



## Lost English plays, 1660-1700

### Citation

Hume, Robert D., and Judith Milhous. 1977. Lost English plays, 1660-1700. Harvard Library Bulletin XXV (1), January 1977: 5-33.

### Permanent link

<https://nrs.harvard.edu/URN-3:HUL.INSTREPOS:37363273>

### Terms of Use

This article was downloaded from Harvard University's DASH repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions applicable to Other Posted Material, as set forth at <http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:dash.current.terms-of-use#LAA>

## Share Your Story

The Harvard community has made this article openly available.  
Please share how this access benefits you. [Submit a story](#).

[Accessibility](#)

# Lost English Plays, 1660-1700

Judith Milbous and Robert D. Hume\*

STUDENTS of Restoration drama do not lack material. We possess more than six hundred plays, drolls, and dramatic entertainments from the period, about four hundred of them known to have been staged in the public theatres in London.<sup>1</sup> A very large majority of the performed plays were printed, and are readily accessible. Consequently, few scholars realize just how many plays from this period do *not* survive — or at least are not known to be extant. The Harbage-Schoenbaum *Annals of English Drama* lists 86 plays in these years as “lost” or unlocatable.<sup>2</sup> Of these plays only 18 are Bartholomew Fair drolls and the like, and no more than four are designedly closet drama. A few were mounted by amateurs, but a large majority are plays which were produced by the professional companies in London. Even discounting ghosts (which are numerous), these plays represent almost one-tenth of the professionally performed plays in the period.

When we say that a play is “lost,” we usually mean that it was not printed and that no manuscript copy is known to survive. Occasionally — as with *The Rival Mother* (“1678”) — we possess reports of an early printing of which no copy can now be located. In addition to the works considered here, there are a number of ghost and probable ghost titles in eighteenth-century playlists.<sup>3</sup> However, we have included

\* For various kinds of information and assistance we particularly want to thank the staffs of the Harvard Theatre Collection and Houghton Library, and those of the Folger, Newberry, Huntington, and William Andrews Clark Libraries.

<sup>1</sup> Of the remainder, some 90 were London civic pageants, Bartholomew Fair drolls, plays staged by amateurs in schools or noble homes, or plays staged professionally only outside of London. Another 120 have no record of performance; the majority were designedly closet drama, political commentary in skit form, and the like.

<sup>2</sup> Alfred Harbage, *Annals of English Drama 1575-1700*, rev. S. Schoenbaum (London: Methuen, 1964).

<sup>3</sup> For an annotated checklist of such play catalogues see Carl J. Stratman, “Dramatic Play Lists: 1591-1963,” *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, LXX (1966), 71-85, 169-188. In tracing the history of titles we have relied principally on the following: Langbaine (1688, 1691), Gildon (1699), Downes (1708), Mears (1713, 1719, 1726), Giles Jacob (1719), Feales (1732), the “Motley” or “Whincop” list attached to *Scanderbeg* (1747), Chetwood (1750), and the 1764, 1782, and 1812 versions of the *Biographia Dramatica*.

only those titles which have made their way into nineteenth- and twentieth-century compilations. We hope to treat those problems on another occasion. The object of this article is (a) to provide a reliable census of the reportedly "lost" plays, dismissing ghosts where possible, and (b) to establish what we do know about each play so that anyone trying to identify a manuscript will have a sound basis from which to work.

To hope to find some of these plays is by no means idle. Frederick S. Boas found and printed Edward Howard's *The Change of Crownes* (1667) in 1949 — a play suppressed by Charles II for its scandalous satire on sale of government jobs. And two of the plays described as "lost" in the *Annals* have come to light since 1973. A considerable number of play manuscripts are preserved (the best list of them is given in an Appendix to the *Annals*), and a brief account of the recent discoveries will show why a systematic approach is required. An untitled, anonymous, undated manuscript was acquired by the Folger Shakespeare Library in 1947. It was studied and catalogued (V.b. 228) without anyone realizing that the piece was *The Country Gentleman*, a notorious political satire which caused a major scandal in 1669 and was extensively commented upon by Pepys and others.<sup>4</sup> All that was required to identify it was a glance at Act III, which contains an "oyster table" scene described in detail by Pepys. But without the sort of census provided here, only a specialist who happened to have exactly the right knowledge would have known what to conclude from that scene. The Shakespeare scholars who originally examined it lacked a very simple key. The case of Elizabeth Polwhele's *The Frolicks* (1671) is even more comic. A manuscript of the play was known to nineteenth-century scholars, but "disappeared." It turns out to have been bought by Benno Loewy, a well-known collector who bequeathed it to Cornell University in 1919. It was sent to Ithaca that year, and was duly catalogued in 1924 (MSS Bd. Rare P P77), and has sat there ever since, "lost" because no interested party knew where it was, and no one in the library realized that it was wanted.<sup>5</sup>

Our procedure in this census will be simple. An entry will be given for each play listed as "lost" in the *Annals*. (We have added five plays

<sup>4</sup> See *The Country Gentleman: A "Lost" Play and Its Background*, ed. Arthur H. Scouten and Robert D. Hume (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1976).

<sup>5</sup> An edition by the present authors is forthcoming shortly from the Cornell University Press.

missed by the *Annals* editors, and one not entered in their chronology.) We will explain, at a minimum, the grounds for believing that such a play ever existed, adding all the details and descriptions we have been able to find. The solidity of the evidence for a play's existence can vary considerably. A title entered in Herbert's records (*Love's Mystery*), the *Stationers' Register* (Edward Howard's *The London Gentleman*), or the Lord Chamberlain's records (*The Recovery*) may be *everything* we know about a play. In other cases, songs may be printed, even when the play itself is not (*The Wavering Nymph*), a play may be commented upon in a magazine (*The Gordian Knot Unty'd*), or we may even possess an observer's description of a play he has seen (Pepys on *The Labyrinth*). Of course, caution must be exercised in assessing such reports. Even the usually reliable Pepys produces some howlers — attributing Flecknoe's wretched *Damoiselles a la Mode* to Dryden, for example, or reporting that he went "to the King's playhouse and there saw, I think, *The Maiden Queene* [Dryden's *Secret Love*]," when in fact he appears to have seen Ben Jonson's *Catiline* (13 January 1669). A great deal remains uncertain about many of these plays, and always will. Nonetheless, as the following survey will suggest, many of the problems still considered open are not as baffling as has heretofore been supposed. Of the 92 plays surveyed here, four are definitely extant, more than half a dozen are demonstrably ghosts, and in more than 20 other cases there is substantial evidence to suggest that we are dealing with a ghost or an alternative title for a known play.

(1) *Love's Mystery* (1660). This play is known only from an entry (subsequently erased) in Herbert's *Dramatic Records* under the date 12 November 1660.<sup>6</sup> *The London Stage* erroneously states that Montague Summers notes the erasure: actually, he simply enters title and date without comment, or even a citation to Herbert.<sup>7</sup> The auspices were (or were to have been) the King's Company acting at the Vere Street theatre. The *Annals* editors sensibly suggest that "Love's Mystery" is either an alternative title for an unidentified older play (*no* new play is definitely known to have been staged by a professional company between May 1660 and December 1661) or an error for Heywood's *Love's Mistress* (1634). The latter explanation may well be

<sup>6</sup> *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*, ed. Joseph Quincy Adams (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1917), p. 116.

<sup>7</sup> *The London Stage 1660-1800*, Part 1: 1660-1700, ed. William Van Lennep, Emmett L. Avery, and Arthur H. Scouten (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1965), p. 20. Montague Summers, *A Bibliography of the Restoration Drama* (1934; rpt. New York: Russell and Russell, 1970), p. 13.

correct, but the crasure in Herbert's records probably indicates that no performance took place at this time. The following 2 March Pepys saw *Love's Mistress* done by the Duke's Company, and described it as "a new play" (i.e., not hitherto performed since the Restoration) for which the house was "as full as could be." Nine days later he saw the King's Company mount the same play — an almost unique juxtaposition in this period. The King's Company eventually wound up with rights to the play, and staged it occasionally through the 1660s. Very possibly a quarrel over performance rights led first to the postponement of a performance scheduled for 12 November 1660 and then to simultaneous productions. At all events, *Love's Mystery* is almost certainly a ghost.

(2) Henry Howard, *The United Kingdoms* (c. 1663-64?). Our only knowledge of this play is from "The Key to the Rehearsal" in volume II of Buckingham's *Miscellaneous Works* (London: Sam. Briscoe, 1705). "Coll. Henry Howard . . . made a Play, call'd the *United Kingdoms*, which began with a Funeral; and had also two Kings in it. . . . It was Acted at the Cock-pit, in *Drury Lane*, soon after the Restoration" (p. 17). Since that theatre was not in regular use by the patent companies after November 1660, Summers infers a King's Company performance in October 1660.<sup>8</sup> However, an anecdote about attempted disruption by a clique led by Buckingham suggests a date of 1663 or 1664. The *Annals* gives its limits as "1660-c. 1664," its auspices as "Duke's (?)" Company, location unspecified. In *The Rehearsal* (IV.i.), Bayes says that "A person of Honour, and a *Scholar*, brought in his Funeral just so." Funerary display is also to be found in Porter's *The Villain*, Act IV (1662) and Elizabeth Polwhele's *The Faithful Virgins*, Act I (c. 1670).

(3) *The Liar* ("1661"). This is simply an anonymous translation of Corneille's *Le menteur* (1643). According to Dryden's *An Essay of Dramatick Poesie* (written in 1665, revised and published in 1668) it had been performed by the King's Company with Charles Hart as Dorant, but without much success.<sup>9</sup> Pepys saw it 28 November 1667 under the title *The Mistaken Beauty*, commenting that it was "an old play," and that it was "also called *The Lier*" — which he thought a more appropriate title. It was revived by the United Company in 1684 and published in 1685 as *The Mistaken Beauty*. The "1661" edition recorded in the 1812 *Biographia Dramatica*<sup>10</sup> may well be a ghost, since no copy can now be found and it does not appear in more contemporary playlists. A 1641 pamphlet called *The Liar* may be the source of confusion. Summers states that "Sir Edmund Gosse had seen and examined a copy of the rare 1661 quarto," but also admits that "the only edition I know is that of 1685."<sup>11</sup> In any case, *The Liar* should not be considered a lost play.

<sup>8</sup> Summers, *ibid.*, p. 77. In *The Playhouse of Pepys* (1935; rpt. New York: Humanities Press, 1964), p. 281, he gives the date as 1663, without explanation.

<sup>9</sup> *Works*, ed. Samuel Holt Monk, et al., XVII (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971), 44-45.

<sup>10</sup> Ed. Stephen Jones, 3 vols. in 4 (London: Longman, et al., 1812), III, 48.

<sup>11</sup> *Playhouse of Pepys* (note 8 above), pp. 362, 450 n.

(4) *Love's Quarrel* (1661). Known only from Pepys's *Diary*, 6 April 1661: "to Salisbury Court [temporary home of the Duke's Company] and there saw *Loves Quarrell* acted the first time." In view of the date and the lack of certain productions of any new plays until the end of 1661, the title is probably an error for or a distortion of the title of an old play. One possibility is Shirley's *The School of Compliments* (1632), otherwise known as *Love Tricks*. This play was a Duke's Company show, and no earlier performance is known.

