School of English, Media and Theatre Studies,

National University of Ireland, Maynooth

Thesis Submitted for MLitt, May 2011.

———

———

The Influence of English Colonial Discourse on Early Irish Adaptations of Shakespeare, 1674-1754

Researched by

Liam O'Dowd

Supervised by

Dr Stephen O'Neill

Head of Department

Prof. Chris Morash

Submitted: May 10, 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments

Note on Procedures

All line references and quotations of Shakespeare are taken from *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*, ed. by W.J. Craig (London: Magpie, 1992).

This thesis has been compiled following MHRA guidelines.

Summary

The aim of this thesis is to examine the earliest Irish adaptations of Shakespeare and to consider to what extent contemporary English-Irish relations informed or shaped the texts. As such, this thesis seeks to build on recent interest in Irish responses to and revisions of Shakespeare, as evidenced by such publications as Robin Bates' *Shakespeare and the Cultural Colonization of Ireland* (London: Routledge, 2007), Rebecca Steinberger's *Shakespeare and Twentieth-Century Irish Drama: Conceptualizing Identity and Staging Boundaries* (London: Ashgate, 2008), and *Shakespeare and the Irish Writer*, edited by Janet Clare and Stephen O'Neill (Dublin: UCD Press, 2010). In doing so it seeks to extend knowledge of Shakespeare in Ireland by attending to overlooked texts from the late-seventeenth century and eighteenth century. The thesis will focus on adaptations of Shakespeare by Thomas Duffet and Nahum Tate, as well as later works by Thomas Sheridan and Macnamara Morgan. It will demonstrate how these writers reconstructed what has Robin Bates describes as Shakespeare's 'cultural impressment' of Ireland and explore the ways in which Irish writers came to signify Ireland through Shakespeare, ultimately signaling a potential proto- or pseudo- nationalism long before the Gaelic Revival of the nineteenth century.

The thesis deploys a historically informed postcolonial analysis, in considering the extent to which the plays in question become bound up with their contemporary moment, on both an individual and collective basis. Duffet and Tate wrote whilst Ireland was still under the effect of plantation, whereas Sheridan and Morgan wrote in the midst of the Protestant ascendancy. Where do these aspects of the English-Irish discourse shine through the chosen material? As many of the texts were produced by individuals with allegiances to both states, a primary area of inquiry is the status of the texts themselves: are they specifically 'Irish' adaptations? What does such a category signify? In addressing these and other questions, this thesis will deploy a primarily postcolonial analysis, for, as Edward Said and other postcolonial critics have shown, such an analysis is particularly useful in recognising and celebrating dual traditions and identities. Where and how such dual allegiances affect the texts remains an open question, and one which this thesis aims to engage with.

Introduction

In Ireland, Shakespeare and his plays have enjoyed a long afterlife, and it is a tradition in which a great number of Irish writers – both creative and critical – have touched upon at some time. This close relationship, however, has complexities and difficulties which are quite unique, owing to the geographical and historical proximity of Ireland and England, with the result that Shakespeare can seem to Irish authors a figure of contrasts. On the one hand, Shakespeare and his plays are a clear a source of aspiration and inspiration to many writers, and Irish writers being no exception to this, such high praise of Shakespeare is evident throughout the various dedications and prologues to Irish adaptations of the plays. Nahum Tate, in the dedication of *The History of King Lear* to his friend Thomas Boteler, writes that the driving force behind his work is his 'Zeal for all the remains of Shakespeare' (at a time when Shakespeare was out of fashion), and declares his confidence in the success of his own redaction because 'in rich Shakespeare's soil it grew'.[1] Macnamara Morgan similarly writes in the prologue to *The Sheep-Shearing* that 'great Shakespeare' came to 'raise the honour of the British stage' and 'swell the glories of Eliza's age', and later again makes reference to 'Shakespeare's skill' and 'his wit'. [2] Thomas Sheridan, too, writes that *Coriolanus* contained 'two characters which seemed to be drawn in as masterly a manner as any that came from the pen of the inimitable Shakespeare'.[3] On the other hand, however, this otherwise wholly positive outlook on Shakespeare is complicated in the eighteenth century by his emerging status as the national poet of Britian, a state with which Ireland shares a history which is both lengthy and troubled. As such, Shakespeare becomes a figure of contrast in the psyche of Morgan and Sheridan, being both a writer of brilliance but also an icon of an oppressive and colonising Britain. For Tate, due to Shakespeare's unpopularity in the 1660s, this is less true, however Shakespeare may still be presented as a figure of contrast, in view of Tate's great esteem for the English writer.

---

[1] Nahum Tate, *The History of King* Lear (London, 1681), p. ii.
[2] Macnamara Morgan, *The Sheep-Shearing*, (Dublin, 1767), p. ii.
[3] Thomas Sheridan, *Coriolanus, or the Roman Matron*, (Dublin, 1760), p.ii.

The objective of this thesis is to examine the earliest Irish appropriations of Shakespeare, to explore this interpretation of the bard's relationship with his earliest adapters and to consider to what extent contemporary Anglo-Irish relations informed or shaped this unique set of texts. As such, the thesis seeks to build on recent interest in Irish responses to and revisions of Shakespeare, as evidenced by such publications as *Shakespeare and the Irish Writer* by Janet Clare and Stephen O'Neill (editors), and Rebecca Steinberger's *Shakespeare and Twentieth-Century Irish Drama: Conceptualizing Identity and Staging Boundaries*. However, it also looks to extend knowledge of Shakespeare's reception in Ireland by attending to neglected texts from the late-seventeenth to mid-eighteenth centuries, and in doing so to separate itself from a particularly concentrated body of research into the Irish revival authors and to shed new light upon the foundational texts of this complex relationship between Shakespeare and Irish authors. The thesis will focus on adaptations of Shakespeare prior to the turn of the nineteenth century; Thomas Duffett and Nahum Tate from the seventeenth century as well as later works by Thomas Sheridan and Macnamara Morgan. It will demonstrate how these writers reconstructed what Robin Bates in *Shakespeare and the Cultural Colonization of Ireland* (London: Routledge, 2008) describes as Shakespeare's 'cultural impressment' of Ireland and explore the ways in which the Shakespearean text can be said to take on a newfound significance in the hands of Irish authors. As a final consideration, the thesis will attempt to determine to what extent these writers may be perceived as transgressive figures on the British stage, in spite of the respected positions within the king's theatre held by individuals such as Nahum Tate. Is it plausible to suggest that the reworking of Shakespeare's 'cultural impressment' of Ireland, if such a thing exists, was an offensive act and not merely a defensive one?

The thesis will primarily employ a historically-informed postcolonial framework for these purposes, since postcolonialism as a discipline has shown itself particularly useful in recognising and dealing with the dual nationhoods evident across the writers considered here, perhaps most notably in the work of Edward Said. Similarly, historicism as an approach presents itself as flexible and self-reflective enough to consider an early-modern text without forcing modern and anachronistic interpretations upon it. Using this combination, it is possible to chart the links between the plays and their contemporary moment on both an individual and collective basis. As many of the texts were produced by individuals with allegiances

to both Ireland and England, a primary area of inquiry is the status of the texts themselves: are they specifically 'Irish' adaptations? What does such a category signify? Initially, it seems to suggest a form of reactionary literature, where the contemporary stereotypes of 'Irishness' – wild, uncivilised, unlawful – are recast, becoming either reversed or validated in the adaptations of the period. Chapter one will consider this question of how one can understand these adaptations or authors to be 'Irish', as well as other primary concerns such as whether a historicist approach is most effective for this set of texts. Chapter two delves into the thesis's central texts, and will concern itself primarily with Nahum Tate and the fight for political power staged in his adaptations of *King Lear* and *Richard II*. Of central importance to this thesis will be a consideration of how the subtleties of this struggle develop in Tate's play, and whether the overlaps with contemporary politics, whilst clearly interesting, have any substance. Chapter three, similarly, will examine power struggles within the plays of Duffett, Sheridan and Macnamara – Shakespeare's other Irish adapters – and as with Tate will seek to set down overlaps between certain implicit readings and historical and political contexts. Chapter four, finally, looks to expand on these discussions of kingliness and power struggle, and will consider more closely the 'everyman' characters throughout the urtexts and adaptations. In doing so, it seeks to build upon the previous chapters to produce a more complete picture of social structure – and the differences therein – of Shakespeare's plays and those of his Irish adapters.

Chapter I

Defining 'Irish' Adaptation

Tempted in foreign nation by that foe,
Which both my soul and body's health envies,
And vexed with several strange perplexities,
Whose cause or reason I could never know,
Or why my mind should mourn afflicted so. [...]
As I have my native Country changed
So likewise from the world I may be weaned:
And as my weed with nation is estranged,
I so may shine in Christian arms unfeigned:

- Barnaby Barnes, 'Tempted in Foreign Nation by that Foe', from *A Divine Century of Spiritual Sonnets* (1595).

For those of the sixteenth century, and even extending to the eighteenth century, there is a perceived inherent link between location and identity, and in many regards this is driven by distinctions in national and local identities. For the writers Nahum Tate, Thomas Duffett, Thomas Sheridan and Macnamara Morgan, this question of nationality was not limited to the political tracts of the era, but extended to identity on stage also, and their adaptations of Shakespeare show many elements of having been influenced by just such a discourse. However, the historicising of nationhood in this way often calls for much subtlety, not least because of the difficulty experienced in assigning meaningful nationalities to old sources without forcing modern understandings and boundaries upon them. In a very apparent sense, all nations are human constructs, and are non-extant outside of the human framework. However, this itemising of nations applies not only to the act of drawing borders between countries, but also stretches to the psyche of those within such margins, and every nation and community of people tends to perceive itself as having defining origins and characteristics which set it apart from others. It is this latter type of constructed boundary between nations which is the central theme of Benedict Anderson's

Imagined Communities, where the author tracks, from the Enlightenment, the development of the defining origins of nations in what was an increasingly secularised world where focus turned away from communities based around a commonality of religious belief, and more towards smaller, geographically-defined, nations. Anderson identifies, on a very global scale, the process by which all peoples produce a set of ideals which ties the nation together though self-identification.

While Anderson's scope is extremely broad in its coverage, Richard Helgerson's *Forms of Nationhood* and David Baker's *Between Nations* have usefully extended the concept of an imagined community and applied it directly to Britain. In addition, both Helgerson and Baker extend Anderson's argument to include the Early Modern period of nation-building, where the basis for much of the change later realised in the Enlightenment was laid. Though both Helgerson and Baker use Anderson's imagined communities to grasp the foundations of a British identity, they do so in slightly different ways. Helgerson prefers a synchronic approach to the poetry, law, cartography, theatre, accounts of British expansionism and religious practices to identify the very explicit process by which the British people carved out their own sense of identity and began to represent itself as a single, coherent community. By contrast, Baker considers that England has always had much difficulty in outlining its own national boundaries and identity against those of its closest neighbours, and that the process often found its greatest successes when the imagining of England was something made implicit or unsaid in the text, as opposed to the very overt references favoured by Helgerson. This interpretation of the formation of an English national psyche emphasises the fluidity and inherent instability of the process of nation building.

Both Helgerson and Baker picture the Early Modern era to be a foundation period in this process – even if this was not an original consideration of Anderson's – and as a result one author who is by necessity placed at the centre of this 'writing of England' (or Britain) is William Shakespeare, whose histories in particular can be viewed as indispensible to the 'formation' of Britain in the popular psyche. In *The Making of the National Poet: Shakespeare* Michael Dobson tracks the reasons surrounding Shakespeare's posthumous elevation from a successful but essentially straightforward playwright to a British national icon, and additionally notes the crucial role which adaptation played in this process. Adaptation, for Dobson, helped alter Shakespeare to the tastes of successive generations, most notably in the

Restoration period, where there was an emphasis on expunging the 'great Original' of the 'barbarity' of his own time. Within a century of Charles II's restoration to the throne, Shakespeare had been elevated from an archaic Elizabethan playwright into a transcendent figure in British literature, free from the shackles of time and tradition. It is this sense of Shakespeare as an all-encompassing form that secured his position as national poet, and as a result a central role in the formation of a British identity. To a similar end, Leah Marcus in *Puzzling Shakespeare: Local Reading and its Discontents* places Shakespeare's plays – with a particular emphasis placed on *Measure for Measure*, *Cymbeline* and *1 Henry V* – in their historical context, but rejects that the work has some imminent transcendence, instead favouring a view that the plays tend to become involved with 'local' or topical significances.

One of the more intriguing syntheses of these 'imagined identities' is in the shared record of Ireland and England, each of whom played a significant role in the formation of the other's national identity. In *Mere Irish and Fior Ghael*, Joop Leersen questions whether an Irish national consciousness was in formation prior to the nationalist ideology which marked the nineteenth century. Bringing together both local and foreign sources, including twelfth century English writings, Leersen finds that the strands which would eventually form the 'imagined community' of Ireland were indeed in development far earlier than the nationalist movement, and that the English-Irish 'imagological system', (which is a collective form of expression of national uniqueness and identity) remained fluid throughout the period, reacting to political changes between the countries, and ultimately defined the national psyche of both. Such a consideration is central to this thesis, as it aims to establish the presence of a written Irish identity through Shakespeare long before the nineteenth century and its Gaelic Revival. Liz Curtis, reacting to anti-Irish sentiments in Britain throughout the 1970s, considers in *Nothing but the Same Old Story: The Roots of Anti-Irish Racism* the emergence of an Irish identity which was produced in England, entirely out of England's own imagining (or perhaps imaging) of the Irish. Curtis focuses on the image of the ape-like, violent and barbaric Irishman prevalent from the seventeenth century, and which plays a major role in this thesis, but has been criticised for largely overlooking the Victorian-era representation of the 'amiable,

stupid Paddy'.[4] In contrast to Curtis's examination of English identification of Ireland, Steve Garner considers the development of an Irish racial identity in Irish literature, specifically considering Ireland as the European Union's only state to have undergone colonisation. In *Racism in the Irish Experience* Garner examines Irish racial consciousness from the colonisation of the sixteenth century, the mass emigrations to England and America, to the extensive immigration of the modern day. What is apparent from this literature is that the foundations of both Irish and English identities are related in complex ways and over an extended period of time. Shakespeare, as Britain's national poet, will inevitably feature as a touchstone of identity formation in the period.

One of the ways in which this dialogue can occur is through the appropriation of the plays, and the effect which contemporary colonial or political discourse can have over these adaptations, something which becomes even more apparent when the tendency of the appropriation is to contest or revise these culturally established representations. There has of late been an increase in the theorisation of adaptations of Shakespeare, and the emergence of anthologies such as Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier's *Adaptations of Shakespeare: A Critical Anthology of Plays from the Seventeenth Century to the Present* is evidence of this. Much theory surrounding adaptation even goes so far as to problematise the categorising of such works as 'adaptation' in favour of other descriptors, such as 'appropriation'. Margaret Kidnie's *Shakespeare and the Problem of Adaptation* addresses this issue, but extends the argument to say that how one defines what constitutes an adaptation can shed light on the Shakespearean urtext. Kidnie identifies that adaptation is regularly made necessary by social change, but while it can often be required in this way, it is also 'culturally problematic' in the sense that it is often distinguished from the faithfully or 'truly' Shakespearean, whereas Kidnie favours an approach to adaptation as an iteration or performance of the text. This sense of adaptation – or at least one subsection of it – is the starting point for Richard Schoch's *Not Shakespeare: Bardolatry and Burlesque in the Nineteenth Century*. Basing his argument on the assumption that nineteenth century burlesque was 'not Shakespeare', but rather an illegitimate and inferior offspring of traditional Shakespearean theatre, Schoch explores the ways in which Shakespeare burlesques

---

[4] John Darby, 'The Problem of English Racism', *Fortnight*, 211 (December 1984 - January 1985), (p. 19).

such as *Hamlet Travestie* (1810), through their liveliness and energy, as well as being self-consciously aware of their own bawdiness and vulgarity, become in actuality more faithfully 'Shakespearean' than their supposedly traditional counterparts. These approaches to the categorisation of adaptation and burlesque are important considerations, for they establish adaptation's dependence on or independence from the urtext, and moreover question what is substantial in the link between the works in question. This process is vital to any work which, like this thesis, attempts to establish the overarching influences upon these links.

In spite of this increasingly theorised area of adaptations of Shakespeare, and despite the influence of earlier periods on the 'writing' of national identities, there has been, perhaps understandably given the influence of the Gaelic literary revival, a strong emphasis of critical attention handed to later generations of Irish writers. Rebecca Steinberger in *Shakespeare and Twentieth Century Irish Drama* considers the plays of Brian Friel and Sean O'Casey in relation to *Henry V* and *Richard II*, and identifies both Friel and O'Casey as representative of a larger trend in the Irish literature of their day. Though Steinberger's estimation of Shakespeare as sympathetic with the Irish 'other' is somewhat in opposition to the assertions of this thesis, her grounding of the plays in their imperialist and nationalist politics, as well as the argument that Irish playwrights were reacting to a language of domination offers many interesting overlaps with the earlier authors that are considered here. Robin Bates, in contrast, views Shakespeare as central to the cultural colonisation of Ireland, and concentrating on Sean O'Casey, Samuel Beckett, W. B. Yeats, Bernard Shaw, James Joyce, and Seamus Heaney, reveals how these authors resisted or reacted to the process identified by Bates as cultural 'impressment', which is an attempt to represent a nation as 'both different enough to require justification for inclusion [but] similar enough to be included'.[5] While Bates does much to track the overt representations of Shakespeare's Irish, such as Macmorris, the more implicit elements of the 'stage Irishman' are largely overlooked, and it is largely these more clandestine elements of the texts which this thesis seeks to explore. In *Shakespeare and the Irish Writer*, editors Janet Clare and Stephen O'Neill consider the influence and interpretations of Shakespeare in the Irish literary tradition. Contributors to the work track Shakespeare's cultural associations in twentieth century Ireland through

---

[5] Robin Bates, *Shakespeare and the Cultural Colonization of Ireland* (London: Routledge, 2008), p. 3.

the works of the period's most renowned authors, and expose the creative ways in which adaptations of Shakespeare shadow the complex history between Ireland and England.

In contrast to the recent critical attention afforded to this eminent set of Irish writers and their relationship with Shakespeare, the majority of examinations into their predecessors each seem somewhat dated or singular in their focus. H.F. Scott-Thomas's 1934 article 'Nahum Tate and the Seventeenth Century', in which Thomas makes an account of Tate as a sentimental Irishman out of step in a rationalist Britain, makes extremely broad strokes in his discussion of Tate, the Irish and the British as a whole. His summation of Tate's persona as always with 'one face turned towards the past and the other looking to the future' is denied by Christopher Spencer's book *Nahum Tate* (1972), an original work on the author which still remains a senior source on his life and works. Spencer finds that Tate was a traditionalist, and that this shaped the esteem with which he regarded Shakespeare, which was at the time extremely unfashionable. Indeed, Spencer attributes the paucity of personal information on Tate (there being no similar lack of official records and documents with which to piece together his more formal employments and movements) to this aspect of his character, pointing to the fact that Tate in his writings, and across all his chosen genres, followed tradition rather than innovated. However, though Spencer spends much time piecing together the relationship Tate had with his predecessor and patron, John Dryden, including the reasons behind Tate's silence upon Dryden's death, there is little consideration of the author's Irish foundations and how this manifests in his work. Similarly, Ronald Eugene DiLorenzo's *The Three Burlesque Plays of Thomas Duffett: The Empress of Morocco; The Mock-Tempest; Psyche Debauch'd* (1973) forgivably devotes its critical material (appearing alongside the text of the plays) entirely to Duffett's place in burlesque history, and while it does help to establish Duffett's short-lived eminence on the London stage, it overlooks the author's Irish foundations.

The basis of twentieth century Irish writers' responses to Shakespeare, utilising adaptation to signify Ireland *through* the scope of his plays, can be traced back to his earliest adapters in the country. With the great emphasis modern criticism places on Gaelic Revival authors, and the continuing study into Shakespeare's reception in Ireland, as well as adaptation as a general concept, it is timely to re-evaluate these foundation texts in light of current approaches to Shakespeare and

adaptation. Thanks to Anderson's theorising of 'imagined communities' it is possible now to reconsider the approaches taken by Spencer, DiLorenzo and others, and track the development of an Irish identity through adaptation of Shakespeare, not as a 'big bang' moment in nineteenth century Ireland, but rather as a longstanding and cumulative process. Leersen's *Mere Irish and Fior Ghael* begins this process by establishing the presence of an Irish national consciousness in the centuries prior to the nationalist movement in the nineteenth century. This thesis seeks to extend earlier criticism by reconsidering Tate, Duffett, and other early Irish adapters as a set of writers defined by a collective experience, rather than separately as individuals, and will show how this shared background and particular sense of national identity surfaces in their respective adaptations.

I

One way of thinking about the English representation of otherness on stage and in literature is, as Michael Neill does, in terms of five perceived dichotomies which were prevalent for a long time in English literature.[6] Neill's dichotomous approach to such a complex intercultural relationship is in some respects slightly binding, running the risk of losing much of the nuance present in the literature, however the nature of his logic does gesture towards the consistency and prevalence of particular themes down through several centuries of English writing. In 'Broken English and Broken Irish', Neill identifies five distinct categories of difference between 'positive' and 'negative' characterisms, and notes the manner in which Early Modern representations of Ireland and the Irish serve as the basis for this latter group. Neill places these five values – wilderness, wandering, barbarity, lawlessness and superstition – in opposition to English ideals of garden, settlement, civility, lawfulness and religiousness, respectively.

Though many of these tropes are classical in origin, it is practically impossible to pinpoint a particular moment at which they were assimilated into English literature as means for describing Ireland or other locations, if for no other reason than there is no apparent consensus amongst historians as to when the national labels of 'Ireland' and 'England' can be applied without being anachronistic. In the first millennium AD, and as late as the twelfth century, there are many writings

---

[6] Michael Neill, 'Broken English and Broken Irish: Nation, Language, and the Optic of Power in Shakespeare's Histories', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 1:45, No. 1 (1994), 1-30.

produced in Irish monasteries by monks of English origin. These texts mostly detail the legendary history of Ireland, however a notable exception is Giraldus Cambrensis (Gerald of Wales), a monk of Anglo-Norman descent, living in Ireland in the late twelfth century. Giraldus's *Topography of Ireland* (c.1188) contains an account of the Irish people, culture and customs which is both extensive and critical. Giraldus's writing is certainly amongst the earliest examples there is of a text which is written on Ireland from the point of view of a settler, and which supports the notion that Ireland is a wild, lawless territory, populated by uncivilised, barbaric people in need of English culturalisation. Over the next number of centuries there occurs an expansion of Giraldus's accounts by a plethora of prominent writers; and in what follows, texts by Edmund Spenser, Fynes Moryson, John Davies, Josias Bodley, and others will be essayed, but such a list is by no means extensive. Notably similar accounts exist by a long series of authors, some of the most notable being William Camden, *Britannia* (1586); Robert Payne, *Brief Description of Ireland* (1589); John Dymmock, *Treatise of Ireland* (c. 1600); and Luke Gernon, *Discourse of Ireland* (1620). After the Elizabethan era there are still a number of interesting texts extant, particularly those produced by Oliver Cromwell's officers and administrators, and evidenced also in Cromwell's own letters. Gerard Boate's *Ireland's Natural History* (1652) and later still Richard Lawrence's *Interest of Ireland in Its Trade and Wealth* (1682) both explore the commercial opportunities for the English in Ireland and support colonisation. The physician William Petty, who also came to Ireland with Cromwell, wrote *Hiberniae Delineatio* (1685) and *The Political Anatomy of Ireland* (1691), both of which are critical of Irish customs and culture. The number of such writings begins to diminish in the 1700s, and by the end of the eighteenth century, a new type of writing on Ireland emerges, which might now be recognised as travel literature. This is given rise to by the Seven Years War, which made it extremely dangerous for upper-class Britons to travel to their favoured classical relics in Rome, to the cradle of the Renaissance in Florence, or to Paris to experience and learn from foreign court life. Combined with the new literary movement, Romanticism, Britons flocked to the England's Lake District, the Scottish Highlands and the west of Ireland in search of the sublime and the picturesque. This brand of writing, whilst not entirely positive (although this was by no means specific to Ireland[7]) nonetheless

---

[7] British reactions to foreign lands and customs have traditionally been mixed. See Lynne Withey,

marked a step away from the political tracts of the preceding centuries, and the generally racialist attitude to the indigenous population of Ireland propagated by such texts as *Ireland's Natural History* (1652) and *Hiberniae Delineatio* (1685).

Edmund Spenser's *View of the Present State of Ireland*, written in 1590, was not published until 1633, after his death, but was widely circulated before this time. The *View* is likely the most known and recognisable of English tracts on Ireland, and has been a site of contention and debate since its initial printing by James Ware in *Ancient Irish Chronicles*. Indeed, Ware himself is quick to point out that Spenser's tract is severely outdated, and goes to some effort to distance modern politics from the ideas held within. In it, Spenser proposes that Ireland may never come fully under British control until the Irish language and customs had been eradicated, and in addition is strongly critical of Irish religious and law systems, portraying each to be primitive and essentially entangled with the soil and other 'earthy' elements. The Irish people are said to be superstitious, in contrast to English piousness, and lacking modern laws such as were present in England's relatively well developed law system. Irish people in the *View* are figured as wild and uncivilised, unable to fend for themselves, and living in conditions which seem fit for only animals. They are unsettled wanderers, in contrast to the English value of towns and settlement. The *View* portrays Ireland as different or 'backward' enough to require English civilisation (that is, colonisation), but at the same time similar enough to prosper from it by aligning the Irish with the historic English; people deemed to have lacked the advanced civilisation of modern England, but did eventually develop it, proving their capacity to become civilised. There is an additional depth applied to this theme in the very prevalent fear of 'degeneration', or the process by which a wild land such as Ireland could affect an individual's very identity, causing them to regress back to a state of wilderness themselves. Stephen Greenblatt comments that Spenser himself felt his own values threatened by his liberal and uncivilised neighbours in his Munster estate.[8] In this way, the Irish are represented as rough and unsophisticated, but not necessarily evil or malicious, and these representations are primarily intended to bring English opinion towards civilising the Irish, and not to discourage them away from it.

Grand Tours and Cook's Tours (London: Aurum, 1998), esp pp. 14-17 & 33-38.
[8] Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (University of Chicago Press, 1980), pp. 184-7.

It is because Spenser's *View* stands uniquely as the most prominent, renowned and sophisticated expression of England's social experimentation in Ireland that in what follows the term 'Spenserian' will commonly be used to describe what was in fact a longstanding tradition in English literature, which in turn was drawn from prominent classical themes. However, the use of such a term can be highly problematic, and there is some lively debate regarding how representative Spenser's dialogue is of prevailing English attitudes towards Ireland. Brady states that when Spenser began work on the *View*, he 'was undergoing something of a personal crisis', *The Faerie Queene* not having received the recognition, nor he the advancement from it, that he had sought. Returning to Ireland on a far smaller pension than he had aspired to, Spenser's problems grew with an unsuccessful pursuit of Elizabeth Boyle. Subsequently, Spenser fell ill and became involved in a lawsuit against a neighbour, and with this Brady concludes that 'as his views on Ireland crystallized, Spenser was becoming an embittered and embattled man'.[9] Viewed in such terms, the arguments contained in the *View* might not be ascribed to a popular English desire to claim Ireland by any means necessary, but rather out of personal frustration. According to this version of Spenser's character and influences, to describe the traditional representations of Ireland in English literature as 'Spenserian' would be inaccurate, and to associate Spenser specifically and personally with the longstanding dialogue begot by people such as Giraldus Cambrensis would be unhelpful.

However, there is much to suggest that Spenser's volume was indeed informed by and related to both historical and prevailing attitudes towards Ireland, and not least of these is Nicholas Canny's personal response to Brady.[10] Canny rejects that Spenser's experience in or opinions of Ireland were to any extent unique or particular, and criticises Brady's rejection of the notion that Spenser's *View* was representative of wider attitudes towards Ireland. Certainly, considering the numerous texts mentioned above, which is in no way exhaustive, it is plain that this Irish trope did not begin or end with Edmund Spenser, but that his *View of the Present State* may be taken as exemplary of English writings of Ireland and in the empire more generally, and as such I find the term 'Spenserian', used to describe a

---

[9] Ciaran Brady, 'Spenser's Irish Crisis: Humanism and Experience in the 1590s', *Past and Present*, 11 (May, 1986), 17-49, (pp. 41-2).
[10] Nicholas Canny, 'Debate: "Spenser's Irish Crisis: Humanism and Experience in the 1590s"', *Past and Present*, 120 (Aug, 1989), 201-9.

discourse in which Ireland and the Irish are illustrated in English literature as wild, lawless and barbaric, as entirely appropriate.

