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The Harvard Manuscript of Parkhurst's Ignoramus

Edward F. J. Tucker

George Ruggles Latin comedy Ignoramus, first performed at Cambridge University in 1615 before James I, was one of the more splendid dramatic achievements of its own day. The mere fact that James himself, who is not especially remembered for his literary taste, so greatly admired this play should not be taken as an indication of its worth. In its vivacious and racy Latin, its witty and delightful macaronics, and its cavalier treatment of pedantry and ignorance, all of which reminds one of Skelton, Ignoramus is a work of considerable literary merit.1 The immediate success of Ruggles comedy was not, however, entirely due to its excellence; for, quite apart from its brilliant satire on the legal profession and its penetrating thrusts at the worst excesses of both the Puritans and the Jesuits, it was a socio-political event of some magnitude which evoked a widespread response.

The initial inspiration for the writing of Ignoramus stemmed from the most recent outbreak of ill-feeling in the long-standing town-gown dispute between the students of the University and the officials of the town of Cambridge, the legal satire being directed at one Francis Brackyn, a common lawyer and Recorder of the town government.2 Yet the satire was so effective that, despite admonishment to the contrary,3 Ruggle had inadvertently succeeded in universalizing...

1 J. L. Van Gundy, Ignoramus (Lancaster, Pa., 1906), passim, gives an exhaustive literary evaluation of Ruggles play.
2 G. C. Moore-Smith, "Introduction," Club Law: A Comedy (Cambridge, 1906), pp. xii-xxx. Brackyn was earlier satirized as the Recorder in the anonymous The Return From Parnassus (c.1600) and as Niphil in the anonymous Club Law (c.1598).
3 See the lines given to Musaeus in Ruggles Ignoramus (Ilvii, pp. 164-165 in J. S. Hawkins ed. of 1787): "Pancrumui egitua gratia, & restos ordines, Et multorum studia inessere (quod nemo non facit) strijunm ego: Et innumerae semper esse resuti. Postea, si auit, Infinitos celeberrim ordinis batus viros, ingenietr, Pietate, doctrina praesentia, adeo omne et institutor parent: Qui jus patrios (quo nil sanctius,
the local dispute to deliver a telling blow at the legal profession as a whole. Ignoramus thus came to be interpreted as an attack upon the Inns of Court and upon such eminent authorities as Sir Edward Coke, the Lord Chief Justice of the King's Bench. It was during this period, of course, that the antagonism between Coke and the King had reached its peak, so that the Chief Justice was quite justifiably nettled by the success of the Cambridge play. But even after this time we find that Ignoramus enjoyed a continuing popularity. Latin editions of the comedy appeared in 1630 (twice), 1658, 1659, and 1668, not to mention seven more editions printed during the eighteenth century. Perhaps the most conclusive evidence we have of the lingering influence of Ruggle's satire is a polemical work entitled The Case and Argument Against Sir Ignoramus of Cambridge which, though written in 1617 when the author, Robert Callis, was a student at Gray's Inn, was not published until 1648, a fact which convincingly establishes the continuing currency of Ruggle's attack upon the Common Law. In later years the name "Ignoramus" becomes synonymous with "legal abuse."  

\[ \text{wibit sequin} / \text{Et explostrum deoie, & sincere dicunt: hos morito, / Ut sequam est, susici mus: non & a nobis & pro nobis nun.} \]


* For complete details of these editions, see J. L. Van Gundy, op. cit., pp. 1-4. Eighteenth-century editions appeared in 1701, 1707, 1711, 1736, 1737, 1763, and 1787. There are also six manuscripts of Ruggle's play: an incomplete manuscript at Clare Hall, Cambridge, Harleian 6659, Scone 2531, Dossie 43, Tanner 305, and Rawlinson 1936.

* A copy of this work is in the possession of the Harvard Law Library. Callis is referring to Ruggle in the title of this work and styles both the author and his character Ignoramus as "kightsmen in ignorance."

