Gentility and the Comic Theatre of Late Stuart London

When Adam delved and Eve span
Who was then the gentleman?

Mark S. Dawson’s approach to this riddle is not to study the lives of those said to belong to early modern England’s gentry. He suggests we remain sceptical of all answers to this question and consider what was at stake whenever it was posed. We should conceive of gentility as a mutable process of social delineation. Gentility was a matter of power and language, cultural definition and social domination. Neither consistently defined nor applied to particular social groups, gentility was about identifying society’s elite.

The book examines how claims of gentility were staged at London’s theatres (1660–1725). Employing a rich assembly of sources, comedies with their cits and fops, periodicals, correspondence of theatre patrons and polemic from its detractors, Dawson revises several of social history’s conclusions about the gentry and offers new interpretations to students of late Stuart drama.

Mark S. Dawson completed postgraduate studies at the universities of Auckland (New Zealand) and Cambridge. He is currently associate lecturer in early modern history at the Australian National University, Canberra.
New cultural histories have recently expanded the parameters (and enriched the methodologies) of social history. Cambridge Social and Cultural Histories recognises the plurality of current approaches to social and cultural history as distinctive points of entry into a common explanatory project. Open to innovative and interdisciplinary work, regardless of its chronological or geographical location, the series encompasses a broad range of histories of social relationships and of the cultures that inform them and lend them meaning. Historical anthropology, historical sociology, comparative history, gender history and historiast literary studies – among other subjects – all fall within the remit of Cambridge Social and Cultural Histories.

Titles in the series include:
1 Margot C. Finn *The Character of Credit: Personal Debt in English Culture, 1740–1914*
2 M. J. D. Roberts *Making English Morals: Voluntary Association and Moral Reform in England, 1787–1886*
3 Karen Harvey *Reading Sex in the Eighteenth Century: Bodies and Gender in English Erotic Culture*
4 Phil Withington *The Politics of Commonwealth: Citizens and Freemen in Early Modern England*
5 Mark S. Dawson *Gentility and the Comic Theatre of Late Stuart London*
For Holly, *in memoriam*
Both because she was a breed apart and because the author cannot trump Hogarth’s memento of his own companion in the attempt to capture London life.
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Abbreviations and note on the text

**ELH**  English Literary History  
**ELR**  English Literary Renaissance  
**HMC**  Historic Manuscripts Commission (London)  
**HWJ**  History Workshop Journal  
**PMLA**  Publications of the Modern Language Association  
**PP**  Past & Present  
**RES**  Review of English Studies  
**SEL**  Studies in English Literature  

**Dates**

Years are ‘new style’, understood to begin on 1 January. However, days and months will be those used by diarists and correspondents themselves. Most, written in England, will therefore be ‘old style’.

**Newspapers and periodicals**

Where these carry no systematic pagination, in either their original or modern editions, I refer to the first page recto of each issue as ‘[1]’, what was technically the verso as ‘[2]’, and so on. Pertinent details of changed titles and interrupted sequences are explained in the relevant section of the bibliography.

**Plays**

I have departed from standard dramatic citation practices in several respects. When quoting dialogue, I have given the speaker’s name in full to avoid any confusion that might have resulted from using the original abbreviations found in some first editions. I reference by act and page number only. So ‘ii, 3’ would refer to act ii, page 3, of the playbook in question.
xvi  Abbreviations and note on the text

I have refrained from citation by scene and line number for two reasons. First, the first editions consulted usually make no systematic attempt to mark their scripts, particularly the line numbers, in this way. Any attempt to do so on my part would not have been productive. Second, many of these first editions are now available as searchable digital transcripts. The active reader can easily pinpoint a particular citation and its context by entering a key phrase into the database, Literature Online. I have used first editions whenever possible. Later editions have been consulted when they compensate for lacunae in the originals and are footnoted accordingly. Readers should also bear in mind that the year of a playbook’s publication does not necessarily match the date of its first performance.

Serial publications
For long-lived organizations (for example, the Camden Society) that have published several ‘series’, every effort has been made to retain consistent numeration of individual volumes. However, in the event of discrepancy, readers should refer to the year of publication.