“Fooles in Retayle”: Personae and Print in the Long 1590s

Ashley Streeter

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

of Doctor of Philosophy

in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

2015

©2015

Ashley Streeter

All rights reserved

Abstract

"Fools in Retail": Personae and Print in the Long 1590s

Ashley Streeter

This dissertation focuses on the proliferation of literary personae in print between 1588 and 1603, a phenomenon which generated the conditions for print stardom, heated debate, cross-volume narratives, and a culture of literary appropriation. Each chapter focuses on a different persona – Martin Marprelate, Thomas Nashe, Colin Clout, and Robert Greene – and contains close readings of generically diverse texts. In so doing, the project tells a new story about literary culture of the 1590s, a story in which personae stimulated the print market by becoming textual celebrities, fighting with one another, and capitalizing on already well-known textual personalities' fame.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements ii

Dedication iii

INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER ONE: Reading for the Persona in *The Shepheardes Calender* (1579) and the *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe* Volume (1595) 26

CHAPTER TWO: “England falls a martining and a marring”: Martin Marprelate and the Marketplace of Print 81

CHAPTER THREE: “Troll and troll by”: Jack Wilton, Tom Nashe, Doctor Harvey, and the Making of the Print Canon 137

CODA: The Notorious R.G.: Posthumous Pamphlets and the Efflorescence of Personae in the 1590s 198

BIBLIOGRAPHY 212

Acknowledgements

I have incurred many debts while wrting this dissertation. Grants, scholarships, and fellowships from the Folger Institute, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the University of Virginia's Rare Book School, the Interdepartmental Committee on Medieval and Renaissance Studies at Columbia, and the Mrs. Giles Whiting Foundation have provided me with the resources to research and write this project. I have presented portions of it at Renaissance Society of America and Shakespeare Association of America conferences, and I am grateful for all of the feedback I received there as well as comments and criticism I received at the Folger "Researching the Archives" and NEH "Tudor Books and Readers" seminars in which I participated. At Columbia, I have benefitted from The Columbia Early Modern Dissertation Seminar, where I presented most of my chapters to a sympathetic, yet critical, audience. The feedback I received from faculty and graduate students has greatly improved this project. I would also like to thank the librarians of the Columbia Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale's Beinecke Library, Princeton's Firestone Library, the Folger Shakespeare Library, the British Library, and Oxford's Bodleian Library for offering me advice, giving me leads, and retrieving my materials from the vault.

My greatest intellectual debts are to my advisors: Alan Stewart, Jean Howard, and David Kastan. Through this whole process they have offered me encouragement and provided insightful commentary on innumerable chapter drafts. My dissertation is the better for it. Alan Stewart has been a wonderful chair: his accessibility, intellectual resources, and general professionalism have made him a joy to work with.

My last, and greatest, thanks go to my family. The whole time I have been writing this project they have been there, offering me support, positive feedback, and shoulders to cry on. I have been very lucky.

Dedication

For my family

INTRODUCTION

The Cambridge scholar Dr. Gabriel Harvey has two different reputations. An obsessive annotator of books, he represents for some scholars a paragon of early modern reading practices, a humanist *par excellence*.[1] But when it comes to his reputation as an English pamphleteer, Harvey is held up as an example of pedantry and humorlessness, an early modern academic who was completely out of touch with the conventions of print authorship in the 1590s. His ignorance, in some accounts, is a cause for laughter.[2] Harvey's long-established bad reputation stems from his public and acrimonious pamphlet war with Thomas Nashe, a quarrel in which Nashe hurled many creative insults at Harvey, calling him "Gabriell Scuruies" and "Doctour *Hum*," among other things. Nashe did not stop at name-calling, either; he relished in detailing his opponent's physical characteristics from his "vlcerous mouth" to his propensity to "pis[s] inke." Thanks to Nashe's skewering, Harvey emerged from the dispute a laughingstock, and many readers of the quarrel have taken Nashe at his word, regarding Harvey as an imbecile. This is largely because few people actively work on Harvey's English pamphlets from the 1590s, and those that do read Harvey's work are often working primarily on Nashe and so are predisposed to

---

[1] For scholarly accounts of Harvey's marginalia and humanism, see Lisa Jardine, "Gabriel Harvey: Exemplary Ramist and Pragmatic Humanist," *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Theologiques 70* (1986): 36–48; Lisa Jardine and Anthony Grafton, "Studied for Action: How Gabriel Harvey Read His Livy," *Past and Present* 129, no. 1 (1990): 30-78; Kendrick Prewitt "'Gabriel Harvey and the Practice of Method," *Studies in English Literature* 39, no. 1 (1999): 19–39; Jennifer Richards, "Gabriel Harvey, James VI, and the Politics of Reading Early Modern Poetry." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 71, no .2 (2008): 303–21; Jennifer Richards, "Gabriel Harvey's Choleric Writing," in *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Literature*, ed. Michael Pincombe and Cathy Shrank (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 655–70; and Chris Stamakis, "'With diligent studie, but sportingly': How Gabriel Harvey read his Castiglione," *Journal of the Northern Renaissance* 5 (2013), accessed July 17, 2014, http://www.northernrenaissance.org/.

[2] For accounts of Harvey's reputation, see Michael Pincombe, *Elizabethan Humanism: Litearture and Learning in the Later Sixteenth Century* (Harlow: Longman, 2001); Charles Nicholl, *A Cup of News: The Life of Thomas Nashe* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984); and Jason Scott-Warren, 'Harvey, Gabriel (1552/3–1631)'. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), accessed July 17, 2014, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/12517.

side with the winner. By 1596, it was obvious that he had lost to Nashe, and, over four hundred years later, he continues to lose in the court of scholarly opinion.

The caricature of Harvey as a bumbling pedant is perhaps too heavy-handed. Harvey's faults are legion – his long-windedness, sour disposition, and tone deafness are among his many grating idiosyncrasies. Even so, in his two printed pamphlets of the 1590s, *Foure Letters* (1592) and *Pierces Supererogation* (1593), Harvey makes some astute observations on late-Elizabethan literary culture as well as trends in the marketplace of print, even as he tries to participate in them.[3] In *Pierces Supererogation* he explains his decision to publish pamphlets against Nashe, providing insightful commentary on the literary marketplace to which he wishes to gain entry:

> I protest, I haue these many yeeres, not in pride, but in iudgement, scorned, to appeere in the rancke of this scribling generation: and could not haue bene hired with a great fee, to publish any Pamflet of whatsoeuer nature, in mine owne name, had I not bene intollerably prouoked, first by one rakehell, and now by an other, the two impudentest mates, that euer haunted the presse: (some haue called them knaues in grose: I haue found them fooles in retayle:) but when it came to this desperate point, that I must needes either bee a base writer, or a vile Asse in printe, the lesse of the two euils was to be chosen: and I compelled rather to alter my resolution for a time, then to preiudice my selfe for euer.[4]

In this explanation, Harvey ostensibly tells his readers why he has chosen to become "a base writer." Put simply, he was provoked by three rakehells and had to defend his reputation. Remaining silent, according to the Doctor, could have disastrous social effects. As for the rakehells, Harvey makes it clear that he is revolted by those contemporary writers, or members of what he contemptuously refers to as the "scribling generation," who frequent the press, writing a

---

[3] I have borrowed the term "marketplace of print" from Alexandra Halasz, *The Marketplace of Print: Pamphlets and the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991). In this project, I use the term interchangeably with the "literary marketplace."

[4] *Pierces supererogation or A new prayse of the old asse A preparatiue to certaine larger discourses, intituled Nashes s. fame* (London: John Wolfe, 1593), A3r.

slew of pamphlets for publication. As Harvey sees it, these writers are impudent knaves, and have used the printing press to impugn him. And he has no choice but to enter their ranks. He, of course, imagines himself as an exception, an unwilling participant in a polemical exchange. He has only entered the fray to preserve his damaged reputation, not because he desires to scribble for the press or write for a "great fee."

Harvey's stated aversion to his enemies is rooted in more than his distaste for his opponents' manners, however. His critique is also economic, and in his denunciation of Nashe and his other adversaries he provides an apt characterization of the commodification of literary writing in late-Elizabethan England, if only to decry it. For Harvey, writers like Nashe have debased themselves and write for money.[5] They "haunt" the press – they "resort" to it often[6] – to earn cash; they are "hired for a great fee." Harvey brands this whole "generation" of writers "knaues in grose," and in so doing calls attention to the large number of professional writers, who, like Nashe, made their living by their pens, in the early 1590s.[7] Harvey's use of "grose" is interesting: he uses it not only to suggests that that writers are publishing books "on a large scale" ("gross could mean twelve dozen), but to characterize his contemporaries as "coarse," "uncultivated," and full of vice.[8] For Harvey, there are a lot of writers flooding the press, and they all embody moral turpitude, something which allegedly repulses him. What is also repugnant to Harvey, as he states elsewhere in the pamphlet, is that their books become commodities,

---

[5] For more on Harvey's attitude toward professional writers, see Halasz, *The Marketplace of Print*, ch. 2.
[6] *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "haunt, accessed July 17, 2014, *Oxford English Dictionary Online* (1467-3894)
[7] For accounts of professional authorship in the period, see Georgia Brown, *Redefining Elizabethan Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); Sandra Clark, *The Elizabethan Pamphleteers* (Rutherford: Fairleigh-Dickinson University Press, 1983); Kirk Melnikoff and Edward Gieskes, eds. *Writing Robert Greene: Essays on England's First Notorious Professional Writer* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008); Edwin Haviland Miller, *The Professional Writer in Elizabethan England* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959); and Phoebe Sheavyn, *The Literary Profession in the Elizabethan Age* (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1967).
[8] *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "gross," accessed September 7, 2014, *Oxford English Dictionary Online* (1467-3894).

circulating in the marketplace of print; they actually sell, and the vendibility of their books entices more authors to frequent the press, increasing the size of the generation, literally engrossing the literary market, and inducing Harvey to publish a pamphlet under his "owne name."

I would argue that Harvey's critique of the buying and selling of literature runs deeper than an attack on the professional writers whom he seems to be imitating clumsily. In his long-winded indictment of his late-Elizabethan contemporaries, Harvey puts his finger on a phenomenon in the literary marketplace, yet he under-describes it. He deftly identifies an efflorescence of writers looking to squabble, but he does not mention the crucial mechanism by which they implement their arguments, a mechanism which is crucial to his response to them: personae. Harvey does not say that the vehicles that unmannerly professional writers use to carry out their attacks are fictions, but in fact they are. They are performances to elicit a public reaction, roles that authors assume. Harvey's adversaries, in other words, are selling fictional versions of themselves in print – they are creating textual personalities, or personae, for "retayle;" they are set to sale for "use or consumption."[9] In the 1590s, as my dissertation will show, it was not just the copy of particular writers' books that attracted readers, but the slanderous personae who share names with their authors, which Harvey calls "knaues" and "fooles," who narrate the texts. The base writers Harvey attacks used literary devices to do their dirty work, and Harvey's pamphlet implicitly levels an attack on both. To be sure, Harvey does not overtly distinguish between the authors writing books and the personae they deploy (though, as I will show in chapter 3, the concept of persona thoroughly informs his 1590s pamphlets), but he does respond, in persona, to those authors who have used personae to flame him. Harvey has to defend himself by playing the

[9] *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "retail," accessed on September 7, 2014, *Oxford English Dictionary Online* (1467-3894).

game other writers have started, and so he takes part in the pernicious trend he has identified. It may seem that he just calls out other writers in his pamphlets – after all, they are the ones behind the personae – but he is engaging the literary devices who attacked him with one of his own. In an attempt to preserve his reputation, the author Gabriel Harvey had to create a compelling persona, Doctor Gabriel Harvey, to take down those that attacked him, and in so doing try to persuade a reading public that he is not a buffoon. By attempting to participate in the trend, Gabriel Harvey took advantage of it, trying to distinguish himself from other authors of the period by creating a better persona. His persona joins the other "fooles in retayle" who are proliferating in the marketplace of print, competing for readers. Having received a serious tongue-lashing, Harvey was victimized, but he did not create a print persona and publish pamphlets only to preserve his reputation. He, too, wanted to write a vendible book, and his strategy for doing so was to repudiate the very fad in which he took part. He may have been an incompetent pamphleteer, but he was no dunce.

This dissertation is about the remarkable phenomenon Harvey observes and in which he tries to participate: the explosion of personae in print between 1588 and 1603. These personae engaged in debate; took on lives of their own; travelled between books; and became common property, available for anyone's use. While literary personae are a common feature throughout Tudor literature, during this fifteen-year period, known as the long 1590s, personae became increasingly visible and vendible, and London bookstalls were peopled with them: Robin Goodfellow, the Cobbler of Canterbury, Tarlton, Martin Marprelate, Martin Junior, Martin Senior, Mar-Martin, Sir Martin Mar-people, Astrophil, Pasquil, Marforius, Piers Penniless, Piers Plainness, Plain Pierce, Martin Mar-Sixtus, Jack Wilton, Colin Clout, E.K, Hobbinol, Immerito, Pappe Hatchet, Cuthbert Curryknave, Cuthbert Connycatcher, Kind-hart, R.G., Misacmos,

Philostilpnos, Misodiaboles, Euphues, Philautus, Plain Percival, and W. Kinsayder, to name a few. What is more, some of the most canonical authors of the decade, including Philip Sidney, Edmund Spenser, and Thomas Nashe, experimented with them. "Fooles in Retayle" historicizes the literary persona in the late Tudor period and tells a new story about the literary culture of the long 1590s, a story in which personae stimulated the print market by becoming textual celebrities, fighting with one another, and capitalizing on already well-known textual personalities' fame.

The personae that populated the print marketplace in the long 1590s are more complex versions of those that literary scholars have described and theorized: devices that are vehicles for authorial self-presentation, something which I will call the *traditional persona*. The concept of the traditional literary persona has been out of fashion for some time now. It has received scant critical attention since the early 1980s, and, even before then, there was not much scholarly work on the topic.[10] Those who have focused their work on these personae have seemed to agree on a definition – "an assumed character or role," which an author takes on in his/her writing[11] – but they have been preoccupied with a single question: what is the relationship between the persona and the author who deploys it? In the twentieth century, critics argued that traditional personae issued from a unified authorial subject and wondered whether or not the persona's stated world view coincided with the author's. Was the persona simply a means for the author to distance

---

[10] The following sources discuss persona at length : Denis Donoghue, *Ferocious Alphabets* (London: Faber and Faber, 1981); Irvin Ehrenpreis, *The Personality of Jonathan Swift* (London: Methuen, 1959); Dustin Griffin, *Alexander Pope: The Poet in the Poems* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978); Alvin B. Kernin, *The Cankered Muse: Satire of the English Renaissance* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959); Burt Kimmelman, *The Poetics of Authorship in the Later Middle Ages : The Emergence of the Modern Literary Persona* (New York: Peter Lang, 1996); Maynard Mack, *The Garden and the City: Retirement and Politics in the Later Poetry of Pope, 1731-43* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969); Niall Rudd, *Lines of Enquiry: Studies in Latin Poetry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976); Ruben Sanchez, *Persona and Decorum in Milton's Prose* (Madison, NJ: Fairleigh-Dickinson University Press, 1997); and Lionel Trilling, *Sincerity and Authenticity* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1972);.

[11] *Oxford English Dictionar*y, s.v. "persona."

himself from the politically dangerous opinions uttered in his text, dangerous opinions with which he agreed? Was the persona totally autobiographical, a literary device through which the author funneled his consciousness? Or was the persona completely separate from the author, a total fiction? Robert Elliot argues that these questions can only be answered with a contradiction, stating that when an author uses a persona "it looks like an evasion, the kind of evasion that" produces contradictory readings of poetry. Focusing on Robert Lowell's poem "Skunk Hour," for example, Eliot argues that the speaking I of the poem "both is and is not to be identified with" the author.[12] Geoffrey Gust, whose book on the traditional persona represents the best recent work on the topic, like his critical forebears maintains that the concepts of author and persona are inextricably linked, and he comes to a similar conclusion as Elliot. He argues that it is nearly impossible to determine the relationship between a writer and the personae s/he deploys since the authorial self who is writing in persona cannot be collapsed into a single identity because it is decentered and performed. And so Gust argues that creating a persona is an exercise in "autofiction," and stresses "that any literary self-presentation is a creative construction, a narrative doubling in which the fictional surrogate need not look, think, or feel like the author him/herself."[13] Gust articulates the critical consensus: a persona may or may not share convictions with the author who uses it. We thus have no way to know if Harvey's feelings were actually hurt by Thomas Nashe and his crew, if his protestations were sincere, or if Harvey's persona is expressing his creator's actual opinions.

The personae who appear in many Tudor texts, even some of those books produced in the 1590s, lend themselves to a more traditional reading. That is, they can be read in relation to

---

[12] *The Literary Persona* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), 165.
[13] *Constructing Chaucer: Author and Autofiction in the Critical Tradition* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 41.

authorial self-presentation. The poet John Skelton is perhaps the most prominent example of an early Tudor writer whose many personae were crucial vehicles for self-presentation and promotion. One of the most printed writers of the first half of the sixteenth century, Skelton's virtuosic poetry is peopled with traditional personae, including a sparrow, a parrot, a rustic, and a poet named Skelton. These personae are foregrounded as such, and they are designed to showcase the poet's learning and skill, his mastery of many voices, his capacity for ventriloquizing. In the sixteenth century, the personae were understood to be Skelton's masks, and the energetic, though jarring, style that characterizes all of them, from the ribald Parrot to the self-righteous Colin Clout, contributed both to his self-styling as England's poet laureate and to his posthumous reputation as a "rude rayling rhymer," to use the words of George Puttenham.[14] Edmund Spenser would later adopt one of Skelton's most famous personae, Colin Clout, as a part of his own authorial self-presentation, and Colin would become a crucial part of Spenser's legacy from the late-Elizabethan period to the present. For these two authors, as I will show in chapter 1, personae were devices vital to their authorial self-presentation. They were deployed as authorial alter-egos, used to craft a desired public image, and revisited to shape his/her afterlife. The creation and reception of the traditional persona, in other words, is tied tightly to the legacy of an author. As I will show, the persona's inherent doubleness – the fact that it is a version of the author that does and does not refer to him – is what allows both Skelton and Spenser to craft reputations for themselves. The question, then, is not, "To what extent do personae share views with their authors?" but "How are personae used to shape the legacies of authors?"

In the 1590s a new type of persona emerged. Like traditional literary personae, most of them can be read as masks for their authors, as the Harvey passage I cite above shows. At the

[14] *The art of English Poesie*, Mr.

same time, the personae who exploded onto the scene in the late-Elizabethan period behave differently than the more traditional ones mobilized by Skelton and Spenser. These personae populate late-Elizabethan prose and verse, and they were creatures of print. They were born in print, lived their lives in print, and died in print, and their popularity was tied to the print market. For these reasons, I have chosen to call these personae *print personae*. Like traditional personae, print personae were fictional and portable; they took on lives of their own and travelled between texts. They were also designed to sell. Printers and publishers advertised books with reference to them. But the print personae of the 1590s diverge from the traditional persona in an important way: they were used to shape print culture. Indeed, the culture personae were used to create was one of hyper competitiveness, bordering on frenzy. Some personae, like Martin Marprelate and Thomas Nashe, were highly polemical and combative, and they sparked debates that can only be characterized as manic back-and-forths. They provoked other personae to argue with them, to attempt to one-up them in public debate. Even those popular personae who were not involved in quarrels opened the door for other personae to outdo them and to reach a wider reading public. In the 1590s, as I will show, the fictional aspect of the print persona became increasingly important, and new books featuring stories about both novel and familiar personae, who may or may not have shared names with their authors, energized the literary marketplace through literary competition.

My work on print persona diverges from earlier work on literary personae in that I do not seek to probe the relationship between a persona and the author who mobilizes it. Because it is impossible to discover a writer's true thoughts, motivations, and intentions, I shall bracket the concept off unless it is absolutely relevant. Even in my first chapter, which deals with traditional literary personae in the works of Skelton and Spenser, I am not interested in authorial intention;

rather, I am focused on how the persona contributes to the social life of the author, which is itself a type of fiction. When a writer takes on a persona, s/he assumes a role and engages in a textual performance, and it is the fictional aspect of the persona on which I have chosen to focus. In the passages from Harvey I cite above, then, I am not interested in whether or not the Nashe-Harvey pamphlet war was a public airing of private grievances; instead, I am interested in how the two writers' personae take on lives of their own in the marketplace. The circulation of personae in the marketplace of print in the 1590s was unprecedented. My inquiry examines how they operate in the marketplace of print. In the 1590s, as I will show, personae were used to attract book buyers and there was consumer demand for them. Shifting focus away from the author enables us to raise a different set of questions about literary personae and the trend that Harvey's persona identifies, questions about how they were used to catch readers' eyes, what kind of readers they were meant to attract, how they stimulated the print market, how they perpetuated the vogue for personae, and what kind of literary, social, and political, work they do. This is not to say that authors do not play a role in the story I am telling – they do, as they were the ones who recycled and updated preexisting personae and created new ones – but it is to say that they are supporting characters because their intentions, political or not, are not essential to the argument I make about print personae.

Bracketing the author also allows me to historicize the persona in the 1590s, thereby broadening the scope of the usual definition of the term. The narrow way in which "persona" has heretofore been defined, as a mask a writer assumes, is not sufficient to explain the way in which the devices were used and understood in the long 1590s. In the late-Elizabethan period, personae, or "personnes" as they were typically called, were understood as literary devices – performances of personhood that were not only portable, but highly stylized and fictional. Although the

literary critics of the period did not theorize the term, a handful of definitions survive that show that, in the 1580s and 1590s, the devices could be used more capaciously than twentieth- and twenty-first-century scholars focusing on traditional personae have allowed. One of the assumptions underwriting early modern definitions of personae is that they are fictional devices that anyone can use; they do not belong to a specific author and thus become a form of common property. George Puttenham calls the practice of using personae "*prosopopoeia*," or "counterfeit impersonation." "By way of fiction," he says, a writer "feign[s] any person with such features, qualities, and conditions."[15] Puttenham's definition speaks to the theatrical aspects of personae; they are performative entities, imaginative renditions of personhood, which can be counterfeit in a variety of discourses, masks any writer can wear. Similarly, William Webbe emphasizes their portability, stating that "personnes are eyther to be fayned by the Poets them selues, or borrowed of others."[16] These definitions and others – Thomas Campion, for instance, says that he has often "shadowed a fain'd conceit," or used a persona, without "reference or offence to any person."[17] – coincide with the traditional definition of persona, in that they suggest that a writer, like Nashe or Harvey, can use a persona to narrate his text. But Puttenham and Webbe's discussions of personae do not state explicitly that the speakers of texts are authors' mouthpieces; rather, they emphasize the portability and fictionality of personae, something which allows for a wider use of the term. Print personae may be deployed and manipulated by the authors, but they are not necessarily inextricably linked with them and so can travel from book to book, be deployed by multiple authors. Considering traditional and print personae on their own terms is crucial when

---

[15] *The Art of English Poesy*, in *English Renaissance Literary Criticism*, ed. Brian Vickers (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), 275.
[16]*A Discourse of English Poetrie*, in *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, 2 vols., ed. G. Gregory Smith (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950), 1:292.
[17] *Observations on English Verse* (1602), in *ibid*., 2:340

studying late-Tudor literature, as focusing on authors' intentions obscures the rich definition of the term and the multiple textual practices associated with it.

I have chosen to refer to "personae" rather than the early modern "person" for two reasons. First, early modern literary critics, particularly Webbe, were working with Latin literary criticism, and their discussions of personation, or the use of personae, were often taken from Latin sources, which referred to "personae." Webbe's "personnes," for instance, is a direct translation of Horace's "personae," which are discussed in the Latin poet's *Ars Poetica*. Second, "persona" has theatrical and social valences that are crucial to my argument. The print personae of the 1590s were dramatically realized, and their quarrels comprised inter-pamphlet dramas. "Persona" has its roots in the theater; it literally means "mask," and in Roman times it could refer to the mask an actor spoke through and which designated the character he was playing.[18] The word has been taken up by social psychologists to refer to the public self, the "aspect of a person's character that is displayed to or perceived by others."[19] Carl Jung has theorized the persona extensively, arguing that it is "designed on the one hand to make a definite impression upon others, and on the other to conceal the true nature of the individual."[20] In the twenty-first century, the word has gained currency in reference to social media and celebrity culture; in both cases, the word is used to describe people creating and performing a specific disposition, a personality, for public consumption and even for economic gain.[21]

---

[18] For a detailed history of "persona," see Robert Elliot, *The Literary Persona*, ch. 1. For a detailed analysis of "persona" and its relation to the theater, see John Parker, "Persona," in *Cultural Reformations: Medieval and Renaissance in Literary History,* ed. Brian Cummings and James Simpson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 591-608.
[19] *Oxford English Dictionary,* s.v, "persona."
[20] Carl Jung, *Two Essays on Analytical Psychology*, 2nd ed., trans. R.F.C. Hull (London: Routledge, 1966), 192. For another take on persona in social psychology, see Eric Berne, *Sex in Human Loving* (Hammondsworth: Penguin, 1973).
[21] For the commodification of celebrity personae in the sixteenth century, see Alexandra Halasz, "So Beloved that Men Use His Picture for Their Signs': Richard Tarlton and the Uses of Sixteenth-Century Celebrity," *Shakespeare*

I have also elected not to use the word "character" to describe the literary figures I consider in this dissertation, even though some of them could legitimately be designated as such. To be sure, personae share many qualities with literary characters, including portability, fictionality, and the way in which they are constructed as imitations of personhood, and "character" was a word in circulation in the Tudor period.[22] Nevertheless, in the sixteenth century, when it was used with reference to people, "character" was most commonly linked with ethics, often used to denote individuals' moral characteristics and qualities (or lack thereof), an area with which I am not concerned in this project.[23] More importantly, Elizabethan literary critics consistently called personae "persons," and they were less interested in the moral attributes of specific personae than in describing the textual practices that accompany their use. Throughout the dissertation, then, I employ "persona" as my central term. In the chapters concerned with the long 1590s, I modify my central term with "print."

My dissertation aims to give a sense of the change that occurs to the persona in the long 1590s. As I shall demonstrate in chapter 2, the vogue for print personae in the long 1590s can be traced to the Marprelate controversy, an infamous religious pamphlet war (1588-91) in which three print personae, Martin Marprelate and his two sons (Martin Junior and Martin Senior), excoriated the established English church and its bishops. They were answered by seven highly entertaining, crude print personae who claimed to speak for the established church. Featuring

---

Studies 23 (1995): 19-38. For the commodification of modern celebrity personae, see Barry King, "The Star and the Commodity: Notes Toward a Performance Theory of Stardom," *Cultural Studies* 1 (1987): 145-161.

[22] My work on persona is heavily indebted to David Brewer's work on literary character, and indeed many of the practices I describe in this dissertation are subjected to penetrating analysis in his book *The Afterlife of Character: 1726-1825* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005). In a different vein, Elizabeth Fowler theorizes literary character, describing them as "social persons." With its emphasis on personhood, Fowler's work also demonstrates the overlap between persona and literary character, particularly when it comes to legal understandings of personhood in the Middle Ages and Renaissance. See *Literary Character: The Human Figure in Early English Writing* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003).

[23] *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "character."

over seventeen pamphlets and ten personae, the vitriolic, yet funny, controversy led to a craze for Martin, and, once it ended, shut down by ecclesiastical authorities, a host of new personae appeared to fill the void left in its wake. These textual personalities became vehicles to market and sell literature; writers used them to create and/or perpetuate markets for their texts, to foment demand for more books, and this trend continued through the decade. Douglas Bruster has referred to the outpouring of print personae in the 1590s as "the personalization of print," describing it as process whereby authors created "embodied" personae who went on to become commodities in the marketplace.[24] While Bruster and I are interested in the same phenomenon, we approach it from different angles and thus come to different conclusions: Bruster is interested in the outcomes of the personalization of print, whereas I am interested in its logic. He argues that the commodification of personae resulted in the development of a concept of authorship grounded in literary property. By contrast, I argue that the vogue for print personae was perpetuated by multiple agents: authors, publishers, printers, and consumers. The trend took place in the marketplace of print, and, as such, not only writers, but, printers, publishers, and book-buyers helped to shape it. It thus operated in both the commercial and literary domains, as its participants sought not only to sell books but also to cultivate different, and competing, versions of an English literary tradition. Theoretically, any writer could participate in the phenomenon either by borrowing an already canonical persona or by creating a new one designed to compete with those who were established marketplace fixtures.

Print personae exploded onto the literary scene in what is generally regarded as one of the most important decades of English literature. C.S. Lewis has gone so far as to call it the "golden age" of English literature, in spite of the fact that the truly great texts published in the decade

[24] *Shakespeare and the Question of Culture* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 67.

appeared alongside mountains of drivel.[25] The last fifteen years of Elizabeth I's reign have been a favorite site for historians, who have examined the political and social unrest of the period in great depth. It is now commonplace that the decade was tumultuous, characterized by bad harvest years, recurrent bouts of the plague, widespread dissatisfaction with England's involvement in international conflicts, rapid population growth, the rise of vocal anti-establishment religious sects, and changes in Elizabeth I's court culture.[26] Literary scholars, by contrast, have shown less sustained interest in the 1590s, producing studies on individual texts, or groups of texts, written in these years, as well as books and articles on authors who were active between 1588 and 1603, but there have been few critical works that approach the decade as a whole. Studies of the 1590s tend to be divided by genre, with scholars writing either on theater, or on poetry and prose. In recent years, theater scholars have had a renewed interest in the decade, writing fascinating accounts of the theatrical culture of the period.[27] Scholars working on non-dramatic literature have been more reticent to approach the 1590s, a reticence, which, according to Georgia Brown, "is due to the culture's perversity. For instance, the decade

---

[25] *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, Excluding Drama* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1954), 1. Lewis has had a huge influence of studies on the 1590s. As recent as 2007, it was the topic of *Early Modern Literary Studies* 13, no. 2 (2007), accessed July 17, 2014, http://extra.shu.ac.uk/emls/emlshome.html. Annaliese Connolly and Lisa Hopkins the editors of this special issue echoed Lewis' sentiments about the greatness of the decade's literature: "The period between the defeat of the Armada in 1588 and the death of Elizabeth in 1603 saw a heady mixture of euphoria, panic, an unprecedented flowering of literary talent, plague, bad harvests, and fin-de-siècle malaise. Most notably, it was the formative decade for the shaping of English literary and historiographical self-consciousness, and left an aesthetic legacy that underpinned literary endeavour and notions of literary value for well over a century. It saw a battle for the hearts and minds of England's poetic, dramatic and historiographical enterprises, as well as political and social unease as the country prepared for an imminent change of regime" ("Preface"). The special issue of *EMLS* looks at individual writers, texts, and political figures rather than the 1590s as a decade.

[26] See Ian Archer, *The Pursuit of Stability* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991); John Guy, ed. *The Reign of Elizabeth I: Court and Culture in the Last Decade* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); and Paul E.J. Hammer, *The polarisation of Elizabethan politics: the political career of Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex, 1585-1597* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

[27] See, for example, Roslyn Knutson *Playing Companies and Commerce in Shakespeare's Time* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001) and Holger Syme, "Three's Company: Alternative Histories of London's Theaters in the 1590s," *Shakespeare Studies* 65 (2012): 269-89.

witnessed the widespread sexualization of literary activity, to the extent that literary production at the end of Elizabeth's reign is, quite simply, dirty."[28] Brown's is one of a handful of studies which tries to provide an over-arching narrative on the flowering of poetry and prose in the 1590s. She contends that the non-dramatic literature of the period was characterized by marginality and shame. Jeffrey Knapp, on the other hand, suggests that the identification between poetic and national selves, particularly after England's victory over the Spanish Armada, contributed to the poetic renaissance of the 1590s.[29]

My dissertation is in the same vein as the work of Brown and Knapp in that it focuses on poetry and prose, but it diverges from previous studies on the 1590s because, in order to account for the dramatic increase in literary production during the 1590s, draws on two distinct subfields: book history and traditional literary study. It thus contributes to current conversations about the Elizabethan literary marketplace and the creation of an English literary tradition in the sixteenth century. Drawing on Tudor literary criticism, early printed books, and Stationers' Company records, in addition to close readings of the texts, I follow four personae – the traditional literary persona Colin Clout as well as three print personae, Martin Marprelate, Tom Nashe, and Robert Greene – and read them on their own, fictional terms; demonstrate how they were used to market literature; trace their contributions to the vogue for personae in the 1590s; and examine the social, political, and/or literary work each does. From points of church doctrine to the politics of publication, all of the personae I consider were mobilized to comment on late-Elizabethan culture. Colin Clout was mobilized in an effort to define an English literary tradition and Edmund Spenser's place in it. Martin Marprelate and his foes wrangle about ecclesiastical

---

[28] *Redefining Elizabethan Literature*, 50.
[29] *An Empire Nowhere: England, America, and Literature from Utopia to the Tempest* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 5.

matters, while Tom Nashe and Gabriel Harvey quarrel over what it means to be a man in print. Robert Greene's several ghosts are used to ponder the death of a celebrity, and the separation of author and persona.

What unites each of the three print personae I consider in this dissertation is that each was used to market and sell the non-dramatic literary texts in which they appeared. Flexible by nature, personae appeared in poetry and prose, and the ubiquity of the devices across the two genres contributed to the explosion of personae in the 1590s. They were not bound to a single text: anyone could borrow a preexisting one or create a new one and extend its narrative across multiple texts. Booksellers and authors would certainly try to cash in on the fame of print personae by printing new books featuring them. They used print personae to attract customers and keep them coming back for more.

In the early modern period, as Zachary Lesser and Alan Farmer have shown, publishing was "speculative."[30] Printers and publishers, that is, would not pay an author for his copy unless they thought they would get a return on their investments. I argue that writers for the print market used personae to make their writing more attractive to publishers and ultimately to customers, and in so doing they often wrote books that capitalized on an already well-known personae's fame. They might reuse a beloved existing persona like Robin Hood or Martin Marprelate. Robert Greene was a wildly popular persona, perhaps the most popular of the 1590s, who was deployed by several authors. Taken together, printed books about Robert Greene provide a wide array of information about his life, from youth to the post-mortem period. Robert Greene himself mobilized the persona in *The repentance of Robert Greene Maister of Artes.*

---

[30] "The Popularity of Playbooks Revististed," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 56, no. 1 (2005): 14.

Wherein by himselfe is laid open his loose life, with the manner of his death (1592),[31] which titillates readers by promising to reveal the details of Greene's lewdness and sensational death, whereas his *Greenes, groats-vvorth of witte, bought with a million of repentance Describing the follie of youth, the falshoode of makeshifte flatterers, the miserie of the negligent, and mischiefes of deceiuing courtezans* (1592)[32] focuses on his youthful indiscretions. Another author, cashing in on Greene's notoriety, published *Greenes vision vvritten at the instant of his death. Conteyning a penitent passion for the folly of his pen* (1592),[33] which focuses on the very end of the persona's life; and yet another penned *Greenes newes both from heauen and hell Prohibited the first for writing of bookes, and banished out of the last for displaying of conny-catchers* (1594)[34] and *Greenes ghost haunting conie-catchers wherein is set downe, the arte of humouring* (1602).[35]

The market for print personae not only encouraged the reiteration of a single persona in different texts; it also pushed writers to create new print personae to compete with already established ones. In the print market, books featuring new personae were often marketed with reference to those that they were trying to supersede. By way of example, Henry Chettle created two new textual personalities to compete with Thomas Nashe's incredibly popular Piers Pennilesse. John Danter printed *Kind-harts dreame Conteining fiue apparitions, vvith their inuectiues against abuses raigning. Deliuered by seuerall ghosts vnto him to be publisht, after Piers Penilesse post had refused the carriage* in 1593 and *Piers Plainnes seauen yeres prentiship*

---

[31] (London: John Danter for Cuthbert Burby, 1592).
[32] (London: John Wolfe and John Danter for William Wright, 1592).
[33] (London: Edward Allde for Thomas Newman, 1592).
[34] (London: Widow Charlewood, 1593).
[35] (London: Peter Short for Roger Jackson and John North, 1602).

in 1595. Both of these books feature new personae, Kind-hart and Piers Plainnes, but they are advertised with reference to Nashe's famous print persona.

The marketing of new print personae with reference to established ones was not always an exercise in name-dropping, however. Many new personae were introduced to the marketplace of print in order to argue with pre-existing, and well-liked, textual personalities. The fad for quarreling personae has its roots in the Marprelate controversy, but, after the Marprelate moment, print personae would argue about anything, not just church doctrine. The little-read *Tarltons newes out of purgatorie* (1590), a book narrated by a persona modeled on the famous stage clown Richard Tarlton, could be described as a jest-book fusion of Dante and Boccaccio – the text, which offers of an account of Tarlton's journey into Purgatory, contains both a description of Purgatory modeled on Dante's and several "pretty tales" plagiarized from *The Decameron.* Apparently, such a trifle was inflammatory and thus generated a polemical response, *The Cobler of Canterburie*, *or an invective against Tarltons newes out of purgatorie* (1590, reprinted 1608).[36] *The Cobler of Canterburie* opens with a letter from a new persona, The Cobbler of Canterbury, who addresses the publication of *Tarltons newes*. In this letter, the Cobbler argues that "while there is some prettie stuffe in it," *Tarltons newes* is "vnworthie Dick Tarltons humour: somewhere too low for iests, somewhere too high for style." Rather than correcting the earlier work, he "amends" it by penning an entirely different text in imitation of Geoffrey Chaucer's *The Canterbury Tales*. *The Cobler*, he advertises, is a "gallimaufrie of all sorts," designed to "feed all mens fancies." The book contains a variety of popular literary forms including jests, doggerel, and tales to rival the "profound histories" of Robin Hood. It is thus

[36]*Tarltons newes out of purgatorie Onely such a iest as his iigge, fit for gentlemen to laugh at an houre, &c* (London: R. Robinson for T. Gubbin and T. Newman, 1590) and *The cobler of Caunterburie, or An inuectiue against Tarltons newes out of purgatorie A merrier iest then a clownes iigge, and fitter for gentlemens humors. Published with the cost of a dickar of cowe hides* (London: R. Robinson, 1590).

more versatile and entertaining than *Tarltons newes*. Stranger still, indoor plumbing became a topic of dispute after John Harington published *A new discourse of a stale subiect, called The metamorphosis of Aiax. Written by Misacmos [sic] to his friend and cosin Philostilpnos [sic]*, using the persona Misacmos. A new persona, Misdiaboles, lambasted Misacmos in *Vlisses vpon Aiax Written by Misodiaboles to his friend Philaretes.* Both of these books were published by John Windet in 1596. Other books, such as those published by Harvey and Nashe as well as a slew of satires published in the late 1590s, trafficked in personal insult; those books were extended character assassinations.

The vogue for print personae spanned from 1588 until the late 1590s, reaching its height just before the Bishops' Ban of 1599.[37] The Bishops' Ban, an act in which John Whitgift, Archbishop of Canterbury and Richard Bancroft, Bishop of London ordered the banning and burning of selected English satires, epigrams, histories, and the entirety of the Nashe-Harvey controversy, contributed to the waning of personae's popularity in print. There have been many plausible explanations for what precipitated the Bishops' Ban: the texts were too pornographic; they were offensive to Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex; they smacked too much of Juvenal; and the satire of the 1590s was getting out of control.[38] I am, however, not interested in the causes, but the effect. The banned texts were all narrated by personae, personae who ultimately provoked others to respond to them and increased the number of offensive satires circulating in the marketplace of print. The censorship of these books did not lead to the demise of the market for

[37] For more on this event, see Debora Shuger, "Civility and Censorship in Early Modern England," in *Censorship and Silencing: Practices of Cultural Regulation*, ed. Robert C. Post (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1998), 89-110.
[38] For reasons why the English bishops may have banned the selected satires, see Cyndia Clegg, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997); Charles Gillett, *Burned Books: Neglected Chapters in British History and Literature*, 2 vols. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1932); William R. Jones, "The Bishops' Ban of 1599 and the Ideology of English Satire." *Literature Compass* 7.5 (2010): 332-46; and Richard McCabe, "Elizabethan Satire and the Bishops' Ban of 1599," *Yearbook of English Studies* 11 (1981): 188-93.

print personae, but it ensured that there were fewer books featuring them published. Fearing the long arm of the law, printers and publishers were less willing to take on jobs that featured particular kinds of personae, personae who might be construed as satirical or quarrelsome. As a result, personae did not disappear from the marketplace of print; they continued to be a selling point for printed books, but their numbers declined.

This dissertation is divided into three chapters and a coda, each on a different persona or cluster of personae. In the first chapter, I focus on Colin Clout and the notion of the traditional persona in the late-Elizabethan period, in order to establish how the traditional persona contributed to the legacy of the author rather than how the persona may or may not express his thoughts. The personae of the 1590s, by contrast, were mobilized to define alternative English literary traditions. These personae were given genealogies, and in some texts associated with other literary personae. Authors manipulated them to give them ties to older literary figures and movements. At the same time, the personae presented themselves as if they were making new contributions to an established literary tradition, effecting change through innovations in style, substance, and/or improvements on earlier literary work. While it is true that not all the personae of the 1590s were used to think about England's literary culture and tradition, focusing on those that do brings to the fore a new perspective on the literary culture of the decade. It allows us to see how the relationship between what, following Pierre Bourdieu, we might call the economic field, the marketplace of print and the selling of books, and the literary field, the creation of literary texts and the English literary tradition, might have been conceived in the late-Elizabethan period.[39]

---

[39] Bourdieu uses these terms in "The Field of Cultural Production, or: The Economic World Reversed," in *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Literature and Art*, ed. Randal Johnson (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), 29-73. I will take up his theory and terminology more fully in chapter 3.

In a ground-breaking essay, Pierre Bourdieu argues that the literary field and economic field are at odds with one another. The economic field is what we would call the mass market, is bourgeois, characterized by gross consumerism and a lack of high culture. It is driven by the market. The literary field, by contrast, is not driven by the mass market; it is small, focused on "cultural production," and its members vie for "consecration" and prestige, not sales. Those who participate in the literary field do not care about money. Bourdieu's work focuses on the late modern period where a mass market exists, but in the period on which this dissertation focuses there was no mass market. As I will show in chapter 2, the book market of the 1590s was tightly regulated by a team of censors. Nevertheless, Bourdieu's terminology remains useful for thinking about the book market of the early modern period. One of the lines of argument I pursue in this project is that, in the early modern period as opposed to contemporary times, literary and economic value were entwined. The print personae Tom Nashe and Martin Marprelate argue that the saleability of their books is a measure of their literary quality, and even the traditional persona Colin Clout suggests that the book market might perpetuate his fame. In the words of Franco Moretti, "Readers read A and so keep it alive; better, they *buy* A, inducing its publishers to keep it in print until another generation shows up, and so on."[40]

I begin with the traditional persona Colin Clout, one of the principal personae in Edmund Spenser's *The Shepheardes Calender* (1579, reprinted 1591 and 1597) and his *Colin Clouts Come Home Again* (1595). Instead of focusing on Colin Clout in relation to Spenser's literary career as many critics have done, I argue that Spenser mobilizes Colin in both books to define specifically English literary histories and traditions and his place in it. In the *Calender*, Colin is linked with Geoffrey Chaucer, Piers Plowman, and especially John Skelton; his style is indebted

[40] "The Slaughterhouse of Literature," *Modern Language Quarterly* 61, no. 1 (2000): 209-10.

to Skelton's, and he is treated like Skelton, as a singular poet who belongs to all of his constituents. In *Colin Clouts Come Home Again*, by contrast, he is commodified and associated with Philip Sidney. Spenser deploys Colin in the former volume to situate it in a politically engaged English literary tradition, a tradition which belongs to all English people, and the latter assimilates Sidney and an updated Colin into that still developing tradition, a tradition which is tied to and perpetuated by the literary marketplace. Just as he was central to Skelton's legacy, Colin Clout becomes an essential part of Spenser's.

In the second chapter, I turn to print personae. The chapter takes as its subject the Marprelate controversy (1588-91), a notorious religious pamphlet war waged by ten fictional personae, of whom the first and most prominent was Martin Marprelate, I lay out the logic underlying the proliferation of personae in the 1590s and demonstrate how personae were used to foment consumer demand. Martin, whose roots stretch back to Piers Plowman, had his life played out in pamphlets. After his initial attacks on the established church, his sons joined the quarrel, providing accounts of their father's death. Martin's detractors, by contrast, told bawdy and unflattering stories about their enemy and his family, stories which only increased the public desire for things Martin. The controversy initiated the fad for print personae in the long 1590s and facilitated the development of a market for the devices, something which would have lasting effects on the book trade. I offer a new reading of the paper skirmish that shows how the parties involved in the pamphlet war actively created this trend in the marketplace, which is structured by the proliferation of and competition between literary personae.

The third chapter focuses on Jack Wilton, Tom Nashe, and the making of what I call the "print canon," in contradistinction to the literary canon based on perceived literary value established by later critics. The print canon was formed in the marketplace of print, and, as such,

not only writers, but, printers, publishers, and book-buyers helped to shape it. It thus operated in both the commercial and literary domains, as its participants sought not only to sell books but also to cultivate different, and competing, versions of an English literary tradition. Personae, I argue, were central to this print canon. In a reading of *The Unfortunate Traveler* (1594), I show how the print canon was conceptualized and formed as a contest between authorial personae, or textual personalities that share a name with the authors that use them. Tom Nashe's quarrel with Gabriel Harvey (1592-96), this chapter argues, is both a dispute about the use and abuse of authorial personae and an effort at canon making. Both figures are invested in participating in the print canon and their argument can be read as an attempt to forge it.

I conclude with Robert Greene, one of the most notorious print personae of the 1590s. An early participant in the Nashe-Harvey controversy, Robert Greene was famous for detailing the lives of members of London's criminal underworld in a series of pamphlets, pamphlets which generated an angry response, or a "confutation of those two injurious pamphlets published by R.G. against the practitioners of many nimble-witted and mystical sciences," by one Cuthbert Cony-Catcher, who alleges Greene is no better than the criminals he exposes. After Greene's creator and namesake, the author Robert Greene, died, the persona lived on in undead form. His ghost appeared in pamphlets, providing details of his afterlife. This coda explores the pamphlets featuring the undead Greene, arguing that the postmortem pamphlets simultaneously explore what happens when a persona is severed from his originating author and has a social life of his own and how that persona's social life might intersect with that of the author.

Personae remained prevalent in the long 1590s precisely because of their flexibility. Authors could use them for commentary on a range of topics, from the vendibility of books to the state of English manners, and they could be endlessly recycled and modified. Yet they have

been grossly understudied in favor of the writers who originated them. Personae have not been analyzed by scholars of the 1590s *as* personae because they are often merged with or read as their historical authors: Euphues becomes Lyly, Harington Misacmos, Astrophil Sidney etc. The persona, however, is worth considering on its own terms not just because it is a ubiquitous literary device, but because it reminds us that our existing critical accounts of the 1590s may not be the only stories there are to tell.

CHAPTER ONE:
Reading for the Persona in *The Shepheardes Calender* (1579) and the *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe* Volume (1595)

Memoirs of fairy land (1716) by Colin Clout is a bizarre book.[41] A dialogue inspired by the works of Edmund Spenser, it recounts how Colin Clout, a "simple clown" and "shepherd's boy," has a vision in which a spirit called Immerito visits his dwelling place and instructs him in "the secrets of *Fairy Philosophy*" (xviii). Having talked awhile, Immerito, impressed by the shepherd's genius and curiosity, conducts the "giddy" boy to "*Arthegal's Court*," where "all the *Fairies* resort to seek for Justice" (xix) by Pegasus, an experience so unfamiliar to Colin that it "tickles [his] brain" – Colin charmingly likens this tickling to the "Rapture" induced by the "Bite of the *Tarantula*" (xxviii). At Artegall's Court, Colin and Immerito witness a trial in which characters from Spenser's *Faerie Queen* (1590, 1596), including Timias, Britomart, Calidore, and, of course, Artegall participate. Though *Memoirs* draws mostly on Spenser's national epic, even reproducing some of its stanzas, its two main interlocutors, Colin Clout and Immerito, are central figures in *The Shepheardes Calender* (1579), a book of eclogues written in imitation of Virgil and Mantuan. Rather than identifying one with the other as the *Calender* seems to do, *Memoirs of fairy land* severs the two and augments their narratives in different directions. These two personae are certainly reminiscent of the figures in Spenser's sixteenth-century book, but they have taken on lives of their own, becoming characters in what might be called early Spenserian fan fiction.

As silly as *Memoirs of fairy land* is, its use of the Colin Clout and Immerito personae is instructive, chiefly because it does not treat them as projections of the author Edmund Spenser

---

[41] *Memoirs of fairy land: written above an hundred years ago. Now translated from the original legends of Eutopia* (London: J. Roberts, 1716). I will cite this book, by page number, parenthetically in the main text. All italics are supplied by the book's author.

and instead understands them as distinct entities. To a modern reader, divorcing Spenser from these personae is unthinkable because both Immeritô and Colin have been associated with Spenser since the anonymous publication of *The Shepheardes Calender*. The 1579 book's know-it-all commentator, E.K., says that its author, who calls himself Immeritô in print, "secretly shadoweth himself" under the name of Colin Clout.[42] In 1590, Spenser publicly announced his authorship of the *Calender* in the opening lines of *Faerie Queene*: "Lo I the man, whose Muse whylome did maske, / As time her taught, in lowly Shephards weeds," the book begins, establishing a link between Edmund Spenser, Immeritô, and Colin.[43] But there is precedent for separating Colin and Immeritô: in 1595, the two were divorced in the *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe* (hereafter *Colin Clouts* volume), a book published by William Ponsonby which contains a poetical account of Colin's journey from his pastoral homeland to Cynthia's court and back. The poem is followed by seven epitaphs to Philip Sidney, under the guise of Astrophil. Colin would also appear in Book 6 of *Faerie Queene* (1596) and *Englands Helicon* (1600) without Immeritô. Yet even though he had been emancipated from Immeritô, Colin remained tied to the author Edmund Spenser. He is, after all, a traditional persona.

Although modern critics have discussed Spenser in relation to Immeritô, they tend to pay more attention to Colin Clout. The scholarly preference for Colin might be traced to the 1590s, when he became a more prominent figure than Immeritô in the Spenser canon – in addition to the *Colin Clouts* volume and *Faerie Queene*, he is referenced in *Complaints* (1591), and is

---

[42] Cited in *The Yale Edition of the Shorter Poems of Edmund Spenser*, ed. William Oram *et. al*. (New Haven: Yale UP, 1989), 33. Hereafter I will cite this edition parenthetically in the main text.
[43] Cited in *The Faerie Queene*, 2nd ed., ed. A.C. Hamilton with Hiroshi Yamashita, Toshiyuki Suzuki, and Shohachi Fukuda (London: Pearson Longman, 2007), 1.1.1-2. I will hereafter cite this edition parenthetically in the main text. Before this announcement Spenser's authorship of the *Calender* was an open secret: William Webbe, in *A Discourse of English Poetrie* (1586), refers to "*Master Sp*." as the "Author of the *Sheepheardes Calender*. Cited in *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, ed. G. Gregory Smith, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1904), 1.263. Italics are Webbe's.

frequently alluded to in the literature of the 1590s.[44] By the time of Spenser's death in 1599, he was identified closely with Colin Clout. The satirist John Weever, in an epigrammatic obituary for the poet, calls him by the name of his most famous persona: "*Colins* gone home," he writes.[45] Scholars have often resisted disentangling Spenser and Colin, emphasizing the traditional aspects of the persona and thus arguing that he can be read as a figure for the author that enhances our understanding of him as a "self-crowned laureate," to borrow a term from Richard Helgerson.[46] This interpretation of Colin has provided particularly valuable readings of the *Calender* and *Colin Clouts Come Home Again.* In the former book, scholars argue, the lowly "Shepheardes boye" registers the poet's Virgilian poetic ambition, for he is the pastoral vehicle by which a twenty-seven-year-old Edmund Spenser initiated his poetic career as the "New Poet." As Paul Alpers succinctly puts it, the *Calender* "was the first set of English pastorals in the European tradition, and in emulating Virgil's Eclogues, it self-consciously inaugurated a poetic career on the model of Virgil's – one that would move from a book of eclogues to a national epic."[47] In a seminal study, Patrick Cheney argues that Spenser uses Colin Clout "in order to represent the inaugural phase of [his] career," a "Christianized Virgilian career that aims to demonstrate to English culture . . . the utility of poetic fame to Christian glory."[48] In a similar vein, scholars

---

[44] For an extensive list of allusions to Spenser in the early modern period and beyond, see R.M. Cummings, *Spenser: The Critical Heritage* (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1971).
[45] "In Obitum E. Spencer Potae presantis," in *Epigrammes in the oldest cut, and newest fashion* (London: Valentine Sims for Thomas Bushell, 1599), G3.
[46] *Self-Crowned Laureates: Spenser, Jonson, Milton, and the Literary System* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983). Rather than Colin, Marcy North has studied Immeritô in relation to Spenser's literary career, arguing that he adopts "a humble pastoral guise appropriate for a new author seeking approval from readers unacquainted with him." See *The Anonymous Renaissance*, 99. For further accounts of Spenser's literary career see Richard Mallette, "Spenser's Portrait of the Artist in *The Shepheardes Calender* and *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe*," *SEL* 19 (1979): 19-41; David Lee Miller, "Spenser's Vocation, Spenser's Career," *ELH* 50, no. 2 (1983): 197-231; Louis Adrian Montrose, "'The perfecte patterne of a poete': The Poetics of Courtship in *The Shepheardes Calender*," *Texas Studies in Language and Literature* 21, no. 1 (1979): 34-67.
[47] "Pastoral and the Domain of Lyric in Spenser's Shepheardes Calender," *Representations* (1985): 83.
[48] *Spenser's Famous Flight: A Renaissance Idea of a Literary Career* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993), 20, xi. For further studies on Spenser and Virgil see Colin Burrow, "Spenser and the Classical Traditions," in *The*

interested in Spenser's re-use of Colin in the 1590s have focused on how the author uses the eponymous persona to rethink his career. Cheney, for instance, contends that the poem "reveals the defining paradox of its author's biography:" Edmund Spenser's "destiny is to be an exiled shepherd writing national epic from the vantage point of the pastoral."[49] David Shore, by contrast, suggests that the poem represents a "return" to the pastoral mode, a return that allows Spenser to "reassess the goals and limitations of the poetic journey he had begun with such confidence a dozen years before."[50] Studying the traditional persona has allowed scholars to map out Spenser's ambitions, to trace the way he presents himself as a national poet in his work.

In studies of Colin Clout's relation to Spenser's poetic career, the author, not the persona, typically takes center stage, something which makes sense because Colin's identity is so obviously entangled with Spenser's.[51] Richard McCabe, for instance, points out that Spenser's Colin is a "poetic fiction," just one of several personae that the author uses. Taken together, these personae, he argues, are "designed to appropriate the readerly 'you' into an appreciative 'we,'" a reading public that admires the poet and his works.[52] Similarly in her analysis of *Colin Clouts*

Cambridge Companion to Spenser, ed. Andrew Hadfield (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 217-36; M.L. Donnelly, "The Life of Vergil and the Aspirations of the 'New Poet,'" *Spenser Studies* 17 (2003):1-35; Rebecca Helfer, "The Death of the 'New Poet': Virgilian Ruin and Ciceronian Recollection in *The Shepheardes Calender*," *Renaissance Quarterly* 56 (2003): 723-56; Nancy Lindheim, "The Virgilian Design of *The Shepheardes Calender*," *Spenser Studies* 13 (1999):1-23; Kreg Segall, "Skeltonic Anxiety and Rumination in *The Shepheardes Calender*," *SEL* 47, no. 1 (2007): 29-56; Jane Tylus, "Spenser, Virgil, and the Politics of Poetic Labor," *ELH* 55, no. 1 (1988): 53-77; John Watkins, *The Specter of Dido: Spenser and Virgilian Epic* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995); David Scott Wilson-Okamura "Problems in the Virgilian Career," *Spenser Studies* 26 (2011):1-30.

[49]"Spenser's Pastorals: *The Shepheardes Calender* and *Colin Clouts Come Home Again*," in *The Cambridge Companion to Edmund Spenser*, 97.

[50]*Spenser and the Poetics of Pastoral* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1985), 105. But see also Paul Alpers, "Spenser's Late Pastorals," *ELH* 56 (1989): 797-817; Donald Cheney, "Colin Clout's Homecoming: The Imaginative Travels of Edmund Spenser," *Connotations* 7, no. 2 (1997-98): 146-58; and Kreg Segall, "The Precarious Poet in *Colin Clouts Come Home Again*," *SEL* 53, no. 1 (2013): 31-52.

