

THE CAMBRIDGE
COMPANION TO
ENGLISH
RESTORATION
THEATRE

EDITED BY
DEBORAH PAYNE FISK



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, United Kingdom
<http://www.cup.cam.ac.uk>
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-3211, USA
<http://www.cup.org>
10 Stamford Road, Oakleigh, Melbourne 3166, Australia
Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain

© Cambridge University Press 2000

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and
to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without
the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2000

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

Typeset in 10/13pt Sabon [CE]

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN 0 521 58215 6 hardback

ISBN 0 521 58812 X paperback

CONTENTS

<i>Illustrations</i>	<i>page</i> xi
<i>Notes on contributors</i>	xii
<i>Preface</i>	xv
<i>Abbreviations</i>	xix
<i>Chronology: Texts and Events</i>	xxi
1 The theatre	I
EDWARD A. LANGHANS	
2 The performance	19
JOSEPH ROACH	
3 Adaptations and revivals	40
MICHAEL DOBSON	
4 Comedy	52
BRIAN CORMAN	
5 Tragedy	70
CHRISTOPHER J. WHEATLEY	
6 Tragicomedy	86
NANCY KLEIN MAGUIRE	
7 Farce	107
PETER HOLLAND	
8 Restoration and settlement: 1660 and 1688	127
DEREK HUGHES	

CONTENTS

9	Change, skepticism, and uncertainty JESSICA MUNNS	142
10	Drama and political crisis SUSAN J. OWEN	158
11	Spectacle, horror, and pathos JEAN I. MARSDEN	174
12	Gender, sexuality, and marriage PAT GILL	191
13	Playwright versus priest: profanity and the wit of Restoration comedy MICHAEL CORDNER	209
14	The canon and its critics ROBERT MARKLEY	226
	<i>Biographies and selected bibliography</i>	243
	<i>Index</i>	289

ILLUSTRATIONS

1	Isometric reconstruction of Drury Lane Theatre, 1674, by Richard Leacroft (by permission of Methuen)	page 6
2	Reconstruction of interior of Drury Lane Theatre, 1674, by Richard Leacroft (by permission of Methuen)	7
3	Baroque flying machine from Pierre Sonrel's <i>Traité de scénographie</i> (by permission of Librairie Théâtrale)	10
4	Thomas Betterton, after Godfrey Kneller (by permission of Folger Shakespeare Library)	21
5	Engraving of the Theatre Royal, 1698, from John Eccles's <i>Theater Musick</i> (by permission of Library of Congress)	22
6	Four engravings of scenery from Settle's <i>Empress of Morocco</i> (by permission of Folger Shakespeare Library)	24
7	Thomas Betterton as Hamlet, frontispiece engraving to <i>Hamlet</i> , possibly from a Restoration production, in Rowe's <i>Works of Shakespeare</i> , vol. VII (by permission of Folger Shakespeare Library)	30
8	Anne Bracegirdle as the Indian Queen, signed by Cooper (by permission of Folger Shakespeare Library)	37
9	Engraving of a scene of prisoners on spikes from Settle's <i>Empress of Morocco</i> (by permission of Folger Shakespeare Library)	178
10	Frontispiece engraving to <i>Amboyna</i> from John Dryden's <i>Dramatick Works of . . . 1735</i> (by permission of Folger Shakespeare Library)	188

3

MICHAEL DOBSON

Adaptations and revivals

Seven years before Charles II was returned to power, eleven after the Puritan régime had brought all legitimate theatrical activity in London to an abrupt halt, Aston Cokaine, writing a dedicatory poem to Richard Brome's belatedly published *Five New Plays* (1653), was already looking forward to the day when the playhouses would reopen. Presciently, he imagined a restored theatre which would be first and foremost a place for the revival of England's native dramatic classics, and only secondarily a venue where living playwrights might resume their interrupted careers:

Then shall learn'd Jonson reassume his seat,
Revive the Phoenix by a second heat,
Create the Globe anew, and people it
By those that flock to surfeit on his wit.
Judicious Beaumont, and th'ingenious soul
Of Fletcher too may move without control,
Shakespeare (most rich in humors) entertain
The crowded theatres with his happy vein.
Davenant and Massinger, and Shirley, then
Shall be cried up again for famous men.¹

