

Submerged Borrowing: The Dynamics of Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Modifications of Shakespeare

John Peter Verdurmen

Associate Professor, Department of English, College of Arts, King Saud University,
Riyadh, Saudi Arabia

(Received 7/4/1412; accepted 9/10/1412)

Abstract. This study challenges the conventional practice of determining the influence of Elizabethan playwrights on Restoration and eighteenth century drama according to frequency of performance and the number of obvious adaptations. It sets out to show that the dynamics of adaptation, by which character configurations, detachable structures and energy patterns, with the attitudes toward life that those elements carry, were internalized by later dramatists as they fashioned "new" dramas. Because of this dynamic, Shakespeare's influence was far greater than statistics suggests. The dynamics of adaptation in question are explored through the analysis of a "network" of borrowing centered on *Twelfth Night*. Two Restoration plays, Nathaniel Lee's *Nero* (1674), Wycherley's *The Plain Dealer* (1676), and an early eighteenth-century drama, William Burnaby's *Love Betray'd*, display complex patterns of modification, patterns further complicated by the subsidiary influence of Beaumont and Fletcher's *Philaster*, which became intertwined with *Twelfth Night* on the strength of its "breches disguise" component. Through an examination of the adaptation process, we find that Lee, Wycherley and Burnaby reacted in varying degrees emotionally, intellectually and dramatically to the two earlier plays, with *Twelfth Night* exerting so powerful and pervasive an influence that we can conclude that it had entered the "theatrical bloodstream" of these later times. Consequently, awareness of the force and substance of the modification process should lead to a sweeping reconsideration of Shakespeare's impact on Restoration and eighteenth-century drama.

On the basis of quantifiable performance lists, it is commonly accepted that Shakespeare's "influence" on Restoration drama was minimal compared to that of Beaumont and Fletcher.⁽¹⁾ The mechanistic tendency that underlies this confident assertion

(1) Emmett L. Avery and Arthur H. Scouten, eds., *The London Stage, 1660-1800 Part I: 1660-1700* (Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois Univ. Press 1968), pp. cxxviii – cxxx; and Arthur Colby Sprague, *Beaumont and Fletcher on the Restoration Stage* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1926), p. 25.

has in fact cast a dead hand over studies of Restoration adaptations. Critics have overwhelmingly addressed themselves to hackneyed issues such as the effects of changing taste on reworkings, "neoclassical" revisions, the tidying up of structure and style in the adaptations, the alleged injection into the adaptations of "heroism" on the one hand, pathos on the other. Absurd sallies into symmetry, as in Dryden's creation of Caliban's sister, are often used to tar all adaptations with the same brush. John Harold Wilson's early pronouncement on the motivation behind Restoration adaptations of earlier dramas captures the spirit of conventional critical mind set:

... certainly there can be only two reasons why a Restoration dramatist should alter any of the older plays which were the stock property of the theatres. Either he had an honest desire to correct some actual fault, or else he wished to gain for himself fame and money by the reworking of a play which may have been popular once but was now forgotten.⁽²⁾

Yet the working playwrights who adapted earlier dramas were manifestly excited by their material; they were neither schoolmasters nor merchants. Shakespeare, for example, was often met head on; his values, implicit and explicit in his dramas, were rejected, opposed or reaffirmed through the adapters' remanipulation of dynamic elements of drama such as character configurations, detachable structures and energy patterns.⁽³⁾ These elements are not cogs and bolts; they carry within them Shakespeare's attitude toward existence as expressed in discrete, focused releases of dramatic energy incorporated into the system of a given play. These elements, derived from Shakespeare, were often fused onto new dramas that are remote from, at times alien to the Shakespeare plays from which they were taken. In this context, Auden's assertion that "The words of a dead man/Are modified in the guts of the living"⁽⁴⁾ takes on added resonance. The number of plays in which we find Shakespearean characters and structures submerged beneath a "contemporary" surface indicates that he had become part of the living theatrical life of these later times. Given the submerged force of the adaptation process, the relative impact of Beaumont and Fletcher and Shakespeare needs radical reassessment. The process itself is equally ripe for exploration.

-
- (2) John Harold Wilson, *The Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Restoration Drama*, Ohio State University Studies, Graduate School Series, Contributions in Languages and Literatures 4 (Columbus: Ohio State Univ. Press, 1928), p. 43.
- (3) An example of a "character configuration" would be the father-daughter-lover grouping of Capulet-Juliet-Romeo; a "detachable structure" the breeches disguise motif; an "energy pattern" the double explosion of Orsino's anger toward the end of *Twelfth Night*. These are not very happy terms, but they manage to describe pieces of dramas that have been recognized as self-contained units by adapting playwrights.
- (4) W.H. Auden, "In memory of W.B. Yeats," 11. 22-23.

A major obstacle to a clear, accurate perception of the complexities and excitement the adaptation process holds lies in certain unquestioned assumptions held by the critics themselves. In broad terms, most critical attention paid to imitations and adaptations of Shakespeare has been controlled by what can be termed the "objectivity fallacy." It involves the cocksure assumption that the dramatist is in cold-blooded control of his material and leads to claims such as Wilson's that the Restoration dramatist was either a schoolmaster or merchant for whom an earlier play was a clocklike mechanism one could bring up-to-date. A corollary assumption is that the dramatist's use of a Shakespearean source is meant primarily to bring forth that material itself or to produce a recognizable variation of it. Although it would be absurd to deny the importance of the material itself, examination of varieties of borrowing in these years suggests that the writing of plays was not, as it is not, a tidy business; playwrights consistently "used" Shakespeare's dramas in the full sense of the term to shape their own interests, impulses and anxieties into autonomous works of art. Wycherley did not care if his audience saw *Twelfth Night* beneath the surface of *The Plain Dealer*. I suspect he did not even care whether the audience compared his Fidelia with Viola, his Manly with Orsino, or his Olivia with her namesake.

