CORA Cork Open Research Archive
Cartlann Taighde Oscailte Chorcaí

Title	Adaptable near and far: C. H. Hazlewood's double adaptations
Authors	Hofer-Robinson, Joanna
Publication date	2020-09-13
Original Citation	Hofer-Robinson, J. (2020) 'Adaptable near and far: C. H. Hazlewood's double adaptations', Nineteenth Century Theatre and Film, 48(1), pp.6-29. https://doi.org/10.1177/1748372720949120
Type of publication	Article (peer-reviewed)
Link to publisher's version	10.1177/1748372720949120
Rights	© 2020, Joanna Hofer-Robinson. Reprinted by permission of SAGE Publications. This is a post-peer-review, pre-copyedit version of the following article: Hofer-Robinson, J. (2020) 'Adaptable near and far: C. H. Hazlewood's double adaptations', Nineteenth Century Theatre and Film, doi: 10.1177/1748372720949120. The final authenticated version is available online at: https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1748372720949120
Download date	2026-11-06 17:40:32
Item downloaded from	https://hdl.handle.net/10468/10514



UCC
University College Cork, Ireland
Coláiste na hOllscoile Corcaigh

Nineteenth Century Theatre and Film, Sept. 2020,
doi:10.1177/1748372720949120.

Adaptable Near and Far: C. H. Hazlewood's Double Adaptations

Abstract:

Stage personnel faced complex and conflicting demands in the nineteenth century to curate and cater to appetites for theatre with perceived local relevance and increasingly mobile and diverse audiences. This article argues that the formulaic melodramas written for less reputable London theatres allowed for just such local identification as well as for coming and going, as playwrights produced dramas which simultaneously traded on their knowledge of managerial preferences and theatrical companies while retaining an inclusive ambiguity in their scripts by avoiding specific political affiliation and curating moments of metatheatrical humour that appealed to audiences' general knowledge of stage conventions, rather than specific local contexts or affiliations. Focusing on two very different dramatizations of Charles Reade's novel *It Is Never Too Late to Mend*, both written by C. H. Hazlewood, this article analyses how the playwright addressed the tastes and capabilities of a network of professionals with whom he was personally connected, while maintaining an essential ambiguity which made these dramas portable across an international dramatic circuit.

Key words:

Adaptation; C. H. Hazlewood; global; local; East End; *It Is Never Too Late to Mend*.

***

Recent research in theatre history has drawn attention to co-existing but apparently antithetical currents in western nineteenth-century theatrical culture. On the one hand, theatre was a fundamentally transnational business. Performers toured globally, and texts and ideas circulated across national and linguistic boundaries unhindered, as spectacles and stories were freely translated, remediated, and adapted for different audiences. For, even though popular playwrights like Dion Boucicault increasingly sought to secure international rights to their work, a lack of legal parity between countries made this difficult to achieve. For example, plays that premiered outside of the United Kingdom received no copyrights for British performances unless the other country

in question had a mutual copyright treaty with the United Kingdom. There was no such agreement between the United Kingdom and the United States of America until 1891.[1]

At the same time, however, managers regularly enticed the patronage of playgoers by appealing to an audience's local knowledge, loyalties, or experiences.[2] For example, local dramas thrilled audiences by emphasising their proximity to melodramatic action, by setting the drama close to the theatre and featuring recognisable landmarks in the scenery.[3] Perhaps the most famous example of a drama being repeatedly re-localised for different cities is Boucicault's *The Poor of New York* (1857), which became *The Poor of Liverpool* (February 1864), *The Poor of Manchester* (March 1864), *The Poor of Birmingham* (April 1864), *The Poor of Leeds* (May 1864), *The Streets of Glasgow* (June 1864), and *The Streets of London* (August 1864) respectively,[4] but throughout the century theatres traded on performances of locally-committed crimes and even had actors impersonate well-known street performers to cultivate an impression of authenticity.[5] Managers also created species of 'brand identities' for their theatres by capitalising on the specialties of star actors, whose popularity was likely to attract a loyal following of regular playgoers. Alternatively, certain theatres sought to address specific communities known to reside nearby. In 1880, the Garrick Theatre in Whitechapel staged Yiddish theatre performed by newly settled Russian Jews.[6] Nevertheless, it was often difficult to target local groups specifically, at least in metropolitan cities. As Jim Davis and Victor Emeljanow have proven, theatre audiences reflected multiple and hybrid communities found in the local area and further afield.[7]

Locality, or localness, is an exclusive concept and postcolonial criticism has drawn attention to the role of nineteenth-century literature and culture in maintaining divisions between those communities who are included in attempts to define known, shared spaces, and those who are left out of dominant forms of cultural representation in spite of their co-presence. Certainly, the desire for dramas to be 'naturalis[ed]' for different places reveals that audiences' appetite for theatre with perceived local relevance was seen to sit in opposition to more dynamic stage realities of touring on international circuits, and common practices of translating and adapting foreign language plays.[8] Conversely, shifting contexts of global and local mobility meant that stage personnel actually faced complex and conflicting demands, as theatres responded to appetites for dramas that curated a rooted sense of locality while simultaneously catering to increasingly mobile and diverse audiences. Paradoxically, then, as the examples above indicate, locality was represented and perceived in nineteenth-century popular theatre via a shifting network of

embodied and material referents that centred around the playhouse, and the apparent immediacy of the drama created by responding flexibly to changing audience demands and experiences.

This article argues that the formulaic melodramas written for less reputable London theatres allowed for both local identification and for coming and going, as playwrights produced dramas which simultaneously traded on their knowledge of managerial preferences and theatrical companies while retaining an inclusive ambiguity by avoiding specific political affiliation and curating moments of metatheatrical humour that appealed to audiences' general knowledge of stage conventions, rather than specific local contexts or affiliations. These play texts thus enabled practitioners to address multiple and hybrid audiences in a known area. However, the script's calculated ambivalence also made these dramas portable across an international dramatic circuit.

How playwrights and practitioners navigated desires for local identification within an international market is a growing field of research. Notable examples include Joseph Roach's *Cities of the Dead* (1996), Elizabeth Dillon's *New World Drama* (2014), and a special issue of *Nineteenth Century Theatre and Film*, "World Literature and Global Performance", edited by Katherine Biers and Sharon Marcus (2014).[9] Each of these studies is animated by the circulation and hybridization of cultural forms and performances, which trouble theatre histories defined by national boundaries. Of course, postcolonial studies long-since revealed the interdependence of British and global contexts and cultures, and recent research builds on this work to address 'the global circulation of Victorian literature and culture and the intercultural transvaluation of actants often associated with Victorian Britain.'[10] Rather than studying the transcultural remediation or appropriation of a drama, however, this article seeks to draw attention to the ways that a single text might traverse such uneven conditions, and address the interface between local community and unpredictable mobility. It argues that adaptations were especially suited to the negotiation of a market in which both local networks and international portability could be valuable assets: one reason, perhaps, why adaptations were such a vital aspect of nineteenth-century theatrical culture.

Double Adaptation

In 1859, the inexhaustible popular dramatist, Colin Henry Hazlewood, wrote two radically different adaptations of Charles Reade's novel *It Is Never Too Late to Mend* (1856): one licensed for the Britannia Theatre on 7 March,[11] and another first performed at the Royal Marylebone

Theatre on 8 May,[12] which was published by T. H. Lacy in that same year.[13] The latter draws more closely on Reade's novel, anticipating Reade's own 1865 adaptation of the novel to a large degree.[14] By contrast, the structure, action, and *dramatis personæ* of the Britannia version deviate markedly from both the novel and Hazlewood's other adaptation. Particularly important is the introduction of an additional character, London Nan, who takes centre stage throughout.