It can not be said with any certainty that Shakespeare did or did not read Spenser's *View of the Present State of Ireland*, although the text was distributed extensively in manuscript form during Shakespeare's most active years. However, this thesis will observe many cases in which aspects of his plays which do suggest a knowledge of the manuscript's content, and the manner in which this prompted a reaction in seventeenth and eighteenth century Irish adaptations, similarly aware of the longstanding tradition within English literature and culture and Spenser's role in it. The printing by Geoffrey Keating of *Foras Feasa ar Éirinn* (c.1634), meaning 'Foundation of Knowledge in Ireland', which includes his response to Spenser, indicates how prevalent this particular text was in the Irish psyche in the seventeenth century. In such a way, Irish authors enjoy a relationship with Shakespeare which is complicated in a manner distinct from others, as they exorcise characters such as Richard II and King Lear of the wildness and barbarism which is so fundamental to their identities in Shakespeare. These ideas of incivility and lawlessness may have signified little or much to Shakespeare himself, however they took on a newfound – and positively unique – significance in the hands of his Irish adapters, in the process of which was formed a distinct body of literature; a small, seemingly insignificant and now largely forgotten set of plays which seem subtly but unmistakably influenced by their contemporary moment.

II

One of the most primary questions facing any research into Irish adaptations of Shakespeare is in regards to just how one defines an 'Irish' adaptation, and to understand what such a category implies. For the purposes of this thesis, an 'Irish' text will be understood to encompass those adaptations of Shakespeare produced by authors whose formative years or habitual residency were in Ireland, who can be considered as having an Irish or dual English-Irish identity, and whose writing can reasonably be interpreted as having been informed by these foundations. This will hopefully separate figures such as Nahum Tate, who grew up in Dublin but in adulthood moved to London, from other figures, such as Spenser, who migrated in the opposite direction but whose identity would not be considered partly Irish.

Nahum Tate ranks as the most recognisable Irish adapter of Shakespeare in the seventeenth century, nonetheless a brief biographical overview is a useful first step in unravelling his Shakespearean adaptations. Tate was born Nahum Teate in Dublin in 1652, into a lineage of Puritan clergymen. Both his father and grandfather were named Faithful Teate,[11] and his mother was Katherine Kenetie Teate. The younger of the two Faithfuls moved the family to London from 1654 to 1660, before returning to Dublin, and by 1668 Nahum Teate entered Trinity College in the city (graduating in 1672 with a Bachelor of Arts). Sometime over the following four years, Teate moved to London and had started writing full-time. Around 1677 he altered the spelling of his name to Tate, and it was under this name that he published in quick succession his three adaptations of Shakespeare; *The Sicilian Usurper* (1681; from *Richard II*), *King Lear* (1681) and *The Ingratitude of a Commonwealth* (1682; from *Coriolanus*). *The Sicilian Usurper* was banned from the stage on its third night, for apparent allusions to contemporary politics. Odai Johnson argues that in Tate's staging of a popular rebellion from an exiled claimant to the crown, he also 'dramatizes civil war, forced the abdication of a legitimate monarch, imprisons that monarch, and the executes him', and that it is not coincidental that all of this occurred 'at the personal theatre of the son of a King who lost his life under remarkably similar circumstances'.[12] In addition, Johnson finds that this play celebrating regicide and mutiny occurred 'only days after the most famous treason trial of the entire Popish Plot, in which William Howard, Viscount Stafford, was tried and convicted for conspiring to bring about the death of the King'.[13] Thus, Johnson interestingly draws a parallel between Tate's supposed subterfuge in the King's theatre and a true story surrounding James Scott, Duke of Monmouth, who quite literally hid in the King's own theatre house, plotting his rebellion (which later failed, leading to his execution) whilst being searched for, charged with treason. Johnson's argument for Tate's subversive politics is particularly interesting in light of his dual nationality, and any significance in this link will be teased out over these pages.

---

[11] John Seymour, 'Faithful Teate', *The Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland*, Sixth Series, 10:1 (1920), 39-45.
[12] Odai Johnson, 'Empty Houses: The suppression of Tate's *Richard II*', *Theatre Journal*, 47:4, Eighteenth-Century Representations (1995), 503-516, (p. 506).
[13] Ibid.

In contrast to the embarrassment caused by *Richard II* – the play was pulled from the stage on Poet's Day leaving little doubt as to where the crown apportioned blame for the debacle – *King Lear*'s reception was positively rapturous, and indeed it was Tate's version of the drama which dominated the stage for the following two centuries as later audiences preferred Tate's 'civilising' influence over the barbarity of Shakespeare's final act. In addition to his adaptations of Elizabethan drama,[14] Tate was also an original stage writer, a poet (most notable collaborating with John Dryden to produce the second part of *Absalom and Achitophel*), a librettist for Henry Purcell's opera *Dida and Aeneas*, a hymnist and a translator. In 1692 Tate succeeded Thomas Shadwell as Poet Laureate, holding the position for 22 years until he died, in hiding from his creditors, on August 12th 1715.

In contrast to Tate, whose life and times have been well established, almost nothing is known of his very close contemporary Thomas Duffett (alternatively spelled Duffet). Duffett was an Irish playwright who enjoyed a period of intense activity on the English stage in the mid 1670s. He first wrote *The Spanish Rogue*, (printed 1674) and *The Amorous Old Woman, or 'Tis Well If It Take* (1674) both unsuccessful original plays, before turning his attention towards burlesquing other authors. Duffett worked for the King's company, and so his later workload is aimed primarily at satirising the output of the rival Duke's company. For this reason, Duffett's canon includes satires of Shadwell's operatic version of Dryden and Davenant's *Tempest*, itself derived from Shakespeare, as well as parodies of Elkanah Settle's *Empress of Morocco* (originally staged 1673, Duffett's farce in 1674) and Thomas Shadwell's *Psyche* (1675), re-released as *Psyche Debauched* in 1678. Unfortunately, very little is known about Duffett aside from his literary output, although a Thomas Duffett confessed to forgery in 1677,[15] and given the author's apparent familiarity with the seedy underside of London society, eminently apparent in *The Mock Tempest*, there is at least some grounds for connection between this Thomas Duffett and what is known of the author.

Duffett and Tate between them form the foremost body of literature dealt with in this thesis, and it is interesting to note how similar these two authors were in

---

[14] Tate not only adapted Shakespeare's plays, but a wide range of authors. He adapted *Cuckhold's Haven* (1685) from Chapman and Marsden's *Eastward Ho*, Aston Cockayne's *Trappolin suppos'd a Prince* was repackaged as *Duke and no Duke* (1685), and *The Island Princess , or, Generous Portugals* (1687) from John Fletcher's work of the same name.
[15] Ronald Eugene DiLorenzo (ed.), *The Three Burlesque Plays of Thomas Duffett* (Iowa: University of Iowa Press, 1972).

their own lifetimes, but how disparate the reception of their work becomes subsequently. Both were born in Ireland, both became professional authors on the London stage at almost the same time period, and both relied heavily on adapting the works of other authors. However, where Tate achieved fame and recognition for his work, and was continually well remembered long after his death (although less so from the nineteenth century onwards), Duffett drifted into almost complete anonymity and has received almost no critical attention. However, one thing which binds these two authors is their unique position within the Anglo-Irish or English-Irish discourse of the seventeenth century, being Irish playwrights, in England, adapting English plays which themselves were potentially subject to influence by works produced by those who had tracked in the opposite direction.

In what seems an uncanny eighteenth-century reproduction of the differences between Tate and Duffett, Thomas Sheridan and McNamara Morgan stand at opposite poles of the literary spectrum. Sheridan was born in County Cavan in 1719, son of Thomas and Elizabeth Sheridan and Godson of Jonathan Swift, and was educated first in London before finally earning a Bachelor of Arts at Trinity College, Dublin in 1739. Having few prospects, Sheridan turned to the stage, and his first play *Captain O'Blunder; or, The Brave Irishman* (written 1743, printed 1754) is a text well established as having been aware of 'stage-Irish' characterisms,[16] a text which in itself shows awareness of the 'stage Irishman'.[17] In the mid 1740s Sheridan became a rapid success on the London stage, at both Covent Garden and Drury Lane, and, returning once again to Dublin, became manager of the Theatre Royal. Sheridan moved back and forth between London and Dublin before finally resettling under David Garrick at Drury Lane, and eventually formed a school of elocution for boys in Bath. Although in 1771 he had once again returned to act on the Dublin stage, Sheridan died in Margate, Kent on August 14th 1778.

In contrast to Sheridan, and much like Duffett, little is known about McNamara Morgan (c. 1720-62) other than what is contained in the works he left behind. In addition to being a playwright, Morgan was a poet and a barrister, and like the other three authors considered in this thesis he spent time writing for the London stage, although it is unclear whether this time was sufficient or significant enough to

---

[16] J.O. Bartley, 'The Development of a Stock Character I: The stage Irishman to 1800', *Modern Language Review*, 37:4 (Oct 1942), 438-47, (pp. 442-443).
[17] Ibid, (p. 443).

complicate his sense of national identity, or whether he can be thought of as a more straightforwardly 'Irish' author. Morgan's most remembered work, *Philoclea*, an adaptation of Philip Sidney's *Arcadia*, was heavily influenced by his compatriot and contemporary Spranger Barry, and debuted in Covent Garden on January 22nd 1754. His Shakespearean adaptation, *The Sheep-Shearing, or Florizel and Perdita,* is a pastoral comedy taken from *The Winter's Tale*, and debuted in Dublin (1747) before being later revived at Covent Garden (1754). Thomas Arne (1710-1778) provided the music, and the adaptation was eventually published in 1767.

An author absent from this thesis due to a lack of 'Irish' imagery in his chosen urtext, but worth mention, is James Worsdale (c.1692-1767). A playwright, painter, actor and libertine, Worsdale penned *A Cure for a Scold* (1735) from Shakespeare's *Taming of the Shrew*, and was later one of the founding members of Dublin's Hellfire Club; a group of individuals devoted to debauchery and excess, who were based on Montpellier Hill in County Dublin. Worsdale moved constantly between London and Dublin, and so alongside the four main authors in this thesis, what becomes apparent from these brief recounts of the lives of Irish adapters is the recurring question of dual identity or dual allegiances. As a result, it is important to be quite precise on the matter that in these pages 'Irish' adaptations should be taken to refer to works informed by an individual's foundations in that country, and not to imply that the authors are unambiguously Irish, nor the adaptation shaped only by this single influence. Tate, Duffett, Sheridan and Morgan were all born in Ireland, and though for some of them the question of nationality is a matter of debate, their collective works as a whole are suggestive of an additional significance which is assumed by the texts in the hands of Irish authors.

III

In what follows, there will be a particular emphasis placed on the historical background and cultural milieu giving rise to adaptations by Tate, Duffett, Sheridan and Morgan, so as to examine on both an individual and collective level what aspects of the prevailing social and historical conditions influenced the changes applied by Shakespeare's Irish adapters. However, to view a group of texts as by necessity involved with (or perhaps even defined by) these external influences is not entirely without controversy, and such historicist approaches are open to certain criticism. In

the third note of *Thesis on Feuerbach,* Karl Marx criticises historicism for claiming that man is solely the product of his circumstances, and that 'changed men' and 'changed upbringing' are linked by necessity.[18] To Marx, man produces circumstances, and not vice-versa, and this natural process leads to 'revolutionary practise', an ideal towards which Marx's mind is clearly much weighted. Viewed a similar way, but turning the focus towards the written word, it is possible to say that literature and history, being both produced by man, should be viewed side-by-side, as opposed to one defining the other. As such, historicism has a tendency to reduce a text to a mere by-product of history, and often overlooks much of the subtlety necessary to literary criticism.

While the limitations of Historicism are very much worth bearing in mind throughout this thesis, the approach has many relative strengths in the area of adaptation. One of the most significant of these is that Historicism does not seek out a singular defining structure in literature, or confine texts to one singular focus, but rather searches for and delineates a multiplicity of shaping influences. Stephen Greenblatt defends New Historicism as an approach to Early Modern literature. Arguing that historicists reject the notion of a 'single, master discourse',[19] and that in turn writers in the Early Modern era were themselves writing 'out of conflicted and ill-sorted motives',[20] Greenblatt finds that 'even those texts that sought most ardently to speak for a monolithic power could be shown to be the sites of institutional and ideological contestation'.[21] What is apparent, however, is that much of what Greenblatt finds effectual about Historicist readings into the Early Modern is also particularly appropriate to these adaptations. It is this proliferation of conflicting perspectives and deviating ideologies (even within the same individuals) that distinguishes many Irish adaptations of Shakespeare (as well, perhaps, as the Shakespearean texts themselves), coming as they do from a set of writers whose national identities and political allegiances are never far from complication or corruption. The historicist method allows for attention to these multifaceted and multilayered aspects of local and national modalities.

---

[18] Karl Marx & Friedrich Engels, *The German Ideology, Including Theses on Feuerbach* (New York: Prometheus, 1998), pp. 572-3.
[19] Greenblatt, *Shakespearean Negotiations* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), p. 3.
[20] Ibid.
[21] Ibid.

However, it is not only due to this complex sense of national identity of the authors involved that Historicism seems a most useful approach in elucidating the most significant shaping influences on these adaptations. This is the case because adaptation would seem to operate in less of a comparative 'vacuum' than an original creative work, which can emerge from a multitude of sources. In such cases Historicism can only conjecture over which elements or contexts seem most influential. Whereas relating the flows and trends of an 'original' to a fixed historical body or process can occasionally be disjointed and mutative, the urtext itself acts as a point of reference for the adaptation, allowing what is subsequently 'done' to a text to be clearly delineated. The historical process is often a critical influence on how a text is adapted, allowing a Historicist approach in particular to make assertions about the links and disjoints between the subject plays.

What sets an adaptation apart from its urtext is commonly a temporal or spatial disjunction between the two, though invariably this can be rendered potentially subjective by the local element of adaptation and the positioning of the urtext. This complication is one for which Historicism again allows room, however another consideration is that through the incorporation of a number of writers and texts, each of whom share a similarly complicated sense of identity, it is possible to focus on the common ground between them, and subsequently to link these tendencies with overarching influences such as historical trends or cultural sway. Using such a focus on the common ground shared by texts, the thesis will offer some insight into the historical trends or cultural incidents or milieu which overlap or complement the textual matter in significant-seeming ways, in the hope of shedding new light on the shaping forces of seventeenth and eighteenth century Irish adaptations of Shakespeare.

IV

Roland Barthes has stated that 'any text is an intertext',[22] which is to say that any cultural expression is by necessity bound up with its artistic and/or social milieu, and this is something which incorporates not only the text's own contemporary moment, but the shaping of previous culture also. This concept of intertextuality throws up significant dilemmas regarding originality, and this is something which we can

---

[22] Roland Barthes, 'Theory of the Text', in Robert Young, *Untying the Text: A Poststructuralist Reader* (London: Routledge, 1981), 31-47, p. 39.

perceive as being complicated by literary adaptation, and made yet more problematic by considering adaptations of Shakespeare, who was himself an adapter of texts. However, in few modern circles would Shakespeare be thought of as a 'mere' adapter, and so this begs the question – when is an adaptation not an adaptation?

There are various worthy candidates for Shakespeare's supposed 'source texts' for (to name a few) *Hamlet*, *King Lear* and *The Tempest*,[23] but it may be that critics will never fully agree on which set of texts were most influential, or indeed if such a list can exist or whether Shakespeare's true sources have been forever lost. However, what is clear is that Shakespeare's plots are often borrowed from other sources, and so begs the question whether, or how, these plays are 'originals' in their own right. In spite of the provenance of his texts, Shakespeare's plays appeared in his own name, and even after his death, Nahum Tate's radically altered version of the play for two centuries dominated the stage as 'Shakespeare's' *King Lear* with alterations by Tate. There seems to be some sense of confusion at work on this side of adaptation; however such things do point towards the loose attitudes surrounding the concept of authorship in the Early Modern and Restoration periods. In the modern copyright era, the author is a far more clearly defined entity, but this still leaves some problems of adaptation. Each theatrical staging of a text inevitably brings its own identity and intertextualities to the work, and so performing a text would seem to be an act of adaptation in its own right. What separates an appropriation such as Paula Vogel's *Desdemona: A Play About A Handkerchief* apart from a theatrical staging of *Hamlet*, which interprets and stages Hamlet as a female,[24] but which seems to avoid the label of 'adaptation'? Margaret Kidnie explores this dilemma extensively in *Shakespeare and the Problem of Adaptation*.

> The difficulties, however, in distinguishing between Shakespeare and new
> drama 'based on' Shakespeare are immediately evident in stagings such as
> Charles Marowitz's *Hamlet* or Robert Lepage's *Elsinore* which cut and
> rearrange lines and scenes already familiar to spectators from the three

---

[23] *Hamlet* possibly came from *Ur-Hamlet*, a lost play potentially written by Thomas Kyd, with some elements also in *The Spanish Tragedy* by the same author, alternatively from the Norse epic *Amleth* or *Amlóði*, or indeed an Icelandic variant of the same. *King Lear* might originate from Holinshed's *Chronicle* or from *The True Chronicle History of King Leir* (author unknown), or some combination of these. *The Tempest* has no apparent single foundation text, but some seemingly influential sources were *Naufragium* by Erasmus, and William Strachey's eyewitness account of the Sea Venture shipwreck.
[24] Tony Howard offers a history of female Hamlets in *Women as Hamlet: Performance and Interpretation in Theatre, Film, and Fiction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

printed versions published in the twenty years between 1603 and 1623 Is the difference between Marowitz's and Lepage's directorial strategies and those used by most modern directors a matter of degree, or is every staging, perhaps, an adaptation?[25]

Kidnie initially locates the 'problem' in an 'unspoken belief that the play exists somewhere',[26] which is to say that there is a Platonic form which constitutes 'the play'. Against this, Kidnie argues that 'perceptions of a textual original necessarily extend well beyond any single text or document',[27] and by extension that the play 'is not an object at all, but rather a dynamic *process* that evolves over time in response to the needs and sensibilities of its users'.[28] What remains to be clarified is the role of adaptation in this 'process' that Kidnie refers to, and specifically here how Irish adaptations play their part in the process of Shakespeare.

Of the various theories of adaptation than could be put forward, the most compelling finds its basis in Jacques Derrida's concept of 'recontextualisation' or 'iterability'; the belief that 'every act of writing, of meaning, all motivated human endeavour, loses its original context, which cannot entirely enclose it, and plays itself out in a potential infinity of new contexts, in which the significance of the writing will inevitably be different […] from what it was'.[29] This process is defined by W.B. Worthen as 'performativity', referring to a question based on first principles; 'what are dramatic performances performances *of?*',[30] Worthen finds that the print edition and performance of a text alike can be considered an iteration of the text, as opposed to the text itself. It is precisely this iterability which is central to an understanding of adaptation, which is to say that the essence of adaptation lies in its ability to recontextualise, and to use this to shed new light on the play and its characters. This recontextualisation lends itself very easily to politicised adaptations of Shakespeare, and his plays are often the arena for gender or race discourse, such as in *Lear's Daughters* by the Women's Theatre Group and Elaine Feinstein, and Djanet Sears's *Harlem Duet*, or for political satire, as is the case with Bertolt Brecht's *Rise of Arturo*

---

[25] Margaret Jane Kidnie, *Shakespeare and the Problem of Adaptation* (London: Routledge, 2009), p. 3
[26] Ibid., p. 1
[27] Ibid., p. 2
[28] Ibid.
[29] Daniel Fischlin & Mark Fortier (eds.), *Adaptations of Shakespeare: A Critical Anthology of Plays from the Seventeenth Century to the Present* (London: Routledge, 2008), p. 90.
[30] W.B. Worthen, Drama, Performance and Performativity'. *PMLA*, 113 (1998), 1093-1107, p. 1100.

Ui. What is interesting about such adaptations is the way in which they can be responsible for solidifying what they interpret the 'meaning' of the text to be. According to Margaret Kidnie, a process of 'writing "back" to a master narrative depends, at least implicitly, on treating the work as a known quantity – so returning us to a model of identity in which the work, considered fixed, is always somewhere else'.[31] What is subsequently 'done' to the later text emphasises what is either overlooked by the reader or missing from the original or urtext, for example the emergence of a political adaptation of *The Tempest*, which necessarily politicises *The Tempest* as an original and binds it to be read in this way. Theory can posit that *The Tempest* is a play which opens itself up to colonial dialogue, but this doesn't by necessity change the 'essence' of the play since theory is always a matter of debate and divergence. This is a point on which adaptation and literary criticism deviate, as the latter must allow a greater degree of freedom and flexibility in its interpretation, positing contributing factors but avoiding suggestions of a singular defining dynamic.

As a result of adaptation's ability to solidify the 'meaning' or context of an original, there are several ironic examples where adaptation, criticism, or both, have altered prevailing perceptions and receptions of the urtext. This is often done by projecting modern approaches or aesthetics onto the original work, and this too is an act of recontextualisation. To this thesis, one of the most relevant examples is the altered reception of *King Lear* through the ages, and this is something which can be traced back to the influence of Nahum Tate's adaptation of the text. Peter Sharkey, in 'Nahum Tate's *King Lear*, Coming Hither by going Thither' posits a notion that Tate's *King Lear* alone was responsible for pinning Lear as the psychologically-charged character he is now perceived to be, and most notably that 'King Lear had no "tragic flaw" until Tate endowed him with one'.[32] Lawrence Green[33] expands on Tate's influence to say that it was his excision of the Fool which forced such changes in the Lear character, as the absence of this sounding board for Lear forced the King to come to the same realisations which were presented to him by the Fool in Shakespeare. Tate's text dominated the stage for two centuries, and in this time Lear

---

[31] Kidnie, p. 9.

[32] Peter Sharkey, 'Nahum Tate's *King Lear*, Coming Hither by going Thither', *QJS*, 54:4 (1968), 398-403, (p. 400).

[33] Lawrence Green, 'Where's My Fool? Some Consequences of the Omission of the Fool in Tate's Lear', *Studies in English Literature*, 12:2 (1972), 259-274.

became a psychologically introspective character. Eventually, Shakespeare's own text and ending was restored to the stage, but the prevailing emphasis on Lear's internal struggle remained behind.

Other prominent examples of plays changing in their significance over time are *Hamlet* and *The Tempest*. Margreta de Grazia notes that 'in its own time [Hamlet] was considered behind the times',[34] perhaps attributable to having come so long after the defining plays of the revenge tragedy genre; Thomas Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy* (c.1586) and Christopher Marlowe's *Tamburlaine* (c.1587-8). However, De Grazia states that in spite *of Hamlet's* original unpopularity, Samuel Taylor Coleridge's later theatre criticism instilled in the play a newfound sense of Hamlet's internal conflict, and that Coleridge applied the label 'psychological' to Shakespeare's play, a term which was unfamiliar to his readership and which wouldn't appear in the Oxford English Dictionary until twelve years later, in 1812, however the psychological aspect of Hamlet now seems integral to the character.[35] Similarly, the emergence of post-colonial criticism realigns the relationship between Prospero and Caliban, with the latter emerging ever more strongly as the protagonist in *The Tempest* since to a very large extent he has been the interpretive focus of the play. In such a way, while adaptation and criticism make the 'meaning' of a play more static, they can also be responsible for projecting their own new contexts onto the urtext itself, removing it entirely from its 'original' basis.

In a sense, we can think of this as an extreme expression of Barthes's intertextuality. Adaptation shows us that intertextuality involves not just the work and 'the texts of the previous and surrounding culture',[36] but can also incorporate that which comes subsequently. The work, just as it inevitably involves itself with its own contemporary moment, can, for better or for worse, become bound up with cultural or creative trends long into the work's afterlife. While adaptation and cultural criticism can vary in how they solidify the 'meaning' of a text, they can both equally play this important role in realising the final expression of Barthes's intertextuality. This study of Irish texts seeks to map out the great extent of intertextuality found throughout Irish adaptations of Shakespeare, not only in the sense that the plays seem reactive to a long-lasting British discourse on Ireland, but

---

[34] Margreta de Grazia, *Hamlet Without Hamlet*, (London: Cambridge University Press, 2007), p. 7.
[35] Ibid, p. 15.
[36] Barthes, p. 39.

also to consider the afterlife of these texts, and their bearing on that of Shakespeare. Following from this, it pays to be always aware that by 'reading into' adaptation, criticism by necessity politicises the urtext, and this is a process which will be very evident throughout this thesis.

Leaders and Leadership Styles in Nahum Tate's Shakespearian Adaptations

> *'Works of literature exist to be made use of in one way*
> *or another. [Adaptation] can be seen as a weapon in the*
> *struggle for supremacy between various ideologies.'*

- André Lefevere, 'Why Waste our Time on Rewrites?'[37]

Djanet Sears's *Harlem Duet* (1997) is a love story set in Harlem in the years 1860, 1928 and the modern-day, and is adapted from Shakespeare's *Othello*. Primarily, *Harlem Duet* complicates the suggested source of trouble in *Othello*, which according to Dympna Callaghan does not exclude the racial other from the community, but still 're-enacts the exclusionary privilege on which such representations were founded: Othello was a white man'.[38] By having a black Othello, played by a black actor and based in a black neighbourhood, Sears shifts Othello himself to be understood in this black context, a side of his character wholly absent from Shakespeare's urtext. Margaret Kidnie writes of Sears's play that one of its foremost successes is the rejection of 'a cycle of racial and sexual prejudice'[39] which had for centuries been an accepted aspect of *Othello*'s performance. Kidnie explains that '*Harlem Duet* marks an oblique intervention that seeks to drive out – or ritually write over – a theatrical 'ghost', simultaneously identified with both a canonical work and its (blackface) legacy of performance'.[40] This 'ghost' of *Othello* is not very far removed from the proliferation of socially and politically-minded representations of the Irish on Shakespeare's stage, and in the literature of medieval and Early Modern England in general. There is an equivalence between Sears's response to the racial and sexual prejudice which appeared in her chosen text, and the reaction of Irish writers to putative barbarisms in Shakespeare. Each adapter

---

[37] In *The Manipulation of Literature*, ed. by T. Herman (London: Croom Helm, 1983), p. 217.
[38] Dympna Callaghan, 'Othello was a White Man', in *Alternative Shakespeares*, 2nd edition, ed. by Terence Hawkes (London: Routledge, 2002), p. 215.
[39] Kidnie, p. 71.
[40] Ibid.

overturns, or even rejects, longstanding stage traditions which throw up problematic signs and depictions of their own quarter of society.

Shakespeare's body of work concerns itself with all social levels, and in doing so not only reflects on the nature of those without titles, but also of the humanity – and the fallibility which comes with it – of those who do have entitlement, and we can think of a character such as Richard II as a very eminent embodiment of this. However, in spite this broad social awareness, it remains evident that the majority of Shakespeare's plays are predicated on the balance of power between various characters. As a consequence of this, some of Shakespeare's characters come to be figured as strong leaders, others as failed leaders, and the motifs which surround and follow these two sets of individuals are particularly intriguing in the context of longstanding English stereotypes of the Irish. The trappings of a 'weak' leader are consistently reflected in the writings on Ireland produced by Shakespeare's predecessors and contemporaries, and Irish adaptations of these plays in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries seem to develop a strong emphasis on the neutralisation of this stereotypical imagery with regard to leaders and leadership styles. The representation of leadership qualities in Nahum Tate's adaptations of *King Lear* and *Richard II* are on the whole indicative of these trends within Irish adaptations. The former, in particular, foregrounds tradition and legitimacy, whilst rejecting militarised attitudes and foreign invaders. Tate himself was demonstrably familiar with potential political overtones on the stage, particularly in Shakespeare's own works, and he notes in his dedicatory epistle to his version of *Coriolanus* that 'there appear'd in some passages, no small resemblance with the busie faction of our own time'[41], and indeed within a year of this his adaptation of *Richard II* was pulled from the stage. However, it is also true that these alterations to the affairs of state within plays are not purely based on politics and national sensibilities, but also in the personal and aesthetic preferences of Tate and his restoration-era audience. Some of Richard's most undesirable qualities develop into generally more acceptable characterisms in Tate, with other aspects of his character discarded entirely, and we might even observe apparent similarities between supposed aspects of Tate's personality and Richard's own naivety.

---

[41] Nahum Tate, *The Ingratitude of a Common Wealth*, pp. ii-iii.

Though Tate and his plays have in the past been significant and somewhat influential, much critical material on him concentrates on his plays within an exclusively British political context. In contrast, here Tate is considered as an author of what we might describe as a 'dual' nationality; born in Dublin but active on the London stage, and was in his own time viewed in London society as an Irishman. In such a way, Tate's adaptations of Shakespeare can interestingly be viewed as suggesting a 'writing back' at what may be interpreted as English stereotypes of Ireland – barbarous, lawless, unsettled, superstitious – left behind by a long tradition of English discourse on Ireland, associated with such writers as Raphael Holinshed, Edmund Spenser, John Davies, Fynes Moryson, and a great many others. Throughout the two centuries with preceded Tate, Irish Catholics had launched countless rebellions, eventually culminating in the Great Rebellion of 1641, which was ultimately suppressed by Oliver Cromwell a decade later. Yet, despite the finality with which this rebellion was finally quashed, just a handful of years after Tate's adaptations appeared, the succession of the Catholic James II to the British throne once again called to question the settlement in Ireland. After being ousted by William of Orange, the Irish Catholics gave James overwhelming support in his bid to reclaim the throne, only for the attempt to end in failure at the Battle of the Boyne. In spite of having such limited success, the Irish populace apparently remained defiant, and Cecil Woodham-Smith writes that towards the settlers they remained 'separate, hostile and violent'.[42] There is a similarity to be observed between the historical resistance of the Irish populace, and the resistance of characters of comparatively powerless stature in Tate's plays, such as Caliban and Cordelia. More significantly Tate's adaptations not only display more preferential treatment to figuratively Irish – or at least non-English – characters, but also distance themselves to a large extent from England's own domestic ideals, as powerful, formerly 'good' English rulers become far more callous and unlawful.

