

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE STAGE HISTORY OF
SHAKESPEARE'S TEMPEST,
1667-1838

A thesis presented in partial
fulfilment of the requirements of the
degree of Master of Arts in
English at Massey University

JEREMY A. BALLANTYNE
1973

- To my family -

ABSTRACT: THE STAGE HISTORY OF SHAKESPEARE'S

TEMPEST, 1667-1838.

After the theatres were re-opened in England at the Restoration, there were many adaptations made of Shakespeare's plays, and this was a common occurrence throughout the eighteenth century, lasting to Victorian times. It was only in the middle of the nineteenth century that Shakespeare began to be appreciated in the original form.

The Tempest was one play that suffered many changes. Sir William Davenant and John Dryden collaborated in the first alteration of 1667, and their version is noteworthy because their changes were to a great extent retained by subsequent adapters. Pandering to a neo-classical desire for artistic symmetry, Davenant, the major contributor, and Dryden paired several of the major characters. To complement the lovers (Miranda and Ferdinand), they added Dorinda (Miranda's younger sister) and Hippolito, who had never seen a woman, to be her mate. Caliban was given a sister, Sycorax, who has eyes for Trinculo (sic), and for Ariel, a female spirit called Milcha was created. Other changes in the dramatis personae are minor. The Restoration Tempest is full of farcical situations which stem from the lovers' naivety and the grotesque antics of the low comedy characters. The masque of Juno, protectress of marriage, in Shakespeare's Act IV has been cut, and altogether the effect of the original vanishes, the new play being much coarser.

In 1674, an operatic version of the Restoration Tempest was published, probably written by Thomas Shadwell. This was basically Dryden and Davenant's play, though many songs were added. An elaborate masque of Neptune and Amphitrite was added towards the end, though it is hard to associate these characters with the ending of the play. Throughout the play there was much opportunity for spectacle and the use of mechanical contrivances.

From 1747, when David Garrick became the manager of the Drury Lane Theatre, many of Shakespeare's plays were given a new look. Shadwell's operatic Tempest had been a long-running success, and in 1756 Garrick turned it into a three-act opera. This incorporated thirty-two songs, only three of which were Shakespeare's, and little regard was paid to the original text. It was a failure and Garrick repudiated authorship of it. In 1757 he reverted to a version that was much closer to Shakespeare's than any other before it. Among the 400 or more lines that Garrick omitted, however, were several intensely poetic passages.

John Philip Kemble's Tempest of 1789, which used just the bare outline of the original plot, was merely a vehicle for the presentation of a number of songs, and was poorly received by critics who had begun to clamour for real Shakespeare, not a hybrid version of him. Kemble's next attempt to produce the play was in 1806, when he tried to combine the original and the Restoration versions.

The last appearance of the Dryden-Davenant Tempest was in 1821 when Frederic Reynolds produced it, but it was greeted with acrid criticism. William Charles Macready restored Shakespeare's original to the stage in 1838; and even though his interpretation catered for the visual impact more than for the poetry, his version was the first serious attempt for over a century and a half to present the unadulterated Tempest to English theatre-goers.

Apart from detailing and commenting on the above changes, I have given several reasons for them, namely the adapters' endeavours to cater for contemporary taste and opinions, the neo-classical desire for symmetry, eighteenth century pragmatism, and the popularity of opera and of spectacle.

CONTENTS

Introduction	p.1
Chapter 1: Sir William Davenant and John Dryden . . .	p.10
Chapter 2: Thomas Shadwell.	p.32
Chapter 3: David Garrick.	p.43
Chapter 4: J.P. Kemble and W.C. Macready.	p.54
Chapter 5: Some Conclusions	p.66
Bibliography	p.72

INTRODUCTION

"Shakespeare's Magick could not copied be,
Within that circle none durst walk but he."

- John Dryden, Prologue to The Tempest, 1670.

Shakespeare's Tempest was first performed on November 1st, 1611, and was probably written during that same year. It was staged "by the Kings players: Hallowmas nyght was presented att Whithall before ye kinges Maiestie a play Called the Tempest." (1) Another performance, cited in the Chamber Account, was in 1613, when the play was one of "fowerteene" presented "before the Princes Highnes the Lady Elizabeth and the Prince Pallatyne Elector", (2) to celebrate their marriage. (3)

There is no record of any performance of the play at a public playhouse before the Restoration. Frank Kermode says that "The Tempest has long... been regarded as belonging to that group of plays which, in their sophisticated design and presentation, seem to belong to the more expensive Blackfriars rather than to the Globe. ...The Blackfriars was the natural home of the play", as a private theatre was better suited, because of its more advanced stage facilities, for a play which needed subtle stage effects and which was "impregnated with atmospheric music" (4) Blackfriars as a venue has no substantiation other than Dryden's remark in 1669 that it had been previously acted there. (5) But most of the critics reject the idea that the play was written for performance at the Globe, Shakespeare's usual theatre, and Dryden's comment has gone unchallenged because of the nature of the play. Although one cannot be patronising about Elizabethan and Jacobean audiences, one can well imagine plays such as Measure for Measure, with its licentiousness, A Midsummer Night's Dream, with its farce, and King Lear, with its elemental cruelty, being received enthusiastically by "general" audiences which were composed in the main of a cross-section of society. Most of

Shakespeare's plays deal with universal human themes and were didactic to a greater or lesser degree; but in The Tempest, there is a heavy reliance on white magic, the supernatural, and fantastic situations, and it has its setting on a fictional island. It is very different from Shakespeare's other plays. The masque of Juno, for example, in Act IV, scene i, is in the tradition of court masques, lavish, tremendously expensive, and very popular in the court of James I. Masques, whose nature demanded spectacle and theatricality, combined scenery, poetry, dancing, music, and elaborate lighting. "Whilst the new emphasis on scenery and lighting could have little influence on the popular open-air theatres, it could affect the 'private' theatres and in due course it was to change the whole character of the English theatre when its traditions were finally swept away by the Civil War and a new indoor theatre was born under Charles II". (6)

Several critics are of the opinion that The Tempest is a summary and a final statement of Shakespeare's view of life. Space will not permit me to elaborate on this commonly-held attitude, further than to say that I regard the play as a quintessential work as far as Shakespeare is concerned. Here we find many of the recurring Shakespearean themes, all co-existing with no sign of strain or artificiality on the author's part: love, honour, kingship, nature, usurpation, etc. The central character, the master-mind and omniscient director of events on his island, is Prospero, quite possibly a dramatic projection of the playwright himself. There is an exceptionally wide range of characters: a king, dukes and usurping dukes, various lords, lower-class sailors, an unfortunate savage, an omnipotent "airy spirit", a girl and her lover, and the spirits of the masque. Shakespeare is holding up his mirror to nature, the nature of dream on one plane and reality on the other, as I hope to show later (Chapter III).

Prospero's renunciation of his art corresponds in real life approximately with Shakespeare's own retirement

from dramatic composition. All told, an allegorical interpretation of the play, though regarded by some as fanciful, seems quite sound. Allegory tends to wrap up the truth, to take it one remove from reality; and this could well account for the fact that the whole play emits an indefinable aura of magic, the supernatural, wonder, and a deliberately vague and ethereal quality.

My intention in this essay is to try to show that, by their additions and deletions, and their often injudicious tampering with Shakespeare's play, the adapters of the Restoration and the eighteenth century failed to appreciate the intended qualities of the play, largely ignored its subtlety and nuances, and felt forced to comply with contemporary taste.

Shakespeare's stage had definite limitations as regards scenery and lighting. Shakespeare and his contemporaries relied largely on their creative powers and verbal imagery to put their plays across to their audiences. Later dramatists, even the Jacobean (who were stimulated by the work of Inigo Jones), had numerous advantages over their Elizabethan predecessors in the way of stage facilities, and were able to incorporate visual illusion into their plays. Consequently the language of Shakespeare's plays was made simpler by his adapters, and his poetry became less important.

Sir William Davenant and John Dryden collaborated in a version of The Tempest, published in 1670 after three years of successful presentation, which attempted to satisfy an Augustan desire for artistic symmetry and farce. They paired off most of the original characters and invented many ludicrous situations for them.

In 1674 Thomas Shadwell (we suppose it was he) was responsible for turning this version into an opera, which was so successful that it occupied a prominent place on the London stage for more than eighty years, during which time Shakespeare's own play appeared only a handful of times.

A parody of Shadwell's version was written by Thomas Duffet in 1675, which shows just how popular the other

adaptations were. Several other versions, based on the Dryden-Davenant one, were produced before the end of the (seventeenth) century, and although I do not intend to discuss them here, they too attest to the popularity of adapting this particular play.

In the eighteenth century, David Garrick made The Tempest into a woefully unsuccessful opera in three acts (1756), and in the following year produced a version very similar to the original. John Philip Kemble in 1789 experimented with his own version, relying mainly on Davenant's additions, but with a welter of new songs and music as well. He, like Garrick, reverted to the original (very nearly) in 1806, although his production of July 10, 1815, at Covent Garden appalled Hazlitt, who complained bitterly about the presence of "the commonplace, clap-trap sentiments ... and all the heavy tinsel and affected formality which Dryden had borrowed from the French school".(7)

In 1821, Frederic Reynolds was still producing a version of the play which was basically Davenant's but in 1838 (when, with the end of the adaptations, my survey stops), the original was restored to the stage by William Charles Macready, and it has been ever since performed in toto, the only alterations being very minor (usually the directors' whims) and the words remaining close to Shakespeare's own. (In 1959, at the Old Vic, the Dryden-Davenant version was given an airing, but this was merely to mark the tercentenary of the birth of Henry Purcell, who had composed music for it in 1695. This production was not intended to start a revival of Shakespearean adaptations.)

Many of the changes to Shakespeare's plays in the two-hundred year interval after the Civil War were due to pandering to contemporary taste and the box office, upgrading and refurbishing the text for a greater understanding of a virtual 'ancient', or to a desire to make them fit for presentation to a certain type of audience (which later in the nineteenth century was Bowdler's intention). Nahum Tate's 'happy-ending' versions of the tragedies were meant to obviate too great a shock to the sensibility.

The reason, I think, why The Tempest was altered with such frequency was mainly that contemporary literary and theatrical taste had to be catered for. Dryden, to use an example, saw the need for updating Shakespeare's comedy, and catered for his audience by increasing the number of characters in his adaptations of Shakespeare. His idea was "the more, the merrier":

"As for Comedy, repartee is one of its chiefest graces; the greatest pleasure of the audience is a chace (sic) of wit, kept up on both sides, and swiftly managed." (8)

(In 1789, a review of Kemble's revival of The Tempest was still saying that "The Tempest certainly owes much to the additions of Dryden"). (9)

The reason why the characters in Restoration comedies, including adaptations of Shakespeare, seem so coarse and lascivious compared with those in earlier plays or the Shakespearean originals is illustrated by many critics, like Hugh Hunt, who says that "Restoration ladies of fashion as well as the gallants were flagrantly immodest and boldly provocative; there was no such thing as a man of virtue, nor an innocent woman either". (10) Consequently the broad, lewd farce of the low comedy characters, and the ribald comments of the two pairs of lovers, as well as the addition of Sycorax, the female monster, all appealed to the audiences of the Restoration Tempest, which derived its popularity largely from these innovations.

The power of the audience as important drama 'critics' was heeded throughout the eighteenth century. Though he professed reverence for Shakespeare, and imagined himself his equal, Garrick often showed that he was prepared to take tremendous liberties with Shakespeare's plays, as an example of his writing will illustrate. It is a speech prepared and delivered by him at the opening of the 1750-51 season at Drury Lane:

"Sacred to Shakespeare, was this spot design'd
To pierce the heart, and humanize the mind.
But if an empty house, the actor's curse,
Shews us our Lears, and Hamlets, lose their force;

Unwilling, we must change the nobler scene,
 And, in our turn, present you Harlequin;
 Quit poets, and set carpenters to work,
 Shew gaudy scenes, or mount the vaulting Turk,
 For, tho' we actors, one and all agree
 Boldly to struggle for our - vanity;
 If want comes on, importance must retreat;
 Our first, great ruling passion is - to eat." (11)

In a letter to Somerset Draper in August 1751,
 (concerning his business partner, John Lacy, who had been
 taking liberties with Shakespeare), Garrick stated that
 "nothing but downright starving would induce me to bring
 such defilement and abomination to the house of William
 Shakespeare. What a mean, mistaken creature is this
 partner of mine!" (12)

Of all the adapters of The Tempest, though, Garrick
 was the most prepared, however reluctantly, to make
 substantial changes, and to produce a version which
 contained very little of the original; and the receipts
 quoted by Hogan for the seasons at Drury Lane leading
 up to 1756 show that Garrick was far from "downright
 starving". (13)

Anyway, Garrick's opera was a flop. With the greater
 critical enlightenment in the latter half of the eighteenth
 century, there was less and less need to alter Shakespeare's
 plays, as several stage-managers and producers found out
 the hard way when their receipts plummeted. Indeed, when
 Garrick's 1757 production proved so popular, the end of the
 road for the adaptations had been virtually reached, and apart
 from a few spasmodic attempts to renew public interest in the
 Dryden-Davenant version, the original was becoming firmly
 re-established.

Many authors have already dealt with the various versions
 of The Tempest far more competently than I, and I here
 acknowledge my heavy debt to them. A full list of my sources
 appears in the bibliography, and from time to time I refer
 to them in my text. Often I have done little more than
 recast their words, or cite them more fully. I have also
 drawn on their readier access to old manuscripts and

periodicals, as well as to several other works which I have been unable to acquire.

The most important and comprehensive work that I consulted on the general subject of Shakespeare in the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries, is Shakespeare - from Betterton to Irving by George Odell. This book treats fully and interestingly theatres, the plays, scenery and costumes, and the actors and managers. I found it most enlightening, and found Odell's approach - a mixture of factual scholarship and subjective and sometimes ironical and cynical comments - most refreshing.

C.B. Hogan's two-volume Shakespeare in the Theatre, 1701-1800 is particularly useful because of its factual information on performances, casts of the various eighteenth century versions, and box-office takings.

For a commentary on the Dryden-Davenant version, possibly the best critic is Hazelton Spencer, whose Shakespeare Improved I found invaluable. Likewise, Five Restoration Adaptations of Shakespeare, by Christopher Spencer, was useful as a starting point in my discussion of the Restoration versions of The Tempest, as Spencer makes mention of many commentaries and critiques. I am aware that my second chapter fairly bristles with excerpts from Christopher Spencer. I have quoted freely from his work for two reasons: the books he cites are mostly unavailable, and I myself have precious little knowledge of seventeenth century music, either in theory or in performance.

There are many books about Garrick. I have mentioned some of these in my bibliography, and have used them for occasional quotations. George W. Stone's article, "Shakespeare's Tempest at Drury Lane During Garrick's Management" (SQ 2, 1953, pp.107), was very helpful in its comments on Garrick's opera.

For John Philip Kemble, Baker's literary biography is unequalled by any other work that I have found. Among the most useful books on Macready is The Eminent Tragedian by Alan S. Downer. J.C. Trewin has written an annotated commentary

on Macready's Journal, and Pollock's one-volume edition of Macready's Reminiscences contains a wealth of material.

