Figure 9: Katherine Philips; from a mezzotino by Isaac Becket. Poems. By the most deservedly Admired Mrs. Katherine Philips, the Matchless Orinda. London: T.N. for Henry Herringman, 1678. British Library.
Chapter 7: "My Ambition...is checkt": Katherine Philips's *Pompey, a Tragedy*.

7.1. "Imaginations rifled ": Katherine Philips as a Writer.

Katherine Philips, née Fowler, was born in London, in the parish of St. Mary Woolchurch on January 1 1632. She descended from a well-to-do middle class family with Presbyterian sympathies. From her infancy, Philips appears to have had a keen interest in the world of letters, and managed to attain a remarkable level of literacy. According to her teacher and kinswoman Mrs Blackett, Philips "had read the Bible through before she was four years old" and "could have sayd I know not how many places of Scripture and chapters" (quoted in Souers, 1931, 19). For Mrs Blackett, defining her pupil's exceptional gift for letters in terms of religious devotion must have seemed appropriate, since religion was regarded as one of the very few suitable areas of study for women. Not surprisingly in the light of Philips's sex, religion constituted a major part of her upbringing at Mrs Salmon's school for girls at Hackney. Apart from religion, Philips was taught French and a little Italian, but no Greek and Latin—subjects which may have appealed to Philips's eager and clever mind, but which were exclusively reserved for boys.

Despite the gender restrictions upon woman's education at Mrs Salmon's, the school lay at the foundation of Philips's future connections with the literary world. Through her school friend Mary Harvey Dering she must have come in touch with Francis Finch, who married Mary's sister Elizabeth.1 Furthermore, as becomes clear from the poems that she addressed to these men of letters, the writers John Berkenhead, Henry Vaughan and Abraham Cowley must be counted among her later acquaintances.2 In these connections with a great number of literary men, Philips did not restrict herself to the role of the patroness or female admirer of their writings. Notwithstanding the social taboo on female utterance, Philips must have started writing poems at an early age. John Aubrey, Mary Harvey Dering's cousin, once stated that Philips "loved poetrey at [Hackney] schoole, and made verses there" (Aubrey, 1898, 153).3 A recent manuscript discovery confirms the date of her first known poetic compositions to 1650, when she was just eighteen.4

---

1 See Limbert, 1991, 27.
2 These poems are: "To Mr. J.B. the noble Cratander upon a composition of which he was not willing to own publiquely" (no. 24; 1654-55), "To Mr. Henry Vaughan, Silurist, on his Poems" (no. 21, 1652-55) and "Upon Mr Abraham Cowley's Retirement" (no. 77; 1663). For a more detailed account of Philips's literary connections, see Limbert, 1991, 28-30.
3 See also Roberts, 1970, 56.
4 *Ibidem* 56.
As a poet, Philips obtained the reputation of the virtuous, modest Orinda who shied away from any public recognition of her works.\(^5\) This is illustrated by the ways in which she was described by other poets of her age. For example, Abraham Cowley's praise for Philips's literary achievements centres particularly on her womanly modesty: "Orinda's inward virtue is so bright,/ That like a lanthorn's fair inclosd Light,/It through the Paper shines where she do's write" (Philips, 1667, a1v). The references to Orinda's virtue as "inward", that is, free from blatant public display, and the image of the light enclosed by the lantern require further attention. They signal inwardsness and privacy, and imply that the "light" of her qualities is not glaring, but shines through the cover of the paper of the lantern. Put differently, Philips does not assert her talents and ambitions.

Katherine Philips was considered to impersonate a "Virtue" which "needs no defence".\(^6\) This was due to the careful way in which she appears to have manipulated her public image as a woman writer.\(^7\) She seems to have forged a feminine identity in relation to her poetic self by her attitude towards publication. Although publication became more accepted for the upper classes of society by this time, a woman publishing her writings hazarded her sexual reputation. In order to uphold a public image of herself as feminine Philips allowed her poems to circulate in manuscript freely among friends. When seventy-four of her poems were published in a supposedly pirated edition in 1663, Philips made a great show of outraged innocence.\(^8\) In a letter to Abraham Cowley, dated January 29th 1663, Philips alleged that "the injury done me by that Publisher and Printer exceeds all the troubles I remember I ever had", since she "never writ any line in my life with an intention to have it printed" (Philips, 1667, A1v). She considers herself an "unfortunate person that cannot so much as think in private", that must have her "rifled and exposed to play the mountebanks" and claims that to have suffered a "sharp fit of sickness" since she heard about the publication (Philips, 1667, A2r). Imaging herself as a woman undone, Philips may have warded off any imputations of sexual incontinence by evoking the impression that her words had been forced into the public arena by others.

Philips assuming a feminine identity as a poet, she often denigrated her literary work. For instance, while addressing the poem, "To the Queens Majesty on her Happy Arrival" (1662), to Charles II's spouse, Catherine of Braganza, Philips calls

\(^6\) As the earl of Roscommon stated. See Philips, 1667, a2r.
\(^7\) As Wheatley has also remarked, Katherine Philips's muse was "deliberately fettered" by her to show her feminine modesty; the praise she received was "partially a consequence of those fetters" (1992, 24).
herself an "obscurer Muse", and requests pardon for the "imperfect" lines that she has written (quoted from the poem, as printed in Hageman, 1995, 323). Furthermore, as becomes clear from the genres that she took up as well as from the themes of her poems, Philips was anxious to be considered acceptable. As William Roberts claims, the 1660s can be regarded as Philips's translation years. Not only did she undertake the translation of two plays by Corneille, *Pompée* and *Horace*, into English, she also translated the story "Paresseuse, mensongère" from Scudéry's *Almahide* by 1663. By devoting herself to translation, Philips therefore chose an area of letters which was regarded as more appropriate for women to engage with.

For a great number of her poems, Philips chose the subject of female friendship, and addressed these poems to female friends, such as Rosania (Mary Aubrey) and Lucasia (Anne Lewis Owen). By presenting her poems in this way, Philips created the impression that her poetry consisted of intimate conversations between her and members of her sex and, consequently, that she did not overstep the boundaries of domestic privacy. This idea of private speech is often explicitly suggested in the friendship poems. A good example to illustrate this, is the poem "6t Aprill 1651 L'Amitie: To Mrs M. Awbrey" (Philips, 1667, L1r). In this poem, Philips describes the communication between herself and her friend as the perfect exchange of thoughts and feelings: "I have no thought but what's to thee reveal'd,/Nor thou desire that is from me conceal'd". Yet, this communication is essentially restricted to the circle of friendship that is formed by the two women, as becomes clear from the image of the private cabinet:

Thy heart locks up my secrets richly set,  
And my brest is thy private cabinet.

In this respect, she appears to use the legitimising strategy of conversation between women that was also adopted by many of her contemporaries. In other poems, Philips also created the illusion of privacy, writing them in the form of self-communing discourse. In these poems, such as "Death" (Philips 1667, no. 75, Hh1v) and "The Virgin" (Philips 1667, no. 90, Mm1v), Philips appears to adopt a persona who speaks within him/herself about particular notions as if in a monologue. This persona does not seem to address an external audience. In addition, Philips's image as a feminine poet must have been reinforced by the fact that she frequently

---

8 See also Mermin's description of the incident and Philips's display of dismay concerning the publication: 1990, 338.
9 The poem can be found in Houghton Library, Harvard University, pEB65 A100 662t.
11 For further details, see Roberts, 1970, 63.
12 See also Moody, 1987, 643.
wrote about domestic matters. For example, she composed poems addressed to her husband and family members upon special occasions, such as "To my dear Sister Mrs C.P. on her Marriage" (Philips 1667, no. 20, H1r). She also wrote poems about the loss of her stepdaughter Frances and her son Hector: "In memory of F.P. who died at Acton on the 24 of May, 1660, at Twelve and a Half of Age" (Philips 1667, no. 30, L1v) and "On the death of my first and dearest childe, Hector Philipps, borne the 23rd of Aprill, and dy'd the 2d of May 1655. Set by Mr Lawes" (Philips, 1667, no. 88, Mm1r).13

Apart from choosing feminine contexts and subjects for many of her poems, Philips also adopted the discourses of virginity and maternity as part of her poetic voice. In the poem on the death of her son Hector, Philips casts her poetic creativity in terms of maternal grief: "tears are my Muse and sorrow all my Art". Moreover, she presents the lines of her poem as a mourning tribute to her son: "Receive these gasping numbers to thy grave,/The last of thy unhappy Mothers Verse".14 By presenting her poem as a mother's care for her dead son, Philips inserts a maternal discourse within her text. In "Friendship" Philips describes her ideal friendship as "calm as a virgin, and more innocent/Than sleeping Doves are" (Philips 1667, L2r). By aligning herself with this pure vision of friendship, Philips also may have sought to dissociate herself from the spectre of the whore that women writers were frequently connected with.

Although it is true that Philips obtained a reputation as the woman poet who avoided public display, this womanly representation is contradicted by the subversive, political nature of some of her poetry as well as the actual public success of her literary achievements. Her poems on female friendship suggest a sphere of privacy, but at times their contents undermine the dominant gender ideologies, challenging the social ideal of marriage and woman's submission. For example, in "Friendship's mystery: To my Dearest Lucasia" (Philips, 1667, G1r) Philips emphasises the freedom that exists in the friendship between her and Anne Owen Lewis, stating that the bond between them was freely chosen,15 and that the relationship is without oppression:

Since we wear fetters whose intent
Not bondage is, but Ornament.

