

CONGREVE'S LOVE FOR LOVE:
VALENTINE'S VOICES

A THESIS
SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN ENGLISH
IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE
TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF
ARTS AND SCIENCES

BY
BARBARA TEER, B. A.

DENTON, TEXAS

AUGUST, 1966

Texas Woman's University

Denton, Texas

August 16, 19 66

We hereby recommend that the thesis prepared under

our supervision by Barbara Teer

entitled CONGREVE'S LOVE FOR LOVE:

VALENTINE'S VOICES

be accepted as fulfilling this part of the requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts.

Committee:

Anthony Hesse Wiley

Chairman

Eleanor James

Lucile M. Wolson

Accepted:

Hallam Wolsey

Dean of Graduate Studies

AUG 1 1966

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
<u>Love for Love</u> in Congreve's Career	1
The Age of Congreve	2
Congreve's Theory of Comedy	3
Defects of Congreve's Works	4
Congreve's Genius	4
Criticisms of <u>Love for Love</u>	5
In the eighteenth century	5
In the nineteenth century	5
By Charles Lamb	6
By William Hazlitt	6
By William Makepeace Thackeray	7
By Edmund Gosse	7
By a reviewer of Gosse	8
In the early twentieth century	8
By William Archer	8
By Henry Seidel Canby	8
By Bonamy Dobrée	9
By Allardyce Nicoll	10
By Alexander C. Ewald	10
In the later twentieth century	10

Chapter	Page
Performances of <u>Love for Love</u>	11
Initial performances	11
Eighteenth-century performances	12
Nineteenth-century performances	13
In England	13
In America	13
Twentieth-century performances	13
1917-1945	13
1943-1944 and 1947 by John Gielgud and Company	15
II. VALENTINE'S FOUR VOICES	17
Introduction	17
Valentine as a Product of His Age	18
Valentine as a Young Man Enjoying Life	19
The Confidants of Valentine	19
Jeremy	20
Scandal	20
Modifications of Valentine's Voice	21
Valentine's Voice for Jeremy	21
His public voice	21
His private voice	21
Valentine's Voice Used for Scandal	22
Comments to Scandal	23
Valentine's Father	25

Chapter	Page
Valentine's Voice for Sir Sampson	25
The son to his father	26
The father to his son	27
Responsibilities of a father	28
Angelica, the Sweetheart of Valentine	29
Valentine's voice for Angelica	30
Valentine's comments to Angelica	31
Valentine's reaction to Tattle	31
Valentine's defense of Angelica	32
Conclusion	32
III. VALENTINE, THE MADMAN	33
Valentine's Realization of His Plight	33
His plan to pretend madness	34
His use of madness	34
The Difficulty of the Role of a Madman	35
The Legal Aspect of the Madman Role	35
The Theatrical History of Madness	35
Congreve's Actual Knowledge of Madness	36
Congreve's Use of Madness	37
Madness as an Acceptable Part of the Plot	38

Chapter

Page

Valentine's Speeches as a Madman	39
Congreve's disillusionment with his age . .	39
Valentine's audience for his speeches . . .	39
Sir Sampson	39
Buckram	40
Sir Sampson	41
Foresight	42
Mrs. Frail	46
Valentine's attempt to foil her plan .	46
The marriage in disguise	47
Tattle	48
Angelica	49
The Elements in the Mad Speeches	50
Questions	51
Interjections and exclamations	52
Adjectives	53
Figures of speech	54
Prepositional phrases	54
Dependent clauses	56
The Sentence Structure of the Mad Speeches . .	57
Simple sentences	57
Complex structures	58

Chapter	Page
Parallel Structure of the Mad Speeches	59
Valentine's Sane Speeches	60
To Sir Sampson	60
To Jeremy and Scandal	61
To Angelica	61
Failure	62
Bitterness	63
To Jeremy	64
The Style of the Sane Speeches	66
The prepositional phrase in the sane speeches	66
The dependent clause in the sane speeches .	67
The Differences Between the Two Types of Speeches	68
The Failure of the Pretense of Madness	68
IV. VALENTINE, THE LOVER	69
Valentine's Role as a Lover	69
The Forces Affecting Valentine	69
The Cause of Valentine's Disillusionment . . .	71
The Effect of Change on the Other Characters .	71
Valentine's Reaction to the Proposed Marriage	72
Valentine's Willingness to Admit His Mistake	73
The Dislike of Valentine for His Father . . .	74

Chapter	Page
Angelica's Announcement of Her Coming Marriage	75
The Destruction of Valentine's Last Hope . . .	76
Valentine's Attitude Toward His Inheritance .	76
The Change in Valentine's Attitude Caused by Angelica's Declaration of Love	78
Valentine's Happiness at His Good Fortune and His Father's Misfortune	79
Tattle's Punishment for Coming Between True Lovers	79
The Depth of Love Declared by Angelica and Valentine	80
The Rarity of a True Lover	81
The Quality of Valentine's Character	81
V. CONCLUSION	82
Summary: Valentine's Voices	82
Other Voices	82
The Voices of the Women	83
Mrs. Foresight's voice	83
Mrs. Frail's voice	84
Miss Prue's voice	85
Angelica's voice	86

Chapter	Page
The voices of the young men other than Valentine	88
Scandal's voice	88
Tattle's voice	89
Ben's voice	90
The voices of the old men	90
Sir Sampson's voice	90
Foresight's voice	90
The voice of Jeremy	91
Work for Future Study	92
PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCES OF <u>LOVE</u> <u>FOR</u> <u>LOVE</u> IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY	93
BIBLIOGRAPHY	95

PREFACE

When I began my study of William Congreve and the play Love for Love, I knew little of Congreve and his genius; I only knew that I enjoyed reading and studying his works. As my study of the voices of Valentine developed, I began to recognize Congreve's ability to use language for dramatic purposes, an ability to create for a character dialogue suited to only that particular character.

I pursued my interest in Love for Love, choosing to examine the dialogue which Congreve assigns to Valentine and to see the changes that occur in Valentine's language when the audience for these speeches changes. These speeches I divided into those which Valentine makes when he is sane and those which he makes when he is feigning madness. I then considered the subject, the structure, the purpose, and the tone to see the way in which a change in one or more of these items would cause a change in Valentine's speech.

I am grateful to Dr. Eleanor James, who read my thesis and in whose sophomore English course I began to learn a critical approach to drama. I wish to extend my appreciation to Mrs. Bing Wolson, who read my thesis, and to Dr. Gladys Maddocks, in whose course in the NDEA English Institute at the Texas Woman's University in 1965 I studied voice and

audience. And I am especially grateful to Dr. Autrey Nell Wiley, who has directed my thesis and guided my graduate work. Her courses in English tragedy and in criticism helped me to determine the general area, drama, in which I wished to work. It was she who suggested my topic of study; without her aid and encouragement this study of Valentine's voices would not have been possible.


Barbara Teer

Waco, Texas
August 9, 1966

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Love for Love, the third of the four comedies that Congreve wrote, is considered the best stage production of his short dramatic career. Appearing for the first time on April 30, 1695,¹ it was an instant success, a fact not unpleasant to the playwright whose last play, The Double Dealer, had been received coolly. Congreve was young, only twenty-five, worldly-wise and financially insecure. Only after the production of Love for Love did he receive a share in the company of the new theatre at Lincoln's Inn Fields, and his first government post was some months in his future. He had the education and family background that polite society demanded, and the London of his day accepted him readily and soon regarded him as a leading wit. Congreve's recognition in the role of a playwright came through John Dryden, his friend, mentor, and defender, who spoke out in his defense when The Double Dealer met the displeasure of the critics:

¹D. Crane Taylor, William Congreve (Oxford, 1931; reissue, New York: Russell and Russell, 1963), p. 62.

Great Jonson did by strength of judgment please;
 Yet doubling Fletcher's force, he wants his ease.
 In differing talents both adorned their age;
 One for study, t'other for the stage.
 But both to Congreve justly shall submit,
 One matched in judgment, both o'er matched in wit.¹

With Dryden's help and understanding, Congreve soon took his place as an acknowledged leader in the world of the Restoration theatre.²

Congreve was a product of an age of transition, an age when the people of the aristocracy, so recently freed from the restricting bonds of extreme Puritanism, had taken for themselves complete mental and moral freedom.³ However, by the last decade of the century, the period in which Congreve's plays appeared, the rule of the completely pleasure-loving Stuarts had passed, and William and Mary were the rulers; a slight change, the forerunner of the Age of Reason, had begun to be felt. The theatre of the time was of and for the aristocracy; the techniques and the plays that were used were different from those of the past; the "anti-heroic" comedy of manners, which presented larger-than-life-sized characters whose ideas were much like those shared by the

¹ John Dryden, "To My Dear Friend Mr. Congreve on his Comedy called 'The Double Dealer,'" The Double Dealer, The Comedies of William Congreve, ed. Norman Marshall (London: John Lehmann, 1948), p. 120.

² John C. Hodges, William Congreve the Man: A Biography from New Sources (New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1941), pp. 12-108.

³ Alexander Ewald, ed., William Congreve, Introduction (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1903), p. viii.

members of the audience, grew to a peak of perfection that can be observed in Congreve's works.¹

During his short dramatic career that covered only a period of about ten years, Congreve developed a theory of comedy as it related to drama. In his Essay Upon Humour in Comedy, he stated that wit was the essential element of any comic writing, that a woman appeared ridiculous and laughable only through acquired folly or affectation, and that humour is "a singular and unavoidable manner of doing or saying anything, peculiar and natural to one man only, by which his speech and actions are distinguished from those of other men."² Satire was often present in his pointed wit that created laughter among the audiences of his plays, and in the prologue to Love for Love he rebuked other poets and playwrights for omitting or softening satire in their works; he stated,

They hold their pens, as swords are held by fools,
And are afraid to use their own edge-tools.
Since The Plain Dealer's scenes of manly rage,
Not one has dared to lash this crying age.³

¹Norman N. Holland, The First Modern Comedies: The Significance of Etherege, Wycherley and Congreve (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959), p. 9.

²William Congreve, Essay Upon Humour in Comedy (1695), as quoted in Edmund Gosse, Life of William Congreve, rev. ed. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924), p. 69.

³William Congreve, The Comedies of William Congreve, ed. with introduction by Norman Marshall (London: John Lehmann, 1948), p. 210.

His description of the task of a comic writer appeared in the dedication of The Double Dealer, wherein he remarked, "It is the business of a comic poet to paint the vices and follies of humankind."¹ His concrete illustration of his theory is highly regarded today. Modern critics believe that "as a painter of contemporary life and manners, studied from the vantage point of fashion, he has no equal."²

The chief objections to Congreve's works are that the plays show people of the highest class of society who have very few morals or scruples; that they present a cynical outlook on the world, that the language Congreve's characters use is immoral and bawdy, and that in his plots the unities are not observed.³ All of these criticisms are deserved, and each successive critic from Jeremy Collier onward has duly pointed them out. However, an evaluation of Congreve should not begin and end with these remarks. In order to understand the playwright and his plays, one must look beyond the mere surface and into the depths.

Congreve's genius, the ability to write sparkling dialogue,⁴ is of first importance among the elements in his plays, for the dialogue is the vehicle that conveys his brilliant,

¹ Ibid., p. 115.

² Ewald, p. ix.

³ Henry Ten Eyck Perry, The Comic Spirit in Restoration Drama, rev. ed. (New York: Russell and Russell, 1962), pp. 66-79.

⁴ Ibid., p. 135.

flashing wit. His characters, a second element, are not just stock figures; they often seem to come to life and assume distinct and vivid personalities. Beneath the glitter of their sophistication, there is a depth of emotion, a core of feeling, in addition to common sense that can only be reached by directness. Congreve soared beyond the requirements of his genre when he not only presented the urbane, gay, sophisticated world around him with its passionate interludes, but also "created what is not to be confined within the limits of a single character or expressed in any one play--a world where each part depends upon the other, the serene, impersonal, and indestructible world of art."¹

When critics consider his plays individually, they deem The Way of the World and Love for Love Congreve's best. Love for Love, although considered inferior to The Way of the World, is recognized for its unexcelled theatrical excellence. Samuel Johnson considered it "a comedy of nearer alliance to life, and exhibiting more real manners,"² than either The Old Bachelor or The Double Dealer. He observed how Congreve's characters enjoyed verbal fencing with each other and said Congreve's ability as a playwright would meet the test of time. "While comedy or while tragedy is regarded, his plays are likely to be read" ³ After Johnson's friendly

¹Taylor, p. 9.

²"Congreve," Lives of the English Poets, (London: Oxford University Press, 1926), II, 26.

³Ibid., p. 35.

criticism in the eighteenth century comes that of Charles Lamb, a nineteenth-century critic who enjoyed Congreve's wit. Lamb was especially concerned with the plays of Congreve and their lack of popularity during his lifetime. This lack of popularity he attributed to the habit of the audience which demanded that the audience view the characters and situations within the play as true to life, the life of the time in which the play was being presented. This habit could be corrected, Lamb insisted, by a reminder that the play was written for a far different era than the one in which the audience was then living. An audience that was mature in understanding would realize that the character did not exist in any real world, but rather in a "Utopia of gallantry, where pleasure is duty, and the manners perfect freedom."¹ In the critical works of another nineteenth-century critic, William Hazlitt, a student can find yet another opinion of Congreve. Hazlitt declares that Congreve "had by far the most wit and elegance, His style is inimitable, nay perfect. It is the highest model of comic dialogue. Every sentence is replete with sense and satire, conveyed in the most polished and pointed terms."² Love for Love, according to this critic, is a good example of the ability with which

¹"On the Artificial Comedy of the Last Century," The Essays of Elia (London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1947), p. 167.

²"Lecture IV: On Wycherley, Congreve, Vanbrugh, and Farquhar," Lectures on the English Comic Writers with Miscellaneous Essays (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1910), p. 71.

Congreve created living drama, "a wonderfully rich and powerful piece of comic acting The gay unconcerned opening of this play, and the romantic generosity of the conclusion . . . are alike admirable."¹ These words are indeed praise from a nineteenth-century critic. Another, but somewhat later nineteenth-century writer, William Makepeace Thackeray, is not so kind to Congreve as other writers have been. He states:

We have had in Congreve a humorous observer of another school to whom the world seems to have no moral at all, and whose ghastly doctrine seems to be that we should eat, drink, and be merry when we can, and go to the deuce (if there be a deuce) when the time comes.²

Judging by Thackeray's tone in his discussion of Congreve, a student of Congreve's works concludes that if Thackeray spoke for his age, then Congreve was not a popular playwright. Thackeray believes that the audience will object to the actual dialogue, especially that exhibited in Love for Love in the Valentine-Foresight scene.³ A still later nineteenth-century critic, Sir Edmund Gosse, writing of Love for Love as a masterpiece, a theatrical success, mentions the crudity of allusion and indecency of language but praises not

¹ Ibid., pp. 71-72.

² "Lecture the Second: Congreve and Addison," The English Humorists of the Eighteenth Century (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1853), p. 76.

