

TILTING THE STAGE: ADAPTING TO AND FROM THE THEATRE

A THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE

TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH, SPEECH, AND FOREIGN LANGUAGES

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

BY

ELIZABETH JENDRZEY B.A., B.F.A.

DENTON, TEXAS

MAY 2019

Copyright © 2019 by Elizabeth Jendrzej

## DEDICATION

For my 22-year-old self, having an epiphany in a dark theater in Washington, DC.

It won't be like you planned, but you'll get there.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the people who made this thesis possible. First, I would like to thank my committee chair Dr. Gretchen Busl, for her unending patience with me throughout this process, as well as her insights into effectively translating from my brain to the page. I am also grateful to Dr. Dundee Lackey and Dr. Ashley Bender for their willingness to be on my committee and provide constructive criticism as I worked. I am thankful to Dr. Jennifer Phillips-Denny, Jaclyn Kliman, and my fellow writing center staff for their understanding; they gave me time, space, and an ear to bend when it was needed. I would also like to thank Deanna, Grace, Nickie, Rebecca, and Rachel for their cheerleading and commentary on my draft when I wanted a few sets of outside eyes. Finally, I would like to thank my parents, for supporting me while I take this step and the next, even when they aren't sure what exactly I'm doing.

## ABSTRACT

ELIZABETH JENDRZEY

TILTING THE STAGE: ADAPTATION TO AND FROM THE THEATRE

MAY 2019

Although adaptations of media are ubiquitous in our society, little attention is paid by the general public as to why these adaptations have come into being. Because of this, this thesis seeks to understand what can be learned about an adaptor's beliefs and ideals through a close analysis of the changes made between the source text and the adaptation. By examining Robert Caisley's *Tartuffe*, Yaël Farber's *Mies Julie*, and Richard Bean's *One Man, Two Guvnors*, alongside their respective source texts Moliere's *Tartuffe*, Strindberg's *Miss Julie*, and Goldoni's *The Servant of Two Masters*, a connection is found between the adaptor's changes and their intentions, especially in respect to their intended audience.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION .....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	iii
ABSTRACT .....	iv
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
Definitions of Adaptation .....	3
Case Study Exclusion Criteria .....	10
Types of Adaptation.....	12
Methodology of Study .....	14
II. POLITICAL ADAPTATION .....	18
Examination of Setting Changes.....	21
Examination of Agent Changes .....	21
Examination of Content Changes .....	25
Analysis of Changes .....	41
III. CROSS-CULTURAL ADAPTATION .....	47
Examination of Setting Changes.....	50
Examination of Agent Changes .....	51
Examination of Content Changes .....	53

Analysis of Changes .....	73
IV. ENTERTAINMENT ADAPTATION .....	76
Examination of Setting Changes.....	79
Examination of Agent Changes .....	80
Examination of Content Changes .....	97
Analysis of Changes .....	105
V. CONCLUSION .....	108
Limitations of Study .....	109
Adapting to Further Research.....	111
WORKS CITED .....	114

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

People like the familiar. It's why they have favorite comfort foods or a preferred side of the bed. It's why people are willing to indulge in nostalgia for old toys and fashions. It's why the basic design for the modern flush toilet has remained unchanged for over a century. As much as people enjoy new and exciting things, they also like the comfort of knowing exactly what they're going to get sometimes.

This extends to media as well. When a certain mood strikes, people will often reach for a specific book or television show or movie so they can fall into that particular story. Creators of media know this as well, which is why when a large number of people get attached to a specific piece of media, it will often be adapted into a new form. Movies may be based on books, while books are sometimes written to capitalize on the success of a movie. One need only look at the excitement surrounding the production of movie versions of *Harry Potter*, *The Lord of the Rings*, and *Twilight* to see how people are attached to things they know. The movie adaptations of these books garnered extensive attention, only encouraging the media franchise to grow and adapt into even more forms, like video games. Delighted by their existence, many fans clambered to get their hands on as many of these adaptations as they could.

However, it is not just an enjoyment of the familiar or a possible paycheck that drives the creation of adaptations. A potential adaptor may become aware of a work and

wonder how it could be reworked to express their views instead of someone else's.

Alternatively, a creator may have a point they want to make, only to find that an existing work provides the perfect framework. Though popular audiences often complain about modern media being nothing but remakes, these scenarios are the driving force behind such works as the 2016 female-led *Ghostbusters* reboot, which wanted to showcase female comedic talents without male overshadowing. In this way, adaptation becomes a window into the adaptor's mind, illuminating what kind of stories they think are important to tell to the audience they have available.

One of the main targets for adaptation is theatre, as many well-known works in the public domain are scripts for stage performances. Though adaptations across mediums are the most common adaptation, there is a distinctive presence of drastically re-rendered stage-to-stage adaptations. Many plays have been rewritten over the years "in an attempt to make [the] plays adhere to the [contemporary] ideals or to expand certain roles for leading performers" (Wilson and Goldfarb 133). It is these ideals that this thesis will seek to identify through a close analysis of stage-to-stage theatrical adaptations. This analysis will reveal an author's intentions with relation to aspects of the culture in which they are writing.

As discussed, adaptation is found in all realms of media. Why then is theatre the chosen medium of focus for this thesis? Theatre is a popular format when it comes to adaptation, and copyright is one reason, as there are many well-known theatrical texts that predate the vaguest concept of ownership of a text. However, theatre is an ideal

medium in which to discuss adaptation mainly because most who are involved in theatre accept that there is a level of adaptation necessary to the art. Not only does the story change from production to production based on the choices of the director and design crew, but from performance to performance as the element of live humans precludes the possibility of identical portrayals every time. There is always the possibility of something going wrong – like a cork refusing to come out of the prop wine bottle that needs to be poured – but actors also make conscious and unconscious decisions regarding their behavior, like pausing for a laugh based on the audience. Because of the necessity of flexibility in presenting a text, theatre practitioners generally look more kindly on adaptation and are more likely to indulge in it, thus opening the field of opportunity.

### **Definitions of Adaptation**

Despite the prevalence of adaptations in today's culture, scholars have a hard time specifically defining adaptation, even those scholars whose focus is adaptation. There are simply too many variables between the types of adaptation for a single definition to account for all possibilities. As such, there is no consolidated thought, no "such thing as contemporary adaptation theory" in a unified form, as Thomas Leitch so succinctly put it in his article "Twelve Fallacies in Contemporary Adaptation Theory" (149). Though written regarding film adaptations, and focusing on the specific challenges thereof, Leitch does raise a point about the nebulous, ever-debated nature of what adaptation is among the many varieties of adaptation theory.

Most scholars firmly acknowledge at least two aspects of adaptation, both based on the common use definitions of the word: the process and the product. Though the existence and steps of the process are acknowledged by some scholars, deeper study of it has fallen by the wayside in favor of a focus on the product. Even here, what constitutes an adaptation varies from scholar to scholar. Jane Barnette, a dramaturg with a specialization in adaptation, adopts the narrowest definition of adaptation in claiming that adaptation is an adjusted version of a text for a new medium (10). This is adaptation as the public generally thinks of it, transmedial adaptations that turn the latest book into the hot new movie. However, there are other possibilities to consider. Linda Hutcheon defines the product of adaptation as “an acknowledged transposition of a recognizable other work or works” (8). This allows for the adjustment seen in Barnette’s definition, but also for the possibility of adaptations within the same medium. However, transposition implies a simple re-situation of the text in a new frame of reference, such as a new narrator or setting. In his essay “Defining Adaptation,” Timothy Corrigan provides the broadest definition for the process of adaptation, “how one or more entities are reconfigured or adjusted through their engagement with or relationship to one or more other texts or objects” (23). His definition for the product is simply the work that results from that process, and these definitions allow for content changes during the process to suit the culture into which the product will be presented. With these contesting versions of what an adaptation actually is, it is easy to forget some of the more subtle nuances that may be involved.

Focusing more on the process than the product, Julie Sanders acknowledges a tangential category to adaptation that is defined by the degree and method in which the adapted text recognizes its primary source. In her view, adaptations are created due to the adaptors' desire to interact directly with the primary source text. They offer a new point of view or a modernization of the primary source, often creating commentary on the original in the process (J. Sanders 23). Appropriation, on the other hand, deviates more significantly from the primary source, often out of the adaptor's desire specifically to critique the primary source (J. Sanders 35). The difference is subtle, and even Sanders acknowledges that there is overlap in the two categories (35). However, the difference in motivation, an important part of the process of adaptation, remains: one treats critique and commentary of the primary text as a side dish while the other pursues it as a main course.

Having provided some broad definitions of adaptations in today's scholarship, I would like to narrow the field to define adaptation as it pertains here. For example, though they are the most common variety of adaptation, transmedial adaptations, the adapting of a story from one medium into another, will not be considered for this thesis. There are two main reasons for this. The first is in regards to the changes that are necessary when moving from one medium to another. Leitch does dispel some of the common arguments regarding the differences between adaptation media, stating that novels have the ability to perform traditionally cinematic functions just as films have the ability to perform literary ones (150-154). That does not change the fact that most

creators utilize the conventions of their genre. In order to keep the focus more clearly on the content alterations, I have opted to remove the potential confusions that could be caused by the trappings of genre.

In addition, removing transmedial adaptations from consideration addresses one of the largest questions in any discussion of adaptation: the importance of fidelity, the degree to which an adaptation resembles its source text. The general public often judges transmedial adaptations on their fidelity to the primary source text, as when a book is turned into a movie, though most adaptation scholars tend to focus on other aspects of adaptations. By focusing on adaptations within the same medium, the question of fidelity becomes moot because an adaptation with the highest level of fidelity runs the risk of being a word-for-word reproduction of the source text. However, this is not to say that fidelity will not play a role in analyzing the chosen adaptations. In fact, it is the absence of fidelity, the changes made from one version to the next, which will provide the basis for this study. Eliminating transmedial adaptations enforces this lack of pure fidelity.

It is this focus on the lack of fidelity that will eliminate many forms of adapting that will not be considered as adaptation. Translation is the most popular way to adapt a text that will not count as adaptation for this thesis. Though the translator is transforming a text to better suit a different community, which is one of the functions of adaptation, they do have a degree of concern regarding fidelity to the primary source text.

Concerning texts written in verse, this may lead to the question of whether to maintain the literal word-for-word translation or to adjust the translated text to mimic the verse of

the original. However, both forms of alteration are focused on remaining faithful to the primary source text in one fashion or another. Regardless of the specific motivations of translators, their work is beyond the scope of this thesis and will not be considered.

Similar to translators are those who amend a text on a bit-by-bit basis, either through adjustment, addition, or deletion. The last one can be fairly uninspired, as in a *Reader's Digest* condensed version of a text, though it can create issues when the deleted selections are integral to the plot and overall understanding of a text. Taken altogether, these kinds of adapting are often used to censor the primary source text to suit the needs of the adaptor. Sometimes called "bowdlerizing," as a reference to Dr. Thomas Bowdler, who published *The Family Shakespeare* in 1807 (Isaac 2-3), these adaptations are often created in regards to issues of morality, constructing what is intended to be a more public-friendly version of the text. An admirable goal, these versions are still attempting to portray a highly similar version of the primary source text, but with different standards in place. While studying these changes would be rather revelatory as to the nature of morality in the cultures that created them, they would likely portray a one-sided view of that nature. These kinds of changes are generally implemented when something normative from an older culture is found to be offensive in a new one, occasionally with the counterbalance of increasing attention to that which the new culture lauds. However, adaptations that apply more holistic changes to a text will provide a more comprehensive view of the adapting culture, as they acknowledge their significant deviation from the primary source and are more likely to make pointed commentary, whereas edited texts of

a variety of purposes are often presented as comparable to the primary source text. They do not wish to acknowledge their adaptation, and so I will not.

There is also the issue of adaptation as a function of production. It is an undeniable fact that any production of a piece of performance art, be it by actors or orchestra, will vary from performance to performance. The question is to whether a production – meaning here a collection of performances under a single production staff – that significantly deviates in appearance or intention from the primary source text without deviating from the actual textual basis is an adaptation. Margaret Jane Kidnie wrote extensively on this topic in *Shakespeare and the Problem of Adaptation*, presenting many different theories on the subject by a variety of scholars. On the one hand, Nelson Goodman claims that as long as a performance sticks to the text from which it is being performed, regardless of the tone or energy, it is a performance of the text; any deviation from the script constitutes adaptation (Kidnie 15). On the other, Richard Wollheim introduced the notion of a *type*, the ideal version or concept of a work, while considering a single performance or physical copy of a text as a token of that same type (Kidnie 18).

Though Goodman's theory does hold a degree of rationale, especially in regards to physical works, Wollheim's more flexible concept is more practical for real world application. Kidnie agrees, stating "it is only because one implicitly supposes the existence of the work that it is possible to draw relations of identity among non-identical instance of texts and performance in order to label some but not all of them *Hamlet* or *Twelfth Night*" (28). This is especially relevant in regards to Shakespeare's works, as

some productions forgo the classic Elizabethan dress costumes appropriate for the plays given setting in favor of a new setting altogether, such as setting *The Comedy of Errors* in a Jazz Age Turkish bazaar.<sup>1</sup> However, this dependence on production to create a new version of the story is not restricted to Shakespeare. Jean Anouilh is notable for his adaptation of Sophocles's *Antigone* during the Nazi occupation of France. Though there are connections between Creon's authoritarianism and the Nazi oppression, the censorship of the time prevented Anouilh from being explicit in these connections, making the functions of production a significant influence on the political commentary of the text. As such, a comparison of Anouilh's *Antigone* with that of Sophocles would reveal much when discussing performance, but less when discussing text alone. Because changes made through production are difficult to evaluate without a production to observe, this thesis will ignore adaptations created mainly through the somewhat geographically restricted medium of performance and focus on the more globally available medium of text.

Considering all the various facets of adaptation and what could and could not be interpreted as such, a finite definition is necessary to prevent confusion and direct the scope of this work. To assist in this definition, I have borrowed terms from narrative theory: constituent elements and supplementary elements. These are a retooling of constituent and supplementary events; as defined by Abbott, constituent events are those

---

<sup>1</sup> This particular performance was directed by Joel Ferrell as part of the Trinity Shakespeare Festival. It featured performances by Richard Haratine as Antipholus and Jakie Cabe as Dromio, and it ran June 10-29, 2014, at the Jerita Foley Buschman Theatre in Fort Worth, TX.

that are necessary for the story to exist and still be recognizable as itself, the *what* of the story, while supplementary events tell the *how* of the story and are not necessary to maintain this recognizability (22-24). With this in mind, for the purposes of this thesis, an adaptation shall be defined as a text in which the majority of supplementary elements, such as phrasing and individual actions, are changed from the primary source while still retaining a majority of said source's constituent elements, which may include plot and character type which apply to the work as a whole as opposed to singular moments. This is by no means a final definition of adaptation for all purposes, but it serves to highlight the focus of this thesis, which is the changes that arise during adaptation. In presenting a definition that not only allows but focuses on these changes, this thesis will fall in line with the majority of scholarly views on adaptation while still retaining the caveats placed on the selection of sources.

### **Case Study Exclusion Criteria**

That being said, there are certain trends in theatre adaptation that make some source texts more popular than others. For example, there is a definitive trend in theatrical adaptation to pull from one of the most famous and prolific names in the English language: William Shakespeare. Because of this preference for the Bard, much of the scholarship on theatrical adaptation focuses on those works adapted from Shakespeare's. Unfortunately, much of the scholarship connected to Shakespeare tends to fall somewhat under Shakespeare studies, which has its own customs. This means that the majority of scholarship on theatrical adaptation, when not focused on transmedial works,

has a Shakespearean focus with all the necessary background knowledge that may entail. Though some of these sources contain valuable material regarding the discussion of play-to-play adaptation, one aim of this thesis is to unite adaptation and theatre outside the well-tread realm of Shakespeare. As such, none of Shakespeare's works or those he was adapted into (or adapted from) will be discussed.

In addition, there is the question of musicals. Though both musicals and straight plays (a term used to contrast with musical plays) belong to the stage, they are functionally very different, to the point where they might be considered different mediums. Consider, for example, George Bernard Shaw's *Pygmalion* and Lerner and Loewe's *My Fair Lady*. The same story is told, with little alteration to the circumstances of the characters or the world they live in, but now they sing. This sounds more like a transmedial adaptation, as the fact of singing does not bear any change on the story itself while still introducing new genre conventions. While there are some musical adaptations that are transformative (*Lysistrata Jones* by Douglas Carter Beane and Lewis Flinn comes to mind), they are still subject to the medium's constraints of including music, which is an additional level of consideration that will complicate direct comparisons. These songs involve not just the lyrics found in the text, but the score, which can have an impact on the tone of a show beyond the words on the page. Comprehension and analysis of musical scores are beyond the scope of this thesis, and therefore, musicals were not included in the case studies.

## **Types of Adaptation**

Given these caveats, there are three main types of adaptation that will be addressed here. The first type is that of the political adaptation. These are works that transform a previous work in order to make a point about current politics. Some may have a longer-lasting relevance or relatability than others, but that is not necessarily the concern. They are written for the moment, to speak to the audience of the now about something of which they should be aware through the lens of something that may be familiar. As a case study, I have selected Moliere's 1664 comedy *Tartuffe* and the 2016 version written by Robert Caisley that uses the same name. Premiering weeks before the 2016 United States Presidential Election, Caisley incorporated a story of gullibility and manipulation with the then-omnipresent highlights of the ongoing political process. In a time of "fake news," this connection would have struck the audience as especially relevant.

The second type of adaptation analyzed is the cross-cultural adaptation. These adaptations place an existing story in an entirely different cultural context, acknowledging the changes that this reframing would create. While this may be moving between years, as time does change the culture of a place, it is more often changing the location of the story and/or the race or ethnicity of the characters. Though it likely contains elements of the political adaptation, as the politics of the past shape the culture of the present, these works are more focused on the longevity of a culture over the immediacy of politics. They seek to give the selected culture a connection to the existing

work, allowing them to claim an ownership of the text through relatability. They may also serve to instruct cultures other than the culture of adaptation as to what matters to that intended audience, giving outsiders an insight into a culture with which they are not familiar. As an example, I will be discussing August Strindberg's 1888 play *Miss Julie*, which was rewritten by Yaël Farber in 2012 as *Mies Julie*. By moving the story from Sweden to South Africa, Farber introduced racial elements into the class and gender struggle originally of the late nineteenth century. Though there are elements of the political, as Farber names specific legislative acts in the subtitle of her version, the politics are of the past, removed from the immediate world in which the text was created and folded into the greater cultural landscape.

The final type of adaptation to be discussed is the entertainment adaptation. Though these may contain elements of the political or the cross-cultural, they are primarily intended to entertain, as the adaptor makes their decisions on what to change based on what will garner the most laughs from a comedy or the most emotion from a drama. These often reset a source text in the modern day, usually with some additional amusements to keep the audience interested. They explore the recognizability of the characters and the story they tell, often through comedic means regardless of the tone of the source text. As Marvin Carlson points out in his work on familiarity and the stage, playwrights often return to what is known to the audience because the audience knows and enjoys it (22-23), which validates the seeking of this enjoyment as a primary motivator for adaptation. In this case, I will discuss 1746's *The Servant of Two Masters*

by Carlo Goldoni, which was adapted into *One Man, Two Guvnors* by Richard Bean in 2011. Where Goldoni wrote in mid-eighteenth century Italy, Bean set his work in 1960s England. These plays utilize tropes and cliches with which the audience is familiar, though these aspects are changed to match the expectations of each audience. It provides new audiences a fun update to a story they may have heard before.

These types were selected after reviewing several adaptational plays and noting the trends that emerged, though they are by no means discrete. There is much overlap between categories; politics is a part of culture, culture is shaped by politics, anything can be entertaining, and the list goes on. The final distinction for each play was based on the rhetorical choices the adaptors made in their changes and the resulting message these changes sent to the audience. In addition, each source text was an English translation of the original source text, selected based on availability.

### **Methodology of Study**

It is worth noting that there is little to no scholarship on the chosen adaptations, let alone scholarship on studying them as adaptations. There are a few articles about *Mies Julie*, but *One Man, Two Guvnors* is used only as a point of reference when discussing comedic forms, and the lack of proper publication for Caisley's *Tartuffe* prevents any scholarship from existing at all. Therefore, to help analyze the chosen texts, I will be taking inspiration from Kenneth Burke's *A Grammar of Motives*. Burke introduced his pentad to help decipher the motives of characters within a text, but it also provides optimal analysis points for helping to discover playwright motives as well. Though Burke

provided many insights regarding the connection of different points on this pentad and what they mean for the character's and their motives, I will be using the pentad primarily as a tool to locate and organize the changes between the source text and the adaptation.

