Rape on the Restoration Stage

Author(s): Derek Hughes

Source: *The Eighteenth Century*, FALL 2005, Vol. 46, No. 3, J. Douglas Canfield (1941-2003) Commemorative Issue (FALL 2005), pp. 225-236

Published by: University of Pennsylvania Press

Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/41467978

Rape on the Restoration Stage

Derek Hughes
University of Aberdeen

In her essay "Rape, Voyeurism, and the Restoration Stage," Jean Marsden quotes a passage from Otway's *The Orphan* (1680), in which a young page describes his reaction to seeing the heroine, Monimia, in bed:

> [I]n a morning when you call me to you,
> As by your bed I stand and tell you stories
> I am asham'd to see your swelling Breasts,
> It makes me blush, they are so very white.[1]

"These lines," Marsden writes,

> draw attention to Monimia's sexual attractiveness, establishing her as erotic object. The emphasis is on the act of looking; the page's words invite us to imagine the bed and the white and swelling breasts. The passage also invites the audience to rediscover this erotic spectacle in the person of the actress who enacts Monimia, whose breasts would be clearly visible. (189)

True: a description of white and swelling breasts certainly invites us to imagine white and swelling breasts—though the speech fairly clearly creates a contrast between the fully clothed Monimia on stage and the nearly naked body that greets the speaker's gaze every morning. But what is the status of the page's gaze? Does it, as Marsden suggests, direct and represent the unanimous gaze of the entire male audience? Is this moment a microcosmic abstract of the Restoration theatrical experience?

Obviously not. The speaker is a sex-crazed child experiencing the first stirrings of puberty. His prurient curiosity and tale-bearing about sex is an important catalyst in bringing about the tragedy, in which one brother surreptitiously takes his twin's place in Monimia's bed, without realizing that the pair are

The Eighteenth Century, vol. 46 no. 3 2005

married and that the act is therefore incestuous. The page's heated imagination certainly reflects the sexual obsessions of the slightly older males, but it is an idiosyncrasy of his personality and age group—one that has tragic consequences. Marsden's reading, however, never entertains the possibility that the page might be critically observed, imperfect, or indeed intensely objectionable. His eyes are those of the Restoration audience. Even though played by a girl, he is the Male Gaze incarnate.

By 1976, when Robert D. Hume decisively transformed the study of Restoration drama with his *The Development of English Drama in the Late Seventeenth Century*, it seemed that the squabble over the morality of Restoration comedy was long over.[2] Hume's concern was not to mount yet another challenge to Macaulay, whose day seemed long done, but to deal with more recent aberrations: the inadequately based generalization, or the thesis-driven search for profundity. Now, however, the battle over morality has emerged in a new form, for a prominent sub-genre of criticism has arisen whose concern is not the meaning of the plays, or their staging, or their cultural reception, but their—alleged—exploitation and gratification of male lust. Restoration drama has, once again, become pornographic. In another milestone in the criticism of Restoration drama, Doug Canfield's *Tricksters & Estates*, there is searching analysis of the sexual dynamics of Restoration comedy, and the ways in which its plots engage with the gentry's need for eugenic self-perpetuation.[3] Few other critics, however, have dealt so subtly with sex in relation to procreation, and with both in relation to specific configurations of class and culture.[4]

For Marsden, for example, not only is the Restoration audience fitly represented by a sex-mad pubescent, it is complicit in rape:

> the rape becomes the physical manifestation of the desire perpetrated by the rapist but implicit in the audience's gaze. Thus the audience, like the rapist, "enjoys" the actress, deriving its pleasure from the physical presence of the female body. (186)

"[T]he proliferation of rape scenes," she urges, "coincides with the appearance of actresses upon the British stage" (185). Similarly, Elizabeth Howe stresses the "titillation" of rape scenes: "the sense of the actress's body being offered to the audience as a piece of erotic entertainment."[5]

Both Howe and Marsden rightly observe that rape is far more common in post- than in pre-Restoration drama. Yet how far is this a direct consequence of the emergence and exploitation of female players? How far does it coincide "with the appearance of actresses upon the British stage"?

