

MUSIC AS MEANING IN *THE TEMPEST*

Julia Muller

On 7 November 1667, the diarist Samuel Pepys “resolv’d [...] to go see ‘The Tempest’, an old play of Shakespeare’s” on the first day it was presented at the Dorset Garden Theatre, also known as “the Duke’s house”.¹ In the same entry, Pepys adds a description of “a curious piece of musique in an echo of half sentences, the echo repeating the former half, while the man goes on to the latter, which is mighty pretty”. This remark both identifies the performance as the Davenant/Dryden adaptation of *The Tempest* by Shakespeare, and brings into focus two questions. First, can we really say that Pepys saw Shakespeare’s play, and, by extension, accept as Shakespeare criticism his additional remark: “The play no great wit, but yet good, above ordinary plays”? Second, we know that the Davenant/Dryden adaptation was not turned into Thomas Shadwell’s opera until March or April 1674.² So whose music did Pepys hear in 1667? Not Robert Johnson’s. The songs which he composed for what was possibly the original performance of *The Tempest* (certainly during Shakespeare’s lifetime) did

¹ The *Diary of Samuel Pepys*, eds R. C. Latham and W. Matthews, London, 1974, VIII, 521-22.

² The full title of the Davenant/Dryden adaptation was *The TEMPEST, or The Enchanted Island*, London, 1670. Shadwell’s opera (in which other librettists may have had a hand as well) bore the same title (London, 1674). In an unpublished essay, Andrew Pinnock has demonstrated that the Shadwell adaptation was a cut up version of the 1670 text (University of London, 1983). On the date of the adaptation see the account of Dorset Garden prompter John Downes in his *Roscius Anglicanus*, London, 1708, 34.

not include anything of the kind.³ Michael Tilmouth says of the 1674 opera:

The Banister songs [including the Echo Duet] and Humfrey's "Where the Bee Sucks" had apparently survived from the 1667 production, but it is perhaps a mistake to think that any definitive form of the operatic version of 1674 ever emerged; items were probably added or removed according to the availability of performers, and Hart's and Reggio's pieces in particular may not have been very permanent ingredients in the score — indeed, Hart's may not have belonged to it at all.⁴

Tilmouth's disheartening conclusion provides an answer to both questions: Pepys never saw what we call *The Tempest*. He never heard it either, and this is equally important because the musical ingredients of an adaptation must be taken fully into account when one is trying to understand what was actually presented to Restoration audiences. For, as David Lewin has proved in connection with Mozart, the musical events on stage contribute to both the action and the stage directions.⁵ This is especially true of a play as full of noises as *The Tempest*. The amount of music in a play, its location and modes, can emphasize characters and highlight situations. In other words, the music can underline or undermine the plot.

The Restoration *Tempest* is a thing of shreds and patches. *The London Stage* lists *The Tempest* under the general heading Shakespeare, while individual entries give an impressive number of performance details that have been collected from diaries, promptbooks, newspapers, periodicals, playbills, prologues and epilogues.⁶ But it is clear that *The Tempest* as a play title (as is the case with so many titles) had become generic. Only the individual performance details can, if available, tell us if we are dealing with some form of the Dryden/Davenant adaptation or (in the eighteenth

³ All references to the music in Shakespeare can now be found in the invaluable work by Bryan N. S. Gooch and David Thatcher, *A Shakespeare Music Catalogue*, 5 vols, Oxford, 1991. For *The Tempest*, see III, 1505-1670.

⁴ *Matthew Locke: Dramatic Music*, ed. Michael Tilmouth, Musica Britannica, LI. London, 1986, xviii.

⁵ David Lewin, "Musical Analysis as Stage Direction", in *Music and Text: Critical Inquiries*, ed. Steven Paul Scher, Cambridge, 1992, 163-76. See also J. S. Manifold, *The Music in English Drama*, London, 1956; and Wilfrid Mellers, *Harmonious Meeting*, London, 1965.