Political Manoeuvrings in Tate's *King Lear*

King Lear is, from its very onset, an ostensibly British play, set in Britain and populated by characters whose titles identify them as British nobility. However, one

---

[42] Cecil Woodham-Smith, *The Great Hunger*, 2nd edition (London: Penguin, 1991), p. 15.

of the most glaring of all anachronisms in Shakespeare must be this very idea and mention of Britishness in *King Lear*. Apparently set 'about eight hundred years before the birth of Christ',[43] *Lear*'s story not only occurs long before the concept of Britishness, but over a millennium before even the earliest construction of the word 'England' entered vocabularies. However, for the play's first audiences such an imagining of the foundation of Britain is entirely apt, with the 'double time' of Shakespeare's histories showing that historical events as portrayed on stage can overlap with topical matters also. In such a way, though all character talk of Britishness throughout the play is wildly anachronistic, *King Lear* is not a text which represents historic Britishness accurately, (although the story of Lear itself was promoted as a true historical event) but rather one which speaks to its audience *about* Britishness. It is because of this that the presence of Britishness, albeit symbolic, throughout *King Lear* is open to criticism and interpretation. To this end, it could be said that *King Lear* is a play which allows formative national values to be staged and propagated, and that this does not apply only to Britain: potentially one of the reasons that the play has a long tradition of adaptation and performance in Ireland all of which can be traced back to by Nahum Tate and his *History of King Lear*. It was this Irishman's work on the play which gives us much of what is now considered integral to Shakespeare's original; Nahum Tate's play was, for instance, where the modern, psychologically-charged template of the 'modern' Lear character was initially carved out.[44] Perhaps even more importantly, as far as *King Lear*'s modern intrigue goes, is the influence of Tate on the psychological examination of Lear himself, now so prevalent both on the stage and in works of criticism. Lawrence Green in 'Where's My Fool? Some Consequences of the Omission of the Fool in Tate's Lear' explains that one of the most primary effects of the Fool's absence from Tate's Lear is to place a greater emphasis on Lear himself. Tate's version of the text dominated the stage for almost two hundred years, and by the time Shakespeare's Lear was gradually reinstated by nineteenth century authors redacting Tate's own work, the psychology of Lear had become so engrained in and intertwined with the text itself that the motif prevailed ever after.

---

[43] Geoffrey of Monmouth, in *The Plays of William Shakespeare, in Ten Volumes*, ed. by Edmund Malone (London 1790), p. 486.
[44] Sharkey, p. 400.

One of the primary concerns which emerges both from Shakespeare's original play and Tate's own adaptive work is that of political power. The two plays' varying attitudes towards this important question can be demonstrated in the clear distinctions between each version of the Lear story, as the traumatic political upheaval of Shakespeare offers a stark contrast with the retention of pre-existing political structures in Tate. C.B. Hardman comments on this aspect of Tate's play:

> In *King Lear* a political crisis involving banishment, exclusion, and the overturning of legitimacy (especially in the Gloster plot, which now stands more prominently at the beginning of the play) leads to the abuse of freedom and eventually to internecine conflict. Despite its justification, an uprising to restore rather than depose monarchy and traditional order fails. It is a potent warning of the consequences of the wilful disturbance of proper succession that initiated the action in the first place. [45]

In addition, by considering the respective virtues and failings of Lear and Edgar in Shakespeare, the transfer of power from a feudal king to a modern, British ruler is ultimately realised. In contrast, Tate's adaptation reconstructs this progression through his own Lear and Cordelia, with faithfulness to original ruling lines becoming a primary aspect of the text. Tate seems to have worked initially from the folio version of the text, however in writing his conclusion he relies more on the quarto version, since its greater emphasis on civil war was more in line with his play's own action and events. Sonia Massai, in 'Nahum Tate's Revision of Shakespeare's "King Lears"' offers an intriguing overview of how Tate blends both versions of the *King Lear* text to produce 'his' Lear. Furthermore, the implications of Tate's version being performed on the British stage are worth considering; was Tate – a playwright in the king's own theatre – actually writing and behaving in the subversive way that Odai Johnson implies? If he was, in what ways may his Dublin-based childhood and education have contributed to this?

Significant political events in these versions of *King Lear* follow two very distinct paths, with Tate's redactions serving to nullify much of the political trauma – the foreign invading army, the overthrowing of the king, the death of his most likely heir – of Shakespeare's own (folio) version. Certainly, the action of Shakespeare's *King Lear* is, at two of the most critical points of the play, progressed by events

---

[45] C.B. Hardman, '"Our Drooping Country Now Erects Her Head": Nahum Tate's *History of King Lear*', *The Modern Language Review*, 95:4 (2000), 913-923, (p. 913). See also Sonia Massai, 'Nahum Tate's Revision of Shakespeare's "King Lears"', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 40:3 (2000), 435-500. Massai explores the ways in which Tate blends quarto and Folio versions of the text to carve out a civil war which brings with it this greater degree of faithfulness to longstanding tradition and lineage.

which undermine the land's ruling class. The first of these comes with the invasion of Britain – ironically – by the rightful British king and heiress. The situation is an intriguing one, since both Lear on the French side and Edmund on the British side have been shown throughout the text to be ineffectual, non-'British' rulers; Lear because of his insanity and Edmund because of his lawlessness. There is some implicit sense throughout this section of the play that military victory here may absolve Lear and Cordelia of their previous errors, and thus restore their regal legitimacy. However, their defeat confirms that the pre-existing political order of the play is fated to be broken, and Edgar's ascension to the crown is the second point at which the sanctity of lineage seems to be disregarded. Edgar has all the hallmarks of a good king, but this only further complicates and undermines the concept of the feudal lineage in Shakespeare's play.

Though Shakespeare situates his play in Britain, the era of the play dramatically – and politically – separates it from its contemporary period. Lear rules a land which is temporally as far removed from Shakespeare's Britain as Ireland was spatially. The theme is deliberated upon by Spenser in his *View of the State of Ireland*:

> EUDOXUS The English were, at first, as stoute and war like a people as ever the Irish, and yet you se are now brought unto that civillity, that no nation in the world excelleth them in all godly conversation.[46]

And later;

> IRENIUS This law was not made by the Norman Conqueror, but by a Saxon King, being at what time England was very like to Ireland, as now it stands.[47]

Following from Spenser's vision of this progression from outmoded rulership to modern kingship, Shakespeare's *King Lear* evinces a primitive rule which is too weak to be self-sustaining, and a king who is ultimately succeeded by a stronger, more 'modern' leader. This creates a scenario in which an outdated king, with his many Irish traits, is replaced by a modern ruler in the mould of a strong and warlike 'British' king, and this is a very intriguing way of thinking about *King Lear* given the closeness with which feudal England is aligned with contemporary Ireland in Spenser.

---

[46] Edmund Spenser, *A View of the State of Ireland*, ed. by Andrew Hadfield & Willy Maley (Oxford: Blackwell, 1997), p. 21.
[47] Ibid., p. 138.

Nahum Tate's 1681 adaptation differs from Shakespeare in all of the aspects outlined above; civil war replaces the invading force, soon after this the play reaches a conclusion which involves the retention of the original ruling lineage of the land, and that lineage is one which carries itself with much more pragmatism and dignity than its Shakespearian alternative. The first indication that the conflict will be a domestic matter rather than an international one is made clear to both Lear and the audience after the king awakens;

> LEAR   Tell me, Friends, where am I?
> GENTLEMAN In your own Kingdom, sir.
> LEAR   Do not Abuse me.[48]

The upcoming war is made apparent with the news that Kent has raised an army with which to go into battle. However, the troops in question are not the French invading force of Shakespeare, but rather one plucked from Lear's own land. In this way, the foreign invaders of the urtext are no longer present, and the final action is instead progressed by civil war.[49] Moreover, it is later said to be Kent who 'didst head the troops that fought [Lear's] battel'.[50] It has been commented already that Cordelia's defeat in battle acts as the final confirmation of the inadequacy of her rule, dooming her and her father to failure. With Kent heading Lear's army in the adaptation, Cordelia is saved from the ignominy of defeat, and thus the aspects of her character which determine the legitimacy of her rule are maintained, whilst still allowing the dramatic finale to take place.

Tate's small redactions, repeatedly gesturing towards Cordelia's unquestionable legitimacy for the throne, eventually begin to take hold over the play. Edgar slays Edmund in a duel, and then leads the politically converted Albany to save Lear and Cordelia from being executed by the guards. Unlike Shakespeare's *Lear*, Edgar's actions come just in time, and he successfully saves the lives of the two rulers. Lear is offered the throne, but rejecting it instead vows to live out his days in peace whilst Cordelia takes over the rule; 'Cordelia has our Pow'r, Cordelia's Queen'.[51] In such a manner, Tate's adaptation reflects both Restoration-era aesthetics (which saw Shakespeare as of a barbarous age, and his texts influenced by this) and

---

[48] Tate, *King Lear*, p. 53.
[49] Tate's emphasis on civil war is in this way more closely aligned to the Folio version of the text than the quarto. See *Norton Anthology of English Literature*, p. 1224.
[50] Tate, *King Lear*, p. 58.
[51] Ibid, p. 66.

political discourses as it ends peacefully and with the retention of that political order which was doomed to failure in Shakespeare.

This, however, is not the only way in which Tate's play moves away from a retelling of specifically British history, and towards a general outline of an idealised monarchy. His adaptation strips the play of many – but not quite all – of its spatial coordinates, and this lends strength to the political undertones of the text. The setting at the beginning of the fifth act, for instance, is merely described as 'A Camp';[52] a far cry descriptively from Shakespeare's 'British Camp near Dover' (V.iii). In the same manner, Shakespeare's Act II Scene i is set at 'A Court within the Castle of the Earl of Gloucester', whereas Tate's corresponding scene merely reads 'Gloster's House'.[53] These changes do not apply only to the location, however, and the identities of certain characters are subtly downplayed also. Shakespeare's Earl of Gloucester, Earl of Kent and Duke of Cornwall[54] become merely Gloster, Kent and Cornwall in Tate's character list, and only very rarely in the text are their titles referred to. While these redactions blur the setting of the play, they do not conceal it entirely. The message which Albany sends out in support of Edmund in the fifth act reads: 'If any Man of Quality, within the lists of the Army, will maintain upon Edmund, suppos'd Earl of Gloster, that he is a manifold Traytor, let him appear by the third sound of the Trumpet. He is bold in his Defence'.[55] Arguably, such diminutive references to Britishness in the text were not an attempt to locate the text necessarily, but rather to help deflect the supposed political inferences which soon after saw his adaptation *History of King Richard the Second* banned from the stage. Tate's play, in other words, produces a spatial ambiguity which allows the action and morals of his play to be more easily applied to Ireland, but at the same time restricts this ambiguity so that the action is still loosely based in Britain, albeit in a far more uncertain way than previous versions of the *Lear* story.

Whatever reasoning lay behind Tate's changes to *King Lear*, they were apparently an uncomfortable one for British reviewers of the text. George Coleman, in his effort to 'purge the tragedy of Lear of the alloy of Tate, which has so long been

---

[52] Ibid,, p. 54.
[53] Ibid., p. 13.
[54] The names under which they appear are generally unchanged between quarto and folio editions, the only exception being an alternate spelling to the Earl of Gloucester's name (Earl of Gloster).
[55] Tate, *King Lear*, pp. 59.

suffered to debase it'[56] rectifies the names of the Earls, and thus places the action back with more certainty in Britain. Similarly, Elizabeth Inchbald's 1808 version of the *King Lear* text reinstates the titles of Gloucester, Kent and Cornwall, reintroduces Burgundy and the King of France, and places the action with more certainty back on British land. Act IV Scene I, for instance, opens in 'An Apartment in the Earl of Gloster's Castle',[57] in contrast to the earlier mentioned 'Gloster's House' in Tate. Whilst such changes are quite minor, they do serve to underline that Tate is very much an outlier in the history of *King Lear*, and so emerges as worthy of some note.

'Idealist' Leaders Redefined: Tate's *King Lear* and *Richard II*

H.F. Scott-Thomas goes beyond the overtly political side of Tate's adaptations, and makes some association between Tate's nationality and his aesthetic:

> [Tate] was an Irishman, to whose national, racial sentimentality all that smacked of the cold cynical realism of the Restoration must have seemed discouraging and repellant.[58]

While Scott-Thomas is again broad – albeit far from alone – in his assumptions about Irish national sentimentality, his claims regarding the author's personal nature raise some interesting overlaps with Tate's characters, particularly *Richard II*. Notwithstanding the assertion that the Irish as a race suffer from a 'national sentimentality', it may be that Tate himself was a sentimental person living in a society which stereotyped him, as an Irishman, as exactly that, whilst it itself moved into the rational age of the Restoration. Reading Tate in this way prompts a discussion of the relationship between Tate's nationality and his work. While previous critical output has focused primarily on Tate's work as referring to contemporary British politics[59] – particularly the exclusion crisis surrounding James II – it is now vital to consider the effect that Tate's Irish background has on his adaptations, particularly questioning whether, and in what ways, reading his work in an Irish context might give some insight into the shaping of the adaptations.

---

[56] George Coleman, *The history of King Lear: As it is performed at the Theatre Royal in Covent Garden* (London: R. Baldwin, 1768), p. iv.
[57] Elizabeth Inchbald, *King Lear: A Tragedy in Five Acts* (London: Longman, 1808), p. 50.
[58] H.F. Scott-Thomas, 'Nahum Tate and the Seventeenth Century', *ELH*, 1:3 (1934), 250-275, (p. 251).
[59] See C.B. Hardman, '"Our Drooping Country Now Erects Her Head": Nahum Tate's *History of King Lear*' and Odai Johnson, 'Empty Houses: The suppression of Tate's *Richard II*'.

If the essence of Tate's *King Lear* is indeed one of 'stability, [...] descent, inheritance, tradition and legitimacy' then it is inevitably a text which applies to Ireland as much – if not more – than it does to Britain. Within Tate's lifetime, Oliver Cromwell's re-conquest of Ireland (1649-53) had raised many questions of lineage, land ownership and legitimacy. These being prevalent interests throughout Tate's formative years in Dublin, it is worth considering the ways in which the Irish context can be seen as a shaping or complicating influence on Tate's choice of play, and the changes that are subsequently applied to it. It is the same values of lineage and legitimacy which emerge in all three of his adaptive works of Shakespeare. Indeed, the very notion of the Shakespearean play taking on topical resonances is a very familiar one to Tate: in the Dedication of his adaptation of *Coriolanus* he writes that 'there appear'd in some passages, no small resemblance with the busie faction of our own time'.[60] In Tate, as in the adaptations of his contemporary, Thomas Duffett, it is hardly surprising to find adaptations of plays such as *King Lear*, *Richard II* and *The Tempest*, because these plays establish interconnections between the recurring themes of land ownership, nationhood and the sanctity of self-government to be reflective of an ongoing English political hold over Ireland.

King Lear, too, is a play which read in a certain light makes Scott-Thomas's claims regarding Tate's 'sentimental' nature all the more intriguing, and there is a sense of overlap between the 'happy' ending to *King Lear* and the personal sentimentality attributed to Tate by his later reviewers. In an often-quoted section of his dedicatory epistle, Tate calls Shakespeare's text 'a heap of jewels, unstrung and unpolished',[61] and that he himself had endeavoured to 'rectifie what was wanting in the Regularity and Probability of the Tale. [...] A love betwixt Edgar and Cordelia [...] renders Cordelia's Indifference and her Father's Passion in the first Scene probable'.[62] The repeated mention of the word 'probable' seems disingenuous from Tate, as it seems conceivable that what he attributes to probability could be more accurately described as ideal or simply pleasant. This may be most obviously evident in his redaction of the final scene, opting to have the action resolve itself joyously than to 'have incumbred the stage with dead bodies',[63] and the overall 'Lesson of

---

[60] Nahum Tate, *The Ingratitude of a Common-Wealth*, pp. ii-iii.
[61] Tate, *King Lear*, p. iii.
[62] Ibid.
[63] Ibid, p. iv.

morality'[64] is immediately summed up in Edgar's final line announcement that 'truth and virtue shall at last succeed'.[65] This finale of *Lear* seems strangely reminiscent of the supposition by Scott-Thomas that Tate's contemporary era was one ruled by the newly-found scientific sensibilities of the Restoration, but that Tate's 'limited intellectual power put rationalism, neo-classical ideals, and the new scientific method almost entirely beyond his reach'.[66] Tate was, so it would seem from Scott-Thomas's assumption, a sentimental Irishman in a rationalist Britain, and interestingly it is this same theme which is developed in his Shakespearean adaptations.

However, one cannot overlook other reasons for the later excision of violent and lawless imagery, not only in Tate's recasting of *King Lear*, but with regard to all Irish adaptations of Shakespeare from this later period. The divide in aesthetics between Elizabethan and Restoration/post-Restoration England is a noteworthy one. Whilst murder, torture and lawlessness came to form a common and accepted element of stage dramatics in Shakespeare's Elizabethan England, such incidents were, by the time of Tate and Duffett, seen to reflect the savage and primitive ideals which were associated with that culture.[67] Indeed, even in the introduction to Shakespeare's own plays, Samuel Johnson comments that 'the English nation, in the time of Shakespeare, was yet struggling to emerge from barbarity'.[68] As such, stage drama shifts towards a more civilised outlook, and the excision of violent imagery from Shakespeare, which is primary to many Irish adaptations, was to some degree part of this.

Regardless of whether the reasons for Tate's changes were political, personal, aesthetic, or a combination of these, the new ending to *King Lear* was strongly disapproved of by many critics in the 'after-life' of the text; particularly the eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries. August Wilhelm Schlegel writes that:

> I cannot conceive what ideas of art and dramatic connexion those persons have who suppose that we can at pleasure tack a double conclusion to a tragedy; a melancholy one for hard-hearted spectators, and a happy one for souls of a softer mould.[69]

---

[64] Thomas Cooke, *Considerations on the Stage*. Quoted in Brian Vickers, *Shakespeare: The Cultural Heritage*. Vol. II. (London, Routledge, 1974), p. 468.
[65] Tate, *King Lear*, p. 67.
[66] Scott-Thomas, p. 250.
[67] De Grazia, p. 9.
[68] Samuel Johnson, 'Preface', in Shakespeare, *Complete Works*, Vol. 1 (London, 1800), p. 223.
[69] August Wilhelm Schlegel, *Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature* (London: Kessinger, 2004), p. 345.

Charles Lamb was no less vitriolic in his distaste for the text, writing in 'On the tragedies of Shakespeare':

> But the play is beyond all art, as the tamperings with it show: it is too hard and stony; it must have love-scenes, and a happy ending. It is not enough that Cordelia is a daughter, she must shine as a lover too. Tate has put his hook in the nostrils of this Leviathan, for Garrick and his followers, the showmen of scene, to draw the mighty beast about more easily. A happy ending! - as if the living martyrdom that Lear had gone through, - the flaying of his feelings alive, did not make a fair dismissal from the stage of life the only decorous thing for him'. [70]

Though primarily both Schlegel and Lamb were concerned at Tate's contravening of *King Lear*'s tragic form (from tragedy to history), mention of 'hard-hearted spectators' and 'souls of a softer mould' in relation to English theatre-going patrons and the Irish adapter, respectively, their words call to mind the same dichotomy between English pragmatism and Irish sentimentality which is as strong as the various other dichotomies found throughout English literature of the Elizabethan and pre-Elizabethan eras. This theme of English pragmatism is one which arises in quite a broad way in Spenser's *View of the State of Ireland*, when Eudoxus speaks at some length about allowing Irish tenants to work land owned by English landlords:

> EUDOXUS It is a great willfulnes in any such landlord to refuse to make any longer farmes to their tennants, as may, besides the generall good of the realme, be also greatly for theire owne profit and avayle: For […] the tennante may by such meanes be drawn to build himselfe some handsome habitation thereof, to ditch and enclose his ground, to manure and husband yt as good farmers use? […] And also it wil be for the good of the tennant likewise, whoe by such buildings and inclosures shall receive many benefits: first, by the handsomenes of his howse, he shall take more comfort of his life, more saife dwelling, and a delight to keepe his saide howse neate and cleanly, which nowe beinge, as they commonly are, rather swyne-styes then howses, is the chiefest cause of his so beastly manner of life. [71]

While the above does not outwardly state that sentimentality itself has an effect on anybody's ability to farm land, there is still an implication that Irish farmers have some quality which is somehow 'other' to the more practical English. Moreover, he represents English habitation as the only plausible way in which the Irish people, lacking in British pragmatism, can aspire to live a less 'beastly manner of life'. In much the same way, Fynes Moryson writes of the Irish and their customs in his *Itinerary*, which documents his extensive journey throughout Europe over the course

---

[70] Charles Lamb. 'On the Tragedies of Shakespeare', in *Essays of Elia* (Paris: Baudry's, 1835), pp. 359-60.
[71] Spenser, pp. 83-4.

of ten years. In the section titled 'The Commonwealth of Ireland' he notes that he had observed 'twenty absurd things practiced by [the Irish], only because they would be contrary to' British methods.[72] In the spirit of this belief in the indiscriminate opposition by Irish people towards English principles, later readers had little difficulty inferring that the Irish rejected the pragmatics of Restoration England merely because it would afford them the opportunity to stand in contrast to the British ideals of pragmatism and practicality. Even later still, Edward Dowden, a notable sceptic of the Gaelic Literary Revival, comments that Irish poetry suffers from 'typical defects', which he attributes to an over-reliance on, amongst other things, sentimentality.[73] Though Dowden was himself a native of county Cork, his response here again suggests the widespread and accepted vision of the Irish as a stereotypically sentimental race.

The severity of this perceived lack of sensibility was exacerbated by an amplified emphasis on the scientific method – and the newfound sensibilities which came with it – surrounding the Restoration period, and it is in this tampering with the play's tragic identity that Schlegel and Lamb find grounds upon which to denounce Tate's supposedly idealistic adaptation. Whilst later British adapters may have openly criticised what they saw as Tate's overly sentimental ending to the play, there seems also to be a more tacit political element both to Tate's adaptation and to later revivals of the Shakespearian text. The upshot of Tate's changes is that the primitive ruling system of the play carries itself with a greater degree of dignity than was evident in Shakespeare's own version of the Lear story. C.B Hardman writes of the adaptation that 'all references to piety, to empire, to peace and plenty are Tate's, not Shakespeare's'.[74] Thus, through the introduction of these themes, the apparently archaic rule of Lear finds far more strength and sophistication in Tate than it did in Shakespeare. This ruling system proves capable of withstanding outside influence, and it is this fact which leads writers like Schlegel and Lamb to criticise Tate for his 'Irish' sentimentality. The strongly British angle of the text is downplayed, which as a consequence lends the whole play to a more ancient air, reminiscent of the legendary tales, like *Beowulf*, told across northern Europe, and free of the national boundaries forced upon it by Shakespeare. It is at this moment that Edgar makes his

---

[72] Fynes Moryson, 'The Commonwealth of Ireland', quoted in Michael Neill, p. 6.
[73] Quoted in Barbara Ann Suess, *Progress and Identity in the Plays of W.B. Yeats, 1982-1907* (London: Routledge, 2007), p. 132.
[74] Hardman, p. 915.

final assertion that 'our drooping country now erects her head'[75], and in the greater degree of locational uncertainty afforded by Tate, this leaves open the question of whether this 'drooping country' truly refers to England and the Exclusion Crisis, as critics have hitherto considered, or whether there is an argument to be made that it can equally be applied to Ireland and the Irish 'image' in the literature of Britain.

The fact that Lear's mode of rule is a very dated one becomes evident quite early on in Shakespeare's text. The whole play operates as something as a 'warning to contemporary fathers not to put too much trust in the flattery of their children',[76] and specifically against the decision to retire. This choice remained a highly unusual in the patriarchal society of Tudor and Stuart England, where a son's accession to his still-living father's position lead to significant confusion – or even tension – over status and power.[77] This retirement on Lear's part is yet another aspect of his character which displays that he does not fit the mould of the modern father figure (and seemingly by extension, ruler). The cause of this decision is that Lear is idealistic to the point of shallowness: he emphasises appearances over reality. The most apparent indication of this comes in the opening scene as Lear distances himself from all those who show him the utmost loyalty, whilst bringing closer those who pay lip service to it. Cordelia had, it seems, earned her place as favourite daughter in the pre-history of the play, with her father describing her as 'our joy' (I.i.83-4), promising her a portion of land 'more opulent' than that of her sisters (I.i.88), and, after the rejection, telling of how he had 'lov'd her most' (I.i.125). However, even given his better knowledge on the subject, it is the lack of appearances which become the greater concern to Lear. Rejecting his favourite daughter over her failure to fall in line with his idealised version of the world, Kent protests and demands that the king 'see better' (I.i.159). In much the same manner, Lear is more concerned with the appearances and affectations of kingship, rather than the responsibilities which are the more practical concerns of it.

> LEAR: Only we shall retain
>   The name and all th'addition to a king
>   The sway, revenue, execution of the rest,
>   Beloved sons, be yours. (I.i.137-40)

---

[75] Tate, *King Lear*, p. 67.
[76] Stephen Greenblatt (ed.), *Norton Anthology of English Literature Volume I: The Middle Ages Through the Restoration and the Eighteenth Century*, 8th edition (London: Norton, 2006), p. 1139.
[77] Ibid., pp. 1139-40.

Undoubtedly, Lear rediscovers many of his positive qualities during the play, traits he must have once possessed to earn the loyalty of respectable figures such as Kent, Gloucester and Edgar. However, ultimately Lear never does develop an ability to deal with the reality of events, and even as he dies he does so locked in an attempt to rectify the idealised version of his world with the undeniable, and distinctly un-ideal, facts which are in front of him. It is this inability to cultivate a sense of reality which ultimately dooms Shakespeare's Lear. Shakespeare's stage directions in this final scene are unambiguous: 'Enter Lear, with Cordelia dead in his arms'. However, Lear sways repeatedly between acceptance of this reality and falling back into the idealism of his own mind. As the scene progresses, Lear sways back and forth between an acceptance of Cordelia's death and an illusion of her life: 'She's gone for ever. […] She's dead as earth. […] This feather stirs, she lives! […] A plague upon you, murderers, traitors all! I might have sav'd her, now she's gone for ever! […] Look on her, look, her lips! Look there, look there!' (V.iii.261-312) His rejection of the facts here mirrors somewhat his behaviour at the play's beginning, and ultimately it is Lear's inability to effectively deal with such realities which cripple his capacity to rule.

The antithesis to Lear's progress in the play is Edgar's, and it is no mistake that it is Edgar who assumes leadership by the end of the play. Early on, Edgar shows slightly too much naivety in trusting his brother, when in the 'Letter' scene he is told that he ought to avoid Gloucester. Similarly, he is further tricked in Act II Scene I, leading to him being pursued by his father as an outlaw. Although naïve and idealistic in these early scenes, Edgar's character soon matures, and by the midpoint of the play his true character and nobility begin to develop, most clearly evident in his portrayal of the beggar Poor Tom, in order to save his father. Act V Scene II is the scene in which Edgar's character comes to the fore, and where his polarisation from Lear's idealism becomes manifest. Caring for his father, who is in the midst of depression, Edgar is philosophical – but at the same time pragmatic – about life.

> EDGAR   Men must endure
> Their going thence, even as their coming hither. (V.ii.9-10)

Edgar is at this point coming to realise what Lear never did: that wishful thinking will not result in happiness. Edgar successfully cultivates a sense of realism and humanity during the course of Shakespeare's play, even managing to gain reprisal

over Edmund for his earlier trickery. He further separates himself from the superstition of other characters with one brief exchange with Edmund in I.ii;

> EDMUND I am thinking, brother, of a prediction I read this
> other day, what should follow these eclipses.
> EDGAR Do you busy yourself with that? (I.ii.157-60)

Edgar's bravery, nobility and humanity make him a good British king: the only person in Shakespeare's play that could put right the damage done by Lear's outdated rule. In a very similar manner the theme of idealism versus pragmatism is played out in *Richard II*, with the initial leader struggling to come to terms with the reality of his situation, leaving him vulnerable to the offences of a newcomer. Robin Bates comments in *Shakespeare and the Cultural Colonisation of Ireland* that Richard II is a 'character whose inability to rule originates in character flaws which are the same as those of an "othered" nation',[78] particularly what Bates describes as Richard's most primary weakness: his idealism; a trait which this chapter attempts to establish as a long-understood stereotype of Irishness (or more broadly, 'otherness', in Bates's terminology) in English literature. Bates continues that '*Richard II* has long been read as a play which moves from a medieval emphasis on spirituality to a Renaissance emphasis on pragmatism',[79] a shift reflected in and conveyed through Richard himself. Though devout and confident in his divine right throughout the play, his pragmatism in this is more open to debate.