As Cokaine's poem in part suggests (apparently remembering Elizabethan and Jacobean playwrights among the glories of the lost Caroline stage), the repertories of the pre-Civil War playhouses had always included a substantial percentage of revived plays, some of them half a century old by the time the theatres were closed in 1642. It is worth remembering, too, that such plays had often been retouched to fit them to the needs and styles of their current performers: one thinks here, for example, of Thomas Middleton's contributions to the script of Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, or the additions made by Ben Jonson in 1601 and 1602 to Thomas Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy*, a play whose continuing ability to compete with newer dramas Jonson himself had gone on to regret in the induction to *Bartholomew Fair* in 1614. But the previous history of the English commercial stage provided no

precedent for the far heavier extent to which the revived theatre, much as Cokaine's wistful and nostalgic prophecy envisioned it, would indeed rely on old plays – albeit sometimes revived in such a manner that one of the contemporaries this poem names, Sir William Davenant, is now more often “cried up” (or down) as a Restoration adaptor of earlier scripts than as a dramatist in his own right.

When public theatre did resume in 1659–60, ending a two-decade hiatus during which there had been no working playwrights, it was of course inevitable that the first shows on offer should be productions of plays now already at least a generation old. It was not inevitable, however, that the new playwrights of the Restoration should make such a comparatively small impact on this all-revival repertory over the next forty years. Two years into the new era, in the 1661–62 theatrical season, records show only 4 new plays being performed, as opposed to 54 written before the Interregnum, and though the proportion of new plays had greatly increased by 1667–68 – when there were 12 recorded premières alongside revivals of 20 plays written since 1660 and 33 written before 1640 – there was little significant change thereafter (for 1674–75, for example, the numbers are much the same, with 13 new plays acted alongside 16 written since 1660 and 25 written before 1640). Although these figures are neither exhaustive nor definitive (the distinction between an adaptation and a new play can be very blurred, as we shall see, and a count of titles alone can't take account of how many times each was acted), they are accurate in their suggestion that Restoration theatre companies usually spent only about half of their time performing strictly Restoration drama. Any consideration of what the theatres were doing between 1660 and 1700, consequently, needs to pay serious attention to the question of what they made of the pre-war dramatic corpus, and whether the extensive uses to which it continued to be put are symptoms of cultural conservatism (as some commentators, such as Nancy Maguire, have argued),² or of an active transformation and renewal of the theatrical past, or of an increasingly uneasy combination of the two.

The most familiar answer to this question hitherto has been that the Restoration made a great deal, or a great mess, of the plays it inherited, trampling on its dramatic heritage in a misguided and arrogant spirit of innovation; for views of the later seventeenth century's treatment of older scripts have been dominated by outrage over the period's notorious adaptations of Shakespeare. Looking at the more famous, or infamous – Davenant's *Macbeth* (1663), with its rhyming couplets and singing, flying witches, Davenant and John Dryden's *The Tempest, or the Enchanted Island* (1667), in which Caliban and Miranda both have sisters and Prospero's extended family further includes a male ward who has never

seen a woman, or Nahum Tate's *The History of King Lear* (1681), with its happy ending in which Edgar marries Cordelia while Lear and Gloucester look forward to a peaceful retirement – commentators have been tempted to regard the theatre managers of the Restoration as ignorant vandals, uncomprehendingly vulgarizing the masterpieces of the previous era in quest of novel but crassly simple dramatic effects and the easy popularity they might earn.

