipts before and after this addition to the programme shows how effective it was in attracting new spectators. From 1714 to 1718 no performances, except benefits, brought in more than eighty-five pounds at Lincoln's Inn Fields. After 1722, after the innovation of afterpieces, nightly receipts of one hundred and fifty pounds became common.

The primary reason that eighteenth century comedy declined into sentimentality was that the influx of middle and low classes demanded an obvious moral. As soon as the moral purpose in comedy became obvious, characterizations became chalky white and sooty black. The masses responded much more readily with their emotions than with their intellects; this forced the drama which catered to them to make its primary appeal an emotional one. Some theatrical figures opposed this development. It is the purpose of this study to evaluate the position David Garrick took in relation to it.
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Chapter II

Garrick's Opinion of Sentimentality as Evidenced by his Correspondence

The extant correspondence of Garrick is voluminous. Of the published selections, James Boaden's two volume, twelve hundred page work is the most comprehensive. It was extracted from the thirty-nine volumes of manuscript correspondence in the Forster-Dyce Collection at the Victoria and Albert Museum. The only other noteworthy holding of Garrick's manuscript letters is the Little Collection at the Harvard University Library. There is a project in progress at Harvard to issue a complete edition of Garrick's letters using this collection as a nucleus. Already this collection has furnished the material for Professor Little's small, but carefully edited, Pineapples of the Finest Flavour and the larger and generally more satisfactory Some Unpublished Correspondence of David Garrick edited by George Pierce Baker. Until the Harvard project reaches fruition no study based on Garrick's letters can be definitive.

Probably a large number of libraries about the world have small, unpublicized holdings of Garrick's correspondence. The National Library of Scotland, for instance, has two letters. This enquiry, though, has been based on the general currents of Garrick's thought as evidenced by as many letters as possible. Thus the future discovery of a few more pertinent ones is
hardly likely to alter appreciably its conclusions.

A very small percentage of Garrick's correspondence has any bearing on this or any other critical enquiry concerning the drama. The preponderence of letters are, of course, letters received. Of these, the majority are from aspiring playwrights submitting plays, talking of submitting plays, or whining or threatening over the rejection of plays. Another large body of letters chronicles Garrick's extensive social life. His position of prestige was a position of power in that he was on terms of social equality with the oligarchical leaders of the time. He was besieged, therefore, with requests for recommendation to his noble friends for this or that preferment, whether military, civil, or ecclesiastical. There were many who wrote to get seats for performances and many others who wrote to borrow money, among them Sterne and Burke.

His most enjoyed correspondents must have been those with whom he could discuss freely his overwhelming passion, drama. Bishop Warburton, Dr. J. Hoadly, and Mrs. Elizabeth Montagu stand out in this classification. With Warburton and Mrs. Montagu, Garrick seemed to discuss little contemporary theatrical writing. Shakespeare was the dominant topic with them. Garrick appeared to be freer about discussing contemporary
theatre with Dr. Hoadly than with any other. He obviously respected the Doctor's opinions highly for he asked for them often. In spite of the fact that Hoadly was not a first-rate dramatist, he had a keen perception regarding not only static production, but the stream and direction of theatrical progress.

In a letter to Mrs. Victor, November, 1764, discussing his criticisms of a play by Mrs. Frances Sheridan, mother of Richard Brinsley Sheridan, Garrick said, "How could Mrs. Sheridan imagine that I wanted the passions to be interested? I should as soon expect to have my laughter rais'd in a tragedy---I said indeed that the Comedy wanted interest, but not of the Passions--I meant a Comic interest, resulting from the varying humours of the Characters thrown into spirited action and brought into interesting Situations, naturally arising from a well constructed fable or Plot---This, with a good Moral, deduc'd from the whole, is all I wish or look for in a Comedy."

Garrick's idea of comedy is here expressed. It remains only for us to compare it with the principles of sentimental comedy. By stating that he did not expect a comedy to interest the Passions, he shows that the line of demarcation between comedy and tragedy was one he respected. By insisting on spirited action he puts himself in opposition to the school of languid
heroes and heroines dragging painfully and verbosely through
the travails of life. His emphasis on a soundly-constructed
plot shows that he would not be satisfied with absurdly con-
trived repentances. One element of his adaptations of earlier
plays was to tighten up the plots and make them more logical.
This is particularly noticeable in his alterations of The
Gamester and The Country Wife. Garrick's desire for a good
moral could be more ambiguous, but it has been seen in the pre-
ceding chapter that a good moral is not the hallmark of sen-
timental comedy, but has been, through the ages, the justifi-
cation for all comedy. The didacticism which pervaded senti-
mental comedy often made the moral just a tagged-on repentance
at the end of the last act. A moral "deduc'd from the whole"
prevents this shock to one's sense of the natural.

In 1770 Garrick wrote to Rev. Charles Jenner, "I could
wish that you would think of giving a Comedy of Character to
the (theatre), one calculated more to make an Audience laugh
than cry—the Comedy Larmoyante is getting too much ground
among Us and if those who can write the better Species of Comic
drama don't take a stand for the genuine Comedy and Vis Comica,
the Stage in a few years, will be (as Hamlet says) like Niobe,
all tears---". ²
In addition to these two letters which unequivocally state Garrick's opposition to the sentimental, there are several others which show his insistence on plot and action, characteristics antithetic to the self-conscious moralizing and protracted suffering common to the sentimental genre. He wrote to Captain Thompson in 1766 criticizing a comedy of his, The Hobby Horse. "---it wants fable---Action, Action, Action, are words better apply'd to the Drama, than to Ora-tory---be assur'd that without some Comic Situations result-ing from the fable, The Hobby Horse will not run the race we could wish it---All the knowledge of Character, with the finest Dialogue would be lost without a proper Vehicle, to interest the Audience. You will throw away much powder & shot, if you don't ram down both, & compress them with a good fable; there is your great failure, and were I worthy to advise you (I am an old pilot & have brought some leaky vessels into port) I would not write a line till I had fix'd upon a good Story & consider'd it well upon paper---If you don't you will sail without rudder, compass, or ballast."^3.

To his intimate friend, George Colman, Garrick was even more explicit when he told him in 1761, "I have read your last & think it a fine Plan a little too hastily finish'd---there is Strength, & good Sense, but I would more laugh and pleasantry."^4.
Mrs. Elizabeth Montagu who had acted as an intermediary for a young dramatist received a frank statement of his lack of ability; Garrick said to her, "The scenes are merely dialogues without the least interest in the fable, or indeed Enough of a Story to carry on your Attention---I likewise think that the characters are not well mark'd, & that the vis comica is wanting through the Whole---There is, notwithstanding all I have said, and cannot conceal, nor will Ever Endeavour to close my opinion from you, there is a certain merit in the Writing of the dialogue, but wholly void of dramatic force & interest to give it Success in the representation."^5.

Mrs. Elizabeth Griffith once approached Garrick regarding an alteration of a play by Marivaux. His answer, which displayed his wide reading as well as his opinion, constituted an indictment of over-refined dramatis personae: "I have read the play of Marivaux's which I remember to have read some time since with his other dramatic works---Not withstanding his wit and great reputation, he is of all the French playwrights of credit, the least to my taste---he is too refined and Particular, both in his dialogue and drawing his characters---he wants that fine, simple, unaffected, forcible flow of style and humour which in my opinion marks the true dramatic genius."^6.
The unswerving consistency of these statements of Garrick's desiring spirit, action, and vis comica in comedy is what makes them convincing, for they are few enough considering the bulk of his correspondence. Never does he even partially reverse himself, and tell a writer to slow down his pace or draw more emotion from a scene.

After his retirement Garrick gave Hannah More advice on how to improve her comedy. The advice referred to specific ways she could make the action more plausible and "might create an animated Scene and more confusion." This emphasis of Garrick's on vis comica was famous enough among his contemporaries to figure in a satire written by Frances Brooke. In her novel The Excursion she had her character the manager (Garrick), criticize a budding dramatist for his play's lack of it.

In addition to this often reiterated advice to hew back to the comic tradition, Garrick told playwrights to beware of having characters do that which was ludicrous or out of character. This emphasis, along with his emphasis on decency, was something that was forced on him, although he had personal inclinations in the same direction. A certain portion of his audiences was quick to condemn and punish that which they felt to be indecorous.
An anonymous correspondent in an open letter warned him in 1758 to be decent and told him, "Such as a loose jest may please, will come whether they have that inducement or not; but those whom these liberties offend you will never see again." He added that "---I could give some instances of persons who were last season driven from the theatres by these indecencies, whose presence is an honour and a sanction to the entertainments of which they partake." That he was sensitive to such warnings can be assumed from the fact that he was warned in October, 1747, that The Scornful Lady by Beaumont and Fletcher was an immoral and atheistical play and never played it again. In fact he never played any Beaumont and Fletcher comedies again without first having them altered.

He took great pains to show by example to a Mr. Lawrence what the audiences would and would not accept after he had rejected his comedy, saying, "To speak my mind without constraint and as circumstances occur to me, the character of your Credulous Man is surely unnatural and improbable; his swallow is too large and too farcical. To convince you how over-delicate the public may be at all times, I will relate to you a passage in a farce called Neck or Nothing. The business is comically enough arranged, and had great applause, till upon the old citizen's asking the sham gentleman
to take a mortgage upon some houses for part of the fortune, the other answers, He is sorry that he could not; but that he had bargained for an estate that was contagious to his own and must be obliged to pay the money in two days or forfeit. "Is the estate good?" says the old man. "In fine condition," answers the cheat." He describes numerous fine qualities it has and then adds, "and then the fine ponds upon the estate." 'Ponds' cries Stockwell (the old man). 'What signify ponds?' ---'what are they good for?' Slip (the sham gentleman) replies, 'To catch gudgeons, Sir. Great profit and pleasure.'

I thought it dangerous, and so it was proved, though but in a farce, and which till the gudgeons came, had met with great applause. I mention this only to show you, that an audience will not suffer the dupe to be cheated too extravagantly even in a farcical piece."

The reference in the above letter "even in a farcical piece" shows another attitude that seems to have been strongly held by Garrick and his friends, namely, that there was a distinct difference between what was proper in farce and in full-length comedy. They felt that exaggeration of character and action that was quite suitable in a farce might be decidedly improper in comedy. Doctor Hoadly wrote Garrick in 1773 saying, "I have not yet had a sight of Dr. G.'s (Goldsmith's)
five-act farce, (for such it must be from the specimen in the papers), which seemed sadly writ, though capable of some fun in the action—. In his first play, the town would not bear his low humour, and justly, as it degraded his Good-Natur'ed Man, whom they were taught to pity and have a sort of respect for, into a low buffoon, and what is worse, into a falsifier, a character unbecoming a gentleman." Again he wrote to Garrick, "You seem now to give in to Dr. Goldsmith's ridicu-
osity in opposition to all sentimentality." Thus we see that John Hoadly, an avowed opponent of excess sensibility, felt that Garrick was going too far in his opposition to sen-
timentality. This leads one to believe that there was a moderate party of anti-sentimentalists to which Garrick and Hoadly belonged, one that desired laughter in comedy, but desired it to come from realistic situations and characteri-
zations rather than from caricature.

When characters exist primarily to show a moral they are flat and lack definition. Garrick's criticisms abound with examples of his insistence upon adequate character delineation. He told Mrs. Montagu, when speaking of another's play, "I likewise think that the Characters are not well mark'd." And when Mrs. Griffith tried pathetically to defend her drama against Garrick's objections, she wrote the following.
"—now for his son, whom you style 'the hackneyed fop' of every play and farce" and "—the only likeness of character which I confess is that between Lady Dainty and Lady Languid." 15. Garrick was the originator of a naturalistic school of acting, and it is not surprising that he also objected to unnaturalness of action in a play. He can be quoted from a letter to Mrs. Griffith to this effect, "—the precipitate manner in which Lord _____ swallows the hook, and her (Lucinda's) unaccountable calm behaviour upon the discovery of the imposition, appear to me neither comic nor natural." 16. Mrs. Griffith defended herself against some of Garrick's disparaging comments in 1773 by writing him, "There cannot be a more natural mistake—than the Doctor's accosting young Fretwell for Charlotte:" and "as to Charlotte's mistaking Sir Charles for the Doctor, She was already prepossessed that it must be him." 17. This same criticism of unnaturalness was applied by Garrick to an unknown tragedy. He wrote, "The Duke's behaviour in this act (5th) very forced, and the calling his child before he intends committing a rape almost ridiculous" and the "Duke's repentance to Clementina laughable." 18. There is no reckoning how many such "laughable repentances" Garrick's judgement saved the theatre.

Another objection Garrick commonly had to plays he rejected was dullness, and the well-known letter to Dr. Arne
shows well his feelings regarding it. "I have read your play and rode your horse, and do not approve of either. They both want that particular spirit which alone can give pleasure to the reader and the rider. When one wants wit, and the other the spurs, they jog on heavily. I must keep the horse, but I have returned you the play. I pretend to some little knowledge of the last; but as I am no jockey, they cannot say that the knowing one is taken in."\(^{19}\).

Both from his explicit statements about sentimentality and implicitly by the qualities he admired in comedy, it is apparent that Garrick, as a dramaturgist and a critic, considered himself in direct opposition to the advance of sentimental comedy. Special considerations, as will be seen, affected his actions as a manager, but as far as his thoughts on the subject are concerned, his attitude is clear. The Garrick who insisted to Mrs. Sheridan that he demanded comic interest, never emotional interest in a comedy, who told Jenner that the *Comedy Larmoyante* was gaining too much ground, and supported action, action, action, and *vis comica* so consistently, was no sentimentalist.
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DAVID GARRICK,
in the character of a Drunken Sailor.
Chapter III

Garrick's Prologues and Epilogues

A study of Garrick's prologues and epilogues complements the previous discussion of his letters. One sees that his public utterances, although expressed in a stylized form, maintain and enlarge upon his private ones.

Garrick's prominence as a writer of such pieces is well known and widely documented. They constituted a form which suited his poetic ability ideally. He had a versifying facility which made his occasional pieces tinkle pleasantly, while he had few of the attributes necessary for the serious poet. Dr. Johnson, prejudiced though he might have been, said that Dryden had written better prologues, but Garrick more good ones.¹

In discussing the Drury Lane production of False Delicacy Benjamin Victor ended a derogatory criticism by adding, "the happy vein of Humour thrown into the Epilogue was so executed ---that even a weak play would have been strengthened by it."²

And when Robert Jephson asked Garrick to write either a prologue or an epilogue for his tragedy, The Law of Lombardy, he emphasized their importance with this statement. "By such head and tail pieces you have saved many a miserable performance from perdition, and I am certain they are great props and embellishments to those of another class."³

Certainly his reputation was high. Many playwrights
applied to him not only for prologues and epilogues but for assistance in writing their own as well.

The primary purpose for mentioning Garrick’s reputation in this metier is to suggest the seriousness with which his pieces were received. Some of them were recited year after year. The newspapers seldom failed to publish a new one, and several of Garrick’s correspondents regretted that there was no collected edition of them.

When Garrick’s reputation encouraged such scrutiny, it is logical to suppose that he took care to see that these works represented his carefully considered views. Although prologues and epilogues are traditionally mere appurtenances to a particular drama, Garrick’s and others of note assumed an independent existence of their own.

Garrick used these compositions as an opportunity for personal contact with his audiences. During his managerial career they formed his main vehicle for self-conscious communication with his public. In the first chapter it was seen how vital the patronage of the audience was to this Drury Lane regime. The manager was constantly under attack for his dramatic policy. While this was, no doubt, a continual source of irritation to him, it is a boon to the researcher, for it forced Garrick to carefully explain his dramatic philosophy.
Reduced to its simplest this philosophy was a strong nationalism. Garrick sincerely believed that sound drama was particularly suited to the English genius. He was loud in his praise of the best English drama, notably Shakesperian, and un-tiring in his labours to popularize it. He felt that modern types of stage entertainment were perverting general taste and preventing playwrights from fulfilling their promise and destiny.

In his prologues and epilogues he expressed a narrowly insular resentment to continental influences although he was anything but narrow on other subjects. Many of his attacks upon peripheral dramatic forms could be interpreted as attempts to discourage Drury Lane competition. To consider that they were merely this would be a mistake. The fortunes of Drury Lane were to Garrick inextricably associated with the success or failure of noteworthy native drama. It is only fair to point out that this linking of this theatre with good drama was not unique with him. Drury Lane had long been the strong-hold of, and the symbol for, quality stage representations.

It remained so throughout Garrick's career.

Sentimental comedy was only one of the many dramatic perversions Garrick attacked. He carefully points out his opinion of it, but he also disapproved of everything which he felt
might impede a re-birth of British dramatic superiority. In his hundred or so extant epilogues and prologues he also lashes all manner of social evil. This investigation must necessarily be confined to works which best illustrate Garrick's impressions of sentimental comedy and to a lesser degree those that illustrate his larger concepts of drama.

However much he utilised prologues and epilogues, Garrick realised their weaknesses and sometimes bemoaned the fact that the public insisted on them. He said:

"Prologues, like compliments, are loss of time,
'Tis penning bows, and making legs in rhyme:
'Tis cringing at the door with simpering grin,
When we should shew the company within........."

Further comments on his prologues might explain why his do not sparkle as much as modern readers and Garrick-lovers might desire.

"Short let me be for wit is scarce.
Nor would I shew it, had I any,
The reasons why, are strong and many.
Should I have wit, the piece have none,
A flash in pan with empty gun,
The piece is sure to be undone."
'Tis wrong to raise your expectation:
Poets be dull in dedication!
Dulness in there to wit prefer -
But, there, indeed you seldom err.
In prologues, prefaces, be flat!
A silver button spoils your hat.
A thread-bare coat might joke escape,
Did not the blockheads lace the cape."\(^5\).

About a hundred of Garrick's prologues and epilogues have been preserved. In all this body of work he only touches on about a dozen subjects. His most belaboured point was the degeneracy of the fashionable element in English society. From a general survey of the subjects discussed one gets a broad picture of the author as one who was strongly nationalistic; had faith in his King; disliked foreign habits, dress, and entertainments; preferred the simple tastes of the gallery folk to the occupants of boxes; advocated a "middle-of-the-road" morality somewhere between the practice of the upper classes and the theorising of the puritans; and preferred that comedy remain pure laughing comedy, rather than become sentimentalised into a blend with tragedy. This is the outline. The distinct portrait will only come to light through an examination of the passages which led to the generalisations.

An examination of the pieces themselves shows Garrick
not as a propagandist against sentimental comedy, but as an acute manager explaining his actions and desires. He made clear the difficulties of satisfying the town.

"To please that fickle, fleeting thing called taste?
It mocks all search, for substance has it none;
Like Hamlet's ghost - 'tis here -- 'tis there--
'tis gone."

"The Greek read critic ---
Excuses want of spirit, beauty, grace,
But ne'er forgives her failing time, and place."

"The first in tenderness a very dove,
Melts like the feather'd snow at Juliet's love;
Her ladyship ---
Detests these things like a true virago;
She's all for daggers! blood! blood! blood! Iago!
A third whose heart defies all perturbation,
Yet dies for triumphs, funerals, coronations!
Ne'er asks which tragedies succeed or fail,
But whose procession has the longest tail."6.

In spite of the difficulties, he dedicated himself to attempting to satisfy the variegated tastes of his patrons,
even going to lengths that must have been distasteful.

"I speak as manager, and your obedient -
I, as your cat'trer, would provide you dishes,
Dress'd, to your palates, season'd to your wishes-
Say but you're tir'd with Boil'd and roast at home,
We too can send for niceties from Rome:
To please your tastes will spare nor pains nor money
Discard sirloin, and get you macaroni."7

Even in this speech, while he was promising to follow the fashion, he stated his faith in the eventual return to popularity of substantial English drama by adding the following significant line to it.

"Shakespear and beef must have their turn again."8

A word such as 'beef', when applied to drama, is subject to various interpretations, but there is little doubt but that it refers here to plays of unquestioned merit.

The sentimentalists concurred in thinking that their drama of feeling constituted a high mark in the annals of drama and that all periods prior to their own had been crude. Garrick shows his divergence from this school by continually harking back to an earlier 'golden age of drama'. He also compares his century unfavourably to previous ones in every
He has a fop speaking one of his prologues shudder ironically at the bad old days of Douglas and Percy..

"Could we believe old stories, these strange fellows Married for love -- could of their wives be jealous-- Nay, constant to 'em too -- and, what is worse, The vulgar souls thought cuckoldom a curse.

Most wedded pairs had then one purse, one mind,
One bed too -- so preposterously join'd --
From such barbarity (thank heaven) we're refined."9.

To realize the extent this attitude toward earlier ages differed from the sentimentalists, one has only to compare the former to such a typical speech as appears in William O'Brien's lachrymose, The Duel. Ranting against duelling, Belville declares,

"Oh! thou abominable prejudice -- thou cruel abuse of a mistaken point of honour! thou couldst only have taken birth in a barbarous, in a rude Gothic age!"10.

As well as merely pointing out his preference for the virtues of past ages, Garrick specifically indicted the superficiality of his own, particularly the aping of foreign tastes. The prologue to Almida carries out this purpose.

"The foreign artist can your smiles secure,
If he be singer, fiddler, or friseur:
From our dull yawning scenes you go,
And crowd to Fantoccini's puppet-show;
Each on the foreign things with rapture stares!
_Sweet dears_! — they're more like flesh and blood
_than play's_!"11.

The vivacious Peg Woffington spoke the following additional lines of Garrick's exhorting the public to "buy British".

"A Modish frenzy so corrupts the town,
That nought but Alamode de France goes down;
We all submit to this fantastic yoke,
Like them we dress, we dance, we eat, we joke;
From top to toe they change us at their will;
All but our hearts — and those are British still.
Rouze, Rouze, for shame! This modish pest oppose!
Nor meanly ape your vain insulting foes!
To kill this fatal weed for ever toil,
Nor let it e'er take root in British soil!
Let low inglorious arts to France belong,
The close deceit, false heart and double tongue!
Let us by noble, generous arts be known,
By valour, wit, and honesty our own!"12.

Not only did he choose to stigmatize the excesses of his age, he carefully pointed out their dangers. He felt that the
present taste educated Englishmen away from an appreciation of their finest drama. He said,

"The youths, to whom France gives a new belief,

Who look with horror on a rump of beef;

On Shakespeare's plays, with shrugg'd up shoulders stare,

These plays? They're bloody murders, -- O Barbare!

And yet the man has merit - Entre nous,

He'd been damn'd clever, had he read Bossu.

Shakespeare read French, roars out a surly cit:

When Shakespeare wrote, our valour match'd our wit;

Had Britons then been fops, Queen Bess had hang'd 'em.

Those days they never read the French, they bang'd 'em.

If taste evaporates by too high breeding,

And eke is overlaid by too deep reading;

Lest then in search of this you lose your feeling,

And barter native sense in foreign dealing;

Be this neglected truth to Britons known,

No tastes, no modes become you, but your own."13.

Garrick's opposition to the fashion was directed at its obscuration of natural taste. He felt that native good sense had accounted for sound dramatic taste in earlier times and had no doubt that it would re-assert itself if only the individual
were free to make his own decisions. He attacked the dictatorial authority of fashion over the individual in his epilogue to Barbarossa. In it a fop ironically defends the vogue against criticism.

"But why attack the fashion? senseless rogue!
We have no joys but what result from vogue:
The mode should all controll - nay, ev'ry passion,
Sense, appetite, and all, give way to fashion:

I hate as much as he, a turtle feast,
But till the present turtle rage has ceas'd,
I'd ride a hundred miles to make myself a beast.

I have no ears; yet op'ras I adore!
Always prepar'd to die --- to sleep --- no more!"¹¹.

His epilogue to Virginia shows his attitude toward the critical taste of the fashionable element in his audiences. Instead of having faith in their own passions, which Garrick felt would be affected most strongly by quality productions, they meekly followed the leadership of untrustworthy guides.

"May I approach unto the boxes, pray -
And there search out a judgement on the play?

In vain, alas! I should attempt to find it -

Fine ladies see a play, but never mind it -

'Tis vulgar to be mov'd by acted passion,
"Or form opinions, till they're fixed by fashion." 15

There was hardly any limit to the fashionable vices Garrick flayed, but his basic reason for opposing the fashion was that it debauched native taste. Even though sentimental comedy had an English origin, it had been developed so enthusiastically by the French that it appeared in England during Garrick's career as an importation. This made it much easier for Garrick to have faith in the ultimate direction of the native taste, unperturbed by foreign influence. He wishfully saw in the middle and low classes an unfashionable segment of the population, one that was content to respond naturally. His prologues and epilogues forever show his preference for the common folk. This was not a romantic preference. He did not have the revolutionary's sympathy for downtrodden masses. Instead he hoped to find in them the tastes that had been only recently abandoned by the upper strata. He looked to them as a conservative element which could encourage a revival of native drama along traditional lines. Mrs. Cibber spoke Garrick's epilogue to *Virginia* which by describing the various sections of the audience clearly exhibited his confidence in the less fashionable.

"And first, with you above, I shall begin - (upper gallery)
"Good natur'd souls, they're ready all to grin.
Tho' twelve-pence seat you there, so near the ceiling,
The folks below can't boast a better feeling.
No high-bred prud'ry in your region lurks,
You boldly laugh and cry, as nature works."16.

Mrs. Barry pretended to be a fortune teller when she recited the lines which most bluntly characterize Garrick's attitude toward the ton.

"What in your faces can a Gypsy see?
Ye youths of fashion, and of family!
What are we not to hope from taste and rank?
All prizes in this lottery?—blank,—blank,—blank;"17.

As well as contrasting the sincere responsiveness of the gallery to the fashionable reserve of the boxes Garrick pointed out that a dramatist was forced to describe the middle classes if he intended to avoid artificiality. He said,

"Nature of yore prevail'd thro' human kind;
To low and middle life — she's now confin'd,
'Twas there the choicest dramatists have sought her;
'Twas there Moliere, there Jonson, Shakespear caught her,"18.
By stating this Garrick showed his alignment with the anti-sentimental dramatists who had been damned for being "low" when they sought their models from the lower classes.

In addition to the already mentioned excerpts which indicate the consistency of Garrick's critical position regarding all the pernicious modern influences with which the drama had been burdened, there is a large body of commentary in his prologues and epilogues that concerns sentimental comedy specifically.

There are four prologues that express Garrick's opposition so well, that a careful winnowing of the remainder of such work in a search for isolated references would be unjustified. By far the best known of the four is the prologue to She Stoops to Conquer. In it Garrick indicates the barrenness that excellent comic actors consistently found in sentimentality. Because the play was produced at Covent Garden he limits his examples to Shuter and Woodward of that company. If, though, these lesser talents were wasted on sentimentality, Garrick's frustration must have been even greater.

Garrick was certainly under no obligation to sponsor this play. He owed favours to neither Goldsmith nor Colman. The reason for his prologue must have been a sympathy with their aim of resisting solemnity in comedy. Woodward spoke the
following lines dressed in black while holding a handkerchief to his eyes.

"Excuse me, Sirs, I pray - I can't yet speak-
I'm crying now - and have been all week!
'Tis not alone this mourning suit, good masters;
I've that within! - for which there are no plaisters!
Pray would you know the reason why I'm crying?
The Comic Muse, long sick, is now a dying!
And if she goes, my tears will never stop;
For as a play'r, I can't squeeze out one drop;
I am undone, that's all - shall lose my bread -
I'd rather, but that's nothing - lose my head.
When the sweet maid is laid upon the bier,
Shuter and I shall be chief mourners here.
To her a mawkish drab of spurious breed,
Who deals in sentimentals will succeed!
Poor Ned and I are dead to all intents,
We can as soon speak Greek as sentiments!
Both nervous grown to keep our spirits up,
We now and then take down a hearty cup.
What shall we do? - If Comedy forsake us,
But why can't I be moral? - Let me try -
My heart thus pressing - fix'd my face and eye,
"With a sentitious look, that nothing means,
(Faces are blocks in sentimental scenes.)
Thus I begin - 'All is not gold that glitters,
Pleasure seems sweet, but proves a glass of bitters.
When ign'rance enters, folly is at hand;
Learning is better far than horse and land.
Let not your virtue trip, who trips may stumble,
And virtue is not virtue, if she tumble.'
I give it up - morals won't do for me;

The other three pertinent prologues were spoken at Drury Lane playhouse. They are, The Prologue to Eugenia (1752), The Epilogue to Zenobia (1768), and the Prologue to Albumazar (1773). In the first Garrick asks the opinion of his audience concerning the presentation of the gorgeous tragedy by Dr. Francis.

"First for the town and us - I see some danger,
Should you too kindly treat this reverend stranger;
If such good folks, these wits of graver sort,
Should here usurp a right to spoil your sport;
And curb our stage so wanton, bold and free!
To the strict limits of their purity;
Should dare in theatres reform abuses!
And turn our actresses to pious uses!"
"Farewell the - the - you guess the thing I mean! If this wise scheme, so sober and so new, Should pass with us, would it go down with you? Should we so often see your well-known faces? Or would the ladies send so fast for places;"

The epilogue to Zenobia pointed out the overlapping of tragedy and comedy.

"The Comic Muse, whose ev’ry smile is grace, And her stage sister, with her tragic face, Have had a quarrel - each has writ a case. And on their friends assembled now I wait, To give you of their differences a true state Melpomene complains when she appears, - For five good Acts, in all her pomp of tears, - To raise your souls, and with her raptures wing 'em; Some flippant hussy like myself comes in; Crash goes her fan, and with a giggling grin Hey, Presto! Pass! - all topsy-turvy see, For ho, ho, ho! is chang’d to he, he, he! We own the fault, but 'tis a fault in vogue, 'Tis theirs, who call and bawl for - Epilogue! "
"What says our Comic Goddess? - with reproaches,
She vows her sister Tragedy encroaches!
And, spite of all her virtues and ambition,
Is known to have an am'rous disposition;
For in False Delicacy - wondrous fly,
Join'd with a certain Irishman - O fye!
She made you, when you ought to laugh, cry;
The sister's smiles with tears she try'd to smother,
Rais'd such a tragi-comic kind of pother,
You laugh'd with one eye, while you cry'd with t'other.
What can be done? - sad work behind the scenes;
These comic females scold with Tragic Queens.
Each party different ways the foe assails,
These shake their daggers, those prepare their nails.
'Tis you alone must calm those dire mishaps,
Or we shall still continue pulling caps.
What is your will? - I read it in your faces;
That all hereafter take their proper places,
Shake hands, and kiss, and friends, and burn their cases."21.

Thus, above, in 1768, Garrick frankly presented the problem of mutual encroachment of tragedy and comedy and suggested the cure while he prophesied its application. In 1773 he felt the
cure had been applied and the real English comic muse re-in- 
stated. This comic muse is much more Shakespearian than 
Restoration. Note in the following satisfied prologue to 
Albumazar how the accent is on broad, guffawing laughter 
rather than on urbane Chesterfieldian smiles of pleasure. 
Thomas King greeted the audience with the following words 
of Garrick:

"Since your old taste for laughing is come back, 
And you have dropp'ed the melancholy pack 
Of tragi-comic-sentimental matter, 
Resolving to laugh more, and be the fatter, 
We bring a piece drawn from our ancient store, 
Which made old English sides with laughing sore. 