⁶ *The London Stage, 1660-1800*, eds Emmett L. Avery et al., Carbondale, 1960-1968.

century) “Shakespeare” as in Rowe or Theobald; whether we are discussing a play with a certain amount of incidental music or a full-scale opera. This is a problem in itself. I have argued elsewhere that the amount of music to text is a continuum, but there is also a debate in the Restoration period about through-sung opera versus English “dramatick opera”, that is, opera with spoken dialogue.⁷ In the preface to his *Albion and Albanus* of 1685, Dryden states specifically that *The Tempest* cannot be called an opera “because the story of it is not sung”.⁸

Aside from the entries in *The London Stage*, the work done on account books of the period by Milhous and Hume contains details of payment for costumes and props which help to determine which version of a play was being performed. Knowledge of the construction of the theatres is useful for the same purpose, and the dating of technical improvements to a stage can play an important part in discovering why and when an adaptation was introduced.⁹ For example, in their version printed in 1670 (and also in the similar 1674), the “original” adapters, Davenant and Dryden, balanced several of the characters. Ferdinand has a rival, one Hippolito who has never seen a woman and who is the rightful heir to Mantua (usurped by Alonzo). Miranda has a sister named Dorinda, Caliban has one named Sycorax. Even Ariel has a soul-mate, one Milcha. This is the bitterest of bit parts in 1670; not even mentioned in the *Dramatis Personae*, Milcha comes to Ariel at his call at the very end of the fifth act. She says one word: “Here!” In Shadwell’s 1674 version, however, while still not mentioned in the *Dramatis Personae*, Ariel’s Milcha “flies down to applause in the very first scene, and they cap it inevitably by flying up and crossing in the air. Here, of course, is the real reason for the inclusion of Milcha [in 1674]. Much as baroque theatre loves symmetry, it is absolutely essential here. The new flying machines cannot be used to their full effect unless Ariel has someone to cross in the air with”.¹⁰ The new flying machines, the expansion of Milcha, and indeed the whole extravaganza of the play

⁷ Julia Muller, *Words and Music in Henry Purcell’s First Semi-Opera “Dio-clesian”*, Lewiston: N.Y., 1990, 27.

⁸ John Dryden, *Albion and Albanus: An Opera*, London, 1685, rpt. in John Dryden, *Of Dramatic Poesy and Other Critical Essays*, London, 1962, II, 41.

⁹ For new technical insights concerning Dorset Garden Theatre, where the adaptations were performed, see F. Muller, “Flying Dragons and Dancing Chairs at Dorset Garden”, *Theatre Notebook*, XLVII/2 (1993), 80-95.

¹⁰ Jocelyn Powell, *Restoration Theatre Production*, London, 1984, 71.

into almost-opera can be put down to the fact that Thomas Killigrew's rival theatre company moved into the newly completed Drury Lane theatre at that time.

Shakespeare critics (but not music critics!) have until very recently rejected Restoration adaptations. Nicholas Rowe, the first post-Restoration editor of Shakespeare, wrote "I have taken some Care to redeem him from the Injuries of former impressions", and, on the following page, "The present age is indeed an unfortunate one for Dramatick Poetry, she has been persecuted by Fanaticism, forsaken by her Friends, and oppress'd even by Musick, her Sister and Confederate Art, that was formerly employ'd in her Defence and Support".¹¹ This may even be a nasty dig at Dryden personally, as the said sisterhood figured prominently in his *Epistle Dedicatory* to Henry Purcell's 1690 opera entitled *Dioclesian*.¹² Oddly enough, this first "real" edition of Shakespeare after the Restoration has as its frontispiece for *The Tempest* not a scene from the original, but a precise depiction of the opening stage direction of the 1674 adaptation.