³ Ibid., pp. 50-71.

only its characters for their vitality but also its interesting plot and its vivid style. He says its major flaw is its length. As for its moral influence, he says the play is not immoral because it does not picture evil as being completely interesting and because it does close with virtue rewarded with good fortune.¹ To the contrary, a reviewer of Gosse's biography of Congreve says Congreve's plays which are remarkable for their excellence in literary style, which are dull to look at but entertaining to read, exhibit such a "deliberate and immitigable baseness of morality as makes them impossible to man."²

Early twentieth-century academic critics have been thorough in their criticism whenever Love for Love has appeared in their studies. In two articles published in the Forum in 1910 (March-April), William Archer, reviewing Congreve's plays, said Love for Love showed the language of its era; it was a fulfillment of the problems presented by its genre; it showed no social code; and its conversation, especially between Valentine and Scandal in Act I, was full of coarse brutality.³ Henry Seidel Canby, in an article published in 1916 in PMLA, discussed the romanticism in Congreve's writings, a discussion applicable to Love for Love. He used as a basis for his study the idea

¹Life of William Congreve, rev. ed. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924), pp. 57-65.

²Athenaeum, II (Nov. 17, 1888), 672.

³Pp. 276-282, 343-346.

that the reason for Congreve's continued popularity in the field of drama lies in an understanding of the demands upon drama in the age in which he wrote. Congreve, according to Canby, did not present life realistically because ". . . he did not see it realistically. He presented life not as it was, but rather the fashionable world's, and his own, conception of the life they were leading."¹ This failure to see and depict life as it really was caused Congreve to idealize ideas such as libertinism. From this romantic point of view Congreve studied his world:

. . . it was this romanticizing of the libertinism of Stuart life which makes the finest of Congreve's plays to seem a Utopia of gallantry wherein man sins without serious injury to the moral sense of the reader. His best characters . . . act . . . in a world idealized by romance, the world in which a libertine society wished to believe.²

In 1924, Bonamy Dobrée, a leading scholar in the field of Restoration drama, included in his specific criticisms of Love for Love a mention of the carelessness of construction and of the strong poisonous satire that he found in the Tattle-Miss Prue scene and in Scandal's speech against poets. According to Dobrée, these factors as well as the portrayal of the social philosophy of the era that can be observed in the Mrs. Foresight-Mrs. Frail scene in Act II, the depth of feeling that is shown in the play, and the perfection of the

¹"Congreve as a Romanticist," XXXI (March 1916), 7.

²Ibid., p. 17.

language are combined to present Congreve's plea for a better way of life.¹ The well-delineated plot, the characters who are individuals, and a realism that is more coarse and more apparent than that of The Way of the World are elements that Allardyce Nicoll considers important in Love for Love. The flaws are its immorality, which is too apparent, especially in the Tattle-Miss Prue scenes, its lack of a central purpose, and its sentimentalism, which seems out of place.² Before Dobrée and before Archer, Ewald said that Love for Love is the most diverting of all of Congreve's comedies and the comedy which presents the least artificial and the least objectionable characters. It incorporates a fine spirit of comedy, especially in the character of Miss Prue.³

More recent critics have also found Love for Love an interesting topic for discussion. They have cited flaws, including the marriage in disguise between Tattle and Mrs. Frail, the unnatural servant-man relationship between Jeremy and Valentine, the uncertain state of Angelica's feelings which remain a mystery to Valentine and the audience alike, the dialogue hampered by the structure, and the stage tricks upon which Congreve relied. Most critics have found interesting the plot, although it is loosely constructed; the

¹ Restoration Comedy: 1660-1720 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924), pp. 132, 137.

² British Drama (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1925), pp. 254-255.

³ Ewald, p. 193.

characters, who are skillfully delineated and whose dialogue reflects only the individual personality of the character to which it is given; the language, which incorporates an impersonal satire; an irony that provides contrasts between characters; and a relaxed, airy, vivacious tone which conveys the high spirits of the theatrically satisfying hero and heroine.¹ "Pure fun" is a phrase that one critic used; he then went on to say, "It opens well, develops well, shows a sense of form as well as construction."² This variety of criticism shows the different opinions that have been expressed about Love for Love in its almost two hundred years of existence; perhaps, the different views that have been expressed help to explain its long dramatic history.

The initial performance of Love for Love in 1695 celebrated the opening of the new theatre in Lincoln's Inn Fields and was graced by the presence of King William;³ and it marked the beginning of a dramatic history of productions that usually have been well received. D. Crane Taylor has made the observation that Love for Love has been revived more often than any play of Shakespeare's or The Beggar's Opera and that he is confident that its success will continue.⁴ The popularity of the first production of the play can be

¹ Perry, pp. 64-77.

² Louis Kronenberger, The Thread of Laughter (New York: Alfred A. Kropf, 1925), pp. 128-129.

³ Taylor, p. 62.

⁴ Ibid., p. 76.

attributed partly to its excellent cast, which included some of the leading performers of the day: Betterton, although not as young and slender as he once was, played the role of Valentine opposite Anne Bracegirdle, for whom the role of Angelica had been created; Mrs. Barry appeared in the role of Mrs. Frail, a part which some critics believe suited her both on and off stage; and Ben was played by Doggett, who, after receiving such high praise for this role, refused to play anything but starring roles.¹ Love for Love, after its initial success of a run of thirteen successive days, became a part of the repertory of the company at Lincoln Inn Fields.

A study of Congreve's plays as they were presented on the stage during the eighteenth century has been made by Emmett L. Avery, who lists each performance of each of Congreve's plays and then summarizes his findings in order to present a total picture. In regard to Love for Love, he states:

Of the five plays, Love for Love received, on the whole, more unqualified praise than any other and it was beyond any doubt the most popular on the stage. It was acted approximately 435 times in the century, . . . and that figure represents a third of the performances of all of Congreve's plays. It was also acted in more seasons than any other play; according to the extant records, it was missing from the stage during only eight of the hundred years.²

¹ John Downes, "Roscius Anglicanus," The Restoration Stage, ed. John I. McCollum, Jr. (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1961), p. 44.

² Congreve's Plays on the Eighteenth Century Stage (New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1951), p.155.

At the end of the eighteenth century, although Love for Love was still the most popular of Congreve's plays, it was presented only infrequently and then usually in a version that had been adapted to the "modern Delicacy" of the era. These productions continued sporadically until the mid-nineteenth century when it disappeared from the London stage.¹ Meanwhile, America had come to know Congreve also; there is a record of a performance of Love for Love that was given in New York City in 1834.²

The American and British stages of the twentieth century have presented several productions of Love for Love. In 1917, the Stage Society presented the first modern production of the play in its entirety, about which William Archer wrote that it was unnecessary to revive a play of a dead convention, for although it had great historical interest, it was completely out of place in the modern, 1917, world.³ According to the drama critic for The Spectator, the 1921 performance of Love for Love given by the Phoenix Society was outstanding and refreshing after the modern dramas of divorce.⁴ The **Oxford** Repertory Company presented the play

¹ Ibid., p. 153.

² Robert L. Sherman, Drama Cyclopedic: A Bibliography of Plays and Players (Chicago: Published by the author, 1944), p. 319.

³ "War Plays in London," Nation, CIV (May 24, 1917), 640.

⁴ "The Theatre," Spectator, CXXVI (April 2, 1921), 428-429.

in 1924 so successfully that the company was required to give extra performances.¹ 1925 was a year in which the Provincetown Players presented their version of Love for Love at the Greenwich Village Theatre in New York;² this company received praise for its production although not all the critics were as kind to the playwright.³ Charles Laughton in the role of Tattle, Flora Robson as Mrs. Foresight, and Elsa Lanchester as Miss Prue appeared in the 1934 production of Love for Love, which was given at the Sadler's Wells Theatre in London, a production that critics deemed one of the best of the season.⁴ In 1936, the Westport Country Playhouse presented their version of Love for Love and included in it scenes from The Way of the World.⁵ The Players' Club production of 1940 included Cornelia Otis Skinner in the role of Angelica, Dorothy Gish as Miss Prue, Violet Heming as Mrs. Frail, and Bobby Clark as Ben.⁶ Although this

¹John Gielgud, "Staging Love for Love," Theatre Arts, XXVII (November, 1943), 663.

²Joseph Wood Krutch, "Drama: Love Without Tenderness," Nation, CXX (April 15, 1925), 44.

³Robert Littrell, "Love for Love," The New Republic, XLIII (April 22, 1925), 237-238.

⁴Derek Verschoyle, "The Theatre," The Spectator, CLII (March 16, 1930), 407.

⁵Newsweek, VIII (July 11, 1936), 27.

⁶"Old Play in Manhattan," Time, XXXV (June 17, 1940), 52.

production was not given outstanding praise, it did prepare the way for the most famous productions of Love for Love during this century.

The London Repertory Company under the direction of John Gielgud, who also starred in the role of Valentine, presented Love for Love in London in 1943 and 1944 and in New York and Ottawa in 1947. The London productions, staged at the Phoenix and Haymarket Theaters, respectively, received the enthusiastic praise of James Redfern, who stated that the play was a "feast for the eye and ear of connoisseurs of acting and playwriting."¹ When the production appeared at the Royale Theatre in New York, where it ran from May 26 to July 5, 1947—a total of forty-eight performances²—the critics were not as enthusiastic as Mr. Redfern had been. Most of the critics agreed that the play was enjoyable entertainment, that it was well-suited to the era, and that the production was inferior to that which the company had presented in The Importance of Being Earnest.³ John Mason Brown suggested that not all the fault rested upon the production or the play itself, but on the fact that modern audiences were too lazy to listen to the complex, witty dialogue as

¹"The Theatre," The Spectator, CLXXX (April 16, 1943), 359.

²Theatre World: Season '47-'48, ed. Daniel Blum (New York: Peter Stuyvesant, 1948), p. 121.

³"The Important Congreve," Newsweek, XXIX (June 9, 1947), 87.

carefully as they should.¹ The main part of the criticism of this successful production was aimed at John Gielgud, whose performance as Valentine was criticized for being too soft for the character, too colorless, and too much like his performance of the role of Hamlet as well as for being out of step with the other excellent presentations of the characters. Sebastian Cabot's Buckram, George Hayes's Scandal, Adrienne Allen's Mrs. Frail, and Jessie Evans's Miss Prue were the roles that received highest praise from the critics.²

That Love for Love has not been presented professionally in the last fifteen years is a regrettable fact. The audience of today, although not trained to listen closely to the dialogue, would enjoy this Restoration play. Its characters, especially the male characters, have the same traits and say almost modern things, if in coarser language, that are said by the characters in the stage and screen comedies that enjoy the greatest popularity today. If the modern trend in movie-making continues, movie-goers may be able to see a revival of this lively comedy in their near-by neighborhood theatres.

¹"Seeing Things: Utopia of Gallantry," Saturday Review of Literature, XXX (June 14, 1947), 20-22.

²Ibid.

CHAPTER TWO

VALENTINE'S FOUR VOICES

In order to understand Love for Love, it is necessary to realize that beneath every character and every piece of action or dialogue are the will and master plan of the playwright, William Congreve. It is he who determines the general subject of the play (a search for real love), the purpose of the play (to amuse the audience and to satirize parts of the Restoration way of life), the audience for whom the play is primarily intended (the Restoration aristocracy), and the speaking voices to be used by the characters that he has created.¹ With these facts clearly in mind, one can then study and try to understand a particular character from the play Love for Love, a character such as Valentine Legend, the hero of Love for Love, who appears as a character playing three different roles. In Acts I, II, and III, he is a young man who is living his life as it comes along and who is worrying only about his love; in Act IV he feigns madness, both to escape signing away his inheritance and to find out whether or not his mistress loves him; in the final act, he portrays the disillusioned lover. In each of these roles, he adopts a different speaking voice, a voice that is modified

¹Louise Smith, "Composition Teachers: Pick Up Your Pens and Write," English Journal, LIV (December, 1965), 870.

not only by the subject and the purpose of his speech but also by the audience within the play to whom the speech is directed. Valentine's voices are the subject of this chapter, and they continue to be of interest to the end of this thesis.

In order to understand the speaking voices that the hero, Valentine, uses in Love for Love, it is first necessary to understand Valentine as a person, as a product of his age, the Restoration period of English history. This age was one that worshipped money, birth, and wit. To be socially acceptable only birth, noble birth, was necessary; but to have also money and wit was the ideal. In this society there was freedom in man-woman relationships; whereas, in the past, only the husband could be unfaithful to his marriage vows without being ostracized by society, at this time a wife could be unfaithful to her husband without being harshly judged by the fashionable world. For instance, among certain circles, making fools of jealous husbands was considered a great sport. From this type of society Valentine comes. He is witty and wellborn; the third ingredient for total success in the eyes of the world—money—he lacks. In fact, he is deeply in debt because he has wasted his money in pursuit of Angelica, with whom he remains steadfastly in love throughout the play. He has been a libertine in the past and has at least one illegitimate child to prove this fact. In contrast to the other characters in the play who seem to think only of love affairs, Valentine is concerned with the fact that dishonesty

and insincerity seem to be widespread; he is sensitive to cause and effect in human relationships. However serious in attitude he may seem at times, this attitude does not last for long. He is by nature a lighthearted and gay person; he is witty in his outlook upon life.¹ When he was asked to describe Valentine, Congreve said, "The character is a mixed Character; his faults are fewer than his good qualities."²

The first role in which Valentine appears is that of a young man living life as it comes to him, a role played in the first three acts. In this role, four primary voices of Valentine and their modifications stand out: his voice when he is speaking to Jeremy, the one he uses when he is speaking to Scandal, a third that he reserves only for his father, and the last which he uses when he speaks to his sweetheart Angelica.

Valentine's confidants, two men from different social worlds, are introduced in Act I. These are the two individuals, Jeremy and Scandal, to whom Valentine can tell his problems, his plans, and his dreams; these are the men who try to help him solve his problems, to carry out his plans, and to realize his dreams. The voices that Valentine uses when speaking to these characters are unique in the play.

¹Thomas H. Fujimura, The Restoration Comedy of Wit (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952), pp. 178-179, 183.

²William Congreve, Amendments of Mr. Collier's False and Imperfect Citations (1698), as quoted by Thomas H. Fujimura, The Restoration Comedy of Wit (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952), p. 129.

Jeremy, the first of Valentine's confidants to appear on the stage, is Valentine's servant who has served his master for seven years, possibly the length of time that Valentine has been taking part in the affairs of polite society. Jeremy believes that he has the right to criticize his master's actions when Valentine and he are alone and that Valentine should listen to him. He is witty by nature, a natural match for his witty master, but he thinks wit is not so important as money.¹ This witty gentleman's gentleman has served as the model for the stock character of the witty and wise family servant who frequently makes more sense than his master does.²

Valentine's other close friend and confidant, Scandal, is a member of the fashionable world, the world of which Valentine is a member. Scandal appears as a Restoration beau and wit who enjoys the risqué in life; he has a roving eye as far as the ladies are concerned, and most women, especially those such as Mrs. Foresight, seem happy to welcome his advances. His caustic tongue does not hesitate to rip a reputation, even the best one, to shreds either by truth or by gossip. He is cynical and skeptical, but he also shows himself to be a faithful friend to Valentine.³

¹Holland, pp. 162-170.

²Taylor, p. 70.

³Fujimura, p. 182.

