

III. Рецепція художньої спадщини Ренесансу в культурі наступних епох

УДК: 821.111:82-2

Philip Major
(London, England)

Thomas Killigrew's *The Pilgrim*

Філіп Мейджер. «Прочанин» Томаса Килигрю.

Об'єктом дослідження статті постає маловивчена трагікомедія «Прочанин» англійського придворного, дипломата, драматурга та театрального менеджера Томаса Килигрю (1612–83). Портретною алюзією до цього літературного твору може служити полотно невідомого майстра, що зображує Килигрю в образі прочанина Шляху святого Якова.

Відомо, що п'єса писалася протягом 40–50-х рр. XVII ст., коли її автор перебував у політичному вигнанні. Тому в статті особливу увагу приділено засобам творення злободенного підтексту та його вплетення у драматичний сюжет і образну систему трагікомедії. Як показано у статті, драматург досягає своєї мети не лише за рахунок використання «роялістських» мотивів рицарської дружби, кодексу честі та ін., але також і завдяки введенню до тексту драми алюзій з політичним смислом. У процесі аналізу віднаходиться ключ до особистого авторського та літературного алюзивних кодів у п'єсі Килигрю.

Ключові слова: трагікомедія, прочанин, вигнанський текст, роялістська література, посилення, алюзія.

I

There are three divergent pieces of evidence linking Thomas Killigrew with the image of a pilgrim. The first is anecdotal, and emphasises the candour with which, as a

III. Рецепція художньої спадщини Ренесансу в культурі наступних епох

groom of the bedchamber to Charles II, he was apparently suffered to speak to his master. It is recorded that, at the height of the controversy of the king's womanising, Killigrew one day went to the King in his private apartment habited like a Pilgrim bent on a long journey – the King asked him 'Whither he was going?' – Killigrew answered him 'To Hell, to fetch Oliver Cromwell to take care of England, as his successor took none at all'.¹

The second is visual; it dates from the twilight of his life, when Killigrew sat for a remarkable portrait, the painter of which remains unknown. In radical contrast to earlier images of Killigrew as the noble cavalier, memorably portrayed by Van Dyke, among others, here he is depicted as a penitent pilgrim of St James, complete with full beard, pilgrim's hat and staff, and a cloak bedecked with scallop shells and a cross. Both anecdote and painting intriguingly coalesce with, and thus help provoke consideration of, the third and most substantial piece of evidence – one of Killigrew's dramatic creations, *The Pilgrim*. Like the majority of the eleven plays in the Killigrew canon, the chief exceptions being *The Parson's Wedding*, *Claricilla* and, pre-eminently, *Thomaso, or The Wanderer*, *The Pilgrim* has been largely neglected by literary critics. Where it is paid any attention, it is treated cursorily, usually absorbed within biographical accounts, though occasionally referred to in general works on Interregnum literature and drama.² The

¹ John Genest, *Some Account of the English Stage: 1660–1830*, 10 vols (Bath: H.E. Carrington, 1832), i, p. 392. In a diary entry of 12 February 1668, Pepy's indirectly lends weight to the story: 'Mr Brisband tells me in discourse that Tom Killigrew hath a fee out of the Wardrobe for cap and bells, under the title of the King's Foole or Jester; and may revile or jeere anybody, the greatest persons, without offense, by the privilege of his place.' *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, ed. Robert Latham and William Matthews, 11 vols (London, 1970–76, this edition, 1995), ix, pp. 66–67 and n. 1.

² See, for example, *The Dictionary of Literary Biography*, vol. 58, *Jacobean and Caroline Dramatists*, ed. Fredson Bowers, (Detroit: Gale Research Company,

fullest account of the play remains a twelve-page section – including synopsis – within Alfred Harbage's biography of Killigrew, published in 1930.³ One of the reasons for this neglect relates to the general complaint of longevity attached to all of Killigrew's works, by critics concerned primarily with assessing aesthetic merit. The nineteenth-century commentator John Genest stands proxy for many others when writing of Killigrew's plays that 'most of them are of an enormous and tiresome length – verbosity is his perpetual fault – there is scarcely a scene in which the dialogue might not be shortened to advantage.'⁴ The absence of a definitive stage history of the play has also militated against sustained scrutiny, and indeed, as we shall see, its very stageability has been challenged.⁵

Conditions favourable to a more sustained examination of *The Pilgrim* have, however, existed for some considerable time. Succinct though his assessment of it was, Harbage gamely and enthusiastically attempted to encourage closer scrutiny of the play (and all of Killigrew's plays, for that matter), albeit purely on artistic grounds. Judging it 'morally sound' in comparison with *The Parson's Wedding*, he finds it 'remarkable that this other play by Killigrew has been

1987), pp. 128–9; Nigel Smith, *Literature and Revolution in England, 1640–1660* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), p. 72; Susan Wiseman, *Drama and Politics in the English Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 199; Dale B.J. Randall, *Winter Fruit: English Drama 1642–1660* (University of Kentucky: Lexington, 1995), pp. 255–7.

³ Harbage, *Killigrew*, pp. 191–202.

⁴ Genest, *Some Account*, p. 392.

⁵ Genest damned the play with false praise, deeming it 'a good Tragedy – with judicious alterations it might have been made fit for representation'; *ibid.*, p. 391. Charles Dibdin is no less lukewarm: 'The Pilgrim was written at PARIS, but is very little calculated for representation', an impression echoed in his view that Killigrew's 'real merit' lay in 'no more than a general predilection for literature, and perhaps dramatic literature in particular'; Charles Dibdin, *A Complete History of the London Stage*, 5 vols (London, 1797), iv, pp. 93–4.

consistently ignored. In many ways *The Pilgrim* is a better play than *The Parson's Wedding* or indeed than any other play Killigrew has written.' 'One can see', he continues, 'that we have here the conception of an excellent plot', and 'on the whole the play has fewer weaknesses and inconsistencies than any of Killigrew's dramas.' Though the dramatist 'is not a poet', the 'speeches of the antagonists and mock-antagonists are eloquent and forceful, and develop cleverly turned arguments', while 'the tragedy rises naturally out of the characters portrayed'; it is a 'dignified and interesting tragedy – a play chiefly remarkable for its revelation of potentialities.'⁶

Furthermore, aside from questions of intrinsic literary worth, the notion that *The Pilgrim* was performed, or was at least intended for performance, has gained credence in recent decades, and has thus ratcheted up its potential significance for theatre historians and literary critics alike. This has stemmed from the belatedly close scrutiny of Killigrew's own annotated copy of the folio of his collection of plays, *Comedies and Tragedies* (London, 1664), whose acquisition by Worcester College Library, Oxford, first received scholarly attention in 1926.⁷ William Van Lennep subsequently highlighted the significant cuts made in 1668 by Killigrew to *The Pilgrim* (and to *Claricilla*, *Thomaso* and *Bellamira Her Dream*), which include the 300-line comic subplot of the ferryman and his wife, and three of the long speeches of Ferdinando's in the Act IV trial scene. Such post-publication interest in *The Pilgrim* shown by the playwright-turned-Restoration theatre manager, it is now plausibly argued, increases the likelihood of its having been performed;

⁶ Harbage, *Killigrew*, pp. 199–200, 202.