"Each sister muse a sep'rate shop should keep, 
Comedy to laugh, Tragedy to weep, 
And sentimental laudanum to make you sleep."

"Let but the comic muse enjoy your favour, 
We'll furnish stuff to make you laugh for ever! 
Do laugh, pray laugh – 'tis your best cure when ill 
The grand specifick, universal pill! 
What would I give to set the tide a-going,
"A spring-tide in your heart with joy o'erflowing!
No superficial skin-deep mirth - all from within!
Laugh till your jaws ache - 'till you crack your skin;

"Shew you are fond of mirth - at once restore us,
And burst with me in one grand laughing chorus!
True comedy reigns still - I see it plain;
Huzza! we now shall live and laugh again!"22.

After considering the above, the lover of the English
Comic Spirit can only huzza with Tom King. Although the huzza
will be tempered by the knowledge that the victory of laughter
was not so permanent as Garrick seems to suppose it to be, one
can hardly doubt the obvious sincerity which permeates his
happy welcome to what he thought was the end of 'sentimental
laudanum' on the stage. Garrick's position as regards his
dramatic practice of these ideas is perfectly consistent in
all his personal actions. Only in his official capacity as
manager, as shall be seen later, did he feel the necessity of
subjugating to any degree his advocacy of Thalia. In his
direct addresses to his audiences, his ideas are sharp and
clearly defined.

His prologues and epilogues show his resentment toward
foreign imports which might weaken the vigour of native drama.
They show his confidence in the soundness of unperverted British taste and in the re-birth of British dramatic genius. They also reiterate what his correspondence expressed, that he desired purity of dramatic form, and had no sympathy for the bastard creation, tearful comedy.
Notes to Chapter III


4. Garrick, David, Prologue to Virginia.
5. Prologue upon Prologues by Garrick.
6. Garrick, David, Epilogue to Athelstan.
7. Garrick, David, Prologue to Virginia.
8. Garrick, David, Prologue to Virginia.
9. Garrick, David, Epilogue to Percy.
11. Garrick, David, Prologue to Almida.
12. Garrick, David, Epilogue to the Astrologer.
13. Garrick, David, Epilogue to Athelstan.
15. Garrick, David, Epilogue to Virginia.
16. Garrick, David, Epilogue to Virginia.
17. Garrick, David, Epilogue to Sethona.
18. Garrick, David, Prologue to The Spleen; or, Islington Spa.
19. Goldsmith, Oliver, She Stoops to Conquer, p. 10. (London 1894)

72.
20. Garrick, David, Prologue to *Eugenia*. (1752)
21. Garrick, David, Epilogue to *Zenobia*. (1768)
22. Garrick, David, Prologue to *Albumazar*. (1773)
23. Garrick, David, Epilogue to the *Choleric Man*. 
Chapter IV

The Prompter Before the Curtain

David Garrick wrote a series of articles, under the pseudonym, The Prompter before the Curtain, during the season of 1776-77. These articles are important because they are the only published articles on the drama that Garrick wrote except for his Essay on Acting, which was largely a defense of his characterization of Macbeth, and too biased to be of much value. As early as 1756 he mentioned the possibility of writing a history of the English stage, but abandoned the project. When Goldsmith proposed the plan for his Popular Dictionary of the Arts and Sciences and arranged with Dr. Burney to write the chapter on Music, Dr. Johnson the one on Ethics, and Reynolds the one on Painting, Garrick was listed to be the author of the section on Drama. Mrs. Parsons, in her book on Garrick, sighs for our loss that he did not write it. These articles do not make up for that loss. They are all too few and are too concerned with matters of the moment. They deserve, however, to be known, for they reveal in dispassionate passages, intimate glimpses into the operation of the theatre of the times; and in heated lines, the strength of Garrick's convictions. Even though they are only slightly relevant to this study, they deserve notice because of the utter neglect into which they have fallen. They constitute a
proof of Garrick's continued concern with drama after his retirement and show him advocating the same causes he had encouraged earlier.

Mr. Gray in his *Theatrical Criticism in London to 1795* brushed them aside as being peripheral to the main growth of dramatic criticism, the development of which he was showing. Except for this mention and rejection, the essays have remained undisturbed in the files of the Morning Post. The first article appeared on November 19, 1776, and the last on April 5, 1777. Four other articles were introduced by Garrick but were signed The Deputy Prompter and apparently were written by an assistant. The purpose of the articles was to expose the weaknesses affecting the Drury Lane stage and point out the necessary cures.

Three main themes appear in these essays: an attack upon the mismanagement of Sheridan, a public exposure of actresses and their indifference to the fortunes of the theatre, and a warning that vigilance is necessary to prevent the taste for music and spectacle from debasing the sound coin of traditional drama. As these writings were directed at theatrical people and designed to correct specific evils, they make little attempt at generalization and can be confusing to the reader unfamiliar with the stage conditions at the time.
A certain recapitulation of contemporary Drury Lane history is then necessitated. It must be remembered that on June 10, 1776, Garrick had played his last part and a combine of Linley, Ford, and R. B. Sheridan had bought his share of the patent. Garrick, presumably, was at last to enjoy the pleasures of retirement that he had been anticipating since his return from the continent in 1765. The social calls on him in his retirement were demanding, but undoubtedly pleasant for one who had revelled in the public favour as long as he. Even stronger, though, were calls to aid Drury Lane.

Sheridan, although owning only one-seventh of the patent, was acting as manager. He had not asked his father, Thomas Sheridan the actor, to help him; probably because Garrick and "Old Bubble and Squeak" as he called him, had never been friends. Garrick felt responsible for Sheridan's success for many reasons. He had a large financial interest in the venture. He had a great desire for the success of the English dramatic and an emotional attachment to Old Drury in particular. Also he felt an affection for young Sheridan and a desire to see him succeed without the managerial assistance of his father.

On October 15, 1776, Sheridan wrote to Garrick of the
trouble he was having with his senior co-patentee, who was about to sell parts of his share of the patent to Captain Thompson. Sheridan declared, "the only method, therefore, which the exigence admitted of, was to convince those who were to find the money, that they were going to embark their property on a vessel that was on flames, and at the same time to let Lacey see that, by thus dividing his share, he would ruin the whole of it." This he did by refusing to go near the theatre. He described gleefully to Garrick some of the results of this plan. "Mrs. A having refused to play, and 'The Christmas Tale' (not being ready from the evening rehearsal, which had waited my coming) being stopped, at twelve 'Richard' and the Pantomime were fixed, the performers not having heard anything of our change.....I still declined hearing anything on the subject, so that they soon found that the whole of their stock, after changing their play several times, was reduced to the Committee, and that after Tuesday they had not one play which they could perform." After this extreme method of Sheridan's for discouraging prospective patent purchasers had proved so effective, Lacey came to terms and agreed never to part with his share of the patent or any part of it except to the other patentees. Apparently Sheridan was pleased with his strategy.
Garrick, however, was experienced enough to realize that once a theatre company is demoralized its decline is rapid and hard to stop.

It is easy to imagine the shock that Sheridan's behaviour must have given the old manager who had striven throughout his career to bring order, discipline and resultant respect to the theatre. Perhaps the efforts Garrick made in helping with the chores of management, were caused as much by a fear of what would happen to the theatre if he did not help, as they were by a friendly desire to assist the young manager. During the first season of Sheridan's management Garrick sponsored the production of Hannah More's tragedy, *Percy*, which he had formerly helped her to compose. He rehearsed his Romeo to Mrs. Robinson's Juliet in a desperate attempt to get the young actress ready for her opening in that part. He wrote the prologue to *The School for Scandal* and helped with it so much that it was said he was as proud of it as if it were his own.

Thus it can be seen that The Prompter before the Curtain articles under discussion were only one aspect of a concerted attempt Garrick made to support "his" theatre through troubled times. In spite of his help, though, the theatre's discipline was poor and spirit in the company was wanting. On July 17,
1777, after the end of the season Garrick wrote to Thomas King, "Poor Old Drury! It will be, I fear, very soon in the hands of the Philistines." These articles represent a part of his fight which this letter seems to indicate he considered lost. Truly, supporting the sagging management of R. B. Sheridan was a sad business. The patentees' income was so low, that at the end of the first season they had extreme difficulty in even paying expenses. In 1778 Thomas Sheridan was brought in by his son to assume the reins of management, showing that after two seasons the young Sheridan admitted failure. Kitty Clive, in a letter to Garrick, showed one of the roots of the malady affecting the theatre. "Everybody is raving against Mr. Sheridan for his supineness; there never was in nature such a contrast as Garrick and Sheridan; what, have you given him up that he creeps so?" Colman and Mrs. Griffith also complained of the lack of devotion Sheridan was showing to his enterprise.

As well as trying to rouse Sheridan to his responsibilities, Garrick tried in his capacity as commentator to curb the erratic behaviour of the three actresses who had been such a trial to him as disciplinarian during his last year in the management. Wags had even said:

"Three thousand wives kill'd Orpheus in a rage,
"Three actresses drove Garrick from the stage."

These three actresses were Mrs. Abington, Mrs. Yates, and Miss Young. The third object of his attack was the effect the fashionable effeminacy of the time had in bringing music, spectacle, and show into undue prominence.

All in all, the purpose of the essays is the same purpose that guided Garrick throughout his career, that of furthering the English stage, both by encouraging what he called "roast beef" drama and by trying to raise the status of the profession of acting. This purpose he clung to to the maximum degree that was compatible with operating a profitable play-house dependent upon the will of the public.

"HAVE YE NOT? BRITONS? HEARTS TO MOVE?
AND MINDS THAT WHOLESOME NURTURE LOVE?
LET TERROR! ... PITY ... LEAD THE WAY,
AND COMEDY FOR EVER GAY
WITH Dimpl'd SMILES AND BURSTS OF LAUGHTER,
COME NODDING! ... BECK'NING! ... TRIPPING AFTER!
BE SHAKESPEARE FIX'D IN ALL HIS RIGHTS!
LET PAINT ... AND SOUND ... AND SONGS AND SIGHT!
WAIT ON HIS STEPS, AND GRACE HIS FLIGHTS!"10.

This is his exhortation to his countrymen. This is what he is afraid a disorderly stage will ruin—his lifelong hope
for tragedy, gay laughing comedy, and Shakespeare. He felt always that if the traditional dramatic forms were properly presented they could drive out the inferior modern deviations. By encouraging regularity in the production of the best, Garrick was fighting sentimental comedy, pantomime, and opera with the most effective means at his disposal. Real comic genius was so rare during most of this century that the new comedies offered little resistance to these forms.

In his writing Garrick particularizes the theatrical calamity besetting Drury Lane: "the calamity, I mean, is the uncertainty of the entertainment you are to have, from which in general may be derived the daily great mischief to the Directors, disappointment to the audience, and discredit to the whole." His sixth article is an open letter addressed to Mr. Hopkins, the prompter of Drury Lane Theatre and an old friend and admirer of Garrick's. "You know, friend Hopkins," he says, "that as your labours are multiplied, the business of the stage must decline: Your chief employment at present is,... or my intelligence has deceived me...not so much to procure fresh entertainment for the public, as to take care, that there may be some entertainment for them." The distress Hopkins suffered in attempting to maintain order in the theatre can be seen from a letter he wrote to
Garrick in 1779. "We played last night 'Much Ado About Nothing' and had an apology to make for the change of three principal parts. About twelve o'clock Mr. Henderson sent word he was not able to play. We got Mr. Lewis from Covent Garden, who supplied the part of Benedick. Soon after Mr. Parsons sent word he could not play. Mr. Moody supplied the part of Dogberry; and about four in the afternoon Mr. Vernon send word he could not play. Mr. Mattocks supplied his part of Balthazar. I thought myself very happy in getting these wide gaps so well stopped. In the middle of the first act, a message was brought me that Mr. La Marsh (who was to play the part of Barachio) was not come to the House. I had nobody there that could go on for it, so I was obliged to cut his scenes in the first and second (ACTS) entirely out, and get Mr. Wrighten to go on for the remainder of the Part. At length we got the play over without the audience finding it out. We had a very bad house." 13.

Garrick shows the practical disadvantages being caused by the chaos in the theatre by the following: "It is an observation made now in every coffee-house, that there can be no assurance of any piece being acted on the evening it is advertised, and consequently, that no parties can be made, the great support of a playhouse, without a probability of being
in some way disappointed;—this might have such a terrible
effect upon the reputation and fashion of a public place, that
no ability, industry, or even fortune can withstand such re-
peated attacks upon its credit."14.

As well as painting the theatrical afflictions and their
possible results, Garrick gives specific instances of mana-
gerial and performers' faults. Commenting on the fact that
Mrs. Yates' appearance in The Roman Father played to half-
houses he said, "The Horatia of Mrs. Yates, deserved a more
brilliant attendance;—but the political, modern refinements
of Mrs. Yates and others, have so chilled the ardour of public
curiosity, that if they go on with this parsimony of their
talents, they may play hereafter only to a few frost-nip't
renters in the boxes, and some huddled-together, starved orders
in the pit, and galleries."15.

Placing blame also on the managers, Garrick, in the manner
of a prosecutor, demands "If it is true, Gentlemen, that Mr.
Sheridan, sen. is to join your troop, as it is given out,...
in the name of common sense, why would you not postpone the
revival of The Roman Father? ...that character seems more cal-
culated for his manner, and time of life, than for any other
performer I ever remember."16.

In referring to a production of Voltaire's Semiramis
Garrick asks the managers, "And where, in the name of decency and justice, was Miss Young? And why was not the spirited, virtuous, tender Azema, to be represented by HER? Was a part, thought worthy of Clairon, upon the French theatre, to be rejected by Miss Young upon the English? --- If it was not sent to her by the managers, or allotted to her by the author, she ought to be excused, and the criminal (for it certainly is a crime of lezemajiste against the public) should be set up at their bar." He tells Mr. Hopkins in the open letter to him, "What say they at the Coffee-houses? --- MacBeth, without Mrs. Yates! --- The Way of the World, and no Miss Younge! --- Let Miss Younge know from me that Mrs. Porter, the first tragic actress of her time and Mrs. Pritchard, the first comic actress of any time, performed the part of Marwood, and therefore Miss Y cannot be justified in refusing it!" 

Using his knowledge of the practice in France of casting both The Dumesnil and Clairon in the same plays and knowing that Mrs. Oldfield and Mrs. Porter used to support one another, Garrick commented on the fact that present-day Drury Lane actresses seemed "like a set of Genii that are mentioned in some oriental tale, while one is exerting his prowess, the rest are fast asleep." This criticism of the actresses' unwillingness to support each other is particularly valid when
one considers how many small parts, such as Scrub in *The Beaux Stratagem*, Garrick himself took to support the production rather than to glorify himself.

He contrasts the good record of steadfastness of purpose and dependability of Kitty Clive, Mrs. Pritchard, Mrs. Oldfield, Miss Pope, and Miss Catley with that of those he castigates. To show that the rewards of the present are greater for actresses than before, he quotes in one essay the yearly account of Zachary Baggs, treasurer of Drury Lane Theatre, for the year 1708-09. These records show that Mrs. Oldfield and comparable actors and actresses were receiving about half the salaries of present-day actresses.

Garrick stops at nothing in this series of essays to emphasize the extent of the danger he thinks is threatening his beloved stage. "What I have said before, I will again repeat, that the false importance of the principal performers at both houses, by the neglect of their duty...misconception of their interest,...and disappointment of the public, has brought disgrace and will bring ruin upon the English theatres!" He says further that "Were the performers of merit to exert their talents as they ought, and as their predecessors always did,...the sterling English drama would never be out of fashion!"

To the nationalistic Garrick nothing could be worse than the menace he saw rushing to replace the poorly produced, but
sound, dramatic pieces. "If plain, excellent beef, and mutton, are served up slovenly by bad cooks, instead of good ones, no wonder that we send for le Cuisinier Francois, and relish nothing but the larae-pique—scrapes, orts, and high sauces, of our fantastical neighbours."22. Continuing in this same vein he adds, "Our strongest dramas are weakened, and our weakest destroyed, by the present mode of performing them; and if the Managers want either spirit or skill to bring about a revolution, a French invasion of our theatre at least, must and will take place."23.

That Garrick was right in realizing the importance of the disorder in the theatre aggravated by Sheridan's lackadasical behaviour, becomes evident when one surveys the subsequent history of the management. As has already been mentioned, Thomas Sheridan took over the management in September, 1778. He is quoted by Rhodes as saying at that time "When by extreme ill conduct they (Sheridan the younger and Linley) were threatened with ruin, he (Sheridan the younger) agreed to put the management into my hands upon condition that I should not appear as a performer, and in this he got his brother managers to join him with such earnestness, that merely to gratify him I aquiesced."24. This change, though, hardly solved the problems. Thomas Sheridan's conduct was so undiplomatic that the young
managers, faced with a near-mutinous company, were forced to restrict his powers. His jealousy was such that he drove Garrick from the theatre where he had been helping the young actor Bannister to learn one of his old parts. 25. This is doubly culpable when one realizes from the correspondence concerning the incident that Thomas Sheridan not only had never acted the part himself, he had never seen it acted. 26.

This picture of occurrences at the theatre makes us realize that Garrick was not being hyper-critical of a new management when he tried to get its managers to accept their respective responsibilities.

Richard Sheridan, whose laggardliness is only too well chronicled by countless anecdotes, was pointedly warned in the sixth essay. "Let him (Sheridan) know," Garrick said, "I admire his genius, and blame his idleness." 27.

Rambling afield from his warnings to the theatre, Garrick, in his last essay, gave a brief picture of British comic genius as personified by Jonson, Beaumont and Fletcher, Congreve, and Vanbrugh. In this survey his love for good, natural comedy again becomes evident. These writers he rightly felt made up the Golden Age of English Drama. His brief comments, while criticising Jonson for sourness, Congreve and Vanbrugh for indecency, and Beaumont and Fletcher for inconsistency, show a
true appreciation of the merits of these men. He mentions the necessity of pruning the plays of the Restoration wits but shows a clear conception of the danger the alterer runs. "But this business must not be done with too much haste, or fear; for wicked wits will condemn all alteration; and alterations made without great care, may be condemned by all." 28.

There are no new facets to Garrick displayed in this collection of essays under discussion. In fact it is characteristic of the man that he worked consistently for the same goals throughout his life. Different works of his serve primarily to underline his determination. The principles he advocated in print were the same he supported through his actions as manager. Unlike Goldsmith and Sheridan who enriched the drama with short brilliant careers, Garrick fought his battles steadfastly and maintained his position in support of the best elements of native drama throughout a long period.
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Chapter V

The Clandestine Marriage*

Although Garrick wrote twenty-one plays, The Clandestine Marriage deserves consideration separately from the rest and a degree of inspection unnecessary for them. This is because of the play's intrinsic merit and popularity. It ran thirteen consecutive nights without benefit of afterpiece and was played six more times in its first season (1765-66). During the next season it was played fifteen times and brought in something over two thousand four hundred pounds. In the next nine years it was played over fifty times. An opera, Il Matrimonio Segreto was made from it, and it has had numerous revivals.

The characters of Lord Ogleby, Mrs. Heidelberg, and Brush, have a *vis comica* that earns them a place with other such comic creations of the 18th century as Goldsmith's Toby Lumpkin, and Sheridan's Lady Teazle and Mrs. Malaprop.

Garrick and George Colman collaborated in the writing of this play, and numerous differing evaluations have been made as to the respective enterprise of the two men. They quarrelled violently over the play when Garrick refused to play the part of Lord Ogleby, but the resultant correspondence does little to settle the question of who wrote which parts. Eugene R. Page, *Synopsis of play appears in Appendix 1.*

91.
in his otherwise excellent biography of Colman, seems to give almost complete credence to the comments of Colman and his son without testing them. Allardyce Nicoll, in British Drama, gives deserved praise to the central character of The Clandestine Marriage.

"Lord Ogleby in The Clandestine Marriage (1776) is another echo of Restoration days. Fops in Colman's time had not been common, and if they appeared occasionally they were vapid and uninteresting. Lord Ogleby, however, is in the best style of the older comedy, and the presentation of his character well qualified Colman for a place among the true masters of comic portraiture." Not only does Nicoll fail to consider Lord Ogleby as Garrick's creation, he fails to mention his name in this context as even a collaborator.

This comment of Nicoll's is not isolated. It stands merely as an example of a large body of writing which gives Colman this credit. George Colman, the younger, appears to have started this opinion in his Posthumous Letters from Various Celebrated Men; Addressed to Francis Colman, and George Colman, the Elder (1820). Although essentially the same opinion was expressed in Biographia Dramatica (1812), it is anecdotal in nature and could not be taken seriously. The
younger Colman's position was maintained in a Modern Language Notes article by Joseph M. Beatty Jr. (1921) and in George Colman, the Elder by Eugene R. Page (1935).

Two more recent works, David Garrick, Dramatist by Elizabeth Stein (1937) and "David Garrick and the Clandestine Marriage" by Frederick L. Bergmann (P.M.L.A., 1952), treat the question of authorship exhaustively and concur in the opinion that most of what we admire in the play is the result of Garrick's authorship. Their work is sound and thorough, and should furnish the generally accepted opinion.

Joint authorship poses a problem to the investigator interested in one man's product. If sufficient evidence cannot be discovered to show beyond reasonable doubt who wrote what, the particular piece is useless to indicate anything about the method of either man.

The purpose of the first examination must be that of incontrovertibly assigning such parts of the play to Garrick as can be so assigned. Colman, himself, made definite statements about some of Garrick's contributions.

1. He admitted that Garrick created the character of Lord Ogleby from the picture of the old lord in Hogarth's Marriage a la Mode.

2. He admitted that Garrick wrote the levee scene
in the second act and the whole of the fifth act.\footnote{5.}

3. He admitted that Garrick planned the fourth act, but insisted that he wrote some of the dialogue, including some of Lord Ogleby's.\footnote{6.}

These instances quoted above are particularly valuable because they are statements made by Colman when he was angry and belittling Garrick's contribution as much as possible.

Several contemporaries made general comments about the authorship of the part of Lord Ogleby. Benjamin Victor said that Garrick wrote and planned the part,\footnote{7.} and Tate Wilkinson that he was certain that Garrick wrote the part of Lord Ogleby before he left for Italy.\footnote{8.} Even Arthur Murphy, usually at odds with Garrick, said that Garrick was the limner of the portrait of Lord Ogleby.\footnote{9.}

The above material was for some time all the evidence that gave Garrick a major share in the partnership. A draft of the play in Colman's papers which seemed to agree closely with the finished production, furnished the ammunition for the early exaggerated claims of Colman's part as author. New manuscript evidence discovered at the Folger Shakespeare Library\footnote{10.} refutes much of this "evidence". This manuscript is obviously a working draft, not a copy. In it are some
parts in Garrick's handwriting, some in Colman's, and short passages in two other hands, probably those of amanuenses.

The opening scene of Brush and the Chambermaid is in Garrick's handwriting, as are the scenes in which Mrs. Heidelberg and Miss Sterling discuss Fanny's supposed plot to thwart Miss Sterling's marriage, and the scene in which Lovewell and Fanny plan to ask Lord Ogleby's assistance. In the fourth act he also wrote the garden scene, Fanny's interview with Ogleby, Lovewell's interview with Ogleby, and Sir John's admission to his uncle of his love for Fanny. The entire fifth act was in Garrick's handwriting.

One point that the early commentators, Colman the Younger, E. R. Page, the editors of Biographia Dramatica, and Joseph M. Beatty, Jr., completely failed to consider, was the ability of the two men to write certain parts and, judging from their previous works, the likelihood that they would have written them. When this play was begun, Garrick was the author of nine successful stage pieces. Colman had written and adapted only five and was a relative newcomer to the stage. Nothing in Colman's previous work is amplified in The Clandestine Marriage, whereas Garrick's two most often used themes form the basis of it. These two Garrick themes are: (1) the young woman who is beset by a number of wooers of various types, degrees, and ages and (2) the elderly beau who attempts to supplant a young
relative in the affections of a young lady. A third theme is also common to Garrick’s previous work and this under consideration, but it is not as commonly used by him as the others. This is the theme of the young lady’s over-refinement making frank expression impossible; her periphrasis leads to ambiguity and comic situations.

The first two themes are common to The Clandestine Marriage, Miss in Her Teens, and The Guardian. Fanny is beset by Lovewell, Sir John Melvil, and Lord Ogleby as suitors. Miss Biddy in Miss in Her Teens is being paid suit by four lovers, Captain Flash (a crude, cowardly boor), Fribble (a tertium quid), Captain Loveit (her true love), and Captain Loveit’s old father. As in The Clandestine Marriage the direction of her true affection is never in doubt. Fanny is married to Lovewell as the play commences; Miss Biddy announces her love for Captain Loveit before the other suitors are introduced. The profusion of beaux exists, not to make the heroine’s emotional choice difficult, but to furnish comic comparisons. In The Guardian Miss Harriet is actually in love with her guardian, Mr. Heartly. She is being paid suit by the fop, Mr. Clackit, and, through confusion rising from her maidenly modesty, old Sir Charles Clackit. This third thematic element of The Clandestine Marriage is a smoother version of this situation in The Guardian. A later play of Garrick’s, The Irish Widow, also has
an old uncle competing amorously with his nephew.

Garrick's early plays are sources, not only of the plot elements of *The Clandestine Marriage*, but also of many of the characters. James Boaden repeats the rumour that was common at the time, that Garrick refused to play the part of Lord Ogleby. This rumour was that Lord Ogleby was too similar to Garrick's character in *Lethe* named Lord Chalkstone, and that Garrick, by playing Ogleby, would make that similarity more obvious to the audiences. This probably had no bearing on Garrick's refusal to play the part. He had sworn, for reasons of health, not to undertake any new part after his continental trip (1763-1765). There is, however, a close resemblance in the two characters.

Ogleby and Chalkstone were both gouty, amorous, crusty, lovable characters. Both were concerned with nephews whom they decided to rival in love. Both had sycophants for valets. Both had conversations with their hosts regarding taste in landscape design: Chalkstone's regarding the Elysian Groves, Ogleby's regarding Sterling's mazes, moats, and views. Chalkstone sees his nephew sporting with "Beauties of Antiquity" in the Elysian groves and decides to compete with him for their favours. Ogleby welcomes Sir John as a rival for Fanny's hand. Bowman and Canton serve equal functions in relation to
the two old men. Each flatters and compliments his master's form, taste, humour, and irresistible way with women.

Mrs. Heidelberg is derived from the character of Mrs. Snip in *Harlequin's Invasion* and, to a certain extent, Mrs. Riot in *Lethe*. Mrs. Riot was ostentatious and mispronounced words. In her lines "Charon" became "Scarroon" just as Mrs. Heidelberg warps "quality" into "qualaty". Mrs. Riot objected to being in the company of "Tradesman's wives and Mechanics" on the river Styx. Mrs. Snip is a coarse tradesman's wife who wishes to be "Qualitified". Mrs. Heidelberg inherits from the two her vulgarity, her domineering spirits, and her desire to ape quality. Mrs. Snip has a daughter and has feelings toward that daughter that are similar to those Mrs. Heidelberg has for her eldest niece. Mrs. Snip sees in Dolly, her daughter, her own likeness. Mrs. Heidelberg sees herself mirrored in Betsy. Both of the women have ambitious plans for the daughter and niece respectively. Both of the women control the man of the household absolutely, although they use different weapons to accomplish the control; Mrs. Snip uses the threat of infidelity, while Mrs. Heidelberg uses money and plays on Sterling's greed.

As has been already said, the pictures of Dolly and Betsy are very similar. Each has the same character and desires in
life. They differ in that Betsy Sterling is a much fuller
caracterization, and that Betsy has a certain amount of
wealth in the beginning that Dolly lacks.

Betty, Fanny Sterling's maid, also shows certain quali-
ties reminiscent of other maids in other plays of Garrick,
particularly Lucy in The Guardian and, occasionally, Tag in
Miss in Her Teens. This similarity becomes noticeable when
they become less bits of stage machinery and more individualised.
In the first and fifth acts of The Clandestine Marriage Betty
shows an outspokenness. She warns Fanny of the "growing" rea-
son (pregnancy) for an early announcement of her marriage, and
in the fifth act speaks out with verve. After telling Sir
Charles in The Guardian that she thinks her mistress is in
love with him, Lucy engages in the following byplay with him.

Sir C.: "—eh, Lucy! you joke for certain?
Lucy: "Indeed I do not, Sir—'twas in vain for
me to say that nothing could be so ri-
diculous as such a choice.—Nay, Sir,
I went a little further, (You'll excuse
me) and told her—Good God, madam, said I,
why he is old and gouty, asmatic, rheuma-
tic, sciatic, spleenatic. It signified
nothing, she had determined.
Sir C.: "But you need not have told her all of that."11.

That Garrick was in his element when describing comic courtships, can be seen by a perusal of his plays. He almost never, however, depicted "straight" love scenes in his plays and seems to have tried to avoid them. It seems that the "straight" proposal of Sir John Melvil to Fanny bears more similarity to some of Colman's writing. This and scenes more closely drawing on Colman's business and legal experience appear to be largest contributions to the play.

Frederick L. Bergmann makes a large point of the fact that The Clandestine Marriage shows the deft hand of the stage professional in its technique.12. Garrick, in the parts of the manuscript at the Folger Shakespeare Library in his handwriting, quite obviously plans whole scenes around audience effect. He envisages entrances and exits. He carefully plans that each entr'acte will take up the time spent by the on-stage characters in a meal. The careful introduction of Lord Ogleby, particularly by Brush, before he appears, is excellent stage business. It shows Garrick following the advice he gave Cumberland when Cumberland was revising The West Indian.

The following reminiscence comes from Cumberland's autobiography.

"I punctually remember when he (Garrick) said to me in his chariot on our way to Hampton—'I want something more to
be announced of your West Indian before you bring him on the stage to give éclat to his entrance, and rouse the curiosity of the audience; that they may say—Aye, here he comes with all his colours flying'. When I asked him how this was to be done, and who was to do it, he considered awhile and then replied—'Why that is your look out, my friend, not mine; but if neither your Merchant nor his clerk can do it, why, why send in the servants, and let them talk about him. Never let me see a hero step upon the stage without his trumpeters of some sort or other.'\(^\text{13}\).

It is also apparent how carefully Garrick tailored the play to fit the capabilities of his company of actors. In an early draft of his of the play\(^\text{14}\) all the characters have the players' names while Colman's\(^\text{15}\) has fictitious ones. "Gentleman" O'Brien was in Garrick's mind for the part of Lovewell before he began to write the play. Mrs. Heidelberg was designed to exploit the vast comic talents of Kitty Clive. Likewise Miss Pope was Betsy Sterling. Only Garrick had this detailed knowledge of the capabilities of his company, and it is no accident that the characters in The Clandestine Marriage fitted so well the proficiencies of the players.