As these two characters take their places on stage, the modifications which occur in Valentine's speaking voice can be readily detected. The entrance of Jeremy at the beginning of Act I of Love for Love opens the doors to the study of Valentine's voices.

The relationship between Jeremy and Valentine has often been described as an unnatural one, and in some ways it is. It is a relationship with two separate and distinct parts: that which exists in the eyes of polite society and that which exists in the privacy of Valentine's rooms. When other members of Valentine's social class are present, Valentine speaks to Jeremy as his master; his words are curt and to the point: "Sirrah, fill when I bid you."¹ They are firm and demanding: "Show her up when she comes."² "Bid him come in."³ In these words there is no cruelty or desire to inflict pain, but neither is there any kindness or warmth.

It is when Valentine and Jeremy are alone that one can see the teasing kindness and affection that Valentine feels for his servant. The kindness allows Valentine to accept Jeremy's criticism and causes him to speak as a gay, light-hearted, well-educated young man whose problems, large as they are, do not seem insurmountable. When Jeremy, taking advantage of their relationship, comments upon Valentine's

¹I. i. 308-309.

²I. i. 627.

³I. i. 377.

financial condition, Valentine, teasingly, yet semi-seriously, too, tells his servant what his plans are:

Why, sirrah, I have no money--you know it--and therefore resolve to rail at all that have; and in that I but follow the examples of the wisest and wittiest men in all ages. (I. i. 39-46).

He also explains a few lines later, lines 59 through 68, how he plans to make use of his poverty in his campaign to win Angelica. Again his voice is teasing; Valentine knows Jeremy does not like to hear him talk in such a way. He says,

Well, and now I am poor I have an opportunity to be revenged on 'em all; I'll pursue Angelica with more love than ever, and appear more notoriously her admirer in this restraint, than when I openly rivalled the rich fops that made court to her. So shall my poverty be a mortification to her pride, and perhaps make her compassionate that love which has principally reduced me to this lowness of fortune.

These statements, uttered as they seem to be in a light-hearted manner, only serve to excite Jeremy the more--as, perhaps, Valentine knew they would--and lead him into a witty yet barbed discussion of writing as a profession; this discussion is aggravated, again deliberately, by the fact that Valentine declares he plans to become a writer.

Into this discussion comes Scandal. With his entrance upon the scene, much of Valentine's freshness and youth seems to leave him. He now appears to adopt the bitter, disillusioned voice of a man of the world, a man who has seen and

done much. Although some of Valentine's speeches to Scandal are gay, most carry a bitter undertone.

Like Jeremy, Scandal is horrified when he discovers that Valentine has even thought of becoming a writer, and he asks Valentine what his purpose in doing this is. Valentine replies with much the same words that he used to answer Jeremy, but in these words can also be heard the sharpness of the disillusionment that Valentine feels about his way of life. He says, "Therefore I would rail in my writings and be revenged."¹ Moments later, he is the self-assured man of the world who wishes to know only what the fashionable world thinks of his state, but this attitude lasts for only an instant. Once again Valentine becomes the bitter philosopher and compares his host of bell-ringers, creditors, with those people who go to seek favors of a great man; in neither place do the people receive a definite answer. When Valentine is faced with the problem of providing for one of his baseborn children, he grows angry with his mistress and declares,

Fox on her! could she find no other time to
fling my sins in my face? Here, give her
this, and bid her trouble me no more.²

He is not at all repentant for his actions; in fact, he and Scandal enjoy a few happy moments discussing the woman in question. He is only angry because he has been reminded of

¹I. i. 173-174.

²I. i. 258-262.

her at an inopportune moment. Another of his embarrassments in the form of Trapland, a man to whom Valentine owes much money, comes to haunt our hero. In order to try to postpone paying the debt, Valentine joins Scandal in confusing and embarrassing Trapland by speaking of Trapland's mistress as though she were common property. When this device appears to be failing, Valentine is forced to take advantage of a desperate plan, suggested by his father, in order that he pay his debts. The gaiety that Valentine has worn while Trapland has been present leaves him immediately after Trapland's exit, and the irony, the satire, and the bitterness once again enter his speech. Upon being questioned by Scandal, who wishes to know whether or not Valentine's father has relented toward him, Valentine harshly replies in lines 410 through 425 of Act I:

No, he has sent me the hardest conditions in the world. You have heard of a booby brother of mine that was sent to sea three years ago? This brother my father hears is landed; whereupon he very affectionately sends me word, if I will make a deed of conveyance of my right to his estate after his death to my younger brother, he will immediately furnish me with four thousand pounds to pay my debts and make my fortune. This was once proposed before, and I refused it; but the present impatience of my creditors for their money, and my own impatience of confinement and absence from Angelica, force me to consent.

The words "booby" and "affectionately" reveal to the audience that Valentine feels that his condition is being harshly exploited by his father, but it is also clear to the audience

that he feels that he must accept the offer. Once his decision is made, he seems to look forward, for the moment at least, only to the time when he can see Angelica; once again he dons a gay outlook on life and enjoys exchanging witticisms with his friend.

After he has accepted his father's "generous" offer, Valentine is once again free to come and to go as he pleases. It is his pleasure to see Angelica once again, and with this thought uppermost in his mind, he goes to the residence of Mr. Foresight, Angelica's uncle with whom she resides. Unfortunately for the lovelorn young man, he does not get to see Angelica; it is his fortune, however, to meet his father who is a guest in the Foresight house.

Sir Sampson Legend, who prides himself on his strength and his look of youth,¹ is not the ideal father. He plays favorites with his sons, but perhaps he prefers Ben, his son the sailor, because Ben is rarely at home. He even stoops low enough to try to persuade Angelica, Valentine's sweetheart, to marry him instead of Valentine. He has a coarse wit that often uses sex as a basis of humor;² in fact, he sees nothing wrong in insinuating to Mr. Foresight, his host, that Mrs. Foresight has been hospitable above and beyond that which was expected of her. This rough, often coarse, man, who is very self-centered, has made his son Valentine suffer many torments, but Valentine still accords his father respect, a

¹Taylor, p. 72.

²Fujimura, p. 178.

respect that can be seen in the voice that Valentine uses when he is speaking to Sir Sampson. This voice may not be entirely genuine, however; it may be a device designed to persuade his father to reinstate him in his rightful position as heir to his father's estates. Although there is truth in the last statement, it is also necessary to realize that there is a nobility of phrase and thought in Valentine's encounters with his father; there is a certain something in the phrasing and construction of the speeches that seems almost Shakespearean.¹ In his speeches to his father, Valentine is not the libertine, not the gay man of the world, not the teasing friend, and not the bitter disillusioned philosopher. No! He is a young man speaking in a voice that conveys respect, respect both for his father's place in his life and for his father's age. No matter what Sir Sampson says, this respect, feigned though it may be, remains.

It is in these passages that Valentine, with softly spoken words, tries to persuade his father to change his mind about the move to disinherit him. In a voice that seems to be brimming with repentance, Valentine says,

I hope you will have more indulgence than to oblige me to those hard conditions which my necessity signed to. . . . You would not go to the extremity of the conditions, but release me at least from some part.²

¹"William Congreve," Cambridge History of English Literature, ed. A. W. Ward and A. R. Waller (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1962), Vol. VIII: The Age of Dryden, p. 151.

²II. 1. 351-353, 357-359.

When this speech does not seem to move Sir Sampson, Valentine continues; he praises his father for what Sir Sampson has done for him; he admits his own errors and the fact that he has probably received as much help from Sir Sampson as he deserves to receive; however, this stirring and heartwarming speech is only the prelude to Valentine's real statement, a plea for more help: "But what you, out of fatherly fondness, will be pleased to add shall be doubly welcome" (II. i. 163-165).

All of Valentine's cajolery is in vain; Sir Sampson can speak of nothing but his son's ingratitude and spendthrift character; he turns a deaf ear to all of Valentine's pleas. Into Valentine's voice, now comes the emotion of one whose sensitive spirit has been deeply wounded: "Sir, is this usage for your son?"¹ Again Sir Sampson refuses to listen to the pleas of his son; instead he begins to think of how wrongly he has been used, to wonder what the "younger generation is coming to," and to conjecture whether Valentine, who is a wretched creature whose actions are so far removed from anything that Sir Sampson might do, can possibly be his son. This provides Valentine with an opportunity that he does not overlook. With a plaintive voice, he declares that the fact that he is not Sir Sampson's son explains his father's "barbarity and unnatural usage" of him.² Although

¹II. i. 389-390.

²II. i. 403.

these words are uttered in tones of respect and deep sadness, not in anger or insolence, they serve little purpose but to inflame Sir Sampson further. He reminds Valentine, in no uncertain terms, that it is because of Sir Sampson Legend that Valentine Legend is alive.

To the harsh statements made by Sir Sampson, Valentine agrees, still with deep respect and affection in his voice, that he owes his father his life; however, this is a conciliatory statement for an idea that Valentine wishes to express. In lines 420 through 422 of the first scene in Act II, he says, "If you don't mean to provide for me, I desire you would leave me as you found me." To this idea Sir Sampson shows an immediate desire to comply, and he demands that Valentine disrobe on the spot; he has not realized that his son, amateur philosopher that he is, has meant more than just material possessions. Valentine does not leave his father in doubt as to what he means for a moment; he replies,

My clothes are soon put off but you must also
divest me of reason, thought, passions, incli-
nations, affections, appetites, senses, and
the huge train of attendants that you begot along
with me.¹

These items which he has listed, Valentine insists, in a soft yet firm voice, are the reason that he has spent so much money; they, not he, are the spendthrifts and the causes of

¹ II. 1. 426-430.

his financial difficulties. Even these stirring reminders fail; Sir Sampson proceeds to let his son know that the appetites and other aspects of his personality which Valentine has named are Valentine's responsibility and that Valentine must support them. Still believing in his own ability to convince his father not to disinherit him, or, perhaps, believing that his father does have more affection for him than what he is showing, Valentine makes one last attempt to convince his father that it would not be right to make him sign away his inheritance. Once again his respectful but firm speech meets failure; his father departs, and Valentine is left with Jeremy, who doesn't hesitate to use an "I-told-you-so" attitude.

After suffering defeat at the hands of his father, Valentine has only one hope left, to find Angelica and to convince her of his love. Not until Act III, scene ii, do the lovers meet on the stage. As Valentine is a man of the world, it is natural that Angelica, a wealthy orphan who is living with her foolish uncle Foresight and his flighty wife, should also be a product of the Restoration world in which she lives. Because she is wealthy, wellborn, and handsome, she has many suitors, and this is a fact which constantly worries Valentine; because she lives during the Restoration period, she has greater personal freedom than did the women of earlier times, a freedom which she values highly; because her mind and tongue are quick, she is considered a wit. To

critics Angelica remains something of a mystery because her actions do not seem consistent.¹ At one time she may seem to play with Valentine much as a cat will play with a mouse that cannot escape its clutches; indifference seems to be another mask she wears in her relationship with Valentine; however, beneath all of the roles seems to lie the true loving affection that is the basis for Angelica's feelings for Valentine. At no time is she prudish or missish in her words or her actions. She is free-speaking at all times, boisterous in her wit, and frankly sexual in her allusions. Her tongue can be sharp and malicious, but this fact is tempered by her frankness and whimsical wit.² Angelica may not be the picture of a sweet, wholesome young lady, but she is definitely the type of sweetheart for a wayward Restoration beau like Valentine.

Angelica's character, which serves as a foil to that of Valentine, is evident in Act III, scene ii, a scene in which the two lovers, Valentine, who is serious and pleading, and Angelica, who is flippant and gay, share their tender moments with Scandal, an invited friend, and Tattle, an uninvited bore. Here Angelica is the primary person to whom Valentine is speaking; here it is her personality that primarily determines the voice which Valentine uses. His basic voice in this scene seems to be that of a lover pleading

¹ Taylor, pp. 70-71.

² Fujimura, pp. 180-182.

earnestly for a pledge of love from his mistress; this voice is varied by Valentine's use of the voice of a man of the world. No matter how hard Valentine is pleading with his love, he never loses his firmness nor his gentleness. This attitude can be seen in the lines 3 through 5, lines in which Valentine attempts to answer Angelica's refusal to give him an answer of any kind or to feel responsible in any way for Valentine's feelings. Valentine comments softly, pleadingly, and gently, "But I can accuse you of uncertainty for not telling me whether you [love me] or not." Unfortunately for the hapless lover, this speech does nothing to help his cause. In fact, it leads Angelica to try to convince Scandal, a willing listener to the lovers' exchange, that Valentine must be convinced that what he feels is merely an affected love, not a true emotion. Sadly but wisely, Valentine gently replies, "I know of no effectual difference between continued affectation and reality."¹

Not until Tattle, a Restoration beau who has a mistaken idea of the value of his own wit and his worth in the world, interrupts Valentine's conference with his mistress, does Valentine's voice show disgust and annoyance. When Tattle makes an ill-timed, involved speech about Angelica's passion for Valentine and Valentine's ability as a persuader, this disgust, annoyance, and even slight anger definitely

¹ III. ii. 19-21.

comes to the surface. "Oh, the devil!" he seems to shout, "What damned costive poet has given thee this lesson fustian to get by rote?"¹

Not until Tattle, who has a false reputation for keeping his amorous affairs secret, is accused of being mistrusted by women, and Angelica is declared to be chaste because no man ever tempted her, does Valentine recover his humor. Leaping to Angelica's defense, Valentine states that he is guilty of having placed temptation in her path, but Angelica is not guilty (not innocent, but simply not guilty) because she has resisted the temptation. From this point until his exit from the scene, Valentine and Scandal enjoy a teasing exchange of witticisms at the expense of Tattle, who, weak-witted as he is, cannot defend himself.

This amusing and revealing scene comes to an end with a song and the entrance of Sir Sampson and Ben, Valentine's "booby" brother. Valentine makes one last, serious attempt to persuade Angelica to admit her love for him and to commit herself. Once again he meets defeat; "Lady Luck" seems to have turned her back on our dashing young hero. With Scandal to bear him company, Valentine exits. Once again, he must try to find a way to solve his problems.

¹III. ii. 59-61.

CHAPTER THREE

VALENTINE, THE MADMAN

As Act III closes, Valentine is forced to face the fact that he will soon be required to sign a deed of conveyance, renouncing his inheritance in favor of his brother Ben. His plight is due to his reckless spending during his courtship of Angelica, who has refused to tell whether she loves him or not, and his desperate renunciation of his inheritance for four thousand pounds, which his father Sir Sampson offered to him for the payment of his debts. Although Valentine has known the conditions of the agreement since the time that he agreed to sign the promissory document, he has not been able to admit to himself the possibility that he will be required to fulfill the stated conditions. He has tried to get his father to relent or to soften the conditions, but he has failed. It is at this point in the plot that Valentine becomes increasingly aware of the desperate situation in which he has placed himself. Rather than accept the conditions to which he has agreed, Valentine seeks a method by which he can escape them. Like other members of his social class, Valentine has little training in the ways of making a living, and he does not wish to learn any.

He has spent his life seeking and enjoying pleasure, and he does not want to change his pattern of living.