Howe asserts that "rapes occur regularly in plays" from Thomas Porter's *The Villain* onwards (43). *The Villain* was first staged in October 1662, and if Howe's claim were true, one might be justified in associating the fashion for rape with the advent of actresses. In fact, however, there is no rape in *The Vil-*

lain. What happens is that the titular villain lays hold of the heroine, whereupon her cries of "help—Murther" bring instant assistance, and the would-be rapist runs away.[6] There are similarly rapid and anaphrodisiac resolutions when usurping tyrants attempt rape in the Earl of Orrery's *The Generall* and Edward Howard's *The Usurper* (both 1664).[7] In the former play, the heroine tells the lustful tyrant that she has taken poison, and he immediately repents; in the latter, the threatened heroine cries "Help, Help! *Dionysius,* A Rape, Treason," whereupon Dionysius (her lover) obligingly enters.[8] With these three examples, we have exhausted the history of rape in the first decade of the Restoration stage: it is hardly something that happens "regularly." It next appears in an offstage attempted rape in the second part of Dryden's *The Conquest of Granada* (1671) and in his *The Assignation* (1672), where a ruler's attempt to rape the woman his son loves produces a serious examination of the subject's right of resistance; as in many later cases of theatrical rape, the principal concern here is not sex, but power.

By rape I mean forcible rape, rather than intercourse achieved by false pretenses (as happens in *The Orphan*), which did not legally count as rape.[9] Such bedroom tricks feature repeatedly both in comedy and tragedy (though, like rape, they are rare during the first decade of the Restoration).[10] In portraying the suspension of socially known identity during the sexual act, they highlight the conflict between the demands of social existence and the primitive egocentricity of the sexual drive, and their consequences may resemble those of rape, as they do in *The Orphan.* The aftermath may also, however, be no more than bored surprise, as in an earlier play by Otway, the comedy *Friendship in Fashion* (1678); and (unlike rapes) bedroom tricks can sometimes be beneficent, in that a man may be duped into sleeping with a partner more appropriate than the intended one. Forcible rape always excites acute distress and a sense of physical and moral pollution. It seems reasonable to treat it as a topic in its own right.

Although the portrayal of rape has been associated with the advent of actresses, the first scene of accomplished rape in Restoration drama is in fact not until 1672, in Dryden's *Amboyna,* where the East Indian heroine Ysabinda is raped by the villainous Dutchman Young Harman. There is, however, no visually titillating exploitation of her ravished state: the "*Scene Drawn discovers* Ysabinda *bound,*" but her English fiancé's response to the sight could scarcely be less arousing:

> What's that which seems to bear a Mortal shape, yet neither stirs nor speaks? or, Is it some Illusion of the Night? some Spectre, such as in these *Asian* parts more frequently appear? What e're it be I'le venture to approach it; My *Ysabinda* Bound and Gagg'd![11]

If rape on the Restoration stage was meant to give titillating prominence to the violated female body, then someone forgot to tell Dryden; one is scarcely like-

ly to mistake a vividly sensualized body for a ghost, however commonly one encounters such things in "*Asian* parts." Indeed, stress on the violated body would interfere with Dryden's main point, which is that the rape victim is as pure after the outrage as before it.

Amboyna is one of a group of three plays from the early to mid-seventies which investigate the problems that rape causes for the innocent victim, though it alone portrays the actual rape. Another play in the group is Henry Neville Payne's domestic tragedy *The Fatal Jealousie* (also 1672). This play portrays a rape victim who is blackmailed by the threat of exposure into repeatedly sleeping with her violator. As she is dying, her husband-to-be discovers the truth and declares her to be pure, but he also dies, and the tale of the victim's unchastity survives her, while the extenuating reasons are forever lost. The emphasis is not on the physical rape, which is not portrayed, but on its consequences for the way in which the woman is represented in the male-dominated sphere of narrative. Elkanah Settle's *Love and Revenge* (1674)[12] portrays the revenge of a rape victim upon the king who violated her; a revenge which gets out of hand—as revenge will—and claims innocent as well as guilty victims. In none of these plays is the rape portrayed in a graphically titillating way. Rather, it is presented as a problem: a problem which in Settle emphasizes the problems of attaining justice in an absolute monarchy, and which in the other plays highlights the tension between the woman's intrinsic character and the social judgments which are passed upon even involuntary unchastity.

