Proliferating Performance, Propagating Print: The Many Lives of Restoration Drama

Stephen Watkins

Huntington Library Quarterly, Volume 85, Number 1, Spring 2022, pp. 113-130 (Article)

Published by University of Pennsylvania Press
DOI: *https://doi.org/10.1353/hlq.2022.0006*

Proliferating Performance, Propagating Print: The Many Lives of Restoration Drama

Stephen Watkins

ABSTRACT This essay explores the myriad stage and paper engagements with one of the most popular plays of the Restoration period: William Davenant and John Dryden's *The Tempest, or the Enchanted Island* (1670). It examines the flurry of printed materials circulated in the wake of the theatrical production, tracing *The Tempest*'s migration from performance to print and back again. By charting how audiences and readers encountered the play beyond the playhouse, Stephen Watkins argues that we will begin to more accurately assess the role that commercial drama played in the cultural and imaginative lives of the people it originally entertained. **KEYWORDS:** William Davenant; John Dryden; Thomas Killigrew; Matthew Locke; adaptations of *The Tempest*

THE PROLOGUE TO WILLIAM DAVENANT and John Dryden's *The Tempest, or the Enchanted Island* (1670) explains the play's curious genesis by way of a horticultural analogy:

> As when a Tree's cut down the secret root
> Lives under ground, and thence new Branches shoot
> So, from old *Shakespear*'s honour'd dust, this day
> Springs up and buds a new reviving Play.[1]

This play, the prologue claims, is a paradox: it is both new *and* revived, both Shakespeare *and not* Shakespeare, the same, yet different, like a plant that grows afresh each spring, fed by the mulch of its previous incarnations. No longer *The Tempest* that

This essay forms part of a special issue: "Performance and the Paper Stage, 1640–1700," ed. Emma Depledge and Rachel Willie, *Huntington Library Quarterly* 85, no. 1 (2022). To read other essays in the issue, follow this link: https://muse.jhu.edu/resolve/167.

1. William Davenant and John Dryden, *The Tempest, or the Enchanted Island* (London, 1670), sig. A4r; italics reversed. Hereafter, *The Tempest* (1670).

was first performed by the King's Men at Blackfriars in 1611, Davenant and Dryden's adaptation nevertheless has its roots firmly in Shakespearean soil. Shakespeare died in 1616, and his plays—along with those of so many others—were then "cut down" from the stage during the official ban on theatrical activities during the 1640s and 1650s. Once the bitter winter of antitheatricalism had thawed, however, a play that had once retreated "under ground," seemingly forever, was able to return to its proper place in the theater. The Davenant-Dryden *Tempest* is much altered from its Jacobean parent text, but the prologue is remarkably keen to foreground how the playwrights have given audiences the opportunity once again to revel in "Shakespear*'s Magick*."[2] Plays may change in response to new performance conditions and locales, the prologue suggests, but their essential components—their "roots"—remain reassuringly the same from one season to the next.

Just as Shakespeare's *Tempest* sowed the seeds for Davenant and Dryden's play, so did their *Tempest* in turn germinate "new Branches" of its very own. Yet, as this essay will demonstrate, their version of the play enjoyed an afterlife that extended far beyond the stage of Davenant's own licensed theater at Lincoln's Inn Fields, with spin-offs and adaptations appearing on each of the four Restoration stages (Lincoln's Inn Fields, Bridges Street, Dorset Garden, and the Theatre Royal) and—even more so—on the page. The changed circumstances of the Restoration theater industry saw a flurry of para- or extratheatrical texts accompanying, promoting, and leeching off cultural capital accrued by successful plays, alongside more traditional theater-bound engagements with plays and dramatic operas. In the sixty years that followed its premiere, *The Tempest, or the Enchanted Island* sprang up in playbooks, songbooks, musical scores, personal diaries, poems, and miscellanies, and even in the guise of a prose romance. These printed seedlings worked to propagate Davenant and Dryden's play beyond Lincoln's Inn Fields, in which it was initially presented, and they offer us vital insights into how Restoration audiences, readers, writers, and even amateur composers consumed (and in turn produced) such dramatic fare. The texts I discuss below thus reveal a fascinating and myriad cultural life for *The Tempest* far beyond the West End of London, one that reached the bookstalls, concert halls, homes, and personal libraries of its early modern audiences. Attending to such printed material will nuance our understanding of the place and power of theatrical texts in late seventeenth-century England.

Much more extratheatrical material is available for the 1660–1700 period than for the pre-1642 theater, yet scholars of Restoration drama have proven remarkably reluctant to search for evidence of nonprofessional or nontheatrical engagements with these plays. This is no doubt an unintended consequence of the kinds of evidence we have readily available to us in such sources as *The London Stage, 1660–1800* and *A Biographical Dictionary of Actors and Actresses*, sources that focus squarely on the

2. *The Tempest* (1670), sig. A4r.

metropolitan theaters and their personnel.[3] Judith Milhous and Robert D. Hume's *The Publication of Plays in London 1660–1800* has put printed playbooks firmly on the agenda for scholars of Restoration drama, but historical and current work by theater historians continues to be concerned primarily with life inside London's licensed playhouses, such as their management and personnel, design, and economic organization.[4] This is not a bad thing in and of itself, but by ignoring the extratheatrical materials I analyze in this essay, we risk underappreciating the full, complex reception histories of Restoration drama.

Scholars of Renaissance drama, meanwhile, have long been attentive to such evidence. In a series of illuminating studies, Tiffany Stern has documented the dynamic paper engagements with drama in the pre-1642 context, showing how, for example, portions of plays, such as songs or poems, "habitually became detached from their [original performance] contexts to thrive in others."[5] Stern uncovers a fascinating archive of evidence demonstrating how early modern playgoers encountered, recorded, and even travestied the plays they watched and read through such processes as commonplacing and extracting, and how remediation into new (paper) forms of cultural production transformed the ways in which people could engage imaginatively with dramatic material. Similarly, Bruce R. Smith has examined popular ballads from Shakespeare's time that ape particular plays, and he argues that these "residuals" not only served to "*record* performances"—in that they recount plot details or memorable lines—but also "*perpetuated* them" in the memories of readers and audiences.[6] For Smith, ballads like "The Lamentable and Tragical History of Titus Andronicus" (1594) and "A Lamentable Song of the death of King Leare and his three Daughters" (1620) have a commercial as well as cultural objective: publishers and ballad sellers

3. *The London Stage, 1660–1800*, ed. William Van Lennep, Emmett L. Avery, Arthur H. Scouten, George Winchester Stone Jr., and Charles Beecher Hogan, 11 vols. (Carbondale, Ill., 1960–68); *A Biographical Dictionary of Actors, Actresses, Musicians, Dancers, Managers, and Other Stage Personnel in London, 1660–1800*, ed. Philip H. Highhill Jr., Kalman A. Burnim, and Edward A. Langhans, 16 vols. (Carbondale, Ill., 1973–93).

