Winkler, Amanda Eubanks, and Richard Schoch. "Davenant's Legacy." *Shakespeare in the Theatre: Sir William Davenant and the Duke's Company*. London: The Arden Shakespeare, 2022. 143–162. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 26 Apr. 2023. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781350130609.ch-007>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 26 April 2023, 09:41 UTC.

Copyright © Amanda Eubanks Winkler and Richard Schoch 2022. Released under a CC BY-NC-ND licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>). You may share this work for non-commercial purposes only, provided you give attribution to the copyright holder and the publisher, and provide a link to the Creative Commons licence.

7

Davenant's Legacy

William Davenant pursued a vibrant style of performing Shakespeare in the 1660s, a style tailored to his theatrical space and the talents of his youthful acting company that appealed to the eye as well as the ear. Davenant's style survived the man himself, for it was taken up and expanded by Thomas Betterton in the 1670s. At the Dorset Garden Theatre, Betterton and his collaborators increased the use of spectacle, expanded the opportunities for music, and tailored the plays to showcase the company's strengths. The dynamic performance style that the Duke's Company fostered found lasting acclaim with generations of audiences. The musicalized *Macbeth* and *Tempest* were revived into the nineteenth century. Other Shakespeare adaptations such as *The Fairy Queen* (1692–3) and Charles Gildon's *Measure for Measure* (1700) built upon Davenant's legacy. As we discuss below, such productions were artistically satisfying but never enjoyed the same financial success as Restoration Shakespeare in the 1660s and 1670s.

Purcell, Shakespeare, and the United Company

By the late 1670s, both patent companies were in financial trouble. Theatre attendance had plummeted during the Popish Plot (1678–81) and Exclusion Crisis (1679–81). This drop in

audience numbers, compounded by mismanagement at the King's Company, led to the merger of the two companies in 1682. The United Company, as the new theatrical entity was known, seemed poised for success: it had a talented company of actors, including Thomas Betterton; it had two relatively new theatres at its disposal, the Theatre Royal for plays and Dorset Garden for performances requiring a high-level of spectacle; and, after 1688, it profited from the services of the highly talented composer Henry Purcell.

Purcell possessed prodigious musical gifts. He began his musical education as a choir boy in the Chapel Royal and, after his voice broke in 1673, received instruction from John Blow and Christopher Gibbons. Matthew Locke, who was deeply involved in the development of English opera from the Interregnum onwards – and who created the earliest score for Davenant's *Macbeth* – was likewise a significant influence on the young composer. By 1677 Purcell had a comfortable royal appointment. Ostensibly the composer for the violins at court, he actually spent most of his time writing sacred music. Over the next few years his career at court flourished: he became the organist at Westminster Abbey in 1679 and three years later was admitted as a Gentleman of the Chapel Royal.¹ Purcell's ascendancy ended when James II, a Roman Catholic, significantly reorganized the court musical establishment upon his succession in 1685, an event that significantly diminished the importance of music for Protestant worship. Purcell's fortunes at court foundered even more after William and Mary began their joint reign in 1689. On 2 May 1690 the king asked the Lord Chamberlain to cut positions from the Royal Household; one of Purcell's appointments – his position as harpsichordist – was eliminated. Although he continued to compose some music for the court, after this point Purcell turned his attention almost wholly to the theatre.²

From 1690 onward Purcell worked on various operatic projects for the United Company, including one notable adaptation of Shakespeare: *The Fairy Queen*, a reworking of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* first performed in 1692. *The Fairy*

Queen was part of a series of dramatick operas mounted by the United Company, which expanded upon the template established by Davenant and his successors in the 1660s and 1670s. Although this anonymous adaptation sometimes has been assigned to Elkanah Settle, we follow Andrew Walkling in suspecting that Betterton supervised or executed the reworking of the text and planned the production.³ The dances were choreographed by Josias Priest, who had worked with Purcell previously on *Dido and Aeneas* (c. 1688), the famous short opera first performed at Priest's school for young ladies in Chelsea, as well as Purcell's previous two dramatick operas, *Dioclesian* and *King Arthur*. *The Fairy Queen* was revived almost immediately in 1693, probably with additional music.⁴

