

## INTRODUCTION

*The Tempest* is a wonderfully rich play. Although most of Shakespeare's works can take on unexpected and yet convincing shapes in the theatre, his last play seems unusually elastic, its almost miraculous flexibility allowing it to embody radically different interpretations, characterizations and emphases. Prospero and Caliban can not only exchange places as hero and villain, but also vie with each other to occupy both places at once. Ariel can be female or male, a willing or an unwilling servant. Miranda can seem an innocent maiden, a hoydenish tomboy or a rebellious teenager. Antonio can seek forgiveness from his brother or remain sinister until the end. Stephano and Trinculo can present themselves as harmless buffoons or dangerous louts. The island can appear a lush paradise or a barren desert or both at once. The narrative can speak for or against racism or turn into a psychological thriller. The play's final effect can be one of decay and despair or of renewal and hope.

These examples are just a small fraction of the infinite potentialities of Shakespeare's text. Throughout its theatrical life, *The Tempest* has been a mirror powerfully reflecting contemporary concerns, be they social, political, scientific or moral; my intention in this edition is to document its myriad stage interpretations<sup>1</sup> as fully as possible in the Commentary and to offer possible explanations for them in the Introduction. However, with a work like *The Tempest*, whose stage history spans the globe as well as nearly four hundred years, a project such as this can never be definitive: there will always be an interesting production omitted, an important detail unknown, a significant context unavailable. Therefore, although this edition offers its own interpretation of the play's history in performance, it is also intended to serve as a primary resource for

<sup>1</sup> Because of limitations of space and time, I have excluded radical stage and film adaptations of *The Tempest*, such as Aimé Césaire's *Une Tempête*, Bob Carlton's *Return from the Forbidden Planet*, Fred M. Wilcox's *Forbidden Planet*, Derek Jarman's *The Tempest* and Peter Greenaway's *Prospero's Books*, from the edition; although significant in different ways, all of these versions so thoroughly rework the play that they would demand a disproportionate amount of description and annotation. Because they are readily accessible for viewing and are not particularly noteworthy, I have also excluded straightforward film and video versions of the play, such as John Gorrie's 1980 BBC production.

2 *The Tempest*

further research. For this reason, I have not simply amalgamated and paraphrased stage directions and reviewers' opinions, but have quoted them extensively; in this way, readers can make up their own minds about the fairness of my judgements and pursue lines of enquiry different from mine.

An introduction to a volume like this must also choose one of two very different approaches: it can try to offer a microcosmic theatre history, detailing changing conditions and conventions as Shakespeare's play moved from its Jacobean roots into the twentieth century, or it can assume a basic knowledge of such matters. Apart from lightly sketching in essential background for the sake of the novice reader, I have opted for the latter course: there is no point in trying to duplicate – in an inevitably reductive way – the many good specialist studies readily available, particularly when doing so would limit the amount of new material I can offer about the performance history of *The Tempest* itself. So that readers can fill in any gaps that may result, I have cited appropriate studies in my footnotes to the Introduction and, where necessary, glossed specialist theatrical terms.<sup>2</sup>

My introduction is divided into six sections, designed to provide a broad overview of the play in performance as well as a context for further information given in the Commentary. The first section deals with *The Tempest* that Shakespeare wrote, the second with the Restoration adaptations that not only held the stage until the mid-nineteenth century but also influenced subsequent productions of the original text. The next three are devoted, respectively, to changes in the playing of the three main roles: the section on Prospero examines the way the human potential of the part has developed; that on Ariel focuses on the part as a vehicle for the expression of gender ideology; and that on Caliban charts the character's evolution from comic monster to (mostly) sympathetic victim. The final section, looking at different ways of staging the storm-scene and representing the island, outlines thematic approaches taken to the play as a whole. Each section and sub-section follows a chronological order, but the considerable overlaps between them will, I hope, destroy any false sense of linear progression in the play's stage history. Although each section can be read on its own as a separate essay, their sequence is intended to build an increasingly complex picture of the play's performance possibilities and of the cultural forces that create them.

2 Simon Trussler's *Cambridge Illustrated History of British Theatre* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994) is valuable in reaching beyond traditional canonical accounts of English drama and theatre.