4. Judith Milhous and Robert D. Hume, *The Publication of Plays in London 1660–1800: Playwrights, Publishers and the Market* (London, 2015). See also Julie Stone Peters's temporally and geographically wide-ranging study, *Theatre of the Book, 1480–1880: Print, Text, and Performance in Europe* (Oxford, 2000).

5. Tiffany Stern, "Repatching the Play," in *From Script to Stage in Early Modern England*, ed. Peter Holland and Stephen Orgel (Houndmills, U.K., 2004), 151–77 at 155. See also her "'I have both the Note, and Dittie about Me': Songs on the Early Modern Page and Stage," *Common Knowledge* 17 (2011): 306–20; "Watching as Reading: The Audience and Written Text in Shakespeare's Playhouse," in *How to Do Things with Shakespeare: New Approaches, New Essays*, ed. Laurie E. Maguire (Oxford, 2008), 136–59; and "Before the Beginning; After the End: When Did Plays Start and Stop?," in *Shakespeare and Textual Studies*, ed. Margaret Jane Kidnie and Sonia Massai (Cambridge, 2015), 358–74.

6. Bruce R. Smith, "Shakespeare's Residuals: The Circulation of Ballads in Cultural Memory," in *Shakespeare and Elizabethan Popular Culture*, ed. Neil Rhodes and Stuart Gillespie (London, 2006), 193–218, esp. 194–95.

could cash in on a play's popularity by providing buyers with material that "enabled performances to happen again and again" away from the theater.[7]

The present essay, then, offers a method for assessing Restoration drama beyond theatrical performance by examining the proliferation and propagation of printed materials relating to and engaging with one of the most popular plays of the late seventeenth century. In what follows, I argue that *The Tempest*'s extratheatrical texts, like Smith's ballads, perpetuated performances of the play, taking it out of the theater and into the homes (and imaginations) of its audiences. Read, excerpted, reimagined, and performed by amateurs and spectators in domestic and other nontheatrical settings, *The Tempest* burst onto the cultural scene of Restoration England, capturing the hearts and minds of a wide swath of the theater-loving public. Restoration audiences did not merely react to performances but were themselves actively bound up in a dynamic, dispersed, and ongoing performance *beyond* the institutional borders of the London theaters, thus prompting us to question such basic notions as "when a play actually starts and stops."[8] Such questions enable us to think about the cultural value of drama, theater, and performance in ways typically neglected by modern criticism.

In order to contextualize this extratheatrical material, I begin with an account of *The Tempest*'s multifarious performance lives on the London stages. I demonstrate that the play qua performance event was always understood to be amorphous and adaptable, even before it was remediated into print, and that this adaptability on the stage prompted new kinds of adaptation in turn. I then analyze the many textual incarnations of the play and suggest ways in which audiences might have engaged with them. First, I discuss the reading of playbooks and the way that these texts serve not only as a record of performance but also as an imaginative intervention in the play's reception history, before I move on to examine more fragmentary and ephemeral engagements with the play in print and manuscript, exploring how songbooks, amateur compositions, and printed music scores remediate *The Tempest* for new contexts and with new objectives in mind. My aim is to show just how diverse and rich nontheatrical encounters with *The Tempest* were in the Restoration period and to suggest that scholars might consider such evidence when accounting for a play's reception history and its broader cultural reach. Finally, I consider the publication of a prose romance based on Davenant and Dryden's text, which mixes paraphrase with verbatim excerpts, suggesting that the appeal of *The Tempest*'s narrative transcends its theatrical auspices while retaining elements that allude to or hint at dramatic performance.

7. Smith, "Shakespeare's Residuals," 195.
8. Stern, "Before the Beginning," 359.

Proliferating Performances: *The Tempest* and Its Stage Offshoots

The Davenant-Dryden *Tempest* took Restoration London by storm. It premiered on November 7, 1667, at Lincoln's Inn Fields, home to the Duke of York's Company, managed by Davenant.[9] It was performed eight times in its first month and enjoyed regular revivals throughout the rest of the decade and beyond. Its popularity was arguably a result of its state-of-the-art scenic effects and its enchanting musical arrangements, not to mention its flaunting of beautiful actresses in the roles of Miranda; her younger sister, Dorinda; and the breeches parts Hippolito and Ariel. It was first published by Henry Herringman in 1670.

From the beginning, the play was bound up in the commercial rivalry between Davenant's theater and that of his competitor, Thomas Killigrew. Davenant and Dryden's prologue cryptically alludes to a "*Storm which vanish'd on the Neighbr'ing shore.*"[10] This is a reference to another play, *The Storm*, staged by Killigrew at the Theatre Royal, Bridges Street, on September 25, 1667, just six weeks before the *Tempest*'s premiere.[11] Evidently, Davenant and Dryden put their text in dialogue with the other play. Riki Miyoshi has shown how, in 1667, Killigrew and Davenant were in direct competition not only to secure audiences (as they always were) but also to secure the loyalty of London's most sought-after playwright, Dryden, and that Killigrew produced *The Storm* in the aftermath of the Duke's runaway success with Dryden's comedy *Sir Martin Mar-all, or, the Feign'd Innocence*.[12] Miyoshi thus assumes that Davenant retaliated in kind by cowriting *The Tempest* with Dryden himself in an effort to demonstrate Dryden's commitment to the Duke's Company, "undoubtedly to Killigrew's even greater chagrin."[13]

Certainly, Dryden's employment is a key motivating factor in the choice of plays programmed by both managers, but I find it hard to accept Miyoshi's implied chronology. I would submit, instead, that the influence of repertoire from one theater to the other goes in the other direction. *The Storm* is, in fact, itself an adaptation, thus becoming subsumed into a larger performance history of *The Tempest*. Killigrew adapted it from John Fletcher and Philip Massinger's *The Sea Voyage* (1622), which was itself a late Jacobean reworking of Shakespeare's play.[14] As a result, Shakespeare

9. On November 7, 1667, Samuel Pepys noted that he went to see "'The Tempest,' an old play of Shakespeare's, acted, I hear, the first day." See *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, ed. Robert Latham and William Matthews, 11 vols. (London, 1970–83), 8:521–22. This date has been taken as the premiere; see *London Stage*, ed. Van Lennep et al., 1:123.