Yet Fidelia, Manly and Olivia were shaped by the clash of his own instincts and drives toward characterization, value and structure with answering elements in *Twelfth Night*. Shakespeare was for Wycherley simultaneously model and provocation. We have non-dramatic models of the same process, such as Joyce's use of Homer in *Ulysses*. That he respected Homer is evident; that he used him certain. Homer offered Joyce a framework for his own values and offered him an organizing structure. The work gains depth by the play of two "cultures" against each other. The dynamic process still holds in drama, as the most cursory comparison of Samuel Beckett's *Endgame* and Harold Pinter's *No Man's Land* will show. Our versions of other men's houses end up having little resemblance to them. The real excitement, however, comes in conceiving of and building them *anew*.

To reveal and trace the process involved in the use and remaking of Shakespeare's dramas by Restoration and eighteenth century playwrights, I will examine dramatic interplay within one of the many networks of plays that depend directly or indirectly upon a focal work, in this case upon *Twelfth Night*. The analysis of the *Twelfth Night* network is meant to be suggestive rather than inclusive.⁽⁵⁾ Further-

(5) I am currently exploring two other networks. The first study, based on the protagonist-wife-mistress character configuration, traces the influence of *Antony and Cleopatra* upon Lee's *The Rival Queens* (1677), Banks's *The Rival Kings* (1677), Cibber's *The Rival Queens* (1710?) and Gay's *The Beggars Opera* (1728). The second considers the impact of the paternal blocking of youthful lovers in *Romeo and Juliet* upon Otway's *Caius Marius* (1679), Lee's *Lucius Junius Brutus* (1680) and Rowe's *The Fair Penitent* (1703).

more, the quality of the plays themselves, notably Lee's *Nero* and Burnaby's *Love Betray'd*, is subordinate to the study of the process of adaptation itself. By following veins of influence traceable to Shakespeare, veins that owe their existence to theatrical practice as well as to dramatic tradition, I hope to illuminate the dynamics of adaptation while broadening our view of Shakespeare's impact on playwrights working during the hundred years following his death. Such a view will not necessarily exalt him, since he was unceremoniously pillaged as often as revered. Yet in a surprisingly large number of instances, the energy, forms and impassioned concepts that make his plays jump on stage were met by these later dramatists with understanding, humility and infectious enthusiasm.

The immediate *Twelfth Night* network is composed of the following plays:

Nathaniel Lee, *Nero*, 1674, Drury Lane, The King's Company

William Wycherley, *The Plain Dealer*, 11 December 1676, Drury Lane, The King's Company

William Burnaby, *Love Betray'd*, 1703, Lincoln's Inn Fields, Betterton's Company⁽⁶⁾

Attesting to the complexity of the process of dramatic transmission, the progress of *Twelfth Night* (1601) through the Restoration and eighteenth century is an irregular one that became entangled with another "breeches disguise-emmissary" play, Beaumont and Fletcher's *Philaster* (1608-1610). We know that *Twelfth Night* itself was produced in the years 1661, 1663 and 1669 by The Duke's Company. The cast list given by Downes, which may represent the 1661 production, with Betterton as Sir Toby, Harris as Sir Andrew, Underhill as Feste, Lovel as Malvolio and Mrs. Ann Gibbs as Olivia, suggests that the comic subplot was extracted and mounted.⁽⁷⁾ *Philaster* was certainly given far greater exposure; productions are legion, and it was eventually adapted by Buckingham as *The Restoration* (though never staged), and under the original title by Settle in 1695, a reworking that replaced the original as the standard version.⁽⁸⁾ The King's Company productions of *Nero* and *The Plain Dealer*, separated by two years, are linked to *Philaster*, *Twelfth Night* and to each other. Burnaby's *Love Betray'd* surprisingly carries traces of all four plays although overwhelmingly indebted to Shakespeare.

(6) Avery and Scouten, I, 216, 253; II, 31. Published in February, 1703, the premiere of *Love Betray'd* has not been established.

(7) *Ibid.*, I, 39-40. There were also performances on 6 January 1663 (I, 60) and 20 January 1663 (I, 153).

(8) Wilson, p. 47.

These plays are related through the disguise structure formed by a woman's impersonation of a young man for the purpose of remaining near the man she loves or detaching him from a rival. The disguised woman is serious, idealistic, patient and self-effacing, and as such is distinguished from the ebullient, rakish and at times violent Jacobean and Restoration "breeches" heroines of comedy.⁽⁹⁾ Despite the contentions of critics such as John Harold Wilson and Arthur Friedman that the breeches disguise convention is so ubiquitous in the seventeenth century that we cannot hope to establish specific sources for a given play by means of it,⁽¹⁰⁾ distinct elements of *Twelfth Night* and *Philaster* can be identified in *The Plain Dealer* and are blurred but recognizable in *Nero*, in which the emissary function of the disguised woman was dropped. The adaptation of *Twelfth Night* by Burnaby presents no problems in terms of source identification.

Whereas the major play in the network is *The Plain Dealer*, a fully developed, original Restoration artifact in which Shakespearean structure and value have been absorbed and radically altered, *Nero*, Lee's maiden play, is a flashy, sporadically powerful drama in which female disguise is used for affective and erotic impact. The play is weakly developed, yet individual in a way that Burnaby's is not. For its part, Burnaby's unassimilated adaptation carried heavily the marks of its times in conventional fashion, yet more importantly, it is connected to other plays in the network in a manner that raises intriguing questions about the process of dramatic transmission. On another level, Burnaby's simple shuffling of unmetamorphosed source material into a "new" play sets off the originality and dynamism Lee and Wycherley display in their transformation of inherited dramas.

We need at this point to distinguish between the differing manifestations of the breeches motif in *Twelfth Night* and *Philaster*, since it constitutes the core of the three reworkings under consideration. Viola adopts her disguise in Illyria to protect herself in an alien country, and falls in love with Orsino as she serves him. A reluctant emissary, she restricts herself to steady praise of Orsino, resisting Olivia's advances and blandishments with wit and self-control. Orsino's jealousy of his own surrogate comes in two outbursts at the end of the play, when he thinks he has lost Olivia to Caesario-Viola. The doubling of Viola through her identical twin brother softens the tone of the play, since both Olivia and Orsino are seen by the audience to be moving toward satisfaction. The doubling further serves to make the search for and fulfillment through love a general, social dynamic. The conclusion of the play is almost stately: after the flurry of identification, there is a well-wrought neatness to the resol-

(9) *Ibid.*, pp. 83-84.