The first point of Burke's pentad is the *scene*, or the context in which the text has been situated (Burke xv). This includes not only the physical location and the time, but the general social climate, including morals, ethics, and standards of behavior. Many adaptations this thesis will focus on will contain a change in the scene, and the new scene will have a significant influence on the rest of the play. However, to prevent confusion between Burke's scene and scene in the sense of a unit of action within a play, I will refer to this point as "setting."

The second of Burke's points is the *agent*, which refers to the characters, the people driving the plot of the play (Burke xv). This includes the various traits and backstory that make up a character. To distinguish between character and agent, an agent shall be an individual while character will be the individual or collective traits of said agent, including when referring to types of characters. Though the broad characteristics of each agent will remain similar between primary source text and adaptation, the change in setting will guide the subsequent changes in detail to the agent.

Another point is the *act*, which, like it sounds, is the action a character commits, whether physical or the words they say (Burke xv). Some of the changes to these actions may be a direct result of the changes in scene or agent, such as inserting updated pop culture references into the dialogue. However, other changes to actions may be due to a

more nuanced reasoning, one that, when closely examined, will reveal the subtleties of the adaptor's inclination.

There is also the *agency*, or the means by which the agent committed the act (Burke xv). This could be seen via props in the case of physical moments or via the content of an agent's speech. This is another instance where the changes to scene will likely influence another point, especially in the case of updating the work to another time frame. On the other hand, a lack of change in the agency may be more telling, such as the insistence on using a knife to kill in an era when guns are a practical alternative. The changes or lack thereof on this front may be extremely significant.

The final item in Burke's pentad is the *purpose*, or the reasoning behind the action (Burke xv). Though this is what many consider the heart of motive, if not the motive itself, it is the least likely to be significantly changed between primary source text and adaptation. This is due to the fact that, with the broad strokes of plot and character maintained between the two texts, the basic purposes driving their actions will likely remain the same. Nonetheless, there may be nuances to some of these purposes, constructed within the framework of the other parts of the pentad. It is these nuances and additional layers to the purpose that underpin the overall message of the adaptation.

As previously stated, the changes made by the adaptor are the focus of this thesis. This is because adaptors create adaptations to use "a familiar story to emphasize the originality of his contribution" (Carlson 27). The originality is shown through the changes made, and taken together, these changes comprise the message or messages the

adaptor wished to communicate. After all, if these changes do not contribute to whatever the adaptor was trying to say, why make them? It is these rhetorical decisions, combining the message, the adaptor as author and the audience receiving the message, that will help create a picture of what is important or at least notable for both the adaptor and audience.

## CHAPTER II

### POLITICAL ADAPTATION

The relationship between theatre, adaptation, and politics is one that is almost as long as the existence of theatre itself. One of the oldest surviving comedies, *The Acharnians*, was written by Aristophanes, who was known for almost exclusively writing political satires based on local issues and figures; it premiered in 425 BCE, a mere 109 years after the first inclusion of tragedies into the City Dionysia Festival, which theatre history scholars mark as the birth of theatre as the Western world knows it today (Wilson and Goldfarb 42-43, 29). However, these political satires were not adaptations as I have defined them in this text; as theatre was still in its infancy, there were not as many scripts available to adapt for a new meaning. Instead, these Old Comedies adapted a situation or person recognizable to Athenians into a fictional version, one that allowed Aristophanes to get his point across while maintaining some distance and avoiding accusation of slander.<sup>2</sup> As time has gone on and the repertoire of available plays has grown a selection designated as so-called classics, there has been a slight shift away from fictionalized adaptations of real politics, which have been embraced more by television, and towards using these classics as a frame on which to display allusions to current politics. While

---

<sup>2</sup> Sometimes, Aristophanes did not bother with the distance, as in *The Clouds* when he portrayed Socrates as someone whose “head is always in the clouds” (Wilson and Goldfarb 42).

some prefer to make these allusions functions of production, others choose to rewrite the script to illustrate their point.

Satire has also changed over time, moving from the biting commentary on contemporary political and social issues used by the Greeks to that of Horace in the first century BCE, who wrote both critical poems and gentler epistles and called them both satire (Weinbrot 130). He was followed by Juvenal in the next century, who abandoned the epistle in favor of focusing solely on harsh verse satire (Griffin 11). As Christianity rose in strength, satire shifted from the political to the moral and avoided rude and un-Christian tones (Griffin 10, 12). Satire in the original sense of political and social commentary was revived in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries under the Age of Enlightenment. Satirists such as Alexander Pope (in the mixed tradition of Horace) and Jonathan Swift (in the focused tradition of Juvenal) were widely-read by those seeking entertaining viewpoints on current events and continue to influence satirical writings (Weinbrot 137; Cannan 22). Moving into the modern day, satire has transitioned from the page to the screen, seeking to reach as many people as possible in a timely manner, much like the political adaptations they are often intertwined with.

For the purposes of this chapter, these political adaptations are defined as adaptations in which changes have been made to the source text to more closely reflect the current events and state of public affairs surrounding the playwright at the time of writing. This often includes changes to supplementary elements like moving the setting to the present day and altering character backstories to fit more realistically into the new

setting, though some adaptations will forgo this in exchange for directly insinuating political commentary into the existing story and setting. It will also include similar changes to the plot, connecting it to the current event to which the playwright is alluding. It is often entertaining and incorporates adjustments due to the focus on a new culture, but what sets the political adaptation as its own category is way it reveals the adaptor's political beliefs and opinions. As the following chapter will show, Robert Caisley's *Tartuffe* is a prime example of these concepts, transforming a seventeenth century religious zealot into a twenty-first century politician in a way that highlights Caisley's views on the then-upcoming elections.

First performed in 1664, Molière's comedy *Tartuffe* focuses on the family of Orgon and their dealings with Tartuffe, a religious man who has been invited into their home by Orgon. Believing him to be a righteous and moral man, Orgon extolls Tartuffe's virtues to his family, insisting that the man is only concerned for their immortal souls. However, Tartuffe's actions make it clear that he lives up to the two subtitles often attached to the play: "The Imposter" and "The Hypocrite." It is only after Tartuffe has claimed, or attempted to claim, Orgon's money, property, daughter, and wife that Orgon becomes aware of his true nature and begins to fight back.

In 2016, Robert Caisley was commissioned by the American Stage Theatre Company of St. Petersburg, FL to write a modern satire based on *Tartuffe*. Performed during the American 2016 election season, the play has never been formally published, but the script can be found on the National New Play Exchange Database. With a

sprinkling of political machinations to flesh out Tartuffe's manipulations, Caisley made the stakes more relevant to a modern audience than the traditional portrayal of the story.

### **Examination of Setting Changes**

The setting changed dramatically between Molière's original and Caisley's adaptation. This is likely due to the fact that the political references Caisley included in his text would make little sense in Molière's world. Molière wrote the world he knew, seventeenth century France with an emphasis on the landed wealthy. Caisley translated this to the world he knew: twenty-first century America. This change is not just production-based, but textually ingrained, with frequent mentions of cell phones and selfies (8, 11). This change in setting frames the action on the stage in an immediate way so that the audience is forced to confront the possibility of the resulting implications in today's world, whereas keeping Molière's setting allows for a degree of distance.

### **Examination of Agent Changes**

The agents have changed as well, though mostly as a result of the change in setting. Orgon in Molière's text is a landed man, and a rather gullible one at that. It is also stated by several agents that he was on the side of the king in some recent "troubles," likely resulting in garnering some degree of favor (Molière 292). Caisley has translated this to the modern American equivalent, a businessman, though still with the trademark gullibility and blind spot in regards to Tartuffe. To provide an equivalent elevation as having favor from the king, Caisley has made Orgon a "self-made man" (21). At first glance, this is in contrast to the family legacy attached to land and power in Molière's

time. However, a report put together by Wealth-X, a company which tracks the trends of the uber-wealthy, defined self-made as those whose funds came primarily from “fruitful business ventures or successful investments,” only putting it in contrast to those who inherited their wealth (29). This draws a stronger parallel to Molière’s Orgon, who capitalized on his family’s connections to gain favor from the king; with this idea of self-made, it is understood that Caisley’s Orgon also built his own kind of power with a base of familial support. This presents as a subtle reference to Donald Trump, who is a self-made man of the same type (Olen).

Orgon’s daughter is another agent who underwent a change between Molière’s and Caisley’s versions. Molière’s Mariane is a mostly a proper young lady of her time. She is noted as being “demure,” but also like she is hiding something (290). This may be related to her relationship with her suitor, as the major departure from her prim characterization is in regards to ensuring that she marries him. Even then, she still follows her father’s lead in relation to her future and love life. Caisley also presents a stereotypical, upper-class girl, though his version is more unflattering. Maryann is a bit of ditz and obsessed with social media (Caisley 8). She is still prepared to subvert her father to marry her boyfriend, but she makes it clear in the end that she will marry him despite her father’s plans. Though they both come from a similar template, the major difference between the two is that Maryann undergoes noticeable character development while Mariane does not.

The rest of the family play more minor roles, and their characterization is roughly the same. Pernelle is Orgon's outspoken mother, and in both versions, she is rarely happy and often insulting someone. Orgon's wife is one of her favorite targets. Known as Elmire in Molière's text and Mira in Caisley's, she is Orgon's second wife and works to expose Tartuffe for the fraud that he is, despite her husband's insistence in his goodness. Orgon also has a son from his first marriage, Molière's Damis and Caisley's Damon. This young man is hot-tempered and always ready to fight Tartuffe to set things right in the family, with most of his focus on his father's money and his sister's marriage. However, Damis has an extra motivation for his sister marrying who she wishes in that he is set to marry her boyfriend's sister, a point that was dropped when Caisley was writing Damon (Molière 292). The boyfriend in question is known as Valère, shortened to Val in Caisley's script. Very little changes between the two versions; he is a young man, with all the pride and arrogance that entails, and he is desperately in love with his girlfriend. The other family member is Orgon's brother-in-law, Cléante for Molière and Clayton for Caisley. He is an intelligent man, constantly trying and failing to convince Orgon that Tartuffe is not who he says he is. Though Clayton is specifically stated to have some kind of job in academia (Caisley 22), Cléante's exact position is unknown, though it is likely he is another nobleman, one who is particularly well-read.

The staff of Orgon's household also includes some changes in agent. Dorine is one such example. In temperament and general actions, she is very similar from Molière's text to Caisley's. She fits the sassy servant template, not only providing aside

commentary to the audience, but sometimes directly snarking at her employers. The difference is in regards to the exact position she holds in the household. Molière has cast her as Mariane's maid, meaning that she is likely Mariane's closest friend and confidant (290). This clearly explains her closeness with Mariane and her willingness to help her get out of her pending marriage to Tartuffe. Since twenty-first century America has mostly eliminated the position of lady's maid, though some young women in wealthier families may have a hired companion or even bodyguard, Dorine is simply an employee of the household (Caisley 3). However, since employer/employee relationships are not as formal as they once were, even in the case of household employees, it is likely that Dorine would still be privy to and emotionally invested in the drama of Maryann's love life. Even more, some of Orgon's interactions with Dorine make more sense if her job responsibilities involve the whole house rather than just his daughter.

Tartuffe himself is also different, in status if not in temperament. The character of Tartuffe is simply corrupt, a "hypocrite" and "imposter," as previously noted. Molière has him playing the part of a religious advisor to Orgon, which is a powerful position given Orgon's own status. However, a religious advisor does not hold the same weight in more secular, twenty-first century America, so Caisley had to give him power in a different way. Initially, Caisley's Tartuffe is the religious advisor to Cannon, an unseen politician running for an unspecified national office (22). As Tartuffe takes over Orgon's family, he also ends up running against Cannon, trying to bring his brand of manipulation and bad religion to the whole country instead of one family. This gives Tartuffe a status

understood by Caisley's audience and a power comparable to the one he had when he became Orgon's heir in Molière's script.

### **Examination of Content Changes**

Much of the first scene of Caisley's script parallels Molière's first act. The majority of the family is sitting around, "enjoying" each other's company. Pernelle begins to berate the people around her, a method of informing the audience about who these people are and what they are like (Molière 290-291; Caisley 7-13). She eventually leaves in a huff, allowing Dorine and Cléante/Clayton to introduce the idea of Tartuffe and the troubles he has caused prior to the play's action.

This discussion is cut off by the arrival of Orgon, arriving home from a trip and asking Dorine how his family, but mostly Tartuffe, have fared in his absence (Molière 292; Caisley 16-17). It is as Cléante/Clayton is attempting to understand Orgon's devotion to Tartuffe that Caisley first significantly deviates from Molière's text. Where Molière's Orgon speaks of how Tartuffe has changed his worldview, allowing him to both see the world for the horrors that it contains and free himself from them (Molière 293), Caisley adds another dimension to this worldview. This Orgon now sees a division "between 'us' and 'them,'" a difference that demands the construction of a "barricade" for protection (18-19). Not only is this allusion to class difference absent from Molière's text, it smacks of Trump's campaign-long insistence on building a wall between the United States and Mexico, a measure intended to keep out illegal immigrants (Johnson). This difference in act, inspired by the change in setting, serves to more firmly situate

Caisley's work as a satire in his time of writing, especially by placing Trump's policies in the mouth of someone who is currently supporting the play's villain.

Caisley continues to use the rhetoric of contemporary politics to make his opinions on said politics clear. When Cléante/Clayton objects to Orgon's near-fanatical ramblings, Orgon sees fit to chastise him for his objections. The agency of the two rebukes varies slightly. Molière's Orgon accuses Cléante of blasphemy, a harsh accusation in Europe in the 17th century (293). However, blasphemy alone does not carry the same weight in 21st century America. Instead, Caisley's Orgon asks Clayton whether he is a patriot or an atheist (20). This framing allows the accusation of impious behavior to stand while making it double as unpatriotic behavior. It is this second accusation that holds the gravity of the act, heightened by Orgon's nationalistic refrain of "You're either with us or against us" (Caisley 20). This level of jingoism from the mouth of an infamously gullible agent makes it clear that Caisley does not have much faith in the blindly patriotic of America to make an independent decision as opposed to being taken in by the appealing words of a big personality.

Cléante/Clayton is not deterred, and he tries yet again to use reason to separate Orgon from Tartuffe. Unfortunately, Orgon is insistent that Tartuffe is what is best for the family, leading to a difference in the text that falls under multiple points on the pentad. The change in act is partially a function of a change in agent; Molière has Cléante launch into a monologue, but Caisley crafts a dialogue in which the bulk of the point is made by Orgon. This also affects the agency and purpose. Cléante's monologue focuses on what

makes a religious man good or bad, with examples of what bad men do and naming specific examples of good men from history (Molière 294). His purpose is to provide examples and showcase what Tartuffe is not. On the other hand, Orgon's purpose is to show Clayton that he is not the righteous man he acts like he is. He does so by setting up an example of a problem and describing how Clayton would fail to solve it (Caisley 21). In doing so, he obviously casts himself in a bad light as well, claiming himself as a "one-percenter" in the same breath that he illustrates the unwillingness of the one percent to pay to solve problems they do not experience, like world hunger (Caisley 21). Where Cléante's agency is to use impersonal and general examples, Orgon's is to make it as personal as possible, attacking both himself and Clayton in the act. However, this change serves the same purpose for both playwrights, presenting what makes a bad person to the audience. As a result, Caisley has placed the "one-percenter," the uber-wealthy, in a bad light, further reflecting on his opinion of Trump and his exorbitant wealth as well as conservative politicians who enact policies against helping the underprivileged. Despite the difference, the scenes end on the same note, with Orgon skirting around the issue of his daughter's marriage.

The next scene begins with Orgon discussing just that with the future bride herself. Caisley uses this moment to begin transitioning Maryann into an agent with control, something not found in Molière's text. Orgon tells Mariane/Maryann that he will not allow her to marry her boyfriend as she has been planning, a constituent element of the plot. Instead, he informs her of his decision to marry her to Tartuffe (Molière 295;

Caisley 27). Despite the pleas by both Mariane/Maryann and Dorine, Orgon will not hear reason and Mariane/Maryann does not stand up to him, which Dorine confronts her about after Orgon leaves (Molière 297; Caisley 31). Mariane/Maryann admits that she doesn't know what to do, and Dorine begins comforting the girl. However, she also tells her that she should not give in to Orgon, though Dorine's agency for this encouragement is different in the two texts. Molière's Dorine seems to be relying solely on the power of love, reminding Mariane that she and Valère love each other and that should be a good enough reason to defy her father (297). Caisley has provided his Dorine with an updated method, relying on feminism to get the point across. This Dorine insists that Maryann needs to be a strong, independent woman, doing what she believes is best for herself rather than listening to what the men in her life want for her (Caisley 32). This change is an effect of the change in setting, as a woman resisting against the men in her life is counter to the image of a proper young lady Molière has painted in Mariane. It is the catalyst for the character development that makes Maryann a different agent from Mariane in the end. It also highlights Caisley's ideas on the politics of being a woman, specifically with retaining authority over the self in opposition to outside authority.

The concept of authority is also brought up by Caisley in connection to money. As Mariane/Maryann continues to resist taking control of her life, claiming that she could never be as bold as Dorine suggests and should probably just kill herself to avoid marrying Tartuffe, Dorine begins to sarcastically remark on her lack of resistance to the possibility of becoming Mrs. Tartuffe. She talks about the benefits of marrying him,

though her agency differs as she focuses on different benefits in each version. Molière's Dorine talks about the status Mariane will enjoy once she marries Tartuffe and goes home with him (297). He has claimed to be a noble where he is from, one who gave up everything in his travels but is still respected among those from his home. Caisley's Dorine uses the appeal of money, as she believes Tartuffe will likely have taken every cent Orgon has in the near future, so Maryann would have access to that as his spouse (34). This is likely a setting-influenced change, as nobility does not have the same impact on modern American audiences as money does. Nonetheless, the connection between nobility and respect in Molière's text and money in Caisley's shows that Caisley sees money as the real political power in 21st century America.

This focus on the power of money continues through the next scene, as Tartuffe attempts to flatter Elmire/Mira, saying all that he would do for her if she should wish. What starts as a fairly innocent conversation quickly takes a turn for the lecherous as Tartuffe begins fondling her under the guise of feeling her dress (Molière 301; Caisley 48). Though Elmire/Mira rejects Tartuffe's advances, she does offer to not tell Orgon about Tartuffe's betrayal. However, this silence comes with a price. Elmire's purpose behind offering to keep quiet is to secure Mariane's marriage to Valère, not only through Tartuffe dropping his own claim but through ensuring Tartuffe's support of Valère's (Molière 302). Mira has a similar purpose with her blackmail, though she has an additional one as well. Not only does she seek to ensure Maryann's happiness through marriage with Val, she asks Tartuffe to "stop bleeding Orgon for every penny" (Caisley

51). While it is possible that Elmire was preparing to make a similar additional request, as she began a line “And...” that was cut off by the sudden entrance of Damis, the fact remains that she only stated one purpose for her blackmail as opposed to Mira’s two.

Damis/Damon interrupts his stepmother’s attempted deal out of anger towards Tartuffe. However, the two versions have different purposes driving their hatred. Like Elmire/Mira’s blackmail, Damis and Damon both name their sister’s marriage as a reason they wish to remove Tartuffe from the house, though both frame it as Val’s marriage instead of Maryann’s (Molière 302; Caisley 52). This is the second named purpose for each of them, and their first is very different. Damis is primarily concerned with his own pending marriage to Valère’s sister, which may stumble if a deal is not through Mariane and Valère’s union (Molière 302). Damon does not have this concern, as his marriage subplot was struck from Caisley’s tale as a supplementary element. Instead, his primary concern is the amount of Orgon’s money that Tartuffe is spending, an echo of Mira’s blackmail offer moments before (Caisley 52). Both Mira’s addition and Damon’s change reinforce Caisley’s notion that money is the most important power in his world and worthy of a fight.