⁷ C.H. Wilkinson, 'Worcester College Library', *Oxford Bibliographical Society Proceedings and Papers*, 1 (1927), 263–320. See the chapter elsewhere in this volume by Marcus Nevitt.

Van Lennep goes so far as to conclude that Killigrew ‘almost certainly presented it at the Bridges Street Theatre in 1668 or 1669’, while another observer claims the manuscript revisions ‘imply that a revival was intended’, adding that, contrary to settled opinion, ‘all of Killigrew’s plays are written with a very nice sense of what is theatrically possible.’⁸

II

What makes this a propitious time for a thoroughgoing re-examination of *The Pilgrim*, however, is not so much a new-found appreciation of the play’s aesthetic attributes, nor fresh evidence of its being performed in the Restoration (though as we will see, the performative aspect of the play is significant), for all the fresh impetus that these factors have – or should have – rendered. Rather, it is the belatedly favourable scholarly climate for studies of the royalist exile.⁹ For though the place and precise date of its composition remain elusive, it is certain that *The Pilgrim* was written on the continent during the 1640s or 1650s.¹⁰ If it is a literary artefact, then it is also, and perhaps principally, a document

⁸ William Van Lennep, ‘Thomas Killigrew Prepares his Plays for Production’, in *John Quincy Adams Memorial Studies*, ed. James McManaway and others (Washington, D.C.: Folger Shakespeare Library, 1948), 803–8 (p. 808); Colin Visser, ‘The Killigrew Folio: Private Playhouses and the Restoration Stage’, *Theatre Survey*, 19 (1978) 119–38 (pp. 121–2).

⁹ A climate created and reflected by publications such as Geoffrey Smith, *The Cavaliers in Exile, 1640–1660* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2003); Christopher D’Addario, *Exile and Journey in Seventeenth-Century Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007); *Literatures of Exile in the English Revolution and its Aftermath, 1640–1690*, ed. Philip Major (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010); and *idem.*, *Writings of Literature in the English Revolution and Restoration* (Farnham and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2013).

¹⁰ One of six plays written by Killigrew during the exile, the others being the two-part *Cecelia and Clorinda*, written in Turin and Florence, the two-part *Bellamira her Dream* (Venice), and *Thomaso, or, The Wanderer* (possibly Madrid).

III. Рецепція художньої спадщини Ренесансу в культурі наступних епох

of exile, and it is in this context that it will be analysed here. In trying to explain, in broad terms, why the play had continued to be overlooked, Harbage commented that ‘surveys of the drama either end at the year 1642 or begin at the year 1660, and *The Pilgrim* comes between these dates.’¹¹

The burgeoning historiography of the royalist exile no longer supports this substantial critical lacuna; just as royalist romances, and romance translations, written in exile have recently come under the microscope, it is natural that royalist drama written overseas should begin to do likewise.¹² In this chapter I examine the background to *The Pilgrim*’s composition, its sources, and its purposes. I also consider the ways in which Killigrew – both sedulously and unknowingly – weaves topical subtext into the play’s dramatic plots and characterisation. As I shall show, he does so not only through employing ‘royalist’ motifs of friendship, codes of honour and disguise but also, and more complexly, through an exhaustive trial scene and pregnant references to quandaries over action versus inertia. In the process, we will discover a play which casts light on the political circumstances of its production, but which also hints at previously unexplored ambivalences in its author’s political outlook. A dramatic text such as *The Pilgrim* offers useful aperçus into the intersections between tragicomedy, royalism and exile in the 1640s and 1650s, generating fruitful discussion of the means by which a popular literary and dramatic genre is filtered through the prism of defeat, dispossession and displacement. It is a discussion which necessarily encompasses such factors as the choice of text, the interface between politics, history

¹¹ Harbage, *Killigrew*, p. 191.

¹² For an example of the former, see my ‘A Credible Omen of a More Glorious Event’: Sir Charles Cotterell’s *Cassandra*, *Review of English Studies* 60 (245) (2009), 406–30; and of the latter, Nigel Smith, ‘Exile in Europe during the English Revolution and its Literary Impact’, in *Literatures of Exile*, 105–18 (pp. 111–17).

and the place of refuge, the personal loyalty of a courtier, psychological and cultural impulses behind the writing of such plays, and semantic instability.

III

In analysing *The Pilgrim* as a royalist exilic text, questions of taxonomy immediately arise: what *is* 'royalism', and an 'exile', in the 1640s and 1650s, and how squarely does Killigrew sit within these categories? To the extent that royalism signified loyalty to the Stuart dynasty, it need hardly be said that Killigrew's royalist credentials were impeccable. His co-monopoly (with Sir William Davenant) of the London playhouses at the Restoration sufficiently bespeaks the royal favour he enjoyed. Yet long before this act of royal approbation he had cemented his reputation as a loyal courtier with a close personal relationship with Charles II – Dibdin writes that 'He had such lively parts, and was a man of such eccentricity and peculiar humour that he was a perfect counterpart to CHARLES'.¹³ Doubtless it was to his advantage that he came from a family which had provided grooms to the royal household for generations. It is unclear whether his loyalty to the monarch translated into military service when civil war erupted in 1642; but we know that he was sufficiently active in the royalist cause to be accused of treason by parliament in that year and subsequently placed under close arrest, before joining royalist forces at Oxford. From there, he left for the continent, where he saw service in various Stuart courts-in-exile.¹⁴

The precise colour of Killigrew's royalist politics is harder to delineate, however; he seems to have been more diplomatic in this sphere of his life than in others, though in any case his role as a groom of the bedchamber ostensibly, at

¹³ Dibdin, *Complete History*, iv, p. 92.

¹⁴ J.P. Vander Motten, 'Thomas Killigrew, (1612–1683)', *ODNB*.

III. Рецепція художньої спадщини Ренесансу в культурі наступних епох

least, left little scope for overt political influence or expression.¹⁵ Partly on the grounds that he and Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, enjoyed a relationship which was uneasy at best, he has traditionally been placed on the opposing side to the Lord Chancellor's faction of so-called 'Old Royalists', 'constitutionalists' or 'ultras'. He has been located, rather, within the 'Louvre' faction associated with Henrietta Maria and Henry Jermyn, his cousin, which generally pushed for a military solution to restore Charles II rather than a long-term diplomatic one. The fact that Killigrew enjoyed culturally fruitful relations with the play-loving Henrietta-Maria from the 1630s onwards may work to support this view.

However, recent scholarship has rendered anachronistic the neatly divisible royalist categories of 'constitutionalist' and 'Louvre'. Instead, a more complex picture of royalism – and royalist writing – has emerged which displays multiple shades of 'royalist' ideologies and commitment. This development has in turn informed debates on such topics as the perceived limits of kingly authority and political loyalty, and provided evidence for literary and political overlaps between royalists and parliamentarians.¹⁶ Royalism can no longer plausibly be viewed as a monochrome creed or culture; it is now more commonly seen as incorporating a variegated and fragmented collection of Stuart supporters, whose heterodoxy the experience of exile only served to reinforce.¹⁷ This comparatively recently formulated critical frame of reference obliges us to remain alive to ambiguity in

¹⁵ This is, of course, not to ignore the significant *unofficial* political influence of the position; for which see Geoffrey Smith, 'Long, Dangerous and Expensive Journeys: The Grooms of the Bedchamber at Charles II's Court in Exile', *Early Modern Literary Studies*, Special Issue, 15 (August, 2007).