John Freehafer and others have discussed the possibility that the wording in the patents granted to Thomas Killigrew and William Davenant by Charles the Second in 1660 made adaptation of Shakespeare's plays obligatory for The Duke's Company.¹³ Freehafer seems to regard this as an extenuating circumstance, in contradistinction to George Odell, who as early as 1920 wondered just what "to reform and make fitt" entailed, while finding the *Tempest* adaptation thoroughly repulsive, as will be shown.¹⁴

Other Shakespeare editors have spoken of the Dryden and Davenant *Tempest* in terms even more unfavourable than those of Nicholas Rowe: "No imagination, derived from a mere description, can adequately depict its monstrosity, — to be fully hated it must be fully seen."¹⁵ Hazelton Spencer, surveying the period to 1710, complained: "Everything that the

¹¹ N. Rowe, Esq., *The Works of Mr. William Shakespear in Six Volumes*, London, 1709, I, sigs. A2^r-A2^v.

¹² Signed by Purcell, but undoubtedly written by Dryden. See Julia Muller, *Words and Music in Henry Purcell's First Semi-Opera "Dioclesian"*, 476.

¹³ John Freehafer, "The Formation of the London Patent Companies in 1660", *Theatre Notebook*, XX/1 (1965), 6-30.

¹⁴ George C. D. Odell, *Shakespeare from Betterton to Irving*, 2 vols (1920), rpt. New York, 1963, II, 24-26.

¹⁵ *The Tempest*, ed. Horace Howard Furness, New Variorum Edition, Philadelphia, 1892, IX, vii.

authors lay their hands on is defiled.”¹⁶ It is probably no coincidence that the most horror-stricken of these reactions to non-authentic Shakespeare date from the time at which Arnold Dolmetsch was trying to persuade musicians to use period instruments for period music — what we have just stopped calling “authentic performance practice” because of the variety of authenticity that has now been brought to light.¹⁷

Recently, however, literary critics have been examining the various re-workings of “The Works” for allegorical content, persuasively linking changes in emphasis with changing perceptions of the importance of empire, religion and sex. The amount of detail now available for such research is truly amazing. Present-day criticism can utilise the readily accessible *London Stage* (a new edition is on the way) and Highfill’s *Biographical Dictionary*, which make it much easier than previously to collect data.¹⁸ In the matter of the most musical plays like *The Tempest*, however, although “the songish part” is noted and sometimes even the number of musical events, the changes in composers, musical style, attribution of songs to actors or singers, dances and masques have been insufficiently incorporated into the discussion in most literary books and articles.¹⁹ For instance, the difference between vocal music sung “for” a

¹⁶ Hazelton Spencer, *Shakespeare Improved* (1927), rpt. New York, 1963, 203. J. A. van der Welle, discussing a Dutch translation of this version of *The Tempest* uses the word “spoiled”. See *Dryden and Holland*, Groningen, 1962, 84-87.

¹⁷ See for instance the introduction to Dolmetsch’s *The Interpretation of the Music of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, London, 1915; as well as Peter le Huray, *Authenticity in Performance*, Cambridge, 1990, xv-4.

¹⁸ Philip H. Highfill, Jr., A. Kalman Burnim and Edward A. Langhans, *A Biographical Dictionary of Actors, Actresses, Musicians, Dancers, Managers and other Stage Personnel in London, 1660-1800*, Carbondale and Edwardsville, 1973-1993.

¹⁹ *The Dramatic Works of John Dryden*, Sir Walter Scott edition, ed. George Saintsbury, Edinburgh, 1882, III, 101-225; commentary and notes in *The Works of John Dryden*, eds Maximilian Novak and G. R. Guffey, Berkeley, 1970, X, 319-79; and Brian Stone, *The Tempest*, Milton Keynes, 1984. David L. Hirst’s *The Tempest, London*, 1984, devotes one paragraph to the period between Shakespeare’s death and the beginning of this century, and has Purcell composing the music for the Shadwell version (44-45). Musicologists have done better. In *The Music in English Drama*, London, 1956, J. S. Manifold discusses the significance of the music, but also of the instrumentation in theatre from Shakespeare to Purcell. Wilfred Mellers in *Harmonious Meeting*, London, 1965, explores the relationship between music, poetry and theatre from 1600-1900. Chelij (note 20 below) and Price (note 22 below) are musicologists, as is Bruce Wood, who has written in *Early Music* on literary and musical interaction in Purcell operas with Andrew Pinnock, who took a degree in English, but now manages Early Music for the Arts Council. The late Jocelyn Powell (note 11 above)

character by a singer costumed as a servant or soldier (in the English dramatic opera tradition) and an aria rendered by the protagonist (as in the operatic *Tempest*) is dramatically significant.