These books are the ones I have used most, but each one of those in my bibliography relates closely to my topic. I have not been fortunate enough to acquire a copy of After The Tempest (ed. G.R. Guffey; Los Angeles, Clark Memorial Library, 1969), which is concerned with eighteenth century versions of Shakespeare's play.

Apart from trying to draw together the critical and interpretative comments of the last three hundred years on the topic, I have traced the stage history of The Tempest, something which to the best of my knowledge no-one has previously done at such length. I have not concerned myself with the various editions of the play which appeared in the eighteenth century, though I do make some remarks in my conclusion about the relationship between stage versions and those amendments by Shakespeare's editors. There can never be, of course, definitive answers to many of the questions that I pose, and many things can only be matters of conjecture. Throughout, I have tried to put my own interpretation on topics like the disappearance and revival of the masque at various times, the way in which the play became an opera, the growth of the use of spectacle and extravaganza, and the pairing of the characters. None of my interpretations can be proven, and I hope that none can be refuted.

Throughout the preparation of this thesis, I have been most grateful for the valuable time, encouragement, and expert suggestions of my supervisor, Dr. Mary E. Chan, of the Department of English at Massey University. I should also like to thank the staff of the Massey University Library for making material available for me, especially for arranging books on interloan, and my sister, Mrs. Heather Watson, who typed my manuscript so willingly and expertly.

NOTES

1. Revels Account. Cited by F.E. Halliday, A Shakespeare Companion, 1564-1964 (Harmondsworth, Middlesex, 1964), p.486.
2. ibid.
3. For the controversy surrounding the date of the play, see the New Arden edition, pp. xi-xxiv. The play was registered on November 8th, 1623, one of sixteen registered by Blount and Jaggard before being published by Heminge and Condell in the First Folio, where it occupies first place in the text. It is generally agreed to be one of the most careful in the Folio, and certainly has the most detailed stage directions. It was set up from a transcript by Ralph Crane of foul papers prepared for production.
4. New Arden edition, pp. 151-2.
5. Preface to the 1670 Tempest.
6. Hugh Hunt, The Live Theatre: An Introduction to the History and Practice of the Stage (London, 1962), p.82.
7. William Hazlitt, in The Examiner (July 23rd, 1815). Cited by Harold Child in the Cambridge edition of The Tempest (1921), p.111.
8. Cited by W.P. Ker (ed.), Essays of John Dryden, 2 vols (Oxford, 1926), I, p.72.
9. Cited by C.H. Gray, Theatrical Criticism in London to 1795, (New York, 1964), p.290.
10. Hunt, (Live Theatre), p.99.
11. The Poetical Works of David Garrick Esq., ed. George Kearsley, 2 vols (London, 1785), I, pp.102-3, ll. 25-36. Cited by Leo Hughes, The Drama's Patrons (Austin and London, 1971), p.88.

12. David Garrick, Letters, ed. David Mason Little and George Morrow Kahrl, 3 vols (Cambridge, Mass., 1963), I, p.172. Cited by Hughes, p.109.
13. C.B. Hogan, Shakespeare in the Theatre, 1701-1800, 2 vols (Oxford, 1957), II, pp.2-15 (passim).

CHAPTER ONE: The Restoration Tempest: Davenant and Dryden

As was the case with Shakespeare's other plays, after its first few seasons The Tempest did not appear regularly on the stage until the Restoration, when there was a spate of Shakespearean adaptations and alterations, all designed to "rediscover" his genius, albeit sacreligiously. Elizabethan England, viewed from the time of Charles II, seemed a crude and barbarous age. As taste changed, the old plays in John Evelyn's words, had "begun to disgust this refined age, since his Majesty's being so long abroad". Very probably the swing in taste towards this "refinement" appeared greater than it was, owing to the fact that the theatres had been closed for eighteen years, from 1642 to 1660. Plays and playhouses had always been opposed by the Puritans, who had begun their attacks when the "Theatre" had been built in London in 1576: "Stan hath not a more speedy way ... to bring men and women into his snare of concupiscence and filthy lusts of wicked whoredom, than those plays and theatres are. ..." (1) Again in the 1630's the attack was resumed, until the theatres were closed at the outbreak of the Civil War.

After the eighteen years, playgoers like Pepys found that Shakespeare's plays lacked much; they were now insipid, silly, coarse, or ridiculous. However, some of the Restoration critics, such as Dryden, could see that in the old plays there was an indefinable essence which the new playwrights could never achieve.

During the period in which plays had been banned, there were several influences working on the theatre. In 1660, the king granted patents to Thomas Killigrew and Sir William Davenant, permitting them to build their own playhouses and form their own companies. Furthermore, they were only to allow women to play women's parts, so that plays might "be esteemed not only harmless delights but useful and instructive representations of human life". (2) The introduction of actresses to replace boy actors, as well as the introduction of mobile scenery, were among the most important conventions

of the new theatres, although both had been seen on the English stage previously. (Inigo Jones, a contemporary of Shakespeare, had constructed elaborate sets and stage machinery; and French companies touring England before the Commonwealth had employed actresses, as had the Commedia dell'arte (in Italy) from the mid sixteenth century.) (3) The use of actresses gave a "new dimension of sensual realism" to the dramatist, and the sliding scenes behind the proscenium arch allowed the playwright great flexibility of location on the stage.

These two features of the stage became popular and well-established. The stage was, as it were, being set for more realistic and spectacular productions.

It seems that the first person to have had the notion of altering Shakespeare's plays was his godson, Sir William Davenant, who, during the Restoration, was keen to show the new generation of play-goers that Shakespeare could be made attractive once more. Theatre tastes had changed greatly since 1611, and for many years Shakespeare had fallen into disrepute among the scholars and critics, mainly because he offended against that holiest of neo-classical 'rules', the necessity for observing the three 'unities'. (In his Poetics, Aristotle had not prescribed any rules on the unities, and his comments on the subject do not extend beyond his insistence on the unity of action, i.e. that all plays should have a beginning, a middle, and an end. The neo-classical 'rules', supposedly ancient and therefore incontrovertible, were in fact of recent origin. They were promulgated by the Italian, Castelvetro, in 1570). Shakespeare's use of language was also regarded as being crude. His plays were simply "indecorous".

In December 1660, Davenant's company (the Duke's), was given exclusive rights for "reformeing" and "makeinge ... fitt" eleven of Shakespeare's plays, including The Tempest, (although with this play, little quarrel could have been found with Shakespeare's adherence to the 'unities').

In his reworking of The Tempest, Davenant collaborated with John Dryden, who constantly alluded to Shakespeare in his works, and praised him on account of his "genius", although

he thought it to be rough and untutored. In his Essay of Dramatic Poesy, he declared that "... however others are now generally preferred before him, yet the age wherein he lived, which had contemporaries with him Fletcher and Jonson, never equalled them to him in their esteem; and in the last king's court, when Ben's reputation was at highest, Sir John Suckling, and with him the greater part of the courtiers, set our Shakespeare far above him." In the same essay he referred to Shakespeare as "the man who of all modern, and perhaps ancient poets, had the largest and most comprehensive soul. ... He is always great." (4)

Later I shall attempt to evaluate the Davenant-Dryden version of the play, but I shall now give an outline of their changes, without any immediate judgement of them.

The list of dramatis personae shows several additions and deletions. Most of Shakespeare's courtiers (Sebastian, Adrian, and Francisco) have disappeared. There are several new characters: Hippolito (one that never saw Woman, right Heir of the Dukedom of Mantua), Mustacho (the Mate), Ventoso (a sailor), Dorinda (sister to Miranda), and Sycorax (sister to Caliban). Milcha, a spirit, has one word to say at the end of the play - she is Ariel's "love", who has waited "twice seven years" for his freedom. The masque in Shakespeare's Act IV has been excised.

The play has a preface, written by Dryden and dated "Decemb. 1. 1669" (more than a year after Davenant's death). Here Dryden deprecates his own part in the reworking, and showers praise on his collaborator for his "quick and piercing imagination", especially in his brainwave of adding "a Man who had never seen a Woman; that by this means those two Characters of Innocence and Love might the more illustrate and commend each other. This excellent contrivance he was pleas'd to communicate to me, and to desire my assistance in it. I confess that from the very first it so pleased me, that I never writ any thing with more delight." According to Dryden, most of the adaptations were Davenant's work: "It had perhaps been easie enough for me to have arrogated

more to my self than was my due in the writing of this Play, and to have pass'd by his name with silence in the publication of it ... but (he) has had a greater inspection over (it), and sometimes added whole Scenes together, which may as easily be distinguished from the rest, as true Gold from counterfeit by the weight".

Hazelton Spencer and Odell, among others, have given plot summaries, indicating the changes from the original version. (5) Shakespeare's I.i is enlarged, but his I.ii is greatly reduced, although the phrasing is little altered. When Caliban leaves the stage, Dorinda enters to tell the story of the shipwreck. The two sisters, Miranda taking the lead, discuss the men in the ship.

Davenant's Act II is a condensed form of the original: Gonzalo's dream of a Utopia, and the Antonio-Sebastian conspiracy to murder Alonzo have been excised. There is a dance of Devils, portraying the evils of crime and ambition, and then a short scene with Ariel singing "Come unto these yellow sands" and "Full fathom five", to which Ferdinand responds wonderingly. There follows one of the low comedy scenes where Caliban meets Mustacho, Ventoso and Stephano (the latter now elevated to ship's captain). Stephano proclaims that he will be the island's ruler, and Mustacho and Ventoso are appointed first and second viceroys. Trincalo (sic) appears, refuses to be the only Indian for so many chiefs, and is declared a rebel. He is left alone and meets Caliban, whom he makes drunk. He makes plans to become the ruler of the island, to marry Caliban's sister, Sycorax, and to have control over the two savages.

Prospero, alone, fills in some background for us, telling how he has kept Hippolito hidden from his daughters. Then Hippolito is called, and Prospero warns him against women. When he goes, the two sisters enter, looking for "the Man", but Prospero tells them to beware. He leaves Dorinda in the older Miranda's care, and departs. The girls set off, naturally, against their father's wishes, to seek a man again, and discover Hippolito in his cave. He and Dorinda at once admire one another, but the sisters are called away

by Prospero.

Act III begins with a father and daughters heart-to-heart talk about Hippolito as an example of the "Salvage race" of young men. The next scene corresponds to Shakespeare's III.iii, and in it a feast (attended by eight fat spirits) is prepared for the nobles by Ariel.

We then see Trincalo's encounter with the amorous Sycorax. Stephano and his "viceroys" appear, having run out of food and liquor, and wish to "treat a peace betwixt us". Trincalo claims the island because of his betrothal to Sycorax, its "lawful Inheritrix". Stephano and his friends "ask an hour's time of deliberation" and take their leave.

Ferdinand, led by an invisible Ariel, enters, and they sing an echo-song, "Go thy way". The scene then changes, and we see Prospero showing Ferdinand to Miranda (Shakespeare's I.ii 411-end). Ferdinand draws his sword, but "is charm'd from moving". Before Prospero and Miranda leave, Prospero summons Hippolito, abuses him for ignoring his command forbidding him to see a woman, and tells him to keep Ferdinand company.

The next scene shows Ferdinand and Hippolito in a cave, exchanging views on love and women. When Hippolito hears that there are many other women besides Dorinda, he is enthralled, and swears that he "will have all of that kind, if there be a hundred of 'em." Though Ferdinand remonstrates with him, Hippolito, at the end of the scene, is determined to have all women for his own.

At the start of Act IV, Prospero asks Miranda to encourage Ferdinand to be friendly with Hippolito. She does this, but Ferdinand becomes petulant and jealous. Prospero, entering, finds out from Miranda that she "loves (Ferdinand) much because she hides it." Hippolito and Dorinda, whose love, Prospero has decided, is best to be left to grow in secret, then enter. Hippolito is still gushing with the "brave news" he has heard from Ferdinand that "there are more Women in the World". He wishes to have Miranda, and tells this to Dorinda, who leaves indignantly. When Ferdinand enters, he challenges Hippolito to a duel, as he thinks that Hippolito

has already seduced Miranda.

The next scene takes us back to the Trincalo group. Stephano and his friends agree to become Trincalo's subjects, in return for which they greedily share in the liquor, and soon they are all drunk. The scene ends with a fight over the respective leadership claims, a fight won by Trincalo.

Following this there is another fight, this time the duel between Ferdinand and Hippolito. When Hippolito falls, apparently dead, Prospero sentences Ferdinand to death for murder. Alonzo and his courtiers have been summoned by Ariel, and when Alonzo protests at Prospero's decision, Prospero "stamps, and many Spirits appear", who drive the courtiers into a cave. Miranda and Dorinda quarrel about their lovers and "exeunt severally, looking discontentedly on one another". Ariel ends the Act with a speech which describes in recapitulation the "harsh discord" which reigns throughout "this fatal Isle".

Act V opens with Miranda pleading with her father for Ferdinand's life, but Prospero turns a deaf ear. Ariel then tells Prospero that he has managed to get Hippolito's soul to return. Hippolito is now "discovered on a Couch, Dorinda by him", and he too pleads that Ferdinand be spared, as the duel had been fought on account of his own naivete. Dorinda likewise runs off to beg for Ferdinand's life, and Miranda goes to Hippolito to cure his wound. On seeing her, Hippolito's new resolution, to love only Dorinda, goes by the board. When Ferdinand and Dorinda enter, both young men are immediately jealous once more, but eventually all four lovers swear eternal fidelity, even Hippolito.

Next, Prospero, Alonzo, and the other courtiers appear, and the two prospective unions are blessed. Finally, Ariel drives in the low-comedy characters, and Trincalo abdicates, mainly, one feels, because his "friend Butt has shed his Last drop of life". When Sycorax begs Trincalo to take her with him when they leave the island, he politely but firmly denies her request. The play ends with Prospero promising calm seas and happy gales in the morning for the departing

travellers. Ariel and Milcha are united because Ariel has been liberated by Prospero, and Prospero himself determines to stay on his Enchanted Isle, with "all the Blessings of the rip'ning year".

There are several main trends in this version of the play, one of which is in the field of stagecraft, or the technique whereby the action is presented.

"The opening lines reveal at once a fundamental difference between the methods of Shakespeare and the adapters laureate. ... The opening scene of The Tempest is beyond the resources of Shakespeare's or any other stage; but by glimpses of confusion, momentary rushes of the various groups of characters across the stage, the bawling of orders, terrified questions, and excited answers, and at last wild cries of despair, he succeeds in creating, at the very height of the storm, an impression of elemental wildness and human disaster." (6)

In Shakespeare, then, we are plunged in medias res, and the impression of tumult and disharmony, mirrored in later events, (like the conspiracy) is immediately established in a concise and gripping 67-line scene. In the Davenant-Dryden version, however, the first scene has 114 lines, or almost double the length of the original. "The storm, like a well-regulated tragedy, has a beginning, a middle, and an end. Instead of a rapid cross-section of the tumult at its climax, we watch the storm beginning after the scene begins. The ship is peacefully at anchor when the mariners predict bad weather. They finally make sail, weigh anchor, and attempt to claw off shore. The guns break loose (off-stage, I suppose), and no sooner is she underway than the pumps are manned with six feet of water in the hold. Amid a chaos of contradictory orders the crew attempt to beach the ship, but she strikes a rock on her starboard bow". (7)

Whereas Shakespeare's scene is convincing because of its conciseness and urgency, the other fails because of its laboured structure. If Shakespeare could be attacked for ignoring the unities and thus being careless of verisimilitude, the charge of unlikeliness can be equally well levelled at

Dryden and Davenant.