* The following works, all of which include the name "Ignoramus" in their titles, refer to various types of legal abuses: (1) an anonymous work of 1664 entitled An Ignoramus Found Upon the Law Article; (2) Sir John Vaughan, Ignoramus Vindicated, in a Dialogue Between Prejudice and Indifference (London, 1681), concerns "the Duty, Power, and Proceeding of Juries" and condemns that "sort of Folks called Ignoramus-men, that reform some times to find Bills, though there be Positive Oaths before them;" (3) Edward Whitaker, The Ignoramus Justice (London, 1681), attacks a series of verdicts handed down by the Middlesex assizes which had applied the terms of the statute against Roman Catholic recusants to the cases of dissenting Protestants; (4) an anonymous broadside ballad (in the Houghton collection) "Ignoramus: An Excellent New Song" (London, 1681), satirizes the courts in the following lines: "Since Reformation! With Whig's in
The revival of interest in *Ignoramus* during the Restoration was doubtless inspired by the return of the Stuart monarchy under Charles II, and perhaps because the Cambridge play had been the peculiar delight of Charles's "Royall Grandfather of blessed memory;" the three authors sought recognition by translating it into English: Ferdinando Parkhurst (c.1660), Robert Codrington (1662), and Edward Ravenscroft (1678). Parkhurst's version of *Ignoramus* is the least known of these works although it was the first to be performed on the popular English stage. The reason for this is simple; the work was never published. Unfortunately for him, Codrington's translation appeared in the same year as the Whitehall performance of Parkhurst's play (1661), and it may have been felt that a second printed version of this comedy was unwarranted or "unprofitable" at that time. What happened to the Parkhurst manuscript after the year 1662 is unknown, at least until it eventually appeared in the private collection of the first Earl Grosvenor in the later eighteenth century. It remained in the Westminster collection until recently when in 1967 it was purchased by Harvard Library, together with a second Parkhurst manuscript, a scientific treatise entitled *Meteorographia seu Meteorography, or The Doctrine of Meteors*. That two such disparate works were preserved in the same collection suggests that they derived from a personal rather than a theatre source, and that they remained in the author's possession until the time of his death. Based upon Giambattista Della Porta's *La Trappolaria*, the plot of *Ignoramus* is typical of the Ariosto-Plautine vein of comedy with its wily servant, identical twins, and its use of stock characters like the *servant*, *senex amans*, and *parasites*. The main plot concerns the plight of young Antonius whose inability to raise sufficient money to satisfy

---

"Fashion/ There's neither Equity nor Justice in the Nation,/ Against their Purities,/ There's no such Care is,/ As lately hath been wrought by Ignoramus-Juries." 


There is no connection between the works of Codrington's *Ignoramus* and Parkhurst's, although Ravenscroft's *The English Lawyer* is based upon Codrington's translation. For further details, see note 17 below.

I am indebted to Mr. Guy Acloge, librarian to the present Duke of Westminster, for this information and for other facts concerning the Westminster collection.

For a recent assessment of Ruggle's indebtedness to Della Porta, see Louise G. Clough, *Giambattista Della Porta: Dramatist* (Princeton, 1965), pp. 184 ff.
the greedy soul of the pander Torcol jeopardizes his chances of winning the hand of Rosabella, Torcol's supposed niece. Two complications threaten the happy resolution of this love affair. First Antonius' father, Theodorus, decides to send his son to London to effect the reunion of their family by escorting his mother Dorothea, his twin brother Antoninus, and his sister-in-law Catharina to Bordeaux by sea. The second threat results from Torcol's decision to marry Rosabella off to Ignoramus, an English lawyer who is in Bordeaux on business. The servant Trico manages to smuggle Antonius off the ship and proceeds to initiate a scheme through which, with the help of the parasite Cupes and a degenerate friar Cola, he dupes both Torcol and the lecherous old lawyer. He engineers an exchange of "maidsens," in which Cupes' shrewish wife Polla masquerades as Rosabella. Numerous difficulties pose a constant menace to the success of Trico's artifices: the sheer persistence of Ignoramus and Torcol, the wrath of Pyropus who has been cheated of the clothes which the plotters use for their disguises, and the ever-present danger that Theodorus will discover what is going on. The subplot explores the tenuous marital relationship between Cupes and Polla and includes a hilarious scheme to have Ignoramus exorcised as a person afflicted by evil spirits. The play concludes with the miraculous discovery of Rosabella's true identity. She is in fact Catharina's long-lost sister Isabella who had been betrothed to Antonius in infancy at the same time as Catharina and Antoninus. All the slighted parties are reconciled in a final scene of feasting, dancing, and singing.

Parkhurst's translation of this comedy is not preserved in a single manuscript, however, but rather in a manuscript-book containing no less than three different versions of Ignoramus. This volume also includes a "side" for the part of Trico, a fragment of an unknown comedy by Parkhurst, and an unrelated letterbook of Robert Newport, a London merchant engaged in the Levant trade during the early 1620's. The book is of folio size and handsomely bound in early nineteenth-century calf, which is still in excellent condition except for some loose stitching at the lower end of the spine. The present binding was probably done about the year 1810, the year when many of the Westminster manuscripts were rebound to go into the new family library at Eaton Hall, Cheshire. The fly-leaf of the book bears the watermark "1803." For the sake of convenience, I have designated the three manuscripts of Ignoramus A, B, and C, but I should emphasize
that these sigla specify the order of their composition rather than their order in the manuscript book. I will also refer to the fragment as the "Chouse fragment," the name taken from the principal character in this comedy. The collation of the whole volume is as follows: MS C, ff. 17-37v; MS A, ff. 38r-93v; MS B, ff. 95r-138v; Chouse fragment, ff. 139r-143v; Trico's Side, ff. 144r-153v; Newport Letter-book, ff. 154r-233v. The missing leaf, f. 94, has been torn out and probably contained a list of dramatis personae for the B text of the play. Other missing leaves will be discussed in the collations of the individual manuscripts.