Only one method, a clever one that Valentine could have learned from frequent visits to the London theatre, seems to present itself: he will pretend madness to postpone the signing of the deed of conveyance. Possibly, he is hoping to postpone this legal act until his brother Ben has returned to sea, an action which Valentine believes will give him a chance to win his father's affection again.

In what way does Valentine, as created by Congreve, hope to make use of madness? How will insanity, feigned though it may be, help to delay the signing of the deed of conveyance? The Restoration audience knows Valentine's plan will work; they know that a person who is regarded as being insane is not legally responsible for documents that he may sign during his periods of instability.¹ Valentine, as created by Congreve, realizes that Sir Sampson will not insist upon his signature on the document if Valentine is thought to be insane; Valentine reasons that Sir Sampson will want to be absolutely certain that the document is signed according to the legal specifications of the day and that there will be no possibility of Valentine's signature being declared invalid. These suppositions prove to be correct:

¹This idea is still present in the legal documents that the twentieth century uses as a basis for civil law. See "Insanity," Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1964 ed., XII, 383-387.

Sir Sampson, upon discovering that Valentine is mad, worries not about his son's inability to sign the deed.

The course Valentine is to pursue is a demanding one both for the actor who plays the role of the mad Valentine character and for the playwright who created him. To learn how Congreve portrayed assumed madness in his hero we must consider Congreve's career for his sources in drama and in the manners of the seventeenth century.

Congreve, in his early years in London, had been a student in the Middle Temple, the law college of the day. There, although he was not so much interested in studying to be a lawyer as he was interested primarily in obtaining social polish as many of the Middle Temple's students were, he most certainly came in contact with many points of the law. Possibly, it was there that he learned the legal aspects of an insanity case,¹ facts that he uses wisely and well in Love for Love.

The idea of madness as a theatrical device is one that Congreve knew in the plays of the Greeks, the Oedipus plays, for example, and in those of Seneca and other Romans. Evidence of madness can be found in the English medieval drama, especially in the plays that deal with Herod. The Elizabethans, beginning with Kyd and his character Hieronimo, also used madness in their plays. It was with Hamlet, however,

¹ Taylor, p. 16.

that insanity began to be used deliberately and frequently to help advance the plot of the drama.¹ And it is Hamlet, the Mad Dane, with whom Valentine is frequently compared; it has been said that Valentine speaks "with the very voice of Hamlet."² Other critics, such as G. Wilson Knight, do not agree that Valentine is a perfect echo of Hamlet; Knight says that Valentine speaks "with an amusing burlesque of Hamlet, as 'Truth'."³ Although Hamlet is the first in a series of characters who feigned madness and is the one whom Valentine more closely resembles, he is not the last madman. The Jacobean playwrights actually were the first to create characters that presented a realistic interpretation of madness. Their characters often pretended to be mad; frequently the pretender to madness was successful in his schemes and outsmarted the villain whose conceit and self-assurance were discredited much as Valentine hoped to defeat the schemes of his father.⁴

This wealth of dramatic background in madness was not, however, Congreve's only source of information about madness.

¹ The Cambridge History of English Literature, VIII, 152.

² Rober Rentoul Reed, Jr., Bedlam on the Jacobean Stage (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952), p. 4.

³ The Golden Labyrinth (New York: W. W. Norton Co., 1962), p. 134.

⁴ Reed, p. 110.

Within the city of London, there existed a famous insane asylum, Bethlehem or Bedlam, as it came to be called. Until its reform in the eighteenth century, it provided the people of London a source of amusement. The attendants, who kept their charges confined in dark rooms, frequently in leg irons, permitted people to view the inmates for a price.¹

Within the drama of the seventeenth century, there exist many references to the institution itself and to its interior environment. These references are accepted as outgrowths of the playwrights' actual knowledge of the institution, knowledge that was gained at first hand.²

Why did Congreve, as well as the other playwrights, use madness within his plays? One reason, and the basic one, is that madness served as a device to advance the plot. Another reason is that a character who is not sane, or who is pretending to be insane, can express the playwright's attitude toward the world in which he lives and can comment on the morals of the day with impunity. He is only a character in a play and not the voice of the playwright.³ An inmate of Bedlam, perhaps a political prisoner rather than an insane person, explained this idea further when he stated "that only

¹"Mental Health," Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1964 ed., XV, 262-264.

²Reed, p. 26.

³Ibid., p. 111.

within Bedlam and by the mad folk could the truth be spoken with impunity."¹ Valentine definitely speaks what he believes to be true; he seems to be not only an individual who expresses human disillusionment but he also reflects the skepticism of the time.² Even though the truth that Valentine utters must have been rankling to some of the individuals of the day, Congreve seems to have escaped censure for trying to speak the truth.

How did Congreve know that the pretense of madness would be an acceptable element of the plot? To understand this, one must review the plot and what the people of the time believed to be the causes of insanity. The plot, at this point in the action, deals with two ideas: Valentine's hopeless love for Angelica and his deep unhappiness because of his financial condition, these two points definitely fit into what the Restoration people believed were the causes of insanity. At this time in history, people believed that insanity was caused by "demons," by extreme anxiety, by excessive sorrows, by fear, by too extensive studies, or by the bite of a mad dog.³ Valentine, it can be argued, suffers not only from extreme anxiety but also from sorrow; his anxiety is caused by his financial condition and his

¹ Ibid., p. 28.

² Ibid., p. 82.

³ Ibid., p. 8.

sorrow is caused by the uncertainty of his relationship with Angelica.

Combining all these factors and writing witty, polished dialogue, Congreve created Valentine in the role of a madman, a role filled with brilliant speeches and witty, satiric comments about the time in which he was living. The speeches Valentine makes in Act IV stand out above those that he makes in other acts; they give us the picture of Restoration times and a knowledge of Restoration social customs.

Within his periods of feigned madness, Valentine speaks to many people, some of whom are his friends and others of whom are his enemies. Scandal and Jeremy, of course, know what Valentine is trying to do; it is they who help him to carry out his plans. Sir Sampson, Mrs. Frail, and Tattle seek to take advantage of Valentine's seeming mental deficiency. Foresight comes as though to view a curiosity; Buckram, Sir Sampson's lawyer, comes to obtain Valentine's signature on the deed of conveyance; and Angelica comes at first from fear that Valentine is truly mad, and she later returns to take her revenge on Valentine for pretending to be mad. The speeches that Valentine makes to each of these characters are important in revealing Congreve's disillusionment with his age and his despair at what is happening in the world that he knows.

The first testing of Valentine's madness occurs when Sir Sampson, determined that Valentine will not escape from

the bargain that he has made, arrives at Valentine's lodging with his lawyer, Buckram. Until he actually sees and hears Valentine, Sir Sampson is certain that the madness is a trick planned by Valentine to prevent the signing of the deed of conveyance, and in this matter Sir Sampson is absolutely correct. However, when he sees Valentine, Sir Sampson loses some of his certainty. When he asks Valentine whether he recognizes his father, then Valentine has his first major opportunity to speak, his first opportunity to echo the riddles of a madman. Valentine says:

There are people that we know and people that we do not know . . . there are fathers that have many children, and there are children that have many fathers. (IV. i. 200-205)

This speech expresses the idea that no one can ever know another person completely; even a close relative such as a father may be no closer to his children than a stranger would be. In a sense, Valentine is criticizing the lighthearted attitude with which his age seems to regard parenthood, an attitude that Valentine himself exhibited when he was dealing with the problem of his illegitimate child.

The next major speech occurs when Valentine sees Buckram, the lawyer, who provides Valentine with a target for satirical comments on the politics and the practices of lawyers of the Restoration period. Valentine's first speech that concerns the lawyer suggests that Valentine believes lawyers to be corrupt individuals, for he asks Sir Sampson,

"Why does that lawyer wear black? --does he carry his conscience withoutside?" (IV. i. 208-209). When Buckram dares to state that he knows Valentine in his guise as "Truth," Valentine hotly refutes this statement. He declares that lawyers and politicians have no acquaintance with "Truth." In fact, Valentine states that "Truth" has very few acquaintances; this speech makes one believe that the idea of telling the truth was not a very prevalent one in the Restoration period, a period in which words, even false words, were carefully used. Buckram becomes frightened and departs, but he is brought back shortly thereafter in accordance with Sir Sampson's commands. His return is the signal for another outburst from Valentine; this time Valentine discusses a lawyer's love of money, as symbolized by an itching palm:

Oh, no, it is the lawyer with his itching palm;
and come to be scratched. My nails are not
long enough—let me have a pair of red-hot
tongs . . . (IV. i. 299-302).

This speech so frightens Buckram, who believes that Valentine will do exactly as he has threatened, that he departs in haste followed by Valentine's harsh reassurance that "honesty will not overtake you" (IV. i. 308).

In his speeches to Sir Sampson, after Buckram's final departure, Valentine rambles more than he has done before. He mentions religion, politics, and marriage; he accuses his father of committing a crime when he brought a child into the

world. However, he does not truly discuss any of these topics in great detail. To offer final proof of his own madness seems to be Valentine's primary interest in these speeches.

The speeches that Valentine makes to Foresight are important, for when Valentine speaks to this foolish old man, he allows his bitter disillusionment with his times to be heard. Foresight, who believes that he is a great astrologer and who wishes to know the future, provides Valentine with an audience who believes every word that he hears. In his opening speech to Foresight, Valentine whispers,

Dost thou know what will happen tomorrow?
Answer me not—for I will tell thee.
Tomorrow, knaves will thrive through
craft, and fools through fortune, and
honesty will go as it did, frost-nipped
in a summer suit. (IV. ii. 255-260)

Here Valentine says that honesty is a rare thing, and not virtue but craftiness and scheming are rewarded. As "Truth" Valentine goes on to declare that he never appears at court, a statement that suggests that flattery and hidden meaning are the languages that find the most favor among the courtiers of the day. Foresight's question concerning the affairs of the city leads Valentine into a bitter tirade against the common practices of the day, a tirade that tells the student of the Restoration period much of the customs of the day. Valentine begins by saying, "Oh, prayers will be said in empty churches, at the usual hours. Yet you will see such zealous

faces behind the counters, as if religion were to be sold in every store" (IV. ii. 268-272). This comment on the lack of religious faith that is a part of the Restoration society is made more apparent by the phrase "empty churches," a phrase that implies a godless people. Valentine continues his condemnation:

Oh, things will go on methodically, in the city;
the clocks will strike twelve at noon and the
horned herd buzz in the Exchange at two. Husbands
and wives will drive distinct trades, and care and
pleasure separately occupy the family. Coffee-
houses will be full of smoke and strategem. And
the cropt prentice, that sweeps his master's shop
in the morning, may ten to one, dirty his sheets
before night. (IV. ii. 272-281)

Thus the infidelity that was common during the late seventeenth century provides Valentine with his theme. He says that nothing will be any different from what it has been in the past; "the horned herd," a phrase which refers to husbands who have been made cuckolds, will meet in the usual place; individual pleasures, as defined by each husband and each wife, will occupy the family's time, presumably in infidelity. Beaus, the bane of each husband's existence, will meet in the popular coffee-houses to plan their latest pleasure, the downfall of some man's wife, and, last but not least, even the apprentices who work and live throughout the city will be busy with their mistresses making fools of their masters. These occupations, if widespread, signify a decadent society, a society that condemns only being caught in the act of

doing wrong rather than the wrong itself. Valentine brings this commentary to a close with a question directed to Foresight. "Are you a husband?" Valentine asks.¹ When the astrologer answers in the affirmative, Valentine offers his sympathy. His natural wit and his desire to prick Foresight cause him to ask, "Is your wife of Covent Garden parish?"² The reference to Covent Garden is deliberate; Valentine knows the reputation that Mrs. Foresight holds. Covent Garden was the place to which a young man, or an old man for that matter, could go when he was seeking female companionship; there men could meet women whose morals were very loose, even for the day in which they lived, and whose virtue was very easy. It was in this area of London that the women of ill-repute lived and plied their trade. By making this remark, Valentine undoubtedly is telling Foresight, very slyly and without danger of being called out for his words, that Mrs. Foresight's morals are very poor and that Foresight should keep an eye on her, if he can. Foresight, however, does not rise to the bait; he does not give the impression that he has even understood what Valentine has been suggesting. This fact does not bother Valentine; his barbed comments beneath the exterior of sympathy continue. He commiserates for the older man because he is married to such a young wife, a situation that is fraught with dangers. He describes

¹IV. ii. 286-287.

²IV. ii. 289-290.

Foresight in such a way that the elderly gentleman must have winced under the blows: "Alas, poor man! His eyes are sunk, and his hands shrivelled; his legs dwindled, and his back bowed!"¹ and so goes the commentary that Valentine makes. Here, without a doubt, Valentine is trying to point out how ridiculous it is for a man of Foresight's age to marry a young woman; they have nothing in common and the marriage will be an unhappy one. With a reference to Medea, who was reputed to have the ability to change an old man to a young one,² Valentine suggests that only through such a metamorphosis can Foresight's marriage become a happy one. He advises Foresight:

Change thy shape, and shake off age; get thee
Medea's kettle, and be boiled anew; come forth
with laboring, sinuous hands, a chine of steel,
and Atlas shoulders. Let Taliacotius trim the
calves of twenty chairmen, and make thee
pedestals to stand erect upon, and look matri-
mony in the face. (IV. ii. 294-305)

He goes on to state that a man who marries when he is old is making himself look ridiculous. These words are enough for Foresight; his curiosity has been satisfied and his nerves and emotions have been wounded; he yields his place in the foreground of action to other characters.

¹IV. ii. 292-294.

²Edith Hamilton, Mythology (New York: New American Library, 1959), p. 127.

As the act proceeds, the audience is given a good opportunity to see a scheming woman at work and to see the way that Valentine, Scandal, and Jeremy foil her plans. The woman is Mrs. Frail, Mrs. Foresight's unmarried sister, whose morals are as weak as her name. When she thought Ben Legend was to inherit his father's estates, she set about to capture his attention and succeeded in persuading Ben to marry her. Now that Valentine is mad, or is pretending to be mad, Ben's chances of inheriting the estate seem remote, and Mrs. Frail, who believes in taking advantage of each situation as it occurs, now casts Ben aside in favor of his older brother, Valentine, whom she plans to marry by trickery. She and Mrs. Foresight, who wishes to see her sister established as a married woman whose husband can provide handsomely for her, plan to convince Valentine, with Jeremy's help, that Mrs. Frail is Angelica and thus to trap Valentine into an unwanted marriage. Needless to say, Valentine has been informed of the scheme by his loyal servant Jeremy and is lying in wait for Mrs. Frail.

Valentine decides to allow Mrs. Frail's scheme to develop, but to develop with some innovations of his own. When Mrs. Frail, somewhat frightened by the idea that Valentine is mad, finally approaches the hero, he exclaims:

Oh, I see her—she comes like riches, health,
and liberty at once, to a despairing, starving
and abandoned wretch—Oh, welcome, welcome!
(IV. ii. 320-323)

Still the lady seems hesitant and frightened; so Valentine, in order to capture her attention, begins to tell her his plan for their secret marriage. The marriage will occur at night, a peculiar time especially for a marriage to which there would have been little objection; the witnesses would be the moon, Selene, and her lover Endymion, whose body lies in eternal sleep on the slopes of Mount Latmos.¹ Hymen, the god of the marriage feast,² as well as Juno, the protectoress of marriage,³ will protect the secrecy of the affair, for even Juno's peacock and her watchman, Argus of the hundred eyes, will be lost in sleep. Only Jeremy will be the one to know the details of the plan; it will be he who gives the mortal assistance needed for the plan to succeed.

