Cultural Adaptations of William Shakespeare's The Tempest: A Study of John Dryden's and William Davenant's The Tempest; or, The Enchanted Island (1667)

Dina Raafat Abdel-Hamid(*)

Abstract

This research paper aims at explaining the lexical, literary, and cultural definitions of the term 'adaptation'. It also presents the opinions of multiple adaptation critics, focusing mainly on Edward Said, Roland Barthes, Julia Kristeva, and Gérard Genette. The paper, moreover, offers an explanation of the meaning of 'cultural adaptation' and highlights the various adaptation strategies used in analyzing adapted texts. This research also presents an analysis of John Dryden's and William Davenant's The Tempest; or, The Enchanted Island (1667), a seventeenth century rereading of William Shakespeare's last play The Tempest (1611). Through the analysis, the paper highlights the features of neoclassicism as applied to the play, as well as offers a comparison between both the renaissance original text and the restoration adapted version so as to satisfy the literary tastes of the seventeenth century audience.

*Assistant Lecturer - Department of Al-Alsun - Faculty of Mass Communication and Al-Alsun - Misr International University

المعالجات الثقافية لمسرحية العاصفة لـ وليم شكسبير
دراسة في العاصفة أو الجزيرة المسحورة (1667)
لـ جون دريدن و وليم دافينانت

دينا رافت عبد الحميد

ملخص

يهدف هذا البحث إلى شرح المفهوم المعجمي و الأدبي وكذلك الثقافي لمصطلح "المعالجة". كما يقدم آراء العديد من النقاد حول موضوع "المعالجة"، مع التركيز على آراء ادوارد سعيد، رولان بارت، جوليا كريستيفا، و جيرار جينيت. و يعرض البحث أيضا معنى "المعالجة الثقافية" مع الإشارة إلى أنواع المعالجات المختلفة التي تستخدم في تحليل النصوص. و يقوم هذا البحث بتقديم تحليل لمسرحية العاصفة أو الجزيرة المسحورة (1667) لـ جون دريدن و وليم دافينانت فيما يعد قراءة جديدة من منظور القرن السابع عشر لمسرحية العاصفة (1611) و هى آخر مسرحيات وليم شكسبير. و يشير البحث أيضا إلى خصائص الكلاسيكية الجديدة حيث يقوم بتطبيقها على المسرحية. هذا و يعرض البحث مقارنة بين النص الأصلي و النص المعالج فيما يتوافق مع الذوق الأدبي لجمهور القرن السابع عشر.

This research paper[1] aims at exploring the lexical, literary, and cultural definitions of the terms 'adaptation' and 'appropriation' as well as examining the differences between them. It also presents the opinions of multiple adaptation theorists and critics, besides, focusing mainly on Edward Said's and Roland Barthes' viewpoints regarding adaptation, Julia Kristeva's theory of intertextuality, and Gérard Genette's theory of transtextuality, with particular reference to the hypotext and the hypertext. The paper, moreover, offers an explanation of the meaning of 'cultural adaptation' and highlights the various adaptation strategies used in analyzing adapted texts.

This research presents an analysis of John Dryden's and William Davenant's The Tempest; or, The Enchanted Island (1667), a seventeenth century rereading, reinterpretation, and redesigning of William Shakespeare's last play The Tempest (1611). Through the analysis, the paper highlights the features of neoclassicism as applied to the play, offers a comparison between both the renaissance original text and the restoration adapted version, as well as illustrates all the alterations and transformations that the hypotext undergoes when being adapted for the Restoration stage so as to satisfy the literary tastes of the Restoration audience and meet the requirements of the seventeenth century stage.

A literary text can be regarded as an expression of the psychology of an individual, which in turn can be seen as a representation of the milieu and the epoch in which the individual lives, and of the race to which he belongs. A text, as a raw material, can be rewritten, reinterpreted, and transposed by numerous adapters who transform and appropriate the text according to the thoughts, beliefs, and the historical and cultural eras where the adapted text emerges.

'Adapt' is "to fit (a person or thing to another, to or for a purpose), to suit, or make suitable. [. . .] To alter or modify so as to fit

for a new use" ("Adapt"). Similarly, 'adaptation' means "the action or process of adapting, fitting, or suiting one thing to another. [. . .] The process of modifying a thing so as to suit new conditions: as, [. . .]; the alteration of a dramatic composition to suit a different audience" ("Adaptation").

Literary, 'adaptation' is the modification of a literary text to another genre or medium. Text adaptation or modification may sometimes include adapting the same literary work in the same genre or medium for different purposes. A writer is attracted to a work of literature that appeals to his beliefs and interests. Therefore, the encounter with the work helps the writer to think of adapting it according to his views, thus presenting a new modified perspective of the work that suits various audiences, several literary tastes, and multiple cultures.

'Appropriate', on the lexical level, is "to make (a thing) the private property of anyone, to make it over to him as his own; [...].To devote, set apart, or assign to a special purpose or use. [...]. To make, or select as, appropriate or suitable to; to suit" ("Appropriate"). Similarly, 'appropriation' means "the making of a thing private property, whether another's or [...] one's own; taking as one's own or to one's own use; [...]" ("Appropriation"). Literary, 'appropriation' "frequently affects a more decisive journey away from the informing source into a wholly new cultural product and domain. This may or may not involve a generic shift, and it may still require the intellectual juxtaposition of (at least) one text against another that [...] is central to the reading [...] experience of adaptations" (Sanders[2] 26).

In Adaptation and Appropriation, Julie Sanders defines 'adaptation' as:

> a transpositional practice, casting a specific genre into another generic mode, an act of re-vision in itself. [...]. Adaptation is frequently involved in offering commentary

> on a sourcetext. This is achieved most often by offering a revised point of view from the 'original', adding hypothetical motivation, or voicing the silenced and marginalized. Yet adaptation can also constitute a simpler attempt to make texts 'relevant' or easily comprehensible to new audiences and readerships via the processes of proximation and updating. (18-19)

Mireia Aragay[3] defines adaptation as "a prime instance of cultural recycling, a process which radically undermines any linear, diachronic understanding of cultural history" (201). Linda Hutcheon[4], conversely, describes adaptation as "an act of appropriating or salvaging, and this is always a double process of interpreting and then creating something new" (A Theory of Adaptation 20).