(10) *Ibid.*, p. 42; Arthur Friedman, ed., *The Plays of William Wycherley* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1979), p. 360.

ution. Sebastian and Antonio are reconciled, Viola and Sebastian reunited, Olivia and Sebastian confirmed in marriage, the Duke and Viola plighted, Malvolio, a discordant element “restored” to sanity and “driven out,” and the rambunctious, malicious Sir Toby and the braggart Sir Andrew chastened. In this broad movement toward completion, Viola’s particular fate clicks comfortably into place.

Bellario-Euphrasia by contrast, having fallen in love with Philaster, leaves her home disguised as a boy and manages, with luck, to be met and taken into service by him. She is subsequently “given” as servant to her rival Arethusa and ordered to act as go-between for the two lovers in a hostile court presided over by Arethusa’s father, the usurper of Philaster’s rightful crown. Arethusa’s father is promoting his daughter’s marriage with Pharamond, a visiting prince. As reluctant an emissary as Viola, Bellario entertains Arethusa with descriptions of her master. Jealousy, a coda in *Twelfth Night*, becomes a large movement in *Philaster* as a spiteful, libidinous court lady, Megra, effectively spreads the rumor that Arethusa is having a sexual affair with Bellario. Philaster’s slowly roused jealousy eventually pushes him to violence, and in a forest setting he wounds Arethusa (with her consent) and Bellario to shift blame onto the latter. Out of the chaos that follows, Bellario’s long-delayed revelation of her identity confirms her loss of Philaster, who is awarded his rightful kingship and the hand of Arethusa. Unlike Viola, who is witty, resourceful and forward-looking, Bellario is victimized throughout the play, and plangently sets off emotional responses in the other characters. From the beginning of her service with Philaster, she has no hope of achieving her love, and gives expression to a death wish repeatedly throughout the play; when echoed by Philaster and Arethusa at various points, longing for death becomes a virtual leitmotif, casting a mood of pleasing sadness over the play. Bellario’s self-abnegation at the conclusion, as she agrees to remain with Philaster and Arethusa in the role of handmaiden, is in keeping with her passive tendency throughout. Like Olivia, Arethusa is high-toned, noble, commanding and active, yet even more solid than Olivia since she lacks the latter’s extravagant “humour” of mourning and isolation. Philaster differs fundamentally from Orsino; he is a passionate man who holds to public values, whereas Orsino is essentially private, an aesthete who feeds on the rarified food of love and cultivates languid frustration for as long as possible.

Before we discuss *Nero*’s connection with these plays and with *The Plain Dealer*, its obscurity and the extravagance of its action necessitate a summary. Nero condemns and executes his mother, carries on an adulterous affair with Poppea, kills his wife Octavia, sister of Britannicus, the “true Heire of the Empire,” and eventually Cyara, Britannicus’s disguised beloved. A Parthian princess, Cyara has fallen in love with Britannicus and he with her during a secret visit he paid to her “famed” brother.

Britannicus fled Parthia soon after their meeting, however, when his identity was revealed by a Roman informer. Cyara has come to Rome, then, disguised as Coralbo, a Parthian citizen, in order to "test" Britannicus. Shortly after Nero kills Octavia, Coralbo-Cyara gratuitously hands Britannicus a farewell letter in which Cyara's imminent death is announced. Under the double shock of the deaths of sister and beloved, Britannicus falls into a fit from which he awakens mad. Acting as his companion-protector from this point, Cyara is stabbed by Nero while screening a helpless Britannicus from the menacing, enraged tyrant. When Poppea subsequently attempts to seduce the hallucinating Britannicus, Cyara's ghost intervenes. After Britannicus dies, poisoned at Nero's command, the conclusion of the play is taken up with the destruction of Nero and the adulterous Poppea.

Although Lee essentially followed the *Philaster* model of breeches disguise, with the omission of the emissary role, the inventiveness and strength of Cyara cause her to resemble *Viola* rather than the passive *Bellario*. The breeches strand of action has been pared to its essentials and used to carry out Lee's affective strategy. In the interest of emotional impact, the playwright exploits Nero's cruelty, the lust of Nero and Poppea, and the suffering that Britannicus, virtually a registering presence, endures. Cyara amplifies and helps to display that suffering. Britannicus, the equivalent of *Philaster* in the play's structure, has in effect usurped the passive, suffering function carried in the Beaumont and Fletcher play by *Bellario*, a sexual role-reversal common in Lee's dramaturgy. Like *Bellario*, Cyara has fallen in love before assuming her disguise. Her murky motivation for concealing her identity from Britannicus, however, throws the dramatic emphasis upon sensation. When her companion *Sylvius* urges her to reveal her identity to Britannicus, she refuses:

Cyara. E're I reveal myself, his love I'll try.
Sylvius. You doubt him.
Cyara. No it is curiosity.⁽¹¹⁾

After her letter trick has stunned Britannicus and he faints, she is struck with guilt and regret:

What have I done? Upon thy dying lips
 I'll print my soul, but I'll bring back thy life.
 Fool that I was, for a fancy, thus
 To play away that Pearl, for which I would
 Have sold my breath, my vital spirits, my all.

(1, III.i.78-82)

(11) Thomas B. Stroup and Arthur L. Cooke, eds., *The Works of Nathaniel Lee*, 2 vols. (New Brunswick, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press, 1954, 1955), I, III.i. 113-115. All references to this text will be cited in the body of the paper.

