

## **DISCOURSE CATEGORIES: A CASE FOR ENGLISH RESTORATION DRAMA**

**Olena Marina**

Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor,  
H. S. Skovoroda Kharkiv National Pedagogical University

[/http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2552-5623](http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2552-5623)

*In this article, the notions of discourse and discourse categories are considered within the framework of a cognitive-communicative paradigm. In particular, three groups of discourse categories: cognitive, communicative and metadiscursive are considered in this paper. The aim of this article is to single out specificities of the categories of the dramatic discourse of the English Restoration, therefore, the object of this paper is the dramatic discourse of the English Restoration, the subject – the categories of the dramatic discourse of the English Restoration. Within the group of cognitive discourse categories, I consider Restoration ideology and argue, that the institution of theatre and the dramatic discourse of the period became powerful means royal propaganda. I argue, that the dramatic discourse of the English Restoration performed two main functions: entertainment and dissemination of a new ideology. In this paper, I substantiate that the religious discourse of English Puritanism was replaced by the secular Restoration one. Within the group of cognitive categories, I also single out basic discourse-generative concepts of the dramatic discourse of the English Restoration. As to the group of communicative discourse categories, I focus on the values, chronotope, and the participants of the dramatic discourse of the English Restoration. I argue, that Restoration discourse disseminated libertine values such as licentiousness and debauchery. As to the chronotope of the dramatic discourse of the English Restoration, in this article, I state that the events in Restoration drama take place mostly in popular and familiar to both readers and viewers places of the London of the seventeenth century and discourse participants are mostly representatives of a wealthy upper middle class and the nobility. Within the group of metadiscursive discourse categories, I focus on the existing variety of genres inherent in the dramatic discourse of the English Restoration. **Key words:** discourse, discourse category, dramatic discourse, play, the English Restoration.*

## **ДО ПИТАННЯ КАТЕГОРІЙ ДИСКУРСУ В ДРАМАТУРГІЇ ЧАСІВ РЕСТАВРАЦІЇ СТЮАРТІВ**

**Маріна О.В.**

кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент,

Харківський національний педагогічний університет імені Г.С. Сковороди

*У статті поняття дискурсу та дискурсивних категорій розглянуто з позицій когнітивно-комунікативної парадигми. У цій науковій розвідці розглянуто три групи категорій дискурсу: когнітивні, комунікативні та метадискурсивні. Метою цієї статті є виокремлення особливостей категорій драматичного дискурсу англійської Реставрації, отже, об'єктом даної роботи є драматичний дискурс англійської Реставрації, предметом – категорії драматичного дискурсу англійської Реставрації. У групі когнітивних категорій дискурсу я розглядаю ідеологію періоду Реставрації Стюартів і стверджую, що інститут театру і драматичний дискурс означеного періоду стали потужними засобами поширення королівської пропаганди. Я стверджую, що драматичний дискурс часів Реставрації Стюартів виконував дві основні функції: розваги та розповсюдження нової ідеології. У цій статті доведено, що релігійний дискурс англійського пуританства поступився світському дискурсу часів Реставрації Стюартів. Також у групі когнітивних категорій дискурсу виділено дискурсоутворюючі концепти драматичного дискурсу часів Реставрації Стюартів. Щодо комунікативних категорій дискурсу, у межах цієї групи я фокусує увагу на цінностях,*

*хронотопі та учасниках драматичного дискурсу часів Реставрації Стюартів. У цій статті я стверджую, що у драматичному дискурсі часів Реставрації Стюартів поширювалися лібертінські цінності, такі як розпуста і дебоширство. Що стосується хронотопу драматичного дискурсу часів Реставрації Стюартів, у цій статті я стверджую, що події у драмі часів Реставрації Стюартів відбуваються здебільшого у популярних і знайомих читачам і глядачам місцях Лондона сімнадцятого століття, а учасниками дискурсу є здебільшого представники заможного верхнього прошарку середнього класу і дворянства. У групі метадискурсивних категорій я фокусує увагу на існуючому розмаїтті жанрів, притаманних драматичному дискурсу часів Реставрації Стюартів.*