> RICHARD   Not all the water in the rough rude sea
>   Can wash the balm off from an anointed king;
>   The breath of worldly men cannot depose
>   The deputy elected by the Lord:
>   For every man that Bolingbroke hath press'd
>   To lift shrewd steel against our golden crown,
>   God for his Richard hath in heavenly pay
>   A glorious angel: then, if angels fight,
>   Weak men must fall, for heaven still guards the right. (III.ii.54-62)

In spite of mounting pressure against him, Richard's spirituality remains strong, evidenced by this belief that he, as king, is empowered by God and is therefore destined to win. However, with Bolingbroke's increasing position of strength, such dogmatism can only realistically be viewed as a sort of superstition (*Macbeth* is a play which also views this unfaltering belief in the infallibility of kingship as a form of superstition). Against Bolingbroke's palpable military advantage it is only a

---

[78] Bates, p. 10.
[79] Ibid., pp. 10-11.

matter of time before we witness Richard's fall. In this way, Richard II aligns himself with Lear, with both characters' impractical rejection of overwhelming evidence playing a direct part in their downfall. Meanwhile, Henry Bolingbroke is shown to be cut from the same cloth as Edgar: the latter realises that wishful thinking will not bring happiness, whilst the former in a similar way knows that merely expecting victory – as Richard does – will not bring it about.

But in Tate's adaptations of *King Lear* and *Richard II*, the corresponding characters are cast in different moulds, and perhaps the duality of Tate's nationhood and identity are more transparent here than at any other point of his creative output. Tate characterises Lear with some of those qualities which might have indicated a 'good' British king – strong, warlike and intelligent – but at the same time seems to reject much of the militarised English attitude towards Ireland.

A telling difference between Shakespeare and Tate lies in the motives behind Lear's 'love test'. In what is likely Shakespeare's primary source for the text, *The True Chronicle History of King Leir* (dating from c.1594, author unknown) Leir's drive for staging the test is clear: Cordella has vowed to marry for love, but Leir has decided she must only marry a man who can be an asset to the kingdom. As a result, Leir stages the love test in order to get Cordella to admit she loves him the best of all men, and to use this to force her to marry the man of his choosing. Leir's plan doesn't work, but the calculating logic of it shows that Leir is still a prudent leader. However, this pragmatic approach is out of step for the Lear presented by Shakespeare's version of the text, and so this motive is taken out and replaced by nothing, with the result that Lear's actions seem all the more erratic and unpredictable, further loosening his grip on reality. However, the motive is one which is predictably reinstated in Tate, as Cordelia's love for Edgar, and unwillingness to be forced into the 'loath'd embraces' of Burgundy, results in her refusal of Lear's test. Lear himself is aware of Cordelia's reasoning, and so the original basis for the test is reinstated.[80] Tate's Lear is thus a logical and calculating

---

[80] See Sharkey, p. 400. Sharkey states that 'King Lear had no "tragic flaw" until Tate endowed him with one", an argument which is amplified in Lawrence Green's later article on the increased emphasis on Lear's psychology which came about through the excision of the Fool. However, I would maintain that Lear did possess a very apparent tragic flaw in Shakespeare's own text, even if Tate was in a way responsible for magnifying it. My reason for this assumption is bound up in the above question of Shakespeare's own excisions from his possible foundation text, *The True Chronicle History of King Leir*, in which he stripped Lear of the sensible motivational factors for his 'love test', and in doing so brought Lear's tragic flaw – his egotism – to the surface. Further, Claire McEahern writes that Shakespeare intentionally excludes the patriarchal discourse and comic undertones of the

figure at this point of the play, not the erratic and unfit feudal ruler observed in Shakespeare.[81]

This opposition is something which Stephen Greenblatt attributes to an emphasis on Lear's actions as being 'rooted in deep psychological needs',[82] however this seems to overlook some of what is known about the developments which the text underwent after Shakespeare. It has already been commented that many of the psychological aspects of the play emerged only after Tate's own redactions, in particular, the excision of the Fool, which placed the emphasis of Lear's actions and speeches on his own mental processes. As a result, the arbitrary nature of Lear's test in Shakespeare can be more convincingly attributed to the characterisation of Lear as an outmoded 'Irish'-style ruler. Tate's adaptation, by doing the opposite, reveals the manner in which Shakespeare's urtext absorbs the textual tradition which associated Irishness with sentimentality and weakness, by imposing upon Lear an Irish mentality and conduct, or, at the very least, what an Early Modern reader would understand as such. This was a very set, predictable and straightforward psychology (ironic as it may be to infer a 'set psychology' from such arbitrary actions) and not associated with the deep psychological examination which later followed as an unexpected result of Tate's interference with the text. Margreta de Grazia, in *Hamlet without Hamlet*, similarly explores the psychological elements retrospectively attached to the Prince of Denmark, initially seen as an unremarkable character.[83]

> Early allusions to *Hamlet* suggest that in its own time the play was considered behind the times rather than ahead of them. To begin with, Shakespeare's Hamlet was a recycling of an earlier play. Even the original *Ur-Hamlet* was remembered not for its novelty but for its tired formulas and stock devices. […] The problem was not that Shakespeare had no method but that his method had not yet been identified. Coleridge labels is *psychological*, an unfamiliar word to his readership. […] While the first use of *psychological* recorded by the OED is from 1812, Coleridge had been using the term in his lectures since 1800 to refer to Shakespeare's singular insight into character.[84]

---

earlier play, in 'Fathering Herself: A Source Study of Shakespeare's Feminism', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 39:3 (Autumn, 1988), 269-90.
[81] See Sonia Massai, 'Nahum Tate's Revision of Shakespeare's "King Lears"'. Massai too makes this association, stating that Lear is "guilty of a lesser crime" in Tate's adaptation.
[82] *Norton Anthology of English Literature*, p. 1140
[83] See for instance Abraham Wright on '*Hamlet*, a Tragedie by Shakespeare', quoted in Arthur J. Kirsch. 'A Caroline Commentary on the Drama', *Modern Philology*. (66:3), 256-61, (pp. 257-8). 'An indifferent play, the lines but meane, and in nothing like Othello. Hamlet is an indifferent good part for a madman. […] Since bettered in the *Jealous Lovers* [by Thomas Randolph, 1632]'.
[84] De Grazia, pp. 7-15.

While de Grazia's implication that Hamlet's psychological depth, whilst not initially recognised by audiences, was always imminent in the character is questionable, her example serves to illustrate how the cultural currency of a text remains fluid, and can be shaped in very significant ways by later cultural sways.

The difference between the two Lears are not only evident at the outset of the play, but also at its conclusion, as by the end of Tate's text Lear has rid himself entirely of the sentimentality and idealism which doomed Shakespeare's character. Where Shakespeare's Lear retains a high level of the metaphorical 'blindness' which paralysed his rule, as shown in the final-scene denial of Cordelia's death, Tate's character demonstrates his efficiencies far more convincingly. At a point of the text in which Shakespeare's Lear is frantically attempting to convince himself that his daughter is alive, Tate's Lear is offering one of the most apparent signs yet that he has overcome his pre-occupation with the idealism and sentimentalities which had caused his problems at the outset. Lear, after the victory over Edgar and the sisters, has all of the appearances of king, even leading other characters to refer to him as such;

> GLOSTER O let me kiss that once more sceptered hand![85]

However, he at this point realises that the implementation of kingship and the appearances of kingship are very different matters, and crucially that one without the other is impossible. Lear realises that Cordelia is more capable of carrying out the practicalities of leadership, and thus also recognises that she also must hold the title which accompanies it.

> LEAR Hold, thou mistake'st the Majesty, kneel here
> Cordelia has our Pow'r, Cordelia's Queen.[86]

In this final act, Lear proves the legitimacy of his power precisely by his rejection of it. The wisdom in Lear's action is that the legitimacy of his rule is passed on to Cordelia, leaving no doubt over whether she will be an appropriate ruler, and thus the retention of the original political order is guaranteed. Such alterations to the most fundamental themes and motifs of the play suggest that Tate viewed the politics of *King Lear*, at least to some extent, in an Anglo-Irish or British-Irish context, and as a result of this he strips Lear of the sentimentality and idealism which Irish people and Irish writers – including Tate personally – had been accused of.

---

[85] Tate, *King Lear*, p. 66.
[86] Ibid.

If *King Lear* is a text which speaks to us about Britishness, and if figurations of Ireland itself were crucial to the formation of a British identity, then this suggests that Irish qualities in the British characters of the play are uniquely significant in the formation of a British national identity. To this end, *King Lear* could be interpreted as enforcing the supposed idea of Ireland and Irish characteristics to effectively pre-determine the outcome of the play, and in a broader context to pre-determine the superiority of 'Englishness' over 'Irishness'. In opposition, Tate's play refuses to characterise Lear in the same way, playing down Shakespeare's construction of Lear as an erratic, outmoded and sentimental king, instead representing him as a more measured and successful ruler. This gestures towards the sanctity of tradition and legitimacy, which is an interestingly timely concept in both Britain and Ireland. In England the Exclusion Bill (1679), promoted by the Earl of Shaftesbury, sought to remove James II's right to the throne, and in doing so seemed to place the natural succession of the throne in danger. On three separate occasions Charles II was forced to dissolve Parliament in order to prevent the bill passing,[87] with the scandal eventually coming to be known as the Exclusion Crisis. Meanwhile, the implementation of a British-appointed king of Ireland (the first of which was Henry VIII in 1542) also appeared to call into question the sanctity of lineage on the other side of the Irish Sea. This is something which is further supported by Tate's emphasis on civil war instead of an invading power, ultimately demonstrating that *King Lear* concerns itself not only with politics of England, but with Ireland and Anglo-Irish affairs.

In a similar way, Tate recasts *Richard II* in ways which transform Richard from one whose sentimentality and weakness was primary to his own downfall, to the abused victim in the play. In Shakespeare's rendering, Richard is at several points shown to be the lawless, sinister type of character reminiscent of those represented throughout British literature. The most straightforwardly comparative incidence of this occurs with Gaunt's final words to Richard in each version of the text. Gaunt forewarns Richard that his present course will lead him to disaster, that he receives little confidence from his subjects, and that he himself is too idealistic to see how deep such troubles run: 'Thy death-bed is no lesser than thy land / Wherein thou liest in reputation sick / And thou, too careless patient as thou art / Committ'st thy

---

[87] John Miller, *James II*, 3rd edition (London: Yale University Press, 2000), pp. 93-104, esp. pp. 103-104.

anointed body to the cure / Of those physicians that first wounded thee' (II.i.95-9). Moreover, Shakespeare's Gaunt passes away implicating Richard in the death of Gloucester; 'My brother Gloucester, plain well-meaning / soul. / Whom fair befall in heaven, 'mongst happy / souls! […] Thy unkindness be like crooked age, / to crop at once a too-long withr'd flower' (II.i.128-34). In this way, Richard comes to be figured as a wild, lawless king, more suited to 'the very wild Irish' than English nobility – an ironic fact given the distaste with which he speaks of Irish soldiers, or 'kerns', in the second scene of Act 2.

In a conspicuously stark contrast, Tate's Gaunt dies supporting Richard to the last, portraying him more sympathetically as having fallen victim to flatterers, landing rather in contrast to Shakespeare's portrayal of Richard as foolhardy and delusional: 'Nature has exposed / His unexperienc'd Youth to flatterers frauds'.[88] Gaunt is precise in his assertion to Richard that 'scarce your failings can be called your faults'.[89] Richard's youth and idealism are maintained by Tate, unsurprisingly, but they are stripped of the negative connotations which so bind him in Shakespeare.

Moreover, the implication of Richard in the death of Gloucester in Shakespeare's *Richard II* is nowhere to be found in Tate's version of the play. The entire exchange between Richard and Gaunt ends in pleasantries and respect:

> KING   Excuse the follies of my youthful Blood
>   I know y'are Loyal both and mean us well […]
> GAUNT   My gracious Liege your pardon, this bold duty
>   Was all that stood betwixt my Grave and me […]
> KING   Thanks my good Uncle, bear him to his Bed
>   Attend him well.[90]

This is entirely in contrast to the heated parting words of Shakespeare:

> GAUNT   Live in thy shame, but die not shame with thee!
>   These words hereafter thy tormentors be!
>   Convey me to my bed, and then to my grave. (II.i.135-7)

Gaunt, a 'lean-witted fool' (II.i.115) according to Shakespeare's Richard, becomes a 'Gentle uncle'[91] to Tate's, and cumulatively the effect is that this Richard is one who is far 'more sinn'd against than sinning' (III.ii.59), to use Lear's sentiments on the matter. If, as Robin Bates argues, Richard does truly represent Ireland and Irishness

---

[88] Tate, *The History of King Richard the Second* (London: 1681), p. 12.
[89] Ibid., p. 14.
[90] Ibid., p. 14.
[91] Ibid., p. 13.

through his idealism,[92] and that the story of *Richard II* is one of pragmatism winning over this approach, or 'Britishness' succeeding over 'Irishness', then Nahum Tate's adaptation of the play is one which reverses the perspective of this to represent subjugation; the naïve, youthful, 'Irish' Richard being misled by and falling victim to more callous ideals and protocols. It is very interesting to note that Tate's seemingly altered 'politics' of *Richard II* closely matches what W.B. Yeats indicates is the true spirit of the play. According to Yeats, Richard II is the 'vessel of porcelain' to Bolingbroke's 'vessel of clay'; Richard stands for all that is fine and eloquent whilst his counterpart, though effective, represents everything brusque and unpleasant. In this sense that the finer, noble Richard is ultimately a figure of pity placed against a contemptible opponent in a war he cannot win, it is possible to view Tate's play as pre-empting Yeats's later writings.

Much has been made of the political overtones of Tate's adaptation, however, as already said, critical attention has focussed on how his play might be read in the context of the Exclusion Crisis in Britain. C.B. Hardman, for instance, reads the reinstatement and justification of Tate's Lear as a nod towards Charles II's return to London in 1660, and 'in doing so reinforces the importance of stability, the preservation of time-honoured tradition of descent, inheritance, tradition and legitimacy'.[93] He sees Gloster's proclamation of Lear's 'Second Birth of Empire'[94] as a reference to Charles II repossession of England, and though Hardman's reading of the play is well grounded in the text, such an interpretation glosses over Tate's dual-nationhood far too quickly. The return of Charles II prompted the beginning of the Restoration period, which, as argued by Scott-Thomas, was an era in which Tate may have seemed greatly out of place. Thus, to view Tate's text as exclusively celebratory of contemporary British politics is to overlook a large part of the play's potentially complicating influences, notably Anglo-Irish politics and Tate's own duality of nationhood.

The real question is whether Nahum Tate was intentionally writing in a politically subversive way, even in spite of his high position within the king's theatre, eventually rising to poet laureate. Odai Johnson argues that despite Tate's assertion that every scene of his *History of King Richard the Second* was written to

---

[92] Bates, p. 64.
[93] Hardman, p. 917.
[94] Tate, *King Lear*, p. 66.

be 'full of respect to Majesty',[95] there is no getting around some of the content of Tate's play. Written at a time in which the Duke of Monmouth was rallying support for a break in the lineage, Johnson notes that Tate's play:

> stages a successful popular rebellion by another claimant to the crown, […] dramatises a civil war, forces the abdication of a legitimate monarch, imprisons that monarch, and then executes him – all fully staged at the personal theatre of the son of a king who lost his life under remarkably similar circumstances'.[96]

Interestingly, Tate's preoccupation with parallels between Shakespearian texts and implied topical interpretations are confirmed by his Dedication in *The Ingratitude of the Commonwealth*. He states here that 'there appear'd in some passages, no small resemblance with the busie faction of our own time'.[97] Recognising that the temporal disjoint between the play and current times were insufficient, Tate hastily repackaged his version of *Richard II* as *The Sicilian Usurper*, in the hope that this new spatial and geographic displacement might defuse topical interpretations. Tate wrote defensively in his Dedicatory Epistle to the play:

> How far distant this was from my Design and Conduct in the story will appear to him that reads with half an Eye. To form any Resemblance between the Times here written of, and the Present, had been unpardonable Presumption in me. If the Prohibitors conceive any such Notion I am not accountable for that.[98]

However, even Tate's wording of the Epistle suggests more than a touch of ill-feeling, with mention of 'they that have not seen it acted', and 'him that reads with half an Eye'. In actual fact, re-releasing the play at all was more an act of transgression than one of subservience. In spite of Tate's high standing within the King's Theatre, and his apparent attempts to realign himself with Royalist politics, Tate's peers had already branded him a radical.[99] This in itself is interesting in the context of this reading of his plays, however what is even more intriguing is that both Tate's father and grandfather – both named Faithful Teate[100] – were similarly accused of rejecting Parliamentary orders in their own lifetimes. Tate's grandfather, a member of the clergy, was ordered to stand down from the provostship of Trinity

---

[95] Nahum Tate, *The Sicilian Usurper*, (London, 1691), p. vii.
[96] Odai Johnson, p. 506.
[97] Tate, *The Ingratitude of a Common-Wealth,* pp. ii-iii.
[98] Ibid., *The Sicilian Usurper*, p. v.
[99] Odai Johnson, p. 507. Johnson also quotes a ballad from 1689 which points to the widespread recognition of Tate as a radical: 'Alas, the famous Settle, Durfey, Tate / That early propped the deep intrigues of State'.
[100] Seymour, 'Faithful Teate'. Seymour is responsible for distinguishing between Tate's father and grandfather, previously often confused as a single person.

College, Dublin in 1642 owing to charges that 'in many ways he had manifested himself to be ill-affected towards "the present established government under His Majesty's subjection". […] Two distinct charges, of inefficiency, and of wrong politics, were brought against him, and both may have been true'.[101] Somewhat less notably, but still interesting, is the fact that Tate's father, also a clergyman, was on the 20th of June 1661;

> Ordered to appear before the House of Lords to answer charges of having preached in Dublin contrary to the declaration of Parliament. […] In the previous May a Declaration had been accepted by the two Houses requiring all persons to conform to Church government by Episcopacy, and to the use of the Liturgy. It is evident that Teate could not conscientiously accede to this, and so was in consequence suspended from exercising ecclesiastical functions.[102]

In such a manner, Tate himself, his father, and his grandfather, were each at some point in their lives deemed to be in violation of Parliamentary orders, despite the positions of high responsibility in which each of them were employed. It would be easy to overstate the implication of these incidents, but what they do demonstrate is that adherence to English laws and customs for Tate and his family were far from unequivocal, and that in this area there is significant confusion and complication which is worthy of consideration.

With such troubled politics surrounding his *History of King Richard the Second*, it seems highly probable that Tate could have held similar feelings towards an overbearing British authority while he was in the process of writing *King Lear*, which emerged just months before *Richard II*. Throughout the play there are several passages in which characters on stage seem not to be addressing other characters, but speaking directly to the audience itself. Albany's declaration in support of Edmund reads: 'If any Man of Quality, within the lists of the Army, will maintain upon Edmund, *suppos'd Earl of Gloster*, that he is a manifold Traytor, let him appear by the third sound of the Trumpet. He is bold in his Defence' (V.iii.111-6) [emphasis added]. Edmund is 'supposed Earl of Gloucester', but who is doing the supposing: the other characters or the audience themselves? Whether Tate himself had the poetic subtlety to have knowingly conjured such a slight is open to debate, his relative frailties – both physical and artistic – being well outlined in several sources.[103]

---

[101] Ibid., p. 40.
[102] Ibid., p. 44.
[103] See Scott-Thomas, p. 611, and Christopher Spencer, *Nahum Tate* (New York: Twayne, 1972).

However, whether intentional or not, the line has something of an unsettling effect in a play which is already deeply unsettled locationally. Later British reviewers of the text, such as Elizabeth Inchbald, were not pleased by whatever implications they saw in Albany's declaration and chose to omit it entirely.

The second point at which it seems that a player is simultaneously addressing both the audience and the other characters on stage comes with Edgar's final speech: 'Our drooping Country now erects her head / Peace spreads her balmy Wings, and Plenty Blooms / […] Truth and Virtue shall at last succeed'.[104] The line carries with it some reflections on Tate's contemporary moment which are interesting on both political and aesthetic levels. Initially, in the context of Tate's spatially unsettled version of *King Lear*, the closing reference to 'our drooping country' no longer necessarily refers to Britain, and in such a way could be said to offer an interesting overlap with Ireland and its formation on stage being 'lifted' by Tate. On a more artistic level, Tate seems to posit a notion that truth and virtue are succeeding after almost two centuries of Shakespeare's text, and this again is interesting in the context of the greater degree of civility which the Restoration English populace attributed to themselves in comparison with their Elizabethan counterparts. This trend on the stage, which sees Elizabethan drama as 'barbaric' in comparison with Tate's contemporaries, is of course a defining influence on the changes made to the play. However, Tate's alterations go above and beyond mere excision of violence. William Davenant's 1664 adaptation of *Macbeth* is a play in which all of the violence and bloodshed of the urtext still occurs, but off-stage and out of view of the audience. In this play there is no scope for the alteration of character which Tate's adaptations of *King Lear* and *Richard II* seem to encourage. Although aesthetic trends can be understood as a primary influence on the 'happy' ending to *King Lear* and the alternate nature of Richard II, it would be a mistake to consider it the sole influence. In the same manner that the concept of Britishness in Shakespeare's *King Lear* is to some extent bound up with an attempt to signify or perhaps imagine the meaning of the term, the proliferation of political and aesthetic themes in Tate's adaptation of the play seems to offer an intriguing reflection of both his contemporary political and aesthetic contexts.

---

[104] Tate, *King Lear*, p. 67.

The effect of these lines is made more prominent by their position within the text. Albany's declaration is read aloud by the herald, and is thus – both within the context of the play and in the auditorium space itself – an announcement to a large gathering of people. The nature of this large gathering is one which seems to be made intentionally ambiguous by Tate, and this cultivates a sense in which the text is potentially addressing not only the characters gathered on stage, but the members of the audience likewise. Edgar's line has a similarly strong resonance, occurring as it does at the very end of the play. His optimistic closing speech both literally and figuratively straddles the boundary between interchanges amongst the characters and an epilogue where the actress playing Cordelia directly addresses the audience. To deduce that Tate here is speaking out in a clandestine way through his text, offers an interesting layer of discussion to Johnson's conjecture that far from being the faithful loyalist his position within the king's theatre might suggest, he was knowingly writing in a politically subversive way.

With Ireland having been re-conquered by Oliver Cromwell a couple of decades previously, and with English laws supporting an upper class of Protestants within broadly Catholic Ireland, it is unsurprising that the role and rights of leaders, and the inviolability of traditional rulership systems, become central to Tate's adaptations of Shakespeare. This is all the more interesting considering that – in spite of the apparent duality in his identity – Tate himself was still viewed in London as an Irishman; a descriptor which brought with it many presumptions of character. Though Tate has been cast by some critics, most notably Odai Johnson, as a disobedient writer on the London stage, readings have thus far overlooked the two vital ways in which his work refers not only to British politics, but to Ireland also. Firstly, King Lear and Richard II, both heavily responsible for their own downfalls in Shakespeare, are recast by Tate into the 'victims' of their respective plays, taken advantage of by the daughters and Bolingbroke, figures who remain representative of the ideal English leader's identity. Tate's stance on the propriety of self-government is manifest, something which is particularly clear in the eventual success of Lear in reclaiming his kingdom. This question of the right to self-rule, the indubitable superiority of time-honoured ruling systems, seems to gesture towards questions which were at the forefront of Irish politics at the time, Ireland itself having been subjected to English settlement and rulership. Cecil Woodham-Smith's description of the native Irish as 'separate, hostile and violent' towards the English settlers is

intriguingly reminiscent Tate's defiant characters, with each retaining a sense of insolence even from positions of little power. The second way in which Tate's texts gesture towards Ireland is rather more implicit, as Tate's characters reject most or all of the associations between them and stereotypical 'Irishness' throughout his adaptations. Tate's Lear is no longer erratic, no longer sentimental, and no longer a weak ruler. He is, instead, a calculating (one could even say manipulative), wise and charismatic king who does eventually ensure success. Perhaps it is these same qualities which eventually saw the character go out of fashion, as later audiences, particularly from the romantic period onwards, again viewed Lear's tragic pathos a key aspect of the play. Tate's Richard is similarly more lawful, more civilised and more diplomatic in his approaches, although unlike Lear he remains ultimately unsuccessful. These characters rebuff the common English visions of 'Irishness' which were prevalent both before and after Tate, and indeed which he was personally subject to, living as he did in London for his adult life.

Chapter III

English Degenerates: the negation of wildness in early Irish adaptations of Shakespeare

> EUDOXUS Is it possible that an Englishman, brought up in such sweet civility as England affords, should find such a liking to that barbarous rudeness, that he should forget his owne nature, and forgoe his owne nation!

- Edmund Spenser, *A View of the Present State of Ireland.*[105]

One of the most repeated tropes throughout Shakespeare is that of the fall of a king or leader from power, and in accompaniment to this theme is a complex cultural association between figures such as King Lear, Coriolanus and Richard II, and an image of Ireland presented ever since the literature of Giraldus Cambrensis and his contemporaries. One of the most primary ways in which literary characters begin to reflect Irish characteristics – those same traits which can be seen to point towards their inability to rule successfully – is to portray them as the wild, unsettled wanderer which was so recognisable in historical English descriptions of Ireland and the Irish. Edmund Spenser was one such writer who drew upon various classical and medieval figurations of this wandering trope, such as Rafael Holinshed and John Davies. The presence of the 'Irished' wandering leader is in this way broadly recognisable throughout British literature, and following from this, many of Shakespeare's tragic leaders suffer a loss of their power through this essential weakness in their character, and none less so than those considered in this chapter; Coriolanus, Lear and Richard II. An often-repeated trend emerges in Shakespeare following the demise of an individual's political power, in that before long they begin a journey which takes them away from the settled, civilised, 'British'-type society over which they had held power, to a lawless, barbaric wilderness where evidence of civilisation seems sparse.

---

[105] Spenser, p. 54.

In this regard, it is very interesting to consider John Gillies's *Shakespeare and the Geography of Difference,* a work which seeks to set out a 'poetic geography' present in Shakespeare, which is a rhetoric which establishes that the margins of contemporary cartographers' maps remained a breeding ground for potentially threatening 'otherness'. Gillies considers Shakespeare's five most notable 'other' characters – Caliban, Shylock, Cleopatra, and the moors Othello and Aaron – to establish a commonality between these 'other' figures; one which ultimately derives from Greek and Roman classical ideas about that which lay beyond their political boundaries.[106]

Throughout British writing of the early modern period there seems to exist a fundamental link between a person's location, and their character development, and this link is borne out in the classical fear of difference and 'degeneration' (in the case of Britain, this involves deteriorating from a civilised 'British' gentleman or lady into an unlawful 'non-British' degenerate) of those who ventured to foreign 'wild' lands, whether for the Irish plantations or for any other reason. This perception that Irish location necessarily produces or leads to degeneracy is precisely why Ireland is such a primary source of anxiety in the period. Michael Neill identifies the fear of 'degeneration' in English literature in 'Broken English and Broken Irish'.

> In an unnatural reversal of the project of civilising incorporation, [the Irish] repeatedly seduced unwary colonists into a degenerate imitation of their own barbarous ways. […] The adoption of Irish manners, costume, and speech by the descendants of the original Normal invaders, the so-called "Old-English," was profoundly threatening to the deeply entrenched notion of "native [inherent] virtue". [107]

As a result of these perceived effects, Ireland is represented as a mirror of the Greek mythological island of Aeaea, or Circe's island, where Circe's enemies were handed potions which metamorphosed them to animals. The comparison with Aeaea is one which is borne out quite forwardly in the writings of several approximate contemporaries of Shakespeare. Richard Stanyhurst, for instance, writes of the 'degenerated' English that they behaved 'as though they had tasted of Circe's poisoned cup'.[108] Notably, the description appears in Holinshed's *Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland*, a known primary source for several of Shakespeare's

---

[106] John Gillies, *Shakespeare and the Geography of Difference* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).
[107] Neill, p. 10.
[108] John Hooker, in *The Second Volume of Chronicles: Containing the Description, Conquest, Inhabitation, and Troblesome Estate Of Ireland*, ed. by Raphael Holinshed (London, 1586), 69.

texts. In addition, John Davies writes in an almost identical manner that such Englishmen were 'like those who had drunk of Circe's cup'.[109] The basis for this recurring trope, of certain characters imitating this type of degenerated wanderer, is evidently a longstanding one, and one which remained prevalent for some time after Shakespeare.