‘. . . WHAT’S PAST IS PROLOGUE’ (2.1.242):  
 SHAKESPEARE’S *THE TEMPEST* IN ITS OWN TIME

As many editors of the play point out, *The Tempest* has always attracted considerable attention because of its prominent position as the first play in the first collection of Shakespeare’s works ever published, the Folio of 1623.<sup>3</sup> The only extant text of the play, it was carefully prepared for publication: it not only contains very few cruxes but also includes extremely elaborate stage directions. Scholars have made a convincing case that most of the latter are not Shakespeare’s own, but embellishments by Ralph Crane, scrivener for the King’s Men, the company with which Shakespeare was associated for virtually all of his professional life.<sup>4</sup> As John Jowett has pointed out,<sup>5</sup> the stage directions of *The Tempest* are mostly written from the point of view of an audience member, of someone who has witnessed an effect rather than planned how to achieve it: most notorious is the direction at 3.3.52, which notes that the banquet vanishes ‘with a quaint device’. However, even though the Folio stage directions are probably not authorial, they provide the template which all subsequent texts and productions either adhere to or deviate from and are therefore reproduced in the text included in this edition. Editorial stage directions have been added only sparingly – for instance, when Shakespeare’s text clearly calls for a particular action or when it fails to note which characters exit; such stage directions are indicated by the square brackets that enclose them.

*The Tempest*, written about 1610–11, features Shakespeare’s most original plot; although the play does borrow from contemporary sources,<sup>6</sup> the

3 My account is indebted to Stephen Orgel’s excellent Oxford Shakespeare edition of the play (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987) and to Frank Kermode’s invaluable Arden edition, 6th edition 1958, reprinted with corrections 1961 and 1962 (London: Methuen, 1964).

4 Peter Thomson’s *Shakespeare’s Professional Career* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), provides an accessible account not only of the playwright’s career but also of Elizabethan and Jacobean theatre.

5 See his influential essay, ‘New Created Creatures: Ralph Crane and the Stage Directions in *The Tempest*’, *Shakespeare Survey* 36 (1983), pp. 107–20.

6 The editions of Frank Kermode and Stephen Orgel document well the play’s borrowings from Golding’s 1567 translation of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, from Florio’s 1603 translation of two of Montaigne’s essays, ‘Of the Cannibals’ and ‘Of Cruelty’, and from contemporary accounts of New World exploration. Orgel, p. 32, notes that the latter subject was ‘especially timely in 1611’ because of the recent shipwreck of one of the Virginia Company’s vessels: ‘William Strachey’s [1610] account of the adventure is generally considered to have clear echoes in the play. This letter, though not printed until 1625, certainly circulated in manuscript, and Shakespeare was evidently familiar with it. The playwright was associated,

4 *The Tempest*

search for one from which the story is taken has proved particularly fruitless. Like the rest of Shakespeare's plays, all of its parts were played by men and boys, as women were not allowed to act in the professional theatre. At the time *The Tempest* was written, Shakespeare's company occupied two different types of playhouse: the large outdoor Globe amphitheatre and the more intimate indoor Blackfriars, which from about 1610 became the winter home of the King's Men. The two kinds of playhouse shared the same basic architectural features: a non-scenic stage with a trap door, a tiring-house facade with a discovery space in the centre and a door on either side, an upper gallery, a music room and a flying device that enabled the descent of thrones and goddesses, among other items. In both playhouses, the audience surrounded the stage on four sides; however, in the Globe those who paid least stood throughout the performance and were closest to the stage, while in the Blackfriars those who paid most sat near or even on it. In both theatres, spectacle was restricted to a sumptuous display of elaborate and colourful costumes; locations were indicated, if at all, by a suggestive prop, such as a throne or a bed.<sup>7</sup>

Despite these physical similarities, there were important differences in performance conditions at the two kinds of theatre. Performances at the outdoor Globe took place in daylight and ran non-stop, while those at the indoor Blackfriars relied on candlelight. The need to tend and trim the candles introduced act-breaks, during which the audience was entertained with music. Andrew Gurr has persuasively demonstrated that '*The Tempest* was the first play Shakespeare unquestionably wrote for the Blackfriars rather than the Globe': the fact that 'Prospero and Ariel leave the stage together at the end of Act 4 and enter together again to open Act 5' provides 'unequivocal evidence that [the play] was conceived with act breaks in mind'.<sup>8</sup> Writing the play for the Blackfriars, whose musicians were

moreover, with a number of members of the Virginia Company . . . [so his] interest in the venture would have been at least partly personal.'