¹⁶ See, for example, D'Addario's chapter on Hobbes's *Leviathan*, in *Exile and Journey*, pp. 57–86.

¹⁷ For a strong assertion of this view, see McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007), 'Introduction: Royalism and its Problems'.

Killigrew's playwriting in exile, which manifests itself in the tensions between, among other things, notions of action and inaction, and between the promulgation of divine right and a more sceptical, Machiavellian outlook to contemporary forms of government.

The theoretical framework underpinning study of *The Pilgrim* is informed further by the relationship between tragicomedy and other 'royalist' literary genres, such as epic and, ubiquitously, romance. Victoria Kahn has convincingly argued that romances of the 1650s constitute a literature of solace but also of political engagement for crown supporters attempting to come to terms with military defeat and political marginalisation. These romances are shot through with characters exhibiting, despite – and also because of – their parlous circumstances, such usefully polemical qualities as constancy and nobility.¹⁸ Within this critical paradigm, tragicomedy comfortingly incubates and conveys the familiar virtues in which readers – and less frequently, spectators – across the royalist spectrum recognise themselves, thus standing athwart Hobbes's exposing of, as he argued in *Elements of Law*, the passions' intrinsic association with self-interest. Hobbes's scepticism nevertheless makes itself felt in these tragicomedies. As we shall see in *The Pilgrim*, the literary conventions of romance – Arcadian love, chivalric codes of honour, an overarching moral elevation – are often more honoured in the breach. What emerges is a genre which creatively melds orthodox motifs with a sceptical tone which recognises that the passions can engender a counterintuitive instability in notions of unconditional and permanent political loyalty.

When exile is added to the mix, the political and psychological ramifications of tragicomedies like *The Pilgrim*

¹⁸ Victoria Kahn, 'Reinventing Romance, or the Surprising Effects of Sympathy', *Renaissance Quarterly* 55 (2002), 625–61.

III. Рецепція художньої спадщини Ренесансу в культурі наступних епох

are brought into even sharper focus. The conditions of exile act as stressors on already diffuse political credos, complicated further as these are by the imperative of personal survival. However, just as the meaning of ‘royalism’ has rightly come under closer analysis in recent years, so too has the term ‘exile’. Was Killigrew an exile? Timothy Raylor has recently exposed as too liberal the application of ‘exile’ to any royalist who happened to live on the continent in the 1640s and 1650s.¹⁹ This corrective fruitfully builds on Geoffrey Smith’s research showing that only 60–70 of the 225 royalists one might call long-term exiles were actually forced against their will to leave England.²⁰ Killigrew was not among them. Indeed, even Harbage concedes that his subject’s motivation for fleeing the realm at some point around 1643 lay with seeking refuge from his creditors as much as from the parliamentary authorities.²¹ Moreover, like many royalist émigrés – former ambassadors, travelling tutors and Grand Tourists – Killigrew was no stranger to the continent of Europe. In 1635 he accompanied Walter Montague on a tour which took in the sites of France and Italy, and in 1639–40 returned to France, also visiting Basel. Nor, it should be added, did he immediately sever all ties with his last place location before the Restoration, Holland, retaining his command of a company of the Dutch army – albeit most probably for financial reasons only – until early

¹⁹ Timothy Raylor, ‘Exiles, Expatriates and Travellers: Towards a Cultural and Intellectual History of the English Abroad, 1640–1660’, in *Literatures of Exile*, pp. 15–44.

²⁰ Smith, *The Cavaliers in Exile*, p. 58.

²¹ Harbage, *Killigrew*, p. 79. The same view was expressed by one contemporary more trenchantly; Richard Flecknoe claimed that Killigrew ‘talks of Banishment, but ‘tis well known he was forced to fly his Country for debt, long before any other Banishment was thought of, and he bandited himself but as Citizens turn Bankerouts to cozen their Creditors.’; *Life of Tomaso The Wanderer: An Epitome* (London, 1667), A4r.

1662.²² It may therefore reasonably be argued that in one respect the cosmopolitan and well-travelled Killigrew is unlikely to have found a life on the European mainland in the 1640s and 1650s a strange or indeed entirely uncongenial experience. Nor does his specific set of circumstances on the continent during the Interregnum appear, at least ostensibly, to mirror the hardships faced by his peers, or those lower down the royalist food chain. As is well documented, at a time when positions at court were at a premium he saw service at several Stuart courts-in-exile as a groom of the bedchamber. He was held in high enough esteem by Prince Charles (though more cynical interpretations are admissible) to be sent on diplomatic missions to raise money and gather support; notably, he was the king's Resident in Venice from 1649–52. Lucratively, he contracted a marriage in 1653 with a wealthy Dutch heiress, Charlotte van Hesse-Piershil (1629–1715), thereafter enjoying the patronage of the Frisian stadholder Willem Frederik of Nassu-Dietz.²³

Indeed, in many ways Killigrew's displacement presented him – as exile often does – with opportunities which might otherwise have passed him by. One could be forgiven, then, for raising a sceptical eyebrow – and not just for reasons of its numerical impossibility – at the licence exercised in Killigrew's epistle 'To the Reader' in his 1664 collection, *Comedies and Tragedies*: 'I wish it you upon better terms than Twenty Years Banishment'. Indeed, rather than his suffering the hardships of 'Banishment', it may be tempting to picture Killigrew sailing relatively serenely through the 1640s and 1650s overseas, a perpetually witty,

²² See Jean-Pierre Vander Motten, 'Thomas Killigrew's "Lost Years", 1655–1660, *Neophilologus*, 82 (1998), 311–34 (pp. 328–30).

²³ On the latter, see Jean-Pierre Vander Motten and Katrien Daemen-De Gelder, "'Les Plus Rudes Chocs de la Fortune': Willem Frederik, Stadholder of Friesland' (1613–1664), Thomas Killigrew (1612–1683) and Patronage in Exile', *Anglia*, 127 (2009), 65–90.

unflappable and debonair figure, a courtier with the ear of Prince Charles, penning inconsequential plays, getting into deep water on occasion (especially in Venice) but somehow always emerging unscathed. It is hardly the traditional, sympathetic image of an exile; rather, it seems of a piece with the image of the opportunist and unscrupulous Killigrew co-ruling the London stage at the Restoration.

