CHAPTER TWO: ADAPTATION

It is not specifically because they were written by Shakespeare that his plays were a desirable theatrical resource when the theatres re-opened in 1660. Thomas D'Urfey's radical adaptation of *Cymbeline*, *The Injured Princess*, was not staged until 1682, however. By that date the choice of a Shakespeare play for adaptation cannot be explained simply by citing shortage of material as in Davenant's early melding of *Measure for Measure* and *Much Ado About Nothing* into *The Law against Lovers* (1664).[1] It is necessary therefore to consider why D'Urfey chose to adapt this particular Shakespeare play and at this particular time. I shall examine his adaptation closely in order to see in what ways he has made the play conform to and reflect contemporary aesthetic and theatrical taste.

It is generally agreed that the King's Company was in severe financial difficulties from 1679 onwards, possibly as a consequence of the expensive re-build necessitated by the Bridges Street theatre burning down in 1672. D'Urfey seems to have viewed the adapted *Cymbeline* as potentially possessing all of the necessary ingredients to revive the company's fortunes. In a time when new plays were regarded as essential, *The London Stage* lists only one new play having been staged by this company in the 1679-80 season, describes actors being absent in Scotland and the theatre being closed between spring and October 1681.[2] Michael Dobson seems to believe that the company "went bust" deservedly as a consequence of "staging this demonstration of the bankruptcy of its royalist theatrical genres" (i.e. D'Urfey's adaptation of *Cymbeline*).[3] I would argue that the reality was very different. D'Urfey seems to have been recruited to improve the company's competitive position rather than being a symptom or cause of its decline.

D'Urfey's *A Fond Husband* (1677), acted by the Duke's Company, "took extraordinary well, and […] got the company reputation and profit", according to Downe the prompter's comment. [4] It also won royal favour, Charles II attending three out of the first five performances.[5] Subsequently D'Urfey not only wrote prolifically for the stage, but his songs, often set to music by Henry Purcell, were collected and published separately.[6] Seen in this light, his second work for the King's Company, *Sir Barnaby Whigg* (October 1681) can be seen as part of a desperate bid by the company for profit and survival. Even in this season, D'Urfey did not wholly write for the King's Men. *The Royalist* was performed by the Duke's Company in late January 1682, and was attended by the king immediately before the fast day for the martyrdom of Charles I – presumably an indication of the play's success.

There was much deliberate and competitive imitation of works and genres by the two companies in the period immediately before the merger. Cecil Deane sees Dryden's *All for Love* (1677) as fostering imitations of Elizabethan models.[7] The Duke's Company performed Tate's adaptation of *King Lear* in 1680-1 and Davenant's adaptation of *Macbeth* in February 1682. If *The Injured Princess* was also performed in that month, it would have been in direct competition. By this date D'Urfey had adapted several plays written by others, including two by Fletcher. The similarities between *Cymbeline*'s genre and Fletcher's tragic-comedy have previously been discussed. When being staged in a Restoration theatre with changeable scenes, this play demands nothing unusual and expensive (except in the excised masque). The production could utilise existing scenery and costumes. It is centred round a potentially pathetic heroine (rather than a witty one) whose virtue is threatened and doubted – giving scope therefore (especially through the addition of Clarina) for an actress to move the audience. As an added bonus there is a 'breeches' role for

Imogen/Eugenia. The villains can easily be made to conform to the Restoration stereotypes of rake and fop, exploiting the more visual medium of Restoration theatre to add humour. There is an opportunity to mock a European neighbour – D'Urfey shifts his target to the French for the audience of 1682. Its politics, with slight adaptation or simplification, can become appropriately royalist and non-controversial. With some rearranging of scenes, simplification and alteration of the language, *Cymbeline* can be made to fit the requirements of the time relatively easily. I shall consider how D'Urfey has deliberately adapted the play in order to conform to contemporary taste.