This sort of "tightening-up" and regulating of Shakespeare's technique is noticeable throughout the adaptation. It is most apparent in the dramatis personae when we consider the functions of the new characters. Every character or set of characters is paired with another. Everything is balanced, and each character has his counterpart. Examples of this include Ferdinand and Hippolito, Miranda and Dorinda, Caliban and Sycorax, Ariel and Milcha, and the Trincalo and Stephano groups.

By doubling up wherever he could, Davenant could be "so symmetrical as never was" (as Dryden puts it in the Preface) in his desire to supply a perfect balance. Thus "he design'd the Counterpart to Shakespeare's plot".

Prospero's ward, Hippolito, an "evolution from airy nothing", (8) plays an important part in the new plot. Prospero introduces him to us in an implausible way:

" 'Tis not yet fit to let my Daughters know I kept
The infant Duke of Mantua (i.e. Hippolito) so near
them in this Isle,
Whose Father dying bequeathed him to my care,
Till my false Brother (i.e. Antonio) (when he
design'd t'usurp
My Dukedom from me) expos'd him to that fate
He meant for me. By calculation of his birth
I saw death threatening him, if, till some time were
Past, he should behold the face of any Woman:
And now the danger's nigh ..."

(Act II, p.24).

Presumably we are supposed not to query how Prospero managed to keep Hippolito separate from his daughters for several years, and his presence completely undetected, despite the proximity of their caves. This is one of the many incredible riddles of the play. Hippolito's function, though he has been warned about that deadly creature, woman, is to be eventually paired off with Dorinda; and the only apparent reason for including her in the plot was to have a mate for Hippolito. Their presence makes for many opportunities for farce, which

the authors willingly seized upon, as farce, or broad wit, was very popular at the time, in much the same way as slapstick comedy was in the early days of motion pictures.

When Hippolito and Dorinda meet, they are immediately smitten by one another's beauty, and fall in love. But having seen and admired one woman, and learning that there are many such beautiful women in the world, Hippolito makes up his mind to have every one of them. This leads to the ludicrous state of affairs where Ferdinand, pursuing Miranda (as in the original play), is forced to preserve her, at least, for himself, by defending her honour in a duel with Hippolito. Just how ridiculous the situation is can be shown by quoting some lines for the preparation for the fight:

Ferd: ... Pray, do not see her, she was

Mine first; you have no right to her.

Hipp: I have not yet consider'd what is right, but, Sir,

I know my inclinations are to love all Women:

And I have been taught that to dissemble what I

Think is base. In honour then of truth, I must

Declare that I do love, and I will see your Woman.

...

...

...

Ferd: Provide your self a Sword; for we must fight.

Hipp: A Sword, what's that?

Ferd: Why, such a thing as this.

Hipp: What should I do with it?

Ferd: You must stand thus, and push against me,

While I push at you, till one of us fall dead.

Hipp: This is brave sport,

But we have no Swords growing in our World.

Ferd: What shall we do then to decide our quarrel?

Hipp: We'll take the Sword by turns, and fight with it.

(Act IV, pp.58-59)

When the duel, such as it is, is over, Hippolito falls, apparently dead, to the ground. Ferdinand, condemned to death for "murder" by Prospero, is pardoned when Ariel brings the news that Hippolito's "soul was but retired,

Not sally'd out, and frighted lay at skulk in
Th'inmost corner of his scarce-beating heart."

(Act V, p.74).

After yet more unintentional buffoonery and naivete on the part of Hippolito and Dorinda in the next scene, one of jealous cross-purposes between the four lovers, the way is cleared for ultimate reconciliation and a happy ending.

Apart from the two pairs of lovers, other changes in the list of characters alter the tone and intention of Shakespeare's play too. If the lovers' scenes are tasteless (to us) and farcical, then so too are those in which we are confronted with the Caliban and Stephano groups. In the original Tempest, Caliban, the "salvage, deformed slave", was subtly set alongside Trinculo and Stephano, who represented the scum of the civilised world. Caliban's better points were implicitly contrasted with the more depraved traits of the flotsam and jetsam of society. In this new version, however, Caliban is a character who cannot gain our sympathy. He is too grotesque; he is constantly seen as a raving, drunken, fawning, lecherous pimp (for his newly-acquired sister Sycorax). Any dignity he may have had is gone. Trinculo, Stephano, Mustacho, and Ventoso are utterly despicable as well, and are commonly drunk and bawdy. They have no redeeming characteristics. The "love" between Trinculo and Sycorax is based on lust, and he abandons her at the end of the play. Sycorax likewise is a pathetic figure, treated by Trinculo as an animal who might be potentially useful.

"She is monstrous fair indeed. Is this to be my Spouse? well, she's Heir of all this Isle (for I will geld Monster). The Trinculo's, like other wise men, have anciently us'd to marry for Estate more than for beauty."

(Act III, p.38)

Trinculo refers to her as "blobber-lips" and "Queen Slobber-Chops", and persists in mocking her and Caliban. Sycorax is so besotted with Trinculo, and with his Butt (his bottle of liquor), that she passively accepts his taunts and demeans herself.

The scenes involving this unpleasant group of characters have little of Shakespeare's more good-natured, though rough, cameraderie, and are very coarse and brutal. And surely there could have been no intention by Davenant merely to heighten the differences between different sorts of 'love'. To our twentieth-century eyes, the whole affair is lacking in taste or wit; though commentators at early performances were of another opinion, as I shall later indicate.

Also connected with the general lowering of tone is the curtailment of those scenes in Shakespeare which involved protracted discussions between members of the "Alonzo group" of characters. An example is Shakespeare's Act II, scene i. Both plays begin with Alonzo, who in the Davenant version is merely Duke of Savoy, though he is also the Usurper of Mantua. Antonio's role, as Usurper of Milan, remains the same. But apart from Gonzalo, the rest of the Court party that was shipwrecked have been deleted from the play. Gonzalo's distinctive old-fashioned courtesy and nobility, and his plea for a Utopia, have been excised; and the sophisticated mockery of Gonzalo by Sebastian and Antonio has also been omitted. Because of this latter, one of the many facets of characterisation and modes of life, which Shakespeare had subtly woven into his story, have been cut out.

In his Act II, scene i, Shakespeare contrasts the evil of the world (notably the veneer of civilisation at court) with the peacefulness and natural goodness of the island, and to this end, the Sebastian-Antonio conspiracy to murder Alonzo is dramatically successful. The way in which Prospero had the conspirators charmed from moving also gave him more stature as Shakespeare's omnipotent stage-manager. In the Dryden-Davenant version, we are uncertain as to what the authors' intention is, and I agree with Hazelton Spencer, who thinks that the conspiracy justifies retention.

Further evidence that the original is being thoughtlessly tampered with comes in Act III, where scene ii corresponds

to Shakespeare's III,iii. Shakespeare's lines create an atmosphere of awe and wonder in his characters who react accordingly:

(Stage directions): Solemn and strange music; and Prosper on the top (invisible). Enter several strange shapes, bringing in a banquet; and dance about it with gentle actions of salutations; and inviting the King, &c., to eat, they depart.

Alon: What harmony is this? My good friends, hark!

Gonz: Marvellous sweet music!

Alon: Give us kind keepers, heavens! - What were these?

Seb: A living drollery. Now I will believe
That there are unicorns; that in Arabia
There is one tree, the phoenix' throne; one
 phoenix

At this hour reigning there.

... etc. (III iii 17-24)

In the Davenant version, however, even the appearance of these "strange shapes" with their "gentle actions" is changed. The effect on the reader is like that of seeing a ballet performed by a rugby team - ludicrous:

(Stage directions): Enter eight fat spirits, with Cornu-Copia in their hands.

Alonz: Are these plump shapes sent to deride our hunger?

Gonz: No, no: it is a Masque of fatten'd Devils, the Burgo-Masters of the lower Region. (dance and vanish).

O for a Collop of that large-haunch'd Devil
Who went out last!

(Act III, p.37)

Shakespeare's spirits provoke a response in the courtiers of incredulity and fear. Their actions are graceful. They can be compared to the will-o'-the-wisp, which lures tired, unwary travellers to their doom. The courtiers can do little more than stand and watch them at work. Even the usually cynical Sebastian is amazed by the sight. In Davenant's version, on the other hand, not only do the spirits assume

a homely, down-to-earth shape, but the responses from Alonzo and Gonzalo are markedly different. The aura of otherworldliness which Shakespeare created has been pricked like a balloon, and once more, Shakespeare's intention has been interpreted crudely, and the situation becomes farcical. Shakespeare's Gonzalo would never have lowered himself to speak the undignified lines which Davenant gave him.

Throughout the Dryden-Davenant play, the adapters have seized upon every opportunity to create farce. Even at the end, when the union of the lovers has been blessed by Prospero and Alonzo, and the stage is set for a happy finale, we have the notion of romantic love being once more debunked, this time rather lewdly.

We must not forget that the general lowering of taste in Restoration drama was due to the Royalists attacking the Puritans. They ridiculed the moral code which the Puritans had imposed on the country, and the result was licentiousness. The Restoration audiences were generally possessed of lower morals. "The Puritan attacks had left in pious people and even in those who merely had some regard for moral decency, a horror of those unhallowed places, where the impropriety of the plays was aggravated by the disorderly scenes for which the performances gave occasion, and by the attitude of the hangers-on who haunted the theatres. The respectable middle class was compelled to stay away. The Restoration theatre was almost wholly an amusement for the corrupt court and for pleasure seekers." (9) John Evelyn's diary entry for June 19, 1668, complains bitterly about how people of his social class and outlook were more or less kept away from the theatres because "the stage was degenerated and polluted by the licentious times".

Consequently, it is not surprising to find in Davenant's text certain examples of lewdness and behaviour which previously would not have been becoming, especially to a female character of noble birth. We find an example of this with Davenant's Miranda who, in contrast to the Shakespearean Miranda, sinks in our estimation.

Previously she has been the "elder" and "more discreet" of the sisters. Now we see that she is just as naive as Dorinda after all:

Prospero: ... "You, Miranda, must with Ferdinand,
And you, Dorinda, with Hippolito lye in
One bed hereafter.

Alonz: And Heaven make those Beds still fruitful in
Producing Children to bless their Parents
Youth, and Grandsires age.

Mir. or Dor: If Children come by lying in a Bed, I wonder yo
And I had none between us.

Dor: Sister it was our fault, we meant like' fools
To look 'em in the Fields, and they it seems
Are only found in beds.

Hipp: I am o'rejoy'd that I shall have Dorinda in a
Bed,
We'll lye all night and day together there,
And never rise again.

Ferd. aside to him:

Hippolito! you yet are ignorant of your great
Happiness, but there is somewhat which for
Your own and fair Dorinda's sake I must instruct
You in.

Hipp: Pray teach me quickly how Men and Women in your
World make love, I shall soon learn
I warrant you.

It is interesting to note Ferdinand's attitude here. Though never the reticent wide-eyed boy that he is in Shakespeare's play, he has previously in the same scene been petulant and childishly jealous, yet now he is about to instruct Hippolito in the art of love.

It is evident that in the Dryden-Davenant version, the nobles have a lot less to say, the lower comedy characters' lines remain fairly constant, and the lovers, with their mixture of increased naivete and farce, are five times more important than they were in Shakespeare's original. (10)
I think that this fact adds weight to the idea that I have thus far been propounding: that in many instances, the Restoration adaptation never rises to the same heights as

the Shakespearean original, and that all told, it is a debasement of it.

"The exquisite Miranda is so degraded that, as Professor Lounsbury remarks, 'her conversation with her sister Dorinda is the kind that might have gone on between two maids of honour at the court of Charles II'." (11)

Prospero, who had originally been so all-important, is now reduced to the stature of a tiresome factotum, and has not the same grip on the destiny of the other characters (or so it appears) as he had before. "His renunciation of his powers is not retained and 'We are such stuff as dreams are made on' is most happily (in these surroundings) omitted." (12)

The changes, then, in characterisation, in the dramatis personae, in the plot, and in the dramatic structure of the whole work, are many and varied, and I have mentioned only a few. The other noticeable change from Shakespeare is the way in which his poetry has been mutilated. Much of Shakespeare's language is retained, as for example in what corresponds to the original Act I, ii, between Prospero and Miranda, but there is so much elsewhere that is new that it is hard to catch a glimpse of Shakespeare at all. Several speeches have been kept in toto, though with minor variations, often to fit in with the new situation.

Prospero's speech about Caliban's origins has kept to Shakespeare's text closely, even at the end, where:

" ... Then was this island -
Save for the son that she did litter here,
A freckled whelp, hag-born - not honour'd with
A human shape," (I ii 281-284)

becomes:

"Then was this Isle (save for two Brats, which she did
Litter here, the brutish Caliban, and his twin Sister,
Two freckel'd hag-born Whelps) not honour'd with
A human shape." (Act I, p.10)

Caliban's "I must eat my dinner" (I ii 332-345) survives in Davenant's version, but Shakespeare's attempt to make Caliban into some sort of a 'poetic' being has been ignored, and the speech has been converted into prose, which removes

its poetic qualities, and keeps Caliban's feet planted firmly in the mud. Miranda's "Abhorred slave", (I ii 353-364) is given to Prospero, (which seems more in keeping with the characterisation, as it sounds more like him than Miranda).

The songs "Come unto these yellow sands", "Full fathom five", and "Where the bee sucks" are augmented with others later in the new version, such as "Dry those eyes" (sung by Ariel), and a duet, "Go thy way", sung by Ariel and Ferdinand. The elaborate wedding masque staged by Prospero in Shakespeare's Act IV has disappeared.

Wherever the collaborators have created their own new lines, the poetry is infelicitous, and never achieves the same ease and flow of Shakespeare's. Whereas Shakespeare was brilliantly conversant with all the nuances and the natural cadences of ordinary speech, and mirrored these in his blank verse, the metre used by Davenant is asymmetrical, haphazard, and disjointed, and is best described as blundering. You cannot sew a new patch on an old garment, says the proverb, and the adapters, although using the fabric of Shakespeare's play, could not match his highlights, his 'purple passages', and his spirit, and their stitching is uneven and rough.

This version of The Tempest, however much it fails to appeal to us today, was extremely popular for many years. If Shakespeare had written his Tempest for small, select, and educated audiences of some refinement, Dryden and Davenant were cashing in, by giving their version a wider, more popular appeal (by lowering the tone and reducing the level of sophistication), on sheer "box-office". The new play was certainly most well-received by contemporary Restoration audiences.