The Fairy Queen adaptation mostly follows the strategies established by the Duke's Company in the 1660s and 1670s. The language of the text (taken from the 1685 Fourth Folio) is modernized, and scenes are reshuffled and sometimes cut to allow more time for the music, but the essential plot structure remains the same.⁵ In terms of the placement of music, *The Fairy Queen* also followed some of the same techniques found in Davenant's earlier adaptations. Sometimes songs were carried over with little or no lyrical alteration. Bottom's unaccompanied 'The Woosel Cock', is one such example, although as with similar songs from *The Tempest*, no musical setting survives. In other cases, Shakespeare's play formed the scaffolding upon which new and more elaborate musical episodes were built. Titania's protection charm/lullaby in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (2.2) is transformed in Act 2 of *The Fairy Queen* into an extended self-contained masque featuring Night, Mystery, Secrecy, and Sleep. In Purcell's opera (3.2), Titania summons a rustic entertainment to please the transfigured Bottom, a dilation of his request for the 'tongs and the bones' in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (4.1).⁶

Many scholars have noted the self-contained nature of masques, what Walkling has called an 'almost total quarantining', which has been viewed as a dramaturgical departure from previous Shakespeare adaptations and earlier dramatick

operas.⁷ Michael Burden has suggested that practical reasons may have informed this choice. A letter written by Katharine Booth to her mother in May 1692 indicates that the roles of 'the Fairy King and the Queen' were taken by 'little children of about 8 or 9'. Perhaps the children needed additional time to practice their parts or perhaps past experience had taught the team at Dorset Garden that musical rehearsals were best conducted separately from dramatic ones.⁸

Burden's explanation for *The Fairy Queen's* structure is certainly plausible. But we would argue, *pace* Walkling, that the 'quarantining' of the masques is not, in fact, absolute. Nor do the masques necessarily impede dramatic momentum. As Burden has noted, 'a masque, by definition, needs to be "presented" to an audience on whose conduct its themes in some way reflect'.⁹ In other words, the masques reflect the character and affect the behaviour of those who see them. Thus, Bottom gets a comical rustic entertainment. Titania is presented an elaborate masque of sleep, fit for a queen at bedtime. Oberon provides the evening's final masque, a celebration of love and marriage directed both to the happy lovers onstage and royal spectators offstage, with its prominent display of orange trees (William of Orange/William III). In the case of *The Fairy Queen*, the reactions of the onstage audience as they witnessed the spectacle would have continued the dramatic trajectory of the play. Such reactions are essential components of the overall performance, even if they were improvised and even if they went unrecorded in the published quartos. In turn, such reactions must have guided the response of the real-life audience, amplifying and reflecting back the wondrousness of what they saw and heard.

Indeed, the difference between the entertainments in *The Fairy Queen* and earlier Shakespeare adaptations (or earlier non-Shakespearean dramattick operas) is one of degree, not kind. Dramaturgically, the masques in *The Fairy Queen* are similar to the moments in Davenant's adaptations where an onstage audience reacts to a musical interlude, such as the Masque of Devils in *The Tempest*, or the interlude in

Macbeth (2.5) where the Macduffs watch as the witches sing and dance. Other sequences in *The Fairy Queen* expanded upon previous instances of machine-spectacle at Dorset Garden, such as the Masque of Neptune in the 1674 *Tempest*, which brilliantly synthesized and harmonized various media. Although printed stage directions do not always reflect reality, one such intermedial sequence was almost certainly staged as described in print, the opening of the Masque of Seasons in Act 4 of the opera. A symphony by Purcell survives to accompany the descent of the machine that opens this sequence:¹⁰

The Scene changes to a Garden of Fountains. A Sonata plays while the Sun rises, it appears red through the Mist, as it ascends it dissipates the Vapours, and is seen in its full Lustre; then the Scene is perfectly discovered, the Fountains enrich'd with gilding, and adorn'd statues: The view is terminated by a Walk of Cypress Trees which lead to a delightful Bower. Before the Trees stand rows of Marble Columns, which support many Walks which rise by Stairs to the top of the House; the Stairs are adorn'd with Figures on Pedestals, and Rails and Balusters on each side of 'em. Near the top, vast Quantities of Water break out of the Hills, and fall in mighty Cascade's to the bottom of the Scene, to feed the Fountains which are on each side. In the middle of the Stage is a very large Fountain, where the Water rises about twelve Foot.¹¹

Walking has surmised that water might have been piped in from the Thames to feed the fountains. This dynamic water effect coupled with the mist, Purcell's regal instrumental music scored with trumpets and kettledrums, and the descending machine would have created a feast for the eyes and the ears – an entertainment fit for royalty.¹²