Caisley continues to contextualize the play as political as Damis/Damon’s rant against Tartuffe is interrupted by the entrance of Orgon. Here is another instance where Caisley has added a line with the new setting in mind. As opposed to Molière’s Orgon who simply enters, Caisley’s Orgon is on his cell phone when he walks in, talking about emails that need to be deleted (53). This is most likely a reference to the emails deleted

by Hillary Clinton's staff which were a subject of controversy late in the 2016 election (Lichtblau and Goldman). It is a timely joke, reminding the audience of the satirical nature of this story, and one that sets up Orgon's problems towards the end of the play.

It is not just amusing references that Caisley uses to reveal his political beliefs, but also the application of political trends to specific agents. Once Orgon becomes aware of the scene he has entered, Damis/Damon proceeds to denounce Tartuffe by naming all of the true, dastardly acts he has committed in his time residing with their family. Tartuffe proceeds to agree with all of these statements, throwing himself at Orgon's mercy. Here is where the two Orgons differ in their act. Though both dismiss their son's claims and side with Tartuffe, Caisley's Orgon does not deny that Tartuffe has done these things. Instead, he focuses on redeeming Tartuffe's faults by claiming that he is a good man for admitting to them (Caisley 54). This is in contrast to Molière's Orgon, who absolutely refuses to believe that Tartuffe could have done wrong. Instead, he calls Damis a liar, despite Tartuffe himself admitting to his sins (Molière 303). This is an example of "post-truth" politics, defined as "relating to or denoting circumstances in which objective facts are less influential in shaping public opinion than appeals to emotion and personal belief" and often mentioned in conjunction to Trump's campaign strategies (Flood). The ridiculousness of Orgon's insistence serves to highlight Caisley's bad opinion of those who believe in post-truth politics, especially Trump's supporters.

Orgon continues to berate his son, though Tartuffe eventually speaks on behalf of the boy, albeit in an underhanded manner. With his good opinion of Tartuffe reinforced,

Orgon drives the rest of his family away, announcing his daughter's immediate marriage to Tartuffe and the removal of his son as heir to his fortune. The scene culminates in Orgon making Tartuffe an offer he can't refuse. While the offer itself is a constituent element indicating an exchange of power, the content of the two offers are different, as is the purpose behind them. Molière's Orgon seeks to simply make Tartuffe his heir, granting him all properties and titles when Orgon passes on (304). The purpose of this offer is to cement Tartuffe's future as well as cementing him into Orgon's family. Caisley takes this offer a step further. In addition to making Tartuffe his legal heir, Orgon expresses a desire to fund Tartuffe's campaign for political office, a campaign that did not exist until Orgon spoke it into being (Caisley 59). His purpose is not just to secure Tartuffe's future personally, but professionally as well, and he seeks to ensure Tartuffe's power not only over his family, but over the nation. This offer showcases Caisley's political leanings on two fronts. The first is the continued parallel between Tartuffe and Trump; Trump is known to have gotten his start with significant help from his father and his father's money (Olen), similar to Tartuffe receiving his initial funds from the man who considers him a son. In a broader sense, this is also a reference to the practice of politicians receiving large amounts of money from specific donors with the implication that these politicians will look out for their donors. As Caisley has framed this exchange of funds as a negative one, it is clear that he does not look kindly on those politicians.

By making the self-serving Tartuffe a politician who betrays his donor, Caisley shows his belief that politicians in general will claim support for their supporters'

interests, but ultimately look out for their own best interests. This is emphasized when the next scene opens on Cléante/Clayton and Tartuffe discussing the fallout from Orgon announcing a new heir. It is the talk of the town, and Cléante/Clayton asks Tartuffe to reconsider accepting Orgon's offer of Damis/Damon's inheritance (Molière 304; Caisley 62). Tartuffe refuses, though his purpose for doing so is very different in the two texts. Molière's Tartuffe gives a reason that is moderately selfish, a change from the Tartuffe that has up to this point tried to win everyone over. According to him, because the people know about the drama surrounding Tartuffe's sudden change in status, it would be "suspicious" if he were to suddenly forgive Damis, as it would make him appear weak (Molière 304-305). Caisley's Tartuffe frames his excuse far more selflessly; he says that Orgon needs someone on his side, so he is trying to prove his loyalty through "this impossible task of 'nation-healing'" (62). He is still avoiding the issue of his unrightful inheritance, but under the guise of goodness. This reinforces the problematic politician/donor relationship, as Tartuffe claims he is beholden to Orgon's ideals as many politicians defend the ideals of their donors. However, it also reveals some of Caisley's cynicism about the American political process.

Their discussion is cut short with the entrance of the rest of the family, Orgon rambling excitedly about the upcoming wedding between his daughter and Tartuffe. Caisley uses this scene to spotlight the shift in Maryann's character, showing approval for the idea of the self-sufficient woman. In the face of the immediacy of her wedding, Mariane/Maryann breaks down. She begs her father not to marry her off to Tartuffe,

claiming that she has nothing against Orgon's love for the man, but she does not share that same love and does not wish to be forced into a situation where she would have to fake it (Molière 305; Caisley 64). Here, there is a difference in agent. Not because the actual person performing the act is different, but because Maryann herself shows a change in character that Mariane does not. While Mariane only seeks to throw herself at her father's mercy, with an offered alternative of entering the convent (Molière 305), Maryann tries more forcefully to make her father listen. Her talk with Dorine earlier in the play seems to have had some effect, as she expresses an awareness of her previous lack of awareness, stating, "My thoughts are regurgitated posts and vines and sound bites and tweets -- my opinions are recycled, my interests are just Pinterests" (Caisley 64). She then goes on to explain the source of her enlightenment, Betty Friedan's *The Feminist Mystique*, and outright calls Orgon an issue just as much as Tartuffe has been. While this is definitely influenced by the change in setting that Caisley has constructed, Mariane could have more directly addressed her father's problematic behavior than she did, which means there is now a marked difference between the demure Mariane and the freshly "woke" Maryann. Caisley's transformation supports the idea of an independent woman with full authority over her self and her decisions, a rather liberal political stance to take.

Despite her efforts at dissuasion, Orgon dismisses his daughter's pleas. Given how it moves the plot of the text forward, this is a constituent act, though Caisley turns the scene on its head to show how women have power rather than focusing on taking it away. In a final effort to make Orgon see the truth in regards to Tartuffe, Elmire/Mira

concocts a plan to have Orgon witness Tartuffe's indiscretions in action. With Orgon hidden nearby, she sets out to seduce Tartuffe, knowing that he will give in with little care for his so-called dear friend. As the plan goes into action, Tartuffe expresses some concerns about Elmire/Mira's sudden change of heart from when she had previously rebuffed his advances. She explains that she did want Tartuffe, even then, but circumstances kept her from acting on it at the time. She gives further evidence to recant her refusal, though the nature of the evidence is very different in the two scripts. Elmire focuses on what she has already done; she claims that if she really didn't want Tartuffe, she would have been much more harsh when she rejected him (Molière 307). Because she was fairly kind, he can take that as a sign that she didn't really mean it. Mira presents a more self-serving example, saying that she has ambitions and Tartuffe will be able to help her reach them (Caisley 69). Both versions appeal to Tartuffe's ego in a way, but with very different agency. Molière's focuses on a woman's relationship to others while Caisley's focuses on a woman as an independent creature.

Caisley also uses this scene to show politicians in an even more negative light. Once she has convinced Tartuffe of her sincerity, Elmire/Mira has to figure out how to hold his interest without actually acting on her supposed feelings. She does so through the act of offering a reason their union would be a horrible idea, though her agency is different. Elmire plays on the image that Tartuffe has presented to the family, that of a holy man. Out loud, she worries that sleeping with Tartuffe will be a sin, which he should not want to do given his righteous standing (Molière 307). Mira also worries about

Tartuffe's reputation, but as it stands with the people instead of as it stands with God. She notes that she is a relative nobody while his new political platform has him on the national stage (Caisley 70). In both instances, she frames her delay as an attempt at protecting Tartuffe, though what she is protecting him from has changed dramatically. In doing so, Caisley has shown that he feels politicians are more concerned with looking like good people than being good people.

Because most politicians are concerned with their reputation, Caisley uses that to draw another connection between Tartuffe and Donald Trump. When Tartuffe is insistent about sleeping with her, Elmire/Mira pulls out one more trick that not only gets Tartuffe to back off for a moment, but allows her to check in with Orgon to see if he believes the family's claims now. She asks Tartuffe to check for those who might spy on them, with the who of who might be spying varying. Elmire mostly expresses concern over her husband, and the fact that his sudden appearance may put a stop to their so-called affair (Molière 308). Though he dismisses this idea, Tartuffe stills goes to check the security of their meeting. Mira tries to offer this same excuse, but Tartuffe brushes it off entirely. As a backup, she expresses concern about the paparazzi, as well as the idea that any less-than-flattering photo would be detrimental to Tartuffe's political campaign (Caisley 72). Tartuffe goes to check, but dismisses her concern for this potential hit on his reputation. Tartuffe states, "I could walk down main street in broad daylight, pull a gun and shoot an old lady in the face, and they'd still have faith in me" (Caisley 72). This echoes a similar statement made by Trump at a campaign rally in early 2016 (Diamond), while further

reinforcing the idea of politicians prioritizing looking like good people, especially to the general public. Despite Orgon reappearing to proclaim his belief in his family's version of events, his creation of Tartuffe as his heir results in Tartuffe taking steps to throw Orgon and family out of their own house.

The final scene of the play opens on Orgon panicking and Cléante/Clayton trying to calm him down. As Orgon explains, a dear friend of his left some incriminating evidence with Orgon for safekeeping, which he then in turn gave to Tartuffe for further safekeeping (Molière 309; Caisley 75-76). However, this evidence could easily implicate Orgon in wrongdoing as well, so it is highly likely he has taken it to the proper authorities in order to get Orgon and his family out of the way. Cléante/Clayton can think of little to do but advise Orgon on what to do in the future. The act is very different between the two versions; Cléante reminds Orgon that he has clearly learned caution, but that he should still believe the best in people and trust them if he can, while Clayton firmly tells Orgon, "[D]on't be so trusting next time" (Molière 309; Caisley 76). What is interesting about this is that Orgon's gullibility is at the heart of the story. While there are other moral lessons at work that will be revealed before the end of the action, this is one of the key ones, so to have it so different between the two scripts is startling, as well as being Caisley's commentary on how much the general public should trust politicians.

Throughout this first part of the scene, Caisley has also dropped in several buzzwords that anyone following the 2016 United States presidential election would recognize. The incriminating evidence that Orgon is hiding includes copies of emails,

another reference to the Hillary Clinton email controversy previously mentioned (Caisley 75; Lichtblau and Goldman). As Damon enters the scene and updates the two men about what is happening outside their house, specifically a press conference in which Tartuffe discusses his campaign, they try to decide what kinds of people seem to be supporting Tartuffe so enthusiastically. Orgon calls them “A basket of deplorables” while Clayton goes for “The silent majority” (Caisley 77-78). These are both terms that have been used to refer to Donald Trump’s supporters, the first by Hillary Clinton at a fundraiser, though the pejorative was soon reclaimed by Trump supporters (Chozick; Cummings). Silent majority is a term that was more used by Trump himself, describing the people who fall into the somewhat conservative middle class and tend to keep their head down (S. Sanders). With Orgon and Tartuffe finally at odds, it is a set of references that not only grounds the story in the politics of Caisley’s time, but sets up the parallels between the agents and the front-running politicians they are referencing in a parody, part of Caisley’s biting satire.

True to form, Damis/Damon expresses his outrage at Tartuffe’s manipulations and volunteers to go perpetrate violence on him, which Cléante/Clayton advises against. The rest of the family enters, including Pernelle, who still refuses to believe in Tartuffe’s guilt. When Orgon tries to explain that he saw Tartuffe with his own eyes, Pernelle dismisses what he has seen as faulty, though her reasons for doing so are entirely setting-based. Molière’s Pernelle blames “slanderers” for coloring her son’s point of view, as gossip was the main weapon of the court of the seventeenth century (310). Caisley’s

Pernelle offers an equally frustrating dismissal, claiming that “facts can be debated” (79). This is an even more blatant example of post-truth politics (Flood), and Caisley’s over-the-top portrayal in Pernelle shows his disdain for those who engage in them.

This pervasiveness of post-truth is also shown in relation to current topics not directly involved in the election. Pernelle further attacks the family’s attack on Tartuffe, especially when they bring up the scene with Elmire/Mira. As mentioned earlier, Pernelle does not think very highly of her daughter-in-law, though this dislike manifests in different acts in regards to the situation. When Molière’s Orgon says that Elmire was at Tartuffe’s mercy, Pernelle says that he should have waited to see what would really happen, with little regard for Elmire’s comfort or safety (310). Caisley’s Pernelle is much more pointed in her dislike, asking Mira what she was wearing (79). This is exploiting the setting to create satire, as the internet often circulates stories of rape victims claiming their reports were dismissed by the proper authorities after they were asked what they were wearing to entice their rapist, a decision based on the victim’s reputation than facts.

Despite the difficulties faced by the text’s agents, Caisley utilizes the story’s inevitable constituent acts to bring about a sense of justice. As the family flounders to take action, an officer of the law enters the house, intending to remove them. He fails to convince them to come quietly and leaves, and Valère/Val soon enters the scene. Though the whole family is to be evicted, he has taken steps to ensure Orgon escapes with some money, as he is the only one facing criminal charges (Molière 312; Caisley 86). Before they can make a move, Tartuffe bursts in with a different law enforcement officer at his

side, announcing Orgon's arrest. When Mariane/Maryann calls out his motives, Tartuffe takes different acts to respond. Molière's Tartuffe essentially declaims any actual guilt, saying that he is only serving the crown and Heaven as any good citizen would do (312). Caisley's Tartuffe does the opposite, taking the credit and simply claiming superiority over the family (87). This idea of being above the law again echoes Trump, especially his previously mentioned claim that he could shoot someone in broad daylight without getting in trouble (Diamond). Tartuffe gets his comeuppance shortly after, being arrested on a number of charges. Given the number of blatant parallels between Tartuffe and Trump, it can be inferred that Caisley wouldn't mind Trump having to face some form of comeuppance for his transgressions.

Though Caisley perpetrates justice upon the political villain of the story, he is by no means satisfied with the remaining state of politics. Orgon is informed that he has been cleared of all charges, though this gets a slight change due to the change in setting. Molière uses Orgon's service to the crown in a previous war as substantial reason to clear him, while Caisley crafts a friendship between Orgon and the Attorney General (Molière 313; Caisley 89). In his relief, Orgon decides they should celebrate, with different acts for each version. At Cléante's suggestion, Orgon agrees that the whole family should go thank the king for his mercy, and after that, they should get Valère and Mariane married (Molière 314). Caisley's Orgon, on the other hand, has decided "[t]he country's going to do what the country's going to do," and he can't waste his time worrying about it (90). As part of the closing remarks/moral of the play, it represents the overall point the author

was trying to make: that American politics are problematic and there's not much the people can do about it.

### **Analysis of Changes**

With all of these changes, a few key themes have emerged. The first and most prevalent is that which makes this a political adaptation, which is Caisley's opinions about the 2016 American presidential election. Rather than create a generic political allegory that shows the messiness of American politics, Caisley has firmly cast Tartuffe in the role of Donald Trump. As mentioned, Orgon mentions that Tartuffe supports the building of a wall between differing factions of people, similar to Trump's own desires to build a wall to keep undocumented immigrants out of the United States (Caisley 18-19; Johnson). Tartuffe himself claims that he could commit cold-blooded murder in broad daylight and still have the support of his voter base, a claim also made by Trump (Caisley 72; Diamond). The final parallel has less to do with Tartuffe and more to do with his supporters, as Orgon and Clayton refer to them as "A basket of deplorables" and "The silent majority," two names used regarding Trump's supporters during his campaign (Caisley 77-78; Chozick; S. Sanders). In contrast, there is only one real reference to Trump's opponent, Hillary Clinton, though it is a recurring one. Orgon is seen a few times referring to emails, specifically emails in regards to Cannon, the unseen politician running for office against Tartuffe. Although Clinton's campaign maintained that the questionable emails of her campaign were deleted as general server maintenance (Lichtblau and Goldman), Orgon is seen explicitly demanding the deletion of these

emails, though they end up returning to haunt him in the form of a legal investigation (Caisley 53, 85). While this allusion does cast some aspersions on the Clinton campaign, the fact remains that Tartuffe is the definitive villain of this play, and dressing him in Trumpian rhetoric makes it clear what Caisley thinks of the man who, though Caisley did not know this at the time, would become the 45th president of the United States of America.

Alongside this frustration over the Trump and Clinton campaigns, there is a degree of cynicism about the political machine that is not present in Molière's work. When Orgon initially suggests that Tartuffe run for office, he lists some of the qualities that will make him appealing to voters. The list is noticeably absent of things like diplomatic skills and understanding policy, but "great hair" is considered a strong selling point, indicating that Orgon believes the voters will only think superficially (Caisley 59). There is also the repeated emphasis on money as a powerful force in both politics and life in general (Caisley 34, 51-52). Caisley's dissatisfaction can also be shown through his agents' moments of lack of national pride, especially in contrast to Molière's agents' support of their country. When Damis/Damon expresses a desire to hurt Tartuffe, Cléante tells him that is not how things are done "[i]n this just kingdom, this enlightened age" (Molière 309). Clayton's appeal to Damon has no such nationalistic pride, and he simply advises him to not get caught (Caisley 78). Tartuffe exhibits a similar comparison when he arrives to arrest Orgon; Molière's Tartuffe gives all glory and honor to the crown while Caisley's Tartuffe revels in his own superiority (Molière 312; Caisley 87).

However, the most blatant show of Caisley's disregard for American political structures comes at the end of the play. Cléante suggests that the family go to the king and express their gratitude before they do anything else, to which Orgon agrees (Molière 314).

Caisley's Orgon, on the other hand, explicitly downgrades any responsibility he owes to his country in favor of setting up Maryann and Val's wedding, stating that the people will do what they will do and he can't be bothered to think about it anymore (90). A lot of this may be due to the culture of the time of writing for each script. Late seventeenth century France was ruled by Louis XIV, who believed he had the divine right to be the sole, unquestioned leader of France. By contrast, America was founded on the principles of free speech, whether or not that speech agreed with the government. Since the arts have a long tradition as a vehicle for speaking against the powers that be, it is little surprise that Caisley has allowed some disdain towards his current state of affairs to slip through while Molière maintained his praise of the crown.

Caisley's frustration with twenty-first century America also shows through in his discussion and usage of religion, which is inextricably linked to that which is right in both texts. Molière's Orgon feels the need to warn Cléante against "impiety" while Caisley's Orgon implies that if Clayton is an atheist, he is against his country (Molière 293; Caisley 20). Cléante responds by reminding Orgon that religion is all well and good when in the hands of a good man, though Clayton denounces religion in regards to its overshadowing of objective truths (Molière 293; Caisley 20). These set a tone of difference that is carried out through the *Tartuffes* and their flagrant misappropriation of

religion and religious ideals. Molière's *Tartuffe* uses his status as a religious man to stay above reproach: Orgon refuses to believe he might have done wrong, even when he confesses (303); Elmire uses the excuse of keeping him pure to avoid sleeping with him (307); and Tartuffe himself says that his claiming of Orgon's property is for the benefit of Heaven (308). In contrast, Caisley's *Tartuffe* has his faults acknowledged, and then forgiven, by Orgon (54); his earthly reputation made a priority alongside his heavenly one by Mira (70); and his claiming of property ensured because both God and America like winners (74). In both stories, Tartuffe uses religion as a means to ensure his own importance. However, in Molière's time, his religious zeal alone was enough to mark him as a man of some status and control; in Caisley's time, it is clear that religion does not hold the same weight, and it is only the tying of religious ideals to other concepts and morals that gives Tartuffe his power.

The final major focus of change in Caisley's text is the treatment of women in society. The bulk of this lies on Mariane/Maryann and the marriage plot she is embroiled in. Dorine pushes Mariane/Maryann to avoid Orgon's plan, but Molière's Dorine focuses on fulfilling her promises to Valère while Caisley's Dorine wants Maryann to think of herself as a person with agency, not just a pawn in her father's games (Molière 297; Caisley 32). Mariane continues to curtail her own agency, insisting that Valère should be the one to talk Orgon out of this plan (297). When she gets desperate, she offers to join a convent as a compromise, something that Maryann in her newfound feminist rage refuses to do as she demands Orgon be held accountable for his decisions (Molière 305; Caisley

64). Even as both Mariane and Maryann are allowed to marry their sweethearts, Maryann takes a moment to assert a bit more agency, stating that she will be keeping her own name, which is a contrast to Orgon framing the wedding as Valère's with no mention of his daughter in Molière's text (Caisley 90; Molière 314). In keeping with the social changes wrought by feminism, Caisley actually treats Maryann as an agent who is allowed to make her own decisions, a contrast to Molière's treatment of her as a prop in the tale of Orgon recognizing his own gullibility. While this may not seem like a radical political statement, it does feed on the constant political struggle of women to assert their agency and independence in the public sphere.