Apart from the difficult secretary script of the letter-book, which need not concern us, there are altogether five distinct scribal hands in the Ignoramus manuscripts, all in easily readable "mixed" (secretarial-italic) script. I have designated them simply as Hands A, B, C, D, and E. Hands A and B are the main hands in the volume: Hand A being responsible for the whole of MS C, Trico's Side, and the Chouse fragment, together with many of the corrections in MS B; Hand B, for the whole of MSS A and B. The Meteorographia treatise mentioned above has special importance in regard to Hand A, for it is almost certainly a holograph manuscript, and the handwriting in this document is identical to that of MS C. On the basis of this similarity, which is documented below, and on the basis of the following inscription which appears on the fly-leaf of Meteorographia, I take Hand A to be that of Parkhurst: "/ferdinando parkhurst/ Huius libri scriptor/ omnibus scientiis/ experientissimus/ Anno Domini/ 1667/ [line]/.

Hand A is a neat, compact hand and quite easy to read except in those few instances where the scribe has been forced to compress his writing, as in the case of marginal additions and interlinearions. The main distinguishing features of Hand A are (1) smaller, more compact characters than those of Hand B, with more lines per page; (2) sharply pointed tails in final "y's," which are quite conspicuous when texts are compared in an upside-down position; (3) 100% usage of letter "y" rather than consonantal "i", (4) miniscule "i" frequently left uncrossed; and (5) fewer abbreviations. In contrast, hand B is a larger and more rounded hand, with fewer lines per page, and his preferences are usually opposite to Hand A's. Thus, in Hand B, we find final "y's" with rounded tails, 100% preference for consonantal "i," and the employment of many more abbreviated forms. Hand A has an angular appearance compared with Hand B, and one of the
outstanding characteristics of Hand B is the capital "T," which looks something like the treble-clef symbol in musical notation. These two hands may also be differentiated on the basis of spelling preferences, as indicated in the chart below. Notice here that the correlation in spelling evidence between MS C and Meteorographia provides further proof that Hand A is Parkhurst's.

### Comparative Spelling Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hand A</th>
<th>Meteorographia</th>
<th>MS C</th>
<th>Chase</th>
<th>Side</th>
<th>Hand B</th>
<th>MS B</th>
<th>MS A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yez (for th)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w. th/ä</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-er (let)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>271</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-et (let)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>go</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>215</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ess</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ness</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possess</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possess</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sound</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>son</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The other three hands are responsible only for alterations within the two MSS B and C. Hand C is a frail, spidery hand which makes many of the changes to MS C, all of which appear to have been added prior to the Royal performance of 1662. Hand D, whose work is of a later date, is an awkward, ungainly-looking hand conspicuous for

"The first emendation made by Hand D appears on the title page which, as I shall prove later in the discussion of MS C, was added to the manuscript at a later date."
its large, upright, rounded characters. The changes made by this scribe are few and relatively unimportant and are confined to MS C. Hand E appears only in MS B and is the easiest to identify because virtually all of the emendations made by this scribe are done in pencil. The particular roles played by these scribes will be discussed more fully in the analysis and description of the individual manuscripts.

Of the three manuscripts, MS A (the first, close translation) presents the least amount of textual difficulty. The second manuscript in the book, occupying ff. 38v–93v, MS A collates as follows:

- f. 38v: blank
- f. 38v: Drammatis [sic] personae
- ff. 39v–49r: Act I (eight scenes)
- ff. 49v–57r: Act II (eight scenes)
- ff. 58v–70r: Act III (thirteen scenes)
- ff. 70v–82r: Act IV (twelve scenes)
- ff. 82v–93v: Act V (eleven scenes)

Measuring 19.4 by 29.6 cm., MS A is almost certainly a fair copy of the first translation made by Parkhurst from Ruggle's Ignoramus. Since the Latin play went through four editions before 1660, all of which perpetuate the same corruptions,18 it would be difficult, without collating the Latin texts, to determine which of the printed editions Parkhurst used for his translation. The paper of MS A bears the same watermark throughout, a small ornamental pot with crescent, fleur-de-lys, handle on the left, and the signature C/RO, which is identical to Hearwood's watermark #3627.19 The paper is neatly trimmed at the margins, leaving no jagged or frayed edges, and each page has a cleanly ruled left-hand margin. Containing very few emendations and textual changes, all made by Hand B, the text of MS A is not a full translation of Ruggle's play. The author has ignored Ruggle's prologues (prior and posterior), and in a number of places he has already begun the process of shortening the play, which was originally of marathon length.20 A good example of this abridging occurs with the

18 See fn. 17.
20 In an account of James's visit to Cambridge taken from a paper in the handwriting of James Tabor, Register to the University of Cambridge in 1615, the play is said to have begun at eight in the evening and not to have ended until one o'clock in the morning. See Hawkins, p. cxxi.
complete omission of Ruggle's Act V, Scene ii, which features an exchange of bawdy jokes between Dorothea's servants Vince and Nell. Despite this, and though one discovers several points in the play where Parkhurst is manifestly taking liberties with Ruggle's Latin, MS A must otherwise be considered a close translation.

