

Shakespeare Jesuited: The Plagiarisms of ‘Pater Clarcus’

Scholars have entertained the possibility that Shakespeare may have had a Roman Catholic readership of expatriate Englishmen on the Continent since Willem Schrickx discovered a book-list of 1619 establishing that a Quarto copy of *Pericles* was then owned by the English Jesuit college at Saint-Omer.¹ A few copies of the Folio are also known to have made their way out of England and into Catholic hands: Gondomar purchased a first Folio in 1623 and reputedly handed it on as an heirloom to his descendants in Spain; and a second Folio existed at the Jesuit college at Valladolid, and was censored by William Sankey SJ, under the authority of the Inquisition, for student reading.² Later in the seventeenth century, an English Catholic at Douai transcribed the texts of six plays from the second Folio, perhaps in preparation for amateur performances.³

A few plays by seventeenth-century Catholic dramatists also have Shakespearean connections, some tenuous and some secure. In his *Palaestra eloquentiae ligatae dramatica* (1664), the German Jesuit Jakob Masen summarizes the plot of a play about Romeo and Juliet, but the most we can say is that the anonymous dramatist was attracted to the same subject matter as Shakespeare: there were numerous versions of the story in European literature of the period, and the author must either have had an unusual source or have been an inattentive reader, for he seems to have thought that Romeo was a Capulet.⁴ There are more certain links to Shakespeare in the satirical comedy, *The Anti-Bishop* (1629–30), written by an English Catholic at the time of the Chalcedon controversy. (The manuscript is now in the English College, Rome, but was probably transcribed in England.) The play’s editor, Suzanne Gossett, has shown that the principal model for the play, with its sardonic on-stage ‘grex’ or chorus, was Ben Jonson’s *Every Man Out of His Humour*; but the inept Constable Pumpkin can trace his lineage back to Dogberry, and even to his antecedent, Anthony Dull: ‘I reprehend the king’s own person here’, says Pumpkin in a fruitless attempt to assert his authority (3369), which comes almost verbatim from Dull in *Love’s Labours Lost*

MARTIN WIGGINS

(1.1.181).⁵ Moreover, this dramatist's experience of Shakespeare was evidently not confined to comic constables: at one point a senior cleric is called 'The setter up and puller down of kings' (1703), echoing Queen Margaret's derisive epithet for Warwick in the Folio text of *Henry VI, Part 3*, 'Proud setter-up and puller-down of kings' (3.3.157). (The line does not appear in the adapted and possibly pirated Quarto version printed in 1595.) Here was one Catholic playwright familiar with and influenced by the London theatrical mainstream of English drama. This essay will present new evidence of another, presumably appreciative, Catholic reader of Shakespeare, who wrote his own plays in mainland Europe before 1660: 'Pater Clarcus' [Father Clarke] of St Omers.⁶

'Clarcus' is the author's name subscribed to *Innocentia Purpurata seu Rosa Candida et Rubicunda* [Innocence Bloodied, or The White Rose and the Red], which was edited in the 1960s by Sister Winefride.⁷ The play survives in a two-volume manuscript collection of poems and plays associated with the English Catholic school run by the Jesuits at Saint-Omer in Flanders.⁸ Like many other surviving St Omers tragedies, the play is written in Latin, and in three acts. Its spoken text runs to 1343 lines, and it has thirty speaking parts, plus a choir. Probably compiled in the second half of the 1650s, the manuscript has a patchy provenance, but in the nineteenth century it was part of the library of Bridgetown House (now Alveston Manor), Stratford-upon-Avon, and was later acquired by Stonyhurst College in Lancashire, where St Omers eventually settled after the expulsion of the Jesuits from France in the eighteenth century.

Innocentia Purpurata is a Catholic historical tragedy about the later stages of the Wars of the Roses. The action runs from Edward IV's escape from custody to Henry VI's death, and the play's sympathies are broadly Lancastrian. Throughout, Henry is treated as the rightful king and Edward as the usurper, a bias reflected in the way Edward is associated with riotous and disruptive scenes, but Henry with orderly and ceremonious ones like the processional entry of the Parliament (1.2) or the investiture of his son with the Order of St George (1.4). The play's tragedy lies in the way Edward comes to recognize the legitimacy of Henry's claim too late to prevent his murder by Richard of Gloucester, and the final scene overtly presents the dead King as a martyr received into heaven by an angel, the typical fate of saints in Jesuit school drama.⁹ A comic sub-plot concerns the baiting of Bold, a braggart unwisely ennobled by Edward IV for abetting his escape in the opening scene.

The *Annals of English Drama* assigns *Innocentia Purpurata* to the author 'P. Claretus', and to the year 1623, on the argument that it is to be identified with the tragedy *Henrici Sexti Regis Angliae Casum* [The Fall of Henry VI, King of England] which was performed by the Rhetoric class – that is, the senior boys – at St Omers on Thursday 26 October that year.¹⁰ Most of this entry derives from conclusions reached by William H. McCabe, the author

THE PLAGIARISMS OF 'PATER CLARCUS'

of the first comprehensive study of Jesuit drama; he further suggests that the play may have been revived as *Plantagenetarum Angliae Regum tragico exitio* on Thursday 16 August 1629.¹¹ These conclusions can now be shown to be erroneous. Sister Winefride pointed out in the introduction to her edition that McCabe had misread the name 'Clarcus': a slip of the scribe's pen on the lower ascending loop of the lower case *c* made it look vaguely like the letters *et*.¹² The signature's initial 'P.' is, of course, an abbreviation for 'Pater', indicating that the author was in holy orders. The author's name, or alias, was evidently Father Clarke.

Surprisingly, in the course of preparing her edition and translation Sister Winefride paid relatively little attention to the play's sources beyond the author's own account. At the end of the Argument to the play, 'Clarcus' cites as his authorities Polydore Vergil, Philippe de Commines, and other English and French historians. In view of this it is striking how little of the play is faithful to the history recorded in these or any other accounts that were available in the seventeenth century: for example, Henry VI's son, Prince Edward, is not killed, as he was historically, at the battle of Tewkesbury, but in a sentimental prison scene invented for the play. Broadly speaking, the historical events form a framework for the action rather than being represented as action in themselves: the dramatic interest lies largely elsewhere. I shall demonstrate that, despite his claims, 'Clarcus' found a substantial part of his principal source material not in a chronicle at all, but in *Mr William Shakespeare's Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies*, the Folio collection of plays which was printed four times during the seventeenth century: there are close similarities with four Shakespeare plays, and a few possible allusions to others. Some of these plays were only available in print after the appearance of the first Folio in November 1623.¹³ It follows that *Innocentia Purpurata* cannot be identified with the *Henrici Sexti* performed the previous month.