Their relationship is filled with self-indulgent frustration; speaking to his sister about Cyara, Britannicus tells Octavia that “Our loves were too happy to flourish long,/ Frost-nipt i’t’h’bud, they wither’d as they hung” (1,II.iii.67-68), because treachery drove him from Parthia so soon after they had met. In probing the emotional possibilities of the pattern, Lee exploits the eroticism implicit in the breeches disguise mode. Late in the play Britannicus wanders off, carrying the slain Cyara, still mistaking her sex.

O, my dear Boy, look up; thou dost not bleed.
 Stop, stop, thou bloody spring, my hair perforce
 Shall bind thee, and damn up the Scarlet source:
 I will my self thy kind Phisician be;
 When I was sick, thou still wert so to me:
 At my bedside, strict watch all night he’ld keep,
 And, with his Songs, rock my dull cares a sleep.
 His cheeks are pale! Roses, look forth again,
 And smile for Joy your pretty Rival’s slain.
 Fate wove thy thread of life too fine to last.
 All’s lost at once! O Sad! O desp’rate cast!
 Thus, in my arms, I’le bear thy beauty’s hence;
 No guilty hand shall touch thy innocence:
 Thus, arm in arm, we in one grave will lye;
 Wretched we liv’d, but happy we will dye.

(1,IV.i.87-101)

Lingering over the erotic possibilities of sexual double identity, Lee merges friend and lover, male and female in this lament; sexual distinctions are lost in a frenzied rush of feeling that terminates in a death wish blending Eros and Thanatos. Typically, the affective qualities that Bellario’s disguise engenders in *Philaster* — hopelessness, melancholy, self-abnegation, victimization — are deepened and suffused with sensuality.⁽¹²⁾ The ironic strategy of shifting the passive sufferer role from

(12) Beaumont and Fletcher were capable of projecting similar though paler erotic overtones. Despite what he believes to be frequent grave provocations, *Philaster*’s animus against Bellario repeatedly dissolves in affection. During a generosity duel in which each tries to take the blame for wounding Arethusa, *Philaster* asks Dion and Cleremont to take him closer to the fainting Bellario (whom he has stabbed):

Would you have tears shed for you when you die?
 Then lay me gently on his neck, that there
 I may weep floods and breathe forth my spirit.
 ’Tis not the wealth of Plutus nor the gold
 Lock’d in the heart of earth, can buy away
 This armful of me. This had been a ransom
 To have redeem’s the great Augustus Caesar
 Had he been taken. You hard-hearted men,
 More stony than these mountians, can you see

Bellario to the Philaster figure (equivalent to a shift from Viola to Orsino), was no doubt calculated to thrill the audience of the day by ringing changes on an established configuration, although there may have been a strong element of psychological projection on Lee's part involved in the inversion. Beyond the love couple, the rivalry between fine lady and disguised woman is submerged almost out of sight, barely perceptible in Cyara's blocking in spirit form Poppea's attempted seduction of Britannicus. Because of Bellario's passivity, such rivalry is minimal in *Philaster*.⁽¹³⁾ Lee's free use of the disguise motif, then, carries to a logical or perhaps reckless extreme the emotional tendencies implicit or partly realized in Beaumont and Fletcher's formulation of it. The active nature of Lee's heroine is the sole trace, and it is a highly attenuated one, of *Twelfth Night*.

Repertory casting must have led Wycherley from Lee's *Nero* to his own *The Plain Dealer*, as he worked out the friendship-love-betrayal nexus involving Manly, Olivia and Vernish. Both *Nero* and *The Plain Dealer* were written during the peak years of the King's Company, when playwrights were formulating and exchanging dramatic structures based on actor/character configurations. Rebecca Marshall and Elizabeth Boutel were consistently paired, the former dark, passionate and active, the latter light-haired, soft and passive. Although Charles Hart specialized in the suffering, passive protagonist opposite Major Mohun's hardened authority type, in these two plays he took the "harder," aggressive roles of Nero and Manly, while Mrs. Marshall played Poppea and Olivia to Mrs. Boutel's Cyara and Fidelia. Both Nero

= Such clear, pure blood drop and not cut your flesh
 To stop his life? To bind whose bitter wounds
 Queens ought to tear their hair and with their tears
 Bathe 'em. Forgive me, thou that art the wealth
 Of poor Philaster.

Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher, *Philaster*, ed. Dora Jean Ashe (London: Edward Arnold, 1975), IV.vi. 111-124. All subsequent quotations will be noted in the body of the paper. Lee would have recognized in this passage his own preoccupations, given its effusion of emotion, the embrace of a precious boy in the "foreign" company of "hard-hearted men" (putatively so), and the graphic description of wounds he himself has inflicted. Such decorous sado-masochism was a component of Lee's own dramatic profile. The passage would have been as alien to Shakespeare as it was congenial to Lee: the former's plays are largely free of what can be called darker erotic shades. A recent London production of *Twelfth Night* strained to bring out such erotic effects by "compounding the play's sexual ambiguities": "Sebastian...and Antonio are in love. Sir Andrew directs his lechery toward Feste, and the surprise union of the finale is that of Feste and Antonio...Orsino's attraction to the 'male' Viola is played as passionate love, and he constantly makes passes at 'him'." Duncan Wu, "After the Real Thing," *The Times Literary supplement*, 23 Jan. 1987, p. 86. To flesh out Shakespeare's "ambiguities," however, it is clear that such a production destroys the delicate, not to say wholesome tone of the play, "remaking" it altogether into a new entity, arguably a travesty. See also Robert Cushman, "Cheek by Jowl with Shekespeare," *International Herald Tribune*, 21 January 1987, p. 5.