**Ключові слова:** дискурс, категорія дискурсу, драматичний дискурс, п'єса, Реставрація Стюартів.

**Introduction.** In modern linguistics there is no consensus of opinions as to the interpretation of the notions of ‘discourse’ and ‘discourse categories’, which still remain in the focus of attention of linguists. In this article, I view the dramatic discourse of the English Restoration within the framework of a cognitive-communicative paradigm and its categories – as “a unity of cognitive, communicative and metacommunicative phenomena” (Shevchenko, 2015: 28). **The aim** of this article is to single out specificities of the categories of the dramatic discourse of the English Restoration, therefore, the object of this paper is the dramatic discourse of the English Restoration, the subject – the categories of the dramatic discourse of the English Restoration. In this article, I use **methods** of discourse analysis (Gee, 1999; van Dyck & Kintsch, 1983) and method of cognitive-discursive interpretation (Bondarenko et al., 2017). The study also applied elements of history of theatre (Keenan, 2016) and literary criticism (Hume, 1972; Zimbardo, 1998) approaches. In this article, the analysis of discourse categories is illustrated with the examples from the four English Restoration plays: “The Country Wife” by W. Wycherley, “The Mulberry Garden” by Ch. Sedley, “The Relapse; or Virtue in Dancer” by J. Vanbrugh and “The Rover” by A. Behn.

**Results and discussion. Discourse within the framework of a cognitive-communicative paradigm.** The conception chosen as the basis for our research was originally offered by Foucault (1972) who considers discourse as ‘a social practice’ and Fetzer (2014: 35) who elaborates it and states that “discourse plays a constitutive part in the constitution and distribution of knowledge, and therefore is of great importance to the processes of social inclusion and social exclusion”. Discourse is the object of discourse analysis which, in its turn: assumes a dialectical relationship between particular discursive acts and the situations, institutions and social structures in which they are embedded: the situational, institutional and social contexts shape and affect discourse, and, in turn, discourses influence social and political reality. In other words, discourse constitutes social practice and is at the same time constituted by it (Wodak, 2009: 8).

Kubriakova (2012: 65) mentions that every phenomenon should be studied from two perspectives: cognitive and communicative (discursive). When considering a certain phenomenon from a cognitive perspective one should analyze its role in cognitive processes, in recording and storage of human experience in comprehension of reality (that is in the acts of attention and imagination, solving problems in humans’ mental activity as they get to know the world etc.). In studying a phenomenon from a

communicative point of view the researcher's attention is drawn to its involvement in the acts of human communication and its role in discursive activity, including the aspect of generation of different types of texts.

In this article, I understand the term 'discourse' after Bondarenko, Martyniuk, Frolova, and Shevchenko as "a multi-aspect cognitive-communicative-linguistic system-gestalt, which is predetermined by the unity of three aspects: formation of ideas and beliefs (a cognitive aspect), interaction of communicants in certain social and cultural contexts/situations (a social and pragmatic aspect) and usage of verbal and paraverbal signs (a linguistic aspect)" (Bondarenko et al., 2017: 115-116). In this paper, I adopt the approach to the analysis of discourse categories offered by Shevchenko (2015: 28), who argues that a category is "the broadest fundamental concept that reflects the most essential, natural connections and relationships between reality and cognition". The scholar singles out three groups of discourse categories: 1) cognitive categories which include cohesion and informativity; 2) communicative categories which reveal social aspects and pragmatics of communication; 3) metadiscursive categories that match structural characteristics of discourse (Shevchenko, 2015).

### **Categories of the dramatic discourse of the English Restoration**

#### **Cognitive categories of the dramatic discourse of the English Restoration**

The advent of Charles II to the throne took place in 1660. The king, who spent many years in exile, longed to recompense it with lavish entertainments. The period of English Restoration witnessed "the outpouring of court-oriented cultural activity" (Walkling, 2001: 231) as the king used all methods to reestablish himself as an absolute monarch, therefore, the 1660s witnessed "a variety of courtly modes" (Walkling, 2001: 231). Cultural forms were used as a royal propaganda, and a particular role in it was attributed to playhouses as "the stage acted both as mirror and model-reflecting social reality and establishing patterns that the people of London would imitate" (Botica, 1985: 399).

During the Restoration the Court Wits, the king's friends and favourites, began writing plays and competed for publicity and popularity with professional men-of-letters (Dharwadker, 1997) thus disseminating the new ideology of hedonism and libertinism in their plays. With the return of the king "the religious discourse was displaced with a secular one" (González-Treviño, 2013: 98). I side with Love (1980: 39) who argues that royal aristocratic patrons directly influenced various aspects of theatrical activity, including management, the cast of plays, and repertoire popularizing a libertine style of life. Therefore, I conclude that the dramatic discourse of the English Restoration performed two main functions: entertainment and dissemination of a new ideology (Arena, 2017; Summers, 1934).

