

BYZANTINE TRAGEDY IN RESTORATION ENGLAND:

JOSEPH SIMONS'S *ZENO* AND SIR WILLIAM KILLIGREW'S *THE IMPERIAL TRAGEDY*

Methinks I hear some travel'd Gallant say,
When he was last at *Rome*, he saw this Play:
That *Zeno* there was Acted; we confess,
And hope that here he'll have as good success.¹

Thus begins the prologue to Sir William Killigrew's *The Imperial Tragedy* (1669), an adaptation of a Latin play written several decades earlier by the English Jesuit dramatist Joseph Simons, *Zeno: sive ambitio infelix* (1631).² This tragedy, drawn

¹ William Killigrew, *The Imperial Tragedy*, 1-4. All references to this play and to Simons's *Zeno* are taken from the online editions by Dana Sutton on the 'Philological Museum' website hosted by the University of Birmingham: for *Zeno*, see <http://www.philological.bham.ac.uk/zeno/> and for *The Imperial Tragedy*, see <http://www.philological.bham.ac.uk/killigrew/> (accessed March 2015).

² 'Joseph Simons, *vere* Emmanuel Lobb', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (hereafter *ODNB*). The fullest consideration of Simons's work can be found in Sutton's introductions to his editions of the tragedies on the Philological Museum website. See also William H. McCabe, S.J., *An Introduction to the Jesuit Theater*, ed. Louis J. Oldani, S.J. (St Louis, MO: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1983), and Alison Shell, 'Autodidacticism in English Jesuit Drama: The Writings and Career of Joseph Simons', *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England*, 3 (2000), 34-56. On Killigrew, see J. P. Vander Motten, *Sir William Killigrew (1606-1695): His Life and*

from an episode in fifth-century Byzantine history, represents a rare convergence between the Restoration literary scene and English Catholic college drama, apparently inspired by the two authors' acquaintanceship.³ The circumstances of its publication, and Killigrew's very discreet claim to authorship, testify to both the awkwardnesses and the advantages of literary fraternisation with Jesuits in Charles II's court: a place where Catholics were prominent, but anti-popish sentiments were frequently expressed and Anglicanism explicitly upheld.⁴

Byzantium in early modern English drama

Killigrew's imaginative interest in Byzantium is unusual — despite the fact that the period abounds in stories of courtly plotting, often with a lavish dose of the supernatural, which might have been very appealing to audiences of Tudor and Stuart

Dramatic Works (Ghent: Rijksuniversiteit te Gent, 1980); Basil Duke Henning (ed.), *The House of Commons, 1660-1690*, Vol. 1 (London: History of Parliament Trust, 1983), 681-2; and *ODNB*.

³ I shall be using the phrase 'English Catholic college drama' in preference to the more usual 'English Jesuit drama'. Though some playwrights — including Simons himself — were Jesuits, others were not, and the English Catholic educational institutions that produced plays during this period were not invariably under Jesuit auspices.

⁴ Matthew Jenkinson, *Culture and Politics at the Court of Charles II, 1660-1685* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2010), esp. Chs. 3 and 7.

professional drama.⁵ To cite one example among many, the emperor Justinian I, whose head was said to disappear occasionally, and his wife Theodora, well-known as an exotic dancer in her pre-imperial days, were rumoured by contemporaries to be vampires who consorted with demons, and a dramatic account of their exploits would have made the Macbeths look tame. But contemporary Byzantine histories such as that written by Procopius, the disenchanted chronicler of Justinian and Theodora, and later historiographers of the period such as Caesar Baronius, whose twelve-volume *Annales ecclesiastici* was published between 1588 and 1607, appear to have been mainly read in England by church historians and religious polemicists, who were more consciously learned than the average playwright, and had a very different agenda.⁶ Suggestively, Philip Massinger's *The Emperor of the East* (1631), perhaps the best-known of the handful of Byzantium plays put on in seventeenth-century England, draws on a translation of a religious work popular in Henrietta Maria's circle, Nicholas Caussin's *La cour sainte* (1624).⁷ In certain contexts, availability of

⁵ J.W. Johnson comments that the Restoration and eighteenth century saw only 'a few scattered, quasi-historical dramas' dealing with Byzantine topics, in *The Formation of English Neo-Classical Thought* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1967), 123 (see also Ch. 6 for his general survey of scholarship during this period).

⁶ Procopius' *Secret History* was first published in Lyons in 1623. On the reception of individual Byzantine historians in the early modern era, see Warren Treadgold, *The Early Byzantine Historians* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007) and *The Middle Byzantine Historians* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).

⁷ Sir Thomas Hawkins, *The Holy Court* (1626), part I. See the introduction to the play in Philip Edwards and Colin Gibson (eds.), *The Plays and Poems of Philip Massinger*, 5 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), Vol. 3, 391-4; and Erica Veevers, *Images of*

Byzantine history would have been a problem too. Richard Knolles's *History of the Turks* (first published in 1603) — a work drawn upon for the much more popular field of Turkish plays — is one vernacular history that did utilise Byzantine sources, but early modern historiographical treatments of the era, as well as editions of the sources themselves, were typically intended for a scholarly audience.⁸ As such, they were expensive and difficult to procure, and where — as often — they were issued under Catholic auspices, they could have been regarded as compromising possessions.⁹

Love and Religion: Henrietta Maria and Court Entertainments (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 76-83. Edwards and Gibson comment on Massinger's 'desanctification' of his source (392). For Nathaniel Lee's dramatization of the same theme, apparently not indebted to Massinger, see below.

⁸ See V. J. Parry, *Richard Knolles' History of the Turks*, ed. Salih Ozbaran Özbaran (Istanbul: The Economic and Social Foundation of Turkey, 2003), 17-19, 118-19, [;] delete and Linda McJannet, *The Sultan Speaks: Dialogue in English Plays and Histories about the Ottoman Turks* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 120. Massinger consulted Knolles's work for *The Renegado*: see Daniel J. Vitkus, *Three Turk Plays from Early Modern England* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000), 41.

