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Abstract

In the face of the generic confusion in the field of English Renaissance non-fictional prose, this thesis outlines a particular type of writing not before acknowledged as belonging to a genre. This kind of writing I call the *farrago*; a *farrago* is defined to be a prose work belonging principally to no one genre, but containing within it pieces belonging to one or more kinds.

Five representative Elizabethan *farragoes* are examined:

William Bullein's *A Dialogue* (1564), Sir John Harington's *The Metamorphosis of Ajax* (1596), and three works by Thomas Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse his Supplication to the Divell* (1592), *Have with you to Saffron Walden* (1596) and *Nashes Lenten Stuffe* (1599).

Each of these works is dissected to show its component parts, and the historical and generic background to these parts is, in most cases, discussed. An evaluation is made of the contribution of the *farrago* form to the work's literary impact.

In the final chapter several other *farragoes*, including Robert Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*, are considered, and their *farraginary* pieces indicated, in order to show the ubiquity of
the genre in Renaissance writing.
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Genome makes good scaffolding but a bad skeleton. It is flexible, easily dismantled and moved, and gives the critic a good view of the work he wishes to examine, without of itself defining its shape. It follows the shape of another's building. Or, to use another metaphor, genre is the proverbial good servant but bad master. Or again, one could say, it is a tool, not an artefact itself.

Genre studies have been under attack for some considerable time. The Romantic conception of poetry was at variance with the idea that works could be held down to certain principles. As Adrian Marino puts it:

"Literary works, unique and irrepeateable in essence and definition, therefore 'original', defy rigorous subcategorization and all leveling pigeonholes. They form distinctive structures,
irreducible to the category of a genre..." (1)

One of the most forceful reasons for rejecting the use of genre in critical study was the straightjacketing of works of literature along taxonomic lines. This biological analogy was given its most extreme expression in the work of Ferdinand Brunetiere, who related the evolution of the species to literary genres, and tried to show that "genres are transformed by a kind of literary process of natural selection of those best able to survive." (2) Although Brunetiere's theory was quickly repudiated, many scholars followed, and still follow the taxonomic method of classifying works. The use of 'genus' and 'species' in respect of genres is still found. (3)

But the use of genre studies has been defended for as long as it has been attacked. Croce himself accepted the usefulness of generic distinctions in classification. (4) Others, for example, Charles Whitmore in 1924, have been vocal in the defence of genres, but have suggested caution in their use. Whitmore writes that literary definitions "must be framed with constant and attentive regard to the works in question." (5) Northrop Frye provided a counterweight to Croce, in that he returned academic respectability to genre studies with his Anatomy of Criticism (1957). Frye attempted to break down some of the long-held ideas on genre, without destroying the concept of broad classifications of literature. For example, he tried to diminish the sway that the genre 'the novel' had held for so long in genre studies by suggesting that prose works should rather be seen in four categories: the novel, the confession, the anatomy and the
The complete resurrection of genre studies was, perhaps, marked by the appearance of the journal Genre in 1968. (7) Eliseo Vivas, writing in the first issue deprecates "men suffering from a taxonomic itch" (8), but argues for the necessity of closed concepts of genre. He says:

"Properly done, the closing of concepts inflicts no harm on the interests or preferences of anyone. The closing is not an act of disparaging exclusion of those objects or classes of objects the critic does not want to bring under analysis. All the closing does is to assert, more or less explicitly, that the objects the critic is interested in are limited— as perforce they must be." (9)

If we adopt John Reichert’s definition of a genre as "any group of works selected on the basis of some shared features" (10), we can see that genre studies are no longer regarded as definitive but descriptive. There is, however, one problem in genre criticism, which is articulated by Henri Bonnet when he distinguishes between ‘essential’ and ‘formal’ genres. (11) The area of the essential genres is generally that in which genre critics operate— that is to say, the major concerns of genre critics are whether there are two genres (in Bonnet's case, these are fiction and poetry), or three (lyrical, tragic and epic genres), or perhaps more. The formal genres are the convenient
names used by bibliographers and literary historians. Bonnet rightly points out that there is little or no theoretic generic difference between a novel and a short story. The difference is of use only in defining a formal, not an essential genre. The area in which I operate when examining Elizabethan prose is that of formal, not essential genre.

Sensitive use of genres in study produces fascinating and unexpected results. Rosalie Colie, in her brilliant study of Renaissance genres, The Resources of Kind (12), shows how Renaissance writers tended to produce both miniature kinds, and enormous combinations of those kinds. She also shows the tendency of these writers to work established genres together, so as to produce a kind unique to each book. Following Frye, Colie adopts the term 'anatomy' for those works which try to "get everything" in". (13) These works are examples of the Renaissance method she calls Inclusionism, that is, the habit of combining many kinds in one work. This complements the 'miniaturisation' of kinds which she also explicates. Renaissance genres, if we take notice of Colie's findings, are simultaneously general and specific, the general genre being a collection of many of the specific.

Bearing this general rule in mind, I now turn to the specific area of Elizabethan non-fictional prose. We find when considering particular areas of literature in order to establish formal genres in them, that confusion rather than taxonomic
reality usually reigns. Johannes A. Huisman highlights this when he writes:

"If we look more closely at the relevant entries in bibliographies, handbooks, and editions arranged according to categories, it becomes clear that necessity has largely been turned into a virtue and that the material has been arranged in genres based on a wide variety of criteria. M.S. Batts, for example, distinguishes seven types in late courtly literature: courtly poetry, lyric and Spruch, heroic literature, minor epic, didactic literature, religious literature, and history. The term 'courtly literature' has a sociological basis; 'lyrics' are named for the musical accompaniment that was obligatory until the eighteenth century; 'heroic poetry' takes its name from the content; 'minor epic' from its length, and 'didactic verse' from the poet's intention. This is not to fault Batts's method; practice cannot wait for theory to establish a definitive system of genres, if such is even possible." (14)

Such confusions of category are commonly found. In Elizabethan prose, the major distinction is between fiction and non-fiction, a distinction based on essential generic distinctions, fiction being for these purposes narrative imaginative writing, and non-fiction non-narrative writing, which may or may not be imaginative. Within non-fictional prose the distinctions between
genres are made almost entirely on the grounds of content, an apparently simple manner of categorising books, but one which is theoretically suspect. As Varino puts it: "(Not all) aesthetic criteria (are) equally adequate. The classification by content, for instance, can be extended ad infinitum." (15) Varino does not refer here specifically to the broad classifications in terms of content that Elizabethan prose is subject to, but his words underline the fallibility of classification on content alone.

In the bibliographies and literary histories of sixteenth century England, certain areas of writing are easily cordoned off from others on the grounds of their subject-matter. Theological, historical and critical writings, for example, are easily removed from other writings, even though there may be good arguments for coupling these writings with works of different content, under a heading determined by aesthetic considerations, or for including works which are not strictly 'theological', 'historical' and 'critical' with these books. (16)

Much smaller areas are roped off on the grounds of content also. For example, there are kinds called 'roque pamphlets', which deal with the nefarious doings of petty criminals, 'tobacco pamphlets', which attack or defend tobacco; there are travel writings, writings on the country, writings on women, and attacks on society. (17) This sort of classification works quite well in the face of a huge mass of writings. The unfortunate result, however, is that the generic inventiveness of this age, underlined by Colie's study, is submerged. To take just one
example, Sir Richard Barkley's Felicitie of Man is neither a
philosophical treatise, a theological tract nor collection of
merry jests or moral tales, but an unusual mixture of all four.
The extent of this generic inventiveness, already apparent in
Colie's book, should become even clearer as this study
progresses.

I said above that non-fictional prose may or may not be
imaginative. It is, in fact, the category of imaginative
non-fiction that causes classification problems for the scholar
of Elizabethan prose. Prose of this general kind, prose which is
not fiction, and yet clearly 'literary', but not easily classed
in terms of its content, is often given the title 'ephemeral',
'miscellaneous' and 'popular'. (18) The first of these titles is
clearly erroneous, since the books would not be in the lists at
all if they were so; the second shows the despair of the
bibliographers quite plainly; the third presupposes an audience
for the works, the existence of which has not been proved. (19)
S.K. Heninger in his bibliography English Prose, Prose Fiction
and Criticism to 1660 has a catch-all section called Ephemeral
and Polemical Writings. (20) Heninger himself is aware of the
unsatisfactory nature of this section, for he writes:
"...ephemeral and polemical writings... ran the
complete gamut from the serious... in
religio-political debate through the realistic and
grim... to the delightful and merely frivolous in
descriptions of pastimes. They all share, however, a sense of immediacy, with the resultant vivacity of thought and language." (21)

In other words, these books have little in common except certain stylistic features. Works in the section range from Sir Thomas More's Utopia through Hooker's Laws of Ecclesiastical Politie to Richard Harvey's highly inaccurate Astro逻辑all Discourse.

Works of the non-fictional imaginative sort by Thomas Nashe, Thomas Lodge, Robert Greene and Thomas Dekker are also included.

One attempt has been made to face up to the generic confusion of Elizabethan prose. Thomas E. Wright, in his dissertation The English Renaissance Prose Anatomy (22) attacks precisely this 'miscellaneous' group of works, and contrives to fit them all into the genre 'anatomy'. He takes his term from Frye, who as I mentioned before, suggested four loose kinds of prose writing, one of them being the 'anatomy'. Frye derives this genre from the Classical 'Menippean satire', which was originally a mixed form of verse and prose dealing with ideas rather than people. The 'anatomy' retains the mixed nature of the 'Menippean satire' but generally without verse. The major distinguishing feature of the 'anatomy' in Frye's definition is its intellectual analysis of the world, a kind of thoughtful satire without the bile. Frye's terms are fairly loose, and intended as an indication rather than a firm directive. Wright, in his use of Frye's genre, 'anatomy', has deduced that all works which do not fit into
Frye's other prose categories (novel, confession and romance) are probably 'anatomies'. This leads him to include in his survey of the Renaissance 'anatomy' a huge number of works whose major feature is their refusal to be categorised. In fact, almost every work which refuses to fit into the classes I mentioned before (viz., prose-fiction or content-classified non-fiction) appears in Wright's list of 'anatomies', along with a few works which do fit into those classes. Wright achieves this feat—no mean one—by defining the 'anatomies' as works in which "the control of fiction by ideas, represented as such, is the common element." (23) Fiction Wright interprets widely as imaginative writing of all kinds, and ideas he uses for any kind of exercise of the mind. There are few, if any, ideas in the traditional sense in works like Nashe's Lenten Stufte or Thomas Dekker's Lanthorn and Candleliqht and certainly no ideas of the depth and complexity of those in Utonia. All three works, however, are in Wright's list of 'anatomies', along with a great many more which seem to have little in common with each other, and precious few ideas expressed in them. Within the huge and vague genre called 'anatomy' Wright has a number of forms which his 'anatomies' use, either for the whole work, or for a part of it. These forms are eight in number, and between them cover most of the kinds of non-fictional non-content-classified prose. (24) Each of these 'anatomy forms' is discussed in a different chapter, with regard to one or two representative 'anatomies'. This method, however, has pitfalls, for Nashe's Lenten Stufte is
discussed as an 'anatomy' which uses the paradoxical encomium as its form, whereas, as we shall see, Nashe's book uses rather more than one form, and scarcely fits the definition of a book concerned with the "control of fiction by ideas, represented as such." In a genre such as Wright's, which aims to embrace a great deal of disparate writing, I feel it is necessary to give a rather more specific indication of the underlying similarities of the books in the genre. Most of the books Wright discusses fit better into the 'sub-categories' of the 'anatomy' genre than into the overall genre, and might as well have been left there. There seems no need whatsoever for an overall genre, based primarily on an intangible sort of content, which merely tidies up all the misfits in English Renaissance prose.

Wright's attempt to find a consistent direction in this difficult area of writing is nonetheless laudable. An experiment of this sort was certainly needed. It is only when one has tried to include all the maverick works in one enclosure and failed, that one can be sure of their idiosyncrasy. Colie's findings, however, which I condensed earlier, are distinctly in favour of a fragmented and experimental attitude to genre in the Renaissance. After reading her work, one would expect to find a multitude of genres, perhaps combined, perhaps separate, rather than a single huge, inclusive genre. That there are inclusive works in the Renaissance, like Gargantua et Pantaqruel and The Anatomy of Melancholy does not imply an inclusive genre. Colie shows that the inclusive works are merely made up from many small genres
combined in a unique manner.

It is necessary, I think, when dealing with a chaotic area from a student's point of view, to begin on a small scale, with a few works which seem to belong together, rather than to try and search for a master plan for the whole area. The latter is a bibliographer's problem, and will be constantly altered as new studies of small areas arise. It is also necessary to look at this literature in terms of form or structure, rather than content, as has been common. (25) The use of form or structure as the basis for generic distinctions is, of course, itself a matter for debate among genre critics, but I assume for these purposes that such criteria, carefully applied are still acceptable. As Paul Hernadi says:

"...modern critics have continued to explore generic similarities. Yet, perhaps under Croce's indirect influence, they tend to realize that the study of genres must not become an end in itself but rather serve as a means towards the fuller understanding of individual works and literature as a whole." (26)

In isolating a genre in Elizabethan non-fictional imaginative prose I am aware, therefore, of the limitations of genre studies, and of the potential uniqueness of each work. Similarly, I appreciate that there may be other and better ways of regarding these works I have chosen to study here than as members of a small genre. I feel, however, that they illuminate each other, and their combination does increase our understanding of the
methods of some Renaissance writers.

Before coming to a definition of a genre, one must first become aware of certain similarities among a group of works, similarities which are of some importance in each member of the group. For example, one does not classify a work as detective fiction merely because a policeman appears in a fiction, but because the solving of a crime, by a policeman or another, is an important element in the fiction. That classification is based on subject-matter, but structural classifications must follow the same rule. It would be fatuous to call a work an oration because at some point in the text it fell into seven parts. Structural elements must be significant if one is to base generic considerations on them. Of course one can logically base a genre on anything from the occurrence of the word 'occurrence' to the presence in a work of warlocks, but common-sense must prevail, and the common element be one of some importance.

Among certain writings by Elizabethans which are neither prose fiction, as it is commonly understood (27), nor satisfactorily defined by their content, I have noticed a structural similarity. These works were written in pieces, or more accurately, were made out of pieces, sometimes welded together so that the joins were not obvious, sometimes clearly partitioned. These pieces were drawn from many different kinds, whereas the overall book which was made by them, belonged obviously to no known kind. I gave works of this sort the name farragoes. A member of the genre, farrago is defined thus: a
prose work which belongs principally to no one genre, but which is constructed from pieces belonging to one or more genres. The existence of this genre accords with Colie's views on Renaissance kind. The farrago is a small and concrete example of Renaissance inclusionism and generic eclecticism. This new genre does not account for all the eccentric works in Elizabethan prose, but it helps to make sense of some of them. The only cogent argument for the existence of the genre is the existence of a similar principle of construction within the works which constitute it; if I have not demonstrated this in the course of this study, then the genre is nothing but a chimera. There is no other satisfactory way of testing a genre's viability.

The term farrago was initially chosen because of its relatively neutral meaning, and also because it occurs in the famous lines from Juvenal, quoted by Robert Burton in the Preface to the Anatomy of Melancholy:

Ouidquid aquint homines, votum, timor, ira, voluptas, Gaudia, discursus, nostri farrago libelli est. (28)

Burton's work I claim as a farrago in the last chapter of this work. Co-incidentally, Northrop Frye also used the term in his definition of the 'anatomy' kind. He mentioned a sub-species of the Classical Menippean satire, which he calls the "encyclopaedic farrago", which is "represented by Athenaeus' Deipnosophists and Macrobius' Saturnalia, where people sit at a banquet and pour out a vast mass of erudition on every subject that might conceivably
come up in a conversation." (29) He goes on to say that the same sort of "exhaustive erudition" is a part of the Anatomy of Melancholy.

The two works Frye mentions in this sub-category are both dialogues between a number of speakers. They are also both vast works, Athenaeus' work running to fifteen extant volumes. Macrobius' work, primarily educative in intention, borrows freely and openly from many sources, but justifies this in the following way:

"Let us gather then from all sources and from them form one whole, as single numbers combine to form one number. Let our minds aim at showing the finished product, but conceal all that has helped to produce it." (30)

The works I look at in this study, in order to establish the genuineness of the genre, are much smaller in scale than the two Classical works Frye cites, and than the Anatomy of Melancholy.

The advantage of considering only the Elizabethan examples of the genre, and not the Classical forebears is that the five works selected are close in time and background, are short and therefore manageable, whereas the encyclopaedic variety come from different cultural backgrounds (one Greek, the other Latin) and are so large that one would find it difficult to view them as entities. In addition, the Elizabethan examples are not, as far as I know, in debt to their Classical forefathers, and can be considered distinct from them. Of course, it is not necessary to
claim actual relationship between works of the same genre. That Macrobius and Robert Burton both wrote encyclopaedic farragoes does not of itself imply that Burton had read or heard of Macrobius’ work. Nor is it important that the three authors dealt with in this study were familiar with each others’ work, although this seems to have been the case.

The three authors whose works I have selected for close scrutiny are William Bullein, Sir John Harrington and Thomas Nashe. The works by these authors which I consider farragoes are

- Bullein’s A Dialogue (1564), Harrington’s The Metamorphosis of Ajax (1596), Nashe’s Pierce Penilesse His Supplication to the Divell (1592), Have with you to Saffron-Walden (1596), and Nashe’s Lenten Stuffe (1599). These books are all made up of a number of pieces drawn from different kinds, as I shall show. Incidentally, although this is by no means a necessary ingredient for a farrago, all five works are unified and satisfying wholes, and all have a large portion of ambivalence in them. This latter seems to arise from the conflict in the author’s mind between an entertaining form and a serious purpose, but each book differs in the way the ambivalence appears.
All three authors are connected, although by no means members of a school. Bullein's book, the earliest of the five, was not only known to Nashe, but actively copied by him in his farrago Have with you to Saffron-Walden. In the Address to that book, Nashe writes: "Memorandum I frame my whole Booke in the nature of a Dialogue, much like Bullen and his Doctor Tocrub."

(31) Harington was well aware of Nashe's writings, for he addressed an epigram to Nashe's opponent Harvey:

The proverbe says, Who fights with durtv foes,

Must needs be soyled, admit they winne or lose.

Then think it doth a Doctors credit dash,

To make himselfe Antagonist to Nash? (32)

Nashe held no great opinion of Harington's Metamorphosis either, for he wrote to William Cotton:

"Only mr. Harrington of late hath sett up such filthy stinking iakes in pouls churchyard, that the stationers wold give any mony for a cover for it. what shold move him to it I know not, except he meant to bid a turd in all gentle readers teeth.... O it is detestable & abominable, farre worse then Munday's ballet of untrusse.... For my parte I pity him & pray for him that he may have many good stooles to his last ending." (33)

I shall now proceed to examine these five works in detail, bearing in mind constantly that genres are, as Marino puts it "historical, therefore mobile, transient, conventional, therefore
approximative, nominal, relative, therefore not entirely adequate. ..." (34) The genre is only a scaffold, it helps us to approach these books, but it does not confine them.

Notes to Chapter 1


5. 'The Validity of Literary Definitions', PMLA, XXXIX, (1924), pp. 722-736. see p. 731


8. Vivas, op. cit., p. 100

9. ibid., op. 104f

10. 'More than Kin and Less than Kind: the Limits of Genre Theory', in Strelka, ed. cit., pp. 57-79. see p. 57
11. "Dichotomy of Artistic Genres", in Strelka, ed.cit., pp.3-16 see p.5
13. ibid., p.77
14. 'Generative Classifications in Mediaeval Literature', in Strelka, ed.cit., pp.123-149. see pp.123f. The reference to Batts is to Numbers and Number Symbolism in Mediaeval German Poetry.
15. Marino, op.cit., p.41
16. For example, a book like Hooker's Laws of Ecclesiastical Politie could be classed as theology, philosophy or literature, while Foxe's Actes and Monuments might equally well be religious or biographical writing.
17. For example, the New Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature (ed. George Watson, Cambridge, 1974) has a subsection of Minor popular literature called General social satires, another called Tracts and satires on women and marriage, and one entitled Tobacco pamphlets. It has a separate section called Travel. Both Travel and Minor popular literature come under Popular and miscellaneous prose. The Cambridge History of English Literature (ed. Sir A.W. Ward & A.R. Walker, Cambridge, 1934) has a
chapter called ‘Writers on Country Pursuits and Pastimes: Gervase Markham’.

18. The New Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature has the following writers in a section called Pamphleteers and miscellaneous writers (a subsection of Popular and miscellaneous prose): Barnabe Rich, Gabriel Harvey, Sir John Harington, Gervase Markham, Samuel Rowlands, John Taylor and Richard Brathwait. The Cambridge History of English Literature has a chapter entitled ‘London and the rise of Popular Literature: Satire, Character, the Essay’ which deals with Thomas Lodge, Thomas Nashe, Robert Greene and Gabriel Harvey, before treating satirists, character writers and essayists, and later popular writers such as Thomas Dekker.

19. No-one has yet determined who read what in the Elizabethan period. Very popular books often do not survive, while apparently ‘popular’ works, like Dekker’s Guls Hornebook or Nashe’s works against Harvey, may have had only a small circulation.

21. Ibid., p.91
23. Ibid., p.4
24. The 'anatomy forms' are as follows: the debate, dialogue, letter-collection, diatribe, paradoxical encomium, essay-collection, character-collection and traveller's tale.

25. see Marino, op.cit., pp.45 & 46 for discussion of form and structure as bases of genre.


27. Wright (op.cit., pp.5ff.) points out that there is no satisfactory definition of prose-fiction, as yet.


29. Frye, op.cit., p.311


33. McKerrow, ed.cit., V.195-6

34. Marino, op.cit., p.54
The book by William Bullein which I propose to examine in this chapter is an excellent example of a farraço. It also shows quite clearly the difficulties of classification which arise with books of this kind, if the genre farraço is not invoked. A Dialogue bothe pleaantaute and pietifull, wherein is a goodly regimente against the fever Pestilence with a consolacion and comfort against death is found first in an edition of 1564. This may not be the first edition, however, since it is described on the title-page as "Newly corrected by Willym Bulleyne the author thereof." (1) Other editions survive from 1574 and 1578, both showing differences from that of 1564. (2) Three extant editions and Nashe's mention of the book in 1596 (3) indicate its popularity, while that of Bullein himself is attested by the use of his name on a posthumous work not of his authorship. (4)
Bullein's life is of some relevance to the Dialogue. What is known of him is to be found in an essay by A.H. Bullen (a distant connection of Bullein's) (5), who drew his material from Bullein's own writings. He travelled in England, Scotland, and Germany, a point of some literary interest, as I shall explain later. He was rector of Blaxhall in Suffolk from 1550 until about 1554, when he began to practise as a doctor in Durham. (6) Bullein moved to London in 1560 and died in 1575 or 1576. In the course of his life he made "mortal enemies", but his tombstone records that he served "rich and poor alike". (7) Four books by Bullein are known: The Government of Health (1558), Bulleyn's Bulwarke of Defence against all Sickness, Soreness and Woundes (1562), and a pamphlet called A Comfortable Regiment against pleurisie (1562), as well as A Dialogue. The first three are primarily health handbooks, the second containing some passages in dialogue, but the fourth is much more ambitious. Like its predecessors, it could be termed a health handbook, since twenty or so of its pages are devoted to the causes and cure of the plague, or fever pestilence. However, it is a great deal more than that; although in dialogue form throughout, and soi-disant a dialogue, it resembles no other English dialogue, in that it bears a close relationship to Morality plays and Interludes, and is perhaps an early instance of citizen and domestic drama. As well as the health section just mentioned, it contains portions explaining some Aristotelian ideas, portions of fable, emblematic writing,
travellers' tales, an early Utopia, and a large quantity of homiletic and theological material. As if this were not enough for any small book (8), the Dialogue has a distinct relationship with Complaint literature and the literature of social criticism. Clearly, it is something of a generic oddity. In The Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature this book is classified under Jestbooks, Comic Dialogues, Burlesques and this, in spite of its overridingly serious concern with death and salvation. It presumably earns this classification because of its lively and moderately comic opening section. From the little I have said about it already, it should be apparent that A Dialogue is an unusual book; C.S. Lewis calls it 'tantalizing'. (9) For the sake of clarity, I shall provide a short summary of the action. After that, I shall proceed briefly to cover the genre of the dialogue, its principal uses in sixteenth-century England, and Bullein's particular use of the form. Then I shall consider, also briefly, the relationship of A Dialogue to various forms of drama, and to Complaint literature. After these surveys, I shall look at the genres which are included as parts of the book: Medical literature, Fables, Emblems, Travellers' Tales, Utopian writing, Homily and the Ars Moriendi. Certain ideas which occur in the book will also be covered. Finally I shall look at the book's structural unity.
The Dialogue has approximately eight scenes or episodes. (I say approximately because the scenes are not indicated in any way, and there are numerous ways in which the action could be divided, assuming one wishes to divide it. It could be seen as having as few as three scenes, or twelve or more scenes. My choice of eight is essentially arbitrary, and designed for convenience). The action flows from scene to scene without a break and sometimes it is not clear what room the interlocutors are in; nonetheless, there is no confusion in the action, the interlocutors stating whatever details are necessary to set the scene. For example, Civis says: "This is a comely parlour, very netly and trimely apparelled, London like; the windowes are well glased, & faire clothes with many wise saynqes painted upon them" (10), which is all the scene-setting necessary for the parlour.

The action opens outside the home of Civis, a citizen of London, who with his wife, Uxor, is in conversation with a beggar appropriately called Mendicus. After a lively exchange of views on the poor state of the world "a blacke warlde, even hell upon yeartth" (11), Civis directs the beggar to the house of Antonius, a miser who is dying of the fever pestilence. The second scene takes place at Antonius' house, as do the third and fourth (insofar as these are distinct scenes). In the second Antonius talks to the Medicus, called in the two later editions, Dr. Tocrub. This name is a clear allusion to Dr. Burcot, apparently a well-known Elizabethan physician. He is the only character in the dialogue who can safely be indentified as
anything more than a type figure, and even he, referred to in the speech headings without exception as Medicus, loses most of his individuality. In this second scene, Antonius and the Medicus discuss religion, and both find that they are nullafidians. The next scene has Crispine, the apothecary who came with Medicus to the house, describing the garden, which contains a statue of a tiger about to kill a crowned child; the statue is on a pillar which is covered with depictions of poets with extracts from their works. (12) In the fourth scene we are introduced to two "Pettifoggers in the Lawe", Avarus and Ambodexter, who are cousins of Antonius, and are plotting for his money. The subsequent scene shows the crisis of the Antonius plot: Antonius has a dream of his damnation, which the Medicus puts down to the hot weather. He then gives his patient a lesson on Aristotelianism, and then on the causes and cure of the plague. Antonius asks the right questions, and thus quite a large quantity of philosophical and medical information is conveyed to the reader. Medicus completes his dissertation with some prescriptions in Latin, which Crispine writes down. This is the last appearance of Medicus and Antonius and their followers, but we hear of them in the final scene. The rest of the dialogue concerns Civis, Uxor and their man, Roger. The sixth scene opens with Civis deciding, after all, to flee London and the plague. (13) On the road, Roger tells fables and stories, and discusses marvels and usury with the Civis. Arrived at an inn, the Civis and his wife walk about the parlour examining the moral pictures with which it is furnished, the Civis deciphering them. Then Roger produces one Mendax, who has a fund of tall travellers'
tales including a description of Taerg Natrib, a Puritan Utopia. The seventh scene takes place on the road from the inn; the party pass some of Civis' land, on which Roger reports he has "raised the rent one hundred marks a year more than it was". (14) They are overtaken by Mors, who has come for the Civis.

Mors addresses Civis on the inevitability of death, and leaves him resigned to dying. He sends Roger for Theologus. Before the final scene takes place, Roger has a soliloquy on his way to fetch Theologus, in which he pledges himself to a life of petty crime. Finally Theologus prepares Civis for a godly end, exhorts Uxor to be restrained in her grief, and attends and prays for Civis as he dies. At the end of the work are several letters from the author to friends, of religious or medical advice. It is as if the book spilled over into real life.
An ancient and widely-used form like the dialogue can only be superficially discussed here. The genre was used in Classical literature for several different ends, and appeared in several different forms. The dialogues of Plato are quite divergent in intention from those of Lucian which have affinities with comedy, while those of Cicero, which purport to imitate Plato, are really quite different in effect, and produce a third major sub-division of the genre in Classical times. These three sorts of dialogue were used respectively for philosophical inquiry, satire, and instruction. (15) In the Middle Ages and Renaissance only the Ciceronian dialogue was imitated until the Humanistic revival of Lucian. His influence on the dialogue was chiefly upon the work of Erasmus, More and Hutten. The Mediaeval dialogue generally took one of two forms; it was either a didactic work—occasionally influenced by Cicero's dialogues (16), more often a catechism of question and correct answer—or it was a debate in which both sides had equal weight. Of the former sort Merrill gives a number of examples, among the better known of which are Boethius' Consolation of Philosophy, Augustine's Soliloquies, and Gregory the Great's Dialogues. The latter sort, the dialogue/debate, has a Classical forebear in the amoeban contests between poets in the ecloques of Theocritus and Virgil. However, it seems to draw most of its strength from the native tradition. One of the earliest English examples of the type is the Old English debate between Body and Soul (17), and Merrill and
Herford (18) give many examples. The contestants were usually in direct contrast: Winter and Spring, Water and Wine, Man and Woman, Ivy and Holly. Petrarch wrote a dialogue of this kind between Pain and Reason. Possibly the best known English example is The Owl and the Nightingale. The dialogue/debate continued to be written well into the sixteenth century, as Hanford shows.

In the sixteenth century two distinct causes contributed to the new life taken on by the dialogue. The first was the change in religious writing from didactic to polemical (although polemical religious writing often contained didactic material) and the second was the increased importance of drama as a vehicle for ideas and as a literary form. There were subsidiary influences, such as the Humanist revival of the Lucianic dialogue already mentioned, and the continued and perhaps increasing delight taken by the reading public in the exercise of wit for its own sake evinced by the popularity of the paradox. The dialogue/debate provided another outlet for the display of wit.

One highly important use of the dialogue in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance was the educative one. Colloquies were written to instruct the young in the easy use of Latin. Of this kind the most famous were Erasmus' Colloquies, which were printed between 1518 and 1533. Although they were best known in their original Latin, four of the colloquies were translated into English in the first half of the sixteenth-century. These were
Funus in 1534, The Epicure in 1545, and De Rebus and Cyclops around 1549. More were translated later in the century. The scope of Erasmus' Colloquies is best suggested by this quotation from Craig R. Thompson's introduction to his translation of the dialogues:

"...the colloquies provided Erasmus with an admirable medium for commenting freely, but informally on any events, customs or institutions that interested him. The result was a book of unusual variety: debates on moral and religious questions; lively arguments on war, government and other social problems; advice on how to train husbands, wives and children; discourses on innkeepers, beggars, pets, horse thieves; on methods of study or of sleep or of burial; on diet and on sermons— all this and much more... Situation, plot, and characterization makes them more than mere dialogues; they are incipient dramas or novels. As such they may have contributed more than has been recognized to the development of drama and prose fiction. Erasmus had the dramatist's eye; he saw everything and could recreate scenes with his pen." (20)
The dialogue was a traditional form for the dissemination of religious knowledge (21) and was readily adaptable as a vehicle for religious controversy, since an opponent's argument could be presented in the mouth of one speaker and then destroyed by another. In the Reformation, particularly in Germany (22), it was widely used for this purpose— for example, in England, Wyclif's Dialogus and Triaulogus, and Sir Thomas More's theological dialogues. From its use in straightforward arguments, the dialogue went on to be used in religious contexts for ridiculing the opposition without even presenting its arguments. Several Englishmen living in Germany adopted this method of attacking their opponents in imitation of the lively German examples. The earliest of these was Roy and Barlow's Rede me and be nott wrothe (1527-8) which satirically laments the 'death of the Mass', and analyses religious and political events in England and Germany, in the course of a conversation between two servants. This dialogue was probably inspired by Die krankheit der Messe by Niclaus Manuel. Other Englishmen in exile in Germany produced polemical religious dialogues in the German manner, and on their return to England in Edward's reign brought this form of writing with them. One kind of polemical dialogue written in Germany was not transported to England; this was what Herford calls the 'drama of debate' to which I shall return shortly. Among the polemical dialogues written in England but inspired by German example, are John Bon and Mast Parson.
(1548), Robin Conscience (also referred to as a Moral Interlude),

and Anthony Skoloker's adaptation of a German dialogue, called in English A Goodly dysputacion between a Christen shomaker and a

Popysshe Person (1548). The orioinal was by Hans Sachs, also

known for his plays. William Turner, also a German exile, produced The Examination of the Mass (1548) which used the German

trial-dialogue, a form of the dialogue which Herford describes.

(23) Later in the century two of the so-called Marprelate tracts appeared in dialogue form: Udall's Diotrephes (1588) and A

Dialogue... Published by Dr. Martin Marprelate. The dialogue was

not only used in England for religious polemics however; Sir Thomas More's Utopia and Ascham's Toxophilus are notable examples

of other uses for the form. These two dialogues are directly

Ciceronian in inspiration: the dialogue form is used as a

convenient vehicle for setting out the author's information and ideas, rather than for ridiculing or shouting down the

opposition. The dialogue, particularly as a debat in the

Mediaeval sense, had a healthy continuance as a means of philosophical and occasional writing. James Holly Hanford (24)

and Rudolph E. Habenicht (25) have traced slightly different

periods of this kind of writing. Habenicht mentions the

'Dialogue-debates' which preceded John Heywood's A Dialogue of

Proverbs (1546) - for example, The Dialogues of Creatures Moralised
(1535) which contains 122 'short prose debates between all sorts of disputants, from the sun and the moon, the air and the wind, to the lock and the key...'. Hanford covers a number of slightly later debates, including for example A Interlocucyon with an Argument betwixt a Man and a Woman the whiche could prove to be more Excellent, which was printed by Wynkyn de Worde. Later in the century came many other occasional and philosophical dialogues, notably those of Nicholas Breton, who was fond of the genre.

THE DIALOGUE FORM AND THE INTERLUDE

Both Hanford and Habenicht, in their discussions of the dialogue are concerned to stress the relationship of the dialogue, especially in its debate form, with two other genres: the interlude and later drama. I have already referred to Robin Conscience, a polemical dialogue which is called an interlude.

Habenicht discusses Heywood's interludes, some of which were translations from the French. In addition to his Dialogue of Proverbs, which is a true dialogue, not intended for performance, Heywood adapted A Dialogue on Wit and Folly (also known as A play of wyty and wyttles) from the French, and wrote A Play of Love.
which bears a strong relationship to _A Dialogue of Proverbs_, since both are concerned with the pros and cons of marriage. Heywood produced a number of other interludes which are rather more dramatic and less discursive. It can be seen from the example of Heywood alone that the dialogue, interlude and play easily flow into one another. Hanford's article is devoted to showing the debate elements in Elizabethan drama, but he also mentions how the dialogue/debates spill over into interludes and interludes into later plays, so that it becomes impossible to draw firm distinctions between the three forms. Certainly each contributed to the others' growth. As regards the definition of an interlude, Peter Happe' in _Tudor Interludes_ has some difficulty with the genre, and Glynne Wickham in the introduction to _English Moral Interludes_ (26) does not even attempt it. The interlude however, seems to be distinguished from the dialogue mainly by its being intended for performance, and from the play proper by its shortness and its slight content and smaller scale. Interludes are generally concerned with moral issues in some way, but they tend to alternate comic and serious scenes, and deal with issues in less depth than morality plays. Their characters are usually types, but they become less abstract and more individual as the century progresses. Frequently the moral and social types are mixed with individual characters; in John Bale's _Nice Wanton_ the dramatis personae include both Iniquity and Worldly Shame, and characters called Barnabas, Ismael, and Dalilah.
Although Bullein's Dialogue has some affinities with the interlude it seems to be most closely related to a kind of dialogue not widely used in England. This is the German "drama of debate", as Herford calls it. (27) Herford mentions two English works which belong to this sub-genre but as both of these are in the form of a trial, they differ from Bullein's. It is in this matter that I think Bullein's travels in Germany have some significance; he may well have become aware of the development of this kind of dialogue while in Germany. These "dramas of debate" are not intended for presentation on stage, but have distinct scenes and precise characters. Bullein's work is not exactly like these works, as Herford describes them, since he has a more varied content and large amounts of didactic material, but perhaps they are the nearest in kind to Bullein's work.

Bullein's is rather like a synthesis of all dialogue forms. It is like the "dramas of debate" and Robin Conscience in that it is very 'play-like', since the characters and much of the speech would be immediately transferable to the popular stage. For example, the opening of the second scene, when Medicus greets Antonius:

Medicus:
How dooe you, good Maister Antonius? Lorde God,

howe are you chaunceid! How chaunceth this? What is the matter that you looke so pale? You did send
for mee by your servaunte Iohannes, a gentle young
-----
man, which lamenteth muche for you; when I heard
it, with all speede I came from my other pacients,
of whom I think I have taken myne ultimum vale.
-----

Antonius
You are welcome, Maister doctour, with all my
harte; now helpe at a pinche, or els never, for I
doe feare my selfe verie much. Oh, my harte,(28)

The characters often speak in a natural manner, and are
characterised in their speech. For example:

roger:
Forsoothe, out of the countree, Maistres
nisibicetur, as fine as fippence!How pretelv you
can call verlet and sweare by Gods dentie! God
blesse you, I did never see you stomble before.
(29)

Care is taken to show the setting of most scenes, and
although some short-cuts are taken- for example when the Civis
decides to leave London he is suddenly ready to go, and his
preparations are instantly accomplished- verisimilitude is
preserved. In the scene just mentioned, although the
preparations to leave are magically swift and the matter of the
Civis' discourse is decidedly bookish (involving quotations from
medical authorities and examples from Scripture), the Civis
concludes in a distinctly human manner:
Also I will leave my house with my faithefull frendes, and take the keyes of my chestes with me. Where are our horses?

To which Uxor replies:

Our thynges are redie; have you taken your leave of our neighbours, Man? (30)

This exchange helps to restore naturalness to the scene, and to show the citizens are ordinary people who do not forget their worldly concerns even if they sometimes speak in homily. However, the few pages which follow this same scene illustrate well how different the dialogue is from a play, how it is truly a dramatic dialogue not a play manque'. In this sequence the characters are riding into the country and although there is no lessening of the verisimilitude, the sequence is clearly not intended to be staged.

Uxor:

What toune is this, I praise you, sir?

Civis:

This is Barnet, whereas Samuel your sonne was nursed; and yonder is Richarde Higmers house;... we will not tarry now, because every Inne is pestered with Londoners and Cariers, and it is earely daies. How like you this toune, dame? (31)

A few lines later, Uxor comments on charcoal burning, and we realise that we are now out of the town.
The structure of the book has some distinctly dramatic elements. For example, the satirical scene between Avarus and Ambodexter comes between two essentially didactic scenes, both involving Medicus. This scene intervening breaks up the pattern of inquiry/answer, and provides variety, much as in an interlude comic scenes alternate with serious. Later in the dialogue, Roger provides a sort of comic relief, with his soliloquy, between the two scenes relating to Civis' death, while Mendax' tales are aptly placed to divide the moral observations on the pictures from the somber ending of the book.

As well as adopting the pseudo-dramatic form of some dialogues, Bullein's book inherits the religious orientation of the dialogue; as I have said, the dialogue was popular for both religious instruction and argument; Bullein's work has passages of both. Theologus' address to Civis and Uxor and, in a perverse way, Medicus' address to Antonius on Aristotelianism are in the catechical tradition, whereas the opening exchange between Mendicus and the citizens (32), Avarus' and Ambodexter's conversation about "Gloses" and their reference to "goode Lorde Boner Quasi Leo rudiens querens quem devoret" (33), Roger's tale about Renob (also Bishop Boner), several of the moral pictures and some of Mendax's references, as for example "Irepop Si Irevank" (34) belong to a more abusive tradition of religious dialogues. Bullein also uses the general didactic character of the dialogue most prominent in the many teaching colloquies (primarily for the teaching of Latin) when he includes the Aristotelian lesson and the moral pictures; he follows the
example of his own earlier books (35), in using the dialogue to convey medical information. In addition to these functions of the dialogue itself, Bullein uses the form to cover a number of other genres, for example, the fable and the traveller's tale.

Mention of the colloquies above raises one interesting problem of influence; C.S. Lewis says of Bullein in this work: "Terence and Erasmus are his models" (36) The influence of Terence I shall consider shortly, with other dramatic matters. Presumably Lewis is referring to the Colloquies of Erasmus, which Bullein had probably encountered at school. One would expect the influence of Erasmus' dialogues to be felt in Bullein's work, but it is difficult to see any specific signs of it. The Colloquies are only superficially similar to A Dialogue. The major difference between the realistic and lively dialogues of Erasmus and Bullein's work is that in the latter there is extended action as well as conversation; nor is Bullein's conversation ever as relaxed and natural as that in the Colloquies. Bullein's characters always talk to some end- moral, religious or didactic- and only occasionally to set the scene or convey character, or to amuse the reader. The snippets of conversation put in for these three purposes are lively enough but do not have the conversational air of Erasmus' speeches. In this extract from the Tudor translation of Funus, two characters called Mercolphus and Phedrus are talking:

Phed: Dydest thou knowe one George belearyke?
Merc: Onely I have herde of him, for to my knowledge
I never sawe his face.
Phed: The other I am sure thou knowest nothyng at all.
He was called Cornelius montius, with whome I
had greate famylyarte many yeares.
Merc: It was never my chaunce to be present at any
mannes deathe.
Phed: I have ben more often than I wold.
Merc: I pray the tell me, is dethe so horryble a
thyng as it is comynly said?
Phed: The passage towards deth is more harde and
paynfull than dethe it selfe...

Some allowance must be made for the stiltedness of the
translation— in Erasmus' Latin the conversation is smoother, and
more natural— but even from this passage, one can detect, I
think, the more relaxed and conversational manner of Erasmus'
dialogues; they were, after all, colloquies. Bullein's
intention was at variance with that of Erasmus. The principal
aim of the Colloquies was to portray correct, natural Latin in
speech; only incidentally do the Colloquies become instruments
for satire, social comment and instruction in good behaviour.
Bullein, on the other hand, sets out to inform and instruct, and
only incidentally does his dialogue contain conversation or
dramatic action. That is not to say that there is an
inconsiderable amount of dramatic content, but only that the
'play-like' elements are relatively unimportant in the book's
scheme. Conversation and action are used to make instruction and
homily more palatable, while in Erasmus’ works, the instruction and comment are to make the conversation more interesting and worthwhile.

BULLEIN’S DIALOGUE AND DRAMATIC TRADITIONS

We have already seen that Bullein’s Dialogue is related to the Interlude by means of the dialogue/debate tradition. Now I should like to consider the relationship between A Dialogue and other forms of drama. There is, of course, only an artificial distinction between the Interlude and other forms of drama, as I have already noted.

The influence of Terentian comedy on A Dialogue is perhaps best considered first. Lewis, whose views I have quoted, thinks Terence was a model for Bullein in this work. It is hard to be as definite as Lewis on this matter. Terence was taught in English grammar-schools, and was probably known to Bullein (38). The influence of New Comedy was certainly felt in early Elizabethan comedy: Ralph Roister Doister (1552) provides a good example of this. Although Bullein was possibly influenced by Terence’s example in his original adoption of a comic framework, the only Terentian element which remains is the figure of the servant, Roger, who recalls the comic, cheeky slaves in New Comedy. Roger is portrayed as roguish and insolent and is given
a comic soliloquy when all the other characters are extremely serious. However, he does not engage in any intrigue as the slaves in New Comedy generally do, nor does his character remain constant; he delivers a tirade against corruption, which is quite out of character. (39) I shall return to this speech later.

A more pervasive dramatic influence than New Comedy is that of the Morality plays. The genre of the Morality play is not confined to the eight Mediaeval exemplars which remain, but continues well into the sixteenth century. Traces of it, as is well known, are found in Marlowe, Shakespeare, and Jonson. The uniting factor of the Morality plays is not as has sometimes been suggested, an allegorical battle between good and evil in the form of the virtues and vices (although this does occur in some plays), but rather a progression from an innocent, or a neutral state through a temptation and fall to repentance. Robert Potter (40) describes the Mediaeval Morality play as 'a didactic ritual drama about the forgiveness of sins.' Death is, not unexpectedly, a significant factor in these dramas, since the proximity of death spurs man to repentance, but only Everyman (1495) is entirely concerned with the last minute preparation for death, and not with some preceding life. The Pride of Life or parts survive, is also concerned with death, but in terms of a conflict between life and death. Most Moralties have as protagonist Man or Mankind, a figure who is weak but redeemable.
Several of the Morality plays are also classed as interludes. Mankind (1465-70) and Youth (1520) are particularly eligible for classification as interludes, since the former is quite short, on a small scale and humorous, while the latter is entitled the enterlude of Youth. Many other interludes, for example, Appius and Virginia (1575) have morality features, such as the personification of abstracts and a battle between good and evil forces, or a temptation and fall as the central material.

In the sixteenth century the Morality play was adapted to Reformation polemics and politics. Henry Medwall's Nature (1490), John Skelton's Magnificence (1515), John Bale's King Johan (1538), Sir David Lindsay’s Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estates (between 1540 and 1552), and Nicholas Udall’s Republica (1553) (also called an interlude) all have distinct features of the Mediaeval Morality plays, but are different in their emphasis. In Lindsay’s play, for example, although the pattern is exactly that of the Mediaeval plays, innocence/temptation/fall/repentance/restoration to a state of grace, the central figure is not Mankind but King Humanitie, and the effect of his sin is felt upon the 'Common Weal' of Scotland. The action, although moral and religious, is political.
Robert Potter has identified twenty-eight plays of a Morality type, or strongly influenced by the Morality tradition, from the sixty-one extant from the years 1558-1586. (41) This figure does not include, of course, the many later Elizabethan plays which use such Morality elements as the Vice. It is not unreasonable, therefore, to associate Bullein's Dialogue, written in or before 1564, with this very lively tradition. The influence of Morality plays is found in comic and tragic plays, plays of state and domestic plays, as well as in interludes; it should not surprise us to find this tradition reflected in a dialogue.

The Book in Meter of Robin Conscience, referred to earlier, a mid 16th-century dialogue, has characters called Covetousness, Newquise and Proud-Beauty, which seem to place it firmly in the Morality tradition. Bullein's Dialogue has been called 'a rerun of Everyman' by a recent scholar (42), but before examining the Morality elements in the work, I should like to mention only one of the several later Morality plays which bear comparison with it.

W. Wager's Enough is as Good as a Feast, described as "a Comedy or Enterlude" is dated possibly 1570, although Potter dates it 1560. (43) Whatever its date, it appeared at roughly the same time as A Dialogue. It has the traditional Morality pattern: neutral state/ temptation/ fall, but without the final
redemption that earlier Moralties provided. In fact, the protagonist, Worldly Man starts off by repenting his worldly ways under the influence of Heavenly Man and Contentation (or contentment), but is persuaded from his repented state by Covetous, the Vice, with the assistance of Temerity, Inconsideration and Precipitation, in spite of the attempts of Enough to win him back. Worldly Man's fall is portrayed in terms of its social effect: the Worldly Man's Tenant, Servant and Hireling all bemoan the hardship caused by his covetousness, and Covetous abets Worldly Man in cruel treatment of them. A Prophet and then God's Plague appear to warn Worldly Man; he shows some signs of repentance, and has dreams of Hell, but Covetous persuades him not to worry, and procures Ignorance as a clergyman to attend him. Master Flebishiten (flea-be-shitten), a Physician, also attends him, and attempts to make him repent, but in vain. Worldly Man puts his worldly goods in order, but neglects the heavenly entirely, and dies damned. Heavenly Man, by contrast, is then shown, not on his deathbed, but foreseeing it with great calm, assured of a godly end.

The parallels between this play and A Dialogue are clear, although there is no need to assume that either writer acquired his ideas from the other. Wafer has two contrasted humans, Heavenly and Worldly Man, and selects Worldly Man as his protagonist; Heavenly Man serves as an almost passive reminder of the other possibilities. Worldly Man's temptation and deathbed are intrinsically more dramatic than Heavenly Man's continued holiness and eventual attainment of Rest, and so it is
on Worldly Man that Wager focuses. Bullein has chosen the other path: his worldly man, Antonius, has the centre of the stage (so to speak) for some time, but is eventually overtaken by the heavenly citizen, Civis. Civis is a more interesting figure than Wager's Heavenly Man, however, because, although he is initially a good man, we see him become progressively more godly during the dialogue.

Like Wager's Worldly Man Civis' sin (such as it is) is measured in social terms:

"he hath raised the rent one hundredth markes a yere more then it was. There were good lying in the plague time, for there are large pastures, and the houses are doune, savyng the Manner place, for the carles have forfected their Leases, and are gone a beggyng like villaines, and many of them are dedde for honger.... My maister is a close wiseman, and lieth in the winde of theim that will buye money for lande." (44)

This issue of social evil I shall return to shortly. Other parallels between these two works are found in the deathbed scenes. The Plaque causes both deaths in A Dialogue and that of Worldly Man in Wager's play. Both Worldly Man and Antonius have dreams of Hell:

Worldly Man: Indeed sir, I dreamed I had great journey to walk. O what great pains and torments I thought myself in Lying in fire which burn did never lin.... (cease)

Covetous allays these fears:
Tush, a straw, upon them never set your mind.
He that to dreams giveth any confidence or trust,
Without doubt very unquietly live he must. (45)

Antonius describes his deathbed dream quite vividly, concluding:

"I did see there many of myne olde acquaintance, whiche sometyme were of create honour, both men Spirituall and Temporall, and the Pope hymself, with many of his frendes. They were in extreme wretchednesse, and sore handled of fearfull monsters, and wormes gnawynq upon their breasts, upon whom was written, Conscience hath accused me and hell devoured me, Ve, ve, ve, 'And thus I am tossed to and fro. Alas, what shall I doe? Also I did heare many ragued and sicke people crie vengeaunce on me, and men in prison also, that said I had undoen them to inriche myself. Oh good God!" (46)

Medicus dismisses this dream as:

"nothynq but proceeding of the abundande of choler, or els some fearfull affection. You are hot and drie, also the time is verie hotte; the Sunne is now 20 degrees in Leo, the Dogge daies are to be observed. Notwithstanding, fear nothynq; I warraunt you, life for life, discomfort not your selfe, a man or a mouse." (47)
The deathbed attendance of Master Fleishiten, the Physician is only a weak parallel to that of Dr. Tocrub. Waer's doctor is both a medical and religious figure (48) but has very little effect as either.

Good Lord have mercy on thee. Belike it is too late to amend.

In wickedness thou hast lived, even so wilt thou end.

Gentlemen, I trust you will not see me lose my labour. (49)

He leaves Worldly Man before he dies, resigned rather than grieved at the loss of a soul. Bullein had separated out the medical and theological 'physicians', and combined the medical with the Vice figure, assigning to the doctor the atheistical role he frequently assumes in Renaissance writing. I shall discuss the doctor as atheist a little later. (50) Theologus takes over the other part of the Physician's role.

Finally, both works have as a theme the ubiquity and enormity of covetousness. In A Dialogue, Antonius is a miser, Avarus, Ambodexter and Medicus are all in pursuit of his money; usurers and covetous men are frequently denounced. (51) Enough is as Good is equally persistent: the Vice is called Covetous, Worldly Man's worldliness is concern for money. The evil of the love of money is hammered home.

Heavenly Man: What men are more wicked, wretched and miserable Than those that in riches account their bliss...

(52)

Covetous: Covetous (saith the wise man) is the root of all evil
Therefore, Covetous is the chiefest that cometh from the devil. (53)

This is, of course, a very common theme in sixteenth century writing, as I shall have cause to mention later in this chapter, and when discussing Pierce Pennilesse.