This phenomenon, which I call 'double adaptation', was not an isolated occurrence. Only a few years later, Hazlewood wrote a double adaptation of Walter Scott's *The Heart of Midlothian* (1818): first 'Jeannie Deans, or, The Sisters of St. Leonards. A Drama in Four Acts', licensed for the Standard (London) on 9 September 1862,[15] and second 'Jeannie of Mid-lothian; or, The Loves of Effie and Madge Wildfire. A Drama in Three Acts', licensed for the Pavilion Theatre (London) on 16 February 1863.[16] Similar to *Never Too Late to Mend*, Hazlewood's dramatizations of *The Heart of Midlothian* were produced in close succession but offer vastly different versions of the same text.[17] Indeed, variations in plot and characterisation suggest that Hazlewood wrote a double adaptation to make opposing interpretations of Jeannie's central moral dilemma available to audiences. For example, each drama differently frames the famous scene in which she refuses to lie in court to save her sister, Effie, from the gallows. In the Standard version, Effie understands and sympathises with Jeannie's religious convictions, and freely forgives her sister:

> Jeannie … Effie do no go till you say I am forgiven, your Death lies at my door – am I am I pardoned[?] take me to your heart and say I am
> Effie You are – you are, and as Dear to me as ever
> 'They Rush into Each others arms Bus + End of Act'[18]

Conversely, the Pavilion version emphasises both Effie's lover's and Jeannie's culpability, while allowing Effie multiple opportunities to assert her innocence. Lengthy cross-questioning of Jeannie draws attention to her hypocrisy. The dramatization highlights that, though she holds tenaciously to religious convictions which demand truth and openness in court, she failed to apply the same principles to her relationship with her sister, and did not question Effie properly about her visibly altered mood and health. Even though Effie still forgives her sister, the effect is not affirmative; instead she offers up Jeannie and the rest of the court for judgement: 'Heaven forgive you all for you will take an innocent life.'[19]

When these adaptations were written, Hazlewood was the most prolific playwright working in London. Between 1859 and 1869, 103 plays bearing his name were submitted to the Lord Chamberlain, many of which were adaptations.[20] By comparison, in the same period, George Conquest, another hard-working dramatist who also adapted *It Is Never Too Late to Mend*, submitted 39 plays.[21] However, writing almost exclusively for London's less reputable theatres – the Royal Marylebone, the City of London, the Pavilion, the Surrey Theatre, and, most importantly, the Britannia[22] – Hazlewood failed to make a substantial living from playwriting, unlike his contemporary Boucicault.[23] Hazlewood was obliged to keep up his career as an actor alongside playwrighting: holding an engagement at the Royal Marylebone from 1857–9, immediately prior to their production of *Never Too Late*, and performing in his own plays at the City of London Theatre until 1862, as well as working in a variety of provincial theatres.[24] Nevertheless, surviving letters that Hazlewood wrote to his publisher Thomas Lacy between 1869 and 1871 reveal that he was often strapped for cash.[25]

Living hand to mouth, the most obvious motivations for Hazlewood to write multiple adaptations of the same novel are financial. Each of the 195 plays that we know Hazlewood wrote for the Britannia were sold individually for between £2 and £5, which bought the theatre the London rights to the drama.[26] He did not receive a regular salary, nor was he paid for revivals of his works at other theatres than those which originally bought his scripts.[27] And, although Hazlewood was free to sell the provincial rights to his dramas separately, he did not receive a stable or a large income from these sales.[28] By contrast, double adaptation allowed Hazlewood to maximise his potential returns from time already spent by selling multiple versions of texts that were likely to have a wide appeal.[29] Reading, let alone dramatizing, a long novel is time-consuming, but, once he had read the novel, Hazlewood's idiosyncratic cut-and-paste approach to dramatic dialogue would have allowed him to produce variants at speed. Moreover, differences between the dramas allowed competing theatres to stage his plays at a similar moment without directly overlapping, and ensured uptake of his dramas by allowing him to cater to a variety of tastes or managerial priorities.[30]

Then as now, adaptations were 'ripe for commercial exploitation'.[31] However, double adaptation should not be dismissed as merely a logical extension of commercial theatre making. Instead they offer a window onto how Hazlewood's formulaic dramas addressed desires for local

identification while retaining an essential ambiguity that made them accessible to various or hybrid publics.

Hazlewood's local professional network was certainly his most immediately remunerative resource, and his double adaptations provide useful perspectives on varieties in East London's theatrical culture. Regularly selling his work to a relatively stable group of known individuals over many years, Hazlewood's personal knowledge of managerial priorities and theatre companies allowed him to calculate formulas likely to please particular buyers.[32] He was able to use his knowledge of the stock scenery and companies of actors at different theatres to write plays that could be quickly and easily included in a swiftly changing repertoire, to ensure that star performers received juicy parts, or to fit a theatre's particular 'brand'. The Britannia version of *Never Too Late* certainly supports this claim and indicates that Hazlewood was adept at adapting novels for specific local theatres. As this article will go on to analyse, aspects of the play fit stylistically with other 'Gospel of Rags' dramas popular at this theatre. Moreover, the addition of London Nan to the cast was expressly suited to the performance style of the Britannia's leading actress and manager, Sarah Lane, who made a speciality of such 'lively and eccentric roles especially written for her by the Britannia house dramatists'.[33] Double adaptations thus allowed Hazlewood to adapt stories with particular and different sets of local co-adapters in mind, rather than simply allowing him to cast his net widely by offering different versions on an open market.

Nevertheless, while a desire to address specific, local contexts could explain why Hazlewood's adaptive decisions deviate so markedly in his double adaptations, close analysis of each of the adaptations reveals a less straightforward process. Hazlewood's double adaptations offer more than different interpretations of the same story, targeted to appeal to particular local theatres or audiences. In fact, his double adaptation of *Never Too Late* draws attention to the elusive 'positionality' of each script,[34] as both adaptations juxtapose and mix conservative and radical statements, and present an inclusive address to various audiences, because their humour and interest does not depend on knowledge of, or sympathy with, particular contexts. There is no consistent approach either across his double adaptation, or within either text. The dramas exist in a state of in-betweenness, which creates the potential for the plays to achieve a significant degree of mobility: between different theatres, contexts, and spaces, and in response to various audience reactions. Therefore, while Hazlewood's adaptive process may at first appear to be predicated on his attention to known communities around particular theatres, he also balances his local

knowledge with an awareness of how the text, or audience, might travel. Hazlewood's 'Jeannie Deans' was revived thirteen (possibly fourteen) times in Scottish theatres between 1862 and 1890, for example.[35] Certainly Hazlewood would have received little personal benefit from the portability of his dramas, but high mobility was also a consideration for East London theatres. For, situated in or near to the dockside region of the metropolis, local tradesmen rubbed shoulders with passing sailors, and whole communities were displaced to make way for new infrastructure and warehousing over the course of the century. In catering to East End theatres, therefore, Hazlewood's plays simultaneously suggest and undermine – even explode – this sense of a known network.

Even while Hazlewood's adaptations address certain local trends and interests, the ambivalence of his adaptations also allows room for coming and going, as the audience or the text is relocated. This is not to say that all social ties, or loyalties to a local theatre, were severed by new contexts of local and global mobility. Still, the ambiguity of Hazlewood's adaptations is productive, because it permitted his works to be multiply reinterpreted for and by various British and international theatres and audiences in the mid-nineteenth century. In other words, these mobile, flexible texts resist reinforcing an imagined hierarchy which elevates London as the centre at the expense of an indistinct wider periphery, because his adaptations avoid explicit political, social, or spatial affiliation.

Adapting *It Is Never Too Late to Mend*

Portability and multiplicity is embedded in the form of adaptations, and theatrical dramatizations in particular. Not only are narratives moved across media, adaptations explore dialogic relationships between multiple texts or actants. Thus adaptation is frequently celebrated as a pluralistic form, open to diverse cultural practices. Particularly as digital culture diversifies media channels, 'adaptation' can refer to a wide range of cultural products, not only 'straight' adaptations of book to film, or page to stage. Concerned that 'the concept of adaptation *per se* has necessarily been diluted as it expands to form a catch-all category for these permutations', Sarah Cardwell stresses that precise and robust terminology is needed to pin down how we distinguish adaptation from other linked practices such as appropriation or translation,[36] but even the term 'adaptation' has multiple resonances. Linda Hutcheon famously defined adaptation as both 'a *formal entity or*

product' and as processes of creation and reception.[37] Still, we often take the latter meaning for granted when we encounter the material end-product, so imaginatively amalgamating process(es) and product.

The surviving play scripts for Hazlewood's adaptations, which are the chief source for this article, are not a finished product, however. Not only are the manuscript copies submitted to the Lord Chamberlain typically insubstantial – produced quickly by copyists, and containing numerous gaps and omissions, which meant that the text could change between licensing and performance – the script is only one aspect of a theatrical performance. And, as Nico Dicecco emphasises, '"the stage" has a way of troubling the apparent ontological stability of "the page".'[38] The liveness of theatre means that the text remains open to numerous (perhaps spontaneous) reinterpretations, or processes of adaptation. For instance, it can be altered by practitioners to suit the target audience of a particular theatre or for different cultural or national contexts. These processes involve diverse creators. Tracey Catell recently drew our attention to the role that the stage manager plays in adapting dramatic texts for live performance,[39] but actors, musicians, and scene painters should equally be included in this network of adapters at any one theatre. Moreover, because theatre is live, this is an ongoing process, with the potential to change flexibly night by night, depending on the shifting make-up of each network of adapters.