[51] Other personae have been read as stand-ins for Spenser. Frances Meres reads Piers as such, arguing that in the October eclogue, Spenser "lament[s] the decay of Poetry at these dayes" in the person of Piers. See his *Palladis Tamia*, fol. 278v.

[52] "Authorial Self-Presentation," in *The Oxford Handbook of Edmund Spenser*, ed. Richard McCabe (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 462-63.

Come Home Again, Sue Petitt Starke suggests that the "Colin persona provides Spenser with a space *outside* the Virgilian career model, a space in which Spenser creates a new type of national poet by melding the conventions of the classical pastoral with the Irish bardic mode as he understood it."[53] In their studies on authorial self-presentation, these critics read the pastoral persona as "auto-referential," to borrow McCabe's term, rather than auto-fictional.[54] They read *beyond* the persona and thus discuss Colin with constant reference to Spenser and his conception of what a poet should be, rather than in terms of fiction.[55] The problem with reading Colin Clout auto-referentially is that it obscures the persona's long history in print. Colin Clout is more than a projection of Edmund Spenser, and focusing on his genealogy showcases the two contradictory possibilities of traditional persona: it can be read as an authorial alter-ego and it can have a genealogy of its own. This chapter traces Colin's genealogy, focuses on how Spenser made use of it when fashioning a poetic self-image. But I want to propose a new strategy for doing this.

What if, instead of reading beyond Colin Clout, we were to read both *with* and *for* him? In this chapter I propose to read the persona, not as a stand-in for the author, but as a literary

---

[53] "Briton Knight or Irish Bard?" Spenser's Pastoral Persona and the Epic Project in *A View* and *Colin Clouts*," *Spenser Studies* 12 (1998): 133-34.

[54] Cited in the Introduction to *Spenser: The Shorter Poems*, ed. Richard McCabe (Hammondsworth: Penguin, 1999), xvii.

[55] The other tradition of reading beyond the *Calender*'s personae is one in which commentators focus on Colin and the book's many other shepherds in order to discern its political and social engagements. One of the book's prominent early modern readers, John Milton, interpreted the *Calender* in a religio-political vein. Of the May eclogue, he writes that under the "false shepherd Palinode," Spenser impersonates "prelates, whose whole life is a recantation of their pastoral vow, and whose profession to forsake the world, as they use the matter, bogs them deeper into the world," something which has resonance for Milton's own "reforming times." (See *The Student's Milton*, ed. F. Patterson (New York, 1933), 500.) Modern readers have done the same. Annabel Patterson suggests that Colin's melancholy is not just personal, but "national," whereas Richard McCabe suggests the interaction between personae points to "the intricate interaction between public and private affairs central to the outlook of the work as a whole." (See Patterson, "Re-opening the Green Cabinet: Clement Marot and Edmund Spenser," *ELR* 16 (1986): 57 and McCabe,"'Little booke: thy selfe present': the politics of presentation in *The Shepheardes Calender*," in *Presenting Poetry: Composition, Publication, Reception*, ed. Howard Erskine-Hill and Richard A. McCabe (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 37.)

device with a genealogy and social life of his own. To be sure, one cannot write about Colin Clout without thinking about him as Spenser's alter-ego, but what I want to do is shift the focus away from Spenser and his ambitions and instead think about the Colin persona and his genealogy, and show how Spenser used key characteristics of an earlier iteration of Colin, the one who appears in John Skelton's *Colyn Cloute*. Temporarily bracketing Spenser allows us to track how and why Colin Clout has been mobilized over time and to examine not just why he used this particular persona who was an integral part of an earlier poet's legacy, but how. I thus intend to tell a complementary narrative to those that examine the relationship between Colin and Spenser, one in which the Colin persona is both key to Spenser's self-representation and a crucial mechanism in the development of an English literary politics and history from Skelton to Spenser. While studies of Colin as Spenser's persona tend to focus on the living poet's self-presentation, I want to examine how the persona allows him to define a literary tradition and them insert himself into it.

This chapter argues that, in the 1579 *Calender*, Colin is a conspicuous vehicle by which the book creates and insinuates itself into a politically engaged English literary history and tradition.[56] Because of its self-conscious attention to its principal persona – E.K. comments on Colin's literary antecedents and the work he does in the text – the book can be read as a document that comments on the sixteenth-century understanding of traditional personae, their uses, and how they might facilitate literary history. The *Calender* presents literary history as a

---

[56] Scholars have discussed the book's relation to its English and medieval predecessors at length. See, for example, Megan L. Cook, "Making and Managing the Past: Lexical Commentary in Spenser's *Shepheardes Calender* (1579) and Chaucer's *Workes* (1598/1602), *Spenser Studies* 26 (2011): 179-222; John N. King, *Spenser's Poetry and the Reformation Tradition* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990); and Abigail Shinn, "'Extraordinary discourses of vnnecessarie matter': Spenser's *Shepheardes Calender* and the Almanac Tradition," in *Literature and Popular Culture in Early Modern England*, ed. Matthew Dimmock and Andrew Hadfield (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009), 137-50.

process propelled by the negotiation of the texts of the past, and nowhere is this more obvious than in its deployment of the pre-existing, stylistically innovative figure of Colin Clout. Colin first appeared in print in John Skelton's *Colyn Cloute*, but in the *Calender* he is appropriated, reimagined, and subject to what David Brewer calls "imaginative expansion,"[57] activities that simultaneously mark a "return to some of the essential features of the past," to borrow a phrase from William Kuskin, and "initiat[e] originality."[58] The Colin that emerges from the *Calender* is common property in two senses, for he is a borrowed person who has been used in other contexts and he belongs to the English literary tradition. He becomes "our Colin Clout," not just Spenser's, a "home-bred" figure that belongs to England's literary past, even as he is mobilized in an effort to inaugurate its future.

At the end of the *Calender*, Colin, having said his final farewell, is poised to die. In a sense, the book achieves closure – Colin has completed his life cycle – and there is not even a faint hint that Colin's narrative would be extended in future books. And yet: in 1595 he appears in Ponsonby's volume, not as a decrepit old man, but as a spry shepherd who has traveled extensively.[59] The difference between these two personae extends beyond age, however. The *Colin Clouts* volume attempts to transform Colin into a vendible commodity in addition to mobilizing him for literary historical work. Although the 1595 book seeks to fulfill, albeit belatedly, a promise made in the *Calender*'s prefatory sonnet: "I will send more after thee," to

---

[57] My work on personae has been greatly influenced by David Brewer's work on literary character. Brewer's work demonstrates that literary characters in the eighteenth-century underwent what he calls "imaginative expansion" – they were detached from their original context and augmented (2). See *The Afterlife of Character, 1726-1825* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005).
[58] "'The Loadstarre of the English Language': Spenser's *Shepheardes Calender* and the Construction of Modernity," *Textual Cultures* 2, no. 2 (2007): 29-30.
[59] Scholars have commonly read Spenser's return to Colin as his way of assessing his literary career. See, for instance, Paul Alpers, "Spenser's Late Pastorals;" Patrick Cheney, "Spenser's Pastorals: *The Shepheardes Calender* and *Colin Clouts Come Home Again*;" and David Shore, *Spenser and the Poetics of Pastoral*.

augment Colin's narrative further. The 1595 re-issue of the Colin persona is worth considering in detail because of the way in which the *Colin Clouts* volume associates its eponymous persona with the recently deceased Astrophil, a persona for Philip Sidney. By attending to the volume as a whole, we can see what the book seeks to accomplish. The volume's nomination of Colin as Astrophil's successor positions Colin, and thus Spenser, as an important figure in the literary culture of the 1590s, but it also grafts Astrophil onto the English tradition established in the *Calender.* In so doing, it presents the literary historical process as ongoing and subject to readjustment.

From "clerkely hagge" to "shepherds boy"

In 1579 Spenser introduced himself a "The New Poet" in the *Shepheardes Calender*. In the book he shrouds himself twice. He takes on a persona, Immeritô, who assumes a persona (Colin Clout). Immeritô was a new creation in 1579 and Spenser would mobilize him again in 1580 in *Three proper, and wittie, familiar letters: lately passed betvveene tvvo vniuersitie men* (1580). There he would discuss English verse and other learned matters with Gabriel Harvey. While Immeritô was a key figure in Spenser's self-presentation in the earlier part of his career, Colin Clout, that lowly shepherd from the *Calender*, looms large throughout his career, a vehicle by which Spenser articulated his poetic ambitions in the 1570s and 1590s. Colin Clout was not a long-forgotten relic of the past dredged up by Spenser; indeed, even before the publication of the *Calender* Colin was well known in literate circles as one of the poet John Skelton's personae, a mask for a former poet laureate. Colin's genealogy, and his obvious parentage, was a crucial part of Spenser's self-presentation, his use of the persona thoughtful and deliberate. Attending to Colin Clout's life before Spenser allows us to see how Spenser was working with the texts of his forebears. And, indeed, Colin does double duty in both the *Calender* and the *Colin Clouts*

volume. He is both a projection of Edmund Spenser and the vehicle by which the poet defined the literary tradition in which he participated. The flexibility of the traditional persona, its status as both an authorial alter-ego and a fictional construction, allowed Spenser to craft a public image for himself, and at the same time to tell a story about English literary history, a story he would return to and revise in the 1590s in *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe*.[60]

Colin Clout, as I mention above, is not the *Calender*'s invention, or put another way, he is already a mediation. He first appeared in print in John Skelton's *Colyn Cloute* (1522-23) and then as the compiler and speaker of the scatological *The treatyse answerynge the boke of berdes* (1541). In both of these texts, Colin is a vitriol-spewing satirist; his style is rough, rustic, and blunt. While there is no evidence that Spenser was working with *The treatyse* while composing the *Calender*, he certainly was familiar with Skelton's *Colyn Cloute*, as E.K. reminds us. I shall thus examine how the *Calender* transforms the speaking persona of *Colyn Cloute* and to what effect. The 1579 Colin bears traces of his former iteration, retaining his predecessors' self-consciously rude style. When he is mobilized in the *Calender*, the rustic figure is presented as an exemplary shepherd-poet whose verses others want to hear. He also becomes a vehicle by which the literary historical process is explored.

When E.K. glosses Colin Clout's name in the *Calender*'s *Januarye* eclogue, he tells us that it appears in a "Poesie of M. Skeltons under that title" (32),[61] establishing a link between Colyn and Colin. That these personae have the same name is significant – as Stanley Fish

---

[60] Although Book 6 of the *Faerie Queene* extends Colin's narrative, I do not discuss it in this chapter. Colin Clout is not advertised on the title page, and the episode in the epic is brief.
[61] The name "Colin" is also associated with the French poet Clement Marot. For the *Calender*'s use of Marot see Patterson, "Re-opening the Green Cabinet" and Anne Lake Prescott, *French Poets in the English Renaissance: Studies in Fame and Transformation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978).

reminds us, Spenser "takes more than his nom de plume from Skelton"[62] – and most scholars have traced the relationship between them in terms of their "similar associations with the poetry of social and religious protest," to cite David Norbrook.[63] I want to suggest that the two are also connected by their manner of speech; both possess a cultivated rusticity, a distinctive poetic style that becomes significant in the context of the works in which they appear. Spenser, in other words, seized on the peculiar style of Skelton's persona and made use of it. Although George Puttenham would suggest that Skelton produced popular verse, claiming that he fancied "short measures pleasing onely to the popular eare,"[64] his poetic personae, especially Colyn Cloute, take a more nuanced approach to their manner of self-expression. Colyn self-reflexively comments on his style, a highly ornamental form of speech that pretends to channel the popular voice. Colyn uses language to align himself with both the people and the clergy, and in so doing politicizes it. His speech is the instrument through which he seeks to persuade a diverse reading public, comprised of common, learned, and pastoral people, that the English church needs reform. Fifty-six years later, in the *Calender*, Colin Clout would also speak like a learned rustic – he, too, deploys sophisticated language masquerading as everyday English – but for more than strictly political ends; Colin's style is singled out as evidence of his literary merit, and it is what, according to E.K., earns him a spot in the English literary tradition.

Colyn Cloute, a satire composed in the early 1520s and printed multiple times in the sixteenth century, attacks unscrupulous members of the laity and clergy, with its most famous

---

[62] Stanley Fish, *John Skelton's Poetry* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965), 203.
[63] David Norbrook, *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance*, rev. ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 52. See also William Nelson, *John Skelton, Laureate* (New York: Russel and Russel, 1964), 203.
[64] *The art of English Poesie*, Mr.

target being Cardinal Thomas Wolsey. [65] Colyn is most often read as a mask for Skelton, as a gauge of his politics in the 1520s. But one of the most understudied aspects of the poem is the way in which its style conveys that politics. Indeed, one of the chief ways by which Colyn tries to garner sympathy from and consolidate a diverse group of readers is through his manner of speaking. The poem calls for social reform; the end of clerical corruption; and the trampling of "Luthers sect," "Wytclyftista," and other schismatic groups.[66] Its eponymous speaking persona, Roland Greene contends, "personifies lack of influence, marginality, and even irrelevance."[67] Situated on the borders of society, Colyn is self-consciously alienated and alienating. He sets up an opposition between "the temporalte" and "the spirytualte," watches their antagonistic behavior – their unholy "werkes" – from afar, and exposes them in print (62-63). In so doing, he positions himself as an adversary to both, correcting those who "hate to be corrected" and inviting their scorn (1235). At the same time, Colyn does affiliate himself with the opposed groups through his language, for he simultaneously ventriloquizes popular speech and showcases his erudition. He is thus a walking contradiction: he is a solitary figure who is and is not a common man, is and is not a clergyman.

Throughout the poem, Colyn creates distance between himself, "the people," and the clergy, describing himself as a solitary, peripatetic person who reports on the bad behavior he sees. When criticizing the clergy, he re-articulates the peoples' grievances as a series of complaints he claims to have overheard in the street. "And wandrynge as I walke, / I here the

---

[65]According to Francis Thynne, *Colyn Clowte* was composed mostly at his father William Thynne's "howse at Erith in Kente." See his *Animadversions uppon Chaucers Workes*, ed. G.H. Kingsley (London: N. Trübner and Co. for EETS, 1865), 10. For the poem's anti-Wolsey elements see Paul E. McLane, "Prince Lucifer and the Fitful 'Lanternes of Lyght': Wolsey and the Bishops in Skelton's *Colyn Cloute*," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 43, no. 3(1980): 159-79; William Nelson, "Skelton's Quarrel with Wolsey," *PMLA* 51, no. 2 (1936): 377-98; and Greg Walker, *John Skelton and the Politics of the 1520s* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).
[66] Cited from *John Skelton: The Complete English Poems*, ed. John Scattergood (Harmondsworth and New York, Penguin, 1983), 545, 549. Hereafter I will cite this edition, by line, in the main text.
[67] "Calling Colin Clout," *Spenser Studies* 10 (1992): 230.

people talke," he begins (287-88): "Men say, for sylver and gold, / Myters are bought and sold (289-90); "Men say ye [priests] are tonge-tayed, / And thereof speke nothynge / But dyssymulynge and glosynge" (354-56); "And all the faute they lay / In you prelates" (402-03); "Your workes, they say, are straunge" (420). As the poem progresses, he continues to recapitulate aggressively what he hears the people complaining about. And, even when he does criticize corrupt people, he conveys their misdeeds as a list of observations. He is saddened to see "Howe the people are glad / The churche to deprave" (512-13) and to witness them "maynteyne arguments / Agaynst the sacraments" (517-18). Worse still, "Bothe women and men" speak openly against the priesthood, spouting "malyce" and "Raylynge haynously / And dysdaynously" (530-37). Colyn's rough manner of speaking, he tells us, is meant to sharpen the distinction between himself and his targets, for it is neither learned nor too common. When he introduces himself, he calls attention to his peculiar style: "I purpose to shake oute / All my connynge bagge," he says, "Like a clerkely hagge" (50-51). He then describes his verse as "jagged" and "rudely rayne-beaten," blunt and unskillful. He is simultaneously educated and simple, irreducible to the clergy or to the people.

But Colyn is not just a brash, anti-social observer of societal ills.[68] Most obviously, he establishes a connection between himself and the common people. In a seminal article, Robert Kinsman connects him to the *vox populi*, discussing the various ways in which he "collects the grumblings of the people and gives them expression."[69] Yet, "the people" with whom he aligns

---

[68] Colyn, as Robert Kinsman notes, does not provide a plan for reform: "His is essentially a poem of attack." See "The Voices of Dissonance: Pattern in Skelton's *Colyn Cloute*," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 26, no. 4(1963): 295. Kinsman focuses on how Colyn's management and deployment of "voices of dissonance" is essential to the poem's structure. Arthur Kinney, by contrast, focuses on the Psalms and their influence on the poem's structure. See *John Skelton: Priest as Poet* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987), 135-49.
[69] "Skelton's *Colyn Cloute*: the Mask of *Vox Populi*," in *Essays Critical and Historical Dedicated to Lily B. Campbell* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1950), 17.

himself are a nebulous bunch, a diverse group of laymen and women who oppose clerical corruption. By lumping a range of Englishmen and women together as if they were a coherent group, Colyn strengthens the rhetorical force of his argument, making it seem as if the lay members of Christendom have unified and turned against the clergy. He takes a similar approach to the spirituality, representing a diverse group of people, from friars to Cardinals, as a coherent entity in order to make a political point.

According to Kinsman, the persona's first name and his surname conjure up the image of a homely person, for by the early sixteenth century "Colyn" "had long been used to designate a person of crude origins" while "Cloute" meant "rag." The persona also speaks in proverbs and proverbial sayings in order to channel the popular voice. [70] What is more, when Colyn describes how the men and women talk – they rail and accuse –his speech takes on those same qualities. "The lay fee people rayl[e]," he says, because the clergy "do them wronge and no ryghte" (401, 404). They fail in their pastoral duty and use "money for theyr masses" on "wanton lasses" (424-25). In characterizing the people's complaints as railing, Colyn implies that they express their dissatisfaction "persistently and vehemently," using plain, blunt language similar to his own.[71] Colyn badgers his clerical opponents unceasingly, rebuking them in a "style rude and playne" (1085). Again and again, Colyn acknowledges that his harsh criticism of the clergy may offend them: after all, his "penne" is "sharpe," especially when he is dealing with "all suche rebelles / That laboure to confounde / And bringe the churche to the grounde" (489-94). Even so, he remains unapologetic for airing his grievances and calls those who criticize his verse not only

[70] *Ibid*., 20-22. Kinsman glosses several of the proverbial phrases Colyn deploys. See also Helen Cooper, *Pastoral: Mediaeval into Renaissance* (New York: D.S. Brewer, 1977), 153.
[71] *OED*, s.v. "rail."

graceless but “Great ydeottes” (1130). Based on his ostensible attitude toward the clergy, Colyn seems to be the people’s spokesman *par excellence*.

Yet Colyn is also linked to the clergy, as he reveals when he showcases his learning and styles himself *vox clericorum*.[72] At the outset of the satire, he describes himself as “clerkely” (52), playing on its double meaning of “pertaining to the clergy” and “book-learned.”[73] Near its end, he announces that he is a cleric:

> Though I, Colyn Clout,
> Amongst the hole rout
> Of you that clerkes be,
> Take upon me
> Thus copyously to wryte
> I do it nat for no despite. (1081-86)

Apparently, Colyn is the only person among the whole rout of English clerics brave enough to speak out against the moral turpitude infecting the church. Even before he directly announces he has clerical ties, Colyn hints that he is a man of the cloth when he describes himself as “connynge” (51), or “full of knowledge or learning,”[74] a quality he associates with uncorrupted members of the spirituality. As it turns out, those clerics in need of reform possess “ryght slender connynge / Within theyr heedes” (140-41), and so it comes as no surprise that “In connynge and conversacyon” the people have “none instruction” (267-68). What is more, many members of the English clergy have not mastered the finer points of Aristotelian logic, which is essential to their duties. Colyn describes an unlearned priest:

> He can nothynge smatter
> Of logyke nor scole matter,
> Neyther *sylogysare*,

[72] As Jane Griffiths points out, *Colyn Cloute* “is not a single-voiced protest,” and Colyn even associates himself with the voice of God. See *John Skelton and Poetic Authority: Defining the Liberty to Speak* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006): 162-67.
[73] *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. “clerkly.”
[74] *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. “cunning.”

> Nor of *enthymemare*;
> Nor knoweth not his elenkes,
> Nor his predicamentes[.] (814-19)

Here, we can assume that Colyn knows his way around scholastic debate and that he can syllogize, he knows "his logical refutations" ("elenkes") and the "ten categories of assertion formulated by Aristotle" ("predicaments") (n. 814-19). Colyn, then, is tied to his opponents by vocation and training, but refuses to be complicit in a corrupt ecclesiastical system. In criticizing corrupt clergymen – "I rebuke no man / That vertuous is," he says (1090-91) – Colyn speaks for those like-minded priests who remain unsullied by greed, ambition, and concupiscence and who are untouched by the rampant corruption plaguing the church.

Colyn's simultaneous identification with the people and the clergy is part of his two-fold political strategy. On the one hand, it helps him to create and persuade a diverse reading public, made up of likeminded members of the temporality and spirituality.[75] On the other, the sophisticated rudeness at the heart of Colyn's self-presentation manifests his status as a spokesman for an imagined future church comprised of virtuous laypeople and clergymen. As a spokesman, Colyn must embrace a contradiction: he must be common and singular. Pierre Bourdieu explains this contradiction when he argues that the spokesman must be simultaneously near to and distant from the group he represents. He must present himself as an ordinary member of the collective, even as he purports to be exceptional, a "holder of a sort of pre-emptive right over" it.[76] But Colyn's status as a spokesman is complicated by the fact that he does not represent an easily classifiable group of people; rather he represents two opposed groups, which he hopes will be reconciled in the reformed church, and his self-presentation reflects that. His

---

[75] Like all satires, *Colyn Cloute* runs the risk of encouraging the readers' self-identification with the virtuous rather than seeing themselves in the satirized and amending their ways.
[76] "The Uses of the 'People,'" 152.

flexible use of language allows him to "lay claim to a form of proximity" with both the people and the clergy, even as it constitutes a "break with them."[77] Although Colyn represents his language as idiosyncratic, and indeed it is, his "Rusty and mothe-eaten" (56), rhyme conceals the impulse toward collectivity at the heart of his both self-presentation and his endeavor. Colyn envisions a reformed church that belongs to everyone who is virtuous.

At the end of *Colyn Cloute*, there is a Latin epigraph, in which Colyn self-confidently comments on his literary prowess and his legacy:

> …*Quanquam mea carmina multis*
> *Sordescunt stulte, sed pneumata sunt rara cultis,*
> *Pneumatis altisoni divino flamine flatis.*
> …
> …*quanquam rustica canto,*
> *Undique cantabor tamen et celebrabor ubique,*
> *Inclita dum maneat gens Anglica* … (1-7).
>
> [Although to the multitude my songs are foolishly contemptible, yet they are rare inspirations for the cultivated who are inspired by the divine breath of the sublime spirit …although I sing rustic songs, I shall be sung and celebrated everywhere while the famous English race still remains. (trans. Scattergood)]

This epilogue, with its literary rather than religio-political focus, seems a strange ending to the satire: Colyn does not express interest in his literary reputation in the English portion of the satire, and, when he speaks in Latin, he seems to de-politicize himself, to abandon church reform in favor of his literary afterlife, and to distance himself from a popular readership. Colyn's stated goal, "to be sung and celebrated everywhere while the famous English race still remains," is to enter the English literary tradition. For Colyn, the literary tradition is formed through moments of assertion and distinction. Poets (or, in his case, poetic personae) and their verse must provide "rare inspirations for the cultivated" but they also must participate in a larger collective of

---

[77] *Ibid*., 152.

literary figures, a collective that, in this case, belongs to the "English race." By his own account, Colyn has proved himself distinctive through his inspirational "rustic songs," which men will sing and celebrate until the English cease to exist. The persona thus reveals that he is a form of common property, for he belongs to the English race and its literary tradition, and as such, he becomes available for anyone's use.

Colyn Cloute's epilogue is important because it plays on the fact Colyn is a traditional persona and tied to the author Skelton and makes a case for the poet's posterity, a posterity that is inextricably linked with that of his persona. Each of the sixteenth-century editions of Skelton's *Colyn Cloute* make the connection between the author and the persona clear. The title page indicates that the poem was "compyled by Mayster Skelton, Poete Laureate," an announcement that makes clear the poem issues from the poet, that it is a product of his mind. Throughout the poem, Colyn's semblance to Skelton becomes clear and it becomes obvious that Skelton used the persona to represent a version of himself. Not only does he mention people and places familiar to the poet laureate, his status as an alienated cleric mirrors that of a discontent Skelton, who was also a cleric, and who, thanks to political fallout in the early 1520s, found himself in exile. The epilogue reinforces the connection between author and persona when it refers to the "laurus honoris" or the "laurel crown of honor," which would be word by poet laureates such as Skelton. Colyn laments that, in modern times, the laurel crown has "wast[ed] away" ("tabescit" [9]) because no one who has worn the crown has given it glory. Colyn's earlier self-promotion serves as an announcement: he will revivify the laurel crown and English poetry with his "rare inspirations." This "I" is where author and persona intersect because it simultaneously refers to Colyn, the speaker of the poem, and Skelton, the "I" who also wears a

laurel crown. It is not just Colyn who will become a treasured possession of the English race, but Skelton, too.

Printed six times during the sixteenth century and imitated frequently, *Colyn Cloute* would prove to be one of Skelton's most popular poems, even during the English Reformation.[78] Though some of Skelton's later readers would not dignify him with the name of a poet ("unless some degree of comic humour, and a torrent-like volubility of words in doggerel rhyme, can make one," as the historian Henry Hallam memorably put it[79]), Skelton and his personae had a positive reputation during the mid-sixteenth century.[80] The sixteenth-century reception of Skelton's poetry illustrates just how crucial personae were to the poet's legacy. English reformers valued them for their anti-clericalism – John Bale would remark that the poet "continuously waged war on certain babbling friars" – and criticism of church corruption, and incorporated him into a Protestant literary tradition, as they did with Chaucer and Piers Plowman.[81] For Bale and others, Skelton's anti-clerical personae were evidence of the poet's dissatisfaction with the Catholic church; the personae became a way in which reformers interpreted Skelton the man.

Sixteenth-century reformers' understanding of Skelton's personae can be read with reference to Foucault's seminal essay on the concept of the author. In that essay, Foucault makes a brief and striking claim: he asserts that authorial persona contributed to the "individualization"

---

[78] See Hadfield*, Literature, Politics, and National Identity* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 42-43

[79] From *Introduction to the Literature of Europe in the Fifteenth, Sixteenth, and Seventeenth Centuries* (1837). Cited in Anthony G.S. Edwards, *Skelton: The Critical Heritage* (London, Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981),92.

[80] According to David Lee Miller, "it was during the 1570s that Skelton's reputation reached its high point." See *The Poem's two Bodies: The Poetics of the 1590 Faerie Queene* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988).

[81] For Chaucer's reception in the sixteenth century, see Theresa M. Krier, *Refiguring Chaucer in the Renaissance* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1998) and Alice Miskimin, *Renaissance Chaucer* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975).

of the author.[82] This statement is made in passing, perhaps because Foucault thinks such a statement is self-evident. The narrative seems obvious: an author crafts personae as part of a self-promotional campaign. The persona points to the author who creates it and entices readers to interpret the device as a stand-in for its originator. In so doing, it shapes the public image of the author, something which bears out in Skelton's case. But the narrative is not that simple. Foucault's treatment of authorial personae is cursory and thus it does not flesh out the dynamic reciprocity between the traditional persona and the author that deploys it. The individualization of an author is not a one-way street in which an author uses a persona to shape his public image: rather, once in circulation, the persona is used to understand the author, to create his legacy. Thomas Churchyard's 1568 edition of Skelton's collected works shows the individualization of Skelton in action. The book treats the poet with antiquarian interest, as a figure of England's literary past who has been "drowned in the dust and flong against the wall."[83] The volume takes poems, which were originally published separately, and anthologizes them, thereby creating a sense of wholeness in the poet's *oeuvre* and consistency across the texts he wrote, a consistency which may or may not actually exist. The book works to recuperate the poet and his personae, to recall them from the recesses of cultural memory, and to place them in a shared English literary heritage among Piers Plowman, Chaucer, and Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, as "the culmination of a *still developing* native English poetic tradition," to use the words of Andrew Hadfield. [84]

---

[82] In his seminal essay on authorship, Michel Foucault remarks in passing that the author's persona plays a role in "how the author became individualized." See "What is an Author?" in *The Essential Foucault*, ed. Paul Rabinow (New York: The New Press, 2003), 377.
[83] *Pithy pleasaunt and profitable workes of maister Skelton, Poete Laureate. Nowe collected and newly published*, ed. Thomas Churchyard (London: Thomas Marshe, 1568), A2r.
[84] *Literature, Politics, and National Identity*, 43. For more on Churchyard's volume see John N. King, *English Reformation Literature: The Tudor Origins of the Protestant Tradition* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982), 255.

Colyn Cloute was reprinted in the 1568 volume, and it is here where a twenty-seven-year-old Edmund Spenser likely encountered him as a specimen of politically engaged, English poetry.

The Colin Clout of 1579 is both literary and political, a mixture of the Colyn of Skelton's epilogue and his verse satire. Because it was not printed in Churchyard's edition, there is no way to know whether or not Spenser had the Latin epilogue in mind while composing the *Calender*.[85] Spenser's specific knowledge of the Latin epilogue matters little, however, because the Churchyard volume connects Skelton's literary merit with his proclivity for political commentary, inserting him into an English literary politics and history that Spenser would appropriate through his use of Colin Clout in the *Calender*. By choosing to deploy the Colin persona, Spenser signals his participation in a native Protestant tradition and calls for a reading public to recognize it; he also implicitly appoints himself Skelton's heir and successor, the new poet laureate of England, and characterizes his work as part of Skelton's legacy. At the same time, Colin is inflected by the classical tradition and aligned with Virgil, whose eclogues were viewed as political texts in the early modern period. George Puttenham argues that the pastoral was created as a vehicle for poets, "vnder the vaile of homely persons, to insinuate and glaunce at greater matters;" it is a type of "drammatick" poem that allows a poet to safely discuss issues of political and social importance.[86] Colin is indeed a homely person who glances at great

---

[85] There is a possibility that Spenser encountered the epilogue in manuscript while studying at Cambridge.
[86] *The arte of English poesie*, F3v-F4r. There is a substantial body of criticism on the *Calender's* generic engagements. For further studies see Patrick Cullen, *Spenser, Marvell, and Renaissance Pastoral* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970); A.C. Hamilton, "The Argument of Spenser's *The Shepheardes Calender*," *ELH* 23 (1956): 171-82; S.K. Henninger, Jr., "The Implications of Form for *The Shepheardes Calender*," *Studies in the Renaissance* 9 (1962):309-21; Isabel G. MacCaffrey, "Allegory and Pastoral in *The Shepheardes Calender*," in *Essential Articles for the Study of Edmund Spenser* , ed. A.C. Hamilton (Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1972), 549-68. Michael McCanles "*The Shepheardes Calender* as Document and Monument," *SEL* 22 (1982): 5-19; Catherine Nicholson, "Pastoral in Exile: Spenser and the Poetics of English Alienation," *Spenser Studies* 23 (2008):41-72; Annabel Patterson, *Pastoral and Ideology: Virgil to Valéry* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), ch. 2; Simon Shepherd, *Spenser* (Harvester Wheatsheaf, Hemel Hempstead, 1989); Bruce Smith, "On Reading *The*

political and social matters, something that needs no elaboration.[87] When he unites the Virgilian and English literary traditions in the figure of Colin, Spenser signals the political import of his poetry and he confers prestige onto homely native literature. But Spenser's use of Colin does more than signal the volume's politics. As I will show, Spenser mobilizes the poet-persona to explore the mechanisms by which the (always politicized) English literary history and tradition to which he belongs are facilitated.

The *Calender* is meant to announce the talents of the "New Poet" Immeritô, not advance Colin Clout's literary career. Put simply, Immeritô's goal is to enter into the English literary tradition. The book's dedicatory epistle, written by E.K. and addressed to the Cambridge scholar Gabriel Harvey, plainly lays out Immeritô's agenda. The persona's choice of name is an exercise in feigned modesty. It means "unworthy," and E.K. claims that is "unknowen to most men" and "regarded but of few." Nevertheless, the letter asserts, as soon as people learn about him he will be "beloved of all, embraced of the most, and wondred at of the best" (13). So he is worthy after all. The book's central fiction is one in which a persona (Immeritô) assumes multiple personae in a series of twelve eclogues, each of which corresponds to a month of the year. The principal persona in this fiction is Colin Clout, a shepherd boy whose fragmentary narrative is augmented

---

Shepheardes Calender," *Spenser Studies* 1 (1980): 69-94; Bruce Thornton, "Rural Dialectic: Pastoral, Georgic, and *The Shepheardes Calender*," *Spenser Studies* 9 (1991):1-20.

[87] The *Calender* has garnered a tremendous amount of scholarly attention for its politics. See F.W. Brownlow, "The British Church in *The Shepheardes Calender*," *Spenser Studies* 23 (2008): 1-12; J.P. Conlan, "The Anglicanism of Spenser's May Eclogue," *Reformation* 9 (2004):205-17; Evan Gurney, "Spenser's 'May' Eclogue and Charitable Admonition," *Spenser Studies* 27 (2012): 193-220; James Jackson Higginson, *Spenser's Shepheardes Calender in Relation to Contemporary Affairs* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1912); L. Staley Johnson, "Elizabeth, Bride and Queen: A Study of Spenser's April Eclogue and the Metaphors of English Protestantism," *Spenser Studies* 2 (1981), 75-91; Gregory Kneidel, "Mighty Simplenesse': Protestant Pastoral Rhetoric and Spenser's *Shepheardes Calender" Studies in Philology* 93, no. 3 (1999):275-312; Robert Lane, *Shepheard's Devices* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1993), 101-14; Richard E. Lynn "Ewe/Who?: Recreating Spenser's March Eclogue," *Spenser Studies* 26 (2011): 153-78; Paul E. McLane, *Spenser's Shepheardes Calender: A Study in Elizabethan Allegory* (South Bend: Notre Dame University Press, 1961); and Louis Adrian Montrose, "'Eliza, Queene of shepheardes' and the Pastoral of Power," *ELR* 10 (1980): 153-82.

across several eclogues and in the commentary. Colin is imagined as having achieved Immeritô's goal – in the pastoral world that he inhabits, he is beloved by and embraced of fellow shepherds, all of whom wonder at his talents. The *Calender*, through the Colin narrative, tells a story about what happens to authors who belong to a literary tradtion –because he is part of the public domain, anyone can extend his narrative, borrow him, and/or impersonate him, keeping his legacy alive. His reception in the eclogues and commentary, moreover, demonstrates the consequences of the model of literary history that Immeritô and E.K. articulate in the *Calender*'s paratexts.

The making of literary history is one of the *Calender*'s central concerns. William Kuskin reminds us that there are two different ways of thinking about literary history: we can view it as "a chronological progression of ideas bound by time in which one literary movement follows the next," or we can remember that "books are transcendent of local history and insistent on their terms through their survival in the hands of readers."[88] Kuskin reads the *Calender* as a document concerned with the "involute" nature of literary history, arguing that Spenser does not break from "an irrelevant past" but engages it.[89] For Kuskin, the book's "originality" resides in its idiosyncratic engagement with fifteenth-century literature, especially by the poet John Lydgate. I agree with Kuskin – in the *Calender*, literary history is a process in which writers engage the work of their predecessors, imitating it and incorporating it into their own. New literary works, then, are always informed by the past, and created through a process in which a reader-writer actively takes components of preexisting materials and transforms them into something new. This process might be called imitation by appropriation. One of the ways in which the *Calender*

---

[88] "'The Loadstarre of the English Language,'" 29.
[89] *Ibid*., 30.

mobilizes this understanding of literary history is in its use of two personae: Colin Clout and Immeritô. These personae are traditional personae, in the sense that Spenser hides behind them, and their identities are linked with his. Rather than focus on how Spenser is related to the two personae, a task admirably undertaken by many critics before me, I want to focus on the personae themselves and their relation to one another. Spenser uses them to model what it means for an author to be part of a national literary tradition – a singular artist who belongs to an entire nation – as well as how literary history is written. In the little book, writing literary history is inextricable from the making of a literary tradition. For Immeritô, who poses as the *Calender*'s creator, the formation of a literary tradition and its history are perpetuated by personae like himself. In the book's epilogue, he imagines himself entering into a canon of personae who have preceded him: Chaucer, Tityrus, and the Plowman. Immeritô not only engages them, but tries to overmatch them, and in so doing imagines himself enduring alongside them. He, along with the poet Edmund Spenser for whom he serves as a mask, emerges from the *Calender* both indebted to his predecessors and an agent who shapes the literary tradition and its history.

In the book's dedicatory epistle to Harvey, E.K. calls attention to the way in which Immeritô has drawn on and transformed the texts of the past. It lays out some of the persona's literary debts and his compositional strategy. The persona's choice of genre and his planned career trajectory adhere to a recognizable pattern, which at least six authors – "Virgile," "Mantuane," "Petrarque," "Boccace," "Marot," and "Sanzarus" – have followed. All of these authors composed pastorals before moving on to epic. To borrow E.K.'s metaphor, as fledglings, they tested out their "tender wyngs" with pastoral, before taking the "greater flyght" to epic (18). The *Calender*, E.K. argues, should be compared to the earlier work of these major classical, Italian, and French poets because Immeritô models his work on theirs by following their

"foting." Even so, he warns, the *Calender* should not be considered a derivative exercise, for its composition was an intricate process. There are but "few" people "wel sented" enough to identify Immeritô's literary debts and "trace him out" (19). The persona's compositional practice, E.K. hints, is one in which reading and writing are inextricably linked. Immeritô not only knows the content of his literary models, but he uses them: he combines various elements of his forebears' texts and makes something new Immeritô earns his spot in literary history because he has created a new work through the use of preexisting texts and masterfully imitated his forebears.

When Immeritô speaks in the book's epilogue, he tells a different literary historical narrative. Rather than situating himself in a group of poets who move from pastoral to epic, he writes himself into a collective of traditional personae whom he views as competitors and colleagues. Addressing the book, he says:

> *Go lyttle Calender, thou hast a free passeporte,*
> *Goe but a lowly gate emongste the meaner sorte.*
> *Dare not to match thy pype with Tityrus his style,*
> *Nor with the Pilgrim that the Ploughman playde a while:*
> *But followe them farre off, and their high steppes adore,*
> *The better please, the worse despise, I aske nomore*. (7-12, italics in original)

Here, Immeritô appears to denigrate himself, claiming that he is inferior to two other personae: Tityrus and "the Pilgrim that the Ploughman playde a while." This assertion is cryptic, for the identities of the named personae are unclear: Tityrus is a speaker in Virgil's eclogues, but he is glossed in the *Calender* as both Chaucer and Virgil, and the Plowman is either Piers Plowman, the speaker of *The Plowman's Tale*, or the Plowman who appears in many mid-Tudor poems and dialogues that urge social and ecclesiastical reform. In any case, by virtue of situating himself in relation to Tityrus and the Plowman, Immeritô makes it clear that the *Calender* has political import. His attempts at self-abasement, however, are merely superficial, his relationship with his

forebears complex. In sternly warning his book not to “match [its] pipe with Tityrus his style,” Immeritô tries to forestall any rivalry, even as he betrays the competitive logic underlying his relationship with his predecessors, as “match” carries with it a double meaning, “to equal” and “to rival.”[90] Although couched as a warning to the *Calender*, Immeritô’s imperative – “Dare not” engage Tityrus or the Pilgrim, he commands – is as much about personae as it is about books: the personae who travel together are the speakers of the books, which they synecdochally represent. Immeritô claims he will always lose this piping contest, and keeping with his modest self-presentation, says that, in “follow[ing] them,” he lags behind. Yet he remains with them and adores them, as their follower or adherent.[91] Indeed, the competition the epilogue hints at fosters collegiality, for it suggests that Immeritô is bound to Tityrus and the Plowman by bonds of affection, accompanying and venerating them, if from a distance. Despite his purported inferiority, Immeritô suggests that he and his *Calender* will have a long afterlife, as the little book “shall continewe till the worlds dissolution” (4). Together, the two will endure time, just as the personae in whose footsteps he follows.

Although Immeritô imagines and presents himself and his work differently than E.K. does, they both tell a story in which literary history and the development of a literary tradition are driven by appropriation of texts from the past. Immeritô’s narrative is structured by his engagement with other traditional personae and the texts in which they appear. In asserting and distinguishing himself as the New Poet, he appropriates the language, style, politics, and other aspects of preexisting personae as a means to enter into a native tradition, and his relationship with the Chaucer persona is a case-in-point. Chaucer is not named in the epilogue, but “Goe

---

[90] *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. “match.”
[91] *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. “follower.”

lyttle Calender" is an appropriation of a famous line in *Troilus and Criseyde*: "Go, litel bok, go, litel myn tragedye," Chaucer, the speaker of the verse, says.[92] In fact, the *Calender*'s opening line, "Goe little book: thy selfe present," is itself a variation of this quotation. Immeritô seems to modify Chaucer's verse for self-promotional purposes, to seize his predecessor's mantle, and announce his status as the new premier English poet and Chaucer's heir and successor. But the allusion also analogizes the two personae. The New Poet has the potential to succeed and supplant Chaucer because he is not only like him – his verse is antiquated and his little book, like *Troilus and Criseyde*, is ambitious – but worthy of his company. Immeritô's allusion to Chaucer, then, does two, interrelated types of work. On the one hand, it pulls the medieval persona into the company established in the epilogue; Chaucer joins Tityrus, the Plowman, and Immeritô in a collective of personae. On the other hand, the allusion sheds light on Immeritô's instructions to the *Calender* in the epilogue's penultimate line, "but followe them [Tityrus and the Plowman] farre off, and their high steppes adore" (11). Here, Immeritô commands his little book to follow its predecessors the way in which he follows Chaucer. That is, he endorses an active form of imitation in which one takes what he reads and appropriates it, even when he shows great deference. He does exactly what E.K. describes in his letter to Harvey: he follows his predecessors "foting" and distinguishes himself in the process. By situating himself among Tityrus, the Pilgrim, and Chaucer, Immeritô simultaneously reveals his ambition and styles himself an object for future poaching and veneration.

Yet Immeritô's fantasy of being incorporated into the English literary tradition is not without consequences, for the literary tradition represents a shared literary heritage and belongs to all. To become a part of that tradition, whether as a persona or author, then, is to become

---

[92] Cited from *The Riverside Chaucer*, 3rd ed., ed. Larry D. Benson (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1987), 5.1786.

common and distinctive at once. This fate befell Chaucer, whose literary merits ensured that he became a figure whom all Englishmen held in common. Roger Ascham would compliment “our Chaucer” as a model poet, commenting on his capacity for “describyng lyuely, both the site of places and nature of persons not onely for the outward shape of the body: but also for the in ward disposition of the mynde.”[93] Thomas Speght would characterize Chaucer as the premier English poet when he titled his 1598 folio *The workes of our antient and learned English poet, Geffrey Chaucer*. When Immeritô reveals his ambition to be like Chaucer, he reveals the paradoxical position he wants to hold – he wants future readers, writers, and personae to recognize his literary merit but to think of him as theirs.

Following the meddlesome E.K.’s lead, scholars often read Colin Clout as a stand-in for Immeritô. In his letter to Harvey, E.K. – himself a persona and thus a fictional construction – collapses Colin into Immeritô: “Colin, under whose person the Authour selfe is shadowed,” he says, does not possess “vaunted titles and glorious shows” (18). He repeats this claim in a long-winded gloss to the *Januarye* eclogue: “Colin Cloute) is a name not greatly used …Under which name this Poete secretly shadoweth himself, as sometime did Virgil under the name of Tityrus, thinking it much fitter, then such Latine names, for the great unlikelyhoode of the language” (33). Immeritô seems to encourage this association in the prefatory verse, “To His Booke,” when he refers to himself as a “shepheards swaine” (9). Yet, to take E.K at his word and read these two personae as interchangeable can be risky, especially since he is notoriously unreliable, a known falsifier.[94] To be sure, *The Shepheardes Calender* encourages the reader to think about Colin in

[93]*A report and discourse written by Roger Ascham, of the affaires and state of Germany and the Emperour Charles his court* (London: John Day, 1570), F4r.
[94] E.K.’s reliability and his function in the *Calender* have been a matter of scholarly discussion. See Sherri Geller, “You Can’t Tell a Book by Its Contents: (Mis)Interpretation in/of Spenser’s *The Shepheardes Calneder*,” *Spenser Studies* 13 (1999): 23-64; James Kearney, “Reformed Ventriloquism: *The Shepheardes Calender* and the Craft of

relation to Immeritô, establishing connections between the two personae, but it never completely reduces one to the other. As Harry Berger, Jr. notes, Immeritô "marks his detachment from Colin's personal affairs" in *Januarye*, when he guesses the cause of Colin's grief: "May seeme he lovd, or els some care he tooke" (9).[95] This speculation serves to sever the two personae – Colin is not a projection of a lovelorn Immeritô; he is a literary device, a fictional construction who has, as E.K. observes, had a life in print prior to the publication of the *Calender*. Because the book encourages us to merge Colin with Immeritô, even as it resists identifying one with the other, I would argue that we should consider Colin Clout in relation to his former iterations, particularly the alienated Colyn Cloute and his sophisticated rudeness, in addition to Immeritô.

E.K. elucidates the *Calender*'s "straunge" style in the epistle to Harvey, calling attention to the sophistication of the language. The letter is ostensibly about Immeritô and his word choices, but it is also about Colin, for it is he who speaks in rustic strains throughout the eclogues. Because the two personae are connected through archaic language, E.K.'s discussion serves not just to characterize Immeritô's verse as home-grown English poetry, but also to highlight Colin's linguistic dexterity, which mesmerizes the other shepherds. The book, E.K. tells Harvey, contains "hard" words, which are "of most men unused" (14). Such "olde and obsolete wordes" make the rhyme seem more "ragged" and "rustical," and they confer cultural authority on the work, as the archaisms are "used of most excellent Authors and famouse Poetes" (14). This language is so sophisticated that it requires "a certaine Gloose or scholion for thexposition of old wordes and harder phrases" (19). E.K. says that such commentary "will seeme straunge and rare" in the English tongue, but the practice is common in the learned books

---

Commentary;" "Michael McCanles "*The Shepheardes Calender* as Document and Monument;" William Slights, *Managing Readers: Printed Marginalia in English Renaissance Books* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2001), 46-52; and Evelyn Tribble, 72-87.

[95] *Revisionary Play: Studies in the Spenserian Dynamics* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 329.

of "other nations." What sets the *Calender* apart from other English books, and even the Continental books it emulates, is the use of archaism. Philip Sidney would comment on its stylistic peculiarity in the *Defense*, saying "*The Sheapheards Kalender,* hath much Poetrie in his Eglogues: indeede worthy the reading if I be not deceiued. That same framing of his stile, to an old rustick language, I dare not alowe, sith neyther *Theocritus* in Greeke, *Virgill* in Latine, nor *Sanazar* in Italian, did affect it."[96] E.K. takes a markedly more positive approach to the *Calender*'s style, arguing that the rustic language elevates the poet and his book above "the rakehellye route of our [other English] ragged rymers … which without learning boste, without judgement jangle, without reason rage and fome, *as if* some instinct of Poeticall spirite had newly ravished them above the meanenesse of commen capacitie" (17, emphasis mine). Immeritô affects antiquity, imports words from medieval poets, and the verse is very intricately knitted together. Even English speakers require assistance to understand it.

Though E.K. is at pains to praise and explain the linguistic dexterity that characterizes the *Calender*, he cannot help but point out the commonness of the English in which it is written. Even the most exceptional features of the language are tied to the ordinary. At first, E.K. says that some of the more archaic words and phrases are ripped out of the work of poets of the past, whose verse was "ringing in [Immeritô's] ears" (14). But then he qualifies his assertion: as it turns out, the "olde and obsolete wordes are most used of country folke," bumpkins who reside in the North of England.[97] By focusing on its association with the people, E.K highlights the *Calender*'s less cultivated qualities, in effect debasing it. Despite their ties to the English poets of the past, Immeritô, Colin, and the *Calender* are linked to contemporary rustics.

---

[96] *The defence of poesie* ,I4v.
[97] For an account of dialects in the *Calender*, see Paula Blank, *Broken English: Dialects and the Politics of Language in Renaissance Literature* (New York: Routledge, 1996), ch. 4.

The status of English comes up repeatedly in E.K.'s letter. By referring to the language as "our English tongue" and "our Mother tong," E.K. reminds the book's reader that it is a shared, vernacular language.[98] As such, it becomes a point of identification for Immeritô, E.K., and, most crucially, the book's putative English readers. The language is an essential component of the book's national project, for Immeritô's goal is to become the new *English* poet who preserves an older vocabulary, a figure who is part of England's literary heritage. (Even the materiality of the book, with its "English" typeface, advances Immeritô's agenda.[99]) For E.K., Immeritô's use of archaism marks his effort "to restore, as to their rightfull heritage such good and natural English words, as have ben long time out of use and almost cleare disherited. Which is the onely cause, that our Mother tonge, which truely of it self is both ful enough for prose and stately enough for verse, hath long time ben counted most bare and barrein of both" (16). He seeks to contribute to a preexisting body of English literature and style himself a national poet. Immeritô becomes a figure of national identification precisely because he recuperates a linguistic heritage shared by Chaucer, yokels from the North of England, and any other English person. His linguistic prowess ensures that the New Poet becomes a candidate for the English literary tradition.

---

[98] For a discussion of the concept of the mother tongue in the early modern period, see Margaret Ferguson, *Dido's Daughter's: Literacy, Gender, and Empire in Early Modern England and* France (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), 107-16.

[99] See Steven K. Galbraith, "'English Black-Letter Type and Spenser's *Shepheardes Calender*," *Spenser Studies* 23 (2008):13-40. Cathy Shrank also discusses the materiality of the book in relation to its national agenda. See *Writing the Nation in Reformation England, 1530-1580* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 226. For other discussions of the *Calender*'s materiality see S.K. Henninger, Jr., "The Typographical Layout of *Spenser's Shepheardes Calender*," *in Word and Visual Imagination*, ed. Karl Josef Holtgen, Peter M. Daly, and Wolfgang Lottes (Erlangen, 1988), 33-71; James Kearney, "Reformed Ventriloquism; Ruth Samson Laborsky, "The Allusive Presentation of *The Shepheardes Calender*," *Spenser Studies* 1 (1980): 29-68; Ruth Samson Laborsky, "The Illustrations to *The Shepheardes Calender*," *Spenser Studies* 2 (1981): 3-53; Andrew Wallace, "Edmund Spenser and the Place of Commentary," *Spenser Studies* 22 (2007): 153-71.

In the *Calender*'s pastoral world, language is not imagined as part of any particular national project. Immeritô's poetic style is presented as innovative and unusual, whereas Colin's is not: Colin describes his verse as "rugged and unkempt," but his language befits his social station (*November*, 51). E.K. marvels at and comments on Immeritô's sophisticated rudeness, while Colin's pastoral companions do not comment on his poetic style because they speak the same way he does. Nevertheless, Colin's fellow shepherds regard him as an exceptional poet – he is as well-established as one can be in a pastoral fiction. Like Immeritô, Colin is tied to his countrymen by a shared language, but it is his rare poetic talent that distinguishes him from them.

Although he is celebrated by his fellow shepherds, Colin Clout is presented as an alienated figure. When we first meet him in the *Januarye* eclogue, he is all alone and "complaineth of his unfortunate love," which has "robbed him of all former pleasaunce and delights" (29). As Catherine Nicholson points out, the forlorn persona's "exile" is "self-imposed" – the pastoral world he inhabits affords him no pleasure.[100] He appears by himself in the book's first and last eclogues, and, even when he does associate with others, his isolation is thematized. In *June*, Colin appears with Hobbinoll, and the two discuss the amatory failures that have led to Colin's anti-social behavior. Hobbinoll complains that Colin no longer sings "rymes and roundelays" on "wastfull hylls" (49-50), enchanting his fellow shepherds and inspiring birds to chirp "chereful[ly]" along. Instead, he remains alone and pipes "piteous plaints," which express his "unrest." When asked why he has been shunning his fellow shepherds, Colin replies: "I play to please my selfe, all be it ill," he says (72). His songs are not meant to encourage conviviality or communion with nature because they are designed to serve his self-indulgent purposes.

---

[100] "Pastoral in Exile," 53.

Thenot echoes Hobbinoll's concern in *November*. The eclogue begins with a question: "Colin my deare, when shall it please thee sing, / As thou were wont songs of some jouisaunce?" (1-2) Colin's alienation manifests as melancholy, as he writes sad songs and sings them alone. At the end of the eclogue, Thenot tries unsuccessfully to lift Colin's mood: "Up Colin up," he says, "ynough thou morned hast, / Now ginnes to mizzle [drizzle], hye we homeward fast" (207-08). Thenot fails, and when we see Colin again in *December*, he is preparing to die.

Despite his efforts to isolate himself, it is clear that Colin's fellow shepherds regard him as part of the pastoral community – Thenot and Hobbinoll want him to return from his self-imposed exile – and consider him their premier poet. Though Colin says he only plays to please himself, his songs do serve a social function in the eclogues. They circulate commonly among the shepherds as part of a shared repertory and become sites of sociability. In the *August* eclogue, which E.K. describes as a "delectable controversie," Willye and Perigot have a singing match, and Cuddy serves as the judge. Perigot mentions that he has lost to Colin "in the playne field" before, and, as a result, had to forfeit one of his sheep to the victor – "Sore against my will was I forst to yield," he admits (139). Willye and Perigot have a sing-off to one of Colin's ditties, or, as Perigot says, "Sike a song never heardest thou, but Colin sing" (50). Once the singing contest ends, Cuddy warbles another song of Colin's to delight his companions. The tune having ended, Perigot exclaims, "O *Colin*, *Colin*, the Shepheardes joye, / How I admire ech turning of thy verse" (190-91). Colin's verse is something to marvel at, but so is the persona who originated it. Perigot's use of the genitive "Shepheardes" is thus suggestive, as it simultaneously points to the delight Colin brings to his fellow shepherds and establishes that he is part of their collective.

In the eclogues, the poet-persona Colin is understood to belong to the pastoral community, a shared possession. Immeritô, by contrast, treats him as a different type of common

property: as a literary device, he is available for anyone, including Immeritô, to borrow. And, indeed, if we are to read Colin and Immeritô analogically as the book suggests, then the Colin persona calls attention to Immeritô's status as a literary device and suggests that he, too, runs the risk of being appropriated by others. This happened to the Chaucer persona, who was extracted from his texts and mobilized in new contexts: he appears with John Lydgate, John Skelton, and a host of other poetic personae in Skelton's *Garlande or Chapelett of Laurell* (published 1523); he is an interlocutor, along with John Gower and Robert Greene, in *Greenes Vision* (1592); and he appears to talk to an imagined reader in Speght's *Workes* (1598). The *Calender*'s Colin narrative shows how even a traditional persona can take on a life of its own, beyond its original context, by subjecting Colyn Cloute to imaginative expansion in both the eclogues and commentary. The Colin Clout storyline, then, models what it means to be a canonical author, and shows how such an author's own biography might take on its life of its own, becoming a fiction. The book's treatment of both Colin and Immeritô reveals the contradictory nature of the traditional persona – it is at once a fiction that can be appropriated by others and a mask for the author. The book never completely disentangles the two, but it is clear that Spenser takes pleasure in playing with the inherent doubleness of the persona, teasing the reader with biographical data and suggesting it might be fabricated.