Some of the morality elements in A Dialogue have already been traversed in the course of this comparison with Enough is as Good. Some overlapping is therefore inevitable when we consider the general debt of A Dialogue to Morality Plays. The central concerns of A Dialogue are traditional concerns of Morality. The preparation for death is the subject matter of Everyman the most famous of all Morality plays, and although Bullein's work is also concerned with preparation for death, there is a notable difference. In contrast to Everyman, where Death approaches Everyman almost at the beginning of the play, Bullein's Mors arrives late in the action. However, he has been amply prepared for by the opening of the work, where Death is depicted as a skeleton leaning on a shovel under the saying: Mors gloriosior est quam mala vita, and by the prevalence throughout of the Plague. The first reference to the Plague is in the opening speech:

Mendicus:
God save my gud Maister and Maistresse, the Barnes, and all this halie houshaude... and shilde and defende you from this Pest. (54)

Avarice, the other central concern of A Dialogue, is common in Morality plays. It is shown as the most powerful temptation of Man in The Castle of Perseverance and Medwall's Nature. In A Dialogue it is virtually the only sin considered.

As well as treating two of the classic themes of Morality plays, A Dialogue has other features of the genre. The central figure, Civis is is a generalised character, like Mankind, or Youth, but with a significant difference: he is a Citizen of Heaven, one of the elect. Bullein's is a Calvinist Morality. Like other representatives of man at the centre of Moralities, Civis is neutral, not markedly good or bad until exterior forces act upon him to convert him. There is not in Bullein's work, however, the traditional pattern of neutral state/temptation/fall/repentance/redemption. This has been replaced by another progression, a physical journey, in the course of which the reader discovers, from Roger, that Civis is a sinful man. But Civis needs only to grasp his election to be saved. This pattern is weaker dramatically than the Morality pattern, but since Bullein's work is not primarily a dramatic one, this is not apparent. Bullein in fact follows the reverse Morality pattern used by certain French writers of Moralities (55) and by Wager, by contrasting a good man's end to an evil man's.
The characters' names are an indication of the dialogue's connection with the Morality. They are not exactly the same kind of names as are found in Morality plays, but rather cousins. Morality characters are generally personifications, such as Riot or Ignorance, while Bullein's are all, except Mors, individualized representatives of a class. Civis and Uxor are not named individuals like Johan and Tib in Johan Johan (56), but they are more individual than Mankind. Medicus, as I have said, is given a specific personality, but his generalised title severely reduces his individuality. He could be any doctor. A Doctor speaks the Epilogue in Everyman. This provides an interesting precedent for Medicus, although the Doctor could be either a theological or a medical person. (The term was used of both professions from the fourteenth century on). The names Avarus, Ambidexter, and their friends, Rapax, Capax and Tenax are certainly reminiscent of Morality. Ambidexter is the name of the Vice in Thomas Preston's Cambises (1561), and Avarus reflects the characters called Covetous or Covetousness in Morality. The other three, who are named but do not appear, are similar to Wantonness, Placebo and Sandie Solace in Lindsay's Thrie Estates, or Snatch and Catch in Wit and Wisdom (1579).

In conclusion, it is worth noting that Bullein includes Skelton and Lindsay among the six contemporary poets depicted in the garden of Antonius' house. Notable among the works of both were their political Morality plays, which, though new, were
firmly in the tradition established by the Mediaeval Moralities and followed by many sixteenth-century writers.

The predominance of the Civis in A Dialogue raises the question of the relationship of the work with citizen comedy. This genre flourished from the 1590's to 1620's, and so is considerably later than the work in question. Plays of this genre generally had citizens either as protagonists or at least as important characters, and frequently had an usurer as an antagonist; the usurer was often the obstacle the citizen had to overcome to gain his happy ending. (57) Some similarity can be seen here, with the contrast of the citizen and the usurer in A Dialogue; there are also some likenesses in the intrigues begun by Avarus and Ambodexter (58), and the attempts of Medicus to gain Antonius' money, to the common material of citizen comedy. In particular, Ambodexter's ruse of making Antonius his executor, and putting it about that he is mortally ill foreshadows Volpone. (58)

In addition, the setting of the first part of the Dialogue is obviously London, a feature which also relates it to the predominantly urban settings of citizen comedy. However, the differences are greater than the similarities. Citizen comedy, obviously enough, is lighthearted with very little didactic aim; A Dialogue occasionally includes intrigue or comedy, but for a moral end. (59)
Another genre related to both citizen comedy and Bullein's work is that of domestic drama. This genre has been very well examined by Arthur Clarke. (60) It is the serious counterpart to citizen comedy, using common men as its protagonists, but having a relentlessly serious concern. Some scholars have been inclined to consider domestic drama as a didactic or homiletic genre rather than a dramatic one. (61) Although the best known examples of the genre are tragic in their conclusions (62), Clarke includes plays with a 'happy ending' as well; A Dialogue can be seen as a similar but different product of the same forces which produced this hybrid genre of teaching and showing, for it uses dramatic material to show and teach moral and religious matters; its ending, like that of some of the domestic dramas, is happy. The use of common people for protagonists is to make the moral lessons more direct to their audience; this is certainly true also of A Dialogue. Civis, like the protagonists of domestic drama could be anyone - that is to say, any member of the middle class.

SOCIAL PROTEST AND COMPLAINT LITERATURE: SOCIAL PROTEST

Nonetheless, Bullein's work is not cut off from the literature which concerned itself with the working man, and with the ills of society. This kind, the literature of social protest has been magisterially examined by Helen C. White. (63) Social criticism is generally to be found in a religious context - hence
the title of White's book — but there are exceptions to this rule: White shows that there were two different strands of social criticism in sixteenth century writing—what she calls the Piers Plowman tradition, and the Utopia tradition. The seminal work of the first tradition, Langland’s poem, was printed in 1550 by Robert Crowley, himself a writer in this tradition. Writing of this kind upholds the poor against oppression by the rich, berates the rich for their waste and thoughtlessness, and frequently attacks clerics, especially monks and friars, before the dissolution of the monasteries. There is no intention to subvert existing society, only to reform it. Later the tradition is turned against monks and friars in a manner intended to help their extirpation, not their reform, but still there is no attempt to suggest an alternative society. In the Utopia tradition, the principal work is, naturally, More’s Utopia, (1516) of which an English translation was published in 1551. The works in this kind are far fewer than in the Piers Plowman tradition strand, and are concerned with the bases of society, and with some alternatives to the status quo. But the Utopia, and the works which followed it, are also concerned with the plight of the poor. Utopia is not only about the customs of the Utopians; the first part is devoted to the troubles of England, and some remedies for those ills. These remedies prompt Raphael Hythlodaeu to describe how the Utopians’ society works. It is not clear, however, how much of the Utopian solution More himself would prescribe for English ills.

"I cannot perfectly agree" he writes at the end of the book "to everything he has related; however,
there are many things in the Commonwealth of Utopia that I rather wish, than hope, to see followed in our governments." (64)

An interesting aspect of the Utopia is the relative unimportance of religion. Although the Utopians have a religion, it is organised in such a way as to produce the least friction in society. In this More stands out from the literature of social criticism of the time, since it is usually concerned with social order in relation to religion, or with abuses within religion.

Bullein's work has a curious relation to these traditions. Like three of the most important works in the Utopia tradition:-

Utopia itself, Thomas Starkey's Dialogue between Cardinal Pole and Thomas Lupset (written c.1538), and John Hales' A Discourse of the Common Wealth of this Realm of England (written c.1549)

Bullein's work is a dialogue between certain representatives of society. (65) Bullein's work also contains a 'utopia', which I shall discuss in a moment. On the other hand, like the Piers Plowman tradition, A Dialogue complains of the evils of avarice,

the miseries caused by enclosure, the sins of the clerics:

Wendicus:

"Ause much reisyng of rentes and gressomyng of men, causyng greate dearth, muche povertie. God helpe, God helpe, the warlde is sare chaunged; extortioners, covetous men, and hypocrites doe much prevaille." (66)
The moral pictures are full of such criticism:

Civis:

"This felowe raketh with the Devils golden rake, even in the conscience of the coveitous patrons or compounders hart, whiche geveth the benefice; he plaieth Symon Maqus, he will buy it, and with Judas the other will sell it...." (67)

An especially ironical piece of social criticism is the following:

Uxor:

"what meaneth yonder shepherd to clip the sheepe so nere that he bleedeth? it is well painted.

Civis: It semeth a covetous land Lorde, that doe so oppresse the tenaunt with fines, rents, bribes &c., whereby he and his familie dooe live...with continuall penurie and affliction of mynde, and he will never suffer the wolle too growe to the full staple, at length to his owne decaie. (68)

Civis is such a landlord we later discover.

The abuses of the clergy and the miseries of the poor caused by enclosure, the most common subjects of social protest (69), are even to be found in the Utopia; this does not, however, mean that Utopia is to be considered in the Piers Plowman tradition of social protest anymore than Bullein's work is to be included in the Utopian tradition even though it contains an 'Utopia'. 
Certain materials were held in common by writers who saw the ills of society. But writers like Robert Crowley, in the Piers Plowman tradition, saw evils in society which should and could be reformed, this reformation being religious in origin. Writers like More saw that more determined efforts must be made to reform or even replace the fundamental assumptions of society; More did not see that divergences in religion need produce a disunited society. Bullein was not quite in either category, for although he saw the evils of society very firmly in a religious light, and used spiritual means to reform his enclosing landlord, he nonetheless used More's model to envisage a more satisfactory society.

SOCIAL PROTEST AND COMPLAINT LITERATURE: BULLEIN'S UTOPIA

Bullein's curious conflation of the two strands of social protest is not mentioned in scholarly works; in fact, scholars seem unaware of the existence of Bullein's 'Utopia'. The only one to comment upon it is Frederick O. Waage who sees it as a parody of the Utopia and an attack upon sinful London, seen as the antitype of nodnol, the city of Taerg Natrib. (70)

There are other wonderful lands discovered by literary travellers, apart from Hythloday: Lucian's Islands of the Blest, Sir John Mandeville's Isle of the Brahmins, or Rabelais' L'Isle Sonnante. Utopia, however, seems the most likely source for
Bullein's Taerg Natrib, especially if we remember that an English translation appeared not long before A Dialogue, and also that although More's work was a Humanist dream, it was also part of the literature of social protest to which A Dialogue belongs to some degree. As far as I can ascertain there are no English "Utopias" (descriptions of ideal lands) written between More's work and Joseph Hall's Mundus alter et idem in 1605, except for Bullein's Taerg Natrib.

Taerg Natrib (Great Britain back to front) is a Puritan Utopia. It is Britain as it would be if Puritans, like Bullein, had their way—a daunting prospect. In contrast to its status in More's world, religion is of prime importance in Taerg Natrib, and is the first thing Mendax describes. Every single person attends church on Sunday, most of them twice; there is "no mingled doctrine, no tromperie of Papistrie, but the naked, true and perfite word of God." (71)

In Utopia conformity is not enforced; different religions and beliefs are allowed. One person, Hythloday recounts, was punished by exile because as a newly converted Christian he "condemned all their (the Utopians') rites as profane; and cried out against all that adhered to them, as impious and sacrilegious persons, that were to be damned to everlasting burnings." (72) In Taerg Natrib however, "The knowne perverse Papiste is burned, for in hym is counted a number of treasons, as he would the chaung of Religion, The Pope to govern the Prince, the destruction of
the faithful." (73)

In Utopia some crimes, such as adultery, are severely punished, but "Their law does not determine punishment for other crimes; but that is left to the Senate to temper it according to the circumstances of the fact.... For the most part slavery is the punishment even of the greatest crimes;" (74) This may seem harsh to a twentieth-century mind but Bullein's scheme of punishment is far harsher:

"The drunkarde is punished with fasting in prison certain daies. The adulterer by death; so is the fellon or murderer accordyng to Moses lawes. The unreconciled stubborne againste the parentes are put to death if they be companions by their parentes.... The Juoglers eyes are put out. The common swearer doe lose his tonge.... The wilfull perjurie is stoned to death, with tongue cut out...."(75)

Civis comments, without any attempt at irony: "So Goddes lawes and the Princes are observed in that happie lande."

Both Utopia and Taerg Natrib are alike, however, in their attitude to lawyers; in Utopia "they have no lawyers among them, for they consider them as a sort of people whose profession it is to disguise matters." (76) In Taerg Natrib, although "There was not a robbere, murder, perjurie, or any horrible crime committed this xxi yeres" (77) lawyers do exist, but they are "worthie Lawiers... whiche have great stipends of the prince, & take no
fees of the people; not a pynne... they have no pettie Foggers."

The people of Taerg Natrib are always perfectly prepared for war "for feare the Golden fleese be stolen." as are the Utopians, who all, including the women "are trained up, that in cases of necessity they may not be quite useless." (78) But the Utopians "detest war as a very brutal thing." (79) Bullein makes no such comment, since he is not concerned with other than religious ideas. The inhabitants of both lands are similar in their dress too, all dressing very plainly except the nobles in Taerg Natrib who "are riche, in faire attire like angelles."

The interesting point about Bullein's vision (if one can call so bleak a picture a vision) is that, although it may seem to derive from the Utopia, it is in effect much closer to the Piers Plowman tradition, and is at variance with More's humanist explorations. (I do not agree that it parodies them, as Waage imagines. Emor is more likely to be Rome than More.) (80) Langland, and most of those who followed him, wanted to retain the status quo, reform certain religious abuses and set people on the right social path by the right religious behaviour. More examined an alternative society, where, for example, the administration is carried out by elected Magistrates, whose main function is to keep everyone occupied. Bullein's other world is no different from England, except for religious reforms. There is a Monarch; there are judges, lawyers, laws, churches with
ministers; society is still class-structured, and there is no murmur of communism. But the society is perfect because religious evils have been removed. (81)

SOCIAL PROTEST AND COMPLAINT LITERATURE: COMPLAINT

Both traditions of social criticism belong to a yet wider kind of writing, that of Complaint. As I use the term throughout this study it would be as well to define it here, even though it is in fairly common use, and is splendidly defined and examined in John Peter's book Complaint and Satire in Early English Literature. (82) Complaint is not a genre, although it is usually treated as if it were one. In this respect it is like Pastoral, for both Complaint and Pastoral are 'super-genres', categories which cover several kinds of writing. Peter makes the very necessary distinction between Complaint and Satire. Complaint is general in application, corrective in intention, bound to the Christian ideology, narrow in its range, conceptual, impersonal and allegorical; Satire, on the other hand, is specific and concrete, abusive and scornful, projects a personal world-view, that of the satirist, can deal with individuals, and has a vast potential range. (83) Peter points out that these distinctions do not create two watertight compartments:

"the whole field of literature under discussion consists, like the rainbow, of a series of
gradations. At one extreme there are purely personal attacks.... These shade off into Satire proper, Satire shades off into Complaint, Complaint into Homily; and Homily in turn may be said to shade off into factious and controversial pieces... where, as if to complete the cycle, personal attacks can often be found. But to say these categories overlap is not to repudiate them or to deny that they are quite as distinct as are the rainbow's yellow and its red."

(84)

Peter divides into several categories the subject matter of Complaint. The ground of all Complaint, which can be a subject in itself, is the fallen state of man, the rottenness of the world, consequent upon the Fall, the imminence of death and judgement. Combined with this sense of present rottenness is a nostalgia for the past, the Golden Age or Eden. This nostalgia gives rise to the topos now-a-days, which contrasts present decay with the golden past. The objects of attack, Peter says, fall into three groups: professions, groups of people or types of sinners, and specific abuses. The favourite professions for attack by writers of Complaint were priests, monks and friars; next in popularity were lawyers and judges, usurers and merchants; doctors were sometimes attacked for their corrupt ethics. In the second group were women, a perennially fruitful subject for complaint; the rich were frequently attacked, since they were assumed to be covetous and miserly; conversely, prodigals were also frowned on, as were upstarts, who contravened the natural order; some attacks were also made on disobedient
children, atheists and foreigners. The third group of abuses which gave rise to righteous anger were such things as cosmetics and fine clothes, dancing and swearing. Forced marriages interestingly enough were also cried down. The same material for Complaint continued to be used into the sixteenth century, but with some additions and developments. The Complaint topos, now-a-days, developed from a general jeremiad on the rottenness of the world, to be limited to an attack on "this land" and later on "England". (85) New subjects for attack were introduced into the canon: Peter lists "boastful swaggering soldiers, tobacco takers, snobs, upstart courtiers, Puritans, bawds, panders and drunkards." (86) These changes in the subjects of Complaint show clearly that it was changing from a universal lament over the sinfulness of man to attacks on specific groups, often quite small ones. The types just listed were the material of Comedy as well as Complaint.

This is the bare outline of Complaint, which is found in both poetry and sermon, and in the sixteenth century in prose as well. The literature of social protest can be seen to belong to this larger area, although it has a significant difference, in that it adds enclosing landlords and the existence of poverty to the list of its subjects for attack, and campaigns for a remedy to these ills. Many of its other subjects are those of the larger literature of Complaint: avarice and usury, rich men, corrupt clergy, lawyers. But it would be wrong to combine the two sorts of writing into one kind, since one of the basic tenets of
Complaint is the continuance of the evils it attacks: fallen man is perpetually fallen, but for grace, whereas enclosing landlords can be prevented by law from their hurtful actions. Bullein's Dialogue, although it has some of the material of the literature of social protest, proposes the solution of Complaint: the redemption of an individual soul.

Various emanations of Complaint are obvious in A Dialogue. The frequent reference to "now-a-days", the constant attacks on usury and covetous behaviour, and on lawyers. (87) The final section of the work, with its emphasis on mortality and the rottenness of the body is Complaint material too. The moral pictures rehearse many of the general and specific subjects of Complaint literature.

THE PARTS OF A DIALOGUE

I turn now to some of the specific items which make up the farrago A Dialogue. I have dealt with the different genres to which the work may be said to belong, at least partially. In addition the work contains pieces from other kinds of writing. The reader has the sense of being led from one portion to another as he reads this book, sometimes with only the dialogue form itself as a link between the passages of information or instruction. The pieces in question are all quite short, which
makes examining them in terms of their literary tradition rather absurd, since in some cases the tradition is long and full, while the pieces are slight. Some of the pieces do not belong to a particular genre, so that their 'tradition' is a huge body of writing in a general area— for example, Bullein's five pages of Aristotelian dogma belong to a great body of writing, but not exactly to a genre. These problems of treatment are not altogether superable, but I hope my solutions are satisfactory. Of those pieces which come from a clear literary genre I have sketched the literary background, no more fully than the pieces themselves warrant. Those pieces which belong to a body of writing, rather than a genre— the Aristotelian and medical pieces— I have cursorily considered in terms of their content rather than their genre. The genres, then, surveyed here include the Fable, the Emblem, travellers' tales, the Homily and the Ars Moriendi.

THE PARTS OF A DIALOGUE: THE FABLE

--- ----- --- --------- --- -----  

The fables which lead us to consider this genre are told when Civis, Roger and Uxor are riding between London and the inn. (88) Roger and Civis pass the time on this journey with a number of entertaining and instructive matters including a tall tale, a discussion on whether animals could speak, several fables, an attack on usury, various tales and histories of monsters and portents, and a lament on the state of England. Although I extract the fables briefly from this collection of pieces, it
should be clear that all this conversation is of the same sort: mildly didactic, amusing, but having a moral purpose and quite possibly all arising from the fondness of preachers for lacing their moral lessons with interesting material. The pervasive influence of Complaint as well as Homily is apparent here.

Animal fables and extended similes using animals to illustrate points of human behaviour are commonly found in sixteenth century writing. Carroll in his study of this phenomenon in non-religious prose (89) lists a great many instances of this kind in all types of prose writers. The fables of Aesop were, of course, one of the major inspirations for this practice, although Pliny's Naturalis Historia and Aristotle's Historia Animalium were also plundered for animal lore, and some of the material used by secular writers as well as preachers was gleaned from Bestiaries. The Latin version of Aesop was printed four times in the first half of the sixteenth century, and an English translation was produced by Caxton in 1484. A great many other English versions and translations appeared in the course of the century. (90) Aesop's Fables was a basic Elizabethan grammar-school text book. Bullein's fable of the Mouse and the Lion is one of the best-known Aesopic fables.

As well as the great secular use made of fables and animal imagery there was a corresponding, probably greater, use in religious contexts of the animal exemplum. Ovst, in his great
book Literature and Pulpit in Mediaeval England (91) devotes some
--- ------ --- ------ ------- ---
space to the use of the animal fable in Mediaeval preaching. He
mentions stories used by preachers in the Middle Ages, drawn from
Aesop and other fabulists. The great work compiled for preaching
by John Bromyard the Summa Predicantium (late fourteenth century)
--- -------
makes
"frequent use of these droll stories... we have
such fables as those which tell of the partridges
calling the hawk to assist them against the kites
with disastrous results... and the dispute
between the peacock and the eagle." (92)

Bullein’s fable of the ducks, the hens and the fox can be seen to
belong in the same company. The use of animal examples in
sermons diminished in the sixteenth century, especially among
Puritan preachers, who espoused a severely plain style.
Nonetheless, exempla were still used in sermons of this period,
and similes drawn from animals, and animal fables were also in
use. (93)

Bullein uses the fable in a traditional manner, to enliven
his moral discourse, and make a point forcefully. Two of Roger’s
fables exemplify ingratitude, a subject perhaps applicable to
Roger himself, and the third curiously presages Civis’ death, in
a manner which for the first time equates Civis with evil. Roger
uses the tale of the foxes who will "never mete againe untill wee
doe meeete together in the Skinners shop" (94) to underline his
assertion that he, Civis and Uxor will "never meeete altogether
again in London." This use of the fable is an extension of its function from illustrative to dramatic.

As well as the three fables there is a tale about 'young Renob' (Bp. Boner), which is only found in the 1564 edition. This, although unpleasant, is in the general tradition of sermon exempla. Latimer was particularly fond of the personal exemplum, but there are many others scattered through sixteenth century sermons. Anecdotes which deprecated Papists were part of the preachers' stock-in-trade. (95)

THE PARTS OF A DIALOGUE: EMBLEMS

The moral pictures which Civis and Uxor encounter at the inn have a somewhat curious connection with the genre emblems; superficially they seem very much of the same kind as those books of allegorical pictures and their interpretations which had a vogue in England in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century. The genre is dealt with in Rosemary Freeman's English Emblem Books. (96) The earliest Emblem book is Italian: Alciati's Emblemata (1531), This collection consisted of 104 emblems, and was later expanded to 212. The emblems were pictures of scenes, drawn from classical myth, natural history or fable, with a motto and explanatory verse, illustrating some
moral point. The meaning of the picture was by no means clear, and required special elucidation. This was the principal attraction of the emblem-books: the appeal of the curious and the witty. A great many imitations of Alciati's book followed in Italy, France and later in England. The first English book of emblems did not appear until 1586; it was Geoffrey Whitney's A Choice of Emblems and Other Devices. However, the continental Emblem books were known in England before 1586. In 1569 a book, the short title of which is A Theatre for Worldlings was published; this book, a translation from the French of a Flemish work, is a collection of sonnets, some translated by Spenser, with woodcuts, interpreted in prose. It is a polemically anti-Catholic book. This has been hailed as the first English emblem book, although it bears little resemblance to Alciati's book. It demonstrates rather the ubiquity of allegory and 'speaking pictures' at the time, and the predisposition of the English towards allegorical pictures. This predisposition is well described by Freeman in her account of the allegorical furnishings in houses and palaces, the emblematic pictures and decorations put up to welcome Elizabeth in various towns and cities, and the witty mottoes in painting and jewellery. (97) This allegorical impulse, however, is much older; the paintings on mediaeval church walls of the wheel of Fortune or the seven deadly sins, as well as the mass of manuscript and later woodcut illustrations in books amply proclaim the Mediaeval tendency to allegory. Visual aids in churches were sometimes used by Mediaeval preachers to add variety to their sermons. (98)
Bullein's moral pictures must be seen as an extension of this native tradition, rather than as an early example of the Continental emblem. One very telling evidence of this is the absence of overlap in Bullein's pictures and Continental emblems. The fool in Bullein's pictures who "stande upon the tree and cutteth the arme thereof asonder whereupon he standeth" (99) is also found in Peacham's Minerva Britannica (1612), but this is the only coincident picture I have found. Bullein's pictures are probably more closely related to other literary forms: the Judge, whose skin was flayed as an example to others is found as a sermon exemplum; the Ship of Fools is a well-known Complaint subject, while the man holding a Lion and a Fox on leashes seems to derive from Machiavelli. The influence of fables is briefly evident too, in the Ant and the Grasshopper.

The subject matter of the pictures covers many of the themes of Complaint, as I mentioned earlier. The subjects are not arranged in any order; general complaints and specific abuses follow one another. The picture which accuses the London Constables of "moste falsely abusyng the tyme" follows directly in the wake of the Ship of Fools, which is of much more general application; after the Constables comes an array of opposites, which mixes mythological persons and real people, the ancient and recent past, human and animal examples indiscriminately. (100)
This curious section of the Dialogue has an air about it of a compendium of possible themes, which might have been included in the Dialogue at greater length, had space permitted. They seem strung together without pattern, and end with no conclusion, and in fact, rather resemble a sermon handbook. Taken with the rest of the book, which is also fairly miscellaneous, they give the impression that Bullein was determined to fit in as many topoi as possible into his short work.

THE PARTS OF A DIALOGUE: TRAVELLERS' TALES

The tales told by Mendax to Civils, Uxor and Roger in the inn (101) derive from those of Sir John Mandeville, the famous "voiace and travayle of syr J. Maundevile" (to quote the title of the 1568 edition). Malcolm Letts in his Sir John Mandeville writes:

"Bullein has obviously read and studied Mandeville, Munster and any other books of travel he could come across.... Most of Mandeville's stories reappear, including the loadstone rocks which Mandeville saw afar off, but on which Mendax and his companions were wrecked." (102)

Josephine W. Bennett says that Bullein "satirizes the Travels and travelers' tales, among other subjects, making use of several of Mandeville's stories." (103) Although Letts' assertion that "most of Mandeville's stories reappear" is rather large, his reference to other travel writers is interesting, and I shall
return to this point shortly. Mandeville's book, written in Norman-French in the fourteenth century enjoyed enormous popularity all over Europe. (104) Although based on genuine travel writings, the Travels was a work of imagination; Bennett writes: "Mandeville was not an explorer but a popularizer; not a creator of a dishonest travel book, but the author of a romance of travel which belongs primarily to the history of literature..." (105) Whether it deceived readers at the time is not sure; Bennett says: "It was surmised at least as early as the fifteenth century, and probably from the beginning, that the Travels was not a factual... account of its author's own experiences." (106)

Mandeville's book is an account of travels in the Near and Middle East, the Holy Land and the Far East. It encompasses both Constantinople and Cathay, as well as imaginary lands like that of Prester John. From Mandeville, Bullein derived both the idea of amazing tales of distant lands, based on fact, and much of his material. For example, Bullein's "Sciopodes", "Ipopodes" and "Fanesis" are from Mandeville, as are accounts of "Prester Jhon" and "the Great Can". Mendax' tales are quite different in their effect from Mandeville's, however, despite the shared material. Mendax rattles off a great many wonders in a short space, and by quantity and exaggeration he removes the credibility that Mandeville's tales retain. Mandeville's travels are based on truth; Mendax give a superficial appearance of truth, given the mention of real places such as Madagascar, Zanzibar and America.
The inclusion of references to the New World was Bullein's major updating of Mandeville and this gave a contemporary flavour to the old-fashioned stories. The New World is first introduced in a serious context. Medicus finds a Map in Antonius' house of "Terra florida in America" and describes it thus: "there the gold & precious stones and Balmes are so plentifulfull, silver and spice are nothyng with them; no labour is in that land, lono life they have...." (107) Terra Florida here is like the Earthly Paradise found in Complaint literature. Bullein here, at least, treats the new discoveries quite gravely. Mendax also mentions America: "we came uppon the mainge lande of Cuba, in the great and mightie lande of America." His account of his travels begins with Florida. (108) Accounts of America had recently been published in England, principally through the efforts of Richard Eden, who translated Book V. of Sebastian Munster's Cosmographia Universalis as A treatyse of the newe India in 1553, and Peter Martyr's work The Decades of the newe world or West India in 1555. These works certainly provided some of Bullein's inspiration; for example, Munster/Eden describes Madagascar:

"it is counted to be one of the greatest and rychest Islandes of the worlde. The inhabitantes are of the Mahumets secte.... It bringeth forthe many Elephantes, by reason wherof there is greate plentie of Iverye... They eate the fleshe of none other beastes, but onely of Camels." (109)

Bullein on Madagascar says:
"wee sailed to the greate Isle called Madagasta, in Scorea, where were Kynges, Mahumitaines by religion, blacke as devilles.... Some had no heddes, but eyen in their breastes. Some, when it rained, covered all the whole bodie with one foote. That land did abound in Elephantes teeth; the men did eate Camiles and Lions fleshe." (110)

Both descriptions continue with accounts of the great plenty of the island. Bullein's version shows the dual influence of Munster and Mandeville well; much of his account is quite close to Munster's, but interpolated into it are two marvels taken from Mandeville: "In another isle also be folk that have no heads, and their eyes and their mouth be behind their shoulders;" the scapods are found in Ethiopia in Mandeville's book: "In that country be folk that have but one foot, and... the foot is so large that it shadoweth all the body against the sun when they will lie and rest them." (111)

Many other indications of Munster's influence can be seen in Bullein's tales; the Anthrophagi are plentiful in Munster's book, inhabiting Gyava and Java (apparently different places) and the "Kynodomme called Fugui", and are found by Mendax in Ethiopia. Marvellous birds and animals abound in Munster's Calicut, where there is also a wonderful tree whose nut produces wine. Great fish are found in Sumatra, and there are plentiful diamonds and precious stones in India. These features and many more are found in Mendax' tales, but always in a magnified version. This has led both Letts and Bennett to say that Bullein
is here satirising travel literature as a whole. I am rather inclined to think that he aimed at producing a new *Wandeville*, which would amuse without claiming to be accurate.

---

**THE PARTS OF A DIALOGUE: HOMILY AND THE ARS MORIENDI**

The necessity to consider these two forms together is created by the last section of *A Dialogue* itself; the passage in question, Civis’ death, seems to be close to Homily, but also resembles the *Ars Moriendi*. This section is rather difficult to discuss generically, for it falls into several pieces, and belongs to several kinds, and the pieces and the kinds do not coincide. This will seem less perverse as I proceed. The death scene opens with the advent of Mors to Civis. Mors makes a series of speeches on the inevitability of death, laced with exempla and Biblical quotations. The aspect of Death here presented is one of terror. Civis responds to this by a lament on the impermanence of the body, and then begins the process of dying, by setting his worldly goods in order, and sending for Theologus. Theologus’ address consists of several parts: first a brief survey of the basic beliefs of Protestant Christianity, then a more detailed spiritual preparation for Death, to which Civis conforms by a confession of faith. Next Theologus expounds the doctrine of the Resurrection, using numerous Biblical quotations; he then turns to Uxor and exhorts her to patience, with several exempla. This address turns into a complaint of the
rottenness of the world, a rehearsal of the ubi sunt motif, and then into an attack on Usury, and a general call to repentance. Finally, Theologus prays for the dying Civis, commending him to Heaven. From the summary, one can see that this section covers a number of different aspects of death, belonging to different traditions. I shall mention the background to the two traditions which deal principally with death, Homily and the Ars Moriendi.

The influence of Homily in this work is not confined to the last part of the book, as should have been clear from the references to the genre throughout this chapter. However, the form is most clearly invoked in the last section by the address of Theologus. This is foreshadowed by Avarus' saying in Antonius' house:

"the curate is a craftie knave: well can hee persuade and rehearse Gods vengeaunce..... readynge the Homely of death, cryng out, all is but vanitie, vanitie and vexation of mynde, damnation except repentaunce and true confession from the harte and restitution of wrongs...." (112)

The Homily of Death here mentioned is presumably "An Exhortation against the Fear of Death", thought to be by Cranmer; it is found in the first book of the official homilies, Certayne sermons, or homilies, apoynted by the kynges maiestie, to be declared a. redde... every Sunday (1547).
Many editions of this book, and its second part were published, and their contents were extremely well known (113). This Homily is worth considering in relation to the Death section of A Dialogue, even though Bullein does not follow its structure or quote from it. It has a certain amount in common with Bullein's but more important, it helps to highlight the difference between his views and the mainline Anglican attitudes. "The Exhortation against the Fear of Death" is divided into three parts, dealing with the three fears that worldly men have of death:

"First the sorrowful departing from worldly goods and pleasures. The second, the fear of the pangs and pains that come with death. The last and principal cause is, the horrible fear of extreme misery and perpetual damnation in time to come."

(114) These fears are systematically dealt with, in an optimistic manner; death is "not a mischief but a remedy for all mischief: no enemy, but a friend: not a cruel tyrant, but a gentle guide."

(115) The exhortation stresses the positive aspects of death, urging both faith and good works, in the form of help for the poor. It has little to say on the rottenness of this present world or the pains of Hell, mentioning almost in passing:

"the manifold sicknesses, troubles, and sorrows of this present life, the dangers of this perilous pilgrimage, and the great encumbrance which our spirit hath by his sinful flesh and frail body, subject to death...: the faithful Christian man"
which considereth all these miseries, perils and incompatibilities whereunto he is subject so long as he here liveth upon earth; and on the other part considereth the blessed and comfortable state of the heavenly life to come." (116)

The mention of the ills of this present life is almost parenthetical, and certainly, throughout the homily the joys of the after-life and the glories of faith are stressed far more than the "encumbrances" of the spirit.

Bullein has no such organised presentation, but he does share the optimism of Cranmer's orthodox homily:

"You are assured in conscience of this blessed resurrection and life everlasting in Christ Jesus our Lorde." (117) "By Jesus Christe, thyne onely Sonne, wee thanke thee, deare father of all mercie, that nowe it hath pleased thee to take to thy mercie at this present tyme our brother, whom thou hast elected, consecrated." (118)

Bullein's optimism is rather different from Cranmer's however, as the passage just quoted shows, since he lays some emphasis on election. Election, or predestination towards salvation is not a doctrine that receives much airing in the official homilies, although it is defined in Article XVII (1552), of the Thirty-Nine Articles. Although Bullein's emphasis on the election of Civis (whose name implies he is a predestined Citizen of Heaven) allies him with the more radical Protestants, he is in fact far short of being a Calvinist, and well within the Anglican fold. The
Calvinists held that not only were individual men predestined to salvation, but others were predestined to damnation. This doctrine was stressed in their preaching. Article XVII admits that souls, generally, are predestined for glory, but does not commit itself on the reverse. The Article also denies the doctrine of individual predestination. (119) Bullein does not mention predestination to damnation, and his emphasis on the individual election of Civis is interpretable as a general theological statement, rather than a statement of the doctrine of individual predestination. Civis can be seen as generalised Elect Man. Bullein is on the Calvinist side of the Anglican camp: he does not step outside the definition of election used in the Article, but he stresses election far more than the official line allowed; there is no mention of election at all in Cranmer's exhortation.

Not only is Bullein at variance with the traditional Anglican preachers in his emphasis on election, he also differs from them in presenting death as a subject at all, and in presenting it as a terrible end. Mors' speech, Civis' reaction to it and Theologus' exhortation to Uxor are in the tradition of Timor mortis conturbat me. (120) Mors declares: "I spare not one, neither Prince nor Peasaunte, against whom I do cast this darte. I have no respecte of any persone;" (121) Civis complains: "Alas woe is my vile stinkying carcass, and filthie fleshe, conceived and born in sinne" (122), while Theologus tells Uxor: "When you doe benolde your selfe in a glasse, remember your face shall bee
lean and pale, your nose rotten, your tethe stinkyng and blacke, your eyen dimme and blinde..." (123) This treatment of death, found frequently in Mediaeval sermons (124), is found in the preaching of the sixteenth century in Catholic rather than Protestant sermons. J.W. Blench in Preaching in England in the late 15th and 16th centuries writes:

"The most characteristic note of the sermons of this time (1450-1547) especially before the controversy over the Roman Primacy in Henry VIII's reign... is the lament over the transience of earthly things, and an admonition about the vanity of trusting in them... The preachers of this time, in the tradition of the Middle Ages, take a mournful view of human life." (125)

With the return of Catholicism in Mary's reign "the old lugubrious declamation on senility and death reappears." But the Reforming preachers of 1547-1553 are not concerned to preach mortality; Blench says: "Gone is the sad expatiation over transience and the vanity of life; gone is the morbid preoccupation with old age, death and decay.... The keynote is rather zeal for the reform of the Church and society...." (126)

Nor do the Elizabethan preachers favour death as a topic; they are more concerned with the evils of Catholicism, social ills, and theological controversy within their ranks. Bullein's death section cannot, therefore, be said to resemble the Anglican preaching of his time in any more than a superficial manner; however, it does hark back to the older style of preaching, and
to the poetry of Complaint already described, in its dwelling on decay, and the gloom and inexorability of death. These are combined with a more optimistic New Testament attitude to death, the hope engendered by the doctrine of election. This curious mix of two styles points not so much to Homily as to the form of writing called Ars Moriendi. Writing of this sort provided detailed instructions on how to die well, with theological and practical guides for the dying person, and for those attending the sick bed. The English occurrences of this genre are amply treated in Nancy Lee Beaty's The Craft of Dying. (127) The genre starts quite clearly with a book called the Tractatus or Speculum artis bene moriendi, in the early fourteenth century. There is also a shorter book, derived from the Tractatus, which has eleven famous wood-block illustrations. The book is in six chapters: the first warns of the imminence of death and the need to learn to die well; the second deals with the temptations of dying men; the third is a catechism of faith; the fourth is a meditation on the Passion and various devotional aids for the dying man, and prayers for him to say; the fifth chapter is addressed to the bystanders, explaining how they can help the dying man, and reminding them of the imminence of their own deaths; the sixth chapter consists of prayers to be said as the central figure dies. This book had numerous imitations throughout Europe. (128) Beaty treats several important sixteenth century contributions to the genre, including Thomas Lupset's The Way of Dyenge Well (1534) and Thomas Becon's The Sicke Mannes Salve
(1561). The latter was enormously popular, and was reprinted many times in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. The work, like Becon's earlier book on the same subject, The Prayse of Death, is in dialogue form; the sick man, Epaphroditus is visited by four friends, led by Philemon who is Becon himself. It is a voluminous book, estimated at 75,000 words. It covers a great many more aspects of Christian conduct than dying well; a very large proportion of Protestant doctrine is included, as well as instructions to wives, children and servants on how to live. The dying man advising his wife not too young a husband after his own death says:

"Choose thee therefore such a husband as loveth thee, and not thy goods only; as is equal to thee in condition, state and age; as also will tender my children, and be a father unto them, and see them brought up in the fear of God, and the knowledge of his blessed word." (130)

The Sicke Mannes Salve is roughly divided into three sections according to Beaty: the first deals with the inevitability of sickness and death, and with the right Christian attitude to it; the second with the right doctrine, and the right disposition of worldly effects; the third contains prayers and exhortations to the dying man. These divisions are not clear in the text, however, which is a welter of Scriptural quotations, exhortations to true faith, attacks on false doctrine and Papists, and guides to good living. Apart from Epaphroditus' will, the addresses to the household, and the Creed Epaphroditus affirms (131) which
occupies ten pages, the text flows from one matter of faith to another, every paragraph being larded with quotation. Becon's aim is to cover all aspects of life and faith.

Bullein's death sequence is a condensed version of the Ars Moriendi. In it he expresses, very forcefully, the certainty of death, confirms right doctrine in the dying man, by question and answer, gives advice to the wife, shows by Biblical example the assuredness of the Resurrection, and prays over the dying man at the point of death. Bullein's is a dramatised Ars, with colourful elements from Mediaeval complaint and preaching inserted for the sake of variety. It is a farrago of elements. The figure of Mors recalls Everyman; his speech is redolent of Mediaeval and pre-Reformation preaching (132); Civis' speech on the body is like those found in Mediaeval complaint-poetry; Theologus' catechism and disquisition on the Resurrection, and prayer over the dying Civis come from the Ars Moriendi tradition; the ubi sunt topos common in Complaint is encountered when Theologus asks: "Where are the old lustie Kynges, Queenes, Lordes, Knightes, Ladies? Where are the old courtiers and valiant men of warre? Where are the Maiors of cities, Lawiers, Bishoppes, Phisicions? Where are all the pleaasante Musicians?..." (133) This closing section mirrors the work as a whole, combining traditional elements to make something new.
Something must be said about the non-generic pieces in *A Dialogue*. There are three of these: the Aristotelian discourse, the medical material, and the description of the statues in Antonius' garden.

The function of the Aristotelian section—that passage in which Medicus instructs Antonius in some of the tenets of Aristotle's teaching—is rather puzzling; I shall have more to say on this in a moment. The lesson consists of a brief scurry over Aristotle's supposed teaching on the nature of matter, astrology, and the soul, material mainly drawn from the *Nicomachean Ethics*. The *ethiques* of Aristotle, that is to say preceptes of good behaviour appeared in 1547, and was apparently a translation from the Italian. Bullein is highly unlikely to have been able to consult the *Ethics* in Greek, but he certainly used some form of translation of the book in *A Dialogue*. For example, Medicus explains that:

"Morall (vertue) provideth that naturall thynges in them bothe can not be moved by contrarie custome. For stones naturally, though they be cast never so high by arte, yet must they naturally fall doune againe. Even so fire, beyng driven doune, yet it will cast his flames upwarde;"
so vertue is not in us by nature, but onely by power to receive theim, for every thyng that is in us by nature, first it is by power, and after commeth to act as it commeth to the senses of mankind." (134)

In the Nicomachean Ethics Aristotle writes:

"...it is also plain that none of the moral virtues arises in us by nature; for nothing that exists by nature can form a habit contrary to its nature. For instance the stone which by nature moves downwards cannot be habituated to move upwards... nor can fire be habituated to move downwards... Neither by nature, nor contrary to nature do virtues arise in us; rather we are adapted by nature to receive them, and are made perfect by habit." (135)

In other places, however, Medicus produces ideas which stem not so much from Aristotle as from the Aristotelianism of the Mediaeval schoolmen. (136) For example, although Aristotle explains at some length that the soul has a rational and irrational principle, and that the latter is divided into vegetative and appetitive elements, he does not schematise these ideas and uses 'seems' and 'appears' instead of bald statements (137) In Bullein, however, this division of the soul has become the standard 'aristotelian' scheme:

"In the soule... he hath three sundrie powers. The one is named vegitable, in whiche every man
taketh part with herbes, trees, and plantes. The
seconde part of the soule is named sensible...
The thirde parte is more whiche is rationall..."

(138)

Some of Medicus' philosophy is not Aristotelian at all: "Men say that certaine starres doe governe the thinges beneth here in yerth." says Antonius. To which Medicus replies: "They doe so in deede, as is wel proved, when as the Sunne and Moone doe enter into any of their circlæ in those great bodies, then our little bodies in earth do feele the goodnes or evilnesse of them..." (139), which is a common expression of astrological belief.

Bullein's Aristotelianism, therefore, is like all the book in question a curious amalgam. It presents inherited Aristotelianism, quotations from Aristotle himself, and ideas which have nothing to do with his writings at all, without apology or distinction.

The medical writing is rather different; it is comprehensive, rather than miscellaneous, dealing at length with both the causes and cure of the Plague. It is so inclusive, that it even has the technical prescriptions for medicines against the Plague. Like medical writers of his day, Bullein leans heavily on sources such as Galen, Hippocrates and Avicenna, but he has some ideas of his own as well; that garlic and onions were effective against the plague was a commonly held medical opinion of the period (140), but Bullein's Medicus rebuts this with
"Garlike is good for to brynge it, but not against it: it is so hotte...hath power attractive." (141)

Although medical books were popular throughout the century (142)- Sir Thomas Elyot's The Castel of Healthe went through twelve editions before 1590- books on the plague seem to have been slow catching on. Bullein himself included a section on the pestilence in his Governement of Healthe (1558), but the bulk of books on the subject seem to date from 1590 onwards. (143)

The medical section is clearly an important part of A Dialogue: it fills a seventh of the whole book, and is the longest single piece in it. (144) During it the 'story' seems suspended; that Antonius is dying of the plague which Medicus so calmly and lovingly describes seems to be forgotten. In this part of the book, Bullein is closest to his own earlier works, which use the dialogue form to transmit medical information as plainly as possible.

The figure of Medicus has another function besides that of mouthing Bullein's medical advice, however. Although I mentioned the figure of the Doctour at the end of Everyman, and the possible conflation of the theologian/physician meanings of the word 'doctor', the figure of the medical doctor frequently represents atheism. The Mediaeval proverb, Ubi tres medici, duo...
Paul Kocher devotes a chapter to The Physician as Atheist (145), citing Bullein's Medicus as a prime example. Kocher says that the ground of Bullein's criticism of the doctor is the same as that voiced in the Middle Ages, that the undue concentration upon the study of nature produced a forgetfulness of the author of the nature. (146) Conversely, though, the doctor as presented on the Elizabethan stage is sometimes virtuous or even sacerdotal, sometimes evil, and sometimes comic. (147) The dramatic doctor has on occasion a priestly function; R.R. Simpson remarks on the "gradual emergence of the medical profession from the priesthood". (148) In A Dialogue we have an illustration of the contrast between the Medicus and the man of God, and also the converse, the conflation of the roles of physician and priest.

The book is built around two contrasting scenes: Medicus' conversation with Antonius, and Theologus' with Civis. Both of these are effectively death-bed scenes, although Antonius does not die 'on stage' as it were. His death is actually reported by Theologus in order to confirm the parallel between the two scenes: "Further, I had soner been with you, but one Maister Antonius sent for me; but or I came he was dedde; and Avarus and Ambodexter is in his house preparyng a solempne Funerall for hym." (149) Another parallel is made by Uxor's desire to send for "maister doctor Tocrub". (150) The theological comfort Theologus
gives is paralleled both by the Aristotelian doctrine of Medicus, and also by his concentration on earthly medicine. That earthly medicine is insufficient is implied by Civis' command, directly after Mors departure: "Helpe me into some house, whereas I might sende for some manne of God to bee my heavenly Phisicion, teachyng me the waie to the kyngdome of Christe." (151), and by Theologus' opening words to Civis: "Sir, God, the heavenlie Phisition, blesse you, and give you the perfect consolation of conscience in Christe his Sonne..." (152) Although the contrast is very boldly drawn between Medicus and Theologus, between the atheist and the man of God, between the covetous Antonius who repents too late, and the rather less covetous Civis who repents in time, the difficulty remains of how to regard the 'false' death-bed scene. The contents of Medicus' teaching should, if the parallel is to be consistent, be as false as the teaching of Theologus is true. However, the Aristotelian material has every appearance of genuine information, and the medical material must be treated as genuine, even though it comes out of the mouth of an atheist; it is unthinkable that a serious medical writer, like Bullein, would promulgate faulty medical material at such length, with prescriptions into the bargain. That Medicus' information is sound is underlined by its reappearance in the mouth of Civis, a character the reader trusts: Civis, like Medicus quotes Galen and Hippocrates on the plague (153), and later re-issues Medicus' Aristotelian doctrine of the soul: "there are three thynge to be considere in eche living creature: the first is vegetable... the second is sensible... The third is... where (man) hath reason and
A similar difficulty arises with the description of the 'ideal' land coming from the mouth of an obvious liar, Mendax. The possibility is suggested by this that the whole 'puritan Utopia' is in effect satirical. I do not subscribe to the notion however. Yet another such oddity is Rooer's speech against Usury and lawyers and the evils of society: "I thinke the daie of Dome is at hande. Every man in a maner is fallen in love with hymselfe... Every churle would possesse al alone... Oh, this gear is monysterous and vile..." (155) Rooer at the end of the Dialogue commits himself to a life of petty crime: "This queere will picke his purse for my sake. She can make false dice.... Oh that I had as muche money as my Maister... then I would I lende my money to Usurie ad use false weightes and measures;" (156) These discrepancies, taken together, seem to me to suggest that Bullein was not concerned in this work to present consistent characterisation as one might expect in a play; his characters are sometimes merely authorial mouthpieces, and sometimes the characters their names suggest. Suspension of belief in the 'real' situation is demanded by much of the Dialogue; in the medical section, for example, Medicus and Antonius discuss the plague as if Antonius were a mere interlocutor and not dying of the disease in question. Antonius responds to Medicus words on the signs of the plague: "your late talke... doth put me in great feare of my life. But I will comen with you for others whiche are not infected; howe may they bee moste safely defended, maister doctor?" (157) When Medicus has answered this,
Antonius says: "these are good rules, & haply are they that doe wisely observe them in time, place and manner accordingly; but if one be newly infected, what remedie then, as when a man is sicke, and the sore appereth not?" (158) Similar withdrawals from the 'realistic' occur during the ride to the inn, since the discussion between Civis and Rooer has a very "bookish' flavour, and at the inn, where Civis' patient explanations of so many pictures taxes realism.

In spite of the apparent inconsistencies in the book, I believe it is a straightforward and unified work. Although composed of pieces its main thrust is coherent; the medical information and the dramatised Ars Moriendi overshadow the pieces which surround them, and their being in direct contrast holds the miscellany together. The impression of unity of purpose which the book gives in spite of its farrago is further strengthened by the undoubted power of the ending, which is amazingly dramatic and moving. This ending gives the work a sense of direction; looking back from the pinnacle of Theolou's final oraye, one feels that the work has all moved inexorably up to this high point. If this impression is not altogether borne out by an examination of the parts, it is all the more to Bullein's credit as an artist, that it seems so at the end. Bullein, I think, was well aware of the artistic content of his book; he sets out to "grace and beautifie" his work, through the setting forth of sundrie shapes... as it were to compelle the commers in to beholde the whole worke." (159) It is not incidental that the figures of recent poets found in Antonius'
garden are all represented as writers of Complaint and enemies of evil conduct. Even Chaucer is presented as such: the quotation supposedly from his works attacks covetousness. Bullein, I feel, allies himself with these poets, for his book treats the same subject as much of their verse: "how vertue doth advance the simple, and vice overthrowe the most noble of the worlde."

Bullein's Dialogue is not a conglomeration of miscellaneous information and religious advice; it is a shaped work, a consciously artistic product. I believe Bullein considered it so; certainly the work, and the figures of these poets, bear out my belief.
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The Metamorphosis of Ajax by Sir John Harington of Kelston was published in 1596. It is a decidedly curious book, since it fits into no obvious category, is the sole work by its author in a popular vein, and has been consistently misunderstood from the time of its publication onwards. (1) Part of the blame for its being misunderstood must lie with Harington himself, who continually refers to it in an off-hand manner, calling it an 'idle toy', and claiming he wrote to "give some occasion to have me thought of and talked of." (2) It will be my task to show that not only has the book several serious points to convey, but also that it is constructed with considerable care - rather more than one might expect from an 'idle toy'. It is, in fact, an extremely sophisticated farrago.
I shall first attempt to reveal how the book is constructed. Since it is rather more complex than the other farragoes studied in this thesis, this analysis will be unusually extensive. I think it is necessary to examine the structure at the beginning of the chapter, since a book crafted as this one is needs to be taken apart carefully, before the relationship of the parts becomes clear. It is not a simple linear work like the other farragoes, works which proceed from one piece to the next. During the course of the survey of the structure, I hope to make the serious points of Harington's book evident also. Then I will discuss the literary kinds on which Harington draws in the farrago: the paradoxical encomium, the treatise, the jest-book, the dream, the 'jury', and the debate. The background to each of these kinds will be sketched, to show the material on which Harington was drawing. In some cases, the kinds are common to more than one of the farragoes studied here, and this background material will therefore be of general relevance to the later chapters. In the case of the dialogue tradition, the discussion in this chapter will be brief, since we have already surveyed that kind in the examination of Bullein's Dialogue. While presenting the background material, I shall indicate how Harington used this material in The Metamorphosis.