Writers on music, too, have discussed Restoration Shakespeare adaptations at length. They have tended to focus on who wrote what (and by implication when), admittedly a knotty subject. The *Tempest* music of the Restoration presents particular difficulties in this respect. Until the literary studies are combined with musical research, however, it will not be possible to ascertain exactly what Samuel Pepys or anyone else saw at a given time.

As stated above, the first Restoration *Tempest* was Dryden and Davenant's 1667 effort, printed in 1670 and made into an opera by Shadwell in 1673-1674. Most of the music for this operatic version was composed by five different composers, mainly Matthew Locke, John Banister the Elder, and Pelham Humfrey, and has been traced or deduced by Michael Tilmouth (1986). Some of the music, by Pietro Reggio and Giovanni Battista Draghi, is lost. As in the later 1695 setting, the main human characters are sung for, whereas Ariel and Caliban — being respectively super- and sub-human — get to sing themselves. The exception is Ferdinand's Echo duet with Ariel, mentioned by Pepys. Most of the music is concentrated in two masques (added to the Dryden/Davenant adaptation in the 1674 quarto). The Masque music in Act 2 is surprisingly sweet for what should be a "Masque of Devils".

It is not certain if the reconstruction now made by Michael Tilmouth was always used, however. For instance, Robert Johnson's original setting for "Where the Bee Sucks" has survived. It may on occasion have been used instead of Pelham Humfrey's new setting, perhaps even by special request. This was not unusual. It is not until "Where the Bee Sucks There Lurk I" (set both by Thomas Arne and Willem de Fesch) that we have a cut-off date proved by a text. Ariel did not start to lurk until Theobald

taught theatre arts, as does Judith Milhous (note 26), the only English literature specialists on the subject being Roger Savage, and Robert D. Hume, editor of *The London Theatre World*, Carbondale and Edwardsville, 1980. See also Hume's "Opera in London, 1695-1706", in *British Theatre and the Other Arts 1660-1800*, ed. Shirley Strum Kenny, Washington: D.C., 1984, 67-91.

produced his emendation to the song, on the grounds that Ariel was too ethereal to suck (1733). But such precise knowledge is rare, and in this case it does not help much either. For the Thomas Arne setting can only be found in songs for Vauxhall Gardens (and a BL Add MS, 29370), and even though he did set *Tempest* music in 1746, and there was certainly a revival that year, Irena Cholij makes a good case for Defesch (also known as “de Fesch”), whose *Tempest* songs may well have been used instead.²⁰

The first new musical setting of the whole play after the versions of the 1670s was long attributed to Henry Purcell (1695). The attribution has, however, been questioned.²¹ Early Purcell biographies and histories of opera have no doubt it was his, but the only song he certainly composed is “Dear Pretty Youth”, the lyrics of which are not extant in any of the seventeenth-century quartos of *The Tempest*. Its 1695 dating is based on publication in the songbook *Deliciae Musicae* (Book III) where it is headed “A New Song in *The Tempest*, Sung by Mis[s] Cross to her Lover, who is supposed Dead”. The date of the songbook (Price assumes November 1695 for this volume), the name of the singer, whose biography is known (see Highfill, among others), and the indication of the Lover all point to a 1695 revival of the 1670/74 version, as Curtis Price shows.²² Cholij joins Laurie and Price in rejecting a complete Purcell score on various technical grounds. The fact remains, however, that the music sounds so much like Purcell, and if it was by his pupil John Weldon, as has been suggested, why did the latter never compose anything as good again?