(13) According to Friedman, p. 360, rivalry is a recurrent element in the breeches motif.

and Manly are drawn into illicit love. Hart as Nero is induced by Petronius into infatuation with Marshall/Poppea, who becomes openly promiscuous after initial wifely reticence. Hart as Manly is obsessed with Olivia, again another man's wife, although obliquely, since she has secretly married in contravention of their love vows during his absence at sea. Olivia, like Poppea, is openly profligate. Both Marshall roles involve the display of uncontrolled sexual passion, and in both plays her lust is undercut by the fact that the object of her desire is without her knowledge female (Cyara, Fidelity), and by the ironic fact that her advances to those women are spied on by a third person (Britannicus, Manly). The "dark" women share an affinity for love and night. With her husband Otho looking on from concealment, Poppea's brother, to prove her guilt, disguised as a black slave baits a trap for her. She rises to it:

Nothing agrees with love so well as Night;
 Hush'd and in darkness hid, the bashful play,
 And happy as the bold, ravish delight:
 Your touches charm; nay, why do you withdraw?
 Grow thus, like a soft cloud upon the sun;
 My powerful flame thy icy fears will thaw.

(I, V.iii. 63-69)

Waiting for her assignation with Fidelity, Olivia muses:

So, I am now prepared for my timorous
 young lover's reception. My husband is gone
 and go thou out too, thou next interrupter of
 love (*Puts out the candle.*) Kind darkness that
 frees us lovers from scandal and bashfulness,
 from the censure of our gallants and the world.
 So are you there?⁽¹⁴⁾

Wycherley seems to be replaying a dramatic moment that Mrs. Marshall had made memorable.

Playing against this "dark" actress, Boutel combined headlong love, frustration, unselfish concern and nimble alertness in Cyara and Fidelity. In testing Britannicus, Cyara controls him and confronts Nero in a manner her lover is incapable of doing. Similarly active, Fidelity gives the audience perspective on Manly's obsession, perspective that he himself lacks, through her forthrightness as she constantly pressures him to abandon a losing, demeaning game; she further shows a dogged wit as well as

(14) William Wycherley, *The Plain Dealer*, ed. Leo Hughes (Lincoln: Bison-U of Nebraska P, 1967), V.iii.1-6. Subsequent references to this text will be made in the body of the paper.

physical courage in fending off Olivia while carrying out her "mission." Although Wycherley expanded the interaction between these two female types, both playwrights used them to dramatize opposing value systems and modes of behavior.⁽¹⁵⁾ The attention of both actresses was focused upon the same actor, Major Mohun as Britannicus and Manly. The congruence of actresses, actors and situation overwhelmingly suggests that Wycherley was working intensively within the context of his repertory company and in tandem with his colleague Lee.

Having decided to work the heroine disguise motif into his gestating play, we can confidently speculate that Wycherley turned his attention to *Twelfth Night*.⁽¹⁶⁾ Since Restoration performances of it were rare,⁽¹⁷⁾ he most likely relied on the text. Giving the name of Olivia to Manly's mistress invited direct comparison with Orsino's, underscoring what Peter Holland has called "the parodic inversion of *Twelfth Night*" in his play.⁽¹⁸⁾ Yet use of the term "parodic" endows Wycherley with a control over his material that does not accord with the anger that constantly disturbs the surface of the play; it is an anger that suffuses Manly, marked as he is by contradictions, by impossible, quickly-broken idealism, violence, prurience and the need to degrade himself and others. It would be more accurate to say that Wycherley confronted directly, and treated harshly, the values that Shakespeare bodied forth with balance and grace: patience, loyalty, friendship, the control of obsessions. Orsino's comfortably frustrated, pleasurable infatuation carries the dignity of autumn twilight; Manly's is bitter and humiliating. The self-imposed isolation of Shakespeare's Olivia has an equally lambent air, and her love for Viola and Sebastian is based on an appreciation of youthful beauty; Wycherley's Olivia is chronically

(15) In *All the King's Ladies* (Chicago Univ. Press, 1985), John Harold Wilson discusses the influence of actresses on the shape of adaptations in the Restoration (pp. 101-105). He also comments on the qualities of Rebecca Marshall (pp. 170-72) and Elizabeth Boutel (pp. 77-79 and *passim*). Regarding the latter, he argues that "It is very likely that Wycherley tailored his *Fidelia* in *The Plain Dealer* (1676) to her specifications" (p. 78). Boutel and Marshall, he contends, played "lustful Poppea versus chaste Cyara in Lee's *Nero*...[and] "lecherous, hypocritical Olivia versus pure, simple *Fidelia* in Wycherley's *The Plain Dealer*..." (p. 97). He believes that Lee's description of Poppea in I.ii. was in fact a portrait of Rebecca Marshall (p. 172).

(16) The slender connection between *The Plain Dealer* and Moliere's *Le Misanthrope*, based on the general similarity between their two anti-social protagonists, is not substantial enough to require consideration here. For Peter Holland, "Moliere's play is recalled [in the opening scene] so that Wycherley can mark his distance from it." *The Ornament of Action* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1979), p. 187. In his edition of *The Plain Dealer*, Leo Hughes argues for a connection between Alceste and Manly, but concedes (p.xv) that "Traces are numerous in *The Plain Dealer*, yet no character, no scene, no bit of dialogue even, is transplanted without change." The connections he points to are nebulous. It is clear that Wycherley was working along English lines, and that *Twelfth Night* was most immediate to him as he brought his play to life.

(17) See note 7 above.

(18) Holland, p. 201.

longing, dissatisfied and sexually indiscriminate.⁽¹⁹⁾ In *Twelfth Night*, couples who eventually unite are suited to one another; in *The Plain Dealer*, the disjunction between the loyal, dignified, objective Fidelia and Manly, who has disgraced himself before her and the audience, strikes us as discordant. Fidelia, unlike Olivia, resembles her equivalent in *Twelfth Night*. She gathers the high-mindedness of Viola about her as she plays a delicate, potentially compromising role between the man she loves and his treacherous, rapacious “beloved.” Fidelia’s traits are closer to those of Viola than to those of Bellario, with whom she shares an occasional expression of despair and desire to escape the pain of unrequited love through death.⁽²⁰⁾ Although he no doubt knew *Philaster*, Wycherley’s target source was manifestly *Twelfth Night*.