---

13 For a detailed overview and categorisation of Philips's poetry, see Moody, 1987, 342-54.
14 The poem can also be found in the anthology Kissing the Rod, eds. Germaine Greer et al., 1988, 196-97.
15 In relation to this poem, Celia Easton wonders "But why is friendship more free than 'Kindred' or 'Marriage-bond'" in Philip's view? She concludes that "From a seventeenth-century woman's perspective it is the only relationship over which she has control, having no choice over the family into which she is born and little choice in the man she must marry" (1998, 98).
Furthermore, Philips points to the equality of both partners within the relationship: she and Lucasia are "both Princes and both Subjects too", that is, they share power alike and neither of them is constrained to the role of the submissive partner. Philips's representation of the female friendship as a relationship in which both partners are subject and ruler alike is not just a playful reworking of John Donne's "The Sun Rising" (1633), which describes a love relationship in which the male speaker is "all princes", the dominating party, and the mistress is "all States" (l.21), the dominated. It is a direct comment on Donne's use of language and its political implications concerning gender. Describing her ideal friendship with Lucasia, "Orinda" indirectly criticises the marriage bond, which is usually not freely chosen by a woman and demands her total obedience and self-effacement. In other words, the poem on friendship expresses covert political views in the form of criticism of conventional gender roles.

While Philips's friendship poems are not overtly political, she also wrote poems in which she openly commented on the political events of her time. Despite her Presbyterian upbringing, Philips later became a devoted Royalist. These Royalist sentiments are clearly expressed in several poems, such as "Upon the double murder of Charles I, in Answer to a Libellous Copy of Rimes by vavasour Powell" (Philips, 1667, B1r). In this poem Philips claims that she does not speak "on behalf of a particular party or ideology but in defense of basic ethics". Nevertheless, she makes her own political arguments all the more effective, by comparing Charles I to the Roman virtuous hero Pompey who was unjustly slain.

Philips also wrote particular poems for important public figures. After the Restoration she sought recognition from aristocracy and royalty, sending poems to the Duchess of York, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and to King Charles himself, and dedicating her translation of

---

16 In a recent study of the poem Andrew Shifflett focuses on the representation of friendship in the light of Philips's Royalist sympathies. See Shifflett, 2001, 185.

17 Intriguingly, Philips's "Friendship in Embleme, or The Seal. To my dearest Lucasia" (1652) also alludes to and reworks a poem by John Donne, "A Valediction: Forbidden Mourning" (1633). In his poem Donne uses the image of the "twin compasses", in order to represent the relationship between the male "I" and his female lover. In this poem, the man is pictured as the foot which "must…obliquely run" (l. 34) while his wife functions as the "fixed foot" (l.27). Thus, woman is restricted to the conventional gender role of immobility, inactivity, whereas the man is the active part. In Philips's poem the compasses also figure as a trope for the relationship that is portrayed. Yet, this relationship between the two women is one of greater equality and balance, since both are active and passive by turns: "And in their posture is exprest/Friendships exalted interest/Each followd where the other leans/And what each does, this other means" (Philips, 1667, H2r).

18 Apparently, Philips did not confine her expression of negative sentiments on marriage to her friendship poems. Limbert and O'Neill refer to an antimarital satire, "Advice to Virgins", that "has sometimes been attributed to Philips, considering the similarity of the poem to one written by Orinda before her marriage to Colonel James Philips in August 1648" (1993, 488).

19 See also Evans 1999, 180.
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_Pompey_ to the Countess of Cork. Supposedly she hoped to improve her husband's public position by gratifying persons in high places. Philips was well known as a poet through manuscript circulation before any of her writings were printed, as is also indicated by the appearance of her "Friendship's Mystery, to my dearest Lucasia" in Henry Lawes *Second Book of Ayres and Dialogues* (1655).

The given that Philips managed to attain success as a woman writer must have frustrated many a male writer who aimed for glory. As a female admirer of Philips's work, "Philo-Phillipa", pointed out in "To the Excellent Orinda", a dedicatory poem attached to her *Collected Poems*, Philips must have "vex'd" the male sex with her "Bright pen": "Its lustre doth intice their eyes to gaze,/ But mens sore eyes cannot endure its rayes" (Philips, 1667, C1v). Indeed male writers must have experienced anxiety about the fact that a woman, supposedly a creature unfit for literary creativity, could equal or even surpass them in poetic skill. This is revealed by the ways in which they feminised Philips in their praises of her. They reduced her to womanly qualities such as physical beauty, procreation, the object of the male poetic subject, and recontextualised her in a 'feminine' sphere in order to exclude her from competition with them.

Paula Loscocco argues that in Restoration England, according to the neoclassical tradition, writers were praised in terms of both femininity and masculinity, and that feminine references were "not specific to the encomia on women poets" (1993, 261). Therefore, in her view, the frequent allusions to Philips's femininity by male poets and critics should not be seen as a reference to her gender, but also "to the qualities of "smoothness" and "sweetness" valued by contemporary literary aesthetics" (1993, 261). Likewise, some suggestions of Philips's masculinity do not necessarily imply "the anomalous achievement of poetry by a woman": "it also suggests the qualities of "wit" and "strength" that were understood to ground and steady "the mellifluousness of neoclassical verse" (1993, 262). However, in my view, the attributions of feminine qualities to Philips by her male friends serve to neutralise Philips's poetic achievements rather than outline particular aesthetic characteristics. For instance, the poet Henry Vaughan once said in relation to Philips: "language smiles and accents rise/ As quick, and pleasing as your Eyes,/ The Poem smooth, and in each line/ Soft as your selfe"

20 See also Hobby, 1998, 75.
21 For a detailed compilation of the history of the reception of Philips's work, see Patrick Thomas, 1988, 22-39.
22 Thus, Joanna Lipking's statement that a "characteristic feature of men's commendations" of a woman writer... is "their ineluctable drift toward the feminine side of her identity" (1988, 59) appears to be particularly true for Philips.
Virtuous Voices

(1965, 11).

Vaughan thus foregrounds the beauty of Philips's body to underscore the beauty of her poem. As a result, her poetic achievement is minimised and her lines are conventionally equated with sexual allurement.

A similar reduction of Philips to her female body can be found in the Earl of Roscommon's "Upon Mrs Philips: her Poems". In this text the Earl of Roscommon describes Philips's production of poetry in terms of childbirth: "Thou bringst not forth with pain,/ It neither Travel is, nor Labor of thy Brain" (Philips, 1667, b1v). The dichotomy of male literary creativity and female procreation, which dominated gender notions, implied that poetic creation was seen as an exclusively male prerogative. By representing Philips the woman writer in terms of her biological function of procreation, Roscommon seems to underplay her non-physical poetic creativity.

7.2. Pompey, a Tragedy: a Performed Translation.

In Dryden's An Essay of Dramatick Poesie (1668-69) Neander declares: "no French Playes when translated, have, or ever can succeed on the English Stage" (1970, 53). It is difficult to reconcile this view with the great success that Katherine Philips enjoyed when her translation of Corneille's Pompée was performed in 1663. Philips was not the first English writer who had translated a tragedy by Corneille into English. The influence of French tragedy in England became pronounced even before the Civil War when Queen Henrietta Maria promoted the Cavalier Platonic drama of Cartwright and Suckling, and supported the first English translation in blank verse of a Corneille tragedy by Joseph Rutter, The Cid (1637). Almost two decades later Sir William Lower translated and published Corneille's Polyeucte (London, 1655) and Horatius (London, 1656). Considering the popularity of Corneille and French classical drama, Philips's translation of Pompée can be considered a sensible choice from a commercial point of view.

Since the theatres only reopened by 1660, Lower's translations could not be put to the stage. By the time Katherine Philips began her translation of Corneille's Pompée, however, theatre performances at public playhouses had become possible again. Furthermore, the

23 See also Mermin, 1990, 338.
24 See Susan Stanford-Friedman on creativity and the childbirth metaphor 371-90.
25 Michel Adam ironically comments upon Cowley's poem: "Quant à Abraham Cowley, le gynécologue bien connu, il applaudit à l'accouchement de Pompey, qui n'a pas nécessité de césarrienne" (847).
26 See also Mambretti 236.
27 As Mulvihill remarks:"Philips's attraction to Corneille was more than literary good sense, it was commercially savvy" (1991, 84).
French influence on the English drama increased due to the fact that the King, having lived in exile in France, encouraged the appearance of French acting companies in London and productions of originally French drama. When the theatres reopened in August 1660, Katherine attended several plays, such as a restaging of Beaumont and Fletcher's pre-war play *The Maid's Tragedy*, and a production by Davenant. She must have perceived a growing female presence in drama, when actresses were admitted to the stage in December of that year. Whether or not Philips had ever entertained the desire to play a prominent role in theatre production, by writing or translating a play for the stage herself, cannot be established for certain. The fact remains, however, that she herself took the initiative to translate a scene from Act III of Corneille's *Pompée* into English by December 1660 at the earliest.

Critics have speculated intensively about Philips's motivations for undertaking the translation. After all, it was remarkable that Philips started to translate the scene when at the time Buckhurst was also at work on a translation of *Pompée* in collaboration with other famous court wits: Edmund Waller, Sir Charles Sedley, Sir Edward Filmer and Sidney Godolphin. According to Mambretti, "Orinda's motives for beginning her translation at that time undoubtedly involved the desire to compliment an important political figure", in order to seek rehabilitation for her husband who had lost his political position (1985, 239). Orinda probably translated the scene, since she must have known that Charles and the duke of York admired French drama. Clemency being the main theme of the scene in Act III, Philips may have translated it with the view of offering her translation to the king, thus implicitly requesting Royal mercy for her once Parliamentarian husband.