⁹ E.g. Baronius' *Annales ecclesiastici*: on this work, see Cyriac K. Pullapilly, *Caesar Baronius: Counter-Reformation Historian* (London: Notre Dame University Press, 1975), Ch. 4. Baronius was, however, one of Joseph Simons's main sources: see below. In estimating how widely Baronius' work was known at this date, one should allow for the fact that Protestant writers sometimes drew on Catholic works without citing them: Peter McCullough cites Donne's unattributed use of the *Annales*, for instance, in *The Oxford Edition of the Sermons of John Donne*, Vol. 1 (*Sermons*

Besides, it was difficult to write about Byzantium without writing about religion, which would have run counter to the strong secular bias of Tudor and Stuart professional drama. Occasional plays from this period have an unambiguously religious theme, it is true. One well-known example, dating from around the time that Simons was operating and frequently revived during the Restoration era, is Philip Massinger and Thomas Dekker's *The Virgin Martyr* (c.1620), which dramatizes the story of St Dorothea's persecution and martyrdom for her Christian faith.¹⁰ But its plot is drawn from the heroic early days of Christianity, when heroes and villains were easy to identify. With its many examples of Christians behaving badly to each other within a godly polity, the Byzantine era complicated matters. Moreover, the

Preached at the Jacobean Courts, 1615-19 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 160-61.

¹⁰ James G. McManaway, 'Philip Massinger and the Restoration Drama', *Journal of English Literary History*, 1:3 (1934), 276–304. For differing identifications of the play's genre, see Louise George Clubb, '*The Virgin Martyr* and the *Tragedia Sacra*', *Renaissance Drama*, 7 (1964), 103-26; and Julia Gasper, *The Dragon and the Dove: The Plays of Thomas Dekker* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990): the disagreement points towards the fact that martyr-narratives were not exclusively Catholic property, and could be given a Reformist cast by suggesting that pagans were proto-papists. See also Jane Hwang Degenhardt, *Islamic Conversion and Christian Resistance on the Early Modern Stage* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010), Ch. 2. In the Restoration period the play helped to shape John Dryden's *Tyrannic Love* (1669) on Catherine of Alexandria: see Maximillian E. Novak and George Robert Guffey (eds.), *The Works of John Dryden*, Vol. 10, ed. (Berkeley, CA: California University Press, 1970), 385.

iconoclast controversies of the eighth and ninth centuries, when those who believed in the veneration of sacred images came to blows with those who disapproved of them as promoting idolatry, so fatefully prefigured a crucial aspect of the conflict between Catholic and Protestant that it would have been extraordinarily difficult to dramatize in the mainstream.¹¹ While it is always difficult to prove a negative, the relative lack of interest in Byzantine history throughout the seventeenth century among dramatists writing for the professional stage suggests, firstly, that the field was not well known, and secondly, that much of it would have posed ideological difficulties.

However, things were very different in the environment where Joseph Simons wrote his plays. Simons is chiefly famous for his role in converting the future James II of England to Catholicism during his period as Jesuit Provincial in London; the fact that, in earlier life, he had been a well-known playwright fascinated by the consequences of courtly conversion illustrates exceptionally well the new historicist truism that Renaissance creative writers could also be political agents.¹² The plays which can be confidently identified as Simons's work were printed, unusually for

¹¹ Significantly, *The History of the Iconoclasts* (1671), the only full-length English-language treatment of the topic to be published during the seventeenth century, was written by the Catholic Thomas Anderton, and dedicated to Catherine of Braganza.

¹² On James II's conversion, see James Stanier Clarke, *The Life of James II* (London: Longman, 1816), 440-43, 482-3, and John Callow, *The Making of King James II: The Formative Years of a Forgotten King* (Stroud: Sutton, 2000), 148, 152-3. In the context of dramatic history the relationship is briefly noted by Derek Hughes, *English Drama 1660-1700* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 78. See also Shell, 'Autodidacticism'.

Catholic college drama, and ran through several editions.¹³ They date from the period when he was professor of humanities at the English College of St Omer, responsible for writing plays performed by the students. The College was founded during Elizabeth I's reign by English Catholic exiles keen to ensure that the younger generation were brought up in the true faith; since Jesuits were heavily involved in the foundation and drama was central to Jesuit educational theory, plays were a regular feature of the college curriculum from early on, and the college became a centre of excellence for Latin drama.¹⁴ As educational dramas, they were [obliged to be instructive and edifying] designed to develop pupils' Latinity and oratorical skills in an edifying manner, and they also betray a Counter-Reformation stress on harnessing the imagination for religious ends. This resulted in an emphasis on sacred subjects. While church history may have been underexploited by the English theatrical mainstream, it was exactly where the playwrights at St Omer turned first for plots, and as William H. McCabe has observed, Simons was among the earliest dramatists in Europe to appreciate the dramatic possibilities of the Byzantine era.¹⁵

Though the chronology of Simons's plays is not entirely certain, those set in the Byzantine era appear to have been written later in his career.¹⁶ As his dramatic

¹³ *Zeno* was first published in 1648 and reprinted in *Tragoediae quinque* (1st ed. 1656).

¹⁴ McCabe, *Introduction*, part II[.] ; Hubert Chadwick, *St Omer to Stonyhurst: A History of Two Centuries* (London: Burns & Oates, 1962), 133-4.

¹⁵ McCabe, *Introduction*, 117, 140. At St Omer, Simons's plays had a precedent in *Arsenius* (anon., 1614).

¹⁶ *Vitus* (1623) and *Mercia* (1624) dramatize stories drawn from the early days of Christianity; *Theoctistus* (1624), *Leo Armenus* (1627) and *Zeno* (1631) are all set in

skills developed, he was drawn to the court intrigues of Byzantine history and the psychological sophistication they required of the dramatist.¹⁷ The plot of *Zeno* demonstrates the kind of challenge he was setting himself. Zeno, the ruler of the eastern empire, is described in the Argument as ‘infamous for his luxuriousness and cruelty’ (*luxuria atque immanitate infamis*). Having been told by an astrologer that he is likely to die violently, he tries to circumvent fate by murdering those he suspects of being his enemies and by settling the succession on his equally tyrannical brother Longinus. To do this he banishes Basiliscus, the current heir to the throne. Harmatius, the general of the imperial armies and Basiliscus’ father, is angered by Zeno’s actions, and several other members of the court, including the crafty Anastasius and the holy Pelagius, express dissatisfaction with Zeno’s rule. Harmatius and Pelagius are put to death, but eventually, thanks to Anastasius and his associate Urbitius, Longinus and Zeno meet the ends they deserve: the former is murdered in mid-flight, his escape routes being blocked by the ghosts of those whom he has murdered, while the latter is buried alive.¹⁸

the Byzantine era. For other possible attributions to Simons, see Sutton’s introduction to his edition of *Sanctus Damianus* (<http://www.philological.bham.ac.uk/damianus/>) [accessed April 2015].

