INHERITING THE STAGE: PRE-INTERREGNUM DRAMA IN THE RESTORATION

A Dissertation

by

LAUREN ELIZABETH LIEBE

Submitted to the Graduate and Professional School of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Chair of Committee,	Margaret Ezell
Committee Members,	James Rosenheim
	Laura Mandell
	Britt Mize
	Heidi Craig
Head of Department,	Maura Ives

August 2021

Major Subject: English

ABSTRACT

Inheriting the Stage: Pre-Interregnum Drama in the Restoration is a study of the intersection of Restoration politics and the appropriation of early modern drama on stage and in print. I examine how publication, performance, and adaptation shaped the reception and canonization of the plays of Shakespeare and his contemporaries in the period from 1660-1685. Through analyzing the uses of these texts alongside the Restoration's renegotiation of monarchy and government, I argue that the literary development of English drama is grounded in its ability to serve as a testing space for political ideology. By integrating existing Shakespeare-centric studies into a broader literary and political history, I explore the politicized roots of early modern dramatic canonization. Particular attention is given to how various agents—writers, publishers, performers, and audiences—contextualized drama within the Restoration's revaluation of its cultural and political past.

The first chapter examines how printed play texts and illicit performances during the Interregnum shaped the canon of early modern drama that was available to Restoration dramatists. The second chapter explores how early performances and adaptations (1660-1666) supported the Restored monarchy's official stance of forgiveness towards actions that had taken place in the English Civil Wars. In the following chapter (1666-1678), I examine how this support turned to subtle questioning of Charles II's increasingly authoritarian policies through plays that critique the roles of subject and ruler. The second half of this project examines a shift in uses of pre-Interregnum drama during the Popish Plot in the late 1670s and the Exclusion Crisis in the early 1680s. While the earlier years of the Restoration saw the revival and adaptation of a wide variety of plays, this period produced a

concentration of adaptations of Shakespeare's Greek and Roman history plays (the subject of Chapter 5) and English history plays (the subject of Chapter 6). While past scholarship has argued that these plays demonstrate allegiance to newly formed political parties, I contend that the plays are far more politically ambivalent than has been recognized, and that they demonstrate a broader cultural concern over the uses of political power.

DEDICATION

For Michael, for endless support, encouragement, and snacks.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

When I began this project a little over three years ago, I believed that the field of Restoration drama was critically understudied. I struggled to find conferences at which to present my work. Studies on the Restoration often exist on the margins of and in reference to two much larger periods of study, the Renaissance and the eighteenth-century. Major national conventions rarely include more than one or two panels on the Restoration—if any at all—and there are far fewer journals dedicated to the Restoration than there are to either of the time periods that frame it. In short, my initial impression of the period was that it was badly neglected and overshadowed by adjacent scholarly and institutional interests, particularly the fields of early modern drama and Shakespeare studies.

In some respects, I still believe that, and my scholarship and my work on the open-access play database *Digital Restoration Drama* are my contribution to increasing the visibility and long-term viability of the field. At the same time, however, I have discovered a small, yet vibrant community of international scholars who are interested in expanding the field of Restoration drama. The innovation and intellectual curiosity of this community are consistently inspiring, and I hope that the strides many of us are making toward making our work more easily accessible and inclusive will lead to further growth for the field.

While the COVID-19 pandemic has been a global tragedy that defies words, it has also forced the scholarly community to make fuller use of modern technological advancements for conferencing. These innovations have allowed me a far richer engagement in my field since they allowed me to attend far more and diverse conferences than I would have been able to participate in in person. I am particularly indebted to the feedback from my colleagues at both the fall and spring sessions of the English Theatre

Culture 1660-1737 Symposium, sponsored by the Department of Theatre Studies and the Department of English and American Studies at Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic. My dissertation is richer for having benefited from this small community and its dedication to examining Restoration and early eighteenth-century theater's connections to the broader social, religious, cultural, and political milieus of the period.

Beyond this broader community, some very specific thanks are in order. I would like to begin by thanking my adviser, Margaret Ezell, for her wonderful guidance, feedback, and support over the last six years. I also owe a debt of gratitude to Laura Estill, who was instrumental in helping me find my place in academia. Further thanks are due to my committee members, past and present: James Rosenheim, Laura Mandell, Britt Mize, Heidi Craig, and Nandra Perry.

I have benefited greatly from access to the Folger Shakespeare Library at several pivotal moments in my doctoral career, and I am particularly thankful to Owen Williams, Abbie Weinberg, Eric Johnson, and Caroline Duroselle-Melish, among others, for their assistance and guidance. I am also greatly appreciative of the community of scholars in my Researching the Archive dissertation seminar, with particular thanks to Carol Levine and Alan Stewart for their thoughtful feedback on a work in progress.

Finally, it is necessary to thank all of the friends and family members who have supported me through these last six years. To my mom, dad, and Matt, thank you for always believing in me and for encouraging a life-long love of learning (and books!). Michael, I couldn't have made it without you; indeed, I would probably never have started. Kumo, Tsuki, Freyja, Mikan, and Marnier, you will never read this, but you were instrumental in the writing process. Kelsey, Box, and Siv, you provided some much-needed sanity outside of

academia, and I am eternally grateful. Finally, Desirae, thank you for all of the writing dates and feedback on so many drafts. This dissertation is better for your friendship.

CONTRIBUTORS AND FUNDING SOURCES

Contributors

This work was supervised by a dissertation committee consisting of Margaret Ezell (chair), Laura Mandell, Brit Mize, and Heidi Craig of the Department of English and Professor James Rosenheim of the Department of History

All work conducted for the dissertation was completed by the student independently.

Funding Sources

Support for this dissertation was provided by the Department of English and the Center of Digital Humanities Research at Texas A&M University. I am also thankful for the support of the Folger Shakespeare Library for courses on archival studies and their year-long dissertation workshop.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Throughout the 1667/1668 theatrical season, Samuel Pepys reported news on the development of an upcoming production: a revival of Ben Jonson's *Catiline*. While it was not unusual for Pepys to report the latest theater news, the continuity of his interest in this particular production is rather remarkable. In December 1667, he records theatrical gossip in his diary, reporting that *Catiline* was "to be suddenly acted at the King's house; and there all agree that it cannot be well done at that house, there not being good actors enow: and Burt acts Cicero, which they all conclude he will not be able to do well. The King gives them £500 for robes, there being, as they say, to be sixteen Scarlett robes."[1] Although the acquisition of these robes seems to have delayed the production substantially,[2] when the play did eventually appear on the stage in December 1668, it was a lavish and popular affair. Indeed, this iteration of *Catiline* was successful enough to merit a reprinting of Jonson's play and became "a secondary stock play" in the King's Company's repertoire.[3] Moreover, the scandal that it wrought—in which Charles II's mistress Barbara Palmer, Lady Castlemaine hired actress Katherine Corey to perform the role of aging courtesan Sempronia as a parody of Castlemaine's court rival Lady Anne Harvey—served not only to advance a particular

---

[1] Samuel Pepys, *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, ed. Robert Latham and William Matthews, 11 vols (Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1974), 8: 575.
[2] Pepys, *Diary*, 9: 19-20. Actress Elizabeth Knepp informed Pepys that the play will be delayed "for want of the clothes which the King promised them."
[3] John Downes, *Roscius Anglicanus, Or, An Historical Review of the Stage from 1660-1706*, edited by Judith Milhouse and Robert D. Hume (London: The Society for Theatre Research, 1987), 24-5.

subset of court interests, but also to enhance the notoriety and popularity of the play throughout the Restoration, both within England and abroad.

This anecdote is only one of many examples of the lasting influence of pre-Interregnum drama on the Restoration stage. Plays produced during the reigns of Elizabeth I, James I, and Charles I gained new cultural and political significance during Charles II's rule, and were often used deliberately to tie an uncertain present to a particular set of historical roots and establish a connection to a deliberately English past. Initially, the usage of these pre-Interregnum plays on the Restoration stage emphasized the power and prestige of the monarchy through continually restaging moments of miraculous recovery. However, as new political tensions developed beginning in the mid-1660s, pre-Interregnum drama was increasingly used to explore the political possibilities and loyalties of a society that was deeply ambivalent about the roles of monarch and subject. This study seeks to understand the multifarious political uses to which early modern drama was put during the Restoration. While many existing studies read the drama of the period as either loyalist/Tory or parliamentarian/Whig, I seek to move beyond these binaries in order to examine how playwrights—and, to a lesser extent, their audiences—used drama as a means of examining, questioning, and affirming their political subjectivity in a period when the role of "subject" was rapidly changing.

The political significance of drama in the Restoration has not gone unnoticed, though as Susan Owen notes, existing scholarship often fails to grasp its full significance. In "Restoration Drama and Politics: An Overview," she describes the "common critical fallacies" which have been assumed by many scholars in the field:

> Restoration drama is effete and courtly, lacking any political 'guts' and vitality (old-fashioned, but surprisingly persistent); that drama was largely apolitical until the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis led to sudden politicization; that in so far as the drama was political, it was mainly royalist and Tory; conversely, that the only drama of real interest in this period is that which prefigures the rise of Whig and/or bourgeois drama; that anti-Catholic drama is not political; that political commentary in the drama is incidental and occasional, rather than sustained and central.[4]

Several of these observations are central to my own work, which attempts to complicate the quasi-anachronistic Whig/Tory divide by demonstrating how revisionist historiography allowed for a nuanced critique of politics that often espoused an ambivalent view of the nascent political parties and current debates. Like Susan Staves, I reject Robert Hume's claim that there is little philosophical value to the plays of the Restoration, or that they "seldom…probe character deeply or present ideas which are essentially more than commonplaces."[5] While their status as popular entertainment is, of course, uncontestable, the frequency with which the plays' topics address points of political conflict—and with which their prologues and epilogues point directly to the sources of political strife as it affects the theatre—clearly demonstrates that these plays, far from being apolitical, are deeply invested in the complexities of their political moment. While the political engagement of some plays—such as Otway's *Venice Preserv'd*, Shadwell's *Lancashire Witches*, or Behn's *The Rover*—has been well documented due to the perceived literary status of their authors, much of the drama from this period has passed without substantial comment.

---

[4] Susan Owen, "Restoration Drama and Politics: An Overview," in *A Companion to Restoration Drama*, ed. Susan Owen (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2008), 126.
[5] Robert D. Hume, *The Development of English Drama in the Late Seventeenth Century* (London: Oxford University Press, 1976), 30.

Existing scholarship tends to position itself within the Whig/Tory binary, even when the existence of this binary is being explicitly denounced as an ahistorical forecasting of a political divide that is still in its first stages of formation. Susan Owen's "Note on Terminology and Conventions" in *Restoration Theatre and Crisis* makes the problems of naming conventions for this time period clear, noting that while "the terms 'Whig' and 'Tory' acquired wide currency in 1681," these terms are hardly stable and have been used anachronistically even in otherwise sound scholarship.[6] Following her lead, I will be using the terms "'royalist' and 'opposition' in contexts where chronology is important or where 'Tory' and 'Whig' would be misleading."[7] It is undeniable that the plays of this period can be critiqued in terms of their sympathies to royalist ideology, Catholicism, Puritanism, or other facets of political life. However, attempts to identify the plays as royalist or proto-Whig have occluded the deeply ambivalent approaches many plays present to the overarching questions of the Restoration, the Popish Plot, and the Exclusion Crisis. This ambivalence can be seen in studies of Thomas Otway's *Venice Preserv'd*, which has been read as a reflection of Whiggish thought and Stuart ideology alike. Even traditionally "royalist" works like Behn's *The Rover* do not offer wholly complementary views of the Stuart court, and "oppositional" plays like the anonymous *The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth* emphasize the importance of monarchy even as they criticize Catholic influence. Similarly, I attempt to preserve a relatively neutral approach to the politics of the time, though the frequency through which pre-Interregnum drama was used to reinforce the monarchical system means

---

[6] Owen, *Restoration Theatre and Crisis*, xi.
[7] Owen, *Restoration Theatre and Crisis*, xi.

that past scholarship often skews towards royalism, in frequency, if not in spirit. There are, however, important performances and adaptations with Whiggish leanings which arise in the last decade of Charles II's reign, and this dissertation examines them in the context of the works with which they shared the stage, some of which were blatantly royalist/Tory, and many which were ambiguous at best in their political allegiances.

This study, then, is chiefly interested in how the theater professionals of the Restoration made use of their pre-Interregnum predecessors to (re)invent the English theatrical tradition. The selection of plays for performance and adaptation (and, to a lesser extent, publication) was crucial to the construction of what theater was and could be, even as the technological and cultural innovations of the Restoration theaters—moving scenery, actresses, increased focus on spectacle—shaped which "old plays" were suitable to join the theatrical repertoire. Because theater and politics were so closely intertwined during this period, these choices were also often, at least in part, influenced by current political shifts and tensions.

As many scholars have noted, the theatrical duopoly of the Restoration was tightly connected to London court politics, with many dramatists serving as courtiers, and the two London commercial theaters were sponsored either by King Charles II or his brother the Duke of York. In many cases, playwrights had a direct, personal connection with one or more nobles, and even amongst the sparse records of the Restoration theater, numerous dedicatory epistles and other anecdotal evidence suggest that the court often influenced plays as they were being written. This made for a London theatrical scene that was intimately bound up in the politics of the Restoration court, and which lived or died by royal and noble patronage. At the same time, the court itself relied upon the images of

statecraft produced in the theater as a form of cultural reinforcement, if not of political propaganda.

Much of the political power of the drama can be traced to the place that many playwrights inhabited on the edges of court culture. Greater access to the court led to the playwrights often becoming public figures in their own rights, and the nature of the playwright's authorial presence in print underwent a similarly radical change during the Restoration. While playwrights such as Ben Jonson had established their authority to speak to the audience—whether from the stage or in print—through paratextual materials such as prefaces, epistles, prologues, and epilogues, such addresses became a necessary component of play publication by the later years of Charles II's reign. For example, at any given point before 1642, only 31-64% of plays had prologues and/or epilogues,[8] yet such paratexts are almost universal within Restoration drama. These moments of authorial intervention became far more codified—in print, at least—during the Restoration. Prologues and epilogues became so fashionable that they were nearly mandatory, a situation which was lamented—ironically, in the prologue itself—as early as Robert Howard's 1665 *The Surprisal*: "Since you expect a Prologue, we submit: / But let me tell you, this Excise on Wit, / Though undiscern'd, consumes the Stock so fast, / That no new Phancy will be left at last."[9] These paratextual spaces, however, quickly became a valuable arena for playwrights

---

[8] Douglas Bruster and Robert Weimann, *Prologues to Shakespeare's Theatre: Performance and Liminality in Early Modern Drama* (London and New York: Routledge, 2004), 4.
[9] Robert Howard, "Prologue," *The Surprisal*, printed in *Four New Plays* (1665), reprinted in Pierre Danchin's *The Prologues and Epilogues of the Restoration 1660-1700: Part One: 1660-1676 The First Volume* (Nancy: Université de Nancy, 1981), 121. A similar, pre-Restoration complaint appears in William Davenant's 1649 *Love and Honour*: "But that the Tyrant custom bears such sway, / We would present no Prologue to our Play: / Since we have

to position themselves in terms of both a literary tradition and a highly charged political landscape.

When Charles II returned to London as King of England in May 1660, he was faced with a considerable image crisis. Having been without a king for eleven years, the English people—commoner and noble alike—had only a negative model of monarchy established by the Interregnum parliaments and Protectorate, thereby necessitating that Charles II and his court reconstruct the image of kingship in a manner that both reasserted royalist expectations and assuaged parliamentarian fears. Rather than looking exclusively to more familiar contemporary models abroad, much of this refashioning deliberately relied upon English predecessors from recent history. In this way, the court fashioned itself not only in terms of its continental exile, but also as a continuation of a pre-Interregnum system of monarchical power that often evoked nostalgia for a supposed golden age of Elizabeth's or James's rule. As Paula Backsheider notes, "Charles's primary efforts were concentrated upon reclaiming English history, not toward directing a breakaway future."[10] Rather than attempting to create a new model of monarchy which acknowledged the realities of the Commonwealth, Charles deliberately and selectively evoked the politics of the past. While the court was also influenced by French monarchical practices due to how long Charles and many of his exiled courtiers had spent there, this influence was often downplayed in favor of depictions that demonstrated the court's Englishness. In fact, French influence came to

---

learn'd in Prologues all the scope / Is with weak words to strengthen weaker hope." This prologue was reprinted in Davenant's *Works* (1673) and may have been used at the play's 1661 revival.

[10] Paula Backscheider, *Spectacular Politics: Theatrical Power and Mass Culture in Early Modern England* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993), 34.

be seen as a liability as questions of authoritarian rule and Catholic interference became central problems for Charles's rule.

In examining Charles's return to power, Tim Harris recounts William Cavendish, Duke of Newcastle's advice to Charles: "On the eve of the Restoration, the Duke of Newcastle had advised Charles that he should show himself 'Gloryously' to his people, 'Like a God,' since then the people would pray for him 'with trembling Feare, and Love, as they did to Queen Elizabeth.'"[11] The lavishness of Charles II's coronation proceedings, "an elaborate and meticulously planned three-day celebration, designed to revive the cult of monarchy after over a decade of republican government,"[12] seems to embody Newcastle's advice. The early pageantry of Charles's monarchy "deliberately reached toward all levels of society and included frivolous amusements," which encouraged the people to mimic the official celebrations and revelry by creating their own, thus "foster[ing] an illusion of spontaneous celebration and universal joy at the restoration."[13] Like many of his predecessors, Charles II understood the power of managing his government and subjects through theatrical spectacle, whether in the streets or on the stage.

It is little wonder, then, that the theaters of the Restoration were quite different from their pre-Interregnum predecessors. While numerous public and private theaters had flourished under Elizabeth, James, and (to a somewhat reduced extent) Charles I, Charles II created a tightly controlled theater duopoly which depended on its ability to cater to an elite audience. This is not to say, of course, that only the court attended theater; plenty of

---

[11] Tim Harris, *Restoration: Charles II and His Kingdoms* (London: Penguin Books, 2005), 68.
[12] Harris, *Restoration*, 69.
[13] Backscheider, *Spectacular Politics*, 10.

London citizens saw plays. However, the court, as we will see, held extensive influence, often to the point of control, over the two commercial theaters and their associated playwrights and actors. Thus, many plays—perhaps even *most* plays—of the period addressed the current conditions of court politics and culture.

At the beginning of the Restoration, however, there were few active playwrights, particularly compared to the demand for theatrical performances. To compensate, both theater companies relied on pre-Interregnum plays, often from authors like Ben Jonson or John Fletcher who had been particularly popular in print during either the reign of Charles I or during the Interregnum. Shakespeare, too, was popular, likely due to the prestige (and perhaps ease of use) of his publication in folio. While some of these plays, like the tragicomedies of Beaumont and Fletcher, were already well suited to the new cultural and political milieu of the Restoration theaters, many were in need of alteration. Shakespeare's plays in particular were viewed as dated due to their archaic and overly poetic language. His works were ripe for adaptation by enterprising playwrights such as William Davenant.

These adaptations served a number of purposes: they were expedient, since the bulk of the text had already been written; they helped establish and perpetuate a prestigious English dramatic history; and they allowed playwrights to write politically provocative plays that granted them an illusion of distance from their source material. While many playwrights chose to adapt Shakespeare's works, particularly as Shakespeare became increasingly recognizable and prestigious throughout the period, many playwrights looked to the work of his contemporaries as well. The ways that these plays were adapted are wide-ranging, from the simple restructuring of existing scenes and dialogue, to the wholesale reinvention of plots, characters, and settings. In all cases, however, these adaptations are important for

what they can tell us about the Restoration theater, its production needs, its playwrights, and the cultural and political climate in which it operated.

In writing about "Restoration drama," one immediately encounters a problem that has been variously interpreted throughout the last century of literary and historical criticism, if not longer: that of periodization. Often, when we talk about early modern drama, we are talking about Shakespeare or his immediate contemporaries. Less often are we considering the theaters that came after, during the reign of Charles I, in covert playhouses and publications during the Interregnum, or, of particular interest to this study, in their reinvented forms in the Restoration. Studies of early modern drama often include a hard stop at 1642, with the beginning of the English Civil Wars, though the start date is somewhat more nebulous. The Restoration has the opposite problem: while there is a clear beginning in 1660 (though theatrical activity began in 1659, 1656, or, perhaps, never truly ended, depending on our perspective), there is no well-defined stopping point. In speaking of English history writ large, Anna Keay writes that "the Restoration has always had something of an uneasy position in English history, trapped awkwardly between two revolutions, neither exactly *ancient régime* nor yet quite enlightenment."[14] Thus, the Restoration is falls between our normal frames of periodization: it is neither truly early modern, nor truly eighteenth-century, though it shares characteristics (and classes, and conferences, and publications) with each. Various scholars have defined their studies of

[14] Anna Keay *The Magnificent Monarch: Charles II and the Ceremonies of Power* (London: Continuum, 2008), 3.

"the Restoration" as 1660-1700 (Allardyce Nicoll,[15] providing us with clean dates, illogical as stopping two years before the end of William III's reign may be); 1660-1702 (Eleanore Boswell,[16] ending with William and Mary); 1660-1710 (Paulina Kewes,[17] ending with Anne's copyright statutes); and 1660-1800 (Milhous and Hume, perhaps as a means of extending their arguments throughout the eighteenth century). Many of these definitions extend well beyond the political concerns that arose with the revival of the monarchy, however.

Much of the canonization of pre-Interregnum drama begins in the Restoration, with dramatists, printers, and theater managers all invested in the continued success of early modern drama, initially to allow for the survival of the theater, and later as a way to lend historical weight to their own creative endeavors. Through performance, publication, adaptation, and the beginnings of dramatic criticism, these individuals established a specifically English precedent for drama as both a valuable cultural commodity and a literary field. Particularly at a time when French plays and theatrical practices such as moving scenery and actresses threatened to dominate English stages, this establishment and reclaiming of English dramatic history was a necessary component of reforming English national identity. At the center of this canonization was, perhaps unsurprisingly, the Triumvirate of Wit: Shakespeare, Jonson, and Fletcher, the same playwrights who today tend to hold central positions in courses and publications on early modern drama.

---

[15] Allardyce Nicoll, *A History of Restoration Drama 1660-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1928).
[16] Eleanore Boswell, *The Restoration Court Stage (1660-1702): With a Particular Account of the Production of Calisto* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932).
[17] Paulina Kewes, *Authorship and Appropriation: Writing for the Stage in England, 1660-1710* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).

For the purpose of this study, then, I adopt a fairly narrow definition of the Restoration, following Tim Harris: 1660-1685, from the beginning of Charles II's reign to his death.[18] While many of the questions raised throughout this book extend into James II's reign and persist across the Glorious Revolution, the particular interplay between the theater, politics, and drama of the past that I examine here is most clearly defined in the first two decades of the Restoration. The reopening of the theaters and Charles's continual engagement with both the writing and the production of drama created an intimate relationship between politics and theater that had little precedent outside of court masquing traditions. As Nancy Klein Maguire has noted, "nearly all the new playwrights were politicians who became playwrights either to gain or to enhance their political credibility."[19] This interconnectedness between court and stage often functioned as a double-edged sword, however, working as often to support Charles and his newly restored regime as it did to comment on and question the court to which the playwrights had unprecedented access. As the political system began to fragment in the late 1670s, these connections became increasingly more contentious, with some playwrights, such as Thomas Shadwell, supporting court factions other than the monarch's.

Throughout this study, I address both revivals and adaptations of pre-Interregnum plays as a vehicle through which Restoration theater managers and playwrights established the history of English drama while also engaging in English politics. Throughout much of

---

[18] Harris's *Restoration* focuses on many of the questions I am interested in here surrounding politics and public perception.
[19] Nancy Klein Maguire, *Regicide and Restoration: English Tragicomedy, 1660-1671* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 3.

the study, I focus on how these plays were made suitable for new stage practices and new audiences. Because most documentation of the theaters from this period has been lost to time, my study tends to center adaptations as the primary means of investigation. These texts are particularly useful, since they allow us to see which plays were judged to be in need of significant change in order to meet the needs of Restoration theaters and the expectations of Restoration audiences, and by contrasting these plays with those that were (or appear to have been) performed more or less as written, we can investigate the differences in how these two sets of texts were treated.

In the following chapters, I treat adaptation quite broadly as a creative interpretation of a past text. In this sense, creative bears the weight of both artistic production and newness, the formation of an original text from parts of other literary works and cultural moments. Linda Hutcheon's definition here most closely matches my own: "As a *process of creation*, the act of adaptation always involves both (re-)interpretation and then (re-)creation; this has been called both appropriation and salvaging, depending on your perspective."[20] This concept of adaptation as creation is central to my reading of the plays discussed in the following chapters. Not only are the playwrights *re*creating the works of their predecessors, they are doing so in a way that creates a historical narrative about the very texts they are reconfiguring even as they remediate that past through the evolving technologies of the Restoration stage.

---

[20] Linda Hutcheon with Siobhan O'Flynn, *A Theory of Adaptation*, 2nd ed. (London and New York: Routledge, 2013), 8.

A wealth of adaptations were produced during the Restoration, but most of them have gone unstudied, and there has not yet been a general study of the process of adaptation throughout the period. Much of the work that has been written is Shakespeare-centric, with a wealth of journal articles and monographs exploring works such as John Dryden and William Davenant's *The Tempest; or, The Enchanted Isle* or Nahum Tate's *King Lear*. Critical editions of a select number of Shakespeare adaptations have also been produced, from Montague Summers' *Shakespeare Adaptations* (1966)[21] to Sandra Clark's *Shakespeare Made Fit: Restoration Adaptations of Shakespeare* (1997).[22] These editions, sparse though they are, already demonstrate the central problem with the current state of studies on Restoration adaptations: not only are they focused exclusively on Shakespeare, they explore only a narrow set of the many adaptations of his plays, generally by the Restoration's most celebrated playwrights.

The majority of the plays adapted throughout the Restoration, however, were not written by Shakespeare; he was merely one of many popular sources of inspiration. Restoration dramatists adapted works from many of the most famous dramatists from the Elizabethan, Jacobean, and Caroline periods, though their sources often went unacknowledged. Generally, unless the source text was written by Shakespeare or Fletcher, the adaptation's debt was glossed over. As Alfred Harbage has pointed out, there are a wealth of Restoration plays—some clearly adaptations, and some of unknown

---

[21] Summers's volume includes *The Tempest* (Dryden and Davenant), *The Mock Tempest* (Duffett), and *King Lear* (Tate).
[22] Clark includes *Sauny the Scot* (Lacy), *The Tempest* (Dryden and Davenant), *All for Love* (Dryden), *King Lear* (Tate), and *Richard III* (Cibber).

provenance—"of mysterious origin—'presents' by self-abnegating authors who were 'contented with applause.'"[23] While critics and scholars from the eighteenth century to the present have sought to identify which plays made use of the works of their predecessors, Harbage argues that Restoration drama is far more indebted to the pre-Interregnum theater than has been, or ever will be, identified, due to a reliance on now-lost manuscript drama.

Even without these lost sources, however, the number of adaptations produced during this period is far greater than has often been acknowledged. While all of the adaptations of Shakespeare have received at least some (and in some cases, quite a lot) of scholarly attention, adaptations of other playwrights' works certainly existed, particularly in the early 1670s, which was something of an experimental period in reworking and reviving the plays of pre-Interregnum playwrights beyond the Triumvirate of Wit. Many of these adaptations are more subtle than the well-known Shakespeare adaptations, and the cultural or political ends toward which they work are more unorthodox and more varied. However, a truly exhaustive accounting is beyond the scope of the present study (or, perhaps, any study). Here, I have chiefly sought to provide a somewhat broad overview of the adaptations as they relate to particular political movements—the Restoration, the Clarendon Crisis, the Popish Plot, and the Exclusion Crisis. Close readings of select adaptations serve to highlight the relevant features of both adaptation processes and dramatists' political engagement as they evolve through the period.

---

[23] Alfred Harbage, "Elizabethan-Restoration Palimpsest," *Modern Language Review* 35:3, 1940, 312

While this project seeks to avoid a Shakespeare-centric approach, it is an unavoidable truth that many of the pre-Interregnum plays adapted during the Restoration, and especially during the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis, were originally written by Shakespeare. However, significant adaptations of Fletcher's plays and adaptations of other dramatists' works written by Aphra Behn were equally as well-received, if fewer in number. Thus, this project places contemporary texts side-by-side, when possible, to focus on the individual political moments that shaped discrete waves of adaptation. I have divided this period into four sections: the early Restoration; 1674-1677; the Popish Plot; and the Exclusion Crisis.[24] Each period evinces distinct trends in adaptation which can be directly linked to both how dramatists imagined themselves as inheriting the plays of the past and how these adaptations allowed dramatists to respond to evolving political crises.

Even as they sought to address the present, however, Restoration-era adaptations also consciously used the drama of the past in order to justify their work in the present. Adaptation is, in some ways, the ultimate expression of cultural inheritance. Not only is it receiving material from the past, it is reworking it into something new that can more immediately speak to the present. The language used to frame this in the Restoration often indicates a sense of mastery over the past—a means of revising and perfecting what came before, remaking it into its ideal shape. We can see this in Nahum Tate's oft-quoted description of Shakespeare's *King Lear* as "a Heap of Jewels, unstrung and unpolisht; yet so

[24] The final years of Charles's reign, including the Tory Resurgence, are discussed briefly in the conclusion.

dazling in their Disorder, that I soon perceiv'd I had seiz'd a Treasure."[25] Of course, the task of arranging and restringing such jewels falls to the adapter, and not all adapters frame their relationship to their source texts so positively. Shadwell discusses his adaptation of *Timon of Athens* as a text which "had the inimitable hand of *Shakespear* in it, which never made more Masterly strokes than in this. Yet I can truly say, I have made it into a play," thus inviting us to ask precisely what it was before. Even more reluctant to admit his relationship to the past, John Crowne asserts that "the Divine Shakespear did not lay one Stone" of his *The Misery of Civil-War* (1680), an adaptation of Shakespeare's *1 Henry VI*. Adapters do not just position themselves in opposition to Shakespeare, however. The writer of the preface to Rochester's posthumously published adaptation of Fletcher's *Valentinian* stresses that Rochester "alter'd and corrected this Play much more than it is…[and] mended the old Play by that little he has done to it, for he had but just drawn it into a regular Form, and laid the Plane of what he further design'd."[26] The entire canon of pre-Interregnum drama was ripe for adaptation, particularly if the works of its best-known playwrights could be reshaped or "made fit." For many dramatists of this era, then, adaptation was not simply a means of iterating on the past, but of demonstrating that they had surpassed the skill and reputation of their predecessors.

Initially, these adaptations served to stabilize and reinforce the sociopolitical goals of the Stuart court. Early adaptations from William Davenant and John Dryden recast older material, particularly from Shakespeare, in terms of redefining a subject's position to

---

[25] Nahum Tate, *The History of King Lear*, London: Printed for E. Flesher, and are to be sold by R. Bently and M. Magnes, 1681, A2v.
[26] John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester, *Valentinian*, London: Printed for Timothy Godwin, 1685.

authority, as well as emphasizing the responsibility of those in power to rule with temperance and mercy. These plays echoed the political moves of the Stuart court, which, through the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion, reiterated its own commitment to restoring a carefully neutral balance between Royalists and Parliamentarians. As this carefully negotiated peace became increasingly strained, however, playwrights looked to older material as a means of critiquing or condemning Charles II's political practices. In many cases, the fact that these *were* inherited texts meant that authors had the relative safety and distance of claiming literary precedent when dealing with politically sensitive subjects, particularly in the years surrounding the Popish Plot and the Exclusion Crisis. This inherited status also allowed them to establish themselves as authors working within long established traditions and placing themselves as heirs to an increasingly literary field that framed itself in terms of its centrality to English culture. However, in most cases, this literary performance of inheritance was also framed within the language of progress, of needing to overcome, surpass, and correct the flaws of the past.

As Hutcheon suggests, the term "adaptation" is notoriously difficult to define in a way that is both comprehensive enough to be useful and narrow enough to offer critical clarity. While it is tempting to treat these adaptations as direct one-to-one relationships between a single source text and the resulting adaptation, doing so fails to acknowledge the complex web of intertexts underlying both plays. Just as Shakespeare and his contemporaries drew on proto-novels, historical chronicles, other plays, and a variety of other sources, so, too, did the dramatists of the Restoration reinterpret pre-Interregnum plays alongside English history, political polemics, current events, and contemporary philosophy. Indeed, it is the connections between the source text, the adaptation, and the

political writings and milieus that guided it that this dissertation focuses on. Because of these complex intertextual networks, the adaptations are generally responding to both a "source text" from which they draw a plot and characters and blocks of dialogue, yet they are also interweaving that text with the complex literary, cultural, and political landscape of the Restoration.

Most of the adaptations in this period refer to themselves as "altering" or providing "additions" or "making" a source text "into a play." The earliest use of the word "adaptation" to describe "an altered or amended version of a text" is dated to 1700. [27] However, the practice has its roots in the ancient idea of *imitatio*, which was particularly influential for early modern and Restoration dramatists. In some senses, the word "alteration" works well as a metaphor for these rewritten texts, considering the discussion of "fashion" that dominates the discourse of dramatic criticism (particularly when discussing French trends) during this time. Indeed, some scholars, such as Emma Depledge, have adopted the term "alteration" in their own studies of these plays.[28] However, I use the term adaptation because of its modern critical valences and because it is the most widely used term in current studies. Additionally, the term "alteration" is more suggestive, at least to modern readers, of cutting and reshaping—adaptation on a fairly minor scale, which I will discuss below—than it is of some of the wholesale rewriting and significant revision that some of these plays undergo. Thus, while I use the term "adaptation" to describe a wide array of plays which demonstrate a variety of approaches to their source texts, I also

---

[27] "adaptation, n.," *OED Online,* June 2019, Oxford University Press.
[28] See, for example, Emma Depledge's *Shakespeare's Rise to Cultural Prominence*.

acknowledge that adaptation is a multi-valent term that includes a variety of practices and meanings throughout history.

While the term "appropriation" has some merit in defining the scope of adaptations that were produced during the Restoration, I avoid it for two reasons. First, the term is often treated as synonymous with theft or inappropriate usage, as in the term "cultural appropriation." Second, there is a sense of survival inherent in the term "adaptation" that seems particularly apt when applied to these plays: their reinvention during the Restoration is in many ways directly related to their continued place in the English literary canon, especially in the case of Shakespeare. As Emma Depledge and Heidi Craig have variously argued, Shakespeare's popularity in print was nearly non-existent throughout the Interregnum; however, the popularity of his plays in their adapted forms led to their survival in both print and performance.[29]

Finally, a great deal of work on adaptations of Shakespeare exists, both on the adaptations of the Restoration and on others throughout time. Often, these works fall into a category of Shakespearean exceptionalism—they address the adaptations because they are reimagining Shakespeare's texts; they draw a direct line of descent from the Shakespearean text to the adaptation in question (often ignoring centuries of intervening adaptations); and they are focused on the Shakespeare-ness of the adaptation produced, rather than considering the adaptation on its own terms. In other words, the question is all too often "what does this adaptation do with/to Shakespeare" rather than "what does this text do,

---

[29] See Emma Depledge, *Shakespeare's Rise to Cultural Prominence: Politics, Print, and Alteration, 1642-1700*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (2018); and Heidi Craig, "Missing Shakespeare, 1642-1661," *English Literary Renaissance* 49.1 (2019), 116-144.

while also borrowing from Shakespeare." Shakespeare's modern status as auteur, however false that status may be, has made it difficult to treat him as merely one playwright (and not one particularly beloved by Restoration audiences) among many. Restoration adaptations of Shakespeare and his contemporaries have often been written off by modern scholars as pale imitations at best. In her introduction to *Shakespeare Made Fit: Restoration Adaptations of Shakespeare*, Sandra Clark cites a number of disparaging analyses of these adaptations, including George C. D. Odell's claim that the Dryden and Davenant adaptation of the *Tempest* is "the worst such perversion of Shakespeare in the two-century history of such atrocities."[30] However, these readings embrace a cultural hierarchy that has long been Shakespeare-centric and thus fails to read the adaptations on their own merits or within their own cultural contexts. Like Hutcheon, though, I push back against these readings and "look instead to such things as popularity, persistence, or even the diversity and extent of dissemination for criteria of success."[31] Under this rubric, the Restoration adaptations, particularly of Shakespeare, were immensely successful. In performance, they almost completely replaced Shakespeare's versions for nearly a century, with their reign ending only gradually in the later eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

Many elements factored into the long-term success of these adaptations. Their language was simplified, even as new affordances for staging allowed for heightened visual spectacle to take the place of poetic language. New roles were written to showcase the

---

[30] Sandra Clarke, *Shakespeare Made Fit: Restoration Adaptations of Shakespeare*, London: J. M. Dent (1997), xliv; quoting from Odell, *Shakespeare from Betterton to Irving*, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons (1920), 31.
[31] Hutcheon with O'Flynn, *A Theory of Adaptation*, xxvi.

talents of newly introduced actresses, and many of these roles changed the emotional tone and weight of the plays in ways that audiences found particularly appealing. The close relationships between court and theater meant that political disputes and scandals could (and did) get performed on stage under incredibly thin guises. Moreover, the political interests and connections of many playwrights led to plays that entered into conversation with the nation's growing political engagement. Finally, in adapting plays that were, themselves, often adaptations, the Restoration dramatists were able to present the lessons in their plays as universal, transcending the particular moments of both the early modern and the Restoration theaters.

This study begins by examining the status of early modern drama in print and performance at the moment of Charles II's ascension to the throne. To do so, it traces the histories of these plays through the Interregnum in order to demonstrate the legacy of these plays inherited by Restoration audiences and theater professionals. Chapter 2 focuses on the work of royalist printers, particularly Humphrey Moseley, in creating the literary dramatic tradition upon which Restoration dramatists later drew. It also explores how clandestine performances during the Interregnum shaped audience's expectations of theatrical performance.

Chapter 3 covers the years 1659-1666 and analyzes early revivals and adaptations that were used to establish the theme of "rightful rule" that dominated early Restoration drama. I argue that in this selection of plays, the theaters sought to instill values of loyalty in Restoration theater-goers, while also celebrating and cementing the restoration of the monarchy. These plays also established clear out-groups—primarily Puritans, foreigners, and those supporting commonwealths—and modeled "proper" responses to them,

primarily through humor and mockery. Towards the end of the period, playwrights began offering gentle, subtle critiques of king and country as a means of combating increased tensions between Cavaliers and former parliamentarians.

In Chapter 4, I survey the years 1667-1672 as a transitionary period for both court and theater. The initial half of the chapter is grounded in an analysis of performances and adaptations which respond to Clarendon's fall from power and exile. The second half of the chapter discusses the wide range of political uses toward which the theater could be directed, suggesting many potential models for political engagement that were ultimately abandoned in light of the Popish Plot and subsequent reduction in theatrical audiences.

Chapter 5 examines adaptations of Shakespeare's Greek and Roman history plays during the Popish Plot. In this chapter, I argue that, rather than representing the growing Tory/Whig divide, these plays reject the idea of factionalism as inherently dangerous to the maintenance of civil society. By contrasting plays that have traditionally been read as Whig (Shadwell's adaptation of *Timon of Athens*) or Tory (Otway's *Caius Marius*, Ravenscroft's *Titus Andronicus*, and Tate's adaptation of *Coriolanus*), I demonstrate that, regardless of the playwright's individual political leanings, all of these adaptations highlight fears of internal division leading to mob violence and domination by external powers.

Chapter 6 serves as a companion piece to Chapter 5 in that it explores adaptations of Shakespeare's history plays as responses to the Exclusion Crisis. While there is some overlap in the general fears expressed in both chapters—fears of crowd violence and popery, for example—the adaptations of the history plays are far more concerned with disruptions in government due to disrupted or improper inheritance. In these plays, the lack of a proper leader, decided by divine right as established through patrilineal inheritance,

always leads to civil war. At the same time, however, these plays also interrogate what qualities are necessary for good kingship, a particularly dangerous topic in plays with failed kings.

Finally, the conclusion examines the legacy of pre-Interregnum drama throughout the end of Charles's reign and into the eighteenth century. In broad strokes, it suggests that the canon of plays and playwrights formed by Restoration dramatists, publishers, and theater managers shaped the field of early modern drama throughout the eighteenth century, and that the effects of that shaping are still represented in our current approach to early modern plays.

CHAPTER II

SETTING THE STAGE: EARLY MODERN DRAMA FROM 1642 TO 1659[32]

The English theater that existed in 1659 was very different from the theater that had preceded the English Civil Wars. In the intervening years, two separate ordinances had restricted, and then banned all theatrical performances throughout England, and many of the former theaters had been destroyed. Many theatrical professionals—from playwrights to actors to stagehands—had found other employment, died, or left England. Yet the drama *did* survive, in print, and in illicit performances and drolleries. However, both of these media altered the drama that they propagated in ways that ensured that when the theaters reopened, the legacy that they inherited was one of drama as literary, subversive, and royalist, with a partially defined canon of celebrated dramatists.

Publishing Drama in the Interregnum

The primary way in which drama survived was through print, which, during the Interregnum, proliferated at an unprecedented pace. With the "Order for Stage-plays to cease" in September 1642,[33] commercial theaters in London were—by law, if not always in practice—closed. In March 1649, many of the playhouses were demolished, leaving even illicit performances with few venues outside of private houses. Thus, printed drama became the sole legal means of accessing theater. During the Interregnum, many previously

---

[32] Keywords: canon, drolleries, illicit performance, Interregnum, Humphrey Moseley, publishing

[33] "September 1642: Order for Stage-plays to cease," in *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum, 1642-1660*, ed. C. H. Firth and R. S. Rait (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1911), 26-27. *British History Online.*

unpublished plays made their first appearances in print as publishers[34] attempted to establish the drama's legacy beyond the stage.

Before 1642, printed drama in England was often relatively marginalized in terms of production quantity and quality. Recent trends in scholarship have questioned the oft-repeated idea that pre-Interregnum playwrights (or, more precisely, playing companies) refrained from publishing their works in order to prevent rival companies from performing them. Instead, the current consensus seems to be that there was simply little profit to be made from the publication of most playbooks. [35] Even so, particularly popular plays such as *Mucedorus* or *The Spanish Tragedy* were printed with some consistency throughout the pre-Interregnum period, and some playwrights—most notably Ben Jonson—sought control over their own legacies in print. For the most part, however, playing companies generally seemed content to keep their plays in repertoire rather than attempt to peddle them to potential publishers. While publication became increasingly frequent throughout the Jacobean and Caroline eras, by 1642, the publication of plays had still not reached widespread popularity.

---

[34] The term "publisher" is somewhat anachronistic during this period, since the hierarchy of printers, booksellers, and other book arts craftspeople does not map neatly to our modern definitions of publication. Here, I define "publisher" following James Raven's description of "stationer-booksellers who, as financing publishers, came to abandon printing." (*The Business of Books: Booksellers and the English Book Trade, 1450-1850*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007, p. 37.) Throughout the Interregnum and the Restoration, we begin to see publishers of this sort, who sought to develop their own brands and assert creative control over the texts they produced. Humphrey Moseley, Henry Herringman, and the Tonsons demonstrate the trajectory of publishing in the late seventeenth century.

[35] Though the scholarly commonplace has long been that playing companies avoided publication due to a fear that their plays would be stolen and that many printings were pirated, scholars such as Rosalyn Knutson and Judith Milhous and Robert D. Hume have demonstrated that companies' aversion to publication has been overstated.

The closing of the theaters created a renaissance of drama in print. The printing of old plays—including first publications for many titles—boomed during the Interregnum. Dale B. J. Randall observes that "at least some of the older drama was printed in every single year from 1640 through 1660."[36] Though Randall notes that publication dropped off briefly immediately after the closing of the theaters, a resurgence in the late 1640s and 1650s demonstrated the persistence of drama in the public imagination. An increase in dramatic commonplacing during the interregnum suggests not only the increased availability of plays but also, as Laura Estill suggests "a sense of nostalgia" for the closed theaters.[37] This same nostalgia is made clear throughout the paratexts that accompany many of the plays published during the Interregnum. Prefacing the Beaumont and Fletcher folio, James Howell laments "since we cannot have them Trod o'th' stage,/Wee will applaud Thee in this silent Page."[38] His sentiments were echoed by poets and publishers alike. Without the possibility of performance on a licensed, commercial stage, publishers like Humphrey Moseley had to reframe plays as literary texts or risk the loss of the entire genre.

Defining "literature" within this period is difficult, particularly since the term as I apply it here is rather anachronistic. Literature, as a category of imaginative texts worthy of being read—whether that worth lay in their aesthetic, moral, or historical value—did not exist as such in the seventeenth century. David Scott Kastan has traced the evolution of the

---

[36] Dale J. B. Randall, *Winter Fruit: English Drama 1642-1600* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1995), 233.
[37] Laura Estill, *Dramatic Extracts in Seventeenth-Century Manuscripts: Watching, Reading, Changing Plays* (Lanham: University of Delaware Press, 2015), 77.
[38] Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher, *Comedies and Tragedies* (London: Humphrey Moseley, 1647), B4r.

term, but tellingly notes that even as the Bodleian Library was beginning its collections, there was a "general lack of interest in English literary production" and that modern "scholarly overemphasis on early modern drama in its accounts of the literary achievement in England has distracted us from seeing that English literature had not yet even formed as a category of collection and organization."[39] In this chapter, I, like Kastan, am interested in literature as a set of texts that is given particular cultural weight by outside forces such as publishers and buyers and is capable of self-definition through shared generic, aesthetic, and material concerns. A text becomes literature through the careful crafting of multiple actors. Authors cannot act as autonomous forces: their appearance in print depends on publishers, and their canonization depends on being read and written about by other writers. The work undertaken throughout the Interregnum, chiefly by Humphrey Moseley and his broad assortment of collaborators, and carried into the Restoration by publishers and dramatists alike placed drama on a relatively equal playing field with poetry, which had long reigned supreme as the early modern genre of choice.

The Interregnum saw the rapid publication of plays that had not previously seen print, and these plays' novelty was as much a selling point as any other aspect of their publication. Indeed, many title pages bore some variation on the phrase "never before printed." Not only did these publications preserve the plays of the past, allowing them to be resurrected in the Restoration, but they also allowed publishers to reframe how drama was consumed, largely through discursive paratextual apparatuses that resembled those Ben

---

[39] David Scott Kastan, "Humphrey Moseley and the Invention of English Literature," *Agent of Change*, ed. Sabrina Alcorn Baron, Eric N. Lindquist, and Eleanor F. Shevlin (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2007), 110.

Jonson routinely attached to his plays. These paratexts served to highlight the novelty of their adjoining plays in print, established the author(s)—not the playing company—as the central creative force behind the plays, and explicitly connected them to structures of the past, namely, the theater and the monarchy. Print, then, was the means by which it was possible for the Restoration theater and its practitioners to inherit the dramatic texts of the past. Publishers of drama during the Interregnum and the Restoration had to create and establish the authority of their texts in much the same way that the restored monarchy did: through a careful performance of authority that called back to earlier forms and texts.

Many publishers at least dabbled in the production of play texts throughout the Interregnum. Of these, Humphrey Moseley was the most prolific and the most deliberate. Moseley's work was instrumental in creating a canon of pre-Interregnum drama that was recognizable as such to dramatists and early theater critics in the Restoration. Like many other publishers of drama during the Interregnum, Moseley almost exclusively targeted plays that had not been previously published, and whenever possible he sought to work from authorial originals. Indeed, there is a strong preservationist aesthetic throughout the paratexts that accompanied Moseley's publications. The title page of the Beaumont and Fletcher folio advertises that the included texts are "Never printed before and now published according to the Authors original copies." In the publisher's letter which immediately follows the title page, Moseley clearly sets out his criteria for including texts in the collection: they must not have been previously printed, and they must be derived from the original copies. In doing so, Moseley advertises the texts as providing "All that was Acted, and all that was not; even the perfect full Originalls without the least mutilation" by the acting companies. This emphasis on authorial copies was unusual, and it shifted the

creative control of the text from the company to the individual author or authors. While the title pages of printed plays throughout the early modern period often "foreground[ed] performance as the marketable attribute of these texts" through citing past performances and their notable scenes or characters,[40] Moseley's publications primarily cite their novelty as their primary selling point. Rather than deriving their marketability from reminders of particular performances or theatre troupes, the playtexts themselves took on meaning, and their authors, like the recognizable names of poets, came to represent the quality of the text.

While the Beaumont and Fletcher folio was Moseley's most notable and lavish dramatic production, and the most influential on Restoration dramatists, he also published the first editions of numerous other texts from dramatists such as Philip Massinger, Thomas Middleton, Richard Brome, and James Shirley, the latter two of which he cultivated a working relationship with. [41] While Moseley is best known for his work as a publisher of new texts, he also purchased the rights to his competitors' backstocks in order to market an increasingly broad variety of playbooks initially produced by other publishers, making his shop a hub for dramatic literature.[42] Throughout Moseley's publication catalogue, we see a consistent effort to reclaim the stage as a series of literary artifacts, new in print, which otherwise would be lost along with the destruction of the professional theaters.

---

[40] Jeffrey Masten, *Textual Intercourse: Collaboration, Authorship, and Sexualities in Renaissance Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 115.
[41] For more on both Moseley's relationship with Shirley and his purchase of copyright, see Jitka Štollová's ""This Silence of the Stage': The Play of Format and Paratext in the Beaumont and Fletcher Folio," *The Review of English Studies* 68.285 (2016), 507-23.
[42] Štollová, 509.

Novelty in print format was equally as important as literary construction for Moseley's establishment of a recognizable brand. While the folio format used for the Beaumont and Fletcher volume in 1647 was a clear indication of prestige, its considerable expense meant that such volumes had necessarily limited audiences. Even so, folio publication did lend authors a specific kind of cultural capital that shaped their reception amongst the nobility and their literary descendants. However, in order to succeed in a post-war book market, Moseley needed to make his playbooks cheap enough to sell, yet refined enough to demonstrate their literary value. Although the Beaumont and Fletcher folio was a lavish undertaking, as much a memorial to the theater as a volume meant to be read, most of Moseley's dramatic volumes were far more modest. He published plays primarily in slim octavo volumes rather than the larger and more popular octavo format, and Moseley kept the general design for the volumes consistent between different authors. Margaret Ezell has drawn attention to Moseley's formatting of poets such as Milton, Waller, and Suckling as a means of framing both poets and their poetry within a classical, literary tradition that emphasized the poetic value of their writing while mitigating any overt political radicalism. Much of this formatting, such as the author portraits and prefaces, was duplicated in Moseley's volumes of plays. This consistency created a distinctive Moseley style, allowing for his publications to be viewed as a cohesive group. As Paulina Kewes has argued, "the Brome and Shirley collections were meant to be recognized as parts of a series."[43] Through

[43] Paulina Kewes, "'Give Me the Sociable Pocket-books…': Humphrey Moseley's Serial Publication of Octavo Play Collections," *Publishing History* 38 (1995): 5-21, 9.

print formatting, then, Moseley was subtly creating a recognizable canon of early modern dramatists.

The formatting also furthered Moseley's goals of enhancing drama's literary prestige, which was crucial to the work of later playwrights like John Dryden in theorizing drama as a field of literature. By publishing plays in the same format in which he published poetry—generally seen as a courtlier and more literary genre—Moseley granted plays a similar literary status. These volumes, dramatic and poetic alike, presented a consistent aesthetic appeal: they were small, sized to fit the hands of the ladies that Moseley saw as his primary audience,[44] and relatively uniform in their typography and their inclusion of paratextual material such as author portraits and dedicatory poems. The octavo format set Moseley's playbooks apart visually, allowing them to function as unique branding which "reduced Moseley's chances that customers would buy his playbooks to have them bound with other publishers' output."[45] They were also far more economical than larger formats, which Peter Berek has suggested made it more appealing in the depressed post-war economy, particularly to the former theatrical community of now-impoverished cavaliers.[46]

This union of poetry and drama also appeared in Moseley's printed advertisements. These lists of books for sale often included poems and plays in a single category, as can be seen in the advertisement attached to the 1650 edition of *The Academy for Complements*, which

---

[44] For more on Moseley's attempts to market playbooks for women, see Margaret J. M. Ezell's "Never Boring, or Imagine My Surprise: Interregnum Women and the Culture of Reading" in *Imagining Selves: Essays in Honor of Patricia Meyer Spacks*, ed. Rivka Swenson and Elise Lauterbach (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2008), 155-69.
[45] Štollová, 522
[46] Peter Berek, "Defoliating Playbooks in the Reading Public," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 56.2 (2016): 395-416.

lists "Choice Poems, with excellent Translations, and incomparable Comedies and Tragedies, written by several ingenious Authors." For playwrights who had also been poets, Moseley occasionally published volumes such as John Suckling's *Fragmenta Aurea* (1642, 1648, and 1658), which combined texts from both genres, much as Jonson's *Works* had done. Moseley's publication agenda, then, relied on marketing playtexts as literary monuments of a mourned-for past via distinctive visual formatting. Visually and textually, the Moseley plays echo one another and other significant dramatic publications, even as they draw upon the conventions used for volumes of poetry. For example, the Beaumont and Fletcher folio mirrors the Shakespeare and Jonson folios in its structure through its engraving of Fletcher, its dedicatory poems and epistles, and its double-column formatting. Likewise, Moseley's single-author octavo publications demonstrate a distinct design aesthetic that set them apart from the works produced by other publishers.

Moseley's format often incorporated lengthy paratexts, many of which served to frame drama not just as literature, but as belonging to a specific cultural past that was strongly aligned with royalism, mourning and making concrete the connections between the theater and the court, which would be further solidified by the Restoration's court-endorsed theatre duopoly. The publication of Beaumont and Fletcher's works became a matter of national pride made all the more imperative by "this *Tragicall Age* where the *Theater* hath been much out-acted" by the horrors of war and a fallen monarchy.[47] Dale B. J. Randall reads the folio as creating "a virtual summary of the ideals and attitudes of an earlier time, all set down in words by men who by and large cared a good deal about language. Here,

---

[47] Beaumont and Fletcher, *Comedies and Tragedies* (1642), A3r.

surely, were rich and varied fruits for mulling in the long winter's night."[48] While all of the paratexts written specifically for the volume reflect the political situation in which they were written, this longing for an imagined, lost theatrical world permeates the breadth of Moseley's dramatic publications.