In the *Calender*, Colin is subject to a two-fold form of imaginative expansion. The eclogues narrate his amatory failures and his self-imposed alienation from the pastoral community, while the commentary supplies him with biographical details. The narrative in the eclogues is fragmentary: frequently interrupted and partial, it is augmented in a piecemeal fashion. Sometimes Colin appears to tell his own story, other times it is his pastoral companions who set forth his tale more largely. Each time Colin appears or is invoked, a new dimension is

added to his narrative. In *Januarye*, he appears forsaken by his love. In *Aprill*, Hobbinoll tells us that Colin composes non-love poetry. In *June*, we learn he has a rival called Menalcas. In *August*, Perigot tells us that he used to engage in singing competitions with his pastoral companions. In *November*, he mourns a great lady called Dido. In *December*, he looks back on his life, compares its stages to the four seasons, and prepares to die. The haphazard style of augmentation calls attention to the fact that Colin's story amounts to an accretion of anecdotes, with little to no narrative connecting them, and, as such makes the persona appear fundamentally incomplete and in need of supplementation. Despite the fact that Colin approaches death at the end of the book, by virtue of their genre, the eclogues do not tend toward closure and thus set themselves up for endless augmentation, or sequels about their shepherds, including other narrative fragments. While *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe* (1595) would tell a coherent narrative about Colin's trip to Cynthia's court, the verse miscellany *Englands Helicon* (1600) contributes to the persona's fragmentary narrative on a much smaller scale. Two poems in the volume are attributed to Colin Clout, while one is addressed to him. Based on these poems, one can infer that he continued to produce love poetry ("Colin the enamoured Sheepheard, singeth this passion of loue"), mourned the death of his pastoral companion Astrophil ("Colin Cloutes mournfull Dittie for the death of Astrophell"), and participated in a poetic community with a shepherd called Tonie ("To Colin Clout").[101]

The most surprising form of imaginative expansion in *The Shepheardes Calender* occurs in E.K.'s commentary. In the commentary, E.K. appears to interpret Colin biographically, grafting Immeritô's personal data onto Colin, and at the same time insinuating that they share a

---

[101] *Englands Helicon Casta placent superis, pura cum veste venite, et manibus puris sumite fontis aquam* (London: J. Roberts for J. Flasket, 1600), 2B4r, G1r-v, D3v-D4r. The compiler *of Englands Helicon* extracted the first three stanzas of Spenser's elegy for Sidney (*Astrophel*) and reproduced them in the miscellany ("Colin Clouts mournfull dittie").

biography with Spenser. The *June* eclogue depicts Hobbinoll offering Colin counsel: “Forsake the soyle, that so doth thee bewitch,” he says; leave the pastoral world that constantly reminds you of Rosalind. E.K. annotates the line thus: “This is no poetical fiction, but unfeynedly spoken of the Poete selfe, who for speciall occasion of private affayres (as I have bene partly of himselfe informed) and for more preferment removing out of the Northparts came into the South, as Hobbinoll indeede advised him privately” (114). Throughout the commentary, E.K. confidently supplies partial biographical information, asserting that Rosalind refers to a real person whom Immeritô, and maybe Spenser, loves and that Colin and the author(s) are one and the same. Colin/Immeritô/Spenser, we also learn, is friends with Doctor Gabriel Harvey and an acquaintance of Thomas Smith, the scholar and political theorist. In mapping Spenser/Immeritô’s biographical information onto Colin, E.K. ostensibly makes it difficult to disentangle the two, for it becomes hard to tell where Spenser ends, and where Immeritô and Colin begin.

In his biographical glosses, E.K. often reads the poetry literally. The problem with this strategy is that it forces E.K. to admit his commentary is full of conjecture and leads him to contradict himself. Hobbinoll refers to Colin as “the Southerne shepheardes boye” in the *Aprill* eclogue (21), and E.K. glosses the line eagerly: “*Seemeth* hereby that Colin perteyneth to some Southern noble man, and perhaps in Surrye or Kent, the rather because he so often nameth the Kentish downes” (77, my emphasis). If Colin is in fact Immeritô who is in fact Spenser, and, if E.K. is telling the truth about his friendship with Immeritô, then this gloss should not be so tentative: E.K. would know whether or not Colin/Immeritô was from Surrey or Kent, whether he was a commoner or an aristocrat. But again and again, the glossator acknowledges gaps in his knowledge. Regarding Dido, for whom Colin sings an elegy in *November*, E.K. says, “The person … of Dido is unknowen and closely buried in the Authors conceipt. But out of doubt I

am, that it is not Rosalind, as some imagin: for he speaketh soone after of her also" (196). Who is "the Author" here? Is it Immeritô, or is it Colin, or is it Spenser, the author of the dirge in question? In his glosses, E.K. raises the question that nearly all critics of the traditional persona has. How do we know where the author ends and the fiction begins?

One might interpret E.K. as being obtuse, a reductive reader who cannot, or will not, differentiate between two distinct personae, but I would suggest that his biographical reading is more sophisticated than meets the eye. By connecting Immeritô and Colin in his glosses, he is treating the personae like the malleable devices they are, extending both their narratives. The purpose of the biographical glosses is twofold. First, by mapping Immeritô's biographical details onto Colin, E.K. supplements the narrative of the eclogues by giving him a back-story. In so doing, he performs the type of narrative augmentation that the eclogues invite. Second, by using Colin as a window into Immeritô's biography, E.K. provides more information about the mysterious New Poet, information which might enhance his reputation and be incorporated into future representations of the persona. E.K.'s extensions of the Immeritô persona's narrative suggest that, like Colin, he is fundamentally incomplete and in need of being set forth more largely. His annotations thus have the effect of enacting and inviting narrative augmentation, and that is precisely what happened with the publication of *Three proper, and wittie, familiar letters*, which provides more information about Immeritô and his relationship with the scholar Gabriel Harvey. At the same time, his manipulation of the persona has the effect of providing an interpretation of the author Spenser. The personae, that is, become Foucauldian in the sense that they contribute to the individualization of the author, shaping his public image, a public image that is surprisingly malleable. Relying on personae for the creation of an authorial biography can

be tricky; it can mean that biography turns out to be fiction because it is based on fiction (as Speight's sixteenth-century biography of Chaucer bore out).

E.K. obsessively associates Immeritô and Colin Clout, but without his insistence the connection between the two personae would not be as strong. Immeritô invites us to think about his relationship to Colin in terms of likeness: the verse that each produces is at once studied and rude, and both are treated as great poets, Immeritô by E.K., Colin by his pastoral companions. At the same time, the book maintains that the personae are two distinct entities: Immeritô, the New Poet, and Colin Clout, a new incarnation of Colyn Cloute refashioned and mobilized by Immeritô. By analogizing himself to Colin, Immeritô reveals his ambition: the New Poet wants to be Our Poet. In order to achieve his goal, Immeritô must become a "home-bred" figure that belongs to England's literary past and someone who can be refashioned and mobilized in order to inaugurate its future. He must become like Colin Clout. And while Immeritô never became like Colin Clout, Spenser did. By the time of his death, or, to use Weever's phrase, by the time he had "gone home," Colin Clout was understood to be Spenser's default alter-ego, the poet's favorite mask, and so bound up in the author's legacy. Colin's verse, even to this day, is used to interpret Spenser's understanding and appraisal of his career, to help us interpret the author. Spenser's poetry is held in high regard, even as he is treated as a shared possession – just like Colin. And so life imitates art.

Colin Clout and the Dead Poet's Society

The Shepheardes Calender ends on a gloomy note. Alone, Colin meditates on impending death and bids his friends "adieu" (*December* 156). The shepherd boy, now turned old man, seems to be saying his final farewell; the eclogue offers no indication that he will appear in print again. Colin's good-bye and his apparently imminent death, however sad they may be, offer

Immeritô an opportunity to detach himself from Colin, to outlive the poetic persona with whom the *Calender* associates him, and to appear on his own, in new contexts. And so he did. Immeritô would come into print with his correspondent Doctor Harvey in *Three proper, and wittie, familiar letters* (1580), but even then he could not get out from Colin's shadow. Harvey merges one persona into the other, refering to Immeritô's wife as "*mea Domina Immerito, mea bellissima Collina Clouta," "my mistress Immeritô, my most beautiful Mrs. Colin Clout."*[102] *It would not be until the 1590s that the two personae were severed completely, and Colin became very closely associated with Spenser in the1595 publication of Colin Clouts Come Home Againe. Colin would appear in print twice more: he appears in Book 6 of Faerie Queene (1596), in "a place, whose pleasaunce did appere / To passe all others, on the earth which were" piping with the Graces, and, as I noted above, we get brief glances of him in Englands Helicon (*6.x.5.4-5). *Though the Calender promotes Immeritô as someone who would be "beloved by all" and have a robust afterlife, it was Colin, not Immeritô, who in the 1590s would be praised for his "diuinest skill"* [103] *and called "so bright a sunne, / Who hath the Palme for deepe inuention wonne."*[104] *It was Colin who would have a larger presence in late-Elizabethan literary culture and was a key figure for understanding Spenser and his legacy.*

The Calender was reprinted in 1591, and it introduced Colin Clout to a new generation of readers. William Ponsonby, the publisher of the Colin Clouts volume, presumably perceived a market for the persona and capitalized on it, using both Colin and Spenser as selling points for the 1595 volume – both the author's and the persona's names are advertised on the title page. As a form of advertisement, the book's title page, as Michael Saenger has argued, is directed toward

---

[102] *Three proper, and wittie, familiar letters: lately passed betweene two vniuersitie men* (London: Henry Bynneman, 1580), F3r.
[103] Michael Drayton, *Endimion and Phoebe* (London: James Roberts for John Busby, 1595), Gv.
[104] Thomas Lodge, *Phillis* (London: James Roberts for John Busbie, 1593), A4v.

a “crucial act of reader-response,” or “the purchase,”[105] and this particular volume entices buyers by highlighting Colin’s narrative. The title page is understated and does not use lavish or sensational terms to attract purchasers; nor does it provide background information on Colin. Rather, it seems to assume that the reader-buyer knows who Colin Clout is, and thus, I would argue, seeks to sell books to a niche market, a reading public who has read the *Calender* and/or other works about the persona, and who would like to read more from them.

The *Colin Clouts* volume is not just comprised of *Colin Clouts Come Home Again*, however. It features seven poems not advertised on the title page, all of which are elegies for Philip Sidney, who died in 1586. The inclusion of these elegies is peculiar because, by the time of their publication, Sidney had been dead for almost a decade, most of the elegies appear in other anthologies, and they are not mentioned on the title page.[106] Stranger still: they occupy more page space (forty-one pages) in the volume than the titular poem (thirty-two pages). Rather than focusing on the relationship between the longer narrative poem and the elegies, scholars working on the *Colin Clouts* volume tend to study it in discrete units. They either examine *Colin Clouts Come Home Again*, often focusing on its Irish elements, its relation to Spenser’s biography, and its attitude toward Elizabeth’s court, or they focus on the elegies, particularly *Astrophel* and “The Lay of Clorinda,” their authorship, and how they perpetuate the myth of Sidney.[107] By examining the book in pieces, these scholars overlook two crucial questions: Why

---

[105] “The Birth of Advertising,” 197.

[106] For the textual history of the seven elegies, see Raphael Falco, *Conceived Presences: Literary Genealogy in Renaissance England* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1994), 87-94.

[107] For *Colin Clouts Come Home Again*, see Patrick Cheney, “Spenser’s Pastorals;” Jerome Dees, “Colin Clout and the Shepherd of the Ocean,” *Spenser Studies* 15(2001): 185-96; Andrew Hadfield, *Literature, Politics, and National Identity*, 188. Lin Kelsey, “Spenser, Ralegh, and the Language of Allegory,” *Spenser Studies* 17(2003): 183-213; Richard McCabe, “Shorter Verse Published in 1590-95,” in *A Critical Companion to Spenser Studies*, ed. Burt van Es (Baskingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 166-87; Benjamin Meyers, “The Green and the Golden World: Spenser’s Rewriting of the Munster Plantation,” *ELH* 76, no. 2(2009): 473-90; William Oram, “Spenser’s Audiences,” *Studies in Philology* 100, no. 4 (2003): 514-33; Sue Pettit Starke, “Briton Knight or Irish Bard;” Burt

are there so many elegies in a book that is ostensibly about Colin Clout? And what is the volume trying to accomplish?

The two critics who have studied the book as a single unit, Raphael Falco and Patrick Cheney, emphasize its significance in English literary history. They agree that it promotes "the Sidney-Spenser relation as the literary genealogy inaugurating modern English literature," and, Cheney adds, "it is the first book in English literature to feature the national poet [Spenser] as the center of a national community of fellow poets and civic leaders, especially Ralegh and Queen Elizabeth, who were themselves poets."[108] Building on the work of Falco and Cheney, I want to examine the *Colin Clouts* volume as a book, I shall focus on the volume's personae, Colin Clout and Astrophil, exploring how they are used to situate Spenser and Sidney into the English literary tradition. Although the biographical connections between Colin and Spenser and Astrophil and Sidney are undeniable, the volume also treats the two personae as fictional constructions and subjects them to imaginative expansion. I will thus consider the personae as authorial alter-egos, though I will not spend a lot of space doing so. In the volume, Sidney and Spenser are always present, and through the manipulation of their most famous personae, the volume crowns the premier English poets. I will instead spend most of this section reading the personae on their own, fictional terms and show that, by manipulating the literary devices, the volume narrativizes the literary historical process as ongoing, driven by the use of previously

---

van Es *Spenser's Forms of History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003); and J. Christopher Warner, "Poetry and Praise in *Colin Clouts Come Home Again*," *Studies in Philology* 94 (1997): 368-81. For the elegies see Pamela Coren, "Edmund Spenser, Mary Sidney, and the *Doleful Lay*," *SEL* 42, no. 1 (2002): 25-41; G.W. Pigman, *Grief and English Renaissance Elegy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985); Anne Lake Prescott, "*Grief and English Renaissance Elegy*," G.W. Pigman, *Spenser Newsletter* 16 (1985): 63; Peter M. Sacks, *The English Elegy: Studies in the Genre from Spenser to Yeats* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985); Theodore Steinberg, "Spenser, Sidney, and the Myth of Astrophel," *Spenser Studies* 11 (1990): 187-202; and G.F. Waller, *Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke: A Critical Study of Her Writings and Literary Milieu* (Salzburg, Austria: Salzburg University Press, 1979).

[108] "*Colin Clouts Come Home Again*, *Astrophel*, and *The Doleful Lay of Clorinda* (1595)," in *The Oxford Handbook of Edmund Spenser*, 239. See also Falco's *Conceived Presences*, 52-123.

written materials, as the *Calender* does. The book, in other words, is only able to initiate a new era in English literary history because it engages with and appropriates its textual forebears. Updated for the 1590s, Colin becomes a figure of the past and the present, a link between a long-standing literary tradition and its future.

The *Colin Clouts* volume signals its participation in the literary tradition established in the *Calender* through its inclusion of Colin Clout. *Colin Clouts Come Home Again* purports to continue Colin's narrative outside of the *Calender* – the persona, for instance, keeps the readers apprized of his feelings for Rosalind – and there are indeed continuities between the two shepherd boys: they both produce exceptional verse and reside in a pastoral community, and they are both mobilized in the service of a model of literary history dependent upon engagement with the past. Nevertheless, the principal persona of the *Colin Clouts* volume is a modified version of his predecessor. Not only is he younger, and much happier, than the near-death melancholic who closes out the *Calender*, but Spenser figures him as an object of demand whose afterlife depends on there being a market for him and his poetry. In so doing, he explores the link between the marketplace of print and literary posterity, a concern that is absent from the *Calender*. In commodifying Colin, *Colin Clouts Come Home Again* articulates a fantasy of widespread fame, a fantasy that is reiterated in *Faerie Queene* when the narrator asks "Who knows not Colin Clout?" (6.x.16.4) Colin, however, was likely a niche figure, known to a select group of literary readers, not book-buyers on a mass scale.[109] Nevertheless, the book's presentation of the persona is worth examining because it shows that "high" literary texts, which we typically think of as

---

[109] Andrew Hadfield argues that this question "could be taken to denote the author's sense of his own obscurity rather than his popularity. See *Literature, Politics, and National Identity*, 172.

being unconcerned with the book trade, were interested in the marketplace of print and their own vendibility, linking the consumption of books to their afterlives.

Colin Clouts Come Home Again represents its eponymous persona as an object of demand. From the outset, the poem establishes that many are desirous to hear Colin playing "his oaten pipe" (5). As he sits piping, a host of shepherds listens "with greedie listfull eares" (6), and they "stand astonisht at his curious skill" (7). When he stops, the shepherds beseech him to sing more, with Hobbinoll, Colin's closest companion from the *Calender*, asking him to tell his auditors about his recent trip to Cynthia's court. Colin obliges, and the shepherds draw closer: they "throng about him neare / With hungrie eares to heare his harmonie" (52-53). The tale is digressive and frequently interrupted by shepherds who want clarification on a particular event or more details about his travels. When Colin tells them about his interaction with the Shepherd of the Ocean, Cuddy, "a bonie swaine" who also appears in the *Calender*, asks for more information: "I would request thee Colin, for my sake, /To tell what thou didst sing, when he did plaie" (83-84). After Colin reproduces his lay, Thestylis interjects and asks a follow up question: "What dittie did that other shepheard sing? / For I covet most the same to heare" (160-61). Unsurprisingly, Colin grants her request.

The poem's narrative, propelled by interruptions and digressions, could be described as long and rambling. Whether the poem's length and lack of coherence should be thought of as good or bad, it is productive to think about why the poem might be structured in such a way. I would argue that the poem and its narrative are structured by consumer demand – Colin's pastoral companions eagerly listen to tales from his travels, but what he reveals to them is determined by their leading questions. When his tale becomes uninteresting or tedious to his auditors, they interrupt, asking him to recount something new. After a lengthy digression on the

shepherd-poets in Cynthia's court, an annoyed Lucida exclaims, "Shepheard, enough of shepheards thou hast told … But of so many Nymphs which she doth hold / In her retinew, thou hast nothing sayd" (457-60). Shortly thereafter, Aglaura grows exasperated with his description of the nymphs and commands, "Finish the storie which thou hast begun" (584). Although his auditors have different interests and become pushy when bored, all are desirous to hear more of his narrative, and each digression aims to satisfy his listeners' demands, even as it provokes new questions. By the poem's end, Colin's companions have not had their fill of his harmony and are thereby "loth to depart," even though darkness has begun to fall.

The episodic structure of *Colin Clouts Come Home Again* may be priming readers for future publications featuring Colin. The poem progresses linearly, but its structure is actually digressive, driven only by the questions of Colin's audience. Colin's pastoral companions, with their constant interruptions, cause him to create truncations and gaps in the narrative. They cut him off while he is in the middle of long descriptions, and in so doing allow him to tease the reader with the details of his travel only to withhold them. The poem's very structure, thus, seems to open up more space for augmentation. It is an incomplete journey that could be supplemented in other books. If this is the case, then we might read the poem as an unsuccessful marketing venture. Besides the *Colin Clouts* volume, there are no books whose sole focus is Colin Clout, his life, and his adventures.

Colin Clouts Come Home Again's investment in consumer demand is motivated by more than a desire to commodify Colin, or make more money by spurring the publication of more books. Instead, the poem is interested in Colin's literary afterlife and the market's role in perpetuating it. Colin tells his auditors that he has a plan for keeping Cynthia in perpetual

memory. "Her name recorded I will leave for ever," he says, playing upon that well-known immortality-by-verse cliché (631):

> And long while after I am dead and rotten
> Amongst the shepheards daughters dancing rownd,
> My layes made of her shall not be forgotten,
> But sung by them with flowry gyrlonds crownd. (640-43)

But it is not just Cynthia whom Colin hopes to immortalize in verse. He wants to do the same for himself. He refers to the "layes" about Cynthia with the possessive pronoun "my" and in so doing calls attention both to his role in immortalizing her and the fact that it is him and his lays that will live on with her. Earlier in the poem, Alexis makes this connection clear: "By wondering at thy *Cynthiaes* praise, / Colin, thy selfe thou mak'st us more to wonder, / And her raising, doest thy selfe upraise" (353-55). Colin's and Cynthia's places in posterity, then, are contingent on the continual reproduction and consumption of his poetry. Though the trope here suggests oral transmission – and indeed it was familiar long before the advent of print – it can be read in terms of the marketplace of print because of its emphasis on the replication and dissemination of Colin's verse. In this case, the commodification of the persona is integral to his posterity. After all, it is a printed volume in which we find Colin advertised, and in which his verse is mechanically reproduced, put to sale, and offered for consumption in the marketplace.

In *Colin Clouts Come Home Again*, the market is figured as a vehicle that can facilitate Colin's literary life-after-death, not as a lowbrow place where people buy and sell wares. Both talent and consumption ensure Colin's future notoriety. Although Colin never brings up the marketplace directly, his self-advertisement – he reminds readers about two other printed books in which he appears, the *Calender* and *Daphnaïda* (1591) – in conjunction with his interest in the reproduction and consumption of his poetry, reveals his interest in it. In the early modern period, Colin could have a literary afterlife outside of print, but the *Colin Clouts* volume had special

appeal to reader-book-buyers, men and women who would pick up the present volume and the others in which he appears in book stalls. The print market, that is, makes him visible to the people who would not encounter him in manuscript. Some of the responsibility for Colin's literary afterlife, then, falls on future consumers of his poetry and to printers and publishers like William Ponsonby, for it is they who make his poetry available to book-buyers. Because the publication of literary texts was "speculative," to use Zachary Lesser's and Alan Farmer's familiar terminology, printers and publishers, as businessmen interested in turning a profit, would only purchase copy and sell books if they suspected that there would be consumer demand.[110] Consumption – buying and reading – not only confers literary and economic value on Colin, but it registers that value, both in his own pastoral community, where his lay to Cynthia will be sung until the end of time, and in English bookstalls, where the continual demand of buyers will push him into perpetuity. The commodification of Colin Clout, then, cannot be thought of as a debasement, but as a means to future glory.

The *Colin Clouts* volume thus establishes a connection between Colin's economic life and his literary afterlife, the marketplace and his literary reputation. As I noted in the Introduction, Pierre Bourdieu has theorized the modern literary field, arguing that it is seemingly opposed to the economic field. The literary field is highbrow, and, with its high art associations, is governed by competition, not for money, but for "consecration," prestige, and symbolic capital. The mass market, on the other hand, is lowbrow, and "literary" writers who try to earn a place in the literary field tend to repudiate success in the economic field as base.[111] Bourdieu's distinction between marketplace and literary prestige cannot apply to the *Colin Clouts* volume,

---

[110] "The Popularity of Playbooks Revisited," 14.
[111] Bourdieu advances this theory in "The Field of Cultural Production, or: The Economic World Reversed," 29-73.

however, because it was a product of an historical moment in which the market was not opposed to the field of artistic production, and in fact it shows that before the development of a true mass market, the literary and economic fields were entwined. The *Colin Clouts* volume, in other words, tries to confer both literary and economic prestige on Colin. To be sure, the market that the *Colin Clouts* volume tries to activate and/or perpetuate is not the mass market Bourdieu describes; the book has a more modest goal of producing a profit in a niche market comprised of literary readers. But even niche markets are driven by consumer demand, and commercial success remains imperative. Colin Clout, who embodies "high literature" to nearly all scholars of English literature and to early modern audiences, is marketed to book-buyers, and his potential saleability is not presented negatively. In fact, the volume consecrates the persona by packaging him as a vendible poet. His commercial viability did not detract from his perceived literary value in the early modern period; rather, it was a measure of his worth.

In *Colin Clouts Come Home Again*, consumer demand and literary value go hand-in-hand: Colin's pastoral companions want to hear him and book-buyers are interested in the volumes in which he appears precisely because he is a talented poet. Indeed, the volume endorses Colin Clout (and with him Spenser) as an exceptional national poet, both in the narrative of *Colin Clouts Come Home Again* and through its association of Colin and Astrophil in the elegies. In the book, Astrophil (and with him Philip Sidney) is imagined as the recently deceased national poet, and Colin is presented as his successor. In the book, the death of one persona paves the way for another to take his place, and literary history is imagined linearly, as a succession of events. Astrophil's death also enables the book to rearticulate and readjust a well-established literary tradition and to narrate a key moment in English literary history, through the use of previously written texts. The *Colin Clouts* volume thus makes use of the two

complementary versions of English literary history that Kuskin describes. At the same time, the books use of Astrophil shows how a persona can be manipulated to understand and shape a poet's, in this case Sidney's, legacy. Ponsonby was not just selling a book about a traditional literary figure; a revised version of the English literary tradition was part of the package.

In the *Colin Clouts* volume, Astrophil, the figure that emerges from the seven elegies – *Astrophel*, "The Lay of Clorinda," "The mourning Muse of Thestylis," "A pastorall Aeglogue," "An Elegie, or friends passion, for his Astrophill," "An Epitaph vpon the right Honourable sir Phillip Sidney, knight," and "Another of the same" – is peculiar because he is a composite, a mingle-mangle of the speaker of *Astrophil and Stella*; Philisides, a shepherd from *Arcadia*; and the deceased Philip Sidney. The elegies blur biographical fact with fiction, and in so doing create a particular persona: a beloved English poet who died in service of the state. By inserting Sidney's biographical data into Astrophil's narrative and suggesting that Astrophil and Philisides are one and the same, the elegies tell a story about a new national poet, Colin Clout, rising to prominence. If Astrophil comes to represent a Sidnean English poetic tradition, then his successor, Colin, who represents an already established and different poetic tradition associated with Skelton, stakes a claim in it and becomes its next spokesman, thereby merging the two traditions.

The *Colin Clouts* volume fictionalizes the intense emotional reaction to Philip Sidney's death through its use of the *Astrophil and Stella* storyline. In the fictional world of the elegies, Astrophil is the most beloved poet whose death causes widespread mourning. To this end, they subject the sonnet sequence to imaginative expansion, altering its setting to a pastoral community and rehearsing Stella's reaction to her lover's death. The change in setting allows the elegies to integrate the dead shepherd-poet into a localized community and to trace the impact of his death

as it extends outward from Stella to his fellow shepherds. Colin Clout, the speaker of *Astrophel*, describes how Stella watches the "Gentle Shepheard borne in *Arcady*" (1) die and its effect on her – "She bathed [his face] oft with teares and dried oft: / And with sweet kisses suckt the wasting breath (164-65), and then dies of a broken heart. News of Astrophil's death travels beyond Stella, reaching all the residents of his pastoral community, shepherds who do not suffer death-by-grief but weep together. The "shepheards *all* which loved him full deare" (200, my emphasis), Colin tells us, come together in a scene of collective mourning in which "every one," overcome by their "anguish and great griefe" (205-07), cries and moans. Never, Colin tells us, was "like mourning seen" (210). Thestylis, the speaker of "The mourning Muse of Thestylis," recounts a similar scenario: Stella responds to Astrophil's death with pearl-like tears and rent-hair. "Alas and woe is me," she declares, wringing her hands; "[W]hy should my fortune frowne / On me thus frowardly to rob me of my ioy?[112] Stella's lament is not anomalous; rather, it joins the chorus of communal mourning the poem describes. Thestylis says that nothing "was to be heard but woes, complaints & mone" (Hv). Astrophil's death may have a profound impact on his lover, but it has an equally devastating effect on the pastoral community of which he is a part. In "An Elegie, or friends passion, for his *Astrophill*," he is called "our *Astrophill*" (H4v), and Lycon, a speaker of "A pastorall Aeglogue," refers to his death as a "greeuous losse of owres" (H2r). Grief over Astrophil's death is shared by all the members of the community to which he belongs; it is *our* grief.[113]

---

[112] *Colin Clouts come home againe* (London: Thomas Creede for William Ponsonby, 1595), G4r. The Yale edition of Spenser's poetry, from which I cite *Colin Clouts Come Home Again* and "The Lay of Clorinda," only contains *Astrophel* and "The Doleful Lay of Clorinda." I will cite the other five elegies from the 1595 volume, by signature number, in the text above.

[113] Collective, national mourning for the death of Sidney was a common trope in elegies dedicated to him. See Falco, *Conceived Presences*, 52-94. For another study that addresses the totality of elegies dedicated to Sidney, see Gavin Alexander, *Writing after Sidney: The Literary Response to Sir Philip Sidney, 1586-1640* (Oxford: Oxford University

Like Colin Clout in the *Calender*, Astrophil belongs to a collective, but he possesses exceptional poetic talent – he is simultaneously common and singular. The shepherds in the elegies mourn a well-known member of their community – "who knew not *Astrophill*," a mourner asks (I3r) – and they weep for the loss of a premier poet, with one elegy ("An Epitaph") calling him the "the Petrarch of our time" (K3r). Colin Clout, in *Colin Clouts Come Home Again*, states that "while *Astrofell* did live and raine" no one was "his Paragone" (450-51), and, in *Astrophel*, he says that Astrophil was so talented that "many a Nymph both of wood and brooke" thronged about him as he piped, ravished by his "enchanting skill" (43-46). Another elegist commenting on Astrophil's poetic skill says that, despite his untimely demise, he remains "aboue all others" because his verse survives him and reveals his "vertuous" qualities (I4r). Astrophil becomes a figure of local identification, and the residents of his pastoral abode recognize his verse as part of the community's own literary output. The death of "our" Astrophil affects the pastoral community's literary production, for, with Astrophil's passing, the flow of his poetry, the great poetry of his pastoral habitat, ceases.

The elegies' presentation of Astrophil is complicated by their inclusion of Philip Sidney's biographical data into his narrative. Not only do some of the poems mention Sidney's name in their titles, but direct allusions to the deceased knight litter the verse: Thestylis mentions "great *Philips* fall" (G3r) and calls the subject of her verse "worthie *Phillip* immortall, / The flowre of *Sydneyes* race" (H2r); another speaker nominates "Phillip" his "liues [sic.] content" and declares Sidney's death "the cause of all [his] woe" (K4r); and still others recount Philip Sidney's death in battle. Attaching Sidney's biographical information to Astrophil's narrative allows the elegies

---

Press, 2006), 56-75. Arthur Marotti also discusses some of the Sidney elegies in *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995), 234-36 and 310-17.

to make a statement about English literature. Invoking Sidney shifts the poetry's focus away from a fictional pastoral world to England, and renders Astrophil a figure of national identification, his death the cause of an entire nation's grief. Moreover, the conflation of Astrophil and Sidney enables the volume to position itself in English literary politics. Given that *Astrophil and Stella* uses the language of love to speak politics, the Astrophil persona already provides a connection between English literature and court politics.[114] But when the elegies connect Astrophil and Sidney, they ensure that the persona they memorialize cannot be separated from English political culture writ large – Astrophil becomes a singular poet and Protestant martyr. When the elegies enshrine him, they celebrate a home-grown, politically engaged literary figure, and in so doing suggest that the contemporary English literature, which Astrophil represents, is inextricable from national politics. The brief mention of Philisides, which occurs in "A pastorall Aeglogue," also suggests that the national poet is in effect a political figure, for Philisides, a persona in the *Old Arcadia* often associated with Sidney, provides veiled commentary on the aristocracy and Elizabeth's court.[115] Although the elegies in the *Colin Clouts* volume do not comment extensively on contemporary English politics, their manipulation of Sidney's biography and his personae point to their endorsement of a particular kind of

---

[114] For the politics of *Astrophil and Stella* see Ann Rosalind Jones and Peter Stallybrass, "The Politics of *Astrophil and Stella*," *SEL* 24, no. 1 (1984): 53-68; Arthur Marotti, "Love is Not Love": Elizabethan Sonnet Sequences and the Social Order," *ELH* 49, no. 2 (1982): 396-428; and Richard C. McCoy, *Sir Philip Sidney: Rebellion in Arcadia* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1979).

[115] For Philisides and early modern English politics, see Edward Berry, *The Making of Sir Philip Sidney* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998), 63-101; Annabel Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England*, 33-36 ; Martin Raitiere, *Faire Bitts: Sir Philip Sidney and Renaissance Political Theory* (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1984), 57-58; Robert Stillman, "The Politics of Sidney's Pastoral: Mystification and Mythology in *The Old Arcadia*," *ELH* 52 (1985): 795-814; and Blair Worden, *The Sound of Virtue: Philip Sidney's* Arcadia *and Elizabethan Politics* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), 266-94 and 347-54.

contemporary Protestant literature for which Astrophil, and by default Sidney, becomes a figurehead.[116]

The two parts of the *Colin Clouts* volume work together to secure Colin's place as Astrophil's successor, a poet from whom he descends and for whom he mourns. One of the ways that the volume accomplishes this task is to characterize Colin as the deceased poet-persona's most talented and prominent mourner. Some of the elegies seem to suggest that in the wake of Astrophil's death poetry has been supplanted by weeping. In "The Lay of Clorinda," Clorinda orders her fellow shepherdesses to destroy their "gyrlonds" and instead "weare sad Cypres" and "bitter Elder" as symbols of mourning (41-42): never "sing the love-layes which he [Astrophil] made," she commands (43), for "mery glee is now laid abed" (47). But, as Clorinda's elegy shows, Astrophil's fellow shepherds will go on singing and versifying, producing verse in honor of their dead companion. Chief of these mourners is Colin Clout, who receives pride of place in the elegies, as his appears first. In another elegy, "A pastorall Aeglogue," one Lycon converses with Colin and expounds on his exceptional talent, claiming that Colin is the only person who can sing dirges worthy of Astrophil. He addresses Colin thus: "Vp iolly swaine, / Thou that with skill canst tune a dolefull lay," and explains that he (Lycon) is not capable of leading a mourning song:

> … My hart with grief doth freese,
> Hoarse is my voice with crying, else a part
> Sure would I beare, though rude: But as I may,
> With sobs and sighes I second will thy song,
> And so expresse the sorrowes of my hart. (H2r-v)

[116] For the political uses of the elegies written in the wake of Sidney's death, see Alan Hager, "The Exemplary Mirage: Fabrication of Sir Philip Sidney's Biographical Image and the Sidney Reader," *ELH* 48 (1981): 1-16.

Lycon opposes Colin's "skill" to his own "rude" verse, and then goes on to call Colin his teacher – "Instruct me," he says, following Colin's lead throughout the eclogue. Lycon's praise, coupled with his willingness to play second fiddle to his fellow shepherd, ensures that Colin's poetic talent is on display. And the eclogue allows Colin to express his grief for the third time in the volume, an opportunity that no other shepherd gets. Colin may be given more page space to grieve because, according to the elegies, he is both talented and, while Astrophil lived, he was an intimate friend, a part of his circle.[117] In *Astrophel*, he declares that the dead shepherd was "dearest unto mee" (150), and Lycon says that Astrophil "cherisht" Colin's "lerned *Muse*" "most" (H4v). With Astrophil's death and the loss of his company, Colin's voice becomes the most remarkable mourning voice in the pastoral world he inhabits and, by extension, England. What makes Colin a figure of national identification is that he is part of a community of grieving shepherds and Englishmen – he could be anyone affected by Astrophil's, or Sidney's, death – and because his poetic talent makes him conspicuous.

Astrophil's death opens the door for a new poet-persona to take his place, and, on cue, Colin Clout, ascends onto the national stage. The book enacts this transition in two ways. First, it gestures toward Colin's rise materially: not only is he given sole billing on the title page, but *Colin Clouts Come Home Again*, which advertises the persona's talent and, as we have seen, dilates on his potential for literary posterity, comes before the elegies. The volume thus privileges Colin, not Astrophil, by design, and in so doing points forward to a new era of English literary history spearheaded by Spenser whose name is linked with Colin's on the title page. But the volume, through its use of personae, also demonstrates how literary historical progress is

---

[117] This elegy participates in what Kevin Pask calls a "cultural fantasy of imagined proximity to Sidney." See *The Emergence of the English Author: Scripting the Life of the Poet in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 88. And, as Alexander notes, in the late sixteenth century, the pastoral mode was often used to "imagine the new configuration of the literary scene." See *Writing After Sidney*, 71.

driven by engaging the literature of the past, no matter how recent it may be. The book sets up a literary genealogy through textual poaching, the reimagining, augmentation, and conclusion of *Astrophil and Stella*'s storyline, killing Astrophil and giving him a poetic heir. Although Astrophil and Colin were contemporaries, the former's death renders him part of England's literary past, his verse part of the nation's shared literary heritage. By virtue of his national stature, Astrophil is treated as the progenitor of an English literary tradition that is associated with court politics and militant Protestantism.[118] Colin participates in and perpetuates this tradition through his famous criticism of the court in *Colin Clouts Come Home Again*, but he is not an exact replica of his predecessor.[119]

Colin does not just propagate a literary tradition initiated in the 1580s because he, too, is a figure of England's literary past, transported from his previous contexts, and altered to fit the volume's needs. He is taken, most immediately from the *Calender*, as *Colin Clouts Come Home Again* reminds us. The poem's opening lines prompt its readers to think of the persona's previous incarnation, with an allusion to the *Calender*: "The shepheards boy (best knowen by that name) / That after *Tityrus* first sung his lay." And, although the poem rejuvenates the persona, its denouement brings up the *Calender* once more, when the shepherd boy's companions ask him about Rosalind, that "thing celestiall" which occupied his thoughts in the *Calender* (930). Colin Clout, as we have seen, is part of a English literary tradition rooted in social and political complaint, associated with Chaucer, Skelton, and Piers Plowman. Like Astrophil, he is affiliated with a Protestant political agenda. In mobilizing Colin Clout, rather than another persona,

---

[118] For a detailed description of how literary genealogy works in the elegies, see Falco, *Conceived Presences*, 95-123.

[119] Richard Hillyer discusses how Spenser positions himself as Sidney's immediate successor, and in so doing accounts for the fact that he did not have a military background when Sidney was a soldier. See *Sir Philip Sidney, Cultural Icon* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2010), 1-22.

Spenser continued to participate in that tradition. Colin's genealogy extends back to a time before Astrophil was even circulating. He does not just act as Astrophil's literary heir; instead, he continues a long-established English literary tradition.

The *Colin Clouts* volume does not merely recycle the traditional literary figure of Colin Clout. Instead, it uses Astrophil's death and Colin's subsequent rise to adjust and expand the Protestant English literary tradition to stretch from the medieval period to Sidney. In so doing, it presents the literary tradition as flexible, subject to augmentation, and revisable over time. The Colin Clout persona became an ideal vehicle for facilitating the volume's literary historical narrative on account of his malleability: he is simultaneously a figure of the past and a flexible, portable literary device that can be endlessly manipulated to reflect an ever-changing literary tradition. When poached, Colin carries with him traces of his medieval and earlier Tudor iterations, even as he is modified and updated and presented as someone who will transmit Astrophil's legacy. In re-deploying Colin Clout, the *Colin Clouts* volume enlarges the persona – it augments his narrative and adds branches to his family tree, providing him with a more robust literary genealogy. The volume may suggest that Colin Clout ushers in a new moment in English literary history, but that history is inextricably linked to the past, shaped not just by the poetry of Colin's immediate predecessor, but by a long succession of poets, including Virgil, Chaucer, and Skelton, among others.

When William Ponsonby put Colin Clout to sale, he hoped to make a profit. And, indeed, the volume, particularly *Colin Clouts Come Home Again*, participates in Colin's commodification, celebrating his literary talents and attempting to push him and his poetry into posterity. The book reminds us that Colin is a fiction and has the capacity to take on a life of his own, to circulate in new contexts. At the same time, the book uses the persona as a vehicle for

Spenser's self-promotion, to present him as the newest national poet in a line of poets that includes Skelton and Sidney. When new writers, like the author of *Memoirs of fairy land*, redeploy him, they cannot liberate him completely from his previous authors, and he always bears traces of his former iterations, recalling his long history in print. Each instantiation, updated to suit contemporary needs, participates in, modifies, and in some cases redefines the tradition in which he participates. For Spenser, the marketplace of print was implicated in this process. When old personae reappeared in new books, they were used to comment on what came before them, recasting an earlier tradition, even as they were often used to market and sell literature. Commodifying Colin, then, is not just a matter of money, but of literary heritage. Economic and literary value remained closely linked through the figure of the traditional persona.

In the seventy-two years between the publication of *Colyn Clowte* and *Colin Clouts Come Home Again*, Colin Clout appeared in four iterations. He was mobilized for a variety of purposes: to criticize social and ecclesiastical corruption, to denounce beards, to explore the politics of canon formation, and to examine the relationship between the marketplace and literary posterity. Colin Clout's sixteenth-century biography allows us to see the possibilities for the traditional persona: on the one hand, it is tied to the author's self-presentation and can be used to comment on the political, social, and literary concerns of its historical moment. On the other, it can have a rich and varied social life in print, and it can come to be associated with many authors. Reading for the persona allows us to tell a story about the literary culture of the sixteenth-century, a story in which personae were not just formal features of literature and not just ways to interpret the lives of the authors that used them, but mobilized in an effort to shape the English literary tradition and its history.

CHAPTER TWO:
"England falls a martining and a marring": Martin Marprelate and the Marketplace of Print

> Fellow that (to be a foole in print) had spent the stocke of his wits vpon inke and paper and made it into a booke, offred it to sell at diuerse Stationers stals, but none would buy it: At the length he came to one of the company, and swore to him he should not neede to feare to venture money vpon it, for it would be to him an euerlasting booke. Oh sayes the other then I will not meddle with it; euerlasting bookes are ill commodities in our trade, bring me a booke that will go away, and I am for you.[120]

In *Foure letters and certeine Sonnets, especially touching Robert Greene and other parties by him abused* (1592), the Cambridge scholar Gabriel Harvey declares that he is writing in a "Martinish and Counter-martinish age," an age "wherein the Spirit of Contradiction reigneth, and eueryone superaboundeth in his owne humour, euen to the annihilating of any other, without rime, or reason."[121] Harvey's assessment of the early 1590s as ruthlessly adversarial is not surprising, given that he wrote in an intensely polemical era and was himself a victim of printed invective. In *Foure Letters*, Harvey directly – even violently – responds to Thomas Nashe's *Pierce Penilesse* (1592) and Robert Greene's *A Quip for an Upstart Courtier* (1592), both of which poke fun at his and his brothers' writing style, affectations, and homely background, apparently "without rime, or reason." Nashe addresses Harvey's brother Richard thus: "Thou

---

[120] Thomas Dekker and George Wilkins, *Iests to make you merie with the coniuring vp of Cock VVatt, (the walking spirit of Newgate) to tell tales. Vnto which is added, the miserie of a prison, and a prisoner. And a paradox in praise of serieants* (London: Nicholas Okes for Nathaniel Butter, 1607), Br-v.
[121] Cited from the Elizabethan and Jacobean Quartos series of the text, ed. G.B. Harrison (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1966), 53. Hereafter, I will cite this edition parenthetically in the main text. When referring to the Marprelate pamphlets, I will cite *The Martin Marprelate Tracts*, ed. Joseph Black (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008) by title and page number in the main text.

great *babound, thou Pigmie Braggart,* thou Pamphleter of nothing but *Peants.*"[122] And Greene charges that the doctor spent time in jail for inventing English hexameter and penning "other familiar letters and proper treatises."[123] As Harvey has it, Nashe and Greene have attempted to annihilate him by depicting him as the very portrait of ridiculousness. Harvey, in his account of the unfounded attack on him, implies that Nashe and Greene participate in the contradictory trend he outlines, for he insists that the two producers of "childish & garish stuff" (51) are pernicious: they "slaunder without cause, and rail without effect, euen in the superlative degree of rauing" (53). But if Nashe and Greene dabble in slander and railing, so does Harvey. And, if Nashe and Greene are "Martinish," then, by answering them in print, Harvey is "Counter-martinish" and just as guilty of perpetuating rancorous print as his adversaries. He, too, is thrall to the spirit of contradiction. In choosing to respond to Nashe's and Greene's printed books he not only engages in but legitimizes the type of quarrelsome behavior that he seemingly despises, even as he superabounds in his own cantankerous humor. Harvey's response to his adversaries is calculating, for he has identified and attempts to participate the vogue for contradictory writing taking the marketplace of print by storm. His innocence is simply an act.

Harvey's characterization of "this Martinish and Counter-martinish age" repays scrutiny, for, as I will show, it offers shrewd commentary on the print personae of the 1590s. It provides an apt characterization of a major trend in the marketplace of print culture during the early 1590s, a trend that Harvey correctly claims has its point of origin in the pamphlet war between

---

[122] *Pierce Penilesse his supplication to the diuell*, in *The Complete Works of Thomas Nashe*, ed. R.B. McKerrow and F.P. Wilson (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958), 1:196.

[123] *A quip for an vpstart courtier: or, A quaint dispute betvveen veluet breeches and clothbreeches* (London: Printed by John Wolfe, 1592), E4r. There is no documentary evidence that Harvey spent time in prison. Greene's commentary on Harvey's family only appears in the first edition of *A Quip*. For the complex publishing history of that text, see Edwin Haviland Miller's "Deletions in Robert Greene's *A Quip for an Upstart Courtier* (1592)," *Huntington Quarterly* 15 (1951-52): 277-82 and his "The Editions of Robert Greene's *A Quip for an Upstart Courtier* (1592)," *Studies in Bibliography* 6 (1954): 107-16.

the persona Martin Marprelate, his sons – Martin Junior and Martin Senior – and various other fictional personae – Double V, Cutbert Curry-knave, Mar-Martin, Pasquil, and Marphoreous, to name a few – which Harvey subsumes under the label "Counter-martin." Harvey's periodizing gesture is significant, particularly since the last anti-Marprelate pamphlet was printed two years before *Foure Letters*, in 1590. The pamphlet war, which spanned almost three years (1588-91), was comprised of at least seventeen English pamphlets – seven ascribed to Martin or one of his sons, seven anti-Marprelate tracts ascribed to various personae, and two texts that attempt to stage a reconciliation between the warring parties – and a Latin pamphlet called *Anti Martinus.* [124] In brief, the seven Marprelate tracts irreverently advocate a Presbyterian form of church government, and they were answered by equally crude pamphlets in support of the established church.[125] The controversy had such an impact that it ushered in the contradictory era Harvey describes, rendering "grosse scurility," "scoffing," "girding," and the "Arte of railing" fashionable, much to the detriment of learned discourse (54).

The Marprelate controversy was a watershed moment for literary personae. It was from this pamphlet war that the print persona emerged. Martin, his sons, and their foes revolutionized print culture. Not only did the dramatically realized personae became vendible commodities, but they helped to shape both the literary marketplace and the print culture of the decade, transforming it so profoundly that even Harvey notices and dubs the decade the "Martinish and Counter-martinish age." The print personae participating in the pamphlet war, and those who appeared in bookstalls afterward, like the traditional persona, traveled between contexts and took

---

[124]For summaries of the Martinist pamphlets, see Black's edition. For summaries of each the anti-Martinist pamphlets, see William Pierce, *An Historical Introduction to the Marprelate Controversy* (Burt Franklin: New York, 1964), 219-40.
[125] For detailed accounts of the controversy, see the Introduction of Black's edition; Pierce, *An Historical Introduction*; and Edward Arber, *An Introductory Sketch to the Marprelate Controversy* (Westminster: Archibald Constable and Co, 1895).

on lives of their own. At the same time, their hyper-competitiveness and combativeness paved the way for more quarrelsome, competitive personae to outdo them. The controversy revealed the economic potential of personae – book buyers were attracted to pamphlets featuring the devices – and opened the door for writers to create new personae or adopt preexisting ones, and sell them to printers and publishers, who would then sell the books to an eager reading public.

Ostensibly, Harvey's commentary on the "Martinish and Counter-martinish age" focuses on polemic – a form of dispute whose objective is not to strive for a higher truth, but the wholesale destruction of one's opponent – and its pervasive presence in the early 1590s. Jesse Lander, in his recent work on early modern polemic, carries out his analysis in a framework that draws heavily on and complicates the work of Michel Foucault. For a person to engage in polemic, Foucault says, he (the polemicist) must envision his opponent as "an adversary, an enemy who is wrong, who is harmful, and whose very existence constitutes a threat." Instead of "recognizing this person as a subject who has the right to speak," the polemicist must destroy his foe and "bring about the triumph of the just cause he has manifestly been upholding since the beginning."[126] He must focus on "the annihilating of any other," to use Harvey's phrase (53). Lander, however, takes issue with the "binary model of addresser and addressee" that is inherent to Foucault's account of polemic and instead argues that the "polemicist's aim is not to convert the object of attack but to convince a wider audience that the case is so." In so doing, the polemicist attempts to create and solidify a diverse, yet partisan, reading public.[127] The Marprelate controversy, then, can be read as an ideological struggle, in which pamphlets on either side of the dispute attempt to reach readers beyond their immediate targets. Lander deftly

---

[126] "Polemics, Politics, and Problematizations," in *The Essential Foucault*, ed. Paul Rabinow and Nikolas Rose (New York: The New Press, 1994), 19.
[127] *Inventing Polemic: Religion, Print, and Literary Culture in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 11-14.

points out that polemic has a generative effect; it produces its own variegated reading public. Harvey also sees this generative potential of polemic, but his emphasis is not on the readers of polemic, but its writers. Nashe and Greene may have cracked Harvey's credit and rendered him a laughing-stock, but they did not annihilate him. Instead, they provoked him to write, and their pamphlets pave the way for the production of his.

Over the course of his sustained denunciation of polemical pamphleteering, Harvey astutely points out that destroying one's opponent is not the only social motive involved in polemic. Indeed, a hearty appetite for popularity leads many lewd writers to try to outdo each other in order to increase the vendibility of their books. The excessive backbiting, tongue-lashing, and invective typical of the "Martinish and Counter-Martinish age" are strategies in a competitive game. Not only do these "gowty Diuels," these irreverent "Martinish and Counter-martinish" pamphleteers, attempt to dominate each other in print, they try to "dominiere in Tauernes, and Stationers shops" (55). For Harvey, the quest for notoriety becomes a contest for a vulgar sort of prestige, to be "egregiously famous" (55). One gets the sense from Harvey's long list of abuses, and the extant literature of the period, that there was a profusion of fame-hungry jokers writing against each other without discretion. Harvey's analysis emphasizes how the ludic and economic dimensions of polemic are entwined, particularly in his use of "dominiere," meaning "to rule over" but also "to revel or roister."[128] He implies that a trend for contradictory writing leads to an efflorescence of roister-doisterly writers because their attempts to dominate each other in print are attempts to outsell each other. The polemical texts these writers produce are gamesome and vendible, and they cater to consumer trends, however distasteful or uncivil they may be.

---

[128] *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "domineer."

Following Harvey's lead, I will attend to the early days of the "Martinish and Counter-martinish age." My central contention is that the Marprelate controversy cannot be fully understood if it is only read in terms of polemic or religious strife, since polemic and religious controversy cannot completely account for the vendibility of the Marprelate and anti-Marprelate tracts, or the controversy's ludic dimension and its ultimate effect on the marketplace of print. While Lander's account of polemic shows how Martin sought to create and persuade a reading public, it does not consider the controversy collectively and thus does not address how the pamphlets work together to attract a readership that is not completely divided along partisan lines. And although the religious and political content of the pamphlets is crucial, part of what made the tracts so dangerous was that they provided entertainment value, largely through the use of proliferating and dramatically realized personae. To understand the controversy and especially its aftermath, we must look to the vehicles by which the polemic was initiated, that is the personae involved, since, as I shall argue, the personae were integral to the pamphlets' marketability. The controversy's first persona, Martin Marprelate, a hyperbolized mixture of Piers Plowman and a reformer, sought to penetrate the book market by appealing to a diverse reading public and deputizing a coterie of personae to produce books for that readership, and the less sophisticated anti-Marprelate personae followed suit.[129] In other words, the personae involved in the conflict created demand for their pamphlets and prepared their readers for more personae and their books. In so doing, they turned themselves and the books in which they

---

[129] By now, it is a critical commonplace that the anti-Marprelate personae tried to out-Martin Martin; they used his subversive rhetorical techniques against him in order to, in the words of Foucault, "reactivate power." (See *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan [New York: Vintage Books, 1979], 49). Indeed, the tracts lend themselves to a Foucauldian reading – Double V says that he plans on giving Martin and his sons a "whisk with their owne wand" in order to destroy them. See *Pappe with an Hatchet*, in *The Complete Works of John Lyly*, ed, R. Warwick Bond, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), 3:396. Hereafter, I cite this edition parenthetically in the main text.

appear into vendible commodities, and changed the culture of textual production in the early 1590s.

Scholars have brilliantly situated the Marprelate controversy in its literary, religious, and historical contexts and within the print culture of the period,[130] while others have tried to solve the mystery of the pamphlets' authorship.[131] Those studies that give due weight to both sides of the conflict tend to examine the ways in which it facilitated the development of a public sphere. Joseph Black, for instance, contends, "The Marprelate controversy revealed both the dangers and possibilities of a public sphere of communication."[132] While these studies have proved highly illuminating, and I build on and complicate them here, they typically ignore one of the most obvious and perplexing facets of the controversy: the multiplicity of personae involved. If the

---

[130] See Patrick Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1967); Collinson "Ecclesiastical Vitriol: Religious Satire in the 1590s and the Invention of Puritanism," in *The Reign of Elizabeth I: Court and Culture in the Last Decade*, 150-70; Peter Lake and Michael Questier, *The Anti-Christ's Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists, and Players in Post-Reformation England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002); and Kristen Poole, *Radical Religion from Shakespeare to Milton: Figures of Nonconformity in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); Raymond Anselment, *Betwixt Jest and Earnest: Marprelate, Milton, Marvell, and Swift and the Decorum of Religious Ridicule* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979); Jesse Lander, "1588-1589," in *The Oxford History of Popular Print Culture*, ed. Joad Raymond (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 557-77; Lander, *Inventing Polemic*; Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Joseph Navitsky, "Disputing Good Bishops' English: Martin Marprelate and the Voice of Menippean Opposition," *Texas Studies in Language and Literature* 50, no.2 (2008): 177-200; Marcy L. North, *The Anonymous Renaissance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003); Evelyn Tribble, *Margins and Marginality The Printed Page in Early Modern England* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1993).

[131] Those studying authorship of the tracts have tended to agree that Job Throkmorton wrote the tracts. The major studies on authorship are Leland Carlson, *Martin Marprelate, Gentleman: Master Job Throkmorton Laid Open in His Colors* (San Marino: Huntington Library, 1981); Donald McGinn, *John Penry and the Marprelate Controversy* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1966); and J. Dover Wilson, *Martin Marprelate and Shakespeare's Fluellen: A New Theory of the Authorship of the Marprelate Tracts* (London: Alexander Moring Limited, 1912).

[132] "The Martin Marprelate Tracts (1588-89) and the Popular Voice," *History Compass* 6, no. 4 (2008): 1093. See also Joseph Black, "The Rhetoric of Reaction: The Martin Marprelate Tracts (1588-89), Anti-Martinism, and the Uses of Print in Early Modern England," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 28, no. 3 (1997): 707-25; Alexandra Halasz, *The Marketplace of Print: Pamphlets and the Public Sphere in Early Modern England*; Kristen Poole, *Radical Religion*; and Peter Lake and Michael Questier, *The Anti-Christ's Lewd Hat*. For recent re-theorizations of the public sphere, see Peter Lake and Steven Pincus, eds. *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007).

controversy is simply a polemic between Martin and anti-Martin, why does Martin have two sons, and why do six distinct personae respond to Martin?

The simplest answer to these questions, and the one I'm proposing, is, "To sell more books." The personae involved in the controversy adhere to a "logic of proliferation," a term borrowed from James English, in which each persona opens the door for a friend or foe to respond to him, and each new persona justifies his existence and distinguishes himself by engaging in dialogue with his forebears, and situates his pamphlet accordingly.[133] This ongoing inter-pamphlet drama is designed to create a reading public who understands, and follows, the structure of attack, counter-attack, assertion, and distinction that characterizes the controversy as a whole. Through this structural logic, the personae produce a market for the contradictory writing Harvey denounces. As the pamphlet war continues, the controversy's contradictory pattern becomes more complex. Martinists and anti-Martinists write against each other, but there is also notable tension within each faction, especially the Marprelate family.

As many critics have noted, the inter-pamphlet conflict characteristic of the controversy is theatrical in nature, and, I will argue, the theatricality derives in large part from the competition and conflict between the participating personae.[134] Vivid and distinct, they draw on recognizable theatrical conventions, liken the pamphlets in which they appear to stage plays, and engage in a highly dramatic and competitive game in which they try to outdo each other. Along

---

[133] In his work on cultural prizes, English argues that the appearance of such awards adheres to a "logic of furious propagation" in which a "prize that declares or betrays a social agenda opens the door to new prizes," and "each new prize that fills a gap or void in the system of awards defines at the same time a lack that will justify and indeed *produce* another prize." While twentieth- and twenty-first century cultural prizes are a far cry from the personae I am analyzing, English's work provides language to talk about the proliferation of personae characteristic of the controversy. See *The Economy of Prestige: Prizes, Awards, and the Circulation of Cultural Value* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005), 60. For a full discussion of the logic of proliferation see chapter 3.
[134] For the dramatic quality of the controversy see Patrick Collinson, "Ecclesiastical Vitriol," Ritchie D. Kendall, *The Drama of Dissent: The Radical Poetics of Nonconformity, 1380-1590* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986); and Kristen Poole, *Radical Religion*.

the way, they evoke recognizable character conventions, particularly Piers Plowman, the Tyndalian reformer, and the Italianiate Pasquino, and exaggerate them in order to domineer over one another. Character assassination, ad hominem attacks, and the manipulation of print conventions become key strategies by which the proliferating personae try to eclipse one another. While the ludic dimension of the controversy attracted readers interested in wit and excess, the pamphlets did more than entertain. Indeed, the ludic, economic, and political are entwined in the pamphlet war. The dramatic and highly competitive game the personae play becomes an integral feature of the public sphere the tracts imagine. As we shall see, what made the controversy vendible made it politically dangerous.