7 For the fullest information on theatre in Shakespeare's time, see Andrew Gurr's *The Shakespearean Stage, 1574-1642*, 3rd edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992) and *Playgoing in Shakespeare's London*, 2nd edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996). *The Revels History of Drama in English*, Volume III, 1576-1613, eds. J. Leeds Barroll et al. (London: Methuen, 1975), includes essays on 'The Companies and Actors' by Alexander Leggatt, pp. 97-117, and 'The Playhouses' by Richard Hosley, pp. 121-235, while *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare Studies*, ed. Stanley Wells (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), includes essays on 'Playhouses and players in the time of Shakespeare' by Peter Thomson, pp. 67-83, and 'Shakespeare and the theatrical conventions of his time' by Alan C. Dessen, pp. 85-99.

8 '*The Tempest's* Tempest at Blackfriars', *Shakespeare Survey* 41 (1989), pp. 92-3.

already famous, may also have encouraged Shakespeare to exploit the potential of music for his drama: as Gurr notes, ‘*The Tempest* is uniquely a musical play among Shakespeare’s writings’, utilizing ‘instrumental music as well as song’ to a degree not found in his other plays (‘*The Tempest’s Tempest*’, pp. 92–3).

Although *The Tempest* was conceived as a Blackfriars play, it would also have played at the Globe: there was no distinction in the repertoires of the two theatres nor any need for one, since the indoor theatre did not offer any facilities unavailable at the amphitheatre. Unfortunately, however, there are no surviving contemporary references to the play in performance at either theatre, the only recorded performances in Shakespeare’s lifetime having taken place at court.<sup>9</sup> The Revels Accounts show that *The Tempest* was performed for James I at Whitehall, probably in the Banqueting House, on 1 November 1611, and court records of a payment made to the King’s Men in May 1613 indicate that it was one of the plays given to celebrate the betrothal and marriage of James’s daughter Elizabeth and the Elector Palatine in February of that year.

Knowledge of these court performances, and particularly of the latter one, has sometimes led to a mistaken belief that Shakespeare added the masque of 4.1 as an afterthought; at other times, it has encouraged a misplaced emphasis in the theatre on the play’s masque-like elements. However, as Stephen Orgel cautions, ‘the masque in *The Tempest* is not a court masque, it is a dramatic allusion to one, and it functions in the structure of the drama not as a separable interlude but as an integral part of the action’.<sup>10</sup> Its presence does not imply the visually spectacular staging associated with the Jacobean court masque, with its perspective scenery and mechanical scene-changes: Shakespeare’s play would have been performed with lavish costume but without scenery on a bare stage. This bare stage did not, however, preclude illusion. As Andrew Gurr has admirably demonstrated, the opening scene of *The Tempest*

is a bravura piece of staging not only in the way it deploys an outdoor effect [the staging of a storm] at an indoor playhouse, but because that effect sets up the ruling conceit for the whole play. A thoroughly realistic

9 Dryden’s 1669 Preface to *The Enchanted Island* notes that *The Tempest* ‘had formerly been acted with success in the Black-Fryers’. The preface and play are reprinted in Montague Summers, *Shakespeare Adaptations* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1922), pp. 1–103, with the quotation on p. 3.

10 For more information about the court performances and the relevance of the masque, see Orgel, pp. 1–4, 43–50, and Kermode, pp. xxi–xxiv; the quotation is from Orgel, pp. 43–4.

6 *The Tempest*

storm, with mariners in soaking work clothes being hampered in their work by courtiers dressed for a wedding, concludes in shipwreck for all. And immediately [with Miranda's entry in 2.1] this realism is proclaimed to be only stage magic, the art of illusion . . . The whole play depends on the initial realism of the shipwreck scene. It is the verification of Prospero's magic and the declaration that it is all only a stage play.<sup>11</sup>

As Gurr's analysis demonstrates, although there are no eyewitness accounts of the play as performed by the King's Men, the explicit and implicit stage directions of the text can offer much evidence about the original performances. The sections of the Introduction that follow, as well as the Commentary, will provide conjectural reconstructions of characterization and action where possible.

ADDING 'MORE AMAZEMENT' (1.2.14):  
 RESTORATION ADAPTATIONS OF *THE TEMPEST*

The version of *The Tempest* most familiar to play-goers throughout much of its performance history has not been Shakespeare's Folio text, but the adaptation by William Davenant and John Dryden, first staged on 7 November 1667 by the Duke's Company at Lincoln's Inn Fields and subsequently published in 1670 by Henry Herringman.<sup>12</sup> This version, which 'includes less than a third of Shakespeare's text',<sup>13</sup> changes the plot of the play and its cast of characters considerably.