Some of the changes made to *Cymbeline* enable D'Urfey to exploit the visual potential of the Restoration stage. By 1682 changeable scenery was the norm. The King's Men would have had to fully re-equip the recently built Theatre Royal, Drury Lane, with scenery and stage machines after losing the Bridges Street theatre ten years before. The new theatre was apparently smaller and plainer than its rival, the Dorset Garden.[8] When D'Urfey cuts spectacle from *Cymbeline* where flying is required (the theophany in Act 5 scene 3), we cannot know, of course, whether this was to please public taste or to save money.[9]

D'Urfey's first alteration to the script is an added prologue. These were almost always used to 'quieten the house' in Restoration drama before the curtain is raised on the first scene, all subsequent scenes being changed in full view of the audience. [10] D'Urfey then rearranges the order of events so that, for example, the action involving the Queen and her drugs (Shakespeare's Act 1 scene 5) precedes the shift to Europe (now France) and the wager between the hero Ursaces and the new villain Shatillion. This reduces the number of scene changes involved. Similarly in Act II scene II, Shatillion's initial conversation with Eugenia is in her bedroom and

his trunk needs merely to be sent for – "I'le have 'um kept /Here in my Apartment", she offers (II, II, 206-7). In Shakespeare her "bedchamber" (1.6.196) is somewhere else. D'Urfey's II, IV "discovers Eugenia in bed". One assumes that the intervening scene, here between the Queen and Pisanio (not Cloten and the two lords as in Shakespeare), is played downstage with the same scenery as scene II. The upstage shutters could then be opened to reveal the bed. Some of D'Urfey's alterations to Shakespeare's Act 2 scene 2 would seem to me to suggest that the action is less visible as it is probably set further upstage and thus at a greater distance from the audience. The scene is shorter. There is no mention of Shatillion "softly press[ing] the [now outmoded] rushes" (2.1.13) but he suggests that she may wake up (there is an added stage direction) before he announces "What's there, a Bracelet on her Arm?" (II, IV, 29), as if the audience would not otherwise see it.

Elsewhere the number of scene changes is also reduced. We only return to the court for one short scene, Act IV scene I, in the later part of the play. The Romans do not negotiate with the King and Queen but proceed straight to battle. The inner stage area could again be used as the cave's entrance and Act V scene II, the final scene, specifies "Palace backward" – i.e. we are outside the palace, and seeing it behind the action. D'Urfey's adaptation allows changeable scenery to be used but rationalises the changes of location to simplify its implementation.

The Injured Princess does not require expensive new costumes. If Roman dress was needed, there were numerous other plays for which this could have been previously acquired such as Dryden's *All for Love*, 1677). Otherwise it is very likely, as engravings for Nicholas Rowe's 1709 edition of Shakespeare's plays suggest, that most characters, with token Roman additions, would wear contemporary dress.[11]

In the majority of his alterations to Shakespeare's play, D'Urfey can be seen to be adapting the characters to fit contemporary stereotypes, and their behaviour and speech to elicit specifically engineered responses. He is also, of course, altering the text to make best use of actresses.

It is hard to think of any other Shakespearean heroine, not already featuring in a Restoration adaptation, who is as suitable to this era as Imogen. More emotional and less witty than the heroines of Shakespeare's comedies, she is far more central to the action than Desdemona, Ophelia or Cordelia – all of whom had already been seen upon the Restoration stage. D'Urfey appears to take considerable inspiration from Tate's adaptation of *King Lear* as there are many echoes of this play in D'Urfey's text. Imogen – or rather Eugenia – requires relatively few changes to make her fit the mould of pathetic heroine. She is being treated unfairly by her father because of what he regards as an unsuitable marriage (Tate had to add that to *King Lear*). Heroines are only allowed to take the initiative if love is their motivation and here romantic love is already at the play's core.[12] Several writers note the rise in popularity of 'pathetic tragedies' in the 1670s and 80s, leading to the later development of 'she-tragedies'.[13] Elizabeth Howe sees this phenomenon not simply as an ironic containment of women perpetuated at a time when they had been given the supposed 'freedom' to appear on stage, but a direct consequence of some actresses' talent for playing these emotional and affective roles.[14]

In order to fulfil contemporary requirements for a heroine, D'Urfey makes some adjustments to Shakespeare's Imogen. I have previously shown that D'Urfey shortens the 'trunk' scene. An additional reason for this is the expansion and alterations to Act II scene II, Eugenia's previous encounter with Shatillion who here

becomes very much the stereotypical Restoration rake. His description of Ursaces's infidelity soon becomes suggestive:

> Eug. And will he kiss those Creatures?
> Shatt. Kiss 'um, Madam?
> Alas, wou'd that were all! there's no great fault in kissing. (II, II, 129-30)

As in Shakespeare's scene, Shatillion offers to be her means of revenge. The addition of the word "thus" to "I dedicate my self to your [sweet] pleasure" (l.146) implies closer physical contact than in Shakespeare's scene. Rather than calling for Pisanio (and having previously locked the doors to guard against interruption), there seems to be a real possibility that Eugenia may submit: "Oh Heaven! Is't possible? And will you love me too?" (l.152) Shatillion, at length, professes to do so – and it is strongly implied that she is not physically resisting:

> Kind Fate, she comes, she yields:
> Oh glorious Conquest!---Let me seal my Passion
> Upon thy snowy hands transported, then rove higher,
> And ransack this white Magazine of Beauty. (158-60)

Eugenia then proves her virtue by drawing a dagger. Shakespeare's heroine does not resort to weapons – her angry words are strong enough to protect her. As is stressed by many commentators, the titillation of having an actual female, physically present and threatened, is the attraction for the audience.[15]

In D'Urfey's play Eugenia is much more thoroughly victimised as everyone assumes that she is guilty of infidelity and blames her for it, not just Ursaces. Eugenia has already assumed "Mens Cloaths" (the added audience bonus of the breeches role) when she and Pisanio enter in Act III, scene III (Shakespeare's 3.4).[16] Unlike Shakespeare's eager, impatient character, Eugenia is complaining about the "strange wild melancholy place" (l.102) and that her legs are "weary" l.104). As soon as she reads the letter, she reacts with appropriately feminine weakness:

> I'le kiss thy Name although it brings me death,

A cruel death to th'Innocent. Oh my Fortune! (III, III, 131-2)
[Swounds

A swoon, according to George Granville's preface to *Heroick Love* (1732) was considered particularly effective on stage.[17] Pisanio regards it merely to be a "Fetch of female Policy", listing numerous trivial occasions where it is resorted to before declaring it "Craft, Craft, damn'd Craft" (134-37). Imogen draws Pisanio's sword herself and roundly orders him to carry out his master's bidding. D'Urfey's Pisanio willingly draws his sword and Eugenia pleads with him affectingly:

Pisanio: […] Kneel therefore, and pray,
Or unprepar'd receive your Fate.
[Draws.
Eugen. I swear
I am not guilty, yet do not wish to live,
[Kneels.
Ursaces being false. Come, strike, my Lord,
Strike the innocent Mansion of my Love, my heart,
And give a hapless, much wrong'd Woman rest,
As lasting as her woes. (156-63)

The contrast here is strong although the text is only slightly altered. Once Pisanio has miraculously been prevented from killing her "it wonnot be: /Methinks some Genius hinders my rash Arm" (167-8), Eugenia pleads with him, in tears, not to leave her. She continues to weep and lament to the end of the scene, and again in Act IV scene II when she reaches Bellarius's cave. She kneels to its inhabitants and weeps fairly continuously until the end of the scene, provoking the poetic description voiced by Arviragus "the clear drops stand on his blushing Cheek, /As pearly dew on Roses" (IV, II, 111-12).

Elsewhere D'Urfey's textual changes are more extreme. Eugenia's (or Fidele's) 'death' in Act IV scene IV is stripped of all Shakespeare's lyricism. It takes a mere eight lines for her body to be found and deposited in the 'grave' – Shakespeare uses seventy-two. Cloten's body, although now pointlessly in her husband's clothes,

is not laid, headless, beside her, so there no emotion from Eugenia on her re-awakening. One can conclude that such a display of (misplaced) grief is not the right sort of pathos for this stage. In the final scene of the play, Ursaces does not inadvertently knock Eugenia down, as Posthumus does Imogen, as it would be inappropriate to her now serious, virtuous persona. D'Urfey, in altering the character, has made her conform to the Conduct Book ideal.[18] Shakespeare's Imogen is thus "elevated by flattening […] into [a] one dimensional icon of virtue".[19]

Eugenia is complemented and her impact reinforced by D'Urfey's addition of Clarina. To accord with the rules governing the decorum of social position, D'Urfey elevates Pisanio from servant to companion/father-substitute to Ursaces; Clarina, his daughter, is thus Eugenia's friend rather than her maid.[20] Sophronia and Aurelia are also added, as maids, thus more than doubling the number of female roles. It is Clarina rather than Pisanio, therefore, who is interrogated about Eugenia's disappearance – and this scene follows straight after the latter's abandonment by Pisanio. Clarina, like Eugenia, kneels and weeps but is dragged off by Cloten's friend Jachimo who is to ravish her. This scene, Act IV scene III, is added by D'Urfey immediately after Eugenia has met her brothers. Thus the suffering of females is expanded and replicated to fill virtually all of Act IV. Elizabeth Howe comments on the huge increase of rape scenes in drama of this period. "Restoration tragedy staged male lust being directly aroused by a real female body".[21] The actress Anne Bracegirdle reputedly specialised in such scenes. The effect of the heroine's distress is acknowledged by Jachimo:

> Tears? Why thou canst not oblige me more than to
> Weep soundly; it makes the flame of Love more
> Vigorous; (IV, II, 11-13)

This added scene is an extreme example of the titillation possible from attempted rape. The actress's body – legs and breasts - would be displayed and her hair dishevelled. Howe (p.45) comments that by this date such scenes had become almost commonplace, thus D'Urfey adds the additional possibility that Jachimo will "ravish her before [her father's] face" (IV, III, 41). This device, and Pisanio's blinding, is used contemporaneously by Tate in his adaptation of *King Lear* and again by D'Urfey in *Trick for Trick.* Poetic Justice – Pisanio is punished as he fails to see Eugenia's virtue – has also been added. Marsden describes Clarina's last minute rescue as "sensationalist Melodrama".[22]

Jacqueline Pearson claims that such scenes were not only liked by men.[23] She quotes Burnaby in *The Reformed Wife* demanding "A Rape or two to engage the Ladies" (though this could be an ironic comment). She states that play-goers preferred tragedy, whose purpose was to "raise the soul to glory" and to display "true honour" to the audience. In this genre their sex was "deified and adored" (p.38). She quotes Farquhar's claim that ladies "cry for death upon the stage" stating that they enjoyed passionate emotion and pathos, even to the extent of masochism and prurience. If that was so, with the alterations to Imogen and the addition of Clarina, D'Urfey was potentially pleasing the whole audience, not merely the men.

Not only does D'Urfey create two emotional if passive heroines, he also alters the role of the Queen. According to Restoration mores, on stage, women who are not governed by love, marital or maternal, are villains. Whilst Shakespeare's Queen is evil, this is made more explicit and the emphasis subtly shifted by D'Urfey although the role is approximately thirty-five lines shorter. In her speech at the end of scene I, she openly states her attitude towards the king who "is old, too old to share my heart" (l.264), and her evil intentions:

> Cloten, For thee I'le cut through all Opposers,
> King, Husband, Daughter, Friend, I'le stop at none,
> But on their bloudy Ruines build thy Throne. (I, I, 272-74)

This is much more melodramatic – and obvious – than in Shakespeare's play. In Act II, scene I she sneers at Pisanio in words reminiscent of Regan to Gloucester in *King Lear*: "The silver Hairs that grace thy Reverend Head, /Should grow in Wisdoms Soyl" (36-37). Pisanio's age is repeatedly stressed as an additional source of pathos. The Queen not only condones but actively supports the intended rape of Clarina by Jachimo: "To you I give the Wretch, /Use her as she deserves: Hence hated Harpey" (IV, I, 20-21). The alliterative ending again gives the speech a strongly melodramatic tone.

As there is no negotiation in this play with the Roman general Lucius, D'Urfey removes any patriotism from the Queen. Similarly, her death is dealt with in a way that diminishes her importance. News is brought by the captain to Lucius, not to Cymbeline, although its cause, "raging with desperate madness" (IV, IV, 141) over her son's absence, remains the same. This is before the battle starts, much earlier than in Shakespeare's play. She is only briefly mentioned again, by Pisanio, as the source of the 'poison'; the King does not speak about her death at all. The implication is that Cymbeline, freed earlier from her influence, is more able to lead Britain successfully against Rome.

D'Urfey does not only adapt the presentation of women to conform to contemporary taste. According to Derek Hughes, Shakespeare's Posthumus is well-born and of worthy ancestry whereas Ursaces is of inferior birth. [24] As his family do not appear at the end of this play, his parentage is not ultimately proven. Perhaps more significantly, Ursaces does not forgive Eugenia for "wrying but a little" (5.1.5). Rather he expresses a cynical attitude, throughout the play, towards women's fidelity.

Gewirtz notes “a deep-seated hostility between the sexes” as a feature of Restoration drama. [25] Death for Eugenia was too great a punishment, he concedes, but this seems to be largely because so many women err that “thy world wou’d be unpeopl’d” (V.I.10) if the guilty were killed. Having adopted British dress, however, Ursaces retains it to the end of the play, not being arrested as a Roman. His status as a hero is increased in the duel with Shatillion, who, through cowardice, *has* disguised himself as a Briton. Poetic justice is again seen in Shatillion’s death, once he has revealed the truth about Eugenia. The language is suitably heroic. Ursaces calls Shatillion “Horrid and damn'd Impostor!” (V, I, 189) and the villain’s closing words “But Oh /My Soul is wandring to its unknown home, /My Blood's all Ice!” (195-96) retain a melodramatic flavour.