¹⁷ See Sutton, ‘Introduction’, *Sanctus Damianus*, who has commented that ‘Court intrigue [...] was Simons’s favourite subject’.

¹⁸ Zeno I was emperor of Constantinople from 474-5, and again between 476-91; for Baronius’ account of his reign, see *Annales*, Vol. 1 (Mainz: Hieratus, 1623), 539-41. See also J. P. Vander Motten, ‘Sir William Killigrew’s *The Imperial Tragedy* as a Transitional Play’, *Studia Germanica Gandensia*, 15 (1974), 193-207.

In typical neo-Senecan style, the play is topped and tailed by speeches from a vengeful ghost, and the staging of these scenes bears out the grisly theme. Empty graves are revealed half-way through the opening scene, with the promise that Zeno will provide a corpse for each one before the end of the following day. At the play's end, the graves reappear with their occupants, in a reiteration of Zeno's own live burial. Then Longinus' funeral cortège passes, ending the play in spectacular fashion: 'Proclus marches at the head of the procession wearing a military uniform. Twelve soldiers follow him, marching in twos with their spears reversed. Soon there comes a drummer, accompanied by a standard-bearer. The drum is covered with a black cloth. There follows the executioner, bearing Longinus' head on a tall spear. Then come the six boys, clad in black, whose fathers Longinus had murdered. They shoot at Longinus' head with arrows. Two soldiers bring up the rear'.¹⁹ The metatheatrical epilogue pronounced by the ghost relates the action back to the play's title: 'Ambition raises up the man whom Fortune brings down. [...] This theater, completely spattered by murder's bloodshed, bears witness to this'.²⁰

Simons and Killigrew

¹⁹ *Pompam praeibat Proclus habitu militari. Sequebantur milites 12 bini et bini versis in terram hastis. Mox tympanista, cui adhaerebat vexillifer. Tympanum tegebat pannus niger. Subsequebatur carnifex, hasta praealta caput Longini praeferens. Pone sequebantur 6 pueri atrati quorum parentes Longinus sustulerat. Hi sagittis caput Longini petebant. Agmen claudebant duo milites.* (V, epilogue).

²⁰ *Tollit ambitio gradum,/ Quem sors ruina sternat. [...] Testis cruenta fronte sanguineum undique/ Caedis theatrum.* (V, epilogue, 2092-3, 7-8).

William Killigrew's adaptation of *Zeno*, under the title *The Imperial Tragedy*, is — as previous scholars have noted — a rare and striking occasion when English mainstream theatre can be seen to be in dialogue with English Catholic college drama.²¹ The fact that in the English court of the late 1660s this would have been a highly controversial literary influence deserves further comment, and explains several odd features of the play's publication.

Killigrew was a prominent figure in the Restoration court, Vice-Chamberlain to Queen Catherine of Braganza from 1664, and like some other Restoration courtiers, he wrote plays in response to the renewed demand from the re-opened public theatre.²² He published five plays, of which *Selindra* (1662) was also derived from Byzantine history — admittedly at several removes.²³ His application for the ambassadorship to Constantinople earlier in life may also have been motivated, at

²¹ See Sutton, *Imperial Tragedy*, and Vander Motten, 'Sir William Killigrew's *The Imperial Tragedy*'.

²² His brother Thomas Killigrew (1612-1683) was, with Sir William Davenant, put in charge of public theatre by Charles II in 1660, and served as Master of the Revels between 1673 and 1677; another brother, the clergyman Henry Killigrew (1613-1700) wrote a play (*ODNB*).

²³ The play dramatizes episodes from the life of Tervel, then believed to be the first Christian king of the Bulgarians. The story was widely treated by Jesuit authors (see Vander Motten, *Sir William Killigrew*, 193-5) and *Trebellius Bulgarorum Rex* was produced at St Omer in May 1624; see William H. McCabe, S.J., 'The Play-List of the English College of St Omers, 1592-1762', *Revue de Littérature Comparée*, 66 (1937), 355-375.

least in part, by an interest in the area and its history.²⁴ *The Imperial Tragedy* was the last of his plays. Though it was issued anonymously, contemporaries attributed the play to Killigrew, and signed copies survive.²⁵ Though much detective work has gone into establishing Killigrew's authorship of the play, there has, surprisingly, been no speculation as to why he should have wished it to remain anonymous. However, his anonymity is a crucial component of this unusual attempt to serve up Catholic college drama on the English mainland.

To begin with, it is highly likely that Killigrew and Simons knew each other personally. Killigrew was a courtier, and, as mentioned above, Simons was in London between 1659 and 1671 in his role as Jesuit Provincial; as such, he was one of the most senior Catholics in England, in a privileged position which placed him at the centre of the Restoration court.²⁶ Simons's dramatic compositions would surely have attracted interest in an environment where Killigrew was not the only courtier to double up as a playwright. To add to this circumstantial evidence, the tone of Killigrew's prologue (cited at the start of this essay) would make good sense in the context of personal acquaintance between the two men:

Methinks I hear some travel'd Gallant say,

²⁴ Vander Motten, *Sir William Killigrew*, p.74. In Vander Motten's later *ODNB* biography, he suggests that Killigrew's application for the ambassadorship may have been financially motivated.

²⁵ See below.

²⁶ This suggestion was first made by William H. McCabe, '*The Imperial Tragedy*', *Philological Quarterly*, 15 (1936), 311-314, and is supported by Sutton, 'Introduction', *Imperial Tragedy*.

