1997

Freedom's inauguration : the evolution of patriotism in early American drama

Marjorie Lonora Foerster
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses

Recommended Citation

Foerster, Marjorie Lonora, "Freedom's inauguration : the evolution of patriotism in early American drama" (1997). *Master's Theses*. 1574.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.qmp7-qh4x>
https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/1574

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

**FREEDOM'S INAUGURATION:
THE EVOLUTION OF PATRIOTISM IN EARLY AMERICAN DRAMA**

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of English

San Jose State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

by

Marjorie Lonora Foerster

December 1997

UMI Number: 1388192

**Copyright 1997 by
Foerster, Marjorie Lonora**

All rights reserved.

**UMI Microform 1388192
Copyright 1998, by UMI Company. All rights reserved.**

**This microform edition is protected against unauthorized
copying under Title 17, United States Code.**

UMI
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48103

© 1997

Marjorie Lonora Foerster

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

John Engell

Dr. John Engell, Director

Susan Shillinglaw

Dr. Susan Shillinglaw, First Reader

Dr. Donald Keese

Dr. Donald Keese, Second Reader

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

William Fisher

ABSTRACT

FREEDOM'S INAUGURATION: THE EVOLUTION OF PATRIOTISM IN EARLY AMERICAN DRAMA

by Marjorie Lonora Foerster

This thesis examines the development of the definition of patriotism from the inception of the American Revolution to the turn of the eighteenth century as portrayed through Mercy Otis Warren's The Group (1775), Hugh Henry Brackenridge's The Battle of Bunkers-Hill (1775), Royall Tyler's The Contrast (1787), and William Dunlap's André (1798) and The Glory of Columbia: Her Yeomanry! (1803, 1817). The last play serves only as a coda to this discussion.

The public nature of drama provides a particular advantage in elucidating cultural aspects of our nation's history. As our nation matured, its drama matured. The unique genre of each play--satire, heroic drama, comedy of manners, tragedy (and spectacle with Glory)--bespeaks this growth and is directly related to the playwrights' perceptions of patriotism. Through their connectedness with contemporary political, religious, philosophical, social, and economic thought, these plays show the definition of patriotism becoming more complex, expansive, and humanitarian. Yet, the playwrights always return to virtue as the foundation of patriotism.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Dr. John Engell, who directed my thesis, deserves the highest praise and my most heartfelt gratitude. His insight, wit, impeccable attention to detail, endless patience, understanding, and respect for the thesis process make him an invaluable director, teacher, and mentor. I cannot thank him enough for all he has given me.

I would also like to thank Dr. Don Keesey, who has helped each step of the way--returning phone calls, assisting with program changes, and reading my thesis. Thanks also to Dr. Karen English for her support and to Dr. Susan Shillinglaw.

Words cannot express how grateful I am to my family who encouraged and buoyed me throughout this entire process in so many ways--listening, reading, questioning, giving ideas, editing, running errands, and saving my paper from the oblivion of a corrupted disk. Thanks for your ever-present love. You do more for me than I could ever re-pay. I also appreciate the support of all my dear friends, especially Bob McDowell for his love and patience; Jennifer Higham for reading my first chapter and for her moral support as a fellow graduate student; Shareen Merriam for drama ideas; Sharon Prefontaine for suggestions; Rich Amlin for answering the phone when I passed my Comprehensives; and other Monta Vista colleagues for help with French--Robert Javier, Lise Gabet and Sandy Bosque-Oliva. I am deeply thankful for my teachers from Principia--Ron Charles who instilled in me the love of our American literary heritage and Richard Morse who taught me what it means to be in the theatre and gave me my motto for teaching from Peter Shaffer's Lettice and Lovage: "Enlarge! Enliven! Enlighten!"

Dedicated
to my family--Mom, Dad, Cliff, Genelle--and to Bob
whose love, encouragement, and support made this possible

In loving memory
of Everett L. Purcell, my grandpa,
whose brilliant writings, insights, and newspaper column,
"The Editor's Squeaky Chair"
from his newspaper *THE ENID EVENTS*,
are still inspiring me

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Chapter 1	8
Virtuous Revolutionary Fervor	
<u>The Group and The Battle of Bunkers-Hill</u>	
Chapter 2	39
Comedy's Honorable Mirror	
<u>The Contrast</u>	
Chapter 3	71
Tragic Awareness and Justice's Mandates	
<u>André</u>	
Conclusion	109
Redefining Patriotism	
Works Cited	115

Introduction

From 1775 and the eve of the American Revolution, to 1787 and the debate over the Constitution, to the close of the eighteenth century, the American idea of patriotism evolved. Its definition became increasingly complex, humane, and self-aware--a testament to the quality and freedom of thought in the early republic. The more troubled and difficult the times, the more drama tends to deal with social and political issues; and the beginning years of the United States were troubled. As an artistic instrument of ideology, drama of this period reflected the views of the people regarding patriotism; it also helped foster and clarify new definitions of patriotism from 1775 through 1798.¹

Although restrictive laws prohibited the performance of plays in many of the North America Anglophone colonies and during the Revolution, drama survived by adapting to the cultural climate, and thus by serving the people.² But not surprisingly, the number of dramatists and dramas was limited. During the last quarter of the eighteenth century, four plays stand out, both for their political and dramatic importance

¹ The relationship of drama to patriotism, while primarily confined to these dates for this study, should not be limited to these dates. It remains a significant concern in later nineteenth-century American drama.

² In 1774, Congress passed the following interdict, which Montrose Moses records: "We will in our several stations, encourage frugality, economy, and industry, and promote agriculture, arts and the manufactures of this country, especially that of wool; and will discountenance and discourage every species of extravagance and dissipation, especially all horse-racing, and all kinds of gaming, cock-fighting, exhibitions of shews, plays and other expensive diversions and entertainments" (*American Dramatist* 41).

and for the political and cultural prestige of their authors. Mercy Otis Warren's The Group (1775); Hugh Henry Brackenridge's The Battle of Bunkers-Hill (1775);³ Royal Tyler's The Contrast (1787); and William Dunlap's André (1798) trace and create changing definitions of patriotism in the new nation. Dunlap's rewriting of André into The Glory of Columbia: Her Yeomanry! (1803, 1817) provides an interesting coda to the evolution of these definitions. Mercy Otis Warren--a close friend of John and Abigail Adams, the sister of James Otis, the wife of James Warren, and the hostess for meetings among the key leaders who pushed for independence--was, as Alice Brown calls her, "one of the gadflies of the war" (189). Through her plays, poems, letters, and private political opinions, Warren helped to form the nation and its citizens' earliest definition of patriotism; subsequently, she wrote one of the first of our national histories.⁴ Perhaps best known for his post-Revolutionary novel Modern Chivalry, Brackenridge held various influential positions: a teacher, army chaplain, poet, novelist, lawyer, frontier newspaper publisher, and Pennsylvania State Assemblyman. Like Warren, he contributed to the definition of patriotism at the beginning of the Revolution. Tyler, too, was an important public figure. He led troops against the Shaysites, was a prominent lawyer, and served as the Chief Justice of the Vermont Supreme Court. Dunlap's influence is most noticeable in the theatrical arena. He wrote and translated over sixty

³ There are several ways to spell Bunkers Hill. Brackenridge wrote "Bunkers-Hill." I will be using Bunker's Hill when I refer to the battle.

⁴ Discussing Charles A Beard's statement that "most of our history has been written by Federalists," Katharine Anthony explains that as a "strong" anti-Federalist, Warren "stood little chance to gain the attention and approval of the ruling party," the Federalists, who produced the major historians (13).

plays, was a producer, and became sole manager of the Park Theatre--New York's leading theatre until the 1840s. In his History of the American Theatre, the "father of American drama," as he is often called, explains that the theatre is a "mighty engine" with the great potential to help a people guided by democratic principles govern themselves more effectively; for theatre not only offers knowledge; it provides "that purity, as well as power, which shall produce the highest moral purpose" (360-61). Moreover, Dunlap writes, "The lessons taught must be those of patriotism, virtue, morality, religion" (129).⁵ For Dunlap, being a leader in the theatre world was nearly synonymous with being a public office-holder or political leader.

These four playwrights' definitions of patriotism arose from the currents of thought surrounding them and also served as beacons, helping the people understand the dictates of "true" patriotism. Each playwright's choice of genre is related to his or her respective conception of patriotism. Writing her biting satire a few months before the first shots of the Revolution, Warren equates patriotism with virtue and anti-patriotism with corruption and treachery.⁶ Writing a heroic melodrama after the war has begun, Brackenridge sees heroism as fundamental to patriotism; the Whigs need soldiers to brave impossible odds if they are to win; cowardice leads to defeat. By the time Tyler writes

⁵ Mercy Otis Warren became the one solid anti-federalist of the four playwrights. Hugh Henry Brackenridge was a Federalist until he re-entered politics in 1798, leading Jefferson's Republican Party in Pennsylvania. Tyler was a Federalist. Dunlap was raised in a Tory home, but became a patriot and espoused a Federalist outlook.

⁶ Alice McDonnell Robinson notes that with her earlier play, The Adulateur (1770), Warren "attempts to define for the first time in original American drama the 'true' American" (134).

his comedy of manners, upholding honor while simultaneously puncturing hypocrisy, the war has ended. Tyler's patriots must be honorable in order to withstand foreign influence and secure domestic peace and unity--the goal of the leaders embroiled in debates during the Constitutional Convention. As a tragedy, Dunlap's André is completely different from these three earlier plays. By nature, tragedy is complex, as is Dunlap's definition of patriotism. For Dunlap, patriotism mandates the ability to temper passion with rationality, nationalism with humanitarian principles. Such a deepening and expanding of patriotic ideals is crucial amidst the complexities of domestic and international affairs.

The four plays were greeted differently by the public. Though the first two plays are propagandistic closet dramas, their effect was immediate. Warren published The Group in pamphlet form--the most desirable and popular mode of disseminating information before and throughout the Revolutionary years because pamphlets were relatively easy to print and inexpensive to purchase.⁷ She gave the first two scenes to her husband who sent them to John Adams; Adams had them published in The Boston Gazette on January 23, 1775. The completed play was sold as a pamphlet beginning on April 3 and created a public debate: Tories opposed her Whig sentiments; Whigs lauded the depiction of despicable Tories. Just as Warren's pamphlet play reached the leaders and followers of the Revolution, so Brackenridge's play reached the youth. Claude M. Newlin explains that Brackenridge "seized the opportunity to instill patriotic sentiments

⁷ Walter Meserve further details the advantages of the pamphlet and its wide-spread dissemination from 1763-1783 (64).

into the minds of his pupils, and wrote a play . . . 'to be performed by the youth of the seminary'" (34). Daniel Marder notes that The Battle of Bunkers-Hill was performed at other academies besides Harvard (Hugh Henry Brackenridge 29). In 1776 Brackenridge published it, making it more readily available. Marder explains that Brackenridge admits that he subordinated style and quality to his heroic message in order to make the political impact of his play more timely (29). Moses declares, "The very fact that the Revolutionary plays did not attempt to be crudely universal, but specifically partisan, makes them of inestimable value as human documents. The fervor of this partisan spirit gave them style which they might otherwise never have possessed" (American Dramatist 54-5).

Unlike these first two plays, The Contrast was a stage success. Helen Tyler Brown notes that the comedy was first performed on April 16, 1787, at the John Street Theatre in New York and ran intermittently until June. The Contrast traveled to Philadelphia (December, 1787 and July, 1790), and found its way to the stage in Baltimore (November, 1787 and August, 1788), Williamsburg (1791), and Boston (October, 1792 and May, 1795).⁸ There were constant revivals of the play until 1917. Even today, theatre companies still perform Tyler's comedy. A successful Bay Area production was performed by the California Theatre Company in Sunnyvale during the Summer 1993 season. Arthur Hobson Quinn affirms that Tyler's play was "the first

⁸ Tyler gave his copyright over to Thomas Wignell who played Jonathan. Wignell published the play in January, 1790 with the inscription "written by a CITIZEN *of the* United States" (Helen Tyler Brown xxix). Among the subscribers was George Washington. Among others, Rinehart notes the democratic flavor that Tyler's anonymity promotes (34).

native comedy to be produced by a professional company” and performed by Americans (64). Candour, who published his critique of the play on April 18, 1787, wrote, “It is certainly the production of a man of genius, and nothing can be more praise-worthy than the sentiments of the play throughout. They are the effusions of an honest patriot heart expressed with energy and eloquence” (Moses, American Theatre 24). It is astounding that at the single most important moment in American history, the debate over the drafting of the Constitution, Tyler was able to write a comedy making Americans laugh at themselves while coming together in national unity.

Contrary to the success of Tyler’s comedy, Dunlap’s tragedy met with apparent failure. In his history Dunlap records the initial rejection to André when it was performed at the Park Theatre in New York on March 30, 1798. But after Dunlap added a scene, the audience approved of the play. Still, André had a short run: the final performance was on April 6, 1798. Annie Russell Marble notes, “It was dangerous to choose the character of André and his fate as a subject for drama within eighteen years of the dates of the events, and while partisan spirit was still smoldering” (255). Yet, the very presence of this “partisan spirit” and the controversy it spawned is indicative of the depth and quality of the exploration of patriotism in André. Gary A. Richardson praises Dunlap for the risk he took: “For the first time in the history of American drama, a native dramatist looked critically at American history, deemed it worthy of serious treatment, and produced a play that transcended panegyric or propaganda” (60). The true test of a play’s merit is the thought, self-evaluation, and cultural debate it provokes. As Moses argues, “The more

one advances in the study of American Drama, the more one is impressed with the fact that its bulk value is social rather than aesthetic" (American Dramatist 39). Though the four plays discussed here--particularly the first two--may not be examples of superb dramatic craft, the powerful ideas explored in these texts shaped the United States and her citizens' evolving definitions of patriotism.

Chapter 1

Virtuous Revolutionary Fervor

The Group and The Battle of Bunkers-Hill

Gordon S. Wood affirms that “those years just prior to the Declaration of Independence, marked the time and spirit which best defined the aims of the Revolutionaries” (88). 1775, in particular, proved to be a volatile and instrumental year in changing the goal of the patriots from preserving their freedoms as colonies to defining their freedoms as independent entities. In 1775 two prominent Whigs wrote plays to convince Americans that British tyranny was unjust and unnatural, and that the fight for independence was right and just. In doing so, they provided initial definitions of American patriotism from which subsequent definitions branch out. Mercy Otis Warren’s The Group and Hugh Henry Brackenridge’s The Battle of Bunkers-Hill are Whig propaganda; the first defines patriotism largely by negative, satiric example; the second by positive example as well.

In its historical context, this propaganda was meant to inform, promote, persuade, and teach, clarifying the spirit and aims of the playwrights. In his study of Revolutionary propaganda, Philip Davidson outlines the goals of the propagandist, among which are “to justify the course he advocates” and “to arouse hatred for the enemy” (103). In general,

both Warren and Brackenridge fulfill these aims in their plays. Warren's bias against the enemy is obvious. After she lists her *dramatis personae*, all of whom are Tories, she explains that they are "[a]ttended by a swarm of court sycophants, hungry harpies, and unprincipled dangles . . . hovering over the stage in the shape of locusts, led by the Massachusettensis in the form of a basilisk. . . . The whole supported by a mighty army and navy, from blunderland, for the laudible purpose of enslaving its best friends" (2). Following Warren's lead, Brackenridge attacks the British, the "envious power" that follows with "persecution," that "abridg'd" the American's "just rights," that rules "[w]ith lawless sovereignty" sewing pain with the "licens'd rage / Of brutal soldiery" (257).⁹ In addition to lambasting the enemy, both playwrights cleverly promote liberty by having these same despicable Englishman extol the noble qualities in Americans. Indeed, one of the Tories in The Group concludes that the patriots "fight in virtue's ever sacred cause" (21). As diametric opposites to the Tories, the patriots uphold religious, political, civil, and moral integrity.

Warren and Brackenridge needed to look no further than their own religious and political beliefs in order to write stirring plays validating the patriot cause. These beliefs, grounded in Protestant theology and Enlightenment philosophy, gave Revolutionary thinking and writing its focus on virtuous government: "Governments existed to preserve

⁹ While these descriptions of the British "arouse hatred," they surprisingly elicit pity as well as ridicule. Perhaps this is due to the playwrights' "attempt at realistic treatment . . . to picture all sorts and conditions of people" (Moses, The American Dramatist 54). Warren believed in the accuracy of her caricatures. Katharine Anthony reminds us, "To the end [Warren] maintained the justice and truth of her simulacra and considered that charity alone could condone [the Group members'] behavior" (245).

those rights which God and nature had given to all, not to reduce them. . . . The very definition of liberty was freedom from arbitrary rule" (Humphreys 22). The Whigs' concept of government stemmed from their concept of history, which Lester Cohen defines as "a struggle between two parallel sets of opposing principles: in political terms, between liberty and arbitrary power; and in ethical terms, between virtue and avarice and corruption (481). Armed with these ideas, Warren and Brackenridge launched their attacks on despotism, fighting to gain their freedom and natural rights.

When the Intolerable Acts required General Gage, Governor of Boston and commander of the British Army in American, to eliminate the power of the electorate by appointing Massachusetts Council members starting in August of 1774, Warren responded immediately and with passion.¹⁰ The title of her play, The Group, refers to the Tories who accepted Gage's appointments.¹¹ Meserve notes that in Warren's eyes (and those of all Whigs) these councilors deserved "contempt because as educated men they should have helped lead the colony toward freedom" (69), not slavery. As Kenneth

¹⁰ In 1774, Gage replaced Hutchinson as Governor of Boston. Warren's satires, The Adulateur (1770) and The Defeat (1773), apparently had a significant impact on politics. Meserve argues that these plays, together with publication of the Hutchinson-Oliver letters, advising to remove colonial rights, helped remove Hutchinson from office (68).

¹¹ Jeffrey H. Richards notes that the resistance to the Massachusetts Government Act was so great that only ten of the thirty-six appointed by the king accepted their office; others fled from the region (94). The historical figures upon whom Warren based her fictional characters are believed to be the following (Quinn 40):

Hazlerod--Peter Oliver
 Meagre--Foster Hutchinson
 Hateall--Timothy Ruggles
 Hum Humbug--John Erving, Jr.
 Sir Sparrow Spendall--William Pepperell
 Hector Mushroom--Col. John Murray
 Beau Trumps--Daniel Leonard

Dick, the Publican--Richard Lechmere
 Simple Sapling--Nathaniel Ray Thomas
 Monsieur de Francois--James Boutineau
 Crusty Crowbar--Josiah Edson
 Secretary Dupe--Thomas Flucker
 Scriblerius Fribble--Harrison Gray
 Commodore Batteau--Joshua Loring

Silverman reasons, this act “represented a loss of self-government of the sort which Bostonians since Puritan times had intensely feared, so intensely that they usually spoke of it in terms of the Apocalypse” (255).

As Warren assaulted the “writ of Mandamus” with her acerbic satire, so Brackenridge answered the call from Bunker Hill. When the rebels learned that Gage was planning to secure the “British hold on Boston” by taking Charlestown Heights and Dorchester Heights, they planned a preemptive strike on Bunker’s Hill and Breed’s Hill. The British countered, enflaming Charlestown, but could not defeat them until after three charges (Silverman 278). Out of 2500 men, the British lost 1150, while the Americans “lost 400 out of some 1,500 engaged” (Wright 87).¹² As Marder affirms, Brackenridge’s response, The Battle of Bunkers-Hill, illustrates how “American bravery wrings a moral victory out of defeat” (Hugh Henry Brackenridge 28).

A brief summary of each play will provide the framework for understanding their arguments. As The Group opens, the Tory councilors, all of whom have had close dealings with their former leader, Rapatio (Thomas Hutchinson), are trying to understand the fierce determination of the rebels, their own discomfort, and British inertia. Through what Zoe Detsi calls “personal confessions” (41), each Tory excuses or defends his present position. Sylla (General Thomas Gage), who has replaced Rapatio, calls his councilors to discuss policy. After pleas for battle, Sylla leaves the group, disgusted at

¹² Exact numbers vary according to the historian consulted, though most record that almost half of the British forces were either killed or wounded.

their inhumanity, to wrestle with his conscience. The play closes with the only patriot in the play--an unnamed woman, "*nearly connected with one of the principal actors in the group*" (22)--mourning the inevitable bloodshed and praising the patriots. Since the lady is the only "good" character in the play, and the group members, including Sylla, are clearly antagonists, the rebels, who are not present, become absent protagonists. In his "Introduction," Benjamin Franklin V commends Warren's decision to fill the play with antagonists, affirming that "the government's men need no foil. They are so obviously venal and spineless" that portraying the patriots "would divert the reader from the group's villainy. The Patriots must be admirable if these men are so bad, as several members of the group realize" (xiv). Thus, justice is implicitly left in the hands and hearts of the virtuous rebels, whose patriotism is defined by its opposite.

While Warren implicitly constructs a paradigm for patriotism, Brackenridge explicitly contrasts American patriots and British loyalists, protagonists and antagonists. Paralleling the historical battle, the play opens with the rebel leaders--Generals Warren, Gardiner, and Putnam--planning an attack on Bunker's Hill. Once they spot the American troops, the British--led by Generals Gage, Howe, and Burgoyne--assault the rebels, but cannot force them to surrender until British reinforcements arrive. The English victory is hollow because the Americans have triumphed psychologically. The grandiose speeches that the generals on both sides give to rally their troops reveal the disparity between the American and English causes and attitudes. Silverman enumerates, "The British fight to preserve their reputation in the world; the Americans fight to

preserve freedom and to deserve the sacrifices of their forefathers" (285). The American aide who speaks the epilogue concludes that God is on the side of those who fight for freedom--the heroic patriots.