Mrs. Frail, overcoming her fear of Valentine in his role of a madman, readily agrees. Therefore Valentine, still pretending madness, continues to expound his ideas. He tells Jeremy,

Angelica is turning nun and I am turning friar,
and yet we'll marry one another in spite of the
pope. Get me a cowl and beads, that I may play
my part; for she'll meet me two hours hence in
black and white, and a long veil to cover the
project, and we won't see one another's faces
till we have done something to be ashamed of,
and then we'll blush once for all. (IV. ii. 340-348)

¹Hamilton, p. 113.

²Ibid., p. 36.

³Ibid., p. 28.

From this speech the audience learns that the proposed marriage, besides taking place at night, will occur with both participants in disguise; this fact places in the minds of the members of the audience a doubt of whether or not Valentine intends to carry out the bargain. "Why must all the precautions be taken?" the audience wonders. Very definite plans are made: Valentine, as the intended bridegroom, will attend the ceremony cloaked in the robes and cowl of a friar while Mrs. Frail, the bride, will wear the black and white habit of a nun. These costumes definitely were chosen because they provided disguises that would cloak the participants' faces without the necessity of using a mask; the cowl that the friars of the day wore usually was worn pulled far over the face, and the nuns frequently used the veil, which, in today's society, primarily is used to cover the hair, to cover the face. There could be no recognition by sight of an individual clothed in either of these two disguises.

The conference between Mrs. Frail and Valentine is interrupted by the arrival of Angelica, escorted by Tattle. At first, Mrs. Frail fears that Angelica's presence will cause her scheme to go awry, but Valentine does not seem to recognize his true sweetheart, although the audience realizes that he must do so. Valentine, who has noticed that Tattle is trying to engage Angelica in a flirtation or, perhaps, something more serious, approaches the couple and questions their identities. Tattle, whose sense of

importance is wounded by Valentine's seeming forgetfulness, declares that he, Jack Tattle, is a friend of Valentine.

To this statement Valentine replies:

My friend? what to do? I am no married man,
and thou canst not lie with my wife; I am
very poor, and thou canst not borrow money
of me; then what employment have I for a
friend. (IV. ii. 423-427)

This speech gives the audience an idea of how friends acted toward one another during the Restoration. Unlike today's ideal of a friend, one who will go out of his way to help someone he likes, a Restoration "friend" would be more aptly named if he were called an enemy. A person who would commit adultery with his friend's wife or a friend who would borrow money frequently would not be a welcome individual in many homes; it would be better to be friendless than to have such a friend as this. Valentine, unfortunately, seems to have little fortune, for he has a friend who fills this description, Jack Tattle. Tattle knows when a statement is directed at his character, and he retreats as gracefully as possible without actually leaving the scene.

Angelica is the next character who demands Valentine's attention; she asks Valentine to identify her. As a reply, Valentine makes a beautifully eloquent speech, but it is a speech in which he never refers to Angelica by name. He softly says:

You're a woman—one to whom Heaven gave beauty when it grafted roses on a briar. You are the reflection of Heaven in a pond, and he that leaps at you is sunk. You are all white—a sheet of lovely, spotless paper when you are first born; but you are to be scrawled and blotted by every goose's quill. (IV. ii. 433-440)

This description given by Valentine is particularly apt. The comparison of Angelica and the rose is excellent; Angelica is reputed to be a lovely woman, yet her wit is sharp much as a rose is a beautiful flower which is surrounded by sharp thorns. When an individual falls in love with her, as Valentine did, he is lost in the depths of his emotion. Each woman, like Angelica, is blessed by innocence at birth, but as time passes, so the innocence, destroyed by the harshness of the world, disappears. This charming, yet satirical, description is brought to a close by a very strange statement, one which Congreve must have believed to be like that of a madman. Valentine declares that a woman is excellent at keeping secrets because she is rarely believed when she tells what she knows. With this cryptic and very unflattering statement about women, Valentine's major performance, as a madman, comes to an end. The brilliance of his speeches is never again matched by anything that he says.

The subjects of Valentine's speeches, important as they are, are not the only interesting items in his role of a madman; it is also necessary to consider their form—to take a look at the composition and the structure of Valentine's speeches.

Valentine's madman speeches are filled with questions. In some of his shorter speeches, the entire comment may be composed exclusively of a question or questions. Frequently these short questions are used to acquaint the audience with the new characters who have entered the scene. To introduce these characters, Valentine asks, "Who's that?"¹ "Who are these?"² "Ha, who's here?"³ To these types of questions the characters reply in such a way that the audience is once again told who each individual is. It is interesting to notice that the combination of words and sounds used in these short questions, especially the combination of "w's," the "wh's," and the "th's," creates a phrase that seems abrupt and even harsh when it is spoken aloud; a demand is made known through the sound. However, Valentine's questions are not limited to those which identify characters; they also include rhetorical questions which frequently introduce major commentaries on the age in which the characters live. One such question, "Why does that lawyer wear black?--does he carry his conscience withoutside?"⁴ leads Valentine into a discussion of the character of lawyers, a discussion that eventually includes a commentary on politics, for lawyers are

¹IV. i. 188.

²IV. ii. 378.

³IV. ii. 384.

⁴IV. i. 209-211.

frequently interested in politics, and one on family relationships, for, of course, Valentine is still trying to make his father relent.

Another characteristic that can be found throughout Valentine's madman speeches is the frequent use of interjections and exclamations, such as the word "ha," a statement of surprise or amazement which occurs several times, and the phrase "ha, ha, ha," which signifies a burst of meaningless laughter and heightens Valentine's madman performance since madmen often laugh for no apparent reason. His exclamations, often expressions of feigned sympathy for Foresight, who, he feels, has made a terrible mistake by marrying a young wife, include remarks that Valentine makes when Foresight first tells of his marital status. "Poor creature!"¹ and "Alas, poor man!"² Valentine cries out. Here the use of the exclamation heightens the satire that is underlying the words; the audience realizes that Valentine does not feel any sympathy for Foresight at all. In fact, the audience is convinced that Valentine thinks Foresight a ridiculous old fool. Some other exclamations from Valentine introduce other contributors to the plot: Buckram and Mrs. Frail. When Buckram re-enters the scene, Valentine exclaims, "What, is my bad genius here again!"³ This statement is made in such a fierce manner

¹IV. 11. 289.

²IV. 11. 292.

³IV. 1. 298.

that Buckram is terrified, as Valentine meant him to be, and he soon leaves not to reenter this act. "Oh, welcome, welcome!"¹ Valentine carols when he observes that Mrs. Frail, whom he has agreed to recognize as Angelica, has entered the scene. Again this statement is satiric in form; Valentine is not truly glad to see the lady, but he is planning to find sport in making a fool of her.

These questions, interjections, and exclamations only serve to add variety to the brilliantly written declarative sentences that form the basis of Congreve's carefully executed prose. The actual words that make up these sentences are also very important; if regarded as separate entities bound together to make a splendid whole, they too show the wealth of care that has been lavished upon them. Some of these words, especially the adjectives, seem to sparkle like exquisitely faceted gems. Terms such as "itching," which was used to convey the idea of Buckram's greed; "frost-nipped," which described the position of truth in society, and the trio of "despairing, starving, and abandoned," which refer to Valentine's emotional outlook on life when he is away from Angelica, have been carefully chosen to convey the one idea that Congreve wishes to create for the audience. They were not hastily chosen; no, each was selected from Congreve's wide vocabulary to fill a particular need.

¹IV. ii. 323.

Other descriptive elements which add stature to Congreve's sentences are his carefully worded figures of speech. One major figure that permeates Act IV is the personification of truth, for Valentine declares that he is this quality in the flesh. Through the use of "Truth" personified, Congreve is able to make his comments on the customs and habits of the day. The lines do not seem to be composed by the playwright; they seem to come from the throat of a madman. Before each major speech of this type, Valentine makes a statement like the following one: "But I am Truth, and come to give the world the lie" (IV. 1. 206-207). In the face of "Truth" even though he is a madman, most of the other characters within the act seem to wilt, to try to escape; truth is not easy to look in the face. Besides the personification of truth, other figures of speech occur, especially within Valentine's description of Angelica. There he uses the metaphors "reflection of Heaven in a pond" and "a sheet of lovely, spotless paper" to refer to the woman he loves; these comparisons add much to the already lovely description that he has given.

In addition to using the descriptive elements that have already been named, Congreve makes good use of the prepositional phrase and the dependent clause. Many of his sentences are enlivened by the prepositional phrases which add clarity and specific details to the ideas that are expressed within the sentence. The adjectival prepositional

phrase which so perfectly modifies its noun is less frequent than the adverbial ones; however, there are a few good examples, ones that teachers who are trying to impress upon their students the value of the adjectival prepositional phrase would do well to recommend as examples. When Valentine is describing Angelica, he states that she is a "reflection," a lifeless word until he further declares it is a "reflection of Heaven,"¹ a phrase that suggests perfection and grace. Consider the term "lawyer"; until Valentine adds the phrase "with his itching palm"² little is known about the lawyer's character. With the addition of the phrase, the audience realizes that Valentine believes the man is a scoundrel who is filled with avarice. However, it is the adverbial prepositional phrase that Congreve makes use of most often. Within the speeches to Foresight, this use of the adverbial phrase is apparent. There is a pair of verbs, stated and understood, which are modified by prepositional phrases. When Valentine states that evil doers "will thrive," he explains how this will be done, "through craft" and "through fortune."³ Within twelve lines of the speech that begins "Oh, prayers will be said . . .,"⁴ there are eleven prepositional phrases used as adverbs. Each of these adds

¹ IV. ii. 435.

² IV. i. 300.

³ IV. ii. 258-259.

⁴ IV. ii. 268.

something to the description of the action, action which is strengthened by the use of these modifiers. At another point Valentine explains the reason that Foresight should pray "for a metamorphosis"; he tells the aged astrologer to "shake off age" and "come forth with laboring, sinuous hands."¹ Each of these adverb phrases gives a definite reason, a specific purpose, and one that cannot be misunderstood. The verbs alone are colorless, but with the adverb phrases they seem to glow and to enlighten the individual to whom they are addressed.

The dependent clauses that add a refreshing extra to the sentences in which they appear often serve to describe an otherwise-ordinary word. Instead of making simple statements, Congreve elaborates and creates a specific picture. When Valentine uses the pronoun "he," it is explained, "He that follows his nose" (IV. ii. 318). The noun "question" is more than just a word or idea; it is a "question that would puzzle a mathematician." (IV. i. 219-220). Words such as "people," "fathers," "prentice," "things," and "he" step out of their otherwise drab existence to become specific items when dependent clauses are added; "people that we know,"² "fathers that have many children,"³ "prentice, that

¹IV. ii. 313-324.

²IV. i. 200-201.

³IV. i. 203-204.

sweeps his master's shop,"¹ and "he that leaps"² are specific and are limited to one meaning. Little ambiguity can exist when specific modifiers are used.

These descriptive elements form important parts of the sentences that compose Valentine's mad speeches, but they cannot be considered as completely independent elements; they, combined with other factors, compose the structure through which Congreve places his ideas before the audience. Within this sentence structure there is a predominance of simple sentences, especially when the sentence is used to identify characters, to ask simple questions, or to make simple statements. As in any particular discussion, when an idea is simple and uncomplicated, a simple sentence structure can be used. This idea has been noticed by students of languages other than English; when a language is used to express complex ideas, it must become complex itself; when a language, such as that spoken in the Pacific islands, has no need to express complex ideas, it remains simple. Valentine's shorter speeches are the largest source of the simple sentence. Examples of this type of sentence, as it is used by Congreve, can be found in all parts of Act IV; some examples of the type are as follows: "Scandal, who

¹IV. ii. 279.

²IV. ii. 281-282.

³IV. ii. 436.

are these?"¹ "It is enough."² "Whisper."³ "Scandal will tell you."⁴ An interesting fact about this type of sentence is that it is simple in content; it does not advance the plot nor does it express any of Congreve's satiric comments on the Restoration period. Simple sentences serve primarily as sentences to fill in between the major ideas.

As the ideas grow more complex, so does the sentence structure which expresses the ideas. The content speeches are stated in compound, complex, and compound-complex sentences; ideas that deal with topics such as social practices, money, business, and love seem to require structures that have been expanded to permit a greater freedom of expression. A sentence, such as the one that follows, would be seriously impaired if expressed in a less complex structure; notice that Valentine is striving to express a unified idea:

Tomorrow, knaves will thrive through craft,
and fools through fortune, and honesty will
go as it did, frost-nipped in a summer
suit. (IV. ii. 257-260)

Valentine's idea seems to be that evil men, dishonesty, and false business practices have practically eliminated honesty; this idea, complicated as it is, needs a complicated

¹IV. ii. 384.

²IV. ii. 378.

³IV. ii. 350.

⁴IV. ii. 265.

structure in which it can best perform. Although a statement such as,

I have been sworn out of Westminster Hall the first day of every term--let me see--no matter how long--but I'll tell you one thing; it's a question that would puzzle an arithmetician if you should ask him, whether the Bible saves more souls in Westminster Abbey or damns more in Westminster Hall. (IV. ii. 217-224)

could be expressed in simple sentences, the rambling structure of the idea heightens the madman quality that Valentine is trying to convey; a madman should not use completely coherent sentences all of the time. This rambling structure can best exist within a complicated sentence structure.

The parallel structure that is present within many of Valentine's speeches is very interesting; in several examples there are prepositional phrases in parallel construction; in others there are independent or dependent clauses. For example, Valentine uses this structure when he tells Sir Sampson,

There are people that we know and people that we do not know; and yet the sun shines upon all alike. There are fathers that have many children and there are children that have many fathers (IV. i. 200-205)

Besides the clauses that begin "There are . . . ," the ones that are introduced by "that" also serve to develop the parallel structure. This structure is an unusual one to find within the speeches of a madman, even though the madness is

only feigned; madness is often thought to cause a person's speech to become disjointed, even incoherent. However rambling Valentine's speeches may be, they are always understandable and frequently make more sense than those of the other rather vain, self-centered characters surrounding him. This paradox, however, makes the play no less interesting and enjoyable.

Although the major part of the act is about madness, Valentine makes several sane speeches which add variety to and give significance to his mad ones. These speeches tell the audience exactly what Valentine's motives are. They show Valentine once again pleading with Angelica in the hope that she will pledge her love to him; he speaks with his father in the hope that his father will waive the conditions of the promissory document. Valentine's first sane interludes occur when he is speaking to his father; of course, Buckram, the family lawyer, has departed before Valentine seemingly regains the wits he has never truly lost. As though he has not seen or spoken to his father before, Valentine queries, "My father here? Your blessing, sir."¹ To Sir Sampson's question concerning his health, Valentine satirically replies, ". . . pretty well—I have been a little out of order" (IV. i. 247-248). Calmly and sanely Valentine continues; his father grows hopeful, thinking that Valentine will now

¹ IV. i. 242-244.

be able to sign the deed of conveyance. Valentine's sanity remains until Buckram once again makes an appearance; at this point in the action, Valentine once again puts on his mask of madness, which is removed only briefly before Angelica and he enjoy a private conversation.