Andrew Shifflett refutes Mambretti's argument. He agrees that *Pompey* is a highly political choice for a translation and that "Philips does engage with the problem of clemency in *Pompey*, and she does so as deeply as any controversialist of her age" (1997, 106), yet claims that this is for other reasons. He argues that, given the greater emphasis on the Cornelia figure in Corneille's original than in other plays with the same topic, Philips's primary interest in translating *Pompey* was neither to follow a French fashion nor to help her husband to the benefits of royal clemency. She sought, rather, to engage in the salient political and intellectual controversy of the day, criticising the notion of royal clemency itself. The Act of Indemnity, which implied Royal clemency for the Republicans, had been passed shortly before. By translating a play in which Cornelia voices ingratitude at Caesar's kingly mercy, Philips sought to "rethink and refine the stoic rhetoric that could support it as an instrument of

---

28 This becomes clear from Philips's letters, 1990, 78-79. See also Mambretti, 1985, 237.
Alison Findlay has shed a gendered light on Philips's possible reasons for translating the scene. Unlike the Cleopatra of Mary Sidney's translation, Philips's queen is very worldly, claiming to put the interests of her country before her emotional ties, and preferring ambition to love. Findlay therefore concludes that by translating Corneille, Philips "found a way to put forward some daring ideas about women's confinement within masculine value systems and the weakness of those systems" (2000b, 130).

Having translated this part of Corneille's play, the scene began to circulate among the Boyle circle in Dublin that Philips had become part of during her stay in Ireland. By 1662 her translated text also fell into the hands of the earl of Orrery, who, at the time, had finished and presented his first play to Charles and had completed his second play. He was so impressed by the translated piece that he urged her to translate the whole Act, and subsequently the rest of the play, sending her a copy of the French version and a laudatory poem. Honoured though Philips may have felt at being asked to undertake the translation project, she suggested that the earl of Orrery had more or less forced her to write the translation. She implied that any public display of her talents was much against her will, and that completing the translation was a sign of proper obedience:

He earnestly importun'd me to pursue that Translation…I obey'd him so far as to finish the Act in which that Scene is….he enjoin'd me to go on; and not only so, but brib'd me to be contented with the Pains by sending me an excellent Copy of Verses. (Letter to Poliarchus, August 20 1662, 1705, F1v-F2r)

Furthermore, Philips brought in the feminine humility topos, implying that she would not be able to meet sufficiently high standards as a woman writer: "You will wonder at my Lord's Obstinacy in this Desire to have me translate Pompey, as well because of my Incapacity to perform it, as that so many others have undertaken it" (1705, F2v). Thinking that "a Translation ought not to be used as Musicians do a Ground, with all the Liberty of Descant, but as painters when they copy" (D2v), Philips remained close to Corneille's original, except for a slight variation of the rhyme scheme in the first quatrain. Immediately after Philips finished her translation of the whole play by October 22, 1662, manuscript copies began to circulate which were praised by their readers. The wide circulation of her text called for a display of humility on the part of Philips. In a letter to Charles Cotterell of October 19, 1662, Philips voiced her anxiety that her Pompey "will not be deem'd worthy to breathe in a place

29 As I have pointed out, Philips compared the beheaded Charles I to Pompey in one of her poems. In the light of this, Shifflett's argument that Philips's choice to translate Corneille's play served as a way to engage with current politics seems valid.

30 See also Corporaal, 2002b, 9-10.
where so many of the greatest Wits have so long clubb'd for another of the same Play" (1990, 55). In November 1662 Philips wrote to Cotterell that copies of her play were being widely circulated: "There are, tho' much against my Will, more Copies of it abroad that I would have imagin'd; but the Duchess of Ormond would not be refus'd one, and she and Philaster have permitted several Persons to take Copies from theirs" (Letter to Poliarchus, December 3, 1662, G4v).

Notwithstanding Philips's real or feigned horror at the availability of her text to the public, her translation was to undergo an even more public display soon after. Although Philips wanted to spare people "the penance of seeing it play'd" (Letter to Poliarchus, February 3, 1663, 1705, H2v), the Lord of Orrery was determined to have Philips's Pompey staged in Dublin. The performance was to be held at a public playhouse, the Smock Alley Theatre. Whereas before the theatre of the court and the public playhouse had been regarded as distinct theatrical contexts, this was no longer the case by 1660. The public theatre had gained much in prominence and status, since the king went to attend plays both at court and at public theatres. As a result, the distinction between these theatrical places as decent on the one hand and vulgar on the other had blurred. For the performance of the play, songs for between the acts were added by Philips. The first production arranged and directed by the Earl of Orrery, was significant for several reasons. It was the first known play to have premiered in Dublin's Smock Alley Theatre and the first translation of a Corneille play into heroic couplets.32 It was also the first play translated or written by a woman to be produced in a professional British theatre, performed, moreover, during the woman writer's life: "elle fut la première femme-dramaturge à voir le résultat de ses efforts, même s'il ne s'agissait "que" de traductions, mis en scene" (Adam, 1993, 12).

Because of a gap of nine weeks in her letters, Philips's comments regarding the first performance of Pompey have been lost. Therefore, how she experienced seeing her play acted out on the stage cannot be traced, unfortunately. As for the letters, the sequence recommences in April. These letters are just concerned with the fact that Sir Charles Cotterell had edited her text and had it published. Both the performance of The Tragedy of Pompey and the published text were immensely successful. Perhaps the most significant indication of Pompey's success was that copies had been presented not only to the duchess of York, but to Charles II as well.33 Her skill as a translator was celebrated by John Davies who dedicated his 1659

---

31 See also Roberts, 1971, 61.
32 See Mambretti, 1985, 244.
33 See Mambretti, 1985, 245.
translation of *Cléopatre* to her in 1662.\(^\text{34}\) Her female admirer "Philo-Philippa" argued that Corneille "gains by you another excellence" (Philips, 1667, B2r). The Earl of Orrery praised Philips in patriotic terms for producing a "copy greater than th'Originall" (Philips, 1667, a1v), claiming that "The French to learn our language now will seek" (a1v). Encouraged by the success of *Pompey*, by January 8th 1663 Philips started to translate the *Horace* of Corneille. Unfortunately, Philips died of smallpox, and did not see the completion of the translation, produced by John Debenham.

### 7.3. Cleopatra's "busie wit".

Most critics focus mainly on the hidden political content of *Pompey* in relation to the re-established monarchy. With the exception of Alison Findlay, who notes the contrast between Philips's display of modesty as a writer and Cleopatra's bold self-assertion,\(^\text{35}\) critics have generally failed to address the representations of gender in the play. Andrew Shiflett, for instance, notices that Philips "does in fact emphasise and favour Cornelia in comparison to Corneille" (1997, 116), expanding Cornelia's role through the songs that she added to the play. However, he does not further explore the effect of this expanded part on the meaning of Philips's translation in comparison to Corneille's original, and neglects to investigate what may have been Philips's possible motives for highlighting Cornelia's presence in the tragedy. Although Shiflett's reading of the secret political agenda of the play concerning the monarchy is valuable, it is also important to consider the fact that the Cleopatra figure in both Corneille's and Philips's text is an assertive, outspoken and witty woman.

As far as the representation of Cleopatra is concerned, Philips's translation stays very close to Corneille's original. Both Corneille and Philips assign an equally large number of speaking lines to Cleopatra. We saw that in Mary Sidney's translation of Robert Garnier's *Antoine* Cleopatra is identified with a capacity for eloquence: a "training speech…forcing voice" (II, 484-85).\(^\text{36}\) References to Cleopatra's eloquence and outspokenness also come up frequently in Philips's translation. Cleopatra refuses to have herself silenced. She speaks up to her brother Ptolomy to claim her equal right to the throne according to "the King your Fathers Will" (I, iii), which he has usurped.\(^\text{37}\) Furthermore, when Photin, Ptolomy's political adviser, attempts to prevent Cleopatra from communicating her grievances to her brother, by

---

34 See also Hobby, 1998, 75.
35 See Findlay, 2000b, 130-33.
36 See my discussion in chapter 4, page 109.
37 References are made to the 1667 edition, which is only divided into acts and scenes.
interrupting her speeches, Cleopatra is not discouraged: "'Tis the King, Photin, I discourse with now; / Stay then till I descend to talk to you" (I, iii). Cleopatra is not just depicted as outspoken, but also as a sharp-tongued and sharp-witted woman in the play. Ptolomy talks about his sister as a "dangerous Woman" with a "busy Wit" (I, iii).

Considering the representation of Cleopatra as an assertive speaker in the play, the question arises whether Philips's translation confirms or undermines the dominant discourses on woman's speech. After all, at the time a great number of plays on Cleopatra had been written that Philips could have chosen to translate as well. Therefore, did she choose to translate a tragedy which evoked the spectre of the witty yet wanton woman, or did she select a play which condoned female speech and dismantled this stereotype?