But this sensory feast did not come cheaply. *The Fairy Queen* cost a princely sum to produce, by some accounts as much as £3,000.¹³ It was certainly the most expensive and

elaborate Shakespearean dramattick opera of its time. We might view *The Fairy Queen* as a cautionary tale, for it pushed the practical limits of the Duke's Company's aesthetic beyond what was financially prudent. The prompter John Downes explained that *The Fairy Queen* was superior in 'Ornaments' to other dramattick operas and that 'The Court and Town were wonderfully satisfy'd with it; but the Expences in setting it out being so great, the Company got very little by it'.¹⁴ Thus, despite *The Fairy Queen*'s considerable charms, it did not turn a significant profit, due to the level of spectacle and the elaborate musical forces involved (not supplied by kingly decree as they had been for *The Tempest*). *The Fairy Queen* might have proved to be a good earner in revivals, but the score was lost c. 1695 and was not recovered until the twentieth century.¹⁵

Shakespeare and theatrical chaos in the 1690s and beyond

1695 was a tumultuous year in the London theatre scene and the missing *Fairy Queen* score was the least of the United Company's worries. Dissension in the company had increased after Christopher Rich took control in 1693. As explained previously, Betterton and Harris had run the Duke's Company after Davenant's death in 1668. But within a decade Harris began to pursue politics more vigorously, and by 1681 he transferred his managerial duties to William Smith. Betterton and Smith jointly managed the Duke's Company from that point forward and likewise took control of the United Company after it was formed in 1682. This arrangement lasted until 1687, when Alexander Davenant bought out his brother Charles's shares with money secretly obtained from Sir Thomas Skipwith and Christopher Rich. In true nepotistic fashion Alexander appointed his brother Thomas, aged twenty-three, as nominal manager, although Betterton and Smith served as a

shadow government, advising the inexperienced Thomas. The dramattick operas of 1690–3, including *The Fairy Queen*, were partially motivated by Alexander's desire to pay off his creditors, a scheme that was unsuccessful and led him to flee to the Canary Islands after an unfavourable chancery audit of his finances. He defaulted on his loans to Skipwith and Rich, who now owned Alexander's shares and patent outright, bringing them on equal footing with Charles Killigrew, Thomas Killigrew's heir and fellow patentee. Skipwith remained uninvolved, but Rich, with the support of Killigrew, set about putting the financial house in order – limiting spending, cutting salaries, and reassigning roles to less well-paid younger actors. Betterton might have retired around this time had he not lost his entire fortune in an unhappy investment on the cargo of a ship captured by the French. Unwilling to be at the mercy of tyrannical management, Betterton and several of his fellow actors deserted the United Company and resolved to start their own acting company. Emboldened by the Lord Chamberlain's support, the rebel actors – led by Betterton, Elizabeth Barry, and Anne Bracegirdle – received a hearing before William III in 1695 and were allowed to set up a separate company at their former theatre in Lincoln's Inn Fields, the very theatre where Davenant had led the Duke's Company.¹⁶

The breakaway company ultimately did not succeed, but it did have well-known actors, proficient singers and dancers, and a popular house composer, John Eccles. These considerable assets would reveal their value as the troupe embraced Davenant's intermedial aesthetic in new productions and revivals of Shakespeare's plays. As Milhous aptly noted, 'these people had in common not only their repertory and training but the philosophy of company management inherited from Sir William Davenant, which put the good of the company above the profits of the owners', a refreshing change from Christopher Rich's self-serving tactics.¹⁷ The fledgling company's move to Lincoln's Inn Fields was a kind of homecoming, because the theatre had been occupied by the Duke's Company in the 1660s and early 1670s, before it moved to more elaborate premises in

Dorset Garden. The return to Lincoln's Inn Fields was more about expediency than nostalgia, however, because the old theatre had been converted back into a tennis court. Once again, the building needed to be adapted for theatrical use. The new company's retrofitted theatre did not include much machinery, but it seems to have had trapdoors, a substage area where music could be played, and an apparatus for flying effects.¹⁸ The breakaway company could not afford to rival the resources of Dorset Garden because its income was restricted to the funds provided by the actor-sharers and, as their official agreement states, 'publique Receipts'.¹⁹ The lack of spectacle coupled with the theatre's small seating capacity ultimately caused the company at Lincoln's Inn Fields great financial difficulty.²⁰