Though numerous scholars have warned against the perils of reading all theatrical publication and activity during the interregnum as inherently Royalist,[49] Moseley's publications do demonstrate clear Royalist sympathies. Lois Potter locates clear evidence for Moseley's royalism in the prefaces he published, both from his own pen and from commissioned writers such as John Berkenhead, which offered a platform to "praise great literature of the past, drawing attention at the same time to the cultural degeneration which they blamed on Parliament and the war."[50] However, Moseley's royalist support was carefully couched in a focus on the effects which war and religious and political division had on literary art. Moseley's commissioning of former nobles and playwrights to write poems and epistles for many of his publications suggests that he was primarily concerned with reconstructing the cultural and artistic community in which these plays were initially written and performed. As noted above, these paratexts often frame the plays as well-suited for reading, even as they lament the silenced stage, yet a great number of them also make

---

[48] Randall, *Winter Fruit*, 236

[49] See, for example Lois Potter's *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641-1660*, which notes that many writers and publishers shifted allegiances at various points throughout the Interregnum and Restoration, and "it is only with reference to a specific date that one can safely describe a writer as belonging to one party or the other" (xii). Similarly, Laura Estill's work on miscellanies written and published in the Interregnum highlights the different political valences of such work beyond a simple royalist/parliamentarian binary.

[50] Potter, *Secret Rites and Secret Writing*.

explicit the connections between the fall of the theater and the fall of the monarchy. Richard Brome notes Charles I's fondness for Fletcher's plays even as he unites them in loss: "good King *Charles*…grac'd these *Poems* well, / Being then in the life of Action: But they dyed / Since the Kings absence; or were layd aside."[51] Similarly, theater and monarchy are seen as symbiotic; the return of one (even in print) may herald the restoration of the other: Brome's poem ends by linking Charles's return to London with the book's production, "crying unto the world, that no protraction / May hinder *Sacred Majesty* to give / *Fletcher*, in them, leave on the *Stage* to live." Though Peter Berek continually frames the Beaumont and Fletcher folio in terms of theatrical, rather than political nostalgia, the paratexts make such a distinction difficult, since the theater is so often presented as only one of many losses, including the death of the king and the exile of the noble patrons who guided, funded, wrote, and even performed in theatrical productions.

The Interregnum publications were central to the restored theaters. There is substantial evidence that printed books became the promptbook sources for new performances. While pre-Interregnum theaters had often relied upon manuscript copies in the theaters, as evinced by Moseley's printing from such texts, in the Restoration, print books seem to have replaced manuscript editions in many theaters. Our best evidence for this comes from the Smock Alley Theater in Dublin, which used a copy of Shakespeare's second folio as a promptbook, and later replaced it with a copy of third folio.[52] The plays

---

[51] Beaumont and Fletcher, *Comedies and Tragedies* (1647), G1r.

[52] Though both folios have been disbound, remnants of them are housed at the Folger Shakespeare Library, and their provenance has been discussed at length by R. C. Bald in "Shakespeare on the Stage in Restoration Dublin." High-quality digital facsimiles can be found via *Shakespeare in Performance: Prompt Books from the Folger Shakespeare Library*, and

marked for performance closely match those that had found popularity in London, and the cuts often mimic popular adaptations, including Davenant's adaptation of *Macbeth* and a non-extant adaptation of *Julius Caesar*.[53] Playbooks, then, were crucial to the transmission of early modern drama to the Restoration stage. Folio texts appear to have been particularly popular, likely because of both perceived literary merit and for the material value of purchasing in bulk many of the most popular plays of the prior generations.

These volumes, along with their less costly quarto and octavo cousins, were popular among readers as well, as numerous commonplace books and copies adorned with readerly marginalia can attest. Moreover, they served as material for the Restoration's fledgling playwrights to adapt and adopt. Indeed, John Harlod Wilson's *The Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Restoration Drama* devotes an entire chapter tracing the development of Restoration comedy's characters and common plot devices from their roots in the works of Beaumont and Fletcher, and he argues that the duo's collected works were more broadly familiar to the up-and-coming playwrights than the majority of other pre-Interregnum dramatists.[54] Likewise, Alfred Harbage has demonstrated that playbooks by Caroline dramatists were attractive reading material for many Restoration playwrights. Beyond being widely available, largely through Moseley's collections, these dramatists' "courtly status"

---

include a second folio copy of *Twelfth Night* as well as third folio copies of *Pericles*, *Othello*, *King Lear*, *Macbeth*, *The Comedy of Errors*, *The Winter's Tale*, *Henry VIII*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, and *Timon of Athens*.

[53] Michael Dobson's "Accents Yet Unknown: Canonisation and the Claiming of *Julius Caesar*" notes that the Smock Alley *Julius Caesar* includes an added death speech for Brutus to "enlist the play on the side of the conspirators, producing what it is tempting to read as the sole potentially anti-royalist Restoration adaptation of Shakespeare" (13).

[54] John Harold Wilson, *The Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Restoration Drama* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1928), 75-117.

made them attractive candidates for emulation in a theatrical world that was intimately connected to the court.[55] In this light, Harbage's argument that "the heroic plays of the Restoration represent a culmination of the Cavalier [or Caroline] mode" seems a reasonable one.[56] Though these playwrights were, in most cases, equally familiar with recent French plays and dramatic trends, their search for specifically English predecessors led them to their most immediate ancestors.

The publications of Moseley and others also kept drama alive for readers throughout the Interregnum. For many readers, the most common forms of interacting with texts that leaves a lasting record are annotating (marking the text, whether for future reference or as a form of guided reading), extracting (copying passages into a diary or miscellany, often for later use), or commonplacing (transcribing sententious passages as part of a reflection on a broader theme). The binding together of purchased texts into sammelbände was also a common practice, which can suggest to us the ways in which readers conceptualized the connections between texts. While the current study does not permit a full examination of such practices and their political implications, it is worth examining at least one case, that of Abraham Wright's commonplace book,[57] to understand the uses to which drama could be put by its readers.

---

[55] Alfred Harbage, *Cavalier Drama: An Historical and Critical Supplement to the Study of the Elizabethan and Restoration Stage* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1964), 53.
[56] Harbage, 48.
[57] Now catalogued as BL MS Add. 22608 and available via *British Literary Manuscripts Online* at http://go.gale.com.srv-proxy2.library.tamu.edu/blm/i.do?&id=GALE%7CMC4400001841&v=2.1&u=txshracd2898&it=r&p=BLM&sw=w&viewtype=Manuscript

Wright's commonplace book, likely compiled sometime in the early 1640s combines excerpts from historical and dramatic texts with his original commentary. The plays included are primarily from James Shirley and from the Beaumont and Fletcher canon. These dramatists remained popular in illicit performances throughout the Interregnum and maintained their popularity on the early Restoration stage. Wright also provides extracts from Ben Jonson's *The Staple of News* ("an indifferent play") and *Bartholomew Fair* ("a good play"); Shakespeare's *Othello* ("a very good play both for lines and plot") and *Hamlet* ("an indifferent play, the lines but meane"); Webster's *The Devil's Law Case* ("an indifferent play"), *The Duchess of Malfi* ("a good play, especially for the plot"), and *The White Devil* ("an indifferent play to reade, but for the presentments I beeleeve good"); and Massinger's *A New Way to Pay Old Debts* ("a silly play").[58] Aside from his evaluations of each play's plot, poetry, and most interesting roles, Wright also discusses their educational value, whether for wit, romance, or morality. As Laura Estill has argued, Wright's miscellany serves as a theatrical counterpoint to prose or poetic commonplace books by "demonstrating how dramatic miscellanies and extracts could be used as a tool for both propagating particular political views as well as achieving the social polish needed to succeed in society."[59] This volume's composition in the early years of the Civil Wars suggests that, for some readers, drama was a source of not only nostalgia, but for the precise kind of social and moral instruction that it came to represent in the later years of the Interregnum and into the Restoration.

---

[58] Transcriptions of Wright's commentary can be found in Arthur C. Kirsch's "A Caroline Commentary on the Drama," *Modern Philology* 66.3 (1969), 256-61.
[59] Estill, *Dramatic Extracts in Seventeenth-Century Manuscripts*, 81.

The Interregnum Stage

Of course, performed drama persisted in England despite government injunctions against it. The numerous publication efforts were crucial for the texts' long-term survival, but for many of the theaters' previous audience members, they were inaccessible. As Dale J. B. Randall has noted, the majority of the English population was still illiterate during this period, and thus was dependent on clandestine performances and readings for engagement with the theater. These performances generally took one of three forms: illegal (or sometimes quasi-illegal) productions of the past's most popular plays; shortened, comedic interludes known as drolleries; or private performances in the houses of the wealthy. For our purposes, the former two are the most interesting, dealing as they do with the perseverance of public theater and its plays, but it is the latter, in no small part due to William Davenant's new operas, which initiated the first new theatrical performances in England in the late 1650s.

Our knowledge of theatrical performance during the Interregnum is largely derived from court records, London newsletters, and sporadic diary entries and letters. There is little formal evidence of the kind of prompt books or theater managers' account books that mark both earlier and later iterations of the English theater. However, some general trends can be observed. Regardless of both the 1642 ordinance, which formally closed the theaters, and the stricter ordinance of 1648, which called "for the effectual Suppressing of Stage Plays, with a severe Penalty upon such as shall offend against it; and for the Pulling down of the Stages, Galleries, and Seats; and making all those Houses unfit for Stage Plays," drama continued to be performed in London throughout the Interregnum. Most of the extant records note only failed or raided performances and their consequences, and the abundance

of these records suggests that the Interregnum theater, while significantly reduced in scope from previous eras, was still quite robust and supported companies at the Red Bull, the Cockpit, Blackfriars, and Salisbury Court with some regularity.

The plays of Fletcher and Beaumont appear to have been particularly popular (or, at least, popular for being raided), and newsletters from the period note performances of *A King and No King*, *Wit Without Money*, and *Rollo Duke of Normandy, or The Bloody Brother*, though there were almost certainly others. That these three plays are the ones for which records survive is suggestive of both the kinds of plays that interested Interregnum audiences and the subject matter that was most likely to draw the attention of the authorities. As Hotson notes, "the choice of the play *A King and No King* was in itself an affront to the Parliament,"[60] though the offense was likely more in the title being read as an allusion to Cromwell's adoption of royal pomp than any critique of the play's relatively apolitical content. In the same vein, the recurring performances of *Wit Without Money* may have served as a kind of rallying cry for the financial plight of the out-of-work actors, whose repeated requests for funding or compensation from Parliament were rejected. Of these three plays, only *Rollo* is a tragedy, and its themes of usurpation and bloodshed likely found little favor with Parliament. Even when drama did begin to be revived in earnest, the bloodier tragedies tended to be ignored in favor of comedies and tragicomedies that reaffirmed current political aims, whether Protectorate or royal. These plays continued to be popular during the early years of the Restoration, where they appeared alongside anti-Parliament plays like *Cromwell's Conspiracy*. Combined with the royalist framing of Beaumont

---

[60] Hotson, 26.

and Fletcher in Moseley's publication, it appears that the playwriting duo were viewed as a kind of analogue for pre-Interregnum popular culture.

Beyond these illicit performances of full plays, new forms of theatrical entertainment innovated on the dramatic texts of the past. Drolleries, reduced and often farcical excerpts of comedic scenes from popular plays, allowed performers to keep the older drama alive, albeit in an abbreviated form which was quick to produce with minimal casting or scenic requirements. Robert Cox's Interregnum drolleries included abbreviated scenes from several popular playwrights, including Shakespeare, whose *Midsummer Night's Dream* was revived as *The Merry Conceits of Bottom the Weaver* (1646). Similarly, Francis Kirkman's *The Wits* includes twenty-seven drolleries extracted from a number of largely Jacobean plays, fourteen of which were derived from Beaumont and Fletcher's works, including *A King and No King* and *Rollo*. These collections of short scenes were sold alongside printed commonplace books, many of which harvested sententious quotations from drama and poetry alike, with little division between the two, suggesting that by the Restoration, drama and poetry were viewed as equally literary, even if—or, perhaps, ideally if—the drama was reduced into shorter and more digestible forms. Moreover, the plays that were reduced into drolleries often made reappearances in the Restoration theaters, suggesting that the drolleries were instrumental in keeping the memory of these plays alive throughout the Interregnum.

While there is significant debate regarding the nature or existence of performances of these "*Rump Drolls*,"[61] as he calls them, Kirkman's publisher Henry Marsh provides an introductory assertion that the texts "do *command*, and have *Emerited* universal applause,"[62] and he describes the benefits of performing his drolleries:

> he who would make up a Treatment to his Friends by any such diversion, cannot study a more compendious method, without the help of Fidlers and mercenary Mimicks, and the long labor of a Cue: one Scene, which may almost be acted *Extempore*, will be abundantly satisfactory, being chosen fit and suitable to the Company, as none can come amiss. 'Twill make Physick work, 'twill cease the pains of more inveterate diseases, 'twill allay the heat and distemper of Wine, and generally it is the *Panacea*, the universal Cure, mighty Mirths *Elixir*.[63]

The drolleries are, then, designed for performance, and the language of healing through theater is common throughout both Interregnum and early Restoration drama, particularly from royalist publishers and playwrights. However, Marsh's introduction also suggests that any performances of these texts would have been private and among friends, rather than as serious productions at playhouses. Indeed, their reduced casts and minimalist plots make them ideal for short performances that do not require the efforts of a full company. Emma Depledge suggests that the drolleries may have been "performed at fairs, such as Southwark and Bartholomew fair; in taverns; in private homes; and as part of mountebanks' shows" while also not foreclosing the possibility that they could have seen performance in the public theaters.[64] She also uses the existence of printed arguments and dramatis personae

---

[61] Kirkman, *The Wits*, A4r. The signature markings for the Huntington Library's copy on *Early English Books Online* skip from A to C, omitting B.
[62] Kirkman, *The Wits*, A3v.
[63] Kirkman, *The Wits*, A3r.
[64] Emma Depledge, *Shakespeare's Rise to Cultural Prominence: Politics, Print, and Alteration, 1642-1700* (Cambridge: CUP, 2018), 16-7.

preceding each of Kirkman's drolleries as evidence that the drolleries were designed for performance rather than as closet drama.[65]

The surreptitious nature of dramatic performance—whether of full plays or reduced drolleries— changed the nature of the playgoing public. While Tiffany Stern's research on documentary evidence of the stage suggests that playbills—advertisements for plays tacked to posts throughout London—were a common method of drawing in audiences throughout the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods,[66] such public invitations were unfeasible under much of Commonwealth rule.[67] Instead, a common method for advertising plays seems to have been by tossing short bills into the carriages of wealthy nobles, who appear to have become the primary audience for the illicit theater.[68] Numerous raids recount the names of those in attendance, and, at least as far as these records tell us, the London audiences appear to have been largely composed of the elite. The fines imposed on theater-goers, when caught, may also have been a deterrent to the far more egalitarian mix of shopkeepers, apprentices, tradesmen, and their wives who made up the audiences of the Globe and the Red Bull.

Beyond London, however, there are records of theatrical performances in the London suburbs and throughout the country. The wealth of printed drama may also have led to private household readings of plays. All of this led to the primary audience for drama being those who could afford it, whether in the form of fines for attending performance or

---

[65] Depledge, *Shakespeare's Rise to Cultural Prominence*, 21.
[66] See chapter two of Tiffany Stern's *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: CUP, 2009).
[67] Some performances still relied upon traditional playbills, including a notorious performance of *A King and No King* at Salisbury Court in October 1674, which was raided by London's sheriffs. See Hotson, *The Commonwealth and Restoration Stage*, 26.
[68] See Hotson, *The Commonwealth and Restoration Stage*, 34.

the price of purchasing texts for private enjoyment. Thus, by the Restoration, the public theaters were likely catering to a different clientele than their pre-Interregnum predecessors, one which tended to be wealthier and, due to the theaters' official patronage, one more closely connected with the court.

While attending performances may have been beyond the reach of many citizens, steadily increasing literacy rates and public political engagement led to a wealth of popular political print, including pamphlets modeled on dramatic dialogue. Although the scholarly commonplace has been that new drama written throughout the Interregnum was both sparse and overwhelmingly royalist, Susan Wiseman's study has revealed that the drama of the period was both prolific—albeit in altered formats—and intensely political in support for either King or Parliament. While the traditional five act play designed for public performance became a somewhat niche genre, dramatic pamphlets, playlets, and closet drama flourished as a space for working through new political theories and reimaginings of government and society, often blurring the line between what modern historians would generally think of as royalist or parliamentarian allegiance.[69]

By the end of the Interregnum, performance was beginning to be legitimized once again, albeit in a slightly different form. Much scholarship has been written about William Davenant's development of English opera as a new generic form which made use of moving scenery and recitative while also drawing upon conventions from court masques, Italian opera, and pre-Interregnum English commercial theater. Davenant's operas, too,

---

[69] Susan Wiseman, *Drama and Politics in the English Civil War* (Cambridge: CUP, 1998). See especially chapters 1 and 2.

were intensely political, designed to provide the Protectorate with "moral representations" with which to provide both education and propaganda to the masses.[70] Indeed, *The Cruelty of the Spaniards in Peru* and *The History of Sir Francis Drake* were written to bolster English morale in their war against Spain. While it has often been argued that Davenant's Interregnum operas were royalist plays in disguise, their political allegiances have been questioned in recent scholarship, with Stephen Watkins suggesting that Davenant's plays should be read as nationalist, rather than adhering to any particular political faction: "the idea was to unite the political disparate spectators in the audience against a foreign enemy, thus creating a national myth that transcended the recent division of Royalists and Parliamentarians."[71] This unifying, nationalist impulse would become a defining feature of early Restoration drama, particularly in its attitudes towards and uses of pre-Interregnum dramatists.

Reopening the Theater

Ultimately, the conventions for publishing, performing, and reading plays that began in the Interregnum and persisted throughout the Restoration shaped drama's reception as a literary art important in shaping national culture and identity. As discussed above, the framing of drama as literature through paratexts and publication format was crucial in defining how drama would be read and interpreted throughout the Restoration. Those dramatists like Shakespeare, Jonson, and Fletcher who received luxury print editions

---

[70] For more on the politics of Davenant's operas, see Wiseman, *Drama and Politics in the English Civil War*, chapters 5 and 6, and Stephen Watkins, "The Protectorate Playhouse: William Davenant's Cockpit in the 1650s," *Shakespeare Bulletin* 37.1: 89-109, 2019.
[71] Watkins, "The Protectorate Playhouse," 98.

likewise remained central to the public conception of theater on the stage, in criticism, and in adaptation. Caroline dramatists who were widely published but in less prestigious forms were well-respected, but not as often performed or imitated. Many other playwrights, such as Thomas Middleton, whose works were not published as recently or were published in less prestigious formats, were less likely to be reperformed and were more susceptible to having their works "adapted"—or plagiarized—without acknowledgement.

The efforts of Interregnum publishers, illicit theater practitioners, and readers kept drama alive and shaped how it was received in the Restoration, both through ensuring textual and theatrical survival and by reframing drama as worthy of serious literary study. The Restoration's dramatists, theater practitioners, audience members, and enthusiasts produced the first substantial body of dramatic criticism in English through an examination of the theater of the past (both from England and from classical antiquity) and the present theater being written and performed on the continent. In all cases, they sought to establish an English theatrical identity that both highlighted the glory of the past and sought to demonstrate how it could be improved upon in the present through closer adherence to Neoclassical unities, simplified language, and streamlined plots.

By the Restoration, the dramatic publications of Moseley and his fellow Interregnum publishers had reshaped how drama was printed, marketed, and read. In the absence of a legally performing theater, publishers had reimagined drama as an ideally literary form, emphasized the role of the author in producing the texts, and positioned drama as a genre suited equally as well for print as for performance. With the reopening of the theaters, however, publishers had to again redefine the role of drama in print. While they inherited the traditions of their Interregnum predecessors, they also faced innovations

in both theatrical performance and perceptions of dramatic authorship that again required changes to how drama appeared in print. The media of print and performance were now seen as intertwined, rather than as wholly separate or even competing realms,[72] and printed versions of new plays often appeared shortly after their initial performances. Print was so ubiquitously tied up in matters of performance, in fact, that scholars—particularly William Van Lennep in the first volume of *The London Stage*—have taken print as an indication of revival even when no clear record of later performance survives.

The publication of pre-Interregnum drama was neither as prevalent or as varied during the Restoration as it had been during the Interregnum. Without the necessity of print for preservation, the publication of older plays became tied to two distinct threads: popularity in performance and the increasing canonization of Fletcher, Shakespeare, and Jonson. Most pre-Interregnum plays that were reprinted during the Restoration were also revived on the stage. Generally, performance and publication took place within the same timeframe. With the theaters reopened, publishers also had to develop print drama as a complementary, rather than rival, force to performance. In many cases, the two presentation methods seem to have been mutually beneficial. A stage revival was likely to trigger interest (new or renewed) in a printed copy of the text. Publications that took place

---

[72] As Paul Cannan has argued in *The Emergence of Dramatic Criticism in England: From Jonson to Pope*, part of this new emphasis on quick publication may also have been due to the close control of drama given to the two theater companies: "Because each playhouse had its own repertory and operated under the assumption that the other would not steal from this repertory, dramatists were permitted to publish their works, a freedom that in turn helped regularize and shorten the time lapse between play performance and publication" (32).

soon after or alongside performance often listed actors' names alongside their roles, further cementing the connection between print and stage.

A great number of early modern play texts reprinted during the Restoration call attention to their longstanding performance history by including both current and past company affiliations on their title pages. For example, the 1665 reprinting of John Webster's *The White Devil* reads "Acted (formerly by Her Majesties Servants) at the *Phœnix* in *Drury-lane*; And AT THIS PRESENT (by His now Majesties) at the THEATRE ROYAL." In doing so, these title pages establish a clear continuum from pre-civil war plays to those of the Restoration by calling attention to provenance through performance. Of course, in many cases, only the King's Company was able to make such claims of continuation. Having made their case as the legal inheritors of the pre-civil war companies under royal patronage, they owned the rights—in performance, if not in print—to many of the more popular older plays, particularly those of Beaumont and Fletcher. Therefore, granting these texts the further legitimacy of recent performance was solely within their purview. However, through print, the broader legacy of pre-Interregnum playhouses and repertoires could be preserved.

The legacy of these plays and their authors also promulgated through paratextual material which acknowledged the Restoration theater's debts to the theaters of the past. In addition to the longstanding practices of including addresses to patrons, dramatists (and sometimes printers) often included addresses to readers or brief essays on the play to come in addition to prologues, epilogues, and occasional advertisements. All of the included paratexts increasingly provided a space for criticism and political positioning. As Diana Solomon has argued, "Restoration audiences viewed prologues and epilogues as

consequential aspects of theatrical performance, and therefore so should we."[73] To this, I would add Restoration readers, who engaged with paratextual materials through writing their own responses[74] or through copying segments of these documents into miscellanies and commonplace books.[75] While plays themselves, in both print and performance, might continue to develop the critical or political frameworks for drama as a form of literature, paratexts were often more explicit and more deliberate in terms of the author's self-positioning.

One of the most well-known and frequently cited of these paratexts, Dryden's *An Essay of Dramatick Poesie*, demonstrates this vogue for authorial intervention in the reading of their work. Moreover, Dryden's prefatory essay frames both *Troilus and Cressida*, the play to which it is attached, and his work as a whole as drawing from a carefully outlined English lineage. Dryden's Eugenius, his stand-in for Charles, Lord Buckhurst, claims that "though I never judg'd the Plays of the Greek or Roman Poets comparable to ours; yet on the other side those we now see acted, come short of many of which were written in the last Age: but my comfort is if we are orecome, it will be onely by our own Countrey-men."[76] Thus, he summarized the general opinion of English dramatists and theater critics: while there were lessons to be learned from both ancient and foreign drama, the best models were their own

---

[73] Diana Solomon, *Prologues and Epilogues of Restoration Theater: Gender and Comedy, Performance and Print* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2013), 3.
[74] These debates can be seen in the essays and paratextual debates between Thomas Rhymer and John Dryden, and Thomas Shadwell and John Dryden.
[75] Although primarily focused on extracts from Renaissance playtexts, Estill's *Dramatic Extracts in Seventeenth-Century Manuscripts* is an invaluable resource for studying the practices of commonplacing in early modern England.
[76] John Dryden, *Of Dramatick Poesie, An Essay* (London: Printed for Henry Herringman, 1668), 7.

English predecessors. The most valuable among these were the so-called "Triumvirate of Wit," those dramatists whose collected works had been published in folio, and whose plays made up the bulk of early Restoration productions: Jonson, Fletcher, and Shakespeare.

The idea of the Triumvirate of Wit was first established in print in the Beaumont and Fletcher folio. John Denham's dedicatory poem "On Mr. *JOHN FLETCHER'S* Workes," provided a lasting definition of the poets of the former age: "Then was wits Empire at the fatall height, / When laboring and sinking with its weight, / From thence a thousand lesser Poets sprong / Like petty Princes from the fall of Rome. / When *JOHNSON*, *SHAKESPEARE*, and thy selfe did sit, / And sway'd in the Triumvirate of wit—"[77] While members of the Triumvirate show up individually throughout the early prologues and epilogues of the Restoration, the first Restoration dramatist to treat them as a group in this kind of paratextual material is Margaret Cavendish. In the "General Prologue" to her 1662 *Plays*, Cavendish compares her dramatic works to those of the Triumvirate:

> As for *Ben. Johnsons* brain, it was so strong,
> He could conceive, or judge, what's right, what's wrong:
> His Language plain, significant and free,
> And in the English Tongue, the Masterie:
> Yet Gentle *Shakespear* had a fluent Wit,
> Although less Learning, yet full well he writ;
> For all his Plays were writ by Natures light,
> Which gives his Readers, and Spectators sight.
> But Noble Readers, do not think my Playes,
> Are such as have been writ in former daies;
> As *Johnson*, *Shakespear*, *Beaumont*, *Fletcher* writ;
> Mine want their Learning, Reading, Language, Wit…
> But I upon my own Foundation writ[78]

---

[77] Beaumont and Fletcher, *Comedies and Tragedies* (1642), b1v.
[78] Reprinted in Danchin, *The Prologues and Epilogues of the Restoration 1660-1700*.

Cavendish here models Restoration usage of the Triumvirate. She praises their various skills, establishes each author as having a particular strength, discusses her own shortcomings in relation to them, and then asserts her own superiority through her creativity. Though Cavendish is never acknowledged as a model for this discourse, likely because her plays were unperformed during her life and she existed somewhat outside of the social sphere occupied by many of the commercial dramatists, her work is clearly illustrative of the presence of the Triumvirate in the Restoration dramatic imagination. Moreover, through her husband's theatrical connections, particularly with Dryden, Cavendish was certainly well aware of the theatrical tastes and trends of her day.

The dramatists of the Restoration, then, sought precedents, but not unquestionable idols. Paulina Kewes argues that "the cultural valorization of Shakespeare (and also of Jonson and Fletcher) during the later seventeenth century has been overstated. The evaluation of both Renaissance and contemporary playwrights in the play catalogues show that though the 'triumvirate of wit'. . . was revered, and indeed was sometimes invoked to castigate modern writers, its members were by no means regarded as a standard beyond the reach of the present day."[79] While it was necessary for Dryden, Tate, Crowne, and other Restoration playwrights to look back to pre-Civil War dramatists for examples, they could not place themselves as lesser poets in the light of an ancient greatness. Instead, it was only by framing Shakespeare, Jonson, Fletcher, and others as brilliant but flawed that Restoration playwrights were able to present themselves as the refined continuation of an English

---

[79] Paulina Kewes, *Authorship and Appropriation: Writing for the Stage in England, 1660-1710* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 10.

dramatic literary history. In a dedicatory poem to Dryden's *The Conquest of Granada*, for example, John Vaughn invoked the triumvirate as both praise and caution: "There will be praise enough; yet not so much/As if the world had never any such:/Ben Jonson, Beaumont, Fletcher, Shakespeare, are,/As well as you, to have a poet's share./You who write after, have, besides, this curse,/You must write better, or you else write worse."[80] In some senses, then, the omnipresence of the Triumvirate in dramatic criticism became a challenge for future generations rather than a stable model.

Through the use of the Jonson, Shakespeare, and Fletcher folios as well as reference to other major Jacobean and Caroline dramatists, the budding critics and theater practitioners of the Restoration shaped the beginnings of an early modern dramatic canon, creating a clear line of descent from the playwrights of the past to those of the present. Much of this canonization and criticism took place in paratexts—generally either dedications, letters to the reader, prologues or epilogues—to new plays, though some freestanding commentary also found its way into print, and reprints of old plays occasionally included new paratexts that reframed them for their Restoration audiences. These paratextual spaces quickly became a valuable arena for new playwrights to position themselves in terms of both a literary tradition and a rapidly evolving political landscape. In the first years of the Restoration, however, this influence was not always or often clearly articulated, and pre-Interregnum drama shared the stage with plays that were generally more interested in current events than in developing drama as a consciously literary field. The

---

[80] [Henry?] Vaughn, "On Mr. Dryden's Play, *The Conquest of Granada*" in John Dryden, *The Conquest of Granada* (London, Printed by T.N. for Henry Herringman, 1672), b3r.

bulk of the new plays, particularly in the first years, were quickly written and highly topical panegyrics, such as John Tatham's *The Rump* or the anonymous *Cromwell's Conspiracy*, celebrating the Restoration or the fall of Cromwell's regime.

During the Interregnum, few English dramatists were still actively producing new drama, and those that were often wrote plays designed for readers rather than for the stage. Many of Thomas Killigrew's plays, for examples, were composed during his "Twenty Years Banishment,"[81] and the title pages of the plays as printed in his 1664 *Works* list the places in which they were composed: Naples, Switzerland, Paris, Lombardy, Madrid, Venice, and Rome. While the plays were not unperformable—indeed, they *were* performed, though infrequently, and one must wonder how much Killigrew's ownership of the theater influenced this decision—their long speeches and relatively detailed stage directions suggest that they were designed primarily for reading audiences. Indeed, when preparing works from the 1664 folio of his plays, Thomas Killigrew often cut hundreds of lines from each play in order to make them suitable for performance on the Restoration stage.[82] Likewise, Margaret Cavendish wrote plays in exile that, similarly, seem better suited for readers than performers.[83] In the early years of the Restoration, however, it seemed that these plays written during the Interregnum held little of the joyful spirit of the present or its longing for

---

[81] Thomas Killigrew, *Comedies and Tragedies*, London: Printed for Henry Herringman, 1664.
[82] See William Van Lennep's "Thomas Killigrew Prepares His Plays for Production" in *Joseph Quincy Adams Memorial Studies* (Washington, D. C.: Folger Shakespeare Library, 1948), 803-808.
[83] Though there is no contemporary record of Cavendish's plays being performed during the Restoration, recent efforts such as a 2005 performance of *The Convent of Pleasure* at McMaster University have certainly proven that the plays are not unperformable, though they are markedly different in style and structure than most of their contemporaries. See John. D. Shanahan's review in *Shakespeare Bulletin* 24.2 (2006), p. 54-59.

the theatrical arts of the past, and thus they were frequently overlooked in favor of plays that had largely originated during the Jacobean period. These old plays had the benefit of both distance and nostalgia, not only for the theater as it had been, but for the monarchical system that had supported it. With both the theaters and the monarchy struggling to reestablish themselves, such links to the past were invaluable.

As less immediately reactionary new plays (or reworkings of old plays) began to surface, however, Restoration drama became a field in which individual authors asserted both literary and political allegiance. By the Restoration, the majority of plays were published with authors' names printed on the title page, often in large enough font to suggest it as a selling point, and collaborations clearly and deliberately acknowledged all involved parties, as seen in Dryden's collaborations with Newcastle, Davenant, and Lee. Paul Cannan traces this new emphasis on authorial control of both text and criticism first to Jonson, always a popular model for the theorization of drama, but observes that the form was popularized by Dryden who "by raising controversial critical questions…inspired participation in, and enlarged the audience for, published criticism."[84] In the plays for which he claims sole authorship, Dryden often emphasizes questions of authorial control over both text and interpretation. Likewise, Dryden's collaborative plays also feature paratextual materials which explore ideas of critical responsibility. Regardless, dramatists throughout the Restoration followed Dryden's lead and increasingly sought to direct the reception of

[84] Paul D. Cannan, *The Emergence of Dramatic Criticism in England: From Jonson to Pope* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 45.

their work as well as their place in a specific literary heritage through the writing of paratextual and supplementary materials.

At the outset of the Restoration, dramatists had had two clear possible models for their dramatic tradition: their English predecessors, some of whom were still living, and the French models they had been exposed to through Charles's exile there. While these French models did influence a great deal of early Restoration dramatic theory—particularly in its insistence on the classical unities of time, place, and action—I argue that English dramatists quickly sought to demonstrate their reliance on their own country's models in order to reestablish a sense of deliberately English literary identity. In this way, the dramatists mirrored what was happening in the court, in which Charles and his nobles asserted their Englishness through emphasizing their connections to the English royal past rather than to the lessons about monarchy they learned abroad.

In practice, this meant that dramatists made use of both contemporary French and pre-Civil War English dramatic models. However, they often asserted a hierarchy of sources which offered primacy to English texts and critiqued French ones. Cannan asserts that "Dryden was the first writer to pull together the various threads of Ancient, Continental, and English criticism and intertwine them in a concerted critical project."[85] However, as Cannan and others have noted, what Dryden is doing is not unique, just somewhat unusual in *English* criticism and follows patters established far earlier by Continental critics.[86] In this sense, Dryden's criticism is doing what a great deal of Restoration dramatists were doing on

---

[85] Cannan, 2.
[86] Cannan, 2.

stage: importing and "Englishing" French fashions, whether through an appropriation of French dramatic theory or through the adaptation of work from Moliere or Corneille. In the *Essay of Dramatick Poesie*, Dryden's characters assert that while they are "at all times ready to defend the honour of [their] Countrey against the French,"[87] their unfortunate reliance on French dramatic fashions can be blamed upon the Interregnum: "we have been so long together bad Englishmen, that we had not leisure to be good Poets; *Beaumont*, *Fletcher*, and *Johnson* (who were onely capable of bringing us to that degree of perfection which we have) were just then leaving the world, as if in an Age of so much horror, wit and those milder studies of humanity, had no farther business among us."[88] Thus, English playwrights had only two reliable, recent models—pre-Civil War English drama and French drama from their contemporaries—and of these, the English models were far preferable.

These preferences are confirmed by the prologues and epilogues of the early Restoration, many of which mock audiences for preferring French dramatic fashions to their own English ancestors. Some dramatists attempted to marry the two, as Dryden did in *Secret Love; or, The Maiden Queen*: "He who writ this, not without pains and thought / From *French* and *English* Theaters has brought / Th' exactest Rules by which a Play is wrought. / The Unities of Action, Place, and Time; / The Scenes unbroken; and a mingled chime / Of *Johnsons* humour, with *Corneilles* rhyme."[89] This play, which premiered in late February 1667, seems to have been the impetus behind the prologue to John Caryll's *The English Princess*,

---

[87] Dryden, *Of Dramatick Poesie*, 26.
[88] Dryden, *Of Dramatick Poesie*, 27.
[89] Pierre Danchin, ed., *The Prologues and Epilogues of the Restoration 1660-1700*, vol. 1, 6 vols. (Nancy: Publications de l'Université de Nancy, 1981), 226.

which was first performed mere weeks later. Caryll's prologue is worth quoting at length to demonstrate the dramatic rebuttal to Dryden's efforts as well as an increasing sense of national identity being established through drama:

> You must to day your Appetite prepare
> For a plain English Treat of homely Fare:
> We neither *Bisque* nor *Olliàs* shall advance
> From Spanish Novel, or from French Romance;
> Nor shall we charm your Ears, or feast your Eyes
> With Turkey-Works, or Indian Rarityes:
> But to plain *Hollinshead* and down right *Stow*
> We the coarse Web of our Contrivance owe.
> Since Laces, Ribbands, and such Modish geer
> Fetcht from abroad are now forbidden here,
> Amongst those Forreign Toys (for ought we know)
> Fine Plots for Plays may be included too.
> *Greece*, the first Mistress of the Tragick Muse,
> To grace her Stage, did her own Heroes chuse;
> Their Pens adorn's their Native Swords; and thus
> What was not *Grecian* past for Barbarous.
> On us our Country the same duty lays,
> And English Wit should English Valour raise.
> Why should our Land to any Land submit
> In choice of Heroes, or in height of Wit?
> This made him write, who never writ till now,
> Only to shew what better Pens should do.
> And for his Pains he hopes he shall be thought
> (Though a bad Poet,) a good Patriot.[90]

Caryll's prologue is mirrored by an epilogue that is heavily critical of the Interregnum regime and positions drama as in need of the temperament of former English poets like Ben Jonson. Over the course of the first decade of the Restoration, prologues and epilogues increasingly focused on their "Englishness," discussing English poets and dramatists as precedents and deriding enthusiasm for French models.

---

[90] Danchin, 231-32.

Through this focus on an English literary dramatic identity, playwrights helped reshape the theater in the same way that Charles and his court reconstructed the monarchy: as systems defined by their connections to their English pasts. However, as the new regime stabilized and then began to face its own problems, dramatic paratexts likewise became a new space for political discourse. This is not to say, of course, that the plays themselves were apolitical. Indeed, much of the drama written during Charles II's reign reflected the cultural concerns of the day, whether they be the newly restored monarchy, war with the Dutch, or rumors of Catholic schemes. The purpose of this volume is to explore these connections between drama and politics, and how both sought self-definition through models from their English past. Thus, I examine how dramatists and theaters of the Restoration adapted and reperformed the works of their literary ancestors, and how these new productions reflected and commented on the Restoration's continual renegotiation of national identity.

CHAPTER III

RESTORING THE MONARCHY, RESTORING THE STAGE (1659-1666)[91]

Recounting the lavishness of Charles II's entrance to England, John Evelyn concludes that "such a Restauration was never seene in the mention of any history, antient or modern, since the returne of the *Babylonian* Captivity, nor so joyfull a day, & so bright, ever seene in this nation: this hapning when to expect or effect it, was past all humane policy"[92] Pepys's account of Charles's arrival in Dover four days earlier likewise focuses on the jubilance of the Restoration, where "the Shouting and joy expressed by all is past imagination."[93] While such expressions of overwhelming enthusiasm were by no means unanimous throughout England, they dominated political and literary discourse. The republican experiment was, for the most part, over. However, England was still a nation deeply divided by religious, political, and economic issues, and participation in political life continued to become available to broader sections of the population through news pamphlets, coffee shop culture, and increased petitioning movements. Thus, Charles II and the restored monarchy had to navigate a tense political climate without alienating possible sources of support. One of those sources was the theater, which, throughout the first years of the Restoration, produced plays that reinforced Cavalier cultural values, mocked Puritans and Parliamentarians, and repeatedly staged moments of miraculous recovery. At the same

---

[91] Keywords: Act of Indemnity and Oblivion, Cavalier Parliament, William Davenant, *Hamlet*, *The Law Against Lovers*, *Macbeth*, patent theatres, Restoration, *The Rivals*,
[92] John Evelyn, *The Diary of John Evelyn, volume 3: Kalendarium, 1650-1672*, ed. E. S. de Beer (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), 246.
[93] Samuel Pepys, *The Diary of Samuel Pepys, volume 1: 1660*, ed. Robert Latham and William Matthews (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970), 158.

time, the theatres repeatedly staged new material that emphasized themes of unity between groups with disparate political or cultural foundations. In doing so, the theatres sought to model the kind of reconciliation and compromise necessary to stabilize the Restoration political scene.

Political divisions between parliamentarians and cavaliers were exacerbated by the return of the monarchy, with many royalists feeling that they were owed compensation for their loyalty and the return of lost lands and finances. They also claimed something of a moral victory and "saw themselves as a breed apart, distinguished by their courageous defense of a virtuous, though unfortunate cause, and by their resolute renunciation of private advantage for honor and public service."[94] By contrast, many former parliamentarians were anxious to see the monarchy restored in a fashion that did not negate parliament's authority or reverse the greater religious freedoms established under Cromwell. The latter of these problems was the most enduring conflict of the Restoration. Religious dissent was still rampant in England, with ongoing conflicts between Anglicans, Presbyterians, and the various Puritan sects, to say nothing of the continued anti-Catholic sentiment that had persisted since Elizabeth's reign.

In order to create any hope of successful government, then, Charles II and his parliament had to balance these opposing political and religious factions, while also mitigating the economic turmoil of high taxation that had led to riots in late 1659 and early 1660. Initially, Charles approached this through the Declaration of Breda, which, as Barry

---

[94] Paul Seaward, *The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1661-1667* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 52-3.

Coward and Peter Grant have argued, "contained something for every political faction in England" through its assertion of parliament's authority, suggestions that lost royalist property would be returned, hints at religious liberty, and promises of pardons for actions committed during the commonwealth for all except the regicides.[95] Through such promises, Charles was able to reassure the vast majority of his soon-to-be subjects, even if many of these promises ultimately failed to manifest.

Charles's new government reflected Britain's divided nature: his new privy council included both long-term royalists and former members of Cromwell's government. The House of Commons was similarly split, with slightly more than half of its members having some royalist allegiance. By contrast, the house of lords was almost entirely royalist in its makeup.[96] This royalist majority ultimately equated to a royalist dominance in religious, though not in economic, policy. The early Restoration government's religious policies were regressive, particularly after the relative religious toleration of the 1650s, and reinstated Anglicanism as a central pillar of government through the Corporation Act (1661) and the Act of Uniformity (1662). Both acts served to limit positions in government, education, and the clergy only to those who abided by Anglican practices, thus removing the influence of Presbyterians and the various dissenting factions from political life. Further reductions of religious liberty were enacted throughout the first decade of the Restoration, establishing a firmly Anglican (and, in many cases, royalist) core governmental structure.

---

[95] Barry Coward and Peter Grant, *The Stuart Age: England, 1603-1714* (London and New York: Routledge, 2017), 326.
[96] Seaward, *The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime*, 36-7.

In general, though, royalists fared far more poorly under Charles's initial reign than they felt they should have. Few had their lost lands and property restored, and their political supremacy was not guaranteed. Punishments against former Parliamentarians were largely negated by the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion, which led to grotesque excess in the "grisly exhumation of the bones of Cromwell, Pym, Blake, and others, even those of Cromwell's mother."[97] This sort of performative violence would later see echoes both on the stage and in pope-burning processions. Throughout the Restoration, public condemnation of opposing political or religious models frequently involved public spectacles of violence.

In less violent terms, Charles's early policies led to a lessening of royalist support. Seaward has noted that

> the royalism of the 1650s had been a philosophy of virtue in adversity, of distance from the corruption and stained principles of political life. Instead of converting royalism into a set of values and ideas which would firmly uphold the government after the Restoration, the court's actions helped to confirm its preference for the 'country', and its contempt for the court, its longing for the clarity of rural fresh air against the smog of city politics. Royalism soon became more of a vehicle for conservatism than for autocracy.[98]

Royalists, then, felt ultimately betrayed by, and often vindictive toward, both the crown and the "country" factions, including former parliamentarians, political moderates, and religious dissenters. Occasionally, this vindictiveness found life on the stage, usually through plays that criticized the royalists' opponents or valorized the cavalier ethos.

Charles's general approach was one of conciliation as he attempted to create balance between these myriad factions, not only in legal terms, but also through a kind of

---

[97] Coward and Grant, *The Stuart Age*, 328.
[98] Seaward, *The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime*, 55.

performative justice and mercy, which was echoed in the theaters. The Act of Indemnity and Oblivion begins by expressing "a hearty and pious Desire to put an end to all Suites and Controversies that by occasion of the late Distractions have arisen and may arise between all [Charles's] Subjects."[99] The need to return to a moment of peace is emphasized throughout the document, which is consistently grounded in producing continuity between Charles II's reign and that of his father, if not attempting to revert to a time before the Civil Wars. The Act's promise of a general pardon for all crimes committed against the monarchy between 1 January 1637/8 and 24 June 1660 legally reset the clock for all but those specifically exempted by parliament: the regicides. The Act has been read as both an attempt to begin Charles's reign on a note of peace and mercy or as a negation of all that had happened during the last eighteen years, and these two readings were not and are not mutually exclusive. While the Act evoked a sense of all-encompassing mercy, "the most striking aspect of the law consisted not in its ability to generate a theatrical display but rather in its refusal to stage justice, a refusal that was general in nature and insisted that the deeds of the revolutionaries should be obliterated even from the theater of memory."[100] Even as the Act attempted to restore balance between the opposing forces through negation, rather than a performance of justice, the theaters repeatedly re-performed the kind of enforced balance and mercy that the Act, in effect, created. Not only did the theaters undergo a similar period of reorganization—which did not appease everyone—they, too,

---

[99] "Charles II, 1660: An Act of Free and Generall Pardon Indempnity and Oblivion.," in *Statutes of the Realm: Volume 5, 1628-80*, ed. John Raithby (s.l: Great Britain Record Commission, 1819), 226-234. *British History Online*, accessed July 13, 2020, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/statutes-realm/vol5/pp226-234.

[100] Bernadette Meyler, *Theaters of Pardoning* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2019), 201.

generally sought to reinforce government policies of neutrality and balance through performances of justice and mercy. That the theaters chose to stage such scenes even when many saw the monarch's actions as unsatisfactory demonstrates the early theatres' strongly royalist inclinations.

Ultimately, however, the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion seems to have caused greater division between factions, who, despite the injunction to forget the last eighteen years, found that, in practice, little was actually reversed. The restored government's "stability might only be preserved and nurtured by assuring the former opponents of the monarchy that their lives and their property were safe in the protection of the law. But for royalists, the firmness of the government's commitment to the Act of Indemnity seemed less statesmanlike than foolish, a little suspicious, and above all insulting"[101] The London commercial stage's attempts at emphasizing the need for mercy and unity, then, were as much political acts as they were echoes of governmental policy.

Restoring the Theaters, Building Repertoires

At the dawn of the Restoration, the theatrical scene had yet to be divided into the two patent companies under Killigrew and Davenant. John Rhodes at the Cockpit, Charles Hart and Michael Mohun at the Red Bull,[102] William Beeston at Salisbury Court, and George Jolly's itinerant troupe produced an array of plays at various points from late 1659

---

[101] Seaward, *The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime*, 196.
[102] Little is known about the hierarchy of the Red Bull company. Here, I follow Gunnar Sorelius's (1966) use of Mohun's name, not because he was clearly in charge of the venue, but because he was one of the more recognizable figures to come from this company, along with Charles Hart, whom I have added.

to the end of 1660. In 1660, they were joined by a united company under Thomas Killigrew and William Davenant, which quickly split into Killigrew's King's Company and Davenant's Duke's Company (circa November 1660). The various companies shared the three extant theaters until the construction of Davenant's Lincoln's Inn Fields in 1661, which became the first permanent home of the Duke's Company. All theatrical endeavors relied on a stock of pre-Interregnum plays from eighteen different dramatists, though primarily from John Fletcher (19 plays, including 5 collaborations with Francis Beaumont and 2 collaborations with Philip Massinger), Shakespeare (5 plays), and James Shirley (4 plays). Appendix 1 demonstrates both how narrow the theatrical repertories were during the first two "seasons" of the Restoration (1659-1660 and 1660-1661),[103] as well as how frequently multiple companies performed the same, presumably popular, plays. Twenty-three plays were performed during these two seasons by more than one company, with Rhodes and Davenant or Hart/Mohun and Killigrew usually, but not always, sharing plays. Of these, six were performed in these two seasons by three companies: Philip Massinger's *The Bondman*, John Fletcher and William Rowley's *The Maid in the Mill*, William Shakespeare's *Othello*, Fletcher's *The Tamer Tamed* and *Wit Without Money*, and Davenant's *The Unfortunate Lovers*.

This small set of frequently performed plays tells us a great deal about what playtexts were viewed as profitable performances in the initial years of the Restoration. Three are comedies, one a tragicomedy, and, somewhat surprisingly given theatrical trends

---

[103] As Van Lennep notes in *The London Stage*, neither of these theatrical seasons is as structured as those that would develop later in the Restoration, but the term is useful for demarcating the initial attempts at reviving more or less legal public theater just before and into the first months of the Restoration.

throughout the 1660s, two are tragedies. The three comedies, all part of Fletcher's oeuvre, are similar in tone and demonstrate many of the components that would become hallmarks of Restoration comedy: a cast largely comprised of nobles and gentry; rather bawdy marriage and romance plots, often centered around inheritance; and combats of wits between the sexes. All three plays were revived on a semi-regular basis throughout Charles II's reign.

The two tragedies, *Othello* and *The Unfortunate Lovers*, likewise saw enduring popularity from 1660 to 1685. While tragedy as a genre was generally not particularly popular throughout the first decade of the Restoration, these two plays demonstrate the qualities that could make tragedy palatable to a country that was still uneasy with the themes of regicide and tyranny that were frequently central to pre-Interregnum tragedy. While *The Unfortunate Lovers* does feature noble characters, the majority of the action, as in *Othello*, is focused on military officials and their romantic entanglements. Of all Shakespeare's plays, *Othello* would have likely been the most familiar to potential audiences. It was one of only three of Shakespeare's plays reprinted during the Interregnum, alongside *The Merchant of Venice* and *King Lear*.[104] It was also one of few Shakespeare plays still in repertory at the beginning of the Civil Wars.[105] It was the only play to hold both such distinctions. It was also one of only three of Shakespeare's plays printed in single-play quarto during the

---

[104] For more on Shakespeare's Interregnum publications, see Emma Depledge, "Shakespeare for Sale, 1640-1740," in *Canonising Shakespeare: Stationers and the Book Trade 1640-1740*, ed. Emma Depledge and Peter Kirwan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 17–25.
[105] Michael Dobson, *The Making of the National Poet: Shakespeare, Adaptation, and Authorship, 1660-1769* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992).

Restoration (along with *Hamlet* and *Macbeth*). *Othello* became one of the earliest touchstones of dramatic literary criticism, first in Thomas Rymer's *A Short View of Tragedy*, which rejected the play's changes to its Italian source text and generally finds both the play's morals and characters "improbable and absurd."[106] While many scholars have noted contemporary critical rejection of Rymer's reading of *Othello*, Paul D. Cannan has observed that Rymer's criticism seems "to have become part of Shakespeare's critical conception in the eighteenth century" and was frequently addressed by Shakespeare's editors.[107]

Davenant's *The Unfortunate Lovers* is something of an outlier in this group of frequently performed plays. Not only is it the only Caroline play, it is also the only production by a living playwright, and Davenant's continued engagement in the Restoration theater may have influenced the frequency with which this play was produced. Although the play does depict, in its final scene, a regicide, King Heildebrand is proven throughout the play to be a lecherous tyrant, and his killer, Altophil, one of the titular unfortunate lovers, does not survive his crime for more than a few lines, and a virtuous prince, Ascoli, is standing by to take up the throne. Because their central concerns are with the plight of thwarted lovers, rather than with the fall of nations, both tragedies are well suited to the atmosphere of the early Restoration.

In contrast to the lasting popularity of most of these early successes, Massinger's *The Bondman* appears to only have been performed between 1660 and 1664. Of the six plays

---

[106] Thomas Rhymer, *A Short View of Tragedy* in *The Critical Works of Thomas Rymer*, ed, Curt A. Zimansky (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1956), 134.
[107] Paul D. Cannan, *The Emergence of Dramatic Criticism in England: From Jonson to Pope* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 77.

examined here, it is by far the most political, and its presentation of "an alternative form of politics itself correlated with a tragicomic vision" mimics political concerns regarding justice and mercy that dominated the early Restoration.[108] As Bernadette Meyler has argued, the play demonstrates the nuances between different forms of pardoning and mercy, observing that "pardoning will only occur for the good of the commonwealth rather than out of an effort to remit a particular person's punishment. The Stoic tragicomedy of *The Bondman*, putting clemency into service of the play, emphasizes the general good of the state over the life of the condemned individual"[109] Furthermore, this focus on clemency as a foundation of good statesmanship allowed the play to reach both royalist and parliamentarian audiences, as can be seen in its extensive theatrical history throughout the Caroline, Interregnum, and Restoration theaters. Maintenance of the state becomes a general requirement of civic duty, and "this general welfare of the state becomes disconnected from any particular form of rule."[110] This sort of non-partisan civic responsibility was a key goal of the moral education project of early Restoration theater, but as the restored government became increasingly authoritarian throughout the 1670s, so, too, did plays such as *The Bondman* decline in popularity.

From these examples, it is clear that the early Restoration stage was, as the covert theaters of the Interregnum had been, dominated by pre-Interregnum plays.[111] Of the

---

[108] Bernadette Meyler, *Theaters of Pardoning* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2019), 144.
[109] Meyler, *Theaters of Pardoning*, 144-45.
[110] Meyler, *Theaters of Pardoning*, 145.
[111] As Susan Wiseman demonstrates in *Drama and Politics in the English Civil War*, the dramatic output of the Civil War years and the Interregnum was varied and experimental, ranging from dialogic political pamphlets to the ten-act plays of Thomas Killigrew and Margaret Cavendish to the operatic entertainments of William Davenant. In reverting back to the

roughly 450 discrete plays performed between 1660-1685,[112] nearly a third of them were first performed before the Interregnum. The reasons for the theaters' initial reliance on earlier drama can largely be separated into two camps: an immediate need for play texts at the reopening of the theaters, and a nostalgia for the popular plays of the past. Despite the initial dominance of pre-Interregnum comedies, tragicomedy quickly became the ruling genre of the early Restoration. Stories of lost princes and restored monarchies, of happy endings manifesting from the most unlikely avenues, were popular for their ability to parallel the narrative of the Restoration itself. This generic preference also shaped the kinds of pre-Interregnum drama that succeeded—and the kinds that were largely ignored. Beaumont and Fletcher's plays, for example, were frequently revived, as their themes were, generally, already more or less in line with what Restoration audiences wanted to see. By contrast, Shakespeare's plays offered few models for the kinds of plays most enjoyed by Restoration audiences. His comedies were generally not bawdy enough in comparison with his contemporaries,[113] and his language was generally seen as too archaic to be performed without significant adjustment. His tragedies, however, focused as they generally are on the falls of kings and civil strife, were prime material for adaptations throughout the later years

---

formulaic five-act plays popularized during the Elizabethan, Jacobean, and Caroline eras, dramatists and theaters alike sought to reconnect dramatic traditions to a monarchical past rather than openly build upon the innovations of the Interregnum. Of course, the nearly two decades of theatrical experimentation still had more impact on the Restoration theater than is often discussed, either within the period itself or by modern scholarship.