We noticed that Mary Sidney left out the sexual connotations of Cleopatra's speech present in the French original. Similarly, in her translation of the play from French to English, Philips clearly suppressed the sexual activity that Corneille attributed to his Cleopatra. In Corneille's text Cléopâtre's narration of her sexual allurement of César foregrounds her active role in capturing César's heart: "César en fut épris…j'eus la gloire" (I, iii). Cléopâtre is thus represented as a woman who deliberately seeks sexual conquest, and derives further pleasure from narrating her sexual achievements and exposing them to the public ear. Thus, the common association of the female speaker with the wanton woman that is evoked in this scene is intensified. Philips, by contrast, diminishes Cleopatra's active role in the establishment of her former relationship with Caesar. Translating Corneille's line, which stressed Cléopâtre's sexual agency, as "Caesar receiv'd, or else pretended love/ And by his Actions would his Passion prove" (I, iii), Philips cleverly shifts the focus and agency to Caesar. Thus, she creates the impression that the relationship between Caesar and Cleopatra was struck up by Caesar when he declared his passion for Cleopatra. Through the emphasis that is thus laid upon Caesar's active, wooing role, the previously evoked association between Cleopatra's bold speech and unfeminine sexual agency is dismantled.

The characters who construct the image of Cleopatra as sexually manipulative are unreliable, self-interested men who use their own tongues to wicked ends. While Ptolomy accuses Cleopatra of talking "at that haughty rate" (II, iv) and implicitly connects her eloquent speech with sexual flagrancy, he employs speech as the means to seduce people into complying with his wishes. He proposes to "flatter" (II, iv) Cleopatra, to prevent her from raising her voice against him any longer, and he endeavours to manipulate Caesar through rhetorical speeches. Caesar, however, manages to unveil Ptolomy's rhetorical trickery: "You
employ, Ptolomy, such Crafty Words,/ And weak Excuses as your Cause affords" (III, ii). Ptolomy's imputations that Cleopatra uses her tongue to charm and manipulate men like Caesar seem a mere projection of his own nature upon his sister, and, hence, an unreliable judgement of her character. The impression that Ptolomy's representation of his sister is a projection of his own mind is confirmed by Charmion's argument that, although her mistress has the power to charm men with her looks and language, she "will ne're employ" these powers (III, iii). Since Charmion is represented as an honest, virtuous woman in the play, this view on her mistress can be considered reliable.

Philips's Cleopatra is unlike the Cleopatra in Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra* who uses her tongue to flatter and manipulate Antony, and who embodies the prototype of the wanton, assertive woman. This Cleopatra is referred to as a "strumpet" (I, i, 13), who was "plough'd" (II, ii, 236) by several men, including Caesar and Antony. She feels no objection to committing adultery with a married man. Considering the popularity of Shakespeare's play, which confirmed earlier depictions of Cleopatra by Lydgate and Chaucer, the representation of Cleopatra as a lascivious, assertive woman was what seventeenth-century audiences would expect. By contrast, Philips's heroine does not attempt to exercise her charms upon Caesar, and will only give in to her passion for him if he divorces his spouse. Having a wide range of Cleopatra representations available to her, which mostly supported the dominant ideology on female utterance, it is notable that Philips chose to translate a tragedy allowing her to undermine the dominant discourses on the female voice.40

7.4. The issues of Honour and Virginity in the Play.

Discourses of virginity play a significant role in the text of *Pompey, a Tragedy*, both in Philips's way of presenting the play and in the characterisation of Cleopatra. In her dedication to the Countess of Cork, added to the first edition of her play in 1663, Philips represented her translation of Corneille's tragedy as "some untimely Flower, whose bashful head" is "Ready to drop into her humble Bed". As Philips argued, her "Translation of strict Eyes afraid,/ With conscious blushes, would have sought a shade". The notion of "Conscious blushes" and the

38 See my discussion in chapter 4, page 110.
39 Like Sidney's Cleopatra, Philips's Egyptian queen contrasts with Samuel Daniel's Cleopatra, in that she refuses to use her sexual charms in order to manipulate people.
40 Intriguingly, Philips's contemporary Margaret Cavendish also challenged the stereotypical representation of Cleopatra as the wanton, wordy queen. As she argued in *The World's Olio*, "As for Cleopatra, I wonder she should be so Infamous for a Whore, since she was Constant to those Men she had taken…if the men had more
word "bashful" appear to be derived from contemporary discourses of virginity of which shame of exposure as well as the trope of the blush were essential components.\(^4^1\) Furthermore, by suggesting that her text "would have sought a shade" Philips implies that she would have preferred her translation to remain unknown instead of being exposed to a larger audience through publication. By depicting her text as a bashful virgin who rejects public display, Philips emphasises the purity of her text and herself as an author.

Antonius, in giving his opinion on Cleopatra to Caesar, claims that Cleopatra's "looks and Language with such ease subdue" (III, iii). Since in seventeenth-century England virginity was associated with a woman's capacity to govern her gaze and speeches, Cleopatra's willingness to moderate her discourse suggests the sexual purity of a virgin.\(^4^2\) This suggestion is supported by the attitude towards love that Cleopatra displays in the rest of the play. In an intimate conversation with her maid Charmion, Cleopatra confesses her love for Caesar, asserting: "Know that a Princess by her glory mov'd,/ No Love confesses till she be belov'd" (II, i). Cleopatra's initial reluctance to show her passion for Caesar, and the private setting in which she makes her amorous sentiments known, indicates that she is appropriately reticent about matters such as love and sexual attraction.

Feminine honour is more important to Cleopatra than sexual fulfilment. As Cleopatra says to Charmion, her love for Caesar is a "Flame so much refin'd,/ How bright soever, dazles not my mind" (II, i). Put differently, Cleopatra's love for Caesar is based on elevated feelings rather than coarse lust. The words "honour" and "dishonour" also play an important role in Cleopatra's speeches on the subject of love. Cleopatra argues:"The Love I cherish no dishonour knows, / But worthy him" (II, i).

In seventeenth-century England the words "virtue" and "honour" meant political loyalty and public reputation in relation to men, but the concepts generally signified sexual virtue in relation to women. For instance, in Othello (1604) Cassio finds that he has lost his honour when his "reputation" (II, iii, 241) has been damaged by his dismissal from service.

---

41 At the time, the idea of "conscious blushes" was identified with virginity in many cultural discourses. For instance, in "Song" (The Penguin Book of Restoration Verse; ed. Harold Love; London: Penguin, 1968, 139) Sir Charles Sedley adopts the persona of the male seducer who attempts to persuade a young modest virgin, Phillis, into sexual intercourse. In employing his rhetoric to override the young woman's chastity, the persona asks her to surrender to his will "without conscious blushes", that is, without any overt display of virginal shame and unwillingness. This association of the trope of "conscious blushes" with sexual purity that came up in many current cultural discourses, was taken up by Philips to construct an appropriately feminine persona as a woman writer.

42 Brathwaite discusses constrainment of both "Look", the gaze, and "Speech", the voice, as conduct becoming a young unmarried woman. See 1641, Tt1V.
Iago and Othello refer to Desdemona's "honour…an essence that's not seen" (IV, i, 15) when they discuss her sexual conduct. Likewise, in her Memoirs (ca. 1677) Lady Anne Halkett associates virtue and honour with sexual purity. She writes about the "conflict betwixt love and honour" (1979, 57) she experienced; being torn between her passion for C.B., a man who could still have a wife living, on the one hand, and her desire to preserve her sexual virtue by on the other.

In Pompey, a Tragedy Cleopatra plays upon this feminine notion of "honour", identifying her love with sexual purity. At the same time Cleopatra uses the concepts of virtue and honour as it was prescribed for the male rather than the female sex, in relation to herself, namely in the sense of political loyalty. She contends that "Princes" like herself "should subdue their passion", so that "Their honour still the Victory will have" (II, i). She would therefore rather defend Pompey's position, as becomes Pompey's former charity towards her family, than give in to her feelings of love at all costs. Cleopatra displays a willingness to forfeit her love for honour and justice. This shows that she has an ambition for moral purity, and that any potential abstinence from amorous relations with Caesar is bound up with state politics. Simultaneously, Cleopatra's emphasis on her political honour implies a radical redefinition of gender notions: it is suggested that the masculine significance of honour may also apply to the female sex.

Interestingly, Cleopatra even appears to fuse the two differently gendered concepts of virtue, by representing her political engagement in terms of virginity. As I have pointed out, in late sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England virginity and sexual purity were often expressed through metaphors of enclosure and confinement. Cleopatra appears to play upon these discourses of virginity, stating: "I have ambition, but it is confined" (II, iii). Arguing that her "ambition…is checkt" (V, i), and that she knows her "reach and shall not that exceed" (II, iii), she defines her ambition in terms of virginity. In the light of the interaction and interconnection between her private, sexual purity on the one hand and public morals on the other, the importance that Cleopatra attaches to her virginal sexual morality creates the impression that she will also display virtue in the political arena. Cleopatra's involvement with the male-dominated political scene seems legitimised by her observing a feminine sexual and moral modesty. This is underlined by the identification of Cleopatra's ambition with spotlessness: "And 'tis this noble passion sure, or none,/ A Princess may without a blemish own" (II, i).

The association of Cleopatra with virginity extends to her speeches. Whereas Ptolomy alleges that Cleopatra's eloquence serves her sexual desire, and that her speeches in favour of
Pompey are rooted in self-interest, Cleopatra claims that she speaks up in defiance of her brother, because "Virtue alone prompts me to what I do" (I, iii). The word "Virtue", in the sense of female sexual purity, relates Cleopatra's speech to chastity. Moreover, it is notable that Cleopatra's speeches are often spoken within the domestic parts of the court. When she expresses her love for Caesar it is in her private chamber in the company of Charmion, another woman. When the political quarrel between Caesar and Ptolomy takes place, Cleopatra does not intrude in the masculine area of debate. She is informed about the proceedings by the messenger Achoreus, while she waits in her private rooms. Thus, while Cleopatra manifests herself as an assertive, outspoken woman at times, she is also represented as a woman whose speech is properly enclosed, and who refrains from participating in the political debate between her brother and her lover.