(5) "Sir W. Bartleys" (Sir William Berkeley?), *Cornelia* (1662). Entered in Herbert's *Dramatic Records* (p. 118) for 1 June 1662 (a Sunday). He calls it "a New Play" acted by the King's Company. Sir Edward Browne saw a play with this title done by that company in 1662 or early 1663.<sup>12</sup> Our only information about it is from a doggerel verse letter, c. June 1662: "For *Cornelia* they all doe say/There was abundance of witt in the play/ Indeed t' had soe much t' was the worse for 't/ For t' was to witty for ye vulgar sort."<sup>13</sup>

(6) George Bayley, *Noah's Flood* (1662). The evidence concerning this piece is a license dated 14 April 1662, from the Revels office, authorizing George Bayley of London, "Musitioner," and eight other "seruants . . . of his Company" "to make shew of the said Play called Noahs flood w<sup>th</sup> other Severall Scenes."<sup>14</sup> The license is directed to Mayors and officers of provincial towns in England, Ireland, and Scotland; is valid for one year; and specifically forbids Sunday performances. The *Annals* calls this piece a "Musical Show," though Leech may be closer to the truth in guessing that it was of the old "mystery type." And though the *Annals* asserts that Bayley performed the piece "in London," the license contains no evidence on the point.

(7) *The New Made Nobleman* (1662). Almost undoubtedly a ghost. *Den nieuwegemaekten Adelman* was seen by two foreign visitors on 22 January 1662, evidently at the Red Bull. Ethel Seaton offers several far-fetched identifications: Rowley's *A Shoemaker a Gentleman*; the Christopher Sly prologue to *The Taming of the Shrew*; and Tourneur's *The Nobleman* (lost).<sup>15</sup> But as William Van Lennep sensibly observes, the play referred to was probably Fletcher and Rowley's *The Noble Gentleman* (1626).<sup>16</sup> That play has a plot conformable to this title, and was the sort of fare offered by Jolly's Company at the Red Bull around this time. Montague Summers observes that it is "highly

<sup>12</sup> *The London Stage*, Part 1 (note 7 above), p. 35.

<sup>13</sup> BM Add. MS. 34,217, f. 31. These verses were published by Leslie Hotson, *The Commonwealth and Restoration Stage* (1928; rpt. New York: Russell and Russell, 1962), pp. 246-247.

<sup>14</sup> Guildhall MS. 2833. For a discussion, see Clifford Leech, "A Restoration Touring Company," *Times Literary Supplement*, 31 May 1934, p. 392. Bayley's show should not be confused with Edward Ecclestone's *Noah's Flood* (pub. 1679), which was inspired by Milton's *Paradise Lost* and Dryden's *The State of Innocence* (c. 1674; pub. 1677).

<sup>15</sup> *Literary Relations of England and Scandinavia in the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1935), pp. 333-335.

<sup>16</sup> *Times Literary Supplement*, 20 June 1936, p. 523.

improbable" that the reference is to a play reduced to a droll, as Seaton suggests.<sup>17</sup>

(8) *The Renegado* (1662). Acted by the King's Company 6 June 1662.<sup>18</sup> The *Annals* lists the title as anonymous, calling it an adaptation or revival of Massinger's *The Renegado* (1624; pub. 1630). Since Herbert does not call it "A New Play" (for which he would have been paid double), we consider a revival the likeliest possibility. In Bodleian MS. Rawl. Poet. 20 there is an MS adaptation of the play in a late seventeenth-century hand. It is not, however, a prompt copy.<sup>19</sup> Although *The London Stage* (Part 1, p. 52) says that "the manuscript [of this adaptation] is in Bod. Rawlinson poet. 20," there is in fact no evidence to show that this performance represents an adaptation, or that the MS adaptation known to us was ever performed anywhere.

(9) John Evelyn, *Thyrsander* (c. 1663). Listed as "lost" in the *Annals* under 1663, but in fact extant in the Library of Christ Church, Oxford, Evelyn MSS.41. See Pepys's *Diary*, ed. Robert Latham and William Matthews (London: Bell, 1970- ), VI, 289 n, where it is called a tragicomedy in verse. See also Geoffrey Keynes, *John Evelyn: A Study in Bibliophily*, rev. ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), p. 21.

(10) *The Exposure* (1663). All that is known of this play is an undated entry in Herbert's *Dramatic Records* (p. 138): "A Pastorall called the Exposure." Herbert's last entry before this one is dated 3 November 1663. Billing of a £2 licensing fee proves that *The Exposure* was a new play, not a revival. The *London Stage* editors state that the auspices are the King's Company at Bridges Street: actually, this particular list of Herbert's is equally divided between King's Company and Duke's Company plays, so the auspices are undeterminable.

(11) *The Secret* (1664). A play with this title (or *The Secrets* in some versions of the poem) is mentioned in "The Session of the Poets" ("1668" version), stanza 35:

Ellis in great discontent went away,  
Whilst D'Av'nant against Apollo did rage,  
Because he declar'd *The Secret* a play  
Fitting for none but a mountebank's stage.<sup>20</sup>

A strong case for composition in late 1664 has recently been made by Gillian Fansler Brown.<sup>21</sup> Since the writer of the poem was extremely well informed

<sup>17</sup> *Playhouse of Pepys* (note 8 above), p. 448 n.

<sup>18</sup> See Herbert, *Dramatic Records* (note 6 above), p. 118. This date may be a falsification, possibly for 6 August. See *The London Stage*, Part 1 (note 7 above), p. 38.

<sup>19</sup> See James G. McManaway, "Philip Massinger and the Restoration Drama," *English Literary History*, I (1934), 276-304, esp. 287-288.

<sup>20</sup> *Poems on Affairs of State*, I, ed. George deF. Lord (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963), 335.

<sup>21</sup> "The Session of the Poets to the Tune of Cook Lawrel': Playhouse Evidence

about playhouse gossip, we may presume that Ellis (identity unknown) and Davenant were in some way connected with a play of this title, probably c. 1663-1664. The only obvious candidate among known plays mounted in this period is James Shirley's *The Court Secret*, seen by Pepys 18 August 1664 (theatre unspecified). His wife thought it "the worst that ever she saw in her life." There are two further pieces of evidence, one of which tends to support this speculative identification, the other to cast doubt on it. A manuscript in the library of Worcester College, Oxford, already revised by Shirley, contains further revisions in two hands, "apparently intended for a Restoration performance."<sup>22</sup> On the other hand, Langbaine implies that the play was mounted by the King's Company — i.e., not by Davenant's troupe.<sup>23</sup> The play had not been performed before the closing of the theatres in 1642: consequently its legal status is vague. (It was never assigned to either company.) Shirley was alive in 1664, but not active in the theatre. If Langbaine is wrong about the auspices, or if the King's Company successfully claimed rights to the play later, then *The Secret* may be a slight revamping of Shirley's play done by Davenant and a helper.

(12) George Digby, Earl of Bristol, *'Tis Better than it Was* (c. 1663-1664). (See #13.)

(13) ————. *Worse and Worse* (1664). Downes includes these two titles with the comment "made out of Spanish, by the Earl of Bristol" in a list of plays staged by the Duke's Company at Lincoln's Inn Fields, 1662-1665.<sup>24</sup> Pepys saw *Worse and Worse* "at the Dukes house" 20 July 1664, observing "just the same manner of play . . . as *The Adventures of Five Hours*." Bristol was a long-time resident of Spain. Judging by the titles, these plays are probably translations of Calderón's *Mejor está que estaba* and *Peor está que estaba* — or so scholars have always assumed.

(14) John Holden, *The German Princess* (1664). Seen by Pepys at Lincoln's Inn Fields, 15 April 1664. The piece told the story of the celebrated adventuress Mary Carleton (who appeared as herself). In 1663 she had caused a sensation by masquerading as a German nobleman's daughter in London.<sup>25</sup> Pepys dismissed the play briefly: "never was anything, so well done in earnest, worse

---

for Composition Date of 1664," *Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Theatre Research*, XIII (May 1974), 19-26.

<sup>22</sup> See R. G. Howarth, "A Manuscript of James Shirley's *Court Secret*," *Review of English Studies*, VII (1931), 302-313, and Gerald Eades Bentley, *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage*, 7 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941-1968), V, 1100-1102.

<sup>23</sup> *An Account of the English Dramatick Poets* (Oxford: L.L. for George West and Henry Clements, 1691), p. 475. "I have seen four [of Shirley's plays] . . . two of which were acted at the King's House; and the other two presented at the Duke's Theatre . . . viz. *Court Secret*, *Chances* [i.e., *Changes*], *Grateful Servant*, *School of Compliments*." The last two were definitely Duke's Company plays.

<sup>24</sup> *Roscius Anglicanus* (London: H. Playford, 1708), p. 26.

<sup>25</sup> See C. F. Main, "The German Princess; or, Mary Carleton in Fact and Fiction," *HARVARD LIBRARY BULLETIN*, X (1956), 166-185.



performed in Jest upon the stage. And indeed, the whole play, abating the drollery of him that acts her husband, is very simple, unless here and there a witty sprinkle or two." This piece has sometimes been confused with T.P.'s *A Witty Combat*, published in 1663. Authorship is ascribed to Holden in the "1668" (1664?) "A Session of the Poets," reprinted in *Poems on Affairs of State*, vol. I, ed. Lord, p. 336.

(15) James Howard, *Romeo and Juliet* (c. 1664). Our only source of information about this happy-ending adaptation of Shakespeare's play is Downes, who reports an early (actually, 1662) Duke's Company production of the original, and continues: "This Tragedy of *Romeo and Juliet*, was made some time after into a Tragi-comedy, by Mr. James Howard, he preserving *Romeo and Juliet* alive; so that when the Tragedy was Reviv'd again 'twas Play'd Alternately, Tragical one Day, and Tragicomical another, for several Days together" (p. 22). There was some vogue for double endings in the mid-sixties. The first post-Restoration performance of Shakespeare's play was seen by Pepys, 1 March 1662; no other performance date is known. James Howard's other plays appeared in 1663 and 1665; both were printed very late (1672 and 1674), evidently without authorial supervision. If Howard's theatrical activity is concentrated in the period before the plague and the closing of the theatres, as seems likely, then the season of 1664-65 is probably a fair estimate of the date of this revival and adaptation. There is no way to determine the extent of the changes. Downes's reference to "Count Paris's Wife" in a celebrated indecent anecdote is taken by Hazelton Spencer as a slip; Montague Summers argues persuasively that the reference indicates an allusion to the Howard version and suggests that he did more than absolutely minimal rewriting.<sup>26</sup>

(16) *Heraclius* [translated from Corneille] (1664). Seen by Pepys 8 March 1664, evidently at the Duke's Theatre, Lincoln's Inn Fields, since the epilogue was spoken by "the little guirle" — i.e., Moll Davis. "The play hath one very good passage well managed in it; about two persons pretending and yet denying themselves to be son to the Tyrant Phocas and yet heire of Mauricius to the Crowne. The guarments like Romans very well. The little guirle is come to act very prettily and spoke the epilogue most admirably. But at the beginning, at the drawing up of the Curtaine, there was the finest Scene of the Emperour and his people about him, standing in their fixed and different postures in their Roman habits, above all that ever I yet saw at any of the Theatres." He saw the play again (definitely at LIF) 4 February 1667. The translator was almost undoubtedly Sir Thomas Clarges. Writing disparagingly of the Waller et al., *Pompey*, 24 January 1664, Katherine Philips says sarcastically, "I understand y<sup>e</sup> confederate-translators are now upon Heraclius, & I am contented y<sup>t</sup> Sr Tho. Clarges (who hath done that last yeare) should adorn [i.e., anticipate and set off] their triumph in it, as I have done in

<sup>26</sup> Hazelton Spencer, *Shakespeare Improved* (1927; rpt. New York: Ungar, 1963), p. 74; Montague Summers, ed., *Roscius Anglicanus* (1929; rpt. New York: Blom, 1968), p. 180.