The audience also plays a formative role. By bearing witness, they give life to the production, but their processes of reception also define the production's status as an adaptation. 'Adaptation requires the "doing" of a certain attentiveness to intertextual similarity, and it results in the "thing done" of adaptive materiality.'[40] Playgoers '[*perform*] that identification' when they actively recognise the play's relationship to other cultural products, such as a novel or previous dramatizations:[41] processes of reception which might be performed through oral indicators such as laughing or heckling. In theatre, these processes of reception can materially feed back into processes of creation, as actors can choose to revise their performances to respond to audience reactions on different nights. Therefore, adaptation-as-product depends on both the audience and the performers in live theatre and is flexibly contingent on playgoers' individual level of engagement or prior knowledge. Thus Hazlewood's script is constantly remade: 'product and process alike depend on crucially on performance.'[42]

Adaptation is central to the cultural history of *It Is Never Too Late to Mend*. The novel began life as *Gold!*, a drama written by Reade and first performed at the Theatre Royal Drury Lane

on 10 January 1853.[43] The play mixes domestic melodrama with Gold Rush adventure in New South Wales. The honest but unlucky farmer, George Sandford, is engaged to Susan Merton, but does not have enough money to marry her. When his farm fails, he secures a promise from Susan's father that the latter will allow the couple to wed if George returns from Australia with a thousand pounds. Unbeknownst to the couple, the wealthy corn factor and money lender John Meadows is also in love with Susan, and – with the help of his alcoholic subordinate, Peter Crawley – is scheming to ruin George and prevent their union so that he can marry Susan instead. Unfortunately for Meadows, he has made an enemy of Isaac Levi, who works to secure George's interests throughout, and ultimately enjoys a well-timed revenge. In Australia, George discovers gold with the help of the reformed ex-convict, Tom Robinson, and in spite of robbery and assassination attempts returns home to England. Meanwhile, Meadows has tricked Susan into thinking that George has married another woman, and financially ruined her father to pressure her to accept his offer of an economically advantageous union. But, despite Meadows' further attempts to thwart George's triumphant return home, George and Tom arrive in time to stop the wedding, the villains are arrested, and Isaac Levi blesses the couple and the audience.

Reade preserved the romance plot when he adapted the play as a novel but significantly extended Tom's story to address recent scandals in the British prison system which had been widely reported in the press.[44] Moreover, alongside changing George's name from Sandford to Fielding, he added three new major characters: the aboriginal Australian Jacky Kalingalunga, the persecuted prisoner Josephs, and the heroic priest Mr Eden. Each of these figures enables and shapes the romance plot at the same time as they extend the novel's interest in social reform. Their centrality to Reade's project is reinforced by their importance in his 1865 (re)dramatization of the novel.[45]

Shifting regularly between domestic and international spaces and concerns, *Never Too Late* requires the reader to recognise how events in England have an impact on those in Australia, and vice versa. It demands a species of double vision to keep abreast of roughly simultaneous but non-sequential narrative action occurring in different hemispheres: a doubleness which emphasises characters' mobility as both a central theme and plot device. Hazlewood's adaptations are still more mobile.

Characterised by a high level of ambiguity, Hazlewood's adaptations were written to engage in mutable and ongoing processes of adaptation, which rely on dialogic interactions

between the stage and the auditorium. As the following close readings explore, his adaptations elude specific political affiliation that could suggest his intention to address a specific audience or social issue. This enables practitioners to play up certain themes over others, or to respond dynamically to audience reactions. Equally, if the texts are played straight, they offer space for members of a diverse audience to find moments of interest or sympathetic identification. In this way, the ambivalence of Hazlewood's adaptations resists specific contextual or political positionality. They are characterised by an in-betweenness which signals the necessity of writing for diverse and potentially dispersed publics, even when a drama was written with a particular theatre in mind. This is not to say that Hazlewood is especially interested in racial politics, even though he often foregrounds marginal(ised) figures in his dramas. Rather, the (individual and collective) doubleness of his adaptations bespeaks the itinerancy of theatrical texts, practitioners and audiences in the mid-nineteenth century: as demolitions and mass migration altered local communities in East London, theatre companies went on tour, and playwrights' works were appropriated overseas. Adaptations are thus both a vital aspect of mid-nineteenth-century theatrical culture and highly sophisticated texts, the ambivalence and doubleness of which enables a collaborative and ongoing process of adaptation, well-placed to move within and across local and international markets.

'Never to [*sic*] Late to Mend' at the Britannia Theatre

Unlike Reade's novel, which foregrounds George's story and introduces the idea of his move to Australia at the outset, the Britannia's interests initially seem to eschew both romance and Gold Rush in favour of specific local concerns. The adaptation opens with a discussion between Meadows and Crawley about Crawley's drunkenness. His alcoholism is austerely represented, he even goes so far as to refer to himself as Meadows' 'slave'.[46] This emotive language recollects fiery diction sometimes used by Chartist activists. Richard Oastler famously called factory labour 'Yorkshire Slavery' in the *Leeds Mercury* in 1830, for instance.[47] It further suggests Hazlewood's awareness of Teetotalism, which had ties to radical working-class movements.[48] The dialogue presents alcohol as a social evil because it makes people more vulnerable to exploitation. Crawley admits that his current position as Meadows' 'slave' owes less to Meadows' manipulation than to 'the fiend thats [*sic*] in me, [which] has made me what I am, the tool of any man'.[49] Conveying

frustration, injustice, and disempowerment, the drama's opening could indicate that Hazlewood is targeting a particular radical subculture, perhaps likely to be in attendance at an East End theatre with a strong history of working-class engagement.[50] Conversely, this assumption is immediately challenged by the introduction of a new character on Meadows's exit, London Nan, who does not feature in Lacy's printed script, *Gold!* or the novel.

Nan's characterisation is calculated to appeal to a working-class audience's sympathies. She is spokeswoman for the poor and virtuous – 'I've more often found respectability in Rags than otherwise'[51] – and so fits with the reverential representation of honest poverty in other popular plays at the Britannia in the same period, which H. Barton Baker called the Britannia's 'Gospel of Rags'.[52] Indeed, she replaces Mr Eden as the moral centre of the drama – challenging the other characters and society to reform, and actively advocating George, Susan, Tom, and Josephs – although, unlike Eden, she presses her points through humour and song. Nevertheless, her characterisation is misaligned with the apparent challenge to existing social inequalities in the opening dialogue.

Directly after Crawley and Meadows' exchange in the opening scene, Nan engages in witty repartee with Crawley, which elaborates the theme of alcoholism further. Nan encourages the audience to pity him by offering an explanation for his addiction. Nonetheless, in so doing she disrupts the potential radicalism of the theme. Diverting from the emotive diction of the opening, she blames Crawley's drinking on social aspirations which cause people to be discontented with their lot in life:

> what a sad thing it is to see a man reduced to his condition, this all comes of wishing to be in a greater position than you really are, I know I would not be a Lady for a trifle[53]

Nan's comments are backward-facing and denote a narrow world view. She evokes Eurocentric feudal histories of inherited social status when she cautions the audience against social climbing. Stating that she 'would not be a Lady', Nan's arguments are framed by a context of aristocratic privilege that does not command the same cachet in Australia. Nan thus appears to address a specifically local context and audience when she preaches her 'Gospel of Rags', even though her speech is out of step with the opening dialogue, the play's later interest in the potential for liberty and financial advancement in Australia, and the fact that it is Nan who holds the prison staff to

account for the grim injustice suffered by Josephs in Act 2, which again suggests a radical political position. It is also incompatible with the Marylebone adaptation, in which Tom comments that England is 'the dead sea to a poor man.'[54] Even in these brief opening dialogues, therefore, the Britannia version side-steps explicit contextualisation, or positionality, even when it appears to address a particular cause or audience.

Despite her apparent conservatism in the opening scene, Nan embodies an in-betweenness that contributes to the drama's wider ambivalence. She is a ballad-singer: a profession which signifies her mobility and social liminality at the same time as her songs and practice of street-selling make her a highly recognisable and audible presence. Both visible and obscure, this doubleness is one reason why representations of ballad-singers in nineteenth-century culture are 'defined by … heterogeneity', ranging from 'shabby, scurrilous, [and] loud' to picturesque and modest.[55] Nan's characterisation cuts across such paradoxical tropes, signifying the mutability of her representation.