Though both plays are obviously partisan and espouse the same ideology, they differ in more than plot and structure. Perhaps the most obvious extrinsic difference is that The Group was written by a woman and The Battle of Bunkers-Hill by a man.¹³ Not surprisingly, Warren spotlights the treatment of women, while Brackenridge only briefly mentions mothers and children. Warren focuses on preparation for war, Brackenridge on war itself. As such, Warren's play is, as Anthony notes, "a conversation piece" (93), whereas Brackenridge's is a battle-cry. However, Warren's diction and metaphors are very warlike, indicating that the fight has already begun. Yet the fight she depicts is predominately internal; it is a psychological war preceding and clarifying the external struggle in The Battle of Bunkers-Hill. The distinct dramatic genres and styles of the plays match their respective conflicts. The Group is a satire touched with tragic and heroic motifs, while The Battle of Bunkers-Hill is a heroic melodrama touched with satiric and tragic motifs. Warren's use of satire "was quite suitable" because "satire was traditionally meant to correct vice and folly," and thus encourages virtue, states Theresa

¹³ Several biographers discuss the fact that Warren published her work anonymously. Detsi claims that anonymity was the only way Warren could solve the struggle between her "need for self expression and her culturally conditioned anxiety about the impropriety of female artistic creation" (38). Anthony says Warren's reason was "unavoidable" since she was a patriot and a woman (115). But when someone else tried to claim The Group, Warren wrote John Adams in 1814, asking him to validate her authorship, which he did, adding a key (previously cited) explaining the historical figures who became the "Group" (243-44).

Freda Nicolay (44). Similarly, Brackenridge's heroic melodrama is appropriate for displaying and praising heroic deeds.

The genres the playwrights choose elucidate definitions of patriotism that are simultaneously distinct and harmonious. In The Group, virtue, supported by the knowledge that freedom is a God-given right, endows the Whigs with what even the British recognize as unshakable moral courage. In The Battle of Bunkers-Hill, this moral courage, supported by virtue, becomes heroism. Significantly, the Latin root of virtue, *virtus*, means "strength, manliness, virtue." One of the archaic definitions for virtue is valor (Webster). Together, virtue and heroism bolster the Americans in the midst of overwhelming odds, giving them power to defeat their enemies.

.....

These enemies represent the antithesis of patriotism. The corruption of the British is thus the focal point of Warren's play. She clarifies her definition of patriotism primarily through satirizing the members of the group, cunningly using their conversations against them, showing that they are divided. One camp brags about being callous, self-serving, and amoral. Those who belong to the other camp criticize Tories, condemn themselves, and struggle with guilt. In addition to being a target of Warren's satiric pen, this latter camp becomes a vehicle for her tragic touch; their self-realization reveals a tragic flaw that will be examined later.

By portraying the members of the first camp as supreme egotists, Warren levels against them what Alice Brown calls her "missiles of warfare in a righteous cause" (163).

Among others, Scriblerius, Hazlerod, Meagre, Simple Sappling, and Hateall are proud of their avarice, inhumanity, and lack of probity. Unmasking their own moral vacuity, Scriblerius scoffs at group members who are “balancing ’twixt right and wrong” (7) and Hazlerod likens “moral sense,” honesty, and justice to “shackles” which cannot satisfy his lust for wealth (4). Clearly disdaining “bugbear conscience” (4), Hazlerod pompously tells Crusty Crowbar how he became a hardhearted judge without knowing the law. Moreover, Hazlerod boasts, “I sold my country for a splendid bribe. / Now let her sink” (5). Apparently, money and position are more important than integrity to Hazlerod, whose stubborn egotism is woven with his greed.

Such avarice turns these group members into irrational hate-mongers who sanction slavery. Annoyed at the rebels’ refusal to submit to tyranny, Hazlerod declares that he does not feel “pity” for those who “dare refuse / The badge of slaves” (6). The colonists’ resistance also arouses anger in Meagre, Rapatio’s brother, who appears to have a maniacal need to dominate not only the colonists, but all humankind. But more than all others, excepting Rapatio, Hateall typifies the antipode of a patriot, the enemy of virtue: “I Nero like, the capital in flames, / Could laugh to see her glotted sons expire” (5).¹⁴ As his name suggests, Hateall hates all, especially the true patriot.

The group’s materialism and disrespect for humanity can be seen as an extension of their stubborn ignorance and disrespect for God. Secretary Dupe, who ironically is not

¹⁴ Brown notes that for Warren, Hutchinson (Rapatio) was “the arch-traitor--always” (169). According to Bailyn, “The feeling was widespread among well informed Americans that Thomas Hutchinson had betrayed his country . . . for sordid, selfish reasons . . . and that in this sense his personal actions lay at the heart of the Revolution” (45).

duped at all, recognizes that the British “tread on divine and human laws” (21). This is heresy to a people who believed that “society originates in a contract between God on the one hand and the people on the other” (Morgan 11), thus renewing the covenant relationship which dominates the Hebrew Scriptures. Moreover, “The laws of God . . . were the natural and rational laws of human society” (Humphreys 23). The group members’ attempts to enslave mankind violate these laws and are therefore contemptible. In turn, these men deserve no respect. Indeed, in the seventeenth century, the “New England divines” had already established that “no obedience was due a civil magistrate when his acts violated the will of God as set forth in the Bible” (Davidson 114). Therefore, Warren’s satiric attacks are religious as well as civil.

Convicting himself of the highest treason possible, Meagre shows his contempt for God’s law. Eager to begin the fight, he turns towards “fortune,” hoping she will crown the British with “success . . . / Though injured justice stern and solemn frown” (22). With this statement, he separates himself from Christianity, since a Christian’s sense of justice and virtue is wedded to a God of love. Detsi reasons, “So absolutely selfish and base the Loyalists appear to be, that they are unable to recognize a higher cause and purpose in life than power and glory” (41). Proving this point, Meagre proposes to bathe in the “lost fortunes” of the rebels and “strive to think there is no after doom” (22). Though Meagre’s diction could imply his fear of a final judgment, his desire to deprive the world of love and justice effectively denies him any religious sense (21).

Moreover, thinking that he can escape the consequences of his actions exposes Meagre as an ignorant and faithless fool, and therefore, an enemy of patriotism and virtue.

Antagonistic to virtue, Meagre's like-minded mentor and cohorts earn the censure of their guilt-ridden group members. Though Beau-Trumps discloses no misgivings regarding his current position, he joins Crusty Crowbar, Collateralis, and others who manifest the effects of having scruples, in denouncing Rapatio.¹⁵ By having Tories slander the former governor, likening him to Satan, Warren punctures the English ego and position politically, ethically, and religiously. Collateralis affirms that Rapatio has a "serpentine brain" which surpasses "the arts of Machiavel himself" (9). Calling the infamous Tory "the Arch traitor," Beau-Trumps asserts, "He strikes a bargain with his country's foes / And joins to wrap America in flames" (10). Like Trumps, Secretary Dupe echoes Milton when Dupe recalls how Rapatio "like the toad squat at the ear of Eve / Infusing poisons by his snaky tongue" (18). Unlike Adam and Eve who try to reconcile themselves to God after they learn that Satan's promises are empty, the group members who see that Rapatio's promises of riches and fame are elusive continue to ignore God and pursue gold with more fervor than before. Neither freedom nor patriotism can abide such conscious villainy.

Warren furthers her purpose--to convince the public of the absolute corruption of the Tory councilors--by placing bitter satire in the mouth of Sylla, the group's

¹⁵ Among others, Nicolay notes that Beau-Trumps "represents the Tory writer who uses his literary talent against his country (in contrast to writers like Warren who use their talents to advance the cause of freedom)" (53).

commanding officer. Corroborating Dupe's claim that his comrades are "selfish venal men" (20), Sylla berates his men, whose self-interested ambition hurts their own people, specifically women and children. Appearing to be sympathetic towards his wife, Simple Sappling acknowledges that his "ambition beggars all her babes" (3). But he shows his hypocrisy, superficiality, and selfishness when he decides to offer his home to the king's men simply for the "sound" of nobility (14). Lampooning Simple for insensitivity as a father and a husband, Sylla also levies vituperation against the king's soldiers who are "[d]evoid of virtue, rectitude, or honour" and would "contaminate" Simple's children (14). Apparently Simple is too callous to care or too simple to understand that Sylla has just insulted him, for the official nonchalantly replies, "If she [his wife] complains or murmurs at the plan, / Let her solicit charity abroad / . . . Disperse her children round the neighb'ring cots" (15). Simple's way of acknowledging his duties as husband and father is blatantly base.

Hateall's even more ignoble treatment of women stupefies his governor. Exclaiming that he has "never felt one tender thought" about women, Hateall boasts that his only desire for wedding "nut brown Kate" was "to secure her dower" (15). Moreover, he thinks other men should admire his abusive treatment of his wife. Whereas Sylla unleashed an effluvium of direct and acerbic accusations at Simple, he can only respond to Hateall with a short, but forceful, command: "Enough of this" (15). Referring to the British "perversion of values," Nicolay explains how such "sexual corruption" creates

“chaos” (54).¹⁶ By inference, patriot husbands treat their wives with respect, thus maintaining order. But Hateall thrives on disrupting the patriotic order. His disdain for women is part of his complete disregard for human life: “I’ll not recede to save from swift perdition / My wife, my country, family or friends” (5). He has no loyalty but to himself, evident in his relishing cry, “How I could glut my vengeful eyes” to behold orphaned girls and boys “thrown helpless on the world” (6). Though we pity and fear for the women and children, we despise Hateall, who is a threat to patriotism.

As is often the case with satire, Warren’s motive is not to move the audience to tears, but to enflame their anger, arouse their patriotic fervor, and catapult them into action. Her purpose and tone compliment each other. Warren’s harsh depiction of Rapatio, Simple, and Hateall, together with the ridicule by their cohorts and commander, foils her implied depiction of the humanity of the Americans. Through her pointed and deadly satire, Warren indicts the English of desiring to enslave mankind both in the political and domestic spheres. As vassals of vice, the English stand opposed to liberty; they are anti-patriots.

.....

The tragic motifs that accompany Warren’s satire lend a different facet to her definition of patriotism. Her use of pity (not *pathos*) and redemption shows that patriotism requires unswerving devotion to good. Underlying Warren’s portrayal of the

¹⁶ Nicolay emphasizes the importance of women in the new republic. Nina Baym writes, “Warren offers herself to the nation as a generalized republican Mother—a republican public mother, whose job is to convey true American values to the next generation of Americans at large” (29-30).

brutal treatment of women by Simple and Hateall is a tragic situation: the British greed not only hurts patriots, it also hurts loyalist families. Realizing that the supercilious attitude which breeds such behavior is self-destructive, Collateralis states, "And tho' Britannia sends her legions o'er, [sic] / To plant her daggers in her children's breast, / It will rebound--New whetted, the keen point, / Will find a sheath in ev'ry tyrant's heart"

(11). Openly calling those who serve the motherland tyrants, he views the impending war not as a battle between two foreign entities, but among family members. This analogy serves to accuse the British of infanticide. Pointedly, Collateralis sees that when the British kill their children, they in effect kill themselves.

Such a realization blends with Warren's second use of a tragic motif--the loss of potential virtue through a tragic flaw, namely the British and loyalist desire for wealth and fame. We have already seen how the second camp of group members malign their cohorts. They also reproach themselves. Collateralis says, "I almost wish I never had engag'd / To rob my country of her native rights" (16). Two points are significant in this statement. First, he identifies his country as America and not Britain; therefore, he implies that he has turned traitor. Second, his diction, his use of "almost," implies that he does not completely regret his decision to seek material gain. This is unfortunate, since Collateralis's insight and compassion are indicative of a noble character. Yet any nobility that he may have is snuffed out by his service to the crown that he acknowledges is oppressive.

Like Collateralis, Monsieur de Francois realizes his servility to an evil cause. He wishes that he could “give up the dread of retribution” and, like Hateall, be able to “curse mankind,” or like Hazlerod, sell out his country (7). The fact that he cannot connotes a humanity buried deep beneath his ambitious desires “for titl’d place” and fame (8). Monsieur de Francois had been raised to love freedom. On his deathbed, his father counseled him to repel oppression. Now, ignoring his father’s wish and suppressing his own conscience, de Francois feels guilty: “Shall I ungrateful erase the sacred bonds / And help to clank the tyrant’s iron chains / O’er these blest shores” (7). If his virtuous upbringing had not given him a conscience, he would not feel the “stings and scorpions” of guilt, the pain of fighting for arbitrary power (7). Regretfully, his desire for reputation has overcome his desire for freedom.

While de Francois’s fear of an “awful reckoning of some future day” (7) suggests a belief in God, Crowbar admits his uneasiness with “hard fate” making him “[p]rophane the sacred sabbaths of my God” (4). Describing his actions as blasphemous and his former religious beliefs as “sacred” shows that Crowbar, too, has been righteous and is capable of reformation. But his belief that fate made him trespass against God indicates a victim mentality and a shirking of individual responsibility. While grappling with his past and present actions, Crowbar blames fate for his crimes and thus relies on a convenient excuse.

Whereas Crowbar appears confused, Beau-Trumps seems comfortable with his avarice. A former patriot now steeled in the loyalist cause, Trumps explains, “When first

I enter'd on the public stage / . . . Virtue look'd fair" (8). But greed has overruled virtue; nothing "has such tempting charms" as material title and wealth (8). Therefore, as all the rest, he pushes forward physically and morally backward, hoping for profit.¹⁷

With her depiction of Sylla, Warren illustrates how serving a morally despicable cause torments the soul and destroys manliness. Sylla's outburst at Simple and Hateall uncovers the depth of his conflict--"ten thousand harrowing cares / Tear up my peace, and swell my anxious breast" (15). Tragically, he cannot free himself of the guilt that hovers in his heart. His only intent is to "bring new glory" to the king (16), a justifiable, even honorable desire. His distress increases as this wish conflicts with his concept of glory and justice, which he believes cannot be gained by "spreading ruin" throughout the colonies; such oppression gives birth to "madness" (16). Sylla's claim that his king is duped "[b]y those he trusts" (16) removes the blame from the king and reiterates the group's underhandedness.¹⁸ Moreover, Sylla's contempt for his councilors, devotion to his king, and fears about his own role juxtapose compassion and conscience with corruption. Remembering that "love of freedom" formerly inspired the British to fight glorious battles, he wonders, "And shall I rashly draw my guilty sword . . . for no cause, but that [the patriots] nobly scorn / To wear the fetters of his venal slaves!" (17). Even

¹⁷ Richards's comments regarding Beau-Trumps are particularly interesting in light of Warren's tragic motif. Richards notes that Beau-Trump's historical counterpart is Daniel Leonard, a wealthy lawyer who was close to John Adams. After the Boston Tea Party, Leonard turned loyalist. Richards explains that "his defection to the Loyalists was seen less as betrayal than a real loss" (99).

¹⁸ Perhaps Warren wants to direct the Whigs' anger towards a local target. Perhaps she hopes that Gage will change his mind and end his struggle by siding with freedom. Whatever the reason, Davidson's notes, "The personal abuse of the King . . . did not become common until after the appearance of Common Sense" (150) in 1776.

more than some of the councilors he commands, Sylla sees the invidious effects of “base born lust of foreign growth” and “false ambition,” which adulterate the Briton, “[p]oison the mind, and brutalize the man” (16). Truly, Sylla has the capacity for good.

Unfortunately, he never resolves his struggle. His ceaseless questioning makes plain that the English have lost their greatness by fighting to imprison a people who are, in many ways, their own children. By implication then, greatness is wedded to the fight for liberty. Rather than confuse conscience, this fight invigorates and frees the mind--a freedom for which Sylla yearns.

Though Sylla and his guilt-ridden councilors condemn themselves, they do not change their actions and follow “right” by leaving their loyalist offices and joining the patriot side. Though they castigate Rapatio, they do not free themselves from his grip--his promises of titles, reputation, and wealth. Rather, they hope to gain peace without having to sacrifice gain. Hinting that the group members fall prey to Rapatio’s manipulation helps prove Silverman’s argument that Warren “wittingly or not created some sympathy for their position” (236). Nevertheless, she clearly portrays the group members as masters of their own fate. Indeed, Hazlerod, Simple, and Hateall gloat in their greed, appearing unredeemable. We do not feel the sense of loss for them that we feel for de Francois, Crowbar, Collateralis, and most poignantly, Sylla. Yet, the loss of potential good would be more tragic if the latter individuals tried harder to change. Brown affirms that the best of the group members “are of that hopeless ilk who, knowing good, still choose the worst” (169). Knowing the imperatives of true patriotism, they

could live by its dictates. Yet their decision to serve the “worst” precipitates their ultimate downfall, thus destroying their potential for virtue and for righteousness.

.....

In so far as The Group deals with heroism, it highlights how the moral vacillation of some group members makes them weak, while the virtue of the patriots makes them bold. Unexpectedly, the Britons have one admirable quality--their recognition of the heroism and honor of the patriots. Collateralis affirms that Americans are “firm, united, bold, undaunted, brave” (11). Dick the Publican curses the “preserving spirit / Of Freedom’s sons” (12). Meagre’s anger at the Whigs, “unremitting vigilance and care / To baffle ev’ry evil machination” (19) implicates the “evil” English. Furthermore, Trumps certifies the benefits of following the patriotic path by explaining how he “tasted solid peace” before he turned traitor (8). Obviously, he does not appreciate the magnitude of the gift he had. Warren’s use of the word “solid” suggests that this “peace of mind” cannot be shaken unless one leaves the path, which, as Collateralis realizes, occasions harm: “How great the pain, and yet how small the *purchase!*” (16). The “pain” of which he speaks cannot be physical; the battle has not yet begun. Rather, it is the pain of spiritual depravity, fostered by selling his soul. Because the patriots know they are right, they have an assurance that precludes pain of conscience and eludes the British. Such assurance makes them formidable enemies. Secretary Dupe affirms, “Their valour’s great, and justice holds the scale. / They fight for freedom, while we stab the breast / Of every man, who is her friend profest” (22). As a result, Secretary Dupe does not believe

that the Americans can be defeated by the English who resort to despicable tactics that are counterproductive to success. By noting the heroic valor and honor of the Whigs, the councilors widen the gap between their decrepitude and the patriots' power.

Tragic and heroic motifs, uncovering the guilt of some Tories and the courage of all patriots, add to Warren's satiric portrayal of the group members. The discussions among all the group members--whether filled with pride in their obdurate nature; ridicule of their leaders, cohorts, or subordinates; discomfort with their present state; or awe at the Americans--prove that they have turned their backs on rectitude and have become icons of despotism to be deplored. Warren's satire not only discredits the British position, but engages in open warfare. Her conviction in the rightness of her cause and in the necessity and potency of virtue to maintain liberty is a powerful weapon. Moreover, her conviction prophesies the imminent war and its outcome. Warren's epilogue, expressing more than her faith, is a revelation.

.....

While Warren defines patriotism primarily through satire, Brackenridge does so through heroic drama. Whereas Warren emphasizes the corruption of the British, Brackenridge emphasizes their cowardice. But he also satirizes their materialism, self-interested concern for reputation, lack of religious values, and fear--all of which lead to cowardice in combat. The war which Warren prophesies in The Group has begun. Using the same tactic as Warren, Brackenridge has the loyalist generals in The Battle of

Bunkers-Hill convict themselves with their words and actions, thus leaving the field clear for the heroic patriots to command.

In order to undercut the English cause, Brackenridge vilifies their motives, which Gage and Howe enumerate. Needing to rally their soldiers to war, Gage tells Howe to capitalize on the desire for wealth and property (252). In addition to land, Howe offers them prestigious titles if they win (257). Significantly, there is no assurance of gaining these materialistic rewards. Brackenridge further mocks the anti-patriots by showing that Burgoyne fears that the British retreat from Lexington and the presence of patriot camps around Boston will taint British reputation abroad (250). Moreover, Howe would "rather die, / Transfix'd in battle by their bayonets, / Than thus remain, the scoff and ridicule / Of glibing wits and paltry gazetteers" (252). Howe's attention to the Whig gazettes proves his insecurity in his own fame. Such insecurity compels Britons to vindicate their reputation.

The preoccupation with fame shows that Britons are egotistical--a natural outgrowth of insecurity.¹⁹ Howe's contumely for the Americans is evident when he declares that the British must "chastise this rebellion, and tread down, / Such foul ingratitude" repudiating the "fond maternal tenderness of soul" which brought them to America (256). Howe's tone is one of a parent admonishing his children for being ungrateful; his words convey anything but motherly tenderness. His supreme ego causes

¹⁹ Brackenridge's accusation is not unfounded. Charles M. Andrews notes, "An attitude of condescension; an air of superiority" that characterized British officials at home and abroad "made for constant irritation and complaint" for the colonists and made an easy target for Whigs (154).

him to say, "What pity 'tis, such excellence of mind, / Should spend itself, in the fantastic cause / of wild-fire liberty" (265). By belittling the patriot cause, he actually legitimizes and strengthens it.

As Howe's ego betrays him, so does Burgoyne's. Telling his disheartened troops that they can easily "bury, this small handful, with the dust / Our march excites" (261) proves inaccurate. Even though the British technically won the Battle of Bunker Hill, Richard L. Bushman notes that "the refusal of the Americans to give way until they exhausted their ammunition compelled the British to reassess American strength. It was no longer certain that the rebels could be intimidated" (940).²⁰ Indeed, Putnam defends the strength of the patriots when he satirizes the fruitlessness of English pride by recounting to his fellow patriots how the British were playing and singing "jocund music" at Concord, wrongly assuming an easy victory (248).²¹ The haughtiness of the British generals renders them incapable of understanding the morality, strength, and nobility of the Americans and the immorality, weakness, and ignobility of the English.

Brackenridge further explores English weakness by satirizing Gage, who represents patriotism's opposite. The playwright's treatment of the general implies a connection between ignorance of religion and cowardice. Brackenridge parodies Gage's

²⁰ Significant to the discussion of British ego, Bushman records, "At the Battle of Bunker Hill on June 17, 1775, the British launched a reckless frontal assault on the American positions on Breed's Hill in an attempt to demonstrate the invincibility of trained troops against untrained militia. The demonstration was a failure" (940).

²¹ The music that the British "fifed" at Concord, as well as at Lexington and Bunker Hill, was none other than "Yankee Doodle," Francis G. Walett records, also noting that "after that costly victory [at Bunker Hill] the tune must have haunted the British" (45).

religious illiteracy and philosophical impotence: "I could philosophize / Eternity is like a winding sheet-- / The seven commandments like--I think there's seven-- / I scratch my head--but yet in vain I scratch" (255). There are ten commandments; Brackenridge knows this; the Americans know this; even the British soldiers know this. But Gage, their leader, does not. By exposing Gage's absurd ignorance of the Bible, Brackenridge suggests that God must be on the patriot side. If this is so, then Gage's fear about dying in combat is justified. His comment about the upcoming battle reveals that he is in the wrong profession: "I dread the issue of the attempt" (252). After his army is repulsed, Gage responds with, "Do as you please, Burgoyne, in this affair, / I'll hide myself in some deep vault beneath" (259). This is the last we see of Gage. Faithless and cowardly, he retreats into his solipsism. He does not have the courage that patriotism requires during a war. Gage's lack of Christian feeling and faith seems to be the cause of his cowardice. In the end, he dishonors himself, arresting his quest for the goal he and his fellow officers have been hoping to attain--fame, reputation.²² English materialism, coupled with a benighted understanding of Christianity, is therefore self-destructive.