Pompey." <sup>27</sup> Stanza 38 of "A Session of the Poets" tells us that a writer named Clarges translated one or more plays into English.<sup>28</sup> Their identity is not otherwise known, and his name is not associated with any printed play. In all probability Waller's clique, discouraged by the reception of their *Pompey*, did not proceed with this project.

(17) *Judith and Holofernes* ("1664"). A Bartholomew Fair puppet show with this title is mentioned by John Locke in a letter concerning French Christmas festivities in 1664. Describing a crèche, he says of its "dramatis personae": "had they but given them motion, it had been a perfect puppet play . . . for they were of the same size and make that our English puppets are; and I am confident, that these shepherds and this Joseph are kin to that Judith and Holofernes which I have seen at Bartholomew fair."<sup>29</sup> On 6 August 1663 Pepys went to "a puppet-play in Lincolnes Inn fields; where there was the Story of Holofernes and other clockwork." This is the earliest reference known to us, but of course the show may be much older.

(18) *The Labyrinth* (1664). Our only record of this play is an entry in Pepys's *Diary*, 2 May 1664. "To the King's play-house . . . and there saw *The Labarinth*, the poorest play methinks that ever I saw, there being nothing in it but the odd accidents that fell out by a lady's being bred up in man's apparel and a man in a woman's." Allardyce Nicoll suggests that this may have been Thomas Forde's *Love's Labyrinth*, published in his *Virtus Rediviva* (1660).<sup>30</sup> However, that play does not contain the plot device Pepys describes. Various authorities offer the suggestion that *The Labyrinth* is a translation from Thomas Corneille. His *Ariane* was indeed translated as *The Labyrinth: or, Fatal Embarrassment* (Dublin, 1795). That play, derived from Plutarch's *Life of Theseus*, is obviously not what Pepys saw. Indeed *Ariane* was not written until 1672. The 1664 *Labyrinth* was in all probability a translation/adaptation of Walter Hawkesworth's Latin comedy, *Labyrinthus* (itself an adaptation of G. B. della Porta's *La Cintia*), performed at Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1603 and published in 1636. Hawkesworth's comedy does turn on precisely the kind of sexual disguise Pepys comments on.<sup>31</sup>

(19) "Roger Boyle, *The Widow*" (1665). Known only from a letter of 4 May 1665 by Henry Savile. From his description of the play, Robert D. Hume has argued that what Savile saw was in fact James Howard's *All Mistaken*;

<sup>27</sup> Cited in *The London Stage*, Part 1 (note 7 above), p. 74.

<sup>28</sup> See *Poems on Affairs of State*, I (note 20 above), 336. Lord notes that another version (Burney MS. 390) expands "Clarges" to "Sir Thomas Clarges."

<sup>29</sup> Peter King, *The Life of John Locke, with extracts from his Correspondence*, rev. ed., 2 vols. (London: Colburn & Bentley, 1830), I, 24-27.

<sup>30</sup> *A History of English Drama 1660-1900*, rev. ed., 6 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1952-59), I, 442.

<sup>31</sup> For a convenient account of that play, see Frederick S. Boas, *University Drama in the Tudor Age* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914), pp. 317-321. *The London Stage*, Part 1 (note 7 above), pp. 77-78, mentions Hawkesworth, but errs in considering Corneille a likelier source.

or *The Mad Couple*.<sup>32</sup> Boyle wrote no comedies before 1669; if Savile had the title correct, the play he saw was probably Middleton's, though from the description of scatological indecency this seems very unlikely. Either way, "Boyle's *Widow*" is almost undoubtedly a ghost.

(20) John Holden, *The Ghosts* (1665). On 17 April 1665 Pepys reports: "to a play, *The Ghosts*, at the Duke's house; but a very simple play." Downes (p. 26) includes "The Ghosts, Wrote by Mr. Holden" among a group of plays acted by the Lincoln's Inn Fields troupe between 1662 and 1665. Nothing else is known of the piece.

(21) "Mr. Stroude," *All-Plot, or the Disguises* (c. 1665?). The only record of this play is a comment by Downes (p. 31), who includes "*All-Plot, or the Disguises, by Mr. Stroude*" in a list of plays "which Expir'd the Third Day" between 1662 and 1671. Presumably it was a comedy, staged at Lincoln's Inn Fields by the Duke's Company. The title suggests a work in the popular Spanish romance intrigue mode.

(22) Davenant (adapter), *Tu Quoque* (1667). On 12 September 1667 Pepys reports: "To a play . . . [at] the Duke of York's House, where *Tu quoque* was the first time acted, with some alterations of Sir W Davenant's; but the play is a very silly play methinks; . . . but it will please the citizens." The original was John Cooke's *Greene's Tu Quoque; or, The City Gallant* (1611; pub. 1614). Since Davenant published other adaptations we may guess that his "alterations" were slight — perhaps amounting to no more than a producer's license.

(23) Richard Flecknoe, *The Physician against His Will* (c. 1667). Presumably this is an unacted translation of Molière's *Le Médecin malgré lui* (acted in August 1666). Our only evidence of this play's existence is a prologue for it published in Flecknoe's *Epigrams of All Sorts* (London: Printed for the Author, and Will. Crook, 1670), p. 76: "Prologue Intended for his *Physician against his will, In a Fool's Coat*."

(24) Edward Howard, *The London Gentleman* (1667). This play is known only from a *Stationers' Register* entry, 7 August 1667. Since no record of production can be traced, we can only speculate that the title suggests a comedy. The *Annals* gives the auspices as "King's (?) Company, presumably because they had done Howard's first two plays, but Lincoln's Inn Fields presented his next two, so not even that is certain.

(25) *The Northern Castle* (1667). A ghost. This title is taken from a mis-transcription in Pepys's *Diary*, 14 September 1667. Scholars have long conjectured that it was an error for Brome's *The Northern Lass* — a hypothesis triumphantly and unexpectedly confirmed in the new Latham-Matthews edition of the *Diary* (VIII, 436). The error, happily, was not Pepys's but his editors', and this ghost need trouble us no more.<sup>33</sup>

<sup>32</sup> "Dryden, James Howard, and the Date of *All Mistaken*," *Philological Quarterly*, LI (1972), 422-429.

<sup>33</sup> Mr. Latham, Pepys Librarian at Magdalene College, has very kindly confirmed

(26) *Patient Grizill* ("1667"). Pepys records a puppet play by this name at Bartholomew Fair, 30 August 1667. It was not new at that time: the story comes from Boccaccio, and had already been dramatized in English by John Phillip (c. 1559; pub. c. 1566) and by Chettle, Dekker, and Haughton (1600, pub. 1603). In 1655 the "Ancient Song of Bartholomew Fair" refers to "Patient Grisel" as a puppet play to be seen for a penny.<sup>34</sup>

(27) *The Poetess* (1667). The *Annals* reports a lost play of an unknown type by this title at the Duke's playhouse, 7 October 1667. The correct auspices were the King's Company, according to the Lord Chamberlain's warrants (5/139, p. 129), but nothing further is known about the play. Nicoll calls the title "almost certainly an error," and clearly it could be an alternative or mangled title for an old play. One possibility, hitherto unremarked, is that it could be a topical burlesque of Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle — familiarly known as "Mad Madge" — whose much-publicized visit to London in the spring of 1667 had stood the town on its head.<sup>35</sup>

(28) *Dick Whittington* ("1668"). Pepys saw a puppet show he calls *Whittington* at Southwark Fair, 21 September 1668. By 1731 scripts for a droll with this title were printed for sale at fair booths, though apparently none is extant.<sup>36</sup> Whether the show Pepys saw was new, and whether it had a settled script, there is no way to determine. The story had been dramatized at least as early as 1605, when *The History of Richard Whittington* appears in the *Stationers' Register*. In 1707 *Whittington* was performed as a fancy droll with live actors: Rosenfeld (p. 141) suggests that Elkanah Settle may have been responsible for that version.

(29) *Merry Andrew* ("1668"). Pepys saw a droll he calls "Mary Andrey" at Bartholomew Fair, 29 August 1668, describing it as a "ridiculous, obscene little stage-play." By 1699 Ned Ward was using the term for a generic fool character, probably one of English origin as distinct from *commedia* derivatives like Polchinello. Rosenfeld suggests that Pepys saw a "mountebank's patter with his fool."<sup>37</sup> We agree that there is no reason to regard this as a scripted performance.

(30) Thomas Betterton, *Appius and Virginia* [also described as *The Roman Virgin* and *The Unjust Judge*] (1669). Seen by Pepys, 12 May 1669, who calls it "an old play," but implies that this was a new production. Scholars have assumed that this was an adaptation of Webster's *Appius and Virginia*. G. E. Bentley agrees with the *Annals* in stating flatly that Betterton's play is lost, and

---

this correction, adding that Pepys actually wrote out "The Northerne lasse" in longhand.

<sup>34</sup> See George Speaight, *The History of the English Puppet Theatre* (London: Harrap, 1955), p. 71.

<sup>35</sup> On this visit see Marjorie Hope Nicolson, *Pepys' Diary and the New Science* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1965), Chapter 3.

<sup>36</sup> See Sybil Rosenfeld, *The Theatre of the London Fairs in the 18th Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960), p. 135.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5, 18, 145.

speculates that the 1679 reprint of the 1659 quarto of Webster's play was an attempt "to capitalize on the popularity of Betterton's adaptation."<sup>38</sup> In fact, like "Betterton's" *Henry the Fourth*, this is probably not even an adaptation: there is no reason to suppose that "Betterton's" play is anything other than Webster's, with some acting cuts.<sup>39</sup>

(31) Sir Robert Howard and George Villiers, Second Duke of Buckingham, *The Country Gentleman* (1669). Extant as Folger MS. V.b. 228. (See the introduction above.)

(32) Thomas Shadwell, *The Hypocrite* (1669). This play is known from references in Settle's preface to *Ibrahim the Illustrious Bassa* (pub. 1677), where it is mentioned three times with Shadwell's other translations and adaptations from French sources; from a Lord Chamberlain's warrant at Harvard, dating it 14 June 1669; and from a reference in line 92 of *Mac Flecknoe*. We have no evidence as to why the play remained unpublished, save that Settle implies it failed to last six nights. It is usually assumed to be a translation of *Tartuffe*, partly because Matthew Medbourne, an actor in the Duke's Company, had his version of *Tartuffe* (1670) mounted by the King's Company. However, the *Annals* suggests a possible alternative source in Scarron's *Les Hypocrites*, presumably on the basis of similar titles.

(33) Silas Taylor, *The Serenade, or Disappointment* (1669). Pepys was shown a manuscript by the author on 7 May 1669. Taylor hoped to have the piece acted by the King's Company, though an offer to the Duke's Company had been rebuffed. Nothing else is known of the play.