Such an impression, however, needs to be qualified. Whatever opportunities for personal and public advancement were taken by Killigrew in his foreign perambulations during the Interregnum, and however familiar those foreign climes were to him, it would require a large dose of cynicism to argue that he was immune to the exigencies of dislocation. The longevity of his absence from England (at least thirteen years and as many as seventeen) is but one factor here.²⁴ Though in one way the impact of prolonged absence can have a diminishing return as the years unravel and strangeness recedes, it is worth reminding ourselves that Killigrew was at his prime during this period: he was in his early thirties when he left England, and did not return until he was forty-eight. As with all royalist exiles, for all he knew his sojourn abroad would be permanent. There is no record of his having returned temporarily to England, as some exiles were able to, for example to visit his relatives, or indeed those of his late wife Cecilia (*d.*1638), whom he mourned for the rest of his days. As discussed in the Introduction to this volume, we may also wish to consider as entirely genuine his sense of anguish, as relayed to the Venetian Collegio in 1650, at the recent tumultuous events precipitating his embassy there, and his near-desperation to secure material assistance to reverse them. Albeit delivered with wit, there is further evidence adduced in *Thomaso* of the financial hardship which dogged

²⁴ Harbage finds it 'quite probable' that he sailed for France with Henrietta-Maria in 1644; Harbage, *Killigrew*, p. 79.

the attenuated court-in-exile in Paris of which he was part: 'they have kept a Lazarello's court there; darkness, leanness and the nest of Poverty; but two loaves a day, and without fish, to work the Miracle.'²⁵ And though it does not necessarily induce pity, he knew no respite abroad from his creditors, who on at least one occasion were boosted by the support of Milton.²⁶ All in all, there is a strong case to be made that Killigrew was, in a meaningful sense, an exile. Consequently, his writing in this period can legitimately be examined for its exilic ramifications. A work like *The Pilgrim*, therefore, seems to fit neatly with those seventeenth-century texts which are most profitably interpreted as both determiners of social and cultural exchange, and also as scripts arising out of the particular effects of banishment from one's home or former way of life. Not only did the text written from a real or imagined exile register the distinct sense of loss, the profound uprootedness, and the novel set of social and political circumstances that attended the author's exile; it also importantly negotiated and attempted to configure these consequences for both the author and his or her audience.²⁷

IV

Though the motivation and critical framework are in place to study *The Pilgrim* as an exilic text, obstacles remain. Unlike *Thomaso* it is not an avowedly self-referential or semi-autobiographical work. As we shall see, by and large the contemporary exilic and political resonances in its plot, characterisation and language are encoded rather than explicit. Nor is there a preface to interrogate which might more explicitly articulate the author's claims for the work's

²⁵ *Comedies*, p. 343, Act III, Sc. 1.

²⁶ Harbage, *Killigrew*, p. 108.

²⁷ D'Addario, *Exile and Journey*, p. 4.

III. Рецепція художньої спадщини Ренесансу в культурі наступних епох

contemporary moment. Moreover, the play was published only retrospectively, in folio form within *Comedies and Tragedies*, not as a discrete, more contemporary octavo; this precludes (as with the other plays he wrote while abroad) an exilic publication history which might have opened windows into questions of readership and reception among exile – and host – communities, though the possibility of manuscript circulation cannot be discounted. The absence of a definitive stage history on the continent (or elsewhere, for that matter) is another potential problem, since a reasonable assumption might be that if *The Pilgrim* were known to have actually been performed – not just written in exile and *intended* to be performed – its exilic associations and repercussions would be that much more urgent and compelling. This is an issue which overlaps inevitably with the continued confusion – applying also to *Thomaso* – over the location and date of the play's composition. In *Comedies and Tragedies*, Killigrew claims to have written *The Pilgrim* at Paris, in 1651, yet his embassy to Venice as the king's Resident was from 1649–52, and records show his appearing frequently before the Collegio throughout 1651, rendering his presence at Paris in 1651 improbable.

In fact, the problem of an absence of a stage history of *The Pilgrim*, linked to the question of its apparently incorrect date of composition in *Comedies and Tragedies*, has already been partially overcome. Harbage first put forward the now widely accepted theory that either Killigrew or the printer erred in date but not location. From this starting position, encouraged by the eponymous, autobiographical *Thomaso*'s soi-disant position of 'Master of the Revels', and by evidence of the performance of a group of touring English actors before Prince Charles, Harbage concluded that 'it is entirely possible' it was written and performed for this company in

Paris in 1646.²⁸ This theory has been afforded added credibility by more recent scholarship on 'Prince Charles's Men', which has established links between them and Killigrew, based partly on the significant overlaps between actors engaged by this troupe and subsequently by the King's Men after 1660.²⁹ These actors included such luminaries of Killigrew's Restoration theatre company as Nicholas Burt, Walter Clun, Charles Hart, Robert Shatterell and William Wintershall.³⁰ In other words, actors whom we know were employed by Killigrew at the Restoration can be placed in Paris (the site of composition, according to the author) at a time when Killigrew was also there. This may remain circumstantial evidence for a performance of *The Pilgrim* in Paris, but it cannot lightly be dismissed. There is another possible scenario. While he thought it unlikely, Harbage conceded 'it is possible that the misstatement in the folio concerns the place rather than the date of composition, and that *The Pilgrim* was written in Venice.'³¹ If true, this might serve to reduce the chances of its being performed in exile (there are no extant records of itinerant English actors living in Italy); yet it by no means vitiates its contemporary exilic applications. *The Pilgrim* touches on Italian history and politics in ways which may well have resonated with his

²⁸ Harbage, *Killigrew*, pp. 116, 193. Knowledge of this troupe was first brought to light in the 1920s. See Hyder Rollins, 'A Contribution to the History of the English Commonwealth Drama', *Studies in Philology*, 18 (1921), 267–333, and Leslie Hotson, *The Commonwealth and Restoration Stage* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1928).

²⁹ Judith Milhous and Robert D. Hume, 'New Light on English Acting Companies in 1646, 1648, and 1660', *Review of English Studies*, n.s., xlii, 168 (1991), 487–509. See also Alan Howe, 'Samuel Speede and the Prince of Wales's Company', *Seventeenth Century*, Autumn 1999, vol. 14, issue 2, 130–42.

³⁰ For biographical details of these actors, including the roles they performed for Killigrew, see Malcolm Elwin, *The Playgoers' Handbook to Restoration Drama* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1928), pp. 217–42.

³¹ Harbage, *Killigrew*, p. 192.

III. Рецепція художньої спадщини Ренесансу в культурі наступних епох

Venetian hosts, given the close relationship between the two states in the early modern period.

Like romance, tragicomedy is invested with authority by allusions to history per se, represented in the *The Pilgrim* by the Milanese ducal name of Sforza, and by the duke's imposing residence and seat of power, the Castello Sforzesco, one of the largest citadels in Europe.³² The play's overarching sense of diversion is thus usefully counterpoised by a degree of verisimilitude. History is a safe haven and literary outlet for royalist exiles in this period; they habitually turn to the past, since it enables them 'to control its very terms within their created worlds, thus justifying and ordering the experience of exile both to themselves and to their audience.'³³ Killigrew's sources for Italian history were most likely William Thomas's *The History of Italy* (1561) and Francesco Guicciardini's *Historia d'Italia*, the latter probably in Geoffrey Fenton's translation (third edition, 1618). The duke of 'Millain' in *The Pilgrim* is one Alphonso, a fictitious appellation, but his son's name, Sforza, provides a piquant historical link with the real-life duchy of Milan, whose most distinguished dukes were Francesco Sforza (1401–1466) and his son Ludovico (1452–1508).³⁴ Sforza features prominently in Machiavelli's influential mirror for princes, *The Prince* (1513). He would have been known through this work to Killigrew and his peers as an efficient, enlightened and cultivated Renaissance ruler, much loved by his people. In this way the name of Sforza, a noble son sympathetically

³² This magnificent castle, reconstructed in 1450 by Francesco Sforza, was famed throughout Europe. Opulently decorated rooms included, most famously, the Sala Delle Asse, with its surviving ceiling paintings by Leonardo da Vinci. During the Spanish occupation of the next two centuries it was guarded by between 1000 to 3000 men, and a 12-bastion star fort was constructed. The castle's external dimensions reached 3 km in length and covered an area of twenty-six hectares.