Cloten is altered more significantly although his name is unchanged. He loses all of Shakespeare’s character’s anxiety about rank, being made intellectually rather than socially ignorant (he confuses Jehu and Job, for example). He is shown indulging in gambling pastimes that are more contemporary. Whilst an element of comedy is retained for this character, it becomes visual as, in an attempt to seem heroic to Eugenia, he dons armour in Act II scene IV. “I Gad this damn'd Armour is plaguy troublesom” (L.46), he complains, before checking “Have I the sow'r Look of a Heroe?” (l.49) Silvio (fulfilling something of the chorus role of Shakespeare’s 2nd Lord) comments on the likelihood of him causing “wonder” rather than “fear” (l.50) – thus emphasising his ludicrous appearance to the audience. This device had been used for comic effect in *The Rehearsal*, Buckingham’s popular and frequently revived burlesque of heroic tragedy. Edward Ravenscroft also used the same device in *The London Cuckolds* (1681). Again here we can see D’Urfey attempting to capitalise on popular theatrical devices used by others.

Cloten is subsequently made far more evil as, seconding Jachimo in Clarina's abduction, it is he who blinds Pisanio. Whilst one could claim that his death in *Cymbeline* (the only one in what is much more clearly a tragic-comedy) is undeserved, thus, in D'Urfey's play, it is. D'Urfey retains most of Shakespeare's language for Cloten's conflict with Arviragus (in Shakespeare it is with Guiderius) but his body does not re-appear – to save money on properties, perhaps. Alternatively, by this stage in the play, as he is an object of horror rather than ridicule, perhaps his headless body would provoke an undesirable audience response.

It would not have been wise for D'Urfey to foreground the political issues inherent in Shakespeare's play. Playwrights, in the wake of the Popish plot, had to be cautious as several plays were banned in the 1678 – 82 period. *The Injured Princess* is therefore not overtly political except in the broadest sense. Removing the negotiations between Britain and Rome simplifies their conflict in the play. It is possible that D'Urfey also intends Cymbeline's victory to be over the Catholic Church, not simply the Roman Empire. When the battle is won in Act V scene I Bellarius declares "haughty Rome must bow/To th'British Power" (l.104), which makes this more explicit than in Shakespeare's version. The reinstatement of the king's sons deprives Eugenia of her power – D'Urfey simply retains Shakespeare's lines here. Providing a now strong if aged king with not one but two active and legitimate heirs is a conclusion that remains politic in 1682. Shakespeare's play already contains this fortuitously apt ending.

Apart from containing what Barbara Murray calls "a new sort of pessimism about political man", D'Urfey adds a quite different 'moral' to his adaptation of the play which seems to be derived from Shakespeare's *Othello* rather than *Cymbeline*.[26] When, in the final scene, Ursaces and Eugenia are reunited. Cymbeline warns:

> But O beware of Jealousie,
> That worst of Passions, cherish'd by the blood,
> And nourish'd by destruction! (V, II, 158-60)

Having previously feared contamination by her infidelity, Ursaces ends the play with the hope that love will heal all griefs:

> Immortal Joys I find,
> And Heaven on Earth, whilst my Eugenia's kind. (l.174-75)

The play's ending thus shifts into a more domestic sphere with the emphasis on marital fidelity rather than international politics. Shakespeare's play, in contrast, concludes with world peace.

Odell, writing in 1920, complains that D'Urfey has "spoil[ed] the entire play" through Pisanio's misogyny. He, and other adapters have "take[n] away the poetry and [left] the horrors"; the "exquisite cave scenes are […] shorn of their loveliness".[27] As Dobson points out "Those dismissing these [adaptations] as travesties are themselves influenced by their cultural contexts". [28] Whilst Shakespeare wrote the play initially to exploit a specific theatrical opportunity, whatever we may think of D'Urfey's rewritten *Cymbeline,* he was adapting a useful company resource for a pragmatic purpose in very specific commercial crisis. He enabled changeable scenery to be used effectively; his added female roles increased the number of actresses involved; the altered, now stereotypical, characters were able to provoke appropriate responses including pathos, and to demonstrate contemporary moral attitudes; political content was non-controversial and royalist in flavour. That D'Urfey's play continued to be performed until 1738 (albeit renamed *Cymbeline* from 1737) suggests that his version, rather than Shakespeare's, was preferred on stage for more than fifty years'. [29]

