The Sexual Politics of Behn's "Rover": After Patriarchy
Author(s): Stephen Szilagyi
Source: *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 95, No. 4 (Autumn, 1998), pp. 435-455
Published by: University of North Carolina Press
Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/4174621
Accessed: 24-09-2019 07:49 UTC

The Sexual Politics of Behn's *Rover*: After Patriarchy

by Stephen Szilagyi

APHRA Behn's *The Rover, Or, The Banish't Cavaliers*, her best known comedy, was first acted and published in 1677. As Laura Brown explains, Behn's play was keeping very good company: it "was produced only three months after *The Plain Dealer*, a year after *The Man of Mode*, and twenty-six months after *The Country Wife*, at the height, that is, of the period of major dramatic satire." Brown connects *The Rover* with these more canonical plays by stressing the formal similarity "in its disjunction of social and moral values as well as in its problematic reconciliation of libertinism and royalism."[1] Of course, Brown correctly emphasizes Behn's serious attention to disjunction, libertinism, and royalism, but much of the play's power originates in a major difference from the famous comedies with which it clusters. Unlike the others, Behn's play is suffused with the Cavalier experience of the Interregnum, not only set in Naples during the exile, but conspicuously adapted from Thomas Killigrew's *Thomaso, or, The Wanderer*, a closet drama written in 1654. In contrast, the other plays have contemporary town settings. This difference does not imply that Behn's is a history play. On the contrary, she too is very much pressured by the social, moral, and political conditions in the mid-1670s; however, she obviously believes they are best examined in the context of the past.

The play's complex historicism has yet to be adequately explained. Maureen Duffy, for instance, stresses the play's "nostalgia," as "a rallying for the faithful when the first romance of the King's return had worn thin and the country was again divided into factions."[2] For Duffy,

[1] Laura Brown, *English Dramatic Form, 1660–1760: An Essay in Generic History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981), 60.

[2] Maureen Duffy, *The Passionate Shepherdess: Aphra Behn, 1640–89* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1977), 145.

the play simply mediates between the past and present. The play's temporal location also interests Edward Burns: "*The Rover* could be seen as anachronistic, either ahead of its time or behind it; its revival of the myth of the cavaliers, its link of Charles's reinstatement to an unambiguously celebrated ethos of pleasure and wit, stands suggestively between the comedies of Restoration and the revival of Stuart iconography that follows on Charles's decision to rule without parliament."[3] Unlike Duffy, Burns situates the play in a complex anachronistic present, but this mistakenly makes it seem more relevant to the past or the future than to its own time. In fact, however, in conflating past, present, and future, Behn's setting intensifies the "problematic reconciliation of libertinism and royalism" noted by Brown. Because of the Interregnum setting, the Restoration play emerges in a Foucauldian interstice, opened by the conjunction of the Cavalier past and present, as the contested space between the Cavalier fathers and their sons. It opens between, for instance, the heroic Cavalier Henry Wilmot, who helps save Charles after his defeat at the Battle of Worcester, and the mock-heroic courtier son, John Wilmot, the notorious Rochester, who attacks the Merry Monarch in his obscene "scepter lampoon."[4] Fundamentally, however, the Royalist situation in both worlds is the same: a legitimate patriarchal figure is absent. Indeed, as Michael Neill justly observes of the younger generation's perception of the Cavalier past, "it was a past which (for all its heroic ethos) presented to the coolly inspecting eye a history of incompetence, failure, and ultimate defeat that the rather prosaic circumstances of Charles's return could scarcely annul."[5] The Cavaliers in their banishment are a sign of the absent patriarch in defeat, and the libertine sons at court are a sign of the absence of Charles's patriarchal rule. In Behn's *Rover*, the patriarchal, royal father is, therefore, doubly absent and only imaged by a fraternal group, in which the mock-heroic is superimposed upon the heroic—the past and present banished Cavaliers. Moreover, the dominance of this group predicts the strife attending same-generation male governance

[3] Edward Burns, *Restoration Comedy: Crises of Desire and Identity* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1987), 140.

[4] This is the apt title of convenience supplied by David M. Vieth for the poem beginning "I' th' isle of Britain, long since famous grown" ("Rochester's 'Scepter' Lampoon on Charles II," *PQ* 37 [1958]: 424–32). The poem's more specific relevance to *The Rover* is discussed later in this essay.

[5] Michael Neill, "Heroic Heads and Humble Tails: Sex, Politics, and the Restoration Comic Rake," *Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation* 24 (1983): 116.

in the future.[6] Indeed, inherent in Foucault's notion of emergence and genealogy is the future, the continuous and discontinuous repetition of emergence, of repeated competition for domination.[7] Of course, Behn's setting further suggests reemergent conflict through carnival, a recurring, hotly contested site of conflicting same-generation desires, during which all patriarchal order appears absent.

In effect, Behn's *Rover* offers an early modern representation of Juliet Flower MacCannell's same-generation "Regime of the Brother," that "distinctive variation on patriarchy or 'traditional' society," which forms out of "that frame of mind that takes the attitude of freedom from tradition, the past, and the ancestor, and places fraternity over paternity."[8] As has been amply demonstrated, political issues in Restoration drama are effectively focused through sexual politics. Indeed, Frances M. Kavenik holds that "all the 'sex comedy' of the seventies served up fare whose challenge to orthodoxy went well beyond sex

[6] Behn's play and those of some contemporaries appear analogous to the prerevolutionary French literature that Lynn Hunt has addressed. Hunt observes of prerevolutionary novels, for instance, that "what is perhaps most remarkable . . . is how much of the action of all of these novels takes place in the absence of the father," and suggests that "in a sense, then, the eighteenth-century French novel predicts the fate of the king; it might even be argued that the novel produces the fate of the king in that the spread of the ideal of the good father and the father's subsequent effacement fatally undermined the absolutist foundations of the monarchical regime." Hunt's may be an ambitious claim, but at the very least, she makes her basic premise credible, that "as the novels and paintings of the prerevolutionary period demonstrated, it was already possible to imagine a world without fathers." Hunt further observes that after Louis's execution a "radical iconography instantiated a new family romance of fraternity: brothers and sisters appeared frequently in this iconographic outpouring, mothers rarely, and fathers almost never." See Lynn Hunt, *The Family Romance of the French Revolution* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 34, 52, 53. This kind of imaginative restructuring of the family in terms of fraternity has many parallels in the patriarchally decentered worlds of Restoration drama, behind which, despite a Stuart return, the death of the father-king, and all that symbol symbolized, was already a *fait accompli*.