MS B, also written by Hand B, measures 19.2 by 30.5 cm., although here accurate measurement is impossible because of the unevenness of the margins. This MS bears a uniform watermark throughout, a medium-sized pot with a crescent, *fleur-de-lys*, and handles left, with a signature R/DB or D/BB and quite similar to Hazwood's #3637 or #3635. Full collation of MS B reads as follows:

f. 94  turned out, a piece of the paper still visible at the lower margin.
ff. 95r-103v  Act I (seven scenes)
ff. 103v-111x  Act II (eight scenes)
ff. 111x-119v  Act III (eleven scenes)
ff. 120v-129v  Act IV (nine scenes and 133 ll. of scene xi)
ff. 130  torn out (containing the remaining lines of scene x and the beginning of scene xi)
ff. 131r-132x  Act IV (remaining lines of scene xi)
ff. 132r-138v  Act V (incomplete: six scenes and 8 lines of scene vii)

I have not given folio numbers to the missing leaves at the end of Act V because they were removed before the binding of the MS, whereas ff. 94 and 130 were torn from the bound MS. Folio 94 probably contained a list of *dramatis personae* and possibly a prologue. The removal of f. 130 and of the leaves which contained the final portion of Act V, however, appears to be related to the role of Hand E in the revision of MS B.

Most of the emendations made by Hand E are of a very simple nature. He adds a number of "asides"; he changes the word "London" to "England" in several places; and he removes the word "God" from many oaths and profanities. But there are a number of places in

\[\text{An example of such a departure occurs in the catch sung in the Tavern scene (III.x in both plays) where Parkhurst translates Ruggle's line "O si frangat colla!" ("O, if she might break her neck!" as "The devil cut her swallow." Parkhurst then proceeds to add extra lines and a full stanza to the original song written by Ruggle.}\]
MS B where speeches have been marked for deletion by means of pencil lines running vertically down the left-hand margins opposite the lines to be omitted. In all of these cases, the lines thus designated do not occur in MS C. The most significant of these deletions occurs in IV.xi where the complete omission of the remaining lines of the scene corresponds with the removal of the beginning lines on f. 130, this revision agreeing with the exclusion of this scene from MS C. Two further pieces of evidence suggest that Hand E's revisions are preliminary to the composition of MS C. The first of these is the marginal reading "add" written opposite IV.i,34–35 (MS B), a point at which a substantial body of lines has been added in MS C. The second item of supporting evidence is the word "finis" placed in the margin opposite V.vi,195, together with a horizontal line drawn between V.vi,200–201. The remaining lines of V.vi in MS B feature an exchange of congratulatory words between Trico and Theodorus, and the omission of this part of the scene corresponds with the organization of MS C in which Trico makes no entrance at this point. It appears certain, therefore, that the work of Hand E was undertaken with the writing of MS C in mind, although we can be certain that these revisions are not Parkhurst's. There is no similarity between Hands A and E, and it is the latter hand that uses pencil. The evidence indicates that Hand E is that of a person connected with the theatre who was interested in reducing the length of the play and in reorganizing the final scenes of Act V. If this is true, it reflects the work of a person with superior theatrical sense, for the original drama, as organized by Ruggles and continued in MS A, has an unsatisfactory ending in which the final scenes are entirely superfluous in terms of the main plot. The romantic plot comes to its full resolution with the discovery of the heroine's identity, just where Hand E has marked it. A short concluding scene is all that is required, and this is what Parkhurst supplies in MS C.

Another curious feature of MS B is the somewhat puzzling role played by Hand B. Here we discern the work of a person who not only transcribes MS A, or more probably a revised version of MS A in foul papers, but also makes a considerable number of substantive emendations. There can be no mistaking the distinctive characteristics of Hand B in these changes, so that if he is a mere scribe, he is certainly taking extraordinary liberties with Parkhurst's text. We are forced to the conclusion that Parkhurst must have authorized the
changes made by Hand B and that the latter was an actual collaborator in the production of MS B. This scribe, however, takes no part in the writing of MS C, which represents a considerable departure from the earlier versions of the play in MSS A and B.

If MS B has its textual difficulties, they are relatively simple compared to the complications of MS C. Measuring 18.8 by 30.5 cm., MS C collates as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ff.</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1r</td>
<td>blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v</td>
<td>Terms of the Actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2r</td>
<td>Prologue to the King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v</td>
<td>Act I (seven scenes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3r-9v</td>
<td>Act II (eight scenes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9v-15v</td>
<td>Act III (eleven scenes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15v-23v</td>
<td>Act IV (eleven scenes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23r-31v</td>
<td>Act V (seven scenes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31r-36v</td>
<td>The Entertainment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlike the two previous manuscripts, which are fair copies, this manuscript is obviously a working copy in which the process of revision stands out quite clearly. In fact, close inspection of all the evidence, textual and bibliographical, reveals that MS C is not a single manuscript but rather a conflation of three manuscripts, or at least of three separate stages of composition: MS C1 (ff. 3r-4v and f. 37), MS C2 (ff. 5r-16v), and MS C3 (ff. 17r-36v). The best method of describing the production of the whole manuscript is to analyze each of these divisions in turn.