On the one hand, Nan is a decidedly sentimental figure. Following familiar romantic tropes of honest poverty, she recounts how she fell in love with Tom in adversity and remains true to him in spite of greater hardships: 'Ah me, my heart is sad, it clings to him, + remembers him only as an honest lad, as he was when we were boy + girl together, I shall never see him again'.[56] Her self-representation as a ballad-singer is, moreover, in the picturesque mode:

> under a broad spreading tree, with the sweet flowers at my feet, + the merry laughing children with their bright eyes looking into mine + listening as I run over my Ballads[57]

Nan's speech evokes a pastoral scene and – though no evidence detailing her costume survives – it is possible that her clothes were designed to emphasise a visually appealing picturesque aesthetic. In this view, Nan appears to be an anti-modern figure, allied to an imagined past prior to modernising processes aimed to control urban space, and separate to the play's contemporary setting and concern with financial gain. She is temporally displaced as well as highly mobile, reinforcing the supposed innocence bequeathed by her outsider status which allows her to act as moral commentator: simultaneously the representative of deeply-felt social values and society's outcast and antithesis. However, Nan is not a disinterested or distant observer, given her love for Tom, nor is she an innocent rustic. Indeed, her references to pastoral scenes are jarring because

she is an urbanite: she was on the streets with Tom 'when [they] were boy + girl together', and her witty replies to Crawley's flirtatious remarks signal her streetwise edge. Indeed, the striking distance between her dreams and her real experience suggests that Nan is cannily manipulating mawkish popular images of ballad-singers.

For Oskar Cox Jensen in *The Ballad-Singer in Georgian and Victorian London*, key to understanding these performers is 'appreciating [them] as relatively autonomous individuals, rather than as uniform and unthinking mouthpieces for the songs they sold'.[58] Ballad-singers' agency is rarely conveyed in representations from above. They are condemned in those which present them as loud, bawdy, and dirty: Other, and potentially disruptive to, the social and political status quo as well as to aural peace. Sentimental or picturesque imagery can be more positive, but it also sanitizes these performers, and restrains their voices and agency. Nan sits between these poles. She may be a sentimental stereotype and mouthpiece for moral platitudes, but she does sing. Moreover, she emphasises her autonomy through performance of ballads.

Directly after Crawley's exit she sings a ballad that picks up the train of the preceding dialogue, 'I'd rather not a Lady be'.[59] However, the song's recurring motif is the freedom offered by her itinerancy: 'No, give me the open air, the bright sun, with merry hearts round me, listening with open ears, while I chaunt the titles of my Ballads'.[60] More than freedom to roam through unlikely pastoral idylls, the ballad highlights the economic and social independence conferred by her profession. Though the opening lines relate to themes explored in the drama, Nan quickly establishes a frame narrative within the song, which creates and maintains a distance between song and singer, and so positions her as an independent agent who chooses to comment on events, rather than one who passively responds by automatically performing on cue. After a brief lyrical introduction in which Nan avows that 'I'd rather have the rags I wear … / Than loaded be with every care / That riches bring when near one',[61] she breaks the song with spoken lines that indicate her move from diegetic to non-diegetic music. Her frame narration directly states that the following verses are about ballad-singing, and the lines of the second verse are disconnected suggestions of various escapist fancies that feature regularly in ballads.

> Here's the Tar that was faithful
> The Soldier thats [*sic*] true
> Here's the Maiden dispiteful [*sic*]

And the Seas over blue[62]

These subjects are not radical. They are cheap, recyclable whimsy, filled with stock types and settings, meant to suggest the titles and topics of the ballads she sells. At first, these fancies appear to break the division between song and singer established in the frame narrative because they fit with her chosen, picturesque self-representation. However, each of the romance figures suggested by the song are so flattened that they signify only their economic value – a value of which Nan is acutely conscious: 'If I but get the rustic maid / To buy Ballads for a Penny'.[63] Nan, the ballad-singer, is the only autonomous figure. She distributes the songs that bring romantic heroines and heroes to life, and her performance of these songs enables her to earn her livelihood, and to be 'Contented [as] I wend my way'.[64] Far from reinforcing restrictive picturesque imagery, therefore, Nan's performance metatheatrically prompts the audience to recognise how she cynically deploys popular tropes to take charge of the narrative, even though she is a liminal 'wanderer'.[65]

The song prefigures Nan's role in the rest of the drama. Nan often takes charge of narrating the action. In Act 1 scene 1, for instance, she informs the audience about George's feelings for Susan, and the possibility of his going to Australia, so briefly dealing with aspects of the romance plot which are dramatized at length in the Marylebone version (as well as in *Gold!* and Reade's 1865 adaptation), and signalling her greater importance than the central romantic couple in this drama. Nan plays an active and significant role. When the persecuted Josephs commits suicide in prison, it is Nan who admonishes the prison governor, Hawes, and organises his punishment.[66] She also warns Susan against Meadows and takes the decisive step to travel to Australia with Levi, 'to redeem Tom + make him again an honest man'.[67] Meanwhile Tom is relegated from savvy second hero, as in the novel and the Marylebone adaptation, to an amiable fool.[68] Indeed, in contrast to Nan, the song performed by Tom as he is led away by police in Act 1 scene 1 emphasises his subjugation rather than his agency: 'The Sessions + Sizes are drawing nigh / I'd rather you'd be hang'd than I / Luddy fuddy, high poor Luddy heigh ho'.[69]

Nan's autonomous movement between local and international spaces, and the agency she exerts to direct the narrative, regardless of her social liminality and gender, signifies Hazlewood's simultaneous attention to local contexts and potential mobility. Heidi Holder explains that 'female roles showed a greater variety' in East End theatres than in the West End around the mid-nineteenth century, which permitted 'the saucy, active "second-lead" female [to achieve] greater prominence

as a type.'[70] In fitting this stock type, Nan signals her association with East End London theatres. Indeed, she appeared in another adaptation of *Never Too Late* licensed for the Surrey Theatre on 26 April 1858.[71] Conversely, as Bratton long-since explored with reference to the stock Jack Tar, theatrical types were not stable or singular categories, and did not signify only one set of characteristics.[72] Therefore, at the same time that it is possible to historically and geographically contextualise Nan, her generic qualities also allow her to be moved into different plays and spaces. A playbill from 1 April 1859 advertises the 'Production for the first time in Lynn of the great Surrey drama' at the Theatre Royal, King's Lynn, for instance.[73] Although this production did not use the London cast, who were still engaged for the London season, it nevertheless indicates the circulation of stock types associated with East End theatres, as the scripts of popular plays were picked up for use in the provinces.

Many of Nan's characteristics are aligned in the Britannia's and the Surrey's adaptations. In both plays, Nan has been attached to Tom since they had been 'Parentless London outcast[s]' together, and she chooses to follow him to Australia.[74] Yet, while her sharp, savvy dialogue is considerably softened in the Britannia version, her role is less significant in the Surrey's play, in which she does not replace Eden as the moral heart of the drama. Thus Nan is both a recognisable and specific stock type in popular East End London theatre, and flexibly contingent on a dramatist's or performer's preferences. The unprecedented significance of her role in the Britannia's 'Never to[*sic*] Late' undoubtedly signals Hazlewood's awareness of Sarah Lane's popularity in such roles, for instance, even though Lane ultimately shared the role with Louisa Cleveland. Nan's generic qualities, as well as her identity as a ballad-singer, thus allow her to occupy a position between known and unknown, the specifically local or locatable and the general or mobile. Meanwhile the ambivalence of her simultaneously sentimental and streetwise characterisation suggests her openness to multiple adaptations, and the difficulty of fixing her meaning.

Hazlewood's decision to foreground Nan's voice and role suggests a radical desire to emphasise the possibility of action and change from below. Nan is cast as society's Other through her profession, poverty, and her criticism of those in powerful positions, such as Hawes. However, Hazlewood's apparent investment in marginal(ised) characters is undermined by the fact that the aboriginal character, Jacky, is entirely elided from the piece. Moreover, Nan is ultimately ousted from her central position, and the final line given to the conventional romantic heroine, Susan.