But did the Martinist and anti-Martinist pamphlets sell? Although we do not have precise sales data for the Marprelate and anti-Marprelate tracts, there is evidence to suggest that there was widespread interest in the pamphlet war.[135] In his day, as the story goes, the Martin persona was regarded as so marketable, threatening, and unstoppable that a multi-media attack was launched on him. The writer of an anonymous commentary on the controversy claims that Martin's "seditious libelles" entered into the "hartes of the vulgar" who were "apt to entertaine matter of Noveltie especiallie if it have a shew of restraining the authoritie of their Superiours."[136] Fearful that Martin's ideas would persuade the people of England to overthrow

---

[135] The information we have about the distribution and sales of the Marprelate controversy comes largely from the deposition of Henry Sharpe, a bookbinder associated with the Presbyterian collective behind Martin. For Sharpe's deposition, see Arber, *An Introductory Sketch*, 94-103. In brief, *The Epistle*, *Mineral and Metaphysical Schoolpoints*, and *Hay any Work for Cooper* had press runs of about 1000; *Theses Martinianae's* press run was 1500. With the exception of *Mineral and Metaphysical Schoolpoints*, which retailed wholesale for a pence, the aforementioned Marprelate tracts sold wholesale for six pence. For a detailed account of the dissemination of the tracts see Black's Introduction. We have no information on the distribution of the anti-Marprelate tracts.

[136] Anonymous, c. 1589, Cotton Manuscripts, British Library, BL Cotton MS Julius F vi, 76r. In a similar vein, a witness who was testifying at the trial of Sir Richard Knightly, in whose home the second tract was printed, said that "Fox his [Knightley's] schoolmaster, and Wastal his man, would commonly read the books in sir Richard's house, and scoff and scorn at John Canterbury." See T.B. Howell, comp., *A Complete Collection of State Trials and*

the established church, the ecclesiastical powers published learned responses and sermons as well as underwrote scurrilous pamphlets. According to a 1597 testimonial by John Whitgift, Archbishop of Canterbury, in order to "stop Martin & his Fellow's mouths," Richard Bancroft, then Whitgift's personal chaplain, hired Thomas Nashe, John Lyly, and others to answer the men behind Martin "after their own vein in writing," and thus mobilized more fictional personae to quarrel with him.[137] In the midst of the controversy, the popularity of the Marprelate and anti-Marprelate personae occasioned remark: the intelligencer Thomas Phelippes wrote in an epistle that Martin was "in every mans mouth" and "a boke in rime called marmartin [had been] published then sold in every booke shoppe."[138] Additionally, the anti-Martinist personae tell us that anti-Martinist theater flourished on the London stage. As late as 1655, the church historian Thomas Fuller remarked that the tracts were "speedily dispersed," "generally bought," "greedily read," and "firmly beleeved, especially of the common sort, to whom no better musick then to hear their betters upbraided."[139] If, as Joseph Black argues, Martin's chief objective was to be "talked about," then he seems to have been very successful.[140]

While the evidence for the popularity of the tracts is largely anecdotal, Martin's marketplace visibility suggests that books related to the controversy sold well. Even writers and publishers who had no official affiliation with the controversial affair capitalized on the brash

---

Proceedings for High Treason and Other Crimes and Misdemeanors, 21 vols. (London: T.C. Hansard, 1816-28), 1:1270.

[137] Albert Peel, ed., "Introduction," in *Tracts Ascribed to Richard Bancroft: Edited from a Manuscript in the Library of St. John's College, Cambridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953), ix-xviii. The above quotation is from a testimonial in which John Whitgift nominates Bancroft for Bishop of London. On 13 February 1589, Elizabeth I issued a proclamation in response to the "seditious books, defamatory libels, and other fantastical writings," which "tend by their scope to persuade and bring in a monstrous and apparent dangerous innovation within her dominions and countries of all manner ecclesiastical government now in use, and to the abridging, or rather to the overthrow, of her highness lawful prerogative. See Paul L. Hughes and James F. Larkin, eds., *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, 3 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969), 3:34.

[138] Thomas Phelippes, Letter, The English National Archive, TNA, SP 13/31 fol. 41.

[139] *The Church-History of Britain* (London: John Williams, 1655), 193.

[140] "The Martin Marprelate Tracts (1588-89) and the Popular Voice," 1100.

persona's notoriety. John Wolfe, whom Martin calls a "Machiavel," recognized the commercial potential of anti-Martinist texts and published Leonard Wright's *A friendly admonition to Martine Marprelate, and his mates;* T.T.'s *Myrror for Martinists* in 1590; and Gabriel Harvey's *Pierces Supererogation*, which features "An Advertisement to Pap-Hatchet and Martin Mar-prelate," in 1593. New Martins sprung up – in 1590 Richard Jones published John Davies' *Sir Martin Mar-People*, and in 1591 Thomas Woodcocke published R.W.'s *Martin Mar-Sixtus* – and capitalized on the notoriety of the "great *Martine.*"[141] *The Marprelate controversy's impact on the marketplace extended beyond things Martin, however.* The competition and conflict between Martinst and anti-Martinist personae facilitated the development of a vendible, inter-pamphlet drama, which would be widely imitated, repackaged, and modified in order to sell books.[142]

From Piers to Martin

Even before the Marprelate controversy, early modern England possessed a native tradition of print personae, of whom the most notable was Piers Plowman. While students of the Marprelate controversy have focused on Martin's innovations and thus deemphasized his continuity with earlier Tudor literature, Martin's own contemporaries recognized him as part of the long-established Piers Plowman tradition. In 1592, Job Throkmorton, now thought to be the primary author of the tracts, places Martin and Piers in an English tradition of anti-clerical writers. He notes that Piers Plowman also marred prelates, when he "wrote against the state of

---

[141] On 9 November 1588, Thomas Orwyn entered "a ballade intytulded *MARTYN said to his man, whoe is the foole now"* in the Stationers' Register. The book does not survive (or it was never printed). See Edward Arber, ed. *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640, A.D.*, 5 vols. (London: Priv. Print., 1875-77), vol. 2.

[142] Writers as diverse as Thomas Nashe, John Harington, and Henry Chettle participated in the trend Thomas Nashe was one of Bancroft's hired pens and is credited with *Almond for a parrat*, the three Pasquil tracts, and *Martins Monthes Minde.* He later created and deployed more personae, such as Piers Penniless and Jack Wilton. Although not all of the personae of the 1590s engage in polemical exchanges, I would argue that the dialogic structure of assertion and distinction structures the behavior of personae throughout the 1590s, including the unnamed speakers of sonnet sequences. Moreover, the persona retains a market function precisely because his story can be serially augmented, as I will show throughout this dissertation.

bishops, and prophecied their fall."[143] More striking still, in 1589 an updated edition of a mid-Tudor text called *I Playne Piers* (originally published in 1547 or 1550) announced on its title page that Piers Plowman was Martin's "grandsire" and was made to look like one of Martin's books. Throkmorton and the Elizabethan editors of *I Playne Piers* evoke Piers Plowman in order to authorize Martin's anti-clerical commentary and to elevate his pamphlets' cultural status. The continuities and connections between Piers and Martin demonstrate how the persona is integral to his pamphlets' political significance. At the same time, attending to the differences between the two personae brings Martin's creators' innovations to the fore and demonstrates how his modifications of their shared traits – their plain speaking, relation to the common man, and commentary on censorship – are market-oriented, deployed to reach a wide variety of readers and potential book buyers.

Piers Plowman, the best-known fictional English persona before Martin Marprelate, first appeared in *Piers Plowman*, a fourteenth-century allegorical poem by William Langland, and was appropriated by reformers in the sixteenth century. Robert Crowley published *The vision of Pierce Plowman*, an edition of Langland's poem, in 1550, averring in his letter to the reader that the old poem by "Roberte langelande" has contemporary value because it repudiates the social, moral, and ecclesiastical transgressions pervasive during Edward VI's reign: "There is no maner of vice, that reygneth in anye estate of men, whyche thys wryter hath not godly, learnedlye, and wittilye, rebuked," he declares. Langland, that is, foresaw the Reformation and advocated for

---

[143] *A petition directed to her most excellent Maiestie* (Middleburg: R. Schilders, 1592), E1v. Interestingly, Henry Sharpe, a bookbinder who took part in the production and dissemination of the Marprelate tracts, deposed that John Penry (a man whom the authorities suspected to be Martin's maker) said that Martin followed "a lawfull Course" because his jesting fell into a tradition of pseudonymous publication, which included books such as *Pasquine in a Traunce*. See Arber, *An Introductory Sketch*, 97.

"the suppresson of abbayes."[144] Langland's *Piers Plowman* has a complicated textual and reception history.[145] Nevertheless, it was a crucial text for sixteenth-century writers with a mind toward ecclesiastical reform, and three Edwardian social and religious satires that bear Piers' name survive: *I Playne Piers* (1547 or 1550), *A Godly dialogue and Dysputacion Between Pyers Plowman and a Popysh Preest* (1550), and *Pyers Plowman's Exhortation unto the Lordes of the Parlymenthouse* (1550). James Simpson has argued that the three Edwardian satires bear no relation to Langland's poem except in name and "the posture of plain speaking."[146] Mike Rodman Jones, however, has convincingly shown that the plowman literature of the mid-sixteenth century works to "polemicize the latent oppositional aspects of [*Piers Plowman*]."[147] It is clear that by the middle of the sixteenth century the Piers persona was closely identified with specific polemical and satirical practices, namely blunt criticism of Tudor social, political, and/or ecclesiastical policy. In the three little books that feature him as a speaker, Piers appears as a "harsh anticlerical spokesman," who, as John King notes, railed "against the enclosure movement and misappropriation of monastic lands by the nobility" as well as the oppression of the poor.[148]

---

[144] Crowley, like John Bale, misattributes the poem. See Bale, *Scriptorum illustriu[m] maioris Brytannie* (Basel, 1557-59), 474.

[145] For a textual history of the poem, see the introductions to the A. B, C, and Z texts: *Piers Plowman: The A-Version*, ed. George Kane (London: Athlone, 1960); *William Langland, The Vision of Piers Plowman, A Critical Edition of the B-Text*, ed. A.V.C. Schmidt, 2nd ed. (London: J.M. Dent, 1995); *Piers Plowman: A New Annotated Edition of the C-Text*, ed. Derek Pearsall (Exeter: U of Exeter P, 2008); and *William Langland, Piers Plowman, the Z Version*, ed. A.G. Rigg and Charlotte Brewer (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1983). See also John Alford, ed., *A Companion to Piers Plowman*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988).

[146] *The Oxford English Literary History, Volume 2, 1350-1547: Reform and Cultural Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 368.

[147] *Radical Pastoral, 1381-1594: Appropriation and the Writing of Religious Controversy* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2010), 10. For another account of Piers Plowman in the sixteenth century, see Helen C. White, *Social Criticism in Popular Religious Literature of the Sixteenth Century* (New York: Octagon Books, 1965), ch.1 and Sarah A. Kelen, *Langland's Early Modern Identities* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007).

[148] John N. King, "Robert Crowley's Editions of *Piers Plowman*: A Tudor Apocalypse," *Modern Philology* 73, no. 4 (1976): 343.

First published in 1547 or 1550, *I Playne Piers* was enlarged and reprinted in 1589, immediately after the publication of the Marprelate tracts. *I Playne Piers* features a more developed persona than its mid-century contemporaries, but, more importantly for my purposes, Piers proclaims that he and Martin are blood relations, and the resemblances between the two speakers are striking. While it is impossible to know whether Martin's creators had *I Playne Piers* in hand when they were writing the first tracts, we can say with certainty that one of Martin's contemporaries saw the books' similarities and drew attention to them in the 1589 edition of *I Playne Piers*. Like his predecessor, Martin speaks plainly, identifies with "the people," and comments on early modern print culture, but he ultimately diverges from his forebear because he hyperbolizes the established tradition, performing it with new levels of invective, contradiction, and jests. The supercharging of the plowman tradition, I argue, allows Martin to extend the range of the reading public that he evokes and shapes, to target popular and learned audiences.

I Playne Piers, as its title page announces, is narrated by a "plowe man" whose language is "fowle," or "inelegant."[149] Throughout the anti-Catholic satire Piers stresses his association with the common man who has been oppressed by corrupt clergymen. He repeatedly uses the pronoun "we" to call attention to his connection with the poor folk that make up the laity. "[T]ho we suffer at home much hunger and wronge" at the hands of "catyffes," or greedy "byshoppes," Piers says, he and the common people "be rich in faythe, and heires of the kingdom [of God]," something which separates them from the unscrupulous clergymen he rails against.[150] The plowman's and the people's shared poverty, simplicity, and plainness also

---

[149] *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "foul."
[150] *I Playne Piers* (London: N. Hill, 1547?), A8r. Hereafter, I will cite this source parenthetically in the main text.

connects them to Jesus, who, Piers informs us, speaks “playne” (B2v). Here, too, Piers’ affiliation with the people and with Christ allows him to draw a distinction between himself and the corrupt bishops, who behave “cleane contrarye” to Christ’s teachings, and who have grown fat and rich while “Christendome” has become “myserable decayed” (C4v-C5r). “Such unproper gere was neuer had before this generacyon,” he complains (E6v).

The rhetorical strategy by which Piers identifies himself with the common man is symbolically effective because it portrays the bishops as mighty abusers of their flocks. But it also exemplifies and reveals a tension between “I” and “we” that has always characterized personae who claim to be representative of “the people.” Satirical personae purport to be representative of specific publics, even though their status as spokespeople separates them from their constituents. They are both *with* and *for* the people. As a mouthpiece against ecclesiastical avarice, Piers sometimes distances himself from the people by using “I” and speaking for them. “I shall breake thy pate,” he threatens. It is he, not the people, who will harm the clergy. Although he reminds us again and again that he has suffered with the people through the violent persecution perpetrated by Catholics Thomas More and John Fisher, “the chefe pyllors of the vyperous generacion” (B2v), he ultimately speaks for himself and his convictions, and seems to have more knowledge of the corrupt clergymen’s doings than the people for whom he speaks. “Piers can tel you mykel more whyche he keepeth yet in store” (E2r), he claims. Pierre Bourdieu points out that the very act of becoming a spokesperson for “the people” constitutes a “break” with them.[151] A spokesman “play[s] on his proximity to the people” and simultaneously asserts his singularity. As Bourdieu notes, spokespeople who closely identify with “the people” often

[151] “The Uses of the ‘people,’” in *In Other Words: Essays Towards a Reflexive Sociology*, trans. Matthew Adamson (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990), 152.

"convert the stigma [of that association] into an emblem."[152] In this case, poverty and "fowle" language become badges of holiness and divine favor. The inability to "vnderstand" the "mysteries of Daniell" and/or "al mennes sotteltes [subtleties]" is presented as far nobler than actually understanding the Bible, deferring to learned "gloses" (B5v- B6r), hypocritically referring to oneself as "Christen," and "kyll[ing]" Christ by violently persecuting his flock, all of which Piers contends Catholic bishops do.

Piers' critique extends to press censorship. Despite the fact that his book appeared under a Protestant king who had considerably deregulated the presses, Piers is anxious about the banning of Protestant books, which, he says, are still being censored:[153] "[H]ere in Englande be so manye of hys [the Pope's] whelpees, that eyther we cannot wryte agaynst him, orells when we haue wrytten agaynst hym, oure bokes and we are both in daunger of their teeth" (C1v-C2r). Writers of Protestant persuasion are still subject to violent persecution, and "[t]he poore Prynter also whiche laboreth but for his lyuynge, is cast into prison and loseth all he hath" (C2r). Moreover, Piers complains, the books that are allowed to circulate are unedifying trash. "[Y]ou allowe they saye, *legenda aurea*, Roben Hoode, Beuys & Gower, & al bagage besyd, but Gods word ye may not abide" (E3v).[154] Catholic *legendi* and romances trump godly texts. Piers argues that the word of God is destroyed when books are chewed up, burnt, or prevented from passing through the press, and is worried that the censors will ban his religio-political ideology, which he views as the Truth, from the book market. For the persona, his ideology, and his books

[152] *Ibid*., 152.
[153] In 1547, the first parliament under Edward VI repealed several long-standing, prohibitive statutes, including a 1542 act that barred the publication of the Tyndale bible and "all other bookes and wrytinges in the English tongue teaching … any matiers of Christen religion," which violated "the doctrines established by the King in 1540."Cited in James Simpson, *Reform and Cultural Revolution*, 334. For a list of the other statutes Edward VI's parliament repealed, statutes that deal mainly with treason and heresy, see Simpson.
[154] One of the most striking statements in *I Playne Piers* calls to mind a public sphere: "[W]e shall haue other, youre owne popyshe wryters, and these we wil publyshe afreshe, onlye for this entent, yf anye of them utteryng your shame, may cause you to repent" (D7v-D8r).

are inextricably linked, and to eradicate Piers' books is also to eradicate him. The mechanisms of censorship and Piers' institutional opponents, rather than his textual ones, threaten to annihilate him and his cause.

In 1588, Martin Marprelate would hyperbolize the Piers Plowman tradition. *The Epistle* and later *The Epitome* (November 1588), *Hay Any Work for Cooper* (March 1589), and *The Protestation of Martin Marprelate* (September 1589), like *I Playne Piers*, feature an adversarial, anti-clerical persona, who appeals to the people. Martin, however, is not an Everyman figure who sympathetically identifies with the oppressed commons; rather, he self-reflexively aligns himself with and distances himself from various publics – the priests of the established church, the people, and puritans.[155] As I will show, this self-reflexivity becomes a strategy through which he seeks to create a multifaceted reading public and prepare it for more books. At the same time, Martin recruits an ongoing writing public, made of personae, who will supply that readership with the promised pamphlets.

Martin's relation to the puritans is difficult to discern because he appears to be a stout defender of the puritan cause, and its spokesman, even as he self-consciously separates himself from them. In all of his pamphlets he refers to "puritans," "the puritans," and "those puritans," not "we puritans." Martin's motives are simultaneously collective – he and puritan figureheads such as Thomas Cartwright subscribe to a set of shared beliefs – and individual – his approach to the ecclesiastical powers differs from his supposed allies. Indeed, mainstream puritans ostracize

---

[155] A note on the term "puritan:" I use "puritan" throughout this essay because Martin uses it in his tracts. Admittedly a slippery term, "puritan" was a term of abuse that, as Black notes, was "applied to a range of social, devotional, and ecclesiastical stances" (Introduction xx). What Martin means by "puritan" is one who would advocate a Presbyterian form of church government. ("Presbyterian" was not commonly used by his contemporaries.) In Peter Lake's seminal work on English Presbyterianism, he explains that "all Presbyterians were puritans," but "not all puritans were Presbyterians." See *Anglicans and Puritans?: Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1988), 7.

him because of his unmannerly writing. “The puritans are angry with me. I mean the puritan preachers. And why? Because I am too open. Because I jest,” he says *(Epitome* 53). In another tract, he reminds his readers and the bishops whom he attacks that the puritans hate him: “I know I am disliked of many which are your enemies, that is, of many which you call puritans,” he says (*Hay Any Work* 119). Puritan texts from the period substantiate these oft-repeated claims. Job Throkmorton denied any association with the brash persona: “I am not Martin, I knewe not Martin, and concerning that I stande enlightened of, I am as cleare as the childe unborne.”[156] Similarly, a distraught Thomas Cartwright denigrates Marprelate. He responds to Matthew Sutcliffe’s accusation that he (Cartwright) rejoiced at the coming forth of Martin, with the following assertion. “I am able to produce witnesses, that the first time that euer I heard of *Martin Marprelate*, I testified my great misliking, & grief, for so naughtie, and so disorderly a course as that was.”[157]

Despite this mutual repudiation, Martin plays on his ideological proximity to the puritans to make a political statement as well as attract reform-minded readers. He transforms the stigma associated with the puritans into an emblem of religious respectability. His central contention is that the Bible prescribes “the external government of the church” and that “it is not lawful for man to alter the same” (*Epitome* 58), something which the established church has done. Worse still, the ecclesiastical powers have branded the biblically dictated form of church polity that Martin advocates as seditious. That Martin abides by the Bible makes him holier than they; the taint of Puritanism becomes a mark of godliness. Associating himself with the puritans allows Martin to characterize the bishops as scripturally deficient and devilish, and his connection to the

---

[156]*The Defence of Job Throkmorton against the slaunders of Maister Sutcliffe* (London, 1594), E2r.
[157] *A brief apologie of Thomas Cartwright against all such slaunderous accusations as it pleaseth Mr Sutcliffe in seuerall pamphlettes most iniuriously to loade him with* (Middleburg: R. Schilders, 1596), C2v.

puritans invites identification on the part of readers who identify with his ideological position, even as it seeks to persuade supporters of the established church that they have lost their way.

If Martin's fraught relationship with the puritans becomes a means to create a reading public, then so does his relationship with the people, which is also structured by a tension between "we" and "I." Martin defends his writing style by citing its popular appeal:

> There may be many that mislike of my doings. But my course I know to be ordinary and lawful. I saw the cause of Christ's government, and of the bishops' antichristian dealing, to be hidden. The most part of men could not be gotten to read anything written in the defence of the one and against the other. I bethought me therefore of a way whereby men might be drawn to do both, perceiving the humors of men in these times (especially of those that are in any place) to be given to mirth. (*Hay Any Work* 115)

Here, Martin deploys his break with both the puritans and the established church to forge a relationship with the people. After all, the puritans do not like his jokes and the established church despises his ideology, but the common man finds him entertaining and appealing. Ostensibly, Martin aligns himself with the common people, declaring he is a "simple ingram man." "Ingram" in this context means "ignorant" and thus unlearned.[158] He repeatedly draws a connection between his manner of speaking and that of the people, emphasizing the plain, simple nature of his speech, which ultimately causes him to call "a spade a spade, a pope a pope" (*Epitome* 53).[159] Martin, like the people, has been tyrannized and oppressed by the ecclesiastical powers during their reign of terror; he, too, is the queen's loyal subject. As Piers did before him, Martin deploys his association with the people for maximum political effect. Bourdieu has

---

[158] *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "ingram."

[159] There is a discrepancy between Martin's claims of ignorance and his emphasis on his plainness and simplicity. In the early modern period, ignorance, plainness, and simplicity were not the same. Plainness and simplicity were associated with Jesus, whereas ignorance was not. The English translation of *Pasquine in a Traunce* (1566), provides a gloss on the distinction between being "ingram" and being simple: "Simplicitie is not ignoraunce, but a certaine clearenesse and singlenesse of minde." See Celio Secondo Curione, *Pasquine in a Traunce*, trans. William Page (London: William Seres, 1566), B3v-B4r.

shown that affiliating oneself with the people allows a person to "lay claim to everything that separates [him] from his competitors."[160] Martin's supposed solidarity with the people allows him to capitalize on a closeness with them, a closeness the bishops do not have, and to make an implicit political claim that he, not his adversaries, has power over the people and uses his knowledge to speak to them and for them.

Bourdieu argues that spokespeople often "conceal" the "break with 'the people' that is implied by gaining access to the role of spokesperson" from their opponents and even themselves.[161] Martin, however, does not conceal his break with the people, but flaunts it to win a "position of dominance" over the bishops as well as to reach a learned audience. Throughout the tracts, Martin works to distance himself from the people by displaying his erudition. For all his claims of simplicity, Martin is very learned – "I have been a great schoolman in my days" (*Epitome* 78), he declares. The Marprelate pamphlets contain massive swings in register, and Martin easily moves from jests to the intricacies of church doctrine. Common and learned styles combine for a dizzying – even maddening – effect. The alternation between the plain style and the baroque erudition of ecclesiastical controversy is calculated, designed to showcase Martin's skills and wide appeal –he can reach the graver and simpler sort simultaneously. "But you see my worshipful priests of this crew to whom I write, what a perilous fellow M. Marprelate is." He continues, "[H]e understands all of your knavery, and it may be he keeps a register of them: unless you amend, they shall all come to the light of day" (*Epistle* 33). Martin can do what the people, the bishops, and even the puritans cannot. He knows what the "bishops' English meaneth," as Martin Senior would later say, can translate it into plain English, and has the

---

[160] "Uses of 'the people,'" 152.
[161] *Ibid*., 152.

capacity to document the bishops' doings for anyone's perusal (*Just Censure* 183). Here Martin's threat is implicit: because they can reach a larger audience, his books have wider commercial appeal than those of the established church.

We can read Martin as a reflection of the diverse reading public he seeks to establish. Part puritan, part common man, part learned priest: Martin seeks to make a readership out of a broad spectrum of society, and to foment its demand for more of his books. [162] In *The Epistle*, Martin provides a catalogue of books he intends to publish against the bishops, one of which is called *Itinerarium*, a survey in folio that contains both an account of various English dioceses and a register of their clergymen's "memorable pranks" (36). In *Lambethisms*, he intends to antagonize John Whitgift and John Bridges further, for he will "set down the flowers of errors, popish and others, wherewith those two men have stuffed the books which they have written against the cause of reformation" (37). This catalogue serves two functions. It both advertises Martin's future exposés, thus readying the reader for them, and it serves to pique his readers' interest, to make them want more books, particularly since the forthcoming titles will be entertaining: "What my masters of the clergy, did you never hear of my books indeed? Foh, then you never heard of good sport in your life" (36). Martin gives a partial description of his soon-to-be-released titles, and, in refusing to show his hand, he tantalizes the readers: "What shall be handled in my 2nd, 3rd, 4th,5th, and 6th books, you shall know when you read them," he teases (36). He redeploys this tactic in a later pamphlet, *Hay Any Work for Cooper*, hinting about the contents of *More Work for Cooper*. "I must be brief now, but *More Work for Cooper* shall examine your slanders," he says to Thomas Cooper, Bishop of Winchester. "They are nothing

---

[162] For a fascinating study of demand in early modern England, see David J. Baker, *On Demand: Writing for the Market in Early Modern England* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2010).

else but proofs that as by your own confessions you are bishops of the devil, so you are enemies unto the state" (123). To learn what Cooper's slanders are and how he is a bishop of the devil, the reader will have to buy the book.

Evelyn Tribble has convincingly shown that the "Marprelate controversy brings into sharp focus the power of the press to proliferate rather than to contain."[163] Martin's books, except maybe the promised volume in folio, were cheaply available to a wide array of people, and the ecclesiastical powers could not stop the flood of pamphlets issuing from Robert Waldegrave's press. I would extend Tribble's argument further and add that the Marprelate controversy also calls attention to personae and their capacity for proliferation. Importantly, the personae are mechanisms by which various Martinist titles proliferate: when Martin threatens to flood the market with books, he also threatens to deputize more personae to publish books against his adversaries, thereby creating a writing public to satisfy the demands of his reading public. Martin conjures the spirit of contradiction, to borrow Harvey's familiar phrase, and enlists multiple personae to write against his opponents. Martin will not harangue the bishops alone – his sons, Martin Junior and Martin Senior, join him in an unending hymn of abuse.

Martin promises his opponents that he will beget like-minded, pamphleteering sons and place them everywhere, so that they can take note of clergymen's escapades. In the very first Marprelate tract he states, "I will place a Martin in every parish. In part of Suffolk and Essex, I think I were best to have two in a parish. I hope in time they shall be as worthy Martins as their father is, every one of them able to mar a prelate" (35). Martin's sons are more than his eyes; they are writers who have inherited their father's capacity for marring their adversaries and will use their talents to produce news about churchmen behaving badly as well as defend their father

---

[163] *Margins and Marginality*, 102.

and his cause. In *The Epitome*, he reiterates that he has "many sons abroad" and warns that "they will not see their father thus persecuted at your [Martin's opponents'] hands" (*Epitome* 53, 55), referencing the government's frantic search for him. The ecclesiastical powers are in hot pursuit of the Marprelate press and Martin's creators. Martin's sons will not brook such behavior and are ready to take up their pens in their father's defense. The result is more Martins, more books, and more titles for his reading public to devour greedily.

Martin lays out explicitly the logic that governs his and his sons' appearances, and in so doing prepares his readers for the impending proliferation of personae and their books. Both the personae and their books are a function of the ecclesiastical powers' actions, and exist solely to announce their opponents' sinful behavior. "Whatsoever you do amiss, I will presently publish it," Martin says (*Epitome* 35). A testament to the clergy's evil doings, each new title will supplement a growing body of texts, comment on a new abuse, and appeal to the "many [who] seek after [Martin's] books" (*Hay Any Work* 101). Each of Martin's sons represents a new persona who writes in Marprelate's jesterly vein. As Martin promises, they, too will mar prelates, but their targets will diverge from his because they may reside in far-flung parishes and/or take note of different clergymen. In other words, Martin can breed like a rabbit; he can spawn an infinite number of sons because each son responds to a different incident, and the clergy has an infinite capacity to sin. Martins may come close to saturating the market, but ultimately they will not do so because each one brings a new perspective on the clergy to light. Although his threats are made with an eye toward the market, Martin's references to his army of sons have a political coloring, for they give the impression that there is widespread discontent with ecclesiastical policy/polity, and the pamphlet campaign has the capacity to attack the bishops on multiple fronts.

Crucially, Martin's threats to procreate rest on the assumption that he is a persona, a fictional construction that anyone can deploy. As I noted in the Introduction, George Puttenham calls this literary convention *prosopopoeia*, or "counterfeit impersonation," wherein, "by way of fiction," a writer "feign[s] any person with such features, qualities, and conditions."[164] Puttenham's definition highlights the dramatic aspects of personae as well as their capacity to travel between books; they are performative by nature, imaginative versions of personhood, which can be counterfeit in a variety of discourses. "Martin" is a mask any writer can put on, a part anyone capable of writing can play. Martin taunts his opponents: "What though I were hanged, do you think your cause shall be the better? For the day that you hang Martin, assure yourselves, there will be twenty Martins spring in my place" (119). "Martin" can be imitated, redeployed in different books, and appropriated by twenty writers at a time. He cannot and will not die, and the death of his creator will not relegate him to oblivion. The bishops' ruthless persecution of his creator, printer, and distributors may prove to be fruitless, and could even backfire. If Martin's sons will not tolerate the bishops' persecution of him, they may produce a profusion of pamphlets against the established church. The persona becomes vehicle for social and political critique, and he is integral to his pamphlets' iterability. It therefore comes as no surprise that, soon after he promises to procreate, Martin's threats come to fruition; his sons attack the bishops in his stead.

With the appearance of pamphlets published under the names Martin Junior and Martin Senior – "martinets" as Richard Harvey calls them[165] – the Marprelate campaign materially enacts Martin's threatened proliferation. July 1589 saw the appearance of Martin Junior in

---

[164] *The Art of English Poesy*, 275.
[165] See the epistle to the reader in Richard Harvey, *A theologicall discourse of the Lamb of God* (London: John Windet for William Ponsonby, 1590).

Theses Martinianae, and Martin Senior came into print shortly thereafter in *The Just Censure and Reproof of Martin Junior*. The spawn of Martin declare that they are carrying out their father's mission, but their tracts are not simply imitations of their father's work. Both Martin Junior and Martin Senior establish their identities in relation to the persona (or personae) that came before them, simultaneously capitalizing on his connection to the original Martin. Both sons frame their pamphlets with familial, rather than strictly ecclesiastical, concerns: Martin Junior wonders at the disappearance of his father and Martin Senior chides his brother for his rash behavior. These personae are "relational" in Pierre Bourdieu's sense of the term; they are situated relative to one other, and their positions in the controversy "depend on the other positions" previous personae have taken.[166] The introduction of new personae into the controversy allows for an inter-pamphlet drama, which seeks to increases the pamphlets' marketability while rearticulating Martin's political and theological points, and nowhere is this more obvious that the books' title pages. Title pages, as forms of advertising, are directed toward what Michael Saenger has called a "crucial act of reader-response," or "the purchase."[167] The title pages of both *Theses Martinianae* and *The Just Censure* entice readers by highlighting the controversy's narrative dimension and addressing the books' potential buyers directly. *Theses Martinianae*, which reproduces old Martin's 110 theses, tells the reader that he "shall understand sufficiently in the Epilogue" how Martin Junior came by them. *The Just Censure* also addresses the reader directly, telling him that he shall find both a reproof and commendations of the

---

[166] "The Field of Cultural Production, or: The Economic World Reversed," 30.
[167] "The Birth of Advertising," in *Printing and Parenting in Early Modern England*, ed. Douglas A. Brooks (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), 197. For more on title pages as early modern advertisements see Michael Saenger, *The Commodification of Textual Engagements in the English Renaissance* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006) and Paul Voss, "Books for Sale: Advertising and Patronage in Late Elizabethan England," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 29, no. 3(1998): 733-56.

youngest Martin. By buying Martin Junior's and Martin Senior's pamphlets, the reader can keep up with the Marprelates and partake in their family drama.

Martin Junior's *Theses Martinianae* is an unusual pamphlet. It purports to reproduce *verbatim* "certain of those things of [his] father's doings which [Martin Junior] found among" old Marprelate's "unperfect papers" (147). The pamphlet features Martin Marprelate's note to the reader, followed by 110 theses that recapitulate his position on the established church and its officials. The tract does not simply reproduce old Martin's writings, however. Martin Junior's letter to the reader precedes Martin Marprelate's theses, which are followed by Martin Junior's letter to John Whitgift and an epilogue that hurls abuses at the bishops and comments on the recently launched anti-Marprelate campaign. *Theses Martinianae* thus participates in the larger Marprelate enterprise by attacking the bishops, but Martin Junior is also concerned with his role in the Marprelate dynasty. To this end, he positions himself as the old man's heir and literary executor, alleging that he, not one of his 500 brothers, will carry the flame for his father: "If my brother be gone, and none else of my brethren will uphold the controversy against you, I myself will do it," he declares (162).

Although Martin Junior says that he will continue his father's mission, he does not seek to replicate or replace him. His textual behavior, in particular his role as publisher, editor, and commentator reframes Martin Marprelate's work; Martin Junior situates it within his own attack on the ecclesiastical powers. Martin Junior's efforts to distinguish himself from his father are evident in the materiality of the pamphlet, especially in his preface and epilogue. Martin Marprelate's theses are sandwiched between blocks of Martin Junior's text. As such, Martin Junior has the first and last word, ensuring that he controls the way his father's text is interpreted, despite his claims to the opposite. Martin Junior promises to let his father speak for

himself as it were – "I have not added unto them aught of mine own, but as I found them, so I delivered them unto thee," he says; nevertheless, he does insert aught of his own, not in the theses, but in his commentary on them. From the very beginning, Martin Junior imposes his own reading on his father's theses, claiming that he is "sorry" to admit that "the speech pretendeth the old man to be something discouraged in his courses" (147). He maintains a critical attitude toward the theses in his epilogue, saying of his father's theses, "I myself do perceive some tautologies in the Conclusions as being the first draft, but I would not presume to mend them; that I refer to himself" (159). Here, Junior gives his father due reverence, and he preemptively refutes anyone who will point out Marprelate's logical fallacies by claiming he has reproduced a mere draft. Martin Junior's critical commentary on the theses provides a space in which he can differentiate himself from his father, even as he professes to continue his father's work. Old Martin may be pessimistic and he may have left a flawed draft, but Martin Junior remains optimistic about the enterprise. After all, he has "a pretty smattering gift in this pistle-making" and, like his father, will write again (163).

The narrative framework of *Theses Martianae* assures the pamphlet's currency, since it allows Martin Junior to respond to new developments in the conflict, most obviously the disappearance of Martin Marprelate and the appearance of the opponent persona Mar-Martin, the speaker of *Mar Martine* (published in May 1589). Mar-Martin seeks to do to Martin what Martin has done to the prelates – to damage their reputations – but instead of prose he writes in verse. Junior responds to Mar-Martin briefly, saying that his father's adversary "had no other bringing up than in a brothel-house" (161) and characterizes his pamphlet as "haggling and prophane" (163). Mar-Martin is bawdy and maladroit, a reflection of the bishops' own ignorance. Notably, Martin Junior does not cite Mar-Martin's text, and the reader has no sense of what is "haggling,"

"prophane," and ignorant about it, unless he or she has read it. Martin Junior thus requires that his reader is aware of the attacks on him and "gets" why he cannot abide such abuse. By responding to Mar-Martin and claiming the right to disseminate his father's textual remains, Martin Junior enters the fray, opening himself up for attack, and provoked two new personae to publish books against him: the anti-Martinist persona Pasquil published a counter-cuff against him (more of which below), and, most damningly, his own brother attacked him, characterizing his pamphlet as flawed.

Martin Junior's presumptuous behavior irked his older brother, "Martin Senior," and created conflict in the Marprelate clan. Martin Senior's *The Just Censure and Reproof of Martin Junior* is framed as a response to *Theses Martinianae*, not to the behavior of the ecclesiastical powers. The subtitle – *Wherein the rash and undiscreet headiness of the foolish youth is sharply met with, and the boy hath his lesson taught him, I warrant you, by his reverend and elder brother, Martin Senior, son and heir unto the renowned Martin the Great* – does not make mention of the controversy begun by old Marprelate and instead focuses Martin Junior's froward comportment. Martin Senior transposes the controversy's structure of charge and counter-charge – Mar-Martin *versus* Martin – into a familial context and uses it as the basis for a narrative of fraternal conflict, an inter-pamphlet controversy that has entertainment value. The pamphlet repackages Martin's platform in an amusing, narrative form, and targets a reading public that is in "the know" by recapitulating the contours of the controversy and complicating it. *The Just Censure* is thus triply contradictory; it speaks against Martin Junior, the ecclesiastical powers, and Mar-Martin. Martin Senior uses his reproof of Martin Junior as a pretext to distinguish himself as Marprelate's true heir, attack the bishops, and humiliate Mar-Martin.

Martin Senior folds an attack on John Whitgift into his pamphlet. This attack acknowledges the Marprelates' shared goal and represents Martin Senior's attempt at continuing his father's work. Martin Senior takes aim at the Archbishop of Canterbury with a spectacular mock-oration, in which Whitgift reacts to Martin Junior and sends pursuivants to hunt for him. Upon learning of Martin Junior, he is incensed:

> For here is a young Martin hatched out of some poisoned egg of that seditious libeler, old Martin. Why it truly grieves me, at the heart, that I, by her majesty's favor, having more authority in mine hand to repress these puritans than any bishop else hath had in England these thirty years, yet should be more troubled and molested by them these six years, than all my predecessors have been these six and twenty years. (172)

Then he sends men to pursue ruthlessly the parties involved in the making and dissemination of the new little book, warning his pursuivants never to return unless they find them: "But if you bring us neither Martin, the press, nor those aforenamed, never look us in the face more" (172). To the oration, Martin Senior, "gentleman, son and heir to the reverend and worthy Metropolitan Martin Marprelate the Great," adds a list of objections against Whitgift. The list recycles his father's complaints and insults, particularly the commentary on clerical greed, accusing John Whitgift "and the rest of his brethren" of "spendi[ing] and wast[ing] the patrimony of the church" (178). As for Whitgift, he is "so hardened in his heinous sins against God and his church, that as he cannot be reclaimed" (179). By attacking Whitgift in his father's stead, Martin Senior situates himself in a lineage of anti-clerical personae and demonstrates his competence in railing. This hyperbolic character assassination makes Martin Junior's verbal assault on the ecclesiastical powers seem tame, and becomes a means for Martin Senior's self-assertion, not just as a spokesman against ecclesiastical corruption, but as the most competent living persona in the Marprelate family.

Martin Senior says he could have tolerated Martin Junior's shenanigans, if his younger brother had taken on Mar-Martin in rhyme. Even the "meanest" of Martin's sons should have the capacity "to answer them, both at blunt and at rhyme," he sneers, taking aim at Junior's age and his undeveloped wit (186). Martin Junior's prose response to Mar-Martin does not constitute an effective counter-attack or even an "answer" because it does not showcase the skill and rhetorical versatility all Marprelates possess. (Here, Martin Senior sounds like his father who claimed that Whitgift's refusal to answer Thomas Cartwright in print signified the former's defeat.) For his younger brother's edification, Martin Senior provides a sample of what a verse response to Mar-Martin looks like, but the verse response presupposes that the reader has read *Mar Martine*. A quarto, *Mar Martine* contains eight pages of unequivocally bad, but fascinating, verse that aims to "mar Martine and his mates," by classifying them as enemies to the state. Martin Senior responds to Mar-Martin in equally bad verse, which recounts the "first rising, generation, and original of Mar-Martin. (A priest of Lambeth incubated the snake egg from which he hatched; the persona looks like a "deformed elf," and he smells "of forge or else of fire; all in all he is "A sot in wit, a beast in mind" [186].) Martin Senior then provides his adversary's epitaph, in case he dies "the death, that to the dog is due:" "He lies enditched here that from the ladder top / Did once bebless the people thus, but first he kissed the rope" (187). This epitaph plays on the one Mar-Martin composed for old Marprelate upon his hanging:

> HERE hangs knaue *Martine* a traitrous Libeler he was
> Enemie pretended but in hart a friend to the Papa,
> Now made meat to the birdes that about his carkas are hagling.
> Learne by his example yee route of Pruritan [sic] Asses,
> Not to resist the doings of our most gratious Hester,
> *Martin* is hangd, o the Master of al Hypocritical hangbies.[168]

[168] *Mar Martine* (London, 1589), A4v. Interestingly, Mar-Martin's epitaph plays on Martin's epitaph for John Bridges: "Here lies John Bridges late bishop, friend to the Papa" (*Epistle* 20).

Martin Senior closely imitates and mocks Mar-Martin's verse, and, while a reader can take pleasure in his ridiculous poetry, he or she cannot "get" the jokes unless he or she has read *Mar Martine*. (In fact, Senior's poetical attack on his opponent might induce someone to go buy *Mar Martine*.) Through his verse, Martin Senior attempts to destroy his opponent, "to give him a wipe or two, which I believe he will never claw off with honesty as he lives" (188). Mar-Martin never responded to Martin Senior, and perhaps Martin Senior successfully annihilated him. But *The Just Censure*, like *Theses Martinianae* before it, would open the door for more anti-Marprelate personae, who, provoked by the deficiencies in his argument as well as his arrogance, attacked Martin Senior.

Old Marprelate set the stage for the proliferation of more Martinist personae, and Mar-Martin, in conjunction with his "broyling brats," generated a profusion of anti-Marprelate personae who wrote against Martin. Inevitably, two personae appeared to comment on both Martinists and anti-Martinists. Plain Percival, the peace-maker of England, sought to reconcile the two sides, and Mar-Mar-Martin berated the opposing pamphlet campaigns.[169] As the controversy continued, it took on a life of its own. The personae's flamboyant personalities and behavior became strategies in a highly competitive game whose aim was not just political and ideological dominance, but also to attract more readers.

Martin, Counter-Martin, and the Marketplace of Print

The competition between Martinist and anti-Martinist personae can be thought of in dramatic terms, chiefly because the stage served as an imaginative resource for polemical texts

---

[169] Richard Harvey, *Plaine Perceuall the peace-maker of England Sweetly indeuoring with his blunt persuasions to botch vp a reconciliation between Mar-ton and Mar-tother* (London, 1590) and *Marre Mar-Martin: or Marre-Martins medling, in a manner misliked* (London, 1589). Hereafter, I will cite these sources parenthetically in the main text.

of the period.[170] Gabriel Harvey, in *Foure Letters* and later *Pierces Supererogation* refers to the marketplace as a "paper stage" and whines that he has been "thrust vpon" it.[171] The dramatic aspect of the controversy derives in part from the personae themselves: between their constant allusions to contemporary theatrical conventions – not only do they have close ties to the stage clown but they liken the books in which they appear to stage-plays – and the recognizable character types, especially the Tyndalian reformer and the Italianate Pasquino, they evoke and exaggerate, the personae become vivid and distinct textual personalities. But the drama and fun of the controversy also derives from the personae's quest to domineer over one another. Indeed, the mobilization of reforming characters, false imprints, rapid-fire character assassination, and literary one-upmanship are all part of a game the personae play, a game that pits Martin against Counter-Martin, Marprelate against Marprelate, and, ultimately, anti-Martin against anti-Martin.

The dramatic quality of the pamphlets comprising the controversy has not gone unnoticed. Ritchie D. Kendall writes, "The theatrical world Martin Marprelate creates in his satires is vibrantly alive with a kaleidoscopic assembly of colorful characters."[172] In a similar vein, Patrick Collinson has argued that "Martin is a character from and for the popular theater," who is answered by equally theatrical personae.[173] Martin's contemporaries, including Francis Bacon, commented on the controversy's dramatic flair. Bacon, in "An Advertisement Touching the Controversies of the Church of England" (1589), complains that the pamphlets are too stage-like: "And first of all, it is more than time that there were and end and surseance made of this immodest and deformed manner of writing lately entertained, whereby matters of religion are

[170] For the dramatic quality of religious polemic see Ritchie D. Kendall, *The Drama of Dissent*.
[171] *Pierces Supererogation*, Z2v.
[172] *The Drama of Dissent,* 183.
[173] " Ecclesiastical Vitriol," 165.

handled in the manner of the stage."[174] The tracts, he says, "turn religion into a comedy or satire" (3). Bacon is disgusted because religious polemic has become a base public performance, a disgrace to the serious matter of religion. "With a laughing countenance," the personae behave like clowns, mingling "Scripture and scurrility" in the same sentence (3).

To be sure, Martinist and anti-Martinist personae were often analogized with stage clowns. Mar-Martin equates Martin with Richard Tarlton: "These tinkers termes, and barbers iestes first Tarleton on the stage, / Then Martin in his bookes of likes, hath put in euery page" (A4v). And the unnamed persona of *Whip for an Ape* (which was also printed as *Rythmes against Martin Marre-Prelate*) calls Martin Tarleton's heir: "Now *Tarleton's* dead the Consort lackes a vice," he says.[175] Martin's enemy, Double V, in *Pappe with an Hatchet*, draws a connection between himself and the extemporal stage clown. He changes costume, and in turn his writing style, a couple times in the pamphlet: "Hollow there, giue me the beard I wore yesterday … But soft, I must now make a graue speech," he improvises (3.403). Later, he asks for a King Charles beard and says he will treat Martin like a monkey: "Take awaie this beard, and giue me a pikede vaunt … I will make him mumpe, mow, and chatter, like old Iohn of Paris garden before I leaue him," he says, expressly comparing his pamphlet to a public entertainment (3.406).

The anti-Martinist personae are so interested in theater that they compare their books to anti-Martinist plays. Their conflation of page and stage allows the personae to penetrate the book market further by attracting readers who delight both in the back and forth of the controversy and

[174] Cited from *Francis Bacon: A Critical Edition of the Major Works*, ed. Brian Vickers (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 4.
[175] For Martin's affinity to Richard Tarleton, see Patrick Collinson's "Ecclesiastical Vitriol." For more on Tarleton see Alexandra Halasz, "'So beloved that men use his picture for their signs.' Although the personae draw on stage conventions and make explicit reference to the theater, and although the controversy's commentators frequently associate Martin and his detractors with Tarlton, it is important to note that Tarlton was a print phenomenon, too. The jest books, which detail the clown's antics, also have a performative aspect. While Martin and his enemies indubitably draw on the popular theater, they also draw on preexisting print conventions that marry stage and page.

drama. These mock-plays have entertainment value; they serve to graphically humiliate Martin; and they become a point of competition. Which persona can stage Martin's demise most luridly? Which one expose him for what he truly is, and, in the process, shame him? The speaker of *A Whip for an Ape* implicitly analogizes his book with a dramatic performance, and the book's subtitle, *Martin displaied*, suggests its theatricality. The pamphlet begins by describing a relatively tame stage-play:

> A Dizard late skipt out vpon our Stage:
> But in a sacke, that no man might him see:
> And though we knowe not yet the paltrie page,
> Himself hath Martin made his name to bee.
> A proper name, and for his feates most fit;
> The only thing wherein he hath shew'd wit. (1-6)

The persona then unmasks Martin, proving "in three plaine poynts" that he is an "apish elfe" in "nature, nurture, name and all" (9-12). Similarly, in *The Returne of the renowned Caualiero Pasquill of England, from the other side the Seas* (October 1589), Pasquil tells Marphoreus that his forthcoming *The May-game of Martinisme has all the trappings of a theatrical performance: "*Pompes, Pagents, Motions, Maskes, Scutchions, Emblems, Impreases, strange trickes, and deuises, betweene the Ape and the Owle, the like was neuer yet seene in Paris-garden." In this book, "*Martin* himselfe is the Mayd-marian, trimlie drest vppe in a cast Gowne, and a Kercher of Dame *Lawsons,* his face handsomlie muffled with a Diaper-napkin to couer his beard, and a great Nosegay in his hande, of the principalest flowers I could gather out of all hys works."[176] Scandalized by this description, Marphoreus exclaims, "Peace, *Caualiero,* your tongue will be slitte if you take not heede, I haue heard some say, you should wringe for this geare if the

---

[176] The Pasquil tracts as well as *An Almond for a Parrat* appear in The Works of Thomas Nashe, ed. R.B. McKerrow and F.P. Wilson, 5 vols. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958). Hereafter, I will cite these texts parenthetically, by volume and page number, in the main text.

Queene were dead."[177] (1.83). Perhaps, if such a play were ever performed, it would invite censorship.

The anti-Martinists do more than compare their pamphlets to plays, however. They vividly describe performances of anti-Martinist theater. Based on these descriptions, scholars have argued that theater companies cashed in on the theatrical potential of the controversy, and anti-Martinist plays flourished on the London stage. These descriptions of anti-Martinist theater tell us that, on different occasions, Martin was "attired like an Ape" and anatomized. Pasquil describes a scene in which Martin "left the print of his nayles" on Dame Divinity's face, "and poysoned her with a vomit which he ministered vnto her, to make her cast vppe her dignities and promotions" (1.92). In *Martins Monthes Minde*, Marphoreus tells us that Martin was "whipt … then wormd and launced, made a "*Maygame* vpon the stage" and that "euery stage Plaier made a iest of him."[178] Scholars have argued that Paul's Boys, the Admiral's Men, Lord Strange's Men, and the Queen's Men put on anti-Martinist plays, which were ultimately censored because they featured material "unfytt and undecent to be handled in playes, bothe for Divinite and State."[179] As legend has it, the Lord Admiral's and the Lord Strange's men faced government sanctions for their part in anti-Martinist entertainments, when in 1589 London's Lord Mayor, John Hart, by order of Lord Burghley, suppressed all plays in the city. Apparently, "the Lord Admiralls players

---

[177] Tellingly, many scholars have misread the description of Pasquil's forthcoming book as a description of anti-Martinist drama.

[178] (London, 1589), E3v- E4r. Hereafter I will cite this book parenthetically in the text above. Martin's influence on the theater extended beyond plays about him; Patrick Collinson has shown that he is the source for the stage Puritan, and Kristen Poole has shown considerable overlap between Martin and FalstaffSee Poole, *Radical Religion*, ch. 1; Collinson "Ecclesiastical Vitriol;" and Collinson "The Theatre Constructs Puritanism," in David L. Smith, Richard Strier, and David Bevington, eds. *The Theatrical City: Culture, Theatre, and Politics in London, 1576-1649* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995), 157-69.

[179] E.K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, 4 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951), 1:295. For the banning of anti-Martinist theater, see Andrew Gurr, *The Shakespearean Stage, 1574-1642*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 23, 33-34, 36, 157 and Joseph Black's Introduction to *The Martin Marprelate Tracts*, lxiv-lxv.

very dutifullie obeyed," whereas "'the Lord Straunges players' went off 'in very contemptuous manner' and at the Cross Keys 'played that after noone to the greate offence of the better sorte.'"[180]

Yet none of the anti-Martinist plays survive and, as Richard Dutton cautions us, the narratives in which theater companies were censored for their part in anti-Martinist theater cannot be substantiated by the historical record. He writes, "We cannot totally discount the possibility that their involvement (whatever it amounted to) in the Marprelate controversy had dire consequences, but with absolutely no evidence of formal action having been taken (for example, nothing in the Privy Council records, although they appear to be complete) this shrinks to a relatively modest wisp of smoke."[181] Outside of the pamphlets comprising the controversy, there exists no record of anti-Martinist drama being performed, and the anti-Martinist personae whose accounts of anti-Martinist theater scholars take as fact are notoriously unreliable. Even Gabriel Harvey comments on their predilection for lying. In his attack on *Pappe with an Hatchet*, Harvey sarcastically surveys Double V's "priuie intelligences," including Martin's incestuous relationship with his own sister, and concludes the pamphlet's "credibilitie" is questionable (*Pierces* R4v-Sr). In short, although the anti-Martinist tracts seem to provide us with ample evidence about the theater and its role in the controversy, we cannot be completely sure about the nature of anti-Martinist performances, if there were any at all. Lewd or popular, pervasive or infrequent, censored or not, the anti-Marprelate plays will remain a mystery.

Whether or not theatrical companies took part in the Marprelate controversy, it continued to unfold on the paper stage, taking the form of a highly competitive and dramatic game in which

---

[180] Cited in Pierce, *An Historical Introduction*, 223.
[181] "The Revels Office and the Boy Companies," *English Literary Renaissance* 32, no. 2(2002): 328.

the personae used a variety of strategies to one-up each other politically and rhetorically. One of these strategies was to mobilize competing reforming characters, and so both Martin and his detractors associate themselves with the reform tradition. Through his commentary on censorship, Martin positions himself as a reformer like Tyndale, whose books were illicitly printed, and targets a readership interested in reformation classics. Not to be outdone, the anti-Martinists also characterize themselves and their "illicitly printed" books as reform-oriented and insist that their mission is to purge Martin and Martinism from England.

In the late-Elizabethan period, the marketplace of print was governed by the Star Chamber Decree of 1586, which ecclesiastical officials and members of the Stationers' Company were charged with enforcing. To gain entry into the marketplace, a text had to pass through specific institutional channels, the most important of which was to get licensed by a designated ecclesiastical official.[182] Martin's creators, of course, bypassed these channels and published his books illicitly. It comes as no surprise, then, that Martin takes aim at the politics of press censorship, thereby opposing himself to the established church and becoming a spokesperson for reform. In the tracts, Martin argues that the ecclesiastical powers target specific printers in order to ensure that puritan books and ideas remain out of circulation. His representation of censorship calls attention to the adversarial relationship between the puritans and the established church in the late 1580s, a time when puritans had been silenced in parliament.[183] According to Martin, the book market becomes another site in which the ecclesiastical powers ruthlessly persecute puritans, even as they protect Catholics. Throughout the tracts, Martin associates the established church with Catholicism, calling the Archbishop of Canterbury "the pope of Canterbury," and

---

[182] The Star Chamber Decree of 1586 put strict regulations on the book trade. Not only did it restrict printing to London, Oxford, and Cambridge, it limited the number of presses in London and required that printers submit to weekly searches of their shops. It is reproduced in Arber, *A Transcript*, vol. 2.
[183] See Carlson, *Martin Marprelate Gentleman*, 6-8.

priests "petty popes" and stating that Catholicism "maintaineth the crown of Canterbury" (*Epistle* 24). He claims that the ecclesiastical powers and Stationers turn a blind eye to Catholic printers who disregard the Star Chamber Decree, while they prosecute (and persecute) the puritans who have violated the same legislation to the fullest extent. In fact, Martin insists that the ecclesiastical powers have recently violated the decree by erecting a Catholic printer, one Thomas Orwin "who sometimes wrought popish books in corners" (*Epistle* 24), even as they ruined Robert Waldegrave's life.[184] After catching Waldegrave secretly printing puritan books, the Stationers confiscated his press and "utterly deprived him from printing ever again," just because he printed books that challenged the bishops' authority, not the state's (*Epistle* 23).[185] Significantly, Martin does not attack censorship as an evil in itself; rather, it is the institutional agents who have the power to censor books with whom he has a problem, for, as cogs in the established church's machine, they are active corrupters of the book market and ensure it reflects the larger religio-political situation in England.

Cyndia Susan Clegg has rightly pointed out that Martin overstates "the oppositional relationship between [puritan] printing and the establishment."[186] But, as Mike Rodman Jones has shown, such overstatement has rhetorical force, for it allows Martin to position himself in a long line of protestant reformers: "The Martinists themselves become part of the history of

---

[184] Interestingly enough, the STC lists Thomas Orwin as the printer of most of the anti-Marprelate tracts. Waldegrave was caught printing *The State of the Church of Englande laide open in a conference betweene Diotrephes a bishop, Tertullus a papist, Demetrius an vsurer, Pandocheus an in-keeper, and Paule a preacher of the word of God* (1588). For this offense, his press was "defaced and made unserviceable." Martin refers to one of the speakers, Diotrephes, as his "friend and dear brother" (*Epistle* 11). See W.W. Greg and E. Boswell, eds., *Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company*, 2 vols. (London: Bibliographic Society, 1955-56), 1:28.
[185] Whitgift responded directly to Martin's commentary on censorship. See Thomas Cooper, *An Admonition to the People of England* (1589), ed. Edward Arber (Westminster: Archibald Constable and Co., 1895), 32-41.
[186] *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England*, 175. For other studies of censorship in early modern Britain see Richard Dutton, *Licensing, Censorship, and Authorship in Early Modern England: Buggeswords* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000); David Scott Kastan, "Naughty Printed Books," in *Cultural Reformations: Medieval and Renaissance in Literary History*, 287-304; and Annabel Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Reading and Writing in Early Modern England* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991).

persecuted reformers from Wycliffe, through Tyndale, to the Marian martyrs – a new chapter to the Foxean narrative of religious history."[187] And, indeed, Martin does associate himself with Tyndale and other reformers. In the last Marprelate tract, *The Protestation of Martin Marprelate* (September 1589), he says his writings, along with Tyndale's, John Foxe's, and James Pilkington's, reveal "the corruption and unlawfulness of the places and proceedings of the lord bishops" to the world (200). Martin's adversaries recognized his reform agenda. In *Lamb of God*, Richard Harvey calls him "counterfeit *Martin*" and "*Psuedomartin*," for not "not euery *Martin* [is] a *Martin Bucer*, or *Martin Luther*" (5.178).