Though only the first of these themes is blatantly political, they all have political implications. The cynicism about the country is shared by many Americans from the time of Caisley's writing, both due to Republican frustrations with a Democratic president pushing a liberal agenda or Democratic frustrations with a Republican legislature that prevented the president from enacting a more liberal agenda. Caisley's presentation of religion as a tool used by unscrupulous politicians reveals his more liberal side, as American conservative politicians are more likely to bring up religion and religious convictions in campaigns. Caisley's transformation of Maryann into an ardent feminist, especially in light of the early October 2016 leak of Trump's comments advocating for sexual assault (Arrowood), also reveals his more liberal side. Thus, Caisley has not only revealed his values through these changes, but his political views, creating a work that was likely intended to sway the audience into seeing the current political climate his way,

and hopefully make them vote his way as well. This call to action, and the fact that, for part of the show's run, action could still be taken, is part of what makes Robert Caisley's *Tartuffe* a prime example of political adaptation.

## CHAPTER III

### CROSS-CULTURAL ADAPTATION

In today's global society, cultural exchange happens often. Cross-cultural adaptations are one example of this, but so is cultural appropriation, a topic that has garnered a lot of attention in recent years. Every Halloween, debates rage online about whether or not this costume or that one qualifies as cultural appropriation. However, taken separately, the terms "cultural" and "appropriation" have specific meanings in the context of different fields of study. Therefore, in a discussion of cross-cultural adaptations, it is important to understand whether or not they are, by their nature, cultural appropriation. Certainly, they fit the definition of appropriation as defined by Sanders: "a wholly new cultural product," different from the original and crafted from the context in which they were created, a contrast to her definition of adaptation, which is more closely related to the source text (J. Sanders 35-36, 23). This appropriation also qualifies as cultural, as culture is a driving factor in the formation of the appropriation. However, cross-cultural adaptations do not automatically qualify as cultural appropriation. As defined by the *Cambridge Dictionary*, cultural appropriation is "the act of taking or using things from a culture that is not your own, *especially without showing that you understand or respect this culture*" (emphasis added). In the case of many cross-cultural adaptations, it is this very respect and understanding of the original culture that drives the

creation of the adaptation. Therefore, while cultural appropriation in the general context is not a good thing, cultural appropriation in the context of adaptation studies may be.

These cultural appropriations, also known as cross-cultural adaptations, are new texts in which changes are made to the source text to focus on a different culture, used here in the common meaning of the customs and social structures of a specific people. This does not include changes in culture due solely to time, as these often share cultural roots and social structures with the source text. These adaptations are easily recognizable primarily through changes to the setting, which may be moved to a different era or part of the world, and the agents, who are probably of a different race or ethnicity from those of the source text. The adaptor focuses on the themes of the source text to construct a work that reflects the experiences of a different culture in the frame of a story from the source culture. In doing this, the adaptor must take care to treat all cultures involved with respect and understanding, lest they be accused of cultural appropriation as defined above. Like most adaptations, they provide a degree of entertainment, but they are also often connected to the politics of the new culture. However, this connection is less immediate than in a political adaptation, showcasing the ways in which past politics have shaped the culture rather than the current political state. In this chapter, Yaël Farber's *Mies Julie* will be shown as an excellent case of cross-cultural adaptation as the change in culture and setting allows for the layer of race to be added to a struggle between class and gender. To prevent confusion, all commentary about an author's viewpoint or culture should be understood as the author's understanding of the culture about which she is writing.

*Miss Julie* is one of August Strindberg's best-known works and an important one in the development of naturalistic plays. These plays were written with a narrative time that matches real time and often covered social issues (Wilson and Goldfarb 336). Written in 1888, *Miss Julie* focuses on the eponymous Miss Julie over one night in Strindberg's native Sweden as she falls into a whirlwind romance with Jean, one of her father's employees. It is a fruitless power struggle between class and gender differences, with Julie having the class advantage and Jean having male privilege, all wrapped in sexual tension.

Yaël Farber took this struggle in 2012 and added another dimension to it, that of race. She was inspired by the dynamic between the main characters of Julie and Jean and the way it mirrored the dynamics of her native South Africa, creating a metaphor carried throughout the play ("Mies Julie"). In an interview with All Access Mzansi, she spoke about why she chose *Miss Julie* and what direction she chose to take with it:

I believe the world has probably seen enough *Miss Julies* in its original form... The original was actually about the battle between gender and class in a turn-of-century story. But in this production that we've done, we've done something very specific with it, and the dialogue hones in around those issues that are about contemporary South Africa... The issue that comes to the fore in this version is the land issues, but it deals with a lot of the other bits and pieces of what the shrapnel of a post-apartheid society is. It is quintessentially South African, this version. ("Theatre: Mies Julie")

These land issues are mentioned in her subtitle, “Restitutions of Body & Soil: Since the Bantu Land Act No. 27 of 1913 & the Immorality Act No. 5 of 1927.” The Bantu Land Act restricted the sale of land between white and black residents of South Africa, as well as curtailed the sharecropping system in place, which left white citizens owning the vast majority of the land. The other named legislation, the Immorality Act, criminalized extramarital sex between a white person and a black person. In this way, Farber is linking these themes together as key parts of the culture in which she is writing, which helps frame the story she is telling.

### **Examination of Setting Changes**

Farber kept the setting of the play similar to Strindberg in that it takes place in the kitchen of the master’s house on the night of a holiday. However, both playwrights set their plays in their contemporary time, in a location and on a holiday that would hold meaning with their audience. Strindberg sets his work in his native Sweden on the eve of St. John’s Day, also known as Midsummer’s Eve. This holiday is known for dancing and other merriment, exemplified through both the dialogue and the ballet Strindberg included (Tidholm and Lilja). As previously mentioned, Farber used South Africa as her stage, which likely influenced her decision to set the action of the play on April 27, 2012, the eighteenth anniversary of Freedom Day in South Africa. This day is also one for celebration, marking the first elections in South Africa that allowed all adults to vote regardless of race. Unlike Midsummer’s Eve, though, Freedom Day is a celebration tinged with bitterness, as mentioned throughout the script.

## **Examination of Agent Changes**

Between the two texts, there is very little major difference between the Julies. Both are the daughter of an upper class man, largely unconcerned about the situations of those in the lower classes. She is headstrong and used to getting her way, which creates issues when faced with things she cannot change. The primary difference between the two Julies is not necessarily a difference in Julie herself, but in her mother. Strindberg's Julie had a mother who was even more strong-willed than her daughter, and raised her to be the same way (443). Farber wrote of a weak mother, one who could not stand the life in which she had found herself (44). Farber's Julie became strong in spite of her mother, likely due to the substitute mother figure she found instead.

Jean, anglicized to John in Farber's text, is the servant in Julie's house with whom she has a relationship. He dreams of having a better life, one that does not involve serving others. Though some theaters may choose to use color-blind casting, the fact remains that Strindberg likely intended Jean to be a young white man while Farber wrote John as black, specifically Xhosa. This has an impact on their character, as John is far more aware of the obstacles and prejudices facing him than the idealistic Jean. John was born into a time when he would not have been counted as a citizen of the country in which he lived, despite the indigenous nature of his ancestry. Though his legal status changed, there are still many avenues closed to him, which leaves him frustrated by the fact that he may never achieve his dreams; this is in contrast to Jean, who is sure that everything will work out in his favor.

The agent who has undergone the most change is Strindberg's Kristine, who Farber renamed Christine. She is a cook in Julie's household, and a person of some importance to Jean/John. However, despite the relationship between characters usually being a constituent element, Kristine is Jean's fiancée while Christine is John's mother. Like John, she is Xhosa and lived through a time when she was called a stranger to her own homeland; unlike John, she lived through this time as an adult and is more aware of how much has and has not changed between the time before the end of apartheid and after. The change in relationship does not change much in the interactions between Christine and John: Kristine/Christine generally tries to put Jean/John on what she considers the right path while he remains stubbornly convinced he is right. What does change is the relationship between Kristine/Christine and Julie. Kristine is seen by Julie as someone who is knowledgeable about things Julie may not know, but her equal for the most part. Christine, on the other hand, is the substitute mother who raised Farber's Julie, resulting in a much greater attachment and a degree of respect that is absent in Strindberg's text.

Farber's version actually adds an agent to the script, though it is not one that speaks or is even referred to often. Ukhokho is described as "a discreet presence" on the stage, though occasionally entering the action (Farber 10). She is the restless spirit of Christine's grandmother (Farber 18). Though stage directions are generally not discussed in this thesis, as stage directions are comparatively limited in older scripts like the source texts and it is more difficult to compare something to nothing, they must be discussed to a

degree in regards to Ukhokho since she does not speak. However, her presence only becomes involved at specific points, which usually correspond to the detailed pantomimes and ballets Strindberg wrote into his text, and these moments are used to showcase traditional Xhosa music (Balkin 566; Farber 57). Rather than examine the details of these moments in either text, the pieces that may change, the scenes will be examined as wholes and the general concepts compared.

### **Examination of Content Changes**

The play opens on Jean/John complaining to Kristine/Christine about Julie's less-than-proper behavior, dancing and partying with the employees of the house with little regard for whether she should or whether they want her there. Kristine/Christine serves up dinner for Jean/John, and given the holiday, he decides to treat himself a bit. However, the agent behind the indulgence and the indulgence itself are different in the two texts. Jean turns down Kristine's offer of a beer in exchange for the bottle of good wine he pulls out, one that is heavily implied to come from his master's stores (Strindberg 435). John, on the other hand, has to be told by Christine that he is allowed to sit at the table to eat because their master won't be present anytime soon (Farber 12). The readiness with which Jean/John gratifies himself and the gravity of the indulgence speak very much to the difference between Jean and John. Farber uses this as an early example of the strictness of the social structure that these agents are living in. Though Jean feels comfortable flaunting the house rules a bit, John's status both as a servant and as a black man does not allow him that same comfort.

As he eats, Kristine/Christine cooks an abortifacient for Julie's dog, who has gotten pregnant with puppies from an undesirable dog. The two gossip, though the topic of discussion is different in the two texts. Jean and Kristine talk about Julie herself, alluding to gossip they've heard from other servants, and Jean teases Kristine about dancing with both her and Julie at the midsummer party (Strindberg 435). John and Christine's conversation focuses more on Julie's father and the way he is mistreating the workers living on his land (Farber 13). This not only allows the audience to understand the situation these three people are living in, it sets up the theme of land and ownership that Farber has woven throughout the story.

Their conversation is interrupted by the entrance of Julie, asking for Jean/John to dance with her. This moment shows Julie's character as it continues, which is a reflection on the character of white South Africa. Jean/John tries to dissuade her, knowing and attempting to explain why that may be a bad idea. In her response, the two Julies show a markedly different characterization. Strindberg's Julie brushes aside any notion of impropriety, naively claiming that there is nothing inappropriate about wanting to dance with "someone who can lead, so [she] won't look ridiculous" (Strindberg 436). Farber's Julie is much more aware of the implications, saying that she's been told since she was little that any black man who places his hands on her has signed his own death sentence at the hands of Julie's father (15). However, she remains unbothered by what that may mean for John, as she still insists she dance with him. Her lack of care is a distinct

contrast to the innocent lack of awareness shown by Strindberg's Julie, serving to show Farber's belief in the callousness of the white upper class in South Africa.

Julie cajoles Jean/John into joining her at the party, and thus begins a pantomime, the first of the breaks in the story. Kristine, who has witnessed the entire conversation between Julie and Jean, simply fiddles around the kitchen, not in a hurry to do anything in particular, but not doing nothing either (Strindberg 436). The pantomime as described by Farber begins similarly. Christine returns from giving Julie's dog her medicine and begins to putter around the kitchen. However, her peaceful moment is interrupted by the appearance of, or rather her sudden awareness of, Ukhokho. She becomes panicked, and when John returns to the kitchen, she begins rambling about the past and the ancestors who have been buried in the land under the house (Farber 17). It is clear that this kind of thing has happened before, as when Christine expresses a desire to tear up the floor and free her family, John responds, "Don't break the floor again, mama! I'm still paying for damages" (Farber 18). John proceeds to calm a hysterical Christine, the final act in a series of acts that greatly contrast with those of Strindberg's scene, which ends with Jean attempting to soothe a Kristine who is miffed about not getting to dance with her fiancée. This pantomime of Farber's shows just how much weight the past has on the actions of the agents in the present, as well as further establishing the divide between the upper and lower classes and the treatment the latter has received at the hands of the former.

Julie returns and begins to chatter with Jean/John, allowing Kristine/Christine to doze off at the table. When Jean/John sits, Julie decides they should drink. The act

between the two texts is very different and shows a difference in opinion for the two Julies. Jean offers Julie some beer from the icebox, which Julie accepts in defiance of the idea that the alcohol is too common for someone of her class (Strindberg 437). In Farber's script, Julie takes the initiative to pour the both of them a glass of her father's best wine (21). This change shows the difference in Julie's opinion of the lower classes; Strindberg's Julie has romanticized the lower class to a degree and wants to portray herself as willing to indulge in their customs, but Farber's Julie sees herself as better and her idea of equality is to raise the lower up. In this, Farber has highlighted just how harshly the upper, white class sees the lower, black class.

This expression of power continues in Farber's text when, after a toast, Julie requests that Jean/John kiss her foot. Strindberg's Julie takes a light-hearted approach to this request, stating that it is the only thing missing to "finish [the moment] properly" (437). Farber's Julie has a markedly different kind of agency. When it seems that John will refuse, she orders him, "Fucking. Do. It" (22). In both cases, the man acquiesces. Where Strindberg presents the moment as a flight of fancy, a whim from a romantic girl to be indulged, Farber's Julie shows no such silliness, putting steel into her order. Farber uses this moment to show that Julie knows that she has her own power and isn't afraid to exercise it, and the fact that she does so openly and aggressively is evidence of the South African white upper class being used to demanding and receiving whatever they wish.

Despite varying concepts of gender in the two cultures, Jean/John attempts to move away from Julie, worried that someone might see them. However, Jean is worried

about what everyone will think of Julie while John is worried about what everyone will think of him (Strindberg 437; Farber 22). This difference in purpose highlights just how delicate a woman's reputation was in each culture; Strindberg acknowledged the fall from grace that could occur at the hint of a rumor, while Farber focuses on the potential fallout of crossing cultural boundaries. In this way, Farber dismisses the idea of women as objects of protection simply because they are women, establishing the nature of the relationship between the sexes in modern South African culture. While there are still inequalities, Farber shows that these women are just as capable of taking care of themselves as men.

Placing an emphasis on the differences between the two agents, Jean/John does not want to be caught with Julie in the kitchen, so Julie offers that they can step outside somewhere. He balks at this idea, though for different purposes. Jean is still expressing worry about Julie's reputation, saying that people might think there is something between them if they wander around together (Strindberg 437). John is more worried about Julie's physical health. The servants outside are celebrating Freedom Day, which has left them "stupid with anger" (Farber 23). He reminds her that they don't respect her, they just need her family for a job (Farber 23), which parallels interestingly with Jean's suggestion that she has their respect to lose (Strindberg 437). This contrast between the social nature of Jean's concerns and the practical nature of John's emphasizes the harsh reality that people of different kinds are not supposed to mix in South Africa, despite the legality of their right to do so.

Having talked Julie out of her walk, Jean/John and Julie end up discussing their dreams. These dreams highlight not only the differences between the agents, but the difference between the two versions of the agents. Julie dreams of falling while Jean/John dreams of failing to succeed. However, the agency through which these dreams are delivered varies. Jean finds himself trying to climb a tree, but unable to reach the first branch, indicating that he won't be able to start his journey to success (Strindberg 437). On the other hand, John is successfully stealing eggs, only to find himself bitten by a black mamba and dying; he moves towards success, only to have it destroy him (Farber 24). These metaphors about achieving goals are evidence of the ability of each man to advance socially. In Strindberg's time, class alone was enough to prevent upward mobility. With the narratives of the "self-made man" in today's world, this is less applicable. Instead, Farber allows John's blackness (in the form of a black mamba) to prevent his attempt at success. This reveals Farber's thoughts on the impact race alone can have on one's social standing.

Farber further emphasizes the complications that race can create in the moment when Jean/John confesses his love for Julie. Julie entreats him one more time to go for a walk, but Jean/John refuses and starts to work on her father's boots. Not eager to stop talking with him, Julie asks if he's ever been in love, and he ends up admitting that he has, with her as the object of his affections. Shocked by his revelation, Julie listens as Jean/John tells how he fell in love with her. Jean mentions sneaking into her father's garden to steal apples and seeing her, wondering why he would never be allowed to play

with her (Strindberg 438). John's story begins much earlier, when Julie first came home from the hospital after being born. He saw that his mother loved her, possibly more than she had ever loved him, and he was helpless because "we love what our mothers love" (Farber 27). This is a difference in agent not because it is a different character but because Jean's and John's character differs. Jean's love is false but simple, based on the desire for something he can't have. John's love is really but far more complicated; as William Hutchings points out in his review of *Mies Julie*, John drawing his love for Julie from his mother has created a "semi-sibling rivalry," one that becomes convoluted in light of their attraction to each other (72). This love is constituent, a driving force in the acts of the agents, and Farber uses this to create an allusion to current race relations in South Africa, as black and white residents both identify as being of the (mother)land, though additional factors complicate the relationship. This is a marked contrast to Strindberg's world in which women are afforded the same respect and concern as objects.

In the course of their discussion, the two end up talking about the harsh nature of childhood, with Farber using this as yet another opportunity to highlight the difference between black and white. Strindberg's Julie seems to be unaware of the possibility that childhood could be difficult, wondering how terrible it is to be poor (438). Farber's Julie acts in a completely different manner, stating that everyone has a rough childhood and dismissing the possibility that John had it worse because of his color (28-29). This shows the lack of understanding that Julie has about the lower classes. Strindberg's Julie has romanticized childhood in general and was surprised that it could be rough, while

Farber's Julie minimizes the degree to which class and race differences impacts one's childhood. By reconstructing this moment to be primarily about race, Farber uses this moment to emphasize the difference in understanding and lived experience between white people and black people.

The conversation turns back to why Jean/John loves Julie, race adding another facet to the purpose. Jean is very aware that when it comes to Julie, he only wants what he can't have, just as John is aware that loving Julie is happening because he hates himself (Strindberg 439; Farber 30). When comparing these two men, it becomes clear that Jean has a much higher opinion of himself than John does. Given that the major social difference between the two versions is race, Farber makes a point that race is a contributing factor to who a person is.

Jean/John tries to go to bed, but Julie prevents him from leaving. She again suggests he entertain her, but Jean rejects her with a different purpose from John. Jean worries about being forced out of his job without someone to vouch for his work ethic at a new job, but John is determined to stay on the land he and his mother have always lived on (Strindberg 439; Farber 32). Both men are worried about the security of maintaining their lifestyle, but Jean is more willing to take a chance than John. The fact that Farber hangs John's expression of this wariness on his presence on a particular piece of land shows that Farber believes the connection to the land holds weight in South African culture.

Though Farber has emphasized the ways in which race impacts someone's place in the social structure, she also shows how race can not matter. Julie protests Jean/John's rejection, saying that it won't matter if the people see them. The action takes a turn at the end of the scene, with Julie and Jean/John engaging in sexual relations, a constituent element to the story. However, the exact act and purpose is dramatically changed between the two versions. Strindberg alludes to the exchange, with Jean leading Julie into his room so the celebrating servants who are approaching do not catch her in the kitchen (439). John and Julie act out of passion, with Julie slapping John and him threatening her before the sex begins (Farber 32-33). Jean treats Julie carefully throughout the scene, giving the impression he is handling her, while John expects Julie to hold her own in their confrontation. This moment could be considered a simplification of the binaries the agents are representing in each play. Jean, both in his role as man and servant, takes care of Julie, who is both master and woman. In contrast, Farber puts Julie (master, woman, and white) on roughly equal footing with John (servant, man, and black). This change shows how, despite the inequalities impressed by the cultural system, Farber understands all people of this culture to be inherently equal.