[7] See Michel Foucault, "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History," in *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, ed. Donald F. Bouchard, trans. Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977), 149–51.

[8] Juliet Flower MacCannell, *The Regime of the Brother: After the Patriarchy* (London: Routledge, 1991), 16, 32. Also illuminating on the post-patriarchal order is Carole Pateman, *The Sexual Contract* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988); see especially chapter 4, "Genesis, Fathers and the Political Liberty of Sons," 77–115. Her persistent point is that "Modern patriarchy is fraternal in form and the original contract is a fraternal pact" (77). The essential background study remains Gordon J. Schochet's *The Authoritarian Family and Political Attitudes in 17th-Century England: Patriarchalism in Political Thought* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1975; repr. with a new introduction, New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books, 1988).

to present a severely weakened form of traditional authority."[9] Even though sex may appear the focus of her comedy, Behn is, in fact, reconfiguring patriarchy as the competition between three irreconcilable kinds of fraternal desire, and in so doing, she uncovers a crisis in the attraction between the monarch and the body politic.

The Rover's action unfolds in the absence of the father of Don Pedro, Florinda, and Hellena. This father is simply removed to Rome (and the mother is not even mentioned). In his father's absence, Don Pedro attempts to represent his father in the crucial stages of his sisters' matrimonial affairs, but he is successfully prevented. Instead, the sisters act for themselves in seeking husbands, and the brother then grudgingly supplies a blessing as a surrogate father. In effect, the brother is no more than MacCannell's "sign" of the father: his authority is imaginary, his concern for the sisters is token, and his real interest is self-interest.[10] Problems also attend the other dominant males, Belvile and Willmore, two "Banish't Cavaliers." Their prince or patriarchal figure, the exiled but future Charles II, is absent also, and they consequently are also merely signs of the father. They and their fellows amount to a loosely associated band of brothers looking to advance themselves with a set of sisters. These young women are able to meet them and their brother on equal terms because they are financially independent. As the comedy ends with the usual pairings for marriage, Behn's emphasis on the equalities within these partnerships is unmistakable. Indeed, the conventional contract discourse between Willmore and Hellena, the play's climax, is even conducted with Hellena dressed in breeches. Nonetheless, as this last circumstance may suggest, the egalitarian reconfiguration between these post-patriarchal brothers and sisters is problematic, not only because dominance is still gendered masculine but also because, as Kavenik stresses, "displays of freedom, of expanded choices, . . . are enacted by characters purely to serve their own ends."[11]

As the play's very first scene makes clear, Florinda, Hellena, and Pedro all intend to disobey their absent father. In this, they have equal

[9] Frances M. Kavenik, "Aphra Behn: The Playwright as 'Breeches Part,'" in *Curtain Calls: British and American Women and the Theater, 1660–1820*, ed. Mary Anne Schofield and Cecilia Macheski (Athens: Ohio University Press, 1991), 182. See in particular Richard Braverman, *Plots and Counterplots: Sexual Politics and the Body Politic in English Literature, 1660–1730* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993). Also see Neill, "Heroic Heads," 119–20. Still of great importance is Susan Staves, *Players' Scepters: Fictions of Authority in the Restoration* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1979).

[10] See MacCannell, *Regime of the Brother*, 9–30.

[11] Kavenik, " 'Breeches Part,' " 182.

agency, parallel agendas: Florinda refuses to marry the old, rich man of her father's choosing; Hellena refuses to enter a nunnery as her father intends; and Pedro also plots to subvert his father's plans for Florinda by insisting on an immediate marriage to his supposed friend Antonio, who is actually his rival for the attentions of Angellica Bianca, the beautiful courtesan. Despite this mutual opposition to the father, the siblings also have such irreconcilable desires that they cannot regard each other as equals, although their positions seem to have equal force given their father's absence. The result is a complex of power relations in which each tries to dominate the others. Thus, Florinda considers Hellena "an Impertinent thing" because she wants to know as much as Florinda about love. Florinda, therefore, tries to put Hellena in her place, snipping, "*Hellena*, a Maid design'd for a Nun, ought not to be so Curious in a discourse of Love" (1.1.1, 28–29).[12] Hellena, however, shrewdly perceives and counters Florinda's real agenda:

> Now you have provided yourself of a Man, you take no care for poor me—prithee tell me, what dost thou see about me that is unfit for Love—have I not a World of Youth? a humour gay? a Beauty passable? a Vigour desirable? Well Shap't? clean limb'd? sweet breath'd? and sense enough to know how all these ought to be employ'd to the best advantage; yes I do and will, therefore lay aside your hopes of my Fortune, by my being a Devote. (1.1.37–43)

Hellena obviously already has some very definite convictions as to the nature of love, and in those too, she is in opposition to Florinda. This conflict is evident in Hellena's mocking rendition of Florinda's romantic longing for Belvile:

> 'Tis true, I never was a Lover yet—but I begin to have a shrew'd guess, what 'tis to be so, and fancy it very pretty to sigh, and sing, and blush, and wish, and dream and wish, and long and wish to see the Man; and when I do look pale and tremble; just as you did. (1.1.9–12)

In contrast to Florinda's romantic behavior, Hellena will not pine for a man. Quite the contrary, she plans a direct assault:

> [T]hat which makes me long to know whether you love *Belvile*, is because I hope he has some mad Companion or other, that will spoil my devotion, nay I'm resolv'd to provide my self this Carnival, if there be ere a handsome proper fellow of my humour above ground, tho I ask first. (1.1.31–35)

[12] All in-text references to *The Rover* are from Janet Todd's edition in *The Plays, 1671–1677*, vol. 5 of *The Works of Aphra Behn* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1996), 445–521.

In addition to their own conflicts, both sisters oppose Pedro. He first pretends to advocate the marriage between Florinda and the old, rich Vincentio that the father has arranged. But Florinda, already in love with Belvile, rejects the proposal. Here Hellena strenuously supports her sister because she is also advancing her own interests. Indeed, Hellena's rebuke of Pedro becomes so offensive that he angrily summons the governess to "take her hence, and lock her up all this Carnival, and at Lent she shall begin her everlasting Pennance in a Monastery." Hellena replies defiantly, "I care not, I had rather be a Nun, than be oblig'd to Marry as you wou'd have me, if I were design'd for't." He does not realize, of course, that she desires a man, but even if he did, he certainly would seek to stop her. He threateningly retorts, "Do not fear the blessing of that choice—you shall be a Nun" (1.1.127–31).

