



Thomas Nashe and the Idea of the Author

CHETA, Arun Kumar

Available from the Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

<http://shura.shu.ac.uk/25583/>

A Sheffield Hallam University thesis

This thesis is protected by copyright which belongs to the author.

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author.

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given.

Please visit <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/25583/> and <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html> for further details about copyright and re-use permissions.

Thomas Nashe and the Idea of the Author

Arun Kumar Cheta

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of
Sheffield Hallam University
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

February 2019

Candidate Declaration

I hereby declare that:

1. I have not been enrolled for another award of the University, or other academic or professional organisation, whilst undertaking my research degree.
2. None of the material contained in the thesis has been used in any other submission for an academic award.
3. I am aware of and understand the University's policy on plagiarism and certify that this thesis is my own work. The use of all published or other sources of material consulted have been properly and fully acknowledged.
4. The work undertaken towards the thesis has been conducted in accordance with the SHU Principles of Integrity in Research and the SHU Research Ethics Policy.
5. The word count of the thesis is 88,000.

Name	<i>Arun Kumar Cheta</i>
Date	<i>August 2019</i>
Award	<i>PhD</i>
Faculty	<i>Development and Society</i>
Director(s) of Studies	<i>Professor Lisa Hopkins</i>

Abstract

Thomas Nashe was a writer whose authorial voice was impacted by a number of different sources. Beginning with figures writing in the classical age, this thesis discusses how Nashe directly engages with their authorial personae by representing them directly in his works, and examines how Nashe presented his views on authorship by examining the manner in which he utilised these authors and their works. The thesis is not limited by genre, but engages with authors across various styles, including satire, history and drama whilst also discussing how Nashe rationalised his admiration of authors whose religious views were antithetical to his own. The scope of the analysis ranges from considering Nashe's responses to classical authors (like Apuleius and Lucian) to contemporary Europe (Aretino) and England (including Marlowe and Greene). This thesis offers an original contribution to knowledge by highlighting how Nashe's self-fashioning of his own authorial persona is developed through his interrogation of the models of authorship offered by both classical and contemporary authorities and discussing how his utilisation of these figures assisted in his growth as a polyauthor. The thesis concludes that Nashe's authorial voice and identity developed through exposure to various influences and was constantly evolving throughout his career.

Table of Contents

Introduction	Page 5
Chapter One - Golden Asses and True Histories; Apuleius and Lucian.	Page 33
Chapter Two - 'True English Aretine'; Nashe and Aretino.	Page 64
Chapter Three - The Fraternitie of Fools: Nashe and the Harvey Circle.	Page 100
Chapter Four - The Reluctant Playwright: Nashe and Contemporary Drama.	Page 200
Chapter Five - 'A diviner muse than him'; the dialogue between Nashe and Marlowe.	Page 288
Chapter Six - Sworn Brothers or Occasional Drinkers: Nashe and Greene.	Page 325
Conclusion	Page 369
Works Cited	Page i

Introduction

Nashe may be said to have made the 1590s his own. In literary circles he was *hic et ubique* as friend, foe, gossip or critic, a darting figure at the thick of the fray. He was the intimate friend of Christopher Marlowe and Robert Greene; he was the co-author of Ben Jonson's first venture as a playwright (the scandalous *Isle of Dogs*); his day-to-day colleagues were writers like John Lyly, Thomas Watson, Harry Chettle, the comedians Tarlton and Kemp, the disreputable printer John Danter, the 'king of the tobacconists' Humfrey King.¹

Nashe can be proved to have been acquainted with a fair number of more or less well-known works, and the date at which he read some of them can be approximately determined. No doubt these were but a small part of the literature with which he was familiar, and possibly not one of them was among the books which had the deepest influence upon him, but still they interested him sufficiently for him to make use of them in his own writings, and they are therefore worth our attention.²

Paradoxically, though Nashe's pamphlets are commercial literature, they come very close to being, in another way, 'pure' literature:

¹ Charles Nicholl, Introduction to *A Cup of News: The Life of Thomas Nashe* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984) p. 1

² R. B. McKerrow, Introduction to *The Works of Thomas Nashe* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958) Vol. 5, p. 110. All quotations from Nashe's works are taken from this publication unless otherwise noted.

literature which is, as nearly as possible, without a subject. In a certain sense of the verb 'say', if asked what Nashe 'says' we should have to reply, Nothing. He tells no story, expresses no thought, maintains no attitude. Even his angers seem to be part of his technique rather than real passions.³

Thomas Nashe is one of the more interesting authors active in the latter part of the sixteenth century and remains one of the most difficult to analyse. It is easy to describe him as an author more concerned with the style of his writing than the substance of his words. As Lewis also notes

Thomas Nashe (1567-1601) is undoubtedly the greatest of Elizabethan pamphleteers, the perfect literary showman, the juggler with words who can keep a crowd spell-bound by sheer virtuosity. The subject, in his sort of writing, is unimportant.⁴

This thesis will pick up the challenge presented by Lewis' words and show that the opposite is true; in his ten years of activity and twelve extant works Thomas Nashe managed to say a great deal; in many cases more than many of his far better-known peers. I will be exploring the works of Nashe and how the idea of the author is represented in his works and show how Nashe represents those who have had impact on his own craft; I will be examining these writers and discussing how he represents and utilises them to enhance and develop his own work. Nashe showed

³ CS Lewis, *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954) this ref. p.416

⁴ CS Lewis, *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century*, this ref. p.411

himself to be a person whose identity and worth was defined by his position as a writer and this thesis will show the ongoing effect of these other writers going back to the classical world and concluding by discussing those authors who were contemporaneous with him. In practice this means that I will be looking at the major writers who feature in Nashe's work and what these choices suggest about his writing career and his ambitions. As Nashe encounters and uses authors from a variety of genres I will also discuss Nashe's position in these different fields; I will discuss his pamphleteering, his other prose writing, as well as engaging with his less considered career as a playwright. In doing so I will establish how Nashe represents and relates to other authors in his own works and how his knowledge and experience with them has informed his own writing. In doing so I am taking the opposite position as that delivered by Barthes in *The Death of the Author*; he notes

the modern writer (scriptor) is born simultaneously with his text; he is in no way supplied with a being which precedes or transcends his writing, he is in no way the subject of which his book is the predicate; there is no other time than that of the utterance, and every text is eternally written here and now.⁵

I shall present a contradictory viewpoint in this thesis; that Nashe's experiences with both his predecessors and his peers have impacted on his own work and show

⁵ Roland Barthes, *The Death of the Author*, translated by Richard Howard, UbuWeb | UbuWeb Papers, http://www.tbook.constantvzw.org/wp-content/death_authorbarthes.pdf

how this exposure developed Nashe as an author over the course of his career and helped Nashe enhance his own authorial voice.

To do this it is useful to discuss how self-fashioning and authorship have been previously considered by modern scholars. Stephen Greenblatt, for example, discusses six Tudor-era authors (More, Tyndale, Wyatt, Spenser, Marlowe and Shakespeare) and examines how these authors' works changed in accordance with the dominant social codes. As he notes

Self-fashioning for such figures involves submission to an absolute power or authority situated at least partially outside the self – God, a sacred book, an institution such as church, court, colonial or military administration. Marlowe is an exception, but his consuming hostility to hierarchical authority has...some of the force of submission.⁶

In similar fashion Laurie Ellinghausen looks at a number of authors, Nashe included, and discusses how they represent themselves in their works and how these authors helped define the concept of professional authorship. She notes how Nashe represents 'the intriguing paradox of a Cambridge graduate...deciding to style himself as a "day labourer" in his writing activities'⁷ and how his 'university training nurtured a hope for preferment that would never be fulfilled'⁸ presenting

⁶ Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2005) this ref. p. 9

⁷ Laurie Ellinghausen, *Labor and Writing in Early Modern England, 1567-1667* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008) this ref. p. 5

⁸ Ellinghausen, *Labor and Writing in Early Modern England, 1567-1667* this ref. p. 7

him as a 'frustrated scholar *cum* writer for pay – one who is compelled to adjust to a new socioeconomic reality.'⁹

Taking a slightly different approach to Greenblatt and Ellinghausen, Patrick Cheney only engages with Shakespeare's works, although he does reference Spenser as one from whom Shakespeare took a different method. Cheney uses the terms 'counter-laureate' and 'counter-authorship' to describe how Shakespeare differed from the poet writing

Furthermore, during the Elizabethan and Jacobean eras Shakespeare's self-concealment, we have finally seen, is so unusual that it might be best to think in terms of *counter-authorship*, a form of authorship that exists not in isolation as a stroke of 'genius' but also in reaction to the dominate 1590's model of authorship.¹⁰

Cheney continues by noting that as Spenser was the leading proponent of pastoral and epic writing at the time, Shakespeare's approach to authorship was distinctly dissimilar to the poet. Shakespeare was deliberately concealing himself in his work, Cheney argues – something that authors like Jonson, Spenser, and – as I intend to show – Nashe did not do.

In contrast to Cheney's conclusions with Shakespeare, Matthew Woodcock discusses Thomas Churchyard, an author

⁹ Ellinghausen, *Labor and Writing in Early Modern England, 1567-1667* this ref. p. 38

¹⁰ Patrick Cheney, *Shakespeare's Literary Authorship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008) this ref. p. 63

[whose] greatest fear was that he would be overlooked, forgotten, ignored, or undervalued. Indeed, one of the reasons he seems driven to continue writing almost until his last breath was to perpetuate a sense of his continued presence, in order to vocalise his own perceived marginality.¹¹

Woodcock also writes that ‘Churchyard pre-empts and, to a degree, enables the attempts at literary self-fashioning of perceived pioneers such as Spenser, Robert Greene, and Thomas Nashe’¹² showing that Churchyard’s approach to authorship may have borne some influence on the younger author.

Richard Helgerson discusses the idea of authorship in a slightly different manner looking both at individual authors and how their experiences impacted upon their writing whilst also discussing them as part of a larger literary scene. *The Elizabethan Prodigals* begins with Helgerson looking at common themes that link a number of authors in the period before examining Gascoigne, Lyly, Greene, Lodge and Sidney in more depth with Nashe being mentioned in connection to both Greene and Sidney. *Self-Crowned Laureates* only looks at three individual authors – Spenser, Jonson and Milton – but discusses in great depth how these three men were

¹¹ Matthew Woodcock, *Thomas Churchyard: Pen, Sword and Ego* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016) this ref. p. 3

¹² Woodcock, *Thomas Churchyard: Pen, Sword and Ego*, this ref. p. 3

both impacted by the literary system they wrote in but also how their works influenced and changed the system in return.¹³

In this thesis I intend to build upon these ideas in order to illuminate the strategies applied by Nashe and show how he used his own experiences and the writings of others to fashion his own identity. Although Ellinghausen describes Nashe as one of these 'writers who adopt suspect, marginal identities'¹⁴ I will show that this description does not apply here – that Nashe's writing indicate that the young author was in the process of developing his own voice and that this persona became more substantial with each publication.

Nashe was baptised in 1567 and was dead by 1601 with the exact year of his death being unknown.¹⁵ Following his years at Cambridge, where he studied at St. John's College, he arrived in London around 1589 and both built on existing university relationships (Marlowe and Greene) and established new ones; as Nicholl suggests above, this was with men like Chettle and Danter as well as alumni from Oxford like Lyly and Lodge. Nashe's career was remarkably varied especially given his relatively brief active period. He was primarily a pamphleteer, as Nicholl notes:

¹³ For more information about Helgerson's work on authorship please refer to Richard Helgerson, *The Elizabethan Prodigals* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976) and Richard Helgerson, *Self-Crowned Laureates* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983)

¹⁴ Ellinghausen, *Labor and Writing in Early Modern England, 1567-1667* this ref. p. 7

¹⁵ Charles Nicholl, 'Nashe [Nash], Thomas (bap. 1567, d. c. 1601), writer', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press 2008

The term “Pamphleteer”, in an Elizabethan context demands explanation. The feel of topicality and reportage in Nashe suggests that the closest modern equivalent is ‘journalist’.¹⁶

However, this was not his sole output. Of the twelve works that can be confidently ascribed to Nashe seven of these can be described as pamphlets with the remainder consisting of two prefaces, one play, one anti-Martinist tract, and one bawdy poem. Even the seven pamphlets are different from each other; Nashe concentrates two of these on attacking Gabriel Harvey (*Strange Newes, Of the intercepting certaine Letters, and a convoy of Verses, as they were going Priuillie to victual the Low Countries and Haue With You to Saffron-Walden*), while two are Nashe pieces aimed at a variety of subjects framed in an almost auto-biographical fashion (*Pierce Penilesse His Svpplication to the Divell* and *Nashe’s Lenten Stuffe*). A third, *Christ’s Teares Over Jerusalem*, is a similar work but is more overtly religious, whereas *The Terrors of the night Or, A Discourse of Apparitions* is a treatise disparaging the practice of dream interpretation. This leaves *The Anatomie of Absurditie*, an exercise in euphuism probably written prior to the writer coming to London. This makes defining Nashe difficult with the term Polygraph¹⁷ probably being the most accurate way to describe a man who was able to write comfortably in a number of different genres. Unsurprisingly for a man with so many interests the writers he utilises come from a variety of different fields. Nashe’s works contain

¹⁶ Nicholl, *A Cup of News*, this ref. p. 3

¹⁷ As per the *Oxford English Dictionary* this word is defined as ‘A writer of many or various works; a prolific author; a writer on many subjects. For the full definition please see “polygraph, n.4”, *OED Online*, Oxford University Press, June 2018

nods to classical rhetoricians as well as poets and playwrights from the same era; he is equally comfortable quoting contemporary prose as he is at describing satire and satirists from the Italian renaissance. Throughout his works Nashe would make references to his classical education – quoting figures like Ovid or Cicero with regularity as a means of showing his superiority to those less educated than himself.

Although there has been less written about Nashe than his more ‘famous’ contemporaries there has still been a reasonable amount of attention focussed in his direction with the last twenty or so years showing a significant increase in the focus paid to the author. The first significant collection of Nashe’s works was edited by A.B. Grosart in around 1883 with the editor also adding an introduction which by his own admission was a difficult task noting

I am under bond to add to the ' Biographical ' a ' Critical ' Introduction. I must fulfil my promise, albeit it was perchance too hastily given; for as one turns back upon the now completed Works one feels that the Man is too shadowy and unrevealed, and the Writings too hasty and unsubstantive, for anything like elaborate criticism or estimate.¹⁸

Grosart’s publication was followed by the edition still mostly referred to by Nashe scholars; R.B. McKerrow’s five volume *Works of Thomas Nashe*. Compiled and

¹⁸ A.B. Grosart, *The Complete Works of Thomas Nashe* ed., with intr., notes etc. by A. B. Grosart. Vol. vi, p. i, https://archive.org/stream/completeworksth01nashgoog/completeworksth01nashgoog_djvu.txt.

published between 1904 and 1910 this remains the standard reference work for Nashe with McKerrow's own notes proving useful insight into critical thinking of the time. It is the 1958 edition of this title that I have used throughout this thesis and McKerrow continues to be relevant in the present day even if some of his findings have been surpassed with the advent of more up to date research techniques.¹⁹

Following McKerrow there was a gap of some 50 years before the next edition concerning solely Nashe was published; even so a number of critics wrote essays about the author and his works. In the 40s and early 50s Summergill and McGinn both published complimentary views on Nashe's style which concluded that his only contribution to the Marprelate argument was *An Almond for a Parrat*;²⁰ separately to this McGinn had also written essays on other parts of the controversy which concerned Nashe as well as looking at aspects of *Pierce Penilesse* in a 1946 essay. Following McGinn and Summergill was C.S. Lewis' contribution to the genre with his *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century Excluding Drama* first published in 1954 but taken from the Clark Lectures of 1944.²¹ This work covered a large remit with Nashe only a small detail of a much larger picture.

¹⁹ Probably the most significant of these is the *Early English Books Online* (EEBO) database which allows a researcher to interrogate over 25,000 texts from the fifteenthth Century onwards significantly reducing search times whilst giving a level of research that previous generations of scholars could not achieve. Similarly online journal databases like JSTOR and the MLA International Bibliography allow the researcher to keep up to date with both current and historic academic thinking.

²⁰ As a starting point for the dialogue between the McGinn and Summersgill I would recommend reading Donald J. McGinn, 'Nashe's Share in the Marprelate Controversy', *PMLA*, Vol. 59, No. 4 (Dec., 1944), pp. 952-984 and Travis L. Summersgill, 'The Influence of the Marprelate Controversy upon the Style of Thomas Nashe', *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 48, No. 2 (Apr., 1951), pp. 145-160

²¹ The Clark Lectures are a series of lectures held annually at Trinity College, Cambridge on an annual basis. They commenced in 1888 and have been given by authors like T.S. Eliot and E.M. Forster. For further information please visit <https://www.trin.cam.ac.uk/about/public-lecture-series/clark/>

After Lewis' book came the next major consideration of Nashe; G.R. Hibbard's *Thomas Nashe: A Critical Introduction*²² published in 1962. This was followed in 1964 by Stanley Wells' *Thomas Nashe. Selected Works*²³ in which Wells offered a twenty-page preface to four full texts and selected extracts from others wherein he presents bibliographical details of Nashe's life. As Drew in his review notes 'His volume is entirely acceptable as a popularization, in the best sense, of the five-volume McKerrow/Wilson edition, making Nashe accessible and attractive to a large public'.²⁴

After these two publications comes a fallow period broken only by a small number of essays and articles from the likes of Duncan-Jones, Drew and Friedenreich discussing different elements of Nashe's writing. This state of affairs remains until 1981 when McGinn produces his commentary on Nashe and his works in his book *Thomas Nashe*.²⁵ In this publication McGinn examines Nashe's writings in varying degrees in a work seen mostly as complementary to Hibbard's earlier contribution. McGinn's book was followed in the 1982 by a much smaller book, Jonathan V. Crewe's *Unredeemed Rhetoric: Thomas Nashe and the Scandal of Authorship*,²⁶ with Crewe framing Nashe and Harvey in reference to more relatively modern scholars like Derrida and Tuve.

²² G.R. Hibbard, *Thomas Nashe: A Critical Introduction* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962)

²³ Stanley Wells, *Thomas Nashe. Selected Works* (originally published in 1964 by Edward Arnold Publishers, revised edition published Abingdon: Routledge, 2015)

²⁴ Philip Drew, 'Review of *Thomas Nashe. Selected Works*', *The Review of English Studies*, Vol. 16, No. 63 (Aug., 1965), this ref. p. 334

²⁵ Donald J. McGinn, *Thomas Nashe* (Boston: G.K. Hall, 1981)

²⁶ Jonathan V. Crewe, *Unredeemed Rhetoric: Thomas Nashe and the Scandal of Authorship* (Baltimore-London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982)

Following McGinn comes the first real biography of Nashe, Charles Nicholl's *A Cup of News: The life of Thomas Nashe* published in 1984. Nicholl concentrates heavily on the biographical side of Nashe's life discussing his works in relation to life events in an effort to bring more focus on the man who wrote the words rather than the words themselves. Nicholl discusses Nashe as a person as well as an author in a manner not previously attempted and as such his work is a valuable resource for the modern Nashe scholar. Stephen S. Hilliard's book *The Singularity of Thomas Nashe*²⁷ is published next coming two years after Nicholl. As with most of the preceding volumes Hilliard attempts to discuss the complete Nashe canon in a chronological fashion whilst developing on themes presented by earlier editors. The final publication of this decade came Lorna Hutson's book *Thomas Nashe: In Context* published in 1989 by Clarendon Press.²⁸ In this book Hutson engages directly with four of Nashe's works whilst examining how and where he fitted into the cultural landscape of his time.

Following this virtual plethora of Nashe study in the 1980s there once again occurs a period with only a small number of essays on Nashe being written in the next twenty or so years.²⁹ This situation changed with the Ashgate/Routledge series about the University Wits with a volume of work being produced for each of the six men known under this label. Nashe was no exception with his volume appearing in

²⁷ Stephen S. Hilliard, *The Singularity of Thomas Nashe* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1986)

²⁸ Lorna Hutson, *Thomas Nashe: In Context* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989)

²⁹ In this period there has been an increase in the number of Nashe essays published online on scholarly journals including pieces by Ossa-Richardson, Ward, and Hadfield which engage with different aspects of Nashe's output. A significant contribution to this has been Duncan-Jones who discovered Ben Jonson's epitaph to Nashe which indicates a depth to their friendship which was previously unsubstantiated.

2011 edited by Georgia Brown³⁰ which collected a number of historical essays written about Nashe on a varied and wide range of subjects and spanning a number of years. The next collection of essays came in 2013 with *The Age of Thomas Nashe: Text, Bodies and Trespasses of Authorship in Early Modern England*³¹ which re-situates Nashe from being a minor character in the 1590s to being considered as a more important character in the milieu. The book contains contributions from a number of names already mentioned with chapters by established Nashe scholars like Crewe, Brown and Mentz sitting comfortably alongside essays by newer scholars such as Landreth and Mceleney. Most recently Jennifer Richards and Andrew Hadfield have launched *The Thomas Nashe Project*, an ambitious project which aims to produce a new collection of Nashe's works with contributions from a number of scholars. I shall discuss this project in more depth later in this introduction as this heralds the first real examination of Nashe's works in a number of years and is a significant step forward for Nashe scholars.

On looking at the attention previously focused on Nashe what is obvious is that a number of scholars followed the same approach and came to similar conclusions; taking each of his works in order and almost in isolation to give what seems to be a complete picture of the author but actually showing Nashe as a one-dimensional character. The exception to this is Nicholl whose biography stands separately to the rest; Nicholl takes efforts to relate the works to the man behind

³⁰ Georgia Brown (ed.), *Thomas Nashe* (Abingdon: Ashgate, 2011)

³¹ Stephen Guy-Bray, Joan Pong Linton, Steve Mentz (ed.), *The Age of Thomas Nashe: Text, Bodies and Trespasses of Authorship in Early Modern England* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013)

them and as such gives a more three-dimensional picture to the author. My approach is closer to that of Nicholl's whilst attempting to see Nashe in a different light to his biographer; I intend to use both his biography and his works together to show Nashe as a product of both his upbringing and his reading. This is not an unusual approach as recently it can be seen that writing biographically is becoming fashionable once again. The last few years have seen biographies on Shakespeare by Peter Ackroyd, Marlowe by Constance Brown Kuriyama and Spenser by Andrew Hadfield³² indicating a growing desire to learn more about the writers who penned the most notable works of the renaissance period. It is my contention that engaging with Nashe in this manner will give the reader a greater insight into one of the more intriguing minds of the renaissance era.

There is a danger in seeing Nashe's works as wholly journalistic, something that Nicholl tends to do. It would seem his movements in London can be reasonably inferred through his writings and the temptation exists to see Nashe's words as an impartial and unbiased chronicle of fact; Nicholl notes that

His work has long been viewed as vividly documentary. "The light tracts of Tom Nash", wrote a historian in 1815, are a positive "granary for commentators".³³

³² For reference purposes these three biographies are Peter Ackroyd, *Shakespeare: The Biography* (London: Random House, 2006), Constance Brown Kuriyama, *Christopher Marlowe: A Renaissance Life* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2010), and Andrew Hadfield, *Edmund Spenser: A Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012)

³³ Nicholl, *A Cup of News*, this ref. p. 3

This position ignores the actual nature of the writings; they represent the stylised life of an author viewed very much through a subjective and partial lens and every encounter or detail given carries with it a grain of doubt. Nicholl makes an effort in trying to infer some details of Nashe's character from his works writing

As with most Elizabethan writers, there are mysteries about him, both biographical and psychological. His life moves in and out of focus. In his heyday in the early 1590's he lived his life in a glare of self-generated publicity; elsewhere there are silences, unexplained movements, hints of dirty dealing. His pamphlets give the 'feel' of him but also throw up questions about the sort of character that could write them, the mind behind the razzle-dazzle.³⁴

The passage concludes 'Like his friend Marlowe, there is something unsettling about him, the unpredictable spark of high psychological voltage'³⁵ which presents an element that has always been the major concern for Nashe scholars; the lack of biographical detail about the man invariably leads to critics, if they choose to look beyond his writing, making inferences and suppositions about Nashe's life often based on little more than how much they like his work or the persona Nashe has presented. The majority of strictly factual scholarship produced since McKerrow have all attempted to follow in his footsteps which has led to knowledge of Nashe being limited. Whereas McKerrow cast a different light on Nashe compared to

³⁴ Nicholl, *A Cup of News*, this ref. p. 7

³⁵ Nicholl, *A Cup of News*, this ref. p. 7

Grosart's collection subsequent editors merely added to the work of their predecessor both enhancing the reputation of McKerrow's collection whilst adding very little themselves. It was Nicholl who changed this state of affairs with his more biographical take on Nashe painting the Elizabethan author in a more intriguing light. This is something that has been continued in recent years with the 2011 Routledge edition of their University Wits Series including a volume of twenty or so essays about the author; the collection includes essays written as early as 1935 and as recently as 2008 and is separated into four sections – Part One - Nashe and Early Modern Literature: Contexts, Relationships, Influence; Part Two - Earlier Works; Part Three - Later Works Including The Quarrel With Gabriel Harvey; Part Four – *The Unfortunate Traveller* (1594). This collection shows how Nashe scholarship has developed and makes it clear how, despite having a limited number of extant works, it can be clearly established that Nashe managed to comment on a number of subjects. It must be noted however that this collection contains no new essays and the edition serves as an anthology of previously published Nashe scholarship and examines Nashe primarily in relation to specific works. The 2013 Guy-Bray, Linton, and Mentz edited book, on the other hand, presents a smaller collection of ten original essays separated into three 'clusters' discussing different aspects of Nashe's writing. The first section, 'Beyond the City' involves Nashe scholars revisiting their earlier criticisms and updating their conclusions; the second discusses how Nashe was influenced by various external factors; whilst the final section considers how Nashe represents himself in his works. Most significantly Jennifer Richards and Andrew Hadfield began *The Thomas Nashe Project* recently

which has brought together a number of Early Modern scholars to discuss Nashe; in their own words

'The Thomas Nashe Project' is an ambitious project of scholarly editing, contracted by Oxford University Press: 6 volumes of all of Nashe's known writings, as well as dubia, with detailed annotation that takes account of advances in our understanding of the 16th century over the last 30 years; a new glossary that makes use of the e-search tools at our disposal; and extensive analysis and commentary.³⁶

This project, which discusses all of Nashe's works and includes suggestions that his involvement with the Anti-Martinist movement goes further than one pamphlet and supposes a larger Nashean hand in Marlowe's *Dido Queene of Carthage* than has previously been thought, will produce a welcome addition to the critical landscape. It is highly significant to scholars of both the period in general and Nashe in particular and has a wide remit discussing all aspects of Nashe's works beginning with his early writings including both prefaces before discussing his contribution to the Marprelate debate. The project will engage with all of Nashe's other works, including giving this author co-authorship credit for *Dido* and not including it in the dubia section of the edition, and has to this date run two events; a one-day symposium held in May 2017 at Shakespeare's Globe called *Thomas*

³⁶ Prof. Jennifer Richards, 'About *The Thomas Nashe Project*', *The Thomas Nashe Project* <https://research.ncl.ac.uk/thethomasnasheproject/about/>

Nashe: Prose, Drama, and the Oral Culture of Early Modern London which discussed Nashe with specific focus on his dramatic output. This was followed in July 2018 by a three-day conference called *Thomas Nashe and his Contemporaries* with papers covering a number of Nashe's works and discussions based on various subjects including Nashe relationship with both Spenser and, in a separate panel, Gabriel Harvey. The work being carried out by the project is intriguing and would appear to have some overlap with this thesis; however, my area of focus is different to those involved in this undertaking as I am concentrating on Nashe as a solo author and how he represents the authors who have had an impact on his works. I am also not only looking at his contemporaries but also examining those referenced from the past as referenced by Nashe's reading habits which leads me to engage with writers from the classical era and the Italian renaissance as well as those from his own time. I am also not concerned with how the manuscripts came to print or how his play or plays were staged; in this thesis the focus is very much on the written word appearing on the page with very little focus on the practicalities of being a writer in the 1590's.

In this thesis I will be looking at a number of authors that feature in Nashe's works and what the inclusion of these figures or the references to their writing suggests about the Elizabethan. In doing so I will demonstrate how Nashe's perceptions and views on authorship have influenced his own writing. I will discuss the impact that different writers and genres had on Nashe and how this impact was represented in his work while also discussing how these authors allowed him to develop his own, unique authorial identity. I shall discuss how Nashe positions

himself within an authorial landscape which predates his own work by over 1,000 years and how he constantly adapted to the people and stimuli around him, not allowing himself to be limited by preconceptions that his upbringing may have given him. Nashe was a writer who encountered many different genres and wrote in most of them in a manner which suggests he was inspired by those who wrote before him. I will be looking at these authors through Nashe's eyes and discussing how he views them rather than making any value judgements of my own; a task made easier by Nashe himself who tends to make it obvious how he feels about those around him leaving very little room for doubt. I shall use the term 'author' as an umbrella label to encompass writers of the various different genres that Nashe encountered as his reading led him to referencing both classical and modern poets, playwrights, prose writers, writers of religious tracts and satirists amongst others and discuss how Nashe develops these genres supplying his own flavour to these genres. This thesis is also not bound by time or distance; a number of Nashe's sources are drawn from classical times and from different countries and as such need to be reflected here. Despite this I will not be discussing the more obvious classical authors that Nashe utilises; there will be no chapter on Ovid, Cicero or Homer for example as despite their clear impact on Nashe this is a path well-trodden. There is little to be gained from noting that *A Choise of Valentines* is a homage to *Amores* as this has been examined before, or discussing every time Nashe quotes from Ovid, as Ossa-Richardson notes

We might contrast pieces such as *Pierce Penilesse His Svpplication to the Divell* - of 36 traced quotations, 16 are from Ovid - and Nashe's

Lenten Stufte -7 Ovid quotations out of 16. In *The Unfortunate*

Traveller, 32 out of 42 quotations are from Ovid.³⁷

Similarly discussing the numerous mentions of Cicero, whilst showing Nashe's knowledge of classical oration and philosophy and emphasising his level of education, add little significance or value to this thesis. As previously noted, I will also be referencing how Nashe's upbringing impacted on his interpretation of the works of the writers that he was impacted by; I will show how Nashe can not be defined by either his own life experiences, or his reading alone but is a product of the two together. As such a focus on his background is as important as focussing on the authors he studied.

Nashe was the son of an Anglican clergyman and was active at a time of major religious turmoil. The difficulties faced by both Protestants and Catholics since the reign of Henry VIII have been well documented with the coronation of Elizabeth meaning that the crown was again Protestant; one of Elizabeth's first actions was to pass The Act of Supremacy in 1558 which 'revived the antipapal statutes of Henry VIII and declared the queen supreme governor of the church'.³⁸ This not only marginalised the followers of Catholicism but also eventually led to a schism appearing within the Anglican church with the Puritan elements within the church finding the established church and its clergy to be too moderate for its

³⁷ Anthony Ossa-Richardson, 'Ovid and the 'free play with signs' in Thomas Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller*', *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 101, No. 4 (Oct., 2006), pp. 945-956 this ref. p. 951

³⁸ John S. Morrill and Stephen J. Greenblatt (April 11, 2018), 'Elizabeth I', *Encyclopædia Britannica*, <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Elizabeth-I>

liking. One of the results of this disagreement was the Marprelate controversy which was likely the reason why Nashe came to London in 1589 to lend his pen to the side of the Bishops. His position as an ally to the Bishops went beyond his involvement in this controversy yet even after excluding his work in the anti-Martinist efforts it was clear that in the early 1590's Nashe was a friend of the established clergy with one of Nashe's more significant early patrons being the Archbishop of Canterbury John Whitgift. And although Nashe tended to avoid making sweeping religious statements in his writing it is not true to say that religion played no part in his work; despite being few explicitly overt references Nashe's knowledge of faith was never too far from the surface. In *Piers Penniless* his supplication uses the Seven Deadly Sins as its basis, whilst *Christ's Teares Over Jerusalem* is filled with biblical references and Harvey's beliefs are constantly called into question. While it would be wrong to suggest that Nashe ignored religion what becomes clear is that Nashe does make efforts to avoid supplying either anti-Catholic or anti-Puritan rhetoric within his works. Instead he focuses on those things that he values higher than religious belief; although Harvey's leanings towards the more radical fringes on the Protestant movement were something that Nashe exploited, it is clear that he had more issues with the quality of his writing and his outrageous boasting (in Nashe's eyes) than his religious choices. Conversely Nashe was content in associating with alleged atheist Christopher Marlowe and praising Pietro Aretino, a long-term associate of the eventual Pope Clement VII although once again both of these two figures wore their religious choices lightly preferring to focus on the failings of man.

This thesis will examine the manner in which Nashe scrutinises a number of those authors that have impacted on him and the manner in which he exploits them in his own works. Very little of this study will focus on stylistic resemblances; instead I will focus on thematic similarities and references made throughout his works which assist in supplying an insight into his thought processes. The thesis covers a large period and does not focus solely on English-speaking authors; Nashe imposed no such restrictions to his reading and as such the authors who impressed him came from a variety of times, places and backgrounds. It is organised chronologically beginning with writers from the classical era and ending with Nashe's contemporaries.

Before discussing the individual chapters in this study, it is important to discuss the personality with whom Nashe will always be linked due to the nature and longevity of their disagreement, the scholar, writer and rhetorician Gabriel Harvey with whom Nashe jousting in print for almost half a decade. When beginning this process, it was not my intention to focus on the nature of this disagreement and the affect this had on Nashe and his writing; however, it became clear that any study of Nashe's influences needed to include some focus on this quarrel and the personalities involved. Nashe's reactions to Harvey inform a great deal of what he says and the manner in which he says it. Because of this, references to the doctor appear throughout the thesis before I address Harvey and his circle in Chapter Three.

Chapter One engages with two of Nashe's less noted sources, Apuleius and Lucian who both wrote in the second century CE. The chapter introduces the

concept of Nashe using significant texts from the past in his own writing; in this case he utilises various texts from both authors including Apuleius' *The Golden Ass* which is referenced in a number of his works. I shall also discuss how Nashe uses these two authors to fire broadsides at Harvey as well as considering which of the two authors can be considered to have had a greater impact on the Elizabethan author.

In Chapter Two I shall focus on Pietro Aretino and will show that the Italian renaissance author had a very significant impact on Nashe and his development as a satirist. Although critics have noted Nashe's usage of Aretino's name within his works this is an area which has been relatively under researched – Jason Scott-Warren notes Aretino is praised in *The Unfortunate Traveller* but makes no further comment about the similarities between the two men. He writes

The best he can say for Aretino is that 'if out of so base a thing as ink there may be extracted a spirit, he writ with nought but the spirit of ink, and his style was the spirituality of arts and nothing else' (II 264).³⁹

That this is the best he says about Aretino is an arguable point to make – in *Lenten Stuffe* Nashe goes beyond this writing 'of all stiles I most affect & striue to imitate *Aretines...*' showing a level of respect that Scott-Warren has not considered.

Conversely Georgia Brown discusses a closer relationship between the two authors and their Roman predecessor, Ovid, writing

³⁹ Jason Scott-Warren, *Nashe's Stuff, The Oxford Handbook of English Prose 1500-1640*, Ed. Andrew Hadfield (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013) this ref. p. 217

Nashe invokes Ovid and Aretino as the patrons of prodigality...Aretino and Ovid are patrons of his attack on the prodigal paradigm and undermine the paradigm's monopolistic claims on authority.⁴⁰

Even here Brown does not fully examine the Nashe/Aretino connection. The relationship has really only been fully considered by Ian Moulton who writes a chapter in which he discusses the impact that the Italian had on Nashe. Moulton notes that Nashe was one of the most ardent supporters of Aretino writing 'The figure who most consistently and celebrated the Aretine was Thomas Nashe'⁴¹ before describing how the Elizabethan 'became known as "the English Aretine" for his biting wit, his "filthy rhymes," and his railing attacks on various social abuses.' Moulton discusses how Aretino was used by both Nashe and Harvey within their argument as well as disagreeing with McKerrow's contention that Nashe knew little of Aretino; he notes

In his 1580 letters to Spenser, Gabriel Harvey complains that at Cambridge there are "over many acquainted with *Unico Aretino*" and if there was indeed "a kind of vogue for Aretino at Cambridge" it is hard to believe that Nashe, who attended Cambridge from 1581 to 1588, would have been unaware of it.'⁴²

⁴⁰ Georgia Brown, *Thomas Nashe and the production of authorship, Redefining English Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004) this ref. p. 98

⁴¹ Ian Moulton, *Thomas Nashe, Before Pornography: Erotic Writing in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013) these refs. pp. 159-160

⁴² Moulton, *Thomas Nashe, Before Pornography: Erotic Writing in Early Modern England*, this ref. p. 163

Moulton's chapter is one of the few that considers Nashe and Aretino; the majority of scholarly activity either ignores the relationship or, as with both Brown and Scott-Warren discusses it as a minor aspect of Nashe's career. I will build on Moulton's contribution and shall show the Italian was one of the writers that Nashe seemed to admire almost unconditionally. I will discuss the manner in which Nashe utilises not only Aretino's name but also elements of his character and his life to enhance both *The Unfortunate Traveller*, and *Pierce Penilesse*; arguably Nashe's two most enduring works.

Chapter Three is the first that interrogates authors active at around the same time as Nashe with specific focus on those who were in some way connected with the Nashe-Harvey quarrel. In this chapter I shall firstly look at Barnabe Barnes, Anthony Chute and John Thorius who all took an active part in the argument on behalf of Harvey before focusing on two of the more significant names of the period, Edmund Spenser and Sir Philip Sidney, who, while not having an active role in the argument, were used by each combatant to belittle and berate the other. The chapter will also discuss in depth the cause of the argument and how Nashe utilised other authors to express himself in terms calculated to give Harvey the most displeasure. I shall also show how the publisher John Wolfe, and Abraham Fraunce became involved in the argument and discuss how they both influenced the disagreement and how Nashe reacted to them whilst he was still attacking his rival.

In Chapter Four I shall discuss to what extent Nashe was involved in playwrighting and how he wrote about the practise in general. While this chapter

will obviously engage with Nashe's only extant play, *Summer's Last Will and Testament*, my focus will not be solely on this work. In recent times there has been a critical focus on how much drama Nashe was involved in and in this chapter I will engage with this critical thinking. I shall also discuss how, for an author not normally associated with drama, Nashe's words indicate an interest that his own words seem to deny. In this chapter I will engage with a number of Nashe's works aside from *Summer's Last Will* as Nashe makes theatrical or dramatic references throughout his oeuvre and will show that Nashe was more heavily involved in the production of drama than has previously been thought. I will also show how exposure to authors like Sidney informed Nashe's own complex feelings about the genre.

The last two chapters of the thesis shall shift focus onto members of the so-called University Wits and will engage with the two authors that it can be reasonably argued that Nashe was closest to. In Chapter Five I will examine Nashe's inter-textual relationship with Marlowe; a relationship which is currently coming under enhanced scrutiny given the desire to attribute *Dido* to Nashe as a co-author. I shall discuss both this play and *Doctor Faustus* within this chapter and discuss to what extent I find the argument that Nashe had a hand in either of these works compelling. I shall also discuss how Nashe and Marlowe would have had a shared knowledge base and how concepts introduced by one author were also featured by the other.

The final chapter examines Nashe in relation to Robert Greene and how he represented the older author in his works. As with the previous chapter I shall

examine the history shared by the two men whilst also noting the numerous references that Nashe makes to Greene in his works. As a significant number of these appear in the two anti-Harvey tracts I shall also discuss how Greene is represented in relation not only to Gabriel Harvey but also to his two brothers, Richard and John. I shall also discuss how examining the manner in which Nashe refers to Greene gives an idea of the nature of the two men's relationship and how this developed and changed over time.

For this study I have read all of Nashe's works but due to the nature of the individual texts they do not feature equally through my thesis. Of all his works I have heavily engaged with *Strange News* and *Have With You to Saffron-Walden* as these not only include most of his anti-Harvey rhetoric but also allow us to gain a significant insight into the Nashe/Greene relationship. Equally useful for a number of chapters was *Pierce Penilesse* in which Nashe spoke of a number of themes relevant to this work while *Summer's Last Will and Testament* was obviously of great significance for the chapter on drama. Both of Nashe's prefaces feature heavily here along with *The Anatomie of Absurditie* while *Nashe's Lenten Stuffe* and *The Unfortunate Traveller* are utilised to a lesser degree. Conversely, I found *Christ's Teares over Jerusalem* and *The Terrors of the night* to be of less use so these do not appear to any great degree within my study.

In this thesis I shall show that, although Nashe has been critically examined by numerous sources, the examination of his works tends to follow similar patterns with a great deal of critical effort focused on the relationship between Nashe and Harvey. Although I shall also engage with Nashe's great rival – no study on Nashe

would be complete without acknowledging the impact that the doctor had on him - what this study shall primarily examine is Nashe in connection with a number of different figures beginning with writers active at the start of the first millennium and concluding with his contemporaries. I intend to show how exposure to these diverse authors assisted Nashe in the development of his authorial voice and will track how, over the course of ten years, that nature and tenor of Nashe's work changed to reflect his different experiences. Nashe is an author almost impossible to define by either his output or his biography alone but needs to be examined with equal regard to both the nature of his upbringing and the nature of his professional relationships – in doing this the reader gains an insight into the development of Nashe from an undergraduate writer into a notorious and accomplished pamphleteer and satirist.

Chapter One - Golden Asses and True Histories; Apuleius and Lucian.

If one thing becomes clear from reading the works of Thomas Nashe, it is that the Elizabethan was extremely well read and was always willing to let that fact be known. His works often contain lists of authors who have impacted on him in some way, either positively or negatively. Some of these are to be expected; throughout Nashe's work there are numerous references to Ovid, Horace and Cicero whom he would have read at Cambridge. Ovid appears as early as *The Anatomie of Absurditie* with McKerrow noting 'Throughout the piece Nashe shows considerable familiarity with Ovid, though the number of actual quotations is small'⁴³ with the Roman's influence also appearing heavily in *The Unfortunate Traveller*; Ossa-Richardson notes that

when Jack exclaims to the reader, '*Crede mihi, res est ingeniosa dare*', he is citing (without alteration) Ovid's Amores-'Believe me, to give is a thing of genius'⁴⁴

Similarly, Horace is quoted generously in *Christs Teares Over Jerusalem* with Nashe declaring

Many puny Poets & old ill poets are vaine-glorious, of whom *Horace* speaketh: *Ridentur mala qui componunt carmina; verum gaudent*

⁴³ McKerrow, Introduction, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 5, p. 118

⁴⁴ Anthony Ossa-Richardson, 'Ovid and the 'free play with signs' in Thomas Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller*', *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 101, No. 4 (Oct., 2006), pp. 945-956 this ref. p. 952

*scribentes et se venerantur, et vltro, si taceas, laudant quicquid
scripsere beati.*

This passage taken from *Epistles II* translates as

Those who write poor verses are a jest; yet they rejoice in the writing
and revere themselves; and, should you say nothing, they themselves
praise whatever they have produced—happy souls!⁴⁵

Horace here is criticising his contemporaries for producing bad quality material whilst representing his own as being more worthwhile; this is something that Nashe echoes in both *Anatomie* and, as I shall discuss in a later chapter, his *Preface* to Robert Greene's *Menaphon*. Cicero is equally as significant as either of the other two classical authors with Nashe often using the Roman's proclamations to strengthen his own arguments; he is mentioned almost thirty times in *The Works* with Ovid getting only two more mentions and Horace appearing far less often. The classical era was significant to Nashe and these three authors appealed to Nashe for both their writing styles and the nature of their content; Nashe could take their words and with only minor alterations could make them pertinent to his own situation. This was also the case with a number of authors from a more recent era with Nashe featuring a number of references from more modern authors; men like Pietro Aretino, Henry Cornelius Agrippa and Erasmus were all active 80-100 years before Nashe and are all either mentioned in his works or quoted at various times. I

⁴⁵ Translation taken from Horace, *Epistles II*, Loeb Classical Library, https://www.loebclassics.com/view/horace-epistles/1926/pb_LCL194.433.xml

shall discuss Aretino in the next chapter as his impact on Nashe deserves to be investigated separately to these others but both Agrippa and Erasmus, whilst being less significant are favourites of the Elizabethan author. Agrippa, McKerrow suggests, is another of Nashe's major sources for *Anatomie* with the editor commenting

Among modern authors the most surprising amount of borrowing is from the *De Incertitudine et Vanitate Scientiarum* of Cornelius Agrippa, to which Nashe appears to be indebted more than seventy times...It is hardly too much to say that the greater part of Nashe's apparent learning is transferred wholesale from Agrippa's work.⁴⁶

Both Agrippa and Erasmus are visited by Jack Wilton in *The Unfortunate Traveller* and both of these figures along with men like Thomas More and Martin Luther are thrust into Wilton's narrative with no regard for historical or geographical accuracy with Hyman writing

Nashe's quashing of literary decorum is his passport into exotic literary, political, economic, and historic territory: the court of Henry VIII; the workshops of Agrippa, Erasmus, and Surrey; the banqueting houses of Italy; the universities of Germany.⁴⁷

⁴⁶ McKerrow, Introduction, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 5, p. 134-135

⁴⁷ Wendy Hyman, 'Authorial Self-Consciousness in Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller*', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, Vol. 45, No. 1, The English Renaissance (Winter, 2005), pp. 23-41 this ref. p.25

Nashe is very keen to make his audience understand just how well read and learned he actually is and is willing to break literary convention to force as many references into this work as possible. It is clear that there are authors that Nashe has read and authors that Nashe is inspired by; Agrippa, Erasmus and Horace for example fall into the former category whereas Ovid and Aretino are in the latter. For the purposes of this chapter I will be looking at two classical authors whom Nashe treats in the same manner as Ovid and Aretino and who have not been explored in relation to the Elizabethan in any significant depth; the Latin language author Apuleius and his Greek language contemporary Lucian, both of whom were active in the second century. Although these two authors do not initially appear to have had a major influence on the Elizabethan poly-author it is my contention that their impact on Nashe's writing is significant and needs to be acknowledged. I shall examine the two authors in turn beginning with Apuleius and conclude the chapter by discussing the impact of these two authors as a whole.

Apuleius, born in c.120, was a Latin language author born in the Roman colony of Numidia in North Africa. Apuleius would almost certainly have come to Nashe's attention in his Cambridge days; as his *Encyclopædia Britannica* entry notes he was a

Platonic philosopher, rhetorician, and author... who was educated at Carthage and Athens, travelled (sic) in the Mediterranean region and became interested in contemporary religious initiation rites, among them the ceremonies associated with worship of the Egyptian

goddess Isis. Intellectually versatile and acquainted with works of both Latin and Greek writers, he taught rhetoric in Rome.⁴⁸

He wrote a number of treatises including three books on Plato but is primarily known for the prose fiction *Metamorphoses*, more familiarly referred to as *The Golden Ass* which explores the adventures of Lucius, a young man who through the misuse of magic accidentally turns himself into an ass. The novel is an early example of the picaresque style of writing and follows the adventures of Lucius both as man and ass and his eventual religious redemption and has significant historical importance as it is the earliest surviving Latin language novel as well as having been noted as an influence on authors as varied as Machiavelli, Shakespeare, C.S. Lewis and Franz Kafka. Apuleius' work also impacted upon Augustin of Hippo, later St Augustine, who studied in Apuleius' birthplace M'Daourouch and, although echoing his predecessor's tone and style in *Confessions*, notably finds fault with many of his conclusions in *City of God*.⁴⁹ Nancy J Shumate concludes her article by saying

⁴⁸ The Editors of *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 'Lucius Apuleius', *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Encyclopædia Britannica inc. April 04, 2018

⁴⁹ There has not been a great deal of scholarly effort concentrated on the relationship between these two figures. Book VIII of *City of God* spends a good number of pages refuting Apuleius' argument that demons should be venerated as they act as messengers between God and humans but there has been very little significant analysis of this work in respect to the two authors. Walsh in his introduction to *The Golden Ass* mentions that Augustine was aware of Apuleius and his legacy and notes that the older author shaped the works of his countryman but makes no further mention of the connection between the two. The most in-depth study of the relationship between the two is Vincent Hunink's essay "'Apuleius, Qui Nobis Afris Afer Est Notoir"; Augustine's polemic against Apuleius in *De Civitate Dei*' (*Scholia. Studies in Classical Antiquity*, N.S. 12, 2003, 82-95) wherein the author notes that it is likely that it was Augustine who gave the Apuleius' most famous work its alliterative title '*Asinus Aureus*' as at no point does Apuleius note that the ass is golden, either in appearance or deed. Hunink also examines in depth Augustine's criticism of *De Deo Socratis* and this is definitely a worthwhile essay to read to gain some understanding of the two authors.

Augustine clearly was familiar with both the novel and the philosophical treatises of his compatriot (De Civ. Dei 4.2; 8.10-27; 9.2-8). Although it seems unlikely that he would deliberately look for inspiration to a pagan whom he regarded as a spinner of dangerous tales, the closeness of the verbal parallels and the similarities in the formulation of the problem suggest some degree of debt on Augustine's part nevertheless.⁵⁰

It is also known that Apuleius' work was taught in both Renaissance Italy⁵¹ and by Oxbridge scholars and his story of *Cupid and Psyche*, originally told in *Metamorphoses*, has been alluded to by a number of writers as well as being the subject for many artists.

Within Nashe's canon Apuleius or his writing is mentioned at several points, either by name or by more oblique allusions. McKerrow notes four explicit references to the Numidian author in *The Works*, which is not a high amount compared to the other authors in this study. Remarkably only one of these occurs in either of the two infamous attacks on Gabriel Harvey, *Strange Newes* and *Haue With You to Saffron-Walden* which for two reasons is quite surprising. In the first instance it was likely Harvey who introduced Nashe to both Apuleius and Lucian; as R.W. Maslen writes

⁵⁰ Nancy J. Shumate, 'The Augustinian Pursuit of False Values as a Conversion Motif in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*', *Phoenix*, Vol. 42, No. 1 (Spring, 1988), pp. 35-60 this ref. p. 59

⁵¹ For further information on the methodology employed to teach *Metamorphoses* please read Julia Haig Gaisser's article 'Teaching Classics in the Renaissance: Two Case Histories', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* (1974-), Vol. 131 (2001), pp. 1-21

In 1578 Gabriel Harvey was a lecturer in Cambridge; Spenser may have been one of his students. Over the next few years his job could have put him in touch with several equally gifted young Cambridge students: Christopher Marlowe, Robert Greene, Thomas Nashe, the experimental poet Abraham Fraunce, the teacher of French John Eliot. One thing that links all these men is an interest in Lucianic magical journeys, which Harvey may have helped to stimulate with his 'Lucian in fower volumes'.⁵²

That Nashe and Marlowe, for example, referred heavily to these writers indicates that for all his other failings Harvey managed to stimulate the minds of a number of important Renaissance figures. It is also unusual, given the nature of Nashe's anti-Harvey works and the moral of Apuleius' story, that he fails to connect the two; Apuleius' protagonist Lucius acted foolishly and paid the consequences and only found redemption by yielding to a higher power. It would have not been beyond Nashe to equate Harvey's actions with those of Lucius and use the classical story to not only chastise his rival but also to imply that simply yielding to Nashe's pen, the higher power, and apologising to both himself and the similarly aggrieved spirit of Robert Greene would be the wisest course of action. Instead it is Harvey who brings Apuleius into the argument by alluding to Nashe in Apuleius-like terms writing in *Pierce's Supererogation*:

⁵² R.W. Maslen, "Magical Journeys in Sixteenth-Century Prose Fiction", *The Yearbook of English Studies*, Vol. 41, No. 1, Travel and Prose Fiction in Early Modern England (2011), pp. 35-50 this ref. p. 43

Hee that will be made a sheepe, shall find wolues inough: but
forsooth this exceeding-wise world, is a great Asse-maker: and he
that will suffer himselfe to be proclaimed an Asse in printe, shall bee
sure neuer to want loade and loade inough.⁵³

He then dispenses with any subtlety by referring to the younger man as 'Young Apuleius' on four separate occasions, an act that Nashe does not take kindly to at all. Nashe takes Harvey's words from this piece and dismisses them, arguing that the Apuleius the older man describes, a man who believed he was better than Plato, Hippocrates and Aristotle, does not exist. Using Apuleius as a starting point Nashe then continues on chastising Harvey for disparaging all classical authors in an attempt to belittle his rival, something Nashe intimates he would never do. He writes,

Cannot a man declaime against a *Catalonian* and a *Hethite*, a
Moabite Gabriell and an *Amorite Dick*, but all the ancient Fathers, all
the renoumed Philosophers, Orators, Poets, Historiographers, and
old & new excellent Writers must bee disparaged and trode vnder
foote, God and man contemned and set at nought? Vniuersities,
Parliaments, general Councells oppugned? and he must be another
Romane *Palemon*, who vaunted all science began and ended with

⁵³ Gabriel Harvey, *Pierces Supererogation*, London: John Wolfe 1593, this ref. A4v

him? a changer, an innouator, a cony-catcher, a railer, and outfacer
of heauen and earth?⁵⁴

He suggests that Harvey's use of these classical authors betrays both his lack of knowledge and his lack of wit. Nashe does not disparage or declaim those who have gone before him; instead he uses these authors as a point of reference and a way to compare the present situation with the past. Nashe often notes that the writers of the past are to be considered superior to those of the present and although this argument is generally presented with caveats and exceptions, he is always willing to champion those whom he feels rise above the mire whenever he sees fit; he will not pull his punches and is always willing to decry the current state of literature and those responsible for it. This is something that can be seen in the first chronological reference to Apuleius in Nashe's oeuvre which occurs in his first published work, *The Anatomie of Absurditie*. Although published after his *Preface to Menaphon*, *Anatomie* shows all the hallmarks of a work written whilst still a student; as Don Cameron Allen describes Nashe's development

as Nashe continued to write, he learned to make more subtle use of his works of reference, works that are no longer the scholarly dowry of the undergraduate but the reading matter of a mature man.⁵⁵

⁵⁴ Nashe, *Haue With You to Saffron-Walden*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 119, lines 5-11

⁵⁵ Don Cameron Allen, 'The Anatomie of Absurditie: A Study in Literary Apprenticeship', *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 32, No. 2 (Apr., 1935), pp. 170-176 this ref. p. 176

In this pamphlet Nashe discusses the literary scene and how the plethora of current authors responsible for it are not very accomplished. He notes that 'as the straightest things beeing put into water, seeme crooked, so the crediblest trothes, if once they come with in compasse of these mens wits, seeme tales,'⁵⁶ arguing that these writers are so unskilled that they make truth seem like fiction. Nashe goes on to detail his fears that his own, as yet unpublished, words will not be heard by more than just the 'Apuleyan eares'⁵⁷ of these authors and that he will essentially be tarred by the same brush. The young Nashe just about to burst onto the scene as one of England's brightest prospects is worried that his obvious talent will be obscured by his contemporaries' lack of skills. Nashe uses Apuleius' name as both a synonym for asinine and as an allusion that these authors are both lacking in skill and the wit to understand how limited they are. He then goes on to discuss for the first time a subject that he returns to time and again in future works; the inability of the majority of his peers to write in anything like a proficient manner and how their failings reflect badly on England, and more specifically, Thomas Nashe. Describing the effects of their substandard writing Nashe declares

What politique Counsaillour or valiant Souldier will ioy or glorie of
this, in that some stitcher, Weauer, spendthrift, or Fidler hath
shuffled or slubbered vp a few ragged Rimes, in the memoriall of the

⁵⁶ Nashe, *The Anatomie of Absurditie, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 24, lines 7-10

⁵⁷ Nashe, *The Anatomie of Absurditie, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 24, lines 13

ones prudence, or the other's prowess? It makes the learned sort to be silent, when as they see vnlearned sots so insolent.⁵⁸

Interestingly, immediately after this section Nashe then comments about these writers that they are 'Such kind of Poets were they that *Plato* excluded from his Common wealth, and *Augustine* banished *ex ciuitate Dei*'; citing two men who will always be linked with Apuleius and the Platonist way of thinking. At this time in his career Nashe was still establishing his writing persona and style and these figures would still be fresh in his mind from his University teachings so Nashe would have had a comfort level in dealing with them that he may not have had with other, less traditional inspirations.

The next reference that Nashe makes to Apuleius comes in the 1592 work *Pierce Penilesse His Supplication to the Devil*. After Pierce has delivered his supplication the Knight of the Post responds by giving the eponymous hero a lesson in theological history. He discusses the various types of devil or demon that exist and as part of this treatise remarks

he maketh these whom *Apuleius* doth call reasonable creatures,
passiue in mind and eternall in time, being those *Apostata* spirits that
rebelled with *Belzebub*: whose bodies, before their fall, were bright
and pure all like to the former; but after their transgression, they

⁵⁸ Nashe, *The Anatomie of Absurditie, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1., p. 24, lines 26-32

were obscured with a thick ayrie matter, & euer after assigned to
darknes.⁵⁹

This is, in the most part, a reference to the biblical story of the fall of Lucifer; that not only was he cast out of heaven but those angels who sided with him were condemned to the same fate to become demons. Of significant interest to us though is that Nashe refers to Apuleius here rather than any other retelling of the fall of Lucifer and of specific note is that in this case he is not referring to the more popular *Metamorphoses* but to one of the author's other, lesser known works, *De Deo Socratis (On the God of Socrates)*. This piece is highly significant as it is here where Apuleius subverts convention and describes demons as creatures to be venerated as they relay messages between God and Man making themselves invaluable to both kingdoms. In itself this is a fairly contentious position; as noted previously it is this point that St Augustine vehemently disagreed with preferring to agree with the traditional interpretation of the devil and his fellows as beings with no redeeming features. In the framework of his story it is curious that Nashe, the Anglican, tells the story of the fallen angels in a very traditional manner but then immediately calls forth images of these entities as being much more sympathetic and nuanced. However, it is my position that Nashe is not in this case trying to be overly contentious and is instead signposting where he got some of his inspiration for *Pierce Penilesse* from. In *De Deo Socratis* the demons are shown to have a useful function and therefore are not the pure essence of evil as described in other works

⁵⁹ Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Svpplication to the Divell, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 227-228, lines 34+

and as traditionally preached. Similarly Pierce spends the majority of his book talking to the Knight of the Post,⁶⁰ a being described on first meeting Pierce as 'a neat pedantical fellow'⁶¹ who describes himself as 'a spirite in nature and essence, that take vpon me this humaine shape, onely to set men together by the eares and send soules by millions to hell.'⁶² Pierce shows no fear or wariness towards the Knight and what he represents, and the Knight, who we can reasonably assume is some form of demon and acts as an emissary between man and the devil, is not portrayed as evil or cunning; instead Nashe depicts him as a creature merely carrying out its function with seemingly no concern as to what will happen when the message is delivered. This is very different to how the devil and his minions are usually depicted in these situations as there is normally some kind of manipulation or bargaining that occurs. With Pierce and the Knight Nashe describes two figures talking with no denouement in sight and their conversation ends with Pierce sending the Knight on its way with the comment

Inough, gentle spirit, I will importune thee no further, but commit
this Supplication to thy care: which, if thou deliuer accordinglie, thou
shalt at thy returne haue more of my custome; for by that time I will

⁶⁰ As per the Oxford English Dictionary a knight of the post is defined as 'A notorious perjurer; one who got his living by giving false evidence; a false bail.' For further info please refer to "knight of the post, n." *OED Online*. Oxford University Press, December 2018.

⁶¹ Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Svpplication to the Divell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 163, lines 30-31

⁶² Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Svpplication to the Divell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 164, lines 10-13

haue finished certain letters to diuers Orators & Poets, disperced in
your dominions.⁶³

There is no bargain here, just the promise that there will be more of the same kind of invective when the Knight returns from delivering this first missive to the Devil. That the Knight is carrying out almost the same function as Apuleius' demons is no coincidence; Nashe is taking the classical author's ideas as a basis for his own and developing them by turning what would be a traditionally supernatural and unsettling encounter into something much more mundane and routine. Nashe differs from Apuleius by having his demon take the message to the Devil whereas the classical author's message recipients are on the opposite side of the traditional theological scale but the function of the beast is the same; to facilitate contact between man and more unearthly figures.

The references to *De Deo Socratis* also begin to help satisfy another question about Nashe; how much impact Apuleius had on him and whether Lucian was more of a primary source. I shall discuss Lucian in more depth later on in this chapter but at this stage it is important to acknowledge the similarities between the two men and their potential impact on Nashe - the student and in turn Nashe – the author. Literary thinking over the past forty or so years encourages the reader to believe that it is Lucian who had the most impact on the Elizabethan author; Kott notes that 'Lucian was praised and quoted by Thomas Nashe';⁶⁴ Maslen writes that

⁶³ Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Svpplication to the Divell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 239, lines 6-11

⁶⁴ Jan Kott, 'Lucian in *Cymbeline*', *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 67, No. 4 (Oct., 1972), pp. 742-744, this ref. p. 742

'Nashe's *Pierce Penniless* (1592) owes much to Lucian's Menippus and his journeys to the underworld'⁶⁵ whilst completely ignoring Apuleius; Jones draws similarities between Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller* and Lucian's works writing that 'Lucian's satires, for example, typify the Menippean's "open and hidden polemics with the various philosophical, religious, . . . and scientific tendencies . . . of the time". Topicality of this kind is rife in *The Unfortunate Traveller*.'⁶⁶ The majority of critical thinking has been focussed along these lines with Lucian cited as a key source for Nashe while Apuleius is relegated to an afterthought or ignored entirely; however, it is my contention that Apuleius' work had equal if not more significant impact. Lucian's *Lucius, or the Ass* was written at roughly the same time as Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* and it has been noted that the primary source for both these works was a piece also known as *Metamorphoses* and attributed to an author identified as Lucius of Patrae. Recent study has now suggested that Lucius of Patrae was in actual fact Lucian himself and that this *Metamorphoses* was the first version of *Lucius, or the Ass*⁶⁷ which, in turn, is cited as the basis of Apuleius' work. In any case there is quite a lot of similarity between the two works that can be confidently ascribed to Lucius and Apuleius. With the citation of *De Deo Socratis* however, there is clear indication that Nashe was not just aware of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* but was equally aware of the Latin language author's extended canon and this causes us to examine Nashe's work in a different light. What is immediately

⁶⁵ R. W. Maslen, 'Magical Journeys in Sixteenth-Century Prose Fiction', pp. 35-50

⁶⁶ Ann Rosalind Jones, 'Inside the Outsider: Nashe's *Unfortunate Traveller* and Bakhtin's Polyphonic Novel', *ELH*, Vol. 50, No. 1 (Spring, 1983), pp. 61-81

⁶⁷ John Ferguson, 'Apuleius', *Greece & Rome*, Vol. 8, No. 1 (Mar., 1961), pp. 61-74

apparent is that the qualities and facets of Lucian's work as noted by other critics to have influenced Nashe are not exclusive to that author but can also be seen in that of Apuleius. The Numidian author was as equally known as his Greek counterpart for Menippean satire, the style of which we see echoed by Nashe in *Pierce Penilesse* and similarly parallels can be easily drawn between the picaresque nature of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* and Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller*. And as previously noted Nashe's references to asses' ears are framed as Apuleian and not Lucianic when either epithet would have sufficed which indicates a similar familiarity with the works of both men.