Thus begins another interlude, with different acts and agents to show the state of race relations in South Africa. Strindberg uses the approaching servants in a ballet, showing the jubilation the audience has been hearing about (439-440). This contrasts in tone from Farber's use of Christine and Ukhokho, who "sing in unearthly tones" while wandering around the kitchen (33). They also serve different purposes on behalf of the

playwrights. The celebratory pantomime provides a distraction and allows for the implication of Jean and Julie having sex offstage while still maintaining a sense of propriety. This is a constituent element of Strindberg's text, allowing the passage of real time to match that of narrative time, but it is supplementary in Farber's text since she is not beholden to the same stylistic decision. However, the presence of Christine and Ukhokho emphasizes the significance of the moment by holding the audience's attention on the stage while John and Julie are still present. Farber feels the need for the audience to see this moment, as the complicated relationship between the agents on the stage is a representation of the complicated relationship between the races in South Africa.

This complicated relationship is expanded upon when the people of the pantomime leave, and Julie and Jean/John are once again alone on the stage. They talk about the possibility of the future, especially the idea of the two of them running away to open a hotel. However, there is a difference in agent that leads to a difference in purpose. Strindberg gives the initial idea to Jean, and Julie claimed that she was willing to throw away all the good things and social standing she could have in her current life to have this future with Jean (440). Farber has Julie present the possibility, and she tries to entice John into joining her by saying they only have bad things they would be leaving behind (36). The two Julies have this differing viewpoint because of the way they were raised. Strindberg's Julie was raised to see her social class as important, which is why the positives of that are her focus when discussing things she would give up. Farber's Julie does not have that same focus, paying attention only to her personal experiences. In

ignoring what walking away from the land would mean for John in favor of what it means for her, there is a reinforcement of the selfishness of Julie and, in the metaphor Farber has built, the white people of South Africa.

The hotel plan stalls when they realize they have no money for the venture (Strindberg 440; Farber 36). Julie begins to break down and expresses regret, which Jean/John brushes off. However, her purpose for regret varies between the two sources. Strindberg's Julie regrets her lowered status, as her liaison with Jean has rendered her less of a proper woman and she will not reap any benefits from it (440-441). Farber's Julie instead has regrets when she realizes that John does not love her (39). This difference is carried further by Jean/John's response, with different agencies; Jean comments that Julie is now on his level while John questions if Julie even knows what love is (Strindberg 441; Farber 39). From this, it is clear that Farber's Julie does not feel the same lowering of status as Strindberg's Julie does, nor does John feel it holds the same weight as Jean. We can then infer that a woman's reputation does not hold the same weight in Farber's view of this culture as it did in the source text.

Farber further establishes the declining importance of a woman's reputation when Julie realizes that Jean/John will not be showing her any sympathy and she shows her anger at him and the situation. Both authors use the same sentence structure, suggesting the moment is a constituent one Farber's mind, but the different agency highlights the impact of the change. Strindberg's Julie tells Jean that "A servant is a servant," to which he fires back, "And a whore is a whore" (441). Farber chooses to start the exchange with

Julie's "A kaffir will always be a kaffir," with John responding, "And a bitch will always be a bitch" (41). This effect is twofold, one for each agent. By changing Julie's comment from class-based commentary to a racial insult, Farber is setting up a hierarchy of defining social characteristics for this culture, in which race is considered more important than socioeconomic class. In Jean/John's comment, the attack on her reputation is replaced by an attack on her personality.

As the anger of people in the kitchen rises, Jean/John exerts what power he has over Julie by bringing up his potential connection to the land. Jean does so by reminding Julie just how weak she is socially; he could hypothetically make her into a countess through marriage, but she does not have the same ability (Strindberg 442). John instead focuses on the fact that Julie might be pregnant, which would return the land she owns to the black people it was stolen from (Farber 42). As is becoming a trend, Strindberg focuses on the value of class while Farber focuses on a more racially-relevant aspect. Though Strindberg places the ability to advance someone else's social standing as an ultimate goal, Farber is more focused on the land. The return of South African lands to indigenous South Africans has been a fraught process post-apartheid, despite the historical connection of certain peoples to certain sections of land. Given the metaphor Farber has developed regarding Julie and John and their respective races, this is a way to eliminate the red tape of reparations and allow for an uncontested right to the land. As John focuses on this, it is shown that an uncontested right is one of the most important things a black person could have in regards to the land they are owed.

Complexities abound as Farber continues the discussion of the land. Though Strindberg's Julie plans an escape, seeing running as the only option (443), Farber's Julie, in a different act, breaks down further, trying to get a reaction out of John through violence before mentioning that she has no idea where she would go if she could not stay at the farm (42-45). Although Farber's Julie has demonstrated more control over herself and her situation up until this point, it is clear that Strindberg's Julie is more composed in this moment. The society she has grown up in demands that babies be born to married couples, so she sees elopement as the only safe and logical solution. Farber's Julie does not have that same strict social rule, so she does not have the same safety net of knowing what needs to be done, leaving her at loose ends. Rather than bring up the rules of society as her point of power in the argument, she brings up the land. In doing so, she mentions that if John is using ancestral burial as an argument for land ownership, she would have similar rights (Farber 45). This moment serves as an example of how complicated the restitution of land can be in South Africa. When both claimants have a long history with the land, the difficulty of making sure everyone is treated fairly increases.

Farber's metaphor with the two agents representing the different races of South Africa continues to bear through, as Jean/John continues to express his distaste at Julie's hysterics, moving from anger to a refusal to engage the way Julie wants him to. Julie decides to try new tactics to get him to stay with her, saying that he owes her. When Jean/John calls her on her claim, he does so with differing agencies. Jean calls her ways "sick" and says that the lower classes don't engage in the game of romance at all times

like she does (Strindberg 23). While he is aware of his status in a lower class, he is determined to destroy Julie's superiority by emphasizing a way in which he and his kind are better than Julie. John instead calls Julie selfish, taking advantage of the servants to tidy up her mess as they always do (Farber 47). Rather than attempting to equalize the two of them, John allows his bitterness at the inevitability of their lives to seep through. In the context of Farber's metaphor, the Europeans have had their fun, while the indigenous people are stuck dealing with the fallout in frustration.

The varying relationship between the character traits of the two continues as Julie convinces Jean/John to let her run away. However, her act between the versions is different. With Strindberg's Julie, her tactic is to stick to pleading, hoping that Jean will agree to come with her (445). She knows that unless he does, she will be in a difficult situation if she is pregnant. Farber's Julie is another story, threatening John with false accusations of rape and reminding him that if she disappears alone, he will be stuck in the same job he's been doing, meaning to force him to come with her (47-48). She does not have the same societal constraints as her predecessor, and therefore has more power in the situation. Race also plays a factor, as Jean would have the ability to walk away in a worst case scenario and John's more limited opportunities due to the color of his skin will keep him where he is. This change highlights both the comparative gender equality and the increased class/race disparity of modern South Africa.

Farber's point about issues of race conflating with and compounding those of class as used by Strindberg comes to the forefront after Julie leaves to gather some

supplies for their journey and Kristine/Christine returns to the kitchen. She reminds Jean/John that he agreed to go to church with her, but when he avoids the point, she realizes that he has done something with Julie. At this point, she gets angry, but for different purposes. Kristine mentions that had Jean slept with one of the other female servants, she would primarily be upset about his infidelity, but as it stands, she is mostly worried about what this means for Julie in the long run (Strindberg 445). Christine is more worried about how this will affect her and John, since if they are fired for his indiscretion, they have no other options (Farber 49). Strindberg uses this moment to further clarify the power of a woman's reputation, as well as the power a man can have to change that reputation: Kristine sees Julie as ruined since she has slept with a man of a lower class, but another servant would not receive the same concern because they are already of a lower class. Farber regards the impact of gender as a supplementary element and once again focuses on race and the connection that implies with the land. Without access to the land they know, John and Christine have very limited options given their race and class.

Though Jean/John gets angry at her in return, Kristine/Christine continues to express her frustration at his actions. Jean claims that it's nice to recognize the upper class is no better than the lower, prompting Kristine to refute his logic by saying that it's nice to have something to aspire to (Strindberg 445). Christine's agency is different, as her response to John's frustration at there being more in the world is that he should be grateful for what he does have (Farber 49-50). Jean/John has spent the play dreaming of a

better life (with better meaning different things for each version), but this is the first time someone has tried to downplay his possibility of achieving his dreams. Kristine sees and believes in the positives of the class structure, while Christine has accepted the inevitability of it; neither woman expresses a belief that Jean/John could rise past his current station. It is Christine's life experience driving this change, as she has seen all the ways in which John will not get opportunities, exemplifying the limited opportunities of black people in modern South Africa.

The limitations placed on black South Africans because of their race are further explored as the scene continues. Kristine/Christine steps out of the kitchen and Julie returns with some supplies, such as money and her pet bird, which she couldn't bear to leave behind. Jean/John refuses this, and he kills it. In her anger, Julie denounces Jean/John, their potential child, and her love for him, though with different agencies. Strindberg's Julie uses her father as a reason to deny Jean the escape he has agreed to (446-447). She believes that her running away to elope with a servant would cause her father great distress, which he does not deserve. Farber's Julie rejects John specifically because he is black, suggesting that he only wanted her to make sure that his children would be able to have a claim to the land (54). She reacts selfishly, lashing out in the most hurtful way possible without regard to anyone else's thoughts or feelings. It is in this moment that the connection between the two people and their respective races is most clear, as the black person is denied what they are owed simply because they are black.

This denial is also a concern with regards to the land in Farber's text. Julie is distracted from her distress with the return of Kristine/Christine, and she asks the other woman to join them in their hotel venture. Jean/John agrees with the idea, but Kristine/Christine turns them down. Kristine's purpose for this is her belief that the plan goes against God's will, as they would be seeking wealth beyond what they might have otherwise (Strindberg 448). She even quotes the Bible, mentioning the New Testament proverb about a camel passing through the eye of a needle (Strindberg 448). Christine simply refuses to leave the land she knows, the land she has a right to through her ancestors (Farber 53). In this unfamiliar situation, both women are clinging to what is familiar to them, what they place as important above all else. In this change, Farber highlights the importance of native African tribes staying on the land they are connected to, lest their right to that land be renounced should they leave.

Farber uses the next moment to get her point across that gender doesn't matter as a defining characteristic of how two people interact. Jean/John and Julie are left alone in the kitchen as Kristine/Christine goes to church. Julie's anger peaks, and this time she goes so far as to grab a weapon. The Julie of Strindberg's play grabs a razor, but Farber's Julie grabs her father's gun that she had brought as part of her supplies, only to have John pull it out of her hands and her to grab a nearby sickle in defense (Strindberg 448; Farber 54-55). As they square off, Jean undercuts Julie's confidence, saying that there is an important difference between them, "the usual difference – between a man and a woman" (Strindberg 448). John does this with different agency, saying that they are not at all

different: “Just two people in a kitchen. Fighting for our lives” (Farber 55). This moment most clearly highlights the level of impact gender has on this relationship and how different that level is in the two plays. Despite the fact that both texts have a focus on the difference between people as a constituent element, Farber makes it clear that maintaining that difference is supplementary.

Julie realizes that things are not going to happen the way she wants, so she decides to take extreme action. Jean suggests that Julie “sleep,” but Julie asks that he order her to do it (Strindberg 449). She sees herself as weak, and believes that having a man order her is the only way she will be strong enough to follow through. Farber’s Julie takes her own action, sliding the sickle into her body to prevent a pregnancy (56). As she does so, she likens her body to the land, saying that John will never be able to lay claim to it or her ever again. Not only does this reinforce Farber’s view that women are independent agents capable of autonomous actions, but the symbolic nature of the white person violently removing the black person’s ability to claim land serves as a reminder of the ways in which white people are still impeding the ability of black people to claim the land they are owed.

This impediment often comes in the form of violence, as Farber is quick to show. In her agitated state, Julie has a vision of smoke. Strindberg’s Julie says the smoke is “so warm and good” (449), but the smoke holds a different purpose for Farber’s Julie. She sees the smoke as violence, specifically the burning of various family farms (Farber 56). This difference makes sense given the context for each version. In a time before electric

heating, a fire would be the quickest way to warm someone during a cold day, so Strindberg's Julie would have positive and comforting associations with smoke. Meanwhile, as aforementioned, Farber's Julie is the product of great violence that has been perpetrated on the land for the sake of gaining it, and witnessing the effects of this violence causes her distress. In this moment of Julie's dissociation, Farber is continuing to remind the audience of the violence that is an integral part of the passing of land from black hands to white.

The value of the land becomes even more clear as Julie asks for comfort, though her agency in asking is different. The Julie of Strindberg's play wants assurance that she will go to heaven at her death and asks to be told that she is "among the very last," in response to Kristine's Biblical reference earlier (449). Like many who know their death is coming, it is little surprise that Julie is concerned with what comes after her earthly life. In contrast, Farber's Julie requests to be buried with her children on the land, though she is hallucinating that she is one of the black people who lived on the land in the past (56-57). However her brain has decided to allow this to come to pass, Julie still feels the connection to the land, one that she wishes to maintain. This contrast between concern with heavenly and earthly matters reinforces that the land holds value among the native African lineages, especially with regard to burial sites and connections to ancestors.

In his final act of the play, Jean/John faces the fact that Julie's father has arrived home. Jean ends with sending Julie out to the barn to kill herself (Strindberg 449). At no point during the play was there any real indication of a threat to his person should their

affair be found out, and he was more interested in Julie as a status symbol than as a person, so it is likely that he survived past the immediate end of the play. However, John was in love with Julie, in his way, and watched her die. In his distress, he makes the decision to kill himself as well (Farber 57). Given the number of mentions about Julie's father killing any black boy who put his hands on her, this is also a small exercise in power, as he is choosing to meet his death at his own hands instead of someone else's. This moment is a bleak one, showing how violence is still being perpetrated on the black people of South Africa even after the white people have stopped actively being violent; the situation has been created in such a way that the indigenous people have little recourse that will actually end well for them.

The play ends on the action of a woman, which Farber uses to assert that the modern culture in which she is writing must bear the consequences of the decisions of the past. Strindberg ends with Julie leaving the stage (449), but Farber changes both the act and the agent. In a final pantomime moment, Christine is on the stage cleaning up the carnage of the previous moments while Ukhokho sings in the background (57). This change is particularly striking, as Strindberg's play simply ends. It has the feeling of both a climax, as the end of the increasingly frantic nature of the action, and a denouement, as the conclusion of the drama these agents have wrought. Farber's play only has the feeling of finality, an epilogue to the text. This is Farber's moral of the tale, the reason she made the changes she has. Christine is left dealing with the consequences of the actions of

those around her. As Farber has spent much of the play discussing consequences, it makes sense that this is the lesson she wishes to impress on her audience.

### **Analysis of Changes**

Throughout these many changes, three major themes emerge. The first is that of class, race, and the relationship between the two. These social structures are integral to an understanding of culture, and Farber makes it clear that not only are class and race connected in her culture, but they compound each other. This can be seen through a comparison of Jean and John. Where Jean flaunts the rules of the house and could, hypothetically equalize himself with Julie (Strindberg 435, 444, 445), John is overly cautious and aware that he has limited options to better his life (Farber 12, 47, 49). The Julies also provide some excellent examples, as Strindberg's Julie has a romanticized notion of the lower class that she feels is within her reach (437, 438), while Farber's Julie is more assured in her superiority (21, 28). However, while Farber acknowledges this intensification, she also shows how issues of race have replaced issues of class in this culture. Julie is the primary vehicle for this in Farber's script, continually referring to John in racist terms and rejecting him for his skin color above all other reasons (41, 42, 54). John also has his moments, such as literally fighting blackness in his dreams and losing, when Jean was only fighting his lower status (Farber 24; Strindberg 437). In establishing this relationship between class and race, Farber shows how the struggle of the haves versus the have-nots is relevant across cultures, no matter what form it takes.

In a similar vein, Farber also has a lot to say about the nature of a woman. This is mostly said in counterpoint to the way Strindberg wrote about the dynamic that gender introduces, a dynamic that changes from culture to culture. Strindberg wrote for a world in which women, especially upper class women, were placed on a pedestal and meant to be protected, with special attention paid to their reputation and rumors of sexual conduct (436, 441, 445). Everything Farber writes about gender relations is in direct contrast to this idea. She makes it a point to show the ways in which women are not on the same pedestal and requiring protection anymore, such as allowing John and Julie to violently fight and threaten each other (32-33, 51). She also reveals the ways in which women are no longer ruled by their reputations, with accusations of sexual misconduct not being as effectively harmful as other attacks on a woman's character (22, 39, 41). Women are allowed to be demanding and autonomous rather than being led by others (Farber 22, 56). By incorporating these changes, Farber is making a point about how the world has changed and the narratives of the world need to change with it. In a play about class and gender differences, she has neutralized these and left race behind as a determining factor.

The third major theme, and the one which Farber purposely incorporated, is that of the land. As previously mentioned, land is a tricky subject to discuss in South Africa, a political topic that has become ingrained in the culture of the nation. This concept is not brought up at all in Strindberg's version, making its presence in Farber's that much more obvious. The land is thoroughly established as something of importance, especially to the Xhosa agents (Farber 17, 32, 53). This importance hinges on history with the land, both

in past ownership and current lack of ownership. John and Christine both want to stay on the land of their ancestors, even though they have no legal right to it (Farber 13, 36, 51). In contrast is Julie's (and in turn, the white) claim on the land. Farber demonstrates the violence with which the land was stolen through references to the past (Farber 18, 56). This is compounded by the violence with which Julie removes John's potential claim to the land by dangerously self-aborting (Farber 56). This issue of the land is a driving force behind Farber's adaptation, and the changes made to incorporate that show how themes and concepts that are essentially South African can coexist with more globally applicable themes.

Yaël Farber is known for her South African adaptations of European works, and she is likely to continue in this trend. In her own words, "I find [adaptation] very exciting because you can work within a frame that most people are aware of and work along a spine of narrative that has been established as very strong... if I shift the ending, there's a very strong statement in that, so you have to become very aware of what you're doing inside the frame of the adaptation" ("Theatre: Mies Julie"). She interweaves inherently South African themes into the works of other cultures, creating a new product that both spotlights and subverts the original, a true crossing of cultures that speaks to her desired audience. In adapting a play from a culture of the majority to that of the minority, Farber is able to bring attention to the master narratives that appear in every culture in different forms while keeping the play inherently South African.

## CHAPTER IV

### ENTERTAINMENT ADAPTATION

As previously mentioned, people like the familiar. The theatre is no different, with playwrights making use of recognizable characters and stories for their plays since the dawn of Western theatre to entertain their audiences. This trend has continued, with theatre companies producing and re-producing shows they have done before, never the same way twice but always with the same script. This love of the familiar is such that the Tony Awards even have two awards for the best revival, one each for plays and musicals. However, sometimes people get tired of the same thing over and over. They want something familiar, but with enough newness that they are still entertained. This may involve updating a known story or taking it in an entirely different direction. It may be production-based or, as will be examined here, involve a new script. These entertainment adaptations are meant to satisfy the craving for the familiar while also providing something new.

An entertainment adaptation is, simply put, an adaptation designed to entertain. They can be comedic or dramatic, sometimes moving from one to the other in the process of adapting, though they often end up comedic. This is because comedy has a history of being formulaic, which audiences often appreciate because they know exactly how certain characters will react in certain situations (Carlson 47). These adaptations will often involve changes in setting and agents to whatever the adaptor desires while still

maintaining this formula, often as the whole point of creating the adaptation. This can lead to simplistic but amusing descriptions of adaptations, such as referring to Lauren Gunderson's 2013 play *Toil & Trouble* as “*Macbeth*, but with broke millennials.” These adaptations are constructed in a way to be most appealing to their intended audience, which is their main goal. As such, a close examination of an entertainment adaptation will show what kind of things the adaptor feels are important to entertain an audience. This chapter will show the ways in which *One Man, Two Guvnors* fulfills the purpose of entertaining the play's target audience.