Meanwhile Nan muddles between conservative and radical statements, making her role difficult to place politically. This in-betweenness is found in the drama as a whole; the play text is not clearly allied to any context or ideology. Domestic spaces, for example, were no more immediate for playgoers than the Australian scenes. The directions for Act 1 scene 1 indicate that the action was set against a generic background, which allowed the Britannia to draw from its stock of reusable scenery: 'Landscape, Cornfields, + Farm House'.[75] Set outside of London, there was no cause for the Britannia to present 'Never to [*sic*] Late' as a local drama, and so the domestic scenes could be non-specific – they existed as a fantasy of stage flats in the same way as 'Australia. Mountains'.[76] Still, this generic setting is inclusive in its ambivalence, as the effect does not depend on playgoers' familiarity with specific local scenes. Any coherence in the drama is thereby is unfixed and depends on performance, and so the adaptation remains open to multiple, and mutable, reinterpretations for and by different audiences.

Never Too Late to Mend at the Royal Marylebone Theatre

Unlike the Britannia adaptation, Hazlewood's Marylebone version of *Never Too Late* reprises the narrative trajectory of the novel in a reasonably straightforward manner. Act 1 introduces the romance plot and sees George leave for Australia. Act 2 largely takes place in the model prison. Tom and Josephs are subjected to various forms of psychological and physical torture by the cruel prison governor, leading to Josephs' suicide and Mr Eden's intervention. Meadows also proposes to Susan and schemes with Crawley to prevent George's return. Act 3 is set in Australia. George has failed at farming, but all is not lost: Jacky makes George's fortune by showing him and Tom where to find a huge nugget of gold, and, although Crawley and a party of bush rangers attempt to prevent their return to England by setting fire to their tent, Levi is fortunately on hand to help the heroes to escape. The final Act returns to Berkshire, where the romance plot is resolved happily. The drama thereby offers both escapist fantasy and domestic melodrama, while repeating and reinforcing Reade's concern with specific cases of institutional abuse and corruption in Britain. Conversely, Hazlewood's shrewd use of melodramatic conventions and generic characterisation allows the play to go beyond an address to specific local contexts or audiences, making it a viable text for Hazlewood to sell for publication and an extra profit.

Hazlewood is a master of this mixed theatrical mode, in which high sentiment and emotive, politicised statements sit alongside comedy and song. In Act 2 scene 2, for example, Meadows delivers a long soliloquy in which he curses the other characters who stand in his way: 'Susan seems farther from me than ever.'[77] This is closely followed by a comical song performed by Crawley, who reviles Meadows in turn, to the tune of 'Nice Young Maidens', only to be caught out by Meadows himself.[78] Crawley must quickly improvise a verse to save his skin: 'I'm sure of masters he's the best! / Bless Mr. Meadows!'[79] Hazlewood makes full use of the possibilities opened by live performance by introducing physical comedy and a famous musical intertext, presumably familiar to at least some members of the original London audience. Here, his parody of a song about individuals' unsuccessful attempts to get what they want ironizes Crawley's cowardly manoeuvres and complaints, and emphasises his similar ineffectiveness. Such performance devices rob Crawley of any psychological depth that he has in the novel and transform him into a low comedy part, whose comic interjections siphon off audience disbelief at moments of high drama. Indeed, another of Hazlewood's important interventions is the development of one of Crawley's throwaway comments in the novel into an amusing obsequious catchphrase, which he uses regularly to puncture sentimental or serious dialogue: 'You're a great man, Mr. Meadows – a very great man, sir.'[80]

Juxtaposition of serious and comic matter is typical of British melodrama, but this generic mixing is also one aspect of the text's ambivalence, as rapid changes of mood are supposed to elicit various affective reactions from the audience. In Act 1 scene 1, Tom introduces a critique of how the poor are treated by the British state in one breath, and begins a comic song with the next:

> England is the rich man's paradise, and the poor man's—Well, I won't swear—it's vulgar. (*sings*)
>
> As I was going up the Strand,
>
> Luddy fuddy! hi, poor luddy heigho!
>
> As I was going up the Strand,
>
> The beaks they took me out of hand,
>
> Luddy fuddy! hi, poor luddy heigho![81]

Tom's song, which reprises the verse he sings in the Britannia version, is an amusing scrap of doggerel that underscores the unfair treatment of the poor by the state, but does not signify psychological complexity. Instead it is an entertaining complement to Tom's sustained and pointed commentary on economic inequality over the course of the scene, which is endorsed by George and his brother. Such intricate relationships in melodrama between oppositional stage modes elude stable or singular responses. However, the scene does more than address various audience emotions. Playfully self-referential, Tom's song also invites knowing playgoers to share his joke, as they recognise that it is a further act of rebellion. Tom has been captured, but he is determined to have the last laugh, and he does. Using the absurdity of melodramatic conventions, which allow him to drop into a comic song at the most unlikely moment, Tom curates a metatheatrical moment that generates humour by playing with the audience's awareness of the artificiality of well-known stage conventions.[82] In so doing, he positions the audience as canny participants, and thus goes beyond an appeal to playgoers' individually felt reactions, or their sympathy with his critique of specifically positioned class hierarchies. It suggests an inclusive request for audience participation, based on general knowledge of the drama's generic qualities, rather than personal sympathy with the onstage action, or specific or local knowledge. Even though musical intertexts or social commentary on poverty in Britain might suggest that Hazlewood's script addresses playgoers familiar with particular cultural and social contexts, therefore, the metatheatricality of his adaptation reveals its potential to speak to diverse and mobile audiences.

Problems remain which limit the appeal of *Never Too Late* to a white, Western audience. Representations of Jacky and Levi are offensively racist by modern standards and many jokes are made at their expense. Nevertheless, we know that this adaptation travelled internationally. The Houghton Library at Harvard holds a copy of Lacy's Acting Edition of the text, which is labelled as the property of Edwin Adams of the Walnut Street Theatre in Philadelphia, and dated March 1861.[83] Moreover, the play was published in New York by Samuel French, and went through at least two editions in the 1850s–60s, widening its distribution in the United States of America. Publication thus enabled Hazlewood's adaptation to reach an international market, but numerous productions of his play in Melbourne, Australia prove that it also certainly reached an international audience.

Hazlewood's adaptation was performed in Australia long before Reade's own 1865 dramatization of his novel. A review in the *Australasian* reports that a new season under new

management had opened at the Princess's Theatre on 30 July 1866 with a 'stage adaptation of Mr. Charles Reade's sensation story of "It is Never Too Late to Mend"';[84] however, the reviewer notes that this is not the first time that a dramatization of the novel has been played in the city. This production was preceded by another 'produced at the Olympic some seven years ago [in 1859], during the management of Mr. Frederick Younge…'

> It differed somewhat from the version now given by Mr. Hall, and I am quite unable to say if it was dramatised by the same individual whose name is now published as the author in the bills, to wit, Mr. Colin Hazlewood. It is quite possible for both versions to have been the work of Mr. Hazlewood, although in the acting they differ, for stage, managers and actors together make terrible work of an author's labours, what with cuts and what with interpolations.[85]

It is unlikely that the two productions produced in Melbourne in 1859 and 1866 represent Hazlewood's alternative versions of *Never Too Late* in spite of their differences, as the Britannia version was never published. Still, the reviewer's comments signal how processes of adaptation continued and diversified in Australia through the 'cuts' and 'interpolations' or practitioners. In short, the adaptability of the play meant that its appeal was not limited to the theatre for which it was originally written. Indeed, the new performance context appears to have materially influenced the representation of the play at Princess's, and to have affected audiences' reception of drama. Certain of the differences between the Melbourne productions may even be attributable to managerial desires to both facilitate local identification and evoke international connections in the 1866 production, analogous to the ambiguity that characterised the London shows.

On the one hand, the fact that the drama premiered in London may have lent its production in Melbourne a cosmopolitan appeal. A contemporary advertisement in the *Melbourne Herald* emphasises that 'All the latest London novelties [are] in active preparation.'[86] The advert appears to target a community of settlers, whose reasons for wishing to see 'London novelties' may range from homesickness to curiosity to pride that Melbourne can compete culturally with the city vaunted as the centre of the British Empire. Nevertheless, as in the London shows, this source of interest sits alongside appeals to contrasting audience desires for local relevance, of which the management was aware. Far from noticing any 'London novelties', it is clear that the reviewer for

the *Australasian* does not think very highly of this piece, which 'altogether is strangely deficient in female interest,' leaving most of the female members of the company with nothing to do.[87] In fact, her or his remarks indicate that the Australian setting, rather than the disconnected plot, accounts for much of the interest and will be the greatest draw for playgoers. The set designers receive special mention for crafting new scenery 'showing the bend of a river undoubtedly Australian;' while 'the diggings "set" in the same act' is deemed 'most carefully and characteristically contrived.'[88] Such scenic effects stand in dramatic contrast to the generic and unconvincing interiors which have clearly been recycled from previous productions, and indicate significant monetary and managerial investment in the 'local' appeal of the Australian scenes. The Melbourne production thus evidences the portability of Hazlewood's drama, but also the flexibility with which locality could be defined in reference to a single text.