[112] This number is derived from the plays listed in Vol. 1 of *The London Stage*.

[113] John Harold Wilson extends this line of argumentation to assert that "very few, if any, elements in Restoration comedy can be definitely shown to be inheritances from Shakespeare." *The Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Restoration Drama*, 41.

of the Restoration, as they could be easily adjusted to address contemporary politics while still offering playwrights some level of distance from any negative political connotations.

Throughout the early Restoration, the popular dramatists of the pre-Civil War theaters developed new legacies on the Restoration stage and as reference points in criticism. They remained popular with both audiences and readers. In some cases, the legacy of a play could evolve on either track: the plays that were most successful in performance were not always those that drew the attention of early literary critics.[114] However, print, criticism, and performance often overlapped more than they diverged. Drama, as it existed at the moment of the Restoration, was, as we have seen, not entirely divorced from performance, but was also deeply bound up in both literary and popular political print. Just as print in folio offered a particular legitimacy and prestige that was, in turn, echoed in criticism, so, too, does it seem to have led to performance. Thus, the plays of John Fletcher, Ben Jonson, and William Shakespeare were popular choices on the Restoration stage, almost certainly in part due to the perception of prestige lent by their folios. Even John Suckling's *Aglaura*, which was initially printed in a lavish single-play folio in 1638, enjoyed a few performances in the early years of the Restoration, apparently with some success. Pepys

---

[114] For example, while Dryden mentions the virtues of both Jonson's *Catiline* and *Sejanus*, only the former has any extant performance record for the Restoration (though Downes notes that Sejanus was one of the King's Company's old stock plays), and *Catiline*'s success seems to have had more to do with political scandal than with any particular love for the play. The reverse is also true: Thomas Rymer found *Othello* (Shakespeare's only tragedy to find success without alteration in the Restoration) only good "to delude our senses, disorder our thoughts, addle our brain, and fill our head with vanity, confusion" (*The Critical Works of Thomas Rymer*, 164).

remarked that it "hath been always mightily cried up," though he ultimately found it "hardly good in any degree."[115]

Pepys was likewise skeptical about Shakespeare, however. While he enjoyed a production of *Othello* in 1660, he generally found Shakespeare's comedies, including *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *Twelfth Night*, to be "insipid,"[116] and "silly,"[117] declaring that *Twelfth Night* was "one of the weakest plays that ever [he] saw on the stage."[118] Yet in the adaptations of *Macbeth* and *The Tempest*, Pepys found Shakespeare's plays "most excellent for variety,"[119] "mighty pretty,"[120] and "full of variety."[121] Regardless of whether they were Shakespeare's "originals" or adaptations, Shakespeare's tragedies generally fared better, and most of his comedies received few performances.[122] While his comedy, unlike that of Fletcher and Jonson, might have seemed out of sync with Restoration standards, his tragedies were esteemed enough that they both drew crowds and could not be merely plagiarized. At the same time, they were also outdated enough in terms of language and a lack of adherence to dramatic unities that they were in need of modernization to succeed on

---

[115] Pepys, 9: 18 (10 January 1668).
[116] Pepys 3: 208 (29 September 1662), regarding a performance of *Midsummer Night's Dream* at the King's Theater.
[117] Pepys 4: 6 (6 January 1663), regarding a performance of *Twelfth Night* at the Duke's Theater.
[118] Pepys 9: 421 (20 January 1669), regarding a different performance of *Twelfth Night* at the Duke's Theater.
[119] Pepys 7: 423 (28 December 1666), regarding a performance of Davenant's *Macbeth*.
[120] Pepys 8: 521 (7 November 1667), regarding a performance of Dryden and Davenant's *Tempest*.
[121]Pepys 9: 48 (3 February 1668), also regarding *Tempest*.
[122] *The Merry Wives of Windsor* seems to have been the main exception, and occasional productions of *Twelfth Night* occurred throughout Charles II's reign. In adaptation, *The Tempest* was one of the most frequently performed plays of the entire period.

the Restoration stage. Thus, Shakespeare's plays were useful reference points and proving grounds for adaptors seeking English source texts, making Shakespeare the perfect paratextual citation: English, talented by the terms of his own day, yet easy to surpass in terms of language, adherence to the classical unities, roles for women, and moments of heightened pathos. It is little wonder, then, that his works became the first subjects for adaptation.

William Davenant's Early Adaptations

William Davenant's role in the evolution of English theater history has been often debated by scholars, not least because of his apparent mercenary political tendencies. His involvement in theater under Charles I, Cromwell, and Charles II has led many scholars to accuse him of intellectual and artistic pandering to whomever held power at the moment, "chang[ing] his political stance to put the best possible gloss on events,"[123] or, during the Protectorate, covertly working within the state to undermine it with covert royalist propaganda. However, I read Davenant's shifting political allegiances as serving a consistent set of moral ideals which sought to unite the English people, particularly against foreign nations, and educate them on public and civic morals—including obedience to the state, regardless of its current configuration—through theater. In a letter to Secretary Thurloe, Davenant explains that the English people "require continuall divertisements, being

[123] Stephen Watkins, "The Protectorate Playhouse: William Davenant's Cockpit in the 1650s," *Shakespeare Bulletin* 37.1, 2019, 89-109, p. 104

otherwise naturally inclin'd to that melancholy that breeds sedition."[124] The most fitting response to avoid such a melancholy, then, is to provide "morall representations" to "those who will too much apprehend the absence of the adverse party…[and] a new generation of youth uningag'd in the late differences."[125] Thus, a new, more moral drama, not unlike that found in the Caroline masquing traditions, could serve to both divert potential political discontent but could also educate London's youth in the values of the Protectorate. Likewise, Davenant's proposed initial subject matter, "the Spaniards' barbarous conquests in the West Indies and…their several cruelties there exercis'd upon the subjects of this nation,"[126] would serve to rally English support against Spain, with whom they were at war from 1654 until 1660. During the Restoration, these same impulses toward moral education and national unity evolved through Davenant's adaptations of Shakespeare, which generally attempt to create a sense of balance and unity between disparate parts while also making use of a distinctly English theatrical past.

In many ways, Davenant's work serves to unite the pre-Interregnum and Restoration theaters, both through his use and memories of Shakespeare (to say nothing of his supposed familial relationship with the Bard) and through his continuation of his own pre-Interregnum theatrical career. Scholars such as Lucyle Hook, John Harold Wilson, and Mongi Raddadi have noted that Davenant's Restoration plays, including his adaptations of Shakespeare, rely heavily on the motifs of love and honor that he had helped popularize in

---

[124] This letter is reprinted in C. H. Firth's "Sir William Davenant and the Revival of the Drama during the Protectorate," *English Historical Review* 19, 1903, 319-21. Firth suggests that it dates from early 1656.
[125] Printed in Firth, 321, 320.
[126] Printed in Firth, 321.

Caroline masques and continued in his Interregnum operas. These motifs have been cited as key elements in the development of the heroic drama that was popular throughout the late 1660s and early 1670s, as well as in the development of the she-tragedy genre. Susan Owen identifies "the dilemmas of love and honour, and personal versus public good" as central themes of the Restoration which are carried over from "those which faced English people before 1660: private royalism versus the public duty of adapting to Cromwell's regime for the sake of peace; or private self-interest in 'selling out' to Cromwell versus a public political duty of oppositional royalism."[127] Thus, Davenant's work serves as an important bridge between the pre-Interregnum and Restoration theaters, not only through the span of his career, but also through his examination of the evolving themes of love and honor as reflections of civic duty.

While Davenant's work may have been politically relevant and highly innovative in its use of new theatrical technology, it was hampered by the strictures of the division of the Restoration theaters. Through three separate orders from the Lord Chamberlain, the theatrical duopoly of Thomas Killigrew's King's Company and William Davenant's Duke's Company each owned exclusive rights to individual plays from the past generations. In these divisions, the King's Company generally saw far more success, as they claimed direct descent from the old King's Company and its sizeable repertory, which they were granted the majority of in 1669. In 1660, William Davenant was granted the rights to a number of Shakespeare's plays, including *The Tempest*, *Measure for Measure*, *Much Ado About Nothing*,

---

[127] Susan J. Owen, "Restoration Drama and Politics: An Overview," in *A Companion to Restoration Drama*, Blackwell Companions to Literature and Culture 12 (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2008), 127-28.

Romeo and Juliet, *Twelfth Night*, *Henry VIII*, *King Lear*, *Macbeth*, and *Hamlet*, as well as Webster's *The Duchess of Malfi* and the anonymous *The Sophy* in perpetuity, followed by rights to a handful of Beaumont and Fletcher's plays and *Pericles* for the succeeding two months.

This document has been the subject of much scholarly discourse, as it includes an injunction for Davenant to "make [the plays] fit for the Company of Actors appointed under his direction and Command."[128] Early readings of this injunction suggested that it functioned as instructions to alter the plays' content for moral reasons: thus, Spencer asserts that "D'Avenant's patent solemnly adjures him to purge the plays he is to produce of all objectionable features."[129] However, this reading has often been questioned, since the plays revised by Davenant as well as those produced by both companies (whether new plays or old) were hardly less bawdy than they had been in earlier times. In general, Davenant (and later adapters) removed contentious religious references or oaths; granted lower-class characters greater socioeconomic status; and simplified the language, morals, and plots of the plays they adapted. Indeed, the sanitizing changes made by Davenant in his adaptations appear to have more to do with his longstanding personal goals of creating a more moral theater than they do with changing tastes or censorship. While the exact nature of what Davenant's injunction to "make fit" the plays of the past era meant legally, it is without question that, for Shakespeare at least, Davenant saw significant room for expansion and improvement. While this may also have been the case for other pre-Interregnum plays in

---

[128] Quoted in Robert D. Hume, "Securing a Repertory: Plays on the London Stage 1660-5," in *Poetry and Drama 1570-1700: Essays in Honour of Harold F. Brooks*, 1981, 158.
[129] Hazelton Spencer, "Hamlet under the Restoration," *PMLA* 34.4 (1923), 780.

the Duke's Company's repertoire, such alterations have not survived, whether in print or in commentary from audience members like Pepys and Evelyn.

As was likely the case even in the pre-civil war theater, plays were often trimmed for performance, whether to remove potential causes for offence or simply to shorten performance times. The practice is so standard that one might even consider it a routine and necessary part of preparing a play for performance, more akin to casting parts and rehearsing lines than to adaptation proper. However, there are always cases in which such cuttings of a play fundamentally change some element of the play itself, whether it be the action, the characterization, or even the cast itself. In order to explore the possibilities of cutting as a form of adaptation, I want to briefly look at the case of Davenant's edition of *Hamlet* (printed 1676, but possibly performed as early as 1661).

Unlike many cut plays, which are ephemeral at best and generally are only used for a single production, Davenant's *Hamlet* is a published cutting. It includes full text of Shakespeare's play (as it appears in Q6),[130] with doubled inverted commas used to mark Davenant's edits. Following the title page, a reader's note explains the device: "This Play being too long to be conveniently Acted, such places as might be least prejudicial to the Plot or Sense, are left out upon the Stage: but that we may no way wrong the incomparable Author, are here inserted according to the Original Copy with this Mark " ."[131] Most of the cuts involve lines that are more poetic than they are material to the plot, particularly passages that relate specific events to metaphor-filled generalities about the state of

---

[130] This attribution is made in Spencer, "Hamlet under the Restoration."
[131] "To the Reader," *The Tragedy of Hamlet Prince of Denmark* (London: Printed by Andr. Clark, for J. Martyn, and H[enry]. Herringman), 1676.

humanity. Likewise, many references to Fortinbras and his appearance in the fourth act are cut, though he still arrives in time for the play's finale and secures the throne of Denmark for himself.

Aside from these time-saving cuts, however, are several changes that substantially alter the tone of the play. Perhaps simply because the play in question is *Hamlet*, there is a sizeable scholarly discussion about this Restoration performance text. Hazelton Spencer and Mongi Raddadi have both read Davenant's cut as an adaptation in its own right, rather than simply a reduced performance text.[132] Raddadi suggests that "many of the omissions were made for political or moral reasons, in anticipation of official censorship" and argues that "all that is left of Hamlet after the cuts is a prince who is called on to revenge the murder of his father," a statement which is perhaps dangerously suggestive of Charles II's own position as the son of a king whose death threw a kingdom into turmoil.[133] As an early adaptation, Davenant's *Hamlet* thus addresses tensions within the court over Charles's rights and responsibilities to punish not only the regicides who signed the execution warrant, but all those who had sided against the crown.

In some ways, reading Davenant's *Hamlet* as an adaptation works. Hamlet's desire for vengeance is subsumed into a need for truth and justice, and his madness is reduced to occasional emotional outbursts rather than a sustained demonstration of mental instability.

---

[132] This line of thinking is explored in Spencer's "Hamlet under the Restoration," which was the first article to cite extensive evidence for Davenant as the cutter/adapter, but has been expanded on by Mongi Raddadi, Gary Taylor, Kathy Boyd, and Barbara A. Murray, among others. Davenant's role in the play's revision is now widely accepted.

[133] Mongi Raddadi, "Davenant's Adaptations of Shakespeare" (Dissertation, Stockholm, 1979), 66, 73.

He no longer debates murdering Claudius during his confession so that "his heels may kick at heaven, and that his soul may be as damn'd and black as hell whereto it goes."[134] Nor does he seek to police his mother's sexuality; instead, his lines at the end of the third act are limited to comparing the worthy dead king to the usurping live one. Claudius is not permitted to suggest that "in the corrupted currents of this world offences guided hand may shew by justice,"[135] since doing so offers an argument that usurping the rightful king may, in fact, be beneficial in the long run. Finally, Polonius's character is transformed from a bumbling, commonplace-spouting schemer into a relatively model servant and father. His interactions with Laertes and Ophelia are far briefer, and the advice he offers them is no longer overblown and cliché (as with Laertes) or excessively sexual (as with Ophelia). These changes, then, have the effect of clarifying the play's moral positions. There is very little room for reading against the play's clear moral alignment: Hamlet is our heroic prince, and Claudius the evil usurper. *Hamlet* works against the grain of Restoration plays that depict the joyful restoration of a rightful ruler by elaborating on the horrors of a usurped throne and eventual conquest by a foreign power.

However, as Emma Depledge has argued, the play generally serves better as "an example of a revival and not an alteration," noting that cutting a play for performance is a normal part of theater, even in Shakespeare's time. Some scenes, such as those in which Hamlet instructs the traveling players, seem to have been reduced solely for the purpose of

---

[134] *The Tragedy of Hamlet Prince of Denmark*, Printed by Andr. Clark, for J. Martyn, and Hm. Herringman, 1676, 52. Lines marked for cutting.
[135] *The Tragedy of Hamlet Prince of Denmark*, Printed by Andr. Clark, for J. Martyn, and Hm. Herringman, 1676, 51. Lines marked for cutting.

shortening the performance time of the play. Other cuts are meant to adjust the content of the play for its intended audience. Casual uses of religious language are frequently removed throughout the text. Likewise, some of the play's more graphic passages are omitted, particularly concerning the hiding of Polonius's corpse and the description of Ophelia's "mermaid-like" passage down the river. These alterations sanitize the play somewhat, though it is difficult to call a play that ends in a pile of corpses exactly "suitable for all audiences." However, that does, in some respects, seem to have been Davenant's primary goal in cutting the play for production. There is less moral ambiguity in his *Hamlet* than there is in the original. Rather than attempting to read Hamlet's madness as real or feigned or interrogating the international politics that bring Fortinbras into the plot, the audience's attention is redirected to a more immediately salient political reading, one which asks what should be done with a regicide. For Davenant, and for much of his audience, the answer is simple: their guilt must be proven, and they must be brought to justice.

In all likelihood, other plays received similar treatment to Davenant's cutting of *Hamlet*, which was trimmed for both production length and to highlight what he saw as the play's crucial themes. However, very few other production cuts were reprinted, and none with both the original and the performance text printed as *Hamlet*'s was. The 1669 edition of Fletcher's *The Island Princess* is another theatrical abridgement, and like Davenant's *Hamlet*, the majority of the cuts are designed to streamline the action and remove lengthy descriptive or metaphorical passages. This cut is less significant for the edits that it makes than it is for its use as the source for a later adaptation by Nahum Tate, as John Harold Wilson has noted. Other evidence of such practices exists in promptbooks from the period, which demonstrate cuts for clarity, simplification, and the removal or politically or

religiously inflammatory language. On the basis of this evidence and the recurrent simplification of language and plot throughout the early adaptations, it seems likely that many, if not most, pre-Interregnum plays produced on the Restoration stage were similarly "made fit" through theatrical cuts.

As with *Hamlet*, Davenant's more substantial reworkings of Shakespeare—*The Law Against Lovers* (a melding of *Measure for Measure* and *Much Ado About Nothing*), *The Rivals* (an adaptation of *Two Noble Kinsmen*), *Macbeth*, and *The Tempest* (which he co-authored with John Dryden)—allowed for novel presentations of old stories that already had a proven record of theatrical success. These adaptations primarily focus on redefining what theater is capable of, mixing old texts with new technology and a radically different sociopolitical atmosphere than had existed either during the Interregnum or during the plays' initial performances.

New emphasis on spectacle was driven by both memories of masque-like productions at the end of the Caroline period and the new forms of quasi-theatrical performance, particularly Davenant's operas, that had evolved during the Interregnum. Technological advances such as flying machines and changeable scenery made the creation of elaborate set pieces and production numbers a possibility, and it is no wonder that Davenant's pioneering of these effects on the Restoration stage also informed his adaptations: *The Law Against Lovers* adds new songs and dances, *Macbeth* includes flying, singing witches, and *The Tempest* opens with an elaborate description of the scene that is to be depicted. Adaptations were also often generically experimental, mixing the formal qualities of pre-civil war drama with prototypes of Restoration modes such as heroic drama and sex comedy

The initial wave of adaptations began in 1662 with Davenant's *The Law Against Lovers* and consisted primarily of Shakespearean adaptations by Davenant, including his co-production of *The Tempest* with John Dryden. It ended in 1667, with two non-Davenant adaptations: John Lacy's *Sauny the Scot* (adapting *The Taming of the Shrew*) and George Villiers's *The Chances* (adapting the Fletcher play of the same name). All of these adaptations are chiefly concerned with the establishment of good government and often provide fairly conservative views of authority and obedience. By the end of this wave of adaptation, however, the political landscape of England had changed drastically. The chief political concerns were no longer how to recreate the monarchy or how to strike a balance between Cavalier and Parliamentarian desires, but how to work with a king who was becoming increasingly absolutist.

The first Restoration adaptation, Davenant's *The Law Against Lovers* (a combination of *Measure for Measure* and *Much Ado About Nothing*, and drawing upon Davenant's own *Love and Honour*)[136], has been almost universally dismissed by modern scholars as a failed oddity.[137] And the play *is* odd: it adds the characters of Beatrice and Benedick from *Much Ado About Nothing*, removes the lower-class characters, changes the setting from Vienna to Turin, and expunges most of *Measure for Measure*'s more overt Catholic references. However, the suggestion that the play was a complete failure seems to be overstated and based

---

[136] Barbara Murray argues that Davenant shifted the setting of the play from Vienna to Savoy so that he could reuse scenes from *Love and Honour*.

[137] For example, Arthur Gerwitz's *Restoration Adaptations of Early Seventeenth-Century Comedies* examines a variety of Restoration comedic adaptations which are usually written off as unworthy of study, and even his assessment of *The Law Against Lovers* is sparse compared to his coverage of other plays, including Davenant's *The Rivals* See also Brian Vickers's *Shakespeare: The Critical Heritage* vol. 1, p. 6.

primarily on a manuscript poem cited in both *The London Stage* and in Hotson's *Commonwealth and Restoration Stage* which reads "Then came the Knight agen with his Lawe / Against Lovers the worst that ever you sawe / In dressing of which he playnely did shew it / Hee was a far better Cooke then a Poet / And only he the Art of it had / Of two good Playes to make one bad."[138] Despite this poet's oft-reprinted and perhaps self-indulgent wit, it is the only extant commentary on the play that portrays it in a negative light. Immediately preceding the reprinting of this poem in *The London Stage* is a note that "The performance was attended by Jacques Thierry and Will Schellinks, who stated: Judged to be their best play."[139] Pepys, who often found adaptations of Shakespeare—though not the original plays—to his liking, termed it "a good play and well performed."[140] Furthermore, *The London Stage* records three performances of the play, twice in February 1662 and again in the next theatrical season in December 1662, possibly at court. That the play was successful enough to be revived seems to speak to its success, even if it does not appear to have seen revivals in later decades. While the play did not appear in print until Davenant's works were collected posthumously in 1673, this was not entirely uncommon for new plays early in the Restoration. Contemporaneous performance and publication did not become consistent until the production of new plays itself had somewhat regularized. By all available measures,

---

[138] BM Add. Mss 34, 217, quoted in *The London Stage* vol. 1, 47. Again, this bit of poetry suggests more than a passing familiarity with Shakespeare, though it is also possible that the author was somewhat more literarily minded than the average playgoer.
[139] *The London Stage*, 47, citing Seaton, *Literary Relationships* 334-36.
[140] Samuel Pepys, *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, ed. Robert Latham and William Matthews, 11 vols (Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1974), 2: 32.

The Law Against Lovers appears to have been a perfectly serviceable, if not extraordinary, first attempt at revising Shakespeare's plays for the tastes of Restoration audiences.

The Law Against Lovers takes the opening scenes and premises of *Measure for Measure* and *Much Ado About Nothing* as starting points for a study on political authority—particularly over constructions of authority and religion—that is unmistakably driven by Restoration concerns about absolutism, the interactions between religion and government, libertinism, and women's public roles, as well as the tension between royalist and parliamentarian mindsets.[141] While many of these fears would evolve more significantly later in the Restoration, *The Law Against Lovers* and *Measure for Measure*'s concerns with the enforcement of old laws under a new regime would have resonated for many audience members, especially given that Davenant's adaptation premiered mere months before the Cavalier Parliament passed the Act of Uniformity, marking a sharp, regressive turn towards strict Anglicanism. However, Davenant's revision of the Duke and the play's conclusion offer a productive means of creating balance between puritan and cavalier forces by removing much of the moral and narrative ambiguity.

While *Measure for Measure* rather famously ends on the interpretive crux of Isabella's response (or lack thereof) to the Duke's marriage proposal, Davenant revises the plot to remove the Duke from any romantic entanglements, placing him largely outside of the plot. A ruler, whether king or duke, is, for Davenant, set apart from the general populace. Such

---

[141] For a reading of how Shakespeare's audiences might have interpreted the legal and political questions raised in *Measure for Measure*, see Cynthia Greenwood's "How *Measure for Measure*'s Bawdy Court Ethos Put the Canon Law Revisions of 1604 on Trial" in *Reflections on Medieval and Renaissance Thought*, ed. Darci N. Hill (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2017), 138-51.

rhetoric was equally important in reestablishing monarchical rule in England, and early Restoration pageantry, pamphlets, and panegyrics sought to emphasize the king's divinity.[142] Instead, the Duke facilitates harmony and unity among his people by blessing Claudio and Juliet's marriage and wedding both the puritan-aligned couple (Angelo and Isabella) and the cavalier couple (Beatrice and Benedick) without enacting punishment for their crimes against each other or the state. The stakes of both Angelo's excessive enforcement of the old laws and Benedick's attempts at besieging the prison are negated through the Duke's universal clemency.

Davenant likewise simplifies the moral ambiguity presented by Shakespeare in Isabella's approach to sexuality. As A. D. Harvey has argued, whereas Shakespeare's Isabella wrestles with an "instinctive revulsion" towards sex on both bodily and spiritual terms, Davenant's revision of her character "refuses merely to yield her *honour* up to shame."[143] Of course, Angelo's threats against her have been simplified as well: Davenant's Angelo expresses his love for Isabella early on, and claims that his attempts to coerce Isabella into sex are merely a test of her virtue. While Angelo's language still leaves quite a bit of room for incredulity, the play's "happy" ending suggests that his love is meant to be seen as sincere, if horrifyingly misguided. The Duke's ability to unite both the disparate couples of Beatrice and Benedick—whose verbally combative relationship is little changed from its appearance in *Much Ado About Nothing*—and Isabella and Angelo is further evidence of the

---

[142] For example, Kevin Sharpe discusses Charles II's need to reclaim religious symbolism from Puritan rule and his means for accomplishing this at length in *Rebranding Rule* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013), 38-43.
[143] A. D. Harvey, "Virginity and Honour in *Measure for Measure* and Davenant's *The Law Against Lovers*," *English Studies* 75.2, 131, 127.

state's authority to set everything to rights, to produce (presumably) happiness and unity between otherwise incompatible individuals or groups.

Michael Dobson has asserted that *The Law Against Lovers* demonstrates "the tremendous pressure toward political orthodoxy under which the re-authoring of Shakespeare's plays in the early 1660s was carried out," suggesting that Davenant's first adaptation is designed to reaffirm the monarchy's position. By doing so, Davenant initially creates adaptations that are pro-monarchy but otherwise politically neutral, supporting neither Parliamentarians nor Cavaliers and instead advocating for moderation and tradition. In this way, Davenant's first adaptation serves as a model for the majority of adaptations throughout the Restoration: it makes use of a core premise (or the core premise from multiple plays) in order to ask completely new questions about society. As Barbara Murray has noted, Davenant's extensive alterations to his source texts provide opportunities "for intrigue and also for debate concerning the relative claims of private desires and public morality…While some of the debates are in extended formal set pieces, many relevant comments are seemingly thrown in during 'social' conversation."[144] Thus, *The Law Against Lovers* serves as an extended meditation on the nature of social contracts, particularly between subjects and authorities and between romantic or marital partners.

Though Davenant uses Shakespeare's plays—and perhaps his growing literary prestige—as a backdrop for *The Law Against Lovers*, his concerns are wholly derived from Restoration social politics, rather than nostalgia for the pre-Interregnum theater. Most immediately, the title and the premise itself are a response to a very real law established by

---

[144] Murray, 42.

the Act of Parliament of 1650, which made adultery punishable by death.[145] What was hypothetical for Shakespeare's audiences had become a fact of recent history. However, "the law was not invoked after the Restoration, and Davenant's revamped plotting creates circumstances in which ethical responses to such a lapsed Puritan law could be expressed and then worked out in action."[146] While *The Law Against Lovers* unconditionally condemns Angelo's enforcement of anti-fornication laws, it does so by positioning it as the antithesis of a Cavalier libertinism, embodied in Benedick, which is also destructive. By the end of the play, both Angelo and Benedick are brought to justice through the same tool: marriage to virtuous women who have consistently advocated for mercy.

Ultimately, mercy is the central theme of Davenant's play. While much of the existing scholarship on *The Law Against Lovers* reads it as an anti-Puritan polemic,[147] I contend that both sides—the Puritanical Angelo and the Libertine Benedick—are condemned for their extremism. Just as draconian laws lead to civil unrest, so does rebellion lead to the dissolution of society. Instead, Davenant's play advocates for mercy and moderation as the guiding principles of the day. In doing so, *The Law Against Lovers* reinforces the ideals governing the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion, reiterating a need to set aside political differences in order to maintain a balanced and just society. Maguire has argued that in *The Law Against Lovers*, "irreconcilable dilemmas…become an occasion to show how under the stern but benevolent Duke (Charles II) the state could be made secure,

---

[145] Murray, 43.
[146] Murray, 43
[147] See, for example, Eckhard Auberlen, "Shakespeare in the Restoration: Puritan Austerity and Its Cure in Davenant's Adaptation of *Measure for Measure*," *Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik* 51 (2003): 437-51.

peaceful succession assured, and the effects of the act of regicide mended."[148] To this end, *The Law Against Lovers* alters the ending of *Measure for Measure*. Davenant pairs Angelo and Isabella and Beatrice and Benedick as a means of providing two couples—one ostensibly linked to the conservative ideals of Puritanism and one embodying a more libertine Cavalier attitude—who, even as they represent opposite ends of the Restoration political spectrum are brought to the same end. Both Angelo and Benedick are pardoned by a ruler who is merciful though absolute in his power and brought back into the conventional social fold of married life. Neither laws against extramarital sex nor a libertine rebellion against marriage are presented as viable ways of life. Instead, just as early Restoration politics sought to mediate between the extremes of royalism and Commonwealth allegiance, a moderate solution is presented as, if not ideal, palatable to all.

Davenant's next adaptation, *The Rivals* occupies a similar place within the canon of early Restoration adaptations: it appears to have been moderately successful, and it, too, is primarily concerned with the fates of opposing political forces. Four performances are recorded in *The London Stage*, three within the autumn and winter of 1664/65, and one later performance in November 1667, suggesting, as with *The Law Against Lovers*, a single revival. Existing commentary is, again, mixed, with Pepys alternately praising the music and dancing, then condemning the entire play as "not good, nor anything but the good acting of Betterton and his wife and Harris."[149] By the latter half of the 1660s, printing new plays

---

[148] Nancy Klein Maguire, *Regicide and Restoration* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 63.
[149] Quoted in *The London Stage*, volume 1, p. 85.

alongside performances or revivals was becoming standard practice, and *The Rivals* was printed in 1668, presumably to profit from the play's recent performances.

One of the most immediately obvious changes Davenant makes to Shakespeare and Fletcher's play is in the size and status of the dramatis personae. *The Two Noble Kinsmen* calls for no fewer than forty-six roles, ranging in class from Queens of Thebes to the nameless Jailer's Daughter and a group of Countrywomen. By contrast, Davenant's adaptation features a radically reduced cast of only nine roles, nearly all of whom have been promoted up the social ladder. As with *The Law Against Lovers*, the cast of *The Rivals* consists almost entirely of members of the ruling class, the government, or their immediate subordinates. Theseus, Duke of Athens, becomes Arcon, Prince of Arcadia, while the Jailer is reimagined as a Provost and "Keeper of the Citadel." His daughter, now named Celania, has her own maid, Leucippe, rather than "A Maid" as "a companion." Emilia has become Heraclia, and is now niece, rather than sister-in-law, to the prince, granting him considerably greater patriarchal authority over her marital prospects. Only Palamon and Arcite, now Philander and Theocles, have remained relatively unchanged in terms of social status and familial bonds.

The Rivals opens by foregrounding the questions of honor, loyalty, and political obedience that form the play's guiding concerns. Arcon and his general Polynices discuss the nature of war and tyranny, presenting themselves and the Arcadians as an embodiment of the royalist ideals of love and honor. Though the tyrant Harpacus believed that the Arcadians would be easily defeated because they "were grown weak with ease; and Love had soften'd us to Cowardize," Arcon asserts that a country built upon "the heat of Love" and

"inclin'd only to Pastoral delights" is still capable of great martial valor.[150] However, in their victory, the Arcadian government is immediately faced with an ethical dilemma: "how shall these his kinsmen [Philander and Theocles] be dispos'd, who did so long support his reeling Cause; whose Valour oft restor'd their army's health, by letting ours blood."[151] Until this line, the word "valor" has only been associated with the Arcadian armies. Indeed, in the next speech, Arcon reiterates the Arcadian-like (and royalist-like) qualities of the two captives. They are "Noble," "their Valour seem'd distracted in the fight, as if they did desire to save the person of *Harpacus*, and yet disgust his cause," they have "Courage…inflam'd with Loyalty" but "pity towards [the Arcadians]" with whom their ethics seem more closely aligned. In the remainder of the scene, Arcon declares that Philander and Theocles should be spared, not just for their noble rank, but for these very qualities that the Arcadians hold in such high esteem. In positioning the opening scene thus, Davenant sets up parallels between Arcon and Charles II, and between Philander and Theocles and those who had remained loyal to the Commonwealth but upheld a code of conduct more or less in line with the values of the restored monarchy.

As with *The Law Against Lovers*, *The Rivals* largely follows the plot of its central source text, with most of the significant deviations taking place at the ending. During the first decade of the Restoration, tragedies and even dubiously positive tragicomedies appear to have been unpopular. Thus, *Two Noble Kinsmen*'s ending is reframed to be unambiguously happy. Rather than one of the kinsmen dying so that the other might happily wed, this

---

[150] William Davenant, *The Rivals* (London: Printed for William Cademan, 1668), 1.
[151] Davenant, *The Rivals*, 3.

adaptation, too, ends with preparations for a double wedding. Theocles is to marry Heraclia, while Philander is to marry Celania, thus offering a far happier fate for the Jailer's/Provost's daughter. Through the marriages at the end of both *The Law Against Lovers* and *The Rivals*, Davenant revises the ambiguous endings of Shakespeare's works in order to emphasize a world in which balance—between men and women, between royalists and parliamentarians, between opponents in war—is joyously and unequivocally restored.

Both of Davenant's early adaptations served as an important framework for future alterations of Shakespeare and his contemporaries. By reworking earlier drama to interrogate contemporary politics and advocate for the crown's official stance of neutrality and mercy, Davenant demonstrated that the literature of the Jacobean court could be used not only to cement cultural ties to an earlier monarchical tradition, but to reinforce the political needs of the present. Likewise, by tailoring these performances to the tastes of the Restoration audience—focusing on the upper classes, incorporating extended singing and dancing numbers, and expanding female roles to allow for the popularity of actresses—Davenant set a pattern for his own later successes in Shakespeare adaptation, the first of which would come in *Macbeth*.

Davenant's *Macbeth* is a far grander reinvisioning of Shakespeare than either of his previous adaptations. Though it follows its source text as a structural and linguistic model throughout, it significantly alters the scope of several roles—shrinking or eliminating many while expanding those of the MacDuffs—in order to shift the focus of the play from a psychological examination of a regicide to a political murder mystery *cum* opera. Printed in quarto in 1674, though possibly performed as early as 1667 or 1664, the adaptation does not clearly signal its source, but the title page does advertise that it includes "all the alterations,

amendments, additions, and new songs."[152] These additions are often quite substantial and fit primarily into two categories: additional spectacle in the form of singing, dancing, and flying witches; and a shift in focal characters away from the regicide Macbeths in order to expand the roles of the Macduffs. As with most of the early adaptations, Davenant has also simplified the language somewhat, revising Shakespeare's linguistic metaphors into more direct statements: thus Shakespeare's "destroy your sight with a new Gorgon" becomes "the sight enough to turn spectators into stone."[153] Cumulatively, these changes reposition *Macbeth*'s moral center. While Shakespeare's play focuses on the figures of Macbeth and his wife, exploring the psychology of the pair of regicides, Davenant's adaptation instead reconfigures the play to focus on the Macduffs, reimagining the central plot as a mystery that must be solved rather than as a personal tragedy of excessive ambition.

In terms of theatricality, Davenant's *Macbeth* offers a fairly representative early example of the differences between Restoration staging and early modern staging. The expansion of the witches' roles makes substantial use of new scenic and technological improvements which allow them to fly across the stage. Likewise, the rebalancing of Lady Macbeth's and Lady Macduff's roles not only reflects the demand for actresses on the stage, but also illustrates the archetypes for female roles (particularly in tragedies) that persisted throughout much of the Restoration: those of the virtuous wife and the evil, power-hungry queen. Hook notes that "the women characters are made guardians of their husbands' honor; and the whole concept of loyalty, of conscience, comes plummeting down from

---

[152] William Davenant, *Macbeth* (London: printed for P. Chetwin), 1674.
[153] William Shakespeare, *Macbeth* ed. Kenneth Muir (London: Arden Shakespeare, 1984), 2.3.70-71; Davenant, *Macbeth*, 22.

Shakespearean heights to a deadly domesticity."[154] In many senses, *Macbeth* represents, then, a turning point in early Restoration drama which exemplifies not only the stark division in archetypal roles for women, but also in trends for adapting women's roles in Shakespeare, which tend to collapse morally ambiguous characters into one of these two extremes.

Through his reconfiguration of both plot and characters, Davenant creates a much starker contrast between the evil Macbeths and the virtuous Macduffs. In the early years of the Restoration, there was little room for a sympathetic depiction of regicide, particularly when motivated by superstition and desire for personal gain. The Macbeths could not be presented as sympathetic or morally complex figures, for to do so would be to invite possible sympathy for the recently executed regicides of Charles I. However, the play carefully draws a line between unjust regicide (Macbeth's killing of Duncan) and the just deposition of an unlawful and tyrannous ruler (Macduff's killing of Macbeth). Like many plays of the Restoration, it makes use of the language of civil conflict to revive memories of the recent past and evoke a strong antipathy toward continued political discord: "there is civil war within [Macbeth's] bosom, and he finds his crown sit[s] loose about him: his power grows less, his fear grows greater still."[155]

A wealth of scholarship has focused on the political implications of Davenant's revisions. Michael Dobson reads the play as "one more reassuring tragicomedy about the fall of a usurping tyrant" which "dramatizes not only the Restoration audience's supposed moral certainties about the Interregnum but its actual experience of ambiguity and

---

[154] Lucyle Hook, "Shakespeare Improv'd, or A Case for the Affirmative," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 4.3 (1953), p. 292.
[155] Davenant, *Macbeth*, 58.

compromise."[156] In this sense, Davenant's *Macbeth* sets the tone for the majority of later adaptations, which generally developed during moments of political turmoil or crisis and addressed an intense need to maintain peace at all costs. While *Macbeth*, *The Rivals*, and *The Law Against Lovers* look at political problems in fairly general terms—the need for mercy, the treatment of opposing factions, and the condemnation of usurpation—adaptations become increasingly direct in their political stances in 1667 as war, plague, and fire destabilize a government that is already precariously balanced between the opposing forces of court/cavalier and country/parliamentarian.

Like many of its companions in the 1664/1665 performance season, *Macbeth*, Shakespeare's famously equivocating play, becomes an unequivocal condemnation of usurpation, plotting, and political strife. While in all likelihood written initially as an exploration of these themes in light of the regicide of Charles I and the Civil Wars, the continued political turmoil of Charles II's reign, including fears of French influence, Catholic conspiracies, and growing monarchical absolutism, Davenant's alteration of *Macbeth* remained a popular play throughout the reigns of both Charles and James.

Though Davenant dominated the market for early adaptations of Shakespeare, other playwrights were beginning to make forays into adapting pre-Interregnum drama, particularly to support either royalist or reconciliatory politics. In March 1662, just a month after the premier of *The Law Against Lovers*, the Duke's Theater also began staging *Romeo and Juliet*, which, in keeping with early Restoration fashions, was reimagined as a tragicomedy,

---

[156] Dobson, *The Making of the National Poet: Shakespeare, Adaptation, and Authorship, 1660-1769*, 37.

albeit sporadically. Though the text of the tragicomic version is no longer extant, Downes notes that it "'twas Play'd Alternately, Tragical one Day, and Tragicomical another, for several Days together."[157] This particular adaptation is interesting, since it both demonstrates the interest in Shakespeare's works driven by semi-frequent performances of Shakespeare's plays and the early Restoration theater's overarching interest in stories of reconciliation and dynastic continuance. One can only imagine a production with cavalier Capulets and parliamentarian Montagues (or vice versa). By Davenant's death in 1668, then, it was clear that Shakespeare's plays were ripe for adaptation, and other playwrights would soon emulate Davenant's model of politically motivated retellings of stories from Shakespeare and, gradually, his contemporaries.

Davenant's early adaptations set the tone for similar texts throughout the Restoration by establishing that pre-Interregnum texts could be reconfigured to address evolving modern sociopolitical concerns. It has often been argued that such adaptations allowed the adapting dramatists to criticize their world at one crucially safe remove—if their plays are merely "altering" or "making into a play" the works of such culturally relevant authors as Shakespeare and Fletcher, then there is reasonable deniability of any political implication. Though this was certainly not always the case—as we shall see in investigating adaptations such as *The Sicilian Usurper*—it was, and has continued to be, a convenient fiction.

---

[157] John Downes, *Roscius Anglicanus*, edited by Judith Milhous and Robert D. Hume, London: The Society for Theatre Research (1987), 53.

CHAPTER IV

ADDRESSING KING AND COURT (1666-1678)[158]

By the middle of the 1660s, the initial jubilation of the Restoration had fully ended, and England was no longer wholly enamored of the returned king. While the Restoration had offered a moment for significant political and social change, the policies of moderation and balance which had dominated Charles II's initial years in power served primarily to stall any sense of progress and often led to bitterness amongst Charles's earliest supporters. Paul Seaward has suggested that the early Restoration government was "paralysed by fear of insurrection, by the king's own political lethargy and his ministers' intellectual bankruptcy…Charles and his ministers, it is said, had neither the time nor the energy to indulge in anything as luxurious as a constructive policy."[159] It is difficult to imagine any other strategy which might have been more successful, however. Through a refusal to promote either royalist or parliamentarian interests, the early Restoration government managed to create an uneasy balance—but a balance nonetheless—between opposing political factions. However, as we saw in the previous chapter, this balance was precarious, and it depended on the careful negotiation of opposing factions, histories, and desires. In the middle years of the decade, any sense of unity became strained by a number of outside

---

[158] Keywords: *All for Love*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, Barbara Palmer, *Catiline*, Earl of Clarendon, *The Great Favourite*, royal mistresses, *The Tempest*

[159] Paul Seaward, *The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1661-1667* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 4.

forces, including the beginning of the second Anglo-Dutch war in February 1665, the onset of plague in early in the same year,[160] and the Great Fire of London in October 1666.

All three events created significant upheavals in both the political and theatrical worlds. The war itself seems to have initially had both popular and political support, particularly from those with mercantile interests. Likewise, the theaters produced a number of militaristic plays, including Davenant's *The Rivals*, the Earl of Orrery's *The Generall*, and Dryden's *The Indian Emperor*. However, a series of disastrous naval losses and financial mismanagement quickly turned public attitudes sour. Despite significant financial grants from Parliament to fund the war, Charles quickly found himself borrowing money from wealthy London merchants, many of whom soon found themselves in dire financial straits due to the plague and then the fire.

The Restoration government encountered the three crises more or less simultaneously, and while its continuation is testament to the country's desire not to repeat the political turmoil of the Civil Wars, it cannot be said that the government, particularly the institution of the monarchy, escaped unscathed. As Tim Harris has noted, the monarchy suffered a serious loss of prestige throughout the 1660s and 1670s through failing to enact either domestic or foreign policies that found wide support.[161] While the Cavalier Parliament that met in 1664-1665 still seemed optimistic, the Parliament that met in 1666-1667 was

---

[160] According to A. Lloyd Moote and Dorothy C. Moote, plague had been present in the greater London metropolitan area since Christmas of 1664, and by May or April of 1665, the plague had grown into an epidemic. Due to inaccurate reporting, the precise number of deaths, particularly in the early months, is difficult to assess. In Whitehall and parishes near the court, examiners seem to have been particularly hesitant to attribute deaths to the plague, which may explain why theatres remained open until early June.

[161] Tim Harris, *Restoration*, 70-71.

deeply divided over the management of the war and the attribution of responsibility for the Great Fire.

The plague seems to have been treated as a largely civic, rather than national, matter. Preoccupied with the war, Charles and his court left much of the management of illness and reporting to city and parish officials. This can perhaps be justified by the perception that the plague was primarily a problem for the city, rather than the country, despite the flight of most of London's wealthier citizens—including Charles and the royal family in July 1665—to the countryside, often carrying the plague with them. The theaters, like many of London's businesses, found little to sustain them, and in June 1665, both theaters were closed by order of the Lord Chamberlain, though the sparse offerings recorded in *The London Stage* from March onward may suggest that theatrical activity had been slowed by the companies themselves for several months.

Although Charles and his court returned to Whitehall in January 1666, theatrical activity did not resume until October of that year at court, and as late as December in the public theaters. In the months between Charles's return and the theaters' reopenings, a further disaster had struck London: the Great Fire. This disaster "laid waste to about 400 streets, 89 parish churches, and 13,200 houses, covering as much as 436 acres in ash,"[162] and it significantly increased tensions between religious factions and against foreigners in London as citizens sought someone to blame. However, the foreign tradespeople, largely French or Dutch, who lived in the neighborhood where the fire began were integral parts of

---

[162] Frances E. Dolan, *True Relations: Reading, Literature, and Evidence in Seventeenth-Century England*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013, 87.

London's bustling textile industry, and the Catholics, as Francis Dolan notes, "had James II's Catholicism and Charles II's suspected Catholicism granting them some social legitimacy."[163] Although numerous acts passed as part of the so-called Clarendon Code had effectively barred Catholics and other non-conformists from public office, they were still a significant, if contentious, portion of the London population, particularly among its foreign citizens. Despite numerous broadsides and pamphlets warning of a Catholic and/or foreign conspiracy to destroy London, however, the eventual conclusion of several investigations was that the fire was caused by "the hand of God, a great wind, and a very dry season."[164] While this conclusion somewhat reduced tensions between the factions—and the official proclamation was used to assuage fears of Catholic insurrection throughout the remainder of Charles's reign—it did not completely eliminate fears of Catholic plotting, which would flare up again in the late 1670s with the Popish Plot.

Thus, the theaters reopened in a changed London and for a changed court. While both companies continued to rely on popular staple plays from pre-Interregnum dramatists, new plays began appearing in greater numbers from both professional dramatists like John Dryden and George Etherege and from courtiers like Roger Boyle and James Howard. Playwrights began writing back at power, rather than endorsing the ideals of forgiveness and mercy that had marked the early years of the Restoration. After the disasters of war, plague, and fire, pre-Interregnum drama and its adaptations served three critical functions in the development of Restoration theatre: it began to be weaponized at court by various factions,

---

[163] Dolan, *True Relations*, 89.
[164] *CSPD (1666-1667)*, 175.

from nobles to would-be courtiers, to king's mistresses; it began to be seen as an important locus of English culture and history; and it became an important training ground for new actors and fledgling playwrights alike. The period between 1666-1678 served as a period of experimentation with the limits of drama as a tool of political critique, as opposed to its role in reiterating the new political regime earlier in the 1660s. The adaptations and revivals of the late 1660s and early 1670s bridged the politically optimistic plays of the early Restoration with a far more critical use of pre-Interregnum drama during the Popish Plot and the Exclusion Crisis.

Pre-Interregnum Drama and the Earl of Clarendon's Impeachment

In the aftermath of the disasters of 1666, politicians and commoners alike looked for someone to blame for London's recent run of misfortunes and England's losses in the war. At court, a clear target emerged: the Earl of Clarendon. His wide-ranging political influence had long been controversial, as his position as the lord chancellor and Charles's longtime advisor offered him great power at court. His staunch adherence to the law made him one of the chief proponents of the policy of balance and mercy that began the Restoration, even when such a balance was detrimental to the king's wishes.[165] He also had little skill with navigating court politics, which left him opposing both Barbara Palmer, Countess of Castlemaine and George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham, the king's two most powerful favorites. An initial attempt at his impeachment had taken place in 1663, and from that

[165] History has painted Clarendon as inflexibly Anglican, to the extent that the series of anti-nonconformist bills passed during the early years of the Restoration were named after him. However, as recent scholarship, including Paul Seaward's biography in the *ODNB* have argued, Clarendon seems to have sought compromise, particularly for the Presbyterians, as a means of securing the power of the restored monarchy.

point onward, his support within the court waned. His opposition to the Second Anglo-Dutch War earned him no friends, and his advice to Charles throughout the war—first to avoid recalling parliament, and later to use the royal prerogative to raise money (which was construed as a proposition for military rule)—proved disastrous for Clarendon's security within the court. In many senses, he became the perfect scapegoat.

Clarendon was dismissed from office at the end of August 1667, though he remained in England to fight against the impeachment charges until "two strong hints from the king" the following November, following charges of high treason, led him to flee to an exile in France from which, despite his best efforts, he would never return.[166] Debates over Clarendon's impeachment seem to have spurred new theatrical productions which moved "away from clear-cut and recidivate Royalist propaganda to cautious and veiled criticism."[167] Clarendon's impeachment and subsequent exile were spurred by a considerable propaganda campaign from "a cabal of ambitious politicians drawn from all factions, welded together by their hatred of Clarendon, and determined to secure office."[168] This cabal included Sir Robert Howard, who turned his playwriting skills towards criticism of Clarendon and England's current political situation.

Howard's *The Great Favourite; or, the Duke of Lerma* is, perhaps, the strongest literary denunciation of Clarendon. Howard was ambitious, both as a politician and as a member of

---

[166] Paul Seaward, "Hyde, Edward, first earl of Clarendon," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 4 October 2008; Accessed 15 September 2020. https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/14328.
[167] Nancy Klein Maguire, *Regicide and Restoration* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 125.
[168] Clayton Roberts, "The Impeachment of the Earl of Clarendon," *Cambridge Historical Journal* 13.1 (1957), p. 6.

the Theatre Royal, for whom he wrote plays and served as scene designer. He was consistently a member of Parliament from 1661 until his death in 1698, though his first real move towards power was in 1666, "opposing the royal prerogative in the debates on the *Poll Bill*."[169] He quickly threw in his lot with a growing anti-Clarendon faction headed by the Duke of Buckingham and became one of its central members. While Howard's prior engagement in the so-called country faction would have made him Clarendon's political opponent, his animosity towards the earl had gained a personal component in 1667, when Clarendon supported Howard's wife Honoria in her petition "for relief from the ill usage of her husband."[170] In the attempts to remove Clarendon from office, Howard found a way to unite his political and literary interests.

The Duke of Lerma was likely composed sometime in late 1666 or early 1667, when Howard was "being to go into the Countrey,"[171] presumably to escape the plague. It was first performed in February 1668, though rumors of its coming had been circulating along those regarding *Catiline* since at least January. By this time, Clarendon was already in semi-voluntary exile, though Charles II "had given his assent to a bill banishing Clarendon for life unless he returned by the beginning of February 1668."[172] The play's premier on the 20th of

---

[169] J. P. Vander Motten, "Howard, Sir Robert" *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography,* 19 May 2011; Accessed 19 September 2020. https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/13935.
[170] H. J. Oliver, *Sir Robert Howard, 1626-1698: A Critical Biography* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1963), 127, quoting from *H.M.C.*, Report 12, App. 7, Sir David Fleming MSS, p.46.
[171] Robert Howard, *The Great Favourite, or, the Duke of Lerma* (London: Henry Herringman, 1668), A2v.
[172] Seaward, "Hyde, Edward, first earl of Clarendon," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.

that same month likely served to reinvigorate anti-Clarendon sentiments against any potential return.

The printed edition of *The Duke of Lerma* begins with a lengthy epistle to the reader, in which Howard explains that he has been more than willing to print this play because his audiences have contested its authorship. Unlike many dramatists adapting the works of others throughout this period, Howard acknowledges his debt but in such a manner that leaves his as the only name attached to the text. He explains that "a Gentleman" had brought a play called *The Duke of Lerma* to the King's Company, and that this play served as Howard's source for the plot. He is careful to explain that the original version of the play was not well suited for the stage,

> since the contrivance, scarce would merit the name of a plot; and some of that assisted by a disguise; and it ended abruptly: and on the Person of *Philip* the *3*. there was fixt such a mean Character, and on the Daughter of the Duke of *Lerma* such a vitious one, that I cou'd not but judge it unfit to be presented by any that had a respect, not only to Princes, but indeed to either Man or Woman.[173]

These complaints mimic those found in justifications for other adaptations, where the adapter explains that they have "made into a play" some earlier, deficient text, usually through extending an abrupt ending or abbreviated text,[174] revising flat or morally ambiguous characters,[175] or refining plot elements to bring them in line with the theatrical

---

[173] Howard, *The Great Favourite*, A3r.
[174] As with Davenant's *Macbeth*, Shadwell's *Timon of Athens*, or Buckingham's *The Chances*.
[175] See Tate's adaptation of *The Island Princess*, which removes moral ambiguity from Quisara and Ruy Dias, and thereby reframes them as paragons of virtue, at the expense of most of the plot's complexity. Ted H. Miller has also argued that this occurs with *Macbeth*'s Lady Macduff in "The Two Deaths of Lady Macduff: Antimetaphysics, Violence, and William Davenant's Restoration Revision of *Macbeth*," *Political Theory* 36.6 (2008).

conventions of the period, including not only critical theories of unity, but also through expanding women's roles and the level of technical and scenic detail required for staging.[176] However, Howard's play is somewhat unusual among early adaptations in that he acknowledges his use of an earlier play without actually naming his source. Howard asserts that he has taken only the "hint" of "the Duke of *Lerma* saving himself in his last extremity, by his unexpected disguise, which is as well in the true story as the old Play" and the names of the characters from his source text. Without access to this earlier, unprinted play, it is impossible to know the extent of Howard's actual alterations. As we will see with other playwrights later in the period, claiming to have completely reworked a play that was, in fact, only somewhat altered, was not uncommon, even when the source texts were available.

Harbage notes that Howard's description of *The Duke of Lerma*'s source as an "old play" suggests that it was a pre-Interregnum manuscript, likely the now-lost *The Spanish Duke of Lerma* known to have been in Humphrey Moseley's possession at the beginning of the Restoration.[177] In receiving this manuscript from an unnamed source associated with the King's Men, Howard must have seen a double opportunity: the chance to increase his own literary prestige through the alteration—however large or small that alteration may have been—of an unprinted play, and an opportunity to draw unfavorable parallels to Clarendon, who filled a similar role in the English court to that of the historical Spanish Lerma.

---

[176] This could be applied to virtually every adaptation from the period, but of particular note is the Dryden/Davenant *Tempest*, which adds both exceptional scenic detail and vastly expanded roles for actresses even as it compresses the timeline of the action.
[177] Alfred Harbage, "Elizabethan-Restoration Palimpsest," *The Modern Language Review* 35.3 (1940), 299. Harbage disputes Moseley's attribution of the play to Henry Shirley and instead assigns authorship to John Ford based on stylistic and linguistic similarities.

