

Student Student
 ENG 439: Restoration Drama
 Annotated Bibliography
 29 May 2007

Annotated Bibliography

Bloom, Donald A. "Dwindling into Wifehood: The Romantic Power of the Witty Heroine in Shakespeare, Dryden, Congreve, and Austen." *Look Who's Laughing: Gender and Comedy*. Ed. Gail Finney. Langhorne, PA: Gordon and Breach, 1994.

Bredvold, Louis I. *The Intellectual Milieu of John Dryden*. Ann Arbor: The U of Michigan P, 1934.

Brown, Laura. "The Ideology of Restoration Poetic Form: John Dryden." *PMLA* 97 (1982): 395-407.

Canfield, Douglas. "The Ideology of Restoration Tragicomedy." *ELH* 51 (1984): 447- 64.

Coltharp, Duane. "Radical Royalism: Strategy and Ambivalence in Dryden's Tragicomedies." *Philological Quarterly*. 78:4 (1999): 417-438.

Coltharp sets out to define Dryden as a "radical royalist," a term coined to describe those writers who embodied the "intellectual heritage of the revolution" while still supporting the monarchy (417). After summarizing the straightforward analysis of Canfield, Klein Maguire and particularly McKeon, Coltharp branches out from their straightforward analysis. He claims that Dryden's plays lack a true low plot, speaking of the dual plots as "comic" and "heroic," with both involving the aristocracy and the court (418-419). Coltharp goes on to assert that this narrow setting allowed Dryden to represent revolutionary ideas and temper them at the same time, thus challenging and supporting the monarchy (419). He begins his argument with an analysis of the challenges to social convention represented by the "philosophical rakes" of the comic plot of *Marriage a la Mode*, and ultimately asserts the liberalism of the proviso scene while noting the tension between "contractualism" Dryden appears to advocate and the "patriarchalism" he "allegedly endorses" (420). He goes on to relate issues of patriarchy to the theories of Hobbes and Filmer, and then looks briefly at the "patriarchal presence" in several other of Dryden's plays, including *Secret Love*. He reads Dryden's "comic libertines" as serving, and ultimately upholding, the principles of patriarchy, even as they are often "violated by oppressive patriarchs". Coltharp then moves from consideration of the comic plots to that of the heroic plots. He connects the struggles with patriarchal obedience in the heroic plot of *Marriage a la Mode* to that of the comic characters, and claims that the ambivalence of Palmyra and Leonidas mirror the "ambivalence of English royalists after 1659" (424). He goes on to interrogate issues of female obedience and patriarchal tyranny in *Marriage a la Mode* and *Love Triumphant* before looking at the tensions between the subjection to a usurper and dynastic loyalty considered in Filmer's writing and very present in Dryden's plays. He reads Dryden's two plot tragicomedies as implicitly critical of tyranny by a usurper, particularly in the interdependence of the "comic rakes and heroic princes" - a relationship he sees as allowing the assertion of "freedom of individual desire against tyrannical power" (429). Coltharp goes

on to closely analyze the plots of several of Dryden's plays including *The Spanish Fryar*, and in them he finds and highlights evidence of "Dryden's ongoing exploration of royal flaws" (432), particularly his denunciation of tyranny. After his analysis of *The Spanish Fryar* and *Don Sebastian* (later and more explicit critiques), Coltharp abruptly ends his essay by asserting that the "radical royalism" of Dryden, "his deployment of revolutionary ideas and rebellious gestures in the service of hereditary monarchy" is embodied fully in the character of Dorax of *The Spanish Fryar* (435).

Davis, Paul. "But Slaves We Are': Dryden and Virgil, Translation and the 'Gyant Race.'" *Translation and Literature*. 10 (2001): 110-27.

Eliot, T.S. "John Dryden." *Selected Essays of T.S. Eliot*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1950. 264-274. Rpt. in *Dryden: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. Bernard N. Schilling. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1965. 8-16.