Clearly, this cluster of rape plays was not directly provoked by the arrival of actresses some twelve years before. Rather, it was part of a more general phenomenon: the unprecedentedly complex exploration of sexual behaviour which was developing at this very time. The year 1672 saw not only the first accomplished rape in Restoration drama, but the arrival of sex comedy, with Shadwell's *Epsom-Wells*. At the same time, Behn was starting to explore the psychological and structural relationship between socially sanctioned sexual relations and prostitution in *The Amorous Prince* (1671) and *The Dutch Lover* (1673). It was during this period that dramatists also started exploring the problematic bedroom trick; along with forcible rape, for example, it features in Shadwell's *The Libertine* (1675). Yes, there is more rape in Restoration than in Renaissance drama, but it is not an isolated phenomenon with an isolated cause. It is part of an initially enlightened testing of received systems of sexual morality and sexual power, in which the concern may be as much with the woman's subjection to male versions of history, as to male force.

Of the three tragedies mentioned above, only *Amboyna* portrays an actual rape. For the next completed rape in tragedy, we have to wait another six years, until 1678—until Nathaniel Lee's *Mithridates*, whose protagonist rapes his son's betrothed in an attempt to gain her in marriage. Again, there is no explicitly sensual exploitation of the rape. The visual image which follows is

one of guilt and menace—and one that is entirely masculine: "Mithridates incompass'd with the Ghosts of his Sons, who set Daggers to his Breast, and vanish."[13] When the victim, Semandra, re-enters, there is no physical description of her state in either the stage directions or the texts. What is explored is distress and guilt.

During the same period, there was an increasing interest in rape—accomplished or attempted—in comedy, but it was always used to criticize the sexual predator, and to show the darker side of the libertinism that Horner and Dorimant carried off with such insouciant panache. In Shadwell's *The Libertine* (1675), the protagonist and his friends perform rapes; Wilmore and others attempt them in Behn's *The Rover* (1677); and Welford, in Durfey's *Squire Oldsapp* (1678), not recognizing his close friend's virtuous wife, attempts to rape her. Perhaps most interesting is Thomas Frollick, the rake-hero of another Durfey comedy, *Trick for Trick* (1678). His name recalls that of Sir Frederick Frollick, the festive comic hero of Etherege's *The Comical Revenge* (1664); indeed *frollick* is a key and repeated word in the play, and the hero at first appears to be an exuberant and entertaining prankster; but gradually his darker side—and the darker side of the generic figure he represents—becomes apparent. He maliciously accuses the heroine of unchastity, and nearly persuades her father to disinherit her; then he attempts to rape her in front of an audience. The spectators of this rape-play-within-a-play do include lascivious gazers: "'Gads noones, this is sport," cries Thomas's servant; "to her agen Boy—ha, ha, ha," cries his debauched father. Yet these voices are drowned out, not only by the distress of the victim and her friend, but by the cries of two men of sense: the victim's father, a comically formal old man who suddenly gains a moral authority that is all the greater for violating the stereotype to which he has hitherto conformed, and the rapist's former friend, a man of sense who interrupts the proceedings and pronounces a definitive moral judgment on them: "What Barbarity is this?" (act 5, 61–62).

A number of stereotypes are unsettled in this scene. The ridiculous old man gains dignity; the carnivalesque rake-hero turns into a figure of ruthless violence; and his former comrade in arms (initially part of a pairing like that of Courtall and Freeman, Dorimant and Medley, or Bruce and Longvil),[14] suddenly turns into his companion's fiercest moral critic. One thing that is not reassessed in this scene, however, is the theatrical value of rape. It is its agreed repulsiveness that gives the old man his dignity, the friend his outrage, and the witty rake his eventual disrepute. A specular delight in the ruffling of the woman is certainly part of the polyphony of this scene, but it is not a delight which is presented as theatrically normal. On the contrary, the other revisions of stereotype only work because rape has a constant and agreed character.

