blik, dat hij op ruim twintigjarigen leeftijd den Nederlandschen bodem betrad. De dissertatie van mej. Bouman orienteert ten opzichte van het te onderzoeken materiaal. Voor een afsluitend resultaat is het niet voldoende, dit stijl-onderzoek te beperken tot Zesen en zijn Duitsche tijdgenooten; zelfs de uitbreiding naar de zijde van het Nederlandsch beteekent alleen vermeerdering van materiaal; definitieve gevolgtrekkingen zal slechts hij mogen maken, die de geheele west-europeesche literatuur van dit tijdperk overziet. Nederlandsche en Fransche factoren bovenal hebben dezen literairen cosmopoliet van de zeventiende eeuw gelijkelijk beinvloed; voor f ging een humanistisch-poetische vorming door mannen als Gueintz en Buchner; het resultaat was een eclecticus van zeldzame veelzijdigheid: een kunstgevoelige met een open oog voor het schoone in natuur en kunst, met een fijn gehoor voor de geluiden der schepping en de resonanties daarvan in de klankwaarden der taal.

Amsterdam. J. H. SCHOLTE.

A CHRONOLOGICAL AND CRITICAL REVIEW OF THE APPRECIATION AND CONDEMNATION OF THE COMIC DRAMATISTS OF THE RESTORATION AND ORANGE PERIODS.

III.

Congreve's character is quite different from Wycherley's — he is not so violent; his words are smoother; his satire is not so cutting. But in his plays, too, the moral aim is easily discernible.

First *The Old Bachelor*. It has been observed[1]) that the title has been "awkwardly chosen", as the Heartwell-plot does not preponderate so much that the title becomes justified. Still, it may be that Congreve thought otherwise: he put Heartwell at the head of his dramatis personae; if he did not succeed in what he would have done we must make some allowance for youthful inexperience. However this may be, the Heartwell plot is moral. This man prides himself on his superiority to Woman; but in secret he is the slave of one of them, and very nearly makes an awful ass of himself, being prevented only by his friends' good-nature. That Silvia marries Sir Joseph Wittol was an excellent joke in the eyes of a Restoration audience — such an oaf deserved no better! It is not in the best style, such joking; but then it was only 1693!

Maskwell, in *The Double Dealer*, as we said before, goes off in disgrace. That is a moral in itself. For it is absolutely his own plotting that has brought about his fall. Caught in his own, too intricate, snares. — Sir Sampson Legend, in *Love for Love*, is thwarted in his design; which is no more than he deserved for his inhuman treatment of his son Valentine; and Valentine, who values Angelica's love higher than worldly goods, is promptly rewarded with the girl's good graces. — If, again, Mirabell, in *The Way of the World*, has difficulties in obtaining the hand of Millamant, it is his own fault; just his due for his ambiguous behaviour towards Lady Wishfort. Surely all these facts point

---

1) *Englische Studien*, XXV p. 449.

to a definite moral intention. Congreve put the moral in; he could not compel the audience to digest it. He held up the mirror to society and hoped they would profit by it; no man could do more.

He hoped they would profit by it. He tells us so himself, in the Epistle dedicatory to *The Double Dealer*: "It is the business of a comic poet to paint the vices and follies of humankind", he says; and: "I designed the moral first, and to that moral I invented the fable." It seems a dubious way of proceeding, so far as artistic spontaneity is concerned; but the moral purpose could not have been more clearly put. What that moral was, we may read in the last lines of the play:

> "Howe 'er in private mischiefs are conceived,
> Torture and shame attend their open birth;
> Like vipers in the womb, base treachery lies,
> Still gnawing that whence first it did arise;
> No sooner born, but the vile parent dies."

Before Congreve took his leave of the stage, a play had been produced by Cibber, in 1696, which heralded a new era in the history of English comedy. We mean *Love's Last Shift.* [1]).

Wycherley and Congreve had seen their fellow-men, to borrow Meredith's phrase, 'no better than they should be' — and they tried to laugh them out of their vices; but they knew better than to represent Vernish or Maskwell as repentant sinners. They showed their audience that vice brings along its own punishment; but there they stopped. They saw no repentant Vernishes and Maskwells in real life — and they were not going to improve upon reality.

Not so Cibber. The contents of the main plot of his first play are very briefly as follows: Loveless leaves his virtuous wife Amanda and for eight years leads a very dissolute life; then he returns to London, quite poor and thinking his wife dead; she hears of his arrival and resolves to win him back by passing herself off on him as a woman of loose morals; he never recognizes her as her face is so altered by the smallpox; the next morning she resolves to make herself known to him. And then the following scene ensues [2]):

Amanda: .... Conscience! did you ne'er feel the checks of it? Did it never, never tell you of your broken Vows?