But in spite of the apparent equivalence of such 'degenerated' Englishman and 'the very wild Irish' in terms of description, there is a great sense in Edmund Spenser's writings that Englishmen who had 'degenerated' were in some respects worse than the native Irish:

> IRENIUS The chiefest abuses which are now in that realme, are growne from the English, that are now much more lawlesse and licencious then the very wild Irish: so that as much care as was by them had to reforme the Irish, so much more must nowe bee used to reforme them; so much time doth alter the manners of men.[110]

Although Neill proposes otherwise later in his essay, in many respects Shakespeare's kings are portrayed not only as having assumed many of those qualities which would have culturally identified them as 'Irish', but in many respects actually *worse* than the Irish themselves. The concept of 'Britishness' was still a poorly formed one in Shakespeare's era, and Britain as a political entity was still a century away from being formed by the 1707 Acts of Union, uniting the Kingdom of England (which included Wales) with the Kingdom of Scotland. In fact, as late as 1805 there is still some lack of a strong British identity, revealed this time by Admiral Horatio Nelson immediately before the Battle of Trafalgar. Prior to the engagements, Nelson issued his famous command 'England expects that every man will do his duty', in defiance of the fact that he commanded not only Englishmen, but also Scots, Welshmen and Irishmen. The use of 'English' as a metonym for many different groupings can be traces back to the Elizabethan period, yet being the case that Britishness was yet an ill-defined concept, it becomes of the utmost importance in Shakespeare that any leader show good 'British' characteristics.[111] Shakespeare uses the notion of Britishness rather indiscriminately throughout the text, and even *King Lear*, set in prehistoric times (c.800BC), employs it as one of its primary themes. This is of

---

[109] John Davies, *Discovery of the true causes why Ireland was never Thoroughly Subdued until the Reign of King James I* (London, 1612), p 170.
[110] Spenser, p. 67.
[111] Alan McColl, 'The Meaning of "Britain" in Medieval and Early Modern England', *The Journal of British Studies*, 45:2 (2006), 248-269.

course impossible, as the earliest formation of the word Britain – 'Breteyne' – only emerges around the year 1300.[112] So it is unsurprising that at the time of Edmund Spenser's writings the concept of Britain was far from transparent, and Andrew Hadfield comments that '[Spenser's] work is defined by the Tudor's attempt to expand their boundaries and unify a nebulously conceived idea of Britain'.[113] While the text in its original quarto version, *The History of King Lear*, was staged as a true history, this could not have extended as far as the notion of an extant Britain in the time period of the text. What seems to be more important to the text is not the factual or literal representation of British history on stage, but rather an imagining of the foundations of Britishness, in such a way 'educating' the play's audience in the mannerisms associated with Britain, and more specifically England. As noted by Neill, Ireland played as large apart in the self-identification of Britain, as Britain's 'imperial ambition' played in the foundation of Irish nationhood.[114] As a corollary it is interesting to note the ways in which 'Irish' characters on stage played a role in the identification of English ideals (by their very opposition to them, as per the discussions on Shakespeare here), and in a similar way how English colonial discourse influenced the identity of 'Irish' characters on stage in the plays' afterlives, particularly in the hands of his earliest adapters in the country, in whose hands the depiction of 'Irish' characteristics takes on a newfound significance and emphasis. The formation of Andersen's 'imagined community' of national identities in this way offers a fascinating overlap with the formation of stage identities.

Adaptations of Shakespeare which are written by authors with some link to Ireland show symptoms of having taken on a distinctly localised interest in the representation of certain characters, and though Restoration literature exhibits a general trend towards more 'civilised' works, there is an essential change of character in Irish adaptations which is not evident in Shakespeare's British reviewers. Most notably, there is a newfound disassociation between 'British' tendencies and political power, while simultaneously all non-British tendencies, previously in Shakespeare represented as essentially weak and doomed to failure, take on a newfound significance in the hands of authors with demonstrable links to

---

[112] 'Britain', Online Etymology Dictionary. Douglas Harper. 2010.
<http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?term=Britain>
[113] Andrew Hadfield, *Edmund Spenser's Irish Experience: wild fruit and salvage soyl*, 2nd edition, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), p. 12.
[114] Neill, pp. 2-3.

Ireland, and become rather less barbaric, but more powerful and self-determining. By removing the 'wandering leader' aspect of characters such as Lear and Richard II, the sense of 'Irish-ing' of leaders or kings is much reduced, nullifying the effect which Robin Bates identifies as the cultural 'impressment' of Ireland,[115] defined by Bates as the need for a colonised people to 'be represented in a way that justifies the rule of the empire, a way which depicts them as inferior enough to need foreign governance but similar enough to warrant inclusion'. In Irish adaptations, characters can and do remain personally flawed, but the nationalised implications of this are downplayed dramatically. Moreover, and as has been made evident with regard to Richard II, characters who in Shakespeare are unambiguously the architect of their own downfall, due to their ignorance and imperfections, are portrayed as the victims in Irish writing, often suffering at the hands of more experienced, established powers. The comparisons between Ireland and Aeaea are thus quashed, dissolving the perception of Ireland as a sort of poisoned chalice, destined to destroy the integrity of those who left the British homeland. By removing the blame for any apparent degeneration of character from the Irish land itself, they founded an implication that there were flaws in the British character, and, perhaps more importantly, that there could be such innate character flaws in a British king. In this way, it is evident that Irish adapters such as Duffett and Sheridan received Shakespeare's plays in a way specific to them and their national identity, which is not apparent in English rewritings of the same period, such as by William Davenant, which though exorcising violence from the plays, do so in a way which is essentially aesthetic and 'fashionable', and does not suggest or bring about specific character change.

Of Shakespeare's plays, perhaps *Richard II* is – along with *Henry V* – one of the most commonly read in relation to its portrait of Ireland. The garden versus wilderness imagery unmistakably present throughout the play is well documented,[116] as is the association between Richard's character and that of a stereotypically idealist Ireland.[117] Although commentators have noted that Richard's presence in Ireland is, in any number of ways, an ill-conceived act, readings tend to concentrate very strongly on the more direct and explicit talk of Ireland in the play, without delving into the more implicit and subtle character deviations which are central to many of

---

[115] Bates, p. 13.
[116] See, for instance, Andrew Gurr, *King Richard II: The New Cambridge Shakespeare* (London: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 86.
[117] Bates, p. 64.

Shakespeare's leaders. Because of this, critical attention has not yet been directed towards Richard as a 'degenerated' Englishman, and the underpinning of this portrayal by 'planting' – to continue the garden imagery of the play – the errant king in Ireland itself.

There is little doubt that Richard is a weak king from the outset, that is, before he has even been across the Irish Sea. To revisit Gaunt's speech, Richard, through his carelessness, has brought himself to the point of downfall; a 'careless patient' who has surrounded himself with 'a thousand flatterers', and whose 'death-bed is no lesser than [his] land' (II.i.95). Richard's downfall is, to put it rather simply, his own fault. Richard is implicated in Gloucester's death, and, perhaps most significantly of all, as far as his ultimate fate goes, he improperly seizes Gaunt's land after his death. Richard is a failing king, but his undesirable qualities – lawlessness (involvement in the death of Gloucester) and idealism (in surrounding himself with 'yes men' who will not conflict with his ideals) – remain merely stated at this point, not directly observed by the audience or the reader. Prior to his going abroad, the character does exhibit a lack of civility with his annexation of Gaunt's estate, but even this is predicated on his venture to Ireland.

If Richard is a 'wild' king then Ireland is his wilderness, with Shakespeare seemingly, in the view of Irish adaptors, taking his model from a longstanding tradition in English literature which placed 'wild' Ireland in opposition with 'settled' England. Throughout the play, the contrast between the virtuous and the sinful is borne out in a dichotomy between flowers and weeds. Gaunt, for instance, refers to the dead Gloucester as 'a too-long wither'd flower' (II.i.134), whilst later in the play the gardener and servants speak of the execution of rebels in terms of the extermination of 'too fast growing sprays' and 'noisome weeds'. In this same scene, the first servant offers a description of England which is often interpreted as Shakespeare's own critique of England's present state;[118]

> Our sea-walled garden, the whole land,
> Is full of weeds, her fairest flowers chok'd up,
> Her fruit-trees all unprun'd, her hedges ruin'd,
> Her knots disordered, and her wholesome herbs
> Swarming with caterpillars. (III.iv.43-7)

---

[118] See, for instance, Rebecca Steinberger, *Shakespeare and Twentieth-Century Irish Drama: Conceptualising Identity and Staging Boundaries* (London: Ashgate, 2008), esp. pp. 12-14.

However, though England is figured as distressed in this way, the responsibility for this is with Richard; had he 'trimm'd and dress'd' (III.iv.56) England – 'this garden' (III.iv.57) in the allegory offered by the gardener – then its ideal state would have been preserved. On the one hand, this aspect of the play carries with it a certain anti-colonial message, and it is true that the turn of events suggests that a king ought to concern himself with domestic rulership rather than overseas conquest, but it may also be seen as suggesting that an successful king should be able to rule effectively both at home and abroad, and this is a suggestion also taken up in *Henry V*. However, much of the moralising over Richard's choice in the play is not based on an ethical dilemma to do with colonial attitudes, but rather remains predicated upon a requisite prioritisation of Britain over foreign land. Richard is wrong to go to Ireland, but only in the sense that he has allowed this to hinder his rulership of England, not because colonial attitudes are immoral by necessity. In such a way, it is possible to perceive the play as a critique of colonial expansion, but not so out of an anti-colonial principle, rather due to a concern with an overarching sanctity of the homeland. England, though distressed by Richard's incapacity to rule, maintains its righteous state, whilst Ireland becomes the wilderness whose very presence lays the foundation for the 'sea-walled garden' to become infested by weeds and insects. This process is an important one within British literature, as Michael Neill notes;

> The idea of Irish nationhood was as much the product of English imperial ambition as any of the later anti-imperial nationalisms that succeeded it. […] Ireland played an equally crucial part in the determination of English identity, functioning as the indispensable anvil upon which the notion of Englishness was violently hammered out. […] It was the Irish "wilderness" that bounded the English garden, Irish "barbarity" that defined English civility, Irish papistry and "superstition" that warranted English religion; it was Irish "lawlessness" that demonstrated the superiority of English law, and Irish "wandering" that defined the settled and centered nature of English society.[119]

While we might question the very idea of an Irish nationhood and nationalism in the Early Modern era, it is evident that at a time when British identity was still a matter of interpretation, and that stage representation of the Irish 'other' played a formative role in the notion of Britishness as a contradictory[120] and superior ideal. However, though this representation of the Irish 'other' does exist, it does not seem to be as utterly separated from visions of Britishness as, say, the newly-discovered North

---

[119] Neill, p. 3.
[120] Perhaps made most explicit in *Richard II,* Richard's describes the Irish as 'the antipodes' (III.ii.49), emphasising their total difference and opposition to British court and society.

American Indians, or people of the Caribbean. This, according to Andrew Murphy, is due to the 'proximity' of the two communities, for whereas exotic aborigines were an entirely new phenomenon to the British, Ireland and Britain already had a relationship stretching back several centuries, and had much commonality in custom, religion, and politics. As a result, the Irish 'proximate other' is often seen to be far less distinct from the 'absolute other' of the Americas.[121]

Nonetheless, by crossing the sea to Ireland, Richard becomes both figuratively and literally 'the very wilde Irish'[122] wanderer; the figure of degeneration, dissolution and incivility in Spenser's *View* and many other Elizabethan and historical writings on Ireland. In spite of Richard's many flaws as a leader, it is not until the moment at which he lands on the Welsh coast, fresh from his forays in Ireland, that his previously stated idealism becomes evident through his very actions. Moreover, it is also at this point that Richard becomes overtly superstitious, for instance calling on the earth to 'feed not thy sovereign's foe […] / Nor with thy sweets comfort his ravenous sense; / But let thy spiders […] / And heavy-gaited toads lie in their way' (III.ii.12-5). Indeed, Richard's unwavering belief in the protection of God, although overtly a religious reference, might be construed as a superstitious or idealistic gesture in itself, given Bolingbroke's overwhelming advantage in power. Similar superstitions play a major role in Richard's final downfall, for instance that of the Welsh army that had been present to save him. Waiting for Richard's return from Ireland, the captain of the army interprets signs from nature;

> The bay-trees in our country are all wither'd
> And meteors fright the fixed stars of heaven,
> The pale fac'd moon looks bloody on the earth
> And lean-look'd prophets whisper fearful
>   change […]
> Our countrymen are gone and fled,
> As well assur'd Richard their king is dead (II.iv.8-17)

Owing to these signs, the Welsh army disperses and it seems Richard is left without hope. Although this act is perpetrated not by Richard, but rather by the Welsh army, it remains an event predicated on Richard's time in Ireland, and committed by a force which was in support of an 'Irished' king. Thus, Richard has become entirely

---

[121] Andrew Murphy, *But the Irish Sea Betwixt Us: Ireland, Colonialism & Renaissance Literature* (Kentucky: Kentucky University Press, 1999), p. 6.
[122] Spenser, p. 67.

'degenerated' by his time on the island, and the strongest indication of this is in Richard's superstition and idealism, standing in opposition to English or British ideals of religion and practicality. Both of these elements to Richard's character play a major part in his downfall to the more pragmatic (ergo 'British') Bolingbroke. As Richard is brought towards the tower of London, Isabel waits along the route in hope of his passing. Once again calling on the weed/flower motif of the play, Isabel exhibits her distress at Richard's present state by lamenting over seeing her 'fair rose wither' (V.i.8): The play's movement towards tragedy complete at this point, its tragic pathos is secured for the 'unking'd' Richard, whose descent into degeneracy seems complete at this point.

In contrast, Tate's Richard is not the architect of his own downfall, nor does he reflect the English fear of 'degeneration' after arriving back from Ireland. Indeed, the very portrayal of Richard as a wanderer is defused in the play, in particular through its altered portrayal of Ireland and the Irish on Tate's stage. The 'Gardening' scene is comprehensively reworked in Tate, the most indicative change to the scene being the elimination of the first servant's 'sea-walled garden' speech (III.iv.40-7), in which he questions the wisdom of utilising British resources on the wild Ireland, while England herself suffers from Richard's carelessness. This is a scene which in Shakespeare is responsible for much of the negativity aimed at both Ireland and Richard at this subtextual level, going abroad having been Richard's own decision. Tate, by its removal, prompts several significant changes to how an audience can receive the play; both in terms of affecting the perception of Ireland, and also dealing with Richard himself. Firstly, by his elimination of the dichotomy between the cultured English and 'the very wild Irish', Tate diminishes the extent to which Ireland is perceived as a wilderness in the text. Secondly, and following from this portrayal of Ireland, there is a reduced sense in the text that Richard has become the 'wandering leader', which was his role in Shakespeare's play. For in Spenser the link between 'wandering' and 'wilderness' is indelible, and this is no more clearly observed than in the British fear of 'degeneration' of those who went to Ireland. To fail to represent the country as a wilderness is to fail to represent Richard as a wandering, 'Irished' king. Finally, by the removal of the servant's 'sea-walled garden' outburst against Richard's policies, Tate in effect dramatically increases Richard's approval ratings with the 'common man' of the text, represented to a great

extent by figures such as the servant in Shakespeare, being one of the only characters in the play without a title to their name.

Shakespeare and Tate offer diverging views in far more overt ways too. The kerns (Irish soldiers) in Shakespeare's text are 'rough' and 'rug-headed' (II.i.157), but not described as such in Tate. In Shakespeare, the nature of the reference to 'those' (II.i.157) same Irish kerns draws a them-and-us distinction between the two nations, implying not only that the English are not 'rug-headed', but emphasising the complete difference between Ireland and England. By a similar token, Shakespeare's Richard describes his time in Ireland as 'wandering with the antipodes', further underlining the total opposition between Ireland and England, and once again calling to mind the extreme antithesis between Irish wandering with British or English settlement. Tate's stance is again opposite, as he does not offer this description anywhere in his text, and the result of this is that Tate, who had experience of both countries, seemingly favoured a view of some commonality between Ireland and England.

By disbanding the image of Richard as a character 'degenerated' by his time in Ireland, the landscape of Tate's play is changed entirely. The implications of Tate's fresh aesthetic to the play are striking, as the play no longer furnishes the audience with a vision of the stereotypical Irishman, familiar to many from British literature stretching over the previous several centuries. However Tate does not go so far as to present an expressly positive portrayal of the Irish in *Richard II*, and his version of the text remains a play in which there is an attempted colonisation of the country. However, it is not the presence of this colonisation which is most important, but rather the way in which it and the Irish are presented, and in this regard Tate is quite in opposition to Shakespeare. His play is responsible for breaking the procession of negative Irish stereotypes on the British stage and in British literature, and even by presenting Ireland from a neutral standpoint Tate takes a large step away from his contemporaries and predecessors.

Tate in this way reveals Richard as a figure of human imperfection; youthful innocence lead astray and poorly counselled by those around him. He is less at fault for his own downfall and failings than Shakespeare's character, though the extent to which this applies depends on whether one views Shakespeare's Richard in a sympathetic or critical light. The failings of Richard are, in the case of Tate, not the fault of the monarch himself, but lie with the crafty, scheming abusers who surround

him. Some readings of Shakespeare's *Richard II* align Richard's downfall with that of the kingdom, seeing Richard's doom and the infestation of the 'sea-walled garden' as one and the same, and thus inferring that the text is actually Shakespeare's own critique of the present state of England.[123] However, such interpretations are at odds with Tate's adaptation, which iterates the basic story but with Richard in a different light; Tate's play is more overt in its separation of the merely naïve Richard from the strife of the kingdom, responsibility for which is placed with more emphasis on the shoulders of his advisors. Again, these renderings of Richard's character are most easily observed in the dramatically variant treatment handed to Richard by Gaunt in each version of the text.

The implication of these modifications is that Tate's play does figure England as being in a state of disorder, but this disorder is not and can not be brought about by one man, and rather stems from corruption and scheming from many different individuals at the highest levels of society. Shakespeare's play too engages in such separation of king and state, but in this instance the bias is in favour of the land; Britain maintains elements of its divinity, but is represented as merely spoilt by Richard's irresponsible mismanagement. Tate's play is different in so far as it portrays this difference in favour of Richard; an innocent youth victimised by the expectations of greater society. Tate's *Richard II* is, in such a way, arguably the indictment of British culture – which is to say, not merely the king – which some critics uphold Shakespeare's own version of the text to be.[124] Richard's presence in Shakespeare's text as the wandering, 'Irished' leader is what marks him as being out of place within his own society, reinforcing the positive British and negative Irish images advanced by a series of English writers in the time leading up to Shakespeare. In contrast, it is Richard's human fallibility in Tate's version which serves to criticise his wider culture. Tate's play, emphasising as it does what can befall a state when ordinary men by duplicity take control of the monarchy, replicates very closely the political preoccupations of Tate's present Britain, shortly after the exclusion crisis. Odai Johnson's reading of Tate as a politically subversive writer on the British stage, even in spite of his high standing within it, is particularly interesting in this regard. However, what is missing from Johnson's consideration is Tate's personal history,

---

[123] See Steinberger, esp. pp. 12-14.
[124] Ibid.

and the presence of Richard's human fallibility, which brings with it a critique of greater British society, seems to accord much momentum to this approach to Tate.

Location and Identity in Thomas Sheridan's *Coriolanus*

In Shakespeare's own renditions of their stories, both Lear and Coriolanus progress through a set of events which are markedly similar to those which Richard II was subject to. It has already been stated how Richard's 'wandering' in Ireland occurred immediately after his loss of control over the kingship, and the same might also be said of both Lear and Coriolanus. Lear's abdication of kingship comes about as a result of his ensuing madness in the first scene, and by the beginning of the third act the king is to be found wandering a wild heath, battered by 'a storm, with thunder and lightning'. Lear in this scene is reminiscent of the Spenserian image of the unsettled Irishman, and there would seem to be an implication that the ailment which brought about this character deviation is the same disorder which caused him to abdicate his leadership responsibilities. Likewise, Coriolanus finds himself rejected by the Roman people, with any chance of standing as consul over Rome lying in tatters. His reaction to losing such power in so short a time is familiar, and he leaves settled, civilised Rome and becomes a 'wanderer', ending up eventually at the Volscian camp. Of course, Rome itself becomes a 'wilderness of tigers' in *Titus Andronicus*, however such representations along with the aforementioned 'Britain' of *King Lear* can be seen as a representation of particular values as opposed to simple realities of location. Much like Richard and Lear, Coriolanus responds to his own terrible errors and loss of power by venturing out into a wilderness, and all three bear a strong resemblance to the wandering Irish figure so robustly vilified by texts such as Spenser's *View of the State of Ireland*. It is of little surprise then that these texts are singled out by Irish adaptors of Shakespeare well into the eighteenth century.

Thomas Sheridan, in writing his adaptation of *Coriolanus* – which was both printed and performed in Dublin, with Sheridan playing Coriolanus himself – seemed to face a difficulty in this regard, for Coriolanus's 'wandering' through to the Volscian camp was a necessary part of the plot, yet it brings with it the negative imagery of Coriolanus as another failed leader exhibiting Irish tendencies. Sheridan's rewriting of the saga is subtle in dealing with the representation, but still follows the same unmistakable trend of rejecting associations between wild characters and wild lands. Shakespeare included two scenes between Coriolanus's flight from Rome, and

his arrival in the Volscian outpost. In one of these two scenes, the distance between the two points is described as 'a day's journey' (IV.iii.10) In Sheridan's rewrite, both of these small items are changed, and both of these alterations reduce the sense with which Coriolanus could be described as a wanderer. There is no injection of scenes between Coriolanus's departure and arrival, with the result that, in the audience's own experience, the time spent by Coriolanus in the wilderness is negligible. In addition, Aufidius later describes Rome as being 'six hours' away.[125] Though colloquially one might well describe a six-hour march as 'a day's journey', the presence of this rhetoric of changing 'day' to 'hour' could serve to dispel the journey in the mind of an audience. Because Coriolanus leaves Rome and then arrives (on stage at least) in Antium seemingly moments later – without so much as a break of act – the image of him as an 'Irish', or at least non-'English', journeyman is diminished.

By the same token, it might be said that the image of Lear as a wanderer in the storm scene is much dispelled by Tate in his adaptation. Lawrence Green argues that the psychological depth which is nowadays a major feature of the character of Lear is directly attributable to Nahum Tate's adaptation and removal of the Fool.[126] The Fool, throughout Shakespeare's play, acts as a sounding board for many of Lear's realisations and developments as a character. Tate's removal of this trusting relationship resulted in players sublimating much of their energy into the psychological aspects of Lear, as it became the sole responsibility of Lear – and his player – to undergo the character's trademark dramatic changes of psyche.[127] The most critical scene in which this occurs is the 'storm scene', and by reconsidering the original in the context of Lear-before-Tate an image of the undesirable figure made most prominent by Spenser emerges once again. Deprived of the psychological depth which is now used to associate the chaos of Lear's mind with the chaos of the storm, Lear comes to be figured far more definitively as the wanderer. The storm is more straightforwardly external to Lear in Shakespeare, and with that comes the wilderness aspect.

In Tate, the absence of his Fool means that Lear has to make his own psychological developments, and so the storm comes to be figured as an extension of

---

[125] Sheridan, *Coriolanus,* p. 38.
[126] Green, 'Where's My Fool? Some Consequences of the Omission of the Fool in Tate's Lear'.
[127] Ibid., esp. p. 259.

Lear's own psyche, rather than a wilderness which is external to him. Indeed, the presence of the storm diminishes throughout Tate's III.iii, as certain issues – such as the love between Cordelia and Edgar – resolve themselves within Lear's own mind. The scene ends with an image of Cordelia going to sleep as Edgar dries her clothes, and a reference to stars that will 'dart their kindest beams'.[128] Such a reference to starlight is deeply at odds with Edgar's description of the scene which came just a couple of hundred lines earlier: 'this dreadfull Night / Where (tho' at full) the clouded Moon scarce / darts / Imperfect Glimmerings'.[129] In contrast, Shakespeare punctuates III.iv, the corresponding scene, with five stage directions referring to the continuing ferocity of the storm. Shakespeare's Lear is thus doomed to wander as a failed leader; he is, similar to the degenerated Englishman, at the mercy of the wild elements, and remains so regardless of personal development or realisation. On the other hand, Tate's character is able to display a certain level of command over the wilderness, displaying that he is not helpless in the face of the wild, that he maintains control over his own nature and motives, an aspect of character established in an alternative manner in chapter II. In this regard he is quite detached from the 'degenerated' Englishman represented throughout British tracts on Ireland prior to Shakespeare.

Parody and Politics

However, Tate and Sheridan are not alone in a tradition of Irish-born authors who carry certain political agendas across the Irish Sea, and indeed it is intriguing to note that Thomas Duffett's burlesque *The Mock Tempest* and Macnamara Morgan's pastoral comedy *The Sheep Shearing* (from *The Winter's Tale*) would also appear to deal with the stage Irishman. While burlesque often deals with a comic inversion of the text, it is possible to say that this alone does not entirely remove the spectrum of politicised adaptation. Linda Hutcheon writes in *A Theory of Parody: The Teaching of Twentieth-Century Art Forms* that 'parody can be a revolutionary position, the point is that it *need* not be'.[130] Further, she notes that parody, often explained away as adaptation done 'with comic effect', is often closer to 'repetition with critical

---

[128] Tate, *King Lear*, p. 36.
[129] Ibid., p. 34.
[130] Linda Hutcheon, *A Theory of Parody: The Teaching of Twentieth-Century Art Forms* (New York: Methuen, 1985), p. 75.

difference'.[131] Since many aspects of both Duffett and Morgan's plays seem reminiscent of much more 'serious' Irish adaptations, they are worth considering within the same discourse as Tate and Sheridan.

Thomas Duffett's *The Mock Tempest, or The Enchanted Castle*, first performed in 1674, printed in London a year later, was written less than a decade before Tate's adaptations of *King Lear* and *Richard II,* and is an adaptation which to quite an extent pre-empts Tate in its dealings with the stage Irishman by its reversal of the 'wandering' element of its Shakespearean urtext. Duffett's text is not a direct adaptation of Shakespeare's *Tempest*, but rather a parody version of Thomas Shadwell's operatic version of John Dryden and William Davenant's own adaptation of *The Tempest,* and as such is one of the most interesting examples of the lively cultural afterlife of *The Tempest* or any other Shakespearean play. However, the changes which are relevant to this reading of the text are Duffett's own, and so for these purposes it will be considered more straightforwardly as a direct adaptation of Shakespeare. Although Duffett does not deal with a leader or king in the same way that the other texts in this chapter do, Duffett's text is nonetheless relevant in that it is equally as indicative of the tacit localised complications recurrent throughout Irish adaptations of the era.

One of the most notable elements of Shakespeare's *Tempest* is the lack of a settled location for the characters, who seem constantly nomadic, and the only times at which settlement is mentioned in the play are in relation to Prospero's cell, or cave, and Sycorax locking Ariel in a tree. This is, moreover, something which is reflected in the narrative structure of the play itself, as the action migrates incessantly between three plots developing on the island, involving Caliban, Prospero and Ariel. This trope of unsettlement is a familiar one in British descriptions of Ireland and the Irish, such as in the following extract from Spenser's *View*:

> IRENIUS Nowe being, as they commonly are, rather swyne-styes then howses, is the chiefest cause of his so beastly manner of life, and savage condition, lying and living together with his beast in one howse, in one roome, in one bed, that is the cleane strawe, or rather a fowl dounghill.[132]

And it is not only the nomadic nature of characters, or the figurative migration of the text itself, which points to a link between Shakespeare's text and previous writings,

---

[131] Ibid., p. 25.
[132] Spenser, p. 84

such as Spenser's. The mention of character settlement which does exist – Prospero's cave, Ariel's tree – are also predicated on the 'wilderness' of life on the island.

An important addition to the wilderness aspect of these characters is the sense in which they seem to live in a society which is almost entirely without law. Such is the extent of the barbarism represented of these English characters, which were wholly in defiance of British ideals of culture, lawfulness and civility, that Barbara Murray says of the characters that there is 'talk or enactment of drunkenness, violence, mutilation, cannibalism; of pimping, prostitution, adultery, incest; of hypocrisy, cowardice, torture, execution; of urine, vermin, venereal disease; of deviance, dissolution, and death'.[133] Caliban views Prospero as a usurper, Prospero views Caliban as a rapist, Stephano and Trinculo plot a rebellion, Antonio and Sebastian plot a murder, and Alonso has a heavy hand in the original setting adrift of Prospero and Miranda. The link between wilderness and lawlessness (or, at least, lack of English laws) is one reiterated in Spenser's *View* by his association of Brehon Law with the soil:

> IRENIUS Oftentimes [in Brehon Law] there appeareth great shew of equity, in determining the right betweene part and party, but *in many things repugning quite from gods law and mans*, as for example, in the case of murther. The Brehon that is ther judge, will compound betweene the murderer, and the frends of the party murdered, which prosecute the action, that the malefactor shall give unto them, […] a recompence. […] And this judge […] adjudgeth for the most part a better share unto his Lord, that is *the Lord of the soyle*, or the head of that sept, and also unto him self, for his judgment, a greater portion than unto the plaintiffes or parties grieved. (emphasis added)[134]

Spenser's thoughts are reflective of a much wider English belief in the link between lawlessness and wilderness, and such themes grow to find their way into much fictional work, including that of Shakespeare. In contrast, Duffett not only offers these characters a place of settlement, but sees fit to lock them up in Bridewell prison at the centre of London. Thus, far from being the unsettled rabble living with no apparent law system which Shakespeare pinned them as, Duffett's characters find themselves trapped in place, and even more indicatively, do so at the very centre of London society.[135]

---

[133] Barbara A. Murray, *Restoration Shakespeare* (NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2001), p. 96.
[134] Spenser, p. 14
[135] However, such a reversal is further complicated by the fact that Duffett's text is a burlesque, this will be considered in Chapter IV.