Sometime in the midst of this chaos, *Macbeth* – always a crowd-pleaser – was revived with a new score by John Eccles, although it is not clear if the production opened before or after the breakaway company established itself at Lincoln's Inn Fields.²¹ Regardless of when Eccles's score was first performed, *Macbeth* proved popular with both companies during this period. We know that Lincoln's Inn Fields revived *Macbeth* with Eccles's score in the early eighteenth century because the names of basses in the first layer of annotations are crossed out and replaced with Cook, a singer at Lincoln's Inn Fields in the early eighteenth century. Another singer in this second layer of annotations, Short, also worked at Lincoln's Inn Fields in the early eighteenth century.²² Indeed, performances of Eccles's *Macbeth* at Lincoln's Inn Fields may have spurred Christopher Rich's company to retaliate in 1702 with a new setting of the witches' music composed by Richard Leveridge.

Leveridge's and Eccles's scores reveal two different approaches to the witches' scenes, one more economical than the other. Eccles's setting is lavish, drawing on the extravagant mode of Purcell's dramattick operas from the 1690s. His score calls for double soprano-alto-tenor-bass (SATB) chorus, a string orchestra with continuo group (likely a harpsichord, theorbo, and bass violin), and the unusual instrument of the

serpent, a low-pitched wind instrument shaped like a snake. Soloists may have been drawn from the chorus, although it is clear that Hecate was performed by a separate bass singer. Despite the quality of Eccles's music, it fell out of favour, perhaps because of the expense involved with hiring the necessary personnel. Leveridge's music, on the other hand, requires more modest resources: a single SATB chorus and string orchestra with continuo, although the role of Hecate still required a separate bass singer. (The earliest manuscript of Leveridge's score indicates that in one production the composer himself, a talented comical singer, took the part.) Perhaps because it was less expensive and less taxing for singers to perform, Leveridge's music endured. Commonly known and advertised as the 'Famous Music', it was used in *Macbeth* productions well into the nineteenth century.

The Tempest also proved popular with audiences around the turn of the century. When Rich's company revived it in 1695, the production seems to have retained the music and text from the 1674 operatic production. Purcell was commissioned to provide a new song, 'Dear pretty youth', sung by Dorinda to Hippolito (4.3) after her beloved was wounded by Ferdinand.²³ Rich's company also mounted a revival with an entirely new score, perhaps hoping to replicate the success they had enjoyed with Leveridge's *Macbeth*. Margaret Laurie has speculated that John Weldon, Purcell's pupil, may have composed the music, given that his setting of *The Tempest* was advertised in the *Daily Courant* as being performed at Drury Lane in July 1716.²⁴ As with the *Macbeth* revivals from the 1690s and early eighteenth-century, the music for this later production uses up-to-date devices: in this case, florid text setting inspired by Purcell and da capo aria forms imported from contemporary Italian opera.²⁵

In the revivals from the 1690s and early 1700s, Davenant's adapted text remained largely unchanged, although the music was updated to suit new tastes. Thus, the dramaturgy established by Davenant and his followers in the 1660s and 1670s remained: the syncretic combination of scenic effects,

dance, music, and drama created meaning in performance. And Davenant's influence proved long-lasting. Although his textual approach to Shakespeare ultimately lost its appeal in the eighteenth century, these interpolated musical scenes from *Macbeth* and *The Tempest* remained popular.

New adaptations at Lincoln's Inn Fields

Between 1698 and 1700 the halcyon dream of a theatre company run cooperatively by the actors at Lincoln's Inn Fields had transformed into a nightmare. Colley Cibber gossiped, 'Experience, in a Year or two shew'd them, that they had never been worse govern'd, than when they govern'd themselves!'²⁶ Negligence and selfishness reigned, and the audience defected to Rich's better-organized troupe.

In addition to the aforementioned *Macbeth* revival, the company at Lincoln's Inn Fields mounted several other Shakespeare adaptations in quick succession: Charles Gildon's *Measure for Measure* (1700); George Granville's *The Jew of Venice* (1701), a reworking of *The Merchant of Venice*; and William Burnaby's *Love Betray'd* (1703), an adaptation of *Twelfth Night*. Describing the rationale for this spate of revivals and adaptations, the anonymous author of *A Comparison between the Two Stages* (1702) imagined Betterton praying to Shakespeare for deliverance: 'O Shakespear, Shakespear! *What have our Sins brought upon us! We have renounc'd the ways which thou hast taught us, and are degenerated into Infamy and Corruption*'. After beseeching the Bard for help, 'he falls to work about his Design, opens the Volume and picks out two or three of *Shakespears* Plays; and now, says he, I'll feague it away ifaith'.²⁷ In response, so the author tells us, Drury Lane turned to their own 'god', Ben Jonson, and the 'Battel continued a long time doubtful, and Victory hovering over both Camps, *Batterton* Sollicits for some Auxiliaries from the same