Before dealing with MS C3, however, it will be necessary to provide a detailed account of the preliminary leaves, ff. 1-2 which cannot be included with the three-fold grouping outlined above. Both of these leaves have been tipped into the first gathering. On f. 1 is the title page which reads as follows: "/Ignoramus./ or/ The Academic-Lawyer.//Acted at the Cock-pitt in Drury Lane./ And also before [their Muses deleted]/The King and Queen's [altered from Queene]/ Majesty [interlined by Hand D]/ at Whitehall, on Saturday night/ 1 st of November 1662,/ with great applause./ [space]/ Paraphrastically Translated/ from the Academic to the English Theatre/ By/ Ferdinando Parkhurst/ [space]/ Ignoramus non habet imicium, nisi ignorantem." This leaf bears a
The Harvard Manuscript of Parkhurst's Ignorantius

watermark not encountered elsewhere in the volume, a barely distinguishable fleur-de-lys in a frame or shield, which, like the watermark of the Meteorographia manuscript, strongly resembles Heawood's #1717 dated 1670. This evidence suggests that the title page was a later addition to the manuscript. The leaf is extremely dirty and stained, somewhat frayed, and torn partially along a horizontal crease where the leaf has been folded from top to bottom. The verso of the leaf is blank. Folio 2v contains a list of the parts and the names of the actors for each role. The actors' names have been added in the left-hand margin by Hand D at a later date. This leaf, which bears no watermark, is creased and folded like f. 1, though it is much cleaner. At some time before the eventual assembly of the manuscript, these sheets were kept separately from the rest of MS C, a fact also indicated by the dirty and stained condition of f. 3v.

That portion of the text designated as MS C1 begins on f. 3r (I,ii,1) and ends on f. 4r (I,ii,44), a page which contains only four lines of text. The last line on f. 4r ("Roger Rackledock de Carton in Comitatu Brecknock; a, ho,"") furnishes an absolute continuity of text with the first line of f. 5r ("Richard Fen, John Den," etc.). These lines also provide an exact parallel with the corresponding lines in MS B (I,ii,45-46), and, since the lines in question belong to an unbreakable legal formula for the writing of indentures, it would have been impossible for the author to have added lines at this point. Thus, it appears that Parkhurst, for some reason, decided to revise the beginning scene of the play. The first scene in MS B is much longer than the C text and, particularly in two long speeches by Theodorus and Antonius, provides a certain amount of superfluous information which is repeated later in the comedy. Having rewritten this first scene, therefore, Parkhurst then transcribed the first forty lines of the second scene, which remains quite close to MS B, from the leaves which he had removed, conflating the two parts of the text as suggested by leaving all but four lines of f. 4v blank. Bibliographical evidence also supports this theory, for these two leaves (ff. 3 and 4) are conjugate, and another dark crease mark on f. 4v indicates that it too had lain apart from the remaining leaves of the first gathering.

MS C2 begins on f. 5v (I,ii,45) and continues to f. 16v (III,ii,50) where the division between the two portions of the text is marked by the complete cancellation of f. 17v and the deletion of the first ten lines of f. 17v. The fifty-four cancelled lines on ff. 17 recto and verso
are in fact revised in the preceding pages. The first line deleted on f. 177 ("for by all Circumstances & Declarations," \(\text{I}\)) corresponds with a line on the lower half of f. 166 (\(\text{III}1,65\)). From this point one may trace a close parallel between the text of f. 16 and the cancelled text of f. 17. But even without the textual evidence of f. 17, it would have been easy to identify a division of text at this point, for MS C6 is a relatively neat piece of workmanship compared with MS C5 which contains considerably more changes and interlineations. Parkhurst had obviously decided to recopy the play in its entirety, but, having reached f. 177, he was forced to stop and collocate the revised portions of the text in MS C5 and MS C6 with the remaining leaves of an older MS (C5). The revision made to the conclusion of the Entertainment on f. 37, which I have included in the designation of MS C5, provides a new epilogue and a continuation of the banter between Ignoramus and Torcol begun on the preceding leaf. It is possible, however, that this revision was made at a later date, and in this case we may have a fourth stage of composition.

Before the assembly of the whole manuscript, the first two sections had been folded and kept separately. We have already observed some evidence of this in the first leaves of the manuscript, but the crease line already remarked on ff. 1–2 does not end with MS C5. It actually runs continuously throughout the first two gatherings to f. 166, the terminating point of MS C5, although the crease mark in the second gathering is not as pronounced as that of the first. The system of pagination through the first two gatherings also reflects the division of texts at f. 17 where consecutive numbering stops. The cancelled f. 177 is not given a number, but the number "20" has been added in the left-hand margin of f. 177 opposite the first line following the deleted ten lines on that page. This page number is so placed to indicate the continuity of text from f. 167, which is numbered 18, but the pagination is not resumed in MS C6. The \(\text{stemma}\) on the following page will show the complete order of composition.