The action begins, as in Shakespeare, with a storm at sea, but in this version Stephano is the ship's Master, and Trincalo the Boatswain; they are joined by Mustacho, the Master's Mate, and by Ventoso, a mariner.<sup>14</sup> Their passengers are Alonzo, the Duke of Savoy, who has usurped the dukedom of Mantua rightfully belonging to Hippolito; Antonio, Prospero's brother

<sup>11</sup> 'The Tempest's Tempest', pp. 95–6. Gurr further argues that the scene is 'a supremely adroit and discreet upstaging' of Heywood's complaint in 1 *The Fair Maid of the West* that 'Our stage so lamely can express a sea / That we are forc'd by Chorus to discourse / What should have been in action', pp. 96, 91.

<sup>12</sup> *The Tempest, or the Enchanted Island. A Comedy. As it is now Acted at His Highness the Duke of York's Theatre.* (London: Henry Herringman at the Blew Anchor in the Lower-walk of the New-Exchange, 1670). The text is reprinted in *Shakespeare Adaptations*, ed. Summers, pp. 1–103; see his Introduction, pp. xli–l, for information about the first performance, publishing history, and Davenant's chief responsibility for the adaptation.

<sup>13</sup> Orgel, p. 64.

<sup>14</sup> This account gives a general outline of the adaptation; see Commentary for details of the lines retained, which allow for a fuller reconstruction.

and the usurping Duke of Millain; Ferdinand, Alonzo's son; and Gonzalo, a nobleman of Savoy. The opening scene, padded out with nautical directives, is double the length of Shakespeare's (see Appendix 1), but ignores what the original so succinctly establishes: the irrelevance of temporal authority in the face of natural forces, and the differences between the genially optimistic Gonzalo, the rather quiet Alonso and the gratuitously unpleasant Antonio and Sebastian. Instead, Alonzo recognizes that his suffering is caused by his as-yet-unnamed crimes, and, since Sebastian is cut, Gonzalo mouths the curse he speaks at Shakespeare's lines 35–6.

As the victims of the stricken ship exit and Prospero enters with Miranda, his question – 'where's your sister?' – immediately points out another major departure from Shakespeare's text. The rest of Act 1 of the adaptation includes Prospero's considerably shortened account of his past, his interview with Ariel (during which we learn that Caliban has a twin sister called Sycorax), Miranda and Prospero's encounter with Caliban, and a short dialogue between Miranda and her younger sister Dorinda which reveals their total ignorance about sex and the nature of men (see Appendix 1). Following the Restoration, female roles were played not by boys but by women, who were regarded as sexually experienced and available; as a result, as Jocelyn Powell has vividly demonstrated, a double dialogue took place in Miranda and Dorinda's scene, one between the characters on stage and the other between the actors and the audience, 'over the characters' heads'.<sup>15</sup>

Act 2 begins like Shakespeare's, with Gonzalo urging Alonzo to 'be merry', but the rest of their interaction is a radical departure from the Folio text. The bantering conversation of the lords is cut, and in his second speech Alonzo reflects that he and Antonio are being punished for their usurpations of Hippolito and Prospero: in fact, the two are returning from a Portuguese crusade to repulse the Spanish Moors, undertaken in an attempt to expiate their guilt. As they discuss their sins, two off-stage devils sing a duet, 'Where does proud Ambition dwell?', and afterwards enter to produce a show of Pride, Fraud, Rapine, and Murther. As the lords exit to seek some food, Ariel and Ferdinand enter as in Shakespeare's 1.2., with the former singing 'Come unto these yellow sands' and 'Full fathom five'.

The action then shifts to the shipwrecked mariners: because he 'was master at Sea', Stephano declares himself 'Duke on Land' and names Mustacho, his erstwhile Mate, 'Vice-Roy'. Ventoso naturally objects, and the squabbles that ensue, with references to speaking for the people, taking

15 Jocelyn Powell, *Restoration Theatre Production* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984), pp. 71–2; see also p. 76 for discussion of the same kind of dialogue in relation 'to recent political events in England'.