When Valentine is planning the marriage in disguise with Mrs. Frail, he shows sanity in his asides to Jeremy and Scandal. The speech he makes to Scandal when Angelica and Tattle arrive shows both his sanity and his careful planning of every detail. He says, "Get away all the company but Angelica, that I may discover my design to her" (IV. ii. 386-388). As Scandal tells him of Tattle's attempt to flirt with Angelica, the audience has an opportunity to observe Valentine's ability to adjust quickly and to plan for any situation that may present itself. In this instance, Valentine develops a plan, with the help of Scandal and Jeremy, by which he hopes to marry Mrs. Frail to Tattle, a plan that seems merely a device to eliminate the two characters from the major love plot.

The next period of sanity for Valentine occurs when he is alone with Angelica. Valentine faces the difficult task of convincing Angelica that he is truly sane, a task that Angelica does not make easy for him. She has guessed that Valentine's insanity is merely a pose and is determined to make his role as difficult as she possibly can. Trying to overcome her refusal to accept his sanity, Valentine explains,

You see what disguises love makes us put on:
 gods have been in counterfeited shapes for the
 same reason; and the divine part of me, my
 mind, has worn this mask of madness, and this
 motley livery only as the slave of love and
 menial creature of your beauty. (IV. ii. 509-516)

In this speech Valentine is declaring that his love for Angelica has caused him to commit the deed of pretending to be mad much as the gods of classical mythology pretended madness to escape the consequences of their actions or to win the person they loved; Valentine states that he is a slave who waits only for Angelica's command. Angelica, carrying out her plan with vigor, refuses to admit that she knows that Valentine is sane. Valentine becomes annoyed and almost distraught. He pleads: "Nay, faith, now let us understand one another, hypocrisy apart. The comedy draws toward an end, and let us think of leaving acting, and be ourselves . . . " (IV. ii. 519-522). His plan has gone against him.

When Angelica commiserates for him on the failure of his plans, Valentine denies vehemently that there has been any failure. According to what he believes, he has avoided signing the deed of conveyance and has provided himself with time to persuade Sir Sampson to forgive him, the major purposes of the plan. This statement does little to increase Angelica's sympathy for him; she accuses Valentine of thinking more of money than he thinks of her. Once more Valentine is on the defensive; his wit appears inferior to Angelica's,

and he is hampered by his emotions. He feels that he must convince her that his efforts to retain his inheritance have been primarily for the purpose of making himself Angelica's financial equal. This speech places Valentine in a position of thinking Angelica mercenary, or so she claims. Nothing that Valentine says seems to satisfy his sweetheart; she can find an opening for a barbed remark in every statement that Valentine makes.

Finally, Valentine is forced to take one last drastic measure to convince Angelica of his sanity; he calls for his faithful servant Jeremy. Jeremy, who does not realize that Valentine is trying to convince Angelica that he is sane, will not admit this fact. He, instead, begins to support the fact that Valentine is truly mad. Even harsh words such as "Sirrah, you lie"¹ and "sot, can't you comprehend?"² serve no definite purpose except to cause Valentine to get more and more involved. A beating does Jeremy no good; still he claims his master is mad. Because Angelica's attitude is rather flippant, Valentine grows bitter and declares, "I'm very glad that I can move your mirth, though not your compassion" (IV. ii. 584-585). Jeremy, who has been thoroughly confused in regard to Valentine's state of mind, enters again to ask if Valentine plans to feign madness for his father or not; the question is one to which Valentine answers a resounding "Yes!" Jeremy exits, once more thoroughly

¹IV, ii. 561.

²IV. ii. 567.

confused, more confused than when he entered. The audience watching such confusion would be undoubtedly amused. At this point in the action, the sane Valentine seems almost more insane in his behavior and his speech than the coldly calculating mad Valentine does. Frustration seems to be Valentine's primary diet; he cannot succeed in anything that he tries. Angelica prepares to make her departure. Valentine is no better off than he was before she came; he still does not know whether his sweetheart loves him or not. After her departure, Valentine consoles himself with this thought: "From a riddle you can expect nothing but a riddle. There's my instruction and the moral of my lesson" (IV. ii. 624-626). He is telling himself that Angelica's feelings will remain a mystery because Angelica herself is a mystery, a fact with which many critics will agree, and he says that he should have known better than to try to fool her.

Jeremy, who has done much to contribute to the utter confusion of the scene, reenters and expresses a hope that Valentine and Angelica have come to an understanding. This ill-timed statement is the last piece of irony that Valentine's wounded emotions can take without explosion. He exclaims:

Understood! She is harder to be understood than a piece of Egyptian antiquity, or an Irish manuscript; you may pore till you spoil your eyes and not improve your knowledge. (IV. ii. 630-634)

The reference to Egyptian relics shows that scholars had spent time trying to understand these relics but had not been successful.¹ During the Restoration period, Gaelic, the language still spoken by the Irish people, still was used frequently in written form; the English, who had little desire to learn a language other than English or French, could not understand these Gaelic manuscripts; even the Englishmen who wished to learn Gaelic discovered that the language was very difficult, almost impossible to learn. By reference to these incomprehensible items, Valentine is stating that Angelica is impossible to understand, a fact with which the audience will readily agree. Jeremy, who feels that he has contributed to Valentine's problems, tries to help his master find a method of understanding his sweetheart. To his suggestion that Valentine should try to read Angelica's emotions from back to front, Valentine disagrees. Valentine believes that there is not a pattern in her emotions, that by no method can she be understood. He declares,

She is a medal without a reverse or inscription,
for indifference has both sides alike. Yet she
does not seem to hate me, I will pursue her and
know her if it be possible in spite of my
satirical friend, Scandal, who says

¹ See "Rosetta," Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1960 ed. XIX, 556. It was not until the discovery of the Rosetta Stone during Napoleon's Egyptian campaign that scholars were given a clue to the hieroglyphics that the Egyptians used for writing and thus were able to understand the significance of many of the items.

The women are like tricks by sleight of hand,
Which, to admire, we should not understand.
(IV. ii. 639-649)

Discouraged though he may be by his continual failures,
Valentine does not plan to give up hope.

The elements within these sane speeches by Valentine are not very different from those within his mad speeches. There are questions, "What bad effects? --what's too late?" (IV. ii. 529-530), and exclamations, "Sirrah, you lie!" (IV. ii. 561). The adjectives used in these speeches are as well chosen as those used within the madman speeches; they too enliven the nouns they modify. Instead of mere "shapes," Valentine refers to "counterfeited shapes";¹ "livery" is a word that is described by the use of the adjective "motley livery."² "Antiquity" is used as a specific type of relic, an "Egyptian antiquity."³ There are also figures of speech, such as, the metaphor, "She is a medal without a reverse or inscription . . ."⁴ and the simile, "women are like tricks by sleight of hand" (IV. ii. 648).

Congreve also shows other examples of the prepositional phrase which he used with such distinction in the madman speeches. The adjectival prepositional phrases are

¹IV. ii. 511.

²IV. ii. 514.

³IV. ii. 631.

⁴IV. ii. 642-643.

combined with the words "mask," "slave," and "creature" to create such expressive phrases as "mask of madness,"¹ "slave of love,"² and "menial creature of your beauty."³ These phrases form the description that is present in a speech which Valentine makes to Angelica and in which he tells her the reason for his madness. Because of the type of speeches, the subject of the speeches, and the total number of sane speeches, the adverbial prepositional phrase is less in evidence in this portion of the act than it is in the mad speeches that Valentine makes; in the sane speeches, the nouns seem dominant whereas the verbs with their distinctive modifiers seem to dominate in the mad speeches.

The dependent clause also appears in a lesser light in the sane speeches. Simplicity, although not always attained, seems to be the goal. However, there are some dependent clauses that are worth observation and study; an example of one of these is "since I thought I wanted more than love to make me worthy of you" (IV. ii. 544-545). Here Valentine is trying to explain himself out of a complicated situation; here a complicated structure is needed.

The sentence patterns are much the same as those used in Valentine's mad speeches. The difference lies not in the

¹IV. ii. 514.

²IV. ii. 515.

³IV. ii. 515-516.

actual structure but in the ideas that the structure is trying to convey. In his sane speeches, Valentine becomes confused; therefore his sentence structure becomes confused.

The actual difference between these two types of speeches is found in the different subjects that are discussed and in the different tones of voice that Valentine uses. Within his mad speeches Valentine makes comments about his age in a cold and organized manner; he has definitely planned his performance as a madman very carefully; his philosophical attitude fits his calculated manner. In his sane speeches, he is on the defensive; he is confused; and the primary subject about which he talks is his love for Angelica, whom he wishes to convince of his sincerity of emotion. The mad speeches seem serious, cold, and calculated while the sane speeches reflect the attitude of fear behind the mask of light-heartedness. The tone is the reverse of what most people would expect of a comparison of mad and sane speeches.

As the act draws to a close, Valentine's performance as a madman loses its effectiveness. Outside forces which will transform this dashing beau from a calculating individual into a disillusioned lover have been placed in motion by Angelica. Poor Valentine, the goddess of Fortune never seems to smile in his direction.

CHAPTER FOUR

VALENTINE, THE LOVER

Valentine Legend, the hero of Love for Love, has appeared in two primary roles, that of a Restoration man of the world and that of a madman. In the last act of the play, he appears in yet another role, the role of a lover whose sweetheart has denied him and of a lover whose sweetheart has accepted his love and his heart in return for her own.

What outside forces have brought about the role as a disillusioned lover? What momentous happening had caused a change in Valentine's life? To understand the change, one must carefully review the plot. Throughout the action, the satirical comments, and the pretense, there has been only one underlying reason for Valentine's behavior; this reason is his overwhelming love for Angelica, a love that appears remarkably constant in an era when infidelity is the common mode. Love starts the chain of events involving Valentine in a complex plot. The fact that Angelica refuses to tell him whether or not she returns his love causes Valentine to spend his money recklessly; the reckless spending leads him into debt. Because he is so deeply in debt, he is forced to remain in confinement in

his lodging to prevent himself from being placed in debtor's prison. While he is confined by his creditors, he cannot see Angelica to plead for her love; this fact causes him to become desperate. His desperate desire to see Angelica is the primary reason for his acceptance of the terms that his father has offered him in return for the payment of his debts. Because he has agreed to renounce his inheritance in favor of his brother Ben yet does not want to, Valentine pretends madness, a device that is also supposed to help Valentine to discover whether or not Angelica truly loves him. Angelica, who by wise deductions has learned that the madness is only feigned, decides to punish her lover and sets her plans in motion. It is within Act V that Congreve reveals these plans to the audience; also within this act, Congreve brings all the loose threads of his plot together; everything comes to its deserved conclusion. Sir Sampson, who not only has treated his sons harshly, even cruelly, but also has planned a marriage for himself with Angelica, is made to appear ridiculous. The marriage in disguise that was proposed in Act IV occurs with Mrs. Frail and Tattle taking the roles of the bride and the groom. Foresight, who has been made a laughing stock throughout the play, has an opportunity to laugh at someone other than himself, Sir Sampson to be exact. Scandal, whose opinion of women in general is low, finds himself forced to admit that some women care for something other than money and position.

And, finally, Valentine receives what Angelica believes he so richly deserves, her own lovely self.

The Valentine that first appears in Act V is different from the one who appeared earlier; no longer is he happy or light-hearted; he no longer enjoys playing with words. This change has been brought about by the news that Angelica is to become the wife of his father. What Valentine does not know is that the scheme is a means that Angelica has developed to punish him for pretending madness. Unknown to either Sir Sampson or Valentine, the scheme is also a means of providing a suitable punishment for Sir Sampson, who, Angelica believes, has committed crimes that are far worse than those devised by Valentine.

Before the audience is given a chance to observe the change in Valentine, other characters within the play set the stage for his entrance. The audience learns that Sir Sampson, far from having Valentine assign his inheritance to his brother, has ordered Buckram to prepare a document by which he, Sir Sampson, can dispose of his own estate at his own discretion; by the use of this plan Sir Sampson hopes to evade the laws of entail that so carefully guard the rights of the eldest son. This, Sir Sampson believes, is a necessary agreement brought about by his future marriage to Angelica. Ben is the one who informs Foresight and his household of the coming marriage, a marriage that is regarded by all who know of it with loathing. Scandal, who was present

when the news was told and who is still completely aghast, leaves to tell Valentine the news, news that he knows will cause heartbreak and despair. With the return of Tattle and Mrs. Frail, united at last in the bonds of unwanted matrimony, and with the entrance of Angelica and Sir Sampson, all the major characters except Valentine and his confidants are assembled. It is Ben who announces his brother Valentine to the group. "The madman," he declares when he sees Valentine.

Here the audience is given an opportunity to see what happens when a man loses all his hope for happiness; he simply quits making an effort to succeed. In the first speech that he makes after his entrance into the scene, Valentine exhibits this attitude through both the tone and the content of his speech. His voice sounds flat and disgusted, almost lifeless, as he says, "No here's the fool; and if the occasion be, I'll give it under my hands."¹ Notice that he calls himself a fool, one who has acted in a ridiculous manner. He is so very much disgusted that he allows his feeling for Angelica to make him act ridiculous, and he is willing, if there is a need, to sign a paper affirming his stupidity. The structure of the speech is that of a compound-complex sentence, a sentence that allows a great amount of freedom of expression without deleting any of the power that is present in the words of the speech.

¹V. i. 625-626.

Another way in which Valentine's depression can be seen is in his willingness and desire to admit his wrong and ask his father's pardon. He states, "Sir, I'm come to acknowledge my errors, and ask your pardon" (V. i. 629-630). There is no belligerence in his tone; there is nothing; there is no emotion of any kind; there is only a dull, flat statement of fact, a statement that reveals nothing of the pain that is coursing through Valentine. Valentine's statement, although not filled with emotions, shows an attitude of respect and a desire to reveal the truth. This statement, as honest and as sincere as it seems, Sir Sampson receives with cold sarcasm. He seems to care little for Valentine's feelings; the dignity that each individual needs in order to maintain self-respect means little to him. Sir Sampson wishes only to belittle his son before his former sweetheart. Perhaps, Sir Sampson is still uncertain of Angelica's feelings for him. Valentine's declaration that his madness was only a pretense, phrased as it is with Valentine admitting his guilt, only serves to infuriate Sir Sampson further. Valentine, not seeming to care what his father thinks, explains only a little: "I thought I had reasons. --But it was a poor contrivance; the effect has shown it as such" (V. i. 638-640). Again the depression that has been present before is the keynote to Valentine's tone. The entire structure of this passage is a combination of a

complex and a compound sentence. Motives are rarely simple facts and are seldom expressed in simple sentences. When Sir Sampson questions Valentine's right to try to avoid signing the deed of conveyance, Valentine tells him, "Indeed, I thought, sir, when the father endeavored to undo the son, it was a reasonable return of nature" (V. i. 644-646). The tone of this speech is sharp and biting; here Valentine tells his father that the pretense of madness was a direct outgrowth of Sir Sampson's attempt to force Valentine to renounce his inheritance; the harsh conditions and harsh treatment at the hands of Sir Sampson were the items that caused Valentine to seek some type of revenge. The respect that once was present in Valentine's speeches is absent now. Again the structure is a complicated one, a complex sentence that makes use of both an adverb clause that explains the cause of the action and a noun clause that identifies the action itself.