Returning his attention to Florinda, Pedro now reveals his true intent:

> As for you *Florinda*, I've only try'd you all this while and urg'd my Father's will; but mine is, that you wou'd love *Antonio*, he is Brave and young, and all that can compleat the happiness of a Gallant Maid—this absence of my Father will give us opportunity, to free you from *Vincentio*. (1.1.137–40)

Pedro then announces his twisted motive: "tis not my Friendship to *Antonio*, which makes me urge this, but Love to thee, and hatred to *Vincentio*." How this disregard of her desires for Belvile shows her brother's love is unclear to Florinda, and so she equivocates in her response: "Sir, I shall strive to do, as shall become your Sister." After Pedro departs, Hellena responds, clearly speaking for both Florinda and herself: "As becomes his Sister!—that is to be as resolv'd your way, as he is his" (1.1.143–49).

These three opposing positions on desire correspond to MacCannell's divisions in her discussion of competing forms of fraternal desire in the eighteenth century:

> Pre-revolutionary libido marked with a male sign . . . is the "heroic" form of desire, don juanism. It yields to the [brother's] categorical imperative of taboo on desire, the desire not to desire. . . . Yet the eighteenth century had also seen the revival of an alternative principle— . . . the feminine side of courtly love—which threatened to compete with the male libido for defining and directing desire's energies.[13]

[13] MacCannell, *Regime of the Brother*, 20.

These three orders of desire also distinguish the relationships the three siblings pursue with their same-generation matches in Behn's play.[14]

The relationship between Hellena and Willmore, the Rover, is undoubtedly the fraternal "heroic." He is the play's much celebrated Don Juan, head of the class in the libertine school, who characteristically boasts, "Oh, I long to come first to the Banquet of Love! and such a swinging Appetite I bring" (1.2.183–84), and she courts him on exactly those "wild" terms. Thus her remarks to him in their second encounter are just as libertine:

> I'm afraid, my small acquaintance, you have been staying that swinging Stomach you boasted of this Morning; I then remember my little Collation wou'd have gone down with you, without the Sauce of a handsome Face—is your Stomach so queasiy now? (3.1.141–44)

Such language is extremely significant in their courtship because the heroic is wildly verbal, spontaneous, and competitive. It is wit, and it is phallic, and it is love at first sight, at first verbal encounter. In effect, Willmore and Hellena are "comrades," as Lynne Taetzsch has suggested. They endorse an ideology of "free love" that casts them equally as both sexual and intellectual subjects.[15] They are not, however, mutual lovers, because despite this "equality," confrontation fires their relationship. As heroic lovers, each seeks to exert power over the other. Thus, they view themselves and their impending married life in terms of strife between worthy opponents.[16] Willmore asks whether she has "no trembling" at the impending nuptials, to which Hellena replies, "No more than you have in an Engagement or a Tempest." This response excites Willmore, who concludes the play with:

> Egad, thou'rt a brave Girle, and I admire thy Love and Courage.
> Lead on, no other Dangers they can dread,
> Who Venture in the Storms o'th' Marriage Bed.
> (5.1.540–45)

[14] Joseph F. Musser Jr. has also focused on the various types of love in the play, in categories basically corresponding to MacCannell's, but with the exception of the desire not to desire. His emphasis, however, is on "feminine love" as constancy. I do not find his discussion of Angellica Bianca convincing. See Joseph F. Musser Jr., " 'Imposing Nought but Constancy in Love': Aphra Behn Snares *The Rover*," *Restoration* 3 (1979): 17–25.

[15] Lynne Taetzsch, "Romantic Love Replaces Kinship Exchange in Aphra Behn's Restoration Drama," *Restoration* 17 (1993): 34–35.

[16] My point is related to David M. Sullivan's emphasis on the contest between male and female wills. I believe, however, that the relationship between Hellena and Willmore is dialogic rather than dialectic, as Sullivan maintains. See David M. Sullivan, "The Female Will in Aphra Behn," *Women's Studies* 22 (1993): 335–47.

Because he is so sexually potent, so naturally irresistable to women, so witty, and so free, the extravagently rakish Willmore has long been identified with what Richard Braverman usefully terms "the Stuart *elan*, that vital spirit of the restored court that takes form in the figure of the libertine-as-new-cavalier."[17] More specifically, he is paradoxically associated with both the womanizing Charles II himself and the libertine John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester, Aphra Behn's good friend. The names Wilmot and Willmore are, indeed, linguistically related, and it is often noted that Rochester and Elizabeth Barry, who played Hellena, were lovers.[18] In addition, it should also be noted that Rochester, just prior to the play's production, was conspicuously banished from court for some considerable time in both 1675 and 1676, and one banishment was frequently linked by contemporaries to his notorious lampoon on the king's scepter and his mistresses.[19] This connection between banishment and lampoon has tended to go unnoticed, but it suggests an extremely important link between the king, the witty earl, and Willmore. Rochester's poem is not only scurrilously irreverent, but grossly antimonarchist, concluding: "All monarchs I hate, and the thrones they sit on, / From the hector of France to the cully of Britain" (32–33).[20] Willmore becomes, therefore, the doubled masculine sign of the banished Cavalier, both past and present, both heroic and mock-heroic, but always designating the absence of the father. Elin Diamond has also remarked on Willmore's doubleness, but she does not acknowledge the powerful, though subtle, criticism inherent in the figure. Diamond argues that Willmore, who is "doubled mimetically and semiotically with both Rochester and the Merry Monarch . . . needs no mask to effect

[17] Braverman, *Plots and Counterplots*, 66.

[18] Duffy, *Passionate Shepherdess*, 146–47. See also Angeline Goreau, *Reconstructing Aphra: A Social Biography of Aphra Behn* (New York: Dial Press, 1980), 212–13.