There is something to be said for this view, of course – whatever else the adaptors of the Restoration may have done for some of Shakespeare's plays, they rarely made them more sophisticated – but it greatly overestimates both the importance of adaptation within the period's Shakespearean repertory and the centrality of Shakespeare to the Restoration's larger archive of pre-war drama. In fact, a small but perennial cluster of Shakespeare plays – *Othello*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, *1 Henry IV*, *Julius Caesar*, and *Hamlet*, all of them still on the boards when the theatres had closed in 1642 – were at once among the most conservatively treated and the most frequently revived of all pre-war plays, together with a similar knot of favorites by Ben Jonson and a rather larger group from the Beaumont and Fletcher canon: had the Restoration companies confined themselves to this group of scripts when in search of older material, England might conceivably have developed a tradition of theatrical revival as reverent as that of the Comédie Française. Outside this stable of unrevised classics, it was by no means only Shakespearean plays which were substantially rewritten for Restoration production: although Jonson escaped entirely (excepting the collaborative *Eastward Ho*), seventeen works from the Beaumont and Fletcher canon were rewritten at different times, along with countless other pre-war plays, from Marlowe's *Dr. Faustus* to Middleton's *No Wit, No Help Like a Woman's*. In effect, a line was drawn during the 1660s (and rarely redrawn thereafter) between those old plays which would merely be revived and imitated and those which would be treated more freely as available raw material by Restoration playwrights, and the placing of that line was in part determined by the relative circumstances of the two patent companies at their inception.

By 1660, the Commonwealth's necessary recourse to reading plays in print instead of seeing them performed had already done much to exaggerate the preeminence among the old dramatists of those whose work had achieved the prestige (and sheer physical durability) guaranteed by publication in folio, namely Jonson, Shakespeare, and the younger and more fashionable Beaumont and Fletcher, singled out for special praise by Cokaine in a manner which was already a critical commonplace in 1653. When two companies of players began to perform in London from late

1659 onward, one of survivors from the old King's Men and one of younger players, both had repertories, in keeping with the closet-drama tradition which Moseley and his ilk had kept alive, which were dominated by Beaumont and Fletcher plays, supplemented by some Shakespeare and Jonson and a number of other old favorites preserved only in quarto. Unfortunately for the members of the younger troupe, Jonson, Shakespeare, and Fletcher had something else in common beyond folio publication: they had all been closely associated with the old King's Men. When the veteran actors were reorganized under Thomas Killigrew in 1660 as the King's Company, seen as the King's Men's lawful heirs, they used this fact to try to lay claim to exclusive performance rights to the works of all three; and in the complex negotiations which followed between Killigrew and the rival Duke's Company under Sir William Davenant (who had recruited the members of the younger troupe), it is clear that Killigrew got a decisive upper hand.³ The King's Company were able not only to ratify a monopoly on the only Jonson plays the Restoration would ever revive (principally *Epicoene*, *Bartholomew Fair*, *Volpone*, *The Alchemist* and *Catiline*), but to secure much of the Shakespeare canon, including those plays which had already re-established themselves at the Red Bull (*Othello*, *1 Henry IV* and *Merry Wives*). Perhaps more advantageously still, they were able to appropriate most of the safest bets in the Fletcher canon, notably *The Humorous Lieutenant*, *The Maid's Tragedy*, *A King and No King*, *Rollo*, *The Scornful Lady*, *The Elder Brother*, *The Chances*, *Philaster*, and *The Tamer Tamed*.⁴ (This last play had been revived by both pre-patentee companies, but was now definitively given to the elder actors: even *Rule a Wife and Have a Wife*, which had been performed by the younger troupe alone, was only grudgingly conceded to Davenant for a short period, reverting thereafter to Killigrew.⁵)

This manifestly unfair division of the dramatic heritage contributed significantly to the recognizably different approaches adopted by the two companies to the materials at their disposal. Innovation, in the treatment of old plays as in much else, became the hallmark of the Duke's Company, conservatism of the King's: of those "Old Stock Plays" which would remain in the repertory in comparatively unaltered form down to 1700 and beyond (long after the two patent companies had merged and then splintered again), the vast majority were plays which had been the preserve of the King's Company in the 1660s and 1670s. When in August 1661 the Duke's Company mounted their first Shakespearean revival, it was, predictably, a production of the only pre-war favorite from the Shakespeare folio which they had been permitted, *Hamlet*, and although Davenant cut the script so as to fit it for the display of his new changeable scenery and slightly