³³ D'Addario, *Exile and Journey*, p. 10.

portrayed in the play, may have been intended as an oblique compliment to Prince Charles, though awkwardly Francesco was criticised in *The Prince* for isolating his family within the Castillo Sforzesco, and hence losing the people's affection.

Historic ties with the two most likely places of composition also present a mixed picture: while, felicitously enough, the Venetians had assisted Francesco in his ascension to the position of duke of Milan in 1450, the association with Paris is more problematic. The back-story in *The Pilgrim* is a fictitious battle at Pavia in which the Milanese duke has emerged triumphant over the duchy of Pavia. The Battle of Pavia (1525) known to history, though, had led to a humiliating defeat for the French army inflicted by Spanish imperial forces, which cemented Spanish Habsburg hegemony in the region. The French king Francis I was taken captive and coerced into signing the Treaty of Madrid, surrendering significant swathes of northern Italy to his captor, Charles V, while according to Guicciardini the remnants of the retreating French army, 'despoiled of their tents, did not stop until they reached the foot of the mountains.'³⁵ Contemporary political applications are less than clearly defined and their intentionality hard to determine. But they help to emphasise that royalist exilic texts like *The Pilgrim* do not necessarily speak solely to the English exile community, or indirectly, as we will find, to the parliamentary authorities at home, but also to host communities. The pervasive sense of dislocation displayed by Killigrew in his literary output, then, should not be viewed as induced solely by forces *beyond* the place of composition. It may also have been a response to current internal tensions within it.

³⁵ *The History of Italy*, trans. and ed. Sidney Alexander (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), p. 346.

III. Рецепція художньої спадщини Ренесансу в культурі наступних епох

Whether *The Pilgrim* was composed in Paris or Venice, its performability is further enhanced by the quantity and nature of its stage directions. The fact that the emendations of *The Pilgrim* made in the Worcester College folio do not include any revision or excision of stage directions gives every indication that these directions are contemporary with the play's composition, though since there is no extant earlier text against which to compare the version in *Comedies and Tragedies* this cannot be confirmed.³⁶ Excluding several asides and simple exits and entrances, there are 102 stage directions in the play, compared with 85 in the apparently more performable *Thomaso*. Many of these directions are basic: '*He embraces her*', '*They kiss*', '*She weeps*'. Others, however, are strikingly detailed. These include entrance cues, as in '*Enter Cosmo, muffled in his Servants Cloak, observing his Sister, and the Princess as they go out*', or '*As she goes out, Cosmo pulls Fidelia*'; comedic 'discovery' directions such as '*Trevallin goes to pluck the Boughes, and findes his wife*'; and noises off, as in '*A noise of Weapons and fighting within; they set upon the Prince*'. There are also precise directions for fight scenes, for example '*Enter Baptista and his party, four in all; Cosmo runs to them, and beats down Baptista's sword pursuing Sforza and Richardo; who after two or three passes, Richardo and one of the Souldiers fall, with their wounds; Cosmo pulls off the head, and discovers a sword-blade in his Staff; they fight and are all wounded: Baptista falls under Sforza, and the Souldiers are kill'd by Cosmo.*' Stipulations concerning scenery feature, too: Act III, Scene 7, for example, '*must present a Chimney, in which she throws the Letter and goes out*', while in the escape scene in Act V we find various directions concerning '*a hole in the*

³⁶ For an account of a selection of the stage directions in *Comedies and Tragedies*, see Albert Wertheim, 'Production Notes for three Plays by Thomas Killigrew', *Theatre Survey*, 10 (1969), 105–13.

Vault'.³⁷ There is also a striking exactness shown by Killigrew in these directions – '*Baptista and his Company peeps and listen after'em; Baptista speaks to his Company, and then Enters*', '*Cosmo goes afore, with the light down the hole, Carlo and Martino follow him*' – and a pervasive emphasis on the physicality of performance – '*They run, to take the Dagger*' – which seems to point to a target audience of actors rather than an intention of merely providing a visual aid with which the reader can mentally picture the play.³⁸

Church of England ceremonial observance on the continent during the Interregnum, such as of burials services, *ipso facto* constituted indirect acts of defiance against the parliamentarian authorities at home, since all such ritual, as set out in the *Book of Common Prayer*, had been proscribed in England.³⁹ In a similar way, because the theatres had been closed by parliament in 1642 one can argue that *any* drama – performed or intended for performance – written in exile, such as *The Pilgrim*, was on one level an act of political opposition. That is, the very composition of a play implicitly signals a repudiation of England's recent civil conflagration and a harking back to a pre-1642 monarchical idyll when the Crown was intensely involved in theatrical patronage. As

³⁷ The latter has provoked discussion of the existence of traps in the plays Killigrew 'designed for the private playhouse stage'. See Colin Visser, 'The Killigrew Folio: Private Playhouses and the Restoration Stage', *Theatre Survey*, 10 (1978), 119–38 (p. 125).

³⁸ *Only rarely, it should be added, such as in 'He looks upon the Ring, and is full of trouble', or 'Cosmo has a Letter open in his hand, which he reads with a troubled look', do we find anything approaching an accent on inner emotion, yet in this The Pilgrim is no different to Killigrew's other plays.*

³⁹ By the terms of the 1645 *Ordinance for taking away the Book of Common Prayer, and for establishing and putting in execution of the Directory for the publique worship of God*; see *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum, 1642–1660*, ed. C.H. Firth and R.S. Rait, 2 vols (London: HMSO, 1911), i, pp. 582–607. See my 'Funerary Rites in the Royalist Exile: The Ministry of George Morley in Antwerp, 1650–53', *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme*, 31.3 (2008), 35–50.

III. Рецепція художньої спадщини Ренесансу в культурі наступних епох

with all plays written on the continent from a royalist perspective, *The Pilgrim* thus suggests a reaffirmation of cavalier cultural autonomy, a demonstration to (as Killigrew saw it) the parvenu regime in England that loyalist émigrés remain outside the ambit of proscriptive domestic legislation. In this way, whether it was performed or not, the play should be seen in the context of engendering, or intending to engender, an empowering sense of transgression among the exile community rather than one of resigned passivity.

There is often, also, a concomitant element of personal survival technique deployed in the writing of such texts. Exile can be a hostile environment in which people, even a cosmopolitan like Killigrew, invariably experience an acute sense of rupture, the loss of an entire world and way of life they have known; hence we should not minimise the acute sense of stability, in the face of cultural as well as physical displacement, which the writing of such plays could both generate and reflect. As with other forms of literary production, and religious observance, they provided English exiles with a fixed point of cultural reference in what could remain, for all their previous experience on it, an unfamiliar political and cultural landscape. Playwriting also afforded an invaluable sense of purpose, where insecurity of employment and cultural ennui threatened to intrude. Length is a factor here; *The Pilgrim* is an appreciable literary accomplishment: only two plays, *The Princess* and *The Parson's Wedding*, occupy more pages than *The Pilgrim's* fifty-nine in *Comedies and Tragedies*; and whilst, as I discuss below, the play is indebted to another source for its plot, it is nevertheless very much an original piece of work. Granted there were royalists living in more reduced circumstances than him, but the sustained levels of creativity and discipline exhibited by Killigrew whilst writing *The Pilgrim* doubtless provided him with a comforting sense of meaning, a cultural shield against

the hostilities he faced in Venice or material impecuniousness of Paris, and the disorientating realities of exile in general. Moreover, moulding a coherence and sense of order from a plot which all too easily – featuring as it does no fewer than twenty-three separate characters – might have descended into confusion, betokens an implicit reaffirmation of, or at least compensation for, now-lost royalist political control.⁴⁰ This is not simply *sprezzatura* operating on a personal level, but a politically pregnant statement about the resilience and recoverability of royalism itself.