Conclusion

Hazlewood's resistance to specific contextualisation is an expression of how he catered simultaneously to diverse audiences within one theatre, and how this ambiguity enabled the mobility of his dramas across different spaces, contexts and audiences. I have suggested that eschewing cultural difference through judicious use of generic theatrical modes made Hazlewood's dramas accessible to a varied and geographically dispersed English-speaking public, even while the dramatist ensured the sale of his works by incorporating his knowledge of popular trends, and the specialties of specific London theatres. In other words, even though Hazlewood wrote adaptations suited to the tastes and capabilities of a network of professionals with whom he was personally connected, these formulaic melodramas retained sufficient flexibility to please a mixed audience, which also gave these plays an international reach. Adaptations are especially well-suited to this kind of productive ambiguity, as the form presupposes dialogic processes of creation and reception. In theatre, the conditions of performing drama – staging, lighting, music, and so forth – are as important to audiences' processes of reception as the actors' performances and the text. Therefore, the process of adaptation did not stop when Hazlewood completed the script but was, rather, extended to include a host of co-adapters. The productive ambiguity of Hazlewood's text thus aided practitioners to engage in an ongoing process of creative adaptation,

and to repeatedly revise the drama for particular audiences through characterisation, music, or setting.

As the most prolific playwright and adapter in mid-nineteenth-century Britain, Hazlewood's works offer a particularly illuminating case study of how playwrights negotiated conflicting market demands for local identification and contemporary contexts of local and global mobility. Not only do Hazlewood's techniques signify widespread professional practices as a result of his own phenomenal productivity, the fact that he is commonly thought of as a 'hack' dramatist who wrote for sales and popularity, rather than an artist who responded to unique inspiration, also indicates that his adaptive strategies worked in contemporary theatre, and so could be appropriated more broadly by other writers. Hazlewood was a master adapter for mid-nineteenth-century London, but, in eluding specific positionality, wrote dramas capable of being inclusive of a mixed and growing global public.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to Prof. Maggie Gale and to Prof. Jim Davis for offering me the opportunity to present at 'Mapping the Past into the Future', where this research was first presented, and to participants at that event for their helpful comments. Thanks are also due to Prof. Adaptable Near and Far 17 Nicholas Daly, Dr Heather Laird, and Dr Oskar Cox Jensen for their valuable feedback on earlier versions of this article.

Notes

[1] Derek Miller, *Copyright and the Value of Performance, 1770–1911* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), pp. 209–10. On how dramatists used copyright performances to counteract legal disparity between countries, see Miller pp. 207–15.

[2] One example of this trend was long since documented by Michael Booth, who drew attention to a significant vogue for London-based dramas in London theatres, which lasted for much of the century, and which translated interest in the modernising cityscape into spectacular theatrical reproductions. See 'The Metropolis on Stage', in Dyos and Wolff (eds), *The Victorian City:*

Images and Realities (London and New York: Routledge, 1973), pp. 211–24, and *Victorian Spectacular Theatre 1850—1910* (Boston, London and Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981).

[3] On local dramas see Heidi J. Holder, 'Outcast London on the Victorian and Edwardian Stage', *Theatre History Studies*, 23 (June 2003), 49–64, and Joanna Hofer-Robinson, *Dickens and Demolition* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2018), pp. 51–90.

[4] For more detail see Nicholas Daly, 'Fire on Stage', *19: Interdisciplinary Studies in the Long Nineteenth Century*, 25 (2017), doi: 10.16995/ntn.793.

[5] Mary Shannon recently examined how theatrical remediations of the famous London busker, Billy Waters, emphasised his theatricality at the same time as claiming that he represented an authentic window onto London's street life. ('The Multiple Lives of Billy Waters: Dangerous Theatricality and Networked Illustrations in Nineteenth-Century Popular Culture', *Nineteenth Century Theatre and Film*, 46: 2 (November 2019), 161–89, doi:10.1177/1748372719852739.)

[6] Jerry White, *London in the Nineteenth Century "A Human Awful Wonder of God"* (London: Jonathan Cape, 2007), p. 154.

[7] Jim Davis and Victor Emeljanow also emphasise London playgoers' propensity travel outside their immediate area to attend the theatre in other regions of the metropolis in *Reflecting the Audience: London Theatregoing, 1840 – 1880* (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2001).

[8] Katherine Biers and Sharon Marcus, 'Introduction: World Literature and Global Performance', *Nineteenth Century Theatre and Film*, 41: 2 (Winter 2014), 1–12, p. 4, doi: 10.7227/NCTF.41.2.1.

[9] Joseph Roach, *Cities of the Dead: Circum-Atlantic Performance* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996); Elizabeth Dillon, *New World Drama: The Performative Commons in the Atlantic World, 1649–1849* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2014); *Nineteenth Century Theatre and Film*, 41: 2 (Winter 2014). See also Benjamin Walton, '*L'italiana* in Calcutta', in Suzanne Aspden (ed.), *Operatic Geographies: The Place of Opera and the Opera House* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2019), pp. 119–32.

[10] Regenia Gagnier, *Literatures of Liberalization: Global Circulation and the Long Nineteenth Century* (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018), p. 26.

[11] London, British Library, Lord Chamberlain's Collection, Add MS 52980 K, handwritten playscript, [C. H. Hazlewood], 'Never to [*sic*] Late to Mend, A Drama of Woman's Faith and Man's Treachery in Two Acts' [*altered from* 'Never to [*sic*] Late to Mend. The golden secret, or, Life in the new world'], March 1859, 45 ff. Allardyce Nicoll attributes this play to Hazlewood in

A History of English Drama 1660–1900: Volume V, Late Nineteenth Century Drama 1850–1900 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, [1946] 1975), p. 842). The MS is written in two different hands, and so may represent a working script or two scripts spliced together. In the third Act, the scenes begin to appear out of order and names are corrected from Esther, Withers, and Beecher to Susan, Meadows, and Fielding.

[12] 'Advertisements & Notices', *The Era*, Issue 1076 (8 May 1859), p. 8.

[13] Cambridge MA, Houghton Library, Theatre Collection, 23498.1.29.77, printed playscript, C. H. Hazlewood, *Never Too Late to Mend. A Drama of Real Life in Four Acts. Founded on Mr. Charles Reade's Popular Novel. Lacy's Acting Edition of Plays, Vol. 2* (London: T. H. Lacy, [1859]). I have been unable to find the licensing copy of this play in the Lord Chamberlain's Collection; however, the text does not match any of the other texts in the collection, indicating that Lacy's script does indeed reproduce another play by Hazlewood. It should not necessarily be surprising that the play is not licensed, as Hazlewood was not always scrupulous about legalities. Frederick C. Wilton's *Britannia Diaries* report that 'Hazlewood's concoction & not licensed' was played on R. Leslie's Benefit Night in 1867 (Jim Davis (ed), *The Britannia Diaries 1863—1875: Selections from the Diaries of Frederick C. Wilton* (London: Society for Theatre Research, 1992), p. 125.) Moreover, there is a reference to the manager of the Marylebone Theatre, J. A. Cave, asking Hazlewood to provide a version of *Never Too Late to Mend* for that theatre in his autobiography, *A Jubilee of Dramatic Life and Incident of Joseph A. Cave: Author, Manager, Actor, and Vocalist*. (I am indebted to my reviewer for this information.) The Marylebone production was advertised in glowing terms in *The Era* on 15 May 1859: 'The sensation created by the production of "Never Too Late to Mend" is beyond precedent. In this adaptation Charles Reade's beautiful novel finds a perfect realization.' ('Advertisements and Notices', *The Era* (15 May 1859), p. 8.)

[14] London, British Library, Lord Chamberlain's Collection, Add MS 53044 D, printed playscript, Charles Reade, *It's Never Too Late to Mend. A Drama, in Four Acts* (London: Clowes and Sons [1865]), 95 pp. Submitted to the Lord Chamberlain on 20 July 1865 to be licensed for the Theatre Royal Manchester, and subsequently performed at the Princess's Theatre, London.

[15] London, British Library, Lord Chamberlain's Collection, Add MS 53016 D, handwritten playscript, C. H. Hazlewood, 'Jeannie Deans, or, The sisters of St. Leonards. A Drama in Four Acts', September 1862, 19 ff. This play was later performed at the Royal Marylebone Theatre, on

14 February 1863 (Janice Norwood, 'C. H. Hazlewood', in Angela Courtney (ed.), *Nineteenth-Century British Dramatists* (Detroit, MI: Gale, 2008), pp. 163–75, p. 165.