Much of the critical output on Duffett views him as bound up in the rivalry between the King's Company and the Duke's Company,[136] and these interpretations correctly point out that Duffett's three primary adaptive works in this period, *The Empress of Morocco*, *The Mock Tempest* (both performed in 1674) and *Psyche Debauch'd* (1675) are targeted at three of the Duke Theatre's most successful productions at Dorset Gardens; Elkanah Settle's *The Empress of Morocco*, Thomas Shadwell's operatic version of Dryden and Davenant's adaptation of *The Tempest*, and Shadwell's own opera, *Psyche*.[137] However, Duffett's own story is lost in these interpretations of the text, and as a subtext to this pointed satire, Duffett's adaptation is a dissenting parody of English society in general. The newly-English characters of Duffett's burlesque are portrayed as no more civil towards each other than Shakespeare's non-English characters were. Though the original text suggests something of a thin line between barbarous natives and civil incomers, this is done still in a way in which gives rise to a dichotomy between (what the audience identifies as) British and non-British characteristics. Caliban, for instance, is notable for the barbarity he displays at several points – the attempted sexual assault of Miranda, plots to kill and/or overthrow Prospero – but this vision of him as a 'thing of darkness' is complicated by the play at several points, perhaps most notably of all in his several floral speeches throughout:

> Sometimes a thousand twangling instruments
> Will hum about mine ears; and sometime voices
> That, if I then had wak'd after long sleep,
> Will make me sleep again; and then in dreaming,
> The clouds methought would open, and show riches
> Ready to drop upon me; that, when I wak'd
> I cried to dream again. (III.ii.147-54)

The musical imagery present here, suggestive of a natural harmony interrupted by the discord of reality on the island, reveals a richness and depth to the character beyond his inhuman physical description, and it is this very ability to speak which is recognised by Prospero as a consequence of his arrival on the island, and a part of the civilising power of language.

> PROSPERO I have us'd thee

---

[136] See Michael West, 'Dryden's Mac Flecknoe and the Examples of Duffett's Burlesque Dramas'. *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 18:3, (1978). Also, Peter Lewis, 'Another Look at John Gray's "The Mohocks"', *The Modern Language Review.* 63:4, (1968), p. 790.

[137] Peter Lewis, 'Review of *Three Burlesque Plays of Thomas Duffett: The Empress of Morocco; The Mock-Tempest; Psyche Debauch'd*, by Ronald Eugene DiLorenzo', *The Yearbook of English Studies*, Vol. 5 (1975), p. 285.

> Filth as thou art, with human care; and lodg'd thee
> In mine own cell […]
> I pitied thee
> Took pains to make thee speak, taught thee each hour
> One thing or other, when thou didst not, savage,
> Know thine own meaning, but wouldst gabble like
> A thing most brutish. (I.ii.345-57)

In this way, though Caliban and Prospero both seem to straddle the boundary between barbarity and civility, it is Caliban who is made more civil by Prospero's arrival, and by a similar token Prospero who is made less so by the requirements of life on the island, another incidence of British fear of 'degeneration' in wild places.[138]

From the very outset of the play, the British characters are portrayed as little more than a rabble, with the storm scene of Shakespeare replaced by a riot in a brothel. The dual emphasis of Duffett's criticism is made particularly palpable by his knowing characterisation of the scene, by having Gonzalo describe the riot as 'more noise and terrour then a tempest at sea'.[139] The thinly veiled reference to Shakespeare's urtext certainly indicates that he also was to some extent another focus of Duffett's satire, but critics have until this point failed to question beyond this, and consider the further implications the text has for the representation of British society.

By figuring his British characters as more chaotic than 'a tempest at sea', Duffett sets them up to be wholly 'burlesquified' (to borrow a word from Richard Schoch[140]) by the end of the play. The author continues to call into question British values of civility, piety and propriety by having Dorinda and Hippolito (characters added to the text by Dryden and Davenant) display images of incivility strongly reminiscent of Spenser's Irish. They are firstly overly familiar with the opposite sex, and secondly thoroughly perplexed by the idea of a husband;

> DORINDA   Husband, what's that?
> MIRANDA Why that's a thing like a man (for aught I know) with a great
>   pair of horns upon his head, and my father said 'twas made for
>   women, look ye.
> DORINDA   What, must we ride to water upon't, sister?
> MIRANDA No, no, it must be our slave, and give us golden clothes, pray,
>   that other men may lie with us in a civil way, and then it must
>   father our children and keep them.

---

[138] It is interesting to note here that in the 'after-life' of the play, Caliban has increasingly been recognised above Prospero as the central figure and main protagonist of *The Tempest*.
[139] Thomas Duffett, *The Mock Tempest, or The Enchanted Castle* (London, 1675), p. 3
[140] Richard Schoch, *Not Shakespeare: Bardolatry and Burlesque in the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 151.

DORINDA   And when we are so old and ugly that nobody else will lie with
         us, must it lie with us itself?
MIRANDA   Aye, that it must, sister.[141]

This exchange between Dorinda and Miranda can be seen as parodic of the relationship between Prospero and Miranda, making light of the law-of-the-father and the institution of marriage. Duffett's text takes the seemingly wild, lawless savages of Shakespeare, and by depositing them into the very centre of London culture takes any perceived representations of 'Irishness' and turns them back towards the English public.

Tate's *Richard II* and Duffett's *Mock Tempest* vary considerably in how they approach the theme of the wandering leader, yet they both offer much the same result. Tate makes generally slight alterations to the text, removing short sections and recasting certain speeches, yet achieves wholesale changes to Richard's character and, in doing so, removes the responsibility from Richard's shoulders, placing it more broadly upon the British court and society. *The Mock Tempest* on the other hand, perhaps unsurprisingly for a burlesque, tends towards outrageous changes of character, location and events. Yet, in spite of his disregard for subtlety, Duffett mirrors Tate's later text not only in 'writing out' the wandering leader element, but also in his critique of general British culture and society, predicated on a recasting of the aspects of character which seemed overly-reminiscent of the longstanding image of Ireland and the Irish.

In both of the Shakespearean urtexts, fear and wandering appear to be linked with a sort of dissipation of the self, a lack of personal identity which carries with it an inevitable lack of English identity. This is something rejected by his Irish adapters, instead favouring a vision of set identity; one which remains constant in spite of outside influence. The 'storm scene' of Shakespeare's *King Lear* expresses this more apparently than any other, but is far from the only instance of it in his writings, just as Tate's rejection of it is not the only one of its kind in Irish adaptations. In *The Winter's Tale* the shepherd and the clown – outsiders in the play – are dramatic character types handed no particular identity beyond the descriptors of their names. They require no further elaboration or designation, and being essentially reduced to anonymity within the text, this is something we might link to their

---

[141] Duffett, p. 13.

inhabiting a 'wild' Bohemia. Macnamara Morgan's 1767 adaptation, *The Sheep-Shearing: or, Florizel and Perdita* goes against this by giving both characters a set identity and an extensive back story within the play. The mockery of Christopher Sly (who in the play's outset is immediately described as a 'beast' and a 'swine' (Induction.35) when discovered sleeping by the Lord) in the introductory scene to *The Taming of the Shrew* carries with it a familiar message.

> LORD What think you, if he were conveyed to bed,
>   Wrapp'd in sweet clothes, rings put upon his fingers,
>   A most delicious banquet by his bed,
>   And brave attendants near him when he wakes,
>   Would not the beggar then forget himself? (Induction.37-41)

This again reflects the belief that the placement of the individual will have a powerful influence over the identity of the person, and also a culturally ingrained anxiety over vagrancy and master-less men or individuals. The scene is excised from James Worsdale's adaptation of the text, however it is interesting to note that in some respects a couple of Shakespeare's Irish adapters do reflect British insistence on the specific placement of the individual, and that this is borne out in their preference for adapting plays to British locations, particularly London. Duffett's *Mock Tempest* is perhaps the strongest example of this, localising itself so as to ridicule not only the British literary discourse which had for centuries represented Ireland so unsympathetically, but also a British theatre-going public who over time had learned through theatre and other literary sources to draw such fundamental distinctions between themselves and those figured on-stage. In such a manner, English authors use vague locations – 'wilderness' – to construct an unfavourable vision of the wanderer character-type, whilst later Irish writers do the opposite by using precise location to complicate this tradition, as well as the theatre-goers themselves, by comparing them to the lawless savages portrayed throughout British literature over a number of centuries.

Macnamara Morgan's *The Sheep-Shearing* (1754), a pastoral comedy based on *The Winter's Tale*, also considers the theme of the 'Irish' wanderer, and although it does so in a different manner to other adaptations, it explores the trope with such faithfulness to the concept of 'degeneration' that in can not be overlooked. At the outset of *The Winter's Tale,* King Leontes becomes convinced that Hermoine is being unfaithful to him with his best friend Polixenes, king of Bohemia. As part of

his jealous rampage, Leontes casts his only daughter and heir into the wilderness of Bohemia, believing her to be illegitimate and therefore unsuitable to the throne.

> LEONTES   Carry
> This female bastard hence; and […] bear it
> To some remote and desart place quite out
> Of our dominions; and that there thou leave it,
> Without more mercy, to its own protection,
> And the favour of the climate. (II.iii.173-8)

Leontes's actions are notably similar to those of Lear, who also banishes his daughter into the wilderness as soon as he considers her an unfit ruler. In such a way, Shakespeare seems to present a link between the land and the person, and suggests that certain kinds of people – failed or unsuitable leaders, or lawless barbarians – are inevitably more suited to or inclined towards a certain kind of situation; alone in the wilderness. As Antigonus places Perdita in the wilderness of Bohemia, he and the mariner at various points offer descriptions of the land: 'The desarts of Bohemia. […] This place is famous for the creatures that lay upon't. […] According to thine oath / Places remote enough are in Bohemia' (III.iii.3-30). Shakespeare, in his own stage directions, figures Bohemia as 'A desert Country' and ends the scene by having Antigonus chased off stage (and presumably killed) by a bear.

However, the link between Perdita and the Bohemian landscape progresses well beyond this link between her as a fallen leader and the wilderness, for Shakespeare also presents us with the reverse by his use of the often-maligned sixteen year gap. Time and the Chorus describe being 'In fair Bohemia' (IV.i.21) right from the outset of the fourth act, and the transformation of the landscape is made yet more clear by Autolycus's later singing; 'When daffodils begin to peer […] / Why, then comes in the sweet of the year […] / the sweet birds, O, how they sing! […] / The lark […] / the thrush and the jay / are summer songs' (IV.ii.1-11). Though the difference in the land is more to do with the onset of summer than the sixteen year disjoint, there is still a sense in which Bohemia has become transformed in some way over the passage of time. It now has a luminescence which was not seen or hinted at in the first section of the play; it is no longer the daunting wilderness that Perdita was abandoned in.

Most interestingly, this dramatic change in the Bohemian landscape mirrors ideally the change in Perdita's fortunes. Leontes soon realises the error of his ways in casting Perdita into the wilderness, recognising her as his legitimate daughter and

therefore as the legitimate future ruler of Sicilia. In the same timeframe, Bohemia undergoes the seeming transformation outlined above, and it is as if Perdita's presence as rightful queen has brought about a change in the land itself. This is, therefore, something of a new interpretation of the English fear of 'degeneration' in Ireland. Rather than the land polluting Perdita's personality, her integrity acts over the landscape as a civilizing force, resulting in a fundamental shift in the imagery of the play.

In contrast, such a link between land and personality is rejected by Morgan in his pastoral recreation of the text, *The Sheep-Shearing*; choosing to write the concept out entirely. In his rewrite, Morgan omits everything which appeared before the sixteen year gap in Shakespeare's play, and instead characters briefly recount events in a final exposition scene. One result of this is that in Morgan, Bohemia is never figured overtly as a wilderness, which in itself complicates the sense with which Perdita (a name which, notably, is Latin for 'lost one') could be read as a 'wandering leader'. A second, perhaps more telling, alteration of Morgan's is that Antigonus is not supposedly killed off-stage by the bear, as in Shakespeare. Rather, he escapes and finds a mauled shepherd, and stealing the shepherd's clothing opts to live in Bohemia, affording him the opportunity to raise Perdita himself and thus removing the guilt he feels over his role in the young child's banishment.

> You May remember […]
> Leontes growing jealous of his queen,
> Far gone with child, most barbarously doomed. […]
> I undertook the task, through mercy,
> First vowing myself to save the babe,
> And fly with it to some more peaceful shore.[142]

In this manner, Perdita is no longer raised by a shepherd and a clown, anonymous foreigners in the Bohemian wilderness, but rather by a nobleman of Sicilia. The play, as is the tendency of pastoral drama, upholds and affirms class position and birthright. Perdita is long longer viewed as a lost wanderer, but rather as always in the care of Antigonus, and in this manner the sense in which Perdita becomes a 'wandering leader' of the same ilk as Shakespeare's Lear, Coriolanus and Richard II is greatly downplayed. Morgan's structural changes to the plot, which were observed as downplaying the portrayal of Bohemia as a destitute wasteland, also play a role in this process of surrounding Perdita with a greater sense of settlement and civility.

---

[142] Morgan, *The Sheep-Shearing*, p. 25.

The more favourable representation of Perdita's upbringing, as well as the positive representation of the Bohemian landscape as a 'more peaceful shore' than the abject wilderness of Shakespeare's text, reflects all of the most common motifs present in many other Irish alterations to Shakespeare, lessening negative representations of foreign lands, and by extension resisting an accepted portrayal of Ireland in English literature.

However, in spite of his play's retention of broadly similar events, Morgan relies on the minor ambiguities and idiosyncrasies of Shakespeare's urtext in order to produce a play which appears to excise the stereotyped vision of 'Irishness' in English literature. In this sense, the style of Morgan's adaptation is far from that of Nahum Tate and Thomas Duffett, who rely respectively on an opposing conclusion and wholesale changes in their texts to produce the same alternate imagery. This is in contrast to the very minor, but very influential, tweaks made by Morgan. By not killing Antigonus on stage Shakespeare leaves this aspect of the play open to analysis, and subsequently by having Antigonus secretly raise Perdita to adolescence Morgan calls into question the image of the 'wandering leader' which had surrounded her.

Morgan's 'writing out' of the unsettled element of Perdita's development is in this way interestingly reminiscent of Thomas Sheridan and Nahum Tate's treatment of similar characters. Across all Irish adaptations of the 'failed leader' motif in Shakespeare, the apparent connection between weak leadership and an unsettled life is disbanded, and it is noteworthy that such alterations concern characters who in chapter II were distinguished as having been shed of the various impediments which were so characteristic of the Irish masses in British writings. In addition to this overlap, it is intriguing to note how closely the 'settlement' of these leaders ties in with the pronounced fear of 'degeneration' of Englishmen who venture beyond their own shores to explore Ireland and other countries. Tate, Sheridan, Duffett and Morgan each offer plays which, in their individually unique ways, reject such an association between location and character, and as such are responsible for distorting the progression of the 'Irish' stereotype in English or British society.

Chapter IV

A Thing Most Brutish: renewed representations of the common man in Tate and Duffett

> No man could enjoy his Life, his Wife, his Lands or Goods in safety, if a mightier man than himselfe had an appetite to take the same from him. Wherein they were little better than *Canniballes*, who doe hunt one another, and he that hath the most strength and swiftness doth eate and devoure all his fellowes.
>
> - John Davies.[143]

There is a demonstrable difference between the features of powerful characters and their powerless counterparts, with the latter becoming subject to a far stronger brand of the 'Irish'-ing handed down to Shakespeare's kings and leaders and their subsequent characterisation in later versions of the plays. It was commented across chapters II and III that prior to his downfall in each version of the text, Richard II as a character progresses from being a figure of objection (at least pre-usurpation) in Shakespeare but emerges as one of pity in Tate; his vainglorious misdeeds and crimes recast and reattributed to the ordinary follies of youth subject to abuse by his elders. Lear's path is similar but his finale the opposite; in Tate's adaptation Lear overcomes the personality flaws with which he was so rife in Shakespeare, but unlike Richard he successfully maintains the ruling lineage of his archaic kingdom. What the varying fortunes of these two characters demonstrates is that leadership qualities and the retention of power are inextricably linked in the Shakespearian texts which present both Richard and Lear as unsuitable and ultimately unsuccessful kings, but that the necessity of this relationship is not carried forward in Nahum Tate's adaptations, most notably in his *King Lear*. The most fundamental indicator of 'kingliness' in this case appears to be the proximity of a character to the stereotyped Irish figure which had cut such a prevalent figure in English literature, and the closer a king comes to this depiction the less likely he is to be successful in his duty. There

---

[143] *Discovery of the true causes why Ireland was never Thoroughly Subdued*, pp. 166-7.

is, therefore, an inverse relationship between these two aspects of Shakespeare's kings, however it should be noted that these character traits may not only be seen working in opposition to each other, but rather in addition also. An abundance of one trait allows or even calls for some mitigation of the other, and this is an important consideration when dealing with the non-titled and non-powerful characters in Shakespeare. Whereas a loss of power and poor leadership can in itself contribute to the stereotyping of Lear, Coriolanus and Richard, such avenues are closed to other characters such as Caliban and Cordelia (after the latter's opening scene, at least). The result is that Shakespeare's illustrious leaders often become *slightly* 'Irish' in the sense of a set of behavioural attributes that variously signify weakness and sentimentality: Richard II is *slightly* naïve in his actions, Lear is *slightly* primitive in his approach.

However, what is apparent is that the 'Irish' imagery which seems rife in Shakespeare is not reserved only for the ruling class, but rather becomes widespread throughout the entire population of his plays. For the weaker and more everyday figures in Shakespeare, a loss of status is no longer a means by which Spenserian 'Irishness' might be indicated, with the result that characters are figured as savage or barbarian in a more demonstratively extreme manner than their empowered counterparts. Although 'everyman' characters are infrequent in Elizabethan England, being a time when stage drama implied kings, queens, dukes and earls, Shakespeare does often prove to be equally aware of those without status and this chapter will hence attempt to focus on the lesser powered Shakespearian characters and the progress they make between their original text and later versions.[144] In this way the focus will be shifted away from the kings and military rulers of Chapters II and III and more towards a balanced representation of wider societal and cultural models within Shakespeare, and how these mirror the English and non-English dichotomy prevalent in the writings of Shakespeare's contemporaries and predecessors. In later Irish adaptations, these characters undergo changes which are equally as striking as those furnished upon Richard II, Coriolanus and Lear; characters that were formerly

---

[144] Richard Helgerson gives an excellent overview of the intricacies of power on the stage (that is, kingly and common characters), power in the theatre (writers and players) and power in the spectators (real life kings and commoners) in *Forms of Nationhood.* (Chicago University Press: London, 1992). Chapter 5, 'Staging Exclusion', pp. 193-247. Helgerson also explores the ways in which exclusion outside the theatre was mirrored by exclusion upon the stage, and identifies the period of this transition: 'From the Queen's Men of Tarlton and Wilson to the King's Men of Shakespeare and Burbage, there is a marked shift from inclusion to exclusion, […] from hodge-podge to "art".'

represented as brash, violent and barbaric in Shakespeare are routinely turned back towards their origin, now used as a stick to lambast or satirise the British society which had initially given rise to them. We may think, for instance, of Duffet's satirical view of mainstream British culture in *The Mock Tempest*, particularly the manner in which Caliban's position of power over the 'common' Englishmen serves to deride London society, and we can similarly consider Nahum Tate's emphasis on the failings of the wider nobility (as opposed to Richard alone) in *Richard II*. In the same way that Caliban and Cordelia become authoritative figures within their written societies, and also assume a pivotal role around which the play's action rotates, we can also consider that Duffett and Tate assume a commanding presence over Shakespeare's urtexts, as the very nature of adaptation enables such a power.

Two characters in particular undergo telling transformations between texts; Caliban and Cordelia. The former develops from one of the few unpowered figures in a world dominated by characters who enjoy special ability, status or rights in some form or another, to a figure of authority (however briefly seen) in Duffett's play, a work almost exclusively populated by criminals and drunkards, who are not only stripped of the special standing they enjoyed in the original, but also of many of the basic privileges of the average man. Meanwhile, Cordelia transcends her role in Shakespeare as an essentially passive character (subsequent to the first scene, at least) to become one of the focal points of Tate's text, helping to move the action forward, and in the process of doing so regaining her powerful position in the kingdom. Tate and Duffett separate themselves from Shakespeare in so far as their plays allow for political change and an empowerment of the oppressed in a way which is never fully possible in the urtexts, although interestingly since the 1960s critics have done much to excavate the centrality of Caliban to Shakespeare's play. This type of change is particularly interesting given the character of Ireland at the time, still feeling the effects of the 1641 rebellion, after which plantation of victorious British soldiers in Ireland sought to finally solidify an English grip over the country. The perceived rigidity of such political structures is reflected in the stiff power structures evident in Shakespeare's *King Lear* and *The Tempest*.

A final reflection on the everymen of the texts will concern itself with one of the most prevalent debates and dichotomies of the period; that between Roman Catholic and Protestant faiths. Throughout the seventeenth century there is an inevitable link between an individual's religious and political beliefs. On one side of

the divide, Protestants approved laws which deprived Catholics of their land and barred them from serving in Parliament (or any other public office), whilst on the other side Catholics plotted and executed several bloody rebellions against those who they saw as intruders. Over the course of the seventeenth century, Catholicism becomes yet another aspect of Irish 'superstition' which stood in opposition to English godliness. The influence of both state and stage politics take an equal role in the fleshing out of this divide in Irish adaptations, and a close consideration of both of these elements is vital to understanding the nuanced approach taken by Irish writers towards representations of superstition throughout Shakespeare. Ultimately, what the chapter aims to establish is that the staging of political struggles by Irish adapters of Shakespeare was not merely confined to the representation of kings, queens and land rights on such a macro level, but also concerned themselves with the very ground-level matter of the common man. Such adaptations not only reject the continuing English representation of the inadequacy of Irish leaders and kings, but also challenge such notions about the Irish everyman. This is evident in the way in which these texts support Irish cultural practises and religion, as well as reject the notion that Ireland and the Irish were too uncivilised to operate independently. It would seem that social freedom for the Irish commoner was seen as every bit as vital as political freedom for the Irish nation.

Caliban Reconfigured: The Newfound Humanity of the Irish Everyman

The Tempest is perhaps the most read Shakespearian play in relation to colonial attitudes, not only towards Ireland but towards all British colonies. Octave Mannoni's *Psychology of Colonization* stands as one of the early efforts to focus on *The Tempest* in terms of what Mannoni identifies as its postcolonial aesthetic, and many reams have been written on the characters of Caliban and Ariel since. When Bertolt Brecht wrote his adaptation of *Coriolanus* he commented in his personal journal that his prominent 'alienation effect' was already strongly evident within the play, and by a similar token one could argue that the same effect is at work in *The Tempest* in its attitude towards colonialism. Caliban, though originally the primary antagonist of the play, is now – as a direct consequence of postcolonial understandings of the text – viewed as a protagonist; the figure that most embodies

the idea of the colonial subject, and at various points of *The Tempest* is a character of pity, capable of eliciting pathos:

> Be not afeard; the isle is full of noises,
>> Sounds, and sweet airs, that give delight, and hurt not.
>> Sometimes a thousand twangling instruments
>> Will hum about mine ears; and sometime voices
>> That, if I then had wak'd after long sleep,
>> Will make me sleep again; and then in dreaming,
>> The clouds methought would open, and show riches
>> Ready to drop upon me; that, when I wak'd
>> I cried to dream again. (III.ii.147-54)

Ariel too is a character often considered by postcolonial critics, and her alliance with and servitude to Prospero offers another view on colonialism. Ariel's preference for negotiation and the rationality we infer along with it stands in opposition to Caliban's fiery resistance.

The very name of Caliban draws associations with savagery, coming as it does from 'Caniba', a word formerly used to describe the people of the Caribbean Sea, which is also the origin of the word 'cannibal'. Caliban itself is an anagram of the Spanish word *canibal*, of obvious meaning.[145] In spite of what would seem a great distance between the Caribbean Islands and Ireland, there is a sense in which representations of these places intersect and overlap. Speaking of Mediterranean and Atlantic connections, Peter Hulme finds the islands itself a place of 'dual topography', and Caliban 'a multiple burden of Atlantic and Mediterranean descriptions'.[146] In further support of the play's dual locality, one might consider the example of the word 'hubbub', which first developed either from the Irish word *ub*, signifying contempt or loathing, or from the Old Irish war cry *abu*. It first appeared in English as 'whobub' in 1555,[147] and within a short space of time it came to be used as a word to describe the 'savage' languages or sounds which were experienced by British travellers and colonialists wherever they went. In such a way, the

---

[145] There is some vigorous debate surrounding the intentionality of the link between the character Caliban and the word 'cannibal', which itself derives from the Latin for 'dog', *canis*. Johnson and Steevens's 1778 edition of Shakespeare's plays stated that 'the metathesis in Caliban from Canibal is evident' and this is a view which carried much weight in the subsequent centuries (see: John Hankins, 'Caliban the Bestial Man', *Modern Language Association*, 62:3 (1947), 793-801, p. 793; Mabel Moraña, & Carlos Jáuregui, *Revisting the Colonial Question in Latin America*. (University of Iberoamericana Press, 2008), p. 188. Also Peter Hulme, *Colonial Encounters*. 2nd edition. (London: Routledge, 1992) pp. 3 & 107). However, it has met with some degree of hostility of late, perhaps most notably in Alden Vaughan and Virginia Vaughan, *Shakespeare's Caliban: A Cultural History*, 4th Edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 23-38.

[146] Hulme, pp. 107-8.

[147]

individuality of different nations is overlooked, and there is a sense in which foreign lands are seen as intrinsically related and similar.

The Spanish anagram of Caliban's name calls to mind Spenser's own view of the origin of the Irish people, which recurs at several points throughout the *View*;

> IRENIUS It appeareth that the cheef inhabitantes in the Iland were Galles cominge thither first from Spayne[148]

And;

> IRENIUS Another nation cominge out of Spaine aryved in the West part of Irelande, and findinge it waste, or weakelie inhabited, possessed yt; who whether they were native Spaniards, or Gaules or Affricans or Goaths, or some other of those Northerne Nations which did spread all over-spred all Christendome, it is impossible to affirme, onlie some naked conjectures may be gathered; but that out of Spaine certenlie they came, that doe all the Irishe Cronicles agree.[149]

In the same way that Spenser here attributes a sole origin to both the Spanish and Irish people, Shakespeare's *Tempest* implies that Caliban shares much of his foundation with that of Spenser's Irish. Firstly, there is a case to be made that Caliban's uncertain and unknowable origins also calls to mind Spenser's expressed view of the Spanish;

> IRENIUS All nations under heaven, I suppose, the Spaniard is the most mingled, most uncertaine, and most bastardlie; wherefore most foolishly doe the Irish thinke to enoble themselves by wrestinge theire auncestrie from the Spaniard, whoe is unable to deryve himselfe from any nation certaine.[150]

If the ancestry of Spain is a matter of ambiguity, then Caliban's own heritage is no more apparent. His own recollection of his mother is questionable – and indeed the notion that she left him the isle is questioned by Prospero, accusing Caliban of being a 'most lying slave' (I.ii.344). In addition, there is no mention of Caliban's father, save for Prospero's consideration that he may have been 'got by the devil himself' (I.ii.319).

It is not only in name and nebulosity of origin that Caliban is reminiscent of those figured in the *View*, for in both appearance and action the character repeatedly and consistently displays much overlap with the Spenserian vision of the Irish. Marked out at the earliest opportunity in the Dramatis Peronae as 'a savage and

---

[148] Edmund Spenser, *A View of the State of Ireland*, ed. by Andrew Hadfield & Willy Maley (Oxford: Blackwell, 1997) p. 51.
[149] Ibid., p. 45-6.
[150] Ibid., p. 50.

deformed slave' Caliban at numerous points of the play acts or is portrayed in a sub-human light. Within moments of his first appearance in I.ii, he is variously referred to as a slave (four times, once 'poisonous'), a tortoise, son of the devil, a rapist, of 'vile race', and a deserving prisoner of 'this rock' (I.ii.308-61). Such descriptions evoke many passages from throughout Early Modern literature which concerned itself with Ireland and the Irish.