The Duke of Lerma begins with the impending exile of the titular character, who begins the play by lamenting that his loyalty has not been rewarded and that the king (historically, Philip II of Spain) "shot Ruine at me, and there lies, forgiving all the world, but me alone."[178] The language of forgiveness, loyalty, and reward in Lerma's opening lines calls back to the themes of early Restoration politics and drama alike, where a failure to reward the faithful Cavaliers was a common complaint. In initially aligning Lerma with a still-disgruntled portion of the court (and one with which the playwright himself was newly associated), Howard emphasizes the need for loyal courtiers to be properly rewarded lest they turn traitor and underlines Lerma's greed through his parallels with Clarendon. While *Lerma* has often been read as a fairly straightforward condemnation of Clarendon, moments like this opening scene complicate the metaphor.

The first scene opens just before Lerma's exile is to be confirmed, only for his exile to be forestalled by the king's death. Seeing an opportunity to integrate himself into the new king's favor, Lerma uses his daughter Maria as a pawn to prevent his banishment and reestablish his political influence. Despite Maria's initial resistance to being used in this manner, believing that she is being prostituted to the king at the expense of her own virtue and a dying promise to her mother, she is convinced to follow her father's plans once she meets the young king, who is instantly enamored of her. From there, the primary action of the play largely shifts away from Lerma's machinations to focus on Maria's own struggles between filial piety and loyalty to her nation. Maguire argues that "to save both her King and her father, Maria risks her 'fame,' and the theatre-goers perhaps felt that her honour

---

[178] Howard, *The Duke of Lerma*, 1.

dilemma paralleled their own Interregnum entanglements—or at least paralleled their rationale of their choices."[179] Howard's play thus marks a new trend in Restoration drama. Whereas the majority of early plays focused on reaffirming the rights of the monarchy and the need for mercy and forgiveness, in the later 1660s, plays began to show a marked ambivalence about the role of crown and court and a subject's duties toward government.

Chief among these concerns at the time of the play's composition was Clarendon's power over the king, the court, and, potentially, the succession. *Lerma* draws parallels between the situation of Lerma, Maria, and the King and that of Clarendon, his daughter Anne, and her husband, Charles's brother and heir James. Since Howard's own preface to *The Duke of Lerma* notes that Maria's character was one of the chief places in which he intervened in the text, presumably making her less "vitious" and more virtuous, it is likely that he reshaped the arc of her story to provide a flattering image of Anne and James's early relationship. While accounts surrounding James and Anne's marriage vary from romantic to coercive,[180] the union was very much against Charles's and the queen mother's political wishes. Charles eventually relented, possibly due to Anne's pregnancy, and the two were married on 3 September 1660. However, Henrietta Maria's violent rejection of the match left Edward Hyde "acutely embarrassed," and, afraid "that he would be accused of unbridled ambition in marrying his daughter into the royal family, he suggested that [Anne]

---

[179] Maguire, *Regicide and Restoration*, 131.
[180] The exact nature of their relationship is, of course, far more complicated than this dissertation has space to explore. As examples of the range of romantic and political valences with which this relationship is discussed, see John Miller's *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* entry on Anne and John Callow's *The Making of King James II: The Formative Years of a Fallen King*, Gloucestershire: Sutton Publishing (2000), 90-92.

should be sent to the Tower and even executed."[181] Though their marriage was eventually accepted, *The Duke of Lerma*'s portrayal of Lerma's forcing Maria into the young king's path must surely have reignited initial tensions over the match. Even so, James "was widely seen as under her thumb" and Pepys commented that "the duke of York, in all things but his codpiece, is led by the nose by his wife (9.342)"[182] With James as Charles's only heir, Clarendon's influence over him through Anne was seen as a direct threat to the succession.

Though it is impossible to know what liberties Howard took with revising his source text, little of the actual history that inspired the plays remains. The Duke of Lerma, Francisco Gómez de Sandoval y Rojas, was a historical figure. His relationship with King Philip II of Spain was contentious, but he became a favorite of Philip III and appears to have held a role similar to Clarendon's: he was thoroughly integrated into court politics and was seen as holding dangerous power over the king. However, his daughter Maria and the play's use of her to seduce the king on Lerma's behalf are purely fictional. Nancy Klein Maguire has suggested that Maria may "represent England itself,"[183] though this reading, particularly given Maria's reluctance toward the King, makes the play a far stronger critique of the monarchy than it initially seems. If Maria is an analogue for England, then Howard is

---

[181] John Miller, "Anne [née Anne Hyde], duchess of York (1637–1671), first wife of James II," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 23 Sep. 2004; Accessed 17 Sep. 2020. https://www-oxforddnb-com.srv-proxy1.library.tamu.edu/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-14325.
[182] Miller, "Anne [née Anne Hyde], duchess of York (1637–1671), first wife of James II." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*
[183] Maguire, *Regicide and Restoration*, 128.

advocating for the King's/Charles's unconditional love for a country that, while it may secretly love him, publicly resists him and refuses to be controlled by him.

The play concludes on an apparently happy note. King Phillip proposes marriage to Maria, asserting that "*Spains* empty Throne;/Unless from you shall want succession," and her uncle Medina and the Duke D'Alva reframe Lerma's earlier claims upon Maria's filial responsibility, arguing that wedding to the king is her duty to the nation. Though Maria appears reluctant to "submit to [Philip]/and Heaven, to teach [her] heart what's best to do," Philip's final declaration that "let not a smile upon a face be seen/Till fair *Maria* yields to be my Queen" suggests that the wedding will move forward, regardless of Maria's wishes. However, this resolution raises more problems than it solves. It emphasizes the power of the royal prerogative (though only through the monarch's ability to dictate his marriage and thus the succession—a problem which would arise again nearly a decade later with the Exclusion Crisis), and "though it advises Charles II, like Philip II [sic], to take a more active role in administration, the conclusion says nothing about the means to that end."[184] What the play does offer, however, are cautions against being led too easily by favorites, whether directly or through the mistresses they provide.

Charles's quarrels with Clarendon stemmed in part from Clarendon's condemnation of Charles's private life, particularly his many mistresses. While the play condemns Clarendon through parallels with Lerma, it also, as Richard Braverman has argued,

---

[184] Richard Braverman, *Plots and Counterplots: Sexual Politics and the Body Politic in English Literature, 1660-1730* (Cambridge: CUP, 1993), 85. Throughout his examination of *The Duke of Lerma*, Braverman references the King character as Philip II; however, a closer examination of the historical figures portrayed in the play suggests that the King is Philip III.

"chastises King Charles through King Philip, a young and inexperienced monarch who nearly loses control of his kingdom" because of his love for the wrong woman.[185] Here is where the play's political motivations become less clear, however. The distrust of favoritism implicit in the play's denunciation of Clarendon matches the politics of the anti-Clarendon faction with whom Howard had aligned himself. However, the play's cautions against the potential power of royal mistresses works somewhat against the desires of the cabal, and particularly Buckingham, who was attempting to replace Lady Castlemaine's influence by recruiting first Nell Gwynn and then Moll Davis as mistresses for the King, perhaps in an attempt to restore his own standing with the king. Nell Gwynn's performance as Maria must have felt particularly provocative, especially for politically savvy viewers like Pepys, who commented only on the play's "reproach [of] our King with his mistress" and "was troubled for it, and expected it should be interrupted."[186] Howard's adaptation thus was a double pronged attack upon the court, one which reflected Clarendon's recent fall from power, but which equally warned against the influence of future favorites, particularly those who wielded power through their mistresses.

Howard was not alone in critiquing the court of the late 1660s, and even royalist playwrights, including John Dryden and William Davenant, sought to offer more subtle guidance through drama. The Dryden-Davenant adaptation of Shakespeare's *Tempest*, subtitled *The Enchanted Island*,[187] became the Restoration's most successful adaptation of Shakespeare and one of its most successful plays overall, particularly if we include the later

---

[185] Braverman, *Plots and Counterplots*, 84.
[186] Pepys, *Diary*, 9: 81.
[187] For the sake of clarity, I will be referring to the Dryden-Davenant *Tempest* by this subtitle.

operatic variation on the play in our accounting. *The Enchanted Island* is less immediately—or, at least, less blatantly—topical than Howard's *Duke of Lerma*; it does not contain easy one-to-one parallels between characters and historical figures. Yet because the play lacks a clear metaphorical key, one can read it as standing in for a multiplicity of recent political and ethical quandaries, or for none at all. Pepys, and likely many others, chose to see it as "the most innocent play that ever I saw."[188] Even so, Pepys did find "the seamen's part"—the most overtly political element of the play—"a little too tedious,"[189] presumably because of the directness of its political content. Still, he returned to see the play at least six more times in the next two years.

Given the play's significance, it is unsurprising, then, that *The Enchanted Island* has seen more scholarly attention than any other adaptation of the period, and more than the majority of new plays received. Though this wealth of scholarship may be driven in part by its Shakespearean source, it also reflects the play's popularity in its own right. If Pepys's diary is to be trusted, *The Enchanted Island* premiered on 7 November 1667 to a nearly full house. According to estimations in *The London Stage*, the play was performed for two consecutive weeks,[190] a phenomenon that the records do not suggest for many other plays performed during Charles II's reign.

Much of the scholarship on the play focuses on Dryden and Davenant's (and, later, Shadwell's) variations from their Shakespearean source text and the significance of those changes, whether in terms of politics, theatrical conventions, gender roles, or other topics of

---

[188] Pepys, *Diary*, 8: 522.
[189] Pepys, *Diary*, 8: 527.
[190] *The London Stage*, 123.

concern in Restoration drama studies. Katherine Eisaman Maus's foundational article "Arcadia Lost: Politics and Revision in the Restoration *Tempest*" has set the tone for much of the work on this adaptation by asserting that it "redefines the limits and uses of sovereignty."[191] Later research has complicated this reading through various critical lenses, particularly feminist and postcolonial approaches, yet the core thesis holds true. *The Enchanted Island* is one of the first plays of the Restoration to call into question the proper uses of governmental authority as well as the loyalties owed to a government by its subjects. Here, I use the term "government" rather than "monarchy" deliberately, for the play is as much an interrogation of duchies, commonwealths, and colonization as it is of the specific power structures associated with monarchy.

The concerns of *The Enchanted Island* are not the same as those of Shakespeare's *Tempest*. Whereas Shakespeare primarily investigates power structures through Prospero's character and his control over both the island and its inhabitants, Dryden and Davenant expand this analysis, incorporating the entire cast to explore questions of loyalty, both to a formerly usurped ruler and to the figure of the father-king, and provide cautions against improper uses of power, particularly in the form of the sailors' duchy-turned-matrilineal commonwealth and Prospero's failed attempts at absolutism.

In Shakespeare, Prospero is the ultimate authority on the island. Ariel's obedience may be in the service of eventual freedom, but it is absolute. He reminds Prospero "I have done thee worthy service, / Told thee no lies, made no mistakings, served / Without or

---

[191] Katherine Eisaman Maus, "Arcadia Lost: Politics and Revision in the Restoration *Tempest*," *Renaissance Drama* 13 (1982): 189–210.

grudge or grumblings."[192] Throughout the narrative, he behaves precisely as Prospero commands, and there is little sense of him exercising agency beyond his strict obedience to Prospero's commands. Similarly, Miranda is consistently concerned about her promises to her father throughout her courtship with Ferdinand. She chastises herself because she "prattle[s] / Something too wildly, and my father's precepts I therein do forget."[193] Even in the midst of confessing her love, she is continually putting Prospero's commands first, her own desires second. Caliban's disobedience is portrayed as comically villainous, though ultimately not a serious threat to Prospero's authority over the island. Alonso concludes the play by repenting his usurpation and restoring Prospero's dukedom to him, though the emphasis is on Miranda and Ferdinand as the future inheritors of the duchy, rather than on Prospero's restoration. Still, Prospero's power is absolute, and all of the events of the play work out as he has dictated through his magic and his control of Ariel.

Dryden and Davenant's Prospero is far less powerful and authoritative, and he often loses control of the very events he is attempting to orchestrate. Whereas Shakespeare's Prospero begins his play by recounting to an obediently listening Miranda the story of how they came to the island, the Prospero of *The Enchanted Island* begins the play in a position of confusion and frustration. He has to enlist Miranda's help in locating her sister Dorinda, one of Dryden and Davenant's additions to the plot, and Miranda begins by immediately questioning her father's reasons for conjuring the storm and wrecking the ship. Miranda and Dorinda conspire to see the shipwrecked men, despite Prospero's strict orders against doing

---

[192] Shakespeare, *Tempest*, 1.2.247-49.
[193] Shakespeare, *Tempest*, 3.1.57-9.

so. Ariel's loyalties are likewise split, for Hippolito has, or at least claims to have, the authority "to bind [Ariel] in the bottom of the Sea, / Far from the lightsome Regions of the Air, / ([His] native fields) above a hundred years."[194] Ariel is also capable of acting on his own authority, without command from either Prospero or Hippolito, for he leaves the island to visit the Hesperides, Palestine, and Britain to concoct a cure for Hippolito after Ferdinand has apparently killed him.

As a patriarch-king, then, Prospero is hardly a successful figure, and his many failures, particularly in ruling over the romantic encounters of his children and ward, allow for considerable questioning of the king's authority over his subjects' individual lives and consciences. Dobson locates the play's central theme in questions of paternalistic power embodied by the authority of the monarchy: "the crisis of authority which the play dramatizes has generally been examined simply in terms of the restored monarchy, rather than of the wider family ideology on which that monarchy depended."[195] This theme, as Dobson reads it, is constructed both through references to Restoration political debates and through the play's naturalization of patriarchal seventeenth-century ideals, particularly regarding women's roles. However, Prospero's continual failure to exercise his authority over his daughters suggests a similar failure of power within Charles II's court. Indeed, during the late 1660s, it became clear that there would be ongoing political divisions within the court that had initially been seen as a remnant of the interregnum split between royalists and parliamentarians, as well as the various religious rifts within English society. Over the

---

[194] Dryden and Davenant, *The Enchanted Island* (London: Printed by J. M. for Henry Herringman, 1670), 66.
[195] Dobson, *The Making of the National Poet*, 41.

next decade, these divisions within the court became stark enough to eventually lead to the formation of England's first two political parties.

While the king's authority might not be unquestionable, the loyalty owed to him by his subjects is portrayed as unquestionable in *The Enchanted Island*. Though Prospero is often challenged, he is still the central figure to whom all other characters continually turn. Prospero's position, if not his power, is unquestioned. As George Robert Guffey has pointed out, *The Enchanted Island* depicts an Alonzo and Antonio who "are already repentant of their crimes at the beginning of the play" and have "tried to expiate their guilt by sailing to Portugal and defending Christianity against the Moors."[196] Even though they are responsible for Prospero's (and Hippolito's) usurpation, they are deeply remorseful. Shakespeare has Alonso and his companions traveling for the wedding of Alonso's daughter, and while that marriage is described as bittersweet at best, it is far from the two usurpers' attempts to make "amends to Heav'n" through crusading in *The Enchanted Island*. Alonzo's own guilt frames him as the subject of divine, and by extension kingly, justice: "No act but penitence can expiate guilt. / Must we teach Heaven what price to set on Murthers? / What rate on lawless power, and wild ambition? / Or dare we traffic with the Powers above, and sell by weight a good deed for a bad?"[197] Only a higher power—god or sovereign—has the power to offer true redemption, regardless of what good deeds have been performed.

---

[196] George Robert Guffey, *After the Tempest* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1969), viii.
[197] Dryden and Davenant, *The Enchanted Island*, 15.

Prospero does offer this redemption, and in language that is highly reminiscent of the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion: "All past crimes I bury in the joy of this / Blessed day."[198] By the end of the final act, Prospero has himself transformed from the jealous and vengeful father into a gentle and forgiving ruler. While Shakespeare's Prospero is an effective, omnipotent ruler of his own (very small) kingdom, the Dryden-Davenant adaptation recreates him as a tyrant, who makes deeply flawed attempts at both policing his daughters' sexuality—thus ensuring their dynastic marriages—and negotiating the restoration of his dukedom. While many scholars have noted the changes in Prospero's character most have written these changes off a "one more element in a good show,"[199] such reductive assessments overlook the political resonance of such a figure, particularly in 1667. The play is ultimately ambivalent about Prospero's use of his power, and this ambivalence reflects growing concerns over Charles II's reign. While Dryden remained a staunch royalist, the national anxiety over proper governance made its way into much of his work in this period. As Laura Brown has argued, "the arbitrariness of Dryden's restoration of civic order reproduces in dramatic form the instability that began to be felt in the political Restoration by the late 1660s and early 1670s with the impeachment of Clarendon, the decline of Cavalier control in the Commons, the weakening of the House of Lords, and the increasing power of merchant and agrarian capitalist interests in the nation"[200] In this passage, Brown is speaking specifically about *The Conquest of Granada*, but the passage is

---

[198] Dryden and Davenant, *The Enchanted Island*, 79.
[199] Gerwitz, *Restoration Adaptations of Early 17th-Century Comedies*, 20.
[200] Laura Brown, *English Dramatic Form, 1660-1760: An Essay in Generic History* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1981), 18.

equally applicable to *The Enchanted Island*'s various failures of civic and patriarchal order and their sudden and supernatural happy resolution.

Whereas the pre-Interregnum plays and adaptations that had been performed in the first years of the Restoration focused on themes of balance, mercy, and forgiveness, *The Enchanted Island* marks a sharp departure from earlier uses of older drama. Here, Shakespeare's text is altered to criticize, albeit gently, the crown and court. As Nancy Klein Maguire has argued, the political parallels are multifaceted, reflecting at different points the struggles of Charles I, Charles II, and the Earl of Clarendon, as well as the perils of the Commonwealth period.[201] In all cases, the play is concerned with how to respond to failures of one's own power. Ultimately, Prospero recognizes his failures as such. Though he is owed a certain level of authority through his position as usurped and exiled duke, he is unsuited to wield the power that he possesses. Whereas Shakespeare's Prospero famously drowns his book of magic and returns to Milan to take up the dukedom once more, his Dryden-Davenant counterpart seemingly remains on the island, asking only that "On my retreat let Heaven and Nature smile."[202] Like Clarendon, he chooses his own exile, and Dryden and Davenant's royalist sympathies depict this as a noble alternative to attempting to wield power poorly.

However, the play also makes it clear that England's recent experimentations with Commonwealth rule are not a viable solution to less-than-ideal monarchs. As George R. Guffy has noted, Dryden and Davenant reassign any discussion of a commonwealth from

---

[201] Maguire, *Regicide and Restoration*, 135.
[202] Dryden and Davenant, *The Enchanted Island*, 82.

the nobleman Gonzalo, who sees the commonwealth as a potential utopia, to the lower class drunken sailors.[203] While this reassignment neatly dodges any hint of rebellious thoughts from serious sources, it also expands the play's discussion of commonwealth ideology—and the problems inherent therein—by transforming the topic of a speech of less than fifty lines into a running theme across multiple scenes. The sailors' government on the island is contested from within nearly from the moment of its creation, with every sailor insisting upon a title and the attempt at "liv[ing] well and orderly" (though if only in hopes of gaining wealth from shipwrecks) almost immediately dissolves into rival dukedoms before Trincalo declares himself the lawful inheritor of the island through his "marriage" to one of its original inhabitants, Sycorax. The ever-changing attempts to create and assert authority over the island and its inhabitants, both foreign and native, provide a compressed parallel to the various power struggles and reinvisionings of government throughout the Interregnum.

In *The Enchanted Island* Davenant and Dryden comment on the failures of the Commonwealth in ways that echo the pro-royalist stance of the first half-decade of Restoration drama, yet their portrayal of Prospero as a failed absolutist patriarch king also highlight potential pitfalls in monarchical rule. However, because they are careful to revise Shakespeare's play in such a way as to avoid drawing direct parallels between Prospero and either Charles I, Charles II, or Clarendon, they are able to create a play that speaks to contemporary concerns without inviting censure and which can be read, as it was by Pepys,

---

[203] George R. Guffey, "Politics, Weather, and the Contemporary Reception of the Dryden-Davenant *Tempest*," *Restoration: Studies in English Literary Culture, 1660-1700* 8.1 (1984), 2-3.

as "the most innocent play I ever saw."[204] Similarly, the play's general concern with the methods of governance—whether over the family or over the nation—were perennial topics of interest throughout the political upheavals of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, and, alongside the play's focus on spectacle and sexual comedy, made *The Enchanted Island* one of the most successful plays of its era.

Royal Mistress, Royal Shrew, Royal Murderess

Clarendon's impeachment was not the only political event of the mid-1660s to inspire adaptations or reperformances of pre-Interregnum drama. Increasingly, the power of women at court, particularly in the figure of Barbara Palmer, Lady Castlemaine, was becoming a central subject for satire and gossip. Pepys frequently records sightings of Castlemaine, tracing her fluctuating political influence as the king's mistress, and Castlemaine earned frequent mentions in contemporary satirical poems.[205] Harold Love has argued that the seventeenth century increasingly saw a transition from medieval satire of generalized vice to personalized attacks on individuals and their specific vices. As with drama, the satire of the early 1660s was primarily concerned with reestablishing the social and political structures of the restored monarchy, here through a consistent anti-Puritanism. However, by the late 1660s and early 1670s, court satire had developed as a distinct genre "written within the court by a court author about court personalities for a court readership" and used "as an instrument of factional warfare."[206] Because both playhouses were

---

[204] Pepys, *Diary*, 8: 521-22.
[205] For a multitude of examples, see John Harold Wilson's *Court Satires of the Restoration* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1976).
[206] Harold Love, *English Clandestine Satire, 1660-1702* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 29.

sponsored by and frequently patronized by the court, they found themselves engaged in enacting these same mockeries for more public audiences, albeit often in more obtuse ways.

One of the chief topics for satire during this period, both on and off the stage, was the royal mistresses and other powerful women of the court. In manuscript lampoons, this often took the form of highly personalized attacks on specific individuals; however, on the stage, these critiques were usually far more subtle. Throughout the late 1660s and 1670s there appears to have been a vogue for pre-Interregnum plays featuring women who misuse political power, including Middleton and Rowley's *The Changeling*, Webster's *The Duchess of Malfi*, Shakespeare's version of *King Lear*, and Beaumont and Fletcher's *The Maid's Tragedy*. In three of these four plays, the impetus for the mismanagement of power comes from romantic entanglements, and *The Maid's Tragedy*, with its repentant and murderous royal mistress, seems a particularly pointed critique of the dangers of powerful women.

The popularity of both *The Duchess of Malfi* and *Othello* during this period is indicative of larger trends found in newly written plays that focused on horror, particularly through scenes of extreme violence, many of them directed against women. Anne Hermanson has argued that these trends were part of a reaction to "a growing disaffection with Charles and his policies."[207] As in these two pre-Interregnum tragedies, the horror plays of the 1670s provide "no clear restoration of order and certainly no sense of renewed faith or hope for the future" as they depict the self-destruction of corrupted monarchs and families.

Similarly, Davenant's *Macbeth* saw frequent reperformance from December 1666 until the mid-1670s, more or less without interruption. As discussed in Chapter 2, the

---

[207] Anne Hermanson, *The Horror Plays of the English Restoration* (Surrey: Ashgate, 2014), 2.

adaptation provides much starker contrasts between the murderous Lady Macbeth and the virtuous Lady Macduff, both of whom exercise considerable moral and political influence over their husbands. Together, these plays and newer offerings such as Howard and Dryden's *The Indian Queen* exemplified both fascination with and fear of ambitious women at court.

Even as this period demonstrated a revitalized interest in tragedy, comedies were still quite popular, and the now quintessential genres of Restoration sex comedies and comedies of manners began to develop alongside revivals of older plays like Jonson's *The Alchemist* or Shirley's *The Changes; or, Love in a Maze*. Alongside these comedies came an adaptation of Shakespeare's *Taming of the Shrew*: John Lacy's *Sauny the Scott*, which shifted the action from Padua to London. Lacy also replaced Petruchio's servant Grumio with the titular Sauny, now a crude Scottish servant played by Lacy himself. Sauny's/Grumio's role is, naturally, expanded, and served primarily as a star vehicle for Lacy's theatrical career. However, the play is also highly topical in its presentation of Scottish figures and its denunciation of rebellious women. Aebischer has noted that the two are, through the figures of Sauny and Margaret (Lacy's revision of Katherina), often placed in parallel with one another:

> Although the plot demands that Sauny remain on Petruchio's side and although both Sauny and Petruchio see the taming of Margaret as a joint enterprise, there is an increasingly strong sense as the play progresses of an affinity between the oppressed footman and his mistress. This establishes an implicit parallel between male dominion of women and English rule in Scotland.[208]

---

[208] Pascale Aebischer, "'Steal[ing] Out 'o th' Old Plays' in John Lacy's *Sauny the Scott: Or, The Taming of the Shrew*," *Restoration and 18th-Century Theatre Research* 16.1 (2001): 28-29.

Both the question of Scottish obedience to England and women's obedience to men were increasingly relevant. The failed Pentland Rising demonstrated the social and religious rifts still present between Scotland and England. Likewise, the power of royal mistresses was seen as detrimental to the potential succession and to the king's (and queen's) authority.

However, the mistresses were not without their own means of social and political commentary, and towards the middle of the 1670s, portrayals of powerful women became increasingly nuanced. As with Clarendon's impeachment, dramatists and theater managers used older plays, either in their original texts or in adaptation, as a means to talk about politically sensitive material. This section examines both an example of mistresses' own theatrical authority[209]—Castlemaine's use of *Catiline* to mock a court rival—and a pair of plays which draw upon Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra* in ways that complicate the roles of mistresses and wives and the sway they hold over powerful men: Sedley's *Antony and Cleopatra* and Dryden's *All for Love*.

The 1668 production of Ben Jonson's *Catiline* was long awaited. Jonson's comedies had already found great success on the Restoration stage, and the production of *Catiline* was rumored to be a particularly lavish affair in its staging and costuming, appealing to growing appetites for visual spectacle on stage.[210] These Restoration performances made Jonson's

---

[209] Actresses, too, had a great deal of power within the theater, and roles were often written with the skills and typecasting of particular actresses in mind. Several actresses also became mistresses to members of the court, meaning that these two roles—actress and mistress—were often conflated in the public imagination as well as in performance and statecraft. However, a substantial review of the intricacies of actresses' authority within the playhouses or within politics is beyond the scope of the present project.

[210] See the introduction to the dissertation for a fuller account of the play's spectacle.

play immensely popular, enough so that *Catiline* was reprinted twice and it became a stock play for the King's Company. [211]

Jonson had castigated *Catiline*'s initial Jacobean audiences for liking all the wrong parts—the relatively more action-oriented scenes of the play's first two acts—and for failing to appreciate Cicero's lengthy orations. Although there was an apparently more successful stage revival in 1634, Jonson's play quickly fell out of favor again on stage, though numerous allusions to the play and commonplaces from its speeches suggest that it remained popular reading material throughout the Interregnum. However, in the Restoration, *Catiline* finally found theatrical success. Many of the problems the play illuminates—disenfranchised noblemen, politicking women, and authoritarian government—were perhaps more salient in Charles II's reign than they had been in James I's. Yet the play was not primarily successful for its broader political parallels. Instead, *Catiline*'s popularity, both on stage and in print, arose because it was used to enact a court rivalry between Castlemaine and courtier Anne Harvey on the stage.

Catiline is, at its core, a political play. It traces the Catilinarian conspiracy of 63 BC, in which Roman senator Lucius Sergius Catiline attempted to overthrow the Roman government. His co-conspirators were largely disenfranchised noblemen and unemployed veterans of Sulla's wars. The historical conspirators seem largely to have been motivated by their disenfranchisement from the political and financial systems of Rome. Catiline had failed to win election to the consulship, and many of the other conspirators had either failed

---

[211] John Downes, *Roscius Anglicanus, Or, An Historical Review of the Stage*, ed. Judith Milhous and Robert D. Hume (London: The Society for Theatre Research, 1987), 25.

to succeed politically or had fallen dramatically out of political favor. Many of the veterans Catiline recruited were deeply in debt. Ultimately, the plot was unsuccessful, and the conspirators were executed.[212] Jonson condenses these problems in his play, largely eliding financial questions and using political disenfranchisement as a catalyst rather than a driving force behind the plot.

While the full breadth of *Catiline*'s political saliency to Charles II's reign is beyond the scope of this project, the conspiracy's initial catalysts of financial and political disenfranchisement were at the heart of political debate throughout the beginning of Charles II's reign. Many of the cavaliers who had supported the monarchy in exile still felt slighted as they "saw the flow of patronage and favour diverted from what they considered to be its natural channel."[213] One of the conspirators' primary complaints is that they, the old nobility, are being forced out of power by "new men," embodied in Cicero's victory in the Senate. Considering that Charles II "created a total of sixty-four peers…more than either his father or his grandfather,"[214] the portrayal of another such newly made politician as the play's moral center may have resonated with the courtiers that so frequently patronized the theater, both for better and for worse. Having learned of Catiline's plot, Cicero laments its threat to Rome's fragile peace: "The common-wealth, yet panting, under-

---

[212] Under existing law, the more appropriate punishment would have been exile; however, Cicero pushed for the harsher punishment to fit the extremity of the crime, a move that would ultimately lead to his own exile under the *Leges Clodiae* of 58 BC, which made it illegal to execute a Roman citizen without a trial. The events of the conspiracy are recorded in Sallust's *The Conspiracy of Catiline*, and Cicero's *Catiline Orations* preserve Cicero's speeches to the Senate against Catiline.

[213] Paul Seaward, *The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1661-1667* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1988), 55.

[214] Harris, Tim, *Restoration: Charles II and His Kingdoms* (New York: Penguin Books, 2005), 61.

neath the stripes, and wounds of a late civil war, gasping for life, and scarce restor'd to hope to seek t'oppress her, with new cruelty."[215] Even more so than in Jonson's day, these words would have lent the play an immediacy that its original performance lacked. In 1668, with the civil wars still part of living memory, these lines would have reminded the audience that peace was not a certainty. Moreover, Clarendon's dismissal in December 1668, the same month as *Catiline*'s premier, demonstrated the instability of the current parliament and led to further internecine conflicts as courtiers fought to fill the power vacuum left behind. Ultimately, however, *Catiline* reinforces the idea that rebellion is the ultimate form of villainy. *Catiline* may portray Cicero as a noble and heroic figure, yet it is difficult to forget that, beyond the scope of the play's timeline, Cicero was also instrumental in the downfall of the Roman Republic. This ambivalence would not likely have been lost on Restoration audiences.

Simultaneously, *Catiline*'s depictions of women almost certainly found parallels amongst the women of Charles's court. The play includes only four female roles: Aurelia, Catiline's wife; Fulvia, a courtesan who helps uncover the conspiracy; Sempronia, a would-be politician and rhetorician; and Galla, Fulvia's servant. While each woman is politically interesting in her own right, particularly given the period's interest in the roles of mistresses and wives, it is the role of Sempronia that caught Castlemaine's attention as a vehicle for parody and critique of her court rival Lady Anne Harvey. Sempronia is an aging courtesan struggling to assert her authority and continued relevance. She fancies herself a rhetorician,

---

[215] Ben Jonson, *Catiline*, Printed for A.C., 1669, 32-33.

"forever preening herself on her knowledge of Greek, her eloquence, and her ancestry,"[216] and her emphasis on the power of rhetoric mirrors Cicero's. When her attempts to climb the political social ladder fail, she turns to the rebellion as an alternate source of power though its members, too, are ultimately dismissive of her.

Little is known about who performed most of the roles in *Catiline*—the 1668 printing only lists the names of the male actors and does not assign them roles—but we do know that Katherine Corey performed the role of Sempronia. Corey was a talented comedienne and had previously performed roles such as Doll Common in Jonson's *The Alchemist*—apparently a defining role, given that this is the only name Pepys refers to her by in regards to the *Catiline* scandal—Abigail in Beaumont and Fletcher's *The Scornful Lady*, and Cleorin in Orrery's *The Black Prince*. As an established figure in the Theater Royal, Corey had quite a fan following and would not have been easily dismissed. Even so, following *Catiline*, Harvey had her arrested by the Lord Chamberlain. Castlemaine petitioned the king to have Corey released and returned to the stage. The play was performed again—with Corey's interpretation of Sempronia intact—and Harvey's supporters pelted oranges at Corey while she was onstage. After this, *Catiline* seems to have disappeared from the stage for a time, though its reprinting in 1674 and Downes's description of it as a successful stock play suggests at least semi-frequent revivals throughout the Restoration.

The dispute between Castlemaine and Harvey, however, is more than just an amusing anecdote. Henri Ferneron, working from French ambassador Honoré Courtin's

---

[216] Peter Lake, "Ben Jonson and the Politics of 'Conversion': *Catiline* and the Relocation of Roman (Catholic) Virtue," *The Ben Jonson Journal* 19.2 (2012), 171.

letters, describes Harvey as "a wit among the witty courtiers of the great king," though he also notes that "her contemporaries spoke undisguisedly of her vices."[217] Although it is not entirely clear what the contention between Castlemaine and Harvey truly was, the crux of the matter seems to have lain in Harvey's own attempts to manipulate court politics. Another French ambassador, Colbert De Croissy suggests that Harvey had attempted to turn the king against Castlemaine, who had long been his mistress:

> The Countess of Falmouth complained to the King that Lady Castlemaine had said extremely offensive things about her that threatened to compromise her reputation.[218] This quarrel, which is said to have been incited to Lady Harvey, has further exacerbated the differences that are already quite marked in the Court here, so much so that everyone is at each other's throats, and even those who hold the reins of government are not above getting involved.[219]

Other contemporary accounts also suggest that Harvey and Castlemaine's squabble was not just a private matter. Pepys's report of the event emphasizes that their fighting was a part of larger political disputes, causing "great factions…even to the sober engaging of great persons, and differences, and making the King cheap and ridiculous…it seems the heat is come to a great height, and real troubles at Court about it."[220] Indeed, Charles was trapped between not just warring factions, but also his patronage of the King's Company, including his newest mistress Nell Gwynn. While his freeing of Corey may have been motivated by

---

[217] Henri Forneron, *The Court of Charles II. 1649-1734. Compiled from State Papers*, London: Swann Sonnenschein & Co., 1897, 179.
[218] Falmouth was another of Charles's mistresses. The web of allegiances between courtiers of both sexes amongst the various factions at court was immensely complex and could change both quickly and frequently.
[219] Colbert de Croissy to King Louis XIV, January 11, 1669, in Colin Visser, "Theatrical Scandal in the Letters of Colbert de Croissy, 1669," *Restoration: Studies in English Literary Culture, 1660-1700*, 7.2 (1983), 54-5.
[220] Pepys, *Diary*, 9: 415.

Castlemaine, as Pepys suggests, it could also have been for the sake of preserving his theater and its actors. Interestingly, aside from freeing Corey, Charles seems to have largely stayed out of the conflict, and de Croissy suggests that "the King…thought it better to leave the players free to correct the faults of the entire court.'"[221]

The "great factions" referred to by Pepys may also have shaped the king's response. De Croissy describes Harvey as a tool used by an anti-Clarendon faction in order to discredit Castlemaine, who had recently allied herself with Clarendon's family.[222] He also alludes to disputes between the Duke of Buckingham and the Howard family that may have helped shape the confrontation between Castlemaine and Harvey. As with the *Duke of Lerma*, division between Clarendon's supporters and his enemies played itself out publicly on stage as well as in the comparative privacy of the court and the secrecy of manuscript lampoons.

It took Harvey quite some time to recover from the incident. Robert Gayle Noyes cites a contemporary letter from "Lady Sunderland (Dorothy Sidney) to Martha, Lady Giffard," which also discusses the scandal and its repercussions:

> Your sister will now bee satisfied her intelligence was true, concerning my Lady Harvie, for I suppose she knowes that she has not bine at Court since the King's seeing that she tooke to herself represented after she had made so publicke a complaint of it and now she expects some favourable expressions from his Ma^{tie} to encourage her coming again. . . but the King being a very civill person, and she having a mind to be satisfied the busynesses will probably be don. Tis a dangerous thing I finde for Ladyes to brage of power in State affaires and I am confident it has caused that to be don that would not have bine to any other gentlewoman. Her brother is extremely concerned in her disgrace wh. has bine now a greate while to satisfy those who did not wishe her in favour. I believe nobody is unwillinge she should

[221] Visser, "Theatrical Scandal," 55.
[222] Visser, "Theatrical Scandal," 55.

> showe herselfe in the Drawing-roome, the Queen has taken no notice of this businesse except very privately.[223]

From this letter, Harvey appears to have been quite formidable in her skills as a courtier. Though she was eventually censored through the performance of *Catiline*, she was able to engage in court politics in a way that Sunderland, at least, found unusual for female courtiers. Her behavior was seen as ill-suited to a woman of her class, yet Sunderland's letter suggests that this was not a significant barrier to her participation at court. Only Castlemaine and her supporters seem to have felt threatened by Harvey's influence. Although this letter is undated, it appears that Harvey's removal from court was in fact temporary, as she appeared in the satirical poem "Colin," written sometime in the late summer of 1679.[224] The fact that she was able to return from her disgrace, possibly even with some encouragement from the king and queen, suggests that it was largely Harvey's own embarrassment, and not any official censure, that kept her away.

Ultimately, however, Castlemaine emerged victorious, and the figure of Sempronia became a byword for a would-be female politician. As DeLuna notes, Sempronia "provided anti-Papists with an adaptable satirical mask," noting that not only was Lady Carlisle "attacked under the name Sempronia" but also that "on Dec. 23, 1680, in a speech on the Exclusion Bill designed to bar Catholics from the English throne, the first Earl of Shaftesbury attacked Hortense Mancini [another of Charles's mistresses]…as 'another Lady

---

[223] J. G. Longe, *Martha Lady Giffard, Her Life and Correspondence*, quoted in Robert Gale Noyes, *Ben Jonson on the English Stage 1660-1776* (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press), 1935, 307.
[224] John Harold Wilson, *Court Satires of the Restoration* (Columbus: Ohio State Univ. Press, 1976), 23-31.

that belongs not to the Court, but like Sempronia in *Catiline's Conspiracy* does more mischief than Cethegus.'"[225] Just as Catiline remained in the common imagination as a notorious traitor, so, too, did Sempronia become synonymous with excessive female political involvement. In an era defined by the powerful mistresses of a libertine nobility, Sempronia was yet another image of the negative cultural reaction to female political power.

The scandal of the *Catiline*'s 1668 performances was enough to cause its immediate success, and its broader applicability to Restoration politics and dramatic theory made it a staple stock play in the King's Company's repertoire. Its condemnation of rebellion echoed rhetoric surrounding the Restoration, and thus *Catiline* served an important propagandic role. As the political situation destabilized throughout the 1670s, this same view of dissent would be adopted by the nascent Tory party as a policy of quietism. However, *Catiline* could have been equally attractive to early Whigs. Susan J. Owen notes a proto-Whig interest in dramatic portrayals of the Roman Republic as both an ideal space where "the common people are treated kindly"[226] and the follies of tyrannical rule are exposed. In this, *Catiline* serves as a precursor of a major debate that was building even in the late 1660s and would reach its apex with the Popish Plot in 1678.

Though the 1668 revival of *Catiline* actively staged conflicts between women at court, many other plays dealt with concerns over powerful women throughout the 1670s. This trend culminated in 1677, with the production of two different iterations of the story

---

[225] B. N. DeLuna, *Jonson's Romish Plot: A Study of Catiline and Its Historical Context* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), 342-3.
[226] Susan J. Owen, *Perspectives on Restoration Drama* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), 87.

of one of the most politically powerful women in history: Cleopatra. However, it must be noted that these plays are often more concerned with her role as Marc Antony's mistress than with her own capabilities for rulership. Charles Sedley's *Antony and Cleopatra* debuted in February 1667 at the Duke's Company's Dorset Garden theater, and in December of the same year, John Dryden's *All for Love* was performed at the Drury Lane theater by the King's Company. Though both plays draw from Shakespeare and his sources, neither is, precisely an adaptation of Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra* so much as they are retellings of the same story, and the general structure remains much the same, though with different emphases. Indeed, it has been argued that Dryden's claim that his play is "Written in Imitation of *Shakespeare's* Stile" and the subsequent poetic language are Shakespeare's primary contribution to Dryden's play. Sedley's play, which has been regarded as of less literary worth, has received little scholarship, despite its proximity to Dryden's play. Moreover, the relationship between Sedley and Dryden, who were close friends, has gone unacknowledged in discussions of the plays, even when Sedley's play is addressed as a companion piece or precursor to Dryden's. Both men were staunchly royalist throughout their political and literary careers, and the two plays read well as responses both to growing tensions at the court, particularly over Charles's French mistress Louise de Kérouaille, and to each other, even as they provide competing narratives of Antony and Cleopatra's relationship and demise.

Both Sedley and Dryden are more concerned with the tragic ending and its moral implications than they are with the longer history of the lovers' relationship and political machinations. Their plays start after the battle at Actium has been lost, roughly contemporaneous with the last scenes of Shakespeare's Act III, and end with the lovers'

deaths. In both plays, the casts are considerably reduced to focus on the lover's pathos and its moral implications for their respective nations. Shakespeare's grand, sweeping history is distilled down to its domestic core, but the domestic here is, as in so much of Restoration drama, an analogue for the monarchical state. Together, the two retellings of *Antony and Cleopatra* serve as a cautionary tale against extreme behavior. Both Antony and Cleopatra are depicted as being ruled by their passions—whether for each other or in the broader sense of being dominated by emotional impulse. Dryden condemns them for this, noting that he has attempted to render both characters sympathetic even though "the crimes of love which they both committed, were not occasion'd by any necessity, or fatal ignorance, but were wholly voluntary; since our passions are, or ought to be, within our power."[227] Indeed, this seems to be the central point of both plays: an inability to control one's passion can be disastrous. When elevated to the position of rulers, such passions can destroy nations.

The plays' depictions of Antony are their strongest point of contrast, offering almost completely opposite readings of his character. In *All for Love*, Antony is too cool and melancholy, ponderously meditating on the nature of love and honor. Susan Staves has noted that Dryden's Antony fails as a heroic figure: he is "open to accusations of cowardice…[and] strangely passive, reacting rather than acting."[228] By contrast, Sedley's Antony is too hot and impulsive, allowing his jealousy to dominate him and making abrupt decisions, as he does with Thyreus's execution and his own suicide.

---

[227] John Dryden, *All for Love: or, The World well Lost* (London: Thomas Newcomb for Henry Herringman, 1678), b1r.
[228] Susan Staves, *Players' Scepters*, 42.

In both plays, however, Antony's failures are a direct result of intemperate and ill-directed love, particularly for a woman whose nation is opposed to his own. Such portrayals of Antony must have echoed Charles's frequent intemperate relationships with women other than the queen, and especially with Louise de Kérouaille, who at the time of production was both well established as Charles's most expensive mistress and deeply entrenched in court politics, particularly concerning foreign affairs with France.[229] Fears of her potentially ruinous foreign influence over Charles worried courtiers and citizens alike. The two presentations of Antony—as alternately too impulsive and too meditative—suggest conflicted perceptions over Charles's government, which, itself, vacillated between moments of sudden activity and ponderous delay. A good ruler must be able to make decisive action, without excess passion or undue external influence from foreign courts.

However, despite being "foreign" in the Roman-centric Antony and Cleopatra plays, Cleopatra is not presented as villainous in either play. Instead, she is a sympathetic character who exhibits most of the qualities attributed to tragic heroines in other Restoration plays: she is faithful to Antony even in the face of temptation, and she chooses self-sacrifice and death over the dishonor of being conquered by Rome. Indeed, Dryden's Cleopatra even claims that "Nature meant me / a wife, a silly, harmless, household dove, fond without art, and kind without deceit,"[230] and it is only the mischances of fortune that have led her to be otherwise. In both plays, Cleopatra takes the blame for Antony's

---

[229] Kérouaille's political involvement is summarized in her entry in the *ODNB*, and Henri Forneron's *The Court of Charles II. 1649-1734. Compiled from State Papers* (London: Swann Sonnenschein & Co., 1897) gives a more thorough account of Kérouaille's role at court as both royal mistress and French agent.
[230] Dryden, *All for Love*, 47.

downfall as well as her own. Sedley's Cleopatra laments that she has led Antony astray: "O that betimes he had my Cause forsook! … The *Romans* against me declared the War, / But caught *Antonius* Vertue in that snare."[231] Cleopatra herself thus represents the dangerous influence of a seductive foreign femininity whose needs and desires are antithetical to Antony's and, through him, England's.

Octavia, too, enacts extreme behavior in response to Antony's abandonment of her and their children, demonstrating that emotional extremity is not simply problematic for an individual, but for the family. Since early modern political philosophy often correlated the family with the monarchy,[232] with the monarch serving as the parent to the nation, Octavia's denunciation of Antony as a failed husband in *Antony and Cleopatra* and father in *All for Love* serves also as a warning to the monarchy. Should Charles stray from his patriarchal/monarchical duties for love of another mistress/country, he can expect citizens to react as Octavia does, with anger and despair.

Though the action of both plays focuses firmly on the lovers, the people surrounding them give weight to the plays' examinations of good governance. Both Cleopatra's courtiers and Antony's soldiers attempt to sow discord between the couple, whether out of a desire to see one faction or another succeed in the war, or simply out of fear of the failure of Egyptian society. Antony and Cleopatra's mutual dependence and influence on one another is presented consistently as a liability rather than a strength. Near

---

[231] Sedley, *Antony and Cleopatra*, 49.
[232] This patriarchal understanding of monarchy was particularly relevant in the late 1670s and 1680s, and found its fullest embodiment as a royalist construction in Robert Filmer's *Patriarcha* (1680).

the end of Sedley's play, Antony begs Photinus to explain the source of the turmoil, to which Photinus replies "The people long have discontented been, / Curst me aloud, and murmur'd at the Queen; / That to your side so firmly we adher'd, / And to their Common Peace your Cause preferr'd."[233] Photinus's lines suggest that growing discontent amongst the common citizens has swelled until it has now reached Antony and Cleopatra's most intimate companions.

In *All for Love*, the disorder caused by Antony and Cleopatra's intemperate passions has even brought on natural disaster. The play begins with Serapion, a priest of Isis, explaining that "Portents, and Prodigies, are grown so frequent, that they have lost their Name."[234] This language not only recalls the horrors of 1666 but also echoes Harriet Lyons's analysis of how monstrous births and other "unnatural" phenomena became a means of "illuminat[ing] the politics of amnesia engendered by the conflict of the 1640s in the early Restoration era."[235] These same phenomena of monstrosity and prophecy soon became associated with the Popish Plot and the surrounding anti-Catholic sentiment. Ultimately, Sedley's and Dryden's Antony and Cleopatra plays foreshadow an important trope that was developing late in the 1670s and would become central to theatrical adaptations during the Popish Plot: the use of plays set in Ancient Rome as a means of engaging with foreign xenophobia.

Adaptation as Proving Grounds

---

[233] Sedley, *Antony and Cleopatra*, 46.
[234] Dryden, *All for Love*, 1.
[235] Harriet Lyon, "The Fisherton Monster: Science, Providence, and Politics in Early Restoration England," *The Historical Journal* 60.2, 2017, 333-362, 335.

Throughout the late 1660s and early 1670s, the political situation continued to destabilize. In 1670, Charles signed the secret treaty at Dover, in which he promised to convert to Catholicism in exchange for French support. While this treaty was not public knowledge, James's public conversion in 1675 caused considerable upset in both politics and religion. All of this occurred against the backdrop of growing economic difficulties (particularly for the monarchy), fears of Charles's growing absolutism, and ongoing anti-Catholic Dutch propaganda.

During the same period, the Restoration theater flourished. Many of the central Restoration dramatists established their theatrical careers in the 1670s, and the comedy of manners and heroic dramas that have become so synonymous with Restoration drama were now recognizable genres. With its own theatrical traditions relatively well established, the Restoration theaters had less need to rely on pre-Interregnum drama for survival. Instead, adaptations, revivals, and reprintings became an important part of English cultural preservation and the grounds for a growing genre of dramatic theory. Importantly, the "drama of the last age" had become a necessary component in defining Englishness against foreign (particularly French) culture and literary traditions.

Theatrical records for much of this period are scarce, even in comparison to the rest of Charles's and James's reigns. Pepys ceased attending plays in May 1669, and thus the calendar of specific dates that marked earlier seasons is absent. It is almost certain that the theaters were far more robust—in terms of quantity of performances, if not of individual plays in repertoire—than known records suggest. However, even taking into account the lack of extant records, a few conclusions can be made about trends in theatrical performance during this time. First, while pre-Interregnum drama was still quite popular

throughout the period, during the 1670s, it gradually came to be replaced with new plays. Second, whereas the first seven years of the Restoration were dominated by the plays of Beaumont and Fletcher, their popularity came to be supplemented—though not replaced—by the works of other authors. The theatrical seasons from 1667-1668 and 1677-1678 demonstrate great diversity in terms of which pre-Interregnum playwrights were performed and adapted.

Of particular note are the plays that were performed for multiple seasons, suggesting their longstanding popularity. Of the seventy-three pre-Interregnum plays known to have been performed during this time, ten of them were performed in three or more seasons: Ben Jonson's *The Alchemist*, *Bartholomew Fair*, and *Catiline*; James Shirley's *The Changes; or, Love in a Maze*; John Webster's *The Duchess of Malfi*; Abraham Cowley's *The Guardian* (performed for five seasons); William Shakespeare's *Othello*; Shakespeare and Fletcher's *Henry VIII*; and Beaumont and Fletcher's *Philaster* (performed for five seasons) and *The Scornful Lady* (probably performed for four seasons). As in previous seasons, most of the revived plays were put on by the King's Company, who performed forty-six pre-Interregnum plays under their original titles. By contrast, the Duke's Company only performed twenty-three old plays, though both companies had similarly sized seasons. While it is impossible to know if the King's Company altered the texts that they performed under their original titles, it is clear that the Duke's Company seemed to specialize in adaptations, building off of Davenant's early successes.[236]

---

[236] It is, of course, quite possible that both companies were performing altered plays, but only the alterations from the Duke's Company were published, while the alterations at the

While Davenant's Shakespeare adaptations made up the majority of the alterations of pre-Interregnum drama during the first years of the Restoration, other playwrights began producing adaptations during this period, most of which drew from less well-known sources and made use of them far more subtly. Indeed, creating adaptations seems to have become a sort of proving ground for would-be dramatists, both noble and professional, and many of these adaptations were more liminal cases—borrowing or reusing plots, character types, scenarios, or other elements of plays. Many plays—we might even say *most* plays—made use of other dramatic source texts, sometimes to the extent that Restoration plays read more like palimpsests than original productions. For example, M. W.'s *The Marriage Broker; or, The Pander* (first published in 1662, though likely performed before the Civil War) has been noted as borrowing from William Cartwright's *The Ordinary* (1635), Jasper Mayne's *The City Match* (1636), Abraham Cowley's *The Guardian* (1642), and "rather extensively" from Richard Brome's *The English Moor* (1659).[237] In this case, the newer play makes use of similar plot elements, but reconfigures them significantly enough that it often seems more "inspired by" rather than "rewriting" its source materials. Alfred Harbage, likewise, points toward several relatively straightforward instances of such borrowing:

> The plot of Orrery's *Mustapha* certainly profited from suggestions in Denham's *Sophy* as well as in Davenant's *Siege of Rhodes*, and the plot of the same author's *The General* from suggestion in Suckling's *Brennoralt*. Orrery, considering that his drama has been called so French, was remarkably familiar with the native English plays of Sir John Suckling.[238]

King's Company were performed under their original names but without accompanying republications to reflect any changes that had been made.

[237] Shirley Bell, "*The Marriage Broker* and *The English Moor*," *Notes and Queries* 64.3 (September 2017), 442-5, 442.

[238] Alfred Harbage, *Cavalier Drama: An Historical and Critical Supplement to the Study of the Elizabethan and Restoration Stage* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1964), 54.

These kinds of adaptations were often the foundations of new careers in theater, and while an exhaustive study of them is beyond the scope of the current project, it is useful to look at a few dramatists for whom this was the case.

A wealth of scholarship already exists on Aphra Behn's dramatic career, and while her indebtedness to pre-Interregnum drama is not infrequently discussed, it is often not viewed as a significant element of her work. While contemporary and early eighteenth-century accounts of her work occasionally accused her of plagiarism—particularly in the cases of *The Rover* (an adaptation of Thomas Killigrew's *Thomaso*), *Abdelazer* (an adaptation of the anonymous *Lust's Dominion*), and *Sir Patient Fancy* (an adaptation of Molière's *Le Malade imaginaire*)—Laura Rosenthal has noted that "critics now generally agree that Behn repeated earlier texts no more than contemporaries who escaped the charge [of plagiarism]."[239] While her first play *The Forc'd Marriage* has been read as borrowing from popular tragedies like *Othello* and *The Maid's Tragedy*, these borrowings are subtle, primarily making use of common tropes and themes rather than borrowing scenes or characters wholesale. However, one key difference between Behn and many of her contemporaries is that she primarily, though not exclusively, drew from English sources, and generally from playwrights who were less well known than Shakespeare or Fletcher.

Unlike the model of adaptation popularized by Davenant, in which the source text remains largely intact—if rearranged, cut, and clarified—Behn's adaptations tended to complicate and provide nuance to the texts they borrowed from. As David Roberts had

---

[239] Laura Rosenthal, *Playwrights and Plagiarists in Early Modern England: Gender, Authorship, Literary Property* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1996), 105.

argued, if "allegations of undue borrowing haunted early criticism of Behn's work" her critics "underestimated the speed with which she picked up how to turn current events into drama, how to construct trickster plots in the style of Thomas Middleton and John Marston or how to use Molière to leaven satire with psychology; or simply how to look at the comic style of her contemporaries on the London stage and give in an ingenious, sideways slant."[240] Through this reconceptualization of her source texts, Behn worked in a mode of adaptation that is far more akin to modern retellings of fairy tales—which often seek to recontextualize older stories through modern sociopolitical concerns—than to the adaptations of her contemporaries.