Author, and then he flanks his Enemy with *Measure* for *Measure*'.²⁸

These productions deploy a combination of old and new strategies. Playwrights adapted the texts in a similar fashion to what Davenant and the Duke's Company had done decades earlier: they modernized and streamlined Shakespeare's texts, and simplified moral complexities. Moral clarity was even more important in this period, given that authors at the turn of the century were keen to pay lip service to the virtues of the theatre in the wake of Jeremy Collier's *A Short View of the Immorality and Profaneness of the Stage* (1698). Admittedly, many playwrights continued to write smut, but Collier's attack did influence Gildon's and Granville's thinking.²⁹ Thus, while both Davenant and the turn-of-the-century adapters felt that morals must be clearly communicated, the early eighteenth-century adapters were responding to a specific recent controversy.

Practical exigencies drove another set of strategies in these turn-of-the-century adaptations. The company at Lincoln's Inn Fields, although it could not match the technological resources of Dorset Garden Theatre, possessed some key strengths in the musical component of theatrical production: John Eccles, the company's house composer; Anne Bracegirdle and John Bowman, both experienced actor-singers; and Thomas Betterton, who had been involved with many of the elaborate musical extravaganzas staged by the Duke's Company and United Company. Thus, music continued to be an essential feature of these new Shakespeare adaptations, whether as one-off songs or as masques performed for onstage audiences.

For the first of these adaptations, Betterton and company had a secret advantage – they possessed a relatively unknown musical score by the recently deceased Henry Purcell: his opera *Dido and Aeneas*. The only known performance of *Dido* was sometime around 1688 at Josias Priest's boarding school for girls, so it was hardly a well-known work to London audiences.³⁰ Charles Gildon, who wrote the aforementioned biography of Thomas Betterton, interpolated Purcell's music and Nahum Tate's libretto for *Dido* into Shakespeare's *Measure*

for *Measure*.³¹ Gildon seems to have been familiar with Davenant's *Law Against Lovers*, a conflation of *Measure for Measure* and *Much Ado About Nothing*, for he includes some of the same material, even though his adaptation is generally closer to Shakespeare's text.³² While Gildon drew upon a pre-existing work for the music, the music functions in a similar fashion as the Shakespeare adaptations from the 1660s and 1670s that had newly composed scores. For instance, Purcell and Tate's allegorical prologue becomes a celebratory Act 5 masque (similar to the 1674 Masque of Neptune in *The Tempest*).

Like Davenant before him, Gildon is also concerned with the slippery signification of music and the unintended consequences of hearing it, questions that are explored through the embedded masques performed for an onstage audience.³³ These masques consist of interpolations from *Dido*, presented by Escalus to 'sweeten' the 'Sour temper' of his master Angelo in the hope that the 'Power of Harmony' might cause him to 'relish Mercy, more than Justice'.³⁴ This is a very old notion – that musical harmony arouses a parallel harmony in the listener. But in the play, Escalus' plan to temper Angelo's mood does not succeed because Escalus misjudges the music and Angelo's nature. At the outset of the first entertainment, Angelo expects a 'Diversion' and hopes that music will 'chase Away the Guilty Image' provoked by Isabella's plea that he show mercy to her brother Claudio.³⁵ But the interpolated Act 1, Scene 1 of *Dido* is ill-suited for soothing a troubled breast, as Dido sings a lament over an oscillating, obsessive repeated bass line, revealing her tormented passions. Her anguished and lovestruck exclamations, the encouragement of her courtiers to pursue the Trojan Prince, and Aeneas's disingenuous declaration to Dido, 'Aeneas has no Fate but you', only stoke Angelo's lust for Isabella. Watching the opera does not spur him to internal 'harmony'.