Loveless: That you shou'd ask me this, confounds my Reason .... your words .... strike my Thoughts with Horror and Remorse .... I have wrong'd you .... Oh! thou hast rouz'd me from my deep Lethargy of Vice! For hitherto my Soul has been enslav'd to loose Desires, to vain deluding Follies, and Shadows of substantial Bliss .... etc. In a word, Loveless's conversion is complete; and it is brought about by an appeal to *sentiment.*

How Cibber hit on the idea of introducing this element in comedy, I cannot say. We know that he was a very wide-awake young man, always on the alert to catch the faintest indication of a change in the likes and dislikes of the audience: "I first consider'd who my Guests were, before I prepared my Entertainment", he tells us in the Dedication. He must, then, some

1) cf. Bernbaum, *The Drama of Sensibility*, ch. I and IV.
2) Edition 1721 vol. I p. 62, 63, 64.

way or other, have had a notion that this was the way to win his audience who desired purer plays: it was 1696! — Another explanation is offered by Osborn Waterhouse[1]): "Cibber and Steele, persistently pursuing their moral purpose but lacking in comic power and incapable of sustained comic effort, not infrequently forsake the legitimate method of comedy, and, instead of appealing to our sense of humour by covering vice and folly with ridicule, call to their aid the tragic emotions of pity and fear." However this may be, *Love's Last Shift* is the first sentimental comedy; that is, it appeals for its effect to the sentiments of the hearers rather than to their sense of ridicule.

It may be well to point out here that the word sentimental is not in this case used in its unfavourable meaning. We must "scrupulously avoid reading into the term those modern opprobrious interpretations which, when the term was first applied to that species of drama, were never invented." [2]) The following definition we found in Leslie Stephen, *History of English Thought* II 437: "It sometimes implies the tendency to substitute a rose-coloured ideal for a faithful portraiture of life".

Cibber tried his innovation first in the fifth act only; tentatively as it were; *Love's Last Shift* shows many traits of traditional Restoration comedy; in his Epilogue he expressly points out to the Beaux in the audience that Loveless is "lewd for above four Acts, Gentlemen!" Still, a new note had been sounded, and the audience approved.

When *Love's Last Shift* was first acted, there was in London a man, Cibber's senior by seven years, who was so struck by the improbability of Loveless's fifth-act conversion that he put pen to paper and threw off in six weeks' time a quasi-continuation of this play, showing in a very anti-sentimental way how much store was to be set by such repentance. '*The Relapse*' is the ominous title of this first comedy of Vanbrugh's. He, too, professed moral intentions in writing; in his "*Short Vindication of the Relapse and the Provok'd Wife from Immorality and Profaneness*" [3]) he says emphatically: "What I have done is in general a Discouragement to Vice and Folly; I am sure I intended it, and I hope I have performed it." The words 'in general', says Mr. Ward, require a little emphasis; but Van was not afraid of some exaggeration: when he affirms that he could very well fancy a virtuous woman laying his plays by the side of her Bible, even his great admirer Leigh Hunt is forced to admit that "it is difficult to believe that there was not something of the noble captain's impudence in this". [4]) Vanbrugh is, indeed, a strangely complex character. By the side of something "so unspeakable as the character of Coupler" [5]) we find a saying so strikingly tender as: "'tis pity any thing that's bad, shou'd come from women." [6]) —

[1]) *Anglia*, 1907 p. 159; and cf. Ward, *Eng. Dram. Lit.* III p. 493, where about tne same is said of Steele.

[2]) *Anglia*, 1907, p. 140.

[3]) The quotations are from the *Introduction* of W. C. Ward's edition of Vanbrugh's plays, p. XL and XLI.

[4]) Leigh Hunt, *Introduction* p. LIV.

[5]) Archer's edition of Farquhar's plays. Mermaid Series, *Introduction* p. 18.

[6]) *Journey to London*, II, 1.

In his *Vindication* Vanbrugh defends his comedies still further. Of *The Provok'd Wife* he says that it is surely "a good End, which puts the Governor in mind, let his soldiers be ever so good, 'tis possible he may provoke 'em to a Mutiny" — and in *The Relapse* he wanted to give "a natural Instance of the Frailty of Mankind, without that necessary Guard of keeping out of Temptation". (XLI).