Most of the texts that Behn adapted would have likely been unfamiliar to most of her audience members. *Abdelazer*, one of her more straightforward adaptations, is essentially a revision of *Lust's Dominion*. Though the authorship of *Lust's Dominion* is now debated to the extent that it is effectively anonymous, its initial publication in 1657 was attributed to Christopher Marlowe, "possibly to make the play more saleable,"[241] through a publication strategy similar to that which led to the Shakespearean attribution of *Birth of Merlin* in 1662.[242] This attribution to Marlowe does not seem to have been helpful, however, since, as Todd notes, "in 1661 the remainder of the 1657 printing was being sold with a new title

---

[240] David Roberts, *Restoration Plays and Players: An Introduction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 79.
[241] Janet Todd, *The Works of Aphra Behn*, vol. 5 (Columbus, Ohio State University, 1992), 242.
[242] Modern attribution has suggested Dekker, Day, and Haughton, based on their composition of a lost play, the *Spanish Moors Tragedy*, which some scholars have posited as an alternate title for *Lust's Dominion*.

page."[243] Thus, when Behn came to this play, it was either attributed to a nearly forgotten playwright,[244] or it was presented as yet another anonymous relic from before the Civil Wars.[245] Behn's changes complicate the original play's straightforward sense of morality while also clarifying the actions and motivations of many of the characters. Like Howard's *The Duke of Lerma*, the play rewrites Spanish history to tell a story of political intrigue. Such borrowing was often indicative of the increasingly global scope of Restoration dramatists' intellectual sphere.

These trends in adaptation gave new dramatists a wealth of material from which to draw, whether they adopted only themes and topics or borrowed plots wholesale. Adaptation also, importantly, gave a level of plausible deniability to the dramatists: should a play be poorly received or be censored for touching too closely on current politics, the playwright could always blame their source rather than their own pen. While actual acts of censorship were rare, fears of lost revenue from an abruptly ended performance run likely made playwrights and theater managers both quite reluctant to stage anything too scandalous, at least in terms of politics. As theaters grew increasingly focused on visual

---

[243] Todd, 242.

[244] Like many other Elizabethan playwrights, Marlowe's name is almost unknown in Restoration drama or criticism. Prior to the printing of *Lust's Dominion*, Marlowe's drama had not been in print since 1633. Only one of his plays, *Doctor Faustus*, was reprinted or reperformed during the Restoration. The attribution of *Lust's Dominion*, then, is an oddity, and could potentially be explained as an evolution of author-centric publication practices throughout the Interregnum, as discussed in the Prologue to this work.

[245] During her early career, Behn also adapted George Wilkins's *The Miseries of Inforst Marriage,* which had not been printed since 1637, as *The Town Fopp*. Two other adaptations from this period, *The Counterfeit Bridegroom* (an adaptation of Thomas Middleton's *No Wit, No Help Like a Woman*) and *The Debauchee* (an adaptation of Richard Brome's *A Mad Couple Well Matched*), have also been attributed sporadically to Behn.

spectacle, however, following the success of new English operas, tragedies developed a new interest in the horrific and the grotesque. Elkanah Settle chose to adapt William Hemming's exceedingly bloody *Fatal Contract* as the more decorous (at least in terms of staged violence) *Love and Revenge*.[246]

The evolution of the horror genre also guided the early career of Nathaniel Lee, whose *Tragedy of Nero* (performed 1674, printed 1675) was an early entry in the genre and adapted the anonymous *Piso's Conspiracy* of 1624. Indeed, there seems to have been something of a vogue for gruesome adaptations of plays set in ancient Rome, including *The Roman Virgin* (an adaption of John Webster's *Appius and Virginia*), the Antony and Cleopatra plays discussed above, and a revival of *Julius Caesar*. This interest in Roman history would evolve into an important means of critiquing foreign influence over England, as we will see in Chapter Five.

Ultimately, the plays of the early 1670s address concerns about court politics rather gently: they either condemn regicide through focusing on virtuous subjects (*The Duke of Lerma* and *Macbeth*) or by painting rebellion as utterly villainous (*Catiline*), poke fun at authoritarian rulers (*The Tempest*), or offer a complex and sympathetic view of the struggles rulers face (*Antony and Cleopatra* and *All for Love*). As playwrights began to experiment with forms of adaptation, dramatists like Behn and Settle began looking for greater moral complexity, even as they challenged the scenic capabilities of the stage. More broadly the

---

[246] Interestingly, Settle credits Hemming as his source, which Carol A. Morley suggests was likely to avoid accusations of plagiarism that had plagued his earlier *Empress of Morocco*. See *The Plays and Poems of William Heminge* (Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, 2006), 246.

practice of adapting pre-Interregnum drama increasingly became a means for would-be dramatists to test and develop their skills. The fashions that developed during this period—especially the genre of horror tragedy, an interest in Roman history plays, and the increasing politicization of drama—shaped the theater of Charles's most difficult struggles: the Popish Plot and the Exclusion Crisis.

CHAPTER V

FACTIONS, PLOTS, AND POPERY: ADAPTING SHAKESPEARE'S GREEK AND ROMAN PLAYS (1678-1682)[247]

The late 1670s had become a "cursed plotting Age" in which "each fool turns Politician…and wears / A formal face, and talks of State-affairs; / Makes Acts, Decrees, and a new Modell draws / For regulation both of Church and Law."[248] Significant divisions were forming within Parliament and the court and quickly spread to a highly political public quick to issue proclamations and petitions of their own. Many of these divisions were rooted in religious or economic debates, and they were amplified by an increasing political awareness amongst the common folk, particularly in London. Tim Harris's *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II: Propaganda and Politics from the Restoration until the Exclusion Crisis* traces this growth of political engagement largely to greater literacy levels and widespread political print propaganda, as well as to social establishments such as coffee houses and taverns, where such documents would be read aloud and debated. During the early- and mid-1670s, those with Whiggish sympathies became particularly adept at creating documents that expressed their growing dissatisfaction with the Court's profligate spending and libertine habits, both Catholicism and many of the trappings of Anglicanism, and fears of Catholics in government. In the theaters, new plays and adaptations were increasingly interested in the portrayal of how political propaganda and division could lead to rebellion and civic crisis.

---

[247] Keywords: *Caius Marius*, crowds, *Coriolanus*, Popish Plot, Shakespeare, spectacular violence, *Timon of Athens*, *Titus Andronicus*, *Troilus and Cressida*, tyranny

[248] Aphra Behn, "Prologue," *The Feign'd Curtizans; or, A Night's Intrigue*, London: Printed for Jacob Tonson, 1679.

Thus, by August 1678, when Titus Oates and Israel Tonge "revealed" the Popish Plot to kill the king and return England to Catholicism, the Whig propaganda mill was well-positioned to stir the country into a frenzy of paranoia and fear. The Court and Parliament became increasingly fragmented over responses to the so-called Plot and all of the attendant fears that it amplified. Concerns over Charles's standing army intensified, as did fears of James's succession. Wild accusations from Oates and his confederates threw suspicion on a variety of known Catholics, from relatively humble priests to James's former secretary Edward Coleman and even Queen Catherine. The murder of Sir Edmund Godfrey, a justice who had heard one of the earliest recounting of the Plot, quickly amplified fears by giving them a sense of legitimacy. Catholics were driven from court and from London itself, and many of them were sent to the Tower of London. A new Test Act was passed, preventing Catholics from participating in Parliament, and though James was excluded from the Act, many began calling for him to be removed from the line of succession completely. Parliament was dissolved, James was exiled, and England began to fear another civil war.[249]

The theaters, like most of popular culture, responded intensely and publicly to the Popish Plot and the divisions it created within the government. Most plays performed between 1678 and 1682, regardless of their actual content, featured politically oriented prologues and epilogues. While there is some variation in the intensity of their condemnation of popery—many playwrights treated the plot, rightfully, as overblown, if

---

[249] This is, of course, a very simplified version of perhaps one of the most complicated periods in Restoration history. For a more detailed analysis of the Popish Plot and its many covert and internecine struggles, see John Kenyon's *The Popish Plot* (London: William Heinemann, 1972).

not a hoax—the vast majority of prefatory materials from this time express a fear of the increasing division of political (and occasionally religious) allegiances. Many of the plays written during the late 1670s and early 1680s also deal with these same concerns. While a wealth of scholarship has sought to align specific plays, or even specific dramatists, to either Whiggish or (predominantly) Tory sympathies, Susan Owen has noted that of the 54 new plays written during the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis seasons, "the same dramatist may veer from tormented quietism, to rousing royalism, to a Whiggish focus on anti-popery and hostility to the court, to scathing Tory satire. Even 'canonical' authors such as Dryden respond flexibly and with enormous vitality and ingenuity to political shifts."[250] This is not to suggest that playwrights wrote only to appease whichever ideology was currently in vogue. Rather, playwrights used the theater as a place to examine and tease out the implications of political division and, increasingly, fears of another civil war.

Such political engagement was dangerous, however, both professionally and financially. As Margaret Ezell has discussed, the political disputes of the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis and their often violent outcomes were highly public noting that "the need for the government and the Church of England to control what was published and performed between 1675 and 1685 was acute."[251] Numerous plays were banned from the stage or forced to undergo significant cuts before they were deemed acceptable for performance.[252] In many cases, these plays were able to be printed, though often after a lag

---

[250] Susan J. Owen, *Restoration Theatre and Crisis* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996).
[251] Margaret J. M. Ezell. *The Oxford English Literary History, Volume 5: 1645-1717; The Later Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: OUP, 2017), 252.
[252] Examples include John Banks's *The Island Queen*; Nathaniel Lee's *Lucius Junius Brutus*; Lee and John Dryden's *The Duke of Guise*; Thomas Shadwell's *Lancashire Witches*; John Crowne's

of some years, and with lengthy prefaces or dedicatory epistles explaining their prohibition from the stage. For both the playwrights and the theaters, these delays and bans caused significant financial hardship. Playwrights were often only paid on the third day of performances, which most of these plays did not reach. Even when plays weren't being censored, the playhouses often had difficulty in selling enough tickets due to the uncertain nature of the times.

It is difficult to assess the exact nature of performances during the Popish Plot. While it is likely that the theaters relied heavily on stock plays, which, at this point, would still largely have consisted of pre-Interregnum drama, there is little concrete evidence for such a practice. The reasons for this are several. First, the records for this period are incredibly scarce, even by Restoration standards. Most records are derived from the Lord Chamberlain's list, the Term Catalogues, or the Stationer's Register, which generally only include new performances, licenses, or publications. For pre-Interregnum plays and other plays which had been previously performed but whose revival was not marked by a new publication, we are forced to rely on sporadic references in letters, memoirs, newspapers, or other ephemera. Thus, it is quite likely that far more plays were performed during this period than we have records of, and further archival work may eventually provide us with a fuller history. After 1685, as we move closer toward 1700, theatrical advertisements in newspapers and playbills become more frequent, allowing us to trace theatrical offerings far more closely.

Henry the Sixth, the First Part, *The Miseries of Civil War*, and *City Politiques*; and Nahum Tate's *Richard the Second*.

Secondly, this period also saw a wave of new plays as playwrights such as Aphra Behn, Thomas Shadwell, Nathaniel Lee, and Thomas Otway reached the peaks of their careers. Alongside numerous new plays, many of which dealt with the politics of the Popish Plot and the Exclusion Crisis, many playwrights wrote highly topical adaptations, particularly of Shakespeare. Indeed, Emma Depledge has argued that this period and its proliferation of Shakespeare alterations was key in establishing Shakespeare as the preeminent historical English playwright in the eighteenth century. The repurposing of pre-Interregnum plays as adaptations may have seemed far more useful than simply restaging the originals. It has become a critical and creative commonplace to assert that the texts of Shakespeare and his contemporaries allow a level of political safety, and while throughout the next two chapters I will be interrogating this idea, it is quite likely that this provided at least an initial justification for the adaptations that dominated this period.

Several dramatists responded to the instability of the late 1670s through adapting the works of Shakespeare in novel ways. Ten of Shakspeare's tragedies and histories were rewritten between 1678-1685, and in most cases these adaptations superseded Shakespeare's originals on the stage throughout the eighteenth century. There are many possible reasons for this wave of adaptation. Many playwrights note connections between the adapted play and the current political moment in their prefaces or prologues. Adapting earlier English works may have been seen as less politically inflammatory or more apt to evoke comparisons to earlier political conflicts. Commenting too openly on political affairs was almost certain to get a play censored or banned, which meant lost revenue for both playhouses and playwrights. Conversely, the increasing emphasis on Shakespeare as an unpolished literary genius may also have served to draw audiences, and surely it was easier

to revise an old play than to write a wholly new one, especially in such tumultuous times. Furthermore, the theaters suffered from smaller audiences and reduced income during this period of uncertainty, and recent successes in performing Shakespeare's plays—in their original or in adaptation—may have led the theaters to hope for increased ticket sales.

The approach to adapting Shakespeare during this period underwent a major shift throughout this period, as playwrights who had previously given no attribution to their source texts were now discussing Shakespeare's merits at length. To some extent, this can be contributed to the increased popularity of lengthy critical essays, dedicatory epistles, and other paratextual materials. However, it seems equally important to note that in emphasizing their Shakespearean source texts, sometimes through comparing Shakespeare with his contemporaries, these dramatists were claiming a specifically English lineage for their own plays, which likely provided them with both a veneer of historical respectability and a level of plausible deniability should their adaptations prove too politically sensitive. Indeed, this precise approach was used when Tate's adaptation of *Richard II*, reframed as *The Sicilian Usurper*, was banned from performance (as discussed in Chapter 4).

Nearly all of the adaptations of this period note their Shakespearean source, whether in a dedicatory epistle, a critical essay, or a prologue. However, the playwrights are often eager to distance themselves from their source texts, even as they attempt to use Shakespeare's name as a kind of shield from accusations of impropriety: they have taken bad plays and made them good, but there is only so much one can do with flawed material. However, such attributions, whether they appeared in the performance or only in print, did not guarantee that the playwright would be free of accusations of plagiarism.

In the beginning of his epistle to the reader, Ravenscroft presents himself as keenly aware of the charges of plagiarism that plagued other dramatists of the 1670s:[253] "That I may not appear Guilty of such a Crime, 'tis necessary I should acquaint you, that there is a Play in Mr. *Shakespeares* Volume under the name of *Titus Andronicus* from whence I drew part of this."[254] In invoking Shakespeare's name, Ravenscroft places himself in the long line of dramatists who use Shakespeare as source for their adaptations or as a centerpiece of their theories about drama and its functions. However, Ravenscroft quickly backs away from associating the play with Shakespeare, claiming that he was "told by some anciently conversant with the Stage, that it was not Originally his, but brought by a private Author to be Acted, and [Shakespeare] only gave some Master-touches to one or two of the Principal Parts or Characters." The play, then, is not Shakespeare's, but merely touched up by him, just as Ravenscroft has now made further improvements on a text he found "the most incorrect and indigested piece in all [Shakespeare's] Works…a heap of Rubbish." Such complaints were not unusual in adapting older plays, particularly Shakespeare's, and

---

[253] Laura Rosenthal discusses such accusations at length in *Playwrights and Plagiarists in Early Modern England: Gender, Authorship, Literary Property* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996), and she argues that the late seventeenth century "defined authorship not just through a material economy of literary property, but through the symbolic economies of social and cultural capital. Authorship becomes meaningful through both material ownership and culturally contingent gestures of attribution" (3). Thus, accusations of plagiarism were often a means of the theatrical community policing and attempting to delegitimize the works of its own members—a skillful adaptation might be praised, but an adaptation which was poorly constructed or too derivative might be accused of plagiarism, particularly if it infringed on the recent plays or performances of another dramatist or company.

[254] Edward Ravenscroft, *Titus Andronicus; or, The Rape of Lavinia* (London: Printed by J. B. for J. Hindmarsh, 1687), A2r.

particularly in the later years of the Restoration stage, when a new generation of dramatists with their own dramatic traditions had been fully established.

Thus, Nahum Tate describes *King Lear* as "a heap of jewels, unstrung and unpolished; yet so dazzling in their disorder" in his 1681 adaptation.[255] Even gentler approaches to this kind of anti-humilitas take pains to mark Shakespeare as something lesser than what the current dramatist has produced. Shadwell's *Timon of Athens* begins with a dedicatory epistle to the Duke of Buckingham, which both praises and condemns the source play: "I am now to present your Grace with this History of *Timon*, which you were pleased to tell me you liked, and it is the more worthy of you, since it had the inimitable hand of *Shakespear* in it, which never made more Masterly strokes than in this. Yet I can truly say, I have made it into a play."[256] This statement, of course, invites the question as to what it might have been before—Ravenscroft's pile of rubbish, or Tate's collection of unstrung jewels?

Michael Dobson notes that Shadwell's adaptation of *Timon of Athens* is significant for its implicit argument about the nature of adaptation; it "explains the adaptor's right to have his name on the title page…by prefacing it with a description of the crucial work he has carried out on the text in question: 'Made into a PLAY. By THO. SHADWELL.'"[257] Unlike many of his contemporary adapters, Shadwell presents Shakespeare in wholly admirable

---

[255] Nahum Tate. *The History of King Lear* (London: Printed for E. Flesher, 1681), A2v.
[256] Shadwell, *The History of Timon of Athens, the Man-Hater* (London: Printed by J. M. for Henry Herringman, 1678), A3r.
[257] Michael Dobson, *The Making of the National Poet: Shakespeare, Adaptation, and Authorship, 1660-1769* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992).

terms.[258] In his preface, he describes his play as "more worthy…since it had the inimitable hand of *Shakespear* in it, which never made more Masterly strokes than in this." Such high praise, of course, does not prevent Shadwell from asserting that he himself has "made it into a play," presumably through his expansion of what is one of Shakespeare's briefest plays, and his balancing of a very male-centric plot with female characters, and his heightening of the play's political intrigue. The Epilogue, too, offers similar praise for Shakespeare, claiming "If there were hopes than ancient solid Wit / Might please within our new fantastic Pit; / This Play might then support the Criticks shock, / This *Scien* grafted upon *Shakespears* stock." Thus, both theatergoers and readers would have been alerted to Shadwell's debt to Shakespeare.[259]

This attribution pattern is also present in Dryden's *Troilus and Cressida*, which discusses Shakespeare's play and his legacy in both an extensive prefatory essay and a prologue spoken by Shakespeare's ghost. The prefatory essay, now often known as the "Grounds of Criticism in Tragedy," dissects the faults of Shakespeare's play, finding that while Shakespeare "seems to have begun it with some fire" it quickly descends into "nothing but a confusion of Drums and Trumpets, Excursions and Alarms" leading to a

---

[258] Otway, too, provides a favorable depiction of Shakespeare, claiming that Shakespeare wrote in a "blest" age when poets never had to fear for their patronage and thus "wrote with Fancy unfoncin'd, / And Thoughts that were Immortal as his Mind." Thomas Otway, *The History and Fall of Caius Marius* (London: Tho[mas] Fletcher, 1680), A3r.

[259] While modern editions have generally accepted Thomas Middleton as Shakespeare's co-author on *Timon*, attributing roughly a third of the play to the younger dramatist, such an attribution was not made until the twentieth century. For more on *Timon*'s authorship, see the introductions to the play in both *Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works* (ed. Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino) and the Arden *Timon of Athens* (ed. Anthony B. Dawson and Gretchen E. Minton).

"heap of Rubbish, under which many excellent thoughts lay wholly bury'd."[260] The prologue is, as Dobson, has noted, more overtly political, "magnifying Shakespeare to enable him to stand not only as a type of the current troubled dynasty but as a figure for 'fruitfull *Britain*' itself."[261] Thus Shakespeare becomes a prime model for England's literary past. In this representation, Dryden clarifies the purpose of adapting Shakespeare throughout the Popish Plot and the Exclusion Crisis: his growing status as one of, if not *the*, preeminent English poet of the pre-Interregnum stage, allowed Restoration dramatists to adapt his works as an act of demonstrating the richness of English literary history, while also commenting on contemporary politics.

Of course, not all adaptations were political in nature, though one might argue that ignoring the tense political atmosphere was a political statement in its own right. As Jean Marsden has noted, Dryden's *Troilus and Cressida* and D'Urfey's *The Injur'd Princess* (an adaptation of *Cymbeline*) are deviants rather than indicative of the times, as they "refer negatively to the politics of the time by their steadfast avoidance of any topic that might be seen as inflammatory," and both texts are reduced to their love plots.[262] Lucyle Hook asserts that the plays adapted under the King's Company (*Titus Andronicus*, *All for Love*, *The Sicilian Usurper*, *The Ingratitude of a Commonwealth*, and *The Injur'd Princess*) "were predominantly male offerings, having been selected and rewritten with Mohun and Heart in mind."[263] By

---

[260] John Dryden, *Troilus and Cressida; or, The Truth Found Too Late* (London: Jacob Tonson and Abel Swell, 1679), 4v.
[261] Dobson, 74-5.
[262] Jean I. Marsden, *The Re-Imagined Text: Shakespeare, Adaptation, and Eighteenth-Century Literary Theory* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1995), 164-5, n. 61.
[263] Lucyle Hook, "Shakespeare Improv'd, or A Case for the Affirmative," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 4.3 (1953), p. 294.

contrast, the Duke's Company's strong core of actresses—Mary Lee, Anne Shadwell, and Elizabeth Barry—made plays with added or vastly expanded women's roles appealing. 1678 and 1679 see a wave of highly politicized Shakespeare adaptations, all of which look to Greek or Roman history as a means of interrogating xenophobia and internal division. This does not, of course, suggest that the playhouses were particularly altruistic when it came to Catholics. Many of the plays staged in the 1678-1679 and 1679-1680 seasons were incredibly anti-Catholic, whether as part of the central plot or in their prologues and epilogues.

The theaters were hardly immune from the anti-Catholic paranoia of the Popish Plot, though the majority of plays produced during this period functioned as biting anti-Catholic satire and political propaganda. As Michael Dobson has argued, the Popish Plot "generated a theatrical climate in which every play produced was potentially controversial, certain to be scrupulously interrogated by censors and audiences alike for covert or explicit propagandist intentions, secret plots, or dangerous sympathies."[264] This held true for original productions and adaptations alike, though many plays saw performance before their banning, which "suggests that either the pre-production licensing was of minor importance or that the implications of these plays did not come to full understanding until they had been acted."[265] Again, as with *Catiline* and other earlier revivals of pre-Interregnum drama, it is likely that the plays chosen for revival during this period addressed elements of the political moment.

---

[264] Michael Dobson, *The Making of the National Poet: Shakespeare, Adaptation, and Authorship, 1660-1769* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), 63-4.
[265] *The London Stage*, cxlvii.

The adaptations written during the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis can be broken into two distinct groups: those that drew from Shakespeare's Greek and Roman plays, and those that adapted his British histories. While there is some overlap in the political interests of these two groups, generally, the adaptations of the Greek and Roman plays were earlier and focused more broadly on the themes of political division and civil war, framed through the specter of foreign invasion, while the English histories tended to be adapted later and focused specifically on questions of rightful succession.

This chapter analyzes adaptations of *Timon of Athens*, *Titus Andronicus*, and *Romeo and Juliet* (performed as *Caius Marius*), with brief glimpses at *Troilus and Cressida* and *Coriolanus*. While readings of these plays have often been reduced to a Whig/Tory binary, I contend that the actual politics being presented are far more ambivalent. Rather than adhering to a particular partisan view, each play expresses alarm at the ways in which political or social authority is used to create opposing factions, the ability of those factions to mobilize crowds, and the potential for violence encapsulated in both intense political opposition and mob action.

Timon of Athens **(1678—Shadwell)**

The first Shakespearean adaptation following the Popish Plot is also the most unusual. In many respects, Shadwell's *Timon of Athens* is representative of broader Restoration trends in adapting Shakespeare: it draws heavily on Shakespeare's plot, while also expanding it to address contemporary political concerns. Roles are often doubled to provide moral contrast, and Shadwell includes two new women's roles, each of which reflects a different archetype of Restoration dramatic femininity. Spectacle-filled scenes such as Timon's banquet and the conclusion's mob are extended to make the play more visually

appealing, and music from Henry Purcell is added, and though the play never develops into an opera, it does share some characteristics with Shadwell's operatic adaptation of Dryden and Davenant's *Tempest* in terms of its attention to staging. Throughout, the language is simplified, extended metaphors are made more direct, and archaic phrasing is modernized. Even so, Shadwell's play has often been read as an outlier in its political alignment: of all the political adaptations of the Exclusion Crisis, only *Timon* is consistently read as pro-Opposition or proto-Whiggish in its sympathies.

In part, this association has as much to do with Shadwell's own political engagement as it does with the content of the play itself. Shadwell was a member of the Green Ribbon Club, one of the most notorious pro-Opposition political societies in London, and made up of a number of important lawyers, politicians, and writers. While recent studies have suggested that the Green Ribbon Club was not as central to Opposition politics as once believed, it was one of the primary producers of Opposition propaganda throughout England.[266] While the majority of Shadwell's plays were dedicated to William Cavendish, Duke of Newcastle, or other members of the Cavendish family, he also frequently dedicated plays to politicians who would later serve as the core of the Opposition party: George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham; Charles Sackville, Earl of Dorset and Middlesex; and James Scott, Duke of Monmouth. The content of his plays was often politically provocative and bitingly satiric. While many of his contemporaries drew upon Fletcherian or

---

[266] For more on the Green Ribbon Club's activities, see Tim Harris, "Green Ribbon Club" (act. c. 1674–c. 1683)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 24 May. 2008; Accessed 6 Dec. 2020. https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-92786.

Shakespearean models, Shadwell venerated Jonson. Most of the playwrights from this era who have become central to the Restoration canon, such as Dryden, Behn, or Etherege, were royalist in their political leanings, which makes Shadwell's work all the more important for considering the full breadth of political stances of the period.

Shadwell's adaptation of *Timon of Athens* premiered at a period of intense anti-Catholicism leading up to the Popish Plot. After learning of James, Duke of York's conversion to Catholicism, members of parliament proposed bills to disenfranchise Catholics from politics and prevent James's accession to the throne. These actions would reach their climax a few years later with the Exclusion Crisis. While no records of specific performances exist, *Timon* was certainly performed sometime during the 1677-1678 season, likely shortly after being licensed on 18 February 1677/8. The print version appeared sometime that same year, and Henry Purcell's musical accompaniment was published in *Choice Ayres and Songs* (1679) and Downes remarks that it was "very well acted, and the Musick in't well Perform'd; it wonderfully pleas'd the Court and City; being an Excellent Moral."[267] Like most Restoration adaptations, including Shadwell's earlier revision of the Dryden-Davenant *Tempest*, Shadwell's *Timon* reshaped its source text through the addition of visual and musical spectacle—here, most profound in the alteration and expansion of the masque in Shakespeare and Middleton's 1.2—and it's new and expanded roles for women: Evadne, Timon's loyal mistress, and Melissa, Timon's fickle fiancée. These roles significantly reshape the source text's famously masculine cast.

---

[267] Quoted in *The London Stage*, vol. 1, 266.

In print, the play's political allegiances are immediately signaled by Shadwell's dedication of the play to the Duke of Buckingham, who by the late 1670s was one of the key leaders of the growing Opposition movement and was particularly known for his work on behalf of Protestant dissenters. While Shadwell's epistle dedicatory primarily discusses Buckingham's own literary successes and his "excellency of Wit and Judgement in [his] Self, and so justly the defect of 'em in others," his brief mention of Buckingham's enemies alludes to the political difficulties that Buckingham faced around the time of *Timon*'s licensing in February 1677. Buckingham was imprisoned in the Tower of London on 17 February 1677, presumably for arguing that "the last long prorogation had been unconstitutional and that therefore Parliament was dissolved" and released on 5 August 1677.[268] Several scholars have read Alcibiades as an analogue for Buckingham. Gary Taylor's *Reinventing Shakespeare* suggests that the play "highlighted parallels between Alcibiades's attacks on the Athenian Senate and the reforming Duke of Buckingham's attacks on the English house of Commons"[269] Similarly, Canfield also sees Alcibiades as a kind of Buckingham, who, through his "freeing" of the people will ultimately cause anarchy. However, given that Alcibiades's overthrow of the Roman senate is ambiguous in its moral and political sentiment, such a reading seems incongruous with the play's dedication to Buckingham.

---

[268] Christine Phipps, ed. *Buckingham: Public and Private Man* (New York and London, Garland Publishing, 1985), 25-7.
[269] Gary Taylor, *Reinventing Shakespeare: A Cultural History from the Restoration to the Present* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 24.

Instead, I suggest that *Timon of Athens* serves as a meditation on Buckingham's personal and political difficulties, much of which can be expanded to the broader struggles of the Opposition party. Buckingham, like Timon, was a known patron of the arts, and he had "ever-present financial worries" throughout the 1670s, largely due to his falling out of favor with the king and his inner circle.[270] By addressing the play to Buckingham, Shadwell was not only acknowledging the duke's patronage of his work and Buckingham's own literary skill, Shadwell was offering joint cautions to Buckingham that he should let neither poverty nor political drive overwhelm him.

The primary political content of the play, however, comes in Shadwell's alterations to the characters of Timon and Alcibiades and the expanded ending. Together, Shadwell's alterations make for a version of *Timon* in which the *vox populi* is granted authority not often found on the Restoration stage. While commonplace critiques of libertinism and mercenary love are also present, they are harsher here than in earlier examples, like *All for Love* or many of the popular comedies of manners, foreshadowing a trend toward moral absolutism in Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis adaptations. Likewise, the growing political divide between old nobility and new money—and likewise between court and country—is teased out in *Timon*'s themes of the economic and social power of wealth.

Like most plays of the period, Shadwell's *Timon* is concerned with the libertine nature of the court and the often-associated fears of "mercenary" or excessively self-interested behavior in romance and marriage. In the tradition of the sex comedies that

---

[270] Christine Phipps, ed. *Buckingham: Public and Private Man* (New York and London, Garland Publishing, 1985), 18.

became popular throughout the 1670s, Shadwell reshapes Timon himself as a libertine who exists in a world of luxury and hedonistic pleasure, and who seeks to both make a political marriage to the faithless Melissa and maintain his faithful mistress Evandra. In this love triangle, Shadwell's *Timon* can be read as an early example of how adaptations of Shakespeare in the Popish Plot reshaped their source texts to create starker moral axes. While morality in *Timon* as a whole is somewhat more complex than later iterations, such as Edward Ravenscroft's adaptation of *Titus Andronicus*, it does emphasize that extreme behaviors—whether of good or evil, benevolence or misanthropy, mercenariness or faithfulness—are the cause of disaster at both the personal and national levels.

Following Shakespeare, Shadwell's Timon moves from extreme munificence and conviviality, both now tinged with a Restoration libertinism, to a hostile misanthropy which fails to be swayed even by faithful love. Shadwell's Timon is, in many senses, the antithesis of the comedic libertine antihero so popular in plays like *The Country Wife* or *The Man of Mode*. He represents a new, cynical kind of libertine who "in spite of a manifest contempt for heroic idealizations he nonetheless held fast to courtly-aristocratic values, none of which was more important than his eroding autonomy that mirrored the predicament of the crown."[271] In both Shakespeare's and Shadwell's iterations of *Timon*, wealth is the means by which this aristocratic power is established and wielded. Without it, Timon has no social or political cachet with which to maintain his status among his peers. His generosity has

---

[271] Richard Braverman, "The Rake's Progress Revisited: Politics and Comedy in the Restoration," in *Cultural Readings of Restoration and Eighteenth-Century English Theatre*, ed. J. Douglas Canfield and Deborah Payne Fisk (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1995), 150.

bought temporary power, not true friendship, and when he turns to his supposed friends to bail him out of debt, they summarily refuse, often while flaunting the gifts that Timon had previously given them. Likewise, Apemantus points out that the senators "swell and grow fat with their oppression," emphasizing the symbiotic relationship of wealth and political power.

Timon's shift from extreme wealth and power to utter poverty and misanthropy is starker in Shadwell's play than in Shakespeare's, largely because Shadwell's Timon does not endure his exile alone. While much of Timon's descent into misanthropy at the banquet is pulled directly from Shakespeare, in the scenes that follow, Evandra is a nearly constant presence throughout the remainder of Timon's scenes in Shadwell's version. Her steadfast faithfulness counteracts Timon's persistent pessimism by providing a vision of humanity that is still worth being part of. Despite Evandra's demonstrations of selfless love, however, Timon continues his misanthropic rage, eventually leading to both of their deaths. In this way, Timon's anger against a small subset of humanity leads ultimately to the destruction of the only character in the play who consistently presents virtue as its own driving force.

Shadwell couples Shakespeare's interrogation of the sociopolitical power of wealth with an expanded examination of how society and politics shape conviviality and social integration. Much of this new material appears in the expansions of the roles of Alcibiades and Apemantus, both of whom serve as foils to Timon and to one another. Alcibiades's justice in Shadwell's *Timon* is not the justice of Athens, but private vengeance couched in a public uprising. In the play's penultimate scene, Apemantus tells him "'Tis true, this base Town deserves thy scourge, and all the Terror and the punishment, thou can'st inflict upon it: the deed is good, but yet thou dost it ill; private revenge, base passion, headstrong lust,

incite thee to it." Where Timon sees the world as evil and retreats from it, Alcibiades fights to correct the injustices of the Senate, even if he ultimately only manages to install his own form of tyranny.

In a similar fashion, Shadwell vastly expands Apemantus's role in order to give a clearer picture of true misanthropy to contrast with Timon's later man-hating. Apemantus's first speeches demonstrate a complete lack of faith in humanity's potential:

> What is this foolish animal man, that we
> Should magnifie him so? a little warm,
> And walking Earth that will be ashes soon;
> We come into the world crying and squalling,
> And so much of our time's consum'd in driv'ling infancy,
> In ignorance sleep, disease and trouble, that
> The remainder is not worth the being rear'd to.[272]

He continues on to explain that all of humanity's inventions—from art to science to sports—are but diversions that seek to make happiness out of misery. For Apemantus, there is nothing redeemable in humanity, and he sees even Alcibiades's conquest of Athens as inherently self-serving and hypocritical, meant to revenge himself upon a Senate who rejected him rather than as a genuine attempt at altruism. In many senses, Apemantus is the play's moral center, if a bleak one. His dislike of humanity does not seem to stem from a specific source, unlike Timon's, but is generalized toward humanity's tendencies toward self-interest, hedonism, and hypocrisy. Yet Apemantus, again unlike Timon, persists in existing alongside humanity, continuing to vociferously critique their behavior even though he seems to hold no hope of ever effecting change.

---

[272] Thomas Shadwell, *The History of Timon of Athens, the Man-hater* (London: Printed by J.M. for Henry Herringman, 1678), 9.

The play's female roles are balanced across a similar moral axis to that of their male counterparts: their capacity for loyalty in love. Canfield's *Heroes and States* looks at this question extensively, particularly in terms of "attacking the mercenary motives of marriage itself" in the person of Melissa.[273] As with many plays in the Restoration, the romantic relationships can be transposed onto the relationship between king and country. Though Timon's motives in marrying Melissa are somewhat unclear—he expresses an infatuation with her, but the surrounding mercantile language makes such protestations difficult to believe—it is implied that Melissa is the more suitable bride both because of her fortune and her bloodline. Evandra protests that she had no fortune to give, and Timon notes that he must marry Melissa soon, for "all the great men of *Athens* urge [him] on / To marry had preserve [his] Race," something he, presumably, would be unable to do with Evandra.[274] The political implication here is that Timon, as a metaphor for Charles II, should place his own faith in the mistress who truly loves and supports him (i.e., his loyal advisors), rather than the would-be wife who may "suffer others to graft upon / [His] stock,"[275] which, in the political climate of the late 1670s could be taken as either self-interested advisors or foreign, particularly French, influence.

Shadwell's *Timon*, more so than Shakespeare's, portrays a Senate that is deeply corrupt, interested only in their own wealth and the preservation of their status. The

---

[273] J. Douglas Canfield, *Heroes and States: On the Ideology of Restoration Tragedy* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 2000), 93.
[274] Thomas Shadwell, *The History of Timon of Athens, the Man-hater* (London: Printed by J.M. for Henry Herringman, 1678), 15.
[275] Thomas Shadwell, *The History of Timon of Athens, the Man-hater* (London: Printed by J.M. for Henry Herringman, 1678), 15.

solution that the play offers lies in the complete dissolution of the Senate by Alcibiades's invading force. Rather than execution, Alcibiades sentences the senators to public penance before turning the governance of the Athens over to the people. *Timon of Athens* is the only adaptation of the period in which the *vox populi* takes the day, even if their victory is forced upon them by military invasion. Jean Marsden contends that Shadwell's *Timon* is "the only play in which a rebellious faction not only brings liberty to the people, suggesting a parallel between Alcibiades' attacks on Athenian corruption and the Duke of Buckingham's attacks on what the Opposition party saw as a corrupt government, an aim which Shadwell emphasizes by dedicating the play to Buckingham. To make his point, Shadwell increases the importance of Alcibiades, making him a foil to Timon"[276]

In his proto-Whiggish adaptation, Shadwell emphasizes the growing role of money as a means of political and social power. This theme is present in Shakespeare's version as well; Sharon O'Dair addresses the role of money in Shakespeare and Middleton's *Timon*, noting that, for Timon and his associates, money and gift giving are representative of social power as much if not more than they are of economic strength.[277] However, for Shadwell, there is an increased focus on the Senate's wealth as the source of their influence—they need ever-expanding wealth in order to survive. Given Charles II's constant demands for further funding, particularly for unpopular wars with the Dutch or the French, the role of money in asserting power must have been quite salient in the late 1670s. Indeed, Canfield

---

[276] Jean I. Marsden, *The Re-Imagined Text: Shakespeare, Adaptation, and Eighteenth-Century Literary Theory* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1995), 44.
[277] Sharon O'Dair, "Introduction," *The Life of Timon of Athens* in *Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works*, ed. Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2010.

has argued that "Shadwell adds the Restoration twist of concern with the shift from a land-based to a trade-based economy and concomitant ruling oligarchy. And this supposedly proto-Whig Shadwell emphasizes his attack on mercinariness by subtly transforming the senators of Athens into cits and thereby transforming his play into a satire on the emergent bourgeoisie."[278] In Shadwell's *Timon*, then, money is equated with political and social power. Noble blood, however, is not, as can be seen in the fact that Evandra's lineage is not enough to circumvent her poverty.

If we read the play as a political allegory, Shadwell seems to be arguing against rule by a small group of the well-funded political elite. Throughout the play, the senators are presented as unethical and immoral, though their individual vices vary. Alcibiades denounces their rulership in terms that equally condemn the parliamentary commonwealth of the Civil Wars: "Oh the base Spirit of a Common-wealth! / One Tyrant is much better than four hundred; / The worst of Kings would be asham'd of this."[279] By the end of the play, Alcibiades has overthrown the tyrannical Senate in favor of a form of government that would likely have appeared even more radical to his audiences—a government of all the people. Within his creation of this new governing body, he again condemns the idea of rule by a small elite:

> Thus when a few shall Lord it o're the rest,
> They govern for themselves and not the People.
> They rob and pill from them, from thence t' increase
> Their private stores; but when the Government
> Is in the Body of the People, they
> Will do themselves no harm; therefore henceforth

---

[278] J. Douglas Canfield, *Heroes and States: On the Ideology of Restoration Tragedy* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 2000), 96.
[279] Thomas Shadwell, *Timon of Athens,* 60.

> I do pronounce the Government shall devolve upon the People, and may Heav'n prosper 'em."[280]

Only a government comprised of the people it serves can truly work in the people's best interests. As Shakespeare's Alcibiades pledged to do, Shadwell's Alcibiades universally pardons the people of Athens, refusing to "upbraid [them] for the unjust sentence past upon [him]."[281] Instead, he places himself as their savior, albeit a militaristic and expansionistic one: "I have subdu'd your enemies and all revolted places, made you Victorious both at Land and Sea, and have with continual toil and numberless dangers stretcht out the bounds of your Dominions far above your hopes or expectations."[282]

While Alcibiades's revolution, at least on the surface, seems to suggest political enfranchisement for all citizens,[283] Shadwell and his audience would likely have understood this passage through the lens of Opposition politics, which, rather than seeking to abolish the existing Parliamentary system, instead sought to strengthen its power in relation to the monarchy. As Marsden argues, this speech "represents an explicit political stand against the king and in favor of Parliament, which did, in part, represent the body of the people."[284] What Shadwell seems to be arguing against, then, is rule by a narrow elite who do not have the country's best interests at heart, and who seek to use their power solely for their own gain.

---

[280] Thomas Shadwell, *Timon of Athens,* 86.
[281] Thomas Shadwell, *Timon of Athens,* 86.
[282] Thomas Shadwell, *Timon of Athens,* 86.
[283] As in most pre-modern texts, we can here safely assume that the definition of "the people" is limited to free men.
[284] Jean I. Marsden, *The Re-Imagined Text: Shakespeare, Adaptation, and Eighteenth-Century Literary Theory* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1995), 44.

The ending of Shadwell's *Timon* most clearly demonstrates his Opposition ethos through it's contrast with the relatively peaceful ending found in Shakespeare: t wo Athenian senators, seeking to halt Alcibiades's attack on the city, seek aid from Timon, but are told that the only remedy against Alcibiades's wrath is suicide. Alcibiades marches on the town, demanding that the senators leave off their "licentious measure." Though the senators attempt to make a case that they "were not all unkind, nor all deserve the common stroke of war," they ultimately concede, inviting Alcibiades to "bring in thy ranks, but leave without thy rage…approach the fold and cull the infected forth, but kill not all together." Alcibiades acquiesces to this plea, claiming "those enemies of Timon's and mine own whom you yourselves shall set out for reproof fall and no more: and, to atone your fears with my more noble meaning, not a man shall pass his quarter, or offend the stream of regular justice in your city's bounds, but shall be render'd to your public laws at heaviest answer." Thus, Alcibiades places himself as an arbiter of justice who still functions within and upholds the Athenian justice system. Upon learning of Timon's death, he swears to "make war breed peace, make peace stint war, make each prescribe to the other as each other's leech," seeking to overcome the deeply flawed humanity that drove Timon to his solitude and eventual death. The conclusion is, rather unambiguously, a hopeful one, a promise that humanity can, and will, do better.

Shadwell's conclusion is far less gentle. As Alcibiades approaches the gates of Athens, the senators (now humanized through names rather than role descriptions) discuss their fears about the approaching army. They worry that Alcibiades will level the city before completing his conquest through pillage and rape. Their fears are, it seems, quite justified, for Alcibiades threatens to "let loose the fury of my Souldiers, and make you all a prey to

spoile and rapine" if he and his army are not given entrance to the city. The senators' pleas for mercy no longer focus on the innocence of the majority of the city-dwellers, but seek personal clemency for themselves, offering after-the-fact apologies for their misdeeds against Timon and Alcibiades. When pressed, they seek protection in numbers, claiming that ""Twas' the whole Senates voice" that condemned Alcibiades, rather than the machinations of any individual(s). Alcibiades does not give the senate the option of singling out its wrongdoers—he demands that the six senators who greet him at the gates submit to public shaming. This public penance is the scene that the play ends on. Alcibiades forces the senators to publicly admit their wrongdoing, but then releases them, noting that their deaths would be meaningless, before addressing the gathered crowd and granting them sovereignty over themselves. The ending is ambiguous: Timon's final statement is read, and Alcibiades laments that Timon and Evandra both have been destroyed by "these smiling, flattering Knaves" in the Senate.[285] However, his final lines suggest that he has, as Apermantus feared, learned nothing: "May *Athens* flourish with a lasting Peace; / And may its wealth and power ever increase."[286] In continuing to highlight the wealth that has been at the center of all the play's conflicts, Alcibiades suggests that, regardless of the supposed change in political structure, it will still be the wealthy who dominate the city.

Ultimately, Shadwell's *Timon* points to the instability of the period, foreshadowing problems to come. Written before the Popish Plot, *Timon* does not address the growing anti-Catholic sentiment as bluntly as later plays; however, within the play there are still

---

[285] Thomas Shadwell, *Timon of Athens,* 86.
[286] Thomas Shadwell, *Timon of Athens,* 86.

significant gestures toward the social and political divisions that led to the Popish Plot hysteria, the formation of the Tory and Whig parties, and the Exclusion Crisis. As J. Douglas Canfield has argued, the conclusion of Shadwell's *Timon* is only momentarily uplifting; Shadwell "leaves us with a trapdoor solution, a radical gesture toward a democracy with no credibility, with a corrupt general…serving as Protector to a people he disdains…Shadwell has satirically turned the Restoration world upside down and left us momentarily pleased as the revolution. . . but nevertheless blinking in anticipation of the ensuing anarchy."[287]

Although there are no extant records of *Timon*'s performance contemporary with its publication, the play seems to have become quite popular around the turn of the century,[288] and it continued to have regular performances until the mid-1740s, with another round of revivals near the end of the eighteenth century. That these performances were all of Shadwell's adaptation, rather than Shakespeare and Middleton's original, is clear from the inclusion of Evadne and Melissa in the cast lists. The lull in interest in the play aligns with Shadwell's own period of theatrical exile. Following the censored production and uncensored publication of the highly anti-Catholic *Lancashire Witches*, Shadwell was all but exiled from London's theatrical world until the beginning of William and Mary's reign. Afterward, however, Shadwell became the English poet laureate, succeeding his longstanding rival Dryden. His plays remained popular until the latter half of the eighteenth

---

[287] J. Douglas Canfield, *Heroes and States: On the Ideology of Restoration Tragedy* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 2000), 99.
[288] Performances are listed in *The London Stage* for nearly every theatrical season between 1700-1717, and while cast lists are not always given, those that are generally include Shadwell's additional characters.

century, when Dryden became the more canonical figure, and Dryden's satire of Shadwell, "MacFlecknoe" cemented Shadwell's reputation as dry and unpoetic.

Anti-Faction Plays: *Titus Andronicus* (1678—Ravenscroft) and *Caius Marius* (1680—Otway)

The second Shakespeare adaptation written during the Popish Plot, Edward Ravenscroft's *Titus Andronicus*, is somewhat less ambiguous in both its politics and its morality than Shadwell's *Timon of Athens*. Given that it premiered sometime just after the Popish Plot was creating an increasingly xenophobic and religiophobic atmosphere in London, this increased polarity is representative of the city's temperament. Dating Ravenscroft's *Titus* is somewhat difficult, since the play was not printed until 1687, and the original prologue and epilogue were lost. However, both Ravenscroft's letter to the reader and his newly written prologue and epilogue point to the "Mad Season" at the beginning of the Popish Plot.[289] Ravenscroft claims that his adaptation "shew'd the Treachery of Villains, and the Mischiefs carry'd on by Perjury and False Evidence; and how Rogues may frame a Plot that shall deceive and destroy both the Honest and the Wise."[290] He presents the play as a form of public service meant to expose the villainy of the Popish Plot and its subsequent hysteria. At the same time, he insists, as we have seen above, on distancing himself from his Shakespearean source text, though this was likely much safer in 1687 than it would have been in 1678. However, Ravenscroft's claim is rather disingenuous, as his

[289] Ravenscroft, *Titus*, A2v.
[290] Ravenscroft, *Titus*, A2v.

borrowings make up the majority of the play, with large swathes of dialogue lifted wholesale from the quarto.[291] By selectively abridging and expanding Shakespeare's text, Ravenscroft's *Titus* makes two substantial changes to its source text: it simplifies the moral questions that drive the revenge plot, and it increases the play's bloody spectacle.

Caius Marius is separated from *Titus* by roughly two years, over the course of which the fears of the Popish Plot led to intense fears of a Catholic king and parliamentary attempts to exclude James from the throne. The play was most likely performed in October 1679, entered in the *Term Catalogues* November 1679,[292] though it was not printed until 1680. While Otway's play does not have the lengthy performance history of many of the adaptations from this period—there are no performance records after its initial run—but as a political adaptation, *Caius Marius* succeeds by refusing to provide the kind of neat one-to-one allegories that appear in other works of the period. Instead, there are just enough scattered references to current and past political struggles to keep the audience suspicious of potential allegorical applicability, but without ever being able to identify particular figures or scenarios definitively. The elusiveness of the allegory is likely what kept the play free of censorship. While many scholars have argued that the play is apolitical or fails in its political

---

[291] Though the texts *Titus*'s quarto and folio are quite similar, the quarto does not include 3.2, the infamous "fly scene." As Ravenscroft also omits this scene—when he omits so few other scenes of spectacle—it seems most likely that he was working from the quarto edition.

[292] *The London Stage*, 282.

goals,[293] I contend that Otway's play succeeds in exploring the inherent societal anxieties of the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis.[294]

Rather than aligning himself with either the nascent Tory or Whig parties, Otway chooses to demonstrate the problems inherent in factionalism and mob rule. As Jessica Munns has argued, "it is not possible to read the play as a straightforward Tory attack on the Whig challenge to the court. Rather, 'a plague on both your houses,' a line Otway does not use in the play but which must have been in his mind, seems to be the underlying response to factional turmoil."[295] At its core, the *Romeo and Juliet* story centers around the disasters of factionalism and civic unrest. However, *Caius Marius* extends this theme through its new interest in state politics and deeper engagement with the opposing families, rather than just the lovers. As Jessica Munns notes, the play is "largely enacted in the public

---

[293] In *Restoration Politics and Drama: The Plays of Thomas Otway*, Jessica Munns has summarized the political readings of *Caius Marius* thus: "Critics have often dismissed the play's topicality as superficial; for J. C. Ghosh, Otway's 'attempt to make the feud between the rival Roman factions suggestive of the Whig Tory controversy' is an unsuccessful attempt to make a 'pot-boiler' popular; see *Works* 1:46. Political discussion has often been limited to the identification of Caius Marius with the Earl of Shaftesbury; see, for instance, J. R. Moore 'Contemporary Satire in Otway's *Venice Preserv'd*. . . Hazel M. Batzer Pollard finds Caius Marius a sympathetic character and, since she also feels he is a portrait of Shaftesbury, she suggests, unhistorically, that Shaftesbury's political position was not clear at the time; see 'Shakespeare's Influence on Otway's *Caius Marius*. . . Barbara A. Murray argues for a close identification of Caius Marius with Shaftesbury in 'The Butt of Otway's Political Moral in *The History and Fall of Caius Marius*'. . . Remarks on Caius Marius's low birth, ambition, age, and ill-health voiced in the play (1.58-65, 97-101) are typical attacks on Shaftesbury. . . However, Caius Marius's physical vigor qualities on easy identification with Shaftesbury and Betterton, who took the part of Caius Marius, had no 'pygmy frame'" (Munns 229, n. 21).

[294] Jocelyn Powell has provided a Tory reading of *Caius Marius* as calling back to cavalier glories: "when Otway's Caius Marius hides from his pursuers in a wood, and so escapes them, the Court part of the audience at least would applaud the memory of Charles' famous escape after the battle of Worcester."

[295] Jessica Munns, "'The Dark Disorders of a Divided State': Otway and Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*," *Comparative Drama* 19.4 (1985-86), 349.

realm," whereas Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* is primarily concerned with the private romance of the young lovers. Michael Dobson centers the figures of the lovers, particularly Lavinia, and argues that "Otway produces a Shakespeare adaptation with a suffering, innocent woman at its center…making the pathos thereby elicited the play's chief *raison d'etre* at the expense of political consistency, his interchangeable Marius and Sylla alternating arbitrarily in the audience's sympathies and only the plight of the blameless young lovers remaining constant."[296] The play grounds its political tragedy in the suffering of those with little or no political authority, and by "concentrating instead on the helpless, voluptuous sufferings of political victims, and despite his own loyalty to Stuart absolutism [Otway] thereby struck a major blow for the *embourgeoisement* of serious drama. After *Caius Marius*, tragedy would no longer be the privilege of monarchs."[297] This interest in the lives of ordinary citizens and both their political potential and the ways that they were affected by those in power became increasingly central to both new drama and the framing of revivals of older drama throughout the latter years of the seventeenth century.

In Shakespeare's *Titus*, the morality of revenge begins quite muddily. Titus has returned to Rome victorious over the Goths, but not without losing twenty-five of his sons in battle. He has the Goth queen Tamora; her sons Alarbus, Chiron, and Demetrius; and her Moorish general Aron in captivity. His first action, after passing over pleas to take up the mantle of emperor, is to order Alarbus sacrificed to "appease their groaning shadows

---

[296] Michael Dobson, *The Making of the National Poet: Shakespeare, Adaptation, and Authorship, 1660-1769* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), 79-80.
[297] Michael Dobson, *The Making of the National Poet: Shakespeare, Adaptation, and Authorship, 1660-1769* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), 80.

that are gone."[298] Though Tamora begs Titus, one parent to another, to spare her son, Titus offers no pity. Initially, then, it would appear that the play's revenger will be Tamora, seeking vengeance for the death of her son; Titus is, initially, framed as the play's villain. Indeed, Titus wrongs several other characters—refusing to honor his daughter Lavinia's betrothal and then murdering one of his remaining sons when he helps her escape. Though Titus does end up the central revenger of the play, he is often the instigator of the play's violence.

Ravenscroft immediately seeks to close off all possible readings of Titus as morally ambiguous. When Tamora pleads for Alarbus's life, Titus reminds her that his "Son, whom chance of War your Captive made, was Born in Glory too, and for great deeds, Adopted was the Eldest Son of Fame; yet fell Victim to Plebean Rage."[299] To clarify, Lucius adds "Deaf like the Gods when Thunder fills the Air, were you to all our suppliant Romans then; unmov'd beheld him made a Sacrifice t'appease your Angry Gods."[300] While Shakespeare's text initially positions Titus as enacting needless and disproportionate violence, his sacrifice of Alarbus in Ravenscroft's adaptation is merely Old Testament eye-for-an-eye justice: an eldest son for an eldest son, sacrificed to quiet ghosts and gods.

Whereas *Titus* begins by highlighting the enmity between the Romans and the Goths and the division of the various Roman political factions from one another, *Caius Marius* begins with a call for unity, for the gods to "fix the Order of our wayward State, / That we may once more know each other; know / Th' extent of Laws, Prerogatives, and Dues; /

---

[298] Shakespeare, *Titus Andronicus*, 1.1.129.
[299] Ravenscroft, *Titus Andronicus*, 4.
[300] Ravenscroft, *Titus Andronicus*, 4.