The most striking disconnect between Escalus's desired outcome and the music he selects comes in Act 3, when Escalus prepares Angelo's 'Thoughts for pleasing Slumbers' by presenting

Dido's desertion by Aeneas and her subsequent death. The tragic subject matter is clearly not designed to promote sleep, particularly as in the previous act Angelo had drawn a parallel between Isabella and himself and Dido and Aeneas.³⁶ Angelo notices Isabella's presence immediately after he hears *Dido's* closing number, a choral lamentation for the dead queen ('With drooping Wings you Cupids come'). The juxtaposition of the visual and the sonic – Isabella's appearance and the musical sighs of Purcell's composition – might have encouraged Angelo to sympathy if he were less immoral. But Angelo cannot feel anything but desire. When he spies his 'Ev'ning Star of Love', he resolves that he will take her by 'Force, if fair means fail'.³⁷

We should not view Angelo's reactions as a haphazard or inept dramatic choice on the part of Gildon, for at the outset of the play the courtier Balzathar is sceptical that Escalus's plan to soften Angelo's heart through music will succeed: 'Musick, Shew, and Opera's; those Seldom please, where Cruelty presides'.³⁸ Angelo is just that kind of cruel man; he experiences only base passions in response to music that urges him to nobler sentiments. His depraved reaction only reinforces the audience's view of him as a brute.

Gildon's *Measure for Measure* points towards the structure used in subsequent Shakespeare adaptations at Lincoln's Inn Fields, for many of them included embedded masques. Such masques, often on mythological topics, had been a staple of the breakaway company's offerings almost from its inception. However, the music for many of these productions has been lost, suggesting that they were not set at all, or at least they did not enter the repertory.³⁹ Such is the case with the masques in George Granville's *The Jew of Venice*, his adaptation of *The Merchant of Venice*, and William Burnaby's *Love Betray'd*, his adaptation of *Twelfth Night*. In his preface, Burnaby griped that his play suffered because his celebratory Act 5 masque was not set to music.⁴⁰ And Granville's masque of Peleus and Thetis from Act 2 of his play may have been excised early in its performance history, given that Granville's adaptation held the

stage for the next forty years and yet the musical entertainment was never subsequently advertised or mentioned in critical commentary.⁴¹

The masque libretto for Peleus and Thetis allows us to assess its relationship with the plot of Granville's *Jew of Venice*. Unlike Gildon's *Measure for Measure*, it is difficult to draw clear parallels between the characters in the masque and the characters in Granville's drama. Prometheus could be Antonio, who has provoked Jupiter's (Shylock's) wrath; but, equally, he might be read as Proteus, who enables the love between Peleus (Bassanio) and Thetis (Portia). Such analogies quickly break down, however, because Shylock is not in love with Portia and Peleus does not save Prometheus. Instead, Portia rescues Antonio with her cleverness in court.⁴² The masque's immediate plot does not connect to the larger dramatic narrative, but relates to it only in a general sense, with regard to Bassanio's liberal approach to money. As Antonio observes:

With such an Air of true Magnificence,
My noble minded Brother treats his Friends:
As hardly has been known to *Italy*
Since *Pompey* and *Lucullus* entertain'd:
To frame thy Fortunes ample as thy Mind,
New Worlds shou'd be created.⁴³

The lack of substantial relationship between masque and play meant that it could be easily excised. Comparing Gildon's adaptation with Granville's shows how embedded masques could be used to great effect, and how in less skilful hands it could fall flat. The embedded masques of *Measure for Measure* enrich the story, revealing Angelo's corrupted nature. Listening to *Dido* does not provoke sympathy; instead, the tragic tale of love piques Angelo's desire for Isabella. In *The Jew of Venice*, the masque is an easily detached entertainment, for it fails to illuminate dramatic action or character.

The Restoration *Macbeth* and *The Tempest* in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries

This cluster of Shakespearean adaptations at Lincoln's Inn Fields differs from Davenant's Duke's Company adaptations: Whereas Shakespeare was not mentioned as the source of Davenant's *Law Against Lovers* and in Dryden's prologue to *The Tempest* the adaptation emerged from Shakespeare's 'dust', later Shakespeare adapters were more concerned with their relationship with the 'original' text. Gildon states in his dedication to Nicholas Battersby that his version of *Measure for Measure* is 'much more *Shakespears* than Mine', a rhetorical move that centres Shakespeare.⁴⁴ Both Granville and Burnaby use marks to differentiate their lines from Shakespeare's and in his prologue Granville anxiously excuses his textual tinkering, claiming that 'Undertakings of this kind are justify'd by the Examples of those Great Men who have employ'd their Endeavours the same Way'. Granville goes on to cite Davenant and Dryden's work on *The Tempest* as an inspiration for his adaptation, but as we've seen, their approach in 1667 was far less reverential than Granville's in 1701.⁴⁵

The increasing value placed upon Shakespeare's 'original' text, however much it was abbreviated in performance, did not diminish the theatrical appeal of Restoration versions of *Macbeth* and *The Tempest*, which held the stage into the era of David Garrick and beyond. Why were these two plays so enduringly popular with audiences? Perhaps it has something to do with the vitality of the interpolated music in each play, a vitality that was strong enough to withstand the cult of Bardolatry that insisted on performing an unadorned Shakespearean text.