(34) *The Heiress* (1669). Seen by the King 29 January 1669 (L.C. 5/12, p. 17). On Monday, 1 February, Pepys reports: "to the King's playhouse, thinking to have seen *The Heyresse*, . . . but when we came thither, we find no play there — Kinaston, that did act a part therein in abuse to Sir Charles Sidly, being last night exceedingly dry-beaten with sticks by two or three that assaulted him — so as he is mightily bruised, and forced to keep his bed." On 2 February he adds: "To the King's playhouse, where *The Heyresse*, notwithstanding Kinaston's being beaten, is acted . . . his part is done by Beeston, who is fain to read it out of a book . . . and thereby spoils the part and almost the play, it being one of the best parts in it; and though the design is in the first conception of it pretty good, yet it is but an indifferent play — wrote, they say, by my Lord Newcastle. But it was pleasant to see Beeston come in with others, supposing it to be dark and yet he is forced to read his part by the light of the candles. . . . But that that pleased me most in the play is the first song that Knepp sings (she singing three or four)." A cryptic comment in a letter by Mrs. Evelyn<sup>40</sup> (10 February) tells us that the play is "one of my Lord of Newcastle's, for which printed apologies are scattered in the assembly by Briden's

<sup>38</sup> *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage*, V, 1245–1248.

<sup>39</sup> For a fuller account see Judith Milhous, "Thomas Betterton's Playwriting," *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, LXXVII (1974), 375–392, esp. 383–384.

<sup>40</sup> *The Diary and Correspondence of John Evelyn*, ed. William Bray, 4 vols. (London: Henry Colburn, 1857), IV, 14.

[error for Dryden's?] order, either for himself who had some hand in it, or for the author most; I think both had right to them." Thus we can deduce that the play was probably by William Cavendish, Duke of Newcastle; that it contained a fop role; that it included a "scene in the dark" in which the fop participated; that the personal satire on Sedley consisted in the actor's dress and mannerisms — it was not written into the text of the play; and finally that Dryden may have had some part in arranging or countenancing the personation. Dryden may have helped Newcastle polish the play, as he had with *Sir Martin Mar-all* (1667) and is rumored to have done with *The Humorous Lovers*. The editors of the *Annals* (p. 168) conjecture that *The Heiress* is identical with, or an early form of, Newcastle's *The Triumphant Widow* (acted in 1674; pub. 1677). The principal character in that play is indeed an "heiress," but the identification seems highly unlikely, for two reasons. First, *The Triumphant Widow* lacks the "scene in the dark" Pepys specifies. Second, *The Heiress* was a King's Company play, while *The Triumphant Widow* was mounted by the Duke's Company, and no such transfer of a post-1660 play is known in this period.

(35) Thomas Betterton, *The Woman Made a Justice* (1670). Ascribed to Betterton by Downes (p. 30). It was performed by the Duke's Company 19 February 1670, according to the Lord Chamberlain's lists at Harvard. Gildon states that the actor refused to allow his plays to be published. Montague Summers suggests, plausibly enough, that Montfleury's *La femme juge et partie* (March 1669) was probably the source.<sup>41</sup>

(36) *She's Jealous of Herself* (1670). This title is known only from a Lord Chamberlain's warrant in the list at Harvard for a Duke's Company performance, 20 October 1670.<sup>42</sup> The *Annals* editors conjecture that this is an alternative title for a known play, though the Duke's Company owned rights to relatively few old plays. We do know that they definitely revived "Cupid's Revenge, under the new name of *Love despised*" (Pepys, 17 August 1668). Several plays staged by the Duke's Company in the 1670s could be retitlings of plays assigned to them in August 1668 (see L.C. 5/139, p. 373), especially #41, 42, and 44 below, as well as *She's Jealous*.

(37) Elizabeth Polwhele, *The Frolicks* (1671). Extant as Cornell MSS. Bd. Rare P P77. (See the introduction above.)

(38) A comedy (title unknown) by Joseph Arrowsmith (1671). Seen by Charles II, 4 October 1671 on a visit to Cambridge. A prologue and epilogue for the occasion by Isaac Barrow survive. Allusions in the epilogue suggest that the play contained a foolish esquire, a wedding (abortive?), and a woman named Betty. See Harold Love, "A Lost Comedy by Joseph Arrowsmith," *Notes & Queries*, CCXII (1967), 217-218.

<sup>41</sup> Charles Gildon, *The Life of Mr. Thomas Betterton* (London: Robert Gosling, 1710), p. 11; Montague Summers, "The Comedies of Thomas Betterton," *Notes & Queries*, CLXX (1936), 454-456.

<sup>42</sup> See William Van Lennep, "Plays on the English Stage 1669-1672," *Theatre Notebook*, XVI (1961), 12-20.

(39) *The Dutch Cruelties at Amboyna, With the Humours of the Valiant Welch-Man* (1672). Known from a playbill in P.R.O. SP 29, vol. 317, no. 187: "At the Booth at Charing-Cross, every day in the Week will be presented variety of Farces Drolls, and Comical Entertainments by Mr. *Anthony Devo* . . . this present *Monday* being the Eleventh of *November*, will be presented the Dutch cruelties at *Amboyna* . . . Acted by Men and Women."<sup>43</sup> On 11 November the Lord Chamberlain ordered "That Antonio di Voto Doe sett forth Exercise & Play all Drolls and Interludes, He not receiving into his Company any person belonging to his Ma<sup>tes</sup> or Royal Highnesse Theatres Nor Act any Play usually acted at any of y<sup>e</sup> said Theatres" (L.C. 5/140, p. 129). We may deduce that this droll was at least partly based on Dryden's *Amboyna, or the Cruelties of the Dutch to the English Merchants* (staged by the King's Company c. May 1672), and further that Di Voto, known as a puppeteer, was using live actors or proposing to do so. Performance records for the King's Company are very sparse in the 1672-73 season, after the burning of their theatre in January 1672. Possibly some of the actors were trying to make a little money on the side.

(40) *The Romantic Lady* (1672). This title is known from an L.C. warrant (5/141, p. 2) for a Duke's Company performance, 13 March 1671/2.<sup>44</sup> The play in question is almost certainly Cartwright's *The Lady Errant* (c. 1637; pub. 1651), which had been licensed for production by the Duke's Company by Sir Henry Herbert on 9 March. The lapse between licensing and production was normally only a few days, and since *The Romantic Lady* is a plausible title for Cartwright's show, we are probably safe in assuming that they are one and the same play.

(41) *Witt a la Mode* (1672). This title is known from an L.C. warrant (in the list now at Harvard) for a Duke's Company performance, 28 February 1671/2.<sup>45</sup> As the *Annals* suggests, it is probably an alternative title for an old play. *Wit at Severall Weapons*, recently assigned to the Duke's Company, is an obvious possibility. Use of this title might have been a jab at the luckless King's Company, which had reopened in the cramped old Lincoln's Inn Fields theatre two days earlier with *Wit Without Money* (a tired stock play) following the burning of the Bridges Street theatre, 25 January.

(42) *The Recovery* (1673). This title is known only from a warrant for a performance by the Duke's Company, 27 September 1673. According to Van Lennep, the original is in the lists at Harvard; the one Nicoll transcribed (L.C. 5/141, p. 216 — cf. Nicoll, I, 348) is a copy.<sup>46</sup> Both Nicoll and Summers report the title as "The Rectory."

(43) *Mock Pompey* ("1674"). This piece is mentioned as a rhyming farce

<sup>43</sup> See *Theatre Notebook*, VI (1952), 34-35 and opposite 36.

<sup>44</sup> The *Annals* editors (note 2 above) wrongly give the auspices as King's Company.

<sup>45</sup> The *London Stage* (note 7 above) ascription to "Edmund Waller and others" is an error arising from confusion with another entry on page 193.

<sup>46</sup> "Plays on the English Stage 1669-1672" (note 42 above).

in Dryden, Shadwell, and Crowne's *Notes and Observations on the Empress of Morocco* (London: Bentley and Magnes [?], 1674), p. 23. It may be, as the *Annals* speculates, a fair droll. More probably, the title refers to Act V of Davenant's *The Play-house to be Let* (1663), a travesty of Katherine Philips' translation of Corneille's *Pompée*. Langhaine (p. 405) remarks that he has seen Davenant's piece acted as an afterpiece for *Pompey* at the Duke's theatre. Its jangling couplets fit the dismissive description.

(44) *The Sea Captains* (1674). This title is known only from a warrant (L.C. 5/141, p. 216) for a performance by the Duke's Company, 18 March 1674.

(45) *The Country Knight* (1675). This title is known only from its inclusion in a bill for plays seen by Nell Gwyn acted by the Duke's Company. The date specified is 19 March 1675.<sup>47</sup> As Van Lennep suggests, this is probably just an alternate title for Crowne's *The Countrey Wit*, known to have been acted by the Duke's Company, 10 January 1676 (L.C. 5/142, p. 81). It was published at an unknown date with a title page dated "1675," though it does not appear in the *Term Catalogues* until May 1676. Both *The London Stage* (Part 1, p. 242) and Nicoll (I, 399) err in citing the date of "Ye Countrey Knight" as 1673/4 (rather than 1674/5), and consequently balk at identifying it with Crowne's play. But for three reasons we agree with Van Lennep that the identification is highly probable. First, predating of quartos by a month or two — or even more — is quite common, but postdating is not. Standard lapse between première and publication was about six months at this time: hence we would expect publication in the fall, and a 1675 date on the quarto.<sup>48</sup> The late advertisement we view as a fluke. Second, the setting of Crowne's play is described as "*The Pall Mall* — in the year, 1675." In other such cases where a date is specified, it is the current year. Finally, the principal character in Crowne's play is Sir Mannerly Shallow, described in the *Dramatis Personae* as "a foolish Countrey Knight." Consequently "Ye Countrey Knight" is probably Crowne's play.

(46) *Paradise* ("1675"). Listed in the *Annals* under 1675 (no date specified) as a "Scenic Display (?)" at Hatton House. In his *Diary*, 23 September 1673, John Evelyn comments: "We went to see Paradise, a roome in Hatton Garden furnished with the representations of all sorts of animals, handsomely painted on boards or cloth, and so cut out and made to stand and move, fly, crawl, roare and make their severall cries, as was not unpretty: though in it selfe a meere bauble, whilst the man who shew'd, made us Laugh heartily at his formal poetic." We may guess that this is a revival or alteration of *Paradise Transplanted and Restored in a most Artfull and Lively Representation of The severall Creatures, Plants, Flowers, and other Vegetables in their full growth, shape and colour: Shown at Christopher Whiteheads at the two wretched Posts in Shooc-Lane*. This pamphlet, by "I.H.," was published in London in 1661.

<sup>47</sup> See William Van Lennep, "Nell Gwyn's Playgoing at the King's Expense," *HARVARD LIBRARY BULLETIN*, IV (1950), 405-408.

<sup>48</sup> See Judith Milhous and Robert D. Hume, "Dating Play Premières from Publication Data, 1660-1700," *HARVARD LIBRARY BULLETIN*, XXII (1974), 374-405.



Harvard owns the only copy known to us in this country. Unlike the *London Stage* editors, however, we would not necessarily identify this display with the "dumb show called *Paradise*" presented without a license by Will Cavill in March 1671. That could well be a separate and otherwise unrecorded production.<sup>49</sup>

(47) *The Armenian Queen* (1674?). Known only from a prologue and epilogue for it by Thomas Duffett, printed in his *New Poems, Songs, Prologues and Epilogues* (London: Nicholas Woolfe, 1676), pp. 84-87. This volume was licensed by L'Estrange, 30 September 1675. References to the operatic *Tempest* and preparations for Bartholomew Fair suggest a performance in August 1674. Duffett seems to have worked exclusively for the King's Company, so they presumably mounted this show. Since all but two of the other fourteen prologues and epilogues in this volume are for other men's plays, the chances are against Duffett's being the author of this one. Most of Duffett's prologues and epilogues are for revivals or revampings of old plays, so *The Armenian Queen* may be no more than an alternative title for a known work.