There are basic discourse-generative concepts in the dramatic discourse of the English Restoration. Schneider (1971) singles out such concepts as: GENEROSITY; LIBERALITY; AVARICE; COURAGE; COWARDICE; PLAIN-DEALING; DOUBLE-DEALING; LOVE; SELF-LOVE. For example, concept LOVE received a new interpretation during the period of English Restoration. Fidelity was no longer in fashion, and ladies and gentlemen spent time in pursuit of love and pleasures. They easily changed partners and enjoyed frivolous affairs:

*Sparkish: I love to be envied and would not marry a Wife that I alone could love. Loving alone is as dull as eating alone (Villiers et al., 1953: 26)*

In other studies, Restoration discourse was dominated by LIBERTINISM Webster (2005), the examples of which are abundant in the play “The Mulberry Garden” by Ch. Sedley:

*Estridge. ...Iack Wildish sent for a dozen more of Champagne  
And a Brace of such Girls, as we shouldn't have  
Made Honourable Love to, in any other  
Place... ” (Sedley, 1668).*

However, Zimbardo (1998: 3) adds TRADE, SCIENCE, and EMPIRE to the list of basic concepts of the dramatic discourse of the English Restoration. The scholar argues, that on the whole, Restoration discourse represents a dialectic unity of different vectors.

### **Communicative categories in the dramatic discourse of the English Restoration: values, participants, and chronotope**

The new ideological paradigm that arose with the return of Charles II quite predictably led to the change in **the system of values**. The king who spent much time in asperities during the Interregnum longed to reestablish his power and enjoy the pleasures of life. After the limitations imposed by Puritanism, freedoms of the English Restoration were welcomed and encouraged. Therefore, it is possible to make a conclusion that Restoration theatre-going public represented a society that questioned its values (Neagle, 1989). As a result, in the dramatic discourse of the English Restoration wit, brilliance and immorality are present to a degree seldom matched elsewhere (Krutch, 1924). Scholars (Webster, 2005; Krutch 1924) single out values that predominated in the dramatic discourse of the English Restoration: puritan values of chastity and fidelity were replaced with **libertine values**, such as licentiousness and debauchery. The first one was fostered by both sexes, however, in variant degrees. As Krutch (1924) argues, at the time of the English Restoration a faithful wife or a virtuous lady were deemed exceptions. So is the case with Restoration plays, where women were ready for mischief and infidelity. This argument can be illustrated with an excerpt from the play “The Relapse; or Virtue in Dancer” by J. Vanbrugh.

*BERINTHIA: ...Besides, faith, I begin to fancy there may be as much pleasure in carrying on another body's intrigue as one's own. This at least is certain, it exercises almost all the entertaining faculties of a woman: for there's employment for hypocrisy, invention, deceit, flattery, mischief, and lying. (Villiers et al., 1953: 460-461)*

As for the male characters of English Restoration plays, despite the fact that the pursuit of women was one of their main activities, marriage was “the most dreaded calamity”, and only men, who were deeply in love, were ready to agree to it (Krutch, 1924: 5):

*MILLAMANT. Ay, as wife, spouse, my dear, joy, jewel, love, sweet-heart, and the rest of that nauseous cant in which men and their wives are so fulsomely familiar – I shall never bear that<...>Let us never visit together, nor go to a play together, but let us be very strange and well bred: let us be as strange as if we had been married a*

*great while; and as well bred as if we were not married at all.* (Villiers et al., 1953: 568-569)

Dobrée (1924: 20) argues, that promiscuous sexual liaisons and aversion to marriage could be explained with the fact that the English Restoration was “an age of inquiry and curiosity”, the time of experimentation with social roles and models of behavior. Women wanted as much sexual freedom as men. The main character of the play “The Country Wife” by William Wycherley, Horner, informs the readers of it at the very beginning of the play:

*HORNER...And the next thing is, your women of honour, as you call 'em, are only chary of their reputations, not their persons; and 'tis scandal they would avoid, not men...* (Villiers et al., 1953: 65)

Another example in support of this observation can be derived from the play “The Rover” by Aphra Behn. When Hellena negotiates conditions of her marriage with her fiancée, she openly declares her intention to be unfaithful. Moreover, she realizes that her future husband hopes for the same:

*HELLENA: Well, I see our business as well as humours are alike: yours to cozen as many maids as will trust you, and I as many men as have faith.* (Behn, 1995: 55)

Licentiousness that manifested itself in infidelity was openly opposed to virtue. Berinthia, the main character of the play by Sir John Vanbrugh “The Relapse; or Virtue in Dancer”, says that infidelity is an inherent part of marriage:

*BERINTHIA: True, and therefore I think 'tis a presumptuous thing in a woman to assume the name of virtuous till she has heartily hated her husband and been soundly in love with somebody else, whom if she has withstood – then – much good may it do her!* (Villiers et al., 1953: 460)

Despite the fact that women had affairs too, they still did it by stealth due to the necessity to support their reputation in public. One of the main female characters of the play by Ch. Sedley “The Mulberry Garden”, Althea, explains, that if women did it openly, they would be condemned:

*Althea. ...The Horse may shake the Rider from his back,  
The Dog his hated Master may forsake;  
Yet nothing of their native worth impair,  
Nor any conscious sting about them bear.  
But if a Virgin an Escape contrive,  
She must for ever in dishonour live,  
Condemn'd within her self, despis'd of all,  
Into worse mischiefs then she fled from, fall.  
Duty commands I shou'd Horatio wed,  
Love does as strongly for Eugenio plead...* (Sedley, 1668).