[19] Rochester was undoubtedly banished for displeasing the Duchess of Portsmouth in the late summer of 1675. George deF. Lord maintains that "there is little doubt that the cause of the Duchess' indignation and the royal displeasure was the following lampoon ['The Earl of Rochester's Verses for Which He Was Banished'], which is dated 1675" (*Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963], 1:423). Although he also records Rochester's "prolonged banishment" in 1675, due to the duchess, David M. Vieth believes the cause is mysterious, dates the lampoon in 1674, and indicates an additional exile in 1676 (introduction to *The Complete Poems of John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968], xxvii–xxix). For additional details, also consult Vieth's earlier essay, "Rochester's 'Scepter' Lampoon," cited above. See also Duffy, *Passionate Shepherdess*, 147; and Goreau, *Reconstructing Aphra*, 212.

[20] All references to Rochester's poetry are from the Vieth edition cited above; line numbers are provided parenthetically.

his ends: his libertine desire is guaranteed and upheld by patriarchal law."[21] As Brown and Neill have convincingly shown, however, comic libertine behavior generally threatens to subvert patriarchy.[22] Such is certainly the case with Willmore, who is additionally connected with the much banished Rochester. Behn's doubled Willmore suggests that heroic desire represents a new "fratriarchal" Royalism, not a nostalgic patriarchalism.[23]

Indeed, the doubled and therefore indirect signification of Willmore's name, along with his and Hellena's heavily metaphoric wit, indicates a culture separated from the father's symbolic order of signification. That order of metaphysical, transcendent, and immediately accessible meaning has been replaced by the more unstable, bifurcated reality of metaphor and imagination.[24] Thus in the play's carnival world, characters interact with each other uncertainly, through disguise and often in the dark. And although, as Diamond rightly points out, Willmore carries but does not wear a mask, he is often drunk or, as he himself metaphorically expresses it, "a little disguis'd at present" (3.2.136). But, of course, he is always disguised, as clever Hellena realizes, for his seemingly irrepressibly inconstant, boorish behavior is actually a mock-heroic sign of his sovereign sexual power, which she finds arousing to contest, not to tame.

As Jones DeRitter has so carefully revealed in examining Behn's use of Killigrew's *Thomaso*, Behn is intent on forging an antithetical and antagonistic relationship between Willmore and the courtly Belvile. In this post-patriarchal world, Wilmore and Belvile may appear as equal alternatives, but as DeRitter justly argues, "Belvile and Florinda in their attempts to use the carnival setting to their advantage suggest that their attitudes represent an honorable but also somehow inappropriate response to the world of *The Rover*."[25] Willmore himself

[21] Elin Diamond, "*Gestus* and Signature in Aphra Behn's *The Rover*," *ELH* 56 (1989): 528.

[22] Brown, *Dramatic Form*, 41–42; Neill, "Heroic Heads," especially 120–22.

[23] J. Douglas Canfield has coined the valuable term "fratriarchal" to designate an unegalitarian domination in a supposedly fraternal order. J. Douglas Canfield, "Shifting Tropes of Ideology in English Serious Drama, Late Stuart to Early Georgian," in *Cultural Readings of Restoration and Eighteenth-Century English Theater*, ed. J. Douglas Canfield and Deborah C. Payne (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1995), 215.

[24] See MacCannell, *Regime of the Brother*, 12. In contrast, for an informative discussion of Behn's use of the symbolic order and desire in a blatantly Tory play, see Elizabeth Bennett Kubeck's " 'Night Mares of the Commonwealth': Royalist Passion and Female Ambition in Aphra Behn's *The Roundheads*," *Restoration* 17 (1993): 98–99.

[25] Jones DeRitter, "The Gypsy, *The Rover*, and the Wanderer: Aphra Behn's Revision of Thomas Killigrew," *Restoration* 10 (1986): 86.

alludes to this inadequacy in his fellow Cavalier when he punningly contrasts two kinds of monarchs in love: "I'm no tame sigher, but a Rampant Lion of the Forrest" (1.2.100). Willmore is like the royal lion of heraldry, whereas Belvile, although virtuously ennobled, is a domesticated, romantic "sire."

Incompatible with the heroic, Florinda and Belvile correspond to MacCannell's "feminine side of courtly love," and compared to Willmore's desire, Belvile's is feminized. This form of desire is characterized by mutual subjectivity, by "deferral of desire," and by "silencing the masculine voice."[26] Florinda, for instance, believes that she must not be a passive object in love. Scorning old Vincentio, she demands recognition as a fully developed female subject capable of objectifying the male:

> [H]ow near soever my Father thinks I am to Marrying that hated Object, I shall let him see, I understand better, what's due to my Beauty, Birth and Fortune, and more to my Soul, than to obey those unjust Commands. (1.1.19–22)

It is as a "soul," not a competitor, that Florinda must respond to a lover, and Belvile has, of course, elicited just such an attraction: "I had a 1000 Charms to meet my Eyes and Ears, e're I cou'd yield, and 'twas the knowledge of *Belvile*'s merit, not the surprizing Person took my Soul" (3.1.49–51). Their long courtship and the muted language of a seemingly impossible relationship, as opposed to Willmore and Hellena's love at first sight and witty verbal assaults, mark Florinda and Belvile's mutual love. Indeed, Frederick, a fellow Cavalier, marvels at the deferred nature of Belvile's love: "and will nothing serve thy turn but that damn'd virtuous Woman? whom on my Conscience thou lovest inspight too, because thou seest little or no possibility of gaining her." Belvile himself admits the distance and silence in their love: "I have recourse only to Letters, and distant looks from her Window, which are as soft and kind as those which Heav'n sends down on Penitents" (1.2.17–20, 27–29). Here, too, he affirms that, like a penitent, he is as much a subject as an object in their mutual relationship: a penitent subject who implores a divinity to treat the penitent like an object. As DeRitter observes, "The perspective shared by Belvile and Florinda is not available to Willmore and the rest of the characters in *The Rover*. It validates itself by reciprocal acts of faith."[27]

Don Pedro's desire is so like and unlike the other two men's that

[26] MacCannell, *Regime of the Brother*, 101, 104.
[27] DeRitter, "Behn's Revision," 86.