The final explicit reference to Apuleius appears in *Pierce Penilesse* and is in one of Nashe's familiar lists of authors. Here the Knight is continuing his lecture about the nature of demons and remarks 'we are all euil, let *Porphirius, Proclus, Apuleius*, or the *Platonists* dispute to the contarie as long as they will';⁶⁸ these cited authors are either Platonist or Neo-Platonists and believe that mankind is inherently good and they ascribe this same value to supernatural spirits arguing there are both good and evil demons. The Knight disagrees with this position giving examples of evil spirits through history and making the distinction that those spirits who are inherently good are angels, not demons. In this regard Nashe is highlighting the difference between angels and demons as in the belief system the Knight describes once an angel falls and becomes evil, they become demons and cannot be redeemed in any way. This is the opposite message to that delivered by

⁶⁸ Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Svpplication to the Divell, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 235, line 22

Apuleius and his fellow Platonists; the denouement of *Metamorphoses* is that Lucius the ass seeks and gains forgiveness at the hands of the god Isis and is returned to his natural form suggesting that no matter what your sins are, salvation is always achievable. This in turn accentuates another one of Nashe's characteristics; although he may not agree with the message that an author represents in their work, he admires skill in writing and is willing to highlight that in his own. In *Strange Newes* there is an excellent example of this with Nashe writing

Lucian, Iulian, Aretine, all three admirably blest in the abundant
giftes of art and nature: yet Religion, which you sought to ruinate,
hath ruinated your good names, and the opposing of your eyes
against the bright sunne, hath caused the worlde condemne your
sight in all other thinges.⁶⁹

In this passage, a response to Gabriel Harvey's hypocrisy at praising and then disparaging these men and others like them, Nashe takes these names of men that he himself professes to admire, and gives them due tribute. Immediately though he tempers this praise with disapproval remarking that their actions with regards to religion cause others to view the rest of their deeds through biased eyes. This seems to replicate Harvey's actions while at the same time censuring them, which would be highly hypocritical, yet Nashe still manages to take Harvey to task for doing this; he shows it is possible for you to admire an author's work even if you essentially disagree with their message. He does this by acknowledging

⁶⁹ Nashe, *Strange Newes*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 285, lines 13-17

immediately that whereas their skills are high, their message is tainted by their 'incorrect' religious viewpoints. Nashe also stops short of specifically including himself in the bracket of those who condemn them, advising it is 'the worlde' that does so; this non-specific, all-encompassing term actually gives Nashe distance from the claim and by not using a personal pronoun here he is making this accusation impersonal and almost neutral. In Nashe's view Harvey's failure is that he is one of those who does not appreciate the talents of these three men who are cited alongside four other classical figures; Harvey writes

I ouerpasse *Archilochus, Aristophanes, Lucian, Iulian, Aretine*, and
that whole venemous and viperous brood, of old & new Raylers:
Euen *Tully*, and *Horace* otherwhiles ouer-reched.⁷⁰

Nashe responds noting

Tully, Horace, Archilochus, Aristophanes, Lucian, Iulian, Aretine goe
for no paiment with you; their declamatory stiles, brought to the
grand test of your iudgment, are found counterfeit; *they are a*
venomous and viperous brood of railers, because they haue broght in
a new kind of a quicke fight which your decrepite slow-mouing
capacitie cannot fadge with.⁷¹

⁷⁰ Gabriel Harvey, *Foure Letters and Certaine Sonnets*, Early English Books Online, London: John Wolfe 1592, this ref A4v

⁷¹ Nashe, *Strange Newes, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 283, lines 22-28

It is Harvey's lack of intelligence and insight that cause these figures to be criticised and not their abilities and they have left the traditionalist, slow thinking Harvey behind. This is a facet of Nashe's work that consistently appears; he does not disagree with Harvey's contention that Aretino is one of the 'abominable Atheistes' in this work, but elsewhere shows his admiration for the Italian because of the quality of his writing.⁷² Similarly, Lucian is invariably mentioned positively and alongside other Nashe favourites like Ovid and Cicero in both *Strange Newes* and *Haue With You to Saffron-Walden*. The real curiosity in this passage is that out of all the names that Nashe could have placed next to Lucian and Aretino from Harvey's list is that Nashe chose the Roman Emperor Julian the Apostate. As noted in his *Encyclopædia Britannica* entry Julian is most famous for being a follower of Neo-Platonism and for having abandoned his Christian faith in favour of paganism converting to the philosophical school of thinking in 351. He is also known for having written a number of works covering a variety of subjects including but not limited to religion and warfare; the same entry describes him as 'noted scholar' and continues on 'That his literary talent was considerable is demonstrated in his surviving works, most of which illustrate his deep love of Hellenic culture.'⁷³ By placing Julian alongside these other figures Nashe indicates that he is able to look past any perceived character flaws as long as the quality of the writing is high, even those who have wholly turned their back on religion. These men represent the

⁷² Nashe, *Strange Newes, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 285, line 18

⁷³ The Editors of *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 'Julian', *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Encyclopædia Britannica inc., September 24, 2009

opposite to Gabriel Harvey, a man whose lack of skill in writing causes Nashe to ignore that he was a teacher at Cambridge and as such a respected member of society. And although the man himself is not mentioned by name in this section, Nashe takes the lessons Apuleius gives in *Metamorphoses* and applies his own logic to them; that forgiveness can be earned if you are able to express yourself in an accomplished manner.

The name Apuleius does not appear again in Nashe's work; however, I believe there is a further reference to the Numidian author which McKerrow failed to note in *The Works*. Once again this appears in *Pierce Penilesse* and occurs when Nashe discusses a solution to some of society's problems. Here Nashe is lamenting about the dearth of good people in the world and writes

We want an *Aretine* here among vs, that might strip these golden asses out of their gaie trappings, and after he had ridden them to death with railing, leaue them on the dunghill for carion.⁷⁴

By referring to these base individuals as 'golden asses' Nashe immediately invites us to think of the eponymous hero of Apuleius's work. Lucius, the merchant turned ass, gets himself into trouble by behaving in an uncivilised manner. He does not learn his lessons, ignores the multiple warnings given to him and as a result ends up in his altered state. Nashe is equating the foolish, badly considered actions of Lucius with the people he encounters on a daily basis and who he believes are a

⁷⁴ Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Svpplication to the Divell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 242, lines 15-18

detriment to society. Nashe's interpretation of Apuleius's work at this point highlights the major difference between the two authors; whereas the Latin-language figure's story preaches salvation and forgiveness, with Lucius eventually gaining redemption, Nashe sees no hope for these wastrels and instead demands they be humiliated, and killed, either metaphorically or literally, and then abandoned as rubbish. They are to be given no opportunity to repent for they have no hope for redemption; rather Nashe appoints Aretino to be his executioner and dispose of these hopeless individuals. This re-enforces the idea that Nashe is able to take references and ideas from other authors but interpret and utilise them in a way completely contrary to their original meaning.

Having examined Apuleius, attention now needs to be focused on Lucian of Samosata, c.125 – c.180. *The Encyclopædia Britannica* introduces Lucian using words that could easily have been written about Nashe himself:

One is entirely dependent on Lucian's writings for information about his life, but he says little about himself—and not all that he says is to be taken seriously;⁷⁵

As previously noted, Lucian was the writer of *Lucius, or the Ass* and may have been Lucius of Patrae, author of *Metamorphoses* and the inspiration of Apuleius' work. The examination of Apuleius in relation to Nashe shows that there are related elements of Lucian's works that appear within the Elizabethan's oeuvre and as such

⁷⁵ The Editors of *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 'Lucian', *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Encyclopædia Britannica inc., April 21, 2018

this author demands to be examined in relation to Nashe. Lucian of Samosata was a Greek language rhetorician, pamphleteer and satirist born in what is now modern-day Turkey under the Roman Empire. *The Encyclopædia Britannica* notes

He became particularly familiar with the works of Homer, Plato, and the comic poets. So successfully did he master the Greek language (he was raised speaking Aramaic) and culture that he began a career as a public speaker, traveling from city to city giving model speeches and public lectures to display his eloquence and probably also pleading in court.

A prolific writer he is known to have written over 70 works, one of the most famous of these being his *Verae Historiae I* and *II* (*True Stories* also known as *True Histories*) which as a whole is commonly referred to as the first science fiction text.⁷⁶ As described by *The Encyclopædia Britannica* in this work

which starts by warning the reader that its events are completely untrue and impossible, Lucian describes a voyage that starts on the sea, continues in the skies, and includes visits to the belly of a whale and to heaven and hell; the tale is a satirical parody of all those fantastic travelers' tales that strain human credulity.

⁷⁶ There are various sources where this has been noted but I have specifically taken this from the introduction of *Lucian's Science Fiction Novel True Histories. Interpretation and Commentary*. For further information please refer to James Romm, Aristoula Georgiadou and David H.J. Larmour, *Lucian's Science Fiction Novel True Histories. Interpretation and Commentary* (Leiden: Brill, 1999)

Immediately there are comparisons to be drawn between this work and Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller* with Wilton's journey, despite being based solely in this plane, being no less fantastical given Nashe's deliberate inaccuracies with regards to the chronological order of historical events. And although Nashe in his introduction does not go as far as to describe his work of fiction as 'all kinds of lies [told] in a plausible and specious way'⁷⁷ his introduction does suggest a number of scatological uses for the book describing how Jack 'hath bequeathed for wast paper here amongst you...In anie case keepe them preciously as a *priuie* token of his good will towards you.'⁷⁸ There is a tongue in cheek yet tacit acknowledgement that this work is to be cherished less than his other productions and this comes from the fact it is wholly fiction as opposed to his pamphlets which are more grounded in reality and are not full of lies.

Lucian's work also became significant in other artistic fields. It is in his *Philopseudes* that the earliest version of *The Sorcerer's Apprentice* can be found; although there were some differences between this and Goethe's more famous 1779 work it is widely agreed that this was the piece that influenced the German.⁷⁹ Lucian also wrote *Menippus, or The Descent into Hades*; Menippus of Gadara has

⁷⁷ Lucian, *A True Story*, translated by A.M. Harmon, *Lucian*, Loeb Classical Library 1913, <http://www.sacred-texts.com/cla/luc/true/tru01.htm> accessed 30.08.2018

⁷⁸ Nashe, *The Unfortunate Traveller*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 2, p. 207, lines 8-10

⁷⁹ Reichling states categorically that the Goethe's works 'is exactly paralleled by the prose story from Lucian's *Philopseudes*' although other sources do note the differences between the two. For example, in his article 'Eucrates and Demainete: Lucian, *Philopseudes* 27-8' Ogden notes that Goethe had the apprentice giving life to a broom; in Lucian's version though it is mentioned that a broom can be enchanted, the protagonist chooses a pestle as his focus instead. For further information read Gerard Alston Reichling, 'A Demotic Folk-Tale the Basis of Goethe's *Der Zauberlehrling*', *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 39 (1919), pp. 295-298 and Daniel Ogden, 'Eucrates and Demainete: Lucian, *Philopseudes* 27-8', *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 54, No. 2 (Dec., 2004), pp. 484-493

been often noted as being a major influence on the Greek-language author and this work features the Cynic Satirist in conversations with Diogenes on a number of topics. The links between Lucian with the father of Menippean satire are important as this is a genre that satirists throughout the ages, including Apuleius and Nashe, have employed to great effect; although the authors Nashe admired covered a whole range of styles and genres the key figures were invariably proponents of satire. That Nashe's only novel shared characteristics with both Lucian's and Apuleius' works is unsurprising; the opportunity to produce a work of fiction that paid homage to two men who were early followers of Menippus was one that Nashe could not ignore. Hilliard takes an opposing position writing

The label that fits the work [*The Unfortunate Traveller*] best is Menippean satire, although there is no evidence that Nashe was conscious of this genre. Both Erasmus and More were influenced by Lucian, and Nashe followed them even if he does not show any direct knowledge of the ancient satirist.⁸⁰

However, this summary feels naïve at best. It is clear from any close reading of Nashe that he had knowledge of Lucian and to dismiss whether an author so versed in satire is unaware of the major forms of this genre seems both hasty and ill informed.

⁸⁰ Stephen S. Hilliard, *The Singularity of Thomas Nashe* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1986)

Looking at the links between Nashe and Lucian what can be noted is that Lucian appears by name only slightly more than his Latin-language contemporary. There are seven references to Lucian in Nashe's works; five of which appear in Nashe's lists where he is either responding to Harvey or is reeling of a number of names to make some kind of point. Three of these occasions, two in *Strange Newes* and one in *Haue With You to Saffron-Walden* where Lucian appears either at the head of lists where he is followed by 'Petrarch, Aretine, Pasquil'⁸¹ or among a plethora of other figures, are direct quotations from either Harvey's *Foure Letters and Certaine Sonnets* or his later work *Pierce's Supererogation* and as such are difficult to draw conclusions from. For the sake of completeness and for ease of reference I have noted below the names of those who appear next to Lucian on all five occasions:

Piece in which reference appears (with McKerrow reference)	Those who appear with Lucian:
<i>Strange Newes</i> (i.283.11)	Petrarch, Aretino, Pasquil - in response to Harvey's <i>Foure Letters</i>
<i>Strange Newes</i> (i.283.22)	Tully (Cicero), Horace, Archilochus, Aristophanes, Julian, Aretino
<i>Strange Newes</i> (i.284.1-2)	Petrarch, Aretino, Pasquil - in response to Harvey's <i>Foure Letters</i>

⁸¹ Nashe, *Strange Newes, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 284, lines 1-2 and 11

<i>Strange Newes</i> (i.285.13)	Julian, Aretino
<i>Haue With You to Saffron-Walden</i> (iii.126.1-3)	Socrates, Aristophanes, Epicharmus, Tully, Quintillian, Sanazarius, K Alphonsus, Cardan, Sir Thomas Moore, Isocrates - in response to a passage in <i>Pierce's</i> <i>Supererogation</i>

These lists are of limited interest or use to us; in the case of the three responses to Harvey they are proof that both Harvey was aware of these classical authors and Nashe was responding to him; proof that is not needed given that these authors were known to be required reading for any university student and Harvey, as a lecturer at Cambridge, would have had to know them. They also show that Harvey's attempts to belittle Nashe's knowledge of these authors were weak and ineffectual; Nashe responds by arguing that Harvey thinks he can write as well as the listed authors and the proof is to be found if you '*looke the first 156. Page of his Booke, & ye shal finde it so.*'⁸² Nashe only refers to Lucian because Harvey brings the classical author into the argument and there is no real significance in Nashe's citation of the Greek in these appearances. The relevance here comes from the fact that it was Harvey who chose to present these names to Nashe; as I shall discuss in later chapters Harvey utilises these lists as a way to either convince Nashe to exit the argument or to berate him. Harvey either knew or guessed that Lucian was an

⁸² Nashe, *Haue With You to Saffron-Walden*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 126, lines 3-4

author that Nashe admired and as such included him as a way of further antagonising his rival.

Of more significance are the remaining two references. The first of these appears in *The Anatomie of Absurditie* and refers to the deluge written about in *De Dea Syria*. Current critical thinking is that Lucian was not the author of this work; in Nashe's time there was no such debate over the work's authorship. The deluge itself, although appearing in a re-telling of the Greek myth of Deucalion, is essentially a biblical reference; Kraeling noted that the statement "'the earth discharged a vast volume of water and the rivers of heaven came down in streams"...is identical with P's in Gen. T: 11.'⁸³ and Nashe himself makes reference to 'Noes flodde.'⁸⁴ Nashe, however, also calls attention to Lucian, who he refers to as 'an Heathen poet',⁸⁵ framing this biblical story in a pagan manner referring to 'Deucalion's ark' and noting that '*Deucalions* Deluge is vnderstoode [to be] *Noes* flood.'⁸⁶ This is a further example of Nashe separating a person's religion from their ability as an author; although he was brought up in an Anglican household and had written on behalf of the bishops, Nashe was also able to give credit to those who did not share his views and was able to distinguish religious beliefs from ability. This goes deeper than his referencing of classical authors as at times Nashe praises the more contemporary Protestant Peter Ramus' work ethic or the morally lacking

⁸³ Emil G. Kraeling, 'Xisouthros, Deucalion and the Flood Traditions', *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 67, No. 3 (Jul. - Sep., 1947) pp. 177-183

⁸⁴ Nashe, *The Anatomie of Absurditie*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 28, line 11

⁸⁵ Nashe, *The Anatomie of Absurditie*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 29, line 24

⁸⁶ Nashe, *The Anatomie of Absurditie*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 29, line 28

and atheistic Aretino's satirical skills. He also appeared to have no difficulty both becoming friends with and working alongside Christopher Marlowe, a figure who has been accused of atheism as far back as the 1590's by Thomas Kyd, and whose religious leaning have been subject of some discussion since.⁸⁷ This shows that Nashe placed intellectual ability before religious proclivities; the aforementioned Aretino appears numerous times throughout Nashe's works but it is only the brief mention in *Strange Newes* that contains any note of censure. This is the same with Lucian; rather than decrying him for his heathen nature Nashe instead makes a brief mention of it and then rapidly moves on to what he feels are more significant and pressing issues. This reference also shows that Nashe's knowledge of Lucian is more than just superficial; it would be unsurprising that he was aware of *Verae Historiae* or even *Dialogi Deorum*; yet he also refers to the less well known *De Dea Syria* to make a further point. This also applies to Apuleius with Nashe equally comfortable citing *De Deo Socratis* as *Metamorphoses*; Nashe's eagerness to show himself as a learned man means that the full extent of his studies is never too far away from the surface.

Nashe's second reference to Lucian's works comes in *Have With You to Saffron-Walden* where he refers to *Dialogi Deorum* (*Dialogues of the Gods*).

⁸⁷ There has been much written about Marlowe's religious belief with the consensus being that, as with much of Marlowe's life, nothing can be satisfactorily concluded. Lukas Erne writes at length about how we should define Marlowe and sums this up effectively by arguing 'Was he an atheist? We don't know—but probably not, if by "atheist" we mean the modern sense of the word.' For further information on this point read Erne's article 'Biography, Mythography, and Criticism: The Life and Works of Christopher Marlowe', *Modern Philology*, Vol. 103, No. 1 (August 2005) 28-50. It should also be noted that Kyd's accusation of Marlowe was likely made in an effort of self-preservation but this is neither the time nor the place to discuss this.

Respondent notes that 'since I parted with him [Harvey] last, got him a Gentlewoman'⁸⁸ upon which Bentilovio then comments that both Respondent and Harvey talk at length about this woman but that he desires to

*see her unhukt and naked once, as Paris in Lucian's Dialogues, desires Mercury hee might see the three Goddesses naked, that stroue for the golden Ball.*⁸⁹

This is a reference to the classical story, The Judgement of Paris, where the Trojan hero has to choose which one of Hera, Athena, and Aphrodite was the most beautiful. What is of interest is that Nashe chooses to reference Lucian here rather than any one of the other versions that he would have been familiar with; the story first appears in Homer's *The Iliad*, albeit in a much truncated form, but was also retold by amongst others Ovid and Stasinos of Cyprus. Choosing Lucian could well have been have been another snipe at Harvey; Harvey refers to Lucian in his *Four Letters* and as previously mentioned was believed to have taught his works at Cambridge; there is no doubt he was an admirer of the classical author and yet when attacking Greene he notes that the Elizabethan was 'a contemner of God, and man: a desperate Lucianist: an abominable Aretinist: an Arch-Atheist'⁹⁰ placing Lucian alongside the heretical Aretino and diminishing the Greek by doing so. There is the suggestion that liking Lucian is a heretical act which Nashe may well have noted given his previous stance on the Greek author; Harvey's hypocrisy would be

⁸⁸ Nashe, *Haue With You to Saffron-Walden*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 120, lines 28-29

⁸⁹ Nashe, *Haue With You to Saffron-Walden*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 120, lines 31-34

⁹⁰ Gabriel Harvey, *Four Letters and Certaine Sonnets*, Early English Books Online, D2v

something that Nashe would not let pass without comment and choosing to reference Lucian here would have been to emphasise the point that the doctor was unreliable and untrustworthy.

Both Lucian and Apuleius had significant impact on Thomas Nashe and this goes beyond Nashe having knowledge of their works and referencing them in his own. In the case of Lucian it is clear that, despite Hilliard's doubts, he is closely linked with Nashe's collegiate life; he is often referenced in conjunction with Gabriel Harvey who it has already been established was likely to have been the man who introduced Nashe to this author. Apuleius was equally as known to Nashe and features heavily in his works but his usage is slightly different; Nashe does not use him as a point scoring mechanism but utilises not only *Metamorphoses* within his works but has been shown to be aware of Apuleius' other writings. In this sense there is a similarity between the treatment of the two classical authors; Nashe has looked deeply into the works of both men and has taken ideas proposed by Apuleius in works such as *De Deo Socrates* and Lucian's *Verae Historiae* and developed them further whilst remaining true to the Menippean format that both Apuleius and Lucian specialised in. It is the depth of use of these other less well-known works that show that both of these authors had a significant impact on the Elizabethan writer beyond the superficial understanding that has been discussed in the past. Although this may not have been as obvious as that of other authors such as Ovid or Aretino, the Numidian and Greek authors should not be swiftly dismissed as it is my belief that works such as *Pierce Penilesse* and *The Unfortunate Traveller* would not have existed as we know them today without the groundwork laid by

these two classical authors. Given that these two authors, alongside Ovid and Cicero, would have supplied some of Nashe's earliest exposure to satire and rhetoric their usage within his works shows that their impact was key in his early development of an authorial identity. Their fiction assisted Nashe in finding his own position and voice which later authors helped to develop further; without his early exposure to them, an exposure most likely supplied by Harvey, Nashe could well have had a very different identity.

Chapter Two - 'True English Aretine'; Nashe and Aretino.

In his pamphlet *Wits Miserie, and the Worlds Madness* Thomas Lodge in a passage lauding the great and good authors of the time describes his friend and fellow University Wit Thomas Nashe as the 'True English Aretine'⁹¹ directly comparing Nashe to the Italian satirist Pietro Aretino. This is high praise indeed as Aretino is regarded as one of the foremost proponents of satire in the era and had a significant effect on the authors of both his native Italy and renaissance England; in an article John Lothian discusses at length the similarities between the work of the Italian satirist and Shakespeare⁹² while Denise Walen notes that 'According to a brief reference in *American Notes and Queries*, allusions to both the *Ragionamenti* and to Aretino's *Sonetti* appear in the writing of Spenser, Robert Greene, Gabriel Harvey, Thomas Nashe, Thomas Lodge, John Marston, John Donne, Ben Jonson, Thomas Middleton, and others.'⁹³ Aretino's appeal to the literati of the English Renaissance is due in part to his varied career; he is described by his *Encyclopædia Britannica* page as an 'Italian poet, prose writer, and dramatist celebrated throughout Europe in his time for his bold and insolent literary attacks on the powerful'⁹⁴, appealing to a number of authors across a range of genres. In similar fashion *The Oxford Companion to English Literature* notes

⁹¹ Thomas Lodge, *Wits Miserie, and the Worlds Madness* (London: Adam Islip, 1596), this ref. H1r

⁹² John M. Lothian, 'Shakespeare's Knowledge of Aretino's Plays', *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 25, No. 4 (Oct., 1930), pp. 415-424

⁹³ Denise A. Walen, 'Constructions of Female Homoerotics in Early Modern Drama', *Theatre Journal*, Vol. 54, No. 3 (Oct., 2002), pp. 411-430, this ref. p. 414

⁹⁴ The Editors of *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 'Pietro Aretino', *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Encyclopædia Britannica inc., April 13 2018. All biographical information has been taken from this source unless otherwise stated

He was the author of five comedies and a tragedy and also satires and other works of a scandalous or licentious character. He is frequently mentioned in English works of the Elizabethan and later periods and differently appreciated, in comments ranging from 'It was one of the wittiest knaves God ever made' of Nashe...to 'that notorious ribald of Arezzo' of Milton.⁹⁵

That Lodge therefore sees Nashe as the English successor to the Italian's throne is unsurprising given that the nature of Nashe's work mirrors Aretino's and the impact the Italian had on the Englishman is evident in a number of Nashe's works. In this chapter I shall examine the output of both men looking specifically for references to Aretino in Nashe's prose as well as noting parallels between the two bodies of work⁹⁶ whilst also establishing how Nashe treats Aretino differently from the majority of the other writers he mentions. I shall discuss the obvious similarities between the two men; the description about the Italian taken from *The Encyclopædia Britannica* could easily apply to Nashe as he was a polygraph in a similar fashion to Aretino and began his career by becoming embroiled in the religiously charged Marprelate controversy taking the anti-Martinist stance, pro-Anglican stance while Aretino became famous by criticising Papal candidates and both men were unafraid to write about this highly controversial and politically

⁹⁵ Margaret Drabble, *The Oxford Companion to English Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1995) 5th Edition, this ref. p. 40

⁹⁶ A difficulty has been finding a good quality and reliable translation of Aretino's works; I have used the translation by Samuel Putnam who has translated *The Works of Aretino* and is available for viewing at <http://elfinspell.com/>.

charged subject. However, the connections between the two go beyond their writing about religion; I shall show that when examining Nashe's work there is a wealth of compelling evidence that illustrates the impact that the Italian had on his English counterpart. I shall look beyond the characteristics that both writers share and examine the difference in their upbringing to determine the reasons why the relatively cloistered, Cambridge educated son of an Anglican clergyman found a kindred spirit in the bastard son of a cobbler who was expelled from school and ran away from his home town of Arezzo to live a varied and controversial life and who fully lived up to his self-given nickname "*flagello dei principe*" or the "scourge of princes". In doing so I shall prove that despite their superficial differences Aretino's impact on Nashe was greater than has previously been considered and Nashe would not have developed his ideas and opinions on authorship without his exposure to the Italian satirist.

Pietro Aretino died in 1556, fully 11 years before Nashe was born, having travelled considerably around Italy; born in Arezzo, he spent the early part of his life in Rome before travelling around Northern Italy and eventually settling in Venice in around 1526, dying in the city in 1556. Nashe on the other hand was baptised in Suffolk, educated in Cambridge, and spent most of his life in the south east of England and died having never left the country. It is clear that even from their formative years and their early upbringing that Nashe and Aretino were markedly different people; Nashe was the son of an Anglican clergyman born to a stable home and well educated, firstly by his father and then subsequently at Cambridge; the Italian on the other hand was born a bastard and had no formal

education; Nashe even remarks upon this in *The Unfortunate Traveller*, writing 'that most of his learning hee got by hearing the lectures at Florence'.⁹⁷ Furthermore, despite these advantages, Nashe was never a rich man, finding and losing patrons in equal measures and ended his life having incurred the wrath of his former patron Archbishop Whitgift; this situation resulted in the Bishops' Ban which saw both himself and his great rival Gabriel Harvey being prohibited from writing or publishing any new works and all existing writing from the two men destroyed.⁹⁸ Conversely Aretino found profit in his writings and he did so in an unusual fashion; as El-Gabalawy notes 'Lodge draws a portrait of the lecherous politician, easily identified with Aretino, who relies on flattery, blackmail and sexual depravity to attain his ends'.⁹⁹ The Italian was noted for being manipulative and an almost Machiavellian individual who received a fair amount of notoriety for his actions. Pamela Cheek notes that 'Pietro Aretino, became the figure for drawing together writing's power to enflame illicitly with the idea that the writer who worked to this purpose for profit was the male equivalent of a "fille publique."'¹⁰⁰ She continues on to write 'A 1750 biography of Aretino pictures him setting out in life, quite literally, a clever young "bastard" who has failed to complete his study of rhetoric,

⁹⁷ Nashe, *The Unfortunate Traveller*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 2, p. 265, lines 3-4

⁹⁸ The bishops' ban of 1599 was more far substantial than purely banning the works of Nashe and Harvey although this was one of the more specific aspects of the law. In actual fact the implementation of the ban resulted in the prohibition of many works deemed lewd or pornographic. As McCabe notes in his piece *Elizabethan Satire and the Bishop's Ban of 1599* the ban encompassed more than erotica and seemed to be focused more on satire and satirical works. For further information about the ban I recommend reading Richard A. McCabe, 'Elizabethan Satire and the Bishops' Ban of 1599', *The Yearbook of English Studies*, Vol. 11, Literature and Its Audience, II Special Number (1981), pp. 188-193

⁹⁹ Saad El-Gabalawy, 'Aretino's Pornography and Renaissance Satire', *Rocky Mountain Review of Language and Literature*, Vol. 30, No. 2 (Spring, 1976), pp.87-99 this ref. p. 91

¹⁰⁰ Pamela Cheek, Prostitutes of "Political Institution", *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, Vol. 28, No. 2 (Winter, 1994-1995), pp. 193-219 this ref. p. 199

philosophy, and classical writing.¹⁰¹ showing that while the Italian was not revered by his fellow authors, he was well known and, more importantly, remained on cordial terms with his sponsors and could count amongst their number 'Francis I, Charles V, and...Henry VIII'.¹⁰² And this shows another difference between the two; despite his obvious literary talents Nashe could not replicate the Italian's successes and instead made a habit of falling out with patrons; the most significant of these being the aforementioned Archbishop of Canterbury and the resultant embargo on his works which brought Nashe's literary career to an untimely and ignominious end. Despite these differences even the most casual examination of Nashe's work demonstrates how the Italian writer exhibited a great influence on the Elizabethan author with the primary example of this being in the genres of literature that both authors specialised in. Aretino has been described as 'the leading man of letters in the 1530's and 1540's'¹⁰³ and, most pertinently as one who 'pre-eminently...writes as a satirist'.¹⁰⁴ This resonates with the works of Nashe whose most well-known works contain many satiric elements. These range from the light-hearted comments written about Edmund Spenser at the end of *Pierce Penilesse* where Nashe discusses the number of salutary verses that Spenser appends to *The Faerie Queen* in a barely disguised attempt to gain more sponsorship to the more celebrated attacks on the Harvey brothers that occur in the majority of his works.

¹⁰¹ Cheek, Prostitutes of "Political Institution", this ref. p. 199

¹⁰² David C. McPherson, 'Aretino and the Harvey-Nashe Quarrel', this ref. p. 1552

¹⁰³ Raymond B. Waddington, 'A Satirist's Impresa: The Medals of Pietro Aretino', *Renaissance Quarterly*, Vol. 42, No. 4 (Winter, 1989), pp. 655-681 this ref. p. 655

¹⁰⁴ Waddington, 'A Satirist's Impresa: The Medals of Pietro Aretino', this ref. p. 655

These attacks are most satirically obvious, though, in *Have With You To Saffron Walden* where Nashe begins by mimicking the style of Richard Lichfield, the barber-surgeon of Trinity College and therefore at least an associate of Gabriel Harvey and a man known for his parodies of scholarly speeches. The connection between Harvey and Lichfield has not been fully explored but given the nature of *The Trimming of Thomas Nashe*, the pamphlet written by Lichfield as a response to *Have With You* attacks Nashe, both as a person and an author, it is clear which side of the argument the barber can be placed on. The *Trimming* was in fact initially thought to be a Gabriel Harvey piece; as Griffin notes 'It was at one time assumed that Harvey was the author, but it is now accepted that Harvey has no connection with the *Trimming*'¹⁰⁵ although Sohmer takes an opposing view writing 'The polemic was likely written by Harvey, but the attribution is to his crony-barber, Richard Lichfield.'¹⁰⁶ Modern readers tend to share Griffin's viewpoint; however the relationship between Harvey and Lichfield is clear to see. Nashe addresses his prologue directly to Lichfield, introducing the barber in overly grandiose terms in a sly effort to belittle this member of Harvey's circle, referring to him as

The most Orthodoxall and reuerent Corrector of staring haire, the
sincere & *finigraphicall rarifier of prolixious rough barbarisme, the*
thrice egregious and censorial animaduertiser of vagrant

¹⁰⁵ Benjamin Griffin, 'Nashe's Dedicatees: William Beeston And Richard Lichfield', *Notes and Queries*, Volume 44, Issue 1, March 1997, Pages 47–49

¹⁰⁶ Steve Sohmer, 'Nashe and Harvey in Illyria', *Reading Shakespeare's Mind*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017), this ref. p. 122

*moustachios, chiefe scauinger of chins, and principall Head-man of
the parish wherein he dwells...*¹⁰⁷

However, Aretino was not just a satirist; indeed, it was his secondary career as a pornographer that probably caused McKerrow to so readily dismiss the Italian as an influence on the Elizabethan author. Aretino was equally as famous for his *Sonetti Lussuriosi* (Lust Sonnets), a series of sixteen sonnets written to accompany Marcantonio Raimondi's *I modi*, which as Fredrika Jacobs describes are 'a set of engravings based on Giulio Romano's graphic depictions of a wide and imaginative array of sexual positions',¹⁰⁸ as he was for his comedies like *Il Cortegiana*. This would offer some explanation as to why the son of a clergyman wrote 'the most overtly pornographic poem of the English Renaissance',¹⁰⁹ *The Choise of Valentines*, commonly referred to as 'Nashe's dildo' and a piece that is markedly different in tone from his other works. It is this piece which seems to have unsettled McKerrow the most; as Katherine Duncan-Jones comments 'However, he [McKerrow] presented the poem in a confused and visibly embarrassed manner' and notes that 'It occupies the penultimate place among Nashe's 'Doubtful Works'.¹¹⁰ What is of particular note here is that as Levine notes *The Choise of Valentines* was 'avowedly derived from Ovid...and implicitly from *Amores*','¹¹¹ Ovid is one of the authors Nashe

¹⁰⁷ Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron-Walden, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 5, lines 1-6

¹⁰⁸ Fredrika H. Jacobs, 'Aretino and Michelangelo, Dolce and Titian: Femmina, Masculo, Grazia' *The Art Bulletin*, Vol. 82, No. 1 (Mar., 2000), pp. 51-67 this ref. p. 53

¹⁰⁹ David O. Frantz, "Leud Priapians" and Renaissance Pornography, *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, Vol. 12, No. 1, The English Renaissance (Winter, 1972), pp. 157-172 this ref. p. 168

¹¹⁰ Katherine Duncan-Jones, 'City Limits: Nashe's 'Choise of Valentines' and Jonson's 'Famous Voyage', *The Review of English Studies*, New Series, Vol. 56, No. 224 (Apr., 2005), pp. 247-262 this ref. p. 247

¹¹¹ Jay Arnold Levine, "The Dissolution": Donne's Twofold Elegy, *ELH*, Vol. 28, No. 4 (Dec., 1961), pp. 301-315 this ref. p.302

consistently places alongside Aretino when attempting to establish the Italian's classical credentials; Nashe identifies a clear link between the two authors and sees Ovid and Aretino as authors who have followed a literary tradition – writing pornographic poetry – and appoints himself as the one most able to continue in the same vein. Despite all of this, critics historically have found it difficult to quantify Aretino's influence on Nashe with McKerrow noting that 'It is indeed true that Nashe often speaks in praise of Pietro Aretino, and even expresses a desire to imitate his style, though he fails to make it clear in what precise respect it seemed to him so admirable'¹¹² before concluding 'I have been unable to discover any points of similarity whatever between the work of the two writers.'¹¹³ Ignoring at this moment McKerrow's discomfort with the more salacious elements of the Italian's works, the biographer makes a valid point if he is referring to Nashe directly quoting from the Italian, yet even this is unsurprising; Nashe's direct quotations tend to come directly from Latin and Greek language classical literature, contemporary English, or translations of modern European languages with Nashe preferring to avoid using languages that the general public would be less familiar with and therefore lessening his impact on the literary scene. Keener notes that Nashe's endeavours would have exposed audiences to Aretino for the first time:

It is hard to say how many English people read these books at first, since they were only available in Italian, but it appears that Aretino

¹¹² McKerrow, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 5, p. 129

¹¹³ McKerrow, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 5, p. 129

soon came to embody "a newly available form of moral transgression." In the early 1590s, English writers such as Thomas Nashe and John Marston made this possible, channelling Aretino and giving English people who could not read the Italian an idea of what they were missing.¹¹⁴

What is intriguing is that Nashe may well have been exposed to Aretino by John Wolfe's editions of the Italian's works which were first produced in 1584¹¹⁵ I shall discuss Wolfe and Nashe's relationship in more detail in a later chapter but what should be noted here is that Aretino is first referenced by Nashe in 1592's *Pierce Penilesse*; neither of Nashe's two preceding works, *The Anatomie of Absurditie* or *The Preface to Robert Greene's Menaphon* have any mention of this writer despite Nashe taking the opportunity to name check many classical and modern authors in both of these pieces. This suggests that, given the frequency and the manner in which Nashe refers to the Italian in his following publications that at the time of writing these two works Nashe's knowledge of Aretino was minimal. The logical conclusion then is that Nashe only became enamoured with the Italian following Wolfe's publication of the majority of the Italian's works and McKerrow is correct in his assertion that there is no appropriating directly from the works of the Italian into Nashe's own writing for the aforementioned reasons. Despite this it can be

¹¹⁴ Andrew S. Keener, 'Robert Tofte's "Of Mariage and Wiuing" and the Bishops' Ban of 1599', *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 110, No. 3 (Summer, 2013), pp. 506-532 this ref. pp. 525-526

¹¹⁵ Soko Tomita's notes that John Wolfe published the first part of *Ragionamenti* in 1584 followed by the second part of this work and *La Cortigiana* in 1588. For further information please refer to Soko Tomita, *A Bibliographical Catalogue of Italian Books Printed in England 1558-1603* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), these refs appear on p.267, p. 314 and p.322

established that once having read these works, Aretino was never far from the Elizabethan writer's thoughts as the nature of his work is often echoed in that of Nashe. Aretino's early life which Folkerth describes as having 'an itinerancy that would have exhausted the hero of a picaresque novel'¹¹⁶ could easily have formed the basis of Nashe's only extant novel, the episodic journey through history *The Unfortunate Traveller*. The parallels between Nashe's hero, Jack Wilton and the young Italian are numerous; Aretino in his youth had a number of jobs including, among many others, "household servant, street singer and hostler. ";¹¹⁷ Wilton may have begun and ended his story on the battlefield but in between he acts as page to the Earl of Surrey in a role that at one point involved squiring for him at a tournament as well as seeing to his everyday needs. Jack for a time actually pretended to be the Earl himself both with and without his master's consent; an act that has a parallel with the time Aretino 'wandered for a time impersonating a mendicant friar.'¹¹⁸ Wilton spent the largest part of his journey in Italy travelling to various cities including Rome and Venice which are both places where Aretino is known to have spent substantial amounts of time; he lived in Rome on at least two separate occasions before eventually exiling himself for the last 30 years of his life to Venice where, in Nashe's novel, the two fortuitously cross paths. All these similarities cannot be simply put down to coincidence; if Aretino and Wilton shared

¹¹⁶ Wes Folkerth, 'Pietro Aretino, Thomas Nashe and Early Modern Rhetorics of Public Address', *Making Publics in early modern Europe: people, things forms of knowledge* ed. by Bronwen Wilson and Paul Yachnin, New York: Routledge 2010, 68-78 this ref. p. 69

¹¹⁷ Folkerth, 'Pietro Aretino, Thomas Nashe and Early Modern Rhetorics of Public Address', this ref. p. 69

¹¹⁸ Folkerth, 'Pietro Aretino, Thomas Nashe and Early Modern Rhetorics of Public Address', this ref. p. 69

only one or two common aspects then this could be dismissed as just that but there are too many parallels for this to be case. It can also be seen that Nashe is more comfortable as a pamphleteer than a writer of traditional 'fiction'; other than *The Unfortunate Traveller*, traditionally his only foray into this world is the play *Summer's Last Will and Testament* which with it's lengthy speeches, lack of action and minimal dialogue, feels closer in nature to one of his lengthy pamphlets and treatises rather than a work of imagination in the mould of Marlowe or Jonson. Nashe would have learned of the biographical details of the Italian's life and basing Wilton's fictional exploits on these would allow him to more comfortably and easily enter this genre and ultimately produce his only novel.

Moving away from the parallels between Wilton and Aretino and looking specifically at Nashe's writing it is evident that McKerrow's original assertion that Nashe 'fails to make it clear in what precise respect it seemed to him so admirable'¹¹⁹ is inaccurate. In most of his major works there is at least one mention of the Italian satirist and these mentions are mostly favourable with Nashe comparing the relatively modern writer to classical greats such as Ovid, Homer and Cicero. For example the first reference Nashe explicitly makes to Aretino is in his 1592 work *Pierce Penilesse* where after the Knight of the Post has left Pierce the author drops out of character to directly address his audience writing 'We want an *Aretine* here among vs, that might strip these golden asses out of their gaie

¹¹⁹ McKerrow, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 5, p. 129

trappings’;¹²⁰ Nashe has observed the world and is calling for someone to right the wrongs he has discovered. He notes that

Alas, it is easie for a goodlie tall fellow that shineth in his silks, to
come and out face a poore simple Pedant in a thred bare cloake and
tell him his booke is prety, but at this time he is not provided for
him.¹²¹

Nashe continues by describing how the poor author is taken advantage of by the richer patron and the difficulty the writer has in getting fair payment for his work and notes how he wants someone to right these wrongs and put these miscreants into their deserved place. And this is a task that Nashe, an author not known for his humility, feels is beyond him but requires the touch of a greater writer and his choice betrays his feelings: that this is an author that he obviously admires and aspires to be like. And even death will not stop Nashe from entreating Aretino; Nashe states 'I will write to his ghost by my carrier, and I hope hele repaire his whip, and vse it against our English Peacokes.'¹²² With this statement Nashe is referring to Aretino within the story of *Pierce Penilesse*; the indication is that the carrier to whom he is referring must be the Knight of the Post who has already been established as one of the devil's emissaries; the conclusion therefore is that Aretino inhabits the same realm as the devil and has been cast down to hell. This

¹²⁰ Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Svpplication to the Divell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 242, lines 15-18

¹²¹ Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Svpplication to the Divell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 241, lines 21-24

¹²² Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Svpplication to the Divell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 242, lines 18-20

shows a variation on a theme that Nashe revisits on numerous occasions in his works; that normally if an author produces high quality work Nashe is willing to overlook their religious beliefs in order to praise them. However, the Italian's shortcomings go beyond his religious beliefs with Hilliard noting that Aretino had a reputation as a blackmailer:

...Aretino had made his reputation naming names. Rather than begging, he extorted support from patrons, as Nashe does when he threatens retaliation against anyone who sends him 'away with a Flea in mine eare'.¹²³

The Nashe equivalence is inaccurate; although he does threaten retribution to those who cross him there is no suggestion that, unlike his Italian predecessor, Nashe will stay his pen for financial gain and instead the Elizabethan found his reward by silencing his critics. Given Aretino's dubious morality and alongside his equally questionable religious leanings, it is no surprise that, although he idolises the author, Nashe can imagine the Italian taking up residence alongside the devil in hell and in this instance, he takes a different tack than normal and instead writes how, despite Aretino being a superior writer with the skills to rectify many issues he is unable to completely excuse the Italian's religious and moral failings. This is supported by the section of *Strange Newes* that I have previously discussed in Chapter One in relation to Lucian where Nashe writes,

¹²³ Stephen S Hilliard, *The Singularity of Thomas Nashe* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1986)

Lucian, Iulian, Aretine, all three admirably blest in the abundant
giftes of art and nature...I protest, were you ought else but
abominable Atheistes, I would obstinately defende you, onely
because *Laureate Gabriell* articles against you.

In this quotation Nashe presents the three controversial figures ostensibly to discuss how much he admires their skills and abilities before tempering his position and explaining how their stance against the 'correct' religion has caused them and their output to be diminished. Yet even this stance is trumped by Nashe's anti-Harvey fervour; even without the advantage of their abilities Nashe acknowledges he would support these controversial figures to spite his rival; this is very much a case of an enemy of Harvey being automatically a friend of Nashe. Nashe is referring to Harvey's passage from *Four Letters* where the doctor writes

One Ouid was too much for Roome; and one Greene too much for
London: but one Nashe more intollerable then both: not bicause his
witt is anye thinge comparable, but bicause his will is more
outragious. Ferrara could scarcely brooke Mandarus, a poysonous
Phisitian: Mantua hardly beare Pomponatius, a poysonous
Philosopher Florence more hardly tollerate Macchiauel, a poysonous
politician: Venice most hardly endure Arretine, a poysonous ribald.¹²⁴

Hadfield notes of this:

¹²⁴ Harvey, *Pierces Supererogation*, this ref. G1r

It is hard to gauge the exact level of Harvey's irony here, and he is clearly being sly and double-edged in an attempt to trade punches with Nashe. The Italian writers that he cites, Machiavelli and Aretino, were published by John Wolfe, Harvey's own publisher, who had produced *Pierces Supererogation* and with whom Harvey enjoyed an especially close working relationship, one he was happy to advertise in print.¹²⁵

Hadfield is correct as there is clearly an element of Harvey being cunning here, especially given that in earlier works the Doctor commended the Italian satirist, writing in a letter to Spenser that

Extra iocum, I like your *Dreames* passingly well: and the rather, because they sauour of that singular extraordinarie veine and inuention, whiche I euer fancied moste, and in a manner admired onelye in *Lucian*, *Petrarche*, *Aretine*, *Pasquill*, and all the most delicate, and fine conceited Grecians & Italians.¹²⁶

Nashe, however, has chosen to take this as it is presented and as such positioned himself next to Aretino, Lucian and Julian on one side of the argument because Harvey is on the other. There is no reason not to take Nashe's word and accept his

¹²⁵ Andrew Hadfield, 'Lenten Stufte: Thomas Nashe and the fiction of travel', *The Yearbook of English Studies*, Vol. 41, No. 1, Travel and Prose Fiction in Early Modern England (2011), pp. 68-83 this ref. pp. 73-74

¹²⁶ Gabriel Harvey, *Three proper, and wittie, familiar letters: lately passed betweene tvvo vniuersitie men: touching the earthquake in Aprill last, and our English reformed versifying With the preface of a wellwiller to them both*, London: H Bynneman 1580, this ref p. F1r

representation of himself as a religious individual who is troubled by, yet willing to overlook, Aretino's lack of faith; after all, Nashe is the son of an Anglican preacher and came to prominence by defending his faith and his bishops in the Marprelate controversy. However, as I have previously shown with Lucian and as is also certainly the case with Aretino, Nashe is laudatory in the majority of his references to these men and in these instances, where he is criticising these figures and their religious leanings, Nashe appears to be merely paying lip service to the idea that their being 'atheist' lessens them and makes them less worthy of praise; it is more convincing to believe that his more genuine opinions can be seen in the other and significantly more numerous passages where he acclaims them.

In the above example Nashe discusses Aretino in the same breath and in the same manner as Lucian and Julian; however, this is not his normal practice when referring to the Italian as the treatment of Aretino is different from how he refers to most other historical figures. With men like Ovid and Cicero, Nashe presents quotations from their works and speeches throughout his canon both fortifying his own work but also exhibiting the breadth of his classical knowledge and formal education. In a similar vein when more contemporary figures are, almost incidentally, introduced in *The Unfortunate Traveller* their inclusion appears to give Nashe's novel more weight but ultimately add very little to the ongoing narrative. Erasmus and Sir Thomas More for example are introduced and dismissed over the course of three or four passing references; Wilton describes meeting the two in Rotterdam where

we met with aged learnings chiefe ornament, that abundant and
superingenious clarke, *Erasmus*, as also with merrie *Sir Thomas*
More, our Countriman, who was come purposelie ouer a little before
vs to visite the said graue father *Erasmus*.¹²⁷

These two historically significant men are placed into Nashe's story as another way to display his learning; this knowledge is presented in a manner in a very off hand manner and the story gains nothing from their presence other than showing that Nashe was very concerned with showing his audience just how well read and well educated he was. Aretino's appearance in this work, on the other hand, is much more significant than those who preceded him as he directly impacts the plot; when he appears Wilton and the Earl of Surrey have encountered trouble in Venice and have been sent to prison and it takes the intercession of a fictional character, John Russell, alongside the more genuine Aretino to obtain their freedom. The way that Aretino is introduced here is vastly different from the way in which the others are described; whereas More is announced as 'wittie' or 'Quick Witted' and Erasmus is 'abundant and superingenious' Nashe gives the Italian a far lengthier and more detailed introduction:

Monsieur *Petro Aretino* searcher and chiefe Inquisiter for the
colledge of curtizans. Diuerse and sundrie waies was
this *Aretine* beholding to the king of England, especially for by this

¹²⁷ Nashe, *The Unfortunate Traveller, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 2, p. 245, lines 22-26

foresayd master *Iohn Russell*, a little before, he had sent him a pension of foure hundred crownes yerely during his life.¹²⁸

With this introduction Nashe is making it clear that he is not only acquainted with the Italian as an author but that his knowledge goes beyond an awareness of his writing; he is also aware of less obvious biographical details including his interactions with Henry VIII. McPherson says about the relationship between the King and the author that 'There was some immediate correspondence, but the main transactions were Aretino's dedication of a volume of letters to Henry in 1542, and Henry's reward four years later, a gift of seventy-five pounds' which, although not the exact amount that Nashe describes, supports the claim of an annual 400 crown bursary as described in the passage above.¹²⁹

There is further significance in the manner in which Aretino is spoken about here. Nashe first establishes the Italian's importance in Jack's release from prison and then quickly takes an interlude from Jack's story writing:

Before I goe anie further, let me speake a word or two of this *Aretine*. It was one of the wittiest knaues that euer God made. If out of so base a thing as inke there may bee extracted a spirite, hee writ with nought but the spirite of inke, and his stile was the

¹²⁸ Nashe, *The Unfortunate Traveller, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 2, p. 264, lines 4-9

¹²⁹ David C. McPherson, 'Aretino and the Harvey-Nashe Quarrel', *PMLA*, Vol. 84, No. 6 (Oct., 1969), pp. 1551-1558 this ref. p. 1552

spiritualitie of artes, and nothing else; whereas all others of his age were but the lay temporalitie of inkehorne tearmes.¹³⁰

Hilliard comments about this passage:

Nashe also goes 'clean out of his way' to include another of his literary heroes, the satirist Aretino, "one of the wittiest knaves that ever God made". Jack praises his style and his rhetorical powers...Again the praise mirrors Nashe's own program as a writer...¹³¹

This shows that Nashe is constantly drawing parallels between himself and the earlier writer. This is not Nashe's normal technique; he shows reverence to those he respects while at the same time stating how he desires to be like them; in this instance he goes beyond this is instead saying how similar and effective he is to Aretino. Hilliard continues by noting,

Jack denies that Aretino penned an atheistic work attributed to him and excuses his lascivious works as youthful indiscretions. Aretino's effectiveness is contrasted with the Puritan diatribes of Nashe's own day: 'Puritans, spue forth the venome of your dull inventions. A toade swells with thicke troubled poison, you swell with poisonus perturbations; your malice hath not a cleere dram of anie inspired

¹³⁰ Nashe, *The Unfortunate Traveller, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 2, p. 264, lines 19-25

¹³¹ Hilliard, *The Singularity of Thomas Nashe*, this ref. pp. 133-134

disposition" (266). In this way Nashe links the praise of the Italian satirist with his own program as Aretino's English counterpart.¹³²

Hilliard's point is well made but does not go far enough; Nashe identifies more with the writings of this avowed atheist and notorious extortionist than he does with the more extreme arm of his own religion and his knowledge of the Italian and his work gives him more weapons to attack his opponents. Nashe disagrees with these Puritans, not only for their message, but also their manner of presenting it; he prefers Aretino's well presented if ethically questionable approach and sees kinship with the Italian despite their vastly different religious views.

Nashe follows his opening comments to Aretino with a series of remarks which pay tribute to the Italian and his skills; Nashe talks at length about his brilliance clearly indicating the influence of the Italian and leaving no doubt that the Elizabethan author desires to be considered in the same breath as Aretino. This passage covers almost 70 lines and is full of compliments and praise, the like of which Nashe does not repeat with respect to anyone else. In a later chapter I shall discuss the numerous praiseworthy mentions that Spenser receives from Nashe over the course of his career but, although greater in number these are all much shorter; Aretino gets this prolonged series of commendations in one solid paragraph in which Nashe covers many topics discussing the Italian's learning, his

¹³² Hilliard, *The Singularity of Thomas Nashe*, this ref. p. 134

treatment of royalty, and his impact on others amongst many other subjects. He writes

Princes hee spard not, that in the least point transgrest. Hys life he
contemned in comparison of the libertie of speech... The French king,
Frances the first, he kept in such awe, that to chaine his tongue he
sent him a huge chaine of golde in the forme of tongues fashioned.
Singularly hath he commented of the humanitie of Christ.¹³³

At every opportunity and in every regard Nashe finds some way to praise the Italian causing Wilton/Nashe to revisit what he already knows and amend his perceptions; later in the passage he writes 'I neuer thought of Italy more religiously than England till I heard of thee'¹³⁴ in direct contrast to the opinion he represented earlier in his career when he wrote in *Preface*, admittedly not about Aretino, that

Tush, say our English Italians, the finest wits our climate sends forth
are but drie brained dolts in comparison of other countries: whom if
you interrupt with *redde rationem*, they will tell you of *Petrarch*,
Tasso, *Celiano*, with an infinite number of others; to whom if I should
oppose *Chaucer*, *Lydgate*, *Gower*, with such like, that liued vnder the
tyranny of ignorance, I do thinke their best louers would be much
discontented with the collation of contraries, if I should write ouer all
their heads, Haile fellow, well met. One thing I am sure of, that these

¹³³ Nashe, *The Unfortunate Traveller*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 2, p. 265, lines 9-11 & 29-32

¹³⁴ Nashe, *The Unfortunate Traveller*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 2, p. 266, lines 14-15

three haue vaunted their meeters with as much admiration in English
as euer the proudest *Ariosto* did his verse in Italian.¹³⁵

Aretino was not even mentioned in this piece with Nashe's Italian touchstone being the poet Ariosto, coincidentally the man who gave Aretino his 'flagello dei principe (Scourge of Princes)' nickname. In five years Nashe went from being apparently unaware of the Italian to becoming one of his greatest proponents. I shall discuss the specific references Nashe makes to Aretino below – however Nashe's respect for the Italian is also exhibited in other, subtler ways. For example, Aretino's *Ragionamenti* is a pair of dialogues between a grandmother and her granddaughter in which the two discuss the potential options available to the younger woman's mother including becoming a courtesan. This has resonance with two of the Elizabethan authors works – firstly this is a device Nashe uses in *Have With You* although with considerably different subject matter with Harvey's letters being discussed by Nashe's various personas. Secondly the work involves a discussion around the life of a prostitute – a vocation that Aretino also writes about at length in *La Cortigiana* (The Courtesan) and in Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller* courtesan's play significant roles within the narrative with both positive and negative effect. In Venice, for example, the courtesan Tabitha attempts to have the Earl of Surrey killed but is executed herself; later Juliana, who is the Pope's mistress,

¹³⁵ Nashe, *Preface to Robert Greene's Menaphon, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 322, lines 17-29

assists Jack and Diamante but ends up getting robbed by the two as a consequence.

Finally, as May argues, Diamante herself is referred to as a courtesan – he notes

Jack repeatedly calls Diamante a "courtesan," but she does not appear to ply the trade. She is a "courtesan" in the same sense that Nashe is "dishonest": they reshape conventions and thereby open themselves up to criticism, but finally return to convention in the end.¹³⁶

These three women are three of the main female characters within the novel and are all defined by their positions as courtesans and as such it is impossible not to see Aretino's influence on Nashe and how the Italian author impacted on his Elizabethan counterpart.

The extent of Aretino's impact on Nashe is confirmed in the preface to *Nashe's Lenten Stuffe* where Nashe removes all doubt as to the impression that the Italian made on him when he writes

Let me speake to you about my huge woords which I vse in this booke, and then you are your own men to do what you list. Know it is my true vaine to be *tragicus Orator*, and of all stiles I most affect & striue to imitate *Aretines*...¹³⁷

¹³⁶ Steven R. Mentz, 'The Heroine as Courtesan: Dishonesty, Romance, and the Sense of an Ending in *The Unfortunate Traveler*', *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 98, No. 3 (Summer, 2001), pp. 339-358 this ref. p. 354

¹³⁷ Nashe, *Nashe's Lenten Stuffe*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 152, lines 5-12

Although Nashe refers to Aretino in a number of his other works it is only here in what becomes his farewell piece that Nashe acknowledges that his aim is to follow in the Italian's footsteps. The significance of this statement cannot be understated; throughout this thesis I shall discuss a number of figures from whom Nashe has taken inspiration but Aretino is the only one who Nashe explicitly says he wishes to be like. Even the great classical authors that I have not included in this study - men like Ovid whose *Amores* is the basis of Nashe's *The Choise of Valentines* or Cicero, who according to McKerrow is referenced just under thirty times in *The Works* - are praised but never in the same manner. Both of these figures, along with a number of other, well-known classical authors are referred to in the same section of *The Unfortunate Traveller* and placed behind Aretino with Nashe declaring 'Tully, Virgil, Ouid, Seneca were neur such ornaments to Italy as thou hast bin.'¹³⁸ Only Spenser, who is equally significant in Nashe's development garners the same level of respect as the Italian but the treatment of the two is quite different. Spenser is identified as someone with great skills and abilities and is presented as an achievable target for Nashe to aspire to be like; the impression that Nashe gives when he discusses Aretino is that this writer has almost supernatural abilities and when Nashe writes about him, the Elizabethan becomes so overwhelmed by respect that the Italian seems to usurp Nashe's pen.

¹³⁸ Nashe, *The Unfortunate Traveller, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 2, p. 266, lines 12-14

The passage from *Nashe's Lenten Stuffe* continues with the Elizabethan expanding on his appreciation for the Italian stating that other writing styles do not appeal to him and that Aretino's satirical bent is the purest form:

not caring for this demure soft *mediocre genus*, that is like water and
wine mixt together; but giue me pure wine of it self, & that begets
good bloud and heates the brain thorowly...¹³⁹

Nashe values Aretino's style of writing above all others and it is his type of satirical prose that can affect both body and mind; Aretino's words have power and can be used to fortify both physically and spiritually. Nashe describes how Aretino's words have an impact on the reader and audience; in this instance he is accentuating the positive effects of Aretino's works but in *The Unfortunate Traveller* he points out how the Italian's skills were utilised for less gentle pursuits. Nashe chooses to portray Aretino in a very militaristic manner; in his description of the Italian's style he identifies him as more than just a passive writer and that he uses his words as a weapon. In Nashe's view there is nothing peaceful about Aretino; rather he is man of violence with many deadly tools at his disposal:

His pen was sharp pointed lyke a poinyard; no leafe he wrote on but
was lyke a burning glasse to set on fire all his readers. With more
than musket shot did he charge his quill, where hee meant to
inueigh. No houre but hee sent a whole legion of deuils into some

¹³⁹ Nashe, *Nashe's Lenten Stuffe*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 152, lines 9-12

heard of swine or other. If *Martiall* had ten muses (as he saieth of himselfe) when he but tasted a cup of wine, he had ten score when he determined to tyrannize: nere a line of his but was able to make a man drunken with admiration. His sight pearst like lightning into the entrailles of all abuses.¹⁴⁰

Nashe writes that Aretino's satiric jibes are not just meant as playful banter but are designed to have a lasting and damaging effect; a target of Aretino's is a target in more than one sense of the word. Nashe calls forth violent and aggressive images of sharp pointed poniards, small slender daggers designed for stabbing and piercing which would enable the wielder to make precise and damaging wounds. Alongside these Nashe imagines Aretino's words to also resemble something more broadly damaging than a standard musket shot showing Aretino as a soldier with the ability to both bludgeon and strike accurately at his disposal and that he can pick whichever one suits the situation. As Badcoe notes

The ability of satire to pierce, scourge, and inflame the reader is deeply embedded in Nashe's concept of what it means to fashion a living in print and is given voice in his praise of the Italian satirist Aretino, a figure of intercession for satirists everywhere...¹⁴¹

¹⁴⁰ Nashe, *The Unfortunate Traveller, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 2, pp. 264-265, lines 26+

¹⁴¹ Tamsin Theresa Badcoe, "'As many Ciphers without an I': Self-Reflexive Violence in the Work of Thomas Nashe', *Modern Philology*, Vol. 111, No. 3 (February 2014), pp. 384-407, this ref. p. 392

Nashe sees the Italian as the prime proponent of this style of writing; he identifies him as a warrior and celebrates that he wields a violent pen. This kind of bloody, martial language is reminiscent of earlier parts of *The Unfortunate Traveller* where, as Fleck has noted, Nashe shows an almost unhealthy obsession with dismemberment on the battlefields. Fleck writes about the scenes that occur at the Münster rebellion that 'this brutal episode exemplifies Nashe's often gruesome focus on the body, especially the body reduced to its parts, here and throughout *The Unfortunate Traveller*.'¹⁴² This fixation with the body is never more apparent than when Nashe describes the dismemberment of Cutwolfe taking great pains in making sure that the reader is fully aware of the severity of the punishment for the guilty cobbler;

No ioint about him but with a hatchet he had for the nones he
disioynted halfe, and then with boyling lead souldered vp the
wounds from bleeding; his tongue he puld out, least he should
blaspheme in his torment: venimous stinging wormes hee thrust into
his eares, to keep his head rauingly occupied: with cankers scrused to
peeeces hee rubd his mouth and his gums; no lim of his but was
lingeringly splinterd in shiuers.¹⁴³

Nashe actually seems to be delighting in the manner in which the capable executioner inflicts physical pain on the guilty man to such a degree that the

¹⁴² Andrew Fleck, 'Anatomizing the Body Politic: The Nation and the Renaissance Body in Thomas Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller*', *Modern Philology*, Vol. 104, No. 3 (February 2007), pp. 295-328, this ref. p. 296

¹⁴³ Nashe, *The Unfortunate Traveller*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 2, p. 327, lines 16-23

passage becomes almost pornographic in nature with the author lingering lasciviously over the gory details. What is also evident though is the similarity between the way Nashe describes the physical dismemberment of Cutwolfe and the way in which he talks about Aretino. In both cases Nashe is impressed by the way the subject is wounded and pierced; in both cases the work of the 'executioner' is not immediately fatal but instead has a lasting and devastating on his target and the true punishment is not the death of Cutwolfe but the torture that comes before it. It is here we see a parallel with one of Aretino's more famous pieces; in act 1 of *La Cortigiana* (The Courtesan) Rosso demands Fisherman is 'strapped to the *colonna* [column]'.¹⁴⁴ When Fisherman returns at the end of the act he talks at length about his punishment saying 'two hours they held me bound to the Colonna as one bewitched, with all the world around me, flaying me, pounding me, and striking at me.'¹⁴⁵ As with Nashe, Aretino ensures the reader is aware of the pain that has been inflicted on the victim although in the Italian story the torture does not lead to death; instead Fisherman is subjected to his punishment as a means of curing his supposed insanity. However, there is an obvious similarity in the two authors' fascination with torture and pain which both reinforces the opinion that throughout his career Nashe desired to ape Aretino and shows that when Nashe was thinking of the Italian, he was not considering him to be an emissary of peace but as one who would violently resolve any disputes. Yet

¹⁴⁴ Pietro Aretino, *La Cortigiana*, translated by Samuel Putnam, Act 1, section 180, <http://www.elfinspell.com/PutnamAretinoCourtezan.html>

¹⁴⁵ Aretino, *La Cortigiana*, Act 1, section 187

even while doing so Nashe was also sure to present Aretino to be more than a hot-witted man of violence but as a well-educated, well-spoken individual. In this same section of *The Unfortunate Traveller* Nashe declares,

It is sufficient that learning he had, and a conceit exceeding all learning, to quintessence euerie thing which hee heard. He was no timerous seruile flatterer of the commonwealth wherein he liued. His tongue & his inuention were foreborne; what they thought, they would confidently vtter.¹⁴⁶

Gohlke notes about this passage that

The figure of Aretino is the locus for this reconciliation. Aretino, who is introduced as "one of the wittiest knaues that euer God made", provides a model for the exercise of wit in a moral and specifically verbal way. It is he who rescues Jack from his first imprisonment by exposing the sinister designs of Tabitha. Aretino's wit, which finds ideal expression in his role as inquisitor, acts as a kind of moral flail, earning him the posthumous title of "il flagello dei principi."¹⁴⁷

This supports the position that Aretino was able to gain Wilton's release using only his words, as his words were more effective than the actions of those around him. Furthermore, Nashe's words could also be read, not only as praise aimed at the Italian, but also as Nashe's own mission statement setting out what he aspires to

¹⁴⁶ Nashe, *The Unfortunate Traveller*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 2, p. 265, lines 4-9

¹⁴⁷ Madelon S. Gohlke, 'Wits Wantonness: *The Unfortunate Traveller* as Picaresque', *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 73, No. 4 (Oct., 1976), pp. 397-413 this ref. pp. 408-409

be. Nashe is at this stage continuing to develop his own authorial identity and moving away from the writers of his college years; it is no surprise he will have been attracted to, and expresses admiration for, a writer who represents a style he wishes to adopt.

I have written about how Nashe discusses Aretino in *Pierce Penilesse*, *The Unfortunate Traveller* and *Nashe's Lenten Stuffe* but equally important as what Nashe says is the manner in which these words are presented. In both *The Unfortunate Traveller* and *Pierce Penilesse*, Nashe breaks out of his main narrative, halting his tale's flow so he can talk about the Italian and his strengths, and then just as quickly returns to the story and Aretino's place within it. Nashe also makes it very clear that it is not Jack Wilton but the author himself who wishes 'Peace to thy Ghost, and yet me thinks so indefinite a spirit should haue no peace or intermissions of paines, but be penning ditties to the archangels of another world'.¹⁴⁸ Not only is there a definite change in the narrative voice but Nashe also signposts this departure from the plot by writing 'Before I goe anie further, let me speake a word or two of this *Aretine*'¹⁴⁹ which plainly indicates we are no longer hearing the unfortunate traveller's story but the next lines are extradiegetic and more representative of the author himself. As Hilliard notes, there is a clear connection between the two authors':

Nashe prided himself on his singular wit and prized the faculty in others. We need look no further than the praise for Aretino in *The*

¹⁴⁸ Nashe, *The Unfortunate Traveller*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 2, p. 266, lines 15-18

¹⁴⁹ Nashe, *The Unfortunate Traveller*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 2, p. 264, lines 19-20

Unfortunate Traveller, which, given Aretino's notoriety, amounted to defiance of the commonplace strictures on wit and singularity.

Although it is Jack who praises Aretino, there is no suggestion that the praise is to be discounted because of its source.¹⁵⁰

In *Pierce Penilesse* Nashe employs a similar device introducing the Italian into this work seemingly out of nowhere to elect him as the one who can put the country back on the right path. It is again important to note that Nashe is choosing an Italian to do this; a direct contrast to his words five years earlier in *Preface* where he announces 'I would preferre diuine Master *Spencer*, the miracle of wit, to bandie line by line for my life in the honour of England against Spaine, Fraunce, Italy and all the world.'¹⁵¹ When added to his overt declaration in *Nashe's Lenten Stuffe* that it is Aretino that he wishes to be like above all else this is a great weight of evidence to suggest that it is the Italian more than any of Nashe's pre-Elizabethan inspirations who had the most impact on him. Despite his flaws Aretino's writing struck a chord with Nashe and caused him to try and write the same type of satire. The importance and relevance of the Italian mean that Nashe is compelled on two occasions to halt his narrative just to reiterate how accomplished and influential Aretino was and how much of an impact he had on the younger author. And when the Italian is referenced in both *Pierce Penilesse* and *The Unfortunate Traveller* there is also the sense that Nashe feels the world would be a much better place if

¹⁵⁰ Hilliard, *The Singularity of Thomas Nashe*, this ref. p. 146

¹⁵¹ Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Supplication to the Diuell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 322, lines 34

¹⁵¹ Nashe, *The Unfortunate Traveller*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 2, p. 266, lines 13-14

Aretino was still alive; as this is an impossibility the world needs a new Aretino to take up the mantle and make sure that those who have transgressed were taken to task. The natural conclusion is that the rampant egotist Nashe is offering himself to fulfil this role, but if he is doing so, he does this in an uncharacteristically covert manner, not explicitly stating his credentials but subtly aping the Italian showing he has learned well from the man he admires. Additionally, throughout *The Unfortunate Traveller* there are constant references to Aretino's qualities and those who misunderstood him; it is here where Nashe places the Italian alongside the classical authors Cicero, Virgil, Ovid and Seneca and finds these long dead authors wanting in comparison. The complete Aretino section of *The Unfortunate Traveller* should be read as a tribute to the Italian with Nashe concluding this part by proclaiming '*Aretine*, as long as the world liues shalt thou liue'.¹⁵² Having praised the Italian Nashe then makes it clear that we are returning to the main story by writing 'My principall subiect pluckes me by the elbow...'¹⁵³ and then continuing with the narrative as if the previous pause had not happened. This re-iterates that Nashe seems to have been so overwhelmed by his predecessor that he must break from the story in order to lionize him. It shows a consistency of thought and feeling that does not repeat itself too often in Nashe's writing career to both his friends and enemies; I will discuss in later chapters the lengths in which he both praises and distances himself from Marlowe and Greene while he also famously attempted to apologise to his great enemy Gabriel Harvey in *Christ's Teares Over Jerusalem*

¹⁵² Nashe, *The Unfortunate Traveller*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 2, p. 266, lines 11-12

¹⁵³ Nashe, *The Unfortunate Traveller*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 2, p. 266, line 23

before being rebuffed and subsequently taking up arms again in *Have With You to Saffron-Walden*. Aretino is the one person that Nashe consistently reaches the same conclusion with; he was a man with skills and abilities and because he used them in the correct manner his other activities can be ignored.