Thereafter things speed up. There are rapes in Ravenscroft's adaptation of *Titus Andronicus*, performed sometime during the Exclusion Crisis, in Nathaniel Lee's *Lucius Junius Brutus* (1680), and in Rochester's adaptation of

Valentinian, which was belatedly performed in 1684. There are also rape attempts in Behn's *The Young King* (?1679, but written much earlier), in Tate's *The History of King Lear* (1680/81), in his *The Ingratitude of a Common-Wealth* (1681), an adaptation of *Coriolanus,* in Durfey's *The Injured Princess* (1682), which adapts *Cymbeline,* and in *Venice Preserv'd* (1682). Rescue in *Lear* is immediate: the villains "*seize Cordelia and Arante, who Shriek out,*" whereupon Edgar arrives.[15] Rescue is as prompt in *The Injured Princess.*

The fullest treatment of rape in Charles II's reign is in Nathaniel Lee's *Lucius Junius Brutus.* This inevitably features rape, but its pertinence to the political crisis makes it rash to assume that Lee wrote the play *in order* to portray a rape. He did not: he wrote it in order to portray a republican revolution, for which rape was the catalyst.

We may reasonably assume that Lucrece enters in some visibly disordered state, but the text does not specify its details. Nor does Lucrece describe the rape in any detail: the dialogue (like that in *Amboyna*) focuses on her own sense of pollution, as opposed to her husband's confidence in continuing purity. Moreover, the entry of the ravished heroine does nothing to isolate her as an object of sexualized contemplation. Quite the contrary: "Enter Lucrece, Valerius, Lucretius, Mutius, Herminius, Horatius, Titus, Tiberius, Collatinus" (1.1.340b–c). She is, decidedly, a face in a crowd—a crowd of men. What is visually foregrounded is not Lucrece's violated body, but her relationship to an overwhelmingly male power group.

This is not to say that Lucrece's body does not—after death—become an important focus of attention, but it does so because it is appropriated by Brutus and turned into an instrument in his own political schemes. With a command to "Advance the Body nearer" (1.1.433), he draws the dagger from the wound, puts it to his lips, and then passes it around to the rest of the cast (with the exception of his two sons, who are perhaps subsumed in his act of tasting):

> Thus to my lips I put the Hallow'd blade,
> To yours Lucretius, Collatinus yours,
> To yours Herminius, Mutius, and Horatius,
> And yours, Valerius: kiss the Ponnyard round. (1.1.437–40)

One by one, the men with whom Lucrece has entered taste her blood (an incident which foreshadows a later and more clearly repellent incident involving the sacrificial drinking of human blood). And, once the men have consumed her blood, her body becomes the complete possession of Brutus's imagination:

> Oh, methinks I see
> The hovering Spirit of the Ravish'd Matron
> Look down; She bows her Airy head to bless you,
> And Crown th'auspicious Sacrament with smiles.

Thus with her Body high expos'd to view,
March to the *Forum* with this Pomp of Death. (1.1.452–57)

Certainly we witness the theatrical manipulation of a female body for the benefit of men, but (like the observed rape scene in Durfey) it is a piece of theatre within theatre, and one that is critically observed. Brutus recreates the raped Lucrece—"methinks I see / The hovering Spirit of the Ravish'd Matron"—as an icon to further his own political agenda. The Lucrece conjured up by Brutus replaces the real but now lifeless one in a way that is consistent with the play's persistent association of political conflict with clashing rhetorical representations of events that are never directly and objectively seen.[16] Immediately before the men's first entrance with Lucrece's body, for example, Brutus claims to see a dragon; we do not see it, but a skeptical bystander is beaten up until he does (1.1.302–36).

In Act II, the eight men enter "with the body of Lucrece" (2.1.128c) and proceed to propagate an outright lie: that Brutus has been miraculously cured of madness (rather than abandoning its pretense). The lie is reinforced by a further appropriation of Lucrece's form:

Behold she comes, and calls you to revenge her;
Her Spirit hovers in the Air, and cries
To Arms, to Arms; drive, drive the Tarquins out.
Behold this Dagger, taken from her wound,
She bids you fix this Trophee on your Standard,
This Ponnyard which she stab'd into her heart,
And bear her Body in your Battels front. (2.1.211–17)

In due course, the men "Exeunt with the body of Lucrece" (2.1.274). This corpse is thus given a quite extraordinary prominence, both as a rhetorical figment and as a physical presence on stage; the idea of its being carried in front of an army of marching men is astonishing. Her body is exploited, but we are placed at a critical distance from that exploitation, which is the subject of the play, not its purpose.