Davenant's *Macbeth* continued to hold the stage until 1744, when David Garrick restored Shakespeare's text, while retaining some of Davenant's lines, including Macbeth's dying words, 'Farewell, vain world and what's most vain in it.

Ambition!' By contrast, Leveridge's music for the witches (which of course used words by Davenant and Middleton) was performed well into the nineteenth century, although his score was sometimes misattributed to Locke or Purcell, both more illustrious composers.⁴⁶ Commentary on the witches' scenes written in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries allows us to understand how those scenes were interpreted and received in successive historical moments. In the pages of *The Spectator* (1711), Joseph Addison recalled the (for him) uncomfortable experience of watching a performance of *Macbeth* while seated near a spectator who was overly fond of the witches:

Some Years ago I was at the Tragedy of *Macbeth*, and unfortunately placed myself under a Woman of Quality that is since Dead. . . . A little before the rising of the Curtain, she broke out into a loud Soliloquy, *When will the dear Witches enter?* And immediately upon their first Appearance, asked a Lady that sat three Boxes from her, on her Right-hand, if those Witches were not charming Creatures.⁴⁷

Obviously, the 'Woman of Quality' was delighted, not frightened by the witches, a reaction encouraged by Leveridge's jaunty sounding music and the travesty performance of Hecate. In 1773, a critic in the *St. James Chronicle* complained that 'comic actors are permitted to turn a solemn incantation into a ridiculous farce for the entertainment of the upper gallery'.⁴⁸ Half a century later, the actress Fanny Kemble remarked that '[w]e have three jolly-faced fellows, whom we are accustomed to laugh at . . . in every farce . . . with a due proportion of petticoats . . . jocose red faces, peaked hats, and broomsticks'.⁴⁹ Clearly, the menace of the witches had been entirely eradicated in favour of comedic diversion.

Surviving theatrical scores and arrangements likewise confirm that Leveridge's score was used in *Macbeth* productions – again, with Shakespeare's text, not Davenant's – well into the nineteenth century.⁵⁰ Leveridge's score even made its way into North American productions of Shakespeare's Scottish tragedy. An

1870 article in the Boston-based magazine *Every Saturday* discusses this longstanding performance tradition and calls for reform:

When Mr. Charles Kean came to revive 'Macbeth,' [1853] after the ornate and elaborate fashion which distinguished his productions of Shakespeare at the Princess's Theatre, he was faithful to the old music, to the singing witches, soloists, and chorus, and Locke or Leveridge enjoyed his own again . . . The interpolated words of the songs are in many instances the merest nonsense, and the tunes, if of a catching and popular kind, still are seriously interruptive of the due progress of the events of the play. It may reasonably be held now that the composer's 'improvements' have become exhausted by the prolonged duration of his tenure, and that he may forthwith be ejected from his occupancy.⁵¹

The reviewer in *Every Saturday* might object to Leveridge's (and Middleton and Davenant's) 'nonsense', but it seems to have been impossible to perform *Macbeth* without the 'old music'. It had become tradition. But the review also hints at the purge that was to come; after centuries of use, Leveridge's score *would* 'be ejected' from the stage by the turn of the twentieth century.

Elements of Shadwell's operatic version of the Davenant-Dryden adaptation of *The Tempest* similarly survived through its interpolated masques, which remained popular with theatre audiences decade after decade. The most frequently performed setting was the previously discussed early eighteenth-century score, likely composed by John Weldon. This music was later printed by Harrison and Company in 1786, a testament to its ongoing popularity, although it was misattributed to Purcell.⁵²