Within *The Unfortunate Traveller* it can also be established that Nashe's reverence for Aretino is not only framed in mundane terms, with some of Nashe's descriptions of the Italian's abilities suggesting his facilities go beyond those of a normal person. As I have noted in Chapter One and even ignoring the physical impossibilities that Nashe presents in this work with regards to the historical events and their out of sequence appearances, there are clear indications of Nashe's attraction towards the supernatural. I have already discussed that, in common with many other Elizabethan authors, Nashe had more than a passing interest in the occult which likely began from an awareness of the works of Lucian – I have discussed in the previous chapter the impact the Latin language author had on the Elizabethan author and as Kott writes

We know also that Lucian was praised and quoted by Thomas Nashe; Gabriel Harvey (*Four Lectures*); Thomas Dekker (*News from Hell and Devil Let Loose*); Ben Jonson (*Volpone*); and John Webster (*The White Devil*)¹⁵⁴

¹⁵⁴ Jan Kott, 'Lucian in *Cymbeline*', *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 67, No. 4 (Oct., 1972), pp. 742-744, this ref. p. 742

Nashe also wrote *The Terrors of the Night* – a treatise on the nature of dreams which, although he dismisses as ‘‘A dreame is nothing els but a bubling scum or froath of the fancie, which the day hath left vndigested; or an after feast made of the fragments of idle imaginations’’¹⁵⁵ discusses, and discredits, various supernatural entities including ‘The Robbin-good-fellowes, Elfes, Fairies, Hobgoblins of our latter age’.¹⁵⁶ This focus on how the supernatural manifests itself with regards to Aretino can be seen within the language which Nashe uses to describes the Italian which results in Aretino being presented as larger than life, an almost god-like figure. This happens in two ways: firstly Nashe portrays his fictional Aretino as a man who was able to establish the truth of Wilton's situation quickly and easily writing

Such and so extraordinarie was his care and industrie herein, that, within few dayes after, mistres *Tabitha* and her pandor cride *Peccaui*, *confiteor*, and we were presently discharged, they for example sake executed.¹⁵⁷

Aretino is presented as having an uncanny ability to glean the truth of the situation which goes beyond the wit of normal men; it takes someone with these heightened senses and abilities to rapidly obtain the truth and thus spare the lives of Wilton and his companion. Secondly the genuine Aretino is described even more favourably and given the same paranormal gifts as his fictional persona; when

¹⁵⁵ Nashe, *The Terrors of the Night*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 355, lines 10-12

¹⁵⁶ Nashe, *The Terrors of the Night*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 347, lines 14-15

¹⁵⁷ Nashe, *The Unfortunate Traveller*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 2, p. 264, lines 12-16

Nashe writes 'nere a line of his but was able to make a man drunken with admiration. His sight pearst like lightning into the entrailles of all abuses'¹⁵⁸ he is ascribing to Aretino talents which transcend normal earthly powers. This can be read as hyperbole but, if so, this is positive hyperbole that Nashe only uses in respect of the Italian. Other authors have their talents praised but only Aretino is ascribed these kinds of gifts.

On the surface Thomas Nashe and Pietro Aretino had very little in common; they came from different countries, had very different upbringings and ultimately lived very different lives with Aretino ending his life aged 64 having influenced both Popes and Kings while Nashe died with his own Church vowing to never publish his work again. However, it is also clear that despite their differences the two men shared many traits; they both became notorious for their antagonistic style of writing, they both chose their victims with little regard for status and position and they both were comfortable taking controversial positions and following them through despite the potential consequences. Aretino set almost impossible targets for Nashe to aspire to by not only becoming profoundly influential during his lifetime but also by managing to maintain a comfortable lifestyle; Nashe although talented never managed to reach the heights of the Italian eventually dying without achieving the same success or legacy. Despite this negative conclusion, it can be argued that without Aretino we would not have had the Nashe who penned the two anti-Harvey polemics *Strange Newes* and *Have With You to Saffron-Walden*,

¹⁵⁸ Nashe, *The Unfortunate Traveller, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 2, p. 264-265, lines 35+

written as much to entertain his audience as to belittle the doctor. Having likely provided the inspiration for *The Unfortunate Traveller*, Aretino's success also would have given Nashe the confidence to write *The Choise of Valentines* which whilst undoubtedly inspired by Ovid's *Amores* definitely has shades of Aretino's more controversial oeuvre. Nashe absorbed a lot of information from various sources throughout his career; out of all of these Aretino is one who fares better than most with his weaknesses excused and his strengths emphasised over and over again. Nashe saw the Italian's ability to turn the page into a weapon and attempted to do this himself; in *Pierce Penilesse* he admits he is unable to do so but by the time of *Nashe's Lenten Stuffle*, published only seven years later, there is a clear sense that Nashe felt he was more able to follow in Aretino's footsteps to the point where he was comfortable admitting that it was this author, above all others, who inspired him. The tragedy is that after *Lenten Stuffle* came the Bishops' Ban and no further Nashe works were published and we were never able to see the next stage of the journey that the Italian instigated with his works almost a century before.

Chapter Three - The Fraternitie of Fools: Nashe and the Harvey Circle.

Nashe is probably as well known for his literary disagreement with Doctor Gabriel Harvey as he is for any of his publications, and any thesis that concentrates on Nashe must consider the impact that the doctor had on Nashe. The majority of criticism that has historically focused on the Elizabethan in some way engages with this argument, which covered five publications over four years starting with Nashe's *Pierce Penilesse* in 1592 and ending with his *Have With You to Saffron Walden* in 1596. It is generally agreed that Nashe emerged from this contretemps the victor; for instance, Griffen notes

In controversies, attention generally focuses on the winners: we read Martin Marprelate much more readily than Mar-Marprelate, *1 Henry IV* in preference to *1 Sir John Oldcastle*...**Nashe rather than Harvey**, Pope rather than Theobald.¹⁵⁹

He later writes:

Nashe, indeed, of all the anti-Martinist writers, learned the most from his participation in the controversy. He distinguished himself in his paper battle with Gabriel Harvey partly because of an acquired trick of keeping the figure of his opponent perennially "onstage" in his own productions. Harvey's own words (often, to be sure, unsubtly

¹⁵⁹ Benjamin Griffin, 'Marring and Mending: Treacherous Likeness in Two Renaissance Controversies', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 60, No. 4 (1997), pp. 363-380 this ref. p. 363

metamorphosed) are set forth in italic type, after the manner of printed commentaries; a demarcation of textual persona that helps not only to separate author from target but also to create a Harvey-in-the-text.¹⁶⁰

This accurately describes the technique Nashe uses to gain the upper hand in the argument; whether via a cutting insult or a play on his rival's name Harvey is placed at the centre of any attack and the reader is always aware of the identity of his opponent. The idea that Nashe emerged with more credit than his rival is well supported; Hadfield discusses the manner in which Harvey is now perceived noting 'In *Pierces Supererogation* Harvey launched a carefully prepared attack on Nashe, which, because *Harvey is assumed to have been trounced* by his opponent in their print war, has probably not been given its due'¹⁶¹ while Hutson describes how Nashe's broadsides in *Have With You* discredited Harvey – she notes that in *Have With You* 'we find the words of Greene's libeller turned like weapons against him' and how

The transparent fraudulence of Harvey's appeal, throughout his libellous account, to 'ascertayned' and 'credible' authorities is travestied throughout Nashe's mock biography by the wild ambiguity of the author's attempts to authenticate his story.¹⁶²

¹⁶⁰ Griffin, 'Marring and Mending: Treacherous Likeness in Two Renaissance Controversies', this ref. p. 372

¹⁶¹ Hadfield, '*Lenten Stuffe*: Thomas Nashe and the fiction of travel', this ref. p. 73

¹⁶² Hutson, *Thomas Nashe in Context*, this ref. p. 213.

Hutson notes how Nashe took Harvey's last attack upon himself and Greene and ensured that, by responding to him using similar vocabulary to Harvey, Gabriel would be further discredited and humbled. As Hutson also noted Nashe made it

impossible to go on maintaining, as Harvey tried to do, that a
'licentious' and 'unauthorized' fantasticality of invention could
somehow represent a subversive threat to the political state'.¹⁶³

Nashe's attack showed that he understood Harvey's position but that this position was out dated and no longer tenable. Stern also notes the larger ramifications for Harvey:

The tirade of rebuttal made by Harvey in *Pierces Supererogation*
(1593) and his other English pamphlets seems to have been
ineffective in removing the tarnish of ridicule from his public image,
and he was unable to realize the political ambitions for which he had
so assiduously trained himself...¹⁶⁴

Nashe's 'victory' though was a pyrrhic one; as previously noted in 1599 both his and Harvey's works, along with sundry others, were ordered to be destroyed as part of the Bishop's Ban and neither man really recovered; Nashe was dead by 1601 and as Harvey's Oxford DNB entry notes

¹⁶³ Lorna Hutson, *Thomas Nashe in Context*, this ref. p. 213. For a more in-depth study of the Nashe-Harvey dynamic and argument I recommend reading Hutson's breakdown of the situation in this book.

¹⁶⁴ Virginia F. Stern, 'The Bibliotheca of Gabriel Harvey', *Renaissance Quarterly*, Vol. 25, No. 1 (Spring, 1972), pp. 1-62 this ref. p. 1

In the last three decades of his life, Harvey largely disappears from view. He had left London several years before Nashe struck his final blows (the *New Letter* of 1593 was dated from Saffron Walden), and there is no evidence of his residence in the capital thereafter. It has been suggested that the motives for his withdrawal were chiefly financial.¹⁶⁵

The entry concludes by noting that Harvey may have returned to the medical profession after returning to Saffron Walden; whether this was in any way connected to the disagreement and subsequent ban of his works is difficult to conclude with certainty but it is equally inconceivable to believe that his departure from the literary world was not in some way influenced by the argument with Nashe.

The conclusion of the argument then is clear; yet the reason why the argument began is less so and has long been debated with early critics like McKerrow noting 'We cannot say for certain what was the first cause of the ill feeling, nor why the dispute was so long drawn out and so acrimonious'.¹⁶⁶ The majority of critical opinion agrees that it was Nashe's attack on Harvey's younger brother Richard that caused the disagreement; as McPherson writes 'It is noteworthy that this pamphlet of Richard's [*A Theologicall Discourse of the Lamb of*

¹⁶⁵ Jason Scott-Warren, 'Harvey, Gabriel (1552/3–1631), scholar and writer', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press (2016)

¹⁶⁶ McKerrow, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 5, p. 67

God] also contained the attack on Nashe which began the whole Harvey-Nashe quarrel'.¹⁶⁷ Kettlich develops this theme writing

When he [Gabriel] saw Nashe's *Pierce Penniless* and its insults about Richard Harvey...Harvey transferred the taunt of Tarltonizing from Greene to Nashe...in Nashe's case Harvey's accusation cuts deeper, and is potentially far more damaging...When viewed in context it is clear that he is not accusing of simply acting like Tarlton, but instead he has expanded his accusation to one of plagiarism¹⁶⁸

By using the term 'Tarltonizing' Harvey was accusing Nashe of plagiarism and it is no surprise that Nashe reacted the way he did; Harvey is impugning both his skills as an author and his honour in general. However, the idea that Nashe was offended by Harvey's insults, although thought-provoking, doesn't really come across in the rest of his work. Nashe shows on a number of occasions that he will enter the battle on behalf of those who can't defend themselves - the recently deceased Greene and the longer departed Aretino for example - but doesn't show the same urgency to overtly defend his own work, preferring to directly attack his rival's skills and abilities in the knowledge that his own authorial endeavours were more accomplished than Harvey's. Nashe's belief that he was a superior to Harvey is ostensibly unusual bearing in mind the two authors' differing statuses. Harvey was

¹⁶⁷ David C. McPherson, 'Aretino and the Harvey-Nashe Quarrel', this ref. p. 1553

¹⁶⁸ Karen Kettlich, 'Nashe's Extemporal Vein and his Tarltonizing Wit', *The Age of Thomas Nashe: Text, Bodies and Trespasses of Authorship in Early Modern England*, ed. S. Guy-Bray, J.P. Linton, & S. Mentz (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013) pp. 99-114, this ref. P. 103

an established figure in both academic and literary circles having lectured at Cambridge, graduated from Oxford as a Doctor of Civil Law, been published on numerous occasions and made a name for himself as an accomplished rhetorician. Nashe, conversely, had only received his Bachelor's degree from Cambridge and by the time *Strange Newes* was published had only written *Pierce Penilesse, Anatomie* and the two prefaces. Harvey had by this date a reputation and a fully formed identity; Nashe was still in the process of developing his own authorial voice. Similarly, although not as financially comfortable as his peers, Harvey did not appear to have many fiscal issues – as his *Oxford DNB* entry notes

Although Harvey retained his Trinity Hall fellowship until 1591–2, and possibly received a stipend from the college still longer, he moved to London at some point between about 1586 and 1588 to take up legal practice in the court of arches.¹⁶⁹

This is once again the opposite to Nashe, a man perennially struggling to earn a living which, as I shall discuss in Chapter Four, likely led to Nashe writing commercially, something that Harvey was not compelled to do. The two men represented very different aspects of the renaissance authorial life with Harvey seemingly having the advantage. Yet Nashe, the relatively fledgling writer still attempting to determine and establish his own voice, not only felt he was superior to the older man but was determined to

¹⁶⁹ Jason Scott-Warren (2004-09-23), 'Harvey, Gabriel (1552/3–1631), scholar and writer', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press Retrieved 8 Jul. 2018, from <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-12517>

prove it to the literary world. Given the way that history remembers the argument it would also be very easy to follow Nashe's lead and dismiss Harvey's value as an author in the strongest terms. In the early pages of the first Anti-Harvey pamphlet Nashe introduces the doctor with the words

Hold vp thy hand, *G.H.*, thou art heere indited for an incrocher vpon the fee-simple of the Latin, anemie to Carriers, as one that takes their occupation out of their hands, and dost nothing but transport letters vp and downe in thy owne commendation; a conspiratour and practiser to make Printers, rich by making thy selfe ridiculous, a manifest briber of Bookesellers and Stationers to helpe thee to sell away thy bookes (whose impression thou paidst for) that thou mayst haue money to goe home to Trinitie Hall to discharge thy commons.¹⁷⁰

This is the first paragraph in which Nashe directly address his rival and immediately shows that the two men will be using different techniques in the argument; Harvey's 'Tarltonizing' comments contain an element of subtlety whereas Nashe immediately dispenses with this and offers an insult-laden broadside in an effort to put the doctor in his place. This attack lays the foundations for themes that appear throughout his attacks: Harvey is not to be trusted, and above all is a poor writer who only sells his works after resorting to bribery and other pernicious activities.

¹⁷⁰ Nashe, *Strange Newes, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol.1, p. 261, lines 23-32

However, as Jardine and Grafton contend the doctor may have had a significant impact on the thinking of Sir Philip Sidney:

For the foundation of study Sidney naturally prescribes scriptural reading. But when he comes to "the trade of our lives", he specifies reading which is (we would argue) quite clearly based on that "reading" with Gabriel Harvey three years earlier...¹⁷¹

Additionally, Prewitt comments

To be fair, Nashe's harsh assessment must be balanced with the general esteem that others, most notably Spenser, had for Harvey. Harvey's letters, however, reveal his painful acknowledgment that his attempts to win favor with his colleagues were often thwarted.¹⁷²

Both introduce the idea that Harvey is more than just the figure of fun and hopelessness that Nashe describes, whilst also acknowledging that the mocking characterisations may have been based in some slight truth given Harvey's various failures. In the same article Prewitt continues by describing the different authors' methodologies and how they were perceived:

though Nashe has been taken as a gadfly journalist, his cultural affiliations were more traditional than Harvey's; Harvey expressed

¹⁷¹ Lisa Jardine and Anthony Grafton, "'Studied for action': How Gabriel Harvey Read His Livy", *Past and Present*, November 1990, Vol. 129(1), pp.30-78 this ref. p. 39

¹⁷² Kendrick W. Prewitt, 'Gabriel Harvey and the Practice of Method', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, Vol. 39, No. 1, The English Renaissance (Winter, 1999), pp. 19-39 this ref. p. 20

reservations about certain tenets of Aristotelianism (as noted in his early struggles for his M. A. at Pembroke Hall) and embraced Ramism and new ideas about method, while Nashe was far more traditionally Aristotelian in his leanings, especially in his decidedly conservative early writing, *The Anatomy of Absurdity*¹⁷³

This is something backed up by Nashe's own words; as noted earlier he describes Harvey as 'an incrocher vpon the fee-simple of the Latin' and will often use classical references in his own works to reinforce his argument. Yet while there is little doubt that Nashe was less willing to embrace the newer thinkers, preferring to stick to the classics, Prewitt's example is flawed. Despite seemingly complementing Ramus' thoroughness in *Preface to Menaphon* writing 'Peter Ramus sixteene yeeres paines that so praised his petty Logicke'¹⁷⁴ Nashe would never consider wholly praising the preaching of Ramism because of its antithetic nature towards his own religious leanings. From an early age Nashe found puritanical figures and teaching unpalatable with Nicholl noting 'Nashe only mentions the town [Thetford] twice in his writings, once to call it 'ruinous and desolate' and once to recall the 'ranting tenne shillings Sermons' of a Puritan preacher there.'¹⁷⁵ He later notes when discussing the beginning of Nashe's career that '[*Anatomie of Absurditie*] is full of his dislike of Puritanism, Ramism, 'barbarisme', duncerie, and so on'¹⁷⁶ showing that even from the earliest moments of his writing career Nashe was an opponent of the

¹⁷³ Prewitt, 'Gabriel Harvey and the Practice of Method', this ref. p. 31

¹⁷⁴ Nashe, *Preface to Robert Greene's Menaphon*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 313, lines 1-2

¹⁷⁵ Nicholl, *A Cup of News*, this ref. p. 20

¹⁷⁶ Nicholl, *A Cup of News*, this ref. p. 36

preaching of Ramus and his fellow Puritans. What can be established is that Nashe and Harvey despite their common educational background saw their paths diverge and the men came to represent very different ideas and methodologies. However, in this chapter rather than focusing on these specific differences, I will instead discuss Harvey in terms of him and his group of friends. When Harvey addresses Nashe he tends to do so in relation to a number of individuals, most regularly Edmund Spenser and Sir Philip Sidney, but also in respect of a number of other authors. This chapter will focus on these key figures, the parts they played in the Nashe-Harvey disagreement and how Nashe wrote about them throughout his career. I shall begin by looking at those members of Harvey's circle who most obviously sided with the doctor before discussing those individuals whose allegiances are less clearly defined. The most logical starting point will be with the three individuals to whom Harvey dedicated his 1593 response to *Strange Newes, Pierces Supererogation or a New Prayse of the Old Asse* before discussing Spenser, Sidney and Abraham Fraunce. In this part of the chapter I shall also be discussing John Wolfe, Harvey's long-term publisher and printer who also had a role in the argument and whom Nashe refers to mainly in conjunction with the doctor so therefore needs to be considered here. By organising the chapter in this fashion, I shall show how the authors who gave assistance to Harvey were not the most significant literary figures of the time, whereas the figures who either remained out of the argument or were more in favour of Nashe were much more noteworthy.

Harvey begins *Pierces Supererogation* by dedicating it to 'To My Very Gentle, And Liberall frendes. M. Barnabe Barnes, M. Iohn Thorius, M. Antony Chewt, and euery fauorable Reader' starting the piece

Louing M. Barnabe, M. Iohn, and M. Antony, (for the rest of my partiall Comenders must pardon me, till the Print be better acquainted with their names) I haue lately receiued your thrise curteous Letters, with the Ouerplus of your thrise-sweet Sonets annexed¹⁷⁷

This refers to the sonnets and letters that were attached to both the beginning and the end of Harvey's tract. All three of these men would have been reasonably well known at the time although to nothing like the level of Harvey's more illustrious companions Spenser and Sidney. By 1593 Barnes had only published *Parthenophil and Parthenophe* of which his DNB entry notes 'his reputation rests principally on the first of them...a sequence of poems in the Petrarchan manner.'¹⁷⁸ Anthony Chute similarly had only had one poem issued at this stage, which his entry in the dictionary notes is

Beawtie Dishonoured Written under the Title of Shores Wife (1593; entered in the Stationers' register, 16 June 1593). It is dedicated to Sir Edward Wingfield, knight; is described by the author 'as the

¹⁷⁷ Gabriel Harvey, *Pierces Supererogation or a New Prayse of the Old Asse*, (London 1593), *2r sig

¹⁷⁸ John. D. Cox, 'Barnes, Barnabe (bap. 1571, d. 1609), poet and playwright', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press. (2004)

first invention of my beginning muse', consists of 197 six-line stanzas;
and tells, through the mouth of 'her wronged ghost', the chequered
story of Edward IV's mistress, Jane Shore.¹⁷⁹

Of the three men John Thorius had a slightly higher profile than the other two, with the writer and translator having had three translations published by 1593; namely 'Spanish Bartolome Felippe's *The Counsellor* (1589), Antonio de Corro's *Spanish Grammer* (1590), and Francisco de Valdes's *The Sergeant-Major* (1590)' which were later followed by 'A *Spiritual Wedding* (1597) [translated from Dutch]. Thorius also contributed verses to Florio's *Queen Anna's New World of Words* (1611)';¹⁸⁰ yet none of the three were noteworthy authors of the period. With regards to their involvement in the argument it is Barnabe Barnes's efforts that are the most significant with his sonnet appearing in *Pierces Supererogation* directly after Harvey's own prologue. Barnes takes aim at Nashe addressing him as the confuting gentleman before describing him as

The Muses scorne; the Courtiers laughing-stock;

The Countreys Coxecombe; Printers proper new;

The Citties Leprosie; the Pandars stew;

Vertues disdayne; honesties aduerse rock;¹⁸¹

¹⁷⁹ Sidney Lee, Matthew Steggle, 'Chute [Chewt], Anthony (d. 1594/5), poet', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press. (2004)

¹⁸⁰ Howard Jones, 'Thorius [Thorie], John (b. 1568), writer and translator', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press. (2004)

¹⁸¹ Gabriel Harvey, *Pierces Supererogation or a New Prayse of the Old Asse*, (London 1593), ***3r sig <http://eebo.chadwyck.com>

Nashe's response to *Pierces Supererogation* comes two years later in *Have With You* and he has not forgotten Barnes' contribution to the work, noting,

Respond: What his Soldiourship is I cannot judge, but if you haue
euer a chaine for him to runne awaye with, as hee did with a Noble-
man's Stewards chayne at his Lords enstalling at *Windsore*; or if you
would haue anie rymes to the tune of *stink-a-pisse*, hee is for you; in
one place of his *Parthenophill and Parthenope* wishing no other thing
of Heauen but that hee might bee transformed to the Wine his
Mistres drinks, and so passe thorough her.

Bentiu: *Therein hee was verie ill aduisde, for so the next time his
Mistres made water, he was in danger to be cast out of her fauour*¹⁸²

Nashe does not waste time with pleasantries accusing Barnes of being a thief before utilising toilet imagery to leave no doubt as to the value he places on the author and his words. Later in the same work Nashe further dismisses Barnes and relegates him to little more than a side line cheerleader for Harvey:

The tenure of the *Scrimpum Scrampum* of *Barneses* is no more but
this, to exhort the sweet Doctor (as hee names him) to confound
those viperous criticall monsters; whereto hee is manifestly vrged;

¹⁸² Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron-Walden, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 103, lines 25-32

though he bee fitter to encounter some more delicate Paranympthes
and honour the *Vrany of Du Bartas*.¹⁸³

Barnes appears a further twelve times in Nashe's works; all of these are in *Have With You* and all of these impugn him in different ways. Nashe's attacks appear to have had the desired effect with Barnes not becoming involved in the argument again.

Barnes' words appear before the main body of Harvey's work unlike the writings of the dedicatees. Both Thorius and Chute have their lines appended to the end of *Pierces Supererogation*; seemingly a decision made at the urging of a number of Harvey's friends including his printer John Wolfe. Wolfe notes in his printer's 'advertisement', which is sandwiched between the Barnes' sonnets and the main body of *Supererogation*,

Curteous Gentlemen, it seemed good to M. Doctour Haruey, for
breuity-sake, and bicause he liked not ouer-long Preambles, or
Postambles to short Discourses, to omit the commendatorie Letters,
and Sonnets of M.Thorius, M.Chewt, and diuers other his
affectionate frendes of London, and both the Vniuersities...Howbeit
finally it was thought not amisse, vpon conference with some his
aduised acquaintance, to make choice of some two, or three of the
reasonablest, and temperatest Sonnets (but for variety, & to auoyde

¹⁸³ Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron-Walden, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 115, lines 23-28

tediousnesse in the entrance, rather to be annexed in the end, then
prefixed in the beginning of the present Discourses): one of the
foresayd M. Thorius, another of M. Chewt¹⁸⁴

Wolfe is an intriguing figure of the period. As noted in his Oxford DNB entry he
spent time in Italy, was imprisoned for illegally printing 'other mens copies', and
eventually became beadle for the Stationers' Company. As also noted

Wolfe's output over his career was prodigious...He published the first
three books of Spenser's *Faerie Queene*...had a close relationship
with Gabriel Harvey, three of whose works he published, and as a
result features several times in Thomas Nashe's attack
on Harvey in *Have with You to Saffron Walden*. He was also a notable
publisher of Italian works, including those by Pietro Aretino¹⁸⁵

The last point is the most significant as this shows that Wolfe was a major figure
not only in London's publishing industry but more specifically in the life of Nashe.
Although classically schooled and therefore well versed in Latin there is no
evidence that Nashe learnt more modern European languages such as Italian or
French. Indeed, as argued by Matthew Steggle and myself, Nashe is more likely to
have utilised an English translation of a work than the foreign language original.¹⁸⁶

¹⁸⁴ Gabriel Harvey, *Pierces Supererogation or a New Prayse of the Old Asse*, (London 1593), sig, ***4r
<http://eebo.chadwyck.com>

¹⁸⁵ I. Gadd, "Wolfe, John (b. in or before 1548?, d. 1601), bookseller and printer." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press. (2004)

¹⁸⁶ For a more in-depth analysis of this please read Matthew Steggle, Arun Cheta, 'Thomas Nashe reads *The Nosegay of Morall Philosophie*', *Notes and Queries*, Volume 61, Issue 2, 1 June 2014, pp. 221–223

Despite this disinclination to use foreign language sources what should be noted is that, with Aretino, Nashe would have had to overcome this reluctance and do just that. Aretino's works were not translated by the time Nashe started referring to the author in 1592 with Wolfe only publishing them in their original language from 1584 onwards. With Aretino being one of Nashe's major influences it is almost certain that it would therefore have been these Wolfe publications of the Italian's work that Nashe would have had to read to gain this understanding. Tomita notes three instances of Aretino's works being published; in all three cases the printer involved was John Wolfe.¹⁸⁷ Perhaps because of this Wolfe, who is referred to over twenty times in Nashe's works, is always mentioned in relation to Harvey and this is never done in a derogatory fashion towards the publisher. Quite the opposite is the case with Nashe constantly and consistently questioning only Harvey's motives for the relationship. Nashe notes about Harvey 'Euen for the printing of this logger-head Legend of Iyes which now I am wrapping vp hot spices in hee ran in debt with *Wolfe*'¹⁸⁸ before also describing how 'at *Wolfes* he is billeted'¹⁸⁹ indicating how the publisher is not only providing him the means to print his works but also a place to stay in London as he does. The idea that Harvey was a man who used his friends for his own personal gain is one I shall explore later in this chapter with regards to Spenser, and this is a device that Nashe also utilises here writing

¹⁸⁷ Information taken from Soko Tomita, *A Bibliographical Catalogue of Italian Books Printed in England 1558-1603*, (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009)

¹⁸⁸ Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron-Walden, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 71, lines 11-13

¹⁸⁹ Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron-Walden, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol 3, p. 88, line 8

Iohn Wolfe sayes nothing, and yet hee beares with him asmuch as
the best, and if hee had borne a little longer, he would haue borne
till his back broke...¹⁹⁰

And although Nashe later seems to concede that the relationship was not purely
one way he ensures the reader is aware that any positives that Harvey could be
credited with were immediately mitigated; he writes

In plaine truth and in verity, some pleasures he did *Wolfe* in my
knowledge. For, first and formost, he did for him that eloquent *post-*
script for the Plague Bills, where he talkes of the series, the classes &
the premisses, & presenting them with an exacter methode
hereafter...¹⁹¹

He immediately adds his own editorial as to the quality of the work using a phrase
from Cicero to ensure the reader is aware of what he actually thought of the work:

By the style I tooke it napping, and smelt it to be a pig of his *Sus*
Mineruam, the Sow his Muse, as soone as euer I read it, and since
the Printer hath confest it to mee.

In this reference Nashe also seems to be suggesting that he had conversation about
this with Wolfe himself; a claim that cannot be proved one way or the other but is
equally believable either way. The usage of Wolfe in this way also gives another

¹⁹⁰ Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron-Walden, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 89, lines 2-5

¹⁹¹ Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron-Walden, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 89, lines 8-13

example of Nashe taking exception to something that his rival has said about him, finding a parallel in Harvey's life, and then escalating it to a much higher level. In this instance Harvey notes a closeness between Nashe and his publisher John Danter which as Duncan-Jones notes 'John Danter's quondam lodger Thomas Nashe with whom he is so closely related associated that Gabriel Harvey sought to insult him by describing him as "Danter's Gentleman"¹⁹²'; Nashe's response to this name calling is to call into question Harvey's honour, his relationship with Wolfe and his value as an author.

Having discussed Barnes and Wolfe, I shall now turn attention to Thorius and Chute. As previously noted, neither man was a major figure at the time of the argument and Thorius's *Oxford DNB* entry even begins by stating he 'is noteworthy not so much because of his own accomplishments as because of the minor part which he played in the tragicomedy acted out by Gabriel Harvey and Thomas Nashe'¹⁹³ before finishing the entry noting his output of four translations and some verses contributed to Florio's *Queen Anna's New World of Words*. Chute merits a slightly longer entry in the dictionary but, as with his contemporary the majority of it focuses on both his involvement in the quarrel and how Nashe reacted to this. Beginning with Chute's more sizeable contribution to *Supererogation* which 'included two prose letters, one sonnet, and a poem entitled 'The Asses Figg'...and

¹⁹² Gabriel Harvey, *Pierces Supererogation or a New Prayse of the Old Asse*, (London, 1593), sig, B2r; Katherine Duncan-Jones, *Shakespeare: Upstart Crow to Sweet Swan: 1592-1623* (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2011) this ref. p. 105

¹⁹³ Howard Jones, 'Thorius [Thorie], John (b. 1568), writer and translator', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press. (2004)

all vigorously following up Harvey's attack on Nashe'¹⁹⁴ it is clear that Chute was firmly on Harvey's side of the disagreement and, as such, attracted Nashe's attention more than Thorius. In response to the poet's words Nashe writes

Chute, is hee such a high Clearke in hys Bookes? I knew when hee was but a low Clarke, and carried an Atturnies bookes after him. But this I will say for him, though hee bee dead and rotten, and by his obsequies hath preuented the vengeance I meant to haue executed vpon him...¹⁹⁵

In the first instance he suggests that Chute has ideas above his station, and in the second lamenting the death of the man, not for any humanitarian reasons, but because it does not allow Nashe to go to the lengths he would with a living rival. Of course, it is not Nashe's fault that he has been compelled to bring Chute into the argument; the blame here lies squarely with Harvey with Nashe arguing

Chute, that was the bawlingest of them all, & that bobd me with nothing but *Rhenish furie*, *Stilliard clyme*, *oyster whore phrase*, *claret spirit* and *ale-house passions*, with talking so much of drinke, within a yere and a halfe after died of the dropsie, as diuers Printers that were at his buriall certifide mee. Beeing dead, I would not haue

194 Sidney Lee, Matthew Steggle 'Chute [Chewt], Anthony (d. 1594/5), poet', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press. (2004)

195 Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron-Walden*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 106, lines 30-35

reuiu'd him but that the Doctor (whose Patron he was) is aliue to
answere for him.¹⁹⁶

Nashe takes the opportunity to describe conversations with publishers and printers that may be entirely fictitious; the conversations exist to not only belittle his target but also suggest Nashe has a familiarity with this circle of highly important literary men which none of his rivals share. The idea that as a group they would happily share gossip about the deceased Chute at his own funeral implies an intimacy that not many other authors had and hints that Nashe is more than merely 'Danters Gentleman.' It is also Chute who gets referred to alongside Barnes on two occasions in uncomplimentary terms with Nashe at one point calling the pair's literary pedigree into question:

Neither of these princockesses (*Barnes* or *Chute*) once cast vp their
noses towards *Powles Church-yard*, or so much as knew how to
knock at a Printing-house dore, till they consorted themselues with
Haruey, who infe-cted them within one fortnight with his owne spirit
of Bragganisme; which after so increased and multiplied in them, as
no man was able to endure them;¹⁹⁷

This manages to not only insult the work of both of his lesser targets but also land a hit upon his main rival.

¹⁹⁶ Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron-Walden, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 136, lines 1-8

¹⁹⁷ Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron-Walden, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 109, lines 18-24

Of the three dedicatees it is John Thorius who attracts little of Nashe's ire mainly because after *Pierces Supererogation* was published with his letter, sonnet and stanzas attached, Thorius wrote to Nashe to explain how he had been unaware in what context his letter would be used and that the sonnet was not actually his work. Although his name does appear nine times in Nashe's response these are either favourable or neutral with Nashe noting

Of this *Iohn Thorius* more sparingly I wil speake, because hee hath made his peace with mee, & there bee in him sundrie good parts of the Tungs and otherwise...being of that modestie and honestie I ascribe to him, cannot but bee irksomely ashamed, to bee resembled so hyperborically¹⁹⁸

There has been little debate as to the veracity of Thorius' letter to Nashe with most critics accepting that this is a genuine communication between the two men. Day disagrees with this contention writing 'Whether the letter genuinely came from Thorius or is Nashe's invention (*the latter seems more likely*), Harvey is being attacked for his inappropriate use of the paratext.'¹⁹⁹ Steggle disagrees, briefly mentioning this letter as part of a much larger argument noting when discussing Nashe's claims that Harvey consistently misrepresents his peers in his own works when he notes 'Nashe's most damning piece of evidence in this respect is a personal letter from John Thorius, one of Harvey's supporters in *Pierce's*

¹⁹⁸ Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron-Walden, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 105, lines 11-14 & 22-24

¹⁹⁹ Matthew Day, 'Hakluyt, Harvey, Nashe: The Material Text and Early Modern Nationalism', *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 104, No. 3 (Summer, 2007), pp. 281-305, this ref. p. 297

Supererogation'.²⁰⁰ Steggle accepts this letter to be genuine which is a position I find more convincing than Day's especially considering that Thorius made no further contribution to the conversation which he surely would have done if Nashe had falsely used his name. Whether the letter is genuine or not it is obvious that Nashe forgave Thorius in a way he did not do with Barnes and Chute; instead both of these received a small dose of what their friend Doctor Harvey received over the years. As with Wolfe, Nashe almost entirely ignored Thorius' contributions to the disagreement using surprising and distinctly un-Nashean levels of tact and restraint in his dealings with both the publisher and the author.

Having discussed the individuals who were more obviously aligned with Harvey I shall now focus on his most famous friend – Edmund Spenser. Given their relative circumstances Nashe and Spenser should have been enemies with the latter being better established as an author and, through his friendship with Walter Raleigh, being known around the court and having connections with both Sir Henry Norris and Sir Henry Sidney²⁰¹ that Nashe could only aspire to. Hadfield, and

²⁰⁰ Matthew Steggle, 'Gabriel Harvey, the Sidney circle, and the Excellent Gentlewoman', *Sidney Circle Journal* 22: 1-2 (2004), pp. 115-129, this ref p. 129

²⁰¹ In his *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* entry, it is noted that Spenser had almost certainly worked as a secretary for Norris and likely took the same position for Sidney. Spenser's connection to the court, whilst not relevant to this piece as anything more than a comparison between him and Nashe is nonetheless interesting. It would be easy to suggest that the author of *The Faerie Queene* was a court favourite but it would appear that Spenser was never truly a favourite of the court. Instead Spenser spent a large amount of time in Ireland initially working as a secretary for Lord Grey of Wilton and then after Grey was recalled taking various positions within the administration. Ultimately Spenser spent a comparatively short amount of time in London; although dying in Westminster in 1599 he had accumulated a large amount of property in Ireland and only returning to the mainland in 1598. In this sense it could be argued that Spenser was as much of an outsider as Nashe was; however, it is also clear that although geographically removed from court Spenser was never too far away from the ministrations of government. For further information about Spenser's life I would recommend reading Andrew Hadfield, 'Spenser, Edmund (1552? –1599)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26145>, accessed 8 July 2015] or for a more in-depth examination Andrew Hadfield, *Edmund Spenser: A Life*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2012).

Cummings observe Spenser was a significant figure in both literary and political terms in the late sixteenth century who has had an enduring influence not only in his era but also on future authors. Hadfield writes that 'Spenser is still one of the four founding fathers of modern literature, along with Chaucer, Shakespeare and Milton'²⁰² and relates how the First World War poet Wilfred Owen describes Spenser in one of his letters back from the front noting that 'Owen, who was middle-class in origin, not privately educated and who did not go to University, read Spenser in school'.²⁰³ Hadfield continues to cite Pope, Keats, Tennyson and Hopkins as others who were similarly impacted by the poet. Cummings' book takes this idea further listing numerous authors, including Nashe, who referred to the poet in some way; Cummings notes over 170 separate authors between 1579 and 1715 in his work including Lodge, Dekker and Dryden. Cummings also notes how Spenser was both a member of the Cambridge Circle and was associated with the Leicester House circle indicating the distinguished company that he kept.²⁰⁴ Conversely Nashe was an outsider and although chosen to anonymously fight in the corner of the anti-Martinist movement on behalf of the Bishops, was far less politically active than the poet. Nashe was also far more focused on writing prose, penning various pamphlets, a novel and a play whilst writing little poetry. Nashe also never received the fame or acclaim that Spenser did being, until recently, one of the less appreciated writers of the period; it is noteworthy that the essential

²⁰² Andrew Hadfield, *The Cambridge Companion to Spenser*, ed. A Hadfield (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001) p. 1

²⁰³ Hadfield, *The Cambridge Companion to Spenser*, pp. 1-2

²⁰⁴ R.M Cummings, *Spenser: The Critical Heritage* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1971) page 3

Thomas Nashe reference books remain R.B. McKerrow's five volume set initially written and published between 1904 and 1910 and Charles Nicholl's *A Cup of News* released in 1984 whereas as recently as 2012 saw the release of Hadfield's biography *Edmund Spenser: A Life*. Instead Nashe achieved notoriety for his feud with both the Harvey brothers and throughout his work Nashe proves time and time again that any friend of these two men is, at least in print, an enemy of his. This goes beyond his passages against Barnes and Chute; he begins his second attack on Gabriel, *Have With You to Saffron Walden*, with a dedicatory epistle addressed to 'Don Richardo Barbarossa de Caesario'; the Cambridge barber Richard Lichfield whom Harvey also counted amongst his allies. As Griffen notes '*Nashe's Have with you to Saffron-Walden* (1596) is dedicated to the 'chiefe scauinger of chins' and 'speciall superuisor of all excrementall superfluities for Trinitie Colledge in Cambridge', 'Richard Lichfield, the college barber'²⁰⁵ who in turn responded pseudonymously one year later with *The Trimming of Thomas Nashe*. In the opening few pages Lichfield is referred to on various occasions as 'Acute & amiable Dick', 'paraphrasticall gallant Patron Dick', 'curteous Dicke, comicall Dicke, liuely Dicke, louely Dicke, learned Dicke, Old Dicke of *Lichfield*';²⁰⁶ all delivered in a faux-respectful and very Nashean fashion. Yet what we find with Nashe's treatment of Spenser is something completely different. Time and again Nashe finds ways to praise him and either ignores the friendship with Harvey or finds ways to excuse

²⁰⁵ Benjamin Griffin, 'Nashe's Dedicatees: William Beeston and Richard Lichfield', *Notes and Queries*, Volume 44, Issue 1, 1 March 1997, pp. 47–49, this ref. p. 48

²⁰⁶ All these names are taken from Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron-Walden*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 5-6

and rationalise it. At this point of the chapter I will look at the manner in which Spenser is treated by Nashe looking at the specific references made within Nashe's works as well as looking at the impact the older author had on his younger contemporary. I shall also begin to address the shortage of critical focus on the two men by examining the works of both of these authors and as part of this exercise will look beyond the Nashe/Spenser relationship in relation to Gabriel Harvey. This is not a well-travelled path; current critical thinking, which is not manifold, tends to focus either on the Spenser/Nashe/Harvey dynamic or addresses one specific section of Nashe's *Pierce Penilesse* in which Nashe 'mocks' Spenser. I shall argue that the relationship between the two men goes beyond this section and pamphlet and that further references, both explicit and implicit can be seen in Nashe's works. I shall also engage with the existing critical output including articles by Hadfield and Brink who reach different conclusions using the same source material and discuss what I believe to be the more persuasive argument. Following this I shall examine the manner in which Nashe treats the relationship between Spenser and Gabriel Harvey; I will then examine the explicit references that Nashe makes to Spenser in his canon and also the elements of Spenser's work which share commonality with that of Nashe. I shall conclude this section with an examination of Spenser's work *Mother Hubberds Tale* as a work of satire and discuss how this influenced Nashe in his career. I will then re-engage with Hadfield's argument which will also involve examining the relationship Nashe has with the geographer Richard Hakluyt and drawing conclusions from them, showing how Nashe's words in *Lenten Stuffle* were more likely to be an attack on Hakluyt than Spenser.

As noted, Nashe and Spenser do not have much in common and little has been written on the connections between the two and the impact Spenser may have had on the younger man. This is very different to the manner in which critics have looked at the relationship between Harvey and Spenser, a friendship which given the wealth of supporting evidence has never been seriously questioned. In 1579 Spenser's first major work, the pastoral poem *The Shepheardes Calender* features the character Hobbinol, a close friend of the primary protagonist Colin Clout and it has long been established that Clout represents Spenser himself and the character of Hobbinol represents Gabriel Harvey.²⁰⁷ Nashe, of course, also featured Harvey in a number of his works but treats his rival in a very different, and distinctly unfriendly manner. That there has been minimal critical interrogation of any relationship between Nashe and Spenser strikes me as a misstep. McKerrow notes a comparatively large number of references to the poet in his works: there are eighteen mentions of Spenser and his works within Nashe's work compared to only ten for Christopher Marlowe. Critical thinking has not historically engaged with Nashe and Spenser compared to the body of work available that focuses on Nashe and Marlowe; for example, there has been a huge wealth of material written about the relationship between Nashe and Marlowe, a relationship I shall also interrogate in a later chapter. With Nashe and Spenser the main focus tends to be on the

²⁰⁷ The identity of Harvey as Hobbinol is beyond question and much has been written on this subject. As Hadfield notes in his article 'Spenser's Rosalind' "Rosalind is not identified in the text but Hobbinol is later identified by E.K as Gabriel Harvey." Even Harvey refers to himself by this name; as Hamer notes in correspondence sent by Harvey to Spenser referring to Spenser's Marriage he writes 'Through your love she is a second little Rosalind, and not another, but the very same old Hobbinol loves her (as before, with your kind leave) with all his heart' (Douglas Hamer, "Spenser's Marriage", *The Review of English Studies*, Vol. 7, No. 27 (Jul., 1931), pp. 271-290 this ref. p. 285).

incidental nature of their interactions with both the most attention concentrated on how each man was related to Harvey. McPherson notes that Harvey's correspondence with Spenser was commented upon by Nashe but does not look any further at any other connections between the two men²⁰⁸ while Friedenreich closely examines *Strange Newes* and the manner in which Nashe attacks Harvey; he notes that Harvey discusses the publication of his supposedly personal correspondence with Spenser, writing 'Harvey, says Nashe, broke a sacred professional taboo by criticizing the work of a friend in print',²⁰⁹ yet, as with McPherson, Friedenreich draws no conclusions as to the nature of Nashe and Spenser's interactions. Indeed, it is only when discussing Nashe's use of the epithet Hobbinol in his own work (he refers to Harvey as '*Poet Hobbinoll, hauing a gallant wit and a brazen penne*')²¹⁰ that Friedenreich comes closest to noting any kind of relationship between Nashe and Spenser. Friedenreich writes that 'By alluding to Harvey's identity as Hobbinol in Spenser's *Shepheardes Calender* (l 79), Nashe emphasizes Harvey's fall from a younger, more proper regard for literature',²¹¹ Nashe is suggesting that the Harvey whose Hobbinol persona was friendly with Spenser a decade previously was greatly different from the '*Gamaliel Hobgoblin*'²¹² that Nashe later encountered.

²⁰⁸ McPherson, 'Aretino and the Harvey-Nashe Quarrel', pp. 1551-1558

²⁰⁹ Kenneth Friedenreich, 'Nashe's *Strange Newes* and the Case for Professional Writers', *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 71, No. 4 (Oct., 1974), pp. 451-472, this ref. p. 466

²¹⁰ Nashe, *Strange Newes, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 289, lines 31-32

²¹¹ Friedenreich, 'Nashe's *Strange Newes* and the Case for Professional Writers', this ref. p. 469

²¹² Nashe, *Strange Newes, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 289, line 24

Other than the Nashe-Harvey-Spenser triangle, the majority of critical thinking with regards to Nashe and Spenser focuses extensively on the passage in *Pierce Penilesse* wherein Nashe examines the dedicatory verses Spenser appended, seemingly hastily, to *The Faerie Queene*. Here Nashe notes that while Spenser has written about numerous other dignitaries he has omitted 'most courteous Amyntas'.²¹³ Nashe continues in this vein at some length:

And heere (heauenlie *Spencer*) I am most highlie to acuse thee of forgetfulnes, that in that honourable catalogue of our English *Heroes*, which insueth the conclusion of thy famous Faerie Queen, thou wouldst let so speciall a pillar of Nobilitie passe vnsaluted. The verie thought of his far deriued discent, & extraordinarie parts, wherewith he astonieth the world, and drawes all hearts to his loue, would have inspired thy forweariéd muse with new furie to proceed to the next triumphs of thy statelie goddess, but as I, in fauour of so rare a scholler, suppose, with this counsell he refraind his mention in this first part, that he might with full saile proceed to his due commendation in the second.²¹⁴

There are two elements that are normally discussed here; the identity of 'Courteous Amyntas' and what were Nashe's intentions when he referenced the sonnets and wrote this passage and his own accompanying sonnet. With regards to

²¹³ Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Svpplication to the Divell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 243, line 29

²¹⁴ Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Svpplication to the Divell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 243, lines 32+
127

the first of these issues there has been general agreement about the identity of Amyntas with Steven May noting that

Modern scholars have consistently identified Amyntas with Ferdinando Stanley, Lord Strange from 1572 to September 25, 1593 and Earl of Derby from the latter date until his death, April 16, 1594' and dissenting voices to this conclusion are difficult to find.²¹⁵

Dissension amongst critics does occur when discussing Nashe's purpose for writing this piece with most focusing on the tone that Nashe uses here; Morris takes Nashe's words at face value:

Nashe scolds Spenser for "forgetfulness" in omitting Amyntas from that "honourable catalogue of our English *Heroes*, which insueth the conclusion of thy famous Fairie Queene," and urges that "Amyntas [be taken as] the second mysticall argument of the knight of the Red-crosse" (Nashe, *Works*, i, 243-244). Nashe alludes obviously to some nobleman whom he wishes to exalt.²¹⁶

²¹⁵ Steven May, Spenser's "Amyntas": Three Poems By Ferdinando Stanley, Lord Strange, Fifth Earl Of Derby, *Modern Philology*, Vol. 70, No. 1 (Aug., 1972), pp. 49-52 this ref. p. 49. Kelsie Harder in his article 'Nashe's Rebuke of Spenser', (*Notes and Queries* (1953) CXCVIII (Apr): p. 145 - to p. 146 this ref. p. 145) provides almost the exact same statement as May writing 'That Amyntas was Ferdinando Stanley, Lord Strange, later the Earl of Derby, has been accepted in general by Spenserian scholars'. This view is echoed by C.G. Harlow, 'Thomas Nashe, Robert Cotton the Antiquary, and *The Terrors of the Night*', *The Review of English Studies*, Vol. 12, No. 45 (Feb., 1961), pp. 7-23 who further adds that 'the Earl of Derby, as Lord Strange, had been (by the most reasonable identification) the Amyntas who was Nashe's patron, and the Lord S. to whom he dedicated *The Choise of Valentines*.'

²¹⁶ Harry Morris, 'Richard Barnfield, "Amyntas", and the Sidney Circle', *PMLA*, Vol. 74, No. 4 (Sep., 1959), pp. 318-324 this ref. p. 319

Morris believes that Nashe is dispensing with his trademark sarcasm and should be believed without question. Brink takes an opposing view which is more consistent with Nashe's writing in general, commenting that this section is part of a much bigger picture and must be viewed in a different light:

Nashe does not repudiate servile flattery and then perversely engage in it on Spenser's behalf. He is highly ironic throughout this entire section of *Pierce Peniless*.²¹⁷

Brink considers Nashe to be continuing in the same fashion when specifically examining the dedication:

[Nashe] cannot resist an ironic aside on the number of dedications included in the 1590 *Faerie Queene*. He wonders why his own 'Amyntas' has been omitted. To correct this oversight, Nashe facetiously furnishes his own sonnet to 'Amyntas', the one peer omitted from the dedicatory sonnets. The editors of the Spenser Variorum and most subsequent commentators have assumed that Nashe was alluding to the omission of Lord Burghley, but they have missed his irony and have in consequence concentrated on identifying 'so special a pillar of Nobilitie'. Nashe wittily repairs Spenser's supposed omission of the exemplary peer who surpasses Homeric heroes and might serve as the subject for a future

²¹⁷ Jean R. Brink, 'Materialist History of the Publication of Spenser's *Faerie Queene*', *The Review of English Studies*, New Series, Vol. 54, No. 213 (Feb., 2003), pp. 1-26 this ref. p. 16

Spenserian epic by supplying his own sonnet. As he puts it, he has amended the omission of this notable figure from 'that honourable Catalogue of our English Heroes, which insueth the conclusion of thy famous *Fairie Queen* (Nashe, *Works*, i, 243-244)'.²¹⁸

This view is more convincing than Morris'; it is not Nashe's style to allude to unnamed noblemen in an effort to exalt them. Nashe has shown with his preface to *Astrophel and Stella* that when he admires someone, he makes this very clear, in that instance praising not only Sir Philip Sidney but also his sister and those who show the good taste to also admire him. Conversely making sly digs and poking sarcastically at those around him is most certainly in Nashe's bailiwick and it is much more compelling to see this passage as another example of this. Brink continues by commenting that the subject of Nashe's pen is not Spenser but that he is more focussed on the system that all authors currently have to work under:

Nashe questions the patronage system on the grounds that patrons only grudgingly reward worthy writers ('for what reason have I to bestow any of my wit upon him, that will bestow none of his wealth upon me?'), but the full complexity of his rhetorical strategy has not been acknowledged. He also wants to parody the effect that the patronage system has on writers, but to do so without disparaging Spenser.²¹⁹

²¹⁸ Brink, 'Materialist History of the Publication of Spenser's *Faerie Queene*', this ref. p. 16

²¹⁹ Brink, 'Materialist History of the Publication of Spenser's *Faerie Queene*', this ref. p. 15-16

In Brink's analysis the ever opportunistic Nashe has seen a chance to rail at the system which is keeping him down and is using Spenser as a means to do so. What needs to be remembered here is that *Pierce Penilesse* was written in 1592 and comes after a period of unsuccessful activity; previous to this Nashe's most recent published work was the preface to the 1590 unauthorised edition to Sidney's *Astrophel and Stella*, an edition which was recalled and replaced, with all of Nashe's work removed. *Pierce Penilesse* represents Nashe at his lowest and angriest ebb; despite this he endeavours to make it clear that this is not an attack on Spenser softening his blows by appending to his sonnet the lines

Beare with me gentle Poet, though I conceiue not aright of thy
purpose, or be too inquisitiue into the intent of thy obliuion, for,
howeuer, my coniecture may misse the cushion, yet shal my speech
sauour of friendship, though it be not alied to iudgement.²²⁰

Nashe is taking pains to distance the poet, who he respects, from the system which he abhors.

An opposing view comes from Andrew Hadfield who also notes the inclusion in *Pierce Penilesse* of the dedicatory sonnet written in the style of Spenser; Hadfield expands his argument by also including one of Nashe's later works noting that *Nashe's Lenten Stuffe* as well as the sonnet can be read as sly attacks on Spenser.

²²⁰ Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Supplication to the Diuell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 244, line 29-33

However closer examination of this argument and the passages Hadfield engages with leads me to a different conclusion. Hadfield notes that in *Lenten Stuffe*

He [Nashe] describes his journey to Yarmouth in terms familiar to any reader of romance, as 'variable Knight arrant adventures and outroades and inroads, at greate Yarmouth in Norfolke I ariued in the latter ende of Autumne'. Adopting one of his earlier pseudonyms, Nashe then proclaims that 'this is a predestinate fit place for *Piers Pennillesse* to set vp his staffe in.'²²¹

Hadfield continues by suggesting this passage can be seen as a sly attack on Spenser describing how Nashe juxtaposes his own prosaic journey with the epic travels of the heroes featured in the works of Spenser and his peers. It is my contention that at this point Nashe is employing the same technique he utilises elsewhere in *Lenten Stuffe* with the tale of Hero and Leander and that both of these passages are better served being treated as a homage to the original authors. Nashe takes the epic poem translated by his friend Christopher Marlowe and morphs this tale of romantic love into a baser tale about fish and their destiny to be together only briefly:

so but seldome should they meete in the heele of the weeke at the best mens tables, vppon Fridayes and Satterdayes, the holy time of

²²¹ Hadfield, '*Lenten Stuffe*: Thomas Nashe and the fiction of travel', this ref. p. 77

Lent exempted, and then they might be at meate and meale for
seuen weekes together.²²²

There is a clear difference to the manner in which Nashe uses the words of those he admires and those he professes to dislike; with Marlowe and Spenser, Nashe uses the same themes and styles as the older writer and converts epic to bathetic as a way of eliciting humour from subjects which should be serious. As a result, the source material is not debased or detracted from; instead Nashe adds his own twist to the story and as such enriches the piece as a whole. Conversely when Nashe writes about Harvey he tends to quote him wholesale and then systematically take apart each point usually accompanied by a withering insult. Where Marlowe is referred to as 'a diviner muse than him [Musaeus]'²²³ Harvey is 'a supernaturall Hibble de beane';²²⁴ Spenser is referred to as 'heauenlie'²²⁵ and 'gentle poet'²²⁶ while Harvey is the nonsensical 'Graphiel Hagiel'²²⁷ or 'Gurmo Hidruntum.'²²⁸ It is also one of these insults that shows Nashe subtly providing another comment on the relationship between Harvey and Spenser. In *Strange Newes* Nashe refers to Harvey as 'Gaffer lobbernoule' writing

²²² Nashe, *Nashe's Lenten Stufte*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 199-200, line 29+

²²³ Nashe, *Nashe's Lenten Stufte*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 195, line 18

²²⁴ Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron-Walden*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 46, line 3

²²⁵ Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Svpplication to the Divell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 243, line 32

²²⁶ Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Svpplication to the Divell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 244, line 29

²²⁷ Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron-Walden*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 107, line 14

²²⁸ Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron-Walden*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 65, line 17. There has been some attention paid to the possible meanings and etymologies of Nashe's nicknames for Harvey. I recommend Matthew Steggle's 'The Names of Gabriel Harvey: Cabbalistic, Russian and Fencing Sources' (*Notes and Queries*, 52 (2), (June 2005) 185-186 to gain an understanding as to the sources of some of these insults.

Gaffer lobbernoule, once more well ouer-taken. How dost thou? how
dost thou? holde vp thy heade, man, take no care; though *Greene* be
dead, yet I may liue to doe thee good.²²⁹

This first part of this name appears to be inconsequential being merely a standard title for a gentleman. However, the *Oxford English Dictionary*²³⁰ notes that the title is of rustic origin often given to elderly men. The *OED* also notes that although the title could be given as a mark of esteem it was also used with no intimation of respect. The usage with regards to Harvey is surely no accident. A cursory glance suggests that Nashe is paying respect to his rival by denoting him as 'a master'; a more in-depth examination shows there is no respect given but instead that by using 'Gaffer' Nashe designates Harvey as rustic and therefore not urbane; elderly and therefore not energetic in mind or deed. The second part of the name is of even greater interest as it bears more than a passing resemblance to Spenser's own epithet of Harvey from *The Shepheardes Calender* 'Hobbinol'. This resemblance becomes clearer when we consider that most of Nashe's nicknames tend to use Harvey's own initials. It therefore follows that 'Jobbernowl' becomes 'Hobbernowl' and it would seem that Nashe is taking the opportunity to further belittle Harvey's relationship with the greater writer. Nashe is taking something which Harvey is proud of - his close association with Spenser - and turning it against him. By parodying this name Nashe is suggesting that perhaps Spenser and Harvey are not

²²⁹ Nashe, *Strange Newes*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 286, line 28-30

²³⁰ The *OED* lists 2 definitions that are relevant to this essay which note the different and contrary sub-texts that can be read into this title. For full definitions please see "gaffer, n." *OED Online*. Oxford University Press, September 2015.

as close as the Doctor suggests and that the relationship has been diminished if not completely soured – this is re-enforced later in *Piers Penniless* when Nashe claims that the correspondence shared by the two men were actually written solely by Harvey writing

I durst on my credit vndertake, *Spencer* was no way priuie to the
committing of them to the print...*G. H.* should not have reapt so
much discredit by being committed to Newgate, as by committing
that misbeleeeuing prose to the Presse.²³¹

Nashe concludes this section by stating unequivocally that he believes Harvey is misrepresenting the relationship writing '*Gabriell*, thou canst play at fast and loose as well as anie man in England';²³² Nashe wants his readers to understand that Harvey's words cannot be taken at face value and the Spenser-Harvey dynamic may be different to what is generally believed. Through all this it becomes evident that within his writing Nashe treats Marlowe and Spenser in similar fashion and with a reverence that Harvey does not get or deserve; Nashe and Marlowe were close whereas Nashe and Harvey were not, and it can be concluded that Nashe saw Spenser in a much more similar light to Marlowe than to Harvey. In this light the dedicatory sonnet looks different. Whereas Hadfield suggests that 'Nashe helpfully supplied his own sonnet to a forgotten patron, cruelly suggesting that the real point of the edition was the collection of sonnets, not the poem itself'²³³ I find myself

²³¹ Nashe, *Strange Newes, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 296, lines 4-9

²³² Nashe, *Strange Newes, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 296, lines 22-23

²³³ Hadfield, '*Lenten Stufte: Thomas Nashe and the fiction of travel*', this ref. p. 78

closer to Brink's interpretation as discussed earlier, that it is not the poet that Nashe takes issue with but the system that requires him to add these flattering tracts. What also needs to be noted is that this sonnet is both pre-dated by Nashe lauding Spenser in *Preface to Menaphon* written in 1589 and post-dated by the large number of pro-Spenser references in both *Strange Newes* and *Have With You*. These references make it easier to believe that rather than attacking or censuring Spenser, Nashe was poking fun at the poet in a friendly fashion, in the same way that he does with his close friend Christopher Marlowe in *Lenten Stuffle*.

A further reason to dismiss Hadfield's conjecture that *Lenten Stuffle* is an attack on Spenser comes from the treatment of Richard Hakluyt. Within his article Hadfield notes Nashe's dislike of this author, the travel writer who famously travelled very little. As noted in his *Oxford DNB* entry Hakluyt was the Chaplain to the English ambassador in Paris for five years in the early 1580's but 'Although Hakluyt contemplated following Gilbert to America, his only travel abroad was to the embassy in Paris.'²³⁴ It is my contention that rather than attacking Spenser, Nashe is using *Lenten Stuffle* to continue a theme he established in *The Unfortunate Traveller*: that there is an unreliability in these second hand travel accounts which leaves them open to his particular brand of satire. Hakluyt, who famously begins his most famous reference work *The Principal Navigations, Voiages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation* with the disclaimer 'there

²³⁴ Anthony Payne, 'Hakluyt, Richard (1552? –1616), geographer', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press. (2004-09-23),

is not any history in the world (the most holy writ accepted) whereof we are precisely bound to believe each word and syllable',²³⁵ asked to be taken as a serious geographer despite his lack of travel and his own admission of the presence of factual inaccuracies. Nashe nods towards this hypocrisy in *Lenten Stuffe* when he writes 'I haue not trauailed farre, though conferred with farthest trauailers, from our owne Realme';²³⁶ by framing this comment in a fantastical work which can in no way be deemed to be non-fiction or a reference book Nashe is showing the difference in integrity between himself and Hakluyt. Because of this and the long-standing well-established enmity that Nashe has towards Hakluyt makes it far more compelling to believe that *Lenten Stuffe*, far from being an attack on Spenser, is a further tirade against the travel writer. As Nashe consistently shows throughout his writings anyone closely linked with Harvey is to be considered a target. Hakluyt and Harvey's relationship would have been well known at this point – as Day writes

A marginal note contained in Harvey's copy of Quintilian's guide to oratory, *M. Fabii Quintiliani Oratoris eloquentissimi, Institutio num oratoriarum Libri XII* (Paris, 1542) that refers to Hakluyt as "being dear" to Harvey was probably made as early as 1578.²³⁷

Hakluyt was also not a writer who garnered any praise from Nashe, unlike Spenser who gets favourable mentions in a number of Nashe's works. I shall discuss the

²³⁵ Richard Hakluyt, *The Principal Navigations, Voiages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English nation*, 2nd edn, 3 vols (London: George Bishop, Ralph Newberie, and Robert Barker, 1598–1600); reprinted. in 12 volumes (Glasgow: James MacLehose, 1903–05), i (1903), Quotation from iii.

²³⁶ Nashe, *Nashe's Lenten Stuffe, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 172, line 16-17

²³⁷ Day, 'Hakluyt, Harvey, Nashe: The Material Text and Early Modern Nationalism', this ref. p. 284

Nashe – Hakluyt dynamic in more depth in Chapter Five – at this point I shall note that Spenser was treated far more positively than the travel writer. In Nashe’s view Spenser also has the advantage over Hakluyt because of his own travels; Spenser spent a considerable amount of time in Ireland leaving England in 1580 and spending the majority of his remaining twenty years in that country. This would have seemed to Nashe to be a far more lawless and daunting prospect than spending five years in France at a relatively cordial time in the Anglo-France relationship. Nashe would have been more likely to consider Spenser’s actions as a quest akin to that of The Redcrosse Knight or Jack Wilton than any actions taken by Hakluyt either during or after his short time abroad. The further arguments that Hadfield makes here are valid but I disagree with the conclusion he makes – that ‘Nashe suggests that he, not Spenser, is fated to produce a true religious vision’.²³⁸ This is not the case with *Lenten Stuffe*, a parody of a classical tale alongside an attack on those who have chased him from London. The piece can be interpreted as many things but not as a religious treatise. I would argue that Hadfield actually gets to the nub of it when he notes that ‘In slighting Spenser, Nashe was, of course, really attacking Harvey, as at various points throughout his writings he accuses Harvey of shamelessly advertising his reliance on Spenser and promoting his own fame through his connection with the celebrated poet’²³⁹ although Hadfield is wrong to claim that Nashe was 'slighting' Spenser. Whereas it cannot be forgotten that Spenser and Harvey were close, Nashe believes Harvey has exaggerated the

²³⁸ Hadfield, '*Lenten Stuffe*: Thomas Nashe and the fiction of travel', this ref. p. 78

²³⁹ Hadfield, '*Lenten Stuffe*: Thomas Nashe and the fiction of travel', this ref. p. 78

friendship and almost always excuses Spenser from any culpability arising from this situation. Nashe treats Spenser with a significant degree of reverence and paints the Nashe-Spenser relationship in a much more favourable light.