Adaptation can also be identified as a creative and a receptive process "whereby adaptations are recognized and enjoyed as adaptations by audiences who are constantly invited to shift back and forth between their experience of a new story and their memory of its progenitors" (Leitch[5]74). Christine Geraghty[6] suggests that "popular and much-adapted texts have to work with similarity and difference in a movement that refers to but does not rely on knowledge of previous versions" (42).

John M. Desmond[7] and Peter Hawkes[8] point out that adaptation is "the transfer of a printed text in a literary genre to film" (1). They divide adaptations into three categories, namely "close, loose, or intermediate" (3), depending on how far they are free in the way they treat their original texts. Desmond and Hawkes deal with adaptations only in terms of their relationships to certain sourcetexts whose elements they can simply "keep, drop, or add" (51).

In The Cambridge Companion to Literature on Screen, Deborah Cartmell[9] and Imelda Whelehan[10] stress that "it's vital that literature *and* film be distinguished from literature *on* film". They

salute the "desire to free our notion of film adaptations from this dependency on literature so that adaptations are not derided as sycophantic, derivative, and therefore inferior to their literary counterparts" (1-2).

Adaptation and appropriation can have various contrasting targets and objectives (Sanders 18). They can differ in the way they expose their intertextual aim. Film, television, or theatrical adaptations of any work of literature are considered an explicit interpretation or re-reading of a predecessor. In appropriations, the intertextual relationship is more implicit, and a political or an ethical commitment usually shapes the writer's decision to interpret a source text (Sanders, "Introd." 2).

Therefore, adaptation focuses on "reinterpretations of established texts in new generic contexts" (Sanders 19). Appropriation "is not closed to the forces of social struggle and political power or to acts of historical consciousness" (Weimann 433), its main objective is to study in detail "the specific impulses and ideologies, personal and historical, that are at play in various acts of adaptation and appropriation" (Sanders 19). Adaptation, or the aspiration to change a text from one genre or medium to another, is neither new nor uncommon in Western culture. Rather, one may believe it is the tendency of the human mind and imagination to retell stories (Hutcheon, "On the Art of Adaptation" 108).

Edward Said[11], in "On Originality", proposes that "the writer thinks less of writing originally, and more of rewriting" (135). This issue of 'rewriting', in theoretical terms, is referred to as 'intertextuality'. The term 'intertextuality' is introduced by Julia Kristeva[12], in her essay "The Bounded Text", to "elaborate a theory of the text as a network of sign systems situated in relation to other systems of signifying practices […] in a culture" (Godard 568). Intertextuality adjusts the text "to its sociohistoric signification in the

interaction of the different codes, discourses or voices traversing the text. In short, a text is not a self-sufficient, closed system" (568), it is not an individual isolated object, but a compilation of cultural textuality that is created and constructed of already existent discourse.

Kristeva, therefore, concedes Said's view while arguing that authors do not create their texts from their own minds, but compile and gather them from pre-existent works. Kristeva, thus, defines and describes intertextuality as a "permutation of texts, an intertextuality: in the space of a given text, several utterances, taken from other texts, intersect and neutralize one another" ("The Bounded Text" 36). Since "any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another" (Kristeva, "Word, Dialogue, and Novel" 66), the interaction and communication between the author and the reader will continuously be connected and related to the intertextual relations between words and their pre-existence in previous works.

The text, to Roland Barthes[13], is a "multi-dimensional space in which a variety of writings, none of them original, blend and clash […] a tissue of quotations drawn from the innumerable centres of culture" ("The Death of the Author" 146). He states that "any text is a new tissue of past citations. […]. Intertextuality, the condition of any text whatsoever, cannot, of course, be reduced to a problem of sources or influences; the intertext is a general field of anonymous formulae whose origin can scarcely ever be located" ("Theory of the Text" 39).

Declaring that "any text is an intertext" (39), Barthes proposes that the works of preceding cultures were always found in literature. He also emphasizes that to produce meaning, texts are not only dependent on their authors, but on readers as well who create their own interpretations and appropriations of the texts and form their own intertextual relations and networks (Sanders, "Introd." 2). In this

respect, Barthes, Said, and Kristeva regard sourcetexts as re-visions, re-evaluations, re-appropriations, and transformations of pre-existent discourses and works of art.

In The Death and Return of the Author: Criticism and Subjectivity in Barthes, Foucault and Derrida, Sean Burke believes that "the decision as to whether we read a text with or without an author remains an act of critical choice governed by the protocols of a certain way of reading rather than any 'truth of writing'" (158). On one hand, the existence of the author in the text leaves no space for readers to interpret the text from their own perspectives and viewpoints. The text, in this case, is haunted by the authorial perspective that forces its presence thus depriving the readers of perceiving the text the way they like. On the other hand, a free text – that is – freed from the author, becomes like an open space where readers can navigate freely expressing their own interpretations of the text without any constraints. The authorial perspective, therefore, will no longer exist since it will be "replaced by that of the reader as producer of the text" (21):

> The removal of the author […] is not merely an historical fact or an act of writing; it utterly transforms the modern text […]. […] Once the author is removed, the claim to decipher a text becomes quite futile. To give a text an author is to impose a limit on that text, to furnish it with a final signified, to close the writing. (Barthes, "The Death of the Author" 145-7)

In other words, the relation between the author and the reader will no longer be the master-slave relationship, but man (reader) – to – man (author) relationship. Barthes proposes that "we shall never know, for the good reason that writing is the destruction of every voice, of every point of origin. Writing is that neutral, composite,

oblique space where our subject slips away, the negative where all identity is lost, starting with the very identity of the body writing" (142).

Intertextuality, for Gérard Genette[14], is the regular way and the usual means of approaching textual production. He describes "literature as a 'second degree' construct made out of pieces of other texts" (Godard 570) and presents a coherent theory and a generic map of what he terms 'transtextuality' which can be considered as a structuralist approach to intertextuality. Transtextuality, or the textual transcendence of the text, can be defined as "all that sets the text in a relationship, whether obvious or concealed, with other texts" (Genette 1). It constitutes elements of imitation, transformation, and the classification of types of discourse. Genette employs transtextuality to reveal how texts can be understood, comprehended, and consequently interpreted. To achieve this aim, he divides the term 'transtextuality' into five specific categories: intertextuality, paratextuality, metatextuality, hypertextuality, and architextuality.