In this respect there appears to be a similarity between Philips as a woman writer and Cleopatra as the outspoken princess. Considering Philips's horror at the idea that her manuscript translation was circulating among a wide audience of readers and was to be performed, one may assume that she originally intended her translation to function as a closet drama. In fact, Corneille's play that she translated was most suitable to be consumed as closet drama, since the tragedy is highly static. In accordance with the Aristotelian principle of the three unities, Achoreus, the messenger, plays a central role in narrating the major events that occur off-stage, such as, for instance, Pompey's death. Likewise, Cleopatra's speeches in her private quarters endorse her virginal sexuality while she also speaks her mind openly in public settings.

7.5. The Function of Biblical References in Pompey, a Tragedy.

In the play allusions to the Virgin Mary are made in relation to Cleopatra. For example, Ptolomy's description of his sister as an ambitious person who "from its Ashes… revives again" (I, i) is used to satirise his sister's just claim for shared rule. Yet, since in early modern England the image of the Phoenix arising from its ashes was used to allude to the Virgin Mary, his remark places her in line with Christ's spotless mother. Furthermore, Cleopatra is said to play the part of the "intercessour" (IV, ii) between her brother and Caesar; a term which refers to the Holy Virgin who was thought to be the intercessor between God and mankind. The association of Cleopatra with the Phoenix together with references to her role as an "intercessour" suggest that Philips relates the princess to the Virgin Mary. Since this
notion of Cleopatra as an intercessor does not come up in Corneille's original, it seems that Philips has deliberately chosen to create a link between Cleopatra and the Virgin Mary. The association of Cleopatra with sexual and moral purity in the play is underlined by the Marian discourses that are used in relation to her. This link that is suggested between Cleopatra and the Virgin Mary is subversive, for in many early modern English writings Cleopatra was compared to the sinful Eve. For instance, in *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum* (1611) Aemilia Lanyer implies that Cleopatra is similar to Eve in tasting the forbidden fruit of adulterous sexual pleasure by sleeping with the married Antonius:

> What fruit did yeeld that faire forbidden tree,  
> But blood, dishonour, infamie, and shame?  
> Poore blinded Queene, could'st thou no better see,  
> But entertaine disgrace, in stead of fame?  

While Philips draws an analogy between Cleopatra and the Virgin Mary, there are many instances in the text which suggest a link between Pompey and Christ. In Corneille's text Cleopatra regards Pompey's death as the spilling of noble blood: "et nos bords malheureux/ Sont-ils déjà souillés d'un sang si généreux?" (II, ii). Philips's translation of these lines is significant: "What, is it done, and hath some Treacherous hand/ With that rich bloud stain'd our unhappy strand?" (II, ii). The connection between bloodstains and hands, which is not present in Corneille's tragedy, reminds one of the Biblical narratives of Christ's Crucifixion. Pilate washes his hands to remove the stains of guilt caused by his condemnation of Christ: "When Pilate saw that he could prevail nothing, but that rather a tumult was made, he took water, and washed his hands before the multitude, stating, I am innocent of the blood of this just person: see ye to it" (Matthew 27: 24). Evoking the notion of hands stained by blood, Philips draws a connection between Pompey and Christ. In Corneille's text, Pompey's princely courage in undergoing his slaughter is foregrounded. Exhibiting stoic fortitude, Pompey feels too dignified to cast a look upon the heavens who assigned him his treacherous fate. He does not express the pain that he suffers: "Il ne semble implorer son aide ou sa vengeance:/ Aucun gémissement à son coeur échappé/ Ne le montre, en mourant, digne d'être frappé" (II, ii, ll. 516-20). However, allusions to Christ's crucifixion in this scene are more overt in Philips's version. Philips's Pompey does not just show dignity, meeting his death without struggle or resistance. He is also completely silent: "Not the least poor complaint fell from his Tongue/ Or ought that spoke him worthy of his wrong" (II, ii, page 18). Corneille's term "gémissement" mainly signifies lamenting of pain or distress, thus implying that Pompey

---

43 The image of the Phoenix was also employed as a trope for Christ. See my discussion of Cary's tragedy, page
did not moan because of pain. However, Philips's choice for the word "complaint" has more to do with language, creating the impression that Pompey did not voice his resentment towards his enemies and met his death in silence. The emphasis that Philips lays upon Pompey's speechlessness reinforces the analogy with Christ, who did not speak during his unjust treatment: "Then said Pilate unto him, Hearest thou not how many things they witness against thee? And he answered him to never a word, insomuch that the governor marvelled greatly" (Matthew 27: 13-14).

The analogy suggested between Pompey and Christ affects the readers' and audience's view of Cleopatra. She is shown to align with the concepts of justice and duty that Pompey, as a Christ figure, represents. Her bold assertion of voice upon certain occasions is thus presented as pseudo-religious praise. Her defence of Pompey is similar to women writers such as Sowernam and Collins who legitimised their utterances by depicting it as praise for God and Christ, and a defence of God and his creation. At the same time, Cleopatra's defence of Pompey can be read as an analogy of the way in which Philips herself engaged with politics by seeking to defend royalty. As mentioned above, Philips commented on what she perceived to be the unjust murder of king Charles I by equating the slaughtered king with Pompey. Philips's legitimisation of Cleopatra's political speeches in support of Pompey therefore seems to entail the justification of her own Royalist sentiments.

7.6. Maternity and Female Address in Pompey.

In the earlier quoted address to the Countess of Cork, Philips asks the Countess to "protect the Person you expose", that is, Philips herself. In this way Philips creates the illusion that her writing was designed to be consumed in an appropriately private, domestic setting. Philips also pictures her play as a child that needs to be mothered by the Countess. She claims that her translated tragedy "must all her being own" to the "breath" of the Countess (1667, Dd1r). Thus playfully alluding to the Countess's role as the patron who lends her support to the translation project, Philips embeds her writing in the feminine context of motherhood.

While shifting the role of the mother to the Countess in her prologue, Philips implicitly assumes the position of mother herself in the songs that she wrote for the performance of her play. The idea conveyed by the song presented after the first Act is that playwrights need to offer diversions to their Monarchs, as soothing moments of repose amidst the heavy burden of Royal responsibilities: "Since the business of Kings is angry and rough,/Their intervals ought to be soft/ To our Monarch we owe, whatsoever we enjoy….To
contribute to his repose". The "diversions" that Philips refers to in her song may also be applied to the tragedy that Philips had translated, which, surprisingly in the light of the tragic plot and its representation of an incapable king, she obviously hoped to be agreeable to the King as a form of relaxation. At the same time, Philips's definition of her function as Royal subject and playwright as the caretaker of the Monarch's comfort suggests that her work has a nurturing character. Philips the playwright must relieve the monarch from troubles, just as a mother would soothe an exhausted child. In other words, Philips identified her role as a playwright with that of the nurturing mother. Thus casting herself as a playwright in the role of the mother, Philips apparently created the illusion that she did not overstep gender boundaries, and legitimised her engagement with drama. Intriguingly, Cleopatra performs an analogous role in the play, as the female subject who aims to protect the King. When Ptolomy expresses his purpose of choosing Caesar's side and abandoning Pompey, Cleopatra speaks up in order to save her brother from harm: "And a few hours will such a change effect./As your Dark Policy did least expect./And shew you why I spoke so like a Queen" (I, iii). Cleopatra boldly speaks her mind in order to take "motherly" care of her brother, which makes her loud protest seem justified.

On the one hand, maternal discourses play a significant role in Philips's legitimisation of female utterance. On the other hand, contradictorily, the acceptability of woman's assertion of voice in the play relies on fatherhood, the Law of the Father, and the erasure of the mother figure. Cleopatra derives her right to speak her from her defence of Pompey, who has been like a father to her family, and who protected and reinstated her own father as a King. Whereas her brother does not seem to be concerned with the duty that he owes to Pompey, Cleopatra is. She must utter her thoughts in order to emphasise Pompey's former paternal care, and Ptolomy's filial duty to him. Cleopatra's assertion of voice seems justified in the light of her father's will. According to "the King our Fathers will" (I, iii) Ptolomy should share his rule over Egypt with Cleopatra. Therefore, the princess has the right to utter her anger at Ptolomy's usurping her "equal seat" (I, iii): "I ask but what's my own" (II, iii). It is the memory of the father figure Pompey, and the law set down by her own father that make Cleopatra's assertive discourse acceptable. Yet this legitimisation involves an erasure of maternity: Cleopatra's and Ptolomy's mother remains unremembered, and the play is devoid of any mother characters.

Perhaps this idea of offering relaxation should therefore be seen as an ironic comment, in that she sought to criticise rather than please the monarch. However, this seems unlikely, considering the fact that Philips translated scenes from the play in order to obtain favours from the king.
It is remarkable how much freedom of speech the two leading female characters, Cleopatra and Cornelia, enjoy in both Corneille's original and Philips's translation. Cleopatra's voice is a prominent presence in the play, whether read or staged, since Cleopatra is involved in self-expression in almost every scene of the drama. Cleopatra's assertion of voice at the moment when Photin attempts to interrupt her discussion with the king, and her subsequent silencing of him, may have had an even greater impact when heard on the Dublin stage than when read out as a closet drama. Moreover, Philips's audience and readers may have been surprised by the public nature and contexts of Cleopatra's speeches. At times Cleopatra openly interferes with and intervenes in the public arena of politics. Rather than meeting her brother's government with feminine silence, Cleopatra asserts her voice, claiming that Ptolemy should not be swayed by the false views expressed by his political advisers, since his execution of Pompey has already evoked Caesar's displeasure. Yet, Cleopatra is not the only female character in the play that asserts her voice publicly. Captured by Caesar, Cornelia raises her voice towards him in defiance of his command over her. She argues that her identity is beyond his control: "Command, but think not to subject my Will/ Remember this, I am Cornelia still" (III, iv).