Building on this interpretation I would like to briefly discuss the language and style used in both Nashe's 'homage' to Spenser's dedicatory sonnets and the previously noted 'Amyntas' passage. Focusing initially on this passage close examination of the text shows the language used here is Spenserian in both nature and style. In referring to Spenser's subject as 'thy stately goddess' Nashe is using a word that Spenser utilises on numerous occasions, not only in *The Faerie Queene* in which it appears thirty times, but also in *Shepheardes Calender* (where it occurs on ten occasions) as well as various other works. Of more significant note is that the Nashe employs a very nautical turn of phrase with his final line. This has a marked similarity with the end of Book 1, Canto 12 of *The Faerie Queene* when in Stanza 42 Spenser encourages the reader to 'Now strike your sailes ye iolly Mariners'.²⁴⁰ This is not a trope that Nashe uses often, other than one reference in *Nashe's Lenten Stuffle* and one in *The Unfortunate Traveller*, both pieces which could easily contain more sailing references given the nature of the works, Nashe does not reference maritime affairs in this manner. The use of this language and the positioning of the references suggest that this is another Nashean homage to the poet; utilising his words, which incidentally appear nine times in the first book of *The Faerie Queene* alongside three instances of the word 'ship'. Equally compelling is Nashe's inclusion

²⁴⁰ Edmund Spenser, *The Faerie Queene*, ed A.C. Hamilton (Pearson: London 2001), p. 155, Stanza 42, line 1

of 'forewearied', an archaic construction of the word 'weary'. Nashe uses 'weary' on 22 occasions across his whole canon; Spenser uses this term 132 times in *The Faerie Queene* alone. This lends more evidence to the idea that Nashe is not just commenting upon Spenser's commendatory verses; he is subtly aping the poet's style and as a result suggesting that he and the older author are writing with similar goals in mind. Nashe then moves on to his own version of a *Faerie Queene* sonnet writing

Perusing yesternight, with idle eyes,
The Faery Singers stately tuned verse,
And viewing after Chap-men's wonted guise,
What strange contents the title did rehearse,
I streight leapt ouer to the latter end,
Where like the quaint Comedians of our time,
That when their Play is doone do fall to ryme,
I found short lines, to sundry nobles pend,
Whom he as speciall Mirrours singled fourth,
To be the Patrons of his Poetry:
I read them all, and reuerenc't their worth,
Yet wondred he left out thy memory.
But therefore gest I he suppress thy name,

Because few words might not coprise thy fame.²⁴¹

Significantly this is Nashe's version of a Spenser sonnet but it is not a 'Spenserian' sonnet; it does not follow exactly the rhyme scheme and pattern that Spenser uses both in *The Faerie Queene* and his other works. Instead Nashe adds his own style to the sonnet using a CDDC rhyme scheme in the second quatrain instead of Spenser's CDCD whilst keeping everything else the same. Immediately this informs the reader that these are not Spenser's words but an interpretation of them by a writer who could easily follow this rhyme scheme - he does so in the remainder of the sonnet - but chooses not to. The content of the sonnet also leaves this in no doubt; in his sonnets Spenser discusses noble lords, sweet poetry and countless muses - he uses this word no fewer than eleven times - whereas Nashe dismisses these men as 'sundry nobles'. Nashe dismisses *The Faerie Queene* itself with equal haste noting how he has 'leapt to the latter end' in order to read these verses. Given the manner in which Nashe mimics this work in his own and noting his previous praise of the author it can be surmised that these words are not to be taken at face value and this leap to the end is Nashe's satirical way of shifting focus away from Spenser's main work and on to the point he wishes to make; this is not a commentary on Spenser's abilities or his work but that any omission of 'Amyntas' is deliberate and this figure's influence and importance is not as great as others may have assumed. Of course, as with anything Nashean, there is clearly an element of sniping towards

²⁴¹ Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Supplication to the Divell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 244, lines 15-28

the original author – Zucher puts together a convincing argument to the many ways in which Nashe criticises Spenser noting

Nashe's elaborate of the 1590 publication of *The Faerie Queene* gestures scattershot at a number of plausible accusations; that the printing event was a debacle, that Spenser confused and delayed the process, that the famous reformatting and re-setting of the Dedicatory Sonnets was related to, or the result of, this confusion...'²⁴²

He continues by describing this section as 'Nashe's devilish and witty, if not finally hostile, parody of Spenser's disgrace' although also notes the relationship between Spenser's words and Nashe's;

Nashe's travesty in *Pierce Penilesse* of the patronage culture of 1590s literary publishing takes the 1590 edition of *The Faerie Queene* as one of its targets because, in his own brilliant way – materially, allegorically, politically – Spenser had already travestied the same system.'²⁴³

Nashe took the opportunity to both playfully mock the poet whilst at the same time

²⁴² Andrew Zucher, 'Getting It Back To Front In 1590: Spenser's Dedications, Nashe's Insinuations, And Raleigh's Equivocations', *Studies In The Literary Imagination*; Fall 2005; 38, 2 pp. 173-198 this ref. p. 191

²⁴³ Zucher, 'Getting It Back To Front In 1590: Spenser's Dedications, Nashe's Insinuations, And Raleigh's Equivocations', this ref. p. 192

taking the advantage given to him by Spenser's words to condemn the system to which all writers must conform.

Thus far we have considered the most controversial references to Spenser. But we turn now to the numerous others that appear throughout Nashe's work. Throughout his career Nashe makes explicit reference to Spenser on a number of occasions. Unsurprisingly given the pre-existing relationship between Gabriel Harvey and Spenser the overwhelming majority of these are in the two works Nashe aimed at Harvey, *Strange Newes* and *Have With You to Saffron Walden*. There is also a reference that predates both of these works which appears in one of Nashe's earliest published works; in his *Preface to Robert Greene's Menaphon* Nashe compares the great continental authors to those of England and holds Spenser up as an example of one who is worthy of praise. After praising Chaucer Nashe then decries the lack of ability in court writing

What should I come to our court, where the otherwhile vacations of our grauer Nobility are prodigall of more pompous wit and choice of words than euer tragicke *Tasso* could attain to?²⁴⁴

He then continues

But as for pastorall poems, I will not make the comparison, lest our countrimen's credite should be discountenanced by the contention; who although they cannot fare with such inferiour facility, yet I know

²⁴⁴ Nashe, *Preface to Robert Greene's Menaphon*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 322-323, lines 30+
143

would carry the bucklers full easily from all forraine brauers, if their
subiectum circa quod should sauour of anything haughtie.²⁴⁵

Here Nashe introduces the theme of pastoral works which would immediately invite the reader to think of Spenser; his first major publication *The Shepheardes Calender* was a recent example of this genre and was the piece that brought Spenser to prominence. To remove any doubt who he is referring to Nashe then continues

And should the challenge of deepe conceit be intruded by any
forrainer, to bring our English wits to the touchstone of Art, I would
preferre diuine Master *Spenser*, the miracle of wit, to bandie line by
line for my life in the honour of England against Spaine, Fraunce, Italy
and all the world.²⁴⁶

This very first mention of Spenser in the works of Thomas Nashe is one of the most intriguing. The statement is unmistakably reverential with Nashe noting that in his hour of need it would be Spenser that he turns towards to defend his life rather than any other writer, including any number of skilled authors that he had a far closer relationship with. *Menaphon* and Nashe's attendant preface was first published in 1589, slightly before the first three books of Spenser's opus *The Faerie Queene* became widely available so this admiration towards the poet seems almost prescient; at this point the only work of note Spenser had produced was *The*

²⁴⁵ Nashe, *Preface to Robert Greene's Menaphon*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 323, lines 1-7

²⁴⁶ Nashe, *Preface to Robert Greene's Menaphon*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 323, lines 7-12

Shepherd's Calendar, although his connections to the court via Raleigh and his half-brother Humphrey Gilbert undoubtedly gave Nashe and others an indication that Spenser would likely become very much in favour. Furthermore, it is highly likely that Nashe would have seen some of *The Faerie Queene*; Christopher Marlowe certainly had seen sections of this as he quotes a stanza from this 1590 publication in *2 Tamburlaine the Greater* which was written in around 1588. As I shall discuss later in the chapter this was most likely due to both Marlowe and Nashe's relationship with Abraham Fraunce, so it is easy to imagine Nashe would have seen Spenser's work as early as Marlowe did. Even so for Nashe to place the poet above others such as Roydon, Achlow and Peele given such a limited sample size is noteworthy; these men are all mentioned in relation to Spenser not being 'the only swallow of our Summer'²⁴⁷ but as such are placed behind and below him. Nashe seems to recognise Spenser's talents before many of his contemporaries and he makes sure that Spenser is not included among the number of

ideot Art-masters, that intrude themselves to our eares as the
Alcumists of eloquence, who (mounted on the stage of arrogance)
thinke to outbraue better pennes with the swelling bumbast of
bragging blanke verse...²⁴⁸

This separates him from the herd in the strongest possible terms. Nashe, never a man to undersell his own skills and abilities, in this instance chooses Spenser as the

²⁴⁷ Nashe, *Preface to Robert Greene's Menaphon*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 323 line 12

²⁴⁸ Nashe, *Preface to Robert Greene's Menaphon*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 311, lines 25-29

man to fight for *his* own life. The impact of this statement cannot be undersold; in writing this Nashe implies that Spenser is a superior author to him and is willing to cede control in a battle of wits to this author. This is an admission that Nashe rarely makes; only Pietro Aretino gets comparable treatment when Nashe notes in *Pierce Penilesse* 'We want an *Aretine* here among vs that might strip these golden asses out of their gaie trappings'.²⁴⁹ Even here there is a significant difference; although Nashe is acknowledging that Aretino also has greater skills than he, the stakes are lower; the Italian is needed to correct the behaviours of other authors but Spenser is the man whom Nashe trusts his very life with; as previously noted he is the man who Nashe would choose 'to bandie line by line for my life in the honour of England against Spaine, Fraunce, Italy and all the world.'²⁵⁰

Attention now must turn to the nature of the language Nashe uses here and as mentioned it is notable that there are a number of words and phrases that give this passage a distinctly religious undertone. Nashe bestows upon Spenser the epithet 'divine' and then emphasises this by calling Spenser 'the miracle of wit'; by doing so he elevates him above mere mortality and gives Spenser an almost pietistic profile. Bearing in mind where the two men stood in relation to the religious landscape (Spenser is often described as a Militant Protestant or Calvinist whereas Nashe is a man famous for his impatience with and dislike of Puritan preaching)²⁵¹ this is remarkable as Nashe is utilising religious iconography to

²⁴⁹ Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Svpplication to the Divell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 242, lines 15-17

²⁵⁰ Nashe, *Preface to Robert Greene's Menaphon*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 323, lines 7-12

²⁵¹ In this essay I do not wish to engage with the many arguments that discuss Spenser's religious tendencies. For an in-depth examination and discussion of these points I recommend reading King's chapter in *The*

commend a man whose religious viewpoint he takes an opposing view on. This is similar to the way in which Nashe treats Aretino although with the Italian Nashe is at least able to acknowledge their theological differences; as noted in chapter two Aretino is described in *Strange Newes* alongside Julian and Lucian as 'abominable atheists'.²⁵² This reference is the exception rather than the rule and elsewhere Nashe consistently holds the Italian up as the pinnacle of satire and one to be aped rather than opposed. With Spenser this situation is even clearer cut; while Nashe and Spenser were both Protestant, Spenser was much more puritanical - this will have been something he was exposed to as early as his university days, as King notes

Spenser began his studies at Pembroke Hall, Cambridge. Cambridge was a hot bed of religious controversy inspired by Thomas Cartwright's attack on the episcopal hierarchy of the Church of England (1569-1570). Puritan criticism of the official worship service, of clerical vestments, and of the church enjoyed a strong following at Pembroke.²⁵³

Cambridge Companion to Spenser which examines Spenser and his work and attempts to define his religious tendencies. It is also important at this stage to note that Nashe's anti-puritan tendencies were well documented; Donald J McGinn in his article 'Nashe's Share in the Marprelate Controversy' notes 'Both Nashe and Mar-Martin Junior attack the puritans as proud and hypocritical.' (p. 976) as well as noting other attacks Nashe makes, either as himself or as the anonymous author of *An Almond for a Parrot*, on this religious faction. For further information see John E. King, *Spenser's Religion, The Cambridge Companion to Spenser*, ed. Andrew Hadfield (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001) and Donald J McGinn, 'Nashe's Share in the Marprelate Controversy', *PMLA*, Vol. 59, No. 4 (Dec., 1944), pp. 952-984

²⁵² Thomas Nashe, *Strange Newes, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 285, line 18

²⁵³ John E. King, *Spenser's Religion, The Cambridge Companion to Spenser*, this ref. p. 202

Yet although the two men do not hold the same extremist views, at no point in his writing does Nashe make any reference to Spenser's puritanism either via obvious reference or sarcastic aside. Instead on the numerous times that Nashe invokes religious connotations in relation to Spenser he uses them to praise and elevate the author. Not only is he referred to in this manner in *Preface* but again in *Strange Newes* when Nashe is looking to cast doubt on the Harvey-Spenser relationship he notes

Onely I will looke vpon the last Sonnet of M. *Spencers* to the right
worshipful Maister *G.H.*, Doctour of the lawes: or it may so fall out
that I will not looke vpon it too, because (*Gabriell*) though I
vehemently suspect it to bee of thy owne doing, it is popt forth
vnder M. *Spencers* name, and his name is able to sanctifie anything,
though falsely ascribed to it.²⁵⁴

There is a clear difference in the treatment of the two men; Spenser is given the simple title 'Master' in contrast to the overly wordy epithet ascribed to Harvey. By over emphasising Harvey's title Nashe is facetiously belittling him; conversely by referring to Spenser with a comparatively minimal amount of the ceremony he offers his great rival he draws a distance between them. By underplaying Spenser's title in close proximity to overplaying Harvey's Nashe gives simple and understated validation to Spenser. However, it is the last line of the passage above that we need

²⁵⁴ Thomas Nashe, *Strange Newes*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 286, line 28-30
148

to focus on here. By saying that the usage of Spenser's name is able to 'sanctifie' anything, Nashe once again evokes thoughts of religion and religious imagery. Nashe could have chosen any number of similar words here but by choosing one which can only be interpreted with a religious bent is very intriguing. This constant referencing of Spenser in a quasi-religious manner suggests that although religion was very important to Nashe he elevates those he admires and respects above theological belief and can venerate the man despite that man's credo, a technique that he revisits throughout his work. I have already noted some occasions where this occurs in *Preface* and *Strange Newes* but the references go beyond these two incidences. In *Strange Newes* Nashe writes a long passage which is a devastating attack on Harvey and his relationship with Spenser. Beginning with a chastisement of the doctor for constantly invoking Spenser's name in an effort to win the argument (incidentally this admonishment has Nashe accusing Harvey of being vain glorious which in itself has religious connotations) Nashe continues on by saying 'Immortall *Spencer*, no frailtie hath thy fame, but the imputation of this Idiots friendship.'²⁵⁵ Again, Nashe is elevating Spenser by calling him immortal but his relationship with Harvey may have a negative effect on his reputation. Similarly, in an effort to minimise the reflected credit that Harvey may get from being friends with Spenser, Nashe repeatedly references the poet and his work as a means with which to chastise and berate the doctor. It begins with Nashe referencing one of Spenser's lesser known works, the poem *Mother Hubberds Tale*, originally written

²⁵⁵ Thomas Nashe, *Strange Newes, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 282, line 11-12

in 1579 and then re-visited and republished in 1590 following the publication of *The Faerie Queene*. Nashe takes issue with Harvey's comments about the work writing

Thou bringest in *Mother Hubbard* for an instance. Go no further, but here confesse thyselfe a flat nodgscomb before all this congregation; for thou hast dealt by thy friend as homely as thou didst by thy father. Who publikely accusde, or of late brought Mother Hubbard into question, that thou shouldst by rehearsall rekindle against him the sparkes of displeasure that were quenched?²⁵⁶

Harvey had earlier criticised Spenser's work in one of his *Four Letters* noting that

Even Tully and Horace otherwhiles overreached, and I must needs say *Mother Hubberd*, in heat of choler, forgetting the pure sanguine of her sweet *Faerie Queene*, wilfully overshot her malcontented self...²⁵⁷

Nashe clearly sees this comment as a betrayal of Spenser; he is angry that in an attempt to score points against Nashe, Harvey is seemingly willing to dredge up an unpleasant occurrence in his friend's recent history. Nashe notes Harvey is committing something he sees as an unforgivable sin:

²⁵⁶ Thomas Nashe, *Strange Newes, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 281, line 24-30

²⁵⁷ Gabriel Harvey, *Four Letters and Certaine Sonnets*, p. 6-7

If any man were vndereruedly toucht in it, thou hast reuiued his
disgrace that was so toucht in it, by renaming it, when it was worn
out of al mens mouths and minds.²⁵⁸

He goes on to write

...vpon an vnspotted *Pegasus* should thy gorgeous attired *Fayrie*
Queene ride triumphant through all reports dominions, but that this
mud-borne bubble, this bile on the brow of the Vniuersitie, this
bladder of pride newe blowne, challengeth some interest in her
prosperitie.²⁵⁹

In doing so he indicates that he feels that Harvey has not only been a false friend to Spenser but also to the subject of *The Faerie Queene* and the country she reigns over. In this passage the different treatment of Harvey and Spenser is stark; Spenser is deified whilst Harvey is vilified. In Nashe's eyes Spenser is *Immortal* suggesting Nashe believes that his memory will live forever and predicting that his works will not be forgotten. This is then followed by a series of insults which leave no doubt how Nashe feels about Harvey disparaging the doctor's character and temperament. In this diatribe Nashe seems to take personal affront that Harvey, who taught at Nashe's *alma mater* Cambridge, was in any way linked to that university. In saying this Nashe is suggesting that Harvey is an embarrassment to most things he comes in contact with; not only is he besmirching Spenser's

²⁵⁸ Thomas Nashe, *Strange Newes*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 282, line 1-3

²⁵⁹ Thomas Nashe, *Strange Newes*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 282, line 12-17

reputation, he is dishonouring a well-established, well respected University and is even able to bring shame on England and her Queen. In three years, Harvey has been transformed from one of the country's brighter stars to a 'mud-borne bubble' that is bringing disrespect to the country whereas Spenser emerges from this relationship unscathed. And this characterisation of Spenser as immortal is not unique; on a number of occasions Nashe venerates Spenser using spiritual and overtly religious epithets or describing the author as heavenly; a search on the Early English Books Online website shows that although Nashe uses this word between ten and twelve times, the only person who merits this moniker is Spenser. It is far more convincing to see that Nashe has genuine admiration for Spenser which goes beyond that of others he has favoured. I will later argue that Nashe's Preface to Sidney's *Astrophel and Stella* was written both to praise Sidney but also as an attempt to gain patronage and exposure to a different circle; unlike with that situation it is evident that the praise for Spenser has no such ulterior motive. Nashe's treatment of Spenser is closer to the manner in which he discusses Aretino and while there are numerous references to both Sidney and Spenser throughout Nashe's works, his treatment of Spenser is closer to that of the Italian. It is clear that Nashe respected the writing achievements of all three men but it was Spenser and Aretino who had a more long-term impact in him. And there is also a similarity in some of the messages that Spenser and Nashe both deliver; as Knapp writes

For Spenser as for Nashe, poets edify better than sermonizers do by making their lessons congenial to the flesh and therefore convenable to their audience. In its doubleness, Spenser's allegory answers the

pastoral question of *The Shepheardes Calender* by enabling Spenser to stoop to his readers' capacities without surrendering his lofty purposes.²⁶⁰

Knapp here is alluding previously to both the pseudonymous anti-Martinist attacks and Nashe's own pamphlets.

The earlier reference to *Mother Hubberds Tale* is the first chronological instance of Nashe calling into question the nature of the Spenser-Harvey relationship; throughout his works Nashe intimates that Harvey is unworthy of any attention paid to him by Spenser and that equating the two men does Spenser more harm than good. By invoking *Mother Hubberds Tale* Nashe feels that by drawing attention to it Harvey is doing his supposed friend a disservice by reminding him of a low point in his career; *Mother Hubberds Tale* when it was revised and released in around 1590 was quite controversial and it has been noted by a number of sources that the piece along with *Complaints* was 'called-in' or withdrawn from circulation. Hile notes the piece's reception:

So Spenser succeeded in communicating with his audience, though perhaps too well, given that *Mother Hubberds Tale*, after being called in by March 1591, was not published again until 1612, after the

²⁶⁰ Jeffrey Knapp, 'Spenser the Priest', *Representations*, Vol. 81, No. 1 (Winter 2003), pp. 61-78, this ref. p. 68

deaths of not only Lord Burghley himself but also his equally powerful son, Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury²⁶¹

Dutton explains 'It acquired the notoriety it did because it was "called in" (that is, unsold copies were impounded) shortly after publication among Spenser's *Complaints* in 1591.'²⁶² There can be little doubt that Nashe saw Harvey referencing this and saw the opportunity to further portray his rival as a man who would easily betray a figure he claimed to be friendly with. Nashe finds this level of hypocrisy untenable; he is offended that a supposedly honourable man would stoop to the level of uninformed outsiders:

Besides, whereas before I thought it a made matter of some malicious moralizers against him, and no substance of slander in truth; now, when thou (that proclaimest thy selfe the only familiar of his bosome, and therefore shouldst know his secretes) giues it out in print that he ouershotte himselfe therein, it cannot chuse but be suspected to be so indeed.²⁶³

Nashe is implying that if Harvey was as close to Spenser as he suggests then his criticism carries more weight than that of those who are less friendly with him. Nashe is both attacking Harvey for misrepresenting his relationship with the more accomplished poet whilst also chiding him for giving validation to the critics who

²⁶¹ Rachel E. Hile, *Spenserian Satire: A Tradition of Indirection*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017), p. 14

²⁶² Richard Dutton, 'Volpone and Beast Fable: Early Modern Analogic Reading', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 67, No. 3 (September 2004), pp. 347-370 this ref. p. 350

²⁶³ Nashe, *Strange Newes, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 282, lines 4-10

would attack Spenser. This is a typical Nashe ploy with the author cherry picking aspects of Harvey's work to maximise the severity of his attack; he wishes to strike at Harvey from multiple directions to confuse and browbeat him into submission.

As well as accusing Harvey of being a false friend to Spenser by criticising him when he should not have done, Nashe also reproaches Harvey for the manner in which he appears to use the more renowned author to validate his own work. Nashe levels these charges against the doctor on numerous occasions in both *Strange Newes* and *Have With You* and with each of these Nashe's method remains the same; Harvey is attacked whilst Spenser remains unsullied, excused and even elevated because of his treatment by the doctor. The first of these appears on *Strange Newes* when Nashe writes

Signior Immerito (so called because *he was and is his friend*
undeservedly) was counterfeitly brought in to play a part in that his
Enterlude of Epistles that was hist at, thinking his very name (as the
name of *Ned Allen* on the common stage) was able to make an ill
matter good.²⁶⁴

Nashe revisits the 'leaked' letter which he believes Harvey released of his own accord. The reference to 'Signior Immerito' refers back to the pseudonym under which *The Shepheardes Calender* was originally released and Nashe is suggesting that the Spenser who wrote this work was a different man to the man who exists at

²⁶⁴ Nashe, *Strange Newes, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, pp. 295-296, lines 35+
155

the present moment. The inference is clear; Spenser and Harvey might have been friends a few years ago but time and ability has put distance between them and today's Spenser would not recognise or defend the Gabriel Harvey that has entered into this argument. Nashe also suggests that Harvey's invoking of Spenser is similar to those dramatists who write sub-standard plays yet hope that people will still patronise them as the production features the popular actor Edward Alleyn. Nashe continues in this vein and becomes much more scathing about Harvey's habits of relying on Spenser's name to publicise his work. He writes

You will neuer leaue your olde tricks of drawing M. *Spencer* into
euerie pybald thing you do. If euer he praisd thee, it was because he
had pickt a fine vaine fool oute of thee, and he would keepe thee still
a foole by flattring thee, til such time as he had brought thee into
that extreame loue with thy selfe that thou shouldst run mad with
the conceit, and so be scorned of all men.²⁶⁵

This develops the thought that Harvey and Spenser were no longer close but also introduces the idea that any apparent friendship now is Spenser playing a joke upon Harvey. This ascribes to Spenser some very Nashean traits and suggests that Spenser is more like him than Harvey. Nashe also cannot seem to countenance the idea that there remains a genuine connection between the two men or at the very least is unwilling to give his rival even the smallest degree of credit for maintaining

²⁶⁵ Nashe, *Strange Newes, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, pp. 323-324, lines 34+

this friendship. This is Nashe at his derisive best; he takes something which is clearly important to Harvey and disparages it in an attempt to score points and ultimately win the argument at the maximum possible cost to his foe. Nashe is not content with merely winning the contest; he needs to ensure that Harvey is humiliated and unable to respond for fear of worse treatment. This approach also shows a clear shift in the way Nashe is citing Spenser from *Strange Newes* to *Have With You*; although his respect for the poet still remains unchecked, Nashe has become more concerned with using Spenser's fame as a means in which attack Harvey. Nashe focuses on the different statuses of the two men to draw a parallel in their differing fortunes; Harvey being unable to further his academic career at Cambridge in direct comparison to his former student who would at this stage have been an established figure in both the literary and political spheres.

Examining *Have With You* in more depth it can be seen that despite the passage of three years Nashe's narrative towards Harvey remained consistent. Very early in the piece Nashe once again accuses Harvey of being unable to stand on his own merits. He places Spenser alongside another one of his favourites, Philip Sidney:

...for hauing found, by much shipwrackt experience, that no worke of his, absolute vnder hys owne name, would passe, he vsed heretofore

to drawe *Sir Philip Sidney, Master Spencer*, and other men of highest credit, into euerie pild pamphlet he set foorth...²⁶⁶

The charge is clear: Harvey has no skills of his own and relies on other, greater and more able names to publicise his works. Nashe is suggesting that Harvey is trying to achieve fame by association as he cannot do so on his own qualities and will use any of these superior authors to do so. Equally unsurprisingly Nashe includes himself in that number as immediately before these lines he comments that Harvey has only managed to sell his response to *Strange Newes* by noting

Piers his Supererogation, or Nashe's Saint Fame, pretely & quirkingly he christens it; and yet not so much to quirke or crosse me thereby, as to blesse himselfe and make his booke sell, did hee giue it that title²⁶⁷

Nashe has no issues with placing himself alongside Spenser and Sidney and as such this situates him above Harvey; he clearly believes he is a superior author to his rival and is not afraid to announce this. This is a new approach with Nashe not only utilising Spenser to belittle his rival but also as a means to elevate himself. This also has an echo of a passage near the end of *Strange Newes* where in direct response to Harvey, Nashe writes

²⁶⁶ Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron-Walden, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 35, lines 9-13

²⁶⁷ Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron-Walden, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 35, lines 5-8

Then thou goest about to bribe mee to giue ouer this quarrell, and
saist if I will holde my peace, thou wilt bestowe more complements
of rare amplifications vpon mee, than euer thou bestowdst on Sir
Philip Sidney and gentle Maister *Spencer*.

Thou flatterst mee, and praisest mee.²⁶⁸

Harvey has asked Nashe to withdraw from their quarrel and to help induce him to
do so has offered to raise Nashe to the ranks that he clearly aspires to achieve.
Unsurprisingly this offer receives short shrift with Nashe continuing

To make mee a small seeming amendes for the iniuries thou hast
done mee, thou reckonst mee vp *amongst the deare louers and*
professed sonnes of the Muses, Edmund Spencer, Abraham France,
Thomas Watson, Samuell Daniell.

With a hundred blessings, and many praiers, thou intreatst me to
loue thee.

Content thy selfe, I will not.²⁶⁹

Nashe repeats his technique from earlier; Spenser's name is held up among others
to be the pinnacle of literary achievement and the idea that Nashe can be elevated
to the same status as him by mere flattering words is offensive to the younger man.
Particularly noteworthy is the stark nature of Nashe's final line; gone is the

²⁶⁸ Nashe, *Strange Newes, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 325, lines 23-28

²⁶⁹ Nashe, *Strange Newes, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 325, lines 29-36

trademark verbosity or amusing word play. Instead there is a directness which can leave the reader in no doubt that this offer to withdraw and be summarily feted will not be accepted. Three years after these words were written Nashe clearly believes that he has earned the right to be placed next to these men and above Harvey himself. Conversely Nashe believes that Harvey's abilities have travelled in the opposite direction in the same period. In *Have With You* Nashe begins a tirade by belittling Harvey's literary abilities stating

But this was our *Graphiel Hagiels* trickes of *Wily Beguily* herein, that
whereas he could get no man of worth to crie *Placet* to his workes, or
meeter it in his commendation, those worthlesse Whippets and lack
Strawes hee could get, hee would seeme to enable and compare
with the highest.²⁷⁰

Nashe is cruelly deriding Harvey noting that, as the great authors of the time no longer seem to write in Harvey's favour, he instead has to invoke lesser names and pretend they are as worthy as these more accomplished authors. Nashe then continues on by listing a group of men that he both respects and admires and that Harvey is comparing his 'worthless whippets and jack-straws to'; this list features 'Sir Thomas Baskerville, Master Bodley, Doctor Andrews, Doctor Dove, Clarencius and Master Spenser'. This is an intriguing list as the names Nashe supplies are all well-known and well-established figures; however, these are men that Nashe has

²⁷⁰ Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron-Walden, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 107, lines 13-18

chosen himself rather than using the names that Harvey originally introduced into the argument. This is a departure from the technique Nashe used in previous works with his references to Spenser, France, Watson and Daniel all being responses to Harvey's letters where these figures are originally mentioned. Here Nashe has chosen his own gallery of great and good men and Spenser is the only one who appears in both of the lists. Instead Nashe looks beyond the page and invokes soldiers, bishops and heralds to make his point. All the men that Nashe names are well respected in their own fields and well known to the establishment; Nashe appears to be suggesting that Spenser is not only a great author as Harvey tends to cite him, but is also a figure worthy of respect outside of the literary world. This idea is supported by the manner in which Nashe then refers to his inclusion of Spenser; he describes the preceding five men in glowing terms, listing their accomplishments and their effect on him before eventually turning to the author. Here Nashe takes pains to make it clear that his placing of Spenser in this final position is not a slight on the poet; rather he notes

Master *Spencer*, whom I do not thrust in the lowest place because I make the lowest valuation of; but as wee vse to set the *Summ' tot'* alway vnderneath or at the bottome, he being the *Sum' tot'* of whatsoeuer can be said of sharpe inuention and schollership.²⁷¹

²⁷¹ Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron-Walden, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol.3, p. 108, lines 17-21

Spenser is not only worthy of his place in the list but is in Nashe's opinion the equal of all the others put together. Nashe makes it clear that despite Spenser's association with his rival this has in no way diminished Nashe's respect for that author; instead the respect that Nashe for Spenser endures and if anything increases over time.

This respect for Spenser stems from a number of sources. It is clear that Nashe believes *The Faerie Queene* is well written but this is not the only work by Spenser that impacted upon Nashe. *Prosopopoia or Mother Hubberds Tale*, which I discussed earlier in the chapter, is one of the first pieces written by the poet and to that date was the most obviously satirical entry into his canon to date. The work and its subsequent censorship according to Hile 'certainly contributed to Spenser's credibility as a satirist to other poets in the 1590s, leading to other poets finding satirical inspiration in such poems as "March" and *Muiopotmos*'²⁷² and will have struck a chord with Nashe whose admiration for satirists is well established. The work itself is a very different piece to Spenser's other writings both in style and substance; *The Faerie Queene* is an epic allegorical poem that begins by praising the Queen whilst also attacking the Catholic Church and which follows a rigid rhyme scheme while the sonnet cycle *Amoretti* is a more personal sequence of eighty-nine Spenserian Sonnets which chart Spenser's courtship and marriage to Elizabeth Boyle. *Mother Hubberds Tale* exists as a poem consisting of rhyming couplets which is the only occasion Spenser uses this technique to such a great

²⁷² Hile, 'Indirect satire: theory and Spenserian practice', p. 35

extent and is Spenser's first foray into satire. This piece is an allegorical work which Thomas Herron notes is aimed at

aggressively [putting] an end to the power of moderate albeit highly corrupt governors of the realm, including those among the queen's own Protestant clerical and civil appointees in Ireland.²⁷³

This to Nashe would have been most attractive; throughout his work the influence of satirists through the ages is obvious beginning with classical writers like Ovid, Homer and Apuleius who, as well as being accomplished poets, and dramatists were also skilled in writing satire, while also taking in more contemporary figures such as Erasmus, or that 'abominable atheist' Aretino who appears repeatedly. Amongst this number Nashe also includes those he knows and has worked with; writers like Marlowe, Greene and Lyly are all noted in positive fashion. It is no surprise that, although not known for his satirical skills, Spenser's foray into the genre resonates with Nashe to the extent that elements of this tale appear in his own work. Spenser's work features two main players, the fox and the ape, with the Fox probably being the chief adviser to the Queen, William Cecil, Lord Burghley and the Ape most likely being Jean Simier.²⁷⁴ In Nashe's *Pierce Penilesse* he briefly

²⁷³ Thomas Herron, 'Reforming the Fox: Spenser's *Mother Hubberds Tale*, the Beast Fables of Barnabe Riche, and Adam Loftus, Archbishop of Dublin', *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 105, No. 3 (Summer, 2008), pp. 336-387 this ref. pp. 336-337

²⁷⁴ Much of the discussion about *Mother Hubberds Tale* centres on the identity of the two animals. Burghley is widely considered to be the Fox with Herron citing a number of sources who have reached this conclusion. In the same piece Herron notes the identity of the ape is less clear cut with Simier being the most persuasive name put forward but with a case also being put forward for James VI and Robert Cecil. These three names are also mentioned by Judson in his article 'Mother Hubbard's Ape' with Judson agreeing that this is most likely to be Simier. More recently Rachel E. Hile in her chapter '*Hamlet's debt to Spenser's Mother Hubberds Tale: A satire on Robert Cecil?*' for *Shakespeare and Spenser: Attractive Opposites* presents a compelling argument for the Ape representing the younger Cecil while maintaining the Fox's identity is his father. For further discussion

relays the story of the Bear and the Fox who are also utilised to represent political figures, in this instance the Earl of Leicester and the Protestant Churchman, and rival of Nashe's sponsor Archbishop Whitgift, Thomas Cartwright respectively. The utilisation of the beast fable in this instance is another aspect of Nashe's work which has been overlooked with only Donald McGinn in his 1946 article 'The Allegory of the "Beare" and the "Foxe" in Nashe's *Pierce Penilesse*' commenting upon this. In his piece McGinn provides a summary of the plot point before noting

London readers apparently had little difficulty in fathoming Nashe's hidden meaning. Indeed, if we may judge from his subsequent apologies, no sooner had the pamphlet appeared than he had reason to regret his venture into political and religious satire.²⁷⁵

Both Spenser and Nashe used their works to take aim at two powerful political figures and the similarities do not end there; in each case the fictional protagonists are close to the main seat of power but are not the ruling character; this honour falls to the Lion who is the figure of power in both tales. In both beast tales the titular figures do not achieve their goal of obtaining more power but are discovered and sent on their way and in the case of Nashe's Fox and his co-conspirator the chameleon 'some saie they were hanged'.²⁷⁶ Despite all these similarities there are

with regards to these identities I recommend beginning with A. C. Judson, 'Mother Hubbard's Ape', *Modern Language Notes*, Vol. 63, No. 3 (Mar., 1948), pp. 145-149 and Rachel E. Hile, 'Hamlet's debt to Spenser's Mother Hubberds Tale: A satire on Robert Cecil?', *Shakespeare and Spenser: Attractive Opposites*, Ed. J.B. Lethbridge (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008) pp. 187-200

²⁷⁵ Donald J. McGinn, 'The Allegory of the 'Beare' and the 'Foxe' in Nashe's *Pierce Penilesse*', *PMLA*, Vol. 61, No. 2 (Jun., 1946), pp. 431-453 this ref p. 432

²⁷⁶ Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Supplication to the Divell, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 226, lines 27-28

also clear differences between *Mother Hubberds Tale* and Nashe's briefer version. Both stories feature a Fox but in Spenser's poem he shares equal importance with the Ape. Nashe's tale also features an ape but here he is an incidental figure rather than a main character; in this tale the ape is also much wiler than his Spenserian equivalent being more comparable with Spenser's Fox. Spenser's Ape is more concerned with baser activities such as gambling and it is the Fox who seems to have most of the ideas and decides their next steps. As such the parallel which can be drawn here is not with *Pierce Penilesse* but with *The Unfortunate Traveller* with the Ape being the equivalent of the Earl of Surrey and the Fox being the page Jack Wilton. Spenser notes that the Ape looks like a man and dresses like a gentleman:

...that the Ape anon

Himselfe had cloathed like a gentleman,

And the slie Foxe, as like to be his groome;²⁷⁷

The Ape's eventual punishment of clipping his ears and tail actually makes him resemble a man even more than he previously did. The Fox is comparatively smarter, more persuasive and tends to do most of the planning inviting comparisons with Nashe's Wilton and Surrey, the latter being the man of greater bearing who nonetheless is happy to let Jack take the lead in most of their adventures. There is also a difference in the positions of the subject in the two tales. The Fox and the Ape both start Spenser's tale unhappy with their station in

²⁷⁷ Edmund Spenser, (1591), *Complaints Containing sundrie small poemes of the worlds vanitie. Whereof the next page maketh mention*, (London: 1591), this ref: O1r, O1v

life and their actions are all about improving their position through whatever means necessary beginning as common subjects and eventually reaching the status of King and Chief Minister. Conversely Nashe's Bear begins his story already in a position of power acting as burgomaster, or Chief Magistrate, for the Lion King and seeks to improve upon this. However, both Nashe and Spenser do focus on the consequences of their protagonist's actions although Spenser's Fox and Ape are merely exiled whilst Nashe's Bear and Fox receive terminal sentences.

Ultimately it is no surprise that *Mother Hubberds Tale* was seen to be so controversial leading to it being called in; this is a satire very much in the Juvenalian mould with Spenser aiming and hitting targets within the Queen's court. The Fox comes across as the puppeteer pulling the Ape's strings whilst the Ape himself is relatively slow-witted and easily influenced by the promise of power and influence. As a result, the regal figure head (in Spenser's case the King) seems unaware of the threat to his throne and it takes Roman Divine interventions - Jove and Mercury - to point out the danger and stir the Lion into action. The King is represented as weak and the true power lies with his advisors with the major decisions coming from them while the surrounding characters, which could easily represent Elizabeth's court, yield easily to the charismatic and persuasive Fox or to the Ape once he obtains the crown. The Fox himself is negatively characterised as cunning, duplicitous and untrustworthy and the Ape emerges with equally minimal credit as he is shown to be shallow, unintelligent and easily manipulated given the promise of power. This type of satire was favoured by Nashe - it is the method utilised by Aretino for example - and Spenser adopting this for his own work would have

appealed to the young author. Despite this he never utilised this form himself; Nashe's style of satire, whilst often being as cruel as that which Spenser exhibits here, tended to be either aimed at more specific and less consequential enemies like Harvey, or to take a more Menippean stance and focus on the ills of society as a whole rather than specific, well known powerful individuals as both Spenser and Aretino targeted. The similarities between the Italian's methodology and those that Spenser adopted would not have escaped Nashe and it is both this and the nature of the targets that Spenser aimed at, that would have drawn Nashe's attention. Having Harvey criticise Spenser for writing the piece would have added to Nashe's enjoyment of the work as it would have given him another opportunity to berate and chastise his rival; as Friedenreich comments

Nashe is as enthusiastic in defending ballad makers as he was in defending dramatists. He enlists as many allies as he is able. Nashe demands that Harvey confess himself "a flat nodgescombe before all this congregation" of writers for censuring his friend Spenser's Mother Hubbard's Tale (I, 281). Nashe would have us see the once arrogant Harvey standing accused before the assembly.²⁷⁸

Not only is Nashe able to call into question the nature of the two men's friendship but he also does this with the added subtext that he is one of the few who can truly appreciate Spenser's efforts in this field and that most others, especially Harvey,

²⁷⁸ Friedenreich, 'Nashe's *Strange Newes* and the Case for Professional Writers', this ref. p. 466
167

don't value the scale of his writing as much as Nashe does. There is no doubt that this piece and the circumstances surrounding it were a gift to Nashe allowing him to both reference one of his favourite authors in his own specialised field while at the same time being able to use it as another manner in which to belittle and rebuke his rival. There are numerous other references to Harvey being unworthy of Spenser's friendship or how Nashe does not believe that the two men are as close as Harvey claims with Nashe preferring to focus instead on Harvey's lack of skills, abilities and qualities rather than comparing his talents to the better author and being found wanting. Spenser's controversial *Mother Hubberds Tale* establishes Spenser, in Nashe's eyes at least, as a worthy satirist; equally he acknowledges that Spenser in his opinion is unmatched as a poet, even by his other favoured authors. Even passages which could be read as critical of Spenser are more easily interpreted as complimentary with Nashe bringing his own style and flair as he compliments Spenser. What is truly significant are the number of techniques that Nashe uses to venerate Spenser; in praising others like Sidney or Aretino Nashe does not overtly attempt to ape them but limits himself to talking glowingly about them. With John Lyly Nashe attempts to follow the path he laid out in *Euphues* by writing the euphuistic *Anatomie*, but spends very few words in praising him; furthermore, after *Anatomie* Nashe steers clear from this genre preferring to take a more sarcastic and caustic viewpoint on life. It is significant that rather than following this path with Spenser, he is instead treated in the same manner as Marlowe indicating a closeness of feeling towards Spenser which has been under recognised and had a major impact on the development of Nashe's authorial style.

Nashe shows a far greater respect to Spenser than he does with most of his contemporaries but one of the few authors he treats in similar fashion is the author of *Arcadia*, Sir Philip Sidney.²⁷⁹ As Katherine Duncan-Jones notes although Nashe mentions Sidney less often than others he still appears frequently enough to be significant writing

Most of the other references treat of Sidney as himself a great scholar, describing him in terms apparently free from Nashe's habitual irony and exaggeration. While the number of these references is less than those to Spenser, Lyly, or Greene, let alone Harvey, their nature does appear to suggest both a serious admiration for Sidney, and some knowledge of his writings.²⁸⁰

Sidney is a man whom Nashe talks highly of in *Pierce Penilesse* writing

What age will not praise immortal Sir Phillip Sidney, whom noble Salustius (that thrice singuler french Poet) hath famoused, together with *Sir Nicholas Bacon*, Lord keeper & merry sir *Thomas Moore*, for the chiefe pillars of our english speech.²⁸¹

²⁷⁹ Sidney is an enduring figure from the period who has had a significant amount written about him both historically and recently. In this chapter I will be focussing on the relationship between Nashe and Sidney; for more detailed information about this second author I would recommend Alan Stewart's *Sidney: A Double Life* (London: Random House, 2011) which looks at Sidney's impact both at home and abroad, Robert E. Stillman's *Philip Sidney and the Poetics of Renaissance Cosmopolitanism* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009) which as per the author 'introduces Sidney's text in relation to the public domain as it was conceived by his closest circle of friends' (p. 29), and Gavin Alexander's *Writing After Sidney* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006) which engages with Sidney's lasting impact on the authors around him.

²⁸⁰ Katherine Duncan-Jones, 'Nashe and Sidney: The Tournament in *The Unfortunate Traveller*', *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 63, No. 1 (Jan., 1968), pp. 3-6, this ref. p. 3

²⁸¹ Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Supplication to the Divell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, pp. 193-194, lines 32+

This both praises Sidney and notes that even the French recognised his importance and skill as a writer. For Nashe to not only quote a Frenchman but also a French Huguenot like Du Bartas is significant; Sidney is clearly a man that Nashe felt was able to cross the boundaries of nationality and religion. Even before this, in *Anatomie of Absurditie* Nashe declared whilst bemoaning a dearth of talent in England that

euery man shotte his bolte, but this was the vpshot, that England
afforded many mediocrities, but neuer saw anything more singuler
then worthy Sir *Phillip Sidney* of whom it may truly be saide, *Arma
virumque cano*.²⁸²

Similarly to Spenser, Nashe uses his first published work to raise Sidney above his peers whilst at the same time inviting comparisons to Aeneas, taking the Latin quotation from Virgil's epic poem. The admiration Nashe had for Sidney is clear praising him not only for his skills as an author but also for the influence he had on younger writers; in *Pierce Penilesse* Nashe portrays the older man as an encourager of scholars and talented writers:

Gentle *Sir Phillip Sidney*, thou knewst what belonged to a Scholler,
thou knews what paines, what toyle, what trauel, conduct to
perfection: wel couldst thou giue euery Vertue his encouragement,

²⁸² Nashe, *Anatomie of Absurditie*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 7, lines 35-36

euery Art his due, euery writer his desert: cause none more vertuous,
witty, or learned than thy selfe.²⁸³

Nashe also admires the manner in which Sidney gave this encouragement and wants to stress how honoured the younger writers are to receive this, as Sidney is, in Nashe's opinion, one of the most accomplished writers of the period. This is a familiar theme that the younger author uses; the people he likes and venerates are the leaders of their chosen field. In this instance Sidney is the best at what he does, in the same way that Spenser the poet, and Aretino the satirist, are unmatched in their specialities. Nashe later repeats this in *Have With You* and, in this instance uses the Sidney praise as a way to berate Harvey; Nashe writes

No more will I flatter him [Harvey]; hee may build vpon it... and then
Sir Philip Sidney (as he was a naturall cherisher of men of the least
towardnes in anie Arte whatsoever) held him in good regard, and so
did most men; & (it may be) some kinde Letters hee writ to him, to
encourage and animate him in those hopefull courses he was entred
into: but afterward, when his ambitious pride and vanitie vnmaskt is
selfe so egregiously, both in his looks, his gate, his gestures, and
speaches, and hee would do nothing but crake and parret it in
Print...the *Sir Philip Sidney* (by little and little) began to look askance
on him, and not to care for him...²⁸⁴

²⁸³ Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Supplication to the Divell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 159, lines 10-15

²⁸⁴ Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron-Walden*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 116, lines 4-20

Nashe presents a good deal on information here; he alludes to the fact that in the past he has praised Harvey in *Preface to Menaphon* and, in doing so, places himself in good company by showing how Sidney has done the same thing. The Sidney-Harvey interaction is viewed through with a heavy bias with Nashe both minimising the praise that his rival received from Sidney and describing a cooling of their relationship which is not necessarily based in fact. This is very similar to how Nashe rationalises Spenser's relationship with Harvey; both of these worthy writers were in some way fooled by the doctor into praising him; with Sidney Nashe also takes pains to note that he is kind to all men of art and even Harvey, the limited hack that he is, is not unusual or special in this regard.

In *Have With You* Nashe also briefly examines the other side of this relationship; namely Harvey's praise of Sidney; and does not pass up the opportunity to question his rival's abilities. Carneades says 'Bodie of mee, this is worse than all the rest, he sets foorth *Sir Philip Sidney* in the verie style of a Diers Signe'²⁸⁵ commenting that Harvey's attempts to praise the older author are workmanlike and lacking in poetry or skill; these comments are functional and formulaic rather than containing any artistry. Later Nashe writes 'I have perused veares of his, written vnder his owne hand to Sir Philip Sidney, wherein he courted him as he were another Cyparissus or Ganimede...' ²⁸⁶ where he comments that Harvey has praised Sidney effusively and cites two classical figures to describe the

²⁸⁵ Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron-Walden, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 50, lines 12-14

²⁸⁶ Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron-Walden, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 92, lines 10-16

Sidney-Harvey relationship. Whereas Nashe himself sees Sidney as an Aeneas type figure, he believes Harvey views him in a different light courting him in a manner similar to the way in which Ganymede and Cypris were pursued by the gods. Nashe presents the idea that Harvey treats Sidney like these two characters - both boys that were beloved by Zeus and Apollo respectively - which is a curious comparison to make. Both of these figures are objects of love but are almost passive receptors of this - it is as if Harvey can't help himself from loving Sidney's 'beauty' which in this instance is his work. This also changes the Sidney-Harvey dynamic; in Nashe's scenario Sidney is portrayed as the innocent 'prey' whereas Harvey is seen to be the powerful God-like hunter. Although the presentation of Harvey as a controlling figure does not fit with the impression that Nashe normally gives about the doctor, he still makes sure he shows his rival as someone who cares only about his own desires; he is happy to use manipulative means to gain relationships with greater writers in an effort to further his own ambitions and does not really care about the works of these more accomplished men.

Nashe's relationship with Sidney is more complicated; it was the unauthorised first edition of Sidney's *Astrophel and Stella* that Nashe had a preface briefly attached to and caused a small stir in the early 1590's when this edition was recalled and replaced with an amended version *sans* Nashe's words. The preface, whilst being relatively short, is one of Nashe's most intriguing pieces. I shall discuss in a later chapter the dramatic language used within this work; at this stage I would like to focus on how Nashe's words here alongside the numerous references to Sidney give some indication as to the impact this author had on the younger man.

As with Spenser who, as per McKerrow, appears eighteen times in Nashe's works, Sidney is often cited with his name appearing on only one less occasion and not including the various allusions to the author that Nashe made in his *Preface to Astrophel and Stella*. Unsurprisingly these are all laudatory with Nashe describing Sidney, or his persona Astrophel, as 'Worthy' (in *Anatomie*), 'Gentle' and 'Immortal' (in *Pierce Penilesse*, or 'divinest' (in *Summers Last Will*) amongst other such comments. More surprisingly is the manner in which Sidney is treated in comparison to Robert Greene, the only other author that had a Nashe preface attached to their work; in Greene's case *Menaphon*. Reading the two prefaces shows an obvious difference in the manner in which the two primary authors are considered within Nashe's works; a difference made more noteworthy when remembering that Greene was someone who Nashe knew personally while Sidney was someone that Nashe had no direct contact with his only exposure to him being via the page. Yet in *Preface to Menaphon*, Greene and his work get mentioned almost as an afterthought, whereas in *Preface to Astrophel* Sidney/Astrophel is constantly being referenced. By doing this Nashe is elevating Sidney not only above the ink-horn writers that Nashe despises, as evidenced in *Preface to Menaphon*, but also above his friend whom he claims to admire. Nashe goes further still when he not only distances Sidney from his contemporaries but positions him close to the pantheon of great Greek and Roman writers quoting from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and specifically the tale of the sculptor Pygmalion taken from Ovid's masterpiece *Metamorphoses*. When Nashe asks '*Quid petitur sacris nisi tantum fama poetis?*', translated as 'what is sought by the sacred poets except fame?' he is using Ovid's

words to raise Sidney to the same level as the Roman; Sidney is the equal of the great Roman writer and, by extension, greater than that of most who have written in the current period including Greene. That parallel that Nashe draws between Sidney and Ovid is one that modern critics have also commented upon; Miller for example looks at Sidney's work and sees Ovidian influences throughout commenting on both *Arcadia* and *Astrophel and Stella*. He notes about the language used in sonnet 100 of this latter work that

Sidney seems to be describing a pastry more than his beloved, and the waves of her panting breasts, maternally filled with flowing cream, have a distinctly erotic and material rather than idealizing cast.²⁸⁷

This suggests that in this instance the author writes more as a lover in the style of Ovid and describes the Elizabethan differently from the chaste and honourable soldier that history tends to remember him as. This is in direct contrast to authors like Golding who describes Sidney as a

right worthie and valiant Knight, your good Lordships noble kinsman Sir Philip Sidney, whose rare vertue, va|lour, and courtesie, matched with equall loue and care of the true Christian Religion.²⁸⁸

²⁸⁷ Paul Allen Miller, 'Sidney, Petrarch, and Ovid, or Imitation as Subversion' *ELH*, Vol. 58, No. 3 (Autumn, 1991), pp. 499-522 this ref. p. 510

²⁸⁸ Arthur Golding, *Trewnesse of the Christian Religion*, Sig. *3v

Similarly, Moss draws comparisons between Sidney's treatment of the poet and that by George Chapman noting

In his famous riposte to Gosson—*The Defence of Poesy*—Sir Philip Sidney quotes and translates a harmless line from the *Ars*, and resorts periodically to Ovidian allusions.²⁸⁹

These allusions would have been obvious to Nashe, a man familiar with classical literature whose own works are scattered with Ovid references, and Sidney's use of the Roman would have made him more attractive to the other author. The Sidney whom Nashe portrays in *Preface* is a softer and more romantic figure in the same vein as Ovid, rather than an accomplished and successful soldier, and thus appealed more to the man whose battles were waged on the page rather than on the field. That Nashe would go on to use the same techniques in a similar fashion to the older man establishes an authorial connection between the two; again, Nashe is adopting practices from a figure he admires which allows him to utilise these ideas to develop his own distinctive voice. Nashe goes further than this though when he engages with *The Defence of Poetry*, taking the ideas that Sidney establishes with poetry and applying them to the act of playwriting. Sidney, for example, describes how critics of poetry have levelled false claims against the genre and proceeds to refute these charges:

²⁸⁹ Daniel Moss, "'The Second Master of Love': George Chapman and the Shadow of Ovid", *Modern Philology*, Vol. 111, No. 3 (February 2014), pp. 457-484 this ref. p. 472

But because we have ears as well as tongues, and that the lightest reasons that may be will seem to weigh greatly, if nothing be put in the counterbalance, let us hear, and, as well as we can, ponder what objections be made against this art, which may be worthy of yielding or answering.²⁹⁰

Nashe begins his own similarly titled section in *Pierce Penilesse* in a comparable, but distinctly more Nashean manner:

To this effect, the policie of Playes is very necessary, howsoever some shallow braind censurers (not the deepest serchers into the secrets of gouernment) mightily oppugne them.²⁹¹

This is something I shall discuss in more depth in the following chapter, yet even a cursory reading of Sidney's work alongside sections of *Pierce Penilesse* shows that Nashe read Sidney's words and took notice of them.

Sir Philip is not the only member of the Sidney family that Nashe chooses to elevate in his preface. Throughout the piece are references to Sidney's sister, the Countess of Pembroke Mary Sidney,²⁹² and these are almost exclusively favourable.

²⁹⁰ Philip Sidney, *A Defence of Poetry*, ed. J.A. Van Dorsten (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1966), this ref p. 49, lines 6-10

²⁹¹ Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Svpplication to the Divell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, pp. 211-212, lines 34+

²⁹² Mary Herbert is described in her *Oxford DNB* entry as 'writer and literary patron' being as well known for the latter as she was the former. This entry also notes quotes from Daniel, Churchyard, and Aubrey who all praised Herbert in their works. For further information about Herbert please read Margaret Patterson Hannay, (2008, January 03), 'Herbert [née Sidney], Mary, countess of Pembroke (1561–1621), writer and literary patron', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press. (2008).

Nashe mentions the countess as a 'second Minerva',²⁹³ he declares she is superior to Sappho amongst others and waxes lyrically about her intelligence. He also takes the opportunity to point out her generosity to people of the arts noting how she 'entertain[s] emptie-handed Homer and keepest the springs of Castalia from being dried up.'²⁹⁴ As Nicholl writes

[Nashe does not] miss the chance to deliver a fulsome tribute to the 'most rare Countesse of Pembroke',²⁹⁵ the 'fayre sister of Phoebus & eloquent secretary to the muses' ...Mary Herbert, Countess of Pembroke, was Sidney's sister and literary executrix, and a highly active patron of literature.²⁹⁶

In characteristically immodest fashion Nashe is attempting to curry favour with the Countess by reminding her of her previous support for young writers and intimating that supporting him would be akin to giving Homer a platform from which he could be heard. And it is this which betrays Nashe's *Preface to Astrophel and Stella* for what it actually is and distances it from his previous preface; this is a piece of writing that, while feting the accompanying piece, is designed to get the attention of a new patron and gain support for his work. As history records this was an unsuccessful attempt with this version being withdrawn and replaced almost immediately with a more complete and Nashe-less version. As history also records

²⁹³ Nashe, *Preface to Sidney's Astrophel and Stella*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 331, line 23

²⁹⁴ Nashe, *Preface to Sidney's Astrophel and Stella*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 331, lines 27-30

²⁹⁵ Nashe, *Preface to Sidney's Astrophel and Stella*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 331, lines 20-23

²⁹⁶ Nicholl, *A Cup of News*, pp. 82-83

a scorned Nashe will always endeavour to get the final word; as Nicholl later comments

Nashe was involved, we remember, in the first edition of Sidney's *Astrophel* in 1591 and he spoke fulsomely of the Countess in his preface. His edition was swiftly supplanted and his overtures ill-received. 'If I bee evill intreated', warns Pierce, 'or sent away with a Flea in mine ear, let him looke that I will raile on him soundly.'²⁹⁷

Although this threat was aimed at Richard Harvey, any study of Nashe shows that is a warning that could apply to a whole host of rivals. Nicholl continues

It is no surprise to find Nashe settling his score with the Countess in *Pierce Penniless*. He does so at one remove, by railing on her beloved uncle [Robert Dudley Earl of Leicester and most likely the bear in *Pierce Penillesse's* Bear and Fox tale] and by viciously refuting the heraldic celebration of him which Spenser had dedicated to her the previous year.²⁹⁸

Nashe goes further in a later work; the title character in *The Unfortunate Traveller* is named Jack Wilton, with Wilton also being the name of the Wiltshire house of the Countess. It would be easy to dismiss this as mere coincidence but the characterisation of Jack as an untrustworthy and duplicitous page who at time

²⁹⁷ Nashe, *Pierce Penillesse His Svpplication to the Divell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, pgs. 195, lines 11-13

²⁹⁸ Nicholl, *A Cup of News*, this ref. p. 119

pretends to be higher than his natural station in life is the kind of subtle dig that Nashe enjoyed making. Coincidence or not, Nashe proved time and time again that he was not one to let a slight pass unresolved and it would not be a surprise to learn this seemingly innocent surname had a more second, more derisive meaning and purpose.

The Unfortunate Traveller, written in 1594, is Nashe's only extant work of prose and as such is closer to the kinds of work normally associated with more celebrated prose authors like Greene and Sidney. When discussing the latter alongside Nashe, most modern critics see this work as the most significant piece to examine, which is understandable given the nature of the novel. Both Duncan-Jones and Ossa-Richardson focus on the tournament scene in *The Unfortunate Traveller* with the former noting

This description appears to be at once a mosaic of references to tournaments and single combats in the *Arcadia*, and, as critics have often observed, a burlesque of chivalric conventions.²⁹⁹

On a similar note Ossa-Richardson writes 'As noted by a number of critics, Daniel's translation [of Paolo Giovio's *Dialogo dell'impresa militari et amoros*] was, along with Sidney's *New Arcadia*, Nashe's chief source for his tournament scene'³⁰⁰ with both critics acknowledging Nashe's debt to Sidney. This kind of behaviour is

²⁹⁹ Duncan-Jones, 'Nashe and Sidney: The Tournament in *The Unfortunate Traveller*', this ref. p. 3

³⁰⁰ Anthony Ossa-Richardson, 'Ovid and the 'free play with signs' in Thomas Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller*', *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 101, No. 4 (Oct., 2006), pp. 945-956 this ref. p. 948

something I've discussed earlier with writers like Spenser where Nashe takes scenes or idea presented by these authors he admires and represents them in his own work. In this instance Sidney's heraldic set pieces are borrowed and amended to fit within his own narrative; Ossa-Richardson continues,

Many critics take Nashe's tournament to be pure burlesque or satire...This element is undoubtedly present - Surrey's armour, for instance, is too silly to transcend the comic mode. But as with the Wittenberg disputations, it is important to notice that while the aim may be comic, or partly comic, the method is a precise distortion of sign-functions.³⁰¹

This is a valid point to make as Nashe writes

His armour was all intermixed with lillyes and roses, and the bases thereof bordered with nettles and weeds, signifieng stings, crosses, and ouergrowing incumberances in his loue; his helmet round proportioned lyke a gardners water-pot...³⁰²

Here is a clear sense that Nashe is deliberately undercutting the seriousness of the scene as it would have been described by his more noble colleague. This idea is confirmed at the end of the tournament when after painstakingly describing a

³⁰¹ Ossa-Richardson, 'Ovid and the 'free play with signs' in Thomas Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller*', this ref. p. 950

³⁰² Nashe, *The Unfortunate Traveller, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 2, p. 271, lines 23-27

number of the participants over eight highly descriptive pages the tournament itself is described over twenty-five lines; with Jack writing following his master's triumph

What would you haue more? the trumpets proclaimed him master of
the field, the trumpets proclaimed *Geraldine* the exceptionlesse
fayrest of women. Euerie one striued to magnifie him more than
other.³⁰³

Nashe takes all the pomp and pageantry associated with this type of event and challenges it by giving the proceedings his own unique flavour. Yet as with his comments on *The Faerie Queene's* dedicatory sonnet Nashe is both respectful and comfortable enough with the source material to be able to subvert it slightly and make his own points; by doing so he is also showing the respect he has for the original authors by allowing their work to influence him in a way Nashe normally reserved for the classical authors of Greek and Roman times. This technique is showcased further in the same work when Nashe describes two buildings that Jack encounters which have direct parallels to those in the works of both Spenser's *Faerie Queene* and Sidney's *Arcadia*. In the first of these Jack is adventuring through Venice and encounters Petro de campo Frego who introduces them to Tabitha 'a wench that could set as ciuill a face on it as chastities first martyr *Lucrecia*.'³⁰⁴ Nashe describes Tabitha's house

³⁰³ Nashe, *The Unfortunate Traveller, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 2, p. 278, lines 31-34

³⁰⁴ Nashe, *The Unfortunate Traveller, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 2, p. 255, lines 23-24

What will you conceit to be in any saints house that was there to seeke?

Bookes, pictures, beades, crucifixes, why, there was a haberdashers shop of
the in euerie chaber. I warrant you should not see one set of her neckercher
peruerted or turned awrie, not a piece of a haire displast. On her beds there
was not a wrinkle of any wallowing to be found; her pillows bare out as
smooth as a groning wiues belly...³⁰⁵

He portrays an opulent scene before immediately continuing 'yet she was a Turke
and an infidel, & had more dooings then all her neighbours besides.'³⁰⁶ As Mentz
notes this has a comparison in *The Faerie Queene*

The contrast between a pleasing outside and perverse inside seems
straightforward. Unlike Spenser's House of Pride, however, this
house offers no means for the hero to recognize the evil interior.
(Nashe's reader is not given the chance to try, as Nashe reveals
Tabitha's evil immediately.)³⁰⁷

Mentz then writes how Nashe does a similar thing later on in *The Unfortunate
Traveller*:

Tabitha's house makes an essential counterpoint to the most famous
building in *The Unfortunate Traveler*, the summer banqueting house

³⁰⁵ Nashe, *The Unfortunate Traveller, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 2, p. 255, lines 24-31

³⁰⁶ Nashe, *The Unfortunate Traveller, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 2, p. 255, lines 31-33

³⁰⁷ Steven R. Mentz, 'The Heroine as Courtesan: Dishonesty, Romance, and the Sense of an Ending in *The Unfortunate Traveler*', *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 98, No. 3 (Summer, 2001), pp. 339-358, this ref. p. 348

in Rome...The house specifically alludes to Kalander's house, the first building described in Sidney's *Arcadia*.³⁰⁸

If Mentz's contention is correct this presents an interesting notion; Nashe utilises the most famous works of Spenser and Sidney in his own fiction and by using them both in *The Unfortunate Traveller* he is aligning *Arcadia* and *The Faerie Queene* and therefore similarly aligning Spenser and Sidney. The contention is clear; both men had a very similar impact on Nashe and although Spenser's is more obvious, Sidney is also not too far from his thoughts. Yet there is a difference in the way in which Nashe uses his supposed source material; as Forsyth notes about Sidney's *Arcadia*:

His house is like him [Kalander], "built of fair and strong stone," but not ostentatious or uselessly fine. Kalander's house is serviceable, just as Kalander (like Sidney himself) stands ready to serve his country.³⁰⁹

Nashe's Roman banquet house on the other hand is introduced using vivid imagery with Wilton saying

I sawe a summer banketting house belonging to a merchaunt, that was the maruaile of the world, & could not be matcht except God should make another paradise. It was builte round of greene marble

³⁰⁸ Mentz, 'The Heroine as Courtesan: Dishonesty, Romance, and the Sense of an Ending in *The Unfortunate Traveler*', this ref. pp. 348-349

³⁰⁹ V. L. Forsyth, 'The Two Arcadias of Sidney's *Two Arcadias*', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, Vol. 49, No. 1, The English Renaissance (Winter, 2009), pp. 1-15, this ref. pp. 4-5

like a Theater with-out: within there was a heauen and earth
comprehended both vnder one roofe...

This displays all the ostentation and finery that Kalanders house does not. The description of the building continues in this vein for a number of pages with Nashe constantly likening it and the surrounding grounds to the garden of Eden. Spenser's House of Pride and the events that unfold around it, on the other hand, are more faithfully reproduced with the schemes of both *Lucifera* (in Spenser's poem) and Tabitha being thwarted. Mentz notes that 'Nashe omits Sidney's lengthy descriptions of individual works of art, but Kalanders house resonates powerfully with the Roman banqueting house...' ³¹⁰ and then quotes a similar passage from *Arcadia*; it is my contention that although there are similarities in the images presented, there are far more differences, with Sidney's descriptions focusing primarily on the depictions of classical figures like Diana and Venus whereas Nashe describes the natural scenes to be found in the banqueting house. He also goes into far more detail than Sidney and surprisingly makes more religious allusions than his peer. Sidney's house suggests a dwelling that while well-appointed and stately is very much a place in which to live; Nashe's banqueting house on the other hand is highly decorated and ostentatious and suggests a venue which although beautiful is not a regular dwelling. And as always when Nashe is overtly complimentary there is the suggestion that what is being written should not be taken at face value; the last

³¹⁰ Mentz, 'The Heroine as Courtesan: Dishonesty, Romance, and the Sense of an Ending in *The Unfortunate Traveler*', footnote on p. 349

line of this passage implies this may be the case with Nashe writing 'Such a golden age, such a good age, such an honest age was set forth in this banqueting house.'³¹¹ The idea that Nashe equates overt finery to virtuousness is inconsistent with the message he delivers elsewhere which serves as a reminder that even in his only work of fiction Nashe cannot resist in relating this to his previous works and making a relevant point within his fictional worlds. The lines in *The Unfortunate Traveller* are in direct contrast to those he delivers in *Pierce Penniless* in which he describes gold as 'delicious gold, the poore mans God and Idoll of Princes.'³¹² Even in this world of imagination Nashe is unable to suggest that fabulous riches are a sign of moral strength and he must undercut this message by overstressing his point.