10. *The Tempest* (1670), sig. A4r.

11. *London Stage*, ed. Van Lennep et al., 1:118.

12. Riki Miyoshi, "Thomas Killigrew's Early Managerial Career: Carolean Stage Rivalry in London, 1663–1668," *Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Theatre Research* 27, no. 2 (2012): 13–33 at 29.

13. Miyoshi, "Thomas Killigrew's Early Managerial Career," 29–30. Dryden would, however, take up a position with the King's Men the following year.

14. See Anthony Parr's discussion of *The Sea Voyage* in *Three Renaissance Travel Plays*, ed. Anthony Parr (Manchester, U.K., 1995), 20–31.

can lay claim, in a certain sense, to both Fletcher and Massinger's play and Killigrew's *Storm*, which is precisely what Davenant and Dryden's prologue states:

> That innocence and beauty which did smile
> In *Fletcher*, grew on this *Enchanted Isle*.
> But S*hakespear*'s Magick could not copy'd be,
> Within that Circle none durst walk but he.[15]

The Storm is an adaptation of an adaptation, then, while *The Tempest, or the Enchanted Island* is only at one remove from the original source, so Davenant and Dryden claim; theirs is, therefore, the better play.

Julie Stone Peters reminds us that "dramatic writing is a continual process of literary inheritance, from play to play and to new play in turn, in which everyone borrows, and attribution depends, in the end, not only on origins but on merit, for one remembers (and in the theater re-members) only what is most 'worth remembering.'"[16] *The Tempest* prologue suggests that it was in fact Davenant, not Killigrew, who first had the idea to adapt a Jacobean "weather" play, and it does seem unrealistic that even as competent a manager as Davenant could turn his production around in only six weeks. This was a creatively and technologically demanding production, which involved rewriting the script, adding songs, commissioning new music, scenery, and costumes, as well as rehearsing the actors. It surely would have been in the planning stage long before *The Storm*'s opening night. More likely, Killigrew got wind of the forthcoming *Tempest* at Lincoln's Inn Fields and moved to mitigate its deleterious effects on his box-office returns; unable to draw on Shakespeare's text, he used the next best thing, Fletcher and Massinger's adaptation of it.[17]

That adaptations of Shakespeare's play appeared in both Restoration theaters so closely together is not only symptomatic of Davenant and Killigrew's rivalry; it also points to the larger tendency of *The Tempest* itself to travel beyond the confines of its institutional auspices. The back-and-forth between the theaters had the effect of reenergizing both productions in the repertory, giving them an added buzz as they circulated in the competitive marketplace. The health of the overall theatrical economy is thus assured, as a King's production feeds off the popularity of a Duke's and vice versa.

Shakespeare's *Tempest* continued to be reimagined by both theaters in the following decade. In 1671, three years after Davenant's death, his successor as manager,

15. *The Tempest* (1670), sig. A4r; italics reversed.

16. Stone Peters, *Theatre of the Book*, 219.

17. On the division of the pre-1642 repertory between the two patent companies after 1660, see Gunnar Sorelius, "The Rights of the Restoration Theatrical Companies in the Older Drama," *Studia Neophilologica* 37 (1965): 174–89; and 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*, ed. Anthony Coleman and Antony Hammond (London, 1981), 156–71.

Thomas Betterton, moved the company to its new, more technologically advanced home, the Dorset Garden Theatre. It was here, in 1674, that Betterton tasked Thomas Shadwell with expanding *The Tempest* to include yet more musical interludes, songs, dances, and elaborate stage business, turning the play into a dramatic opera while showing off the theater's capacity for special effects.[18] In order to remain competitive, Killigrew reacted by commissioning Thomas Duffett to write a parody of the Duke's new production. Seven months later, they offered up *The Mock-Tempest: Or the Enchanted Castle*. No longer a play about familial reconciliation set on an exotic island, in this version Prospero and his daughters are transported to the "enchanted castle" of Bridewell Prison. The Duke of Milan becomes a jailer, while his pickpocket servant Ariel causes a riot in a brothel instead of a storm at sea.[19] The Dorset Garden *Tempest* was a phenomenal success—"not any succeeding Opera got more Money,"[20] according to the company's prompter, John Downes—and no doubt the King's Company's burlesque helped boost its public profile still further. As we will see, though, *The Mock-Tempest* not only aped Shadwell's opera on the stage in ways analogous to *The Storm* back in 1667, but it, too, left its own residuals, in paper form.

The various performances of *The Tempest* across both theaters in the 1660s and 1670s suggest that it was susceptible to alteration and imaginative reinvention. Shakespeare's *Tempest* was, for whatever reason, considered inappropriate for the new conditions governing the Restoration stage and so left the stage free for a series of reworkings, whether directly, as in Davenant and Dryden's adaptation, or through more circuitous routes, as in Killigrew's adaptation of an adaptation, *The Storm*. This proliferation of the play no doubt encouraged a similar imaginative response to it in paper form—although in the realm of print, it would be one of the adaptations itself, Davenant and Dryden's *The Tempest, or the Enchanted Island*, that would serve as the "secret root."