To summarize the respective contributions of the co-authors, Garrick seems to have been the principal contributor
to all the scenes, excepting those primarily concerned with Sir John Melvil, and the lawyer scene. These exceptions consist of Sir John's interview with Lovewell in which he seeks his aid in proposing to Fanny, their interruption by Sterling's party touring the garden, and Sir John's actual proposal (parts of Act II, scene 2), the lawyer scene (Act III, scene 1) and the interviews with Sterling and Heidelberg in the same act (scenes 1 and 2); and the two episodes in Act IV, one concerning Mrs. Heidelberg's threat to cut the Sterling family out of her will, and the other Miss Sterling's appeal to Lord Ogleby (Act IV, scenes 1 and 3). This covers Colman's major contributions to the play with the exception of the first act.

There seems to be legitimate doubt as to who was the major designer of this act, and any pronouncement one way or the other would be based on uncertainties. Because of this the first act has been omitted from the preceding analysis.

Now to examine the play itself with particular reference to its sentimentality or lack of it. The prevailing spirit of the play is comic and satiric. There is no heroine for the audience to weep tears for; instead there is a heroine in a succession of embarrassing situations, mostly of her own making, designed to arouse laughter. Fanny's sensibility, rather than
being something to raise lumps in our throats, is exaggerated to the point at which it becomes ludicrous and causes her embarrassment. We, as an audience, never identify ourselves with Fanny. We are forever on the outside chuckling at the trouble her over-refinement is causing her. The sentimental heroine must have the sympathy of the audience. Her course is usually exaggerated into absolute right versus absolute wrong. A point which would mean little to a modern audience but would be significant to an eighteenth century one, is that Fanny has put herself outside the pale of absolute right by being, in the first place, a daughter who has disobeyed the wishes of her father who, though brusque and obsessed with money, is amiable. Parental authority, unless it was terribly perverted, was something the eighteenth century respected. Also the fact that Fanny's maid, Betty, although Fanny's true friend, objected strongly to her hyper-sensitivity shows that an audience is not expected to sympathise with it.

No more is Lovewell the typical sentimental hero. He is enough of a rational schemer, to be quite frank in his intention of postponing the announcement of his marriage until he can get Sterling to look with favour upon the union, and bless it financially. For the prospect of money Lovewell is willing to cause his wife much anguish. This is not the reaction of a
sentimental hero.

Sterling, Mrs. Heidelberg, and Betsy Sterling are satires on the merchant class. They show in a ludicrous manner characteristics of their class by chasing after titles, aping fashion, and completely lacking any taste of their own. The very fact that middle class caricature could be popular, shows how firmly established the middle class had become since the days of Lillo when it demanded glorification. Sterling's landscaping is laughed at, and Betsy's pretensions to society are laughed at, and Mrs. Heidelberg's portrait in the costume of a shepherdess is laughed at, — along with her quaint little dairy where she can play at being a dairymaid. At the same time their exaggerated regard for money is made ridiculous. As their sacrifices to money are emphasized, so is the humour in their wasting of it heightened. Sterling's eager acceptance of Sir John Melvil's change in affection between the sisters as long as the Sterling family benefits financially is an example. Another is Sterling's sacrifice of all freedom of decision, for the possibility of becoming his sister's heir.

Sir John and Lord Ogleby are both compromises between Restoration and sentimental types. They are Restoration rakes with their rough edges shorn. Sir John is at first quite willing to marry a merchant's daughter for money with no
consideration of affection between them, but he later feels love for Fanny. Lord Ogleby has the rake-hell's attitude, but because of his advanced age and his infirmities, is comic rather than dangerous. His susceptibility to feminine charm and his sense of chivalry, serve the sentimental function of getting Fanny's marriage accepted by her family.

It is very important to understand the denouement of this play thoroughly, for it is superficially sentimental without being actually so. It shows Sterling and his sister becoming reconciled to the clandestinely married couple. They do this, however, not because of a fifth act conversion to tender feelings, but because of logical action stemming from their faults of character. Sterling reconciles himself because his sister becomes reconciled. This is consistent with his action throughout the play. In the making of every decision he has acted to please his sister. Mrs. Heidelberg agreed to overlook Fanny's transgression only because Lord Ogleby had. She had always considered Lord Ogleby the essence of that "Qualaty" which she wanted to ape and would be eager to placate. Why did Lord Ogleby champion the lovers? He did it because, as he said in the last act, "I swore to support her affection with my life and fortune; 'tis a debt of honour, and must be paid." His primary consideration then was chivalry—faithfulness to
an oath. His secondary reason was his vulnerability to any
delectable damsel's charms. The play was exhibiting follies
to ridicule, follies of the aristocracy in the need to refill
their purses, follies of the middle class in the first flush
of wealth, follies of over-sensibility, etc. The Clandestine
Marriage has elements of farce, sentimental comedy, and the
comedy of manners in it. It is, though, predominately a
comedy of manners and as such will stand or fall.

Nineteenth century criticisms show the wearing qualities
of the play. Samuel Phelps' revival of The Clandestine Marriage
at the Royal Princess' Theatre in London brought forth the
following from the drama critic of the London Times.

"If 40 years ago an habitual playgoer had been asked
which was the best known comedy in the English language, the
two celebrated works of Sheridan being set aside, he would have
probably named the Clandestine Marriage of Garrick and the
elder Colman. Carefully constructed, with dialogue elegantly
written, though not brilliant, untainted by the slightest sus-
picion of farce, unexceptionable in its moral, free alike from
the licentiousness of a preceding and the sentimentality of a
succeeding period, this comedy might be regarded as one of the
most genuine classics of the British stage."
When Cyril Maude played Lord Ogleby at the Haymarket Theatre in 1903 the London Times spoke thus:

"And then Lord Ogleby has the supreme merit of sometimes talking like Lord Chesterfield. One of his good things in the Chesterfieldian vein is worth transcribing for it establishes him, we suggest, as the direct ascendant of Mr. Pinero's aged nobleman in Mrs. Ebbsmith -- who confessed that "he could never approach women in a missionary spirit." 'Beauty, madam' says Lord Ogleby, 'is to me a religion, in which I was born and bred a bigot, and hope to die a martyr.' That is superb; even his lordship's contemporary, Sir Charles Grandison could not have bettered it."
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GARRICK in the Character of ST. JOHN BRUTE.
—So! how d'ye like my Shafes now?
Chapter VI

Garrick's Short Dramatic Works

If one is concerned with the position of Garrick's dramatic works as regards sentimentality, there is no alternative to a thorough analysis of them. While none of the short pieces deserves the detailed consideration given The Clandestine Marriage in the preceding chapter, all the works with the exception of the Christmas pantomimes merit some discussion, for in a study of this kind, negative evidence (i.e. lack of sentimentality) can serve the positive purpose of helping to indicate the author's feelings and influence.

Six of Garrick's plays have real comic merit. All of them offered good acting parts and held the stage well. None kept their place in the repertory long after Garrick's retirement. Their primary function was to satisfy the audiences' demand for new pieces in a period when there were few new pieces of merit being written. They held a place on the stage that would have otherwise been usurped by either didactic or musical presentations.

Two of these farces, The Lying Valet and Neck or Nothing, utilized a central roguish character to furnish spirit and vitality to the production. Another two, had heroines who 'stooped' in one manner or another to 'conquer' the opposition to romantic success. A fifth, Bon Ton; or, High Life
above the Stairs, was a sequel to one of the finest farces of the century, Townley's High Life below the Stairs. The last, The Guardian, was an overtly anti-sentimental comedy.

The Lying Valet was altered from Motteux's All Without Money, and in the alteration one can see Garrick's attempts to lessen the didacticism. He was in favour of a moral only when it was "deduc'd from the whole." Gayless in Motteux's play decides in the last act that his rakish existence is shallow and that he will reform. Garrick refused to leave this character as written. He started the first scene with Gayless planning reform and has the valet, Sharp, keep prodding him forward in deception. This makes for excellent dialogue as well as sound motivation of the eventual disavowal of his former ways.

Gay.: "....What, because I am poor, shall I abandon my honour?"

Sharp: "Yes, you must, Sir, or abandon me; so pray, discharge one of us; for eat I must, and speedily too; and you know very well that that honour of yours will neither introduce you to a great man's table, nor get me credit for a single beefsteak."

Gay.: "What can I do?"
Sharp: "Nothing while honour sticks in your throat: do gulp, master, and down with it."

Gay: "Prithee leave me with my thoughts."

Sharp: "Leave you! no, not in such bad company, I'll assure you!"............

Gay: "Don't be witty, and give your advice, Sirrah!"

Sharp: "Do you be wise, and take it, Sir."1

Time after time he saved his master's condition from exposure. A typical example of his ingenuity was a subterfuge he devised to prevent Melissa from bringing her friends to his master's for a party. He appeared at her house in a disheveled condition and artfully encouraged her to draw from him his carefully prepared story. He explained that as he was leaving his master's a neighboring attorney's wife told him that she was going to have Gayless's house indicted as a nuisance - that she had seen Gayless and Melissa making love through adjoining bedroom windows.

Melissa: "Did you not contradict her?"

Sharp: "Contradict her! Why, I told her I was sure she lied: 'For zounds!' said I -- for I could not help swearing, -- 'I am so well convinced of the lady's and my master's prudence, that, I am sure,
had they a mind to amuse themselves they would certainly have drawn the window curtains."

---

Sharp admits he made a full confession after the attorney fell upon him and beat him.

Neil.: "A full confession! What did you confess?"

Sharp: "That my master loved fornication; that you had no aversion to it; that Mistress Kitty was a bawd, and your humble servant a pimp."

After this, logically enough, Melissa decides she has a vapour and cannot attend the party.

However, to Gayless' confusion, she sends her friends. By ruse after ruse, Sharp postpones the eventual discovery of his master's poverty. Melissa arrives at the party in disguise and observes the confusion. A servant of Gayless's father acts as *deus ex machina* to resolve the difficulties.

Melissa, here at the conclusion, is so impressed with Sharp's faithfulness to his master that she promises a dowry to Kitty if Sharp and Kitty marry. Sharp, though, remains the rogue to the last:

Sharp: "I fancy, Madam, 'twould be better to half the small fortune between us, and keep us both single: for as we shall live in the same house, in all probability we may taste the comforts of matrimony, and not be troubled with its inconveniences."
Cayless, as he has been threatening from the beginning, repents. But his place has ever been dominated by the pleasant rascality of The Lying Valet.

When Garrick sent his brother Peter a copy of this farce, he said, "The Valet takes prodigiously, and is thought the most diverting farce that ever was perform'd; I believe you'll find it reads pretty well, and in performance 'tis a general roar from beginning to end." Nothing sentimental ever met with such an audience reaction.

Neck or Nothing utilizes the same humorous character, a rascal. It is a fast-moving farcical comedy of intrigue which concerns the nefarious plans of two valets to get the 10,000 pound marriage portion of Nancy Stockwell, and the eventual failure of their plans. The pace of the action is as fast and witty as that of The Lying Valet and The Clandestine Marriage. As in The Lying Valet the pleasure in the play comes from watching Slip imaginatively improvise escapes from the net of circumstance closing in on him.

Slip is the valet to Harlowe, son of Sir Harry Harlowe who has arranged a marriage between his son and Nancy, the
daughter of Mr. Stockwell, a wealthy citizen of London. Harlowe, though, unfortunately for his father's plans, was forced into a country marriage by a neighbour's girl with a military brother. As the farce begins, Slip is on his way to old Stockwell with a letter informing him of his master's marriage and the necessity of breaking the marriage contract. Slip meets his friend, Martin, who is valet to Bedford, Nancy's real love. Realizing that the Stockwells have never seen Harlowe, Martin decides to impersonate him and get away with the 10,000 pounds, even marrying Nancy if necessary.

The battle of wits begins with Slip's presentation of a near-illiterate letter of his own composition introducing himself as Harlowe. It continues very amusingly until Harlowe's father appears on the scene in time to expose the plot.

As the emphasis is on intrigue few of the characterizations are particularly strong. The two rascals, of course, dominate the piece. Stockwell is a good picture of an avaricious but pleasant citizen. He and Sir Harry Harlowe represented between them, the two types of wealthy men in England at the time, the country squire and the nouveau-riche.

This farce was adapted from Le Sage's *Crispin, rival de son maitre*. Despite its fast pace it was not a Drury Lane
favourite. Unlike most of Garrick's farces which wore well, it was acted for only two seasons. Its emphasis on intrigue certainly places it in opposition to the general stream of sentimentality which was threatening to engulf the stages of the time.

Both Miss in her Teens and The Irish Widow are primarily concerned, as their titles indicate, with women. In each play the hero is a relatively minor character. In Miss in her Teens, the first of the two plays, Miss Biddy Bellair finds herself with two unwanted suitors when her lover, Captain Loveit, returns from war in Flanders. She has inadvertently made engagements with them both. Fribble comes first, pays court, and is concealed when someone else is heard at the door. Flash arrives and Biddy tells him her heart is pledged to another. He promises to run the man through if he should ever meet him. Miss Biddy accommodates him by ushering in Fribble and introducing him as her lover. Both draw their swords but each is afraid to fight, Flash being a cowardly bully and Fribble openly effeminate. Captain Loveit enters, exposes Flash as a deserter from Flanders and runs them both away.

The humour comes from the precocious behaviour of the teen-age heroine in playing her suitors off against each other;
in the typical servants' commentary on sex and life; and most
important of all, from the two caricatures, Flash and Fribble.
Here we see casting showing that element of the play
that is to be emphasized. In the twenty-seven seasons it was
acted at Drury Lane during Carrick's period of management,
the most common players of Flash and Fribble were Woodward
and Carrick, the two best male players. Bits of the dialogue
when each had his interview with Miss Diddy show the humorous
characterisation.

First, Captain Flash.

Tag: "Pray, sir, hear reason a little."

Flash: "I never do, madam; it is not my method of pro-
ceeding; here is my logic (draws sword) Sa, Sa,---
my best argument is carte over arm, madam, ha, ha!
(Laughs) And if he answers that, madam, through
my small guts, my breath, blood, and mistress,
are all at his service------nothing more, madam."

Biddy:-------

Tag: "But, sir, sir, sir!"

Flash: "But, madam, madam, madam! I profess blood, madam;
I was bred up to it from a child; I study the book
of fate, and the camp is my university; I have
attended the lectures of Prince Charles upon the
Rhine, and Bathiani upon the Po, and have extracted knowledge from the mouth of the cannon: I'm not to be frightened with squibs; madam, no, no,"?

Puff describes Flash in action later, after Captain Loveit recognizes him. The difference between the real Flash and the Flash described by himself is the source of much comedy. As one can see, the difference is large.

Puff: ‘He was the first that fell, sir; the wind of a cannon-ball had struck him flat upon his face; he had just strength enough to creep into a ditch, and there he was found after the battle in a most deplorable condition.’

Fribble aroused even more controversy than Flash. The Fribble type seems always to have been a pet aversion of Garrick’s. The highest abuse he could heap on Fitzpatrick, who led the rioters against Drury Lane in 1763, was to call him Fribble and preserve his memory in that epic of poor taste, The Fribble-rial. No doubt the dandified manners of the time encouraged a boldness and openness, which the type had never before affected. This character was not altogether new on the stage, however. Genest mentions that Maiden in Thomas Baker’s Tun-bridge Walks is similar.
A sample of the dialogue will show the Fribble that Carrick painted in the play.

Fribble: "But to return to my accident, and the reason why my hand is in this condition——. There is not an animal in creation I have so great an aversion to, as those hackney coach fellows——. As I was coming out of my lodgings, says one of them to me, "Would your honour have a coach?" No, man," said I, "not now (with all civility imaginable)——I will carry you and your doll too," says he, 'Miss Margery for the same price.'——Upon which the masculine beasts about us fell a laughing; then I turned round in a great passion, 'curse me,' says I, 'fellow, but I will trounce thee.—And, as I was holding out my hand in a threatening poster,—thus——; he makes a cut at me with his whip, and striking me over the nail of the little finger, it gave me such exquisite torturer that I fainted away; and while I was in this condition, the mob picked my pocket of my purse, my scissors, my vases smell-bottle, and my huswife.

Biddy: "I shall laugh in his face (aside)——but I hope
your hand is in no danger.

Fribb.: "Not in the least, maam; pray do not be apprehensive—a milk poultice, and a gentle sweat to-night, with a little manna in the morning, I am confident, will relieve me entirely."9

Several publications indicate the widespread public annoyance with the Fribble prototypes. A tract entitled The Pretty Gentleman: or, Softness of Manners Vindicated from the False Ridicule exhibited under the character of William Fribble, Esq., and published in 1747 purports to vindicate Fribble but is actually a fiercer satire against him. "How virtuously, how usefully are their Hours employed! Not in wrangling Squabbles of the Bar, or the unseemly contention of the Senate; not in the robust Sports of the Field, or in a toilsome application to ungentlemanlike Science; but in the pretty Fancies of Dress, in criticisms upon Fashions,----in sewing, in knitting Carters, in knotting Fringe, and every gentle Exercise of Feminine Economy."10 This pamphlet parallels Garrick's opinion of the Fribbles so neatly that it is quite probable that it was written by an ally of his. It must have portrayed a real evil, however, for the pamphlet was reprinted in Edinburgh in the nineteenth century.

The Present State of the Stage in Great Britain and Ireland
gives a factual case by its anonymous author to support the realistic characterization in Miss in Her Teens. "At this very time," he says, "I know by sight, thank Heaven it is only by Sight! a Person who is a very Falstaff in size, yet speaks and moves for all the World like a Lady. --- This same delicate Object came not long since into a Coffee House, with his Hand Muffled in black Silk, and told a deplorable Story of a Hurt received, in a Voice almost as fine, and Manner quite as melancholy as does the Fribble of Garrick."11

Murphy, in his Life of Garrick said that "Fribble and Captain Flash.......exploded two miscreants that were a disgrace to society."12

This farce, at any rate, is another 'roar from beginning to end,' reaching a climax when Miss Biddy engineers the duel. Miss Stein points out that the two caricatures are all Garrick's, and with them, the emphasis is on pre-Restoration type humour rather than Restoration wit. The same may be said for Goldsmith's plays.

It is interesting to note that the affairs of the heart are never in doubt in Garrick's plays. The problem of making a choice which so easily lend themselves to sentimental treatment appear in none of these plays under consideration. Gayless is betrothed to Melissa at the very beginning of The
Lying Valet, and Captain Loveit and Miss Biddy announce their love for each other as soon as they reunite in Miss in her Teens. The same is true in The Irish Widow.

This play was dedicated to Mrs. Barry, the great actress, and written so that she could have an Irish part. This Irish part, Widow Brady, would certainly give a talented actress opportunity. The plot involves an old gallant, Old Whittle, who has decided to marry the Widow that his nephew is in love with. Widow Brady is in love with the nephew but is powerless against the influence of her father, Sir Patrick O'Neal, who cannot resist the lure of Old Whittle's money.

The nephew, and his allies get Widow Brady to affect a loud coarse Irish brogue, and to paint such a terrible picture of her expected married life that Old Whittle will be scared away from the union. This she does. As well, she disguises herself as a non-existent brother and with an even coarser Irish brogue, accuses Old Whittle of breach of promise. Through these and other machinations the lovers are united, and the nephew's fortune, left in trust by his father, comes to him. Another old man, Kecksey, serves as a bad example of an old man married to a young girl.

The jollity of this farce comes from the picture of the
Irishwoman which is very tastefully planned. It has all of the robust, exaggerated humour one desires; yet it is not an unfair picture because it makes no pretence of being accurate. It is an intentional exaggeration that is assumed with the full knowledge of the audience. Thus it presents a stage Irishwoman on two levels, one the Widow Brady herself, and the second the Widow Brady as she exaggerates herself to discourage Old Whittle. Another comic element is, of course, Old Whittle who in old age is re-committing the follies of youth, and appearing a perfect fool in the process. As Old Whittle's servant, Thomas, says to the family friend, Bates, "You never saw such an alter'd man in your born days!—he's grown young again; he frisks, and prances, and runs about, as if he had a new pair of legs—he has left off his brown camlet surtout, which he wore all summer, and now with his hat under arm, he goes open-breasted, and he dresses, and powders, and smirks so, that you would take him for the mad Frenchman in Bedlam—something wrong in his upper story—would you think it?—he wants me to have a pigtail."

Kecksey gives a good warning to Old Whittle as to what happens to an old man who marries a young woman. Throughout his lines he afflicted with a terrible cough. This seems to
be the dramatic indication that his days are numbered. He describes his marital state well.

Keck: "Life's nothing without love—*hush! hush!—*

I'm happy as the day's long! My wife loves gadding, and I can't stay at home, so we are of a mind—*

she's every night at one or other of the garden places; but among friends, I am a little afraid of the damp; *hush! hush! hush! she has got an Irish gentleman, a kind of cousin of hers, to take care of her; a fine fellow; and so good-natured. ---It is a vast comfort to have such a friend in a family! *Hush! hush! hush!*"\(^{11}\).

Just after Old Whittle finishes describing Widow Brady to Kecksey as a soft-spoken young thing, she appears and puts on her act. The close positioning of her speeches as Whittle wants her, and her speeches showing her as she pretends to be, heighten the contrast. Old Whittle says, "---the Widow was made on purpose for me; she is so bashful, has no acquaintance, and she never would stir out of doors, if her friends were not afraid of a consumption, and so force her into the air. Such a delicate creature! ---"\(^{15}\). A few minutes later the Widow says to him, "---It is impossible to be in this metropolis of London, and have any thoughts but of the Operas, Plays,
Masquerade, and Pantomime, to keep up one's spirits in the winter, and Reelalagh, Varnish, and Marybone fireworks to cool and refresh one in the summer. La! la! la! 16. As she leaves a few minutes later she says, "My mantua-maker is waiting for me to choose my clothes, in which I shall forget the sorrows of Mrs. Brady, in the joys of Mrs. Whittel.

I have no fortune myself, I shall bring a tolerable one to you, in debt, Mr. Whittel. Etc., etc."

17.

The denouement is active and bustling. Old Whittle finally agrees to make financial retribution to his nephew when he allows him to marry the Widow, but there is no apparent reform in his character. Indeed, he attempts to evade the agreement after he has made it, but is prevented by the family friend, Bates, and the old servant, Thomas. There is no real sympathy for any party in the play. Old Whittle tries to take his nephew's fiancée and her money as well. But he is, in turn tricked himself. Then all are tricksters the pleasure is derived from watching the tricks in action rather than seeing right triumph. True love, in this case, is victorious.

But again Garrick starts the play with the love scene and merely lets the lovers overcome obstacles in their way. There is no love scene as such.

The play, because of its resemblance to Moliero's Le
Marriage forced must be considered an adaption rather than a complete original composition. The pace, though, the striking characterisations throughout, the combined dialect-breeches part for Mrs. Barry, several minor characters, and the denouement are all Garrick's.

Garrick's prologue for *Ben Ton; or, High Life Above Stairs* defines the bon ton of which the farce shows the follies:

"Ben ton's a constant trade

Of rout, festino, ball, and masquerade;

*Tis plays and puppet-shows; *tis something new;

*Tis losing thousands ev'ry night at Loc;

Nature it thwarts, and contradicts all reason:

*Tis stiff French stays, and fruit when out of season;

A rose when half a guinea is the price,

A set of boys scarce bigger than six mice;

To visit friends you never wish to see:

Marriage *twixt those who never can agree:

Old dowagers drest, painted, patch'd, and curl'd;

This is bon ton, and this we call the world."¹⁵

This is without a doubt an excellent high-spirited comedy designed to wittily expose the superficiality of the fashionable set. The intrigues between Lady Miniker and Col. Tivy
and between Tittup and Lord Miniken furnish one amusing scene after another. Their modern concept of morals forbids them to be too worried about being caught in an amour by their rightful partner, but they play the game of deception as society dictates and are heartily anxious about their licentiousness being discovered by the crusty, strait-laced Sir John Trotley. As Lady Miniken's uncle and Tittup's cousin, he has it in his power to disinherit them.

Early in the play Lady Miniken summarizes the concept the fashionable wife has for her husband: "I hate to praise myself, and yet I say with truth ever, that no woman of quality ever had, can have, or will have, so consummate a contempt for her lord, as I have for most honourable and puissant Earl of Miniken, Viscount Periwinkle, and Baron Titmouse—Ha, ha, ha!" Later in the same scene Tittup soliloquizes on the family: "What a poor, blind, half-witted, self-conceited creature, this dear friend and relation of mine is! (Lady Miniken for not seeing through Tittup's relations with Lord Miniken) And what a fine spirited gallant soldier my Colonel is! (her fiancé) My Lady Miniken likes him, he likes my fortune: my Lord likes me, and I like my Lord; however, not so much as he imagines, or to play the fool so rashly as he
may expect; she must be very silly indeed, who can't flutter about the flame without burning her wings."^{20} Then in the remainder of the speech the audience gets the history of this fine family. "What a great revolution in this family in the space of fifteen months!—We went out of England a very awkward, regular, good English family! but half a year in France, and a winter passed in the warmer climate of Italy, have ripened our minds to every refinement of ease, dissipation and pleasure."^{20} Sir, John, the moral spokesman of the piece, speaks much that is merely old-fashioned as well as much that is old-fashioned and sensible. This keeps him from being a stock foil for vice. In conversation with his servant, Davy, who is intrigued by the city, Sir John sometimes comes out the worst. Garrick is not above poking fun at his reformers. As a true satirist, he attacks hypocrisy and vanity wherever it lies.

Davy: (describing the city's charm) "Such crowding coaching, carting, and squeezing; such a power of fine sights, fine shops full of fine things; and then such fine illuminations all of a row; and such fine dainty ladies in the streets, so civil and so graceless—they talk of country girls, these have look more
healthy and rosy by half.

Sir John: "Sirrah, they are prostitutes; and are civil to delude and destroy you: they are painted Jezebels; and they who hearken to them, like Jezebel of old, will go to the dogs: if you dare to look at them you will be tainted; and if you speak to 'em, you are undone.

Davy: "Bless us, bless us! — How does your honour know all this? Were they as bad in your time?

Sir John: "Not by half, Davy. — In my time, there was a sort of decency in the worst of women—but the harlots now watch like tigers for their prey, and drag you to their dens of infamy. — See, Davy, how they have torn my neckcloth. (Shows his neckcloth)

Davy: "If you had gone civilly, you honour, they would not have hurt you."

Sir John discovers Lord Miniker on his knees to Tittup in his chambers, and Col. Tivy on his knees to Lady Miniker in hers. Tittup hides behind Lord Miniker's chair at first and contributes, undiscovered, to a good scene, but Sir John re-enters after she has left her hiding place. Sir John accepts the
explanations, but obviously sees through them. Tittup said that she had just given her consent to marry Lord Miniken's friend Col. Tivy, and that Lord Miniken was on his knees in joy at this good news. In the parallel scene in her ladyship's room, where Sir John goes to "comfort her" for being mated to a profligate, he discovers Col. Tivy on his knees to her. A tryst had just been arranged by them for the evening. Lady Miniken's answer to Sir John's exclamatory "All pigs of the same styne" is to say that she had just announced to Col. Tivy that she had removed all objections to his marriage with Tittup, and that he, in a moment of ecstasy, had kissed her hand in gratitude.

The final excellent scene takes place after the masquerade. First Tittup and Lord Miniken return for a tête-à-tête. Jessamy guards the door. Col. Tivy and Lady Miniken arrive, Tittup is hidden in a closet, and Lord Miniken goes to his room. Lady Miniken hides Col. Tivy behind the chimney-board after finding the closet locked. Lord Miniken and his wife then meet, express surprise at seeing each other home so early, and each sets to work to rid himself of the other. This Lord Miniken accomplishes by asking the opposite—that they have the fire lighted and stay up together. Their fond good-night
is beautifully satirical with Col. Tivy and Tittup hidden in the room.

Lord Min.: "Well, if your ladyship will be cruel, I must still, like the miser, starve and sigh, though possessed of the greatest treasure—(Bows)—I wish your ladyship a good-night.—(He takes one candle and she takes the other.) May I presume—(Salutes her.)

Lady M.: "Your Lordship is too obliging.—Nasty man (aside).

Lord M.: "Disagreeable woman! (aside)

(They wipe their lips and exeunt ceremoniously.)

Each of the Minikens comes back in the dark to rescue his hidden partner. In the dark identities are confused and each ends with his morally rightful partner when Sir John fearing burglars rouses the house.

Sir John: "Give me a candle, I'll ferret 'em out, I warrant;—bring a blunderbuss, I say; they have been skipping about that gallery in the dark this half hour; there must be mischief—I have watch'd 'em into this room—"
again.—You'll excuse me, gentlemen and ladies!"  

The play has a moral ending in that Lord Miniken is sent to deal with his creditors and Lady Miniken and Tittup are taken to the country by Sir John in the hope that they will reform. Col. Tivy leaves as soon as he hears Tittup is no longer Sir John's heiress. There is no sentiment, though, because there is no last act reform. The nearest approach to this is a rather uninterested comment by Lady Miniken, to the effect that she is not as bad as she seems and that there is a possibility she may reform. Tittup does not go this far.

The play has a good structure and genuine vis comica. The interruption of the final scene by Sir John looking for burglars is well motivated. Before the masquerade he mentioned that his sword had been stolen from him in the street and that he was now worried about thieves. The secondary action involving Sir John's country servant who falls in love with the city, and Lord Miniken's servant Jessamy who considers himself a fine gentleman, shows clearly the effect of fashion on the lower orders. If all of Garrick's writing had been up to the level of this farce his name would rank high as an eighteenth century dramatist. Certainly this was an example of the type of play that successfully protected the stage from being engulfed by the tearful.
The Guardian takes the offensive against sentimental comedy. Not only is its humour derived from situation and social satire, it is also derived from the ludicrous behaviour of a heroine and a hero endowed with a surplus of sentiment. The play is furnished with a down-to-earth maid (played by Kitty Clive for the first five years of the piece's run) who points out the comical aspects of this sentiment and the difficulty it causes.

The source for the farce is Barthelemi-Christophe Fagan's La Pupille. William Whitehead later used the same French theme for his extremely sentimental comedy, The School for Lovers. Garrick, the non-sentimentalist, ridiculed the sentiments that Fagan showed respect for in the original and Whitehead heightened in his adaptation. The action of The Guardian proceeds as follows. Mr. Clackit, a fop, persuades his uncle, Sir Charles Clackit, to help him further his suit with the ward of Sir Charles' old friend, Mr. Heartly. Miss Harriet, the ward, is actually in love with her guardian, but because of her excess of sentiment, is unable to tell him so. When he asks what her feelings are about young Clackit she is so perturbed that at first Heartly thinks she loves the fop. Later, though, he realizes his mistake and asks her for the truth. Lucy, the
maid, determined to get to the bottom of the issue discovers that her mistress is in love with an older man and tells Sir Charles it is he. This scene of an old man presuming a young lady to be in love with him is a favorite in Garrick's plays and never fails to furnish amusement.