The overall action of the Jesuit play corresponds roughly with the last third of *Henry VI, Part 3* (4.5 on), though with substantial deviations into other material. 'Clarcus' evidently also consulted a chronicle source, since details are included which were omitted by Shakespeare; Sister Winefride argues plausibly that correspondences in two scenes, the deaths of Warwick and Montacute (2.1) and the capture of Prince Edward (2.2), that this was John Speed's *History of Great Britain* (1611, reprinted 1623 and 1650).¹⁴ This should make us cautious in assessing the extent of the Shakespearian influence. However, there are some features of *Innocentia Purpurata* which the author can only have found in Shakespeare's play.

In particular, the opening scene of the Latin play, in which Richard, Bold, and Stanley disguise themselves as huntsmen and rescue Edward IV from custody while he is out hunting, derives from the similar scene in Shakespeare's play involving Richard, Hastings, and Stanley: both have the same basic scenic form, beginning with Richard talking with his fellow ambushers and

MARTIN WIGGINS

then moving on to the rescue. It is true that there are only a few exact correspondences: the rescuers' disguise in the Jesuit play was probably suggested by a remark made by Shakespeare's Edward (*3H6*, 4.6.15), and in both plays Richard refers to a horse awaiting Edward (*IP*, 1.1.61–2; *3H6*, 4.6.19).¹⁵ There are, moreover, some differences: the Jesuit dramatist has Edward rather more stoutly guarded than Shakespeare, and the result is a minor stage battle. What makes the debt certain is the fact that Shakespeare invented some fundamental details of the scene in combining two different passages of his chronicle source, Hall's *Union of the Two Noble and Illustre Families, Lancaster and York*. In Hall (and in Speed, for that matter), Edward's rescuers are Stanley and Sir Thomas of Borough; Richard is only present in *Henry VI, Part 3* because Shakespeare amalgamates the incident with Edward's flight to Lynn, accompanied by his brother, which takes place a few pages later in Hall.¹⁶ 'Clarcus' could only have found the material for his version of the incident by reading Shakespeare's play.

From this point, the narrative of the Jesuit play loosely follows Shakespeare's. In both, the next scene has Edward pronounced a traitor, after which a messenger reports his escape (*IP*, 1.2.110–15, 161–4; *3H6*, 4.7.54–5, 78–9). But after this, *Innocentia Purpurata* follows a circuitous route around the events of *Henry VI, Part 3*: first it jumps forward to cover Clarence's defection back to the Yorkist side (*IP*, 1.2.181–3, 1.3.206–23; *3H6*, 5.1.85–108), and then back to the start of Shakespeare's play where Prince Edward of Lancaster protests that his father's willingness to resign the crown will disinherit him (*IP*, 1.4.330–8; *3H6*, 1.1.227–8). 'Clarcus' then leap-frogs forward, perhaps drawn on by a similar protest from Shakespeare's Clifford (*3H6*, 2.1.34–8), to the knighting of the Prince (*IP*, 1.4.353–60; *3H6*, 2.1.60–5), before finally snapping back to his starting-point, the scene of Edward's attainder, to present the meeting between Henry VI and the young Earl of Richmond.

This moment is closely imitated from Shakespeare:

Innocentia Purpurata:

Placet: capessat sceptrum; coniungat Rosas.

Perplacet: ad omne stamus imperium, Deus,

Parere prompti. proprius huc gradum, Puer.

(*Imponit manum capiti Richemondi.*)

Audite, Proceres: fata sic voluit deus.

Quod nunc rebelli captat Odoardus manu

Ebur Britannum; capiet hic olim Puer,

Geminas maritans calice consorti rosas.

(1.4.364–70)

[Yes! Let him have the sceptre. Let him join the roses. I am quite satisfied. I obey your every command promptly, O God. Come here, my boy. (*He puts his hand on Richmond's head.*) Listen, nobles, God wishes the fates to be thus. The sceptre of Britain which Edward now holds in his rebellious hands, this boy will hold at a future date, marrying the two roses in one flower.]

THE PLAGIARISMS OF 'PATER CLARCUS'

3 *Henry VI*:

Come hither, England's Hope:

Layes his Hand on his Head.

If secret powers suggest but truth

To my diuining thoughts,

This prettie Lad will proue our Countries blisse.

His Lookes are full of peacefull Maiestie,

His Head by nature fram'd to weare a Crowne,

His Hand to wield a Scepter, and himselfe

Likely in time to blesse a Regall Throne:

Make much of him, my Lords, for this is hee

Must helpe you more, then you are hurt by mee. (4.7.68–76)

Shakespeare's version appears to have suggested the references to Richmond's sceptre-wielding future as King, and also the staging, with Henry calling the boy forward. The statement that he will join the roses may, moreover, have been suggested by Richmond's statement at the end of Shakespeare's *Richard III*, 'We will vnite the White Rose, and the Red' (5.8.19).¹⁷ But it is the stage direction which conclusively establishes the debt to the Folio text. It seems to have been Shakespeare who first underlined the sixth Henry's prophecy of the seventh with physical contact: the detail is not mentioned in the accounts of the King's meeting with young Richmond that appear in the Tudor chronicles of Polydore Vergil, Hall, and Holinshed, nor does it appear in Speed. Moreover, there is no such stage direction in the adapted and possibly pirated Quarto version of *Henry VI, Part 3* that was published in 1595. Clarke could only have found it in one of the seventeenth-century Folios.

The main plot of *Innocentia Purpurata* next presents the battle of Barnet (2.2; 5.2 in *3H6*), at which Warwick and Montacute die in each others arms, rather than taking their leave from one another as in Shakespeare. (Both plays exploit the sentimental possibilities of the moment.) Then Prince Edward is captured and interrogated – but instead of an immediate murder on the battlefield, as in *Henry VI, Part 3*, he is sent off to prison, to participate in an imitation of *King John*.

The two other players are Richard of Gloucester and Croft, the Prince's tutor. 'Clarcus' may have been remembering Rutland's tutor in *Henry VI, Part 3*, but Croft's principal antecedent is Hubert in *King John*. In the second act, Richard bribes him to undertake Prince Edward's murder in prison, or at least to blind him:

Lumina praeusta sude

Sive eruantur, sica seu fauces petat

Nihil interesse duxerim. caecum Ducem,

Nisi mente cassus, nemo sibi regem velit. (2.4.688–91)

[I consider it of no importance whether his eyes are burnt out with a poker or gouged out, or whether a sword finds his throat. No sane person would want a blind man for King.]