The basic principle of structure in The Metamorphosis is division into three. This is most apparent in the division of the book into three separate parts, each with its own title. Although they are sometimes found
published separately (3), the three parts are obviously intended to form a unity, and were first published together, with continuous signatures. They are called A New Discourse of a Stale Subject, Called The Metamorphosis of Ajax Written by Misacmos, to his friend and cosin Philostilpnos; An Anatomie of the Metamorphos-ed Ajax; and An Apologie. These are hereafter referred to as the New Discourse, the Anatomie, and the Apologie.

The middle of these three has an extended rubric on the title page which claims it is "By T.C. Traveller, Apprentice in Poetrie." This is almost certainly Thomas Combe, Harrington's personal servant and friend, who Harrington states in the New Discourse will draw the plan of his invention: "My servant Thomas (whose pensil can performe more in this matter then my pen) will set downe the forme of this by it selfe in the end hereof." (4) Whether Combe also wrote the text of the Anatomie as well as drawing the pictures is a matter for debate (5), but there seems to me no reason for doubting the evidence of the text, which is written as if by Combe, as well as the statement on the title-page. If one assumes that Combe wrote the second of the three parts of this work, how does that affect statements about the work as a whole creation? Very little, I believe. It seems that Harrington and Combe were very close friends (6) and that if Harrington handed over a part of the book to his friend, he no doubt was able to control and edit what went into it. The
Anatomie, in any case, is very short, and consists mainly of the plans of the famous water-closet, which the book is concerned to propound, and a description of its construction. A few jests and humorous pieces are tacked on, and there is a recapitulation of Harington’s arguments in the New Discourse. All in all, Combe’s authorship would affect the substance of the rest of the work very little.

The first and third parts are much longer and considerably more complicated than the second. The second part is disjoint from the other two parts, Harington claims, "that you" (Edward Sheldon, to whom the book is addressed) "...may impart it to such friends of yours, as you shall thinke worthie of it, though you put them not to so great penance as to reade this whole discourse." (7) Perhaps this is so, but there are other possible explanations for the separation out of the three parts, not incompatible with it. For example, dividing the work into three parts is the first step in the 'triad' process Harington uses throughout the book. The use of the 'triad' gives a pleasant feeling of harmony and design to a book consisting of disparate pieces. Almost everything in the book is grouped in threes, and this in itself provides entertainment of a mild kind - 'spot the three'. More significantly, the separation of the Anatomie throws emphasis on the contents of the other parts; the reader is forced to consider them for themselves, not as the preamble and postscript to the design of the water-closet (though this they purport to be). They stand as books in their own right, and
demand attention for themselves in spite of their being part of a whole in which the designs of the water-closet are essential.

Finally, this separation of the parts gives Harington the opportunity for a small joke at the reader's expense, a joke which is also a useful structural device. For the whole of the New Discourse and especially its third section, appears to lead up to the wonderful invention of Harington's. When he finally arrives, as promised, at the point of 'shewing the forme, and how it may be reformed', he delivers his description in some six or seven lines, and then promises a separate book on the subject, to follow. He is surely aware of this trickery, saying, before he introduces the six-line summary "And not to hold you in too long suspense, the devise is this:" and after delivering it "I may now... end your pence that have taken all this pains to read this..." (8), implying that the reader has endured much to reach this point, only to have his prize removed. The reader is then, presumably, supposed to ask 'what was the purpose of all this preamble, if not to lead us to the "forme"?' To this implicit question Harington replies in the subsequent pages:

"give me leave briefly to shew you what pretie pills you have swallowed in your pleasant quadlings, & what wholesome wormewood was enclosed in these raisins of the sunne. Against malcontents, Epicures, Atheists, heretickes, & carelesse and dissolute Christians, and especially against pride & sensualitie, the Prologue & the
first part are chiefly intended. The second gives a due praise without flatterie, to one that is worthie of it, and a just checke without gall to some that deserve it. The third part as it teacheth indeed a reformation of the matter in question, so it toucheth in sport, a reprehension of some practises too much in custome." (9)

This "briefe sum of the true intent of the booke" provides a very clear, but nevertheless tantalising answer to the reader's query. Clear, because it is quite specific in its objects; tantalising, because it is much harder to discover precisely which portions of the book are referred to by Harington's classes "malcontents, Epicures" etc. However, before we come to ponder that, we must glance at the physical divisions of each of the three books. Those of the first book are the most marked.

The New Discourse opens with two letters and a Proloque, which could be seen as a triad of introductory pieces. This material includes the letter from 'Philostilbonos' (Edward Sheldon) which gives 'Misacmos' (Harington) his excuse to write the book. The Proloque deals with the first of the 'metamorphoses' in the book. Then follows the main work, "devided into three parts or sections" carefully tabulated as follows:

1. The first justifies the use of the homelyest wordes.
2. The second prooves the matter not to be contemptible.
3. The third shewes the forme, and how it may be reformed.
1. The first begins gravely, and ends lightly.
2. The second begins pleasantly, and ends soberly.
3. The third is mixt both seriously and merily." (10)
The table continues for two more 'triads'. As with the attacks on "malicants, Epicures" etc., it is not always easy to see quite how Harington's declared scheme fits the text, but on close examination it seems to do so, as I hope to show later. The second of these three sections is considerably longer than the first and third, which are of comparable length.

The Anatomie advertises itself as a book "wherein by a tripertite method is plainly, openly, and demonstratively, declared, explained, and eliquidated, by pen, plot, and precept, how unsaverie places may be made sweet, noysome places made wholesome, filthie places made cleanly." (11) The use of 'triads' is certainly prominent on the title page, but it is not as simple to find the three-part division of the Anatomie. The "tripertite method" possibly only applies to the fact that it is by "pen, plot and precept" that the device is explained, but could also imply a three-part division of the text. The Anatomie does have three rough parts, in fact, but they are not labelled, as the sections of the New Discourse are. They could be called the introduction, explication and defence, the third part being as long as the first two combined. (12) In the introduction Combe presents his credentials, and gives a few of the reasons for the Anatomie's existence; in the explication he gives a detailed
account of the construction of the water-closet, the cost of the parts, and two plans of the device; in the defence there is a jumbled reworking of some of Harington's own arguments in defence of the book, with an eight point comparison of Combe and his master. It ends with a rebus on Harington's name, which clinches his authorship of the whole book, were this in doubt, and prevents its being technically a libel. The Anatomie adds very little to the argument of the other two parts, and is significant only as part of the 'treatise' strain in the Metamorphosis. In this context, I shall discuss it (13), but otherwise I shall concentrate on the New Discourse and Apologie, when examining the contents of the book.

The third part of the book, the Apologie, is, not surprisingly, in three rough parts. They are not separately labelled and are of different lengths, as are the parts of the Anatomie. The first part I take to be up to the start of the inspennelling of the jury. It includes an account of Harington's critics at their sport, the charges brought against Harington for his book, the six classes of people to whom the book should be shown and the four to whom it should not, and a short debate on the composition of the jury. (14) The second part consists of the calling of the jury and the defence of Harington's kinsman, Thomas Markham, who is called to the jury. The defence of Markham is as long as the calling of the other eleven jurymen put together. (15) Finally, in a short section, Harington answers
the three Articles brought against him and his book. (16) My division of the Apologie into three parts is possibly an artificial one—other arrangements are equally plausible— but given the ubiquity of threes in the rest of the book, it is probably intentional that the Apologie should appear to fall into the three parts I have outlined.

We turn now to the significance of all this "justificatory" material. (17) The two letters which open the book are more than the conventional exchange of civilities between dedicatee and author. (18) The first, by a 'gentleman of good worth', Philostilpnos, sets an aristocratic tone, by referring to the graciousness of Harington's house and the visit to it of Queen Elizabeth. In this context the 'shyting place' next mentioned is ennobled, and the whole extraordinary paradox of the book set in motion: the homely place, the stately setting; the low subject, the learned treatment; the dirty subject cleanly treated. The opening of the second letter, Misacmos' reply to Philostilpnos, continues the same paradoxical vein with a series of simple Silenus paradoxes:

"you shall passe downe a streame that seemes to be no streame, by corne fields that seeme no fields, downe a street no street, in at a gate no gate, over a bridge no bridge, into a court no court, where if I be not at home, you shall finde perhaps a foole no foole." (19)
Furthermore, the first letter, purporting to come from Harington's cousin, breaks the ice (as Misacmos admits in the next letter) in the use of "broad phrases." (20) Since Philostilpnos has used them, there is no reason why Misacmos should not also, since the harm, if there is any, has already been done. The fact that the letters are probably both Harington's, and that very few 'broad phrases' are used in the work anyway is incidental. The impression of modesty and reluctance made in the course of the opening letters remains. Renaissance authors were given to producing a 'friend', who either insisted upon, or personally effected publication of a work, while the author remained reluctant. Harington finds this convention even more useful than other authors, for he has the problem of introducing vulgar words. Philostilpnos, therefore, is doubly useful to Misacmos. The opprobrium is to be borne partly by Philostilpnos for bringing the subject up. Misacmos side-steps it, and manages to appear gracious and good-mannered in answering his correspondent's request for a description of the water-closet. This first letter illustrates the subtlety of Harington in his persona—his ability to have things both ways. This could be viewed as an extension of the paradoxical vein.

In the second letter, Misacmos—or Harington as I shall now call him—is mainly concerned with proving the literary respectability of his undertaking. He sets himself firmly in the tradition, which we shall examine shortly, of the paradoxical encomium, quoting seven examples of that genre, and concluding: "Now it is possible that I may be reckoned after these seven, as
sapientum octavus." (21) As so often afterwards, Harington displays ambivalence in his attitude to the book. He finds respectable literary antecedents for it, but then implies that he and the other seven writers cited are all fools (the sapientum octavus is intended to imply the opposite of its meaning). Later in the same defence of the book's origins, he says of it: "I will clothe it (like an ape in purple) that it may be admitted into the better company" (22), again implying that in spite of his defence, it is somehow a shameful or absurd thing. I shall say more about Harington's ambivalence later.

When the reader arrives at the Proloque, he is already aware of the jesting and ambivalent tone the author is to employ. The Proloque is a parody of a metamorphosis, in which by an unlikely succession of events, the warrior Ajax is turned into a 'jakes'. This might look at first glance as if it were the metamorphosis referred to be the title, but as it is disposed of in the Proloque the reader finds he must look elsewhere for the true metamorphosis of a 'jakes'. He discovers it, of course, in the transformation of a stinking jakes into a sweet privy, and also, more surprisingly, of an 'idle toy' of a book into a serious defence of persons and principles.
The Proloque seems to be no more than a comic metamorphosis, with a few extra pieces, such as the 'Blacke Sauntus' added for good measure. However, we do have Harington's statement at the end of the New Discourse, that it is "Against malcontents, Epicures, Atheists, hereticke... and especially against pride and sensualitie, the Proloque & first part are chiefly intended." Quite which part or parts of the Proloque attack these abuses is not clear to me. There is a reference to a malcontent at the opening to the Proloque, with a classic description of one malcontent, and it is possible that the "Blacke Sauntus" sung by the "Austen Friers at Genova" and their version of a litany of the Saints addressed to various heretics is the attack on atheists and heretics Harington mentions. Generally though, Harington's claim seems only weakly borne out by the Proloque, so perhaps the Prologue was included in the "briefe sum of the true intent of the booke" to make the construction appear even tidier than it is.

The contents of the New Discourse, apart from the letters and Proloque, are confusingly titled The Metamorphosis of Ajax, which is the name usually given to the whole book. I shall continue to call it the New Discourse. This has, as I outlined above, three distinct sections, defined and delineated by Harington with specific reference to their contents and intent.
The first section has the following properties, according to Harington's scheme: it "justifies the homelyest wordes" and "begins gravely, and ends lightly". It also attacks, as we have seen Harington claim, various undesirable types of people, and "pride and sensualitie". The public use of words referring to scatological matters is defended by citing biblical examples, Classical divinites, emblems, epigrams, and even a little history, with hunters' terms thrown in for good measure. It certainly fulfills its promise to justify the use of the "homelyest wordes." After encountering Harington's plethora of evidence for the respectable use of such terms, the reader is inclined to wonder how he could ever have been upset by them.

As for beginning gravely and ending lightly, this claim is harder to substantiate, for the section opens with a jest, and has a number of other jokes scattered through the early, presumably grave, part. But it is, perhaps, more serious than the latter half, since it deals with biblical examples of the use of supposedly impolite words, but more especially because it makes a serious moral statement, though this is so well camouflaged by humour that one might fail to notice it, were it not for Harington's unequivocal statement of the intent of the section.

In a brief introduction Harington sets out his message. First to show his intention to amuse, he opens with a humorous anecdote. But secondly, and far more importantly, he launches an attack on those who are too fine to be concerned with excrement,
even though they must perforce defecate, those who are too proud
to consider their own humanity, who set themselves above human
functions. To be able to admit one shits is merely to be honest.
Harington abhors what we would call 'double-think', and this same
attitude is found in his opinions on religion in the Apologie.

In fact, it underlies the whole book. He states his belief quite
categorically at the opening:

"I know that the wiser sort of men will consider,
and I wish that the ignorant sort would learne;
how it is not the basenesse, or homelinesse,
either of words, or matters, that makes them foule
& obscenous, but their base minds, filthy
conceits, or lewd intents that handle them." (23)

Then he continues in this grave vein:
Surely, if we would enter into a sober, and sad
consideration of our estates... we shall observe,
that the joyes we enjoy in this world, consist
rather in indolentia... which is an avoiding of

grievances and inconveniences, then in possessing
any passing great pleasures; so durable are the
harmes, that our first parents fal hath laid on
us, and so poore the helps that we have in our
selves." (24)

In this passage, and its continuation Harington manages to
combine several unlikely elements by sleight of hand. He begins
with a 'contemptus mundi' which accords with the attack on pride

on the page preceding it, but swiftly and adroitly brings this
resume" of the world's worthlessness back to the subject of the book- privies- by way of a jest. The swift transition Harinington makes from the "short & momentarie... contentments that we fish for" to the man who in his middle age found lechery no more or less pleasurable than "to go to a good easie close stoole, when he hath had a lust thereto" (25) gives the impression, no doubt intentional, that all worldly pleasures, and all worldly things are no more, and no less than a "jakes." All things come down to the same end, so why should we despise it so? Harinington is not yet finished with his moral point, nor with his attack on "pride and sensualitie" (however oblique this attack may seem). He returns from this reductionist anecdote, to his earlier point about the double-standard and moral stupidity of those who are offended by "privie matters" but let gross sin pass without comment. The tale of the Hermit and the Angel, as told by "the grand-mother of all my wife's children" (26), is in the tradition of moral exempla found in sermons. It states quite plainly in story terms what Harinington has just said: it is our sinful selves which are foul, not our bodily functions.

A further statement of this fundamental moral point is to be found in the third section of the New Discourse, when Harinington, summing up his book, observes "A Jax when he is at his worst, yeelds not a more offensive savour to the finest nosthrils, then some of the faults I have noted do, to God and the world." (27)
This moral point firmly made, Harington gets on with the business of the first section, which is to show how common references to defecation and other 'unmentionable' subjects are in earlier writings. The curious fact about his account is how cleanly he writes about 'dirty' matters. In spite of his remark that Philostilipnos had "broken the yce" with the use of the term "shyting-place", Harington still prefers to show how much can be said without using words which will offend (even though they should not offend). He both pretends to be "scurril" and refrains from being so. He leaves Latin epigrams in the original if he thinks they will not translate decently and misremembers English epigrams on purpose, to make them less crude. He leaves out the rhyme-word in his own epigram on leeks (28), and uses periphrases regularly. (29)

As for attacks on "malcontents, Epicures, Atheists, heretickes" and so on, they are not to be found in this section. However, perhaps this troublesome list should be construed as a particularized equivalent to "pride and sensualitie". That is to say, it is people like malcontents, epicures, atheists, and careless and dissolute Christians who set up the false standard, who refuse to be honest about their own humanity, who make evil out of natural processes, instead of acknowledging their own short-comings. It is people of these kinds who turn up their noses at a dung-farmer, but not at a courtesan, and who consider a prayer made while sitting "on a draught" to be "unmeet".
The second section of the New Discourse "proves the matter not to be contemptible", and "begins pleasantly and ends soberly". It also "gives a due praise without flatterie, to one that is worthie of it, and a just checke without gall, to some that deserve it." (30) It is the longest of the three sections by a considerable amount, and ostensibly concerns the care that has in the past been given to the provision of adequate sanitary facilities. However, as Harington's own admission makes clear, it is also concerned with personalities. These personalities are veiled under the persons of emperors and other public figures whose sanitary provisions Harington sets out. It is not easy to tell which ancient figures represent contemporaries of Harington's, although it seems fairly clear that Essex is praised under the quise of Trajan and that some unknown persons are satirised as the Bruti and perhaps as Claudius also. Nevertheless, the ostensible task, to show how "the greatest magistrates that ever were, have employed their wits, their care, and their cost, about these places" (31), is well carried out, with numerous convincing examples wedged in between the satirical (and now almost incomprehensible) sallies. The authorities cited in this section begin with the "prophane" and end with the "divine", whereas in the first section the biblical examples came first, and the secular examples second. To say that the second section "begins pleasantly and ends soberly" is only roughly accurate, for although the soberer content of the section is toward the end, there is the usual scattering of jests throughout. This description may refer to the movement from "prophane" to "divine", however.
The sober content just referred to is the attack on the authors of The Reformation of Religion by Josiah, a production of the Brownist heretical sect. It may be the Brownists to whom Harington delivers the "just check without call", although it is not possible to be sure. This attack is neatly, but somewhat tenuously, tied into the subject of privies by means of London's Dougate (or Doungate), Jerusalem's Porta Stercoris and gehenna. Gehenna leads to the controversy surrounding gehenna and Hell, and the original devastation of gehenna by Josiah. By this route Harington arrives at the subject of the latter-day Josiah's Reformation. His attack on the Brownists seems at odds with the tolerance he propounds elsewhere in the book, but on examination it does appear consistent. It is precisely the intolerance of the heretics that Harington abhors, and which makes him vehement in attacking them: "they would ruinate our cathedrall churches, and make them Speluncam latronum." (32) This passage is more sober than anything else in the section but is followed by a fairly light-hearted piece on how to reform a smoking chimney, dropping eaves and a "brauling woman". However, the second section actually concludes with some fairly serious reflections on the connection between 'unwholesome privies' and disease. Harington's assertion that the section ends soberly is more or less justified by these passages on the Brownists, and on disease.
The second section of the New Discourse is rather less unified than the first. Nonetheless, Hariington rarely digresses from his main thread for any length of time. When he does so, it is generally for some specific end, such as the praise of Trajan or the attack on the Brownists, both pieces of some importance, one feels, in Hariington's scheme. (33)

In the third section "shewing the forme, and how it may be reformed", the matter is "mixt both seriously and merily." One might be forgiven for supposing that the other sections had been equally as mixed, since jests are scattered uniformly through them. But in the third section there is no obvious progression from 'divine' to secular sources, or vice versa, as there is in the first two. There is, in fact, a certain shortage of material here, despite Hariington's confident assertion that "the third part as it teacheth indeed a reformation of the matter in question, so it toucheth in sport, a reprehension of some praises too much in custome" (34), a description which would lead one to expect a humorous survey of contemporary vices.

The section concerns itself with other devices which attempt a reform of the stinking privy, with the absurdities of Sir Hugh Plat the 'inventor', with an attack on Monopolies, and with an account of the inception of Hariington's own invention. These pieces seem to be strung together, and give the impression, rather, of the last parts of a Nashe farrago, where the attempt
at unity seems to have fallen down. Harington does connect his pieces quite deftly, however, twinning the satire of Plat with the attack on Monopolies, by suggesting that Plat should join Harington in applying for a Monopoly. The description of the company in which Harington thought up his device is deliberately introduced as a tail-piece ("I will not end abruptly here... I will first... tell you somewhat of the place, of the company that first put so necessary a conceyt in my hed" (35)), and so need not be bound into the text. It concludes the book very nicely, in fact, for it returns to the stately house/lowlv device contrast stated by Philostilpnos in the opening letter. This juxtaposition of the lowly and noble is current throughout the book (for example, the Venetian gentleman who entertains on the close stool (36)), and is here brought into prominence, providing a fitting end to this paradoxical book.

In the second book, the Anatomie, as I have said, there is relatively little added to the satirical or moral meaning of the other two books. Combe's purpose seems to be quite simply to present the plans for the device, and entertain the reader to a certain degree. The inclusion of the rebus on Harington's name at the end of this part was obviously considered fairly important, since Harington in his remarks to the printer insisted that it be included. Combe states that "a booke without name may be called a libell" (37); Harington clearly wished to make sure his book was not considered a libel.
The Apology, although functioning as a defence of the New Discourse and the Anatomie, does rather more than merely defend these pamphlets. Each part contains a different element. In the first there is a defence of the book by a satirical account of those who criticise it, and a discussion of the types of people who should and should not read it. In the second section, which covers the impanelling of the jury, there is the defence of some of Harington's friends and relatives, notably the long defence of Thomas Markham. The third section is a statement of some of Harington's attitudes, and, though jocular in tone, it embodies the most significant statement of his doctrine of toleration: "I am a protesting Catholic puritan." That Harington finishes the book on this note is not accidental, given the care with which all three parts which make up the book are constructed. As he began with a clear, but graceful statement against pride and intolerance, so he ends with another statement against intolerance, unmistakable for all the humour that surrounds it. It may be precisely this statement of tolerance which is the jewel Harington refers to in his last line: Gallus gallinaceus dum vertit stercorarium inventit gemmam.

In attempting to sum the book up, I find it necessary to distinguish several different levels of 'purpose'. The relative weight each reader gives to the various purposes of the book is partly subjective, for Harington gives no clear statement of his intentions. Of the greatest significance I would consider the
moral and religious statements which open and close the first and third parts respectively, and the design of the water-closet which is the physical centre of the book. On a second level - although there is room for argument here - I would place Harington's wish to have himself noticed, his desire to produce an impossible paradox of a book, and to entertain his friends and other possible readers. Of similar importance, I think, are the satirical attacks on political enemies, the praise of Essex and the defence of Sheldon and Markham. On yet another level I would set miscellaneous pieces, such as the attack on the Brownists, the plea for the city of Bath, and the attack on monopolies. These pieces are seriously intended, even though they have less importance than the other matters mentioned. These various and varied aims do not conflict. This book is a true farrafo, a medley of ideas and genres, but amazingly, out of all its diversity comes unity. This we must attribute to the wit and care Harington has used in putting it all together.

Now we must consider the different generic parts of which this unified whole is composed.
The paradoxical encomium is a literary form in which the Metamorphosis of Ajax lays claim in the first instance. Harington places his work in the company of seven other works written in praise of unworthy or unlikely subjects, the most important of these being The Praise of Folly by Erasmus. Although the works Harington cites are all Renaissance products, the genre is a very ancient one. A.S. Pease, in his article 'Things without Honor' describes its genesis and provides reasons for its popularity in antiquity. It was, he says, both a fertile area for writers, and a politically safe one, and also provided excellent oratorical training. Pease also mentions the generic difficulties attached to the paradoxical encomium, or 'adoxography' as it is called, showing how it shades into other genres, such as the Theophrastan character, the essay and the epistle. Pease then lists the subjects of such encomia in antiquity, the most famous being Polycrates' defence of Busiris, 'the mythical inhuman Egyptian king' (40), Gordias' and Isocrates' encomia of Helen of Troy, and Synesius' praise of baldness, which he wrote in answer to Dio of Prusa's eulogy of hair. The most important Classical adoxographist, as far as the Renaissance was concerned, was Lucian, whose praise of the fly, (Laus muscae), of parasites (Parasitus), and of tyranny (Phalaris) inspired Renaissance practitioners of the form. (42)
Of Mediaeval encomiography little is said by Pease, or any other scholar, although some mock encomia are known from the Middle Ages. Miller mentions some Mediaeval works which can be described as encomiographic, but they tend to be serious in subject, and not disposed to frivolity, as for example the De laude flagellorum of St. Peter Damian. (43)

In the Renaissance the form flourished again, in acknowledged imitation of the Classical form. The most famous example, Erasmus' Moriae Encomium or Praise of Folly (1511), cites certain Classical examples as precedents:

"Well, those who are offended by frivolity and fun in a thesis may kindly consider that mine is not the first example of this; the same thing has often been done by famous authors in the past. Homer amused himself ages ago with his 'Battle of the Frogs and Mice', Virgil with his Gnat and Garlic Salad, Ovid with his Nut. Polycrates wrote a mock eulogy of the tyrant Busiris and so did his critic Isocrates; Glaucio spoke in favour of injustice and Favorinus of Thersites and the quartan fever; Synesius praised baldness and Lucian the Fly and the Parasite. Seneca was joking in his 'Apotheosis' of the Emperor Claudius, as Plutarch was in his dialogue between Gryllus and Ulysses. Lucian and Apuleius both wrote in fun about an ass, and some one whose name
escapes me about the last will and testament of the quill Grunnius Corocotta: this is mentioned by St. Jerome." (44)

This list is significant in two ways. Firstly it confirms the link with the Classical adoxographic literature, since the list occurs in the Preface, in which Erasmus is addressing More seriously, and there is no need for the reader to interpolate Folly between the remarks and their meaning. One may assume that Erasmus was genuinely connecting his work to those ancient mock encomia. Secondly the use of precedents became in itself, after Erasmus, something of a tradition, reaching its apotheosis in the great list in Nashes Lenten Stuffe, which we will have cause to consider later. At present, it is merely enough to note that Harington was following Erasmus' example in citing earlier examples, although Harington's list has some interesting differences, as I shall show.

The form proved very popular in the Renaissance. A catalogue of titles published in 1619 gives literally hundreds of examples of Latin paradoxical encomia, ancient and contemporary (45), and Nashe's list mentioned above gives a selection of 'praises' written in the Renaissance. Although primarily written in Latin (46), the form also spread into vernacular literatures. Italian and French mock encomia appeared in the course of the sixteenth century (47); a few English examples are to be found also, and I shall deal with them in the chapter on Nashes Lenten Stuffe. The principal concern in this place will be with the works Harington
himself cites as precedents.

Harington's seven authors are not named:

"One writes in prais of follie. 2. an other in honour of the Pox. 3. a third defendes usurie. 4. a fourth commends Nero. 5. a fift extolls and instructs bawderie. 6. the sixt displayes and describes Puttana Errante, which I here will

come forth shortly in English. 7. A seventh (whom I would guesse by his writing, to be groome of the stoole to some Prince of the bloud in Fraunce) writes a beastly treatise onelv to examine what is the fittest thing to wype withall." (48)

Elizabeth Donno identifies these seven authors as follows; the first is certainly Erasmus. The third and fourth are probably Sperone Speroni, author of Dialogo della Usura, and Girolamo Cardano, who wrote a Neronis Encomium. The seventh is clearly Rabelais, and in fact, 'Rables' is given in the marginal note on this passage. The second author could be one of two Renaissance Italian writers, or a Frenchman, all of whom wrote on the Pox. La Putana Errante was similarly the title of two Italian books, one a poem, another a dialogue. The fifth author may well be Aretino. The distinguishing mark of these seven books is that they are all Renaissance, as far as can be told, and none of them seems to be English. Harington does not mention any Classical
defences of trivial objects, which are recurrent in lists such as this (49), and of the number of mock encomia available for citation in such a list (50) he uses only a small selection. Since there is some doubt as to which works Harrington is referring to, it is difficult to make any general statements about the books chosen for this list as a group, but there seems to be a deliberate attempt to select the more outrageous paradoxical encomia from among those currently being written in Europe, and by limiting the number to throw emphasis on those chosen. The emphasis falls particularly on the first and last books in Harrington's list: Erasmus' Praise of Folly, and the thirteenth chapter of the first book of Gargantua and Pantagruel (1534). The first receives emphasis from its primary position, obviously enough, and also from the remark further on that "though my discourse will not be so wise as the first of those seven I spake of, that prayses folly: yet it shall be civiller then the second, truer then the third...." (51) Erasmus is the only author in the list to whom Harrington bows. The chapter from Rabelais receives special emphasis because of the space allotted to it; after the sentence quoted above, which ends "the fittest thing to wype withall", Harrington continues

"...alleging that white paper is too smooth, brown paper too rough, wollen cloth too thick, or perhaps too costly: but he concludes, that a goose necke to be drawne betweene the legs against the fethers, is the most delicate and cleanly thing that may be." (52)
It therefore seems reasonable to consider briefly Harington's relation to Erasmus and Rabelais, even though the two works, the Praise of Folly and Gargantua and Pantagruel belong to different kinds.

Sister M. Geraldine writing on 'Erasmus and the Tradition of Paradox' infers that Harington must have undervalued the Praise of Folly since he quotes it in such poor company. Sister M. Geraldine, it seems to me, rather undervalues The Metamorphosis since she says of it: "Sir John Harington... in The Metamorphosis of Ajax mentions the Praise as one of many such pieces, serious treatments of light subjects, of which he cites seven. The Praise heads the list, although the other six are no more of its kind than the the Metamorphosis itself..." (53) Sister Geraldine, like several scholars before her, was unable to see past the subject matter of the Metamorphosis, to the true resemblance to the Praise of Folly which underlies it. It is salutary to notice that in Erasmus' own time the Praise was misunderstood, and thought to be a satirical portrait of folly, rather than a complex Christian-humanist discourse on the nature of true wisdom. (54) It should not surprise us therefore, that Harington's lesser work of the same type is still misunderstood.
The key to the resemblance between the two books (apart from generic likenesses between two mock encomia) is the image of the Silenus, which is fundamental to the Praise, and also acts as a perfect image of the Metamorphosis. Of this figure Erasmus writes: "...it seems that the Sileni were small images divided in half, and so constructed that they could be opened out and displayed; when closed they represented some ridiculous, ugly flute-player, but when they opened they suddenly revealed the figure of a god." (55) He refers to it in the Praise thus:

"It's well known that all human affairs are like the figures of Silenus described by Alcibiades and have two completely opposite faces so that what is death at first sight, as they say, is life if you look within, and vice versa, life is death. The same applies to beauty and ugliness, riches and poverty, obscurity and fame, learning and ignorance, strength and weakness... in fact you'll find everything suddenly reversed if you open the Silenus." (56)

Both Levi in his commentary and Kaiser in his study Praisers of Folly, consider this the central image of the book. Writing of the process he calls 'transvaluation of values' - Erasmus' method in this book - Kaiser says: "The entire concept of the transvaluation of values is postulated on this simple assumption" (i.e. that all human affairs are Sileni). He continues:

"It finds its authorities in Socrates, who claimed
that ignorance was wisdom, and in Christ, who claimed that death was life. At the same time, the image of the Silenus has another function: it bears not only the implication of paradox but the hint of concealment as well. The internal truth is hidden behind the external façade, even as the seriousness is hidden within the jesting."

(57)

On the previous page Kaiser writes: "...on the surface (arcane literature) may seem ridiculous and trifling, but underneath it contains divine wisdom." (58) Although Kaiser refers here only to Erasmus and Rabelais, the same remarks could be made about Harington. The anecdote about the dung-farmer and the courtesan, told at the beginning of the New Discourse, is a perfect example of a Silenus; and indeed, the whole book with its clean defence of a dirty subject, its amazing attempt to defend tolerance through fooling, its ennobling of a lowly matter is itself a Silenus. I have already remarked on the Silenus paradoxes in the opening letters. No one regarding the book and its subject could guess what lay inside the grotesque exterior.

Like Erasmus, Harington uses his apparently trifling work for a serious end, and incidentally aims satire in various directions in the course of it. Erasmus' satire is much more general and copious; it covers all sorts and conditions of men, whereas Harington, apart from his general moral sallies, only attacks specific persons or abuses, such as the Brownists and monopolies. Nevertheless, the two do have this third similarity, in that both
use a paradox not only for a serious moral and religious message, but also for a series of satirical attacks.

The relationship between Harington and Rabelais is not so straightforward. Gargantua and Pantagruel had little influence on the form of The Metamorphosis; Rabelais' influence on Harington is rather on his style and manner, and so (unfortunately) of rather less interest to this study, which is concerned with literary traditions and forms. Nonetheless, a word must be said about Rabelais' connection with The Metamorphosis, since he is emphasised by Harington himself.

A comparison of Harington's work with Rabelais' is to be found in Huntington Brown's book Rabelais in English Literature (59); Brown devotes a whole section to The Metamorphosis. (60)

Apart from the two specific references to Rabelais in the Prologue: - the resume' of chapter 13 of Book I, and the fictitious book "the xiii book of his tenth Decad" (61), Brown finds that overall Harington caught "the charm of (Rabelais') miscellaneous learning, his mock-gravity, and his healthy coarseness." (62) He goes on to demonstrate the many similarities between The Metamorphosis and Rabelais' work, noting for example, the delight in natural and sensual matters, the dislike of intolerance, the use of popular literature, thorough knowledge and very frequent use of Classical tales and exempla, and
constant reference to Classical literature. Brown even goes as far as to say: "Owing perhaps to the expository rather than narrative character of his work (Harington) makes proportionately more learned references than Rabelais." He adds that "Rabelais surpasses him in sharpening the contrast between the depth of his learning and the ridiculous uses to which it is put." (63) This difference is due also to the different purposes and lengths of the two books. Harington is attempting a serious end in a short space, out of comic beginnings; he does not want, or need to make his own antics a source of fun, since he needs to convince his reader of his seriousness, in spite of his ability to entertain them. It is interesting to read, by way of contrast, C.S. Lewis' opinion of the difference between Harington and Rabelais. Lewis writes:

"The style is modelled (in places closely) on that of Rabelais. Yet Harington is very unlike his master. Rabelais was a fighter, defending humanism and attacking the monks. He was also an inventor in the realm of Nonsense.... Harington lacks both qualities. He is too frivolous, too detached to be as robustly comic as (the earlier English humorists. More had been a grave droll and Nashe a clown; Harington is only a wag." (64)

The inclusion of Rabelais in the list of seven authors does not really justify making a derogatory comparison between Harington and Rabelais. Although Harington had read and was influenced by Rabelais, his inclusion in the list does not imply
that we are to see the *Metamorphosis* as a work in imitation of
--

Rabelais. Rabelais, like the others cited, represents respectable writers who have produced works on unacceptable topics, and that is all. A more curious feature of the inclusion of this piece from Rabelais in this list is that the piece is not a paradoxical encomium. If Harington merely desired to show Rabelais as a model in the writing of mock encomia he could have cited Panurge's praise of debt, or of the codpiece in Book iii, which are much more like paradoxical encomia than the catalogue of 'torcheculs' in Book i. The point is, though, that Harington starts the list of authors off to look as if it were a standard list of paradoxical encomia, but ends it by citing a piece which looks as if it were a paradoxical encomium also, but is of a different kind. It is a catalogue and a celebration. Harington was using Rabelais not as a pointer to the literature he hoped to write, but as a subtle indication of the nature of own work.

For, as the splendid catalogue of 'torcheculs' might have been a mock encomium of the 'wipebreech', but is something other, so *The Metamorphosis* of Ajax though it looks initially like a paradoxical encomium of a water-closet, is nothing of the sort. It has certain basic ingredients of that kind; as Colie puts it: "...one is supposed to ask, what is intrinsically ignoble about a nut, or a flea, or a water closet (the subject of a famous encomium by Sir John Harington)?" (65) Certainly, the whole area of the water-closet and bodily functions is defended, and made to appear a perfectly reasonable subject of discourse. But
Harington's book does not praise the water-closet; rather, it argues the desirability of an honest approach to a taboo subject. It concerns itself with foolish mental barriers and 'double-think', and uses the starting point of the water-closet to achieve this. In addition, of course, it aims to disseminate the concept and plans of the water-closet itself. Harington quite seriously propounds his invention, not as an adjunct to his defence of lowly matters, or as a cover for his satire, but as a matter of equal importance. In a paradoxical encomium, the perverseness of praising something unworthy is paramount. Harington's aim is to show that there is nothing unworthy about a water-closet, and therefore no paradox in his treating it seriously. That he sets out to have his book taken for a straightforward paradoxical encomium is a joke on the reader, similar to the joke created by his pretending to use "scurril" phrases and almost entirely avoiding them. The same sleight-of-hand is to be discerned in the manner in which Harington leads up to the description of his device in the New Discourse, and then barely describes it, and in the sly way he moves from the matter of privies to morality and back. All of this could be summed up as Harington unsettling the reader in order to disturb his complacency about himself.
THE TREATISE

I shall briefly mention another kind of which Harington made use in his farrago; the mechanical treatise. The figure of Archimedes is used by Harington to symbolise the tradition of mechanical inventions which precedes his own. Archimedes appears in the first diagram of the device, described as 'the rare engineer' and is described in the third section of the New Discourse as "the excellent engineer, (a man in his time fully as famous in Syracuse, as our M. Plat is here in England)." No mechanical treatises by Archimedes survive, and it is probable he wrote only one; Plutarch said of him that "he would not deign to leave behind him any writings on his mechanical discoveries." Nonetheless, several writers describe Archimedes' mechanical inventions, among them Diodorus, Vitruvius and Cicero and Plutarch. As well as formidable engines of war, Archimedes is credited with making a planetarium, a hydraulic organ and a screw to raise water. This latter makes him a particularly suitable patron saint for the Harington invention. Archimedes, whom Plutarch praises in glowing terms as "a man who possessed such exalted ideas, such profound superhuman vision, and such a wealth of scientific knowledge..."(66), is clearly history's most notable maker of devices, who gives to Harington's invention decided respectability.
Popular interest in science increased enormously in sixteenth century England. (67) This is well attested by the number of books on the subject which appeared in this century. One branch of this— the invention and dissemination of mechanical devices—was likewise of some popular interest, although the number of books published in England on inventions was quite small. On the Continent, however, a large number of treatises on mechanical inventions were published in the course of the sixteenth century, and we may assume that Harington knew of these, or perhaps had seen some of them, since he was acquainted with much French and Italian writing. The more famous books of this kind are Jacques Besson's *Theatre des instruments mathematiques et mechaniques* (1579), Agostino Ramelli's *Le diverse et artificiose machine* (1588), and especially Georgius Agricola's *De Re Metallica* (1556), which was translated into German and Italian, and possibly also into French and Spanish. The Italian translation, by Michael Florio, was dedicated to Queen Elizabeth, and therefore possibly had some circulation at the English court. (68) These books describe and illustrate a variety of machines, notably pumps and mills, but also other devices such as spits, lathes, jacks and derricks. (69) The books are beautifully illustrated with detailed plans and have specific descriptions of the dimensions of the machines. Although the standard of the engravings in them is much higher than Combe's, it is possible to see Harington and Combe's drawings as products of roughly the same impulse which produced those elegant plates in Agricola or Ramelli. Although there were no English versions of these works,
five illustrations from Besson's treatise were used by Cyprian Lucar in his work A Treatise named Lucarsolace, printed in London in 1592. One of these, for example, is of "a type of squirt which hath bene devised to cast much water upon a burning house." (70)

In England, as I have noted the literature of mechanical inventions was quite small (71); it had one devoted author in the person of Hugh Plat, who produced many designs of use and enterprise. His major collection of inventions is The Jewell House of Art and Nature (1594), which Harington satirises in the Metamorphosis. His attitude to Plat is curious, since much of Plat's work was admirable, and has been endorsed by modern writers (72), and also because Harington recognised that his device was of the same kind as those Plat laid forth, or hinted at: "I was advised by some to have recommended this devise to your (i.e. Plat's) illustrations." (73) If this is ironical, the irony undercuts Harington's device as much as Plat's inventions, but, in fact, Harington seems to be totally serious about his invention. It would appear that his attitude to Plat is ambivalent: he acknowledges that Plat is indeed an inventor, but he ridicules him nonetheless for his manner of presenting his inventions.
The treatise section of the Metamorphosis is given prominence by its central position: it comes in the middle of the middle book. Although it is only a few pages in length, its centrality lends it weight. In it, Combe is very specific, and although some humour creeps in among the directions, as for example, "This is Don a Jax house of the new fashion", there is no suggestion that the device should be taken lightly. The directions are detailed, so detailed that Combe suggests: "that Children & busie folke, disorder it not, or open the sluice with putting in their hands, without a key, you should have a little button or scallop shell to bind it downe...." (74) The price of each part is given and these prices were revised between the manuscript and the printed version, which indicates the care Harrington and Combe took to make their plan practical.

This portion of the farrago differs from most of the other pieces we examine in other places. Generally speaking, when a farraginous element takes up as small a part of the whole as the treatise section of the Metamorphosis does, that element is of small importance to the mixture. In this case, however, the small central section, comprising less than a hundred lines and two diagrams, is also central to the book. It is the excuse for all the rest, the climax of the whole first part of the book. To stress its importance it has its own title page. This gives it much more weight than its length deserves. Nonetheless, its briefness is still obvious, and this helps to emphasise the fact that although the treatise is a highly important part of the
book, it is only a part.

THE JEST BOOK

--- ---- ----

The jest-book, although a significant popular literary form, has not been studied at any great length by English scholars. (75) The origins of the form are the subject of some debate, since jest books may descend equally well from Mediaeval sermon exempla, or from Continental facetiae. This particular matter has been discussed by several scholars, and is not likely to be resolved easily. (76) In the course of the transition from collections of exempla and facetiae, however, the jestbook lost both the moral content of the exempla, and much of the wit of the facetiae. Only the stories themselves or the puns remain. The earliest extant jest-books in both English and German provide interesting evidence of the mixed origins of the genre. According to F.P. Wilson (77), the earliest collection of jests in English is the series of translations called the Fables of Poge the Florentyn appended to Caxton’s Fables of Esope (1484). These fables, described by Wilson as jests, are partly drawn from Poggio’s Facetiae, the most famous humanist collection of jests. The earliest native English collection in existence is A C mery
Talys (1525/6), which draws most of its material from indigenous sources, whereas another early surviving jest-book, Tales and ouicke answeres (1536) draws on humanist sources, such as Poggio, Erasmus and More. (78) In Germany, the first jest-book to appear was Bebel's Facetiae tres libri (1508), which drew on the humanist tradition, and the second was Pauli's Schimpf und Ernst (1519) which, as Herford writes "though owing much to Bebel, is still more closely related to mediaeval collections, such as the Gesta Romanorum, or moral examples for use in the pulpit." (79) Kahrl is at some pains to show the relationship of jest-book stories to moral exempla. That the origin of jest-books is partly in Mediaeval homiletic exempla is relevant to the use of jest-book material in The Metamorphosis of Ajax, since in his book Harington uses the jest to underline a moral point on occasion, or to enliven a serious point. I shall demonstrate this procedure shortly.

The jest-book flourished in England in the sixteenth-century. Ernst Schulz (80) identifies three types of jest-book: detached collections of jokes, jest-biographies centred around one character, and collections of comic novelle. The first of these three is of most importance to the Metamorphosis, and the second
I discuss in relation to Have with you to Saffron-Walden. (81)

The third type does not concern the Farragoes discussed in this work greatly, except for the use of comic novelle in Dekker's The Raven's Almanack. (82) F.P. Wilson has pointed out the progression in the course of the century from jokes which were truly 'jests', or things done, to jests which rely on spoken humour, frequently a pun. Thomas Dekker distinguishes between these two sorts of jest in the introduction to his Jests to Make you Merry (1607), although by that date almost all jests were 'jests spoken'. (83)

In Ulysses upon Ajax Harington is accused of leaning upon A C merry Talys: "I could tell you more as hee hath done (out of that most learned author the booke of merrie tales from whence his best jests are derived)." (84) This accusation is overstated, as are most of the accusations in that scurrilous book, but there is undoubtedly some connection between jest-book collections and The Metamorphosis of Ajax. Harington's book is not in any formal sense derived from the jest-book; A C merry Talys and Tales and quicke answeres, for example, are completely unstructured, mere successions of jests with titles, such as "Of the maydes answere that was with chylde. xliv." or "Of the Welcheman that delivered the letter to the ape. xlvi." (85) or "Howe Alexander was
monysshed to slee the fyrste that he mette. lxxvi."
"or "Howe the cite of Lamsac was saved from destruction. lxviii."

There is no grouping of jests, although similar subjects recur frequently, as, for example, jests 14, 28, 29, 46, 59, 79 & 89 in A C mery Talys, which are all about Welshmen (as Wilson points out, the favourite butt of sixteenth-century English racist jokes). There are seven jests about priests and sixteen about friars scattered more or less evenly through the collection of a hundred. Very occasionally jests which have something in common may be contiguous, for example, jests 52, 53, 54 & 55 which concern the Paternoster, Ave Maria, articles of the Creed and Ten Commandments, and show several different ways of learning them without absorbing their meaning. Harington used these books only for material; he could not be said to have produced a sophisticated jest-book, in spite of the quantity of jests in the early part of the book. He is rather returning jest-book material to one of its original uses, that is as pleasant exempla of moral points.

There are only two occasions on which Harington uses identifiable material from a jest-book (87), but it must be remembered that much jest-book literature has not survived. There are numerous anecdotes and witty apothegms throughout the New Discourse, many of which may have come from lost jest-books.

The first and second sections of the New Discourse are the most richly endowed with jests, and the second letter has several.
The first letter, Prologue, and third section have few, if any, jests in them, but why this should be so is not easy to determine. This is perhaps because the Prologue is consistently humorous in its narrative, and so needs no jests to supplement it; the first letter is mainly concerned with civilities and preparing the ground for what is to follow. The shortage of jests in the third section of the first book is harder to account for. There are two tales which are not especially comic, one of Archimedes leaping from his bath, and another of an Italian who discovered how to prevent the Venetian arsenal exploding (88), and another grimly comic tale of a friar whose sermon consisted of the words "Matto san Pietro" (89), and one joke whose tag is left in Italian. It may be that Harington, having woed his readers in the first two sections, considers them won in the third, and is content to pass on information, explain himself and put his case roundly without a larding of jests.

The jests in the first letter and first two sections take several forms. First there are complete tales, which might have stepped out of any collection of exempla or jests, tales like that of the Hermit and the Angel, or the apothegms of Sir Thomas More, or the tale about Claudius and Vespasian. (90) These stories are included for a variety of ends: the story of the Hermit and the Angel makes a direct moral point; the More jests remind the reader of the gravity of More, as well as his wit, and so develop the connection between respectable sources, and disreputable subjects; the stories about the Roman Emperors,
while providing comic relief from the historical material, may also have some satirical relevance, which is now lost. Other such tales are introduced for different reasons. The opening story about 'M. Jaques Wingfield' opens the New Discourse with a comic flourish, while establishing very pointedly the folly of false scruples over words.

Another sort of jest used by Harington has the potential of an anecdote, but is just alluded to, or is passed over quickly. Examples of this kind are the man in church who said 'he-hem' instead of "Amen", or the lady who could never eat parsnips "after she heard how they grew." (91) These jests act as a comic seasoning to the text, and keep the serious parts from heaviness.

The same function, on a smaller scale, is performed by the third sort of jest, which is no more than a pun or humorous turn of words, or a witty aside- jokes thrown off even more lightly than those in the second category. Verbal jokes of this kind are scattered throughout the book, and some are no more than a conceited turn of phrase: "they will say, I am a proper scholar, and well seen in latrina lingua" (92), or

"it were good to make a pause, & (as it were at a long dinner) to take away the first course; which commonly is of the coursest meate, as... fresh biefe and garliske; for that hath three properties, more suting to this discourse: viz. to make a man winke, drinke, and stinke." (93)
Harington's jokes are primarily jests spoken rather than jests done. And in fact the three types of joke are not really distinct, for the third type, the pun or witty turn of phrase, is the basis of the first and second types. The distinction between the types in Harington's work is more a matter of function; some jests are only to amuse, others to instruct, and some to make a point neatly.

Combe follows Harington in opening with a comic tale - about a servant, suitably, who seeing his master kiss the Pope's toe, ran away afraid "they would have made me, have kist him in some homlyer place" (94), a joke which although amusing is not as apt as Harington's tend to be. There are, naturally enough, relatively few jokes in the Anatomie, since it is so short, but those which Combe does include belong to the third or first types. One of Combe's jests is taken from A C mery Talys. (95)

In the Apologie jests of the first type virtually disappear. There are a few in the earlier part of this book: one about the King of the Lacedemonians playing with his son (96), and another very amusing one, about a young couple's repartee. (97) But the humour is mostly of the third type - puns, witticisms and amusing expressions. This is perhaps because of the different nature of the third part. In it Harington is on the defensive, and not the relaxed author who drops jests into his text at frequent intervals. In addition, the Apologie is composed of two
new kinds—the dream and the ‘jury’—and has also elements of the debate. With these three kinds in it already the presence of the jest-book could easily seem de trop. But there is a certain amount of verbal humour in this third book, and as a bonus, a fourth type of jesting, not found in the other parts. This is the satire of types, which is directed towards amateur critics, miserly gentry, and others. (98)

Harington displays considerable flexibility in his use of jests and is not merely inserting them at regular intervals to keep the text from dragging. The text is genuinely funny in itself, and the jokes are chosen with care to fit in without dominating, and to make a point succinctly, without lewdness. To some extent it is true that Harington used jest books, such as Aemery Talys as source books, probably more than we can now gauge. This is not, surely, the shame that the author of Ulysses upon Ajax suggests it to be, for Harington’s jokes do not stand out of the text, but are an essential part of it.
THE DREAM

The whole of the third part of The Metamorphosis of Ajax is in the form of a dream.

"I know not how, but betimes one morning when we use commonly to take our sweetest sleepe, namely betweene eight and halfe houre past ten, I was either in so straunge a dreame, or in so strong a melancholie, that me thought there came to me a nimble dapper fellow...." (99)

The 'dapper fellow' relates the meeting of critics, and their censures. Then Harington, still in his dream, is arraigned on their charges, and calls his jury. He defends himself, and awakes. "And with that I awaked, vowing I would never write any more such idle toys, if this were well taken:" (100) Apart from these framing remarks, the dream is not mentioned again. Nonetheless, as the dream form was common, and important in European literature, Harington was no doubt alluding to the traditions of the form when he chose to cast his defence as a dream.

The dream was primarily used in Classical literature as a vehicle for prophecy, for divine interference in human events, or demonic misguidance. (101) There are many dreams of this kind in the works of Homer, Virgil and Ovid. Although the dreams in the Aenid and in Ovid's Metamorphoses were known in Mediaeval Europe, the most influential 'dream form' was the Somnium
Scipionis of Cicero, which is appended to the De Re Publica in an imitation of the Myth of Er which ends Plato's Republic. (102)

This was the only part of Cicero's De Re Publica which was known in the Middle Ages (103), and its fame was chiefly due to the commentary written by Macrobius around 400 A.D. (104) The dream of Scipio is used by Cicero to give apparently supernatural information about cosmology and the destination of the human soul after death. It was understandably attractive to the Middle Ages, as it was a "pagan vision which could be easily understood or reinterpreted in Christian terms." (105) Macrobius' commentary dealt with the Somnium in terms of a theoretical discourse on the five kinds of dreams defined by Macrobius.

As well as this Classical influence on the writing of dream literature, there was also a powerful influence from a Christian source: Boethius' De Consolatio Philosophiae which was translated in the course of the Middle Ages by Jean de Meun, continuer of the Roman de la Rose, and by Chaucer. This work is not explicitly a dream, but rather a supernatural vision. It is thought to have inspired a number of Mediaeval dream-poets, not least its two translators. (106)
The Christian tradition gave strength to the writing of dream-poems in a more direct way. There are, of course, numerous dreams and visions in the Old and New Testaments, in which God’s will is made known in clear or symbolic terms. The most powerful vision or dream, obviously, is the Revelation of St. John. Spearing also refers to the apocryphal Apocalypse of St. Paul, which was known to Dante and Chaucer and others. (107) The importance of visionary dreams in the Bible made the dream a popular form for didactic religious writing in the Middle Ages: Pearl, Piers Plowman, Wife and Waster and Parliament of the Three Ages are some of the numerous examples of such poems.