Lucy: "I pressed her so much, that at last she confessed.

Sir C.: "Well, what?

Lucy: "That, in the first place, she did not like your nephew.

Sir C.: "And I told the puppy so.

Lucy: "That she had a moral antipathy for the young men of their age; and that she had settled her affections upon one of riper years, and riper understanding.

Sir C.: "Indeed?

Lucy: "And that she expected from a lover in his autumn more affection, more complaisance, more constancy, and more discretion of course.

Heart.: "That is very particular.

Sir C.: "Aye, but it is very prudent for all that.

Lucy: "In short, as she had openly declared against the nephew, I took upon me to speak of his uncle."
Sir C.: "Of me, child?

Lucy: "Yes, of you, Sir;—and she did not say me nay,—but cast such a look, and fetched such a sigh,—that if ever I looked and sighed in my life, I know how it is with her.

Sir C.: "What the devil!—Why surely,—eh, Lucy! you joke for certain. Mr. Heartly!—eh!

Lucy: "Indeed I do not, sir,—'twas in vain for me to say that nothing could be so ridiculous as such a choice.—Nay, sir, I went a little further,(you'll excuse me) and told her—'Good God, madam,' said I, 'why he is old and gouty, asthmatic, rheumatic; sciatic, spleenatic.—It signified nothing, she had determined.

Sir C.: "But you need not have told her all that."26.

After Sir Charles has his moment of delusion, Harriet overcomes her reserve sufficiently to announce her love to Heartly. This scene is saved from being over-sweet by Lucy's earthly comments.

Lucy: "Since matters are so well settled, give me leave, sir, to congratulate you on your success,—and my young lady on her judgment,—You have my taste exactly, miss; ripe fruit for my money; when it is
too green it sets ones teeth on edge, and when too mellow it has no flavour at all. 27.

The humour comes from several sources. First is the picture of a fop, young Clackit, packed with all the absurdities of his time and the undigested matter of continental travel and the contrast between him and his uncle. Second is the excess of sentiment which causes the misunderstanding essential to the plot. Harriot blames Heartly's "Excess of Merit" for his failure to recognise her love. Lucy, the spokesman for the straightforward, says "The trade will soon be at an end, if young Ladies and Gentlemen grow over nice and exceptional." Third is the old presumptuous fop, Sir Charles Clackit, who is so quick to believe Harriet loves him. Fourthly, Lucy's outspokenness furnishes humour both in itself and in contrast to the lovers' super-sensitive reticence and circumlocution. The French play originally treated the lovers in a sentimental manner. Garrick, by heightening their folly, made them ridiculous. Instead of being made sympathetic, Heartly and Harriet have been made, by Garrick, subjects of satire.

The six plays discussed represent Garrick's best dramatic activity in the short form. All of them had sufficient quality to discourage the sentimental by encouraging public interest in
true wit and humour.

Lethe and The Male Coquette serve as vehicles for stringent social satire, but both have serious dramatic failings. They are anti-sentimental in that satire itself is not a sentimental device.

Lethe had so little plot that it was described as a dramatic satire, a form enabling the author to introduce and satirize characters at will.

The first satire is directed at a poet bothered by the ghost of a former damned play. In Aesop's discussion with the poet Garrick inserts two bits of self-directed satire.

Poet: "---But, to say the truth, my performance was terribly handled before it appeared in public.

Aesop: "How so, pray?

Poet: "Why, Sir, some squeamish friends of mine pruned it of all the bawdy and immorality; the actors did not speak a line of the sense or sentiment; and the manager (who writes himself) struck out all the wit and humour, in order to lower my performance to a level with his own."28.

Aesop suggests a way the water might help the poet.

Aesop: "Suppose you could prevail upon the audience to
drink the water; their forgetting your former work might be of no small advantage to your future productions.

Poet: "Ah, Sir! if I could but do that—but I am afraid—Lethe will never go down with the audience." 29

The third character, a fop, is the next character to have any interest in this study. He says he is a fine gentleman and defines that as being "the delight of the ingenious, the terror of the poets, the scourge of players, and the aversion of the vulgar." Aesop questions him about what exactly he learned on his tour of Europe. The fop answers, "I learnt drinking in Germany; music and painting in Italy; dancing, gaming, and some other amusements at Paris; and in Holland—faith nothing at all. I brought over with me the best collections of Venetian ballads, two eunuchs, a French dancer, and a monkey, with tooth-picks, pictures, and burlettas.—In short, I have skim'd the cream of every nation, and have the consolation to declare, I never was in any country in my life, but I had taste enough thoroughly to despise my own." 30 The fine gentleman by his actions and manners as well as his lines shows his vanity and utter uselessness.

Lord Chalkstone, the prototype for Lord Ogleby, enters next. His fashionable views of landscaping and marriage are subjected
to ridicule. Mrs. Tattoo then furnishes a picture of a 'modern fine lady' to balance the previous description of the fine gentleman. A modern, fine lady, according to Mrs. Tattoo, "lies in bed all morning, rattles about all day, and sits up all night; she goes every where, and sees every thing; knows every body, and loves nobody; ridicules her friends, coquets with her lovers, sets 'em together by the ears, tells fibs, makes mischief, buys china, cheats at cards, keeps a pug-dog, and hates the parson; she laughs much, talks loud, never blushes, says what she will, marries whom she pleases, hates her husband in a month, breaks his heart in four, becomes a widow, slips from her gallants, and begins the world again." 31.

People stop arriving when fights break out on the opposite shore of the Styx, to decide who has the prerogative of going first. The farce ends with Aesop saying vice in one form or another is the trouble with all the petitioners, but that each individual wants to eradicate the effects, rather than the basic causes.

This play, having so little form in the beginning, was altered from time to time. The Frenchman described above was a 1741 addition. An Irishman was added at the same time but was soon dropped. In 1749 the Poet, the Old Man, and The Taylor were
added and Lord Chalkstone in 1756. In 1772 the Irishman was reinstated, the Fine Gentleman dropped and a Fribble added. This form probably did not last long. Tate Wilkinson's prompt copy was a 1767 version and the title page reads, "Lethe. A Dramatic Satire with the Additional Character of Lord Chalkstone."

As a dramatic form, Lethe is very weak. As a vehicle, though, for good comic actors it must have served a noble function. (Garrick played the Poet and Frenchman, Kitty Clive the Fine Lady in the season of 1748-49.) A glance at theatrical records shows that it was as durable as any farce of the period. It held the stage for all but four seasons of Garrick's management, and was an audience favourite. It served society well.

That it is highly effective satire, is the point arrived at by a pamphlet entitled: *Lethe Rehears'd: or, A Critical Discussion of the Beauties and Blemishes of that Performance.* In it Snip Snap is anti-Garrick and Dr. Heartfree and Sir Francis Friendly are pro-Garrick. The following is from page four.

Snipsnap: "So then you think it is extremely reasonable that the Manners of People of Quality should be ridiculed, their fables exposed, and everything they do censured, by every little Fellow that takes
himself to be a Wit.—At this Rate, Sir, what does Birth, Title, Rank, Place, or Seat in either House signify?

Dr. H.: "Nothing, Sir, if a Man possesses them without Desert...."

This effective yet moderate satire was perhaps Garrick's greatest gift as a minor dramatist. He kept away from the personal and vituperative, as Fielding and Foote did not, but at the same time avoided stereotyped characters. His major stage characters had a quite individual existence. Yet they were stage creations, not thinly veiled caricatures of living people. They satirized the vices they possessed, not personalities.

The Male-Coquette hearkens back to the comedy of manners tradition and serves to satirize a fashionable character (the Daffodil), and a fashionable vice (gaming); but it lacks the general quality of some of Garrick's other farces, notably Don Ton and The Lying Valet. The author states in his introduction that the play was written with two purposes in mind: one, to serve as a part for Mr. Woodward and, two, to "expose a Set of People (the Daffodils) whom the author thinks more prejudicial to the Community, than the various characters of
Ducks, Bloods, Flashes, and Fripples which have by turns infested the Town, and been justly ridiculed upon the Stage."

Daffodil is an anaemic variation on the scheme of a rake. He no longer ruins women; he ruins their reputations. As Daffodil explains to Sophia disguised as the Marquis of Macaroni, "To ruin women 'would be troublesome; to trifle and to 'am amuses one.--I use my women as daintily as my Tokay; I merely sip of both, but more than half a glass palls me." And as he explains previously to his incredulous servant, "A true Sportsman has no pleasure, but in the Chase; the Game is always given to those who have less Taste, and better Stomachs."

The plot is straightforward enough. It simply shows the extent of Daffodil's perfidy and then exposes him. One digression in the second act points out the evils of modern gambling. The breeches part for Sophia is the only one of note in addition to the title role. The Theatrical Examiner of 1758 defends the play by saying that the witty and humorous exposure of such a hotch-potch as Daffodil (a hotch-potch of Blood, Buck, Flash, and Fripple), who is a common type, is true comedy and fit for the stage. With this a modern critic would agree. This play is sufficiently blunter than others of Garrick's for it not to appeal so much. Yet one cannot doubt the effectueness
of the satire or the staging of the key scenes of this farce. Although Turkel is the moral avenger in this play, one looks in vain for sentimentality and last scene repentances. One is certain that Daffodil and his dupes have learned a lesson. On the question of whether or not the lesson constitutes a cure, our dramatist is discreetly silent.

Garrick's Harlequin's Invasion first appeared on the stage in 1759 at the end of the great pantomime decade of the eighteenth century. In the fifties Covent Garden Theatre attracted so many crowds with its pantomimes that Garrick was forced to reply in kind. Harlequin's Invasion, while not worth considering as a play, is interesting. It shows that although Garrick went so far as to write a Harlequin play, he left no doubt as to his opinion of Harlequin's importance; and he makes the play symbolic of the Harlequin-productions' invasion of the legitimate theatre. Garrick has Mercury tell Harlequin that his attack on Parnassus has failed, and that Jove's decree is that Harlequin:

"Wait on the Muses' Train, like Fools of Yore
Beware encroachment and invade no more."35.

After this pronouncement Harlequin sinks from view, Shakespeare appears, and a song praising him is sung as a finale.

The production is carried by singing, dancing, stage
business, trickery, etc. Along with this, though, Garrick intrudes the characters of Mrs. Snip and Dolly Snip. They definitely appear to be forerunners of Garrick's later characters in *The Clandestine Marriage*, Mrs. Heidelberg and Betsy Sterling. Mrs. Snip forces her will on her weak husband, Joe, much as Mrs. Heidelberg does on her brother, Sterling. The threats are different, but the effect is similar. Betsy Sterling dreaming of living a life of a fine lady is quite similar to Dolly dreaming of being a fine lady. In both cases Garrick's satiric views of fine ladies are shown. In the Dolly Snip soliloquy he also sets down his views on the behaviour of fine ladies. To fill out the catalogue of fashionable follies Garrick has ridiculed in other plays, this speech should be quoted.

Dolly Snip: "O Law, if I should be Lady Doll Snip, the first thing I do, I'll be half Lame, and Half Blind like Lady Totteridge, and I'll have a long train Dragging after me, which when I want to be Smart I shall tuck under my Arm thus, and Jig it away, my Teeth shall be white as Ivory, & my Cheeks as Red as a Cherry. I'm not an Ugly Girl. I know that—I won't be stuff'd up twice or thrice a
year at Holiday Time at the Top of the Playhouse, amongst Folks that laugh and cry, just as they feel. Then I'll carry my Head as High, and have as High a Head as the best of 'em, and it shall be all set out with Curls.——It shall be too high to go in at any Door, without Stooping, and so broad that I must always go in Sideways; Then I shall Keep a Chair with a Cupola of top to hold my Feather Head in, and I shall be carried in it by Day, and by Night, Dingle, Dangle, Bobbing and Nodding, all the way I go. Then I shall sit in the side Boxes, among my equals, Laugh, talk loud——mind nothing——Stare at the low People in the Galleries, without even looking at them——Thus——Then they'll hate me as I shall my old Acquaintance——What a Life shall I lead, when I'm a fine Lady, I'll be as fine as any of 'em, and will be turn'd out quite topsy turvy as well as the best of 'em."3/6.

This burlesquing of the absurd headdresses of the time seems to have been a favourite occupation of Garrick. When he played Sir John Brute in woman's attire in *The Provok'd Wife*, he wore an extravagant headdress replete with feather and fruit.

*A Peep Behind the Curtain; or The New Rehearsal* is in the
tradition of the play within a play. It has a plot, if a thin one, but the effectiveness of it depends on Garrick's satire. He satirises audiences in Lord and Lady Fuz. Lord Fuz sleeps regularly in his box and Lady Fuz is highly enthusiastic but completely indiscriminating. He satirises the excesses and monstrousities of current musical productions, by introducing patent absurdities into the one rehearsed. This burletta included, in the act rehearsed, dancing cow. The author, Lib, mentions he had planned to have the trees and houses dancing as well, but had decided it would crowd the stage too much. In a future act the production was to have Cerberus stop Orpheus at the gates of Hell and sing him a trio—one head treble, one tenor, and one bass.

Sir Macaroni Virtu represents the effete connoisseur so often attacked by Garrick. His vices are the standard fashionable ones of the time: he stays up all night and sleeps all day, he has no great opinion of anybody but himself, and he is proverbially late everywhere he goes. In this characterization Garrick also inserts, though, what seems to be a genuine comment of the author. He has the connoisseur say, "I abominate a Play-house; my ingenious countrymen have no taste now, for the high season'd comedies; and I am sure I have none for the pap and loploity of our present writers." This criticism of the
sentimental and the criticism of the excessive stage business in operas, are the only elements in this play that concern those interested in Garrick's critical attitude.

The Farmer's Return from London, being only ninety-four lines in length, belongs to that species of eighteenth century drama called an interlude. It was designed to be played between the regular play of the evening and the afterpiece. The content accordingly is slight. Garrick says in his introduction that he wrote the play for Mrs. Pritchard and had not felt it worthy of publication until Hogarth did an engraving of a scene from it. Garrick dedicates the work to Hogarth, both the artist and the man.

A farmer returns home from a coronation visit to London and tells his wife what he has seen. He speaks on three subjects, the coronation crowds, the theatre, and the Cock Lane Ghost. The latter was a hoax that aroused a tremendous amount of interest, until a select committee, which listed Samuel Johnson among its members, exposed it. Only his commentary on the theatre is of interest here.

"I saw a new Play too—they call'd it the School—
I thought it pure Stuff—but I thought like a Fool—
'Twas The School of—pize on it!—my Hour'y is naught—
The Great Ones dislik'd it—they heats to be taught:
The Cratticks too grumbled—I'll tell you for why,
They wanted to laugh—and were ready to cry."38.

The play he refers to is William Whitehead's *The School for Lovers*. It was definitely in the sentimental vein. Although Garrick as a sound manager had put the play on, as a writer, he showed its faults.

The musical prelude, *The Theatrical Candidates*, which appeared during Garrick's last acting season, states as clearly what Garrick felt about sentimental comedy as anything he ever wrote. In it he unequivocally states that Comedy and Tragedy should not encroach on each other's domain. This prelude has three candidates who plead for audience favour, Tragedy, Comedy and Harlequin. In answer to Tragedy who speaks first, Comedy says:

"—Britons, 'tis yours to chuse,
That mard'ring lady, or this laughing muse?
How make your choice;—with smiles I'll strive to win ye:
If you chuse Her, she'll stick a dagger in ye!"39.

After Comedy's exposition, a dialogue between Tragedy and Comedy takes place. In this Garrick faces the fact that Comedy has in some cases become tearful.

Trag.: "Such flippant flirts, grave Britons will despise.

Com.: "No but they won't;—they're merry and are wise:

Trag.: "You can be wise too; nay a thief can be!"
Wise with stale sentiments all stolen from me:
Have stuff'd your motley, dull sententious farces:
The town grew sick!

Com.: "For all this mighty pothee,
Have you not laugh'd with one eye, cry'd with t'other?

Trag.: "In all the realms of nonsense, can there be,
A monster, like your comic-tragedy?

Com.: "O yes, my dear!—your tragi-comedy."

After Harlequin's appeal Mercury enters and hands down
the decision of Apollo:

"Apollo, God of wisdom and this Isle,
Upon your quarrel deigns to smile,
With your permission, Sirs, and approbation,
Determines thus, this sister altercation.—
You, Tragedy, must weep, and love and rage,
And keep your turn, but not engross the stage;
And you, gay madam, gay to give delight,
Must not, turn'd prude, encroach upon her right:
Each separate charm: you grave, you light as feather."

This was Gerrick's pronouncement, but Gerrick like so many
others was perplexed by Shakespeare. A Shakespeare worshipper,
Gerrick gave his master license to do what he would allow no
one else. Apollo's accordingly decree continues:
"Unless that Shakespeare bring you both together;
On both by nature's grant, that Conqueror seizes,
To use you when, and where and how he pleases,"

The remainder of Garrick's stage works is not of sufficient interest to bear detailed inspection here. *Cymon, The Enchanter,* and *A Christmas Tale* are all three stock Christmas plays. These had become a tradition; the galleries demanded them, and Garrick, never willing to cross his audience, produced them. There was, however, no hypocrisy involved in these productions. He made it quite clear in his prologues their purpose and their content. They consisted primarily of music, costume, stage magic, dancing etc. They have been referred to as both "plum cake" and "gilt gingerbread". Both highly descriptive terms are reasonably accurate. One should be neither condemning nor excusing when he considers Garrick's reputation in the light of these productions. Most of them were conventions of the time.

Also omitted from this discussion of Garrick's shorter works were *Lilliput,* a play acted by children, *May-Day; or the Little Gipsy,* a trifle dependent on song and dance for effectiveness, *The Jubilee,* which was largely pageantry, *The Meeting of the Company; or Baye's Art of Acting,* and Lincol's
Travels. While none of these were sentimental comedies, none was of sufficient merit or interest to assume a place in this study.

Several of the plays considered in this chapter, notably *The Theatrical Candidate* and *The Farmer's Return From London*, stated Carrick's opposition either generally or specifically to sentimental comedy. The first six discussed best show how he used his dramatic pen to oppose it.
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Any attempt to discuss comprehensively Garrick's alterations is doomed to failure at the outset. No doubt there are far more of Garrick's alterations unacknowledged than acknowledged. One sometimes wonders if a new play ever appeared on the stage of Old Drury without undergoing some alteration by Garrick. Certainly he consistently kept new plays a long time after accepting them and before producing them. Colman, Cumberland, and Jephson, three of the most responsible writers in Garrick's employ, mention gratefully the assistance they received. Garrick's correspondence with Hannah Cowley and Elizabeth Griffith, to mention only two, contains a mass of suggested alterations for their works. Much of the ill-feeling that arose between Arthur Murphy and Garrick was the result of alterations suggested by the manager and ill-taken by the playwright. Boswell records Johnson's pique at Davy's necessary alterations to *Mahomet* and *Irene*. The realization that this was standard practice could have been a reason for Johnson's never again attempting to write for the stage. Goldsmith's recalcitrance at the prospect of being forced by Garrick to alter *The Good-Natur'd Man* is well documented.

The stage success of Garrick's acknowledged alterations
leads one to feel that Garrick's suggestions must have been consistently sound. Perhaps not artistically sound, but surely sound in stagecraft. As an actor Garrick was a natural genius, feeling instinctively what was right. As an alterer he was a shrewd manager, knowing well the desires of his audiences and the capabilities of his company. No present-day reader would seek to find in a Garrick alteration of Jonson or Wycherly an improvement on the original. Conversely though, one cannot find a Garrick alteration that was not a better stage investment, at the time, than the original or the contemporary version.

Six plays are to be here discussed as the body of Garrick's amendatory work. They are Jonson's Every Man in His Humour, and The Alchemist, Shirley's The Casket, Wycherly's The Country Wife, Tomkies' Alumassar, and Fletcher's The Chances. Beaumont and Fletcher's Rule a Wife and Have a Wife has been omitted from this list because of Garrick's denial of authorship, in spite of the existence of a published version listing Garrick as the author. Of these plays Alumassar and The Alchemist underwent the fewest changes; The Casket and The Country Wife suffered the most. In each of these last two plays Garrick removed an entire plot. From the former he removed the tearful
sub-plot and from the latter he removed the indecent subter-
phage and resultant sexual activity of Horner. The cutting of
both types of material was consistent with Garrick's critical
concepts, and the resultant simplification of the plays seemed
to have been a general desire of his.

The negative tendencies one notices in all of the altera-
tions were: the removal of topical references, the removal of
words and oaths which would have caused moral indignation,
ocasionally the cutting of situations too bawdy for represen-
tation, and a general speeding up of the action, accomplished
both by breaking up long speeches and by cutting, completely or
partially, characters and scenes that were peripheral to the
main stream. In a positive direction he often added to the
parts of the minor characters he retained, tightened the
logical framework of the plots, increased the motivation for
much action, altered characters to suit talents of particular
actors including himself, and improved both dramatic effect and
easy staging by re-arranging scenes. His actor's desire for
clarity of characterisation encouraged his tendency to sharpen
caracter delineation if over a play included similar characters.

The history of all eighteenth century alterations has been
so clouded by partisan criticism of various times, that one must
review each alteration separately to obtain a clear conception of it. The following discussions of each play taken chronologically are intended not as finished studies, but only as examples of Garrick's alterations. They are done in sufficient detail to reveal his practice and intent, and hence to shed light on his attitude to sentimentalism. A thorough literary and dramatic criticism of each, such as is now being written by Frederick L. Bergmann, would only serve to diffuse the aim of this study.

When Garrick adopted Every Man in His Humour to the stage in 1751, he elevated it to a position in the repertory long held by Volpone, The Alchemist, and The Silent Woman. In Garrick's last twenty-five years at Drury Lane his version of Every Man in His Humour played eighty-one times. His Kitley became one of his most famous parts. The alteration was, as Garrick later testified, a painstaking one. He wrote in 1759, "I was three years before I durst venture to the Comedians with their Characters, when it was first reviv'd." The time was well spent. The alteration was one of the most successful to appear on an eighteenth century stage. It aroused as much discussion as any play on the boards. Garrick became famous as Kitley, Woodward as Bozadil, and Shuter as Stephen. 

Garrick's changes in the play were discreet. He left
the basic play after having pared it of obscure references, puns, and indecencies which he knew would not go down with an audience of his time. He built up the part of Kitely to give the play more focus. It is easy to see how this could serve this particular play well, for by portraying such a large number of "humours" the effect of the original is almost panoramic. Also the low comedy part of Cob was cut quite considerably. In Act I Garrick cut Cob's account of his lineage. In both versions Cob answers Mathew's question, "dost thou inhabit here Cob?" by saying, "Ay Sir, I and my Lineage ha' kept a poor House here, in our Days." In the first Quarto Cob then goes into a speech about his lineage deriving from the first red herring eaten in Adam and Eve's kitchen. Garrick omits this and goes into the action of the scene. The first quarto scene runs seventy-five lines, Garrick's version fifty-three. In the next scene a conversation between Boabadjil and Mathew is cut out, as is some of the mass of Boabadjil's boasting.

Act II was merely pruned and speeded somewhat. References to Gargantua, to motley, and to the master at Mile-end were cut. Some of the speech on the old fashioned education of old Bowell's days was cut. Scenes two and three of the original were merged in the Garrick version and Cob lost a walk across the stage.
Act III was considerably pruned. It lost primarily a section of low wit between Cob and Kitely in which Cob tells more of his relatives, the herrings. Also lost in this act were some of Cob's aspersions cast on tobacco and Boabadil's eulogistic defence of it. Garrick's scene four leaves out completely the scene in which Cob asks Clement for a judgment against Boabadil. This shows Garrick's consistent cutting of these parts. Knowing his desire for action in a play, these shortenings are quite logical, for Cob's scenes are almost separate interludes and have little to do with the stream of the story.

Act IV involves a lot of juxtaposition and a little original composition on Garrick's part. The effect was to give Kitely a long continuous period on the stage, rather than several short, interrupted entrances. This gave emphasis to the central figure, Kitely, and to his humour of Jealousy, to which Garrick was directing additional attention. He also added a piece of action in which Kitely and his wife appear together, and Kitely displays his jealousy. This scene was made the high point of the play. To heighten the effect of this scene and to give his stage-hands time to change sets, Garrick ended the fourth act here, although Jenson carried it on for three more scenes.

The fifth act is much the same as Jenson's, even though it
encompasses more.

A detailed exposition of the differences in this alteration and the first Quarto would appear needlessly complex. Carrick often ran scenes together that had intervening scenes in the original. This was to save time required for set changes. The first Quarto version is, of course, set in Italy and the cast have Italian names. The 1616 folio changed this long before Carrick began his alterations, and he retained its English names and scenes that had become familiar. Carrick cut the several references to the quality of Stephen's leg and the advisability of wearing different types of hose on it. He cut many of the oaths which had either lost their topical appeal or had become incomprehensible. Actually the Carrick version, with the exception of the added emphasis on Kitely's jealousy, was nothing more than a modernized version. His changes were more or less the sort an author would make on an old play of his own to bring it up to date. It is a tribute to the dramatic genius of Jonson that a realistic play a hundred and fifty years old could, with only minor changes, still mirror nature and excite an audience. It is a tribute to Carrick's perspicacity that he realised the play's merits and did not attempt any wholesale re-writing, as did John Rich.
whose version played at Lincoln's Inn Fields in 1725. Seven characters were omitted from it then, and the part of Kitely was taken by Hippisley, a mere buffoon.

In 1754 Garrick presented Fletcher's *The Chances*. He altered it from the version previously altered by the Duke of Buckingham. This is not surprising since the Buckingham version had been long accepted and was generally considered superior to the original. Garrick used a 1705 edition for his original alterations, and this copy, later used as a prompt book, is now in the Folger Shakespeare Library. The manuscript alterations appear in the handwriting of Garrick and his aid and prompter, William Cross. The 1777 version of *The Chances*, published as altered by Buckingham and Garrick, shows certain differences and can be considered as a second Garrick version. The changes, though, are of such a minor nature that they deserve only cognisance, not discussion, in this study. The most interesting fact about them is that some are returns to the original Fletcher wording.

The changes Garrick made were first, expurgating, as was done to all older plays revised during this period; second, heightening the character delineation between Don John and Don Frederick; third, inserting several humorous touches; fourth, simplifying; and fifth, giving Miss Macklin, who played First
Constantia, a song to enable her to exercise her musical talents. A comparison between the first act speeches in the Garrick version and the Buckingham-Fletcher version, when Don John becomes burdened with the foundling, shows the type of expurgation used.

The original:

"Fetch'tover with a Card of five; and in my old days,

After the dire Massacre of a Million

Of Maidenheads? Caught the common way, i' th' night too

Under another's name, to make the matter

Carry more weight about it? Well Don John

You will be wiser one day, when ye've purchas'd

a Beavy of those Butter-prints together,

With searching out concealed Iniquities,

Without Commission: why, it would never grieve me,

If I had got this Ginger-bread: never stirr'd me,

So I had a stroke for't: 't had been justice,

Then to have kept it; but to raise a Dayxy

For other men's adulteries; consume myself in Candles

and scouring work, in Nurses, Bells, and Babies,

Only for Charity, for Neer I thank you,

A little troubles me; the least touch for it,
"Had but my Breeches got it, it had contented me.
Whose e'er it is, sure't had a wealthy Mother,
For 'tis well cloth'd, and if I be not cozen'd,
Well lin'd within; to leave here were barbarous."

The alteration:

"At my Age too!—Well, Don John
You'll be wiser one Day, when you've purchase'd
A Bevy of these Butter-prints—'twould never grieve me
If I had got this Ginger-bread, but to pay the piper
And not a Dance for't? to raise a Dairy
For other Men's adulteries, consume myself in Candles,
And scouring Work, in Nurses, Bells, and Babies
Only for Charity; for near I thank you,
A little troubles me—what shall I do with it?
Shou'd I be caught here Dangling of the Pap-spoon;
I shall be sung in Ballads; 'Prentice Boys
Will call me nicknames as I pass in the streets
I can't bear it—No eyes are near—I'll drop it,
For the next curious Corner—Yet 'Twere barbarous."

The Garrick speech has been expurgated and had an addition as well. This addition is a typical example of Garrick's concept of humour. Don John in both versions is angry at the fates that have loaded him with such an embarrassing burden; in Garrick's
he is, as well, aware of being an object of ridicule; since he, the sharper (in a sense) has been taken in. In part it is Don John's personal vices, his pride and his worldliness, that make him ridiculous in this situation. This is the manner in which true comedy can have a moral effect.

The by-play between Don John (Garrick) and his landlady was increased in the alteration. For the sake of decency many of the landlady's references to Don John's whoring were excised, but the drinking scene was enlarged and the following soliloquy was added.

"So, I thought the wine would do its 
Duty, She'll kill the Child with Kindness,
't other Glass & she had ravish'd me——
There is no way of bringing a Woman of 
her Age to Reason but by this; Girls of 
fifteen are to be caught fifty ways,
They bite as fast as you throw in 
But with the old & cold 'tis different dealing
'tis wine must warn them to their sense of feeling."

The pugnacious Anthony, who made a good stage character, had lines given him in several places. In the first act some of the spirited dialogue from Scene 10 is taken from the Duke and his men and given to Anthony and his cohorts in Scene 8.
He receives the call to action, "So be it; & he that flinches, 
May he die lousey in a Ditch." 5.

Scene 11 of the first act has six lines of Don Frederick's 
salacious musings cut.

The manuscript alteration shows Garrick in the actual pro-
cess of pruning the play to suit the ears of his comparatively 
decorous audience. In the second act when Don John asks Don 
Frederick to guess what he has got this night, the Fletcher-
Buckingham version has him answer simply, "Pox". Garrick 
scratched this out and first wrote, "What such a mad wanton 
fellow ought to get." 6. After consideration even this thinly 
veiled reference must have seemed too rough, for Garrick then 
scratched it out and omitted the piece of byplay in its entirety. 
Later in this same act Garrick copied out lines on four different 
occasions exactly as they had been, only to reconsider and 
purify them.

Moralists of the eighteenth century must have had the 
practice in common with those of the present day, that they 
objected to certain words more than to actual intent or effect. 
This allowed Garrick to remain remarkably true to his originals 
while at the same time presenting a piece receiving little 
censure. One notices certain word substitutions cropping up 
regularly. No doubt a researcher could soon discover a voluminous
glossary of eighteenth century equivalents of earlier terms. Particularly noticeable are the substitutions wench for whore, laziness for lewdness, plague for pox, and vestal for maid.