modernized some of its diction, his acting version is far from being a full-scale adaptation.⁶ (Davenant, indeed, teaching the young Thomas Betterton to play the Prince just as he had seen Joseph Taylor of the old King's Men play him before the civil wars, seems here to have been consciously competing with the King's Company on their own ground, the revival of pre-war traditions of performance.⁷) But the other Shakespeare plays he had been allotted, unperformed for generations, required more drastic treatment, their apparently unpromising and archaic dramatic materials stimulating Davenant to grow ever more inventive in suiting them to the new possibilities of the Restoration playhouse and the changing tastes of the Restoration audience. The patents granted to both companies had specified, in a token bid to placate anti-theatrical opinion, that any old plays should be "reformed and made fit" before being revived, and from 1662 onward Davenant seems to have taken this injunction to heart, albeit in a spirit of aesthetic rather than moral reformation. He transplanted Beatrice and Benedick from *Much Ado* into a sanitized *Measure for Measure* to produce a fashionable love-and-honor play, largely in couplets, called *The Law Against Lovers*, acted in February 1662; in 1663 he further showed off his theatre's capacity for grand scenic effects with a lavishly decorated *Henry VIII*; in 1664 he staged his equally spectacular, and far more heavily rewritten, *Macbeth*; and in 1667 appeared his last Shakespearean adaptation, co-written with Dryden, *The Tempest; or, The Enchanted Island*. A 1674 prologue to one of countless productions of this play (the most frequently revived of the entire period), scoffing at the King's Company, makes it clear that it was precisely the raw deal given the Duke's Company in the sharing of the pre-war repertory which had helped to motivate their emphasis on new stage effects and new writing:

Without the good old plays we did advance,
And all the stage's ornament enhance.
Too much of the old wit they have, 'tis true:
But they must look for little of the new.⁸

The King's Company may have established themselves as the rightful custodians of the pre-war theatrical tradition, but according to this prologue their productions were in danger of merely curating the "good old plays" they had been granted when compared to the new ornaments and new writing displayed by their competitors, features no less of their revivals than of their premières.

While it is true that the practice of full-scale adaptation thus begins with Davenant's Shakespearean experiments in the 1660s, and can be related to the fact that Killigrew had secured most of the old plays which a

contemporary audience was likely to wish to see in their original forms, the distinction between “adaptation” and “revival” in the Restoration is more blurred than the above may suggest. For one thing, there were certain crucial respects in which it was simply no longer possible for any company to perform pre-war plays without radically altering them, whether or not such alterations extended to their texts. On becoming the King’s Company in 1660, the veteran players had forever abandoned the Red Bull, the last survivor of the unroofed playhouses for which most of the older repertory had been written, and once Killigrew had followed Davenant’s lead thereafter in adopting changeable scenery, both companies were performing their pre-Commonwealth plays on stages (and now sets) quite unlike those envisaged by their playwrights. As any playgoer accustomed to late twentieth-century revivals of Renaissance drama knows, a play can be transformed almost as thoroughly by the provision of unfamiliar décor and stage design as it can by the actual rewriting of its text, whether or not the former in practice mandates the latter. Even Jonson’s critically revered comedies must have looked quite different after 1660, although their neo-classical respect for the unity of place saved them from some of the omissions and transpositions of scenes which the new playhouses required of most other pre-war plays.

The other factor which transformed the pre-war corpus, equally affecting the unadapted repertory no less than the adaptations which it often stimulated, was the advent of the female player. Within a few seasons of the Restoration, none of the female roles which had been written for boys were still in male custody: confusingly, even the boy who passes himself off as the Silent Woman in Jonson’s *Epicoene* was played by an actress from 1663 onward, perhaps the most extreme example of the 1660s’ interest in transforming the cross-dressed boy heroines of the early 1600s into opportunities for the display of actresses’ legs in tight-fitting breeches. Even plays which didn’t have new female roles written into their scripts in the manner of Davenant’s *Tempest* were liable to have their existing ones enlarged, if only by the provision of interpolated songs and dances. The combined effects of the arrival of onstage women and the discrepancy between pre-war and Restoration playhouses are vividly exemplified by a revival attended by Samuel Pepys in August 1667. In a bid to emulate the success of the Duke’s Company’s Tudor spectacular *Henry VIII*, the King’s Company had exhumed two of the most popular plays of the entire pre-war period, Thomas Heywood’s chronicle of the youthful sufferings and triumphant reign of Elizabeth I, *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody*, parts 1 and 2 (1605, 1606).⁹ Pepys, however, despite his compassionate lifelong interest in Gloriana, was only intermittently impressed:

[August 17 1667] to the King's playhouse, where the house extraordinary full; and there was the King and the Duke of York to see the new play, *Queen Elizabeth's Troubles, and the History of Eighty-Eight*. I confess I have sucked in so much of the sad story of Queen Elizabeth from my cradle, that I was ready to weep for her sometimes. But the play is the most ridiculous that sure ever came upon stage, and indeed is merely a show; only, shows the true garb of the queens in those days, just as we see Queen Mary and Queen Elizabeth painted – but the play is merely a puppet-play, acted by living puppets. Neither the design nor the language better; and one stands by and tells us the meaning of things.

For Pepys, Heywood's popular drama, written sixty years earlier for the Red Bull, seems hopelessly vulgar in the presence of real royalty at the King's Playhouse, its dumb shows and chorus performing expository work which nowadays ought to be performed by more psychologized dialogue and representational scenery. Furthermore, its principal female roles are clearly inadequate, reducing their players to mere clothes-horses: historically interesting as their dresses remain, they fail to compensate Pepys for what he has learned to expect from actresses, the display of a female interiority identified with the female body itself. Characteristically, the actress in the cast to whom Pepys does respond positively is the one wearing the minimum of costume:

Only, I was pleased to see Knepp dance among the milkmaids, and to hear her sing a song to Queen Elizabeth – and to see her come out in her night-gown, with no locks on, but her bare face and hair only tied up in a knot behind; which is the comeliest dress that ever I saw her in to her advantage.¹⁰

Neither dancing milkmaids nor any song by the Queen's confidante feature in the original *If You Know Not Me* plays, so that although the text used on this occasion doesn't survive (as Pepys' comments might lead us to expect, the show was not sufficiently popular to send any bookseller rushing into print with the script) it is clear that there had been some additions made along with the major abridgment required to compress two plays into a single entertainment, much of it to the benefit of Mrs. Knepp. By 1667, clearly, the King's Company had begun to emulate Davenant's habit of adapting lesser-known plays: in the same year they also performed John Lacy's *Sauny the Scot*, an updated version of *The Taming of the Shrew* designed to make it a better companion piece to Fletcher's Anglicized sequel *The Tamer Tamed*, and in 1669 they would even mount an anonymous adaptation of one of their cherished Fletcher plays, *The Island Princess*.

What is perhaps more interesting than this evidence of minor adaptation, however, is the way in which Pepys refers to the show (under its altered

title) simply as “the new play,” without reference to any author, whether Thomas Heywood or the choreographer of the interpolated milkmaids. He may be thinking of it as an old play newly revived, remaining unconscious of how its script has been altered, or he may genuinely believe that it is a wholly new play, but in either case its authorship is of little interest. For the Restoration, vintage plays belonged to theatre companies much more securely than they belonged to their dead authors, and beyond the most famous masterpieces of Jonson, Shakespeare, and Fletcher (writers granted authorial personae by the preliminary materials of their respective folios), old plays were generally regarded as fair game for any writer prepared to carry out the work of making them worth performing.¹¹