MARTIN WIGGINS

In this passage ‘Clarcus’ tries to make sense of the inconsistency in Shakespeare’s play as to whether Hubert is to murder Arthur or merely put out his eyes. In the murder scene itself, when Croft, like Hubert, finds himself inhibited by conscience, the parallels are more precise.¹⁸ First the imprisoned prince shows concern about his captor:

Innocentia Purpurata:

Quas cogis ore, Crofte, nubeculas? Satin?
Vales? (3.1.983–4)

[What clouds are darkening your expression, Croft? Aren’t you very well?]

King John:

Are you sicke, Hubert? you looke pale to day (4.1.28)

The assassin is worried that talking to the boy will shake his resolve, so he shows his warrant.

Innocentia Purpurata:

Quot verba fundit; tot sinum iaculis fodit.
Labefacta mens succumbet, actutum scelus
Nisi occuparo. Syngropham hanc, Puer, lege. (3.1.1000–2)

[Every word he speaks is like an arrow plunged in my breast. My tottering resolve will give way if I do not begin the deed immediately. Read this scroll, my boy.]

King John:

If I talke to him, with his innocent prate
He will awake my mercie, which lies dead:
Therefore I will be sodaine, and dispatch.
.....
His words do take possession of my bosome.
Read heere yong *Arthur*. (4.1.25–33)

The boy then asks if the killer really means to follow his instructions:

Innocentia Purpurata:

ODOARDUS: Proh scelus! an ambos forcipe ignita mihi
Effodiet oculos, Croftus?
CROFTUS: Hanc dedi fidem.
ODOARDUS: Datamque praestas?
CROFTUS: Praesto.
ODOARDUS: Non poteris, scio.
CROFTUS: Potero.
ODOARDUS: Mihine, Croftus, eripere diem,
Radice ab ima penitus evulsos dare
Oculos alumno?
CROFTUS: Penitus evulsos dabo. (3.1.1003–8)
[EDWARD: What a crime! Would Croft gouge out both my eyes with red-hot pincers?
CROFT: I’ve given my word.]

THE PLAGIARISMS OF 'PATER CLARCUS'

EDWARD: But can you keep your promise?
 CROFT: Yes.
 EDWARD: I'm sure you won't be able.
 CROFT: I will.
 EDWARD: Will Croft be able to deprive me of sight; to hand over my eyes
 torn out by the roots, from me, his pupil?
 CROFT: I will hand them over, torn out utterly.]

King John:

Must you with hot Irons, burne out both mine eyes?
Hub. Yong Boy, I must.
Art. And will you?
Hub. And I will.

Hub. I haue sworne to do it:
 And with hot Irons must I burne them out. (4.1.39–59)

The parallels become even closer in the next passage, when the scene moves towards its crisis:

Innocentia Purpurata:

CROFTUS: Prodi satelles Ditis . . . (*Prodit lictor teter aspectu ferrum
 candens manu ferens*)

Huc ferrum cito.

ODOARDUS: Tuere, Crofte, proh trucis vultum viri!
 CROFTUS: Retorta vinctum brachia hac sella loca.
 ODOARDUS: Repelle monstrum, Crofte, Tisiphone satum.
 Per aurea Poli signa, quae post hac mea
 Nunquam videbunt lumina, hunc, precor, canem
 Procul amoveto. Nil erit vinclis opus.
 Utrumque lumen sponte praebebo tibi
 Mox eruendum. vulneri occurram meo.
 Mussare contra nolo, non caput huc et huc
 Volvendo plagam differam, aut trepidus metu
 Frustrabor ictum.

CROFTUS: Lictor exporta pedem.

LICTOR: Carere foedo me ministerio iuvat. (*Exit*)

ODOARDUS: Demens quid egi? Miles huc gressum refer.
 Quem rebar hostem causa benevolum mea
 Habuit patronum. teter aspectu stetit
 Amicus animo. Crofte, lictorem precor
 Revoca benignum, cuius exemplo ferum
 Ponas furorem.

CROFTUS: Mitte blanditias Puer,
 Hac sede membra colloca, exolvam fidem. (3.1.1011–30)

[CROFT: Come here, genius of Dis.
*(A lictor, ugly-looking and carrying a glowing
 hot iron in his hand, approaches)*

MARTIN WIGGINS

Bring the iron here quickly.

EDWARD: Look out, Croft. What a face the ugly fellow has!

CROFT: Put him in this chair with his hands bound behind his back.

EDWARD: Ward off the monster, Croft. He's a son of Tisiphone. I beg you by the golden stars of heaven which my eyes shall never see again after this, move this cur from me. You won't need chains; I'll willingly present both my eyes to be gouged out. I'll go to meet my wounding. I won't complain about it; I won't try to divert the wound by turning my head, nor will I tremble with fear so as to frustrate the aim.

CROFT: Lictor, take yourself off.

LICTOR: I'm glad to avoid this ugly job. *(Exit)*

EDWARD: What have I been mad enough to do? Soldier, come back. My cause had a friendly champion and I thought him an enemy. He seemed ugly in appearance but was friendly in disposition. Croft, I beg you, call back that kind lictor, and, taking his example, put aside your mad resolve.

CROFT: Give up your persuasive arguments, boy. Settle yourself in this chair. I'm going to keep my word.]

The sequence of events is virtually identical in Shakespeare. The killer calls out his assistants (Shakespeare provides more than one, compared with *Innocentia Purpurata's* single lictor) and their faces frighten the boy; the killer orders him to be tied up, but the boy pleads against it and offers to co-operate without being bound. The killer then sends away the assistants, one of whom is relieved to be excused the job. The boy realises his mistake and asks for the executioners back to revive the killer's compassion; he also mentions how their appearance belies their true nature. The killer tells him to prepare himself for death.

King John:

Hub. Come forth: Do as I bid you.

Art. O saue me *Hubert*, saue me: my eyes are out
Euen with the fierce lookes of these bloody men.

Hub. Giue me the Iron I say, and binde him here.

Art. Alas, what neede you be so boistrous rough?
I will not struggle, I will stand stone still:
For heauen sake *Hubert* let me not be bound:
Nay heare me *Hubert*, driue these men away,
And I will sit as quiet as a Lambe.
I will not stirre, nor winch, nor speake a word,
Nor looke vpon the Iron angerly:
Thrust but these men away, and Ile forgiue you,
What euer torment you do put me too.

THE PLAGIARISMS OF 'PATER CLARCUS'

Hub. Go stand within: let me alone with him.
Exec. I am best pleas'd to be from such a deede.
Art. Alas, I then haue chid away my friend,
 He hath a sterne looke, but a gentle heart:
 Let him come backe, that his compassion may
 Giue life to yours.
Hub. Come (Boy) prepare your selfe. (4.1.71–89)

At this point, of course, Croft relents, and the Prince remarks that in doing so he has returned to his true identity:

Innocentia Purpurata:

Vera iam suas agit
 Persona partes. (3.1.1042–3)
 [Now you are showing yourself in your true colours.]