(48) *No Fool Like the Old Fool* (1676). This title is known only from a warrant (L.C. 5/141, p. 359) for a performance by the King's Company, 13 June 1676.

(49) *The Captain, or Town Miss* (1677). Seen by the King at Drury Lane, 2 April 1677 (L.C. 5/141, p. 359). This is probably just Fletcher's *The Captain* (c. 1612; pub. 1647). The added subtitle is a plausible description of Lelia. Fletcher's play had been assigned to the King's Company in 1669. Writing in 1699, Gildon remarked that "This Play has not been Acted of late years,"<sup>50</sup> but this certainly does not preclude revival in the 1670s.

(50) *Midnight's Intrigues* (1677). This title has been conjectured from a reference in the prologue to Chamberlayne's *Wits Led by the Nose* (mid-June 1677), which also alludes to *The Country Innocence* and *The French Conjuror*, plays staged that spring. The *Annals*, *The London Stage*, and Nicoll all suggest that Aphra Behn's *The Feign'd Cartezans or a Night's Intrigue* is meant. That play was certainly performed c. March 1679. This identification seems unlikely, for two reasons. Publication delay of two years would be quite unusual at this time, especially for Mrs. Behn. And the prologue and epilogue published with her play definitely belong to spring 1679, as topical allusions prove. The sneering allusion to "Midnight's Intrigues" in Chamberlayne's prologue could be a sour reference to the bedroom antics in Durfey's *A Fond Husband*, just mounted at Dorset Garden with great success by the rival Duke's Company. No conclusion can be drawn on the present evidence, but the Behn connection seems far-fetched. This title is sometimes associated with *An Evening's Adventures* (alternatively titled *An Evening's Intrigue*), a comedy translated from Spanish by Captain John Stevens and published with three "novels" under the general

<sup>49</sup> See *The London Stage*, Part 1 (note 7 above), p. 182. Cavill's show is known from a warrant for his arrest, L.C. 5/188, p. 111.

<sup>50</sup> Charles Gildon, *The Lives and Characters of the English Dramatick Poets* (London: Leigh and Turner, n.d. [1699]), p. 57.

title *The Spanish Libertines* (London: Samuel Bunchley, 1707). There is no evidence to suggest that this sodden, ultra-moral piece was ever performed, or that it was not newly translated in 1707. The title appears in all the early eighteenth-century playlists, without date. In 1750 Chetwood enters it as "*An Evening's Adventure, or A Night's Intrigue, a Comedy, 1680.*"<sup>51</sup> This is apparently an irrelevant ghost.

(51) *Sir Popular Wisdom; or, The Politician* (1677). Seen by the King, 17 November 1677 (L.C. 5/145, p. 120). In a letter that day, Andrew Marvell comments: "To-day is acted the first time *Sir Popular Wisdom* or *the Politician*, where my Lord Shaftesbury and all his gang are sufficiently personated. I conceive the King will be there."<sup>52</sup>

(52) "Joan Philips," *Pair Royal of Coxcombs* (c. 1678). This title is known only from *Female Poems on several Occasions*, written by Ephelia (London: William Downing for James Courtney, 1679), which contains a "Prologue to the Pair-Royal of Coxcombs, Acted at a Dancing-School," two songs, and an epilogue (pp. 16-21). The prologue explicitly states that "A Woman wrote" the play. The ascription to Joan Philips seems to have been made by the often-unreliable Gosse, who believed that she was the daughter of Katherine Philips.<sup>53</sup> G. Thorn-Drury has pointed out that "Orinda's" only daughter was also named Katherine.<sup>54</sup> Like Thorn-Drury, we do not know what evidence led Gosse to identify "Ephelia" with "Joan Philips," whoever she may have been.

(53) Thomas Shipman, *Henry IV [of France]* (1673-1677). Known only from a reference in Shipman's *Carolina; or, Loyal Poems* (London: Samuel Heyrick and William Crook, 1683), p. 169. "The Plunder. 1677. To the honourable *William Byron*, begging Verses he pleas'd to write upon my *Tragedy of Henry* the fourth." This is not to be confused with Shipman's *Henry the Third of France* (pub. 1678), mentioned on p. 206. That play was probably performed in 1672. In a poem dated 1673 (*Carolina*, p. 140) Shipman speaks of "two of my Tragedies." No others are known by name or subject. Shipman remained a vehement partisan of rhyme in 1678, and attacked Dryden's backsliding in a preface to *Henry the Third*. We may hypothesize, therefore, that *Henry IV* was a rhymed sequel (concerning "Bold Grillon and the generous *Navarre*"), performed by the King's Company if by anyone.

(54) *The Rival Mother* ("8vo 1678"). This title first appears, without date, in the playlist appended to *Scanderbeg*, where the piece is described as "A Comedy."<sup>55</sup> Chetwood (p. 136) adds the date. The 1764 edition of the *Bio-*

<sup>51</sup> William Rufus Chetwood, *The British Theatre* (Dublin: Peter Wilson, 1750), p. 136.

<sup>52</sup> *Historical Manuscripts Commission*, Fourteenth Report, Appendix, Part II (1894), Portland MSS., III, 357.

<sup>53</sup> Edmund W. Gosse, *Seventeenth-Century Studies* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, 1883), pp. 227-228.

<sup>54</sup> *A Little Ark* (London: Dobell, 1921), p. 29.

<sup>55</sup> Thomas Whincop, *Scanderbeg* (London: W. Reeve, 1747), p. 312.

*graphia Dramatica* adds "8vo."<sup>56</sup> No copy of such an edition can now be found. The only known Restoration work with this title is a novel published by R. Baldwin, 8vo 1692. Wherever the title comes from, we suspect that the date should be counted among Chetwood's numerous fabrications. That such a play was published or performed in the Restoration seems very unlikely.

(55) Samuel Butler, *Nero* [fragment] ("before 1680"). This piece is neither lost nor an original composition by Butler. It has been included in playlists for 150 years on the strength of a review in the *British Critic* (September 1793) of Nash's edition of *Hudibras*, which mentions that the editor had access to Butler's unpublished Commonplace Book, said to contain an unfinished tragedy under this title. The Commonplace Book is now in the Rosenbach Collection, Philadelphia. Leaves 60<sup>r</sup>-61<sup>v</sup> of the numbered section are indeed devoted to parts of a "Tragedy of Nero." However, as Norma E. Bentley has pointed out, the passages involved are derived from an anonymous *Nero* published in 1624.<sup>57</sup> The Duke's Company revived that play with alterations as *Piso's Conspiracy* in August 1675 (pub. 1676). Even the selection of passages is probably not Butler's. Professor A. H. de Quichen has very kindly informed us that the "Nero" section is not in Butler's hand, but in that of his literary executor, William Longueville. He has therefore excluded it from his Oxford English Texts edition of Butler's MS prose, forthcoming shortly. For a full discussion of the case the reader should consult the notes to de Quichen's edition.

(56) *Fools Have Fortune, or Luck's All* (c. 1679-80). This title is known only from a manuscript prologue and epilogue for a play so designated, Huntington Library MS EL 8924. From prologue references to Leigh and Nokes, and to "Protestant Intelligences," we may deduce a Duke's Company performance in the time of the Popish Plot. If the new actress referred to is Charlotte Butler, then the première probably occurred in the 1679-80 season. Her first recorded performance is in *The Orphan* in late February 1680.

(57) Aphra Behn, *Like Father Like Son, or The Mistaken Brothers* (1682). Known from the separate publication of prologue and epilogue, reprinted and dated mid-March by G. Thorn-Drury in *A Little Ark*, pp. 43-46: "A Prologue By Mrs. Behn to her New Play, called Like Father, like Son, or the Mistaken Brothers." A mangled form of the epilogue appeared in *Miscellany, Being a Collection of Poems by several Hands* (London: Hindmarsh, 1685), p. 263, under the heading, "Epilogue To the Jealous Lovers. By Mrs. Behn, in 1682." Theatre historians have always supposed, therefore, that this play was an alteration of Thomas Randolph's *The Jealous Lovers* (1632), which is likely enough.

(58) *The Irish Evidence, The Humours of Tieve; or The Mercenary Whore* (1682). This Bartholomew Fair droll was advertised in *The Loyal Protestant and True Domestick Intelligence*, 22, 27, and 29 August 1682 — "an Incomparable Entertainment . . . with a Variety of Dances at Mrs Saffry's, a Dutch woman's booth, over against the Greyhound Inne in West Smithfield." Sybil

<sup>56</sup> David Erskine Baker, *The Companion to the Play-House*, 2 vols. (London: T. Becket, et al., 1764), s.v. title.

<sup>57</sup> "Another Butler Manuscript," *Modern Philology*, XLVI (1948), 132-135.

Rosenfeld speculates that this piece was a "political squib" echoing the Popish Plot.<sup>58</sup>

(59) *The Princes Ball; or The Conquest of Queen Judith* (1682). This piece is known only from an entry in Summers' *Bibliography*, p. 18, in which he states without citing a source that it was "A Droll, Acted at Bartholomew Fair in 'the Booth next to the Grey-hound,' August 1682." Sybil Rosenfeld reports that she has been "unable to trace this piece in any advertisement";<sup>59</sup> we have had no better luck.

(60) *Love and Danger; or, The Mistaken Jealousie* (c. 1693? or c. 1683? or earlier?). Performed at Drury Lane, 6 November 1703, when it was advertised in the *Daily Courant* as "a Revis'd Tragedy," "Not Acted these Twenty Years." The advertisement for the performance of 8 November was amended to: "Acted but once these Ten Years." On the 17th the advertisement read: "Acted but twice these Twenty Years." According to a complaint recorded in the loose papers of L.C. 7/3 the performance 6 November was delayed by a protest to the theatrical authorities: "Upon a false surmise of Mr Congreves at 3 in the afternoon our Reviv'd Play stopt so y<sup>t</sup> the best part of the Audience was lost." What the play was, what Congreve thought it was, and whether we know it under another title, one can only speculate.

(61) *The Wavering Nymph, or Mad Amyntas* (1684 or earlier). This title is known from publication of two lyrics by Aphra Behn in her *Poems Upon Several Occasions* (London: R. and J. Tonson, 1684), pp. 68-69: "Song to Ceres. In the *Wavering Nymph, or Mad Amyntas*," and "Song in the same Play, by the *Wavering Nymph*." These songs were evidently for a revival or adaptation of Thomas Randolph's *Amyntas, or The Impossible Dowry* (1630; pub. 1638). The poems in Behn's collection vary widely in date, so publication in 1684 gives us only a *terminus ad quem*. And there is no evidence either that this title represents an adaptation or that Mrs. Behn was the adapter, though she does seem to have altered another Randolph play in the early 1680s (see #57 above).