Play as Book, Reading as Performance

Early modern people did not encounter drama solely on stage. The publication of playbooks was a crucial factor in precisely how audiences engaged with a play before, during, and after the production. With only two companies in operation after 1660, the printing of playbooks immediately after performance was not a threat to their

18. On the technical demands of this production, see Jocelyn Powell, *Restoration Theatre Production* (London, 1984), 62–83. For the late seventeenth-century fashion for dramatic operas more generally, see Andrew R. Walkling, *English Dramatick Opera, 1661–1706* (London, 2019); and Judith Milhous, "The Multimedia Spectacular on the Restoration Stage," in *British Theatre and the Other Arts, 1660–1800*, ed. Shirley Strum Kenny (Washington, D.C., 1984), 41–66. There is general agreement that Shadwell adapted the text, though the evidence is admittedly thin. See Helene Maxwell Hooker, "Dryden's and Shadwell's *Tempest*," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 6 (1943): 224–28.

19. Thomas Duffett, *The Mock-Tempest: Or the Enchanted Castle* (London, 1675).

20. John Downes, *Roscius Anglicanus*, ed. Judith Milhous and Robert D. Hume (London, 1987), 74.

endeavors as it had been to the prewar theater, but was instead a marketing opportunity and, often, a secondary revenue stream for writers. Milhous and Hume have established that many a successful play in the 1660s was published within two months of its first performance but that a delay of up to a year was the norm.[21] For reasons unknown, Davenant and Dryden's *Tempest* was published three years after its first performances, in 1670. Possibly, there was some reluctance to publish immediately because Dryden's future with the Duke's Company was uncertain, and either he or Davenant refused to risk losing the performance rights and publication royalties should he move back to Killigrew's Theatre Royal, as he eventually did. Davenant, however, died in April 1668, leaving Dryden finally free to publish it when he saw fit.

The text of the 1670 *Tempest* records the dramatis personae, the prologue and epilogue spoken on the first night, and the spoken dialogue included in the production, as well as a preface by Dryden. There is no mention of the scenery or music used, despite their accounting for much of the production's success. Readers were provided instead with the bare bones of the drama and had to rely on their imaginations and memories (if they had seen it) to reconstruct the scenic spectacle and musical elements of the original production, should they want to do so.

By 1674, this had changed. To coincide with the Dorset Garden opera, Henry Herringman published an expanded quarto playbook, complete with masque-like descriptions of the scenery, music, and dances, giving readers an aide-mémoire of the extensive theatricality on display in the new theater.[22] Take, for example, this opening stage direction:

> The Front of the Stage is open'd, and the Band of *24* Violins, with the Harpsicals and Theorbo's which accompany the Voices, are plac'd between the Pit and the Stage. While the Overture is playing, the Curtain rises, and discovers a new Frontispiece, joyn'd to the great Pylasters, on each side of the Stage. . . . Behind this is the Scene, which represents a thick Cloudy Sky, a very Rocky Coast, and a Tempestuous Sea in perpetual Agitation. This Tempest (suppos'd to be rais'd by Magick) has many dreadful Objects in it, as several Spirits in horrid shapes flying down amongst the Sailers, then rising and crossing in the Air. And when the Ship is sinking, the whole House is darken'd, and a shower of Fire falls upon 'em. This is accompanied with Lightning, and several Claps of Thunder, to the end of the Storm.[23]

21. Judith Milhous and Robert D. Hume, "Dating Play Premières from Publication Data, 1660–1700," *Harvard Library Bulletin* 22 (1974): 374–405; Milhous and Hume, *Publication of Plays*, 54–57.

22. See William Davenant, John Dryden, and Thomas Shadwell, *The Tempest, or the Enchanted Island* (London, 1674); hereafter, *The Tempest* (1674).

23. *The Tempest* (1674), 1; italics reversed.

The playbook clearly intended its reader to imagine the play as a theatrical performance, drawing attention to the "Stage," the musicians present, and the special effects used onstage, such as the darkening of the house lights and the "Claps of Thunder." At no point are readers meant to imagine Prospero and his daughters as real people on a real enchanted island (even the prologue to the 1670 text, reprinted in 1674, militates against this by drawing attention to the cross-gender casting in the play). Texts for dramatic operas were sometimes published ahead of performance, perhaps with the intention of being sold at the theaters themselves in order to assist audiences in interpreting the words of the songs and to provide information about the settings, characters, and plot not supplied directly by the dialogue.[24] As we will see, however, playbooks do not necessarily reflect the realities of the performance they claim to record. In some circumstances, they diverge from their staged referents in ways that transform how we interpret the narratives presented to readers.

As in earlier periods, reading playbooks was one of the main ways that people in the Restoration encountered drama outside of professional performance.[25] Evidence of play reading from the period is sketchy, but we do have access to an important, if flawed, source: Samuel Pepys. It is practically de rigueur to cite Pepys's diary in accounts of Restoration drama. As he was an avid reader as well as spectator of plays and an amateur musician, Pepys's extratheatrical engagement with dramatic material is extremely useful for thinking about nonprofessional activities.[26] Pepys enjoyed reading plays as much as seeing them. On Sunday, August 5, 1666, for example, he passed a pleasant afternoon sailing down the Thames, reading (yet again) the second part of Davenant's *The Siege of Rhodes*, "with great delight."[27] He and his wife, Elizabeth, spent many evenings reading sections of plays together; on December 19, 1668, Elizabeth read her husband some of Davenant's play before dinner, while earlier that year, Pepys made her and a friend read out William Habington's *The Queen of*

24. This is equally true of Davenant's Protectorate opera, *The Siege of Rhodes*, which was printed in August and first performed in September 1656. Cf. Milhous and Hume's discussion of quick publication for other operatic productions, such as Shadwell's *Psyche* (1675) or Charles Davenant's *Circe* (1677), in "Dating Play Premières," 383–84. Certainly, plays in the 1690s explicitly advertised themselves as being sold at the theater.

25. Louis B. Wright, "The Reading of Plays during the Puritan Revolution," *Huntington Library Bulletin* 6 (1934): 73–108; Rachel Willie, *Staging the Revolution: Drama, Reinvention and History, 1647–72* (Manchester, U.K., 2015), 52–79; Marisa Nicosia, "Printing as Revival: Making Playbooks in the 1650s," *Papers of the Bibliographic Society of America* 111 (2017): 469–89.