The presence of order and sequence in *The Pilgrim* is not intended, however, to obscure the sense of exoticism closely associated with tragicomedy. The grandeur of the action, intrigue and usurpations amongst the Milanese and Pavian royal families is standard fare for the genre, but it is also likely to speak to recent extraordinary events in England and the subsequent upheavals faced by crown supporters. In this way the play coalesces with royalist romances, such as *Cassandra*, about which Cotterell claimed no ‘passage in it seem improbable to us, whose eyes have in as short a space, been witnesses of such Revolutions, as hardly any Romance, but sure no History can parallel.’⁴¹ This sense of dramatic equivalence, which thereby somehow renders catastrophic events in England more comprehensible, is one of *The Pilgrim*’s more potent political ramifications. At the same time, for the exiled Killigrew and his (potential) audience there are also the rewards of escapism and denial in a play set in magnificent, distant Milan, and also, for the former, kudos-bringing dramatic accomplishment for a man self-fashioning his identity amongst – and perennially seeking employment in – attenuated courts.

⁴⁰ Modern-day readers may not all agree, however, with Harbage’s assertion that ‘the structure of his play [*The Pilgrim*] is never so complex that its story is not perfectly clear’ (Harbage, *Killigrew*, p. 199).

⁴¹ Preface to *Cassandra: The Fam’d Romance...* (London, 1652).

V

In attempting to examine and understand some of the other salient features of the *The Pilgrim*, a useful starting point is its title. If we are to consider the word in the sense of ‘a person who experiences life as a sojourn, exile, or period of estrangement from such a state’,⁴² the image of a pilgrim seems an appositely exilic one for Killigrew to have chosen. The honourable Cosmo, son of Julia, Duchess of Pavia and now wife of the victorious Alphonso, Duke of Milan, is the titular character of the play, and exhibits many of the features of an exile, as he strives to unravel the plotting of Count Martino and his mother against the Duke and Sforza. The name Cosmo probably refers, appropriately enough, to Cosimo de Medici, though it is interesting to note the existence of another royalist writer of tragicomedies in the 1650s to whom the appellation may have paid compliment, Cosmo Manuche; together, Killigrew and Manuche have been described as ‘two most prolific royalist writers of tragic-comedy’⁴³ It should be noted that exile does not in itself confer honourable status, however, in keeping with a number of ambiguous facets of the play: Count Baptista is an exiled villain who does Martino’s and Julia’s murderous bidding for them.

Though the religious temper of *The Pilgrim* is sceptical, the title is charged with Christian significance, deriving both from post-biblical acts of devotion and passages of Scripture, such as Hebrews 11:13. It is tempting to speculate that the elderly Killigrew depicted in the image of a pilgrim of St James had himself visited the shrine of St James at

⁴² *OED*

⁴³ *The Revels History of Drama in English: 1613–1660*, ed. Philip Edwards et al, 9 vols (London and New York: Methuen, 1981), iv, p. 273. For the political import of Manuche’s writings, see Wiseman, *Drama and Politics*, pp. 206–9.

Compostella in northern Spain as a younger man during his exile. There is certainly no shortage of devotional and other literature published in England in the early 1650s with the theme of pilgrimage at its core. Between 1646 and 1651 some 160 publications were printed featuring pilgrims, such as Richard Braithwaite's *The penitent pilgrim bemoaning his sinfull condition* (London, 1651).

The metaphorical application of 'pilgrim' to someone questing for love is also of relevance here, in a play where the love interest encompasses four couples – the Duke of Milan and Julia, Count Martino and Julia, Sforza and Fidelia, and Cosmo and Victoria. Again, literature contemporary with the play is replete with such uses of the word; for example Margaret Cavendish, the Duchess of Newcastle's play *Loves Adventures* (1662), where Orphant pursues her beloved in the guise of a pilgrim: 'Though I am loves Pilgrime, yet I shall travell to an honest heart; there to offer my pure affections'.⁴⁴

John Fletcher's play *The Pilgrim* was originally published in the first Beaumont and Fletcher folio of 1647, and indeed appears on the list of plays allotted to Killigrew and acted by the King's Men at the Theatre Royal, having previously been performed at the Blackfriars.⁴⁵ Killigrew's play bears no relation to Fletcher's late-Jacobean comedy, so for Killigrew to have insisted on this title for his own play risked at least initial confusion among the theatregoing public once the 1664 folio had been published. We may therefore safely conclude that, in being retained, the imagery of Killigrew's title was of some significance to him.

⁴⁴ *Plays written by...the Lady Marchioness of Newcastle* (London, 1662), p. 000.

⁴⁵ Allardyce Nicoll, *A History of English Drama 1660–1900*, 6 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961), i, p. 354. On the same list appears Beaumont and Fletcher's tragicomedy *Loves Pilgrimage*, also first published in 1647. Fletcher's play was successfully adapted by John Vanbrugh in a production which premiered at Drury Lane in April 1700.

III. Рецепція художньої спадщини Ренесансу в культурі наступних епох

If it owed nothing to Fletcher's play, *The Pilgrim* was, however, significantly indebted to James Shirley's *The Politician*, published in 1655 by Humphrey Moseley but licensed and first performed in 1639–40. Harbage may have overstated the case in asserting that 'the basic situations in the *The Pilgrim* and *The Politician* are identical.'⁴⁶ Nevertheless, there are sufficient parallels in structure, characterisation and plot between the two plays for Shirley's to be considered Killigrew's prime source.⁴⁷ *The Politician* is itself closely related to another Shirley play, *The Gentleman of Venice*, licensed in 1639, which may conceivably add another twist to the question of where Killigrew's play was written. Its association with *The Politician* provides further insight into *The Pilgrim*'s political moment. Although not exiled, Shirley demonstrated in his writings of the 1640s and 1650s an ardent devotion to the royalist cause, evidenced in his poem 'On a Black Ribband' (1646) and in his partisan address to the reader in Beaumont and Fletcher's first folio. Thus in one sense *anything* connected to Shirley was bound to be interpreted as politically coalescent. Though its first performance predates the civil wars, *The Politician* contains much material supportive of the Stuart status quo in the late 1630s and beyond. Most notably, at all times in the play the rebels, middling-class craftsmen of an implicitly puritan hue, and rebellion itself, against church and monarch, are portrayed in an unequivocally negative light, the divine right of kings is upheld, and civil war is an unmitigated disaster for the state. Yet, *The Politician* was not without biting opprobrium for the House of Stuart. The perceived endemic corruption of the court system is given surprisingly full exposure, considering Shirley was a court dramatist, and its

⁴⁶ Harbage, *Killigrew*, p. 194.