King John:

O now you looke like *Hubert*. All this while
 You were disguis'd. (4.1.125–6)

From here the two plays' confluence gradually recedes: in *Innocentia Purpurata*, Richard arrives to check on Croft's actions, and Croft tries to lie his way out of the situation by saying the murder has been done (*IP*, 3. 1. 1049–51; *KJ*, 4. 2. 85); but the deception is soon discovered, Croft is taken away to prison, and Richard kills the Prince himself, behind the arras. It may not be entirely coincidental that the action of the play is moving in the direction of *Hamlet*.

After a brief interlude of spectacle and song, King Edward IV encounters the armed ghost of his father. The parallels with *Hamlet* are less detailed, though equally clear. First the Ghost, visible only to Edward, beckons to him:

Innocentia Purpurata:

Umbra manu Odoardum invitat ad se sequendum (3.3.1110s.d.)
 [The Ghost beckons to Edward to follow him]

Hamlet:

Ghost beckens Hamlet. (1.4.48s.d.)

Edward follows it, his sword drawn, threatening anyone who dares to follow him (*IP*, 3.3.1110–14; *Ham.*, 1.4.56–63), and the lords left behind decide to do so anyway (*IP*, 3.3.1114–15; *Ham.*, 1.4.65), though in fact they do not reappear in *Innocentia Purpurata*. Next father and son re-enter, and Edward stops the Ghost:

Innocentia Purpurata:

Siste! Non ultra sequar.
 Hic ora solvas, arbitro vacat locus.
 Quae fata te de sede marmorea cient? (3.3.1115–17)

[Stand! I shall not follow any farther. Here you may say what you have to say. What fates call you up from your marble tomb?]

MARTIN WIGGINS

Hamlet:

Where wilt thou lead me? speak; Ile go no further. (1.5.1)

Hamlet has already asked, in the previous scene, Edward's question why his father has been called back from the grave:

Let me not burst in Ignorance; but tell

.....

why the Sepulcher

Wherein we saw thee quietly enurn'd

Hath op'd his ponderous and Marble iawes,

To cast thee vp againe?

(1.4.27–32)

After issuing instructions to his son, the Ghost then makes his exit:

Innocentia Purpurata:

Te Nate monui. Plura conantem data

Destituit hora. retrahor, ad poenas. vale,

Memor, memor

(3.3.1136–8)

[I warn you, my son. The span given to me ran out while I was still trying to achieve many things. I am being dragged back to my punishment. Goodbye. Remember, remember . . .]

*Hamlet:*Aduè, adue, *Hamlet:* remember me.

(1.5.91)

Except for this final injunction of remembrance, the verbal parallels with *Hamlet* are more tenuous: the reference to the marble tomb may have been suggested by Hamlet's reference to the sepulchre's 'marble jaws', and the Ghost's mention of his sudden death with many things still unachieved may also derive from the stress in *Hamlet* on the Ghost's unaneled state when he was murdered. But the most striking debt is to the structure of Shakespeare's episode: the father and son go to talk alone, signalled by an exit and re-entry, after which the Ghost issues his instructions and closing injunction to remember. It is also suggestive that the lords who were following Edward fail to reappear after the encounter with the Ghost: their decision to pursue Edward is determined solely by the playwright's attention to the sequence of events in *Hamlet*, rather than because, like Shakespeare, he is setting up a later stage in the action.

The principal difference between this scene of *Innocentia Purpurata* and its Shakespearian source is that the Ghost demands not vengeance but virtue: Edward is to restore the deposed King Henry to the throne. These orders are pre-empted in the penultimate scene when Richard attempts to murder Henry in the Tower of London, only to be prevented by an angel who receives the former King into heaven; he is last seen as part of a vision of the saints, promising divine vengeance on the usurpers. This ending has little in common with Shakespeare's conclusion to *Henry VI, Part 3*, or indeed with any corresponding chronicle material; it is, in effect, a Catholic riposte to the

THE PLAGIARISMS OF 'PATER CLARCUS'

official history of Henry's death, construing it as the martyrdom of a holy monarch.¹⁹ It is remotely possible that the Shakespearian Richard's wry comment on the effect of gravity on Henry's blood – 'What? will the aspiring blood of Lancaster | Sinke in the ground? I thought it would haue mounted' (5.6.61–2) – may lie behind the Jesuit Richard's line, 'Dabit ista pennas sica, conscendes polos' (3.4.1190) [This sword will give you wings, you will climb the heavens]; but the remark is congruent enough with the rest of the conclusion to mean that these loose similarities might equally be no more than coincidental.

So much for the main plot. There is an equally remarkable development of Shakespearian source material in *Innocentia Purpurata*'s comic sub-plot, which runs over three scenes in the first two acts and concerns the discomfiting of the braggart Bold: he undertakes a dangerous military exploit, to kill the Earl of Warwick in battle (1.3), but is ambushed by his associates, masquerading as Danes and talking gibberish; he offers to betray his allies and is led away (1.5), finally to be exposed as a coward when he next appears (2.5). This sequence derives from the trick played on Paroles in *All's Well That Ends Well*, when he proposes to recapture the lost drum (3.6), but is taken, offers treachery, and ends up humiliated in the same manner (4.1 and 4.3); the parallels are exceptionally close. Both gulling scenes open with the ambushers placing themselves by a hedge:

Innocentia Purpurata:

Sub hac sedentes sepe, tendiculum placet
Lepori fugaci struere. (1.5.383–4)

[Sitting under this hedge, we must lay a snare for the fleeing hare.]

All's Well:

He can come no other way but by this hedge corner (4.1.1–2)

They then decide on the language they will speak, and appoint an interpreter, after which the braggart enters. (One difference between *All's Well* and the Latin play is that Bold is equipped with a confidant, Rubuff.) Each braggart shows self-knowledge in drawing a distinction between his tongue and his heart:

Innocentia Purpurata:

Cum enim Prometheus ille hominum figulus
vim leoninam stomacho meo apponere
debuisset; delirus senex quicquid leonis
ad manum habebat in ore, lingua, supercilio
et pedibus absumpsit, pectori autem
inseruit cor plane leporinum.

.....
O praeposteram
linguae intemperantiam! (1.5.407–21)

MARTIN WIGGINS

[When Prometheus, shaper of men, should have placed the strength of a lion in my inwards, the doting old man had something of the lion at hand and he used it for mouth, tongue, eyebrows, and feet. In my breast, however, he put a heart which is patently that of a hare . . . O preposterous intemperance of the tongue!]