.....

The tragic element of Brackenridge's play, through which he, like Warren, uncovers the loss of potential good and the effects of guilt, points towards the antipode of patriotism. Though Brackenridge shows that Howe feels guilty for his part in spreading

²² Silverman notes, "Bunker's Hill, many felt, at last revealed the depth of Gage's cynicism." Wrongly, people placed the blame on Gage, instead of on Howe, for burning Charlestown. Moreover, Howe "proposed leading the troops while Gage remained at headquarters to be available for reinforcement and for dealing with emergencies." Logically, Whigs saw Gage's role as a reflection of his "cowardice" (279).

tyranny, the playwright centers his study on the same man whom Warren portrays most sympathetically--Gage (Sylla). Tellingly, he affirms that guilt "plays the coward with my trembling heart / And cools the blood, with frightful images. / O guilt, thy blackness hovers on the mind" (254). Guilt, after all, indicates a knowledge of what is right. Therefore, Gage is frustrated that the knowledge of his rewards--"honor," "renown abroad," and "dominion, o'er this Continent" (254)--do not assuage the "inward gnawing" he feels for breaking his promise to the Americans, turning his prisoners into hostages instead of freeing them (254). He shows he has a heart when he is moved by the women and children who mourn for their "detain'd" husbands, fathers, and brothers (254). Yet, he suppresses these feelings and argues that he should not care for these innocents when the "mighty cause, / Of *George and Britain*, is endangered" (254). Moreover, Gage sees fighting to "rule mankind . . . with an iron rod" as a "just prerogative" (254). But the struggle is too much; Gage crumbles, torn between his duty and his conscience. For a moment, Brackenridge evokes pity for the man who wishes for the "sweet tranquillity, and peace of soul" that the "cottager" knows (254). Because Gage is more humane and perceptive than the other commanding officers, his decision to serve the British cause is tragic; he has the opportunity to be noble, but fails. Gage's inability to find a sense of comfort with his part in the battle inevitably controls him, turning him into a coward who tries to hide from the consequences of his actions. As the antithesis of a patriot, he therefore becomes pathetic, whereas he could have been heroic.

.....

In The Battle of Bunkers-Hill, the heroic ultimately dominates the satiric and tragic and defines patriotism. Unlike Warren, Brackenridge explicitly contrasts the loyalists and patriots, particularly antagonist and protagonist, Generals Gage and Warren. Gage's tragic cowardice makes him unfit for battle. As his detaining of the prisoners proves, his "word of honor" is worthless (247). Understandably, Warren sees Gage as having a "hard heart," as one of the "slaves of Royal Power" (247). Indeed, Gage seems chained by his own ambition, unwilling or unable to release the shackles that bind him. In turn, he enslaves others, whereas Warren works to free them. As Richardson claims, Warren epitomizes "[t]he mettle of the American fighting man" (36). Though the situation is bleak for both his captive countrymen and his ready soldiers, Warren cannot stand idle and watch the loyalists "impeach our worth / As vain, and call our patience cowardice" (247). The "this" which catalyzes Warren into thinking of a risky plan to save his fellow patriots is not fear of losing his reputation but indignation caused by Gage's cruelty and hypocrisy. Gage's character is antithetical to Warren's, whose patriotism is defined by his heroism, manifested in his willingness to take the hill, to brave impossible odds: they have 700 men; the British 3,000 (257).²³ Even Warren's fellow officers acknowledge the precariousness of Warren's plan. Gardiner states, "The thought is perilous, and many men, / In this bold enterprise, must strew the ground" (250). But only the "thought" is dangerous; the men do not "dread" peril. Though this distinction is syntactical, it has a larger impact on the individuals involved in this battle.

²³ Brackenridge's particularly low number for the Americans makes their task even more formidable.

Once the plan is created, Gardiner gains strength from Warren's invincible spirit, and together they revitalize their men in the face of certain death. To his seven hundred men, Gardiner heroically cries, "I have challeng'd you, / To this bold enterprise, as men of might / And valour eminent" (253). While Gardiner focuses next on the practical aspects of a surprise midnight assault, Warren centers on the psychological, giving his men reason to fight, telling them to avenge the deaths of those victimized in the Boston Massacre, driving "lightning" in their hearts: "Let every arm / This day be active, in fair freedom's cause, / And shower down . . . / Full store of lightning . . . / To blast the adversary" (258). Warren and his fellow officers care more about freedom and their fellow men than they do about themselves, which inspires them to fight long after their physical strength should have expired. Even when he has been mortally wounded, Warren insists, "[L]et not the cause, / The sacred cause of liberty with me / Faint or expire" (260). He reassures his men that he is glad to die for his country, as he knows they are. Injured, Gardiner shows similar bravery. Instead of asking to be carried from the battlefield or to be put out of the aim of yet another "musket-ball death-wing'd," Gardiner requests to be removed only enough to stop his bleeding so that he can fight "one half hour more" before he dies and returns to God (263). Near the end of the fight and now in command, Putnam calls on the inner strength of his troops, telling them to "[r]eceive the battle, as a shore of rock / The ocean wave," not fearing death, certain in the knowledge that if they die, they have given their lives to a worthy cause (264). All

three generals, as well as their men, provide a striking contrast to Gage and the cautious British soldiers, who fear to face the fire of an energized, patriot foe.

The American display of heroism elicits both praise and resentment from the British. Like Mercy Warren, Brackenridge heightens patriotic courage by having the British notice it. Frustrated at the “haughty insolence” of the rebels, Burgoyne wonders at the source of American determination (250). Gage reasons that such valor is a product of “the zeal, of fiercest liberty” (251). Though ignorant of religion, Gage pays tribute to its power, crediting “[g]rey-headed clergymen” whose prayers give the rebels “fortitude” and whose “talk of heav’n” assures them that the “sweet soul, who dies in battle, / Shall walk, with spirits of the just” (251). Gage implies that the assurance that their fight for liberty is divinely sanctioned makes the patriots indomitable. Indeed, Putnam declares that he and his compatriots know “no sentiment of fear” (248).

Gage’s assessment of the patriots is enforced by Howe, whose adulations suggests a direct correlation between virtue and heroism. Before the battle has begun, Howe extols: “A people brave , / Who never yet, of luxury, or soft / Delights effeminate, and false have tasted. . . / Oft have I heard their valour published: / Their perseverance, and untamable / Fierce mind” (251). Their valor is an outgrowth of their rectitude. By implication, Howe incriminates himself and the Britons who fight for “false” riches and “luxury.” While he may earn the audience’s approval for recognizing American bravery, he elicits their criticism by displaying arrogance. Howe is unable to give his foes the credit they deserve; he calls them “sons of Britons” who “shew their ancestry,” claiming

that their heroism is not of their own genesis, but of British origin (265). This assertion further illustrates British selfish pride, conversely magnifying the unselfed courage of the patriots.

The courage of Warren and his fellow patriots is not only engendered by their moral integrity, but also by the righteousness of their cause, which General Warren delineates: "The word is, LIBERTY / And Heaven smile on us, in so just a cause" (258). More than merely insisting that the "sound" of freedom stirs "strength, and noble confidence" (257), Warren proves this when, mortally wounded, he heroically cries, "Fight on, my countrymen be FREE, be FREE" (261). In order to be free, the patriots must fight against "those proud champions of despotic power / Who . . . mock / Our prayers" (249). Even history approves of the patriots' cause. Using past examples of heroism to bolster his troops, Gardiner likens his men to the "three hundred at Thermopylae," telling his soldiers that if they die, they will "give our Country credit" (253). Gardiner thus invigorates his men with strength, freeing them from paralyzing fear.

Howe, on the other hand, fuels the flames of fear that already surround his men. Reproaching his soldiers, who are trying to flee the battlefield, he says, "But that so many mouths can witness it, I would deny myself an *Englishman* / And swear this day, that with such cowardice, / no kindred, or alliance, has my birth" (262). Howe's purpose seems to be to distance himself from his troops, who have been thrashed by the patriots, so that they will become embarrassed and seek revenge. Using fear to make sure his men

fight, Howe orders officers to use "the small sword, and sharp bayonet, / Drive on each coward that attempts to lag, / That thus, sure death may find the villain out" (262).

Therefore, while Gage's fear arises out of faithlessness and Howe's out of insecurity in his own fame, the British soldier's fear stems from the dread of death, which confronts him on both sides--on one, the "bold rebel" who Burgoyne says "show'rs destruction down" (260); on the other, his superior officer who holds sword in hand. Instead of furnishing his men with hope, as Gardiner does, Howe insults his troops, commanding, "Back to the charge, once more, and rather die / . . . Than live the blemish of your Country's fame" (262). Of course, reputation is not enough for which to fight, thus making eventual cowards of the British, rendering them incapable of patriotism. But since Howe equates honor with fame, he would rather see his men killed by his own officers than live, shamed by the Americans. Thus, the Briton makes his own soldier a hostage. No wonder, then, that the British soldiers fear to engage in battle, despite their overpowering numbers.

In order to annul any potential anxiety in the patriots' hearts, caused by the impossible odds, Brackenridge shows why the British cannot succeed. Through Gardiner, the playwright further accentuates the link between the weakness of the British soldiers and the vileness of their cause. Talking to his own men, Gardiner teaches, "You see, brave soldiers, how an evil cause, / A cause of slavery, and civil death, / Unmans the spirit, and strikes down the soul" (262). The English have nothing to fight for except reputation, and everything to fight against when fighting liberty. As a result of fighting

for an empty cause, the Briton is “found this day shorn of his wonted strength” (262). In staunch opposition to such weakness, the patriots stand, steadied in the knowledge that both they and their cause are virtuous. Denoting the moral supremacy of the American cause, Gardiner iterates, “The free born spirit of immortal fire / Is stranger to ignoble deeds, and shuns / The name of cowardice” (248). Cowardice in the midst of combat obviously precipitates ultimate defeat. Such fear is therefore antithetical to Brackenridge’s definition of patriotism, which requires of patriots the ultimate sacrifice-- to give their lives for their country. Brackenridge’s patriots define heroism.

.....

The interconnectedness of the definitions of patriotism offered by Warren and Brackenridge is unmistakable. Warren’s predominately satiric play reveals that moral depravity, disdain for justice, and inhumanity mix to make anti-patriots. Brackenridge’s patriots are fearlessly able to give their lives for their country because they know they serve a righteous cause. For Warren and Brackenridge, the absence of probity turns into cowardice, which ensures the downfall of those enslaved by corrupt desires and bent on enslaving others. By contrast, heroism rests upon virtue.

Warren’s definition of patriotism seems to have grown from the Puritan and Whig concept of virtue already instilled in her before she ever lifted her pen against tyranny. Cohen explains that the “principal characteristics” of virtue “were patriotism [my emphasis], self-discipline, autonomy,” and that virtue’s opposite, “avarice and corruption, lust for personal wealth, power, and artificial distinction . . . resulted in the pursuit of self-

aggrandizement, luxury, glory" (482). The Group aggressively implies the dichotomy between virtue and vice; The Battle of Bunkers-Hill portrays this conflict. In The Group, Warren attacks corruption which spawn callous inhumanity, divisiveness, guilt, and indecision. In Battle of Bunkers-Hill Brackenridge reveals how such moral degeneracy enervates the soul and culminates in massive destruction.

Warren's vehement satire of the adversaries of patriotism leaves patriots only one choice--to wage war against these subtle and viscous enemies. Brown declares, "The ideal of liberty, as [Warren] saw it, was crystalline, pure, not to be approached save through ways as spotless. If there must be war, . . . it should be a holy war" (155). Behind the lines, the "crystalline, pure," virtuous patriots are poised to conquer the corrupt Tories. What more suitable avenue for Warren to express this virtue, this purity of character, than a woman. The "Lady" who speaks the last words of The Group mourns the inevitable fight: "What painful scenes are hov'ring o'er the morn. / . . . Must the stain'd field salute our weeping eyes" (22). Evidencing as much courage as Generals Warren and Gardiner do in fighting at Bunker Hill, Warren's patriot lady affirms, "Till British troops shall to Columbia yield, / And freedom's sons are Masters of the field" the Americans will not stop, but rather "seek each patriot dead" and raise a "monument . . . / With this inscription--*Virtue's sons lie here!*" (22).²⁴

²⁴ Jean B. Kern affirms that the "epilogue is as close as Mercy Warren comes in her satiric plays to speaking in her own voice" (249).

Just as the last words of Warren's play establish that the patriots are children of virtue, so the final words of Brackenridge's drama confirm that those same virtuous patriots are fighting with the sanction of God: "Sure of success, with this sweet comfort giv'n, / Who fights for FREEDOM,--fights the cause of HEAV'N" (268). Significantly, the aide to General Putnam utters these words after the patriots have already lost the battle. But, as Newlin reminds, Brackenridge is not referring to the success of battle; he "interpreted the battle as a moral victory, a glorious display of American bravery" (34). With the assurance that "GOD is our Aid," Gardiner calls for "Achilles-like" revenge on an "evil cause" (262). General Warren compares the Battle of Bunker Hill to Biblical battles: "As when an angel smote / The Assyrian camp" (249). Linking heroic Homeric and Biblical battles to their own reiterates the patriots' religious reason to fight. According to Davidson "Civil and religious liberties were mutually interdependent" (122). Biblical authority provides a moral framework from which to battle the enemy. The Group and The Battle of Bunkers-Hill herald the "Americans of 1776" who, according to Wood, believed that the "moral quality of their social character thus became the measure of the success of their Revolution" (87).

To have the English concede moral supremacy to the patriots is a masterful touch. Such a strategy evokes "reactions as explosive as those generating their creations" (Meserve 65). The images that the Whig playwrights create also are "explosive." Realizing his part in tyranny's play, Collateralis wishes his "right hand cut off" so that he would not be able to help "rescind / The wisest step that mortal man could take / To curb

the tallons of tyrannic power” which is “ready to devour / The fair possessions, by our Maker giv’n / Confrim’d by compacts--ratify’d by Heav’n” (17). Explaining his apprehension about Britain’s ability to win, Secretary Dupe paints a vivid picture: “While virtue’s banners shroud each warrior’s head / Stern Justice binds the helmet on his brow, / And liberty sits perch’d on ev’ry shield” (14). These metaphors show that power lies not in banners, helmets, or shields, but in virtue, justice, and liberty. The lack of virtue serves to undermine the mental strength of the British, which in turn affects their physical strength. Virtue, justice, and liberty--and not material armor or physical strength--are the arms of the patriot and lead the Americans on to victory. As the British bring down their own hard fate upon themselves by ignoring God’s laws and their application in daily life, so the American patriots rise in everlasting victory as long as they adhere to divine moral laws.

Chapter 2
Comedy's Honorable Mirror
The Contrast

As the nation developed and changed, so did its needs, which in turn altered the characteristics assigned to a patriot. In the 1780s, the newly formed nation was having problems, which Richard S. Pressman summarizes: "a post-war trade deficit and debt; a subsequent depression; a resultant struggle between the weakest faction, the agrarianists, and the strongest, the mercantilists; its exacerbation in Shays' Rebellion; and a concomitant drive for a government more centralized than that under the Articles of Confederation" (89). After the end of Shays's Rebellion and one month before the Constitutional Convention in May of 1787, Royall Tyler wrote and saw his first play, The Contrast, performed.²⁵ Silverman notes that due to "Tyler's enthusiastic commitment to the unique social reality of 1787, *The Contrast* is as much a work of social and cultural history as it is a play" (560). No longer at war with Britain, the Americans in their loosely-formed confederacy focused on the nature of American government and society and on defining the "new," post-war patriot.

²⁵ G. Thomas Tanselle discusses the general "legend" that Tyler wrote the play within this time period without any previous knowledge of drama and claims that Tyler must have had some familiarity with drama (51-3).

Most people concerned with “how to be both free and orderly” believed an effective government rested upon what Marder calls “an educated and sensitized population” capable of ruling effectively (Reader 5, 6). Though describing Brackenridge’s desire, Marder’s statement can be applied to the thoughts of Warren, Tyler, and Dunlap. While the ideological and political currents flowing through the nation at the time had a common lineage, they were not concurrent. The Federalists wanted a strong union, generally supported mercantilist interests, and did not see the need for a Bill of Rights; the anti-Federalists feared a powerful central government, believed in the importance of states-rights, generally supported agrarian interests, were appalled at the Federalists’ omission of a Bill of Rights from the proposed Constitution, and demanded that individual rights be protected. Needless to say, the debates before and during Shays’s Rebellion about the powers of the government that continued during the Philadelphia Convention were heated. Tyler was among the majority who wanted to create a powerful, central government for the United States.²⁶

Tyler’s choice to write a comedy reveals his Federalist opinions and his patriotic purpose, which, as Pressman explains, was to unite “all classes behind the drive for the new Constitution” (94). Tyler’s play, therefore, is an attempt to minimize the divisions between his fellow Americans. “In such a moment, in which the powers that be see cause

²⁶ Only when the Federalists, who were in the majority, yielded to the anti-federalists’ demands for a Bill of Rights was the Constitution fully operative and widely supported: the first ten amendments were passed by Congress on September 25, 1789, but not ratified until December 15, 1791 by three-fourths of the states. Brown notes that when the “first congress adopted” the amendments, Warren and the other anti-Federalists “retired from the battle with a unanimity that has seldom been equaled in American history” (161).

for optimism that their forces will prevail and yet see the need for continuing reform to assure it," Pressman explains, "an appropriate literary mythos is comedy" (94). As a Federalist, Tyler apparently agreed with this need, giving his nation a comedy, to which his audiences responded favorably. Silverman states that Tyler's "unquestioning decision to treat the country's foibles with amusement rather than anxiety rested in the profound new assumption that there now existed a country substantial enough to withstand laughter" (563). Six years after Yorktown and more than a decade after Warren and Brackenridge wrote their propaganda plays, Tyler resurrected the Revolutionary soldier to play his hero. But the Revolution is not the focus of Tyler's wit. Rather, Tyler examines its effects--blatantly focusing on the social aspects and more subtly on the political ramifications. Richardson states, "Overt political influence might have ended when the Redcoats abandoned their redoubts, but British social attitudes and values, long admired by Americans, still held many captive" (48). According to The Contrast though the need for the heroic soldier has declined, the need for the patriot has not; the war has moved from the battlefield to the social front.

Adapting characters and elements from classic Roman and Restoration marriage comedy to suit his American play, Tyler spotlights, in Brown's words, "the *contrasts* of the tastes and fashions, the manners and morals of the period" (xxxv) in order to teach patriotism.²⁷ Indeed, Tanselle claims that Tyler's "emphasis on patriotism and native

²⁷ Among others, Pressman discusses how comedy "envision[s] a recovery of a tradition, a Golden Age" and explains the traditional cast of characters and their roles (94-5). Rinehart qualifies the characters in a similar, though different manner (31).

worth" distinguishes The Contrast from other Restoration comedies, their themes, and their characters (73). Maria, the sentimental heroine, is engaged against her wishes to the villainous fop Dimple. Simultaneously and secretively, Dimple courts the coquettes, Charlotte and Letitia. Charlotte's brother Manly, an American Revolutionary war veteran whose personality is antithetical to hers, assumes the role of the hero. In New York on military business, Manly meets Maria, and the two fall in love without knowing their respective identities. When Manly finds out Maria is engaged, they agree to part unhappily, though honorably. Later, waiting for his sister, Manly overhears Dimple first give his "heart" to Letitia and then to Charlotte. Letitia also overhears the latter conversation. When Dimple forces himself on Charlotte, she screams, and Manly intercedes. Maria's father Van Rough is astonished when Letitia explains the shenanigans, and Maria waits until Dimple leaves. Maria's merchant father, having learned of Dimple's gambling debts, the love that Maria and Manly share, and Manly's financial stability, blesses the union of Maria and Manly. The sub-plot, centered on the servants, also highlights contrasts in social and moral behavior. Dimple's servant, Jessamy, makes a fool of the Yankee Jonathan, Manly's waiter, by having the Yankee boldly assault Jenny, Maria's maid, fail, and return to his down-home values.

Pitting patriot against Anglophile, Tyler uncovers their disparate values. As Thomas Pickman Tyler remembers, Royall Tyler's purpose was "to contrast the homely, honest plainness of our native character and breeding, with the polished, tinselled, hypocrisy and villainy of foreign fashionable society" (Carson 67). Like their ideological

ancestors--the British in the plays of Warren and Brackenridge--Tyler's Anglophiles pursue reputation, luxury, and self-interest.²⁸ Because Britain has become an influence to shun, not an enemy to conquer, Tyler's softer tone responds to the changes that have occurred since the war. Charlotte, Letitia, Jessamy, and Dimple are all hypocritical, but to different degrees. The viciousness of the sexual abuse portrayed by Warren has softened. The brash ego of the earlier loyalist leaders has turned into the vanity of fashionable urbanities. These copy-cat, Anglophile conformists present a striking contrast to the Americans who retain the principles that enabled a people to gain their independence--virtue and heroism. Manly is Tyler's virtuous, sincere, and selfless contrast to Dimple. Jessamy's opposite, Jonathan, is honest and simple. Maria, polar to Charlotte and Letitia, exemplifies filial piety, sentimental integrity, and independent thinking. Above all, Manly, Jonathan, and Maria honor both their country and themselves. The paradigm of opposites implied by Warren and illustrated by Brackenridge is still in place, but it is not the same. The Contrast reveals a shift in the nature of the patriot.