Though it represents an early piece of criticism, Eliot's essay on Dryden remains illuminating and pertinent. In it, he defends Dryden as a poet, and categorizes his talent and wit as poetic, setting him in relation to the poets and writers who preceded and historically accompanied him. He begins by advocating a kind of second look at Dryden – an appreciation of his poetry as "a Successor of Jonson, and therefore the descendant of Marlowe," and hence "the ancestor of...all that is best in the poetry of the eighteenth century" (8). He suggests that a full appreciation of all the English poetry for at least a hundred years after Dryden requires an appreciation of Dryden, as he influenced writers from Pope to Wordsworth and Keats and beyond. He recommends Mark Van Doren's book, *John Dryden*, and then goes on to consider the reasons that Dryden "has sunk by the persons he has elevated to distinction – Shadwell and Settle, Shaftesbury and Buckingham" (9). He credits Dryden's reputation as a satirist, and suggests that one must consider the fine art behind his satire and wit – looking closely at the craftsmanship of a passage from *Mac Flecnoe*. Eliot asserts that, because opinions on the value of English poetry are based on Shakespeare and Milton, often Dryden is neglected because of the perception that his "material, the feelings, out of which he built [were] no poetic" (11). He goes on to "debunk" the criticism of Dryden offered by Matthew Arnold, Pater and Hazlitt – revealing that criticism of Dryden stemmed not from his writing, but from the "material out of which Dryden's poetry is built" (12). He states that the true genius of Dryden lies "in his ability to make the small into the great, the prosaic into the poetic, the trivial into the magnificent" (12), and he looks at several verses that illustrate the literary control Dryden wields – particularly in contrast to Milton. Eliot goes on to look at the language of Dryden's drama, and asserts that while his plots are exceptionally arranged, "it is the pure magnificence of diction, of poetic diction, that keep his plays alive" (14). While he praises Dryden very highly, Eliot recognizes that he was not "unchallenged in his supreme ability," and states that "his powers were...wider, but no greater, than Milton's; he was confined by boundaries as impassable" (15). He finishes by reasserting the poetic genius of Dryden and hopes that "in the next revolution of taste it is possible that poets may turn to the study of Dryden" (16), and from the glut of recent criticism on Dryden's poetry and particularly his drama, one finds Eliot's essay almost prophetic.

Hammond, Paul. *John Dryden: A Literary Life*. Basingstroke, England: Macmillan, 1991.

- Harth, Phillip. "Dryden's Public Voices." *New Homage to John Dryden*. Los Angeles: U of California P, 1983. Rpt. in *Critical Essays on John Dryden*. Ed. James A Winn. New York: G.K. Hall & Co, 1997. 104-122.
- . "The Prologue and Epilogue to Dryden's *Marriage A-la-mode* and the Problem of *Covent Garden Drolery*." *PBSA*, 81 (1987): 155-72.
- Kropf, Carl R. "Patriarchal Theory in Dryden's Early Drama." *Essays in Theatre*. 6:1 (1987): 41-48.
- Kroll, Richard. "Instituting Empiricism: Hobbes's Leviathan and Dryden's Marriage a la Mode." *Cultural Readings of Restoration and Eighteenth-Century English Theater*. Eds. Douglas J Canfield and Deborah C. Paine. Athens: U of Georgia P, 1995.
- . *Restoration Drama and the Circle of Commerce: Tragicomedy, Politics, and Trade in the Seventeenth Century*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge UP, 2007.
- Love, Harold. "Dryden Rochester, and the Invention of the Town." *John Dryden: His Politics, His Plays, and His Poets*. Eds. Claude Rawson and Aaron Santesso. Newark, DE: U of Delaware P, 2004.
- "Dryden, Durfey, and the Standard of Comedy." *Studies in English Literature: 1500-1900*. 13:3 (1973): 422-436.

In this essay, Love looks at the way in which a particular controversy surrounding Gildon's criticism of Dryden's view of the value of comedy ultimately changed the way in which Dryden conceptualized comedy. He claims that, in response to Gildon's criticism of his views on comedy, Dryden moved toward "a broader concept of comedy in which the value is neither repartee nor plot but...a merging...[of both] into a harmonious aesthetic whole" (422). Love privileges this particular controversy because it essentially pitted Dryden, Southerne and Congreve against Durfey and Charles Gildon, and involved the popularly prized category of Restoration genteel comedy. He begins with an overview of Restoration tradition – from the foreign festivity and carnival of early comedy to the English settings and "realistic social comedy...revived in the nineties by Congreve, Southerne and Farquhar" - comedy which had "a real interest in ideas" (423). Love then examines the issue of the "gentility" of the later comedies, and Dryden's preface to *An Evening's Love* in which he espoused his own view that the importance of comedy lay in the "genteel art of repartee" (424). Dryden privileged high comedy, with a focus on the pleasure offered by wit while apparently ignoring both drama's "instructive value" and the possible value of low comedy (424-25). Love argues that Dryden's failure to recognize the "utile" of comedy is what left him open to the criticism of Durfey and Gildon (425). In the next pages, Love goes on to detail the failure of Southerne's (Dryden's protégé) *The Wives' Excuse*, even as the more farcical *The Marriage Hater Match'd* thrived on the stage (426). He then explores further Dryden's preoccupation with the value as comedy as based on "the pleasure it gave" (427), as well as his "condemnation of farce" which found reproof in a "straight-out attack" from Charles Gildon (428). Love then looks at Gildon's views on the ultimate ends of comedy in comparison with Dryden's, and considers the way that Gildon and Durfey, particularly Durfey's notion of Design (432), ultimately influenced Dryden. He suggests this influence

by looking at Dryden's praise of Congreve, Etherege and Wycherly, and his eventual focus on the art of "just Design" – the combination of pleasure and utility - and the integration of style (434). He notes the "development in Dryden's theory of comedy, which narrows...the gap between moral justification and aesthetic criterion" (434). Love's article proves especially interesting because, like Miner's essay, it offers context and insight into the interaction of Dryden and his contemporaries. It would prove particularly helpful in an research involving the influence of Dryden on other author's of the period, or on Dryden's beliefs about his comedy and that of his contemporaries.