(62) *The Indian Empress* (c. 1683-84). Known from two prologues and an epilogue in *Flosculum Poeticum*, by P.K. [Patrick Ker, fl. 1691] (London: Benjamin Billingsley, 1684), pp. 58-61. The first prologue, "To a play entituled, *The Indian Empress. A Tragedy*, acted by some young Ladyes at Green-wich," implies that the author was aged 16 at the time of performance. The epilogue admits that "The substance of the play is still the same" as one which "serv'd it's time . . . at Court" and pleased Charles II.

(63) *The Whore of Babylon, the Devil, and the Pope* (1685). The evidence concerning this piece is an anecdote about Jo Hayns in Aston's supplement to Cibber's *Apology*: "In Bartholomew-Fair, he set up a Droll-Booth, and acted a new Droll, call'd, *The Whore of Babylon, the Devil, and the Pope*. This was in the first Year of King James II. when Joe was sent for, and roundly admonish'd, by Judge Pollixfen for it. Joe reply'd, *That he did it in Respect to his*

<sup>58</sup> *Fairs* (note 36 above), pp. 6-7.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 7.

Holiness; for, whereas many ignorant People believed the Pope to be a Beast, he shew'd him to be a fine, comely old Gentleman, as he was; not with Seven Heads, and Ten Horns, as the Scotch Parsons describe him."<sup>60</sup> If this account may be trusted, the droll was performed in August 1685. Henry Pollexfen (1632?-1691) was indeed active on the bench at that time.

(64) *St. George and the Dragon* ("1686"). (See #65.)

(65) *Vienna Besieged* ("1686"). These drolls are traditionally entered under 1686 from allusions in a song, "The Second Part of Bartholomew Fair," printed in Playford's *Second Book of the Pleasant Musical Companion* (1686 and later editions). "Here's valiant St George and the Dragon, a farce / . . . / Here is Vienna Besieged."<sup>61</sup> Neither is likely to have been new that year. The topic of the siege of Vienna in 1683 suggests a date closer to that event.

(66) *Augustus Caesar* ("1687"). W. C. Hazlitt reports that "a play under this title is mentioned in a list of books printed for R. Bentley in 1687."<sup>62</sup> Halliwell-Phillipps dates this list "about 1691."<sup>63</sup> We have not been able to locate either list, if they are indeed separate. However, *Augustus Caesar* is almost certainly an alternative title for Nat. Lee's *Gloriana, or the Court of Augustus Caesar*, published by Richard Bentley and James Magnes in 1676. Bentley and Magnes advertised "Augustus Caesar" in the 1677 quarto of Durfey's *A Fond Husband* (a reference heretofore overlooked), and we note that a list of books published by "R. Bently and M. Magnes" [Mary, James's widow] in the 1690 quarto of Lee's *The Massacre of Paris* gives the *Gloriana* title in full. For further discussion of the 1687 playlist problem see #68 below.

(67) *The Critics* (1687). The Mayor of Norwich granted Col. Hefford's soldiers permission to act a play with this title at their Christmas entertainment in 1687.<sup>64</sup> Summers speculates (plausibly enough) that *The Rehearsal* is the play in question.<sup>65</sup>

(68) *Woman Rules* ("1687"). The 1812 edition of the *Biographia Dramatica* includes this title with the comment that "we have no other knowledge of this, than that it is advertised among a list of plays printed for Richard Bentley and M. Magnes, Russell Street, Covent Garden, 1687" (III, 418). We have not been able to locate such a list. Under *The Knave in Grain* the *Biographia Dramatica* says that the title appears "in the List of Plays printed for Bentley and Magnes, who published a Collection of Lee's Plays, in one volume 4to, 1687. At the end of which volume their Catalogue is printed." No such catalogue is printed with the two copies of this volume that we have been able to examine (Folger,

<sup>60</sup> Ed. Robert W. Lowe, 2 vols. (1889; rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1966), II, 314-315.

<sup>61</sup> See Spraight, *op. cit.* (note 34 above), p. 78.

<sup>62</sup> W. Carew Hazlitt, *A Manual for the Collector and Amateur of Old English Plays* (1892; rpt. New York: Burt Franklin, 1966), p. 20.

<sup>63</sup> James O. Halliwell[-Phillipps], *A Dictionary of Old English Plays* (London: John Russell Smith, 1860), p. 26.

<sup>64</sup> See Sybil Rosenfeld, *Strolling Players and Drama in the Provinces 1660-1765* (1939; rpt. New York: Octagon, 1970), p. 41.

<sup>65</sup> *Playhouse of Pepys* (note 8 above), p. 124.

William Andrews Clark).<sup>66</sup> We note, however, that in the back of most copies of Lee's *The Massacre of Paris* (London: R. Bentley and M. Magnes, 1690) there is "A Catalogue of Some Plays Printed for R. Bentley and M. Magnes" numbering 106 titles. *The Knave in Grain* is included. So are "Woman Bully" — i.e., *The Woman turn'd Bully*, originally published by T. Dring in 1675 — and "Woman Captain" — i.e., Shadwell's *The Woman-Captain*, originally published by Samuel Carr in 1680. "Woman Rules" is evidently an error for one of these plays. The supposed "1687" list may well be the result of confusion caused by a unique copy of the 1687 Lee *Works* now in the Dartmouth College Library (Special 8a4L51 I), presented to the library by Matt B. Jones, '94.<sup>67</sup> Into the back of that copy have been bound the 1689 quarto of Lee's *The Princess of Cleve* and the 1690 quarto of *The Massacre of Paris*, which of course makes the volume end with the 1690 playlist. (Both play titles appear on the general title page, but they are handwritten additions to the printed list.) The derivation of *Attgustus Caesar* (#66 above) and *Woman Rules* from this list could only be the result of extreme carelessness.

(69) *Love in, and Love out of Fashion* (c. 1689). The only evidence for this play's existence is its inclusion by Downes in a list of nine "other new Plays Acted" soon after *The Squire of Alsatia*.<sup>68</sup> However, three of the others are definitely pre-1682 shows, and as the *Annals* editors speculate, this title could well be a deformation of John Bulteel's *Amorous Orontus, or The Love in Fashion*, acted by the King's Company in 1664, and printed the next year. Bulteel's play was reprinted in 1675 as *The Amorous Gallant: or Love in Fashion*. As an old King's Company show it might indeed have seemed "new" to Downes twenty-five years later. The evidence suggests that we are dealing with an otherwise unrecorded United Company revival of Bulteel's play — itself simply a translation of Thomas Corneille's *L'Amour à la mode*.

(70) "W.C.," *The Rape Reveng'd, or The Spanish Revolution: A Tragedy* (c. 1690). A manuscript was extant late in the nineteenth century: W. C. Hazlitt implies that he has seen it. He reports that it is "A folio MS. of 54 leaves," written "about 1690." "The drama is in five acts, and in blank verse, and is laid in the period of the Gothic domination of Spain" — in Cordova, his headnote states.<sup>69</sup> According to the *Annals*, the present location of the manuscript is unknown. Hazlitt states erroneously that it was sold in "part 2" of the celebrated Joseph Lilly sale (1871-73). Actually, it was item #747 in the First Part, Third Day. According to an annotated copy of the sale catalogue in the Newberry

<sup>66</sup> *The Works of Mr. Nathaniel Lee, in one Volume* (London: Printed for Richard Bentley and S. Magnes, in Russel-Street in Covent-Garden, near the Piazzas. 1687). This nonce-collection, with separate title pages for the various plays, is designated W&M 726a in Fredson Bowers' *Supplement* (1949), p. 9, to Gertrude L. Woodward and James G. McManaway, *A Check List of English Plays 1641-1700* (Chicago: The Newberry Library, 1945).

<sup>67</sup> For information about this volume we are indebted to Walter W. Wright, Chief of Special Collections, Dartmouth College Library.

<sup>68</sup> Downes, *op. cit.* (note 24 above), p. 41.

<sup>69</sup> *Manual* (note 62 above), p. 191.

Library, the buyer was "Arthur," the price 1s. Summers suggests that the play may be an adaptation of Rowley's *All's Lost by Lust*.<sup>70</sup>

(71) *The Gordian Knot Untied* (1690). Acted by the United Company c. November 1690. It is mentioned in the prologue to "Bancroft's *King Edward the Third* and in the *Gentleman's Journal* (January 1691/2 [sic]), where it is called "witty." Purcell wrote music for the play; the author may have been Dryden's friend William Walsh. See *The London Stage*, Part I, p. 390. Apparently the author deliberately refused to publish, and concealed his identity — or so Motteux implies.

(72) *The Rehearsal of Kings* ("1692"). This is a show staged by Fielding in March 1737 (not printed), to which Chetwood added this grossly erroneous date. The title appears in *Scanderbeg*, without date; Chetwood supplies one.<sup>71</sup> There is no evidence whatever for a play with this title in 1692, though Buckingham's *Rehearsal* still held the stage and was indeed reprinted in that year.

(73) *The Siege of Derry* and *Piety and Valour, or Derry Defended* ("1692"). Neither title appears in any playlist before Chetwood, who gives both, dated 1692 (p. 138). Baker's 1764 *Companion to the Play-House* suggests that the two are probably one and the same, intimates that it was definitely published, and says censoriously that it is "an exceedingly bad play, and was never acted," but that it gives a realistic account of the distresses of the garrison and the city's inhabitants. This account is echoed in later editions. No copy of a "1692" edition can now be located, and we suspect that date is merely an approximation for the time of composition. *The Annals* calls both titles "Lost" and speculates that they are alternative names for the same work. However, these titles are almost undoubtedly to be identified with *Ireland Preserv'd: or Siege of London-Derry*, by Col. John Michelburne (1647–1721), first published in 1705 (London: privately printed). The siege occurred in April–July 1689; Michelburne was the military governor of the city. Chetwood may have taken his date from Michelburne's *An Account of Transactions in the North of Ireland* (London, 1692). The successful defense of Derry against the Catholics long remained a popular subject for Protestant propaganda.<sup>72</sup> Michelburne's original work comprised two parts and ten acts, as did the "1708" issue. This probably accounts for Chetwood's two titles. Under the same general title, however, the second part alone was several times reprinted during the eighteenth century, often together with Robert Ashton's *The Battle of Aughrim*. The silent disappearance of the first part probably accounts for Baker's belief that only one play was involved. The only copy of the 1705 edition that we have seen is in the British Library (G.5820). The copy of the "1708" issue in the British Library (186.c.2) is bibliographically problematical: it is partly reset, partly

<sup>70</sup> *Bibliography* (note 7 above), p. 32.

<sup>71</sup> See *The London Stage*, Part 3: 1729–1747, ed. Arthur H. Scouten, 2 vols. (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1961), I, cvii–cviii and March 1737; *Scanderbeg* (note 55 above), p. 312; Chetwood (note 51 above), p. 138.

<sup>72</sup> See Cecil Davis Milligan, *History of the Siege of Londonderry* (Belfast: H.R. Carter, 1951), esp. pp. 178–179, 349, 386.

not, but definitely contains post-1714 elements. Michelburne probably wrote the work as part of his long public campaign to obtain Royal or Parliamentary recompense for the losses suffered by loyalists in the siege. See *The Case of Col. J. Michelburne* (1699?) and *The Case of Col. John Michelburne further considered* (1708?) and related documents in British Library 516.m.17.

(74) *The Earthquake in Jamaica* (1692). A droll or a puppet play on this topical subject was acted 13 September 1692 at Southwark Fair. It was immediately suppressed.<sup>73</sup>

(75) Joseph Williams, *Have at all, or the Midnight Adventures* (1694). Known only from a reference in the *Gentleman's Journal* (May 1694), which implies that it was a new play by the actor Joseph Williams. This makes the *Annals* editors' conjecture that it is the same as *Midnight's Intrigues* (1677 — #50 above) unlikely.