Debauchery became another value disseminated in the dramatic discourse of the English Restoration. Krutch (1924, 2) notes, that during this period debauchery was popularized as a philosophy. Neagle (1989: 9) speaks in support of this fact and emphasizes “an exceedingly bad” moral code of the dramatic discourse of that time. The excerpt from the play “The Man of Mode; Or, Sir Fopling Flutter” by George Etherege vividly demonstrates this observation:

*SIR FOPLING. By heavens, and so it is! I have sat up so damned late and drunk so cursed hard since I came to this lewd town, that I am fit for nothing but low dancing now – a courante, a bourrée, or a menuet. But St. André tells me, if I will but be regular, in one month I shall rise again. Pox on this debauchery! Villiers et al., 1953: 213)*

Quite often dramatists summarized the values of the new discourse immediately in the prologues to their plays. So is the case with “The Rover” by Aphra Behn:

*New plays are stuffed with wits, and with debauches... (Behn, 1995: 4)*

Besides, characters of English Restoration plays ardently promote new values by constantly mentioning that they themselves adhere to them. Thus, the main character of the play “The Relapse; or Virtue in Dancer” by J. Vanbrugh describes his daily routine in such a way:

**Lord Foppington:** ... *Far example, Madam, my life; my life, Madam, is a perpetual stream of pleasure, that glides through such a variety of entertainments I believe the wisest of our ancestors never had the least conception of any of 'em... (Villiers et al., 1953: 439)*

**Lord Foppington:** ... *Between eating my dinner, and washing my mauth, ladies, I spend my time till I go to the play, where, till nine a'clock, I entertain myself with looking upon the company; and usually dispose of one hour more in leading 'em out. So there's twelve of the four-and-twenty pretty well over. The other twelve, Madam, are disposed of in two articles: in the first four I toast myself drunk, and in t'other eight I sleep myself sober again. Thus, ladies, you see my life is an eternal raund of delights. (Villiers et al., 1953: 439)*

All in all, the morals were low, and modesty was no longer in fashion. The main character of the play “The Mulberry Garden” by Ch. Sedley, Forecast, says that young ladies can no longer learn anything virtuous in town:

**Forecast.** ... *I see nothing they can  
Learn here but vanity. (Sedley, 1668)*

**Forecast.** *What do you count it nothing, to be all  
Day abroad, to live more in their Coach  
Than at home, and if they chance to keep  
The House an Afternoon, to have the Yard  
Full of Sedans, the Hall full of Footmen  
And Pages, and their Chambers cover'd all over  
With Feathers and Ribands, dancing and playing  
At Cards with 'um till morning. (Sedley, 1668)*

Moreover, one of the most radical shifts in the system of values of the English Restoration manifests itself in the fact that in its dramatic discourse actions and views of the wrong-doer found sympathy and support rather than disapproval of the public. Neagle (1989: 7) argues that all means were “fair in an armorous intrigue” and the English Restoration was the time when a dashing man who made a husband a cuckold was treated like a hero.

In this article, I argue, that dissipated behavior and debauchery were a reaction against rigid limitations imposed by the Puritan ideology that had lasted for 18 years and with the change of discourse religious values were replaced by circular ones.

The **participants** of the dramatic discourse of the English Restoration are mostly men and women of the upper middle class and the nobility. They are people who are rich enough to lead a life that is carefree and full of pleasures. These ladies and gentlemen welcomed the changes and the stage and the halls of the royal palace were full of stories of sexual liaisons and cuckoldry (Styan, 1986). The conclusion as to the social status of the participants of the dramatic discourse of the English Restoration can be drawn from the analysis of the characters' titles and ranks: 'Don', 'viceroy', 'Colonel', 'cavalier':

*HELLENA. That blush betrays you. I am sure 'tis so – or is it Don Antonio the viceroy's son? – Or perhaps the rich Don Vincentio, whom my father designs you for a husband? – Why do you blush again? (Behn, 1995: 7)*