When he was last at *Rome*, he saw this Play:
That *Zeno* there was Acted; we confess,
And hope that here he'l have as good success.
But we are pester'd with so many Wits,
And some, like Madmen, have such judging fits,
That this great Tragedy they may condemn;
Though, in a humor, they have pardon'd them,
Who rob the *French* and *Spanish* of their Bayes;
And make a fashion of Translating Playes.
To own his pattern, th' Author's not asham'd,
That Model, which in *Italy* was fram'd
He has new Moulded, for our *English* Stage;
Hoping 'twill fit the temper of this Age:
And the learn'd Latin Author not offend,
For alt'ring, what he dares not think to mend.
Though boldly it be here transformed so,
That Author cannot his own Issue know:
Like crafty Beggars, when they Children steal,
Disguise them; lest they should their Thefts reveal.²⁷

Considered as one playwright's message to another, this is notably cordial and respectful — not least because, in a golden age for plagiarists, Killigrew is anxious to give his source.²⁸ Paulina Kewes has observed that on the rare occasions when a

²⁷ *The Imperial Tragedy*, 1-16.

²⁸ Paulina Kewes, *Authorship and Appropriation: Writing for the Stage in England, 1660-1710* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 34-6.

source was acknowledged, this usually gave an opportunity for authors to boast that their task had been proposed to them by the king.²⁹ It may be possible to build on this, and speculate that the Duke of York might have put a word in here for Simons — yet if so, this is not openly acknowledged. Killigrew's is, in this as in other ways, a tribute somewhat at arm's length, anticipating diversity of opinion within the rest of his audience, and defensive about what is, on the face of it, a non-issue: why should those who pardon translations from the French and Spanish object to an Englishing of Latin drama? But the problem here may be less the play's translated status than its foreignness in other respects. If Killigrew is guardedly admitting that the play is likely to attract censure because of its Roman and Catholic provenance, that would help to explain his stress on the thorough-going nature of the adaptation, tactfully rendered — perhaps for Simons's eyes — as 'alt'ring, what he dares not think to mend'.

Something more is happening too, as we infer after reading the title page. Here, *An Imperial Tragedy* is described as 'taken out of a Latin Play, and very much Altered: By a Gentleman for his own Diversion. Who, on the Importunity of Friends, has consented to have it published; but without his Name: because many do censure Plays, according to their Opinion of the Author.'³⁰ It is, of course, conventional for authors to assert that they have only ventured into print because of such amicable pesterings. Yet it would have been possible to publish the play anonymously and without titular comment, as Killigrew did with an earlier play of his, *Pandora* (1663), rather than draw such blatant attention to the anonymity. As it stands, the wording

²⁹ Kewes, *Authorship and Appropriation*.

³⁰ Kewes, *Authorship and Appropriation*, 42, compares this to other dramatists' justification of adaptations.

invites the reader to ask which of the two authors might invite censure, and why.³¹ Interestingly in this context, when *The Imperial Tragedy* was reissued, nothing was said on the cancel title-page about its being an adaptation; readers are told only that it was ‘written by a gentleman for his own diversion and then made publick at the importunity of friends’.³² Whether deliberately or carelessly, the introductory poem remains, making it quite clear that the play is an adaptation[,] substitute semi-colon but the rewording has the effect of directing attention away from Killigrew’s source, and, whether this was Killigrew’s own decision or that of his publishers, it is suggestive. 1669, the year when both the first edition and the reissue of *The Imperial Tragedy* came out, was also the year when James II is known to have consulted Simons, and when James first expressed his belief that there was no salvation outside the Church of Rome.³³ Any courtier would have been alert to the possible political and religious dynamics here. The spiritual guide of the heir to the throne would have been a good recipient for literary flattery, but it is no wonder either that Killigrew should have been so alert to the need for deniability.³⁴

³¹Cf. the comments in Kewes, *Authorship and Appropriation*, about how both dramatists are described as ‘Author’ in the prologue (44-5).

³² For more information, see the ESTC: 1st ed., *ESTC* R17594; reissue, *ESTC* R205488.

³³ John Miller, *James II: A Study in Kingship* (London: Methuen, 1978), Ch.5; W.A. Speck, *James II* (London: Longman, 2002), 24. Callow places James's reception into the Catholic faith 'at some unspecified time between mid-1669 and early 1670': *Making of James II*, 152.

³⁴ James II did occasionally pay favoured writers: see Kewes, *Authorship and Appropriation*, 26.

Why might Killigrew have chosen *Zeno* from the substantial corpus of Simons's work? *Zeno* was one of Simons's most popular and frequently revived plays, and this might have been reason enough. It may also be relevant that it is one of the least obviously Catholic plays within Simons's corpus. *Vitus* and *Mercia* feature martyrs, while *Leo Armenus* dramatizes the clash between iconoclasts and iconodules in eighth-century Byzantium to imaginatively subversive effect. It is hard to imagine that Killigrew would have got away with, or even been attracted by, a scene such as the denouement of the latter play, where assassins disguised as priests slaughter a monarch in church; in a London which was subject to regular fits of anti-Catholic paranoia, this would have been nearly as incendiary as the Great Fire three years earlier.³⁵ Still, Killigrew does seem to have been happy to retain some of Simons's religious matter. *Zeno* contains a scene where Pelagius is caught up in an ecstasy in front of a crucifix, and framed by supporters of Zeno who substitute a statue of Jove, thus meaning that he can be arraigned for pagan worship and eventually executed. *The Imperial Tragedy* retains this scene, together with some of Simons's special effects: the chapel opening up, and a choir of angels (32-34). Clearly, both playwrights envisaged the use of flying machines to enhance the celestial effect: Simons stipulates, 'On either side of the altar, two angels appear on cranes, as if hovering in mid-air', while Killigrew asks for two angels to 'descend'.³⁶

³⁵ On iconoclasm and English Protestantism, see Keith Thomas, 'Art and Iconoclasm in Early Modern England', in Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake (eds.), *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2006), Ch. 2.

³⁶ *Ex utroque cornu altaris machinis quibusdam apparent duo angeli quasi in aere penduli* (IV. iv); *Imperial Tragedy*, IV, after l. 1321.

In other ways, though, Killigrew's adaptation does have a secularising effect. Commenting on the opening of the chapel doors, Simons's Pelagius speaks as follows:

And behold, the doors open and the altar stands revealed. Christ, ruler of this world, judge of kingdoms and terror of kings, favour my undertakings. Grant strength to my mind, thunder to my eloquence, and a moderation that suits my cause. Grant me to shatter the proud arrogance of our rulers, and the ability to return to a course of peace. If someone unable to manage his anger should violate this body with his steel, grant me to end my life in an exalted state of mind. Let the shedding of my blood avert whatever evil threatens this frail world of ours.³⁷

Adapting this speech, Killigrew markedly dechristianises its devotional content, and patriotically recasts Pelagius' hope that his martyrdom may counteract evil in the world:

The chappel opens. 'Tis a happy omen.
No time is lost when we implore heaven's aid.
Here I shall take new courage, raise my heart,
And cheerfully resign myself to death.