As previously noted, Sidney is referenced seventeen times throughout Nashe's works; of these seventeen the majority appear in *Have With You to Saffron-Walden* with Sidney being mentioned on nine occasions. The remaining eight are spread across Nashe's oeuvre with one appearing in his first work, *The Anatomie of Absurditie*, one appearing in his last, *Nashe's Lenten Stuffe* and the others being sprinkled throughout his output. I shall now engage with the references that appear in the two anti-Harvey works, both *Have With You* and *Strange Newes*. Sidney only appears once in *Strange Newes* when he is noted, as I have discussed earlier, alongside Spenser in response to Harvey's attempt to encourage Nashe to withdraw from their argument. What is evident is that Nashe

³¹¹ Nashe, *The Unfortunate Traveller*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 2, p. 285, lines 16-18

³¹² Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Supplication to the Divell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 165, lines 27-28

took real exception to this suggestion that if he removed himself from their quarrel, in return Harvey would place him alongside the literary greats. Nashe refers to this act on two separate occasions; here and in *Have With You* when he writes in the guise of Respondent

he raild vppon me vnder the name of *Piers Pennillesse* and for a bribe that I should not reply on him praisd me, and reckond me (at the latter end) amongst the famous Schollers of our time, as S. *Philip Sidney*, M. *Watson*, M. *Spencer*, M. *Daniell*, whom he hartily *thankt*, & promised *to endow with manie complements for so enriching our English Tongue*.³¹³

It can be inferred from this that Nashe is saying that this behaviour speaks to Harvey's inconstancy and the lack of value his praise holds; that he would be willing to place a man who at the time of Harvey's offer had only had published *Anatomie* and *Piers Penniless* alongside the authors of *Arcadia*, *The Faerie Queene* and *Amyntas*. Nashe does not agree with this practice and as a result calls into question Harvey's value as both a literary figure and a critic with there being a clear suggestion that all of Harvey's praise should be interrogated as this is something that can be 'bought' or carries very little critical worth. Harvey's praise of Sidney is also called into question in a different section of *Have With You* where Respondent declares

³¹³ Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron-Walden, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 131, lines 2-8

Harke, harke, how hee praiseth *Sir Philip Sidney*

Oration

Sweete Sir Philip Sidney, he was the Gentleman of curtesie and the verie Esquire of industrie.

Carneades picks up this thread declaring

The Esquire of industrie? O scabbed scald squire (*Scythian Gabriell*)
as thou art, so vnder-foot to commend the cleerest myrrour of true
Nobilitie.³¹⁴

Here Nashe is noting Harvey's praise of Sidney made in *Pierce's Supererogation* and then criticising him for doing this; as with Harvey's praise of Spenser Nashe is suggesting that for him to do this there is an ulterior motive. Not only this but the paragraph continues with Bentivole noting

It is a common scoffe amongst vs, to call anie foolish prodigall yong
gallant, the gentleman or floure of curtesie; & i(if it were wel scand) I
am of the opinion, with the same purpose hee did it to scoffe and
deride *Sir Philip Sidney*, in calling him the Gentleman of curtesie, and
the verie Esquire of industrie³¹⁵

The characters now not only question the motives behind the flattery but also the nature of the flattery itself. This is something that differs from Harvey's treatment

³¹⁴ Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron-Walden, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 49, lines 9-20

³¹⁵ Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron-Walden, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 49, lines 28-33

of Spenser and Nashe's commentary upon it; Bentivole is insinuating that Harvey is trying to belittle Sidney whereas with Spenser it was very much a suggestion that Harvey was constantly riding on his coat tails and that this was purely for self-aggrandisement and did not contain any malice towards the poet. Nashe immediately has Respondent dismissing this idea saying

...on my conscience I dare excuse him, hee had neuer anie such
thought, but did it in as mere earnest as euer of himself and his
brothers hee writ these two verses...³¹⁶

However, that this is even suggested here is one step beyond anything previously implied about Harvey's actions. Nashe then also inserts his own experiences of being discussed by the doctor - following Carneades words Consiliadore says

What a mischiefe does he taking anie mans name in his vicerous
mouth? that, being so festred and ranckled with barbarisme, is able
to rust and canker it, were it neuer so resplendent.³¹⁷

Nashe vividly describes here how he feels when he is being spoken about by the doctor. The vocabulary used here is extremely evocative and leaves no doubt that being mentioned by Harvey is a purely negative experience. This is similar to how Nashe describes Harvey's treatment of Spenser; that he drags Spenser into 'into euerie pybald thing you do'³¹⁸ but here he goes further; Nashe notes that by

³¹⁶ Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron-Walden, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 49-50, lines 34+

³¹⁷ Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron-Walden, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 49, lines 17-20

³¹⁸ Nashe, *Strange Newes, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 323, lines 35-36

referencing Spenser Harvey is negatively affecting the poet but by mentioning Sidney he is actively tarnishing his legacy. Nashe is often derogatory toward his rival but this is one of the most concentrated outpourings of venom he writes; he is making it evident that he believes Harvey is such a negative force that he lessens the impact of the great men who are unfortunate to be associated with him. This has a secondary effect; without explicitly saying he is doing so Nashe is positioning himself as the champion of men like Sidney and Spenser who may be too close to Harvey to see his true nature and it takes an outsider to point out his faults. What does need to be clarified is that there is a distinct difference between Harvey's relationships with Spenser and Sidney. With Spenser the friendship is long established and plenty of evidence has been produced to prove their interactions; with Sidney and Harvey there is not the same level of closeness. Indeed most modern scholars only point to one clear interaction between the two men which I have previously noted in this chapter; Day writes 'in early 1577 Harvey read Livy's *Romanae historiae principis, decades tres, cum dimidia* (Basle, 1555) in the company of Sidney, just prior to his embassy to Emperor Rudolf.'³¹⁹ Jennifer Richards agrees with this contention: 'Moreover, Jardine and Grafton have been able to connect these debates to "real-life events." Harvey's reading of Livy with Sidney, they argue, probably took place just before Sidney's embassy to Rudolph II in 1577.'³²⁰ The connection exists of course because of Spenser; his *Shepheardes*

³¹⁹ Day, 'Hakluyt, Harvey, Nashe: The Material Text and Early Modern Nationalism', this ref. p. 285

³²⁰ Jennifer Richards, 'Gabriel Harvey, James VI, and the Politics of Reading Early Modern Poetry', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 71, No. 2 (June 2008), pp. 303-321, this ref. p. 304

Calender was dedicated to Sidney while Harvey as Hobbinol was featured throughout. Yet because of this more tenuous relationship Nashe feels more comfortable in making assumptions on behalf of Sidney than he does with Spenser. With Spenser Nashe suggests that he was tricked into liking Harvey; he makes the same claim with Sidney but goes further by noting

...Sir *Philip Sidney* (by little and little) began to looke askance on him,
and not care for him, though vtterly shake him off hee could not, hee
would so fawne & hang vpon him.³²¹

There is no evidence to back up any of Nashe's claims; this relationship, which seems to be incidental at best and mostly based on Harvey writing laudatory comments about Sidney, has remained mostly unremarked upon and any cooling toward Harvey that Sidney may have felt has not been recorded. At the same time Nashe does not resist from attacking his rival and ensures that he is characterised as a sycophantic, hanger-on who did not realise he was no longer welcome in the Sidney circle.

Having spoken about Nashe in relation to Harvey, Spenser and Sidney it is time to turn attention to a man who connects all four – the poet and lawyer Abraham Fraunce. As his *Oxford DNB* entry notes 'He matriculated as a pensioner at St John's College, Cambridge, on 20 May 1575. On 8 November 1575 he was made a Lady Margaret scholar of his college; he graduated BA in 1580 and in the

³²¹ Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron-Walden, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 116, lines 19-22

same year was elected one of its fellows. He commenced [his] MA in 1583'.³²² This meant he would have been in and around not only the university but also the same college at the same time as both Nashe and Harvey. The same entry also observes,

All his writing was dedicated to members of Sir Philip Sidney's circle...Nashe commends him as 'sweete Maister *France*' in his preface to Robert Greene's *Menaphon*...even Gabriel Harvey...names Fraunce as one of those 'commendably employed in enriching, and polishing their native Tongue...[and] He is believed to be Corydon in Spenser's *Colin Clouts Come Home Again* (1595).

Yet for such a seemingly key figure of the time relatively little has been written about him in recent years. Ralph Pomeroy writes about him:

Abraham Fraunce holds a conspicuous though somewhat anomalous place in Renaissance literary history. He is usually regarded as a minor poet, worth studying mainly for his close association with two major ones - Edmund Spenser and Sir Philip Sidney and for his translations of Virgil, Heliodorus, and Tasso.³²³

He continues by pointing out that 'James J. Murphy has recently identified Fraunce as one of the twenty most frequently cited Renaissance rhetoricians'.³²⁴ Taylor

³²² W. Barker, 'Fraunce [France], Abraham (1559? –1592/3?), poet and lawyer', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press. (2004)

³²³ Ralph S. Pomeroy, 'The Ramist as Fallacy-Hunter: Abraham Fraunce and the Lawiers Logike', *Renaissance Quarterly*, Vol. 40, No. 2 (Summer, 1987), pp. 224-246, this ref. p. 224

³²⁴ Pomeroy, 'The Ramist as Fallacy-Hunter: Abraham Fraunce and the Lawiers Logike', this ref. p. 224. In this article Pomeroy cites James J. Murphy, "One Thousand Neglected Authors: The Scope and Importance of

describes Fraunce as 'this eccentric literary acolyte of the Sidneys'³²⁵ when discussing his usage of Sabinus' *Metamorphosis Seu Fabulae* when producing his own *Amintas Dale* or *The Third Part of the Countesse of Pembrokes Yvychurch* yet his impact is generally overlooked with most critics preferring to focus on other, more prominent figures from the era. With regards to the interactions between Nashe and Fraunce even less has been written with most modern commentators noting their separate relationships with the Sidney circle but making no connection between the two men. Even McKerrow only noted two occurrences of Fraunce's name in the collected works; the first of these appears in *Preface to Menaphon* when Nashe lauds the other author:

had not sweet Maister *France*, by his excellent translation of Maister *Thomas Watsons* sugred *Amintas*, animated their dulled spirits to such high witted indeuours.³²⁶

The second reference to Fraunce comes in *Strange Newes* when that author is placed, by Harvey, alongside Spenser, Watson and Daniel as one of those who Nashe can be compared to if he withdraws from their argument. In this instance Nashe is merely responding to Harvey's list of names so throughout his career Nashe only references Fraunce once at the very start of his career and would appear to have had little impact on him. However, I contend that Fraunce's impact

Renaissance Rhetoric, " *Renaissance Eloquence: Studies in the Theory and Practice of Renaissance Rhetoric*, ed. James J. Murphy (Berkeley and London: University of California Press 1983), this ref. p. 23

³²⁵ Anthony Brian Taylor, 'Two Notes on Shakespeare and the Translators', *The Review of English Studies*, New Series, Vol. 38, No. 152 (Nov., 1987), pp. 523- 526, this ref. p. 524

³²⁶ Nashe, *Preface to Menaphon*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 320, lines 11-14

on Nashe was greater than has previously been thought. Steven W. May begins to draw the circle together noting

He may have provided Christopher Marlowe with access to the first instalment of *the Faerie Queene* in manuscript, access that allowed Marlowe to work some of Spenser's verse into both parts of Tamburlaine. Fraunce was also well positioned to lobby William Ponsonby to publish the first edition of *the Faerie Queene*. Finally, I believe that Fraunce is ultimately responsible for the contents of the first quarto of *Astrophil and Stella*, including the text of Sidney's poetry, the dedication to Francis Flower, the preface by Thomas Nashe, and the anthology of verse by other poets that was appended to the volume.³²⁷

May is suggesting that Fraunce held a position of importance and influence and it was his intervention that led to a number of significant literary occurrences of the time. The significance for this chapter is that May's contention establishes Fraunce as not only a contemporary of Harvey, but also one with direct connections to Nashe's own circle. Giving Marlowe access to parts of *The Faerie Queene* will also have allowed Nashe to see them; this would help explain why as early as 1589 he was already being complimentary about the poet. May continues in his article by

³²⁷ Steven W. May, 'Marlowe, Spenser, Sidney and—Abraham Fraunce?', *The Review of English Studies*, New Series, Vol. 62, No. 253 (FEBRUARY 2011), pp. 30-63, this ref. p. 31

noting that it can be interpreted that Fraunce also had a role within the Nashe-Harvey argument:

Retaliation [to Richard Harvey's attacks in *The Lamb of God*] hung fire until 1592 when Greene expanded the conflict by indicting all three Harvey brothers in his Quip for an upstart Courtier (entered in the Stationers' Register on 21 July). Nashe's outright attack on Richard alone in Pierce Penilesse, registered on 8 August, was in effect simultaneous. Fraunce's book was registered on 2 October; by appending to it the 'genial' prose satire, apparently at the last moment, he joined his fellow St. John's alumni in their coordinated response to Richard Harvey's aggression.³²⁸

May is referring to Fraunce's addition to his work of a satire which as he notes

[pokes] fun above all at a fiasco in astrological prophecy committed by Richard and John Harvey during the 1580s. Both had forecast that the 1583 conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn would produce catastrophic earthly consequences. When the crisis passed without incident, both brothers became objects of public ridicule.³²⁹

This gives us the second instance where a member of the Harvey camp writes against his supposed principal; the first as previously established being Thorius who

³²⁸ May, 'Marlowe, Spenser, Sidney and—Abraham Fraunce?', this ref. p. 47

³²⁹ May, 'Marlowe, Spenser, Sidney and—Abraham Fraunce?', this ref. p. 45

withdrew his anti-Nashean comments from *Supererogation*. This has more significance as Thorius only said his words were taken out of context; Fraunce is actively satirising not only Harvey but also his two brothers and is actively aligning himself with Nashe and Greene. Fraunce's presence on Nashe's side of the argument is further explained when taking into account events that occurred just after he left St John's. In his essay May discusses a manuscript entitled Bodleian Library MS. Rawlinson poetry 85 known as RP85, possibly compiled by St John's student John Finet, and looks at some of the works discussed within its pages. Of most significance to this thesis is the work *Terminus et Non Terminus*, a play put on at Cambridge in which Nashe is rumoured to have played a part; May notes that in *The Trimming of Thomas Nashe* Richard Lichfield made note of having 'a hand in a Show called *Terminus & non terminus*, for which his partener in it was expelled the Colledge: but this foresaid Nashe played in it (as I suppose) the Varlet of Clubs...'.³³⁰ May adds

Following this Mills [Robert Mills, a fellow Johnian matriculating at the same time as Nashe] provides suggestive evidence that Nashe was a sixth member of their literary circle, although he is not named in either manuscript...he mentions neither Nashe nor a 'Varlet of Clubs', but it is tempting to cast Nashe as the jester, Doleta...Nashe later accused Gabriel Harvey of being 'a base Iohn Doleta, the

³³⁰ Gabriel Harvey, *The trimming of Thomas Nashe Gentleman, by the high-titled patron Don Richardo de Medico campo, barber chirurgion to Trinitie Colledge in Cambridge* (London 1597) this ref sig G3r. It should be noted that EEBO ascribes this work to Gabriel Harvey although this is clearly not his work and is almost certainly the work of Richard Lichfield whose name appears on the very next page to the above reference.

Almanack-maker', and his attack on astrologers' prophecies in *The Anatomie of Absurditie* (1589) includes a gibe at 'the Country Plowman' who 'feareth a Calabrian floodde in the midst of a furrowe'.³³¹

Matthew Steggle also notes the existence of this manuscript and Mills' implication that Nashe had some part in *Terminus et Non Terminus* had a future effect on Nashe's work with his production of *Summers Last Will and Testament* played at Archbishop Whitgift's Croydon residence. Steggle notes

In choosing a form of entertainment to present before the Archbishop of Canterbury, it now seems, Nashe was drawing not merely on the folk traditions of Carnival and Lent, but on those folk traditions as already mediated through the very high-cultural form of a Cambridge University entertainment.³³²

The existence of this work shows that Nashe's involvement here alongside fellow students such as Mills and Finet points fairly conclusively to a Johnian literary circle of which he and Fraunce were members and Harvey almost certainly was not. This also shows that Nashe's future career, not only in the writing of *Summers Last Will* but also as a commercial author, was influenced by the work he produced at

³³¹ May, 'Marlowe, Spenser, Sidney and—Abraham Fraunce?', this ref. pp. 36-37

³³² Matthew Steggle, 'Thomas Nashe and Robert Mills, *Terminus et Non Terminus*, *Digital Humanities and the Lost Drama of Early Modern England: Ten Case Studies* (Abingdon: Ashgate, 2015) this ref. p. 40

Cambridge, and the experience he got by writing for his university peers assisted in the development of his mature authorial voice.

Despite all of Nashe's other activities the most significant portion of his writing career revolves around the Harvey circle. Harvey himself is the focus of two major works but appears consistently throughout Nashe's oeuvre as do those who are more closely linked with his rival than himself. Chief among these is Spenser who as I have established is consistently treated with a respect and reverence Nashe rarely uses for other authors. What can also be observed is that Nashe may have looked at Harvey's relationships with Spenser and Sidney and saw them as something that made the Doctor more legitimate than he deserved to be and, for Nashe, this would have been unacceptable. Constantly belittling his rival and questioning the nature of his various connections would have been a way that Nashe rationalised this; every Harvey relationship's veracity is interrogated and eventually dismissed with any laudable figures being absolved of blame while the doctor was accused, tried and found guilty in every case. Significantly with the exception of a couple of minor players Harvey's circle stayed out of the argument, while in Nashe's case he had support throughout his campaign from his friends with figures like Greene and Fraunce weighing in to support Nashe. That Nashe and his 'team' won the argument is clear; Harvey's reputation as an author and rhetorician never recovered and to this day he is better known for this incident than for any of his non-Nashe related activities. At the same time this can be seen as a pyrrhic victory for Nashe; despite his output of non-Harvey related work this is often overshadowed by the argument. Notably the introduction on the homepage

of The Thomas Nashe Project mentions this situation in its second paragraph showing that the two men are inextricably linked and any in-depth study into either man needs to engage with the other; Nashe was only literarily active for eleven years and Harvey was a significant factor in his life for most of them. Within all this remains the fact that Nashe used the argument as a way in which to engage fully with the major literary figures of the day; an opportunity he seized writing enthusiastically about the lives and works of those men who he clearly respected. As a result, the reader receives a better insight into Nashe and this chapter of his life allows us to better understand where Nashe fitted into the literary world and where he ideally wanted to be.

Chapter Four - The Reluctant Playwright: Nashe and Contemporary Drama.

In this time of playwrights and dramas, only one of Nashe's eleven extant works is a play. Even this, *Summer's Last Will and Testament*, is not a play written for mass consumption; it is clearly designed for a small private audience, most likely performed when Nashe was residing with his patron Archbishop Whitgift and family. As Peter Berek notes '[the] latest surviving play which may have been done by a professional child company...is *Summer's Last Will and Testament*, performed at the summer "court" of the Archbishop of Canterbury at Croydon in the fall of 1592.'³³³ Katherine Duncan-Jones notes that 'Chettle could have seen Nashe's *Summer's Last Will and Testament*, performed at Croydon palace with Shakespeare as a principal performer, perhaps in the role of Summer'.³³⁴ Other than *Summer's Last Will* and the lost play *The Isle of Dogs*, co-authored with Ben Jonson, it would appear that Nashe did not spend a significant amount of time writing drama, a viewpoint that historical critical thinking supports. More recently, critics have begun to take the opposite view as more efforts are being focused on Nashe in general but more specifically his contribution to the dramatic genre with Nashe being considered one of the co-authors of *1 Henry VI* as well as a collaborator with Marlowe on *Dido, Queen of Carthage* at the very least. The Thomas Nashe Project consider this to be so relevant that a 2017 symposium held at The Globe Theatre in London focused primarily upon considering Nashe as something other than a prose

³³³ Peter Berek, 'Artifice and Realism in Lyly, Nashe, and *Love's Labor's Lost*', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, Vol. 23, No. 2, Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama (Spring, 1983), pp. 207-221 this ref. p. 208)

³³⁴ Katherine Duncan-Jones, 'Shakespeare, The Motley Player', *The Review of English Studies*, New Series, Vol. 60, No. 247 (November 2009), pp.723-743 this ref. p. 723

writer and looking at his work within drama; there is a growing belief that the accomplished pamphleteer was also practised in play writing. In this chapter I shall begin by examining the manner in which opinions have shifted over the past 40 or 50 years beginning with an examination of one of Nashe's most interrogated passages, the references to Talbot in *Pierce Penilesse*. I shall then discuss the many references to drama, the stage, plays and players that appear with regularity in Nashe's works aside from those that appear in *Summer's Last Will*; in all of Nashe's works there appears some reference to drama or the stage in one form or another suggesting that despite not publishing significant amounts of drama in his own name Nashe had some interest in the genre. Following this I shall look at the section of *Piers Penilesse*, 'In Defence of Plays', where Nashe writes at length in support of the genre. Concluding the chapter, I will examine Nashe's only extant foray into the genre and discuss how this relates to the points previously made. I have earlier cited Duncan-Jones' article about *Summer's Last Will* but will more fully engage with this essay at this stage as well as discussing other critical thinking about the work and how this piece reflects Nashe's skills and abilities as a writer and a playwright. Throughout this chapter I shall discuss how Nashe's opinions of the dramatic genre are significant in him establishing his own authorial identity as at a time when authors were making their mark by writing drama, Nashe took the opposite tack and wanted to be identified as a writer of non-dramatic prose. I shall show how, although he was involved in the production of dramatic work, Nashe seemed to be keener to have his name associated with other genres of writing. I shall also discuss how Nashe saw playwriting as a way of earning money – unlike

the authors like Sidney whose work he admired he had no other source of income so needed to write commercially.

Nashe has previously not been considered to be a major dramatist at a time when authors like Marlowe, Shakespeare and Jonson were more prevalent, due partly to his excellence as a satirist and writer of prose and partly due to the lack of focus on identifying his contributions to the genre. While discussing elements of the Marprelate controversy Kristen Poole notes 'Thomas Nashe, for instance, perhaps frustrated by the stifling of the stage and of the pamphlet war, continued to allude to the Marprelate controversy in such popular texts as *Pierce Penilesse*'.³³⁵ Nashe, an expansive and descriptive writer, is clearly more comfortable when not being restricted by the genre's conventions and writing drama does not allow him to express himself and his ideas as fully as his preferred methods of writing. However closer examination suggests that although Nashe may have been reluctant to be involved in the genre and only had his name attached to a small number of plays he spent a significant portion of his time writing for the stage. A letter sent to William Cotton in 1596 by Nashe notes that he had hoped '[for] an after haruest I expected by writing for the stage & for the presse',³³⁶ a wish that couldn't be fulfilled due to the closure of the theatres by the authorities in that year. Nashe is also now being linked with some of the more significant dramatic works of the time. Key amongst these is Shakespeare's *1 Henry VI* whose

³³⁵ Poole, 'Saints Alive! Falstaff, Martin Marprelate, and the Staging of Puritanism', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, this ref. p. 63

³³⁶ Thomas Nashe, *Letter to William Cotton, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 5, p. 194

authorship has been the subject of much discussion. CG Harlow discusses the idea that Nashe had a hand in writing the first play of Shakespeare's first tetralogy. He presents a number of theories as to why Nashe's participation was unlikely, eventually concluding

Pointing to Nashe's participation in the play stands a single passage from his favorite source [Cornelius Agrippa's *De Incertitudine et Vanitate Sientiarum*]. Against his participation stand: the differences in language; the likelihood that, despite superficial resemblances, Nashe and the dramatist were in two striking instances using different sources; and the difficulty of reconciling the dates.³³⁷

Harlow's position is directly countered by Gary Taylor who engages at some length with the questions of authorship. Taylor closely examines the text noting frequent uses of certain words and stage directions to conclude initially that '...act 1 differs remarkably not only from the rest of *1 Henry VI* but also from the rest of the early Shakespeare canon...the author of act 1 (Z) did not write the rest of the play and was not Shakespeare.'³³⁸ He then examines Harlow's argument countering many of the earlier critic's assertions; when discussing potential sources for the play he writes

³³⁷ C. G. Harlow, 'The Authorship of *1 Henry VI* (Continued)', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, Vol. 5, No. 2, Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama (Spring, 1965), pp. 269-281 this ref. p. 280

³³⁸ Gary Taylor, 'Shakespeare and Others: The Authorship of *Henry the Sixth, Part One*', *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England*, (Jan 1 1995), pp. 145-205 this ref. p. 160

Harlow alleges that *Part One* draws primarily upon North, and claims that the use of North's translation of Plutarch points to Shakespeare. In the first place we have no reason to believe that Shakespeare had read North by 1592; in the second place the parallel passage in Nashe is the only one which, like *Part One*, specifies that the coffer is 'carried before' Alexander. Harlowe's [sic] full discussion of the sources here actually strengthens the force of the parallel with Nashe.³³⁹

Taylor continues his argument by citing Nashe's use of 'here' in stage directions for *Summer's Last Will* as well as discussing Nashe's use of Agrippa and Howard when Shakespeare doesn't utilise these sources. This allows Taylor to confidently assert that

...for the moment it seems safe to conclude, barring the discovery of very strong evidence to the contrary, that Part One was written by Shakespeare, Nashe and two other as-yet-unidentified playwrights³⁴⁰

Taylor's argument is backed up by Vickers who also notes the weight of evidence that favours this position.³⁴¹ Importantly the last two articles were written in 1995 and 2007 compared to Harlow's much earlier work in 1965 signifying a shift in critical thinking and supporting the idea that Nashe was more of a playwright than

³³⁹ Taylor, 'Shakespeare and Others: The Authorship of *Henry the Sixth, Part One*', this ref. p. 175

³⁴⁰ Taylor, 'Shakespeare and Others: The Authorship of *Henry the Sixth, Part One*', this ref. p. 186

³⁴¹ For further information please read Brian Vickers, 'Incomplete Shakespeare: Or, Denying Co-authorship in *1 Henry VI*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Vol. 58, No. 3, Special Issue: The Complete Shakespeare (Autumn, 2007), pp. 311-352

his extant output suggests. Indeed for modern critics this position is often presented as a matter of fact; Bart Van Es when discussing whether Shakespeare should be categorised as a player or a playwright notes 'Nashe, who possibly wrote the Marlovian opening of *1 Henry VI* - "Hung be the heavens with black" was listed as Marlowe's co-author in *Dido, Queen of Carthage*'³⁴² yet feels no need to provide evidence to support either position due to the growing assumption that Nashe was involved with both of these plays. There is little disagreement with this position with only Hanspeter Born in 1974³⁴³ or more recently Brian Walsh in 2004 not reaching the same conclusion. Even in these the author is not explicitly stating the opposite position; in both articles Nashe is mentioned in conjunction with *Henry VI* without the question of authorship being considered. Both of these articles discuss the oft-discussed 'Talbot' paragraph from *Piers Penilesse* in which Nashe writes

How would it have ioyed braue *Talbot* (the terror of the French) to
thinke that after he had lyne two hundred yeares in his Tombe, hee
should triumphe againe on the Stage, and haue his bones newe
embalmed with the teares of ten thousand spectators at least (at
seuerall times), who, in the Tragedian that represents his person,
imagine they behold him fresh bleeding.³⁴⁴

³⁴² van Es, "'Johannes fac Totum'?: Shakespeare's First Contact with the Acting Companies', this ref. p. 572

³⁴³ Hanspeter Born, 'The Date of 2, 3 *Henry VI*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Vol. 25, No. 3 (Summer, 1974), pp. 323-334

³⁴⁴ Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Supplication to the Divell, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 212, lines 22-28

Born, whilst primarily discussing 2, 3 *Henry VI*, invokes Nashe's passage as an aid in dating all three Henry VI plays and although he writes at length as to how Nashe's comments allow the plays to be dated there is no suggestion that Nashe may have had a hand in writing it. Although not relevant to the main purpose of his article - dating the latter two Henry VI plays - Born makes no acknowledgement that Nashe may have been a co-author. Similarly, while engaging quite thoroughly with the same section of *Pierce Penilesse* Walsh notes that

On one hand, Nashe argues that plays are valuable because they distract playgoers from more nefarious behavior. At the same time, Nashe asserts that plays serve a didactic purpose, through which both vices and virtues "are most liuely anatomiz'd" to a heuristic end.³⁴⁵

Again, this does not recognise that Nashe has been linked with authorship of 1 *Henry VI* and, other than Harlow in 1965 and McKerrow in *The Works* this lack of acknowledgement from Born and Walsh is the closest modern critics come to denying Nashe assisted in the writing of this play. McKerrow notes when discussing the Talbot quotation:

Collier says that this 'is supposed to refer to a play upon which Shakespeare founded his *Henry VI*, part i, and not to Shakespeare's alteration and improvement of it', and refers to the Introduction of

³⁴⁵ Brian Walsh, "'Unkind Division': The Double Absence of Performing History in 1 *Henry VI*", *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Vol. 55, No. 2 (Summer, 2004), pp. 119-147 this ref. pp 139-140

the play in his Shakespeare, vol. v, p. 5. Mr Fleay considers that it is the play which we now have that is referred to...A play of the same name was played for the first time on March 03, 1591-2...by Lord Strange's men, and this may well be the one referred to by Nashe; but, as Dr Ward says, there is no evidence for identifying it with the play which we now have.³⁴⁶

Even here this is not a direct discrediting of the idea that Nashe was responsible for a portion of Shakespeare's play, but the idea that this may be the case is something that did not occur to McKerrow or his peers. Conversely, finding modern commentators who do not consider *1 Henry VI* to be a play written by more than one hand is difficult and it is even rarer to find one who does not consider one of these hands to be Nashe; the historical arguments presented by McKerrow and Harlow position are countered by modern scholars like Van Es, Duncan-Jones, and Matthew Dimmock. Importantly *The Thomas Nashe Project* also officially ascribes parts of *1 Henry VI* to Nashe meaning for the first time this play will be considered as part of his output alongside those works that more certainly bear his name.

Critics no longer believe that Nashe's only forays into the genre are *Summer's Last Will*, which I shall discuss later in this chapter, his alleged involvement with Marlowe's *Dido* and *Dr Faustus*, or his misadventure with Jonson and *The Isle of Dogs*. As early as 1948 Agnes M.C. Latham described Nashe as a 'satirist; a touchy,

³⁴⁶ McKerrow, Notes to *Pierce Penilesse His Svpplication to the Divell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 4, p. 134

fleering, flyting pamphleteer; a professional wit; a stylist; and a hack dramatist';³⁴⁷

more recently Katherine Duncan-Jones, while examining the depth of the relationship between the two authors and their collaboration on *The Isle of Dogs*, mentions that this play

wasn't just a semi-accidental arrangement, as Jonson biographers have suggested, but more probably the product of an acquaintance already established, perhaps during that shadowy period around 1590/1 when Jonson may have been a strolling player and Nashe a jobbing playwright and press-corrector.³⁴⁸

Almost incidentally Duncan-Jones notes that in his early London days, Nashe was involved in producing drama. This viewpoint is further supported by Matthew Steggle who describes Nashe as 'prose satirist, poet and occasional professional-theatre dramatist' as well as a 'future commercial theatre playwright'.³⁴⁹ Despite only being credited with one extant play – I shall discuss Nashe's involvement with *Dido, Queen of Carthage* in the following chapter and the Jonson collaboration *The Isle of Dogs* remains lost – there is a growing opinion that Nashe should be considered to be more of a dramatist than has traditionally been believed and this position is further supported by elements of Nashe's own works. As I have previously noted each of Nashe's works contain at least one allusion to plays or

³⁴⁷ Agnes M. C. Latham, 'Satire on Literary Themes and Modes in Nashe's *Unfortunate Traveller*', *English Studies*, n.s. 1 (1948), 85-100 this ref. p. 88

³⁴⁸ Duncan-Jones, 'City Limits: Nashe's *Choise of Valentines* and Jonson's *Famous Voyage*' this ref. p. 249

³⁴⁹ Matthew Steggle, *Digital Humanities and the Lost Drama of Early Modern England: Ten Case Studies* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2016), this ref. p. 29

drama which show that the genre was as relevant to him as pamphleteering and poetry. I shall now discuss these individual references by interrogating Nashe's works for key words and focusing on how Nashe utilises them within his writing and show how right from the beginning of his career Nashe viewed life through a dramatist's lens; by adopting this language he is positioning himself as an author with a familiarity of both the stage and the terminology that surrounds it. The use of these images show that Nashe's seeming lack of interest in the genre comes not from him having a lack of awareness or understanding of drama and the playwright's craft. And as modern scholarship becomes more willing to accept that renaissance authors often worked in collaborative groups as often as they wrote alone Nashe is one of a growing number of authors linked with a number of different works.

Nashe inclusion of allusions to the stage and drama within his writing begins in a work that he officially had no connection with, with some of these terms appearing in the pseudonymous anti-Martinist publication *An Almond for a Parrat*, still the only one of these tracts currently confidently ascribed to Nashe. I will examine this tract first before interrogating Nashe's 'own' works despite the fact that this would chronologically follow both his preface to Greene's *Menaphon* and his own *Anatomie of Absurditie*. It is also important here to briefly discuss Nashe's involvement in the anti-Martinist movement as there remains much discussion as to how much Nashe actually contributed. *Almond* is included in the 'Doubtful Works' section of McKerrow's *Works* although he notes its inclusion with the corollary 'To me it seems that the style of *Almond* more resembles Nashe's than it

does any of the other tracts but there are two reasons against attributing it to him.³⁵⁰ He then elaborates on these two reasons noting

The writer was apparently an Oxford man [Nashe studied at Cambridge]. He speaks of 'our Vniuersuty schooles at Oxord' and of 'our Beadles' - the Oxford ones - and seems to know the number of students at Cambridge only vaguely'...A second argument against Nashe's authorship is of far less weight but must not altogether be passed over. It lies in the fact that the work appears to be its author's first contribution to the controversy...Now, as we have seen, Nashe considered himself to belong to the group of writers attacked in Richard Harvey's *Plain Perceval*, which almost certainly appeared before the *Almond*, and therefore his share of the controversy must have begun earlier.

McKerrow does however conclude by noting,

Until new evidence comes to light, we shall, I think, be wise to admit that, though the tract *may* be his, we have no reason for attributing it to him as a whole.³⁵¹

³⁵⁰ McKerrow, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 5, p. 60

³⁵¹ McKerrow, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 5, p. 63

He also notes with respect to *Mar-Martin* and *A Whip for an Ape* that 'There is, as far as I can see, no evidence at all for attributing these productions to Nashe'³⁵² before concluding his thoughts on the affair by noting

I fear that the result of this investigation into Nashe's part in the Marprelate controversy has been merely negative. That he had some share is fairly certain, but beyond that I think we cannot go. So far as I can see there is not a single tract produced by the anti-Martinist group of writers which may safely, or even probably, be attributed to Nashe.³⁵³

McKerrow's viewpoint is effectively countered by McGinn's when he writes 'A careful, unbiased study of all the evidence at hand designates *An Almond for a Parrat* as Nashe's sole contribution to the Marprelate controversy'³⁵⁴ analysing the tracts in detail to reach this conclusion. Black goes one step further crediting *Mar-Martine* to both Nashe and Lyly³⁵⁵ writing simply '*Mar-Martine*, a collection attributed to John Lyly and Thomas Nashe'³⁵⁶ yet offers no supporting evidence for this claim. Stallybrass, Chartier, Mowery and Wolfe noted that 'in '*A Countercuffe giuen to Martin Iunior*', Thomas Nashe refers to "a newe paire of Writing-tables" which contain "profitable Notes"' but again no corroborative evidence for Nashe's

³⁵² McKerrow, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 5, p. 63

³⁵³ McKerrow, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 5, p. 65

³⁵⁴ McGinn, 'Nashe's Share in the Marprelate Controversy', this ref. p. 954

³⁵⁵ 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*, Vol. 28, No. 3 (Autumn, 1997), pp. 707-725

³⁵⁶ Joseph Black, *The Martin Marprelate Tracts: A Modernized and Annotated Edition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008) this ref. lxii

involvement in this tract is supplied.³⁵⁷ Arul Kumaran takes an alternative position: he believes Nashe's involvement in the Martinist affair is limited to *Almond* noting 'Nashe, for example, responded to the influence and power of Martin through his own self-constructed pamphlet personality-Cuthbert Curry Knave, who wrote *An Almond for a Par-rot* (1589)³⁵⁸ and then continuing 'While it is generally accepted that Nashe was Cuthbert Curry Knave (in *Almond*) and Lyly wrote under the name Pap Hatchet (in *Pap With a Hatchet*), the identity of Pasquil, who wrote three anti-Martinist tracts, remains hidden.³⁵⁹ In this Kumaran agrees with McKerrow, even noting that 'Though McKerrow included all Pasquil tracts in his edition of Nashe, his conclusion that Nashe did not write those tracts has remained unchallenged. Nor is Lyly a generally accepted candidate.'³⁶⁰ For the purposes of this chapter I will agree with McGinn and Kumaran's positive assertions and McKerrow's more qualified statements and consider only *Almond* to be a part of Nashe's canon and ignore the other tracts. As McGinn notes

he [Nashe] implies that *An Almond* is his first contribution to the controversy. It certainly was his last, for with the next anti- Martinist publication, Pasquil's Apology, the controversy ended. Hence on the

³⁵⁷ Peter Stallybrass, Roger Chartier, J. Franklin Mowery and Heather Wolfe, 'Hamlet's Tables and the Technologies of Writing in Renaissance England', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Vol. 55, No. 4 (Winter, 2004), pp. 379-419 this ref. p. 394

³⁵⁸ Arul Kumaran, 'Robert Greene's Martinist Transformation in 1590', *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 103, No. 3 (Summer, 2006), pp. 243-263 this ref. p. 252

³⁵⁹ Kumaran, 'Robert Greene's Martinist Transformation in 1590', this ref. p. 253

³⁶⁰ Kumaran, 'Robert Greene's Martinist Transformation in 1590', this ref. p. 253

author's own words, as well as on the more debatable basis of style,
we may pass over the other tracts...' ³⁶¹

McGinn is referring to the passage in *Almond* where Nashe writes 'I giue thee but a brauado now, to let thee knowe I am thine enemie' wherein he appears to be introducing himself as a new player in the argument – this is a typically Nashean thing to do as, although writing pseudonymously he would have wanted his true impact in the debate to have been undersated.

Almond, written by Nashe under the pseudonym 'Cuthbert Curry-Knave', reads as a typical Nashean broadside against a weaker target. Of specific relevance here though is the opening dedication which is addressed

To that most Comickall and conceited Caualeire, Monsieur du Kempe,
lestmonger and vice-gerent generall to the ghost of Dicke Tarlton. ³⁶²

Monsieur du Kempe is obviously Will Kemp, the celebrated clown who acted in numerous plays and succeeded Richard Tarlton, also mentioned here, as the best-known clown in England. It is significant that Nashe chooses this figure to be his dedicatee as he knows that this is a name his reader will not only recognise but also easily identify as a theatrical clown or fool. As Rasmussen and De Jong note,

While we might think little of the buffoonery of a Nick Bottom or
the witticisms of a Feste, Shakespeare, his contemporaries in the

³⁶¹ McGinn, 'Nashe's Share in the Marprelate Controversy', this ref. p. 958

³⁶² Nashe, *An Almond For a Parrat, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 341, lines 1-5

early modern professional theatre and *especially* his audiences, valued clowning highly.³⁶³

This opinion is reinforced by Michael De Porte who writes

Not until the later sixteenth century, with the appearance of strong comic personalities such as Richard Tarlton and Robert Armin, who were literate and resourceful enough to present a new beguiling image of the fool, did he acquire the reputation for recondite wisdom associated with the fools of Shakespeare.³⁶⁴

This indicates that Nashe has not randomly or accidentally picked Kemp to dedicate his anti-Martinist tract to. Instead Nashe has chosen someone of significant enough fame to get the reader's attention but has also chosen the player of a role which is not straightforward and obvious to understand. By choosing Kemp and referencing him alongside Tarlton, Nashe is suggesting that his pamphlet is fulfilling a subtle yet important role and contains more nuance than might be otherwise found in this exchange. Nashe's use of the two players also indicates that not only was he highly aware of the dramatic genre and of the roles within them, but also comfortable and confident enough to be able to cite them knowing the effect this would have on his audience. Finally, Nashe signs off the dedicatory note as 'Thine in the way of brotherhood, Cuthbert Curry-Knave'³⁶⁵ suggesting that in this instance he, like

³⁶³ Eric Rasmussen & Ian De Jong, *Shakespeare's Fools*, <https://www.bl.uk/shakespeare/articles/shakespeares-fools>, this article retrieved on 04 June 2017

³⁶⁴ Michael DePorte, 'Review of A Social History of the Fool by Sandra Billington', *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 83, No. 1 (Jan., 1988), pp. 135-136 this ref. p. 136

³⁶⁵ Nashe, *An Almond For a Parrat*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 343, line 14

Kempe and Tarlton, is also a role-player playing the role of Cuthbert, the anti-Martinist writer. There are obvious and prosaic reasons as to why Nashe used a pseudonym to write this pamphlet; it is the use of 'brotherhood' which indicates that in writing this pamphlet he considers himself as a contemporary of Kemp and Tarlton and part of the acting fraternity. The admission that he is playing a role indicates not only his comfort within this field but his tacit acceptance that he is able to be an active participant within the genre. As I shall go on to show however, this is not Nashe's preferred medium and any forays into drama appear to be less by a desire to hone his craft in this medium, and more driven by circumstance, convenience and necessity. In this Nashe is not unusual – for a large number of authors of the time writing for the stage was a full time job rather than an artistic pursuit with Halpern noting 'Many early modern playwrights cranked out their work at an industrial pace,'³⁶⁶ – the majority of Nashe's peers produced plays as a means of earning money and he would have been no exception.

While the dedication to *Almond* is the most overtly 'dramatic' reference to be found in this work, it is not the only one. In his collected works Nashe employs the word 'stage' on almost twenty occasions; in this relatively short tract the word appears three times. The first occurrence is in the very first line of the main pamphlet when Martin's re-appearance into the fray is greeted with 'Welcome Mayster Martin from the dead, and much good ioy may you haue of your stage-like

³⁶⁶ Richard Halpern, 'Marlowe's Theater of Night: *Doctor Faustus* and Capital', *ELH*, Vol. 71, No. 2 (Summer, 2004), pp. 455-495 this ref. p. 462

resurrection.³⁶⁷ By characterising Martin's return as 'stage-like' and by introducing his tract in this way, Nashe immediately implies that Martin's position is all an act and calls its legitimacy into question. Immediately this pamphlet hints that Martin's actions, words, and the whole Martinist argument are to be doubted and to be treated in a similar manner to a stage production. Nashe is disparaging the whole argument by linking it to fiction and suggesting that the Martinist argument has little factual basis. This equivalence continues and becomes clearer when Nashe notes later

My selfe doe knowe a zealous preacher in Ipswich that, beeing but a
while a goe a stage player, will now take vpon him to brandish a text
agaynst Bishoppes as well as the best Martinist in all Suffolke.³⁶⁸

Nashe accuses the Martinists to be false in deed and suggests that they are merely converted actors playing the part of religious reformists. The identity of this preacher remains in question with McKerrow noting 'I cannot identify him'.³⁶⁹ However, one plausible candidate may be John Burges, the noted Puritan and religious controversialist,³⁷⁰ who became a preacher in Ipswich in 1592. Burges was also a student at Nashe's *Alma Mater* St John's College, Cambridge and attended at the same time as the author and St John's, of course, was particularly noted for its vigorous traditions of student drama, in which Nashe himself took part. It is my

³⁶⁷ Nashe, *An Almond For a Parrat*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 344, lines 2-3

³⁶⁸ Nashe, *An Almond For a Parrat*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 351, lines 7-10

³⁶⁹ McKerrow, Notes to *An Almond For a Parrat*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 4, p. 466

³⁷⁰ For further information about Burges please see Elizabeth Allen, 'Burges, John (1563–1635)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press 2004

contention that Burges is the former 'stage player' turned 'zealous preacher' that Nashe is referring to at this point. The usage of stage-player stresses that the Martinist argument has no solidity and is merely another role for people to take up and present as the truth when in reality it is simply nothing more than a ruse. Nashe is commenting that the Martinist positions are acting roles with lines to be read from a page like a script and can be done so by one without a religious calling.

The final use of 'stage' further re-enforces this position when it appears around midway through the tract with Nashe writing

Therefore we must not measure of *Martin* as he is allied to *Elderton* or tongd like *Will Tony*, as he was attired like an ape on y^e stage or sits writing of Pāphlets in some spare out-house, but as hee is *Mar-Prelat* of Englāḁ, as he surpasseth King & colier, in crying, So ho ho, brother *Bridges*.³⁷¹

Nashe goes further than he has previously in this instance not only equating the Martinist cause with dressing like an ape in a play but also to writing in a toilet. This is Nashe's way of telling the Martinists how much value their writings actually have; the act of writing in a toilet is unsubtly drawing a parallel between that and other bathroom related activities. The statement also speaks to Nashe's larger point; acting like an ape which would generally be a non-speaking, physical role, has the same worth and longstanding value as these other two actions. Nashe, when

³⁷¹ Nashe, *An Almond For a Parrat, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 354, lines 20-24

deciding how to belittle the Martinists is constantly comparing their actions, with not only appearing in plays, but having the lowest, most basic parts an actor can have. This should be compared with the kinds of roles taken by *Almond's* dedicatees Will Kemp and Richard Tarlton; HF Lippincott's article '*King Lear* and the Fools of Robert Armin' primarily concerns itself with this actor's portrayal of the comedic figure but briefly engages with Tarlton noting his place in the list of dramatic fools and jesters writing 'Tarlton was even better known than Sommer³⁷² and like Will became a folk hero, but Tarlton was an actor from the emerging stage, not a fool, despite occasional appearances at court.'³⁷³ Although Kemp was more of a physical actor than both his predecessor and Armin who followed him as a member of the Lord Chamberlain's Men, his roles still involved the clever word play and character interactions that Tarlton made famous and that Nashe admired; in Kemp's hands the role of the fool was still highly prized and in many cases as important as that of the leads. The names Nashe uses in the above passage also provide an interesting counterpoint to the dedicatees; Elderton is William Elderton, the ballad writer and sometime actor friend of Robert Greene while the identity of Will Tony remains elusive with McKerrow stating 'I can give no information about this person. One may safely infer that he was notorious for the scurrility of his language.'³⁷⁴ Nungezer notes that 'Will Tony seems to have acted Martin

³⁷² Will Sommer was Henry VIII's court jester and one of the subjects who appeared in Armin's history of clowns *Foole upon Foole*.

³⁷³ H. F. Lippincott, '*King Lear* and the Fools of Robert Armin', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Vol. 26, No. 3 (Summer, 1975), pp. 243-253 this ref. p. 248

³⁷⁴ McKerrow, Notes to *An Almond For a Parrat*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 4, p. 466

Marprelate'³⁷⁵ taking this information directly from *Almond* itself. Neither of these names are actors of the same stature of Kempe or Tarlton with Elderton being better known as a writer and Tony now forgotten – the former is described in his *Oxford DNB* entry as a ballad writer with only a brief mention of his acting career,³⁷⁶ whereas with Tony only Nungezer mentions this actor – like McKerrow I have been unable to find any other references to this character. This would appear to be a deliberate choice; Nashe references notable actors to strengthen his position but uses lesser known names when discussing Martin to belittle his cause. Nashe's final theatrical reference appears near the end of the tract when to prove he is arguing seriously he informs Martin that 'I come not abruptly to thee like a rednosde jeaster'³⁷⁷ continuing his overarching theme. When Nashe wants to belittle or demean he references the lowest form of theatre he can imagine, slapstick and physical comedy, and in order to prove that his position has been firmly thought out, well-reasoned and above all else correct the easiest way to do this is by distancing himself from this form.

Having considered Nashe's pseudonymous output I shall now look at the works directly attributed to Nashe. Chronologically the first of these is Nashe's *Preface to Menaphon* released in 1589 just prior to *The Anatomie of Absurditie*

³⁷⁵ Edwin Nungezer, *A Dictionary of Actors* (New York: Cornell University Press 1929) this ref p. 374

³⁷⁶ Elderton's full entry notes 'Given the inherently ephemeral nature of ballads and broadsheets, it is impossible to give a precise count of Elderton's works, but all the evidence suggests that his output was prolific.' In contrast the entry lists only one possible acting credit for this individual. For further information please refer to Elizabeth Goldring, 'Elderton, William (d. in or before 1592)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press 2004

³⁷⁷ Nashe, *An Almond For a Parrat, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 374, line 9

published in the same year. Both of these works contain references to the stage;

Preface begins with Nashe talking of

the seruile imitation of vaine glorious Tragedians, who contend not so seriously to excell in action, as to embowell the cloudes in a speech of comparison, thinking themselues more than initiated in Poets immortality, if they but once get *Boreas* by the beard and the heauenly Bull by the deaw-lap.³⁷⁸

This is echoed by a passage in *Anatomie* when Nashe writes

But as the Stage player is nere the happier, because hee represents oft times the persons of mightie men, as of Kings & Emperours, so I account such men neuer the holier, because they place praise in painting foorth other mens imperfections.³⁷⁹

Nashe begins his authorial career by making a clear distinction between the kind of writing he wants to produce with that produced by 'lesser' talents and throughout *Anatomie* this theme is revisited; at the end of a long diatribe wherein he laments the tendency of people to give unqualified opinions on subjects they know little about, Nashe writes

³⁷⁸ Nashe, *Preface to R. Green's 'Menaphon'*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 311, lines 19-24

³⁷⁹ Nashe, *The Anatomie of Absvrditie*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 20, lines 18-22

But as hee that censureth the dignitie of Poetry by *Cherillus*³⁸⁰
 paultry paines, the majestie of Rethorick by the rudenesse of a
 stutting *Hortensius*, the subtletie of Logique by the rayling of *Ramus*,
 might iudge the one a foole in writing he knewe not what, the other
 tipsie by his stammering, the thirde the sonne of *Zantippe* by his
 scolding; so he that estimats Artes by the insolence of Idiots, who
 professe that wherein they are Infants, may deeme the Vniversity
 nought but the Nurse of follie, and the know-ledge of Artes, nought
 but the imitation of the Stage.³⁸¹

By conflating 'the imitation of the stage' with Ramus' railings or Cherillus' poetry Nashe is making it clear he believes that the stage is the poor relation of true art and should not be considered in the same breath; doing so reflects badly on the work of more noble and accomplished writers, amongst whose number he eventually sees himself. The references that Nashe uses here are key; Cherillus is an almost forgotten poet whom McKerrow describes as 'a worthless poet'³⁸² and one whom Nashe would have not only known via his education, Cherilus appears in the second book of Horace's *Epistles* where he is referred to as 'One poet to, that poet was Sir *Cherilus* the bad',³⁸³ but also in H. William Adlington's dedication to his

³⁸⁰ DC Allen notes that Cherillus is mentioned in what he considers to be one of Nashe's primary sources for this work, Textor's *Officina* although with this specific passage Cherillus is the only name that appears in both works. For further info about the relationship between the two works see Don Cameron Allen, 'The Anatomie of Absurditie: A Study in Literary Apprenticeship', *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 32, No. 2 (Apr., 1935), pp. 170-176

³⁸¹ Nashe, *The Anatomie of Absvrditie, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 45, lines 2-11

³⁸² McKerrow, Notes to *The Anatomie of Absurditie, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 4, p. 38

³⁸³ Horace, *Horace his arte of Poetrie, pistles, and Satyrs Englished and to the Earle of Ormounte* translated by Tho. Drant, (London 1567), C4r sig

translation of one of Nashe's earlier sources, Apuleius' *The Golden Asse*.³⁸⁴

Similarly, although in *Preface to Menaphon* Nashe seems to be lauding Ramus's hard work when noting that '*Peter Ramus* sixteene yeeres paines that so praised his petty Logicke',³⁸⁵ Nashe is clearly at odds with the Protestant humanist with Turner noting "his parody of antiquarianism in *Lenten Stuffe* implies a certain anti-Ramist attitude and an interest in Aristotelian thought'.³⁸⁶ The references to stuttering Hortensius and Zantippe are harder to explain with McKerrow noting about the former 'the Roman orator was, of course, especially famous for the grace of his diction'³⁸⁷ and making no mention of the latter. McKerrow does suggest about these references that

It seems to me just possible that the classical names here used may veil contemporary allusions. If so I would suggest – but only in the most doubtful manner – that the person here pointed at may have been Churchyard and that this may be the attack referred to in *Strange News*.³⁸⁸

Unfortunately, modern critics have been unable to reach any further conclusions to this passage and the identities of these characters remain elusive.

³⁸⁴ This dedication begins '*After that I had taken vpon me (right Honorable) in manner of that vnlearned and foolish poet Cherillus', Apuleius, The XI Bookes of The Golden Asse, translated by William Adlington, (London, 1566), A1r sig*

³⁸⁵ Nashe, *Preface to Menaphon, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 313, lines 1-2

³⁸⁶ Henry S. Turner, 'Nashe's Red Herring: Epistemologies of the Commodity in *Lenten Stuffe* (1599)', *ELH*, Vol. 68, No. 3 (Fall, 2001), pp. 529-561 this ref. p. 538

³⁸⁷ McKerrow, Notes to *The Anatomie of Absurditie, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 4, p. 39

³⁸⁸ McKerrow, Notes to *The Anatomie of Absurditie, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 4, p. 39

In both of these passages Nashe refers to those who appear on stage and it is the manner in which he does so that is noteworthy. I shall discuss Nashe's treatment of specific individuals shortly; however, in these sections it is Nashe's treatment of actors and players in general that is being addressed. In *Preface* Nashe contemptuously describes these Tragedians as 'vaine glorious', in *Anatomie* he is equally dismissive of the trade and in *Summers Last Will* he directs

*Actors, you Rogues, come away, cleare your throats, blowe your noses, and wype your mouthes ere you enter...none of you stroake your beardes to make action, play your cod-piece poynts, or stad fumbling on your buttons, when you know not how to bestow your fingers.*³⁸⁹

In these instances Nashe shows how little regard he holds for acting in general, even though in later works he make exceptions for specific individuals. Nashe's choice of the term 'stage-player' in *Anatomie* is particularly telling; as Bart van Es notes when discussing Shakespeare and his contemporaries '[Ben] Jonson is mocked as the lowest form of actor. Yet he, like Munday, was not really a player, if by this we mean either a shareholder or someone with an established place within the acting fraternity.'³⁹⁰ By using this phrase Nashe shows a familiarity with the intricacies of the stage industry whilst also making it clear that it is not only minor actors that he holds no regard for; he is painting all involved within the trade with

³⁸⁹ Nashe, *Summers Last Will and Testament, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 236, lines 96-102

³⁹⁰ van Es, "'Johannes fac Totum'?: Shakespeare's First Contact with the Acting Companies', this ref. p. 563

the same broad brush and giving even the theatres' financial backers little to no credit. As I shall discuss later there are a number of exceptions to Nashe's rule but the point he establishes in these two early works is one he continues to make in his later writings and on more than one occasion Nashe equates being an actor to being false and untrustworthy. The whole nature of acting, and by extension the business of producing plays and drama has no moral value and is used by Nashe as a shorthand way of invalidating other people's actions and belief; he belittles those he disagrees with by essentially declaring 'you are no better than an actor'. It should be noted that this is an insult that Nashe returns to on numerous occasions and as such feels less like a flippant and easily ignored jibe but more like an indication of his thoughts about the theatre and those who worked within it.

Considering these pieces were both written no later than 1590 both passages show that the young, relatively inexperienced Nashe already held very strong opinions on the acting industry and the men who worked within it, whether they were writing for the stage, or performing upon it. Given that Nashe was so young it can be assumed that these words were a little naïve; yet his opinion that drama represents itself to be of more value than it actually is, hardly changes despite his growing experience both in life and within the genre. This bias against drama appears again in *Strange Newes* when he writes

*But by the meanes of his death thou art depriued of the remedie in
lawe, which thou intendedst to haue had against him for calling thy
Father Ropemaker. Mas, that's true: What Action will it beare? Nihil
pro nihilo, none in law: what it will doe vpon the stage I cannot tell;*

for there a man maye make action besides his part, when he hath
nothing at all to say, and if there, it is but a clownish action that it will
beare: for what can bee made of a Ropemaker more than a Clowne?
Will Kempe, I mistrust it will fall to thy lot for a merriment, one of
these dayes.³⁹¹

In discussing the lack of legal recourse available to Harvey after Greene refers to his father as a rope maker Nashe compares responding to the slander via drama unfavourably with the more formal act of taking the case to court. This is not a controversial position to take; going to court is obviously a much more formal and legal process than simply responding with a play, yet Nashe does not miss the chance to further his agenda. Nashe seems to be making this comparison purely so he can slander the genre again; he makes a clear distinction about the things that will be allowed to be spoken in court as opposed to those that can be said in a play. There is also the suggestion that acting on stage has no value as represented by the line 'a man maye make action besides his part, *when he hath nothing to say at all*'. Not only does Nashe re-iterate that that acting on stage has little or no value compared to the real world of the courts and the law and the genre values style over substance but the line also contains a Nashe pun: 'action' in this instance would have a double meaning not only referring to a legal suit but also pertaining to 'stage-business'. Nashe is making this statement in reference to Harvey's own words about Greene and by utilising this imagery he is suggesting that Harvey's

³⁹¹ Nashe, *Strange Newes, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, pp. 286-287, lines 33+
225

'case' would not stand a legal examination and has no more value than a simple play. Nashe continues by invoking the now familiar name of Will Kemp; by doing so he is equating Harvey's posturing with the slapstick tomfoolery of the famous clown. The obvious conclusion from all of this is that Harvey needs to be given only the most minor of consideration as his actions are foolish and overstated, and his words are both false and meaningless.

Throughout his work Nashe consistently makes the point that writing drama is the least valued form of writing, making this case both explicitly and implicitly. In his *Preface to Robert Greene's Menaphon* Nashe describes the figures who will defend England's honour. He names writers more commonly known as poets than as dramatists as the ones who will fight the literary cause noting

Mathew Roydon, Thomas Achlow, and George Peele; the first of whom, as he hath shewed himselfe singular in the immortall Epitaph of his beloued *Astrophell*, besides many other most absolute Comike inuentions (made more publike by euery mans praise, than they can be by my speech), so the second hath more than once or twice manifested his deepe witted schollership in places of credite: and for the last, though not the least of them all, I dare commend him vnto all that know him, as the chiefe supporter of pleasance now liuing, the *Atlas* of Poetrie, and *primus verborum Artifex*: whose first increase, the arraignment of *Paris*, might pleade to your opinions his pregnant

dexterity of wit, and manifold varietie of inuention, wherein (*me iudice*) he goeth a steppe beyond all that write.³⁹²

Nashe's citation and praise of Peele's play *The Arraignment of Paris* would appear to suggest that he is giving credit to the genre; it should be noted though that this immediately follows Nashe calling Peele 'the Atlas of poetry' indicating that Nashe admires Peele more for his work in this genre and that his work in drama is an example of his overall writing skill. This is not surprising; although today Peele is known as a playwright with five plays penned under his own name, only *The Arraignment of Paris* and *The Battle of Alcazar* were published before *Preface* and at the time Nashe wrote *Preface* he was better known for a number of other activities with his *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* page noting he began writing poetry whilst doing his MA and 'Like his father, Peele was enlisted to devise mayoral pageants for the city of London. Two of these are extant: *The Device of the Pageant Borne before Wolstan Dixi* (1585) and *Descensus Astraeae* (1591)'³⁹³. Aside from these Peele also had a number of poems in print in 1582 he had had published commendatory verses to Thomas Watson's *Hekatompathia* (1582), *Pareus* (1585) and *A Tale of Troy* and *A Farewell to Norris nad Drake* (both in 1589) - given he had only produced two plays by 1590 alongside his other works it would be more unusual if Nashe had considered him to be first and foremost a playwright. That Nashe does not consider these men as playwrights is also not unusual bearing

³⁹² Nashe, *Preface to Menaphon*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 323, lines 18-31

³⁹³ Reid Barbour, 'Peele, George (bap. 1556, d. 1596)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press 2004

in mind that many authors of the time avoided using the term to describe themselves – Peele either gives himself no title or refers to his qualifications self-identifying as ‘Maister of Artes’ on around half of his published works. This is the same as Greene who is either ‘Master of Arts’, untitled or on one early occasion simply calls himself ‘Graduate’. Nashe only titles himself in three works – in all of these he calls himself ‘Gentleman’ appending the designation ‘Author’ for *Pierce Penilesse*. In each case the authors in question choose not to associate with a solitary genre but prefer to refer to their education as their primary means of identification. This passage lauding Roydon, Achlow and Peele also follows immediately after Nashe’s flattery of Spenser, titles both ‘Poet Laureate’ and ‘England’s Arch Poet’ on the frontispiece’s of various editions of *The Faerie Queene*, in which he declares that author as ‘the miracle of wit’ who he will nominate to ‘bandie line by line for my life, in the honour of England against Spaine, Fraunce, Italy and all the world’.³⁹⁴ Nashe stresses that England’s honour is linked with the abilities of its poets and places this genre above all others.

In the same work Nashe, while lamenting the lack of good pens finds time to praise ‘*Thomas Newton* with his *Leiland*, and *Gabriell Haruey*, with two or three other’;³⁹⁵ Newton the poet here being praised for his edition of John Leland’s collected works and Harvey at this stage well known for his work in poetry and rhetoric. Nashe does not, however, praise playwrights within *Preface*; indeed one

³⁹⁴ Nashe, *Preface to Menaphon*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 323, lines 10-12

³⁹⁵ Nashe, *Preface to Menaphon*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 323, lines 28-29

of the most interrogated passages of this work indicates Nashe's opinions lie in the opposite direction. Nashe writes

yet English *Seneca* read by candlelight yeelds many good sentences,
as *Blood is a beggar*, and so forth; and if you intreate him faire in a
frostie morning, hee will afford you whole Hamlets, I should say
handfuls of Tragicall speeches. But O grieve! *Tempus edax rerum*,
whats that will last alwayes? The Sea exhaled by droppes will in
continuance bee drie, and *Seneca*, let blood line by line and page by
page, at length must needes die to our stage; which makes his
famished followers to imitate the Kid in Aesop³⁹⁶

This has historically intrigued many critics for its references to kid/Kyd and the *Ur-Hamlet* and, as is often the case with Nashe, the conclusions drawn have changed over time. In 1905 Albert E. Jack writes an entertaining and well-argued essay eventually finishing by writing

The conclusion reached is twofold: 1st, Nash has not Kyd in mind in this paragraph nor indeed any dramatist at all; 2nd, this paragraph throws no light upon the authorship of the *Ur-Hamlet*, nor indeed is it perfectly clear that Nash knew of a Hamlet drama.³⁹⁷

³⁹⁶ Nashe, *Preface to Menaphon, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, pp. 315-316, lines 30+

³⁹⁷ Albert E. Jack, 'Thomas Kyd and the Ur-Hamlet', *PMLA*, Vol. 20, No. 4 (1905), pp. 729-748

More recently prevailing wisdom has taken the opposite point of view with most critics seeing Nashe's words as heavy indication that Kyd was the author of this work. Østerberg closely analyses the same passage and concludes 'After all this, as it seems to me, the theory of another than Kyd as the author of the old *Hamlet* becomes absurd. *Kyd's authorship must be accepted as a fact*, and we then have a firm basis for our enquiries concerning Shakespeare's relationship with his predecessor.'³⁹⁸ These thoughts are echoed by Hardin Craig who, while primarily discussing Shakespeare's *Hamlet* as a man of action, notes Kyd's probable role as the *Ur-Hamlet*'s creator. As part of his essay Craig quotes generously from the passage in *Preface*, accurately introducing this with the words 'It is a satire not wanting in snobbery and malice'.³⁹⁹ He continues noting 'This is enough, although there are at least five other allusions that have been seen to be applicable to Thomas Kyd. Not all of the allusions have been identified, but most of them have, and they are so obvious that it seems absurd to disregard the Kyd authorship of a lost play on *Hamlet*'. The Lost Plays Database also cites this passage in its page about the *Ur-Hamlet* and discusses at length whom Nashe may have been referring to as the author of this work as well as summarising the thoughts of modern scholars such as Erne, Jenkins and Boas.⁴⁰⁰ It is clear that scholars cannot agree whether this passage is specifically an attack on Kyd, and his possible *Ur-Hamlet*,

³⁹⁸ V. Østerberg, 'Nashe's "Kid in Æsop": A Danish Interpretation Source', *The Review of English Studies*, Vol. 18, No. 72 (Oct., 1942), pp. 385-394

³⁹⁹ Hardin Craig, 'Hamlet as a Man of Action', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 27, No. 3, Shakespeare (May, 1964), pp. 229-237 this ref. p. 231

⁴⁰⁰ For further information about the *Ur-Hamlet* I recommend visiting the Lost Plays Database which breaks down not only Nashe's references but discusses comments from Lodge and de Belleforest. "Hamlet". *Lost Plays Database*. Ed. Roslyn L. Knutson, David McInnis, and Matthew Steggle.

or if this is a more general broadside against playwrights in general. In either case the argument that Nashe has a low opinion of this genre is strengthened. The ability to 'offer up whole Hamlets' quickly betrays Nashe's opinion that producing drama is both easy and value less; he does not make the same claim about poetry or non-dramatic prose writings. As a comparison, consider the manner in which Nashe refers to his own forthcoming *Anatomie* in *Preface* writing

It may be, my *Anatomie* of *Absurdities* may acquaint you ere long
with my skill in surgery, wherein the diseases of Art more merrily
discovered may make our maimed poets put together their blankes
vnto the building of an Hospitall.⁴⁰¹

Nashe suggests his prose will be able to assist and complement the work he feels the poets are best placed to do; a claim which once you look past the self-promotion and self-aggrandisement is something Nashe does not make on behalf of drama. For Nashe there is a clear pecking order when it comes to writing; poetry is to be considered to be the at the top of the pile followed by pamphlets and non-dramatic prose writing with drama and plays some distance behind. Even Christopher Marlowe, Nashe's friend and potential collaborator, is primarily referred to as a poet despite his many forays into drama; in *Nashe's Lenten Stuffe* it is Marlowe's version of Musaeus' *Hero and Leander* that causes Nashe to venerate his friend referring to him as 'a diuiner Muse than him [Musaeus]'.⁴⁰² Marlowe

⁴⁰¹ Nashe, *Preface to Menaphon*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 324, lines 26-30

⁴⁰² Nashe, *Nashe's Lenten Stuffe*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 195, line 18

would have been well known as a playwright at the time of Nashe's activity in no small part due to the popularity of plays like *Tamburlaine the Great* and his relationship with the actor Edward Alleyn, who starred in both of these plays as well as other Marlowe ventures. This omission suggests a deliberate decision by Nashe to not classify his friend as a playwright but to consider him only as a poet as this is the worthier occupation. That Nashe identifies Marlowe in this manner is not surprising bearing in mind that Marlowe's development as a writer followed a classical template – one set out by Ovid. As Cheney describes Marlowe follows the Roman in rejecting the Virgilian model – he notes

Marlowe could have found Ovid replacing the Virgilian triad of genres (pastoral, georgic, and epic) with an Ovidian triad: amatory poetry, tragedy and epic...what is remarkable is that Marlowe is the first Western writer to translate this Ovidian *cursus*, and thus the first to make it literally his own.⁴⁰³

Bearing in mind Nashe's familiarity with these writers it becomes evident that when he describes his friend as 'poet' he does not simply mean a writer of verse but means a writer of substance. Throughout his work Nashe uses the term to describe writers who wrote in different genres – it is the quality of their work that Nashe is alluding to as well as the medium in which they wrote. However, those whose

⁴⁰³ Patrick Cheney, *Marlowe's Counterfeit Profession* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997) this ref. p. 10

output was aimed solely at the stage do not get this epithet – these are the nameless playwrights that, as I have earlier discussed, get short shrift from Nashe.