26. Of course, we must be careful not to take Pepys's experiences as representative of broader contemporary responses to the play in question. Michael Cordner has rightly cautioned against drawing uncritically upon the testimony of this "most obsessively idiosyncratic of observers." See his "Introduction: Expanding Horizons," in *Players, Playwrights, Playhouses: Investigating Performance, 1660–1800*, ed. Michael Cordner and Peter Holland (Houndmills, U.K., 2007), 1. For a useful discussion of Pepys's spectatorship, see Deborah C. Payne, "Theatrical Spectatorship in Pepys's Diary," *Review of English Studies* 66 (2015): 87–105.

27. *Diary of Samuel Pepys*, ed. Latham and Matthews, 7:235 (August 5, 1666).

Aragon (1640) until eleven o'clock at night.[28] Although it is not possible to know how histrionic such occasions were, the act of reading out loud is inherently performative, as Jennifer Richards has recently demonstrated, so that reading a play prompts interesting and suggestive questions about the nature (and limits) of genre.[29] Are plays only "plays" in the theater, when recited by professional actors, or can they be reenacted in analogous ways in the home, by just one or two participants? Is reading—or reading aloud—different from acting, amateur or otherwise?

Pepys's contemporary Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle, certainly felt that reading plays required an actorly appreciation for the "several humours, or passions, as are exprest by Writing."[30] An amateur playwright herself, Cavendish insisted that there was a performative element to the reading of plays: readers "must not read a Scene as they would read a Chapter; for Scenes must be read as if they were spoke or Acted."[31] Cavendish entertained little hope that her own scripts would be professionally staged, and she developed a sophisticated (if fanciful) method for capturing their peculiar theatricality through her imagination, which she termed the "Stage in my Brain."[32] For such amateurs, reading plays was inherently a performative activity, which in its own way served to perpetuate theatrical performance while at the same time transposing it to the domestic, private sphere.

"Lead on Musician": Circulating Songs and Scores

As we have seen, Pepys read *The Siege of Rhodes* long after it had ceased to be a popular novelty at Lincoln's Inn Fields. Yet, his engagement with the play goes beyond merely rereading it for pleasure. Intrigued by the many songs in the production but not content with merely acquiring the play's lyrics in the form of a printed edition, Pepys went to the trouble of asking one of the Duke's musicians for a copy of the music, "which he tells me he can get me, which I am mighty glad of."[33] Whether Pepys, a keen amateur musician and singer, intended to perform the music at home or simply to acquire it as a collector, these residuals of performance (text *and* tune) allow an imaginative engagement with the play outside of the theater that would bring him closer to what he had first seen and heard onstage.

Another example of creative engagement with *The Siege of Rhodes* is presented in John Hayls's portrait of Pepys, painted in 1666, in which the diarist is depicted

28. See *Diary of Samuel Pepys*, ed. Latham and Matthews, 9:396 (December 19, 1668) and 9:333 (October 20, 1668), respectively.

29. Jennifer Richards, *Voices and Books in the English Renaissance: A New History of Reading* (Oxford, 2019).

30. Margaret Cavendish, *Playes Written by the Thrice Noble, Illustrious and Excellent Princess, the Lady Marchioness of Newcastle* (London, 1662), sig. A6v.

31. Cavendish, *Playes*, sig. A6v.

32. Margaret Cavendish, letter CXCV, in *CCXI Sociable Letters, Written by the Thrice Noble, Illustrious, and Excellent Princess, the Lady Marchioness of Newcastle* (London, 1664), 408.

33. *Diary of Samuel Pepys*, ed. Latham and Matthews, 8:25 (January 22, 1667).

holding a libretto and score.[34] The music is Pepys's own: it is a setting of a lyric from Solyman's final speech in act 4 of Davenant's second part of the play (ca. 1659–61), called "Beauty, retire."[35] Pepys's encounters with the play are thus not simply consumptive, as his intention to acquire the "official" tune from the musician might suggest; they are productive, generative, and creative in themselves. Pepys composed his own music for the lyrics (did he ever get hold of the score from the Lincoln's Inn Fields's musician?) and performed it himself. These amateur engagements with plays are an important, though neglected, part of Restoration cultural life. Plays are not fixed entities watched or read and then laid aside; they are material objects to be reimagined, adapted, and replayed within a whole variety of contexts beyond the theater.

Returning to *The Tempest, or the Enchanted Island*, we find in Pepys the same preoccupation with transferring elements of the live production to the domestic sphere. In an entry for November 7, 1667, he records in his diary his delight with "a curious piece of musique in an echo of half sentences . . . which is mighty pretty."[36] He is referring to the third-act duet "Go thy way," sung by Ferdinand and Ariel. This famous song represents a perfect example of how part of a play can become detached and move across institutional and imaginative borders, from stage to page, from professional performance to amateur dramatics.[37] It also demonstrates the ways in which the publishing and theater industries developed more broadly across the 1660s and 1670s. Spectators like Pepys clearly desired to take home pleasing moments of a production in more tangible forms. As Stern observes, songs tend to come in for this treatment because they are "in general more extractable, moveable, revisable units of play than other pieces of text."[38] No doubt songs appeal, too, because they tend to be deployed at moments of high emotional tension and are thus likely to stick in the memories of spectators.

Very quickly, Pepys set out to acquire both the music and lyrics for his new favorite song, as he had done previously with the lyric from *The Siege of Rhodes*. Six months after *The Tempest*'s premiere, on May 7, 1668, he found himself at dinner with the song's composer, John Banister. Keen not to pass up the opportunity, he asked the musician to "prick me down the notes of the Echo in 'The Tempest.'"[39] This Banister willingly undertook for his new friend. But Pepys still did not have the lyrics to the

34. The portrait is most readily available through the National Portrait Gallery's website. See John Hayls, *Samuel Pepys*, oil on canvas, 1666, National Portrait Gallery, accessed April 30, 2021, www.npg.org.uk/collections/search/portrait/mw04948/Samuel-Pepys.

35. William Davenant, *The Siege of Rhodes: The First and Second Part* (London, 1663), 47 (second pagination). This piece has been recorded by Richard Wistreich and Robin Jeffrey in *The Musical Life of Samuel Pepys*, Saydisc, CD-SDL 385, 1994, compact disc.

36. *Diary of Samuel Pepys*, ed. Latham and Matthews, 8:522 (November 7, 1667).

37. *The Tempest* (1670), 43; *The Tempest* (1674), 42. The verses were set by John Banister (1630–1679).