Spenser's suggested suppression of the native Irish by more practical English farmers is viewed as mutually beneficial (while the benefits to Prospero himself are evident);

> IRENIUS It is a great willfulnes in any such landlord to refuse to make any longer farmes to their tennants, as may, besides the generall good of the realme, be also greatly for theire owne profit and avayle: For […] the tennante may by such meanes be drawn to build himselfe some handsome habitation thereof, to ditch and enclose his ground, to manure and husband yt as good farmers use? […] And also it wil be for the good of the tennant likewise, whoe by such buildings and inclosures shall receive many benefits: first, by the handsomenes of his howse, he shall take more comfort of his life, more saife dwelling, and a delight to keepe his saide howse neate and cleanly, which nowe beinge, as they commonly are, rather swyne-styes then howses, is the chiefest cause of his so beastly manner of life.[151]

And by a similar token Prospero's views his taking control of Caliban's island as beneficial for the slave (although this is not necessarily the view taken by the play itself);

> I have us'd thee
> Filth as thou art, with human care; and lodg'd thee
> In mine own cell […]
> I pitied thee
> Took pains to make thee speak, taught thee each hour
> One thing or other, when thou didst not, savage,
> Know thine own meaning, but wouldst gabble like
> A thing most brutish. (I.ii.345-57)

In a similar way, the animal imagery attached to Caliban also finds a basis in the 'very wild Irish' described in the *View*,[152] as well as in many other contemporary writings, such as John Derricke's *Image of Irelande,* which describes the Irish as all manner of beast, including 'bears', 'foxes', 'boars' and 'dogs'.[153] Identically, Josias Bodley notes more of the subhuman nature of the Irish; 'a most vile race of men-if it

---

[151] Spenser, pp. 83-4.
[152] Ibid., p. 67.
[153] John Derricke, *The Image of Irelande with A Discoverie of Woodkarne*, ed. David B. Quinn (Belfast: Blackstaff, 1985) pp. 191, 188, 183 & 200.

be at all allowable to call them "men" who live upon grass, and are foxes in their disposition and wolves in their actions.'[154] In such a way, an animalisation of the Irish people operates as a strong function within English literary discourse in the Early Modern era, and these are motifs which become bound up with Shakespeare's later writings, resulting in further complications when his plays are in the hands of Irish adapters.

Throughout Spenser (as well as many of his contemporaries) there exists a dichotomy between English lawfulness and Irish lawlessness. This was observed to some extent in the case of each version of *Richard II* in the previous chapters, however when applied to a powerless figure such as Caliban, representations of lawlessness become far more outward and extreme. Caliban's crimes include plotting with Stephano and Trinculo to murder Prospero, trying to usurp Prospero, and attempting to rape Miranda. What's more, all three incidents are tied in with Caliban's aspirations to reclaim the island which he sees as rightfully his own. Of the two former, this point is obvious; Caliban's desire to kill and/or overthrow Prospero is based on an aspiration to reclaim power for himself. However, even of the attempted rape of Miranda, Caliban boasts 'O ho! O ho! Would it had been done! / Thou didst prevent me; I had peopled else / This isle with Calibans' (I.ii.349-51). Thus, his sexual assault is tied in with his repopulating the island 'with Calibans', by such means undermining Prospero's power on the island. Caliban in this instance reflects once more the English vision of the colonised subject fighting for his beliefs in a way which is savage, barbarous, and entirely against the moral qualities of Early Modern England. In such a way, yet another telling parallel is raised between Caliban and the prevailing vision of the foreign subject in which he finds much of his basis.

Importantly, Caliban is not only represented as transgressing traditional English lawfulness, but also as seemingly not being subject to any 'logical' laws whatever. If Ariel is 'an airy spirit' (Dramatis Personae) then Caliban is surely her earthy counterpart, and indeed is described as such – 'thou earth' – by Prospero immediately before he makes his first entrance to the play. The link between this

---

[154] Josias Bodley, "An Account of a Journey of Captain Josias Bodley into Lecale, in Ulster, in the year 1602-3", quoted in Michael Neill, 'Broken English and Broken Irish: Nation, Language, and the Optic of Power in Shakespeare's Histories'. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 45:1 (Spring, 1994) 1-32, pp. 6-7.

earthyness and lawlessness is once more one which smacks of Spenser's description of Irish Brehon Law;

> IRENIUS Oftentimes [in Brehon Law] there appeareth great shew of equity, in determining the right betweene part and party, but in many things repugning quite from gods law and mans, as for example, in the case of murther. The Brehon that is ther judge, will compound betweene the murderer, and the frends of the party murdered, which prosecute the action, that the malefactor shall give unto them, […] a recompence. […] And this judge […] adjudgeth for the most part a better share unto his Lord, that is the Lord of the soyle, or the head of that sept, and also unto him self, for his judgment, a greater portion than unto the plaintiffes or parties grieved.[155]

This supposed association between Caliban and the Irish is very thorough; every aspect of the character, from his name to his personality, his origins to his appearance, is strongly reminiscent of Spenser's view of the Irish, and as such is an image which was distinctly open to critique and interpretation by Irish writers of the period.

When Thomas Duffett came to review the text in 1674 he made wholesale changes to Calyban's role in the play. A superficial viewing of the text would suggest that Duffett gave the character little thought, reducing his role to a single scene cameo; however once Calyban's vital role in his only scene in *The Mock Tempest* becomes apparent, as well as the overwhelmingly positive characteristics afforded to him throughout this appearance, a wholly different picture emerges. Even the slight alteration to the character's name begins to alter his image, as it becomes further removed from the word *caniba*, and no longer works as an anagram of *canibal*. The effect of this not only erodes the previous associations between Calyban and savagery, but also dents any link from Calyban back to the Spanish origins of the name, a lineage which formed a lengthy part of Spenser's *View of the Present State of Ireland*. In contrast to Caliban's introduction to Shakespeare's text, where he is denounced as a slave, a tortoise, son of the devil, a rapist, of 'vile race', and a prisoner, Calyban's first appearance in Duffett's text is through the eyes of a narrator, who paints a stark contrast between him and the rest of the characters: 'The scene drawn discovers Bridewell with prisoners in several postures of labour and punishment, then a Band and Pimp drawn over the stage in a cart followed by a rabble, then arise Calyban, and Sycorax'.[156] Calyban and Sycorax are given what

---

[155] Spenser, p. 14.

[156] Thomas Duffett, *The Mock Tempest, or The Enchanted Castle* (London, 1675), p. 51.

almost amount to regal status in the scene by the use of the word 'arise', whilst other characters are reduced to anonymity – 'prisoners', 'Band', 'Pimp', 'rabble' – and suffering. Sycorax first refers to her son as 'my lord great Cac-Cac-Cac-Cac-Calyban',[157] removing him entirely from the sub-human, vile-seeming creature of Shakespeare's original. Given that Duffett's adaptation is a self-proclaimed mock version of the play, such a reversal in situation is perhaps unsurprising. However, the play's opening gambit is certainly indicative of a widespread change of thematic and character make-up throughout the rest of the play.

Duffett's Calyban seems a far more moral and sympathetic character than Shakespeare's Caliban. Where Caliban had shown no remorse for his attempted rape of Miranda - 'O ho! O ho! Would it had been done! / Thou didst prevent me; I had peopled else / This isle with Calibans' (I.ii.349-51) – Duffett's Calyban spends his short time on stage doing as much good as possible; pitying the prisoners, providing them with rations, and singing with them. Before long, Calyban speaks with the head-keeper and convinces him to allow the prisoners to go free, very rapidly bringing about the joyous end to the play. Calyban's association with the good does not end with his good deeds, and even the character's occupation as a prison officer implies a commitment to law and morality. He is therefore both by occupation and by action *the* advocate of compassion and morality in *The Mock Tempest*, a matter in which he could not be more distinctly removed from the apparently lawless and amoral character of Shakespeare's play.

We could not complete this discussion of Duffett's *Mock Tempest* without gesturing towards the fact that it is a 'mock' *Tempest*, and as such must be viewed as a comic inversion of Shakespeare's text. In such a sense, it is of little surprise that Caliban is rehabilitated to the extent he is, and that the action of the play would be so specifically 'close to home' for the play's audience, in contrast to the spatial distancing of Shakespeare's work. Although Duffett's play is ostensibly a parody of *The Tempest* (although it is again worth remembering that Duffett was not satirising Shakespeare directly, but rather his adapters and Duffett's contemporaries), it does interestingly gesture towards the topics present in Spencer's *View*, most specifically lawlessness, wilderness and barbarity. Duffett produces a vision of Calyban that is to a large extent empathetic and positive, and in doing so, perhaps unwittingly,

---

[157] Ibid.,

complicates a long-established association of Ireland with barbarity, wildness and lawlessness. Duffett's play remains a parody, but it throws open the door to the politics of parody, and its comic take on Calyban as the humanitarian master of Bridewell gaol can for us infer things beyond the merely parodic or comic. Duffett, in the process of adapting Caliban, causes some disorder in the image of the Irish common man on the London stage by entering into a dialogue of what could be interpreted as the stereotypical representations of Irishness advanced by a tradition of English writers.

The Probability of Change: Passivity in Powerless Characters

One of the most interesting aspects of Calyban's characterisation is his newfound position of authority and power afforded to him by Duffett's adaptation. This is a progression which Calyban overlaps with *King Lear*'s Cordelia, and it is worth noting the ways in which – and the reasons why – Irish adapters saw fit to place each of these characters in positions of greater power and responsibility within their own texts. From a political standpoint, Caliban and Cordelia have much in common; both flirt with rule but are ultimately rendered powerless by the events of their respective plays. Caliban – according to himself – was the rightful ruler of the island after the death of his mother, Sycorax, whilst Cordelia, as Lear's favourite daughter, is also preordained for the best share of Lear's estate. But through the action of the plays, Prospero and the sisters reduce Caliban and Cordelia respectively to positions of abject powerlessness.

However, what is most intriguing is that both Calyban and Cordelia are restored to positions of power in their respective adaptations. Indeed, Calyban, now Bridewell's prison guard in *The Mock Tempest*, is arguably the only character in any position of power in a play almost exclusively populated by prostitutes, criminals, louts and drunkards. In much the same manner, Cordelia makes significant advances in Tate's adaptation of *King Lear*. This occurs in two ways; the first, and the most palpable, is that by the end of the play, Cordelia is the ruler of Britain: something which is in total opposition to her final-scene death in Shakespeare's own telling. However, in a far more subtle way, Cordelia gains extensive power not just *in* the text, but by extension of this becomes a central figure to the unfolding narrative itself. This is to say that she moves from the essentially passive (subsequent to the

first scene, at least) character of Shakespeare towards being one of the driving forces of the play in Tate. In this way, Cordelia does not passively drift from one scene to the next, but has a vital role in affecting the outcome of the play itself.

This renewed sense of power, and the capacity for self-destination which comes with it, offers an interesting overlap with Irish politics during the Restoration era. Subsequent to the unsuccessful, eleven-year rebellion attempt, one-third of all Irish Catholics were dead and the rest were offered transplantation either 'to hell or to Connaught' by Oliver Cromwell, desperate to give his victorious soldiers the reward of fertile land in the eastern and central parts of the country. However, even in the face of an apparently helpless situation such as this, the rebels, interestingly mirroring the form of Calyban and Cordelia in Irish adaptations, sought to retain control over their own fortunes. Cecil Woodham-Smith wrote that even after the failed rebellion 'the Irish nation still existed, separate, numerous and hostile'.[158] Such a drive to regain a position of power resulted in a further rebellion, just a few years after Tate and Duffett's works appeared on stage.

Caliban is a similarly passive character throughout his own text.[159] In *The Tempest*, Caliban is adamant that the island is rightfully his and that Prospero has unlawfully taken it from him. However, his plans to rise back to power never amount to more than idle plotting and debates with Prospero; 'This island's mine, by Sycorax my mother, / Which thou tak'st from me' (I.ii.331-32). In spite of his persistent protests, Caliban is entirely powerless to reclaim the island for himself. This issue of Caliban's powerlessness is underlined by the various titles and abilities of almost every other inhabitant of the island: Alonso is a king, Sebastian is his brother and a prince, Prospero was a duke and is the current ruler of the island, Antonio is a duke, Ferdinand is a prince, Adrian and Francisco are lords, Gonzalo is 'an honest old counsellor' (Dramatis Peronae), Miranda is Prospero's daughter, and Ariel and the other spirits have supernatural powers. Moreover, Caliban is alone in the brutal disapproval which is attached to him in the *Dramatis Personae*: 'a savage and deformed slave' (Dramatis Personae). One incident in particular candidly makes Caliban's political impotence a focal point of the play – Prospero's accusation that he

---

[158] *The Great Hunger*. 2nd edition. (London, Penguin, 1991), p. 15.

[159] Paul Brown attributes to Caliban a 'desire for powerlessness' in *Political Shakespeare: New Essays in Cultural Materialism*, ed. by Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield (London: Cornell University Press, 1985), p. 66. However, this motion is countered by Margaret Paul Joseph, who cites Caliban's desire for the old hierarchy – in which he held power – to be restored, as an example of his need for power. See *Caliban in Exile; The outsider in Caribbean fiction*. (New York: Greenwood, 1992), p. 18.

tried to rape Miranda. Prospero claims that Caliban 'didst seek to violate / The honour of [his] child' (I.ii.347-8). Caliban does not deny the accusations, retorting 'O ho! O ho! Would it had been done! / Thou didst prevent me; I had peopled else / This isle with Calibans' (I.ii.349-51). But in spite of his defiance, Caliban's attempted rape flies along the same line as his attempts to regain a semblance of power on the island.[160] Indeed, this associates the assault itself with Caliban reclaiming the island and repopulating it with a native bloodline. However, both in the instance of Caliban's attempted usurpation and in the sexual assault, Caliban is frustrated by Prospero and ultimately never quite acts out, reducing his role in the play to one of mere idle talk and impotence. In addition, it does not seem to be by chance that Caliban teams up with the only two other non-powerful characters in the text, Stephano and Trinculo – a butler and a jester, respectively – in his attempt to overthrow Prospero in the final scenes. However, ultimately even this plot ends in a non-event with the character eventually agreeing to mend his ways. Such incidents show Caliban up as an entirely passive character throughout the text, finding himself unable – or unwilling – to affect its action or progression, and having very little influence on its ultimate conclusion.

However, in contrast to this, the briefly-seen Calyban from *The Mock Tempest* is a character who is placed in a position of authority both by his job title and by his cordial and friendly attitude towards the prisoners. Indeed the situation is a complete reversal of *The Tempest*, where all those surrounding Caliban had either political or supernatural power attached to them. In the adaptation, however, Calyban is not only the sole figure of authority, but the prisoners around him, due to their lack of freedom, are forced to be equally as impotent as Caliban had been in the original play. In such a way, Calyban's newfound power serves to satirise the British society which had given rise to Caliban, placing the London-based, lawless and uncivilised, characters of Duffett's *Mock Tempest* entirely at his mercy. However, Calyban's influence is not only *in* the play, but is also *over* the play, as he takes decisive action in the final scene to change the course of the text and lead to a happy ending. Prior to Caliban's arrival, the prisoners had hit a particularly low ebb, Prospero having sent

---

[160] Frankie Rubenstein sheds more light on Caliban's multi-faceted impotence; 'Prospero directs his urchins to make Caliban impotent; and this they do when they prick him. Prick; to pierce and wound a horse's foot, lame him – as Caliban is wound with adder's pricks and made lame (impotent)'. In *A Dictionary of Shakespeare's Sexual Puns and their Significance*. 2nd edition. (London: Macmillan, 1989), p. 25.

them to his prison, the 'Enchanted Castle' of the play's title – 'Now to wipe out the remembrance of all past sorrow, I'le show you the pleasure of my enchanted Castle'[161] – the characters are discovered 'in several postures of labour and punishment'.[162] However, after Calyban's extremely brief appearance, the landscape of the play is changed entirely, and little over a page after his first appearance or mention Calyban engages in singing with the prisoners and the head-keeper of the gaol before all are set free. The abruptness of the whole exchange makes apparent the final contrast between Calyban and Caliban; the potency of each character. Caliban talks for much of his text whilst never taking any action. In contrast, Calyban enters the text abruptly and with little debate or argument thrusts his influence over it. In such a way, Duffett's Calyban contradicts everything that Shakespeare's Caliban appeared to be. Calyban is a humanitarian, not a rapist, he is a morally upright prison guard, not a 'savage and deformed slave', and he is a potent and credible influence over his text, instead of a powerless victim rendered essentially passive by the greater strength and status of the characters around him. also embodies an imagining of the return to power of a formerly 'Irished' character.

In a similar way, *King Lear*'s Cordelia is a character who is stripped of power and responsibility in Shakespeare, but finds it restored to her in Tate's later version. Moreover, Cordelia's rejection of power is followed closely by the end of her capacity to affect the action of the play, rendering her – like Caliban – an essentially passive figure for much of the text. This impotence, however, is again reversed in the subsequent revision, allowing Cordelia to assume positions of responsibility, and in doing so enabling her to become an active agent capable of influencing her own fate.

The direct link between power *in* the play and centrality *to* the play in Shakespeare's version is made most evident in the first scene of *Lear*. Here, Cordelia stands in a position of authority, just about to inherit the greatest part of Lear's kingdom. This is also the one and only scene in the play in which Cordelia behaves as an active character in the play, directly affecting the progress of the action and in such a way influencing her own destiny. Her rejection of this power and subsequent banishment from the kingdom is the end of her influence over the play. From this particular point onwards, Cordelia is incapable of shaping her own destiny, rendered helpless by her lack of power in and over the play, instead merely reacting to events

---

[161] Tate, *King Lear*, p. 51.
[162] Ibid.,

as they happen around and independently of her. By a similar token, Lear's loss of control, as well as the emergence of Goneril and Regan as powerful forces of evil in and over the text, coincides with a change in the balance of power in those directions.

However, the Cordelia observed in Nahum Tate's adaptation is one changed entirely. Though her introduction to the play is no different, with her rejection of the power which Lear offers to her, Tate's Cordelia is a character who continues to influence the action around her and maintains her status and ability as an active agent of the play. The first four acts of Tate's adaptation are almost entirely unchanged from Shakespeare's version of the play, but his most dramatic change is also his most telling. Relying on ambiguities within the text, Tate spots an opportunity – or as he states in his Dedication, a 'probability'[163] – for a relationship between Cordelia and Edgar. The effect on the play is telling, as his feelings for Cordelia motivate Edgar to act as he does throughout the entire play. Edgar stays behind disguised as Poor Tom so that he can keep an eye on Lear and attempt to defend his former King. In such a way Cordelia remains an effective agent of the play by proxy. Were this her only influence over the play then this may be viewed as an act of impotency in its own right; the female character only capable of action through the eyes and ears of her male lover. However, Cordelia's dynamism goes further than the surrogacy handed down to Edgar. Cordelia continues, throughout the play, to take events and situations into her own hands and continues to fight for and affect her own destiny right up to the success in the final scene. The Cordelia of Tate's *History of King Lear* is not the browbeaten character envisaged by Shakespeare (in both the quarto and Folio), passively and powerlessly propelled towards an inevitable conclusion, but rather one who takes charge over her own fate, and in doing so brings about a radically different sequence of events.

Naturally, other factors behind Cordelia's increased role cannot be overlooked, and the most primary of these is the increased popularity of actresses on the Restoration stage.[164] However, what is most telling is not the mere fact of Cordelia's new role, introducing popular female players to the stage, but the manner in which this is carried out. Tate's Cordelia is in this development a character

---

[163] Tate, *The History of King Lear* (London: 1681) p. iv.
[164] *Adaptations of Shakespeare: A Critical Anthology of Plays from the Seventeenth Century to the Present*, ed. by Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier. 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 2005), p. 66.

strongly reminiscent of Duffett's Caliban, and it begs the question why Irish adapters may have sought to develop Shakespearian characters in such a manner.

Whilst Cordelia and Caliban are characters who strongly evince this development from powerless to powerful, there are some outliers in the texts. Edmund is the most notable of these, but also considerable are Goneril and Regan. These are characters who start from positions of either no power or comparatively little power, but who engage the action of the text in a way which levers them into positions of authority. Edmund begins his play as an illegitimate son of Gloucester, practically an outcast in his family and with none of the future entitlement prospects of his brother Edgar. Goneril and Regan begin the play in a comparatively weak position compared to Cordelia, but their manipulative acts in the first number of scenes change the face of the play and leave them in a position of power both in the play and over it. Whilst earlier we might have recognised Caliban as a practically ideal representation of Spenserian Irishness, the three villains of *King Lear* far surpass him in the extent of their misdeeds, and this is primarily due to their very powerful influence over the play. The callousness and barbarity is not confined to Shakespeare in this case, but also appears in his Irish adapters.

Outliers in this approach, such as those outlined above, beg explanation. The key to understanding the significance of the developments undergone by Caliban and Cordelia, as well as understanding the alternative treatment handed out to the villains of *Lear,* is entrenched in an understanding of the political context of Elizabethan and Restoration England, on both the macro level of struggle between Ireland and England, and the micro level of stage politics. One classical way of interpreting Shakespeare's histories, as stated by Richard Helgerson, is that they are 'a paradigmatic expression of Anglo-British understanding'[165] and 'crucial […] in the history of the English stage as a site of individual and collective struggle and self-legitimation'.[166] Shakespeare's histories played a formative role in the development of a British national psyche, borne out of 'a strong popular desire to be instructed of the facts of history'.[167] Anecdotally, too, Charles Gildon writes in his 1721 *Laws of Poetry Explained and Illustrated* that 'in a conversation betwixt Shakespeare and

---

[165] Richard Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England.* (London: Chicago University Press, 1992), p. 204.
[166] Ibid.
[167] Eustace Mandeville Wetenhall Tillyard, *Shakespeare's History Plays.* 3rd Ed. (London: Penguin, 1991) p. 58.

Ben Johnson, Ben ask'd him the reason 'why he wrote those historical plays'. He reply'd, 'That finding the people generally very ignorant of history, he writ them in order to instruct them in that particular'.[168] Shakespeare's histories cover the rule of England between 1377 and 1485, and according to Carter and McRae 'these works are a glorification of the nation, but also examine the qualities which make a man a hero, and a king'.[169]

However, as Shakespeare's career progressed, so did the expectations of theatre-goers, trending away from a staging of the national history and towards dramatic narratives or comedic plays. This was a movement met with heavy resistance from the nobility, who viewed the interest as an unwelcome exposure in the public realm. For Queen Elizabeth and others to be seen in public in any form, even as a characters on stage, was to be subject to scrutiny, and a mere player – a low social class in the era – could not be trusted to maintain the dignity of the monarchy, nor did it seem acceptable for such a lowly figure to appropriate the Queen's name and dress.[170] Louis Montrose states that 'Queen Elizabeth's reputed speech of 1586 strongly suggests that the "privileged visibility" of royal power also entails liabilities, that visibility implies vulnerability. […] Her privileged position exposes her to "the sight and view of all the world […] the eies of manie"'.[171] This proliferation of topical interest on stage added a folio to the job of Master of the Revels (the public officer entrusted with such matters of censorship – a responsibility later assumed by the Lord Chamberlain); stage censorship. Indeed, Nahum Tate's own adaptation of *Richard II* was notably removed from the London stage after just three performances because it was deemed to contain potentially subversive allusions.

However, some playwrights responded to censorship not by submitting to the new restrictions (although many did), but rather by catering to their audience's preferences by other means. For Shakespeare, this involved either a spatial or temporal separation of the plot from what we might suppose to be topical references; setting plays either in the distant past or in some exotic, foreign location, where the trials and tribulations of kingship could be played out by proxy. Plays in this way

---

[168] Quoted in Brian Vickers, *Shakespeare: The Cultural Heritage.* Vol. II. (London, Routledge, 1974), p. 370.
[169] Ronald Carter and John McRae, *The Routledge History of Literature in English.* (London: Routledge, 1997) pp. 92-93.
[170] See Helgerson, ch. 5 'Staging Exclusion', esp. pp. 195-215.
[171] Louis Montrose, 'Shakespeare, the Stage, and the State', *SubStance,* 25:2 (Special Edition, 1996): 46-67, p. 47.

were capable of being politicised without endangering the life of the play or even the career or wellbeing of the playwright, and that many of Shakespeare's own plays were instilled with political undertones is well established. However, the underlying moral of his treatment of Caliban and Cordelia is in this instance unproblematic for the Master of the Revels (notwithstanding current postcolonial analyses of the relationship betwixt Prospero and Caliban), as their continuing powerlessness throughout, and lack of successful revolt, is not and could not be a threat to the ruling characters of their respective plays.

In contrast, Duffett and Tate's adaptations of these plays suggest an alternate moral. Where Shakespeare rejects the notion of reclaiming power from abject positions, his Irish adapters seem not far from encouraging it. Considered in the context of the Irish political struggle, Duffett and Tate's dealings with Caliban and Cordelia put forward the notion that political change, even from a position of little or no power, remains possible. Cordelia in particular stands as a strong proponent of this moral, and this is a reading which, if overt in the text, would have been expelled from the stage by the Master of the Revels. However, by tying Cordelia's new role to an increase in the presence of women on stage,[172] and to the Restoration ideals of 'regularity and probability',[173] Tate is able to get his potentially subversive character through the strict censorship which later saw his rendition of *Richard II* banned from the stage.

However, the politics which surrounded the notably active antagonists of Shakespeare's *King Lear*, who maintain their activity throughout Tate's adaptation, is different. Both Tate and Shakespeare's versions of the text share much of same moral focus – that good triumphs over evil – and both show a link between power within the social structures of the play and a centrality to the unfolding action of the text. Tate in this manner seems to adapt little, at least in comparison to the wholly altered characteristics of both Caliban and Cordelia. Where Tate does offer a dramatic step away from Shakespeare is in the final scene of the text; the now-infamous happy ending to *The History of King Lear*. Whereas Shakespeare's tragedy turned political upheaval into almost complete annihilation for the protagonists (with some exceptions, such as Edgar and Albany), Tate's version takes an identical

---

[172] Sonia Massai, 'Nahum Tate's Revision of Shakespeare's "King Lears"', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 40:3 (2000), 435-500, (p. 436).
[173] Tate, *King Lear* p. iv.

political foundation but furnishes it with the most wholly positive outcome possible; not only is the original order restored, but the existing ruling powers seem greatly strengthened by the action of the text.[174] In such a way we might observe a glimmer of Tate's dual nationality at work, as the author born in Dublin but active in London lingers between offering a text which rejects that an uprising will inevitably lead to ruin for one and all, but at the same accepts that the current powers may indeed be strongest and could be further strengthened by such an uprising. The successful Cromwellian re-conquest of Ireland occurred just decades before Tate's text (indeed, it was still reaching its conclusion at the time of his birth in Dublin in 1652), and the seventeenth century in general stands amongst the bloodiest in the history of Ireland, punctuated by two civil wars (1641-52; 1689-91) and ongoing engagements between Catholic and Protestant powers across the country. It is interesting therefore that what remains common to both Duffett and Tate's respective adaptations of *The Tempest* and *King Lear* is the retention of the possibility of political change. Unlike Shakespeare's characters, ultimately consigned to ineffectual wandering from point to point through their texts without ever claiming or reclaiming power, the downtrodden characters of his Irish adapters go in the opposite direction, instead opting to lay claim to their own destiny, and successfully bringing it to pass through their active roles.