Pepys, writing in his diary of 7 November 1667, describes favourably his first attendance at the play: "...The house was mighty full; the King and Court there; and the most innocent play I ever say; and a curious piece of musick in an echo of half sentences (i.e. the Ferdinand-Ariel duet in Act III), the echo repeating the former half, while the man goes on with the latter; which is mighty pretty. The play has no great wit, but yet good, above ordinary plays." Pepys was to see this version of the play another seven times, and was generally impressed, especially by the "variety"; and once

he "took pleasure to learn the tune of the seamen's dance", (Act IV, p.61), he seemed to enjoy it thoroughly each time he went to see it.

Some modern critics (13) have pleaded for a tolerant understanding of the Restoration version of The Tempest, but they are in the minority, and most of the available books on the subject are condemnatory. Hazelton Spencer calls this particular adaptation "wretched stuff", and thinks that "one aim and one alone animated its authors: to pander". (14) Odell writes that "this alteration is the worst perversion of Shakespeare in the two-century history of such atrocities." (15)

Furness, thinking (16) he was writing about this version, but in reality describing the 1674 opera, said "No words which would not with justice be called idle can be expended on this version ... It is interesting to note that the additions to the original ... are wholesale plagiarisms from Calderon's play written twenty years earlier, so says Hermann Grimm (in his Fünfzehn Essays, 1875, p.206), who also says, with humour, that such is the quality of these additions that the two poets laureate might well have contended for the honour of having contributed the smaller share ..." (17).

Views such as these, positive as they may be, do not, however, seem to be very fair. "The usual criticism is that the adaptations are made superficial in language, in character, in subject, and in overexplicit statement of theme, or 'preaching'. Moreover, the indictment continues, the alterations go much further than necessary: The Tempest could have been adapted to the Restoration theatre without adding sisters for Miranda and Caliban, a female companion for Ariel, and a man who has never seen a woman. Furthermore, critics object, the additions are often incongruous with what remains of the original: by changing too little or too much, the adapters created their own indecorum, in which their additions seem superficial and thin beside the Shakespearean material." (18)

So it is to the position of understanding and tolerance that we must turn. For however much we are tempted to judge

these Restoration efforts harshly, we must never forget the enormous popularity which they had for more than a hundred years. Dryden's All for Love looks thin if we compare it with Shakespeare's Antony and Cleopatra; it is, to adapt Johnson's words, like comparing "a garden accurately formed and diligently planted, varied with shades, and scented with flowers" with Shakespeare's "forest, in which oaks extend their branches, and pines tower in the air, interspersed sometimes with weeds and brambles, and sometimes giving shelter to myrtles and to roses; filling the eye with awful pomp, and gratifying the mind with endless diversity." (19) Johnson could see the merits of both plays. And we are best advised to take such a balanced and reasonable view, too, in our assessment of the Dryden-Davenant Tempest. All for Love is a very good play if it is set alongside other examples of Restoration tragedy - Allardyce Nicoll (British Drama, p.235) calls it Dryden's best - but it must be criticised in its own right, not as a miserable comparison to Shakespeare. It is the same with all of the Restoration (and subsequent) adaptations: they must be regarded as new plays if we are to evaluate them properly without constantly referring to Shakespeare as a yardstick by which to measure their worth. We definitely should regard Shakespeare as the ultimate source of the adaptations, but we seldom compare Shakespeare and his own sources when we appreciate one of his plays; likewise it is unfair to over-compare the Restoration adaptations with their Shakespearean originals. "The Augustan dramatist followed (Shakespeare) closely at times, but ... he made changes that are keys to his vision of the potentialities of story, character, and theme." (20)

Dryden and Davenant combined to create a new impression for a new, different type of audience. What were they doing when they made their adaptations? Were they simply pandering to contemporary taste? Were they merely polishing the gems which Shakespeare had been too ignorant and uncouth to polish? Dryden gives us some idea himself. "I take the imitation of an author ... to be an endeavour of a later poet to write

like one who has written before him, on the same subject; that is, not to translate his words, or to be confined to his sense, but only to set him as a pattern, and to write, as he supposes that author would have done, had he lived in our age, and in our country." (21) The word 'imitation' implies far kinder and less sacreligious connotations than "adaptation" or "alteration", and helps to put his version into a more congenial light from our point of view.

In Dryden's "Grounds of Criticism in Tragedy" (1679), he wrote that Shakespeare was indeed a genius, but this genius was buried under the "coarse" language of his day, and under other improprieties. Dryden felt that a lesser man could, indeed should, "make fitt" this genius by re-ordering it, chopping, pruning, and refurbishing, all with the laudable intention of giving a new lease of life to the poet.

It seems anomalous that despite these intentions, The Tempest, originally designed for the audience of a private theatre, should suffer changes which were the opposite to those meant (in the way of refinement); but Dryden, perhaps, was confining his remarks here to the tragic genre alone. As far as bringing Shakespeare into line with popular taste was concerned, however, the new desire for harmony and order was certainly catered for in the additions to the characters, all of whom were complementary to others.

NOTES

1. John Northbrook, Treatise against Dicing, Dancing, Plays and Interludes, with other idle Pastimes, 1577. Cited by Hunt, The Live Theatre, p.82.
2. Cited by Hugh Hunt, "Restoration Acting", Restoration Theatre (Stratford-upon-Avon Studies, Vol 6), London, 1965, p.179.
3. ibid., pp.179-194 (passim).
4. Dryden, Essay of Dramatick Poesy (London, 1668), 2nd edition, 1684. (In Poems and Prose of John Dryden, ed. Douglas Grant (Harmondsworth, Middlesex, 1955), pp.197-198.)
5. Hazelton Spencer, pp.193-201; Odell, I, pp.31-33.
6. Hazelton Spencer, p.194.
7. ibid., p.195.
8. ibid., p.197.
9. Emile Legouis, A Short History of English Literature, trans. V.F. Boyson and J. Coulson (Oxford, 1934), p.183.
10. Christopher Spencer, in Five Restoration Adaptations of Shakespeare (Urbana, 1965), p.20, gives a list of the numbers of lines in both Shakespeare's version and the new one. In Shakespeare's play, the lines are distributed approximately as follows: 256 for the lovers, 428 for the low comedy characters, 436 for the courtiers, and 925 not specifically attached to any single group. In the Davenant version, however, it is interesting to note that the lovers, now that there are four of them, have 1,227 lines, the low comedy characters 444, the nobles a mere 188, and 849 are unattached.
11. Hazelton Spencer, p.204.
12. ibid.

13. Alfred Harbage, Cavalier Drama (New York, 1936), p.250, comments that "critics have been humourlessly severe with Davenant for his bungling, failing to see that a man might deserve credit for trying to make Shakespeare palatable to an unsympathetic age even though incapable of improving upon the master". John Harold Wilson, A Preface to Restoration Drama (Boston, 1965), p.85, is of the same opinion, and writing of the Restoration adaptations of Shakespeare in general, says: "These were not mere wanton changes. The Restoration playwrights had their reasons: to improve the liaison des scenes, and tighten up the plots, to 'correct' Shakespeare's archaic and too figurative language, to distribute poetic justice, to modernise out-of-date themes, and to fit the old plays to audiences which liked happy endings, villain plays, and pathetic tragedies". Concluding that "sometimes they reduced Shakespeare's 'native woodnotes wild' to the piping of a penny whistle", he obviously cannot go along with many of the changes, but makes a plea for greater tolerance and understanding on the part of the modern reader.
14. Hazelton Spencer, p.201.
15. Odell, I, p.31.
16. Furness' New Variorum edition of The Tempest was published in 1892, and was supposed to be the "last word" on the play, as well as being reliably definitive. Furness, however, was so outraged by "Dryden's version", and his attack on it is so scathing and bigoted, that he did not bother to check his facts, and the text he gives as Dryden's is, in fact, Shadwell's operative version of 1674. Some modern critics have misunderstood the position, too (such as Ann Righter, who makes the same mistake on p.53 of her New Penguin Shakespeare edition of the play).

17. Furness, p.449. According to the Oxford Companion to English Literature, ed. Sir Paul Harvey, 3rd edn. (Oxford, 1946), p.129, Pedro Calderon de la Barca (1600-1681) was "a great Spanish dramatist, and the successor of Lope de Vega. Eight of his plays were translated into English by (Edward)Fitzgerald. ... Dryden, Goethe, Shelley, Bridges, among others, were under obligations to him. ..."
The play by Calderon mentioned by Furness and Grimm is En esta vida todo es verdad y todo es mentira; but no indication is given as to what specific additions, nor what scenes in Calderon's play, are the ones under discussion.
18. Christopher Spencer, pp.7-8.
19. Preface to The Plays of William Shakespeare, ed. Sam. Johnson, 8 vols (London, 1765), I, pp.xxxv-xxxvi. (Reprinted with the original pagination by AMS Press, Inc. (New York, 1968).
20. Christopher Spencer, p.9.
21. Preface to the translation of Ovid's Epistles, 1680. In Essays of John Dryden, ed. W.P. Ker (Oxford, 1926), I, pp. 237 and 239.

CHAPTER 2: Shadwell and the Operatic Tempest of 1674

Such was the popularity of the new Tempest that by 1675, there had been yet another version (an operatic one), and a parody of the opera. It seems that the play was a great draw-card at the time.

The authorship of the opera was the issue of a debate which lasted over forty years, since W.J. Lawrence wrote an article called "Did Thomas Shadwell Write an Opera on The Tempest?" (1) As his proof, and admittedly his only authority, Lawrence cited John Downes, the author of Roscius Anglicanus which was published in 1708, and which was a rambling account of Restoration plays. Lawrence himself stated that Downes was an old man with a defective memory, and that his statements have largely been taken on trust. He admitted that the Roscius Anglicanus is "honeycombed with error", but said that in regard to the operatic version of The Tempest, Downes was "probably accurate (as he was a prompter at the old Duke's Theatre in Dorset Gardens)", where, as the title page announced, it was acted.

It is difficult to credit Lawrence's view as to the authorship of the opera, especially in the light of his own dubiety as to Downes' reliability. At any rate, no authorship can be completely proven, as on the title page there appears no name. We know that Henry Herringman published both the Dryden-Davenant quarto of 1670 and the operatic version in 1674 (which includes Dryden's 1667 Prologue and Epilogue), but unfortunately we were never told who made the changes.

Lawrence found two other pieces of "evidence" for his claim: first, that Pietro Reggio attributed the song "Arise, arise, ye subterranean winds" to Shadwell (2); and second, that stylistically the unpublished Prologue and Epilogue (in Egerton MS 2623) were Shadwell's, (because of the doggerel nature of the verse).

Downes' testimony cannot be taken too readily, as he was old (about seventy) when the Roscius Anglicanus was published

in 1708, and the events he described had happened at least thirty years previously. Pietro Reggio is the only person to have ascribed "Arise, arise" to Shadwell; and it is possible, according to Charles E. Ward (3), that Reggio was only a music teacher, with no first-hand dealings with the leading theatrical figures of the day. Also there were plenty of poor poets besides Shadwell who could have written the Prologue and Epilogue in Egerton MS 2623. So Lawrence's theory does rest on shaky ground.

In 1925, G. Thorn-Drury pointed out the weakness of Lawrence's evidence. "Shadwell was then (1674) a friend of Dryden and also of Reggio, the composer, and he was, which Dryden was not, a musician though only an amateur. In these circumstances I see nothing of moment in the appearance of the words of a song by him in the 1674 text, nor should I be impressed to the extent of adopting Mr. Lawrence's view, if it could be proved to demonstration that the words of the masque were also his." (4) Thorn-Drury likewise questioned Lawrence's attribution of the prologue and epilogue, and was suspicious at the lack of corroboratory evidence altogether. He argued that Dryden was responsible for the operatic additions.

The following year, 1926, D.M. Walmsley disagreed with Thorn-Drury and urged the claims of Shadwell. (5) Thorn-Drury in reply again attacked the reliability of Downes, being most sceptical about Shadwell's part in the new version. He asked whether anyone could make an opera out of what was already operatic. Again advocating Dryden's authorship, he felt that the play was revised bit by bit from time to time, rather than in one concentrated effort. (6) Walmsley replied again in 1927 (7), but by now the two scholars were going over old ground, and the controversy lapsed for twenty years. A stalemate had been reached.

In 1946, Ward argued that Thomas Betterton was responsible for the operatic version, as he was "the most likely person to have had the legal right to Davenant's Tempest, the interest, the knowledge, and the skill to make it an opera". (8) In 1673, said Ward, when the new play was being prepared for its

lavish production at Dorset Garden, Shadwell would have been too busy to be greatly connected with it, as he was engaged at the time with his own adaptation of Corneille's Psyche.

W.M. Milton, in 1947, summarised the arguments, and virtually cried enough when he pleaded reasonably: "Convenient as it would be for students of literature were it otherwise, dramatic productions are not, as are novels, essays, and poems, written by an individual and presented - in sacred individuality - to an individual. Old productions are often dug up, revised, modernised, "improved", and finally beaten into shape. Surprisingly, they are sometimes very successful. It may be of great historical and scholarly interest to determine exactly what any person did in a certain production, but let us avoid, if possible, attempting to decide who "wrote" such a hodge-podge as The Tempest of 1674. Nevertheless, Lawrence's conclusion, that Shadwell was responsible for the revisions in this version, appears to be, on the whole, still sound". (9)

It is the nature of the opera, not its authorship, which is the more important. Thorn-Drury, as has been said, pointed out the operatic nature of the Dryden-Davenant version, and there are a few new songs; but the operatic text of 1674 includes not only detailed stage-directions, and instructions which specify the musical nature of the piece, but also exhibits a much greater scope for spectacle and machinery.

The stage-directions introducing Scene i give the reader a good impression of what he is likely to experience as the plot unfolds:

"The Front of the Stage is open'd, and the Band of 24 Violins, with the Harpsicals and Theorbo's which accompany the Voices, are plac'd between the Pit and the Stage. While the Overture is playing, the Curtain rises, and discovers a new Frontispiece, joyn'd to the great Pylasters, on each side of the Stage. This Frontispiece is a noble Arch, supported by large wreathed Columns of the Corinthian Order; the wreathings of the Columns are beautifi'd with Roses wound round them, and

several Cupids flying about them. On the Cornice, just over the Capitals, sits on either side a Figure, with a Trumpet in one hand, and a Palm in the other, representing Fame. A little farther on the same Cornice, on each side of a Compass-pediment, lie a Lion and a Unicorn, the Supporters of the Royal Arms of England. In the middle of the Arch are several Angels holding the King's Arms, as if they were placing them in the midst of that Compass-pediment. Behind this is the Scene, which represents a thick Cloudy Sky, a very Rocky Coast, and a Tempestuous Sea in perpetual Agitation; This Tempest (suppos'd to be rais'd by Magick) has many dreadful Objects in it, as several Spirits in horrid shapes flying down amongst the Sailors, then rising and crossing in the Air. And when the Ship is sinking, the whole House is Darken'd, and a shower of Fire falls upon 'em. This is accompanied with Lightning, and several Claps of Thunder, to the end of the Storm."