[16] London, British Library, Lord Chamberlain's Collection, Add MS 53020 B, handwritten playscript, C. H. Hazlewood, 'Jeannie of Mid-lothian; or, The loves of Effie and Madge Wildfire. A Drama in Three Acts', February 1863, 76 ff.

[17] Janice Norwood attributes a third adaptation of *The Heart of Midlothian* to Hazlewood, which was performed at the Britannia on 16 March 1863 (p. 165). The anonymous licensing script of 'Jeannie Deans, Deerfoot's Rival, or, Any other gal', held in the Lord Chamberlain's Collection, describes itself as a 'burlesque extravaganza'. Different again from Hazlewood's two other adaptations, its tongue-in-cheek maxim nonetheless represents a different kind of adaptive process from his two other generically similar versions. (London, British Library, Lord Chamberlain's Collection, Add MS 53020 P, handwritten playscript, [C. H. Hazlewood], 'Jeannie Deans, Deerfoot's Rival, or, Any other gal', March 1863, 21 ff.)

[18] Hazlewood, 'Jeannie Deans', f. 8b.

[19] Hazlewood, 'Jeannie of Mid-lothian', f. 43b.

[20] Joanna Hofer-Robinson and Beth Palmer, 'Introduction', in Joanna Hofer-Robinson and Beth Palmer (eds), *Sensation Drama, 1860-1880: An Anthology* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2019), pp. xi–xxxvi, p. xxi.

[21] Other playwrights notable for their substantial number of submissions to the Lord Chamberlain in this period include John Oxenford (37 plays) and W. E. Suter (44 plays).

[22] From 1855 on, Hazlewood had a close working relationship with the Britannia Theatre, though he was never contracted as its House Dramatist, and continued to sell plays to other East End and south London theatres throughout his career.

[23] Boucicault's economic success was built on profit-sharing with theatre managers, rather than selling his plays outright. For more detail see John Russell Stephens, *The Profession of the Playwright: British Theatre 1800—1900* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), pp. 51–84.

[24] Norwood, pp. 170–2. Hazlewood never acted at the Britannia, despite selling the majority of his plays to that theatre between 1855 and his death in 1875.

[25] Jim Davis, 'Introduction', in Jim Davis (ed.), *The Britannia Diaries 1863—1875: Selections from the Diaries of Frederick C. Wilton* (London: Society for Theatre Research, 1992), pp. 1–47, p. 22.

[26] Norwood, p. 172. However, his most successful plays were often revived at other theatres. For example, his adaptation of Mary Elizabeth Braddon's *Lady Audley's Secret* premiered at London's Royal Victoria Theatre on 25 May 1863, but was subsequently performed at the Britannia Theatre, in 1863, 1864, 1866, 1868, and 1871. (See *The Britannia Diaries*.)

[27] In 1863, Wilton records in his diary: 'Went to Victoria Theatre, to get M. S. S. of *Detective*. Frampton [lessee of the Victoria Theatre] would not lend the M. S. S. while piece playing there, but consented to let their copyist make a Transcript. Agreed with copyist for 10/0 to be brought Tuesday night or Wednesday morning next.' (*The Britannia Diaries*, p. 63.) *The Detective; or, The Ticket-of-Leave's Career* was a play that Hazlewood had adapted from the same source as Tom Taylor's *Ticket of Leave Man*, but Wilton makes no reference to paying Hazlewood for the revival of the play at the Britannia, despite his near decade-long relationship with the theatre at this point. Wilton does record asking for Hazlewood's 'consent' to play the piece, but this appears to have been done simply as a courtesy (p. 63).

[28] Hazlewood occasionally sold plays outside of London, but his income from provincial theatres was far less than he received from his more regular London sales. Examples include *The Dragon of Wantley; or Harlequin Moore of Moore Hall, and His Fayre Margery* (Sheffield, 1861), *Hearts, Hearts, Hearts; or Good and Bad* (Liverpool, Royal Colosseum Theatre, 1868), and *Aileen Asthore; or, Irish Fidelity* (Portsmouth, Albert Theatre, 1871). See Norwood, pp. 165–8.

[29] Another adaptation of *Never Too Late* by George Conquest was already playing at the Royal Grecian Theatre when Hazlewood's first version of the drama opened at the Britannia Theatre ('Multiple Arts and Popular Culture Items', *The Standard*, Issue 10784 (8 March 1859), p. 4), and another dramatization of the novel opened at the Victoria Theatre in the same week ('Advertisements & Notices', *The Era*, Issue 1068 (13 March 1859), p. 8). More broadly, though, his versions of *Never Too Late* built on the success of other popular dramas about the Australian Gold Rush, including Reade's play *Gold!* (1853). Meanwhile both of his 'Jeannie Deans' plays rode a renewed wave of interest in the Deans' plight, sparked by Boucicault's 1860 adaptation staged at the Winter Garden Theatre in New York, and then at Astley's in London in 1863 (H. Philip Bolton, *Scott Dramatized* (London: Mansell Publishing Ltd., 1992), p. 259.) Hazlewood

also wrote other adaptations which capitalised on Boucicault's successful productions; for example, 'Eily O Connor' (Britannia 1860) offers another version of *The Colleen Bawn*, and 'The Great Strike' (Pavilion 1866) follows *The Long Strike*. However, neither of these productions nor 'Jeannie Deans' are simply commercial imitations. Hazlewood reworks Boucicault's texts significantly on each occasion. Indeed, according to Walter Baynham, Hazlewood's 'Jeannie Deans' was more popular in Scotland than Boucicault's play (*The Glasgow Stage* (Glasgow: Robert Forrester, 1892), p. 105). Bolton's record of Scott adaptations also suggests audience discrimination in Hazlewood's favour. Between 1862 and 1890, there are thirteen (possibly fourteen) recorded productions of Hazlewood's adaptation and only six of Boucicault's. Hazlewood's version, with Miss Marriott as Jeannie, was frequently revived in Scotland (Bolton 288–94). Nevertheless, in 1860, under threat of an injunction from Boucicault, the Britannia agreed to withdraw Hazlewood's 'Eily O'Connor' on the grounds that it was based on *The Colleen Bawn*. Once the theatre conceded to Boucicault's rights, however, performances of the play was allowed to continue. (Davis, 'Introduction', p. 19.)

[30] 'In 1924 H. Chance Newton, who had worked with Hazlewood, recalled his idiosyncratic writing technique. Hazlewood amassed a large collection of clippings and notes taken from magazines and journals that he filed alphabetically by sentiment, such as "Ambition," "Benevolence," and "Courage." He used these scraps to craft his dialogue:

> Thus, when dear old Colin (and a loveable little fellow he was!) came to dictate a new three-pound a week dramatic work his dictation came out thus:
> "Margaret: Back, Back, base would-be Betrayer! Remember, ere 'tis too late, that unchecked Ambition" (throw in that slip) is, &c. While Manly Courage (drop this one in there) will always, &c., &c. And so he would proceed with all the Virtues and Vices which peppered all his works, and drew respectively hurrahs and hisses in unfolding these Plays for the People.'

(Norwood, p. 174.)

[31] Lissette Lopez Szwydky, 'Adaptations, culture-texts and the literary canon: on the making of nineteenth-century "classics"', in Dennis Cutchins, Katja Krebs and Eckart Voigts (eds), *The*

Routledge Companion to Adaptation (London and New York: Routledge, 2018), pp. 128–142, p. 128.

[32] Hazlewood had long-term connections to several East London theatres, particularly the Royal Marylebone, the City of London, the Surrey Theatre, and the Britannia. On Hazlewood's substantial contributions to the Britannia's repertoire, see Davis, 'Introduction', and Janice Norwood, 'Documents of Performance: The Assignments Book of the Britannia Theatre, Hoxton', *Nineteenth Century Theatre and Film*, 41:1 (June 2014), 85–95.

[33] Jim Davis, 'The Gospel of Rags: Melodrama at the Britannia, 1863–74', *New Theatre Quarterly*, 7: 28 (1991), 369–89, p. 371. Interestingly, even though Nan is a role typical of Sarah Lane's wider repertoire, she may have only played the part in the productions first week. For, though an advertisement in the *London Daily News* gives her top billing on 12 March 1859 ('The Daily News', p. 4), the part was played by Louisa Cleveland the following week. Sarah Lane was not absent, but instead took the lead as Susan in 'an entirely New Operatic Extravaganza, founded on the Popular Ballad of "Black Eyed Susan," to be entitled WILLIAM THAT MARRIED SUSAN.' ('New Britannia Theatre, Hoxton', *Shoreditch Observer* (19 March 1859), p. 2.)