The London Stage gives details about the music in revivals whenever contemporary documentation has been found. Thus we know that a certain *Tempest* was performed at Drury Lane on 7 August 1716 with “All the

²⁰ Irena Cholij, “Defesch’s *Tempest* Songs”, *Musical Times* (June, 1986). See also Cholij’s entry on *The Tempest* in *The New Grove Dictionary of Opera*, London and New York, 1992, concerning the composer of the 1695 *Tempest* music (IV, 684-85). The Defesch settings have been published in replica by King’s Music, Huntingdon, Cambridgeshire, n.d.

²¹ See Margaret Laurie, “Did Purcell Set *The Tempest*?”, *PRMA* (1963-64), 43-57, and Irena Cholij’s *Grove* entry. A detailed chart of various musics may be found in Roger Covell, “Seventeenth-Century Music for *The Tempest*”, *Studies in Music* (1968), II, 43-63.

²² Curtis Price, *Henry Purcell and the London Stage*, Cambridge, 1984, 204. The difficulties in attributing the 1695 *Tempest* and in dating the relevant BL Add MS 37027 are discussed at length. Although the manuscript in the BL is almost certainly post-Purcell, there is no proof that it is an original rather than a (later) copy.

Musick compos'd by Mr Weldon, and perform'd Compleat, as at the Revival of the Play" (part 2, vol. I, 410). But which revival? And if the (earlier?) music is Purcell's, where is Weldon's? The problem has not yet been solved.

In order to trace the changes in the Restoration *Tempest*, it is useful to know how it worked. On the Shadwell version, Odell had the following to say: "I am inclined to believe that this alteration is the worst perversion of Shakespeare in the two-century history of such atrocities" (I, 31). Odell summarizes the plot:

[Hippolyto] has been kept a prisoner in a cave, in a remote part of the island, warned against the deadly creature, woman; why he has never seen Prospero's two girls — for Dryden and Davenant have generously given Prospero an extra child, Dorinda — it would be hard to say; at the beginning of the action, they live just around the corner, in a cave similar to that to which he has recently been moved from the more remote part of the island. When Ferdinand falls into Prospero's power, he, too is confined in a cave — not set to log-piling as in Shakespeare. He and Hippolito meet; Hippolito, having seen and admired Dorinda, and learning now that there are many such beautiful women in the world, resolves to have every one of them. Hence, against his will, Ferdinand, to preserve at least Miranda unto himself, is forced to fight a duel with the ambitious youngster. Apparently killing him, he is doomed to death (really) by Prospero. Then when Hippolito, by Ariel's aid, recovers, there is an absurd scene of cross-purposes (jealous, of course) between the four lovers. I doubt if sillier stuff was ever written by two poets, laureate, or other. Everything in this play goes in couples; Ariel has a spirit-mate, Milcha, and Caliban a lumpy sister Sycorax, who really has a nasty mind. [...]

Not much of Shakespeare's language is retained in this capital offence. The opening scene between Miranda and Prospero is largely like the original, and, scattered throughout the work, fragments of the mighty voice come floating on the wind. But so much of the material as well as of the poetry is new that one hardly connects the thing with Shakespeare at all. Yet it drove Shakespeare's play from the stage till late in the Eighteenth Century, and even after that John Kemble found Hippolito harder to shake off than the old man of the sea.²³

The operatic *Tempest* by Thomas Shadwell, though its plot is Dryden and Davenant's, announces its musical aspirations from the first stage direction:

²³ Odell, I, 3 1-33. In view of the remark that Caliban's sister Sycorax has "a nasty mind", it is worth remembering Samuel Pepys' comment recorded on 7 November: "the most innocent play that ever I saw."

The front of the Stage is open'd, and the Band of 24 Violins, with the Harpsicals and the Theorbo's which accompany the Voices, are plac'd between the Pit and the Stage. The "Masque of Furies" in the second act is much elaborated, encompassing as it does Pride, Fraud, Rapine and Murther.²⁴ And Shadwell concludes this act with the song "Arise, arise, ye subterranean winds", which can be found in Part II of Pietro Reggio's songs published in 1680 as "A Song in the Tempest. The words by Mr. Shadwell."²⁵ This is not proof that the whole operatic version was written by Shadwell, in the same way it is not proof that Reggio wrote all the music; he did not.