This bold outspokenness of the two women in the play is not condemned, but legitimised. In her translation Philips reinforces Cleopatra's femininity, by diminishing the aggressiveness and forcefulness of her female protagonist's self-assertion. When Philips's Cleopatra insists that she is entitled to part of the government of Egypt, she alleges that she speaks like a Queen because of the Royal pride "which is conveyed to Princes with their blood" (I, ii). By using the pronoun "their", Philips's Cleopatra is less assertive than Corneille's Cléopâtre who emphasises her own royal status: "les coeurs de ceux de notre rang" (I,ii, emphasis mine). Cornelia's outspokenness is also represented as just and acceptable through its identification with loyalty and duty towards Pompey. Cornelia's public indignation at her husband's murder implies that her assertion of voice serves justice, and indicates that she is a loyal wife. Moreover, as Caesar suggests, Cornelia is the passive vessel through which her father's and husband's voices express themselves: "Your generous Thoughts do quickly make us know/ To whom your Birth, to whom your Love you owe… Crassus… Pompey…The Scipio's blood, who sav'd our Deities,/ Speak in your Tongue, and sparkle in your Eyes"(III, iv). In other words, Cornelia is depicted as the instrument of her
father's and husband's will to speak. Her bold expression of thoughts is represented as part of her role as a submissive daughter and faithful wife.

Whereas Cleopatra and Cornelia are successful in their address to Caesar, Ptolomy fails to persuade Caesar. Cleopatra manages to convince Caesar to spare Ptolomy's life, and Cornelia's speeches secure Caesar's mercy towards her. By contrast, Ptolomy lacks the oral skills to convince Caesar of his good will towards him, Caesar unmasking his orations as hypocritical flattery: "You employ, Ptolomy, such Crafty Words./ And weak Excuses as your Cause affords" (III, iii). Cornelia manages to uphold her own identity as "Cornelia still" (III, iv) despite Caesar's initial aim to reduce her to the role of prisoner. Philips's Cleopatra succeeds in constructing and adopting the role of "Queen" (II, iii) in spite of her brother's efforts to appropriate royal authority. However, Ptolomy lacks control over his own representation, and is excluded from the role of producer of meaning. He fails to construct the illusion that he is an ally to Caesar, because Caesar divines Ptolomy's opportunism in defining himself as his friend. Likewise, Cleopatra is not deluded by the identity of the authoritative, determined ruler that her brother wishes to present to the world. She displays consciousness of the fact that her brother is a mere plaything, swayed by his political advisers: "I know but too much Photin, and his Crew/ Have with their wicked Counsels poison'd you" (I, ii). Apart from lacking control over his own public image, Ptolomy is denied the authority of representing other people. When he endeavours to describe Pompey to Caesar, Caesar does not allow him to proceed, exclaiming: "Forbear, touch not his Glory, let his life suffice" (III, iii).

If we consider the issues of knowledge and narrative command, one could argue that the female characters enjoy a greater degree of subjectivity than the male characters. Ptolomy cannot keep it a secret that he is ruled by his advisers, nor can he create the illusion that he has chosen Caesar's side. Caesar, in turn, cannot hide from Cornelia that his supposed devotion to memorialise Pompey is rooted in the desire for further admiration and the ambition to extend his influence: "Thou to this Hero now devout art grown./ But, raising his Name, doth exalt thy own" (V, i). Cleopatra, however, manages to harbour secrets that remain unknown to the outside world until she decides to reveal them, being fully in command over the extent to which she allows herself to be known. Cleopatra has concealed Caesar's former passion for her for many years, until she considers the time to be ripe for revelation: "Receive a secret I conceal'd before" (I, ii). Moreover, as she says to Ptolomy, as far as her right to the throne is concerned, she leaves him "to divine/ In this Contest" what could be her "design" (I, ii).
As far as narrative control is concerned, one can again make a distinction between the male characters and the female characters. The men in the play strive for command over the events in order to attain power, but fail to achieve this control. Despite his mercy towards and respect for Cornelia, Caesar wishes to organise burial ceremonies for Pompey in order to enhance his fame. However, as we have seen, Cornelia exposes Caesar's self-interest. As a consequence, it is not only Caesar's plan of triumphing that is thus upset, but also his scheme of winning over Cornelia. Cornelia refuses to accept Caesar's clemency and friendship, arguing: "if Pompey's Sons and Kindred do/ Attempt thy death, then I shall with it too" (IV, iv). Ptolomy is even more obsessed by the idea of narrative autonomy than Caesar. Assuming that "he Reigns not, that does not Reign alone" (I, i), Ptolomy is unwilling to share the throne with Cleopatra. However, this desire to command the course of events is in shrill contrast with the lack of narrative command that he exercises as a king who is "always steered" by the "advice" (II, iii) given by the politician Photin.

Ptolomy intends to achieve control over the plot, but fails to reach it. His plan to obtain Caesar's favour by beheading Ptolomy ends up in a fiasco, since he evokes Caesar's anger. His subsequent plot of having Caesar murdered is also undermined, because Cornelia has discovered his murderous intent, and exposes the plot to Caesar: "Caesar, have a care,/ For traytors have against thy life combin'd" (IV, iv). Ptolomy's failure in directing the course of events appears to be bound up with his unwillingness to observe the Law of the Father and his irreligious attitude. His refusal to share regal power with Cleopatra signifies a transgression of his father's will. Although Ptolomy is set upon controlling his and other characters' existence single-handedly, he faint-heartedly shifts responsibility for his decisions and deeds to the Gods: "I of his Fortune not of him complain,/ But with regret Act what the Gods ordain" (I, i)..."I have done only what the Gods inspir'd" (I, ii). Ptolomy's unjustified thirst for absolute power is accompanied by an adoption of religious discourses which define the gods as the sole agents of history, so that Ptolomy may evade responsibility for his deeds.

In contrast with Ptolomy in particular, the female characters in the play mainly aim for narrative command in order to see to it that justice is done. Cornelia discards carrying out a revenge plot, for she claims that she wants to leave vengeance in the hands of Pompey's sons and her kindred. This feminine forfeiture of narrative command is countered by Cornelia's later statement that she will pursue revenge for Pompey's death: "This hate shall be my Pompey now, and I/ In his Revenge will live, and with it die" (V, iv, 60). Yet, at the same time, the aim that she expresses to arrange revenge seems legitimised: her desire for revenge is at the same time an urge for political and moral justice. Moreover, her utterance "This hate
shall be my Pompey now" creates the impression that Cornelia has set her mind on revenge because the hatred that she feels at her husband's assassination has taken the place of her spouse himself. Revenging Pompey's slaughter therefore is equated with being a loyal wife. While Cornelia displays an urge for narrative command over the plot that is compatible with her femininity, intriguingly, she appears very successful in attaining this control. Cornelia experienced helplessness at her husband's brutal murder: "By woful shrieks, she try'd his life to shield/ Then hopeless up to Heav'n her hands she held/ fainting as in a deadly swoon" (II, ii). However, Cornelia manages to withstand and overrule Caesar. She stoically defies his narrative command over her as his prisoner, which eventually results in his mercy and her release: "Command, but think not to subject my Will/ Remember this, I am Cornelia still" (III, iv). At the same time Cornelia respects the agency of the divine. She views herself as an object whose fate is governed by supernatural forces: "what Stars do govern me" (III, iv).

Similar to Cornelia, Cleopatra enjoys a high degree of narrative control. Although she believes that she "with Caesar little can prevail" (IV, iii), she can successfully direct his will into promising to spare her brother. In addition, Cleopatra refuses to assume the conventional female role of the object of exchange that is subjected to man’s will. When Ptolomy proposes to marry her off to Caesar, Cleopatra indignantly replies: “Make your own Presents, I’le dispose of mine” (I, ii). The fact that Philips's Cleopatra exercises control not just over her own existence, but also successfully directs others in order to see her desires come true marks her out as different from Sidney's Cleopatra figure who can only govern her own existence by her autonomous choice for death. This shows that Philips chose to translate a tragedy which goes further in granting narrative control to female characters than her female precursors.