Perhaps imitation of these religious works was felt to confer respectability on other works in the same form. As Constance Hieatt writes: "All over Europe didactic poems galore were cast in the dream form." (108) One of the most significant of these was Alanus de Insulis’ poem De Planctu Naturae, written in the twelfth century. It is a long discourse, cast in the form of a vision, on the philosophy behind the Christian view of sexual love. One of the more unlikely uses of the dream form was in Oresme’s De commensurabilitate motum celestium written about 1370 in which Geometry and Arithmetic debate in a dream.
Many famous Mediaeval poems were written in this form; in addition to those already mentioned, Chaucer’s Booke of the Duchess, House of Fame, Parliament of Fowls and the prologue to The Legend of Good Women are in this kind. So are Lydgate’s The Temple of Glass and Clanvowe’s The Cuckoo and the Nightingale, and a number of Scottish poems, including the Kingis Quair.

(109) The form was used in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries in works like John Skelton’s Bowke of Court (1498) and Garland of Laurel (1523), and Gavin Douglas’ The Palice of Honour (1501). Later in the century come works like the anonymous Armonye of Bir1s (1550) and Anthony Copley’s A Fig for Fortune (1596). (110) Manfred Weidhorn shows that the form continued in good heart into the seventeenth century. (111) Francesco Colonna’s Hypnerotomachia was translated in 1592 by one R.D. and published as The Strife of Love in a Dream a title which aptly describes its form. (112) Robert Greene’s A Quip for an Upstart Courtier, important in another respect to The Metamorphosis of Ajax, was published in 1592 also. It opens in April, as do so many dream-works (113), with the author falling asleep: "solitarye seeking to solace my selfe I fell in a dreame, and in that drowsie slumber, I wandered into a vale." (114) Greene also used the dream form in his verse. (115)
Spearing shows that the writers of dream-poems were aware of other poems of the same kind, and were conscious of writing in a kind. The Roman de la Rose (the major dream poem of the Middle Ages) refers to Macrobius' commentary on the Somnium Scipionis and the De Planctu Naturae; in Piers Plowman there is discussion of biblical dreams. Spearing has numerous other examples and concludes his discussion thus:

"That mediaeval writers of dream poems were conscious of writing in an ancient tradition, going back to Scriptural and Classical sources, to which they felt a need to establish the relationship of their own poetic visions." (116)

Whether this sense of genre persisted into the sixteenth century is, of course, extremely difficult to determine, but there does seem to be a related sense of tradition shown by such works as A Fig for Fortune and A Quip for an Upstart Courtier, and perhaps F. T.'s Debate between Pride and Lowlinesse. The use of the dream-framework in these books seems to be a deliberate attempt to evoke the spirit of Piers Plowman, a work which, as we have seen in the previous chapter, was of considerable importance in the sixteenth century as a symbol of protest. There is no internal evidence with which to gauge Hariot's attitude to the genre, but it is nonetheless possible that in using it he was deliberately harking back to the traditional uses of the form, both for social comment and religious writing. This reinforces
the moral message conveyed by the Metamorphosis as a whole, and
found particularly in the Apologie, in the defence of Markham and
the statement of toleration. (117)

There are two additional reasons why Harington may have used
a dream form for his defence. Spearling notes how, in Mediaeval
dream-poetry, the poet himself comes more and more to the fore,
until in the latest work he deals with "the focus comes to be
explicitly on the role of the poet himself." (118) In Skelton's
Garland of Laurel there may even be mention of some of the poet's
enemies and rivals. (119) If Harington was aware of this use of
the dream earlier in the century he may have been alluding to it
in the defence of his work and the attack on his critics. (120)
More significant than this, however, is a general feature of the
dream as a literary form: its unreality. This confers two
advantages upon the writer: one, that the dreamer becomes a seer
- as Weidhorn writes "the mediaeval poet implies that if we had
sufficient insight this is what we would see while awake;
instead we attain the insight when the spirit is freed from the
flesh" (121) - the other, that the dreamer "could not be held
responsible for the contents of a dream, something quite beyond
his conscious control...." (122) Harington benefits by both of
these aspects of the dream's unreality. The added insight of the
dreamer strengthens his final assertions on tolerance, and the
unreality of the whole episode allows him to be free from
allegations of portraying particular persons (except the ones who
are named, of course) or of holding dangerous opinions, since he
could always claim not to be responsible for a 'dream'. As the epilogue to A Midsummer Night's Dream puts it:

If we shadows have offended
Think but this, and all is mended
That you have but slumb'red here
While these visions did appear.
And this weak and idle theme
No more yielding than a dream.

Although dreams may have supernatural significance, they can equally well be regarded as mere nothings. Perhaps this is a paradox which appealed to Harington.

Finally, we may note how in almost all dream works, the time and location of the dreaming are given. In Mediaeval dream-poems this is frequently April or May. (123) Greene follows this convention, as I noted, in A Quip, and Harington uses the time and location of his dream as a means to satirise himself and his class: "but betimes one morning when we use commonly to take our sweetest sleepe, namely betweene eight and halfe houre past ten..." -a time, of course, when most people were at work. Harington is careful also, to mention various possible causes of his dreaming, often a feature of dream literature. (124) However, in Harington's case, the causes of dreams are of a very pragmatic nature: "whether it were overwatching myselfe at primero, or eating too much venison...." He seems to be satirising the form in a very mild manner here. This produces an uncomfortable feeling in the reader: if the dream-form is
satirised, albeit mildly, how is one to regard the dream. Like much else in the book, the dream is a source of ambivalence, for in spite of his satire, and his assertion that it is an 'idle toy', there seems to me no doubt that Harington is perfectly serious about what he has to say in the dream.

IMPANNELLING THE JURY

The use of a jury to act as a framework for a book is not a common literary practice. Trials are quite a common motif in Mediaeval and Renaissance writing; in John Bale's Nice Wanton (125) a jury appears among the characters. But Harington may have derived the idea from Greene's Quip for an Upstart Courtier, which in turn is thought to have arisen out of F.T.'s Debate between Pride and Lowliness. (126) In F.T.'s work, as in Greene's, a jury consisting of representative members of different trades and classes of society is selected to judge the debate between allegorical representations of pride and humility. In Greene's book, these representations are a pair of Cloth-Breeches, standing for old-fashioned humble qualities, and a pair of Velvet-Breeches, which represent courtly pride and new-fangledness. In the process of selecting a jury of twenty-four satisfactory to both parties, sixty trades or classes are examined, which makes the book a fairly comprehensive survey of Elizabethan society. (127) The difference between Greene's
use of the jury and Harington's is almost as great as any similarity; although both works have a general moral purpose, and both employ the selection of a jury as one of the means to convey it, the moral purpose and the selection differ markedly. Greene's message is of the most common and general kind: defending lowliness against pride, and maintaining that certain classes are more prone to pride than others. This is the core of Mediaeval Complaint literature. All his characters, with the exception of the ropemaker (128), are types, and intended to be so. Harington, although concerned with pride and humility also, presents his moral concern in a highly idiosyncratic manner, and chooses to illuminate one novel aspect of man's pride, his disdain for bodily functions. Not only are all twelve of his jurymen individuals of the same type and class, they are real people, whose biography it is essential to know in order to understand the references made about them. The impannelling of the jury is only one of the structural devices in Harington's book, whereas it is the basic device of A Quip. Harington, therefore, although probably not inventing the 'jury', used it in his own way.

One of the purposes which the 'jury' section serves in The

---

Metamorphosis of Ajax is an underlining of the respectability of

---

the book. Harington was endeavouring to show the good stable from which his book had come when he explained its inception in the last part of the New Discourse. He reinforces that sense of

---
dignity by associating twelve highly respectable gentlemen with the work. All Harington does, in fact, is name them as jurors, but the very fact that he dared to name them in the defence of his 'idle toy' implies that they were not scandalised by it, and were content to be named. Some of them are clearly Harington's friends and relatives, which reinforces the standing of the author.

The 'jury' has another purpose; among the twelve men named are four (and it is possible there were others among the twelve) who were either Catholics or Catholic sympathisers: Sir John Peeter, Sir Matthew Arundell, Ralph Sheldon and Thomas Markham. These last two had suffered considerable set-backs, in spite of their loyal service to the Queen and admirable personal qualities, because of their Catholicism. In selecting these four men, and especially Sheldon and Markham, for his jury, Harington had an opportunity to defend them, and put into practice the toleration he supports in theory. Markham and Sheldon are loyal and of splendid character, Harington asserts, and their religious convictions cannot impair those qualities. He puts this obliquely, but unmistakably when he says of Sheldon:

"It is straunge to see the world, not halfe a yeare before (i.e. before Sheldon's disgrace) I heard one that was a great Courtier say, that he thought him one of the sufficiest wise men of England, and fittest to have bene made of the Counsell, but for one matter; and indeed... that is a right Courtiers commendacion; For after they
have roved three or four idle words to praise a
man, straight they mar all at the buts:"

Harington implies in his defence of Sheldon that envious and
ambitious men make a good man's religious beliefs a lever to
remove him from their path; if society in general was aware of
the relative unimportance of sectarian belief beside the higher
matters of honesty and virtue, these men would not be able to
make of religion a snare to trip their enemies. From this point,
Harington widens his scope, for as well as defending Sheldon and
Markham, he takes upon him to answer a libel on Hatton (recently
dead) and his circle, all of whom were Catholic sympathisers and
were therefore very vulnerable to libels of this sort. Harington
defends all those named, and then generalises the point already
made in the defence of particular persons, in the following
passage:

"So you worthy members of your country (God amend
you, for I was saying, the plague take you all)
when you would make Mal-contents then your
pollicie gives out first that they be so. Oh take
heed of such a one, he is a dangerous man. A
Puritan, why so? He will not sweare nor ride on a
Sunday, then he wishes well to the Scottish
Church, note him in your tables. An other is a
Papist. How know you? He said he hoped his
grandfathers soule was saved. Tush but he goes to
Church. Mary they be the most perilous men of
all. And why so I pray you? if they will venter
their soules to please their Prince, what do you
suspect them of. Oh if they be Catholicke, they are Spanish in their harts, for he is their Catholicke king. By my say that is somewhat you say, but I pray you, you that are not Spanish but all for the French, what Religion is the French king of?" (130)

This passage underlines clearly Harington's feelings on religious bigotry used as a political weapon.

THE DEBATE

The passage just quoted illustrates very well another generic element in the make-up of the Metamorphosis. That is the debate or dialogue. The form is well submerged in the text, but provides a useful means for Harington to present and quash argument. The history of this form I have outlined in the previous chapter, and it is not necessary to repeat it, but Harington's use of the dialogue form is comparable to that of Martin Marprelate. Marprelate developed the genre along lines of his own. As Summersgill writes:

"Dialog is (a) distinctive character of Marprelate's work. In serious argument his technique of quotation and reply gives form to the discussion. It also has humourous possibilities: a particularly inappropriate statement by either Cooper or Bridges may be quoted out of context and
then ridiculed; or a bishop maybe imagined as saying something which invites and receives a scornfully humourous reply." (131)

The passage just quoted from Harington shows two features of the Marprelatean casual dialogue particularly well. First, the complete lack of form. The interlocutors are not specified; one is only addressed as 'Sir' and the other one assumes to be the author. The conversation starts and finishes without warning, and frequently it is difficult to sort out the two speakers. Secondly, the vitality which the device imparts to the subject and to the text is remarkable. It is an effective manner of highlighting a point— in this case a very important part of Harington's argument— and of providing variety within the text. A large portion of the Apologie is in submerged dialogue form,

since every juryman called is discussed by Harington and the interlocutor who is, I suppose, the 'Maister Cryer'. Occasionally the conversation is widened: for example, the discussion on the foreman of the jury, Sir John Harington of Exton, includes four other speakers. (132)

There are pieces of dialogue throughout the work which generally contribute to the liveliness of the text. They also, on occasion fulfill a serious role. Consider for example, the short conversation between the author and the objector who cannot believe "that there should be such a Scripture, that handleth so homely matters?" and whose attitude to the Bible is satirised:

"I have alwayes had a Bible in my parlour thus many yeares, and oft time when the weather hath
bene foule, and that I have had no other booke to reade on, and have wanted company to play at cards or at tables with me, I have read in those bookes of the old Testament, at least halfe an houre by the clocke." (133)

The speaker goes on to mention his preacher, who, though dwelling on the Old Testament prescriptions, has never mentioned the one Harington has quoted as part of his survey of sanitary arrangements. It has to do with sewage provisions in a camp of war. Harington answers this objector obliquely, talking of the New Testament's predominance over the Old. This piece of dialogue is primarily, I think, intended to amuse the reader and create a diversion from the more serious matter which has preceded it. The objector is not a serious satiric portrait of a Puritan, merely a comic diversion. Having amused the reader with him, Harington takes the opportunity offered by the speaker's introduction of his preacher, who to the speaker is all-knowing, to expand on the sacramental freedom of the New Testament, as opposed to the legalistic nature of the Old favoured by the preacher. And so we get this attack, very much in passing, on the puritan who leans upon the Old Testament for authority, growing out of a digression planted for amusement. This piece of dialogue can truly be said to serve two functions, for it serves structurally as a leavener of the text, a different sort of writing to provide variety and sustain interest, and also as a tidy way in and out of a digression, a digression which in fact involves a serious religious point. As so often with Harington, we have a paradoxical situation, where the comic and serious have
been turned inside out.

In the submerged dialogue - that is to say the casual or formless dialogue, which has no names printed before the speeches - the interlocutor with whom the author engages in conversation is frequently the general reader. This makes some of the book at least look two-sided, and the author appear reasonable, because although he always wins the arguments or answers the objections, he has listened to the other side. In this respect, it is similar to the explicit or formal dialogue, which as we saw in the previous chapter was very popular for religious polemic and argument, since the author's convictions always carried the day, but did so while appearing to be reasonable. The submerged dialogue has an added advantage for writers like Marprelate, Harington and Nashe who make something of a cult of their personality. (134) They seem to be talking directly to their readers, since some of their readers appear to answer them back. Harington's use of the device is similar to his use of the first letter, from Philostilbonos; it creates an illusion of the author - urbane, clever in argument, well-mannered, approachable. This illusion is essential to the book, for to fall for the charm of Misacmos the author is tantamount to falling for his extraordinary ideas and taking seriously his amazing invention.
One aspect of this book remains to be touched upon. In spite of the serious aspects of the book which I have pointed out in the course of this chapter, and in spite of the respectable literary forebears the book has, Harington persists in pretending to regard it as a mere trifle and a waste of time. This is even more amazing when one considers the carefulness of its construction, the subtlety of the moral message presented and the large range of literary references and witty devices in the book. Some of the studied casualness with which Harington regards his book may derive from the conventional modesty of Renaissance writers, described by J.W. Saunders in his article 'The Stigma of Print.' (135) But there seems to me to be a much more ambivalent attitude towards The Metamorphosis of Ajax on the part of its author than a mere convention of letters would produce. For example, writing of it in an epigram Harington says:

"You muse to find in me such alteration
That I, that maidenly to write was wont,
Would now set to a Booke so desparate front,
As I might scant defend by ymitation.
My Muse that time did need a strong Purgation,
Late having tane some bruse by lewd reports;
And when the Physick wrought, you know the fashion
Where to a man in such a case resorts:
And so my Muse, with good decorum spent
On that base titled Booke, her excrement." (136)
I mentioned at the beginning of this chapter Harington's protestation in a letter to Lady Russell that he wrote the book, which he calls a 'toy', to be noticed. In the course of the book also, Harington displays a mixed attitude towards it. In the advertisement he writes of it in depreciating terms: "When you have read it, say both of us have lost more time than this in our days...." (137) His commendation here of his book could be taken as litotés, but it is so back-handed as to be almost a damnation with faint praise. Harington likes to refer to the book in terms of a meal or banquet, which seems a noble metaphor enough, and an expression of respect for the book, until one realises the true end of all banquets. Harington himself points this out:

"Now for your second course (the second section of the New Discourse), I could wish I had some larks and quailles, but you must have such as the market I come from will afford, always remembered, that our retiring place, or place of rendezvous (as is expedient when men have filled their bellies) must be Monsieur A Jax, for I must still keep me to my tesh:" (138)

Once again, Harington simultaneously praises and denigrates his work. In the opening of the Apologie he again comments on his book in an off-hand manner:

"When I had finished the precedent pamphlet, & in mine owne fantasie very sufficiently evacuated my head of such homely stuffe, of which it might seeme it was verie full charged, and shewed how
little conceit or opinion I had of mine owne
ability to handle stately matters, by chusing so
meane a subject to discharge my selfe upon: I
thought to rest me a while...." (139)
And at the conclusion of the book, Harington wakes from his
dream: "vowing I would never write any more such idle toys, if
this were well taken: praying the readers to regard it but as
the first lyne of Isop's Fables. Gallus gallinaceus dum vertit
stercorarium invent gemmam." (140) This is yet another ambiguous
comment on the book; it is an 'idle toy', nevertheless Harington
hopes it will be well-received. It is to be regarded like a
fable, but the line quoted from the fable, although it refers to
dung, implies that the book contains a jewel. This jewel is the
last word in the book. The implication that the book contains
something precious is disguised in Latin and within a rather
misleading quotation, and is casually included after the author's
own statement that the book is an idle toy. A more elaborate
device to disguise one's attitude could hardly be imagined.
However, this ambivalence is part of Harington's meaning in the
book: as in the Praise of Folly our sense of values is turned
upside down by the spectacle of Folly herself praising folly (two
negatives not making a positive, or not necessarily making a
positive), and then by Folly's increasing utterance of words we
feel not to be foolish, but wise, which shatters the reader's
self-confidence and certainty about all established values, so in
the Metamorphosis, comparing one's book to an excrement and
describing it as fit for a dunghill are not the denigrations they appear at first. Harington's protestation that he had his head full of "homely stuffe" and had "litle conceit or opinion" of his "ability to handle stately matters" becomes not a piece of self-depreciation but an irony. For he has just spent the whole 'precedent pamphlet' proving to the reader that 'homely stuffe' is as reputable as "stately matters", and it is only our frail minds that draw the distinctions. And here is Harington himself drawing them for us, to see whether we fall into his trap. Even if we avoid this trap, however, there remains the uncomfortable feeling, generated by the epigram and the letter mentioned above, by the excessive understatement of the ending, that Harington was not absolutely convinced by the "ennobling of his argument" (141) which he had himself effected. This impression is strengthened by the following passage from the book:

"I know if I contend with dirtie foes,

I must be solld, whether I win or lose.

Which Emblem has almost hindered me the writing of this present discourse, save that a good friend of mine told me, that this is a fansie and not a fight, and that if it should grow to a fight; he assured me I had found so excellent a ward against his chiefe dart, which is his strong breath, that I were like to quit my hands in the fray, as well as any man." (142)

The import of this passage is unsettling. Harington quotes the 'emblem' approvingly, and himself used it in an epigram. (143) He admits that the force of it put him off writing his book, and
his answer to the proverb is rather an evasion than a refutation. If unanswerable, the proverb would have been better omitted, but Harington chose to include it, even though he could not effectively disprove it. Although an unimportant moment in the book, this evasion ("this is a fansie not a fight"... "I were like to quit my hands in the fray, as well as any man") helps to confirm any suspicion the reader might have of Harington's slight discomfort with his topic. Finally, there is an epigram of Harington's which states well his mixed feeling towards the book.

"To the Queens Maiestie, when shee found fault

with some particular matters in Misacmos

Metamorphosis

Dread Soveraign, take this true, though poore excuse
Of all the errors of Misacmos Muse,
A hound that of a whelpe my selfe hath bred,
And at my hand and table taught and fed,
When other curres did fawne and flatter coldly,
Did spring and leape, and play with me too boldly:
For which, although my Pages check and rate him,
Yet stil my selfe doth much more love them hate him.
(144).

We are left with a paradox.
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Chapter 4

PIERCE PENILESSE HIS SUPPLICATION TO THE DIVELL

In the next three chapters I shall look in detail at three farragoes by Thomas Nashe, each different from the others in intention and nature. The first, Pierce Penilesse (1592), is a miscellany written for gain. The second, Have with you to Saffron-Walden (1596), is a unified collection of pieces attacking Gabriel Harvey, while the third, Nashes Lenten Stuffe (1599), is a congeries in praise of the town of Yarmouth. Nashe provides fascinating material for any student since he is unfailingly inventive and idiosyncratic, and almost as constantly Protean and self-contradictory. His linguistic and stylistic inventiveness is well known, but his equally novel treatment of kind and subject matter is not so obvious. In the three chapters which follow I demonstrate, I hope, Nashe's facility for adapting known kinds and themes or inventing new ones. (1)
Nashe wrote Pierce Penilesse in 1592; it was probably his
fourth work, and is the first work of his maturity. Preceding it
are The Preface to Menaphon, The Anatomie of Absurditie and An
Almond for a Parrat.

A few words about An Almond are in order before we pass on to
Pierce Penilesse. An Almond appeared in 1590, towards the
tail-end of the Marprelate controversy, to which it contributes.
It is by one 'Cuthbert Curry-Knave', and attacks Martin
Marprelate in his own flearing and scurrilous manner. Its prose
style is extremely suggestive of Nashe's, but McKerrow found he
could not attribute it to him since the author seemed to be an
Oxford man, while Nashe is known to have been only at Cambridge.
G.R. Hibbard, following the lead of Donald J. McGinn, however,
has argued forcibly for Nashe's authorship of An Almond, and I am
more than content to agree. (2) Nashe's two earlier works are
written in a dense Euphuistic style, but An Almond is of interest
here because it is the first work in Nashe's new style, modelled
on Marprelate's. Nashe's substantial debt to Marprelate has been
well documented by Summersgill in the article referred to in the
last chapter. (3) In An Almond Nashe uses Marprelate's colourful
abuse and copious language, but also hits upon a new vehicle for
satire, a mock-biography of John Penry (whom Nashe takes to be
Martin (4)). In this inclusion of a second form within the first
- the first in this case is the kind of pasquil developed by Martin - we can see Nashe moving towards the farrago. As An Almond has only the two forms in it (although one might see traces of other kinds with a microscope) it cannot be be seen as a true farrago. Nonetheless it is clearly a move in the direction of that kind.

In the same year as Pierce Penilesse, Robert Greene published A Quip for an Upstart Courtier. It has been argued by Edwin H. Miller that Nashe had seen this work in manuscript. (5) The two works have a certain amount in common, but were published within two weeks of each other, effectively dismissing the idea of one borrowing from the other, even if the similarities could be treated as borrowings. R.B. Parker, the most recent editor of A Quip, sees the "many parallels between (the two works as) evidence of a community of ideas between Nashe and Greene although not of actual borrowing" (6) and suggests "it is even probable that (Nashe) was writing Pierce Penilesse at the same time that Greene was writing A Quip and that the two authors discussed their work together." (7) Parker cites numerous similarities in expression and ideas, none of which are close enough to constitute copying. The interest of A Quip for our purposes is rather in its form, than in its content. In it, as in An Almond, the beginnings of a farrago can be seen. Greene's
book is a social satire in the Complaint mould, and derives partly from Stubbes' influential *Anatomie of Abuses*; but to frame his work Greene used two forms, the dream and the selection of a jury. Like *An Almond, A Quip* has only two clear forms (although in this case also others might appear on close examination), showing that Greene, like Nashe, was becoming aware of the uses of mixed genre works. (8)

Pierce Penilesse opens without any of the usual introductory material. (9) The first few pages of the book are a fairly conventional series of complaints about the hard lot of poets and the rottenness of the times. Pierce Penilesse (the author's persona) turns this traditional pose of the impoverished writer into a novel method for changing his lot. He decides to send the Devil a supplication asking for the release of Gold into the world. His difficulty is how to deliver his petition. In the course of a passage of social satire on Westminster Hall and Usurers, Pierce meets a Knight of the Post, that is, a professional perjurer, who agrees to take the supplication to his master, the Devil. The text of the supplication is then given. It consists of a long survey of the Seven Deadly Sins mainly in the form of satirical portraits of contemporary types. At the end of it, Pierce and the Knight discuss the Devil, Hell and Spirits. In the course of their conversation, the Knight tells a Beast Fable, which seems to have some political meaning, and also gives a long disquisition on spirits. After this comes the Address to the Reader, and the equivalent of an Epistle.
Dedicatory, the praise of a person called Amyntas. With this, the book ends.

Two points are notable about the structure of this book. The first is that essentially it is made up of one large structural piece - the Supplication. Under this umbrella, however, are to be found a diverse array of things: descriptions of the Sins, passages in defence of poetry and the stage, an attack on Antiquaries and an invective against Richard Harvey. This large piece is preceded by a small amount of necessary narrative introduction, and followed by a collection of pieces which look suspiciously like make-weights. The second point of interest is the novel position of the Address to the Reader and the Epistle Dedicatory. These are actually part of the text, and have been deliberately removed from the very beginning to the very end, and placed in the reverse of their usual order. The Epistle usually precedes the Address; here it follows it. But the book, in spite of this upheaval of the conventions of introduction, does not show any evidence of careful overall structuring. The pieces which make up the farrago do not seem to be in any proportion to one another; structurally, the work would be more successful if all the miscellaneous matter were somehow included in the Supplication, or if the pieces following the Supplication were balanced in length or kind by those preceding it. Hibbard does, however, regard the book as rather better planned than I do. He sees the Supplication as balanced by the discourse on spirits, and the whole as a finished four-part structure. (9a) This sounds very convincing, but does not account for the impression
the book gives, as it now stands, of being dominated by one large piece, followed by a collection of bits. This impression is confirmed by the relative lengths of the pieces. The introductory narrative is 8 pages (using McKerrow's page as the unit), the Supplication 52, the Fable 9, the discourse on spirits 12 and the Address and Epistle together 6 pages. The Supplication and its narrative introduction are twice as long as the other three pieces combined together.

In my discussion of Pierce Penilesse I do not attempt to cover every theme raised in the book, or mention every part of it. To do so would require a vasty work. Rather, I attempt to sketch the background to Nashe's work so that his inventiveness in using kind and themes may become apparent. I treat principally the Supplication, as befits the major part of the work, and approach this from several angles: the theme of the Seven Deadly Sins in preceding English literature, Nashe's use of Complaint and Satire motifs in the Supplication, the use of the character sketch, and the extent to which Nashe's character sketches are indebted to the genre 'Theophrastan Character', and the tradition of writing in defence of poetry and the stage. A short discussion of the beast fable follows, then a consideration of the contradiction implicit in Nashe's plagiarism of the discourse on spirits. Finally, in a discussion of the Address and Epistle Dedicatory, I point to Nashe's amazingly paradoxical attitudes, which infiltrate the whole book.
In selecting the Seven Deadly Sins as the principal subject for Pierce Penilesse, Nashe was working with a traditional subject, used by many writers before him.

Harvey in Four Letters (10) accuses Nashe of cribbing much of his Seven Deadly Sins material from Tarlton's 'famous play of the seaven Deadly sinnes', an accusation which Nashe rejects with some vigour. (11) Even if he had not done so, subsequent critics would not have taken Harvey's remark seriously, partly because it is clearly a jibe on Harvey's part, Tarlton representing the popular literature Nashe affects to despise, and partly because the outline of the play which survives bears no relation to Nashe's treatment of the subject. In addition, the Seven Deadly Sins occur so frequently in Mediaeval and Renaissance writing that one would not suppose Nashe to have been influenced by only one treatment of the material.

On the importance of the Sins to Mediaeval and early Renaissance literature in England, there is one standard, all-inclusive book: Morton W. Bloomfield's The Seven Deadly Sins. (12) This deals with the early history of the concept, the formulation of the seven, and the more important treatments of the Sins in English literature. Most of my material will, perforce, be drawn from this book. Bloomfield covers the
sixteenth-century only partially, however, and omits dramatic literature from his study.

It is probably significant that for his first Farrago Nashe chose a subject of enormous traditional popularity, one that might spring easily to mind as a good general subject, hallowed by tradition and totally familiar. By using such a well-known subject, Nashe was able to show off his wit and idiosyncratic treatment of the material to full advantage. For in spite of the plethora of literature about, including or alluding to the Sins, there is no obvious predecessor for Nashe's version.

Bloomfield traces the development of the concept historically, the selection of seven sins rather than eight or more, the Psychomachia tradition, and the differences in order and division in various writings on the Sins. The most popular Mediaeval orderings were those of Gregory the Great and Henry of Ostia, which, using the Latin names of the Sins, produced the acronyms Siaqla and Saligia. (13) The latter order (superbia, ira, invidia, avaritia, accidia, gula, luxuria) was the most persistently popular. The order used by Nashe, which can be summarised as Asiigal, is not very common.

The order of the Sins was highly variable, and so also were the sins included. Tristitia and vanagloria often appeared, as well as, or instead of accidia and superbia. (14) Even more
confusing is variation among the branches of the Sins. This area was highlighted by Frederick Tupper's attempt to show that the Canterbury Tales were based around the concept of the Seven Deadly Sins. Tupper argued that the Tales used various branches and antitypes of the Sins. (15) For example, the Second Nun's Tale represents Sloth, since it is concerned with Idleness, a branch of Sloth, 'businesse' an antitype of Sloth, and Undevotion, another branch of Sloth. In reply to this clever scheme, John Livingstone Lowes lists the branches of the Sins as detailed in several Mediaeval English works, and shows that these are not consistent with one another, since the same sub-sins appear attached to different primary sins in different works. For example, the sin of Inobedience or Unbuxomness appears as a branch of Pride, Sloth, Avarice and Gluttony (under the latter as one of the sins of the tongue) in, respectively, Confessio Amantis, the Ayenbite of Inwit, Jacob's Well and the Ayenbite once more. (16) Lowes has examined only five treatments of the Sins, and produced dozens of variant attributions of the sub-sins. To speculate about the history of the branches of the Sins which Nashe chooses to include in his account of the Sins would therefore be unfruitful, in view of this proliferation and divergence.
The principal sin of the seven was often held to be Avarice, because of St. Paul's writing in his letter to Timothy "the love of money is the root of all evil". (17) Gregory the Great however, gave Pride the dominant position, and generally speaking it remained there. But the significance of Avarice was not forgotten. In the Morality play The Castle of Perseverance, for example, although all Seven Sins battle for Humanum Genus against the Seven Moral Virtues, it is Avaritia who succeeds in alluring Humanum Genus first of all the Sins. In addition Avaritia has a scaffold to himself in the staging, while the other Sins share, three on Flesh's scaffold and three on Belial's. As society became increasingly capitalistic and money-based, the importance of Avarice in the list of sins also increased. (18) In Dunbar's Dance of the Seven Deadly Sins, to take only one work as an example, we can see the conflict between the traditional predominance of Pride and the growing importance of Avarice. Dunbar writes:

First of all in dance wes Pryd,
    With hair wyld bak and bonet on syd...

but later:

Mist him in dans come Cuvatyce,
    Rute of all evill and grund of vyce,
    That never cowd be content; (19)

Nashe was following a well-established tradition when he placed Avarice first in his order of handling, followed by Pride. The latter Sin, suitably enough, has the longest portion of text
allotted to it.

I should like now to examine, in a certain amount of detail, a handful of treatments of the concept of the Seven Deadly Sins which stand out from the great mass, either because of their literary excellence, or because of their peculiar relevance to Nashe’s version. I hope to demonstrate a few of the shapes into which the concept was turned, principally in the sixteenth century, for two reasons: first to demonstrate that there are no treatments which approximate to Nashe’s, although some contain elements he used or enlarged upon; secondly, in contradiction, to show that Nashe was following an established custom in using the concept of the Sins in a novel way. Several of the works I shall shortly describe are, like Nashe’s, original and unlikely uses of the theme, and these are only a selection of those works which employ it for unusual ends.

The most outstanding literary descriptions of the Sins are those in Piers Plowman and Book I of The Faerie Queen. The former may well have been Nashe’s source for the idea, for, as we saw in Chapter 2, Piers Plowman was well-known in the sixteenth-century, and it is unlikely that Nashe was not aware of the literary forebear of his persona. It also seems likely that Spenser’s treatment was known to Nashe, for he admired Spenser immensely. The ‘famous Faerie Queene’ is praised in Pierce Penilesse itself (20), and in Strange Newes Nashe refers to the
poem thus: "upon an unspotted Pegasus should thy gorgeous
attired Fayrie Queene ride triumphant through all reports
dominion."(21)

Although, as Bloomfield observes, the treatment of the Sins becomes progressively more realistic and dramatic as the Renaissance approaches (22) - a process which perhaps reaches its climax in Nashe and Marlowe's portrayals - the later realism is foreshadowed by Langland in Piers Plowman, although with significant differences in the purpose of the realism. Langland is, of course, a serious religious writer, and his lively dramatic presentations of the Sins, complete with convincing details, are intended to highlight, not disguise the enormity of the evil. The descriptions are minute:

Covetyse: "And as a bondemannes bacon his berd was yshave, With his hood on his heved and his hat bothe, In a tor tabard of twelve winter age- But yf a lous couthe lepe, I leve and I trowe, He sholde wandre uppon that walch, so hwas hit thredbare."

(23)

This picture is perhaps a direct ancestor of Nashe's Greedinesse, whose clothes manifest his avarice, and in whose house the rats and mice can find only an old cod-piece to feast upon. But, in fact, as Boyce points out (24), there is a difference between Langland's portraits and the truly realistic which is comparable to the difference between Nashe's Langlandesque Sins Greedinesse and Niggardize, and his other Sins. (This discussion is related
to that which follows in the section entitled Characters, but is, 
----------
I hope, suitably anticipated here.) Langland’s Covetyse, says
Boyce, is not

"a picture of the Avaricious Man, an actual representative man, but a horizontal study in one tendency, avariciousness in all men. The virtue of the Character is vraisemblance; the virtue of 
----------
figures in Piers Plowman... is symbolism, for 
-----
they are fictions or fancies pointing at the inner natures of all unregenerate men."

We shall consider this point later; at present it is sufficient to note that the apparent realism of Langland’s characters is actually symbolic representation made contemporary, humble and colourful. Langland wishes the Sins to be real to his readers as mirrors of tendencies in themselves, not as realised human beings. Nashe on the other hand, is often striving to create portraits or caricatures; occasionally his materials are the same as Langland’s, but his intention and end result are different. It need hardly be said that whereas Langland was in moral earnest, Nashe, one might say, is in moral jest.

Spenser also differs from Nashe in the seriousness of his intentions. His picture of the Sins, however, shows this quite clearly, and there is no confusing appearance of realism. A certain amount of detail is given about the Sins in Spenser’s account, but this is obviously symbolic. There is never any question of taking Spenser’s Sins for ‘real people’, as one might
take Langland’s, and may often take Nashe’s. Spenser’s description of the Sins is vivid and original in its iconology, but strictly organised. Each of the six ‘counsellors’ who accompany the chariot of Lucifera (Pride) has three stanzas allotted to him; each rides a suitable beast, is suffering from a disease proper to his Sin, carries a symbolic object, and is dressed in suitable clothes. The Sins are in three pairs: Idleness rides by Gluttony, Lechery by Avarice, and Envy and Wrath together. In five out of six cases, Spenser has organised the descriptions in the same way (Idleness being an exception); for example, the garment is described at the opening of the second stanza, the beast each rides is mentioned in the second line of the first stanza, the disease is described in the last three lines of the third stanza. In other respects Spenser has allowed himself some latitude. Samuel Chew in his study of the iconology of this passage (25) shows that in many cases the emblems used were invented by Spenser himself. Spenser also varied the manner in which he envisaged the Sins; for example, Avarice is described in terms of his personal misery and mental attitude:

Most wretched wight, whom nothing might suffice,
Whose greedy lust did lacke in greatest store,
Whose need had end, but no end Covetise,
Whose wealth was want, whose plenty made him pore,
Who had enough, yet wished ever more; (26)

Wrath is described in terms of his effects:
Full many mischiefs follow cruell Wrath;
Abhorred bloodshed, and tumultuous strife,
Unmanly murder, and unthrifty scath,
Bitter despight, with rancour's rusty knife,
And fretting griefe the enemy of life. (27)

In other respects, Spenser allows himself a little freedom also; the amount of detail accorded each Sin varies. For instance Avarice's symbolic object is described more fully than the others' and the person of Lechery is described. Spenser keeps a balance between the firm and apparent structure, and the wealth of varied detail. In this he is very different from Nashe, who submerges his structure in a mass of detail, and tries out a different method of organising each Sin, as well as allotting quite different amounts of his text to each Sin.

Two dramatic treatments deserve some attention since it seems to me there is a certain element of the dramatic in Nashe's presentation; equally, the use of the Seven Deadly Sins by Tarlton cannot be overlooked, since it is the only named source for Nashe's Sins, although that naming is intended to insult Nashe.

Marlowe's presentation of the Seven Deadly Sins in Dr. Faustus is of some relevance to Nashe because it seems probable that Pierce Penilesse was written in the wake of Dr. Faustus. (28)

It is quite probable that Nashe had seen Dr. Faustus. The Seven Deadly Sins sequence is brief, but the effect of a dramatic presentation is greater than a glance at the text would suggest. Marlowe's treatment of the Sins is highly personalised, that is,
his sins speak in the character of the sin rather than explaining it formally. For example, Pride speaks with enormous pride:

I am Pride; I disdaine to have any parents...

But fye, what a smell is heere? I'le not speak an other word, unlesse the ground be perfum'd and cover'd with cloth of Arras.

and Sloth, suitably enough, says:

Hey ho; I am Sloth: I was begotten on a sunny bank: Hey ho: I'le not speak a word more for a kings ransome. (29)

These characterisations are the most realistic to emerge in English literature before Nashe's; Marlowe's sins are persons as well as symbols; however the briefness of their appearance does not allow this interesting combination to develop.

Tarlton's play on the Seven Deadly Sins is now only to be found in a plot summary of The Second Parte of the Seven Deadlie Sinnes, which may or may not be Tarlton's play. I assume that this is the play referred to by Harvey and Nashe, and accept Greg's assertion that it was performed in 1590, though written before Tarlton's death in 1588. (30) The outline of the play deals only with three episodes, presumably short plays within the play, displaying Envy ("Ferrex and Porrex"), Sloth ("Sardanapalus") and Lechery ("Tereus"). These are set within a historical framework of Henry VI's imprisonment. Lydgate the poet acts as a chorus. All seven Sins parade at the beginning of the play, and the relevant sin 'passeth over' at the beginning of
each episode. This play, in spite of Harvey's mention of it, cannot have had very much influence upon Nashe's work. The Sins do not speak (31) and are not characterised; their character is instead shown in action in the exempla.

In one way, however, Nashe was perhaps influenced by these dramatic examples. Not only are most of his Sins vividly realised, as if they were comic types in stage-comedy, but there is also an element of the stage-tableau, the sort of dumb-show contained in Tarlton's play. In the description of Pride Pierce addresses the Devil and shows him various examples of Pride in action, as if they were tableaux. However, it would be wrong to emphasise this dramatic element, since the characters never speak, and the writing is principally concerned with describing the Sins and not with portraying a dramatic action.

I turn now to three prose versions of the Seven Deadly Sins; these are Bateman's A Christall Glass (1569), Munday's Mirrour of Mutabilite (1579), and Whetstone's Mirrour for Magestrates of Cyties (1584). They are all serious works, without a trace of the gusto of Langland or Nashe, but although very different in intention, they illustrate the literary background to Nashe's version of the Sins, show some of the unusual forms the Sins could appear in, and highlight the originality of Nashe's treatment of his common theme.
Stephen Bateman's A Christall Glass of Christian Reformation is described by Samuel Chew as "the most ambitious of all English treatments of (the Sins) because of its range of imagery." (32)

It is a religious work, with a strong anti-Catholic strain, and consists of a series of emblematic pictures on the Seven Deadly Sins, each emblem being followed by an explanation. A prose discussion of the Sin with examples of biblical and historical figures who suffered from it follows each group of emblems. The edition of this book which I have studied (33) allots five emblematic pictures to Covetousness - which comes first in the order - four to the other Sins, and only two to Pride. This gives considerable prominence to Covetousness, illustrating as does Nashe's work, Huizinga's statement that "a furious chorus of invectives against cupidity and avarice rises up everywhere from the literature" of the late Middle Ages and early Renaissance. (34)

Unlike other treatments of the Sins, Bateman's does not show each Sin as a single dominant figure, but rather as a collection of the branches and emanations of the Sin. Gluttony, in the second picture of that Sin, is represented by Podagra (gout), leading Prodigus and Ravin, branches of the Sin. In the other Gluttony pictures we see Insatiable Desire, Neither hot nor cold, Credulity, Bacchus, Force and other consequences and adherents of Gluttony, but not a figure representing the Sin itself. Even in pictures which do have figures which stand for the principal Sin, these do not dominate. Lechery, for example, in one picture, is a goat ridden by Whoredom and led by Meretrix, in front of whom a
devil Nicticorax flies. The first three figures are all of a size and have equal status in the design of the picture, but the difference in class between them - a Deadly Sin, a branch of that Sin, and a particular sort of sinner - not to mention the inclusion of a named devil, tends to confuse the symbolism. Nashe was akin to Bateman in that he also saw some of his Sins as a variety of types rather than as a single dominant figure. One possible reason for this change in the portrayal of the Sins seen in Bateman and Nashe is a certain staleness which may have been creeping into portrayals of the Sins, and their desire to renovate the concept in order to make it more effective.

Perhaps the most curious work to use the Sins for its material is Anthony Munday's *The Mirrour of Mutabilitie, or principall Part of the Mirrour for Magistrates*. This attempts to cash in on the popularity of the *Mirrour for Magistrates* (as does the Whetstone work I shall mention). Munday hit upon the idea of combining the De Casibus tradition of the original *Mirrour* with the Seven Deadly Sins (the same idea, incidentally, as Tarlton used in his play). The first part of the book takes the form of seven complaints by biblical characters who fell as a result of a Deadly Sin. King David represents Lechery, Dives Gluttony, Judas Avarice, and so on. The characters do little more than bemoan their fall, giving little detail of their sins or their lives. As well as combining the Seven Deadly Sins and the Fall of Princes, Munday contrives to give his work a philosophical
strain, by citing Cicero in support of virtue. Munday's stated objections to the Sins seem to be secular, for he quotes Cicero as decrying them because they weaken the good man, and the characters bewail their sins because they have fallen as a result of them. (35)

The interest of this book for our purposes is in Munday's selection of the Sins as a framework for his work; the work is basically a reworking of the Mirrour for Magistrates, but given a novel form. Nashe followed exactly the same process, for he hit upon the traditional concept of the Sins to inform his farrago.

George Whetstone's moral work A Mirrour for Magestrates of Cyties with An Addition: or Touchstone For the Time provides an interesting variation on the theme of the Sins. Whetstone is concerned with the moral degradation of London, particularly that caused by gaming-houses. His main aim is their removal. He lists seven sins which arise from these establishments, Pride, Prodigalytie, Dryncge, Drunkennesse, Lecherie, Usurie, Coveitousness. Each of these is dealt with individually, but only Coveitousness is treated in the traditional emblematic or symbolic manner. This Sin is drawn in a chariot whose wheels are "Pusalanimitie, Crueltie, Misprisning of God, and Forgetfulness of certaine death." The chariot has two horses named Theft and Hardnesse; the waggoner is called Earnest desire to have, and so
This use of the Sins could be called novel, or perhaps individual, for Whetstone has tailored the Seven to his own ends, and is content to isolate only one Sin as a symbolic character, thereby throwing great emphasis on the portrait. Whetstone is, needless to say, at complete variance with Nashe, since the former is a practical moralist, and the latter concerned to entertain. Nonetheless, they both found the concept of the Seven Deadly Sins a flexible and useful instrument in the design of their books.

We have now seen the concept of the Seven Deadly Sins in some of its guises, and can appreciate more clearly Nashe's divergence from and, in an odd way, adherence to the traditions. The Seven Deadly Sins appeared in moral and religious works, and often supplied colourful detail to those works; they are found in a variety of literary forms: poems, plays and prose tracts. They are, in the Renaissance, tied to other kinds, such as the emblematic picture or the De Casibus tradition, to produce interesting new slants on the subject. As the century progressed, the standard Seven Sins changed with the requirements of a more specific sort of moral writing. Avarice became ever more prominent. Clear symbolic characters gave way to more fragmented figures.
During the sixteenth-century the predominant kind of writing against society changed from Complaint to Satire, as we saw in Chapter 2. In Nashe's treatment of the Seven Deadly Sins we can see in a fascinating way the changeover from one kind to the other.

Nashe's treatment is anything but consistent. His method of dealing with the Sins alters with each one, and his digressions appear to come in without plan. In actual fact, if one looks closely enough there is evidence that Nashe planned the section dealing with the Sins with at least a little care, for all its rambling and extempore air. Hibbard points out that Nashe cultivated this air of miscellaneousness and aimlessness. (38)

That he had some plan is indicated by the following quotations: "I thought it expedient, in this my Supplication, to place (Envie) next to Pride: for it is his adopted sonne" (39) and "The childe of Sloath is Lecherie, which I have Plac't last in my order of handling:" (40) The Sins, broken up into four groups, are presented in this order: Avarice and Pride, Envy and Wrath, Gluttony and Sloth, and Lechery. Envy and Wrath as well as Gluttony and Sloth (the former pair being sins of the Devil, the latter sins of the Flesh) are the same two pairs as in Spenser's procession of the Sins. As well as this evidence of a considered order of handling, there seems to be a planned structure to the
inclusion of sub-sins within the catalogue of Seven. The pattern
Deadly Sin - branch of that Sin - Deadly Sin is followed for each
of the first three groups. We therefore have Greediness, Niggardize (a recognised branch of Avarice), Pride; in the next
group, Envy, Murder, Wrath (Murder could be a branch of either
Envy or Wrath); and in the third, Gluttony and its branch
Drunkenness, and Sloth.

Between each group of sins is a digression. The first,
between Pride and Envy is a short attack on Antiquaries; the
second, after Wrath is twofold- a defence of poetry and an
invective against Richard Harvey; the third, between Sloth and
Lechery, defends the stage.

This certainly looks like a clear structure, and Hibbard is
convinced of the planning of the book. (41) However, when Nashe
came to execute this plan he seems to have done his best to
obscure the skeleton of his work. The elements are treated so
diversely that in reading it one is conscious only of this
diversity and never of an underlying structure. Consequently, I
am cautious about proclaiming this structure.

I shall consider the Sins in the order Nashe presents them,
giving most weight to the section on Pride, which is the longest
account of a Sin. This discussion is mainly concerned with the
switch backwards and forwards from Mediaeval symbolic figures to
Renaissance satiric types, and with the use of various standard
butts, as well as the complex movement from Complaint literature
into Satire. In the section which discusses the Theophrastan Character we view the same switching, the same contrast of characterisations in terms of the rhetorical tradition, and the infiltration of a specific genre, the Character. The section which follows and that on the Character are two different methods of viewing basically the same material. The conclusions of these sections are not incompatible.

Nashe's Greedinesse and Niggardize are fundamentally Mediaeval symbolic figures. Everything about their portrayal is symbolic; they are never intended to be taken as pictures of contemporary types. In this they are little different from Langland's Sins, for Nashe's Greedinesse and Niggardize are the distilled essence of Avarice. Their clothes, for instance, are entirely emblematic; Greedinesse's cap is 'be tasseld with Angle-hookes... ready to catch hold of all those to whom he shewes any humblenes" and his shoes are "a couple of crab shells... toothd at the tooes with two sharp sixpennie nailes, that digd up every dunchil they came by for gould. (42) Nashe does not see any need to restrain himself from adding detail to the descriptions, for his purpose is merely to create opportunities for writing, not to make a moral point. The delight of exaggerating the meanness of Greedinesse carries Nashe to a wildly hyperbolic description of his household. The excuse for all this is that in this house Gold is imprisoned; but in reality, it is Nashe pushing the theme of meanness in several of its aspects to its limits, before abandoning it for some new theme.
After this portrait of a Sin and its branch in the traditional manner of Langland and Spenser, replete with symbolic trappings, Nashe changes his method and describes Pride in a series of vignettes of contemporary life. The move is analogous to that from Complaint literature to Satire. (43) That is not to say that the portrait of Greedinesse is truly Complaint (Nashe lacks the moral fervour necessary for Complaint), but that it is nearer the Complaint tradition than the pictures of Pride, which verge on Satire, although they contain Complaint elements. The difference is not to be seen in the amount of detail used to describe the different Sins, but in the extent to which the reader is expected to recognise the detail as realistic. The details in the portraits of Pride are doubtless exaggerated but far less so than those in the pictures of Greedinesse and Niggardize; the details in Pride are not symbolic but descriptive, indicative of the characters' pride. The descriptions of the Proud are specific, each one concentrating on a person who is proud in particular ways, not Proud in general. The attack is social rather than moral.

I shall have more to say on these portraits when I discuss them as examples of the genre Character, but in the meantime I shall outline the types of Pride Nashe attacks. Since it was traditionally regarded as the dominant Sin, it is not surprising that Nashe finds it so widespread, and devotes to it the longest portion of the section. However, as I have said above, the types of Pride he chooses to attack are found in social types of whom he disapproves. There is no general condemnation of Pride in
every man and stratum of society.

The first object of Nashe's satire is 'an upstart', a man of low birth, who apes the extreme fashions of the nobility. Next he attacks the "counterfeit politician", then the prodigal, followed by the learned, who are led by Pride to atheism. After this comes a brief attack on an "artificer", and then a portrait of Mistress Minx "a Marchants wife". "The pride of pesants sprung up of nothing" and "the base insinuating of drudges and their practise to aspyre" occupy the next two pages, and these are succeeded by attacks on the Pride of various nations. The Spaniard, the Italian and the Frenchman are dismissed fairly briskly, for Nashe reserves his greatest scorn for the Dane, whose sin lies in forbidding social movement: "None but the son of a Corporall must be a Corporall, nor any be Captaine, but the lawfull begotten of a Captaines body." In the margin, Nashe sums this up as "No rewards amongst them for desert." (44)

The curious feature of the section on Pride is the contradiction inherent in it: English Pride is epitomised by those aspiring to a higher station than they are born to - "the greasie son of a Cloathier", Mistress Minx who is "so finicall in her speach", the "obscure upstart gallants... raised from the plough to be checkmate with Princes," while Danish Pride seems to consist in the precise opposite- forbidding men to aspire. Indeed Nashe goes so far, in his condemnation of the Danes, as to commend the English for allowing the sons of husbandmen to become Privy Counsellors, the very thing he has recently deplored.
Nashe seems unaware of the contradiction between attacking upstarts in one breath, and turning on a static society with the next. Hibbard explains this apparent oddity by saying that Nashe dislikes English upstarts because of their lack of social concern and because they have risen through usury. (45) I prefer to accept that there is a contradiction here, caused by Nashe's method of writing. Each piece of Pierce Penilesse, it seems to me, is disjoint, in spite of Nashe's plan, and does not carry over into the next. This is an excellent illustration of the farraginary method. Nashe wrote the pieces on English Pride under the influence of the Complaint tradition merged with Satire. (46) Then he wrote the passage on national Pride, finishing up with the virulent attack on the Danes, the motivation for which is obscure. These pieces are different, and as we shall see in considering the last section of this book, Nashe seemed to consider his pieces as watertight compartments, or rather as building blocks, mortared firmly together, but nonetheless separate. The colour of one does not affect the colour of the next.