Hypertextuality is the most important type of transtextuality as well as the main focus of Genette's study and the terrain of Palimpsests. It is defined as "any relationship uniting a text B (which I shall call the *hypertext*) to an earlier text A (I shall, of course, call it the *hypotext*), upon which it is grafted in a manner that is not that of commentary" (5). A hypertext, then, is "any text derived from a previous text either through simple transformation, which I shall simply call […] *transformation*, or through indirect transformation, which I shall label *imitation*" (7). Genette proposes that all literary works are hypertextual since all works of art do evoke – to a certain degree and according to how they are interpreted – some other literary work (9).

Thus, Kristeva's intertextuality and Genette's transtextuality pave the way for various adapters to rewrite multiple texts, transform and

appropriate them across cultures to fit new historical, social and cultural contexts, and eventually present a modern rereading of the past. This is referred to as 'cultural adaptation' where adapters, in creating hypertexts, should ensure their message using cultural references that their intended audience or readers will identify with. Texts can never be separated from the larger cultural and social textuality out of which they are formed. Linda Hutcheon asserts that adapting literary texts across cultures does not imply mere translation of words, but rather the conveyance of the cultural and social meaning and its adaptation to the new environment or context (A Theory of Adaptation 149). This indicates that adaptation comprises the transformation and appropriation of pre-existent works in new and modern contexts. Adapters repeat without replication, they "pick and choose what they want to transplant to their own soil" (150) eventually achieving new results and hybrid works.

Adaptation has various strategies that filmmakers follow when they endeavour to put literature on screen. The first one is known as the 'Concentration Strategy' where adapters follow the story "almost line by line before going off for the rest of its length in a completely new direction" (Desmond and Hawkes 128). In the 'Interweaving Strategy', filmmakers "retain the leading elements of the story at hand but disperse those elements throughout the film [...] and interweave either invented elements or expansions on already existing elements" (133). Adapters "drop most of the narrative elements from the short story [...] and [...] invent a new story based on the remaining elements" (136-7) in case they pursue the 'Point of Departure Strategy'.

Deborah Cartmell supports classifying adaptation into three main categories, namely – 'transposition', 'commentary', and 'analogy' (Adaptations: From Text to Screen, Screen to Text 24). The first category is 'transposition' where "the literary text is transferred as accurately as possible to film" (24). Transposition also means taking a

text from one genre and delivering it to new audiences "by means of the aesthetic conventions of an entirely different generic process […]. But many adaptations, […], contain further layers of transposition, relocating their source texts not just generically, but in cultural, geographical and temporal terms" (Sanders 20).

Cartmell's second category is 'commentary' where "the original is altered" (Adaptations: From Text to Screen, Screen to Text 24). Commentary denotes "adaptations that comment on the politics of the source text, […], usually by means of alteration or addition" (Sanders 21). In this stage, "the process of adaptation starts to move away from simple proximation towards something more culturally loaded" (21). 'Analogy' is the third and final category of adaptation where "the original text is used as a point of departure" (Cartmell, Adaptations: From Text to Screen, Screen to Text 24). In this phase, the text is completely changed and altered to become a newly shaped product.

Throughout the history of the theatre, modification, variation, revision, transformation, alteration, rewriting, and adaptation have started and remained popular till the present day. The abundance and availability of Shakespeare's plays have paved the way for the descent of multiple adaptations (Fischlin & Fortier 1). This availability has endowed Shakespeare with his cultural value where "each new generation attempts to redefine Shakespeare's genius in contemporary terms, projecting its desires and anxieties onto his work" (Marsden 1).

Adapting Shakespeare "invariably makes him 'fit' for new cultural contexts and different political ideologies to those of his own age" (Sanders 46). Shakespeare's adapters "undertake a number of responses to Shakespeare's canonical status: some seek to supplant or overthrow; others borrow from Shakespeare's status to give resonance to their own efforts" (Fischlin & Fortier 6). Therefore, through the adaptation process, the Bard is continuously made new and remade:

"if adaptations of Shakespeare somehow reinforce Shakespeare's position in the canon […] it is a different Shakespeare that is at work" (6). Yet, in spite of this universal genius and intelligence, his plays have never been regarded as sacred or unchangeable texts. They have always been subject to reinterpretation, alteration, and revision. Each generation has rewritten and appropriated Shakespeare's plays to fit the moral, social, and political background and circumstances of a certain culture and age (Lee 1).

Neoclassicism is a period of European literature that emerged in France during the mid-seventeenth century. It developed in England thirty years later and lasted until the middle of the eighteenth century. The Neoclassical Age, also known as the Age of Reason or the Enlightenment Age, is characterized by its adherence to order, restraint, clarity, and decorum in order to attain the objectivity, conformity, and rationality of classicism. The era is referred to as 'neoclassical' since its writers followed the intellectuality, ideals, and art forms of classical times. In an attempt to break loose from the fetters of the renaissance as a period of vast expansiveness, broad exploration, wide experimentation, and linguistic freedom, neoclassicists stressed the significance of following 'reason' and 'nature', rather than feelings and emotions, in all aspects of life (Massoud 65). In literature, the neoclassical view encourages a preference for general truths rather than particular insights. It also promotes the principle of decorum which stresses the fact that the style should suit the subject-matter and the belief that art must both instruct and delight (Baldick 148).

Dryden adopts the classicist view believing that the purpose of literature is to portray truth and to imitate nature in the style of the ancient Greeks and Romans. Literature, to him, should follow rules in order to satisfy reason. Unlike renaissance dramatists, neoclassical playwrights no longer coined new words, but rather intended to

standardize grammar and vocabulary. The language neoclassicists used was simpler and clearer and the figures of speech were more traditional thus dispensing with the more sophisticated and metaphorical language that was used in most of Shakespeare's plays. Obscure, ambiguous, and mysterious scenes no more signaled grandeur and magnificence but rather ineffectiveness and incompetence. In contrast to renaissance plays, neoclassical dramas strictly applied the three unities of place, time, and action as well as developed a single plot line therefore maintaining a unified structure and a refined tone. Restoration literature, thus, offers a simpler and a more unified reevaluation, rereading, and transformation of the renaissance literary works in order to balance the social anarchy, chaos, and confusion of the restoration period.