it perverts both. This negation of desire is evident in his relationship manqué with Angellica Bianca, the famous courtesan. He has admired and courted her even while she was his uncle's mistress, and therefore an unattainable, if not taboo, object. Now dead, the uncle is yet another absent father figure for which Pedro will substitute. As Angellica's servant Moretta recalls, he "us'd to prance before our Window, and take such care to shew himself an Amorous Ass." This behavior suggests Belvile's courtship of Florinda. Angellica, however, replies that Pedro is "brave and generous, but of an humour so uneasie and inconstant" (2.1.123–24, 126–27), traits which imply, of course, the noncourtly, roving, heroic qualities of Willmore. Despite his deferred desire, however, Pedro does not consider Angellica an equal, but rather an object to be purchased at the highest possible price. And despite some heroic impulses, he is not consumed with desire for her. Indeed, far from a "free love" comrade or courtly partner, Angellica represents an object of Pedro's desire only insofar as he can use her to thwart the desire of a fraternal equal, like Belvile or Antonio. His desire is heroic, therefore, only as this woman is to be possessed within "a positive ideology of male fraternity"[28]—in other words, within an aggressive struggle between males in which he, posing as the dominant brother, seeks to deny the desire of others. In fact, Pedro's concern for enforcing a desire not to desire ultimately obscures his own desire for Angellica. He allows Antonio to precede him in offering the thousand crowns she demands for her attentions, and he then fails to approach her with an equal or greater offer, even though he has exclaimed when he first read the advertisement: "Fetch me a thousand Crowns, I never wisht to buy this Beauty at an easier rate" (2.1.109–10). The tendency of Pedro's behavior illustrates MacCannell's general characterization of the brother's domination in the father's absence:

> What then does this son enjoy in replacing his father? Well, he gets to act *as if*, without having to take any action. A father-figure, he mimes, selectively, the father's features. . . . It seems that what he "enjoys" is the power to distort and center all familial relations on himself alone.[29]

Pedro's intentions fail. He does not, in fact, dominate the other relationships because in Behn's very early enactment of a post-patriarchal society, the brother's will in love relations is only one of several possibilities. In addition, Behn seems especially interested in exploring the

[28] MacCannell, *Regime of the Brother*, 98.
[29] MacCannell, *Regime of the Brother*, 16.

competition between the heroic and courtly, for she not only draws the antithesis between Willmore and Belvile, but also stresses the incompatibility of Willmore and Angellica Bianca.

Although set with considerable insistence during the Interregnum—and consequently with emphasis on the absence of the monarch—the play alludes to power relations after the Restoration, and Behn implies that Charles has returned more as a same-generation brother than as a father. No doubt, the unresolved rivalry between the males in *The Rover* mirrors the factionalism of Charles II's reign. This situation was to be exacerbated later by the attempted exclusion of yet another brother, James II, but the "Stuart *elan*" was already under stress in the mid-1670s.[30] Moreover, Charles Stuart undoubtedly returned as a sexually heroic brother, and that sexual-political model, Behn suggests, does not bode well for women or the nation. The seemingly tragic relationship between Willmore and Angellica indicates Behn's disappointment with the heroic brother's sexual politics. This relationship is carefully formed out of the source material and elaborately staged. Behn gives it so much careful attention because she dramatizes a very delicate matter indeed: the incompatible desires of a fratriarchal sovereign and a prostituted body politic.

In revising her source, Behn seems intent on removing her same-generation female leads from a patriarchal hierarchy that labels them either good or bad, feminine or masculine.[31] Killigrew's Angellica Bianca is, for instance, a patriarchal model of the good whore who passively accepts her doubly subservient place as both female and prostitute. As she admits to Thomaso, "Onely (once a whore and ever) is the world adage; yet there may be degrees of ill; and I am vain enough to believe, though I am not a good woman, I am not an ill Mistriss."[32] She also accepts that her loss of virtue renders her unfit for marriage in a system wherein female chastity serves to guarantee male honor and birthright. All women should be willing objects in this system, but the prostitute especially so. She says, for instance, "oh! that such a stream [of tears] could make me as pure a Virgin as I am now a perfect Lover; then I would beg to be thy wife; but that must not be; for love bids me

[30] Braverman, *Plots and Counterplots*, 157.

[31] As DeRitter demonstrates, "Although Hellena inherits Angellica's good nature and Serulina's wealth, her most important attributes suggest a deliberate effort on Behn's part to subvert Killigrew's typology of women" ("Behn's Revision," 89).

[32] *Thomaso Part 1*, act 2, scene 4, p.339. Thomas Killigrew, *Comedies and Tragedies* (London, 1664; repr., New York: Benjamin Blom, 1967).

not ask that which honour forbids thee to grant; yet you may be my friend."[33]

Behn's Angellica, on the contrary, appears based on a fraternal model of female subjectivity and independent agency. Just like Hellena, Florinda, and Lucetta, she ignores patriarchal strictures and exhibits no remorse. Indeed, as Nancy Copeland has argued, Behn attempts to minimize the difference between the status of the virgin and the whore. Copeland identifies the chief similarity between Hellena and Angellica as their "advertising of themselves." She calls particular attention to how Hellena's self-blazon in the first scene functions like Angellica's pictures hung out to lure buyers of her body: "Angellica advertises herself publicly; Hellena's self-advertisement . . . takes place within the privacy of her home. This difference is eroded, however, when Hellena is blazoned by Willmore at the beginning of Act V. . . . The ambiguity of Hellena's position now extends to a loss of control over her 'public representations' that brings her yet closer to Angellica."[34] But it is not only through Hellena and Angellica that the similarity between virgin and whore develops. For instance, both Florinda and Lucetta also advertise themselves publicly. Florinda passes a jeweled miniature of herself to Belvile, who then circulates it among his companions (3.1.254–76). Lucetta, the cunning whore, parades herself provocatively before her prospective new dupe, the Essex calf Blunt, observing, "This is a Stranger, I know by his gazing; if he be brisk, he'l venture to follow me; and then if I understand my Trade, he's mine" (1.2.193–94). Her behavior is, of course, not unlike Hellena's aggressiveness in verbally accosting Willmore.

In fact, with all four women the distinction between whore and "virgin" is in some way blurred. Thus, Hellena and Florinda appear as "gipsies," or cross-gendered female rovers, in a crowd that includes both real and feigned courtesans. Later, Florinda is almost raped by drunken Willmore as she awaits Belvile in "The Garden in the Night. . . . in an undress" (3.2.110). Willmore nevertheless denies a charge of at-

[33] *Thomaso Part 1*, act 2, scene 4, p.341.