The Effect of Religious Struggle on Shakespeare's Common Man

Throughout this period of agitation between Ireland and England, there is an inherent link between a person's religious beliefs and their political allegiances. To be Protestant was to be aligned with the Irish King and Parliament, whilst Roman Catholicism seemed inescapably threatening to the British power over Ireland. Following the Flight of the Earls (1607), Catholics were barred from entering the Irish Parliament and almost all other public offices, while the Adventurers Act (1642) deprived wealthy Catholics of their rightful land. The Test Act of 1673, part of the Penal Laws, contributed further to the marginalisation of Catholics, requiring

---

[174] See Thomas Cooke, *Considerations on the Stage*. In Vickers, p. 465 Cooke outlines why Tate's play propagates, by his reckoning, an almost ideal morality, being a play in which 'almost every Character in that Play is an Instance of Virtue being rewarded and Vice punished'.

all those in public office to swear an oath against the Catholic belief of 'Transubstantiation in the Sacrament of the Lords *[sic]* Supper'.[175]

The longstanding paranoia between both sides of the Catholic-Protestant divide, both of whom considered the other to be heretics, is indicative of numerous British writings on Irish religious practices from the centuries before. The religious debate being so prevalent, it is perhaps unsurprising that elements of this struggle permeate into Shakespeare's own plays. Shakespeare relies on superstitious practices in his plays to indicate the divide between English and non-English styled characters, and this politicisation of religion re-emerges in some later Irish adaptations of Shakespeare, where imagery of non-British 'superstitions' are discarded. Although perhaps using a binary logic which perhaps oversimplifies what is a complex history of cultural exchange, Michael Neill does capture this aspect of seventeenth century culture in his essay 'Broken English and Broken Irish' that;

> It was the Irish "wilderness" that bounded the English garden, Irish "barbarity" that defined English civility, Irish papistry and "superstition" that warranted English religion; it was Irish "lawlessness" that demonstrated the superiority of English law, and Irish "wandering" that defined the settled and centred nature of English society.[176]

Thus, Ireland becomes an important factor in the formation of the English identity, and it is the very abject state of Ireland which calls for and justifies English settlement. For Spenser, Irish papacy represented little more than an intentional jibe at the English; 'the Irish were Catholic simply for the reason that the English were Protestant: are of the protestants' profession, and yet do they hate it, though unknown, even for the very hatred which they have of the English and their government'.[177] However, Neill comments that the noted Spenserian emphasis on 'the absolute difference between English and Irish'[178] is not the full story, and that there is much 'assimilationist rhetoric'[179] also found in British literature of the period. He quotes Richard Beacon as saying 'difference of laws, religion, habit, and language, which by the eye deceiveth the multitude, and persuadeth them that they be

---

[175] John Raithby (ed.), 'Charles II, 1672: An Act for preventing Dangers which may happen from Popish Recusants.' *Statutes of the Realm: volume 5: 1628-80* (1819): 782-785. British History Online. Web. 18 April 2011. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=47451>
[176] Neill, p. 3.
[177] Ibid., p. 6.
[178] Ann Rosalind Jones & Peter Stallybrass. 'Dismantling Irena: The Sexualizing of Ireland in Early Modern England' in *Nationalisms and Sexualities*, ed. by Andrew Parker et al. (New York: Routledge, 1992), p. 158.
[179] Neill, p. 4

of sundry sorts, nations, and countries, when they be wholly together but one body'.[180] Attention has been given at various points of this thesis to law, civilisation and language, but it is clear from Beacon's observation, as well as that from Spenser above, that also standing at the epicentre of this union was a uniformity of religious belief. Despite the apparent fissure between Spenser and Beacon's views of the English-Irish relationship, with the former's emphasis on the differences between the two nations while the latter focuses on commonality, there is also significant ground common to both. Both authors recognise the differences, one more vociferously than the other, and both recommend that such differences be eradicated out of mutual benefit, although Irenius's solution of mass starvation of Irish Catholics certainly deals with the problem in the most extreme terms.

It is an irony that the Penal Laws were passed by the English Parliament in order to subdue the piety of an Irish populace that for hundreds of years prior had been widely portrayed as essentially godless and uncivilised. However, it does imply that Ireland's Catholicism was seen merely as another aspect of the nation's superstitious heritage, which saw them inevitably at odds with organised English beliefs; in this case, Protestantism. Edmund Spenser writes that the Irish 'be all Papists by their profession, but in the same so blindly and brutishly informed (as that ye would rather thinke them Atheists of infidles) that not one amongst a hundred knoweth any ground of religion.[181] Many characters in Shakespeare seem possessed of a remarkably similar element of superstition, leaving very little to separate them from the portrayal of Ireland and the Irish throughout English literature.

The sense in which Caliban is a superstitious character might be most clearly indentified if one bears a simple definition of the word –an irrational belief[182] – in mind. With this definition, it is easy to distinguish that many of Caliban's strongest beliefs might be viewed as superstitious in their own right, particularly those which involve supernatural powers. Most apparently, it is Caliban who believes that

---

[180] Richard Beacon, *Solon his Folly, or A Politic Discourse, touching the Reformation of commonweals conquered, declined or corrupted.* (Oxford, 1594), quoted in Neill, p. 5.
[181] Spenser, p. 81. Ware's printing, which forms the basis for this edition, omits the text found here in brackets, but is included by Hadfield & Maley in Appendix II (p. 173).
[182] Advanced Learner's English Dictionary, ed. by John Sinclair. 4th ed. (HarperCollins: Glasgow, 2005), p. 1455. 'Superstitious fears or beliefs are irrational and not based on fact'.'superstition, n.'. OED Online. Oxford University Press. Web. 18 April 2011 <http://www.oed.com/viewdictionaryentry/Entry/194517>.

Stephano has come from the Moon, believing irrationally that he had seen him on the Moon's face;

> CALIBAN: Hast thou not dropp'd from heaven?
> STEPHANO: Out o' th' moon, I do assure thee; I was the Man i' th' Moon, when time was.
> CALIBAN: I have seen thee in her, and I do adore thee. My mistress show'd me thee, and thy dog and thy bush. (II.ii.146-52)

Caliban might also be accused of other superstitions; namely his belief in the supernatural powers of Sycorax, as well as his belief that he is the rightful owner of the island. However, without observing the pre-history of the play first hand it is difficult to argue whether these are baseless superstitions or realistic claims on his part. Certainly the presence of Ariel and other spirits seems to lend some credibility to the former claim, but Prospero's total dominance over the island and all those on it runs contrary the latter.

However, Caliban is not alone amongst Shakespeare's powerless characters in showing his superstition, and indeed it is the case that superstition itself in the texts is often the locus upon which the balance of power swings – naturally enough, invariably away from the superstitious party. When Richard II returns from Ireland to fight for his crown, the Welsh army has been raised and is ready to fight for him. Unfortunately the Welsh perceive bad omens all around them, and choose to flee instead of wait for Richard.

> CAPTAIN: 'Tis thought the king is dead; we will not stay.
> The bay-trees in our country are all wither'd
> And meteors fright the fixed stars of heaven;
> The pale-faced moon looks bloody on the earth
> And lean-look'd prophets whisper fearful change;
> Rich men look sad and ruffians dance and leap,
> The one in fear to lose what they enjoy,
> The other to enjoy by rage and war:
> These signs forerun the death or fall of kings.
> Farewell: our countrymen are gone and fled,
> As well assured Richard their king is dead. (II.iv.7-17)

This superstitious act on their part turns out to be ruinous for Richard's hopes of reclaiming control over his kingdom, and from this point on it is clear that only one fate awaits him. Similarly, Gloucester suffers a superstitious attack in the 'Letter' scene of *King Lear*; 'These late eclipses in the sun and moon portend no good to us' (I.ii.115-6). This is notable in so far as it occurs at the same moment in which he throws his support behind Edmund, asking him to confront Edgar over the letter.

Across the whole exchange, Edgar stands in total opposition to Gloucester, rejecting the very notion of these unfounded beliefs; 'This is the excellent foppery of the world, that, when we are sick in fortune, – often the surfeit of our own behaviour, – we make guilty of our disasters the sun, the moon, and the stars' (I.ii.129-134). Edmund then goes further with this pragmatic approach, using eclipses as idle talk with which to disarm his brother, and to bring up the subject of Gloucester. The result of Gloucester's superstition, and Edmund's cunning in taking control of it, is that by the end of the scene Edmund has claimed much of Gloucester's authority for himself. Not only has he quickly moved himself into the position of 'favourite' son (or at very least the more trusted of the two), but he has taken on responsibility for defending Gloucester's name and honour. Gloucester's superstitious attack is the moment at which his own plot within the play truly begins, and ultimately leads to the loss of his eyes. If Gloucester's metaphorical blindness is, as often commented, mirrored by his physical blindness, then these superstitions are his figurative blindfold.

It is largely difficult to write about the equivalent moments in Irish adaptations of these plays, as in most cases the appearance of baseless beliefs in the original text is merely discarded from the later adaptation, as opposed to overtly rejected, satirised or spoken out against. The Welsh Army in Tate's *History of King Richard the Second*, for instance, is said to have dispersed a day before Richard's arrival having been 'miss-informed' about Richard's death.[183] Certainly in the parlance of seventeenth century England it would have been possible for the phrase to indicate that they had wrongfully inferred his death from natural sources, in the same way as Shakespeare's text. However, considering the length at which the Captain described the various 'signs' in the original, and the brevity with which the misinformation is mentioned in the adaptation, it at least leaves open the possibility that the Welsh were 'miss-informed' or poorly advised in a rather more practical sense than in Shakespeare. In a similar way, Duffett's Calyban never does anything to suggest with any certainty that he does or does not subscribe to superstitious beliefs. His role in the text is so limited in length and so full in action that it scarcely leaves any room for such themes to emerge. What we can tell by Calyban's brief but undeniably central appearance is that he is a pragmatic character, short on words but

---

[183] Tate, *Richard II*, p. 28.

full on action, and so a rejection of superstitions would likely fit with this element of his character. In such cases, the 'Irish' superstition held by Shakespearian characters plays a significantly reduced role in their texts, although the lack of relevant textual substance in the adaptations makes it difficult to consider at a more significant length.

Tate's Gloster still shows the same superstitious thoughts as Shakespeare's Gloucester: 'These late Eclipses of the Sun and / Moon / Can bode no less; Love cools, and friendship / fails'.[184] Where Tate diverges from Shakespeare is in the apparent effect of Gloster's beliefs. The opening four acts of Tate's version are notably similar to those of Shakespeare, and this makes the few changes he does apply all the more intriguing. Whereas Gloucester's superstitious talk of eclipses marks the moment in Shakespeare at which he surrenders much of his power in the text, in Tate's adaptation it is merely a passing remark leading to little or no ultimate consequence. The wheels of Edmund's plan have already been in motion since the opening lines of Tate's play, and in this way the link between superstition and the loss of power is cut. Moreover, superstition plays a far reduced role in the scene as a whole, as the following exchange between Edmund and Edgar forgets it entirely. In Shakespeare, Edmund engages Edgar in a discussion of eclipses, giving him an excuse then to segue discussion towards their father. However, this exchange is absent from the adaptation and points to Edgar not taking advantage of Gloster's superstitions to the same extent observed in the original text. This 'writing out' of superstitious talk and tendencies in characters is once more symptomatic of the sensitive religious debates raging in both Dublin and London in the late seventeenth century.

Whether one is discussing the empowered or the powerless characters of Shakespeare, the account of both sets of individuals is intertwined – somewhat unsurprisingly – with the balance of power itself. While previous chapters saw figures such as Richard II, King Lear and Coriolanus engaged in power struggles in which they were always doomed by their non-English characteristics to failure, this chapter takes into account the weaker characters of texts such as *The Tempest* and *King Lear* and considers the ways in which they are represented differently to their

---

[184] Ibid., *King Lear*, p. 9.

empowered counterparts. In Shakespeare, the loss of control and poor leadership which were a hallmark of non-English values was no longer a means by which wrong values could be hinted at, with the result that non-empowered characters assumed far more extreme qualities in comparison with their regal counterparts. This can be observed in the barbarity and lawlessness displayed by Goneril and Regan throughout their text, as well as the uncivil, animal-like Caliban, in contrast to the far more restrained way in which characters such as Richard II come to be figured as lawless and amoral. Irish adapters, approaching the play from their own aesthetic viewpoint, rewrote much of what could be perceived as stereotyped 'Irish' imagery, most clearly evident in this case through Duffett's treatment of Calyban. Made more humane and more human, Calyban becomes one of the primary protagonists of *The Mock Tempest*; his unpleasant traits a distant memory, far removed from a long-established English idea of the conventional overseas native.

Yet, the trait which politically weaker characters have in common with their empowered counterparts is this involvement in an ongoing power struggle. In Shakespeare, powerlessness and lack of status is inextricably linked with a marginal role in or over the play's progression, with characters such as Caliban and Cordelia (subsequent to I.i) rendered powerless by the action of their plays, and at the same time completely incapable of affecting their own outcome. These characters become 'passengers' of the play, brought from one point to the next by the action proceeding all around them. However, quite the opposite is true of these characters in Irish adaptations, as both Calyban and Cordelia leverage themselves into positions of power and responsibility. Calyban's is inherent; he is a prison guard from the outset of the play. However, Cordelia, from a position of having given up her entitlement, moves again to affect the outcome of her play, the end result being that she eventually reclaims her lost power. The religious struggles on both sides of the Irish Sea emerge through the texts too in their occasional dealings with a theme of superstition, with the stigma and bad luck attached to 'Irish' superstitions in Shakespeare written out of the later Irish adaptations.

There is arguably a political side to the alternate aesthetics adopted by Shakespeare and his Irish adapters. On the Dublin stage, the message that active change remains possible, even from the most abject position, is one which undermines the position of the offshore ruling powers of the country. Across the Irish Sea, Duffett and Tate must equally be considered as potentially subversive writers on

the London stage. At a time when much Irish land was subject to English ownership, Irish laws subject to English Parliament, Irish culture subject to English limitation and Irish Catholic practices subject to strict English restriction, the presence of two prominent Irish (at least by birth) writers active on the English stage represent in this regard an incongruity. Nahum Tate imagines a successful mutiny from a downtrodden character, wrongly stripped of her original power, whilst Duffett places a group of imprisoned Englishmen entirely at the mercy of the formerly 'Irish-ed' Calyban, and in this sense both of these works carry with them a tangible shade of contemporary English-Irish politics.

Conclusion

Most fundamentally, this thesis has set out to establish what the primary influences acting upon early Irish adaptations of Shakespeare were, and to question how and in what ways these forces were borne out in a delineable trend across the set of texts produced by Irish authors or those with dual English-Irish identity. From an early stage, the suggestion that Irish adaptations subtextually constituted a reaction to English writings *on* Ireland assumed much eminence in this research, and indeed it was the prevailing image of the 'stage Irishman', itself derived from a long history of English discourse on Ireland, and the binaries associated with it (barbarism/civility, lawlessness/lawfulness, etc.), upon which much of this thesis is based, both in content and structure. As I have shown, these seventeenth and eighteenth century adaptations exhibit a 'writing out' of the barbaric, lawless, wild aspects of many Shakespearean characters: traits which themselves may or may not have found basis in the writings of Spenser and his predecessors and contemporaries, but of which they were certainly reminiscent. This set of changes is evident across the plays essayed here, and remained also across genre: more 'serious' adaptations such as Nahum Tate's rewriting of *King Lear* and Thomas Sheridan's *Coriolanus* followed similar paths to Thomas Duffett's burlesque *The Mock Tempest* and Macnamara Morgan's comedy *The Sheep Shearing*.

Though this was the case, not all aspects of the Irishman character are dealt with equally within the plays; for instance rewritings of barbarous, uncivil and wild imagery was more explicit than rewritings of superstitious aspects of character. For the former category, most particularly in the example of Caliban, but also evident in Lear and Richard II, these negative characteristics are reversed, and such characters are renewed with these newly-established virtues in place. It was also found that these aspects of character were often bound together by an altogether different fear within representations of an English psyche, that of 'degeneration'; the process by which one can become infiltrated or corrupted by the very land or air of the foreign wilderness, quickly becoming indistinguishable from the natives themselves. However, where superstitious imagery is present in Shakespeare, it is rather excluded from the adaptation, as opposed to being entirely reversed as with wilderness and incivility. This is a surprising finding given the particular importance of religious

discourse in Ireland at the period, where Penal Laws, such as the Adventurer's Act (1642) and the Act of Settlement (1652) drew such sharp distinctions between different religions. However, perhaps it is precisely this eminence of such discourse in the plays' contemporary moment that rule out the possibility of explicit inclusion.

Nonetheless, there is still a distinct treatment of superstition, as well as the other character traits, in the early Irish adaptations, and as a result it is worth considering what social or political dimensions most strongly informed this discourse. One aspect of culture which is particularly relevant to the excision of violent and barbaric imagery from the urtext is the change in aesthetics which occurred between the Elizabethan stage of Shakespeare and Restoration era of Tate and Duffett. After the mid-seventeenth century and the restoration of Charles II to the throne, the renewed interest in the Renaissance, and a newfound popularity of the scientific method which came with it, created a cultural emphasis on regularity, rationalism and sensibility. Indeed, Nahum Tate's own remarks in his version of *King Lear* state that the author found Shakespeare's text wanting in these very regards. During the time at which Tate and Duffett wrote their adaptations, there is a sense in which Shakespeare's plays themselves are associated with the barbarisms of the Elizabethan age, with the 'genius' of the bard becoming 'tainted' by the incivility of his own era. Samuel Johnson, in his preface to Shakespeare, states quite bluntly that 'the English nation, in the time of Shakespeare, was yet struggling to emerge from barbarity'. In light of this development in what was fashionable, it must be established whether the tendencies observed in Irish adaptations might be more readily explained by this cultural sway than by an early sense of nationalism, and whether this resulted in more 'tame' versions of the plays.

For this reason, it is worth questioning whether Irish adaptations are particularly distinct in their treatment of Shakespeare, or whether British or other adaptations of the era display similar influences. William Davenant's adaptation of *Macbeth* (1674) initially seems to display some similar traits to Irish adaptations, as much of the violence and barbarism, particularly that of Macbeth himself, is expunged from the stage. The murders of Banquo, Lady Macduff and her son all occur off-stage in Davenant, and the only on-stage slayings, those of Lenox and Macbeth himself, happen in the duels of the final scene. With all murders are taken off-stage, and only more 'legitimate' duels or confrontations remaining, there is an evident exclusion of the barbaric and the lawless through Davenant's play. However,

this adaptation makes the distinction between Irish rewritings and 'sensible' adaptation very apparent, for the alterations throughout Davenant are linked with the civility of the play as a whole, and do not alter Macbeth as a character in the manner of Duffett's Calyban or Tate's Richard II.

Similarly, the other aspects of the stage Irishman are not altered in Davenant. Shakespeare's *Macbeth* is a play which in a very literal sense stages the encroachment of nature or wilderness upon the psyche of the individual, as Birnam Wood, carried by the soldiers, migrates towards Dunsinane Castle, forecasting the death of Macbeth. Moreover, Macbeth's superstitions and his reliance on the witches to foretell his fate ultimately lead to his downfall, just as the superstitious pantheism of the Welsh army in Shakespeare's *Richard II* undermined any hope Richard had of winning his own battle. These very prominent aspects of Macbeth, characterisms routinely excluded from Irish adaptations, remain untouched in Davenant's *Macbeth*, indicating that this play sought to restore sensibility to the play, in the taste of Restoration drama, but that this did not extend to the image of the stage Irishman in the same way as his Irish contemporaries Tate and Duffett. Where these authors sought to reform characters, Davenant reformed the play itself.

Another play which underlines the distinctness of contemporary Irish adaptation in even more extreme terms is Colley Cibber's rewriting of *Richard III* (1700), which, in opposition to Davenant's excision of the barbaric and the unlawful, stages much of the violence which was left obscured in Shakespeare. Cibber includes the murder of Henry VI, not from the original of *Richard III* but rather taken from *3 Henry VI*, and also stages the murders of the Princes in the Tower, as well as the discarding of the bodies. Cibber's play is in these terms very distinct from Davenant's *Macbeth*, and rather than producing a play in which the wild barbarisms of *Richard III* are played down, the lawlessness and murderousness of Shakespeare's arch villain is actually exaggerated throughout. This is in quite stark opposition to the trends observed in contemporary Irish adaptations of plays, in which violence and barbarity as character traits were excised. Cibber's play demonstrates for us that Restoration sensibilities are not a compelling explanation for the alterations observed in Tate, Duffett, Sheridan and Morgan, while Davenant's play shows that even when violent imagery is excised from a play through aesthetic motivations, it is carried out in a way which regenerates the play as a whole, and not individual characters, as in Irish adaptations.

In spite of these brief considerations, it is worth bearing in mind that English adaptations of Shakespeare are more numerous than Irish, and their study extends well beyond the boundaries of this thesis. Even having committed to carrying out such a study would yet leave open other questions, such as whether the adaptations of other colonial locations were shaped by a similar set of influences. As such, though we can take these few examples of British adaptations to establish their relation to Tate, Duffett, et al., further and more dedicated research would be needed to enlighten the field fully. However, it would seem to be the case that Irish adaptations of the seventeenth and eighteenth century form a stable body of literature in their own right, shaped by a distinct set of influences and informed by a particular discourse, in a manner in which the non-Irish adaptations considered here were not. The factors most involved with the writing of these plays appear to be, firstly, a longstanding English discourse in which the Irish were represented as uncivil, barbaric and unlawful, and secondly, an ongoing struggle for power and identity propagated upon the Irish and Ireland itself. While it may or may not be the case that these adaptations were borne out of a pseudo- or proto- Irish nationalism of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, these texts do form a basis for 'imagining' Ireland through Shakespeare, and this is a tradition which has been carried long into the Gaelic Revival and even later.

Bibliography

Primary Material

Duffett, Thomas, *The Mock Tempest, or The Enchanted Castle* (London, 1675).

Morgan, Macnamara, *The Sheep-Shearing* (Dublin, 1767).

Sheridan, Thomas, *Coriolanus, or the Roman Matron* (Dublin, 1760).

Tate, Nahum, *The History of King* Lear (London, 1681).

--------, *The History of King Richard the Second* (London: 1681).

--------, *The Ingratitude of a Common-Wealth, or, The Fall of Laius Matius Coriolanus* (London, 1682).

--------, *The Sicilian Usurper* (London, 1691).

Secondary Material

Barthes, Roland, 'Theory of the Text', in Robert Young, *Untying the Text: A Poststructuralist Reader* (London: Routledge, 1981).

Bates, Robin, *Shakespeare and the Cultural Colonization of Ireland* (London: Routledge, 2008).

Beacon, Richard, *Solon his Folly, or A Politic Discourse, touching the Reformation of commonweals conquered, declined or corrupted* (Oxford, 1594).

Brady, Ciaran, 'Spenser's Irish Crisis: Humanism and Experience in the 1590s', *Past and Present*, 11 (May, 1986), 17-49.

Callaghan, Dympna, 'Othello was a White Man', in *Alternative Shakespeares*, 2nd edition, ed. by Terence Hawkes (London: Routledge, 2002).

Canny, Nicholas, 'Debate: "Spenser's Irish Crisis: Humanism and Experience in the 1590s"', *Past and Present*, 120 (Aug, 1989).

Coleman, George, *The history of King Lear: As it is performed at the Theatre Royal in Covent Garden* (London: R. Baldwin, 1768).

Darby, John, 'The Problem of English Racism', *Fortnight*, 211 (December 1984 - January 1985).

Davies, John, *Discovery of the true causes why Ireland was never Thoroughly Subdued until the Reign of King James I* (London, 1612).

De Grazia, Margreta, *Hamlet Without Hamlet* (London: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

Derricke, John, *The Image of Irelande with A Discoverie of Woodkarne*, ed. David B. Quinn (Belfast: Blackstaff, 1985).

DiLorenzo, Ronald Eugene (ed.), *The Three Burlesque Plays of Thomas Duffett* (Iowa: University of Iowa Press, 1972).

Dollimore, Jonathan, and Alan Sinfield (eds.), *Political Shakespeare*, 3rd edition (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989).

Fischlin, Daniel, & Mark Fortier (eds.), *Adaptations of Shakespeare: A Critical Anthology of Plays from the Seventeenth Century to the Present* (London: Routledge, 2008).

Gillies, John, *Shakespeare and the Geography of Difference* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

Green, Lawrence, 'Where's My Fool? Some Consequences of the Omission of the Fool in Tate's Lear', *Studies in English Literature*, 12:2 (1972), 259-274.

Greenblatt, Stephen (ed.), *Norton Anthology of English Literature Volume I: The Middle Ages Through the Restoration and the Eighteenth Century*, 8th edition (London: Norton, 2006), p. 1139.

----------, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (University of Chicago Press, 1980), pp. 184-7.

----------, *Shakespearean Negotiations* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988).

Gurr, Andrew, *King Richard II: The New Cambridge Shakespeare* (London: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

Hadfield, Andrew, *Edmund Spenser's Irish Experience: wild fruit and salvage soyl*, 2nd edition (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001).

Hankins, John, 'Caliban the Bestial Man', *Modern Language Association*, 62:3 (1947), 793-801.

Hardman, C.B., '"Our Drooping Country Now Erects Her Head": Nahum Tate's *History of King Lear*', *The Modern Language Review*, 95:4 (2000), 913-923.

Helgerson, Richard, *Forms of Nationhood* (Chicago University Press: London, 1992).

Holinshed, Raphael (ed.), *The Second Volume of Chronicles: Containing the Description, Conquest, Inhabitation, and Troblesome Estate Of Ireland* (London, 1586).

Howard, Tony, *Women as Hamlet: Performance and Interpretation in Theatre, Film, and Fiction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

Hulme, Peter, *Colonial Encounters*, 2nd edition (London: Routledge, 1992).

Hutcheon, Linda, *A Theory of Parody: The Teaching of Twentieth-Century Art Forms* (New York: Methuen, 1985).

Inchbald, Elizabeth, *King Lear: A Tragedy in Five Acts* (London: Longman, 1808).

Johnson, Odai, 'Empty Houses: The suppression of Tate's *Richard II*', *Theatre Journal*, 47:4, Eighteenth-Century Representations (1995), 503-516.

Johnson, Samuel, 'Preface', in Shakespeare, *Complete Works, Vol. 1* (London, 1800).

Jones, Ann Rosalind, & Peter Stallybrass. 'Dismantling Irena: The Sexualizing of Ireland in Early Modern England' in *Nationalisms and Sexualities*, ed. by Andrew Parker (New York: Routledge, 1992).

Kidnie, Margaret Jane, *Shakespeare and the Problem of Adaptation* (London: Routledge, 2009).

Lamb, Charles, 'On the Tragedies of Shakespeare', in *Essays of Elia* (Paris: Baudry's, 1835), pp. 359-60.

Lewis, Peter, 'Another Look at John Gray's "The Mohocks"', *The Modern Language Review*. 63:4, (1968).

--------, 'Review of *Three Burlesque Plays of Thomas Duffett: The Empress of Morocco; The Mock-Tempest; Psyche Debauch'd*, by Ronald Eugene DiLorenzo', *The Yearbook of English Studies*, Vol. 5 (1975).

Malone, Edmund (ed.), *The Plays of William Shakespeare, in Ten Volumes* (London 1790).

Massai, Sonia, 'Nahum Tate's Revision of Shakespeare's "King Lears"', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 40:3 (2000), 435-500.

McColl, Alan, 'The Meaning of "Britain" in Medieval and Early Modern England', *The Journal of British Studies*, 45:2 (2006), 248-269.

Miller, John, *James II*, 3rd edition (London: Yale University Press, 2000), pp. 93-104, esp. pp. 103-104.

Montrose, Louis, 'Shakespeare, the Stage, and the State', *SubStance,* 25:2 (Special Edition, 1996): 46-67.

Moraña, Mabel, & Carlos Jáuregui, *Revisiting the Colonial Question in Latin America* (University of Iberoamericana Press, 2008).

Murphy, Andrew, *But the Irish Sea Betwixt Us: Ireland, Colonialism & Renaissance Literature* (Kentucky: Kentucky University Press, 1999).

Murray, Barbara A., *Restoration Shakespeare* (NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2001).

Neill, Michael, 'Broken English and Broken Irish: Nation, Language, and the Optic of Power in Shakespeare's Histories', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 1:45, No. 1 (1994), 1-30.

Patterson, Annabel, *Censorship and Interpretation* (London: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984).

Rubenstein, Frankie, *A Dictionary of Shakespeare's Sexual Puns and their Significance*, 2nd edition (London: Macmillan, 1989).

Schlegel, August Wilhelm, *Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature* (London: Kessinger, 2004).

Schoch, Richard, *Not Shakespeare: Bardolatry and Burlesque in the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

Scott-Thomas, H.F., 'Nahum Tate and the Seventeenth Century', *ELH*, 1:3 (1934), 250-275.

Seymour, John, 'Faithful Teate', *The Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland*, Sixth Series, 10:1 (1920), 39-45.

Sharkey, Peter, 'Nahum Tate's *King Lear*, Coming Hither by going Thither', *QJS*, 54:4 (1968), 398-403.

Spencer, Christopher, *Nahum Tate* (New York: Twayne, 1972).

Spenser, Edmund, *A View of the State of Ireland*, ed. by Andrew Hadfield & Willy Maley (Oxford: Blackwell, 1997).

Steinberger, Rebecca, *Shakespeare and Twentieth-Century Irish Drama: Conceptualising Identity and Staging Boundaries* (London: Ashgate, 2008).

Suess, Barbara Ann, *Progress and Identity in the Plays of W.B. Yeats, 1982-1907* (London: Routledge, 2007), p. 132.

Tillyard, Eustace Mandeville Wetenhall, *Shakespeare's History Plays,* 3rd edition (London: Penguin, 1991).

Vaughan, Alden, and Virginia Vaughan, *Shakespeare's Caliban: A Cultural History*, 4th edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

Vickers, Brian, *Shakespeare: The Cultural Heritage, Vol. II* (London, Routledge, 1974).

West, Michael, 'Dryden's Mac Flecknoe and the Examples of Duffett's Burlesque Dramas', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 18:3, (1978).

Withey, Lynne, *Grand Tours and Cook's Tours* (London: Aurum, 1998).

Woodham-Smith, Cecil, *The Great Hunger*, 2nd edition (London: Penguin, 1991).

Internet Sources

Harper, Douglas, 'Britain', Online Etymology Dictionary. Web. 12 December 2010. <http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?term=Britain>

'superstition, n.'. OED Online. Oxford University Press. Web. 18 April 2011 <http://www.oed.com/viewdictionaryentry/Entry/194517>.

Raithby, John (ed.), 'Charles II, 1672: An Act for preventing Dangers which may happen from Popish Recusants.' *Statutes of the Realm: volume 5: 1628-80* (1819): 782-785. British History Online. Web. 18 April 2011. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=47451>