John Dryden, 'Neander', as he calls himself in his Essay of Dramatic Poesy (1668), and the first great literary critic of the new movement, believes that imagination, feelings, and emotions are not to be trusted and that the ideal way is to live a peaceful life ruled by mind and reason. Accordingly, he abandons the Elizabethan style, rejects the metaphysical conceit in favour of more clarity and precision, believes that poetry is didactic and is an imitation of nature, as well as changes Shakespeare's metaphorical language into a more conventional one, thus conceding Burgess' view of neoclassicism:

> We may expect no more Shakespearian nature-pieces, no poems smelling of flowers or telling of shepherds and milkmaids. The human brain has taken over and is in complete control: good manners replace passion, wit replaces eloquence; the heart is not worn on the sleeve nor, seemingly, anywhere else. The literature of the Restoration is neither moved nor moving. (120-1)

John Dryden and William Davenant thought of 'revising' Shakespeare's works in an attempt "to reform and make plays fit"

(Bate & Jacken 43) to neoclassical standards. The Tempest; or, The Enchanted Island (1667) is a comedy adapted by Dryden and Davenant from Shakespeare's last play The Tempest (1611) "to suit a view of man's relation to the universe compatible with the age" (Novak 342). Their adaptation is usually considered as an endeavour "to neutralize various threats to contemporary patriarchal orders" (Schille 273) and "to problematize the too easy attribution of qualities of savagery and ungovernability to the play's gallery of 'others' who are the nominal threats to Prospero's control" (273).

John Dryden's and William Davenant's The Tempest; or, The Enchanted Island (1667) redesigned and reshaped Shakespeare's The Tempest (1611) in accordance with Restoration notions and thoughts of neoclassical decorum. In examining the Dryden's-Davenant's version, fidelity to the hypotext was not a prime concern. The adapters regarded the Shakespearean play as raw material that could be re-visioned, re-fashioned, and transposed in a manner that appeals to the Restoration audience. They lengthened the opening scene of the play to take advantage of the spectacular storm effects. They simplified the Shakespearean scenes and modernized a great deal of Shakespeare's language thus embracing the technical innovations of the new theatres. They also altered and added a number of characters – Hippolito, the right heir of the Dukedom of Mantua who has never seen a woman, Dorinda, Prospero's second daughter who has never seen a man, Sycorax, Caliban's lustful sister and monster of the isle, and Milcha, Ariel's lover. The adapters have, therefore, appropriated and transformed the play's characters and plot restructuring them to fit the changing literary tastes and the varying political and social contexts.

Following the norms and standards of neoclassicism, Dryden and Davenant appropriate the Shakespearean original approaching it from a new angle and a different perspective that suit the literary tastes of the restoration audience. Accordingly, the Dryden's-Davenant's

hypertext greatly stresses the importance of 'nature' and 'reason' as well as focuses on the qualities of order, clarity, restraint, and precision in a way that meets the features and requirements of classical patterns.

Characters, inhabiting the world of the enchanted island, are all endowed with more fascinating roles "in the value system of the hypertext than was the case in the hypotext" (Genette 343). They are all bound by the belief that 'nature' and 'reason' are the chief instigators of their actions and deeds and that if they live in a well-ordered society following the qualities of decorum, they will be rewarded by 'heaven'. After the shipwreck, the mariners, being cast away on a deserted island, assume that, unable to go back home and doomed to live the rest of their lives on such an island, they will turn into savages devouring each other and their only way to redemption is to behave in a decorous manner, thus applying the principles of neoclassicism:

> MUSTACHO. Our Ship is sunk, and we can never get home agen: we must e'en turn Salvages, and the next that catches his fellow may eat him.
>
> VENTOSO. No, no, let us have a Government; for if we live well and orderly, Heav'n will drive the Shipwracks ashore to make us all rich, therefore let us carry good Consciences, and not eat one another. (2.1.48)

In his first encounter with his monstrous, "Abhor'd Slave" (1.31), Caliban, the Duke of Millain highlights the fact that good nature can never be inherent in the personalities of uncivilized slaves and savages:

> PROSPERO. Abhor'd Slave! Who ne're would any print of goodness take,being capable of all ill: I pity'd thee, took pains to make thee speak,taught thee each hour one thing or other; […]. But thy wild race (thoug thou did'st learn) had that in't, which good Natures could

not abide to be with: […].(1.31)

In an attempt to abide by the classical patterns, almost all human events in the restoration version have fallen under the spell of nature (Armistead 30). Dryden and Davenant have continuously referred to 'nature' either as a means of their characters' salvation and redemption from any misfortunes or as a way of taking revenge from other characters who are secretly plotting against each other. The Duke of Savoy believes that being marooned on the enchanted island and dying out of hunger is nature's punishment for his evil deeds:

> ALONZO. I'm faint with hunger, and must despair Of food, Heav'n hath incens'd the Seas and Shores against us for our crimes. (3.1.86)

In the final reconciliation of the play, the Duke of Millain declares that 'kind and sweet Heaven', an example of 'Nature', has been very just and fair in giving the inhabitants of the enchanted island their full rights:

> ALONZO to PROSPERO. Let it no more be thought of, your purpose Though it was severe was just. In losing *Ferdinand* I should have mourn'd, but could not have complain'd.
>
> PROSPERO. Sir, I am glad kind Heaven decreed it otherwise. (5.190)

In the process of adaptation and appropriation, the hypotext undergoes continual metamorphosis, alteration, and transformation until it ultimately produces multiple hypertexts that conform to the rules and principles of a certain culture, society, and age. Dryden's and Davenant's The Tempest; or, The Enchanted Island (1667) presents a seventeenth-century inversion and rereading of the Shakespearean original in a way that suits the tastes and thoughts of the restoration stage and audience.