I have established that Nashe considers there to be a 'prose hierarchy'; Poetry is followed by pamphlets, and novels etc with drama firmly at the bottom of the pile – this is similar to how Sidney viewed writers with 'true' poets being described

These be they that, as the first and most noble sort may justly be termed *vates*, so these are waited on in the excellentest languages and best understandings with the fore-described name of poets.⁴⁰⁴

Later in the same work then Sidney discusses dramatists describing these authors as 'naughty play-makers and stage—keepers'⁴⁰⁵ – Sidney establishing a theme that Nashe regularly re-visits that dramatists should be less revered than their poetry writing counterparts. What also becomes evident when examining Nashe's dramatic references is that within drama Nashe also has another, more subtle hierarchy; he places drama based on history like *The Famous Victories of Henry V* above non-historical drama; these plays in turn are above comedies which are the lowest rung on the ladder. This order can be ascertained by considering the way Nashe refers to different players and characters within his own works. I have previously mentioned the famous actor Edward Alleyn in relation to his connection with Marlowe and this is an individual whom Nashe praises in *Pierce Penilesse*. In

⁴⁰⁴ Philip Sidney, *A Defence of Poetry*, ed J.A. Van Dorsten (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1966) this ref. p. 26

⁴⁰⁵ Sidney, *A Defence of Poetry*, this ref. p. 44

the section 'The Defence of Plays', which I shall consider in more depth in due course, Nashe produces a sub-section 'The due commendation of Ned Alleyn.' In this section he writes

Not *Roscius* nor *Æsope*, those admyred tragedians that haue liued
ever since before Christ was borne, could euer performe more in
action than famous *Ned Allen*...Here I haue vsed a like Method, not of
tying my selfe to mine owne Countrie, but by insisting in the
experience of our time: and, if I euer write any thing in Latine (as I
hope one day I shall), not a man of any desert here amongst vs, but I
will haue vp. *Tarlton*, *Ned Allen*, *Knell*, *Bentlie*, shall be made knowne
to *France*, *Spaine* and *Italie*: and not a part that they surmounted in,
more than other, but I will there note and set downe, with the
manner of theyr habites and attyre.⁴⁰⁶

For Nashe comparing someone with a classical counterpart is high
praise; that he does this for Alleyn with two such individuals shows the
regard he holds for this actor and also indicates the extent to which that
Nashe's feelings towards the stage are nuanced. Nashe respects the
work of the actor – a position possibly influenced by their mutual
relationships with Marlowe. The manner in which he describes Alleyn –
as Rutter describes him 'the most foremost actor of his day'⁴⁰⁷ – has

⁴⁰⁶ Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Svpplication to the Divell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 215, lines 13-34

⁴⁰⁷ Tom Rutter, *The Cambridge Introduction to Christopher Marlowe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012) this ref. p. 36

parallels with the manner in which Nashe describes Spenser in *Anatomie*. For Nashe to make the decision to do this suggests that whereas he may not value the genre there are facets of it that he does respect. Adding Tarlton, Knell and Bentley's names alongside Alleyn's indicates that the whilst the latter might be the greatest proponent of the craft, he is not alone and as such Nashe does not dismiss the genre out of hand but, like Sidney before him, regards it as a lesser craft than the production of other forms of writing. Nashe was also not the only writer who praised Alleyn with Ben Jonson famously penning *Epigram* 89 in his honour;

IF *Rome* so great, and in her wisest age,
Fear'd not to boast the glories of her stage,
As skilfull ROSCIVS, and graue AESOPE, men,
Yet crown'd with honors, as with riches, then...

How can so great example dye in mee,

That ALLEN, I should pause to publish thee?

Who both their graces in thy selfe hast more

Out-stript, than they did all that went before.⁴⁰⁸

⁴⁰⁸ Ben Jonson, *The Works of Ben Jonson: Epigrammes*, London: Printed by W: Stansby, and are to be sould by Rich: Meighen, 1616 p. 793

That Jonson would write these words in praise of an actor is in itself unlikely; Julian Koslow introduces his essay 'Humanist Schooling And Ben Jonson's *Poetaster*' by writing 'Ben Jonson has long been seen as the playwright for whom the theater was at once too real and yet not quite real enough--who wanted to escape from the stage's hurly-burly world of material flux to print culture's cool, static world of end'⁴⁰⁹ and later noting that 'It is well known that Jonson's attitude towards actors, as towards many of the more obtrusive elements of theater, could often be dismissive or hostile'⁴¹⁰ while Hyland, when directly engaging with this epigram comments 'It is generally accepted that Jonson's loathing of the stage included loathing of actors.'⁴¹¹ Jonson's words in this work also have resonance with Nashe's own praise for the actor almost a quarter of a century earlier. Both Nashe and Jonson use the figures of Roscius, the legendary Roman actor, and Aesop in close proximity to each other. Despite being two well-known figures, between the years 1550 and 1650 EEBO suggests only one other man used the two names in such close proximity; Robert Greene in *Francesco's Fortunes or The second part of Greene's Neuer too late*. In this piece Greene writes 'Why Roscius, art thou proud with Esops crow being pranked with the glorie of others feathers'.⁴¹² Berek notes in

⁴⁰⁹ Julian Koslow, 'Humanist Schooling and Ben Jonson's *Poetaster*', *ELH*, Vol. 73, No. 1 (Spring, 2006), pp. 119-159 this ref. p. 119

⁴¹⁰ Koslow, 'Humanist Schooling and Ben Jonson's *Poetaster*', this ref. p. 133

⁴¹¹ Peter Hyland, 'Jonson's *Epigram 89*, To Edward Alleyn', *The Explicator*, 64:4 (2010), pp. 208-209 this ref p. 208

⁴¹² Robert Greene, *Francesco's Fortunes or The second part of Greene's Neuer too late*, (London 1590), B4v – C1r sig

an article concerning Greene's 'attack' on Shakespeare in *Greene's Groatsworth of Wit* that this reference is linked to Greene's more famous work writing

The "Shake-scene" of the passage is thus mocked as an ignorant actor who pretends to poetic skill, but is in truth fit only to speak words others have written. Such interpretation finds support in Greene's own *Francesco's Fortunes* (1590), where he attacks the actor Edward Alleyn: "Why Roscius, art thou proud with Esop's crow, being pranked with the glory of others' feathers?"⁴¹³

Berek interprets Greene's words as an attack on Alleyn; conversely both Nashe and Jonson use the same two classical figures as the older man but in a contradictory manner and to give the opposing viewpoint. One could argue that Nashe actually felt the same way as Greene and was satirically mocking the actors using what appears to be complimentary language and praise but indicating his 'real' message by using the same points of reference as his contemporary; this does not seem like the case especially bearing in mind the other references to both Alleyn and Tarlton in Nashe's canon which are exclusively positive. Even the most cursory examination of Nashe's work shows that this kind of laudatory treatment is rare with faux-praise normally being followed by a cutting aside that reveals the writer's true opinions. Given that Jonson also then uses the same classical names to venerate Alleyn thirty

⁴¹³ Peter Berek, 'The "Upstart Crow," Aesop's Crow, and Shakespeare as a Reviser', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Vol. 35, No. 2 (Summer, 1984), pp. 205-207 this ref. p. 205

years afterwards reinforces the opinion that Nashe was truly respectful of the four actors.

At this point it is important to look at the section of *Pierce Penilesse* in which this praise for Alleyn appears; '*In Defence of Plays*.' This is one of the most intriguing parts of the work as, unusually for this piece, Nashe is not ostensibly attacking or berating anyone. Closer examination proves this is not the case but both the main piece and this sub-section in particular begin in very positive fashion; as noted Nashe invokes comparisons with Roscius and Aesop to leave little doubt as to the high regard in which he holds Alleyn. Nashe, who makes it clear in *Preface* that he wants English writers to best their continental neighbours, in this instance identifies certain actors as the ones who he wants to become well known in '*France, Spaine and Italie*.' Nashe names William Knell, John Bentley and Richard Tarlton alongside Alleyn; the first two known primarily as dramatic performers and all three being members of the Queen's Men. Tarlton may also have been the author of *The Famous Victories of Henry V*;⁴¹⁴ the play where Knell performed as the title character to acclaim. This indicates that, although Nashe will go on to use the term 'stage-player' as an insult, he elevates those who act in historical plays to a higher level. Involvement in plays such as *Tamburlaine* or *Famous Victories* gives, in Nashe's eyes, some more legitimacy as these plays are not just mere

⁴¹⁴ This is noted in F.G. Fleay's *A Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama, 1559-1642* who notes on page 284 that the work was produced 'for Thomas Creede' and credits this to Tarlton.

entertainment but can be used to learn from. This is a thought hinted at in *Anatomie* where Nashe writes

I am not ignorant, that farre more ardent is the desire of knowing
vnknowne thinges, then of repeating knowne things: this we see
happen in Stageplayers, in Orators, in al things, men hast vnto
nouelties, and runne to see new things, so that whatsoeuer is not
vuall, of the multitude is admired, yet must Students wisely prefer
renowned antiquitie before newe found toyes, one line of *Alexanders*
Maister, before the large inuective *Scolia* of the *Parisian* Kings
Professor.⁴¹⁵

This is in part a borrowing from one of Nashe's favourite sources, *Manipulus
Florum*, with the line '*Hoc in hystrionibus, hoc in oratoribus*' appearing in *Curiositas
ae*. This section sees Nashe advising his contemporaries to understand the worth of
known things and antiquity and that there is much to be learned by looking
backwards. It would make sense that Nashe would therefore value a medium that
allows people to do this rather than just frivolously distract them away from
knowledge. The inverse of historical or serious drama though is comedy and Nashe
makes it clear that he does not value this type of writing in any way. Although he
clearly venerates Tarlton it has been established that the actor was not a standard
comic clown, but brought a more layered and nuanced treatment to those roles.

⁴¹⁵ Nashe, *The Anatomie of Absvrditie, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 43, lines 26-34

Similarly, Will Kemp, a more physical performer and closer to the more traditional clowns, was still considered to be more than just a performer of slapstick and japery and hence worthy of Nashe's higher consideration. Tarlton and Kemp though are the exceptions – they are the two great comic actors of the time and no other actors of this type get this treatment. Nashe recognises that no matter what the genre there are still men worthy of his praise – in the case of comedy these two are the only ones he respects. That Nashe considers comedy to be the lowest form of this already lowly regarded genre is emphasised when noting the moments in which Nashe explicitly refers to this type of drama. In *Have With You* Nashe describes how Harvey's life can be summed up in a series of increasingly unlikely comedies. He writes

Comedie vpon Comedie he shall haue, a Morall, a Historie, a Tragedie, or what hee will. One shal bee called *The Doctor's dumpe*, another, *Haruey and his excellent Gentle-woman, Madame Whipsidoxy*, a third, *The triumphes of Saffron-walden, with the merrie conceipts of Wee three, or, The three Brothers*; a fourth, *Stoope Gallant, or The Fall of pride*; the fifth and last, *A pleasant Enterlude of No foole to the old Foole*, with a ligee at the latter ende in English Hexameters of *O neighbour Gabriell, and his wooing of Kate Cotton*. More than half of one of these I haue done already, and in *Candlemas Tearme* you shal see it acted, though better acted than hee hath been at *Cambridge*, hee can neuer bee; where vpon

euerie Stage hee hath beene brought for a Sicophant and a Sow-
gelder.⁴¹⁶

Nashe suggests that Harvey's life deserves only to be memorialised in plays and not in any more significant or worthy form of writing; even in this unworthy genre he only warrants comedies to be written about him which, as I have previously noted both he and Sidney regard as the least valuable form of writing. And although the first line suggests that Nashe may write a history or tragedy for Harvey the titles that follow all fit easier to the comic genre. This echoes the earlier point from *Strange Newes* when Nashe says 'Will Kempe, I mistrust it will fall to thy lot for a merriment, one of these dayes';⁴¹⁷ Harvey is not to be seen as a Tamburlaine worthy of Alleyn or a Henry V to be portrayed by Knell but is only to be granted the status of a clown. And although Nashe calls to Will Kemp at this point he does not assume Kemp himself will be taking this role; rather this role could be equally well performed by one of many lesser skilled individuals.

As previously noted three of the four men that Nashe praises were members of the Queen's Men acting troupe. What should also be noted is that all three of these men were deceased by the time *Pierce Penilesse* was published. John Bentley died in 1585, William Knell in 1587 and Tarlton passed one year later in 1588, a full four years before *Pierce Penilesse* came off the presses. In his note 'Simon Jewell and the Queen's Men' Scott McMillin describes the worsening fortunes of this

⁴¹⁶ Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron Walden, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 114, lines 9-22

⁴¹⁷ Nashe, *Strange Newes, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 287, lines 3-4

group noting 'The great figures of the earlier company - Tarleton, Bentley, Knell - had now become memories, and if their replacement by little-known actors such as Robert Nicholls and William Smith suggests a swift decline, that is what the career of the company, as we know it from other sources, really does illustrate.'⁴¹⁸ Nashe will have watched and enjoyed the work of these men; his dissatisfaction with the genre is heightened and highlighted by their departure from the stage. A number of years later this same critic partially amends his view; in his book written alongside Sally-Beth Maclean the authors make reference to this passage from Nashe as being indicative of a much larger situation writing

If the notion of a collapse [of the troop] upon the death of Tarlton can be laid aside, the company's diminishing role in London can be seen in balance with their continuing success in the provinces. The Queen's Men without Tarlton appeared at court more often than did the companies headed by Edward Alleyn – Strange's Men and the Admirals Men – down to 1591-2, but the Alleyn companies were narrowing the gap. Then in 1591-2 there was a drastic shift, with the Alleyn company (Strange's Men) playing six times at court to only once for the Queen's. By that time, commentators on London culture could see the Queen's Men as figures of the past. In 1592 Thomas Nashe named the four English actors whose fame he would

⁴¹⁸ Scott McMillin, 'Simon Jewell and the Queen's Men', *The Review of English Studies*, New Series, Vol. 27, No. 106 (May, 1976), pp. 174- 177 this ref. p. 177

immortalize throughout the continent (in *Pierce Penilesse*). Three of them had been Queen's Men – Tarlton, Bentley and Knell – but all three had died within the first six years of the company's career. The fourth was Edward Alleyn, young and very influential, the new star of the London theatre – a different kind of actor in a different kind of play.⁴¹⁹

Even though the Queen's Men may have been still experiencing success in the provincial arena Nashe, being a London-centric writer, will have observed the same things as the other critics and commentators; the troop he admires and respected were diminished and exiled and replaced by a lesser group, albeit one containing a talented actor. The apparent decline of this troop cemented Nashe's opinions toward the genre and so even when praising it he is doing so in a limited and pointed manner; with the exception of Alleyn the great actors have all died and, unlike with the great poets, authors and rhetoricians, there are no obvious replacements. As I have previously noted with Tarlton and Kemp, Nashe is able to recognise those who have achieved greatness in their field – however this number is far less than those in that Nashe mentions in other fields and of the six actors that Nashe names only two are alive. It can be argued that because of the respect shown to these actors Nashe had a fondness for drama – my position is that

⁴¹⁹ Scott McMillin and Sally-Beth MacLean, *The Queen's Men and Their Plays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998) this ref. p. 53

whatever his previous feelings for the genre he does not value it as much as other forms of media.

The idea that Nashe believes writing drama is a less worthy occupation than producing other types of writing is further strengthened when looking at less explicit references to the genre and considering how Nashe utilises 'dramatic' terminology within his writing. The word 'applause' for example appears in some form on thirteen occasions across his output with the first reference appearing in *Preface* and the last being found in *Lenten Stuffe*. The word's usage is of course is not limited to drama and plays; what I shall discuss in this section are the occasions where Nashe appears to be using them in relation to dramatic action rather than in other mediums. What immediately becomes obvious about the usage of this word is that the references are mostly used with negative connotations. Of the thirteen references six appear in the anti-Harvey works *Strange Newes* and *Saffron Walden* and of these six, five can be noted as being dismissive. In *Strange Newes* Nashe attacks Harvey for seeking applause writing

I doe not doubt but you are vnwaueringly resolued, this indigested
Chaos of Doctourship, and greedy pothunter after applause, is an
apparent Publican, and sinner, a selfe-love surfetted sot, a broken-
winded galdbacke lade, that hath borne vp his head in his time, but
now is quite foundred & tired, a scholer in nothing but the scum of

schollership, a stale soker at *Tullies Offices*, the droane of droanes,
and maister drumble-bee of non-proficients.⁴²⁰

Nashe has an issue with writers actively seeking applause believing it should be something that is offered freely and the inference here is those that look for applause are lesser than those who produce work for the benefit of man. It is easy to continue this line of thought and compare those who seek applause in writing to those who seek applause be acting especially when considering that the act of applauding is something more associated with the theatre than the literary arts. By suggesting Harvey is nothing but a seeker of praise he is associating him with the lowest art form he can imagine. Nashe clearly believes that authors should seek to educate and enrich the readers as their primary goal; pursuing applause shows the writer is primarily trying to elevate themselves. This is a theme that Nashe revisits and expands upon in *Have With You*; he writes

With such incredible applause and amazement of his ludges hee
bragd hee had cleard himself, that euey one that was there ran to
him and embrast him, and shortly hee was promist to be cald to high
prefermet in court, not an ace lower than a Secretariship, or one of
the Clarks of the Councill.⁴²¹

This passage sees the continuation of a significant anti-Harvey motif; Nashe likes to suggest that Harvey thinks far more of himself than others do, so any first-person

⁴²⁰ Nashe, *Strange Newes, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 302, lines 1-8

⁴²¹ Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron Walden, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 79, lines 4-9

accounts of his actions need to be questioned and can most likely be dismissed as fantasy. The phrase 'incredible applause' suggests that the idea that Harvey was applauded is beyond belief; a point which Nashe re-iterates by describing the unlikely scene that follows. That Harvey is responding to applause further strengthens the idea that this is his true motivation for his actions and again shows Nashe considers Harvey to be less of an academic and more of a performer. This follows on from an earlier passage in *Have With You* when Nashe decides to describe Harvey and his characteristics, announcing

*From the generall Discourse of his vertues let mee digresse, and
informe you of some few fragments of his vices; as. like a Church and
an ale-house, God and the diuell, they manie times dwell neere
together.*⁴²²

There follows four points describing Harvey's character flaws; it is the third of these that is of relevance here as Nashe writes

*Thirdly, he is verie seditious and mutinous in conuersation, picking
quarrells with euerie man that will not magnifie and applaud him,
libelling most execrably and inhumanely on lacke of the Falcon.*⁴²³

The accusation that Harvey is an applause seeker is fully displayed here; not only does he actively pursue the plaudits of his audience he will verbally abuse those

⁴²² Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron Walden, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 67, lines 33-37

⁴²³ Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron Walden, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 68, lines 29-32

who do not offer this to him. As a comparison Nashe writes later in the piece 'Applaud and partake with him who list, this is my definitiue position'⁴²⁴ as if to suggest that applause is something that Nashe himself doesn't seek; instead he writes the truth and isn't concerned with gaining the praise of others.

What needs to be noted at this point is that the act of applauding is not a theatre or drama specific thing. Its relevance here is the manner in which Nashe utilises this word. The above example shows Harvey seeking applause for his performance in court; a dramatic and physical act. In comparison Nashe uses the word applause in a positive manner on a number of occasions but only when either flattering others or talking about his own works. An example of the former appears in Nashe's unauthorised Preface to Sidney's *Astrophel and Stella* when he writes

And here peraduenture my witles youth may be taxt with a margent
note of presumption, for offering to put vp any motion of applause in
the behalfe of so excellent a Poet.⁴²⁵

Nashe is both humbling himself in the presence of a greater poet while offering positive feedback to a man he professes to admire. Similarly, in his dedication to *Anatomy* Nashe flatters Charles Blount by writing

⁴²⁴ Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron Walden*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 128, lines 24-25

⁴²⁵ Nashe, *Preface to Astrophel and Stella*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 329, lines 21-24

In this heate of opinions, many hopes of Nobility were brought in
question, but nothing so generally applauded in euery mans
comparisons as your worshippes most absolute perfections.⁴²⁶

Again there is a difference with how Nashe is using the word with Blount's qualities and not his actions being praised, although as with anything Nashe writes in a dedication, especially one so early in his career, the reader needs to be slightly wary of taking anything at face value as he has proven himself willing to say or write anything in an attempt to gain patronage. As noted at the beginning of this section the word 'applause' and its variant forms appear in Nashe's works thirteen times and are mainly negative. I have pointed to the manner in which Nashe chastises Harvey for seeking applause as this is something no true man of letters would do; it should be no surprise then that Nashe does practically the same thing in relation to *Anatomie*. Nashe writes in *Preface to Menaphon* 'If I please, I will thinke my ignorance indebted vnto you that applaud it [*Anatomie*]⁴²⁷ which is an attempt to garner praise whilst technically not overtly or explicitly seeking it. It needs to be considered that this is Nashe's first work to be published under his name and as his career developed his opinions on seeking applause changed over his career especially; it is however characteristic of Nashe to criticise his rival for doing something that he himself has also done. Despite this Nashe remains mostly consistent in his message, and that the act of seeking applause - an act which lies at

⁴²⁶ Nashe, *The Anatomie of Absvrditie, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, pp. 7-8, lines 36+

⁴²⁷ Nashe, *Preface to Menaphon, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 325, lines 4-5

the heart of drama and the theatre - is something that is to be considered unworthy.

‘Applause’ is not the only dramatic term or word that Nashe uses in his works. I have already discussed the usages of the word ‘Stage’ in *Almond* in which it appears in one form or another on three occasions and also two of his three usages of the word in *Anatomie*; further to these two pamphlets the word or one of its variations is used another ten times in six of Nashe’s other works. Two of these appear in *Saffron-Walden*; I have already noted one of these is when Nashe describes how Harvey’s life could be acted ‘upon every stage’ as a series of ridiculous comedies. The other appears slightly earlier when Nashe describes a time when Harvey was actually represented on the stage when he writes

What will you giue mee when I bring him vppon the Stage in one of the principallest Colledges in *Cambridge*? Lay anie wager with me, and I will ; or, if you laye no wager at all, Ile fetch him aloft in *Pedantius*, that exquisite Comedie in *Trinitie Colledge*; where, vnder the cheife part, from which it tooke his name, as namely the concise and firking finicaldo fine School-master, hee was full drawen & delineated from the soale of the foote to the crowne of his head.⁴²⁸

In recalling a time when Harvey was belittled on the stage Nashe is deliberately drawing parallels between the use of this medium with the basest of humour yet,

⁴²⁸ Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron Walden, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 80, lines 4-12

in a typical Nashean manner, there is also something more suitable and almost contradictory happening here. In the first instance Nashe chooses not to describe the ways in which the stage may elevate people or even show how different media may be used to denigrate Harvey but instead his bias against the stage ensures he uses this genre as the way in which he will reduce his rival. Secondly Nashe describes *Pedantius* as 'that exquisite Comedie'; one of the only times Nashe uses a positive adjective to describe this manner of play and seemingly inconsistent with his message about comedies in general. The reason though becomes obvious when examining the play in question. *Pedantius* follows the tradition of most University staged plays in that it was almost entirely performed in Latin; as Wiggins notes

So far as surviving texts are concerned, the total number of English words heard on any Cambridge stage during the 1580s amounts to four, the mocking phrase 'Tarantara bounce' and references to 'moustaches' and 'pantofles', all in *Pedantius*.⁴²⁹

Nashe consistently shows himself as one who is proud of his classical education with all his works being littered with Latin and classical allusions. It is clear that he would have more respect for a play written in this language – not only does he describe *Pedantius* in glowing terms, but he was also heavily involved in the production of the lost play *Terminus et Non-Terminus* - and that he would consider university drama to be worthier than that played for the less educated public. This

⁴²⁹ Martin Wiggins, 'When Did Marlowe Write *Dido, Queen of Carthage*?', *The Review of English Studies*, New Series, Vol. 59, No. 241 (Sep., 2008), pp. 521-541 this ref. p. 530

is re-enforced in areas where Nashe is not attacking his rival; in the pamphlet *Christ's Teares Over Jerusalem* Nashe makes two references to the stage. In the first as part of a long passage describing how people make themselves up he writes 'Theyre heads, with theyr top and top gallant Lawne baby-caps, and Snow-resembled siluer curlings, they make a playne Puppet stage of.'⁴³⁰ This whole section concerns itself with how women present themselves to appear more 'heavenly' than they actually are and Nashe again equates this action with the actions of preparing to go on stage and act. In itself this description of how women paint and display themselves being similar to the actions of an actor is not ground breaking; naturally the actors and players wear make up to play their parts as this is the very nature of plays. Given all the other times in which Nashe makes this comparison it becomes clear that his consistent point is that there is a distinction between true appearance and honesty, and the false nature of drama. On numerous occasions if Nashe wants to represent deceit he refers to the stage and drama; if he wants to call someone's actions into question, he will frame that criticism using dramatic language and terms. This is repeated and expanded upon slightly later in *Christs Teares* when he writes

England, the Players' stage of gorgeous attyre, the Ape of all Nations
superfluities, the continuall Masquer in outlandish habilements,
great plenty-scanting calamities art thou to await, for wanton

⁴³⁰ Nashe, *Christs Teares Over Jerusalem*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 2, p. 136, lines 31-33

disguising thy selfe against kind, and digressing from the plainnesse
of thine Auncesters.⁴³¹

This line is the first sentence of a section where Nashe describes the decline of England and its people. And once again Nashe introduces this highly negative passage with a reference to the stage; the initial description of the country as a 'Players' stage of gorgeous attyre' is followed by more derogatory adjectives leaving no doubt as to Nashe's message; the country as whole has become as insubstantial as a beautiful stage with no real depth or value.

Having examined some of the dramatic terms that Nashe utilises within his works I would like to switch focus to two sections of Nashe's writing that have the highest content of theatrical language. The first of these is his unauthorised and short-lived preface to Sir Philip Sidney's *Astrophel and Stella*. I have already noted that the word 'stage' appears in this piece but this preface has a far higher concentration of dramatic language than any of Nashe's other works. However before examining these instances, it is important to understand the background to this piece and the potential reasons for Nashe having written this preface; a work that is dissimilar from anything he produced before and is vastly different from the *Preface to Menaphon* which preceded the publication of this preface by two years. The two prefaces are very different in both composition and tone; the *Preface to Menaphon* was first published in 1589 and appears in all future editions of the work

⁴³¹ Nashe, *Christs Teares Over Jerusalem, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 2, p. 142, lines 18-22

and is something that the author of *Menaphon*, Robert Greene, had either approved or, at the very least, had no issues with. It is also unsurprising that Nashe would have written a preface for a work by this older author; the two men's names were regularly to be found together with Nashe being noted as one of Greene's allies. They attended Cambridge, shared a common circle of friends and acquaintances and were cut from the same satirical cloth. Nashe's preface to Sidney's sonnet sequence, on the other hand, is less easy to explain as the two men had no pre-existing relation. The sequence was initially published with Nashe's preface attached to it in 1591, and was produced by Thomas Newman; this first edition as McKerrow notes 'seems to have been unauthorised, for another, with a very different text and without Nashe's preface, was issued by the same publisher in the same year'.⁴³² Like McKerrow the majority of critics tend to avoid questioning why Nashe penned the preface or why this edition was subsequently called in.

The different statuses of the two pieces are a major difference between them, but not the only one. Whereas Nashe's *Preface to Menaphon* only briefly mentions Greene or the work that Nashe's preface is supposedly introducing, the preface to *Astrophel and Stella* places a lot more focus on that work and both the author and his family. It is the manner in which Nashe makes these references which is relevant; throughout this preface there are numerous dramatic and theatrical allusions which the preface to Greene's work does not contain. The first of these references appears on the very first line of the preface which includes a

⁴³² McKerrow, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 5. p. 17

line taken directly from Ovid's *Amores* 3.2; '*Tempus adest plausus, aurea pompa venit*, so ends the Sceane of Idiots, and enter *Astrophel* in pompe.'⁴³³ Immediately Nashe is making a theatrical connection; the Latin quotation translates as 'The time for *Applause* is here – the golden procession comes' and as I have previously noted the word applause appears in English on numerous occasions in his work. In this instance Nashe is choosing to introduce his preface dramatically, whereas the Latin element could be interpreted as in a much more mundane manner, by immediately following this line with the concept of a scene ending he makes it clear this is a stage direction. In this preface any reference to *Astrophel* is meant to represent Sidney; this *Astrophel* is a character in a play and an important and well-heeled one at that. Nashe continues with more classical allusions; after writing '*ex uno puncto impudentiae*'⁴³⁴ which appears to be from the Roman Tacitus, Nashe immediately continues by noting 'two famous Mountains goe to the conception of one Mouse',⁴³⁵ a reference to the fable credited to Aesop and popularised by both Phaedrus and Horace in his *Ars Poetica*. Aesop's fables, unlike the writings of Horace and Tacitus, were passed mainly via storytelling and have a much more theatrical nature to them. The piece continues with a paragraph littered with more theatrical references with Nashe writing,

let not your surfeted sight, new come fro such puppet play, think
scorne to turn aside into this Theater of pleasure, for here you shal

⁴³³ Nashe, *Preface to Astrophel and Stella*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 329, lines 3-4

⁴³⁴ Nashe, *Preface to Astrophel and Stella*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 329, line 6

⁴³⁵ Nashe, *Preface to Astrophel and Stella*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 329, lines 6-7

find a paper stage streud with pearle, an artificial heau'n to
ouershadow the faire frame, & christol wals to encounter your
curious eyes, whiles the tragicommodie of loue is performed by
starlight.⁴³⁶

In this section Nashe writes of a puppet play, a 'theater' of pleasure, and a paper stage introducing the poem and the character of Astrophel in dramatic terms. As Duncan-Jones notes 'It was not unusual to refer to non-dramatic poems as if they were theatrical enactments.'⁴³⁷ By introducing elements like the 'paper stage streud with pearle', 'an artificial heau'n' and 'christal wals' Nashe fills the first part of his apparent paean to Sidney with this heavily dramatic language which on examination suggests both a lack of permanence and a degree of falseness. Pearl and crystal are shiny and look opulent but are impractical for building anything of foundation on; the whole suggestion of a paper stage insinuates fragility and ephemerality. This is Nashe continuing his theme that while plays and their surroundings look spectacular to a casual viewer, in the cold light of day they have very little value or substance. Immediately then the vocabulary used calls into question the nature of this preface, whereas it can be argued that Nashe's positive feelings for Sidney and his writing were genuine - he compliments the author in *Anatomie* noting 'but neuer saw any thing more singuler the worthy Sir *Philip Sidney*, of whom it might truly be saide, *Arma virumque cano*. ' -⁴³⁸ he was also

⁴³⁶ Nashe, *Preface to Astrophel and Stella*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 329, lines 11-17

⁴³⁷ Katherine Duncan-Jones, 'Much Ado with Red and White: The Earliest Readers of Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis* (1593)', *The Review of English Studies*, Vol. 44, No. 176 (Nov., 1993), pp. 479-501 this ref. p. 494

⁴³⁸ Nashe, *The Anatomie of Absvrditie*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 7, lines 34-36

taking this opportunity to audition for a better-connected literary circle. This would go some way into explaining the uncharacteristically high number of classical references that Nashe uses in this relatively short piece; although he shows over his complete canon that he is not one to shy away from showing his classical education, the references Nashe utilises are normally scattered throughout the individual works and are used relatively sparingly to strengthen his arguments. Here we see allusion following allusion with hardly any pause between them; Nashe is determined to show a new audience just how well educated he is and how easily he could fit into a more rarefied group of people. Following these references this section continues with Nashe mentioning the 'tragicommodity of loue'; as previously established Nashe has a hierarchy within drama and tends to reserve comedy of any sort for his enemies. It is surprising then that in this section introducing the supposedly glorious Astrophel that there would be another reference which appears to be covertly negative, although this may be a reference to Sidney's own words in *A Defence of Poetry*. Here Sidney refers to tragicomedy as a 'mongrel'⁴³⁹ suggesting that this type of play lies lower than plain tragedies or comedies. In either case Nashe is enforcing the idea that there is more to this section than is originally apparent and that taking this at face value may be a mistake. The dramatic allusions continue after this point; Nashe writes

The chiefe Actor here is *Melpomene*, whose dusky robes, dipt in the
ynke of teares, as yet seeme to drop when I view them neere. The

⁴³⁹ Sidney, *A Defence of Poetry*, this ref. p. 67, line 19
256

argument, cruell chastity, the Prologue hope; the Epilogue despaire;

*videte, queso, et linguis animisque fauete.*⁴⁴⁰

This first line marries both Nashe's desire for classical allusions and his need to add another theatrical reference; he invokes Melpomene, the muse of tragedy and one of the Nine Muses of Greek mythology, the 'nine sisters' who are also referred to in passing later on in this preface. By using Melpomene Nashe is stressing the links between this preface and the theatrical world; Melpomene is the only muse other than Thalia involved with the dramatic arts with the other seven being engaged in much higher callings like history, poetry and astronomy. Even Thalia, the muse of Comedy, is also the muse of pastoral poetry meaning Melpomene is the only muse solely concerned with the dramatic artform. Nashe then uses phrases that are commonly found in plays referencing a prologue and an epilogue before closing the sentence with another classical reference, borrowing the Latin directly again from Ovid's *Amores* 3.2. Nashe then nicely bookends the first paragraph with a reference from a different fable by Aesop noting

yet those that obserue how iewels oftentimes com to their hands that
know not their value, & that the cockscombes of our daies, like *Esops*
Cock, had rather haue a Barly kernell wrapt vp in a Ballet than they
wil dig for the welth of wit in any ground that they know not, I hope

⁴⁴⁰ Nashe, *Preface to Astrophel and Stella*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 329, lines 17-21

will also hold me excused, though I open the gate to his glory and
inuite idle eares to the admiration of his melancholy.⁴⁴¹

This fable has been interpreted in many ways but Nashe's usage is consistent with the interpretation made by Robert Henryson in around 1480, that the cock's rejection of the jewel in favour of searching for corn represents foolishness and lack of awareness. In this case the jewel is *Astrophel and Stella* and the kernels of corn are the other literary works of the time. Nashe appears to be suggesting that Sidney's work is so complex and unlike anything else that has been written that it is destined to be misunderstood by the present-day literati; they will value the more commonplace corn above the sparkling jewel that is *Astrophel and Stella*. Nashe wishes to leave no doubt that, unlike himself who can see the value of the jewel over the corn, contemporary readers are relative simpletons lacking in basic wit and education. And therein lies the difficulty with interpreting the first part of the preface; Nashe is balancing his obvious respect for the older author and his desire to obtain a sponsor and gain some measure of financial security from Sidney's circle with his fiercely satirical nature and his instincts to criticize even at the most inopportune moments. By using theatrical language Nashe is attempting to disguise his contempt for the patronage system while at the same time seeming to play along. Nashe, a writer who failed to keep a patron for any significant length of time unlike so many of his better known contemporaries, would have been aware of the both the advantages and disadvantages of having a patron and that sacrificing

⁴⁴¹ Nashe, *Preface to Astrophel and Stella*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 329-330, lines 26+
258

some artistic integrity in order to gain a measure of financial stability was not unheard of.

Nashe's *Preface to Astrophel and Stella* was both published and withdrawn in 1591 and despite all the conjecture the circumstances behind its publication and subsequent removal remain unclear to this day. There are no such issues with the next piece I shall examine, *Pierce Penilesse*, which remains the standard bearer for Nashe's typical style of writing in which he discusses the Seven Cardinal Sins alongside his opinions of various nationalities and specific people. Specifically, I will re-engage with the section 'In Defence of Plays' in which the defence of the genre actually begins prior to the start of this paragraph — before doing so I will briefly discuss this pamphlet as it holds a significant position in Nashe's canon.

In *Pierce Penilesse* Nashe discusses a number of elements that, in his view, have negatively contributed to life as a whole. It is here that Nashe uses the same literary techniques that become his stock in trade in later works condemning large groups of people with sweeping generalisations. It is 'typical Nashe' in the sense that he takes the opportunity to satirise nameless individuals, nationalities and specific figures in the same manner – there are sections devoted to 'the prodigall yoong master', 'The Danes enemies to al learning' and 'Philip of Spaine as great an enemy to mankind as the divell.'⁴⁴² Nashe is a man who has recognised the things that ail the world and, while he may not have the solutions, he is sure he is the right

⁴⁴² Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Svpplication to the Divell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, pp. 170, 178 & 184
259

person to point these out. Nashe is not afraid to attack his subjects to the fullest extent and throughout the piece uses nicknames, puns, classical references and Latin quotes establishing a method of writing he utilises in later works. For example, the contempt he displays in *Pierce Penilesse* for the King of Spain is echoed by that he shows for Harvey in *Strange Newes* and *Have With You*; references to *Iaques Scabd-hams*, or *Monsieur Mingo de Moustrap* are forebearers to any number of insulting nicknames given to those Nashe disagrees with in the future. *Pierce Penilesse* contains all the facets of a Nashe pamphlet with complaints about various Europeans sitting next to compliments directed towards those that Nashe respected – Sidney, Watson, Moore for example are all lauded here as they are in later works. This is the pamphlet that both introduced Nashe to London and established the manner in which he would write until his passing less than a decade later.

Looking specifically now at ‘In Defence of Plays’ section this is linked with Nashe’s theories on how to combat the sin of Sloth with him seeming particularly worried about the effect of this sin noting:

There is a certaine waste of men for whome there is no vse but warre: and these men must haue some employment still to cut them off...if they haue no service abroad, they will make mutinies at home.⁴⁴³

⁴⁴³ Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Svpplication to the Divell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 211, lines 23-27
260

His solution is to get these idle people to watch plays: 'To this effect, the policie of Playes is very necessary'.⁴⁴⁴ Given the manner in which Nashe has referred to plays in the other works means this declaration is surprising; as discussed Nashe places drama below Poetry and Pamphlets as literary pursuits. In the previous chapter though I have noted how this section follows a path laid out by Sidney in his *Defence of Poetry*. Sidney's work, most likely written as a response to Stephen Gosson's 1579 tract *Schoole of Abuse, containing a pleasant invective against Poets, Pipers, Plaiers, Jesters and such like Caterpillars of the Commonwealth*, addresses not only Gosson's attack on the stage but also more historical objections to poetry. Nashe uses Sidney as a template in which to also seemingly defend the stage and subscribes to a hierarchy within the genre that the older writer alludes to. I have already described how Nashe sees comedy as the lowest form of drama and this is something that Sidney has previously indicated writing 'No, perchance it is the Comic, who naughty play-makers and stage keepers have justly made odious.'⁴⁴⁵ Sidney makes it clear that it is not comedy that he has an issue with, but the problem lies with those who are currently responsible for putting it on the stage. He continues:

So that the right use of comedy will (I think) by nobody be blamed;
and much less of the high and excellent Tragedy, that openeth the

⁴⁴⁴ Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Svpplication to the Divell, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 211, line 34

⁴⁴⁵ Sidney, *A Defence of Poetry*, this ref. p. 44, lines 17-18

greatest wounds, and showeth forth the ulcers that are covered with tissue.⁴⁴⁶

Sidney describes the same opinion about the relative worthiness of these types of plays that Nashe later goes on to deliver in *Pierce Penilesse*, with both men describing tragedy as high and excellent whilst being less laudatory about comedy; it is likely that Sidney's work influenced Nashe into also representing the hierarchy of drama in this way. Sidney's words had a lasting effect on the younger man – he not only represents them in *Pierce Penilesse* in a section whose title invites comparisons with Sidney's own work – but throughout his later works Nashe remains faithful to Sidney's hierarchy. At no point does Nashe depart from the idea that comedy was a lesser form of drama than tragedy – it is a concept he re-enforces whether he be discussing 'Noble Talbot' or the various mis-adventures of Gabriel Harvey. Putting this hierarchy to one side however, Nashe then decides he needs to become a champion of the genre as a whole – he describes an argument that lesser characters might put forth in favour of drama:

For whereas the after-noone being the idlest time of the day,
wherein men that are their owne masters (as Gentlemen of the
Court, the Innes of the Court, and the number of Captaines and
Souldiers about *London*) do wholly bestow themselves vpon pleasure,
and that pleasure they deuide (howe vertuously it skills not) either

⁴⁴⁶ Sidney, *A Defence of Poetry*, this ref. p. 45, lines 14-16

into gaming, following of harlots, drinking, or seeing a Playe, is it not then better (since of foure extremes all the world cannot keepe them, but they will choose one) that they should betake them to the least, which is Playes?⁴⁴⁷

This argument suggests that the perceived wisdom of the time is that seeing a play is the least of four evils, drinking, whoring and gambling being the other three.

Nashe disagrees arguing 'Nay, what if I prooue Playes to be no extreame; but a rare exercise of vertue?'⁴⁴⁸ and continuing to describe how drama helps his contemporaries learn from history. It is at this point though that Nashe reverts back to the kind of language he uses consistently about the genre throughout the rest of his works; the section continues into the Talbot quotation which I have previously discussed with regards to how it has been used in an effort to establish how involved in drama Nashe was. At this stage I will focus again on this section looking more closely at the vocabulary of Nashe. In this section Nashe talks of how the stage has revived 'braue *Talbot*' and 'how would it have ioyed [him]...to think that after he had lyne two hundred yeares in his Tombe, hee should triumphe again on the stage'⁴⁴⁹ yet chooses to focus not on Talbot's successes but on his defeat. Nashe calls attention to the fact the play depicts the noble gentleman with 'his bones newe embalmed with the teares of ten thousand spectators...who...behold him fresh bleeding.'⁴⁵⁰ Nashe is using emotive and negative language to describe

⁴⁴⁷ Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Svpplication to the Divell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 212, lines 3-12

⁴⁴⁸ Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Svpplication to the Divell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 212, lines 12-14

⁴⁴⁹ Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Svpplication to the Divell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 212, lines 22-24

⁴⁵⁰ Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Svpplication to the Divell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 212, lines 25-28

how the play represents things; rather than describing any of Talbot's positive acts he instead concentrates on his defeat and subsequent painful death. As previously noted, this is a much-interrogated part of Nashe's works; Walsh writes

Nashe's enthusiastic praise of Talbot's valiant stage death suggests that Shakespeare's play affected audiences by vividly "reviving" the past, showing the brave Talbot "fresh bleeding" as he dies at the hands of the French.⁴⁵¹

This focuses on the language that Nashe uses to describe Talbot's end and how this appealed to the audience which goes some way into understanding what Nashe was doing in this section but does not fully consider the author's intentions. Similarly, Maurice Hunt has produced an examination of *1 Henry VI* which discusses the character of Talbot at some length but sees Nashe's comments relegated to a footnote of which Hunt says 'Nevertheless, contemporary evidence exists that Talbot's death moved whole audiences to tears'⁴⁵² before quoting the relevant paragraph from *Pierce Penilesse* and then making no further comment. Neither critic pays much more than lip service to the words and their potential to be social commentary or is able to draw the conclusion that given Nashe's low regard for the genre it is no surprise

⁴⁵¹ Walsh, "'Unkind Division': The Double Absence of Performing History in *1 Henry VI*", this ref. p. 125

⁴⁵² Maurice Hunt, 'The Politics of Vision in Shakespeare's *1 Henry VI*', *South Central Review*, Vol. 19, No. 1 (Spring, 2002), pp. 76-101, this ref. p. 100

that he draws attention to how 'Shakespeare's play' fascinates a less intellectual audience than would be attracted by a poem or even a historical drama.

As the analysis above shows, Nashe's 'defence of plays' begins in what seems to be an unqualified vindication of the genre but can quickly be seen to be something more half-hearted. At this point though, this manner of treatment ceases with Nashe continuing the section in a more positive vein and actually defending the genre as the section originally claimed to do. With a shift of tone also comes a shift in focus with Nashe no longer concerning himself with the genre itself but with the people that he claims are attacking it. He begins his tirade by announcing

I will defend it [plays] against any Collian or club-fisted Vsurer of them all, there is no immortalitie can be given a man on earth like vnto plays. What talke I to them of immortalitie, that are the onely vnderminers of Honour, and doe enuie any man that is not sprung vp by base Brokerie like themselves? They care not if all the auncient houses were rooted out, so that, like the Burgomasters of the Low-countries, they might share the gouernment amongst them as States, and be quarter-masters of our Monarchie. All Artes to them are vanitie: and if you tell them what a glorious thing it is to haue Henrie the fifth represented on the Stage, leading the French King prisoner, and forcing both him and the Dolphin to sweare fealty, I, but (will they say) what do we get by it? Respecting neither the right of fame

that is due to true Nobilitie deceased, nor what hopes of eternitie are
to be proposed to aduentrous mindes, to encourage them forward,
but onely their execrable luker, and filthie vnquenchable auarice.⁴⁵³

This passage sees Nashe deploring the state of the world and those within it who do not appreciate 'art.' He categorizes these people as rascals and loan sharks - baser individuals with low morals and lower integrity. In a classic straw man argument Nashe is announcing that the true path to immortality is not gained through obtaining money but through following the arts. This passage which describes glorious scenes of Henry V leading his vanquished foes is everything that was missing in his original paragraphs and reading this passage in isolation to his other works this is a whole-hearted vindication of the genre. However it is impossible to separate Nashe's other works from this one which indicates that this passage is not so much a defence of plays but an attack on those ignorant, less educated people who do not understand the genre and value material things above intellectual pursuits. Of course, this is a theme that is evident throughout all of Nashe's writings; Nashe patronises and condescends to those whose education, background or vocation does not match his heady ideals and this theme is continued and expanded upon in the next paragraph when Nashe writes

They know when they are dead they shall not be brought vpon the
Stage for any goodnes, but in a merriment of the Vsurer and the

⁴⁵³ Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Supplication to the Diuell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, pp. 212-213, lines 29+

Diuel, or buying Armes of the Herald, who gives them the Lyon,
without tongue, tayle or tallents, because his maister whome hee
must serue is a Townesman, and a man of peace, and must not
keepe any quarrelling beasts to annoy his honest neighbours.⁴⁵⁴

Nashe is not only adding peaceful townsfolk to his list of unworthy people, but seems to take particular exception to them; especially those who commission coats of arms. Nashe sees this as an incredible insult and the contempt and disgust he has for these kinds of people is clear from his choice of words. No blame is assigned to the herald who as he notes '*must serve*' the townsman, and instead Nashe commends the man for portraying the lion, not as a ferocious and dangerous beast but as a neutered pussy cat. Nashe makes it clear that the kind of man who commissions this herald is not the kind of individual who will not be celebrated on the stage but any portrayal of them will be negative. Nashe has no issue with that kind of treatment being meted out but it is the qualifying statement that this will be done by 'the Vsurer and the Diuel' that is of interest. Nashe is intimating that the play can be manipulated by nefarious types to suit their own ends and again this casts doubt on the credibility of the genre as whole.

Immediately after this section Nashe writes a further section over a total of forty lines which succinctly sum up his thoughts. Labelled as both 'The vse of Playes' and 'The Confutation of Citizens objections against Players' Nashe succeeds

⁴⁵⁴ Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Svpplication to the Divell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 213, lines 14-20
267

in both minimizing the importance of the genre whilst also belittling those who would criticise the medium and those who take part in it. This section begins Nashe listing the types of action that he feels the genre represents writing

In plays, all coosanages, all cunning drifts ouer-guylded with outward holinesse, all stratagems of warre, all the cankerworms that breede on the rust of peace, are most liuely anatomiz'd: they shew the ill successe of treason, the fall of hastie climbers, the wretched end of vsurpers, the miserie of ciuill dissention, and how iust God is euermore in punishing of murther.⁴⁵⁵

Frauds, wars and lies are all given top billing by Nashe with the author focussing on the way that the genre highlights the negative behaviours of man and is reminiscent of the venomous manner in which Nashe often discusses Gabriel Harvey in his other works. This is too similar to be coincidental and invites parallels to be drawn; in *Have With You* when discussing how Harvey has praised Sidney Nashe writes

Consil: What a mischiefe does he taking anie mans name in his vlcerous mouth? that being so festred and ranckled with barbarisme is able to rust and canker it, were it neuer so resplendent.

Respon: In all his praises he is the most fore-spoken and vnfortunate vnder heauen, & those whom he feruentest strives to grace and

⁴⁵⁵ Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Supplication to the Divell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 213, lines 21-27
268

honour he most dishonors and disgraceth by some vncircumcised
sluttish epithite or other: and euen to talke treason he may be drawn
vnwares, and neuer have anie such intent, for want of discretion how
to manage his words.⁴⁵⁶

Nashe uses similar imagery in both instances and even suggests in both cases that the words are treasonous; a serious accusation in both cases which indicates the low regard in which Nashe held both Harvey and the genre. The passage from *Pierce Penilesse* also has similarities to the way Nashe describes Talbot in terms of his defeat; he has the opportunity to give a more balanced account of what plays bring to the populus but chooses instead to avoid doing so focusing on their negative usage. Nashe does not seem to class plays as a form of entertainment but that its true value, if it has any at all, is as a means of censure or warning. This passage has almost puritanical levels of caution and disapproval; an approach normally antithetic to Nashe's normal methods. As Andersen notes about Nashe's works

The Unfortunate Traveller has been generally dismissed by literary critics as a novel manqué, but the polemical implications of its fictional setting in early Reformation Europe help explain Nashe's

⁴⁵⁶ Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron Walden*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 49, lines 17-27

rhetorical strategy. As in the anti-Marprelate pamphlets, here Nashe also attacks Puritan visions of the true church.⁴⁵⁷

Although Nashe is never hesitant in telling his audience the right way to live their lives he normally does so in a manner which does not involve references to punishments by God – *Christs Teares* is the only one of Nashe's extant works which engages overtly with religion - which makes this passage unusual throughout Nashe's works. Nashe then continues,

Whereas some Petitioners of the Counsaile against them object, they corrupt the youth of the Cittie, and withdrawe Prentises from theyr worke; they heartily wishe they might bee troubled with none of their youth nor their prentises; for some of them (I meane the ruder handicrafts seruants) neuer come abroad but they are in danger of undoing: and as for corrupting them when they come, that's false; for no Play they haue, encourageth any man to tumults or rebellion, but layes before such the halter and the gallows; or praiseth or approueth pride, lust, whoredom, prodigalitie, or drunkennes, but beates them down vtterly.⁴⁵⁸

Here Nashe appears to be addressing the closure of the theatres although as McKerrow notes about this passage 'This seems to have been written while the

⁴⁵⁷ Jennifer L. Andersen, 'Anti-Puritanism, Anti-Popery, and Gallows Rhetoric in Thomas Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller*', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol. 35, No. 1 (Spring, 2004), pp. 43-63 this ref. p. 43

⁴⁵⁸ Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Supplication to the Diuell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 213-214, lines 32+

theatres were closed...but the closure at the time of writing seems to have been on account of the plague.'⁴⁵⁹ In any case Nashe takes the opportunity to upbraid the men who have taken the decision to shut the theatres; a decision that Nashe apparently disagrees with on the basis that plays have no impact on the morals of the viewing audience, but as discussed earlier probably had more to do with the impact it had on his potential to earn money. The two passages show Nashe at the height of his hypocrisy with the author wanting to both criticise the genre whilst minimising its significance as a whole; in the first passage he suggests that plays have no moral value and highlight man's behaviour at its worst, yet in the second he says that the decision to close the theatres is hasty and pointless as banning plays will not actually negatively influence the populace.

The section ends with Nashe revisiting a theme he established only a few pages earlier: that watching a play is better than partaking in a number of other vices. As previously though he does this in such a way that it is clear that this is a grudging concession to the genre rather than a wholesale recommendation. He writes

As for the hindrance of Trades and Traders of the citie by them, that is an Article foysted in by the Vintners, Alewiues, and Victuallers, who surmise, if there were no Playes, they should haue all the companie that resort to them, lye bowzing and beere-bathing in their

⁴⁵⁹ McKerrow, Notes to *Pierce Penilesse His Svpplication to the Divell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 4, p. 39

houses euery after-noone. Nor so, nor so, good brother bottle-ale,
for there are other places besides where money can bestow it selfe:
the signe of the smock will wipe your mouth cleane: and yet I haue
heard yee haue made her a tenant to your tap-houses. But what shall
hee doo that hath spent himselfe? where shall hee haunt? Faith,
when Dice, Lust, and Drunkennesse, and all haue dealt vpon him, if
there be neuer a Playe for him to goe too for his pennie, he sits
melancholie in his Chamber, deuising vpon felonie or treason, and
howe he may best exalt himselfe by mischief.⁴⁶⁰

The message is clear: the common man is going to spend his money doing something wasteful and if plays did not exist, he would take part in any number of base activities or think of ways to 'exalt himself by mischief.' This would appear to be Nashe praising or defending the genre but by mentioning plays in this proximity to sinful behaviour he is drawing close parallels between the acts. With this being the second time in a short space that Nashe makes this connection, this is something so important to Nashe that he wants to make sure his audience recognises his opinions and that he will not be misunderstood on this. What becomes evident from 'The Defence of Plays' is that this section does not achieve what its title suggests it would. There can be little doubt that the title deliberately echoes Sir Philip Sidney's *The Defence of Poesy* (also known as *An Apology for Poetry*) which has been recognised as one of the key contributions to literary

⁴⁶⁰ Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Supplication to the Diuell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 214, lines 10-25
272

theory of the era. However what Sidney's work does for poetry, Nashe's most certainly does not do for his subject. Whereas Sidney develops and presents theories as to why poetry will have an enduring effect and importance on culture Nashe succeeds only in faintly praising his chosen medium. Nashe shows time and again that he is prepared to elevate plays, a genre that Nashe believes is one of the lower forms of art, to a more rarefied level but only for very clear and specific reasons. In order to make the point that money-lenders, rascals and their ilk are so wretched Nashe establishes the value of this genre and subsequently notes they cannot even appreciate this lowest of all the art forms. And ultimately this shows that even though Nashe initially indicates he will be supportive and positive of plays the evidence proves something quite different; Nashe is instead saying that writing plays is preferable only to writing nothing at all.

Having engaged with a number of Nashe's other works it is now time to examine the only extant play written in Nashe's name, *Summer's Last Will and Testament*. Although it is now believed that he had a far more significant impact within this area this remains the only play that currently exists with Nashe named as the author. In it Nashe uses the ghost of Will Sommers (whom Nashe spells as Will Summers throughout), Henry VIII's court jester and the predecessor of men like Tarleton and Kempe, to introduce his musings on the passing of the season. It is well established that this was written for a private audience; Groves notes 'This [*Summer's Last Will*] was performed before Archbishop Whitgift and his household in autumn 1592 at his palace in Croydon, where Whitgift had retreated to escape

the plague'⁴⁶¹ and the play would have been written at the behest of his then patron. As Duncan-Jones notes,

Though London's public theatres were closed, private theatrical entertainments continued in private locations seven or more miles from the City of London. One such, *Summer's Last Will and Testament*, appears to have taken place at Archbishop Whitgift's out-of-town residence, Croydon Palace, in the late summer or early autumn of 1592.⁴⁶²

This also explains a significant portion of Summer's first speech which reads,

But that *Eliza*, Englands beauteous Queene,

On whom all seasons prosperously attend,

Forbad the execution of my fate,

Vntill her ioyfull progresse was expir'd⁴⁶³

The word choices that Nashe makes in this speech are unusual as throughout his work Nashe tends to refrain from discussing the monarch and the word Eliza only appears in one other work, in *Lenten Stuffe* when Nashe is discussing the goddess of the earth in a passage in which he also discusses Moses and other biblical figures. As Duncan-Jones continues

⁴⁶¹ Beatrice Groves, 'Laughter in the Time of Plague: A Context for the Unstable Style of Nashe's *Christ's Tears over Jerusalem*', *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 108, No. 2 (Spring, 2011), pp. 238-260 this ref. p. 258

⁴⁶² Duncan-Jones, 'Shakespeare, The Motley Player', this ref. p. 737

⁴⁶³ Nashe, *Summers Last Will and Testament*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 237, lines 133-136

...the extravagant compliments to her [Elizabeth] with which the piece closes were commonplace in plays of the period, and Whitgift, a Privy Councillor and one of her best-loved courtiers, would surely have insisted on them...the play had presumably been planned, as so many were each summer, in the fervent hope that she would grace it with her presence.⁴⁶⁴

Nashe would have been aware that he needed to write this piece to retain his position and is willing to compromise his ideals to do so; that he did so in a play re-enforces the idea that this piece was not one Nashe freely chose to write but was something something requested by his patron. Duncan-Jones presents a further theory as to its composition:

However, it is extremely probable that Greene collaborated with Nashe on the composition of the play in its early stages, for in the epistle to the gentleman playwrights in *Groatsworth* 'R.G' addresses Nashe as 'Young Juvenall, that byting Satyryst that lastly [i.e., most recently] with me together writ a comédie'. Hitherto, this collaborative comedy has not been identified. But *Summer's Last Will* is the obvious candidate both because of the period of its composition, during the last summer of Greene's life, and because its English setting and old-fashioned medley style, which alternates

⁴⁶⁴ Duncan-Jones, 'Shakespeare, The Motley Player', this ref. p. 737
275

prose with verse and songs with set speeches, strongly resemble

Greene's attested work for the stage.⁴⁶⁵

Duncan-Jones's contention that this was written in conjunction with Greene is logical – although Nashe was involved in the production of drama it follows that he would have sought assistance from a more experienced colleague, especially bearing in mind that this was a specific commission from a wealthy patron.

Summer's Last Will alternates between characters talking in verse and others who talk in prose although the characters themselves remain mostly consistent: Summer, Solstitium, Sol, Autumne, Winter and Orion solely talk in verse; Will, Bacchus and Christmas speak in prose. Of the others Harvest speaks mainly in prose but has two lines in verse, and Back Winter is the opposite. Only Vertumnus switches significantly between the two; even here though there is consistency with the character announcing the entrance of Summer's courtiers with verse but making his sole lengthy speech in prose. In general, Nashe tends to avoid exchanges of dialogues preferring to have his characters give vent in long passages of prose before being countered by another player doing the same thing. In this sense, the play has similarities with *Pierce Penilesse* in which Pierce spouts forth about the ills of the world before the Knight of the Post responds in kind. Equally there are numerous similarities between *Summer's Last Will* and *Have With You*, in which the various speakers take it in turns to enhance the criticism of the

⁴⁶⁵ Duncan-Jones, 'Shakespeare, The Motley Player', this ref. p. 738

unfortunate Doctor; the difference being In *HWY* the characters criticize a target who is not present whereas in *Summer's Last Will* the subject of their commentary, the eponymous Summer, is present on stage at all times. Like his pamphlets the play begins with the 'narrator' setting the scene; in this instance Nashe presents the audience with a prologue that stretches over two pages and is then immediately followed by the characters entering a song. The first dialogue appears two and a half pages after the 'start' of the play with an exchange between the two featured characters, Summer and the character who takes on Nashe's persona, Will Summers. It is interesting to note these two characters along with Winter and Autumne remain on stage throughout the play; although there is a fair degree of movement on and off stage these four are always present. This is also against the convention of the genre – it is rare in renaissance plays for even one character to remain onstage throughout the production and to have four doing so is highly unusual and adds to the impression that this isn't really a 'play'; there is minimal action and it reads more as a series of set pieces between Summer and the various members of his court, held together with cutting asides supplied by Will. This is something that Berek comments on when discussing Nashe's play, Lyly's *Gallathea*, and *Love's Labours Lost* he writes

But Nashe breaks the framework separating play from audience in *Summer's Last Will and Testament*. By calling attention to the contrived, "unrealistic" qualities of the pageant, Nashe makes more

direct connections than Lyly can between his allegorical narrative and powerful emotions felt by his audience in their own.⁴⁶⁶

What needs to be considered though is that this is not a play written for a mass audience – as I have previously noted it was designed to be played to Archbishop Whitgift's household and invited guests. As such traditionally dramatic convention could be ignored and Nashe was able to fulfil the conditions of his patron whilst producing something different. The suggestion that Nashe is re-inventing the genre is going too far; it would be closer to say that Nashe is bringing his own interpretation to the play and in essence deconstructing the genre. The play's introduction and the lengthy prologue, both delivered by Will, show the standards of a typical Nashe work and which could easily have been transplanted from one of Nashe's earlier works. He introduces a whole host of classical allusions mentioning the *Triumviri*, *Socrates* and *Didymus* to name but three whilst giving a brief overview of the story to come. These allusions seem to come mostly from Agrippa's *de incertitudine et vanitate scientiarum*; McKerrow in his notes to the piece finds most of Nashe's references can be found in this text.⁴⁶⁷ Untypically he also, in the guise of Will, takes aim at himself 'So it is, *boni viri*, that one foole presents another; and I, a foole by nature, and by arte, do speake to you in the person of the Idiot our Playmaker.'⁴⁶⁸ Nashe can be accused of many things but humility is not one of them; a line and sentiment like this immediately causes alarm bells to ring. This is clearly false

⁴⁶⁶ Peter Berek, 'Artifice and Realism in Lyly, Nashe, and *Love's Labor's Lost*', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, Vol. 23, No. 2, Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama (Spring, 1983), pp. 207-221 this ref. p. 208

⁴⁶⁷ McKerrow, Notes to *Summers Last Will and Testament*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 4, p. 420-421

⁴⁶⁸ Nashe, *Summer's Last Will and Testament*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 233, lines 19-22

modesty as even in his darkest moments Nashe never resorts to this kind of self-criticism. Instead it would be easier to see this as Nashe subtly subverting the genre and his own contribution to it; not only does he minimise the quality of the writer and the work, he also later on in the prologue addresses the length of the beginning portion of the play. He writes 'How say you, my masters, doe you not laugh at him for a Coxcombe? Why, he hath made a *Prologue* then his play: nay 'tis no play neyther, but a shewe'⁴⁶⁹ admitting that he is not only disregarding standard dramatic principles but he is also not concerned about whether his audience consider this to be a play in the conventional sense. This is one of the main purposes of Will throughout the play; he undercuts the action of the previous dialogue by sarcastically commenting about it, commentating in much the same way Nashe would on someone else's less than impressive work. Nashe even signposts his intentions with Will announcing 'Ile sit as a *Chorus*, and flowte the *Actors* and him at the end of euey Sceane',⁴⁷⁰ a promise he keeps at every opportunity throughout the play. By doing this Nashe is further distancing him from a genre he does not enjoy; at every turn he is belittling his own work to also belittle plays as a whole.

It is not only the 'playwright' who gets short shrift from Will and the prologue sees Nashe taking aim at another one of his favourite targets; in this case it is the men who appear on stage who feel Nashe's tongue. I have previously noted the

⁴⁶⁹ Nashe, *Summer's Last Will and Testament*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 235, lines 74-75

⁴⁷⁰ Nashe, *Summer's Last Will and Testament*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 236, lines 91-92

manner in which Nashe instructs the actors writing in an admittedly humorous but also hugely derogatory and incredibly graphic manner as he feels that without this instruction the players will not be able to behave themselves in a manner that befits their surroundings – he can not even credit them with realising that they are playing to an aristocratic crowd as opposed to their usual, less refined audience.