38. Stern, "Repatching the Play," 158.

39. *Diary of Samuel Pepys*, ed. Latham and Matthews, 9:189 (May 7, 1668).

tune. A few days later, on May 11, he succeeded in obtaining these as well, although this proved a more challenging task: "I to the Duke of York's playhouse, and there saw 'The Tempest,' and between two acts, I went out to Mr. Harris [who played Ferdinand], and got him to repeat to me the words of the Echo, while I writ them down, having tried in the play to have wrote them; but, when I had done it, having done it without looking upon my paper, I find I could not read the blacklead. But now I have got the words clear."[40] Pepys's attempt to record verses from the play is in line with standard accounts of early modern commonplacing.[41] But the practicalities of securing the lyrics were anything but straightforward. In the gloom of the theater's auditorium, Pepys made such a mess of the transcription that he had to track down an actor to recite the lines, which he could then accurately record. This is not something everyone in the audience would have been in a position to do, of course. Most spectators would never have had such unlimited access to the actors after the performance. What Pepys's individual experiences do tell us about Restoration theater culture, though, is that people apparently wanted to take certain parts of the plays they enjoyed away with them, but that they did not necessarily have the means to do so. The theatrical market of the 1660s was unprepared to satisfy adequately this peculiar desire of its patrons. To get what he wanted, Pepys had to either struggle inexpertly in the dark or else corner an actor in the tiring-room.

By the 1670s, however, the market had responded. Had Pepys wanted a textual record of the songs from the Dorset Garden *Tempest,* he would no longer have needed to bring pencil and paper to the theater; he could simply have picked up a songbook from one of the orange sellers or from a bookstall on his way home.[42] In Buckingham's *The Rehearsal* (1672), the playwright Bayes explains how he has "printed above a hundred sheets of papyr, to insinuate the Plot into the Boxes,"[43] suggesting that printed materials were becoming a common paratextual feature of performance.

Within a year of the Dorset Garden production, copies of two songbooks were made available for purchase. *The Songs and Masques in the Tempest* (ca. 1674) was a small pamphlet printed in quarto containing the lyrics of all the songs of the 1674 production.[44] *The Ariels Songs in the Play call'd the Tempest* (ca. 1675) consisted of just four folio sheets, setting Ariel's songs, "Come unto these yellow Sands," "Dry those Eyes," "Go thy Way," "Full Fathom five," and "Where the Bee Sucks," along with a setting of

40. *Diary of Samuel Pepys*, ed. Latham and Matthews, 9:195 (May 11, 1668).

41. See Laura Estill, *Dramatic Extracts in Seventeenth-Century Manuscripts: Watching, Reading, Changing Plays* (Newark, Del., 2015).

42. For eighteenth-century evidence that orange sellers sold printed material relating to the day's play, see Valerie Fairbrass, "'Books of the Songs to be Had at the Theatre': Some Notes on Fruit Women and Their Contribution to Theatre Finances," *Theatre Notebook* 66 (2012): 66–84.

43. George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham, *The Rehearsal* (London, 1672), 8. For a discussion of this episode in relation to printed libretti in the theater, see Stone Peters, *Theatre of the Book,* 48–49.

44. *The Songs and Masques in the Tempest* (London, ca. 1674).

a song associated with Dorinda, "Adieu to the Pleasures and Follies of Love," all set to the music of John Banister, Pelham Humfrey, and James Hart.[45] John Playford had printed these sheets to be inserted into his *Choice Ayres, Songs, & Dialogues to Sing to the Theorbo-Lute, or Bass-Viol . . . the Second Edition Corrected and Enlarged* (1675). As James McManaway has shown, the independent copy in the British Library cited here, which displays neither page numbers nor signatures, has been carefully cropped and presumably either removed from its copy of Playford's book or never actually sewn into it.[46] It is likely that *Songs and Masques* was printed in anticipation of the first performance, in part functioning as a libretto for the sung elements of the play, while *Ariels Songs* looks to be a true "residual," in Smith's sense, as a text that remembers and perpetuates performance beyond the stage while taking commercial advantage of the production's popularity beyond the theater.[47]

While *Songs and Masques* and *Ariels Songs* are fascinating for many reasons, the most notable thing about these texts is that they diverge from the playbook in several key respects. *Songs and Masques*, for instance, prints the "masque of devils" from act 2, but where Shadwell's playbook boasts three devils, thus mirroring the three Italian visitors—Alonzo, Antonio, and Gonzalo—that they taunt, the songbook insists that the masque was performed by no fewer than five devils (four each conjuring up the figures of Pride, Fraud, Rapine, and Murder and one to summon up the "subterranean Winds" that eventually chase the Italians away).[48] As this songbook was specifically designed to work in concert with the production as a libretto, we must assume that, at some point in the run, the masque graduated from three to five devils. Thus, if audience members keen to relive the performance they had watched in the theater on that "Stage in [their] Brain" should turn to the playbook, they would not, in fact, find the scene exactly as it was performed onstage, but rather a slightly altered version of it. The number of devils in the masque may be a small point in the grand scheme of things, but it is nonetheless a salutary one: it cautions us against taking the printed playbook as an accurate mediator of performance and instead recognizes that it is as contingent in its relationship to the theatrical event as any other residual. In some cases, it may be even less reliable a record than the supposedly ephemeral songbook.

The same might be said for *Ariels Songs*, which contains a song sung by Dorinda over the supposedly dead body of her lover, Hippolito, in act 4. This is not the place to rehearse the complex performance and print history of this song and its

45. *The Ariels Songs in the Play call'd the Tempest* (London, ca. 1675), Music Collections G.109.(2.), British Library.

46. James G. McManaway, "Songs and Masques in *The Tempest*," in *Theatre Miscellany: Six Pieces Connected with the Seventeenth-Century Stage* (Oxford, 1953), 71–96 at 77. On Playford's text, see John Playford, *Choice Ayres, Songs, and Dialogues*, ed. Ian Spink (London, 1989), ix and appendix 2.