In adapting The Tempest (1611), Dryden and Davenant have made some changes that signal various remarkable additions and

subtractions from the original sourcetext. The seventeenth-century adaptation made the opening shipwreck such a spectacle where "the storm scene was revised with additional characters and almost double the number of lines" (Durrach 7). Inclined to employ simpler and less sophisticated language in their plays than their renaissance predecessors, the restoration adapters open their 1667 version with "a heavy infusion of technical language that makes the shipwreck seem much more circumstantial and less nightmarish than in Shakespeare" (Armistead 24):

> VENTOSO. What a Sea comes in?
> MUSTACHO. A hoaming Sea! We shall have foul weather.
> TRINCALO. The Scud comes against the Wind, 'twill blow hard.
> STEPHANO. Bosen!
> TRINCALO. Here, Master what cheer?
> STEPHANO. Ill weather! let's off to Sea. (1.6-7)

The renaissance original opens with a tempestuous storm at sea that has been the creation of Prospero's magical art. The sea "is associated with the larger forces of life, which men neither bring into being nor initiate, but which they can aspire, within limits, to shape to ends of their own" (Traversi 374). The Shakespearean opening scene highlights a dreadful and a frightful representation of the violent storm at sea:

> MASTER. Boatswain!
> BOATSWAIN. Here, Master. What cheer?
> MASTER. Good. Speak to the mariners. Fall to it, yarely, or we run ourselves aground. Bestir, bestir.
> […]
> BOATSWAIN. Down with the topmast! Yare! Lower, lower! Bring her to try with main-course. [*A cry within*] A plague upon this howling! They are louder than the weather or our office. (Tmp. 1.1.1-3)

Although the language used in the two texts is different, yet both Dryden's Prospero and Shakespeare's Prospero have 'safely ordered' the tempest, without causing any harm to all those on board the ship. At this point, the magical power of the Restoration Duke of Millain is reduced, marking one subtraction from the original play, compared to that of the Renaissance Prospero who "feels no compulsion to set aside his magic robe to distinguish the enchantment of the present from the actuality of the past as he tells Miranda of the political intrigues that led to their banishment" (Armistead 24-5):

> PROSPERO. 'T is time
> I should inform thee farther. Lend thy hand,
> And pluck my magic garment from me. – So. [*He lays his mantle down*]
> Lie there, my Art. Wipe thou thine eyes. Have comfort.
> The direful spectacle of the wrack, which touched
> The very virtue of compassion in thee,
> I have with such provision in mine Art
> So safely ordered that there is no soul –
> No, not so much perdition as an hair
> Betid to any creature in the vessel
> Which thou heard'st cry, which thou saw'st sink. (Tmp. 1.2.9)

The updating of characters and their relationships is one of the additions that Dryden and Davenant have based their play on. They wanted to boast the excessive presence of their female characters, therefore, causing the population of the enchanted island to become "a peculiarly female one, in that it includes Dorinda, Sycorax, and, problematically, Hippolito, since this male character is designated to be played by a woman" (Schille 274). In his prologue to the play, Dryden announces that having a female actress play the role of a male character is one of the major transformations and additions that has

surpassed all the magic of the renaissance play:

> Who by our dearth of Youths are forc'd t'employ
> One of our Women to present a Boy.
> And that's a transformation you will say
> Exceeding all the Magick in the Play.
> Let none expect in the last Act to find,
> Her Sex transform'd from man to Woman-kind. (4)

The opening act in the Dryden's-Davenant's restoration version follows the same sequence of events of its renaissance counterpart. Yet, towards the end of the act, the seventeenth-century play diverges from its predecessor to shed light on the naïve conversation between Miranda and her younger sister, Dorinda, about sex and reproduction as well as to emphasize Miranda's thoughts and feelings concerning the effect of her father's magic on all those who were on board the ship, therefore, stressing, in a way, the prominence of the female roles over male ones:

> MIRANDA. […] But, Sister, I have stranger news to tell you;
> In this great Creature there were other Creatures,
> And shortly we may chance to see that thing,
> Which you have heard my Father call, a Man.
> DORINDA. But what is that? for yet he never told me.
> MIRANDA. I know no more than you: but I have heard
> My Father say we Women were made for him.
> DORINDA. What, that he should eat us Sister?
> MIRANDA. No sure, you see my Father is a man, and yet
> He does us good. I would he were not old.
> DORINDA. Methinks indeed it would be finer, if we two
> Had two young Fathers. (1.34)

Conversely, the Shakespearean opening act ends with a romantic and sensitive meeting between Miranda and Ferdinand, displaying an

aspect of Prospero's powerful art:

> MIRANDA. What is 't? A spirit?
> Lord, how it looks about! Believe me, sir,
> It carries a brave form. But 't is a spirit.
> […]
> FERDINAND. Most sure the goddess
> On whom these airs attend! Vouchsafe my prayer
> May know if you remain upon this island;
> And that you will some good instruction give
> How I may bear me here. My prime request,
> Which I do last pronounce, is – Oh, you wonder! –
> If you be maid or no? (Tmp. 1.2.43)

In act two of the restoration Tempest, Dryden and Davenant differentiate between the main and the sub plots where they devote the sub plot to the mariners' violent competition for power and sovereignty, aiming to neutralize the strength and effectiveness of such matters, unlike the renaissance Tempest that addresses the issues of state and government to the upper class in the main plot, thus accentuating their potency and importance. Consequently, devaluing and lessening the role of Dryden's Alonzo, the Duke of Savoy, as compared to the role of Shakespeare's Alonso, the King of Naples, is part of Dryden's and Davenant's target to "assuage anxieties" (Schille 277) regarding authorial issues since all the rebellious characters in the play are made less prominent:

> STEPHANO. […] I was Master at Sea, and will be Duke on Land: you *Mustacho* have been my Mate, and shall be my Vice-Roy.
> VENTOSO. When you are Duke you may chuse your Vice-Roy; but I am a free Subject in a new Plantation, and will have no Duke without my voice. […].
> STEPHANO *whispering*. *Ventoso*, dost thou hear, I will advance thee, prithee give me thy voice.