Although the parts of the 'Harrison' score continued to hold the stage into the nineteenth century, versions of songs from the 1674 *Tempest* were reset by subsequent composers and used in radically different dramatic contexts. For instance, in 1756 Garrick mounted an ill-fated 'operatic' version of *The Tempest*

that included a new setting by J.C. Smith, one of Handel's pupils. His opera begins with Ariel singing 'Arise ye subterranean winds', a song performed by a Devil in the 1674 *Tempest*. In 1789 John Kemble also mounted a version of *The Tempest* that combined the 'Harrison' score with newly composed music. The singer and composer Michael Kelly, who played Ferdinand, wrote new music for the production, but also reported that it included 'the whole of the delightful music by Purcell [*sic*]' which was 'well got up by Mr. Linley; the accompaniments by himself'.⁵³ In his *Reminiscences*, William Macready recalls a similar production that combined old and new *Tempest* music. In 1821 he acted Prospero in 'a *mélange* that was called Shakespeare's "Tempest," with songs interpolated by Reynolds, among the mutilations and barbarous ingraftings of Dryden and Davenport [*sic*]'.⁵⁴ According to the surviving playbill, this included 'The Original Musick by *Purcell* [*sic*]' alongside additional music by 'Haydn, Mozart, Dr. Arne' and many others.⁵⁵

After Macready became manager of Covent Garden in 1838, he jettisoned the 1674 *Tempest* text in favour of Shakespeare's original. But notably he retained some of 'Purcell's' music – it proved too appealing to eliminate entirely.⁵⁶ Macready's compromise – restore Shakespeare's text, but keep Restoration-style music and spectacle – proved a winning formula, and *The Tempest* was performed in this manner at Sadler's Wells and elsewhere throughout the nineteenth century. The 'Harrison' score also made its way to America: an 1897 review in *The New York Times* mentions music by Arne and Purcell [*sic*] as well as '[Wilhelm] Taubert's "Tempest" music composed for the Munich Court Theatre ... and presumably those tunes composed for the play in 1610–11 by R. Johnson'. Given this description, the sound of this revival must have been truly eclectic, with nineteenth-century musical romanticism coexisting alongside the Italianate 'Harrison' score and Johnson's Jacobean songs.⁵⁷

These anecdotes about eighteenth- and nineteenth-century performances of *Macbeth* and *The Tempest* demonstrate the

lasting audience appeal of the Restoration approach to Shakespearean performance. Even after Shakespeare's text was restored, the Leveridge and 'Harrison' scores persisted. This approach is unheard of today in mainstream productions – it would be the equivalent of staging Shakespeare with a score originally composed for Charles Kean or Henry Irving. And yet the juxtaposition of Restoration-era music with Shakespeare's text proved a winning formula and persisted in performances of these two plays well into the nineteenth century.

Davenant's approach to Shakespeare adaptation – one that drew upon contemporary music, visual splendour, and rewritten texts – clearly had a substantial and powerful theatrical afterlife and continues to shape performance to this day. Productions that update Shakespeare's language to speak to a contemporary audience, for instance *O* (2001), which adapts *Othello* to an American high school; *10 Things I Hate About You*, a rom-com version of *The Taming of the Shrew* (1999); or 'Play On', the Oregon Shakespeare Festival's project that translated Shakespeare's early modern texts into modern English, are indebted to Davenant and the Duke's Company, whether they know it or not. We can also see traces of this aesthetic in productions that employ cutting-edge technology, such as the Intel co-sponsored *Tempest* at the RSC (2016). The virtual reality Ariel avatar produces a similar sense of wonder in the audience as the changeable scenery at Lincoln's Inn Fields, the machines at Dorset Garden. Baz Luhrmann's frenetic *William Shakespeare's Romeo + Juliet* with MTV-style editing and a popular music compilation soundtrack also incorporates a similar set of intermedial strategies as seen at the Duke's Company, as up-to-date music combines with a distinctive visual vocabulary to produce meaning. Restoration Shakespeare has also had a lasting effect in the opera house. Jeremy Sams's pastiche opera, *The Enchanted Island*, performed at the Metropolitan Opera (2011), drew liberally upon the 1674 version of *The Tempest* for inspiration, combining it in true Restoration fashion with elements drawn from *A Midsummer Night's Dream*.

We hope this book has put to rest any presumption that Restoration adaptations of Shakespeare are lesser or inferior versions of Shakespeare. As we have argued throughout, Restoration Shakespeare is a historical performance genre in its own right, possessing its own aesthetic aims and its own hermeneutic agency. To understand Restoration Shakespeare as anything else is to misunderstand it entirely. Perhaps the best way to appreciate the distinctiveness of Restoration Shakespeare is by studying the theatrical and musical innovations introduced by Davenant and the Duke's Company. We can come to see that those innovations are still part of our theatrical consciousness, still part of the artistic vocabulary used by directors, designers and actors to create performances today. One way or another, Davenant and the Duke's Company are still with us.