Among the common themes of Complaint literature described by Peter the upstart figures quite prominently. (47) "The pride of peasants sprung up of nothing" is frequently attacked in Mediaeval Complaint literature, as were other of Nashe's butts: the atheist, the prodigal and the users of cosmetics. (48) Nashe's use of these Mediaeval conventions is idiosyncratic however. In the course of his attack on the upstart, Nashe introduces the subject of the 'Frenchified Englishman' (more commonly portrayed
as the Italianate Englishman). The Italianate Englishman was a conventional Renaissance topic, although of a much less ancient sort than the upstart, which has a history going back at least as far as the Roman hatred of novi homines. Nashe's upstart "hath been but over at Deepe, (but) wrings his face round about, as a man would stir up a mustard pot, & talkes English through the teeth, like Jacques Scabd-hams, or Monsieur Mingo de Moustrap."

(49) This common type, fully described by Z.S.Fink (50), is presented slightly differently by Nashe, for this 'traveller' is not even a real 'Italianate Englishman', but one who apes these men; he is even more of an upstart. (51)

There is an unbroken transition from Complaint to Satire, with regard to certain subjects. The upstart, favourite target of Complaint writers, reoccurs in Satire, generally as the upstart courtier. (52) Nashe attacks this type separately from the upstart gentleman, and though I would not go so far as to say that these two separate attacks represent the move from Complaint to Satire, the existence side by side of the two does demonstrate the complex crossing over between the two kinds. For the attack on the upstart gentleman is basically the traditional Complaint topic dressed up in Renaissance satiric detail, as a 'traveller' and a malcontent, while the upstart courtier is a Renaissance topic which is treated by Nashe in general terms reminiscent of Complaint. (53)
These 'general terms' require some illustration. In attacking the upstart gentleman Nashe is specific in his abuse: "hee will be an Inamorato Poeta & sonnet a whole quire of paper
in praise of Lady Swin-snout, his yeollow fac'd Mistres."(54) But on the subject of the upstart courtier the terms used are general, and concerned less with the doings of the upstart than with his aims and values. In addition, the class of upstart courtiers is attacked, rather than an individual. The upstart gentleman was visualised as one person: "All malcontent sits the greasie son of a Cloathier, & complaines... of the ruine of ancient houses:" (55) The upstart courtier is a whole tribe of persons: "Theyr big limbes veilde the Common-wealth no other service but idle sweate, and theyr heads, like rough hewen Gloabes, are fit for nothing but to be the blockhouses of sleepe." (56) As this passage shows, this class is attacked directly instead of satirised through their actions. The attack also has remarks of a proverbial kind, such as "Thus do weedes grow up whiles no man regards them" and admonitory words: "But beware you that he great mens Favorites" which are more in keeping with Complaint literature than Satire.

When Nashe deals with another common topic of Complaint and Satire, the prodigal, he again diverges from the conventional line. Prodigality appears in the Seven Deadly Sins literature as the antitype to Avarice (57), and prodigal children are, following biblical precedent, found as a Complaint theme. (58) But Nashe is more interested in the narrative potential of the
"yoong Heyre or Cockney", whom he satirises by means of a comic tale. His prodigality as such is scarcely mentioned, and his Pride has to be inferred from his behaviour.

Another aspect of Nashe's treatment which I have already mentioned in regard to the dramatic influence on his work, but which is also related to the emblematic treatments of the Sins, is the use of 'tableaux'. I have already mentioned these in the context of Tarlton and Marlowe's plays, but it is also possible to regard them as descendants of the emblematic method of Bateman and Spenser. Nashe, even in the midst of his most realistic portraits, shows the characters to the Devil, and also to the reader, as if they were static: "In one place let me shew you a base Artificer.... In an other corner, Mistress Minx, a Marchants wife.... The next object that encounters my eyes, is some such obscure upstart gallants." (59) This is partly a conducted tour of sinful London but also partly a moralist displaying his emblems of wickedness. In Nashe, the moralist or complainer is almost a neutral character, concerned more with his own poverty than with the sin of the city, but he is not completely in abeyance, and those moral standards he does assume are relatively simple in comparison to the elusive standards of later satirists. (60) The underlying contention of these satirical pictures is that they are, for all their selectivity, pictures of Pride, and Pride is wrong. Between the distaste of Nashe/Pierce for certain types of person and his descriptions of those people, is inserted an old-fashioned Mediaeval reason for this distaste, drawn from Complaint literature.
The attacks on national Pride are a commonplace of Elizabethan writing, of the same sort as the satire on the 'Italianate Englishman', and often found in the same context. (61) Foreigners were one of the groups disliked in Mediaeval as well as Renaissance writing (62), but the systematic stereotyping of nations seems to have been a purely Renaissance phenomenon. (63) The curious feature of Nashe's tirade against foreign nations is his attack on the Danes as I have already mentioned. The accusation of drunkenness against the Danes is relatively common, but the attack on that nation for its social system is found only in Nashe. Cay Dollerup in his exhaustive study Denmark, Hamlet and Shakespeare treats Pierce Penilesse as a compendium of popular opinion, and Nashe's comments on the Danes as an expression of common thought about Denmark. He is unable, however, to find any other Elizabethan comment which echoed Nashe's vehement criticisms. (64) Ethel Seaton in Literary Relations of England and Scandanavia in the 17th Century comes to the conclusion that there may have been some political motivation for Nashe's attack. (65) It is no longer possible to decide on this matter, but it is nonetheless worth noting two points about this passage: first, that Nashe was by no means always the mouthpiece of his age, and should not be regarded as a 'typical Elizabethan'; secondly, that Nashe is capable of turning pieces of his farrago into whatever he chooses, so that a passage on Pride could become a political invective, regardless of context or consistency.
As the treatment of the Seven Deadly Sins progresses, so Nashe's manner changes. The first Sin was presented as a pair of Mediaeval symbolic types, the second as a series of satiric types. The other Sins are treated more generally than Pride, but not as walking allegories like Greedinesse. Certain elements of the specific, 'characterising' method, used with Pride, remain however. For example, the 'complaint of Envie' begins:

"The Poets were ill advised, that fained him to be a leane, gag-toothd Beldam, with hollow eyes, pale cheeks, and snakie heire: for he is not onely a man, but a jolly lusty old Gentleman, that will winke, and laughe, and jeast drily." (66)

This personal description very soon turns into a general discussion of the Sin, with a patriotic flavour, for Philip of Spain becomes a symbol of Envy. Emblematic elements also occur: "Envie is a crocodile that weepes when he kils" and so do commonplaces of the Complaining kind: "Tis rare to finde a true frend' in Kings Pallaces:" Later Envie is described as a "quicke-sighted monster", which is at variance with the initial "jolly lusty old man", and shows that the personification has slipped somewhat. In Wrath we see the fusion of the symbolic presentation of a Sin, and the satiric characterisation: "A hare-braind little Dwarfe it is, with a swarth visage, that hath his hart at his tongues end.... If hee bee a Judge or Justice... then he sweares, but by Saint Tyborne & makes Newgate a Nowne Substantive." (67) Sloth, on the other hand, is depicted in personal terms:

"If I were to paint Sloth... I would draw it like
a Stationer that I knowe, with his thumb under his girdle, who if a man come to his stall and ask him for a booke, never stirs his head, or looks upon him, but stands stone still, and speakes not a word: onely with his little finger points backwards to his boy...." (68)

Even this specific portrait has some relation, however, to the emblematic tradition, for Nashe introduces it in terms of a picture he might draw to represent Sloth. (69)

When he arrives at Lechery, Nashe seems to have run out of invention altogether; for, using McKerrow's pages as the unit, we find that Avarice has three pages dedicated to it, Pride, the longest section, fourteen, Envy four, Wrath, excluding the digressions, four and a half, Gluttony, filled with exemplary tales and historical information, nine, and Sloth three and a half. But Lechery, though one might have expected a thorough treatment of this most colourful and rewarding of subjects, rates a bare one and a half pages. (70) There are no exemplary tales, or merry ones, only the odd historical reference, and an attempt to treat the subject in the manner of a Complaint, but without an allegorical figure. Nashe's attempt to be morally serious produces here, as in other parts of his writing (71), an uncomfortably comic result: "Westminster, Westminster, much maydenhead hast thou to answere for at the day of Judgement." (72) This hortative manner is new to Nashe's treatment, although there have been approaches to it in some of the Complaint elements.
It will be clear from this that Nashe uses a number of different methods to describe the Sins, that he moves on from one new technique to another, and that even in the last description of a Sin, he is experimenting with a new manner. The evasiveness of the structure is also explained by this mass of different methods, for the dissimilarity of the treatments of each Sin, and the discrepancies in length effectively obscure the planned structure to the reader's eye. The fluidity with which the digressions appear and take over, combined with the dissimilarities in method and manner, give the appearance of a haphazard piece of writing. However, it seems quite probable that this was Nashe's intention; certainly in other works he shows evidence of planning, and even in the jovial chaos of the Seven Deadly Sins section of Pierce Penilesse there are traces of an organising hand.

In the merging of Complaint and Satire in the treatment of the Seven Deadly Sins we can see that the two modes were anything but distinct at this period. Nashe himself, like many of his contemporaries, was probably unaware of the distinctions which we can now see so clearly.
In discussing the use made of the Seven Deadly Sins motif it has been impossible to avoid some mention of the characterising of the Sins. It will have been obvious that variation in characterisation is an important part of Nashe's technique, and also that there are in Nashe's treatment of the Sins two ways of presenting figures: the one an emblematic, symbolic manner, the other a specific life-like method. In this section, we shall examine some of the background to the 'naturalistic' form of presenting persons, and shall discover in the rhetorical tradition, some formal distinctions between the two ways. Up till now I have distinguished between them as manifestations of Complaint and Satire in characterisation but there is, as we saw, some confusion in that distinction, since the methods of one form are used by Nashe on figures which seem to belong in the other.

Classical Rhetoric, with which we may assume Nashe was familiar (73), distinguished between two forms of portraying character, effictio and notatio. (74) The former term refers to the description of a person's physical appearance, while the latter is used to cover description of a person's nature by characteristic speech and action. Notatio is also used by Erasmus to mean a single specific characteristic that marked out a man as belonging to a type. (75) In oratory there were similar terms, ethopoeia and prosopopoëia; the former defined the
orator's assuming the habits of speech of another person, and the latter his presenting a full dramatisation of that person. This pair of definitions, found in Quintillian, was modified by Elizabethan theoreticians. In the Arte of English Poesie Puttenham distinguishes between prosopographia, the apparently 'true' descriptions of persons, such as "our poet Chaucer doth in his Canterbury Tales set forth the Sumner, Pardoner..." (76) and prosopopoeia or "the Counterfait in personation", of which he says "no prettier examples can be given you thereof, than in the Romant of the rose translated out of the French by Chaucer, describing the persons of avarice, envie, old age, and many others, whereby moralitie is taught". (77) In other words, Puttenham distinguishes between what I have called emblematic and specific characters with the terms prosopopoeia and prosopographia.

The possibilities of the original figure of prosopopoeia, (that is to say, the full dramatic impersonation of a character in oratory) producing truly individual and lively characterisations in oratory and poetry were severely limited by the doctrine of decorum, which was given its classic expression by Horace in the Ars Poetica. (78) This decreed that a character should not speak in any way that was not typical of his kind. This naturally prevented any attempt at overly idiosyncratic
characters emerging from the Classical practice of prosopopeia.

(79)

Another potentially lively figure of characterisation common in rhetorical teaching was descriptio personae, which occurs in Cicero's *De Invenzione*, and is a complete catalogue of a person's appearance, life and personality. It was intended to apply to a specific individual, not a type, but the rigid categories implicit in Cicero's formulation (eleven points the writer may consider) were strengthened by Mediaeval theorists to the point where the descriptio personae was a formal decoration rather than a living picture. (80)

These technical terms were probably known to Nashe, and he was therefore aware of the possibility of vivid personal descriptions, even though no practice of vivid characterisation had derived from the definitions. It is also possible that Nashe was aware of the other strand of character description in Classical antiquity, the Theophrastan Character.

Theophrastus produced his collection of Characters in the fourth century B.C. Thirty character descriptions survive, some minute and very vivid pen-portraits of particular men, some more general surveys of one tendency in several men. For example, Garrulity concentrates entirely on one man, while Ill-breeding is more generalised. They are moral in intention, and although
biting, and at times amusing, not principally intended for entertainment. The Characters were printed in several European editions in the sixteenth century, but were known only to scholars until Casaubon's edition appeared in 1592. This gave the Greek text of twenty-seven Characters, with a Latin translation, and a Prolegomenon which mentioned other Characters of the Theophrastan type in Classical literature.

In Thomas Wilson's influential Arte of Rhetorique (1553) there is a descriptio personae which is, to all intents and purposes, a Theophrastan Character. It describes a 'pinch-penny' who "will not lose the paring of his nailes..., one paire of shone serveth him a twelve moneth, he is shod with nailes like a Horse. He hath bene knowne by his coate this thirtie Winter." (81) Wilson's description conforms to the type of the Theophrastan Character because, Boyce says, of its "brevity, representativeness, graphic and suggestive detail... and also acid humour and... sting in the final sentence." (82) Nashe's description of Greedinesse could hardly be more different, for he is a generalised figure whose dress is lengthily and symbolically described:

"...his breeches, they were made of the lists of broad cloaths, which he had by letters patents assured him and his heyres.... But of al, his shooes were the strangest, which being nothing els but a couple of crab shels, were toothd at the tooes with two sharp sixpennie nailes, that digd
Dame Niggardize, similarly, is extravagantly and wordily described. She has, for instance, "an old wives pudding pan on her head, thrum’d with the parings of her nailes." (84) The community of topic between Wilson’s description and Nashe’s allegorical figures helps to highlight the difference in form.

However, if we consider the next emanation of a Deadly Sin, the first Pride figure, we find it does have certain features in common with the Character, of Theophrastan type, which Wilson presents. It is relatively short, specific and much more cutting in its observation and wit. It deals with a particular character, not a symbolic figure or a group of persons of a type. Nashe, however, unlike the practitioners of the Theophrastan character, tends to elaborate, even in places where brevity would better serve his purpose. If Nashe took the Theophrastan Character as his starting point for these pictures of Pride, he blurred the outlines of that form. For example, marking the upstart gentleman as a feigned poet, he says: "Sometimes (because Love commonly weares the livery of Wit) hee will be an Inamorato Poeta, & sonnet a whole quire of paper in praise of Lady Swin-snout." (85) The phrase in parentheses is strictly unnecessary, and clutters the satire. In the same way the simile in "weare a feather of her rain-beaten fan for a favour, like a fore-horse" (86), is excess to the clear edge of the portrait, though witty in itself. If Nashe were attempting to imitate the Theophrastan Character, he was not particularly successful, for
the hallmark of that form is brevity, and Nashe shines in elaboration and profusion.

Boyce, in his useful book The Theophrastan Character in England to 1642, does not consider Nashe an early practitioner of the Classical genre, but rather the apex of the native form of character description. This native form combined with the Classical Character to produce the English Character collections of the next century. The native character is found in Chaucer, and in the homiletic tradition, but flowered in the work of Lodge and Nashe. But Boyce cannot be sure to what extent these two writers were aware of Classical Characters and theories of characterization. (87)

"In Pierce Penilesse both the matter and form that we associate with the Character began to emerge, and the more conspicuously because of the prose style — a scoffing manner; sentences loaded with epithetic colloquialism, and slang; short, pronounced cadence; and an abundance of photographically vivid details from real life."(88)

Boyce goes on to say, however, that the characters in the Theophrastan manner are outnumbered by those in the allegorical and burlesque manner, and perhaps "one cannot be sure that the two passages (the descriptions of the upstart and Mistress Minx) came close to the genuine Character for any reason other than accident (that is to say, through the inevitable maturing of
earlier tendencies in type satire.)"(89)

There is no likelihood, therefore, of defining Nashe's precise relationship with the tradition, native or Classical, of Character writing. Time and again in Nashe's work, we find the same idiosyncratic use of genre. He is a magpie of form, a masterly converter of kinds.

The portrait of Mistress Minx, 'a Marchants wife' seems to conform closely to the Theophrastan Character; in it Nashe wastes no words, interpolates few superfluous phrases. The woman is portrayed through specific actions. The prose is tauter than in the descriptions of other sin-types, and more ironical and the humour is not as broad:

"she is so finicall in her speach, as though she spake nothing but what shee had first sewd over before in her Samplers... she will not go into the fields, to cowre on the greene grasse, but she must have a Coatch for her convoy: and spends halfe a day in pranking her selfe if she be invited to any strange place." (90)

Boyce is right, however, when he says that the framework of these characters vitiates against their 'theophrastan' nature. (91)

The last sentence on Mistress Minx is immediately followed by a return to the broad Complaint manner: "Is not this the excesse of pride, signior Sathan? Goe too, you are unwise, if you make her not a chiefe Saint in your Calender."
Although Nashe was probably aware of the rhetorical background of characterisation, it is not possible to apply the terms of rhetoric with any certainty to his writing. Generally, he will conform in some degree and diverge in some other point from any technical definition. For example it might be possible to regard the portrait of the Stationer which I quoted earlier as an illustration of notatio as Erasmus defined it. However, Nashe is not merely content to sum a man up through one characteristic pose and gesture; he must add more to his picture— not enough to make it a full description, but enough to detract from its being classic Erasmian notatio. Similarly, one could see the description of Greedinesse as a standard combination of effictio and notatio, in the sense used by the author of the Ad Herennium.

The first half of the description of Greedinesse is a purely physical outline, and the second describes the nature of the man by his actions. (92) However, the description of Greedinesse is rather a collection of symbolic attributes than a delineation of a man required by rhetoric. At most we can say that a rhetorical training shaped the emblematic tradition to produce the picture of Greedinesse.

Another interesting version of a rhetorical feature is found in the treatment of Wrath. Although Nashe characterises Wrath very little, and chiefly in emblematic terms ("a hare-braind little Dwarf it is, with a swarth visage, that hath his hart at his tongues end"(93)), he could be viewed as practising the
Classical form of prosopopoeia (not to be confused with

Puttenham's use of the same term); he attacks Wrath, but later,
in the course of his defence of poetry (which is a digression
under the Wrath topic), Nashe boasts of his skill as a poet and
as a writer of invective. He then launches an attack on Richard
Harvey, at the end of which he writes:

"I would not have you thinke that all this that is
set downe heere is in good earnest... but onely
to shew shewe for a neede I could rayle, if I were
throughly fyred.... Tell me (Harvey) what doe you
thinke of the case? am I subject to the sinne of
Wrath I write against, or no, in whetting my penne
on this blocke. I know you would faigne have it
so, but it shall not choose but be otherwise for
this once." (94)

The invective is a proof of skill, and perhaps is an exercise in
Classical prosopopeia. Nashe implies that he has succeeded in
convincing Harvey of his genuine wrath, while being unmoved.

We turn, finally, to Puttenham's distinction between
prosopographia and prosopopeia, that is 'realistic' and
'emblematic' characterisation. This, it seems to me, is a
covenient way of differentiating between Nashe's types of
characterisation of the Seven Deadly Sins. Nashe can be seen as
using prosopographia for Pride and Sloth, and prosopopeia for
Greedinesse, Niggardize, Envie and Wrath. Both terms, however,
are coupled by Puttenham under the term Hypotiposis or "counterfeit representation" (95), so that they are not directly opposed methods of characterisation. We may assume that Nashe felt similarly about their use, and changed from one to another for the sake of variety rather than for any decorum or principle.

As with the distinctions between the modes of Complaint and Satire, the different methods of characterisation to which they correspond in our minds were probably only dimly differentiated in Nashe's mind. He drew from every stream that sprang up, regardless of its origin.

THE SUPPLICATION:– THE DEFFENCE OF POETRY AND THE STAGE

In the course of the Seven Deadly Sins section of Pierce Penilesse, Nashe inserts two digressions in defence of matters close to his heart: poetry and the stage. One might be tempted to say that these defences were the 'real purpose' of the book, since they seem so genuinely urged. There is no need, however, to see their urgency as a dismissal of the more relaxed residue of the book. Pierce Penilesse seems to have several aims in view, and defending the arts is only one of them. Political satire and the desire to make money by entertaining the reading public cannot be discounted as 'real aims'. 
These two pieces belong clearly to a strain of English writing, which cannot be called a kind, since it is bonded by subject matter rather than by any form. Nashe's pieces are only small contributions to the battle between the enemies and supporters of poetry and the stage. One might uncharitably suspect Nashe of "jumping on the bandwagon" of Lodge and Sidney if it were not evident from the tone of the writing and from Nashe's own situation that he was sincere in his defence.

The historical background to Renaissance attacks on poetry has been well described and documented by Basil Willey in Tendencies in Renaissance Literary Theory (96) and by Arthur F. Kinney in Markets of Bawdrie: The Dramatic Criticism of Stephen Gosson. (97) The case of poetry and that of drama were often tackled together, and similar arguments were extended to attack or defend them. However, among the Elizabethans the arguments against the stage were strengthened by practical and more strictly moral considerations, and the defence, as Nashe's example shows, had to take a different course.

Plato's famous opposition to poets, and his excluding them from his commonwealth (98) is the earliest example produced by the opponents of poetry, as well as the most cogent. Gosson bases his Schoole of Abuse on Platonic writings (99), and Sidney considers Plato's opposition a serious bar: "But now indeed my burden is great, that Plato's name is laid upon me, whom I must
confess, of all philosophers I have ever esteemed most worthy of reverence." (100) Plato provided the most reverent authority for an attack on poetry and drama, but the Church Fathers, especially Tertullian and Augustine gave Christian support to the position he had first plotted. Tertullian's attack De Spectaculis was specifically against plays, which he regarded as idolatrous. He was followed by Cyprian, Lactantius and Clement of Alexandria (101) in similar denunciations. Augustine in his City of God confirmed these earlier opinions on the pernicious nature of poetry and drama (102), and the same objections were repeated in many later writers. Willey sums up the general Mediaeval attitude: "For the Christian church... all art was pernicious, except that which subserved the prevailing religious consciousness." (103) During the Renaissance the attack on poetry continued, Savonarola being its foremost antagonist in Italy. Atkins also cites Agrippa's De Vanitate et incertitudine scientiarum and Berni's Dialogo contra i Poeti (104) as examples of the attack.

In England the attack on poetry was part of the attack on the theatre. In 1577 John Northbrooke opened the ecclesiastical attack on the theatre (105), constructing his onslaught out of Augustine and Agrippa. (106) Shortly thereafter Stephen Gosson widened the attack to include poetry in the general condemnation in the Schoole of Abuse (1579). This is subtitled "a plesaunt invective against Poets, Pipers, Plaiers, Jesters and such like
Caterpillers of a Commonwealth. Gosson's book is important not only because it had official backing and a wide distribution (107), but also because it provoked considerable reaction among actors and poets. Several plays and tracts were produced supporting or answering Gosson, most notably Lodge's Honest Excuses and Sidney's Defense of Poesy. (108) Gosson's work admits the antiquity of poetry and that poetry has its good uses. He attacks the modern abuse of poetry, music and the stage, rather than the arts per se. Almost at the outset of the Schoole of Abuse he puts this as plainly as his Euphuistic style allows:

"I must confess that Poets are the whetstones of wit, not withstanding that wit is dearly bought: Where honv and gall are mixed, it will be hard to sever the one from the other." (109) Poetry is degenerate, since its "right use" in the past was to present the "notable exploits of worthy Captaines"; but poets now are wanton and "amarous", and their "allurement... drawes the mind from vertue, and confoundeth wit." Equally degenerate are "piping and playing... all three chavned in linkes of abuse." Theatres are the centres of all these abuses: "There set they abroche straunce consortes of melody, to tickle the eare; costly apparel, to flatter the sight; effeminate gesture, to ravish the sence; and wanton speache, to whet desire too inordinate lust." (110) English society is consequently degenerate: "Compare London to Rome & England to Italy, and you shall finde the Theatres of the one, the abuses of the other, to be rife among us." (111) There are some good plays, however,
including one by Gosson himself, but these "are not fit for every
man's dye: neither ought they commonly to bee shewn." (112)
The majority of Gosson's arguments are drawn from Classical
sources, frequently in the form of anecdotes. One, for example,
from Macrobius or Dio Cassius is used by Nashe in his defence of
poetry; Gosson's version goes

"if Players bee called to accounte for the abuses
that growe by their assemblyes, I would not have
them answere, as Pilades did for the Theatres of

Rome when they were complained on, and Augustus

waxed angry: This resort O Caesar is good for

thee, for heere we keepe thousands of idle heds

occupied which else peradventure would brue some

mischief.

To this Gosson adds "A fit Cloude to cover their abuse, & not
unlike the starting hole that Lucinius found...." (113) This

shows the level of Gosson's argument; he cannot destroy the
contention of Pilades, but he cannot resist quoting it either.

There were numerous attempts to defend poetry in Renaissance
Europe, notably those of Minturno, Castelvetro and Ronsard.
(114) Lodge's Honest Excuses (1579/80), written in answer to

Gosson's book follows the footsteps of these. Lodge takes on the
Schoole of Abuse point by point. Lodge agrees with Gosson to
some degree, for he too deplores the abuses which he sees in contemporary arts:

"the abuse is, when that is a polved to wantonnenesse, which was created to shewes Gods worthinesse. When the shamefull resorts of shameles curtezanes in sinful sonnets, shall prophane vertue these are no light sinnes, these make many goodmen lament. if this were reformed by your policie I should esteme of you as you wysh." (115)

But Lodge produces much in defence of poetry; his arguments are reasoned, although conventional. (116) Poetry is ancient, divinely inspired, and a mass of ancient authors can be quoted to defend it- plays are useful didactic vehicles. Lodge quotes Horace on early playwrights: "sayeth he ther was no abuse but these men reprehended it."(117)

Whether Sidney’s Defense of Poesy (printed 1595) was a direct answer to Gosson or not, it remains the crystallisation of all arguments in defence of poetry and the arts. Sidney has an immensely high regard for poetry and the poet, setting him next under God as a creator of "things either better than nature brings forth, or quite anew, forms such as never were in nature." (118) Incidentally, a poet for Sidney is not only a writer of verse, but any writer of sufficient standard: "it is that feioning notable images of virtues, vices, or what else, with that delightful teaching which must be the right describing note to know a poet by."(119) This helps to clarify Nashe’s conception
of himself as a writer, for he describes himself as a poet, but only mentions works in prose. Under Sidney’s definition a fine prose-writer could be a ‘poet’.

Sidney is concerned to show the superiority of the poet as a moral teacher over all other kinds of writer; the poet can assist the reader in experiencing virtue and vice, rather than telling him about them. Sidney summarises the arguments against poetry: that poetry is a waste of time compared with other studies; that poets are liars; that poetry nurtures abuses by insinuation, and has made mankind weak and unwarlike; and that Plato banished poets from the Republic. He answers these arguments, which are to be found partially or embryonically in Gosson, with these contentions: that if poetry teaches virtue (as he has spent much energy showing) it cannot be a waste of time; that the poet "nothing affirms and therefore never lies"; that although amorous poetry may sometimes produce undesirable results, this is but man’s wit abusing poetry, not poetry abusing man’s wit; that poetry predates ascertainable history and was and is "the companion of camps"; finally, Sidney accuses Plato of inconsistency, since the philosopher while banishing poets, was capable of using poetic language; furthermore, Plato’s philosophy was at times more corrupt than amorous poetry, witness the Symposium and Phaedrus. (120)
Nashe's defence of poetry is slight by comparison with Sidney's. Nashe had, in fact, contributed to the debate on poetry in his earliest work, The Anatomie of Absurditie (1588).

This youthful work is in part an answer to Philip Stubbes' The Anatomie of Abuses (1583), that very popular tirade against social abuses, including the theatre. Nashe's Anatomie, in McKerrow's words, is "evidently a patchwork of scraps from others, containing little, if any, original material." (121) It is interesting, nevertheless, to compare Nashe's defence of poetry in the Anatomie to that in Pierce Penilesse. The former is highly conventional. Hibbard says "Nashe proceeds to an eloquent defence of true poetry, treating it along familiar Renaissance lines as the most effective form of moral philosophy" (122), whereas McKerrow says, more scathingly, "Nashe's views on poetry correspond closely to those put forward by Plutarch in De Audiendis Poetis. These have, however, been so often repeated by other writers that there seems no reason for supposing direct imitation." (123) Nashe goes so far as to state in his defence that "Poetry is the very same with Philosophy", but follows this with the assertion that the more obscure the poet's meaning the more wholesome the fruit of his moral lesson: "in Poems, the things that are most profitable are shrouded under the Fables that are most obscure." This is a curious defence of poetry to say the least. Nashe treads on dangerous ground when he declares that lascivious verse is designed to show the "of-spring of
lust'; this common defence of amorous poets, such as Ovid, regards such writers as allegorists. Nashe further muddies the water of his argument by declaring that a wise man will be unaffected by trifling poetry anyway, which rather undermines his argument that poetry is the finest moral teacher. He then goes on to argue the merits of Classical verse on the grounds that it occasionally mentions biblical matters. This particular defence takes up two pages of the five devoted to the matter. Finally, Nashe concludes that there are obscene poets, and although "out of the filthiest Fables, may profitable knowledge be sucked and selected", it would be wiser to keep these from "tender youth". Nashe betrays something of the spirit he will later show when he says of Virgil and Ovid, apropos their obscene poems: "I commende their witte, not their wantonness, their learning not their lust:" (124) Even in this conventional cento Nashe shows his admiration for wit and invention: apparently quoting Cicero, but supplying the words himself, Nashe begins his defence by praising poetry for two things, "sweetness of verse, and variety of invention."

Nashe's arguments in his second defence of poetry, that in Pierce Penilesse, are far less elevated than those found in his earlier piece. He argues from practicalities, rather as Gosson argued against the theatre and poetry on practical grounds. He introduces the subject of poetry in the course of his discussion of Wrath, by means of a link between "those that ravle at all men", and those who rail against learning, in particular
Cornelius Agrippa (from whose work Nashe culled exhaustively). Nashe declares that the attack on learning is evidently self-defeating, since the attackers could never have framed their arguments "if her selfe (Learning) had not helpt (them) to hurte her selfe." (125) Nashe is not concerned with this debate, but finds it a useful step towards "an invective against the enemies of Poetrie". He juxtaposes the attackers of learning and those of poetry, an arrangement which would not altogether please the latter group, but which gives Nashe an invisible advantage.

Nashe opens his defence by carrying the fight into the enemies' camp, and pointing out how much better a preacher is a man who has been trained in poetry: "How admirablie shine those Divines above the common mediocrity, that have tasted the sweete springs of Pernassus?" (126) On his way to this novel defence, Nashe produces another unusual proof of the superiority of poets: they are better than preachers because the poet is original, while the preacher borrows most of his material. Poetry is also justified on the grounds that it requires pains: "you shall finde there goes more exquisite paines and puritie of witte, to the writing of one such rare Poem as Rosamond, than to a hundred of your dunsticall Sermons." (127) All three of Nashe's initial defences are really attacks on his opponents; he begins his defence proper from a position of strength.
His grounds for defence are two-fold. Poetry has purified English to the point where it is the richest language in the world; and poetry encourages virtue and discourages vice. The first of these arguments is interesting, and engages Hibbard's attention (128), but is not developed by Nashe. He concentrates on the second point. Unlike Sidney, he does not contend that poetry establishes virtuous behaviour by showing it in action, or that vice is discouraged by its portrayal; Nashe considers it is fear of posterity's opinion, enshrined in poetry that will discourage men from wrong and urge them to do good, and thereby attain true fame in poetry. That the only lasting fame was that endowed by poetry was a common concept in Renaissance criticism, and drew its beginnings from Plato (129); it lies at the base of Gosson's remark: "The right use of auncient poetry was too have the... vertuous lives of predecessors set downe in numbers." (130)

Nashe succinctly and practically states his thesis thus:
"Those that care neither for God nor the divell, by (poets') quills are kept in awe." (131) This, like his previous contentions on behalf of poetry is a new kind of argument, an argument from practical results, and contrasts strongly with the ill-thought-out theoretical arguments in the Anatomie. Nashe produces reasonable examples to bolster his case: Sidney's good fame is promulgated by Du Bartas, while Chaucer's characters are famous or infamous as a direct result of his poetry. (132) Still pursuing his practical course, Nashe propounds the use of poetry (or rather 'choise words', since the true poetry can be in prose
or verse) in writing history, and by implication local history. This would seem to be an entirely new idea of Nashe's own; one he was to try out for himself in Lenten Stuffe.

Nashe concludes his defence of imaginative writing with a practical display of its power; in this case, its power is seen in denigrating an opponent. Whether this does the cause of poetry any good is doubtful but it does give Nashe the opportunity to introduce an attack on Richard Harvey into the discussion. This piece could be said to belong to a genre of its own—flyting (133)—but it is typical of Nashe's sleight-of-hand in linking the pieces together, that it appears to come under the umbrella of a defence of poetry.

In his defence of the theatre (134) Nashe uses practical arguments again, this time more down-to-earth ones. In times of peace, he says, "there is a certaine waste of the people for whome there is no use, but warre." (135) These people are better occupied at the theatre than at home plotting mischief, or abroad "gameing, following of harlots, drinking." Having established a sound social reason for the existence of theatres, Nashe decides to have it both ways, and defend the theatre on less dramatic grounds, similar to those he defended poetry upon. Curiously, they are the same as Gosson's reasons for allowing certain exceptions to his blanket disapproval of plays. Plays, says Nashe, as did Gosson grudgingly (136), can show great martial feats and immortalise great and wicked men. He seems to have forgotten that he said the same of poetry, when he affirms that
"there is no immortalitie can be given a man on earth like unto Plays." (137) Plays also actively discourage treason, by showing its unfortunate end and "the miserie of civil dissention." Like Lodge, Nashe maintains that "no Play... raiseth or approoveth pride, lust, whoredome, prodigalitie, or drunkennes, but beates them downe utterly." (138) Unlike Lodge, Nashe does not mention comedy in this respect, no doubt thinking it safer to use only serious moral and historical plays in his argument.

Finally, Nashe appeals to the same sentiment he played on in his descriptions of Pride - the prejudice against foreigners. Foreign actors are "a sort of squirting baudie Comedians, that have whores and common Curtizens to playe womens partes" (139); but English actors are quite different, and a cause for patriotic pride. Ned Allen is particularly praiseworthy, and should be known throughout Europe. In appealing to national security, in his argument that plays discourage treason, and to patriotism, in his ennobling of English actors, Nashe takes the ground from under his opponents' feet, since these are arguments they are themselves fond of using. (140)

The Supplication is itself a farrago- for it contains within it pieces of different kinds, bound together under one roof. It is also a piece, albeit the major one, of the farrago Pierce Penilesse. The Supplication is a more successful 'farrago' than Fierce Penilesse, since it has a strong thread- the Seven Deadly Sins- which keeps its digressions in control. Pierce Penilesse
has a much weaker thread, that of devils in general. However, the major flaw of the Supplication is the same as that of Pierce Penilesse— the first piece or pieces are the best and longest, and the latter pieces drag as if Nashe had run out of steam.

THE FABLE

Nashe's fable of the Bear, the Fox and the Chameleon (141) is ostensibly an illustration of hypocrisy: "Hypocrisle I remember, was our Text." It is really two fables rolled into one, the first concerning the blood-thirsty ambitions of the Bear, the second the deceitful practices of the Fox and the Chameleon. Fundamentally, these tales owe their origins to the Aesopic fable, and possibly to the Renard cycle (142), but they have a more immediate source, which again shows Nashe's ability to subsume any useful literary form.

The use of a beast fable to carry a satirical point was found in Mediaeval and Tudor writing (143), but it seems clear from Nashe's particular fable that the beasts are not used merely to portray general human failings but specific persons. The two works from which Nashe seems to have drawn his inspiration for these fables bear this out. Spenser's Mother Hubberds Tale (dated between 1580 and 1590 (144)) is referred to by Nashe in Strange Newes (145), and its calling-in by the authorities is
implied by Nashe's comment that the poem kindled "sparkes of displeasure" against Spenser. It is this displeasure, as well as the nature of the poem itself, which has led critics to believe it a political satire on Burghlev and Alencon, an attempt to gain patronage from Leicester by attacking his enemies in general and the French marriage in particular. The Fox and Ape of Spenser's tale, though like Nashe's beasts they draw their origins from Aesop and the Renardic tales, are interpreted as Burghlev, who used 'fox-like' strategies in his rise to power, and a combination figure of Simier and the Duc d'Alencon. Simier, who was Alencon's emissary, was referred to by Elizabeth as her 'ape' because of the pun implicit in his name. (146) The lion is Elizabeth herself. These identifications seem to apply to the latter part of the poem (lines 950 - end), whereas in the earlier part, the beast fable seems intended as a general complaint rather than a specific satire. Nashe was certainly familiar with this tale in 1593, so it is not an unlikely assumption that he was consciously imitating it in his own beast fable. This fable, like Spenser's, is generally regarded as having specific reference to persons. Even the cautious McKerrow says:

"It certainly seems possible that the bear may stand for Robert, Earl of Leicester, who had died in 1568 and whom it was therefore safe to attack.... His cognizance was a bear and ragged staff.... The Fox is perhaps Cartwright or Martin, and the old Chamaeleon either Martin or Penry.... It is possible that the general idea of the fable was suggested to Nashe by Spenser's
Others are less cautious; Donald J. McGinn in his article "The Allegory of the "Beare" and the "Foxe" in Nashe's Pierce Penilesse" (148) identifies almost all the beasts in Nashe's fable. The Bear is Leicester, the horse that kicks him Norfolk, the deer which the Bear poisons the first Earl of Essex, the unicorn possibly Lady Lennox, and the Ape conceivably Throckmorton. The Fox McGinn takes to be Cartwright and the Chameleon John Penry. McGinn posits as a source for Nashe's tale the underground political attack on Leicester, Leveasters Commonwealth (1584). This appear to have been a popular work, despite its being suppressed with some vigour. McGinn finds that all the incidents in the fable, and the attitude expressed towards the Bear correspond to those in Leveasters Commonwealth. Although he makes nothing of this, it seems to me very likely that, whatever political advantage Nashe might have been pursuing in writing his fable, he was aware of the popularity of the underground attack, and was attempting to 'cash in' on yet another popular form. Naturally, since Leicester was dead by 1592, there was a much smaller risk for Nashe than for the author of Leveasters Commonwealth. Nevertheless, as Anthony Petti points out, Nashe may have suffered as a result of this fable. Petti in his article 'Political Satire in Pierce Penilesse His
Supplication to the Divill' (149) interprets the whole work as an attack on Burghley. This identification is backed up by a letter from an English Catholic exile, Richard Verstegan, who wrote: "In a late pamphlet entytuled A Supplication to the Divell he (Burghley) is girded at, though he not somuch as in Mother Hubberdes Tale." (150) Petti sees satire of Burghley in everything from the figure of the Bear to Greedinesse and the Devil; even the Fox and the Chameleon he imagines might be Burghley and Robert Cecil, his son. Petti seems to have changed his mind however, by 1963, for in 'Beasts and Politics in Elizabethan Literature' (151) he accepts McGinn's interpretation of the Bear as Leicester, and only tentatively suggests his own theory of Burghley and Walsingham or Robert Cecil for the Fox and Chameleon. Hibbard, on the contrary, accepts that the Fox and Chameleon are, as McGinn suggests, Cartwright and Penry, but rejects the Leicester/Bear interpretation on the grounds that Nashe would not "have taken the risk of offending so powerful a family." He also believes that "Leicester does not seem... to be nearly big enough to fill the skin of Nashe's Bear." (152) Hibbard thinks the Bear may be a type, as Nashe claimed, of a blood-thirsty tyrant, with affinities with Philip of Spain. I am inclined to agree with McGinn's identification of the Bear with Leicester; the use of Leycesters Commonwealth seems to me to coincide with Nashe's common practice of adapting a popular form to his own purposes. In this case, he seems to be amalgamating the fable Spenser used with the sensational allegations of
Leicester's Commonwealth. But it is impossible to make any certain identifications with the information we have to hand.

PLAGIARISM: THE DISCOURSE ON SPIRITS

The fables are told by the Knight of the Post, but there is no attempt to characterise him in his speech; he exists as a convenient interlocutor. He thus serves a useful function in the book for his presence binds together several disparate pieces. The Knight tells the fable to illustrate hypocrisy, and concludes it "How likest thou my tale, friend Persie? Have I not described a right earthly Devil unto thee, in the discourse of this bloodie minded Beare?" (153) This helps to lead into the next part of the book, which is a discourse on devils and spirits. This is taken from a book by Georgius Pictorius called De Illorum Daemonum qui sub lunari collimitio versantur ortu... Isaqoge.

Nashe apparently translated what he used of this book himself, and slightly altered it, but otherwise made no contribution to Pictorius' text. McKerrow describes Nashe's method thus:

"Nashe's text is for the most part a close translation, with such slight modifications as are necessitated by the abandonment of the dialogue form (of Pictorius' work). Sometimes, however, he paraphrases, while more frequently he omits passages or inserts remarks of his own. These
latter are, however, as a rule quite short." (154)  
There is, I think, no point in discussing the literary antecedents of Pictorius' treatise, since Nashe was not following or adapting the treatise genre, but borrowing wholesale from another book, without regard to the genre. More relevant, perhaps, to a consideration of Nashe as a literary artificer, is the curious contradiction between his statements and his practice in this instance. Not only is the Pictorius copied, it is copied unacknowledged. And yet in this same book Nashe writes with some vehemence against plagiarists:

"Should we (as you) borrowe all out of others, and gather nothing of our selves, our names should bee baffuld on everie Booke-sellers Stall, and not a Chandlers Mustard-pot but would wipe his mouthe with our wast paper. Newe Herrings, new, wee must crye, every time wee make our selves publique, or else we shall be christened with a hundred newe tytles of Idiotisme." (155)

In the Preface to Menaphon he attacks writers who "in disguised array vaunt Ovids or Plutarchs plumes as thevr owne" (156) and praises "the man whose extemporall veine in any humour will excell our Arte-maisters deliberate thoughts; whose inventions... will challenge the prowdest Rhetorician." (157)

Elsewhere in the same Preface he attacks those who borrow "whole sheetes & tractates verbatim from the plentie of Plutarch and Plinie." (158) In the Anatomie of Absurditie, as I have
mentioned, a great deal is borrowed, however. It seems that Nashe was theoretically determined on the method of original writing he describes in Nashes Lenten Stuffe as wringing "juice out of a flint" (159), and propounded it quite seriously; but that he was at first unable to procure materials for his books without borrowing. As he became more proficient at the production of his books the amount of borrowing diminished, and what was borrowed was radically altered. In Pierce Penilesse, Nashe has not mastered the art of transforming his borrowed matter. The discourse on spirits, in spite of its bulk and its function in balancing the descriptions of the Sins, as Hibbard points out (160), has the air of a 'filler', a piece acquired to pad out the book. Nashe makes only desultory efforts to bind it in.

THE CONCLUDING INTRODUCTION

One of the features of the other four farragoes which are dealt with in this study is the underlying unity of intention, which binds the farraginary elements together. In Pierce Penilesse, however, in spite of Petti's contention (161), there seems to be no unifying intention, except to provide entertaining reading-matter, and so provide Nashe with some money. The Supplication fulfills itself, in that by publishing his Supplication Nashe goes the quickest way to get money. Instead
of an unifying intention, there is a certain unity of subject matter; the Divell of the title is never far from the subject in hand, and all the digressions are connected. The lonnest digression, the defence of poetry and the attack on Richard Harvey, is bound into the subject of Wrath, one of the major subjects of the Supplication. Occasionally the connections are a little tenuous: the Supplication proper, concerning the imprisonment of Gold, really ends after the description of Greedinesse and Niggardize and their house; by sleight-of-hand Nashe carries on with the description of the other Deadly Sins, referring to the Devil throughout, in such phrases as "Is this not the excesse of pride, signior Sathan?" and "be advertised, Master os foetidum, Bedle of the Blackesmithes" which remind the reader that he is still within the Supplication. After the Supplication, Nashe admits that he has strayed a little from his original purpose, when he has the Knight of the Post say: "A Supplication calst thou this?... it is the maddest Supplication that ever I sawe; me thinks thou hast handled all the seven deadly sinnes in it..., it is well done to practise thy witte but (I beleeeve) our Lord will cun thee little thanks for it." (162) At that point, of course, it is of little consequence that the Supplication was really a huge digression, since the reader has passed that point; the rest of the text is bound together through the person of the Knight of the Post with whom Pierce converses. The Knight is originally introduced in the narrative section which is differentiated from the Supplication; this narrative section is balanced by a final section which is likewise outside the conversation of Pierce and the Knight. In
this final section Pierce turns to the reader, after the departure of the Knight, and addresses him directly. He has in some sense been addressing him throughout the book, since the first-person narrative with which he opens appeals to the reader for sympathy. However in the final section Nashe turns to his reader explicitly, and initiates his concluding 'introductory' material.

As I shall mention in the next chapter, it was general practice for writers to open with an Epistle Dedicatory and an Address to the Reader. Facetious or unconventional introductory material was virtually unknown in England before the 1590's, so that Nashe's device in Pierce Penilesse was decidedly original.

He explains his topsy-turvy order thus:

"what, an Epistle to the Readers in the end of thy booke? Out upon thee for an arrent blocke, where learndst thou that wit? O sir, holde your peace: a fellon never comes to his answere before the offence be committed. Wherfore, if I in the beginning of my Book should have come off with a long Apologie to excuse my selfe, it were all one as if a theefe, going to steale a horse, should devise by the waile as he went, what to speake when he came at the gallows." (163)

It is clear that Nashe is not only aware of the novelty of placing his Address and Epistle at the end, but also regards them as a necessary justification of his work and not a mere formality. Paradoxically, Nashe takes a casual attitude towards
the book: "Gentle Reader... I dare say thou hast called me a hundred times dolt for this senseless discourse: it is no matter, thou dost but as I have done by a number in my days." (164) Nashe, as we have just seen, refers to himself as a criminal. In contrast to this the Address is really concerned with an attack on those who publish mediocre and bad books, both writers and booksellers and stationers, and with defending his own book's curious nature. Nashe makes only an implicit distinction between himself and the "base Ink-dropper, or scurvy blodder at Noverint" who so frequently "comes off with long Circumwauque to the Gentleman Readers." (165) At the same time he is elaborately casual about his claims for his book, and vehemently contemptuous of writers he considers beneath him.

In a similarly ambivalent manner, when Nashe opens the Epistle Dedicatory (for such it is, although it has no separate title (166)) he is cynical about patronage and dedications: "Now, Pierce peniles, if for a parting blow thou hast ere a tricke in thy budget more then ordinarie, bee not daintie of it, for a good Patron will pay for all. I, where is he?" (167) He continues to attack patrons in general and the folly of artists who let others steal the riches of their pens without payment; by this he means merely that patrons do not recompense writers for the oiled compliments they receive, though there is a further implication that to read and enjoy a book, and not repay the author's dedication is somehow theft. Paradoxically, Nashe's attitude to other writers expressed in this portion of the book
differs markedly from that in the Address to the Reader. There writers were base and scurvy; here they are "like the Indians, that have store of gold & precious stones at command, yet are ignorant of their value, & therefore let the Spaniards, the Englishmen and everie one loade their ships with them without molestation." (168)

With further lack of consistency, after attacking patrons and those who bother with them, Nashe turns about and produces a dedication to Amyntas which is so extreme as to sound almost like a parody of dedicatory writing: "that woonder, the matchlesse image of Honor, and magnificent rewarder of vertue, loves Eagle-borne Ganimed, thrice noble Amyntas." (169) The distinction between Nashe's dedication and those that he attacks is presumably that he expects his bid for patronage to be more successful than those he criticises. There is some suggestion also of a close bond between Nashe and "Amyntas", for example, Nashe's saying "let me digres to my private experience" when he introduces the subject of Amyntas, and the use of the name itself. The dedicatee presumably was known in some circle or other by this pseudonym. It is not known who he was—perhaps Fernando Stanley, Earl of Derby— but presumably some readers of the book recognised him under the disguise.
The praise of Amyntas is a prime example of the contradictory nature of Nashe's writing, and his lack of self-awareness. Within a page of writing with cynical superiority: "give an Ape but a nut, & he will look your head for it; or a dog a bone, and hele wag his taile: but give me one of my yoong Maisters a booke, and he will put of his hat & blush, and so go on his waie" (170), he can write, in all seriousness:

"Manye writers and good wits are given to commend their patrons and Benefactors, some for prowesse, some for policie, others for the glorie of their Ancestrie and exceeding bountie and liberalitie: but if my unable pen should ever enterprise such a continue taske of praise, I woulde embowell a number of those wind puft bladders... that so I might restore glorie to his right inheritance, and these stoln Titles to their true owners." (171)

The excessive praise is apparently acceptable if the object of it is worthy enough; although it is wrong to throw away one's riches on an unworthy patron, it is permissible to prostitute one's pen for the truly great, like Amyntas. Nashe is presumably unaware of the contradiction here, as he was of that in the section on Pride.

From these contradictions, we may deduce that Nashe divided his writing into quite small sections and wrote each piece without much attention to the others, except to ensure continuity and plausible links between them. These small pieces are bound
together to form larger sections, and the larger sections to form the whole farrago, but each piece is governed by its own rules, not by any overall principle determined by the whole work.

Following Nashe's example, I am tempted to conclude this chapter with an introduction. Nashe's work shares with the other farragoes we have examined a certain amount of unity in spite of the miscellaneous nature of its components, and an ambivalent attitude to writing itself, well demonstrated in the wild extremes of the Address and Epistle. Pierce Penilesse was Nashe's most successful work, even though to the modern eye it appears his most 'bitty'; it is possibly this strong sense of barely controlled miscellaneity which made it so popular. Nashe gives a vivid impression in this work of an artist so copious that he can only just manage to organise himself. That he does just manage it gives the book its appeal. We are satisfied by the intimation that there is an underlying plan, while revelling in the appearance of unplanned excess.
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Have with you to Saffron-Walden, or Gabriel Harvey's Hunt is up.

Was published by Nashe in 1596. It was his second full-length contribution to the dispute between himself and the Harvey family, the first being Strange Newes published in 1593. The prolonged and complex wrangle between the Harveys and Nashe and others is well documented by Hibbard, and has been minutely researched by other scholars. (1) I do not propose to cover this ground again, since it is sufficient for our purpose only to know the immediate context. Have with you was written in answer to Gabriel Harvey's Pierces Supererogation, although published three years after that voluminous work. Strange Newes had been similarly written in answer to Harvey's Foure Letters. Although Strange Newes is not a farrago it is worth considering here.
because of the connection in subject-matter with Have with you.