The bickering between the father and the son continues. Sir Sampson wants Valentine to sign the deed of conveyance right away, but Valentine wishes only to speak to Angelica; he wishes to ask her just one question, "Is she truly planning to marry Sir Sampson?" Valentine's desire is blocked by his proud and boasting father, who, when he tells Valentine of the approaching marriage, is enjoying the chance he has to make his son miserable. This bickering causes Valentine to reply: "I have heard as much, sir, but I would have it from her own mouth" (V. i. 656-657). The audience

realizes that Valentine has decided that he will not believe what he has heard until Angelica herself admits to the fact. He is reacting much like someone who has heard something terrible about a close friend; he will not believe what he has heard until he has gathered his own evidence.

Sir Sampson, as can be expected of such a perverse individual, takes this refusal as a personal affront and uses it as an occasion for rebuking Valentine further, but he finally tells Angelica to speak to his wayward son so that Valentine will sign the deed of conveyance. Of course, Sir Sampson has also realized that what Angelica is going to say to Valentine will be another means of reducing his once proud son to despair. The answer that Angelica gives Valentine is one that is guaranteed to inflict pain:

'Tis true, you have a great while pretended love to me. Nay, what if you were sincere; still you must pardon me if I think my own inclinations have a better right to dispose of my person than yours. (V. i. 669-674)

Notice that Angelica still will not admit that Valentine's love for her is genuine; however, she states that even if it were, he has no rights as far as her life and the disposition of her love are concerned. Although Angelica has been coy in other places in Love for Love, this is the first major instance in actual cruelty; here her words seem to have been chosen for one purpose, to cause pain to Valentine. This aspect of Angelica's personality is not a pleasing one.

This speech with its firm and harsh tone is the final defeat for Valentine. The minute hope that he has kept alive by sheer force of will has been destroyed; his life has lost its meaning. It is at this point in the action that Valentine finally agrees to sign the deed of conveyance, an action which will definitely destroy all of the efforts he has put forth in Acts III and IV to preserve his inheritance and to outwit his father. Scandal, who has been a party to all the schemes and who has been a force in carrying out the work that was involved in fulfilling these plans that were designed to protect the inheritance, is horrified to think that all his work has been for nothing. He exclaims, "'Sdeath, you are not mad indeed, to ruin yourself?" (V. i. 682-683). He is beginning to believe that the insanity that Valentine pretended was not just a pretense. "What sane individual would work so hard for something and then throw it away in the next instant?" Scandal is saying. In his life, love is far less important than money or property. His view as to the importance of women is that women are nothing to make a man lose his head. Infidelity, not fidelity, is Scandal's creed; therefore, Valentine's actions seem incomprehensible to him.

Valentine, however, has an answer, a direct one that expresses his attitude toward the inheritance and his love

for Angelica. His tone is somber and melancholy as he states:

I have been disappointed of my only hope, and he that loses hope may part with anything. I never valued fortune but as it was subservient to my pleasure, and my only pleasure was to please this lady. I have made many vain attempts, and find at last that nothing but my ruin can effect it; which for that reason I will sign to." (V. i. 684-691)

Congreve, in this speech, has expressed several ideas in balanced structure, ideas that explain the reason for Valentine's actions. The loss of hope causes Valentine to have an "I-don't-care" attitude; his fortune, or lack of it, means little to Valentine now because the only reason that he wanted it was that it would be a means of pleasing Angelica; and now that Angelica is lost to him, he cares nothing whatsoever about the inheritance. Because he believes that Angelica wishes him to sign the document, he will sign it. Once again Congreve has admirably used cause and effect, the ruling principle of the plot of the play. A careful look at Valentine's speech reveals an interesting fact: although Valentine now knows that Angelica is truly promised to his father, his love is not dead; it remains as steadfast and as true as ever. Valentine only asks to serve his love, although that love has renounced him. Valentine's love for Angelica is deep and true; it is a lasting one that even despair and denial cannot destroy. As a symbol of his

love, Valentine proceeds to sign the deed of conveyance, an action which he believes will make Angelica happy. As in most of his speeches that deal with the complex emotion of love, the sentence structure is complicated; the dependent clauses, which are frequent, contribute specific details to the bare essentials of the sentences.

This speech marks a turning point in the act. Valentine's role as a disillusioned lover, like his previous roles, has served its purpose, and Valentine is now ready to discard them. At this point in the action, Angelica seemingly does a complete reversal. The audience's first clue as to what is happening occurs when Angelica, in an aside, states in reply to Valentine's speech, "Generous Valentine" (V. i. 693). At first this statement seems almost confused for Angelica has very recently implied that Valentine means nothing to her; her motives and actions are not clearly understandable. The final revelation of her love for Valentine comes when she destroys the promissory note which Valentine has signed, thus cancelling any fulfillment of the terms of that agreement that Valentine might be expected to make. Valentine is so astonished by the turn of events that he can only say, "Between pleasure and amazement I am lost. --But on my knees I take the blessing" (V. i. 709-711). Here his emotions are too strong to be expressed in

a complicated manner; the sentences are simple and so are his ideas; he is happy that Angelica loves him, and he is humble in his love. He does not understand the reversal of the roles, but he is not going to question the fact that this has happened. Happiness is the theme of all of Valentine's speeches within the latter part of the act. If Valentine's happiness could be made any greater, it is intensified by Angelica's speech to Sir Sampson in which she tells him that his punishment is what he deserves for being such a bad father. This idea is one that Valentine has been trying to convey, without success, since the beginning of the play. Angelica, however, cuts through the involved phrases and makes a direct statement; plain words for her are the best.

Valentine almost sings as he says, "If my happiness could receive addition, this kind of surprise would make it double" (V. i. 729-731). He can think of no greater happiness that he can have. He has Angelica, his father has nothing, and his inheritance is safe. His tone of voice is again light; there is a glow that surrounds his words; love fills his very being.

Tattle, who has been a witness to this happiness and who is very unhappy because he was tricked into marriage, speaks of this happy state very satirically. This speech

gives Valentine an opportunity to say, "Tattle, . . . you would have interposed between me and Heaven; but Providence laid purgatory in your way:—you have but justice" (V. i. 747-750). Here Valentine compares his love for Angelica and her love for him to heaven; because Angelica returns his love, Valentine believes himself to be in a heaven of joy. Because Tattle dared to attempt to destroy this idea of heaven, he is condemned to suffer in less than heaven but not in hell, in purgatory to be exact, until his sins have been absolved; an occurrence which will not be soon in happening for, unwanted as the marriage was to Mrs. Frail, it is still a marriage, a semblance of respectability. Each individual who has tried to come between Valentine and Angelica has been punished in some way.

Valentine's happiness grows and grows until it seems to fill him with joy; he and Angelica discuss the depths of the love that they have for each other. Only when he ceases to love enough will Angelica seem to love too much, or so Valentine declares. His speech seems to imply that this disaster will never occur: "Therefore I yield my body as your prisoner, and make your best on 't" (V. i. 775-777). Thus Valentine submits his life and happiness to Angelica's

mercy; she will be the ruling factor in everything that he does.

Angelica's words are the final words in the actions of the play, and they are used to explain what the play has been about. She says, "The miracle today is, that we find a lover true: not that a woman's kind" (V. i. 804-805). The key phrase is "A lover true," a phrase that tells the audience that, in an age that makes sport of love and marriage, it is unusual to find a lover who makes fidelity his ruling principle.

In all his roles, Valentine has been philosophical and determined. He has had only one major thought, to win Angelica, a reward which he finally receives. His tone has varied with the content of his speeches from the very light and gay to a very somber and dark one. His structure has been suited to his content, and the language that Valentine has used has been completely suited to his character. He is, without a doubt, a very well constructed character, one who definitely fits the description that Congreve gave of him, "The character is a mixed Character; his faults are fewer than his good qualities."¹

¹Congreve, as quoted by Gosse, p. 69.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

This study of Valentine's voices has shown that there is a definite difference between the sane voice and the mad voice of Valentine. This difference results primarily from the difference in the content of the two types of speeches. In the sane speeches, Valentine discusses his affair of the heart and the life of the fashionable world. His mad speeches are satiric denunciations of the common practices of the times. The purpose of Valentine's speeches during his periods of sanity was different from that during his periods of feigned madness. In the first he was trying to convince Angelica and the world of his love for her, and in the latter he was trying to convince the world of his madness. Although the structure of the two types of speeches is similar, the tone is not. Each type of speech is dominated by a tone especially suited to the content and the audience of that speech. Valentine's voices provide interesting information about the life of the time.

Although this study has been concerned with only the voices of Valentine, there are other voices that could

be studied. The women, the young men of fashion, the old men of fashion, and the servants and commoners are some of the groups whose voice-patterns are distinctive.

Within the group of women in the play, there are four major characters: Angelica, who is virtuous because she wants to be; Mrs. Foresight, who amuses herself by making a cuckold of her husband; Mrs. Frail, who enjoys life by relaxing her morals; and Miss Prue, more a girl than a woman, who is virtuous only because she has been sheltered and reared away from the world of fashion. These distinct characters have distinct voices.

The voices of Mrs. Foresight and Mrs. Frail are similar because the two women are basically the same type; they are both well-bred women of the world whose morals are very easy. The differences that are noticeable are due to the differences in their stations in life. Mrs. Foresight, a married woman, has a position of respectability even though she may not live up to it. She can do and say immoral things with little regard for what the world will think of her. Her voice is that of a woman of few morals who enjoys flirtations with the beaus of the era. Her immorality and her flirtatious ways are to be seen especially when she speaks to Scandal:

Mrs. Fore. And so you think we are free for one another?

Scan. Yes, faith, I think so; I love to speak my mind.

Mrs. Fore. Why, then I'll speak my mind.--
 Now, as to this affair between you and me.
 Here you make love to me; why, I'll confess,
 it does not displease me. Your person is
 well enough, and your understanding is not
 amiss. (III. ii. 813-822)

Her flirtatious voice does not attempt to hide her enjoyment of the situation as she announces to Scandal, "Well, I won't go to bed to my husband tonight, because I'll retire to my own chamber and think of what you have said" (III. ii. 890-893). When Ben's plans for a jolly evening seem to interfere with her own amusement, she exclaims upon the lateness of the hour, declares that she must go to bed; and, in a last statement of gross immorality, she tells Scandal, "Mr. Scandal, you had best go to bed and dream too" (III. ii. 961-962). Mrs. Frail, who is quite similar to her sister, explains in a scheming voice the difference in their situations:

You have a rich husband, and are provided for;
 I am at a loss, and have not great stock
 either of fortune or reputation and therefore
 must look sharply about me. (II. i. 619-623)

She is a scheming minx of a woman, one who is willing to do anything from which she will profit. Her scheming and her immorality are two aspects of her personality that can be seen in her speech. She does not hesitate when an opportunity presents itself; when she discovers Sir Sampson's plan for Valentine and Ben, she says:

Sir Sampson has a son that is expected to-night, and by the account of him I have heard of his education, can be no conjurer. The estate you know is to be made over to him--now if I could wheedle him, sister, ha? You understand me.
(II. i. 623-628)

Besides the schemer and the well-established woman of the world, there is within the play a young person, Miss Prue, fresh from the country, a country hoyden and the first of her type to appear on the stage.¹ She is ignorant of the ways of the fashionable world, but she is eager to learn them. Miss Prue is innocent but only because she has been carefully protected; her character shows a fondness for the dalliance that she has observed in the fashionable world around her. After acquiring some social polish, she will more than likely be a counterpart for Mrs. Foresight and Mrs. Frail. Her voice reflects her exuberance, her lack of town polish, and her eagerness to learn city manners and to be courted. When she is first introduced to perfume, her ignorance and her protected upbringing can be heard in her voice as she gushes:

Smell, cousin; he Mr. Tattle says he'll give me something that will make my smocks smell this way. --Is not it pure?--It's better than lavender, mun. I'm resolved I won't let nurse put any more lavender among my smocks--Ha, cousin? (II. i. 667-672)

Her eagerness to learn of love and her ignorance of love affairs are two aspects which her voice reveals when Tattle

¹Taylor, 71.

asks to teach her about love. She replies as if she had been asked if she wished a drink of water: "Yes, if you please. . . . Well, and how will you make love to me? Come I long to have you begin. Must I make love too? You must tell me how" (II. i. 747, 754-756). This same country girl speaks with a voice that is direct when she tells Ben, the man her father intends her to marry, "I don't know what to say to you, nor I don't care to speak with you at all" (III. ii. 425-426). Although she is not one of the foremost women characters in the play, Miss Prue does have a voice that offers a wide range of contrasts that can be studied.

After the country quality of Miss Prue's tongue and the jaded voices of Mrs. Foresight and Mrs. Frail, it is refreshing to consider the voice of Angelica, the heroine of the play. She, unlike most of the other women in the play, possesses several voices. Some of these are the voice in which she speaks to Sir Sampson, the one for Foresight, another for Valentine and the other Restoration rakes, and still another for Valentine, the man she loves. For Sir Sampson Angelica uses a voice which is filled with flattery and bored comments on marriage. Her voice drips with flattery as she says, "You're an absolute courtier, Sir Sampson" (V. i. 24-25). When she hopes to enlist his aid in her plan to teach Valentine a well-deserved lesson, Angelica tells Sir Sampson:

She that marries a fool, Sir Sampson, commits her honesty or understanding to the censure of the world; and she that marries a very witty man submits both to the severity and insolent conduct of her husband. (V. i. 90-95)

This voice disappears when, speaking to Foresight the amateur astrologer, her uncle, she uses a voice that is sharply satirical, one that contains references to astrology, to sex, and to witchcraft. She tells Foresight, "You know my aunt is a little retrograde (as you call it) in her nature. Uncle, I'm afraid you are not lord of the ascendant, ha! ha! ha!" (II. i. 86-89). When Foresight dares to disagree with what she has planned, Angelica uses a mocking voice to threaten him; she says, "I'll indict you for a wizard" (II. i. 112). Again Angelica's voice changes when her audience changes. In a group with the other wits in the play, Valentine and Scandal, her sharp wit and quick mind can be heard in the swift interchange of ideas. Here Angelica can shine; here she attains the glory which Congreve created for her. Her voice is sharp and satirical and her comments are biting, especially those to Valentine. She and Scandal match wits, and neither declares the other a victor;

Ang. You mistake indifference for uncertainty;
I never had concern enough to ask myself the
question.

Scan. Nor good nature enough to answer him that
did ask you; I'll say that for you, madam.

Ang. What, are you setting up for good nature?

Scan. Only for the affectation of it, as the
women do for ill nature.

Ang. Persuade your friend that it is all
affectation. (III. ii. 6-17)

Angelica's last voice, and the one that seems the most unnatural for her, is the one she uses in Act V when she admits her love for Valentine. There has been little basis for the major change from harshness to softness in her voice. Where a short time before satire had its sting, now her voice is dominated by love. This voice is a happy one, and one that needs little explanation; she says, "I have done dissembling now, Valentine; and if that coldness which I have always worn before you, should turn to an extreme fondness, you must not suspect it" (V. i. 760-764).