Cleopatra's efforts to obtain her share of rule over Egypt, and her ultimate success in gaining the position of Queen, may have seemed outrageously ambitious to readers and theatre audiences in Philips's time. However, her ambition and narrative command are depicted as acceptable through their association with justice. Since Cleopatra had been granted a portion of rule by her father, she is entitled to achieve her title, and her right to the throne is further emphasised by the suggestion that she would make a more loyal, determined monarch than her feeble, false brother. Cleopatra's exertion of and will to command over her existence and the events around her seem less transgressive, because she respects the hand of divine power in the fate of mankind. As she says to Cornelia: "Heaven does not govern as our Wills direct" (V, ii). By thus pointing to the limits to man's narrative control, Cleopatra phrases the main idea of the song at the end of Act IV. In this song Philips emphasises that man may not always be able to fulfil his or her ambitions, since death often overturns one's
plans: "What is become of all they did? / And what of all they had design'd/ Now Death the busie Scene hath hid?". Since life may take unexpected turns, it is better to aim for honourability than for greatness: "What is the Charm of being Great?/ Which oft is gain'd and lost with Sin". Cornelia may wish to have Pompey's murder revenged, and Cleopatra may argue that ambition is the only "Sovereign of my Will" (I, iii), both women nevertheless respect the limitations of human control. The differences between Ptolomy on the one hand, and Cleopatra and Cornelia on the other hand as far as the extent of their narrative control is concerned, has to do with the fact that the women respect divine power, whereas Ptolomy does not. Corneille apparently intended to differentiate between the two sets of characters on the basis of their attitude towards divinity. It is interesting that Philips, as a woman writer in a culture which denied woman a narrative voice at all, translated this particular play in which the women characters achieve more narrative authority than the male characters.


Since the only characters in the play that die are of the male sex, it is impossible to compare and contrast the deaths of the male and female characters in Pompey, a Tragedy. However, since both male and female characters are engaged with memorialising rites, the issue of memory deserves further attention in relation to the representation of gender in the play. The play contests men's appropriation of the discourses of memorialisation. For Ptolomy memory is a concept of little significance, since he refuses to consider the memory of Pompey's good will towards his family in his politics, remembering it "with a scornful pride" (I, ii). Contrary to her brother, Cleopatra voices the memory of Pompey's former service, and thus is shown to be better able to adopt memorialising discourses than her brother. Caesar offers to arrange extensive burial rites, and pay his respect to Pompey through speeches, but only does so out of self interest, his memorialising rites for Pompey serving as the means to secure his own lasting fame in memory. It therefore seems appropriate that Cornelia manages to gain possession over Pompey's head and the rest of his remains, so that "The Head of Pompey with his Bones may rest" (V, iv) in a family grave. Besides, Cleopatra, though yet alive, already manages to ensure transcendence over her future death. Caesar will not just "let Altars build" to Pompey, but also a "Throne" to Cleopatra, with the injunction: "And to them both Immortal Honours yield" (V, iv). Whereas Cleopatra is thus granted a place in eternal memory while still alive, her dead brother Ptolomy remains unnamed in this scene, and seems to be forgotten already.
Philips's Cleopatra manages to transcend death while being alive. This marks her out as different from the Cleopatra figures in previously written or translated Renaissance drama. Shakespeare's Cleopatra can only achieve full narrative control over her own existence by committing suicide. Samuel Daniel's and Mary Sidney's Cleopatra characters manage to attain narrative control through the representation of their deaths as acts of self memorialisation, which are outside Caesar's control. However, they can also only achieve full narrative authority through their self-fashioned deaths. Philips's Cleopatra is therefore unique among these Cleopatra representations, in that she does not have to lose her life, or undergo a complete erasure of identity and subjectivity, in order to become a narrative subject in the play. One may therefore conclude that Philips's choice of text for translation implied a reconstruction of the subjectivity granted to Cleopatra figures in the English seventeenth-century dramatic tradition.


When Philips translated Corneille's tragedy and when her tragedy was staged in Dublin in February 1663, the British theatres had only been open again for three years. Although in the interval of the closure of the theatres some dramatists had produced new plays in the form of closet dramas or published texts, the early Restoration theatres faced a shortage of plays that could be staged. Therefore, in the early years of the Restoration revivals of Fletcher, Shakespeare, Massinger, Suckling made up 55 per cent of the repertory. Given the important position of Shakespeare and Fletcher in the early Restoration tragic tradition as well as Philips's own attendance of Beaumont and Fletcher's The Maid's Tragedy in 1660, it appears relevant to compare Philips's translation to tragedies such as Shakespeare's Othello, Beaumont and Fletcher's The Maid's Tragedy, Shirley's The Politician and Ford's two major tragic plays. The question that should be central to this comparative analysis is: to what extent does Philips' choice to translate Corneille's tragedy into English imply alternative representations of woman's utterance and female tragic subjectivity?

As we have seen, the stereotype of the wanton, wordy woman is confirmed by most tragic drama written during the Jacobean and Caroline periods, and the Civil War. John Ford's female characters Annabella, Putana and Hippolyta as well as James Shirley's Marpisa correspond to the culturally constructed image of the outspoken, eloquent woman whose assertive voice signals her sexual incontinence. At the same time, from the Jacobean period
onwards alternative views on female utterance were negotiated on the stage. Webster's Duchess of Malfi is morally and sexually pure, yet witty, and Ford's heroines Calantha and Penthea speak up without being sexually defiled creatures. Philips's selection of a drama in which an outspoken heroine is identified with moral, political and sexual virtue shows that she probably wished to elaborate upon the emerging discourses which presented woman's speech in a more positive light. In fact, there are clearly distinguishable correspondences between Philips's drama and earlier tragedies as far as her representation of the female speaking subject is concerned. Her Cleopatra, experiencing chaste sexual desire, and placing honour before lust, is similar to the Duchess who is loyal in her amorous passions.

Furthermore, similar to Othello, The Duchess of Malfi and, to some extent, 'Tis Pity She's a Whore, Philips's play attributes the stereotype of the outspoken, lusty woman to man's wanton nature. Philips's play differs from most seventeenth-century plays in that woman's self expression is depicted as in line with the patriarchal laws, rather than transgressive of the patriarchal order. This depiction intensifies the positive portrayal of woman's utterance by Philips.

However, Philips's translation contains a more radical recreation of the conventions of female tragic subjectivity than the other plays mentioned. Ford's Annabella, Putana and Hippolyta all undergo the plot conventionally reserved for the outspoken women. Whereas they enjoy some control over the plot and over their own representation earlier on in the play, they lose this command in the course of the tragedy. They end up as exposed, signified objects who do not even exercise autonomy over their lives and deaths. Likewise, Beaumont and Fletcher's Evadne loses her initial command over her discourse and life. The price that all these women characters have to pay for their self-assertion is death. Philips's translated tragedy differs in this respect, in that her assertive heroines may speak up boldly and exercise control over their own lives and the "plots" of the other characters, yet stay alive at the end of the tragedy. Thus, she increased the scope for female tragic subjectivity by introducing a drama which allowed the female protagonist a greater discursive and narrative command without submitting her to death. By contrast, the men in the play fail to achieve the status of the signifying, directing subjects at the tragic closure. Philips thus appears to have subverted the conventional tragic plot according to which men end up as powerful, whereas women are reduced to powerlessness. In addition, Cornelia and Cleopatra achieve control over the process of memorialisation: Cleopatra succeeds in securing eternal fame during her lifetime, and Cornelia commands the ways in which her husband Pompey is to be memorialised.

Ptolomy and Caesar, on the other hand, fail to establish a lasting fame as glorious rulers: Ptolomy is forgotten after his death, and Caesar does not succeed in gaining the reputation of the conqueror. This pattern is in contrast with conventional tragedies in which the male characters rather than the female characters achieve transcendence in memory.

7.10. Conclusion: Katherine Philips as a Dramatist and her Female Precursors.

The legitimising discourses in *Pompey, a Tragedy* with regard to woman's voice are similar to those used by Sidney, Cary and Cavendish in their tragedies, namely the discourses of maternity, religion, female address and virginity. However, in Philips's case her use of the discourses of virginity implies a legitimisation of woman's public position as well. In the text of her play the discourses of virginity closely intersect with discourses of political justice and morality, so that she involves the political in her legitimising representation of her female protagonist. In doing so, she brings the two separate gender spheres of the private domestic and public political together. Although *Pompey, a Tragedy* suggests a female "Ambition" that is "checkt", Philips thus opens up the possibilities for questioning woman's exclusion from politics and political speaking positions in a way similar to Cavendish. Challenging woman's exclusion from the sphere of public speech by Cleopatra's lawful claim to the throne, Philips takes the legitimisation of woman's utterance even a step further than Sidney and Cary did.

The role of political and public discourses in the legitimisation of Cleopatra's voice and authority may have been the reason why her translated play was so readily adopted for the stage. Like Sidney's, Cary's and Cavendish's tragedies, Philips's translation has generic characteristics that obviously belong to closet drama. Pompey's death is not staged, but narrated by the messenger; his decease halfway the play influences the other characters and the course of the plot; Cornelia is clearly Stoic in her resistance towards Caesar, and political issues are debated through dialogues. Yet, at the same time the idea of the tragedy as "enclosed" is undermined. Cornelia has left the scene, but her disappearance does not preclude her coming back to take revenge after all. Furthermore, in contrast with most female heroines, Cleopatra is alive and kicking at the end of the tragedy, enjoying more glory than she had previously. In this sense Philips's tragic closure is similar to Cavendish's, in that the outspoken women seem to live happily ever after. The tragic closure of *Pompey* does not mark the female protagonist's death, and thus allow for a continuation of her actions and speeches beyond the limits of the play. Philips's translation pushes the limits of closet drama again even further than Cary's tragedy, in that Cleopatra's tongue remains a living presence
which therefore may move beyond the boundaries of the text, while Mariam's voice transcends tragic closure as a dead woman's speech. Furthermore, unlike Mariam, Cleopatra does not have to suffer death in order to attain narrative and semantic control. In this way, like Cavendish who depicted women who did not have to die in order to be in command over their fates, Philips introduced a female dramatic character enjoying a previously unknown degree of subjectivity.
Part IV. "I'm hither come, but what d'ye think to say?":
Women and Tragedy, 1665-1680
Figure 10: Nell Gwyn, by Sir Peter Lely (National Portrait Gallery, London).
Part IV. "I'm hither come, but what d'ye think to say?": Women and Drama, 1665-1680.