The way in which Tyler arrives at his definition of a patriot shows us this shift. While Warren and Brackenridge present the dichotomy between the Briton and American, the opposing sides are never shown together. As a result, The Group and The Battle of Bunkers-Hill have no tangible dramatic conflict. Tyler, however, clarifies and

²⁸ Though Tyler and Warren defend opposing viewpoints in regards to the Constitution, the concept of a strong central government, and Shays's Rebellion, they both agree that luxury is a pernicious evil and that virtue is requisite for building a strong republican government.

accentuates the dramatic conflict by having the anti-patriots and patriots interact. Like his predecessors, Tyler uses both satiric and heroic elements, but he eschews the tragic. As the previous playwrights' definitions of patriotism are linked to the genres of their respective plays, so is Tyler's. Whereas Warren and Brackenridge satirize Britons to condemn them, Tyler satirizes Americans who try to emulate Britons in order to uncover faults "not to expose them, but amend" them (21), to laugh his American audience out of their own foibles before they end up like Dimple--alone, poor, and despised. Through his drawing room comedy, Tyler implies that Americans need to turn inward and look at themselves if they expect to maintain the values for which they fought. Significantly, Tyler not only condemns the British indirectly by lampooning the Anglophiles, he also gently ridicules the patriotic Americans.²⁹ The beauty of Tyler's play is that the patriotic heroes, amusing in sentimentality and simplicity, are nevertheless lovable; the villains are foolish and contemptible. Since Tyler's purpose is to change the audience, not the characters, since his comedy is a social and political satire, his characters, though vibrant, are predominately static. Nevertheless, his comedy was successful. Apparently Tyler was able to make the audience laugh not only at English ways, but at themselves. Laughter creates a tone in The Contrast not found in The Group or The Battle of Bunkers-Hill. Warren's satire, carrying the poignancy of a Revolutionary age, elicits not laughter, but rage at the Tories she condemns; her satire is juvenalian. The satiric tone in

²⁹ Throughout his article, Pressman discusses why Tyler satirizes the patriots. One of his conclusions is that Tyler distances his upper-class audience from the rural patriots (Manly and Jonathan) in order to allow his audience to see their own faults while maintaining class separation and simultaneously closing the gap between upper and lower classes, merchant and agrarian interests.

Brackenridge's heroic drama is not comic either. But Tyler's departure from the loftiness of blank verse, his vivid use of the prosaic language of the people, and his comedic treatment of the situation, allows the audience to embrace a conception of patriotism which necessitates a self-examination that sees faults in order to change them and that prescribes the sort of behavior needed to succeed in a world quickly becoming more complex.

Perhaps the mere introduction of complexity into a world that was formerly simple--a world in which British could do only evil, the patriots only good--impelled Tyler to soften his serious message with laughter in order to help people adjust. Indeed, "Dimple's willingness to adopt an English moral and social model," Richardson writes, "suggests the precariousness of the cultural identity that flowed from national independence" (48). Responding to this "precariousness," Tyler returns to a simple dichotomy and moves beyond it: the anti-patriot apes foreign values and tries to gain reputation through dissimulation; the patriot shuns British influence and upholds American values. Anatomizing the differences between these two sides, Tyler depicts four primary contrasts between Anglophiles and patriots: frivolity versus seriousness; materialism versus love; worldly vanity versus decent simplicity; hypocrisy versus honesty and honor.³⁰ I will examine these contrasts in their social context, which Tyler highlights, prior to discussing their political impact, to which Tyler alludes. Each

³⁰ The contrasts are as numerous as the critics who have analyzed *The Contrast*. Meserve sees the conflict "between affectation and straightforwardness, between city and country, between hypocrisy and sincerity, and between foreign fraud and native worth" (99). Rinehart lists them as "America and England, virtue and luxury, country and city, sentiment and hilarity, sincerity and affectation" (32).

Anglophone attribute can be seen as a facet of hypocrisy; each patriotic one as an element of honor. In both the social and political realms, the quality which enables the patriot to secure an American identity, and thus become the guardian of the United States of America, is honor--the child of virtue and heroism.

.....

Tyler begins his play by portraying what patriotism is not--foolish and mindless mimicking of British fashion. By the second scene, he clearly illustrates what patriotism requires--American sincerity seasoned with a little sentimentality. The playwright creates two different facets of this polarity: the first compares the women--Charlotte and Letitia versus Maria; the second juxtaposes sister and brother--Charlotte and Manly. Like his dramatic predecessors, Tyler has his British sympathizers show themselves guilty of different vices. Charlotte and Letitia, who begin the play with a discussion that centers on styles of hoop skirts, the pocket-hoop or the bell hoop, illustrate their foolish slavery to fashion. In Act II, when Letitia questions Charlotte's reasons for purchasing something that "will never fit becomingly," Charlotte responds, "I know that; but did not you hear Mrs. Catgut say it was fashionable?" (40). Charlotte's pettiness has a motive. In the first scene, she rather archly claims that the role of women is to find a husband and to bear children as quickly as possible (24). She insists that this can be accomplished by dressing fashionably for men. Yet she undermines her own success by buying an unbecoming, though stylish, garment. In line with her superficial and irrational attitude regarding fashion, Charlotte places more emphasis on money than on character. Such an

attitude preempts her patriotism, as her commitment to reputation supersedes devotion to country. When Letitia informs her that Maria does not want to marry Dimple, Charlotte cannot believe that “sensible Maria would give up Dumpling manor . . . for the absurd, ridiculous reason, forsooth, because she despises and abhors him” (28). But Charlotte is more “absurd” than Maria. Ever a materialist, Charlotte thinks a lady is “privileged to spend a man’s fortune, ride in his carriage, be called after his name, and call him her *noun dear lovee* when she wants money, without loving and respecting the great he-creature” (28). Not only is her goal inane, her strategy is hypocritical.

Maria’s sensible honesty contrasts her with the frivolous Charlotte and Letitia. The audience first meets Maria reading and singing the Song of Alknomook, not primping or discussing the latest fashion. “The manly virtue of courage,” Maria claims, “displays something so noble, so exalted, that in despite of the prejudices of education I cannot but admire it, even in a savage” (33). Tyler’s brief depiction of the “noble savage” not only calls upon the portraits of Brackenridge’s brave patriots, but also portrays Maria’s “sentimental,” yet open-minded ability to sympathize with fellow humans, however different. Unlike Charlotte and Letitia, Maria does not give credence to appearance; rather, she judges a man’s worth by his merit, his character, not his money. The man she finds most meritorious is a patriotic soldier, one who protects women who are too delicate and naive “to guard against the wiles of mankind” (33).³¹ Though she

³¹ Mercy Otis Warren stands as a shining example of a strong woman capable of not only protecting herself from the world, but changing the world. She was one of a number of women writers in her generation who proclaimed the values of the virtuous, and honorable patriot.

appears entrenched in the eighteenth-century sentimental view of women's roles, Maria has a mind forceful enough to see the duplicity in this system: "How inconsistent! that man should be leagued to destroy that honour upon which solely rests his respect and esteem"--to take away a woman's honor (33). Therefore, Maria's conclusion that only a man "nerv'd by virtue and directed by honour!" can protect women (34), is integral to Tyler's perception of patriotism. Maria herself provides a clear example of a virtuous patriot whose serious contemplation and honorable living enable her to recognize the moral laxity of Dimple and the moral strength of Manly.

Manly deepens the contrast between puerility and sentimental seriousness. One of the reasons why Maria falls instantly in love with Manly is that contrary to those who communicate superficially, "he entered readily into a conversation worthy a man of sense to speak, and a lady of delicacy and sentiment to hear" (88). However, Manly's "sense" draws out Charlotte's sarcasm. Indeed, Manly lives up to his sister's mocking description of him, which crystallizes their divergent attitudes: "I am gay, he is grave; I am airy, he is solid; I am ever selecting the most pleasing objects for my laughter, he has a tear for every pitiful one" (42). Manly's first words are, "My dear Charlotte, I am happy that I once more enfold you within the arms of fraternal affection. I know you are going to ask (amiable impatience!) how our parents do" (45).³² Though George O. Seilhamer's calls Manly "a most insufferable prig" (226), a label which his syrupy emotionalism bears, the

³² Taubman writes, "It seems hard to believe that Tyler or his audience could take Manly's pompous nobility seriously, but more than another hundred years passed before the theatre gave up the stereotype, if indeed it has been totally abandoned" (49).

hero's respect for his parents and sister is intended to be a touchstone of honor.

Moreover, his wit is as quick as Charlotte's. Defending his sentimentality, Manly takes a jibe at Charlotte's artificiality: "Though sentiment and gravity, I know, are banished the polite world, yet I hoped they might find some countenance in the meeting of such near connections as brother and sister" (45). Pointedly Charlotte cannot bear such sincerity and has to laugh it off with a remark about how his gravity will make her cry, ruin her appearance, and make her unpresentable for suitors (46). While her remarks encourage the audience to laugh at Manly, they also foster laughter directed towards her. Moreover, Manly's sentiments cannot be faulted in the context of the unfolding plot.

The witty interchange between Manly and Charlotte regarding his Revolutionary War coat shows that he is not prey to false social forms. In response to Charlotte's remark that his coat is not fashionable, Manly explains that the recent uprisings have "induced me to buckle on the sword in support of that government which I once fought to establish" (51).³³ Moreover, he subtly corrects his sister's sarcasm, reminding her that Revolutionary soldiers who fought, starved, and suffered for their country were once admired and "at least deserved that the poverty of their appearance should not be ridiculed" (50). His noble rationale reprimands not only his sister, but any audience member who may have laughed with Charlotte at her brother's lack of style. Continuing logically, Manly argues that Americans are blindly and "indiscriminately" following English fashion "because it is so" and for no other reason (51). Furthermore, he insists

³³ The uprisings are presumably those of Shays's Rebellion.

that “the only excuse a young lady can have for going extravagantly into a fashion is because it makes her look extravagantly handsome” (52). While Manly’s intent is not to injure his sister, his comments condemn her disingenuous, conformist behavior, which is contrary to the purpose of the Revolution. Manly suggests that the independence for which Americans fought is not just political, but also social and cultural. Charlotte’s social dependence is hypocritical and unpatriotic, while Manly’s cultural independence is honorable and patriotic.

.....

The second contrast, which elucidates the polar thinking of father and daughter, implies that arranged marriages are harmful to patriotism, as they rule out love and therefore freedom. Acting as an antagonist to Maria, Van Rough tries to force his daughter to marry Dimple, a man he sees as rich and fashionable. Since she detests Dimple, her father’s design creates both an external and internal conflict. According to Letitia, Maria’s wish to marry for love comes from reading British novels, Clarissa and Sentimental Journey among others, while her fiancé was in London. Moreover, reading these novels has made her realize that “she had unthinkingly engaged her hand without her heart,” which of course, “now appeared so unsentimental, and looked so like bargaining for a bale of goods” (27). By supporting Maria’s British-based viewpoint, Tyler joins Fielding and Richardson in challenging the long-standing tradition of arranged marriages that can lead to oppression and even death. But Maria’s exposure to these sentimental novels also teaches her the pettiness and corruption of the English.

Tyler has Letitia explain that Maria sees Dimple's travels to Europe bequeathing to him "all the wickedness of Lovelace without his wit, and the politeness of Sir Charles Grandison without his generosity" (27), destroying his former "good-natured" American attitude that Maria thought she loved (26). Thankfully, Maria's love for Manly further Americanizes her sentiments, and she escapes the apparently pernicious tendency of these British novels to proclaim the value of excessive sentiment, which ultimately is self-destructive.

But Maria has a harder time escaping the dictatorial strictures of her father. With his insistence that Maria marry a man she despises, a man he has chosen for his own materialistic reasons, Van Rough aligns himself with the villains in the British novels, such as the Harlows who ignore their daughter's health, happiness, and freedom. Like them, Van Rough believes he is ensuring his daughter's happiness by betrothing her to an apparently wealthy man. His position makes him a descendent of British middle-class morality. To Maria's response that she would rather be poor and marry a man she loved, her father retorts that this notion is "downright nonsense. . . . No, no, no! child; it is money makes the mare go; keep your eye upon the main chance, Maria" (35). He will not allow Maria to question his authority or explain her reasons. His decree is final: "I'd have you to know, Mary, if you won't make young Van Dumpling the man of *your* choice, you shall marry him as the man of *my* choice" (36).

Maria feels trapped because she is honorable: she has given her word that she will marry Dimple, and in Letitia's mocking words, Maria "thinks her word too sacred to be

trifled with" (28). Her father exacerbates her struggle by instilling guilt into his daughter's heart, constantly implying that ignoring the marriage contract between him and his late friend, Dimple's father, would insult the dead. Actually, upholding the contract insults both Maria and patriotism. Scolded and threatened by her only living parent, Maria wrestles with her conscience, situation, feelings, and sense of filial duty. Though she claims to know her father loves her, the audience must wonder about the quality of her father's love. Maria shows her sense of honor when she, rather melodramatically, declares that if her father ordered, she could "wed awkwardness and deformity," even weakness; but "to marry a depraved wretch, whose only virtue is a polished exterior; who is actuated by the unmanly ambition of conquering the defenceless; whose heart, [is] insensible to the emotions of patriotism" is unthinkable (38-9). Maria knows that Dimple's disregard "for the peace and happiness of other families" can never make him care for "his own" (39). Given this information, Van Rough's importunity regarding this onerous union is despotic, and therefore, antithetical to freedom. Maria's demand for love, virtue, respect, and freedom is honorable, and therefore crucial for a happy and patriotic union.

.....

The third contrast, between Jessamy and Jonathan, villain and hero once-removed, depicts the disparity between worldly vanity and simple decency. Jessamy's conceit regarding his attention to British fashion is as anti-patriotic as it is un-American. He is egotistical enough to think that girls, who have "adopted the elegant London fashion" of

noticing men, look approvingly on him (53). In addition, he considers himself more fashionable than his master, Dimple. Jessamy's vanity is rivaled only by his pettiness; he is fascinated by Lord Chesterfield's rules on how to clip fingernails (68).³⁴ Trying to gain reputation through devious tactics, Jessamy takes credit for folding Dimple's letters, thinking that such an accomplishment will give him "honour" (67). Previously, Jessamy had implied that he wrote Dimple's letters, until he learned of the contents. Jessamy's slavery to British fashion and form and his devious attempts to obtain that which he has not earned subvert honorable patriotism.

Though on the surface Jonathan's straightforward attitude appears counterproductive to patriotism, since his naiveté makes him vulnerable to city schemes and people, his artless nature is actually central to Tyler's definition of patriotism. The audience must have laughed at Jonathan's naiveté when, wanting to see the "sights" (74), he ends up enthusiastically watching the events in "the next neighbour's house" (72), which is in fact a theatre--"the devil's drawing-room," as he calls it (70).³⁵ They also must have laughed when Jonathan describes what happened at the "Holy Ground," where he had gone expecting a prayer meeting. He met a woman who sweet-talked him until sailors made him "split home, right off, tail on end, like a stream of chalk"(57). Though

³⁴ Among others, Mercy Otis Warren was disturbed by Chesterfield's letters. Edmund M. Hayes examines a letter that she wrote her son Winslow "warning him against the letters" and instilling "the spirit of virtuous American republicanism" (617).

³⁵ Pressman writes that Jonathan's "ignorance of the theater is really an inability to differentiate between illusion and reality." Moreover, "his being ridiculed tends to undercut his apparent native worth" (95). Tyler's satire of Jessamy attacks the strictures against the theatre and calls for a more open-minded view of the theatre.

Jonathan's words are not polished, his intent is pure and honorable. Indeed, Jonathan is surprised when he learns from Jessamy that the woman was not "the deacon's daughter," but "a harlot" (57). Alan S. Downer writes that "he is baffled by, but rises superior to, the un-American degeneracy of the city" (3). In a sense, his innocence protects him from vice, even from Jessamy.

Wanting Maria's maid Jenny for himself, Jessamy fools Jonathan into believing that he can wind up with "cherubim consequences" from Jenny by kissing her and speaking sweet nothings in her ear (62). Apparently, Jessamy cannot win her on his own, but has to depend upon someone else's stumblings to send her running to him for shelter: "How sweet will the contrast be between the blundering Jonathan and the courtly and accomplished Jessamy!" (63), he says. But Jonathan's failure at wooing Jenny paradoxically taints Jessamy. Had Jonathan remained his natural self throughout the interview, he would have made a better impression on Jenny, for she appears genuinely to like his singing of "Yankee Doodle." Jonathan's simple country ways endear him to Maria's maid, while his novice attempts at bold sophistication offend her. Thus, as Jenny slaps Jonathan in the face for his Jessamy-instigated effrontery, Tyler hilariously scolds Jessamy's absurd Anglophilia for its hypocrisy, evidenced in the practiced and insincere seduction of women. Pressman argues that though Jonathan "makes a fool of himself, he emerges unscathed, by virtue of his agrarian values" (97). The Yankee eventually realizes knows that the nonsense words he whispers to Jenny are lies. Unlike Jessamy,

Jonathan discovers that he cannot win a woman by deception, since deception is antithetical to freedom and honor.

Though plain, Jonathan stands for something--decency, freedom, simplicity, and honor. Therefore, Richardson's claim that "the audience's appreciation of Jonathan's patriotism is inevitably mitigated by his lack of sophistication" (50) is not entirely true. Only when he is out of his country environment and in a city which breeds dissimulation does Jonathan appear foolish. In fact, when contrasted to Jonathan's decency, the city people look even more foolhardy. Humble in manner, Jonathan is nonetheless proud of his freedom and ancestry. After Jenny leaves, he declares, "If this is the way with your city ladies, give me the twenty acres of rock, the Bible, the cow, and Tabitha, and a little peaceable bundling" (78). He returns to his own basic agrarian values which are virtuous, in part, because they are humble. Indeed, the waiter's integrity, and not the servant's worldly knowledge, perpetuates patriotism. Through the contrast between Jonathan and Jessamy, Tyler warns Americans not to be hypnotized by subtle sharks who try to infect them with luxurious or sensual temptations that strip them of their values, honor, and patriotism.

.....

The most glaring contrast in the play is between the supremely hypocritical Dimple and the entirely honorable Manly and crystallizes Tyler's definition of patriotism. When we first meet Dimple in Act III, he is "*discovered at a Toilet*" studying Chesterfield's letters (64) in order "to put the infamous principles in practice upon every

woman he meets" (27). Reading his book aloud and replying in solo conversation, Dimple sounds like Charlotte and Letitia; he is "feminized." His travels to England have taught him to flirt with women and marry a fortune. As a result, Dimple's worthless passions and goals lead him not to fidelity or sincerity, but rather to duplicity and debts. He desires Charlotte, but needs Letitia's dowry (67). In an attempt to sever the marriage contract with Maria, he treats her disrespectfully, hoping that she will break with him, which would allow him to maintain appearances. Since Maria's sense of duty compels her to obey her father, Dimple's treatment of her frustrates his evil machinations and intensifies her misery. Dimple's solution, as expressed to Jessamy, is both absurd and specious: "I must break with Maria, marry Letitia, and as for Charlotte--why Charlotte must be a companion to my wife" (66). His English-derived vices--gambling, petty concern for fashion, pursuit of luxury, hypocrisy--when infused into the American culture, strip Americans of their freedom, their desire to pursue happiness, and their patriotism.

Diametrically opposed to such vice stands Manly, the "*one*, [who] whilst imitation bears the sway, / Aspires to nobler heights, and points the way," as the Prologue announces (21). Whereas Dimple is nothing but an imitation, indifferent to the thoughts or happiness of others, Manly, like Maria, is genuine, sympathetic, and concerned about the welfare of his fellow Americans and of the United States. He tries to make people's lives better by "plucking the briars and thorns from the path of the unfortunate" (42). His purpose for being in New York, to help secure pensions for his fellow Continental Army

soldiers, proves his altruism (94). For Manly, country and family are the same. When Charlotte suggests that her brother should cash his government notes to use on himself or his sister, Manly explains that though he would like to please his sister, he will not embarrass his country. Rather, he will wait until the government has enough money to honor his notes. "If that is not in my day," Manly asserts, "they shall be transmitted as an honourable certificate to posterity, that I have humbly imitated our illustrious WASHINGTON in having exposed my health and life in the service of my country, without reaping any other reward than the glory of conquering in so arduous a contest" (47). Unlike Dimple and Jessamy, Manly refuses to take advantage of others' misfortunes. According to Richardson, "Manly is the first in a long series of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century embodiments of idealized American manhood whose central concern, both on and off the battlefield, is their nation's moral and political health" (48). Manly's pride at wearing his regimental coat, his refusal to cash the notes, and his unity with his fellow veterans proves his patriotism.

Indeed, his concern for his nation's "moral and political health" consumes him. Charlotte explains that if a lady dropped her "fan or bouquet in his presence," Manly would not see it, but he would "fly an hundred miles to relieve a distressed object, or to do a gallant act in the service of his country" (43). He lives up to her assessment. Manly's disdain for ridiculous rules of courtship amuses Charlotte and Letitia, perhaps even the audience. Charlotte muses that Manly believes the "best evidence a gentleman could give a young lady of his respect and affection [is] to endeavour in a friendly

manner to rectify her foibles" (43). By juxtaposing Manly's apparent lack of social gallantry with his true patriotic gallantry, Tyler allows the audience to laugh at Manly through Charlotte's eyes while approving of his honor.

Yet Manly's emphasis on his country partially blinds him not only to Anglophile social customs but also to the knavery of sycophants who practice such customs. When Manly first meets Dimple, the Anglophile hypocritically praises patriotic soldiers (81). Though the audience knows Dimple is lying, Manly feels honored. Believing Dimple a patriot, Manly forgives him the grosser sentiments he expresses regarding women. But when Dimple goes too far, Manly's horror at his lascivious suggestions proves Manly's integrity. Sounding rather like Maria, Manly insists that a man's intentions towards a woman must be clear and respectful. If a man speaks tenderly to a woman as Dimple intimates, he had better intend to marry her. If the man's intent is not serious, then his flirtations are "cruel," as they could compromise her (83). When Dimple realizes Manly is a man of honor, he responds with duplicity: "Sir, I admire your sentiments;--they are mine. The light observations that fell from me were only a principle of the tongue; they came not from the heart; my practice has ever disapproved these principles" (83). Not only does Dimple uncover his true nature (his treatment of women is never completely honest), he acknowledges the "superiority of [Manly's] sentiments" (83). Unfortunately, Manly's naiveté, a product of his fervent patriotism, causes him to be duped by the dishonorable Dimple and accept his absurd excuse. As he does with Jonathan's initial acceptance of Jessamy's teachings, Tyler cautions, through Manly's initial acceptance of

Dimple's excuses, that appearances can be deceptive and that vice can pose a threat to a trusting and naive patriotic heart.