Nashe's second attempt at reducing Harvey to silence is generally considered more successful than the first. The secret of this success lies, I think, partly in the choice of the form. Strange Newes, like Have with you, has a facetious Dedication, to one Master Aoislapis, who seems to have been a notable drinker and something of a notorious character. As in the later work too, this Dedication sets the tone of the whole book - racy, pugnacious and popular. This is followed by an address to the reader, at the end of which Nashe writes: "Heere lies my hatte, and there my cloake, to which I resemble my two Epistles, being the upper garments of my booke, as the other of my body." (2) He clearly associates the two introductory pieces with the book, although different in nature, as the hat and cloak are different from other clothes. For its structure Strange Newes follows the book it is attacking, Harvey's Foure Letters, criticising that work in order, but with many digressions along the way. This simple method of working suits Nashe quite well, for when he has reached the end of a digression's potential, he merely quotes another passage from one of the unfortunate letters and comments on it. The digressions cover Richard Harvey's book The Lamb of God, the character of Robert Greene and various episodes from the lives and writings of the Harvey family. Like An Almond for a Parrat, this book shows distinct leanings towards the farrago.
There is an attempt to break the flow of the book up with a piece called: "The Arraignment and Execution of the third Letter." (3) Summersgill observes that the three-way dialogue is set up between Nashe, Harvey and the reader (4) which relates to the Marprelatian manner of dialogue I have mentioned earlier. There are also passages of biography, which in Have with you become a fully-fledged Life. Essentially, however, Strange Newes is written in a linear manner; that is to say, it is a simple progression of quotation and comment, and the interpolated pieces never constitute a large enough part of the whole to be termed farraginary elements. Nashe, in his second attempt on the Doctor took more pains with the construction, following the pattern he had already found successful in Pierce Penilesse. The result is much more satisfactory than Strange Newes, for although the latter is a very funny book, it tends to drag rather towards the middle, when the reader realises that the whole book is based on the same principle - quotation and ridicule- and that there are no surprises in store. How Nashe's own readers felt about the relative merits of the two books we have no indication, but the evidence of the books themselves suggest to me that Nashe felt he needed to make more of the second attack on Harvey. The format of Strange Newes was retained for one part, the Analysis, but enlivened by the addition of the dialogue form, and jest-book material, as we shall see. Otherwise, Nashe constructed a different kind of attack, presumably designed to silence the Doctor for ever, and used the farrago form to do it.
I shall treat Have with you in a slightly different manner from the other works we have examined. I shall, after an initial discussion of the dialogue genre and flying as a form, proceed through the book in order, looking more at literary devices than traditional forms. This is because Nashe is much more original here in his use of the traditional material, and in some cases does not draw on particular genres at all. The book is, nonetheless, a farrago, for it is constructed out of distinct pieces, some of which do have forebears in the preceding literature, and all of which can be given distinct titles. My sub-headings refer not to generic pieces, but to the divisions of the book. I do not give any background material in the sections on the Introductory Dialogue and the Analysis, since these pieces are not obviously descended from any tradition. The Address is not a form whose history is relevant to the work. It is too general a phenomenon to induce comment. The book opens with a long Epistle Dedicatorie to a barber named Dick Lichfield. This is humorous and linguistically extravagant, and takes up some ten per cent of the whole book. Next comes an address To all Christian Readers which introduces the speakers in the Dialogue to follow; this occupies about five per cent of the book. The Dialogue section begins with a discussion between the Interlocutors on Harvey and Pierces Supererogation and on Nashe's need to answer Harvey's accusations, all of which absorbs another fifteen per cent of the whole. This leads naturally into the attack which gets into gear with the parodic Oration, taken from
Harvey's own works. This, with the comments of the Interlocutors upon it, takes up another tenth. There follows the comic Life of Harvey which is the major part of the book and occupies a third of the whole. Finally comes A Summarie or breife Analysis of Pierces Supererogation which is a quarter of the book's length.

This last part is more concerned with the characters of Harvey's friends who contributed to Pierces Supererogation than with the book.

Each of these parts has a distinct role in the total destruction of Gabriel Harvey, or to use Nashe's own metaphor, each is a necessary stage of the Hunt. These functions will be enlarged upon as each part is discussed, but I shall summarise them now for the sake of clarity.

The Epistle Dedicatorie sets a particular humorous tone for the work which is to follow. I have called this a "mythic" tone, because it uses figures of legend to laud the dedicatee, Richard Lichfield. It is in fact mock-mythic, since the jocular tone turns the mythic figures into burlesque ones, and consequently sets the tone for the rest of the work, for Harvey and Nashe compete in this same area of popular legend and comic myth. The other function of the Epistle is to set a linguistic tone. The promise held out by the linguistic extravagance of these first few pages is never fulfilled, for the rest of the book is much less elaborate in style, but the setting is clear: this work is
one of linguistic enterprise: language and the act of producing it are very important. This is no mere work of personal abuse; it is also a work of literary creation. Nashe was to demonstrate in Lenten Stuffe the fulfillment of the introductory promise of 

Have with you. In this work it is necessary only to set the 

right tone. The right use of language is part of his quarrel with Harvey. As it transpires, the two subjects of the Epistle 

Dedicatorie are the essentials of the whole book: personality 

and language. The other parts use one or other of these aspects of Harvey's enormity.

The Address To all Christian Readers also deals with 

personality, but in an ambivalent way, as we shall see. Basically, however, it sets out to contradict the tone set in the Epistle and concentrate upon the reality of the characters 

involved, rather than their "mythic" or literary status. Nashe uses the Address to present himself as author rather than as Piers, and to present Harvey as a person, rather than as the comic personality which he will assume for the larger part of the book.

The next section is straightforwardly introductory. Piers is required to explain to his friends why he has not answered the Doctor's book. He does explain, thus setting the scene for any reader ignorant of the dispute to date. He also confirms the
comic dimensions of the work, set out in the Epistle, by his hyperbolic description of Pierces Supererooaation. The secondary function of this part is to provide Nashe with a justification for writing his attack on Harvey - his friends urged him to it.

In the Oration Nashe again engages simultaneously in the two offensives against his enemy, the war of personality, which turns Harvey into the Arch-Pedant, a larger-than-life figure of fun, and the war of language. In the Oration, Harvey speaks a ridiculous conglomeration of impenetrably defensive remarks. His language and his person are held up for laughter as the same time.

In the Life, however, Harvey the comic personality is more elaborately presented. He becomes a complete detailed comic hero, a mock-epic man. This is the culmination of the war of personality in which Piers Penilesse, the well-born, witty, modern young man, always surrounded by friends, is pitted against Gabriel Huddleduddle (or whichever of Nashe’s names for his opponent you prefer), the upstart, dull, pedantic, unsuccessful and friendless old man.

In the Analysis Nashe completes his devastation of Harvey by suddenly returning everything to reality. He attacks the real Harvey, not the comic personality, by attacking the real man’s friends, and he refuses to accept the convenient ‘gentlewom
whom Harvey had invented as an ally in Pierses Supererogation.

By refusing to accept Harvey's myths, and by putting aside his own, after they have been so successfully used to mock Harvey, Nashe has things both ways.

In all six parts of the book we see Nashe applying his chosen weapons in different ways. He oscillates between regarding his characters as real people and as "mythic" figures, as he does between a wildly extravagant style and a plain. This sets up a series of bathetic and incongruous effects which gives the book an ambivalent, but nevertheless, splendidly eccentric humour.

Of the six parts, the first two are clearly disjoint from the others, by nature of their kinds. (5) The other four are all linked together by the dialogue form in which the work is cast. Only the Life is not actually written in dialogue, but is inserted into it.

The history of the Dialogue form I have already examined in Chapter 2, but there are certain aspects of Nashe's use of the form which must be examined. Firstly there is the interesting problem of the relationship of Have with you to Bullein's Dialogue. In the Address Nashe states: "Memorandum, I frame my whole Booke in the nature of a Dialogue, much like Bullen and his Doctor Tocrub." (6) There are some similarities; Bullein's work
had twelve interlocutors who are distinct characters and Nashe's has five, who are supposed to be specific characters. Bullein's was a comic work, at least initially, and Nashe was also writing a comic dialogue, a form of the dialogue which was rare in English before Bullein. (7) Bullein's work used the dialogue form as an umbrella for several other pieces from other genres; Nashe wanted to do the same. This last similarity, of course, seems to me the most significant, since I would like to suggest that Nashe recognised the successful farrago Bullein had produced using the dialogue 'umbrella', and imitated him in this. It may be, however, that Bullein's was the only popular dialogue remotely like Nashe's, and this was the sole reason for Nashe's mentioning that work.

The difference between the two dialogues is very great. As we have seen, Bullein's is rather like a play, with many scenes and well differentiated characters, with considerable movement, and moments of comedy and drama. It is very wide-ranging in its subject matter, but firm about its general direction. Nashe's work is completely static, never moving from the "nooke or blind angle of the Black-friers" in which it is set. The characters, apart from Piers, have no distinctive characteristics, in spite of their being based, as Nashe assures us, on real friends of his. There is no action or climax, and no clear direction; Nashe is not religious, nor even moral in his conclusions, and sticks closely to his one subject, Harvey. Nashe's work is far more like the mainstream dialogues than it is like Bullein's work, for they are generally set in one spot, with speakers who
are not characterised beyond an initial name and sometimes age, and the only movement is that of the argument.

Nashe also uses in Have with you the kind of submerged dialogue which originated with Martin Marprelate. I mentioned this kind of dialogue in relation to The Metamorphosis of Ajax.

The submerged dialogue is seen for example after the formal Dialogue begins when Nashe/Pierce is in conversation with the Carrier who has brought him the Doctor's Book:

"Carrier, didst thou bring it by wayne, or on horse-backe? By wayne, sir, & it hath crackt me three axeltrees, wherefore I hope you will consider me the more. Heavie newes, heavie newes, take them againe, I will never open them. Ah, quoth he (deepe sighing), to mee, I wot, they are the heaviest, whose Cart hath cryde creake under them fortie times everie furlong:" (8)

This dialogue is reported by Piers as part of the Dialogue proper. Nashe here layers two forms for the purposes of variety and emphasis. This reported conversation with the Carrier makes vivid the enormity (in both senses) of the Book.

Nashe finds the Dialogue form most convenient. It allows him to include disparate pieces in his book without losing the appearance of unity. Piers' four friends comment on everything Piers has to say. They interrupt the Oration to point out folly..."
of the everything in it; they all take part in tearing apart the Doctor's Book. The Life is told to them, although they do not interrupt it much, and most importantly, they urge Piers to write an answer to his enemies. By using the Dialogue form, moreover, Nashe can look as if he is a cool-tempered man who does not wish to quarrel with the Doctor. When faced with such scorn as that of Importuno, how could Piers refuse to write his answer:

"Neither, if thou beest so senselesse that thou wilt not let it sinke into thee, (i.e. Harvey's insult to Piers' fame) doo I hold thee worthy to be any thing but the sinke of contempt, to be excluded out of all men of worths companies, & counted the abject scumme of all Poets and ballet-makers." (9)

Finally, the Dialogue form also provides a certain amount of variety. As we have observed in Nashe's work, variety is important since he must at all costs be amusing. Changing of forms and subjects is the major source of this, but merely changing speakers helps to break up the text and adds a little interest.
Before launching into an examination of the text, part by part, some discussion is necessary of the genre 'flyting'. As an established form, this is usually associated with late Mediaeval Scottish writing. Its origins are ancient, as W. Mackay Mackenzie has shown. (10) The form is related to the Mediaeval debat tradition but seems to be much less widespread than works of that kind. A Flyting is specifically an exchange of written personal abuse between two writers. The term is sometimes used of one-sided attacks, but this is misleading. (11) The most famous example in British literature is the flyting of Dunbar and Kennedy, which resulted in Dunbar's poem of the same name (1508). (12) In spite of the relative commonness of the term, there appear to be few real flytings in English Renaissance literature. Sir David Lindsay engaged in a flyting with James V and his counsellors. Thomas Churchyard engaged in an exchange of poems with one Camel, producing among other works The Contention bettwixte Churchyeard and Camell (1560). In the seventeenth century John Taylor the Water-Poet indulged in a feud with Coryate, and in 1605 there appeared The Flyting of Montgomerie with Polwart. However, apart from the Marprelate controversy, which might at a pinch be labelled a flyting between the bishops and Martin, there is nothing I have been able to discover which resembles the battle of books between Nashe and Harvey. This is
sometimes termed a flyting (13), and the term fits it well. However, there does not seem to be a tradition of flyting to which these books could be said to belong. They are an isolated example of the genre 'flyting' - almost incidentally in the same camp as Dunbar's poem. There is no literary tradition of prose abuse on which the two antagonists drew.

THE EPISTLE DEDICATORIE

Nashe's dedication of his book is to Dick Lichfield, the barber of Trinity College, Cambridge. The Dedication is, of course, facetious, both in its mere existence - to dedicate a work to a barber is a parodic action in itself - and in its tone, which is wildly extravagant. It simultaneously elevates the recipient and emphasises his lowliness. The resultant bathos is designed not to harm Lichfield, but Harvey, however, for the barber is held up as a man who is wittier and worthier than him.

Facetious dedications were rare before Nashe's works, three of which have such dedications, and increasingly common after them. (14) It may be that Nashe's example was followed by satiric writers of the next century. Certainly it is clear that in this, as in many other ways, Nashe was an inventive artificer.
Earlier in the century humorous dedications are found in Barnes' Treatyse answeyng the Boke of Berdes (1548), where the dedicatee is, interestingly enough, "Barnade Barber in Banbury". William Wedlocke's Image of Idlenes (1558) is dedicated to "Lady Lust". In the 1590's quite a number of such dedications are found; for example that in Martins Months Minde (1589), Greene's Newes both from Heaven and Hell (1593), Tarlton's Newes out of Furgatorie (1593), "Phillip Fowlface's" Bacchus bountie (1593), Chettle's Kind Hearts Dreame (1593), which is dedicated to "all the pleasant conceited wheresoever", and of course, Strange Newes dedicated to Master Apislapis. John Marston shortly afterwards dedicated The Metamorphosis Of Pigmalions Image (1598) to "the World's Mighty Monarch, Good Opinon" and The Scourge of Villanie (1598) to "his most esteemed, and best beloved Selfe" and to "Detraction". After 1600, writers such as John Taylor the Water Poet, Thomas Dekker, Samuel Rowlands and George Wither all adopted on occasion this sort of dedication.

Nashe did rather more than most of these authors with his facetious Dedications. He integrated their contents with the book, to make it a piece which was not appended to but part of the whole. In Pierce Penilesse, as we have observed, there is no Epistle Dedicatorie as such, but a dedication, and an address
imbedded in the text at the end. This radical but simple change allowed Nashe to make his dedication sound more sincere than dedications placed at the beginning generally do. The praise of Amyntas, coming straight out of the text (in spite of its curious context discussed in the last chapter) has more chance of being taken as a heartfelt expression of praise than if it had come at the opening.

In An Almond for a Parrat Nashe dedicates a conventionally placed Epistle to Will Kemp, a dedication which demonstrates clearly the tone of the pamphlet which is to follow; it aims to be humorous (as Kemp is humorous) at Martin's expense. The dedication, like that in Have with you, is couched in the most high-flown language: "To That Most Comicall and conceited Cavaleire Monsieur du Kempe, Jestmonger and Vice-Regent generall to the Ghost of Dicke Tarlton. His loving brother Cuthbert Curry-knave sendeth Greeting." This, like the dedication to Lichfield, is not intended to parody Kempe, but the butt of the book, Martin/Penry. In another respect too, Nashe uses the Epistle of An Almond in the same way that he uses it in Have with you. He introduces into it an anecdote telling of the rejoicing in Rome over Martin's successes against the Church of England. This clever combination of a good story and a bold jibe at Martin is exactly the sort of material that the book to follow is filled with, and it is also the kind of thing which Martin himself
excelled at. This Epistle, then, makes clear to any reader that the attack on Martin is to be in Martin's own manner.

In Have with you Nashe produces something which is both a parody of a dedication and a positive contribution to his book. Choosing a barber as a dedicatee and praising him in enormously grandiose terms immediately looks like a parody of the dedication as an institution, and a satire on the person so lavishly praised. However, after this initial impression it becomes clear that Lichfield is not the subject of the jest, but the means, and that the Epistle form is not only being parodied; it is being used. In the Epistle to Have with you Nashe refers to a sycophantic dedication prefixed to Richard Harvey’s Defence of Short Hair:

"In the Epistle Dedicatorie... to a great Man of this Land, whom he calls his verie right honourable good Lord, he recounteth his large bounties bestowed upon him, and talkes of the secret favours which hee did him in his Studie or Closet at Court." (15)

This dedication is mentioned partly to hint at unpleasant aspects of Richard Harvey’s personality, and also, I think, to point up the contrast between Dick Harvey and Dick Lichfield even though the former is the author of the sort of dedication which is being parodied and the latter the recipient of the parody.
The contrast Nashe is able to build up between the two Dicks was one of the reasons, no doubt, for his choosing Lichfield as a dedicatee, but another was, I imagine, that Richard Harvey was reputed to have written a book on beards and short hair. A third was the absurd contrast between the barber of Trinity College and the Fellow of Trinity Hall, Gabriel Harvey. Lichfield is besought by Nashe to give the Doctor a trimming, a double-edged jest, since it presents the ridiculous image of the Doctor "trimmed" - that is cut down to size - by a mere barber, and also parodies the usual requests of writers for favours from their dedicatees. Nashe has more fun with this idea when he says:

"Shall I make a motion, which I would not have thee thinke I induce to flatter thee neyther, thou being not in my walke, whereby I might come to wash my handes with thee a mornings, or get a sprinkling or a brushing for a brybe: wilt thou commence and make no more ado, since thou hast almost as much learning and farre more wit than the two Brothers." (16)

Linguistically, the Epistle is, as I have mentioned, important to the work. Nashe squanders all the riches of his linguistic invention on the first paragraph:

"To the most Orthodoxall and reverent Corrector of staring haires, the sincere & finigraphicall rarifier of prolixious rough barbarisme, the thrice egregious and censoriall animadvertiser of vagrant moustachios, chiefe scavinger of chins,
and principall Head-man of the parish wherein he
dwells, speciall supervisor of all excrementall
superfluities for Trinitie Colledge...." (17)
Although this is clearly a parody of the language of dedications
and also, probably, a parody of the language of Harvey (18), it
is uncomfortably close to the language Nashe himself uses in his
serious dedications: "Excellent accomplist Court-adorining
Lady... most resplendent Ladie... " (19) and "that woonder, the
matchlesse image of Honor, and magnificent rewarder of virtue,
loves Eagle-borne Ganined, thrice noble Amvntas." (20) There are
-- ---
two points to be made about this apparent contradiction.

Firstly, the main difference between the terms Nashe uses
seriously and those he uses in parody is not in the rhythm or
structure of the sentences nor in the large number of adjectives
attached to each noun, but in the linguistic inventiveness
displayed in the humorous dedication. The number of new words
and coinages in the latter is high, while in the serious
dedications he is conventional. The opening paragraph of the
Epistle Deducitorie of Have with you alone could be taken,
--- ---
therefore as a claim to linguistic originality. This book is
deeply concerned with the right use of language, and here we see
Nashe's credentials as a practitioner. He uses 'huge woordes'
but does so in a manner which he hopes will impress and amuse,
gracefully and wittily, unlike Harvey, who has, as he puts it in
Strange Newes: "some good words, but he cannot writhe them and
--- ---
tosse them to and fro nimbly." (21)
Secondly, the discrepancy between Nashe's hyperbolic serious dedications and his only slightly more hyperbolic humorous dedication is perhaps explained by Nashe's observable contradictory nature, which we saw in Pierce Penilesse. He may not be aware that in parodying dedications he is parodying himself. He is also notably inconsistent on linguistic matters, for he criticises Harvey's use of language while employing similar words and phrases to Harvey's, as Summersgill shows in some detail. (22) He even criticises Harvey for using the same words as he does himself. Nashe felt strongly about language, but not very clearly.

The Epistle is connected, in its concern with linguistic matters, with the Oration, in which Harvey is attacked for his linguistic incompetence. A certain difficulty arises in this connection, as the language of the Epistle is rather like that censured in the Oration. One must accept— as with the contradiction between Nashe's parody of dedications and his own use of dedication language— that there is an inconsistency at the base of Nashe's feelings about language. One might explain the existence in the same work of Nashe's "huge woords" in the Epistle and those ridiculed in the Oration by the fact that the former are in a comic setting and designed to be amusing, while the latter are plucked from a serious context, were it not for the case of Christs Teares over Jerusalem which is studded with the most amazing neologisms, which Nashe felt he had to defend.
(26) However, there is some justification for Nashe's stance: his polysyllabic neologisms are embedded in long and flowing sentences which are nonetheless comprehensible. Harvey's words of a similar sort are packed into dense, jerky sentences, which are, because of their compression and their strange vocabulary jointly, are almost impenetrable.

The major creative device in the language of the Epistle is the pun; the whole thing is written around the puns on barbers and barbarism - which Gabriel Harvey supposedly represents - and the puns on trimming. Nashe (or his printer) conveniently places all the subsidiary puns in italics, just in case one should miss them, and this gives the Epistle the appearance of a sort of exercise, or parlour-game: "how many puns can be made on barbering?" One feels that the Epistle is something of a set-piece, a demonstration of the fertility of Nashe's wit, and with its emphasis on words it reinforces the idea that this book is concerned with language. (25) Nashe begins by showing his mastery over it.

In a sense this Epistle, with its burlesque praise of a barber and its strong emphasis on the exercise of wit for wit's sake in the many puns, is related to the paradoxical encomia at which we looked in Chapter 3. Like a paradoxical encomium Nashe's Epistle Dedicatorie represents the triumph of skilful writing over unlikely subject-matter. What Nashe actually suggests in the Epistle is that Lichfield should defeat Harvey on academic grounds, an absurd notion in itself, but one which he manages to
make plausible by translating the battle to the realm of paradox. In a paradoxical way, the barber is Harvey's match, for he is a practical man, and, Nashe affirms, a witty man. Nashe succeeds, I think, in making us accept his paradoxical world by rewriting the rules: wit, and particularly wit put to work, is the true value by which people should be judged. Nashe puts his wit to work in turning out pun after pun without boring his reader.

Another demonstration of Nashe's enormous fertility is the catalogue of Dicks which begins the Epistle. This opens with a mock-heroic flourish: "Die mihi, Musa, virum" which provides the first of the 'negative prototypes' of Dick Lichfield - Musing Dick. By 'negative prototypes' I mean figures to whom Dick Lichfield, is compared in order to show his difference or superiority. The figures (the 'negative prototypes') chosen are significant, in that, in spite of the promise of the mock-heroic praise, we have heroes not of epic or Classical myth but of local folk legend. Who all these Dicks are, with the exception of Dick of the Cow, is not known, but it seems from the context that they were known to the readers and were figures of popular lore. Nashe is employing a complex parody here as he does with the Dedication as a whole; he uses the 'negative prototypes' which recall the 'outdoing' topos (26), in a humorous manner, as if laughing at this convention, but then completely reverses the convention, by not claiming this Dick's superiority to all the other Dicks at all. He lists them merely, he says "to shew the redundance of thy honorable Familie, and how affluent and copious thy name is in all places." (27)
Apart from the element of parody, the catalogue of folk-tale characters helps to associate the book and its characters with those legends. It is into a world of jest-book heroes and comic legends that Nashe places Harvey. In fact, Harvey and Nashe both become figures of the same kind as Dick of the Cow and Dick Swash-buckler in the historical sense, but much more vivid and memorable by virtue of the gestes attached to them. Nashe becomes, of course, Piers Penilesse, and Harvey Doctour Vanderhulk, Gregorie Huldrick, Gabriell Scurveie, or Frigius Pedagogus or whatever. These figures have clear-cut characteristics, rather like Commedia dell'Arte characters, or like Gargantua, Howleglas or Robin Goodfellow. Nashe does not at this point, however, lean much upon the jest-book tradition, though he does later. He relies upon the introductory flourish of Dicks to place the whole book in the legendary world.

Dick Lichfield becomes one of the company, or 'dicker' of Dicks; he is Diamond Dick and Donzel Dick among other names, and is contrasted to Richard Harvey, who is nicknamed Astrological Dick (for writing prognostications), favourite Dick (for writing sycophantic Dedications), and later Lipsian Dick (28), so that he too is gathered into the crowd of folk-figures.

Finally, it is worth noting that even in a piece as short and self-contained as the Epistle, Nashe inserts another piece, in order, one assumes, to stop the battery of puns and extravagant comparisons becoming boring. A Grace put up in behalfe of the
Harveys seems to have no function except to break up the surface of the Epistle, and allow Nashe to start the second half of it with a new impetus.

THE ADDRESS

Having established in the Epistle the areas in which he is working - burlesque, folk-tale and linguistic extravagance- and having securely established a comic tone, Nashe changes his manner to address his readers. He himself comments on the difference between these two parts:

"Gentlemen, what think ye of this sober mortified stile? I dare say a number of ye have drawn it to a verdit alredie; and as an Elephants fore-legs are longer than his hinder, so you imagine my former confutation wilbe better than my latter." (29)

But he will return to his exuberance: "you shall see me, in two or three leaves hence... powre hot boyling inke on this contemptible Hegoledepeqs barrain scalp." (30) However, in the mean time, Nashe makes an important contribution to the book. He makes the Address a point of contact between the reader and himself- as Thomas Nashe, not as Piers Penilesse. He adopts the manner of one telling the truth; he confides that he has been toying with this book for a long time, that he gets no money out of it, that he and Harvey would rather cease the quarrel, but
neither will give in, that he, Nashe, only writes against Harvey because he wants to "shew that (he) is able to answer him." Whether these confidences are true is not important; Nashe creates the impression that he is being honest and unpretentious with his readers. The real person behind Piers Penilesse is affirmed to exist, as is that behind 'Gorboduck Huddleduddle'. "Harvey and I... take upon us to bandle factions" Nashe writes, which implies that the two men are playing a game, and are somehow in connivance with each other, as does "...all the controversie Is no more but this, he began with mee, and cannot tell how to make an end; and I would faine end or rid my hands of him, if he had not first begun." (31)

Other participants in the comedy are introduced as real persons here too. 'M·Lilly' is mentioned, rather than 'Pappe-Hatchet', his persona, and the people behind the interlocutors are rather vaguely described, but with such appearance of sincerity that the reader is persuaded they do indeed mirror Nashe's friends. There is no reason at all why they should represent actual persons, but it is in Nashe's interest that they should appear so, since they are his allies, as the real Barnabe Barnes, John Thorius and Anthonie Chute are Harvey's. Nashe lays some emphasis on their existence: "Neither would I have you imagine that all these persons are fained...

true tis that there are men which have dealt with me in the same humour that heere I shaddow ." (32)
Curiously enough, although Nashe speaks of his "sober, mortified stile" and presents an illusion of plain- and true-speaking, the Address is, in fact, only slightly less ornate and cluttered with allusions than the Epistle. There are few long words, and there are some passages of simple prose; but there is also a liberal sprinkling of Euphuistic similes and mythologising comparisons. The very opening of the Address betrays the uncertainty in Nashe's approach, for it begins in the manner of Marprelate, with a submerged dialogue between Nashe and an opponent, but very soon develops into a Euphuistic simile:

"O good Brother Timothie, rule your reason, the

Miller gryndes more mens corne than one... I will not gainsay but I have cherisht a purpose of persecuting this Liff-lander Bogarian so long time

as ye speak of, and that, like the long snouted Beast (whose backe is Castle proofe) carrying her yong in her wombe three yere ere she be delivered, I have been big with childe of a common place of revenge, ever since the hanging of Lopus."

This juxtaposition of the frank, plain manner and the ornate simile and complex sentence continues throughout the Address. It is one of the bases of Nashe's style, and could be seen as a reflection of the book, but in the Address, supposedly in a 'sober' style, with its emphasis on the reality behind the masks, the discrepancy is more marked. Nevertheless the overall impression of this piece is that of plainness, perhaps because, in comparison with the preceding pages it is plain, and perhaps
because Nashe handles his long similes and sentences so gracefully that even when they are out of place, they delight.

Equally disquieting is the simultaneous unmasking and mythologising of persons which Nashe indulges in. For example he writes:

"Harvey and I (a couple of beggars) take upon us

to bandie factions, and contend like the Ursini

and Coloni in Roome; or as the Turkes and

Persians about Mahomet and Mortus Ali, which

should bee the greatest... when all the

controversie is no more but this..." (34)

Here we can see Nashe presenting the truth behind the quarrel, and at the same time comparing the quarrel to the grandest factions he can conjure up. He phrases this absurd juxtaposition so that it is clear that he sees the incongruity: "a couple of beggars... the Ursini and Coloni... the Turkes and Persians"

However, in spite of this mockery, there is a sense in which the comparison of Nashe and Harvey with the grand factions of Rome is seriously intended, for it accords with the folk-tale mythologising of Diamond Dick and Astrological Dick in the Epistle, and in addition, with many of the comparisons in the Address itself. For example, Nashe and Harvey are like see-less Bishops, Nashe will "come upon (Harvey) with a tempest of thunder and lightning worse than the the storms in the West Indes cald the Furicanoes", Nashe will be like the German General Wezell,
and so on. Harvey is given several comic nicknames, such as Peter Malvenda, Sinibaldo Crasko and Gorboduck Huddleduddle. Nashe's friends are described in terms of Aesculapius, Hippocrates and Poggio. And there are frequent references to Classical and foreign matters, which give a high tone to a low subject. Therefore, it would seem that when Nashe makes the remark about Harvey and himself quoted above, he is really aiming at having things both ways, both ridiculing his high literary treatment of the quarrel, and furthering it with grand comparisons. This ambivalence is at the heart of the book's humour: the whole business is absurd, and yet it is taken seriously.

THE INTRODUCTORY DIALOGUE

Once the Dialogue itself has begun, the wisdom of the choice of form becomes plain. It provides a cover for Nashe's ambivalence. Importuno, the Opponent, is Nashe in a sober mood, angry with the Doctor and intent on getting even with him. His opening speech is quite plain in style, free from humorous asides and similes, and it tackles squarely the harm done to Nashe by the Doctor's Book. Importuno is angry, though with Piers rather than the Doctor at this point. Importuno allows Nashe to take the quarrel in earnest, while Piers allows him to be casual about the whole affair, for Piers is not affected by this anger. The other interlocutors are supposed to have different functions in the conduct of the quarrel, but these are not made clear. Their
presence, however, helps to widen the whole dispute, since the other speakers join Piers in ridiculing the Doctor once the attack has been launched. Nashe is able to give his natural ambivalence a suitably many-sided vehicle. While Importuno is harsh to Piers, and towards the Doctor, and Piers is casual, the others are variously more moderate or more inclined to ridicule Harvey. For example, Bentivole points out that it is not enough to desire to answer the Doctor, it is important to publish the answer: "I am very glad, for thy credits sake, that thou perseverst in that purpose, but more glad would I bee to see it abroad and publish." (35) Carneades finds the whole affair amusing: "a dramme and a halfe of Tower-hill vineger will seeme a high festivall banquet, and make a famous coronation shew on this forlorne Civilians hungry table." To which the earnest Importuno replies: "Tush, tush, you are all for jest, & make him more careles of his credit than he wold be." (36)

An interesting device used by Nashe in this section is the 'disagreement' between Importuno and Piers. Importuno rails upon Piers to such a extent that Bentivole has to intervene. Piers begins the defence of his silence with the determination to answer not the Doctor, but Importuno: "you shall heare me expressly and roundly give him his quietus est." (37) He then proceeds to defend himself quite fully against his friend's charges, reinforcing thereby the impression of his own coolness in the dispute and absolving himself from any suggestion that he is raising an old score or is of a quarrelsome nature. Equally,
he is demonstrating his sufficiency in argument, for he concludes, to Importuno: "And thus I trust all reckonings are even twixt you and me." And Importuno replies: "Nay, I promise thee, thou hast given me my Passport, and I know not what to say, now thou sayst he shall be answer'd." (38) He has completely satisfied Importuno and is therefore demonstrably capable of answering others, particularly the Doctor. Piers' answer is, understandably, wittier and more colourful than Importuno's attack. Piers can not only answer anyone's charges, he can do so more cleverly and with more grace than anyone else.

It is worth noting, in passing, that Nashe uses in this book the same device used by Harington in The Metamorphosis. Harington kept leading up, with more and more introductory and explanatory pieces, to a centre which was virtually non-existent, having been removed to another book. Nashe here has first an Epistle and an Address, then the opening of the Dialogue, then the opening of Piers' answer, and finally, after more introduction, the beginning of the attack proper. When "the pageant begins" (39) almost a quarter of the book has passed. This is perhaps, a device partly to amuse the reader with its eccentricity and partly to keep the reader reading.

There are three principal subjects in the opening of Piers' answer to Importuno: the magnitude of the Book, Harvey's pedantry, and the supposed portrait of Harvey which is given in the text and described. These three are bound together by tenuous verbal links, the first two by the similarity (in Nashe's
mind) of prolixity and pedantry, the second and third by a pun on the words flea and flay. On the subject of Nashe's links, Donald McGinn has expressed dissatisfaction, claiming that the transitions between subject and subject are laboured. (40) This I feel is a misapprehension of Nashe's method. Certainly the links like that between flea (the flea that Harvey is said to want to train) and flay ("I must flay his asses skin over his eares") (41) are very delicate and only cunning phrasing can carry many of them off; but cunning phrasing is precisely what Nashe is dealing with, and delighting with. The nearer his transitions come to failing the more daring and witty he seems to be, in that he alone is prepared to take these risks, and not plod dully across established logical paths, but jump from idea to idea across crevices of inconsequentiality.

The subjects of these few pages are kept together not only by links of this nature, but also by a common delight in exaggeration - maximising the size of the Doctor's Book, minimising his scholarly claims and vastly overstating the merits of his rude little woodcut of a portrait. As in the Epistle Nashe produced an exhaustive catalogue of puns on bartering, so in this piece of the book we have a large range of variations on the idea that Pierces Supererogation is a very long book. It is "an unconscionable vast gorbellied Volume, bigger bulked than a Dutch Hoy"; it is a "Gargantuan bag-pudding"; Piers had to take his door off its hinges to get it in and so on. Although this
hyperbole is an exercise of wit, another preliminary flourish like the Epistle, to show what the author can do, it also, like the Epistle, helps set the tone. It becomes immediately clear from the enormously exaggerated description of the Book, that what is said of the Doctor is likely to be equally as extravagant, and just as much a jeu d'esprit.

But-and there is so often a but-part of the comic tone of this book results from its ambivalent traffic between the wildly exaggerated (for example, the descriptions of the Book) and the relatively accurate. An expression of this is found in the passage which ends the Introduction (at last) and brings in the Oration. Nashe affirms he will be presenting the Doctor accurately in his speech (as indeed he does), but the affirmation is couched in very lofty terms which seem to contradict what he is saying: "here expect the cleare repurified soule of truth, without the least shadow of fiction; the unflattered picture of Pedantisme, that hath no one smile or crinkle more than it should." (42) The level of reality has moved from the legendary in the Epistle to the 'truth' in the Address, through the exaggerations of the Introduction, and now promises truth again. The joke of this assurance of 'truth' with regard to the Oration is that the Doctor's style is in reality as extreme as Nashe's exaggerations; he cannot in fact outdo the Doctor's style to ridicule him-quoting it is enough. So, although the Doctor's character and the size of his Book may be the subject of huge distortion in order to fit them for the legendary world Nashe
creates, his style already belongs there.

THE ORATION
---

The Oration is almost entirely drawn from Harvey's own writings, but concatenated to reduce what sense there was in the original to the minimum. For example, Harvey uses in different places the phrases "energeticall lines", "perfunctory Pamflets", "Ambidexterity or rather Omnidexterity", "matters Adiaphorall", and "I disbalased my minde". whereas Nashe renders them thus:

"In manie extraordinarie remarkeable energegeticall lines and perfunctorie pamphlets, both in ambidexteritie and omnidexteritie, together with matters adiaphorall, have I disbalased my minde...." (43)

In spite of its scarcity of meaning, the Oration seems to me to have some remnants of the seven-part structure usual in orations. Thomas Wilson in his widely-read work The Arte of Rhetorique (1553) calls the parts the Entrance, Narration, Proposition, Division, Confirmation, Confutation and Conclusion. (44) All seven parts can be identified in Nashe's Oration.
The Entrance, according to Wilson is the opening part
"whereby the will of the standers by, or of the Judge is sought for, and required to heare the matter." Harvey cannot suffer to do this simply, nor can he address his hearers civilly without reference to himself: "Renowned and amicable Readers... Tell mee (I pray you) was ever Pegasus a cow in a cage.... Why should I then... be thus prestigiously besieged... by them that are superficial in Theory?" (45) All he is attempting, under the great mass of words, is to ask, "why me?" After this travesty of an Entrance (a travesty because it is concerned only with Harvey and not with his hearers), there follows the Narration. (46)

Wilson describes the Narration as "a plain and manifest pointing of the matter, and an evident setting furthe of all thynges, that belong unto the same, with a brief rehersall, grounded upon some reason." There is nothing plain, brief or manifest about Harvey's Narration. In fact, although it more or less covers the ground of the quarrel, much of it is taken up with self-adulation:

"...my encomiasticall Orations, and mercuriall and martiall discourses... every way comparable with the Cavalcads of Bellerophon... my Seraphicall visions in Queene Poetrie... whose beau-desert and rich oeconomie the inspiredest Heliconists & Arch-patrons of our new Omniscians have not stickt to equipage with the ancient Quinquagenarians... notwithstanding all which... some smirking Singularists... commense redoubtale Monomachies
against mee, and the dead honie-bee my brother."

After the Narration come a few sentences which perhaps represent the classical Proposition, described by Wilson as: "a pithie sentence, comprehending in a smale roume, the some of the whole matter." Harvey, however, has four or five sentences, which could be construed to contain the whole matter, but they bear the same relation to the Classical Proposition that the Harvey Entrance and Narration do to their Classical versions— that is to say, they are travesties. Harvey's summation of the whole is that everyone else is wicked: "The world never such a Scogin as now, and the divell never such a knave as now." (47)

The three parts of the traditional Oration which follow— the Division, Confirmation and Confutation— are rather confused in Harvey's Oration, Nashe's point being, no doubt, that Harvey is incapable of coherent argument, and must fall back on catalogues and apostrophe instead. For in place of the Division, intended by Wilson to be "the openyng of thynges, wherein we agree and rest upon, and wherein we stick and stand in traverse", Harvey gives a list of truisms, which Nashe could hardly fail to agree with: "What (is) the sanctification of Browne? a Nullitie. What the communitie of Barrow? A Nullitie. What the plausibilitie of Martin? A Nullitie; yea, and a woful Nullitie, and a piteous Nullitie." (48)
After this comes a collection of nonsensical statements to take the place of arguments in the Confirmation and Confutation. Instead of confirming his stand by argument, Harvey calls upon the memory of Sir Philip Sidney, whose friend he once was, calling him, much to the interlocutors' disgust, "the verie Esquire of Industrie". Instead of confuting Nashe, Harvey attacks him obliquely: "But some had rather be a Pol-cat with a stinking stirre, than a Muske-cat with gracious favour." (49) Harvey has only two stances: praising himself or abusing Nashe. He continues to 'confute' Nashe by expressing his feelings, but even this turns into self-praise:

"Cordially I could wish, that the pelting horne of these sturres (according to the foeciall law) were rebated, wherby our populars might taste of some more plausible Panegericall Orations, fine Theurgie, and profound essentiall God-full arguments." (50)

This is doubly amusing, in that as well as displaying his pomposity and ridiculous style, Harvey has shown himself incapable of any sort of argument, let alone "profound", "essential" or "God-full" ones.

Finally, the Conclusion, which Wilson describes as the "clarkely gathering of the matter" is as little collected as one might expect from Harvey, consisting as it does of nonsensical sentences and vague promises to defeat his adversaries. It is only a Conclusion by virtue of the fact that it ends with: "And so I recommend every one, and them all, to your curtesies. Your
mindfull debtor, Gabriell Harvey." (51) It is, if anything, more larded with inconsequential remarks than the rest of the Oration.

The Oration is, therefore, a mockery of Harvey and his language, and also a mock-Oration. The significant parts of the Classical Oration (the Confirmation and Confutation) are the most insignificant in Harvey's version, while sententiae and self-justification, which constitute only a small part of the form and content of the Classical Oration, have taken over. The Mock-Oration argues without arguments, and attempts to convince by confusing, the precise opposite of the traditional aim of the Oration. What grappling with the real matter of the dispute there is, consists of abuse of Nashe (52) and the pronouncements of Harvey's excellence. Both of these are unsupported by argument.

The form of the Mock-Oration is, however, a subsidiary matter, for Nashe's major concern is with the language Harvey employs, and it is upon this that the interlocutors comment. Alexander Sackton (53) has pointed out how unusual it is for an Elizabethan critic to look specifically at the text of whatever he is criticising. Nashe looks very minutely at the text, commenting on particular words which offend him, phrases which conceal rather than reveal meaning, metaphors which produce the wrong effect and sentences which hop rather than flow. These are encapsulated by Nashe himself as Harvey's "words, his metaphors,
his methode, his matter, his meeters". (54) His method and matter he ridicules in the form of the Oration, but not explicitly; the other three are treated during the Oration by the comments of the characters.

The comments passed on Harvey's prose take the form of witticisms rather than critical judgements, but even witticisms serve to focus attention on the words and phrases themselves, and frequently expose their lack of suitability or meaning. For example, the word tropologicall is described as "gotchie and boystrous... able to spoyle anie little mouth that offers to pronounce it." (55) Of Harvey's phrase "the dead honie-bee my brother" Importuno remarks: "What a supernaturall Hibble de beane it is, to call his brother a dead honnie-bee" (56) This comment does not point out why the metaphor is absurd, but merely holds it up for inspection. When an explanation is given, it rarely illuminates Nashe's critical reason for objecting. "I laughd at nothing so much as that word Arch-patrons. Goe thy wayes, thought I; thou art a Civilian, and maist well fetch metaphors from the Arches." (57) Occasionally, a comment will point out why, rather than how, Harvey is ridiculous: Harvey has written "mortall fewde (is) the claw of an adamant" about which Importuno comments: "Hath adamant such sharpe clawes? that makes it hold yron so fast when it hath it." (58) The longest truly critical comment is that on the phrase "the Esquire of
Industrie" which is discussed by Sackton. Disappointingly, however, most of the comments are puns at the expense of Harvey's language. Nashe stumbled upon the critical device of minute textual examination, but did not know how to use it; he turned it into another way of displaying his skill at word-play.

THE LIFE

The art of biography was in an interesting state of flux at the time Nashe wrote his Life of Harvey. In the Middle Ages there had been two major strands of biographical writing, the hagiography and the royal chronicle biography. The former developed in the late Middle Ages from the individual lives of men into hagiographic romances, in which miracles predominate. The most famous example of romantic hagiography is Voraione's Golden Legend, translated and printed by Caxton in 1483. (59)

However, individual verse lives of Saints were still written in the later Middle Ages by such notable poets as Chaucer and Lydgate. (60) Hagiography did not die out in the Renaissance. Laudatory biographies were still written, the most famous example being Roper's Life of More (written 1558, published 1626). The hagiographic collection still continued, with John Foxe's Actes and Monuments (1563), as the best-known Elizabethan representative. An interesting development of the hagiographic collection is the anti-hagiography, that is to say the scurrilous
and malicious reporting of the lives of adversaries. The most potent work of this kind is John Bale's *The Actes of Englysh Votaryes* (1546). This amazing work, of some significance for the study of Nashe's Life, deals with the supposedly evil ways of English monks. It recounts with great venom stories collected, according to its title, "out of theyr own legendes and Chronycles." Bale specifically quotes Saints' lives, but in such a way as to cast doubt upon the motives of the Saints. For example:

"This Aldelmus never refused women, but wold have them commonly both at borde and at bedde, to mocke the devyl with. In that tyme he was abbot of Malmesbury he appoynted oft tymes to hys fleshe thyss martyrdom. As he felt any sore movinges therof, he layed by hym naked, the fayrest mayde he could get, so longe tyme as an whole Davids Psalter was in saynge, And whan hys heate was past, he sent her home agayn as good a mayde as he lefte her. Is not thys, thynke you, a strange arguement to prove that all prestes maye lyve chast:" (61)

The other strand of Mediaeval biography, chronicle writing, merged with the De Casibus tradition in the late Middle Ages and early Renaissance, to produce works like Lydgate's *Fall of Princes* (written 1431-9, published 1494) and the very popular,
and much enlarged Mirror for Magistrates (1555 onwards).

In the Renaissance Humanist learning naturally affected the writing of biography, but in the two most outstanding biographies of sixteenth-century England, Sir Thomas More's Lyfe of Johan Picus Erle of Mirandula (1510) and his attributed History of King Richard III (written c.1513, printed 1557), both Mediaeval and Renaissance elements can be seen fused. In the life of Pico della Mirandola (62), More used the traditional form of a Saint's life, short titled chapters, and followed the tradition of recording omens before the birth of the holy man. Pico is treated throughout as a saintly figure. (63) However, there is considerable use of Humanist learning, and as Stauffer points out, the omen before Pico's birth is "interpreted by Platonic philosophy." (64) In the life of Richard III, More blends the traditional chronicle biography of Kings, which was already allied to the De Casibus tradition, with the model for writing biography afforded by Tacitus and Suetonius. As Stauffer shows, Classical biographers were increasingly translated into English from the middle of the century onwards.

Nashe's biography, although unlike any other written in the century, shows the same signs of fusing traditions. It opens, for example, with two references to the chronicle historian, Polydore Vergil. Vergil was not, however, a chronicler in the Mediaeval style, but a Humanist historian. (65) Recalling the
Classical tradition of history, Nashe also refers to Livy. (66)
The reference to Livy is in relation to the prodigies Nashe
relates attending the birth of Harvey. As I mentioned above,
omens preceding the birth of the subject of a life were one of
the hallmarks of Mediaeval hagiographic writing (67), so that
Nashe could be seen as drawing on either the tradition of Livyan
prodigies which generally foreshadowed great events (68) or on
that of omens which predicted the birth of a Saint in Mediaeval
hagiography or on both at once.

Nashe also connects with the hagiographic tradition obliquely
through the work of John Bale. McKerrow shows that Nashe was
reading this book while at work on Have with you, and says of it:

"One may indeed wonder what can have led him to
peruse and even to quote from such an abominable
legend of lies as this... than which hardly
anything worse has disgraced even the literature
of theological controversy. He can hardly have
read it as current literature, or on account of
any interest it might possess for him, for it
belonged to a class of books almost forgotten at
the date. Can he have thought that 'bilious
Bale', notorious above all men for the violence of
his controversial methods, was a fit study for one
who wished utterly to demolish Gabriel Harvey?"
(69)
It seems to me quite likely that Nashe was aware of Bale's
anti-hagiographies as a precedent for his own work. Like Bale he
uses fairly accurate information, but retells it in such a way that it redounds badly on the subject. The passage quoted from Bale above could in other circumstances appear to the credit of Aldelmus, just as Harvey's wooing of the laundress' daughter, might in another version of the story appear to Harvey's credit.

Closer to Nashe's work, however, are the biographical portions of Martin's work, and the biography of Penry in An Almond for a Parrat. Martin did not produce any biographies as such, but frequently included factual information in his attacks on the Bishops. Much of this information has the ring of truth about it, and is retold with circumstantial detail which seems to confirm its accuracy. For example, Martin writes

"Wohohow, brother London, do you remember Thomas Allen and Richard Alworth, merchants of London, being executors to George Allen sometimes your grocer, but now deceased: who came unto you on Easter Wednesday last being at your masterdoms palace on London, having bene often to speake with you before and could not, yet now they met with you: who tolde you they were executors unto George Allen (sometimes) your grocer, and among his other debts, we finde you indebted unto him, in the some of 19 pound and upward...." (71)

Nashe benefitted from Martin's example in this, for he no doubt realised that a seemingly accurate account of one's enemy's follies or crimes is more effective propaganda than a good, but
clearly exaggerated story. However, when he himself wrote his life of Penry in An Almond, he was inclined very much to exaggerate, claiming that Penry was "begotten in adultery and conceived in the heate of lust (and) brought into the world on a tempestuous daie" (70) and was abandoned in the church porch. However, Nashe's allegation that Penry started out as a Catholic - a very damaging allegation to Martin - is not so unlikely that his modern biographers can ignore it completely, and although the life is largely composed of allegations, it is much closer to revealing the truth behind Martin's persona than any of the anti-Martinist writings before it. No doubt it was considered a success in the campaign to destroy the insouciant anonymity of Martin. (72) It was probably the success of this life of Penry which inspired Nashe to produce that of Harvey.

Nashe evidently took some time to collect the material for this biography - at any rate he declares to Importuno, as one reason for his delay in writing his answer to the Doctor:

"I must have some further time to get perfect intelligence of his life and conversation, one true point whereof, well set downe, wil more excruciate & commacerate him, than knocking him about the eares with his owne stile in a hundred sheetes of paper." (73)

There is less exaggeration in the Life of Harvey, than in that of Penry, partly because Nashe was presumably able to find out more facts about him, and partly because he could allow Harvey to have
some good qualities, which would have been a bad tactic in dealing with Martin.

The Life mirrors the construction of the whole work, in that it has inserted within it certain discrete portions around which the rest of the material is arranged. That Nashe thought in terms of sections when constructing his work is made clear by his saying, after listing a number of Harvey's misdemeanours on which he might expand: "But in none of these will I insist, which are remnants in comparison of the whole peice I have to shew." (74) The 'peice' in question is the account of Harvey's debt to his printer Wolfe, and his imprisonment.

The most obvious of the pieces of which the Life is made is the Letter, a brilliant satiric device, which damn Harvey with faint praise and recounts with admiration his unlaudable feats. It is a useful device, as well as clever, for it covers Harvey's University days swiftly and succinctly, and introduces a new slant on Harvey - that is to say, he is seen through his tutor's eyes rather than through Nashe's, and still comes off badly. The Letter also reminds the reader of the humble father in Saffron-Walden, to whom the Letter is addressed, and with whom the conflict between Harvey and Nashe could be said to begin. Nashe does not jeopardise his appearance of truthfulness by pretending this document, so blatantly false, is real. He readily admits he wrote it, which by implication makes the rest
of Nashe's 'facts' seem the truer, and Nashe the more reliable.

The other two major features of the Life are not formally distinct as the Letter is, but are rather narrative climaxes. These two are the accounts of Nashe and Harvey's meeting, and the account of Harvey's debt and imprisonment. The former is probably true, and the latter probably not, according to Hibbard (75) with whom I have no reason to disagree. Both pieces have the appearance of reality, in that circumstantial detail is carefully provided, and the accounts not so exaggerated as to appear 'tall tales'. Nashe is concerned to set his comic creation, Tapthartharthath, in a credible world. The two episodes selected for longer treatment show Nashe's skill in varying the treatment of Harvey. The first piece, the occasion of their meeting, is primarily a descriptive passage, and Nashe uses it to create a picture which is on the same scale as the legendary names and mythologising comparisons I have earlier remarked on. (76) Harvey emerges from this description as a splendidly grotesque character:

"...his skin (is) riddled and crumpled like a piece of burnt parchment; & more channels & creases he hath in his face than there be Fairie circles on Salsburie Plaine, and wrinkles & frets of old age than characters on Christs Sepulcher in Mount Calvarie, on which everie one that comes scrapes his name and sets his marke to shewe that
Hee hath been there... look on his head, and you shall finde a gray haire for everie line I have writ against him; and you shall have all his beard white too, by that time hee hath read over this booke." (77)

Harvey's appearance has been a theme throughout the Life, notably when the Queen compliments him on his Italian look. This theme, therefore, reaches its climax in this hyperbolic description, which is so exaggerated as to leave the subject of it far behind. Not even the buffoon Harvey is large enough to fit the grand similes used on Huddleduddle, but nevertheless, the description does affect the real person of Harvey in that it quite destroys any claim he once had to good looks, and emphasises his age. His age, of course, is one of the points of contrast between the personae of Nashe and Harvey.

The function of the other account, that of Harvey in the Fleet, is to show the pedant in direct contact with the outside world, and his total inability to realise what is happening around him, or to act in the proper manner. In the context of the Fleet, Harvey is completely ridiculous, and also rather pathetic. Nashe has trounced him so thoroughly that he can allow the reader to feel sorry for him, when, for example, he has the Harvey who is no relation of Gabriel's, take pity on him for his name's sake, Gabriel Harvey having no friends or allies at all. As Piers says earlier: "It is a miserable thing for a man to be said to have had frends, and now to have nere a one left." (78)
Although these two set pieces follow one another closely this does not distort the structure of the Life. The two pieces are different in manner and content, the first being an essay in the description of character, somewhat similar to those in Pierce Penilesse, and the second consisting entirely of action and dialogue. The first, in a way, sets the scene for the second, so that we have an elaborate portrait of the protagonist before his major engagement.