³⁷ *Et ecce foribus ara diductis patet./ Fraenator orbis Christe, regnorum arbiter,/ Idemque regum terror, inceptis fave./ Da robur animo, fulmen eloquio, modum / Causae decorum. Da superbificos ducum / Frangam tumores, inque tranquillum retro/ Cursum reflectam. Sin quis irarum impotens/ Hos rumpat artus chalybe, da mente ardua / Vitam resolvam. Quicquid occiduo imminet/ Orbi malorum, sanguis avertat meus* (IV. iii. 1451-60).

To have Longinus glutted with my blood,
I shall not grudge it for my countries good. (IV, ll. 1316-21)

Discomfort with Simons's religious language is also apparent in the way that Pelagius' execution has been rewritten. Simons makes this an opportunity for a full-blown baroque meditation on Christ's wounds:

To You, Christ, I dedicate my life, and likewise my death. Hail, my wounds, your bloody stars of my wounds. Hail, you ruddy light of the setting sun, and you little gems in the east, your faces wealthy with the blood of the Red Sea, you standards of the conquered Styx, the prices I paid for this world (. . .)³⁸

Killigrew was to publish some very popular religious meditations later in life, but at this point in his career and within this particular context, he was dismissive of devotional amplitude.³⁹ The corresponding scene in *The Imperial Tragedy* is distinctly laconic:

OFFICER: Come, Sir, 'tis time you should be on the Scaffold.

³⁸ Simons, *Zeno* (V. iii. 1772-7): *Tibi, Christe, vitam, pariter et mortem dico./ Salvete, plagae, sydera cruenta plagae./ Salvete, rutilae solis occidui faces./ Litoris Eoi gemmulae, rubei freti/ Frontes cruore divites, victae Stygis/ Vexilla, mundi pretia [...]*. English translation by Sutton; see also Sutton, 'Introduction', *Zeno*, on the play's complex textual history: Killigrew appears to have used either the 1648 edition of Simons's play published at Rome or that in *Tragediae quinque* (Liège, 1656).

³⁹ See below.

PELAG: 'Tis what I wish for; Oh accursed Times!

When Piety, and Truth, are counted Crimes!

OFFICER: Dispatch: we have no time for Homilies.

PELAG: Indeed such time would be mispent [*sic*] on you.⁴⁰

The Officer's rebuke to Pelagius can also be seen as Killigrew's slightly impatient metadramatic comment on his Latin original. How far Pelagius' speech went because its succulent religious metaphors jarred with English Protestant taste, and how far because Killigrew had other dramatic priorities, is a moot point, though plenty of Simons's monologues are carried over elsewhere. Killigrew also deletes an earlier scene (IV. i), in which Pelagius instructs his son in moral precepts, probably because outside the avowedly didactic context of Catholic college drama this might seem to hold up the action. Yet such neo-Stoic sentiments as Pelagius' reflection 'The way of austere virtue is rarely taken, yet on it your footsteps are firm' do provide a moral focus for the audience, just as his prayers advance a Christian model of behaviour, and their truncation shifts the balance of the drama.⁴¹ In all, it is Pelagius' part which suffers most from Killigrew's attempt to recast a Catholic school tragedy for an English context, and as a result, *The Imperial Tragedy* is left without a hero; the characters Anastasius and Urbitius, who eventually topple Zeno, are too compromised by political dirty tricks to be taken seriously in this role.

Given Simons's obligation to provide role models for his students, he would have had cause to dislike this feature of the rewrite. All the same, Killigrew's decision takes to its logical conclusion a train of thought which Simons himself had initiated.

⁴⁰ Act V, ll. 1621-5.

⁴¹ *Severae rara virtutis via est,/ Stabilisque gressus* (IV. i. 1372-3).

Tragoediae sacrae depend on the idea that the martyrs are the true winners, and given that, it can seem almost a disgrace to remain alive at the end of the play. Simons often does interesting things with this assumption: for instance, in an earlier play, *Vitus*, he extracts considerable comedy from the fact that when the boy-hero is miraculously rescued from torture, he objects loudly to his martyr's palm being snatched away.⁴² *Zeno* also experiments with sidelining the martyr-figure: Pelagius' execution is not the denouement, but happens some time previously, nor does he die for his Christian faith, but for his principled opposition to a nominally Christian tyrant. While Simons is very interested in religious language, he often chafes at the plot-requirements that conventionally attended the dramatization of sainthood and martyrdom.

Elsewhere too, Killigrew picks up on passages in Simons's original where dramatic requirements seem at odds with pastoral considerations. One such moment occurs in the scene where *Zeno* visits the magician Euphemianus in disguise, and asks for the help of demons:

(The mage stands up and, displaying a series of rings, offers evil spirits for sale.) But come now, who should this spirit be in its art? How great in its wit? What manner of character would you like him to have? Do you want to be overwhelmed by lust and that

⁴² See the discussion of *Vitus* in Alison Shell, 'Furor juvenilis: The Post-Reformation English Catholic Mission and Exemplary Youthful Behaviour', in Ethan Shagan (ed.), *Catholics and the Protestant Nation* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005), 185-206.

little boy of Venus? Here you have Ashmodaeus. He will be your professor of seductions, illicit amours, wantonness, lustful fires, and the sin of Gomorrah.⁴³

In the context of a school play, it is understandable that the demon of lust should be concealed in a magic ring, rather than portrayed by a pupil.⁴⁴ But Killigrew had no need to shield performers or audience from graphic depictions of lust, and when Euphemian says to Zeno in *The Imperial Tragedy*, ‘Does Venus sports delight thee? Here’s/ The god of lust. This rapes and inestests and/ All Gomorrah’s horrid sins shall teach thee’, he is gesturing towards an actor passing over the stage — clad, no doubt, in a suggestive costume.⁴⁵ It is hard not to feel that Simons would have written the scene this way originally, if he could.