The Bounds of Rules and Magistracy, who Ought first to govern, and who must obey."[301] The play's opening scene has statesmen debating over the flaws of the two candidates for the consulship of Rome. Marius is excessively ambitious after having risen from the peasantry, and he is not above buying votes with bribes. He is accused of "Base Ingratitude, / Dissimulation, Cruelty, and Pride, / Ill Manners, Ignorance, and all the Ills / Of one base born."[302] The long recounting of his sins suggests initially that the play is setting him up to be a clear villain. Lisanna Calvi has used this opening scene to argue for a Tory reading of the play, arguing that "The emphasis on the role of the 'sordid Rabble' (I.i.109) and on Marius' corrupt ways to gain their favour is kindred to contemporary party attitude. The Tories regarded the intrusion of the people into state matters as ruinous in its ultimate anarchical effects. A strong critical attitude was therefore reserved for the Whig 'rabble-rousing' tactics especially during the electoral campaign of 1679."[303] Indeed, Marius's popularity with the common folk of Rome initially seems to suggest a Tory reading, yet over the course of the play this reading, along with the political distinctions between Marius and his rivals, breaks down.

Over the course of the play, it becomes clear that none of the politicians are virtuous, and, in fact, many of them share the same sins of ambition and self-interest. The division between factions is emphasized in the descriptions of Marius's rivals. Metellus highlights both Sylla and Cinna's hatred of Marius as central qualities in their suitability for

---

[301] Thomas Otway, *The History and Fall of Caius Marius* (London: Printed for Tho[mas] Flesher, 1680), 1.
[302] Otway, *Caius Marius*, 3.
[303] Lisanna Calvi, *Kingship and Tragedy (1660-1715)* (Verona: QuiEdit, 2005).

the consulship. After banishing Marius from Rome, Metellus comments on the merits of the new consuls Cinna and Octavius. What he says suggests that, in ridding themselves of Marius, the senators have simply exchanged one bad politician for another. Cinna seems to have ingratiated himself to the Senate through his gifts for speechmaking and flattery. Metellus notes that he "knows how to tell a story to the Rabble."[304] Marius junior's earlier speech clarifies: Cinna is "a Thoughtful Villain…wh'has rais'd his Fortune by the Jars / and Discords of his Country: Like a Fly / o're Flesh, he buzzes about itching Ears, / Till he has vented his Infection there, / To fester into Rancour and Sedition."[305] In short, Cinna is, much like Marius, a rabble rouser whose political career depends on his ability to sow discord amongst the people, particularly those not of noble birth. The character of Cinna, then, seems designed primarily to critique the growing floods of political propaganda aimed at swaying a newly politicized public. Likewise, the fear-mongering rhetoric of Marius, Metellus, and other politicians throughout the play mirrors the inflammatory language used in print depictions of the Popish Plot and the Exclusion Crisis. Cinna's co-consul Octavius's excessive religious zeal also ties neatly into Otway's overarching critique of mixing religion and politics at the end of the play.

In a similar fashion, Marius accuses the senators of the same misbehavior they have charged him with. He labels Antonius as a "talking Knave, / That when he should be doing publick Service, / Consumes his time in Speeches to the Rabble, / And sows Sedition in a City."[306] The play emphasizes that none of the various factions operating in Rome are

---

[304] Otway, *Caius Marius*, 40.
[305] Otway, *Caius Marius*, 26.
[306] Otway, *Caius Marius*, 49.

virtuous. Indeed, they all share the same flaws, and whatever philosophical differences their different political positions may encompass are rendered illegible and irrelevant by the play's focus on their commonalities and the violence caused by their divisions.

The play likewise emphasizes the divisions between the House of Commons and the House of Lords through the figures of Marius and Sylla. Marius's humble beginnings are noted frequently, as is Sylla's noble blood. As the vote for consul begins, a group of citizens gather in the streets, plotting to commit "as much mischief" as possible on behalf of Marius. Their rationale is that he is one of them, risen from the citizenry rather than the lords, and their hatred of the lords is made plain.

> **3. Cit.** Look you…but what's this *Sylla*? this *Sylla*? I've heard great talk of him…He's a damnable fighting fellow they say; but hang him…he's a Lord.
> **1. Cit.** Ay, so hie is, Neighbours: and I know not why any one should be a Lord more then another. I care not for a Lord: what good do they doe? nothing but run in our debts, and ly with our Wives.

The voice of the common folk is rarely heard in the majority of the adaptations from this period, but when it is, it expresses bafflement at the destructive actions of the powerful. In *Caius Marius*, a group of herdsmen discuss rumors of Marius's banishment alongside another litany of ill omens—farm disasters, the appearance of soldiers—before determining that "These Bitious folk make more stir in the world then [sic] a thousand men."[307] When harassed by the soldiers looking for Marius, one of the herdsmen reminds them that "I keep his Cows and his Oxen…but I keep none of him."[308] For the majority of England's citizens, this was also the case—their local lord might own their labor, but beyond that their affinity for him was often minimal, particularly when it came to national politics. While greater

---

[307] Otway, *Caius Marius*, 43.
[308] Otway, *Caius Marius*, 43.

levels of literacy and political awareness may have meant that the general populace was more aware of national politics, many of those outside of London likely cared only insofar as their lives and livelihoods were affected.

Both plays present factionalism as leading to a society that is self-devouring. *Titus*'s wilderness of tigers leads ultimately to a cannibal banquet, while *Caius Marius* features several ominous portents of animals eating their young. Scenes of intense, spectacular horror, often involving self-destruction or the annihilation of society by its own members escalate throughout both plays. Ultimately, both *Titus Andronicus* and *Caius Marius* end in corpse-strewn stages with little sense of possible redemption.

The stage itself is a key component in the portrayal of spectacular violence in *Titus*. Ravenscroft makes use of the expanded scenic capabilities of the Restoration theater in his staging for *Titus*, though his adaptation is somewhat unusual even among the Popish Plot plays in that it does not significantly increase the scope of women's roles. While some of the violence in the play is reduced—Titus's hand is removed off stage, and the scene preceding Chiron and Demetrius's deaths is abbreviated, this only serves to heighted the horror of the expanded final scene. Rather than slowly inoculating the audience to scenes of violence, Ravenscroft allows the play's two most horrific scenes—Lavinia's rape and the cannibal banquet—to deliver the full force of their terror.

Shakespeare's Act 2 opens with a description of the setting for the hunt: "the fields are fragrant and the woods are green,"[309] and the idyllic setting sharply contrasts the horrors that are to follow. However, Ravenscroft shifts the setting to a far more appropriate hidden

---

[309] Shakespeare, *Titus Andronicus*, 2.1.2

grotto, and he foreshadows the horrors to come. At the end of Act 2, just as Chiron and Demetrius are fighting over who should have rights to Lavinia, Aron details the precise location that their attack should take place:

> The Emperour at his *Banii* holds his Court,
> The Gardens Round are Large, Miles in Diameter,
> Many close walks there are, and private Groves,
> Grottoes, and on the more Remoter parts,
> Dark Caves and Vaults, where water crusted Lyes
> In Ice, all the hot season of the year
> As Christallin; And firm as when
> 'Twas taken from the Winters frost; and Snow
> As white and Crisp as when at first it fell
> From the cold Regions of the air
> There where these things are thus preserv'd,
> To cool the hot Pallets of thirsty Romans,
> Quench you the boyling feavors of your bloods,
> And Bath your Limbs in fair *Lavinia*'s Snow,
> 'Till all your Lust like that does melt away,
> When to the Sun Expos'd.
> …
> The Emperours Court is like the house of Fame,
> The Pallace full of Tongues, of Eyes and Ears,
> The Groves are gloomie, deaf and silent—
> There speak and strike shaded from humane Eye,
> And ransack fair *Lavinia*'s treasury.[310]

Rather than setting the scene of Lavinia's rape and mutilation in an idyllic forest grove, Ravenscroft shifts the setting to an eerie cavern that is suggestive of a grave. Furthermore, Susan Owen has noted the increased political significance lent to Lavinia's rape, since it "is presented as an 'Invasion on a Princes right' (II, p. 16) by plotters,"[311] much as the events of

---

[310] Ravenscroft, *Titus Andronicus*, 17-18.
[311] Susan J. Owen, *Perspectives on Restoration Drama* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), 152.

the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis were seen by many as an assault on Charles's royal prerogative.

Further cuts are designed to heighten the play's violence. Many scenes are greatly reduced or removed entirely, including slower moving sections such as the "fly scene" in 3.2 and Titus's summoning of the gods in 4.2. These reductions allow the play to proceed at break-neck speed toward the cannibal conclusion. In this manner, Ravenscroft seems to be working more heavily within the Senecan tradition towards which Shakespeare nods through his focus on the culmination of the revenge plot. Even Chiron and Demetrius's death scene is highly truncated in favor of a far more spectacularly grisly cannibal feast. In killing Chiron and Demetrius, Titus explains his plan: "Your Flesh shall be Cook'd for the Empress Palate, and your Blood mixt with all the Wine that's drunk" (50). Although the culinary act itself is not performed on-stage in either version of the play, Shakespeare describes Titus's entrance in the next scene as "like a cook, placing the dishes" before bidding Tamora and Saturninus to eat.[312] The lines that follow create one of the play's most interesting array of performance possibilities, with precious little stage direction guiding the action beyond notations of death.

It is, ultimately, unclear whether or not Saturninus or the Andronici join in Shakespeare's version of the cannibal banquet[313], or how Tamora responds to Titus's

---

[312] Ravenscroft omits this stage direction, potentially envisioning that Titus dresses as he would normally in order to avoid raising suspicion too early.

[313] The possibility that the Andronici may partake of the feast as well is intriguing when juxtaposed with anthropological narratives of exocannibalism, or the eating of slain enemies, that "may well make the consumption of one's victims *more*, rather than less terrifying, given that they are being devoured 'body and soul'—metaphysically as well as

revelation. Likewise, no reaction is specified for the tribunes and senators who have been gathered to view the proceedings. What *is* certain, however, is that Tamora "daintily hath fed…[on] the flesh that she herself hath bred]," and that is all that is necessary to complete her punishment not only for transgressing against her role as a mother, but as an empress. In both versions, it is crucial that Tamora does eat, as Titus's insistence demonstrates. In the moment of her "feeding," or, perhaps, the moment of Titus's revelation of what she has done, Tamora completes the ritualized punishment that has been carefully prepared in order to symbolically undo all the harm she and her offspring have brought to Rome.

Although less poetic than Shakespeare's description, Ravenscroft here clarifies one important point that is left rather vague by his predecessor, the matter of who, exactly, is engaging in the act of cannibalism. If there were any lingering doubts, during the banquet Titus commands that he be given "a Bowl fill'd with Falernian Wine, the like to every one" followed by an explicit stage direction that calls for everyone to drink to the emperor's health.[314] Once Roman and Goth alike are bound together by this cannibalistic toast, the action escalates quickly. Lavinia's murder is transposed line-for-line from Shakespeare's text, but then Titus reveals Aron bound to a rack. As he tries to get a confession from Aron, Titus has Aron's limbs disjointed before he displays the "heads. . .hands, and mangl'd Truncks" of Chiron and Demtrius. Only after these two grisly displays does Titus reveal that Tamora—and in this version, everyone else as well—has eaten her own children. He then stabs her, Saturninus stabs Titus, and Lucius stabs Saturninus as in Shakespeare's play.

---

physically, transformed and dominated" (Richard Sugg, *Murder After Death: Literature and Anatomy in Early Modern England*, 38).

[314] Ravenscroft, *Titus Andronicus*, 52.

However, unlike Shakespeare, Ravenscroft chooses to let Tamora and Saturninus linger in their deaths. Tamora begs Aron not to "speak. . . a word against [her] honour to save the World."[315] Through this, it is clear that while Tamora is willing, or perhaps unable to deny, her role in Lavinia's death, she still seeks to hide her infidelity. While there is some room for her to argue that her actions against the Andronici were performed for the good of the country after Lavinia's refusal to marry Saturninus, her infidelity will instantly mark her as treasonous. Unfortunately for her, Aron confesses all that has happened in an attempt to save his son's life. Enraged, Tamora stabs their child, as if by doing so she can retroactively unmake it, and thereby recant her treason. Aron then laments that Tamora "has out-done [him] in [his] own Art—Out-done [him] in Murder" and asks that the child be given to him so that he may eat it.[316] The play concludes, as in Shakespeare, with a corpse-filled stage and the utter destruction of both Rome's empire and the families that comprised it.

Whereas much of the violence in *Titus* is staged, *Caius Marius* tends to rely on extremely graphic, violent imagery, with much of the physical violence being reported rather than explicitly staged.[317] This approach is established at the end of the fourth act, when Lavinia is captured and brought before her father. Her rhetoric speaks of intense physical

---

[315] Ravenscroft, *Titus Andronicus*, 54.
[316] This moment offers several potential readings, none of which seem entirely supported by the text as there are no stage directions to suggest whether or not Aron *actually* eats the child, and Aron dies a few lines later without further comment on the matter. Although it is tempting to read Aron's request as a means of fulfilling Tamora's wish to unmake the child out of respect for her "out-doing" him, other readings seem equally as valid.
[317] Since no stage design is extant for *Caius Marius*, this is, of course, only presumed. Act 5, Scene 3 could easily be staged with a backdrop reminiscent of the infamous stage design for the final scene of Settle's *Empress of Morocco* (see p. 71 of the 1673 first edition).

violence, though at no point in the play does Metellus threaten her with such violence.[318] Before Metellus has had an opportunity to speak, Lavinia tells him that now that he has caught her, he might as well kill her. She continues,

> Do, bind me, kill me, rack these Lims…
> Oh! Bid me leap (rather than go to *Sylla*)
> From off the Battlements of any Tow'r.
> Or walk in Thievish ways, or bid me lurk
> Where Serpents are: chain me with roaring Bears;
> Or hide me nightly in a Charnell-house
> O're-cover'd quite with Dead mens rattling Bones,
> With reeky Shanks, and yellow chapless Sculls:
> Or bid me go into a new-made Grave,
> And hide me with a Dead man in his Shrowd.[319]

While civil war has been threatened before this point, none of the impending violence has been expressed in such explicit turns.

At the beginning of the fifth act, Marius and Sulpitius return to Rome alongside Cinna, who has been rejected by the Roman Senate. The three have raised an army and are looking for revenge. Though the ambassadors who come to meet them make use of the familial language so often used to describe nations and governments throughout the early modern period, Cinna's and Marius's responses emphasize the betrayal that they believe themselves to have suffered at the hands of the Rome's government. They, too, perceive themselves as having been disowned by the maternal nation and patriarchal government. Their response is to "dispeople *Rome*" through the destruction of those who are dishonest, unchaste, or unfaithful.

---

[318] He does threaten to disown her, but not through violent language.
[319] Otway, *Caius Marius*, 51.

While Lavinia's language earlier in the play suggests physical horrors, those horrors are fixated on the personal level, the physical destruction of one body, much as the mutilation of *Titus*'s Lavinia is a precursor of the utter destruction to come. As they march on Rome, Marius provides bloody instructions to Sulpitius that are designed to instill the true horrors of civil war:

> Whom-e're I smile on let thy Sword go through.
> Oh! Can the Matrons and the Virgins Cries,
> The Screams of dying Infants, and the Groans
> Of murther'd men be Musick to appease me?[320]

A few scenes later, it becomes clear that he has delivered on his promises, as two citizens lament that "Already reeking Murther's in our Streets, / Matrons with Infants in their Arms are butcher's, / And *Rome* appears one noisome House of slaughter."[321] The scene only grows grimmer. An old man and his grandson enter, seeking safety, just before Marius and Sulpitus enter with their troops. Though the assembled citizens and senators beg for mercy, or at least to "offer up [their] Lives for all" of Rome, Marius rejects the very notion of peace, claiming that the "Heads and Patrons of Rebellious *Rome*" are inherently corrupt:

> Who trusts your Penitence is more then Fool.
> Rebellion will renew: ye can't be honest.
> Y'are never pleas'd but with the Knaves that cheat you,
> And work your Follies to their private ends.
> For your Religion, like your Cloaths you wear it,
> To change and turn just as the Fashion alters.[322]

---

[320] Otway, *Caius Marius*, 55.
[321] Otway, *Caius Marius*, 57.
[322] Otway, *Caius Marius*, 57.

The commentary on religion is particularly interesting in light of the strong anti-Catholic sentiment of the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis and suggests that much of the excessive religious zeal of the late 1670s was as much political posturing as it was sincere faith.

Marius closes out the scene by ordering that the gathered Romans be killed (if male) or spared for his troops "to rejoice in" (if female). When the child begs for his grandfather's life, Marius commands Sulpitius to "Take hence this Brat too; mount it on a Spear, / And let it sprawl to make the Grandsire sport,"[323] though he relents when the child offers himself up for Marius's sexual pleasure instead, noting that the child's "crocodile tears" have appealed to his belief that Rome breeds only mercenary self-interest. Such a fascination with the horrors of excessive selfishness, particularly in the realms of politics and love, was a common theme throughout the late 1670s in both comedy and tragedy.

Like *Titus*, *Caius Marius* ends in a spectacular wave of violence. While Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* simply has Friar Laurence arrive too late to prevent Romeo's suicide, Otway reconfigures this scene to have the unnamed Priest encounter Marius junior attempting to open Lavinia's tomb. Not recognizing one another, the Priest attempts to stop Marius junior from what he believes to be an act of grave robbery, only to be stabbed by Marius junior. After the fatal blow has been dealt, Marius junior recognizes the Priest, who attempts to tell him that Lavinia yet lives, but dies before he can do so, and Marius junior hauls his corpse into the tomb.

In a cruel revision of Shakespeare's play, Otway has Lavinia revive just after Marius junior has taken the poison, but before he dies. The lovers are granted a brief conversation

---

[323] Otway, *Caius Marius*, 59.

before Marius junior succumbs. As in Shakespeare, Lavinia then plots her own suicide, but before she can complete it, Marius senior arrives with her father Metellus, who immediately dies upon entering the tomb. Seeing her father's death, Lavinia seizes Marius senior's sword, and after reminding him who she is and how she cared for him in his exile, she stabs herself and curses all humanity: "This Sword yet reeking with my Father's Gore, / Plunge it into my Breast: plunge, plunge it thus. / And now let Rage, Distraction and Despair / Seize all Mankind, till they grow mad as I am."[324] Marius begins to repent all the destruction he has caused, but the arrival of a messenger with news of Sylla's return and a new rebellion, as well as the arrival of a mortally wounded Sulpitius cement the complete destruction of Marius's faction. Unlike *Romeo and Juliet*, which suggests that the Montagues and Capulets may learn from the deaths of their children, there is no sense of potential redemption at the conclusion of *Caius Marius*. Neither set of parents is left alive to resolve the enmity between the families, and Rome faces yet another invasion, with the "Rabble…in new Rebellion" at Sylla's approach.[325] It is unclear whether Marius and Cinna's troops succeeded in capturing Rome, or if the city has been left in complete and leaderless chaos. The play ends in a tomb strewn with fresh corpses from both factions, with little sense that any restoration of peace is on the horizon.

Ultimately, both *Titus* and *Caius Marius* respond to the tensions of the Popish Plot and, later, the Exclusion Crisis, through a rejection of factional politics. Such divisions, they suggest, only leads to self-destruction through civil war. While *Titus* might begin with a clear

---

[324] Otway, *Caius Marius*, 65.
[325] Otway, *Caius Marius*, 66.

hero and villain, by the end, none of the characters can lay any claim to virtue. *Caius Marius* takes the opposite approach, by demonstrating the corruption of both (or, given the shifting nature of the characters' political allegiances, all) sides. Titus demonstrates unquestioning loyalty to the idea and ideals of Rome, only to ultimately be betrayed by a ruler who becomes entranced and then controlled by a foreign power. That the ruler is new to power, and has inherited the throne not because of his fitness for the role, but through rule of patrilineage, suggests parallels between the play's opening situation and the incipient Exclusion Crisis. If Saturninus is read as a James figure, then *Titus*'s critique of a ruler led astray by a foreign queen echoes common fears that James's Catholicism, his connections with the French court, and his Catholic wife would spell the destruction of English religious and social values, and potentially even English independence.

Royalist Adaptations: *Troilus and Cressida* (1678—Dryden) and *The Ingratitude of a Common-Wealth* (1681—Tate)

While much of the literature of the Popish Plot was primarily concerned with anti-Catholicism or the growing divisions between the opposition and royalist parties, there was still a sizeable amount of writing done on behalf of the monarchy. The royalist position at this point would have been anti-factionalist, seeking to avoid the divisions between the king's supporters and those who wished to limit his power. In this regard, the royalist plays of the period share much with the more ambiguous plays discussed above: they primarily seek to demonstrate the evils of political division, even as they support a clear monarchical structure founded on divine right. Both Dryden's *Troilus and Cressida* and Tate's *Ingratitude of*

a Commonwealth, an adaptation of *Coriolanus*, have been consistently read as presenting royalist politics as they appeared in the late 1670s.

Dryden's adaptation of *Troilus and Cressida* has, like many of the adaptations of the period, created significant division amongst scholars. Jean Marsden and others see Dryden's *Troilus* as deliberately avoiding political engagement through a "steadfast avoidance of any topic that might be seen as inflammatory" and an exclusive focus on the love plot rather than the politics of war.[326] By contrast, scholars like Michael Dobson read the play as a significant piece of royalist literature, arguing that the play "present[s] a highly topical adaptation under the flag of convenience provided by Shakespeare's sacred laurels…[and] resurrects Shakespeare as a Trojan horse by which to smuggle a guarded royalist polemic onto the stage of the Duke's Theatre."[327] Whereas many playwrights used Shakespeare as a means of creating plausible deniability for potentially dangerous, ambivalent politics, Dryden here does the opposite: he uses Shakespeare's centrality in the English theatrical canon to endorse a particularly royalist stance.

This royalism seeks to negate the ambivalence of the other adaptations, as it stresses the heroism and nobility of both the Greeks and the Trojans, and portrays them both as adhering to a quasi-monarchical hierarchy of leadership. George McFadden, too, has suggested that Dryden adhered closely to both Shakespeare and the *Illiad* to emphasize "the need to avoid division among the followers of a ruler, especially in the face of disaster. In

---

[326] Jean I. Marsden, *The Re-Imagined Text: Shakespeare, Adaptation, and Eighteenth-Century Literary Theory* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1995), 164-5 n.61.
[327] Michael Dobson, *The Making of the National Poet: Shakespeare, Adaptation, and Authorship, 1660-1769* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), 73.

the spring of 1679 this stress was more hopeful than realistic."[328] Furthermore, McFadden has demonstrated that Dryden's adaptation is deeply political, citing numerous satirical references to the Duke of Buckingham, who was Dryden's poetic rival as well as a leader of the Opposition party. However, these references point to the problems of having noble subjects who fail to grant the monarch/leader their divinely ordained position.

As W. W. Bernhardt has pointed out, Dryden simplifies the moral positions of Shakespeare's characters, making Troilus and Cressida unquestionably virtuous. Indeed, there is no true villain to be found in the play. Both sides are striving to maintain their honor, and the leaders of both the Greeks and the Trojans recognize that the war they are fighting is largely to maintain their own pride in regards to Helen and to gain glory in battle. In many senses, their conflict is framed more as a sporting event than a conflict between two morally opposed sides. The Greeks and the Trojans both espouse the same ideals, particularly when it comes to patriarchal rulership. The final lines of the play reiterate Dryden's guiding concern with the relationship between ruler and subject. Ulysses, after reflecting on the newfound peace, expounds "since from homebred Factions ruine springs, / Let Subjects learn obedience to their Kings."[329] In Dryden's imagining of these two opposing factions, both Priam and Agamemnon are strong, virtuous rulers; it is only the independent actions of over-ambitious subjects that leads to internal chaos. Significantly, because the two factions are from different nations, the Greek-Trojan conflict is not

---

[328] George McFadden, *Dryden: The Public Writer 1660-1685* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978), 212.
[329] Dryden, *Troilus and Cressida* (London: Printed for Jacob Tonson and Abel Swall, 1679), 69.

directed internally, allowing the two factions to confront each other as honorable opponents, rather than with the bitterness born of internal division.

Lewis D. Moore has provided an extensive reading of *Troilus and Cressida*'s possible parallels to the Stuart court. He asserts that "Priam, the ideal father figure, cares for and loves his family and people, while Hector firmly supports him in his counsels and on the battlefield. If we see Priam as a model for Charles and Hector for James, the suggestive ideal with which Dryden works is clear: both Stuarts fail in comparison with these models."[330] In this reading, *Troilus and Cressida* functions much the same way as Dryden's earlier adaptation of *The Tempest*—by providing a gentle critique of the Stuarts through providing alternative models of power and rulership. Moore, glancing ahead to *Absalom and Achitophel*, often reads individual characters in *Troilus and Cressida* as direct allegories for particular members of the Stuart Court—though he also envisions these allegories shifting throughout the plot. However, I find Moore's rather oblique argument that Dryden's reorganization of Shakespeare emphasizes the political, rather than the romantic, plot far more intriguing and compelling. Moore also comments on Dryden's addition of significant critiques of priests, particularly Cressida's father Calchas, asserting that "Dryden's harsh references to priests reveal an intention to warn his countrymen against the dangers of religious fanaticism and priestly abuse."[331] At the height of the Popish Plot, this warning would have been much needed in attempts to reduce anti-Catholic hysteria of the kind that Ravenscroft's *Titus Andronicus* sought to inflame.

---

[330] Lewis D. Moore, "For King and Country: John Dryden's *Troilus and Cressida*," *CLA Journal* 26.1 (1982), 101
[331] Moore, 102.

If Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida* is, following his medieval and classical sources, the story of lovers destroyed by the politics of war, then Dryden's *Troilus and Cressida* is the reverse, an attack on war and political division, which is lent a personal face and pathos through the tragic lovers. Dryden's reorganization of the plot means that the decision to exchange Cressida for Anthenor occurs at roughly the midpoint of the plot, at the climax of the third act. In this scene, which is so crucial for the sweeping changes in Dryden's conclusion, that Dryden presents his clearest critique of the guiding mindset of many of the courtiers he critiques. Troilus initially refuses to part with Cressida, and commands that Hector report this answer. Hector instead stresses that this is not a choice for Troilus to make, and that by letting Cressida go, he is, in fact, becoming the hero that he seeks to be:

> If parting from a Mistriss can procure
> A Nations happiness, show me that Prince
> Who dares to trust his future fame so farr
> To stand the shock of Annals, blotted thus
> He sold his Country for a womans love?[332]

Troilus protests that he should not have to do so, that the public are only "the Lees of vulgar slaves…who, were one Soul extracted / From all their beings cou'd not raise a Man."[333] However, Hector reminds him that they are the same such men, and even if they were gods, such a public would be necessary to build their altars and serve them.

Thus, Dryden neatly circumvents the questions of kingly divinity by arguing that the public good must come first, or else princes, gods, and kings mean nothing. Though Troilus

---

[332] Dryden, *Troilus and Cressida* (London: Printed for Jacob Tonson and Abel Swall, 1679), 36.
[333] Dryden, *Troilus and Cressida* (London: Printed for Jacob Tonson and Abel Swall, 1679), 36.

further argues that King Priam's judgement in this is unjust, Hector stresses that the will of both father and king must be obeyed. After briefly swearing enmity to one another, the brothers are reconciled, emphasizing Dryden's goal of reuniting the quarreling factions. As many critics have noted, both the Trojans and the Greeks are presented as heroic and noble, and the mistakes that lead to the play's tragic ending are often personal, rather than political.

In many senses, Tate's *Ingratitude of a Commonwealth* works toward the same goal as Dryden's *Troilus and Cressida*—a play that demonstrates a royalist, Tory ethos and denounces the horrors of division and war—but from wholly opposite ends. Whereas Dryden's play removes much of the violence and less-than-courtly moments from Shakespeare, Tate fully embraces the horrors that many feared would follow the divisions of the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis. Tate is quite explicit about his goals in adapting *Coriolanus*: he views Shakespeare as a solid foundation—"it was my good fortune to build upon a Rock"[334]—upon which to construct his own moral tale. The play is designed to let "the People see what Miseries *Common-Wealths* have been involv'd in, by a blind Compliance with their popular Misleaders: Nor my it be altogether amiss, to give these Projectors themselves, examples how wretched their dependence is on the uncertain Crowd."[335] As in Shakespeare, *Ingratitude* opens with "a company of mutinous citizens" preparing to riot against Martius.[336] The language of the adaptation is both more straightforward—the citizens are not trained rhetoricians—and more violent. The word "factious," which does not appear in

---

[334] Tate, *The Ingratitude of a Common-Wealth*, A2r.
[335] Tate, *The Ingratitude of a Common-Wealth*, A2v.
[336] Tate, *The Ingratitude of a Common-Wealth*, 1.

Shakespeare's play, is used to describe the mob repeatedly, and the self-devouring language of *Titus* and *Caius Marius* is again invoked in this opening scene, even as Martius threatens to kill the gathered citizens and stack their bodies "as high as their own Capitol."[337]

Whereas Dryden uses Shakespeare as a means of eliding the political ramifications of his adaptation, Tate's adaptation of *Coriolanus*, *The Ingratitude of a Common-Wealth*, is more deliberate in its politicized approach. Tate frames Shakespeare as the "Rock"[338] upon whom he has constructed his story, though he emphasizes the fitness of Shakespeare's tale, since it bears "no small Resemblance with the busie *Faction* of our own time."[339] Still, he notes that he has been careful not to draw close parallels between *Ingratitude*'s characters and "those *Troublers* of the State, that out of private Interest or Mallice, Seduce the Multitude to *Ingratitude*, against Persons that are not only plac't in Rightful Power above them; but also the Heroes and Defenders of their Country."[340] Thus, Tate's play presents an anti-Whig message, supposedly without reference to specific Whig politicians such as Shaftesbury.

Ultimately, the four adaptations of Shakespeare's Roman plays produced during the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis present varying approaches to factional politics and the role of the public in political life. Both Ravenscroft's *Titus Andronicus* and Otway's *Caius Marius* reject political division through demonstrating that the creation of opposing sides is inherently self-destructive. Conversely, Dryden's *Troilus and Cressida* and Tate's *Ingratitude of a Common-Wealth* are both profoundly Tory in their sympathies, though they approach such a

---

[337] Tate, *The Ingratitude of a Common-Wealth*, 5.
[338] Nahum Tate, *The Ingratitude of a Common-Wealth*, A2r.
[339] Nahum Tate, *The Ingratitude of a Common-Wealth*, A2r-A2v.
[340] Nahum Tate, *The Ingratitude of a Common-Wealth*, A2v.

worldview in vastly different ways. Dryden seeks to underline the commonalities between the two factions, while Tate highlights their differences and vilifies those who create populist uprisings against established rulers. Conversely, Ravenscroft and Otway are more egalitarian in their approach to political division: such divisions destroy both sides as well as the innocent bystanders caught up in their battles. However, for as different as the plays are in terms of their political leanings, they also share a great number of similarities. Both Dryden and Ravenscroft trim their source texts to focus exclusively on those in power, while Otway and Tate expand the roles of ordinary citizens to demonstrate the growing political power of the public. All four plays, as well as Shadwell's *Timon of Athens*, look to Shakespeare's Greek and Roman tragedies as relatively safe texts to adapt to examine a period of growing political division and uncertainty.

CHAPTER VI:

REVISITING ENGLISH HISTORY (1678-1682)[341]

By 1678, the religious tensions sparked by the supposed Popish Plot intensified around longstanding debates over the inheritance of the crown. While fears over James's Catholicism had long caused tensions within the court, the events of the Popish Plot led to a number of anti-Catholic measures throughout Parliament. Among these was a new Test Act to prevent Catholics from holding office, and while the general parlance of modern scholarship has come to refer to this period as the Exclusion Crisis, Mark Knights points out that this term reduces a complex array of political and religious debates into "the single issue of exclusion…[which] implies that the crisis was merely a parliamentary one, centering on one piece of legislation."[342] However, the exclusion question served as a rallying point in both parliamentary and popular discussions of the period, and this debate catalyzed a resurgence of interest in the mechanisms of royal inheritance on a scale that had not been seen since Queen Elizabeth's reign.

James Stuart, Duke of York's claim as Charles's heir apparent was contested by those who sought to avoid having a Catholic king on the throne. Instead, they sought to legitimize Charles's eldest illegitimate son, James Scott, Duke of Monmouth. York's inheritance was supported by the traditional models of monarchical succession in England, and to subvert his claim to the throne was seen by many, particularly those in the nascent

---

[341] Keywords: Exclusion Crisis, *Henry the Sixth*, inheritance, James Scott, James Stuart, *King Lear*, legitimacy, *The Miseries of Civil War*, *Richard the Second*, succession

[342] Mark Knights, *Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678-81*, Cambridge Studies in Early Modern British History (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 4-5.

Tory party, as subverting both tradition and divine right. However, York was immensely unpopular with the Whiggish faction, both for his religion and for his profligate spending habits. His rulership would, some argued, lead not only to England being restored to Catholicism but also to financial ruin and domination by other countries, namely France. By contrast, Monmouth held considerable popular sway in both the House of Lords and the House of Commons. He was also viewed as pliable and would be easily led by his Parliament. Furthermore, he was also a recent war hero and he had a substantial popular following.[343] The Exclusion debate, then, boiled down to a few central concepts that became topics of intense debate both in the political arena and in popular culture: divine right, the necessary qualities for a king, the role of popular support, and, to a lesser extent, the nature of bastardry.

Like their peers in many other cultural production venues, playwrights responded to this crisis through composing and adapting plays that examined moments in English history when disruptions or threats to the line of succession threatened the stability not only of the crown, but of the nation itself. However, due to the nature of such plays, governmental officials and censors were particularly attuned to the potential for performances of these plays—though, as we will see, not publications of them—to provoke dissent. Thus, the drama of the Exclusion crisis "generated a theatrical climate in which every play produced was potentially controversial, certain to be scrupulously interrogated by censors and

---

[343] This is, of course, somewhat of an oversimplification of a very thorny and long-running political debate. However, in general terms, the popular press of the day, at this point dominated by Whigs, tended to valorize Monmouth and villainize York. By the Tory Resurgence (circa late 1681), this was no longer the case.

audiences alike for covert or explicit propagandist intentions, secret plots, or dangerous sympathies."[344] Though there are no clear records of the plays actually having this effect, the fact that many of them focus on the dangers of political rhetoric, which influences "the crowd" or the general citizenry, suggests that the authors were aware that the ability to speak to the masses was a powerful tool.

Many playwrights saw natural parallels between the Exclusion Crisis and various other disruptions of succession throughout English (and sometimes more broadly British) history. For example, John Banks produced a series of plays set during the life of Elizabeth I, two of which were viewed as potentially scandalous enough to be banned from the stage. Even so, these plays lived on in print—a genre with which they may have had a more natural affinity, given that they were largely adapted from "secret history" texts. Banks's plays generally included lengthy prefaces defending themselves from the claim that they produced "a wrong Interpretation of the Scenes, or of the Story."[345] Though these plays were eventually printed, Banks notes that they were amended by the king's own hand in advance, emphasizing the tight control that the crown attempted to keep over potentially seditious plays.

At the same time, the playhouses' waning fortunes, which had begun during the disruptions of the Popish Plot, continued, and theatre managers and playwrights alike sought inexpensive but highly marketable plays for performance. Again, Shakespeare was a

---

[344] Michael Dobson, *The Making of the National Poet: Shakespeare, Adaptation, and Authorship, 1660-1769* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), 63-4.
[345] John Banks, "The Epistle Dedicatory," *The Island Queens: Or, The Death of Mary, Queen of Scotland*, 1684.

popular choice, and his name became increasingly important to marketing a new wave of adaptations both in print and on the stage. Davenant's *Macbeth* and the Dryden-Davenant *Tempest* saw further revivals which supported the Tories' anti-usurpation viewpoint, while several of Shakespeare's English history plays were adapted with an emphasis on their parallels to the Exclusion Crisis.

These adaptations could subtly invert Shakespeare's original texts, as with Banks's *Vertue Betray'd; or, Anna Bullen*, which, as Kim H. Noling has demonstrated,[346] carefully adapts key moments and themes from *Henry VIII* in order to reframe the character of Elizabeth and her role in the Protestant Reformation. Noling argues that Banks grants Elizabeth greater agency, even as a child, and "identify[s] Elizabeth as a *born* Protestant rather than a 'made' one. . . [which] undoes the patriarchal origin of England's Protestantism suggested by Shakespeare in the alliance of Henry VIII and Cranmer, and proposes instead a maternal origin."[347] Similarly, Thomas D'Urfey's *The Injur'd Princess*, an adaptation of *Cymbeline* that may have been written in the early 1670s, attempts a complementary reshaping of a quasi-historical romance into a domestic tragicomedy which depicts "Imogen as a wronged wife first and the heiress to the British state only second."[348] While many critics have viewed this emphasis on the domestic as a central failing of D'Urfey's adaptation, similar alterations are made even in more politically charged

---

[346] Kim H. Noling, "Unpropping the Princess: John Banks's Revision of Shakespeare's Elizabeth" in *Resurrecting Elizabeth I in Seventeenth-Century England* ed. Elizabeth H. Hageman and Katherine Conway, Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2007, p. 205-19.
[347] *Ibid*, 219.
[348] Michael Dobson, *The Making of the National Poet: Shakespeare, Adaptation, and Authorship, 1660-1769* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), 85-6.

adaptations, seemingly as a means of diffusing or deflecting central narratives of usurpation, regicide, and public uprising.

In this chapter, I examine four plays from this period: John Crowne's *The Miseries of Civil War* and *Henry the Sixth* and Nahum Tate's *King Lear* and *Richard the Second* (performed and printed as *The Sicilian Usurper*). All four plays are concerned with the nature of kingship—the processes through which it is inherited, the criteria by which its success is determined, and the religious and political beliefs through which it is validated. These plays achieved different levels of success and censorship, much of which was determined by their relationship to one another as well as the current political climate. This chapter argues that the four plays build off of one another to create a complex interrogation of royal legitimacy that is neither entirely Whig nor Tory in its sentiments; instead, the plays navigate the fluctuating power dynamics between the two parties through a careful political agnosticism.

The adaptations of Shakespeare's history plays examine an assortment of potential failures of kingship as well as political crises and civil strife caused by interrupted or disputed lines of inheritance. Because these plays are also adaptations of Shakespeare's own reimagining of English history, they are essentially adaptations functioning at several removes from their original sources, and thus the adapters generally seem content to create rather revisionist versions of the plays, particularly when certain characters are either too politically damaging (e.g., *Richard II*'s Duke of York) or could be put to more explicit political use (Plantagenet's sons in the *Henry VI* plays).

The kings presented in these plays are all failed rulers, generally rendered so through a combination of their own beliefs about kingship and a particularly ambitious set of subjects who are skilled in garnering public support. The combination of lackluster rulership

with grounds for contested inheritance—whether because of past usurpation (Henry VI), competing bloodlines (Richard II), or the king's own destabilizing of inheritance patterns (Lear)—proved, in all cases, disastrous. The only possible outcome of such divisions, these plays warn, is civil war. In this sense, all of these plays can be read as espousing royalist/Tory sympathies; however, their concerns over good governance and the effects of governmental strife on the general populace suggest that these plays should be read as nuanced critiques of the Exclusion Crisis and not simply as party-line propaganda.

John Crowne's The Miseries of Civil-War (1680)[349] and Henry the Sixth, the First Part (1681)

At the height of the Exclusion Crisis, John Crowne adapted segments of Shakespeare's *2-3 Henry VI*.[350] Much of the text of both plays is drawn directly from Shakespeare, though Crowne makes substantial cuts to the more formal historical sections of his sources. In their place, Crowne adds scenes of spectacular violence and expands women's roles to include additional romance, both common requirements for successful Restoration plays. He also reshapes the political landscapes of both plays in order to comment on the Exclusion Crisis while simultaneously not offending the monarch enough

---

[349] This play is known by two similar titles: *The Misery of Civil-War* (the title given on the title page) and *The Miseries of Civil-War* (given on the first page of the play and as the running header throughout). Here, I follow general scholarly convention in accepting the title that appears more frequently.

[350] Crowne's naming scheme is somewhat confusing: *Henry the Sixth, The First Part* is an adaptation of Shakespeare's *2 Henry VI*, while *The Misery of Civil War* is an adaptation of *3 Henry VI*.

to have his play immediately removed from the theaters.[351] Though performance records for both plays are lacking, both publications list the names of actors, suggesting at least brief production histories. Similarly, both received publications within the same year of their debuts.[352] While the exact premiere date of *The Miseries of Civil-War* is unknown, "the fact that Narcissus Littrell purchased a copy on 22 March 1679/80 suggests that the premier occurred not later than February [1680]."[353]

This performance date places *The Miseries of Civil-War* in the same season as *Caius Marius*, the second half of the season following the fast day for Charles I's martyrdom presents increasingly grim plays. The comedies, like *The Rover*, generally present a bitter worldview, and tragedies became increasingly central to the repertoires of both companies. Anti-pope plays, particularly *The History of Pope Joan* and *The Female Prelate*, were popular. Crowne's *Miseries* is, like many of these plays, examining and commenting on the intense anxieties of the period. However, Crowne is more direct in his play's didacticism: "this Tragedy a Rod will prove, / To whip us for a Fault, we too much Love, / And have for ages liv'd, call'd Civil Strife. / The *English* Nation, like a *Russian* Wife, / Is to a gentle

---

[351] Though both plays were performed during the Exclusion Crisis, *Henry the Sixth* was apparently "stifled by command" after only a few performances, according to the dedicatory epistle for *The English Friar* (1689). Barbara A. Murray has suggested that the reason for this ban was the play's "powerful representation of a collection of treacherous, albeit foiled, plotters and of a charismatic leader, in York, bent on exploiting a band of rebellious citizens" (*Restoration Shakespeare: Viewing the Voice*, 180).

[352] *The Miseries of Civil War*, at least, proved popular enough to warrant a reprinting following the publication of *Henry the Sixth*, *the First Part*, where it was retitled *Henry the Sixth, the Second Part; or, The Miseries of Civil-War*.

[353] *The London Stage*, volume 1, 283. Lutrell's copy is noted as being held in the Ohio State University Library.

Husband always curst, And loves him best, who uses her the worst."[354] These lines set up the central argument of *Miseries*: a king who is—or seems to be—too gentle, as these plays' version of Henry VI was, is ultimately dooming his country to suffer at the hands of those without such scruples. Remembering the horrors of the civil wars, the theater of the Exclusion Crisis does not retreat into courtliness, but instead creates increasingly vivid and violent spectacles as a warning against repeating the conflicts of the past.

Both plays are explicit about framing their relationship to Shakespeare and their source texts, though this relationship is more complex than Crowne acknowledges. Unlike most of the dramatists adapting Shakespeare in the Restoration, Crowne attempts to reject Shakespeare's influence. In the Prologue for *Miseries*, Crown claims, perhaps ironically, that "by his feeble Skill 'tis built alone, / The Divine *Shakespear* did not lay one Stone."[355] However, the actual text of the play draws quite heavily from Shakespeare's, with Crowne's contributions generally functioning as additions to the existing text rather than a full-scale revisions. In the Dedicatory Epistle for *Henry the Sixth*, Crowne is more explicit about his reasons for using Shakespeare, even if he is no less truthful about the extent to which he copies Shakespeare's text. He claims to have only used Shakespeare's name "to support it on the Stage" (i.e., to prevent it from being censored).[356] His assertion that Shakespeare "has no Title to the 40th part of" the text is a rather incredible falsehood,[357] as many scenes are lifted more or less verbatim from Shakespeare. Indeed, many scenes read more like

---

[354] Crowne, *The Misery of Civil War*, A1r.
[355] Crowne, *The Miseries of Civil War*, A1r.
[356] Crowne, *Henry the Sixth*, A3r.
[357] Crowne, *Henry the Sixth*, A3r.

patchwriting than as adaptations. Still, Crowne's critiques of Shakespeare's *2 Henry VI* are neither wholly condemnatory nor praising:

> For though *Shakespear* be generally very delightful, he is not so always. His Volumn is all up-hill and down; *Paradise* was never more pleasant than some parts of it, nor *Ireland* and *Greenland* colder, and more uninhabitable then others. And I have undertaken to cultivate one of the most barren Places in it. The Trees are all Shrubs, and the Men Pigmies, nothing has any Spirit, or shape; the Cardinal is duller then ever Priest was. And he has bu[n]dled up the Murder of Duke *Humphry*, as if he had been guilty of him self, and was afraid to show how it was done.[358]

This claim highlights Crowne's own interventions: while he has made use of the scenes in Shakespeare that he has found useful or pleasing, he has approached both *Henry the Sixth* and the earlier *Miseries* with an eye toward increasing its grandeur: heightening the emotional weight behind each scene, whether through increased violence, romance, or intrigue. Throughout both plays, the horrors are greater, and the moments of pathos extended to a degree that modern audiences would likely find uncomfortable. In these reworkings, the plays come to resemble heroic tragedies of the kind popularized by Dryden more so than the history plays that Shakespeare wrote them as.

Crowne's paratexts also make explicit the supposed political goals of each play, though again this seems to be as much a screen against potential censorship as it does an honest accounting. If Crowne is to be believed, then the primary aim of each play is to produce an anti-Catholic polemic, rather than a nuanced examination of kingship and governance. While the plays can—and do—achieve both, Crowne's paratexts suggest that the sole purpose of each is to highlight the horrors of popery in past ages. In *Miseries*,

---

[358] Crowne, *Henry the Sixth*, A3v.

Crowne's Prologue gestures outward to the conflicts of the Popish Plot, centering them as the key problems with both the theaters and English society. He begins by asking if there are "no other ways, / To damn the Pope, but damning all our Plays?"[359] In doing so, he, like most playwrights of the late 1670s and early 1680s, condemns hysteria over the Popish Plot for its negative effects on theatre attendance. Similarly, the prologue for *Henry the First* suggests that the theaters have been "forsaken" and are now abandoned even by the prostitutes, unless they are seeking shelter from the "Constables [who] find 'em elsewhere, / And their torn Coats for Romish Reliques seize, / And the poor Girles for Painted Images."[360] Fears of Catholicism have not only driven away both the audiences and the related industries from the theaters, they have also led to the persecution of any suspected of or related to Catholic traditions. Here, the prostitutes in their (presumably colorful) clothes and their "painted" makeup are mistaken for Catholic idols, perhaps with an additional joke implying the supposed lechery of priests. Crowne's dedicatory epistle to Charles Sidley is more direct in stating his anti-Catholic stance within the play: "this play is no indifferent Satyre upon the most pompous fortunate and potent Folly, that ever reigned over the minds of men, called Popery." [361] This letter goes on to denounce the failure of reason in a period where folly (i.e., Catholicism) "rode on mends Shoulders, and trod on Princes Necks" before drawing parallels between the Popish Plot and the Gunpowder Plot [362]

---

[359] Crowne, *The Miseries of Civil War*, A1r.
[360] Crowne, *Henry the First*, A2r.
[361] Crowne, *Henry the Sixth*, A3r.
[362] Crowne, *Henry the Sixth*, A3r.

This anti-Catholic narrative in the prefatory material is, unlike Crowne's description of his use of Shakespeare, supported by the content of both plays. Among the targets of Jack Cade's mob violence are those who speak Latin and all "notorious Knaves…[who] sit up nightly a Plotting and Caballing."[363] Beyond this, however, much of *Miseries* is anti-French, rather than explicitly anti-Catholic, though during the period the two were often synonymous. By contrast, *Henry the Sixth* frequently evokes common tropes of anti-Catholic literature through the character of the Cardinal, who parodies Catholic rites and seeks illegitimate and excessive political power. Moreover, Crowne's depiction of Elianor as engaged in demonic summoning and Queen Margaret cursing England to "make Religion thy Reproach and Curse" creates an atmosphere in which political authority is undermined less by religion as such, and more by the state of religious hypocrisy as a path to power. As Barbara Murray has argued, Margaret's curse embodies one of Crowne's central themes "by which this state of moral and political collapse is conveyed; that of the perceptible encroachment and developing power of a new and infernal order…it is rather a clear awareness and conscious acceptance among many characters of what is essentially a wicked supernatural parody of human social hierarchy at work behind all of the play's action."[364] The anti-Catholic narrative, then, functions less as a condemnation of Catholicism than as a means of using popular vernacular to critique the moral fabric of the realm.

Crowne's devoutly anti-Catholic satire is hardly unusual in the period; indeed, most plays included at least some jab at popery, even if only in their prologues. However, the

---

[363] Crowne, *Miseries*, 4.
[364] Murray, 175.

subject matter of *Henry the First* and *Miseries* makes a more nuanced reading of anti-Catholicism in these plays necessary. Just as in Shakespeare, one of the most significant features of Crowne's Henry VI is his religious devotion, and, given that the play is set in pre-Reformation England, that devotion can only be Catholic in nature, and while Henry VI is hardly heroic, he is the pathetic center of the plays' interrogations of power and inheritance. In order for the plays to have the necessary emotional weight to make these interrogations valuable, Henry VI has to evoke sympathy from the audience, even as a devoutly Catholic king. Otherwise, Plantagenet's usurpation of his throne can too easily be read as the removal of an unjust and unlawful king, rather than the murder of a rightful monarch.

However, Crowne's paratextual centering of the plays' anti-Catholic plotlines is partially a smoke screen to distract censors from the plays' more politically provocative content: their examinations of kingship. By framing the plays as explicitly anti-Catholic, Crowne likely sought to avoid having his plays banned before they could be performed. Doing so would both ensure that he and the theater received payment for the play and allow Crowne's complicated analysis of kingcraft to become part of the political discussion. Playgoers from the court and the commons alike would be leaving the theater with the complexities of inheritance, succession, and political division fresh in their minds. Through parallels with the Exclusion Crisis and past political conflicts, "Crowne's play embodies the historical irony that the efforts of the previous twenty years to forget the miseries of the interregnum have led to a point where another civil war seems possible precisely because

the Whigs and Tories appear to have lost touch with the lessons of the past."[365] Far from being a neatly Tory denunciation of usurpation, Crowne examines political power as it exists both in the hands of the people and in various factions within a highly divided court, suggesting that it is more important to seek a good ruler—in whatever form—than to adhere dogmatically to particular rules of inheritance.

Crowne's *Miseries* begins with a stark example of what happens when leadership fails: rebellion and civil war. The play opens on Jack Cade's rebellion, greatly expanding Shakespeare's *2 Henry VI* 4.6. More of the rebels speak, their threats and demands are more specific, and their violence is more explicit. This first scene sets up the discord at the heart of Henry VI's reign—he is not a strong king, and rulership can be created by force (even if only temporarily). Indeed, Robert Shimko notes that while Shakespeare "takes great pains to prepare his audience for Cade," Crowne's abrupt and violent beginning "establishes the state of disruption it represents as the rule rather than the exception."[366] This section is intensely violent, and while it draws upon Shakespeare's *2 Henry VI* 4.6, it significantly expands upon the original to highlight the horrors of mob justice and the stark division between the "plain honest men" of Cade's rebellion and the various learned or wealthier classes. Cade and his men have suffered under intense economic disparity, often due to

---

[365] Robert Shimko, "The Miseries of History: Shakespearean Extremity as Cautionary Tale on the Restoration Stage," *Theater History Studies* 29 (2009): 88.
[366] Shimko, "The Miseries of History," 85, 86. Shimko also asserts that "Crowne's revision of Shakespearean dramaturgy and his amplification of Shakespeare's violent imagery reflect the royalist program of selective historiography and scare tactics meant to deter the Whigs from renewing their challenge to royal authority." However, I read Crowne's play as more nuanced. Although Crowne's depiction of Cade can certainly be read as Whiggish, the continual interrogation of successful kingship does not lend itself to an uncomplicated royalist reading of the play.

foreign trade with France. They see intellectual pursuits, education, the ability to write or to speak Latin, and the increase of popular print as central to their oppression, and rather than appropriating these tools for their own use, they seek to destroy them and those with access to them in order to reduce everyone to their own level.

As discussed in Chapter 3, such depictions of the crowd's potential for violence are commonly read as anti-Whig in nature, but Crowne complicates such a reading by having Cade explain how he will restore the nation to its former glory and "sweep the world clean of such filth" as has been brought upon the country by the current nobles. Cade denounces propaganda (and printing writ large) as "contrary to the King, his Crown and Dignity."[367] Throughout the Exclusion Crisis, a profusion of Whig propaganda was produced to build upon the fears aroused by the Popish Plot and "stressed the horrors that could be expected should a [C]atholic be king."[368] While such propaganda was rarely directly critical of the king, it did galvanize the crowd to hold Whiggish beliefs and "had a potential for being interpreted in a more radical way than perhaps its authors desired,"[369] leading to stronger anti-Catholic and Exclusionist beliefs among a broader section of the population. Having Cade denounce propaganda suggests an oddly royalist bent to his rhetoric, albeit one that would only serve to support his own reign. Elsewhere in the play, Crowne revisits the question of propaganda's power to shape politics. This skepticism of propaganda extends throughout the play; for example, Young Clifford asks "Are royal Robes made of such rags

---

[367] Crowne, *Miseries*, 3.
[368] Tim Harris, *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II: Propaganda and Politics from the Restoration until the Exclusion Crisis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 97.
[369] Tim Harris, *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II: Propaganda and Politics from the Restoration until the Exclusion Crisis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

as Pamphlets?"[370] Cade's extended critique of all education, by contrast, extends the anti-Whig argument well beyond its logical end, seeking to disenfranchise everyone from education and politics alike, creating mob rule or tyranny as the only kinds of possible government. In doing so, Crowne demonstrates that the kind of policies that would limit the printing of propaganda would inherently limit the crowd's access to information and thus their ability to act as informed members of a civic body.