All's Well:

I finde my tongue is too foole-hardie, but my heart hath the feare of Mars before it, and of his creatures, not daring the reports of my tongue . . . Tongue, I must put you into a Butter-womans mouth, and buy my selfe another of *Baiazeths* Mule, if you prattle mee into these perilles.

(4.1.28–43)

After some talk, each braggart is seized and blindfolded, and the scene's dialogue moves into gibberish. *Innocentia Purpurata* echoes *All's Well* even in this nonsense language:

Innocentia Purpurata:

FITZALANUS: Crugo Cyfarniddoss truchenninnicke furco.

HAVARDUS: Furco villanda par crugo.

OMNES: Furco, furco.

(1.5.461–4)

FITZALANUS: Accordo torri dryllis.

(1.5.490)

*All's Well:*Lo. E. *Throca movousus, cargo, cargo, cargo.*All. *Cargo, cargo, cargo, villianda par corbo, cargo.*

(4.1.64–7)

Inter. *Acordo linta.*

(89)

The Latin playwright here adds to the tension by incorporating a suggestion of impending execution: his version of Shakespeare's 'cargo', 'furco', takes significance from its assonance from the Latin *furca*, which could mean (among other things) *gallows*. Paroles and Bold both react in the same way: each identifies his attackers, worries that ignorance of the language will cost him his life, and asks for an interpreter.

Innocentia Purpurata:

FITZALANUS: Disparthol Cadwallader Danos.

BOLDUS: Probe novi vos Danos esse. Proh Jupiter! Hic ego quasi murena exossabor, quod caninam hanc linguam ignorem. Si quis adsit qui Anglice, Gallice, Italice, Latine, aut Graece fari novit, detur mihi interpres; illi ego indicabo quae Odoardum Archiproditorem et turpem illum suem Richardum et perfugam Clarentium, omnesque Perduellium copias funditus evertant.

PUER INTERPRES: Hannerog Gohir. Latinus ego sum, implora Ducis clementiam, nam amplius 100 mucrones iam pectori tuo admoventur.

(1. 5. 468–79)

[FITZALAN: Disparthol Cadwallader Danos.

THE PLAGIARISMS OF 'PATER CLARCUS'

- BOLD:** Oh yes, I know you're Danes. God! I'll be filleted like a fish because I don't know their beastly language. If there's anyone here who knows English, French, Italian, Latin, or Greek, can I have him as interpreter? I'll tell him things that will utterly overthrow the archtraitor Edward, that vile pig Richard, the renegade Clarence, and all the forces of the rebels.
- BOY:** Hannerog Gohir. I speak Latin. Implore the mercy of our leader, for more than a hundred swords are already trained on your breast.]

*All's Well:**Inter.**Boskos thromuldo boskos.**Par.*

I know you are the *Muskos* Regiment,
 And I shall loose my life for want of language.
 If there be heere German or Dane, Low Dutch,
 Italian, or French, let him speake to me,
 Ile discouer that, which shal vndo the Florentine.
Int. Boskos vauvado, I vnderstand thee, & can speake thy
 tongue: *Kerelybonto* sir, betake thee to thy faith, for
 seuteene ponyards are at thy bosome. (4.1.69–78)

Bold pleads for his life, and is told that the 'Danish' leader is content to spare him in return for information; arrangements are made for him to be kept captive, still blindfold, until the King can be shown how loyal he really is (1.5.483–97); Paroles is treated similarly, to have his treachery exposed to Bertram (4.1.82–93).

In each case, the sub-plot re-emerges part-way into a scene which has previously dealt with other matters. Both dramatists keep the stakes high when the braggart is brought on by having tortures called for:

Innocentia Purpurata:

Portado cido los tortorossos. (2.5.814)

All's Well:

Portotartarossa. (4.3.123)

Each braggart is then interrogated. Each reveals the military strength of his own side, disparaging their quality as fighting men (*IP*, 2.5.821–6; *AWW*, 4.3.133–7). Each is asked personal questions about the people who are, unknown to him, listening to the interrogation, and each disparages them in particular terms (*IP*, 2.5.839–64; *AWW*, 4.3.177–238), causing one of them to propose that the miscreant should be whipped through the army:

Innocentia Purpurata:

Equina cauda per exercitum tractus
 flagris animetur, ut turbo. (2.5.866–7)

[Let him be dragged at a mare's tail through the army and whipped like a top.]

MARTIN WIGGINS

All's Well:

He shall be whipt through the Armie with this rime in's forehead.
(4.3.239–40)

This escalates to hanging (*IP*, 2.5.868–9; *AWW*, 4.3.245–6), and an imaginary executioner is invoked (*IP*, 2.5.873; *AWW*, 4.3.311). Each braggart then asks to be allowed to see his own execution (*IP*, 2.5.876–8; *AWW*, 4.3.312), and the blindfold is removed, facing him with his true captors, who greet him sarcastically (*IP*, 2.5.882–90; *AWW*, 4.3.315–24).

The key difference between the two plays is in the outcome of the episode. In *All's Well*, Paroles finally loses all credibility with Bertram when he is searched and his satirical poem about the Count is found on his person. In contrast, a pocketed document, found when getting out a handkerchief to dry his tears, is Bold's salvation. He had fortuitously picked up this letter the night before, and it proves to be a description, written by Richard, of the trick that has just been played on him. Thus Bold can turn the tables on his molesters, pretending that he was only play-acting, and knew the truth all along, like Falstaff claiming that he recognized the men in buckram.

This is not the only distant echo of Falstaff to sound about the character of Bold. Earlier in the play, he asks his servant Rubuff for advice on how to save his skin and yet also keep his reputation intact. Rubuff's reply offers a familiar argument:

De cute, si placet, philosophari malo,
quippe quae mihi proprius adhaeret, quam
fama. Fac te, dominum, meum capite et
cervicibus (quod Dii averruncent) breviorum
feri; num speciosa illa recula (quam
gloriam appellant) te in integrum
restituēt. Crede mihi (nam miles ego
sum et bellis enutritus, plurimae sub
hac veste latent cicatrices) Gloria
pharmacopola non est, nec vulneribus
alligandis assueta. (1.5.432–42)

[If you please, I prefer to philosophise about my skin than about my reputation because it sticks closer to me. Now, suppose that you, my master, were made shorter by head and neck (which may the gods forbid), would that little matter called glory put you together again? Believe me (for I am a soldier and was reared in the midst of wars – there are many scars hidden under this cloak), glory is no physician and is not accustomed to heal wounds.]