*The Servant of Two Masters* was written by Carlo Goldoni in 1746. It follows many of the conventions of *commedia dell'arte*, an Italian comedic style that depends on stock characters to create improvised scenes. Because improvisation is a key part of traditional *commedia* theatre, the fact that Goldoni's text was written in full precludes it from being an actual *commedia* play, but it does make use of the stock characters of the style. Despite the title, the bulk of the plot is centered on two pairs of young lovers. Clarice and Silvio are preparing to marry, to the delight of their fathers, when their plans are derailed by the arrival of Federigo, who was betrothed to Clarice until his untimely death. However, Federigo is actually his sister Beatrice in disguise, who is looking to receive Clarice's dowry and run away with her lover, Florindo, who did kill her brother. Neither Beatrice nor Florindo is aware that the other is in the same city, just as neither is aware that they have both hired Truffaldino to work for them. What follows is a series of miscommunications and mistaken identities as the two pairs of lovers try to get their

happy ending and Truffaldino tries not to get caught. In the tradition of comedies, everything works out in the end with the promise of weddings on the horizon.

Inspired by Goldoni's work, Richard Bean wrote *One Man, Two Guvnors*, which premiered in London in 2011. Though the basic plot and agents were taken from *The Servant of Two Masters*, Bean gave the humor of his version a distinctly British twist. He drew from pantomime, often called panto, which is most common in the current era in the form of Christmas plays performed all over Britain ("It's Behind You!"). This genre grew out of commedia, still featuring similar stock characters in its past years and relying on some of the same slapstick humor. However, it also developed its own flavor, exemplified in crude humor that goes over the heads of younger audience members and the encouragement of audience interaction with the story ("It's Behind You!"; Richards 171). This connection between the two comedic types allowed for a smooth adjustment of the script to accommodate the new jokes, which in turn made the show that much more enjoyable to its British audiences.

The organization of this chapter is different from previous chapters, primarily due to the way in which the play was adapted. In political and cross-cultural adaptations, the adaptors are generally conscious of the fact that they are making a point in their adaptation, so they are more likely to either maintain the supplementary events of the source text or change it to serve a purpose. In entertainment adaptations, the adaptor is more likely to be instinctively thinking about how to make their adaptation entertaining to a new audience rather than being consciously aware of the rhetorical nature of the

choices they are making. Because of this, entertainment adaptations are more likely to deviate from the structure of the source text and focus on broad plot and characterization points. This is especially prevalent in this pair of plays, as the story is based on the use of stock characters instead of a plot concept. These stock characters are often flat stereotypes, and their comedic value comes when they are put in outrageous situations; what would be shocking when it happens to a human being or even a more complex character becomes humorous when it happens to stock characters because they are so clearly not real. As such, this analysis will focus on the changes to the stock characters, from commedia types to modern day television tropes. This was chosen as a primary comparison point because while the concept of stock characters persists, the actual shape of the characters change. The website TV Tropes was chosen as a point of reference for modern stock characters because the TV sitcom is the modern form of this kind of comedy, “the continuing adventures of a small group of central characters whose essential traits never change” (Auslander qtd. in Carlson 47). This comparison of character types is followed by the analysis of moments that do not contribute to the formation of the individual agents but still contribute to the change in what is entertaining.

### **Examination of Setting Changes**

Goldoni sets his play in Venice of an unspecified year, though likely contemporary to his time of writing. This location makes sense given that not only was Goldoni a Venetian, but the ports of Venice allow for the comings and goings of several

agents. Bean abandons Venice in favor of the seaside town of Brighton in the year 1963. The change in location was agreed upon by both Bean and the play's original director, Nicholas Hytner, artistic director of the National Theatre in London. Hytner said the city felt similar to Venice, calling Brighton "a slightly seedy tourist town with lots of hotels — exactly where you'd go if you were on the run from the law in London" (qtd. in Haun). As far as the year goes, Bean originally wanted to set the play in the 1950s, but agreed with Hytner that it fit better with the "energy, colour and music of the 60s" (Hopkins 484). These atmospheric elements create an excitement in the story, one that the story will seek to maintain.

### **Examination of Agent Changes**

The title agent of Goldoni's play is Truffaldino, so named for a subtype of the Harlequin who grew out of the Zanni class, who represent the servants in general. From the moment he appears on stage, he is fulfilling his function, going after what he wants while still acting on behalf of his employer (Goldoni 3). It doesn't take long for him to find himself with two masters, which he recognizes as difficult to handle but worth it in the long run (Goldoni 17). He is not the most intelligent, though it was not unheard of for a person of a lower class to deal with his frequent issue of illiteracy (Goldoni 21, 56). Nonetheless, he is driven by his baser instincts, such as a scene in which Truffaldino is distracted from serving his masters dinner simultaneously by his efforts to keep some food for himself (Goldoni 46). Once his hunger is satisfied, Truffaldino seeks to slake his lust in the form of a marriage between himself and Smeraldina, the maid who has been

flirting with him when they meet (Goldoni 55). He also has a tendency to blame the things that go wrong in his life on Pasquale, an imagined friend who gets himself in trouble only to have Truffaldino bail him out like a good friend (Goldoni 73). The Truffaldino of Goldoni's text fits the concept of the Truffaldino stock character well, being "crafty, false, and boastful" while still maintaining his position as a loyal and effective servant (Duchartre 157).

A similar position is held by Francis Henshall in Bean's play. Like his commedia counterpart, Francis is not a particularly nice person. He takes the part of the Unsympathetic Comedy Protagonist, a character who would be generally unlikeable except in their specific context (TV Tropes, "Unsympathetic"). He is manipulative and lies to his second employer within minutes of meeting him, just to get the job (Bean 18). He also concocts improbable lies to get out of telling his employers why he has opened their mail (Bean 22, 24). However, he is not quite as clever as Truffaldino, as seen in the scene where he gets into a slapping fight with himself over whether or not he can pull off his scheme (Bean 19). He also complains more to the audience about the circumstances he is dealing with, to the point that he even calls out to the audience for the possibility of some food, and the audience responds by offering a sandwich (Bean 23). Francis is cruder than Truffaldino, expressing his desire for Dolly not by offering marriage or even a proper date, but "a leg-over in Majorca" (Bean 48). In the end, when Francis's lies begin catching up with him, he does not explain how he was trying to be a good friend, but makes his invented friend Paddy take all the blame instead (Bean 54-55). All these

changes make him less desirable to the audience, but the audience is still clearly supposed to root for him. However, these changes are because he is influenced by panto, especially his crudeness and interactions with the audience. Bean has implemented this characterization so that audiences will respond positively to this familiar style of humor.

One of Truffaldino's masters is Florindo, on the run after killing Federigo Rasponi in a duel. He is one of the *Innamorati*, one of the lovers that drives the romantic plot of the story. In his first scene, he expresses a desire to return to his love as soon as he finds out he may not be in legal trouble (Goldoni 20). The only reason he does not is because he inadvertently intercepts a letter, via Truffaldino, which is addressed to her that reveals she is no longer in their hometown of Turin (Goldoni 23). He is also a proud man, getting angry at Truffaldino when he sees him being beaten by Beatrice, who is dressed as Federigo. As a punishment for allowing himself to be hit and disrespecting his master in that way, Florindo proceeds to hit Truffaldino as well (Goldoni 59). Despite this moment of pride, he is not too proud to be devastated when he hears the false news of Beatrice's death; he goes so far as to try to kill himself, only to be stopped when he sees Beatrice attempting the same thing (Goldoni 70). It is through this level of devotion that he fits the part of the *Innamorati*, who are meant to portray the state of being in love rather than a specific agent (Duchartre 286). This is a constituent element, as in a theatrical style built on generally one-dimensional characters, in love is all he needs to be.

Florindo's equivalent in Bean's script, Stanley, loves his significant other, but also carries a few extra traits. Where Florindo is generally an honorable man, if a bit

proud, Stanley is rougher around the edges, which contributes to his status as a Jerk with a Heart of Gold (TV Tropes, “Jerk”). Before even meeting him, the audience is told that he owns a nightclub whose clientele include “criminals, gangsters, [and] Princess Margaret” (Bean 14), setting him up as a tough guy. Upon hearing that the man he has killed, Roscoe, may not be as dead as he thought, Stanley’s first instinct is also to return home to his girlfriend Rachel to be with her; however, he rethinks this idea and decides to stay in Brighton to follow through on the plan that will keep him safe, showing a greater instinct towards self-preservation (Bean 21). Stanley also fails to understand things like the privacy of letters and tends towards the offensive when discussing things like lesbianism (Bean 22-23). He also has a pronounced violent streak, threatening Francis with things like never being able to “wrestle the dolphin again” or mentioning that he enjoys pain in a moment of innuendo (Bean 22, 29). This combines with his chivalrous streak during the scene in which he beats Francis after seeing him beaten by Rachel, a parallel of the scene in which Florindo beats Truffaldino. When questioned about it, Francis said he was first attacked because he kissed another man’s girlfriend, which Stanley agrees is a fair reason to be attacked and probably deserves further injury (Bean 47). Rather than hurting his servant out of his own pride, Stanley is defending the pride of some other man. He continues to show his softer side after reuniting with Rachel, including trying to play matchmaker between Francis and Dolly under the assumption

that Dolly has been tricked into going on holiday with the horrible Paddy (Bean 58).<sup>3</sup> All this taken as one places Stanley within the realm of Jerk with a Heart of Gold, a character who comes across poorly at first only to reveal their sweet side as the story continues (TV Tropes, “Jerk”). This pairs well with Florindo’s somewhat brash lover role, turning him into a new type of stock character that the audience does not have to consider too heavily to understand. Bean’s decision to broaden the one-dimensional lover into a bad boy type makes him more entertaining to the audience not only as a more complicated agent, but as one they know.

Truffaldino’s other master is Beatrice, the member of the Innamorati who is Florindo’s beloved. She spends the play dressed as her recently deceased brother Federigo in an attempt to gather some money from Pantalone in the form of a dowry for his daughter, who was promised to Federigo (Goldoni 11). Though she is determined to stay her course and achieve her goal, she also decides to enjoy her time in disguise (Goldoni 10). This includes telling her false betrothed, Clarice, the truth to get her on her side, as well as dueling Silvio, Clarice’s love, when he threatens Clarice’s father (Goldoni 30, 36). When she receives the fake news that Florindo has died, Beatrice is just as devastated as Florindo was upon hearing the same (Goldoni 70). Their reunification results in a sharing of stories that led them to that point, followed by a reconciliation with the families whose lives they nearly ruined (Goldoni 71-72, 80). Despite the additional

---

<sup>3</sup> Florindo has a moment similar to this when asking Pantalone for Smeraldina’s hand in marriage on behalf of Truffaldino (Goldoni 94). However, he treats it more as a business transaction than out of any care for Dolly not ending up with a reprehensible man like Paddy.

facets of her characterization, Beatrice is primarily driven by her love for Florindo, marking her as one of the young lovers of the *Innamorati* (Duchartre 271).

Rachel, Beatrice's parallel, is not particularly different from the source text. She interrupts an engagement party for Pauline and Alan and proceeds to cause lighthearted trouble dressed as her brother Roscoe (Bean 13). She also opts to get Pauline on her side and holds a knife to Alan's throat (Bean 27, 42). She takes the news of Stanley's death poorly and is ecstatic to find him again, though their discussion of their time apart is contains much more flowery language<sup>4</sup> than in the source text (Bean 53). However, there is a slight difference in that there is an emphasis on Rachel's crossdressing that wasn't present in Goldoni's text. There are a handful of pointed jokes along these lines, including two drawn-out instances wherein Rachel has to explain the difference between identical and fraternal twins and why she can't be her brother's identical twin (Bean 51, 57). This attention to the crossdressing, part of a long tradition on the stage, classifies Rachel as a Sweet Polly Oliver in contemporary tropes, a female who dresses as a male as a means to an end, as opposed to one who prefers dressing that way all the time (TV Tropes, "Sweet Polly"). Though this thesis is focused on the changes made in creating an adaptation, a categorical lack of change is also worth noting. It seems that Bean believes cross-dressing to be entertaining enough on its own merit that he felt no need to make a drastic change.

---

<sup>4</sup> This is both literal and figurative, as the sappy pair discusses their emotions in an extended metaphor centered around "a floral clock in the middle of winter."

The other female *Innamorati* is Clarice. She is the daughter of Pantalone who is the subject of an arranged marriage to Federigo. Though she loves her new intended, Silvio, she is also subservient to her father in his decision to follow through on his initial marriage contract for her (Goldoni 27). However, she makes it clear that she is not above manipulating circumstances for her own gain, as she does when she indirectly threatens to tell Beatrice's secret before she even knows it (Goldoni 29). Clarice also makes Silvio beg for her forgiveness after he speaks cruelly about her for keeping Beatrice's secret (Goldoni 78-79). Nonetheless, when Silvio expresses the slightest interest in someone other than her, she lets her possessive side come out (Goldoni 81). These traits fit well for an *Innamorati*, especially the subtype sometimes called the *Isabella*. She is "a flirtatious young miss" with a quick mind and the ability to bend those around her to her will (Duchartre 276). As a young woman in love and willing to do what it takes to keep that love, Clarice fits well.

The most noticeable difference between Clarice and her equivalent Pauline is intelligence, a supplementary element which becomes her defining trait. From the outset, she expresses an inability to understand things like metaphors and foreign languages (Bean 8-9). She also seems to be slightly aware of her intelligence, as she tells her father at one point, "Five years ago I was young and stupid... I'm a lot older now," with little mention of getting smarter in that time (Bean 26). She is also more willful than her counterpart, refusing her father's plan because she wants to marry someone she loves (Bean 25). However, when her boyfriend Alan is apologizing to her, she has a moment of

toying with him similar to Clarice, though this moment is marred by her lack of understanding some of the words he uses (Bean 57). She is also a bit kinder, eager for everyone to get a happy ending if possible (Bean 58). All this put together casts her in the role of the The Ditz, who is known to be stupid but sweet (TV Tropes, “Ditz”). This character type is used in many comedic works, and therefore has widespread recognizability among audiences. Many of the jokes around this type of character involve inviting the audience to laugh at her lack of intelligence, which they usually do, either with genuine amusement or as part of a mob mentality that has individuals laughing at something because everyone else is laughing. As audiences are unlikely to find a love interest amusing simply because they are a love interest, this additional layer to the agent provides something for the audience to find entertaining.

Clarice’s lover in Goldoni’s text is known as Silvio. This is a classic name intended to denote one of the *Innamorati* (Duchartre 286). Silvio fulfills this role through his clear attraction and connection to Clarice. When a challenger to his marriage surfaces, he proclaims that he would rather die than lose her, and identifies himself as Clarice’s future husband (Goldoni 8, 9). He expresses a clear willingness to fight for her, calling the challenger’s honor into question and attacking Pantalone for going back on his promise (Goldoni 10, 18, 36). While he is enamored of his beloved, he does have some of his own pride. He explicitly tells the audience that he “will never suffer the presence of a rival,” though that too seems to be motivated by love, as he simply does not want to share Clarice’s affections (Goldoni 18). He loses that pride when he fears that Clarice will not

forgive him, flattering her as she calls him names until she grants him her pardon (Goldoni 79). Like the previous lovers mentioned, Silvio fulfills the *Innamorati* role of being in love, though he more than the others leans on the descriptor of “just a trifle ridiculous” (Duchartre 286). He is willing to go over the top in defense of his love.

The parallel to Silvio is known as Alan, a name he chose for himself since there was already an Orlando Dangle in the Actors’ Equity Association (Bean 21). Though his primary function is still as a love interest, Bean has once again decided this is too one-dimensional for modern audiences and fashioned him as a Large Ham, an exaggeratedly dramatic agent expanding on Silvio’s own expressive nature (TV Tropes, “Large Ham”). This often results in announcements that amplify Silvio’s already-dramatic proclamations of love. Where Silvio would rather die than give up Clarice, Alan requires the slaughter of nations (Bean 13); where Silvio says he will fight for his love, Alan calls himself a storm (Bean 13). When Alan goes to fight for his beloved, he does not question his rival’s honor, but outright calls him a dog (Bean 19). He even attacks the audience at supposed slights to Pauline’s honor; when she shows the worst of her Ditz side, Alan, in anticipation of audience laughter, defends her as “pure, innocent, unsoiled by education, like a new bucket,” a defense that gets more aggressive at the end of the show (Bean 9, 58). However, this over-the-top nature seems to come a bit more from his own pride and self-concern rather than purely from love of Pauline. Though Silvio identifies himself as Clarice’s future husband in the face of adversity, Alan calls himself the “nemesis” of Pauline’s original intended (Bean 13). This statement is still based on Pauline, yet leaves

her out entirely. This self-centeredness comes through again when he goes to fight said intended; he seems less concerned with losing the girl herself and more with losing the “beautiful dream” she represents (Bean 19). He does show some humility in begging Pauline’s forgiveness, but given that he is an actor by trade and both his father and father-in-law are commenting on his performance, it is anyone’s guess how much was sincere (Bean 56). With his over-the-top pronouncements and grandiose actions, Alan embodies the Large Ham (TV Tropes, “Large Ham”). As with Clarice, the audience often finds themselves laughing at him for his very nature, though it is more likely to be due to a genuine enjoyment. This characteristic gives the audience something to latch onto as amusing as it presents itself in conjunction with his love for Clarice.

Silvio’s father is Doctor Lombardi. In fitting with his occupation-defined stock character of *Il Dottore*, he is an intelligent man. He has doubts about Truffaldino’s intentions from the moment he meets him, believing Truffaldino to be much more intelligent than he acts (Goldoni 4). When trying to convince Pantalone to honor Silvio’s claim on Clarice, he insists that he will be able to talk him around using reason alone (Goldoni 32). Lombardi does act as a spectator when Clarice and Silvio reconcile, but for the most part, he is removed from the action (Goldoni 78-79). He also has a tendency to incorporate Latin into his everyday speech, showcasing his intelligence in an obnoxious manner (Goldoni 9, 34, 35). This trait, combined with his aforementioned profession, define him in the role of *Il Dottore* (Duchartre 196). As *Il Dottore*, he fulfills his actions

of conspiring with Pantalone on behalf of their children (Duchartre 197). He is a stock character who serves solely to drive the plot rather than be an individual agent of action.

Like his commedia counterpart, Harry Dangle is also fond of using foreign phrases in common speech (Bean 8, 9, 41). Unlike his counterpart Doctor Lombardi, Dangle is a lawyer, specifically the lawyer of Charlie the Duck, Pauline's father. He also has doubts about Francis, but where Lombardi thought Truffaldino was a manipulator, Dangle just thinks Francis is an idiot (Bean 11). He also uses his intelligence differently, trying to confuse Charlie with large words instead of logic (Bean 40-41). Dangle is mostly on the sidelines of the story, stepping back in at the end to cheer on Alan's apologies and offer his services as an attorney to Stanley and Rachel (Bean 56-58). It is his glee at the prospect of getting paid for another court case that cements his status as an Amoral Attorney, one who puts their ethical beliefs aside in favor of their own benefit (TV Tropes, "Amoral"). Not only does he not particularly care about whether his clients are innocent or guilty (Bean 8, 58), he is also not above trying to use his legal knowledge to manipulate others, as seen in his confrontation with Charlie. Though it would be logical to assume that a pair of character types named after professions would have their professions be constituent elements, Bean's changes to the profession prove that they are supplementary, with the change to the agent occurring due to the fallout from the changing profession. This is likely a plot-driven decision, as a lawyer would be more help at resolving the issue of murder charges than a doctor. As such, another loose end is tied up, leaving the audience with a feeling of satisfaction rather than frustration.

The other father involved in this tale is Pantalone, Clarice's father. He is determined to get his daughter married to whoever she is supposed to be married to, which is a complicated question given the overlapping promises he's made. Bound as he is by his honor, Pantalone is willing to hand his daughter over to "Federigo" when she first arrives, lest he be accused of not keeping his word (Goldoni 9). That does not stop him from being flustered at having to tell Doctor Lombardi that he has ultimately decided to uphold this deal and deny Silvio the chance to marry Clarice (Goldoni 33). Once his honor is called into question, Pantalone lashes out, stating that Federigo is worth much more money than Silvio, which is a good reason to carry on with his plan (Goldoni 35). He then cowers in the face of a sword drawn by Silvio, trying to get away until Beatrice comes to his aid (Goldoni 36). Throughout the play, he takes advantage of small opportunities, like someone else paying for lunch or eavesdropping on Beatrice, just to make things go his way without compromising his integrity (Goldoni 45, 67). Though the Pantalone as a stock character was initially known as greedy, the Pantalone in this play fits the later version, a father who is "extremely particular about his word of honour" (Riccoboni qtd. in Duchartre 185). More importantly to his type is that he is the one being swindled out of his money (Duchartre 181). This hallmark of this stock character is the result of Beatrice and her plan to collect from him under false pretenses.