This is an attitude which began to change over the course of the period. Aphra Behn, for example, had trouble with Thomas Killigrew’s publisher after transforming his closet drama *Thomaso* (1664) into her own *The Rover* (1677). As a result, she published two subsequent adaptations of pre-war plays, *The Debauchee* (1677, from Brome’s *A Mad Couple Well Matched*) and *The Revenge* (1680, from Marston’s *The Dutch Courtesan*), anonymously. For most playgoers, though, adaptations of unknown old plays were simply new plays, and whether we now categorize a Restoration adaptation as such or as a Restoration play in its own right tends simply to reflect our own sense of the relative importance of the two writers involved. If by some freak of literary history Thomas Durfey had achieved the status of a major playwright while Shakespeare and Fletcher had faded into obscurity, we would now be reading his *Trick for Trick, or the Debauched Hypocrite* (1678) and *The Injured Princess* (1682) as a Restoration intrigue comedy and an unusual heroic tragicomedy, rather than as adaptations of Fletcher’s *Monsieur Thomas* and Shakespeare’s *Cymbeline* respectively. Even those members of Durfey’s audience familiar with these two source-plays are unlikely to have regarded his efforts to update them as innately reprehensible (though they might have expected Durfey to make more acknowledgment of his debts to Fletcher and Shakespeare than in either case he did): to contemporary criticism, a play’s “fable” and “sentiments” mattered far more than mere verbal details, so an adaptation, preserving both while stripping what had become obscuringly obsolete superficialities of idiom, might more genuinely “revive” an old play than what we would now call a revival.¹²

Hence even that expert in the various shades of dramatic rewriting, Gerard Langbaine, author of *Momus Triumphans: or the Plagiaries of the English Stage* (1688), could use the verb “revive” either in the sense it retains now (“[Brome’s *The Northern Lass*] was revived by the players.”) or as a synonym for “adapt” (“[*Eastward Ho*] . . . hath lately appeared on the present stage, being revived by Mr Tate under the title of *Cuckold’s*”).

Haven").¹³ When dealing with better-known plays than these examples, more self-consciously literary writers might produce what were in effect “closet” adaptations, designed less for performance than for leisurely comparison with their well-known originals (such as Rochester’s version of Fletcher’s *Valentinian*, and Waller’s of *The Maid’s Tragedy*, both published posthumously, in 1685 and 1690 respectively). Similarly, the authors of acknowledged stage adaptations might discuss the grounds on which they had made alterations in the prefatory materials to their printed editions (the best-known examples being the simultaneously exasperated and reverential engagement with Shakespeare visible in Dryden’s prefaces and prologues to *The Tempest, or the Enchanted Island*, 1667, *All for Love*, 1678, and *Troilus and Cressida, or, Truth Found Too Late*, 1679). But in either case there was no stigma attached to adaptation, quite the contrary: the title-page of the 1678 stage version of *Timon of Athens* actively boasts that it has been “Made into a PLAY . . . by Thomas Shadwell”, and when Colley Cibber published his enduringly popular version of *Richard III* in 1700 with inverted commas in the margins to indicate which lines he had left unaltered, it was as much to allow his readers to savour his redactive talents – and to counter the allegation that he had rewritten the play for political motives – as to clear himself of any accusation of either plagiarism or misguided literary zeal. In general our sense of a difference in kind between revivals, adaptations, and new plays based on old is largely anachronistic: as we have seen, all Restoration revivals were to a greater or lesser degree adaptations, as were a great many new plays (even Dryden’s *The Wild Gallant*, supposedly a definitively early Restoration comedy, may have been based on a now lost play by Brome), and it is often more useful to consider the different purposes to which the Restoration put the older corpus in general than to devote undue attention to matters of authorship and copyright which were only beginning to take their modern shape.

For the pre-war dramatic heritage was the laboratory of the Restoration stage, and it is perhaps most useful to examine the period’s revivals and adaptations alike as experiments in negotiating the political position of the restored theatres, and attempts to find new genres which might flourish within them. Publicly reviving pre-war drama at all, and with it by implication the Royalist culture of the Caroline court, made a conspicuous statement about the defeat of the Commonwealth in 1660, and Pepys cannot have been alone in seeing a political “use” behind the early King’s Company’s repeated performances of such specifically anti-Puritan plays as Jonson’s *Bartholomew Fair*.¹⁴ (Other early Restoration favorites, clearly rendered topically loyal to the new monarchy by recent events, included 1 *Henry IV*, a play about the successful defeat of a rebellion, and Fletcher’s *A*