But eventually, duplicity self-destructs. Dimple's effusive vanity, compelling him forward in his conniving schemes, ensnares him. At first, he is able to mesmerize Charlotte and Letitia, who themselves are somewhat artful. But when he does not yield to Charlotte's cries to stop kissing her, he exposes his selfish lust. Had her brother, who was in the library, not defended her honor when he heard her cry, Dimple could have destroyed her reputation. Humiliated, Dimple challenges Manly to a duel and declares that if Manly does not accept, he will call him "a coward" (112). This time, Manly is not fooled; he now knows the hypocrisy of Dimple's words and the value of his own honor. Fittingly, Dimple is self-deceived. Even after having ruined any possibility of marrying Charlotte or Letitia, Dimple still hopes to marry Maria, presumably for her money. Unbenighted, Van Rough quickly denies Dimple's request. Moreover, the fop believes that this incident and his present conduct will actually make ladies more interested in him. As he exits, the British imitator states, "Ladies and gentlemen, I take my leave; and you will please to observe in the case of my deportment the contrast between a gentleman who has read Chesterfield and received the polish of Europe and an unpolished, untravelled American" (112). The audience, of course, observes the contrast, and there is no comparison.

Manly is the better man, by far, acting honorably while Dimple acts dishonorably. Whereas Dimple forces himself upon Charlotte against her wishes, Manly gracefully

stops pursuing Maria even though she desires his attention and love. Unaware that she is engaged to Dimple, Manly tries to allay her apparent fears by saying that he would never court her without the approval from her father. In addition to acknowledging the filial tie, he reveals his democratic, patriotic principles. He reasons, "In our country, the affections are not sacrificed to riches or family aggrandizement" (98). Unknowingly, Manly has just indicted Maria's father of such deplorable behavior. When Manly learns of Maria's situation, he resigns himself to his fate: "We are both unhappy; but it is your duty to obey your parent--mine to obey my honour" (99). Manly's decision to bow out could be construed as insensitivity--leaving Maria in the hands of a lecherous and egotistical lout who will game away her money. Since Maria and Dimple never marry, the more appropriate response to Manly is to see, in Howard Taubman's estimation, that the hero "is capable of a true gentleman's self-restraint as well as the dignity not to deny his ardor" (49). By upholding the dignity of both Maria's and himself through forthright, honest, sincere, and selfless interaction, Manly proves his worth as an individual, as a husband for Maria, and as a patriot. On the other hand, Dimple's underhanded, deceptive, insincere, materialistic, and self-serving flirtation deceives and entraps him. Logically, Tyler implies that the welfare of the nation should be entrusted to one who is capable and worthy of the task--an honorable patriot.

.....

Though primarily a social comedy, The Contrast also comments on the political and economic issues that prevailed at the time--depression, rebellion, weak central

government, and factionalism. Brown writes, "The play was an illustrated lesson in patriotism needed because mingling with stanch patriots, were those who aped foreign modes and felt, or feigned to feel, disdain for the new Republic and distrust of its Government" (xxxv). Amidst the social turmoil, Tyler makes an appeal to his countrymen through Manly: "Oh! that America! Oh! that my country, would, in this her day, learn the things which belong to her peace!" (80). As a Federalist, who commanded a mission to apprehend the fugitive, Shays, Tyler had a definite opinion on how to secure peace (Carson 32-63). Shays's Rebellion, which occurred from August 1786 to February 1787, was a threat to national peace. In Tyler's own words, the insurgents were "the common enemies of civil society" (Carson 47). Initially, many Americans supported the agrarian Shaysites, who began their protests as unarmed citizens, fighting to "re-secure the liberties they believed they had fought for and won: representational taxing, property rights, and individual independence" (Pressman 90).³⁶ Burdened by heavy war debts passed on to them by merchants, many farmers were thrown into jail because they could not pay their creditors. Also protesting the high cost of lawyers' fees, the Shaysites effectively banded together and closed courts. On the other side were the merchants who, Pressman explains, "accused the Shaysites of seeking a general redistribution of wealth" (90).³⁷ When the Shaysites took up arms, the government responded. In the end, four

³⁶ Mercy Warren generally sympathized with the Shaysites and disapproved of the way the government handled the situation (Brown 152-3). But she would have agreed with Richard D. Brown's comment which found it "striking" that the Shaysites, who thought of themselves as "reformers" turned to "the tactics of the previous decade--country convention, and physical coercion" (598).

³⁷ Pressman thoroughly and insightfully examines the connection between The Contrast and Shays's Rebellion.

insurgents were killed, most apologized, and in 1788 (after The Contrast and the Constitutional Convention), Shays and other leaders who had been labeled traitors were pardoned (Carson 15 of "Notes" for 23-47, note 34.28).³⁸ Significantly, Jonathan sides with Shays's Rebellion, but does not join the insurrection. Jonathan informs Jessamy that Colonel Manly frowned on it as "it was a burning shame for the true blue Bunker Hill sons of liberty, who had fought Governor Hutchinson, Lord North, and the Devil, to have any hand in kicking up a cursed dust against a government which we had, every mother's son of us, a hand in making" (56). Both Tyler's life and his play support Manly's view. But by having the honest Jonathan approve of Shays's Rebellion, Tyler takes a step towards uniting the divided nation. On the one hand, Jonathan shows his agrarian origins and his disapproval of aristocracy, burdensome taxes, and authoritarian and intrusive government. On the other, by not fighting and by acknowledging Manly's enlightened views, Jonathan indicates his desire to maintain property rights and established law, and to support a united nation.

Though a Federalist, Tyler's condemnation of British-spawned sophistication, his subtle praise of country values, and his extremely gentle mocking of Jonathan's democratic nature suggests some sympathy for the anti-federalists. When Jonathan protests being called a servant, explaining that he is Manly's "waiter," he becomes an

³⁸ Interestingly, Carson notes that Daniel Shays, who entered the Revolutionary War at Lexington, "was cited for bravery and promoted at the Battle of Bunker Hill" and continued his military prowess, aiding the patriots (note 34.28). The links between the early dramas of Warren and Brackenridge and Tyler's comedy are made explicit through history.

object of Jessamy's sarcasm: "A true Yankee distinction, egad, without a difference" (54). But Jonathan's insistence that "no man shall master me" (54)--his assertion of freedom, his implied approbation of a universal "Bill of Rights"--gives him a mental liberty which none of the Anglophiles possesses.³⁹ Bound to urbanities, Jessamy is willing to be Dimple's servant, to have a master, to be dependent while at the same time thinking himself superior to Dimple. Significantly, Jonathan's political philosophy poses a threat to the aristocratic way of life. Jonathan's assertion, "I swear we don't make any great matter of distinction in our state between quality and other folks," creates consternation within Jessamy, who retorts, "This is, indeed, a levelling principle" (55). Jessamy's disgust at democratic principles bespeaks his anti-patriotic nature, while Jonathan's support of them breaks through economic barriers and provides room for patriots at every level of society.⁴⁰ Despite the comedy created by Jonathan's obtuseness, his egalitarian views, natural purity, and unaffected principles gain ascendancy over the Anglophiles' dependence upon class stratification, duplicity, and arrogance. Again, Tyler closes the gap between the upper and lower classes, merchants and farmers, Federalists and anti-Federalists.

To Tyler, unifying the several states and their people was crucial to preserving the nation. But union requires that citizens have a common American identity of which to be

³⁹ Pressman reasons that Jessamy's comment is ironic, since Manly actually "mastered" Jonathan by influencing his decision not to fight with Shays. Silverman explains, however, that Jonathan is the "purest democrat, contemptuous of servitude and of social distinctions" (561).

⁴⁰ Pressman argues that Tyler wants to maintain "class distinctions" while simultaneously balancing them with "egalitarian values" (92).

proud and that they subordinate regional and class differences to national pride. Through his hero, Tyler reprimands the disdain which Dimple and Jessamy hold for American values and customs and declares that “knowledge” which fosters “distaste” for America is worthless (92). Europe’s polish does not make a good interior for America. Tyler’s patriotism “was to be found in gingham and rustic mottos, not in epigrams and ‘fashion,’” claims Mordden, who also affirms that “Tyler naturally preferred” in his plays and in his country the “downhome (American) roots versus social ambitions (Anglophilia)” (8). Indeed, Manly insists that “there is a laudable partiality which ignorant, untravelled men entertain for everything that belongs to their native country” which “when extended becomes the noble principle of patriotism” (92). Jonathan, even more “untravelled” than Manly, is a blatant example of such patriotism. Though Jonathan is simple and gullible, his honesty gives him a nobility that deceitful Jessamy and Dimple cannot attain.

Yet Manly, as a true patriot of his time, is not blind to the faults of his country; rather he insists that “we her children should blush for them in private, and endeavour, as individuals, to reform them” (94). Tyler’s patriotism, expressed in its highest form through Manly, eschews the screaming eagle philosophy which infuses earlier plays and prohibits national admission of mistakes. In its place stands the idea that Americans must see themselves more clearly, must resist the temptation to believe that they are invincible because they are free. Tyler teaches that Americans must be willing, as they were in 1776, to “forego their selfish interest for the public good” (Wood 86). If they do not, they

will render themselves useless or even dangerous to the nation, and they will have fallen prey to the invidious forms of vice poised to enslave them.

One such vice is luxury. "Luxury is surely the bane of a nation," Manly cries, for it "enervates both soul and body, by opening a thousand new sources of enjoyment, opens, also a thousand new sources of contention and want . . . renders a people weak at home, and accessible to bribery, corruption and force from abroad" (79). Manly, and apparently Tyler, joins many others in believing that the American people were largely responsible for the post-war economic depression. Edmund S. Morgan writes, "Having won their political independence, they had promptly mortgaged it by extravagant purchases from their old masters" (129). England must have enjoyed helping the Americans lose economic control by allowing her former colonies to run up their debts and by closing ports to Americans. Warren and Brackenridge had cautioned against the pursuit of luxury. Wood explains that to the Revolutionaries, "love of luxury widened the gap between rich and poor and tore the society with faction and violence" (86). Now, with luxury rampant in an economic depression, Americans were suffering the consequences of faction. Like other patriots, Tyler uses the fall of Greece to expose the evils of luxury. Manly explains that "when foreign gold, and still more pernicious foreign luxury, had crept among them, they sapped the vitals of their virtue" (80). As a result, "The common good was lost in the pursuit of private interest; and that people who, by uniting, might have stood against the world in arms, by dividing, crumbled into ruin" (80). Thus luxury is a vice antithetical to the patriot of 1787.

Maintaining the principles at the core of the republican theory of government in America, Tyler reiterates that public virtue rests upon private virtue. Lucy Rinehart affirms that the “public and private selves” of hero and heroine, as well as of Van Rough, “are inseparable” (37).⁴¹ Wood notes that “vicious behavior by an individual could have only disastrous results for the community. A man racked by the selfish passions of greed, envy, and hate lost his conception of order” (86). Dimple is one such man. According to Silverman, Dimple is “the very embodiment of the attempt to bring the country down by introducing Luxury” (561). By condemning luxury, “Tyler criticizes in the audience the very tendencies that had exacerbated the Shaysite situation: the self-aggrandizement and self-congratulation of the rich,” argues Pressman (98). The vain and self-interested pursuit of luxury strips an individual of honor, harms others, and therefore undermines patriotism. Unlike the anti-patriots, Manly recognizes that “private violence is more despicable than open force, and money of less value than happiness” (82). His comment heightens the importance of leading a righteous life, directed by a sense of honor that is nerved by moderation and humility. Honor not only helps to fashion the many-faceted definition of public patriotism, but defeats the temptation of luxury and restores order. Maria’s commitment to genuine love--respecting her father and desiring a husband she can love--replaces the false love of fashion and money. Jonathan’s country simplicity replaces city vice and deceptive frivolity. Manly’s duty to his country, his respect for

⁴¹ Examining the separate styles of speech that individualize each character, Rinehart affirms that Manly, Maria, and Van Rough are the only characters who “say what they mean and mean what they say” (36).

women, and his integrity replace contempt for county, disregard for women, moral degeneracy, and hypocrisy. Only by leading virtuous and honorable lives will Americans be able to strengthen their nation and survive the troubles that beset them.

But Tyler implies that many Americans are lacking in honor; that they are currently in danger of repeating the British or Anglophile errors which Warren, Brackenridge, and Tyler elucidate; that many of them are unpatriotic. Coveting luxury, as Dimple, Jessamy, Charlotte, Letitia, and Van Rough do, inevitably forfeits the dear-bought freedom for which the patriots fought. Thus, Americans who have strayed from true patriotism must recognize their mistakes and change their behaviors. The sudden changes that occur within two characters, Charlotte and Van Rough, in the resolution of The Contrast point to this necessity. Charlotte's abrupt transformation becomes less problematic when seen as representative of the nation's people and indicative of Tyler's desires to impel his audience to change. Though Charlotte has poked fun at Maria and has secretly worked to gain Dimple's hand, she is now convinced that Dimple is a louse and that her behavior has been reprehensible. Humiliated, she asks forgiveness of Maria, explaining that she abhors the pettiness of her "past conduct" and has learned "that the heart of any worthy man cannot be gained by invidious attacks upon the rights and characters of others" (114). Recognizing the cruelty and hypocrisy of her deviousness enables Charlotte to begin the reformation process.⁴²

⁴² Rinehart argues that Charlotte is actually the "model citizen" for Tyler's audience because she changes. Manly and Maria, on the other hand, do not. Rather, "Manly's is an untried virtue," whereas Charlotte's virtue "is of a newer, dynamic, even theatrical, bourgeois order" (38-9).

Van Rough's reformation also serves as an example for Tyler's audience. Before reforming, the tyrannical Van Rough honestly admits, "I did not care what his principles or his actions were, so long as he minded the main chance" (96). Cruel and patriarchal, his treatment of Maria is comparable to Britain's treatment of the colonies--irrational and disrespectful. As the English tried to enslave the Whigs, Van Rough tries to enslave his daughter; both masters are driven, in large measure, by the love of riches and reputation. For most of the play, Van Rough represents not only materialism, but absolute power like the British in The Group and The Battle of Bunkers-Hill. Maria's familial struggle recalls, in microcosm, the position of the rebels in the earlier plays who, impelled by patriotism, revolt against an unjust parent.

Pressman notes, "Symbolically, a Maria-Dimple marriage would have prostituted the wealth of the American mercantilist class to Britain;" therefore, Van Rough's fortune must "be entrusted to a patriotic, homespun American" (99). Pressman argues that for this to happen, Van Rough has to move "from selfish toward selfless, from materialist toward idealistic" (99). However slight, his movement is important, as he learns that Manly, though humble in dress, speech, and action, is more sober and financially prudent than Dimple, who dresses affluently and speaks pretentiously. Van Rough is no longer deceived by the fake who "always appeared so prudent, and talked so well upon money matters" (96). Though his eyes are open, Van Rough still seems to sound the same note, telling his future son-in-law to "mind the main chance" (113). But Van Rough's understanding of the "main chance" has changed and deepened; he realizes that a lack of

honor and an abundance of vice deplete wealth and spoil the "main chance." Tyler counsels those who court the enervating values of the British to follow the example of Charlotte and Van Rough, to change before they end up as slaves to vanity, conformity, frivolity, reputation, luxury, and hypocrisy.

While they change, Charlotte and Van Rough are not ideal models of patriotism. Rather, Manly, Maria, and to a lesser degree Jonathan exemplify the qualities which provide a strong foundation for the next step in building the nation--sincerity, simplicity, purity, honesty, and honor. Tyler also furnishes a political reason to practice these qualities: moral courage not only benefits the individual but the entire nation. While Dimple's vices entrap him, when exposed, they liberate Maria; she is now free to wed the patriot who is meant for her. Maria and Manly are rewarded by living spotless, honorable lives. The Manly-Maria marriage symbolizes not only a just and honorable union of hearts, but also a union of several states into one nation.

In a sense, this marriage foreshadows the successful creation of the Constitution by the "People of the United States" whose purpose was "to form a more perfect Union." Tyler's conception of this "perfect Union" is based upon the ideological strength of the past and the moral visions of the future. Manly declares, "I am proud to say America--I mean the United States--has displayed virtues and achievements which modern nations may admire, but of which they have seldom set us the example" (93). America's success has been in not following "little minds" full of "[e]nvy and suspicion" (80), but in forging her own path to freedom. The virtue which Warren's satire champions and the heroism

which Brackenridge's melodrama depicts remain vital to the nation's health, for they give the nation's citizens the courage to defend liberty honorably, to be true patriots. "The true motif of the play," writes Marble, is found in Manly's last words (241): "And I have learned that probity, virtue, honour, though they should not have received the polish of Europe, will secure to an honest American the good graces of his fair countrywomen, and I hope, the applause of THE PUBLIC" (115). When the public applauds for the performance, they applaud for the values and virtues cherished by the patriots on stage and preserved by the marriage between Manly and Maria.⁴³ Tyler's patriotic comedy not only shows its ancestry, but forces audience members to open their eyes, to laugh at their faults, and to see his vision. The Contrast encourages people to become the kind of patriots who will enable the next generation of Americans to meet the ever-changing demands and intense struggles of their nation with unity and honor. Furthermore, Tyler's play prepares the way for the free people of the United States to consider more deeply what it means to be both united and free.

⁴³ Pressman writes that Tyler's play served as a "moral lesson to the enlightened among the Federalists in keeping their right wing in line" by reprimanding "a self-satisfied, materialistic, Anglophilic elite, to bring them just close enough to democratic idealism to establish a strong home market and to unify under their control a class-divided nation" (100).

Chapter 3
Tragic Awareness and Justice's Mandates
André

Only a year or two after Tyler's The Contrast was initially performed, William Dunlap decided to write a tragedy about Major André, the British soldier who conspired with Benedict Arnold during the Revolution.⁴⁴ While Arnold escaped and eventually died in England, André was captured by American farmers and hanged as a spy in 1780. In his Preface to the play, Dunlap writes, "Many circumstances discouraged him from finishing his play, and among them must be reckoned a prevailing opinion that recent events are unfit subjects for tragedy" (xxix). Dunlap did not complete and produce André until 1798, still only eighteen years after the events and in the same year that tension between Republicans, Federalists, and High Federalists, who were demanding war against France in order to gain domestic political advantage, were at a peak.⁴⁵

⁴⁴ Meserve, among others, thinks that Dunlap's long and successful career was "stimulated by Tyler's success with *The Contrast*" (103).

⁴⁵ For about two years after the XYZ Affair in which Talleyrand, the French foreign minister, tried to collect several million dollars from the US in order to negotiate peace, the U. S. and France engaged in an undeclared war on the seas. Peace was not made until John Adams finally and decisively sent an American negotiating team to France in February, 1799, which avoided a war with France, ensuring domestic security and opportunity abroad, at least for the moment. As thanks for keeping the peace, the citizens voted Adams out of office in the next elections (Morgan 160, 164).

Though Dunlap's tragedy does not directly mention current domestic and foreign conflicts, the uneasiness of 1798 permeates his play. In fact, Dunlap's decision to write a tragedy and to honor an English soldier is symbolic of the complexity of the age and the seriousness of rising tensions among the people of the United States. André illustrates a definite shift in cultural attitudes and in the meaning of patriotism, which is more complex than the definitions propagated by Warren and Brackenridge or even by Tyler. The two earlier playwrights reveal the disparity of the two sides through satire and heroic drama, and insist on the clear opposition of good and evil forces: virtuous Americans fight for freedom against corrupt and weak British loyalists who promote slavery. Basing his comedy upon this patriotic paradigm, Tyler alters its structure by chastising the English indirectly through ridiculing American Anglophiles. Still, Tyler maintains a polarity between "true" and "untrue" Americans, linking the behavior of "untrue" Americans to English culture. Dunlap goes beyond Tyler's depictions, praising not only an Englishman, but a "traitor" to the Revolution. Implied in this shift is the concept that patriotism is necessarily a by-product of nationality; it is an extension of both collective and individual values. As a tragedy, André eschews the simple dichotomies of propaganda plays and comedies.

Dunlap, the "father of American drama," is clearly conscious of the problems that his play might cause, just as he is aware of "the diversity of opinion which agitated the minds of men at that time" when André was captured (xxx). As a result, Dunlap tries to

appease both sides--those for and against André's execution--as can be seen in his justification of his tragedy,

whose principal incident is the sad catastrophe which his [André's] misconduct, in submitting to be an instrument in a transaction of treachery and deceit, justly brought upon him; but his friends have no cause of offense; the author has adorned the poetical character of André with every virtue; he has made him his hero [...] . . . (xxx)

Dunlap thus asks a great deal of his audience--to accept a British spy as the hero of an American play. The play opens with André in prison, the night before his execution. Upon hearing that André is to be hanged, Bland, a young American soldier whom André previously saved, tries desperately to absolve his savior of any crime. In the course of arguing for André's life, Bland dishonors himself, his countrymen, and his country in front of Washington, who is referred to as the General. André is resolved to die until his long-lost love, Honora, arrives at his prison cell and eventually goes insane, unable to free him. But before André dies, he spares the life of Bland's father, whom the English hold captive and plan to kill if the Americans kill André. Though Washington hears the pleas of Bland, Bland's mother, and Honora--all of whom argue for the rescue of André or of Bland's father--he cannot disobey the rules of war, no matter how piteously they cry, no matter how his position tears at his heart; he must put the spy to death. Shortly after the cannon sounds, reporting André's death, M'Donald responds to Bland who has collapsed on the ground, closing the play with words that teach justice and help to redefine patriotism.

By asking his audience to envision a different concept of justice, which allows an Englishman to be honorable, Dunlap seems to destroy the paradigm for defining patriotism that the earlier patriot writers created. But this is not entirely accurate. The broad patriotic matrix praising Americans and condemning Britons is still present. Washington declares that the "Britons dar'd to violate those laws, / . . . And strove to make their fellow-subjects slaves" (8). By leaping back nearly twenty years, Dunlap revisits the memories of the harsh laws the British inflicted upon the colonists. After Washington condemns British tyranny, he applauds American valor and readiness to fight for freedom. He praises his men for their discipline and order. Most important, he praises their cause: "O patriotism! / Thou wondrous principle of godlike action. / Wherever liberty is found, there reigns / The love of country" (9). Speaking of his country, the General believes that armed with such "godlike action" and patriotic spirit, "No power on earth shall crush thee" (9). Dunlap invests Washington with the same patriotic fervor found in the American heroes of the earlier plays. Through his depiction of Washington, Seward, M'Donald, and other Americans, Dunlap extols virtue, bravery, and honor, while disdaining ambition, avarice, cowardice, and duplicity. In general, the Americans are fighting a just battle; the Britons are villains.