⁴⁷ See Robert J. Fehrenbach, *A Critical Edition of The Politician by James Shirley* (New York and London: Garland, 1980), pp. lxiv–lxvii.

treatment extends well beyond exposing the oiliness of individual ambition. Indeed, a credible comparison has been drawn between the eponymous politician of the play and Charles I's favourite, the Duke of Buckingham, in which, although the king's authority is preserved, it is nevertheless portentously and irreversibly diminished.⁴⁸ If Killigrew's source play can evince such themes, we should be that much more alive to the possibility, even likelihood, that *The Pilgrim* itself may pass comment, unflattering as well as flattering, on the Stuart court.

Killigrew's dedication of *The Pilgrim* in the 1664 folio to the Countess of Carnarvon may receive partial explanation in his link with Shirley. The latter has long been held to be the author of *The Arcadia* (1640), a dramatization of Sir Philip Sidney's *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia* (1593). Elizabeth Capel (1633–1678), Killigrew's dedicatee, married Charles Dormer (1632–1709), 2nd Earl of Carnarvon, at some point before 1653, becoming Countess of Carnarvon, and the Pembrokes were blood relatives of the Dormer family. It would therefore have been only fitting for a Shirley-inspired play to be dedicated to the Countess. It is also of relevance that the name of Capel reverberated with royalists during the Interregnum and afterwards as a result of the loyalty and death of Arthur Capel, first Baron Capel of Hadham (1604–1649), Elizabeth's father, who was executed on the orders of parliament in 1649. Though Killigrew's dedication to Elizabeth is likely to have been retrospective, it nonetheless points up the politically partisan potential of the work.

VI

⁴⁸ James R. Keller, 'James Shirley's *The Politician* and the Demand for Responsible Government in the court of Charles I', *Journal of the Rocky Mountain Medieval and Renaissance Association*, 18 (1997), 179–99.

III. Рецепція художньої спадщини Ренесансу в культурі наступних епох

In offering his own assessment of *The Pilgrim's* contemporary political resonance, Harbage confined himself to the general comment that the play 'might have been written to please the exiled English gentry', without assessing the reasons why it might have done so.⁴⁹ A number of those reasons have already been discussed, but a closer reading of the play's text will help to explicate more of them. Act I inculcates an immediate sense of intrigue and national crisis, in which Giovanni and Ferdinando, 'Honest' friends, respectively, of Cosmo and Sforza, with two officers of the army present, ponder the recent strange events by which the triumphant Duke of Milan, Alphonso, has made his stepson Cosmo General, while his own son Prince Sforza has been made Governor of defeated Pavia. The plotting of Julia (as previously mentioned, widow of the Duke of Pavia, and now married to Alphonso) to advance her real son Cosmo is already suspected by the friends. The nation is threatened, and the duplicity of Julia, a ruler loathed by her own people, and her lover Martino, threatens civil war:

Ferdinando: Prithee talk no more of her; she is an evil the Nation ought to arm against; The sword (and that speedily bent against her) can onely prevent the ruine she and *Martino* threaten this State with. Prayers find too slow Remedies for such mischiefs as their power daily contrives.

Giovanni: Heaven had many Crimes to punish in *Millain*, when she and *Martino* were sent our scourges; Her own Subjects despis'd and scorn'd her, and deriding her victory, say, we fought for their diseases onely.

...
Ferdinando: [...] Oh, *Giovanni*, the ruine that threatens this State must have sudden, honest, and bold remedies; and we must wear our swords ready for all occasions.⁵⁰

⁴⁹ Harbage, *Killigrew*, p. 193.

⁵⁰ *Comedies*, Act I, Sc. 1, p. 157. All quotations from *The Pilgrim* to this source.

The disastrous consequences – disorientation, senselessness and rank political dissimulation – of civil war are pervasively articulated in the play, witness Fidelia's stark warning to her brother Cosmo in Act II that 'this Civil-war will ruine thee' (167). Such a narrative provides monitory warnings for both parliamentarians *and* royalists, and chimes in harmony with other plays of the period which evince 'nostalgia for a lost, Arcadian world violated by faction and civil war', as well as with other genres of royalist writing, such as Charles Cotterell's translation of Davillas's *The Civill Warres*.⁵¹ Yet, as illustrated in this passage, *The Pilgrim* also – and primarily – seems to endorse a military response to the threat of civil war on the part of the ruling elite. It therefore may not be coincidental that this places the playwright – probably, as discussed above, true to life – in the camp of those royalists who favoured a more bellicose stance towards the parliament. Even without such a correlation, however, the very fact that marital forces in this work of fiction are galvanised in the defence of the princely state acts as bulwark to the emasculating effects of royalist political and military evisceration, though it may also expose a sense of denial over the loss of royalist military power. On occasion the imperative of action over inaction in response to a usurped royal throne is instructively melded with the duty of princes, exemplified in Richardo's well-intentioned baiting of Sforza in Act III:

Sir, I have letters here second yours, and from your best Friends, such whose affection, Faith, nor duty, ought to be suspected; They are full of Amaze and Wonder, to finde your Highness will so tamely consent to lose a Countrey that cost so much blood to purchase; Was not *Cosmo* born Prince of *Pavia*? how think you, Sir, a man of his Spirit, and Title to the Place,

⁵¹ Karen Raber, 'Warrior Women in the Plays of Cavendish and Killigrew', *Studies in English Literature*, 40.3 (2000), 413–33 (p. 430).

III. Рецепція художньої спадщини Ренесансу в культурі наступних епох

should consent to hold his birth-right for another? You are deceived, Sir; Nor were *Cosmo* fit for your Friendship, if his Spirit could grow so tame and degenerate, as to set a Slave upon his Fathers Throne; Come, Sir, 'tis Flattery and dissimulation, and they are all false; this is the opinion of your best Friends.⁵²

In the previous passage (above), 'Prayers find too slow Remedies' is another example of a impatience with allowing events to drag on; but it also points up a sceptical attitude towards religion which surfaces throughout the play, for example in Act IV, Scene 1, where Victoria is gently chiding the inert duke into action.

Duke: Heaven forbid the Execution of this wicked Design.

Victoria: 'Tis not the heavens, Sir, must do it; their part is here in the discourse; you must act now, as their Minister here where Justice and Nature call for your Defence; and if you do not suddenly Seize *Martino*, who thus long has abused your trust, you will see this last Seene of your life set in the blood of your self, and family.⁵³

There is little evidence in the surviving records for the precise nature of Killigrew's religious bent, but such scepticism is only partially corroborated by the dramatist's *Letter concerning the possessed Ursuline Nuns* (1635), in which he remains reasonably open-minded as to the genuineness of the physical transformations undergone by the women.⁵⁴ As embodied by the Queen, royalty per se is scarcely a uniformly virtuous commodity in *The Pilgrim*, yet in the person of Prince Sforza it is invested with qualities which would doubtless have gained the approbation of the exiled court.

Giovanni: O 'tis a matchless Gallantry inhabits in him; his Princely breast is all compos'd of Honour; whether Enemy or Friend, he conquers still; so faithfull in his Promise, mild in

⁵² Act III, Sc. 1, p. 176.

⁵³ *Ibid.* p. 192.

⁵⁴ BL, Add, MS 27,402. See Harbage, *Killigrew*, pp. 61–3.