In *Love's Last Shift*, then, and *The Relapse*, we have the New and the Old at war. Sentimental comedy against Restoration comedy. That the old Restoration view of mankind was served by a man of greater genius, could not save it. It lingered on for some time — Cibber himself never outgrew it — but it was doomed. For the influence of the New Sentimental way of writing was so great that even its first and greatest opponent, Vanbrugh, could not keep it out of his plays — not even out of the first: witness the ending of the by-plot Amanda — Worthy, and the latter's sudden converison, which is not a whit more credible than Loveless's repentance in *Love's Last Shift.* [1]) —

Cibber's next comedy, *Woman's Wit* (1697) was not accessible to us; so we must pass it by. Then there follow two which might have been left unwritten without detriment to his fame as a dramatist: *Love Makes a Man* (1700) — based on Fletcher — and: *She Wou'd and She Wou'd Not* (1703) — from a Spanish source. In the first we again notice the sentimental element; the sinner reclaimed in the 5th act is here a lady: Louisa is in love with Carlos; when she becomes aware that his affection is centred on Angelica she is going to have that innocent girl murdered before his eyes; but his eloquence disarms her anger; her conversion is brought about with remarkable swiftness and all ends sentimentally well. — *She Wou'd and She Wou'd Not* is a real Spanish comedy in its intricate plot; it is so full of movement that there is no place left for sentimentality.

In 1704 Cibber brought out his great success: *The Careless Husband.* Never again did he rise to such heights as here. Lady Easy is, as Osborn Waterhouse observes, "quite different from the heartless coquettes which are found in the Restoration comedies" (Anglia 1907 p. 165). Sir Charles Easy is a fine picture of a man, not bad at heart, but thoughtless and impulsive. — This play is, again, in many respects a Restoration comedy — perhaps its last bright flicker. — Lord Foppington is good, and, for a wonder, quite different from his namesake in *The Relapse*; Lady Betty is admirable; she might give the play a sub-title, the same as Meredith proposed for *The Way of the World*: "the Conquest of a Town Coquette." — Lord Morelove is colourless.

In the main plot the sentimental element is very strong. It culminates in the scene where Lady Easy, the long-suffering wife, finds her 'woman' and Sir Charles asleep in easy-chairs; he with his wig off. It is a terrible

---

1) It has been observed (by C. M. Scheurer, *Anglia* Bd. 37) that a sentimental comedy was written early in the seventeenth century (*The Town-Shifts*, by Edward Revet); but we need not wonder at that, for, says Mr. Scheurer, "all the conventional features of sentimental comedy had been for generations the common property of English playwrights"; nor has this anything to do with the 1696 movement.

blow to her; but she resolves not to complain, certain as she is that her husband will return to her one day; and afraid he will catch cold by sitting bare-headed so long, she even covers his head with a piece of Steinkirk she wore. No wonder he feels penitent when he wakes up; "how mean a vice is lying!" how simple and true sound his words; here is a conversion we can fully believe in; but sentimental it is all the same.

Still more so is *The Lady's Last Stake, or, The Wife's Resentment* (1708). In a way this is a companion-piece to *The Careless Husband*; for it shows what will happen when a wife is foolishly jealous: her husband will go from bad to worse. In the end husband and wife agree upon a separation; but now their mutual friend, Sir Friendly Moral steps in and a tearful reconciliation is brought about which we are glad we need not explain psychologically. — The subplot, of the gambling Lady Gentle and Lord George Brilliant borders dangerously upon tragedy — but it all ends very well and is very sentimental.

We shall pass by *The Nonjuror* (1711) and *The Refusal* (1721) in silence; the first is a kind of political comedy; the second was partly inspired by John Law's machinations. Both are adapted from Molière and cannot enlarge Cibber's fame.

And then, towards the end of his career as a playwright, Cibber meets Vanbrugh again: he finished *The Journey to London*, which Van had left incomplete (1728). Again we have an opportunity to point out the difference between the two tendencies in comedy. Cibber tells us in his *Advertisement to the Reader* [1]): "All I could gather from (Vanbrugh) of what he intended in The Catastrophe, was, that the conduct of his imaginary fine lady had so provok'd him, that he design'd actually to have made her husband turn her out of doors. But when his performance came, after his decease, to my hands, I thought such violent measures, however just they might be in real life, were too severe for comedy." It could not have been more clearly expressed in what the Old and the New School differed. Vanbrugh, the moralist, wanted to punish the unworthy wife; Cibber, the sentimentalist, was all for tearful repentance and forgiveness.