[34] Nancy Copeland, " 'Once a whore and ever'?: Whore and Virgin in *The Rover* and Its Antecedents," *Restoration* 16 (1992): 22–23. Another similarity between Hellena and Angellica is argued by Julie Nash. Nash believes that Angellica aggressively attempts to manage her objectification as a public representation and so control the male gaze and establish her female subjectivity. Similarly, Nash contends, "the masquerade allows Hellena to take control of the gaze and subject Willmore to her gaze without humiliating him" (" 'The sight on't would beget a warm desire': Visual Pleasure in Aphra Behn's *The Rover*," *Restoration* 18 [1994]: 81, 84).

tempted rape because she appears a whore: "'A Rape! Come, come, you lye you Baggage. . . . [W]hy at this time of Night was your Cobweb Door set open Dear Spider—but to catch Flyes?" (3.2.158–61). He then offers to pay her. Florinda runs into similar trouble with Blunt, who hides in his apartments after being fleeced by Lucetta. Grabbing her, he threatens rape to "be reveng'd on one Whore for the sins of another" (4.1.614–15).[35] Lucetta does not pretend to be a virgin, but she plays the unfortunate innocent married to an "Old Jealous Husband." Now, she professes, seemingly for the first time, "such a Love as cannot but be great, since at first sight of that sweet Face and Shape, it made me your absolute Captive" (3.2.9–11). Blunt is so impressed he imagines marrying her. Only Angellica, however, actually, if paradoxically, embodies both whore and virgin. As she silences Moretta, who has complained about the five hundred crowns given Willmore, Angellica pathetically confides the extent of Willmore's violation:

> Oh, name not such mean trifles;—had I given him all
> My Youth has earn'd from Sin,
> I had not lost a thought, nor sigh upon't.
> But I have given him my Eternal rest,
> My whole repose, my future joys, my Heart!
> My Virgin heart *Moretta*; Oh 'tis gone!
>
> (4.1.229–34)

Angellica emerges, therefore, a comprehensive character, incorporating the play's same-generation women within the trope of prostitution. This comprehensiveness, however, enlarges to include men who would be husbands.[36] Indeed, as Angellica explains to Willmore, who concurs, prostitution is not just a female profession, for men actually sell themselves to the wife who can pay the most:

[35] Diamond also convincingly examines a similarity in staging to connect virgin and whore: "If Angellica Bianca makes a spectacle of herself through balcony curtains and paintings, Florinda's 'undress' and her proximity to the painted scenes signify a similar reduction to commodity status" ("*Gestus*," 534).

[36] The cross-gendered inclusiveness of Angellica's character is also present in her connection with Aphra Behn herself—another "A.B." As Catherine Gallagher argues in her now famous article, "given the general Restoration delight in the equation of mental, sexual, and theatrical 'parts,' and its frequent likening of writing to prostitution and playwrights to bawds, one might argue that if Aphra Behn had not existed, the male playwrights would have had to invent her in order to increase the witty pointedness of their cynical self-representations" ("Who Was That Masked Woman?: The Prostitute and the Playwright in the Comedies of Aphra Behn," *Women's Studies* 15 [1988]: 30). Nash cogently makes a similar point about theatrical productions generally when she writes that "it is a process for which prostitution is an apt metaphor: both prostitutes and people in theater seek to captivate and please those who pay" ("Visual Pleasure," 76).

Pray tell me, Sir, are not you guilty of the same Mercenary Crime, When a Lady is propos'd to you for a Wife, you never ask, how fair—discreet—or virtuous she is; but what's her Fortune—which, if but small, you cry—she will not do my business—and basely leave her, thou she languish for you—say, is not this as poor? (2.1.357–61)

This remark, original in Behn's play, considerably enhances the play's political dimension. More than a metaphor for the commodification of women, Angellica's prostitution image is cross-gendered, for men are designated "mercenary" in negotiating sexual contracts between husband and wife. Moreover, this prostituted contract is, in principle, foundational for all the socio-political contracts between male individuals in public life.[37] Prostitution, a kind of commonwealth, readily becomes, therefore, an image of the body politic because women and men are associated in both prostitution and marriage with sexual access and property to be contractually exchanged. Furthermore, the body politic is, like prostitution, gendered feminine overall, even though both sexes participate.[38] Indeed, Willmore himself appears prostituted in accepting five hundred crowns from Angellica, and in the subplot, Blunt's barbarous treatment by Lucetta parallels Angellica's by Willmore. The political implications of Willmore's desire for Angellica are augmented by his Royalist associations and the "sign of Angellica."

The scenes involving Willmore, Angellica, and her portraits are peppered with allusions that reinforce the association of Willmore with Charles II. Willmore enters in the second act, for instance, "in his own Cloaths," whereas Belvile and Frederick are in "Masquing Habits." Willmore, therefore, stands out as unconcealed in "Buffe," a military coat of coarse leather (*OED*, s.v. *buff*). As he says, sensing his conspicuousness, "I shou'd have chang'd my Eternal Buffe" (2.1.4). A little later,

[37] As Pateman explains, "the sexual contract . . . is not associated only with the private sphere. [Modern fraternal] Patriarchy is not merely familial or located in the private sphere. The original contract creates the modern social whole of patriarchal civil society. Men pass back and forth between the private and public spheres and the writ of the law of male sex-right runs in both realms. Civil society is bifurcated but unity of the social order is maintained, in large part, through the structure of [fraternal] patriarchal relations" (*Sexual Contract*, 12).