Command, and gentle in Dispute, Constant and Resolute in dangers, never absent to himself, never transported when he overcomes, nor losing himself in disorder, nor amazed when he is worsted; I have seen him win and lose a battle, but with that evenness of Soul, as fair Gamesters use to meet their fortunes with.⁵⁵

Honour, courage, equanimity – these are virtues which tragicomedies like *The Pilgrim* pervasively appropriate for a royalist audience. They not only pay compliment to the exiled Prince Charles, but seem to bespeak the survival of royalism itself during its darkest days (though this paradigm is potentially compromised in Sforza's tragic death at the end of the play). In fact, Act I points up a number of other virtues which would have been seized upon by exiled royalists, not least Killigrew himself, as affirming the justice of their cause: loyalty, justice, obedience, innocence, patience, endurance, suffering, honour, continence and selfless love of country all feature prominently.

Again, however, there is evidence of ambivalence. Obedience to the monarch is contingent, instanced in Sforza's response to losing his military command: '*Alphonso* the Duke may command, and 'tis just that I obey; And 'tis as great a truth, his Command ought to be just. [But] what if I will not quit the Army? 'tis not this paper can force me, *Carlo* (158). And while patience is virtuously to be displayed in suffering, there comes a time when vengeance is the prime mover, as articulated by Cosmo:

...and though I lost my Country, I kept my honour. But when they will call me friend, and injure me; smile in my face, and stab me; wish health to *Cosmo*, and put poyson in his cup; the world must pardon me, if then my passion grows untame; when I see they aim to make me the basis to build anothers

⁵⁵ Act I, Sc. 1, p. 157.

III. Рецепція художньої спадщини Ренесансу в культурі наступних епох

greatness on; which ere I will suffer, I'll raise a storm shall shake the proudest in their proudest thoughts.⁵⁶

Consonance with the vengeful words of Shakespeare's Shylock is unmistakable here, revealing something of the excluded, 'outsider' mindset of the royalist exile during the 1640s and 1650s. *The Pilgrim* is in fact studded with references and allusions to Shakespeare and other canonical texts fixed in the consciousness of Killigrew's intended audience. Julia is a Lady Macbeth character, who exhibits 'the malice of a bloody and an ambitious woman'⁵⁷; Carlo's albeit disingenuous defence of Martino in the trial scene, desiring to know why 'one that two hours since all men honoured, one that this morning was trusted and revered by all' is now so dishonoured⁵⁸, resembles Kent's defence of Cordelia in *King Lear*; Julia's cool pragmatism and Machiavellian independence – '*Martino*, thou hast taught me to know we are our own Gods; those thrive here that dare Fortune, she knows neither conscience nor prayer'⁵⁹ – remind us of Edmund; Julia's suicide in Act V is redolent of *Julius Caesar* – 'Make room, *Cosmo*, for thy mother: I struck not thee with half so good a will'⁶⁰; and *Hamlet* is brought to mind both in the realisation of bloody guilt in a mother by a young prince and in specific passages of dialogue, such as Alphonso's Fortinbras-like command to 'Take up their Bodies, and let all Funeral Rites be given to these unfortunate people: and since they have born the punishment of their Crimes, let their faults have no more memory, but, with them, lie buried in their Grave'.⁶¹ Whilst such borrowing from literary exemplars was standard practice, in an age when

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 158.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 159.

⁵⁸ Act IV, Sc. 7, p. 202.

⁵⁹ Act V, Sc. 1, p. 207.

⁶⁰ Act V, Sc. 5, p. 213.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 214.

readers expected derivativeness and reworking rather than 'originality', such a strategy assumes additional significance in the context of the royalist exile, where – again – it inevitably evokes memories of 'how things were' before the theatres closed. In the circumstances of exile the familiarity of such references no longer acts simply as a courteous literary convention, but as a psychological handrail for a royalist audience – and playwright – whose world has been upturned. Just as the familiar liturgy of the *Book of Common Prayer* brings comfort and custom to royalist worship on the continent, so literature and drama provide reassuringly fixed cultural coordinates in an often hostile exilic environment.

Ambivalence is never far away, however. Loyalty is another theme in *The Pilgrim* which complicates its pro-royalist tenor, for it cuts both ways. The loyalty of Prince Sforza and Cosmo to the state pervades the drama, but the loyalty displayed by Julia in her illicit relationship with Martino seems no less admirable, or affecting: 'This Lemon in mine eye, that I may weep, and down with my hair; so: now Fortune if ever thou wert kind to Lovers, assist in this my last great action, that I may revenge and save a friend'; 'Let all perish, ere I have a hand in the ruine of my friend'.⁶² Friendship, love and loyalty may be useful attributes for Killigrew to appropriate for a royalist audience, but they cannot be confined to or contained within the parameters of politically conservative characters. Similarly, while the tendentiously twinned notions of banishment and innocence are chiefly associated with the virtuous Cosmo and Sforza, they find even fuller expression in Sforza's enemy in love, Baptista, who bemoans his loathed form! scorn'd fortune! wretched *Baptista*, disgraced, banished, and despised by her I Love! O Heaven! Is there no way to conquest but through the miseries of the Innocent? My crime to this State was my faith to

⁶² Act IV, Sc. 1, pp. 196, 194.

III. Рецепція художньої спадщини Ренесансу в культурі наступних епох

my dead prince and kinsman; which too well *Martino* and false *Julia* know; if they had any gratitude for his memory, they might long since have dispersed this cloud, having absolute power in *Millain*.⁶³

Killigrew's extension of virtue to characters not only loyal but also disloyal to the state may on one level simply be the even-handedness necessary to make any late-Renaissance play read – and be performed – satisfactorily. On the other hand, it is not inconceivable that Killigrew is deliberately attempting, at least in places, to transcend the political partisanship and factionalism of the age in order for his work to attempt to breach the divide between political opposites. In this way, *The Pilgrim* sits squarely with royalist literature examined in recent years, such as romances, which communicate a more complex message than one-sided propaganda. In fact, the closest male friendship in the play is that between former adversaries of separate states, Sforza and Cosmo. Just as in Cotterell's translation of *Cassandre*, the warmest and most enduring friendships are between former adversaries, sworn enemies who have recently clashed in battle. It is an unexpected fluidity in relationship-forming and identity-fashioning, coordinate with the destabilisation of the medium of English itself when it is transferred to the exilic arena.⁶⁴

VII

In conclusion, Killigrew's *The Pilgrim* provides compelling material with which to continue the comparatively incipient process of mapping Caroline drama of the Interregnum and Restoration on to the political, psychological and literary preoccupations of the royalist exile. I have examined the internal as well as external

⁶³ Act II, Sc. 1, p. 164.

⁶⁴ See D'Addario, *Exile and Journey*, p. 123.

evidence for the place and date of composition, the poignancy and of the play's title as it relates to paintings of Killigrew in later life, the writing of the play as a personal survival technique, the debt it owes to Shirley's *The Politician* and the royalist tropes it both exhibits and manipulates. Above all, perhaps, as with so much royalist writing of displacement, we have found ambiguity and contingency, as the taxing conditions of exile persistently impose themselves on normative linguistic and partisan expression. In his epistle to the reader in the 1664 folio, Killigrew wrote:

I shall only say, if you have as much leasure to Read as I had to write these *Plays*, you may, as I did, find a diversion; though I wish it you upon better terms than Twenty Years Banishment.

On the evidence of this study of *The Pilgrim*, at least, the disingenuousness of these words resides not so much in the alleged length or status of his exile, but in the disarming substitution of 'diversion' for a work freighted with exilic significance.