Usually the orchestra for such a work contained twelve violins and other stringed instruments, and sat in the gallery. (10). The twenty-four violins were "evidently the Royal Band, established by Charles II early in his reign, in imitation of the band of Louis XIV". (11) The "Voices" are explained in a warrant of May 16, 1674: "It is his Ma^{ties} pleasure that Mr. Turner & Mr. Hart or any other Men or Boyes belonging to His Ma^{ties} Chappell Royall that sing in ye Tempest at His Royall Highnesse Theatre doe remaine in Towne all the Weeke (dureing his Ma^{ties} absence from Whitehall) to performe that service ..." (12).

Squire's account of the music in the opera is full and clear, although it is so complex, according to Christopher Spencer (p.409), that it needs the tabular listing given by J.G. McManaway (13).

The tunes for the entries and some of the dances were written by Giovanni Battista Draghi, but have been lost. In 1675, Matthew Locke wrote and published an overture, the Curtain tune, four Act tunes, and a Conclusion, John Banister

arranged settings for "Come unto these yellow sands" and "Full fathom five" in Act III. i, and "Go thy way" in Act III. iii. Pelham Humphrey composed a tune for "Where the bee sucks" in Act V. ii. (Both of these composers' works are printed in The Ariels Songs in the Play Call'd the Tempest, 1674-5).

McManaway emphasises (pp.79-80) that the operatic parts of the play, at least, were continually changing, a point which is connected with that of Thorn-Drury, that the Dryden-Davenant Tempest was becoming more operatic before 1673.

Music by Humphrey for "Where does the black fiend" (Act II. iv) and the masque in Act V. ii survives in manuscript, and was printed in part by Squire. "Arise ye subterranean winds" was set by Reggio and published in 1680.

In the mid-1690's, music composed for the opera by Henry Purcell replaced the earlier music. (14) Purcell's text for the masque in Act V is different from the published version of Shadwell's, being only about half as long and having other wording.

The striking features about the stage direction, etc., preceding Act I are the size of the "band", which approached an orchestra in volume, the elaborate set, reminiscent of those of Inigo Jones, the attempts at patriotism - no doubt to honour Charles II - and the provision for violent stage-effects at the end of the scene. Throughout the opera, there are a host of similar effects: "aerial wires for Ariel and Milcha to frisk about on, a tricksome table that whisked up and down through an eminently 'practical' trapdoor, bottles that disappeared undrained by human gullet, a rising sun, and various other mechanical excellencies, not to mention a chorus of devils, ballets of winds and Tritons ..." (15)

For the Restoration playwright and theatregoer, the word "opera" was more closely related to the Latin "works" than it is for us today, and music and stage machinery were of equal importance in the presentation. One aim of Restoration playwrights was to create a novel experience for their audiences. Music was popular on the stage of the period, and accompanied by visual effects of a striking nature, would

satisfy the common theatregoer, who seemed to like the theatre more when there was a lot going on in front of his eyes. There was much experimentation with new aspects of stage machinery. For example, in Act III, where Davenant had had the masque of the "eight fat Spirits", Shadwell penned a "Dance of fantastick Spirits", after which a table covered with meat and fruit is brought in by two spirits, so that Alonzo, Gonzalo, and Antonio may satisfy their hunger. But before they can start to eat, "Two Spirits descend, and flie away with the Table". This would have called for some quite ingenious machinery, which was, no doubt, extremely sophisticated. Montague Summers mentions the attempts at realism in the opera, and speculates upon the nature of the "flyings", which were used extensively later (1838) by Macready.

Shadwell made very few changes from the version by Davenant. There is really little more than the transposition of a few scenes, with occasional cuts and deletions, and the addition of the colourful masque at the end. Examples of scene changes include Davenant's II. i, which becomes II. iii in the opera. (It opens with a few speeches taken from the first half of Davenant's II. i, and continues with a masque of Devils, allegorical figures - Pride, Fraud, Rapine and Murder - who upbraid Alonzo and terrify him and his courtiers.) The two songs ("Come unto these yellow sands" and "Full fathom five") are transferred from Davenant's Act II to the beginning of Act III in the opera.

Milcha, with her one word ("Here") in the earlier version, has a much more expanded role, though she still does not warrant a place in the dramatis personae. She makes her first appearance in Act I. ii, and sings duets with Ariel, as well as one song, "Full fathom five", by herself. Apart from her, there are no character changes at all.

The major addition, and the most interesting, is the masque at the conclusion of Act V, a "prodigious" spectacle, with Neptune, Oceanus and Tethys appearing "in a Chariot drawn with Sea-Horses; on each side of the Chariot, Sea-Gods and Goddesses, tritons and Nereids". The masque, says Odell (I, p.34) is "quite in the operatic vein of the period to

which it belongs - the period of the opening of the Dorset Garden house, and of (a) succession of operatic wonders ...". The masque consists of a "perfect orgy of solos, duets, dances, and appearances. Winds fly up and down." (16) At one juncture the Tritons, "at every repeat of 'Sound a Calm'", change "their Figure and Postures (and) seem to sound their wreathed Trumpets made of Shells". This is followed by a "Symphony of Musick", dances, and choruses. The play ends with Ariel, accompanied by a number of "Aerial Spirits", flying from the Sun, and singing, before gaining his freedom, "Where the bee sucks", no doubt hovering in mid-air, dangling from a wire. Ariel is then granted his freedom by Prospero, and the whole is rounded off by an Epilogue, the same as the 1670 one.

Despite these differences, it is easy to see that basically the operatic version is still the Dryden-Davenant version, embellished and modified. The 1667 adaptation, though exceedingly popular, had not contained enough spectacle, and Shadwell obviously made his changes, as I have said before, with the hope of creating better box-office appeal. The opera, says Hogan (17) was certainly the version used in the theatres in the eighteenth century. Downes recorded that everything was "perform'd in it so Admirably well, that not any succeeding Opera got more money". (18) It was a case of money making money: if the Egerton MS 2623 Prologue and Epilogue can be quoted in evidence, the opera was staged at "a vast expence ... for now no cost wee'll spare". The more lavish the production, the more attracted the audiences, and the greater the profit, which was intended to be ploughed back into the business, so that more would come along and envy "our Splendid house, & prosp'rous playes". (Prologue). The writer boasted in the Epilogue of "the new Arts" to please the spectators, arts especially imported from France: "Machines to some perfection brought, And above 30 Warbling voyces ...". Nothing, he continued, had been spared.

There are many contemporary allusions which show that the Dryden-Davenant-Shadwell adaptations were very popular with Restoration audiences. An anonymous poem published in the Country Club 4to, 1679, contained these lines:

"Such noise, such stink, such smoke there was, you'd swear
The Tempest surely had been acted there.

The cryes of starboard, Lar-board, cheerly boys,
Is but as demy-rattles to this noise." (19)

The Rehearsal, a comedy (1671), attributed to the second Duke of Buckingham but probably the work of Samuel Butler and others, satirised the heroic tragedies of the Restoration, especially Davenant's Shakespearean reproduction. Here the playwright mocks the lack of skill of the actors, who dance "worse than the Angels in Harry the Eight, or the fat Spirits in The Tempest, I gad". (20)

The Marriage Hater Matched, written by Thomas D'Urfey and presented at the Theatre Royal early in January 1692, has the following reference:

Lord Brainless: A player, ha ha ha, why now you Rave,
Madam, - Darewel, thou canst witness the contrary
of that, thou toldst me her Breeding was such, that
she had been familiar with Kings and Queens.

Darewell: Ay my Lord in the Playhouse, I told ye she was
a High Flyer too, that is, I have seen her upon a
Machine in the Tempest. (21)

So well was the opera received by the public, and so financially successful had it become, that in turn it underwent a "sea-change", when in November 1674 a mediocre milliner-turned-playwright employed by the King's Company, Thomas Duffet, was commissioned to write a parody. This was entitled The Mock Tempest, or The Enchanted Castle, "writ on purpose to draw company from the other theatre, where was great resort about that time to see that revived comedy called 'The Tempest', then much in vogue". (22)

First published in February 1675, Duffet's Mock Tempest is very rare, as there are only two issues of it, both in quarto. It was not well-received by playgoers; Lawrence says that people seeing it in Dublin were "quitting the house before the performance was half over". As a parody, it is not a work of art in its own right, but the fact that it was written at all attests to the enormous popularity of the adaptations.

Shakespeare's genuine play was not seen on the stage from the outbreak of the Civil War until 1746, and even then it was

"not deemed strong enough to stand alone, and was bolstered with Shadwell's old masque of Neptune and Amphitrite for which (Thomas) Arne had written new music". (23) However, revivals of the operatic version were frequent throughout the eighteenth century. Hogan shows that from 1701 to 1750 it ran through 180 performances (compared with six of the original, all staged in 1746). As was the case universally, Shakespearian adaptations drove the originals from the stage.

NOTES

1. Anglia, XXVII (1904), pp.205-217. Revised and reprinted in W.J. Lawrence, The Elizabethan Playhouse and Other Studies (New York, 1963).
2. Pietro Reggio, Songs, Part II (1680): "'Arise, arise, ye subterranean winds", A Song in The Tempest - the Words by Mr. Shadwell'. Cited by Odell, I, p.34.
3. Charles E. Ward, "The Tempest: A Restoration Opera Problem", ELH, XIII (1946), p.125.
4. G. Thorn-Drury, "Some Notes on Dryden", RES, I (1925), pp.327-330.
5. D.M. Walmsley, "Shadwell and the Operatic Tempest", RES, II (1926), pp.463-466.
6. Thorn-Drury, "Shadwell and the Operatic Tempest", RES, III (1927), pp.204-208.
7. Walmsley, "Shadwell and the Operatic Tempest", RES, III (1927), pp.451-453.
8. Ward, op. cit., p.128.
9. William M. Milton, "Tempest in a Teapot", ELH, XIV (1947), p.218.
10. E.J. Dent, Foundations of English Opera (Cambridge, 1928), p.140.
(For notes 10-14 (inclusive) I am indebted to Christopher Spencer, pp.409-410, and all of the comments on and references to the music in Shadwell's opera come from his book.)
11. W.B. Squire, "The Music of Shadwell's Tempest", Musical Quarterly, VII (1921), pp.565-578.
12. Allardyce Nicoll, History of Restoration Drama (London, 1925), I, p.356.

13. J.G. McManaway, "Songs and Masques of The Tempest", Theatre Miscellany, Luttrell Society Reprints, No.14 (1953),p.87.
14. Purcell's music is described by Robert E. Moore, Henry Purcell and the Restoration Theatre (Cambridge, Mass., 1961), pp.188-203.
15. Hazelton Spencer, p.204.
16. ibid., p.208.
17. C.B. Hogan, Shakespeare in the Theatre, 1701-1800, 2 vols, (Oxford, 1957), I, p.422.
18. Cited by Odell, I, p.33.
19. Montague Summers, Shakespearean Adaptations (London, 1966), p.liv.
20. Mentioned by Halliday (Companion), p.406.
21. Cited by Hazelton Spencer, p.209.
22. Gerard Langbaine, An Account of the English Dramatick Poets (1691); cited by Wilson, p.138.
23. Lawrence (Elizabethan Playhouse), p.206.

CHAPTER 3: David Garrick's adaptations

For about eighty years, the Dryden-Davenant-Shadwell version of The Tempest was not interfered with and drew good houses. It was still a major attraction when David Garrick assumed management of the Drury Lane Theatre in 1747. "Nineteenth- and twentieth-century critics have deplored the fact that Garrick, when he became manager, turned back to the Dryden-Davenant-Shadwell version, and failed to schedule the original despite a lack of interest displayed by an audience which cared to see it only half a dozen times. A new manager not firmly intrenched, however, was hardly going to court failure. So during his first season he produced the late Restoration adaptation which had proved itself successful in the box-office". (1)

This venture (on December 26, 28, and 29, 1747) was, surprisingly, a financial failure. Stone, p.1., gives the takings for the three nights: £160, £150, £100. A further night (on April 11, 1748) realised £130. (2) In 1750, Garrick tried again, with a six night season (from January 1 intermittently to April 27) having an average receipt of little over £100. At last, it was only too apparent that the Restoration adaptation had had its day. A reaction had set in quite early in the eighteenth century against taking wholesale liberties with Shakespeare's texts. Henry Fielding, in the Historical Register for the Year 1736, had written: "Shakespeare is already good enough for people of taste; he must be altered to the palates of those who have none ... I have too great an honour for Shakespeare to think of burlesquing him, and to be sure of not burlesquing him by accident". (3)

Apparently, though, Shakespeare's Tempest was one of the best examples of Shakespeare's (uncouth) genius. William Warburton, the fifth editor of Shakespeare, called The Tempest (and A Midsummer Night's Dream) "the noblest effort of that sublime and amazing imagination, peculiar to Shakespeare, which soars above the bounds of nature, without forsaking sense; or more properly, carries nature along with it, beyond her terrestrial limits". (4)

In The Adventurer No.93, September 25, 1753, Joseph Warton summed up contemporary opinion when he wrote: "Of all the plays of Shakespeare, the Tempest is the most striking instance of his creative power. He has there given the reins to his boundless imagination, and has created the romantic, the wonderful, and the wild, to the most pleasing extravagance. ..." As well as extolling the play's virtues, however, Warton did mention its faults too: its obscurity and its archaic, inflated language. Garrick was obviously fond of the play, as indeed he was of its author, and after the failure of the 1750 season of the Restoration version, he kept the original up his sleeve for several years.

Garrick can best be described as a Shakespeare fanatic, as Christian Deelman's fascinating account of the 1769 Stratford Jubilee relates. (5) Garrick envisaged himself as Shakespeare's heir. His favourite portrait of himself was one by Thomas Gainsborough, which depicted him standing casually, with his legs crossed, and leaning on a bust of Shakespeare. A typical conception of Shakespeare at the time is Peter Scheemakers' statue of him draped over a book-covered pedestal, holding a scroll on which appears Garrick's own hybrid version of Prospero's words in Act IV, scene i (148-158). Garrick was determined to acquire a reputation as the saviour of Shakespeare, the man who rescued him from the spoils of time:

"'Tis my chief wish, my joy, my only plan,

To spill no drop of that immortal man."

(What Garrick intended to do, and what he did in practice, were completely different things, as I shall attempt to show later on.)

No eighteenth century adaptations of Shakespeare lasted as long as the Restoration versions, but it was more or less expected that famous actors would publish their own versions, "usually transpositions of scenes and omissions of passages that 'wound the patience'". (6)

During the 1750's, when musical shows were popular and fashionable, Garrick began to experiment himself with Shakespeare. In 1755, his Fairies (from A Midsummer Night's Dream) had proved immensely popular. (7) Encouraged by this

success, he saw the operatic possibilities of The Tempest, as well as its fanciful elements, and converted it (or had it converted - it is not certain which) into a three-act opera. This was first performed on February 11, 1756, at Drury Lane, and was published, according to the Gentleman's Magazine of February 1756, in its list of new books, the same month by J. & R. Tonson. (8) On the title-page there is no indication of authorship, except that the music was composed by "Mr. Smith" (John Christopher Smith (1712-1795), Handel's protégé). At the foot of the list of the cast, a note hoped that readers would "excuse the omission of many passages of first merit", as it was impossible to incorporate them in the opera. Garrick denied authorship of this and the Fairies, but the weight of critical evidence points to his sanctioning of it, if not his own personal hand.