From a dramatic standpoint the most important alteration in the second act was the heightening of contrast between First Constantia and Second Constantia (although Second Constantia does not appear until further in the play); and between Don John and Don Frederick. First Constantia becomes in the Garrick version more the gentle lady suffering her misfortunes in a melancholy manner, while Second Constantia becomes more spritely, active, and witty than in the earlier version. Don John sums up the effect of the additional Don John-Don Frederick dialogue in this act when he addresses him: "I am the Honester, Thu' you may be the modest man." While there was little difference between these two characters in the 1705 edition, Garrick interpreted Don John more definitely as the impulsive roister, and Don Frederick as the thoughtful, quiet person.

This last mentioned tendency is also the major alteration in the third act. The following piece of stagey byplay shows Garrick near his best. The lines are perfectly in character. They suit the friendly wrangling of the two comrades, they
point up the character differences, and they recite well.

Fred.: "I am glad you are so merry, Sir.

John: "I am sorry you are so dull, Sir.

Fred.: "I hate trifling when my Honour is at stake.

John: "If you will stake your Honour

Upon trifling things, you must.

For my part, I'll not look like a

Murderer in Tapestry, as you do,—thus—

for all the Honour in Christendom.

Fred.: "Here let us part, & if the Lady be not forthcoming

'Tis this, Don John, shall damp yr. levity,

John: "Or this shall tickle up your Modesty."

The fourth act remains the same except for the ever present process of purification. When Don John sees Second Constantia at a Tavern window, originally he says: "That's a Whore; I know it by her smile. O my conscience take a Woman masked and hooded, nay, covered all o'er, so that ye cannot see one bit of her, and at 12 score distance, if she be a whore, as ten to one she is, I shall know it certainly; I have an instinct within me never fails." This was cut. In the same scene he says, "By this Light a rare creature! Ten thousand times handsomer than her we seek for! this can be sure no
common one; Pray Heaven she be a Whore." Garrick amended this last wish to, "Pray Heaven she be a kind one."

The fifth act has the character of the drunken constable who preaches against drink removed from it. This was probably done to simplify the final act and to retain proper emphasis on the comic minor characters, Antonio and the Landlady whose parts had already been heighten. The dialogue between Don John and Second Constantia and between Antonio and Second Constantia is pruned of excessive crudity of expression, but the essence is retained and the length of the scene is increased, probably to heighten the audience impact of Second Constantia, who does not appear on stage until the fourth act. She gets excellent lines from Garrick's pen. Her final advice to Antonio, who has failed to purchase her, is particularly effective. "Purchase yourself a little wit," she says, "& a great deal of Flannel, against the cold Weather, or, on my Word, you'll make a Melancholy Figure."11.

This alteration was moderately successful. It played for eight seasons and for a total of thirty performances while Garrick was manager. This was in spite of a poor beginning caused by the miscasting of Mrs. Cibber as Second Constantia. This tragic actress and singer always fancied herself a comedian,
and took this part because she had an exceedingly generous contract which allowed her her choice of parts. After a month she relinquished her part to the more suitable Miss Haughton.

The advertisement to Bell’s 1777 edition of *The Alchemist* emphasizes how necessary was the work Garrick did, if Jonson’s work was to be kept on the stage. "The alterations and additions in this play (as performed at the Theatres) on comparing it with the original, were judged so necessary and judicious, and the omissions so numerous and intricate, that it was impracticable to give the original entire, without greatly embarrassed the reader;—12.

The play begins with a scene between Subtle, Face, and Dol. This is a scene full of indecent language. It has been pruned heavily. The scene between Druger and Face had had the humour heightened somewhat. In the original Druger answers Face’s question "No gold about thee?", by saying, "Yes, I have a portague, I ha’ kept this half yeere."13. Garrick adds to this answer a plaintive, "And I would fain keep it half a year longer."14.

In Act II Nannoy’s talk with Surly has been cut quite considerably. The problem here was similar to the one Garrick later faced in revising *Alumazar*. The long cataloguing of
projected alchemical wonders and the discussion of Subtle's treasures, while they might have been pleasing to a seventeenth century audience which liked the fantastical, slowed down the action and would have become monotonous. Two passages compared will show how Garrick made his cuts. First the passage as Jonson wrote it:

"This is the day, wherein, to all my friends,
I will pronounce the happy word, be rich.
This day, you shall be spectatissimi.
You shall no more deal with the hollow die,
Or the frail card. No more be at charge of keeping
The livery-punk, for the young heire, that must
Seale, at all heures, in his shirt. No more
If he denie, ha' him beaten to't, as he is
That brings him the commodotie. No more
Shall thirst of satten, or the covetous hunger
Of velvet entrails, for a rude-spun cloke,
To be displaid at Madame Augustal, make
The somes of sword, and hazzard fall before
The golden calfe, and on their knees, whole nights,
Commit idolaterie, with wine, and trumpets:
Or goe a feasting, after drum and ensigne.
No more of this. You shall start up yong Vice-royes,
"And have your punques, and punquettees, my Surly.
And unto thee, I speak it first, be rich."15.

Garrick's passage goes as follows:

"This the day, wherein, to all my friends,
I will pronunce the happy word, Be rich.
This day you shall be spectatissimi,
And have your punques, and punquettees, my Surly.
And unto thee, I speak it first, Be rich."16.

Thus were fourteen lines expurged from a passage without harming the action of the play. The character of Mammon is lessened in importance by repeated instances of this kind, but the part of Abel Druggor could no doubt carry the added emphasis, particularly when acted by Garrick, himself.

The next scene between Mammon and Face shows Mammon's dream of power becoming more fleshy. As this happens Garrick's pruning becomes more severe. Mammon was allowed, in Garrick's version, to tell Face that he intended to put him in charge of his seraglio and to describe that seraglio as consisting of a list of wives and concubines equal to Solomon. He is not, however, allowed to tell Face that this position will require his castration, or that he will take an elixir to enable him to take on fifty of his harem in one night. Also Mammon's reference to the Tiberius-like pictures he intends to decorate with, is
removed along with details concerning baths and perfuming. Disgusting details describing the poets and eunuchs he would surround himself with, are cut and rightly so. Typical of Nemon's rich, if lustfully perverse, desires was his choice of an entree for his dream meal, "the swelling unctuous paps of a fat pregnant sow, newly cut off, breast with an exquisite and poignant sauce." Needless to say this was not suffered to remain in the acted version. Scene 3 has only small bits of the alchemical jargon cut from it, mostly from one speech of Subtle.

Scene 1 in Act III is but a shred of the original. The speeches of Ananias and Tribulation vanish in large sections. At the beginning of the scene Tribulation loses a twenty-one line speech. As their dialogue was concerned with their sect and alchemy the language was involved and not conducive to the action of the play. In scene 2 Subtle has a seventeen line speech cut out. In it he was detailing the advantages the sect would gain from possession of the Stone. Later in the scene lines are cut concerning the approval Ananias is certain his brethren will give to the project of manufacturing Dutch dollars. This cutting shows evidence of taste overcoming earlier vituperation in discussion of religious sects. Scene 3 is cut of the detailed instruction Face gives Dal for entertaining and cozening the Spanish Don. Nemon, during his
tete-a-tete with Dol promises her a deluge of gold when he gets the stone. The next two speeches, hers saying that no monarch would allow a private subject to have such a power, and his, saying they would go to a free state, are cut, as one would expect. Garrick wisely held the monarchy in great respect. It had served him and he served it. Scene 3, Act IV loses about a page in the Garrick alteration. This occurs when Face and Subtle plan to give Widow Pliant to the Spanish Don (Surly in disguise) because Dol is busy with Mammon. Act IV, scene 1, loses a few lines at the very end, lines punning on Widow Pliant's name. Lines were lost when Dol was in her "fit" with Mammon. Some for reasons of decency, others because they were pseudo-historical jargon and meaningless.

In Act IV, scene 7 a line is given Drugger after Kastril says, "Did I not quarrell bravely?" Drugger says, "Well, and how did I?" The reference is to a piece of the action that was changed. The Theatrical Review for Feb. 1, 1763, describes this usurping by Drugger of an action that was originally all Kastril's. The print at the beginning of this chapter shows Garrick playing Drugger in an exaggerated boxing pose. Thus it was that he must have looked when he took a share in driving out Surly.

Scene 1, Act V, has lines added which detail the numerous
things Lovewit imagines Jerry could have done to have attracted crowds to the house. "He hung out no banners of a strange calf, with five legs, to be seen? Or a huge lobster, with six claws?"

The only major change in the last act is the failure of Drugger to appear. The boisterous scene with Surly must have made this last timid appearance an anti-climax.

Wycherly's play *The Country Wife* was played at Drury Lane from 1748 until 1766, when Garrick's alteration replaced it. The coarseness of Wycherly's play was definitely out of place in the latter part of the eighteenth century, for the age was becoming progressively more refined. Garrick, with his respect for humour, tried to maintain the spirit of the piece and at the same time make it acceptable to his audiences. The result is a massive job of cutting and alteration. The entire story concerning Horner's feigned emasculation, and his resultant seduction of bevies of society women whose husbands had no objection to their consorting with a eunuch, was cut out. If cutting had to be done, this was probably a wise move; otherwise there would be no place to stop, for the whole situation was based on indecency. The Garrick alteration took the overshadowed Mrs. Pinchwife--Horner relationship and made it the focus of the play. In Wycherly's version Mrs. Pinchwife throws herself on Horner, who had kissed her in the park and muttered typical
gallant's phrases about loving her, but in this version Horner turns her down rather than admit in front of his cuckolds that he is sexually able. Garrick makes Horner (Belville he becomes) begin the play in love with Mrs. Pinchwife, (Miss Peggy in the alteration) and his friend Harcourt in love with Alitha. In *The Country Wife* the Pinchwife's have been married for some time, while in *The Country Girl* Moody (Mycherly's Pinchwife) is the guardian of Miss Peggy and has to come to London to get the necessary legal business arranged before he can marry her. To protect her from other advances he has gone through a juvenile ceremony of breaking a coin with her, and has told her they are as good as married and that she has to call him Husband or Bub, an eighteenth century diminutive of husband. Very few of the scenes retained in *The Country Girl* have to be changed at all. The Harcourt-Alitha romance and the Belville-Miss Peggy one go on their ways with the only major difference being that mentioned above, that Belville's attention to Miss Peggy becomes honourable and more important. Sparkish remains the same transparent, foolish fog, and Moody the same insanely jealous man. A few of the lines are toned down, but this is seldom required, for the bawdy element in the play occurs predominantly in the scenes which have been omitted. There are,
however, certain exceptions, such as Moody’s comments on his early life, which required changes.

In Garrick’s version Harcourt makes allusions to Moody’s wild youth but the allusions are general. In Wycherly’s play Harcourt’s comments are particular and Pinchwife explains why he married rather than keep a whore: "Fox on’t, the Jades wou’d jilt me, I cou’d never keep a Whore to my self."²⁰

Garrick cut the more licentious elements out of Miss Peggy’s naive humour. In Wycherly’s play Mrs. Pinchwife explains to Alithea why her husband will not let her out of the house. "He says he won’t let me go abroad for fear of catching the Fox." Alithea answers, "Fye, the small Fox you shou’d say."²¹ This is omitted from Garrick’s play.

Some of the action is changed as well. When Pinchwife takes his wife for a walk disguised as a boy, Horner absconds with her for a while to his chambers near the park, and gives her oranges. When Moody takes Miss Peggy for a walk dressed as a boy, Belville merely takes her into another path and kisses her. The kisses are just kisses in Garrick’s script, while in Wycherly’s the kisses are later described by Mrs. Pinchwife as being largely performed with the tongue.

Garrick’s denouement is more logical than Wycherly’s;
Garrick has had Belville urge his suit toward Alitheoa to enable him to get near Miss Peggy. Therefore when Miss Peggy tells Moody that Alitheoa has renounced Sparkish and is to go to Belville this action has more credibility than the same scene in Wycherly's play. Wycherly has Pinchwife lead his wife to Horner by the hand. Garrick has him surreptitiously follow her. The latter case makes Moody's discovery of her real identity more difficult, and therefore his failure to see through the disguise more believable. The mask was a common enough device of gentlewomen in Wycherly's time for Mrs. Pinchwife to wear one when impersonating Alitheoa. By Garrick's time, though, the mask had fallen out of fashion because of its use by prostitutes and could not be used by Miss Peggy. Another change dictated by fashion occurs when Alitheoa tells Miss Peggy the most fashionable places to walk. In Wycherly's play, and in his time, the places were Mulberry Garden, St. James Park, and the New Exchange. In Garrick's play, and in his time, the fashionable walking places were Vauxhall, Kensington Garden, and St. James Park.

As Garrick puts all his emphasis on the courtships of Belville and Harcourt, he contrives to make their actions more logical. Wycherly, whose main situation was Horner duping the town, left room for improvements in some of the courtship
incidents. In *The Country Wife* Harcourt suddenly appears as the chaplain for Sparkish's wedding, having told Sparkish only a short time before that he is his brother, Ned Harcourt. Garrick has Sparkish in his first scene ask Harcourt to suggest a chaplain. Harcourt, at that time, creates a fictitious twin brother in the ministry to use as a device to delay the wedding in case he has not won Alithea from Sparkish by that time.

Wycherly's acts run five hundred and three lines, six hundred and five lines, six hundred and twenty-five lines, eight hundred and ninety-nine lines, and seven hundred and sixty lines respectively. Out of these Garrick cut over a thousand lines; most of these omissions were either in the scenes discussing Homer's 'affliction' and his seduction by means of it, or the scene in which Sparkish and the chaplain (Harcourt in disguise) come to marry Alithea. As the cast of characters is cut nightly, all scenes in which they appeared have been cut to eliminate them. Wycherly's play required a cast of seventeen, Garrick's ten. These characters who have been dropped were the ones such as My Lady Fidget, Mrs. Dainty Fidget, Mrs. Squeamish, Old Lady Squeamish, Sir Jasper Fidget, and the Quack who had to do with the Horner who was the cuckold, but not with the Horner chasing Mrs. Pinchwife. Garrick's play uses only one of the two plots in *The Country Wife*, and only
those characters that pertain to it. As Davies says: "he preserved some of the most interesting scenes of the old play, but he absolutely changed the plot, and new modeled the dialogue; to the Characters he also gave a more modern glow. Notwithstanding he took infinite pains to adapt the whole of the play to the present taste, he could not entirely please the palate of the audience." 22.

Contemporary criticism of the adaptation is, as is particularly common in the eighteenth century, somewhat conflicting. The main stream of thought seems to have been that the alteration was quite acceptable, and more acceptable the more one forgot how much of the original was lost. Genest did not think well of the alteration at all. 23. To him the alteration of Horner, the ingenious rake, into a normal fashionable lover was a sad loss. The fact, though, is as Biographia Dramatica said, that if the play had not been purged of the vicious Horner it would not have remained a stage piece. The age would not have allowed it. 24. Murphy regretted the extent of the alteration; but felt that the production was well liked. 25. He said that the audiences were favourable enough toward it and that Garrick could bring it out as often as he liked. He brought it out twenty-three times in four seasons, which does
show it to be a popular piece. The older version was acted only eleven times in five seasons and was cut to two acts for some of these performances.

The Gamester was nearly as popular a title for a play in the eighteenth century as gaming itself was as a vice. The records of Drury Lane Theatre show that Susannah Centlivier's play, The Gamester was produced once in 1756, that Edward Moore's tragedy The Gamester was produced for seven seasons, and that Garrick's alteration of James Shirley's The Gamester was produced for four seasons. Garrick's dislike for gaming, both as a vice in itself and as a vice typical of the fashionable dissolute of the time, is documented well by several of his prologues. His prologue to this play shows well the depth of his feeling.

The alteration itself is a deft piece of work. Garrick neatly snipped out a secondary plot which slowed the pace and divided the focus of the drama. He skillfully reove the sharp edges and hanging characters left from his excision into the solid framework of the main plot. It is satisfying to see a scene between Barnacle's nephew and Leonora (one of the characters dropped in Garrick's alteration) neatly transposed into a scene between Barnacle's nephew and Penelope.

The original, humorous lines are maintained very faithfully,
and changes are made only to make the scene a logical outcome of what came before.

The main plot of Shirley's The Gæmester concerned Wilding, the rake and gambler. He had married wealth but now mistreated his wife, and desired her kinswoman and his ward, Penelope. The action turns on a scheme of Mistress Wilding to shock him out of his profligacy. She gets Penelope to agree to a midnight assignation with her husband. Conditions of this bedroom rendezvous are to be absolute darkness and no conversation. As the time for this meeting arrives, Wilding finds himself so attached to his gaming that he cannot bear to leave. In return for a loan he lets Hazard substitute for him. When Mistress Wilding tells her husband of her substitution of herself for Penelope in order to shame him, he is thunderstruck. He has become the object of ridicule, a cuckold, as a result of his own subterfuge. In haste to carry out the fiction that Hazard slept with Penelope, he arranges, with the help of a generous portion, a marriage between them, and says that Penelope feels ruined and distraught after her indiscretion. He realises, though, that when Hazard finds Penelope a virgin he will know it was another he had his tryst with. All is settled in the dénouement, when Hazard tells Wilding that he
had been recognised by his wife as soon as he entered the bedroom and had kept silent at Mistress Wilding's request.

This plot, with few exceptions, is Garrick's plot. Shirley, though, had as well, another plot, a highly romantic and even sentimental one. This involved the two girls, Leonora and Violante, in a series of heart-rending episodes. First, Leonora is in love with Delamore, but her father Sir Richard Hurry will not consent to the match. Then Beaumont, Violante's lover, wounds Delamore in a brawl. If Delamore dies, Beaumont will be hanged. We are told Delamore died. Next Sir Richard announces that Leonora must marry Beaumont. Sir Richard insists he can get a royal pardon for Beaumont and will do so if Leonora marries him. This plot uses a series of emotional scenes. Leonora interviews Beaumont in prison while Violante eavesdrops, and finally Beaumont is brought out of prison in irons to face the girls and choose between death and marrying the wrong one. The denouement consists of Sir Richard admitting he lied about Delamore's death and that he is so impressed with Beaumont's and Leonora's honour that he will consent to their marriage.

In cutting this plot from the play, Garrick showed once again his sincerity in believing that tragedy and comedy should be quite separate. The pity one feels in the second plot is
quite foreign to his concept of comedy. Although Garrick did believe, along with most of the eighteenth century critics, that comedy should have its moral effect, he believed that effect should come from comic exposure of follies, and that the audience should laugh at the objects of ridicule portrayed on the stage, not feel with them. This play, as Garrick altered it, shows that moral effect in action. Gaming is attacked by making it ridiculous. Wilding's morals are exposed by having him trapped by his own behaviour into thinking he is that thing most despised by his own code, a cuckold.

A comparison between the first quarto edition of Shirley and the 1758 edition of Garrick's alteration, shows two major differences in the first act. Shirley's play has a scene in the first act showing the wounded Delamore and later Beaumont under arrest. Some of the minor blades want to attempt a rescue, but Will Hazard talks them out of it. This is all omitted in Garrick's version. Garrick, in the same act, added a short conversation between Wilding and Hazard which prepared the audience for Hasard's scene with Barnacle. This preparation of a scene is something Garrick often adds in his alterations. Some of Hasard's wit, in this act, written by Shirley and maintained by Garrick word for word, is very good.

Act II of the original has in it an emotional scene in
which Leonora is told by a servant that Delamore is dead, and that she is to be coerced into a marriage with Beaumont. Garrick, of course, purged his second act of this. Also evident in Garrick's second act is some whitewashing of seventeenth century dialogue. In the original, Mistress Wilding setting her stratagem into operation, tells Penelope, "Love him (Wilding) as I do with a resolution to give yourself to him, if he desire it." Garrick has Mistress Wilding say merely, "Love him as I do."26.

Act III shows many more examples of this same type of alteration, to suit the more proper audiences of the time. When Wilding becomes excited upon having Penelope offer herself to him, in the original he says, "Excellent! And shoo be a bed but half so nimble, I shall have a fine time on't; how she glides?"27. The same speech in the alteration becomes, "Excellent! what a time shall I have on't? Zounds, I am on fire; how she glides."28. In the same conversation a few minutes later, Wilding, in the older version, says apropos of his plan to continue to use her as a mistress after he has married her off,

"And the assurance that thou hast two fathers
Before thou hast a child, will make thee spring
More active in my arms."29.
This comment is not in the alteration at all. The longest cuts for decency's sake occur in another scene in this act. When Hazard speaks to Penelope, Shirley has him say, "No, no keep thy name, How ere thou dost thy maiden-head." Penelope answers by asking, "Can you tell me of any honest man that I may trust with it?" Hazard later says, "Yes, you may trust me, I have possess a hundred maiden-heads——and then urges her, "—how light thou be Without thou maiden-head, dost not spoile thy sleepe and breed the night-mare?" Garrick writes less bluntly the first quoted line of Hazard, "Wilt thou dispose of thyself" and when he has Penelope answer with the same question, "Can you tell me of any honest man, whom I may trust myself with?" he omits the boastful and wheedling part of Hazard's answer above. In Shirley's play there is no motivation for Hazard's visit and the witty conversation that comes from it. Garrick remedies this lack both by having Barnacle offer to pay Hazard for introducing his nephew's reputation to Penelope, and by having Hazard earlier evidence his desire for Penelope. Although the subject matter is serious, the mood is very light and the tone one of banter.

Shirley's gambling room scene is longer than Garrick's. Shirley describes several types who have come to gamble.
Garrick omits this and keeps to the business of his main characters. While Shirley, though, ends this act with Hazard leaving to substitute abed for Wilding, Garrick inserts a scene showing Hazard discovered and his agreement to Mistress Wilding's amended scheme. This is quite a change. Garrick's audience knows then from the end of the third act that neither Penelope's virtue nor Mistress Wilding's constancy has been damaged. They then watch Wilding's consternation at being cuckolded as a humorous thing. Shirley's audience, however, did not learn this until the denouement. This means that the Shirley effect was one of audience and character surprise, whereas the Garrick effect was one of character surprise and audience anticipation. The surprise of the stage character with the audience warned is superior theatre. Not only this, but the denouement becomes much more realistic when the audience is not treated to a superfluity of surprises.

Act IV shows Garrick's neatestness of improvisation, which was discussed earlier. A scene between Barnacle, his nephew, Mistress Wilding, and Penelope, uses most of the comic material which in the Shirley version was used in a scene between Barnacle, his nephew, and Leonora.

Except for differences already noted, Garrick's fifth act is very similar to the original. The romantic, sentimental re-
vealing of Delamore's survival, and Sir Richard's reform is
cut out, as this sub-plot has been throughout. The ending of
the main plot is unchanged. Wilding promises a reform, but it
is one that has been rather well motivated throughout by both
Shirley and Carrick. It does not belong in the "fifth act of
reformation" classification so common in sentimental comedy.

The adaptation and presentation of Alhambra in 1773 con-
stituted a very definite move in the direction of true comedy.
Indeed, emboldened by the success of Goldsmith's She Stoops to
Conquer, Carrick wrote a prologue which heralded the strengthen¬
ing of the taste for comedy. Although quoted in Chapter III,
its stirring lines deserve recalling here.

"Since your old taste for laughing is come back,
And you have dropp'd the melancholy pack
Of tragic-comic-sentimental matter,
Resolving to laugh more, and be the fatter,
We bring a piece drawn from our ancient store,
Which made old English sides with laughing sore." 34

The claim for the past success of the piece seems a bit
exaggerated in the light of evidence as to early production,
but the play did at least have a long history by the time
Carrick staged this alteration. It had its premier at Trinity
College, Cambridge, in 1614/15 when the King paid a royal visit
to that university. The next verified production was at the Duke of York’s Theatre, Lincoln’s Inn Fields in 1668. Dryden wrote a prologue for it, and Pepys mentioned seeing it. His remarks were cursory and, in the main, unflattering. In 1704 appeared an alteration of very dubious quality by John Corey. This version was called *The Metamorphosis: or, The Old Lover Out-Witted*.

The next version, and the first that Garrick had any connection with, was one written by James Ralph, an itinerant American. It was played in 1744 at Lincoln’s Inn Fields with an epilogue written by Garrick. The epilogue shows that he approved of the attempt rather than the alteration. "Long have our senseless Playwrights, void of Spirit, from Molière’s Humor pilfer’d all their Merit," said Garrick.

“Our author scorn’d in foreign Climes to roam,
He thought some Merit might be found at home;
Upon the Patriot Principle he stood,
And, tho’ his Head may fail, his Heart is good."

His production failed miserably, as can be judged from a pathetic introduction to the 1744 printed text. In it, Ralph says the first night receipts were only twenty-one pounds and on the second night the manager had to close for want of an
The Ralph version is no better than the record of production indicates. He needlessly altered the plot and hopelessly ruined the language by translating it into eighteenth century English.

Garrick, as manager, put the original Tomkis piece back on the stage in 1777-78. It played seven times that season, and Garrick showed his interest by reciting the Dryden prologue to it. Certain aspects of this original must not have been satisfactory to Garrick, though, because in 1773 he brought out his own alteration. This we must consider as a piece of Garrick's work. The differences between this play and the original quarto, while many, are not revolutionary. They are briefly the following. He cut all of Act I, scene 6, and a large amount of Act I, scene 3. In Act II he shortened scenes 3 and 4. Act III had scenes 2 and 10 shortened. In Act IV scene 6 is pared slightly and scene 7 is altered. Scenes 9 and 10 are left out, and the necessary action is compressed into scene 8. Scenes 11, 12, and 13 are transferred to the fifth act. In the fifth act, scene 8 is merged with scene 9 and the latter is cut. Scene 10 is cut considerably.

In spite of the large number of changes noted here, the amount of change is usually slight, and the change in mood or effect even less. Garrick seemed to be attempting several
things by his alteration. First, he wanted to cut a lot of the astrological mush—juice which would begin to pall on a "modern" audience. Second, he wanted to speed up the action. This seems to have been a general desire of Garrick's, and he accomplished it in this alteration by judiciously clipping lines that contributed little to the play. Third, he desired that Trincalo be a more consistent character. He is basically a country-bumpkin. Tonkis, in the original play, has him challenge a gentleman to a duel and by sophisticated wit excuse himself of the necessity of carrying it through. This scene does jar when one has become accustomed to Trincalo as the character who jumped into the half-full water cask when Bevilone's "husband" arrived, and the character who admits he does not understand many of the speeches he hears at the Theatre. Garrick kept the Trincalo characterization consistent by having the gentleman soundly trounce him. Garrick's speech is more what would one expect from Trincalo. "Hold! hold!—Murder! murder! Give me my life, and take Antonio."37.

The plot remains the same. An astrologer teams with three thieves to rob Pandolfo. Pandolfo and Antonio are elderly friends and each has promised the other his young daughter in marriage, although the son of each is in love with the other's daughter. Antonio makes a trip to Barbary and is missing. To
insure Pandolfo's getting the young wife, Albumazar, the astrologer agrees to change Pandolfo's farmer, Trincalo, into Antonio for one day. During this day he can make the marriage arrangements. Albumazar uses the magic transmutation process as a cover for his robbery of all the rich goods, which he had said were necessary for the operation. Trincalo is convinced by the connivance of Albumazar's confederates that he actually is transmuted. The real Antonio returns and is at first taken for the transmuted Trincalo. Finally, after he and Trincalo have had numerous humorous adventures, Antonio, who has changed his mind regarding the marriage, arranges the marriages between the two sons and the two daughters. Albumazar is cheated by his confederates, and the lot of them are apprehended. Pandolfo, having his treasure returned, pardons them.

There is no sentiment in either version of this play. It is a story of thieves and dupes, of mistaken identity, and of assumed position. It would have been very simple for a moralist to have forced poetic justice by changing the ending. With a very little re-writing Garrick could have had the culprits imprisoned instead of freed to gull others. A sentimentalist would have done so.

In summing up the total effect of Garrick's non-Shakespearean alterations, one is first impressed by the quality of
the plays he deemed worthy of alteration—the plays he felt deserved a place in his repertory. Of these only **The Gamester** had a measure of the pathetic, and this element occurred in the sub-plot removed by Garrick. **The Gamester**, as well, was the only one to have a prevailing reform spirit. In it Garrick maintained the attack on the excesses of vice as one would expect from one who had himself written against it in **The Male-Coquette**. Both the original, though, and the alteration avoid the sentimentalist’s methods. Wilding is exposed as a man of folly, deserving of ridicule by his own code, rather than a degraded villain. The "hero" Wilding is no paragon of virtue, but himself a gentleman and gamester, but with a control Wilding lacks. Mrs. Wilding achieves her end not by pity, but by stratagem.

The alterations of **The Alchemist**, **Every Man in His Humour**, and **Alhambra** are more modernised than purified. Although they undergo expurgation of lines, their fundamental spirit remains unchanged. This expurgation appears to have been almost an automatic editorial process of Garrick’s, rather than the crusade it could easily have become in less dramatically sound and more morally concerned hands.

First Constantin’s pitiable condition is slightly heightened in Garrick’s version of **The Chances**. She was, though, a distressed gentlewoman originally and had to be so in order to
account for her two flints, and to contrast with the different reactions of Second Constantia undergoing difficulties.

First Constantia's problems are solved, not by appeal to the tender nature of her friends, but by the exposure of the true situation. The two Constantias were supposed to look very nearly alike. It was sound dramatic technique for them to differ in character. Garrick heightened this difference both by making the First more sensitive and the Second more saucy.

The only play that had its tone changed to any considerable degree was Wycherly's The Country Wife. Garrick's adaptation which he called The Country Girl has been severely criticised, both for losing the spirit of the original and for leaving in too many indecencies. No alteration is going to satisfy everyone, but this particular one has suffered an unreasonable amount of abuse. There is not the slightest doubt but that by removing the Horner episodes Garrick stripped the play of most of its fruitful source of wit and spirit. But it is just as definite that the play would never have been suffered to appear if those episodes had remained. Thus Garrick should be spared the acrimony directed toward his purgation of Horner. Any question regarding the retention of Horner in a late eighteenth century acting version is purely academic; it would not have gone down with the audiences. Garrick's decision was not whether or not
to present the play with the character of Horner intact, but whether there was enough left without Horner to make a play worthy of revival. He decided there was, and the box-office success seemed to justify his decision. There are two plots in the Wycherly play, and Horner is a central figure in both. The original ending of the Horner-Mrs. Pinchwife plot is anti-climatic and unsatisfactory. It is only acceptable because of his immoral character and because it keeps him from facing exposure to the consequences of his actions in the other plot. Given just the Horner-Pinchwife plot to work with, a union between the two becomes almost necessary. Mrs. Pinchwife's married state is a dramatic obstruction to this. Garrick realized that it was not essential to the plot, and not essential to Pinchwife's jealousy. There were sound dramatic reasons for changing The Country Wife into The Country Girl as well as the obvious moral ones. Indeed one of the major elements of the play is Mrs. Pinchwife's innocence and naivete. This becomes heightened in the Garrick version by her believing childish in the binding power of splitting a coin.

The Country Girl is by no stretch of the imagination a sentimental comedy. Belville, only, appears weak, and the play only appears dilute when compared to the original Horner and
the original play; both of which were anachronistically strong for Garrick's time.