Continuing in Tyler's vein, Dunlap implies that the battle Americans are fighting after the war has changed, and he raises the same concern--the issue of British influence on Americans. By 1798 Americans had not freed themselves from the evils that Warren, Brackenridge, and Tyler feared, as is evident in a discussion between Seward and

M'Donald, two officers close to Washington. Their debate portrays the differences between what Meserve calls "short-sighted isolationism" and "national and international views" (107). Fearing the encroachment of British influence after the war is won, Seward wishes that there were a physical barrier between England and America to keep out the vices flowing from the mother country--"th' extremes of poverty and riches," the "lust / Of viand-pampered luxury" (23), and "knowledge / All unguarded" (24). Indeed, Seward believes, "Europe's ports / Shall pour a herd upon us, far more fell / Than those, her mercenary sons, who now / Threaten our sore chastisement" (24). Like Tyler, Dunlap suggests through Seward that English influence corrupts the purity and simplicity of American life. But unlike Tyler, Dunlap presents through M'Donald the benefits of cultivating a closer relationship with European countries. Calling Seward, "Prophet of ill," M'Donald believes that Europe's "commerce" and "blest science" will "enrich" America and move the nation "from that simplicity, / With ignorance curst, to that simplicity, / By knowledge blest" (24).⁴⁶ Dunlap intensifies the officers' differences, mirroring the national struggle of 1798, by having Seward disregard M'Donald's reasoning, claiming his "theoretic dreaming" (24) creates wishes that are "guides to error" (25). This interchange suggests that Dunlap believes the ills which corrupt the mind and the heart are as great as the ills which turn people into physical slaves. But M'Donald imagines America somewhat as his forefathers did, as a sanctuary for virtue, and a

⁴⁶ M'Donald's emphasis on "blest" knowledge counters Tyler's depiction of Jonathan's naiveté. In other words, through M'Donald Dunlap seems to argue that while Americans should maintain their simplicity, they should also become aware of the world around them so that they are not duped.

"resting spot for man if he can stand / Firm in his place, while Europe howls around him" pressing him with "vice" and "feeble malice" (11). Underlying Dunlap's use of the word *if* is the notion that some Americans have not been able to resist vice, which they need to do in order to triumph in this "[o]ne trial" and be successful (11).⁴⁷ Nevertheless, M'Donald's vision is one of hope, a hope that displaces the pessimism of the isolationist.⁴⁸

Though at times idealistic, M'Donald's vision indicates a new kind of patriotism in which "happiness alone proceeds from justice" (25). While the propaganda playwrights champion justice, affirming that justice rests on the side of the Whigs, Dunlap investigates what sort of actions and society are required for justice. When the General receives a flag from the British, he says, "Let us, unwearied, hear, unbiased judge" what the British have to say about André's capture (39). From these statements, we can infer that justice depends upon an unbiased mind. Only when there is a discrepancy of opinion is unbiased judgment requisite. Dunlap's play depicts a world in which differing views held by people fighting on the same side must be considered and reconciled. While the tension in the plays of Warren, Brackenridge, and Tyler arises from simple dichotomies--virtue and vice, courage and cowardice, honor and hypocrisy,

⁴⁷ This "[o]ne struggle" could apply not only to the moral struggle to maintain one's integrity in the midst of corruption, but also to the Revolutionary War and to the decision regarding war against France.

⁴⁸ On a different note, Richardson argues that Dunlap "undermines" Seward's political opinions, weakening his credibility, by portraying him as overly optimistic in the first act and extremely pessimistic in the second (59). In doing so, Dunlap emphasizes "the dangers of civil emotionality" (57). Conversely, Dunlap strengthens M'Donald's viewpoints, making him representational of "enlightened reason" (57).

American and Englishman--Dunlap's tragedy creates tension through complexity of character. The "revolutionary fervor" which Richardson explains "effectively reduced the political words to black and white" (57), clearly defining good and evil, is replaced with the struggle to determine justice in the midst of moral ambivalence. Dunlap shows us an American--Bland--who, according to the structure of the earlier plays, should be the protagonist but who becomes more of an antagonist. Bland expresses the ignoble quality of irrational passion, wanting to suspend wartime law in order to save the life of his condemned friend, a British spy who saved his life. Another alteration Dunlap makes to the earlier concept of patriotism is that the Briton--André--who should be the antagonist, but clearly is not, acts with honor. Richardson writes, "Though guilty, and therefore justly condemned, André becomes more than an emblem of treason within the play. His humanity emerges and he becomes an appealing and complex enemy, a man who, having compromised his personal ethics, atones for his lapse with his life" (56). In his tragedy, Dunlap directly links humanity to patriotism. While Tyler provides humor with which to correct our mistakes, Dunlap elicits pity, compassion, and charity which allow the audience to sympathize with those whose mistakes are too severe for laughter. Such humanity soothes the soul and allows for reformation and healing in both Americans and Britons. By examining the virtues and vices of Americans and Englishmen, Dunlap shows that true patriotism is synonymous with the ability to balance reason and emotion. Therefore, the antithesis of patriotism is extreme emotion or extreme rationality, both of

which can destroy not only the individual, but the nation. In contrast, balance, or temperance enables the patriot to make unbiased, just decisions that benefit humankind.

.....

One of the challenges the tragic playwright must meet is to make the audience see the greatness of the hero and his fall. By choosing André as his stated hero, Dunlap makes this task doubly difficult. The young nation has been freed only recently from the political oppression of England; the American people have endured economic hardship at home, compounded by economic subservience to their mother country; they are currently wrestling with international problems and dealing with the legacy of English culture. As a result, their inclination would not be to look favorably on a traitor to their cause. Moreover, such turmoil can obscure Dunlap's definition of patriotism. But history helps the dramatist create an empathetic picture of André. Before André's act of treachery, his honor was established throughout the colonies; Dunlap notes that "all who knew him were his friends" (xxx). Melville, a middle-aged American captain, notes that people found him to be honorable, "brave and virtuous" (6)--the three definitions of patriotism propounded by Tyler, Brackenridge, and Warren. When Melville first tells Bland that a Briton is to be hanged as a spy, he attests to the man's goodness by explaining that everyone "pities" him, as he was "till now, the darling child of Honor" (6). But Bland still thinks of André as "the pupil / Of Honor" and of "sweet Humanity" (7). The American youth is so convinced of André's kindness and straightforwardness that he refuses to believe that André is guilty of spying since he has "never yet put on / The guise

of falsehood" (6). When Bland was a captive on a British prison ship, André, "like an angel, seeking good for man," lessened Bland's suffering (7). Moreover, André took particular care of Bland, nursing him back to health and befriending him. Thus, Bland's love for André is justified. Pleading with Washington for André's life, Bland reasons, "O, there are Englishmen as brave, as good, / As ever land on earth might call its own; / And gallant André is among the best!" (33). Such statements, missing from the previous plays, attribute patriotic qualities to an Englishman.

But the playwright also preserves some traditional views about Britons, traitors, and patriots. Dunlap's description of the Englishman's lapse from good judgment, signaling his departure from honor, coincides with the earlier plays. By acting as a spy--donning American clothing, pretending to be someone else, and bribing his captors--André has stripped himself of his former esteem. His simple American captors resist the temptation "to sell the public weal for gold" (5), proving their patriotism in contrast to André's treachery. According to Melville, most Americans who proclaim André's former honor also denounce his crime, and therefore pity the man--a significant change from the hatred engendered by the propaganda plays. But Bland does not feel pity, only indignation that such an honorable man will be executed.

Indeed André's own words prove his worth, even as they reveal his error and his predilection to trust foolishly in appearances. In prison, he thanks "KIND HEAVEN" that he is alone "[i]n grief, in shame, and ruin" (15). His father and mother have died, and he believes that his one true love, Honora, has married another. Were these three

individuals still with him, his actions would cause them great pain. Such fellow-feeling indicates a degree of selflessness in André, a quality that patriotism mandates. Only at one point does André question his own fate--when Honora unexpectedly arrives at his prison cell--alone and unmarried. At this point he pleads, "What!--and *must* I die? / Die!--and leave her *thus*--suffering--unprotected!" (59). His desire to live is not only motivated by his longing to be with Honora, but also out of his noble desire to protect the woman he loves and almost married. We cannot ignore the significance of Honora's name, nor the significance of how this union was broken. André was almost honorable, almost united with Honora. But because he trusted in her father's "snowy locks" and what her father said--that she had married another--rather than trusting himself or her love for him, André lost her and his honor. Not until Honora crosses the ocean and sees André face to face does he know the truth: she still loves him; she never married another; her father whisked her away, "Spreading false rumors to remove [his] love" (58). Honora gently chides André: "Thou did'st too soon believe them" (58). As a result, he has "destroy'd" both himself and his love and deprived himself of the honor for which he is known (58). This information, unveiled in Act IV, suggests why such an honorable man donned a disguise and offered a bribe. André has placed too much importance on appearance, mimicking a fault of the British and Anglophiles in the three earlier plays; this distances an otherwise just and honorable man from patriotic attributes.

Despite this fault, Dunlap's portrayal of André evinces sympathy, if not empathy, for the captive. By adorning André with qualities that the earlier playwrights admire in

American patriots, Dunlap softens the severity of the demands placed upon his audience. In addition, Dunlap explains in his Preface that in order to make André “his hero” he had to make “him condemn his own conduct in the one dreadfully unfortunate action of his life” (xxx). By allowing André consciousness of his own fault, by allowing him his *anagnorisis*, the playwright creates tragedy and makes the concept of a British hero more palatable to his American audience. Full of shame, facing certain death by hanging, André knows that he “requires a fortitude / Which naught but conscious rectitude can give” (16). He must make an effort to gain, or re-gain, conscience, or moral integrity. He has deviated from the path of honor; he must find and follow it in order to have the courage to steady him in his last hours. He desires to be honorable in order to be brave.

In showing André’s recovery of virtue and honor, Dunlap gives wayward Americans an example to help them obey the dictates of patriotism. The first step towards recapturing honor, whether for a patriot or Briton, is self-knowledge. André tells Bland, “I . . . dared act / Against my reason, my declared opinion; / Against my conscience” (17), acknowledging that his actions have made a mockery of his words and values. Despite Bland’s attempts to discover “excuses for his erring friend,” André insists that he has erred (18). He believes that his flaw, his *hamartia*, is in following ambition, in trying to promote his established reputation and fame. This proud ambition causes him to “sink into the spy” (20), to become like the enemies of freedom and patriotism portrayed by Warren and Brackenridge. With the scales fallen from his eyes, André admits, “When avarice or ambition Arnold tempted,” the possibility of increased

fame made him neglect his “former purity of thought, / And high-ton’d honor’s scruples”

and ensured his failure (19). Despairing, André recognizes,

Tho’ all thy life pass pure
Mark’d by benevolence thy every deed; . . .
It all avails thee naught, if in one hour,
One hapless hour, thy feet are led astray;--
Thy happy deeds all blotted from remembrance;
Cancel’d the record of thy former good. (17-18)

His discovery about the consequences of a single action makes the audience both pity and admire him. André’s ability to see his own weakness shows that he retains some strength, some sense of honor, fundamental to patriotism.

This sense allows André to fulfill the second step towards recovery--repentance. To Bland, he confesses that he would rather have died in battle and have it proclaimed, “He died a gallant soldier,’ / Than with my country’s gold encourage treason, / And thereby purchase gratitude and fame” (17). Moreover, he is ashamed that his words, condemning “bribery base, all treacherous tricks in war,” become hypocritical in light of his actions (17). André’s understanding of the relation between thought and deed, his shame at his duplicitous actions, and his former sense of honor enable him to transform his character and atone for his trespass against himself and America.

Atoning for his wrongs, André finally abjures the hold of avarice and fame, qualities antithetical to patriotism. His current action is the best evidence of reformation--the third step towards recovery--since reformation requires a change, not only in words, but in deeds. André is horrified to learn that as retaliation for his execution, his English

general plans to take the life of Bland's father whom the British hold captive. While the British see such an action as just, André sees their threat as vindictive. The news intensifies his misery; he despairs that he, "so trifling in life's scene," will take with him to the grave a brave and honest man undeserving of death, thus "drawing such a ponderous ruin" (45). Therefore, he tells Bland to leave him so that he can "prevent injustice" (45). André's concern for others proves that he has regained his rectitude. At the close of his life, he is driven "by anxious wishes to redeem / My fellow-men from pain" (46). André most fully redeems himself by using his influence to free Bland's father. He proves that his lapse from judgment has been an aberration, not a norm. Moreover, he proves that he is compassionate.

By showing André as compassionate, honorable, and just, Dunlap likens him to earlier dramatic depictions of American patriots. By revealing and damning André's dishonorable and deceptive actions, Dunlap likens him to earlier depictions of British anti-patriots. While Dunlap's portrayal of his declared hero appears to be contradictory, it is rather complex in a fully tragic way. André is therefore neither the chief protagonist nor the primary antagonist of the play. Meserve notes that although "André might be considered a major focus of the play, he has little overt action, and his conflict is concerned with the manner in which he must die" (108). His capture provides an inciting incident for the play, but André is not the primary hero. Unlike the previous plays whose characters are stereotypes of either virtue or vice, André portrays complex and dynamic characters who struggle with good and evil. Through the use of *pathos*, Dunlap helps the

American audience appreciate the Briton's former and present virtue while condemning him for a single act and the flaw it represents.

.....

While the British spy André is at times compassionate, honorable, calm, and rational, and thus exemplifies in these moments aspects of patriotism, the American officer Bland, who perhaps should be the hero, is passionate and irrational. Initially he displays patriotic fervor by claiming that executing the condemned spy, of whose identity he is ignorant, is just and should be the consequence for people who either openly or secretly "seek to shake / The Tree of Liberty" (6). But when Bland learns the identity of the spy, he maintains his passion thus suggesting that his initial patriotic fervor is not true patriotism. Indeed, passion causes him to commit numerous lapses of judgment. In his Preface, Dunlap explains that in order to accentuate the power of "Major André's excellent qualities," he "has drawn a generous and amiable youth, so blinded by his love for the accomplished Briton, as to consider his country, and the great commander of her armies, as in the commission of such horrid injustice, that he, in the anguish of his soul, disclaims the service" (xxx). Throughout most of the play, Bland expresses qualities counterproductive to patriotism. When Melville first tells him that André is the spy, Bland, convinced that this cannot be true, impetuously declares, "I'll pawn my life, my ever sacred fame, / My general's favor, or a soldier's honor" (6). Perhaps Dunlap was conscious of the potential negative reaction to Bland and tried to avoid emotional upheaval in his audience by having Bland ask for "pardon" when he describes his

devotion to André (7). Yet while Bland's love for André and his aim to save him from certain death do not appear in themselves irrational, Bland is consumed by emotion.

Irrationally, Bland is unwilling to admit that André has done anything wrong and is therefore unable to place the good of his country above his devotion to a single individual. Bland affirms that André was doing his country the service expected of him. André, the spy, is more rational than his friend and corrects him: "Nay, nay; be cautious ever to admit / That duty can beget dissimulation" (19). After all, André disguised himself, concealed papers that Arnold had supplied him, tried to coax others to treason, and conspired against America. In refusing to find fault with André's behavior, Bland subordinates his rational duty to his country to his personal feelings. His passion causes him to lose perspective, ignore the danger spies cause to the security of his nation, and even profess to "forswear my country" and join the English (22). André is horrified at the prospect of helping another man turn traitor to his country and counsels him: "Restrain thy ardor" (22).

Consumed by ardor, Bland repeatedly makes mistakes. Not only does he challenge his superior officers, he rejects justice by trying to exempt André from his due punishment. Frustrated that M'Donald has an answer for every argument he makes in André's favor, Bland finally shouts, "Thou liest!" (49). M'Donald responds, noting the reason for Bland's behavior: "How passion / Mars thee! I pity thee" (49). Instead of hearing the truth in this statement, Bland only hears the superior tone connoted by "pity." Enraged by M'Donald's calm demeanor, the young soldier tries to embroil him in a duel,

insisting that M'Donald is passionate. Then, in apparent contradiction, Bland retorts, "Thy coolness goes to freezing; thou'rt a coward!" (50). Even Bland's insults are inconsistent and passion-swayed. Finally, Bland accuses his superior of having "no sense of honor" (51). But nothing that Bland says moves M'Donald to passion. He asserts, "I am honor's votary. Honor, with me, / Is worth; 't is truth; 't is virtue . . . / My honor is so truly mine, / That none hath power to wound it, save myself" (51). Despite M'Donald's warning not to continue in a disrespectful manner, Bland explodes in immature rage: "I'll brand thee,--damnation!" (51). Rather than get angry at Bland, M'Donald pities him, understanding the ill effects of passion on the young man: "A man who values fame far more than life; / A brave young man; in many things a good; / Utters vile falsehood; adds injury to insult; / . . . And all from impulse of unbridled feeling" (52). This "unbridled feeling" causes Bland to act antithetically to the values of patriotism; the revolutionaries and the new nation need patriots who temper their emotion with reason.

Even when Bland tries to persuade M'Donald by logical arguments, emotion taints him. Still desperately trying to find immunity for André, he makes another entreaty--for gratitude, "that first, that best of virtues,-- / Without the which man sinks beneath the brute" (48). Bland argues that gratitude civilizes humanity, that reason turns people cold. This argument, while at first appearing rational and humane, appeals to the audience's sensitivities. Bland's strength lies in his ability to see how each situation differs; but he cannot understand that individual situations never stand alone. Rather, they are part of a larger picture, a picture M'Donald tries to show him. Instead of

praising Bland for his gratitude towards André, M'Donald reprimands the youth for feeling too much of the "selfish rule of action, which commands / That we our preference make of men, / Not for their worth, but that they did *us* service" (48). Gratitude is a "man-created virtue" that "blinds thy reason" and erects "in the way / Of justice stumbling-blocks," and thus, "cannot be virtue" (48). M'Donald's polemics effectively nullify Bland's emotional appeal, reminding him that André "sav'd thy life, yet strove to damn thy country; / Doom'd millions to the haughty Briton's yoke" (48). If the spy had reached British lines, the English would have had the American plans in their hands. M'Donald further explains that Americans must show the English that they abide by the laws of war; André must die in order to spare "our much-suffering soldiers" from "the wanton cruelties of war" (49). Thus, gratitude that ignores law and justice, allowing for greater destruction, cannot be applauded. Neither should gratitude be dismissed; rather, it should be felt and expressed in harmonious concert with rationality in order to uphold justice. Striving for such equipoise is the goal of the patriot.

.....

While Bland illustrates how passion can disturb rationality, M'Donald shows how reason can calm emotion. Analyzing the cause for the Revolution, M'Donald argues, "Rises not man forever 'gainst oppression? / It is the law of life" (10). In addition to having a logical motive for defending the patriotic cause for freedom, he also has a personal motive--a home to defend and a "butcher'd" son to avenge (11). Seward challenges these emotional aspects of M'Donald's own patriotism, implying that fighting

out of “love of property and thirst of vengeance” is ignoble (11). Whereas in the earlier propaganda plays these reasons seem natural, in *André* they seem less dignified. But M'Donald calmly answers Seward's challenge, explaining that he has a higher purpose: “I love this country for the sake of man” and for the feeling of a “mind unshackled, free, expanding” (11). M'Donald appreciates the value Americans place on freedom of thought which liberates the individual and benefits humankind.

M'Donald's rational attitude towards the British shows another significant shift in the patriotic paradigm. He asserts, “O! I could hate, if I did not more pity / These bands of mercenary Europeans, / So wanting in the common sense of nature, / . . . [who] sell themselves for pelf / To aid the cause of darkness” (12). While this comment shows that M'Donald loves his country and believes Americans have every right to fight the British, it also shows that hate and disdain of the British should be tempered by pity. In one way this transformation implies a maturity of thought. Hate controls the person who hates. Pity, on the other hand, is based on understanding more than on unleashed emotion, and thus, does not consume a person. But M'Donald's remark can be seen as pompous-- pitying the British because he sees himself as superior. While the three previous playwrights freely and lavishly extol the superiority of America and American ideals over the British, Dunlap cautions us against smug superiority through this scene as well as through a meeting between M'Donald and Bland. To Bland, M'Donald appears to assume a holier-than-thou attitude when he admits that “passion sometimes sways / My older frame, through former uncheck'd habit; / But when I see the havoc which it makes /

In others, I can shun the snare accurst, / And nothing feel but pity" (50). Yet M'Donald simply affirms that which is evident--that seeing and solving other's problems is easier than seeing and solving one's own. Though M'Donald prides himself on his rationality, pride is not his prevailing attitude, as he can only "hope" that "deliberate judgment" guides all his actions (12). Perhaps the fact that M'Donald has himself felt the effects of passion allows him to help Bland curtail his emotion. Experience has taught M'Donald how to detoxify passion, and now he pities Bland, scolding him for his zeal, yet understanding that the youth must see his error and reform.

Yet just as Bland's unleashed passion is detrimental to patriotism, so is M'Donald's tendency towards cold rationality, for which he earns the censure of Seward and Washington. Acting as a foil to M'Donald, and thus helping to expand the definition of patriotism, Seward successfully chides M'Donald: "You have much shew of reason; yet methinks / What you suggest . . . / Tastes not of charity" (12). Whereas M'Donald works to dilute Bland's passion with rationality, Seward tries to temper M'Donald's rationality with a fuller sense of compassion, reproaching him for superficial, haughty, and compassionless reasoning. Unlike the characters in Brackenridge's and Warren's plays, Seward insists that some men, even British men like André, are fortune's fools. But M'Donald refuses to believe that fortune was responsible for André's downfall. Rather, he believes that André was "sunk by misdeed, not fortune" (12). M'Donald logically and powerfully argues, "Man runs the wild career of blind ambition, / . . . And when he feels the waves of ruin o'er him" blames fortune for his problems, which is a

“most convenient” way to shun responsibility (12).⁴⁹ Yet, instead of receiving words of praise for his statement, M'Donald elicits a gentle reprimand from Washington:

Worthy M'Donald, though it suits full well
 The virtuous man to frown on all misdeed,
 Yet ever keep in mind that man is frail;
 His tide of passion struggling still with Reason's
 Fair and favorable gale, and adverse
 Driving his unstable bark upon the
 Rocks of error. Should he sink thus shipwreck'd,
 Sure, it is not Virtue's voice that triumphs
 In his ruin. (13)

This speech serves as a key to understanding Dunlap's new idea of patriotism.