[38] Braverman is very clear on this matter: "Dynastic politics are manifest as sexual politics because the quest for a settlement was played out in terms that refigured the body politic as a feminized body. The political Other, so to speak, was a woman only in a symbolic sense, of course, but sexual difference applied to the political difference of crown and parliament because that difference was inscribed in the hierarchy of the body politic; in that context the conflict between sovereign and nation over traditional powers and privileges was a contest over the definition and control of a political body" (*Plots and Counterplots*, xii).

after he has taken Angellica's picture and become embroiled in a fight with Antonio and others, Angellica singles him out with, "You Sir in Buffe, you that appear a Souldier" (2.1.222). Then, after he has been invited into Angellica's apartments, Moretta belittles his appearance, which must dramatically contrast to the opulence of the great courtesan's: "He knows himself of Old, I believe those Breeches and he have been acquainted ever since he was beaten at *Worcester*" (2.1.291–92). Later, even after he has changed clothes, Hellena still refers to Willmore as the man who "us'd to be in Buff and Scarlet" (4.1.362). Of course, Willmore may have fought at Worcester, the last Royalist stand against Oliver Cromwell, but the "he" who was defeated was the young and recently crowned Charles II. And although a buff leather coat may be common soldier garb, as Angellica suggests, it was apparently that lowly garment, with a scarlet sash, that Charles himself donned in an effort to rally his routed men after he removed his armor at Worcester.[39] This royal presence in lowly circumstances is reiterated when Willmore, not having a thousand pennies, let alone Angellica's price of a thousand crowns, takes one of her small pictures. Halted by Antonio's question, "What right can you pretend to't?" Willmore majestically and disdainfully replies to the viceroy's son, "That of Possession which I will maintain—you perhaps have a 1000 Crowns to give for the Original" (2.1.213–15). With Willmore clad in buff and scarlet, this declaration of his transcendent right of "Possession" resonates with Royalist ideology. A sense of the power of a transcendent male authority is also registered by Willmore's gaze. Stage directions specify that he gaze on the portrait before taking one of the two small ones (2.1.202), and it is with his gaze that he later seduces the original: "Nay I will gaze—to let you see my strength" (2.1.339).[40] Just before her final surrender, he warns Angellica with regal double entendre:

> —Take heed, fair Creature, how you raise my hopes,
> Which once assum'd pretends to all dominion.
> There's not a joy thou hast in store,
> I shall not then Command.
>
> (2.1.406–9)

Similar Royalist allusions appear in *Thomaso*, but as Diamond has so perceptively noticed, Behn has her Cavaliers treat the relationship be-

[39] See Antonia Fraser, *Royal Charles: Charles II and the Restoration* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1979), 115.

[40] For some of Behn's other uses of the "royal gaze," see Kubeck, "Royalist Passion," 97–98.

tween Angellica and her portrait very differently, announcing an epistemological shift. In Killigrew's play, Angellica and her sign are simultaneously on stage for viewing, and the men are concerned with the direct and immediate identification of the portrait with Angellica.[41] In the actual Interregnum play, the proximity of the sign and meaning suggests the operation of the father's symbolic order. In contrast, as Diamond remarks, in Behn's play "Angellica's simulacra, not Angellica, preoccupy her male audience. . . . That is, the iconicity of the paintings, their likeness to Angellica, which so impresses Killigrew's cavaliers, is in Behn's text suppressed."[42] Belvile, for example, radically distances the relationship between the portrait and the original by resorting to a sneering metaphor: "See there the fair Sign to the Inn where a Man may Lodg that's Fool enough to give her price" (2.1.88–89). In Behn's play, Angellica does not even appear before the Cavaliers until after Willmore has taken the portrait, and so the stolen sign can and does exist with ambiguous meaning because the signified is absent. In the Restoration play, the metaphoric, fraternal order operates, indicating that the body politic is not symbolically integrated with the fratriarchal sovereign.

Diamond is less accurate in distinguishing Willmore's particular behavior, however. She styles him "monarchy's representative, [who] succumbs to the lure of the signs, believing not only in their iconicity but in their value as pleasurable objects."[43] But Willmore does not succumb to the picture's iconicity because he has not yet seen Angellica; consequently, his expressed desire is essentially imaginary. Given the allusions to Charles, Willmore certainly is "monarchy's representative," but this banished Cavalier represents the absence of a patriarchal monarch in Charles. Furthermore, he does not "restore" the sign to its place of symbolic meaning, as he is twice specifically ordered to do (2.1.206, 216). (And certainly the word "restore" remained highly charged at this juncture in Charles's reign.) Instead, he divorces the signifier from the signified, even while claiming his right of possession. In fact, he cannot restore the picture and the symbolic order because in contesting the picture with Antonio, he participates, like Pedro throughout the play, within "a positive ideology of male frater-

[41] *Thomaso Part I*, act 2, scene 3, pp. 332–35. In Killigrew's play, Thomaso almost seems to take the portrait in order to provoke direct contact with Angellica, which is very unlike Willmore's situation in Behn's play. Killigrew's stage directions read: "Then he [Thomaso] turns sleightly from him [Pedro], and looks to the window and speaks."

[42] Diamond, "*Gestus*," 529, 531.

[43] Diamond, "*Gestus*," 531.

nity." Furthermore, embracing the small picture, he seems, as Diamond maintains, "to understand that the appeal of the paintings is precisely that they are not the original," but fetishes.[44] As an erotic substitute for any woman, each picture is not a symbol of the body politic, but rather a metonymic image of the brother's own imaginary desire itself. In other words, Willmore's possession of the "sign of Angellica" suggests the king's alienation from the body politic and Charles's confusion of the symbolic with the metaphoric orders: he desires to rule by a patriarchal right of possession, but he is actually only a fratriarchal image of the father.

Willmore's strange remark upon taking the picture reinforces a sense of this confusion:

> This Posture's loose and negligent,
> The sight on't wou'd beget a warm desire,
> In Souls whom Impotence and Age had chill'd.
> —This must along with me.
>
> (2.1.202–5)

Killigrew's Thomaso says nothing like this. Consequently, the issue of impotence seems oddly original in Behn's play because her randy Rover is neither impotent nor old. Nevertheless, the remark is not out of character, for as Robert Markley cautions, Behn's characters tend to be drawn ideologically: "Her plays present gender roles in ideological rather than essentialist terms."[45] And indeed, as Braverman points out, images of Charles as both sexually and politically impotent "recurred with increasing frequency in the mid-1670s, and with them came the sense that a threshold which marked a new phase in the reign had been crossed. . . . [T]he royalist vision of restoration was already anachronistic."[46]

As a matter of fact, the speech reaffirms Willmore's doubled association with both Charles and Rochester. In associating strength of libertine desire with impotence, Willmore resembles Rochester's persona in "The Disabled Debauchee" (1675), who imagines watching, as if he himself were old and impotent, the depraved activities of others, which he hopes to inspire with tales of his past debauches:

[44] Diamond, "*Gestus*," 531.

[45] Robert Markley, " 'Be Impudent, be saucy, forward, bold, touzing, and leud': The Politics of Masculine Sexuality and Feminine Desire in Behn's Tory Comedies," in *Cultural Readings of Restoration and Eighteenth-Century English Theater*, ed. J. Douglas Canfield and Deborah C. Payne (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1995), 115.