In addition to the voices of the women within the play, there also exist the voices of the young men of fashion other than Valentine—the voices of Scandal and Tattle and of the sailor Ben. Scandal, an acknowledged man about town, has a reputation for slashing reputations. To ensure the successful delivery of the qualities of this character, Congreve assigned to him the bitter, dagger-sharp voice of a wit. Even when he is making love, he retains this sharpness and intensity. In the first act the audience is given an excellent opportunity to hear this slashing, witty voice at work when Scandal denounces writing as a profession. He scornfully states:

Rail? at whom? the whole world? Impotent and vain! Who would die a martyr to sense in a country where the religion is folly? You may stand at bay for a while; but when the full cry is against you, you won't have fair play for your life. If you can't be fairly run down by the hounds, you will be treacherously

shot by the huntsmen. No, turn pimp, flatterer, quack, lawyer, parson, be chaplain to an atheist, or stallion to an old woman, anything but poet. A modern poet is worse, more servile, timorous, and fawning, than any I have named--without you could retrieve the ancient honors of the name, recall the stage of Athens, and be allowed the force of open honest satire. (I. i. 176-192)

Tattle serves as a perfect foil for Scandal; he is a would-be wit rather than a natural wit. His conversations are light and airy, and they rarely serve any purpose but to amuse. His voice is that of a man of little actual wit whose main interest is in the art of making elegant love. Because of this interest that Tattle has, the audience is presented a clear picture of the rules by which the Restoration fashionables conducted their affairs of the heart. Notice that Tattle takes these rules seriously; there is little laughter or amusement in his voice when he is teaching Miss Prue to make love. He says:

Yes, if you'd be well-bred; all well-bred persons lie. Besides, you are a woman; you must never speak what you think. Your words must contradict your thoughts, but your actions may contradict your words. So, when I ask you if you can love me, you must say no, but you must love me too. If I tell you you are handsome, you must deny it and say I flatter you. But you must think yourself more charming than I speak you, and like me for the beauty which I say you have, as much as if I had it myself. If I ask you to kiss me, you must be angry, but you must not refuse me. If I ask you for more, you must be more angry--but more complying; and as soon as ever I make you say you'll cry out, you must be sure to hold your tongue. (II. i. 771-788)

Ben, the seagoing brother of Valentine, has an unusual voice, the voice of a sailor who has little interest in things of the land. His frank speeches are filled with nautical terms; when he speaks "the salt tang of the sea and the sharp spray come and go with him."¹ Ben makes use of this frankness and the nautical quality of his voice when he tells Mrs. Frail:

Marry, and I should like such a handsome gentlewoman for a bedfellow, hugely; how say you, mistress, would you like going to sea? Miss, you're a tight vessel! and well rigged, an you were but as well manned. (III. ii. 361-366)

Ben's nautical voice, like the voice of Miss Prue, adds contrast to the voices of the fashionable characters of the play.

The old men of fashion, Sir Sampson and Foresight, provide an interesting contrast to the younger men in the play. Both Sir Sampson and Foresight possess distinctive voices. Sir Sampson possesses the voice of an old rake, one who enjoys the pleasure of elegant dalliance, while Foresight has a voice which is filled with references to his usual pastime, astrology. These voices can be observed most clearly when the two characters are speaking to each other. Notice that Sir Sampson, who has traveled to many places, is laughing at Foresight; Foresight, whose sense

¹ Taylor, p. 75.

of humor is slight, is serious in his speech, especially in regard to astrology. They converse in the following manner:

Sir Sam. I tell you, I have travelled, old Fircu, and know the globe. I have seen the antipodes, where the sun rises at midnight and sets at noonday.

Fore. But I tell you, I have travelled, and travelled in the celestial spheres--know the signs and the planets, and their houses. Can judge of motions direct and retrograde, of sextiles, quadrates, trines and opposition, firey trigons and aquatical trigons. Know whether life shall be long or short, happy or unhappy, whether diseases are curable or incurable; if journeys shall be prosperous, undertakings successful, or goods stolen recovered; I know--

Sir Sam. I know the length of the Emperor of China's foot; have kissed the Great Mogul's slipper, and rid a-hunting upon an elephant with the Cham of Tartary.--Body o'me, I have made a cuckold of a king, and the present majesty of Bantam is the issue of these loins.

Fore. I know when travellers lie or speak truth, when they don't know it themselves.

Sir Sam. I have known an astrologer made a cuckold in the twinkling of a star; and seen a conjurer that could not keep the devil out of his wife's circle. (II. i. 256-284)

These two older men deserve each other's company; both are very foolish and pompous, qualities they reveal through their voices.

Of the servants and the commoners in the play, only one, Jeremy, has enough dialogue to make possible a true study of his voice. His voice is much like that of his master, for he is interested in the same ideas that his

master has. This is not to say that Jeremy is only an echo of Valentine's ideas and thoughts. He has ideas and thoughts of his own, sometimes in direct opposition to those of his master, and he does not hesitate to speak them, once he has an opportunity to do so. His voice is the voice of an educated commoner, one who can look with amusement on the foibles of the world of fashion. Through Jeremy the audience is given an idea of what the commoners thought of the fashionable world.

Thus the voices of characters subordinate to Valentine, the hero, lend variety and entertainment to Congreve's comedy. In them, a student has an opportunity to continue a study such as I have made of Valentine's voices.

PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCES OF
LOVE FOR LOVE IN THE
 TWENTIETH CENTURY

DATE	PLACE	GROUP	THEATRE
1917	London	Stage Society	Aldwych Theatre
1921	Hammersmith, London	Phoenix Society	Lyric Theatre
1924	Oxford	Oxford Repertory Company	New Theatre
1925	New York	Provincetown Players	Greenwich Village Theatre
1934	London	Sadler's Wells Company	Sadler's Wells Theatre
1936	Westport, Connecticut	Westport Country Playhouse Company	Westport Country Playhouse
1940	New York	Players' Club	Hudson Theatre
1943	London	London Repertory Company	Phoenix Theatre

DATE	PLACE	GROUP	THEATRE
1944	London	London Repertory Company	Haymarket Theatre
1947	New York	London Repertory Company	Royale Theatre
1947	Ottawa	London Repertory Company	

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, Henry Hitch, and Baxter Hathaway, eds. Dramatic Essays of the Neoclassical Age. New York: Columbia University Press, 1950.
- Aiken, Janet Rankin. English--Present and Past. New York: Ronald Press Co., 1930.
- Archer, William. "The Comedies of Congreve." Forum, XLIII (March-April, 1910), 276-282, 343-346.
- _____. "War Plays in London." Nation, CIV (May 24, 1917), 640.
- Avery, Emmett L. Congreve's Plays on the Eighteenth Century Stage. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1951.
- Baugh, Albert. The History of the English Language. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1935.
- Beyer, William. "The State of the Theatre: Drama and Music Drama." School and Society, LXVI (June 26, 1947), 65-66.
- Brown, John Mason. "Seeing Things: Utopia of Gallantry." Saturday Review of Literature, XXX (June 14, 1947), 20-22.
- Burton, Kathleen M. Passmore. Restoration Literature. London: Hutchinson University Library, 1958.
- Canby, Henry Seidel. "Congreve as a Romanticist." PMLA, XXXI (March 1916), 1-22.
- Cerf, Bennett A., and D. S. Klopfer, eds. Twelve Famous Plays of the Restoration and Eighteenth Century. The Modern Library. New York: Random House, 1932.
- Clark, Barrett H. "The Circus and Other Things on Broadway." Drama, XV (May, 1925), 171.

- Congreve, William. The Comedies of William Congreve, ed. Norman Marshall. London: John Lehmann, 1948.
- _____. Love for Love. Types of English Drama: 1660-1780, ed. David Harrison Stevens. New York: Ginn and Company, 1923.
- _____. William Congreve, ed. Alexander Ewald. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1903.
- "Congreve's Comedies: Speed, Stillness, and Meaning." The (London) Times Literary Supplement, September 25, 1937, pp. 681-682.
- "Congreve's Wit Merrily Blended in Connecticut Revival." Newsweek, VIII (July 11, 1936), 27.
- Cook, Albert. The Dark Voyage and the Golden Mean. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949.
- Curme, George O. Parts of Speech and Accidence. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1936.
- Dobrée, Bonamy. Restoration Comedy 1660-1720. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924.
- _____. Variety of Ways: Discussion on Six Authors. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1932.
- Dryden, John. "To My Dear Friend Mr. Congreve, on his Comedy Called 'The Double Dealer.'" The Double Dealer, The Comedies of William Congreve, ed. Norman Marshall. London: John Lehmann, 1948.
- Ellehague, Martin. English Restoration Drama. Copenhagen: Levin and Munksgaard Publishers, 1933.
- Elwin, Malcom. The Playgoer's Handbook to Restoration Drama. London: Jonathan Cape, 1928.
- Fujimura, Thomas H. The Restoration Comedy of Wit. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952.
- Gassner, John. "The Theatre Arts." Forum, CVIII (August, 1947), 123-127.
- Gibbs, Anthony. Restoration Comedy. London: Hutchison and Company, 1939.
- Gielgud, John. "Staging Love for Love." Theatre Arts, XXVII (November 1943), 632, 662-668.

- Gosse, Edmund. Life of William Congreve. Rev. ed.
New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924.
- Hamilton, Edith. Mythology. New York:
New American Library, 1959.
- Hazlitt, William. "Lecture IV: On Wycherley, Congreve,
Vanbrugh, and Farquhar." Lectures on the English
Comic Writers with Miscellaneous Essays.
New York: E. P. Dutton, 1910.
- Hexon, Jerome C., and I. Colodny. Word Ways.
New York: American Book Co., 1939.
- Hodges, John C. William Congreve the Man. New York:
Modern Language Association of America, 1941.
- Holland, Norman N. The First Modern Comedies: The
Significance of Etherege, Wycherley and Congreve.
Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959.
- "The Important Congreve." Newsweek, XXIX (June 9, 1947),
87.
- "Insanity." Encyclopaedia Britannica. 1964 ed.,
XII, 383-387.
- Johnson, Samuel. "Congreve." Lives of the English
Poets. Vol. II. London: Oxford University Press,
1926.
- Kellner, Leon. Historical Outlines of English Syntax.
London: Macmillan and Company, 1924.
- Knight, G. Wilson. The Golden Labyrinth. New York:
W. W. Norton Company, 1962.
- Knowlson, James R. "The Idea of Gesture as a Universal
Language in the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries."
The Journal of the History of Ideas, XXVI
(1925), 495-508.
- Knonenberger, Louis. The Thread of Laughter.
New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1952.

- Krutch, Joseph Wood. Comedy and Conscience after the Restoration. New York: Columbia University Press, 1949.
- _____. "Drama." Nation, CLXIV (June 7, 1947), 691-692.
- _____. "Drama: Love Without Tenderness." Nation, CXX (April 15, 1925), 44.
- _____. "Drama: Naughty Sixteen-Nineties." Nation, CL (June 15, 1940), 739.
- Lamb, Charles. "On the Artificial Comedy of the Last Century." The Essays of Elia. London: London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1947.
- Lardner, John. "Further Benefactions by the Gielgud Company." New Yorker, XXIII (June 7, 1947), 55.
- Leonard, Sterling A. The Doctrine of Correctness in English Usage 1700-1800. New York: Russell and Russell, 1962.
- Littrell, Robert. "Love for Love." The New Republic, XLII (April 22, 1925), 237-238.
- Loftis, John. Comedy and Society from Congreve to Fielding. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1959.
- _____. The Politics of Drama in Augustan England. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.
- Lynch, Kathleen M. The Social Mode of Restoration Comedy. New York: Macmillan Company, 1926.
- "Mental Health." Encyclopaedia Britannica. 1964 ed., XV, 262-264.
- Meredith, George. An Essay on Comedy and the Uses of the Comic Spirit. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1918.
- Nathan, George Jean. "The Theatre." American Mercury, V (June 1925), 244.

- Nicoll, Allardyce. British Drama.
New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1925.
- _____. A History of Restoration Drama: 1660-1700.
Cambridge: University Press, 1928.
- "Old Play in Manhattan." Time, XXXV (June 17, 1940),
52.
- "Old Play in Manhattan." Time, XLIX (June 9, 1947), 54.
- Palmer, John. The Comedy of Manners.
New York: Russell and Russell, 1962.
- Perry, Henry Ten Eyck. The Comic Spirit in Restoration
Drama. New York: Russell and Russell, 1962.
- Potts, L. J. Comedy. London: Hutchinson's University
Library, 1948.
- Redfern, James. "The Theatre." Spectator, CLXX
(April 16, 1943), 359.
- _____. "The Theatre." Spectator, CLXXIII
(October 27, 1944), 383.
- Reed, Robert Rentoul, Jr. Bedlam on the Jacobian Stage.
Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952.
- The Restoration Stage, ed. John I. McCollum, Jr.
Research Series. Boston: Houghton Mifflin
Company, 1961.
- Review of Edmund Gosse's Life of William Congreve.
Athenaeum, II (November 17, 1888), 672.
- "Rosetta." Encyclopaedia Britannica. 1960 ed., XIX, 556.
- Sherman, Robert L. Drama Cyclopedia: A Bibliography of
Plays and Players to 1940. Chicago: Published
by the author, 1944.
- Smith, John Harrington. The Gay Couple in Restoration
Comedy. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948.
- Smith, Logan Pearsall. The English Language.
London: Oxford University Press, 1960.

- "The Stage and Screen." The Commonweal, XXXII
(June 14, 1940), 170.
- "The Stage and Screen." The Commonweal, XLVI
(June 13, 1947), 216.
- Summers, Montague. The Restoration Theatre.
New York: Macmillan Co., 1934.
- Taylor, D. Crane. William Congreve. New York:
Russell and Russell, 1963.
- Thackeray, William Makepeace. "Lecture the Second:
Congreve and Addison." The English Humorists of
the Eighteenth Century. New York: Harper and
Brothers, 1853.
- "The Theatre: The Phoenix Society in Love for Love."
Spectator, CXXVI (April 2, 1921), 428-429.
- Theatre World: Season 1947-1948, ed. Daniel Blum.
New York: Stuyvesant Press Corporation, 1948.
- Verschoyle, Derek. "The Theatre." The Spectator,
CLII (March 16, 1934), 407.
- Warfel, Harry R. Language: A Science of Human Behavior.
Cleveland: Howard Allen, 1962.
- Wedgwood, C. V. Seventeenth-Century English Literature.
New York: Oxford University Press, 1961.
- White, Richard Grant. Words and Their Uses, Past and
Present. New York: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1927.
- "William Congreve." The Cambridge History of English
Literature, ed. A. W. Ward and A. R. Waller.
Vol. VII: The Age of Dryden. Cambridge: At the
University Press, 1962.
- "William Congreve." The (London) Times Literary
Supplement, January 17, 1929, pp. 33-34.
- Young, Stark. "Theatre: Love for Love." New Republic,
CXVI (June 16, 1947), 31-32.