[34] Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (London and New York: Routledge, 1994), p. 53.

[35] Bolton, pp. 288–94.

[36] Sarah Cardwell, 'Pause, rewind, replay: adaptation, intertextuality and (re)defining adaptation studies', in Dennis Cutchins, Katja Krebs and Eckart Voigts (eds), *The Routledge Companion to Adaptation* (London and New York: Routledge, 2018), pp. 7–17, p. 7.

[37] Linda Hutcheon with Siobhan O'Flynn, *A Theory of Adaptation.* 2nd ed. (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013), pp.7–8, italics in original.

[38] Nico Dicecco, 'The Aura of Againness: Performing Adaptation', in Thomas Leitch (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Adaptation Studies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), pp. 607–24, p. 608.

[39] Tracy Cattell, 'Transmitting the Thinking: The Nineteenth-Century Stage Manager and the Adaptation of Text for Performance', *Nineteenth Century Theatre and Film*, 42: 1 (2015), 39–49, doi: 10.1177/1748372715619430.

[40] Dicecco, 'The Aura of Againness: Performing Adaptation', p. 609.

[41] Ibid. p. 614, italics in original.

[42] Ibid. p. 609.

[43] Charles Reade, *Gold! A Drama, in Five Acts* (London: Thomas Hailes Lacy, n.d.).

[44] For substantial analysis of the theatricality of Reade's fiction see Emerson Grant Sutcliffe, 'The Stage in Reade's Novels', *Studies in Philology*, 27: 4 (October 1930), 654–88. On the topicality of *Never Too Late*, and Reade's fiction more broadly, see Ian Henderson, 'Jacky-Kalingaloonga: Aboriginality, Audience Reception and Charles Reade's It is Never Too Late To Mend (1865)', *Theatre Research International* (2004), 95–110, and Beth Palmer, 'Investigating Charles Reade, the *Pall Mall Gazette* and the "Newspaper Novel"', *Journal of Victorian Culture*, 19: 2 (June 2014), 183–197.

[45] Reade's play was notorious for its hard-hitting prison scenes. 'Frederic Guest Tomlins, theatre critic for the *Morning Advertiser*, even interrupted the performance by jumping to his feet to shout: "It's revolting!"' (Hofer-Robinson and Palmer, p. xxx.) However, it is uncertain to what extent the play would have shocked contemporary audiences, given that it was preceded by adaptations for London's Surrey, Britannia, Marylebone, and Grecian theatres.

[46] [Hazlewood], 'Never to [*sic*] Late', f. 2a.

[47] Richard Oastler, '*Yorkshire Slavery* (1830)', in Elaine Freedgood (ed.), *Factory Production in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), pp. 215–18.

[48] Susan Zieger, 'Temperance, Teetotalism, and Addiction in the Nineteenth Century', *Victorianweb* <http://www.victorianweb.org/science/addiction/temperance.htm> [accessed 3 August 2019].

[49] [Hazlewood], 'Never to [*sic*] Late', f. 2a.

[50] See Davis and Emeljanow, *Reflecting the Audience*.

[51] [Hazlewood], 'Never to [*sic*] Late', f. 4a.

[52] Qtd in Davis, 'The Gospel of Rags', p. 376.

[53] [Hazlewood], 'Never to [*sic*] Late', f. 5b.

[54] Hazlewood, *Never Too Late*, p. 16.

[55] Oskar Cox Jensen, 'The Ballad-Singer in Georgian and Victorian London' (unpublished book manuscript, forthcoming Cambridge University Press, 2021), p. 3. I am grateful to Oskar for allowing me to read a copy of his book prior to its publication.

[56] [Hazlewood], 'Never to [*sic*] Late', ff. 20b-21a.

[57] Ibid. f. 6b.

[58] Cox Jensen, p. 3.

[59] [Hazlewood], 'Never to [*sic*] Late', f. 6a.

[60] Ibid. f. 6a.

[61] Ibid. f. 6a.

[62] Ibid. f. 6a.

[63] Ibid. f. 6b.

[64] Ibid. f. 6b.

[65] Ibid. f. 6b.

[66] 'You will have to answer this (officers enter) There's your Prisoner (to Hawes) read this authority, + you'll find in it the dismissal of Mr Hawes from the Gaol + a Warrant to detain him for cruelty to Prisoners under his charge' ([Hazlewood], 'Never to [*sic*] Late', f. 23a).

[67] [Hazlewood], 'Never to [*sic*] Late', f. 21a.

[68] Unlike his characterisation in other adaptations, Tom has a catchphrase which undermines his intelligence: 'dash my old felt hat' ([Hazlewood], 'Never to [*sic*] Late', f. 29a).

[69] [Hazlewood], 'Never to [*sic*] Late', ff. 14b–15a.

[70] Heidi J. Holder, 'The "Lady Playwrights" and the "Wild Tribes of the East": Female Dramatists in the East-End Theatres, 1860–1880', in Tracy C. Davis and Ellen Donkin (eds), *Women and Playwrighting in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 174–92, p. 189.

[71] London, British Library, Lord Chamberlain's Collection, Add MS 52973 P, hand-written playscript, Anon., 'Never Too Late to Mend. A Drama in Four Acts', April 1858, 59 ff. Nan was played by Mary Elizabeth Braddon in this production.

[72] J. S. Bratton, 'British heroism and the structure of melodrama', in J. S. Bratton, Richard Allen Cave, Breandan Gregory, Heidi J. Holder and Michael Pickering (eds), *Acts of Supremacy: The British Empire and the Stage, 1790—1930* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991), pp. 18-61.

[73] Canterbury, Templeman Library Special Collections, Playbill Collection, UKC-POS-LYNR.0595608, playbill, *Never Too Late to Mend* and *All That Glitters is Not Gold.*, April 1859.

[74] Anon. 'Never Too Late to Mend', f. 3a.

[75] [Hazlewood], 'Never to [*sic*] Late', f. 2a.

[76] Ibid. f. 25a.

[77] Hazlewood, *Never Too Late*, p. 29.

[78] Ibid. p. 31. Hazlewood parodies a song collected in *The National Songster; A Collection of Scotch, English and Irish Standard Popular Songs* (Glasgow: Francis Orr and Sons, 1847), pp. 154–5, and *The Universal Comic Song Book* (Glasgow: Printed for the Booksellers, 1857), p. 8. The song also survives in many broadside ballad sheets from the nineteenth century (see The Vaughn Williams Memorial Library archives <https://www.vwml.org.uk/> and The Bodleian Libraries *Broadside Ballads Online* collection <http://ballads.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/>), and was arranged by John Rutter in the twentieth century. I am grateful to Oskar Cox Jensen for his advice on this query.

[79] Hazlewood, *Never Too Late*, p. 32.

[80] Ibid. p. 17.

[81] Ibid. p. 20.

[82] Katherine Newey, 'Melodrama and Metatheatre: Theatricality in the Nineteenth Century Theatre', *Journal of Dramatic Theory and Criticism*, 11: 2 (1997), 85–100, p. 86.

[83] Hazlewood, *Never Too Late*, ex libris detail written in pencil on title page. Reade was certainly concerned by the mobility of Hazlewood's script, and, in 1861, sued the publisher Lacy, arguing that printing Hazlewood's Marylebone script was an infringement of copyright. Even though Hazlewood was legally entitled to adapt from the novel without Reade's permission, and he claimed to have no knowledge of *Gold!*, Lacy's text was found to be an infringement. See 'Vice Chancellor Wood's Court. Reade v. Lacy and Another.—*April 17*', *The Jurist.—Reports* (18 May 1861), pp. 463–64, and Sarah Meer, 'Adaptation, Originality and Law: Dion Boucicault and Charles Reade', *Nineteenth Century Theatre and Film*, 42: 1 (2015), 22–38, p. 31.

[84] Jaques, 'Entertainments. The Theatres &c.', *Australasian* (Melbourne, Victoria: Saturday 4 August 1866), p. 17.

[85] Ibid., p. 17.

[86] 'Amusements', *Herald* (Melbourne, Victoria: Thursday 2 August 1866), p. 2.

[87] Jaques, 'Entertainments. The Theatres &c.', p. 17.

[88] Ibid., p. 17.