A tolerant readership

⁴³ Magus surgit et promptis ordine annulis malos genios venditat. *Sed age, quis arte? Quantus ingenio? Quibus/ Attemperatus moribus genius placet?/ Vin’ te libido vastet et Veneris puer?/ En Asmodaeus. Stupra et illicitos toros,/ Luxumque, et ignes, et Gommorhaeum scelus/ Docebit iste* (I. ii. 78-83).

⁴⁴ On magic rings, see Jan R. Veenstra, 'The Holy Almandal: Angels and the Intellectual Aims of Magic', in *The Metamorphosis of Magic in the Late Medieval and Early Modern Period*, ed. Jan N. Bremmer and Jan R. Veenstra, Groningen Studies in Cultural Change, 1 (Leuven: Peeters, 2002), pp.189-230. For a contemporary reference to conjurers keeping evil spirits in rings, see Edmund Porter, ΘΕΔΩΣ Ἄνθρωποπόροϋς; *Or, God Incarnate* (1655), 57.

⁴⁵ *Imperial Tragedy*, I. 80-82.

Killigrew states in the prologue to *The Imperial Tragedy* that the play was ‘new Moulded, for our *English Stage*’. However, ever since the theatrical bibliographer Gerard Langbaine dubiously recorded that it was ‘acted (if I mistake not) at the Nursery in *Barbican*’, its performance has remained an open question.⁴⁶ On the other hand, there is good evidence that Killigrew actively sought a coterie readership for this play and others. Two volumes of his printed plays, annotated by him, are known to survive: the first in the Rosenbach Library, Philadelphia, and the second in the Brotherton Library, Leeds.⁴⁷ Both give detailed evidence of Killigrew’s revisions: typographical errors are corrected, altered stage directions and second thoughts on

⁴⁶ Gerard Langbaine, *An account of the English dramatick poets* (Oxford: L.L. for George West and Henry Clements, 1691), 535. Vander Motten, *Sir William Killigrew*, 176-8, considers the question in most detail.

⁴⁷ Brotherton Collection, Leeds University, MS Lit. q 16; Rosenbach Museum and Library, Philadelphia, EL2 f.K48f, item 5. See Joseph S. Johnston, Jr., ‘Sir William Killigrew’s Revised Copy of his *Four New Plays*: Confirmation of his Claim to *The Imperial Tragedy*’, *Modern Philology*, 74 (1976-7), 72-4; John Horden, ‘Sir William Killigrew’s *Four New Playes* (1666) with his *Imperial Tragedy* (1669): A Second Annotated Copy’, *The Library*, 6th series, 6:3 (1984), 271-5; John Horden and J. P. Vander Motten, ‘*Five New Playes*: Sir William Killigrew’s Two Annotated Copies’, *The Library*, 6th series, 11:3 (1989), 253-71. Annotations to another play of Killigrew’s, *The Seege of Urbin*, are preserved in the Dyce Collection in the National Art Library, Victoria and Albert Museum (D.2.M.11, 5510), and described in J. P. Vander Motten, ‘Another Annotated Copy of Sir William Killigrew’s *Four New Playes* (1666)’, *The Library*, 6th series, 8:1 (1986), 53-58.

dialogue are incorporated, and manuscript prologues and epilogues are supplied from envisaged or actual stage incarnations.⁴⁸ They also clearly establish Killigrew's authorship of *The Imperial Tragedy*, since he signs it at the end in both.⁴⁹

Though both these volumes have received meticulous scholarly attention, the evidence they yield for the relationship between Killigrew and Simons, and the impact of Jesuit drama in England, deserves further discussion. Together, they shed an interesting light on the relationship between Simons and Killigrew, and how the latter wished it to appear to the outside world. The Rosenbach copy was given by Killigrew to Arthur Annesley, 1st Earl of Anglesey, who had a habit of fraternising with those of differing religious persuasions, and so would have taken Killigrew's acquaintanceship with Simons in his stride.⁵⁰ Though the recipient of the Brotherton copy has never been identified, we can again deduce that he or she would not have objected to Killigrew's literary contacts.

Killigrew's alterations go further than the printed text in suggesting a friendly relationship between him and Simons, and give us other clues as to the presumed

⁴⁸ On how Killigrew's revisions compare to those of other contemporary playwrights, see Nancy Klein Maguire, *Regicide and Restoration: English Tragicomedy, 1660-1671* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 119-20.

⁴⁹ Joseph S. Johnston, Jr., and J. P. Vander Motten, 'Some Unpublished Restoration Prologues and Epilogues: New Light on the Stage History of Sir William Killigrew's Plays', *Modern Philology*, 77:2 (1979-80), 159-63.

⁵⁰ See M. Perceval-Maxwell's *ODNB* entry on Annesley. Horden and Vander Motten comment that the volume 'is in no sense a formal presentation copy [...] for the text displays none of the careful preparation normally associated with presentation' (*Five New Playes*', 265).

sympathies of his readers. Lines 5-10 of the printed prologue, which — as discussed above — defend the play against the condemnations of those who dislike foreign material, have been cut and replaced by the following quatrain in the Brotherton copy:

Thefts did I saye! our Author bids me owne
The womens parts, because that Playe has none.
And all the rest so chang'd! it maye be sayd.
Tis so transformd! as if twere all new mayd.⁵¹

Killigrew's addition of female characters is indeed a very obvious difference between the two texts. Women's parts were officially discouraged at several periods in the life of Catholic college drama, and Simons adheres to this stricture: there are no parts for women in *Zeno*.⁵² But Killigrew had no ideological reason not to supply women within his adaptation — indeed, if the play were intended for performance, he had every incentive to do so, since in the early years of Restoration theatre the relative novelty of actresses would surely have increased a play's attractiveness to the general public.⁵³ Female characters — Zeno's wife, whom he is slowly poisoning, and the virtuous Irene, whom he wishes to marry instead — are foregrounded in *The Imperial Tragedy*, and markedly change its emphasis.

Another annotation, peculiar to the Brotherton copy, refers to a banquet scene in *Zeno* where one of the performers is dressed up as Bacchus, and enters in on a

⁵¹ TBC in print version.

⁵² Elizabeth Howe, *The First English Actresses* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992). On women in *The Imperial Tragedy*, see Sutton, 'Introduction'.