(76) *The Unhappy Marriage* ("1694"). This Bartholomew Fair droll is reported by Thura, a Danish student, 5 September 1694.<sup>74</sup> He probably saw *Bateman or The Unhappy Marriage, with the Humours of Sparrow* (title varies). Author, date, and origin are unknown; Tom Brown calls it a "humble" old story in 1699.<sup>75</sup>

(77) *The Marshall of Luxembourg, upon his Death-bed* ("1695"). This title first appears in the 1782 *Biographia Dramatica*, where it is said to be a tragic-comedy translated from French, published 12mo at "Collen" (Cologne?) in 1635, and reprinted in 1710.<sup>76</sup> The 1812 *Biographia Dramatica* changes the original date to 1695, and adds that the reprint has a frontispiece. No copy can now be located, but since the generally reliable Stephen Jones evidently saw one, the title should not be considered a ghost.

(78) "Thomas Doggett," *Mad Tom of Bedlam; or, The Distress'd Lovers: With the Comical Humours of Squire Numscul* ("c. 1696"). A droll by this title was advertised for the Tottenham Court Fair in August 1730 as being "by the late facetious Mr Doggett."<sup>77</sup> No earlier performances of the droll are known. Apparently the *Annals* editors are conjecturing a late 1690s date because Doggett (d. 1721) was active in Fair theatricals soon after he came to London. But we know of no evidence to connect him with this droll before 1730; so late an attribution must be suspect; and there is no earlier record of this title. Whatever its date and authorship, the droll is lost.

(79) Thomas Durfey, *A Wife for any Man* (1695-1697). Our knowledge of this play comes from separate publication of some of its songs in 1699.<sup>78</sup>

<sup>73</sup> See Narcissus Luttrell, *A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs*, 6 vols. (Oxford: University Press, 1857), II, 565, and John Evelyn, *Diary*, 15 September 1692.

<sup>74</sup> Seaton, *op. cit.* (note 15 above), p. 339.

<sup>75</sup> For various later appearances of the droll, see Rosenfeld, *op. cit.* (note 36 above), esp. pp. 13, 16, 31, 136. She does not, however, mention this date or title.

<sup>76</sup> Isaac Reed, *Biographia Dramatica*, 2 vols. (London: Messrs. Rivingtons, et al., 1782), II, 222.

<sup>77</sup> *The London Stage*, Part 3 (note 71 above), I, 73-74.

<sup>78</sup> See Cyrus L. Day, "A Lost Play by D'Urfey," *Modern Language Notes*, XLIX (1934), 332-334.



Since "Mrs. Cross" is specified as the singer, the auspices must have been Rich's Company. The terminal date is from topical references to King William's campaigns. Day takes the play's omission from a catalogue of Duffey's works said to be published with *3 Don Quixote* (pub. December 1695) as proof that it was a later production. We have not seen this catalogue: it does not appear in the copies of the play which we have examined. But since the catalogue is presumably of published works, the omission is probably meaningless. However, since Miss Cross is not known to have performed before 1695, Day's dating is probably correct anyway.

(80) John Hughes, *Amalasant, Queen of the Goths, or Vice Destroys Itself* (c. 1697-1699). This title first appears in the 1726 Mears playlist, where *Amalazonta* is attributed to J. Hughes, without date.<sup>79</sup> The 1812 *Biographia Dramatica* (II, 23) says that *Amalasant* was written in 1696 when Hughes (1677-1720) was nineteen, and that a manuscript was reported to have been formerly in the possession of the Rev. John Duncombe. This information is evidently drawn from *The Correspondence of John Hughes, Esq.*, 2 vols. (Dublin: Thomas Ewing, 1773). A letter by Hughes to Samuel Say, dated 6 November 1697, says: "*Amalasant* is not yet upon the stage, but I suppose will be this winter" (I, 15). See also *Notes & Queries*, Series 1, X (1854), 266-267 and 413. *Amalasant* was almost certainly produced at Drury Lane c. 1699, although the title does not appear in *The London Stage. The British Museum Catalogue of Printed Music* (II, 365) records undated publication of a song by Daniel Purcell, "In a Grove's forsaken Shade" from this play, "Sung by Mrs. Erwin." She had joined the Drury Lane Company by the 1699-1700 season. Halliwell-Phillipps reports the preservation, in Chetham's Library, of "a song in the tragedy call'd Amalasant . . . set by Mr. D. Purcell, sung by Mrs. Lindsey."<sup>80</sup> This song, "Hence ye Curst infernal Train," is Halliwell-Phillipps broadside no. 1943 in Chetham's Library, Manchester, said to be printed in London c. 1700. Mrs. Lindsey, we may note, had joined the Drury Lane Company late in the 1696-97 season. Hughes had three musical shows professionally staged between 1712 and 1720.

(81) W. Philips, *Alcarnenes and Menalippa* ("1698"). Title and attribution appear for the first time in the Appendix to Mears's 1726 playlist (p. 97). No dates are given for any of the plays in the Appendix. Almost all of them are to be dated after the 1719 edition of Mears, though there are a few exceptions (e.g., Dennis' *Gibraltar*). Chetwood dates the play 1668 without naming an author (p. 134); Halliwell-Phillipps corrects this "to 1698, or thereabouts," presumably on the assumption that the author was William Phillips, whose *The Revengeful Queen* appeared at Drury Lane and was published that year. This is quite possible. However, Feales's playlist does not indicate that *Alcarnenes and Menalippa* was ever publicly performed,<sup>81</sup> and William Phillips lived until

<sup>79</sup> *A Compleat Catalogue of all the Plays That were ever yet Printed in the English Language*, 2nd ed. (London: W. Mears, 1726), Appendix, p. 97.

<sup>80</sup> *Op. cit.* (note 63 above), p. 13.

<sup>81</sup> *A True and Exact Catalogue of all the Plays and other Dramatick Pieces, That were ever yet Printed in the English Tongue* (London: W. Feales, 1732), s.v. title.

1734. We are inclined to suppose, therefore, that this unperformed and unprinted play is to be dated in the early 1720s.

(82) *The Young Coquet* (1698?). When this piece was advertised by Drury Lane for 16 June 1705 (*Daily Courant*) it was billed as "Not Acted these 6 years." It was a two-act play, always performed as part of double and even triple bills. Mrs. Cross, who took the title role in 1705, would have been available at Drury Lane until early in the 1698-99 season, when she eloped to France. She did not return to the London theatre until December 1704.<sup>82</sup> No other actors are known. Source and author remain a mystery.

(83) *Jephthas Rash Vow or the Virgin Sacrifice* ("1697"). A puppet play or droll by this name was acted at Bartholomew Fair in 1697. By the 1703 Fair live actors had taken over the story and were promoting it as a comedy "all new writ," "With the Comical Humours of Nurse and her Sons Toby and Ezekiel. Together with the Pleasant Manner of Didimo, Toby's Man." A script from the 1733 form of the droll is extant, and Rosenfeld describes the play as a "pocket heroic tragedy."<sup>83</sup> That this old story was first dramatized in 1697 is much to be doubted.

(84) *The Siege of Namur* (1695). Rosenfeld reports a droll at May Fair in 1696 under the title "King William's Happy Deliverance and Glorious Triumph over his Enemies or the Consultation of the Pope, Devil, French King and the Grand Turk, with the Whole Form of the Siege of Namur, and the Humours of a Renegade French-Man and Brandy Jean, with the Conceits of Scaramouch and Harlequin." There are also references to this show in 1698. An undated description by Walter Moyle says that "the whole Siege was carry'd on as Sieges generally are, with a great deal more noise than Mischief."<sup>84</sup> The siege in question ended in August 1695, and a topical puppet show must have been concocted almost immediately. The puppet master in Part 3 of Duffey's *Don Quixote* (c. November 1695) offers to perform "a pritty piece, call'd the taking of Namur."<sup>85</sup>

(85) *The Strollers* ("before 1698"). Probably a ghost, created by Montague Summers.<sup>86</sup> In B.M. Egerton MS 2623, f. 63 is a "Prologue to the Stroulers by S<sup>r</sup> C.S. Bar'." With minor variants it appears in the 1698 *Poems on Affairs of State* collection (p. 161). Pinto says that "Sedley probably wrote this Prologue for a strolling company of players."<sup>87</sup> Summers says curtly that the piece "is almost certainly a Prologue to a play of this name, *The Stroulers*, and not written for any itinerant company." The *Annals* editors say "before 1698"

<sup>82</sup> See *The London Stage, Part 2: 1700-1729*, ed. Emmett L. Avery, 2 vols. (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1960), I, 83.

<sup>83</sup> Rosenfeld, *op. cit.* (note 36 above), pp. 9, 15, 17, 135, 139-140.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 9-10, 108.

<sup>85</sup> *The Comical History of Don Quixote: The Third Part* (London: Samuel Briscoe, 1696), p. 30.

<sup>86</sup> *Bibliography* (note 7 above), p. 20; *Playhouse of Pepys* (note 8 above), p. 145 n.

<sup>87</sup> *The Poetical and Dramatic Works of Sir Charles Sedley*, 2 vols., ed. V. de Sola Pinto (London: Constable, 1928), I, 49, 289, 324.

from the *FOAS* publication, and conjecture performance by the Patent Company, probably because Sedley wrote at least one prologue for that group. But "strollers' prologues" are common (there is a "Stroulers Prologue at Cambridge" in the same Egerton MS) and on present evidence hypothecation of an otherwise unknown play seems unsound. Summers' "almost certainly" is a gross exaggeration: nonetheless there remains some possibility that his conjecture is correct.

(86) *The Devil of a Wife* (1699 or earlier). Ned Ward records a "Dwarf Comedy, Sir-nam'd a Droll" by this title at Bartholomew Fair in the *London Spy* for August 1699.<sup>88</sup> It was presumably cannibalized from Jevon's popular farce sometime between 1686 and 1699.

(87) *Fryar Bacon: or, the Country Justice* (1699 or earlier). An undated playbill advertises "a New Droll" by this title at "Parker's and Doggett's Booth."<sup>89</sup> It specifies further: "With the Humours of Tolfree the Miller, and his Son Ralph, Acted by Mr. Doggett. With Variety of Scenes, Machines, Songs and Dances." The *London Spy* for August 1699 gives an extensive account of this droll.

(88) John Crowne, *Justice Busy* (c. 1699-1700). Known principally from Downes: "*Justice Busy*, a Comedy wrote by Mr. Crowne; 'twas well Acted, yet prov'd not a living Play" (p. 45). He adds a comment on a special staging effect: "Mrs. Bracegirdle, by a Potent and Magnetick Charm in performing a Song in't; caus'd the Stones of the Streets to fly in the Men's Faces." Two songs are extant. Both were set by John Eccles and sung by Mrs. Bracegirdle. One ("I'll hurry thee hence") is in the British Library, dated 1700. The other ("No, no, ev'ry Morning my Beauties renew") was printed in *Wit and Mirth: or Pills to Purge Melancholy* (London: William Pearson, 1707). Both dub the play *Justice Buisy, or the Gentleman-Quack*.<sup>90</sup>

(89) *The Morose Reformer* (c. 1700). According to the *British Museum Catalogue of Printed Music* (I, 422-423) a song by John Eccles, "The Pow'r of Wine," was published c. 1700 and is said to be from a play with this title, otherwise unknown. The singers specified are Messrs. Gouge, Courco, and Spalding — which suggests that the auspices were Betterton's Company at Lincoln's Inn Fields, date vague.<sup>91</sup> The auspices are confirmed by publication of another Eccles song for this play, "You Ladyes who are young and gay," sung by Mrs. Hudson (i.e., Hodgson), also published c. 1700. An anonymous play called *Feign'd Friendship; or, The Mad Reformer* was mounted by the Lincoln's Inn

<sup>88</sup> See *The London Stage*, Part 1 (note 7 above), p. 512.