Milcha, who does not appear until the very end of the play in 1670 (in answer to Ariel's call for his waiting love; he then dances a Saraband with her to celebrate his freedom), is present in 1674 as early as Ariel's first scene, the "flying" discussed by Powell. Ariel begs Prospero to let "it" (Ariel's word: a spirit, after all) assist him in his work which "it/she" may do invisibly. Odell points out that "she" (his word) shares some of Ariel's music (I, 35). "Come unto these yellow sands" is Ariel's, but Milcha sings "Full fathom five", and "Dry those tears" (3.3) becomes a duet. The final Masque of Neptune and Amphitrite is also greatly extended. That was what Dorset Garden was for, says Odell rightly. However, he does not comment on the impact on the playgoer of these expansions, which take the stage show farther and farther from any reality.

Presumably it was this operatic *Tempest* which flourished at Dorset Garden until 1695. Judging by the number of performances, it was the most popular thing on the London stage until *The Beggar's Opera* (produced in 1728), and the enthusiastic Pepys saw it eight times. After 1695 the number of theatres in use increased. Dorset Garden closed in about 1709, and Lincoln's Inn Fields was far too small for a "multi-media spectacular", as Judith Milhous has called it.²⁶ Between 1710 and 1742, when Colley Cibber was managing Drury Lane, *The Tempest* was regularly revived. Odell is convinced that this was the Dryden/Davenant version rather than an operatic one, as the latter would have been too expensive (I, 226). Eric Walter White points out that the Drury Lane performance on 2 February 1710, which included an additional elaborate Turkish entertain-

²⁴ In reality, these "Furies" were "Devils", transposed from 2.1 to 2.3.

²⁵ *Songs set by Signior Pietro Reggio*, London, 1680. See Tilmouth, 232 and 235.

²⁶ Judith Milhous, "The Multi-Media Spectacular on the Restoration Stage", in *British Theatre and the Other Arts 1660-1800*, ed. Shirley Strum Kenny, 41-66.

ment, was “hardly likely” to include Purcell’s music.²⁷ However, the performance is listed in *The London Stage* with the note “As 20 Jan” (pt. 2, vol. I, 211), and is one of many given that season. It seems unlikely that a very different version of any play would suddenly be introduced in the middle of a run. That would cause problems with scenery and costumes, for one thing. Without more material there is no absolute certainty, however. But we can be sure that Rowe’s then newly-published “authentic” Shakespeare did not create a furore and lead to an immediate abolishment of the Dryden/Davenant play, since even where it is not specified as their adaptation, the extraneous characters are mentioned in the cast lists, and that dead giveaway, Trincalo for Trinculo, is found throughout.

Between 1742 and 1776, *The Tempest* was performed in nineteen different seasons, as Shakespeare/Rowe, Davenant/Dryden and “Shadwell”, but never in Covent Garden (Odell, I, 338). In 1745/46, the adaptation was temporarily shelved at Drury Lane, in favour of Shakespeare’s, “never acted there. Unfortunately, Davenant and Dryden’s perversion was restored to the repertoire in the following season” (Odell, I, 353). It is tempting to relate this production — directed by Garrick and with music by Thomas Arne — to the stirring events of The ‘45, but Shakespeare can hardly be said to have made less of the theme of usurpation than his adapters.

Garrick’s “operatic” *Tempest*, if it was indeed his, was presented on 11 February 1756, with music composed by John Christopher Smith.²⁸ The principal parts were sung (the list does not indicate what parts were entrusted to the actors specified) by Beard, Signora Curioni and Mrs Vernon (Odell, I, 362). The dialogues are almost all Shakespeare’s, but greatly curtailed. Every few minutes there is music, thirty-two songs and duets being crammed in. Hippolito and Dorinda are removed, but Mustacho, Ventoso, Trincalo and Stephano remain from the Dryden/Davenant adaptation.²⁹ George Odell quotes Tate Wilkinson’s comment on this *Tempest*: “It was dreadfully heavy [...] It went through with great labour eight nights, but not without the aid of the garland dance, well performed by

²⁷ Eric Walter White, “Early Theatrical Performances of Purcell’s Operas”, *Theatre Notebook*, XIII/2 (Winter 1958/1959), 50.