In the place of Pantalone, Bean has given his audience the semi-retired mobster Charlie the Duck. In many ways, Charlie is The Patriarch, including his overprotective streak and his willingness to get his hands dirty (TV Tropes, "Patriarch"). He is a

stubborn man who wants what is best for his daughter, which is why he initially tells Rachel that she has arrived too late to claim Pauline's hand (Bean 13). However, once Pauline has expressed a desire to marry Rachel-as-Roscoe, he refuses to apologize to the Dangles for the confusion and says they should get over it (Bean 41). This gets him threatened with a knife by Alan, not that he is phased in the least; he goes so far as to goad Alan into attacking him (Bean 41). He bows to his daughter's whims, buying lunch for Rachel when she is his daughter's intended and getting Alan back on board with marrying Pauline when Rachel's secret comes out (Bean 31, 51). However, The Patriarch is primarily a dramatic character, which means his placement in a comedic work puts a twist on what is known. Though he has his moments of more intentional comedy, Charlie functions often as a straight man, used here in the sense of duo comedy. He reacts to the events as they unfold on stage without trying to make things more complicated. As a "normal" agent in a madcap story, his presence serves to highlight the absurdity of the show, making it all that more enjoyable to the audience.

The primary employee in Pantalone's household is Smeraldina, who works as Clarice's maid. Both her name and her job cast her in the stock character of the Columbina, the sassy and flirtatious maid (Duchatre 278, 284). Aside from a brief moment of flirtation with Truffaldino in the first scene and opening the door when Beatrice arrives to meet with Clarice, Smeraldina does not appear in the first half of the play (Goldoni 3-4, 28). When she does join the action, she does so to reprimand Silvio about his accusations towards Clarice, saying that men are far more likely than women to

lie and cheat (Goldoni 39). She soon after has another encounter with Truffaldino, proclaiming her status as a virgin while he asks what he would have to do to marry her and change that (Goldoni 52-55). She agrees fairly easily, saying that she is willing to marry him if her employers will allow it (Goldoni 55). Though she is generally amenable to what she is told to do, she also has a bold streak, such as opening a note from Clarice because she wants to know the gossip (Goldoni 56). She also doesn't hesitate to throw Truffaldino under the bus when it looks like she might get in trouble for opening the letter (Goldoni 57). This is another way in which she fits the Columbina stock character, as she uses her wits to get out of trouble with little difficulty (Duchartre 278). In the final scene, Smeraldina requests that Clarice speak up for her right to marry Truffaldino, fulfilling the final major trait of a Columbina as the Harlequin's lover (Goldoni 82; Duchartre 284). Of the agents in Goldoni's play, Smeraldina is one of the ones who most closely fits the ideal of her stock character.

Smeraldina in Bean's play is represented by Dolly, Charlie's bookkeeper (11). Like Smeraldina, Dolly appears very little in the first half of the play, though her flirtation with Francis is more blatant (Bean 11). When she returns in the second act to yell at Alan, her emphasis is on feminism and the rising power of women in society (Bean 43). She continues flirting with Francis when she goes to pass along a letter from Pauline, but like Francis's flirting, her expression of interest is downright lewd. It is also somewhat negative, as seen in this aside to the audience about Francis: "Calling a woman 'gorgeous' is patronizing and chauvinist, obviously, but since I fancy him rotten, and I

haven't had a proper workout for a while, I'll forgive him" (Bean 44). When Francis offers a weekend away, she puts him off, saying that she doubts he can afford it (Bean 46). She is also protective of those she cares about, telling Francis that he can't open the letter from Pauline and taking the fall for Francis when he does it anyway, mostly because she knows saying she did it for Pauline's sake will keep her out of trouble (Bean 46). As the story draws to a close, she does not ask for permission to see Francis, but expresses a desire to be "in a hot bath with a firefighter" (Bean 56). Nonetheless, she does agree to spending two weeks in Majorca with Francis once she finds out he's gotten the tickets (Bean 60). Dolly embodies the trope of Girl Friday, a source of competent assistance as well as snark and sexuality (TV Tropes, "Girl Friday"). This is very similar to the Columбина, but updated for the new setting to be more relatable. Bean has opted ease the suspension of disbelief, making it easier for the audience to stay in the moment and enjoy the play.

The final named agent is Brighella, though that name does not fit his character type. He runs the local inn and is an old friend of Pantalone, even having called on the man to be a witness at his wedding (Goldoni 1). Brighella is a sycophant in this tale, telling Pantalone that he is pleased to serve him (Goldoni 3). Though he is one of the only ones who knows Beatrice's secret, he is absent from most of the play, only stopping in during the dinner scene between the first scene and the final ones (Goldoni 42-43). He is a witness to the reunion of Florindo and Beatrice, congratulating them on their happiness and reminding him of what services he can offer (Goldoni 72). When Beatrice's secret

comes out, he tries to soothe Pantalone's wounded pride by saying that anyone could have been tricked the same way (Goldoni 80). This does not fit the Brighella stock character as it is traditionally known. Originally, Brighella was an opportunist, prepared to do what he had to do, including commit a crime, for a bit of money (Duchartre 161). However, he does fit among the Brighellas as they were written during Goldoni's time, when they were "scarcely more than lackeys" (Duchartre 164). This is blatant character decay, a shame in a play that would be interesting with an opportunistic agent.

Lloyd takes the place of Brighella in Bean's play. Interestingly, Lloyd is a criminal, as he states several times in the first scene that he spent some time in Brixton Prison, where he met Charlie (Bean 9). Possibly because of this different backstory, he is less willing to bend to Charlie's whims (Bean 10). Lloyd does have the same appearance schedule as Brighella, and he is also willing to do a lot for Rachel. However, this readiness is because, in his own words multiple times over the course of the play, "[Rachel's] like a daughter to me" (Bean 15, 52, 57). This combination of tough guy and caring father figure paints Lloyd as a Bruiser with a Soft Center (TV Tropes, "Bruiser"). By changing the agent from a slightly unpleasant, one-note type to a kindly contradiction of a character, Bean is once again showing that agents with layers are more entertaining to audiences than those that are static.

There are a few more agents in the form of various service staff. As Florindo and Beatrice each arrive at Brighella's inn, they engage the help of a porter to carry their trunks (Goldoni 13-14, 24). He is beleaguered and underpaid for his troubles, which has

left him annoyed and abrasive. There is also a pair of waiters who help Truffaldino with the meal scene (Goldoni 45-51). Only one waiter speaks, and he spends much of his time being confused with and exasperated by Truffaldino. The waiters reappear later to help Truffaldino with his masters' trunks, and the one waiter expresses his astonishment at Truffaldino's ability to serve two separate masters as well as his disbelief in Truffaldino's good intentions for working for two people (Goldoni 60-61). These servants represent the general Zanni, the servants of a commedia play. Their personalities run the gamut, which is how more specialized servant types like Harlequin came to be (Wilson and Goldfarb 137). As Goldoni used specific role types as names in this text but these servants are unnamed, they do not have specific stock characters related to them.

Bean gives these generic characters personalities and even some backstory in order to make them more appealing to the audience. A driver takes the place of the porter in Bean's script, though he has the same complaints and personality (Bean 17). The true change comes with the waiters, named Gareth and Alfie. Gareth is somewhat condescending towards Francis, not believing that he has the credentials he claimed (Bean 33). However, that doesn't stop Gareth from agreeing to Francis's offer of one pound as a tip (Bean 30). Gareth fits the general profile of a Servile Snarker, throwing sarcasm at Francis who is playing the part of his employer, even if only for a few dollars (TV Tropes, "Servile"). He also introduces the other waiter, Alfie, an old soldier with a pacemaker and a hearing problem (Bean 29). Alfie is new to the job, and his disabilities prevent him from keeping up with the fast and confusing pace caused by Francis's

complications. However, he keeps going, turning up his pacemaker past the recommended setting (Bean 37). He later helped Francis with his quest to bed Dolly by delivering messages at strategic times (Bean 54, 59). The closest trope that fits Alfie is that of the Perilous Old Fool; he is a former soldier who is still active despite his injuries, though he is adamant that he will not return to war (TV Tropes, “Perilous”; Bean 29). However, he does continue to do things that result in further injury to himself, such as passing out from an overloaded pacemaker or getting hit by Stanley (Bean 37, 60). Though their existence is a constituent element, as the play needs the extra hands, the exact use of these side characters proves to be a supplementary element.

### **Examination of Content Changes**

Having covered the various agents of the plays, there are a few additional moments of note that exemplify the difference in what qualifies as entertainment between the two authors. The first comes with a suggestive joke during Beatrice/Rachel’s initial claim over Clarice/Pauline. Silvio/Alan challenges Beatrice/Rachel, and her response is a slightly different act. Beatrice insists that she is willing to marry Clarice regardless of any other promises, making it sound as though she will stake a claim once and for all (Goldoni 10). Rachel is more flexible, offering Alan the chance to carry on an affair with Pauline after the wedding as long as they are quiet about it (Bean 13). This is partially a function of the setting, as while affairs happened in the eighteenth century, they were not something to be discussed openly as part of a marriage negotiation. It also shows some of the influence of pantomime, as subtly inappropriate commentary is part of the genre (“It’s

Behind You!”). With the inclusion of such a comment, Bean is showing his belief that audiences enjoy this bawdy humor.

When Clarice/Pauline is upset at being denied the chance to marry her love, she tells her father that he can't force her into the old arrangement he had planned. However, her agency in expressing this is different between the two texts, resulting in a moment of comedic phrasing. Clarice says that she would rather marry the local hangman before storming out of the room (Goldoni 10). Pauline, on the other hand, tells her father that he can't make her marry someone else (Bean 14). This difference comes down to different expectations on women in each time. A woman of the mid-eighteenth century or before was expected to get married, and Clarice provides the best refusal she can for her situation. Pauline does not have that same expectation, so she is free to blurt out, “It's 1963 Dad! You can't force me to marry a dead homosexual!” (Bean 14). This is a reference to rumors previously mentioned in the story about Roscoe's sexuality, rumors that Rachel may have inadvertently confirmed with her offer to let Pauline have affairs as discussed in the previous paragraph. This facet of Roscoe was conceived by Bean to explain why Pauline was contracted into an arranged marriage in the first place: to help Roscoe keep up appearances (Hopkins 485). However, this change turns sexuality into a punchline, which is evidence of what kind of humor Bean is catering to. More than that, it is a line with some shock value, as it is not a sentence one hears every day. In this instance, Bean is depending on words more than physical comedy to entertain and amuse the audience.

After Brighella/Lloyd catches wind of Beatrice/Rachel's secret, she confesses as to why she is dressed as her brother, and the explanation in each text must match the expectations of the audience. Beatrice is worried about the potential reaction of a young woman travelling alone; if she were found out, she fears that Pantalone would try to take care of her and prevent her from meeting up with Florindo again (Goldoni 12). The element of crossdressing is constituent to the text, which means Rachel must have a different purpose: hiding from the police as a person of interest in her brother's murder (Bean 15). The change itself is not amusing or entertaining in anyway, but it still serves to establish a principle in Bean's philosophy of entertainment. This is a setting-driven change in purpose, as Rachel would not have the same concerns thrust upon her as Beatrice does. It is a change that is integral to the plot, providing Rachel with a time-period legitimate reason to be in disguise as she is. Though there is a suspension of disbelief for many parts of these plays, Bean is careful not to push it too far lest the audience begin to question the play's circumstances and lose sight of their enjoyment.

The clothes are brought up again during the semi-secret meeting between Clarice/Pauline and Beatrice/Rachel. Clarice mentions that it is odd that Beatrice is dressed as a man, for which Beatrice offers no explanation (Goldoni 30-31). In a different act, Pauline speculates that the wearing of her brother's clothes might be an act of mourning, odd though it may be (Bean 27). It is an unexpectedly touching moment in the play, quickly ruined by the return of Charlie. The agents show sides not otherwise seen, humanizing them to the audience. While this moment does not contribute to either of

them as character types, it does serve to give them dimensions beyond their character types, which allows the audience to connect with them better and enjoy them more easily.

Bean also makes changes to establish the pacing of the show. When Lombardi/Dangle and Pantalone/Charlie have their confrontation over who has the right to marry Clarice/Pauline, the acts of the interaction vary slightly. Lombardi and Pantalone have a series of rapid back-and-forth exchanges, with Pantalone trying and failing to interrupt. Eventually, Lombardi decides to let him speak, only to cut him off again (Goldoni 33-34). This kind of interplay allows both actors their space to go over the top in their performance. The scene plays out similarly in Bean's script, though Charlie never gets a word in edgewise (41). He is instead relegated to asking for clarification at the end of Dangle's speech and never gets to speak his piece. In making this change, Bean advances the story more quickly and keeps the dialogue at a fast pace. This implies that Bean believes his audience needs that fast pace, otherwise they might risk getting bored and stop paying attention.

In most narratives, the order in which the scenes are presented greatly impacts the course of the story. However, Bean proves that this is not always the case by switching two scenes in order to capitalize on the potential for humor and energy. In Goldoni's text, the scene in which the Lombardis confront Pantalone takes place before the scene with Truffaldino serving dinner to each of his masters while trying to gather enough food for himself. In Bean's script, the dinner comes before the confrontation. This is one change which has been discussed on record by the original production team of *One Man, Two*

*Guvvners*. Nicholas Hytner, the director, explained that the scenes were switched because of where they wanted to put the intermission (Haun). Bean further expanded that he liked the idea of coming back from intermission to see Alan attempting to be threatening with a department store knife (Hopkins 485). As Goldoni wrote with three acts and Bean wrote with two, this is a logical thing to consider. Specifically, this switch allowed the intermission to directly follow the dinner scene without making the first act too long in comparison to the second act. This serves both the practical purpose of allowing the crew time to clean the stage from the inevitable mess and the entertainment purpose of allowing the audience to head into intermission on an excited note.

This high energy is maintained moving into the dinner scene, where Truffaldino's act of ordering food differs greatly from that of Francis. Truffaldino has a full conversation with Brighella, elaborating on which dishes will be served at which points in the meal (Goldoni 42-43). Francis is a lot snappier; when asked what kind of food he wanted, his response was "Can I have a lot of hot food, and, you know, just keep it coming" (Bean 31). This changes the pacing of the scene. Goldoni allowed the agents to carry on, likely to give enough room for improvisation and/or moments of physical comedy, as are common in commedia. As mentioned when discussing pacing earlier, Bean opted to keep a fast pace, letting the action keep moving and keeping the audience engaged and entertained as the action is what carries the show.

There was also another a major change to the dinner scene, which is the inclusion of an entirely new agent on the stage in Bean's work in an attempt to connect with the

audience further. Goldoni allows Truffaldino to suffer alone, with only occasional help from the two waiters popping in and out (45-51). Francis decides that Gareth and Alfie are not enough help, so he asks the audience for help. He engages a plant, a cast member placed in the audience and referred to in the script as Christine Patterson, to hide some of his stolen food under her seat (Bean 34). Eventually, he pulls Christine on stage to help him steal food, hiding her and his food in various places on stage as other agents enter and exit until he nearly sets her on fire (Bean 35-39). Even the act of speaking to the audience has them paying more attention, so the incorporation of one of their own has the audience invested in and entertained by the events on stage.

In a similar vein of audience interactions, Francis directly addresses the audience to hold their attention after he returns to the stage following the dinner scene (Bean 43). Though Truffaldino briefly addresses the audience throughout Goldoni's text, he does not have a short soliloquy like Francis does at this point. Beyond the awareness of the audience, Francis is also aware that he is not only in a play, but in a commedia play (Bean 43). The referential nature of his comment creates an in-joke for the audience, one that the other agents in the play would not be aware of. In doing so, Bean is further establishing a connection with the audience, drawing them in in the hopes that they will be more entertained if they are part of the story.

Even in more hypothetically serious moments, Bean finds a way to incorporate humor in the words of his agents. The next major difference comes when Florindo/Stanley is under the impression that his lover is dead. He has come across a

picture in Truffaldino/Francis's possession that he should not have, so he begins to question the man (Goldoni 63; Bean 49). The agency in this questioning is very different between the two versions of the scene. Florindo and Truffaldino have a back and forth, firing short sentences at each other in a rapid-fire fashion (Goldoni 63-64). Stanley and Francis use longer statements and questions, but they are marked by a hefty amount of alliteration, including such phrases as, "He was diagnosed with diarrhea but died of diabetes" (Bean 49). The letter D dominates this discussion, and it isn't until Stanley realizes that Rachel might be dead that the alliteration train breaks. Bean relies heavily on wordplay in this scene, even repeating parts of the conversation later in the show (60). Therefore, it can be implied that Bean finds this kind of humor entertaining.

Following this is a series of revelations, as Pantalone/Charlie and Truffaldino/Francis find out the truth about Beatrice/Rachel's disguise and Pantalone/Charlie goes off to spread the word. In Goldoni's version, the audience sees Pantalone meeting with Lombardi and Silvio to tell them the good news: Clarice is free to marry Silvio (68-69). This scene has no equivalent in Bean's script, having been cut entirely and simply assumed to have happened; though the action within the scene is constituent, the scene itself is supplementary. There is little importance to showing this scene, as it can be easily implied from both Charlie's comments and Alan's pleading with Pauline in the final scene that Alan has been told the truth. Bean cut the scene to keep the pace of the play moving quickly, entertaining the audience by not boring them with repetitive information.

This scene also sees the return of Alfie in Bean's version for some slightly inappropriate humor, an inclusion that does not happen in Goldoni's. Francis has conscripted Alfie into helping him woo Dolly, and part of that involves Alfie delivering a vacation brochure to her. When Alfie asks how he might recognize Dolly, Francis uses his hands to mimic large breasts (Bean 54). Entirely missing the point, Alfie replies, "What? She's got arthritic hands?" (Bean 54). This is an example of pantomime, both in the sense of miming an item and the crude humor of British panto. Bean believes his audience will enjoy this humor, which is why he added an agent to the scene to allow it to happen.

In the final scene, all secrets have been revealed except for Truffaldino/Francis and the ruse he has constructed using his imaginary friend, Pasquale/Paddy, a source of regional humor for Bean. This somewhat gets in the way of his final attempt to win Smeraldina/Dolly's hand. In Goldoni's text, Florindo and Clarice each try to convince Pantalone to marry Smeraldina off to a specific servant, not realizing that they are both referring to Truffaldino (84-85). However, Francis has more actively incorporated Paddy into his ruse, enabling him to pull out a shoddy Irish act for a moment in an attempt to throw everyone off (Bean 59). Though this change in act was motivated by the change in setting, since a man arranging a marriage for his female employee is not believable in 1963 Brighton, Bean does take advantage of this moment to slip more appropriate comedy into place. Francis as Paddy puts on an Irish accent, adding the regional humor in true panto fashion ("It's Behind You!"). He banks on the fact that his original London

audience will find this joke entertaining, though by coupling it with the double identity gag, it remains amusing to those outside the region.

### **Analysis of Changes**

Much of the entertainment value of Bean's work relies on his sense of humor. The distinctly British humor of panto comes out often, especially in the form of off-color remarks. These are sprinkled throughout the play and often sexual. This includes blatant expressions of sexual interest in casual moments when they may not be expected, especially in the case of Francis and Dolly (Bean 48, 56). Visual gags are employed as well, sometimes coupled with misunderstanding to enhance the moment, as with Alfie's mistaking of large breasts for arthritic hands (Bean 54). Not all of the jokes of this flavor are sexual; there are repeated references to Dangle as the guy who "got the Mau Mau off," making light of a violent Kenyan uprising of the 1950s (Bean 9, 12, 57). Mentions of the late Roscoe's sexuality are made in a less-than-flattering light, as well as Stanley having a negative reaction to the potential implication of lesbianism (Bean 9, 14, 23). These moments are so casual, they seem to be a part of the everyday nature of the agents instead of being played for a laugh among others on the stage. The fact that they are jokes for the audience implies that this kind of humor is standard for the initial British audience, which means that Bean played to what the audience is familiar with when deciding what would be most entertaining.