Rape also provokes revolution in *Valentinian*, and here the sexual dimensions of rape are finally explored, as well as its moral and political dimensions. Rochester removes the religious absolutes that had controlled the Fletcher play: he justifies the deposition of the rapist Emperor, but he also portrays the rape as a conflict not between good and evil, but between Lucina's (the victim's) own sexuality and her sense of the forbidden; for, especially in her dreams, she acknowledges the emperor's sexual magnetism. This, certainly, is a man's-eye view of rape; it is also without parallel in other late seventeenth-century drama.

Nevertheless, it remains clear that there was a sudden increase in the num-

ber of rape plays in the late 1670s. The reason, however, was not the advent of actresses nearly twenty years before; it was the Exclusion Crisis. Rape came to the forefront as a theme during a crisis of political authority which focused attention on the clash between tyranny and private rights. This phenomenon is repeated from 1688 onwards, when the production of new plays started again after a six-year slump caused by the merging of the theatrical companies in 1682. There is an accomplished rape in William Mountfort's *The Injur'd Lovers* (February 1688), Elkanah Settle's *Distress'd Innocence* (1690), Nicholas Brady's *The Rape* (1692), and in Cibber's comedy *Love's Last Shift* (January 1696); it is attempted in John Crowne's comedy *The English Frier* (1690) (where the effect is similar to that in Durfey's *Trick for Trick*), *Edward the Third* (1690), attributed to John Bancroft, George Powell's *Alphonso King of Naples* (1690), and the anonymous adaptation of Fletcher's *Bonduca* (1695). Then, from mid-1696, there is an explosion: there is rape in Mary Pix's *Ibrahim, the Thirteenth Emperour of the Turks* (May 1696), John Crowne's *Caligula* (1698), and Charles Hopkins's *Boadicea* (1697). The heroine of Cibber's *Xerxes* (1699) escapes rape but nevertheless presents a sensual spectacle, entering "Plunder'd, her Hair and Cloaths disorder'd; the Rabble with her Child, she striving to recover it."[17]

In addition, rape is attempted in Thomas Scott's *The Unhappy Kindness* (1696) (a revision of *A Wife for a Month*), William Walker's *Victorious Love* (1698), Durfey's *Massaniello* (1699), and in Nicholas Rowe's *The Ambitious Step-Mother* (1700). Moreover, Charles Gildon's *The Roman Brides Revenge* (1696) portrays an emperor engaged in prolonged sexual pursuit of a subject's wife; although this never reaches even the attempt stage, it does provoke a comparable display of violated femininity, when the emperor's neglected wife enters with her "Hair dishevell'd, and her Bosom all bloody."[18]

Rape upon rape, certainly, but rather late in the day. Why do we get the sudden surge in rape plays from 1696 onwards? After the reintroduction of theatrical competition in 1695, sexual titillation did become a weapon in the at times cutthroat competition between the rival companies, and it is clear from the above examples that rape was not the only means of eliciting sensual display. At the same time, the checkered and uneven history of sex comedy was finally coming to an end; abused virtue in a torn dress perhaps provided an alternative yet more respectable frisson. One might notice another pattern, however. There was a clutch of rape plays from 1688 to 1690; that is, in the prelude and immediate aftermath of the 1688 Revolution. In the next five years, there was only Brady's *The Rape*, a generally anomalous play. Then the rapist returned.

In the rape plays from 1696 onwards, however, there was a new element, in that a noticeable number of them authorized regicide, even when the slaughtered monarch was a legitimate ruler. This was a marked change, for in the immediate aftermath of the Revolution, dramatists were still reluctant to justi-

fy the killing of a lawful monarch. The turning point appears to have been the attempt, early in 1696, to assassinate William III. This, along with greater success in the war against France, boosted the king's previously shaky popularity. Rape was now a justification of extreme political action: a means of focusing attention on the supremacy of private rights over tyrannical power, even when wielded by a legitimate, hereditary monarch.