²⁸ Garrick denied it. See George Winchester Stone, Jr., “Shakespeare’s *Tempest* at Drury Lane during Garrick’s Management”, *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 7 (1956), 2; and Brian Vickers, *Returning to Shakespeare*, London, 1989, 232 n11.

²⁹ Gooch and Thatcher get this wrong. They refer to “Trinculo” and “Mestacho” in entry 15479 (III, 1601) pertaining to the Garrick/Smith opera.

sixty children, at the end of the second act, and the pantomime of Fortunatus, or the Genii, after that” (I, 423-24).

Garrick’s opening scene has a ship in trouble. Ariel is first upon the scene and sings “Arise, ye Subterranean winds”; in the first operatic adaptation of 1674, this text (with music by Reggio), belonged to the Fifth Devil in the second act. By giving it to Ariel at the very beginning, Garrick suggests that he is in charge. It is not until the next scene that Miranda and Prospero discuss the storm as Prospero’s. In Shakespeare’s original, of course, the initial impression is that the storm is natural. In the second scene of the Garrick version, Miranda wants Prospero to stop the storm, as she suffers with the seamen. She sings about it. He replies that those on the ship set Miranda and her father adrift. He sings about it. The “human” characters sing their own parts, as opposed to earlier English opera convention, changing the relationships to one another and to the audience. Garrick produced what was more or less Shakespeare’s original play again on 20 October 1757, “for the first time in fourteen years” (according to the playbill, but actually not quite twelve). It was performed seventeen times, which hardly marks it as a huge success.

Bell’s critical acting editions were published between 1773 and 1775 (not to be confused with Bell’s library edition of 1788, from Samuel Johnson and George Steevens), and *The Tempest* (“A Comedy, by Shakespeare”) appeared in the third volume of 1774. The editor was Francis Gentleman, working from the Drury Lane promptbook by Hopkins. Odell says that of this edition almost every word is Shakespeare’s: “every vestige of the Dryden-Davenant stuff being eliminated” (II, 28). There are large cuts in Act 2, however (Gonzalo, Antonio, Sebastian) but Stephano, Trinculo and Caliban as a trio is practically intact, so their music is presented. The banquet in this version is manipulated by “devils” and the masque is

shorn of many lines — even of Iris [...] The last act is almost entirely Shakespeare’s, with only a few lines missing. Is not this a surprise? It seems a great pity that in 1789 [i.e. 13 October] Kemble felt called upon to lay hands on this very satisfactory version, and restore all the silly Hippolyto-Dorinda stuff that Bell had cleansed out of it. But Kemble seems to have cared but little what elements he might mingle, so long as he could stand up and say to all the world “This is a play” (II, 28-29).

On 27 December 1776, *The Tempest* finally got to Covent Garden, choreographed by Aldridge and including Catherine Valois as Ceres. It was for this (anonymous) operatic adaptation that Arne probably wrote the song

“Bid your Faithful Ariel Fly”, found in the later quartos. Other (lost) music was attributed to John Fisher by the reviews.³⁰ There is an engraving in Odell (opposite II, 28) of Miss Brown and Mr Mattocks in *The Tempest*, attributed to *The Universal Magazine* of 1777.³¹ They are wearing gorgeous contemporary clothing, and “Ferdinand’s powdered George III wig and the gentle Miranda’s towering coiffure show how much was yet to be done before historic accuracy could obtain on the stage” (II, 83-84). Only a week later, on 4 January, according to *The Westminster Magazine* for January 1777, *The Tempest* was revived at Drury Lane. Garrick had just retired and one of the new managers was Richard Brinsley Sheridan. The adaptation is said to be his, and he used the brilliant designer De Loutherbourg, famed for his realistic ships and seas, for the “scenes and machines”.³² Thomas Linley Jr., who was Sheridan’s brother-in-law, wrote additional music, but the complete score was either not published or has yet to be discovered. “The music and dancing in *The Tempest* were rendered too consequential, they took up too much time, and made the whole tedious”, is a contemporary complaint (Odell, I, 431). If the Linley music was used in addition to what Smith had already composed for Garrick, that could well be true.