Of Vanbrugh it is not necessary to say much more. His first and last plays have already been mentioned. — '*The Confederacy*' is a translation; only a minute comparison with the French play could bring out in how far Vanbrugh has retained his originality. — There is only one other comedy of Vanbrugh's that requires some comment: *The Provoked Wife*. If space allowed, we should like to make long quotations from this admirable play. The characters are so well-drawn; Lady Brute and her husband especially, and Belinda; of Mademoiselle we do not think so highly. How fluent is the dialogue, and how pointed the moral! There *were* John Brutes in the audience, and here they could see what their fate might become if they did not mend their ways. It is remarkable that here, too, Vanbrugh must pay his tribute to sentimentalism: Constant nearly swoons when suddenly met by Lady Brute

1) Reprinted in the *Mermaid Edition* of Vanbrugh's plays, p. 441, 442.

(III, 1); he opines that "to be capable of loving one, doubtless, is better than to possess a thousand." In the face of these facts we see how truly it has been observed that "if not exactly playing a 'Vermittlerrolle' the germ of a reaction is in (Vanbrugh's) plays." [1]) He felt — unwittingly, no doubt — the growing influence of sentimentalism; he could not keep it out of his plays; still he was, to the end, decidedly opposed to it.

The next author — and the last — we shall meet here, is poor, wavering George Farquhar. His first play — *Love and a Bottle* (1698) — is a mean and contemptible production; we have not a word to say in its defence. Its indecency is shocking; it is as if the different characters take all the pains they can to be as vulgar as possible. We notice here the same regrettable flippancy as caused Farquhar to be expelled from college. In fact, we consider *Love and a Bottle* as little better than pornography and can only shrug our shoulders at Leanthe's good opinion of Roebuck (III, 2): "Wild as winds, and unconfined as air! — Yet I may reclaim him. His follies are weakly founded, upon the principles of honour, where the very foundation helps to undermine the structure. How charming would virtue look in him, whose behaviour can add a grace to the unseemliness of vice!" This sounds untrue and artificial — in such a play; still, it is an appeal to the innate goodness of human nature; that is, it is sentimental; we may be of opinion that Farquhar only put it in because that sort of thing was in vogue then, but that would only show the more the growing influence of the new ideas.

Farquhar's next play, *The Constant Couple, or, a Trip to the Jubilee* (1700), shows great progress in power and tone; Sir Harry Wildair we think diverting and original; he is of the breed of Lord Foppington, but by no means a colourless imitation. Sentimentality is not found in this play; Lady Lurewell and Colonel Standard are united at the close, but they are anything but sentimental characters.

In 1705 Farquhar produced *The Twin Rivals*; here he returns to sentimentalism. Constance — the name is an omen — weeps when she finds her lover's picture; and then there is the conversion of Richmore — as sudden as it is incredible. Farquhar himself did not believe in it, "for", he flippantly says in his Preface, "he was no sooner off the stage but he changed his mind." Farquhar did not put his heart into the business; he allowed Richmore to be converted because he knew the audience would expect as much.

From *The Recruiting Officer* (1706), again, the sentimental element is absent; the play is too much based on things seen in real life to leave much room for exalted feeling. And in his last production, *The Beaux' Stratagem* (1707), poor George, who never seems to know his own mind, becomes again sentimental, though not much, in the love-affair between Mrs. Sullen and Archer.

Our final impression is that only in one play — *The Twin Rivals* — Farquhar deliberately employed the new expedient in comedy on a larger scale; but he did not really feel for it, and in his other plays he used it only sparingly.

---

[1]) *Englische Studien*, Bd XXV, p. 449.

He has been called "perhaps a beginning of the sentimental comedy" (Cambr. Hist. VIII 172). *A* beginning he was; but *the* beginning was Cibber. —

We have come to the end of our task ;much more might be said of Restoration comedy — we might examine its plot-construction, its display of wit, the lyrics it contains, etc. — but into these details we cannot now enter. Before concluding, we will sum up the results which our discussions have yielded.

During the first few years after the Restoration the court-circles — a convenient appellation for that part of the nation which had suffered most from puritanical oppression — lived chiefly for pleasure. People wanted to make up for lost time, as it were.

From these circles issued a writer who with great genius, but with absolute unconcern about good or bad, produced three plays, in which he reproduced men and manners as he had seen them in that part of society which was familiar to him. — We mean Sir George Etherege; his comedies we consider as a faithful reflection of these un-moral times.

After this time of moral indifference the inevitable reaction followed; and a man came forward who with veritable moral fury lashed the vices he observed round him. This was William Wycherley, who was two decades later followed by William Congreve, not so violent a character as his predecessor, but as indignant at moral perversion as he. The third man who deserves mention here, as he worked on the same lines, is John Vanbrugh.