> VENTOSO. I'le have no whisperings to corrupt the Election; and to show that I have no private ends, I declare aloud that I will be Vice-Roy, or I'le keep my voice for my self. (2.1.48)

Furthermore, in an attempt to relieve and reduce even more worries and anxieties troubling the restoration audience concerning the issue of patriarchy, the seventeenth-century adapters emphasized the role played by the female characters in the play. In the main plot, the threat that Prospero's daughters, Miranda and Dorinda, pose to the patriarchal models of the government is neutralized towards the end of the play by getting married, thus strengthening Prospero's rule. Whereas, in the sub plot, Dryden and Davenant shed light on the character of Sycorax who also poses another threat to Prospero's patriarchal and colonial power by accepting to marry Trincalo who, by marrying and having children with Sycorax, endeavours to affirm his claim over the island (Schille 278):

> TRINCALO. Brother Monster, welcome to my private Palace.
> But where's thy Sister, is she so brave a Lass?
> CALIBAN. In all this Isle there are but two more, the Daughters of the Tyrant *Prospero*; and she is bigger than 'em both. O here she comes; now thou may'st judge thy self, my Lord.
> *[Enter Sycorax.*
> TRINCALO. She's monstrous fair indeed. Is this to be my Spouse? well she's Heir of all this Isle (for I will geld Monster). The *Trincalos,* like other wise men, have anciently us'd to marry for Estate more than for beauty. (3.1.88-9)

In the third act, Dryden's and Davenant's The Enchanted Island completely navigates far from the Shakespearean original regarding various aspects. Prospero's confidence as he watches the growing love between Miranda and Ferdinand, the significance of Ferdinand's piling logs, the vanishing banquet, and Caliban's plot to rape Miranda so as

to give birth to a new race of young Calibans, are all removed from the plot of the restoration play (Armistead 26). Moreover, the 1667 version eradicates Caliban's scheme to murder Prospero attempting to put an end to the suffering and the maltreatment he has been receiving from his colonizer, a parallel incident to Antonio's plan, who intends to kill his brother so as to usurp the kingdom of Milan. Accordingly, towards the end of the second scene of the third act, the Duke of Millain doubts the certainty and probability of his 'art' when dealing with human desires:

> PROSPERO. True, he has seen a woman, yet he lives, perhaps I took the moment of his birth amiss, perhaps my Art it self is false: on what strange grounds we build our hopes and fears, mans life is all a mist, and in the dark, our fortunes meet us. (3.2.112)

In act four, Prospero's doubt regarding the effectiveness of his art is verified. The friendship that Prospero has arranged between Ferdinand and Hippolito to 'secure' the latter against the 'dark danger' predicted by his magic has conversely led to further perils:

> PROSPERO. This may secure *Hippolito* from that dark danger which my art forebodes; for friendship does provide a double strength t'oppose th'assaults of fortune. (4.121)

Instead of implementing the foretelling of Prospero's magic and becoming intimate friends, Hippolito and Ferdinand quarrel over the former's naïve demand to possess all beautiful women on earth including Miranda, Ferdinand's lover. In an endeavour to defend their views, both gentlemen are involved in a duel where Hippolito is injured and the two young ladies, Miranda and Dorinda, start to lay the blame on each other pushing their father to charge them of being disobedient, to take revenge from Ferdinand, to accuse Ariel of ignoring his tasks and duties, and eventually to lament the failure of his art:

> PROSPERO. Alas! how much in vain doth feeble Art endeavor To resist the will of Heaven? (4.159)

Although the reduction of Prospero's powers is among the transformations that the hypertext undergoes, yet, he continues to act as a colonizer threatening and intimidating his colonized subjects. He keeps on terrorizing Ariel, towards the end of the fourth act, for not informing him of the suspected duel between Ferdinand and Hippolito:

> PROSPERO. I'le chain thee in the North for thy neglect,
> Within the burning Bowels of Mount *Heila*,
> I'le sindge thy airy wings with sulph'rous flames,
> And choak thy tender nostrils with blew smoak,
> At ev'ry Hick-up of the belching Mountain
> Thou shalt be lifted up to taste fresh Air,
> And then fall down agen. (4.160-1)

The struggle between the colonizing European master and the colonized indigenous slave also extends, in the restoration play, to cover the relationship between Prospero and Caliban. Prospero is the main cause of Caliban's civilization. He has educated him and taught him a civilized language to serve his own selfish ends and satisfy his colonial purposes. The language that Prospero and Caliban use is considered "a discourse of colonialism partly because it is a discourse which arises out of their physical colonial relationship" (Hay). In this way, Simon Hay confirms Edward Said's viewpoint who believes that "every discourse which arises out of a society which is involved in the colonial process is itself colonial" (Culture and Imperialism 12). Having learnt a civilized language, Caliban has never been grateful to his master, but rather, he uses the civilized tongue to curse him:

> CALIBAN. You taught me language, and my profit by it is, that I know to curse: the red botch rid you for learning me your language.

(1.31)

Consequently, the contradiction between Prospero and Caliban alludes to Octave Mannoni's explanation of the psychological atmosphere of colonialism where Prospero suffers from an inferiority complex, while Caliban from a dependence complex. On one hand, Prospero's complex obliges him to carefully search for uncompetitive situations where he feels that his colonial power and authority, over submissive indigenous slaves, are augmented and amplified, and that his minor skills are regarded as great magic. On the other hand, Caliban's complex compels him to cautiously look for another master "not to win his freedom, for he could not support freedom, but to have a new master whose 'foot licker' he can become" (106-7):

> CALIBAN. Torment me not;
> I'le bring thee Wood home faster.
> TRINCALO. He talks none of the wisest, but I'le give him
> A dram o'th' Bottle, that will clear his understanding.
> Come on your ways Master Monster, open your mouth.
> […].
> *[Pours Wine down his throat.*
> CALIBAN. This is a brave God, and bears coelestial Liquor,I'le kneel to him. (2.1.54-5)

The Prospero-Caliban complex is also depicted in the Shakespearean Tempest. Caliban's attempt to rape Miranda carries great consequences for his relationship with Prospero, though it is Miranda who is supposedly victimized by Caliban:

> PROSPERO. [...] I have used thee,
> Filth as thou art, with human care, and lodged thee
> In mine own cell, till thou didst seek to violate
> The honour of my child. (Tmp. 1.2.37)

Prospero's claim shows that his "fear that the inferior will defile the

superior leads him to punish Caliban for his act (real or imagined), and at the same time it presses him to take paternalistic responsibility for the offender" (Barnett). Therefore, both Prospero and Caliban enter into a relation of co-dependency. Their master/slave relationship makes Caliban dependent on Prospero who enslave him owing to his magical powers. Likewise, Prospero and Miranda depend on Caliban whose services they exploit: "We cannot miss him. He does make our fire, / Fetch in our wood, and serves in offices / That profit us" (Tmp. 1.2.35).