Washington, expanding on Seward's earlier remarks, suggests that individuals should not gloat over the ruin of a fellow man, or put themselves above him. Rather, people should have compassion. Clearly, the implication is that André's capture is not a victory: an honorable, but “frail,” man has fallen. Had André not fallen, had he refused to become a spy, then virtue would have triumphed. André has not been able to curtail ambition with reason. Washington's remarks remind us that we, too, struggle to find the proper balance between emotion and reason.

.....

Although Dunlap proclaims André as his hero, the real protagonist of the play is Washington, who, more than André, Bland, Seward, or even M'Donald, exemplifies

⁴⁹ Interestingly, André's description of how he became a spy indicates that he takes responsibility for his actions (19-20). Therefore, we can conclude that Dunlap sees people as masters, not victims, of their lives. Yet Washington's argument is equally persuasive. Thus, Dunlap's position seems to be a combination of M'Donald's insistence upon taking responsibility and Washington's call for compassion for those men who fail.

patriotism.⁵⁰ Of all the characters in the play, the General not only is most aware of the battle between passion and reason, but comes nearest to finding a proper balance and thus upholding justice. Moreover, as commander-in-chief of the Continental Army, Washington has to make sense of apparent moral confusion. Washington maintains such complete self-control that to others he does not at first appear to struggle with the challenges that confront him. Returning from the General after vainly trying to save her husband who is marked for death, Mrs. Bland exclaims in a burst of emotion that “war hath made men rocks” (63). Her comment is striking not only because of its overt meaning, but because it indicates that Dunlap was willing to write such a statement so close to the Revolution and Shays’s Rebellion and in the midst of other national uprisings. Dunlap has the voice of a woman reveal how war deprives us of our humanity, our ability to feel, and even our ability to reason. But though her husband may die when André dies, Mrs. Bland seems to sense that the General is just, and that in spite of his calm, rational appearance, he feels tenderness. Speaking of Washington, Mrs. Bland also says, “All unmov’d / He hears my words, he sees my desperate sorrow / Fain would I blame his conduct, but I cannot. / . . . My scrutiny but ends in admiration” (52). Mrs. Bland’s second child proves this by telling her, “You need not cry, Mamma, the General will do it, I am sure, for I saw him cry. He turn’d away his head from *you*, but I saw it”

⁵⁰ Richardson claims that Dunlap’s decision to use André as his hero is “artistically appropriate” and allows him to explore the “moral and political complexities that arise in the ostensibly unambiguous arena of war” (56). For Richardson, André represents “the British-American world being swept away by war” (56). Indeed, André’s ambition during war does carry him to his death. Richardson also suggests that M’Donald is more rational than Washington, who has some idealistic views of America (59).

(63). By turning his head from Mrs. Bland, Washington makes a conscious effort to appear composed. But he cannot hide his compassion from a child. Thus, Dunlap's vision of patriotism includes a benevolence that encompasses humankind, a benevolence that Washington expresses.

Echoing his mother's cry that "war hath made men rocks," Bland appeals to M'Donald for compassion towards André. Though exonerating André could be destructive, Bland's larger point is significant. He reasons that "a deed of mercy" towards the British would take away the "gorgon horrors" of war, institute "[m]ore humanized customs," serve as an example to other nations, and benefit civilization (47). But we cannot forget that in war, mercy plays little part. What is required in this situation is not mercy for one individual, but bold certitude and adherence to the rules of war. Bland's father has such courage and certitude. He writes a letter to the General saying he will die for his country. M'Donald tries to impress this upon young Bland's heart: "Imitate / Thy father!" (48). His point is lost upon Bland, who retorts, "My father knew not André" (48). Like Bland, Washington understands that each case is unique. He explains to the youth that the leaders of the nation value "[a]n individual's virtue" (33); but Washington also knows that leaders cannot allow subjective opinions or personal attachment, however logical in appearance, to obstruct justice, especially during wartime.

Washington's willingness to be merciful backfires. Honora's pitiful plea to stay the execution and be admitted to the General moves Melville, who agrees to go to the General on her behalf: "For rather would I lose my rank in arms, / And stand cashier'd

for lack of discipline, / Than gain 'mongst military men all praise, / Wanting the touch of sweet humanity" (60). Melville's humanity does not seem to stem from passion as does Bland's, but carries with it a larger perspective, a more temperate compassion. This same tempered compassion is present in the General, for he listens to Honora's plea. In so doing, he proves again that he is not a "rock." Stumbling into his office, Honora throws herself at his feet and begs for André's life. Washington "*hides his eyes with his hand*" (67)--another indication of his pity, and even his anguish. Washington is forced by the necessities of war to appear unmovable, but his apparent rock-like nature comes ultimately from the General's ability to balance emotion and feeling. He knows the time and place for both. Sentencing André to death is difficult for Washington who cries, "O, what keen struggles must I undergo!" (66). He knows that he can pardon the spy, and yet he also recognizes "that circumstances strong as fate / Forbid to obey the impulse" (66). Washington is undergoing an intense internal conflict, heightened by his compassion for André and Honora.⁵¹ But in the midst of Honora's appeal, a messenger walks in to tell him that the British have hanged their American captive Hastings in order to mock the Americans. "Why, why, my country, did I hesitate?" Washington cries (68). Though the British may have killed Hastings anyway, the General's magnanimous patience allows the British to take advantage of his apparent indecision. Though this indecision stems not from irresolution, but from humanity, this distinction does not matter to the British.

⁵¹ Richardson notes, "The ambivalence that attaches itself to André also reflects the conflicting emotions which characterized colonial responses to the Revolution" (57).

Therefore, though the calls for mercy from Mrs. Bland, Bland, and Honora appeal to the heart, the audience, like Washington, must understand that mercy cannot over-rule wisdom.

Washington's understanding of the interrelation between mercy and wisdom, emotion and rationality is deepened by the death of Hastings which enables him to overcome weak compassion and provide strong leadership as a true patriot. Though he has two apparent choices, as a leader he has no choice at all. "I know the virtues of this man and love them," he affirms. "But the destiny of millions, millions / Yet unborn, depends upon the rigor / Of this moment" (34). Thus, for Dunlap's Washington, patriotism consists of the ability to step back from a situation, to gain perspective through tempered reason, and to act with justice. In the end, he does not let his feelings for André, the Bland family, or Honora distort his judgment: "Mercy, / Humanity, call loudly, that we make / Our now despised power be felt, vindictive. / Millions demand the death of this young man. / My injur'd country, he his forfeit life / Must yield, to shield thy lacerated breast / From torture" (34). One of Washington's primary goals is to teach the British that though simple, the "rebels" are "men" (32). Dunlap's decision to use the word men is significant. The General speaks for humanity, not for the warriors of a single nation; the rational justice of the American cause supersedes questions of power. Thus, the General reasons that the sacrifice of André is not an act of vengeance, but a way to save humanity, to salvage the "millions" who demand André's death. It is merciful because it is just.

Though we may be tempted to think that Washington is abdicating responsibility to the mob, the “millions,” we cannot ignore the whole of his argument. Not only the people, but the law demands that he exact justice on André and hang him. There is, in fact, a great emphasis throughout the play on the rule of law, not men. This emphasis reflects a shift from patriotic fervor to patriotic rationality. Bernard Hewitt writes that Dunlap portrays war as “grim and cruel but it is a gentleman’s game. The rules are not always observed, but there *are* definite rules” (53). Washington insists on obeying those rules, one of which proscribes the manner of André’s death. George Bancroft explains that “the English themselves had established the exclusive usage of the gallows” as the punishment befitting a spy (324). If the Whigs do not abide by such laws, Washington warns of “the flood of ills, which else fell war / Would pour, uncheck’d, upon the sickening world, / Sweeping away all trace of civil life” (33). Whereas Bland calls for mercy and gratitude to preserve civility, the General adheres to law to protect civilization. The General’s logic is sound, especially in Revolutionary times. If he does not take action against André, he is negating the law and inviting the English to torment Americans even more. He tells Bland that both he and the “men entrusted with thy country’s rights” have thoroughly examined “every circumstance” regarding André, ensuring the justice of their decision (33). The Americans are fighting to replace unjust laws with just ones which protect their freedoms and rights. Therefore, as a patriot, Washington’s allegiance must be to justice.

.....

In order to define justice, Dunlap allows his characters to question it.⁵² But when Bland exceeded the audience's tolerance, they demanded a change in the play. Blinded by his narrow emotionalism, Bland does not understand that he is one of those men whom Washington seeks to protect, and in turn eschews patriotism. Rather than distance himself from his passion, Bland is ruled by it. He is so overcome with anger, frustration, and indignation that he never conveys André's request--to change "the *manner* of my death" which would allow him to "die as he lived, / A soldier" (22). Though Bland tells André that his appeal will be made with a "powerful voice of friendship" (20), he does not act as a friend. His selfish passion causes him to neglect the one request that enacted, would have restored honor, at least partially, to André. Infuriated at Washington's refusal to spare his friend's life, Bland accuses the General and his country of inhumanity. Though the General has told Bland that he will grant a just request, the soldier contrives to believe that Washington and his country are unjust. Based upon this belief, Bland declares, "I have a soldier's honor, / But 't is in union with a freeman's judgment, / And when I act, both prompt. Thus from my helm / I tear what once I proudly thought the badge / Of virtuous fellowship" (34). By tearing off his cockade, Bland commits an act of extreme disloyalty. From Bland's "blustering about," Richardson elicits a warning:

His uncontrolled passions deftly suggest what Dunlap most feared, what the political history since the Revolution had seemingly borne out, and what the partisan reception of his play itself suggested--that unrestrained, unreflective emotion, while glorious in the Revolution, now threatened to undermine the existence of a peaceful nation. . . . For Dunlap Bland

⁵² Both Bland and André question the justness of André's sentence.

embodies uncontrolled passion, and the essential issue of the tragedy becomes the potential consequences of emotionality, not its genesis. (57)

Dunlap makes clear that the consequences of Bland's "uncontrolled passion" could be severe. The General admits that had someone else witnessed this scene, "Duty would ask that thou shouldst rue thy folly" (35). But instead of exacting the requisite punishment, Washington pardons the impetuous youth: "But, for the motive, be the deed forgotten" (35). The General sees that Bland is not acting out from reason; rather, he is swayed by his love for André. By forgiving Bland, Washington reveals his strength of character, his humanity, his rationality, his own sense of justice--and in Dunlap's lexicon--his patriotism.

Unlike Washington, the first night's audience was not prone to excuse Bland's affront to "patriotism." In his Preface, Dunlap notes that he "has gone near to offend the veterans of the American army who were present on the first night, and who, not knowing the sequel of the action, felt much disposed to condemn him" (xxx). In his history, Dunlap explains that the "mixed assembly . . . thought the country and its defender's insulted, and a hiss ensued" (20). Though the play continued, Dunlap reports that after the curtain fell, the friends of the actor who played Bland, Mr. Cooper, rioted outside and demanded that the play be "withdrawn" (21). Dunlap's explanation of why Cooper's friends wanted the play stopped--because they thought it would hurt his "popularity" (21)--reveals that patriotism defined by emotional fervor was still prevalent in American society of 1798. To protect his own career, Dunlap felt that he had to respond to the

audience's unleashed emotion. But rather than completely acquiesce to their wishes, the playwright added a scene in which M'Donald returns Bland's cockade to him, showing a reconciliation and a re-affirmation of patriotism. After a successful short run, Dunlap records, "The play was printed, and is forgotten" (21). Richardson claims that Dunlap's audience could not digest "a play which sought to examine in any meaningful way the unresolved conflicts between aristocratic personal values and the demands of democratic idealism which resided just below the surface of Federalist America" (55). This statement is reinforced by the public's enthusiastic approval of Dunlap's 1803, Fourth of July celebration play, The Glory of Columbia: Her Yeomanry!, for which he lifted large portions of André. Dunlap's initial revision of André and his later remaking of it into Glory deserve attention in order to help us understand how the public and the playwright interacted to form a definition of patriotism.

Notably, the changes that Dunlap made to his tragedy to make it palatable for his audience of 1798 are minimal. Audience reactions to the different versions show that some audience members were trying to hold on to the past while simultaneously embracing a broader concept of patriotism. Their applause for the successive performances which portrayed Bland's movement towards transformation could indicate an ability to forgive. In addition, Dunlap's alterations seem to focus, if not clarify, his definition of patriotism. In both the original and revised scene, Bland sees that his passion has used him. The youth apologizes to M'Donald for slandering him, and M'Donald forgives him. The older man seems to have Bland's interest uppermost in his

thoughts, acting in a way that will speed Bland's transformation. Whereas earlier in the play M'Donald reprimanded Bland, he now encourages him, counseling Bland not to be overwhelmed by the "vice" of "remorse" (64). He tells Bland to let his past actions remind him of the dangers of uncontrolled emotion: "Say to thyself; 'I *am* not what I *was*; / I am not *now* the instrument of vice; / I'm changed; I am a man; Virtue's firm friend'" (64-5). M'Donald's ability to see Bland as a changed man is not only unbiased and just, but charitable. His perception of Bland gives the younger soldier the confidence to reform. M'Donald has blended reason and feeling, showing himself a true patriot.⁵³

While M'Donald's attitude remains the same in both 1798 versions of the play, Dunlap's additions for subsequent performances emphasize Washington's compassion. In the version used in the first performance, Bland does not apologize to M'Donald for the way he has treated Washington. The reconciliation between Bland and M'Donald concerns only their earlier conflict. In the version written for succeeding performances, Bland tells M'Donald that he has dishonored himself and his country "[e]ven in the presence of the first of men," and that he wishes somehow to right his wrongs (xxx). This change allows M'Donald to know of Bland's paramount offense to the patriot cause, whereas the initial performance does not clarify what M'Donald knows. Regardless, the elder's unconditional forgiveness of the younger is still significant. But in the re-write, Washington anticipates Bland's repentance and gives M'Donald Bland's discarded

⁵³ Indeed, Richardson affirms, "It is M'Donald who . . . guides Bland (and the audience) to understand Dunlap's position on ideological issues vital to the nation's future course"(57-8).

cockade to return at the appropriate time. The revision has a great impact. It makes M'Donald appear even more empathetic towards Bland because it leads M'Donald into a discussion which shows his humility and compassion. In explaining to the youth that Washington has forgiven the young soldier, M'Donald praises the General for his perceptiveness and charity: "Alive himself to every generous impulse, / He hath excused the impetuous warmth of youth, / In expectation that thy fiery soul, / Chasten'd by time and reason, will receive / The stamp indelible of godlike virtue" (xxxii). As M'Donald humbly shifts the emphasis from himself to his leader, Washington appears godlike. Like M'Donald, the General can forgive and forget, rather than punish the offender, revealing his heart as well as his reason. Ironically, both officers act in the way Bland says people should behave--in accord with humanity. Though M'Donald can forgive and encourage, he cannot exonerate or reinstate Bland; but Washington can. The General's patriotic humanity allows for Bland's reformation. Thus, in the revised version of 1798 Washington acts even more fully as the protagonist: his word determines the fate of both Bland as well as André, while M'Donald's guidance helps Bland reform. While justice demands that the General execute André, it also demands that he pardon Bland, bringing him back to the American fold, and allowing him to don again the garb of the patriot. For the original performance, Bland ends his exchange with M'Donald by telling him that he hopes to prove that he has changed: "I must yet a trial undergo, / That will require a consciousness of virtue" (65). In the modified version, he attributes his change of heart and action to Washington and M'Donald--a testimony to the healing power of

forgiveness, compassion, reason, and justice. Bland asserts, "[L]et my actions henceforth show what thou / And he [Washington] have made me. Ne'er shall my helmet / Lack again its proudest, noblest ornament" (xxxii). Such a comment must have made the audience feel the triumph of patriotic virtue.

Though only a symbol, the cockade was a powerful representation of patriotism for some members of the audience--perhaps too powerful. Their condemnation of Dunlap suggests that unlike Washington, they were not able to separate the man, Bland, from his action, nor the motive from the effect. Though waiting to reinstate Bland, Washington forgave him immediately. Not until Bland changes does the audience forgive him. The audience members who took offense during the first performance ironically acted with the same passion and irrationality they condemned in Bland; only the motive differed. Moreover, they misunderstood Dunlap's point--that extreme passion is unacceptable in a patriot and dangerous to a nation. Dunlap's message does not change with the insertion of this short scene. If anything, the playwright intensifies the importance of charity and forgiveness combined with unbiased judgment for a people struggling to make sense out of the complexities of freedom.

Though based on the same story, Glory clearly and perhaps ironically emphasizes the earlier concepts of patriotism promulgated by Warren, Brackenridge, and Tyler. Dunlap does this most notably by changing the genre of the play from a tragedy to a celebration of American patriotism, complete with patriotic songs. Thus, unlike André, Glory does not depict moral complexity. To the basic plot of André, Dunlap adds

Benedict Arnold; the farmers who captured Andre;⁵⁴ the farmers' friends; and Sally Williams, a strong girl who defends American freedom. Dunlap's depiction of Benedict Arnold draws on the propagandistic portrayals of the enemies of freedom: Sounding the same note as a member of the group, one of Brackenridge's English officers, or the Anglophiles of The Contrast, Arnold cries: "Gold! I must have thee! idol of mankind! . . . else will my well earned name . . . nought avail me. Perish the public good! my private welfare henceforth be my aim!" (1817, 3). The greed, ambition, self-interest, fame, reputation, and avarice that drove the British to enslave the Americans in earlier plays, and drove the Anglophiles of Tyler's comedy, drives Arnold to betray his country.

Dunlap also undercuts some of the sympathy for André evident in his earlier tragedy. After receiving the papers of American plans from Arnold, the Briton is shocked to learn that he is on American-held turf and feels "betrayed" (10). Nevertheless, he agrees to Arnold's insistence that he must put on a disguise. By portraying Andre as consciously choosing to act dishonorably, secretly, deceptively, Dunlap removes some of the moral ambiguity embraced in André. Moreover, Dunlap shows the superiority of Americans over Britons by comparing the virtuous strength of Andre's captors to his moral weakness. Disguised and using a pseudonym, Andre tries to evade capture by making up stories about himself and offering his captors bribes several times; each time they refuse with more certainty. Their integrity makes Andre exclaim, "[T]heir honesty

⁵⁴ For whatever reason, Andre does not have an accent acute (André) in Glory.

o'erwhelms me!" (1803, 99).⁵⁵ Dunlap directly addresses the issue of Andre's disguise by having Williams, an American yeoman, declare, "An american soldier *wears an uniform*, to show that *he serves his country*" (99). By implication, this indicts Andre. Realizing that "moderate desires" and not reputation or titles "ensure virtue," the spy responds, "You have not only captured--you have conquered me" (99). Thus, he acknowledges his own moral collapse. But the earlier tragedy does not show André's capture. The play opens with André in prison awaiting his execution. As a result, the audience is left to decide whether André was a victim of circumstances or the master of his own fate. In Glory, Bland still tries to save Andre's life, but Dunlap omits the cockade incident. Moreover, he writes a scene in which Sally Williams declares, "I hope no one will ever put on the american uniform, till well assured they will never disgrace it" (100). In Glory, Bland does not disgrace the American uniform.

These differences do not entirely erase the definition of patriotism in André.⁵⁶ In Glory, Dunlap still shows that Bland's rashness is motivated by love for André, suggesting that uncurtailed emotion is destructive, that deceit ensures failure, that Washington's decision to execute Andre is difficult, and that compassion is necessary. The rustics who capture Andre tell him not to worry, for "tho' you are a prisoner,

⁵⁵ In the 1817 version of Glory, Andre thinks, somewhat more complexly, "confusion! how am I sunk! how does the plain honesty of these men confound and lower me in my own esteem" (14).

⁵⁶ Though Bland does not throw down his cockade in Glory, he still appeals to the General; the General answers Bland with the exact same words as in the first play. Mrs. Bland talks with her children, Honora with Andre. Both women distress over their men. Bland talks with his mother. The list goes on. The one character that Dunlap omits in Glory is M'Donald. Though Dunlap erases M'Donald's voice of reason, he does not erase the voice of reason completely, for the General still fulfills this role--instructing Bland where M'Donald cautioned him, showing the balance between passion and reason.

americans know what is due humanity" (98). This emphasis on humanity, particularly on American humanity, again reverberates in the last act of the play when Williams cries, "To arms! on, lads! let the word be 'victory and mercy'" (114). But the tenor of the second play is completely different. The songs, coupled with the minor characters who have little to do with the plot, create humor and instill patriotic sentiments of an emotional, popular kind. *Glory* simply does not challenge its audience as much as *André*, which perhaps indicates that the audience did not want to be challenged. Meserve notes, "It is a comment on the times and on Dunlap that he felt obliged to rewrite *André* as a patriotic spectacle," noting that "patriotic plays . . . were extremely popular at this time" (109). In a sense, the audience returned to the 1775-1776 attitude that Dunlap hoped in 1798 the nation had outgrown, an attitude demanding a more simplistic moral world. Perhaps the audiences enjoyed *Glory* because they could ignore Dunlap's serious message in his earlier tragedy, hearing only the clamor of the screaming-eagle, while pretending to be magnanimous. Feeling benevolent is not as difficult as confronting the consequences of passion, consequences portrayed openly in *André*. In Dunlap's tragedy, the audience could not miss the complexity surrounding his definition of patriotism as temperate justice, a definition of patriotism mandating an unbiased judgment, a more expansive humanitarian viewpoint, an understanding of the implications of both sides of a historical situation, and a confidence to follow a morally difficult course that alone secures "Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness."

.....