Despite the fact that *The Plain Dealer* is an intense, splendidly elaborated play that balances three lines of action — satiric rounds attacking corrupt institutions and malicious individuals, Freeman’s pursuit of the Widow Blackacre, and the inter-necine war between Manly, Fidelia, Olivia and Vernish — it is the latter conflict that carries the dominant charge of dramatic energy. The venality of characters such as Plausible and Novel, the malice and acquisitiveness of Widow Blackacre, the unscrupulous materialism of Freeman, when added to the viciousness of Olivia and Vernish, create an environment in which we would expect Manly to appear sympathetic, given his hostility to precisely those elements of society. Yet here Wycherley puts to work the Manly-Olivia-Fidelia configuration. The salubrious Shakespearean values that adhere to it reinforce audience expectations that Wycherley raises before undercutting them cruelly through the behavior of Manly himself. The gap between Fidelia and Manly, which widens as the play proceeds, dramatizes his corruption, obscuring her implicit offer of an alternative to the play’s seamy social and emotional entanglements. Wycherley pushes to an anti-idealistic extreme the emissary and jealousy motifs he shares with Shakespeare and with Beaumont and Fletcher: Olivia reassures Fidelia that Manly will not harm “him” or disturb their “affair,” as she sustains a sexual assault that constitutes a pointed debasement of Olivia’s advances to Viola, delicate by comparison; Manly threatens at the height of the action to kill Fidelia as an ultimate act of revenge against Olivia, a threat that lacks Orsino’s metaphoric leavening.⁽²¹⁾ Although *Twelfth Night* rests behind *The*

(19) Her motto is “Go Husband and come up friend, just the buckets in the well” (p. 128). It would apply to Poppea equally, as she revolves from Nero to Britannicus to the disguised Piso after she has left her husband.

(20) See for example, *The Plain Dealer*, IV.ii. 299-303.

(21) Since you to non-regardance cast my faith,
And that I partly know the instrument
That screws me from my true place in your favour,
Live you the marble-breasted tyrant still.
But this your minion, whom I know you love.

Plain Dealer, its bones fleshed out by Wycherley, ultimately we remain unaware of the skeleton, especially in performance; Wycherley's energetic rush sweeps us away on its own terms. His use of Shakespeare's play was more useful to him in elaborating his own drama, in conceiving it even, than it was in bringing out its meaning through "parodic" contrast. The issues and emotions raised by *Twelfth Night* took Wycherley deep into his own psyche. The plunge was painfully objectified in *The Plain Dealer*.

In contrast to the two modifications we have discussed, William Burnaby's *Love Betray'd* is a direct reworking of *Twelfth Night*. It fails to generate enough heat of its own to fuse elements of the target play into a new compound, which may have been beyond the intentions if not the abilities of the playwright. Streamlining the play, Burnaby cut out most of the tribulations of Malvolio while retaining the enforced duel between Caesario (Viola); and Taquilet (Sir Andrew). Broad character types often used in the Restoration, such as the rowdy companion (Pedro) and the pert maid (Emilia, Laura) were added, along with town banter and passages that are satiric, bawdy and erotic as well as sentimental. Vilaretta (Olivia), herself prone to deal out satiric attacks, inveighs fashionably against

satyr ... [which] is the Vice of Wit, as Bullying is of Courage; the Love it abuses, wou'd teach it to be Gentle! Good-natur'd! Kind! Sincere--! That only Cordial-drop that sweetens Life, and gives us Joys which are ally'd to Heaven.²²

Caesario can tell her maid that "This Servitude is Freedom, for it brings me to the Man I love ... The little spot that holds him, *Laura*, is all the liberty I ask; the World

And whom, by heaven, I swear I tender dearly.
= Him will I tear out of that cruel eye
Where he sits crowned in his master's spite.
Come, boy, with me; my thoughts are ripe in mischief:
I'll sacrifice the lamb that I do love,
To spite a raven's heart within a dove.

William Shakespeare, *Twelfth Night*, J.M. Lothian and T.W. Craik, eds. (1975; London and New York: Methuen, 1985), V.i. 119-129. All references to this text will be cited in the body of the paper. Compare Orsino's tone with Manly's, as he orders Fidelia to stand sentry while he attacks Olivia:

Hold Off. What, you are my rival then and therefore you shall stay and keep the door for me whilst I go in for you.
but when I'm gone if you dare to stir off from this very board or breathe the least murmuring accent, I'll cut her throat first, and if you love her you will not venture her life. Nay, then I'll cut your throat too and I know you love your own life at least.

(IV.ii.276-282)

- (22) William [erroneously identified as "Chas." in autograph in The British Library text, shelf-mark 83. a. 8. (1.)] Burnaby, *Love Betray'd; Or, The Agreeable Disappointment* (London, 1703), p. 31 (E4^v). All references to this text will be cited in the body of the paper.

without it is a prison" (C1^v), a statement more in keeping with Bellario and Fidelia than with Shakespeare's resourceful Viola. Yet Burnaby's Caesario is capable of bawdy as well. Rebutting Laura's contention that "Twill be impossible for [Moreno (Orsino)] to see a Woman, as they say, thro' a Pair of Breeches," Caesario counters "No more than thro' a Nun's Habit... When I find a proper time for my purpose, a little thing will show him what I am" (12 [C2^v]). Burnaby briefly approaches the type of eroticism exploited by Lee, as Caesario tells her maid that Moreno "Receiv'd me; liked my person; calls me pretty/Youth; makes me sing to him, and sometimes kisses me..." (12 [C2^v]). Yet the Viola, Orsino and Olivia figures have undergone no sea-change. Beyond her town banter at the opening, Vilaretta remains the grand lady, and Moreno, more the high-flown lover than repining aesthete, is still her balancing counterpart. Caesario, though less witty and more urgent in her reluctant wooing, remains the steady agent and beneficiary of the whirligig of time.