Had Garrick been a first rate dramatist, he would have written a mass of first rate comedies full of character and humour. Not being himself a first rate dramatist, and not having one that he could expect consistent production from, he wrote the major portion of one good comedy and a mass of competent short pieces which kept laughter on the stage. As well, he kept as many of the better comedies from earlier periods as was consistent with sound management. It was no sentimentalist who brought Jonson's plays back on the stage so successfully and neither was the ever-increasing audience sensitivity the only explanation for the sudden dropping of his plays upon Garrick's retirement.

The names of Garrick and Shakespeare are inextricably entwined. Garrick, by building a Shakespeare Temple at his home at Hampton, was able literally as well as figuratively to worship at the shrine of his idol. Garrick's most famous stage interpretations were of Shakespearian characters. His conversation and correspondence were probably more concerned with Shakespeare than any other subject. The generous loaning of his own dramatic library, the finest of his time, made possible
the quality of Cappell's and Steven's works. He encouraged
Elizabeth Montague in the championing of Shakespeare, and
never forgave Voltaire for his attacks on him. Although it
was dogged by bad luck and brutally attacked by some critics,
particularly Foote, his Shakespeare Jubilee in Stratford was
obviously a sincere tribute to Shakespeare and one of the most
important dramatic events of the eighteenth century. Although
the Shakespeare he presented was often in corrupted form, the
corruption, with few exceptions, preceded his influence. Ham-
let to the contrary, Garrick's treatment of acting versions of
Shakespeare was consistently sound. The criticism of informed
Shakespeare critics must be regret that he did not go further
in his restoration of contemporary texts, rather than misgiving
that he worked on them at all.

The re-birth of interest in Shakespeare began a decade
before Garrick's influence began, but it cannot be denied that
he was a strong force in encouraging it. His concern for the
texts of Shakespeare opened the eyes of many to the extent
corruption had reached. His naturalistic style of acting and
his sheer ability helped focus attention on the magnificent
characterizations of Shakespeare and away from the concern
over irregularity of plotting. By stimulating public interest
in Shakespeare, he helped create a receptive audience for the
numerous late eighteenth century critical tracts and reasonably sound editions of his works.

George Winchester Stone, Jr. has meticulously traced this rise in interest in Shakespeare and has reached a sound analysis of Garrick's share in it, which was large. The periodicals of the first two decades of the century hardly ever mention Shakespeare. Garrick's productions, though, aroused such interest, his interpretations such discussion, that by the 1760's periodicals became intensely concerned with the poet.

No general tract on either Garrick or the history of the stage of this period could justifiably slight this phenomenon. However, there is little in Garrick's treatment of Shakespeare to interest the student concerned with Garrick's attitude toward sentimentality. An extended excursion into this subject would be, for such a person, unrewarding.

In general the record of Garrick's handling of Shakespearian comedy was a happy one. He popularized a good version of Much Ado About Nothing, presented a sound version of As You Like It with only Sir Oliver Martext cut, and played a shortened, but good, Twelfth Night. He used a hacked text of All's Well That Ends Well for nine performances only, before abandoning it.

The Merry Wives of Windsor he avoided for lack of a good Falstaff in his company. The Folger Shakespeare Library has an
operatic version of *Love's Labour Lost* which was commissioned by Garrick and executed by Captain Thompson. It is very close to the original. However, it was never acted and merely shows Garrick's continuing interest in the presentation of Shakespeare. He altered *The Winter's Tale* into a short pastoral called *Florizel and Perdita*. Only two Shakespearean alterations of his deserve further attention here. They are the farce, *Catherine and Petruchio* and the opera, *The Fairies*, which are significant only in that they show no sentimentality.

*Catherine and Petruchio* was a three act condensation of *The Taming of the Shrew*. It was definitely a farce, no more, no less. In it Garrick utilized Woodward in the part of Petruchio and Kitty Clive in the part of Catherine. These two had a dislike for one another which must have made the proceedings lively indeed. After detailing the fact that Woodward knocked her down once and stuck a fork in her finger in the dinner scene, Davies puckishly adds, "As it is well known that they did not greatly respect one another, it was believed that something more than chance contributed to these excesses."\(^{36}\)

This farce which did not claim to be *The Taming of the Shrew*, but merely a distillation from it, had more Shakespeare in it than any of the other versions acted since the Restoration. When it appeared it forced Lacey's *Saurus The Scot* and Warsdale's...
A Cure for a Scold from the stage. Not only that but it held
the stage until 1686 when The Taming of the Shrew was brought
back.

To effect the cut in length necessary to reduce the play
to an afterpiece Garrick cut out everything that was not ger-
mune to the Catherine and Petruchio plot. He had Bianca and
Hortensio married when the play begins. There is no Christo-
pher Sly material, no wooing of Bianca, and there is no disguise
of her suitors. Kate agrees to marry Petruchio for a chance to
get revenge on him. Garrick broke up most of the long speeches
in order to achieve a pace he felt necessary. G. W. Stone, Jr.
said, in considering that pace, "The whole piece moves with
breathless speed and with such action until Kate's spirit is
broken. She scarce has a moment's rest from beginning to
end." The alteration showed a respect for Shakespeare by
not adding scenes or material. The characterizations and mood
of the farce are compatible with those of the original. It
served its purpose as an extremely successful farce, and Garrick:
showed by his change in title an unwillingness to pass it off
as something which it was not. This farce taken from The Taming
of the Shrew shows once again Garrick's invention in the direc-
tion of the fast moving, boisterous humour.

In the heart of the pantomime decade Garrick produced an opera
called The Fairies (1755). It was taken from A Midsummer Night's Dream. The story of the opera is made up only of the first four acts of the play, and all references to Bottom and his group are cut. Garrick admitted that he had cut excellent material but felt what he cut would not go down when supported only by recitative. The extravaganza although criticised by Genest was approved by those who were contemporaries of Garrick. Both Murphy and Tate Wilkinson spoke favourably of it. The Garrick additions are very slight and are added primarily to seal together the edges of his omissions. With very few exceptions the Shakespeare material that Garrick maintained was kept intact. There were twenty-eight songs that can be criticized severely as speech but must have been sound enough operatic airs. Seven of them are from the original play. Only four were songs in the play; the other three were bits of Shakespearian text put to music. Four other songs were appropriated from other plays by Shakespeare, and several of the remaining were non-original. It is impossible to assess the part the composer, Mr. Smith, took in the writing of this production. But when one considers that the emphasis was directly on music his part must have been considerable.

The preceding discussion concerns only the three act
version of The Fairies. There was a five act version which was
produced by Colman while Garrick was abroad in 1763. This was
as complete a failure as one could imagine. Through the years
Garrick has been considered the author of this piece. He wrote
to Colman, though, from Paris telling him that he felt his
presence would be necessary to bring his version on, but gave
Colman permission to proceed without him if he chose. Stone
quotes William Hopkins' diary regarding Colman who "attended
every Rehearsal & had alterations innumerable to make." Two
rare items in the Folger Shakespeare Library do a lot to show
the direction of these innumerable changes. First is Garrick's
own copy of the Tonson duodecimo of 1731 which contains notes
and directions for cutting in Garrick's script. The second is
a four and a half page manuscript detailing Garrick's altera-
tion. This was sent to Colman and returned with his suggestions.
Only a few Garrick incorporated; he kept Shakespeare's lines
untouched although Colman objected to their rhyme. The printed
version of 1763 follows Colman's ideas. Garrick, for instance,
had planned to omit only twenty-two lines from the Pyramus
and Thisbe play. Colman retained only eighteen lines of the
entire fifth act. Probably in this one instance Colman gauged
the taste of the age more correctly than Garrick. The play
was damned, not for its absurdities, but in spite of them.
The children and the fairies were the parts applauded. Perhaps Colman's severe alterations were advisable under the circumstances, but it is he who should take the responsibility for changing Shakespeare's lines so drastically. Garrick used Shakespeare to serve the purpose of the moment, he cut his writings, but he amended them as little as was consistent with sound plotting.

The extent to which Shakespearian performances were encouraged by Garrick can be measured by noting their frequency after he became manager. From 1747-1776 Garrick produced 5,309 performances of which 1,274 were Shakespearian. From 1703-1740 only one play in eighteen was a reasonably sound version of a Shakespearian play, and between 1660-1703 only six Shakespearian plays which remained close to the original texts were performed. Until Garrick assumed management of Drury Lane, the Post-Restoration public had had little chance to know real Shakespeare.
Notes to Chapter VII


10. Ibid, p. 41.


203.


34. Prologue to *Albumazar*.

35. Epilogue to the *Astrologer*.


43. Colman, George, the Younger, *Colman's Posthumous Letters*, p. 240. (London, 1820)


45. These statistics are based on the Winston Manuscript and are quoted from various sections of G. W. Stone Jr.'s *Garrick's Handling of Shakespeare*. 
GARRICK'S THEATRE, WITH HIS LATEST IMPROVEMENTS, AS IT APPEARED IN 1775.
Chapter VIII

Garrick as Manager

Garrick was the best theatrical manager of the eighteenth century, and was much more versatile than Irving the only other actor-manager who might be considered his equal in that double capacity. The business success of Drury Lane when owned by Lacey and Garrick was the first example the century had seen of what a regular, intelligent, management could do. Garrick's share of the patent cost him eight thousand pounds in 1747; he sold the same share for thirty-five thousand pounds in 1776. During this period the status of the acting profession was being raised continually, as were the financial rewards a good actor could command. Dr. Johnson said, "Mr. Garrick and his profession have been equally indebted to each other. His profession made him rich, and he made his profession respectable." The most important factors contributing to Garrick's success as a manager were his acting talent, his social prestige, his serious purpose, and his critical judgment.

His acting talent as well as being a property of inestimable value to the management of the theatre put him on a good footing with his acting personnel. They respected him and were more likely to follow his advice than that given by one whose theatrical knowledge they doubted. Garrick's talent as an actor also was a great asset to the many weak plays he had to present during his career, a time not notable for its dramatic...
writers. The power he had of improving plays by his acting is most amusingly seen illustrated from a bitter, slightly coarse, typically eighteenth century satire by William Shirley, a voluble enemy of Garrick's. Addressing Garrick the satire said,

"Whatever you give 'em (the town) contented are they;
Whatever you ask 'em, submissive they pay.
Nay, there are those who have thought, that, instead of
a Farce,
Should you print your Intention to show 'em your A_____e,
The Design all Reward would of Novelty reap,
For they'd hurry, and cluster, and pay for a Peep
So strong is the Frenzy of Infatuation
You may do what you will wi' a preposs'd Nation."3

An anonymous stage reformer gave evidence of this same power of Garrick's when he told him in 1747 that he had the power to bring better plays on the stage because his acting would make any play popular.4

Coupled with his acting talent and managerial industry
Garrick had a record of social acceptance unequalled by any actor. This social position was something no former actor or manager had ever had. Cibber, it is true, became Poet Laureate, but Cibber did hack work for every honour received and though
he "loved a Lord" he never met them equally as Garrick, aided by his fortunate marriage, did.

By his social contacts with the great and the near great Garrick kept his theatre a fashionable topic of interest. No doubt the parties brought to Drury Lane by Garrick's fashionable friends helped not inconsiderably to swell the receipts. Boswell mentions Sir Joshua Reynolds buying forty places in the front boxes and including Johnson and him in the party. But an even greater stimulus to business must have come about indirectly merely because Drury Lane and its manager were the height of fashion.

When Lord Camden wrote to Garrick, "Speak no more of the honour of my friendship, we are perfectly equal being both private Gentlemen with this difference only, that your talent is in full exercise and living and mine (if it ever was any) is silenced and forgot; but when you retire as you sometimes threaten then we shall be quite upon a par, Garrick and Camden instead of Roscius and the Chancellor." he clearly showed the extent of Garrick's position in society. In spite of the difficulty these friends sometimes caused him by recommending poor authors, plays, or players to him, the net effect of Garrick's friendships aided his career as manager. A direct example of this is a letter from the wife of the Lord Chamberlain
in which Lady Hertford told him secretly yet authoritatively, that he had nothing to fear from the current rumour of a new licensed theatre. 7.

The articles Garrick wrote in the Morning Post showed what interest he manifested in the regularity of the stage immediately after his retirement. He always felt that even the best drama required excellent production to maintain its superiority in relation to modern opera, pantomime, and sentimentality. This interest was one that he had expressed throughout his career. By his own personal example he encouraged industry and application in his fellow performers, and by means of his lash-like tongue at rehearsals, which was a direct contradiction to his easy-going manner outside the theatre, he forced it. When these two methods failed he resorted to fines. Davies, after his retirement from the stage, referred to his driving fury at rehearsals in a letter he wrote to Garrick: "I declared—that I should not have quitted the theatre when I did, if your warmth of temper had not provoked me to it." 8. Garrick's prompter, Hopkins, wrote to George Garrick: "Your brother is very well but has not forgot to scold.—good god what an angel he would be if he would do his business in good temper but that's impossible." 9. In 1765 the excellent Kitty Clive wrote to Garrick about a
penalty that even she had suffered for failing to attend rehearsal. "I beg you would do me the favour to let me know if it was by your order that my money was stopped last Saturday: you was so good, indeed last week to bid me take care or I should be caught,----I thought you was laughing, and did not know it was a determined thing." That this was not an isolated instance becomes apparent from the context when she adds, "I had my money last year stopped at the beginning of the season for not coming to rehearse two parts that I could repeat in my sleep." Garrick realized the importance of rehearsing the cast together regardless of how well individuals knew their lines. He knew that sound native drama would only reveal its true quality when properly supported by good acting.

The irascible author, Arthur Murphy, by his waiving of an author's right to assist at the rehearsal of his play The Grecian Daughter showed the respect others held for Garrick's production abilities. He said, "Were the play to be got up at another playhouse, I should think it absolutely necessary to attend the rehearsals, but when you are willing to undertake that trouble, the anxiety of an author may be natural, but it is superfluous." Nowhere does the painstaking quality of Garrick's management appear more appreciated, than when it is
contrasted with the lackadaisical attention of R. B. Sheridan. Cumberland wrote to Garrick in 1777 as follows: "I read the tragedy in the ears of the performers on Friday morning; I was highly flattered by my audience, but your successor in management is not a representative of your polite attentions to authors on such occasions, for he came in yawning at the fifth act with no other apology than having sate up two nights running. It gave me not the least offence, as I put it all to habits of dissipation and indolence; but I fear his office will suffer for want of due attention, and the present drop upon the theatre justifies my apprehensions."¹². How quickly the stage degenerated without the control of Garrick's firm hand has already been shown in Chapter V.

There are many brief references throughout the periods to Garrick's "reformed stage", but it is only Kitty Clive, the favourite of Dr. Johnson and Walpole, who has given fair tribute to his managerial ability. She refrained from making any statements which could be misconstrued while she was in Garrick's employ, but after they both retired and the barriers to objectivity were removed she wrote as she felt about Garrick the manager.

"In the height of the public admiration for you, when you were never mentioned with any other appellation but the Garrick,
the charming man, the fine fellow, the delightful creature, both by men and by ladies; when they were admiring everything you did, and everything you scribbled,—at this very time, I, the Pivy, was a living witness that they did not know, nor could they be sensible, of half your perfections.

I have seen you with your magical hammer in your hand, endeavouring to beat your ideas into the heads of creatures who had none of their own—I have seen you, with lamb-like patience, endeavouring to make them comprehend you; and I have seen you when that could not be done—I have seen you when your lamb turned into a lion; by this your great labours and pains the public was entertained; they thought they all acted very fine,—they did not see you pull the wires. There are people now on the stage to whom you gave their consequence; they think themselves very great; now let them go on in their new parts without your leading strings, and they will soon convince the world what their genius is;—While I was under your control, I did not say half the fine things I thought of, because it looked like flattery; and you know your Pivy was always proud.

There were very few good plays written during his career that he failed to produce, and in each case there were extenuating circumstances. A previous commitment to Covent Garden kept Sheridan from submitting The Rivals to Drury Lane.
Stoops to Conquer was submitted to Garrick after it had been accepted with reservations at the other patent house. Well before Garrick had time to give an opinion of the play, perhaps before he even read it, Goldsmith demanded it back saying he preferred to have it play at Covent Garden. What other reasons there might have been for this rash request are unknown, but the reason Goldsmith gave Garrick was that if the reception at Covent Garden were poor, he could appeal to the judgment of the town; whereas if it failed in a Garrick production, it would have been given every chance and there would be no justification for such an appeal. The excellent prologue Garrick wrote for it serves to indicate that he bore neither the play nor its author ill will.

Dramatic historians have admitted that Garrick had serious failings as a literary critic; but all have concurred with the vast majority of his contemporaries, who felt that there was no better judge of what would and would not succeed on the stage. Mrs. Hannah More once sent a play of hers to Mrs. Bos- cawen for criticism and received the following reply: "Your play, I doubt not, has already received the criticism of Mr. Garrick; I have no idea it can have or want any other. Law and criticism must stop somewhere; the former, from appeal to appeal, ends en dernier resort with the House of Lords. Mr. G.
is indisputably the House of Lords to dramatic poets;—they can go no further for decision of what is right or wrong; his fiat precludes all other judgement."\(^{15}\) G. Faulkner sent a play to him and explained his reason, "as you are the best and most universal judge of what will please the public."\(^{16}\)

Frances Sheridan, mother of R. B. Sheridan, said, "I have the utmost deference for Mr. Garrick's opinion; I think extremely well of his wit, and still better of his discernment in judging what will, or will not succeed with the public;—"\(^{17}\) Doubtless this quality was one of the important factors contributing to his success as a manager.

The manager of a licensed theatre in the eighteenth century owed responsibility to the crown and the public far in excess of a private manager. He got certain real benefits such as a semi-monopoly during the winter season and an indefinite number of command performances which always resulted in large audiences. In return for these, a patentee was expected to instill a patriotic spirit in the audiences, to refrain from opposing the government, to preserve the native drama, to use the drama as a moral force, and to provide amusement for all classes of Londoners. In addition he was expected to keep his playhouse relatively quiet and to run a profitable business.
An awareness of what the manager's responsibilities were, explains the presence of many otherwise odd items in the repertory. It explains the large number of patriotic prologues as well as such nationalistic pieces as Smollett's *The Reprisal; or, The Tars of Old England*, *Britannia* by David Mallet, and *The Institution of the Garter; or, Arthur's Round Table Restored*. Because Garrick, as a semi-public functionary, had to cater to all classes, he had to produce many lavish spectacles which were either incorporated into other productions or played as separate interludes.

Garrick who had been brought up as a son of a half-pay army officer in a "family whose study was," as Dr. Johnson said, "to make fourpence do as much as others made fourpence-halfpenny do"\(^{16}\), was not likely to renge on his share of a bargain, which saved him from what might have been ruinous competition. Although he showed almost no personal interest in the international affairs of Great Britain, he served the crown well. He assumed his public responsibilities so enthusiastically that Professor Dougald MacMillan, one of the soundest present-day Garrick commentators, once said in conversation, "Davy fancied himself a regular B.B.C."

The justifiably famous prologue he delivered at the opening of the theatre at the beginning of his reign, gave a good
picture of his concept of management. No doubt he conferred often with Dr. Johnson, the author of it, to insure that it represented his true feelings. It reads:

"Hard is his lot that, here by Fortune plac'd,
Must watch the wild vicissitudes of taste;
With ev'ry meteor of caprice must play,
And chase the new-blown bubbles of the day.
Ahn let not censure term our fate our choice,
The stage but echoes back the public voice;
The drama's laws, the drama's patrons give,
For we that live to please, must please, to live.
Then prompt no more the follies you decry,
As Tyrants doom their tools of guilt to die;
'Tis Yours, this night, to bid the reign commence

Garrick; often accused of high-handedness, never failed to serve those who were the joint patrons of his success, his audiences and his Government. The mere fact that a play was produced did not mean that it was a play of which Garrick personally approved. He frankly admitted that other reasons sometimes governed his choices. In an answer to a letter of Mr. Cleland's sneering at his production of the frigid tragedies of the time, especially Boadicea and Barbarossa, Garrick
explained that if he had not performed Boadicea he would have been a poor politician, if not Barbarossa, a poor manager.20.

In reference to a certain popularity achieved by Isaac Reed's tragedy Dido while Garrick was in Bath, he wrote his brother George, "And does Dido please? Good God! and will they come twice to see it? Good God! it is time to leave the stage if such a performance can stand upon its legs. Good God!"21. Again showing strongly his dislike of much that he had to produce, Garrick wrote Colman in 1775 "D—— in all Tragedies, the modern ones I mean, they are such ill made matters that I sick(en) at the sight of 'em."22.

The armchair critic of any age has the prerogative of disdaining contemporary composition. However much he might have liked to, Garrick as a manager who desired and achieved success had no such path open to him. In addition to what he could write he had only the choice of what was presented him, and often even this was far from a free choice. He had to reciprocate favours to the mighty who supported him, and acquiesce to the bullies who had it in their power to hurt either him or his enterprise. Sir Joshua Reynolds, Lord Chesterfield, Mrs. Montagu, Edmund Burke, and William Robertson were among the influential people who submitted plays to Garrick for their friends. A businessman who treasured the favour of the mighty
was under terrible pressure to accede to the wishes of these and others. At a dinner at Holland House Garrick was obliged by Henry Fox and Horace Walpole to accept Arthur Murphy's *The Orphan of China.*\(^{23}\) The Countess of Coventry personally delivered Crisp's *Virginia* to Garrick and insured its production.\(^{24}\) By blustering threats Isaac Reed secured the acceptance of *Dido,*\(^{25}\) and by pathetic begging Mrs. Griffith and other female authors secured favours. One of the plaintive letters from Mrs. Griffith is endorsed in Garrick's hand,

"I see your tears and hear your sighs,
Which ever female craft supplies,
To move a hard obdurate block."\(^{26}\)

Found among his miscellaneous papers after his death was a manuscript scrap that has remained unpublished. It deserves notice because it shows that Garrick must have carefully considered his responsibilities as manager, and perhaps even considered publishing a justification of himself. The manuscript is headed, "Miscellaneous thoughts upon the Stage, Authors, Actors, etc." and it reads, "There are no hopes of seeing a perfect stage, till the public as well as the Manager get rid of their errors & prejudices—the reformation must begin with the first. When the taste of the public is right the Managers and Actors must follow it or starve. I speak of those who
understand something of their business—there are & have been Managers and Actors who are so naturally blind that they cannot find the right way tho' the finger of the Publick point it out ever so strongly to 'Em."27.

By his comments, both public and private, and by his own productions, Garrick, as has been seen in preceding chapters, was exerting an influence in favour of laughing comedy. He felt, though, that in his capacity of licensed patentee he had no right to use his power to encourage one type of play over another. Of course he was not able to rule out completely his personal prejudice in favour of the "old comedy"; but he felt that when he considered a play, he considered only whether it would succeed on the stage and suit the Crown and the patrons. William Kenrick, by injudicious wording of a letter, drew from Garrick a statement of this "public Ownersip" aspect of the theatre. Kenrick said, "In May, sixty-eight, I offered him (Garrick) the choice of a tragedy or a comedy for the next year; the tragedy being founded on part of the story of Rousseau's Kloisa, whose distress being of a domestic kind, I improperly perhaps called it of a popular nature."28. Garrick took exception only to that part of the letter mentioned above. Referring to it he said: "I am a little alarmed at your popular topicks, for the stage can be of no party—"29.
Garrick's first season as manager of Drury Lane, 1747-48 saw the production of two new comedies, Reddley's *The Suspicious Husband* and Edward Moore's *The Foundling*. The latter must be classified as a sentimental comedy because of its plot which is basically the one of *The Conscious Lovers*: a young woman of unknown parents is the ward of a man in love with her. Eventually she is found by her parent. The plot is embellished with other complications, but the sentimentality is not emphasised or dragged out. Much comedy arises from the absurd predicaments in which the lover finds himself. *The Suspicious Husband* on the other hand was a true comedy, one of the best of the century. *The Suspicious Husband* ran thirteen nights the first season and *The Foundling* fifteen, so both were successes. The former retained its popularity, being played every season of Garrick's management, while the latter only played eight seasons.

The next season saw no new sentimental comedy but three non-sentimental ones new to Drury Lane, Massinger's *A New Way to Pay Old Debts*, Shakespeare's *Much Ado About Nothing* in which Garrick and Mrs. Pritchard scored signal successes as Benedick and Beatrice, and Aaron Hill's translation of Voltaire's *Herode*. 1750-1751 saw *Gil Blas* as the only new comedy;
while the revival of Every Man in His Humour, beginning a series of Jonsonian successes, was the only comic addition in the following year. The next attempt at a new comedy was not until 1754-55 when an altered version of Jasper Mayne's The Schemer was attempted. A short run of two performances hardly justified its revival. Foote's malicious satire appeared at Drury Lane in 1755-56 in the shape of a farce The Englishman in Paris, and Murphy's more polished wit also came out the same season in afterpiece form as The Apprentice. All the new comedy in the next season also falls into the farce category; Foote's The Author and Garrick's The Male-Coquette. Shirley's The Gamester was altered by Garrick and produced the next season, along with Murphy's farce The Upholsterer. Garrick's farce The Guardian was the prime comic presentation in 1758-59.

Another year which saw no new full length comedies produced passed, with comic interest again on farce. Townley's High Life Below Stairs, Macklin's Love-a-la-Mode, Carrick's Harlequin's Invasion, and Murphy's The Way to Keep Him were the most notable.

1760-61 was a banner year for comedy. It marked the first time since 1747-48 that more than one new comedy appeared. That year Murphy's full-length The Way to Keep Him, Foote's The Minor, and Colman's The Jealous Wife came onto the scene. In these
three plays are represented the merits of four of the men most strongly opposed to the rise of sentimentalism. Garrick is represented only indirectly but it is known that he helped Colman with *The Jealous Wife*. Foote's *The Minor* is the only one of the plays that has touches of sentimentality sufficient to mention. It is the only play of Foote's that does have such elements. The treatment of Shift and the hypocritical Mrs. Cole, though, is so satiric that the comedy as a whole should not be considered sentimental. Of *The Jealous Wife* Benjamin Victor said, "IT was observed by the greatest Connoisseur, and those who remember the last race of great actors, that no Scenes ever produced greater Effect than those in which Mrs. Pritchard and Mr. Garrick exerted their Comic Talents in the characters of Mr. and Mrs. Oakley." Howard Dunbar in discussing *The Way to Keep Him* says "The action proceeds naturally without unusual or grotesque incidents: no daughters are abandoned by severe parents; no wild but loveable spendthrift is disinherited; no sacrifice is made to love, avarice, or interest; no wealthy relative returns unexpectedly from the Indies.---It is not interrupted by epigrammatic wisdom, sugary sentiment, obtrusive morality, sparrings of repartee, or broad innuendo in narrow circumstances." He sums up, "It is a comedy of manners free from Restoration obscenity." It is also one
of the few eighteenth century plays that have deserved and received twentieth century production.\(^{32}\)

At the end of fourteen seasons at Drury Lane Garrick had produced only one full-length comedy that could justifiably stand as an example of sentimental comedy. Sentiment by this time was, however, an accepted thing and traces of it appear in most of the new comedies to a greater or lesser degree. Regardless of this, there was such a paucity of the real product that Bernbaum is supported by facts when he says, "The drama of the 1750's showed a strong revival of the comic spirit. A new group of playwrights---notably Samuel Foote, Arthur Murphy and George Colman,---raised comedy, not to the high level on which it moved in the days of Vanbrugh, but much higher than it moved in the depressing period between 1730 and 1750."\(^{33}\)

The next season, that of 1761-62, saw the end of the almost undisputed sway laughing comedy held. Garrick produced William Whitehead's *School for Lovers*, the most purely sentimental comedy that appeared on Drury's stage while Garrick was manager. It was adapted from *Le Testament* of Fontenelle who was the most determined French advocate of sentimentality. Victor describes Whitehead's play well when he says, "--it is of that species of the Drama which has more of the Pathos than the *Vis Comica*, and calculated more to draw Tears than raise
Laughter. Garrick gave his opinion of it and its genre in his interlude The Farmer's Return from London, which came out the same season; but the fact that it ran for thirteen nights shows that it must have pleased the public. The next season saw Mrs. Frances Sheridan's The Discovery. This play offers both sentiment and well-drawn comedy, as one would expect from the prologue which reads:

"The comic dame, her different powers to prove,

Gives you the dear variety you love;

Sometimes assumes her graver sister's art,

Borrows her form and tries to touch the heart."

Both Bernbaum and Nicoll conclude that it should be grouped among the sentimental comedies, but Nicoll tempers this classification by saying, "The Discovery is more vivacious. Here a certain return has been made to the style of the writers of the comedy of manners." Garrick achieved great comic success by underplaying the part of Sir Anthony Braville.

The two seasons Garrick spent abroad saw Colman bring out two comic failures, Mrs. Sheridan's The Dupe and Mrs. Griffith's The Platonic Wife. The failure of the first is blamed on Mrs. Sheridan's inability to draw low characters. The primary character in the comedy is Sir John Woodfall who is the dupe of Mrs. Etherdown his mistress and Sharply, her principal tool.
Only a quick perusal of the play is sufficient to convince a reader that these two vicious characters are unskillfully drawn. This is the reason Victor gives for the failure of the play. There is a pair of sentimental lovers, Wellford and Evely, but these are not the concern of the major business of the play. Victor blames the failure of the second play on the following three reasons: first, the failure of the title to describe properly the main character who was a romantic rather than a platonic wife, second, Mrs. Griffith's failure to draw low characters with realism, and third the production errors caused by Colman.

Garrick's return was marked by the production of The Clandestine Marriage, Kenrick's Falstaff's Wedding, and a temporary halt to the seasons dominated by comedies of sentiment. Both of these plays are true comedies. 1766-67 brought Garrick's alteration of Wycherly's The Country Wife and Colman's The English Merchant. The first has already been discussed and the second was an adaption of Voltaire's L'Ecossaise. The English version definitely shows the sentimental character of the original, but every important change of Colman's was an attempt to increase the comedy. He increased the importance of a secondary character, the merchant, into the title role, and made this humorous individual the instrument of much of
the action that had originated with the lover in the original. For purposes of classification The English Merchant should be considered sentimental, but it should be borne in mind that Colman the anti-sentimentalist furnished as one would expect, truly comic elements.