Two of the three attempted rapes in the first decade of the Restoration had been by usurpers who clearly represented Cromwell. Along with further rapist villains, the Exclusion Crisis brought a change in the politics of rape, introducing royal rapists who were not usurpers but legitimate rulers, and in general constituted insoluble problems (though Rochester's *Valentinian* suspends judgment about regicide). From 1696, however, the problem had disappeared: rapist legitimate rulers could simply be killed. This is not to say that people did not go to the theatre with sex on their minds, or that the competitive ruffling and raping of Anne Bracegirdle and Jane Rogers in the late 1690s did not have an element of sex appeal. It is, however, to say that rape was a serious theme, seriously examined. Had its prime purpose been sexual titillation, there would have been a steady production of rape plays throughout the period. Instead, they clustered at three points, all representing significant crises of authority: the Exclusion Crisis, the Revolution, and the aftermath of the Assassination Plot. In addition, the earliest representations of attempted rape in the Restoration (in *The Villain*, *The Usurper*, and *The Generall*) were bunched together in its immediate aftermath, in the years 1662–64. As noted, two of the three would-be rapists represented Cromwell.

As well as being a means of exploring political problems, rape plays can sensitively explore the vulnerability of women in a world controlled by male drives and male authority, and it is noteworthy that three women writers—Behn, Pix, and Trotter—use it. Puzzlingly, Jean Marsden treats Nicholas Brady's *The Rape* as typical of the Restoration rape play, and devotes some space to this supposedly archetypal example of the genre (191–92). Yet its regressive attitudes are quite exceptional. The rape victim, Eurione, is so irremediably contaminated by her experience that she can only die, and a test used to establish the innocence of a suspect is an offer of marriage to the victim; if he is willing, he must be guilty, for no man would wish to marry a woman defiled by another. Far more sensitive is Charles Hopkins's *Boadicea* (1697). This is the second Boadicea play of the 1690s, the first being the 1695 adaptation of *Bonduca*, the topic being obviously pertinent to a period of war in which British liberty was menaced by foreign tyranny. Here, one of Boadicea's daughters is raped by a male supremacist Roman (French) soldier: "Nature design'd your Sex to be controll'd" (act 3, p. 25), he boasts.[19] Camilla, the victim, does kill herself, but she is clearly submitting to an irrational and oppressive tradition, explicitly rejected by her fiancé. Along with the use of the

female body to express the rights of the oppressed subject of either sex goes an insistence that women are not merely to be categorized by the kind of sexual contact they have with men. In its denial of this, the Brady play is an offensive exception.

There remains one play to be discussed: Charles Sedley's comedy *Bellamira* (1687). One of the heroines, the gentlewoman Isabella, has from childhood repeatedly been the object of kidnap, purchase, and enforced possession. She has wandered from Jamaica to Spain, and to London. She is rescued from her life of slavery by a prostitute, Bellamira (whose motives are, however, mercenary). And, although Isabella achieves the closest approximation to a romantically satisfying marriage in the play, her bridegroom is making amends in marriage for having raped her.

This is, manifestly, a worldly and cynical play. There is no moral horror about rape, but neither is it portrayed with any gloating salacity. As in so many other Restoration plays, rape is used to portray the anomalies of power far more than to exploit the delights of lustful violence. What the play does is reverse the social roles of the prostitute and the gentlewoman. The prostitute emerges as the figure of true social power: power without the contradiction and self-deception with which Behn invested the power of Angellica Bianca in *The Rover.* Whereas the gentlewoman is enslaved and raped, the prostitute is a skilled exploiter of the monetary and sexual interests that are the ruling principles in life. Bellamira is repeatedly described as exercising monarchic power over her keeper, and at the end of the play, she and he agree to support the decayed gentleman Smoothly: the gentleman's place is sustained not by his ancestral estate, but by the benevolence of a successful prostitute. Rape here manifests a realignment in the distribution of social power.

It does so ironically and dispassionately, without the outrage which the tragedies seek to excite, but it also does so without sexual sensationalism, and it did not offend the woman (probably Judith Drake) who, in 1696, offered her judgment on the theatrical writing of her male contemporaries:

> Whose Grief is more awful and commanding than Mr. *Otways?* Whose Descriptions more Beautifull, or Thoughts more Gallant than Mr. *Drydens?* When I see any of their Plays acted, my passions move by their Direction, my Indignation, my Compassion, my Grief are all at their Beck. Nor is our Comedy at all inferiour to our Tragedy; for, not to mention those already nam'd for the other part of the Stage, who are all excellent in this too, Sir *George Etherege* and Sir *Charles Sedley* for neat Raillery and Gallantry are without Rivals, Mr. *Wicherley* for strong Wit, pointed Satyr, sound and useful Observations is beyond Imitation. . . . In short, were it not for the too great frequency of loose Expressions, and wanton Images, I should take our Theaters for the best Schools in the World of Wit, Humanity, and Manners.[20]

By the standards of some recent scholars, this is a list of Public Enemies. This female witness of the Restoration stage, however, finds fault only with their freedom of language. She gives no indication that her visits to the theatre exposed her to the company of a mob of tumescent oglers; rather, she felt herself to be at a school "of Wit, Humanity, and Manners."