Nonetheless, the hint of kinship we have mentioned between Burnaby's Caesario, Wycherley's Fidelia and Lee's Cyara raises issues concerning the process of transmission that transcend the quality of the adaptation itself. Evidence at hand suggests that satellites of a source play, in this case *The Plain Dealer*, arguably *Philaster* and *Nero* as well,⁽²³⁾ become linked to it structurally in such a way that playwrights working from the source may adopt units developed in the satellites. That is, diverse plays that dramatists have written in reaction to a source play may become fused in the mind of a later dramatist as he confronts the source itself. A single source thus can become multiple. We have seen hints of such a dynamic at work in the overlapping of *Philaster* and *Twelfth Night* character traits in the plays of Lee and Wycherley. In Burnaby's plays we have a more tangible example of this process, and it appears that he was fully conscious of the multiple linked sources bearing upon his play. At the risk of sounding abstruse, it seems to me that a kind of collective unconscious operates within theatrical tradition. While collective instinct may lead dramatists to certain source dramas, collective experience may furnish added material for the fulfillment of those instincts.⁽²⁴⁾ Whether through bookishness or theatrical memory, although the energy with which they are used suggests the latter, Burnaby seems to have superimposed elements of the breeches tradition that come from *The Plain Dealer* and possibly *Nero* onto the *Twelfth Night* materials that he was primarily adapting. Beyond the fact that these elements were alive for Burnaby, no reason for such secondary imposition is apparent.

(23) *Nero* is a satellite through its connection with *The Plain Dealer*; *Philaster* through the fact that it overlaps with *Twelfth Night* in later borrowings.

(24) I am using the term "collective experience" in the broadest sense to include the reading of plays, witnessing of performances, discussing of drama with fellow playwrights.

In common with *The Plain Dealer* and *Nero*, and possibly by way of *Philaster*, Burnaby's Viola has met and fallen in love with Moreno in France prior to her employment by him in Venice; she contrives to be near him, like the others, out of love and hope of winning him.⁽²⁵⁾ This departure from *Twelfth Night*, seemingly gratuitous, matches up with burnaby's echoing of *The Plain Dealer* at a crucial point in his play. Expressing anguish at having to pimp for Manly, Fidelia complains in a soliloquy:

For his love, must I then betray my own?
 Were ever love or chance, till now, severe?
 Or shifting woman posed with such a task?
 Forced to beg that which kills her if obtained,
 And giving away her lover not to lose him.

(III. 135-140)

The desperation of Fidelia represents a radical alteration of Viola's mood, which is marked by optimism and resilience within an unwelcome yet legitimate mission. As Viola receives her orders from Orsino, she complains of her entrapment in matter-of-fact terms:

I'll do my best
 To woo your lady: [aside] Yet, a barful strife!
 Who'er I woo, my self would be his wife.⁽²⁶⁾

(I.iv. 40-42)

Unexpectedly, Burnaby endows Caesario with Fidelia's tone as well as her phrasing, and shifts location of the outburst, placing it in the midst of her reluctant wooing of Moreno: "I beg for him – what if obtained kills me..." (29 [E3^r]). The repetition of Wycherley's key words "beg," "obtained" and "kills," with the dovetailing of sense,

(25) Since Bellario is without hope of marrying Philaster on the basis of social status, a connection with *Nero* or *The Plain Dealer* is most likely. For a description of her despair, evident from the beginning of her involvement in the play, see I.ii. 113-142. Bellario's commission involves the exchange of information between confirmed lovers, rather than wooing. Her role is by its nature more passive than that of Viola.

(26) There is a closer approximation of the Burnaby Caesario and Wycherley Fidelia in the following exchange in *Twelfth Night*, although the mood is dominated and perhaps cast by Orsino's plan-
 gency:

Duke. ...let thy love be younger than thyself,
 Or thy affection cannot hold the bent:
 For women are as roses, whose fair flower
 Being once display'd, doth fall that very hour
 Viola. And so, they are: alas, that they are so:
 To die, even when they to perfection grow.

(II.iv. 36-41)

virtually rules out accident in this confluence. In both *Twelfth Night* and *The Plain Dealer*, the Viola figure's expression of reluctance occurs as she receives her unwanted commission. Burnaby, then, detached a dramatic unit from his target source, adopted a satellite reworking of the unit by taking over its tone and phrasing, and fixed it in a different context. The heightened emotionalism and sense of threat offered by the Fidelia model may account for Burnaby's choice, assuming that the choice was a conscious one.

There are further links between Burnaby's adaptation, *Nero* and *The Plain Dealer*. Like Shakespeare's Duke, Moreno is seized by a fit of jealousy against Caesario at the end of the play; in both instances the master's rancor explodes, subsides, and washes forward once more in a milder form. In a passage noted earlier, Orsino's jealousy takes the form of cold menace, as he tells Olivia

...this your minion, whom I know you love,
 And whom, by heaven, I swear I tender dearly,
 Him will I tear out of that cruel eye
 Where he sits crowned in his master's spite.
 Come, boy, with me; my thoughts are ripe in mischief:
 I'll sacrifice the lamb that I do love,
 To spite a raven's heart within a dove.

(V.i. 123-129)

In an action as out of character as this threat of Orsino, yet in its open violence closer to Manly, who repeatedly threatens Fidelia's life,⁽²⁷⁾ Moreno attempts to stab Caesario at the equivalent point in *Love Betray'd*. Vilaretta, Cyara fashion, places herself between Moreno and Viola. Once again, Burnaby must instinctively have turned to the more sensational "satellite" version of this dramatic moment. Along the same lines, the Caesario-Moreno plighting is closer to Wycherley than it is to *Twelfth Night*. In the latter, Orsino's tone is formal, nearly patronising, as he presumptuously arranges Viola's future in the manner of the Duke in *Measure for Measure*:

Your master quits you; and for your service done him,
 So much against the mettle of your sex,
 So far beneath your soft and tender breeding,
 And since you called me master for so long,
 Here is my hand; you shall from this time be
 Your master's mistress.

(V.i. 320-325)

(27) See the passage from *The Plain Dealer* in note 25 above. Since *Philaster's* jealousy is strangely cold, *Philaster* is not involved in this particular nexus. He stabs Arethusa on request, and to conceal his crime duplicates his own wounds on the sleeping Bellario. We can describe his jealousy as courtly.