The opera was basically a new version, not merely a revamping, though Garrick did bring in several features of the Dryden-Davenant-Shadwell effort, as they had proved to be the most popular of the additions in the past.

Act I opens with Shadwell's "Arise, arise, ye subterranean winds" (previously ending Act II), sung by Ariel, not by a Devil. From this song to the duet by Ferdinand and Miranda which closes Act III, Garrick cut much of the original Shakespearean text and did away with most of Davenant's additional characters. Trincalo's role is greatly diminished, and Hippolito, Dorinda, Sycorax, and Milcha have utterly disappeared, which is no great loss to the stage. Only Mustacho and Ventoso remain.

The opera, then, is reasonably brief, but it has been greatly swollen by the inclusion of thirty-two songs, only three of which are actually Shakespeare's, (including "Come unto these yellow sands" and "Full fathom five", which have been taken from Act I, scene ii in the original, and placed in Garrick's Act I, scene iv.) "Where the bee sucks" has been omitted from the text. Most of the songs were written (lyrics and music) by Smith, but Garrick incorporated several of Shadwell's as well.

The opera apparently was a dismal failure, and it is not surprising that Garrick repudiated authorship of it. The first

night (February 11) saw a receipt of £180, but the popularity of the premiere was short-lived, and for the rest of the season, the opera made little money. (9) Even Garrick's usually-appreciative supporters were scathing in their attacks on the new venture. Murphy wrote that "Garrick ought not to have suffered such a play to dwindle into an opera. The harmony of the versification wanted no aid from music. He had said in a former prologue that, 'He wished to lose no drop of that immortal man', and here he has lost a tun of him. Had he revived the Tempest, as it stands in the original, and played the character of Prospero, he would have done justice to the God of his Idolatry, and honour to himself". (10)

Theophilus Cibber, referring to Garrick's adaptation of The Winter's Tale, described it as "Thus lop'd, hack'd, and dock'd, appears without Head or Tail". He used similar terms about The Tempest, which he considered to have been "castrated into an Opera", and called Garrick a "pilfering pedlar of poetry". "Oh! what an agreeable lullaby might it have proved to our Beaus and Belles, to have heard Caliban, Sycorax, and one of the Devils trilling of trios.... Why truly ... he does bottle him (Shakespeare) up with a Vengeance! - he throws away all the Spirited part of him, all that bears the highest flavour; - then, to some of the dregs, adds a little flat stuff of his own, and modestly palms it off on his customers - as Wines of the first Growth ..." (11)

From comments such as Murphy's and Cibber's, it is apparent that Shakespeare, pure and unadulterated, was now being preferred to subsequent improvements of whatever type. Despite the fact that some critics, Warburton for example, praised Garrick's new work, the opera was doomed, and Garrick seems to have learnt his lesson, for in a letter of December 1756 to James Murphy French, who had accused him of setting "even Shakespear a quavering", he repudiated the operatic version entirely. (12)

On October 20, 1757, he presented at Drury Lane a version of the play which remained part of that theatre's repertoire for as long as Garrick was its manager (until 1776). Stone tells us, and Hogan shows us, that there were only two seasons

(1759-60 and 1767-68) when it was not acted there. More than 400 lines were deleted and only fourteen added; the plot was kept simple and concise and was close to the original. The "Alonzo-group" had their conversation in Act II. i greatly reduced, the plot by Antonio and Sebastian to murder Alonzo was curtailed, and so was the masque of Iris, Juno, and Ceres in Act IV. In this way, the exigencies of plot were retained and everything remained clear, despite the abridgements.

Beside the three major excisions, little else was altered. As Stone, p.6, points out, "the twentieth century critic misses most Gonzalo's description of his Utopian commonwealth, and Prospero's lines, 'We are such stuff as dreams are made on, and our little life is rounded with a sleep'. All in all, Garrick's is an excellent acting version, preserving a remarkably pure text in which only one character, Gonzalo, can be said to have lost anything significant by excision. All the Shakespearean songs remain, and no others are added".

Gonzalo's Utopian views and Prospero's "Our revels now are ended" tended to give the original a little more dream-like quality. Both deal with the intangibility and ethereal aspects of man's dreams and aspirations. Gonzalo's speeches on his 'perfect' commonwealth (Shakespeare's Act II, scene i), are so idealistic that he disregards utterly the ramifications of running such a state, or even living in it. Picking out a few phrases from his three short speeches, we can at once see inevitable anarchy occurring, should such a commonwealth ever be established, for there would be "no name of magistrate", but no crime either; no "treason, felony, sword, pike, knife, gun, or need of any engine"; there would likewise be no trade, no need to work: "all men idle, all". What Gonzalo is propounding is too far removed from real life, and his ideas are impracticable. The worldly sophisticates, Sebastian and Antonio, immediately mock Gonzalo's plans.

Prospero, however, who has seen as much of the world as Sebastian and Antonio, realises the need to listen to men of an idealistic temperament in a stale and cynical world. The

world created by men's minds, he implies in his speech in Act IV, scene i (ll. 148-158) is more important for men than reality. His is the Platonic idea - that the world around us is only a poor shadow of the ultimate reality, an imitation. A man should endeavour to transcend this world and contemplate the other. One is reminded of Browning's "A man's reach should exceed his grasp/ Or What's a heaven for?" in Andrea del Sarto, or of Graham Greene's phrase in The Lawless Roads, where he talks about the benefits religion and faith bring, enabling a man to get away from "the graceless, sinless, empty, chromium world". Prospero implies that Caliban's reach does not exceed his grasp. Caliban is not one of those who are "such stuff/ As dreams are made on". The other characters are, and because they are, they should not be tied to the rather drab, sterile, and demeaning world around them, but should aspire to transcend it.

In Shakespeare's Act V, i, when Prospero has "spell-stopp'd" the courtiers, he speaks some words that show his spiritual kinship with Gonzalo. He calls him "holy" and "honourable", and obviously shares his idealism. Man's dreams and aspirations may be intangible and ethereal, but nevertheless, they are absolutely necessary for his balanced existence.

It was typical, perhaps, of the eighteenth century, with its greater matter-of-factness, and its emphasis on material, not on spiritual welfare, that Gonzalo's "I'th' commonwealth" and Prospero's "Our revels now are ended" should have been excised in Garrick's 1757 version. The eighteenth century was a period of rationalism and materialism. Reason was regarded as being paramount, and society was rather stagnant, because it was felt strongly that man had reached his peak. Man was seen as the master of creation. He was more or less his own God. "The proper study of mankind", said Pope in his Essay on Man, "is man". The present, and material objects, were more important and more tangible than the future or the idealistic, and consequently aspirations such as Gonzalo's had little place in men's lives.

I believe that this is the reason why Garrick removed the two speeches above: they had precious little relevance to contemporary life.

Garrick's version was first printed in Bell's Acting Edition in 1773, "regulated from the prompt-book". The only minor fault that can be found, perhaps, is in the song, "Where the bee sucks", where Garrick did not restore the original second hemistich, "there suck I"; instead preferring the eighteenth century amendment of "there lurk I", which sounds ridiculous to modern ears, but which to Theobald was the only possible rendering. (Furness, on p.241, tells us in a note that Theobald had "lurk" 'on the plea that "a spirit of a refin'd aetherial essence" could not be "intended to want food".')

The restored play proved highly successful, and was as popular as Shadwell's version had been earlier. There are receipts available for thirty-two performances; more than £4783 was realised for them. It was also performed at Royal Command in front of the king (George II) on November 23, 1757, attracted a full house on December 5, 1757, despite a simultaneous performance of King Lear at the rival theatre, Covent Garden, which starred the famous actor, Spranger Barry, and was chosen for actors' benefits twenty times between 1757 and 1775. (13)

There are several reasons why an almost-pure Shakespeare was now preferred to versions that were his only by a long stretch of the imagination. Critics began to defend Shakespeare against the charges brought against him by Voltaire, Dennis, Rymer, inter alia, for his lack of decorum and his neglect of the strict neo-classical rules. Shakespeare's "neglect" of the unities, which for so long had kept him in disrepute, was condoned by Horace Walpole, who rejected the unities as "mechanic". (14) Pleas were made for greater latitude in Shakespearean criticism, notably by Dr. Johnson, who, writing in the Preface to his edition of Shakespeare (1765), argued on behalf of commonsense and (to use Coleridge's phrase) a willing suspension of disbelief. Johnson openly attacked Dennis, Rymer, and Voltaire, and said that their criticisms of Shakespeare were "the petty cavils of petty minds". (15)

In 1775, the Universal Magazine commented that writers

who use mechanical methods "are justly denied the palm of genius", and therefore critics should not "comment by line and rule". (16)

It was in the face of such opposition to the narrow criticism of the neo-classical critics that Shakespeare began to be appreciated for what he was, not condemned for what he was not. Pope, in 1725, had pointed out the folly of judging Shakespeare by Aristotle's 'rules', which, he said, "is like trying a man by the Laws of one Country, who acted under those of another". (17)

What Babcock termed "the genesis of Shakespeare idolatry" was well-established when Garrick redecorated the whole bandwagon with his famous Jubilee at Stratford in September 1769. Popular regard and respect for the poet was brought to fever pitch. For months preceding the event, local tradesmen and confidence men were drawing the tourists with extravagant claims. The mulberry tree reputed to have grown outside Shakespeare's back door in Stratford had been chopped down, and enough artifacts and carvings purporting to come from it were sold at exorbitant rates to have demolished a whole forest of mulberry trees. But nobody cared. Stratford became a focal point of interest. Halliwell-Phillips gave an account of the proceedings last century:

"The Jubilee of 1769 was the name given to a series of entertainments at Stratford that were devised and arranged in that year by Garrick, a celebrated actor of the day, under the ostensible pretence of doing honour to Shakespeare. And the great poet was dignified in this fashion. - The opening of the celebration having been duly announced in early morn by a powder cannonade, the lady visitors were serenaded in rotation by young men attired in fancy costume, and when everybody had thus been thoroughly aroused, Garrick was presented by the Corporation with a medal and a wand, both made from relics of the famous mulberry-tree, bells and cannon loudly uniting to proclaim the acceptance of the gifts. Then there were public feasts, more serenading, an oratorio at the church, elaborate processions, a masquerade, illuminations, fireworks, horse-races, and

an unlimited supply of drummers. In the midst, however, of all this tomfoolery, the presiding genius of the show recited an ode in praise of the great dramatist, that achievement and some of the gaieties taking place in a large wooden theatre that had been erected for the occasion on the Bancroft." (19)

It was unfortunate for Garrick that his dream was ended rather hastily when, following torrential rain, the proceedings had to be curtailed because of flooding.

In October, the Jubilee was transferred to Drury Lane, and for several years the public was entertained by this and other spectacles, all paying homage to Shakespeare, but consisting of little else than processions of favourite Shakespearean characters across the stage, and potted excerpts of the better-known speeches. What had started out as idolatry and genuine reverence was turning into flamboyant bad taste on a vast scale. Like Dryden, the adapters of the later mid-eighteenth century were theoretically full of the best intentions, but faltered in practice. F. Gentleman, writing in 1770, deplored the trend: "Oh Shakespeare, Shakespeare, what a spectacle art thou made; how is thy muse of fire cabin'd, cribb'd, confin'd, by such mechanical representation; methinks, if thou wert alive again, the shallow justice who prosecuted thee for stealing venison would be sooner forgiven, than those who make thy great name a bait for gudgeons". (19)

NOTES

1. George Winchester Stone, "Shakespeare's Tempest at Drury Lane During Garrick's Management", SQ, II (1953), p.1.
2. loc. cit.; Hogan, I, pp.76, 78.
3. Cited by Karl J. Holzknecht, The Backgrounds of Shakespeare's Plays (New York, 1950), p.418.
4. Cited by Elizabeth Griffith, Eighteenth Century Shakespeare (London, 1971), Vol.14.
5. Christian Deelman, The Great Shakespeare Jubilee (London, 1964).
6. Holzknecht, ibid.
7. Described by G.W. Stone, "A Midsummer Night's Dream in the hands of Garrick and Colman", PMLA, LIV (June 1939), pp.467-482.
8. Stone, p.2.
9. Hogan, II, p.14, gives the receipts for the ensuing nights:
Feb.13: £140; Feb.18: £100; Feb.20: £90; Feb.26: £100;
Mar.16 (with Fortunatus in a double-bill): £130.
10. Arthur Murphy, Life of Garrick, II, pp.302-303. Cited by Stone, p.3.
11. Theophilus Cibber, Two Dissertations upon the Theatres ... (1756?). Cited by Odell, I, p.365.
12. Cited by E.P. Stein, David Garrick, MLA Revolving Fund Series, VII (1937), p.47.
13. Stone, p.7 (from Cross Diary, and Drury Lane Treasurer's Books (Folger Shakespeare Library)).

14. Horace Walpole, Postscript to The Mysterious Mother (1768). Cited by R.W. Babcock, The Genesis of Shakespeare Idolatry (Chapel Hill, 1931), p.48.
15. Samuel Johnson, Preface to his edition of Shakespeare (London, 1765; reprinted in the original pagination by AMS Press, Inc., 1968), p.xiii.
16. Babcock, p.48.
17. D. Nicol Smith, Shakespearean Criticism (Oxford, 1916), p.51.
18. Cited by Halliday, Companion, p.260.
19. A comment on George Colman's Man and Wife; or The Shakespeare Jubilee (1770), which was a great tribute to Shakespeare and his popularity. Cited by Babcock, p.40, who also lists contemporary reviews of the various Jubilees.

CHAPTER 4: Kemble and Macready

The next person to lay his hands on The Tempest was John Philip Kemble. In 1757, the Kembles, a touring theatrical family, were at Worcester in the spring, where Roger Kemble, the father, arranged a "Concert of Musick" which was to feature, intermittently throughout the evening, "gratis, a celebrated comedy, call'd The Tempest; or the Enchanted Island ... with all the scenery, machinery, musick, monsters, and other decorations proper to the piece, entirely new". At the end of the evening the audience was to see a grand tableau involving Neptune, "Poetick of God of the Ocean", with Amphitrite in a chariot which was drawn by "Seahorses, accompanied with Mermaids, Tritons etc." (1)

John Philip Kemble, who was at this time only a baby, was thus more or less born into the world of Shakespearean extravaganza. After starting his training as a priest, a vocation to which he found himself unsuited, he returned to the theatre in 1776, and for five seasons from 1783 played many tragic roles opposite his sister, Sarah Siddons. From 1788 to 1802 he was the manager at Drury Lane, then, following an argument with Sheridan, the proprietor, he became manager of Covent Garden in 1803, retiring in 1817 (when the rivalry of Edmund Kean was threatening his success).

Though Kemble staged many of Shakespeare's plays in their original form, he often preferred 'improved' versions, and apparently had a penchant for Tate's King Lear.

Kemble thought of Shakespeare as rather a formless writer, and set out with the intention of imposing form on him. Baker (p.158) says that "this is the key to understanding Kemble's very free omissions, rearrangements, bowdlerizings, and even verbal alterations of a poet whom he professed to adore". Baker goes on to imply that to Kemble as to the Restoration dramatists and critics Shakespeare needed to be brought sharply up-to-date and refined "for presentation on the sacred boards of Drury Lane". Kemble, he continues, was eager to produce Shakespeare to the public in a form which was "shapely and polite and 'classical'".