8 *The Tempest*

silence for consent and civil war, satirize the recent Commonwealth years. Although Stephano solves matters by declaring both Mustacho and Ventoso his viceroys, Trincalo's arrival complicates them again: he renounces Stephano's authority and sets himself up as a rival duke. When he meets Caliban, he quickly enlists him as subject and decides to marry Sycorax to 'lay claim to this Island by Alliance'.

In the act's final scenes, Prospero reveals to the audience that, unknown to his daughters, he has also raised Hippolito in a separate part of the island: their ignorance of each other's existence was necessary, since Prospero foresaw that the young man would die if he beheld a woman before a certain time. Because the crucial period is close, Prospero warns Hippolito of 'Those dangerous Enemies of Men call'd women', which Hippolito had 'never heard of . . . before' – an irony as the part was a breeches role (that is, played by a woman). When Hippolito exits, Prospero again warns his daughters of the dangers of men, eliciting some sexual *double entendres* and firing a curiosity that the women promptly gratify once their father leaves. However, because the off-stage Prospero calls Miranda back, only Dorinda speaks to Hippolito: the two are immediately attracted to each other, although they do not understand their feelings.

Act 3 opens with Prospero chastising his daughters for their disobedience and then discussing with Ariel his intentions towards the lords as he does at the beginning of Shakespeare's 5.1. He instructs Ariel to feed them, after which the lords enter: an invisible Ariel sings 'Dry those eyes which are o'reflowing' (*sic*), and eight fat spirits entertain them as a prelude to a genuine feast. The action then shifts to Trincalo's first meeting with the monstrous Sycorax, during which Ariel plays a trick in substituting water for wine, and to another encounter between the two would-be ducal factions. Ferdinand then enters, still led by Ariel's music, and the two sing the Echo Song before Miranda and Ferdinand meet and fall in love as in Shakespeare's 1.2. After imprisoning Ferdinand and chiding Hippolito for his disobedience in speaking to Dorinda, Prospero tells Hippolito to visit and comfort Ferdinand. The act ends with their meeting, during which Hippolito learns there are more women in the world than Dorinda and resolves to have them all. As recent editors of the play explain, Davenant and Dryden's Hippolito is a typical seventeenth-century figure, symbolizing natural man raised in isolation and outside the laws of civilization; his rejection of monogamy illustrates the libertine argument against marriage.<sup>16</sup>

16 Maximillian E. Novak and George Robert Guffey, in their notes to Volume x of *The Works of John Dryden*, gen. ed. H. T. Swedenberg, Jr. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970), pp. 319–79, provide a very useful analysis of the play and its changes from Shakespeare's text, setting those changes in their Restoration contexts. The points about Hippolito are made on pp. 330 and 369.



However, the fact that Hippolito was a breeches part implicates both sexes, rather than men alone, in a naturally unrestrained sexuality, a fact already implied by Dorinda's innocent but equally powerful desires, expressed in her first scene with Miranda.

At the beginning of Act 4, Miranda visits Ferdinand with Prospero's permission, but unwittingly arouses her lover's jealousy by asking him to be kind to Hippolito; soon after, Hippolito upsets Dorinda by disclosing his ingenuous desire to have all the women in the world as well as her. Ferdinand then encounters Hippolito and challenges him to a duel; before they fight, however, the action shifts to the two ducal factions, with Stephano appearing to capitulate to Trincalo but in fact using the opportunity to woo Sycorax for himself.<sup>17</sup>

In the duel between the rival lovers, Ferdinand wounds Hippolito, whose refusal to retire results in his apparent death. Prospero berates Ariel for failing to prevent the catastrophe and announces that he will execute Ferdinand for his crime; however, he first reunites Alonzo with his son so that 'the sudden joy of seeing him alive' will lead to 'greater grief to see him dye'. Dorinda, meanwhile, ignorant of what death is, unsuccessfully tries to revive her lover, and then she and Miranda fall out, blaming each other for the turn events have taken. Ariel ends the act with a soliloquy, commenting on the 'Harsh discord reign[ing] throughout . . . [the] Isle' and asking 'Why shou'd a mortal by Enchantments hold / In Chains a Spirit of aetherial mould?'. His reply to himself, 'Accursed Magick we our selves have taught; / And our own Pow'r has our Subjection wrought!', makes his questioning of Prospero's authority seem merely rhetorical.