All the complications found in the Dryden's-Davenant's version come to a final resolution in the last act of the restoration play. The Duke of Millain renounces his magical power over human lives, and accordingly, in an attempt to carry out heavenly justice, he forgives Ferdinand, cures Hippolito, and unites all the characters together thus ultimately achieving a harmonious reconciliation among all the inhabitants of the enchanted island.

The spell of nature, as the main core of neoclassicism, greatly affects all the human relations and incidents in the play. The seventeenth-century Prospero has corrected all the mistakes that he has been confronted with on the island. He forgives his enemies, Alonzo and Antonio, who have already repented and regretted their evil intentions towards him. The sailors get bored with the greediness and materialism that their drunken souls have imposed upon them. They yearn for their ranks and duties on board the "gallant Ship" (5.195).

The two couples, Ferdinand and Miranda, and Hippolito and Dorinda, are happily married after Hippolito admits his naïve views concerning marriage and declares that he will only be tied to Dorinda. Caliban and Sycorax, "those mishapen Creatures" (5.196), as Gonzalo refers to them, also rejoice in returning to their natural places in life. The airy spirit, Ariel, freed from Prospero's magic, takes his place in

the order of nature by marrying his mistress, Milcha, and living a normal life.

Therefore, Dryden's and Davenant's play The Tempest; or, The Enchanted Island (1667) offers a seventeenth-century transformation, appropriation, rereading, and reinterpretation of the Shakespearean original The Tempest (1611), thus presenting a 'transpositional' adaptation based on the 'Concentration Strategy' since the adapters have almost followed the hypotext line by line before they navigate in a completely different direction so as to employ the features of neoclassicism, satisfy the literary tastes of the restoration audience, and meet the requirements of the seventeenth-century culture and stage.

Notes

[1] This research paper is an excerpt from my PhD thesis that is entitled Cultural Adaptations of William Shakespeare's The Tempest: A Study of John Dryden's and William Davenant's The Tempest; or, The Enchanted Island (1667), W. H. Auden's The Sea and the Mirror (1942), and Mary Druce's Prospero's Lie (2000).

[2] Julie Sanders is Professor of English Literature and Drama at the University of Nottingham, UK and currently Head of the School of English Studies. She is the author of several books and articles on early modern literature, the most recent of which Ben Jonson in Context was published by Cambridge University Press in 2010. She is the author of Adaptation and Appropriation (Routledge, 2006), part of the New Critical Idiom series, and has also published Shakespeare and Music: Afterlives and Borrowings (2007) and Novel Shakespeares: Twentieth Century Women Novelists and Appropriation (2002).

[3] Mireia Aragay is Senior Lecturer in the English Literature Section of the Department of English and German, University of Barcelona. Her research interests focus on Harold Pinter and contemporary British theatre, film adaptations of literary classics, Shakespeare and critical theory. She has edited Books in Motion: Adaptation, Intertextuality, Authorship (Rodopi, 2005).

[4] Linda Hutcheon holds the rank of University Professor of English and Comparative Literature at the University of Toronto. She is a specialist in postmodernist culture and in critical theory, on which she has published nine books. She has also worked collaboratively in large projects involving hundreds of scholars (the multivolumed ***Rethinking Literary History***, which was awarded a Major Collaborative Research Initiatives grant from the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada in 1996).

[5] Thomas Leitch is Professor of English at the University of Delaware, where he directs the Film Studies Program. His books include Find the Director and Other Hitchcock Games (1991), The Encyclopedia of Alfred

Hitchcock (2002), and, most recently, Film Adaptation and Its Discontents: From Gone with the Wind to The Passion of the Christ (2007).

[6] Christine Geraghty is Professor of Film and Television at the University of Glasgow. She has published extensively on film and television with a particular interest in fiction and form. Her publications include Women and Soap Opera (Polity, 1991), British Cinema in the Fifties: Gender, Genre and the 'New Look' (Routledge, 2000) and The Television Studies Book (Arnold, 1998). Her most recent book, Now a Major Motion Picture: Film Adaptations of Literature and Drama (Rowman and Littlefield 2007), pays particular attention to genre, setting and performance.

[7] John M. Desmond is Associate Professor of English at Dutchess Community College where he teaches courses in composition, film and literature, and politics and film.

[8] Peter Hawkes is Professor of English at East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania. He holds a doctorate in English from Columbia University. He teaches courses in composition, literature, and film. He has also published a number of articles on literature.

[9] Deborah Cartmell is Senior Lecturer in the School of Arts and Humanities at De Montfort University, Leicester. She is Director of the Centre for Adaptations, and currently co-editing the international journals, Shakespeare (Taylor & Francis, 2005-) and Adaptation (Oxford University Press, 2008-). She is a founding member and secretary/treasurer of the Association of Adaptation Studies.

[10] Imelda Whelehan is Principal Lecturer in English and Women's Studies at De Montfort University, Leicester. Her research is in the fields of women's writing, feminism, popular culture and literary adaptations. She has co-edited Adaptations: From Text to Screen, Screen to Text (with Deborah Cartmell, 1999) and The Cambridge Companion to Literature on Screen (with Deborah Cartmell, 2007).

[11] Edward W. Said was Professor of English and Comparative Literature at Columbia University in New York. His major interests were in many

fields, including literature, music, and Palestinian issues. He was best known by his tireless roles of supporting Palestine's freedom and countering violence in the Middle East. His first and most important work, Orientalism, was published in 1978.

[12] Julia Kristeva is a French psychoanalyst, sociologist, feminist, critic, and philosopher. She is Professor at the University Paris Diderot. She became influential in international critical analysis, cultural theory, and feminism. Her work includes books and essays addressing intertextuality, semiotics, literary theory, and criticism. Together with Roland Barthes and Gérard Genette, she stands as one of the prominent and leading structuralists.