Public opinion backed Kemble's treatment of Shakespeare's plays, but subsequent criticism has taken him to task for his interpretations' being too liberal.

The Tempest he tried to make "prodigiously attractive". Being a competent businessman with an eye for receipts, Kemble noted the tremendous success that operatic versions had had, and determined to continue in the same vein. He also knew that the public liked variety, and so he contrived to make the most of all the previous additions and alterations. Garrick's 1757 version, which as far as the Shakespearean purist is concerned was a most satisfactory one, Kemble neglected completely for reasons best known to himself. Garrick, despite his shortcomings, at least had had the decency to delete Davenant's additions, but Kemble "felt called upon to ... restore all the silly Hippolito-Dorinda stuff" when he was preparing his own version for Drury Lane. (2)

The main features of this version, first produced on October 13, 1789, are like the Restoration ones: Hippolito and Dorinda, the duel between Hippolito and Ferdinand, the anger of Prospero and his judgement on Ferdinand, and so on. He "went to Dryden's alteration, and virtually duplicated that gentleman's operatic melange". (3) If Garrick in 1756 had included thirty-two songs, Kemble was determined to be even more musical and, as Odell puts it (ibid.), the new version "bristles with music" (especially the parts of Ferdinand and Miranda), to the point of becoming sickening.

It is difficult to imagine what was in Kemble's mind as he rehearsed his new opera. He was undoubtedly aware of the success of the original Tempest in Garrick's hands, the version he had restored to the stage in 1757, and which had run to 114 performances by 1787. He must also have known that Garrick's 1756 opera died after six performances, and that an operatic version had been unsuccessful at Covent Garden in the late 1770's. (4) But despite the irrefutable evidence that operatic versions did not attract the fullest houses any longer, nor have long seasons, Kemble pressed on. His action, especially in the light of what his biographer, Boaden, wrote about his notion of producing Shakespeare, is inexplicable:

"(It) was not to order the prompter to write out the

parts from some mutilated prompt-copy lingering on his shelves; but himself to consider it attentively in the author's genuine book; then to examine what corrections could be properly admitted into his text; and finally, what could be cut out in the representation, not as disputing the judgement of the author, but as suiting the time of the representation to the habits of his audience, or a little favouring the powers of his actors in order that the performance might be as uniformly good as it was practicable to make it." (5)

By contemporary standards, Kemble's gamble paid off, and his opera was fairly successful, far more so than Garrick's had been. Within two years of its initial production, it had been staged twenty-two times, and its receipts showed no sign of slackening. These twenty-two performances realised nearly £4,200, so Kemble had in Boaden's words, obviously suited "the time of the representation to the habits of his audience".

Hogan summarises the action (6). Kemble retained Purcell's 1695 music for the opera, and the additional music composed by Thomas Arne. His plot, and his method of presentation, are about as far as it is possible to get from Shakespeare's original. Much of Shakespeare's poetry has been pruned away - only a little remains to provide a skeleton framework for the action, or to provide link-passages for the copious number of songs.

Baker calls Kemble's opera a "monstrosity" which pleased the town because "after all, virtually the same piece had been pleasing the town for more than a century". (7) In his Journal for October 13, 1789, Kemble wrote that the production "was received with great Applause - Miss Farren (Dorinda) and Mr. Moody (Stephano) acted inimitably - Mr. Kelly (Ferdinand) and Mrs. Gouch (Miranda) considerably aided the success of the piece" (8)

One contemporary editor (of the theatrical periodical, the Prompter, which ran to nineteen issues between October 24 and December 10, 1789) did, however, sound a note of caution: "The Tempest always brings a full house, but the audience were disappointed and displeased at the liberties taken by authors

and managers with one^{of} our poet's most celebrated comedies. ... It is a very hazardous attempt to alter Shakespeare's writing, for we at once lose connection, thought, stile, and language." (9)

The opera was not destined for a long run of successes. Kemble, like Garrick before him, obviously had a change of heart when, in 1806, December 8, he produced a new version at Covent Garden. The multitude of songs was deleted, and Kemble felt that this new attempt was "greatly superior to his first". Odell says that this Tempest is as good a union as can be made of the discordant elements in Dryden and Shakespeare", and wonders why these elements were only then, after a lapse of 140 years, mingled. (II, p.60) The critics of the time mocked Kemble's efforts. One said that they were "as tasteless as indecent, and totally subversive of the simplicity of Shakespeare's drama". (10)

The last adaptation of The Tempest was staged in 1821. Produced by Frederic Reynolds, and starring William Macready as Prospero, the version was, once again, basically the Dryden-Davenant one, with music by Purcell, Haydn, Mozart, Rossini, and others. Odell (11) says that it was "popular vogue to add music to Shakespeare in the early nineteenth century ... (but) the novelty of this sort of entertainment was evidently starting to wear off". An article in John Bull, 27 May, 1821, sounded what was probably the death-knell for the Dryden-Davenant collaboration, which, after all, had had a marvellously long, if chequered, career. "The Tempest has been revived at Covent Garden with equivocal success, at which we are not surprised; the system of making tragedies operas, and singers actresses, is an absurd one, and only serves to show how much in the way of combination is required, in these times, to make a house; in this instance, however, the effort has failed, for the audience have not increased in number at all since this revival, so that getting up The Tempest, even with additional airs, has failed 'to raise the Wind'". (12) The revival, according to Baker too ostentatious, had a limited season of only eleven performances. Macready, who played Prospero in this version, detested this "melange that was called Shakespeare's Tempest, with songs interpolated by Reynolds among the mutilations and barbarous ingraftings of Dryden and Davenant". (13)

Unlike Dryden, Garrick and Kemble before him, all of whom had professed that Shakespeare would never be adulterated at their hands as long as it was practicable to stage his original plays, Macready seems to have had such genuine regard for Shakespeare that he restored Coriolanus, King Lear and The Tempest to the London stage in more or less their original form.

If Macready had a weakness, it was for an excessive use of his stage machinery, but apart from this, the production by him of The Tempest which began its season at Covent Garden on October 13, 1838, is by far and away the version which was closest to Shakespeare's in intention, form, and dialogue. Above all, the text was purged of the long-standing additions by Dryden and Davenant. In his diary, he made mention of the island which he had had covered with rocks and trees in incredible shapes. "as though the sylphs that dwelt there had gambolled and twisted them into sylph-like meanings".

(14) Macready still retained a little music, but this was not an obtrusive clotheshorse upon which to hang a little dialogue, as Garrick's 1756 and Kemble's 1789 versions had been. What music there was was largely Purcell's, dating from 1695, and "was so performed that it seemed to come, magically, from every part of space". (15)

The preparation proved to be a headache for Macready. His diary of the last days leading up to October 13 reveal how hard he was working to ensure that everything was perfect:

October 9th: Attended the night rehearsal of 'The Tempest', with the scenery of which I was detained till half-past two o'clock. Went to bed about half-past three, and read Prospero till past four.

October 10th: Very much fatigued, in fact, rather overworked. Went to the theatre, and attended to the rehearsal of the words of 'The Tempest' ... Spoke with Marshall about some very important alteration in the scenery

October 11th: Lay in bed to recover my exhausted frame from the wearing effects of the late hard labour ...

October 12th: The entire day, from eleven in the morning until past one at night, devoted to the rehearsal of

'The Tempest', with the effect of which I am by no means satisfied. (16)

On the 13th, after he had made some last minute "valuable alterations" to the play, the first night went off smoothly, and its reception was ample recompense for his painstaking work beforehand. "Was greatly received. Called for after the play, and received again with enthusiasm. Dickens and Forster went to our box". (17) Forster, indeed, writing in The Examiner 8 days later, enthused about the play, calling it "a daydream realised for all eyes and hearts".

It was Macready's intention to give a largely visual interpretation of the images evoked by Shakespeare's poetry. Act I, scene i, for example, was played entirely in pantomime, with an enormous ship ploughing up and down and foundering on a painted ocean at the rear of the stage. Macready was not content to exhibit an earth-bound Ariel. Taking the name "Ariel" literally, he had Miss Priscilla Horton appear in this scene, as in the subsequent ones, in a flying harness, floating above the action below. Her "skimming flights as Ariel delighted the house, though John Bull complained testily that she had been whisked about by wires and a cog-wheel like the Cinderella fairies". (18)

But apart from John Bull, Macready's audience loved the play. His diary entries for the next two days show how the performance had affected him too:

October 14: Could not recover myself from the excitement of last night. The scenes of the storm, the flights of Ariel, and the enthusiasm of the house were constantly recurring to me.

October 15: Went to the theatre, where I saw the newspapers, renewed the excitement that I thought had subsided. I tried to tranquillise myself, but vainly. This is not a life to live for one who wishes to improve himself by living - it is a tempest itself. (19)

Perhaps "this life" was proving too strenuous for Macready. He was engaged in all sorts of dramatic performances at the time, and was not only playing the part of Prospero, but other Shakespearean heroes as well. At any rate, he decided, after fifty-five well-received performances which averaged £230 a night,

to end the play's season. One of his eccentricities was that he "considered it a point of integrity to perform no work more than four times a week, regardless of its popularity". (20) I can put forward no other reason for his decision to end the popular run other than the pressure of his commitments. It is difficult to reconcile his diary entry for June 3, 1839:

"The last night, the 55th, of 'The Tempest' was crowded. I felt quite melancholy as we approached the end of the play; it had become endeared to me from success and the benefit it had conferred upon my undertaking. ... I look back upon its production with satisfaction, for it has given to the public a play of Shakespeare which had never been seen before, and it has proved the charm of simplicity and poetry." (21)

Despite the rather surprising nature of the end of the revival's season, Macready had, at long last, been able to restore The Tempest, almost wholly unadulterated, to the stage, and secure an audience which was generally appreciative of, and ready to applaud, the true Shakespeare. The announcement of the reopening of Covent Garden on September 24, 1838, had promised "the revival of the standard plays of Shakespeare in the genuine text of the Poet", to be "persevered in with increased activity, and without regard to expense in attaining the utmost fidelity of historic illustration", (22) and Macready had been as good as his word. His version earlier in 1838 of King Lear had been so faithful to the original text that "the ghost of Nahum Tate ... was laid forever". (23) His integrity shows through constantly when one reads his diaries - unlike other producers and arrangers of Shakespeare before him, he was no hypocrite, and his professed regard for Shakespeare is clearly exhibited in his productions. (24) It is noticeable, however, that Shakespeare's poetry took rather a back seat; Odell gives us (II, p.218) John Bull's remarks for October 21, 1838, which chide Macready for his use of scenery, mime, and machinery.

... The first scene of the play, as now presented, gives the clue to the grand mistake which has misled its producer. He has supposed that the material horrors of the tempest were uppermost in the author's

thoughts as a means of producing an impression on the spectator; and, accordingly, a mimic vessel is outrageously bumped and tossed about on waves that we can liken to nothing save tiny cocks of hay, painted green, and afflicted with a spasm. ...

... In the same aim at trifling effects, when Ferdinand is disarmed, ... the sword is made to fly over his head ... And we may observe that the red fire, Salamander spirits, and trumpery phantasmagoria ... are, in our opinion, altogether unwarrantable.

... We repaired to the first representation of the play with high hopes. But on witnessing it ... we left with a misgiving that we had been in the wrong when we advocated the use of scenic resources to their utmost extent, as accessories to the mental triumphs of the stage. Still, remembrances of (Macready's) Coriolanus, Lear, &c., intervened to prove that provided they are made subservient to the higher purposes of the scene, they do indeed aid the dramatic 'illusion'".

This is a very modern view. Most critics and producers of today would agree with John Bull that the most important aspect of Shakespeare is Shakespeare himself, not the various interpretations of him that have been added over the years. Only recently has the scenery for Shakespearean productions become less lavish. Scant attention is paid today to elaborate sets and costumes. Often when one goes to see a production of a Shakespearean play one is confronted with stylised scenery of a stark nature, so that one is more dependent on the poetry for the dramatic illusion. I recall a television programme which was a documentary on a recent performance of The Tempest in Stratford, where the director had used no scenery at all, only a long horn-shaped tunnel. Shakespeare's poetry was not obscured by anything extraneous which could have distracted the audience's attention.

The John Bull critic's view of the "spectacle" in Macready's Tempest is that of an obvious purist. But when we consider the scenic limitation of the Shakespearean stage, and the fact that Shakespeare's descriptive poetry is so full of vivid imagery because his theatre had little sophisticated machinery to supply

"dramatic illusion", we can hardly blame Macready for anticipating modern film techniques in his productions, and for using those devices available to him to their fullest extent. It may be granted that his production of The Tempest was biased too far towards scenic splendour and mechanical ingenuity, but the most significant aspect of his endeavour was his fidelity to the original text. (25) It was not until this century that Shakespeare's poetry and imagery assumed the importance it must have had in its own theatre, and in Macready's time the effect produced by a play was deemed more important than its poetry. So despite John Bull's comments, which are ahead of their time, we must be grateful to Macready for at least reverting to Shakespeare's text.

"The Tempest, like King Lear, had been one of the worst sufferers from the adapters; Macready put to his credit a literal freeing of Ariel and the other spirits and mortals of the magic isle. From 1838 Dryden and Davenant joined Nahum Tate in the shades; Dorinda and Hippolito never again raised their diminished heads on the English stage. To have restored King Lear and The Tempest - those two inveterately and incurably diseased members of the Shakespearean body - to something like their original textual purity was a feat of which any man might be proud." (26)

It is the lack of "original textual purity" with which I have been the most concerned, and anyone who worked so hard to present Shakespeare faithfully and attractively to his audiences deserves great credit.

NOTES

1. Harvard Playbills. Cited by Herschel Baker, John Philip Kemble (Cambridge, Mass., 1942), p.21.
2. Odell, II, p.58.
3. Baker, p.161.
4. Hogan, II, p.637.
5. On Kemble's revival of Henry V. James Boaden, Memoirs of the Life of John Philip Kemble (1825), II, p.2. Cited by Holzknrecht, p.418, and Odell, II, p.53.
6. Hogan, II, p.638.
7. Baker, p.162.
8. Cited by Baker, ibid.
9. Cited by Gray, p.305.
10. Monthly Mirror, XXII (1806), p.766. Cited by Baker, p.288.
11. Odell, II, p.137.
12. Cited (ibid.).
13. Macready's Reminiscences, ed. Sir Frederick Pollock (London, 1876), p.171.
14. The Diaries of William Charles Macready (1833-1851), ed. William Toynbee, 2 vols (London, 1912), II, p.188.
15. Alan S. Downer, The Eminent Tragedian: W.C. Macready (Cambridge, Mass., 1966), p.178.
16. Reminiscences, p.460.
17. loc. cit.
18. J.C. Trewin (ed.), The Journal of William Charles Macready (London, 1967), p.125. Also cited by Odell, II, p.218.