47. McManaway, "Songs and Masques," 73–74.

48. *The Tempest* (1674), 28–30; *Songs and Masques*, 2–3.

relationship to the production, but what is important to note here is that no playbook printed during the period reprints this song as part of the play. *Ariels Songs* was printed after the first appearance of the play's 1674 quarto, which suggests that the song was added into the production after the initial run, possibly to add color to a scene that was otherwise considered emotionally flat. There is evidence that the song was widely known and popular, however.[49] Reading the playbook would deny readers the opportunity to relive the moment of this song's performance in their imaginations, which drastically alters the emotional impact of the scene in which Dorinda discovers Hippolito's body. What *Songs and Masques* and *Ariels Songs* demonstrate, then, is that plays frequently alter over time, even during the run of a production, and that to reconstruct this process requires looking far beyond the usual textual evidence theater historians rely upon—namely, the printed playbook alone.

That the long-established tradition of detaching songs from their plays and circulating them in scribal form continued in the 1660s is, given what we know of earlier periods, wholly unsurprising.[50] What is new is that across the first two decades of the Restoration, the print market for dramatic materials responds, reasonably rapidly, to the desires and frustrations of patrons, for whom the troublesome business of commonplacing during performance ceases to be fashionable or, as Pepys's diary entry attests, even practicable in the larger indoor theaters of the Restoration. By the mid-1670s, the elements of a production that spectators are most likely to want to "detach" are anticipated by the theater management and publishers and sold in standardized print formats. This was true for productions at the Duke's and King's theaters alike; as happened with Shadwell's play, Duffett's *The Mock-Tempest* prompted the publication of a bespoke songbook, *The Songs & Masque in the New Tempest*.[51]

Songs were not the only musical elements of *The Tempest* to find themselves an independent readership. Within a year of the Dorset Garden production's opening night, Matthew Locke, the main composer responsible for the music for the operatic *Tempest*, published his instrumental scores to the play in a large volume, combining it

49. The lyrics were set by James Hart, a singer in the 1674 production. They were frequently reprinted in theatrical miscellanies. See, for instance, *A Perfect Collection of the Several Songs Now in Mode Either at the Court or, Theatres. All New* (London, 1675), sig. B1r–v; *A Perfect Collection of all the Songs Now in Mode Either at the Court, or, Theatres. With New Additions* (London, 1675), sig. B1r–v; *A New Collection of the Choicest Songs Now in Esteem in Town or Court* (London, 1676), sig. B5r–v; John Playford, *Choice Ayres, Songs, & Dialogues to Sing to the Theorbo-Lute, or Bass-Viol* (London, 1675), 73; and Henry Playford, *Wit and Mirth: or, Pills to Purge Melancholy* (London, 1699), 189–90. Hart's tune for Dorinda's popular lament was used as the basis for a later ballad, "Good News in Bad Times; or Absaloms Return to David's Bosome." See 34788, Early Broadside Ballad Archive, dir. Patricia Fumerton, accessed April 30, 2021, https://ebba.english.ucsb.edu/ballad/34788/image.

50. See Harold Love, *Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford, 1993); Stern, "Watching as Reading."

51. Charles Haywood, "*The Songs & Masque in the New Tempest*: An Incident in the Battle of the Two Theatres, 1674," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 19 (1955): 39–56.

with his score for Shadwell's other operatic success, *Psyche* (1675). The scores appeared together under the triumphantly patriotic title *The English Opera*.[52]

On the face of it, the volume appears to be making a political, rather than a musical, statement. The collection is a reduced score of the act tunes and curtain music used in the Dorset Garden *Tempest*; as a working document for performance, it is essentially unusable. Instead, Locke's intended purpose for this strange text is to demonstrate a native—that is, English—operatic style that is distinct from the French or Italian models that were then gaining popularity in London, especially at court.[53]

However, Locke does have another motive for producing this reduced score, one that speaks to early modern desires to acquire and own elements of theatrical productions away from the circumstances of professional performance. In his text, Locke claims to be providing a record of performance that, while impractical from a musicological standpoint, does at the very least aid both the memory and imagination of its readers. In his preface to the text, Locke explains that he decided to publish his scores "to satisfie those Lovers and Understanders of Musick, whose business or distance prevent their seeing and hearing it" in its proper context of theatrical performance. He even directs his readers to the published playbooks of *The Tempest* and *Psyche*, should readers desire to see further their "particular Excellencies," such as the plot or elaborate descriptions of the scenic effects used in the production.[54]

In *The English Opera*, Locke appeals to multiple markets: musical connoisseurs and patriots who want to survey the latest in English musical styles, musicians looking to play his works either as rehearsal exercises or as concert repertoire (though this would require some creative engagement with the score), spectators of the original production who want an aide-mémoire of the theatrical event, and potentially interested readers who were unable (or unwilling) to pay to visit the theater to see *The Tempest* in performance but who can now use these scripts and scores to re-create the opera in the theater of their imaginations, or in the privacy of their own homes. Of course, these groups are not mutually exclusive; Locke's readers may well have used his scores in one or all of these ways, and we might assume the same thing is true of the published playbooks as well. What is important is that Locke's readers are *acquiring* the production's music for their own ends away from the playhouse. How buyers then create, perform, and otherwise engage with the text is out of the control of the original institutions—the theaters—that traditionally controlled access to productions.

52. Matthew Locke, *The English Opera, or, the Vocal Musick in Psyche, with the Instrumental Therein Intermix'd. To which is Adjoyned the Instrumental Musick in The Tempest* (London, 1675).

53. On the presence of foreign musicians in London during the later seventeenth century, see Andrew R. Walkling, *Masque and Opera in England, 1656–1688* (New York, 2017), 193–218, 264–90.