Lewis, Jayne and Maximillian E. Novak. *Enchanted Ground: Reimagining John Dryden*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2004.

McFadden, George. *Dryden: The Public Writer, 1660-1685*. Princeton NJ: Princeton UP, 1978.

McKeon, "Marxist Criticism and Marriage A-la-Mode." *The Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation*. 24 (1983): 141-162.

Miner, Earl. "The Poetics of the Critical Act: Dryden's Dealings with Rivals and Predecessors." *Evidence in Literary Scholarship: Essays in Memory of James Marshall Owen*. Eds. Rene Wellek and Alvaro Ribeiro. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1979. Rpt. in *Critical Essays on John Dryden*. Ed. James A. Winn. New York: G. K. Hall & Co, 1997. 33-47.

In this essay, Miner examines Dryden's relationship with his contemporaries, his predecessors and his audience. He begins by suggesting a number of ideas or conceptions to which the literary world is in Dryden's debt. First, he claims that we owe to Dryden our understanding that what we can know "involves defining self in relation to the world, world to self" (33). He goes on to explain Dryden's innovation in consistently joining disparate human understandings of the world – "literature, politics, history, religion, science" (34). Miner then highlights Dryden's progressive ideas about art and imitation in relation to both Milton and Aristotle, and finally suggests that Dryden effectively "redirected our thought" through his radical concept of "changing nature," and especially through his definition of the idea of a literary period or age (35). Miner argues that, by "historicizing" literature, Dryden effectively created links between his prose and poetry and that of his predecessors, including Killigrew and Purcell, while still maintaining historical differentiation. He then goes on to consider Dryden's unique relationship with his contemporaries, particularly his high praise of William Congreve. Miner asserts that Dryden, as is evidenced in his praise of his contemporaries, possessed an "explicit understanding" of them and such an understanding allowed him to define himself in relation to them – through both flattery and just criticism. Miner provides as evidence Dryden advice to Thomas Southerne his criticism of Kneller, and his commemoration of Milton (38-39). Miner then looks at Dryden's inclusion of his contemporaries in his art by means other than direct address such as in the characters and relationships in *Mac Flecknoe* and *Absalom and Achitophel*. Ultimately, he states that Dryden, through constructive praise and criticism, "managed the writer's most difficult critical passage, relation with contemporaries" (40). Miner then tackles Dryden's relation to earlier writers, particularly his "indifference to what we would call plagiarism" (41). He points out Dryden's use of previous author's work through "transfusion," which ranged from "translation and plagiarism to allusion or echo" (41). Finally, Miner turns to Dryden's relationship with and self definition by his audience, beginning with Dryden's early

preoccupation with audience, and concluding with his shift toward instructive, moral driven drama and poetry including *Fables Ancient and Modern*. He traces the increase in moral didacticism of Dryden's writing to the enlargement of his audience and the greater number of women in that audience, and suggests that Dryden maintained, even late in his career, "a saving remnant of a knowing audience" (45). In closing, Miner stresses the important relationships of writer to contemporaries, to predecessors, and to audience – particularly in Dryden's own self definition. He concludes by asserting that, as readers, we should recognize "that the poet is the radical, if only implicit, critic, who best understands what is of import in what has gone before and what exists at present" (46).

Rawson, Claude and Aaron Santesso. *John Dryden: His Politics, His Plays, and His Poets*. Newark: Delaware UP, 2004.

Rosenthal, Laura. "A Kind Mistress is a Good Old Cause: The Gender of the Heir in *Marriage a la Mode*." *Journal of Dramatic Theory and Criticism*. 5:1 (1990): 39-48.

Sauer, Elizabeth. "Milton and Dryden on the Restoration Stage." *Fault Lines and Controversies in the Study of Seventeenth-Century English Literature*. Eds. Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth. Columbia: Missouri UP, 2002. 88-110.

Ward, Charles E. *The Letters of John Dryden*. Durham, N.C.: Duke UP, 1942.

---. *The Life of John Dryden*. Chapel Hill N.C.: The U of North Carolina P, 1961.

Zwicker, Steven N. *The Cambridge companion to John Dryden*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004.