While Crowne's presentation of Cade suggests an anti-Whig political bent, both *Miseries* and *Henry the Sixth* have also been viewed as anti-royalist due to potential parallels between Henry VI and Charles I. Though these parallels are, at times, nebulous, the plays' depictions of weak rulership leading to civil war revived the recent history of the English civil wars even as they implied that the disputes between Charles II and his Parliament over succession could lead to conflict yet again. The qualities of a good king, a decisive and warlike king, are quantified through comparisons between Henry VI and his father Henry V. *Miseries* has Henry VI pointedly explain his failure to live up to the legacy of his father: "My Childish hand, not able to support / My Fathers Sword, dropt the victorious point, / And let fall all the Lawrels that adorn'd it."[371] In *Henry the Sixth*, comparisons between Henry VI and his warlike father are equally as pronounced. One of the core conflicts of the play is the Queen's desire to remove Henry from the control of his protector, Humphrey Duke of Gloucester, and see him rule in his own right. However, nearly all of Henry's courtiers express doubts about Henry's capability to rule, which are summarized by Suffolk:

> He is indeed no more but a King's Ghost,

---

[370] Crowne, *Miseries*, 13.
[371] Crowne, *The Miseries of Civil War*, 9.

> That walks in night; it has been night in *England*
> E'r since that Glorious Sun, his Father, set.
> And *France* and *England*, like two metled Steeds
> Bound, startle, break their reins, and run away,
> At the sight of this pale Ghost; nor will be Govern'd.[372]

Henry VI's central failing, then, is that he is not his father, that he has none of the warlike qualities or leadership skills of his predecessor. He is, at best, a pale imitation, and, at worst, too caught up in his own religiosity to succeed in politics.

Despite its anti-Catholic framework, however, the central tension of *Miseries* is determining the legitimacy of royal succession. Illegitimate rule, the play suggests, leads to civil war on the national level and internal conflict for individual citizens, as evidenced through the continuous references to Henry VI's "bad luck." The initial conflict of the play is rooted in the murky legitimacy of Henry VI's reign, which is the product of an interrupted line of inheritance, namely that of Richard II, whose throne was usurped by Henry IV, Henry VI's grandfather. Douglass Canfield has argued that Crowne "emphasizes Shakespeare's point that King Henry is weak precisely because this title to the crown is weak, and he portrays Edward of York, who emerges at the end as Edward IV, as flawed but legitimate."[373] The play's ends ambiguously, with Edward declaring that Henry's and "the Kingdom's dreadful Ruines prove, / A Monarch's Right is an unshaken Rock, / No storms of War nor time can wear away, / And Wracks those Pirates that come there for prey."[374] These lines suggest that, with Henry deposed and dead, the line of succession has been put once more to rights. However, they counterintuitively leave the path open for

---

[372] Crowne, *Henry the Sixth*, 10
[373] Canfield, *Heroes and States*, 42.
[374] Crowne, *Miseries*, 71.

future succession debates, even as they ground kingship in a sort of uncontestable divine right.

However, throughout much of the play the very concept of legitimacy is open to debate. Henry VI's divine right is challenged by the competing blood rights of the Plantagenets, though both claims are ultimately determined not by legal claims, but by martial ones. Even though Henry attempts to name the Plantagenet line as his heirs, Warwick points out that this, too, causes a crisis of succession, that the king "cou'd not give away another's right. *Henry* usurp'd the right of the next Heirs,"[375]—his own children. Thus, *Miseries* offers an impossible position for the English monarchy. Henry is unfit to rule, and his claim to the throne is grounded in usurpation. Yet he cannot simply relinquish his crown without both inciting violence and further destabilizing the line of succession.

This conundrum echoes the central conflict of the Exclusion Crisis. Although Charles's legitimacy was not in question, his successor was. Despite his claim as Charles's legal heir, James's Catholicism disqualified him from the throne in the eyes of many. However, to disinherit James would be to negate the ideas of divine right that had governed monarchy for centuries, and which Charles invoked frequently as a means of legitimizing his restored reign. To legitimize Monmouth would, perhaps, solve the problem of an heir with a blood claim to the throne, yet to do so would be to circumvent James's right even as it set a dangerous precedent: that Parliament could dictate the line of succession. Though newly emerging secret histories suggested that Monmouth was actually legitimate, Charles steadfastly denied both such claims and the possibility of legitimizing his son. Still, the

---

[375] Crowne, *Miseries*, 25.

question of legitimacy was central to the discourse of the Exclusion Crisis, including the drama of the period.

Crowne's adaptations never offer a clear assertion of what a legitimate reign actually is, only that an illegitimate king, however defined, will lead to unending strife. *Miseries* presents a series of possible kings—Cade, Henry VI, Plantagenet, and Edward—but all are presented as flawed both in their ability to lead and in the legitimacy of their claims to the throne. The need for clear lines of succession is of utmost importance to the entire cast of the play. Upon taking the throne, Plantagenet's first act is establishing a line of succession: "Sons, I here take possession of my right, / And will be Crown'd or kill'd:—if I shou'd fall, / Son *Edward* claim the Crown, if you fall with me, / Then, *George*, the Crown is thine, if both you die, / Then, *Richard*, thou art King… / And last in birth by not in my Affection, / Here is my litle [sic] pretty darling *Rutland*, / Look to him, Guard, for if his brothers Perish, / He is your King."[376] Edward likewise reestablishes the line of succession when he claims the throne.

Ultimately, Crowne's adaptations are an interrogation of what makes a good king, and whether a good king is more important than the rightful king. As with the question of legitimacy, none of the potential rulers is, truly, suited to rule. Throughout both plays it becomes clear that it is not—or, at least, not only—Henry VI's descent from a usurper that makes him an unfit king. His father, Henry V, is repeatedly used as a model of successful kingship: he is warlike, he conquered France, and "the whole Empire of the World did seem

[376] Crowne, *Miseries*, 23.

to own itself the Birth right of his Valour,"[377] yet the "degenerate faint-hearted" Henry VI, with his pious nature and his impoverished foreign bride, has in a matter of years lost all that his father had built. Though *Henry the Sixth* is careful to balance the blame for many of these losses across Henry V's brothers—particularly Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, whose murder gives the play its subtitle—Henry VI's unsuitability as a king is continually contrasted against his father's overwhelming successes in war and in empire building.

Rather than raise his own armies against Plantagenet, Henry's initial response is a long period of introspection on the legitimacy of his crown. Determining that his troubled reign is due to his grandfather's usurpation, he decides to yield to Plantagenet's supposedly more rightful claim in order to avoid the very miseries for which the play is named: "I am better arm'd with innocence. / But I confess I do fear Civil War; / Not for my own, but for my peoples sake, / I am afraid to shed the blood of *English* men, / But you indeed are bold in cruelty."[378] Paradoxically, Henry's willingness to give up his throne stems from a desire to serve his people, thus evidencing a level of civic-oriented compassion that makes him, at least in one respect, a good king. Even as he realizes that his claim to the throne is, on some level, at least, illegitimate, he knows that any abrupt shift in monarchical power will "set a thousand Veins a bleeding" as those who support his claim or benefit from his reign tear the country apart against his wishes. Of course, this debate is ultimately made moot by the eventuality of Richard III's seizure of the crown, and anyone familiar with their Shakespeare

---

[377] Crowne, *Henry the Sixth*, 2.
[378] Crowne, *Miseries*, 23.

or with the Tudor propaganda campaign against Richard would be well familiar with his villainy.

Edward is the closest example we are given of a successful king, yet he is hardly without his own flaws. Throughout the play, he is presented as a standard Restoration libertine rake, seducing women and making promises of marriage that he cannot keep. It is this characterization that led Douglass Canfield to read Edward as a commentary on Charles II that both condemned his womanizing even as it demonstrated his potential for successful rule.[379] However, Edward is given little time to rule in Crowne's play, and his reign was, at least in terms of the drama and historical chronicles of the day, far less noteworthy than the reigns of either Henry VI or Richard III. Perhaps, then, Crowne's argument is that the only good king is a quiet one.

The Sicilian Usurper (Tate, December 1680)

Barbara A. Murray has argued that Crowne's Henry VI plays set up Tate's adaptation of *Richard II* to be even more unsettling to political censors "because Crowne chose both to stress the guilt of Henry VI's usurping grandfather, by having Henry continuously acknowledge this, and to conclude with a promise of heavenly reward for his personal goodness, the king's assassination in the earlier play may have appeared to be a much less heinous event."[380] Crowne's Henry VI is ultimately portrayed sympathetically—if he is not a good ruler in the same warlike manner as his father, he is, at least, a pious one,

---

[379] See Canfield, *Heroes and States: On the Ideology of Restoration Tragedy*, Chapter 3.
[380] Barbara A. Murray, *Restoration Shakespeare: Viewing the Voice* (Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2001).

and the continuous praise of Henry V throughout Crowne's plays suggests that the usurpation of Richard II led, albeit briefly, to a golden age for England. For Tate to immediately stage that usurpation seems, in hindsight, inevitably doomed to failure. Though Tate makes significant changes to Shakespeare's characterization—making Richard II less autocratic and modeling parts of Bullingbrooke's rebellion on populist Whig discourse—he is still, ultimately, producing a play in which a reigning monarch is deposed and murdered by someone with little legal claim to the throne. Thus, Tate's *The Sicilian Usurper* was banned from the stage not once, but twice, under two different names, first under its original name, and later under its alias.[381] It was printed shortly after it was pulled from performance, due to both far less stringent censorship rules governing print than performance and Tate's own desire to clear his name through demonstrating that the content was not worthy of being censored.

Tate's rebuttal of government censure is foregrounded on the title page of the first edition of the play. The center of the page, often reserved for the descriptive subtitle of a play, instead reads "With a Prefatory *Epistle* in Vindication of the AUTHOR. Occasion'd by the PROHIBITION of this *PLAY* on the Stage."[382] The six-page epistle begins by

---

[381] There is some confusion over exactly how the play was presented. Tate's dedicatory epistle notes that the play was "suppress, first in its own Name, and after in Disguise." Given that the title page and character names are for *The History of King Richard the Second*, this seems to suggest that the play was initially performed under this Shakespearean title, and later under the title of *The Sicilian Usurper*. However, based on the Newdigate Newsletters, *The London Stage* also lists a third title, *The Tyrant of Sicily*, which is not mentioned by Tate or included in the printed edition. It is thus possible that an attempt was made at staging the play after its publication.

[382] Tate, *The History of King Richard the Second* (London: Printed for Richard Tonson and Jacob Tonson, 1681).

vindicating itself through citing its Shakespearean source text as both justification for its content and its continued survival. Had the play been Tate's alone, it "shou'd have been buried in Oblivion…but it still retains the immortal Spirit of its first-Father, and will survive in Print, though forbid to tread the Stage."[383] Tate thus claims that his use of Shakespeare makes his play worth reading, even as, throughout the dedicatory epistle, he repeatedly tries to distance himself from the thornier political implications of Shakespeare's play.

Tate presents a rather naïve front, claiming that his play has "as little design of Satyr on present Transactions, as *Shakespear* himself that wrote this Story before this Age began."[384] This is only true on a technicality—Shakespeare could not, of course, write about future events—yet it also overlooks the troubled history of *Richard II*'s Elizabethan performances. Shakespeare's *Richard II* was a controversial play in its own time, and Tate's adaptation was, perhaps, even more so. The censors may have been particularly attentive to Tate's play due to the use of Shakespeare's *Richard II* both as commentary on the uncertainty surrounding Elizabeth's successor and in Essex's rebellion.

One of the most famous anecdotes in early modern literary history involves the performance of a play "of King Henry the Fourth, and of the killing of Richard the Second, and played by the Lord Chamberlain's players."[385] While it is uncertain how much of this history would have been well known in the 1680s, Scott-Warren has proved that Lambarde's manuscript was known, at least to those with a connection to the family, and a

---

[383] Tate, *Richard the Second*, A1r.
[384] Tate, *Richard the Second*, A1r.
[385] *S.P. Dom. Eliz.* 1598-1601, vol. CCLXXVIII, art. 78, quoted in Evelyn May Albright, "Shakespeare's *Richard II* and the Essex Conspiracy," *PMLA* 42.3 (1927), 689.

continued interest in Elizabeth as a historical figure and model for protestant monarchy suggests that Tate and his censors likely had at least a passing familiarity with the play's earlier connotations. Though there has been some scholarly debate over precisely what play was performed, the general scholarly consensus points to Shakespeare's *Richard II*. An accompanying anecdote reports Elizabeth herself saying to William Lambarde "I am Richard II. Know ye not that?"[386] Scholarly arguments linking Elizabeth with Shakespeare's *Richard II* and reading the play's performance at the start of the Essex rebellion have long served as key exempla in the politicization of drama in the early modern period.

In this light, it is easy to see why Tate's adaptation of *Richard II* was censored, particularly when performed under its original name, and with its original characters. Parallels between both Charles I and Charles II and Richard II would not have been difficult for a suspicious audience member or reader to find, and choices made in performance may have highlighted these parallels further through dress or mannerisms. Helpfully, Tate's dedicatory epistle outlines exactly the parallels that he claims not to be making:

> I am not ignorant of the posture of Affairs in King *Richard* the Second's Reign, how dissolute then the Age, and how corrupt the Court; a Season that beheld *Ignorance* and *Infamy* preferr'd to *Office* and *Pow'r*, exercis'd in Oppressing, Learning, and Merit; but why a History of those Times shou'd be supprest as a Libel upon Ours, is past my Understanding.[387]

---

[386] Quoted in Jason Scott-Warren, "Was Elizabeth I Richard II?: The Authenticity of Lambarde's 'Conversation,'" *The Review of English Studies* 64.264 (2012), 208. Scott-Warren's article analyzes the history of this this quote and argues convincingly for its validity.
[387] Tate, *Richard the Second*, A1r-A1v.

Charles II and his court were, of course, commonly critiqued for their own dissolute natures and corruption, so much so that entire schools of satire were founded on such critiques and were popular enough that courtiers themselves often participated. At the same time, however, Tate's statement seems to echo common denunciations of the Whig party, which sought to diminish the "office and power" of the king and his ability to rule by royal prerogative. The ambivalence of this initial statement about the play's censorship demonstrates the nature of the political critique established by the play itself: even as it depicts a king whose chief failure is his inability to be guided by others, it also condemns Whiggish populism and attempts to usurp royal authority. Even more so than in Shakespeare's play, Tate's Richard and Bolingbroke (here, Bullingbrook) are both deeply flawed and politically problematic.

Tate describes Shakespeare's depictions of the Duke of York and King Richard in terms that could be—and were—applied to James and Charles by members of the opposition: Shakespeare's "*Duke of York* after all his buisy pretended Loyalty, is found false to his Kinsman and Sovereign, and joyn'd with the *Conspirators*. His King *Richard* Himself is painted in the worst Colours of History. Dissolute, Unadviseable, devoted to Ease and Luxury."[388] However, Tate is careful to distinguish his approach to these same characters. He has revisited the chronicle histories that served as Shakespeare's sources, and he provides a more charitable reading of Richard, whom he has "given…the Language of an Active, Prudent Prince. Preferring the Good of his Subjects to his own Private Pleasure."[389]

---

[388] Tate, *Richard the Second*, A1v.
[389] Tate, *Richard the Second*, A1v.

Beyond this, Tate notes that his "Design was to engage the pitty of the Audience for [Richard] in his Distresses, which I never could have compass'd had I not before shewn him a Wise, Active and Just Prince. Detracting Language (if any where) had been excusable in the Mouths of the Conspirators."[390] Thus, the only negative depictions of Richard are those that come from his opponents, not from Tate himself, and any who read Tate as opposing the king or advocating for regicide are, according to Tate, misreading the play.

Yet such misreadings were apparently quite common, at least among censors, for the play was suppressed twice, under two or three different titles, and was presumably censored before the first performance under its original title. When first performed in December 1680 as *The Sicilian Usurper*, the play survived for three performances, before being banned "'by the Lord Chamberlain Arlington as an anti-monarchical play.'"[391] The next month, the play was revived under the name *The Tyrant of Sicily*, with renamed characters and a new setting, but the alterations were not enough to either appease or fool the censors. The revived play was removed from the stage after only two performances, experiencing "a positive Doom of Suppression *without Examination*."[392] While the text of the play itself offers a deeply ambivalent view of kingship and authority, it may also have suffered from the proximity of other critiques of monarchy. Following Crowne's plays, censors may have been more alert to the potential for Shakespeare's histories to be adapted as political critique. Beyond the playhouse, Leticia Álvarez-Recio has pointed out that

---

[390] Tate, *Richard the Second*, A1v.
[391] *The London Stage* cites the preface to Charles Gildon's *The Patriot* (1703), which briefly discusses the banning. *The London Stage*, 293.
[392] Tate, *Richard the Second*, A2v.

"Tate's work was performed at the same time as the Whigs brought up the story of King Richard in a pamphlet by John Somers entitled *A Brief History of the Succession*, in which Richard's deposition was justified and the parliament's supremacy over the king's divine rights was asserted."[393] Thus, it is possible that the censoring of Tate's play was an attempt to quell yet one more entry in a long political debate, rather than a reaction to the specifics of Tate's play on their own merits.[394]

Conversely, the precise timing of Tate's performances may have influenced the decision to ban it from the stage. The king and the various court factions had long been at odds over the matter of the succession and its implications for religious stability within the kingdom. Yet these questions were not merely ideological; they bore implications for the financial wellbeing of the court and country as well. As Barbara Murray writes, "Parliament had been steadily denying money to Charles and on 10 January [1681], a week before the play's performances, the king had prorogued (and was soon to dissolve) his apparently rebellious legislature. Parallels with the events of the 1640s…must have been very apparent in many minds."[395] When Crowne's *Miseries of Civil War* was produced eleven months earlier, in February 1680, the political situation was somewhat more stable: the organization of the opposition party was beginning to crumble as many of its leaders resigned, and Charles

---

[393] Leticia Álvarez-Recio, "Nahum Tate's The History of King Richard the Second (1681): Politics and Censorship during the Exclusion Crisis," *Restoration & 18th Century Theatre Research* 24, no. 1 (n.d.): 18.

[394] The opposite, of course, also holds true: Tate's play *as performed* may have held even more explicit visual parallels to current events, and thus drew the ire of the censors in ways that the pamphlet and other performances did not.

[395] Barbara A. Murray, *Restoration Shakespeare: Viewing the Voice* (Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2001).

"took advantage of the opposition's difficulties to purge dissent among his judges, and to remodel his Court, though as much with an eye to diplomacy as internal strength."[396] This sense of stability did not last, however, and by 1681, Charles faced increasingly determined attempts at passing an exclusion bill or some other means of limiting James's potential power should he take the throne. Thus, Tate's play premiered at a moment in which the Exclusion Crisis had reached its climax, when Charles and his loyal factions were almost certainly desperate to keep rebellious sentiment as limited as possible. Staging a regicide—no matter how that regicide was framed—simply could not be allowed.

Though Tate could not have foreseen the difficulties of his play's premier, he did take several steps to mitigate some of the more obvious objections that could be raised about Shakespeare's play. Not only did he alter the characterization of both Richard and Bullingbrook, he made a number of additions to the play that make it a somewhat unusual adaptation for the Exclusion Crisis, though a rather ordinary one by the standards of the 1660s and early 1670s. Beyond alterations to Shakespeare's language, slightly expanded women's roles, and manipulation of the source text's politics, Tate adds two songs—a meditation on "Love's Delights" and "SONG for the Prison SCENE in the last ACT"—and some "additional Comedy…judged necessary to help off the heaviness of the Tale" and to offer "the Pleasure of Variety" since "few Tragedies (except those in Verse) shall succeed in this Age if they are not lightned with a course of Mirth."[397] However, it is difficult to locate the comedy in these added scenes, which are primarily mob scenes that echo those

---

[396] Knights, 69.
[397] Tate, *Richard the Second*, A5r (songs); A3r.

added in adaptations throughout the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis. Any comedy to be found in these scenes would almost certainly be overshadowed by the threats of rebellion and civil war that lay behind them.

Richard the Second, then, is often a play of contradictions, many of which are brought about by the changes Tate makes to both Richard and Bullingbrook. Tate's characterization of Richard, as with Crowne's depiction of Henry VI, suggests a ruler who is often too distanced from the matters of state. Several scholars have read this distance as a reference to Charles I. Lisanna Calvi, for example, argues that Tate's Richard is read as analogous to Charles I, and seems to hint that Charles II could meet a similar fate.[398] Similarly, Matthew H. Wikander sees both Tate's Richard II and Crowne's Henry VI as "figure[s] of Charles I, king and martyr, dying to spare his country's blood."[399] Such readings draw attention to the frequent cries of "forty-two is come again" that emphasized similarities between the Exclusion Crisis and the events that led to the demise of Charles I. Indeed, Richard echoes the common refrain against civil war in the period: to stop Mowbray and Bullingbrooke from fighting, Richard declares that his "Eyes detest the spectacle / of Civil Wounds, from whence the dire infection / Of general War may spring" In the opening scenes, there are several such lines that seem to position Richard as an analogue to Charles I on the eve of disaster. However, I contend that Tate's Richard is equally as much a commentary on Charles II as on his father.

---

[398] Lisanna Calvi, *Kingship and Tragedy (1660-1715)* (Verona: QuiEdit, 2005).
[399] Matthew H. Wikander, "The Spitted Infant: Scenic Emblem and Exclusionist Politics in Restoration Adaptations of Shakespeare," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 37.3 (1986), 353.

Gaunt criticizes Richard as a young, inexperienced king who will not listen to his council and "whose easie gentle Nature has expos'd His unexperienc'd Youth to flatterers frauds."[400] Although Charles II was, at fifty, no longer young, the image of a king who is by nature both gentle and easily flattered fits at least one popular portrayal of the king—the same one which has granted him a lasting reputation as England's "Merry Monarch," however much of an oversimplification that title may be. Gaunt also notes that many of Richard's "Sycophants [have been] bred from [his] Child-hood with [him]," much as some of Charles's more troubling courtiers—notably George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham, who was one of the leading voices of the opposition party—had been raised with him in exile during the Interregnum. Charles himself was accused of neglecting to listen to his Parliaments and his advisors. Even after dismissing his Parliament in July 1679, Charles retained his privy council, though it was "rent by division and anomalies" in terms of political ideology, religious belief, and foreign policy.[401] Thus, Charles was able to play the various factions off of one another, leaving himself with a variety of different potential positions, which he could adopt as the situation demanded.

By contrast, Tate's Richard is, at least initially, somewhat more willing to listen to the advice of his counsellors than either his Shakespearean predecessor or Charles II. At the beginning of the second act, Richard asks forgiveness for his "youthful Blood" and promises that he will not "be unmindfull to redress, / (However difficult) our States

---

[400] Tate, *Richard the Second*, 12.

[401] For a more detailed examination of Charles's privy council and court throughout the Exclusion Crisis, see Mark Knights's *Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678-81* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994). The citation is from this volume, p. 56.

corruption, / and purge the Vanities that Crown'd our Court."[402] Such vanities were, of course, a common critique of and the butt of many satires on Charles II's court. Tate's Richard attempts to circumvent accusations of corruption and vanity through lengthy speeches. While Tate revises Richard's seizure of Bullingbrook's lands and goods, his revisions highlight corruption and financial trouble within the court. Richard claims to seize the property in order to fund his return to war, a move necessary because "our Coffers with too great a Court / and liberal Largess, are grown somewhat Light."[403] Like Charles, Richard has overspent on courtly grandeur and now requires funds in order to maintain foreign policy. Though the funds are only to be seized "for a time,"[404] York begs Richard not to enrage Bullingbrook and invite a rebellion. While Shakespeare's Richard tells York to "think what you will,"[405] Tate's Richard offers a lengthy justification for the "loan" which he "but shortly will with interest restore."[406] According to Tate's dedicatory epistle, this scene is designed to illustrate Richard's good intentions, but a less charitable reading only emphasizes the instability of Richard's court and political goals. He is more interested in the glory of his wars with Scotland and the maintenance of a lavish court than he is with avoiding the displeasure of his subjects. Given the timing of Charles II's own recent conflicts with Scotland and his continued rejection of popular politics, Richard II likely served as a far more compelling analogue for the current monarch than Crowne's Henry VI.

---

[402] Tate, *Richard the Second*, 13-14.
[403] Tate, *Richard the Second*, 14.
[404] Tate, *Richard the Second*, 14.
[405] Shakespeare, *Richard II*, 2.1.209.
[406] Tate, *Richard the Second*, 15.

Moreover, the Scottish rebellion of 1679 was likely key in Tate's construction of Bullingbrook, who frequently reads as analogous to the Duke of Monmouth. Tate recharacterizes Bullingbrook as a brute, "as hot in Combate as…in Brawl."[407] This characterization is not present in Shakespeare, but could easily be read as a gesture towards Monmouth, who was not only a central figure in the English military hierarchy, but who also had violent tendencies and was involved in at least one fatal brawl. Even so, Monmouth, like Bullingbrook was often viewed as heroic, rather than brutish. Immediately after the exchange above, Bullingbrook declares himself an exposer of "all the Treasons, Plots, Conspiracies…within this realm."[408] While this line closely follows Shakespeare's "all the treasons…complotted and contrived in this land,"[409] the addition of the words "plot" and "conspiracy" inevitably echo the language used to discuss the Popish Plot and conspiracies to assassinate Charles II or alter the succession. Tate also removes Mowbray's confession to attempting to have Bullingbrooke killed, thus giving Bullingbrooke less tangible motive for his attacks on Mowbray. The differences between the two lords here seem more ideological than physical or material, allowing the audience's focus to linger on the ideological bases for each character's actions.

Bullingbrook's initial concerns with plotting echoes the central Whiggish goal of exposing and counteracting the Popish Plot. His friends and followers are quickly painted with Whiggish sympathies as well. They lay out the core of their grievances early in the play:

---

[407] Tate, *Richard the Second*, 3.
[408] Tate, *Richard the Second*, 3.
[409] Shakespeare, *Richard II*, 1.1.95-6.

"Now rot the tongue that scants a Subject's freedom."[410] This line, not in Shakespeare, seems to endorse the Whig slogan of "liberty and property," asserting the individual subject's rights against an absolutist monarch. However, as with most plays of this period, it is not possible to read Bullingbrook and his supporters as mere stand-ins for Whig ideology. Their plots also highlight one of the key arguments in favor of James's succession, that to subvert the line of inheritance would subvert the natural order. Willoughby observes that

> Nature her self of late hath broke her Order…
> Rivers themselves refuse their wonted course,
> Start wide or turn on their own Fountain heads;
> Our Lawrels all are blasted, rambling Meteors
> Affright the fixst inhabitants of Heav'n.
> The pale fac't Moon looks bloody on the Earth,
> And lean-lookt Prophets whisper dreadful change.[411]

These lines point to several contemporary events, including a series of anti-Catholic prophecy pamphlets published in 1679. [412] More notably, the scene likely refers to a meteor which on 12 December 1680 John Evelyn described as "of an obscure bright Colour…resembling the brightnesse of the *Moone* when under a thin Clow'd, very much in shape like the blade of a sword…What this may Portend (for it was very extraordinarie) God onely knows; but such another *Phaenomenon* I remember I saw…in the yeare *1640*, about the Triall of the greate Earle of *Strafford*."[413] Evelyn's connection of this meteor to the Earl of Strafford's trial echoes similar connections being made between the 1640 trial of the

---

[410] Tate, *Richard the Second*, 15.
[411] Tate, *Richard the Second*, 16.
[412] See, for example, "Dr. Martin Luthers Prophecies of the Destruction of Rome and the Downfall of the Romish Religion" (London: Printed for W. W., May 7, 1679), or Hanserd Knollys, "An Exposition of the Eleventh Chapter of the Revelation. Wherein All those Things therein Revealed, which must shortly come to pass, are Explained." (n.p., 1679).
[413] John Evelyn, *The Diary of John Evelyn*, ed. E. S. deBeer. Vol. 4 (Oxford: OUP, 1955), 235.

Earl of Strafford and the more recent trial and impending execution of the Earl of Stafford in November 1680 for treason. The mention of such a portent in Tate's play connects the distant past of Richard II's reign to the more recent conflicts that led to the Civil Wars to the immediate present. Rather than simply expressing a stereotypical Whiggish distaste for Richard's absolutism, then, Bullingbrook's supporters voice a sense of political ambivalence and impending doom connected to seemingly inevitable change, whether within the diegesis of the play or contemporary society.

This ambivalence further connects Bullingbrook to his most common analogue, the Duke of Monmouth. Following his suppression of the Scottish rebellion in 1679, Monmouth was a popular war hero, and much of Bullingbrook's authority seems derived from his own warlike nature. When he returns to England, he is met by numerous supporters of his cause. Johnson argues that this scene echoes the Duke of Monmouth's contemporary progresses through England, noting that he "like Bolingbroke in the play, slipped back into the country. As late as September of 1680, Monmouth was on a series of highly produced progresses in the West, drumming up popular support as Protestant heir and dismissing claims of illegitimacy by touching—successfully—for the 'King's Evil.'"[414] Álvarez-Recio suggests that Bullingbrook is a representative of the fears surrounding the Earl of Shaftesbury and other prominent Whigs whose "dangerous populism" allowed them to manipulate the public.[415]

---

[414] Odai Johnson, *Rehearsing the Revolution: Radical Performance, Radical Politics in the English Restoration* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2000), 101.
[415] Leticia Álvarez-Recio, "Nahum Tate's The History of King Richard the Second (1681): Politics and Censorship during the Exclusion Crisis," *Restoration & 18th Century Theatre Research* 24, no. 1 (2009.): 24.

As in Crowne's *Miseries*, Tate chooses to stage a demonstration of what such a dangerous crowd looks like. Scene 2.4, the scene presented by Tate's introduction as comedic—begins with the entrance of a "rabble" made up of a number of tradesmen: "a shoomaker, farrier, weaver, taaner, mercer, brewer, butcher, barber, *and infinite others with a Confused Noise*."[416] Tate clearly signals the working-class nature of Bullingbrook's supporters, and these professions would likely have been signaled through costumes on stage. Yet these initial descriptors and appearances are oversimplifications. Tate's mob is not just working-class, they are also largely Puritan as demonstrated by names like "Revelation Stitch" and their focus on "strict and wholsom Laws."[417] Moreover, they assert their own political authority, claiming that if "Bullingbrook shall approve himself to our liking, we will fix him upon the last of the Government, or cast him out amongst the shreds and shavings of the Common-wealth."[418] Thus, as the Whig Parliament would seek to do, Tate's mob claims the ability to create kings or cast them off, but that the office of the king is subservient to the commonwealth, here seemingly synonymous with the mob. At the same time, however, a lengthy meditation on the nature of the Commonwealth—"the Butt End of the Nation"—emphasizes that there is little consensus regarding what a commonwealth actually is and who it is designed to support or fail. Though one member of the rabble asserts that in the Commonwealth "all shall be reduc't to the Score and Tally," another asserts that to do so would be to relinquish the power that they have when they hold the debts of gentlemen. Canfield asserts that "the rhetoric of the scene is clearly Royalist: these are not republicans

---

[416] Tate, *Richard the Second*, 20.
[417] Tate, *Richard the Second*, 20-1.
[418] Tate, *Richard the Second*, 21.

but self-interested rebels."[419] However, in their self-interest, the rabble adopt the language of the Whiggish cause.

The opposition of the nobility to the mob is immediately on display when Bullingbrook and his men enter. Both Northumberland and Piercie attempt to "sweep this Dirt out of [Bullingbrook's] way," but Bullingbrook recognizes their usefulness and also appears to identify a particular kinship with their situation: "Rage is the proper weapon of these Bruits" and of brutes like Bullingbrook.[420] Bullingbrook uses common Whig rallying cries in addressing the rabble, noting that he is "jealous of [their] Liberty and Rights" and denouncing "that curst Limb that stirs against your Priviledges."[421] The rabble answers with cries of "A Bullingbrook! A Bullingbrook!" that echo demands for "No York, a Monmouth, a Monmouth!" Yet the scene is also careful to emphasize that Bullingbrook is not just wronged and seeking the recovery of his "borrowed" lands and goods. Here, Tate creates the greatest change in Bullingbrook's character, by having him explain his definition of usurpation:

> If it be only to ascend the Throne,
> To see that justice has a liberal course,
> In needful Wars to lead you forth to Conquest,
> And then dismiss you laden home with Spolis;
> If you mean this, I am at your disposal,
> And for your profit am content to take
> The burden of the State upon my hands.[422]

---

[419] J. Douglas Canfield, *Heroes and States: On the Ideology of Restoration Tragedy* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 2000), 41.
[420] Tate, *Richard the Second*, 22.
[421] Tate, *Richard the Second*, 22.
[422] Tate, *Richard the Second*, 23.

Bullingbrook's usurpation is inherently violent in nature, and seems aimed as much at allowing the rabble to ransack the kingdom as it does about any concept of justice. Moreover, Bullingbrook's concept of justice is quickly revealed to be draconian. When one of the rabble seeks assurance that Bullingbrook is, in fact, aiming to take the throne, Bullingbrook orders him to death, claiming that "as a Ruler, justice bids me doom…blood shou'd be the Prologue to my Reign."[423] There is no room in Bullingbrook's reign for dissent, and the rabble is easily swayed by the supposed justice that he demands.

Even as Tate constructs Bullingbrook as a populist tyrant, however, he is very careful elsewhere in how he frames the death of kings. For example, most of Richard's speech in 3.1 is lifted directly from Shakespeare:

> For Heavn's sake let's sit upon the ground,
> And tell sad stories of the death of Kings,
> How some have been depos'd, some slain in War,
> Some poyson'd by their Wives, some sleeping killd;
> All murtherd: for within the hollow Crown
> That rounds the mortal Temples of a King,
> Keeps death his Court, and there Antique sits,
> Scoffing his State, and grinning at his Pomp!
> Allowing him a short fictitious Scene,
> To play the Prince, be fear'd and kill with looks.

All monarchy is, in this construction, a kind of ruse, a temporary power that always, inevitably ends in death, and the only deaths that Richard can imagine involve treachery. Yet Tate also makes some additions to this speech that make it somewhat more relevant to the current political moment. The next lines read

> *'Till swell'd with cain conceit the flatter'd thing*
> *Believes himself immortal as a God;*
> *Then to the train fate's Engineer sets fire,*

---

[423] Tate, *Richard the Second*, 23.

> *Blows up his pageant Pride* and farewell King.
> Cover your heads and mock not flesh and blood,
> With solemn reverence, throw away Respect;
> Obeysance, Form, and Ceremonious Duty,
> For you have but mistook me all this while,
> I live with bread like you, feel Wants, tast Grief,
> *Therefore am I no King, or a King nothing.*[424]

A king may be divinely appointed, but he himself is not divine. The mortal king is all too susceptible to mortal needs, regardless of the ceremony inherent in his station. Such a king can easily be killed, and the language of explosions here seems designed to echo not only the Gunpowder Plot, but the Great Fire, the Popish Plot, and contemporary associations of Catholics with fire and explosions. Tate here observes that a king who is too convinced of his own unquestionable authority—like Richard, like Charles I, and, perhaps, like Charles II—is imminently doomed.

The language of Fate here and elsewhere in the play suggests that a tragic end is inevitable. Just as in Crowne's Henry VI plays, in Tate's *Richard II*, abdication is offered as a solution, but one which is ultimately untenable. While a willful surrender of the crown might initially seem like it will prevent war, it inevitably leads to long-term civil strife (if not outright civil war) and the death of the former monarch. Yet this is not what happens, at least, not immediately. The civil conflict is quite brief, and it takes place more in words than with swords. Richard yields his crown "in pity to his Subjects…that have no pity for their King,"[425] and in the next scene, Bullingbrook ascends the throne before Parliament. Together, these two moments encapsulate the central ambiguity of Tate's adaptation. The

---

[424] Tate, *Richard the Second*, 30. Italics mine, representing Tate's deviations from Shakespeare.
[425] Tate, *Richard the Second*, 39.

transfer of power itself is bloodless; there are none of the imagined civil wars in which unhappy subjects rally to Richard's cause. Yet by the end of the play, the former monarch is murdered, and those familiar with history or with Crowne's Henry VI plays know that the supposedly bloodless transition has only delayed the violence inherent in a disruption of the monarchy. These moments, then, offer two contrasting readings of the play's politics. If looking only at the immediate moment in which the play is set, then deposition can succeed with little violence. If looking to the future that this play's events allows, then deposition necessitates civil war.

Tate's alterations to Shakespeare's plot ultimately do little to alter the moral ambiguity of its source. Álvarez-Recio contends that the play reflects Tate's "personal notion of monarchy, which is not always consistent. For instance, he disagrees with Hobbes' extreme political absolutism and so, he echoes contemporary criticism on the Stuarts and identifies with a Whig position when Richard reflects upon royal vanity."[426] Regardless of how the dedicatory epistle frames the play, it is difficult to read *Richard the Second* as a royalist revision of Shakespeare's play, and even the most substantial alterations often reflect the political ambivalence of the period, especially as the two parties were continuing to form. Even if Tate had attempted a Tory adaptation, however, the changes necessary to do so would require extensive historical revisionism.

While Shakespeare's *Henriad* explores the spiritual, moral, and political implications of the regicide in *Richard II*, without this context, the play ends too swiftly for Bullingbrook,

---

[426] Leticia Álvarez-Recio, "Nahum Tate's The History of King Richard the Second (1681)," 22.

now Henry IV, to receive any kind of punishment for his regicide. While the earlier staging of Crowne's Henry VI plays offers some of this context, it also foregrounds Henry V as a heroic king, and a king who would not have ruled without his father's deposition of Richard II. Furthermore, Henry VI is presented as pious and innocent, and even if he is not the rightful king, he has done nothing himself to gain the crown unlawfully. By contrast, while Tate makes Richard II a better king than he is in Shakespeare, he is still certainly not a good king. It is little wonder, then, that Tate's play was so quickly and repeatedly banned from performance.

Still, Tate knew that official censorship boded ill for his future as a dramatist. He quickly took steps to remedy this situation. First, Tate published the play along with his justification for its existence and his attempts at making Shakespeare's famously anti-monarchical play royalist. Tate's choice of publisher may, in itself, have been a political move: as Álvarez-Recio notes, "Jacob Tonson's frequent collaboration with John Dryden, a firm supporter of the Stuarts, may imply Tate's wish to be identified with him, thus preventing any possible accusation of sedition."[427] To further reinstate himself as a royalist dramatist, Tate quickly produced a new, overtly royalist adaptation: *King Lear*.

King Lear **(Tate, March 1681)**

Following the disaster of *Richard the Second*, it was necessary for Tate to redeem his standing within the theater. To do so, he turned once again to Shakespeare. Tate's

---

[427] Leticia Álvarez-Recio, "Nahum Tate's The History of King Richard the Second (1681): Politics and Censorship during the Exclusion Crisis," *Restoration & 18th Century Theatre Research* 24, no. 1 (n.d.): 19.

adaptation *King Lear* premiered the same month as his final attempt at staging *Richard the Second* as *The Tyrant of Sicily*. Much has been written about Tate's *Lear*, so much so that it is one of the best studied Shakespeare adaptations of the Restoration, second only, perhaps, to the Dryden and Davenant *Tempest*. Though the play was long vilified for its addition of a romantic subplot between Cordelia and Edgar and its "happy" ending, recent scholarship has been willing to examine the play on its own merits, particularly as it relates to the cultural and political atmosphere of the early 1680s.

In the dedicatory epistle for *King Lear*, Tate reframes his "Zeal for all the Remains of *Shakespear*"[428] This epistle famously includes Tate's description of Shakespeare as "a Heap of Jewels, unstrung and unpolisht; yet so dazling in their Disorder" and needing only a little modernizing and some revising of "the Regularity and Probability of the Tale." [429] Yet here Tate presents a less cohesive case for his alterations. In the dedicatory epistle for *Richard the Second*, he is much more explicit about the particular historical and political faults of his source text, while in *King Lear* he is primarily focused on adherence to the rules of style and language popularized in Dryden's essays. In many ways, this seems just as much of an attempt at political diversion as the epistle for *Richard the Second*. In avoiding political discussion in the epistle to *King Lear*, Tate seems to be attempting to negate any accusations of political intent through framing his play as apolitical, though most readings of the play identify a strongly royalist bent. Indeed, as Michael Dobson has argued, "Tate could not afford to make the same mistake twice, and his next offering, produced just when Whig

---

[428] Tate, *King Lear*, A2r.
[429] Tate, *King Lear*, A2v.

demands for the legitimization of Monmouth were reaching their climax, more than makes amends. In this far more timely alteration of a Shakespeare play about British history, a bastard's rebellion is crushed and the legitimate monarch triumphantly restored."[430] The adaptation is presented as an exercise in refining Shakespeare's plots and poetry for a modern age of neoclassical tastes, completely removed from the politics of the court that supported both the theater and its playwrights.

However, from the opening of the play, it is clear that Tate was still keenly invested in using drama as a means of thinking through contemporary politics. Tate's adaptation opens not with Gloucester's bawdy recounting of Edmund's parentage, but with Edmund's "Thou Nature art my Goddess" speech, in which he meditates on the nature of bastardry.[431] Though much of the language is drawn directly from Shakespeare, Tate's changes are significant to both the plot and the political reading of the play. While Shakespeare's Edmund laments that he is "some twelve or fourteen moonshines lag of a brother,"[432] thus cementing his status as a second son, Tate revises this to simply have Edmund note that he "came not in the dull Road that custom has prescrib'd." The birth order of the brothers, and thus Edmund's ability to serve as Gloster's heir, is deliberately left ambiguous in the opening scene. Because this scene suggests that Edmund now *could* be his father's heir, if not for the illegitimacy of his birth, he serves as a more direct parallel to the Duke of Monmouth who likewise, is only disqualified from inheritance due to his status as Charles's

---

[430] Dobson, 81.
[431] This is commonly Shakespeare's 1.2.
[432] Shakespeare, *King Lear*, 1.2. 5-6.

bastard. However, we quickly learn that this is not the case, as Gloster denounces Edgar, "a Son / First born and best Belov'd,"[433] for the treachery that Edmund has orchestrated.

Even as Tate opens up the possibility of Edmund's inheritance, he reduces him merely to his birth status: though Edmund names himself in his initial speech, the speech prefix assigned to him throughout the play is merely "Bastard." Any suggestion of moral ambiguity is removed from his character, and he is presented as thoroughly villainous. He seeks not just to be Gloster's heir, but notes that he would "Reign, cou'd [he] but mount a Throne."[434] Beyond seducing both Goneril and Regan (and doing so at far greater length than he does in Shakespeare),[435] he attempts to rape Cordelia. By seeking sexual dominion over all three sisters, Edmund attempts to guarantee himself the future of Lear's kingdom.

Edmund's constant fixation on legitimacy and power run parallel to contemporary narratives surrounding the Duke of Monmouth. Attitudes toward the duke were complex, often blurring party lines, and "the doubleness and paradoxes that characterized contemporaries' views of Monmouth were crucial to unnumbered attempts in the 1680s to represent—that is, to order and rationalize—Monmouth's story, and suggested larger contradictions at the heart of late Stuart governance."[436] Throughout the Exclusion Crisis, there were numerous attempts at legitimizing Monmouth, whether through having Charles

---

[433] Tate, *King Lear*, 2.
[434] Tate, *King Lear*, 25.
[435] Edmund's sexual fixations may have been read as another reference to Monmouth. In "Behn's Monmouth: Sedition, Seduction, and Tory Ideology in the 1680s," Toni Bowers demonstrates that Behn's "retelling of Monmouth's story in *Love-Letters Between a Nobleman and His Sister* (1684-7) claimed for Tory partisan purposes the fallen prince's history as seduced seducer" (17). I suggest that Tate is doing something similar here, though with a rather more sinister bent.
[436] Bowers, 17.

recognize him as a legitimate son or through conspiratorial pamphlets claiming that Charles had actually been wed to Monmouth's mother. The most famous of these, the so-called "Black Box" pamphlets, attested to secret documents verifying the duke's legitimacy. Beyond trying to legitimize Monmouth, Whiggish pamphleteers wrote panegyrics celebrating his prowess in war and his ability to cure the King's Evil. Much of Tate's presentation of Edmund draws upon the popular print image of Monmouth, with his questionable legitimacy and his potential for rulership.

Yet, despite Edmund's centrality to most political readings of the play—Michael Dobson has argued that he is "the real star" of the play[437]—his machinations are still relatively minor in the face of Lear's transgressions against the institution of monarchy. As in Shakespeare and in the chronicle history before him, Lear divides his kingdom rather than allowing the laws of succession to rule. He attempts to play his daughters off of one another in order to have them perform their love for him publicly. Though the love game is ostensibly meant to determine how the kingdom is divided, Tate's Lear tells the gathered nobles that he has already "divided / In Three our Kingdom, having now resolved / to disengage from Our long Toil of State."[438] The division is already determined, and Lear announces which portions have been assigned after each daughter has spoken; the game is a matter only of theater.

Regardless of the staging, Lear's abdication throws the country into almost immediate turmoil. Tate emphasizes that Goneril and Regan are not just bad daughters, they

---

[437] Dobson, 82.
[438] Tate, *King Lear*, 3.

are bad rulers. Edmund marvels at their swiftness in having "impos'd the galling Yoke / Of Taxes, and hard Impositions on / The drudging Peasants Neck, who bellow out / Their loud Complaints in Vain," and later in the same scene, Gloster identifies them as tyrants whose actions will "inflame [the Commons] into Mutiny."[439] Yet, despite the clear tyranny of the current rulers, rebellion is not presented as a viable option. Just as in the other adaptations of the Exclusion Crisis and Popish Plot, mob violence is doomed to failure, even when it happens for the king's benefit. In Tate's *Lear*, Gloster uses his wounds to demonstrate the cruelty of Regan and Goneril. He successfully inflames the citizens to the point that they are willing to form an army to be led by Kent in rebelling against Edmund and the sisters. However, this army is unsuccessful, and in the very scene after we learn of its existence, we are told of its defeat. The rest of the play, with the exception of its final conclusion, continues more or less as it does in Shakespeare.

Tate's alterations to *Lear*'s ending are infamous. Cordelia and Edgar are to be married, and they will take the throne from a still-living Lear, who plans to retire with Kent and Gloster at his side. Some significant revision of both Cordelia and Edgar's characters makes this ending both plausible and well within the scope of common Restoration literary tropes. Whereas Shakespeare's Cordelia is initially introduced through anxious asides, Tate provides her a new motivation in the love game by having her loyalties divided between her father and Edgar. Her first lines note her love for Edgar, but renounce that love for Burgundy's "in obedience to a Father's will."[440] Because she cannot bring herself to openly

---

[439] Tate, *King Lear*, 25-6.
[440] Tate, *King Lear*, 3.

reject her father's wishes, she must "with cold speech tempt the chol'rick king" to disown her, thus making her an unsuitable bride for Burgundy. With these speeches, Tate stresses that Cordelia is both a loyal daughter and a loyal lover, but that her circumstances do not allow her to fill both roles simultaneously. By emphasizing her virtue, however, Tate is able to make Cordelia's character less ambiguous than she is in Shakespeare. Rather than simply refusing to overstate her love for Lear, Tate's Cordelia recognizes the game as the pageantry it is, and rejects it in order to reject an unwanted marriage.

In reorganizing the play's opening scenes, Tate has Edgar known as a traitor to his father Gloster, but still present at Lear's division of the kingdom. In doing so, Tate significantly alters the initial weight of Edgar's supposed betrayal. Here, he is portrayed as the leader of a rebellious faction, more than a would-be patricide. By continuously portraying both Cordelia and Edgar as unfailingly virtuous, Tate is able to end the play with a providential restoration of a monarchy with a solid moral foundation. Since this play, like Shakespeare's, deviates from the chronicle retellings of Lear's tale, there is no reason to assume that tragedy awaits this Cordelia.

Conclusion

Odai Johnson has asserted that in banning or censoring Crowne's and Tate's plays, "what is being governed is more than the representation of dispossession myths…but an effacement of any image that publicly traffics in the assailability of monarchy. The closing of the theater became a regulation of the collective memory, physicalized as an illegitimate trespass on royal property."[441] By taking such action, the monarchy began to reassert its

[441] Johnson, 107.

own narratives of rulership through suppressing stories that questioned royalist authority. In many ways, the suppression of drama throughout the Exclusion Crisis forecasted the Tory Resurgence that would follow, in which royalists inverted Whig propaganda practices in order to negate the opposition narrative and reconstruct it as their own.

Yet even banned from the stage, Crowne's and Tate's adaptations persisted in print, and the presence of lengthy paratexts often allowed them to frame their plays' politics in a way that would not have been possible on the stage. Print allowed Crowne and Tate to reshape the narratives of their own plays in order to make them both politically inoffensive and to establish them within the framework of Shakespearean adaptation, often through both rejecting and embracing the historical legacy that such a framework entailed.

CHAPTER VII:

CONCLUSION: THE EARLY MODERN LEGACY

In March of 1681, Charles dissolved Parliament. He would not call another. While such a move must initially have only inflamed fears of another civil war, it instead began a Tory counter-propaganda campaign that shifted the balance of power from the Whigs to the Tories, effectively ending the Exclusion Crisis. James was recalled from exile, and many of the civic positions that had been held by Whigs were transferred to Tories in a new round of elections. The Tories appropriated many of the Whig strategies, including popular ballads, pamphlets, poems, and, of course, plays.[442]

Drama did not cease to be political after the resolution of the Exclusion Crisis. But it did change in some significant ways. The drama of the period was less ambivalent than it had been in the past decade. As Odai Johnson has noted, "after the defeat of the Exclusion Bill in March of 1681 even the problematic plays of the early crisis…gave way to a more hardened royalism, as the king's playhouse engaged in a concentrated assault on the Whig platform."[443] New plays from dramatists like Aphra Behn and John Dryden consistently supported king and succession.

While playwrights continued to adapt pre-Interregnum plays, the nature of the adaptations shifted away from the political interrogations of the Exclusion Crisis and the Popish plot and back towards royalist drama that echoed the early years of the Restoration.

---

[442] Tim Harris's *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II: Propaganda and Politics from the Restoration until the Exclusion Crisis* discusses the Tory propaganda campaign and its successes at length in Chapter 6: The Tory Response.

[443] Odai Johnson, *Rehearsing the Revolution: Radical Performance, Radical Politics in the English Restoration* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2000), 32.

The final years of Charles's reign saw one final wave of adaptations. Though they are no less politically motivated, they are written by staunch Royalists, many of whom are also members of the court, and form a dramatic component to the Tory Reaction. Interestingly, these adaptations ignore Shakespeare in favor of Fletcher, creating a division in which Shakespeare is associated with the public theater and the public propaganda and politics of the Exclusion Crisis, while Fletcher becomes a figure of royalism and court life. The court thus writes an alternate dramatic history, one without Shakespeare's associations with the Exclusion Crisis. The Fletcher plays adapted during this period also seem to be focused on telling a particular narrative of monarchy, though not one which is always flattering. In 1683, Buckingham adapted *Philaster* as *The Restoration*, and while the text of this play has been lost, this tale of the providential return of a deposed monarch seems emblematic of the Tory return to power.

Similarly, Rochester's adaptation of *Valentinian* was performed at court in 1684, though it was initially written sometime before 1679.[444] The play has a lengthy preface defending Rochester, written by Sir Charles Wolseley. As with Shadwell's *Timon of Athens*, the text is described as being made into a play: "my Lord has made it a Play, which he did not find it, the chief business of it (as *Fletcher* had contriv'd it) ending with the *Fourth Act* and a new Design, which has no kind of relation to the other, is introduc'd in the *Fifth*, contrary to a Fundamental Rule of the Stage."[445] Rochester's adaptation condenses the plot

---

[444] For more on the history of Rochester's *Valentinian* in print and manuscript, see Lucyle Hook, "The Publication Date of Rochester's *Valentinian*," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 19.4 (1956).

[445] Charles Wolseley, "Preface," *Valentinian*, London: Printed for Henry Herringman, 1685. From Folger Shakespeare library F1354 (copy 1), sig. A2r-v.

to bring it more in line with neoclassical unities, but it also expands and centralizes the roles of Valentinian and Lucina, transforming the play into something more akin to a heroic tragedy, as both Peter Byrne and J. Harold Wilson have noted.[446] Similarly, Edmund Waller's adaptation of *The Maid's Tragedy* was likely written sometime in the mid-1680s, though there are no performance records for the play, and it was not published until 1690. In their original versions, both of these plays focus on tyrannical, lustful kings who are unquestionably the villains of their respective plots. However, both adaptations reframe these kings as rake figures and reimagine the roles of their seduced mistresses to make complex metatheatrical statements on the nature of performance and libertinism in the Restoration. At the same time, however, the eventual deposition of these tyrannical kings by their own nobles seems to offer a similar ambivalence to the Shakespeare adaptations of the Exclusion Crisis. While both Rochester and Waller recognize and complicate the nature of their respective play-kings' tyranny and ambitions, both also not-so-subtly suggest that a truly villainous king can and will be kept in line by those closest to him, no matter the consequences.

Notably, these plays had limited performances, if, indeed, they were performed at all. The theaters faced a number of significant shifts in the 1680s that left little room for new plays, particularly those that might be seen as politically inflammatory. The political turbulence and social unrest of the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis led a marked decline in the number of theatrical performances in London. Though the King's Company had been

---

[446] Peter Byrne, "'Where Appetite Directs': Tragic Heroism's Recovery in Rochester's *Valentinian*," *Pacific Coast Philology* 40.1 (2005). J. Harold Wilson, "Rochester's *Valentinian* and Heroic Sentiment," *ELH* 4.4 (1937).

in financial difficulty for some time, the 1681/1682 season marked a final (though ultimately fatal) rallying attempt. This season saw the company present five new plays, two of which, *The Ingratitude of a Commonwealth* and *The Injur'd Princess*, were new adaptations of *Coriolanus* and *Cymbeline* respectively. Additionally, they staged the perennial favorite *Rollo, Duke of Normandy* and a revival of *The Mock Tempest*, likely seeking to draw crowds from the Duke's Company's revival of Shadwell's operatic *Tempest*. These attempts at drawing in larger crowds were ultimately unsuccessful, though, and in 1682, the Duke's Company and the King's Company became a single company: the United Company. As early as Colley Cibber, theater aficionados and scholars have noted that "the Union was not so much a joining of equal companies as a subordination of the weaker one (King's) into the stronger Duke's Company, for several of the principals in the King's Company retired at the time of Union, or soon afterwards."[447] These changes in personnel also led to alterations in the plays being performed, since it was necessary to suit the performances to the available performers.