Burnaby puts heat into the chill of this resolution by adding guilt to Moreno's pledge:

You make me more your slave, than you was mine;
 The merit of your Breast I love'd before;
 And if mine, madam, does not appear
 Less worthy for the love it bore another –

(60)

This seems to pick up Manly's justifiable anxiety at awarding Fidelity the gift of himself after a series of brutal actions, though Manly's arrogance and egotism are absent in Moreno:

I know not what to speak to you or how to look upon you. The sense of my rough, hard and ill usage of you, though chiefly your own fault, gives me more pain now 'tis over than you had when you suffered it; and if my heart, the refusal of such a woman (*pointing to Olivia*), were not a sacrifice to profane your love and a greater wrong to you than ever yet I did you, I would beg of you to receive it, though you used it as she had done; for though it deserved not from her the treatment she gave it, it does from you.⁽²⁸⁾

(V.iii. 106-116)

We get a mere hint of this sort of self-denigration in Moreno, yet given Burnaby's clear departure from his target source in the direction of guilt for an earlier infatuation, that hint is significant.

Burnaby's use of sections or shadings from "accretion" plays as he worked on the original illustrates how complex the process of adaptation had become by the opening of the eighteenth century. In one sense, his superimposition of variations introduced by Lee or Wycherley onto the ground of *Twelfth Night* were of a piece with his addition of satire, bawdy and sententiousness: they injected an air of modernity, raciness, verve. Yet at a deeper level, his orchestration of the full range of altered source materials attests to the fact that Shakespeare's play had become part of the theatrical bloodstream of Burnaby's time; he worked with what had been made of *Twelfth Night* as well as with *Twelfth Night* itself. Involved in the ongoing ingestion of dramas of the past, we find these three adaptors reacting to the despair and pessimism of *Philaster* as it clashed with the active optimism of Shakespeare's comedy. The Restoration in particular was in tune with the mood of Beaumont and Fletcher while it found, finding provocative, at times angering, Shakespeare's recog-

(28) Moments later Manly's claim that his "heart was before [Fidelity's] due" is close to Moreno's admission that "The merit of [Caesario's] Breast I lov'd before" (60) in an analogous dramatic location.

dition of responsibility and trust in the autonomy of the individual. Both source plays lie beneath the Lee and Wycherley adaptations, obscured but perceptible, like radioactive substances continuously emitting their energy.⁽²⁹⁾ The complexity of this phenomenon should convince us that it is perilous to determine Shakespeare's influence on the Restoration and eighteenth-century stage according to statistics and highly "visible" borrowings alone. By doing so we squint at the words of a dead man, ignoring what our guts should tell us. "Modification" is a potent, vibrant dynamic.

(29) The same "radioactive" process may be at work in Settle's 1695 adaptation of *Philaster*. The sense of guilt expressed by Bellario for Philaster's wounding of Arethusa found in Settle does not exist in the original; guilt analogous to that of Settle's Bellario, however, is prominent in Lee's *Nero*, where another "page," Cyara, regrets having prolonged her disguise to the injury of Britannicus. Compare *Nero*, I, III. i. 78-82 (also quoted on page 8 above) with Settle's *Philaster*, p. 42 of the first Settle edition, beginning "Why was I born for the accursed Cause..." (cited in Sprague, *Beaumont and Fletcher*, p. 200).

الاقتراض الخفي: ديناميكية الاقتباس من أعمال شكسبير في عصري عودة الملكية والقرن الثامن عشر

جون بيتر فردرمن

أستاذ مشارك، قسم اللغة الإنجليزية وآدابها، كلية الآداب، جامعة الملك سعود، الرياض، المملكة العربية السعودية

ملخص البحث. تشكك هذه الدراسة في صحة الطريقة التقليدية التي تقوم على تحديد التأثير الذي تركه كتاب المسرح الإليزابيثيين على مسرحي القرن الثامن عشر «والريستوريشن» (عهد عودة الملكية) بمقتضى تكرار الأداء المسرحي وعدد الاقتباسات adaptations الواضحة من مسرحيات سابقة. إنها تسعى إلى تبيان أن ديناميكية الاقتباس، متضمنة تشكل الشخصوص، والبنى القابلة للفصل، وأنماط الطاقة، وما تحمله هذه العناصر من مواقف نحو الحياة، قد استبطنت من قبل المسرحيين المتأخرين عندما صاغوا مسرحياتهم «الجديدة». نتيجة لهذه الديناميكية بلغ تأثير شكسبير حدًا أكبر مما توحى به الإحصائيات. وفي هذه الورقة يتم استكشاف ديناميكية الاقتباس المقصودة عبر تحليل «شبكة» من الاستعارات المتمركزة حول الليلة الثانية عشرة. ففي مسرحيتين من عهد عودة الملكية هما نيرولنانايبيل لي (١٦٧٤م)، والمتعامل الصريح (١٦٧٦م)، بالإضافة إلى مسرحية من أوائل القرن الثامن عشر هي الحب مخدولاً لوليم برنابي، نجد أنماطًا معقدة من الاقتباس تزداد تعقيدًا من خلال التأثير الرافد لمسرحية فيلاسترليمونت وفليشر، التي تداخلت مع الليلة الثانية عشرة عبر توظيفها القوى لعنصر «التخفي بالبنطلونات». فمن التمعن في عملية الاقتباس نجد أن لي وويتشرلي وبرنابي كانت لديهم ردود فعل عاطفية وفكرية ومسرحية متفاوتة إزاء المسرحيتين السابقتين بتأثير قوي وشامل لـ «الليلة الثانية عشرة» إلى حد أننا نستطيع القول إن هذه المسرحية قد دخلت «صلب التيار المسرحي» لتلك الفترات المتأخرة. لذا فإن من الضروري أن يؤدي الوعي بقوة العملية الاقتباسية وجوهرها إلى إعادة تقويم شاملة لتأثير شكسبير على مسرحي عصر عودة الملكية والقرن الثامن عشر.