As Act 5 begins, Miranda pleads unsuccessfully with Prospero for Ferdinand's life, but Ariel intervenes, explaining that after discovering Hippolito's 'Soul was but retir'd, not sally'd out', he had worked through the night to save him. He explains the ministrations still necessary, which Prospero dispatches Miranda to perform; meanwhile, the recovered Hippolito sends Dorinda to Prospero to plead for Ferdinand's life. Consequently, when Dorinda and the freed Ferdinand encounter Miranda with Hippolito, the quartet of lovers quickly dissolves again into mutual misunderstandings, which are then finally cleared. Alonzo and Ferdinand are more happily reunited, the usurped dukedoms willingly rendered back to their rightful holders, and the would-be ducal mariners apprised of the return to the

17 Novak and Guffey, *Works*, p. 329, note that the adaptation's three couples (Miranda/Ferdinand, Dorinda/Hippolito, and Sycorax/Trincalo) occupy different places on the scale of love, descending from the platonic to the purely sensual. While the point seems valid in regard to some of the individuals concerned, it is perhaps a bit too schematic to apply to the couples, since, for example, Trincalo finds Sycorax physically repulsive and maintains the alliance only for political advantage.

*status quo*. Prospero promises Ariel his freedom once he has provided ‘calm Seas and happy Gales’, and after singing ‘Where the bee sucks’, Ariel introduces his love Milcha, who has waited for his freedom for fourteen years. The two dance a saraband before Prospero speaks the final lines, dedicating the enchanted isle as ‘A place of Refuge [to the afflicted]’.

Davenant and Dryden’s adaptation was itself transformed by Thomas Shadwell into an opera, which had its first performance at Dorset Garden, probably on 30 April 1674; retaining John Banister’s songs for the 1667 text, it added new music by Matthew Locke, Pietro Reggio and James Hart, dances by Giovanni Battista Draghi, and masques by Pelham Humfrey.<sup>18</sup> The text, which was published by Herringman in 1674, follows that of 1667, apart from the added songs and dances, a slightly different act/scene arrangement, some insignificant scene transpositions and two major changes.<sup>19</sup> The first is the early introduction of Milcha, who joins Ariel at the end of his first scene with Prospero; the second is the masque of Neptune and Amphitrite, an entertainment conjured by Prospero at the end of the play ‘to make amends / For the [lords] rough treatment’.

The extremely popular Restoration adaptations of *The Tempest* held the stage well into the nineteenth century, only finally being ousted with William Macready’s reversion to Shakespeare’s text in 1838.<sup>20</sup> As a result,

18 Powell, *Restoration Theatre Production*, pp. 62–3; see also Orgel, p. 66. According to J. G. McManaway, Humfrey set ‘Where the bee sucks’ for the 1667 adaptation; see ‘Songs and Masques in *The Tempest* [c.1674]’, *Theatre Miscellany* (Luttrell Society Reprints No. 14) (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1953), p. 79.

19 *The Tempest, or the Enchanted Island. A Comedy. As it is now Acted at His Highness the Duke of York’s Theatre*. (London: Henry Herringman, 1674). The text is available in the facsimile edition taken from the copy in the Birmingham Shakespeare Library (London: Cornmarket Press, 1969).

20 Judith Milhous and Robert D. Hume, in their edition of John Downes’s 1708 *Roscious Anglicanus* (London: Society for Theatre Research, 1987), p. 74 n. 218, ‘judge from fragmentary performance records [that] *The Tempest* was the most popular work on the London stage prior to *The Beggar’s Opera* in 1728’. Shakespeare’s text received six performances at Drury Lane in 1746, but even these performances retained Shadwell’s masque of Neptune and Amphitrite (George Winchester Stone, Jr., ‘Shakespeare’s *Tempest* at Drury Lane During Garrick’s Management’, *Shakespeare Quarterly* 7 (1956), p. 1). After assuming management of Drury Lane two years later, Garrick produced in 1756 his own opera adapted from Shadwell’s, but its lack of success led Garrick to restore Shakespeare’s text the following year; in this version, only 432 lines were cut and 14 added (Stone, *Shakespeare’s Tempest*, pp. 5–6). This text remained in the repertory until Garrick retired in 1776, but in 1777, Sheridan, the new manager, ‘reintroduced both the masque of Neptune and Amphitrite and the “Grand Dance of Fantastic Spirits” which inaugurates Shadwell’s disappearing banquet scene’ (Orgel, p. 67). However, even this version of Shakespeare’s text was