King And No King, a play about the miraculous restoration of the legitimate heir.) The full-scale adaptations of the 1660s often similarly display an agenda as much political as literary, supplying resolutions designed to replay the most favorable version possible of the Restoration itself: Davenant's *Macbeth* is an Oliver Cromwell doomed to exemplary punishment ("Farewell vain world, and what's most vain in it, Ambition," he gasps before his onstage death), and his Duke Vincentio and Prospero are both righteous Charles IIs, happily restored to power after the aberrations of Angelo's Puritan régime and Antonio's usurpation. As the political situation grew more troubled through the constitutional crises of the late 1670s and 1680s, the usually blurred distinction between adaptations and revivals – between what had been added to a play, and what had been in its script all along – made the rewriting of lesser-known old plays an even more attractive medium for covert political comment by playwrights who would have been wary of making such observations in scripts which would be regarded as all their own work. Hence the suspicion which attached to Cibber's *Richard III*, accused of Jacobitism when first performed in 1699: by the turn of the century the censors had seen a good many old history plays mined for instructive parallels with contemporary politics. These included Tate's *Lear* (1681) – whose bastard Edmund, his evil enhanced by a rape attempt against Cordelia, was clearly intended to remind the audience of the aspiring illegitimate Duke of Monmouth – and John Crowne's *Henry the Sixth, the First Part* (1681), banned for its interpolated satire against Catholics at a time when the heir to the throne, the future James II, was himself a member of the old faith. Even the respectably classical *Julius Caesar* had been slightly rewritten after the Glorious Revolution in order to make it more unambiguously sympathetic to the constitutional libertarian Brutus.

Such examples of local topicality in the deployment of the older drama, however, are probably less interesting than instances where we can see Restoration playwrights, in their various attempts to render the miscellaneous old plays they had inherited theatrically useful, actually discovering the genres they would make their own. Thus while the broad influence of Jonson and Fletcher on the development of early Restoration comedy is clear, it is particularly illuminating to see Davenant contributing the "gay couple" tradition of repartee to the form by adding Shakespeare's Beatrice and Benedick to the cast of *The Law Against Lovers* (1662). Likewise the emergence of semi-opera as a form in the 1660s owes much to Davenant's particular sense of how the new scenic and musical resources of the indoor playhouses might be called into play by Shakespeare's scenes of magic and the supernatural in *Macbeth* (1663) and *The Tempest, or the Enchanted*

Island (1667, a musical whose score was extended still further in 1674). The renaissance of semi-opera in the unsettled and experimental 1690s similarly took shape around such lavish revivals and adaptations, with some of Henry Purcell's best music accompanying Thomas Betterton's versions of Fletcher's *The Prophetess* (in 1690) and Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (heavily and ingeniously rewritten, probably by Betterton, as *The Fairy Queen*, 1692). In an odder experiment still in combining the appeals of opera and drama, Purcell and Tate's *Dido and Aeneas* found itself transplanted in installments into Charles Gildon's version of *Measure for Measure* (1700). Perhaps the most striking instance, though, of the contribution of remodeled old plays to a new form is the emergence of affective tragedy in the late 1670s and early 1680s, which coincided with the stage's discovery – at a time when crises in the monarchy were making Restoration heroic tragedy look ideologically obsolete – of several tragedies of Shakespeare, often rewritten with an emphasis on private pathos, most signally in Thomas Otway's ancient Roman version of *Romeo and Juliet*, *The History and Fall of Caius Marius* (1679).

It is perhaps in cases such as these – of adaptations visibly metamorphosing into contemporary plays of wholly new kinds – that the Restoration's characteristically divided response to its theatrical heritage is most intriguingly visible. Nominally revered old plays might be “revived” by judicious rewriting, as if in a bid to prove that the cultural gap between the pre-Commonwealth and post-Restoration worlds could be effortlessly bridged, and yet the scope of the alterations they required often demonstrated the complete impossibility of this project – the attempt at cultural nostalgia actually produces cultural innovation. Perhaps the restoration of the monarchy was itself just such an exercise in “revival, with alterations.” Just as the gradual dwindling in the proportion of the repertory devoted to unaltered revivals of Jonson and Fletcher from the 1700s onward appears to suggest in the theatre, eventually the element of alteration would become more obvious than the element of revival.