THE LIFE AS JEST-BOOK

The whole of the Life can be viewed as the gestes of Gabriel Harvey, as well as a biography. (79) Nashe's indebtedness to the jest-book has been mentioned in connection with Pierce Penilesse, but is more striking in this book. Summersgill, however, feels it is easy to overstate the influence of the jest-book on Nashe's work. (80)

I mentioned, in Chapter 3, the three sorts of jest-book distinguished by F.P. Wilson. (81) It is with the second of Wilson's categories, the jest-biography, that I am concerned here. Jest-biographies, for example The Merie Tales of Skelton (1567) and The Jests of Scoqin (1565), are not really lives of
their eponymous heroes, but collections of tales centered around one character who is sometimes historical. They trace the hero’s progress through life (or, in Scogin’s case, from university to death). In these tales the hero is frequently placed in an uncomfortable position from which nothing can save him but his ready wit. For example, in the tale called "How Scogin came to the Court like a monstrous Beast, and should have been hanged", (82) the hero is condemned to be hanged for a "pranke doing" and requests he be allowed to choose the tree. He provides sustenance for himself, and leads the men appointed to hang him all through Windsor Forest looking at trees, until they are faint with hunger, and it is night. At this point, Scogin says he will never choose a tree to be hanged on, and so escapes. The joke is not very good, but the story demonstrates Scogin's ability to survive in impossible circumstances. Very occasionally the jest-book hero has a prank played upon him, or is worsted in some way, but in most situations he makes the witty remark that redeems the impasse or solves the problem. Harvey, in Nashe's tale, does occasionally behave like a jest-book hero; for example, he converts a velvet saddle to a velvet suit, appropriates another man's servant and slithers out of his debts. But Harvey's Life is the reverse of a jest-biography, in that the jests are designed to show the obtuseness and clumsiness of Harvey, as the jests of Scogin show his ready wit and talent for survival. For this reason, these "jest-book feats" of Harvey's redound upon him, for the velvet suit is a huge cause for mirth, and the removal of the servant and the accumulation of debts mount up and result in his imprisonment and great shame. Skelton
and Scogin also perform deeds which catch up on them: Skelton is "complayned on to the bishop of Norwich" for keeping a woman, and later imprisoned by Cardinal Wolsey. In both instances, he turns his misfortune to his own advantage by making a joke on the situation he is in. Scogin plays a number of jests upon the Queen, which make her steadily more angry, and eventually, when his invention can extricate him no more, he is banished to France. There he immediately sets about performing his jests for the French King. Banished back to England for his wit, he turns his original banishment into a jest, by filling his shoes with French soil, and declaring that he does not tread upon English soil. Harvey, however, placed in a situation which requires him either to extricate himself, or to make some remark which would show his wit, only succeeds in making his plight worse and worse. He falls for the deceit of Scarlet, cannot believe he is in Newgate, draws his dagger upon the keeper’s wife and refuses to eat at table. In these feats he does the precise opposite of Scogin, by making things worse for himself by his obtuseness, rather than better by his wit. Only in his escaping from various debts run up inside prison and after his release, does he successfully overcome odds against him, and there is no wit displayed in these defaultings, only "a fayre paire of heeles".

In another sense also, Harvey is the anti-type of the jest-book hero; he is the butt rather than the perpetrator of a number of jests. As a pedant, he fits naturally into this role, since the pedant is one of the oldest butts of jokes known. (83) Harvey is forced to dance with "the foulest ugly gentlewoman or
fury that might be" by the courtiers, and being Gabriel Harvey, he turns this situation to his disadvantage by falling in love with her. He is also cruelly satirised in the play Pedantius, and, worse indignity, his gown is borrowed for the play. A gentleman friend of Nashe's goes to Harvey to view him and Harvey unaware puts on his best show of elaborate manners and vocabulary. The largest prank of all played on Harvey is perhaps Nashe's goading him to write: "hee lying in the raging st furie of the last Plague... inck-squittring and printing against me... neglect(ing) soule and bodies helth." (84)

Herford, discussing jest-books in his work on English and German literary relations (85), notes that the humour in them comes to a considerable degree from the tensions between social classes:

"A whole family of jests sprang from the casual involuntary collision of divergent customs, unlike moral standards, unequal knowledge... foolish scholars come to grief at the University. The eccentricities of particular districts and professions supply another group: the greed and uncouth dialect of the Saxon... the slyness of taylors..." (86)

The same point is made by Keith Thomas, in an article on Tudor and Stuart humour (87): "the jokes (in jest-books) reveal the social tensions of the time... jokes are a pointer to... areas of structural ambiguity in society itself." These two writers also point to the double standard found in these jokes: shrewish
wives were fair game, but so were foolish husbands; the bishop scores a point off the ignorant priest, but the priest often worsts the bishop. These double standards, as Thomas says, shows the ambiguity of society towards certain areas of society, and it is precisely this ambiguity and uncertainty which make Gabriel Harvey so suitable a butt for Nashe's humour. In principle Nashe had nothing against the sons of yeoman (as Harvey was) making their way in the world (as Harvey was trying to do). It was accepted by society in general, and could be sanctioned by antiquity: "It is no true glorie of ours what our fore-fathers did.... Demosthenes was the sonne of a Cutler, Socrates of a Midwife." (88) Nashe admits this readily, but nonetheless it is clear that Harvey's low birth was a sensitive matter. Nashe echoes the anxiety of his society over the fluidity of social classes, when he both defends Harvey's right to rise, as above, and mocks him for his pretensions: "(he) would make no bones to take the wall of Sir Philip Sidney and another honourable Knight..." (89) and "there being a better man than hee present, who was plac'd at the upper end of the board,for very spite that hee might not sit highest, he straight flung to his chamber."

(90) Nashe avoids the contradictions of his society's attitude towards Harvey and his kind, by reserving his mockery for Harvey's personal pretension, and in particular, Harvey's embarrassment over his origins. This makes a convenient and unimpeachable focus for Nashe's insecurity about those who rise in society through their own efforts. Consiliadore objects to Piers' remarks about Harvey's birth: "it is his Fortune, and Natures, & neither his fathers fault nor his." Piers replies to
this: "Neither as his fathers nor his fault doo I urge it, otherwise than it is his fault to beare himself too arrogantly above his birth, and to contemne and forget the house from whence he came." (91) Harvey had apparently given Nashe splendid cause for this complaint, when he wrote in Four Letters: "And may not a good sonne have a reprobate to his father?" which Nashe interprets as a reference to himself, and adds "a Periphrasis of a Ropemaker which... I never heard before." (92) This seems to justify Nashe, but in fact Harvey was speaking of Greene's son, not himself when he made the remark.

Jest-book humour is not merely found in the treatment of Harvey. In the Analysis, which I will discuss shortly, Nashe uses the anti-types of jest-book tales to discredit Harvey's friends, Anthonie Chute and Barnabe Barnes. Carneadeg tells a tale, for example, of Barnes' conduct in France, when he told the General: "he did not like of this quarrelling kinde of life, and common occupation of murdring... wherefore hee desir'd license to depart, for hee stood everie howre in feare and dread of his person." (93) This compares with the jest in the Merie Tales of Skelton called "Howe the cobler tolde maister Skelton, it is good sleeping in a whole skinne."

"Why, sayd the cobler, what shuld I doo? wyll you have me to goe in the kynges warres, and to bee killed for my labour?... What knave, sayd Skelton, art thou a cowarde?... No sayde the
cohler, I am not afeard; it is good to sleepe in
a whole skinne." (94)

THE ANALYSIS

In this work, it seems to me, Nashe realised that firm
structure was necessary to contain the exuberance of his prose.
He goes so far as to claim that such structures are his own idea.
For in the Analysis he says of an imitator: "he hath purloyned
something from mee, and mended his hand in confuting by fifteen
parts, following my presidents." (95) Harvey, on the other hand,
has little use for such things. The part divisions of Pierces
Supererogation were so unimportant that they were omitted
(96), and the lack of structure within his works, coupled with
their length and impenetrable prose style, makes them difficult
to analyse. Nashe comments upon it:

"(his booke)... is devided into foure parts; one
against mee, the second against M. Lilly, the
third against Martinists, the fourth against Dr.
Perne. Neither are these parts severally
distinguished in his order of handling, but, like
a Dutch stewd-pot, jumbled altogether, and
linsey-wolsey woven one within another." (97)

Given this confusion in Harvey's work and Nashe's affection for
structures, it is not surprising that Nashe's Summarie or Breife

Analysis of Harvey's book is confused and insubstantial, and

rather difficult to discuss. It is a patchwork criticism of a
patchwork book.

Nashe seizes on what structural elements there are in the
Doctor's book when he sets about his summary, and expends most of
his energy upon the Epistle Dedicatorie, the prefatory sonnets
from Barnabe Barnes and the 'Gentlewoman', the address of the
Printer to the Reader, and the concluding verses and letters from
Anthony Chute and John Thorius, in all some thirty odd pages
(using Grosart's edition) out of a total of three hundred and
forty. Ridicule of this matter takes up more than half the
Analysis.

Of the allies Harvey has invoked in his book, Nashe reserves
his greatest scorn for the 'gentlewoman'. Chute, although the
subject of some scorn, was dead, and John Thorius had made his
peace with Nashe. The 'gentlewoman' was a different proposition.
As Harvey's creation she was vituperative in her attacks on
Nashe, as an apparently separate entity she was dangerous, for she
implied support for Harvey from a quarter which Nashe might
hesitate to attack. He could not pour scorn upon an anonymous
'gentlewoman' with the same ease as he could ridicule Chute and
Barnes. In their case he knew the extent of their potential
danger to him, but if the 'gentlewoman' did exist she might turn
out to have important connections, or be indeed a vicious enemy.
It is patently obvious, fortunately, that the 'gentlewoman' was either an invention of Harvey's, or if real, penned nothing Harvey attributed to her. This allowed Nashe to be as rude about her as he wishes, and also gave his abuse of Harvey a new lease of life, for it allowed him to draw upon the traditional abuse of women. (98) Nashe found so much to abuse the 'gentlewoman' over that he returns to her for a second round when he has already devoted considerable space to her. (99) Nashe's abuse of the 'gentlewoman' introduces a vein of scurrility which has not been present before, although there have been attacks on Richard Harvey for his lewdness and jokes about the amorous pretensions of Gabriel. Richard Harvey is pilloried for his hypocrisy rather than his sexual exploits, and Gabriel mocked for his attempts rather than his achievements. The 'gentlewoman' is attacked in a straightforwardly sexual manner, which is rather unpleasant: 'Yea, Madam Gabriela, are you such an old joker? then Hey ding a ding up with your petticoate, have at your plum-tree.' (100)

This crude tone is not the only different element in the Analysis. In this section Nashe reverts to the truthful stance he took up in the Address. He refuses to believe in the mythical gentlewoman, he attacks Harvey's real friends by name, and he includes what seem to be genuine letters from Henry Chettle and John Thorius. (101) These letters mark the limits of Nashe's fiction. In employing them in the body of his work he has reached the end of his games with Harvey. He has used satire and witty invention and hyperbole and comic caricature and
straightforward denial to defeat Harvey and now uses real documents. The fictive devices have passed their usefulness. Nashe decides to be factual and serious, and confront Harvey who has become more and more fictionalized as the book progressed, with the truth. Even in the area of plain fact, Nashe trounces Harvey, for Chettle's simple letter directly contradicts Harvey's contention that Nashe has 'misused' all his friends, including Chettle. (102) John Thorius' letter is most civil, and in addition claims that his verses appended to Pierces Supererogation "are... altered to your disgrace in some places."

Apart from these two new elements, the scurrilous abuse and the adherence to facts, the Analysis is much like Strange Newes in little. Much of it is simple denial of Harvey's allegations in Pierces Supererogation. For example, "He upbraides me by the poore fellow my Fathers putting me to my scribbling shifts.... My father put more good meate in poore mens mouthes than all the ropes and living is worth his Father left him." (104) This kind of statement does not make very interesting polemic, but is necessary, since Nashe must be seen to answer the Doctor's book, in case its allegations be taken as true. The poverty of this section, described by Hibbard as "far and away the scrappiest and least interesting (part)" (105) shows how much improved Nashe's invective is when controlled and directed by a form, such as the farrago. Strange Newes had seemed amusing and effective, but
when the reader encounters another Strange Newes in the
structured ridicule of Have with you, he realises the great
difference in quality between the rambling former and the
farragoinary latter.

As I have mentioned with regard to all these farragoes
(although it must again be stressed, this is not a necessary
ingredient in a farrago), there is a strain of ambivalence
running through this book. I noted this in regard to the
Address, and when commenting on the multi-faceted author. The
conclusion of Have with you shows this ambivalence too. Nashe,
in spite of his success in trouncing the Doctor cannot feel
satisfied, for he writes at the end: "More battering engins I had
in readines prepared to shake his walles, which I keepe backe
till next Tearme." (106) The ending is decidedly strange:

"Herewith the Court breaks up and goes to dinner,
all generally concluding with Trajan; The Gods
never suffer anie to be over-come in battail, but
those that are enemies to peace. Tu mihi criminis
Author." (107)

McKerrow is unable to find this saying attributed to Trajan, so
it would seem that Nashe used Trajan as a suitably lofty peg on
which to hang his unusually high-toned and serious concluding
sentence. The sentence sounds as if Nashe were trying to confer
moral righteousness on his work in retrospect. The whole of the
last pace has the most unhappy insecurity about it, as if Nashe,
having effected his victory over Harvey, was unwilling to take it. He ends by needing to reassure himself that the fault was really Harvey's, and that Harvey has deserved all the shame and ridicule. The Latin tag, taken from Ovid, means 'you are are the cause of my accusation', making it clear that Nashe finally wishes to consider himself wronged.
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Nashes Lenten Stuffe, published in 1599, is the latest work of Nashe's to survive, since his works were banned in that year, and he himself died not long after. (1) In this book two tendencies, marked in Nashe's work before, become predominant. One is the use of strange coinages and unusual words, the convolution and distortion of language as an exercise in its own right, and the other is the tendency towards farcinaelity, the combination of several different genres to make one work. This is not to say, however, that it is Nashe's best work, for both tendencies are exaggerated, and the subject of the book is too slight to bear the weight of so much linguistic horse-play and such fragmentation in the form. (2)
Although considerably shorter than Have with you (80 pages, using McKerrow's edition, rather than 130) Lenten Stuffe has more than twice the number of pieces. These pieces are much shorter than the parts of Have with you. Generally they are joined together well, but Lenten Stuffe lacks the sense of purpose of Have with you, each part of which, as we saw, had a distinct function in the destruction of Harvey. In Lenten Stuffe, despite the unified subject-matter, there is no strong sense of purpose. Nashe's ambivalent attitude towards the book is shown by his references to the next book he will write on the same subject—Yarmouth—which will really contain its praise, as if he felt that Lenten Stuffe had not done so:

"For a patterne or tiny-sample what my elaborate performance would bee in this case, had I a ful-sayld gale of prosperity to encourago mee,... I take the painses to describe this superiminent principall Metropolis of the redde Fish." (3)

and later:

"Adew, adue, tenne thousand folde delicate paramour of Neptune, the nexte yeare my standish may haps to addresse another voyage unto thee, if this have any acceptance." (4)
The book is essentially a praise of Yarmouth, and takes as its principal subjects the history and description of Yarmouth and the red herring, the major product of that town, and source of its prosperity. It opens with an Epistle Dedicatory, which like that in Have with you is addressed to a common man, not a --- patron--- in this case a popular poet called Humfrey King. There follows a short Epistle to the Reader, which defends Nashe's style and method of writing. After a few pages of introductory matter, explaining Nashe's presence in Yarmouth, and his gratitude to the town for sheltering him, comes the History and Description of Yarmouth, occupying some seventeen pages of McKerrow's edition. Almost all of the book thereafter, is taken up with the subject of the red herring, except for a digressions about Burgh Castle (5), lawyers, informers and fishermen. (6) The red herring is first praised in a traditional paradoxical encomium, which opens with a long list of previous encomia. After the paradoxical encomium comes a burlesque version of the story of Hero and Leander, who are here metamorphosed into herring and lino, and a number of comic tales, which, grouped with the burlesque myth, I call for convenience the Invention of the Red Herring, since they refer to the beginning of herring, and the discovery of the red, or smoked herring. These tales are interpolated by the digressions mentioned before.

The last portion of the book is rather piecemeal, with nothing after the tale of Hero and Leander being longer than five or six pages. The earlier pieces, the History and Description and the Praise are the longest portions, but coming together in
the first half, they make the book as a whole seem unplanned and top-heavy. Certainly as one reads it, one feels that Nashe's plan for the book did not extend beyond the Hero and Leander story, and that the rest is 'tacked on' to make the book a bit longer. However, it seems to me more surprising that Nashe should have found so much to write around the subject of Yarmouth, than that his invention ran out towards the end, and to give him credit, all his pieces are bound in to the central subject, Yarmouth, however tenuously. The digression on Burgh Castle, for example, belongs with the topographical material in the Description, but has strayed in among the tales, where its presence is excused by its being the setting for one of the tales. The pieces on lawyers and informers are related to the topic, since it was because of legal matters, and the activities of informers that Nashe was forced to flee to Yarmouth at all. Only the final piece, in praise of fishermen, is not properly bound in, and when one considers its shortness, and the apologetic remarks Nashe makes about it — such as "No more can I do for you than I have done...(7) — this last piece looks suspiciously like a make-weight. It is not unsuitable that apropos this passage Nashe writes "Alas, poore hunderstarved Muse..." (8); one does have the impression that Nashe had run out of invention, especially in the last few pages.
Nashe tells us quite a bit about his method of writing in Lenten Stuffe: firstly, he was, or felt he was, dependent on his notebooks. He says: "of my notebooks and all books else here in the countrey I am bereaved." (9) This is not literally true, since he had copies of Hakluyt, Camden, Plautus' Rudens, Froissart and perhaps other historians. (10) Nevertheless, he felt the need of his notebooks to "enamell and hatch over this device more artificially and masterly, and attire it in his true orient varnish and tincture;" (11) The reader might be forgiven for thinking that Lenten Stuffe is quite ornate enough as it is, but no doubt Nashe felt he might have written a more satisfying book if he had had his 'topickes' by him; certainly, the piecemeal nature of the last quarter of the book indicates a certain exhaustion of material. Apart from this matter, however, this quotation gives some idea of how Nashe regarded writing: to him it seems to have been a process of enormous elaboration of a 'device'. Beginning with a simple datum, Nashe, it would seem, added more and more description and simile, more and more matters somehow related to the central idea, until the central 'device' is almost invisible under the ornament. Writing was a process of adorning a received idea. In the writing of the History of Yarmouth, we see this process at work very clearly.

In that same passage in which he laments the absence of his notebooks, Nashe refers to himself as a workman: "a workman is nothing without his tooles." In the address to the Readers he does the same, saying: "...out of drie stubble to make an after
harvest, and a plentiful croppe without sowing, and wring juice out of a flint, that's Pierce a Gods name, and the right tricke of a workman." (12) Nashe, therefore, saw himself as a workman of language, a professional user of words. He talks about his words in the Epistle to the Readers also, as if concerned that the reader should be aware of his craftsmanship:

"Let me speake to you about my huge woords which I use in this booke, and then you are your own men to do what you list. Know it is my true vaine to be tragicus Orator, and of all stiles I most affect & strive to imitate Aretines, not caring for this demure soft mediocre genus, that is like water and wine mixt togither; but give me pure wine of it self...." (13)

Another indication of Nashe's working method is given when he writes: "My Tables are not yet one quarter emptied of my notes out of their Table, which... I tie my selfe to more precisely, and thus it leadeth on." (14) This suggests that Nashe had taken his notes down from the "Chronography Latinetable" at Yarmouth, which he mentions, and from other sources, and was working through them, elaborating as he went. At the point in the text where this quotation comes, he seems to think he has spent too much space on too little of the history, which suggests he had a specific length in mind for the piece. After this quotation he returns to a plainer style to include more matter in less space.
Further on, Nashe gives another glimpse of his working method, when he writes: "I had a crochet in my head, here to have given the raines to my pen, and run astray thorowout all the coast townes of England...." (15) He goes on to explain that he omitted it so as not to appear to praise Yarmouth by dispraising others, concluding: "Of that prolifigated labour yet my breast pants and labours: A whole moneths minde of revolving meditation I raveling out therein (as raveling out signifies... the unweaving of a webbe before woven and contexted.)" (16) Why Nashe abandoned this piece after so much work on it is not clear; it may have been that he feared the antipathy of other municipal bodies. However, it shows that there was to have been another piece in Lenten Stuffe which was dropped completely, apart from the reference to its being dropped. It was written, as presumably all the other pieces were, with patient care, or so the image of the weaving suggests. In this reference we have a glimpse of the farrainary process at work.

The forms used in Lenten Stuffe are of two sorts:

traditional genres and new adaptations of known forms. Of the first kind are the paradoxical encomium (the Praise of the Red Herring) and the list of encomia which precedes it, and the comic tales scattered through the last part of the book. Nashe also calls upon a traditional genre, the 'discovery' or invention of some skill. The more original forms are the local history, which is like nothing else in English before it (though there were some local histories written) and the burlesque myth, which follows
some precedent examples, but does not belong to an established
genre. It seems to me that in writing his celebration of
Yarmouth Nashe cast about for forms which would be suitable, and
found it necessary to adapt and invent in some cases in order to
provide the necessary variety.

The manner in which Nashe links his pieces together in this
work is worth examining. It would not be practicable to look at
all the links in this work, since every one of the small pieces
has a link before (and of course after) it. I shall look at
links from the opening of the paradoxical encomium and from the
final fragmented quarter; in the course of my discussion of the
encomium itself, other links will be commented upon also.

The linking passage between the Description of Yarmouth and
the beginning of the paradoxical encomium (17) is a curiosity.
It shows Nashe taking particular trouble to bind in certain
pieces he wanted in his work without stepping outside the firm
structure, which at this stage seems to control it. (In the last
quarter this apparently firm structure has, as I have said,
disappeared.) The link in question explains how Nashe came to
write the praise of the Red Herring, but in this explanation
there is a praise of the Yarmouth-born explorer, Harborne, and an
apology for Nashe's supposed poverty of invention. Harborne is
introduced parenthetically but nonetheless has almost a page of
ornate praise devoted to him. He, as a worthy son of Yarmouth,
clearly must be mentioned, but Nashe could not quite fit him into
the History. He is dragged in as an exception—"Mercuriall
brested M. Harborne alwaies accepted" (18) - and placed in this linking passage.

The second piece inserted into this link - Nashe's apology for his lack of materials - belongs, of right, in the Epistle to the reader. The reason for its appearance here is perhaps Nashe's desire to avoid apology in that Epistle, which is an uncompromising statement. He wished his readers to be aware, however, how disadvantaged he was by his exile from London. The language in which the apology is couched is rich and florid, and so is the whole context and the long list of paradoxical encomia which immediately follows. The apology might almost be taken as ironical, so striking is the contrast between Nashe's claim of inadequacy and the obvious copiousness of what follows, and has preceded it. It is perhaps an attempt to impress upon the reader the enormous resource of the author's pen, or perhaps is merely an exaggerated version of the old humility topos. (19)

Both these pieces are presumably elements which did not quite fit elsewhere, and so could be neatly included in a link passage between the two large pieces, the History and Description, and the Praise. In the last part of the work, however, such an attempt is impossible, since the pieces are not much longer than this link passage itself. However, to retain a semblance of unity, Nashe does try to move from one small piece to another with some care. He has two main methods of linking these small pieces: the flowing link which carries the reader through
unwittingly from one subject to another, and the 'link by discontinuity' which draws attention to the sudden change of subject. Of the first type is the link which attaches the third of Nashe's comic tales— that of the herring caught in fresh water— to the discussion on informing lawyers. (20) The third tale gives rise to the reflection that there are simple people who will believe anything— that a herring can be caught in fresh water, or that Nashe's tales are covert political allegories. But people would not believe such things unless they were shown to them, and no-one would see political meanings unless some informing lawyer were to point them out. The bones of this link, which are not a comfortable fit when clear, are covered with a mass of words and examples which disguise the lack of relationship of the two pieces linked, and carry the reader on, so that he travels easily from one subject to the next, but could not easily say how he arrived there. Nashe confuses with his rhetoric and charm, and the length and complexity of his sentences, so that the occasional dubiousness of his logic passes unquestioned.

The second kind of link, that by discontinuity, is to be seen in the transition to the fourth tale— about a Herring and a Turbot— from the attack on informing lawyers. Although the two passages have a connection, in that Nashe pretends the tale is a bait for informers, the actual link is very short:

"I stand lawing heere, what with these lawvers... so long, that my redde herring, which was hot brovling on the coles, is waxt starke cold for
want of blowing. Have with them for a riddle or two.... There was a Herrino...." (21)

The link between this tale and the next passage, a diatribe against informers, is even more abrupt: "0, for a Legion of mice-eyed deciherers and calculaters upon characters, now to augurate what I meane by this...." (22) Again, the attack on informers is naturally related to the tale, since it is the material on which informers might feed. A second kind of 'link by discontinuity' Nashe uses to draw attention to himself as manipulating author. He employs one of these at the conclusion of the attack on informers, and combines it with a flowing link of the first type, in order to end with Alchemv, when he began with informers:

"Stay, let me looke about, where am I? In my text, or out of it? not out, for a groate: out, for an angell: nay, I'le lay no wagers, for nowe I perponder more sadlie uppon it, I thinke I am out indeede. Beare with it, it was but a pretty parenthesis of Princes and theyr parasites, which shall doo you no harme, for I will clov you with Herrning before wee part." (23)

After this he continues for some time on no particular topic until he arrives at a convenient point to switch to his next, which he does with a simple verbal leap: "Carpe or descant they as theyr spleene mooves them, my spleene mooves me not to file my handes with them, but to fall a crash more to the redde herrino." (24)
Therefore we can see that Nashe effects his links in a variety of ways, although in the earlier part of the book they are more circumspectly arranged. The later links betray a little uncertainty about the direction of the book, but no less skill.

EPISTLE DEDICATORIE, EPISTLE TO THE READERS & INTRODUCTION

We have seen in Pierce Penilesse and Have with you that Nashe uses the traditional forms of Epistle and Address in new and fruitful ways, and makes them part of his whole book. The prefatory pieces in Lenten Stuffe are used similarly, although the purpose of the book is, of course, different.

The dedication to Humfrey King is not, like that to Dick Lichfield, determined by the subject of the book. It rather arises, I think, out of Nashe's desire to align himself with a more popular kind of writing than he had been associated with before. In Pierce Penilesse he had espoused an elitist view of poetry and of writing in general. This is to be contradicted in Lenten Stuffe; in Have with you he was concerned with a private literary quarrel, but in Lenten Stuffe he is aiming at a popular audience, and he opens by addressing a popular poet. He is careful, however, not to overpraise King's poetry at the outset: "Most courteous, unlearned lover of Poetry, and yet a Poet
thysel, of no lesse price than H.S...." (25) This is designed to satirise H.S., whoever he was (26), rather than to elevate King. When Nashe does come to King's poetry, saying he is: "expecting your sacred Poeme of the Hermites Tale, that will restore the golden age amongst us" (27), he is so outrageous that no one could take this comparison seriously. In the same way he praised Dick Lichfield's intellectual powers in Have with you. He is both siding with the common man, and keeping his standards intact.

The contrast between King and more conventional dedicatees is stressed by the portraits of the possible patrons; these men, the "lusty-blood Bravamente signiors" and the "primerose knight" are characterised in sketches like those in the Supplication in Pierce Penilesse. The first of these extended comparisons which help to give body to the Epistle is characterised through the speech of the person described— a novel idea in characterisation, although one found in Theophrastus. (28) The second is a portrait of a conventional figure, the dandified knight, but brought to life by the addition of well-observed concrete details. The obsession of this second character is money, which, with Poetry, is one of the themes of the Epistle.
The theme of money is continued by the assertion that "Bounty is bankrupt", but this monetary concern is intimately connected with poetry, which has according to Nashe, been debased by it; poetry has become "a trick to please my Lady". King, however, will "restore the golden age amongst us", a truly ambivalent remark, since it implies that King will provide money, and true poetry, neither of which seems likely. And yet Nashe is not satirising King; possibly he is claiming that in the popular vein in the true worth of poetry.

There is a deliberate attempt at egalitarianism in the Epistle, which bears out this last suggestion. It opens with an apostrophe to King which stresses his friendship with all classes:

"Lustie Humfrey, according as the townsmen doo christen him, little Numps, as the Nobilitie and Courtiers do name him, and Honest Humfrey, as all his friends and acquaintance esteeme him.... (29)

Further extreme contrasts, which emphasise King's equality with the best are found in the phrases "King of Tobacconists... and a singular Maecenas to the Pipe and the Tabour" and "diminutive excelsitude". Nashe's contention is that love of poetry makes a man fit to be a prince, regardless of birth. Nonetheless, there is a certain paradox in these phrases—the deliberate contrast between 'Maecenas' and 'Pipe and Tabour', for example, which once again produces an ambivalent effect: is Nashe really laughing at King? He seems unable to make up his mind. A similar disquiet is caused by Nashe's saying of his book: "if it be not the next
stile to The strife of Love in a Dreame or the Lamentable burning

of Teverton " King should "renounce eating of greene beefe and

garlike...." (30) King's opinion of the book is not particularly
important, but the two books to which Nashe pretends to wish
Lenten Stiffe compared create an odd effect. The comparison with

the translation by R.D. of Colonna's Hypnerotomachia might

possibly be a serious one, for McKerrow says: "One might almost
fancy Nashe to have been a little jealous of its truly amazing
style." (31) R.D.'s exuberant use of language might have prompted
Nashe to 'overco' him. However, the addition of The Lamentable

Burning of Teverton seems to undercut any serious intention, for

this work is presumably a ballad or a piece of popular reporting,
of quite a different sort from R.D.'s work or Lenten Stiffe.

Nashe might have been attempting to degrade The Strife of Love by

placing it in this company, or he might have been aiming at
humour through the incongruity. It is not clear, but given the
incongruous effects of Humfrey King as Maecenas, restoring the
Golden Ace with his verse, this strange juxtaposition of two
works, is at least in keeping with the general tone of the
Epistle.
Nashe's intention in the Epistle was, I think, to have things both ways: to bid for support among ordinary people, to whom Kino might seem a worthy object for praise, and to reserve his opinion of his poetry. By praising Kino in so hyperbolic a fashion, he also allows the Epistle to be taken as a satire, although I do not think this was his prime intention. In addition to eliciting support from all manner of men, Nashe uses the Epistle to show his cleverness in revamping the old complaint found in Dedications that 'Bounty is bankrupt'. He does so, not only by his amazing command of language, but by interpolating character sketches in the Theophrastan mode into his complaint against patrons.

In the Epistle to the Readers, which I have already talked about, Nashe makes a positive statement of his principles of working. No reader, after his confident assertion that he actually sets out to "wring juice out of a flint" can easily accuse him of having no matter, or of writing for the sake of spinning words. That is precisely his purpose. At this point it might be relevant to quote C.S. Lewis' remarks about the subject of Lenten Stuffe:

"Paradoxically, though Nashe's pamphlets are commercial literature, they come very close to being in another way, 'pure' literature: literature which is, as nearly as possible, without a subject. In a certain sense of the verb 'say', if asked what Nashe 'says', we should have to reply, Nothing. He tells no story, expresses
no thought; maintains no attitude... In his exhilarating whirlwind of words we find not thought nor passion but simply images:..." (32)

Nashe, as he did in Have with you, points out the importance of words - "Let me speake to you about my huge woords" - before setting out on his linguistic exercise. As if to make good immediately his claim that he can make something out of nothing, he decorates the account of his flight to Yarmouth with an amplified version of the rejection of Homer by seven cities. In Nashe's version "those gray-beard Huddle-duddles and crusty cum-twanos were strooke with such stinging remorse of their miserable Euclionisme and snudgery that hee was not yet cold in his grave but they challenged him to be borne amongst them...." (33). The simple comparison of his lot with that of Homer has turned into a set-piece display of vocabulary and elaborate periphrasis. Likewise, the account of Nashe's flight itself is made splendid with big words: "Too inconsiderate headlong rashness this may be censured in me, in beeing thus prodigall in advantaging my adversaries, but my case is no smoothered secret." (34)

The few pages which precede the History of Yarmouth are introductory in two senses: they make good the claim of the Address to make much out of little, and they establish the situation in which the book was conceived, and the continuing persona of the author. Piers Penilesse is not forgotten. The pamphlet written against Nashe, called The Trimming of Tom Nashe...
is mentioned: "I having a pamphlet hot a brooding that shall be called the Barbers warming panne." (35) There are many personal comments which emphasise the presence of the author, and his friendly attitude to his reader, which balance the grandiose manner of the writing, and so produce the ambivalent effect so characteristic of Nashe.

**HISTORY AND DESCRIPTION OF YARMOUTH**

Nashe's history and description of Yarmouth is one of the larger portions of Lenten Stuffe, and the most self-contained in the book. It is interesting that Nashe's tribute to Yarmouth took the form of a history rather than an encomium, since town histories were not a common form at the time, although there was a great surge of interest in local and national history. Nashe took advantage of this new enthusiasm of the reading public of England.

Louis R. Wright in his *Middle-Class Culture in Elizabethan England* outlines the strong middle-class belief in the utility of history, as a moral, and in some senses, practical guide for the reader. He says that the middle-class man "would as willingly spend money for histories as for Bibles." (36) There was a large market and reading public for history. At first historical works were of the large-scale, universal kind, such as Holinshed's
Chronicle, and in these works moral lessons could easily be read.

But the appeal of history was not purely moral; it was also patriotic. F.S. Fussner writes, apropos Hakluyt and Purchas' works on exploration:

"All kinds of topographical studies flourished in Elizabethan and Stuart England.... Patriotic pride was a simple unsophisticated pleasure to most Englishmen; and the glorification of England was a theme with infinite variation in Elizabethan literature." (37)

A third kind of appeal held by history for the Elizabethans was that to civic pride, which is related, of course, to patriotism. This kind of appeal accounts for the popularity of local histories, which provided material for civic and patriotic complacency in the form of ascertainable facts, and in addition gave useful pointers to mercantile success. The prime example of local history is John Stow's Survey of London (1598), of which Wright says: "it is the record of a city made great by the industry, thrift and daring of a body of citizens." (38)

Local history in England was confined to manuscript works until the last twenty years of the sixteenth century. Of these the most influential was John Leland's Itinerary which remained in note form at his death in 1552, and was consulted by many historians thereafter. There was a considerable amount of historical activity on a smaller scale; for example, the reports
of heralds, and the efforts of antiquaries. (39) Little of this, however, surfaced in print. In fact, John Hooker's Description of the Citie of Excester (1583) appears to be the only printed piece of narrowly local history before Nashe's Lenten Stuffe.

The manuscript document which covers the same material as Nashe's history, Henry Manship's A Booke of the Foundacion and Antiquitys of the Toune of Yarmouth (n.d.) belongs to the body of manuscript town chronicles, described by Ralph Flenley in Six Town Chronicles Of England. (40) Flenley shows that in spite of the increase in energy put into these chronicles in the sixteenth century, the content is uniformly dull and unimaginatively written, sometimes no more than a list of mayors and customs. Manship's work, in fact, he picks out as exceptional, since it was a rare attempt "to write the history of specific towns in a broader form than the town chronicle could allow" (41), yet this work seems dull and pedestrian beside Nashe's account of the same material. (42) The usual manner of presenting material in a town chronicle can be gauged from this short extract from the chronicle of Lynn:

1479 John Borbave maior
In this yere Mahomet the torke besydoed the Rode but lost his labr.

1480 William Marche maior
1481 William Marche maior
In this yere the Skots begane to store and the
was sent to them but he returned without battle."

(43)

Chronicles of this sort are perhaps what Nashe had in mind when in Pierce Penilesse he berated "lay Cronigraphers, that write of nothing but of Mayors and Sheriffs, and the deare yeere, and the great Frost." (44) Although Nashe took advantage of the growing interest in town histories, he produced a work of a different order.

The most comprehensive work of topographical history, William Camden's Britannia first appeared in 1586, and was steadily reprinted. This satisfied much of the demand for local history, since it covered the whole country in remarkable detail and with considerable accuracy. Despite its great size (and expense) and its being in Latin, Britannia was reprinted three times between 1586 and 1599, when Nashe wrote Lenten Stuffe (that is, in 1587, 1590 and 1594). It was, of course, reprinted many times thereafter. It not only contained enough specialised information to satisfy local interest, but also was complete enough to satisfy the public taste for overall views and exhaustive information. (45)
Other topographical works were produced in the last quarter of the century, notably Lambard's Perambulation of Kent which paved the way for Stow's great work. The latter is local, in that it deals only with London, but also comprehensive, in that it abounds in accurate historical information.

Nashe's small contribution to historical writing adds nothing in the historical sense, but shows the pervasiveness of interest in history. Nashe used Camden's Britannia for his own work:

"I may not dully overpasse the gallant beauty of their haven, which, having but as it were a welte of land, or, as M. Camden calls it, linoulam terrae, a little tong of the earth, betwixte it and the wide Maine, sticks not to mannage armes and hold his owne undefeasably against that universall unbounded empery of surges..." (46)

He possibly also leant on works by Buchanan and Polvodore Veroil. Certainly he used a "Chronigraphicall Latine Table", the work of local antiquaries in the Yarmouth Town Hall, which is also the source of Manship's history of the town. Nashe seems also to have had access to an enlarged version of the Table, in manuscript. (47) He did not undertake any research of his own, but at least copied his sources accurately, and made history available in print, in an attractive manner.
Nashe drew, as he had done in Have with you, on Hakluyt's PrincipalNavigations. He mentions it by name in the account of William Harborne, already discussed, and so links the local history of Yarmouth with the patriotic accounts of Hakluyt. Wright and Fussner both feel that the Elizabethan interest in local history was generated by the same causes as the interest in the exploits of the English overseas. Nashe seems to believe that Yarmouth's flourishing condition ought to be directly related to the exploits of her sons overseas:

"I mused how Yarmouth should be invested in such plenty and opulence, considering that in M. Hakluyt's English discoveries I have not come in ken of one mizzen mast of a man of warre bound for the Indies... Mercuriall brested M. Harborne alwaies accepted...." (48)

Nashe goes on to explain that the apparent discrepancy is caused by the fact that the red herring is the splendid cause of Yarmouth's prosperity, not voyages of purchase. The herring is thus ennobled rather than Yarmouth diminished.

Nashe's History of Yarmouth is unusual in many ways. Not only is it written in a florid style, unlike that of any other history, it also has a personal historian, an author who addresses his reader. Nashe as a character has already appeared in the book before the History starts and he by no means disappears when the new form is embarked upon, though he is
subdued in the interests of the material. There are several places in the course of the Yarmouth section when Nashe writes in the first person, or suddenly addresses the reader. These seem deliberately designed to revive the reader's interest, should it be flagging, and remind the reader that Nashe/Piers is still at large. There are some eighteen personal remarks scattered through the eighteen pages of the History. Some are only passing remarks, as, for example: "Shall I particularize unto you quibus viis et modis, how and wherein?" (49), but others are a more substantial attempt to divert the reader and remind him of Piers: "There be of you, it may be, that will account me a palterer, for hanging out the signe of the redde Harring in my title page..." (50), or "Here I could breake out into a boundless race of oratory..." (51) Nashe is determined not to disappear behind any collection of facts, however elegantly presented. The personal references do not occur regularly, but are concentrated at the beginning and end of the piece, when Nashe is getting into his stride, and later when he thinks the reader's attention might be flagging from all the information. The middle section of the history (52) has almost no references to or remarks from Piers, except for that quoted earlier: "My Tables are not yet one quarter empty...". There seems to me some indication that Nashe wanted to get on with the history here, so as to be sure of packing all the history in. These pages contain the most important facts about Yarmouth. That Nashe had a specific length in mind for the piece is shown by the following quotation: "I am posting to my proposed scope, or else I could runnne ten quier of paper out of breath." (53) The middle section appears,
in the light of this confidence, to be a determined effort to put
everything down on paper, and still leave room for some
recreation. Towards the end of the History, before he starts on
the Description, Nashe seems to run out of breath, traversing
over a hundred years in a few lines, when earlier he had spent
half a page on the reign of King John:

"Henry the sixth, Edward the fourth, Henry the
seventh and King Henry the eight, with his
daughters Queene Mary and our Chara deum soboles,

Queene Elizabeth, have not withred up their handes
in signing and subscribing to their requests...."

(54)

The passages of the history not written under pressure of
space, however, present a new phenomenon in English prose: the
marriage of fact and ornamental language. (55) When Nashe wishes
to state that in the ninth year of John's reign, 1209, Yarmouth
gained yet more privileges, he expresses it thus: "King John...

in the ninth yeare of the engirting...his annoynted browes with
the refulgent Ophir circle, and Anno 1209...." (56) In this
passage, as in most others the facts are presented, and the
presentation ornamented, but both facts and ornament have equal
status. This is not always so in Nashe's writing, for there are
numerous occasions on which the fact is merely the excuse for the
ornament. In passages like the one quoted, I feel that Nashe was
trying the limits of factual prose, by seeing how far it could be
decorated without losing its meaning. He also seems to be trying
the limits of his prose in another way - seeing how idiosyncratic he can be without, again, losing the facts: "Cerdicus... was the first maylord or capitaine of the morris daunce, that on those embrenched shelves stampt his footing" (57), or "a Church of that magnitude, as, under ministers and Cathedrals, verie queasie it admits any haylefellow well met;" (58) In these expressions the imagery employed is very vivid and unexpected, and not particularly relevant to the History, but in spite of that, the meaning is clear, and the History continues.

The Description of Yarmouth gets short shrift, perhaps because to do it well would have required Nashe to do some practical research. He admits that: "Voide ground in the towne from the walles to the houses, and from the houses to the haven, is not within the verge of my Geometry." (59) Other information about Yarmouth is very cursorily presented, as if it had to be cut out of the way: "Gates to let in her friends, and shut out her enemies, Yarmouth hath ten; lans sevenscore...." (60)

The emphasis during the History and Description falls, as one might expect from the middle-class bias of Elizabethan history, on sound middle-class virtues. The magistrates, for example, though apt for high praise are endowed with "grave modesty", and would not welcome such effusions. The historical emphasis is on the "notable immunities, franchises, privileges" Yarmouth has obtained, and on solid achievements such as the church and the town wall. Yarmouth's wealth is stressed, but so is the large spread of her money; Nashe describes the town as a true
commonwealth where "one man hath not too much riches, and another man too much povertie." Yarmouth steers a middle course, for "one or two there pockets not up all the peeces; there being two hundreth in it worth three hundred pounds apeece." (61) Wealth is well divided, but there is no dangerous "mungrel Democratia in which one is all & all is one." (62) The town is the figure of a perfect middle-class state. The poor are provided with honest work to keep themselves:

"Yarmouth... could clap up... a shewe of netbrayders, or those that have no cloathes to wrappe their hides in or breade to put in their mouthes but what they earne and get by brayding of nets (not so little as two thousand pound they yearely dispersing amongst the poore women and children of the country for the spinning of twine to make them with, besides the labour of the inhabitantes in working them.)" (63)

Although it keeps its own first, Yarmouth also does its part for the whole country. It is "a town of defence... to the Counties of Suffolke and Norfolke" (64) and produces cheap food for the whole nation, in the form of herring. This utilitarian view of Yarmouth is expanded by Nashe into a precise account of the money spent by Yarmouth on various public works and on national charoies, as if these were a measure of her worth. It is notable that Nashe thought these of interest to his readers, when he has omitted so much - for example, the recent history of the town- which might seem more entertaining. His readers must have considered these monetary facts important. Finally, although it
has been implicit throughout the description especially, Nashe praises Yarmouth for her supreme middle-class virtue, industry. Nashe seems to believe that if other coastal towns were as industrious as Yarmouth, there would not only be fish in plenty, but all other economic problems would also be solved: "it would be as plentifull a world as when Abbies stoode." (65)

THE PARADOXICAL ENCOMIUM

This genre I have already discussed in Chapter 3, but it seems necessary to enlarge the discussion here, to include the English encomia written before Nashe's, and also to examine the "List", the traditional array of encomia prefixed to an encomium. In Harington's case, the list was short—only seven works—and I looked at the work of Erasmus and Rabelais whom Harington mentioned in it. There were, however, a vast number of mock encomia written in Europe, as I have stated, some of which were translated into English, while a few original encomia were written in English. Nashe cites a great many precedents in his "List", but in fact, appears to me to be as original in his use of this common genre, as he was in his use of the relatively uncommon form of the local history.

Since Nashe's mock encomium of the Red Herring differs markedly from Harington's of the water-closet, the former being entirely a jeu d'esprit, while the latter is a serious
intellectual argument, it might be as well to mention here Sister M. Geraldine’s article entitled ‘Erasmus and the Tradition of Paradox’. (66) Sister Geraldine distinguishes between two types of mock encomia: the essentially serious, and the frivolous. Erasmus’ Praise of Folly, naturally, is the leading example of the former, while pieces like the Prayse of the Red Herrino belong to the latter category. Quite unjustly, Sister Geraldine classes The Metamorphosis of Ajax along with Nashe’s work, as a frivolous work. The major point which distinguishes a ‘serious’ from a ‘frivolous’ mock encomium in this view is that the former is intended to provoke disagreement or stimulate thought about the subject, while the latter is merely an exercise of wit. (67) Sister Geraldine does not consider any English works in the sixteenth century to belong in the first group; all are fundamentally frivolous.

However, when we stop to examine some of the paradoxical encomia which appeared in English in the sixteenth century, we find the position is not so clearcut. It seems to me that there are three or even four possible categories of encomia, rather than two. I hope the following survey will clarify this.

The most confusing matter which arises when discussing the paradoxical encomium is that of genre. In the case of Harington’s book, we found that not only was one of his seven cited examples (Rabelais’ chapter on the torcheul), not
technically a paradoxical encomium, but neither was The _
Metamorphosis. In addition, many of the works traditionally ____________
treated as paradoxical encomia, such as the pseudo-Virgilian 
Culex, Ovid's Nux, and the Homeric Battle of the Frogs and Mice ___
are not in the form of mock-praises. The confusion is not
reduced by Sister Geraldine's article, which deals with paradoxes 
and paradoxical encomia at the same time. There is, of course, 
o no objection to this, since she is specifically concerned with 
the tradition of paradox which includes both encomia and plain
paradoxes. Rosalie Colie has shown the extent to which paradox
spread through different genres in Renaissance literature. (68)

Nashe partakes of the general confusion over what is and is
not a paradoxical encomium, for his long list of precedents
includes works which belong in several different categories,
particularly plain paradoxes, which maintain that something bad
is good, without praising it. In these circumstances, it would
be foolish for the critic to be too rigorous in discussing the
paradoxical encomium when its Renaissance practitioners were
relatively careless about applying the term. The works I mention
hereafter are works which are nearer paradox, as exemplified by
Donne's Paradoxes and Problems, than paradoxical encomium,
______________
represented by the Praise of Folly.
One might imagine that tracing the tradition of paradox down to the Praye of the Red Herring would be an easy matter, since

Nashe opens his piece with an enormous list of precedents. But the inclusion of a list of precedents was a traditional part of the encomium, as I noted in Chapter 3, and Nashe may very well have included many of the works in his list merely to make it more copious— to overgo all previous lists; he may even have invented some books to make it more colourful. Many of the books he mentions McKerrow was unable to identify. The prime difficulty with the list, however, is that McKerrow was of the opinion that Nashe "took most of this list in a piece from somewhere" (69), but had not been able to discover where. A claim of this nature from such a scholar cannot be easily disregarded, and so it is irrelevant to talk of "Nashe's" list at all. McKerrow says only "most of the list", and I am inclined to think that Nashe copied the first part of the list—the Classical and European exempla—from some source and himself compiled and invented the list of English—mock encomia. This is partly because of the inclusion of Harington's work in the English list— (there were only two years between the publication of The

Metamorphosis and Lenten Stuffe)— and partly because of the

greater care lavished upon the thirteen English examples than upon the forty or so Classical and European. These are listed one after another with little or no comment.
Only five of Nashe's English examples are positively identified by McKerrow. The work on "the noble science of defence" is the translation by I.G. of the Arte of Defence; "something in praise of nothing" is E.D's (Sir Edward Dyer's?) The Praise of Nothing; the work in "commendation of daunsing" is Sir John Davies' poem Orchestra; the book on the "reformation of close stooles" is, of course, The Metamorphosis; and the book proposing "Tosted turves against famine" is probably one of Sir Hugh Plat's. (70) Most of the other books in Nashe's English list sound remarkably like inventions, for example, the work "in laud of a bag-pudding", but one cannot be sure.

From these works alone, one can see how far from being a collection of paradoxical encomia the list is; books on defence and dancing, and Plat's inventions belong in quite different genres.

Since Nashe's list is inadequate for the purpose, I have had to fall back on a selective sort of guess-work, in sketching the state of the English paradoxical encomium before Lenten Stuffe. The five works I shall mention all feature in Nashe's list, as far as one can tell—it is not possible to distinguish between one paradox on madness, or one praise of the Ass, and another, without some specific indication. The Praise of Folly is mentioned in Nashe's list very much in passing. Praises of "the
ague, the dropsie, the sciatica, follie, drunkennesse, and slovenry" (71) are strung together, and so, in spite of the

obvious importance of Erasmus' work to the history of the paradoxical encomium in general, one cannot imagine it had much influence on Nashe's piece.

The classic collection of paradoxes— one which went through numerous editions in Italian, French and English— was that by Ortsensio Lando, called the Paradossi. This was translated into English by Anthony Munday, from the French translation, and appeared in 1593. It may be paradoxes from this collection which are referred to in Nashe's list as praises of "povertie, imprisonment, death, sicknesse, banishment..." (72) Munday's version of the Paradossi (which it must be conceded differs from its original) is not a facetious work, being rather in the tradition of Cicero's serious philosophical work, the Paradoxa Stolcorum, than of the humorous paradoxical encomium. The paradoxes take the form, for example: "that blindness is better than sight" or "that dearth is better than plenty." The arguments put forward to support these contentions are moral and religious, and although the work may be intended to entertain, the result is rarely amusing. This is partly caused, I think, by the ineptitude of the translator, for Lando's original is elegantly witty, while Munday's becomes earnest. (73) Lando had found moral and religious arguments the most cogent to support his paradoxes, and Munday was unable to deal with such matters
without becoming dull. There are occasionally moments when humour breaks the surface, as in the paradox on Drink, where the author suggests that water-drinkers procreate less, and thus do not fulfil their natural duties, but in Munday's version even this appears seriously meant. In the Defense of Contraries, therefore, we have the spectacle of a fairly frivolous (or at least, not deeply moral) paradoxical work turned into a serious one by the constraints of the material, and by the incompetence of the stylist.

The work in praise of baldness which Nashe lists is doubtless Synesius' well-known Laus Calviti. This was translated by Abraham Fleming in 1579, and entitled A Paradoxe Proving by reason and example, that Baldnesse is much better than bushie haire. Although Synesius was later a Christian bishop, this work seems to have been written before his conversion, for it is serious in undertone, but without specifically Christian content. It is an amusing work, and translated so as to retain its charm. Synesius displays enormous ingenuity in the arguments he produces, and delight in their cleverness, and it is perhaps interesting that he makes his authorial presence felt in the work. This book is a true paradoxical encomium, since it does actually praise baldness, and follows the prescription laid down by A.S. Pease for the genuine adoxographic work in that it lays "chief emphasis upon the number, variety, and unexpected character of the arguments adduced for praise." (74) Synesius'
supreme argument for the bald head is its affinity with the eye, and with the Divine:

"The bald pate hath a kinde of naturall acquaintance with God. now, Sir, whether God be bald, or not: that is counsell to us. Of this I am assured, that the things which are next unto God, are the spheres of the heavens, and they are balde: in like manner are the starres." (75)

Although Synesius' work is very amusing, I think it has the same end in view as Harington's paradox, that is, to make the reader think again about the nature of human life, and his preconceptions. It is no Praise of Folly, with a deep moral and religious undertone, but it is not entirely frivolous either.