[13] Roland Barthes was a French literary critic, literary and social theorist, philosopher, and semiotician. His work extended over many fields and he influenced the development of schools of theory including structuralism and semiotics.

[14] Gérard Genette is a literary scholar and structuralist theorist who has had a broad impact on the development of narratology. He is a writer and teacher, and is currently Professor of French literature at the Sorbonne and a senior lecturer at the École Normale Supérieure. He has also served as an academic Dean at the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, and is the founder and director of the Poetics collection for the Seuil publishing house.

Works Cited

"Adapt." Def. 1, 2a, 3. The Compact Oxford English Dictionary. 2nd ed. 1993.

"Adaptation." Def. 1, 2a. The Compact Oxford English Dictionary. 2nd ed. 1993.

"Appropriate." Def. 1, 3, 6, 8. The Compact Oxford English Dictionary. 2nd ed. 1993.

"Appropriation." Def. 1, 3. The Compact Oxford English Dictionary. 2nd ed. 1993.

Aragay, Mireia, ed. Books in Motion: Adaptation, Intertextuality, Authorship. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2005.

Armistead, Jack M. "Dryden's Prospero and his Predecessors." South Atlantic Review 50.1 (Jan. 1985): 23-33.

Baldick, Chris. The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Barnett, Jeffrey C. "Prospero's Orphans in Uva de Aragón's 'Not the Truth, Not a Lie'." Anthurium: A Caribbean Studies Journal 5.1 (2007). 8/5/2014

<http://scholarlyrepository.miami.edu/anthurium/vol5/iss1/1>.

Barthes, Roland. "The Death of the Author." Image- Music- Text. Ed. and trans. Stephen Heath. New York: Hill and Wang, 1977. 142-8.

---. "Theory of the Text." Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader. Ed. Robert J. C. Young. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981. 31-47.

Bate, Jonathen, and Russell Jacken. Shakespeare: An Illustrated Stage History. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Burgess, Anthony. English Literature. London: Longman, 1974.

Burke, Sean. The Death and Return of the Author: Criticism and Subjectivity in Barthes, Foucault and Derrida. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1992.

Cartmell, Deborah. Introduction. Adaptations: From Text to Screen, Screen to Text. Ed.

Cartmell and Imelda Whelehan. London: Routledge, 1999. 23-28.

Cartmell, Deborah, and Imelda Whelehan, eds. The Cambridge Companion to Literature on Screen. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007.

Davenant, William, and John Dryden. The Tempest; or, The Enchanted Island. N.p.: Kessinger Publishing, n.d.

Desmond, John M., and Peter Hawkes. Adaptation: Studying Film and Literature. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2005.

Dryden, John. Prologue. The Tempest; or, The Enchanted Island. By William Davenant and Dryden. N.p.: Kessinger Publishing, n.d. 3-4.

Durrach, Christine. Designing Shakespeare's The Tempest. MA thesis. Ashland University, 1999. Ann Arbor: UMI, 1999. ATT 1394965.

Fischlin, Daniel, and Mark Fortier, eds. Adaptations of Shakespeare: A Critical Anthology of Plays from the Seventeenth Century to the Present. London: Routledge, 2000.

Genette, Gérard. Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree. Trans. Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997.

Geraghty, Christine. Now a Major Motion Picture: Film Adaptations of Literature and Drama. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, INC., 2008.

Godard, Barbara. "Intertextuality." Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory: Approaches, Scholars, Terms. Ed. and comp. Irena R. Makaryk. London: University of Toronto Press Incorporated, 1993. 568-72.

Hay, Simon. "The Colonial Discourse of Robert Browning's 'Caliban': Subversive Articulations or Method of Containment." Deep South 2.3 (Spring 1996). 4/3/2015

<http://www.otago.ac.nz/deepsouth/vol2no3/shay2.html>.

Hutcheon, Linda. "On the Art of Adaptation." Daedalus 133.2 (Spring 2004):108-11.

---. A Theory of Adaptation. New York: Routledge, 2006.

Kristeva, Julia. "The Bounded Text." Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art. Ed. Leon S. Roudiez. Trans. Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, and Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press, 1980. 36-63.

---. "Word, Dialogue, and Novel." Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art. Ed. Leon S. Roudiez. Trans. Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, and Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press, 1980. 64-91.

Lee, Michelle, ed. "Shakespearean Stage Adaptations." Shakespearean Criticism 99 (2006): 1-10.

Leitch, Thomas. "Adaptation Studies at a Crossroads." Adaptation 1.1 (2008): 63-77.

Mannoni, Octave. Prospero and Caliban: The Psychology of Colonization. 2nd ed. Trans. Pamela Powesland. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 1964.

Marsden, Jean I., ed. The Appropriation of Shakespeare. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991.

Massoud, Mary M. F. From the Pharaohs to the English Neoclassicists: The Story of a Cultural Age. Cairo: Anglo-Egyptian Bookshop, n.d.

Novak, Maximillian E. "Commentary on The Tempest." The Works of John Dryden. Ed.

Maximillian E. Novak and George R. Guffey. Vol. 10. Berkeley: U of California P, 1970. 319-79.

Said, Edward W. Culture and Imperialism. London: Chatto, 1993.

---. "On Originality." The World, the Text, and the Critic. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983. 126-39.

Sanders, Julie. Adaptation and Appropriation. New York: Routledge, 2006.

---. Introduction. Adaptation and Appropriation. By Sanders. New York: Routledge, 2006. 1-14.

Schille, Candy B. K. "'Man Hungry': Reconsidering Threats to Colonial and Patriarchal Order in Dryden and Davenant's The Tempest." Texas Studies in Literature and Language 48.4 (Winter 2006). 273-90. 11/2/2015 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40755467>.

Shakespeare, William. The Tempest. Ed. D K Swan. London: Longman Group Limited, 1984.

Traversi, Derek. "Shakespeare: The Last Plays." The New Pelican Guide to English Literature: The Age of Shakespeare. Ed. Boris Ford. Vol. 2. New York: Penguin Books, 1982. 357-83.

Weimann, Robert. "Text, Author-Function, and Appropriation in Modern Narrative: Toward a Sociology of Representation." Critical Inquiry 14 (1988): 431-47.