With the emphasis on glory's lack of medical skill, 'Clarcus' was perhaps remembering Falstaff's views in *Henry IV, Part 1*: 'Can Honour set too a legge? No: or an arme? No: Or take away the greefe of a wound? No. Honour hath no skill in Surgerie, then? No.' (5.1.131–3)

There are a handful of other possible, though very tenuous, links with Shakespeare's plays. The image of a rose with blood on its petals, used in

THE PLAGIARISMS OF 'PATER CLARCUS'

both *Part 1* (2.4.50,61) and *Part 3* (1.2.33–4) of Shakespeare's *Henry VI*, also appears in *Innocentia Purpurata*:

Dudum rubenti flumine, et scelerum notis
 Ebria cruentis candidi floris coma,
 Punicea sacrae folia mentitur rosae. (2.1.512–14)

[The petals of the white rose long soaked in a river of red and marked with the bloodstains of crimes counterfeit the crimson leaves of the sacred rose.]

However, this may be an obvious conceit in a play about the Wars of the Roses, and 'Clarcus' appears not to share Shakespeare's emblematic sense of the image: Shakespeare consistently bloodies the white rose, playing on the significant change of colour, whereas 'Clarcus' confuses the issue by subjecting the red rose to the same treatment a few lines earlier (1.2.502). Similarly, though the text contains reference to several characters who appear in *Troilus and Cressida* – Thersites, Achilles, and Paris are all mentioned within two lines (1.3.237–8) – there is no particular detail to suggest that 'Clarcus' necessarily drew these names, familiar to any educated writer of the time, from Shakespeare. The most that can be said of these points of association is that they raise the possibility that the Jesuit dramatist's reading of Shakespeare may have influenced him more extensively, and more subtly, than is apparent in his obvious plagiarisms.

Be that as it may, it is clear that 'Clarcus' drew substantially on four heterogeneous Shakespeare plays in compiling his Latin tragedy. Even if we allow that the borrowings from *Henry VI, Part 3* were determined by the subject-matter, it is an interesting group: perhaps *Hamlet* is universally popular, but *King John* and *All's Well That Ends Well* are more striking choices. It is possible to argue that both plays contain elements which might have appealed to a Catholic reader: the miraculous cure of the King of France, for example, or the submission of an English king to the papal legate, an incident which made King John a common subject for Jesuit plays, two of which were performed at the Jesuit colleges at Antwerp and Malines.²⁰ However, these are conspicuously not features of the plays which 'Clarcus' chose to adapt: as a working playwright, he seems rather to have been drawn to the strong dramatic qualities of the Hubert and Arthur scene, the Paroles sub-plot, and the appearance of the Ghost.

Nevertheless, the close verbal parallels strongly indicate that he was working from a written text rather than a memory of a powerful early stage performance, and this is confirmed by his imitations of the gibberish of *All's Well* in the scenes in which the phoney Danes make a fool of Bold: at several points, the pastiche language incorporates reworkings of Shakespeare's own nonsense words, with, (for example) 'cargó' lightly revised into 'crugo' and 'furco', and 'Portotartarossa' into 'Portado cido los tortorossos'.²¹ Evidently the dramatist had his Folio open before him as he wrote.²² One particular adaptation of this material further indicates that the Folio 'Clarcus'

MARTIN WIGGINS

used was probably not the third edition of 1663. Normally, dependence on one edition rather than another would be virtually impossible to detect: the creeping modernizations of the seventeenth-century Folios might be a useful guide in the case of an English play, but the sense remains the same, and in a Latin plagiarism it is the sense that counts. Fortuitously, however, one of the bibliographical oddities of the third Folio concerns *All's Well's* gibberish: where the first, second and fourth Folios all print 'villianda' (4.1.66), the third gives the word as 'villiando'.²³ In *Innocentia Purpurata*, the word reappears as 'villanda' (463).²⁴ It seems likely, then, that 'Clarcus' did not use the third Folio – which, in any event, was probably published several years after the play was written.

It is certain that a play about the fall of Henry VI was performed at St Omers in October 1623. It is equally certain that this play cannot have been *Innocentia Purpurata*: ignoring tendentious possibilities, seven of the play's fifteen scenes indubitably feature Shakespearian material, most of it unavailable before November 1623. Now that we have conclusively dispensed with McCabe's hypothesis that the two plays were one and the same, other evidence can speak more clearly about the date and origins of *Innocentia Purpurata*. The Stonyhurst manuscript collection includes a second tragedy subscribed 'Pater Clarcus', which follows immediately: its title – *Homo Duplex sive Funestum Corporis et Animae Duellum* – appears directly underneath *Innocentia Purpurata*'s closing lines on fo. 34^r. *Homo Duplex* is much easier to date: it can confidently be identified with the 'tragoedia ... de *Duello inter Corpus et Animam*' which was performed at St Omers in July 1655.²⁵ This date necessarily exerts a strong pull on *Innocentia Purpurata*; without the counter-attraction of 1623, there emerges a compelling probability that the play was written during the 1650s.

Establishing the play's period of origin helps to clarify the question of its authorship. Hitherto, scholars have had to believe in a Jesuit playwright, mistakenly known as 'Pater Claretus', writing two plays, one in 1623 and one in 1655, but with no discernible output in the intervening thirty-two years; all this has inevitably hindered attempts to identify him. Now that we can assume a narrower span of activity within a single decade, we can rule out two of the three candidates proposed by Sister Winefride in her thesis.²⁶ One of these, John Clarke (1604–72) was never a strong possibility, since he was present at the college only in the capacity of a student in the 1620s; he was not entitled to be known as 'Pater Clarcus'. One of his teachers would have been Francis Clarke (1589–1656), a master there during the period 1620–33. *Innocentia Purpurata* might conceivably date from his time at St Omers, but *Homo Duplex* certainly does not; he too is unlikely to be the dramatist. A more superficially attractive candidate, not considered by Sister Winefride, is Robert Clarke (d. 1675; real name Robert Graine), to whom *Homo Duplex* is ascribed in the catalogue of the Shakespeare Institute Library.²⁷ This Clarke is a known Latin author, as well as several non-dramatic poems, he wrote

THE PLAGIARISMS OF 'PATER CLARCUS'

two plays performed in 1629 at Douai, where he was Professor of Poetry and Rhetoric; he was also briefly assigned to the English mission in late 1629, but spent the last forty-three years of his life with the English Carthusians at Nieuport.²⁸ What most tells against him is that he had no connection with St Omers, where *Homo Duplex* was certainly and *Innocentia Purpurata* presumably performed. The third name on Sister Winefride's short-list, another Francis Clarke (1619–1656), presents the opposite case: he was appointed Professor of the Humanities at St Omers in 1651, and remained there until his death five years later, but is not otherwise known to have been a playwright. But, since drama was an important Jesuit educational practice, it might be argued that play-writing is something one would expect of a humanities professor in any event. On balance, this Francis Clarke seems the most convincing of the four candidates.