*PEDRO. I know not how dear I am to you, but I wish only to be ranked in your esteem, equal with the English Colonel Belvile. Why do you frown and blush? Is there any guilt belongs to the name of that cavalier? (Behn, 1995: 10)*

Restoration drama reflected social changes and featured characters that both viewers and readers could observe in their everyday life and quite often were copied from the audience. George Etherege states that in the epilogue to the play "The Man of Mode; Or, Sir Fopling Flutter":

*Most modern wits such monstrous fools have shown,  
They seem'd not of heav'n's making, but their own.  
Those nauseous harlequins in farce may pass,  
But there goes more to a substantial ass.  
Something of man must be expos'd to view*

*That, gallants, they may more resemble you (Villiers et al., 1953: 242)*

There are such participants of the dramatic discourse of English Restoration as: "wits, gallants, braves, and fops" (Botica 1985: 81). In the excerpt below the characters of Restoration plays mention such personalities among their acquaintances:

*DORIMANT: He has no more excellence in his heels than in his head. He went to Paris a plain, bashful English blockhead, and is returned a fine undertaking French fop. (Villiers et al., 1953: 213).*

Hume (1972) adds "a country lass" to this list, while Corman (2000) mentions "blocking parents". From the excerpt below it becomes clear that the elder brother informs his sister about their father's will as to her marriage with an old man. In this example the 'blocking' characters are both father and son:

*PEDRO. Good morrow, sister. Pray, when saw you your lover Don Vincentio?*

*FLORINDA. I know not, sir. – Callis, when was he here? For I consider it so little, I know not when it was.*

*PEDRO. I have a command from my father here, to tell you ought not to despise him, a man of so vast a fortune, and such a passion for you. – Stephano, my things.*

*Puts on his masquing habit*

*FLORINDA. A passion for me! 'Tis more than e'er I saw, or he had a desire should be known. I hate Vincentio, sir, and I would not have a man so dear to me as my brother follow the ill customs of our country and make a slave of his sister. – And sir, my father's will, I am sure you may divert. (Behn, 1995: 9-10)*

Cuckolds become important and popular characters of Restoration drama as objects of ridicule and satire (Corman 2000):

*HORNER. ... His company is as troublesome to us as a cuckold's when you have a mind to his wife's. (Villiers et al., 1953: 67)*

There are also cast mistresses, unhappy wives, gay couples, smart and helpful servants (Corman 2000):

*CALLIS. What, go in masquerade? 'Twill be a fine farewell to the world, I take it. Pray what would you do there? <...>*

*FLORINDA. Callis, will you give us leave to go?*

*CALLIS. (Aside)*

*I have a youthful itch of going myself (Behn, 1995: 14)*

I argue, that to this far from being complete list it is possible to add flirts, coquettes, coxcombs, bawds:

*MEDLEY: The most noted coquette in town, Beware of her (Villiers et al., 1953: 211).*

*PINCHWIFE. (aside) I have been detained by a sparkish coxcomb, who pretended a visit to me; but I fear 'twas my wife – What, have you done? (Villiers et al., 1953:116)*

*FAINALL. Why then Foible's a bawd, an arrant, rank, match-making bawd. (Villiers et al., 1953: 561)*

The playwrights created recognizable characters the prototypes of which either frequented playhouses or were well known to the general public (Botica, 1985).

The events in the dramatic discourse of the English Restoration take place in the London of the seventeenth century and are set in the popular places of that period, such as coffee-houses, the Mall, the Park, Mulberry Garden etc. and in the main characters' drawing-rooms – these are the main characteristics of the **chronotope** of the dramatic discourse of the English Restoration. Botica (1985: 9) mentions, that “Caroline plays <...> had begun the business of presenting on stage the new attractions and public areas of London”. The excerpts from the play “The Mulberry Garden” by Ch. Sedley and “The Country Wife” by W. Wycherley support this observation:

*Estridge. ...he swears hee'l n'er stir*

*Beyond Hide-Park or Colebys at farthest,*

*As long as he has an Acre left...” (Sedley, 1668)*

*Estridge. These Country Ladys for the first month*

*Take up their places in the Mulberry Garden,*

*As early as Citizens Wife at a new Play. (Sedley, 1668)*

*SPARKISH. Said I, I know where the best new sign is. – Where? Says one of the ladies. – In Covent Garden, I replied. – Said another, In what street? – In Russel Street, answered I... (Villiers et al., 1953: 68)*

It is possible to make a conclusion that the participants of the dramatic discourse of the English Restoration are heterogeneous though the majority of them belong to upper-middle class and high society; the events reflected in it mostly take place in well-known and popular places of the London of the seventeenth century.