In a fuller evaluation of the relationships between the three manuscripts, one discerns three basic types of revision: (1) material omitted in the process of reducing the length of the play; (2) change of emphasis from one version to the next; and (3) the addition of new passages together with revision of those parts of the play felt to be unsatisfactory. The process of excision, although it continues to be a factor in MS C5, is the most significant feature in the relationship
between MSS A and B. We have already observed how Parkhurst had begun to shorten the play in the first translation of Ruggles's text, but quite obviously MS A was still too long for stage representation. Not much shorter than Shakespeare's Hamlet, which is rarely staged in its entirety, MS A (3920 ll.) is 900 lines longer than MS B.

Although at first glance many parallels appear to exist between the texts of Parkhurst and Codrington, these common readings may be easily explained by reference to the early printed editions. First of all, a number of scenes in Ruggle, beginning at IV.ii, are written wholly or partly in English where Antonius and Rosabella pretend to be Antoninus and Catharina newly arrived from England. Second, the early printed editions were filled with errors which were not corrected until Hawkins published his edition in 1787. A good example is furnished in Ignoramus' "Joynture" in I.69-80 in MS A. Here we find such readings as "jaldeman," "velloninus," "valoas," and "extra Hevs" common to both Parkhurst and Codrington (sig. Ea). Hawkins readings, based upon collation of all known editions and some of the manuscripts, are "jaldagrum," "sellagruum," "unachum," and "extrahures." The corrupted readings may be traced to any of the first four editions of Ignoramus. Ravenscroft's lines also seem to reproduce Parkhurst's in many instances, but one invariably finds that Codrington's translation is closer. Only two direct parallels occur between Parkhurst and Ravenscroft. The first common reading is found in the last three lines of the catch in III, i.42-59(C): "For her tongue and her belly/ if ever they faile/ the Devill shall have her gracie." Ravenscroft reproduces these lines verbatim (sig. E3'). The second occurs in Ravenscroft's Epilogue (sig. K3') where he uses the line which appears as a motto or epigraph on Parkhurst's title page (f.: 1): "Ignoramus non habet inimicum, nisi ignorantem." Although this latter example stems from the proverb "Ars non habet inimicum, nisi ignorantem," and although bawdy songs have a way of perpetuating themselves, it appears likely that Ravenscroft must have had some knowledge of Parkhurst's version of Ignoramus.
A good example of this cutting is seen in the omission of III.iii (A) from MS B. In this scene, Ignoramus the lawyer, after having been driven off in a previous scene by Cupes disguised as a sowgelder, makes a second attempt to visit Torcol in order to complete the arrangements for his wedding with Rosabella, but he is again intercepted by Cupes and driven off with terrifying blasts upon the sowgelding horn. III.iii (A) is a funny scene but quite unnecessary to the action of the play, and Parkhurst drops it in MS B. There are also several places in the play where Parkhurst has conflated two scenes from MS A into one shorter scene in MS B. The best example of this has already been mentioned in connection with MS C, where I.i of MSS C and B combines I.i-ii of MS A. The original scenes, as devised by Ruggle and translated almost word for word in MS A, have two extremely long speeches: the first in I.i where Theodorus delivers a long-winded explanation of his situation, and the second in I.ii where Antonius soliloquizes on his misfortunes with Rosabella and on the state of her affairs with Torcol. In both of these cases, the information imparted is repeated elsewhere in the drama, and thus the exclusion of these speeches not only gets rid of superfluous material but adds to the suspense of the later scenes. Parkhurst does well in making these cuts and thereby reduces the number of lines from 204 in the first two scenes of MS A to a respectable 124 in I.i of MS B. The process of abridging continues in the changes made to MS C which is 90 lines shorter than MS B. For example, IV.xii of MS B has been omitted in MS C, and I.i has been reduced by a further fifty lines. The end of the play has been revised to exclude the final scenes of the original in MS A (V.ix-x).

Occasionally we see where some of these omissions serve to create a change of emphasis in the play. For example, the exclusion of Ruggle’s V.ii from Parkhurst’s first translation, as noted earlier, establishes a definite trend in the further omission of bawdy passages. Another instance of this type of cutting occurs with the gradual stripping of anti-Catholic satire from the final version of the play. The original Latin drama includes a great deal of satire upon the anti-Jesuit theme of equivocation. This first appears in II.iii (all three manuscripts) where Trico and Cupes discuss a series of “libelli,” little books or pamphlets. One of these titles is The Snake of Equivocation, or The Art of Lying cram Privilegia, an allusion to the polemical writings of men like Henry Garnet, Robert Parsons, and Andreas
Cydonius who were the originators of the "equivocation" dispute which raged throughout the seventeenth century. In MS C, however, this type of satire is minimized, with many of the more esoteric allusions omitted. We also find several references to the Pope and the Catholics as associates of Beelzebub, the Prince of Liars. After that, most of the characters in the play engage in lying and in various forms of equivocation. In MS A, for example, we find the following instances:

1. Antonius and Rosabella combining to deceive Theodorus with forged letters (IV.1);
2. Antonius and Trico denying each other's identity in a second attempt to defraud Pyropus the broker from whom they have rented clothes for their disguises (IV.31);
3. Trico explaining his deceptions as "truth" with a "mental reservation" (VIII.1);
4. Trico promising to stage a comedy for the nuptials called Equivocus (VII.16);
5. Cupes attempting to deceive Polla for the umpteenth time with Friar Cola's help after he has almost been caught red-handed among his prostitutes (V.3);
6. Polla trying to seduce her erstwhile lover Cola while her husband is hiding under the friar's smock. When Cola denies her, she justifies her desires by citing "Talions law of revenge quid pro quo," "that if the husband have to doe with another woman, it is lawfull for the wife to doe with another man." Then she adds, "I remember your words, you said there was the same for Titius as for Sempronius" (VIII.14, 49-52). Cupes' subsequent words about having hid within the Trojan horse recall the most famous instance of equivocation in classical literature.

This is only a brief and far from complete outline of the theme of the deceitful breaking of sacred vows and relationships in the play: be-

"Robert Parsons' A Treatise of Equivocation (1602) was a Jesuit polemic advocating oath-breaking and regicide. This book was later used in the trial of Henry Garnier, who was condemned and executed for complicity in the Gunpowder conspiracy. Henry Mason's The New Art of Lying under the Veil of Equivocation (1614) may have been inspired by Ruggles' title. Robert Sanderson, in his Obligation of Promissory Oaths (1615), defines 'equivocation' as 'An oath, where the words according to their common signification are clear enough, but the party swearing having no will to oblige himself in that sense intendment another . . . is that verball equivocation, which among some other Casuists and Scholiasticks, the Jesuits especially maintain and practise.' Samuel Butler also satirizes this notion in a lengthy discussion between Hudibras and Ralpho (see Hudibras, Book Two, Canto Il, and especially II. 55-58, 107, and 266-268). The whole matter was, of course, resurrected in the Titus Oates and Monmouth plots later in the century.
tween father and son, master and servant, man and wife, lawyer and
the true spirit of justice, churchman and his Church. All consecrated
bonds are in jeopardy, and this is brought about by the “snake of
equivocation.” Of the six items listed above, however, MS C retains
only the first, while MS B retains the first three. Most of the anti-
Catholic satire is pared away in this manner, so that the final version
of the comedy contains only a few isolated examples such as those
already noted in II,iii (C).

Another noteworthy change of emphasis occurs in MS C where the
role of Pyropus is drastically revised to emphasize his Puritanism.
This is most clearly seen in a comparison of IV,iv-v in MSS B and C
where, from a mild religiosity, the broker’s character is transformed
into that of a fire-eating, egocentric Puritan of the Zeal-of-the-Land
Busy variety. The following passages (the first from MS B, the
second from MS C) will serve to illustrate the thoroughness of this
metamorphosis:

Textorous: Who do’t think this is?  His name is Antonius.
Pyropus:
Th: I knew thou wast deceiv’d.
Ant: It goes well hitherto.
Py: I was indeed sir, for the diamond ring
      I took in pawn for his clothes, was Counterfeit.
        [IV,iv,16–21 (B)]
Theo: Who do’t think this is?  His name is Antonius.
Pyr: I knew thou wast deceiv’d.
Theo: It goes well hitherto.  Aside
Ant: Verily so I was, for the diamond ring
      he gave me in pawn for his vestments is counterfeit.
      Here is thy Ring, thy abominable ring,
      thou son of Satan, thou imposture of the devill,
      I tell thee thou man, thou wicked son of a wicked man,
      these evil practises are abominations,
      yea abominations upon the face of the earth.
        [Emended from Ros:  IV,iv,29–37 (C)]

This revision is certainly more in keeping with Restoration dramatic
practice when anti-Puritan satire came into vogue. In 1660, when
Parkhurst first began the work of translation, this type of satire may
not have been as well received. The addition and the expansion of
songs, together with two exorcism incantations, an epithalamium, and
a wedding dance, are also changes made with an eye toward the new fashion for music and spectacle on the Restoration stage.

Over and above the abridgments, changes of emphasis, and the newly introduced passages, Parkhurst devoted considerable effort to the rewriting not only of long speeches but also of whole scenes. III.6 (in both MSS B and C), for example, has been so completely revised that only a few lines may be read in parallel. But detailed comparison of the two texts reveals that MS C is more than a mere revision, for in many ways the final text is a considerable improvement over the author’s first stumbling attempts. The much larger number of Latinisms in MS C, for example, furnishes an excellent illustration of the superiority of the final version of the comedy. Parkhurst must have realized that he had overtranslated Ruggles’s text in MSS A and B. In restoring many of the legal phrases and much of the mutilated Latin, he manages to preserve something of the meaning of Ruggles’s satire, for the humor of the original play derives largely from the linguistic barbarities which flow from Ignoramus’ tongue. The following list will show that these changes have been made throughout the play and that they are generally of the type that would be readily understood:

I,i,10 Rubba me cimn Towadi.
I,i,17 bonum agramentum, quasi aggregatio mensium
I,iii,3 tiorum sim servus servorum
I,iii,23 unus Lex, unus Rex
I,iii,24 in propria persona
I,iv,62 billa vera
II,viii,23 Jubeo vos custodire pacem in nomine Regis
III,i,6 insani-pilei (i.e. “madcaps”)
III,i,51 O valde curtesius homo
III,i,56 Comteste de Angleterrre
III,iv,33 Incursi — servicum — pecus
III,v,38 nabulo in graio
III,vii,42 Ego te sculpam pro sorciere ut es
III,vii,49 Abeo, sum valde brusatus
IV,viii,15 Ego complementabo tecum
IV,viii,17 Diabolus frangat tummi cornu oollum
IV,viii,43 si ego te capio in manus
IV,x,7–8 Projecto habenbo te in corni nobis

This is an incomplete list, of course, and the lawyer appears only
briefly in the fifth act. We must also remember that all of these phrases and sentences have been translated into English in MSS A and B, and the accuracy with which they have been reproduced from Ruggle's text clearly indicates that Parkhurst was systematically checking MS C against the Latin version of the play.

The restoration of these Latinisms not only improves the characterization of Ignoramus and his half-witted clerks Dulman and Pecus but is also required in the plotting of the play. The exorcism scheme actually depends upon the ability of Ignoramus to confuse his auditors with his "Babel of tongues." In IV, vii, for example, the lawyer rages incoherently because Dulman has been duped into bringing him Polla in the place of Rosabella. In his fury, he raunts at Polla using all of the pig Latin and Norman French at his command. Needless to say, Polla cannot understand a single word he says, and after she has routed the lawyer, who mistakes her for a witch and tries to bleed her, she comes to the conclusion that he must be possessed by evil spirits. As Cupes later explains to Trico,

*Ille tell thee Trico, this simple Ignoramus*  
canting hyperboles in lawyers Rhetorick  
alias Pedlars-French, such as lawyers use  
to ev'ry person, and to ev'ry purpose  
has begot a rumor among the people  
that he's possesst with spirits; and ev'ry word  
he speaks in's Court-hand Language  
is taken for the name of some infernal spirit.  

[IV,v,97-104(C)]

In both MSS A and B, however, all of these Latinisms and the law terms have been translated into English, thus eliminating the real cause of Polla's bafflement. By restoring Ignoramus' "lawyers Rhetorick" in MS C, Parkhurst produces a much more convincing scene by giving Polla a reason to be confused and for identifying Ignoramus as a person afflicted by the Devil.

As suggested in the *steamina* above, the manuscript of Trico's Side relates very closely to the finished text of MS C, or the conflation of the three stages of composition previously recognized as MS C, MS C2, and MS C3. With the exception of the name "Mr. Medbourne" added later by Hand D, the entire manuscript is written in Hand A's italic script. The Side contains very few internal changes, and these are generally of a simple nature and mainly concerned with
The correction of misreadings. Collation of the Side with MS C shows such close correspondence that where one does encounter substantive differences, these are usually one-word substitutions such as “you” for “your,” “shall” for “will,” “faith” for “truth,” and “might” for “may.” Most of the remaining differences consist of the alteration of phrases like “who is” and “I have” to contracted forms like “who’s” and “I’ve.” Only a few remaining examples of real substantive difference occur, and these can be briefly listed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS C</th>
<th>Trico’s Side</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II, vi, 94</td>
<td>sift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, vii, 28</td>
<td>sometime a Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, viii, 57</td>
<td>turne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III, iii, 19</td>
<td>weare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III, iii, 59</td>
<td>two or three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV, vi, 107ff.</td>
<td>[blank]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“But we must not bring such holy men oth’ stage, it may prejudice our Play.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV, vi, 29–30</td>
<td>“Ie to Antonius, let him understand/ the state of things and what is now in hand.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Ent.</td>
<td>[blank]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only the last three of these examples show any real divergence between the Side and MS C. The lines in IV, vi, 107ff. echo lines previously assigned to Trico in II, vi, 23 where he warns the scholarly law clerk Musaeus that he should not speak harshly of such men as his master Ignoramus upon the stage. None of the three versions of Ignoramus, moreover, contains an “Ante-Epilogue” featuring Trico and Ignoramus. On the basis of these changes, it appears as if the Side, though extremely close to MS C, was transcribed from an early version of the play, other than that staged at Whitehall in 1662. We can imagine that the author had little time for the final preparation of the manuscript, and in his haste, he failed to catch these differences between the Side and MS C.

Whether or not another theatre copy of this version of Ignoramus was made, we cannot say, but it appears most likely that the author retained the present copies of his work among his personal papers.
This is the only reasonable explanation for the collection of documents as we have them in the Harvard manuscript of Parkhurst's *Ignoramus* and for the fact that they have been preserved together with a totally unrelated work such as the *Meteorographia* treatise.
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