Now it must never be forgotten — as has only too often been done — that the moral sense of these men was quite different from ours, nay, even from that of their contemporaries outside these 'court-circles'. They satirized what was wrong in *their* eyes — if they did not assail beef-eating, or beer-drinking, or conjugal infidelity, it is because they did not consider these things to be morally wrong. — But hypocrisy — lechery — backbiting — ill-treatment of wives and daughters — these are the vices of the day which are attacked with unceasing vigour by the Comic Dramatists of the Restoration, these they recognized as vices and persistently endeavoured to lash into improvement.

We have tried to show that this moral desire to improve society is found in all their plays — for Vanbrugh with the proviso: in so far as they are original — also, that the moral element is always an inherent part of the intrigue; it has not, so to say, strayed into it by accident.

But — "'tis hard indeed, when people won 't distinguish between what is meant for contempt, and what for example" (*Careless Husband* V 3); after a time it appeared that ridiculing, and even satirizing social evils was not sufficient to exterminate them; and the comic writers began to feel the need of another expedient to accomplish their moral aim: then they introduced a sentimental element into their comedies. Whence they took this idea we cannot say; we only know that Cibber was the first to try the innovation; then Steele applied it on a larger scale. — Congreve has not one sentimental line in all his plays; Vanbrugh — though not immune from it — remained opposed to it to the last; and Farquhar vacillates between 'comedy proper' and 'sentimental comedy.'

To indecency all these plays must plead guilty; even from sentimental Cibber we might quotë startling instances. But, much as we regret this, we cannot think it strange. If such a fairy play as *Midsummer Night's Dream* had sprung up in Restoration society, there would, indeed, have been cause of wonder; as things are now, they seem perfectly natural. In dissolute times we cannot expect Sunday-school productions for the stage; we must be thankful that the leading playwrights showed real and great indignation at what they considered to be the moral corruption of the age, together with a serious design to reform it so far as lay in their power.

Amsterdam. W. HELDT.

OE. *PILLSÁPE* 'SOAP FOR REMOVING HAIR'.

In 1894 Clark Hall had booked, but not explained, the gloss on *silotrum* recorded WW. 127[86] as *pillsápe.* This was taken up 1897 by Sweet who ventured on the guess that the word designated a plant. Hence his entry on page 136a of his *Students Dictionary* to that effect. The 3d part of the Bosworth-Toller published in 1898 registers the word the way Hall had done with that difference that it designates the Latin lemma as doubtful and refers to Wright *Voc.* I, 27, 32 rather than to the more modern edition of this work cited by Hall. In 1911 I solved the riddle by showing that silotrum probably stands for psilotrum = Greek ψίλωθρον and consequently *pillsápe* must mean 'soap for removing hair'. On the strength of my showing (in *Englische Studien* XLIII, 334) Hall in 1916 assigned this meaning to *pillsápe* exhibited on page 234b of the revised edition of his *Concise Dictionary.* As by the query affixed to the meaning he indicates there is some doubt attached to it, I shall remind him first of the *p* being silent before *s* in the gloss azelia. i. silotrum (C. G. L. III 597, 5) which Goetz in his *Thesaurus Glossarum Emendatarum* on page 154a books thus: <P> silothrum azelia (ἀζαλέα?). This gloss, at first blush, would seem to give some countenance to Sweet's guess that by Silotrum *pillsape* a plant must be meant, since *azalea* in English is a plant name. However as ἀζαλέα, if that be the correct reading, is identified with Grecolatin *psilothrum,* it is plain that some preparation similar to that which is designated by psilothrum must be alluded to by the lemma, and that conclusion is confirmed by the fact that the whole bunch of glosses collected under the title *Hermeneumata* on page 177 recto—178 recto of Cod. Vat. Reginae Christinae 1260 are either terms of diseases like the first one, antrix (= ἄνθραξ). .i. rubor insuperficiem cutis etc., or of preparations for the care of the sick body like *apocima* (= ἀπόζεμα) *aqua cum surculis uel radicibus cocta,* a gloss preceding the one we are dealing with, or expressions of a similar nature, like *acoras, icar,* following it, which Goetz reads achoras. ἰχώρ, referring to Cassii Felicis ed. Rose ind. p. 199 s. v. ἀχώρ. Now the meaning of *psilothrum* is quite established as a face wash for removing hair by such passages as Martial 3, 74, *psilothro faciem levas at dropace calvam.* Greek ψίλωθρον signifies according to Liddell-Scott any 'means for bringing hair off', used especially in the bath: it was made chiefly of heated arsenic and unslaked lime, like the