### **The metadiscursive category of genre in the dramatic discourse of the English Restoration.**

After the official renewal of theatrical activity Killigrew and D'avenant, the two main theatre managers and official patentees, had doubts as to what repertoire had to be restored and what new plays had to be created (Nettleton, 2017). There is no consensus of opinions as to the degree of native and foreign influence on the formation of the dramatic production of English Restoration. Dobrée, (1924: 47) argues, that Restoration drama was formed under the influence of the English writers of the past and therefore, was essentially a native product: "Restoration comedy can claim legitimate descent from our own earlier plays". Corman (2000: 55) mentions "the practice of Fletcher, Jonson, and other pre-Restoration English playwrights" and Nettleton (2017) names prolific adaptations and revivals of the plays by Shakespeare, Beaumont, Fletcher, and Jonson among major influences.

Despite the fact that the majority of scholars (Corman, 2000; Hume, 1972; Nettleton, 2017; Scouten & Hume, 1980) emphasize the predominantly native, English, nature of Restoration drama, they still acknowledge French and Spanish contribution in the formation of the theatrical production of the English Restoration. In particular, Corman (2000) cites the influence of a Spanish comedy and works by Calderon. The Spanish influence manifested itself in the fact that issues of love and honour were raised in the domestic sphere, and a fashion for sword plays in the dramatic works was started, while Nettleton (2017) mentions occasional introduction of Spanish characters and scenes.

When King Charles II and his cavaliers returned from exile in France, they brought French ideas, plots, and dramatic canons to England. Numerous translations, adaptations, and imitations of French authors enjoyed popularity at the time (Nettleton, 2017). In particular, the English dramatic tradition felt the influence of Molière, Corneille, Racine, La Calprenède, Madeleine de Scudéry and others (ibid.). Arena (2017) argues that the French influence brought cynicism and epicureanism into Restoration drama.

The dramatic discourse of the English Restoration is characterized by a completely new genre that appeared in this period – "a society comedy" or "comedy of manners" (Krutch, 1924: 2). I argue, that this particular genre may serve as "an umbrella term" encompassing all the subgenres of Restoration plays. As the dramatic discourse of English Restoration was formed at the intersection of two paradigms, the religious, Puritan one, and the secular, Restoration paradigm, as well as under the influence of native, French and Spanish dramatic traditions, it is characterized by simultaneous functioning of a great number of genres and their combinations. Among them the scholars single out: a 'wit' comedy, a serious court or romantic tragicomedy, a comedy of London low life, a Spanish romance, a serious intrigue comedy, a serious intrigue tragicomedy, an intrigue-farce, a Pseudo-Spanish intrigue comedy, a romantic intrigue comedy, a heroic, double plot tragicomedy, a satirical city comedy, a farcial city comedy (Hume, 1972), a heroic romance, a political tragedy, a personal tragedy Canfield (2000), a libertine sex-comedy (Scouten & Hume, 1980), heroic drama

(Nettleton, 2017). I argue, that the list of genres and their combinations in this period is unprecedented and can be continued.

Thus, although in variant degrees, English Restoration drama was formed under the influence of native, French and Spanish forces. The dramatic discourse of the English Restoration is characterized by a great variety of genres.

**Conclusion.** Being both an instrument and shaper of ideology, Restoration theatre produced a discourse that unprecedentedly blurred the difference between reality and fiction; its concepts being a reflection of imperialistic ambitions of royal absolutism, while Restoration drama revealed its readers'/viewers' concerns about local, domestic issues which required recapitulation in connection with the change of the ideological paradigm. Therefore, the dramatic discourse of the English Restoration is devoid of deep philosophical issues. It disseminates libertine values and offers new models of behavior. The participants of the dramatic discourse of the English Restoration are mostly wealthy representatives of a high society whose main occupations include pursuit of love and other pleasures of life. The English Restoration drama absorbed many native and foreign traditions and produced an extremely diverse repertoire, which reflects both instability of the audiences' tastes during the period and the authors' search of new success formulas.