1767-68 saw Kenrick's The Widow'd Wife and Hugh Kelly's False Delicacy as the only new comedies. In The Widow’d Wife the main character is a wife who has been deserted. Consistent with the practice of the sentimentalists the husband returns before the play ends. A comic interlude involving young lovers, the woman's daughter and a man who is apparently the son of the errant husband, takes precedence over the sensibility for a time. The emphasis throughout most of the play, however, is on the emotional. False Delicacy is notorious in theatrical histories as the outstanding example of the sentimental strain. Actually it is nothing of the kind. Compared with the purely sentimental works of Whitehead and Mrs. Griffith it is well supplied with comedy. Benjamin Victor, who strenuously objected to the sentimental aspects, concluded his discussion by adding: "The Fable is well drawn and has an Air of Originality that does Credit to the Author;". 39. Bernbaum savagely attacks the critics who conceived of False Delicacy as a play which carried sentimentalism to an extreme, and carefully points
out the fact that Kelly is blending sentiment with an under-
current of satire throughout. Actually all of Kelly’s three plays attempt this difficult feat of combining senti-
ment and satire, but in the last, The School for Wives, he interchanges scenes of different nature rather than attempt-
ing to blend them. Kelly was trying to be true to two ideals at once. Because of this his plays suffer. But he did have a concept of the comic and attempted to retain it, even if in a subordinate capacity, while he was following the fashion of appealing to emotions.

The next season saw premier performances of both a laugh-
ing comedy and a sentimental one. The representative of the laughing genre was an adaptation of Colley Cibber’s The Mockor by Isaac Bickerstaffe; the sentimental piece was a true senti-
mental comedy, more like Whitehead’s School for Lovers than any-
thing else which had followed it. It was Mrs. Elizabeth
Griffith’s The School for Rakes. Both were well received by
the public. The Hypocrite played fifteen times and The School
for Rakes thirteen times the first season.

Hugh Kelly’s second play appeared briefly in 1769. En-
tries from the prompter’s diary constitute the best record of
its performance. "A Party was made against it because he was
suspected of writing for the Court-party—much Hissing—Mr.
Garrick called for. — "No Play & c. 'cryed out. — At last, the Play was got thro' with much hissing and groaning." It survived its first performance but not its second as Hopkins said: "Bills were put up for A Word to the Wise. — As soon as the Curtain was drawn up, a great hissing. — Mr. Garrick went on the Stage; several plays were proposed to be done; but Mr. Kelly's party would have none but A Word to the Wise, and the other party would not consent. Mr. Garrick offered to play himself; but that would not satisfy them. At length, the House was dismissed about nine o'clock."[1] This same season saw William Whitehead the Poet Laureate, reverse the extreme sentimental position he had taken in The School for Lovers, by the composition of a farce, A Trip to Scotland, in which he soundly satirised the tearful drama.

Richard Cumberland's first play written for Garrick, The West Indian, came on the stage in 1771 after several alterations suggested by Garrick had been made. The play was of a sentimental nature. It portrayed a West Indian, a frequently satirised type, sympathetically. Contrary to the usual sentimental play, though, it bustled with action. The languidness of the usual tearful comedy must have been one of the chief reasons for Garrick's opposition to it. No such criticism could be made against The West Indian. The play must
have satisfied its manager for Victor says, "It has unquestioned Merit:—and though when critically compared, not quite equal to some few of our best comedies, yet the Success that has attended the Performance of The West Indian has exceeded that of the oldest Man living! There was the same Demand for Places in the Boxes, and the same crowding to get into the Pit and Galleries at the twenty-sixth Representation as on the first Night."42.

'Tis Well It's No Worse a laughing comedy by Isaac Bickerstaffe represented the older type in the season of 1770-71, but its success was in no way comparable to that of Cumberland's play and it never appeared at Drury Lane after its first season.

Richard Cumberland brought out another sentimental play The Fashionable Lover the next season. It was the only new play of the season, but its success was not as great as that of The West Indian. Like The West Indian it presented a sympathetic portrait of a type usually ridiculed, this time a Scot. Also like the earlier success, it had a vigorous, fast-moving, complex plot, that afforded an opportunity for much stage business.

In 1772-73 Garrick presented his new farce, The Irish Widow. This is true comedy and excellent comedy, though in the two act form. It was the only new palliative to the sentimental
offering of William O'Brien, The Duel, also brought out that year. Adapted from Le Philosophe sans le Savoir of Sedaine, this is a propagandistic, humanitarian play as well as one designed to affect the emotions. It, like many others which appeared in the eighties and nineties of the century, glamorized the tradesman and attacked the artificial concepts of the nobility. A typical "handkerchief strain" speech from this little known play occurs in the second act. Young Melville says, "How can I answer this (fighting a duel) to my family?—I cannot bear the sight of them. Their cheerfulness, their joy and happiness upon my sister's marriage gives me the most exquisite torture—I whom they all love so much—shall I be the base destroyer of their peace?......"3. In spite of the popularity of plays which appealed to the emotions, O'Brien's play was damned and only appeared once. No doubt its romanticism was too much before its time.

The season of 1773 at Drury Lane marked a temporary high water mark of sentimentality there. This upsurge of sentiment on the stage, that began with Whitehead and continued through the work of Mrs. Griffith, Richard Cumberland, Hugh Kelly, Mrs. Sheridan, and William O'Brien, met opposition at other theatres in 1773. Foote brought out his satire on the type, Piety in
Patterns at the Haymarket Theatre and Goldsmith gave Covent Garden his She Stoops to Conquer with its anti-sentimental prologue by Garrick. A year before, Goldsmith had attacked the sentimental muse in the Westminster Magazine.

The sentimentality on the stage was far from being an isolated phenomenon. In fact it had met more opposition on the stage than elsewhere. As has been seen, such farces as Whitehead’s A Trip to Scotland, Garrick’s Neck or Nothing, and The Irish Widow, and Colman’s Polly Honeycombe and such comedies as Bickerstaffe’s This Well It’s No Worse and The Hypocrite, and Garrick’s The Country Girl had furnished opposition at Drury Lane. No such effective opposition is seen in the notable novels or poems of the period which included, Sterne’s A Sentimental Journey (1769), Goldsmith’s The Deserted Village (1770) and Mackenzie’s Man of Feeling (1771).

The spirited prologue to Garrick’s adaptation of Alhambra, applauding the renewed interest in the traditional comedy has already been noted. This play was Garrick’s attempt as manager and author in 1773 to further this counter-revolution. Also produced the same season was Cumberland’s first comedy The Brothers which had hitherto been produced only at Covent Garden. Thus once more were the factions preferring each type placated.
Richard Cumberland contributed a surprise offering to the stage in 1774-75. His Choleric Man was, as Bernbaum notes, "the first tolerably successful effort in the comic vein, subsequent to She Stoops to Conquer." This was even more of a surprise than the anti-sentimentalists' Colman's earlier adaptation from the sentimental, The English Merchant. The main figures in Colman's plays are never sentimental. Garrick's farce Bon Ton; or, High Life Above Stairs, that delightful petite piece in the tradition of the comedy of manners, also appeared this season.

The last season of Garrick's reign furnished a mixed bag. Old City Manners, a much shortened version of the Jonson-Chapman-Marston piece, was brought out; as was Colman's alteration of Epicoene. These along with Garrick's trifle May Day; or, The Little Gypsy were, in varying degrees, in opposition to the sentimental which was represented by The Runaway of Hannah Cowley.

From the point of view of examining the production of sentimental plays Garrick's management at Drury Lane divides itself into three phases. The first period, from 1747-1762 saw very few new sentimental comedies brought on. The second period runs from 1762 to 1773 when sentimental comedy continually gained ground. Lastly comes the period from 1773 to 1776.
when there was a resurging of the comic. Perhaps Garrick felt that this effective opposition would eventually drive the artificially sentimental from the stage; certainly others did overestimate the effectiveness of their counter-revolution, which, viewed in historical perspective, was nothing more than a death spasm of true comedy. By 1779 that genre was effectively vanquished; all its defenders gone. Arthur Murphy was dead; Goldsmith was dead; Samuel Foote was dead. Sheridan who had promised so much with The Rivals and The School for Scandal had retired from comic writing, and Colman’s mantle had fallen upon his son, an ardent sentimentalist. Even Bickerstaffe, a more minor figure, had been discredited in a manner similar to Oscar Wilde. To complete this list of persons who had resisted the encroaching movement of sentimentality, one notes that Garrick, by this time, was also dead.

The field was left to Richard Cumberland, George Colman the younger, and Thomas Holcroft whose attitudes dominated comedy for at least seventy years. Professor Bernebaum points out that “to this day no comedy that antagonizes the sentimental ideas and hopes regarding human nature can gain really popular support.”

The sense of public responsibility Garrick felt as manager kept him from letting his own personal desires dictate solely
his choice of new plays. From the above sketch of new plays brought out at Drury Lane from 1747 to 1776, it is obvious that he did present numerous sentimental comedies that he felt would be popular and financially successful. That he never encouraged an interest in the passions in comedy, is evident from his own writing, particularly his letters to various authors. It is problematical how much of the comic element in the sentimental comedies he produced is the direct result of his suggestion, but it is known, for example, that he encouraged it to the author of the Discovery, and that he is responsible for the first scene in The West Indian. This is the only scene in the play that shows Belcour in a less than favourable light, consequently making the character more realistic.

As a receiver of plays, though, Garrick cannot be considered an effective influence against sentimentality. He "lived to please", and considered remarkably little else in the accepting or rejecting of a new play. His influence in the direction of true comedy lay predominately, as has already been shown, in his correspondence, his prologues and epilogues, his preservation of worthwhile laughing comedies by alteration, and his own dramatic compositions. The only other method he used to support traditional comedy was his steady maintenance
of old comedies in his repertoire.

Dougald MacMillan's Drury Lane Calendar makes practical a detailed analysis of comedy at Drury Lane during Garrick's time. The new sentimental comedies he produced have already been discussed. There were fourteen of them in the twenty-nine seasons under consideration, and they accounted for a total of three hundred and thirty-three performances. They were the following.

- The Brothers by Richard Cumberland
- The West Indian by Richard Cumberland
- The Fashionable Lover by Richard Cumberland
- The Runaway by Hannah Cowley
- False Delicacy by Hugh Kelly
- A Word to the Wise by Hugh Kelly
- The School for Wives by Hugh Kelly
- The Platonic Wife by Mrs. Elizabeth Griffith
- The School for Rakes by Mrs. Elizabeth Griffith
- The Foundling by Edward Moore
- The School for Lovers by William Whitehead
- The English Merchant by George Colman
- The Discovery by Mrs. Frances Sheridan
- The Widow'd Wife by William Kenrick

Fourteen true comedies which played for a total of four hundred
and seventy-six evenings furnished good balance in the new material and tipped the scales in favour of pure comedy as regards total performances. These plays are listed below.

**All in the Wrong** by Arthur Murphy

**The Way to Keep Him** by Arthur Murphy

**The Hypocrite** by Isaac Bickerstaffe

**'Tis Well it's No Worse** by Isaac Bickerstaffe

**The Clandestine Marriage** by Garrick and Colman

**The Jealous Wife** by George Colman

**The Choleric Man** by Richard Cumberland

**The Suspicious Husband** by Benjamin Hoadly

**Falstaff's Wedding** by William Henrick

**Gil Blas** by Edward Moore

**The Dupe** by Mrs. Frances Sheridan

**The Minor** by Samuel Foote

**Herope** by Aaron Hill

**The Maid of Kent** by Francis Godolphin Waldron

Eight sentimental comedies which antedated Garrick's accession to the management were played a total of two hundred and seven times. One sees from the list below that they include two of Gibber's, one of Vanbrugh's, and one of combined authorship. This group of four represents very early examples
of the type. They retained more of the Comedy of Manners
tradition than was customary later.

- *Love's Last Shift* by Colley Cibber
- *The Lady's Last Stake* by Colley Cibber
- *Aesop* by Sir John Vanbrugh
- *The Provok'd Husband* by Cibber and Vanbrugh
- *The Conscious Lovers* by Sir Richard Steele
- *The Drummer* by Joseph Addison
- *Irish Hospitality* by Charles Shadwell
- *The Gamester* by Susannah Centlivre

These three classifications of plays, the new sentimental,
the old sentimental, and the new non-sentimental account for
much less than half of the total number of comic performances
during this period. Fifty-three old comedies were played for
a total of 1,283 times from 1747-1776 at Drury Lane. These
made up the bulk of full-length comedies and represent a way
in which Garrick resisted sentimentality by playing against it,
when the output of good non-sentimental comedies was low, the
excellent comedies of times past. The following were the ones
he chose to present.

- *The London Cuckolds* by Edward Ravenscroft
- *The Committee* by Sir Robert Howard
- *Woman is a Riddle* by Christopher Bullock
The Schemers by Jasper Mayne
The Man of Mode by Sir George Etherage
The Inconstant by George Farquhar
The Recruiting Officer by George Farquhar
The Stratagem by George Farquhar
The Twin Rivals by George Farquhar
The Constant Couple by George Farquhar
Sir Courtly Nice by John Crowne
The Double Dealer by William Congreve
Love for Love by William Congreve
The Way of the World by William Congreve
Love Makes a Man by Colley Cibber
She Would and She Would Not by Colley Cibber
The Careless Husband by Colley Cibber
The Double Callant by Colley Cibber
The Refusal by Colley Cibber
The Honiour by Colley Cibber
Eastward Hoe by Chapman, Jonson, and Marston
The Busy Body by Susannah Centlivre
The Wonder by Susannah Centlivre
A Bold Stroke for a Wife by Susannah Centlivre
The Pilgrim by Beaumont and Fletcher altered by Vanbrugh
The Scornful Lady by Beaumont and Fletcher
The Fair Quaker of Deal by Charles Shadwell
The Squire of Alsatia by Charles Shadwell
Friendship in Fashion by Thomas Otway
The Country Wife by William Wycherly
The Plain Dealer by William Wycherly
The Rehearsal by Duke of Buckingham
The Confederacy by Sir John Vanbrugh
The False Friend by Sir John Vanbrugh
The Mistake by Sir John Vanbrugh
Epicoene by Ben Jonson
A New Way to Pay Old Debts by Philip Massinger
The Provok'd Wife by Sir John Vanbrugh
The Relapse by Sir John Vanbrugh
The Funeral by Sir Richard Steele

The subsequent comedies in this list were altered to make them acceptable to audiences of the time.

The Ghost by Susannah Centlivre
Albumazar by Thomas Tomkins
The Chances by Beaumont and Fletcher
The Country Girl (from Wycherly's The Country Wife)
Every Man in His Humour by Ben Jonson
There was nothing new about old comedies furnishing a majority of the repertoire. It was the case earlier in the century under Cibber's management, but no manager ever showed more zeal than Garrick in keeping it so. The six old comedies that he altered to keep them acceptable accounted for two hundred and fifty-one performances. This group itself accounted for more performances than did all the sentimental comedies written before his management. After his retirement Congreve's and Jonson's plays became closet pieces. Only his care had kept them and others alive and with them, English Comic Spirit.
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Conclusion

The preceding chapters leave no doubt as to Garrick's opinion regarding sentimentality. In his correspondence he stated that all he desired in a comedy was a well-constructed plot, characters with varying "humours", interesting situations, spirited action, and a moral drawn from the whole. He further explained his point of view by showing amazement when Mrs. Sheridan confusedly thought he wanted the passions interested in comedy. Nothing could be more explicit than his remarks to the Reverend Jenner that the comedy Larmoyante was gaining too much ground among them. Likewise his exhortation to Captain Thompson to emphasize Action was in direct opposition to the sentimental approach which was to heighten suffering and soul-searching.

In his prologues and epilogues he directed the Comic and Tragic Muses to be mutually exclusive. By using the two comedians of Covent Garden Theatre as examples he explained, in his prologue to She Stoops to Conquer, how frustratingly impossible sentimental parts were for first rate comic actors to play.

Although the Prompter before the Curtain essays were primarily concerned with misconduct on the part of the Drury Lane company, they contain strong proofs of Garrick's love for traditional English comedy. His advocacy of comedy 'forever gay with dimpl'd cheeks and bursts of laughter' is consistent with 2h4.
all his previous statements. His nationalistic comments in these columns are as strong as those in the prologues and epilogues. When he stated that the 'sterling English drama' would never be out of fashion if the theatrical companies attended to their duties he indicated why it was important to him that they should.

By taking a large share in the composition of *The Clandestine Marriage* Garrick did much to aid the cause of laughing comedy. It has worn better than all but a very few plays of this period. Lord Ogleby and Mrs. Heidelberg continued to make audiences laugh throughout the most barren period English comedy has known. Also its success is said to have encouraged Goldsmith to write for the stage.

Garrick's afterpieces served to keep much less worthy productions from the stage. They kept audiences from losing touch with the comic tradition. His alterations were judiciously chosen to exhibit some of the best examples of older English comedy - in most cases examples that would have been unplayable without his attention.

As a manager of a theatre-royal, Garrick felt obliged to serve all interests, but he never did true comedy an injustice. He played all the noteworthy new comedies that were offered him and produced a wider variety of good comedies of earlier periods
than any previous manager.

As an actor he made famous many comic roles. His playing of Abel Dragger and Kitely, for instance, was the strongest force in the century for popularizing Ben Jonson.

He was without a doubt the most widely respected person associated with the cause of true comedy in this century. His personal influence in the support of traditional comedy and the whole of traditional English drama was more general than that of any others. He tirelessly advocated the 'sterling English drama' in his correspondence and his conversation, both at home and abroad.

His dramatic works lacked the genius so apparent in the comedies of Goldsmith and Sheridan, but he wrote much more than either of them, was more consistent in his anti-sentimental position, and was much more dedicated to the field of drama. Garrick's works include no sentimental poems or novels as do Goldsmith's, nor do they include as sentimental a play as Sheridan's Pizzaro. Goldsmith's and Sheridan's dramatic careers appear as brilliant interludes of short duration when compared with Garrick's dedication to the cause of English drama from 1737 to 1779.

Considered purely as dramatists both Foote and Murphy were more prolific in the production of laughing comedies than either
Garrick, Goldsmith, or Sheridan. Both of them wrote many plays and both wrote plays of consistent quality. Neither though were effective anti-sentimentalists except through their plays. Foote's works were too individualistic, too caustic, and too personal to exert a large influence. Murphy lessened his possible effect by writing tragedy as well.

George Colman, the Elder, deserves a place among the anti-sentimentalists because of his laughing comedies and his share in the writing of The Clandestine Marriage. On the other hand his play, The English Merchant, is more sentimental than anything Garrick ever wrote. Although he produced Goldsmith's comedies while he was manager of Covent Garden Theatre, he did so only under pressure and with misgivings.

Only Garrick's lack of original genius as a playwright and his unwillingness to use his semi-official position as patentee to limit the production of sentimental comedies kept him from being unquestionably the strongest influence of his time against them. The power of his position, the magnetism of his name, the length of his career, and the variety of his realms of activity insure him a place alongside Murphy, Goldsmith, and Sheridan - all outstanding opponents of sentimental comedy.
Appendix I

Synopsis of \textit{The Clandestine Marriage}.

\textbf{Act I}

\textbf{Scene I.} Betty (the maid) and Fanny talk of the secret marriage between Fanny and Lovewell. Lovewell enters, and Fanny entreats him to make the marriage public. He promises to arrange it as soon as possible. Sterling enters and he discusses marriage for Fanny in bantering terms with Lovewell. He makes it plain that Lovewell, not having enough money, would not be considered as a suitor for Fanny.

\textbf{Scene II.} Betsy Sterling insists that Fanny should be jealous of her, revels in her impending entrance into the Beau Monde as the wife-to-be of Sir John Melvil. The sweet naturalness of Fanny is contrasted with the snobbishness of Miss Sterling. Mrs. Heidelberg enters, and Miss Sterling admits she is worried about her fiancé's coldness. Mrs. Heidelberg then sends servants scurrying to prepare the house for the visit of "quality". Sterling enters and does the same. Then Canton enters and announces that the party will arrive in a quarter of an hour.

\textbf{Act II.}

\textbf{Scene I.} Brush flirts with a maid and gives details of Lord 216.
Ogleby's senility and character. Canton enters and he and Brush get Lord Ogleby ready to face the day. His vanity and humour are shown, also his ardour and his dislike of the boorish Sterling. Sterling and Sir John enter, and Sterling shows off his poor taste. Lord Ogleby expresses the attitude that he only bears with Sterling because of his money.

Scene II. Sir John speaks with Lovewell, tells him that he discovered him out of his room at five in the morning and speculates about which maid he is sleeping with. They are interrupted by Sterling, Heidelberg, Lord Ogleby, Canton, Miss Sterling and Fanny. Sterling shows his poor taste and describes his monstrous estate. Canton and Lord Ogleby give his estate and taste ironic praise. Each of the sisters gives Lord Ogleby a bouquet, and he assumes they both dote on him. The party then goes to look at an old restored ruin and leave Lovewell and Sir John. Sir John tells Lovewell that he has fallen in love with Fanny and thinks she is in love with him because of her confusion when he addresses her about it. He asks Lovewell to help him advance his suit. He then approaches her in the garden. He and Fanny are alone, and she, of course,
denies love for him, but he kisses her hand and promises his love. Miss Sterling comes upon them and accuses Fanny of being a temptress and Sir John of being fickle. Fanny laments her fate.

Act III

Scene I. Lawyers arrive to arrange marriage contract, and preliminaries are begun with Sterling. Then Sir John interrupts. He tells Sterling that he wishes to marry Fanny instead of Miss Sterling. At first Sterling is furious, but grows to like the idea after Sir John offers to make it financially acceptable to him. Sterling then admits that Mrs. Heidelberg controls his decisions because the family has financial expectations from her and that he will agree to Sir John's marriage with Fanny only if she does.

Scene II. Miss Sterling and Mrs. Heidelberg are talking venomously of Fanny. Their thoughts agree, and Mrs. Heidelberg promises that Betsy will be the wife of Sir John if it costs her 10,000 pounds. Miss Sterling leaves. Sir John enters and announces that he wishes to marry Fanny instead of Betsy. He says that Sterling will agree if she does. Sterling enters. Mrs. Heidelberg
refuses to consider such a thing. Sterling has to follow her lead. He tells Sir John aside that only Lord Ogleby has enough influence with Mrs. Heidelberg to help him.

Act IV

Scene I. Sterling, Miss Sterling, and Mrs. Heidelberg. Mrs. Heidelberg forces Sterling to agree to send Fanny away at six in the morning.

Scene II. Canton and Lord Ogleby hear of Fanny's being sent away. Lord Ogleby regrets it because she is the only bearable member of the family. Canton, in his usual flattering way, insists that Lord Ogleby is irresistible to Fanny. Lord Ogleby's vanity makes him half believe this.

Scene III. Lovewell sends Fanny to tell all to Lord Ogleby, to throw herself on his mercy, and ask for his support when they announce their marriage. Fanny, of course, stammers and blushes. Lord Ogleby interprets her ambiguities to mean that she is declaring her love for him. He promises to do anything for her. Sir John, through Canton, asks to see Lord Ogleby who insists he is too busy. Mr. Sterling and Miss Sterling enter. They have come to inform Lord Ogleby of Sir John's
refusal to marry Betsy and of Fanny's baseness in luring him away from her sister. At this point Lord Ogleby can hear no evil spoken of Fanny. He defends her. Speaking only to Sterling, he then plays on Sterling's ambition to become allied to his house and asks Sterling's permission to marry Fanny, assuring him that this is Fanny's desire. As usual Sterling's only reservation is that his sister must agree. Lord Ogleby assures him that he can get Mrs. Heidelberg's permission. Sterling says he will dispatch Lovewell for fresh papers for the lawyers. Sterling leaves and Lovewell enters. Lovewell thinks all his problems have been solved because Lord Ogleby says he will make Fanny happy. At length it becomes apparent to Lovewell what is transpiring. Sir John enters and asks Lord Ogleby's help. Lord Ogleby gleefully offers it, saying he is "on the wing" and winking at Lovewell. Sir John asks his permission to drop his suit to Betsy. Lord Ogleby grants it. Then he asks permission to pay court to Fanny. Lord Ogleby winks at Lovewell and asks "Do you think he'll succeed Lovewell?" At the same time he gives Sir John permission, saying "I look on women as lawful game".
Act V

Scene I. In the night Lovewell and Fanny are together in Fanny's chamber. Betty is keeping watch at the door. Lovewell has been sent to get papers for Lord Ogleby, but, as he surmises the reason for them, he has not gone. He announces his intention of telling all in the morning. He and Fanny comfort each other until Betty announces they have been heard. Fanny asks Lovewell to return to his room and he agrees. Betty is to go first and make sure the way is clear.

Scene II. Betsy enters gallery leading Mrs. Heidelberg in nightdress in general disarray. Betsy tells her that she heard a man's voice in Fanny's room and knows Sir John is in there planning an elopement before morning. Mrs. Heidelberg doesn't want to be seen without her head-dress and they hide when they hear Brush and a chambermaid. Brush rambles on in a comic drunken manner about the Sterling house, Mrs. Heidelberg, and Miss Sterling. Finally Mrs. Heidelberg interrupts and discovers that Brush had announced a holiday in the servant's quarters because Sir John was going to marry Fanny instead of Betsy. Maid is sent to arouse Sterling. Betty enters gallery, is grabbed by Betsy and Mrs. Heidelberg, and yells a warning to Fanny.
Sterling stumbles on the scene asking whether robbery, fire, or rape is the reason for the alarm. Mrs. Heidelberg answers, "No, no, there's no rape, brother! -- all parties are willing, I believe". She tells her brother that Sir John is in Fanny's chamber. Sterling promises to make him marry her in the morning. This is not what Mrs. Heidelberg wants so she screams to wake the whole household. All appear and Lord Ogleby offers to get Fanny to open the door. Betty opens it with a key. Lord Ogleby calls in a mock tragic voice for Sir John to appear. He appears from his own chamber. Lord Ogleby, confident that his faith in Fanny was justified, calls for her to appear. She does, attempts to explain, and faints. Seeing this, Lovewell enters and all is explained. Sterling, in a passion, orders them from his house. Lord Ogleby, living up to his promise in the garden, offers them sanctuary in his. Then Sterling, following his sister's lead, reconsiders and all accept the marriage.

Final Curtain
Mr. Editor:

The criticks upon our theatres, are so apparently influenced, that I never knew a more fit time for a calm, impartial spectator to make his appearance; and when I assure you that no privilege in the power of a MANAGER to give - can bribe me, nor that any art of any performer, or even part of his, or her salary shall guide my pen, my unbiassed judgement will make no bad figure among the present writers upon the same subject. The Theatres are acknowledged, by the best authors of this age, French as well as English, to be the great source of our pleasures if not of our morals; and therefore it is a subject that the wisest, - the Wittiest, - and the most virtuous need not blush to handle. - A poet, in a poem to the late Manager of old Drury, has rightly said,

"A nation's taste depends on you,
Perhaps a nation's virtue, too!"

Whitehead

Tho' nobody can be more sensible of that Manager's merit than myself, yet I must attribute a great part of the present theatrical calamity to him; the calamity, I mean, is the uncertainty of the entertainment you are to have, from which in general may be derived the daily great mischief to the Directors, disappointment
to the audience, and discredit to the whole. - The capriciousness, unfeeling importance, and pretended indispositions of the performers, are, I fear, the root of all this evil. - Before I proceed, it is proper for my own sake, to explain what I meant by saying, that I attributed the present theatrical calamity to the late Manager. - He indulged the performers too much, to the great injury of his successors. Had he been political, or resolute enough to have crushed the mischief in the birth, we should not now have an actor, or an actress dare to make excuses for not playing parts they have long acted and others withdrawing themselves from characters in which they have long pleased; by quitting which to inferior performers, they only indulge the vanity of comparison, while they destroy with the public entertainment; the property of their employers.

In a future paper, I will particularize this freedom of behaviour, so disrespectful to the town, injurious to the theatre, and in the end ruinous to themselves. Had Mr. G. at first done, what Mr. Sheridan is now obliged to do from necessity, - bring the culprits to the bar of the public, instead of stopping the gap himself, he would have transferred to the purchasers a property of double the value. - Mrs. Cibber (who had really an ill state of health) began the fashion; but if I am rightly informed, the Managers had a right to deduct a portion of her
salary, for every omission of her duty when called upon. —

Mrs. Clive, and Mrs. Pritchard with great deference to
the present ladies, were both inimitable actresses, and never
copied Mrs. Cibber, in disappointing the public; — they per¬
formed their characters whenever called upon, without notice or
murmuring, nor were any frivolous excuses made to incense the
audience and discredit the theatre. — It is an observation made
now in every coffee-house, that there can be no assurance of any
piece being acted on the evening it is advertised, and conse¬
quently, that no parties can be made, the great support of a
play-house, without a probability of being in some way dis¬
appointed; — this might have such a terrible effect upon the
reputation and fashion of a public place, that no ability, in¬
dustry, or even fortune can withstand such repeated attacks
upon its credit.

I will not suppose, that the performers are wantonly sacri¬
ficing the interest of the present Patentees, to aggrandize the
merit of their late Manager; — and yet, from what source does
this evil arise? — We will endeavour in some future letter to
trace it to its head, and if we succeed, will produce it bare¬
faced, to the confusion of the guilty, — be they Managers, or
be they Performers! Every frequenter of our theatres must be
convinced, by some late mortifying proofs, at both houses, that
there is no actor or actress who can draw an audience, by his, or her own peculiar strength; and that success can only be obtained by the united powers of the company: - this is a fact, the truth of which, I challenge the whole body of theatrical flatterers to refute. - If so, what a foolish endeavour it is in anyone (and I have my eye on many) to set up a mock importance, - to be supported by mock indisposition, - and thus make a mockery of everything, that must of necessity fall sooner or later, very heavy upon part, or the whole of the theatrical stage. - In a future paper I shall particularize some of the general propositions laid down above: - I shall give due praise, where praise is due; - but I give notice to the dramatis personae that they must not expect me to prostitute the words exquisite, inimitable, matchless, incredible, and what not, to every rant! flare! strut! bounce! jerk of the body! flouncing of the petticoat! or flirt of the fan! -- Tho' I may be deceived in my judgement, I will be above telling a falsehood, or taking a bribe!

The PROMPTER before the Curtain
Mr. Editor,

What Sancho Panza says — "if I give you a button you'll take my coat"; — and our old homely proverb, "give them an inch, and they'll take an ell", — cannot be better apply'd, than to many of our present performers, upon both theatres. — By the behaviour of many, who shall separately be brought to trial in the course of these papers, we would imagine, that their interest was combined with their inclination, to distress, and perplex the public entertainment. — However, as my chief motive for taking up the pen was, — to effect a calm investigation of the means by which the theatres are at present ill spoken of, and sometimes neglected; — I shall at once come to the point, and lay facts before the public, for them to draw the consequences.

The tragedy of the Roman Father, was revived, in the strength of the company, the 16th instant; — and the town had likewise an additional incitement to their curiosity, which was Mrs. Yates' first appearance, after her late fracas with the Managers; and yet with all this allurement, the curtain was drawn up to half a house, and continued indifferent to the end. — The excellent pastoral comedy of "As You Like It" was represented at the theatre royal, in Covent Garden, — the part of Rosalind excellently performed by Mrs. Barry, to a shameful
I say shameful, because such an author as Shakespeare, and such an actress as Mrs. Barry, should have had a stronger effect upon the town. But the fact being so, let us inquire into the cause.