Martin's flamboyant pleas for reform did not go unanswered, as the anti-Martinists mobilized reform-oriented personae as a response to him and his ilk. Two of these counter-reformers are incarnations of the Italianate Pasquino and Marforio (anglicized to Pasquil and Marphoreus). The Pasquil and Marphoreus pamphlets — Pasquil is the speaker of *A Countercuffe giuen to Martin Junior* (August 1589) and *The First parte of Pasquils Apologie* (July 1590); Marphoreus is the speaker of *Martins Months Minde* (November 1589); and they appear together in the dialogue *The Returne of the renowned Caualiero Pasquill of England, from the other side the Seas* (October 1589) – merge the preexisting satirical tradition, which in England was associated with social and ecclesiastical criticism, with the reform tradition in order to take on Martin.

In 1501, a dilapidated statue was erected in Rome and given the name "Pasquino" or "Pasquillo," and later another was set up and called "Marforio" or "Marvortius." A custom, wherein people posted anonymous satires, called "pasquils," on Pasquino, developed, and a

---

[187] *Radical Pastoral*, 145.

pasquinade is a dialogue wherein Marphoreus and Pasquil debate.[188] Pasquil appeared in two sixteenth-century English satirical pamphlets – Thomas Elyot's *Pasquil the Playne* (1533) and *Pasquine in a Traunce* (1566), William Page's 1566 translation of Celio Secondo Curio's *Pasquillus ecstaticus*.[189] In both English books, Pasquil plainly attacks contemporary social and/or ecclesiastical vice, calling for the reformation of social and/or religious ills. In so doing, he and resembles the mid-Tudor Piers persona. The anti-Martinist Pasquil, as Alvin Kernan explains, modifies the humble, simple persona, transforming him into a "malcontent, arrogant, ostentatious" figure who rails against Martin energetically, ridiculing his platform, and matches wits with him.[190] More than a hyperbolic mouthpiece against vice, Pasquil is also a reformer. He states that news of Martinism caused him to hurry to England and that he plans to return to Europe and print more books against Martin and his sons, something which suggests his books are subject to censorship, just like Martin's. As we shall see, Pasquil mirrors Martin in more ways than these.

Pasquil was not the only anti-Martinist personae who explicitly aligned himself with the reform tradition. Cuthbert Curry-knave, speaker of *An Almond for a Parrat* (March 1590), says that he, too, has recently returned from the Continent in order to combat Martin and Martinism with his pen. On his way home from Italy, Cuthbert ran into an Englishman who told him that Martin had done something "which neither the Pope by his Seminaries, Philip by his power, nor all the holy League by their vnderhand practises and policies could at any time effect;" Martin had sown the seeds of discord in England and he must be stopped. Less obviously, Mar-Martin calls on the authority of Chaucer, who in the sixteenth century was viewed as a proto-reformer,

---

[188] Alvin Kernan, *The Cankered Muse*, 51.
[189] See Thomas Elyot, *Pasquil the Playne* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1533) and Curio, *Pasquine in a Traunce*.
[190] *The Cankered Muse*, 53.

to refute Martin. Toward the middle of his pamphlet, he begins speaking middle English: "*Thou* caytif kerne, vncouth thou art, vnkist thou eke sal bee," he says, alluding to a famous line in *Troilus and Cresyde* (A2v).

Part of what makes the battle between reforming personae entertaining is the ways in which their pamphlets manipulate recognizable print conventions associated with the reform tradition. An important element of the history of persecuted reformers is the history of their books, which were not only censored but often illegally printed on the Continent. Tyndale had English New Testaments printed in Cologne and Worms (1525 and 1526) and his influential *The Obedience of a Christian Man* (1528) was printed in Antwerp and smuggled into England (with the imprint "At Marlborow in the la[n]de of Hesse").[191] Several of John Bale's important anti-Catholic works were printed abroad, and even domestically, with false imprints. *An excellent and a right learned meditacion* (1554) states that it was "Prynted at Roane: By an Englysh scolers copie, by Michael VVodde,"[192] and *The vocacyon of Ioha[n] Bale* (1553) indicates that it was "Imprinted in Rome before the castell of S. Angell at ye signe of S. Peter."[193] Through jokey false imprints, Martin implicitly associates his books with such canonical reformation texts.[194] *The Epistle* states that it was "Printed oversea, in Europe, within two furlongs of a Bouncing Priest, at the cost and charges of M. Marprelate, Gentleman;"[195] *The Epitome* announces that it was "Printed on the other hand of some of the Priests;" and *Hay Any Work* indicates that it was

---

[191] *The obedie[n]ce of a Christen man and how Christe[n] rulers ought to governe* (Antwerp, 1528).
[192] John Bale, *An excellent and a right learned meditacion* . The STC says that this book was possibly printed in London by John Day.
[193] John Bale, *The vocacyon of Ioha[n] Bale*. The STC says that this book was possibly printed in Wesel by J. Lambrecht.
[194] Protestant reformers were not the only people who printed and shipped books with false imprints to England; Catholics did, too. Robert Parsons' *The First Booke of the Christian Exercise* (Rouen, 1582) does not list a printer or publisher, but states that it was printed with authority.
[195] Patrick Collinson has argued out that the false imprint is a joke. "'Europe' was Mrs. Crane's establishment at Molesey [where the first tract was printed], and little more than two furlongs away, over the Thames, was Hampton Court Palace." See *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* , 391.

"Printed in Europe, not far from some of the Bouncing Priests." By materially associating his books with English reformers', Martin authorizes and legitimates his religio-political critique and frames his pamphlet as a "kind" of book that a specific group of readers, one familiar with Reformation classics, would recognize.[196] Because this kind of authority-flouting book is produced and disseminated extra-institutionally, it is unsullied by the censors that Martin castigates.[197]

If the Marprelate tracts deployed false imprints to associate themselves with reformers, then so did the anti-Marprelate tracts. In an analysis of Martinist and anti-Martinist false imprints, Helen Smith has rightly argued that "the imprint becomes a crucial part of the reading experience, giving the lie, thanks to its exuberant fictionality, to R.B. McKerrow's insistence that title-page information is useful only as an advertisement, and has no relevance for the reader."[198] Smith's analysis is astute, but it looks forward to the seventeenth century, when satires routinely had humorous false imprints. As I have been arguing, the false imprints, as ludicrous as they might be, also look backward, and the pamphlets' relation to the reform tradition enables them to make a political statement. Like Martin and his sons, the anti-Marprelates align their books with illegally produced reformation classics, even though it was an open secret that they were

---

[196] Rosalie Colie, *The Resources of Kind: Genre-Theory in the Renaissance* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973), 2. Michael Saenger has argued that Colie's work is especially useful for studying the front matter of books because it "foregrounds recognition and comprehension" of specific textual forms. See *The Commidification of Textual Engagements*, 8.

[197] Interestingly, it was the material features of Martin's books that were of interest to the authorities pursuing him. In 1589 government officials were doing bibliographical detective work to discern whether or not the books had the same authorial origin. In a letter dated 24 August 1589 to Burghley, Whitgift wrote, "The letters [type] wherewith they were now taken printing, are the same whereby MARTEN Junior, and MARTEN senior, as they term them selfs, were printed: and therefore I dowt not, but that the author of those vnchristian Libles, may by them be Detected." See Arber, *Introductory Sketch*, 112

[198] "'Imprinted by Simeon such a signe': reading early modern imprints," in *Renaissance Paratexts*, ed. Helen Smith and Louise Wilson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 31. Smith cites R.B. McKerrow, "Booksellers, Printers, and the Stationers' Trade," in *Shakespeare's England*, ed. C.T. Onions et. al., 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1916), 2:231.

subsidized by the ecclesiastical powers.[199] What is more, the anti-Marprelate pamphlets' false imprints seek to surpass Martin's; they maintain their reform associations, but become increasingly absurd. Pasquil's *A Countercuffe giuen to Marin Iunior* (1589) riffs on *Theses Martinanae*, which brags that it was printed "without any privilege of the Catercaps" because it says that it was "Printed between the skye and the grounde, within a myle of an Oake, and not many fieldes of, from the vnpriuiledged Presse of the Ass-ignes of Martin Iunior." Other anti-Marprelate tracts concealed their origins by listing obviously fictional printers, publishers, and book sellers. *Almond for a Parrot* boasts that it was "Imprinted at a place, not farre from a place, by the Assignes of Signior Some-body, and are to be sold at his shoppe in Trouble-knaue Street, at the signe of the Standish." *Pappe with an Hatchet* has an even stranger false imprint: "Imprinted by *Iohn Anoke* and *Iohn Astile*, for the Bayliue of *Withernam*, *cum priuilegio perennitatis*, and are to be sold at the signe of the crab tree cudgell, in thwack-coat lane." Luke Wilson has shown that John Anoke and John Astile were "imaginary persons who were nothing more than names,"[200] and "Withernam" is a legal term for "reprisal."[201] While neither *Almond for a Parrat* nor *Pappe with an Hatchet* directly allude to the reformation, their patently fictional imprints give them an illicit coloring and can be read as an exaggeration of the existing conventions. Here, the ludic, economic, and political converge, as the playful false imprints alert potential book buyers to the pamphlets' potentially illicit content.

---

[199] Despite their false imprints, most people recognized that the anti-Marprelate tracts were church-sponsored. Writing during the height of the controversy, Thomas Phelippes wrote that *Mar Martine* "seemeth to be *cum privilegio*." In his "Advertisement," Bacon hints that they were published with authority, and Martin Junior tells the bishops to stop approving such "haggling pamphlets" for publication, as the books betray their ignorance.
[200] *Theaters of Intention: Drama and the Law in Early Modern England* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000), 219.
[201] *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "withernam."

Although the anti-Martinists assert that their aim is to murder Martin and his brood in print, they have economic motives of their own. In fact, they use many of their enemies' tactics to generate interest in their own pamphlets: they promise more books, they try to deputize an anti-Martinist writing public, they jest, they comically demonize their enemies, they threaten to breed, and they proliferate. Even so, the opposing campaigns are not identical. For the most part, the anti-Marprelate personae are not as sophisticated as their enemies, and the quality of their pamphlets ranges from crude (i.e. *Whip for an Ape*) to well-wrought (i.e. *An Almond for a Parrat*). The anti-Marprelate personae are not blood relations; there are more of them than there are Marprelates; and their pamphlets are more generically diverse. The multifaceted nature of the anti-Marprelate campaign, I would suggest, serves to generate reader interest by playfully packaging the anti-Martinist platform in a variety of ways, even as the many anti-Martinist personae make it seem as if Martin and his boys have provoked an army of detractors. By engaging Martin on his own terms, anti-Marprelate personae contribute to and complicate the ongoing textual drama, for the anti-Martinists do not just try to outdo Martin. They try to best one another.

Because he appears in three pamphlets, Pasquil best exemplifies how the anti-Martinists appropriated the logic of the Marprelate campaign. In many respects, Pasquil mimics Martin: he advertises future titles, threatens to deputize a writing public, and spawns more personae, though not through breeding. Throughout his pamphlets, Pasquil kindles demand for his future books. He states that he "hath vndertaken to write a very famous worke, Entituled *THE OWLES ALMANACKE*: wherein the night labours and byrth of your [Martin's] Religion is set down" Readers will have to buy the book in order to learn why this title is celebrated even before its publication (*A Countercuffe* 1.60). Pasquil's last published pamphlet, *The First parte of Pasquils*

Apologie, whose false imprint announces a forthcoming sequel, begins with an apology to the readers who have been anticipating more books. Pasquil, it seems, has failed to release the advertised titles because the "opening of [grievances against Martinism], is such an opening of waters, as will fill the eares of the world with a fearefull roaring" (1.109). Marphoreus confirms the demand for Pasquil's books in *The Returne* – "The Owles Almanack is expected at your hands," he tells his companion (1.74). Although Pasquil has not delivered the promised volumes, he does offer a glimmer of hope to his readers: a writing public to supply them with texts. Anyone can be a Pasquil, and so he calls on "any man, woman, or childe" to write against Martin and "to sticke uppe their papers uppon London-stone" (*The Returne* 1.101), to produce manuscript anti-Martinist reading material that is conveniently available all around town. [202]

Although Pasquil does not breed, he does provoke a multiplicity of personae to attack Martin in print. [203] He paves the way for more anti-Martinist personae whose books complement, comment on, and try to supersede his work. The responses to Pasquil reveal the competitive energy governing the anti-Marprelate campaign, particularly since each one adds complexity to the initiative. Marphoreus, for instance, publishes *Martins Months Minde* in order to attack Martin and point out a gap in Pasquil's knowledge. The book's front matter – its title page and dedicatory epistle – places it in two separate, yet entwined, dialogues. The title page, which announces that the book contains *the cause of his* [Martin's] *death, the manner of his buriall, and the right copies both of his will, and of such epitaphs, as by sundrie his dearest friends, and other of his well willers, were framed for him*, can be read as an adversarial answer

---

[202] Here, Pasquil alludes to the practice of verse libeling, wherein people anonymously wrote and circulated defamatory poetry. For more on this practice, see Alastair Bellany, "Libels in Action: Ritual, Subversion, and the English Literary Underground, 1603-1642," in Tim Harris, ed., *The Politics of the Excluded, c.1500-1850* (Basignstoke: Palgrave Macmillan,, 2001), 99-124.
[203] None of the anti-Martinist personae reproduce, but in *Almond for a Parrat* Cuthbert Curry-knave says Mar-Martin Junior is coming.

to and continuation of *Theses Martinianae*, for it tells the story of Martin's downfall to readers who have been following the unfolding family drama. The dedicatory epistle, however, establishes that the little book supplements Pasquil's work by giving their nemesis "one Cuffe more," and implies that it is more relevant than its forebears (A2r). Marphoreus, after all, bears news not just of Martin's death but his burial – "And so, if any man will knowe where *Martin* lies; let him vnderstand, that he is endunged in the field of *Confusion* enditched in the pit of *Perdition:* and cast ouer with the dirt of *Derision:* and there lieth he" (G4r) – and smugly apprizes Pasquil of the situation. Similarly, Cuthbert Curry-knave builds on Pasquil's work and tries to one-up him in *An Almond for a Parrat* (March 1590). Curry-knave associates himself with the anti-Martinist enterprise by suggesting that he is one of "a whole hoast of *Pasquils* are comming vppon you [Martin], who will so beleaguer your paper walles as that not one idle worde shall escape the edge of their wit."[204] Yet he distinguishes himself by calling attention to the humorous dimension of his pamphlet – "beware (gentle Reader) you catch not the hicket [hiccups] with laughing" the title page says – and dedicating it to his "loving brother" Will Kempe, implying that he and the stage celebrity are "fellows" and that Kempe will protect the book with the "credit of [his] clownery" (3.341-43). Pasquil cannot boast of such a distinction.

The anti-Marprelate campaign has received little scholarly attention, perhaps because the accretion of personae, in conjunction with their serial game of literary one-upmanship, is tedious. As Joseph Black explains, "The problem with much anti-Martinist material is that the style is often an end in itself, and quickly becomes tiresome – even, at times, to the writers themselves."[205] Black rightly observes that the pamphlets are interested in verbal acrobatics, yet

---

[204] *The Complete Works of Thomas Nashe*, 3.350. Hereafter, I will cite this edition parenthetically in the main text.
[205] "The Rhetoric of Reaction," 714. The dearth of scholarship on the anti-Marprelate tracts would surely surprise Isaac Disraeli who in 1835 lamented that "the books and manuscripts of the Mar-prelates have been too cautiously

his narrative is a degenerative one, wherein the pamphlets become increasingly obnoxious exercises in style. By contrast, I want to focus on the generative aspects of the anti-Martinist personae's rhetorical pyrotechnics. The outrageous, railing style that pamphlets possess, exasperating as it may be, is part of the competitive game that leads to the propagation of more personae. The anti-Martinists' quest to out-Martin Martin is a ludic undertaking – "Yes *Martin,* wee wil play three a vies wits," Double V, the speaker of *Pappe with an Hatchet*, V says, with "three a vies wits" meaning "match or wager three wits against thine" (3.399; 3.577, n.11) – a scoff-off between Martin and anti-Martin. New textual personalities, coupled with the tracts' invective diversity, allow the pamphlets to recapitulate the anti-Martinist platform in novel ways; generate small, but multi-faceted textual exchanges; and augment the ongoing textual drama.

The anti-Marprelates' railing style is most evident in their hilarious character assassinations, of both Martin and Martinists. The verse attacks on Martin, *Mar-Martine* and *Whip for an Ape*, try to rhyme Martin dead; their personae call attention to Martin's style, distinguish theirs from his, and try to murder him in print. *Mar-Martine*'s title page attacks Martin's "prose-books" and announces that "one truth in rime is worth ten lies in prose." Although he takes jabs at Martin and Martinism throughout, in a striking passage, Mar-Martin but zings his opponent in a rustic dialect:

> Holde my cloke boy, chill haue a vling at *Martin,* O the boore;
> And if his horseplay like him well, of such he shall haue store.
> He thus bumfeges his bousing mates, and who is *Martins* mate?.

---

suppressed, or too completely destroyed; while those on the other side have been as carefully preserved." The tables have turned since Disraeli's time, and so there is an excellent new scholarly edition of the seven Marprelate tracts but, sadly, not one of the Anti-Marprelate texts. See Disraeli's *Curiosities of Literature* (New York: William Pearson & Co, 1835), 245. *Almond for a Parrat* and the three Pasquil Tracts (A *Countercuffe Given to Martin Junior, The Return of Pasquil, and The First Part of Pasquil's Apology*) have been most recently edited and annotated in Ronald B. McKerrow's magisterial *The Works of Thomas Nashe*. *Pappe with an Hatchet*, *A Whip for an Ape*, and part of *Mar-Martine* all appear in volume 3 of *The Complete Works of John Lyly*. As far as I can tell, *Martins Monthes Minde, Anti-Martinus, Mar Mar-Martin,* and *Plain Percival the Peacemaker of England* have not been edited.

> O that the steale-counters were knoune, chood catch them by the pate:
> Th'vnsauorie snuffes first iesting booke, though clownish, knauish was:
> But keeping still one stile, he prooues a sodden headed asse.
> Beare with his ingramnesse a while, his seasoned wainscot face[.] (A4v)

What is striking about these lines is Mar-Martin's insistence that Martin's consistency in style betrays his ignorance. Mar-Martin, by contrast, deploys a variety of poetic styles to demonstrate his superiority over Martin: besides a rustic dialect, he taunts him in middle English, calling him a "chauntecleere" and characterizing Martinism, that "newfangled religioun," as "grosse knaverie, and maistres of confusioun" (A3r); he writes him an epitaph; he produces a dialogue; and he mocks his enemy in crude, metrically irregular couplets. Mar-Martin's stylistic virtuosity adds insult to injury, for, by attacking Martin in a variety of verse forms, his adversary claims to be the superior wit. (That claim is surely dubious). As we have seen, Mar-Martin's verse opened the door for a counter-invective – Martin Senior attempted to humiliate him in rhyme – but it also paved the way for imitators. The unnamed speaker of *Whip for an Ape*, which was also published under the title of *Rythmes against Martin Marre-Prelate*, entered the fray, and not only took aim at Martin and his character, but distinguishes itself from *Mar-Martine* by revealing Martin for what he truly is: a primate.

Whip for an Ape calls out the Marprelates, Martinists, and their monkey business. Like its predecessor, it attacks Martin in verse, but the persona sticks to an elegiac stanza form throughout the pamphlet. Both title pages situate the verse in relation to the controversy. *Whip for an Ape*'s subtitle *Martin displaied* indicates that it will expose Martin by putting him on display, and *Rythmes against Martin Marr-Prelate* gives an unequivocal statement of what the pamphlet contains. Like Mar-Martin before him, this persona takes aim at Martin's style in order to insult him:

> Such fleering, leering, iarring fooles bopeepe;

Such hahaes, teehees, weehees, wild colts play:
Such sohoes whoopes and hallowes, hold and keepe;
Such rangings, ragings, reuelings, roysters ray,
With so foule mouth, and knaue at euery catch,
Tis some knaues neast did surely *Martin* hatch. (25-30)

This sort of textual behavior, according to the speaking persona, demonstrates the Martins' affinities to monkeys. In the early modern period "martin" meant "monkey,"[206] and *Whip for an Ape*'s speaker relishes in making a point-by-point comparison between the two types of creatures – "Your babbling bookes bewraies [sic] you all for Apes," he says (60). And while this persona does not engage in the ape-like, stylistic "bopeepe" that Martin does, as the above quotations make obvious, he is not the solemn critic his verse form would suggest. Long ago, Isaac Disraeli noted the antithetical relationship between the poem's form and its content: "In our poetical history this specimen too is curious, for it will show that the [elegiac] stanza … is adapted to opposite themes."[207] The speaker, that is, uses a serious, regular verse form to caricature his foe, who is notorious for his freewheeling "colts play." Moreover, by equating the Marprelates with apes, he expands the range of insults applied to them, makes a connection that Mar-Martin does not, and, in the process, claims that he has rhymed "Martins Monckies face … staring mad" (151-54).

Whereas some personae try to assault Martin's integrity through rhyme, others deploy jest-book style, defamatory vignettes, which recount in vivid detail the pranks of Martin, his sons, and his followers. These comical, though libelous, interludes are part of the anti-Martinist game of one-upmanship, since they augment the body of anti-Martinist literature and each persona's stories surpass those of his forebears, but they also have an economic function for they

---

[206] *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "martin."
[207] *Quarrels of Authors* (London: J. Murray, 1814), 269.

seek to extend the range of the reading public the anti-Martinists pamphlets create by attracting those readers interested in jest books. So, when Cuthbert Curry-knave tells a story about a young Martinist, who "tombled his wife naked into the earth at high no one, without sheete or shroude to couer her shame, breathing ouer her in an audible voice: Naked came I out of my mothers wombe, and naked shall I return againe," he not only seeks to discredit Martinism, but titillate and entertain his readers with lurid news about Martin and Martinism (3.344). In *Pappe with an Hatchet*, Double V articulates the economic value of jest-book-style character assassination. He regales the reader with the following: "I could tickle Martin with a true tale of one of his sonnes, that hauing the companie of one of his sisters in the open fieldes, saide, hee would not smother vp sinne, and deale in hugger mugger with his conscience" (3.401). This story is just a taste of what is to come, for it is but one of "the hundred merrie tales" he plans to set forth soon, he advertises, whetting his readers' appetite for more hilarity. A font of funny information, Double V also purports to know about the foibles of Martinists: one such preacher, he says, could only handle four topics in a sermon: "why Christ came, wherefore Christ came, for what cause Christ came, and to what end Christ came" (3.405). Martinists, too, are morons whose deeds can be exposed for a reader's merriment. In telling comical stories to attract readers who take delight in the character assassination of Martin and his crew, Cuthbert Curry-knave, Double V, and the other anti-Martinists create demand for the publication of successively more entertaining anti-Martinist books, and more personae appear to satisfy that demand.

So far, my analysis may seem to suggest that the Martinists and anti-Martinists used similar tactics to consolidate discrete, partisan reading publics – Martinists and those who delighted in the Marprelates' humiliation. But I would suggest the contrary; the two enterprises have, instead, a shared readership. The anti-Marprelate personae market their books to people

familiar with Martin and his books – they make "benefit of [their] enemie," as Nashe would say – to sell their pamphlets to readers who recognize and enjoy them, and, by attacking his character, create a market for contradictory writing. Pierre Bourdieu has argued that the practice of "polar individuals," people who are completely at odds with each other, "remains determined by the negative relation that unites them."[208] Martin and his detractors were of a piece, which is something their contemporaries realized. Plain Percival, who seeks to reconcile the two parties, dedicates his book *Plaine Perceuall the peace-maker of England* (1590) to:

> *THE NEW VP-START MARTIN, AND THE MISBEGOTTEN HEIRES OF HIS body: his ouerthwart neighbor, Mar-Martin, Mar-Mar-Martin, and so foorth …* To all Whip Iohns, and Whip Iackes: not forgetting the Caualiero Pasquill, or the Cooke Russian, that drest a dish for Martins diet, Marphoreus and all Cutting Hussnufs, Roisters, and the residew of light fingred younkers, which make euery word a blow, and euery booke a bobbe. (A2r)[209]

Martin's and/or his sons' names appears prominently on the title pages of all the anti-Martinist pamphlets. The subtitle of *Whip for an Ape* is *Martin displaied; Pappe with an Hatchet* promotes itself as "*a countrie cuffe, that is, a sound boxe of the eare, for the idiot Martin to hold his peace, seeing the patch will take no warning*;" Marphoreus' contribution to the campaign, *Martins Months Minde*, cleverly plays with the genitive, and one has to read more than first two lines to

---

[208] "The Field of Cultural Production," 46. This quotation comes from Bourdieu's work on the modern field of cultural production, and "polar individual" in that contexts means competitors in the field of cultural production, particularly antagonists who "struggle to impose the legitimate definition of literary or artistic production." While the modern and early modern fields of cultural production are divergent, Bourdieu's discussion of the competition between participants in the field of cultural production is useful for thinking through the behavior of the personae involved in the Marprelate controversy.

[209] In a sermon preached at Paul's Cross, Robert Temple commented on the similarity between the Martinists and anti-Martinists: "So *Martin* publisheth manye his friuolous Pamphlets, bewraying in this, a spirite rather of scorne and slaunder, then learninge and loue, because hee handleth diuinitie with sucrrillitie, & scripture with laughter, more pleasant to a sight of gospell Libertines, and Churchrobbers, then medling at all with the matter in hande, much less deciding the controuersies by moment and wayght of argument, and therefore better answered alreadie by some merrie mates like himslfe … Fie for shame both *Martin* and *Antemartin*." See *A sermon teaching discretion in matters of religion, and touching certayne abuses nowe in the Churche* (London: R. Bourge for Edward Aggas, 1592), B8v-C1r.

find out whether it is a pamphlet by Martin or about him. These advertisements presuppose that the potential book buyer knows who Martin is and wants to learn more about the Marprelates and/or what befalls them, even if it is terrible news (such as "Martin died of the groin"). Making use of one's enemy's name to sell books was common in the early 1590s. In *Have with You to Saffron-Waldon* (1596), Thomas Nashe charges that his adversary, Gabriel Harvey, sometimes known as "Gorboduck Huddleduddle," sponges off his (Nashe's) success to attract readers. Nashe contends that Harvey's *Piers Supererogation* (1593) borrows "the name of *Piers Pennilesse* (one of [Nashe's] Bookes) which he knew to be most saleable, (passing at the least through the pikes of sixe Impressions) to helpe his bedred stuffe to limpe out of *Powles Churchyard*.[210]

By marketing their books to Martin's readers, the anti-Martinist personae commodify their adversarial relation to their opponent, and make "marring," to use terminology from the controversy, fashionable. Although the anti-Martinist tracts are not void of political content – indeed, all of them bring up the threat Martin poses to the state – they are framed as assaults on Martin's person, not just his Presbyterian platform. In the early modern period, "mar" was a multivalent term, meaning "to hamper, hinder, interfere with, interrupt, or stop (a person, event, etc.); "to impair or damage;" "to produce a flaw in;" and "to do fatal or destructive bodily harm to (a person, limb, etc.)."[211] The anti-Martinist personae mar Martin in all these ways – some try to destroy his credit, some expose his character flaws, and others try to murder him in print – and

---

[210] Cited in *The Complete Works of Thomas Nashe*, 3.35. Title pages frequently refer to books they were responding to, not only as a way to situate themselves in relation to their interlocutor, but as a way to increase their marketplace visibility. Gabriel Harvey's *Foure Letters* makes use of Robert Greene's name to sell books. *The Cobler of Canterbury* explicitly mentions *Tarltons news out of Purgatory*; Henry Chettle's *Kind-harts Dreame* (1593) and the anonymous *The returne of the knight of the poste from Hell with the diuels aunswere to the supplication of Pierce Penilesse* (1606) mention *Piers Penniless*; and *Vlisses vpon Aiax. Written by Misodiaboles to his friend Philaretes* (1596) alludes to John Harington's *Metamorphoses of Ajax* (1596).
[211] *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "mar."

turn that marring into a consumable product. Every book becomes “a bobbe” that can be bought and sold; Martin, anti-Martin, and their oppositional books are for sale, and so is the controversy. The proliferation of agonistic personae and their contradictory texts satisfies the demands of “in-the-know” readers and becomes a recognizable, trendy, and saleable, form of textual practice.

What made the Marprelate controversy a phenomenon, and what fueled demand for things Martin, was the persona with his limitless potential for augmentation and proliferation. Personae, as Puttenham reminds us, are feigned and portable. The persona can take on a life of his own – he can be berated, lanced, whipped, killed, and resurrected, *ad nauseum* – and travel from context to context, and so, for pamphleteers, Martin was an inexhaustible resource: his story could be written and rewritten, revised, retold, enlarged, and sold again and again. Martin himself argues that the portability, performativity, and iterability inherent to personae make him politically dangerous and elusive, since anyone can become a Martin and foment civil discord. But the very same qualities that make him a threat to the state ensure his commodification and his and his detractors’ proliferation. For if he was not portable, iterable, and performative; if his story was set in stone; and if he was a real person, then his story could not have been imagined in lurid detail, bought, and sold.

But the proliferating personae that made the controversy vendible also made it politically dangerous, for by turning religious polemic into a public performance the personae facilitated the development of a public sphere of communication, or a kind of public sphere. As Peter Lake and Steven Pincus have shown, the period following the Reformation “fostered public spheres of sorts; spaces for or modes of communication or pitch making in which appeals to a general audience were made through a variety of media, appealing to a notion of the public good (or

religious truth).”[212] Indeed, the struggle between Martinists and anti-Martinists was about the state’s religious welfare, and the competing personae used a variety of recognizable literary characters and forms to attract and maintain a “popular” readership, something which, as I noted above, caused the authorities great consternation, since they feared Martin and Martinism had the potential to cause civil unrest. Bacon’s disgusted commentary on the stagey aspects of the pamphlets can be seen as a reaction to their popular appeal, an anxious recoil from the way in which the controversy “offereth itself to the conceits of all men” (6).

While the personae’s public performance is a key feature of a “post-Reformation public sphere,” to use Lake’s and Pincus’ words, what troubled the controversy’s contemporaries was not simply that these personae appealed to the public in their religio-political debates; rather, the proliferative logic of the controversy itself generated anxiety, for its very structure threatened to perpetuate interminable contradiction, a boundless public sphere, and thus had serious political consequences. The anti-anti-Marprelate persona Mar-Mar-Martin suggests that the prevalence of endless controversy threatens the very foundations of the state: “While *England* falles a Martining and a marring,” he says, “Religion feares, an vtter ouerthrowe”(A3r). He continues, “Whil'st we at home among our selues are iarring, / Those seedes take roote which forraign seedes men sow (A3r). The profusion of brawling pamphlets, the incessant back-biting, and the proliferation of personae who propagate the same threaten national security, for the civil strife they incite plays into England’s foreign adversaries’ hands. Contradictory writing is a consumer trend with serious political ramifications. Interestingly, the anxiety about railing political pamphlets attracting foreign attention lingered on after the controversy. Writing in 1592, Robert

---

[212] “Rethinking the Public Sphere in Early Modern England,” in *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England*, 6.

Beale, then clerk of the Queen's council, and enemy to Archbishop Whitgift, argued that "invectives could not but serve the enemy's turn." In a letter to Burghley, Beal writes Thomas Nashes' *Pierce Pennilesse* could cause international conflict, for it "so reviled the whole nation of Denmark, as every one, who so bore any due respect to her Majesty and her friends, might be sorry and ashamed to see it. The realm had otherwise enemies enough, without making any more by such contumelious pamphlets."[213] It seems that little books had incredible domestic and international reach.

The Marprelate controversy eventually came to an end, but Martin's notoriety endured.[214] In the wake of the controversy, Martin became a recognizable character type, associated with religious and social satire. New Martins appeared in print, and one, the speaker of *Martine Mar-Sixtus*, repurposed the "great *Martine"* to take aim at Catholicism. In the book's dedicatory epistle, R.W. (Robert Wilson) blithely explains what a Martin is: "if you aske what *Martine* is, I must desire you to *Etymologize*," he says; "you shall pick his nature out of his name, the first sillable whereof implying of it selfe to *Mar*, and being he added with a *Tine*, the murdering end of a forke, it must needes be that *Mar-tine* being truely spelled and put together, signifieth such a one as galleth and pricketh men to death" (A4v). Mar-Sixtus says that he and old Marprelate only diverge in their chosen targets: "wheras he [Marprelate] most vnnaturally laid siege against his natiue soyle, & spent his powder vpon his owne countrey walles, I haue pickt me out a forreine aduersary, a common enemy to play vpon," he says (A4v). Sir Martin Mar-people, by contrast, attacks pervasive social vice and pleads that his contemporaries "turne from all [their] wicked waies" (A4v). These two new Martins capitalize off Marprelates' fame, even as they

---

[213]Cited in John Strype, *The Life and Acts of John Whitgift, D.D*., 4 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1832), 2:140.
[214] Martin Marprelate would resurface in the seventeenth century. For more on the persona in the seventeenth century see Nigel Smith, "Richard Overton's Marpriest Tracts: Towards a History of Leveller Style" *Prose Studies* 9 (1986), 39-66.

follow the pattern of assertion and distinction that characterizes the controversy. In overtly alluding to "the great *Martine*," the creators of Mar-Sixtus and Mar-People tap into Marprelate's political and market potential in order to penetrate the book market; they attract readers interested in the Marprelate controversy in order to sell politically oriented books.

What is striking about the Marprelate controversy is the extent to which the political, ludic, and economic are entwined. The personae turn their religio-political struggle into a highly competitive game, whose entertainment value attracts an in-the-know reading public interested in wit and excess as well as following the contours of the unfolding drama. The competition between the vivid, proliferating personae allows the Martinists and anti-Martinists recapitulate the same opposing religio-political points in new packages, making what would otherwise be a boring religious dispute arresting and facilitating the development of a public sphere. The controversy's political and literary significance cannot be understood without recourse to personae. More than mouthpieces for religious and political positions, the quarrelling, proliferating personae are the key to the controversy's vendibility and a crucial mechanism not just for the pamphlets' vendibility and a mechanism for their proliferation; they are crucial for the formation of the public sphere; they are responsible for the fun of the pamphlets; and they ushered in the "Martinish and Counter-martinish age." After the controversy, "the spirit of Contradiction" began her reign and new personae, including one Tom Nashe, who will be the subject of the next chapter, appeared to cash in on the polemical trend.

CHAPTER THREE:
"Troll and troll by": Jack Wilton, Tom Nashe, Doctor Harvey, and the Making of the Print Canon

In the epistle to "the fauourable or indifferent Reader" that prefaces *Lamb of God* (1590), Richard Harvey makes a connection familiar to many twenty-first-century scholars. One Thomas Nashe, whom Harvey testily claims he has "neuer heard of before," has had the audacity "to censure" Sir Thomas More, Roger Ascham, and Doctor Gabriel Harvey, among other prominent sixteenth-century English intellectuals, in print. This nobody, he remarks, is a "iolly man" who "play[s] the douty *Martin* in this kind," identifying Thomas Nashe with the fictional persona Martin Marprelate.[215] A few periodic sentences later, Harvey refers to Nashe and Martin in one breath: "Yet let not *Martin*, or *Nash*, or any such famous obscure man, or any other piperly makeplay or makebate, presume ouermuch of my patience" (5:180), he threatens. For Harvey, one of the reasons that Nashe and Martin are alike is that they are "makebates," indecorous writers who purposefully foment discord and provoke quarrels; they are the early modern equivalent of what Internet users would call "trolls."[216] Unfortunately for the Harvey family (but fortunately for Elizabethan, and modern, reading publics), Harvey played into Nashe's and Martin's hands by quarreling with them. In twenty-first-century slang, Richard Harvey fed the trolls, and in so doing provoked the Nashe-Harvey controversy.

The link between Thomas Nashe and Martin Marprelate is by now critical commonplace. Scholars acknowledge that the Marprelate controversy had a profound impact on Nashe's style. Nashe's polemical and rhetorical strategies, particularly his gift in the art of railing, bear striking resemblance to Martin's. Critics also agree that the long, vitriolic Nashe-Harvey controversy

---

[215] Cited from *The Complete Works of Thomas Nashe*, 5:180. Hereafter I will cite this text parenthetically above.
[216] *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "makebate."

capitalized on the Marprelate controversy's vendibility, filling a void left in its wake.[217] Yet, without the benefit of hindsight, there is something peculiar about Harvey's analogizing. Why compare Nashe to a fictional persona? Is there something, besides style and a polemical bent, which makes Martin and Nashe alike? By referring to Nashe and Martin as "obscure men," Harvey may be making an allusion to the scandalous sixteenth-century satire *Epistolae obscurorum virorum* (*Letters of Obscure Men*), a famous collection of fictional epistles from imaginary men. If this is the case, then Harvey not only classifies Martin and Nashe as fictional, but places them among an outrageous crew of writers.[218] Harvey's juxtaposition seems even stranger as the letter continues: "I am easily ruld by reason, so no feirce or prowde passion can ouerrule me." Besides Martin and Nashe, he asserts, no "vayne Paphatchet, or madbraine Scoggin or gay companion, any thing moue me" (5:180). Nashe is not just in the company of one fictional persona, but three.[219]

Twentieth- and twenty-first-century scholars do not seriously consider Nashe alongside fictional personae (Martin excepted); rather, they read his works, even those which are narrated by fictional personae, in terms of his status as an early professional author. Most critics agree with Lorna Hutson, who argues that Nashe possesses "a general critical awareness" of "the conditions of authorship" in the late sixteenth century and responds to them. For Hutson, Nashe's work resists the humanist conception of the author – a purveyor of wisdom whose books were

[217] Virtually all studies of Nashe make one, or both, of these points in passing, and most scholars argue that John Wolfe had hand in manufacturing the Nashe-Harvey controversy. For Wolfe's role in the controversy, see Charles Nicholl, *A Cup of News: The Life of Thomas Nashe* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984).
[218] For more on *Epistolae*, see Reinhard Paul Becker, *A War of Fools: The Letters of Obscure Men: A Study of the Satire and Satirized* (Bern-Frankfurt am Main-Las Vegas: Peter Lang, 1981).
[219] Paphatchet is shorthand for the speaking persona of *Pappe with an Hatchet*. Scoggin refers to John Scoggin, a jester who was the subject of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century jest books.

full of "educational possibilities" – by portraying it as "extraordinarily restrictive."[220] In a similar vein, Georgia Brown contends that, taken together, Nashe's writings can be read as attempts "to work out ways of articulating what has not yet been thought out, including the unfamiliar role of professional author."[221] According to Brown, Nashe's works figure professional writing in terms of frivolity and stylistic excess: "their self-promotion is based on the unashamed promotion of the trivial, negative, and peripheral aspects of authorial occupation."[222] Steve Mentz, too, argues that Nashe's prose "clarifies the tenuous position of the newly professionalized author in early modern England." As Mentz has it, Nashe's conception of authorship results from the tension between "the extemporal flow of writing and the mechanical work of printing."[223]

Studies that focus on Nashe as a professional author have illuminated not only the writer's works, which have often been considered exercises in "inexplicable themelessness," but also the early modern institution of authorship and its relation to the literary marketplace. Such scholarship is valuable, but it fails to account for the gap between the personae who narrate Nashe's work and the writer himself; instead it merges author and persona. Even scholars, such as Steven Hilliard, who acknowledge that "the Nashe we know is very much his own creation, the outspoken persona that he develops in a series of works," cannot resist collapsing the persona

---

[220] *Thomas Nashe in Context* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 65.
[221] *Redefining Elizabethan Literature*, 101
[222] *Ibid*., 33.
[223] "Day Labor: Thomas Nashe and the Practice of Prose in Early Modern England," in *Early Modern Prose Fiction: The Cultural Politics of Reading*, ed. Naomi Conn Liebler (New York: Routledge, 2007), 18. For more on Nashe and authorship see Jonathan V. Crewe, *Unredeemed Rhetoric: Thomas Nashe and the Scandal of Authorship* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982); Laurie Elinghausen, *Labor and Writing in Early Modern England, 1567-1667* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), ch. 2; Margaret Ferguson, "Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller*: The 'Newes of the Maker' Game*," English Literary Renaissance* 11, no. 2 (1981): 165-82; Stephen Guy-Bray, "How to Turn Prose into Literature: The Case of Thomas Nashe," in *Early Modern Prose Fiction*, 33-45; G.R. Hibbard, *Thomas Nashe: A Critical Introduction* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962); Wendy Hyman, "Authorial Self-Consciousness in Nashe's *Vnfortunate Traveller*, *SEL* 45, no. 1(2005): 23-41; Charles Nicholls, *A Cup of News*; Per Sivefors, "'This Citty-Sodoming Trade': The Ovidian Authorial Persona in Thomas Nashe's *Christ's Tears over Jerusalem*," in *Urban Preoccupations: Mental and Material Landscapes*, ed. Per Sivefors (Pisa, Italy: Fabrizio Serra, 2007), 143-57; and Mihoko Suzuki, "'Signorie ouer the pages': The crisis of Authority in Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller*," *Studies in Philology* 81, no. 3 (1984): 348-71.

into his originator.[224] This is largely because the personae narrating Nashe's work –Pierce Penniless; Adam Fouleweather, student in Asse-stronomy; Pasquil; Marphoreus; Cuthbert Curry-knave; Jack Wilton; Jesus Christ; and, of course, Tom Nashe himself – encourage us to read them in such a way. These personae seem authorial, in that they speak in the first person and are presented as writers in the texts in which they appear. For the purposes of this chapter, I will refer to these figures as "authorial personae" because they pose as the creators of literary texts, but also because the more famous personae – Euphues, Robert Greene, Martin Marprelate, and Thomas Nashe – have been interpreted in terms of Foucault's author function, becoming a principle of interpretation for the texts that bear their names.[225] They, and their creators, engage in a form of textual practice identified by Douglas Bruster as "embodied writing," a practice in which "persons merged with characters, and books merged with their authors."[226] Yet, the merging of author and persona, writer and character, person and book that Bruster traces is not as seamless as it seems, as my examination of Tom Nashe bears out. Authorial personae were complex figures precisely because their first-person rhetoric makes them seem as if they are projections of their creators, yet they have a highly fictional quality; they simultaneously encourage and resist absorption into an author.

Rather than think about Thomas Nashe the author, I want to take Richard Harvey's comparison seriously and think about Tom Nashe the authorial persona, a rhetorically constructed, fictional entity. Because I wish to distinguish the artificial figure, which is a formal

---

[224] *The Singularity of Thomas Nashe* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1986), 1.
[225] On Nashe, see critics cited above; on Robert Greene, see Steve Mentz, "Forming Greene: Theorizing the Early Modern Author in *the Groatsworth of Wit*," in *Writing Robert Greene: Essays on England's First Notorious Professional Writer*, ed. Kirk Melnikoff and Edward Giesekes (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), 115-32; on Martin Marprelate, see Marcy North, *The Anonymous Renaissance*, ch. 5.
[226] *Shakespeare and the Question of Culture*, 67. Bruster's work has been foundational for me, but he is interested in embodiment, and I am not. I will take his argument up more fully in my discussion of the Nashe-Harvey controversy.

feature of the literary texts in which he appears, from the historical author, and so I refer to the persona as "Tom Nashe" and the author as "Thomas Nashe." As I shall argue, Tom Nashe possesses a general critical awareness of his status as persona and responds to it. This is not to deny that Thomas Nashe existed, that he wrote pamphlets, that his pamphlets comment on the conditions of authorship, or even that there is truth to be gleaned from his writing. Nashe's texts do contain verifiable biographical data – in *Lenten Stuffe* (1599) he tells us he was born in Lowestoft and his "father sprang from the *Nashes* of Herefordshire" (3:205) – but it is also true that the Tom Nashe who narrates *The Anatomy of Absurdity* (1589), *Strange News* (1592), *Have with You to Saffron-Walden* (1596) and *Lenten Stuffe* is highly stylized and can be read in terms of "autofiction," to borrow a term from Geoffrey Gust. Gust explains: "Autofiction emphasizes that any literary self-presentation is a creative construction, a narrative doubling in which the fictional surrogate need not look, think, or feel like the author him/herself,"[227] and Tom Nashe suggests as much. In *Have with You to Saffron-Walden*, he explains that he "personate[s]" himself in the text, which suggests that Piers Respondent (sometimes called "Tom," sometimes "Nashe," and sometimes "Piers Respondent") is "an assumed character," not necessarily a vessel for Nashe himself.[228] Similarly, in the preface to *Christs teares over Ierusalem* (1593), he writes "I transforme my selfe from my selfe" (2:16), a statement that underscores the performative quality of the book's narration. As we shall see, for Nashe, "to be a man in print," to use Thomas Dekker's oft-quoted phrase, is not to be an author of books; it is to feign a person in print, a

[227]*Constructing Chaucer*, 41.
[228] *OED*, s.v. "personate."

person who has the potential to take on a commodified life of his own beyond the author, and thus to become an identity that anyone can assume, to be mobilized in new narratives.[229]

In focusing on the malleable figure of the authorial persona, this chapter contends that the device is the organizing principle of what I shall call the "print canon," an alternative type of canon in the long 1590s, one not tied to the authority of authors, but to the authority of authorial personae, and therefore to the market. Tom Nashe is not only central to this canon – he actively helped to shape it – but, during the Nashe-Harvey controversy, his and Doctor Gabriel Harvey's use and abuse of authorial personae point to the way in which the print canon was formed. The print canon is not synonymous with the literary canon established by modern literary scholars because it is perpetuated by consumer demand. Attached to vendible textual personalities, it links literary and economic value.[230] The print canon is also specifically a phenomenon of the long 1590s, a product of the Star Chamber Decree of 1586 which placed strict regulations on the book trade. In light of the censorship mechanisms put in place by this legislation, personae became attractive literary devices, as their originators could disclaim responsibility for seditious statements these fictional entities might make. Following the Marprelate controversy, authorial personae became more vendible and began to take up a larger market share, as an increasing number of retailers sold books about them, something encouraged by the practices and protocols of late-Elizabethan book production. Because publishers paid writers and printers up front for their literary wares and kept the book profits for themselves, they benefitted financially from

---

[229] *The guls horne-booke* (London: Nicholas Okes for R.S., 1609), A4r. The phrase "man in print" was common in the late-sixteenth and early-seventeenth centuries. For a discussion of the social and gender implications of being a man in print, see Wendy Wall, *The Imprint of Gender: Authorship and Publication in the English Renaissance* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993), Intro.

[230] The print canon that is the subject of this chapter resembles the social canons discussed by David Brewer and Franco Moretti. Like Brewer and Moretti, work also seeks to posit an alternative to the traditional academic canon, a model that would explain the prevalence of authorial personae in the long 1590s. See Brewer, *The Afterlife of Character, 1726-1825*, Intro and Franco Moretti, "The Slaughterhouse of Literature," *Modern Language Quarterly* 61, no.1 (2000): 207-27.

producing pamphlets featuring saleable personae. Though this chapter focuses exclusively on the print canon, I do not argue that the authorial persona was the only path to canonicity in the late-Elizabethan period, as literary critics like Philip Sidney and George Puttenham were engaged in the type of author-driven canon formation familiar to modern critics.[231] Nor do I make an argument about publishers pushing the agenda of the print market as other critics have done.[232] Early modern publishers did contribute to the development of the literary marketplace, but it is my contention that the publication of books featuring personae was a response to the consumer demand created by authorial personae rather than a calculated effort to shape the literary culture of the 1590s.

As I will show in this chapter studying authorial personae on their own terms complicates our definitions of the literary canon and authorship. It is divided into two sections, with the first focusing on *The Unfortunate Traveller* (1594), an episodic fictional text that is narrated by a page named Jack Wilton. The book characterizes the making of the print canon as a contest between authorial personae, a contest in which they assert and distinguish themselves from their predecessors, simultaneously vying for literary and market dominance. Jack attempts to enter the print canon by competing with Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, and the interaction between these two personae is a crucial context not only for Tom Nashe's self-presentation, but the Nashe-Harvey controversy. The second section of this chapter examines the last two texts in that pamphlet war: *Pierces Supererogation* and *Have with You to Saffron-Walden*. The speaking personae of these polemics, Tom Nashe and Doctor Gabriel Harvey respectively, engage in the type of contest that *The Unfortunate Traveller* outlines, with each persona trying to destroy his

---

[231] See George Puttenham, *The arte of English poesie* (London: Richard Field, 1589) and Philip Sidney, *The defence of poesie* (London: William Ponsonby, 1595).

[232] See Zachary Lesser, *Renaissance Drama and the Politics of Publication: Readings in the English Book Trade* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007)

enemy's reputation as well as his commercial viability, and Tom Nashe emerges the clear victor. He enters and exits the Nashe-Harvey controversy a textual celebrity, earning a spot in the print canon alongside Martin Marprelate.

Jacking Around, or, A Tale of Two Personae

The Unfortunate Traveller has long been the object of critical scrutiny, largely because the book's generic experimentation is dizzying. Throughout his travels, the narrator Jack Wilton deploys a vast array of literary forms – humanist oration, life-writing, sermon, jest-book anecdotes, urban journalism, lyric poetry, revenge tragedy, medical anatomy and satire[233] – and over the past forty years, scholars have situated the pamphlet in these generic contexts.[234] Some critics argue that Jack's generic mixing allows him to make an argument about the nature of early modern literary culture.[235] These studies have been valuable, and I build on them here, but in their emphases on genre, they often neglect the book's narrator, who as its subtitle (*The Life of Jack Wilton*) attests is its subject. Jack Wilton may or may not be "a truly neurotic personality,"

---

[233] Ann Rosalind Jones identifies most of these genres in her "Inside the Outsider: Nashe's *Unfortunate Traveller* and Bakhtin's Polyphonic Novel," *ELH* 50, no. 1(1983): 64.

[234] Scholarship that situates *The Unfortunate Traveller* in various genres includes: Judith Andersen, "Anti-Puritanism, Anti-Popery, and Gallows Rhetoric in Thomas Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller*," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 35, no.1 (2004):43-63; Alex Davis, *Renaissance Historical Fiction: Sidney, Deloney, and Nashe* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2011); Philip Edwards, "Unfortunate Travelers: Fiction and Reality," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 50, no. 3 (1987): 295-307; Andrew Fleck, "Anatomizing the Body Politic: The Nation and the Renaissance Body in Thomas Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller*," *Modern Philology* 104, no. 3 (2007): 295-398; Marina Gibbons, "Polemic, The Rhetorical Tradition, and *The Unfortunate Traveller* 63, no. 3 (1964): 408-21; Madelon S. Gohlke, "Wilton's Wantonness: *The Unfortunate Traveller* as Picaresque," *Studies in Philology* 73, no. 4 (1976): 397-413; Dorothy Jones, "An Example of Anti-Petrarchan Satire in *The Unfortunate Traveller*," *The Yearbook of English Studies* 1 (1971): 48-54; Steven R. Mentz, "The Heroine as Courtesan: Dishonesty, Romance, and the Sense of an Ending in *The Unfortunate Traveller*," *Studies in Philology* 98, no. 3 (2001): 339-58; Allyna E. Ward, "An Outlandish Travel Chronicle: Farce, History, and Fiction in Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller*," *The Yearbook of English Studies* 41, no. 1 (2011): 84-98.

[235] For studies on the literary historical elements of the text, see Stephen Guy-Bray, "How to Turn Prose into Literature" and Steven R. Mentz, "Jack and the City: *The Unfortunate Traveller*, Tudor London, and Literary History," in *A Companion to Tudor Literature*, ed. Kent Cartwright (London: Blackwell, 2010): 489-503.

to cite Richard Lanham, but his self-dramatization is at the center of the book,[236] which Nashe himself suggests when he calls it "[his] *Iacke Wilton*" in the dedicatory epistle to the second edition of *Christs teares over Ierusalem* (2:182). Based on Jack's seemingly erratic self-dramatization and his labyrinth prose style, one might call *The Unfortunate Traveller* an exercise in jacking around. In shuffling through an ill-defined generic and stylistic repertory, Jack does not merely waste time, however. Through his virtuosic shape-shifting, from jester, to preacher, to court poet, and more, Jack narrativizes the commodification of the authorial persona as well as vies for a spot in the print canon.

The Unfortunate Traveller follows the format of what Ernst Schulz calls "Schwankbiographien" (jest-biographies[237]), which are structured by the exploits of "a popular hero," or a specific persona.[238] These books, arranged in a series of third-person vignettes, recount the memorable pranks of their titular heroes.[239] Jack establishes a connection between his text and the jest-biographies, prior to cataloguing his "scutcherie," or knavery[240]: "Here let me triumph a while … I will not breath neither till I haue disfraughted all my knauerie," he states ebulliently (2:224). *The Unfortunate Traveller*, however, diverges from the established jest-biography tradition, in that Jack connects each of his little stories with prose and tells his tale in

---

[236] "Tom Nashe and Jack Wilton: Personality as Structure in *The Unfortunate Traveller*," *Studies in Short Fiction* 4, no. 3(1967): 215.
[237] Cited in F.P. Wilson, "The English Jest-books of the Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Centuries," in *Shakespearean and Other Studies*, ed. Helen Gardner (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), 286.
[238] *Ibid*., 298. For a history of the genre, see *A Hundred Mery Tales*, ed. P.M. Zall (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1963), Intro.
[239] Besides Richard Tarlton, the jest-book personae that were circulating in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries include: Jack of Dover (*Jack of Dover* [London: W. Wright for William Ferbrand, 1604]); George Peele (*Merrie Conceited Iests of George Peele Gentleman* [London: Nicholas Okes for Francis Faulker and Henry Bell, 1607]); John Skelton (*Merie tales newly imprinted [and] made by Master Skelton Poet Laureat* [London: Thomas Colwell, 1567]); John Scoggin (*The iests of Skogyn* [London: Thomas Colwell, 1570]); the Widow Edith (*XII mery iests of the Wydow Edyth* [London: Richard Jones, 1573]); and Old Hobson (*The pleasant conceites of Old Hobson the merry Londoner* [London: George Eld for John Wright, 1607]).
[240] *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "scutchery."

the first person, styling himself the book's popular hero and its writer. Its use of the jest-biography genre calls attention to its eponymous persona's portability and his potential for commodification. At the same time, Jack's modifications to the jest-biography tradition allow him to highlight the authorial persona's fictional qualities and its capacity for augmentation, despite the fact that it is mediated by the books in which it appears.

Jack Wilton has been called many things – hubristic, scoundrel, grotesque exaggerator, satirist, scamp, and scoffer, among other choice epithets – but he is nothing if not an opportunist. Throughout *The Unfortunate Traveller*, he tries to best authority figures, attempting to advance himself socially and/or financially.[241] But he also presents himself as a vendible commodity, which has the potential to become a marketplace fixture, and he does so through the use of the jest-biography tradition. When we first meet Wilton, it is 1513 and he is a soldier for "the terror of the world and feauer quartane of the French, *Henrie* the eight (the only true subiect of the Chronicles)" (2:209). The page tells us that the King and his troops are encamped and ready for battle, set to take "*Turney* and *Turwin*" (Thérouanne and Tournai) (2:209). The King's camp buzzes with various types of personnel, including soldiers, shopkeepers, and servants, as "[w]ho so euer is acquainted with the state of a campe vnderstandes" (2:210). As such, it is an ideal site for mischief of the sort found in jest books – "Much companie, much knauery, as true as that old adage, Much curtesie, much subtiltie," Jack tells us slyly (2:210). Wilton's account of his time in Henry VIII's military camp showcases his roguery, recounting how he pranks a cider merchant, an "vgly mechanicall Captaine," a "Switzer Captaine," and a "companie of coystrell Clearkes." These incidents are arranged in episodic form, almost like a list of Jack's youthful jollity, his

[241] For more on Jack's issues with authority figures, see Suzuki, "'Signorie ouer the pages;'" Richard Lanham, "Tom Nashe and Jack Wilton;" and Philip Schwyzer, "Summer Fruit and Autumn Leaves: Thomas Nashe in 1593," *ELR* 24, no. 3 (1994): 583-619.

quips, cranks, and wanton wiles. The events of the book, according to Agnes M. C. Latham, are "designed to leave its readers giddy, gasping and weak with laughter, as though they had just come off a switch-back."[242] If this is even true, then Jack fails because he has repulsed many readers, who have found his jests to be unfunny and downright disturbing.