### **Bibliography**

- Бондаренко Е. В., Мартынюк А. П., Фролова И. Е., Шевченко И. С. Как нарисовать портрет птицы: методология когнитивно-коммуникативного анализа языка: коллективная монография / под. ред. И. С. Шевченко. Харьков: ХНУ имени В.Н. Каразина, 2017. 246 с.
- Кубрякова Е. С. В поисках сущности языка: Когнитивные исследования. Ин-т языкознания РАН. М.: Знак, 2012. 208 с.
- Arena, T. F. *Masking the drama: A space for revolution in Aphra Behn's "The Rover" and "The Feign'd Courtezans"*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2017. 184 p.
- Behn, A. *The Rover*. ed. By R. Bolam. London: A&C Black, 1995. 126 p.
- Botica, A. R. *Audience, playhouse and play in Restoration theatre, 1660–1710*. PhD Thesis. Oxford: The University of Oxford, 1985. 433p.
- Corman, B. *Comedy*. In D.P. Fisk (Ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to English Restoration Theatre*. Cambridge, 2000. P. 52-69.
- Dharwadker, A. *Class, Authorship, and the Social Intertexture of Genre in Restoration Theater*. *Studies in English Literature, Restoration and Eighteenth Century 1500-1900*, 1997. Vol. 37, № 3. P. 461-482.
- Dobrée, B. *Restoration Comedy 1660-1720*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924. 188 p.
- Fetzer A. *Conceptualizing discourse*. In Schneider K.P., Barron A. (Eds.) *Pragmatics of Discourse*. Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter GmbH, 2014. P.35-64.
- Foucault, M. *The Archaeology of Knowledge and Discourse on Language* / Transl. from French. New York: Pantheon Books, 1972. 245p.
- Gee, J. P. (1999). *An Introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and Method*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- González-Treviño, A. E. "Kings and their crowns": Signs of monarchy and the spectacle of new world otherness in heroic drama and public pageantry. *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture*. 2013. Vol. 42. P. 103-121.  
DOI:10.1353/sec.2013.0003.
- Hume, R. D. *Diversity and Development in Restoration Comedy 1660-1679*. *Eighteenth-Century Studies*. 1972. Vol. 5, № 3. P. 365-397.
- Keenan, T. (2016). *Restoration staging, 1660-74*. London, England: Routledge. 234 p.

- Krutch, J. W. Comedy and conscience after the Restoration. New York: Columbia University Press, 1924. 300 p.
- Love, H. Who Were the Restoration Audience? *The Yearbook of English Studies*, Vol. 10, Literature and Its Audience. 1980. I Special Number. P. 21-44.
- Neagle, R. C. The Restoration theater world and the plays of William Wycherley: Unpublished doctoral dissertation / Loyola University of Chicago, 1989. 273 p.
- Nettleton, G. H. English drama of the Restoration and eighteenth century (1642-1780). New York: The Macmillan Company. (Classic Reprint) Forgotten Books, 2017. 386 p.
- Schneider, B. N. The ethos of Restoration comedy. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1971, 201 p.
- Scouten, A. H. & Hume, R. D. 'Restoration Comedy' and Its Audiences, 1660-1776. *The Yearbook of English Studies*, Vol. 10, *Literature and Its Audience*, I Special Number (1980). P. 45-69
- Sedley, Ch. The mulberry-garden a comedy: as it is acted by His Majestie's servants at the Theatre-Royal. London: H. Heringman, 1668, <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A59056.0001.001?view=toc>, accessed 15 March 2021.
- Shevchenko, I. Discourse Categories: A Case for Metacommunication. In: *Materials of the XI conference "Proceedings of Academic Science" Aug 30 – Sept 7. 2015*. Vol 51. Sheffield: Science and Education Ltd, P. 28-33. [http://doi.org/10.17686/sced\\_rusnauka\\_2015-1758](http://doi.org/10.17686/sced_rusnauka_2015-1758)
- Styan, J. L. Restoration Comedy in Performance. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986. 287 p.
- Summers, M. The Restoration theatre. London: K. Paul, Tench, Trubner & Co, 1934. 420 p.
- The discursive construction of national identity (2nd ed.) / Wodak, R. et al. Edinburgh University Press, 2009. 288 p.
- Van Dijk, T.A., & Kintsch, W. (1983). *Strategies of discourse comprehension*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Villiers G., Wycherley, W., Etherege, G., Dryden, J., Otway, T., Vanbrugh, J., ... Farquhar, G. *Restoration Plays*. H. Bruce (Ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, 1953. 674 p.
- Walkling, A. R. (2001). Court Culture and 'Absolutism' in Restoration England. *The Court Historian*, 6(3), 225-233.  
DOI: 10.1179/cou.2001.6.3.003
- Webster, J. W. Performing libertinism in Charles II's court: Politics, drama, sexuality. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. 260 p.
- Zimbaro, R. A. At zero point: Discourse, culture, and satire in Restoration England. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 1998. 208 p.