⁵³ McCabe, *Introduction*, Ch. 15.

chariot drawn by monarchs, illustrating the moral commonplace that even they are subject to the irrationality brought on by wine, and probably alluding to the chariot drawn by kings in Christopher Marlowe's *Tamburlaine*.⁵⁴ Ironically in view of his own imminent downfall, Longinus hails the spectacle as an excuse to raise a glass: 'Thus may Bacchus lead us to his chariot in triumph. Evoe, let's drink'.⁵⁵ Killigrew has written in the margin of his own version: 'Leaue out these lines, tis not fitt to shew such great Monarks on the stage, in such contempt! though my Latin Authour haue done it; I dislike it. W:K:'.⁵⁶ Though Horden and Vander Motten suggest that these lines were Killigrew's memorandum to himself or to a copyist, this kind of extensive justification implies a reader who was not Killigrew himself, and who was reading the text for critical rather than mechanical reasons. The context is ludic, but one can understand why Killigrew had second thoughts about these lines, especially given the common suspicion that Jesuits were ambitious to overthrow kings.⁵⁷ Over and above the political sensitivities at play here, it is worth noting that Killigrew is

⁵⁴ Act V, viii. See the opening stage directions to *Tamburlaine the Great*, II. iv. 3, in David Bevington and Eric Rasmussen (eds.) *Doctor Faustus and Other Plays* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995).

⁵⁵ *Sic nos triumpho Bacchus ad currum trahat. / Evoe bibamus.* (V. viii. 1861-2).

⁵⁶ See Horden, 'Sir William Killigrew's *Four New Playes*', 274-5. For a contemporary dramatisation of the commonplace that Bacchus conquered kings, see Louis Grabu, *Ariadne, or, the Marriage of Bacchus* (1673/4).

⁵⁷ Though the idea does indeed come from Simons, the kings (Alexander and Antony) are only named in Killigrew's play: see Horden and Vander Motten, '*Five New Playes*', 257.

using the post-print circulation of his text to alleviate the agonising, all too familiar sensation of printing something and then wishing to withdraw it.

To summarise: this article has suggested that Killigrew was on friendly terms with Simons in the late 1660s and wanted to pay him a compliment by adapting his play; but that he printed it anonymously, not mentioning either Simons's name or his own, because he was aware that Simons was a controversial associate. At the same time he appended a tantalising title page to his work, suggesting that there was more to his anonymity than mere modesty, and came clean about his authorship to the semi-private audience with whom he also shared his revisions: an audience which included at least one individual with a pronounced interest in religious toleration. In recent years, scholars of the early modern period have developed a sharp awareness of how the gift of books could cement literary and personal alliances, and how manuscript circulation could define friendship and patronage networks.⁵⁸ Killigrew gives us something in between: a case study of how an author's previously printed material could be personalised by manuscript annotation for an inner circle. This type of circulation could be used to shield the authors of politically sensitive literary material, but also to disclose them; after all, the attribution of *The Imperial Tragedy* would still be uncertain without Killigrew's annotations.

Like Killigrew's life as a whole, this testifies to a difficult balancing act. In 1675 Killigrew served on a committee to hinder Roman Catholics from sitting in

⁵⁸ On coterie circulation in this period, see Harold Love, *The Culture and Commerce of Texts: Scribal Publication in 16th-Century England* (first publ. in 1993; reprinted Amherst, MA: Massachusetts University Press, 1998), and Margaret J.M. Ezell, *Social Authorship and the Advent of Print* (Baltimore, ML: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999).

Parliament, yet as a courtier in the Queen's household and supporter of the Duke of York, he had an obligation to fight their corner. During the debates on the Test Act of 1673, which stipulated that all office holders in the service of Charles II or the Duke of York should subscribe to an oath of allegiance, Killigrew pleaded that the queen's servants should be exempt. Most painfully of all, on 21 November 1678 he was to break down in Parliament during a debate on excluding the Duke of York from the House of Lords, with the words, 'I dread taking the Duke from the King'.⁵⁹ His retirement from public life and a turn to piety followed shortly afterwards, accompanied by the publication of his most successful literary effort, *Midnight Thoughts*, a book of religious jottings in verse and prose. This first appeared in 1681 with the subtitle *The constant meditations of a man who for many years built on sand, which every blast of cross fortune has defaced. But now he has laid new foundations on the rock of his salvation*. We can learn something about the volume's reception from a change of subtitle the following year: *Mid-night thoughts, writ as some think, by a London-Whigg, or, a Westminster-Tory; Others think by a Quaker, or a Jesuit: But call him what they please, they may find him a true penitent of the church of Christ*.⁶⁰ If we assume Killigrew composed this — highly likely, judging from its personal tone and his interventionist textual habits elsewhere — he was to have third

⁵⁹ Henning, *House of Commons*, further notes that Killigrew's long-running battles in the House of Commons over the drainage of Lindsey level in Lincolnshire would have been hindered by his opposition to the Test bill (681).

⁶⁰ On the complex textual history of this multi-part work, see the online *English Short-Title Catalogue*: R8939, R11693, R15985, R22780, R41038, R179237, R179239, R221028, R227259 [accessed April 2015]. Title transcriptions taken from *ESTC*.

thoughts, reverting to the original subtitle for subsequent editions. But the statement is interesting for its very temporariness, as Killigrew does his best to resist party politics and uphold the idea that pious meditation could be inspired by Christians of many persuasions.⁶¹ The fact that he was willing to endorse Ignatian — and indeed Quaker — meditative practice fits with his overall desire for religious tolerance, and would surely have taken on an added resonance for those who knew of his earlier borrowing from a Jesuit author.

Conclusion

Even if the history of the Byzantine empire was a relatively uncommon source for Tudor and Stuart professional dramatists, Killigrew was not the only Restoration playwright to draw on it. Two of Nathaniel Lee's dramas have opening scenes dramatizing the vision which inspired the emperor Constantine to make Christianity the official religion of the Roman empire, one of the few episodes of Byzantine history which reached a wider public than church historians in this era.⁶² For the earlier of the two plays, *Theodosius* (1680), the stage directions read as follows:

⁶¹ In *Midnight Thoughts* (1688), he claims: 'I am told that my *Midnight Thoughts*, are full of Quakerisms; though I know not any one Tenet belonging to that Calling [...]' (223). However, cf. *Midnight Thoughts* (1694): '[I] do not profess to be an inspir'd *Quaker*, nor a profess'd Hermit; though I do believe that both those Callings may have pious Men, that do abhor Hypocrisie in Devotion as much as I do' (53).