The union of the two companies also brought on a new reliance on old plays, and though the reasons for this are still uncertain, they were likely financial in nature. The sparse nature of performance records for the seasons between the Exclusion Crisis and Charles's death in 1685 make any level of certainty about the nature of the United Company's performances difficult. However, as Judith Milhouse has shown, while the 1682-83 season was quite lucrative, the following four seasons were far less so.[448] The United Company's

---

[447] *The London Stage*, vol. 1, 313.
[448] Judith Milhous, "United Company Finances, 1682-1692," *Theatre Research International* 7.1 (1981), 41.

initial seasons included the greatest number of new or recent plays. The 1682-83 season saw the premiers of Crowne's *The City Politiques*, Otway's *The Atheist*, Ravenscroft's *Dame Dobson*, and Dryden and Lee's *The Duke of Guise*, which had been banned in the previous season. These were performed alongside two new adaptations—Buckingham's *The Chances* and *The Restoration*—as well as Fletcher's *Rule a Wife and Have a Wife* and Shakespeare's *Othello*. The following season was a similar mix of new plays, new adaptations—here Rochester's *Valentinian* and Tate's *A Duke and No Duke*—and old stock plays like Brome's *A Jovial Crew; or, The Merry Beggars* and Beaumont and Fletcher's *The Scornful Lady*. In most cases, it seems that the United Company was reluctant to take risks on new plays, and the financial needs of grand tragedies and operas meant that many of the new plays were quite expensive to produce and maintain.

Under James II's reign, the United Company continued to function in a similar manner. Most of what is known about performances during this period comes from records of performances at court, suggesting that James and his courtiers had significant interest in pre-Interregnum drama. The political upheavals of the Glorious Revolution caused significant difficulties for the theaters as well, though by the 1690-1691 season, new plays were being produced regularly, and the reliance on older plays seems to have gradually decreased.

Yet pre-Interregnum drama never fully left the theater, and even today, the plays of Shakespeare, Fletcher, Jonson, and their contemporaries are still commonly found in the repertoires of amateur and professional theatre companies alike. Just as in the Restoration, these plays and their playwrights are often used to lend a particular kind of canonical prestige and gravitas to the companies that perform them. While this sense of early modern

drama as particularly culturally valuable is often framed in terms of its artistic merit, much of the reason for its survival is due to the same kinds of political malleability that it underwent in the Restoration.

This is, as Emma Depledge has demonstrated, the key to Shakespeare's success.[449] Adaptations of his plays made them popular both in print and on stage, and in these updated forms, many of these plays persisted in theatrical repertoires for decades. Such popularity kept Shakespeare in the public consciousness, and the updated nature of his plays made them seem continually relevant, thus reinforcing to the now-familiar claims of Shakespeare's universality. Though other pre-Interregnum dramatists were equally, if not more, popular during the Restoration, they were somewhat less fortunate as the seventeenth-century stage gave way to the eighteenth-century. Ben Jonson's comedies and the Beaumont and Fletcher canon remained common stock plays; however, nearly all of their contemporaries fell into relative obscurity on both page and stage. By the mid-eighteenth century, Shakespeare, Jonson, and Fletcher had come to dominate the field of early modern drama so completely that publisher Robert Dodsley lamented "All our Old PLAYS, except Shakespear's, Johnson's [sic], and Beaumont and Fletcher's, are become exceeding scarce and extravantly [sic] dear."[450] His resulting publication *A Select Collection of Old Plays* became the first multi-author anthology of complete early modern play texts, and

---

[449] This is the central argument of Emma Depledge's *Shakespeare's Rise to Cultural Prominence: Politics, Print, and Alteration, 1642-1700*.

[450] Robert Dodsely, "A Proposal," *London Evening Post,* March 24-26, 1743, *17th-18th Century Burney Collection Newspapers*, Document Number Z2000645489.

was the beginning of a wide-spread antiquarian and academic interest in the preservation and study of pre-Interregnum drama beyond the canon.

Throughout this dissertation I have challenged the scholarly commonplace that the Restoration theatre was, essentially, royalist or Tory in nature. Tradition has long held that the patent system and court patronage meant that theatres and playwrights alike have been read as constantly jockeying for royal favor through supporting the monarch's political positions. This reading does, certainly have some merit. Most plays throughout Charles II's reign at least tangentially support royal authority, at least when wielded appropriately by a worthy monarch. Likewise, enthusiastic support for the monarchy seems fairly clear in the first years of the Restoration, with the vast majority of plays focusing on miraculous reversals of fortune, condemning Puritans and Parliamentarians, or sometimes achieving both goals at the same time.

However, with the first true challenges to the restored monarchy, I argue that the theatre, like the fields of pamphleteering and satirical poetry, became a central venue for discussing analyzing and critiquing a variety of political positions. Unlike pamphlets and poetry, however, the theater rarely took a firm political stance, and instead served as a space for political ambivalence. The reasons for this are twofold. First, the patronage system, censors, and highly public nature of the theatre made it a prime venue for pitting multiple potential political viewpoints against one another. This could, of course, be done in such a way that endorsed some viewpoints while condemning others: the anti-Puritan and, later, anti-Catholic plays throughout the period are clear examples. At the same time, though, playwrights could and did write plays that embraced political nuance and offered characters with complex political views and relationships to power. These characters and their plays

evoked the deep political ambivalence likely held by a large majority who were neither devoutly Whig nor unquestioningly Tory.

The plays of the Restoration, then, serve as a space for reimagining the structures of political and monarchical power at a time when those very structures were being renegotiated. That they often did so through reshaping the plays produced before the Interregnum echoes the Restoration court's own looking back to the courts of Elizabeth, James, and Charles I to rebuild its own authority. In the cases of both theatre and court, the present that was produced often claimed to be an extension of, and occasionally an improvement on, the past. Yet such claims often masked radical changes in cultural and social mores, often while simultaneously establishing an "English" precedent for new, ancient, or imported ideas.

REFERENCES

Primary Sources

Banks, John. *The Island Queens; or, The Death of Mary, Queen of Scotland*. London: Printed for R. Bentley, 1684.

———. *The Unhappy Favourite; or, The Earl of Essex*. London: Printed for Richard Bentley and Mary Magnes, 1682.

———. *Vertue Betray'd; or, Anna Bullen*. London: Printed for R. Bentley, 1692.

Beaumont, Francis and John Fletcher. *Comedies and Tragedies*. London: Printed for Humphrey Robinson and Humphrey Moseley, 1647.

Behn, Aphra [?]. *The Counterfeit Bridegroom*. London: Printed for Langley Curtiss, 1677.

———. *The Debauchee*. London: Printed for John Amery, 1677.

Behn, Aphra. *The Feign'd Curtizans; or, A Night's Intrigue*. London: Printed for Jacob Tonson, 1679.

———. *The Town-Fopp; or, Sir Timothy Tawdrey*. London, Printed by T. N. for James Magnes and Rich[ard] Bentley, 1677.

———. *The Works of Aphra Behn*. Edited by Janet Todd. 7 vols. Columbus: Ohio State University, 1992.

"Charles II, 1660: An Act of Free and Generall Pardon Indempnity and Oblivion." In *Statutes of the Realm: Volume 5, 1628-80*, edited by John Raithby. s.l.: Great Britain Record Commission, 1819: 226-234. *British History Online*

Crowne, John. *City Politiques*. London: Printed for R. Bently and Joseph Hindmarsh, 1683.

———. *The English Frier; or, The Town Sparks*. London: Printed for James Knapton, 1690.

———. *Henry the Sixth; The First Part. With the Murder of Humphrey Duke of Glocester*. London: Printed for R. Bentley and M. Magnes, 1681.

———. *The Miseries of Civil War*. London: Printed for R. Bentley and M. Magnes, 1681.

Davenant, William. *The Law Against Lovers*. In *The Works of Sir William Davenant Knight*. London: Printed by T. N. for Henry Herringman, 1673.

———. *Love and Honour*. London: Printed for Hum[phrey] Robinson and Hum[phrey] Moseley, 1649.

———. *Macbeth*. London: Printed for P. Chetwin, 1674.

———. *The Rivals*. London: Printed for William Cademan, 1668.

———. *The Works of Sir William Davenant Knight*. London: Printed by T. N. for Henry Herringman, 1673.

Downes, John. *Roscius Anglicanus*. Edited by Judith Milhous and Robert D. Hume. London: The Society for Theatre Research, 1987.

"Dr. Martin Luthers Prophecies of the Destruction of Rome and the Downfall of the Romish Religion." London: Printed for W. W., 1679.

Dryden, John. *All for Love: or, The World well Lost*. London: Thomas Newcomb for Henry Herringman, 1678.

———. *The Conquest of Granada*. London: Printed by T. N. for Henry Herringman, 1672.

———. *Of Dramatic Poesie, An Essay*. London: Printed for Henry Herringman, 1668.

———. *Troilus and Cressida; or, The Truth Found Too Late*. London: Jacob Tonson and Abel Swell, 1679.

Dryden, John and Nathaniel Lee. *The Duke of Guise*. London: Printed by T. H. for R[obert] Bentley, 1683.

Dryden, John and William Davenant. *The Tempest; or, The Enchanted Island*. London: Printed by J. M. for Henry Herringman, 1670.

Duffet, Thomas. *The Mock-Tempest; or, The Enchanted Castle*. London: Printed for William Cademan, 1675.

D'Urfey, Thomas. *The Injur'd Princess; or, The Fatal Wager*. London: Printed for R. Bentley and M. Magnes, 1682.

Evelyn, John. *The Diary of John Evelyn*. Edited by E. S. de Beer. 6 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.

Filmer, Robert. *Patriarcha; or, The Natural Power of Kings*. London: Printed by Walter Davis, 1680.

Flecknoe, Richard. "A Short Discourse of the English Stage." In *Love's Kingdom*. London: Printed by R. Wood, 1664.

Hemming, William. *The Plays and Poems of William Heminge*. Edited by Carol A. Morley. Cranbury, N.J.: Associated University Presses, 2006.

Howard, Robert. *The Great Favourite; or, The Duke of Lerma*. London: Printed for Henry Herringman, 1668.

———. *The Surprisal*. In *Four New Plays*. London: Printed for Henry Herringman, 1665.

Jonson, Ben. *Catiline*. Printed for A. C., 1669.

Killigrew, Thomas. *Comedies and Tragedies*. London: Printed for Henry Herringman, 1664.

Kirkman, Francis. *The Wits; or, Sport upon Sport*. London: Printed for Henry Marsh, 1662.

Knollys, Hanserd. "An Exposition of the Eleventh Chapter of the Revelation. Wherein All those Things therein Revealed, which must shortly come to pass, are Explained." London: n. p.1679.

Lee, Nathaniel. *Lucius Junius Brutus; Father of his Country*. London: Printed for Richard Tonson and Jacob Tonson, 1681.

Lust's Dominion. London: Printed for F. K., 1657.

Marlowe, Christopher. *The Tragicall History of the Life and Death of Doctor Faustus*. London: Printed for W. Gilbertson, 1663.

Middleton, Thomas. *Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works*. Edited by Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino. Oxford: OUP, 2010.

Otway, Thomas. *The History and Fall of Caius Marius*. London: Tho[mas] Fletcher, 1680.

Pepys, Samuel. *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*. Edited by Robert Latham and William Matthews. 11 vols. Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1970-83.

Ravenscroft, Edward. *Titus Andronicus; or, The Rape of Lavinia*. London: Printed by J. B. for J. Hindmarsh, 1687.

Rymer, Thomas. *The Critical Works of Thomas Rymer*. Edited by Curt Arno Zimansky. New Haven: Yale UP, 1967.

Sedley, Charles. *Antony and Cleopatra*. London: Printed for Richard Tonson, 1677.

Settle, Elkanah. *The Empress of Morocco*. London: Printed for William Cademan, 1673.

Shadwell, Thomas. *The History of Timon of Athens, the Man-Hater*. London: Printed by J. M. for Henry Herringman, 1678.

———. *The Lancashire-Witches and Tegue o Divelly the Irish-Priest*. London: Printed for John Starkey, 1682.

Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet*. Edited by Neil Taylor and Ann Thompson. London: Arden Shakespeare, 2006.

———. *King Lear*. Edited by R. A. Foakes. London: Arden Shakespeare, 1997.

———. *Macbeth*. Edited by Kenneth Muir. London: Arden Shakespeare, 1984.

———. *Measure for Measure*. Edited by J. W. Lever. London: Arden Shakespeare, 2008.

———. *Much Ado About Nothing*. Edited by Claire McEachern. London: Arden Shakespeare, 2005.

———. *Richard II*. Edited by Charles R. Forker. London: Arden Shakespeare, 2004.

———. *Romeo and Juliet*. Edited by René Weis. London: Arden Shakespeare, 2012.

———. *The Tempest*. Edited by Alden T. Vaughan and Virginia Mason Vaughan. London: Arden Shakespeare, 2011.

———. *Titus Andronicus*. Edited by Jonathan Bate. London: Arden Shakespeare, 2018.

———. *The Tragedy of Hamlet Prince of Denmark*. Edited by William Davenant. London: Printed by Andr. Clark for J. Martyn and H[enry]. Herringman, 1676.

Shakespeare, William and Thomas Middleton. *Timon of Athens*. Edited by Anthony B. Dawson and Gretchen E. Minton. London: Arden Shakespeare, 2008.

"September 1642: Order for Stage-Plays to Cease." In *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum*, edited by C. H. Firth and R. S. Rait. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1911: 26-27. *British History Online*.

Tate, Nahum. *The History of King Lear*. London: Printed for E. Flesher, and are to be sold by R. Bently and M. Magnes, 1681.

———. *The Ingratitude of a Common-Wealth: Or, the Fall of Caius Martius Coriolanus*. London: Joseph Hindmarsh, 1682.

———. *The Island Princess*. London: Printed by R. H. for W. Canning, 1687.

———. *The History of King Richard the Second*. London: Printed for Richard Tonson and Jacob Tonson, 1681.

Vaughn, [Henry?]. "On Mr. Dryden's Play, *The Conquest of Granada*." In John Dryden, *The Conquest of Granada*. London: Printed by T. N. for Henry Herringman, 1672.

Villiers, George, Duke of Buckingham. *The Chances*. London: Printed for A. B. and S. M., 1682.

Wilkins, George. *The Miseries of Inforst Marriage*. London: Printed by I. N. for Richard Thrale, 1637.

Wilmot, John, Earl of Rochester. *Valentinian*. London: Printed for Timothy Godwin, 1685.

Wright, Abraham, Commonplace Book. BL MS Add. 22608. British Library.

Secondary Sources

"adaptation, n." *OED Online*. Oxford University Press, June 2019.

Aebischer, Pascale. "'Steal[ing] Out 'o th' Old Plays' in John Lacy's *Sauny the Scott: Or, The Taming of the Shrew*." *Restoration and 18th-Century Theatre Research* 16, no. 1 (2001): 24-41.

Albright, Evelyn May. "Shakespeare's *Richard II* and the Essex Conspiracy." *PMLA* 42, no. 3 (1927),

Álvarez-Recio, Leticia. "Nahum Tate's The History of King Richard the Second (1681): Politics and Censorship during the Exclusion Crisis." *Restoration & 18th Century Theatre Research* 24, no. 1 (2009): 17-30.

Auberlen, Eckhard. "Shakespeare in the Restoration: Puritan Austerity and Its Cure in Davenant's Adaptation of *Measure for Measure*." *Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik* 51 (2003): 437-51.

Backscheider, Paula. *Spectacular Politics: Theatrical Power and Mass Culture in Early Modern England*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1993.

Bald, R. C. "Shakespeare on the Stage in Restoration Dublin." *PMLA* 56, no. 2 (1941): 369-78.

Bell, Shirley. "*The Marriage Broker* and *The English Moor*." *Notes and Queries* 54, no. 3 (2017): 442-45.

Berek, Peter. "Defoliating Playbooks in the Reading Public." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 56, no. 2 (2016): 395-416.

Boswell, Eleanore. *The Restoration Court Stage (1660-1702): With a Particular Account of the Production of Calisto*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1932.

Bowers, Toni. "Behn's Monmouth: Sedition, Seduction, and Tory Ideology in the 1680s." *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 38 (2009): 15-44.

Boyd, Donna Kathleen. "'Hamlet…Made Another Thing': An Examination of Adapted Versions of *Hamlet*." MA thesis, University of St. Andrews, 1992. Proquest (http://hdl.handle.net/10023/14969).

Braverman, Richard. *Plots and Counterplots: Sexual Politics and the Body Politic in English Literature, 1660-1730*. Cambridge: CUP, 1993.

———. "The Rake's Progress Revisited: Politics and Comedy in the Restoration." In *Cultural Readings of Restoration and Eighteenth-Century English Theatre*, edited by J Douglas Canfield and Deborah Payne Fisk. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1995: 141-68.

Brown, Laura. *English Dramatic Form, 1660-1760: An Essay in Generic History*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1981.

Bruster, Douglas and Robert Weimann. *Prologues to Shakespeare's Theatre: Performance and Liminality in Early Modern Drama*. London and New York: Routledge, 2004.

Byrne, Peter. "'Where Appetite Directs': Tragic Heroism's Recovery in Rochester's *Valentinian*." *Pacific Coast Philology* 40, no. 1 (2005): 158-77.

Callow, John. *The Making of King James II: The Formative Years of a Fallen King*. Gloucestershire: Sutton Publishing, 2000.

Calvi, Lisanna. *Kingship and Tragedy (1660-1715)*. Verona: QuiEdit, 2005.

Canfield, J. Douglas. *Heroes and States: On the Ideology of Restoration Tragedy*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 2000.

Cannan, Paul. *The Emergence of Dramatic Criticism in England: From Jonson to Pope*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Clark, Sandra. *Shakespeare Made Fit: Restoration Adaptations of Shakespeare*. London: J. M. Dent, 1997.

Coward, Barry and Peter Grant. *The Stuart Age: England, 1603-1714*. London and New York: Routledge, 2017.

Craig, Heidi. "Missing Shakespeare, 1642-1661." *English Literary Renaissance* 49 no. 1 (2019): 116-144.

Danchin, Pierre, ed.. *The Prologues and Epilogues of the Restoration 1660-1700*. 6 vols. Nancy: Publications de l'Université de Nancy, 1981.

DeLuna. B. N. *Jonson's Romish Plot: A Study of Catiline and Its Historical Context*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.

Depledge, Emma. "Shakespeare for Sale, 1640-1740." In *Canonising Shakespeare: Stationers and the Book Trade 1640-1740*, edited by Emma Depledge and Peter Kirwan. Cambridge: CUP, 2017: 17-25.

———. *Shakespeare's Rise to Cultural Prominence: Politics, Print, and Alteration, 1642-1700*. Cambridge: CUP, 2018.

Dobson, Michael. "Accents Yet Unknown: Canonisation and the Claiming of *Julius Caesar*." In *The Appropriation of Shakespeare: Post Renaissance Reconstructions of the Works and the Myth*, edited by Jean I. Marsden. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991: 11-28.

———. *The Making of the National Poet: Shakespeare, Adaptation, and Authorship, 1660-1769*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.

Dodsely, Robert. "A Proposal." *London Evening Post,* March 24-26, 1743. *17th-18th Century Burney Collection Newspapers*. Document Number Z2000645489

Dolan, Frances E. *True Relations: Reading, Literature, and Evidence in Seventeenth-Century England*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013.

Estill, Laura. *Dramatic Extracts in Seventeenth-Century Manuscripts: Watching, Reading, Changing Plays*. Lanham: University of Delaware Press, 2015.

Ezell, Margaret J. M. "Never Boring, or Imagine My Surprise: Interregnum Women and the Culture of Reading." In *Imagining Selves: Essays in Honor of Patricia Meyer Spacks*, edited by Rivka Swenson and Elise Lauterbach. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2008: 155-69.

Firth, C. H. "Sir William Savenant and the Revival of the Drama during the Protectorate." *English Historical Review* 19 (1903): 319-21.

Forneron, Henri. *The Court of Charles II. 1649-1734. Compiled from State Papers*. London: Swann Sonnenschein & Co., 1897.

Gerwitz, Arthur. *Restoration Adaptations of Early Seventeenth-Century Comedies*. Washington, D. C.: University Press of America, 1982.

Greenwood, Cynthia. "How *Measure for Measure*'s Bawdy Court Ethos Put the Canon Law Revisions of 1604 on Trial." In *Reflections on Medieval and Renaissance Thought*, edited by Darci N. Hill. Cambridge: CUP, 2017: 138-51.

Guffey, George Robert. *After the Tempest*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1969.

———. "Politics, Weather, and the Contemporary Reception of the Dryden-Davenant *Tempest*." *Restoration: Studies in English Literary Culture, 1660-1700* 8, no. 1 (1984): 1-9.

Harbage, Alfred. *Cavalier Drama: An Historical and Critical Supplement to the Study of the Elizabethan and Restoration Stage*. New York: Russell & Russell, 1964.

———. "Elizabethan-Restoration Palimpsest." *Modern Language Review* 35, no.3 (1940): 287-319.

Harris, Tim. "Green Ribbon Club. (act. c. 1674–c. 1683)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. 24 May 2008*. https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-92786.

———. *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II: Propaganda and Politics from the Restoration until the Exclusion Crisis*. Cambridge: CUP, 1987.

———. *Restoration: Charles II and His Kingdoms*. London: Penguin Books, 2005.

Harvey, A. D. "Virginity and Honour in *Measure for Measure* and Davenant's *The Law Against Lovers*." *English Studies* 75, no. 2 (1994): 123-32. doi: 10.1080/00138389408598904.

Hermanson, Anne. *The Horror Plays of the English Restoration*. Surrey: Ashgate, 2014.

Hook, Lucyle. "The Publication Date of Rochester's *Valentinian*." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 19, no. 4 (1956): 401-07.

———. "Shakespeare Improv'd, or A Case for the Affirmative." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 4, no. 3 (1953): 289-99.

Hotson, Leslie. *The Commonwealth and Restoration Stage*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1928.

Hume, Robert D. *The Development of English Drama in the Late Seventeenth Century*. London: Oxford UP, 1976.

———. "Securing a Repertory: Plays on the London Stage 1660-5." In *Poetry and Drama 1570-1700: Essays in Honour of Harold F. Brooks*, edited by Antony Coleman and Antony Hammond. London and New York: Methuen, 1981: 156-72.

Hutcheon, Linda with Siobhan O'Flynn. *A Theory of Adaptation.* 2nd ed. London and New York: Routledge, 2013

Johnson, Odai. *Rehearsing the Revolution: Radical Performance, Radical Politics in the English Restoration*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2000

Kastan, David Scott. "Humphrey Moseley and the Invention of English Literature." In *Agent of Change*, edited by Sabrina Alcorn Baron, Eric N. Lindquist, and Eleanor F. Shevlin. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2007.

Keay, Anna. *The Magnificent Monarch: Charles II and the Ceremonies of Power*. London: Continuum, 2008.

Kenyon, John. *The Popish Plot*. London: William Heinemann, 1972.

Kewes, Paulina. *Authorship and Appropriation: Writing for the Stage in England, 1660-1710*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.

———. "'Give Me the Sociable Pocket-books…': Humphrey Moseley's Serial Publication of Octavo Play Collections." *Publishing History* 38 (1995): 5-21.

Kirsch, Arthur C. "A Caroline Commentary on the Drama." *Modern Philology* 66, no. 3 (1969): 256-61.

Knights, Mark. *Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678-81*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Knutson, Rosalyn. *Playing Companies and Commerce in Shakespeare's Time*. Cambridge: CUP, 2001.

Lake, Peter. "Ben Jonson and the Politics of 'Conversion': *Catiline* and the Relocation of Roman (Catholic) Virtue." *The Ben Jonson Journal* 19, no. 2 (2012): 163-89.

Love, Harold. *English Clandestine Satire, 1660-1702*. Oxford: OUP, 2004.

Lyon, Harriet. "The Fisherton Monster: Science, Providence, and Politics in Early Restoration England." *The Historical Journal* 60, no. 2 (2017): 333-62.

Maguire, Nancy Klein. *Regicide and Restoration: English Tragicomedy, 1660-1671*. Cambridge: CUP, 1992.

Marsden, Jean I. *The Re-Imagined Text: Shakespeare, Adaptation, and Eighteenth-Century Literary Theory*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1995.

Masten, Jeffrey. *Textual Intercourse: Collaboration, Authorship, and Sexualities in Renaissance Drama.* Cambridge: CUP, 1997.

Maus, Katherine Eisaman. "Arcadia Lost: Politics and Revision in the Restoration *Tempest*." Renaissance Drama 13 (1982): 189-210.

McFadden, George. *Dryden: The Public Writer 1660-1685*. Princeton: PUP, 1978.

Meyler, Bernadette. *Theaters of Pardoning*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2019.

Milhous, Judith. "United Company Finances, 1682-1692." *Theatre Research International* 7, no. 1 (1981): 37-53.

Milhous, Judith and Robert D. Hume. *The Publication of Plays in London 1660-1800: Playwrights, Publishers, and the Market*. London: The British Library, 2015.

Miller, John. "Anne [née Anne Hyde], duchess of York (1637–1671), first wife of James II." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 23 Sep. 2004. https://www-oxforddnb-com.srv-proxy1.library.tamu.edu/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-14325.

Miller, Ted H. "The Two Deaths of Lady Macduff: Antimetaphysics, Violence, and William Davenant's Restoration Revision of *Macbeth*." *Political Theory* 36, no. 6 (2008): 856-882. https://doi.org/10.1177/0090591708323367.

Moore, Lewis D. "For King and Country: John Dryden's *Troilus and Cressida*." *CLA Journal* 26, no. 1 (1982): 98-111.

Moote, A. Lloyd and Dorothy C. Moote. *The Great Plague: The Story of London's Most Deadly Year*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2004.

Munns, Jessica. "'The Dark Disorders of a Divided State': Otway and Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*." *Comparative Drama* 19, no. 4 (1985-86): 347-62.

———. *Restoration Politics and Drama: The Plays of Thomas Otway, 1675-1683*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1995.

Murray, Barbara A. *Restoration Shakespeare: Viewing the Voice*. Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2001.

Nicoll, Allardyce. *A History of Restoration Drama 1660-1700*. Cambridge: CUP, 1928.

Noling, Kim H. "Unpropping the Princess: John Banks's Revision of Shakespeare's Elizabeth." In *Resurrecting Elizabeth I in Seventeenth-Century England*, edited by Elizabeth H. Hageman and Katherine Conway. Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2007.

Noyes, Robert Gale. *Ben Jonson on the English Stage 1660-1776*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1935.

O'Dair, Sharon. "Introduction: *The Life of Timon of Athens*." In *Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works*, edited by Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2010.

Oliver, H. J. *Sir Robert Howard, 1626-1698: A Critical Biography*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1963.

Owen, Susan J. *Perspectives on Restoration Drama*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2002.

———. "Restoration Drama and Politics: An Overview." In *A Companion to Restoration Drama*, edited by Susan Owen, 126-93. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2008.

———. *Restoration Theatre and Crisis*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

Phipps, Christine. *Buckingham: Public and Private Man*. New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1985.

Potter, Lois. *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641-1660*. Cambridge: CUP, 1989.

Powell, Jocelyn. *Restoration Theatre Production*. London: Routledge, 1984.

Raddadi, Mongi. "Davenant's Adaptations of Shakespeare." PhD diss., University of Stockholm, 1979. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis Studia Anglistica Upsaliensia 36.

Randall, Dale B. J. *Winter Fruit: English Drama 1642-1660*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1995.

Raven, James. *The Business of Books: Booksellers and the English Book Trade, 1450-1850*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007.

Roberts, Clayton. "The Impeachment of the Earl of Clarendon." *Cambridge Historical Journal* 13, no. 1 (1957): 1-18.

Roberts, David. *Restoration Plays and Players: An Introduction*. Cambridge: CUP, 2014.

Rosenthal, Laura. *Playwrights and Plagiarists in Early Modern England: Gender, Authorship, Literary Property*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1996.

Seaward, Paul. *The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1661-1667*. Cambridge: CUP, 1988.

———. "Hyde, Edward, first earl of Clarendon." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 4 October 2008. https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/14328.

Scott-Warren, Jason. "Was Elizabeth I Richard II?: The Authenticity of Lambarde's 'Conversation.'" *The Review of English Studies* 64, no. 264 (2012): 208-30.

Shakespeare in Performance: Prompt Books from the Folger Shakespeare Library. Adam Matthew Digital, 2021. https://www.shakespeareinperformance.amdigital.co.uk/#

Shanahan, John D. Review of *The Convent of Pleasure*. *Shakespeare Bulletin* 24, no. 2 (2006): 54-59.

Sharpe, Kevin. *Rebranding Rule: The Restoration and Revolution Monarchy, 1660-1714*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2013.

Shimko, Robert. "The Miseries of History: Shakespearean Extremity as Cautionary Tale on the Restoration Stage." *Theater History Studies* 29 (2009): 81-94.

Solomon, Diana. *Prologues and Epilogues of Restoration Theater: Gender and Comedy, Performance and Print*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2013.

Sorelius, Gunnar. *"The Giant Race before the Flood": Pre-Restoration Drama on the Stage and in the Criticism of the Restoration*. Uppsala: Almquist and Wiksells, 1966.

Spencer, Hazelton. "Hamlet under the Restoration." *PMLA* 33, no. 4 (1923): 770-97.

Staves, Susan. *Players' Scepters: Fictions of Authority in the Restoration*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1979.

Stern, Tiffany. *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: CUP, 2009.

Štollová, Jitka. "'This Silence of the Stage': The Play of Format and Paratext in the Beaumont and Fletcher Folio." *The Review of English Studies* 68, no. 285 (2016): 507-23.

Sugg, Richard. *Murder after Death: Literature and Anatomy in Early Modern England*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2007.

Summers, Montague, ed. *Shakespeare Adaptations*. New York: Haskell House, 1996.

Taylor, Gary. *Reinventing Shakespeare: A Cultural History from the Restoration to the Present*. Oxford: OUP, 1989.

The London Stage 1660-1800. Part 2: 1700-1729. A New Version Compiled and Edited by Judith Milhous and Robert D. Hume. Draft. http://www.eighteenthcenturydrama.amdigital.co.uk/Documents/Images/RDH_The_London_Stage_p2v1/0

The London Stage Database. https://londonstagedatabase.uoregon.edu/

Van Lennep, William, ed. *The London Stage 1660-1800*. Vol. 1, *Part 1: 1660-1700*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP, 1965.

———. "Thomas Killigrew Prepares His Plays for Production" in *Joseph Quincy Adams Memorial Studies*. Washington, D. C.: Folger Shakespeare Library, 1948: 803-808.

Vander Motten, J. P. "Howard, Sir Robert." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography,* 19 May 2011. https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/13935.

Vickers, Brian. *Shakespeare: The Critical Heritage* Vol. 1, *1623-1692*. Boston and London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1974.

Visser, Colin. "Theatrical Scandal in the Letters of Colbert de Croissy, 1669." *Restoration: Studies in English Literary Culture, 1660-1700* 7, no. 2 (1983): 54-7.

Watkins, Stephen. "The Protectorate Playhouse: William Davenant's Cockpit in the 1650s." *Shakespeare Bulletin* 37, no. 1 (2019): 89-109

Wikander, Matthew H. "The Spitted Infant: Scenic Emblem and Exclusionist Politics in Restoration Adaptations of Shakespeare." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 37, no. 3 (1986): 340-58.

Wilson, John Harold. *Court Satires of the Restoration*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1976.

———. *The Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Restoration Drama*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1928.

———. "Rochester's *Valentinian* and Heroic Sentiment." *ELH* 4, no. 4 (1937): 265-73.

Wiseman, Susan. *Drama and Politics in the English Civil War*. Cambridge: CUP, 1998.

Wynne, S.M. "Kéroualle, Louise Renée de Penancoët de, suo jure duchess of Portsmouth and suo jure duchess of Aubigny in the French nobility (1649–1734), royal

mistress." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 23 Sep. 2004. https://www-oxforddnb-com.srv-proxy2.library.tamu.edu/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-15460.

APPENDICES:

A NOTE ON THE APPENDICES

Records of performance for the Restoration period are scarce, and almost exclusively come from either sources outside the theater (as with Pepys's Diary or financial reports on Nell Gwynn's theater-going habits) or significantly removed in time (as with Downes's *Roscius Anglicanus*). Currently, the prime resource for researching performance records is *The London Stage*, volume 1, edited by William Van Lennep, Emmett L. Avery, and Arthur H. Scouten, and available online as a searchable database through *The London Stage Database Project*.[451] Despite the value of these projects, they are severely limited by the inconsistency of information available to them, such that "we know no more than about 7 per cent of the performances that were given" between 1660-1700.[452]

It is, of course, possible that some of the plays listed as unadapted are actually alterations of pre-Interregnum drama. While plays were almost certainly cut, as with the text of *Hamlet* discussed in Chapter 1, these performance cuts were generally not printed. Additionally, many alterations were performed under their original names, and thus, unless a new edition of the play was printed, no record exists of how the original text was altered for the stage. As Emma Depledge has suggested, it is likely that most audience members were

---

[451] https://londonstagedatabase.uoregon.edu/ Note: because *The London Stage Database* is structured around individual performance events, much of the speculative data regarding potential performances, particularly those based on republication, are absent by design. The present study, however, makes use of that data.

[452] *The London Stage 1660-1800. Part 2: 1700-1729. A New Version Compiled and Edited by Judith Milhous and Robert D. Hume*. Draft. http://www.eighteenthcenturydrama.amdigital.co.uk/Documents/Images/RDH_The_London_Stage_p2v1/0

unfamiliar with the original texts of these older plays, which allowed many adaptations to go unremarked. While modern scholarship has identified a far broader pattern of borrowing and imitating than is suggested by the title pages or paratexts of Restoration-era publications, it is almost certain that the use of pre-Interregnum drama was even more widespread than can be accounted for in extant records.

APPENDIX A:

PRE-INTERREGNUM PLAYS PERFORMED IN LONDON'S PUBLIC THEATRES,

1659-1661[453]

Play Title	**Play Author(s)**	**Performance Company**	**Provenance**[454]
Aglaura	John Suckling	Rhodes/Cockpit	Downes
The Alchemist	Ben Jonson	Killigrew/Gibbons's Tennis Court	Downes; Pepys's Diary, 22 June 1661
All's Lost by Lust	William Rowley	Jolly(?)/Red Bull	Pepys's Diary 23 March 1661
Antipodes	Richard Brome	Killigrew/Gibbons's Tennis Court	Pepys's Diary, 27 August 1661
Argalus and Parthenia	Henry Glapthorne	Killigrew/Gibbons's Tennis Court	Herbert; Pepys's Diary, 31 January 1661 and 5 February 1661
Bartholomew Fair	Ben Jonson	Killigrew/Gibbons's Tennis Court	Pepys's Diary, 8 June 1661
The Beggar's Bush	John Fletcher, Philip Massinger	Hart & Mohun/Red Bull	Cast List in Folger Shakespeare Library B1589.8 p. 96
		Killigrew/Gibbons's Tennis Court	Herbert
The Bondman	Philip Massinger	Rhodes/Cockpit	Downes
		Davenant/Salisbury Court	Downes; Pepys's Diary, 1, 19, and 26 March 1661
		Killigrew/Gibbons's Tennis Court	Herbert
Brenoralt	John Suckling	Killigrew/Gibbons's Tennis Court	Pepys's Diary, 23 July 1661
Bussy D'Ambois	George Chapman	Hart & Mohun/Red Bull	Herbert
The Chances	John Fletcher	Killigrew/Gibbons's Tennis Court	Herbert; Pepys's Diary, 27 April 1661
The Changeling		Rhodes/Cockpit	Downes

[453] This list includes only public performances, not performances at court. Additional performances were held at Oxford, with a similar repertoire of pre-Interregnum drama.
[454] These probable performances are compiled in *The London Stage* volume 1, with additions as noted. Herbert's list of performances at the Red Bull likely includes plays from both the Interregnum and from the first months of the Restoration.

	Thomas Middleton, William Rowley	Davenant/Salisbury Court	Downes; Pepys's Diary, 23 February 1661
Claricilla	Thomas Killigrew	Hart & Mohun/Red Bull	Herbert
		Killigrew/Gibbons's Tennis Court	Herbert
The Elder Brother	John Fletcher	Hart & Mohun/Red Bull	Herbert
		Killigrew/Gibbons's Tennis Court	Herbert
Epicene, or The Silent Woman	Ben Jonson	Hart & Mohun/Red Bull	Pepys's Diary, 6 June 1660
		Killigrew/Gibbons's Tennis Court	Herbert; Pepys's Diary, 4 December 1660 and 25 May 1661
Hamlet	William Shakespeare	Davenant/Lincoln's Inn Fields	Downes; Pepys's Diary, 24 August 1661
Henry IV[455]	William Shakespeare	Hart & Mohun/Red Bull	Herbert
		Killigrew/Gibbons's Tennis Court	Herbert
The Humorous Lieutenant	John Fletcher	Hart & Mohun/Red Bull	Herbert
		Killigrew/Gibbons's Tennis Court	Herbert; Pepys's Diary, 4 June 1661
The Jovial Crew	Richard Brome	Killigrew/Gibbons's Tennis Court	Pepys's Diary, 25 July 1661 and 27 August 1661
A King and No King	Francis Beaumont, John Fletcher	Hart & Mohun/Red Bull	Herbert
		Killigrew/Gibbons's Tennis Court	Downes; Herbert; Pepys's Diary, 14 March 1661
The Lost Lady	William Berkeley	Killigrew/Gibbons's Tennis Court	Pepys's Diary, 19 January 1661 and 28 January 1661
Love's Cruelty	James Shirley	Hart & Mohun/Red Bull	Herbert
		Killigrew/Gibbons's Tennis Court	Herbert
Love's Mistress	Thomas Heywood	Davenant/Salisbury Court	Pepys's Diary, 2 and 25 March 1661

[455] Presumably this is both *1 & 2 Henry IV*, since both have a performance history in the early Restoration.

		Killigrew/Gibbons's Tennis Court	Pepys's Diary, 11 March 1661
The Loyal Subject	John Fletcher	Rhodes/Cockpit	Downes
The Mad Lover	John Fletcher	Rhodes/Cockpit	Downes
		Davenant/Salisbury Court	Downes; Pepys's Diary 9 February 1661
The Maid in the Mill	John Fletcher, William Rowley	Rhodes/Cockpit	Downes
		Davenant/Salisbury Court	Downes; Pepys's Diary, 29 January 1660
		Killigrew/Gibbons's Tennis Court	Herbert
The Maid's Tragedy	Francis Beaumont, John Fletcher	Hart & Mohun/Red Bull	Herbert
		Killigrew/Gibbons's Tennis Court	Herbert; Pepys's Diary, 16 May 1661
The Merry Devil of Edmunton	Unknown	Killigrew/Gibbons's Tennis Court	Pepys's Diary, 10 August 1661
Merry Wives of Windsor	William Shakespeare	Hart & Mohun/Red Bull	Herbert
		Killigrew/Gibbons's Tennis Court	Herbert; Pepys's Diary, 5 December 1660
The Night Walker	John Fletcher	Davenant/Salisbury Court	Pepys's Diary, 2 April 1661
The Opportunity	James Shirley	Killigrew/Gibbons's Tennis Court	Herbert
Othello	William Shakespeare	Rhodes/Cockpit	Pepys's Diary, 11 October 1660
		Hart & Mohun/Red Bull	Herbert
		Killigrew/Gibbons's Tennis Court	Herbert
Pericles, Prince of Tyre	William Shakespeare	Rhodes/Cockpit	Downes
Philaster	Francis Beaumont, John Fletcher	Hart & Mohun/Red Bull	Herbert
		Killigrew/Gibbons's Tennis Court	Herbert
The Poor Man's Comfort	Robert Daborne	Jolly(?)/Red Bull	Extant Prologue
Rollo, Duke of Normandy	John Fletcher	Hart & Mohun/Red Bull	Herbert
		Killigrew/Gibbons's Tennis Court	Downes; Herbert; Pepys's Diary, 28 March 1661
	John Fletcher	Rhodes/Cockpit	Downes

Rule a Wife and Have a Wife		Davenant/Salisbury Court	Pepys's Diary, 1 April 1661
The Scornful Lady	Francis Beaumont, John Fletcher	Killigrew/Gibbons's Tennis Court	Herbert; Pepys's Diary, 12 February 1661
The Spanish Curate	John Fletcher, Philip Massinger	Rhodes/Cockpit	Downes
		Davenant/Salisbury Court	Pepys's Diary, 16 March 1661
The Tamer Tamed	John Fletcher	Rhodes/Cockpit	Downes; Pepys's Diary, 30 October 1660
		Hart & Mohun/Red Bull	Printed Prologue and Epilogue
		Killigrew/Gibbons's Tennis Court	Pepys's Diary, 31 July 1661
The Traitor	James Shirley	Hart & Mohun/Red Bull	Herbert
		Killigrew/Gibbons's Tennis Court	Herbert; Pepys's Diary, 22 December 1660
The Unfortunate Lovers	William Davenant	Rhodes/Cockpit	Downes
		Hart & Mohun/Red Bull	Herbert
		Killigrew/Gibbons's Tennis Court	Downes, Herbert
The Virgin Martyr	Thomas Dekker and Philip Massinger	Killigrew/Gibbons's Tennis Court	Pepys's Diary, 16 February 1661
The Wedding	James Shirley	Hart & Mohun/Red Bull	Herbert
		Killigrew/Gibbons's Tennis Court	Herbert
The Widow	Thomas Middleton	Hart & Mohun/Red Bull	Herbert
		Killigrew/Gibbons's Tennis Court	Herbert; Pepys's Diary, 8 January 1661
A Wife for a Month	John Fletcher	Rhodes/Cockpit	Downes
		Killigrew/Gibbons's Tennis Court	Herbert
The Wild Goose Chase	John Fletcher	Rhodes/Cockpit	Downes
Wit Without Money	Francis Beaumont, John Fletcher	Rhodes/Cockpit	Pepys's Diary, 16 October 1660
		Hart & Mohun/Red Bull	Herbert
		Unknown/Middle Temple	*A Calendar of the Middle Temple Records*, ed. Hopwood

APPENDIX B:

NON-ADAPTED PRE-INTERREGNUM PLAYS PERFORMED IN LONDON'S PUBLIC THEATRES, SEASONS OF 1661-1662 TO 1666-1667[456]

Play Title	**Author**	**Company**	**Seasons Performed**
Aglaura	John Suckling	King's	1662-1663 1666-1667
The Alchemist	Ben Jonson	King's	1661-1662 1662-1663 1663-1664
Bartholomew Fair	Ben Jonson	King's	1661-1662 1663-1664 1666-1667
Beggar's Bush		King's	1661-1662
The Bondman	Philip Massinger	Duke's	1663-1664
Brenoralt; or, The Discontented Colonel	John Suckling	King's	1666-1667
The Brothers	James Shirley	King's	1663-1664
Bussy D'Ambois		King's	1661-1662
The Cardinal	James Shirley	King's	1662-1663 1666-1667
The Chances	John Fletcher	King's	1661-1662
The Changes; or, Love in a Maze	James Shirley	King's	1662-1663 1664-1665 1666-1667
The Committee		King's	1661-1662
The Constant Maid	James Shirley	Nursery	1666-1667(?)
Cornelia		King's	1661-1662
The Court Secret	James Shirley	King's	1663-1664
The Custom of the Country	John Fletcher and Philip Massinger	King's	1666-1667
Doctor Faustus	Christopher Marlowe	King's	1661-1662 1662-1663(?)
The Duchess of Malfi	John Webster	Duke's	1662-1663
The Elder Brother		King's	1661-1662
Epicene	Ben Jonson	King's	1661-1662 1663-1664 1666-1667

[456] This list includes only public performances, not performances at court, though it does include performances from the Nursery which trained new actors.

The Fatal Contract	William Heminge	(?)	1663-1664(?)
The Faithful Shepherdess	John Fletcher	King's	1662-1663 1664-1665(?)
Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay	Robert Greene	Jolly's(?) King's(?)	1662-1663
The Goblins	John Suckling	King's	1666-1667
The Grateful Servant	James Shirley	Duke's	1666-1667(?)
Hamlet	William Shakespeare	Duke's	1662-1663
Henry VIII	William Shakespeare and John Fletcher	Duke's	1663-1664
Heraclius, Emperour of the East	Lodowick Carlell	(?)	1663-1664(?)
The Humorous Lieutenant		King's	1661-1662 1662-1663 1666-1667
The Imposter		King's	1661-1662
The Jovial Crew	Richard Brome	King's	1661-1662
King Lear	William Shakespeare	Duke's	1663-1664
The Knight of the Burning Pestle	Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher	King's	1666-1667(?)
Love in a Maze		King's	1661-1662
Love Tricks	James Shirley	Duke's	1666-1667
Love's Mistress; or, The Queen's Mask	Thomas Heywood	King's	1664-1665
Love's Sacrifice	John Ford	King's	1663-1664(?)
The Maid in the Mill		Duke's	1661-1662
The Maid's Tragedy	Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher	King's	1661-1662 1666-1667
The Merry Wives of Windsor	William Shakespeare	King's	1666-1667
A Midsummer Night's Dream	William Shakespeare	King's	1662-1663
The Night Walker; or, The Little Thief	John Fletcher	King's	1664-1665
The Opportunity		King's	1661-1662
Othello		King's	1661-1662
The Puritan; or, Widow of Watling Street	Thomas Middleton	(?)	1663-1664(?)
Queen Elizabeth's Troubles, and the History of Eighty Eight	Thomas Heywood	King's	1666-1667

The Renegado		King's	1661-1662
Rollo, Duke of Normandy; or The Bloody Brother	John Fletcher	King's	1666-1667
Rule a Wife and Have a Wife	John Fletcher	King's	1666-1667
The Scornful Lady	Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher	King's	1662-1663 1666-1667
The Surprisal		King's	1661-1662
The Tamer Tamed		King's	1661-1662
The Traitor	James Shirley	Duke's	1664-1665
Twelfth Night; or What You Will	William Shakespeare	Duke's	1662-1663
The Virgin Martyr		King's	1661-1662
Volpone	Ben Jonson	King's	1661-1662 1662-1663 1664-1665 1666-1667
The White Devil; or Vittoria Corombona	John Webster	King's	1664-1665
The Widow		King's	1661-1662
Wit Without Money		King's	1661-1662 1662-1663 1666-1667
The Witty Fair One	James Shirley	Duke's	1666-1667(?)
The Woman is a Weather Cock	Nathan Field	Duke's	1666-1667(?)
The Young Admiral	James Shirley	King's	1662-1663

APPENDIX C:

NON-ADAPTED PRE-INTERREGNUM PLAYS PERFORMED IN LONDON'S PUBLIC THEATRES, SEASONS OF 1667-1668 TO 1677-1678[457]

Play Title	**Author**	**Company**	**Seasons Performed**
1 Henry IV	William Shakespeare	King's	1667-1668 1668-1669
Aglaura	John Suckling	King's	1667-1668 1674-1675
Albumazar	Thomas Tomkis	Duke's	1667-1668
The Alchemist	Ben Jonson	King's	1668-1669 1674-1675 1675-1676
Arviragus and Philicia	Lodowick Carlell	King's	Unknown, probably 1672-1673
Bartholomew Fair	Ben Jonson	King's	1667-1668 1668-1669 1674-1675
The Beggar's Bush	John Fletcher	King's	1667-1668 1673-1674
Brenoralt; or, The Discontented Colonel	John Suckling	King's	1667-1668
Bussy D'Ambois	George Chapman	King's	Unknown, probably 1645-1646 or 1646-1647
The Cardinal	James Shirley	King's	1667-1668
Catiline	Ben Jonson	King's	1668-1669 1673-1674 1674-1675
The Changes; or, Love in a Maze	James Shirley	King's	1667-1668 1673-1674 1674-1675
The Changeling	Thomas Middleton and William Rowley	Duke's	1668-1669
The City Match	Jasper Mayne	King's	1668-1669
The Coxcomb	Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher	King's	1668-1669
Cupid's Revenge	Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher	Duke's	1667-1668

[457] This list includes only public performances, not performances at court, though it does include performances from the Nursery which trained new actors.

Doctor Faustus	Christopher Marlowe	Duke's	1675-1676
The Double Marriage	John Fletcher and Philip Massinger	Unknown	Unknown, new prologue in *Covent Garden Drollery* (1672)
The Duchess of Malfi	John Webster	Duke's	1668-1669 1671-1672 1675-1676
Epicene	Ben Jonson	King's	1668-1669
The Eunuch	William Hemings	Unknown	Unknown, probably 1676-1677
Every Man in His Humour	Ben Jonson	King's	1669-1670
Every Man out of His Humour	Ben Jonson	King's	1674-1675
The Faithful Shepherdess	John Fletcher	King's	1668-1669
The Gamester	James Shirley	Duke's	1669-167
The Gentleman of Venice	James Shirley	Duke's	1669-1670
The Goblins	John Suckling	King's	1667-1668
The Grateful Servant	James Shirley	Duke's	1668-1669
The Guardian/The Cutter of Coleman Street	Abraham Cowley	Duke's	1667-1668 1671-1672 1672-1673 1674-1675 1676-1677
Hamlet[458]	William Shakespeare	Duke's	1667-1668 1674-1675
Hannibal	Thomas Dekker, Michael Drayton, and Robert Wilson	Duke's	1671-1672
Henry VIII	William Shakespeare and John Fletcher	Duke's	1668-1669 1672-1673 1675-1676
Hyde Park	James Shirley	King's	1667-1668
The Jovial Crew	Richard Brome	King's	1668-1669
Julius Caesar	William Shakespeare	King's	Unknown, before 1672 1676-1677
A King and No King	Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher	King's	1668-1669 1674-1675

[458] This is almost certainly the same cut version of *Hamlet* discussed in Chapter 1.

King Lear	William Shakespeare	Duke's	1674-1675
The Lady's Trial	John Ford	Duke's	1668-1669
The Little French Lawyer	John Fletcher and Philip Massinger	King's	1669-1670
Love and Honour	William Davenant	Duke's	1674-1675
Love Tricks	James Shirley	Duke's	1670-1671
Love's Cruelty	James Shirley	King's	1667-1668
Love's Mistress	Thomas Heywood	King's	1667-1668
The Mad Lover	John Fletcher	Duke's	1668-1669 1675-1676
The Maid in the Mill	John Fletcher and William Rowley	Duke's	1668-1669
The Maid's Tragedy	Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher	King's	1667-1668
The Merry Wives of Windsor	William Shakespeare	King's	1675-1676
The Ordinary	William Cartwright	King's	1672-1673
Othello	William Shakespeare	King's	1668-1669 1674-1675 1675-1676
Philaster; or Love Lies a Bleeding	Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher	King's	1667-1668 1671-1672 1672-1673 1674-1675 1675-1676
The Pilgrim	John Fletcher	Unknown	Unknown, new prologue in *Covent Garden Drollery* (1672)
Psyche	Thomas Heywood	King's	1668-1669
The Queen of Aragon	William Habington	King's	1668-1669
Rollo, Duke of Normandy	John Fletcher	King's	1668-1669 1674-1675
The School of Compliments	James Shirley	Duke's	1667-1668
The Scornful Lady	Frances Beaumont and John Fletcher	King's	1667-1668 1668-1669 1675-1676 1676-1677 (probably)
The Sea Voyage	John Fletcher and Philip Massinger	King's	1667-1668
A Shoemaker a Gentleman	William Rowley	King's?	Unknown, probably 1674-1675 1676-1677

The Sisters	James Shirley	King's	1668-1669
The Spanish Curate	John Fletcher and Philip Massinger	King's	1668-1669 1675-1676
The Spanish Gypsies	Thomas Middleton and William Rowley	King's	1667-1668
The Spanish Tragedy	Thomas Kyd	Nursery	1667-1668
The Tamer Tamed	John Fletcher	King's	1668-1669 1674-1675
The Traitor	James Shirley	King's	1667-1668 1674-1675
Trappolin, Suppos'd a Prince	Aston Cokain	King's?	Unknown, probably 1674-1675
Twelfth Night	William Shakespeare	Duke's	1668-1669
The Unfortunate Lovers	William Davenant	Duke's	1667-1668 1674-1675
The Virgin Martyr	Thomas Dekker and Philip Massinger	King's	1667-1668
Volpone	Ben Johnson	King's	1675-1676
The White Devil	John Webster	King's	1670-1671
The Wild Goose Chase	John Fletcher	King's	1667-1668
The Wits	William Davenant	Duke's	1668-1669 1671-1672
Women Pleased	John Fletcher	Duke's	1668-1669

APPENDIX D:

NON-ADAPTED PRE-INTERREGNUM PLAYS PERFORMED IN LONDON'S PUBLIC THEATERS, SEASONS OF 1678-1679 TO 1681-1682[459]

Play Title	**Author**	**Company**	**Seasons Performed**
Othello	William Shakespeare	King's(?)	1680-1681(?)
Rollo, Duke of Normandy; or, The Bloody Brother	John Fletcher	King's	1681-1682

[459] This list includes only public performances, not performances at court, though it does include performances from the Nursery which trained new actors.

APPENDIX E:

NON-ADAPTED PRE-INTERREGNUM PLAYS PERFORMED IN LONDON'S PUBLIC THEATERS, SEASONS OF 1682-1683 TO 1684-1685[460]

Play Title	**Author**	**Company**	**Seasons Performed**
Epicene	Ben Jonson	United	1684-1685
Hamlet	William Shakespeare	Duke's	1682-1683(?)
A Jovial Crew	Richard Brome	United	1683-1684
Julius Caesar	William Shakespeare	United	1683-1684(?)
A King and No King	Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher	King's	1682-1683(?)
The Loyal Subject	John Fletcher	United	1684-1685(?)
The Maid in the Mill	John Fletcher and William Rowley	United	1682-1683(?)
The Northern Lass	Richard Brome	United	1683-1684
Othello	William Shakespeare	United	1682-1683(?) 1684-1685 (after the death of Charles II)
Rollo, Duke of Normandy; or, The Bloody Brother	John Fletcher	United	1684-1685
Rule a Wife and Have a Wife	John Fletcher	Duke's	1682-1683

[460] This list includes only public performances, not performances at court, though it does include performances from the Nursery which trained new actors.