In his first-person commentary on his misdeeds, Jack calls attention to his pamphlet's debt to the jest-biography tradition. Not only does he self-reflexively remark on his authority-defying comportment, saying that his tricks are nothing less than "the foundation of [his] roguerie" (2:226), but he also refers to his antics as "iests" and declares himself a "famous Foole" (2:217). He even says that his bad behavior has become the basis for winter's tales, which is a common jest-book trope. After he dupes a cider merchant into giving out a "doale" of the delicious beverage – an heavenly scene that features "syder in bowles, in scuppets, in helmets," and even in boots (2:216) – the King gets wind of this jest and has the page "pitifully whipt for [his] holiday lye." Even so, "they [the King and camp] made themselues merrie with it manie a Winters euening after" (2:16). As a point of comparison, the subtitle of *Pasquils iestes* (1604, frequently reprinted) – *Very prettie and pleasant, to driue away the tediousnesse of a winters evening* – suggests that jests and jest books are perfect entertainment during cold, dark evenings.[243] Similarly, the epistle to the reader in *The Cobler of Canterburie* (1590) says that the jest-filled pamphlet is best enjoyed on a winter's night: any farmer can hear the book's merry tales read aloud and "laugh while his belly akes."[244]

At first glance, it appears that Jack reproduces his jests because he desires to achieve celebrity, to elevate himself to popular hero status. A popular hero, as Tony Bennett and Janet

---

[242] Cited in Lanham, "Tom Nashe and Jack Wilton," 209.
[243] William Fennor, *Pasquils iests, mixed with Mother Bunches merriments. Wherevnto is added a doozen [sic] of gulles. : Pretty and pleasant, to driue away the tediousnesse of a winters euening* (London: John Brown, 1604).
[244] *The cobler of Caunterburie*, A3r.

Woollacott remind us, is “an established point of cultural reference,” which is “lodged in the memory bank of [a] culture.” Available for anyone’s appropriation, they circulate commonly and develop a “semi-independent existence” in the marketplace.[245] In the early modern period, Robin Hood, Richard Tarlton, and John Scoggin became brands, and their names sold books. Jack seeks to enter into their company, as he reveals in a particularly telling aside. Wilton, it seems, was a celebrity in his camp but his exploits and notoriety are fading into obscurity. While he was once the subject of winter’s tales whose devious actions constituted “famous atchieuements” (2:217), his zany exploits are mostly absent from the annals of posterity. “It is pitie posteritie should be depriued of such precious Records; & yet there is no remedie,” he laments (2:217). Jack immediately undercuts this pessimism: “yet there is too,” he says, “for when all failes, welfare a good memorie. Gentle readers (looke you be gentle now since I haue cald you so), as freely as my knauerie was mine own, it shall be yours to use in the way of honestie” (2:217). The pamphlet, as a precious record of his waggish doings, becomes instrumental for his entrance into cultural memory, since readers will keep his memory alive.

Jack’s preoccupation with the perpetuation of his once-great notoriety, however, betrays his, and the book’s, interest in the marketplace of print. Indeed, the pamphlet is framed by the marketplace and champions Jack as a vendible commodity. The “Induction to the dapper Mounsier Pages of the Court,” which prefaces *The Unfortunate Traveller*, calls Jack “the King of the pages” and comments on the persona’s commercial visibility. The pamphlet and its “grand printed Capitano” can be found in “Euerie Stationers stall,” it advertises (2:208). This dubious claim to popularity is designed to create a fictional consumer trend to attract readers. The book’s conclusion also functions as an advertisement, for in his parting words Jack tells the reader that

---

[245] *Bond and Beyond: The Political Career of a Popular Hero* (Basingstoke: Macmillan Education, 1987), 14.

he may appear in print again: “All this conclusiue epilogue I will make is this; that if herein I haue pleased anie, it shall animat mee to more pains in this kind” (2:328). These closing remarks attest to Jack’s ability to circulate commonly; although an invention of *The Unfortunate Traveller*, he can be reanimated in more books, if the pamphlet proves saleable. Throughout the book, Jack hints at future publications. Toward the middle of the pamphlet he makes a wistful statement: “I had done a thousand better iests, if they had been bookt in order as they were begotten” (2:217). Later, he abruptly stops cataloguing his misdeeds in Henry VIII’s court because it would be inappropriate to “place a volume in the precincts of a pamphlet,” (2:227). Although this is not a promise of sequels, it does open up a space for more volumes about the page, volumes which will take advantage of his commodity status and continue his narrative in the marketplace of print.[246]

Although Jack appears to abandon jest-biography when he leaves Henry VIII’s military camp, he never truly leaves that genre behind. He continues to engage in trickery and deceit, and the book remains governed by an episodic structure linked only by Jack’s biography. The pamphlet seems to progress linearly, yet Jack makes temporal leaps and his story ends abruptly. He points out gaps and truncations in the narrative, tantalizing the reader with details of his life only to withhold them. He turns from an account of the King’s camp at “Turwin,” even though what happened there could fill a volume; he refuses to “discouer … how oft [he] was crowned King of the drunckardes” (2:228); he will not tell us how he “dealt with” Diamante (his courtesan) successfully (2:263); he avoids discussing the contents of a conversation he has with

[246] Jest books are an ideal, and marketable, vehicle to extend a persona’s narrative because of their episodic structure. Accretions of fictional anecdotes with little to no narrative structure between them, they contribute to the preexisting body of materials about a given persona. Moreover, jest books do not tend toward closure and thus set themselves up for endless augmentation, or sequels, including other jest books. This happened in the seventeenth century, when the popular *Scoggins iestes* (1613) was expanded and marketed as *The first and best part of Scoggins iests* (1626), which implies there are more books to come.

Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey (2:269); and he cuts his tale short because he has "wearyed all [his] readers" (2:315). The very structure of the book demonstrates how Jack can be imagined in a variety of generic contexts. Wilton acts in several capacities – preacher, companion of a courtesan, counterfeit Earl, traveler, student, and prisoner, among others – moving from situation to situation, genre to genre. Jack's efforts, however, are unsuccessful, as he only appears in *The Unfortunate Traveller*. Even though the book went through two editions, there seems to have been a dearth of consumers who wanted to know Jack better.

*The Unfortunate Travelle*r's use of jest-biography can also be read in terms of Jack's literary ambitions: Wilton wants to become one of the famous textual personalities that were circulating in the marketplace of print, and to earn a spot in English literary history, becoming a member of the print canon. One of the chief alterations that Jack makes to the jest-biography genre is that he speaks in the first person, as both the book's subject and its writer. Merging jest-book persona and authorial persona forces an analogy between the two, an analogy in which the authorial persona can be detached from the site of its original production and take on a commodified life of its own in the marketplace. Through his interaction with other authorial personae – including Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam, Thomas More, and Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey – The Unfortunate Traveller stages a competition between authorial personae, who are mediated by the books in which they are conveyed, in the marketplace, a competition for celebrity, literary dominance, and vendibility that is central to the formation of the print canon.

Because Jack is simultaneously author, character, and printed page, he seems to be a poster child for Douglas Bruster's "embodied writing." The book's Induction suggests that Jack is indistinguishable from the material context in which he is conveyed, referring to him as both a page and a "grand printed Capitano." Because author, book, and character are one, the Induction

claims, slandering *The Unfortunate Traveller* constitutes slandering its eponymous hero, and it thus instructs the reader to give whoever "shall dispraise it or speake against it [the pamphlet/Jack]" the "stockado" (2:207). The result of embodied writing, as the pamphlet shows, is that the book circulates and produces authorial personae as well as determines their meaning. In other words, the readers cannot verify what Jack tells them, for he is a function of the printed book. Jack highlights this implication when he suggests that his credibility springs from his materiality. Introducing his love interest and courtesan, Diamante, he says, "I durst pawn the credite of a page, which is worth an ams ace at all times, that she was immaculate honest till she met with vs in prison" (2:262).[247] Jack confirms what the reader already knows; he is a liar – an "ams ace" is the lowest throw at dice (4:278) – and the pages of the book are full of fabrications. Later, Jack contradicts himself by feigning honesty, saying that if he partially reproduced what he learned in Rome, such as " halfe the miracles which they there told [him] had beene done about martyrs tombes," the reader would regard him as "the most monstrous lyer that euer came in print" (2:280). Here, the book becomes a principle of interpretation, as Jack's textual behavior determines whether or not he is perceived as a liar.

Throughout *The Unfortunate Traveller*, authorial personae are mediated by books in which they appear, and, like Jack, they are shaped by their textual manifestations, not bound by them. During his travels, Jack interacts with and analogizes himself to three other authorial personae – Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey; Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam; and Thomas More. These figures are not stand-ins for historical figures; rather, they are closely aligned with the speaking personae of their publications *Songs and Sonnets*, *Praise of Folly*, and *Utopia* respectively. Because they recall their original textual manifestations, these personae could be

---

[247] For more on credit in the book see Hutson, *Thomas Nashe in Context*, ch.11.

described in terms of Mikhail Bakhtin's work on heteroglossia in language, wherein every word "tastes of the context and contexts in which it has lived." [248] Surrey, Erasmus, and More savor of their former material contexts, even as they are redeployed in the marketplace. Like Jack, these personae are portable, and *The Unfortunate Traveller* subjects them to "imaginative expansion," a term borrowed from David Brewer.[249] As we shall see, in reusing these three famous authorial personae, the pamphlet engages in what Michel de Certeau calls "textual poaching," a process by which the pamphlet's writer combines the "fragments" of preexisting texts and "and creates something unknown … allowing an indefinite plurality of meanings."[250] Through textual poaching, Jack imagines himself as the preeminent authorial persona in a company of vendible, and celebrated, literary innovators.

It is through Jack's extended interaction with Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey that the logic of print canon formation comes into focus. Wilton's attitude toward the Earl appears to be negative, largely because, in relentlessly mocking Surrey's literary style, Jack implicitly argues that he has more talent than his master. While it is clear that Jack attempts to dominate Surrey in a literary sense, Jack does not completely reject the Earl. Wilton's behavior toward the Earl can be read in terms of *both* inclusion and individuation: he desires to be included with Surrey, as well as Thomas More and Erasmus, in a literary canon, even as he wants recognition for his distinctive literary style. *The Unfortunate Traveller* participates in a long-established tradition, in which canon formation is imagined as a pattern of authorial personae asserting and distinguishing themselves from those who came before. In this respect, the book resembles John

---

[248] *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, ed. Michael Holquist, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1982), 293.
[249] My work on personae has been greatly influenced by David Brewer's *The Afterlife of Character*. Brewer's work demonstrates that literary characters in the eighteenth-century underwent what he calls "imaginative expansion" – they were detached from their original context and augmented (2).
[250] *The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans. Steven Rendall (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 169.

Skelton's *Garlande or Chapelett of Laurell* (published 1523), Robert Greene's *Greenes vision* (1592), and even Edmund Spenser's *Colin Clout's Come Home Again* (1595), all of which imagine the English literary canon as a group of authorial personae who welcome new, and sometimes superior, personae into their canonical fold.[251]

As a point of comparison, John Skelton's *Garlande or Chaplett of Laurell* is a dream vision narrated by Skelton's persona, Skelton poeta. In the poem, Skelton poeta seeks "promocyon" to canonical status; he desires to "triumph in the courte of Fame" as poet laureate of England.[252] This persona has (and achieves) two goals: first, he wants to take his place among Continental and English canonical authors, and, second, he wants to obtain special distinction by receiving the crown of laurels in the Queen of Fame's court. Before arriving at the Queen's court, Skelton travels through a "prease," or crowd, of famous Continental authors, including Virgil, Boccaccio, and Petrarch (240). These figures are authorial personae similar to those found in *The Unfortunate Traveller*, for they are derived from and constructed in relation to their books: Orace (Horace) is described in terms of "new poetry" (352), Juvenal "satirray" (340), and Theocritus "bucolycall relacyons" (327). Among the crowd, Skelton sees "Englysshe poetis thre" Gower, Chaucer, and Lydgate (391) – "Togeder in armes, as brethren, enbraisid" (393). The placement of these poets, particularly how they stand together as a unit, arms interlaced, situates the English literary tradition as part of, yet distinct from, a larger literary heritage. The English poetic trinity welcomes Skelton into their circle, effectively canonizing him, with Chaucer emphasizing that Skelton poeta's "delygence" (414) has earned him a place in their "collage"

---

[251] This tradition is traceable back to Lucian.

[252] *Garland or Chaplett of Laurell*, in *John Skelton: The Complete English Poems*, ed. John Scattergood (New York: Penguin, 1983), lines 63-71. Hereafter I will cite this poem, by line number, in the main text.

(417).[253] But being included in this great company is not enough; Skelton poeta vies for superiority over them. Chaucer, Lydgate, and Gower, he tells us, "wantid nothynge but the laurel" (397), a laurel that Skelton poeta stands to gain. And, predictably, Chaucer, Lydgate, and Gower concede victory to Skelton, escorting him to the Queen of Fame's court to obtain his crown. Skelton becomes part of the "prease" of poets and turns the trifecta of English poets into a foursome, but he ultimately stands out among the crowd.[254]

Although *The Unfortunate Traveller* does not neatly fit into the template set forth by Skelton's *Garlande or Chapelet of Laurell* – it is neither a dream vision, nor does it directly take as its subject its speaking persona's position in the English canon – it does follow the same pattern of assertion, distinction, and competition between personae. In particular, it seemingly situates the English literary tradition, represented by Jack and Surrey, in the context of a Continental literary heritage, represented by Thomas More and Erasmus, even as it distinguishes between the two. Jack, like Skelton, is attracted to the literary collective as well as individual recognition; he actively differentiates himself from his literary predecessors, even as he purports to be one of them. *The Unfortunate Traveller* ultimately diverges from the established tradition, in that the literary canon it envisions is centered on travel and is inextricable from the marketplace of print. Moreover, the book self-reflexively comments on the protean, fictional vehicles by which it establishes a canon.

During their travels, Jack and Surrey (to whom I shall return shortly) encounter Erasmus and Thomas More in the former's hometown of Rotterdam. This episode is brief, particularly in

---

[253] "Collage" is also used in Dekker's *A Knight's Conjuring* (1607). That pamphlet also has a scene similar to this one, wherein personae are grouped into a bizarre, lowbrow canon and welcome a new member, Henry Chettle, "sweating and blowing, by reason of his fatnes" into their fold. I will discuss this scene below. Cited in *Thomas Dekker's* A Knights Conjuring *(1607): A Critical Edition*, ed. Larry M. Robbins (The Hague: Mouton, 1974), 157.

[254] In a similar vein, in the charming pamphlet *Greenes vision*, Robert Greene, Chaucer, Gower, and eventually King Solomon vie for literary dominance, even as they gather together as a collective of literary figures.

comparison to Jack's extended engagement with Surrey. Nevertheless, in the paragraphs describing this meeting, Jack imagines himself, and Surrey, as part of a company of travelling authors. What is peculiar about this encounter is that Jack refuses to reproduce what the four personae talked about in any detail – "[W]hat talke, what conference [they] had then" is left to the reader's imagination (2:245) – and instead focuses on how bookish Erasmus and More are, in terms of studiousness and manner of speech. These two personae, like Jack, are constructed in relation to the printed books in which they appear. Erasmus, Jack tells us, "in all his speeches seemed so much to mislike the indiscretion of Princes in preferring of parasites and fooles, that he decreed with himself to swim with the streame, and write a booke forthwith in commendation of follie" (2:245). In the sixteenth century, the speaking persona of *Praise of Folly*, Folly, was understood to be a version of Erasmus. In a 1549 English translation, Thomas Chaloner establishes this connection: "For as *Erasmus* in all his woorkes sauoureth of a liuelie quicknesse, and spareth not sometyme in graue mattiers to sprincle his style, where he maie suche oportunitie with meerie conceited sentences: so in this booke, treatyng of suche a *Theme,* and vnder suche a person [Folly], he openeth all his bowget [budget]" [to speak his mind, or, in a metaphorical sense, to strew his wise sentences liberally over his prose].[255] Similarly, in *The Unfortunate Traveller*, Sir Thomas More resembles a printed book. "Quick witted" More, according to Jack, seeing "that in the cheefest flourishing kingdoms there was no equall or well deuided weale one with another, but a manifest conspiracie of rich men against poore men, procuring their owne vnalwfull commodities vnder the name and interest of the common-wealth," decides to write *Utopia* (2:245-46). *Utopia* is not mentioned explicitly, but the More's description of his upcoming project implicitly reveals the identity of the work. More was not only the author of

---

[255]*The praise of folie*, trans. Thomas Chaloner (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1549), A3v.

Utopia, but his persona appeared in it and become a lens through which later readers viewed the former Lord Chancellor and his political proclivities. In the letter to the reader preceding his translation of Jean Bodin's *The six bookes of a commonweale* (1606), Richard Knolles argues that *Utopia*, composed "for the maintenance and preserving of humane societie [the ground and stay of mans earthly blisse]," is a reflection of More's mind.[256] Likewise, for Thomas Wilson, More is a function of *Utopia*: "sir *Thomas More* for his *Eutopia* can soner be remembred of me, then worthily praised of any."[257]

By the time Jack and Surrey leave Rotterdam, the book has gathered the four personae together into one group and broken that group in half. Not only are they physically together for an interlude, but Jack emphasizes that the group is a collective by mentioning that they held "conference," which implies a "bringing together" or a "collection."[258] Even so, initially it seems that Jack considers himself, Surrey, and More apart from Erasmus. He refers to More as "our Countriman" and suggests that their travels parallel one another's. More, he says, had "come purposelie ouer a little before vs [Jack and Surrey] to visite the said graue father Erasmus" (2:245). Jack implicitly analogizes himself with Surrey and More further by saying that *Utopia*, like *The Unfortunate Traveller* and *Songs and Sonnets,* is a product of travel. Through visiting various countries, More observes that "most common-wealths [are] corrupted by ill custome" and resolves to write *Utopia* (2:246). In a similar vein, sixteenth-century literary theorists erroneously believed that Surrey "trauailed into Italie, and there tasted the sweete and stately measures and stile of the Italian Poesie," improving English literature with the sonnet form he

---

[256] *The six bookes of a commonweale*, trans. Richard Knolles (London, 1606), v.
[257] *The arte of rhetorique* (London: Richard Grafton, 1553), fol. 106
[258] *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "conference."

found there.[259] The action of *The Unfortunate Traveller* presumably takes place before the composition of *Songs and Sonnets*, for Jack does not mention it explicitly. Instead, he expands the basic narrative of the poetry in the little book, figuring the speaking persona as a traveler interested in visiting "Tuscanie" to see the seat of his lady's "worthy race." [260] The sonnets attributed to Surrey throughout the text are inspired by his wanton peregrinations. *The Unfortunate Traveller*, as its title suggests, results from Jack's journey across Europe. Jack, More, and Surrey, then, seem to be three of a kind, men whose paths conveniently cross in Rotterdam.

Yet, it is obvious that More has more in common with Erasmus than he does with Jack and Surrey. For one, More is not Jack's and Surrey's travelling companion. His journey terminates in Rotterdam, as he has traveled there "purposelie" in order to visit Erasmus, whereas the Low Countries are but one stop that Jack and Surrey make on their way to Italy. Jack overtly connects Erasmus' and More's books: after Erasmus "decree[s]" that he will write *Praise of Folly*, More supplies a description of his book as a response. Many early modern readers would recognize the connection between *The Praise of Folly* and *Utopia* without Jack's prompting. Both books are written in Latin, and More appears in *Utopia* as a character called Morus, which is also Folly. Erasmus' book is not only dedicated to More, but its Latin title, *Encomium Moriae*, is prominently advertised on the title pages of the sixteenth-century English editions.[261] Furthermore, as opposed to Surrey and himself, Jack depicts More and Erasmus as scholars, hyperbolically referring to Erasmus as "aged learnings chiefe ornament" and an "abundant and

---

[259] George Puttenham, *The arte of English poesie*, H4v.
[260] Cited from *Songes and sonnets, written by the Right honorable Lord Henrie Haward late Earle of Surrey, and others* (London: Robert Robinson, 1587), fol. 5v. Hereafter I will cite this edition parenthetically in the main text.
[261] *Praise of Folly* went through three English editions 1547, 1557, 1577 (prior to the publication of The *Unfortunate Traveller*), whereas *Utopia* went through two (1551, 1556) and was reprinted again in 1597.

superingenious clarke" (2:245). More, too, is academically inclined, as he has stopped travelling in order to engage in "discontented studies" (2:246) with the famous scholar. When the group parts company, Surrey and Jack continue to explore Europe, while Erasmus and More hit the books in Rotterdam.

Jack's encounter with Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey is the most obvious example of the persona's creative use of his source texts in *The Unfortunate Traveller*. In this episode, much like the meeting with More and Erasmus, Jack situates himself in relation to an authorial persona that came before, establishing continuities and connections between himself and his predecessor, even as he distinguishes himself from him. But Jack's engagement with Surrey is lengthier and complex than his (and Surrey's) interaction with Erasmus and More, for Jack does not just enter into the Earl's company; he impersonates and thus identifies with him. Jack and Surrey do not directly compete with More and Erasmus – their departure from the two studious personae marks a moment of assertion and distinction – but Jack obviously vies for literary supremacy over the Earl, even though he does not aspire to a crown of laurels. This contest is not just literary in nature; it is inflected by the marketplace.

The Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey whom Jack encounters bears no resemblance to the historical figure, a "noble yong man / of wyt and excellence" who was executed "for so small offence;"[262] rather, he is a fictive version of the versifier, who was christened "Chawcers mate" by his contemporaries.[263] More specifically, Jack meets an imaginative version of the speaker of *Songs and Sonnets* (1557, most recently printed in 1587), a lovesick figure who is not identical to the verse miscellany's speaker but who is heavily mediated by it. The Earl in *The Unfortunate*

---

[262] George Cavendish, *Metrical Visions*, ed. A.S.G. Edwards (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1980), lines 1194-95.
[263] *The Arundel Harington Manuscript of Tudor Poetry*, ed. Ruth Hughey, 2 vols. (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1960), 1:282.9-10

Traveller speaks like the dejected lover of a sonnet sequence, another very recent print vogue, and in so doing parodies the lyric language of love. One of the first things Surrey tells Jack is that he is burning with desire – his love interest Geraldine's sunny eyes have set the "Phenix neast of [his] breast is on fire" (2:243). This cliché can be compared to the seventh poem of *Songs and Sonnets*, in which Surrey's persona says that his "colde limmes" are "so opprest" by the "creeping fire" of love (fol. 5r). In a similar vein, Surrey tells Jack he is ruled by Cupid, "a little God called Loue, that will not bee worshipt of anie leaden braines" (2:243), a statement that has an analogue in the sixth poem of the verse miscellany ("Complaint of a Louer rebuked"). In that sonnet, the speaker addresses Cupid as his sovereign: "Loue that liueth and raineth in my heart," he apostrophizes (fol. 5r). And, finally, Surrey's Tuscan love interest in *The Unfortunate Traveller*, the Florentine Geraldine, is also derived from *Songs and Sonnets* (specifically Sonnet 8, "Description and praise of his love Geraldine"). *The Unfortunate Traveller* takes the raw materials supplied by the 1587 octavo and transforms them into a ridiculous story arc that enables Jack to identify with and distance himself from the English Earl.[264]

While they are travelling together, Jack does not just become a comrade of the Earl; he analogizes himself with his master. Not content with being just travelling companions, the two men decide to impersonate one another: "By the waie as we went, my master and I agreed to change names. It was concluded betwixt vs, that I should be the Earle of Surrie, and he my man" (2:253), Jack says, the rationale being that Surrey wants to misbehave, or, to use Jack's phrase, "to take more liberty of behauior" (2:253). And so he does. During this episode, the Earl consorts with prostitutes and coiners, and ends up in jail. Jack, we soon learn, is a masterful impersonator,

---

[264] I have selected to cite this edition because it is probably the one Nashe used. For this book's printing history see *Tottel's Miscellany (1557-1587),* ed. Hyder Edward Rollins, rev. edition, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965).

tricking everyone whom he encounters into believing he is the Earl of Surrey. "Through all the cities past I by no other name but the yong Earle of Surry," he tells us; "my pomp, my apparel, traine, and expence, was nothing inferior to his, my looks were as loftie, my wordes as magnificall" (2:267). His hosts in Venice, the bawd Tabitha and Petro de Campo Frego, fall for the charade, as do the keepers of the prison in which Surrey and Jack find themselves. After they are released from jail, Jack and Surrey part ways, but Jack continues to impersonate his master and in so doing convinces people all over Italy that he is an Earl of the House of Surrey. Jack is successful because of his skill, but also because his new travelling companion, his courtesan Diamante, "fully possest of her husbands goods," provides the cash for the page to live like an aristocrat (2:267). The conditions are right for Jack to take on the Earl's persona fully. His behavior, spending patterns, and (supposedly) "meritorious workes" make him indistinguishable from Surrey.

Jack lives the high life while pretending to be Surrey, and eventually the Earl catches up to and confronts him about his unauthorized impersonation. This encounter is saturated with the type of language used to describe literary personae in the sixteenth century, and points to the artful and performative aspects of Jack's behavior. Surrey, it turns out, is amazed by Jack's "arte," not mad – how could he be angry when he "loue[s Jack] so"? (2:269) – and even marvels at how well Jack could "separate the shadow from the bodie" (2:267). What Surrey describes is physically impossible – a shadow can only be created by a body – but becomes possible in print, when an author creates a persona that can be detached from its originating body and replicated by others. "Shadow" was frequently used in relation to such personae in sixteenth-century literary theory – in *The Shepheardes Calender* (1579), E.K. tells us that Colin Clout is a figure under which "this Poete [Spenser/Immeritô] secretly shadoweth himself, as sometime did Virgil

under the name Tityrus."[265] Jack responds to Surrey with similar imagery: "vnder your colours all my meritorious workes I was desirous to shroud," he informs the Earl (2:268). Jack conceals his identity under what sixteenth-century literary critics would call "a feigned person," a persona, not for his own gain, but for Surrey's.[266]

In relation to Jack's behavior, shadowing and shrouding conjure up simultaneously images of performance and covering up. When discussing literary personae, sixteenth-century literary theorists combined the language of performance and concealment, for to assume a literary persona one must suppress his identity. Discussions of pastoral poetry often contain descriptions of personae, for that genre is peopled with personae. George Puttenham, for instance, argues that the pastoral was created as a vehicle for poets, "vnder the vaile of homely persons," to insinuate and glaunce at greater matters," not to represent the rustic manner of shepherds. The pastoral, he says, is a type of "drammatick" poem that allows a poet to safely discuss issues of political and social importance.[267] Similarly, William Webbe, in his *A Discourse of English Poetrie* (1586), discusses a poet's relationship to his pastoral personae: "For vnder these personnes, as it were in a cloake of simplicitie, they would eyther sette foorth the prayses of theyr fréendes, without the note of flattery, or enueigh grieuously against abusess,

---

[265] Citation taken from *The Yale Edition of the Shorter Poems of Edmund Spenser*, ed. William Oram et. al (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 33. Likewise, a commonplace in Francis Meres' *Palladis timia* (London: P. Short for Cuthbert Burby, 1598) associates shadow and persona: "As the rude Poet *Cherillus* had nothing to bee noted in his verses, but onely the name of *Alexander;* nor that rurall painter *Daretus* any thing to couer his deformed Ape, but a white curtaine: so manie haue nothing to shadowe their shamelesse wickednes, but onely a shew of wit" (sig. Ll8v). See also Thomas Campion's *Observations in the Art of English Poesie* (London: Richard Field for Andrew Wise, 1602), 20.

[266] The Earl of Surrey cannot just stick to one metaphor to describe Jack's imitative behavior: "I am well pleased thou shouldest bee the ape of my birthright," he says (2:269), introducing a theatrical image to the conversation. "Ape" has performative connotations, for it means to imitate or mimic, and it was often used to describe the textual behavior of personae. Gabriel Harvey, by way of example, refers to Robert Greene as "the Ape of Euphues;"[266] and Martin Marprelate was frequently associated with simians, as the pamphlet against him called *Whip for an Ape* attests.

[267] *The arte of English poesie*, F3v-F4r.

without any token of bytternesse."[268] Cloaking is a mode of dissimulation, and disguising, whereby a poet plays a different "personne" – he takes on a role, as it were.

As *The Unfortunate Traveller* shows, authorial personae are textual costumes that can be put on by anyone, shadows that can be separated from their originating bodies. They can be borrowed and, like the personae that circulate in jest books, redeployed in different contexts. When confronted, Jack tells Surrey, "your name which I borrowed I haue not abused" (2:268). Jack, of course, has not just temporarily taken Surrey's name. He has taken on all the Earl's outward trappings, his "estate and port," including his "pomp," "apparel," "traine," "expence," "loftie" looks, and "magnificall" speech. To these ingredients, Jack adds liberality. "No English-man would I haue renowmed for bountie, magnificence, and curtesie," he assures Surrey; "Deeme it no insolence to adde increase to your fame" (2:268). Jack cloaks himself in the Earl's colors and gives Surrey's persona a new life, increasing the Earl's fame by spending "large summes of monie" under his name. Indeed, Jack's use of "borrowed" points to the way in which a persona can take on a semi-independent existence, circulating freely. William Webbe underscores their portability when he says that one poet's personae may be "borrowed of others." "If he borrow them," Webbe cautions, he must "folow that Author exactly whom he purposeth to immitate."[269] Jack has, he tells Surrey, imitated him exactly. He has traveled in style, without bringing shame upon a noble house.

The Unfortunate Traveller's account of Jack's and Surrey's name exchange showcases the malleability and flexibility of authorial personae in the marketplace. By changing places, Jack and Surrey create a peculiar form of doubling in which there are two Surreys as well as two

---

[268] C4r.
[269] *A Discourse of English Poetrie*, K2r.

Jacks. One Surrey travels with Jack for a while and then leaves him, eventually meeting "another Earle of Surry besides himself," which comes into existence through Jack's performance (2:267). At the same time, one Jack impersonates the Earl of Surrey and narrates the book, and the other is a product of Surrey's impersonation – the Earl, Jack declares, "could counterfeit most daintily" (2:257) – who, with the evil Petro de Campo Frego and Tabitha of Venice, conspires to kill his master with a "pistoll" (2:257). This doubling enacts the structural potential of the book, in that it stages how personae are reused in the marketplace of print. Once replicated in the marketplace, authorial personae participate in new narrative trajectories. Yet, the book suggests that these personae do not just take on a life of their own, proliferating in the marketplace; rather they coexist and transact across multiple permutations. The second Earl of Surrey (Jack), as I have noted, "add[s] increase to [the first's] fame," and in so doing "inhance[s] his obscured reputation" (2:268-69). There is thus reciprocity between a persona and its subsequent instantiations.

The redeployment of a persona can be understood on its own terms, but it also constitutes a critical act, commenting on and perhaps shaping readers' perceptions of its previous iterations. Although Jack clearly identifies with the Earl, he also seeks to distinguish himself from his sometime double. The most obvious competition between the two personae is literary, and, as most scholars have noted, Jack emerges the clear victor. According to Louise Simons, "Surrey represents a leftover from a discredited romance-world, a figure of ridicule skewered by Nashe's quill."[270] Mihoko Suzuki, too, argues that Surrey is portrayed negatively in *The Unfortunate Traveller*: "Surrey's sonnet in praise of Geraldine's room thus becomes a perfect emblem for his

[270] Louise Simons, "Rerouting *The Unfortunate Traveller*: Strategies for Coherence and Directions," *SEL* 28, no. 1 (1988): 31.

self-contained and solipsistic 'forming fancie.'"[271] That Surrey fails to win Diamante because he can only woo in sonnets demonstrates that he is trapped in conventional, passé literary mode. Jack, on the other hand, is inventive and thus "caught the birde." "[S]implicitie and plainnesse shall carrie it away," he says of his victory (2:263). For all his plainness, Jack deploys a range of literary modes and styles, singling himself out as an extraordinary talent, as David Kaula observes.[272] *The Unfortunate Traveller* opens and closes with reference to Jack's exceptionality: the Induction refers to him as "the King of pages" and Wilton's very last sentence designates him an "outlandish chronicler" (2:328). Jack is simultaneously a monarch and a non-normative writer; his story, and his style, make him distinctive.

Jack's alleged marketability, coupled with his literary merits, make him a prime candidate for the print canon, and, he would like to think, a distinctive member of it. Like Martin Marprelate, Jack describes himself as a hot commodity, and in so doing opens up the door for competitors. In other words, the form of canonicity in which Jack is invested is tied to consumption patterns. Book buyers who are interested in specific personae and writers who wish to take advantage of or contest a persona's celebrity perpetuate this canon. It is thus starkly different from the one familiar to most scholars because, theoretically, anyone can participate in it. For most contemporary scholars, canonical literature is a restricted domain and thus at odds with the marketplace. To borrow Pierre Bourdieu's terminology, there is a "fundamental opposition" between the fields of "restricted production" and "mass production."[273] In this formulation, as I noted in the Introduction, canon formation does not occur in the field of mass

---

[271] "'Signiorie ouer the pages,'" 365-66.
[272] For more on Jack's literary style see, A.K Croston, "The Use of Imagery in Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller*," *RES* 24 (1948): 90-101; Guy-Bray, "How to Turn Prose into Literature;" David Kaula, "The Low Style in Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveler*," *SEL* 6, no. 1 (1966): 43-57; Agnes M.C. Latham, "Satire on Literary Themes and Modes in Nashe's *Unfortunate Traveller*," *English Studies* 1948 (London, 1948): 85-100; and Mentz, "Jack and the City."
[273] "The Field of Cultural Production, or: The Economic World Reversed," in *The Field of Cultural Production*, 53.

production; instead, canonical authors are "consecrated" into an exclusive collectivity, which exists apart from the realm of the consumer-demand-driven press. In the alternative canon I describe, however, vendibility, and perhaps popularity, is coextensive with canonicity, literary value with marketability, literary influence with commodification. A prerequisite for entering into this canon was consumer demand, a demand that ensured these figures and their competitors were reanimated, bought, and sold in the marketplace.

As I have argued, the organizing principle of the print canon is not authors, but vendible authorial personae, or "men in print." Like a popular hero, the canonical persona could take on a life of its own, beyond the site of its original production; it might become a brand, its name becoming a selling point; it might provoke market trends, inspiring apes, imitators, and rivals; or it could do all three. In the 1590s, canonical personae were textual celebrities, personalities who drew both criticism and praise, especially by those who sought entrance into their company. Gabriel Harvey, for instance, denounces several of them, especially Robert Greene, Tom Nashe, and Piers Pennilesse, as members of a "scribblinge crew, that annoyeth this Age, and neuer more accloyed the worlde."[274] Sometimes he speaks of them favorably: he compares the work of Robert Greene to "a sweating Impe of the euer-greene Laurell;" likens Piers Pennilesse's rhetorical flowers to "the riche garden of pore Adonis;" and flatters Tom Nash, "whose Arte [is] a misterie, whose witt a miracle, whose stile the onely life of the presse."[275] What sets these figures apart from authors is their fictional status; even if they share a name with their originators, they can be appropriated by anyone, replicated in more books, both as a marketing device and as a means to engage in literary competition. The appropriation and redeployment of

---

[274] *Foure letters, and certaine sonnets* (London: John Wolfe, 1592), G2r.

[275] *Pierces Supererogation,* B3r. Hereafter, I will cite this text parenthetically, by signature, in the main text

a given persona attests to his vendibility, but it also confirms his cultural capital. Euphues, for instance, is invoked in eight titles between his initial appearance in 1578 and 1599 (*Euphues. The anatomy of vvyt*; *Euphues and his England; Zelauto. The fountaine of fame Erected in an orcharde of amorous aduentures*; *Euphues his censure to Philautus*; *Menaphon Camillas alarum to slumbering Euphues*; *Rosalynde. Euphues golden legacie: found after his death in his cell at Silexedra*; *Euphues shadow, the battaile of the sences*; and *Arisbas, Euphues amidst his slumbers*).[276] Each of these books presupposes Euphues' celebrity, even as it seeks to increase his fame. (Richard Tarlton, Martin Marprelate, Tom Nashe, Astrophil, and Robert Greene, to name a few, received the same treatment.)

Although he first appeared in 1557, Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, was a crucial figure for the print canon, as his poetry was a shaping force in the literary marketplace well into the 1590s. Not only is he associated with a vendible book – his was the only name featured on the title page of *Songs and Sonnets*, which went through nine sixteenth-century editions (1557, 1559, 1565, 1567, 1574, 1574, 1585, and 1587) – but he inspired what Franco Moretti calls "rivals," contemporaries who behave "more or less" like canonical personae.[277] The rivalries Surrey provokes create a market trend: *The Unfortunate Traveller* claims the Earl initiated the sonnet craze of the 1590s. Following its publication, a profusion of personae appeared in print, not only participating in the fad for sonnets, but aspiring to best Surrey.[278] While in Florence, Surrey posts "a proude challenge… against all comers, (whether Christians, Turkes, Iewes, or

---

[276] Both *Euphues* and *Euphues and his England* went through several editions between their initial dates of publication (as did *Menaphon* and *Rosalynde*). If one were to take into account the various editions in the marketplace during the 1580s and 1590s, then Euphues would appear in more than eight books. For an account of Euphues in the marketplace see Steve Mentz, *Romance for Sale in Early Modern England: The Rise of Prose Fiction* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006).
[277] "The Slaughterhouse of Literature," 208.
[278] In this formulation, Philip Sidney's Astrophil is not the originator of the sonnet craze, as most narratives have it; instead he is mobilized as a challenge to Surrey.

Saracens), in defence of his *Geraldines* beautie" (2:271).[279] Jack describes this tournament in great detail. The knights distinguish themselves from one another – a "blacke knight," a "knight of the stormes," and a "forsaken knight" are among the competitors – and they each claim they have the most beautiful mistress. (One of the entrants even deigns to love a mistress who "was fallen into a consumption" [2:277].). The tournament follows the proliferative logic of the sonnet craze of the 1590s (and, importantly, the Marprelate Controversy), wherein each persona that praises a mistress in print (Geraldine, Delia, Fidessa, Diana, Laura, and Stella being examples) opens the door for more personae to outdo him with better sonnets, more desirable mistresses, and a bigger market share. Surrey is canonical because he had a simultaneous impact on both literary culture and the marketplace. He is a formidable competitor for Wilton.

Despite Surrey's economic success, Jack suggests that he is more commercially viable than the Earl. Jack, as we have seen, can participate in many literary genres, and Surrey cannot. While Surrey is supposed to be imitating Jack, in prison, he seeks to woo Diamante in the conventional sonnet language, assaulting her with passionate prose as well as "rimes" (2:262). This moment signals his literary failings, as Suzuki points out, but it also signals his market inflexibility, for his storyline remains constrained by *Songs and Sonnets*. Imaginative expansion only occurs within an established poetic narrative, which in turn limits market potential. That he is associated with a single genre suggests that his impact on the market is restricted, for Jack seems to suggest that he can only start one trend. Surrey takes on a life of his own, insofar as he is impersonated and imagined in new scenarios, but the possibilities for story arcs are limited. The Surrey episode, situated in the middle of Jack's travels and his generic experimentation, is

---

[279] This tournament is often discussed in relation to Sidney's *Arcadia*. See, for example, Katherine Duncan-Jones, "Nashe and Sidney: The Tournament in *The Unfortunate Traveller*," *The Modern Language Review* 63, no. 1 (1968): 3-6.

meant to contrast Jack's flexibility with Surrey's fixedness. Jack can take the form of nobility better than a nobleman – after all, he improves Surrey's decaying reputation – he can be a jester; he can sermonize; he can ventriloquize a murderer's scaffold speech; he can satirize. Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey can imitate Jack temporarily, but he eventually returns to his old, hackneyed tricks.

Jack's twin emphases on his vendibility and his exceptional literary style is not surprising because in the first half of the 1590s the print canon was dominated by stylistically innovative, saleable personae. Euphues, Martin Marprelate, Richard Tarlton, and Robert Greene: all these figures were associated with idiosyncratic, commodified literary styles, to which they lent their names. Euphues produced Euphuism, Martin Marprelate Martinism, Richard Tarlton Tarltonizing, Robert Greene Greeneness.[280] To be canonized, as it were, Jack Wilton must not only be associated with a best seller, but his style must be unique and nameable. Wilton's style, as I noted earlier, might be called "Jacking around." Based on Jack's self-presentation, one might think that he has all the makings of a canonical persona: commodifiable, innovative, and stylistically singular. Yet he never makes it into the print canon. *The Unfortunate Traveller* was not a market sensation; Jack was not compelling enough to incite consumer demand; and the page's style was perhaps too uncommon. The page aims high and falls short.

John Hoskins, in his manuscript publication *Directions for Speech and Style* (c. 1599), provides extensive commentary on personae, highlighting their uses: "It is most convenient sometimes for the bringing in of life and lustre to represent some unexpected strains beside the tenor of your tale, and act, as it were, your meaning; which is done either by feigning the presence or the discourse of some such persons as either are not at all or, if there be, yet speak

---

[280] Gabriel Harvey refers to Euphuism, Greeneness, and Tartlonizing in *Foure Letters*, E2v.

not but by imagination."[281] In *The Unfortunate Traveller*, authorial personae are, to twenty-first-century eyes, mobilized in unexpected ways. Protean and portable, they do not necessarily point to and name an author and are thus ripe for appropriation and commodification. Shaped by but not bound to their original textual manifestations, available for anyone's use. Those personae, like Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey who exist in multiple iterations in the marketplace as well as inspire rivals successfully enter the print canon. Without consumer demand, even the most innovative persona fades into oblivion.

Feeding the Troll, or, Author and Persona in the Nashe-Harvey Controversy

The Nashe-Harvey controversy is usually seen as a battle between two men, while *The Unfortunate Traveller* is a fictional proto-novel. But, in fact, the latter is an important context for the former. The prose narrative invites us to rethink the notion of the "man in print," generally thought to be a human man who goes into print, as a man who is born of print and whose initial existence should be understood as being in print as a portable authorial persona.[282] It narrativizes what befalls men in print in the marketplace – not only do they proliferate, but various permutations of a given man can transact. What I aim to show in the pages that follow is that we can read the Nashe-Harvey controversy, a polemical exchange that is usually understood as being "real," in terms of the narrative *The Unfortunate Traveller*, a fictional text, tells. The participants in the controversy, Tom Nashe and Doctor Gabriel Harvey, are not representative of the flesh-and-blood authors that created them, but men in print, just like Jack Wilton. The difference between Wilton and the participants in the Nashe-Harvey controversy is that Nashe and Harvey achieved fame (in Harvey's case infamy), while Jack remained a failed celebrity.

---

[281] *Directions for Speech and Style*, ed. Hoyt H. Hudson (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1935), 36; 47-48. Geoffrey Gust discusses this passage in relation to medieval theories of personae. See *Constructing Chaucer*, 26.
[282] For more on the man in print, see Wendy Wall, *The Imprint of Gender*, Intro.

Like the Marprelate controversy, the Nashe-Harvey controversy is a polemical exchange carried out by authorial personae. In this case, however, the personae involved share names with actual historical figures – Thomas Nashe and Gabriel Harvey. Because I am making an argument about personae, not authors, as I noted earlier I differentiate between the two, referring to the authors by their given names and the personae as "Tom Nashe" (as well as "Tom," "Nashe," and "Piers Respondent") and "Doctor Harvey" (as well as "the Doctor" and "Harvey"). Though often discussed in terms of their differences, Tom Nashe and Doctor Harvey share a polemical strategy. They detach their opponents' authorial personae from their original contexts and manipulate them, and these redeployed personae are meant to shape a reader's perception of their previous iterations.

The Nashe-Harvey controversy officially began in 1592 with the publication of Thomas Nashe's *Pierce Pennilesse* and Robert Greene's *A Quip for an Upstart Courtier*, both of which attack the Doctor and his brothers. In response to these publications, Doctor Harvey attacked Tom Nashe and Robert Greene in *Foure Letters, and certaine sonnets especially touching Robert Greene, and other parties, by him abused*. Tom Nashe responded quickly, in *Strange newes, of the intercepting certaine letters, and a conuoy of verses* (1592), which skewers Doctor Harvey and the pamphlet in which he appears. In 1593, Nashe apologized to his adversary in the letter to the reader in *Christs teares ouer Ierusalem*, but John Wolfe effectively renewed the quarrel by publishing Harvey's *A new letter of notable contents* (1593) and *Pierces Supererogation* (1593), two texts that inveigh against Tom Nashe and his books. Nashe retaliated in the letter to the reader of the 1594 edition of *Christs teares*, comparing the "impious" Doctor's style to "a dog-house in the fields" that "is pestered with stinking filth" (2:180). Then, in 1596, he attacked Harvey at greater length, issuing his deathblow to his "constant approued mortall enemie" in

Have with You to Saffron-Walden, which effectively ended the long and acrimonious conflict (3:70). Looking back on this four-year war, Paper, the speaking persona of John Davies' *A Scourge for Paper-Persecutors, or Papers Complaint* (1625), laments that the polemical exchange made him look like a "hellish monster" and condemns both Nashe and Harvey for making him "beare their choller spude, so long."[283] The controversy was so caustic that it was singled out in the 1599 Bishops' Ban, which ordered that "all nasshes bookes and D Harvyes bookes be taken wheresoever they may be found and that none of their bookes bee ever printed hereafter."[284] Though the Bishops' Ban seems to attack Thomas Nashe and Gabriel Harvey, it actually bans Tom Nashe and Doctor Harvey. The authors themselves were not banned, as Nashe's *Summers last will and testament* was published shortly after the Bishops' Ban in 1600.

Scholarship on the Nashe-Harvey controversy has been wide-ranging, and critics have shown that the literary combatants were interested in style and decorum, university education, and "the vulgar parthenogenesis of printed texts."[285] While these analyses have proved insightful, they do not acknowledge Tom Nashe's and Doctor Harvey's interest in, and apparent dispute over, the meaning and function of the authorial persona. It seems that the two opponents disagree over what an authorial persona is, and that their competing definitions have their basis in

---

[283] *A scourge for paper-persecutors. Or Papers complaint, compil'd in ruthfull rimes, against the paper-spoylers of these times. By I.D. With a continu'd iust inquisition of the same subiect, fit for this season. Against paper-persecutors. By A.H.* (London: H. Holland and G. Gibbs, 1625), A4v.

[284] Cited in R.A. McCabe, "Elizabethan Satire and the Bishops' Ban of 1599," *The Yearbook of English Studies* 11 (1981): 188.

[285] Maria Teresa Micaela Prendergast, "Promiscuous Textualities: The Nashe-Harvey Controversy and the Unnatural Productions in Print," in *Printing and Parenting in Early Modern England*, ed. Douglas A. Brooks (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), 173. For more on the Nashe-Harvey controversy, see Kenneth Friedenreich, "Nashe's *Strange Newes* and the Case for Professional Writers," *Studies in Philology* 71(1974): 451-72; Alexandra Halasz, *The Marketplace of Print*, ch. 3; Zachary Lesser, *Renaissance Drama and the Politics of Publication*, 120-22; R.B. McKerrow and F.P. Wilson, eds., *The Complete Works of Thomas Nashe*, 5:65-109; David Perkins, "Issues and Motivations in the Nashe-Harvey Quarrel," *Philological Quarterly* (1960): 224-33; Anne Lake Prescott, *Imagining Rabelais in Renaissance England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 199-202; Phoebe Sheavyn, *The Literary Profession in the Elizabethan Age*, 133-38; Travis Summergill, "The Influence of the Marprelate Controversy on Thomas Nashe," *Studies in Philology* 48 (1951): 145-60; and Sidney Thomas, "New Light on the Nashe-Harvey Quarrel," *Modern Language Notes* 63, no. 7(1948):481-83.

contradictory understandings of the persona as literary property. For Tom Nashe in *Have with You*, authorial personae are inherently fictional, ripe for imaginative expansion (like those in *The Unfortunate Traveller*), and, as such, they are a form of common property: portable and detachable, they can be manipulated and redeployed in different contexts and become a fertile site for literary invention. Doctor Harvey appears to have a different understanding of authorial personae in *Pierces Supererogation* (1593). In that text, the Doctor merges the personae and the writers that created them – so Piers Pennilesse and Tom Nashe become Thomas Nashe, Double V John Lyly – and makes the authorial personae part of a writer's literary identity and his property; they point to and name their author. Despite their superficial differences, I will show that Tom Nashe and Doctor Harvey have the same understanding of authorial personae as well as deploy and manipulate them with the same flexibility for the same polemical ends.

In this chapter, I focus exclusively on the last two texts in the Nashe-Harvey controversy, *Have with You* and *Pierces Supererogation*, not just because they are a pair, but because they are more focused in their approach to authorial personae than the texts that come before them in the pamphlet war. *Pierces Supererogation* is a sustained first-person tirade against Nashe and Double V, the speaker of the anti-Martinist book *Pappe with an Hatchet*, and it subjects these personae to imaginative expansion at great length, whereas only two of Harvey's *Four Letters* are authored by the Doctor, and, in the polemical parts of the book – that is, the sections that are not preoccupied with lavishing praise onto Harvey – are largely concerned with condemning Robert Greene. Harvey's *A new letter of notable contents* only derides Tom Nashe in passing. *Have with You* approaches authorial personae in a more meta-critical way that Nashe's other contribution to the quarrel, *Strange newes*, does. In *Have with You*, Nashe's characterization of Harvey is inspired by Harvey's books, but not bound to them, and the book self-consciously

plays with the multiplication of authorial personae in the marketplace. *Strange newes*, by contrast, is a point-by-point takedown of *Four Letters*; it attacks the Harvey persona in a systematic way, and the polemic is generated by and tied to the contents of Harvey's book. The polemical strategies I outline below can, of course, be found in other texts of the pamphlet war, but *Have with You* and *Pierces Supererogation* exemplify most obviously the divergent approaches to augmenting an authorial persona's personal narrative in the controversy. Whereas Nashe sets forth authorial personae more largely through fiction, Harvey seeks to discredit them through the use of their originator's biographical data.

One of the fundamental assumptions governing Tom Nashe's self-presentation is that there is reciprocity between multiple iterations of a persona in the marketplace, with the various instantiations contributing to a persona's celebrity and reputation. Tom often identifies with Piers Pennilesse, the narrator of *Piers Pennilesse his supplication to the divell* (1592) and vice versa. In *Piers Pennilesse*, the titular persona establishes a connection between himself and Tom Nashe, thereby laying the groundwork for Tom's later identification with him. Responding to a passage in Richard Harvey's *Lamb of God* (cited at the beginning of this chapter), in which Harvey compares Tom Nashe to Martin Marprelate, Piers says, "Poor slaue … Why could you not haue sate quiet at home, and writ Catechismes, but you must be comparing me to *Martin*?" (1:197) In *Strange newes* – originally published as *Strange newes, of the intercepting certaine letters and a conuoy of verses, as they were going priuilie to victuall the Lowe Countries* – a satirical text that attacks Gabriel Harvey's *Foure Letters*, Tom resists this comparison. Addressing Doctor Harvey's criticism of Piers, Nashe says "Hee hath a twitch at *Pierce Pennilesse* too, at the parting stile, and tearms him *the Deuils Orator by profession*" (1:267, emphases Nashe's). Yet, the third edition of *Strange newes*, published in 1593 as *The apologie of*

Pierce Pennilesse. Or, strange newes, of the intercepting certaine letters and a conuoy of verses, as they were going priuilie to victuall the Lowe Countries, suggests that Piers and Tom might be one and the same. Because its use of the genitive is vague, the title is unclear as to whether or not Piers is the speaking narrator, its subject, or both (or neither). It is impossible to know if the title-change was Nashe's idea or his printer-publisher John Danter's, but it is almost certain that the title was altered to attract book-buyers, to cater to the consumer demand created by the vendible Piers persona. *Have with You* foregrounds Tom Nashe's association with Piers: when Tom Nashe "personates" himself he goes by "Piers Respondent," "Tom," and "Nashe." In every book comprising the Nashe-Harvey controversy, including Harvey's, it is difficult to tell where Piers ends and Tom Nashe begins. It is thus more productive to think of the two personae in unison rather than as discrete entities because they are so closely identified with one another that the mention of one's name recalls the other's. This mutual identification allows Tom and Piers to capitalize on one another's fame and promote themselves as marketable by association/identification. Each new pamphlet featuring Tom, Piers, or a combination of the two, responded to consumer demand, bolstered the persona's fame and celebrity, and added layers to his personal narrative.

Tom Nashe is interested in the vendibility of his pamphlets because each book that proves saleable creates a space for more Toms to enter the book market, routinely represented as Paul's Churchyard. Nashe often touts the commercial success of *Piers Pennilesse* – "*Piers Pennilesse* (one of my Bookes)," he says in *Have with You* has passed "at the least through the pikes of sixe Impressions." (3:35). In the letter to the printer prefacing *Piers Penniless*, Nashe says that the success of his book has induced others to extend the persona's narrative for financial gain: "there bee obscure imitators, that goe about to frame a second part to it, and offer

it to sell in Paules Church-yard," he brags. (1:153) Even when Tom is not directly commenting on his marketplace visibility, he attempts to foment consumer demand for future publications. In the first edition of *Christs teares*, he claims that, "Two or three triuiall Volumes of mine at this instant are vnder the Printers hands, ready to be published" (2:13). In the second edition of the same book, Tom reiterates that more of his pamphlets will be in the marketplace soon: "Farewell Paules Church-yard, till I see thee next, which shall not be long," he writes. (2;186). These statements presuppose that there is demand for Tom Nashe, which future publications will satisfy. Indeed, even in his earliest appearance, Tom Nashe was interested in the marketplace. In the preface to Robert Greene's *Menaphon* (1589), he advertises his forthcoming book:

> It may be, my *Anatomie of Absurdities* may aquaint you ere long with my skill in surgery… If you chance to meete it in *Paules*, shaped in a new suite of similitudes … think his master hath fulfilled couenants, and onely cancelled the Indentures of his dutie. If I please, I will thinke my ignorance indebted vnto you that applaud it: if not, what rests, but that I be excluded from your curtesie, like *Apocrypha* from your Bibles. (3:325)

It was not the *Anatomy of Absurdity* (1589) that established him as a vendible persona, though it did provoke the ire of Richard Harvey, also known as "Duns furens" (the mad dunce). With its six editions in four years, *Piers Pennilesse* catapulted both Tom and Piers to fame.[286]

Besides vendibility, Tom Nashe is interested in the protean and malleable nature of authorial personae, and nowhere is this more obvious than in *Have with You to Saffron-Walden*. One of the key assumptions underwriting Tom's self-presentation in the final pamphlet of the Nashe-Harvey controversy is that the authorial persona is a form of common property, which any one can use. Individuals do not own literary devices, after all; they can be "borrowed," to use

---

[286] For *Piers Pennilesse*'s early modern publication history, see *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, ed. McKerrow, 1:137-39.

William Webbe's terminology. In the letter to the reader prefacing *Have with You*, Tom objectifies himself into a character that can be "personate[d]," and proceeds to do so. The notion that personae are common property also underwrites Nashe's treatment of Harvey, for he redeploys his nemesis's various personae in an outrageous biographical narrative. Piers Respondent, of course, does not pose as Doctor Harvey, but the mock-biography that is central to Tom's takedown of Doctor Harvey is predicated on the fact that his opponent is a detachable, and fictional, literary construction, which can travel from context to context and be endlessly augmented: Doctor Harvey can be transposed from a first-person narrator to a character, and his story can be rewritten, revised, retold, and enlarged again and again.

Have with You, a book that capitalizes on Tom Nashe/Piers Pennilesses' celebrity and the vendibility of the Nashe-Harvey controversy, is a dialogue that takes as its focal point the way in which redeploying an authorial persona has the potential to make or break his reputation because the new iteration of a given persona exists alongside previous permutations and is in dialogue with them. The bizarre and incoherent text, which according to R.B. McKerrow is "very disorderly and defies analysis" (4:302), is "a fiction about the issues of publication," as Lorna Hutson has shown, including patronage, libel, authority, and the way in which the press is a "form for the creation of public reputation."[287] Building on Hutson's work, I would argue that one of the issues of publication with which *Have with You* is preoccupied is the way in which the press facilitates the public reputation of authorial personae both positively and negatively. The book takes a form of a dialogue that stages Piers Respondent's conference with four other personae – Signor Importuno, Don Carneades de boone Compagionla, Grand Consiliadore, and Domino Bentivole. The letter to the reader claims that the topic of their conference is Tom's

[287] *Thomas Nashe in Context*, 208; 214.

"learning and industrie" and that the little book comprises a riposte to *Pierces Supererogation* (3:23). According to Tom, the dialogue does not replicate an exact conversation, but it has its basis in reality – "true it is that there are men which have dealt with me in the same humour that here I shaddow," he says (3:21). As in *The Unfortunate Traveller*, shadows are separated from their bodies.