54. Locke, *English Opera*, sigs. A1v, A1r.

The Tempest beyond Performance, beyond Drama

My final example of *The Tempest* "on the move" perfectly illustrates some of the things I have been discussing throughout this essay about print not just remediating a performance text but actually perpetuating performance in altered forms. *The Force of Nature; or the Loves of Hippollito and Dorinda* was published by the Northampton-based chapbook printers Robert Raikes and William Dicey in 1720.[55] The title page insists that it is a new romance "Translated from the French original, and never before printed in English," while its running title reads, "The History of *Prospero*, *Duke of* Milan."[56]

The text is not a translation but instead a prose retelling of the Davenant-Dryden-Shadwell play. Whether the author really thought his readers would believe it was originally French, rather than immediately recognizing the play that lay behind it, is difficult to determine, although it seems unlikely that anybody would be duped by such an obvious deceit, especially given that it quotes the masques in acts 2 and 5 verbatim. Nicholas Rowe's edition of Shakespeare's *Works* was published in 1709, but the Shadwell adaptation was still the only *Tempest* being performed onstage during the early eighteenth century. A new edition of the 1674 play was also published in 1720 by Thomas Johnson of The Hague under the title *The Tempest: Or, the Enchanted Island. A Comedy. First Written by Mr. William Shakespear. & since altered by Sr. William Davenant, and Mr. John Dryden*, and it looks as though the romance writer used this as his or her source text.[57] Given Johnson's reputation for pirating London Shakespeare editions, the fact that he calls attention directly to Davenant and Dryden's modifications to the play on his title page suggests how well known their version had become and how their own names added value to the edition rather than detracting from Shakespeare's "brand" recognition. In this instance, it paid Johnson to draw on the Restoration playwrights' status and fame as well as Shakespeare's.

It is clear that the author of the prose romance had an intimate knowledge of Shadwell's text. They take great care to base their narrative on the script, using a

55. *The Force of Nature; or the Loves of Hippollito and Dorinda. A Romance* (Northampton, 1720). See also Victor E. Neuburg, "The Diceys and the Chapbook Trade," *The Library* 24 (1969): 219–31.

56. Charles C. Mish provides a short introduction to a transcription of the text in "An Early Eighteenth-Century Prose Version of *The Tempest*," in *British Theatre and the Other Arts*, ed. Strum Kenny, 237–56.

57. *The Tempest: Or, the Enchanted Island. A Comedy. First Written by Mr. William Shakespear. & since altered by Sr. William Davenant, and Mr. John Dryden* (London, 1710; repr., The Hague, 1720). Although the title page does not name Johnson as the publisher explicitly, the ornament is his. See Milhous and Hume, *Publication of Plays*, 247. See also Theo Bögels, "'Fit for the Pocket': Thomas Johnson's Edition of *The Tempest*," in *Shakespeare and the Low Countries,* ed. Ton Hoenselaars and Holger Klein (Lewiston, N.Y., 2005), 165–78. The Restoration adaptation of the play, rather than Shakespeare's text, was also translated into Dutch at around this time. See Ton Hoenselaars and Frank van Meurs, "The Haarlem Manuscript of *Hartogh Van Savoij*: An Eighteenth-Century Dutch Translation of *The Tempest: or the Enchanted Island*," in *Shakespeare im 18. Jahrhundert*, ed. Roger Paulin (Göttingen, Germany, 2007), 243–65.

mixture of paraphrase and direct quotation. For example, midway through, we join Alonzo, Antonio, and Gonzalo wandering about the island: *"Alonzo . . . Antonio . . .* and *Gonzalo*, had now found out each other; but instead of being mutual Comforts, they only serv'd to aggravate their respective Miseries: The two Dukes appear'd like Men distracted; and good *Gonzalo*'s Tears run down his Beard, like Winter-Drops from Eves of Houses: *Alonzo* was brimful of Grief, for the Loss of his Son *Ferdinand*, whom he suppos'd to be drown'd; and reproach'd *Antonio* with his being the Cause of all their Sorrows; which he indeed could not deny; but laid the Crime at *Alonzo*'s Door."[58] At this juncture, "to complete their Terror and Amazement, *Alonzo* pulling a Tree, Blood issued out of it." This is a paraphrase of what was said on stage: "I pull'd a Tree, and bloud pursu'd my hand."[59] Ghostly noises are then heard, and the ground opens to reveal "a horrid Masque of Spirits." At this point, the writer quotes verbatim the masque of devils (though the romance calls them "Spirits") from act 2 of Shadwell's text.[60] The romance concludes with Ariel's song "Where the Bee Sucks" and Prospero's final farewell to his faithful servant.[61]

Charles Mish suggests that *The Force of Nature* "attests, along with the frequent performances of *The Tempest* recorded in theatrical history, to the staying power of Shakespeare's imagination."[62] When considering its immediate sources, however, we see instead that the romance attests to the staying power of Davenant and Dryden's *Tempest* in the late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century imaginary, not Shakespeare's. The prose narrative is a remediation of the Restoration play into another textual form, the prose romance, which enables it to encounter new audiences (non-London-based readers, who may not have access either to Shadwell's text or the operatic stage performance), while also perpetuating *The Tempest*'s life beyond the stage. Whoever wrote *The Force of Nature* clearly felt a desire to pay homage to the original playtext while, at the same time, they created a new and distinctive literary product in print for a new readership.

The Tempest captured the public imagination in the late seventeenth century. It was picked up and reused in a wide range of contexts for a variety of purposes: from personal study, to public performance, to amateur entertainment, to the pleasure of collecting and ownership, and as an aide-mémoire of personal spectatorship or a record of the larger performance. To achieve this wide set of aims, it was remediated: from performance, playtext, and stand-alone song, to miscellany, music score, and even fictional prose. In describing and accounting for its popularity, it is necessary to examine each of these iterations of the play in turn. Each represents an imaginative engagement with *The Tempest* that, for those who made it, was potentially as

58. *Force of Nature*, 13.
59. *The Tempest* (1674), 27.
60. *Force of Nature*, 13–14.
61. *Force of Nature*, 28–29; cf. *The Tempest* (1674), 81.
62. Mish, "Early Eighteenth-Century Prose," 240.

powerful and fulfilling as seeing the play at Lincoln's Inn Fields or Dorset Garden (or at either of the King's Company's theaters, as *The Storm* or *The Mock-Tempest*). But the implications reach far beyond *The Tempest*. Restoration drama tout court frequently proliferates in new and varied published forms, nourished by the developing print market and an expanding middle-class readership. If we are to fully understand the cultural and imaginative power these plays enjoyed during the second half of the seventeenth century, then we must look for those parts of plays that become detached from the main body of the text and those residuals that linger long after the thrilling storm of performance has vanished into thin air.

STEPHEN WATKINS is a departmental lecturer in English Language and Literature at St. John's College, Oxford, and a visiting fellow at the University of Southampton. His research focuses on late seventeenth- and eighteenth-century English theater and opera. He is currently completing a short book for Cambridge University Press on *Acting Shakespeare in the Restoration*.