<sup>89</sup> See William Van Lennep, "Some Early English Playbills," *HARVARD LIBRARY BULLETIN*, VIII (1954), 235-241, and *The London Stage*, Part 1 (note 7 above), p. 512.

<sup>90</sup> For a discussion see J. G. McManaway, "Songs and Masques in *The Tempest*," *Theatre Miscellany: Six Pieces connected with the Seventeenth-Century Stage*, Luttrell Society Reprints, No. 14 (Oxford: Blackwell, 1953), esp. p. 74. Professor Curtis A. Price informs us that a third song for this play, "Wine does Wonders every day," was published in John Eccles' *A Collection of Songs* (1704), p. 55.

<sup>91</sup> We owe this reference to Professor Edward A. Langhans.

Fields company c. May 1699, but nothing in that play would justify the description "morose."

(90) *The History of Hengist, the Saxon King of Kent* (1700). This play is known only from an announcement in the *Post Boy*, 30 May-1 June 1700, stating that it will be performed 3 June by Rich's Company. It is probably an adaptation or revival of Middleton and Rowley's *The Mayor of Quinborough* (1618), which is sometimes referred to as *Hengist King of Kent*. That play was acted by the King's Company in the 1660s: no more recent revival is known. However, in the spring of 1700 Rich revived several Renaissance plays which had been out of the repertory twenty years or more.

(91) *The Tempest: or, the Distressed Lovers* ("c. 1700"). An undated playbill in the British Library advertises a new droll at Miller's booth at Bartholomew Fair under this title, adding "with the English Hero and the Island Princess, with The Comical Humours of the Incharnted Scotchman: or Jockey and the Three Witches." Rosenfeld says "the chief scenic effect was 'Neptune with his Tritons in his Chariot drawn with Sea-Horses and Mermaids singing'"; the story "showed 'how a Nobleman of England was cast away from the Indian Shore and in his Travel found the Princess of the Country with whom he fell in love, and after many Dangers and Perils, was married to her: and his faithful Scotchman, who was saved with him, travelling thorow Woods fell in among Witches where between 'em is abundance of Comical Diversion'." <sup>92</sup> The piece appears to be a reworking of material from Thomas Heywood's *The Fair Maid of the West* (Part 1, 1610; Part 2, 1631). From the use of machinery we would guess that the date of this show (as advertised) is likelier to be c. 1703 than c. 1700. Whether a simpler staging was used in previous years one can only guess. An undated bill from 1702 or later ("*Vivat Regina*") advertises what appears to be the same show under the title *The Distressed Virgin or the Unnatural Parents*, "At Doggett's Booth . . . during the Time of Bartholomew Fair" — specifying that it is "a New Droll." <sup>93</sup>

(92) *Women will have their Wills* (c. 1699-1700). This piece was probably performed as an afterpiece at Lincoln's Inn Fields c. 1699-1700. Date and auspices are deduced from a song by Eccles, "Belinda's pretty, pleasing Form," said to be from a play with this title, listed in the *British Museum Catalogue of Printed Music* (I, 423) as published in 1700. The singer is cited as Mr. Gouge, who sang at Lincoln's Inn Fields from about 1698 through 1700. He is known to have appeared at LIF on 5 July 1700, and at York Buildings the previous 8 May. The play may well have been produced in the spring of 1700. Another Eccles song, "Love is a God whose charming Sway," is listed in the *British Museum Catalogue* (I, 424) as published c. 1700, sung by Mr. Knapp "in the Farce call'd *Women will have their Wills*." An afterpiece called *A Woman Will Have Her Will* (anonymous) was played Tuesday, 24 February 1713, advertised as a benefit for the author, and was played again the following 3 June.

<sup>92</sup> Rosenfeld, *op. cit.* (note 36 above), pp. 16 and 142 (citing BM Harl. MS. 5931).

<sup>93</sup> See Henry Morley, *Memoirs of Bartholomew Fair*, rev. ed. (London: Chatto and Windus, 1880), p. 283.

This work was not printed: very possibly the two are the same. A likely source for an afterpiece reduction with this title would be William Haughton's *Englishmen for My Money, or A Woman Will Have Her Will* (1598; pub. 1616), which contains a plot in which Pisaro's three daughters dislike the Frenchman, Italian, and Dutchman he designs them for, and manage to marry men of their own choosing. In *Momus Triumphans* Langbaine lists "Woman will have her Will — C. 4<sup>o</sup>" among plays by unknown authors.<sup>91</sup> Rodes states erroneously (p. xv) that this play is omitted from Langbaine's later *An Account of the English Dramatick Poets*. Actually, it is included in the Appendix to that work, where Langbaine gives "*Englishmen for Money*" as an alternate title, though still without naming an author.<sup>95</sup>

Of the plays surveyed here almost one-third of the total should not in fact be regarded as "Lost English Plays." They are, variously, extant, ghosts, or alternative titles for known plays. Undoubtedly some others will be found, exploded, or properly identified in years to come. We can only hope that those cases which have baffled us will yield to someone else's discoveries or expert knowledge.

The extant play manuscripts from this period have never been studied systematically, and we have no doubt that such study would be repaid with some exciting discoveries and identifications. The discoveries yet to be made are by no means limited to *lost* plays. A manuscript of Shadwell's *The Sullen Lovers* now in the Nottingham University Library (Portland MSS. PW v 34) contains a most interesting scene not in the printed quarto.<sup>96</sup> Another Shadwell manuscript at Nottingham (PW v 33) turns out to be the original, suppressed form of *The Humorists*, and is now being edited by Mr. Richard Perkin of Leeds University. What has happened to the 1663 form of Dryden's *The Wild Gallant*, or to the 1665 version of Buckingham's *The Rehearsal*? The *Annals* editors note a number of manuscripts, reported in nineteenth-century sources, whose present whereabouts are unknown — and there are other cases. For example, Dryden says in the dedication of the 1680 quarto of his notorious *Mr. Limberham* that he has "taken a becoming care, that those things which offended on the Stage, might be either alter'd, or omitted in the Press." Malone, writing in 1800,

<sup>91</sup> Gerard Langbaine, *Momus Triumphans* (1688[1687]), introduction by David Stuart Rodes (Los Angeles: Augustan Reprint Society, 1971), p. 32.

<sup>96</sup> *Women Will Have Their Will, or Give Christmas His Due* (1649) is a political dialogue in the form of closet drama and can be dismissed as a possible source.

<sup>99</sup> See Richard Perkin, "Shadwell's Poet Ninny: Additional Material in a Manuscript of *The Sullen Lovers*," *The Library*, 5th ser., XXVII (1972), 244-251.

comments: "This comedy is, however, I believe, yet extant in its original state; for some years ago I saw a manuscript copy of it, which had been found by Lord Bolingbroke among the sweepings of Pope's study, in which a pen had been drawn through several exceptionable passages, that do not appear in the printed play."<sup>97</sup> It may have been destroyed a century and a half ago — or it may yet await a lucky discoverer. In any event, Restoration play dates, identifications, and manuscripts remain a fruitful and exciting field.<sup>98</sup>

#### ADDENDUM

Since this article was sent to press we have learned from Professor Curtis A. Price (Department of Music, Washington University, St. Louis) of his exciting discovery of eight previously unrecorded play titles in music manuscripts from this period. (His discoveries are described in an article forthcoming in *Music and Letters*.) Several, if not all of them, are probably alternative names for known plays, but until so proved they must be considered possible candidates for discovery or fuller identification. Six of the titles or title fragments belong to the years 1660-1700, and would be designated as follows:

(54A) — *Pleasure* —, extant by 1679.

(71A) *All in Confusion*, extant by 1691. We would hazard the guess that this is Harris' *The Mistakes*, 1690.

(71B) *The City Ramble*, extant by 1691.

(77A) — *Matchles* —, extant by mid-1695.

(92A) *Love's Stratagem*, probably a Drury Lane play, c. 1700.

(92B) *Wives Victory*, c. 1700. The music for this last title might, of course, be for a revival of Shadwell's *The Woman-Captain*, or even Betterton's lost *The Woman Made a Justice*.

<sup>97</sup> *The Critical and Miscellaneous Prose Works of John Dryden*, 4 vols., ed. Edmond Malone (London: Cadell and Davies, 1800), I (Part 1), 118.

<sup>98</sup> We would like to thank Professors Edward A. Langhans and Oscar L. Brownstein for advice and criticism.

## CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

HUGH AMORY, Rare Book Cataloguer in the Harvard College Library, won the Solier Prize in 1952 as a Harvard Senior; his Columbia dissertation was "Law and the Structure of Fielding's Novels," and he edited volume VII of *Sale Catalogues of Libraries of Eminent Persons*.

DEBORAH CLIFFORD, a Radcliffe graduate of 1957, is a contributor to *Vermont History*; at present she is at work on a biography of Julia Ward Howe.

MARCEL FRANÇON, Associate Professor of French Literature, *Emeritus*, at Harvard, is the author of many books and articles and editor of a number of sixteenth-century French texts; his contributions to previous issues of the HARVARD LIBRARY BULLETIN appeared in the October 1973 and January 1975 issues.

ROBERT D. HUME, Associate Professor of English at Cornell University, was a contributor to the April 1973 and October 1974 issues of the HARVARD LIBRARY BULLETIN; in 1976 the University of Pennsylvania Press published *The Country Gentleman*, a "lost" play by Sir Robert Howard and George Villiers, Second Duke of Buckingham, which he edited with Arthur H. Scouten. In 1976 also, the Clarendon Press at Oxford published Professor Hume's *The Development of English Drama in the Late Seventeenth Century*, the first full-scale account of Restoration drama to appear in half a century.

MARY HYDE is the author of *The Impossible Friendship: Boswell and Mrs. Thrale*, which was published by the Harvard University Press in 1972 following its serialization in the HARVARD LIBRARY BULLETIN; her earlier works include *Playwriting for Elizabethans, 1600-1605*, based on her dissertation, which was published by the Columbia University Press in 1949. A collector as well as an author and scholar, she is a member of the Overseers' Committee to Visit the Harvard University Library, and has also been an active friend of the Columbia, Yale, and Pierpont Morgan Libraries.

KATHERINE SINGER KOVÁCS is the author of a Harvard dissertation, "Flaubert's *Le Rêve et la vie: A New Theatrical Conception*" (1974); she has recently returned from South America, where she worked on a Fulbright research grant for study of French influences on the contemporary Argentine novel, and is now lecturing at Stanford and the University of California, Berkeley.

JUDITH MILHOUS, Assistant Professor of Speech and Dramatic Arts at the University of Iowa, wrote "Thomas Betterton at Lincoln's Inn Fields" as her dissertation at Cornell, and was a contributor to the October 1974 issue of the HARVARD LIBRARY BULLETIN.