The letter to the reader betrays the book's polemical strategy: the text constructs a new iteration of Tom Nashe for the marketplace, an iteration that is meant to repair his supposedly damaged reputation by answering the objections, challenges, and criticism of four other personae. When Tom distinguishes himself from Piers Respondent, saying he will "personate" him, he creates a doubling in the text, and marks one persona off from another: one Tom writes the preface while the other participates in the dialogue. As the dialogue shows, the persona exists in a dynamic reciprocity with its predecessors, informed and shaped by its former instantiations, even as it sheds light on them. The Tom in the dialogue looks back to his previous instantiations – "many a faire day agoe, haue I proclaimed my selfe to the worlde *Piers Pennilesse,*" he declares. (3:31) – and comments on how vendible his books are and how skillfully he decimated Harvey in *Strange newes*. Piers Respondent's previous marketplace and literary success bolster his celebrity, and his capable defense of himself in *Have with You* boosts the credibility of the speaking personae of *Strange newes*, *Piers Pennilesse*, and other publications. By redeeming himself from the "disgraced and condemned" state induced by not answering *Pierces Supererogation* in print (3:27) and "counterbuff[ing] and beat[ing] back all those ouerthwart blowes" Harvey pummels him with (3:28), Piers Respondent seeks to enhance the reputation of all the Tom Nashes circulating in the marketplace.

The framing device also betrays Piers Respondent's motive for reanimating Doctor Harvey's persona. In the dialogue portion of the text, Tom Nashe uses the same strategy outlined in the preface – he redeploys and manipulates Harvey's authorial personae – in order to crack his enemy's credit. Harvey constantly calls attention to the fictional aspects of his self-presentation, referring to himself as a "wise man in print" and, hilariously, lamenting that he has to choose between being "a passiue, or an actiue asse in print" (V3r). Tom Nashe provides this fictional persona with a magnificent mock-biography in which the Doctor becomes "the vnflattered picture of Pedantisme," (3:42) also known as "*Talatamtana*" (3:75), "*Graphiel Hagiel*" (3:107), "iracundious *Stramutzen Gabriell*" (3:119), among other things. Piers Respondent creates a feedback loop between the long-winded Harveys that speak in *Pierces Supererogation*, *Three proper, and wttie, familiar letters* (1580), and *Foure Letter* and the star of *Have with You* such that that all parties whom Nashe ridicules are rendered laughingstocks. The Doctor Harvey that emerges from *Have with You* is a ridiculous figure whose books will not sell.

In *Have with You*, Doctor Harvey is a function of Gabriel Harvey's printed writings, especially *Pierces Supererogation*. Even the material features of that book facilitate Nashe's construction of the Doctor, as Piers Respondent describes *Pierces Supererogation* as a "Babilonian towre or tome of confutation" as "an vnconscionable vast gorbellied Volume, bigger bulkt than a Dutch Hoy & farre more boystrous and cumbersome than a payre of *Swissers* omnipotent galeaze breeches" (3:36).[288] To add insult to injury, Nashe claims that the book manifests "incomprehensible corpulencie" (3:35), a phrase that characterizes Doctor Harvey throughout *Have with You* in terms both of the Doctor's appearance and his writing. Tom claims

---

[288] According to R.B. McKerrow, the reference to "Swissers galeaze breeches" is a jab at the book's size, since "the Swiss seem to have been notorious for their great breeches" (4:319).

that the book's woodcut, supposedly representing Harvey's "liuely counterfet and portraiture," doesn't reflect what the doctor actually looks like – "a case of tooth-pikes or a Lute pin put in a sute of apparel" (3:38); Doctor Harvey is "more dapper & plump and round" than Gabriel Harvey. Nashe also describes the Doctor's writing in terms of corpulence: "Neuer was man so surfetted and ouer-gorged with English" (3:91). His mouth is "stufft" with "Orations and Disputations" (3:80).[289]

The Doctor's bloated prose and the authorial personae by which it is conveyed take center stage in the humiliating mock-biography, as it draws on the speaking personae of Harvey's printed books – *Three proper, and wittie, familiar letters*, *Foure Letters*, and *Pierces Supererogation*. This mock-biography is perhaps the most stunning example of character assassination in the long 1590s, and it brings into focus the two main lines of attack that Nashe follows in *Have with You*: Tom parodies these personae, particularly Harvey's invention of English hexameter and his prideful verbosity. The "first motiue or caller foorth of *Gabriels* English Hexameters was his falling in loue with *Kate Cotton,*" Piers Respondent tells his interlocutors. ("Gabriell was alwayes in loue" [3:81]). Skewering his verbosity, Tom reproduces a letter from one of the Doctor's former school masters, which waxes rhapsodic about his pupil's word choices, particularly how the young Doctor refers to a shoe as "vnder foote abiect" (3:65). These hexameter-spouting, garrulous personae lack literary talent, something that prevents them from being commercially viable. Doctor Harvey's biography reveals the persona the portrait of "Buffianisme [ruffian buffoonery] throughout his whole bookes," books that he will later claim

[289] These remarks recall his characterization of the Doctor in *Strange newes* as "fedde … fat in his humor of *Braggadochio Glorioso."* (1:294)

will not sell, which, as we shall see, is why Harvey ends up paying John Wolfe to print them (3:80).

Harvey's life story begins *in utero*, during which time his mother has three terror-inducing dreams regarding her fetus. These dreams and the interpretation thereof epitomize and foreground Nashe's attack on Harvey and determine the mock-biography's narrative trajectory, as they portend that the Doctor's vanity-fueled literary career will be a series of failures. Tom Nashe recounts the first of these nightmares. Harvey's mother "dreamed her wombe was turned to such another hollow vessell full of disquiet fiends as *Salomons* brazen Bowle, wherein were shut so manie thousands of deuils," who ultimately "broke loose amongst humane kinde" (3:61). This foreshadows the Doctor's poverty-driven career in print – "his discontented pouertie (more disquiet than the Irish seas) hath driu'n him from one profession to another" (3:61). Through his "moral Epistling," English hexameters, and "roguish Comment[ing] vppon earth-quakes as by famous Epistles (by his owne mouth onely made famous)," Harvey plagues the world with his pamphlets (3:61). In the second dream, which is equally disturbing and prophetic, Harvey's mother envisioned that "shee was deliuerd of a caliuer or hand-gun, which in the discharging burst" (3:61). This horrific vision foretells Harvey's failed attempts at poetry; instead of beautiful verse, he "shoots nothing but pellets of chewd paper" (3:61). In her third nightmare, Mrs. Harvey's womb was "ouer-run with garish weedes innumerable, which had onely one slip in it of herb of grace," a Narcissus-like flower which bloomed only at the roots (3:61). This peculiar bud, as Harvey's mother correctly "augur'd and coniectur'd," signifies that "at the height of his best proofe he would bee found a barrain stalk without frute" (3:62). Even in the prime of his career as a pamphleteer, Harvey's books would be "illiterat" and repulse book buyers (1:258). As

Harvey's life story unfolds, these nightmares become his reality: poor, vain, and proud, he produces unsalable books for the press.

After a detailed account of his childhood, Tom Nashe comes to the "first prime of [the Doctor's] pamfletting" (3:69), the fruitless period after Harvey disgraces himself in print by coming "verie short and sharpe vppon [the] Lord of *Oxford* in a ratling bundle of English Hexameters" (3:69).[290] After this unfortunate incident, the only way the Doctor can "get three pence a weeke and keepe the paper soales and vpper leather of his pantoffles together, is to write Prognostications and Almanackes" (3:71). To avoid the shame associated with becoming "a common writer of Almanacks," Harvey assumes a new persona and styles himself Gabriel Frende.

The inclusion of Gabriel Frende in Harvey's mock-biography is part of an elaborate joke on the Doctor. The Gabriel Frende almanacs, published annually in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, typically contained an "astrological description of the foure quarters of the yeere" and an overview of "the dayly disposition of the weather."[291] Almanacs were extremely popular in the sixteenth century, and thus they sold well. By writing for the almanac market, Harvey secures an income. Harvey and Frende are connected only by a first name, and so, by linking Harvey to these almanacs, Nashe insults the Doctor (and Frende), associating a learned man with a low literary form. In a similar vein, Nashe argues that Harvey took on a female persona, "Gabriella," in order to eviscerate Tom. This woman is the speaker of a prefatory sonnet sequence in *Pierces Supererogation* (2*v-3*). She denounces Nashe, calling him "Railipotent" and a "gagtooth'd fopp." As Tom has it, Gabriella is just another mask for Doctor Harvey.

---

[290] Harvey supposedly affronted the Earl of Oxford in *Three proper, and wittie, familiar letters*. For more on this incident, which Nashe also mentions in *Strange newes*, see McKerrow's note, 4:176.
[291] For more on almanacs, see Adam Smyth, *Autobiography in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), ch. 1.

According to Tom Nashe, Gabriel's almanacs are most saleable, as even "the poorest walking-mate" and "thred-bare cut-purse" has to have them. As it turns out, the Doctor always had a gift for the art of almanac-writing: as a child, he "exercised to write certain graces in ryme doggrell, and verses vppon euerie Month, many of which are yet extant in Primers and Almanacks" (3:64). Because they are written under an alias, the vendible almanacs do nothing to increase Harvey's fame. But the Doctor cannot resist praising himself, and he lauds the almanacs' merits in front of his friends, suspiciously telling them that "a frend of his … thought good to shroud himself vnder that title" (3:70). Since Gabriel Harvey and Gabriel Frende are apparently one and the same, Tom advises his interlocutors to distrust the prognosticator's "durtie astronomicall predictions," as they are designed to "delude" all who read them (3:70). In any case, as Tom notes, the marketplace visibility of these books partially quenches his thirst for fame. Becoming a "busie Chronicler of high wayes" puts him on "the high way to honour" (3:73). Almanac writing, to Piers Respondent's mind, suits the doctor well because the roads that the Doctor maps in his almanacs correspond to the "number of vgly wrinckled high ways in his visage" (3:73). The books will perpetuate his memory, becoming "his best Philosophers Stone till hys last destiny" (3:71).

Harvey's alleged almanac persona provides him with the ready money necessary to pay for the printing of books that will not sell. The final section of the mock-biography covers the printing of one such book, *Pierces Supererogation*, and its aftermath. Tom's account of the Doctor's humiliation in the wake of the volume's publication draws attention to the persona's unsalable qualities, his vanity, and his desperation for fame, all of which are related. Throughout his biography of the Doctor, Tom Nashe calls attention to his bad style – apparently he tends to "hewe and slash with his Hexameters" (3:78) and his writing is full of "the pittifullest pangs that

euer anie mans Muse breathd foorth" (3:80) – claiming that it repulses book-buyers. Apparently, the only way his books have any retail value was because he is in the habit of mentioning "*Sir Philip Sydney, Master Spencer,* and other men of highest credit into euerie pild ["robbed, plundered or pillaged," and "threadbare"][292] pamphlet he set foorth" in order to "march vnder their Ensignes" (3:35). (In *Pierces Supererogation*, he marches under Tom Nashe's ensign, as Tom notes.) Because he is so desirous of fame, and because his illiteracy drives potential book buyers away, Harvey promises the printer-publisher John Wolfe that he will "defray" the publication costs of *Pierces Supererogation*, something he cannot afford to do (3:96). Unable to repay John Wolfe, the Doctor is arrested and put in jail, something that provokes a "more than *Herculean* fury" in him because he feels "betrayd and bought and sold" (3:99). Once in prison, the Doctor's pride and vanity issue forth, when he instructs the jail keepers to keep their hands off his "reuerent person." For reasons of safety, the jail keepers try to confiscate his dagger, at which point Harvey betrays his elevated sense of self-importance: "[M]y life then, I see, is conspired against, when you seek to bereaue me of the instruments that should secure it" (3:99), he says, as if failure to cover the costs of an unsalable book warrants execution. The arrest proves to be so humiliating that Harvey escapes to his hometown of Saffron-Walden, where he "mewd and coopt vp himself" to avoid the shame he has brought upon himself (3:101). This is the persona that has assaulted Tom Nashe's integrity. Ostentatious, opportunistic, and prideful: he is a criminal who will do anything to "come in print" (3:109), at the expense of "all his credit and reputation" (3:17). As his life story reveals, this Doctor Harvey, like the ones who came before him in print, is rotten to the core. As Don Carneades de boone Compagionla says, "His

---

[292] *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "pilled."

life and doctrine may both be to vs an ensample, for since the raigne of Queen Gueniuer was there neuer seene worse" (3:102).

The splendid mock-biography at the heart of *Have with You* exploits the malleability of authorial personae and showcases the extent to which the literary devices can be treated as common property. Tom Nashe revels in the flexibility of these feigned persons, particularly in his self-presentation. When he cleverly cloaks himself in his own colors, he calls attention to himself as a shadow that can be separated from his originating body. By turning himself into a detachable authorial persona, Nashe invites someone to assume and/or appropriate him, and indeed several people did. Tom Nashe achieved what Jack Wilton could not: he became a relatively famous authorial persona, which was augmented and appropriated in the early modern period. The anonymous author of *The trimming of Thomas Nashe Gentleman* (1597) appropriates and attacks Tom Nashe much in the same way that Nashe did to Doctor Harvey. And long after Nashe's death, his persona lived on. In the 1640s, "Tom Nashe" was resurrected to attack "nonconformists, schismatiques, separatists, and scandalous libellers."[293]

A cursory reading of *Have with You* and *Pierces Supererogation* would suggest that the two texts express contradictory attitudes toward authorial personae. If we read Tom Nashe's response to authorial personae in terms of expansion, we can read Doctor Harvey's as a unifying gesture – he insists that the persona and his creator share an identity. As he does in *Foure Letters*, Doctor Harvey seems to mistake the persona for "the real thing."[294] Full of long digressions on arcane matters, *Pierces Supererogation* is basically unreadable. (Harvey's biographer, Virginia Stern, is too generous when she says that it "tends sometimes to become

---

[293] This is taken from the title page of John Taylor's *Differing worships, or, The oddes, betweene some knights service and God's Or Tom Nash his ghost, (the old Martin queller) newly rous'd* (London, 1640). See also Taylor's *Tom Nash his ghost* (London, 1642) and his *Crop-eare curried, or, Tom Nash his ghost* (London, 1645).
[294] *Thomas Nashe in Context*, 197.

tedious" and that "the reader is occasionally lulled into inattention and near insensitivity."[295])
The main text is divided into three sections: the first an attack on Nashe, the second an attack on *Pappe with an Hatchet* (1589) and Martin Marprelate, and the third another attack on Nashe. I have selected to focus on the book's second section – Doctor Harvey's apparent attack on John Lyly – because the strategy he deploys in that tirade epitomizes his polemical strategy against Tom Nashe.

In the middle of *Pierces Supererogation*, Doctor Harvey turns from Nashe and attacks John Lyly's *Pappe with an Hatchet* and Martin Marprelate in a section called "An Advertisement for Pap-hatchet, and Martin Mar-prelate" (I4r). *Pappe with an Hatchet* is an anti-Martinist book, and its speaking persona, Double V, draws a connection between himself, the extemporal stage clown, and a jester. The book contains jest-book style, fictional accounts of the misdeeds of Martin Marprelate and his followers, and, importantly, Double V refers to himself as the pamphlet's writer throughout. Harvey's assault on *Pappe* – that "stincking Pamflett" – proceeds in a predictable fashion: he harangues the book, its speaker, and Lyly as if they were one and the same. "[W]ould God, Lilly had alwaies bene Euphues, and neuer Pap-hatchet," he laments early in his diatribe (I4r). As the invective unfolds, he hardly mentions *Euphues* and instead focuses his energy on *Pappe*. Based on his persona's textual behavior in the anti-Martinist volume, as Harvey has it, John Lyly is a real braggadocio, or "Pappadocio," who proclaims "his owne vanities in a thousand sentences, and whole Volumes of ribaldry" (T4r).

Initially, it seems that Harvey is offended by *Pappe*'s prose style. He attacks the book's manner of argumentation, particularly the way its persona jokes about the serious matter of religion, and suggests that the little book's railing style reveals the true nature of its speaker,

---

[295] *Gabriel Harvey: His Life, Marginalia, and Library* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), 104.

whom he alternately refers to as "Pappe" and "Double V" and whom he attacks as if he (the authorial persona) is responsible for *Pappe*'s contents. As part of his attack, Harvey reproduces *Pappe*'s opening lines – "*Roome for a roister: so that's well said … Ile make such a splinter runne into your [Martin Marprelate's] wittes*" (Kr, emphasis Harvey's) – and provides commentary on them. Although Double V claims to be "marueilous discreet" and a "modest man of the soberest sort," his text, replete with scoffs and invective, proves him otherwise. According to the Doctor, learned men would "blush" to read such "hairebrain'd trickes," "thread-bare iests," and "weather-beaten cranckes" (Kv). Tedious and "tinkerly," the pamphlet's style proves Double V's "conceit [to be] as lank, as a shotten herring" (K2r).[296] Worse still, it offers damning evidence of the authorial persona's "madbrayned and desperate" disposition as well as his "contempt of all good Order" (K2v).

Yet, as Harvey's critique of the pamphlet continues, the polemic changes directions, for the Doctor brings up John Lyly in relation to Double V. Harvey inserts Lyly's biographical data in the middle of his invective against Double V's roister-doistering: "They were much deceiued in him, at Oxford, and in the Sauoy, when Master Absolon liued; that tooke him onely for a dapper & deft companion, or a pert conceited youth, that had gathered together a fewe prettie sentences." (Kv). Not only did Lyly attend Oxford, but it is possible that he also resided at the Savoy when William Absolom was master there. Here, the inclusion of Lyly's biographical data can be read as an assimilation of the author and the authorial persona; Harvey appears to insinuate that Double V is a projection of Lyly. And, in contrasting Lyly's past comportment with Double V's present behavior, Harvey calls Lyly's honesty into question, with the help of

---

[296] Essentially, Harvey is saying that Double V has a slender wit. The term "shotten herring," when used in reference to a person, means "thin, emaciated; worthless, good-for-nothing." See *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "shotten."

circular reasoning. If Double V is a representation of Lyly, then his (Lyly's) past behavior was deceitful – he fooled people into thinking he was "dapper & deft" when in reality he is a "terrible creature." But Lyly's past deceit bolsters Harvey's claim that Double V (i.e. Lyly) is presently a liar. Reading Double V biographically allows Harvey to find evidence of Lyly's degenerate mind and his fondness for falsifying. The Doctor sarcastically surveys Double V's "priuie intelligences," including Martin Marprelate's supposed incestuous relationship with his own sister, and concludes "the credibilitie of the Autor" is questionable (R4v-Sr). Lyly, as it turns out, is "the Spawne of ranke Calumnie," and "his knauish and foolish malice palpably bewrayeth it self in most-odious fictions [fictional accounts of Martin and his followers]" (R4r). Even in *Pappe*'s most artificial spots, Harvey seems to say, Lyly's malice and his inclination for lying shine through.

Over the course of his sustained denunciation of *Pappe*, Harvey references Lyly's biography again and again. It thus becomes impossible to tell whether or not Harvey is referring to the authorial persona, his creator, or both. He refers to Double V/Lyly as "a professed iester, a Hick-scorner, a scoff-maister, a playmunger, an Interluder; once the foile of Oxford, now the stale of London, and euer the Apesclogg of the presse" (K3r). While "the foile of Oxford" alludes to Lyly's time at college, "playmunger," "Interluder," and "Apesclogg of the presse," may refer to Lyly, Euphues, or Double V. Lyly was a playwright and a published writer, but Double V also claims to pen comedies and takes responsibility for the publication of *Pappe*. The point is not that we should try to disentangle Lyly from Double V; rather, it is that we cannot because Harvey's insults frequently take the form of lists in which Double V and Lyly are indistinguishable. As his name suggests, Double V is truly "double" and "double you." Harvey insists that Lyly's biography as an Oxford student, London playwright, and affiliate of Paul's

Boys informs *Pappe*: "He hath not played the Vicemaster of Poules, and the Fool master of the Theater for naughtes: himself a mad lad, as euer twangd, neuer troubled with any substance of witt, or circumstance of honestie, sometime the fiddle-sticke of Oxford, now the very bable of London" (R4r). Whatever name he goes by, John Lyly has no wit.

Based on the commingling of historical author and authorial persona in the text, one might produce a reading of *Pierces Supererogation* that goes something like this: by merging authorial persona and writer, Doctor Harvey incorporates Double V into Lyly's literary identity, allowing him to assign Lyly responsibility for and thus ownership of *Pappe* and its speaking persona. In short, the Doctor's response to Double V supports Douglas Bruster's argument that the 1590s saw the emergence of a concept of authorship based on literary property. "Literary identity, like literary property, depends on ownership," he writes.[297] After all, a recognizable individual (in this case John Lyly) can be blamed for a book's style and the vehicle through which it is conveyed – the authorial persona. For Harvey, then, Double V offers the most damning evidence of Lyly's disregard for the social order, and it is something for which the wayward writer should be held accountable. If Foucault's argument that the author of a book stands to be punished for it is correct, then Doctor Harvey is Foucauldian *avant la lettre*.

But it would be too hasty, and in fact incorrect, to dismiss Harvey as proto-Foucauldian in one breath. Given what we know about Gabriel Harvey's behavior in the margins of his books and manuscripts, particularly his predilection for literary personae, we ought to read *Pierces Supererogation* with caution.[298] What is more, Doctor Harvey often calls attention to the fact that

[297] *Shakespeare and the Question of Culture*, 88.

[298] For Harvey's use of personae in his manuscript notebooks, see Katharine Wilson, *Fictions of Authorship in Late Elizabethan Narratives: Euphues in Arcadia* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), ch. 1. For Harvey's use of personae in the margins of his books, see Virginia Stern, *Gabriel Harvey: His Life, Marginalia, and Library*. Stern

he is a persona, famously calling himself a "sheep in wolf's print," calling attention to his assumed, but uncharacteristic, ferocity and punning on the name of his publisher John Wolfe. If the Doctor has a sophisticated understanding of his own status as fictional persona, then it stands to reason that he is aware of Double V's, Euphues', Piers Pennilesse's, and Tom Nashe's. And, indeed, there are moments in *Pierces Supererogation* when he acknowledges the personahood of his opponents. At one point, he threatens to "dismaske" Double V (2C4v). At another, he separates Thomas Nashe from his persona Piers Pennilesse and argues that Thomas Nashe will carry a "tache," or "spot," of Piers Pennilesse with him to his grave.[299] Harvey is not as obtuse as many critics would claim, and, I will show, his flattening of Double V into Lyly, Piers Pennilesse and Tom Nashe into Thomas Nashe, can actually be read as a form of imaginative expansion; detaching Double V and Tom Nashe and from their original contexts and identifying them with historical figures serves Harvey's pedantic goals because it allows him to undermine his fictional opponents' credibility.

Let us consider the context of the moments in which Doctor Harvey grafts John Lyly's biographical data onto Double V. As the section heading – "An Advertisement for Pap-hatchet, and Martin Mar-prelate" – makes clear, Doctor Harvey is launching an attack on personae, not John Lyly the author. The purpose of mapping Lyly's biographical details onto the persona is not to damage the author's reputation (though that may have happened); rather, it is to damage the persona's. In bringing up Lyly's time at the university, Doctor Harvey gives his nemesis a back-story, which, he hopes, will expose past, present, and future iterations of the persona as frauds. Alexandra Halasz has convincingly argued that Harvey is preoccupied with how the marketplace

---

lists 6 personae associated with Harvey's books: Axiophilus, Angelus Furius, Eudromus, Eutrapelus, Chrystotechnus, and Euscopus (176).

[299] *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "tache."

of print initiates the "degradation" of university learning.[300] The "marketplace willy-nilly," in other words, "reduces 'a greate scholler' to the price of his 'prostituted devices.'"[301] Double V, though not a "greate scholler," exemplifies the degradation that worries Doctor Harvey, a Cambridge M.A., so.[302] That persona supposedly has a college degree, yet he is "Sir Gawain reuiued, or rather Terrour in person" (Kv), who writes in a "cutting vaine." According to Harvey, Double V has squandered his education and behaves as if he does not have a degree. Rather than incorporating his learning into civil discourse, the Doctor complains, he debases it, and participates in "infinite Controversies." Double V, that is, chooses to "disguise [his] witt, and disgrace [his] arte with ruffianly foolery" (I4r), and he ought to know better.

In his critique of Double V, Doctor Harvey is insistent that the persona is a disgrace to the university and society. To this end, he argues that Double V played a long con on Oxford, "deceiu[ing]" his colleagues at school by making him think that he was "a deft companion, or a pert conceited youth" (Kv), when, in reality, he was more interested in jesting. What is worse, Doctor Harvey hints that Double V's wanton disregard for civility and his textual behavior may lead to the embarrassment of Oxford: he calls Double V the university's "foile" (K3r), which implies not only "disgrace" but "stigma."[303] This use of the genitive in "the foile of Oxford" suggests that Double V was not only viewed as the disgrace of Oxford while he was there, but also that he brings public shame to the school. Later, the Doctor continues his assessment of his opponent, referring to him as "the fiddle-stick of Oxford" (R4r), an epithet that may suggest that

---

[300] *The Marketplace of Print*, 96. For more on Tom Nashe's and Doctor Harvey's positions on the relationship between university learning and the marketplace, see ch. 3.
[301] *Ibid*. 93.
[302] Harvey served in a variety of capacities at Cambridge before departing to London between 1586 and 1588. He was a fellow of Trinity college, lecturing in Greek (appointed 1572), acting as junior treasurer (1574) as well as senior treasurer (1575), and lecturing in rhetoric (appointed praelector in 1574). For an overview of his time at the university, see his *Oxford DNB* article.
[303] *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "foil."

Double V's colleagues perceived the absurdity of his character.[304] Euphues, too, is connected to Oxford, for it was there that he composed his "prettie sentences" (Kv). When he connects Double V to Euphues through Lyly's biography, Doctor Harvey calls the credibility of both personae into question. If Double V and Euphues are actually the same person with a different name, and Double V is a liar and a blight on society, then Euphues might be too.

Doctor Harvey's apparent attack on Thomas Nashe, which bears resemblance to his seeming attack on Lyly – he connects Tom Nashe to Thomas Nashe's time at the university[305] – is diffuse, but one of its recurrent themes is that Tom Nashe does not behave like a gentleman. As he does with Double V, Harvey subjects Tom Nashe to imaginative expansion by augmenting his biography with an historical figure's personal data. And so, when he collapses Thomas Nashe into Tom Nashe, Doctor Harvey confers the title of Gentleman on the persona. (Thomas Nashe considered himself a gentleman, styling himself as such on the cover of several books, including *Piers Pennilesse*). In a particularly telling passage, Doctor Harvey issues a command to the reader: "Examin the Printers gentle Preamble before the Supplication to the Diuell: and tell me in good sooth, by the verdicte of the Tuchstone, whether Pierce Penniles commende Pierce Penniles, or no." He continues, "and whether that sory praise of the Authour Thomas Nashe, be not loathsome from the mouthe of the Printer Thomas Nashe" (F2v). Here, the author, persona, and printer seem to be collapsed into one figure, who arrogantly sings his own praises. As if this comparison were not explicit enough, Harvey links the book's prose to Thomas Nashe's lifestyle, claiming that *Piers Pennilesse*'s abhorrent style seems to be a product of Thomas Nashe's licentious living: "His Life daily feedeth his Stile, & his Stile notoriously bewraieth his

---

[304] *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "fiddlestick."
[305] For more on this topic see Halasz, *Marketplace of Print*, ch. 3.

Life" (F2v). But hope remains, for Nashe can mend his ways. The Doctor chides Nashe: "Rule thy desperate infamouse penne, & bee … the printers Gentleman," obliquely referencing Nashe's employment at John Danter's printshop. (He makes direct reference to Nashe's work for Danter later in the pamphlet.) Behave like a gentleman, reform your style, he warns. Here, "gentleman" is used as an insult, as it is in *Foure Letters* when Harvey refers to Tom Nashe as a "mightie lashing Gentleman" (E2v). Yet this barb encapsulates Doctor Harvey's mode of attack on Tom Nashe; he discredits his opponent by demonstrating that he does not possess the excellence, kindness, and goodness expected of a gentleman. Instead, he is complicit in the social ills wrought by the contradictory writing I outlined in chapter 1 and a "rakehell."[306] He might be compared to what John Awdeley calls a "troll and troll by," or "he that setteth naught by no man, nor no man by him. This is he that that would bear rule in a place and hath no authority nor thanks, and at last is thrown out of the door like a knave."[307] Tom Nashe, Piers Pennilesse, and their books are bad for society, and their readers should beware.

Before closing, I want to return briefly to the account of Harvey's reading practices outlined above, an account that posits that Harvey understands the authorial persona as a projection of the historical author. In that narrative, personae become interpretive devices; they shape and determine how readers think about their originators. Harvey's apparent mode of reading is familiar to all scholars of Nashe, and it certainly was an available mode of reading in the early modern period. Tom Nashe, after all, encourages us to read his voice as the author's, and it would be impossible to erase Thomas Nashe, or Gabriel Harvey, from their books. As

---

[306] Thomas Thomas, in his *Dictionarium Linguae Latinae et Anglicanae* (London, 1587), lists the qualities associated with a gentleman in the following entry: Gĕnĕrosus, a, um. Noble, comming of a good or noble rase, a gentleman borne, excellent, puissant, couragious, of a gentle and good kinde: fruitfull, plentifull, of a verie kind and good, &c.

[307] *The Fraternity of Vagabonds* (1561), in *Rogues, Vagabonds, and Sturdy Beggars*, ed. Arthur Kinney (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1990), 98.

Geoffrey Gust notes, "By definition, any literary work is voiced by speakers with some sort of oblique relationship to the author him/herself."[308] When a persona shares a name with its author and appears as a writer in the text, the temptation to equate them becomes even greater. There is a danger, with this sort of reading, however, to cede too much authority to the author, particularly since authorial personae announce themselves as fictions and have social lives in the marketplace. As Roland Barthes has taught us, a text can derive meaning from its "destination," not just its point of origin, and the various permutations of a given authorial persona are sometimes shaped by their readers, or consumers, not their producers.[309]

In "The Structural Transformation of Print," Douglas Bruster describes the creation of authorial personae as a process whereby authors create "embodied" personae, who become commodities in the marketplace. This form of textual practice, for Bruster, induces the birth of a concept of authorship grounded in literary property. With its emphasis on ownership over the text, this narrative is obviously Foucauldian, and it even confirms Foucault's assertion that the authorial persona contributed to the "individualization" of the author.[310] These personae, and the books in which they circulated, were taken to coexist and transact with their originators. And literary history has borne this out: Harvey's commentary on and manipulation of Double V have been taken as fact, and so Lyly's *Oxford DNB* entry cites Harvey as an authority on Lyly's time at the Savoy. Chaucer's personae shaped sixteenth-century biographical accounts of the author, too. In the 1602 Speght Chaucer, for instance, the poet's biographer alleges that *The Testament*

---

[308] *Constructing Chaucer*, 39.

[309] Roland Barthes, "The Death of the Author," in *Image-Music-Text*, trans. Stephen Heath (New York: Hill and Wang, 1977), 148.

[310] In his seminal essay on authorship, Michel Foucault remarks in passing that the author's persona plays a role in "how the author became individualized." See "What is an Author?" in *The Essential Foucault*, ed. Paul Rabinow (New York: The New Press, 2003), 377.

of Love recounts Chaucer's "dealings in the City."[311] The author is even assigned a coat-of-arms, reproduced based on "simple coniecture."[312] Early modern readers and writers may have had a proto-Foucauldian understanding of authorial personae, but it was certainly not the only understanding available to them. Portable and fictional, these literary devices became constitutive of an alternative form of canonicity, which was rooted in the marketplace.

The singularity of Tom Nashe's self-presentation, prose style, and rhetorical acrobatics – a singularity that he reminds us of again and again – and his vendibility facilitated his entry into the print canon. In works like *Anatomy of Absurditie*, *Piers Pennilesse*, and *Lenten Stuffe*, the persona comments on late-Elizabethan literary culture, but as contemporary responses to Tom Nashe show, he also helped to shape it. In *Kind-Hartes Dream* (1592), the ghost of Robert Greene addresses Piers Pennilesse, telling him what he "once intended" to exclaim: "Awake (secure boy) reuenge thy wrongs, remember mine: thy aduersaries began the abuse, *they continue it*."[313] Piers, that is, has become the victim of continual textual abuse and the life of the press. In this respect, Piers participates and helps to shape the trend of contradictory writing I outlined in a previous chapter. He has provoked a polemical trend and is the subject of many books, including *Kind-Hartes Dream*, but it is Tom Nashe's old nemesis, Doctor Harvey, who provides the most compelling evidence for his print canonicity. One of the reasons Harvey is angry at personae like Martin Marprelate is that they have flooded the market with rancorous books, a phenomenon which has wrought a strange alteration on early modern literary culture through their perpetuation of the contradictory writing I discussed in chapter 1. Harvey lumps Nashe together

---

[311] *The vvorkes of our ancient and lerned English poet, Geffrey Chaucer, newly printed* (London: Adam Islip, 1602), b2r.
[312] *Ibid*., b2v.
[313] *Kind-harts dreame Conteining fiue apparitions* (London: John Danter and John Wolfe for William Wright, 1592), Ev (emphasis mine).

with other vendible, stylistically innovative personae, calling them (Robert Greene, Tom Nashe, Martin Marprelate, Euphues, Double V and Richard Tarlton) "fooles in retayle" (*Pierces* A3r). For Doctor Harvey, Nashe is not just a member of this company, but a distinctive member: "He weeneth himselfe a speciall penman; as he were the headman of the Pa*m*fletting crew" (Z3v). He laments that "the Presse [would] suffer this scribling Asse to dominere in Print" (Y2v), "dominere" having both economic and literary resonances. Tom Nashe's books perform well in the market, and he has inspired imitators, and rivals (including Gabriel Harvey). And for this reason, Doctor Harvey says that a virtuous gentlewoman he knows has "canonise[d Nashe] the Patriarke of newe writers" in verse (E4r).[314]

Doctor Harvey's alleged female friend was not the only early modern to consider Tom Nashe a canonical figure. Thomas Dekker's 1607 pamphlet *A Knights Conjuring* looks back on English literary history and situates Tom Nashe at the center of the literary culture of the 1590s.[315] Like Skelton's *Garlande or Chapelett of Laurell*, *A Knights Conjuring* is a dream vision that depicts the literary canon as a collective of distinct authorial personae. Dekker's pamphlet, however, separates these authorial personae by kind, with each group encapsulating a division in the English canon. In the Elysian fields sit the venerated authors of high poetry – "old Chaucer, reverend for priorite" (155) is surrounded by unnamed poets singing in verse; his son, "Grave Spenser," is seated at his right hand (155). Seated apart from them, is another distinctive group, or "a colledge," comprised of four print personae: Christopher Marlowe, Robert Greene, George Peele, and Tom Nashe. Here, the recently deceased Tom Nashe is a function of the

---

[314] This is the same woman that Nashe calls "Gabriella."

[315] This text is the second revised edition of Dekker's *Newes from Hell* (London: R.B. for W. Fereband, 1606). I cite from *Thomas Dekker's* A Knights Conjuring *(1607): A Critical Edition* parenthetically in the main text. For the relationship between *Newes from Hell* and *A Knights Conjuring*, see *Thomas Dekker's* A Knights Conjuring *(1607)*, 55-58. Moreover, this book, in the vein of Thomas Middleton's *The Black Book* (1604), purports to be a sequel to *Piers Pennilesse*.

books in which he appears, and so he “invey[s] bitterly (as he had wont to do),” descrying the world he just left (156). When Tom Nashe enters into this “colledge,” he is not crowned with laurels, nor is he afforded the title of “Patriarke” or monarch. He does not appear to be in competition with his peers, though his satirical spirit certainly makes him stand out from the crowd. Nashe’s entrance into the “Baye-tree Grove” situates the him in literary history, as a new addition to a centuries-old canon; he exists on the same plane as Chaucer, Spenser, and their heavenly choristers, but he, like Peele, Marlowe, and Greene, is distinct from them. The presence of 1590s print personae in the English literary canon is significant, for it suggests that, even though they are associated with cheap print, they, and the print canon they comprise, are an important part of English literary heritage.

The Nashe-Harvey controversy is an important polemical exchange precisely because it brings to the fore period tensions over the place of the authorial persona in the marketplace of print. The seemingly contradictory attitudes toward authorial personae embedded in the controversy have allowed us to tell two different stories. On the one hand, the authorial persona can be incorporated into a commonplace critical narrative: it plays a pivotal role in the development of modern authorship. On the other hand, *Have with You*’s and *Pierces Supererogation*’s treatment of authorial persona, like that of *The Unfortunate Traveller*, should give us pause about the way we read the first-person narration of pamphlets in the 1590s. Jack Wilton, Tom Nashe and Doctor Harvey are all fictional personae, and to think of them as such opens up new avenues for reading literature. To be sure, it seems as if Harvey has won – we speak of Piers Pennilesse and Tom Nashe as if they belong to Thomas Nashe, and we include them in the story of the Author. But the authorial persona, because of its autofictional quality, is worth considering on its own terms not just because it is a literary device, but because it reminds

us that our narratives about literary identity and property may not be the only ones that the books of the past tell.

CODA:
The Notorious R.G.: Posthumous Pamphlets and the Efflorescence of Personae in the 1590s

1592 was a big year for Robert Greene the author and Robert Green the persona. The author, if accounts by his contemporaries are to be believed, fell ill and died in squalor after gorging himself on wine and pickled herring. By contrast, the persona, whose exploits were inspired by the author with whom he shared a name and was an established marketplace fixture, continued to have a glorious life in print: he was featured in eight books. This coda concerns itself with the Robert Greene persona, one of the most popular and notorious print personae of the 1590s. In particular, I am concerned with the books that were published after the historical author's death in 1592 because these little books, which I will call the "posthumous pamphlets," most fully expose the true mechanics of the print persona phenomenon of the 1590s. The books were produced and sold to satisfy consumer demand for all things Robert Greene. In them, we meet multiple authors, well-known and now-forgotten, who have chosen to deploy a popular persona in their writing. By using a well-known textual personality, they gain access to the marketplace of print. At the same time, we see printers and publishers appealing to readers to buy their books, demonstrating their investment in the literary marketplace. The posthumous pamphlets illustrate one of the underlying assumptions of this dissertation: the profusion of personae in the 1590s was propagated by three distinct parties: readers who would buy books, authors who would write books to satisfy consumer demand, and printers and publishers who would produce and sell pamphlets to readers.

As I have argued in chapters 2 and 3, any writer of the 1590s could participate in the marketplace of print by assuming a print persona; the person using the device need not be its originator, as by their very nature print personae are flexible and portable, available for anyone's

use. These devices gained popularity and marketplace prominence after the appearance of Martin Marprelate, and their market function separated them from more traditional personae deployed by earlier Tudor authors. Designed to sell, they became vendible commodities and were used to attract reading publics, something that was of interest to both writers and Stationers of the decade. Indeed, one of the reasons that the literature of the 1590s is peopled with personae is because printers and publishers were willing to take a gamble on their potential popularity. They would produce books by then-unknown and now-forgotten authors if they featured a popular persona, such as Martin Marprelate, Tom Nashe, and Robert Greene, and they would take those personae designed to compete and/or argue with pre-existing personae to print, if they thought they could sell them. In the second and third chapters of this project, I focused on the literary and economic work personae did in the marketplace. Books featuring the devices were published to satisfy a reading public eager to hear more about their lives, quarrels, and exploits. These personae, however, were not just marketing devices: they did political and literary work. In the case of Marprelate, they were initially used to persuade their readers on matters of church doctrine, while Tom Nashe and Gabriel Harvey were engaged in the making of a literary tradition tied to the marketplace of print, which I termed the print canon.

In this coda, I want to turn to one last 1590s persona, Robert Greene, and argue that the pamphlets featuring the persona Robert Greene but written after the author Robert Greene died lay out a persona-centered model of print authorship, a mode of authorship which made the profusion of personae in the 1590s possible. I have gestured toward this mode of authorship throughout this dissertation, particularly in my examination of personae as forms of common property. But the little books published on Robert Greene, particularly those published after the author with whom he shared a name died (which I refer to as “the posthumous pamphlets”),

demonstrate how non-famous early modern writers, printers, and publishers made use of popular personae in order to get books published. Crucially, they also illustrate another line of argument that I have been pursuing throughout this dissertation: the efflorescence of print personae in the 1590s was collaborative: writers, printers, publishers, and book buyers, all played a role in shaping the literary marketplace.

Robert Greene was perhaps the most popular print persona of the decade, appearing in at least eighteen pamphlets.[316] Like the other 1590s personae I have discussed in this dissertation, he was involved in quarrels; authors other than his originator deployed him; and he had a large fan base. As with Thomas Nashe, he was an authorial persona: not only does he pose as an author in the texts in which he appears, but he shares a name with the writer who originally deployed him. But after the author Robert Greene's demise – it was said that he died in of a surfeit of pickled herring and Rhennish wine – there was a remarkable flurry of literary activity featuring the persona, both living and dead. Not only did he feature in deathbed confessions and literary tributes, but his ghost appeared in printed books, allegedly inspiring London writers to take up their pens. His name became a brand, and it was used to sell books.

In 1590, as the Marprelate Controversy was lurching toward its inglorious end, the print persona named Robert Greene entered the print marketplace in a little book called *Greenes never*

---

[316] *Greenes farewell to folly* (London: Printed by Thomas Scarlet, 1591); *Greenes mourning garment* (London: Printed by John Wolfe, 1590); *Greenes never too late* (London: Printed by Thomas Orwin, 1590); *Greenes Vision* (London: Printed by Thomas Scarlet, 1592); *A notable discovery of coosenage* (London: Printed by John Wolfe, 1591); *The second part of conny-catching* (London: Printed by John Wolfe, 1591); *The thirde and last part of conny-catching* (London: Printed by Thomas Scarlet, 1592); *The blacke bookes messenger* (London: Printed by John Danter, 1592); *A disputation between a hee conny-catcher and a shee conny-catcher* (London: Printed by Abel Jeffes, 1592); *Greenes groats-worth of witte* (London: Printed by John Wolfe and John Danter, 1592); *The repentance of Robert Greene Maister of Artes* (London: Printed by John Danter, 1592); Henry Chettle, *Kind-Harts Dream* (London: Printed by William Wright, 1592); Nicholas Breton, *Greenes funeralls* (London: Printed by John Danter, 1593); John Dickenson, *Greene in conceipt* (London: Printed by Richard Braddocks, 1598); Barnabe Riche, *Greenes newes both from heaven and hell* (London, 1593); and Samuel Rowlands, *Greenes ghost haunting conie-catchers* (London: Printed for Robert Jackson, 1602).

too late. The name Robert Greene was familiar to many late-Elizabethan readers because he shared his name with his creator, the well-known literary author Robert Greene. Greene the author was a graduate of both Cambridge (BA [1580] and MA [1583]) and Oxford (a second MA [1588]). Having graduated from Oxford, Greene moved to London to earn his living by his pen. Even before he moved to the capitol, Greene was at work writing mainly prose romances for the literary marketplace. *Mamillia, A mirrour or looking-glasse for the ladies of London*, was published in 1583, and it was followed by twelve prose pamphlets that made use of popular romance motifs: orphaned daughters, prodigal sons, disguised maidens, lowly yet noble shepherds, separated family members, and long-lost princesses appear throughout Greene's romance pamphlets, which are often didactic in nature.[317] Greene may have been content to be an author of romances, and later plays, if not for the Marprelate Controversy. Even though there is no evidence, except for the arguments of another fictional persona, one Tom Nashe, scholars have argued that Richard Bancroft, Bishop of London, and John Whitgift, Archbishop of Canterbury, hired Greene to write anti-Marprelate propaganda; he may be the writer behind one of the many personae who took Martin to task.[318] Whether or not this is true, as the story goes, the controversy's popularity wrought a change in the author, a change which Arul Kumaran has called "the Martinist transformation of Robert Greene." It was during the pamphlet war that

---

[317] *Mamillia* (London: Printed Thomas Dawson, 1583); *Gwyndonius. The carde of fancie* (London: Printed by East, 1584); *Arbasto, the anatomie of fortune* (London: Printed by Thomas Windet and Thomas Judson, 1584); *The myrrour of modestie* (London: Printed by Roger Ward, 1584); *Morando the tritameron of love* (London: Printed by John Charlewood and Kingston, 1584); *Planetomachia* (London: Printed by Thomas Dawson and G. Robinson, 1585); *Penelopes web* (London: Printed by Thomas Orwin, 1587); *Euphues his censure to Philautus* (London: Printed by John Wolfe, 1587); *Peremides the blacke-smith* (London: Printed by John Wolfe, 1588); *Pandosto the triumph of time* (London: Printed by Thomas Orwin, 1588); *Menaphon* (London: Printed by Thomas Orwin, 1589); *Ciceronis amor Tullies love* (London: Printed by Robert Robinson, 1589); and *The Royall Exchange* (London: Printed by John Charlewood, 1590).

[318] For an overview of this argument, see Arul Kumaran, "The Martinist Transformation of Robert Greene in 1590," *Studies in Philology*, vol. 103, no. 3 (2006), 243-63.

Greene started to recognize the "potentialities of a print persona," and created one with whom he happened to share a name.[319]

Kumaran locates the Martinist transformation in *Greenes Vision* (written 1590, published 1592), a bizarre dream vision in which Greene, Chaucer, Gower, and King Solomon discuss the most edifying type of literature. There is no doubt that in *Greenes Vision* the author Greene self-consciously "constitutes himself" as a print persona, particularly in relation to Gower and Chaucer, thereby situating himself into an English literary canon. Indeed, Greene's efforts in the *Vision* prefigure Jack Wilton's with More and Surrey in *The Unfortunate Traveler*. But, in terms of the marketplace of print, it was not *Greenes Vision* that established Robert Greene as a print persona because it was published after his death – "written at the instant of his death" is its subtitle, in fact – after he had been an established and vendible persona. While Kumaran's analysis is penetrating and indeed one of the few that takes Greene seriously as a persona, he is interested the development of the Greene persona as it relates to the chronology of Greene's career.[320] By contrast, I am interested in how the persona operated in the print marketplace, both before and especially after the author's death. I thus consider his pamphlets in the order they

---

[319] *Ibid*., 245.

[320] Scholars generally discuss Greene in two ways, either as an author of prose pamphlets or an author of plays. Those that discuss the prose pamphlets approach them in a variety of ways, discussing Greene's life in relation to his literary career, situating his work in their historical context, or considering his texts as "cheap print." There is a rich body of scholarship on Greene, and so listing all criticism would be futile. Key scholarship includes: Reid Barbour, *Deciphering Elizabethan Fiction* (Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 1993); W.W. Barker, "Rhetorical Romance: The 'Frivolous Toyes' of Robert Greene," in *Unfolded Tales: Essays on Renaissance Romance*, ed. George M. Logan and Gordon Teskey (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989); Charles Crupi, *Robert Greene* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1986); Craig Dionne and Steve Mentz, eds., *Rogues and Early Modern English Culture* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2004); Richard Helgerson, *The Elizabethan Prodigals* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976); Arthur Kinney, *Humanistic Poetics: Thought, Rhetoric, and Fiction in Sixteenth-Century England* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1986); Kirk Melnikoff and Edward Gieskes, eds., *Writing Robert Greene: Essays on England's First Notorious Professional Author* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008); Steve Mentz, *Romance for Sale in Early Modern England* (Aldershot: Ashagate, 2006); and Katharine Wilson, *Fictions of Authorship in Late Elizabethan England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006).

were published, not composed. It was *Greenes never too late* (1590) that first introduced readers to the print persona, and it is there that I want to begin.

Greene appears to assert and distinguish himself from other personae in the prefatory materials of three pamphlets – *Greenes never too late*, *Greenes mourning garment* (1590), and *Greenes farewell to folly* (1591). In this group of pamphlets, he appears as a writer who is repentant for the romances he had previously written – he repeatedly calls his earlier pamphlets his "follies" and claims he has decided to write edifying works of fiction, not superficial toys. In *Greenes never too late*, he tells us that the book will allow "Gentlemen to see" the dangers of love: "as the Diamond is beauteous to the sight, and yet deadly poyson to the stomacke, that as the Bacan leafe containeth both the Antidote, and the Aconition, so love (vlesse only grounded vpon vertue) breedeth more disparagement to the credit than content to the fancy."[321] In *Greenes farewell to folly*, he distinguishes and distances himself from the famous Martin Marprelate by insisting he is sincere: "I cannot Martinize, sweare by my faie in a pulpit, rap out gogs wounds in a tauerne, fain loue when I haue no charitie, or protest and open resolution of good, when I intend to be priuately ill, but in all publike protestations my wordes and my deeds iump in one simpathie, and my tongue and my thoughts are relatiues."[322] Yet in these pamphlets, which for all Greene's protestations still contain frivolous romances and prodigal son narratives, the persona remains at the periphery, relegated to the prefatory material. Although not as successful as later pamphlets featuring Greene, they are important because they begin the storyline that would underwrite nearly all representations of the persona, a storyline in which he turns from writing trash to authoring works that perform a public service. But as every pamphlet that

[321] A2v.
[322] A2v-A3r.

features the persona from *Greenes never too late* to *Greenes ghost haunting cony-catchers* (1602), makes clear, he exists to entertain and sell books, not edify his readers.

Greene became a print sensation with the publication of *A Notable Discovery of Cozenage* (1591), a shocking expose of London's criminal underworld that, according to its subtitle, "playnely lay[s] open those pernicious sleightes that hath brought many ignorant men to confusion." Greene, who calls himself "R.G.," narrates the book, which begins with him reiterating to the readers that has reformed himself into a public servant, a change wrought by age and and then goes on to tell the reader that he has spent time with many of London's professional criminals, and despite their threats to harm him – he claims that he has been "sore threatened by the hacksters of that filthy facultie," that if he "sette[s] their practises in Print, they will cut off that hand that writes the Pamphlet" – he remains unafraid ("howe I feare theire bravadoes, you shall see by my plaine painting oute of them"[323]) and committed to the common good. The so-called "pernicious sleights" covered in the volume are called "conny-catching" and "cross-biting," or thievery and cheating at cards. This pamphlet was not original or unique; in fact, it was plagiarized wholesale from an earlier cony-catching pamphlet. Nevertheless, *A Notable Discovery* was an immediate success, going through three editions in 1591 and one in 1592. Its popularity prompted the publication of more books like it; it was the first in a series of six books that appeared in 1591 and 1592, all of which elucidate and provide taxonomies for the petty crime plaguing London. It was followed by *The Second Part of Conny-catching* (1591); *The Thirde and Last Part of Conny-catching* (1592); *A Disputation betweene a Hee Conny-catcher and a Shee Conny-catcher* (1592); *The Blacke Bookes messenger* (1592); and *The Defence of Conny-catching* (1592).

---

[323] A3v.

These pamphlets, in which Greene goes by "R.G." and claims to be a "spie," not a companion, to London criminals, adhere to the logic of proliferation I discussed in chapter one. Each pamphlet opens the door for more specialized pamphlets, pamphlets which feature R.G. and/or continue the persona's mission to expose the petty criminals of London and pamphlets featuring new personae, both friends and foes, who respond to R.G. directly. Five dramatically realized personae – R.G., Nan the traffique (a prostitute), Laurence the foist (a thief), Ned Browne, and Cuthbert Curry-knave – participate in the series, and each new pamphlet situates itself in relation to those that came before it, engaging in dialogue with its predecessors. This ongoing, multi-pamphlet narrative is designed to create a reading public who understands, enjoys, and follows R.G. and the inhabitants of London's criminal underworld. It is this structural logic that enabled the author Robert Greene to create a market for the cony-catching series and the persona bearing his name. The series' success made the Robert Greene persona a popular marketplace fixture, which in turn paved the way for a variety of books featuring him.

Each pamphlet in the cony-catching series is designed to attract readers interested in the series by revealing new information about London's criminal underworld. Greene makes it clear in the dedicatory epistle of *A Notable Discovery* that he "will only speake of the two "notable abuses" advertised on the title page (cony-catching and cross-biting).[324] The second book, *The Second Part of Conny-Catching*, attracts readers through its title page, which indicates both that it is a continuation of the first pamphlet and that, through "pithy and pleasant tales," it will reveal the secrets of seven "wondrous coosenages" not covered in the first book: "picking of lockes, coosenage at bowls, horse stealing, hooking of windowes, stealing of parcels, the pickpocket, and the cutpurse." The title page of the third book also tries to persuade book buyers to make it

[324] A2v.

go away. *The Third and last part of Conny-Catching*, not only professes to be the series finale, but also to illuminate "the new deuised knauish arte of Foole-taking." "The like coosenages and villanies neuer before discouered," the title page advertises, promising the readers new material. But Greene did not stop after three books, and the final three pamphlets of the series also use their title page to encourage readers to buy them. *A Disputation between a Hee Conny-catcher and a Shee conny-catcher* advertises that it provides a window into yet another profession, that of "alluring strumpets." This book also represents a turning point in the series because for the first time the criminals are given a voice. The speakers of this dialogue, a thief and a prostitute, according to the title page, discuss "whether a theefe or a whore is most hurtfull" to society. *The Black Bookes Messenger* is narrated by Ned Browne, a notorious pickpocket, who "verie pleasantly in his owne person" recounts the "strange pranckes and monstrous villanies" that he "performed" in his life. "The like was neuer heard in any of the former bookes of conny-catching," the title page asserts. In the final book in the series, *The Defence of Conny-Catching,* Cuthbert Curry-knave asserts and distinguishes himself from R.G. and the other personae of the series by stoutly defending his profession. In *The Defence*, he takes aim at *A Notable Discovery*, *The Second Part of Conny-Catching*, and the Robert Greene persona, calling him a cony-catcher for his treatment of two London playing companies. Curry-Knave accusing him of selling the Queen's Men the play *Orlando Furioso* for twenty nobles and then, when they were touring in the country, turning around and selling it "for as much more" to the Admiral's Men,[325] behavior that is very shady.

Taken together, the six cony-catching books created a reading public eager to hear more from Robert Greene. The writer Robert Greene died in 1592, shortly after the series was

[325] C3r-v.

complete, and his death created a both a void in the market and an opportunity for other writers to step up and fill that void. It was at this point that several authors deployed the Greene persona in the posthumous pamphlets, transporting him to new contexts. The cony-catching pamphlets set the stage for future pamphlets about Greene. In the dedicatory epistles we learn that he is aging – he repeatedly refers to his "riper years" – and suffering from a mysterious "sicknes," an illness which has affected his writing.[326] The pamphlets produced after the writer's death follow that lead: *The Repentance of Robert Greene* and *Greenes Groats-worth of Wit* provide some details of Greene's earlier, debauched lifestyle and his grotesque, if repentant, manner of death, while *Greenes Vision*, supposedly composed at "the instant of his death," features a Greene who is sorry for the follies of his pen. *Greene in Conceipt*, *Greenes Newes from Heaven and Hell*, and *Greenes Ghost Haunting Conny-Catchers* reveal what happened to the persona before and after he died.

While the contents of the posthumous pamphlets are fascinating for the ways in which they subject the persona to imaginative expansion, they are not my concern here. What I want to emphasize about these pamphlets is that they show, in miniature, that the efflorescence of print personae in the 1590s was driven by multiple parties: book buyers, writers, printers, and publishers. The reason that books featuring Robert Greene appeared even after the writer's death is that there was a fad for things Greene: Greene's lascivious and lewd living, his claims to personal reform, his forays into the criminal underworld, and his squalid, disgraceful of death attracted readers who could not get enough of the persona. After the writer Robert Greene died, it was up to other writers, printers, and publishers to cater to this demand; pamphlets featuring the persona continued to proliferate. Early modern writers "borrowed," to use William Webbe's

---

[326] *The Blacke Bookes Messenger*, A2r.

familiar term, the Greene persona, subjected him to imaginative expansion, and then sold books featuring the persona to printers and publishers, who would in turn produce pamphlets and sell them to book buyers, stoking more demand and more sales.