Nashe leaves no doubt as to what he thinks of the majority of the acting profession assigning them and their craft little worth. As previously noted, though there are a small number of men who are above this criticism and one of them, Edward Alleyn, makes a brief appearance in the introduction to *Summer's Last Will*; Will declares 'Be it so, if my cousin *Ned* will lend me his Chayne and his Fiddle.'⁴⁷¹ This is not the only reference to this name in the play; Will notes that 'I haue had a dogge my selfe, that would dreame, and talke in his sleepe, turn around like *Ned foole*, and sleepe all night in a porridge pot.'⁴⁷² McKerrow believes that Ned or Ned foole is 'Presumably the name of a household fool; possibly, however, a mere general term, like "Tom-fool" ',⁴⁷³ a position echoed by Berek who writes 'He speaks of borrowing props from "cousin Ned", presumably Whitgift's fool'.⁴⁷⁴ Neither McKerrow or Berek offer evidence of this fool and searching EEBO finds no other reference to 'Ned Foole' from the period. I believe that this name is a reference to Edward Alleyn, Ned is the pseudonym Nashe uses for Alleyn in *Pierce Penilesse*; as Smuts

⁴⁷¹ Nashe, *Summers Last Will and Testament*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 233, lines 7-8

⁴⁷² Nashe, *Summers Last Will and Testament*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 258, lines 783-784

⁴⁷³ McKerrow, Notes to *Summers Last Will and Testament*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 4, p. 430

⁴⁷⁴ Berek, 'Artifice and Realism in Lyly, Nashe, and *Love's Labor's Lost*', *Studies in English Literature*, this ref. p. 211

notes “Even the leading actor Edward Alleyn bequeathed instruments among the furniture, books, and other possessions in his will of 1626, and the earliest reference to his profession (1595) actually calls him a ‘musicion’⁴⁷⁵ so it would not be unlikely for Will to request these items from this source. By invoking Alleyn at the start of the play - this line comes at the very start of the introduction - Nashe is indicating he knows who and what makes a good play and the fact that he then goes on to write one which does not compare favourably to those with which Alleyn is associated with is even more significant. This is not to say that Nashe has produced a sub-standard piece of work - rather that given the nature of the audience and the manner in which this would have been performed this can not be compared to those works that were designed for mass consumption.

The language that appears within the play itself is not typical of a Nashe piece and is not delivered in his normal aggressive style or quick tempo. The interchanges between Summer and his court members are pedestrian lacking the crispness of the dialogue that appears in *Have With You* and, with the exception of Will’s asides, contain very few of Nashe’s trademark ripostes; instead these are full of prevarication with the speaker avoiding simple answers in an effort to frustrate and annoy the other characters. When Bacchus for example enters the court, he is asked by Summer

I would about thy vintage question thee:

⁴⁷⁵ *The Oxford Handbook of the Age of Shakespeare*, R. Malcolm Smuts (Ed.) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016) this ref. p. 762

How thriue thy vines? hadst thou good store of grapes?

He responds with an evasive, out of place and strangely argued defence of drinking declaring

Vinum quasi venenum, wine is poison to a sicke body; a sick body is no sound body; *Ergo*, wine is a pure thing & is poison to all corruption. Try-lill, the huters hoope to you: ile stand to it. *Alexander* was a braue man, and yet an errant drunkard.

This causes Winter to interject and demand answers to the question which Bacchus eventually supplies. The whole exchange takes place over around 30 lines and is full of posturing and trading of insults and threats with little to no actual substance – Autumn asks ‘How many tunnes of wine hast in thy paunch?’ to which Bacchus responds

Hear’st thou, dow-belly? because thou talkst and talkst, & dar’st not drinke to me a black lack...I know thou art but a mycher, & dar’st not stand me.⁴⁷⁶

It is also noteworthy that Bacchus defends one of the many activities that the author declaims against in *Pierce Penillesse*; Nashe is not only against drinking and drunkards but he uses the activity as evidence against both whole nationalities and specific people alike. That Nashe should have Bacchus defending the activity ties in

⁴⁷⁶ Nashe, *Summers Last Will and Testament*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 266, lines 1034-1038
282

with his overriding message about drama and those who indulge in it; that the play is a duplicitous thing and that the genre and its proponents cannot be trusted.

Bacchus' lines are not the only ones that feel forced and out of place in the piece. In parts of *Summer's Last Will* Nashe, consistently an author whose word play is clever and witty uses metaphors and similes in the way of a much less accomplished writer.

When Solstitium, representing equilibrium, enters carrying scales he and Summer exchange a number of lines about the nature of balance and equanimity; Solstitium notes

In them I weigh the day and night alike.

This white glasse is the houre-glasse of the day,

This blacke one the iust measure of the night;

One more than other holdeth not a grayne;

Both serue times iust proportion to mayntayne.⁴⁷⁷

The verse here is plodding and uninspired with a reference to white followed by a reference to black. Nashe also leaves no room for interpretation with the visual prop of the scales immediately referred to. Summer responds with 16 lines of a similar nature – as with Solstitium he makes a reference to a 'white glasse' before immediately noting it is 'blacke with equall poyze and stedfast hand'. This is

⁴⁷⁷ Nashe, *Summers Last Will and Testament, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 245, lines 383-387

followed with references smiles and frowns, weighing and balancing and tides ebbing and flowing. Within the context of *Summers Last Will* this is unsurprising; Nashe is using and repeating tried and tested tropes and not adding anything to the concepts of balance in the same way he does not offer anything to any of the other subjects discussed throughout the play; it is full of repetition of commonly held beliefs and thoughts. The whole exchange between Solstitium and Summer is stulted and unimaginative and is something that Will comments upon:

Fye, fye, of honesty, fye: Solstitium is an asse, perdy; this play is a gally-maufrey: fetch mee some drinke, some body. What cheere, what cheere, my hearts? are not you thirsty with listening to this dry sport? What haue we to do with scales and hower-glasses, except we were Bakers or Clock-keepers? I cannot tell how other men are addicted, but it is against my profession to vse any scales but such as we play at with a boule, or keepe any howers but dinner or supper.⁴⁷⁸

The commentary both here and throughout the play is clear; the constant sniping and belittling is Nashe saying that the genre is beneath him; this is a workmanlike part of a workmanlike play in the most workmanlike of genres. It is this exchange and the others like it that show *Summer's Last Will* for what it is; Nashe has been asked by his patron to produce a play that will both entertain his retinue and flatter

⁴⁷⁸ Nashe, *Summers Last Will and Testament*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 246-247, lines 421-429
284

the Queen and to an extent this is what Nashe has written. He has done exactly as his benefactor has requested and the play fulfils all the basic requirements; classic characters are described in classic, although uninspired, situations using dialogue which seems clever and witty. Yet the satirist Nashe has added his own touch to proceedings and the inclusion of Will with his ongoing criticism of the characters, dialogue and situations suggests that Nashe is once again trying to prove that he is has more to offer than simply writing a simple drama designed for a private audience. He has done everything that Whitgift asked him for and yet he adds more than he needs to with every scene, no matter what is said, concluding with Nashe/Will reminding his audience that they are just that; an audience watching a play. Nashe does the opposite to every other playwright; instead of trying to immerse the viewing public in his work he takes every opportunity to pull them out of the narrative. His praise of Elizabeth, which appears genuine and well written, reminds the reader of both his abortive preface to Sidney's work and the gently satirical commendatory verses at the end of *Pierce Penilesse* written to harmlessly poke fun at Spenser. This view is enforced when looking at the last main verse of the play when Summer begins to bring proceedings to a close by delivering his will. Here he announces his bequeathments offering amongst other things

...my withered flowers and herbes

Vnto dead corses, for to decke them with;

My shady walkes to great mens seruitors,

Who in their masters shadowes walke secure;

My pleasant open ayre, and fragrant smels,

To Croyden and the grounds abutting round;⁴⁷⁹

It is the twenty plus lines offered to the Queen that are of the most interest here.

Beginning by calling her '*Eliza*, that most sacred Dame' he continues on by giving her 'All my faire dayes remaining'⁴⁸⁰ and continues in this vein giving her dominion over nature and the other seasons. This is not an unusual tack for a renaissance author to take, yet it is uncommon for Nashe to do so and to use such adulatory and fawning terms. This is further indication that the author is doing so to prove his myriad skills as a writer; that he can as easily praise his queen as pen a polemic tirade against the Spanish.

Summer's Last Will is Nashe the author playing the role of Nashe the playwright. His characters are barely fleshed out, represent a number of character traits and opinions that he indicates in his other works he is firmly against and do not, at first reading, sit easily amongst his other works. It is one of the most difficult Nashe works to read as it contains little of the author's trademark style with Will's mocking responses standing out in an otherwise mundane and unimaginative series of exchanges. It would be easy to suggest this is because this is a piece that Nashe has been instructed to write and is not something he feels strongly about; it is my contention that he deliberately wrote *Summer's Last Will* in this technically

⁴⁷⁹ Nashe, *Summers Last Will and Testament, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, pp. 290-291, lines 1825-1830

⁴⁸⁰ This section of Summer's last speech begins on p. 291 and continues on to p. 292. All quotations taken are from lines 1840 onwards.

accomplished yet lacklustre manner as a way of showing that drama is a genre he chooses not to engage with but has no difficulty in doing so when asked. What is also evident from the way Nashe describes drama and plays as a whole is, despite the section in *Pierce Penilesse* in which he purportedly defends the genre, his feelings are generally negative. As ever Nashe is a man of contradictions; he praises by name the actor Edward Alleyn and speaks highly of the clowns Richard Tarlton and Will Kemp and yet on numerous occasions uses the term 'stage-player' as a derogatory term meaning 'one who can't be trusted'. Tellingly as a look at McKerrow's index shows us he only mentions Marlowe with reference to his other works such as the poem *Hero and Leander* and not with reference to any of his numerous plays, some of which Nashe himself may have had a hand in. George Peele, the other member of Nashe's circle known as a playwright, gets even less attention with the commendatory mention of his 1584 play *The Arraignment of Paris* 'whose first increase...might pleade to your opinions his pregnant dexterity of wit, and manifold varietie of inuention'⁴⁸¹ being preceded by the writer being given the epithet 'the *Atlas* of Poetrie'⁴⁸² indicating where Nashe believed his colleague should concentrate his efforts. And as previous chapters show Nashe's major influences are mainly men who dealt in genres other than drama with the author praising Spenser, Baskerville and Bodley amongst others but with hardly any playwrights given similar treatment. Nashe's work does show he has been impacted by writers like Aretino and Apuleius yet these seem to have most affected

⁴⁸¹ Nashe, *Preface to Menaphon*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 323, lines 28-30

⁴⁸² Nashe, *Preface to Menaphon*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 323, line 27

him for their satirical nature rather than their ability to write a play. Yet despite all his misgivings towards the genre what also is evident is that Nashe was able to produce reasonably good drama; his own play is solid if unspectacular with brief moments of Nashean excellence; the elements of *1 Henry VI* ascribed to him do not stand out for their lack of quality. There is growing evidence to show that Nashe was a handy playwright, clearly not of the same standard as Marlowe or Jonson but competent enough to write alongside them when requested and make a living from the genre when his own work was not able to provide him with one. Ultimately the true extent of Nashe's ventures into the genre are not known but what can be gleaned from his own work is that this is not a style of writing Nashe truly felt comfortable with preferring less restrictive media to write in and to both make and score points.

Chapter Five - 'A diviner muse than him'; the dialogue between Nashe and Marlowe

Up to this point I have discussed a number of different factors that impacted on Nashe's work but as yet I have not individually engaged with any of the five men who make up the group Nashe has historically been linked with; the so-called University Wits. The final two chapters of the thesis will address this with Chapter Six focusing on Nashe's relationship with Robert Greene. In this chapter though I shall examine the most historically significant member of this group: the playwright, poet and potential political agent for Queen Elizabeth, Christopher Marlowe. Marlowe was an author who had a considerable impact on his peers; as van Es notes 'Shakespeare in the early 1590s was certainly influenced by Marlowe, but so were his contemporaries - Nashe, Greene, Peele, and others'.⁴⁸³ Out of all of these Marlowe and Nashe shared the most common ground; they both matriculated at Cambridge at the same time albeit in different colleges with Marlowe attending Corpus Christi between 1581 and 1586 while Nashe both began and ended his career at St John's one year after his friend. In this chapter I will discuss the interaction between the two men as evidenced by their works as well as examining the references both explicit and implicit that Nashe makes to his peer. As part of this I will look at the two Marlowe plays that most closely link the two men, *Dido, Queen of Carthage* and *The Tragical History of the Life and Death of Doctor Faustus* as well as suggesting a shared source for the latter work. Finally, I shall look at

⁴⁸³ Bart van Es, "'Johannes fac Totum'?: Shakespeare's First Contact with the Acting Companies', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Vol. 61, No. 4 (Winter 2010), pp. 551-577 this ref. p. 571

Nashe's final pamphlet and discuss to what extent this can be read as an elegy to Marlowe. This chapter will show that the interactions between Nashe and Marlowe allowed the former to further develop his own authorial voice in a manner in which he was unable to do so with the authors who preceded him. That Nashe would have been able to use Marlowe as a sounding board, whilst performing the same role for his friend will have allowed him to both find and advance his own identity.

Baptised in 1564 in Canterbury, Marlowe has become regarded as one of the key figures of the renaissance period with literary influence equal to that of such authors as Jonson, Webster and Greene whilst also being as equally well known for events away from the page. His *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* entry not only records seven eventful years at Cambridge and numerous successful productions on the stage, but also his rather more shadowy time in 'Government service' which could have detrimentally affected his schooling:

It is at this point of transition, in the summer of 1587, that there is the first indication of Marlowe's involvement, during his time at Cambridge, in certain political 'affaires'. On 29 June, meeting at St James's Palace, the privy council considered the case of a Cambridge student named Christopher 'Morley', who had been the subject of defamatory reports, and whose MA degree, 'which he was to take at this next Commencement', was being called into question.⁴⁸⁴

⁴⁸⁴ Charles Nicholl, 'Marlowe [Marley], Christopher (bap. 1564, d. 1593), playwright and poet', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2008

He remains a shadowy figure to this day with speculation still rife as to his political actions in the late sixteenth Century; the *DNB* entry continues

Between his appearance at the Newgate sessions in December 1589 and his arrest in the Netherlands in January 1592, there is virtually no biographical knowledge of Marlowe's movements.⁴⁸⁵

He was also accused of being a spy, a murderer and was thought to have had some impact on Shakespeare:

Shakespeare was not of this set; his relations with Marlowe are unrecorded except in the form of Marlowe's literary influence on him, though their collaboration on the *Henry VI* cycle, or some antecedent version of it, remains a possibility.⁴⁸⁶

Intriguingly the link with Shakespeare, the *Henry VI* cycle, presents another connection to Nashe; as discussed in an earlier chapter it is most likely that Nashe was responsible for parts of *1 Henry VI*, so the idea that he and Marlowe may have worked alongside Shakespeare in helping him produce elements of the tetralogy is not unlikely.

Biographically little is known of Marlowe; he attended Corpus Christi College, Cambridge from 1580 receiving his Bachelors of Arts in 1584 before receiving his MA in 1587 and moving to London. Between 1580 and the time of his death he wrote seven plays and numerous other shorter works including a translation of

⁴⁸⁵ Nicholl, 'Marlowe [Marley], Christopher (bap. 1564, d. 1593), playwright and poet', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*

⁴⁸⁶ Nicholl, 'Marlowe [Marley], Christopher (bap. 1564, d. 1593), playwright and poet', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*

Musaeus' mythological poem *Hero and Leander*, and the love poem *The Passionate Shepherd to his Love*. He was killed during an argument in 1593 and as Hopkins describes it 'the circumstances of his death remain mysterious.'⁴⁸⁷ Marlowe died as he lived; shrouded in mystery.⁴⁸⁸

When examining the relationship between Nashe and Marlowe critical effort has tended to have a narrow focus; critics either discuss to what extent Nashe had a hand in writing two of Marlowe's plays, *Dido* and *Faustus*, or interrogate the two in relation to the passage in *Greenes Groatsworth of Wit* in which they are both seemingly referred to. I shall discuss Greene in more depth in the next chapter but it is worthwhile to engage with this section in *Groatsworth* and note that both men alongside fellow wit George Peele are, although not mentioned specifically by name, the men who Greene feels will benefit from some sage advice from their 'wiser' and, in the case of Nashe and Marlowe at least, older companion. The passage begins with Marlowe being instructed to

Wonder not, (for with thée wil I first begin) thou famous gracer of
Tragedians, that *Greene*, who hath said with thée (like the foole in
his heart) There is no God, shoulde now giue glorie vnto his greatnes:

⁴⁸⁷ Lisa Hopkins, *A Christopher Marlowe chronology* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), this ref. p. 136

⁴⁸⁸ Despite his significant output and influence Marlowe has traditionally been overlooked by readers due to his proximity to Shakespeare although this has changed recently with a number of books about the author being written in the past two decades; two good references are the books *Christopher Marlowe: a literary life* and *A Christopher Marlowe chronology* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000), both by Lisa Hopkins. Tom Rutter's *The Cambridge Introduction to Christopher Marlowe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012) is also well researched and gives a good account of the author and his plays while Park Honan's (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005) delivers an unusual look at Marlowe's life. Also, more recently *Christopher Marlowe in Context*, ed. Sara Munson Deats and Robert Logan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013) contains a number of essays focused on the author including chapters from both Wiggins and Rutter which briefly discuss the shared authorship questions surrounding both *Dido* and *Faustus*.

for penetrating is his power, his hand lyes heauie vpon me, hee hath
spoken vnto mee with a voice of thunder, and I haue felt he is a God
that can punish enemies.⁴⁸⁹

Greene then addresses Nashe:

With thee I ioyne yong *Iuuenall*, that byting Satyrists, that lastly with
mee together writ a Comedie.

Sweet boy, might I aduise thee, be aduised, and get not many
enemies by bitter wordes: inueigh against vaine men, for thou canst
do it, no man better, no man so well: thou hast a libertie to reprove
all, and name none; for one being spoken to, all are offended; none
being blamed no man is iniured. Stop shallow water still running, it
will rage, or tread on a worke and it will turne: then blame not
Schollers vexed with sharpe lines, if they're proued thy too much
liberty of reproofe.

Greene feels his advice can prevent the two younger men from making the same
mistakes he did; as Sawyer notes 'Greene suggests that the other playwrights
abandon the stage and turn to more moral and cultural pursuits'.⁴⁹⁰ In his eyes,
Nashe and Marlowe were similar personalities who needed his guidance; an
unsurprising connection given the history the two younger men shared. This goes

⁴⁸⁹ Robert Greene, *Greene's Groatsworth of Witte*, London: William Wright (1592) E4v-F1r

⁴⁹⁰ Robert Sawyer, 'Rivalry, Rhetoric, and the *Groatsworth of Wit*', *South Atlantic Review*, Vol. 76, No. 2 (Spring 2011), pp. 47-64 this ref. p. 54

beyond their time at Cambridge but this period is an appropriate place to begin as it was here the two men will have most likely first encountered each other.

Although *Tamburlaine the Great* was Marlowe's first major production, performed in London in 1587, it has long been argued that *Dido* is most likely to have been chronologically the first of his plays to be written. Deanne Williams, for example, presents as fact that '*Dido, Queene of Carthage*, [was] written by Christopher Marlowe in collaboration with Thomas Nashe sometime between 1585 and 1588';⁴⁹¹ Wiggins presents a different hypothesis proposing the date to be after *Tamburlaine* and closer to 1588 whilst also summarising the historical arguments in favour of alternative dates.⁴⁹² Date of production aside, *Dido* is particularly intriguing to Nashe critics as there exists a frontispiece noting the play was written by both Marlowe and Nashe. Opinion has differed on to how much, if any, of *Dido* Nashe was responsible for; Tucker Brooke writes firmly in the belief that *Dido* is the sole work of Marlowe listing a number of concurring sources that suggest Nashe's role was acting as editor for the play at most and was in all likelihood just responsible for ensuring the play was printed after Marlowe's death. He dismisses conjecture that the play was co-authored by Nashe as unlikely noting that

The idea that Marlowe and Nashe wrote the play in conjunction has been seriously advanced only by Collier, Fleay, and W. Wagner; the still less reasonable view that it is chiefly the work of Nashe only by

⁴⁹¹ Deanne Williams, 'Dido, Queen of England', *ELH*, Vol. 73, No. 1 (Spring, 2006), pp. 31-59 this ref. p. 31

⁴⁹² For a better understanding of the arguments presented for the alternative dates for *Dido* I recommend reading Martin Wiggins, 'When Did Marlowe Write "*Dido, Queen of Carthage*?"', *The Review of English Studies*, New Series, Vol. 59, No. 241 (Sep., 2008), pp. 521- 541

the publisher of the Hurst edition of 1825 (who adduces no arguments) and by Grosart in a very ill-argued passage in his *Complete Works of Nashe*.⁴⁹³

Taking the opposite view is Wiggins who states with certainty that Nashe was co-author of this play, consistently referring to him by this term and writing

If we are to discount a direct title-page statement of authorship, we ought to demand a very good reason for doing so...it is clear that, on the available evidence, the question editors should now be posing is not whether, but what, Nashe contributed to *Dido*.⁴⁹⁴

Wiggins is firmly of the opinion that Nashe co-wrote *Dido* and in this article he looks at flaws in the arguments presented that place Nashe in no more than an editorial role for Marlowe's play. Wiggins demands more from those who believe that this is a solo authored work, writing about those who dismiss Nashe's contributions on the basis that this amounts to little more than a long-lost elegy

Nothing here is verifiable; every lead ends in a black hole. This is fruitful ground for myth-making. The bibliographical facts compel those committed to the Nashe elegy's existence to propose that it came to the press after printing had started, and was inserted as an additional leaf in some copies of the book.⁴⁹⁵

⁴⁹³ Tucker Brooke, 'The Marlowe Canon', *PMLA*, Vol. 37, No. 3 (Sep., 1922), pp. 367-417, this ref. p. 370

⁴⁹⁴ Wiggins, 'When Did Marlowe Write *Dido, Queen of Carthage?*', this ref. pp. 525-526

⁴⁹⁵ Wiggins, 'When Did Marlowe Write *Dido, Queen of Carthage?*', this ref. p. 525

Yet although Wiggins dismisses these claims as conjecture, he then does the same thing to support his own claim. In response to Rasmussen, Wiggins writes Rasmussen, rather half-heartedly looking for Nashe in *Doctor Faustus*, points out that rare-word tests are of limited significance when the author sought has an uncommonly wide vocabulary, and instead rests his case against Nashe as the *Faustus* collaborator on the absence of a handful of identifiable tricks of style, two observed by McKerrow and two by Nashe himself, in the second edition of *Christ's Teares over Jerusalem*.

He immediately continues

But then, would we expect a stylist so self-conscious that he can name his own quirks, to be limited to a single distinctive idiolect? If Dido sounds more like Marlowe than like Nashe, perhaps that is because Nashe adopted a Marlovian 'house style' when writing in collaboration with Marlowe.⁴⁹⁶

It is always going to be difficult to say conclusively whether Nashe was involved in the writing of *Dido* but to dismiss one author's 'evidence' as supposition before supplying the same type of conjecture himself with no real support does not advance the argument in his favour. van Es, when looking at Marlowe's influence on the time as a whole makes a valid argument when he writes

Marlowe's authorial presence reverberates through the theatrical world of the early 1590s, influencing Shakespeare and other

⁴⁹⁶ Both references from Wiggins, 'When Did Marlowe Write *Dido, Queen of Carthage*?' pp. 525-526

contemporaries. But even that is not quite right. Marlowe's plays, like those of his contemporaries, are intercut with the work of others Nashe, who possibly wrote the Marlovian imitation at the opening of *1 Henry VI* - "Hung be the heavens with black" (LI.I) - was listed as Marlowe's co-author in *Dido, Queen of Carthage*. Yet scholarship has found no way of distinguishing Nashe's contribution from Marlowe's in this work. Similar questions surround the authority of *Doctor Faustus*.⁴⁹⁷

I have previously looked at the probability of Nashe being the involved in the production of this Shakespeare play so will not discuss this again here; it is van Es' comments about the Marlowe works that are of importance here. There is an eagerness to ascribe parts of both *Dido* and *Faustus* to Nashe which, in some cases, causes the modern critic to overlook the simplest explanation: that the reason it is impossible to see two different hands at work on these plays is because there was only ever one who wrote it. Despite all the attempts to include Nashe in the authorship of either or both of these Marlovian works it is more compelling to conclude that he had nothing fundamental to do with them – despite Nashe's name appearing on the frontispiece there is no clear evidence within the play's text of any Nashe involvement. As van Es notes above modern scholarship has failed to discern two separate hands within the work with the existence of the title page being the only concrete evidence offered by those who believe *Dido* was written by both

⁴⁹⁷ van Es, "'Johannes fac Totum'?: Shakespeare's First Contact with the Acting Companies', this ref. p. 572
297

men. However, whether Nashe assisted Marlowe in writing the play or not, the idea remains that he may have done showing the enduring belief that the two men were closely linked both on and off the page. Nashe's name appearing on the frontispiece of *Dido* most certainly helps this as well as offering the rather tantalising theory that he assisted in the publication of a version of the play which included an elegy to Marlowe. This is a possibility that has been discussed on numerous occasions; Wiggins discusses the possible existence of this elegy at some length noting 'In 1781, Thomas Warton mentioned the elegy in his History of English Poetry, and...claimed to have seen it in a copy of *Dido* offered in a bookseller's 1754 catalogue'.⁴⁹⁸ Charles Nicholl 'How we have a glimpse of one lost piece about Marlowe, Nashe's 'elegy', which was spotted in a copy of *Dido* in the eighteenth century.'⁴⁹⁹ Park Honan also presents the existence Nashe's elegy as *fait accompli* writing 'For one thing, he readied a quarto edition of the poet's *Dido* and wrote elegiac lines on Marlowe to go with it.'⁵⁰⁰ McKerrow also believed that this edition existed:

It is said that there formally existed a copy or copies of *Dido* which contained an Elegy by Nashe upon Marlowe...I think there is no reason to doubt that this elegy did actually exist and fully expect that it will come to light again some day.⁵⁰¹

⁴⁹⁸ Wiggins, 'When Did Marlowe Write *Dido*, Queen of Carthage?', this ref. p. 524

⁴⁹⁹ Charles Nicholl, *The Reckoning: The Murder of Christopher Marlowe* (London: Pan Books, 1993), this ref. p. 75

⁵⁰⁰ Park Honan, *Christopher Marlowe: Poet and Spy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), this ref. p. 362

⁵⁰¹ McKerrow, Notes to *Dido, Queene of Carthage, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 2, pp.335-336

This prediction which as yet has not come true as unfortunately the elegy has not been noted since the late Eighteenth Century and remains lost to this date. Coming more up to date the idea that Nashe co-wrote *Dido* still prevails with *The Thomas Nashe Project* following McKerrow's lead by including the play as one of Nashe's confirmed works. Both McKerrow and the *Thomas Nashe Project* have included a Dubia or doubtful works section; neither edition includes *Dido* in this part of their collection but locates them in the normal sections of their respective editions.

Equally as pervasive as this theory is the idea that, as van Es alluded to above, Nashe had a hand in writing the comic scenes from *Faustus*. Ruth Stevenson notes that 'critics have wondered if Marlowe had a collaborator. The most likely candidate is Thomas Nashe.'⁵⁰² Stevenson's article does touch on the fact that the two great Nashe biographers, McKerrow and Nicholl take different views on the subject with McKerrow making no mention of *Faustus* in his definitive collection of Nashe's works believing that Nashe had nothing to do with this play whilst Nicholl takes the opposite viewpoint:

The argument is plausible and the phraseological parallels numerous, but an actual reading of the scenes has left most critics unconvinced.

There seem to be flashes of Nashe amid a welter of witless knockabout.⁵⁰³

⁵⁰² Ruth Stevenson, 'The Comic Core of Both A- and B-Editions of *Doctor Faustus*', *Studies in English Literature, 1500 - 1900*, 53(2) (Spring 2013), pp. 401-419 this ref. p. 401.

⁵⁰³ Charles Nicholl, *A Cup of News*, this ref. p. 96

In this instance I side with McKerrow; although the *Faustus* comic scenes are unusual for Marlowe to write it does both writers a disservice by claiming these must come from the pen of Nashe. Marlowe was clearly adept at writing more than just tragedy and Nashe was more than just a comic satirist as evidenced by his full body of work. I would contend that Nashe was influenced by Marlowe's work to write *Pierce Penilesse*, his own treatise on the seven deadly sins as *Faustus* would have been written at some point between 1589 and 1592⁵⁰⁴ and this latter year also being the publication date of *Pierce Penilesse*. The relationship between the two authors has long been established; that they both produced works based on the Sins cannot be dismissed as co-incidence. It is unlikely that Nashe would have therefore been involved in the production of *Faustus* if he was concentrating on his own interpretation of the story; as discussed by Paul Kocher he almost certainly had sight of this play prior to its publication:

The question must be asked whether the two quotations from *Faustus* are certainly in Nashe's hand. In my judgment they are. The resemblance between them and Nashe's subscription to the verses on Ecclesiasticus is closest in the two writings of the word "Faustus," where the hand is less cursive than it is in the later portions of the quotation.⁵⁰⁵

⁵⁰⁴ Kocher in his note 'The Early Date For Marlowe's *Faustus*' gives textual evidence as to why he believes it is the earlier of the two dates that is more accurate. Other sources including Houk and Wall-Randall cite the English translation of "*The Historie of the Damnable Life, and Deserved Death, of Doctor Iohn Faustus.*" in 1592 as the source material for Marlowe.

⁵⁰⁵ Paul Kocher, 'Some Nashe Marginalia concerning Marlowe', *Modern Language Notes*, Vol. 57, No. 1 (Jan. 1942), pp. 45-49 this ref. p. 48

He then establishes a timeline for when this may have happened.⁵⁰⁶ Taking this further I also contend that both men were inspired by two main sources; firstly, and unsurprisingly, by the German tale of Faust, the story of whom would have been relatively new to the renaissance authors with the chapbook from which Marlowe took his inspiration probably only reaching England in the late 1500's.⁵⁰⁷ The secondary influence is less obvious being William Langland's *The Vision of William concerning Piers The Plowman*, a late 14th Century allegorical poem written in Middle English. As Burton notes 'The folk motif of the compact with the devil has long been rich source material for formal literature'⁵⁰⁸ citing Marlowe amongst others who use this device before talking at length about Langland's middle ages version of this trope. Nashe's connection with Langland's work is more apparent than Marlowe's with his character Pierce Penilesse not only sharing a first name and both initials with Langland's character but also having autological surnames; one of Piers Plowman's first acts is to plough a half-acre field whilst the character of Nashe's Pierce is, like his creator, a perpetually poor author, constantly struggling to make ends meet. Of course, utilising the Cardinal Sins as a plot device is not unique to these three authors or their respective times; as *The Encyclopædia Britannica*

⁵⁰⁶ In his article Kocher discusses the appearance in John Leland's *Principum Ac Illustrium Aliquot & Eruditorum In Anglia Virorum Encomia* of two quotes from *Faustus* written in Nashe's hand. Kocher concludes these must have been added in 1589 suggesting Nashe was more than just passingly aware of Marlowe's work. For further information I suggest reading Kocher's full article.

⁵⁰⁷ Peter Thorslev when discussing Faust's character notes, he made 'his first appearance in the German and the English Faust books of the sixteenth century' (Peter Thorslev, *The Byronic Hero: Types and Prototypes* (University of Minnesota Press, 1962). Similarly, Kocher concludes 'if I am right in thinking that there was an edition of the English Faust Book at Cambridge at least as early as 1590, the chances are that the traditional date of 1588 or 1589 for the composition of Marlowe's play is correct.' (Paul H Kocher, 'The English Faust Book and the Date of Marlowe's *Faustus*.' *Modern Language Notes*, 55(2) (1940), pp. 95-101 this ref. p. 101.

⁵⁰⁸ Dorothy Jean Burton, 'The Compact with the Devil in the Middle-English: *Vision of Piers the Plowman*, B. II', *California Folklore Quarterly*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (Apr., 1946), pp. 179-184 this ref. p. 179.

notes the sins were 'First enumerated by Pope Gregory I (the Great) in the 6th century and elaborated in the 13th century by St. Thomas Aquinas'⁵⁰⁹ so would have been firmly established by the latter part of the Elizabethan period. From a literary standpoint Dante's *Divina Commedia* [*Divine Comedy*] was written in the early 1300's with the second book, *Purgatoria*, seeing Dante being led by Virgil through Purgatory where they encounter the sins in order as part of the main character's redemption. Pre-dating Dante by over one hundred years, Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* include *The Parson's Tale* which takes the form of a sermon about the Cardinal Sins and, in a manner later echoed by the Italian, engages with them as a route to repentance. It is here where the different paths that Marlowe and Nashe took begins to become clearer; Langland and Marlowe introduce the sins not just as moral and theological concepts but give them a physical presence and active role in each author's narrative while Nashe follows a path closer to that of Chaucer and Dante. At this stage to gain a better understanding of how Nashe and his contemporary developed their different works I shall examine how both authors, as well as Langland, utilise the Cardinal Sins in their work.

In Passus V Langland gives physical form to the sins introducing them to both his audience and the eponymous Plowman over the course of the following 430 or so lines with each Sin describing their misdeeds and asking for repentance. Notably the individuals are treated in similar fashion to Marlowe's, being endowed with similar characteristics to those that the Elizabethan author later utilises; they are

⁵⁰⁹ The Editors of *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 'Seven deadly sins', *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Encyclopædia Britannica inc., April 06, 2018, <https://www.britannica.com/topic/seven-deadly-sins>

depicted as being lazy, wasteful and, despite seemingly looking for forgiveness, ultimately only playing lip service to the idea of repentance. In Marlowe's play Faustus encounters the Sins in Act II Scene iii during a set piece in which Lucifer and his attendant demons present each one of the seven as a distinct and unique character as a way to further seduce the doctor in a moment of indecision. Each figure introduces themselves in turn speaking briefly about their nature before Faustus moves on and interrogates the next. Langland and Marlowe use very similar techniques in the way they introduce the vices; in Langland's work the majority of the sins are introduced either with their physical appearance:

Now awaketh wratthe · with two whyte eyen,
And nyuelynge with the nose · and his nekke hangynge⁵¹⁰

or by describing their actions:

Peronelle proude-hearte · platte hir to the erthe.
And lay long ar she loked · and 'lorde, mercy!' cryed'.⁵¹¹

Marlowe uses the same approach in *Faustus* as each Sin introduces themselves with a statement that describes both their nature and origin. Covetousness, for example, tells Faustus

I am *Couetousnes*, begotten of an olde churle, in an olde leatherne
bag: and might I haue my wish, I would desire, that this house, and

⁵¹⁰ William Langland, *The Vision of William concerning Piers The Plowman*, edited by the Rev. Walter W Skeat (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1910) Passus V, p. 47, lines 134-135

⁵¹¹ Langland, *The Vision of William concerning Piers The Plowman*, Passus V, p. 45, lines 63-64

all the people in it were turnd to golde, that I might locke you vppe

in my good chest: O my sweete golde.⁵¹²

By taking a similar approach to Langland, Marlowe is therefore taking a different tack to Chaucer and Dante; as these are authors he almost certainly would have been aware of this would seem to be a deliberate stylistic decision on his part. In contrast to both Langland and Marlowe, Nashe chooses not to portray the Cardinal Sins as characters in his narrative but employs a method more similar to that of the older authors. It should also be noted that *Pierce Penilesse* is a prose pamphlet unlike the works of Langland (a narrative poem) and Marlowe (a play) which gave Nashe the freedom to utilise the Sins in a different way to the other two authors. In *Pierce Penilesse* the Sins are renamed as Complaints and then discussed using these vices as a starting point to discuss society's problems. He does this by visiting each sin in turn in a manner reminiscent of Chaucer's sermonising, whilst also bringing his treatise up to date by replacing the traditional vice of Covetousness as described by the other authors with the more contemporary complaint of Drunkenness. Nashe also chooses to describe the sins in much more depth than both Marlowe and Langland elevating them from characters in a play to an important framing device which allows Nashe to discuss various ills using each Sin as an umbrella term covering a number of subjects. For example, when Nashe begins describing The Complaint of Pride he does so in general terms writing

⁵¹² Christopher Marlowe, *The tragicall History of Dr Faustus, The Works of Christopher Marlowe*, edited by C.F. Tucker Brooke (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1910), Act 2 Scene 3 page 169 lines 732-736

O, but a far greater enormity raigneth in the hart of the court: Pride,
the peruerter of all Vertue, sitteth appareled in the Marchants
spoiles, and ruine of yoong Citizens; and scorneth learning, that gaue
their vp-start Fathers titles of gentry.⁵¹³

but then breaks this down into numerous sections discussing a whole host of topics including 'The Nature of an Upstart', 'The Counterfeit Politician', 'The Prodigal Young Master', 'The Pride of Spaniard' and even 'Sparagus, a flowre that neuer groweth but throgh mans dong.'⁵¹⁴ In total Nashe discusses this first sin in over twenty separate sections before turning his attention on to the next sin, Envy. Nashe follows this pattern throughout his discourse; Envy numbers only six subsections but the author uses them in respect of some weighty subjects denouncing the act of murder and criticising Italians in general as well as such specific luminaries as 'Philip of Spaine as great an enemy to mankind as the diuell'⁵¹⁵ and 'Cardinal Wolsey, for example.' Wrath follows next and although described as a 'branch of Enuie'⁵¹⁶ warrants nineteen separate entries which criticize the Irish and those who do not value the art of poetry. It is also in this section that the seeds of the Nashe-Gabriel Harvey argument are sown with Nashe taking the opportunity to disagree with Gabriel's younger brother Richard having

⁵¹³ Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Svpplication to the Divell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 168, lines 28-30

⁵¹⁴ Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Svpplication to the Divell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 174

⁵¹⁵ Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Svpplication to the Divell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 184

⁵¹⁶ Both quotations from margin, Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Svpplication to the Divell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 187

taken exception to lines written in Richard's *A Theologicall Discourse of the Lamb of God and his enemies* noting he had no option but to

bequeath it to the Priuie, leafe by leafe as I read it, it was so vgly,
dorbellical, and lumpish. Monstrous, monstrous and palpable, not to
bee spoken of in a Christian Congregation: thou hast skumd ouer the
Schoolemen, and of the froth of theyr folly made a dish of diuinitie
Brewesse which the dogges will not eate.⁵¹⁷

Gluttony follows Wrath meriting six entries and includes further jibes at Spain and Italy; this is in turn followed by Nashe's 'new' Complaint, Drunkenness which warrants seven entries and precedes The Complaint of Sloth which has nine. Nashe finishes this discourse with 'The seuenth and last complaint of Lecherie'⁵¹⁸ which he describes as 'The childe of Sloath'. Although this is the shortest of the entries with barely 6 paragraphs Nashe does not under-estimate the effect of this vice noting that Lechery is

a sinne that is able to make a man wicked that should describe it; for it hath
more starting holes than a siue hath holes, more Clyents than *Westminster-
hall*, more diseases than *Newgate*.⁵¹⁹

There are palpable differences in the way the three authors treat the Cardinal Sins; Nashe uses them metaphorically as a means of railing against the ills of society and describes them as they relate to his experiences; although both Langland's and

⁵¹⁷ Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Svypplication to the Diuell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 198, lines 11-17

⁵¹⁸ Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Svypplication to the Diuell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 216

⁵¹⁹ Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Svypplication to the Diuell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 216, lines 1, 2-5

Marlowe's usage have much in common Langland discusses the sins in significantly more depth than the Elizabethan whereas Marlowe discusses them very briefly and in a more humorous fashion. That being said the sins appear at equally pivotal moments in both of the narratives; in *Piers Plowman* the sins are introduced at the same time as the eponymous hero and are used in obvious juxtaposition to him. The Plowman represents truth, honesty and diligence while the sins are lazy and only work when threatened despite the clear consequences. In Marlowe's play, Lucifer deploys the Sins when Faustus is wavering and needs further encouragement. Prior to their appearance Faustus can be found appealing to the heavens crying

Ah Christ my Sauour,

Seeke to saue Faustus soule.⁵²⁰

Yet immediately after the sins say their piece Faustus' tune has changed proclaiming 'O this feedes my soule.' and 'O might I see hel, and returne againe, how happy were I then?'⁵²¹ Despite their different approaches it cannot be disputed that each of the three works chooses to significantly invoke the cardinal sins. Langland obviously led the way writing around 400 years earlier than the other two but there is little doubt that Nashe and Marlowe were both influenced by his work. Marlowe's treatment of the sins is relatively closer to Langland's using similar techniques to introduce and discuss them although he does so in significantly less

⁵²⁰ Marlowe, *The tragicall History of Dr Faustus, The Works of Christopher Marlowe*, Act 2 Scene 3 page 168 lines 695-696

⁵²¹ Marlowe, *The tragicall History of Dr Faustus, The Works of Christopher Marlowe*, Act 2 Scene 3 page 171 lines 781, 783-784

depth as well as utilising a similar narrative genre to the older author. Nashe develops Langland's themes in a different way choosing not to anthropomorphise the sins but instead taking the same qualities that Langland describes and ascribing them to those who he feels deserve them whilst also writing in a very different fashion to both Langland and Marlowe. Also given the volume of evidence and the manner in which Nashe and Marlowe treat the source material closely but not identically it is evident that although the two men may have written their works at the same time Nashe did not have a significant hand if any in the writing of *Faustus*; they may well have discussed this concept of invoking the Cardinal Sins into their writing but each ultimately chose their own manner in which to do so.

Before moving completely away from the theme of shared authorship between Nashe and Marlowe it is important to acknowledge one last possible joint project. As previously noted Brooke dismisses Nashe's involvement in *Dido*; in this same article he also both introduces and discredits the idea that Nashe was responsible for another Marlowe play, *Tamburlaine The Great*, noting that although there was some early conjecture that this was not Marlowe's work the weight of evidence points to this not being penned by Nashe, or any other, writing 'The record of the performance of the two parts by the Lord Admiral's Company harmonizes with the idea that they are Marlowe's work, whereas no evidence which has survived points to any other author.'⁵²² The idea that Nashe wrote *Tamburlaine* is also considered by Oliphant who notes

⁵²² Brooke, 'The Marlowe Canon', this ref. p. 190

Harvey in 1593 calls Marlowe "Tamburlaine," but that does not necessarily mean that Marlowe wrote the plays. It is just as reasonable to regard the statement of 1604 regarding Nashe, that the spiders "went stealing over his head as if they had been conning of Tamburlaine," as proof of Nashe's authorship.⁵²³

This is a little held view though in more recent times; talks in some detail about *Tamburlaine* in relationship to Nashe's novel but does not even consider that these could have come from the same man.⁵²⁴

Looking away from Marlowe's texts I shall now consider Nashe's final work, *Nashe's Lenten Stuffe*. This work, published in 1599, has been the subject of much discussion. Henry Turner notes the pamphlet 'has been called the premier English example of the mock encomium, epideictic oration, or paradox, in the European humanist tradition'⁵²⁵ while Andrew Hadfield describes the work as Nashe's 'rambling, digressive, and brilliantly satirical praise of the red herring, written after he had retreated to Great Yarmouth in the wake of the *Isle of Dogs* scandal.'⁵²⁶ It is also important to note that in Nashe's first published work, *The Anatomy of Absurdity*, he begins the epistle to Charles Blount in similar fashion:

⁵²³ E. H. C. Oliphant, 'Problems of Authorship in Elizabethan Dramatic Literature', *Modern Philology*, Vol. 8, No. 3 (Jan., 1911), pp. 411-459 this ref. p. 24.

⁵²⁴ For further information please read Allyn E. Ward, 'An Outlandish Travel Chronicle: Farce, History, and Fiction in Thomas Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller*', *The Yearbook of English Studies*, Vol. 41, No. 1, Travel and Prose Fiction in Early Modern England (2011), pp. 84-98

⁵²⁵ Henry S. Turner, 'Nashe's Red Herring: Epistemologies of the Commodity in *Lenten Stuffe* (1599)', *ELH*, Vol. 68, No. 3 (Fall, 2001), pp. 529-561 this ref. p. 530

⁵²⁶ Hadfield, '*Lenten Stuffe*: Thomas Nashe and the Fiction of Travel', page 76

What I haue written, proceeded not from the penne of vain-glory but
from the processe of that pensiuenes, which two Summers since
ouertooke mee⁵²⁷

This shows that the device of beginning his works by referring to past events (co-
incidentally in this case both being two years previous to the present day) is
something not unique to *Lenten Stuffe*. There is also relevance to the fact that the
true title of the piece is *Nashe's Lenten Stuffe* with the author using his surname as
part of the title. Nashe is willing to announce himself as the author of this work – he
is publicly proclaiming this is his work and his authorial voice and the narrator in the
pages is Nashe himself. In this instance, Nashe is not hiding behind a pseudonym
like Cuthbert Curry-Knave, or a character like Piers Penillesse or Jack Wilton; the title
announces this is Nashe writing as Nashe. This does not suggest a miserable or
unhappy man; rather it fits in with the idea that the author was tired of hiding and
ready to face his troubles and all the attendant issues that came with them. There is
a difference in tone between the epistle that precedes *Pierce Penillesse* and the
introduction to *Lenten Stuffe* which I believe comes from the fact that Nashe had no
control over the death of Greene while the *Isle of Dogs* troubles that he and Jonson
encountered were visited upon them due to the whims of the court and the
political climate. Nashe would have no problems with passing the blame for the
'tragedie two summers past' onto someone else; he may have been slightly
culpable but Nashe has never proved adept at supplying a literary *mea culpa* on the

⁵²⁷ Nashe, *The Anatomie of Absvrditie, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 5, lines 15-18

occasions where he has been at fault. I would suggest that *Lenten Stuffe* proves him to be a man who, while not exactly willing to face trouble head on - fleeing from London to Great Yarmouth rather than facing the music being a case in point - did not linger on the consequences of his writing as much as the fragility of the human condition. What is unusual is that although Nashe and Greene were friends, Nashe and Marlowe had a far more intimate relationship and yet Marlowe's death never seemed to influence the writing of the younger man in the same way. There are suggestions that Nashe did refer to the passing of Marlowe in his work; the previously discussed 'lost verses' in *Dido* being the main one of these with Steane joining McKerrow, Nicholl *et al* by hypothesising that Nashe's 'version' of the play contained 'some verses on Marlowe's death to be published with the first edition, and now, most unfortunately, lost.'⁵²⁸ Additionally David Kathman notes

Thomas Nashe in *The Unfortunate Traveller* has a discussion of the Italian playwright Pietro Aretino which some (including Nicholl) have seen as an oblique tribute to Marlowe, though this is a matter of conjecture since his name is nowhere mentioned.⁵²⁹

Nicholl himself seems more non-committal:

Nashe's long commendation of Aretino has also been combed for sidelong tributes to Marlowe's restless, outspoken temper...These fit

⁵²⁸ Nashe, *The Unfortunate Traveller and Other Works*, Steane introduction, p. 17

⁵²⁹ David Kathman, 'Shakespeare's Eulogies', *The Shakespeare Authorship Page*, <http://shakespeareauthorship.com/eulogies.html> Page consulted 6th August 2013

well as oblique epitaphs for Marlowe, but they tell us little of

Marlowe's actual death, so violent and so questionable.⁵³⁰

This conjecture is one I cannot agree with as although there is a similarity to the way in which Aretino and Marlowe wrote Nashe's treatment of the two is very different. He is far more reverential to the Italian whereas his interactions with Marlowe reflect their personal, more comfortable relationship and these words contain none of the familiarity that Nashe would have included if they were meant for his friend. With these being the only suggestions that Nashe in any way noted the departure of his friend prior to penning *Lenten Stuffe* makes this work more intriguing as it is this piece that contains Nashe's only surviving reference to his friend, the parody of Marlowe's poetic version of the Greek myth *Hero and Leander*. The parody within *Lenten Stuffe* has, in most cases been critically neglected with the majority of critics preferring to see this as one small part of the work and pay little heed to it, instead choosing to focus on the sheer volume of ideas and themes the author has included in the work. Searching for articles on JSTOR that discuss *Lenten Stuffe* yields a small number of results. Of the first five I encountered, three - Tamsin Theresa Badcoe's "'As many Ciphers without an I': Self-Reflexive Violence in the Work of Thomas Nashe', David C. McPherson's 'Aretino and the Harvey-Nashe Quarrel' and Andrew Hadfield's '*Lenten Stuffe*: Thomas Nashe and the Fiction of Travel' – make no reference to the parody. Henry S. Turner notes 'An earlier critical tradition singled out the parody of Marlowe's

⁵³⁰ Nicholl, *A Cup of News*, p. 164

Hero and Leander as the centerpiece of the text and regarded it as a peak in Nashe's mercurial literary career' but makes no further reference to the parody in his article while Alice Lyle Scoufos notes

G. R. Hibbard...has found Nashe's guying of Marlowe's poem the center of *Lenten Stuffe*; in his sensitive analysis of this episode he examines Nashe's ability to handle the mode of studied indecorum. However, it seems to me that Nashe's little parody of "Hero and Leander" serves as an introduction to the story of the famous red herring rather than as the center of the satire.⁵³¹

However, dismissing this section so readily is a mistake as doing so seriously misjudges and undervalues the impact of this section of the pamphlet. Instead I believe it is wise to focus on part of the subtitle of the work which mentions that this features 'a new Play neuer played before, of the praise of the RED HERRING'.⁵³² The mention of the red herring is key; despite critics such as Scoufos noting 'Nashe is quick to deny that any of his fables has a dual meaning or is allusive (this in spite of his introductory avowal of revenge)'⁵³³ it is more compelling to see the author being deliberately misleading or employing a 'red herring'; Hibbard follows the same thought process as I when he writes

⁵³¹ Tamsin Theresa Badcoe, "'As many Ciphers without an I': Self-Reflexive Violence in the Work of Thomas Nashe", *Modern Philology*, Vol. 111, No. 3 (February 2014), pp. 384-407; David C. McPherson, 'Aretino and the Harvey-Nashe Quarrel', *PMLA*, Vol. 84, No. 6 (Oct., 1969), pp. 1551-1558; Hadfield, '*Lenten Stuffe*: Thomas Nashe and the Fiction of Travel'; Henry S. Turner, Nashe's Red Herring: Epistemologies of the Commodity in *Lenten Stuffe* (1599)', *ELH*, Vol. 68, No. 3 (Fall, 2001), pp. 529-561 this ref. p. 530; Alice Lyle Scoufos, 'Nashe, Jonson, and the Oldcastle Problem', *Modern Philology*, Vol. 65, No. 4 (May, 1968), pp. 307-324 this ref. p. 317

⁵³² Nashe, *Nashe's Lenten Stuffe, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 145

⁵³³ Alice Lyle Scoufos, 'Nashe, Jonson, and the Oldcastle Problem', this ref. p. 318

But for the fact that the Oxford English Dictionary can produce no example...of the term 'red herring...before 1892 I would think that it was this meaning...that Nashe had uppermost in his mind when writing *Lenten Stuffe*.⁵³⁴

And just like Hibbard I also find it difficult to conclusively believe the OED's evidence and abandon the idea entirely; the critic notes that 'Nashe himself knew and mentions the use of the red herring by hunters.'⁵³⁵ Indeed Nashe's description of the use of the fish 'Next, to draw on hounds to a sent, to a redde herring skinne there is nothing comparable'⁵³⁶ is remarkably close to the actual etymology for the proverb even though Nashe's work appears around 200 years earlier than that quoted by the dictionary; Quinion writes at some length about the phrase and eventually comes to the conclusion that in 1803

the radical journalist William Cobbett... wrote a story, presumably fictional, in the issue of 14 February 1807 about how as a boy he had used a red herring as a decoy to deflect hounds chasing after a hare.⁵³⁷

Despite this seemingly contradictory evidence, reading *Lenten Stuffe* leaves the impression that there is little about the work that can and should be taken at face value. And it for this reason when examining Nashe's treatment of *Hero and*

⁵³⁴ G.R. Hibbard, *Thomas Nashe: A Critical Introduction*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962), page 237

⁵³⁵ Hibbard, *Thomas Nashe: A Critical Introduction*, this ref. p. 237

⁵³⁶ Nashe, *Nashe's Lenten Stuffe*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 221, lines 20-21

⁵³⁷ Michael Quinion, 'The Lure of the Red Herring', *World Wide Words*, <http://www.worldwidewords.org/articles/herring.htm>

Leander I suggest that this is actually Nashe's way of both venerating his friend and attacking those who failed to realise the qualities of the accomplished dramatist and poet.

The inclusion of Nashe's version of *Hero and Leander* of course has echoes of the manner in which he treated the addition of the laudatory sonnets at the end of Spenser's *The Faerie Queene* as well as the way in which he engages with another Marlowe translation in an earlier work. Looking at Spenser first, I have already discussed this incident in more depth in a previous chapter and have noted that although there is little doubt that these sonnets were appended to curry favour and gain patronage, rather than attacking the author for this rather venal activity Nashe instead gently pokes fun at him without ever getting close to the levels of criticism aimed at his more genuine adversaries. Nashe employs the same techniques with Marlowe as he does with Spenser; although the works parodied are very different, the treatment of both these authors is similar and they are both handled with a good deal of respect and good humour. In this case the treatment of Marlowe contributes to why this prose has been called 'quite the most idiosyncratic, and in some ways, also the most brilliant and witty of all Nashe's writings'⁵³⁸ while also, and most importantly, re-affirming the link between the two friends. Turner points out 'an earlier critical tradition singled out the parody of Marlowe's *Hero and Leander* as the centerpiece of the text and regarded it as a peak in Nashe's

⁵³⁸ Hibbard, *Thomas Nashe: A Critical Introduction*, this ref. p. 236

mercurial literary career'⁵³⁹ but prefers to read *Lenten Stuffle* 'in the context of England's growing participation in overseas trade'⁵⁴⁰ which I feel misses the point of this work entirely. I believe the treatment of *Hero and Leander* 'in which the heroes are metamorphosed into the ling fish and the herring'⁵⁴¹ is not an easily dismissed element of the work but is significant enough to be considered of primary importance as it gives a further insight into Nashe's character and his and Marlowe's relationship. And this is something that Nashe has done before; when discussing *The Choise of Valentines* Duncan-Jones notes

What seems most striking about the poem is its fluid freshness and gaiety. Nashe may have set out with the idea of amplifying his friend Marlowe's translation of Ovid's Elegia III. vi. Ovid's speaker laments an episode of impotence, for which he blames the girl. Perhaps 'she was not the wench I wish'd t'have had'; certainly her arousal techniques were defective.

The parallel between this and the way Nashe utilises *Hero and Leander* is striking; in both instances he takes the source material and goes further than the original author, Ovid and Musaeus, could manage and in both cases uses his friend's translation as the basis for his work. When we consider the sharing of ideas that led to the production of two similar works *Pierce Penilesse* and *Faustus* so soon after the other, as well as Nashe being able to place his name on the Frontispiece of *Dido*

⁵³⁹ Henry S. Turner, 'Nashe's Red Herring: Epistemologies of the Commodity in *Lenten Stuffle* (1599)', *ELH*, Vol. 68, No. 3 (Fall, 2001), pp. 529-561, this ref. p. 530

⁵⁴⁰ Turner, 'Nashe's Red Herring: Epistemologies of the Commodity in *Lenten Stuffle* (1599)', this ref. p. 530

⁵⁴¹ Scoufos, 'Nashe, Jonson, and the Oldcastle Problem', *Modern Philology*, this ref. p. 317

it becomes evident that the two men shared a good deal of ideas during their literary lives. And although it would be easy to assume that Nashe's parody of *Hero and Leander*, appearing as it does in a work which begins in challenging fashion to those who dared to silence both him and Jonson whilst also criticising Hakluyt's *Principal Navigations*, is a similar attack on Marlowe this is not the case. Nashe and Marlowe shared a closeness coming from their time at University and strengthened by their time in London whereas Nashe and Hakluyt's relationship was one of enmity and sniping. Day points out the differences between the two men:

Superficially, Nashe and Hakluyt stood at opposed ends of the publishing spectrum. Nashe was a semi-professional author whose (often scurrilous) pamphlets were ultimately censored; Hakluyt was a clergyman and the editor of two folio works that had two secretaries of state and the admiral of the fleet as their patrons.⁵⁴²

These differences along with Hakluyt's relationship with the Harvey's would have added fuel to Nashe's dislike of and disrespect towards the older writer; as Hadfield writes

The immediate spur for Nashe's hostility to Hakluyt was undoubtedly the fact that his arch-opponent, Gabriel Harvey, heaped enthusiastic praise on the *Principal Navigations*.⁵⁴³

Nashe is also quite dubious about the veracity of the travel writer's work within *Lenten Stufte* stating 'in M. Hackluits English discoeries I haue not come ken of one

⁵⁴² Day, 'Hakluyt, Harvey, Nashe: The Material Text and Early Modern Nationalism', this ref. pp. 298-299

⁵⁴³ Hadfield, '*Lenten Stufte*: Thomas Nashe and the Fiction of Travel', this ref. p. 73

mizzen mast of a man of warre bound for the Indies.⁵⁴⁴ Conversely when examining Nashe's treatment of *Hero and Leander* we see Marlowe being described in heavenly terms; in Marlowe's version of the poem he refers to the original classical author as 'divine *Musaeus*';⁵⁴⁵ Nashe uses the exact same epithet but then continues to call Marlowe 'a diuiner Muse than him'.⁵⁴⁶ It is evident that Nashe, a great lover of the classical authors, is placing his friend in exalted company, something he never does with the likes of Harvey or Hakluyt. It is also important to note that Nashe doesn't twist or alter Marlowe's words here; he uses the same phrase as Marlowe to describe Musaeus and then elaborates upon it to bring his friend into the conversation. By doing this Nashe is paying tribute to Marlowe and not belittling or minimising his work; there is no suggestion that Nashe is trying to gain points or reduce Marlowe's impact on the genre as he does with less favoured writers. He does this to ensure his audience is aware of the affection he has for his recently deceased friend; without this the parody could easily be seen as another Nashe attack in the series of antagonistic epistles that make up *Lenten Stuffe*.

The parody itself shows Nashe at his comedic best. He recognises the absurdity inherent in elements of the original story such as the chaste Hero's swift submission to Leander and uses his talents to magnify these. Marlowe writes at length about Hero's demeanour and appearance describing her as '*Hero the faire*' and describes her attire in highly poetic terms:

⁵⁴⁴ Nashe, *Nashe's Lenten Stuffe*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 173, lines 8-10

⁵⁴⁵ Marlowe, *Hero and Leander*, *The Works of Christopher Marlowe*, p. 493 line 52

⁵⁴⁶ Nashe, *Nashe's Lenten Stuffe*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 195, line 18

The outside of her garments were of lawne,

The lining purple silke, with guilt starres drawn.⁵⁴⁷

Nashe is much more direct and gives much less embellishment; 'she was a pretty pinckany and Venus priest.'⁵⁴⁸ with no mention of her attire. He goes further with this reference to being Venus' priest swiftly followed by the author describing how Hero 'might liue chaste vestall Priest to Venus, the queene of vnchastitie' before describing her reaction to her visitor:

Of Leander you may write vpon, and it is written vpon, she likte well,
and for all he was a naked man, and cleane displayed to the
skinne...⁵⁴⁹

This presents Hero in a different light to the original descriptions of both Musaeus and Marlowe as someone who is both pure and chaste, but makes more sense in the whole narrative when we see how quickly she succumbed to Leander's naked and highly persuasive charms in both Marlowe's version and Nashe's parody. Even then Nashe adds comedy to the scene describing their coming together as almost accidental or at the very least circumstantial; he describes how Hero's actions were born out of concern for his well-being writing 'for he might not take cold after his swimming, she lay close by him, to keepe him warm' and only then did the 'scuffling or bopeepe in the darke'⁵⁵⁰ occur. Nashe is once again using the same situations as

⁵⁴⁷ Marlowe, *Hero and Leander*, *The Works of Christopher Marlowe*, p. 492, lines 4, 9-10

⁵⁴⁸ Nashe, *Nashe's Lenten Stuffe*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 195, lines 23-24

⁵⁴⁹ Nashe, *Nashe's Lenten Stuffe*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 196, lines 8-9, 19-21

⁵⁵⁰ Nashe, *Nashe's Lenten Stuffe*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 196, lines 28-30

Marlowe and adding his own spin on them; when Leander appears in Marlowe's poem Hero

Where seeing a naked man, she sciecht for fear

Such sights as this to tender maids are rare

and ran into the darke herselfe to hide.⁵⁵¹

In Nashe's version there is no such flight or hesitation, instead he describes how Hero swiftly invites Leander into her bed to warm him and then allowing nature to take its course in a particularly farcical manner.

It is at this point that Marlowe's tale ends; his poem was left unfinished and it will be forever unknown how he would have concluded the tale. The story was eventually completed, firstly by Chapman and again by Petowe with both editions being published in 1598. Both versions have their flaws; as Booth describes 'His [Chapman's] deployment of an inadequacy *topos* sounds all too like a half-acknowledged desire to obscure the subject' while Petowe's work was 'star-struck with Marlowe'⁵⁵² and suffered because of this. Booth also notes that 'Though Chapman had threatened to over-elevate the topic, and Petowe to sink it, the two faithful lovers were still irresistible to all'⁵⁵³ and it is this reaction of the public which most likely caused Nashe to produce his own version of the poem. It is at this point where Nashe's parody truly gathers pace as he writes puns, skips over large

⁵⁵¹ Marlowe, *Hero and Leander*, *The Works of Christopher Marlowe*, pp. 509-510 lines 237-239

⁵⁵² Roy Booth, 'Hero's Afterlife: *Hero and Leander* and 'lewd unmannerly verse' in the late Seventeenth Century', *Early Modern Literary Studies* 12.3 (January, 2007) 4.1-24 <http://purl.oclc.org/emls/12-3/boother2.htm> this ref. paragraph 6

⁵⁵³ Booth 'Hero's Afterlife: *Hero and Leander* and 'lewd unmannerly verse' in the late Seventeenth Century', this ref. paragraph 6

tranches of the story and ultimately turns Marlowe and Musaeus' noble lovers into fish that will only 'meete in the heele of the weeke at the best mens tables.'⁵⁵⁴

Booth notes that

Thomas Nashe introduced his own lively prose burlesque (written in the same year as Chapman and Petowe's publications), with the observation that: 'every apprentice in Paul's Churchyard', could 'tell you for your love' who Hero and Leander were, and of course 'sell you for your money'⁵⁵⁵ the poem about them...⁵⁵⁶

However he fails to take this train of thought to its obvious conclusion; that Nashe was writing these comments because of the substandard efforts of Chapman and Petowe in trying to continue Marlowe's work; that the two imitators are merely lesser authors looking to make money by using the name of the more famous author. It is also interesting to read Baskervill's comments about the work of Nashe and Jonson when interpreting Marlowe's work:

both Nashe and Jonson begin with praise of Marlowe's *Hero and Leander*, and proceed to travesty the story, destroying all romance, vulgarizing Hero, and stressing her unchastity. Both men are doubtless mocking romance as it is fed to the populace, one utilizing

⁵⁵⁴ Nashe, *Nashe's Lenten Stuffe, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 199, line 37

⁵⁵⁵ Booth 'Hero's Afterlife: *Hero and Leander* and 'lewd unmannerly verse' in the late Seventeenth Century' Quotation from 6. *Lenten Stuffe* quotes can be found in *Nashe's Lenten Stuffe, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 195

⁵⁵⁶ Booth 'Hero's Afterlife: *Hero and Leander* and 'lewd unmannerly verse' in the late Seventeenth Century', Quotation from 6

the puppet-shows and the other the commercial town of Yarmouth,
where all sentiment is subordinated to the glory of the herring.⁵⁵⁷

It is my contention that while he may be correct when talking about Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair*, Baskervill completely misunderstands Nashe's intentions. He is not mocking romance or travestying the story; rather he is mocking the other authors' interpretations of Marlowe's poem and is suggesting that his version which ultimately focuses on fish is as valid a conclusion as the weakly written, yet more traditional offerings from Chapman and Petowe. Nashe proves by writing this engaging parody that he is able to interpret the work of his friend while retaining his own style and voice; his ability to criticise other authors for trying to imitate the Marlowe while doing the same thing stems from the years the two spent together and the nature of their relationship.

That Nashe and Marlowe had a strong bond is without question – the existence of the *Dido* frontispiece in both names along with their shared educational history describes a lengthier literary relationship than Nashe had with any of his other peers. May discusses in some depth the nature of their relationship noting how they would have a number of common friends both from their time at Cambridge and in their professional lives in London.⁵⁵⁸ That both men had knowledge of

⁵⁵⁷ Charles Read Baskervill, 'English Elements in Jonson's Early Comedy', *Studies in English*, No. 1, English Elements in Jonson's Early Comedy (APRIL 8, 1911), pp. i, iii-v, vii-x, 1-328, this ref. p. 14.

⁵⁵⁸ For example, May notes that both men would have had an acquaintance with Abraham Fraunce which most likely would have given both men sight of the early books of Spenser's *The Faerie Queene*. For further information I recommend reading Steven W. May, 'Marlowe, Spenser, Sidney And—Abraham Fraunce?', *The Review of English Studies*

Langland's work also appears indisputable; there is a clear connection between Nashe's *Pierce Penilesse* and Langland's *Piers Plowman* which goes beyond the almost identically named protagonists whilst Marlowe's descriptions of the sins have echoes in Langland's; when describing himself Langland's Wrath notes 'I, wrath, rest neuere';⁵⁵⁹ similarly this sin in Marlowe's play is introduced by saying 'I haue runne vp and downe the worlde'⁵⁶⁰ conveying the same message in a slightly different manner. The Nashe/Marlowe connection goes beyond this though with rumours of co-authorship never far away whether it be the comic scenes in *Faustus* or Nashe's supposed involvement in *Dido*. More frustratingly their story is one of lost prose with the tantalising prospect of a Nashe epitaph to Marlowe mentioned on numerous occasions. In lieu of this and with no extant evidence to the contrary it is compelling to see answers in Nashe's final work; although it would be convenient to suggest that *Lenten Stuffe* is just another Nashe confrontation piece as it contains all the elements the reader would expect from Nashe including anger at the Catholic Church, and disdain for his critics and rivals the piece is significantly more than this. It is my contention that this is the only true remaining record of Nashe's feelings for the man who both inspired and collaborated with him. There is little doubt that Marlowe's death would have affected Nashe profoundly and it would seem strange that the man who lived with a pen in his hand, he did not place his feelings down on paper other than as an addition to one of Marlowe's own works.