In André, Dunlap's profound vision of patriotism strives to enable Americans to adapt to a rapidly changing world. Moreover, his examination of the effects of war illustrates a patriotism that preserves the values upon which our nation was founded--virtue, heroism, and honor. To these cornerstones of the United States, Dunlap adds first a call for compassion; second, a call for reason to steady passion. To Melville, one voice of humanity, Dunlap gives the opening lines of his tragedy, among which are the following:

Alas, all is not well;
Else, why stand I, a man, the friend of man,
At midnight's depth, deck'd in this murderous guise,
The habiliment of death, the badge of dire
Necessitous coercion. 'T is not well.
--In vain the enlighten'd friends of suffering man
Point out, of war, the folly, guilt, and madness.
Still, age succeeds to age, and war to war;
And man, the murderer, marshals out in hosts
In all the gaiety of festive pomp,
To spread around him death and desolation.
How long! how long!-- (1-2)

As if to answer Melville's cry, M'Donald comforts Bland. Understanding that Bland should not witness the spy's hanging, M'Donald kindly leads André's friend away from the scene of the execution. After the cannon sounds to announce the spy's death, Bland affirms, "O! let my countrymen, / Henceforward when the cruelties of war / Arise in their remembrance; when their ready / Speech would pour forth torrents in their foe's dispraise, / Think on this act accurst, and lock complaint in silence" (75). Here, Dunlap, like Warren, Brackenridge, and Tyler before him, acknowledges the horrors of war. But

unlike the earlier playwrights, Dunlap, in André, reveals a maturation of American identity by asking Americans to see the good in their foes. Dunlap suggests that the dictates of true patriotism are never easy, obvious, or simple, but are rather inevitably complex--as Washington understands: "O, I feel / That man should never shed the blood of man!" (66). Ironically, war engenders this feeling of desperation and compassion by spreading destruction that appears to be endless.

Therefore, in André reason is requisite in order to steer successfully through the mire of war and its aftermath. Furthering Dunlap's definition of patriotism, M'Donald uses reason to counter consuming passion. By having M'Donald, not Washington, close the play, Dunlap diminishes the gap between the man who has made the decision and the people who have to make sense of it. In the last words of the play, M'Donald says that people must deal with the effect of André's execution, whether or not they sanction it. But his directive is not cold. Rather, he tries to reconcile the possible disparate feelings among audience members, whether American or English, by giving guidance to their thoughts and actions, as he does to the suffering Bland who is sprawled on the ground, grieving for his lost friend. Rather than discount Bland's feelings and words, M'Donald identifies their nature and origin: "Such are the dictates of the heart, not head" (75). M'Donald continues to reason with Bland as well as with the audience, affirming that Columbia's children should be taught not to submit to oppression, but rather understand that

no foreign force,
Nor European influence, tempt to misstate,

Or awe the tongue of eloquence to silence.
 Still may our children's children deep abhor
 The motive, doubly deep detest the actors;
 Ever remembering that the race who plann'd
 Who acquiesced, or did the deeds abhor'd,
 Has pass'd from off the earth; and in its stead,
 Stand men who challenge love or detestation
 But from their proper, individual deeds.
 Never let the memory of the sire's offence
 Descend upon the son. (75)

Through M'Donald's final words in André, Dunlap affirms that we must "judge righteous judgment." Grounded in Revolutionary principles, M'Donald advises us not to hold the son accountable for his father, nor blame an entire nation for the faults of her sons. By implication, we must examine each act individually, yet see it as part of a larger historical pageant. This unbiased attitude, international in tenor and therefore inclusive of England as well as the United States, promotes forgiveness and reconciliation. However, this view is not blindly tolerant nor passionately impelled. M'Donald demands that we remember the awful deeds and laws the British exacted; yet at the same moment, he pleads for a more expansive and balanced view of mankind. If we expect to succeed in a changing world, we must separate the deed from the person or the country and also realize that nationality does not determine a person's greatness. Rather, greatness is determined by an individual's ability to live justly and righteously. When M'Donald praises the "good and great" Washington, he implies that the General is the exemplary patriot, "grac'd / With that best quality which gives due force / To every faculty, and keeps the mind / In healthful equipoise, ready for action; / Invaluable temperance--by all / To be acquired, yet

scarcely known to any" (14). Such temperance does not destroy the patriotic paradigm created with the inception of our nation; rather, it enlarges it. True patriotism balances emotion with reason, blending compassion with wisdom, and thus maintains the integrity of the nation. It promotes virtue, heroism, and honor; it ensures justice; and it protects the freedoms for which the Revolution was fought.

Conclusion

Redefining Patriotism

The scope and definition of patriotism expands, and the demands placed upon patriots increase with each play--The Group, The Battle of Bunkers-Hill, The Contrast, and André--that has been discussed. To Warren's concept of the virtuous patriot, Brackenridge adds heroism, and Tyler adds honor. By the time Dunlap writes André, he believes that the dictates of patriotism demand that the patriot be able to resolve morally complex issues, balance passion with reason, and promote justice through compassion. Each playwrights' definitions of patriotism, wedded to his or her choice of genre, both respond to and direct the times. By showing what patriotism excludes, as well as portraying what patriotism requires, the plays catalyze and clarify the struggle to create and secure an independent and united nation. Warren's satire illustrates the destructiveness of corruption, avarice, concern for reputation, and egotism. In addition to the unpatriotic qualities Warren highlights, Brackenridge's heroic drama displays the self-defeat of cowardice. Tyler's comedy shows how manipulation and hypocrisy are

inconsistent with patriotism. Dunlap's tragedy accentuates how uncontrolled passion and compassionless reasoning undermine justice.⁵⁷

The metamorphosis of patriotism in these plays intimates a change in attitude regarding patriots, Americans, and Britons. In the two propaganda plays, Warren and Brackenridge lump the British together, branding them as evil. Americans have no faults; Britons have many--faults that they either regret but do not change or applaud and foster. Though Tyler is less harsh in his criticism of the British and amusingly describes both Anglophiles and patriotic Americans, he reprimands customs associated with the English. Dunlap's Americans, like Tyler's, exhibit positive and negative qualities. Unlike the three earlier playwrights, Dunlap implies that Britons have positive qualities. By showing that André behaves honorably, Dunlap moves the definition of patriotism from emphasis on the individual to exploration of motives and actions. Thus, in a sense, Dunlap depersonalizes patriotism. André suggests, even more than The Contrast, that an individual's qualities, not merely his or her nationality, determine a patriot.

The conclusions these plays reveal the implications of the evolving definitions of patriotism. Both The Group and The Battle of Bunkers-Hill close with contrasting portraits. Meagre, the last group member to speak, turns his back on justice, embraces corruption, and challenges the divine will by "striv[ing] to think there is no after doom" (22). Countering his disdain, the patriot lady who enters to close the play weeps about

⁵⁷ Ironically, the fame, title, position, and reputation that the anti-patriots desire, elude them, while the patriots, whose goal is freedom, gain eternal fame--an effect of fighting with honor to defend a virtuous cause.

the imminent bloodshed. Her apprehensive, but bold epilogue foretells the sorrow that war will bring as well as the potential strength of America and Americans. Her mourning yields to the conviction that virtue will support the struggling patriots until they win. The melodramatic ending of Brackenridge's play fulfills Warren's prophesy. After the battle has subsided, Burgoyne insists, "But this rude day, unparallel'd in time, / Has no competitor" (266). Like Meagre, he confronts doom. But Burgoyne sounds more like the patriot lady than Meagre, his fellow loyalist, crediting the American heroism he has witnessed that day. Rather than relish revenge, Burgoyne understands the destructive nature of war. Burgoyne sees the burning of the town and, calling forth images of Armageddon, declares that it is "[a] scene like which, perhaps, no time shall know, / Till Heav'n with final ruin fires the ball, / Burns up the cities, and the works of men, / And wraps the mountains in one gen'ral blaze" (266). But this fire, while it destroys, also purifies. In order to create liberty, the patriots must burn the traces of British tyranny. The epilogue to Brackenridge's heroic play, spoken by Lieutenant Colonel Webb, a member of the Continental Army, concludes with a powerful paean to heroic patriotism. Having mourned the deaths of his fellow patriots, Webb promises that he will not sheathe his sword until the patriots succeed--a feat he believes is assured, since the patriots fight for freedom, "the cause of HEAV'N" (268). Such heroism, grounded in virtue, defeats cowardice and corruption. From out of the ashes, a new nation will arise.

While both The Group and The Battle of Bunkers-Hill end with a foretelling of the destruction of the old order, The Contrast ends with the beginning of the new order.

The new order requires Americans who have won a revolution yet subsequently lost their social and cultural independence to mend their ways before vice, hypocrisy, and conformity strip them of their national identity. In the denouement, Tyler's characters model behaviors consistent with maintaining a united republic. Van Rough and Charlotte apologize and change; Maria and Manly remain firm in their honor and are rewarded. Unlike his predecessors' satiric and heroic dramas, Tyler's comedy encourages transformation through laughter. After depicting the failure of Dimple's duplicity, Tyler asks for the audience's approval--"applause"--of his vision of a strong nation supported by honorable patriots who are directed by virtue (115).

With André, Dunlap broadens the scope of patriotism beyond the earlier playwrights' definitions. As in the three earlier plays, the ending of Dunlap's tragedy portrays a contrast. The passionate Bland "*throws himself on the earth*" after André's execution, while the reasonable M'Donald stands beside him (75). Even this stage picture conveys Dunlap's patriotic message. Passion, represented by Bland, has fallen, unable to support itself. But the emotionalism of the moment cannot throw M'Donald to the ground. Reason, represented by M'Donald, stands firm. While understanding the importance of the individual, M'Donald recognizes how the individual must be viewed as part of a community. His perspective is national, international, and humanitarian. His closing words, "Never let memory of the sire's offence / Descend upon the son" (75), remind us of André's chief protagonist, General Washington, and bespeak a compassion that secures justice through reason.

Dunlap's Glory returns in part to the patriotic rally-cries of the propaganda plays.

In a way, Glory indicates a "backwards" slide--an attitude in Americans that disallows change and insists upon simple dichotomies of "right" and "wrong." Dunlap placates the public not only by modifying André but by turning his earlier tragedy into a "patriotic" spectacle, removing complexity and replacing it with simplicity. Yet though his style changes, his definition of patriotism still rests upon humanity, reason, compassion, and justice--qualities central to André. At the end of Glory, Dunlap's soldiers echo M'Donald's words and cry, "Humanity! remember we are men, and they are our fellow men!" (1803, 114). Along with this call for humanity, comes the General's benediction: "May that spirit which has animated the sons of Columbia, in this glorious struggle, remain pure and unimpaired, for then long will she be free and happy" (114). That "spirit" is the same quality which Warren champions and which Bernard Bailyn affirms is "the animating principle of republics" (241). That quality is virtue. Thus, Glory reminds patriots of their origins--their nation's dreams, values, character. Though each playwright expands the definition of patriotism, each also upholds the importance of virtue, for without virtue, freedom turns into anarchy and licentiousness, heroism becomes brute force, honor loses its sincerity and adopts superficiality, and justice becomes inhumanity.

Though only twenty-three years transpired between Lexington and Concord and Dunlap's tragedy, the United States had already won a war and withstood intense external and internal conflict, economic depression, and ideological and political divisions.

Regarding the Whig playwrights involved in the "War of Belles-Lettres" during the

inception of the Revolution, Meserve notes, "The effect of their work is difficult to discover but, in reading some of the plays two hundred years later, one can still feel their power" (65). The ideas in these plays, as well as in the later plays discussed in this paper, appear to have been powerful enough to help a people remain united despite the differences that threatened to divide them. The playwrights' definitions of patriotism were intended to influence citizens and instill in them an indefatigable desire to define freedom. These plays provided a mirror for the citizens to view themselves and to form their own definitions for patriotism. Today these plays open a window to our nation's past and to the origins of our concept of patriotism. André virtually closes the eighteenth century. Between the first edition of Glory in 1803 and the second in 1817, the United States was involved in the War of 1812.⁵⁸ This again redefined patriotism, as did the great conflagration of the Civil War when northerners and southerners struggled to support their separate economies, identities, and values. The earlier struggle to define and understand patriotism was captured in the dramas of the Revolution and early republic. The patriotic search for freedom underlying the Revolution and the freedom partially assured by the Constitution and Bill of Rights has given us the freedom to explore, to question, and to redefine what it means to be an American patriot. Our early drama is a superb place to look as we pursue this exploration.

⁵⁸ Richard Moody notes that Glory was performed on July 1, 1812 "with the subtitle, 'What we have done, we can do'" (91).

Works Cited

- Andrews, Charles M. The Colonial Background of the American Revolution: Four Essays in American Colonial History. Rev. ed. New Haven: Yale UP, 1964.
- Anthony, Katharine. First Lady of The Revolution: The Life of Mercy Otis Warren. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1958.
- Bailyn, Bernard. Faces of Revolution: Personalities and Themes in the Struggle for American Independence. New York: Knopf, 1990.
- Bancroft, George. The History of the United States of America from the Discovery of the Continent. Abr. and ed. Russel B. Nye. Chicago: The U of Chicago P, 1966.
- Brackenridge, Hugh Henry. The Battle of Bunkers-Hill. 1775. Representative Plays by American Dramatists: 1765-1819. Vol. 1. Ed. Montrose J. Moses. New York: Blom, 1964. 3 vols. 233-76.
- Brown, Alice. Mercy Warren. New York: Scribner's, 1896.
- Brown, Helen Tyler. Introduction. The Contrast: A Comedy in Five Acts. By Royall Tyler. New York: AMS, 1970.
- Brown, Richard D. "Shays's Rebellion and Its Aftermath: A View from Springfield, Massachusetts, 1787." William and Mary Quarterly 40 (1983): 598-615.
- Bushman, Richard L. "Revolution." The Reader's Companion to American History. Eds. Eric Foner and John A. Garraty. Boston: Houghton, 1991. 936-46.
- Candour. "Royall Tyler's The Contrast." The Daily Advertiser 18 Ap., 1787. Rpt. in The American Theatre As Seen by its Critics, 1752-1934. Eds. Montrose J. Moses and John Mason Brown. New York: Norton, 1934.
- Carson, Ada Lou. "Thomas Pickman Tyler's 'Memoirs of Royall Tyler': An Annotated Edition." Diss. U of Minnesota, 1985.
- Cohen, Lester. "Mercy Otis Warren: The Politics of Language and the Aesthetics of Self." American Quarterly 35 (Winter 1983): 481-98.
- Davidson, Philip. Propaganda and the American Revolution: 1763-1783. Chapel Hill: The U of North Carolina P, 1941.

- Detsi, Zoe. "Mercy Otis Warren: Her Political Self and Her Personal Dilemma." Gramma: Journal of Theory and Criticism 2 (1994): 35-45.
- Downer, Alan S. Introduction. American Drama. Ed. Downer. New York: Crowell, 1960. 4-7.
- Dunlap, William. André. Facsimile of 1887. New York: Burt Franklin, 1970.
- . The Glory of Columbia: Her Yeomanry. Microprint 3, item 40699. New York, 1817.
- . The Glory of Columbia: Her Yeomanry! 1803. Dramas from the American Theatre: 1762-1909. Ed. with Intros. by Richard Moody. Cleveland: World, 1966. 87-114.
- . History of the American Theatre and Anecdotes of the Principal Actors. 1832. 2nd. ed. Improved. Incorporating a list of early plays and "A Narrative of his connection with the old American Company 1792-1797." John Hodgkinson. 2 vols. New York: Franklin, 1963.
- Franklin, Benjamin V., comp. Introduction. The Plays and Poems of Mercy Otis Warren. Facsimile. Delmar, NY: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1980.
- Hayes, Edmund M. "Mercy Otis Warren versus Lord Chesterfield." William and Mary Quarterly 40 (1983): 616-21.
- Hewitt, Bernard. Theatre U. S. A. 1668-1957. New York: McGraw, 1959. 28-53.
- Humphreys, R. A. "The Rule of Law and the American Revolution." Law Quarterly Review (1937): 80-98. Rpt. in The Role of Ideology in the American Revolution. Ed. John R. Howe, Jr. San Francisco: Holt, 1970.
- Marble, Annie Russell. Heralds of American Literature. Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries P, 1967. 233-75.
- Marder, Daniel., ed. A Hugh Henry Brackenridge Reader: 1770-1815. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1970.
- . Hugh Henry Brackenridge. New York: Twayne, 1967.
- Meserve, Walter J. An Emerging Entertainment: The Drama of the American People to 1828. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1977.

- Moody, Richard. Introduction. The Glory of Columbia: Her Yeomanry! 1803. Dramas from the American Theatre: 1762-1909. Ed. Moody. Cleveland: World, 1966. 87-93.
- Mordden, Ethan. The American Theatre. New York: Oxford UP, 1981. 5-8.
- Morgan, Edmund S., et al., eds. The National Experience: A History of the United States. 5th ed. New York: Harcourt, 1981. 6-165.
- Moses, Montrose, J. The American Dramatist. Boston: Little, 1925. 4-76.
- Newlin, Claude Milton. The Life and Writings of Hugh Henry Brackenridge. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1932.
- Nicolay, Theresa Freda. Gender Roles, Literary Authority, and Three American Women Writers: Anne Dudley Bradstreet, Mercy Otis Warren, Margaret Fuller Ossoli. The Age Of Revolution and Romanticism. Interdisciplinary Studies 9. San Francisco: Lang, 1955.
- Pressman, Richard S. "Class Positioning and Shays' Rebellion: Resolving the Contradictions of The Contrast." Early American Literature 21 (1986): 87-102.
- Quinn, Arthur Hobson. A History of the American Drama: From the Beginning to the Civil War. New York: Harper, 1923.
- Richards, Jeffrey H. Mercy Otis Warren. New York, Twayne, 1995.
- Richardson, Gary A. American Drama from the Colonial Period through World War I: A Critical History. New York: Twayne, 1993.
- Rinehart, Lucy. "A Nation's 'Noble Spectacle': Royall Tyler's The Contrast as Metatheatrical Commentary." American Drama 3 (Spring 1994): 29-52.
- Robinson, Alice M. "Mercy Warren, Satirist of the Revolution." Women in American Theatre. Eds. Helen Krich Chinoy and Linda Walsh Jenkins. New York: Crown, 1981. 131-37.
- Seilhamer, George. O. History of the American Theatre: During the Revolution and After. Vol. 2. Philadelphia: Globe, 1889. New York: Blom, 1968.

- Silverman, Kenneth. A Cultural History of The American Revolution: Painting, Music, Literature, and the Theatre in the Colonies and the United States from the Treaty of Paris to the Inauguration of George Washington, 1763-1789. New York: Crowell, 1976.
- Tanselle, G. Thomas. Royall Tyler. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1967.
- Taubman, Howard. The Making of the American Theatre. Rev. ed. New York: Coward-McCann, 1967.
- Tyler, Royall. The Contrast: A Comedy in Five Acts. 1790. New York: AMS, 1970.
- Wallet, Francis G. Patriots, Loyalists, and Printers. Worcester, MA: American Antiquarian Society, 1976.
- Warren, Mercy Otis. The Group. 1775. The Plays and Poems of Mercy Otis Warren. Facsimile. Comp. Benjamin Franklin V. Delmar, NY: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1980.
- Wood, Gordon S. "Rhetoric and Reality in the American Revolution." Chicago Speech, Organization of American Historians. Chicago, Ap. 1967. Rpt. in The Role of Ideology in the American Revolution. Ed. John R. Howe, Jr. San Francisco: Holt, 1970.
- Wright, Esmond. Fabric of Freedom: 1763-1800. Rev. ed. New York: Hill, 1978.

Additional Works Consulted

- Anticaglia, Elizabeth. "Mercy Otis Warren." Twelve American Women. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1975.
- Baym, Nina. "Between Enlightenment and Victorian: Toward a Narrative of American Women Writers Writing History." Critical Inquiry 18 (Autumn 1991): 22-41.
- Brockett, Oscar G. History of the Theatre. 3rd ed. Boston: Allyn, 1977.
- Coad, Oral Sumner. William Dunlap: A Study of his Life and Works and of his Place in Contemporary Culture. New York: Russell, 1962.

- Dunlap, William. Diary of William Dunlap (1766-1839): The Memoirs of a Dramatist Theatrical Manager, Painter, Critic, Novelist, and Historian. The Collections of the New York Historical Society for the Year 1930. The John Watts DePeyster Publication Fund Series 1. 1930. New York: Blom, 1969.
- Faces of the Enemy. Dir. Jeffrey Friedman. Prod. Bill Jersey. Commentary by Sam Keen. Quest Productions, 1987.
- Fiske, John. The Critical Period of American History: 1783-1789. New York: Houghton, 1899.
- Hatch, Robert McConnel. Major John André: A Gallant in Spy's Clothing. Boston: Houghton, 1986.
- Hornblow, Arthur. A History of the Theatre in America from its Beginnings to the Present Time. 2 vols. 1919. New York: Blom, 1965.
- Howe, John R., Jr. The Role of Ideology in the American Revolution. San Francisco: Holt, 1970.
- Hughes, Glenn. A History of the American Theatre: 1700-1950. New York: Samuel French, 1950.
- Jameson, J. Franklin. The American Revolution Considered as a Social Movement. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1926.
- Kern, Jean B. "Mercy Otis Warren: Dramatist of the American Revolution." Curtain Calls: British and American Women and the Theater, 1660-1820. Eds. Mary Schofield and Cecilia Macheski. Athens: Ohio UP, 1991. 247-259.
- McKee, Thomas J. Introduction. The Contrast. 1887. New York: Franklin, 1970.
- Meserve, Walter J. An Outline History of American Drama. Totawa, NJ: Littlefield, 1965.
- Oreovicz, Cheryl. "Heroic Drama for an Uncertain Age: The Plays of Mercy Warren." Early American Literature and Culture: Essays Honoring Harrison T. Meserole. Ed. with and Intro. by Kathryn Zabelle Derounian-Stodola. Newark: U of Delaware P, 1992.
- . "Mercy Warren and 'Freedom's Genius.'" The University of Mississippi Studies in English 5 (1984-87): 215-30.

- Schlueter, June, ed. Modern American Drama: The Female Canon. Cranbury, NJ: Associated UP, 1990.
- Tassi, Aldo. The Political Philosophy of the American Revolution. Washington, D.C.: UP of America, 1978.
- Vaughn, Jack A. Early American Dramatists: From the Beginning to 1900. New York: Ungar, 1981.
- Wilson, Joan Hoff and Sharon L. Bollinger. "Mercy Otis Warren: Playwright, Poet, and Historian of the American Revolution." Female Scholars: A Tradition of Learned Women Before 1800. Ed. J. R. Brink. St. Albans, VT: Eden P, 1980. 161-182.
- Woloch, Nancy. Women and the American Experience. 2nd ed. San Francisco: McGraw, 1994. 70-89.
- Wright, Julia McNair. Patriot and Tory: One Hundred Years Ago. A Tale of Revolution. San Francisco: Bancroft, 1877.