The audience also becomes a part of the humor with the use of plants among them. Though commedia, like many forms of comedic theatre, utilizes asides to engage

with the audience and let them in on a further joke, Bean pushes the panto tradition of audience engagement to the extreme. Francis regularly engages with the audience, such as discussing the fact that he is in a play and asking for ideas about where he should take Dolly on a date (Bean 43, 45). However, it is when Bean scripts how the audience should respond that things become even more entertaining. The two instances when this happens are when Francis asks the audience for a sandwich, only to have someone tell him they have a hummus sandwich he can have (Bean 23). The second is the presence of Christine Patterson in the dinner scene, as discussed previously (Bean 34-39). Bean makes the audience believe they are fully a part of the show, even though these interactions are planned beforehand. The bizarre nature of these encounters leaves the audience unable to disengage from the show, keeping them entertained even if the on-stage action is stalled.

Bean also made judicious use of his changes to keep the pace of the show brisk. This includes the switching of the dinner scene and Alan's confrontation of Charlie, which allows the intermission to begin and end on a high note (Bean 39-40). He also cut a supplementary scene, which kept the action of the show focused on new information for the audience to uncover instead of rehashing previous material. Within scenes, he utilized literary techniques like alliteration to create a rhythm to the agents' words (Bean 49). All of this contributed to the fast, attention-grabbing movement of the story, leaving the audience consistently entertained for fear that they might miss something if they blink.

However, the most pervasive changes that Bean made were to the nature of the agents. *Commedia* relied on stock characters their audience knew to create a portion of its

humor, so Bean updated these stock characters to ones that a modern audience is more likely to recognize, such as Dolly as a Girl Friday instead of a sassy maid or Charlie as a stubborn Patriarch instead of a man determined to hold onto his (questionable) honor. He also added extra dimensions to some of these agents, as when he added Jerk with a Heart of Gold and Large Ham to the young lovers Stanley and Alan, respectively. There were even moments of character development that went against the new tropes of the agents, like Pauline and Rachel's discussion of grief, which made them more human than flat (Bean 27). These changes rendered the agents more relatable, or at least more recognizable to the audience. In turn, it made the agents easier for the audience to connect with, and this connection made it easier for the audience to find their antics entertaining.

Though the source text of *The Servant of Two Masters* has entertainment value in its own right, Richard Bean opted for a slightly different notion of what is entertaining when creating his adaptation. By following Italian commedia through the history of theatre into British pantomime, Bean has highlighted both the enduring power of stock and trope concepts as well as how they can change with preferences as to what is humorous. Bean has adapted this play with the intention of making it more familiar and enjoyable to the modern audience, specifically the modern British audience, while still acknowledging the roots of the comedy. In doing so, he has created an adaptation that redefines what is entertaining in this new context.

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSION

Throughout this thesis, it became clear that, though there are themes and trends in the changes made in creating an adaptation, there are no definitive categories in which to place adaptations. The labels applied here do fit the given adaptations, but there are other labels that could apply as well. However, that does not matter because the categories themselves do not matter. They are a useful tool with which to organize adaptations, but they are not the true intention behind the creation of an adaptation. Rather, the intention in creating an adaptation is appealing to an audience.

As has been shown, a close analysis of adaptations can shed some light on ideas held by the adaptor. However, these adaptations can also be used to understand ideas held by the audience as well. In any medium, the creator of a work wishes to find some kind of common ground with their audience. This is especially true of theatre, when the audience's reaction to a work can alter the production as it is being performed. Therefore, the creator needs to have similar ideals to the audience, or at least an audience open to the ideals being implied through the work. In adaptation, this rings true even more often, as adaptations are created specifically to appeal to the audience. This is a kind of narrative-based confirmation bias, as audiences are given not media that challenges their beliefs, but media that reaffirms them. It stands to reason, then, that these same close analyses could be used as a tool to examine the culture for which the adaptation was produced.

Due to this connection, the reverse is also applicable. Some scholars choose to focus on the content of a text rather than any context in which it was created. This can be a useful approach, but it is less possible in the case of adaptations. By their nature, adaptations have a context which can be impossible to ignore: the source from which they are adapted. Though some source texts may be lesser-known or even lost, most adaptations leave at least some trace of the source text in their content. In addition, the culture in which the adaptor is creating is a key factor in the desire to adapt. If the source text is sufficient for the culture, the adaptor would likely see no reason to create an adaptation. This extends to reasons as complex as socio-political commentary and as simple as a belief that the adaptor could create a better version for their potential audience. Therefore, the culture in which an adaptation is created is an important framework for the adaptation, and should be acknowledged by any who wish to analyze an adaptation.

### **Limitations of Study**

One of the main limitations on these case studies is the fact that all texts were examined in English. Though the adaptations were all originally written in English (with the exception of *Mies Julie*'s moments of Xhosa and Afrikaans), the plays they are based on were written in other languages. *Tartuffe* was written in French, *Miss Julie* in Swedish, and *The Servant of Two Masters* in Italian. As mentioned, translators inevitably make changes when adapting a work from one language to another. There are rarely exact equivalents of phrasing between two languages, so translators have to make choices

about which words to use, and that choice will change based on the context in which the translation is being produced. These choices have more effect on *how* a character says something than on *what* they are saying. This means that neither the constituent elements nor the supplementary elements change much in the creation of the translation. As such, using a translated text has little bearing on examining the changes between texts in the cases of political and cross-cultural adaptations. However, it does have an impact when examining entertainment adaptations. One of the qualities of entertainment is how something is said, as evidenced in the discussion of alliteration in *One Man, Two Guvnors*. Many plays are written in verse, at least partially, and translators must often choose between fidelity to the meaning or maintaining the rhythm, as Richard Wilbur did in the translation of *Tartuffe* that was used. By not examining the source text in its original language, there may have been changes discussed which were not present in the actual source text, as well as changes that may have been translated out and thus ignored.

There are also the limitations formed through the use of Burke's pentad as a tool for organization rather than a theory with which to explore. One of Burke's uses for the pentad was examining which point was being emphasized in order to decipher a character's motives. Applied here, a change by the adaptor to one of these points could be analyzed not just in the sense of the change itself and the effect it had, but why the adaptor changed that aspect. This could provide further insights into their process of adapting and what ideals and concepts were guiding their work. In addition, Burke pointed out that there are many combinations that could be created using pairs of items

on the pentad. Some of these could help with the understanding of some of the more nuanced changes between the two scripts, which could have fallen into multiple categories.

Another major limitation is the self-imposed exclusions of this study. Though the exclusion of transmedial adaptations was intended to enforce the focus on lack of fidelity, there are numerous transmedial adaptations which fit the definition of adaptation as it pertains to altering and retaining the supplementary and constituent elements, respectively. This also includes musicals that make changes to the supplementary elements rather than simply adding songs to an existing play. These transmedial works are worthy of consideration, as they exemplify many of the same principles used to guide the adaptations discussed here.

In the same vein, the elimination of Shakespeare's works significantly narrowed the selection pool. Though they do come with the daunting field of Shakespeare studies involved, the fact remains that the vast majority of well-known English stage-to-stage adaptations are based on a work of Shakespeare. By removing these plays from consideration, the possibility of examining existing scholarship about stage-to-stage adaptations was severely impacted.

### **Adapting to Further Research**

Future studies may address not only the limitations mentioned above, but could cover any number of adaptations. It would even be pertinent in adaptations that bear a closer resemblance to their source text, retaining not only the constituent elements, but

many of the supplementary elements. This would include the majority of transmedial adaptations as well as censored versions of works. Each of these adaptations is being created with a different audience in mind than the source text, which means changes made to appeal to that different audience, no matter how slight the difference. This is obvious in censored works, such as the bowdlerization of Shakespeare as mentioned in the introduction. However, even relatively straightforward book-to-movie adaptations could benefit from a similar examination, no matter the difference in audience; the *Hunger Games* movies were targeted at a very similar audience as the books, given that they premiered a mere four years after publication, yet there were still marked differences to be commented on. Translations would also fall under this umbrella because, as mentioned previously, the word choice involved in creating a translation can create variations in meaning. Despite its common exclusion from consideration as an adaptation, fanfiction could also be examined under this lens. Truthfully, nearly any work that draws heavily from another could be analyzed using these same theories, and as people continue to enjoy the familiar, the chances to do so will never run out.

There are many fields outside adaptation studies that could make use of this study as well. The theories and concepts underpinning this thesis belong to fields such as rhetoric and narratology, and these theories were reworked in order to best suit the purposes of this study. The resulting theories could still be useful outside of the scope of this thesis. For example, Burke's pentad is intended to analyze the motivations of characters in fictional narratives, though some people have also applied it to things like

speeches as well. However, there is little indication that it is used to analyze an author's motivations based on the decisions made in regards to what the pentad reveals about the fictional narrative. In addition, as narrative theory relies on narrative being a series of events, the concept of constituent and supplementary elements may be more flexible for those narratives which do not follow a standard pattern of events to analyze. There is also the possibility of interdisciplinary use of these theories, with both rhetoricians and narratologists using some of the methods used here which may be outside their normal scope.

In closing, this thesis offers a new look at how to analyze adaptations, especially in relation to their authors and audiences. People flock to adaptations because they enjoy the familiar, both in the case of the story and as pertains to the ideals presented through the adaptation. However, they fail to realize that while elements of the adaptation may be familiar, they are actually being presented with a new story, one that changes what they know. The entire point of an adaptation is not to be the same, but to be different, and as adaptations keep appearing across various forms of media, these differences should be embraced rather than audiences complaining about seeing the same story retold over and over.

## REFERENCES

- Abbott, H. Porter. *The Cambridge Introduction to Narrative*. Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Arrowood, Emily. "The Very Definition of Sexual Assault." *U.S. News & World Report*, 7 October 2016, <https://www.usnews.com/opinion/articles/2016-10-07/hot-mic-catches-donald-trump-bragging-about-sexual-assault>. Accessed 8 November 2018.
- Balkin, Sarah. Review of *Mies Julie*, adapted and directed by Yaël Farber, *Easter*, adapted and directed by Robert Greer, and *The Dance of Death*, adapted by Mike Poulton and directed by Joseph Hardy. *Theatre Journal*, vol. 65, no. 4, 2013, pp. 565-568. *JSTOR*, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24580429>.
- Barnette, Jane. *Adapturgy: The Dramaturg's Art and Theatrical Adaptation*. Southern Illinois University Press, 2018.
- Bean, Richard. *One Man, Two Guvnors*. Dramatists Play Service, 2011.
- Burke, Kenneth. *A Grammar of Motives*. 1945. University of California Press, 1969.
- Caisley, Robert. *Moliere's TARTUFFE in a New Adaptation for American Stage* [PDF document]. *New Play Exchange*, National New Play Network, 2016, [https://newplayexchange.org/system/files/field\\_play\\_current\\_draft/TARTUFFE%20Production%20Draft.pdf](https://newplayexchange.org/system/files/field_play_current_draft/TARTUFFE%20Production%20Draft.pdf).
- Cannan, Gilbert. *Satire*. Martin Secker, 1914. *Hathi Trust*, <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=nyp.33433082526371>

- Carlson, Marvin. *The Haunted Stage: The Theatre as Memory Machine*. University of Michigan Press, 2001.
- Chozick, Amy. "Hillary Clinton Calls Many Trump Backers 'Deplorables,' and G.O.P. Pounces." *The New York Times*, 10 September 2016, <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/11/us/politics/hillary-clinton-basket-of-deplorables.html>. Accessed 29 October 2018.
- Corrigan, Timothy. "Defining Adaptation." *The Oxford Handbook of Adaptation Studies*, edited by Thomas Leitch, Oxford University Press, 2017, pp. 23-35.
- Cummings, William. "'Deplorable' and Proud: Some Trump Supporters Embrace the Label." *USA Today*, 12 September 2016, <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/onpolitics/2016/09/12/deplorable-and-proud-some-trump-supporters-embrace-label/90290760/>. Accessed 30 October 2018.
- "Cultural Appropriation." Cambridge Dictionary, 2019, <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/cultural-appropriation>. Accessed 31 March 2019.
- Diamond, Jeremy. "Trump: I Could 'Shoot Somebody and I Wouldn't Lose Voters'." *CNN*, 24 January 2016, <https://www.cnn.com/2016/01/23/politics/donald-trump-shoot-somebody-support/index.html>. Accessed 30 October 2018.
- Duchartre, Pierre Louis. *The Italian Comedy: The Improvisation Scenarios, Lives, Attributes, Portraits, and Masks of the Illustrious Characters of the Commedia dell' Arte*. Translated by Randolph T. Weaver, Dover Publications, 1966.

Farber, Yaël. *Mies Julie*. Oberon Books, 2012.

Flood, Alison. "'Post-truth' Named Word of the Year by Oxford Dictionaries." *The Guardian*, 15 November, 2016, <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2016/nov/15/post-truth-named-word-of-the-year-by-oxford-dictionaries>. Accessed 19 March 2019.

Goldoni, Carlo. *The Servant of Two Masters*. Translated by Edward J. Dent, 2nd ed., Cambridge University Press, 1959.

Griffin, Dustin. *Satire: A Critical Reintroduction*. University Press of Kentucky, 1994. *Google Books*, <https://books.google.com/books?id=MLM2edymLtUC>

Haun, Harry. "Two Guvnors, One Hit: How Nicholas Hytner and Richard Bean Put British Bounce in Italian Classic." *Playbill*, 17 April 2012, <http://www.playbill.com/article/two-guvnors-one-hit-how-nicholas-hytner-and-richard-bean-put-british-bounce-in-italian-classic-com-192622>. Accessed 2 April 2019.

Hopkins, Didi. "Roots and Routes: One Man, Two Guvnors." *The Routledge Companion to Commedia Dell'Arte*, edited by Judith Chaffee and Olly Crick, Routledge, 2015, pp. 480-489. *Google Books*, <https://books.google.com/books?id=BUGLBQAAQBAJ>.

Hutcheon, Linda with Siobhan O'Flynn. *Theory of Adaptation*. 2nd ed., Routledge, 2006.

Hutchings, William. "Post-Colonial Strindberg: Yael Farber's South African *Mies Julie*." *Text & Presentation, 2013*, edited by Graley Herren, McFarland & Company, 2014, pp. 69-78. *Google Books*, <https://books.google.com/books?id=k4sjAwAAQBAJ>.

Isaac, Megan Lynn. *Heirs to Shakespeare*. Boynton/Cook Publishers, 2000.

“It’s Behind You!” *The Economist*, 17 December 2014,

<https://www.economist.com/britain/2014/12/17/its-behind-you>. Accessed 31 March 2019.

Johnson, Jenna. “‘Build That Wall’ Has Taken on a Life of its Own at Donald Trump’s Rallies — but He’s Still Serious.” *The Washington Post*, 12 February 2016,

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-politics/wp/2016/02/12/build-that-wall-has-taken-on-a-life-of-its-own-at-donald-trumps-rallies-but-hes-still-serious/>. Accessed 30 October 2018.

Kidnie, Margaret Jane. *Shakespeare and the Problem of Adaptation*. Routledge, 2009.

Leitch, Thomas M. “Twelve Fallacies of Contemporary Adaptation Theory.” *Criticism*, vol. 45, no. 2, spring 2003, pp. 149-171. *Project MUSE*, doi: 10.1353/crt.2004.0001.

Lichtblau, Eric and Adam Goldman. “F.B.I. Papers Offer Closer Look at Hillary Clinton Email Inquiry.” *The New York Times*, 2 September 2016,

<https://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/03/us/politics/hillary-clinton-fbi.html>. Accessed 30 October 2018.

“Mies Julie.” *YouTube*, uploaded by RUTV Journalism Rhodes University, 4 July 2012,

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=W3lfS4fvIj4>.

Molière. *Tartuffe*. Translated by Richard Wilbur, Harcourt, 1989. Rpt. in *The Compact Bedford*

*Introduction to Drama*, edited by Lee A. Jacobus, 6th ed., Bedford/St. Martin’s, 2009, pp. 290-314.

- Olen, Helaine. "Trump and the Myth of the Self-Made Man." *Chicago Tribune*, 4 October 2018, <https://www.chicagotribune.com/news/opinion/commentary/ct-perspec-donald-trump-self-made-tax-fraud-1005-20181004-story.html>. Accessed 18 March 2019.
- Richards, Jeffrey. *The Golden Age of Pantomime: Slapstick, Spectacle and Subversion in Victorian England*. I.B. Tauris, 2015. *Google Books*, <https://books.google.com/books/?id=nL6lBAAAQBAJ>
- Sanders, Julie. *Adaptation and Appropriation*. 2nd ed., Routledge, 2016.
- Sanders, Sam. "Trump Champions the 'Silent Majority,' but What Does That Mean in 2016?" *NPR*, 22 January 2016, <https://www.npr.org/2016/01/22/463884201/trump-champions-the-silent-majority-but-what-does-that-mean-in-2016>. Accessed 29 October 2018.
- Strindberg, August. *Miss Julie*. *Strindberg: Five Plays*, translated by Harry G. Carlson, University of California Press, 1983, pp. 63-112. Rpt. in *The Compact Bedford Introduction to Drama*, edited by Lee A. Jacobus, 6th ed., Bedford/St. Martin's, 2009, pp. 434-449.
- "Theatre: Mies Julie | Baxter Theater." *YouTube*, uploaded by AllAccessMzansi, 6 September 2012, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uBKCak-Gmig>.
- Tidholm, Po, and Agneta Lilja. "Midsummer." *Sweden.se*, 30 October 2018, <https://sweden.se/culture-traditions/midsummer/>. Accessed 9 April 2019.
- TV Tropes. "Amoral Attorney." *TV Tropes*, 22 March 2019, <https://tvtropes.org/pmwiki/pmwiki.php/Main/AmoralAttorney>. Accessed 31 March 2019.

- . "Bruiser With a Soft Center." *TV Tropes*, 25 March 2019,  
<https://tvtropes.org/pmwiki/pmwiki.php/Main/BruiserWithASoftCenter>. Accessed 31  
March 2019.
- . "The Ditz." *TV Tropes*, 30 March 2019,  
<https://tvtropes.org/pmwiki/pmwiki.php/Main/TheDitz>. Accessed 31 March 2019.
- . "Girl Friday." *TV Tropes*, 24 March 2019,  
<https://tvtropes.org/pmwiki/pmwiki.php/Main/GirlFriday>. Accessed 31 March 2019.
- . "Jerk With a Heart of Gold." *TV Tropes*, 29 March 2019,  
<https://tvtropes.org/pmwiki/pmwiki.php/Main/JerkWithAHeartOfGold>. Accessed 31  
March 2019.
- . "Large Ham." *TV Tropes*, 5 March 2019,  
<https://tvtropes.org/pmwiki/pmwiki.php/Main/LargeHam>. Accessed 31 March 2019.
- . "The Patriarch." *TV Tropes*, 24 March 2019,  
<https://tvtropes.org/pmwiki/pmwiki.php/Main/ThePatriarch>. Accessed 31 March 2019.
- . "Perilous Old Fool." *TV Tropes*, 24 February 2019,  
<https://tvtropes.org/pmwiki/pmwiki.php/Main/PerilousOldFool>. Accessed 31 March  
2019.
- . "Servile Snarker." *TV Tropes*, 9 March 2019,  
<https://tvtropes.org/pmwiki/pmwiki.php/Main/ServileSnarker>. Accessed 31 March 2019.

---. "Sweet Polly Oliver." *TV Tropes*, 28 March 2019,

<https://tvtropes.org/pmwiki/pmwiki.php/Main/SweetPollyOliver>. Accessed 31 March 2019.

---. "Unsympathetic Comedy Protagonist." *TV Tropes*, 28 March 2019,

<https://tvtropes.org/pmwiki/pmwiki.php/Main/UnsympatheticComedyProtagonist>. Accessed 31 March 2019.

Wealth-X. *World Ultra Wealth Report 2017*. Wealth-X, 27 June 2017,

<https://www.wealthx.com/report/exclusive-uhnwi-analysis-world-ultra-wealth-report-2017/>. Accessed 5 March 2019.

Weinbrot, Howard D. *The Formal Strain: Studies in Augustan Imitation and Satire*. University of Chicago Press, 1969.

Wilson, Edwin, and Alvin Goldfarb. *Living Theatre: History of Theatre*. 6th ed., McGraw Hill, 2012.