NOTES

- 1 Richard Brome, *Five New Playes* (London, 1653), A2.
- 2 See Nancy Klein Maguire, *Regicide and Restoration: English Tragicomedy, 1660–1671* (Cambridge University Press, 1992), esp. chs. 1–2; also Nicholas José, *Ideas of the Restoration in English Literature, 1660–1671* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1984), ch. 7.
- 3 On the complicated matter of how the repertory was divided, see especially Gunnar Sorelius, “The Rights of the Restoration Theatre Companies in the Older Drama,” *SN* 37 (1965), 174–89; Robert D. Hume, “Securing a Repertory: Plays on the London Stage, 1660–5,” in Antony Coleman and Anthony

- Hammond, eds., *Poetry and Drama, 1500–1700: Essays in Honour of Harold F. Brooks* (London: Methuen, 1981), pp. 156–72; Judith Milhous, *Thomas Betterton and the Management of Lincoln's Inn Fields, 1695–1708* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1979), esp. pp. 15–19; and John Freehafer, "The Formation of the London Patent Companies in 1660," *TN* 20 (1965), 6–30.
- 4 The popularity of these plays can be gauged from their frequent appearances on such records we have of which plays were being revived both just before the Commonwealth and just after the Restoration: see, for example, the overlaps between the lists of "Plays acted before the King and Queen" for 1636 and 1638, and "Plays acted by the Red Bull actors," provided by the disgruntled Master of the Revels displaced by Davenant and Killigrew's patents, Sir Henry Herbert. Joseph Quincy Adams, ed., *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert, Master of the Revels, 1623–1673* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1917), pp. 75–76, 82. See also John Downes, *Roscius Anglicanus* (London, 1708), pp. 18–19, on the Fletcher-dominated repertoire of the younger troupe before the establishment of the patent companies.
 - 5 This arrangement whereby companies held sole performing rights to particular old plays broke down with the secession of Betterton's troupe from the United Company in 1695: from then onward, the two licensed companies might offer rival productions of the same old play at the same time, a situation exploited most famously by the notorious "War of the Romeos" in 1748, when both Drury Lane and Covent Garden presented competing productions of *Romeo and Juliet* for twelve successive performances.
 - 6 It was published, without Davenant's name, as *The tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark: as it is now acted at his Highness the Duke of York's Theatre* (London, 1676).
 - 7 See Downes, *Roscius Anglicanus*, p. 21.
 - 8 Printed in W. J. Lawrence, *The Elizabethan Playhouse and Other Studies* (Stratford-upon-Avon: Shakespeare Head Press, 1912), pp. 200–01.
 - 9 The pre-war popularity of these plays can be gauged by their publishing history: before the closing of the theatres, part 1 had gone through eight editions and part 2 through four.
 - 10 Samuel Pepys, *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, ed. Robert Latham and William Matthews, 11 vols. (London: Bell and Hyman, 1970–83), VIII, 388–89.
 - 11 On authorship, performing rights and literary property in this period, see Laura J. Rosenthal, *Playwrights and Plagiarists in Early Modern England* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996), esp. ch. 1.
 - 12 On adaptation and Restoration criticism, see especially Jean Marsden, *The Re-Imagined Text: Shakespeare, Adaptation and Eighteenth-Century Literary Theory* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1995), pp. 1–71.
 - 13 Gerard Langbaine, *An Account of the English Dramatick Poets* (London, 1691), pp. 37, 66. On Langbaine's sense of the distinction between adaptation and plagiarism see Paulina Kewes, "Gerard Langbaine's 'View of Plagiaries': the Rhetoric of Dramatic Appropriation in the Restoration," *RES* 48 (1997), 2–18.
 - 14 See Pepys, *Diary*, IX, 298–99.