If we accept this identification, there is good reason to think that, of Francis Clarke's two surviving plays, *Homo Duplex* was not only the second in the Stonyhurst manuscript but also the second to have been written. Clarke was already ill at the time it was performed in July 1655: two months earlier he had been appointed Rector of Liege, but his health made it impossible for him to take up the post; he was probably in no state to write another play. In any event, since there are records of plays at St Omers in 1651, 1652, and 1653 as well as in 1655, none of them remotely identifiable with *Innocentia Purpurata*, a plausible date for the play might be 1654. Any future edition of the *Annals of English Drama* should assign it to this year, with limits of 1651–6, the period when Clarke was at the college; the play falls outside the scope of the comprehensive catalogue of British drama of the period 1533–1642 which is currently being compiled by the present author.²⁹

As a product of the 1650s, the play may acquire an additional layer of political meaning. Alison Shell has demonstrated that lamentation for the sufferings of England was a well established topos in Jesuit drama of the Elizabethan and early Stuart period as exiled Catholic playwrights chafed against the dominion of heretics in their native land.³⁰ After the strife of the 1640s, this theme arguably gained in urgency, so that *Innocentia Purpurata*'s treatment of the fifteenth-century civil wars may have a contemporary as well as a historical application:

Haec pestis Anglum vastat imperium diu.
Cruor hinc Britannus discoloravit solum
Undique salumque, caede cognata Albion
Late cruenta nomen erubuit suum. (Praeludium, 16–19)

[Now for a long time this rot has been eating into the English Empire. Hence, the blood of Britons has been discolouring land and sea on all sides; Albion has reddened her own name far and wide, with murder of her own family.]

The play's royalism, too, is the more resonant if the play was written after the King's execution in 1649: however little cause the English Jesuits had for

MARTIN WIGGINS

loyalty to the house of Stuart, one can see a loose reflection of English affairs in the play's concluding portrayal of a deposed royal martyr wielding a thunderbolt and threatening a Senecan vengeance on his oppressors –

Scelera pensabit scelus
Vulnus repositet vulnera, cruorem cruor.
Suamque Genitor victimam et natus suam. (3.5.1326–8)

[Crime will lead to more crime, wounds call for wounds, blood for blood. Father and son will each be appeased by his own victim.]

It is an inconclusive ending because, obviously, there is more history yet to come in the reign of Richard III, but also perhaps because interregnum England had not yet passed over the time of its troubles: the play's representation (in 1.4) of the portents indicating the true heir, Richmond – one of the rare points at which Clarke is relatively faithful to his historical material – perhaps reflects the as yet unrealized hopes placed on the exiled Prince Charles.

These are vague resonances rather than precise political comment. It is as well to keep in mind the play's primary purpose as a pedagogical vehicle for the education of schoolboys in Latin and rhetoric. Given our natural interest in the Shakespearian material, moreover, it is also worth remembering that there is much in the play with no such antecedent: for example, the Yorkist noblemen Fitzalan and Stanley are both substantial parts, whereas one of them does not appear in *Henry VI, Part 3* and the other is only a non-speaking role; and one of the play's highlights is a scene in which Richard of Gloucester and an evil spirit make a bargain for the throne, and Richard is branded on the forehead with the devil's mark. It may seem that Clarke has gifts of dramatic invention which belie his reliance on Folio material elsewhere; but there is another intriguing, if unprovable, possibility.

One short account of drama at Stonyhurst, written for the College's tercentenary (and the centenary of its arrival in Lancashire), claims:

a large stock of pieces, adapted to Stonyhurst requirements, were handed on from generation to generation with continual additions as time went on, for no play might be given more than once in seven years.³¹

It is unclear how far back this tradition of cumulative adaptation goes: in general, the records of seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century performances compiled by William H. McCabe, though incomplete, do not support the hypothesis of a seven-year repertory cycle, but rather attest to the continuing inventiveness of the College's successive professors in devising new plays for their pupils to stage. However, a notable partial exception is the early to mid-1650s, when the College appears to have been revisiting the subject matter, and perhaps also the texts, of plays given earlier in the century: plays, or the same play, on Arsenius, a figure from Byzantine history, were performed in 1614 and 1652, and 1613 and 1656 saw tragedies, one in English and the other in Latin, about the loss of the true cross and its later

THE PLAGIARISMS OF 'PATER CLARCUS'

recovery by the Emperor Heraclius.³² Is it entirely a coincidence that this period corresponds with Francis Clarke's tenure at St Omers?

There is, then, at least a presumptive case that the surviving text of *Innocentia Purpurata* may be more a compilation than a composition, a palimpsest incorporating material from the 1623 *Henrici Sexti* as well as from Shakespeare. Beyond admitting the possibility, however, there is no more to be said in support of the hypothesis, and one significant objection to be made. If Clarke used his Shakespeare Folio to refurbish and titivate a thirty-year-old play, then his historical material would have been ready-made, and his work as an adapter would have entailed tipping in his choice of striking scenes from Shakespeare. It follows that there was one Shakespeare play that he would not have needed to raid: *Henry VI, Part 3*. The fact that he did, and that it supplied not only a powerful stage moment in the Richmond scene but also the quasi-historical foundation for the opening scene, paradoxically keeps open the possibility that Father Francis Clarke may yet have had a spark of originality to his credit amidst his abundant acts of plagiarism.³³

*The Shakespeare Insitute,
University of Birmingham*

MARTIN WIGGINS

Notes

- 1 Willem Schrickx, 'Pericles in a Book-List of 1619 from the English Jesuit Mission and Some of the Play's Special Problems', *Shakespeare Survey*, 29 (1976), 21–2.
- 2 Sidney Lee, *Shakespeare's Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies: A Census of Extant Copies* (Oxford, 1902), p. 13; Anthony James West, *The Shakespeare First Folio: A History of the Book*, Vol. 2: *A New Worldwide Census of First Folios* (Oxford, 2003), pp. 9–12; Roland Mushat Frye, *Shakespeare and Christian Doctrine* (Princeton and London, 1963), pp. 275–93.
- 3 G. Blakemore Evans, 'The Douai Manuscript: Six Shakespearean Transcripts (1694–95)', *Philological Quarterly*, 41 (1962), 158–72.
- 4 Jakob Zeidler, 'Romeus Capelletus et Julietta: Ein Zeugnis für *Romeo und Julie* in der Jesuitenlitteratur', *Studien zur vergleichenden Litteraturgeschichte*, 2 (1902), 1–2.
- 5 Suzanne Gossett (ed.), *Hierarchomachia, or The Anti-Bishop* (London and Toronto, 1982); William Shakespeare, *The Complete Works*, ed. Stanley Wells, Gary Taylor, John Jowett, and William Montgomery (Oxford, 1986).
- 6 The form 'St Omers' is customarily used of the College, to differentiate it from its home town of Saint-Omer.
- 7 Catherine Houlihan [Sister Winefride] (ed.), 'Three Jesuit Plays: An Edition from Manuscripts and Translation of *Britanniae Primitiae*, *S. Eduardus, Confessor*, and *Innocentia Purpurata*', unpublished Ph.D. thesis (Birmingham, 1967). Throughout this essay I am deeply indebted to Sister Winefride's scholarship, despite her curious blind spot in respect of the play's sources.