The advent of the actress thus did not produce an immediate fashion for the portrayal of rape. The fashion, perhaps, would not have appeared on a stage without actresses, but that is a rather different matter. Even when rape did become established as a dramatic subject, portrayals of rape clustered around crises of authority, and only after the 1696 crisis did it take off as a self-reproducing theatrical attraction, along with other tantalizing displays of the vulnerable female body. Even here, however, the preoccupation with such displays expressed a significant shift in the interpretation of individual rights in the face of absolutist tyranny.

NOTES

1. *The Orphan,* in *The Works of Thomas Otway,* ed. J. C. Ghosh, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1932), 2: 1.1.222–25; Jean I. Marsden, "Rape, Voyeurism, and the Restoration Stage," *Broken Boundaries: Women & Feminism in Restoration Drama,* ed. Katherine M. Quinsey (Lexington, 1996), 185–200.

2. Robert D. Hume, *The Development of English Drama in the Late Seventeenth Century* (Oxford, 1976).

3. J. Douglas Canfield, *Tricksters & Estates: On the Ideology of Restoration Comedy* (Lexington, 1997).

4. The argument that Restoration drama exploits the charms of rape arises from the wider belief that it is devoted to the commodification of the female body. An excellent rebuttal of this belief is provided in Deborah C. Payne, "Reified Object or Emergent Professional? Retheorizing the Restoration Actress," *Cultural Readings of Restoration and Eighteenth-Century English Theater,* ed. J. Douglas Canfield and Deborah C. Payne (Athens and London, 1995), 13–38.

5. Elizabeth Howe, *The First Modern Actresses: Women and Drama, 1660–1700* (Cambridge, 1992), 43, 46.

6. Thomas Porter, *The Villain* (London, 1663), act 4, 60.

7. This is the date of the first London performance of *The Generall.* It was first performed in Dublin in 1662.

8. Edward Howard, *The Usurper* (London, 1668), act 5, 62.

9. See Anita Pacheco, "Consent and Female Honor in *The Luckey Chance,*" *Aphra Behn (1640–1689): Identity, Alterity, Ambiguity,* ed. Mary Ann O'Donnell, Bernard Dhuicq, and Guyonne Leduc (Paris, 2000), 148–49.

10. In the 1660s, there is only one bedroom trick in which the dupe is a woman (in William Killigrew's *Pandora* [1662/3]). In Richard Fleckno's probably unperformed *Erminia* (1661) and in Sir Robert Stapylton's *The Slighted Princess,* a transgressing male is tricked into sleeping with a partner more appropriate than the intended one.

11. *Amboyna,* in *The Works of John Dryden,* ed. Edward Niles Hooker et al., 20 vols. (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1956–2002), 12:4.5.5–9.

12. This play is an adaptation of William Hemings's tragedy, *The Fatal Contract.*

13. *Mithridates,* in *The Works of Nathaniel Lee,* ed. Thomas B. Stroup and Arthur L. Cooke, 2 vols. (New Brunswick, 1954–55), 1:4.1.0a–b. All citations of Lee are to this edition.

14. In Etherege's *She Would If She Could* (1668) and *The Man of Mode* (1676), and in Shadwell's *The Virtuoso* (1676).
15. Nahum Tate, *The History of King Lear* (London, 1681), act 3, 34.
16. See Derek Hughes, *English Drama, 1660–1700* (Oxford, 1996), 293–300.
17. Colley Cibber, *Xerxes* (London, 1699), act 5, 41.
18. Charles Gildon, *The Roman Brides Revenge* (London, 1697), act 5, 44.
19. Charles Hopkins, *Bodicea* (London, 1687), act 3, p. 25.
20. *An Essay in Defence of the Female Sex* (London, 1696), 48–49.