[46] Braverman, *Plots and Counterplots*, 116–17.

With tales like these I will such thoughts inspire
As to important mischief shall incline:
I'll make him long some ancient church to fire,
And fear no lewdness he's called to by wine.

Thus, statesmanlike, I'll saucily impose,
And safe from action, valiantly advise;
Sheltered in impotence, urge you to blows,
And being good for nothing else, be wise.
(41–48)

Moreover, Rochester's persona cynically asserts that because political and sexual power are substitutes, untrustworthy political power implies impotence.

Rochester's notorious "scepter lampoon" on Charles and his mistresses—for which he was reportedly banished—also resorts to this impotence trope. This turn in the poem is unexpected because the first two stanzas are devoted to mock-heroic glorification of Charles's princely attribute: "Nor are his high desires above his strength: / His scepter and his prick are of a length" (10–11). Indeed, the description of the king might easily be applied to the insatiable but impoverished Rover:

Though safety, law, religion, life lay on't,
'Twoud break through all to make its way to cunt.
Restless he rolls about from whore to whore,
A merry monarch, scandalous and poor.
(18–21)

Nevertheless, despite his sexually heroic propensities, the king apparently needs considerable encouragement to "beget a warm desire":

This you'd believe, had I but time to tell ye
The pains it costs to poor, laborious Nelly,
Whilst she employs hands, fingers, mouth, and thighs,
Ere she can raise the member she enjoys.
(28–31)

"Nelly" is, of course, Nell Gwyn, actress and royal mistress, but the poem also specifically mentions "Carwell" (22), Louise de Keroualle, Duchess of Portsmouth, as well as all that rolling "about from whore to whore." Somewhat surprisingly, such "high desires" and "strength" are linked with both inconstancy and impotency, and these in turn are associated with the loss of the nation's trust. As Charles "rolls around from whore to whore," the Commons has had to force the king to nego-

tiate an end to the Third Dutch War, wherein he had been, according to the lampoon, the "cully" of Louis XIV, "the hector of France" (33).[47]

Similarly, Willmore's high desire for Angellica paradoxically concludes in charges of inconstancy and impotency. Although he pledges to pay Angellica "Intirely" with his love (2.1.420) before the consummation, he cruelly betrays her trust shortly thereafter. When Angellica and Moretta witness his wooing of Hellena, Morretta asks, "What cou'd you less expect from such a swaggerer?" As Angellica's response reveals, she expected a courtly relationship of shared, mutual love:

> Expect! as much as I paid him, a Heart intire
> Which I had Pride enough to think when 'ere I gave,
> It would have rais'd the Man above the Vulgar
> Made him all Soul! and that all soft and constant.
> (3.1.153–57)

Angellica apparently wanted a relationship with a "soul" such as Belvile; instead, she acquired a competitive comrade. For in an obvious parallel, when Belvile is asked, "Can you resign your Claims to other Women, / And give your heart intirely to *Florinda*?" he unambiguously responds, "Intire! as dying Saints Confessions are!" (4.1.138–40). In contrast, Willmore's response of "Intirely" prevaricates, for he only cavalierly pretends to "devotion." The incompatibility of his unalterable heroic desire and Angellica's courtly expectation is evident when they confront each other later, and significantly, the trope of impotence reappears. After she castigates him for his selfishness, Willmore angrily complains:

> So gad there are of those faint-hearted Lovers, whom such a sharp Lesson next their hearts, wou'd make as Impotent as Fourscore—pox o' this whining.—My bus'ness is to laugh and love—a pox on't, I hate your sullen Lover, a Man shall lose as much time to put you in humour now, as wou'd serve to gain a new Woman.

Angellica cuttingly replies, "I scorn to cool that Fire I cannot raise" (4.1.249–254). Willmore's point is that the courtly "sullen Lover" she desires is not very potent sexually, unlike him. Her proud retort is that he is actually impotent because even all she can offer is not enough to "raise" his desire. Willmore's impotence, like the king's in Rochester's poem, is not, of course, literal. On the contrary, it is a trope for the mutual incompatibility of heroic and courtly desires, for the loss of trust between the Merry Monarch and the body politic.

[47] See Braverman, *Plots and Counterplots*, 114–16.

The Rover presents this impasse, and Behn's sympathies clearly divide. Willmore is certainly somewhat discredited, but not to the extent argued by some critics.[48] Instead, Behn's treatment of Willmore and the Royalism he stands for might be termed "admonitory": despite the power of charismatic appeal, neither Charles nor Willmore will ever be patriarchal in the most positive sense of caring, protective authority. Behn's Royalism should not be doubted, however, even if at this particular time she reveals doubts about the royal performance, which Willmore's irresponsible behavior registers. Indeed, in the early 1680s, she will author staunchly Royalist dramas, *The Second Part of the Rover* not the least. Furthermore, Behn's imaging the body politic as a prostitute qualifies sympathy for Angellica and condemnation of Willmore. As with the nation for the king, she suggests, Angellica has a natural, initially irresistible attraction to Willmore, which reveals an essential goodness and yearning for fidelity, but her trust having been betrayed, she furiously seeks an ignoble and unlawful revenge. Moreover, even in her brightest moment, Angellica can conceive of mutual love only in mercenary terms: "And will you pay me then the price I ask? . . . The pay I mean is but thy love for mine" (2.1.412, 418). This rhetoric betrays the further admonition that not even love is a transcendent sovereign power when the body politic has become defined by financial contract.

Nevertheless, *The Rover* ends auspiciously with a set of same-generation marriages, but trouble stands in the wings: both the absence of a trustworthy patriarch and the disaffection of Angellica, as the body politic, menace. Behn, therefore, leaves pressing questions about authority and the nation raised but unanswered as the Regime of the Brother holds the stage.

The University of Alabama in Huntsville

[48] DeRitter's treatment of Willmore is probably the most negative, and although extremely well argued, to say that "Willmore is damned" by Behn overstates the case, especially given the play's popularity at court and the association of Willmore with Rochester ("Behn's Revision," 87). Of course, the other extreme needs to be avoided as well. For instance, Kavenik mentions Willmore's "almost childlike licentiousness" ("'Breeches Part,'" 183). How is such a thing possible at all—let alone in a man who almost commits rape?