MARTIN WIGGINS

- 8 Stonyhurst MS B. VII. 23 (2).
- 9 Compare, for example, *St Francis Xavier*, ed. Charles Burnett, in Masahiro Takanaka, *Jesuit Plays on Japan and English Recusancy*, Renaissance Monographs 21 (Tokyo, 1995), pp. 68–123.
- 10 Alfred Harbage and S. Schoenbaum, *Annals of English Drama*, 2nd edn (London, 1964); the entry is unchanged in the unreliable third edition of 1989.
- 11 William H. McCabe, SJ, *An Introduction to the Jesuit Theater*, ed. L. J. Oldani, SJ (St Louis, 1983), pp. 85 n. 15, 89 n. 23.
- 12 Sister Winefride, ‘Three Jesuit Plays’, p. 56. It is perhaps worth recording that two experienced colleagues, Stanley Wells and Susan Brock, to whom I showed a microfilm copy of the manuscript, both independently read the name as ‘Clarilus’, not ‘Claretus’. In any event, the subscription also appears at the foot of a Latin morality play in the same manuscript, *Homo Duplex sive Funestum Corporis et Animae Duellum*, assigned by the *Annals* to 1655; here it reads much more clearly ‘Clarcus’. ‘Clarcus’ is correctly named in Hubert Chadwick, SJ, *St Omers to Stonyhurst: A History of Two Centuries* (London, 1962), p. 136, but Chadwick’s brief account is otherwise entirely indebted to McCabe’s findings (which had originally been published in 1937).
- 13 The first Folio was entered in the Stationers’ Register on 8 November 1623; allowing for the ten-day gap between the Gregorian calendar used on the Continent and the Julian calendar used in England, this was just over three weeks after the performance at St Omers. W. W. Greg argues (in *The Shakespeare First Folio* [Oxford, 1955], p. 454) that the book was probably issued late in the month; a copy had reached the Bodleian Library by 17 February 1624, when it was sent for binding. This was the first time *All’s Well That Ends Well* and *King John* saw print.
- 14 Sister Winefride, ‘Three Jesuit Plays’, p. 466; John Speed, *The History of Great Britaine* (London, 1611), sig. 5M2r-v.
- 15 *Innocentia Purpurata* is quoted from Sister Winefride, ‘Three Jesuit Plays’; the translations are also hers. Act, scene, and line references follow in brackets. This edition has through-line numbers, but acts and scenes are also cited here. Shakespeare’s plays are quoted in the form published in the first Folio of 1623, but, for convenience, act, scene, and line references are to the Oxford *Complete Works*.
- 16 Geoffrey Bullough (ed.), *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare* (London, 1957–75), III, 190, 192–3.
- 17 This is a frequent topos in *Innocentia Purpurata*: see also 1.1. 30 and 3. 5. 1321–2.
- 18 Most of the details ‘Clarcus’ imitates are not present in the play’s analogue, *The Troublesome Reign of King John*, which had been available in print since 1591, and was reprinted in 1611 and 1622: he must have found the material in the Shakespeare play first printed in 1623.
- 19 Formal attempts to have Henry canonized lapsed with the English Reformation; see Ronald Knox and Shane Leslie, *The Miracles of King Henry VI* (Cambridge, 1923). Perhaps the issue lived on, or was revived, for expatriate Englishmen in the seventeenth century.
- 20 Sister Winefride, ‘Three Jesuit Plays’, p. 487.
- 21 The latter adaptation, incidentally, suggests that he may have had an ear for Spanish.
- 22 There is a copy of the first Folio in the library of Stonyhurst College, but it is not one of the books which arrived with the Jesuit school in 1794: the Folio had been

THE PLAGIARISMS OF 'PATER CLARCUS'

- the property of the Arundel family, and was presented to Stonyhurst in 1837. (West, *The Shakespeare First Folio*, p. 122.)
- 23 This is not among the numerous variants between the Folios recorded by Black and Shaaber in *Shakespeare's Seventeenth-Century Editors* (New York & London, 1937), but it appears in every copy of the third Folio that I have been able to examine. The restoration of the correct reading in F4 does not provide a basis to challenge the consensus that the text was set up from F3: the letters *o* and *a* were in adjacent compartments of the type-case (R. B. McKerrow, *An Introduction to Bibliography*, 2nd edn. [Oxford, 1928], p. 9), so the error was as easy to reverse inadvertently as it was to make in the first place; and, since this was only gibberish, it probably did not warrant close attention from the proof-reader.
- 24 Sister Winefride muddies the waters slightly by mistranscribing, or mistyping, the word as 'villando', but the original manuscript reading is clearly 'villanda', as in her facing-page translation.
- 25 McCabe, *An Introduction*, p. 94.
- 26 Sister Winefride, 'Three Jesuit Plays', pp. 57–9.
- 27 The catalogue entry relates to a photostat of the Rome manuscript of the play (English College, Rome: Archives, MS C. 17) shelved in Shakespeare Institute Library Pamphlet Box 195.
- 28 Clarke's two plays, *The Emperor Otho* and *The Return of St Ignatius*, are mentioned in his *Dictionary of National Biography* entry; they are not, however, listed in any edition of the *Annals of English Drama*.
- 29 Martin Wiggins, Catherine Richardson and Mark Merry, *British Drama, 1533–1642: A Catalogue*, forthcoming from Oxford University Press.
- 30 Alison Shell, *Catholicism, Controversy and the English Literary Imagination, 1558–1660* (Cambridge, 1999), pp. 181–3.
- 31 John Gerard, SJ, *Centenary Record: Stonyhurst College* (Belfast, 1894), quoted in Sister Winefride, 'Three Jesuit Plays', p. 50.
- 32 McCabe, *An Introduction*, pp. 82–3, 94–5.
- 33 I am grateful to the late Father F. J. Turner, SJ, Librarian of Stonyhurst College, for answering my questions during the early stages of my research on this paper.

Address for Correspondence

Dr Martin Wiggins, The Shakespeare Institute, Mason Croft, Church Street, Stratford-upon-Avon, Warks., CV37 6HP, email: martin@malfi.u-net.com