## References

- Bondarenko E. B., Martyniuk A. P., Frolova I. E. Shevchenko I. S. (2017). *Kak narisovat portret ptitsy: metodologiya kognitivno-kommunikativnogo analiza yazyka: kollektivnaia monografiia [How to paint a portrait of a bird: methodology of a cognitive-communicative analysis: a collective monography]* / pod. red. I. S. Shevchenko. KhNU imeni V.N. Karazina.
- Kubriakova E. S. (2012). *V Poiskakh Sushchnosti Iazyka: Kognitivnye issledovaniia [In search of nature of a language: Cognitive research]*. In-t iazykoznaniiia RAN. Znak.
- Arena, T. F. (2017). *Masking the drama: A space for revolution in Aphra Behn's "The Rover" and "The Feign'd Courtezans"*. Peter Lang.
- Behn, A. *The Rover*. (1995). ed. By R. Bolam. A&C Black.
- Botica, A. R. (1985). *Audience, playhouse and play in Restoration theatre, 1660–1710*. PhD Thesis. The University of Oxford.
- Corman, B. (2000). Comedy. In D.P. Fisk (Ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to English Restoration Theatre*. Cambridge University Press. 52-69.

- Dharwadker, A. (1997). Class, Authorship, and the Social Intertexture of Genre in Restoration Theater. *Studies in English Literature, Restoration and Eighteenth Century 1500-1900*, 37(3). 461-482.
- Dobrée, B. (1924). *Restoration Comedy 1660-1720*. Clarendon Press.
- Fetzer A. (2014). Conceptualizing discourse. In Schneider K.P., Barron A. (Eds.) *Pragmatics of Discourse*. Walter de Gruyter GmbH, 35-64.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge and Discourse on Language* / Transl. from French. Pantheon Books.
- Gee, J. P. (1999). *An Introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and Method*. Routledge.
- González-Treviño, A. E. (2013). "Kings and their crowns": Signs of monarchy and the spectacle of new world otherness in heroic drama and public pageantry. *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture*, 42. 103-121.  
DOI:10.1353/sec.2013.0003.
- Hume, R. D. (1972). Diversity and Development in Restoration Comedy 1660-1679. *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 5(3). 365-397. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2737835>
- Keenan, T. (2016). *Restoration staging, 1660-74*. Routledge.
- Krutch, J. W. (1924). *Comedy and conscience after the Restoration*. Columbia University Press.
- Love, H. (1980). Who Were the Restoration Audience? *The Yearbook of English Studies*, 10, Literature and Its Audience. I Special Number. 21-44.
- Neagle, R. C. (1989). *The Restoration theater world and the plays of William Wycherley*: Unpublished doctoral dissertation / Loyola University of Chicago.
- Nettleton, G. H. (2017). *English drama of the Restoration and eighteenth century (1642-1780)*. The Macmillan Company.
- Schneider, B. N. (1971). *The ethos of Restoration comedy*. University of Illinois Press.
- Scouten, A. H. & Hume, R. D. (1980). 'Restoration Comedy' and Its Audiences, 1660-1776. *The Yearbook of English Studies*, 10, Literature and Its Audience, I Special Number. 45-69.
- Sedley, Ch. (1668). The mulberry-garden a comedy: as it is acted by His Majestie's servants at the Theatre-Royal. London: H. Heringman. URL: <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A59056.0001.001?view=toc>, (accessed 15 March, 2021).
- Shevchenko, I. Discourse Categories: A Case for Metacommunication. (2015). In: *Materials of the XI conference "Proceedings of Academic Science" Aug 30 – Sept 7*. 51. Science and Education Ltd, 28-33. [http://doi.org/10.17686/sced\\_rusnauka\\_2015-1758](http://doi.org/10.17686/sced_rusnauka_2015-1758)
- Styan, J. L. (1986). *Restoration Comedy in Performance*. Cambridge University Press.
- Summers, M. (1934). *The Restoration theatre*. K. Paul, Tench, Trubner & Co.
- The discursive construction of national identity* (2nd ed.) (2009). Ed. by Wodak, R. et al. Edinburgh University Press.
- Van Dijk, T.A., & Kintsch, W. (1983). *Strategies of discourse comprehension*. Academic Press.
- Villiers G., Wycherley, W., Etherege, G., Dryden, J., Otway, T., Vanbrugh, J., ... Farquhar, G. (1953). *Restoration Plays*. H. Bruce (Ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Walkling, A. R. (2001). Court Culture and 'Absolutism' in Restoration England. *The Court Historian*, 6(3), 225-233. DOI: 10.1179/cou.2001.6.3.003
- Webster, J. W. (2005). *Performing libertinism in Charles II's court: Politics, drama, sexuality*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Zimbaro, R. A. (1998). *At zero point: Discourse, culture, and satire in Restoration England*. University Press of Kentucky.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 30.04.2021 р.