Nashe lists, among his precedents, many eulogies of animals. Such eulogies were particularly popular in ancient adoxography, as Pease shows. (76) Among those listed by Nashe is a praise of 'the asse', which might be that contained in Cornelius Agrippa's famous book De Vanitate et Incertitudine scientiarum with which Nashe was very familiar, and which he abused, but pillaged. (77) This was Englished in 1569 as Henry Cornelius Agrippa, of the Vanitie and uncertaintie of Artes and Sciences by Ia. San., who is presumably James Sanford. It is a wholesale attack on received opinion, rather than learning, and contains many paradoxical pieces. For example, learning and bawdry are both held up for scrutiny in Chapter 64, where Agrippa points out that
"Grammar is required in baudrie.... Poetrie is needfull in baudrie.... Oratorie (is) necessarie for baudrie." (78) The praise of the Asse comes very near the end of the book, and is a true paradoxical encomium. The ass is venerated because it is humble, and humility is close to God; the ignorant, so often called asses, are usually humble too, and so in the manner of Erasmus, Agrippa, after a huge display of learning in a work intended to purge learning of its folly, comes down on the side of ignorance. This is a serious work—though not dull—in two ways: it is serious about its desire to restore truth to learning, and it is finally serious about the supremacy of the spiritual over the intellectual. (79)

In his list of English paradoxical encomia Nashe refers to E.D.'s Prayse of Nothing. This work was printed in 1585, and although sometimes called Erasmian, is of rather a different sort. The author, presumably Dyer, denies following earlier masters of the paradox:

"Whilst I endeavored to shun Agrippas vanities, and Erasmus follyes, as one that might have beene a paterne of either, I cloathed with bare garments this treatise.... My purpose hath not beene to publishe any thing contrary to pietie... or beguilng the time.... I... had rather breede no delight then betraie the sences." (80)

Dyer's is a serious religious work, although it has occasional flourishes of wit. It is rarely, if ever, amusing, and written in a thorny style.
"(I) am persuaded that this latter age cannot but acknowledge sundry benefits which rise of nothing, as that which nurseth the godly in the love of vertue, and punisheth the transgressors of good lawes...." (81)

This work is no 'light friskin'.

There is one paradox, not alluded to in Nashe's list, which seems nearer The Praye of the Red Herring in manner than any other produced in English, but even this work has distinct differences. It is called A Mirour of Madnes or a Paradox maintayning Madnes to be most excellent (1576). It claims to be a translation from the French, by James Sanford, who also translated the work by Agrippa. Sister Geraldine thinks the work is original to Sanford (82), but does not give any reason, except for its 'burly' quality. I cannot see why it should not be the translation it claims, although there are possibly additions by the translator which give it an English flavour. (83) The work defends madness on the grounds that it is universal, and that love depends upon it. The work surveys all of society, and finds madness in philosophy, religion, the pursuit of fame and glory in war, in the way people dress, in the conduct of women, and so on. Many of the arguments for madness the author adduces are serious, and even religious; many of the acts of 'madness' among the religious are performed by Catholics, whom the author abhors. The book is witty, however, and has a colourful style, at times approaching that of Nashe. Talking of excess in apparel, the
author says:
"...the straunge devises nowe a daves, create, bigge and boysterous, bumbareld burste belted and burden buttocke Breeches.... I beleve no one thyng hath so many qualityes, first in warre for wante they may serve for great Drummes... in tyme of peace in it they serve to manye purposes, first when hee rydeth they may serve very well for a paire of palterers panniers, secondly when he goeth they may serve for colliers sackes, and lastly when he sitteth they may serve for fattles to kepe plate from rayne and snow...." (84)

This book, though clever in its arguments and colourful in its style, and in many places playfully witty and frivolous, is not really a precedent for Nashe's paradox. A Mirour is partially serious in its contention that all things are madness, and in addition, is not actually a paradoxical encomium. Madness is found everywhere, the author proves, but madness is not praised or presented as admirable. The author, although he was probably inspired by the Praise of Folly, produced a different sort of book, a satire using paradox, rather than a paradoxical encomium.

These five works of paradox are of several different sorts: the Munday translation is serious by virtue of the material it deals with; Synesius' work is essentially amusing, but imbued with an intelligent thoughtfulness; Agrippa is concerned, as I said, with two important issues; Dyer deliberately eschews
frivolity; the author of A Mirour allows bitterness to creep into his game, as well as numerous serious arguments. Nashe is quite different - he is absolutely frivolous. There are no serious issues or undertones in the Pravse of the Red Herring; it is precisely as Nashe describes it, a "light friskin of (his) witte"; he imitates those whom "a wantonizing humour once in their life time hath possesst to play with strawes, and turne mole-hils into mountaines." (85)

Nashe's 'wantonizing humour' results in a completely insubstantial but delightful encomium. I shall attempt to show how Nashe has made something out of nothing in the body of the encomium, but first a few words about the 'List' seem in order.

The embellishment of a long list of previous mock-encomia presents something of a challenge to Nashe. Nothing could be duller than a catalogue of obscure writers and their trifling subjects, and one of over fifty items could extremely be tiresome. In Nashe's hands this list becomes, if not particularly funny, at least readable. He orders it by several means. He begins with Classical encomia, such as the familiar Nux and Culex, and after these famous examples, begins to organise the encomia by subject. His method then is to list a number of related objects of encomium without comment, and then to elaborate on some part of the list, either an element in it, or the introduction to it: "Physitions deafen our eares with the Honorificabilitudinitatibus of their heavenly Panachaea, their
soveraigne Guiacum, their glisters, their triacles...." (86) As well as the subject divisions, there are geographical divisions, so that a collection of Italian and German encomia precedes the English encomia. It is to these latter "harmonius calinos" that Nashe gives his attention; each of the ten named is given a roundabout description, except for Dyer's Praye of Nothing, about which even Nashe was struck dumb— all he could say about it was: "a fourth comes forth with something in praye of nothing." Other works in the English list are better treated.

The Metamorphosis which Nashe privately disliked is described thus:

"A ninth offers sacrifice to the goddesse Cloaca, and disportes himselfe very schollerly and wittilie about the reformation of close stooles and houses of office, and spicing and embalming their rancke intrailes, that they stinke not."

(87)

Nashe was prepared to admit Harington's cleverness and erudition at any rate, even if he failed to see the point of the book. (88)

By speeding through the first forty items and dilating upon the last ten, Nashe does attain a measure of entertainment out of his catalogue. After delivering himself of this huge catalogue, Nashe dismisses it all thus: "The application of this whole catalogue of wast authours is no more but this, Quot capita tot
sententiae, so many heads, so many whirligigs" (89), as if to
--------
cast away the effusions of his pen.

When I surveyed the English paradoxical encomia, I noted that
Nashe's was unusual in being without serious intention, and in
employing no serious arguments. Nashe could not have afforded,
had he so desired, to use or imply serious content in his piece,
because of the danger of misinterpretation. The year Lenten
--------
Stuffe was written. A long and confused poem called A Herrings
--------
Tayle appeared. This work seems to have some contemporary,
-----
possibly political, meaning, which is now irretrievable. The
work is almost impenetrable to a modern reader. It is not
fanciful, therefore, to imagine Nashe's paradox becoming the
subject of political scrutiny. Nashe mentions the possibility in
his section against informers, and one twentieth century writer,
William Meredith Carroll, believes that Nashe did intend the Red
Herring to allude to the House of Tudor. (90) Circumspection,
therefore, as well as personal preference led Nashe to avoid all
serious comment in his humorous piece. There is, however, one
point on which Nashe approaches seriousness, but he contradicts
himself twice on that same point, and so cannot be deeply
concerned. This is the matter of a warlike and a peacable
stance. On the age of the Black Prince, Nashe says:

"O, it was a brave age then, and so it is ever,
where there are offensive wars, and not defensive,
& men fight for the spoile, and not in feare to be
spoiled, & are as lions seeking out their prey,
and not as sheepe that lie still whiles they are
prayd on." (91)

Nashe follows this immediately with:
"The redde herring is a legate of peace, and so
abhorrent from unnatural bloudshed that if, in his
quarrell or bandying who should harbinc him, there
be any hewing or slashing, or trials of life &
death, there where that hang-man embowelling is,
his pursuivants or balies returne non est
inventus, out of one bailiwick he is fled." (92)

There is no logical connection between these two sentences, and I
am at a loss to explain this inconsistency. It is further
increased by Nashe's recounting in the red herring's favour that
the red herring is "such a hot stirring meate... enough to make
the cravenest dastard proclaime fire and sword against Spaine."
(93) Although we have observed other instances of Nashe's
contradictory thinking, this one is baffling, since the major
contradiction is between two contiguous passages. One
explanation is that the warlike statement was perilously near a
political sally, and had to be instantly rectified by another,
more pacific, and clearly on the subject of the red herring.

In the Prayse, Nashe makes the following points about the red
herring: no other country has the herring in such abundance, and
it is therefore England's most precious product and lucrative
export; it sets "a worke thousands"; it demands less of sailors
than voyages of purchase, but produces as much; herring-fishermen are good sailors; the practice of fasting would be impossible without herring; the herring makes Yarmouth flourish, and brings more ships to the town than Helen's beauty brought to Troy; the herring flies from bloodshed, and likes elegant surroundings; the effect of herring meat stirs the blood; the herring is the true 'flying-fish' because he goes all over Europe.

Nashe has produced quite a number of points in the herring's favour, but even so he is short of material. The matter of the encomium overlaps at either end, in that the good effects of the herring on England and on Yarmouth have been mentioned before, in the description of the town, and the last points made about the herring— that the myths of Dionysius and Midas are really about him—are trial runs for the burlesque myth which follows.

Nashe's normal method of composition in the encomium is one of comparison, suggestion and amplification. By this I mean that whenever possible Nashe compares what he is discussing with something else, however unlikely, follows on to whatever that comparison suggests, and amplifies it all with adjectives and descriptive phrases and periphrases. This is a useful method of procedure in a piece like this encomium, where there is no fixed line to follow. For an example of this in practice, consider the first four pages of the encomium. Nashe starts with the point that the herring is England's most precious product, and this suggests a comparison with all the other contenders for the title
"most precious merchandize"; they are considered and rejected. This provides a topic for amplification. The next point— that the herring provides work— gives some scope for amplification, in that all the varieties of such work can be listed and described. The general topic of navigation suggests the next point— voyages of purchase— which is amplified before we discover its relation to the main point: that the herring demands much less of sailors than the voyages of purchase. This is a comparison in reverse, one might say. The next point in favour of the herring is the skill his pursuit instills in fishermen. The fishermen of Yarmouth can then be compared to those of Rye, and the comparison amplified. The comparison, later in the piece, of Helen and the herring is particularly fruitful, since it allows Nashe to move by suggestion from the great crowds of ships attending Helen to other congregations of ships, which provide good material for amplification. The subject— of Helen also introduces the mythological theme, which is continued in the 'demythologising' of the story of Midas and of Dionysius' theft of the golden image of Jupiter, which was really a red herrino. These stories lead into the burlesque version of the story of Hero and Leander, which I have chosen to treat separately. It is not distinct from the encomium; everything which follows the encomium could be taken as part of it. However, it seems to me that the praise proper is found between the 'list' and the story of Hero and Leander, which is long enough to be thought of as an item on its own. All the material between these points hangs together, while that which follows the Hero and Leander story is different, consisting of tales and digressions. It is necessary, in a work
as chaotic as this one becomes, to be a little Procrustean.

**BURLESQUE MYTH**

The story of the origins of the herring is a burlesque version of that of Hero and Leander found in the work of Musaeus, and given its most famous treatment by Christopher Marlowe.

Although I call this work a 'burlesque', it fails to conform to the usual definitions of that mode. Most definitions of burlesque distinguish between the high treatment of a low subject and the low treatment of a high subject, and between burlesque and parody. (94) Nashe's piece is a combination of lofty and denigrating treatments, and has parodic elements. As I shall demonstrate shortly, however, it can legitimately be described as a burlesque. Another possible title would be "travesty", defined by Douglas Bush as "a free, humorous reworking of a serious narrative which retains the characters, and at least a recognizable amount of the subject matter of the original, but reduces everything to the level of bourgeoís comedy or farce." (95) Bush in this discussion is concerned with travesties of Classical myths, which he sees as originating in England with Nashe's "Hero and Leander", and proliferating in the seventeenth century. There are, however, a few other instances of comic treatments of the characters of myth before or contemporary with Nashe's. For example, William Warner uses mythology humorously in Albions England (1586-9) (96); in Love's Labour Lost
Worthies sequence burlesques Classical heroes, and the Pyramus and Thisbe play in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* ridicules high treatments of romantic love in Classical myth; the brief inserted play in Marston's *Histriomastix* (97) foreshadows Shakespeare in mocking the Troilus and Cressida story. The best-known example of a mock-myth is rather later: the puppet-play version of Hero and Leander and Damon and Pythias in Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair* (1614). In addition, there are two humorous treatments of the Hero and Leander story which found in the sixteenth-century; one is the brief account in *As You Like It* (usually dated 1598-9), and the other, even briefer, is in a satirical poem called *Tyros Roring Megge* (1589). The passage from *As You Like It*, although well-known, is worth quoting, since it displays the same attitude to the story as Nashe's burlesque does. Shakespeare brings the romantic tale down to earth:

"Leander, he would have lived many a fair year, though Hero had turned nun, if it had not been for a hot midsummer night; for, good youth, he went but forth to wash him in the Hellespont and being taken with the cramp was drowned, and the foolish chroniclers... found it was 'Hero of Sestos'...."

(IV.1)
Although Nashe may have been in the vanguard of classical burlesque, in another sense he was following a classical tradition in his treatment of the figures of myth. An attitude of irreverence towards mythological characters is found in the works of Aristophanes and Lucian, in Plautus, Juvenal and Persius.

The gods and heroes appear as butts or buffoons, or are treated as ordinary people, which can itself be a cause of humour. (98) As works by Lucian and Plautus were on the grammar school syllabus in sixteenth-century England (99), and writings by Juvenal, Persius, and, to a lesser extent, Aristophanes were well-known in the Renaissance (100), this irreverent attitude towards the characters of myth would have been available as source material for writers of burlesque. This attitude was mirrored by Elizabethan writers of epyllia, following the cynical manner of Ovid. The English Ovidians introduced a broader humour than that of Ovid himself, however, which paved the way for burlesque. Shakespeare’s Venus and Adonis (1593) has a number of humorous elements, some of which border on the burlesque, as in Stanza 6:

"Over one arme the lustie coursers raine,
Under the other was the tender boy,
Who blusht, and powted in a dull disdaine..."

or in Stanza 99:

"On his neck her yoaking armes she throwes.
She sinketh downe, still hanging by his necke,
He on her belly falls, she on her backe.

Much of the humour in this poem, however, is of a more subtle kind, more like that found in Ovid's poetry. (101) More significant for the genesis of Nashe's work are Marlowe's Hero and Leander (1593), and Marston's The Metamorphosis of Pigmaliion's Image (1598). The former introduces a subtle satiric humour which undercuts the romantic stance of its characters, while the latter professes to be a burlesque of the whole tradition of Ovidian epyllia.

Marlowe, for example, introduces Hero, and describes her dress thus:

"Her kirtle blue, whereon was many a stain,
Made with the blood of wretched lovers slain." (102)

This description places Hero in a hyperbolic world, and equally in a slightly ridiculous light, after which it is difficult to take her totally seriously. Leander, likewise, is introduced ambiguously:

"Even as delicious meat is to the taste,
So was his neck in touching, and surpass'd
The white of Pelops' shoulder. I could tell ye
How smooth his breast was, and how white his belly."

(103)

Marlowe, in using extravagant imagery, in playing with the idea of cannibalism, (Pelops was served up at a feast for the gods), and in tantalising the reader with Leander's beauty, ("I could
tell ye"), is making Leander not a tragic or romantic figure, but an instrument of Marlowe's mockery of conventions. He is brought down to earth also by his innocence:

"...this jewel he enjoyed,
And as a brother with his sister toyed,
Supposing nothing else was to be done,
Now he her favour and good will had won." (104)

But he is lifted up to the heights by the extravagant comparisons awarded him—his hair

"Would have allur'd the venturous youth of Greece
To hazard more than for the Golden Fleece." (105)

and he is compared to Theban Hercules and Ganymede. (106) The contrasts of these high and low elements, and the humour produced by the mockery of classical extravagance and convention combine to make a work which is a refined cousin to burlesque.

Marston's poem presents something of a puzzle. In later verses, Marston claimed it as a travesty of Ovidian epyllia:

"...Curio, know'st my spright?
Yet deem'st that in sad seriousness I write
Such nastie stuffe as is Pigmalion?" (107)

Bush accepts Marston's word, and says of the poem: "to a literary aspirant of strongly satirical bent the vogue of the sensuous mythological poem might well seem to invite an ironic piece of studied excess." (108) Later he says: "Marston's assertion regarding his tale of Pigmalion at least shows that he could entertain the notion of a mythological burlesque, though not of the bourgeois kind." (109) Others, notably Marston's
editor, Arnold Davenport, feel that Marston intended the poem as a straightforward, commercial venture, and only afterwards decided to call it a burlesque, since its erotic nature did not accord with his later pose as satirist. (110) Whatever the truth about this poem; it demonstrates, as Bush's remark quoted above implies, that burlesque myth was a plausible idea among writers in the late sixteenth century.

Another treatment of mythological figures, however, combines with the satire found in Marlowe and others to produce Nashe's burlesque piece. This strand is the familiar or plain approach to Classical figures found in Mediaeval literature, and in Elizabethan ballads. This familiarisation reaches its lowest point when Nashe adapts it to produce: "the gods and goddesses all on a rowe, bread and crow, from Ops to Pomona, the first applewife, were so dumpt with this miserable wracke..." (111), or when Jonson's puppet-master says:

"Now here come the friends again, Pythias and Damon,
And under their cloaks, they have of bacon, a common." (112)

In earlier forms, this treatment of mythological figures was the norm: Orpheus becomes King Orfeo, Eurydice Heuridis, and Thrace is domesticated to Winchester. Thereafter, the hero behaves as a native would, and the writer's approach to him is plain and straightforward. In the Merchant's Tale, Chaucer is using the same process of familiarisation as other Mediaeval writers in introducing Pluto and Proserpine, but because the poem is comic, they also become comic figures. They are not funny because they
are gods, but because marital relationships are a cause for humour in this tale. Elizabethan ballads inherited the Mediaeval tendency to present Classical figures in plain, familiar terms, but their familiarisation usually appeared in a very plain, low style. This in the hands of inferior writers frequently produced bathetic verse, which seems on occasion perilously close to burlesque. Consider A new Sonet of Pyramus and Thisbie:

"Then from his sheathe he drew his blade,
and to his hart
He thrust the point, and life did vade,
with painfull smart:
Then Thisbie she from cabin came
with pleasure great,
And to the well apase she ran
there for to treat:
And to discusse, to Pyramus
of all her former feares.
And when slaine she, found him truly,
she shed foorth bitter teares." (113)

It is not difficult to see the connection between this ballad, which is unintentionally funny, and Shakespeare's burlesque, but there is also a link between ballads and Nashe's piece. Mythological ballads abounded in the sixteenth-century (114), and are found in respectable anthologies, as well as on broadsheets. Tottel's Miscellany contains a ballad beginning:

"In Greece somtime there dwelt a man of worthy fame:
To grave in stone his connyng was: Pigmallion was his name."
The Handful of Pleasant Delights (1584), which consists entirely of ballads has, in addition to the ballad of Pyramus and Thisbe quoted above, a Historie of Diana and Acteon. This demonstrates well, how in making the subject familiar, and treating it plainly, humour can inadvertently be derived from a tragic subject:

"For Diana brought it thus to passe,
and play'd her part,
So that poore Acteon chang'd was
to a huge Hart,
And did beare, naught but haire." (116)

The story of Hero and Leander was popular among ballad writers. A ballad on the subject was sung by Scottish shepherds before 1549 (117), and three separate treatments of the theme in ballads survive from the seventeenth century. (118) It is quite possible that a ballad version was current in the late sixteenth century. The reference in Lenten Stuffe to the story as one which "everie apprentice in Paules churchyward will tell you for your love, and sel you for your mony:" (119), implies that the tale was common, and commonly in print.
From all that I have said, it will be apparent that although Nashe was the first English writer to produce a prose burlesque myth, there was a lively tradition which treated Classical figures as lowly or comic before him.

The major characteristic of Nashe's treatment of the story of Hero and Leander is that it is alternatively high and low. It takes a high romantic tale, brings it down to earth, and then raises it up again by virtue of the grand style. This sounds paradoxical, and indeed the whole tale is paradoxical and ambivalent, Nashe being unsure of his attitude to the story he was telling. That he was in debt to Marlowe is clear, not only from his mention of that poet, but from borrowings in the text. (120) Nashe admires Marlowe's poem and follows it in his treatment, but reacts against it simultaneously. (121) For example, Nashe makes use of the elaborate, and partly satirical description of Leander in Marlowe's work, which I quoted from earlier. Nashe's Leander is deliberately not described:

"Of Leander you may write upon, and it is written upon, she likte well, and for all he was a naked man, and cleane dispoyled to the skinne... O, ware a naked man; Cithereaes Nunnes have no power to resiste him:" (122)

This 'description' of Leander also makes reference to Marlowe's satirical account of Hero's reaction to the naked Leander. (123)
Nashe was attracted to the poignant aspects of Marlowe’s story, it seems to me, but incapable of conveying emotion in his prose. Instead he turns to jocularity and clever language. For example, the picture of Hero running "in her loose night-gowne, and her haire about her eares" to Leander’s body, and thinking "to have kist his dead corse alive againe" (124), has the makings of a genuinely affecting scene, but Nashe was unable to handle such emotion, and so continues: "but as on his blew tellied sturgeon lips she was about to clappe one of those warme plaisters, boystrous woolpacks of ridged tides came rowling in, and raught him from her...." (125) There may seem a contradiction in my claiming this work is a burlesque, and then arraigning Nashe for his inability to be serious. This contradiction lies in the very nature of the work, in its ambivalence of mood and style, in Nashe’s perennial desire to have things both ways. Nashe could not very easily take a story as genuinely affecting as that of Hero and Leander and ignore its pathetic elements, unless he were prepared to debase it completely as Jonson did in Bartholomew Fair. This he cannot bring himself to do; he allows certain romantic elements in: "Hero wept as trickling as the heavens, to thinke that heaven should so divorce them. Leander stormed worse than the stormes, that by theem he should be so restrained from his Cinthya." (126) This is only one of several romantic passages, relatively free of verbal trickery, and without bathos. At times, Nashe seems to be attempting in prose what Marlowe did in verse: to create romantic, affecting characters, potentially tragic, but ever so slightly undercut by the poet’s satire. Nashe’s Hero, "a pretty pinckany and Venus
priest", who dreams that "Leander and shee were playing at checkestone with pearles in the bottome of the sea" (127) almost seems to be such a character. Nashe achieves here the Marlovian combination of beauty and humour. But his own ambivalent attitude, his desire to "show off" verbally, and his final refusal to let the story carry him, and not his prose the story, reduces him to the sort of jarring bathos we saw in the passage quoted above, in which Hero ran out to kiss the body of Leander. This bathos is not funny, but frustrating.

In order to observe Nashe's method of story-telling, his alternating of high and low, we shall examine the opening of the tale:

"Twoo faithfull lovers they were, as everie apprentice in Paules churchyard will tell you for your love, and sel you for your mony: the one dwelt at Abidos in Asia, which was Leander; the other, which was Hero, his Mistris or Delia, at Sestos in Europe, and she was a pretty pinckany and Venus priest; and but an arme of the sea divided them: it divided them and it divided them not, for over that arme of the sea could be made a long arme. In their parents the most division rested, and their townes that like Yarmouth and Leystoffe were stil at wrig wraq, & suckt from their mothers teates serpentine hatred one against each other. Which drove Leander when he durst not deale above boord, or be seene aboorde any ship, to saile to
his Lady deare, to play the didopper and ducking water spaniel to swim to her, nor that in the day, but by owle-light." (128)

The opening is quite plain, setting the scene, and stressing that the story is a popular one, not an aristocratic preserve. Apart from a little indulgence in balanced phrases and sentences, the opening is free of affectations. But shortly afterwards Nashe cannot resist a pun on "arme of the sea" - "long arme" - which immediately places the story in a comic context. Not content with that Nashe domesticates the story by comparing the islands to Yarmouth and Lowestoft, so that the reader feels he is in a familiar setting. Immediately, however, Nashe changes tone again, and thrusts the reader into the melodramatic world implied by "serpentine hatred". Directly after that, Nashe plunges into the story of the lovers, with a sentence which is full of changes of direction. Beginning with a pun on "above boord" - "aboorde" - the tone becomes briefly romantic ("Lady deare"), but he swiftly destroys that tone by comparing Leander not to one - but two water animals, neither very noble (128a) - and in case swimming by night might appear romantic, Nashe adds "by owle-light". The complexity of the sentence belies the exaggerated plainness of its contents; Nashe strips away decorative elements from the story with one hand, by insisting on an unromantic attitude to Leander, and puts them back with the other, by creating decorative sentences, adorned with alliteration and puns.
This sort of to-ing and fro-ing, unsettling for the reader, is not confined to the first paragraph, but is continual, and results in confusion as to Nashe's intention. He is, however, much more at ease, and easier to follow, when he recounts the second part of the story, the transformation of Hero and Leander into herring and ling. This is partly because he no longer has Marlowe's poem to tempt him into seriousness, and partly because, once the lovers are dead, and the story removed to the realm of the gods, studied prose and jocular descriptions no longer seem out of place. For example, the transformation of Hero's nurse into mustard, because "shee was a shrewish snappish bawd... and had rumatique sore eyes that ran alwaies", with the observation that "mustard looks of the tanned wainscot hue of such a withered wrinklefaced beldam as she was" (129) is merely comic; the lovers are removed already into another sphere. But when the nurse was referred to in the earlier part of the story in this way- "and the olde nurse (as there bee three things seldom in their right Kinde till they bee old, a bawd, a witch, and a midwife) executed the huckstrling office of her yerers very charily..."(130)- the interpolation jarred and fought against the pathetic mood Nashe seemed to be building up.

The story of Hero and Leander shows Nashe's strengths and weaknesses very well indeed. His inability to make up his mind as to which effect, of the several he might strive for, he really wants; his lavish gifts of language which he cannot resist employing; his adherence to and revolt from tradition- all these can be seen in this short piece more easily than usual.
THE INVENTION OF THE RED HERRING

This title I use to cover all the tales at the end of the book which are concerned with the discovery of the 'red' or smoked herring, how the herring came to be king of the fishes, and one or two other matters related to the fish. There is other material scattered through the last part of the book, of course: the digressions and scraps of information about the herring, and finally the praise of fishermen.

The tales which deal specifically with the origins of the fish could stem from two quite different kinds of writing, one academic, the other folk. It is difficult to say which of these traditions is predominant in the tales, for although it would be in keeping with the satirical approach of Nashe—seen in this work in the satirical treatment of the Epistle Dedicatorie and the classical myth—to write a satire on the academic 'de inventionibus' literature, the folk elements seem more prominent to me.

The 'de inventionibus' literature, or what Curtius calls 'the discoverer topos' (131), is found in antiquity, the Middle Ages and in the Renaissance. Pliny, in his Natural History treats the question, "who discovered it?" and lists over 150 skills, crafts and deeds, with their discoverers or inventors. These
discoveries range from "the tongs, hammer, crow-bar and anvil" (132) to monarchical government and slavery. (133) So diverse is this list, that 'smoking the herring' would not appear out of place in it. Pliny's work was well-known in England, both in the Latin, and an English abridgement. (134) In Renaissance Italy, following the example of Pliny and the great Mediaeval encyclopaedist, Isidore of Seville, a considerable number of books were compiled, giving the origins of everyday things, religious practices and customs. Of these the most ambitious, and by far the best-known was Polydore Vergil's De inventionibus rerum (1499) which, according to John Ferguson (135), went through 110 editions. It was translated into most European languages, including English. The English version was an abridgement of the vast original, and is found in three editions. This academic literature of origins was, therefore, well-known in the Renaissance, and it is quite plausible that Nashe was referring to it when he wrote: "To recount ab ovo, or from the church-booke of his birth, howe the Herrino first came to be a fish, and then how he came to be king of fishes, and gradationately how from white to red he changed, would require as massie a toombe as Hollinshed." (136) Although it is quite likely that academic invention literature is here parodied in the three 'origins' of the herring, it is just as likely that Nashe drew the content of his "Invention of the Red Herrino" pieces from folk-tales. All three tales in the "Invention" belong to types outlined in Stith Thompson's Motif-Index of Folk-Literature.
(137) The metamorphosis of people into animals, to account for their creation is a fairly common folk motif, although not in Europe (138), and the idea of animals being created through transformation of some kind is very widespread (139), and was no doubt current in England. Nashe has grafted a linguistic derivation (Hero-herring) on to a folk motif. (140)

The second tale—how the herring came to be king of the fishes—is the most firmly rooted in the folk-tale tradition. Two very well-known folk tale motifs are combined in it: the election of a king by a group of animals, and a battle between two kinds of animal. (141) The first motif is better known in England as the election of a king of birds (141), but that of fishes is found in other parts of Europe (142), and the idea of the herring as the king of fishes is likewise current in European folklore. (143) The war between groups of animals is most commonly found as a conflict between birds and quadrupeds, but other animals engage in combat also. (144)

The third tale, which is the most closely allied to the 'de inventionibus' tradition, has, however, analogues in folk-lore as well. There are tales found in Europe about the origin of ale, brewing, brandy, whisky, coal, iron, vehicles, crafts, cooking and a great many more. (145) Although there is nothing closer to smoking the herring than cooking in general, it is not impossible that Nashe's format for this tale has folk origins.
It is, of course, worth remembering that most folk tales were not committed to paper until the nineteenth century, and we have, therefore, no way of knowing what tales were circulating in sixteenth century England. Those which survive give only an indication of the areas in which folk tales moved. Tales very like those Nashe gives may well have been current about Yarmouth, or other ports at the time. Nashe makes use of jest-books and other forms of popular literature, and no doubt saw no objection to the adaptation of folk tales in his comic version of the 'de inventionibus' literature.

The third of the 'invention' tales, and the two snippets of tale which follow it (146) belong to the jest-book tradition, particularly that strand of it which deals with the juxtaposition of the clever man and his dupe. The second 'invention' tale is related by Nashe himself, to the tradition of Aesopic fables. But all the tales (excluding the story of Hero and Leander) have a marked difference from the jest-book and fable. They are told with much verbal flourish, as one might expect in this book, but are without the interest in the story for its own sake that is found in a jest-book tale or a fable. They are told to make some point about the herring, not as stories interesting in themselves. In the tale about the 'king of the fishes', for example, there is a long introduction explaining why the birds and fishes were at war, how each type of creature responded, and what preparations were made. After all this, the herring is chosen king of the fishes, which is the point of the story, as
far as Nashe is concerned. After that he loses interest in it, and says: "Which had the worst end of the staffe in that sea journey... I leave to some Alfonsum, Poggius or Aesope to unwrap, for my penne is tired in it:" (147) He has let the story lapse, after all the introduction, once he has reached the point he wanted, simply because he is bored. The next tale, about the inventor of the smoked herring who takes his wares to Rome, and after much bargaining, gets an exorbitant price for them from the Pope's caterer, is almost without point, except for its unsubtle mockery of Papists. The story wanders distractedly from place to place, ending with an unconnected piece about a courtesan, which Nashe introduces with the inspiring words: "I had well nie foroot a speciall poynct of my Roman history." (148)

As a collection of tales, then, this part of the book is not a success. One has no ending, another rambles to no end, and two more are told so briefly as to seem no more than links. Another tale, about the herring who woos a turbot, is scarcely a tale at all, and seems to be introduced only as a 'red herring' to fool the informers Nashe inveighs against. (149)

Nashe grew tired of this book, doubtless because he had not planned it properly, and, starting to wander, lost his sense of purpose and his initial inspiration. Near the end he writes: "Be of good cheere, my weary Readers, for I have espied land, as Diogenes said to his weary Schollers when he had read to a waste leafe." (150) It is sad that Nashe, who had such splendid gifts
of invention, both linguistic and formal, had no corresponding gift for organisation. In this book, as in Pierce Penilesse and to a lesser extent in Have with you, the ending is the tail-end. The large, impressive pieces are found in the beginning, or the middle, and the oddments near the end. One has only to consider the difference it would have made to Lenten Stuffs if the "Hero and Leander" passage had been placed at the end of book. Nashe's work contrasts markedly, therefore, with that of Bullein and Harington, even though all three writers used the form of the farrago. Bullein's book moves forward, lineally, to its climax; Harington's is carefully crafted so as to have climax points at various intervals; Nashe's start off with a bang and end with a whimper.
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In this final chapter I propose to extend the scope of this thesis, by mentioning other works which seem to me to fall into the genre I have outlined. The works I touch on here are by no means all of the possible candidates for inclusion in the genre, farrago, but only some of the more obvious or interesting examples.

The work of Thomas Dekker provides the most obvious examples of the genre in all Elizabethan and Jacobean literature. I have not included any of these for detailed study for two reasons: firstly, they are later than the five books studied in the body of this work, and therefore could be said to have been influenced by them, and secondly, they are relatively uninteresting as farragoes— the number of pieces in them, and the uses to which these are put being fewer than in the works already examined. Incidentally, Dekker's farragoes are generally a conglomeration
of pieces, and lack the unity of the five given special treatment. This unity, although by no means necessary for a farrago, does make the books which have it more satisfying to read and easier to consider as a whole.

In some of Dekker's farragoes the farraginaeity is very clear- the separate pieces have their own titles, and are clearly different in subject or kind from those around them. In other works, Dekker writes continuous prose, which is, nonetheless, farraginary. His first prose work The Wonderfull Yeare (1603) is one of these. This book commemorates the events of the year 1603- the death of Elizabeth, the accession of James and the plague- and attempts to palliate the effects of the plague by providing some entertainment. This outline of the contents alone makes it clear why the farrago is a suitable form for this book: the subject-matter is varied, and requires a variety of treatments. An address To the Reader opens the book, followed by a description of spring; this in turn is followed by an account of the Queen's sickness and death. The Queen's death occasions three poetic pieces, and the accession of James another, but the prose accounts of the death and accession can be treated as one piece. Next comes an evocation of the atmosphere of the plague, and an account of London during its visitation. The last part of the book is taken up with various tales, some pathetic, some merry, all to do with the plague and its victims. The proportions given over to each part (using the edition of F.P. Wilson (1)) are as follows: the first part, including the
description of spring, the death of Elizabeth, the verses and the account of the accession of James, takes up 16 pages; the second, describing the plague, 13; the third, consisting of 'certaine tales', 24 pages. It may be seen from these figures, that the tales, although referred to by Dekker as "a mery Epiloque" and "a certaine mingled Troope of strange Discourses, fashioned into Tales" for which he feels it necessary to apologise (2), take up the greater part of the book. Its major kind is therefore the jest-book, rather than the 'plaque-pamphlet'. This kind, the 'plaque-pamphlet', and the ornate descriptive history which constitutes the first piece are both developments of Dekker's own. They have forebears in the preceding literature but are not, as such, established kinds. The merry tales have, however, many standard precedents, as we have seen throughout this study.

The 'plaque-pamphlet', a kind in which Dekker subsequently made something of a corner, is often thought to have arisen from Bullein's A Dialogue, since this is the earliest piece to deal with the plague in a literary work. It is conceivable that the idea of writing a 'plaque-pamphlet' was suggested to Dekker by Bullein's work, but there is no evidence on this matter. The two literary treatments of the plague are quite different, and the two works have little in common except for their ferradinary construction. Dekker's work is a continuous piece of description, without dialogue or character, while Bullein's is, obviously, in dialogue, and with little descriptive prose. Dekker's section on the plague is an exercise in fine writing,
designed to raise in the reader some of the emotions experienced by the victims of the epidemic. Dekker attempts to find a verbal equivalent for the terror endured. Bullein, however, uses the plague as a setting, an excuse for medical and moral lessons; the effects of the plague on the atmosphere of London are not considered. There is little terror in Bullein's book, and little else in Dekker's plague section. In addition, the plague is Dekker's whole subject in one section, while it is the starting point for Bullein's book. Stressing the differences between these two treatments of the plague does not, however, affect the genre of the two books, but merely illustrates that the kind 'plague-pamphlet' cannot truly be said to apply to Bullein's work, as it does to Dekker's Wonderfull Yeare and other writings on the plague.

The first section of Dekker's book, the description of the death of Elizabeth and the accession of James, is perhaps related to the ordinary historical prose, and more especially to the civic chronicle we examined with regard to Lenten Stufte. There is a strong element of local (in this case London) feeling in Dekker's first prose work, as there is in much of his dramatic and non-dramatic writing: "London was never in the high way to preferment till now;... she saw her selfe in better state then Jerusalem, she went more gallant than ever did Antwerp." (3) In some ways, Dekker's section on recent history is of the same kind as Nashe's history of Yarmouth in Lenten Stufte:- both are
attempts to marry fine writing with historical fact. The difference is as great as the similarity, however. Nashe produces a whole history of Yarmouth, and deals eloquently with a great many historical facts, but Dekker has only a handful of facts, and concentrates more on the 'writing-up' of them, the expressing of them in novel and elegant ways. Nashe kept a sort of balance between fact and style, which allows his piece the title 'history'. Dekker makes no claim to this; as with the section on the plague, he attempts to write around the subject, using it as a springboard for his fine style.

The third part of the book belongs, as I said, to the jest-book tradition. It is however, a novel application of the tradition, for the tales are both merry and pathetic. The merry tales are in addition, amusing in a rather macabre way. For an example of the pathetic sort, consider the tale of the "paire of Lovers". (4) Superficially it is merely a sad tale of a young couple cruelly parted by the plague. However, Dekker has made of this tale something much more closely allied to the traditional jest-book story than a synopsis of the tale would suggest. He has used the tale to present two witty points:- that at the words "in sickness and in health" the bride took sick, and that in dying directly after the wedding ceremony the bride was "a wife, yet continued a mayd." This paradox, which Dekker elaborates, turns the tale from the narration of a purely sorry event into the opportunity for an exercise of wit, and a sort of ghoulish entertainment. The tale of the Tinker (5) is a much more straightforwardly 'merry' jest, although written in a more
decorated style than such jests generally were. It celebrates the invulnerability of a jest-book hero in the mould of Howleglas or Scoogin. The Tinker profits when apparently deceived, and is neither afraid of the plague nor affected by it. Dekker admits the affinities of his latter tales with the jest-book, when he says: "I could fill a large volume, and call it the second part of the hundred mery tales." (6)

Dekker makes use of the jest-book tradition in another of his farradinary prose works- one which is perhaps the most fragmented dealt with in this survey- Jests to Make vou Merie (1607). (7)

The title proclaims it to be precisely a jest-book. There are sixty jests, all of them apparently original. (8) According to the Introduction, "What a Jest is", there are two sorts of jest: the jest spoken and the jest done. Most of Dekker and Wilkin's jests are, however, spoken ones:- puns or witty answers in difficult situations. But there is more to this farrago than the main title suggests. The title page reads: "Jests to Make vou Merie:/ with the conjuring up of Cock Watt (the walking Spirit of Newgate) to tell Tales/ unto which is added the miserie of a Prison and a Prisoner./ And a Paradox in praise of Seriants."

The longest portion of the book is taken up with a speech by Cock Watt (9), so that, like The Wonderfull Yeare, the book is dominated by a piece which seems to be an afterthought. The Cock Watt and the 'Miseries' are pieces of prison literature, a kind favoured by Dekker, who spent much time in prison (10); the paradox belongs in the paradox tradition, obviously enough; the
Cock watt piece equally derives from the so-called rogue literature, which deals with the doings of criminals. (11)

This book is obviously a miscellaneous collections of pieces, mostly connected to the subject of prison. It shows the farraginary process at work. Frequently in Dekker's farragoes the desire to produce a book of publishable length seems much stronger than the urge to write around a central subject, and as a result the farragoes are nothing more than collections of pieces, bound together by contingency but not by any overriding concern. Although lacking in interest as literary creations, they are interesting to anyone studying the farrago, since they show the building blocks of works of this kind, without any covering.

In The Raven's Almanac (1609) Dekker is rather less eclectic than in Jests, but still produces a farrago, combining two kinds in one book. The titular part of the book belongs to the kind 'mock-prognostication', which F.P. Wilson describes as "the comic parody of the astrological prognostication" (12), but this is heavily supplemented by comic tales or novelle. These novelle are much longer than jest-book anecdotes, and belong to a continental tradition. (13) There are four of them in The Raven's Almanack, with titles such as "How in a houshold civell were, a woman may be safe from a cruell husband." (14) One tale is interpolated between the mock-prognostications for spring and
summer, and is related to its context by a play on words:

"The disposition of this season is to be hot and moist... (some) shall be hot in their tongues. But if any woman happen to fall into that pestilent infirmity, let the poor man... apply this medicine, for its present cure.

A Medicine to cure the Plague of a woman's tongue,

---

experimented on a Cobbler's wife." (15)

A comic tale then follows. The other three tales are grouped together at the end of the prognostication. As with the other two farces of Dekker's I have mentioned, the apparently lesser part of the whole actually takes up a greater part of the book than that which provides the title. In the case of The Raven's Almanack, the comic tales take up two-thirds of the whole book.

The Strange Horse-Race (1613) is even more of a mixture than before. Dekker himself describes it in the Epistle Dedicatory thus: "A mixt Banquet of Sweete and Sowre, Fulsome and Wholesome, Serius cum Iociis." (16) He further dilates on the nature of the book when he writes in the Address:

"The Title of this booke is like a Jesters face, set (howsoever he drawes it) to beget mirth: but his ends are hid to himselse, and those are to get money.... Within is more than without.... I have strove to feed the mind as well as the body; if
one leafe makes you laugh, the next settles your countenance. Tart meates go easily downe, being stewd with sugar."

This could be the classic description of the farrago. It displays, in addition, the ambivalence which we often find associated with farragoes. Dekker compares himself to a man performing for money, and then corrects this mercenary impression by presenting himself as a moral teacher, following Horace's prescription, Omne tulit punctum qui miscuit utile dulci. (18)

Further on in the Address, Dekker strives to justify the quite outstanding farraginæity of the book:

"The maine plot of my building is a Moral
labyrinth; a weake thred guides you in and out:

I will shew you how to enter, and how to passe
through, and open all the private walkes, that
when you come to them, you may know where you are:" (19)

Although Dekker claims an underlying unity in the book, this is not superficially obvious; the "contents of the Booke" are listed as follows:

"A strange Horse-Race/ Chariot Races/ Foot Races/
The Sunnes Race/ The Mone's Race/ Races of the
winds and waters/ Races of the Elements/ Races of
Vertues and Vices/ A Masque of Catch-pols/ Who are
Catchpols/ The Devils falling sicke/ His Will and
Legacies/ His Recovery/ His Dam brought to bed
The text is not as heavily subdivided as this table would lead one to expect. There are only four physical divisions in the book: A Strange Horse-Race, which includes all the races mentioned above; A preparation to the Masque ensuing and the cause thereof, which links the races to the next sections, by reporting the effect of the last race (virtue against vice, with virtue the victor) on the world, and on Hell: The Devil's last Will and Testament, which contains both the Will, the description of the Devil's progeny, and the Masque of Catch-pols (in a different order from that given in the table of contents); and the Bankrouts Banquet. There is a narrative link throughout these sections, for the 'dying' of the Devil follows on the triumph of virtue, the section on his progeny comes naturally after his will, and the masque and banquet are those held in celebration of the birth of these off-spring. Dekker has quite skillfully achieved an appearance of continuity in his labyrinth, but the underlying moral purpose of all the miscellaneous entertainment is difficult to see. I am rather inclined to think that the moral message— a complaint against various abuses—is sporadic, not continual, as Dekker would have as believe. The origins of some of the pieces in this farrago are discussed by M.T. Jones-Davies. (21) The 'will and 'testament' kind was
quite common, but the concept of the set of races to bind
together numerous disparate sorts of information and types of
writing, seems to be Dekker's own.

These four books are clear examples of farragoes. Their
structure is immediately obvious on the most casual inspection of
the books. But as we have seen in previous chapters, not all
farragoes have such obvious farraginaity. Dekker produced works
which, though less blatantly piecemeal, still fit into the
category farrago. The Guls Hornbooke (1609) is one such. It is
generally felt to be Dekker's most successful prose work, and has
a strong unified framework, on to which various observations and
descriptive passages are hung. The book as a whole is both a
satire on contemporary life, and a satire of the conduct-book,
but has other elements in it. Part of it is inspired by
Frederick Dedekind's Latin poem Grobianus (1549), which gave
instructions on how to be a boor. It opens with a fairly long
Prooemium which, though part of the book proper, is an extended
Address to the Reader, explaining the author's position. The
first chapter of the book, called "The old world, and the new
weighed together: The Tailors of those times and these compared:
the apparel and diet of our first fathers" (22), is an exercise
in traditional Complaint about the decay of the world. Most of
the book is taken up with advice to the incipient gull, advice
which satirises various aspects of London life, but there are two
sections of encomium, praises of sleep and of going naked, and a
praise of long hair. These digressions, which come early in the
book, make up more than a third of the whole, and so certainly allow this book to qualify for the title "farrago". The book is, incidentally, entertaining and attractive, and made more so, I feel, by the variety of pieces interpolated into it.

Dekker's farragoes differ, naturally enough, from those of Bullein, Harington and Nashe, as those differed from each other's. Dekker is a professional writer under great pressure to turn out prose works in order to earn his living. Consequently his books are less finished and less well organised than the others we examined. Nonetheless, they are interesting on both literary and purely generic grounds. They demonstrate very well how useful the farrago was to the writer of general prose, for it allowed him to include various oddments under one umbrella, and equally to make his work more stimulating for the reader.

Nashe and Dekker did not hold the monopoly on farragoes among professional writers of their time. Nicholas Breton, an interesting and neglected prose-writer, produced among many other books, a monumental example of a farrago, one which proclaims its farragoary nature immediately. The Wil of Wit, Wits Will, or Wils Wit chuse you whether. Containung five discourses, the effects whereof follow (1599). (23) The five discourses are A Pretie and Wittie Discourse Betwixt Wit And Wil; The Authors Dreame of Strange Effects; The Scholler and the Souldiour; The Miseries of Mavillia; and The Praise of vertuous Ladies.
Several of these discourses are themselves subdivided; for example, the first discourse has pieces of verse, songs and tales as parts of it, and the last has appended to it A Dialogue betweene Anger and Patience, A Phisitions Letter and A Farewell. Each of the five discourses has a separate title page and pair of epistles, but none appeared in print on its own, although they may have been circulated separately in manuscript. Whether the conjunction of these five (or more) works is purely practical, or whether there is an underlying unity to the collection requires considerable study to determine. I feel, however, that all the parts of The Wil of wit do display various aspects of the will's reaction to adversity, and of the author's wit.

Thomas Lodge produced in 1584 a motley collection of pieces called An Alerum against Usurers. Containing tried experiences against worldly abuses. Wherein Gentlemen may finde good counsels to confirme them, and pleasant Histories to delight them: and every thing so interlaced with varietie: as the curious may be satisfied with rarenesse, and the curteous with pleasure. Whereunto are annexed the
delectable historie of Forbonius and Prisceria:

with the lamentable Complaint of Truth over

England. (25)

This book holds several points of interest for us. Firstly, there is the use of variety as a point in the book's favour. Clearly, Lodge considered that his readers would admire him for suiting many tastes, and providing a farrago of pieces. Secondly, the first piece in the farrago is itself a submerged farrago, in that it consists of pieces joined together under one umbrella. The Alarum has pieces of narrative, exhortation, complaint, factual information and political writing. It is a treatise and a tract and a story. Thirdly, the collection has a high proportion of verse. Forbonius and Prisceria is interspersed with a 'Sonet' and an 'Aegloq', as well as prose letters; Truth's Complaint over England is entirely in verse. This book, although disconnected and of no great literary interest, is significant to the farrago, since its title page makes evident that a writer might aim at farraquinaety, rather than arrive at it through incompetence.

There are other Elizabethan and Jacobean farragoes: Henry Chettle's Kind-Hartes Dreame (1592), Samuel Rowland's Diogenes Lanthorne (1606), John Taylor's A Bawd (1630) among others.
However, instead of dwelling on these pignies, let us consider rather the giant among farragoes, Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy (1620). In its company, the other works I have mentioned in this chapter may seem ridiculously slight; in length alone it outdoes all five farragoes treated in the earlier chapters combined. Genre, however, is no respecter of length. Lodge's A Margarite of America belongs to the same genre as The Countess of Montgomery's Urania, despite the fact that the latter is more than five times the length of the former.

Rosalie Colie has discussed The Anatomy of Melancholy in both Paradoxa Epidemica and The Resources of Kind. She makes frequent reference to the genre of the book, especially its mixed nature, and its relationship to many kinds. "When one looks at the separate parts of the book, one sees remarkable examples of different literary genres." (26) And further "Burton's book was a 'macaronicon' as he said, but a macaronic not of genres territorially divided, but of genres mutually serviceable." (27) She outlines some of the many genres to be found in Burton's book: the work as a whole can be seen in different lights as a medical treatise, as an 'anatomy', or laying bare of a subject, or as a consolatio philosophiae. (28) As well as belonging, as a whole work, to several genres, The Anatomy includes in it many different kinds. Colie dilates upon the sermon, or Christian
consolation to be found in the book, in addition to the contemptus mundi piece, the complaint, satire, utopia and religious dialectic. (29) If this were not enough, there is a use of the forms of the treatise of education and the love treatise, which Colie says, is a sub-class of the behaviour or courtesy manual. (30) The travellers' tale is utilised, and even, Colie argues, the picaresque. Finally, climactically, Colie shows how the whole work is woven through with paradox and paradoxes. (31)

In The Resources of Kind Colie links the inclusiveness of The Anatomy with that of other large-scale Renaissance works, but she does not form any huge category to put the books she discusses in, as Dr. Wright does. (32) She demonstrates the tendency of Renaissance works to 'inclusionism' as she calls it, and to the frequent intermingling of genres. The Anatomy admirably displays these qualities. (33) It is the grand exposition of inclusionism in general, and I would add, the farrago in particular.

In her recent book of The Anatomy, Ruth Fox makes frequent comment on the mixed, or as I would say, farraginary nature of Burton's book. For example, she writes: "...the Anatomy is not just the medical treatise of melancholy, nor is it just the Preface with its Utopia or the partition of Love-melancholy, nor is
it primarily 'critical comment' in detachable sermons and essays or digressive expatiation on topics ancillary to melancholic disorders. It is all of these things joined in one Anatomy of Melancholy, and repeatedly, through six editions, so joined and so titled. Despite the 'compound character' of the book, it might not 'suitably be entitled Opera Burtoni' (Babb, p.9), though it might well be subtitled Opus Burtoni." (34)

These scholars bear witness to the mixed genre of The Anatomy, to its inclusiveness, and to its unity. All I need to add to that is the assertion that it is, in fact, wholly conformable to the definition of the farrago: a prose work, belonging totally to no one genre, containing in it pieces from one or more kinds. Furthermore, like the more successful farracoes I have discussed, it forges from the pieces a satisfying, nay, splendid whole. It has a common concern running through all the pieces, a general subject to which all the digressions return, but it is nonetheless farraginary. Although comparison with The Metamorphosis and Lenten Stuffe provides little illumination on either those works or The Anatomy- its size and scope completely overwhelming their slight and amusing contributions to literature- it is still both interesting and
comforting to see all three works as members of the same genre. It is perhaps possible to claim that the pioneering farragoes of Bullein, Harrington and Nashe prepared the way for the great Farrago itself, The Anatomy of Melancholy. It is certainly possible to affirm, now, that English Renaissance non-fictional imaginative prose is not the tumbled heap of unsuccessful experiments it has often seemed, but an experiment which produced a masterpiece.
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