⁶² Lee's main source was Gaultier de Coste, seigneur de la Calprenède, *Pharamond* (1661), translated into English by John Phillips in 1677. See the introduction to

A stately Temple, which represents the Christian Religion, as in its first Magnificence: Being but lately establish'd at Rome and Constantinople. The Side Scenes shew the horrid Tortures with which the Roman Tyrants persecuted the Church, and the flat Scene, which is the limit of the prospect, discovers an Altar richly adorn'd, before it Constantine, suppos'd kneels, with Commanders about him, gazing at a bloody Cross in the Aire, which being incompass'd with many Angels, offers it self to view, with these words distinctly written, (In hoc signo vinces! [Under this sign you will conquer!]) Instruments are heard, and many Attendants; The Ministers at Divine Service, walk busily up and down. Till Atticus the Chief of all the Priests, and Successor of St. Chrysostom, in rich Robes, comes forward with the Philosopher Leontine. The Waiters in Ranks bowing all the way before him. A Chorus heard at distance.⁶³

Print, of course, is not necessarily a guide to what was staged. Even so, this full-blown baroque spectacle, in a play that was frequently revived within the Restoration period, shows that it was quite possible to dramatize religious matter on the late seventeenth-century London stage if the tone was elevated enough.⁶⁴ While respectful

Theodosius in Thomas B. Stroup and Arthur L. Cooke (eds.), *The Works of Nathaniel Lee*, 2 vols. (New Brunswick, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1954), Vol. 2, 231 (all quotations are taken from this edition). Stroup and Cooke comment that 'Lee drew almost nothing from actual history' (232). See also J. M. Armistead, *Nathaniel Lee* (Boston: Twayne, 1979), Ch. 9.

⁶³ Stroup and Cooke (eds.), Vol. 2, 241.

⁶⁴ For the play's popularity, see Stroup and Cooke, eds., 231. A similar scene opens Lee's *Constantine the Great* (1683), which features Pope Sylvester I among the

allusion to Constantine's reign was not a Catholic preserve — in *Acts and Monuments* a century earlier, John Foxe had compared it to Elizabeth I's — the staging seems designed to evoke Catholic church design and ritual.⁶⁵ This may seem a surprising departure for Lee, recently the author of two virulently anti-Catholic plays, *The Massacre of Paris* (1679) and *Caesar Borgia* (1679); yet the first of these dramas had been banned, and the second had been almost as controversial.⁶⁶ The dedication of *Theodosius* to Frances Stewart, Duchess of Richmond, a lifelong Catholic, suggests a degree of backtracking and points towards his ideological flexibility where court patronage was in question.⁶⁷ For Lee, as for Killigrew, an interest in Byzantine history came in useful where one wished to show friendliness towards individual Catholics or the Catholic cause.

dramatis personae, admittedly without his title. See *ibid.*, 481. On the latter play, see Armistead, *Nathaniel Lee*, Ch.12, who sees it as a providentialist drama addressing the court's religious differences, and A. L. Cooke and Thomas B. Stroup, 'The Political Implications in Lee's *Constantine the Great*', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 49:4 (1950), 506-15. Matthew J. Kinservik has stated that 'plays that ridiculed religion [...] were most likely to be banned': see his 'Theatrical Regulation During the Restoration Period', in Susan J. Owen (ed.), *A Companion to Restoration Drama* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), 36-52 (41).

⁶⁵ Gretchen E. Minton, "'The same cause and like quarell': Eusebius, John Foxe and the Evolution of Ecclesiastical History', *Church History*, 71:4 (2002), 715-42.

⁶⁶ See Stroup and Cooke (eds.), Vol. 1, 13.

⁶⁷ On Frances Stewart and her religious sympathies, see *ODNB* and Armistead, *Nathaniel Lee*, 127; Armistead argues that the plot of *Theodosius* encourages pragmatic Christian action while discouraging religious fanaticism (128).

When an historical period is relatively little drawn upon by playwrights, occasions where it is used take on a particular significance. Similarly, Killigrew's exploitation of Simons's work is interesting precisely because of its rarity. While English Catholic school drama did sometimes borrow from the mainland, the compliment was seldom returned — probably because it was little known about.⁶⁸ Richard Carpenter, a serial convert between Catholicism and Protestantism, wrote an anti-Catholic closet drama during one of his Protestant phases, in which — perhaps referring to the uninhibited dramatizations of the English Reformation in Catholic college drama — his spokesman, Aristotle Junior, asks: 'These Renegadoes expose our Nation, being also their own, ridiculous in their Colledg-Comedies beyond the Seas: why should not we then, within our own Sphere and Region, pay them with the Law of Talion, especially after such most abusive, and most injurious Transactions?'⁶⁹ It is a good question, especially if one extends it beyond playwrights to anti-theatrical commentators and anti-Catholic polemicists; for instance, though in the early seventeenth century two publications described an occasion when actors died from being struck by lightning during a Jesuit drama condemning the English Reformation, neither has anything to say about the English contribution to the genre.⁷⁰

⁶⁸ See Martin Wiggins, 'Shakespeare Jesuited: The Plagiarisms of 'Pater Clarcus'', *The Seventeenth Century*, 20:1 (2005), 1-21; and the recently discovered First Folio on the Public Library at St Omer: <http://theshakespeareblog.com/2014/12/shakespeare-in-france-the-st-omer-first-folio/> [accessed March 2015].

⁶⁹ *A New Play Call'd The Pragmatical Jesuit New-Leaven'd* (1665), 65.

⁷⁰ *The Jesuits Comedy* (1607) and S.R., *The Jesuites Play at Lyons in France* (1607).

See Alexandra Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford

Historians of English theatre have largely continued to ignore Catholic college drama, which is certainly hard to integrate into the usual narratives; many of Simons's plays, and those of his anonymous colleagues, are best understood as throwing the differences between mainstream English theatre and English Catholic college drama into sharp relief. But this makes Killigrew's adaptation of *Zeno* all the more fascinating as a rare, nervous, politically sensitive convergence of the two worlds.

University Press, 1999), 236-7. On anti-theatricalism in the Restoration, see Michael Corder, 'Playwright versus Priest: Profanity and the Wit of Restoration Comedy', in Deborah Payne Fisk (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to English Restoration Theatre* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 209-225.