[1] Barbara A Murray, *Shakespeare Adaptations from the Restoration: Five Plays* (Madison, Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2005), p.xxiv

[2] William Van Leenep, ed., *The London Stage 1660 – 1800: A Calendar of Plays, Entertainments and Afterpieces* (Carbondale, Illinois: South Illinois University Press, 1965), p.279
[3] Dobson, Michael, *The Making of the National Poet: Shakespeare, Adaptation and Authorship, 1660 – 1769* (Oxford: Clarendon Press: 1992), p.90
[4] *The London Stage*, p.257
[5] John Loftis, Richard Southern, Marion Jones & A.H. Scouten, *The Revels History of Drama in English*, vol. V. 1660 – 1750 (London: Methuen, 1976), pp.206-8
[6] *The Revels History of Drama in English*, pp.206-8
[7] Charles Victor Deane *Dramatic Theory and the Rhymed Heroic Play* (London: Frank Cass/OUP, 1931), p.159
[8] *The London Stage*, p.xli
[9] Barbara Murray, *Restoration Shakespeare: Viewing the Voice* (Cranberry NJ: Associated University Presses, 2001),p.191 suggests that it was for the latter reason.
[10] *The London Stage*, p.cxxxii
[11] Engravings of *Othello*, *Cymbeline* reproduced in Elizabeth Howe, *The First English Actresses: Women and Drama 1660 – 1700* (Cambridge: CUP, 1992), pp.39-41
[12] Marsden, Jean I., *The Re-imagined Text: Shakespeare, Adaptation & Eighteenth Century Literary Theory* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1995), p. 35
[13] Laura Brown, 'The Defenceless Woman and the Development of English Tragedy' in *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900*, 22 (1982), pp.130-4
Elizabeth Howe, *The First English Actresses*, pp.39, 108
Katherine M Quinsey, ed., *Broken Boundaries: Women and Feminism in Restoration Drama* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1996), p.2
[14] For the opposite view see Jean I Marsden, 'Re-written Women: Shakespearean Heroines in the Restoration' in *The Appropriation of Shakespeare: Post Renaissance Reconstruction of the Works and the Myth* ed. by Jean I Marsden, (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991), pp.44-7
[15] Jean I. Marsden, 'Spectacle, Horror and Pathos' in *The Cambridge Companion to English Restoration Theatre* ed. by Dorothy Payne Fisk (Cambridge: CUP, 2000), p181
Jean I Marsden, 'Re-written Women: Shakespearean Heroines in the Restoration', p.44
Elizabeth Howe, *The First English Actresses*, p.39
[16] Elizabeth Howe, *The First English Actresses*, p57, states that such roles, designed to show off the female body, occur in 89 out of 375 plays performed between 1660 and 1700.
[17] Quoted by Elizabeth Howe, *The First English Actresses*, p.119
[18] Jean I Marsden, 'Re-written Women: Shakespearean Heroines in the Restoration', p.44;
Jean I. Marsden, 'Spectacle, Horror and Pathos', p. 182
[19] Jean I Marsden, 'Re-written Women: Shakespearean Heroines in the Restoration', p.49
[20] Brian Vickers, ed., *Shakespeare: The Critical Heritage, Volume 1 1623 -1692* (London & Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1974), p.6
[21] Elizabeth Howe, *The First English Actresses*, p.43
[22] Jean I Marsden, 'Re-written Women: Shakespearean Heroines in the Restoration', p.52
[23] Jacqueline Pearson, *The Prostituted Muse: Images of Women and Women Dramatists 1642 – 1737* (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1980), pp.33-8
[24] Derek Hughes, *English Drama 1660 – 1700* (Oxford: OUP, 1996), p.280
[25] Arthur Gewirtz *Restoration Adaptations of Early Seventeenth Century Comedies* (Washington: University Press of America, 1982), p.141
[26] Barbara A. Murray, *Shakespeare Adaptations from the Restoration: Five Plays* (Madison, Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2005), p.xxvii
[27] George C. D. Odell, *Shakespeare from Betterton to Irving*, p.70
[28] Michael Dobson *The Making of the National Poet*, p.9
[29] John McVeagh *Thomas Durfey and Restoration Drama* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000), p.169