19. Reminiscences, p.460.
20. Oscar G. Brockett, History of the Theatre (Boston, 1968), p.450.
21. Reminiscences, p.475.
22. ibid., p.458.
23. Odell, II, p.197.
24. An example of this is Macready's diary for March 30th, 1839, describing a dinner at the Shakespeare Club, which was attended by such men as Dickens, Leigh Hunt, . Thackeray, and Forster. Dickens proposed Macready's health, gave "a review of my enterprise at Covent Garden, and summed up with a eulogy on myself that quite overpowered me". In reply Macready "disclaimed all credit beyond what was due for faithful service to him, transferring from the priest to the object of their adoration the honour they offered. I had no claim for originating or creating; I had only removed and restored; was only the purifier of the temple, had only restored to its sublime simplicity the text of Shakespeare". (Reminiscences, pp.472-473).
25. In a speech at the Freemasons' Tavern on July 20th, 1839, Macready included the following remarks about his approach to Shakespeare:

"Some exceptions have been taken to the amount, the extent of decoration lavished on our plays; but I would beg with deference to inquire the particular instance (for I do not know it) where the embellishment has exceeded propriety and the demand of the situation? In all that has been attempted, the object has been simply truth. What my own imagination has presented to me, in turning over the pages of our great poet, I have endeavoured to make palpable to the senses of my audience, and I would beg distinctly to repudiate the idea that has been entertained by some persons, that it is to the care bestowed on our wardrobe and scene-room that we are alone

indebted for our successes; the plays of Shakespeare have been produced of late years in the same theatres with far more lavish expenditures, but the results have not been equally fortunate. . . . Our aim has been fidelity of illustration. The 'delicate Ariel' is now no longer in representation a thing of earth, but either 'a wandering voice' or a visible spirit of air, flitting in his own element amid the strange and sweet noises of the enchanted island. With the restoration of the text, our object has been to make palpable the meaning of Shakespeare, and to this is to be attributed mainly, if not entirely, the popularity of our theatre". (Reminiscences, p.480).

26. Odell, II, p.201.

CHAPTER 5: Some conclusions.

It is evident that the changes made to The Tempest by Dryden and Davenant, and subsequently by Shadwell, were the most significant and it is clear that they were the most durable. Time and again, when reading later adaptations and critiques of them, we come across the Restoration changes.

One thing must be borne in mind: until this century, Shakespeare was not universally admired. In his Preface to Shakespeare's plays, Johnson sums up many of the attitudes to him that were held by critics and editors. "It does not appear, that Shakespeare thought his works worthy of posterity. ... Of the plays which bear the name of Shakespeare in the late editions, the greater part were not published till about seven years after his death, and the few which appeared in his life are apparently thrust into the world without the care of the author, and therefore probably without his knowledge". (1) Johnson condemns Shakespeare's publishers' "negligence and unskilfulness", and generally praises Shakespeare's recent editors for setting to rights the unskilled transmission by copiers, the actors' mutilations, and the uncorrected prints.

It is hardly surprising that if Shakespeare himself had been careless, and had given no thought to posterity, men coming upon his plays later would not be particularly impressed by plays that were "ungrammatical, perplexed, and obscure". Eighteenth century editors and producers felt that it was their duty to alter Shakespeare, if only to provide versions that could be readily understood by the public. Shakespeare was enormously popular in the eighteenth century, but not the Shakespeare we know today.

Rowe, in 1709, published his edition of the 'best of our poets'. Pope's edition, according to Johnson in the Life of Pope, popularised Shakespeare's plays. Theobald based his edition on Pope's (which in turn was derived from Rowe's who took his mainly from the Fourth Folio of 1685). Theobald and the next two editors, Hanmer and Warburton, were not as concerned with Shakespeare as with their own subjective comments on taste. It was not until Johnson in 1765 recognised

the value of the First Folio that Shakespearean criticism began to have much worth. The earlier editors, however, were enthusiastic, if unscholarly, in their approach to Shakespeare, and doubtless did much to further his popularity in the eighteenth century.

D. Nichol Smith's Eighteenth Century Essays on Shakespeare is full of essays which are laudatory. Smith himself, on p.xiii, describes "the present volume... (as a) panegyric of Shakespeare".

It is worthwhile noting the approximately parallel courses of the stage versions and the editions of Shakespeare's plays in the eighteenth century. That Shakespeare's plays were mangled for many years both by editors and producers there is no doubt, but the fact that he was mangled so much shows how popular his plays were.

Rules, to the Restoration and eighteenth century, were rules. It was left, as I have shown (pp.43-44) to a few men to defend Shakespeare from the attacks of the rule-mongers, but it is not until the nineteenth century that we find any consistent and universal praise for him. In Biographia Literaria (Chapter II), Coleridge remarks on the one-eyed views of Pope and his contemporaries, who mistook "for the essentials of the Greek stage certain rules which the wise poets imposed upon themselves in order to render all the remaining parts of the drama consistent with those that had been forced upon them by circumstances independent of their will; out of which circumstances the drama itself arose. The circumstances in the time of Shakespeare, which it was equally out of his power to alter, were different and such as in my opinion, allowed a far wider sphere, and a deeper and more human interest. Critics are too apt to forget that rules are but means to an end; consequently where the ends are different the rules must be likewise so". (2)

It was only in the nineteenth century that Shakespeare was recognised fully. After Macready's successful restoration of a textually-perfect Shakespeare to the stage in the late 1830's and early 1840's, no-one tried to revive adaptations. From that time on, Shakespeare's reputation remained uniformly

stable and on a high level. In the previous two centuries, however, it was never stable. Whereas no-one today, unless he were writing an expurgated version for schools, would dream of tampering with a Shakespearean play to the extent, say, that Garrick did, it was not thought of as sacrilege so to adapt the original that it became unrecognisable and disappeared under the weight of additions, alterations, and 'improvements'. Shakespeare, even to self-styled Shakespeare 'buffs' like Dryden, Garrick, and Kemble, was not sacrosanct. He was not seen as an artist who occupied the top rung on the literary ladder, but as a man with certain valuable ideas who expressed them so clumsily, and who was so outmoded, that he had to be up-dated and re-modelled before anyone could derive any real benefit or pleasure from his works.

With regard to The Tempest, eighteenth century adapters felt the profoundest debt to Dryden and Davenant. These two men, it was felt, had made the way clear for a new understanding of a relatively inaccessible playwright. In Dryden's time, Shakespeare was seen only as a precursor. Dryden himself was among the first to recognise Shakespeare's worth, and had to spell this out in his Prologue to The Tempest and elsewhere. Davenant, he said, had first taught him to admire him (i.e. Shakespeare). Davenant, too, gained Dryden's admiration by seeing fit to add "to the Design of Shakespear".

Davenant's additions were gratefully received by the Restoration audiences who, in Dryden's words, felt that they "were sober and judicious", not that Dryden termed them additions, but "corrections". It is interesting to note that in the preface to the 1670 Tempest Dryden holds Davenant in equal regard to Shakespeare, whereas a modern critic would not hesitate to choose between them.

Odell, an acknowledged expert in the field of Shakespearean adaptations, shows "something of the attitude of the various revisers toward the great plays they mangled. Evidently they treated Shakespeare as a wayward child of extraordinary cleverness. They must polish his jewels and sweep away the dustheap in which these jewels had so long been concealed; or they must free his garden from the weeds whose rank growth

was killing the flowers. To do him these valuable services they must rewrite his plays, change and alter scenes at will, or write in new ones; they must revise and make more correct every single line, until its own author would not have recognised it. Those lines which could not be retained must be superseded, when necessary, by original lines of the adapters". (3)

The popularity of the revised Tempest was increased by Shadwell in two ways. First was his inclusion of songs, which had the effect of turning the play into an opera, as the words became mere link passages between the songs. Second was the lavish display of spectacle on the stage. Several of Shakespeare's comedies were chosen during the period for adaptation, mainly because they lent themselves readily to operatic treatment and elaborate presentation. It would be a valuable exercise to do research into these two areas. I can only offer a few suggestions. The plays may have been 'operatised' owing to the Italian and French influences on drama from earlier in the seventeenth century. The number of accomplished musicians and composers at the time was considerable, and with this coincided the growth of string orchestras, and the size of musical groups. Whereas Shakespeare's poetry had often been lyrical, especially in The Tempest, verse drama tended to disappear after the Restoration. Perhaps more songs were added to the Shakespearean adaptations to compensate for this. As regards spectacle, when greater technical innovations became available, it was only commonsense to use them.

On pp.47-48 I dealt with the materialism of the eighteenth century. This could have been extended into a longer discussion of Rationalism, as it was a phenomenon which was widespread and long-lasting, and obviously had a profound effect on men's thoughts. However, I think that a fuller treatment of the subject does not come within the scope of my topic, other than to point out the width of the gulf between Renaissance humanism and Platonism on the one hand, and neo-classical Rationalism on the other.

Concerning the masque in Shakespeare's Tempest, it is

plain that what happened to it was the result of changing thought and changing taste. Davenant cut the masque mainly, I think, because he felt that it did not comply with Restoration taste, which was basically down-to-earth. Shadwell re-inserted it, and made it far more protracted and splendid than Shakespeare's, because of the increased contemporary taste for extravagant spectacle. Garrick retained Shadwell's version of it for the same reason.

One possible reason for the coarse witticisms and lascivious behaviour of the descendants of Shakespeare's characters is that the Puritans had put such a damper on the display of immoral behaviour (i.e. on all plays) that the Restoration changes were a means of compensating for the previous constraints.

In conclusion, I would stress that it was only after Macready that we see the first return to a real appreciation of Shakespeare. Those comments in John Bull which I cited on pp.60-61 paved the way for productions of Shakespeare as we know them on our modern stages. It is true that Kean's Tempest of 1857 had rather too much pantomime at the expense of the poetry, and that in general Kean preferred his own stylised versions of Shakespeare (in which he invariably acted the male lead); but although "managers still fitted Shakespeare to scenery, rather than scenery to Shakespeare, ... one thing was clear: every one realised that everything spoken must now be Shakespeare. The day of rewriting was past forever". (4)

NOTES

1. Johnson, Preface to Shakespeare, p.xiv.
2. S.T. Coleridge, Biographia Literaria (1817), Everyman edn., ed. George Watson (London, 1956), p.18(n).
3. Odell, I, p.88.
4. ibid., II, p.311.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

NOTE: Line references to Shakespeare's text are those in the Arden Shakespeare, 6th edn, ed. Frank Kermode (London, 1958). The text followed and cited for the Dryden-Davenant version is that published by the Cornmarket Press Ltd (London, 1969), a facsimile of the copy in the Birmingham Shakespeare Library.

- Babcock, R.W.: The Genesis of Shakespeare Idolatry (Chapel Hill, 1931).
- Baker, Herschel: John Philip Kemble (Cambridge, Mass., 1942).
- Brockett, Oscar G.: History of the Theatre (Boston, 1968).
- Brown, John Russell, and Harris, Bernard (gen.eds.): Stratford-upon-Avon Studies 6: Restoration Theatre (London, 1965).
- Chancellor, E. Beresford: The Pleasure Haunts of London (London and New York, 1925).
- Coleridge, S.T.: Biographia Literaria (1817), ed. George Watson (London, 1956).
- Deelman, Christian B.: The Great Shakespeare Jubilee (London, 1964).
- Downer, Alan S.: The Eminent Tragedian: W.C. Macready (Cambridge, Mass., 1966).
- Elwin, Malcolm: Handbook to Restoration Drama (New York, 1928).
- Furness, H.H.: The Variorum Shakespeare: The Tempest (London, 1892).
- Grant, Douglas (ed.): Poems and Prose of John Dryden (Harmondsworth Middlesex, 1955).
- Gray, Charles Harold: Theatrical Criticism in London to 1795 (New York, 1931; 1964).
- Griffith, Elizabeth: Eighteenth Century Shakespeare: Vol. 14 (London, 1971).
- Halliday, F.E.: A Shakespeare Companion, 1564-1964 (revised edn.) (Harmondsworth, Middlesex, 1964).
-: An Illustrated Cultural History of England (London, 1967).
- Harbage, Alfred: Cavalier Drama (New York, 1936).

- Hogan, Charles Beecher: Shakespeare in the Theatre, 1701-1800 (2 vols) (Oxford, 1957).
- Holzknicht, Karl J.: The Backgrounds of Shakespeare's Plays (New York, 1950).
- Hughes, Leo: A Century of English Farce (Princeton, New Jersey, 1956).
-: The Drama's Patrons (Austin and London, Texas, 1971).
- Hunt, Hugh: The Live Theatre: An Introduction to the History and Practice of the Stage (London, 1962).
- Ker, W.P. (ed.): Essays of John Dryden (2 vols) (Oxford, 1926).
- Lawrence, W.J.: The Elizabethan Playhouse and Other Studies (New York, 1963).
- Legouis, Emile: A Short History of English Literature, trans. V.F. Boyson and J. Coulson (Oxford, 1934).
- Loftis, John (ed.): Restoration Drama: Modern Essays in Criticism (New York, 1966).
- Lynch, James J.: Box, Pit, and Gallery: Stage and Society in Johnson's London (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1953).
- Milton, W.M.: "Tempest in a Teapot", ELH, XIV (1947), pp.207-218.
- Nicoll, Allardyce: British Drama: An Historical Survey (4th edn, 1947) (London, 1925).
- Odell, George C.D.: Shakespeare from Betterton to Irving (2 vols) (New York, 1920; 1963).
- Pollock, Sir Frederick (ed.): Macready's Reminiscences (London, 1876).
- Richards, Kenneth, and Thomson, Peter (eds.): Nineteenth Century British Theatre (London, 1971).
- Smith, D. Nichol: Shakespeare in the Eighteenth Century (Oxford, 1928; 1967).
-: Eighteenth Century Essays on Shakespeare, 2nd edn (Oxford, 1963).
-: Shakespearean Criticism (Oxford, 1916).
- Spencer, Christopher (ed.): Five Restoration Adaptations of Shakespeare (Urbana, 1965).
- Spencer, Hazelton: Shakespeare Improved (New York, 1927; 1963).
- Sprague, Arthur Colby: Shakespeare and The Actors (New York, 1963).
- Stein, E.P.: David Garrick (MLA Revolving Fund Series VII, 1937).
- Stone, George Winchester (Jr): "A Midsummer Night's Dream in the hands of Garrick and Colman", PMLA, LIV (June 1939), pp.467-482.

-: "Shakespeare's Tempest at Drury Lane During Garrick's Management", SQ2, 1953, pp.1-7.
- Summers, Montague: The Restoration Theatre (London, 1934).
-: Shakespeare Adaptations (London, 1966).
- Thorn-Drury, G.: "Some Notes on Dryden", RES, I (1925), pp.327-330.
-: "Shadwell and the Operatic Tempest", RES, III (1927), pp.204-208.
- Tynbee, William (ed.): The Diaries of William Charles Macready, 1833-1851 (2 vols) (London, 1912).
- Trewin, J.C. (ed.): The Journal of William Charles Macready (London, 1967).
- Walmsley, D.M.: "Shadwell and the Operatic Tempest", (i) RES, II (1926), pp.463-466; (ii) RES, III (1927), pp.451-453.
- Ward, Charles E.: "The Tempest, A Restoration Opera Problem", ELH, XIII (1946), pp.119-130.
- Wilson, John Harold: A Preface to Restoration Drama (Boston, 1965).