When the public theatres re-opened in 1660, the distinction between courtly theatre and popular theatre disappeared. Instead of having plays brought to the court, the King attended performances at the public playhouses, and thus set the fashion for theatre going. Furthermore, King Charles II lent patronage to a group of actors called the King's men. He decreed that the London theatres should be organised by two patent companies run by Sir Thomas Killigrew and Sir William Davenant. These groups were located at two theatres, the King's and the Duke's, and the repertoire of plays from before the Civil War was divided between them. The King's support of the public theatre enhanced its popularity, and as a result, it became a writer's market.

Being a patron of drama in the public theatre, King Charles II could exercise influence on the dramatic production. Living in exile on the Continent, the King as well as the greater part of the English nobility had become used to seeing women actors on the public stage, and the King foresaw the demand for actresses in English theatres as well. Using boy-actors in plays became prohibited as an immoral act, so that the need for introducing women to the stage could no longer be denied. Yet, as I have pointed out, due to their public utterances on the stage the actresses were associated with wanton conduct, and backstage they were treated as if they were sexually available. This association between the actress and the prostitute was reinforced by the scenic stage of the Restoration theatre, which allowed for a promiscuous interchange through asides and direct address between actress and audience, who were not

---

1 Wiseman speaks about the "blending of courtly and public performance after the restoration, with the increased presence of the court at the public theatre" (1998, 92).
3 See also Wiseman, 1996, 25-26.
4 As Stephen Orgel claims: "the male public theatre represents a uniquely English solution to the universal European disapproval of actresses" (1996, 10), for actresses had already been a common phenomenon on the continent in the sixteenth century. As Cockin points out, Marie Fairet was a celebrated actress in France around 1545, and Isabella Andreini (1562-1604) "achieved fame for her work as performer and organizer of commedia dell'arte in Italy and France" (1998, 19). See also Michel Adam: "Le long exil d'une importante fraction de la noblesse anglaise sur le continent avait familiarisé les spectateurs avec la présence habituelle des actrices...Le ridicule tuait encore à la cour de Charles II, et l'on comprend aisément que les émigrés de 1642-1660 aient préféré retrouver en Angleterre une distribution analogue à celle du continent" (Adam, 1993, 44).
5 Already before the Civil War, criticism was expressed on the use of transvestite boy-actors: it was believed that male spectators would become effeminate by watching crossdressing male actors on stage, coming to "lust after the youth beneath the woman's costume, thereby playing the woman's role themselves" (Orgel, 1995, 27). In Histriomastix (1633) William Prynne argued that "players and play-haunters in their secret conclaves play the sodomites" (211).
sealed off from each other. The admission of women as actors on the stage also led to an increase in eroticised parts. The actresses were often identified with the parts of the sexually thirsty and promiscuous woman, because the audience found it hard to view the actresses as separate from the roles that they played.

Intriguingly, the period in which women became involved with writing for the public theatre was the same period in which actresses were introduced to the English stage. Hence, it can be argued that "women's public drama flower[ed] with the appearance of women playing women's parts" (Ballaster, 1996, 269). By seeing women on the stage who publicly asserted their voices, women playwrights were partly encouraged to display their words to the public in the theatre as well. The admission of actresses contributed to women's creation of public drama in another sense, because as actresses women for the first time obtained practical theatrical apprenticeship. Yet, while the introduction of actresses partly stimulated women's production of plays for the stage, the performance of their plays with women acting female parts may have forced a constraint on women playwrights. Women playwrights may have experienced an enormous anxiety that they would be identified with the other women who were involved with the play, and who also spoke up in public, albeit more directly: the actresses, who were socially branded prostitutes. The analogy between the prostitute, the actress and the female playwright was reinforced by the fact that, like the prostitute, the actress and the female playwright were engaged in a process of offering pleasure in exchange for money. The actress offered her body as a pleasurable spectacle to the audience in exchange for payment, while the playwrights offered part of herself, her work, to the spectators in exchange for admission fees. As a result, the exchange relation between female actor and audience was constructed in sexual and commercial terms, and the pleasure-for-money provided by the female dramatist "acquired sexual undertones", which "created an association between playwrighting and whoring" (Straznicky, 1997, 709).

---

6 See Munns, 1991, 204. As Deborah Payne argues, the actress was not only an object to be looked at by the audience, but actively gazed back in return. This intensified the eroticisation of actresses. See Payne, 1995,30.
7 "When women began to act for the first time the audience had to acknowledge real women, not simply their symbolic or aesthetic representation. The effect of this clash- the flesh and blood actress colliding with a dominant tradition of male-generated female characters- had the effect of suggesting that actresses are not creators of theatrical roles but are merely women who play themselves" (Ferris, 1998, 167).
9 Actresses like Elizabeth Barry, Frances Maria Knight and Elizabeth Boutel had the reputation of being almost prostitutes: "Chestnut-man'd Boutel whom all the Town F-ks" (quoted in Pearson, 1988, 27). Women playwrights identified with the actresses on stage, as is revealed by the prologues and epilogues to Aphra Behn's plays. Behn often represents her role as the playwright as the assumption of a role. For instance, in the prologue to The Forc'd Marriage (1671) it is suggested that the female playwright adopts "Stratagem", and uses "Arts" in order to win the audience for her. This is an allusion to performativity. Moreover, in the epilogue to Abdelazer
Not surprisingly, the first female dramatists who had their plays performed on the public stage displayed anxiety about the public appearance of their drama. For instance, Frances Boothby, whose tragicomedy *Marcelia, or The Treacherous Friend* was staged at "the Theatre-Royal by His Majesties Servants" (A2v) on October 9th 1669, voices the fear that the audience will condemn her play:

I'm hither come, but what d'ye think to say?
A Woman's pen presents you with a Play:
Who smiling told me I'd be sure to see
That one confirm'd, the House wou'd empty be…
'Tis still the Critick men she most does fear:
For if that Solomon now liv'd and writ;
They'd cry, Pish, hang't, there's nothing in't of Wit.10 (A3r)

At the same time, Boothby seeks to distance herself from the female presence of the actress on the stage. The prologue to the play is presented by a male actor who suggests that he is passing on messages from the female playwright who is backstage: "Guess now the Message; /
She prays ye to be gone" (A3r). The absence of the female dramatist from the stage is thus emphasised. As a result, the woman playwright is dissociated from the women appearing on the stage: the actresses who were identified with sexual availability. The continuously created impression that the dramatist's voice cannot directly be heard in the public theatrical setting signals Boothby's anxiety about exposing her drama in public.

While writing for the public stage was a most adventurous undertaking for a women, a small number of women from the middle and lower ranks, such as Frances Boothby, Elizabeth Polwhele and Aphra Behn nevertheless sought to have their plays staged in public theatres. Getting their plays staged was by no means easy. In order to write a play for the stage, a good working knowledge of stage-craft was indispensable. Such knowledge of production and stage mechanics could only be acquired by either working as an actor or watching many plays.11 Since women were only admitted as actresses by 1660, and since going to the theatre was still held rather unacceptable for a woman, it was very difficult for women dramatists to break free from the "closet" of domestic drama, and move on to writing for the public theatre. Because access to the theatrical world was still rather limited for

---

10 As Ros Ballaster argues: "This structure becomes the distinctive mark of the woman dramatist's prologue in Restoration drama...providing a specifically female twist to the male prologue, which also addresses and attempts to invoke the interest of specific sectors of the audience" (1996, 278).
11 "If a novice playwright was not a working actor, or at least a company hanger-on, and had not learned the craft through performance itself, the only other avenue of entry into a working knowledge of theatre craft was to watch a great number of plays or to be carefully edited by a manager willing to take the time" (Donkin, 1998, 66).
women, it is not remarkable that of all playwrights whose plays were being produced in London from 1660 to 1800 only about seven per cent were women.\textsuperscript{12}

Apart from these difficulties, women with aspirations to become professional playwrights had to convince theatre managers that a woman could write a good play. The women who desired to have their plays performed had to submit their texts to theatre managers, usually established members of the nobility, "who would read the scripts and suggest alterations", and if the play was deemed acceptable, would "recommend performance at a particular theatre (Straznicky 1997, 707).\textsuperscript{13} For women who supported the Royalist cause, such as Aphra Behn, access to the stage was facilitated through her connections with nobility involved in managing public theatres and financially sponsoring dramatic productions. Women's increasing engagement with theatre management appears to have contributed to an increase in performances of plays by women. Lady Davenant had, at least nominally, taken over the Duke's Company on her husband's death in 1668, which may have helped the presentation of Behn's first play by that company.\textsuperscript{14} Interestingly, it was not just Behn, but also Elizabeth Polwhele, and several decades later, Mary Pix, Delarivier Manley and Catherine Trotter who had their first plays performed by the Duke's Company. Thus, the Duke's Company appears to have played a significant role in the development of the professional female playwright.

\textsuperscript{12} Ibidem 65.

\textsuperscript{13} Like their male colleagues, women playwrights could be forced to alter a play significantly by the theatre managers implied that they could not always voice radical views in their plays, or suggest revolutionary plots.

\textsuperscript{14} As Elizabeth Howe states: "After William Davenant's death in April 1668 his widow, Lady Davenant, did become manager of the Duke's Company, remaining in the position until June 1673 when her son Charles was old enough to take over" (1992, 46). See also Lewcock, 1996, 68.