I will venture to assert, that these mistaken Ladies injure their own consequence, by falsely imagining, that they support it, in appearing seldom. The Horatia of Mrs. Yates, deserved a more brilliant attendance; but the political, modern refinements of Mrs. Yates and others, have so chilled the ardour of public curiosity, that if they go on with this parsimony of their talents, they may play hereafter only to a few frost-nip'd renters in the boxes, and some huddled-together, starved orders in the pit, and galleries.

I am sorry that I am obliged to produce a singer — Miss Catley, in defence of my proposition. It is well known that this performer visibly brings more money to the theatre, than any person or persons now upon it. It is likewise as well known, that with all her extraordinary peculiarities, of private, and public behaviour, she was ever ready to do her duty when called upon. Has this willingness to obey the managers, and to be often seen, and heard, diminished her popularity? No: just the contrary! Nay, I will go farther: her frequent
appearance has seemingly diminished the errors of her acting, and
magnified the merits of her voice; -- the more she is seen, the
less will her tricks, and oddities disgust; -- and the more she
is heard, the more will she be followed and applauded.

"Hear this proud Dames! who drag the sweeping train,
Nor for the future, rant -- and strut in vain!"

In short, Ladies, -- I speak to the capital ones, for those
who mimic their errors will change with their models, -- you in-
jure yourselves by keeping from the stage. The more you are
seen, the more you'll be admired; and if doing your duty to the
public, and your paymaster, may be taken into the account; -- and
I will not suppose you above such considerations, -- your minds
will be free, and undisturbed by continual bickerings, and the
invention of excuses; and your private character will be as
much approved of out of the theatre, as your public one will be
applauded within it. -- Let me venture to say, that you lose
more time, and spirits, in disputing, and vexing yourselves
about when you are to play, than would suffice for doing what
you ought to do twice over. -- During this unprofitable debate,
the Directors are injured, -- the theatre discredited, -- the
town disappointed, -- and your delicacy hurt by receiving your
salaries, for -- not doing your duty! --
Having said so much against the present mode of acting off
the stage, I must beg the MANAGERS to take what I have to say to
them in good part. — If it is true, Gentlemen, that Mr. Sheridan,
sen. is to join your troop, as it is given out, — in the name of
common sense, why would you not postpone the revival of the Roman
Father? — that character seems more calculated for his manner,
and time of life, than for any other performer I ever remember.
Let not the actor who has lately appeared in it, be dissatis-
fied with what I say; — his merits as a man, and an actor, are
well known to me. He could not refuse such a part; but I think
the management to blame, to allot it to him. When violent and
contrary passions, proceeding from age and infirmity, are to be
represented, I cannot think of Mr. Bensley. Let the requisites
of a character be manhood, — spirit, and rough resolution —
and there is no one of either theatre, will be superior to him;
— but tenderness, and weakness, are not adapted to his abili-
ties, and therefore such qualities in a character must distress
him. — Mrs. Yates, and Mr. Smith could not be better employed.

In a future paper, I will endeavour to account for the de-
cline of the Stage, and offer some proposals for the raising it
equal to any degree we have ever seen it. I shall unveil some
characters which are too much in shade, and point out a method,
which, if my vanity does not deceive me, may restore acting, —
the only natural public entertainment of this country to its wonted favour. Your painters, and musicians, shew that good English authors, and actors, ought to stand foremost in the catalogue, and that the crochets and quavers of Mr. Dibdin, and the pencils and brushes of Mr. De Loutherbourg should -- with all their secondary merits, -- retire to the margin, or the bottom of the page.

Have we not done, for many years,
As if we'd only eyes, and ears?
Have ye not, BRITONS, hearts to move,
And minds that wholesome nurture love?
Let Terror! -- Pity -- lead the way,
And COMEDY for ever gay
With dimpled smiles, and bursts of laughter,
Come nodding! -- beck'ning! -- tripping after!
Be SHAKESPEARE fix'd in all his rights!
Let paint, -- and sound, -- and songs, and sight!
Wait on his steps, and grace his flights!

The PROMPTER before the Curtain
Mr. Editor,

You have lately given us to understand, by what authority you best know — that we are soon to be entertained with a company of strolling French actors! — That there may be such an intention among our people of fashion, is not to me amazing, or unaccountable; and could I take the vanity to myself upon the occasion, my former letters have in a manner foretold the event, without entering into particulars — Should this troop of Monsieurs and Madames ever gain an establishment amongst us, the English actors may thank themselves for the consequences. — What I have said before, I will again repeat, that the false importance of the principal performers at both houses, by neglect of their duty — misconception of their interest, — and disappointment of the public, has brought disgrace, and will bring ruin on the English Theatres!

I shall lay aside the intended subject of this letter, to prove by a variety of facts, and arguments, the position I have advanced — The love of theatrical entertainments — in our own language, I mean, — is perhaps more sincere, and violent in London, that at Paris. The taste of entertainments may vary like other fashions, and may rise to an enthusiasm for the divinity of Shakespeare, or sink to the enjoyment of an unnatural, —
unmeaning farce, made up of dance, shew, and sing-song, in which the capers of Slingsby, and the colours of De Loutherbourg, may perform the principal parts! -- This granted, --- what has vitiated the public taste in this manner? -- Be not offended, ye heroes and heroines of tragedy! nor you, ye fine Gentlemen and Ladies of Comedy --- it is you, and you only, to whom this disgraceful charge can be attributed. -- Had you, as you ought -- protected and supported the true staple commodities of our best manufacturers, the smuggling, trifling, tinsel, exotic, frippery, had never been encouraged amongst us.

Colley Cibber tells us of the merits of the old actors, preceding his management; and Old Downer the Prompter, in his List of Plays, gives an account of their first actors and actresses, playing for weeks together, characters of the greatest length, and force --- When Booth, Wilkes, and Cibber, were the directors of the stage (and some are now alive to remember that Augustine age of the theatre) --- no actor, or actress, unless prevented by real indisposition, ever made excuses for not doing their duty to the public and the managers; and I will, in some future paper, produce examples of Messrs. Booth, Wilkes, and Cibber, -- Mrs. Porter, Mrs. Oldfield, etc. etc. performing capital characters, for weeks together, not only without murmuring, but with a certain conicious (sic) spirit of their own
consequence, and of the interest and reputation which must result to themselves, and the theatre, from their honest, and constant endeavours to support it.

What can possibly have brought about a total revolution in this particular, since the exit of Clive and Pritchard, who were the last well disposed — not indisposed labourers in our dramatic Vineyards? — Were their constitutions better? — Has luxury so far gained ground upon us, that our capital performers are so impaired by it now, that even their fine feelings cannot be moved to assist their less happy brethren at their Benefits? — Or, putting the degrees of genius and ability out of the question — are they not so well paid in these times, as they were formerly? — In a future letter I shall present the public with a full, and authentic account of that matter in the time of Betterton, which will throw a light upon the subject, and prove both instructive, and entertaining: --- but to come to the point: ---

---It may be asked, what has all this to do with French players, and vitiating the taste of the town? --- I will tell you: --- Were the performers of merit to exert their talents as they ought, and as their predecessors always did, --- the sterling English drama would never be out of fashion! --- but if the want of a gown, the prophecy of a soar throat*, --- the change
of characters, and a total relaxation of discipline, should weaken, as they certainly must, the public pleasure, the people of fashion will be glad of an excuse to change their entertainment; --- and if plain, excellent beef, and mutton, are served up slovenly by bad cooks, instead of good ones, no wonder that we send for _le Cuisinier Francois_, and relish nothing but the _larae-pique_---scrap, orts, and high sauces, of our fantastical neighbours!

By casting my eye over the bill of fare, which has been set before us this winter, we shall find from what the public disgust arises; --- there is no _Variety_! our strongest dramas are weakened, and our weakest destroyed, by the present mode of performing them; and if the _Managers_ want either spirit or skill, to bring about a revolution, a _French invasion_ of our theatres at least, must, and will take place. It is exactly the same, this moment, at _Paris_; --- the public there, for the same reasons, have deserted the _Comedie Francoise_, and they now flock to the _Boulevards_, to be better entertained by _Oudonot's_ children, and the _Neapolitan puppet-shew_!

When the late _Manager_ left the stage, his place as an actor made certainly a considerable chasm; which should have been supplied by the joint merit of the best performers. If this had been done, I will assert, what will be thought a paradox by some _idol worshippers_, --- that an excellent play, perform'd in the
strength of the company, without their old leader, would be preferable to the same play, only assisted by the performance of Mr. Garrick. — Let us for once, compare mock Majesty, and mock heroes, to real ones. — When Alexander died, he left his empire to be governed by his Captains: Had they exerted their talents, and with their united powers, nobly, and politically assisted each other, the Imperial legacy had not been rent and disjoined, by their quarrels, and separate interests. If the present Captain Patentees will not agree, and the Captain Actors, and Capital Actresses, will not exert their powers jointly, in their proper stations, old Aesop, in his fable of "the bundle of sticks", will tell them the consequence! I would not alarm the Dramatis Personae, with a Greek quotation, let La Fontaine speak to them more intelligibly.

"Toute Puissance foible a moins que detreunie?"

Take this warning, ye sons of the sock! and buskin!

either from the Greek, — the Frenchman, — or

The PROMPTER before the Curtain

*This alludes to a custom, with some fine Ladies of the Theatre, foretelling that they shall be ill, on such a day; — and then they perform in the interim with great spirit, it never has the least effect on the prediction.
Mr. Editor,

In Fielding's Preface to his comedy of Love in several Masques; there are these words; "---Lastly, I can never express my grateful sense of the good nature of Mrs. Oldfield, who, tho' she had contracted a slight indisposition by her violent fatigue in the part of Lady Townely, was prevailed upon to grace that of Lady Matchless, which placed her in a light so inferior to that, which she had in the others. --- After this follows the character of this excellent actress which I have omitted, because the world is satisfied that no greater genius ever adorned the English, or any other stage. This Actress performed the character of Lady Townley for twenty-eight nights, as may be seen in the Preface, and thus fatigued as she must have been, she undertook an indifferent part in the first play of a young author, immediately after the other. --- What an encouragement to genius? --- and in what an agreeable, and just light, does the conduct of this charming actress appear! and where shall we search now for a good copy of this excellent original?

Mrs. Oldfield as Cibber tells us, had a fine understanding: --- she knew her strength, and managed it to the increase of her own fame, and the welfare of the Theatre in general. --- She did not appear at her first setting out, to promise that high, and exquisite pleasure, which she afterwards returned to the
public for their very kind indulgence, and favour to her, at
the dawn of her merit; --- and, indeed, she never withdrew her
meridian rays from her generous and grateful patrons, but shone
out with all her splendour day by day, whenever called upon by
the Managers. --- To pursue the metaphor, -- had every thea-
trical luminary since her time, done the same, we should not now
complain of the clouds, and darkness, which at present hang
over our Theatres Royal.

If any person will please to doubt the authenticity of my
facts, relative to the constant employment of the first per-
formers, in, or before Giber's time, I will produce the play-
bills, as they stand in the original Spectator where will be
found the first Tragedians, as well as Comedians, acting charac-
ters of length, and violence for many nights successively, and
often without respite, taking up others, till a change of the
business gave them some necessary repose. I therefore revert
to my former proposition, "That the chief performers, by appear-
ing seldom, and adhering to a kind of system of false impor-
tance, have injured their own reputation, and -- with their
directors, have more than half ruined the entertainments of the
stage!" -- In this hypothesis I have been obstinate, in propor-
tion to my conviction. The next source from whence discredit,
and distress are brought upon the whole, -- is, by the best
performers withdrawing themselves from the old, and new plays. --- I will produce as an instance of what I urge, a play that has been acted within these few days; I mean the new tragedy of Semiramis, from Voltaire. I shall not now speak of the merit, but of the performance of this play: -- It received the public approbation, tho' one of the characters suffered greatly from the fear, or the inability of one of the Ladies. -- In the name of common sense, why would the managers try such an experiment upon the first night of a new play, of an uncelebrated author? And where, in the name of decency and justice, was Miss Young? And why was not the spirited, -- virtuous, -- tender Azema, to be represented by HER? -- Was a part, thought worthy of Clairon, upon the French theatre, to be rejected by Miss Young upon the English? -- If it was not sent to her by the managers, or allotted to her by the author, she ought to be exculpated, and the criminal (for it certainly is a crime of leze-majesté against the public) should be set up at their bar. --- Are we only in two plays to see these heroines, Mrs. Yates, and Miss Young together? --- Theatrical entertainments must fall, unless, as I said before, the best performers will give their united strength, to the support of them. -- Mrs. Oldfield and Mrs. Porter were ever employed in the same play, when they could properly be so. --- The Dumesnil, and the Clairon in France, always took
the character, whatever its degree of merit, in that species of acting which suited their particular talents.

It was such an arrangement of business that gave a well-founded reputation some years ago to the French stage, and to the English also, under the direction of Booth, Wilkes, and Cibber. But with very considerable merit among our Dramatis Personae, we cannot have the full enjoyment of any one play: for, like a set of Genii that are mentioned in some oriental tale, while one is exerting his prowess, the rest are fast asleep.—

If I could rouse the Knights, and Amazons of the theatre to a proper sense of their own interest, I should think my pen not ill-employed. Whatever they may think, they have not a more sincere friend, and admirer than the writer of these letters. He much esteems their profession, and only opposes himself to the ruinous endeavour of some against themselves. Real talents stand not in want of daily, hurtful, nauseous panegyrics in prose and verse; which, not content with giving common praise, must even—to deserve their hire—change the fall of the leaf, into the very budding of the spring!

I shall finish, for the time, with an assurance of my warm wishes for the theatrical community, but with still warmer for
the English stage; which, without a speedy revolution, must sink into neglect. — Many persons have been named as the authors of these Essays, which are intended to support our best national entertainment: The players will soon find out, that their curiosity is upon a wrong scent. Should they ever get upon a right one, and pursue me to cover, they will find, however misinterpreted I may have been, that I am their very hearty, well wisher, ---

The PROMPTER before the Curtain

P.S. I cannot omit this occasion of declaring my opinion, that Mrs. Yates never appeared to greater advantage than in Semiramis. The translator should present her with some token of gratitude, as the Roman Catholics do their Saints, for some signal escape from peril!
The Prompter before the Curtain,

to the Prompter behind the Curtain.

Our situations, brother Hopkins, have great resemblance:
--- You keep yourself conceal'd from the public, while you
prompt the Ladies and Gentlemen, behind the Curtain, -- and
I -- notwithstanding the many wise endeavours to discover me,
still give the word, and will continue to give it, to the Ladies,
and Gentlemen before the curtain! -- We are very much alike in
other things: -- an injured woman complains of you, and has
painted you with your crutches, like the Devil upon two sticks,
riding about upon 'em to raise conspiracies against her. --
Some Injured Ladies of the theatres too complain, that my stric-
tures upon their private conduct to the public and managers,
have been less polite, than severe. -- Now you, Mr. Hopkins,
being a very honest, painstaking man, without a grain of the
conspirator about you, the public sees, that the Injured Woman's
complaints are directed to your place and, not your person; --
and a Prompter before the curtain, who will observe upon indis-
positions! -- hoarseness! and all the female artillery of tricks,
and devices to support female importance -- injure their employ-
ers, or disappoint the public, will call down the vengeance of
those injured Medeas! -- Hermoines! -- Zetas -- and Semiramises,
&c. &c. &c. -- who
"Red with uncommon wrath, would blast the man that should dare to soil their ermine, or to wish for the sake of the English stage, that they would carry some of the noble sentiments of their assumed characters, into their private conduct."

I must desire you, Mr. Hopkins, to assure them, for the last time, that they have no admirer more devoted to them than I am; and that the great end of my labours, for a reformation, is to be still more their admirer; and that the charm'd spectators may have the fullest enjoyment of their theatrical powers, by knowing, that they are not only applauding exquisite Actresses, but worthy Women! -- Mrs. Clive, and Mrs. Pritchard, have often received this double tribute to their virtues, and their talents. -- Pray tell Miss Pope, that I think her merit now inferior to none; -- and that her conduct to the public in every respect, deserves the warmest protection, and the honour of being placed next to the two last mentioned Ladies, her models off, and on the stage.

-- Don't be in a hurry, my good brother! -- rest your crutches a while, and let me desire you, as you have the pleasure of seeing, and of conversing with them oftener than I can, or indeed wish to do, -- to convey my honest warm wishes, and I hope faithful observations. -- You know, friend Hopkins, that
as your labours are multiplied, the business of the stage must decline: Your chief employment at present is, -- or my intelligence has deceived me -- not so much to procure fresh entertainment for the public, as to take care, that there may be some entertainment for them. -- The caprices of a certain fine Lady, -- to whom I shall dedicate a whole Prompter, in a little time -- would be truly ridiculous, and diverting, were they not at the same time most destructive to the theatre. -- The fashionable ton at present, is to be totally void of feeling, and to pursue the whims of the moment, without the smallest consideration of the consequences, or of any immediate injury that might happen: at all events the whim must be gratified! -- If this is to be a fine Lady, we have not a finer upon the stage! -- But I will not keep you too long, Brother Hopkins.

Let me first desire you to present my compliments to your Managers: -- and to the oldest, who I believe is the youngest man, give him this hint from me, -- to be somewhat attentive to his dress -- more to his company -- and more still to his property; and to remember, that Alexander was a little, and not a tall man! -- These four rules, well observed, may prove golden ones to him in the end! Present me likewise to the other young Manager; -- let him know I admire his genius, and blame his idleness:
though I would not have him descent to labour like his predecessor in the low province of pantomime, yet it will be expected from him, that he produce in a winter something more than a score of elegant lines, to bring up the REAR of a translation from Voltaire! — Assure Mr. Linley of my best wishes to him; — but at the same time whisper in his ear, that Terpsichore is but a Lady-in-Waiting upon Melpomene, and Thalia; whenever she is made of equal consequence, and is raised to be a third in the empire of Old Drury, I will not answer for the consequences! — Gold fringe is a fine ornament for a noble dress, but a habit made of that only, will not give the wearer any credit, either for his taste, or his understanding!

Lay me at the feet likewise of your three capital Ladies, and assure them, that the various reports about them, neither do honour to their heads, or their hearts; — the repeated exhibition of some worn-out plays to losing houses within these few weeks, and the feeble manner of performing some revived ones, have sent a general murmur thro' the town! — What say they at the Coffee-houses? — MacBeth, without Mrs. Yates! — The Way of the World, and no Miss Younge! — Let Miss Younge know from me that Mrs. Porter, the first tragic actress of her time and Mrs. Pritchard, the first comic actress of any time, performed the part of Marwood, and therefore Miss Y____ cannot be
justified in refusing it! —

As I shall have much more to say to these ladies hereafter, I shall leave them now, and present them with a fable from Aesop, imitated by the humorous Sir John Vanbrugh, which puts these quarrels, and contentions with their Managers in the fairest, and the properest light.—

FABLE

Once on a time, the hands, and feet
As mutineers, grew might great;
They met! — caball'd! — and talk'd of Treason!
They swore by Jove! they knew no reason
The belly shou'd have all the meat!
It was a damn'd, notorious, cheat!
They did the work, and --- Death! and Hell! they'd eat!
The belly, who ador'd good cheer,
Had like t'have dy'd away for fear!
Quoth he, "Good folks! you little know"
"What 'tis you are about to do!
"If I am starv'd, what will become of you?"
"We neither know, nor care, "cry'd they,
"But this we will be bold to say,
"We'll see you damn'd.
"Before we'll work,
"And you receive the pay!"
With that the hands to pockets went
Full wrist-band deep;
The legs and feet fell fast asleep!
Their liberty they had redeem'd,
And all, except the belly, seem'd
Extremely well content!

But mark what follow'd! --- 'Twas not long
Before the right became the wrong!
The mutineers were grown so weak,
They found 'twas more than time to squeak:
They call for work, -- but 'twas too late!
The stomach, (like an aged maid
Shrunk up, for want of human aid
The common debt of nature paid,
And with its destiny entrain'd their fate!

That the wise Aesop, and the witty Vanbrugh may be felt,
and have their proper effect upon the theatrical members, is
the sincere wish of

The PROMPTER before the Curtain
From the great politeness of a stranger, who felt for my uneasiness, and has relieved it, I am at once freed from the most disagreeable situation, which my mind ever felt; - that of not keeping my word with the public; at the same time I am furnished with the means of indulging the curiosity of your correspondent Theatricus.

The following curious paper was published by the Proprietors of the Theatre, at that time, to convince the world how unreasonable the performers then were, and how groundless were all the complaints of their small gains, and ill usage. I confess it has almost the appearance of irony; and the name of the Treasurer Zachary Baggs, at first view may occasion some doubts; but the sight of the original, if its existence should be doubted, will clear them immediately; and for that purpose it is now left in your hands Sir, to be inspected by any Gentlemen who may desire to see it. - I shall myself draw no inferences from the paper, but leave every reader to make his own conclusions. I must however repeat what I have hinted in a former paper, - that it was supposed with some foundation, that the first rate performers in the time of Betterton, had more labours, and less salary, than the present Dramatis Personae: - I presume I am authorized in contradicting that supposition, by the following
ADVERTISEMENT

Concerning the poor Actors, who under pretense of hard usage from the Patentees, are about to desert their service.

Some people having industriously spread about amongst the Quality, and others, what small allowances the chief actors have had this last winter from the Patentees of Drury-Lane Play-house, as if they had received no more than so many poor Palatines; it was thought necessary to print the following account:

The whole company began to act, on the 12th of Oct. 1708, and left off on the 26th of the same month, by reason of Prince George's illness and death; and began again the 11th of December following, and left off upon the Lord Chamberlain's order on the 14th of June last, 1709. So acted, during that time, in all 155 days, which is 22 weeks and 3 days, accounting six acting days to a week.

In that time

To Mr. Wilks, by salary, for acting, and taking care of the rehearsals; paid

168 6 8

By his benefit play; paid

90 14 9 259 1 5

To Mr. Betterton, by salary, for acting

4 pounds a week for himself and 1 pound a week for his wife, although she does not act; paid

112 10 0
By a benefit play at common prices, besides what he got by high prices, and guineas, paid 76 4 5 188 14 5

To Mr. Estcourt at 5 pounds a week salary; paid 112 10 0
By a benefit play; paid 51 8 6 163 18 6

To Mr. Cibber, at 5 pounds a week salary; paid 111 10 0
By a benefit play; paid 51 0 10 162 10 10½

To Mr. Mills, at 4 pounds a week salary for himself, and 1 pound a week for his wife for little or nothing, 112 10 0
By a benefit play paid to him (not including what she got by a benefit play) 58 1 4 170 11 4

To Mrs. Oldfield, at 4 pounds a week salary, which for 1½ weeks and one day; she leaving off acting presently after her benefit, viz. on the 17th of March last 1708, tho the benefit was intended for her whole nine months acting, and she refused to assist others in their benefits; her salary for these 1½ weeks and one day came to, and she was paid, 56 13 4

In January she required and was paid ten guineas, to wear on the stage in some plays, during the whole season, a mantua and petticoat that was
given her for the stage, and though she left off three months before she should, yet she hath not returned any part of the ten guineas, 
And she had for wearing in some plays a suit of boys clothes on the stage, paid 
By a benefit play; paid 

Besides which certain sums above-mentioned the same Actors got by their benefit plays, as follows:

Note, That Mr. Betterton having had 76-4-5d. as above mentioned for two thirds of the profits by a benefit play, reckoning his tickets for the boxes at 5s., a piece, the pit at 3s., the first gallery at 2s., and the upper gallery at 1s. But the boxes, pit, and stage being laid together on his day, and no person admitted but by his tickets, the lowest at half a guinea a ticket; nay he had much more; for one Lady gave him ten guineas, some five guineas, some two guineas, and most one guinea, supposing he designed not to act any more, and he delivered tickets out for more persons than the boxes, pit, and stage could hold; 'tis thought he cleared at least 450 pounds over and besides the said 76-4-5d. 

It is thought Mr. Estcourt cleared 200 pounds besides the 51-8-6d.
285.

That Mr. Wilks cleared by guineas as it is thought about
40 pounds besides the said 90-14-9d. 40 00 00

That Mr. Cibber got by guineas it is thought about
50 pounds besides the said 51/10/10½ 50 00 00

That Mr. Mills got by guineas about 20 pounds as it
is though, besides the said 58-1-4d. 20 00 00

That Mrs. Oldfield it is thought got 120 pounds by
guineas over and above the said 62-7-8 120 00 00

In all 880

So that these six comedians who are the unsatisfied people,
have between the 12th of October, and the 11th of June last,
cleared in all the following sums,

Acted 100 times

Mr. Wilks, certain, and 259 1 5
more by computation, 40 0 0 299 1 5

Both

Acted 16 times

Mr. Betterton certain; 138 14 5
and more by computation 450 00 0 638 14 5

Acted 52 times

Mr. Estcourt certain, 163 18 6
and more by computation 200 0 0 363 18 6
Acted 71 times
Mr. Cibber certain, 162 10 10½
and more by computation 50 0 0 212 10 10½

Acted ____ times
Mr. Mills certain, 170 11 4
and more by computation 20 0 0 190 11 4

Acted 39 times
Mrs. Oldfield certain, 132 6 7
and more by computation, 120 0 0 252 6 7

In all 1957 3 2

Had not acting been forbid seven weeks on the occasion of Prince George's death, and my Lord Chamberlain forbade acting about five weeks before the 10th of July instand, each of these actors would have had twelve weeks salary more than is above mentioned.

As to the certainties expressed in this paper to be paid to the six Actors, the same are positively true; and as to the sums which they got over and above such certainties, I believe the same to be true according to the best of my computation.

Witness my hand, who am Receiver and Treasurer at the Theatre-Royal in Drury Lane.

Zachary Baggs
Yours etc.

July 8, 1709

The PROMPTER before the Curtain
Mr. Editor:

The English Comedy, notwithstanding the contrary boast of the French writers, is much superior to that of our neighbors; — the reason is very plain; from the necessary effects of our constitution, we have a greater variety, and strength of character than any other nation in Europe. — All the people of education in France, have nearly the same modes, and manners, regulated by a greater, or less share of understanding. We have scarcely a single Gentleman in England, who does not differ from other Gentlemen, as much in whim, humour, and manner, as in countenance; and our lower class of people are still more variegated and particular; in short, where France hath one strong character, we have a thousand. Our present fine Gentlemen indeed, — could we suppose that such a senseless — lifeless— listless race, could continue to spread their non-existence round the circle of high life, would in a short time reduce their species to no more discrimination, that there is in so many cabbages: But such singular, unnatural beings, cannot possibly increase, and therefore cannot possibly affect our drama. — Calves with two heads! — Sheep with five legs! — and Macaronies, one mere lusus naturae! — monsters of a false conception, and cannot long continue to exist.

The middle life in France being less confined to certain
rules of breeding are certainly more varied; and yet the Burgoisee Francoise hath a peculiar manner of acting, appearing almost uniform to strangers, who consider them superficially. But Moliere, one of the greatest dramatic geniuses that nature ever produced, saw deeper than the surface, and brought forth riches, from a soil which would appear barren, and of no value to less piercing eyes of common observers. — Our Dramatists, from the very liberty I have been speaking of, indulged themselves in a certain loose manner, which with all their merit, hath discredited our stage. The wits of Charles the Second, took their colouring from court-practice, and have painted with great strength, and great truth, but thought it below their art to make use of any kind of drapery.

"Themselves they studied; as they felt they writ, Intrigue was plot — obscenity was wit; Vice always found a sympathetic friend, They pleas'd their age, and did not aim to mend."

Congreve and Vanbrugh, in the very first class of Comedy writers, caught the infection from Wycherly, — Etheridge, — and Dryden. As their genius was so powerful, they should have brought about a revolution, instead of assisting to keep on the stage, those low, immoral substitutes for wit, and humour, — indecency, and double entendre. Cibber is not free from the accusation: — I will not mention Farquhar, for tho' he wrote naturally, he was
carried away by the fashion, and had not strength and vigour enough, as the others had, to spring from the filth, and mire of a corrupt, and abandoned taste. — Whoever can well weed the dramatic pastures of Congreve, and Vanbrugh, without plucking up some of the best flowers, or disfiguring their shape, and beauty, will deserve the warmest praises the lovers of the drama can bestow. But this business must not be done with too much haste, or fear; for wicked wits will condemn all alterations; and alterations made without great care, may be condemned by all.

Shakespeare, — Jonson, — Beaumont and Fletcher were the stage luminaries of that day; each hath his peculiar merits, yet very distinct from each other. Jonson was a sour, tho' keen observer of nature; he ransacked every corner for objects for his dramas; — he sought, and found: by the dint of learning, and the labour of art, he became a great writer of comedy, but yet he wanted that ease, and pliancy of mind, which his contemporaries had. Tho' there is very good drawing, — a bold expression, — and high colouring, yet the outline is hard, and there wants a certain relief to his figures; he was the Hans Holbein of our dramatists. — Beaumont and Fletcher's comedy was of another kind; they had a very free pencil, and they wrote with very great ease whatever they conceived was natural, therefore they
are often faulty, and sometimes very extravagant in their charac-
ters, and fable: they lived upon what stock they had, and having
gathered their treasures merely from observation, they often
failed in art. — Dryden says of Fletcher, "If he wakes in one
scene, he commonly slumbers in another; and if he pleases you
in the first three acts, he is frequently so tired with his
labour, that he goes heavily into the fourth, and sinks under
his burden in the fifth." — The character of Gentlemen are
well imagined by them, and written with a spirit, — freedom,
and elegance, that has not yet been surpassed. — I shall speak
of Cibber's and Sir George Etheridge's excellencies in this
particular, when I come to speak of their merits.

I shall now finish what I call this first, and Golden Age
of the English drama, by the first of all comic, dramatic writers,
Shakespeare. — Jonson searched after character; — Beaumont
and Fletcher, two gentlemen of wit and the world, sat down per-
haps over their bottle, and gave themselves very little trouble
about their plays in partnership; they seized upon some novel,
and did very little more, than divide it into acts, and then
wrote away, with great freedom, spirit, and gallantry most ex-
cellent scenes — but not one correct, and finished comedy. —
Shakespeare appears to be the amanuensis of nature; — she dictates,
and he writes. All the nice, minute distinctions of character
are seen by him, not with the poring eye of Jonson, the careless one of Beaumont and Fletcher, but at one glance! Every being he produces, is a separate being from the rest of the drama; if any of his characters hath but ten lines to speak, they belong to him, and him only: -- if he is got into a romantic fable (as it was too much the fashion of the times to make plays of Italian and Spanish novels) he would, by his great talents, naturalize it as it were, and by the magic of his pen give it probability. In short, tho' he was only learned in the book of Nature, -- he read it with such genius and sagacity, that his works, which in spite of the limited servitude of French criticism, and practice -- and in spite of the ignorant malignity of Voltaire, will, and should always be the Magna Charta of the English stage!
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