In *Pierce Pennilesse*, Pierce, the speaker of that book, notes that there has been "a coil" of "pamphleting on [Robert Greene] after his death."[327] Even though Greene apparently met his demise, the persona lives on, appearing in several books. Pierce, and the writer behind him, Thomas Nashe, was not the only person to notice that Greene was the subject of multi-volume narratives. Henry Chettle and the printer Thomas Newman both mention that authors other than Greene were using his famous persona, that the persona facilitated a model of authorship not centered on the name of the writer, but the popularity of the persona. In the dedicatory epistle to *Greenes Vision*, Newman says, "Manie haue published repentaunces under [Greene's] name, but none more vnfeigned than this, being euerie word his own phrase, his owne method."[328] While scholars generally hold that Greene did write the *Vision*, this statement is telling. In its use of "vnfeigned" it calls attention to Greene's status as a persona, a "feigned person" to use George Puttenham's oft-quoted phrase, and emphasizes that there are many pamphlets, including the *Vision*, circulating in the marketplace of print which feature him. Similarly, in a prefatory epistle to Henry Chettle's *Kind-Harts Dreame*, Chettle denies he posed as Greene in *Greenes Groats-worth of Wit*. "It was all Greenes," he insists.[329] And while Chettle may or may not have mobilized the Greene persona in the *Groats-worth*, he had no problem doing so in *Kind-Harts Dreame*, where he deploys Greene's ghost come back from the dead to condemn Pierce Pennilesse for not defending him against Gabriel Harvey. Even though they try to distance

---

[327] Thomas Nashe, *The Unfortunate Traveler and Other Works*, ed. J.B. Stearne (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971), 49.
[328] A3r.
[329] A4r.

themselves from it with pleas of authenticity, both Newman and Chettle point to a market trend of 1592 and 1593: that of writers publishing books under the Greene persona. That trend would continue through the end of the 1590s and even into the early seventeenth century – *Greenes Funeralls* (1593), *Greenes Newes both from Heaven and Hell* (1593), *Greene in Conceipt* (1598), and *Greenes Ghost Haunting Conny-Catchers* (1602) would follow the *Repentance*, the *Groats-worth*, and the *Vision*. In the cases of *Greenes Newes* and *Greene in Conceipt*, Barnabe Riche and John Dickenson respectively, have their names printed on the title page. In both of these pamphlets the writers use Greene's ghost to authorize their own prose fiction. The narrative of each book has Greene anointing Riche and Dickenson to tell his post-mortem stories. These two authors take advantage of Greene's popularity, incorporating the persona – Dickenson even calls Greene a shadow, which can allude to his ghostly presence but also his persona, as I have noted in earlier chapters – into their own work to attract both publishers and a larger reading public.

Writers were not the only people interested in cashing in on Greene's fame. Printers and publishers were eager to profit from the notorious persona's demise. In some of the posthumous pamphlets printers and publishers speak for themselves, offering their books to a public interested in Robert Greene. In William Wright's brief letter prefacing the 1592 *Groats-worth*, he states that he has published the book, Greene's "last birth," for his readers "mirth and benefite." "Accept it," he says; buy it. In a similar vein, Cuthbert Burby tries to entice readers to buy the *Repentance*. Like Wright, he comments on Greene's notoriety, his "pleasing" pen, and states the pamphlet stands out because it is "very passionate" and "of wonderful effect." John Danter, in a note appended to the beginning of *Greenes Funeralls*, says he has published the book contrary to the author's "expectations." And Thomas Newman, in the letter I cite above,

says that the Vision is “one of the last workes of a wel known author.” In each of these letters, the printer seeks to differentiate his pamphlet from other Greene pamphlets – it was illicitly printed; it was Greene’s last work; it is morally edifying – and in so doing tries to convince readers to take the book home with them. At the same time, these letters reveal the pivotal role printers and publishers took in bringing all books, not just persona-centric books, to the market. It was because of them that printed books, from Greene’s last birth to the word of God, were available for sale. They chose to make them available to the reading public, making the moral edification, entertainment, and learning that printed books facilitated possible.

The pamphlets printed after Greene’s death are unique because it is in them that we catch a glimpse of several writers making use of a popular persona in their work and we encounter printers and publishers as businessmen selling their wares, not just names on title pages. We see how personae are portable, detachable, and flexible; how they are forms of common property, available for anyone’s use; and how they are fundamentally incomplete, allowing anyone to extend their narrative. Each book featuring the persona provoked more writers to extend Greene’s narrative, and so the pamphlets proliferated. The malleability of the Greene persona allowed writers to mobilize him in new contexts, to depict him both living and dead, and his popularity enticed printers to publish books featuring him. Greene was not unique. To be sure, he was one of many personae populating the marketplace of print, but the coil of pamphlets produced on him after his death bring to the fore the many agents responsible for bringing and keeping personae into the marketplace of print, the logic of proliferation underwriting volumes featuring popular personae like Martin Marprelate and Tom Nashe. In the posthumous pamphlets, we see authors’ names on the title pages and find printers’ letters telling readers why they should buy a particular book. While some of the other persona-centric books of the period

may not have their writers' names on the title pages, and most do not contain letters from the printer, it was these same two parties, in conjunction with book-buyers, that worked together to propagate the phenomenon that has been the center of this dissertation, a phenomenon that produced dramatically realized personae, a flurry of energetic literary activity, and the print canon.

Readers bought books featuring personae, and so writers, printers, and publishers produced books that satisfied that demand and, at the same time, prodded the readers to buy more books. Each new persona opened the door for another to compete with him for more readers. Writers, printers, and publishers had diverse reasons for writing and publishing books: illusions of grandeur, vanity, participation in the print canon, and money are just some of them. It does not matter, really, why people liked reading books about personae, nor are the personal motivations of writers and printers important. What does matter is that writers, readers, printers, and publishers came together to create a profusion of print personae in 1590s England, and English literature has not seen the like in over 420 years.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alexander, Gavin. *Writing after Sidney: The Literary Response to Sir Philip Sidney, 1586-1640.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Alpers, Paul. "Pastoral and the Domain of Lyric in Spenser's Shepheardes Calender." *Representations* (1985): 83-100.

--- "Spenser's Late Pastorals." *ELH* 56 (1989): 797-817.

Andersen, Judith. "Anti-Puritanism, Anti-Popery, and Gallows Rhetoric in Thomas Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller.*" *Sixteenth Century Journal* 35, no.1 (2004): 43-63.

Anonymous. *The cobler of Caunterburie, or An inuectiue against Tarltons newes out of purgatorie A merrier iest then a clownes iigge, and fitter for gentlemens humors. Published with the cost of a dickar of cowe hides* London: R. Robinson, 1590.

--- *Englands Helicon Casta placent superis, pura cum veste venite, et manibus puris sumite fontis aquam*. London: J. Roberts for J. Flasket, 1600.

--- *A pleasant conceyted comedie of George a Greene, the pinner of VVakefield.* London: Simon Stafford, for Cuthbert Burby, 1599.

--- *Greenes ghost haunting conie-catchers wherein is set downe, the arte of humouring*. London: Peter Short for Roger Jackson and John North, 1602.

--- *Greenes newes both from heauen and hell Prohibited the first for writing of bookes, and banished out of the last for displaying of conny-catchers.* London: Widow Charlewood, 1593.

--- *Greenes vision vvritten at the instant of his death. Conteyning a penitent passion for the folly of his pen.* London: Edward Allde for Thomas Newman, 1592.

--- *The iests of Skogyn.* London: Thomas Colwell, 1570.

--- *I Playne Piers.* London: N. Hill, 1547?.

--- *Jack of Dover.* London: W. Wright for William Ferbrand, 1604.

--- A *pleasant commodie, called Looke about you.* London: Edward Allde for William Ferbrand, 1600.

--- *Mar Martine.* London, 1589.

--- *Marre Mar-Martin: or Marre-Martins medling, in a manner misliked.* London, 1589.

--- *The Martin Marprelate Tracts*. Edited by Joseph Black. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

--- *Martins Monthes Minde.* London, 1589.

--- *Memoirs of fairy land: written above an hundred years ago. Now translated from the original legends of Eutopia.* London: J. Roberts, 1716.

--- *Merie tales newly imprinted [and] made by Master Skelton Poet Laureat* London: Thomas Colwell, 1567.

--- *Merrie Conceited Iests of George Peele Gentleman.* London: Nicholas Okes for Francis Faulker and Henry Bell, 1607.

--- *The pleasant conceites of Old Hobson the merry Londoner.* London: George Eld for John Wright, 1607.

--- *A Skeltonicall salutation, or condigne gratulation, and iust vexation of the Spanish nation that in a bravado, spent many a crusado, in setting forth an armado England to invade.* London: Thomas Orwin for Toby Cooke, 1589.

--- *Tarltons newes out of purgatorie Onely such a iest as his iigge, fit for gentlemen to laugh at an houre, &c.* London: R. Robinson for T. Gubbin and T. Newman, 1590.

--- *The true tragedie of Richard the third.* London: Thomas Creede for Thomas Barley, 1594.

--- *Vlisses vpon Aiax Written by Misodiaboles to his friend Philaretes.* London: John Windet, 1596.

--- *XII mery iests of the Wydow Edyth.* London: Richard Jones, 1573.

Alford, John, ed. *A Companion to Piers Plowman*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.

Anselment, Raymond. *Betwixt Jest and Earnest: Marprelate, Milton, Marvell, and Swift and the Decorum of Religious Ridicule.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979.

Arber, Edward. *An Introductory Sketch to the Marprelate Controversy.*Westminster: Archibald Constable and Co, 1895.

--- *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640, A.D.* 5 vols. London: Priv. Print, 1875-77.

Archer, Ian, *The Pursuit of Stability.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Ascham, Roger. *A report and discourse written by Roger Ascham, of the affaires and state of Germany and the Emperour Charles his court*. London: John Day, 1570.

Awedley, John. *The Fraternity of Vagabonds* (1561), in *Rogues, Vagabonds, and Sturdy Beggars*, edited by Arthur Kinney, 85-102. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1990.

Bacon, Francis. *Francis Bacon: A Critical Edition of the Major Works*. Edited by Brian Vickers. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Baker, David J. *On Demand: Writing for the Market in Early Modern England.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2010.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Edited by Michael Holquist. Translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1982.

Bale, John. *An excellent and a right learned meditacion.* London, 1554.

--- *Scriptorum illustriu[m] maioris Brytannie.* Basel, 1557-59.

--- *The vocacyon of Ioha[n] Bale.* Wesel, 1553.

Barbour, Reid. *Deciphering Elizabethan Fiction*. Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 1993.

Barker, W.W. "Rhetorical Romance: The 'Frivolous Toyes' of Robert Greene." *Unfolded Tales: Essays on Renaissance Romance*, ed. George M. Logan and Gordon Teskey. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989.

Barthes, Roland ."The Death of the Author," in *Image-Music-Text*, trans. Stephen Heath, 142-48. New York: Hill and Wang, 1977.

Bate, John. *The portraiture of hypocrisie, liuely and pithilie pictured in her colours wherein you may view the vgliest and most prodigious monster that England hath bredde*. London: Robert Robinson for John Dalderne, 1589.

Becker, Reinhard Paul. *A War of Fools: The Letters of Obscure Men: A Study of the Satire and Satirized.* Bern-Frankfurt am Main-Las Vegas: Peter Lang, 1981.

Bellany, Alastair."Libels in Action: Ritual, Subversion, and the English Literary Underground, 1603-1642," in *The Politics of the Excluded, c.1500-1850*, ed. Tim Harris, 99-124. Basignstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001.

Bennett, Tony, and Janet Woollacott. *Bond and Beyond: The Political Career of a Popular Hero.* Basingstoke: Macmillan Education, 1987.

Berger, Harry. *Revisionary Play: Studies in the Spenserian Dynamics*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.

Berne, Eric. *Sex in Human Loving*. Hammondsworth: Penguin, 1973.

Berry, Edward. *The Making of Sir Philip Sidney.*Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998.

Black, Joseph. "The Martin Marprelate Tracts (1588-89) and the Popular Voice." *History Compass* 6, no. 4 (2008): 1091-1106.

--- "The Rhetoric of Reaction: The Martin Marprelate Tracts (1588-89), Anti-Martinism, and the Uses of Print in Early Modern England." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 28, no. 3 (1997): 707-25.

Blank, Paula. *Broken English: Dialects and the Politics of Language in Renaissance Literature*. New York: Routledge, 1996.

Bodin, Jean. *The six bookes of a commonweale*. Translated by Richard Knolles. London, 1606.

Bourdieu, Pierre. "The Field of Cultural Production, or: The Economic World Reversed," in *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Literature and Art*, ed. Randal Johnson, 29-73. New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.

--- "The Uses of the 'people,'" in *In Other Words: Essays Towards a Reflexive Sociology*, trans. Matthew Adamson, 150-55. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990.

Breton, Nicholas. *Greenes funeralls*. London: Printed by John Danter, 1593.

Brewer, David. *The Afterlife of Character: 1726-1825.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005.

Brown, Georgia. *Redefining Elizabethan Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Brownlow, F.W. "The British Church in *The Shepheardes Calender*." *Spenser Studies* 23 (2008): 1-12.

Bruster, Douglas. *Shakespeare and the Question of Culture*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Colin Burrow, "Spenser and the Classical Traditions," in *The Cambridge Companion to Spenser*, ed. Andrew Hadfield, 217-36. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Campion, Thomas. *Observations in the Art of English Poesie*. London: Richard Field for Andrew Wise, 1602.

Carlson, Leland. *Martin Marprelate, Gentleman: Master Job Throkmorton Laid Open in His Colors.* San Marino: Huntington Library, 1981.

Cartwright, Thomas. *A brief apologie of Thomas Cartwright against all such slaunderous accusations as it pleaseth Mr Sutcliffe in seuerall pamphlettes most iniuriously to loade him with.* Middleburg: R. Schilders, 1596.

Cavendish, George .*Metrical Visions*. Edited by A.S.G. Edwards. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1980.

Chambers, E.K. *The Elizabethan Stage*. 4 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951.

Chaucer, Geoffrey. *Troilus and Criseyde*, in *The Riverside Chaucer*, 3rd ed. Edited by Larry D. Benson. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1987.

--- *The vvorkes of our ancient and lerned English poet, Geffrey Chaucer, newly printed*. London: Adam Islip, 1602.

Chettle, Henry. *Kind-harts dreame Conteining fiue apparitions*. London: John Danter and John Wolfe for William Wright, 1592.

Cheney, Donald. "Colin Clout's Homecoming: The Imaginative Travels of Edmund Spenser." *Connotations* 7, no. 2 (1997-98): 146-58.

Cheney, Patrick. "*Colin Clouts Come Home Again*, *Astrophel*, and *The Doleful Lay of Clorinda* (1595)," in *The Oxford Handbook of Edmund Spenser*, ed. Richard McCabe, 237-55. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

--- *Shakespeare's Literary Authorship.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

--- *Spenser's Famous Flight: A Renaissance Idea of a Literary Career*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993.

--- "Spenser's Pastorals: *The Shepheardes Calender* and *Colin Clouts Come Home Again*," in *The Cambridge Companion to Edmund Spenser*, ed. Andrew Hadfield, 79-110. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Chute, Anthony. *Beawtie dishonoured vvritten vnder the title of Shores wife.* London: John Windet for John Wolfe, 1593.

Clark, Sandra. *The Elizabethan Pamphleteers.* Rutherford: Fairleigh-Dickinson University Press, 1983.

Clegg, Cyndia. *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Colie, Rosalie. *The Resources of Kind: Genre-Theory in the Renaissance*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973.

Collinson, Patrick. “Ecclesiastical Vitriol: Religious Satire in the 1590s and the Invention of Puritanism,” in *The Reign of Elizabeth I: Court and Culture in the Last Decade*, ed. John Guy, 150-70. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

--- *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1967.

--- “The Theatre Constructs Puritanism,” in *The Theatrical City: Culture, Theatre, and Politics in London, 1576-1649*, ed. David L. Smith, Richard Strier, and David Bevington, 157-69. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Conlan, J.P. “The Anglicanism of Spenser’s May Eclogue.” *Reformation* 9 (2004):205-17.

Connolly, Annaliese, and Lisa Hopkins, “Preface,” *Early Modern Literary Studies* 13, no. 2 (2007), accessed July 17, 2014, http://extra.shu.ac.uk/emls/emlshome.html.

Cook, Megan L. “Making and Managing the Past: Lexical Commentary in Spenser’s *Shepheardes Calender* (1579) and Chaucer’s *Workes* (1598/1602). *Spenser Studies* 26 (2011): 179-222.

Cooper, Helen. *Pastoral: Mediaeval into Renaissance*. New York: D.S. Brewer, 1977.

Cooper, Thomas. *An Admonition to the People of England*. Edited by Edward Arber. Westminster: Archibald Constable and Co., 1895.

Cotton, Robert. Manuscripts. British Library.

Coren, Pamela. “Edmund Spenser, Mary Sidney, and the *Doleful Lay*.” *SEL* 42, no. 1 (2002): 25 -41.

Crewe, Jonathan V. *Unredeemed Rhetoric: Thomas Nashe and the Scandal of Authorship.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982.

Croston, A.K “The Use of Imagery in Nashe’s *The Unfortunate Traveller*.” *RES* 24 (1948): 90 -101

Crupi, Charles. *Robert Greene*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1986.

Cullen, Patrick .*Spenser, Marvell, and Renaissance Pastoral*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970.

Cummings, R.M. *Spenser: The Critical Heritage.* New York: Barnes and Noble, 1971.

Curione, Celio Secondo. *Pasquine in a Traunce*. Translated by William Page. London: William

Seres, 1566.

Davies, John. *A scourge for paper-persecutors. Or Papers complaint, compil'd in ruthfull rimes, against the paper-spoylers of these times. By I.D. With a continu'd iust inquisition of the same subiect, fit for this season. Against paper-persecutors. By A.H.* London: H. Holland and G. Gibbs, 1625.

Davis, Alex. *Renaissance Historical Fiction: Sidney, Deloney, and Nashe*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2011.

De Certeau, Michel. "Reading as Poaching," in *The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans. Steven Rendall, 165-76. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

Dees, Jerome. "Colin Clout and the Shepherd of the Ocean." *Spenser Studies* 15 (2001): 185-96.

Dekker, Thomas. *The guls horne-booke*. London: Nicholas Okes for R.S., 1609.

--- *Thomas Dekker's* A Knights Conjuring *(1607): A Critical Edition*. Edited by. Larry M. Robbins. The Hague: Mouton, 1974.

Dekker, Thomas, and George Wilkins. *Iests to make you merie with the coniuring vp of Cock VVatt, (the walking spirit of Newgate) to tell tales. Vnto which is added, the miserie of a prison, and a prisoner. And a paradox in praise of serieants.* London: Nicholas Okes for Nathaniel Butter, 1607.

Dickenson, John. *Greene in conceipt*. London: Richard Braddocks, 1598.

Dionne, Craig and Steve Mentz, eds. *Rogues and Early Modern English Culture*. Ann Arbor: University
of Michigan Press, 2004.

Disraeli, Isaac. *Curiosities of Literature*. New York: William Pearson & Co, 1835.

--- *Quarrels of Authors*. London: J. Murray, 1814.

Donnelly, M.L. "The Life of Vergil and the Aspirations of the 'New Poet.'" *Spenser Studies* 17 (2003): 1-35.

Donoghue, Denis. *Ferocious Alphabets*. London: Faber and Faber, 1981).

Drayton, Michael. *Endimion and Phoebe*. London: James Roberts for John Busby, 1595.

--- *Matilda The faire and chaste daughter of the Lord Robert Fitzwater.* London: James Roberts for Nicholas Ling and John Busby, 1594.

--- *The tragicall legend of Robert, Duke of Normandy, surnamed Short-thigh, eldest sonne to*

William Conqueror. VVith the legend of Matilda the chast, daughter to the Lord Robert Fitzwater, poysoned by King Iohn. And the legend of Piers Gaueston, the great Earle of Cornwall: and mighty fauorite of king Edward the second. London: James Roberts for Nicholas Ling, 1596.

Duncan-Jones, Katherine. "Nashe and Sidney: The Tournament in *The Unfortunate Traveller*." *The Modern Language Review* 63, no. 1 (1968): 3-6.

Dutton, Richard*. Licensing, Censorship, and Authorship in Early Modern England: Buggeswords*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000.

--- "The Revels Office and the Boy Companies." *English Literary Renaissance* 32, no. 2 (2002): 324-51.

Edwards, Anthony G.S. *Skelton: The Critical Heritage*. London, Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981.

Edwards, Philip. "Unfortunate Travelers: Fiction and Reality." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 50, no. 3 (1987): 295-307.

Ehrenpreis, Irvin. *The Personality of Jonathan Swift*. London: Methuen, 1959.

Elinghausen, Laurie. *Labor and Writing in Early Modern England, 1567-1667*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008.

Elliot, Rober.t *The Literary Persona*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982.

Elyot, Thomas. *Pasquil the Playne*. London: Thomas Berthelet, 1533.

English, James. *The Economy of Prestige: Prizes, Awards, and the Circulation of Cultural Value.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005.

Erasmus, Desiderius. *The praise of folie*. Translated by Thomas Chaloner. London: Thomas Berthelet, 1549.

Erne, Lukas. *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist*, 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Falco, Raphael. *Conceived Presences: Literary Genealogy in Renaissance England.* Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1994.

Fennor, William*. Pasquils iests, mixed with Mother Bunches merriments. Wherevnto is added a doozen [sic] of gulles. : Pretty and pleasant, to driue away the tediousnesse of a winters euening.* London: John Brown, 1604.

Ferguson, Margaret. *Dido's Daughter's: Literacy, Gender, and Empire in Early Modern*

England and France. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.

--- "Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller*: The 'Newes of the Maker' Game*," English Literary Renaissance* 11, no. 2 (1981): 165-82.

Fish*,* Stanley. *John Skelton's Poetry*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965.

Fleck, Andrew. "Anatomizing the Body Politic: The Nation and the Renaissance Body in Thomas Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller*." *Modern Philology* 104, no. 3 (2007): 295-398.

Fletcher, Giles. *Licia, or Poemes of loue in honour of the admirable and singular vertues of his lady, to the imitation of the best Latin poets, and others. Whereunto is added the rising to the crowne of Richard the third.* Cambridge: John Legat, 1593.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.

--- "Polemics, Politics, and Problematizations," in *The Essential Foucault*, ed. Paul Rabinow and Nikolas Rose, 18-24. New York: The New Press, 1994.

--- "What is an Author?" in *The Essential Foucault*, ed. Paul Rabinow, 377-91. New York: The New Press, 1994.

Fowler, Elizabeth. *Literary Character: The Human Figure in Early English Writing*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003.

Friedenreich, Kenneth. "Nashe's *Strange Newes* and the Case for Professional Writers." *Studies in Philology* 71 (1974): 451-72.

Fuller, Thomas. *The Church-History of Britain*. London: John Williams, 1655.

Galbraith, Steven K. "'English Black-Letter Type and Spenser's *Shepheardes Calender.*" *Spenser Studies* 23 (2008): 13-40.

Geller, Sherri. "You Can't Tell a Book by Its Contents: (Mis)Interpretation in/of Spenser's *The Shepheardes Calneder*." *Spenser Studies* 13 (1999): 23-64.

Gillett, Charles. *Burned Books: Neglected Chapters in British History and Literature*. 2 vols. New York: Columbia University Press, 1932.

Gohlke, Madelon S. "Wilton's Wantonness: *The Unfortunate Traveller* as Picaresque." *Studies in Philology* 73, no. 4 (1976): 397-413.

Greene, Robert. *Arbasto, the anatomie of fortune*. London: Thomas Windet and Thomas Judson, 1584.

--- *The blacke bookes messenger*. London: John Danter, 1592.

--- *Ciceronis amor Tullies love*. London: Robert Robinson, 1589.

--- *A disputation between a hee conny-catcher and a shee conny-catcher*. London: Abel Jeffes, 1592.

--- *Euphues his censure to Philautus*. London: John Wolfe, 1587.

--- *Greenes farewell to folly*. London: Thomas Scarlet, 1591.

---*Greenes, groats-vvorth of witte, bought with a million of repentance Describing the follie of youth, the falshoode of makeshifte flatterers, the miserie of the negligent, and mischiefes of deceiuing courtezans.* London: John Wolfe and John Danter for William Wright, 1592.

--- *Greenes mourning garment*. London: John Wolfe, 1590.

--- *Greenes never too late*. London: Thomas Orwin, 1590.

--- *Greenes Vision*. London: Thomas Newman, 1592.

--- *Gwyndonius. The carde of fancie*. London, 1584.

--- *Mamillia*. London: Thomas Dawson, 1583.

--- *Menaphon*. London: Thomas Orwin, 1589.

--- *Morando the tritameron of love*. London: John Charlewood, 1584.

--- *The myrrour of modestie*. London: Roger Ward, 1584.

--- *A notable discovery of coosenage*. London: John Wolfe, 1591.

--- *Pandosto the triumph of time*. London: Thomas Orwin, 1588.

--- *Penelopes web*. London: Thomas Orwin, 1587.

--- *Peremides the blacke-smith*. London: John Wolfe, 1588.

--- *Planetomachia*. London: Thomas Dawson and G. Robinson, 1585.

--- *A quip for an vpstart courtier: or, A quaint dispute betvveen veluet breeches and clothbreeches*. London: Printed by John Wolfe, 1592.

--- *The repentance of Robert Greene Maister of Artes. Wherein by himselfe is laid open his loose*

life, with the manner of his death. London: John Danter for Cuthbert Burby, 1592.

--- *The Royall Exchange*. London: John Charlewood, 1590.

--- *The second part of conny-catching*. London: John Wolfe, 1591.

--- *The third and last part of conny-catching*. London: Thomas Scarlet, 1592.

Greene, Roland. "Calling Colin Clout." *Spenser Studies* 10 (1992): 229-44.

Greg W.W., and E. Boswell, eds., *Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company*, 2 vols. London: Bibliographic Society, 1955-56.

Griffin, Dustin. *Alexander Pope: The Poet in the Poems*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978.

Griffiths, Jane. *John Skelton and Poetic Authority: Defining the Liberty to Speak*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006.

Gurney, Evan. "Spenser's 'May' Eclogue and Charitable Admonition." *Spenser Studies* 27 (2012): 193-220.

Gurr, Andrew. *The Shakespearean Stage, 1574-1642*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Gust, Geoffrey. *Constructing Chaucer: Author and Autofiction in the Critical Tradition.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Guy, John, ed. *The Reign of Elizabeth I: Court and Culture in the Last Decade.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Guy-Bray, Stephen. "How to Turn Prose into Literature: The Case of Thomas Nashe," in *Early Modern Prose Fiction: The Cultural Politics of Reading*, ed. Naomi Conn Liebler, 33-45. New York: Routledge, 2007.

Hadfield, Andrew. *Literature, Politics, and National Identity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Hager, Alan."The Exemplary Mirage: Fabrication of Sir Philip Sidney's Biographical Image and the Sidney Reader." *ELH* 48 (1981): 1-16.

Halasz, Alexandra.*The Marketplace of Print: Pamphlets and the Public Sphere in Early Modern England.*Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

--- "So Beloved that Men Use His Picture for Their Signs': Richard Tarlton and the Uses of Sixteenth-Century Celebrity." *Shakespeare Studies* 23 (1995): 19-38.

Hamilton, A.C. "The Argument of Spenser's *The Shepheardes Calender.*" *ELH* 23 (1956): 171 -82.

Hammer, Paul E.J. *The polarisation of Elizabethan politics: the political career of Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex, 1585-1597.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Harington, John. *A new discourse of a stale subiect, called The metamorphosis of Aiax. Written by Misacmos [sic] to his friend and cosin Philostilpnos [sic]*. London: John Windet, 1596.

Harvey, Gabriel. *Foure letters, and certaine sonnets, especially touching Robert Greene and other parties by him abused.* London: John Wolfe, 1592.

--- *Foure letters and certeine Sonnets, especially touching Robert Greene and other parties by him abused.* Edited by G.B. Harrison. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1966.

--- *Pierces supererogation or A new prayse of the old asse A preparatiue to certaine larger discourses, intituled Nashes s. fame*. London: John Wolfe, 1593.

Harvey, Gabriel, and Edmund Spenser. *Three proper, and wittie, familiar letters: lately passed betweene two vniuersitie men*. London: Henry Bynneman, 1580.

Harvey, Richard. *Plaine Perceuall the peace-maker of England Sweetly indeuoring with his blunt persuasions to botch vp a reconciliation between Mar-ton and Mar-tother.* London, 1590.

--- *A theologicall discourse of the Lamb of God.* London: John Windet for William Ponsonby, 1590.

Helfer, Rebecca. "The Death of the 'New Poet': Virgilian Ruin and Ciceronian Recollection in *The Shepheardes Calender*." *Renaissance Quarterly* 56 (2003): 723-56.

Helgerson, Richard. *Elizabethan Prodigals*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976.

--- *Self-Crowned Laureates: Spenser, Jonson, Milton, and the Literary System.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.

--- "Writing Empire and Nation," in *The Cambridge Companion to English Literature*, ed. Arthur Kinney, 310.29. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Henninger, Jr., S.K. "The Implications of Form for *The Shepheardes Calender*." *Studies in the Renaissance* 9 (1962): 309-21.

Henslowe, Philip. *Henslowe's Diary*. Edited by R.A. Foakes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

--- *Henslowes' Diary.* Edited by W.W. Greg. 2 vols. London, 1904 and 1908.

Heywood, Thomas. *The first and second partes of King Edward the Fourth. Containing his mery pastime with the tanner of Tamwoorth, as also his loue to fayre Mistresse Shoare, her great promotion, fall and misery, and lastly the lamentable death of both her and her husband. : Likewise the besiedging [sic] of London, by the bastard Falconbridge, and the valiant defence of the same by the Lord Maior and the citizens.* London: J.W. for John Oxenbridge, 1599.

Hibbard, G.R. *Thomas Nashe: A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962.

Higginson, James Jackson. *Spenser's Shepheardes Calender in Relation to Contemporary Affairs.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1912

Hilliard, Stephen. *The Singularity of Thomas Nashe*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1986.

Hillyer, Richard. *Sir Philip Sidney, Cultural Icon*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2010.

Hoskins, John. *Directions for Speech and Style*. Edited by Hoyt H. Hudson. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1935.

Howard, Henry, Earl of Surrey. *Songes and sonnets, written by the Right honorable Lord Henrie Haward late Earle of Surrey, and others.* London: Robert Robinson, 1587.

Howell, T.B. comp. *A Complete Collection of State Trials and Proceedings for High Treason and Other Crimes and Misdemeanors.* 21 vols. London: T.C. Hansard, 1816-28.

Hughes, Paul L. and James F. Larkin, eds. *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, 3 vols. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969.

Hughey, Ruth, ed. *The Arundel Harington Manuscript of Tudor Poetry*. 2 vols. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1960.

Hutson, Lorna. *Thomas Nashe in Context.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.

Hyman, Wendy. "Authorial Self-Consciousness in Nashe's *Vnfortunate Traveller*." *SEL* 45, no. 1 (2005): 23-41.

Jardine, Lisa. "Gabriel Harvey: Exemplary Ramist and Pragmatic Humanist," *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Theologiques* 70 (1986): 36–48.

Jardine, Lisa, and Anthony Grafton."Studied for Action: How Gabriel Harvey Read His Livy."

Past and Present 129, no. 1 (1990): 30-78.

Johnson, L. Staley. “Elizabeth, Bride and Queen: A Study of Spenser’s April Eclogue and the Metaphors of English Protestantism.” *Spenser Studies* 2 (1981): 75-91.

Jones, Anne Rosalind. “Inside the Outsider: Nashe’s *Unfortunate Traveller* and Bakhtin’s Polyphonic Novel.” *ELH* 50, no. 1(1983): 61-81.

Jones, Ann Rosalind, and Peter Stallybrass, “The Politics of *Astrophil and Stella*.” *SEL* 24, no. 1 (1984): 53-68

Jones, Dorothy. “An Example of Anti-Petrarchan Satire in *The Unfortunate Traveller*.” *The Yearbook of English Studies* 1 (1971): 48-54.

Jones, Mike Rodman. *Radical Pastoral, 1381-1594: Appropriation and the Writing of Religious Controversy*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2010.

Jones, William R. “The Bishops’ Ban of 1599 and the Ideology of English Satire.” *Literature Compass* 7.5 (2010): 332-46

Jung, Carl. *Two Essays on Analytical Psychology*. 2nd ed. Translated by R.F.C. Hull. London: Routledge, 1966.

Kastan, David Scott. “Naughty Printed Books,” in *Cultural Reformations: Medieval and Renaissance in Literary History*, ed. Brian Cummings and James Simpson, 287-304. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Kaula, David. “The Low Style in Nashe’s *The Unfortunate Traveler*.” *SEL* 6, no. 1 (1966): 43-57

Kendall, Ritchie D. *The Drama of Dissent: The Radical Poetics of Nonconformity, 1380-1590.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986.

Kelen, Sarah A. *Langland’s Early Modern Identities.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Kelsey, Lin. “Spenser, Ralegh, and the Language of Allegory.” *Spenser Studies* 17 (2003): 183 -213.

Kernin, Alvin B. *The Cankered Muse: Satire of the English Renaissance.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959.

Kimmelman, Burt. *The Poetics of Authorship in the Later Middle Ages: The Emergence of the Modern Literary Persona.* New York: Peter Lang, 1996.

King, Barry. “The Star and the Commodity: Notes Toward a Performance Theory of Stardom.” *Cultural Studies* 1 (1987): 145-161.

King, John N. *English Reformation Literature: The Tudor Origins of the Protestant Tradition* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982.

--- "Robert Crowley's Editions of *Piers Plowman*: A Tudor Apocalypse." *Modern Philology* 73, no. 4 (1976): 342-52.

--- *Spenser's Poetry and the Reformation Tradition* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990).

Kinney, Arthur. *Humanistic Poetics: Thought, Rhetoric, and Fiction in Sixteenth-Century England*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1986.

--- *John Skelton: Priest as Poet*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987.

Kinsman, Robert. "Skelton's *Colyn Cloute*: the Mask of *Vox Populi*," in *Essays Critical and Historical Dedicated to Lily B. Campbell*, 17-27. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1950.

--- "The Voices of Dissonance: Pattern in Skelton's *Colyn Cloute*." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 26, no. 4 (1963): 291-313.

Kirschbaum, Leo. "A Census of Bad Quartos." *Review of English Studies XIV* (1938): 20-43.

Knapp, Jeffrey. *An Empire Nowhere: England, America, and Literature from Utopia to the Tempest*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.

Kneidel, Gregory. "Mighty Simplenesse': Protestant Pastoral Rhetoric and Spenser's *Shepheardes Calender." Studies in Philology* 93, no. 3 (1999): 275-312.

Knell, Thomas. *An answer at large, to a most hereticall, trayterous, and papisticall byll in English verse which was cast abrode in the streetes of Northamton, and brought before the judges at the last assizes there, 1570*. London: John Awdelye, 1570.

Krier, Theresa M. *Refiguring Chaucer in the Renaissance.* Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1998.

Knutson, Roslyn. *Playing Companies and Commerce in Shakespeare's Time.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Kumaran, Arul. "The Martinist Transformation of Robert Greene in 1590." *Studies in Philology*, 103, no. 3 (2006): 243-63.

Kuskin, William. "'The Loadstarre of the English Language': Spenser's *Shepheardes Calender* and the Construction of Modernity." *Textual Cultures* 2, no. 2 (2007): 9-33.

Laborsky, Ruth Samson. "The Allusive Presentation of *The Shepheardes Calender*." *Spenser Studies* 1 (1980): 29-68.

--- "The Illustrations to *The Shepheardes Calender*." *Spenser Studies* 2 (1981): 3-53.

Lake, Peter. *Anglicans and Puritans?: Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker*. London: Unwin Hyman, 1988.

Lake, Peter, and Steven Pincus, eds. *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007.

--- "Rethinking the Public Sphere in Early Modern England," in *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England*, ed. Peter Lake and Steven Pincus, 1-30. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007.

Lake, Peter, and Michael Questier. *The Anti-Christ's Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists, and Players in Post-Reformation England*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.

Lander, Jesse."1588-1589," in *The Oxford History of Popular Print Culture*, ed. Joad Raymond, 557-77. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2011.

--- *Inventing Polemic: Religion, Print, and Literary Culture in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Lane, Robert. *Shepheard's Devices*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1993.

Langland, William. *Piers Plowman: The A-Version*. Edited by George Kane. London: Athlone, 1960.

--- *William Langland, Piers Plowman, the Z Version*. Edited by A.G. Rigg and Charlotte Brewer. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1983.

--- *William Langland, The Vision of Piers Plowman, A Critical Edition of the B-Text*. 2nd ed. Edited by A.V.C. Schmidt. London: J.M. Dent, 1995.

--- *The vision of Pierce Plowman*. Edited by Robert Crowley. London: Robert Crowley, 1550.

Lanham, Richard. "Tom Nashe and Jack Wilton: Personality as Structure in *The Unfortunate Traveller*." *Studies in Short Fiction* 4, no. 3 (1967): 201-26.

Latham, Agnes M.C. "Satire on Literary Themes and Modes in Nashe's *Unfortunate Traveller*." *English Studies* 1948 (1948): 85-100.

Latimer, Hugh. *27 sermons preached by the ryght Reuerende father in God and constant matir [sic] of Iesus Christe, Maister Hugh Latimer*. London: John Day, 1562.

Lesser, Zachary. *Renaissance Drama and the Politics of Publication: Readings in the English Book Trade*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Lesser, Zachary, and Alan Farmer. "The Popularity of Playbooks Revistited." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 56, no. 1 (2005): 1-32.

Lewis, C.S. *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, Excluding Drama.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1954.

Lindheim, Nancy. "The Virgilian Design of *The Shepheardes Calender.*" *Spenser Studies* 13 (1999): 1-23.

Lodge, Thomas. *Phillis* London: James Roberts for John Busbie, 1593.

Lyly, John. *The Complete Works of John Lyly*. Edited by R. Warwick Bond. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.

Lynn, Richard E. "Ewe/Who?: Recreating Spenser's March Eclogue." *Spenser Studies* 26 (2011): 153-78;

MacCaffrey, Isabel G. "Allegory and Pastoral in *The Shepheardes Calender*," in *Essential Articles for the Study of Edmund Spenser*, ed. A.C. Hamilton, 549-68. Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1972).

Mack, Maynard. *The Garden and the City: Retirement and Politics in the Later Poetry of Pope, 1731-43*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969.

Mallette, Richard. "Spenser's Portrait of the Artist in *The Shepheardes Calender* and *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe*." *SEL* 19 (1979): 19-41.

Manningham, John. *Diary of John Manningham, of the Middle Temple, and of Bradbourne, Kent, Barrister-at-law, 1602- 1603,* Edited by John Bruce, Esq. Westminster: J.B. Nichols and Sons, 1868.

Marotti, Arthur. "Love is Not Love": Elizabethan Sonnet Sequences and the Social Order." *ELH* 49, no. 2 (1982): 396-428.

--- *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995.

McCabe, Richard. "Authorial Self-Presentation," in *The Oxford Handbook of Edmund Spenser*, ed. Richard McCabe, 462-84. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

--- "Elizabethan Satire and the Bishops' Ban of 1599." *Yearbook of English Studies* 11 (1981): 188-9.

--- "Introduction," in *Spenser: The Shorter Poems*. Edited by Richard McCabe.

Hammondsworth: Penguin, 1999.

---"'Little booke: thy selfe present': the politics of presentation in *The Shepheardes Calender*," in *Presenting Poetry: Composition, Publication, Reception*, ed. Howard Erskine-Hill and Richard A. McCabe, 15-40. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

--- "Shorter Verse Published in 1590-95," in *A Critical Companion to Spenser Studies*, ed. Burt van Es, 166-87. Baskingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

McCanles, Michael "*The Shepheardes Calender* as Document and Monument," *SEL* 22 (1982): 5-19.

McCoy, Richard C. *Sir Philip Sidney: Rebellion in Arcadia*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1979.

McGinn, Donald. *John Penry and the Marprelate Controversy*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1966.

McKerrow, R.B. "Booksellers, Printers, and the Stationers' Trade," in *Shakespeare's England*, ed. C.T. Onions et. al., 2 vols. 2:212-39. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1916.

McLane, Paul E. "Prince Lucifer and the Fitful 'Lanternes of Lyght': Wolsey and the Bishops in Skelton's *Colyn Cloute*." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 43, no. 3(1980): 159-79.

--- *Spenser's Shepheardes Calender: A Study in Elizabethan Allegory*. South Bend: Notre Dame University Press, 1961.

Melnikoff, Kirk and Edward Gieskes, eds. *Writing Robert Greene: Essays on England's First Notorious Professional Writer.* Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008.

Mentz, Steven. "Day Labor: Thomas Nashe and the Practice of Prose in Early Modern England," in *Early Modern Prose Fiction: The Cultural Politics of Reading*, ed. Naomi Conn Liebler, 18-32. New York: Routledge, 2007.

--- "Forming Greene: Theorizing the Early Modern Author in *the Groatsworth of Wit*," in *Writing Robert Greene: Essays on England's First Notorious Professional Writer*, ed. Kirk Melnikoff and Edward Giesekes, 115-32. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008.

--- "The Heroine as Courtesan: Dishonesty, Romance, and the Sense of an Ending in *The Unfortunate Traveller*." *Studies in Philology* 98, no. 3 (2001): 339-58.

--- "Jack and the City: *The Unfortunate Traveller*, Tudor London, and Literary History," in *A Companion to Tudor Literature*, ed. Kent Cartwright, 489-503. London: Blackwell, 2010.

--- *Romance for Sale in Early Modern England: The Rise of Prose Fiction*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.

Meres, Francis. *Palladis timia.* London: P. Short for Cuthbert Burby, 1598.

Meyers, Benjamin. "The Green and the Golden World: Spenser's Rewriting of the Munster Plantation." *ELH* 76, no. 2 (2009): 473-90.

Miller, David Lee. *The Poem's two Bodies: The Poetics of the 1590 Faerie Queene*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988.

--- "Spenser's Vocation, Spenser's Career." *ELH* 50, no. 2 (1983): 197-231.

Miller, Edwin Haviland. "Deletions in Robert Greene's *A Quip for an Upstart Courtier* (1592)." *Huntington Quarterly* 15 (1951-52): 277-82.

--- "The Editions of Robert Greene's *A Quip for an Upstart Courtier* (1592)." *Studies in Bibliography* 6 (1954): 107-16.

--- *The Professional Writer in Elizabethan England.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959.

Milton, John. *The Student's Milton*. Edited by F. Patterson. New York, 1933.

Miskimin, Alice. *Renaissance Chaucer*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975.

Montrose, Louis Adrian. "'Eliza, Queene of shepheardes' and the Pastoral of Power." *ELR* 10 (1980): 153-82.

--- "'The perfecte patterne of a poete': The Poetics of Courtship in *The Shepheardes Calender*." *Texas Studies in Language and Literature* 21, no. 1 (1979): 34-67.

Moretti, Franco. "The Slaughterhouse of Literature," *Modern Language Quarterly* 61, no.1 (2000): 207-27.

Nashe, Thomas. *The Complete Works of Thomas Nashe.* Edited by R.B. McKerrow and F.P. Wilson. 4 vols. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958.

--- *Pierce Penilesse his supplication to the diuell*. London: Abel Jeffes for John Busby, 1592.

Navitsky, Joseph. "Disputing Good Bishops' English: Martin Marprelate and the Voice of Menippean Opposition." *Texas Studies in Language and Literature* 50, no.2 (2008): 177-200.

Nelson, William. *John Skelton, Laureate* (New York: Russel and Russel, 1964.

--- "Skelton's Quarrel with Wolsey," *PMLA* 51, no. 2 (1936): 377-98.

Nicholl, Charles. *A Cup of News: The Life of Thomas Nashe.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984.

Nicholson, Catherine. "Pastoral in Exile: Spenser and the Poetics of English Alienation." *Spenser Studies* 23 (2008):41-71.

Norbrook, David. *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance*. Rev. ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

North, Marcy L. *The Anonymous Renaissance*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.

Oram, William. "Spenser's Audiences." *Studies in Philology* 100, no. 4 (2003): 514-33.

Parker, John. "Persona," in *Cultural Reformations: Medieval and Renaissance in Literary History,* ed. Brian Cummings and James Simpson, 591-608. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

Parsons, Robert.*The First Booke of the Christian Exercise*. Rouen, 1582.

Pask, Kevin. *The Emergence of the English Author: Scripting the Life of the Poet in Early Modern England.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Patterson, Annabel. *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Reading and Writing in Early Modern England.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991.

--- *Pastoral and Ideology: Virgil to Valéry*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.

---"Re-opening the Green Cabinet: Clement Marot and Edmund Spenser," *ELR* 16 (1986): 44-70.

Peel, Albert, ed. *Tracts Ascribed to Richard Bancroft: Edited from a Manuscript in the Library of St. John's College, Cambridge.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953.

Perkins, David. "Issues and Motivations in the Nashe-Harvey Quarrel." *Philological Quarterly* 39 (1960): 224-33

Pierce, William. *An Historical Introduction to the Marprelate Controversy.* Burt Franklin: New York, 1964.

Pigman, G.W. *Grief and English Renaissance Elegy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Phelippes, Thomas. Manuscripts. The English National Archive.

Pincombe, Michael. *Elizabethan Humanism: Litearture and Learning in the Later Sixteenth Century.* Harlow: Longman, 2001.

Pollard, Leonard. *Fyve homiles of late, made by a ryght good and vertuous clerke, called master Leonarde Pollarde*. London: William Griffith, 1556.

Poole, Kristen. *Radical Religion from Shakespeare to Milton: Figures of Nonconformity in Early Modern England.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Prescott, Anne Lake. *French Poets in the English Renaissance: Studies in Fame and Transformation.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978.

--- "*Grief and English Renaissance Elegy*." G.W. Pigman. *Spenser Newsletter* 16 (1985): 63.

--- *Imagining Rabelais in Renaissance England*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.

Puttenham, George. *The arte of English poesie.* London: Richard Field, 1589.

--- *The Art of English Poesy*, in *English Renaissance Literary Criticism*, ed. Brian Vickers, 190-296. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.

Prendergast, Maria Teresa Micaela. "Promiscuous Textualities: The Nashe-Harvey Controversy and the Unnatural Productions in Print," in *Printing and Parenting in Early Modern England*, ed. Douglas A. Brooks, 173-96. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005.

Prewitt, Kendrick. "'Gabriel Harvey and the Practice of Method." *Studies in English Literature* 39, no. 1 (1999): 19–39.

Raitiere, Martin. *Faire Bitts: Sir Philip Sidney and Renaissance Political Theory.* Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1984.

Raymond, Joad. *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Richards, Jennifer. "Gabriel Harvey's Choleric Writing," in *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Literature*, ed. Michael Pincombe and Cathy Shrank, 655-70. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

--- "Gabriel Harvey, James VI, and the Politics of Reading Early Modern Poetry." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 71, no .2 (2008): 303–21.

Riche, Barnabe. *Greenes newes both from heaven and hell*. London, 1593.

Rollins, Hyder Edward, ed. *Tottel's Miscellany (1557-1587).* Rev. ed. 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.

Rowlands, Samuel. *Greenes ghost haunting conie-catchers.* London: Robert Jackson, 1602.

Rudd, Niall. *Lines of Enquiry: Studies in Latin Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

Sacks, Peter M. *The English Elegy: Studies in the Genre from Spenser to Yeats.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985.

Saenger, Michael. "The Birth of Advertising," in *Printing and Parenting in Early Modern England*, ed. Douglas A. Brooks, 197-220. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005.

--- *The Commodification of Textual Engagements in the English Renaissance.* Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.

Sanchez, Ruben. *Persona and Decorum in Milton's Prose.* Madison, NJ: Fairleigh-Dickinson University Press, 1997.

Schwyzer, Philip. "Summer Fruit and Autumn Leaves: Thomas Nashe in 1593." *ELR* 24, no. 3 (1994): 583-619.

Scott-Warren, Jason"'Harvey, Gabriel (1552/3–1631)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), accessed July 17, 2014, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/12517.

Segall, Kreg. "The Precarious Poet in *Colin Clouts Come Home Again*," *SEL* 53, no. 1 (2013): 31-52.

--- "Skeltonic Anxiety and Rumination in *The Shepheardes Calender*," *SEL* 47, no. 1 (2007): 29-56.

Shakespeare, William. *A most pleasaunt and excellent conceited comedie, of Syr Iohn Falstaffe, and the merrie wiues of Windsor Entermixed with sundrie variable and pleasing humors, of Syr Hugh the Welch knight, Iustice Shallow, and his wise cousin M. Slender. With the swaggering vaine of Auncient Pistoll, and Corporall Nym.* London: Thomas Creede for Arthur Johnson, 1602.

--- *The second part of Henrie the fourth continuing to his death, and coronation of Henrie the fift. VVith the humours of sir Iohn Falstaffe, and swaggering Pistoll.* London: Valentine Sims for Andrew Wise and William Aspley, 1600.

--- *The tragedy of King Richard the third Containing, his treacherous plots against his brother Clarence: the pittiefull murther of his iunocent [sic] nephewes: his tyrannicall vsurpation: with the whole course of his detested life, and most deserued death.* London: Valentine Sims for Andrew Wise, 1597.

Sheavyn, Phoebe. *The Literary Profession in the Elizabethan Age.* New York: Barnes and Noble, 1967.

Shepherd, Simon. *Spenser.* Harvester Wheatsheaf, Hemel Hempstead, 1989.

Shinn, Abigail. "'Extraordinary discourses of vnnecessarie matter': Spenser's *Shepheardes Calender* and the Almanac Tradition," in *Literature and Popular Culture in Early Modern England*, ed. Matthew Dimmock and Andrew Hadfield, 137-50. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009.

Shore, David. *Spenser and the Poetics of Pastoral.* Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1985.

Shrank, Cathy. *Writing the Nation in Reformation England, 1530-1580.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Shuger, Debora. "Civility and Censorship in Early Modern England," in *Censorship and Silencing: Practices of Cultural Regulation*, ed. Robert C. Post, 89-110. Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1998.

Sidney, Philip. *The defence of poesie.* London: William Ponsonby, 1595.

Simons, Louise. "Rerouting *The Unfortunate Traveller*: Strategies for Coherence and Directions." *SEL* 28, no. 1 (1988): 17-38.

Simpson, James. *The Oxford English Literary History, Volume 2, 1350-1547: Reform and Cultural Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Sivefors, Per. "'This Citty-Sodoming Trade': The Ovidian Authorial Persona in Thomas Nashe's *Christ's Tears over Jerusalem*," in *Urban Preoccupations: Mental and Material Landscapes*, ed. Per Sivefors, 143-57. Pisa, Italy: Fabrizio Serra, 2007.

Skelton, John. *John Skelton: The Complete English Poems*. Edited by John Scattergood. New York: Penguin, 1983.

--- *Pithy pleasaunt and profitable workes of maister Skelton, Poete Laureate. Nowe collected and newly published*. Edited by Thomas Churchyard. London: Thomas Marshe, 1568.

Slights, William. *Managing Readers: Printed Marginalia in English Renaissance Books.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2001.

Smith, Bruce. "On Reading *The Shepheardes Calender*." *Spenser Studies* 1 (1980): 69-94.

Smith, Helen. "'Imprinted by Simeon such a signe': reading early modern imprints," in *Renaissance Paratexts*, ed. Helen Smith and Louise Wilson, 17-33. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Smith, Nigel. "Richard Overton's Marpriest Tracts: Towards a History of Leveller Style." *Prose Studies* 9 (1986), 39-66.

Smyth, Adam. *Autobiography in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

Spenser, Edmund. *Colin Clouts come home againe.* London: Thomas Creede for William Ponsonby, 1595.

--- *The Faerie Queene*. 2nd ed. Edited by. A.C. Hamilton with Hiroshi Yamashita, Toshiyuki Suzuki, and Shohachi Fukuda. London: Pearson Longman, 2007.

--- *The Yale Edition of the Shorter Poems of Edmund Spenser*. Edited by. William Oram et. al New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.

Stamakis, Chris. "'With diligent studie, but sportingly': How Gabriel Harvey read his Castiglione." *Journal of the Northern Renaissance* 5 (2013). Accessed July 17, 2014. http://www.northernrenaissance.org/

Starke, Sue Pettit. "Briton Knight or Irish Bard?" Spenser's Pastoral Persona and the Epic Project in *A View* and *Colin Clouts*." *Spenser Studies* 12 (1998): 133-34.

Steinberg, Theodore. "Spenser, Sidney, and the Myth of Astrophel." *Spenser Studies* 11 (1990): 187-202,

Stern, Virginia. *Gabriel Harvey: His Life, Marginalia, and Library*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.

Stillman, Robert. "The Politics of Sidney's Pastoral: Mystification and Mythology in *The Old Arcadia*." *ELH* 52 (1985): 795-814.

Stow, John. *A suruay of London.* London: John Windet for John Wolfe, 1598.

Strype, John. *The Life and Acts of John Whitgift, D.D*. 4 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1832.

Summergill, Travis. "The Influence of the Marprelate Controversy on Thomas Nashe." *Studies in Philology* 48 (1951): 145-60.

Suzuki, Mihoko."'Signorie ouer the pages': The crisis of Authority in Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller*." *Studies in Philology* 81, no. 3 (1984): 348-71.

Syme, Holger. "Three's Company: Alternative Histories of London's Theaters in the 1590s." *Shakespeare Studies* 65 (2012): 269-89.

Taylor, John. *Crop-eare curried, or, Tom Nash his ghost.* London, 1645.

--- *Differing worships, or, The oddes, betweene some knights service and God's Or Tom Nash his ghost, (the old Martin queller) newly rous'd.* London, 1640.

--- *Tom Nash his ghost*. London, 1642.

Temple, Robert. *A sermon teaching discretion in matters of religion, and touching certayne abuses nowe in the Churche*. London: R. Bourge for Edward Aggas, 1592.

Thomas, Sidney. "New Light on the Nashe-Harvey Quarrel." *Modern Language Notes* 63, no. 7(1948): 481-83.

Thomas, Thomas. *Dictionarium Linguae Latinae et Anglicanae*. London, 1587.

Thornton, Bruce. "Rural Dialectic: Pastoral, Georgic, and *The Shepheardes Calender*." *Spenser Studies* 9 (1991): 1-20.

Throkmorton, Job. *The Defence of Job Throkmorton against the slaunders of Maister Sutcliffe*. London, 1594.

--- *A petition directed to her most excellent Maiestie*. Middleburg: R. Schilders, 1592.

Thynne, Francis. *Animadversions uppon Chaucers Workes*. Edited by G.H. Kingsley. London: N. Trübner and Co. for EETS, 1865.

Tribble, Evelyn. *Margins and Marginality The Printed Page in Early Modern England.* Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1993.

Trilling, Lionel. *Sincerity and Authenticity*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1972.

Tylus, Jane. "Spenser, Virgil, and the Politics of Poetic Labor." *ELH* 55, no. 1 (1988): 53-77.

Tyndale, William. *The obedie[n]ce of a Christen man and how Christe[n] rulers ought to governe.* Antwerp, 1528.

van Es, Burt. *Spenser's Forms of History.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Voss, Paul. "Books for Sale: Advertising and Patronage in Late Elizabethan England." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 29, no. 3(1998): 733-56.

Walker, Greg. *John Skelton and the Politics of the 1520s*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Wall, Wendy. *The Imprint of Gender: Authorship and Publication in the English Renaissance.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993.

Wallace, Andrew. "Edmund Spenser and the Place of Commentary." *Spenser Studies* 22 (2007): 153-71.

Waller, G.F. *Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke: A Critical Study of Her Writings and Literary Milieu.* Salzburg, Austria: Salzburg University Press, 1979.

Ward, Allyna E. "An Outlandish Travel Chronicle: Farce, History, and Fiction in Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller*." *The Yearbook of English Studies* 41, no. 1 (2011): 84-98.

Warner, J. Christopher. "Poetry and Praise in *Colin Clouts Come Home Again*." *Studies in Philology* 94 (1997): 368-81.

Watkins, John. *The Specter of Dido: Spenser and Virgilian Epic*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.

Weimann, Robert. *Shakespeare and the Popular Tradition in the Theater: Studies in the Social Dimension of Dramatic Form and Function*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987.

Weever, John. *Epigrammes in the oldest cut, and newest fashion*. London: Valentine Sims for Thomas Bushell, 1599.

Wilson, F. P. "The English Jest-books of the Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Centuries," in *Shakespearean and Other Studies*, ed. Helen Gardner, 285-324. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969.

Wilson, J. Dover. *Martin Marprelate and Shakespeare's Fluellen: A New Theory of the Authorship of the Marprelate Tracts*. London: Alexander Moring Limited, 1912.

Wilson, Katharine. *Fictions of Authorship in Late Elizabethan Narratives: Euphues in Arcadia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Wilson, Luke. *Theaters of Intention: Drama and the Law in Early Modern England*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000.

Wilson, Thomas. *The arte of rhetorique*. London: Richard Grafton, 1553.

Wilson-Okamura, David Scott. "Problems in the Virgilian Career." *Spenser Studies* 26 (2011): 1-30

White, Helen C. *Social Criticism in Popular Religious Literature of the Sixteenth Century*. New York: Octagon Books, 1965.

White, Paul Whitfield. *Drama and Religion in English Provincial Society 1485-1660.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Worden, Blair. *The Sound of Virtue: Philip Sidney's* Arcadia *and Elizabethan Politics.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996.

Zall, P.M. "Introduction," in *A Hundred Mery Tales*. Edited by P.M. Zall Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1963.