These three productions were very close together, and only where the singer is both known and specified in the songsheet or score, or the music, is described elsewhere (as in Pepys), can we tell exactly what was used where. Also, printed versions of both words and music were often dated considerably later than the original performance.

John Philip Kemble was acting director of Drury Lane in 1788/89. In his 1789 *Tempest*, the first of at least two, he introduced much new music, about which the introduction says nothing.³³ Ferdinand and Miranda sing their own parts, having now been turned into the most sentimental of

³⁰ *The London Stage* quotes the playbill as stating it was “never performed there” [i.e. at Covent Garden] and adds that it was contracted into three acts, with the masque in Act 4 forming the conclusion of the play (V, part 1, 410).

³¹ On page 83 it is attributed to the *Westminster Magazine*. The performance would seem to be the one at Covent Garden.

³² For the attribution to Sheridan see Gooch and Thatcher, III, 1553. The *Public Advertiser* for 6 January mentions De Loutherbourg. For his career see Highfill, John Loftis, *Sheridan and the Drama of Georgian England*, Oxford, 1976, 119; and Sybil Rosenfeld, *A Short History of Stage Design in Great Britain*, Oxford, 1973, 91.

³³ Reprinted from the copy in the Birmingham Reference Library (S347. 31789) and published by Cornmarket (London, 1972) with an introduction by Martin Wright.

couples. The log-bearing scene contains this gem by Miranda:

*To see thee, so gentle a creature distrest,
With tears fills my eyes and with sorrow my breast.
Oh, would I, possess'd of my father the art,
Or had I his power, or had he my heart!
With tears I'll beseech him, with sighs I'll assail,
Can the sign of my soul with my father e'er fail?*

Later in the scene there is a duet between Ferdinand and Miranda:

*What new delights invade my bosom;
In every vein what rapture plays;
What new delights invade my bosom;
Whilst on thee I fondly gaze.
Oh, thou art source of all my pleasure,
Treasure of my soul art thou.
Without measure
Am'rous pleasure
Crowns my nights and wings my days.*

(Kemble, 3.3)

According to George Odell, Kemble had restored the poetry by 1806. In that version “The lovely Crouch” played Miranda, and Hippolito was, as usual, a breeches part.³⁴ Kemble’s final 1806 version of the play was still a mix of Shakespeare and Dryden/Davenant, with Dorinda as a “minx” in the tradition of “Miss Hoyden”. Odell remarks that “this version [...] had a steadier and longer stage life than Shakespeare’s work has ever since enjoyed” (II, 59-60). He was writing in 1920. It was not just Pepys who never saw *The Tempest*.

The early music revival that has swept Western Europe and North America includes an interest in baroque opera and the music in the plays of the period. Recently literary criticism has also begun to focus on the theatrical, sociological and historical facts to be gleaned from the musical adaptations of Shakespeare and his contemporaries during the Restoration. Renewed interest in the playwrights of the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (Dryden, Aphra Behn) has led to performances like Dryden’s *All for Love* to critical acclaim in the 1980s. There have since been productions of

³⁴ Gooch and Thatcher say that Anne Brunton played Miranda (III, 1532), which is probably correct. Crouch died in 1805. The music was by John Davy.

joyously non-canonical works in the theatre and on the concert stage, but seldom both together. It is true that the Royal Shakespeare Company's 1992 *Beggar's Opera* tried to approximate period staging, but the music was murdered. William Christie's 1989 *Fairy-Queen* was a musical joy marred by high-tech staging. It is high time the two disciplines started working together.