⁵⁵⁹ Langland, *The Vision of William concerning Piers The Plowman*, Passus V, p. 48 line 151

⁵⁶⁰ Marlowe, *The tragicall History of Dr Faustus*, *The Works of Christopher Marlowe*, Act 2 Scene 3 page 170 lines 740-741

It is much more like Nashe to use his own work and own talents to celebrate the man who inspired and assisted him in so many ways. When viewing *Lenten Stuffe* in this light we see that the parody of *Hero and Leander* is not a satirical swipe at his late colleague; rather it is a unique homage to the author which unsurprisingly contains no cloying sentimentality; instead Nashe chooses to venerate his friend in a way that Marlowe would have appreciated; by parodying his most famous poetical piece and entertaining the audience rather than depressing them with tales of woe and sadness. As such this ensures *Lenten Stuffe* shows the development of Nashe as both an author and as a man; the despair evident at the beginning of *Pierce Penilesse* is replaced here with an air of celebration of the life of his great friend.

Chapter Six - Sworn Brothers or Occasional Drinkers: Nashe and Greene.

In the previous chapter I discussed Nashe's involvement with Christopher Marlowe, the member of the 'University Wits' group that Nashe arguably had the strongest bond with. In this chapter focus will now move to the only other member of the group whose friendship with Nashe could be seen to seriously rival this relationship. Robert Greene is one of the more intriguing figures of the renaissance period with a career that began in 1580 and continued to his death in 1592. Greene was a writer who tried his hand at many genres and was proficient at most as his *Oxford DNB* entry notes

Greene published some twenty-five prose titles, in genres ranging from courtly romance to crime exposé (the 'coney-catching' pamphlets) and deathbed confession. He also wrote some half-dozen stage plays, probably between 1587 and 1592, some highly successful but none published in his lifetime.⁵⁶¹

Greene was also probably as well known for his lifestyle as his writing with the same *Oxford DNB* entry noting 'Greene was England's first celebrity author, a role that he invented and others elaborated for him. By the late 1580s he and his contemporaries agreed that his had become a household name...' Greene remains a figure of interest to critics and retains a higher modern-day profile than that of many of his contemporaries including Nashe; as a 'University Wit' one of the

⁵⁶¹ L. H. Newcomb, 'Greene, Robert (bap. 1558, d. 1592), writer and playwright,' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press (2004)

volumes of Routledge's 2011 series of the same name focused on him and his work,⁵⁶² and a biography edited by Melnikoff and Gieskes was published in 2008.⁵⁶³ With respect to his relationship with Nashe, he was someone the younger author was definitely acquainted with when he arrived in London but may have first become familiar with at their shared university; although Greene would have been at Clare College at the time of Nashe's Cambridge career he was previously also a St John's student and it is likely would have been in proximity to Nashe and would have had been present at a time when Nashe was at his most impressionable. At the very least the relationship between Greene and Nashe began no later than 1589 with Greene's *Menaphon: Camilla's Alarum to Slumbering Euphues* including a preface written by the younger man and may well have developed into something more; as Nicholl writes

There is no proof Nashe actually knew him [Greene] at Cambridge, though their close friendship in London in the later 1580s makes it likely. Either way, the maverick Greene offered Nashe a model – the scholar as entertainer and wit, homme du monde rather than dromidote ergonist.⁵⁶⁴

In this chapter I will look at the relationship between Greene and Nashe and note how the older man may have had a significant impact on the writing style of the

⁵⁶² Kirk Melnikoff (ed.), *Robert Greene* (Abingdon: Ashgate 2011)

⁵⁶³ Kirk Melnikoff and Edward Gieskes (ed.), *Writing Robert Greene: Essays on England's First Notorious Professional Writer*, (Aldershot: Ashgate 2008)

⁵⁶⁴ Nicholl, *A Cup of News*, this ref. pp. 27-28

younger and how he assisted Nashe in developing his own authorial voice; furthermore, I shall discuss how Nashe referred to Greene across his works before suggesting the nature of their relationship is not as straightforward as most critics tend to believe. I shall also demonstrate how this relationship is important in showing, not only how Nashe developed as an author, but also how he represented different aspects of the 'author' in his own work.

Nashe arrived in London in 1588 to write on behalf of the anti-Martinist side in the Marprelate controversy; an argument that Greene was also a part of and as Kuraman notes

...Nashe himself seems to say that Greene was part of the anti-Martinist team in his *Strange News* (1592), a reply to Harvey's attack on Greene, when he explains the origin of the Harvey brothers' animus toward the recently dead pamphleteer: "Somewhat I am privy to the cause of Greene's inveighing against the three [Harvey] brothers. Thy [Gabriel Harvey's] hot-spirited brother Richard (a notable ruffian with his pen) having first took upon him in his blundering Persival, to play the Jack of both sides twixt Martin and us, and snarled privily at Pap Hatchet, Pasquil, and others, that opposed themselves against the open slander of that mighty

platformer of atheism, presently after dribbed forth another fool's

bolt, a book I should say, which he christened The Lamb of God."⁵⁶⁵

Nashe goes further as he comments, almost incidentally, in one of his many attacks on the Harveys 'Greene beeing chiefe agent for the companie (for hee writ more than foure other, how well I will not say: but *Sat cito, si sat bene*)...' ⁵⁶⁶ with Nashe describing a much larger role for Greene than previously believed and that his involvement in this controversy was not a minor one. If this was the case then Greene would be one of the most prolific voices on the Bishop's side and Nashe calling Greene the 'chiefe agent' would have some basis in fact. Nicholl, for one agrees with Nashe:

But if Nashe was the news-hound, who actually wrote the Pasquill tracts? A plausible answer is Robert Greene. He was certainly a member of the anti-Martinist clique...⁵⁶⁷

He advances an intriguing theory as to how it was here that Nashe and Greene first professionally worked together suggesting Nashe hunting for information and presenting Greene as a candidate to be the pseudonymous Pasquill and therefore the writer of three more pamphlets. Carroll also postulates

⁵⁶⁵ Arul Kumaran, 'Robert Greene's Martinist Transformation in 1590', *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 103, No. 3 (Summer, 2006), pp. 243-263 this ref. p. 253 & Nashe, *Strange Newes, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 270, lines 16-25

⁵⁶⁶ Nashe, *Strange Newes, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 271, lines 15-23

⁵⁶⁷ Nicholl, *A Cup of News*, this ref. p. 72

Yet Greene was clearly connected with the party of the prelates, with "the little faction" of Hatton, Whitgift, and Bancroft. Hatton, who died in 1591, was his patron. He may well have been recruited by Bancroft, along with Lyly and Nashe, for the counterattack against Martin, in pamphlets or on stage.⁵⁶⁸

Due to the pseudonymous nature of the Anti-Martinist responses the full extent of either Greene or Nashe's involvement in the affair will never be fully known but it is without question that Nashe's earliest professional writing was as part of the Anglican response to the Puritan attacks on the Church and that he and Greene may have worked closely together before the *Preface to Menaphon* was published. Unfortunately, with the exception of this Nashe's preface to Greene's romance there are no existing works which share both writers' names to support Nicholl's supposition that Greene provided a model for Nashe; however even without this clear evidence I find the suggestion compelling since, as I shall discuss through this chapter, the author of *Anatomie* feels like a different writer from the man who penned *Pierce Penilesse*, or *Strange Newes*. Whereas a development of talents and techniques would be natural given that Nashe had moved from a very cloistered environment in Cambridge to the city with all its myriad influences, the most persuasive reason for the rapidity with which Nashe changes and improves would be that an older, more experienced author became a mentor type figure. Looking

⁵⁶⁸ D. Allen Carroll, 'The Badger in *Greenes Groats-Worth of Witte* and in Shakespeare', *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 84, No. 4 (Autumn, 1987), pp. 471-482 this ref. p. 477

at Nashe's circle of colleagues when he arrived in London only two men could really fulfil this role; Lyly and Greene. One would imagine that if Lyly had been Nashe's mentor though that his works would have remained as Euphuistic as *Anatomie* or at least borne some resemblance to this piece; Nashe's future works instead have more in common with Greene's writings. As Ward notes when addressing Nashe's habit of 'borrowing' styles from other authors', despite Nashe's future denials to the contrary

...he imitates the episodic narrative structure of the popular *A Mirror for Magistrates* and *Acts and Monuments*, as mentioned above, but also other contemporaneous examples of prose fiction such as Robert Greene's *Pandosto* (1588) and *Mamillia* (1583).⁵⁶⁹

If Nashe was writing in a similar manner to Greene this could easily come from having spent some time learning from the other man; Nicholl comments after discussing *Menaphon*

Their collaboration may well extend to the Pasquill tracts – Greene, the foremost scribbler of the day, being hired to write them, with Nashe, his lesser-known associate, as co-author and chief supplier of piping hot 'informations'.⁵⁷⁰

⁵⁶⁹ Allyna E. Ward, 'An Outlandish Travel Chronicle: Farce, History, and Fiction in Thomas Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller*', *The Yearbook of English Studies*, Vol. 41, No. 1, Travel and Prose Fiction in Early Modern England (2011), pp. 84-98 this ref. p. 87

⁵⁷⁰ Nicholl, *A Cup of News*, this ref. p. 72

The idea that Greene mentored Nashe is a reasonable one; this would certainly help to explain why his *Preface to Menaphon* is quite different to the earlier written work and the ongoing and rapid development in writing style. *Anatomie* was an exercise in euphuism betraying both Nashe's youth and education; Nicholl writes when noting the death of Nashe's father in 1587 that '*Anatomie* was written around this time, while 'idle in the Countrey' during a vacation, probably in summer 1587.'⁵⁷¹ D.C Allen also comments on the inexperience of the author noting that the Nashe who wrote *Anatomie* was 'a pretender who overwhelms his reader'⁵⁷² while Nicholl adds 'It is a student piece through and through, clever, polished and shallow...'.⁵⁷³ Allen goes on to note that McKerrow 'noticed more than twenty unacknowledged translations from the *Parabola* of Erasmus via the *Apophtegmata* of Lycosthenes.'⁵⁷⁴ and suggests that closer analysis of the work would yield 'more borrowings from other Renaissance books of similitudes.'⁵⁷⁵ Conversely the *Preface*, while still containing some Euphuistic elements was a much more varied, accomplished and original piece of writing which as Nicholl notes was 'polished, acrid, acute and, to some, insufferably arrogant. He hits a light fluent,

⁵⁷¹ Nicholl, *A Cup of News*, this ref. p. 37

⁵⁷² Don Cameron Allen, '*The Anatomie of Absurditie: A Study in Literary Apprenticeship*', *Studies in Philology*, Vol 32, No. 2 (Apr. 1935), pp. 170-176 this ref. p. 170.

⁵⁷³ Nicholl, *A Cup of News*, this ref. p. 37

⁵⁷⁴ Allen, '*The Anatomie of Absurditie: A Study in Literary Apprenticeship*' p. 170

⁵⁷⁵ Recently Professor Matthew Steggle and I have completed research on *The Anatomie of Absurditie* and have discovered that Nashe significantly borrowed from a little-known compilation of aphorisms, *The Nosegay of Morall Philosophie* (1580) written by Thomas Crewe. In this article 'Thomas Nashe reads *The Nosegay of Morall Philosophie*' we contend a large portion of *Anatomie* was adapted from Crewe's work which in turn was a close translation of Gabriel Meurier's *Le Bouquet de Philosophie Moral* (1568). This suggests that *Anatomie*, while technically less accomplished than his later works, is more than just a purely euphuistic exercise and instead shows the birth of Nashe's satirical bent.

humorous tone, what the Elizabethan's called "facetious".⁵⁷⁶ In the short time between writing the two works it is clear that Nashe developed as an author in no small part to the group of writers he associated with. Elsewhere Nicholl writes

it is a fairly safe bet that in these early days he was to be found out in these same liberty alleys that lodged the likes of Greene, Marlowe, Watson, Shakespeare and Tarlton.⁵⁷⁷

Although no documents exist detailing any financial link between the two men detailing a formal mentoring relationship the wealth of circumstantial evidence points to the existence of a similar, yet more informal type of relationship; it would be too much of a coincidence for Nashe to have developed in the manner he did after his arrival in London without Greene having some input, however casual this may have been.

Looking at *Preface*, ostensibly an introduction to the work of Greene, Nashe begins to exhibit the traits that would become characteristic in his future output. *Preface* begins in traditional fashion; Nashe addresses this to 'The Gentlemen Students of Both Universities', echoing one of Greene's own dedications 'To the gentlemen readers, health',⁵⁷⁸ and acknowledging both Cambridge, his and Greene's *alma mater*, as well as Oxford, the University of one of Nashe's other early influences and the creator of Euphuism, John Lyly. Nashe quickly moves

⁵⁷⁶ Nicholl, *A Cup of News*, this ref. p. 53

⁵⁷⁷ Nicholl, *A Cup of News*, this ref. p. 41

⁵⁷⁸ Robert Greene, *Menaphon; Camilla's Alarum to Slumbering Euphues* (London: W. Stansby, 1589), A2r

passed the pleasantries; he shows he is dismissive of the writers of the current era making it evident that he is not impressed by the quality of many of his contemporaries and instead looking fondly back at the recent past. He compliments Greene whilst at the same time condemning other, unnamed authors:

To you he appeales that knew him *ab extrema pueritia*, whose *placet* he accounts the *plaudite* of his paines; thinking his day-labour was not altogether lausht *sine linea*, if there bee any thing at al in it that doth *olere Atticum* in your estimate. I am not ignorant how eloquent our gowned age is grown of late; so that euery mechanically mate abhorreth the English he was borne too, and plucks, with a solemne periphrasis, his *vt vales* from the inke-horne⁵⁷⁹

This passage suggests that, as with *Anatomie*, Nashe is once again concerned with showing his education; the casual scattering of Latin phrases is followed by a reference to getting 'Boreas by the beard', the classical Greek name for the god of the north wind. What is particularly intriguing about this passage is Nashe's usage of the phrase 'ink-horn'; a term that the Oxford English Dictionary currently defines as 'a term of the literary language, a learned or bookish word'⁵⁸⁰ but in the sixteenth century had come to mean affectedly or ostentatiously learned and pedantic. Nashe notes that the majority of his contemporaries are uninspired and lacking in the basic skills exhibited so frequently by those that have preceded them,

⁵⁷⁹ Nashe, *Preface to Menaphon, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 311, lines 9-18

⁵⁸⁰ "ink-horn, n." *OED Online*. Oxford University Press, March 2014

dismissing them as authors who are only capable of 'the servile imitation of vainglorious tragedians, who contend not so seriously to excel in action as to embowel the clouds in a speech of comparison'.⁵⁸¹ Greene of course is seemingly exempt from all these accusations; after Nashe continues in the same vein for a number of lines he brings *Preface* back to its intended subject noting

I come (sweet friend) to thy *Arcadian Menaphon*, whose attire
(though not so stately, yet comely) doth intitle thee aboue all other
to that *temparatum dicendi genus*, which *Tully* in his Orator termeth
true eloquence.⁵⁸²

This is Nashe raising his friend and writing partner above the majority of the other authors of the time; only ten lines previously Nashe is dismissing these others as 'Schoolemen and Grammarians, who, hauing no more learning in their skulle then will serue to take vp a commoditie...'⁵⁸³ making it very clear that at this stage he does not consider Greene to be one of these. By offering the epithet 'Arcadian' Nashe is also immediately inviting favourable comparisons to Sidney's great work further with Nashe suggesting that Greene is no common writer. It could be argued that by making this comparison Nashe is being ironic; comparing the heavily euphuistic *Menaphon* with the Hellenistic and occasionally harrowing *Arcadia*. This was not the manner in which this was received at the time; initially Greene's work was published under the title *Menaphon: Camilla's Alarum to Slumbering Euphues*

⁵⁸¹ Nashe, *Preface to Menaphon*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 311, lines 19-22

⁵⁸² Nashe, *Preface to Menaphon*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 312, lines 15-19

⁵⁸³ Nashe, *Preface to Menaphon*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 312, lines 7-9

but this had changed by 1599 to be preceded by *Greene's Arcadia*. While it is not clear whether it was Nashe's use of the epithet or the numerous references Greene makes within *Menaphon* to Arcadia that caused the publisher to amend the title, it was Nashe who first described the piece thusly. Stylistically of course *Menaphon* is much closer to Sidney's piece than Lyly's *Euphues* sharing the same structure of clearly defined and relatively short chapters containing both prose and poetry; Lyly's romance is conversely very prose heavy and lacking in poetry, while the chapters are significantly longer. Nashe, who would have had sight of all three pieces by the time he wrote *Preface*, would have undoubtedly noticed the similarities and made the connection. A similar impression is conveyed with Nashe invoking both Cicero's name and using an approximation of one of his quotations; the implication is that Greene at this stage in his career sits comfortably alongside both modern and classical greats alike.

Bearing in mind the manner in which *Preface* begins with Nashe praising Greene in fairly strong terms it is therefore surprising that Nashe does not mention the supposed subject of the preface again preferring to continue on his original theme of berating the current batch of English writers in comparison to the historical greats from both England and abroad. At points Nashe draws up lists of those current authors that he feels buck this trend and give hope for the future; at various points this list includes Thomas Watson, Abraham Fraunce, Gabriel Harvey,⁵⁸⁴ later Nashe refers to '*Mathew Roydon, Thomas Achlow and George*

⁵⁸⁴ Nashe, *Preface to Menaphon*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 320, lines 12, 13 and 28

*Peele*⁵⁸⁵ while, as noted in a previous chapter, reserving special praise for the 'diuine Master *Spenser*'.⁵⁸⁶ Throughout this Nashe has the opportunity to place Greene back in the spotlight yet he declines to make even an oblique reference preferring to focus on these other names, a number of whom he will have had little or no contact with. This is markedly different to Nashe's other preface attached to Sidney's *Astrophel and Stella*; in that much shorter piece he refers to Sidney as Astrophel on five occasions while the whole work is overtly complimentary to both Sidney and his family. As a result this piece is not as adulatory towards its subject as Nashe's later preface; Østerberg notes 'Only incidentally does it [*Preface*] stand as an introduction to *Menaphon*'⁵⁸⁷ with Nashe preferring to write about Cicero, Ovid et al rather than discuss the work which *Preface* theoretically presents. Given this, the question that needs to be asked is why Nashe treats Greene in such an obviously different manner to Sidney and these other authors? To answer this, I will move away from *Preface* and examine the other references that Nashe makes throughout to Greene in his works.

The majority of the many references that Nashe makes about Greene appear not in *Preface* but in the two anti-Harvey works. Looking more closely it can be established that this is not a real surprise; it was the Harvey brothers who instigated the disagreement by attacking not only Nashe but also his fellow anti-Martinists, taking specific aim at Greene. That Nashe feels the need to defend

⁵⁸⁵ Nashe, *Preface to Menaphon*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 323, lines 19-20

⁵⁸⁶ Nashe, *Preface to Menaphon*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 323, line 9

⁵⁸⁷ V. Østerberg, 'Nashe's 'Kid in Æsop': A Danish Interpretation', *The Review of English Studies*, Vol. 18, No. 72 (Oct., 1942), pp. 385-394, this ref. p. 386

Greene is not surprising; it is the manner in which he does so that is worth remarking on. In the first of these pamphlets, *Strange Newes*, Greene's name appears in some context over thirty times almost entirely in response to Harvey's comments made in his *Foure Letters* and it is this work I shall initially focus on. The first of these is a reference to one of Greene's works and appears at the very beginning of the work with Nashe writing

He [Gabriel Harvey] had many aduersaries in those times that he wrote, amongst the which Cloth-breeches and Veluet-breeches (his fathers pouerty, and his owne pride, were none of the meanest).⁵⁸⁸

This phrase 'Cloth-breeches and Veluet-breeches' comes directly from Greene's pamphlet against Gabriel, *A Quip for an Upstart Courtier*, which was itself partially a response to Richard Harvey's *The Lamb of God*. By immediately framing his work in this manner (this reference is from the second paragraph of *Strange Newes*) Nashe is aligning this work with that of Greene's and with these words he is backing up those of his fellow Anti-Martinist. This is actually Nashe's first major contribution to the argument with Gabriel; his comments in *Pierce Penilesse* include his vicious declaration to Richard that

The Lambe of God make thee a wiser Bell-weather than thou art are,
for else I doubt that thou wilt be driven to leaue at all, and fall to thy

⁵⁸⁸ Nashe, *Strange Newes, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 267, lines 14-15
337

fathers occupation, which is, to goe and make a rope to hang thy
selfe.⁵⁸⁹

Despite being quite personal this comes in the middle of a huge treatise that covers a number of different, larger and less personal complaints. Whereas in *Pierce Penilesse* the attack against Richard is an incidental comment in a work that concerns itself with far larger issues, *Strange Newes* a pamphlet which is much more personal, and is part of an anti-Harvey narrative begun by Greene and responded to by the older Harvey. One such reference is not enough for Nashe; after initially quoting Greene in the first few lines of his work he then uses the same quotation only a few pages later writing

Hence *Greene*...tooke occasion to canuaze him a little in his Cloth-
breeches and veluet-breeches and because by some probable
collections hee gest the elder brothers hand was in it, he coupled
them both on one yoake, and, to fulfill the prouerbe *Tria sunt omnia*,
thrust in the third brother, who made a perfect parriall of
Pamphlelers.⁵⁹⁰

Greene believed that both Richard and Gabriel were involved in writing against him while the youngest brother John was found to be guilty by association and, while probably not actually involved in the argument, was attacked in the same manner as his siblings. By repeating Greene's words – Greene's piece begins with him

⁵⁸⁹ Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Svpplication to the Divell*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 199, lines 21-24

⁵⁹⁰ Nashe, *Strange Newes*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 271, lines 15-23

referring to a 'quaint dispute betweene Clothbreeches and Veluet breeches'⁵⁹¹ and referring to the characters using the same epithets throughout his work - Nashe fully establishes his credentials as part of Greene's camp and invites *Strange Newes* to be viewed, in part, as a companion piece to his colleague's *Quip*. Nashe ensures this message is further corroborated by writing later in his work

*Tubalcan,*⁵⁹² alias *Tuball*, first founder of Farriers Hall, heere is a great complaint made, that *vtriusque Academia Robert Greene* hath mockt thee, because hee saide, that as thou wert the first inuenter of Musicke, so *Gabriell Howliglasse* was the first inuenter of English Hexameter verses.⁵⁹³

Here Nashe once again adopts some of his comrade's comments from *Quip* into this new argument with Greene in that work comparing Harvey to Tubulcain, a biblical figure who is known as the first artificer; he was mentioned in the bible as one who created instruments of brass and iron. Greene is suggesting that although Tubulcain may have created the tools for music to be played on he did not create music; similarly Harvey may have used the tools of verse to write English Hexameter verses but he did not invent them and this is yet another baseless claim from Harvey. Nashe electing to keep Greene's biblical reference in this piece and at

⁵⁹¹ Robert Greene, *A quip for an vpstart courtier: or, A quaint dispute betwveen veluet breeches and cloth-breeches Wherein is plainly set downe the disorders in all estates and trades*, (London 1592), A2r <http://eebo.chadwyck.com>

⁵⁹² Tubal-cain is originally mentioned in *Genesis* 4:22 and is described here as 'a forger of every implemēt of bronze and iron'.

⁵⁹³ Nashe, *Strange Newes, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 298, lines 23-28

this time is intriguing; elsewhere in his works Nashe uses the bible more frequently with *Christs Teares Over Jerusalem*, for example, containing references to Abraham, Lot, Noah and David amongst many others. Yet in the anti-Harvey literature Nashe mostly avoids overt references to the bible despite their clear differences with regards to religion; the majority of religious references are based around their opposite positions in the Martinist argument. Conversely Greene and Nashe have been on the same side of the religious argument for almost the entirety of Nashe's literary career and by once again using Greene's words and references from *Quip in Strange Newes* he further re-enforces the link between both the two men and their works; the two are firmly on the same page whereas Gabriel has been placed on the other side of the argument. Nashe later also uses an oblique reference to the bible in connection with Greene slightly earlier in the same work when he notes when discussing the older man's virtues and vices - 'Debt and deadly sinne, who is not subject to?'⁵⁹⁴ - which invokes comparisons with John 8:7 which reads 'He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her.'⁵⁹⁵ As mentioned Nashe does not often utilise the bible in these works but refers to Greene, the flawed writer, using both Old and New Testament terminology on a couple of occasions. Nashe using Greene's Tubulcain analogy shows that this was a comment he enjoyed as he was willing to reproduce it in his piece; Nashe only tends to quote whole lines to either belittle the primary author or to fete the original source and its usage here both lauds Greene whilst at the same time putting Harvey in his

⁵⁹⁴ Nashe, *Strange Newes, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 287, line 13

⁵⁹⁵ *King James Bible, Book of John*, Chapter 8:7

place. Similarly, Nashe is not afraid to give his own flavour to these other comments to 'improve' them and does so here by adding the Nashean epithet *Gabriell Howliglasse* to Greene's quotation. As with most Nashean insults this name also has a deeper meaning; as the Oxford English Dictionary writes Howliglasse or Owlglass is

(An Anglicization of the name of) the legendary German jester Till Eulenspiegel, the type of a roguish fool; (hence) a jester; a buffoon. Also occasionally as a more general term of abuse.⁵⁹⁶

Furthermore, Nashe himself uses this term in *Anatomy*:

These they be that publiquely pretende a more regenerate holiness, beeing in their priuate chambers the express imitation of Howliglasse.⁵⁹⁷

He not only compares Harvey to a buffoon but also one who fakes a level of religious fervour which does not stand up to closer inspection. Given that this follows so soon after Nashe describes Greene in relation to the bible this strengthens the position that Nashe's imperfect friend is more religiously aligned than the seemingly pious Gabriel and his brothers. Nashe and Greene in this instance were on the same side of this argument and speaks to a friendship and kinship between the two men which as Nashe makes clear here and as Greene had

⁵⁹⁶ "Owlglass, n." *OED Online*. Oxford University Press, June 2018. Web. 3 July 2018.

⁵⁹⁷ Nashe, *Anatomie of Absvrditie, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 22-23, lines 36+

already noted in *Greene's Groatsworth of Wit* when he named Nashe as 'Young Juvenal' was a friendship based on a mutual appreciation of the other's talents and abilities. While there has been some debate as to whether Nashe is the subject of this comment - Phillip Drew does an excellent job in summarising the arguments up to that point without himself coming to a conclusion⁵⁹⁸ - it is more often considered that this reference is to Nashe with Nicholl in *A Cup of News* presenting him as this figure without question introducing the relevant paragraph by simply writing 'Next comes Nashe.'⁵⁹⁹ Duncan-Jones agrees:

However, it is extremely probable that Greene collaborated with Nashe on the composition of the play [*Summers Last Will and Testament*] in its early stages, for in the epistle to the gentleman playwrights in *Groatsworth* 'R.G' addresses Nashe as 'Young *Juvenall*, that byting Satyryst that lastly [i.e., most recently] with me together writ a comedie.'⁶⁰⁰

What becomes clear is that unlike with Nashe and Spenser, or Nashe and Sidney this is a two-way connection born from a close working relationship which allowed both men to produce literature which may have otherwise been beyond them.

⁵⁹⁸ Philip Drew, 'Was Greene's "Young Juvenal" Nashe or Lodge?', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, Vol. 7, No. 1, The English Renaissance (Winter, 1967), pp. 55-66. I would recommend reading this article to get a good overview of the way in which critical thinking had shifted between deciding which of Lodge and Nashe was 'Young Juvenal'.

⁵⁹⁹ Nicholl, *A Cup of News*, this ref. p. 124

⁶⁰⁰ Katherine Duncan-Jones, 'Shakespeare, The Motley Player', *The Review of English Studies*, New Series, Vol. 60, No. 247 (NOVEMBER 2009), pp. 723-743 this ref. p. 738

Nashe's admiration for Greene is not limited to his part in either the Anti-Martinist movement or as a fellow combatant in the Harvey attacks. Immediately at the start of *Strange Newes* Nashe wants to make it clear that he is writing on behalf of Greene as a necessity caused by the death of his colleague and if it wasn't for this unfortunate turn of events Greene would have been able to easily defend himself against Gabriel and his brothers although not initially in the manner in which you'd expect. Nashe writes

Had hee liu'd, *Gabriel*, and thou shouldst so vnarteficially and
odiously libeld against him as thou hast done, he would haue made
thee an example of ignominy to all ages that are to come, and driuen
thee to eate thy owne booke butterd, as I sawe him make an
Appirater once in a Tauern eate his Citation, waxe and all, very
handsomly seru'd twixt two dishes.⁶⁰¹

This passage has Nashe writing not about Greene's abilities as an author but as a physical threat who can force his enemies to bend to his will which seems almost counter intuitive as Nashe shows himself to be a man who fights his battle with a pen rather than with more martial weaponry. This passage also establishes a theme that is continued later in the same work with Nashe making it clear that although Greene was a flawed man he was, on balance, a good one. He writes

⁶⁰¹ Nashe, *Strange Newes*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 271, lines 25-31

Hee inherited more vertues than vices: a iolly long red peake, like the spire of a steeple, hee cherisht continueally without cutting, whereat a man might hang a lewell, it was so sharpe and pendant.

Why should art answer for the infirmities of manners? Hee had his faults and thou thy follies.

Debt and deadly sinne, who is not subject to? With any notorious crime I neuer knew him tainted: (& yet tainting is no infamous surgerie for him that hath beene in so many hote skirmishes).⁶⁰²

Nashe paints an evocative picture of his fellow Wit describing a proud man who although willing to break some rules knew both his own limitations and those of the law. Nashe continues

A good fellowe hee was, and would haue drunke with thee for more *angels* than the Lord thou libeldst on *gaue thee in Christs Colledge*; and in yeare he pist as much against the walls, as thou and thy two brothers spent in three.⁶⁰³

This gives Greene a position higher than any of the Harveys, despite his less restrained behaviour, as well as suggesting he was a man that Nashe had experience of socialising with. Nashe also finds time to cast further aspersions at Harvey by noting that he had previously been supported by a Lord he later turned

⁶⁰² Nashe, *Strange Newes, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 287, lines 7-16

⁶⁰³ Nashe, *Strange Newes, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 287, lines 17-21

on. These would seem to be a reference to the Earl of Oxford who gave financial assistance to Harvey while he was at Cambridge; McKerrow simply writes 'i.e. Lord Oxford'⁶⁰⁴ in his notes to this passage; and as per Harvey's *Oxford DNB* entry

Harvey's support for the pro-Leicester camp was made evident in the *Three Letters* of 1580, the third of which contained a poem entitled 'Speculum Tuscanismi', which was taken (probably with some justice, although Harvey denied it) as a libel on Sidney's enemy Edward de Vere, earl of Oxford.⁶⁰⁵

Nashe provides a counterpoint that no matter how low Greene may appear to be, Harvey and his brethren are lower. Later in the same passage Nashe also stresses that Greene's literary output and ability was far in advance of not only the brothers but also of many other writers:

In a night & a day would he haue yarkt vp a Pamphlet as well as in seauen yeare, and glad was that Printer that might bee so blest to pay him deare for the very dregs of his wit.⁶⁰⁶

In these few lines Nashe firmly establishes Greene as a man who is by no means perfect but who many found to be entertaining whilst at the same time maintaining

⁶⁰⁴ McKerrow, Notes to *Strange Newes*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 4, p. 173

⁶⁰⁵ Jason Scott-Warren (2004-09-23), 'Harvey, Gabriel (1552/3–1631), scholar and writer', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press Retrieved 8 Jul. 2018, from <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-12517>

⁶⁰⁶ Nashe, *Strange Newes*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 287, lines 22-25

a high standard of work, to such a degree that he had printers waiting for him to produce something so they could publish it and make money. As Friedenreich notes

Nashe follows this splendid praise of the writing craft with a sympathetic portrait of Greene, his late contemporary and a literary professional without peer. What Harvey had considered despicable about Greene, Nashe extolls. Here readers perceive that Nashe's picture of Harvey darkens considerably.⁶⁰⁷

The rules of engagement are clear; if Harvey is against it Nashe is firmly for it and if Harvey supports something then Nashe will find fault with the same thing. In Greene's case this is unsurprising; their shared academic and literary history would make Nashe more likely to defend Greene against most detractors. And as has previously been established this ability to constantly produce high quality material would have appealed greatly to Nashe as he has shown he will overlook much greater 'failings' (for example in the case of both Marlowe and Aretino this would have included atheism) if the author produces the quality of material he admires. According to this passage Greene seems to be the ideal companion for Nashe and was someone whom Nashe could learn from; as Nicholl notes of their relationship Greene was not only an entertaining, witty and intelligent type who saw eye-to-eye with Nashe on the most of the important issues of the day but 'it was above all Greene's catch-penny commercial skills which Nashe learnt from him, his

⁶⁰⁷ Kenneth Friedenreich, 'Nashe's *Strange Newes* and the Case for Professional Writers', *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 71, No. 4 (Oct., 1974), pp. 451-472 this ref. p. 467

adaptability and nonchalance.⁶⁰⁸ What is clear is that Nashe reaching London and reconnecting with his fellow Cambridge alumnus developed his writing style and general confidence; the development of the Nashe who wrote the euphuistic *Anatomie* to the man who penned the more bombastic and aggressive anti-Harvey tracts is in no small part due to Greene's impact.

It would seem that given the weight of evidence gathered from *Preface to Menaphon* and the early part of *Strange News* as well as comments made by Nashe scholars over the past few years that the nature of the relationship between Greene and his younger colleague is easy to understand; the two men were very close and that Nashe held his older colleague in high esteem. It is my contention however that this is not fully accurate and that a closer examination of Nashe's treatment of Greene in his writing allows the reader to see a different picture; of Nashe showing some respect for Greene and his works but also showing a degree of reluctance in all his works to fulsomely praise the man who many have claimed had a huge impact on the fledgling writer. This can even be seen in the above passages where Nashe seems to be firmly defending Greene and his practises but a more detailed look reveals a different edge to his words. When Nashe notes that Greene involved John Harvey, for example, there is a hint of censure that he had to bring in the deceased brother to make his point and fit a Latin proverb; something as I have discussed in Chapter Four Nashe claimed that he himself would never do when discussing Anthony Chute. Nashe also makes reference when discussing

⁶⁰⁸ Nicholl, *A Cup of News*, this ref. p. 48

Greene's flaws that he 'hath beene in so many hote skirmishes'; almost certainly a reference to venereal disease and painting a vivid picture as to what kind of person Greene was. These examples show that Nashe rarely fully supported Greene; even when he was praising him he was qualifying this praise with implications that Greene's flaws could not be easily overlooked. Nashe wrote *Pierce Penilesse* in 1592 and at this point he was already beginning to distance himself from Greene; by the time *Strange Newes* was published it was clear that Nashe felt he had outgrown his former 'mentor' and indeed surpassed him in most ways. To support this position, I will look at the remaining Greene references that appear in Nashe's collected works once again initially focussing on *Strange Newes* (of the remaining references over half come from this pamphlet) whilst also examining *Have With You*, *Pierce Penilesse* and briefly re-engaging with *Anatomie*.

Having already examined several Greene references within *Strange Newes* there still remains a significant number which do not paint the author in a positive light. A small amount of these make reference to Greene's words in relation to one or both of the surviving Harvey brothers; in one instance Nashe writes

It was not for nothing, brother Richard, that *Greene* told you you kist
your parishioners wiues with holy kisses, for you that wil talk of
opening the senses by carnal mixture (the very act of lecherie) in a

Theological Treatise, and in the pulpit, I am afraide, in a priuater
place you will practise as much as you speake.⁶⁰⁹

This draws on Greene's suggestion that Richard may have abused his position within the church as a further excuse to throw more accusations at Gabriel's younger brother. However, the remaining references show a pattern beginning to emerge as to how Nashe utilises his older colleague; most of these show Nashe either simply acknowledging Greene's presence in the argument or, more significantly, actively distancing himself from the author of *Menaphon*. The first reference to consider is when Nashe notes that Greene, in criticising Richard Stanihurst's translation of Virgil, caused Harvey to attack him. As Nashe writes

*Greene for dispraising his practise in that kinde, is the Greene Maister
of the blacke Art, the Founder of vglie oathes, the father of
misbegotten Infortunatus, the Scriuener of Crossbiters, the Patriark of
Shifters, &c.*⁶¹⁰

Here he quotes Harvey's insults in full yet what follows is not a defence of Nashe's friend as one might expect; instead Nashe chooses to make a full-blooded attack on his rival:

Why, thou arrant butter whore, thou cotqueane & scrattop of
scoldes, wilt thou neuer leaue afflicting a dead carcasse, continually

⁶⁰⁹ Nashe, *Strange Newes, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 273, lines 14-15

⁶¹⁰ Nashe, *Strange Newes, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 299, lines 21-24

read the rhetorick lecture of Ramme-Allie? A wispe, a wispe, a
wispe, rippe, rippe, you kitchinstuffe wrangler.⁶¹¹

At no point is Greene mentioned again in relation to this point although he earlier makes it clear that he shares the same view point as his colleague earlier making reference to how 'Master *Stannyhurst* (though otherwise learned) trod a foule lumbring boystrous wallowing measure, in his translation of *Virgil*.'⁶¹² Even this throwaway line about Stanihurst being 'otherwise learned' is more praise than Greene gets at this time; for Nashe to not give the same minor consideration to his friend can be considered highly unusual. This has echoes with the passages in *Preface to Menaphon* where Greene is mentioned almost incidentally as a means for Nashe to sound forth on many other subjects; here Gabriel's attack on Greene is used as a way for him to justifiably attack his rival. Later in the work Nashe goes further by actually criticising Greene; something he rarely does with those he admires. He writes ostensibly in defence of Greene that

Of force I must graunt that *Greene* came oftner in print than men of
iudgement allowed off, but neuerthelesse he was a daintie slaue to
content the taile of a Terme, and stuff Seruing mens pockets...⁶¹³

Here Nashe sandwiches a compliment between a concession that Greene wrote too much and a comment that can be read as an insult. By saying Greene's work

⁶¹¹ Nashe, *Strange Newes, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 299, lines 31-35

⁶¹² Nashe, *Strange Newes, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 299, lines 17-19

⁶¹³ Nashe, *Strange Newes, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 329, lines 4-7

was popular with 'Serving' men Nashe is suggesting that it did not hold as high a value as that work being read by nobles and the court. It has been established that Nashe is a literary snob and this comment can definitely not be seen as praise, but is more of a subtle comment as to the quality of Greene's words. This is followed by the imagery of Greene's work being found 'stuffed in pockets' which again speaks to it being of low value; you would not treat something of consequence or merit in such a casual manner. Although Nashe is not overtly criticising Greene it needs to be remembered that this is a man who chooses his words very carefully and when he chooses to can wield a subtle pen as handily as he employs his more customary sledgehammer-like attacks. Nashe is using this imagery to show that although Greene is an accomplished writer, he does not garner the same levels of respect of those men like Sidney and Spenser that Nashe praises with no hesitation.

Almost immediately after this paragraph Nashe refers to Greene again, and once again this reference can be seen to be at best ambivalent towards the other author. Once again Nashe is responding to Harvey's criticism of Greene:

What *Greene* was, let some other answer for him as much as I haue done: I had no tuition ouer him; he might haue writ another *Galateo*⁶¹⁴ of manners, for his manners euerie time I came in his companie; I saw no such base shifting or abhominable villanie by

⁶¹⁴ *Il Galateo* by Giovanni Della Casa was published in 1558 and was recognised as the most significant guide to manners and social etiquette of the time. It would have been available to Nashe and his peers in both its original Italian and translated into English in 1576. As noted in Tomita this text was translated by Robert Peterson and printed by Henry Middleton for Ralph Newbery. For further information please see Tomita, *A Bibliographical Catalogue of Italian Books Printed in England 1558-1603*, p. 1576

him. Something there was which I haue heard, not seene, that hee
had not that regarde to his credite in, which had beene requisite he
should.⁶¹⁵

Considering the manner in which Nashe berates Harvey for mentioning Spenser's difficulties when he produced *Old Mother Hubbard* what Nashe does here can be seen to be worse. In response to vague accusations of misdoings in the past Nashe initially distances himself from Greene before noting that Greene behaved well in his presence. It is the last line of this paragraph though that is of most significance with Nashe hinting at a dubious incident in Greene's past but not explaining what this was. Very little has been said about this passage with only McKerrow venturing that the incident referred to here may be Greene selling *Orlando Furioso* to different companies:

There is, of course, the story of Greene's selling *Orlando Furioso* to the Queen's men, and reselling it, when they were in the country, to the Admiral's men...This, if true, might perhaps be called 'base shifting.'⁶¹⁶

Nicholl in comparison does not mention the *Strange Newes* passage but does refer to the above incident in a different light quoting the same part of *The Defence of Cony Catching* as McKerrow but writing

⁶¹⁵ Nashe, *Strange Newes, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 330, lines 7-14

⁶¹⁶ McKerrow, Notes to *Strange Newes, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 4, p. 194

This is kid-glove stuff – if anything it makes Greene sound rather attractive: the *louche*, easy going ‘scholler’. Nor would he much mind his own ‘conny-catching’ of the players being exposed (even if true)

...⁶¹⁷

In either interpretation Nashe is alluding to an incident in Greene’s past which he considers to be serious enough to both mention and use to lightly censure his colleague. That he does this in such a vague manner and without attempting to rationalise Greene’s actions is key; Nashe is essentially betraying his ‘friend’ when Greene has no way of defending himself with this being published after his death while leaving little opportunity for any surrogate to do so either. It is also unusual for Nashe to be so ambiguous as he has shown himself to be a man of absolutes; whether defending or attacking someone he does so with full vigour. For Nashe to be this indecisive suggests that although he is not willing to bury Greene, he’s equally as unwilling or unable to fulsomely praise him either.

As I shall discuss later in this chapter this is something that occurs regularly when Nashe mentions Greene’s name; his praise for his colleague tends to be double-edged. However, before I shall examine these references I wish to engage with *Pierce Penilesse* as it is in this work that Nashe does not merely hint toward a cooling of their friendship but attempts to actively place distance between the two men. *Pierce Penilesse*, published soon after Greene’s death in 1592, is one of

⁶¹⁷ Nicholl, *A Cup of News*, this ref. p. 126

Nashe's most well-known works and was not only the first work to carry his name since his 1589 debut *The Anatomie of Absurditie* but was his first real literary success. In the pamphlet Nashe denounces society and its ills using the seven deadly sins as the method of framing his criticism; a criticism he demands be transported straight to the ears of the devil. In this Nashe finds fault with all and sundry including politicians, drunks, the Spanish, the Dutch, and other authors. Despite all this, and as discussed on previous chapters, he manages to find space to commend the actor Edward Alleyn and Sir Philip Sidney. It is a work which is quintessentially Nashe and the character of Pierce Penniless was considered to be so close to that of Nashe that a number of his contemporaries, including Gabriel Harvey, referred to the author by that sobriquet. Its relevance to this chapter though is not found in the main body of the piece but in the letter that precedes the second edition of the work. In this comparatively brief letter, which is just over a hundred lines long, Nashe takes the opportunity to discuss the reception of the initial edition of *Pierce Penilesse* as well as addressing certain stories that surfaced since the pamphlet first appeared. It in this letter that Nashe focusses on the rumour that it was he who was responsible for writing the posthumously published *Greene's Groatsworth of Wit*. The identity of the author has been discussed by critics for a number of years with many critics presenting theories that Greene was not the author of this eponymous work due to the severity of his illness and the speed with which the work appeared after his death.⁶¹⁸ Nashe, given his

⁶¹⁸ John Jowett, for example, continues the work made by Warren B Austin the late 60s by giving the reasons why Henry Chettle is the likely author of this work noting how Austin's computer-aided study of the authorship

relationship with Greene, was immediately thought to be the ideal candidate to have written the piece with rumours gathering traction that he was the actual author of the *Groatsworth*. Nashe however uses this letter to address these rumours and does so in very strong terms:

Other news I am aduertised of, that a scald triuial lying pamphlet, cald *Greens groats-worth of wit*, is giuen out to be my doing. God neuer haue care of my soule, but vtterly renouce me, if the least word or sillable in it proceeded from my pen, or if I were any way priuie to the writing or printing of it.⁶¹⁹

At no point does Nashe suggest the work was not written by Greene or make any effort to excuse the other man; all he is concerned with at this point is to ensure that his name is not linked with this 'scald triuial lying pamphlet' which carries the name of his supposed friend. This action has a parallel with a passage in *Strange Newes* where Nashe also distances himself from Greene in response to a Harvey jibe that Nashe is '*Greene's inwardest companion*'.⁶²⁰ Nashe responds by saying

of the *Groatsworth* shows, conclusively in the author's view, that Chettle forged the pamphlet. Austin's study remains the main argument for Chettle being the author of this work being cited not only by Jowett but also numerous others. As Sawyer notes 'Until the later twentieth century, most critics simply assumed that Greene was the sole author of this important work. The chorus of dissenters, however, has grown more vocal, so much so that most scholars now fall into one of three camps: the first believe it was Greene's work in essence and purport, even if Chettle did edit it; the second camp, led by Warren B. Austin and then supported by John Jowett, think that Chettle is the sole author, and they detect only minor residual utterances from Greene's pen; others, such as David Bevington, take a position somewhere in between.' For further information about the authorship of *Groatsworth* I recommend reading John Jowett, 'Notes on Henry Chettle', *The Review of English Studies*, Vol. 45, No. 179 (Aug., 1994), pp. 384-388, W. B. Austin, *A Computer-Aided Technique for Stylistic Discrimination: The Authorship of 'Greene's Groatsworth of Wit'*, (Washington DC: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Office of Education. Bureau of Research 1969), Robert Sawyer, 'Rivalry, Rhetoric, and the *Groatsworth of Wit*', *South Atlantic Review*, Vol. 76, No. 2 (Spring 2011), pp. 47-64

⁶¹⁹ Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse His Supplication to the Divell, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 154 lines 10-15

⁶²⁰ Nashe, *Strange Newes, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 303, line 5

‘thou art farre wide of thy ayme; for neither was I *Greenes* companion any more than for a carowse or two’,⁶²¹ taking pains to leave the reader and Harvey in no doubt that Greene was not as key a figure in his life as previously thought. This is highly significant as up until this point Nashe has been reasonably ambivalent towards Greene with his praise being muted, even any criticism levelled toward the man having been reasonably restrained. Here Nashe claims that any substantial friendship that has been assumed up to this point has been overblown and that despite their shared history they were barely any more than occasional drinking companions. A similar theme becomes apparent when considering the references Nashe makes to Greene in *Have With You to Saffron-Walden*. Although he does not as obviously distance himself from the more experienced writer Nashe makes sure that the difference between the two of them is noted. Again, Nashe is writing in response to some of Harvey’s claims; in this instance Gabriel has accused Nashe of having a similar style to Greene. Unlike when Harvey makes this connection with Nashe and Spenser, Sidney *et al* in *Four Letters* where he offers to place Nashe alongside the great authors of the time if he withdraws from the argument, here he directly compares his rival to other authors writing ‘His gayest floorishes, are but Gascoignes weedes, or Tarletons trickes or *Greenes cranks*, or Marlowes brauados’⁶²² with Greene being just one of these. Later on in the same work Harvey continues ‘Nash, the ape of Greene, Greene the ape of Euphues [Lyly], Euphues the

⁶²¹ Nashe, *Strange Newes, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 303, lines 11-13

⁶²² Gabriel Harvey, *Pierces Supererogation Or A New Prayse of The Old Asse*, (London 1593), p. 141 <http://eebo.chadwyck.com>

ape of Enuie, the three famous mammals of the presse, and my three notorious feudists'⁶²³ adding a further Wit to the argument. Nashe initially responds using non-committal language:

What truly might be spoken of *Greene* I publisht, neither discommending him, nor too much flattering him (for I was nothing bound to him); ...How he [Harvey] hath handled *Greene* and *Marloe* since their deaths, those that read his Bookes may iudge:⁶²⁴

Once again he distances himself from Greene whilst also casting more aspersions at his greatest rival. The passage continues in stronger terms with Nashe responding to the accusation of 'aping' in a much more familiar fashion:

and where, like a iakes barreller and a Gorbolone, he girds me with *imitating of Greene*, let him vnderstand, I more scorne it than to haue so foule a iakes for my groaning stoole as hys mouth; & none that euer had but one eye, with a pearle in it, but could discern the difference twixt him and me; while he liu'd (as some Stationers can witnes with me) hee subscribing to me in any thing but plotting Plaies, wherein he was his crafts master.⁶²⁵

There are a number of things to discuss from this passage; from the first section Nashe is being very restrained with his praise for Greene in a way he doesn't do

⁶²³ Gabriel Harvey, *Pierces Supererogation Or A New Prayse of The Old Asse*, (London 1593), p. 141

⁶²⁴ Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron Walden, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 132, lines 7-9 & 13-15

⁶²⁵ Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron Walden, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 132, lines 15-23

with Spenser, Sidney or Aretino while actively making clear that although he has never attacked Greene, he has also never overly praised the man. This restraint soon disappears when he specifically deals with the claims that he and Greene are similar where he reacts extremely strongly and using aggressive and scatological language. This is on a par with the way he responds when Harvey tries to buy him off with false flattery as I have previously discussed in Chapter 5 but for what seems like different reasons. Nashe's anger at being placed next to Spenser comes from the idea this is unearned and is Harvey resorting to bribery; here there is a real sense of fury that he is now being compared to a man who Nashe believes is beneath him a writer. In the same breath he is also accusing Harvey of having no real eye for literature; that not only are Nashe and Greene dissimilar but any suggestion that they aren't is ridiculous. This is a section that Mentz briefly engages with:

In *Have with You*, he denies the charge of imitating Greene, but the denial focuses on Greene's cony-catching pamphlets and his prose style, not on his primary genre, romance.⁶²⁶

Although Nashe does mention cony-catching a little later it is my contention that Nashe is attempting to completely dissociate himself from Greene despite his literary pedigree and qualities. This passage does include the Nashe belief that Greene is the king of plays but this is written in a manner that suggests that writing

⁶²⁶ Steven R. Mentz, 'The Heroine as Courtesan: Dishonesty, Romance, and the Sense of an Ending in *The Unfortunate Traveler*', *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 98, No. 3 (Summer, 2001), pp. 339-358 this ref. P. 346

in this genre is the only thing that Greene does better than Nashe. There is no doubt that the younger author had some respect for his fellow wit but this was by no means absolute and that he felt that, with the exception of drama, by this stage in his career he had surpassed anything that Greene had achieved in his life. Nashe continues this passage with a further impassioned defence:

Did I euer write of Conycatching? stufft my stile with hearbs &
stones? or apprentisd my selfe to running of the letter? If not, how
then doo I imitate him? A hang-by of his (one *Valentine Bird*⁶²⁷, that
writ against *Greene*) imitated me and would embezill out of my *Piers*
Pennilesse six times at a clap, and vse them for his owne.⁶²⁸

This turns Harvey's accusation on its head; Nashe is not the imitator but is instead the victim of plagiarists who are known to be friendly with his rival. Throughout this passage Nashe is making it clear that Harvey's allegations are both untrue and baseless, and that as a superior writer in almost every way, he is more likely to be the one who is plagiarised rather than the one who commits this act. This reference also shows that Nashe sees writing styles as being something very personal and individual. When he notes 'none that euer had but one eye, with a pearle in it, but could discern the difference twixt him and me' he is not only denigrating Harvey for

⁶²⁷ Unfortunately, this is another Nashe reference that cannot be explained. McKerrow notes 'I know nothing of this person; he may, however, have been related to the Christopher Bird of Saffron Walden, whose letter introducing Harvey to Demetrius is given in the *Four Letters*, and who is frequently referred to by Harvey.' (McKerrow, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 4, pgs. 368-369) and I can find no other critics who have discussed this figure.

⁶²⁸ Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron Walden*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 132, lines 23-29

thinking that he and Greene are similar but is also emphasising that each writer has their own distinctive style. Nashe not only does not want to be mistaken for a lesser writer (in this instance it is Greene but it has also been figures like Lyly and Tarlton) but he also does not want to be given an unearned place next to those he admires and venerates; his violent reaction in *Strange Newes* to Harvey offering to elevate him to the same status as Spenser and Sidney bears testament to this. Nashe sees his identity very much tied into his writing and each piece of work is as personal and unique as a fingerprint; the idea that anyone can read his work and think this is Greene is as ludicrous as meeting one of them and thinking it is the other.

What also needs to be noted is that in *Four Letters* Harvey charges Nashe with copying numerous other writers but these are claims that Nashe in general does not feel the need to respond to. What can be seen from Nashe's responses to Harvey's allegations is that Nashe recognises them but does other than briefly acknowledging them does not feel the need to refute them in the same manner as he does with those that compare him to Greene. Harvey writes in his work

What hee is improued since, excepting his good olde *Flores Poetarum*, and Tarletons surmounting Rhetorique, with a little Euphuisme, and Greenesse inough, which were all prettily stale, before he put hand to penne⁶²⁹

Nashe amends slightly this to read

⁶²⁹ Gabriel Harvey, *Four Letters and Certaine Sonnets*, p. 34
360

*A perse a is improoued nothing since, excepting his old Flores Poetarum,
and Tarletons surmounting rethorique, with a little euphuisme and
Greenesse inough.*

Soon after Nashe comments further saying

Wherein haue I borrowed from *Greene* or *Tarlton*, that I should
thanke them for all I haue? Is my stile like *Greenes*, or my ieaſts like
Tarltons? Do I talke of any counterfeit birds, or hearbs, or stones, or
rake vp any new-found poetry from vnder the wals of *Troy*? If I do,
trip mee with it; but I doe not, therefore Ile be so saucy as trip you
with the grand lie. Ware stumbling of whetstones in the darke there,
my maisters.⁶³⁰

Nashe is making it clear he is different from both Greene and Tarlton whilst also potentially alluding to Marlowe with his reference to Troy. He points out the differences between the styles of all the mentioned authors and goes out of his way to show that he is calling the Harveys out at this point. The difference between this passage though and those that follow in his later work is that Nashe is not making any value judgements here; he is merely saying that he is different from the others and not claiming he is better. His focus is belittling the Harveys for making an uneducated comparison rather than scoring points against those he has been compared to. He continues the passage saying

⁶³⁰ Nashe, *Strange Newes, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, pp. 318-319, lines 34+

This I will proudly boast (yet am I nothing a kindred to the three brothers) that the vaine which I haue (be it a *median* vaine or a madde man) is of my owne begetting, and cals no man father in England but my selfe, neyther *Euphues*, nor *Tarlton*, nor *Greene*.⁶³¹

Again he denies the claims of similarity without commenting on the character of those he is being compared to. It seems that is only the comparisons to Greene alone that seem to rankle, with Nashe only concerned about correcting the other claims to ensure that the 'truth' is firmly established and ensuring the Harveys are suitably admonished; he does this without even hinting that he is a more accomplished writer than the others instead only doing so when it is solely Greene that he is compared to.

That Nashe believes himself to be superior to Greene can also be seen in the manner in which he sometimes refers to the other man's writing. In an amusing passage from *Have With You* three of the personas have a conversation about Greene's foibles which begins

Consiliadore: That word Aphorisms Greenes exequutors may claime from him; for while hee liu'd he had no goods nor chattels in commoner vse than it.

Importuno: Away, away, I cannot be perswaded he wold euer come forth with anie one of these balductum bastardly termes.

⁶³¹ Nashe, *Strange Newes, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 319, lines 8-12
362

Respondent: You cannot? then cannot I be perswaded that you cannot bee perswaded; since I haue as much reason not to credit your bare assertion, where you say you are perswaded it is not so, as you to distrust my deep vehement protestatios, wherein I would perswade you it is so: ⁶³²

This exchange about Greene's use of terms with *Importuno* seemingly unable to believe the evidence of his own eyes that a writer of Greene's standing would use words like these, as they are not intellectual, with *Consiliadore* and *Respondent* advising he does and the proof is clearly seen in his writing. Amongst the levity though there is another serious point; Nashe is once again subtly criticising Greene by noting he uses these 'bastardly' types of phrases. In isolation this would be a minor point but given the manner in which Greene is referred to both later in this work and in previous Nashe writings further supports the idea that the Nashe-Greene relationship is not as positive or straightforward to understand as has previously been believed. Another interesting point here is the word *Importuno* uses to describe the words Greene is alleged to have used; the OED gives the definition of 'Balductum' as 'A farrago of words; trash, balderdash' and notes its first usage as being in Harvey's *Pierces Supererogation*.⁶³³ Searching EEBO shows the word appears before Harvey's work being used by Spenser in his *Three Letters*, Fraunce in *The Lawiers Logike* and John Harvey in *A Discovrsive Probleme*,⁶³⁴ the

⁶³² Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron Walden, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 3, p. 44, lines 8-18

⁶³³ "bal'ductum | bal'ducta, n." *OED Online*. Oxford University Press, June 2018. Page accessed. 28 June 2018.

⁶³⁴ The word also appears one more time before its usage by Gabriel – in Adam Foulweather's anti-Marprelate tract *A wonderfull, strange, and miraculous astrologicall prognostication for this yeere 1591*. This is an obvious

first of these published in 1580 with the second two both published in 1588, five years before Harvey's work. Nashe most likely would have got this term from one of these works produced by members of 'The Harvey circle'; using it in a manner in which he is discussing Greene invites further comparisons between his friend and his enemy which Nashe normally only does if he is actively belittling Gabriel. That he is not doing so here suggests that something subtler is at work; utilising a Harvey word to describe an ally is unheard of and lends credence to the idea there was some separation between Greene and Nashe before the former's death.

As is clear from examining the various Greene references in Nashe's work the true nature of their relationship is quite difficult to establish. As Nicholl notes

After their close acquaintance at the time of *Menaphon* and Martinism, 1589, the pair seem to have drifted apart. Nashe says for that for a stretch of 'two yeares together', after 'I first knew him about town', they had scarcely seen one another 'any more than for a carowse or two'. During Greene's last months, however, they became closer again.⁶³⁵

It would appear though that the nature of their association is more complex than this and that, although Nicholl is accurate with his summation of their interactions

pseudonym with no real discussion as to the identity of the writer although this is briefly and tentatively attributed by Hopkins to Nashe in her book *Renaissance Drama on the Edge* (Abingdon: Ashgate, 2014), noting in her reference 'Adam Foulweather (Thomas Nash?)' p. 170. Although it is tempting to ascribe this work to Nashe there is no convincing evidence that this is the case but it is worth noting that this scarcely used word was utilised by members on both sides of the argument.

⁶³⁵ Nicholl, *A Cup of News*, this ref. p. 126

his conclusions are not. After Greene's death Nashe went to lengths to distance himself from his fellow anti-Martinist which, for Nashe, is unusual. As shown with his defence of Aretino and his lauding of both Marlowe and Sidney after their passing, death is no reason for Nashe to change his opinion of a fellow writer. It is also important at this stage to consider *Anatomie* as it is this early work that contains a passage which may have held the key to Nashe's future writings. Early in this work Nashe writes a passage that is a precursor to the kind of attacks he launches in *Preface* and beyond. Nashe begins this passage by writing

Such and the very same are they that obtrude themselues vnto vs, as
the Authors of eloquence and fountains of our finer phrases, when as
they sette before vs nought but a confused masse of wordes without
matter, a Chaos of sentences without any profitable sence,
resembling drummes, which beeing emptie within, sound big
without.⁶³⁶

This passage of some thirty plus lines continues in this vein and includes an attack on an unnamed author who writes of

Histories of antiquitie not halfe so much belyed, Minerals, stones,
and herbes should not haue such cogged natures and names ascribed
to them without cause...⁶³⁷

⁶³⁶ Nashe, *Anatomie of Absvrditie*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 10, lines 3-8

⁶³⁷ Nashe, *Anatomie of Absvrditie*, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 10, lines 19-21

As McKerrow notes this was historically believed to be an attack on Greene himself; Nashe uses the terms 'Minerals, stones and herbes' here and later in *Strange Newes* when arguing his style is different to Greene asks 'Do I talke of any counterfeit birds, or hearbs, or stones';⁶³⁸ although McKerrow does not reach a conclusion himself using his notes to this passage to offer the evidence both for and against Greene as being the subject here.⁶³⁹ Nicholl also briefly addresses this passage:

It is worth noting, incidentally, that a passage in Nashe's *Anatomie of Absurditie* reads very like a hit at Greene himself...Greene must surely have seen the *Anatomie* in manuscript, and seen himself, the great 'penner of Love Pamphlets, ragged in it. If Nashe regretted the passage, he did not withdraw it: he even uses the *Menaphon* preface to puff the forthcoming publication of the *Anatomie*. A bit of healthy satire was all in the game.⁶⁴⁰

This feels like an over-simplistic and charitable reading of the situation; there is no record of Greene having read *Anatomie* or even having seen this passage and it is impossible to gauge his reactions if he had done so. In any case if this is to be read as an attack on Greene it is Nashe's only overtly negative piece against him but does establish a pattern that he follows throughout his career in that Nashe only attacks by name those who have initially attacked him. As noted in previous

⁶³⁸ Nashe, *Strange Newes, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol. 1, p. 319, lines 2-3

⁶³⁹ McKerrow, *Notes to Anatomie of Absvrditie, The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Vol 4, pp. 7-10

⁶⁴⁰ Nicholl, *A Cup of News*, this ref. p. 53

chapters the Harveys, Barnes and Chute all get namechecked by Nashe in response to their aggressive entries into the argument, whereas the *Preface to Menaphon* contains a number of allusions to authors that Nashe did not agree with but none are individually or specifically called out. This passage hints that Greene's writing style was not one that Nashe overly admired as a student and would infer that the Nashe/Greene friendship did not begin with the same respect that Nashe had for not only Spenser and Sidney but the other Wits like Lyly and Marlowe. The true nature of this relationship is always going to remain unknown - however what can be established is that Nashe knew Greene as a fellow anti-Martinist with each of them having written at least one tract in the argument each, and possibly having co-authored others And that Nashe clearly considered Greene to have been a friend at some point, defending him to his detractors when it was necessary to do so. That Greene impacted on Nashe's writing style is also clear; if the gap between the Nashe who wrote *Anatomie* and *Preface* was significant the difference between the Nashe who wrote *Preface* and *Pierce Penilesse* is even more so; a stylistic improvement that can be put down to his growing exposure to and familiarity with London's literary scene of which Greene in the late 1580's was a significant part. Yet Nashe also presents Greene as a figure who was incredibly flawed with a number of character and personality traits that Nashe was uncomfortable with. Nashe's works suggest a growing remoteness on behalf of the younger man who believed he had outgrown his colleague; if Greene was in any way Nashe's mentor this was a situation that by Greene's passing in 1592 Nashe already felt he had surpassed and was keen to be regarded on his own

merits. Equally notable is that Nashe fails to pay the same respect to the familiar Greene as he does to those he has likely not met; men like the much-lauded Edmund Spenser, the noble Sir Philip Sidney who travelled in far more rarefied circle than Nashe or even that 'abominable atheist' Pietro Aretino, all of whom Nashe defends or excuses whenever needed. With Greene we see a man that Nashe was constantly reserved towards in print and may even have disliked his writing style prior to finishing his education. The true nature of the relationship will never be known; from Nashe's words it can be seen that this was one that shifted on numerous occasions and might have changed again if not for Greene's untimely and unfortunate death. It is this constantly changing opinion of Greene that gives us a greater understanding as to how Nashe was impacted upon by other authors and how he represented this impact in his own works. Nashe rapidly developed his own voice and style in his first few years in London, a development which is will have been aided by his exposure to Greene and his works. The decline and death of Greene though, also gives an opportunity to see how Nashe built upon these foundations and surpassed one of his most significant influences and see how Nashe's authorial voice continued to develop after Greene had passed.

Conclusion

In this thesis I have argued that Thomas Nashe was a product of both his education and his time. He was a man defined by contradictions in almost everything he said; he converted friends and patrons that he was clearly close to become enemies and rivals with alarming regularity. He was a man who wrote only one play under his own name and clearly gave little of no value to the genre and yet would often fall back in to this style of writing to make ends meet. As can be noted in his *Preface to Menaphon* he was fervently in favour of English writers over those from the continent (he spends large parts of *Pierce Penilesse* pointing out the flaws of the Dutch and the Spanish) yet when looking for inspiration who would happily drop references to Apuleius, Ovid and Lucian into his writing and praised Aretino above almost all else. The same Aretino whose religious viewpoint was as antithetical to Nashe as Harvey's and yet got treated markedly differently with Nashe making excuses for the Italian while taking every opportunity to criticise the doctor. Similarly, Marlowe's lifestyle did not concern Nashe in the slightest whereas Greene's behaviour was talked about with a feeling of implied disapproval. Nashe represented his favoured authors more sympathetically because in his eyes the quality of their output superseded their ideological or theological shortcomings and these flaws were not an impediment to enjoying and being motivated by their writing. I have shown how Nashe represented these figures within his own works and how their impact on him assisted him in developing his own unique authorial voice with elements of each man's writing being embodied within his own works.

In this thesis I have examined Nashe in a different way to those who have previously written about him. Unlike Nicholl I have not attempted to write a biography, although I have utilised some biographical details in order to provide some context as to how Nashe's life compared to those he read and represented. This thesis observes Nashe in a manner in which no previous study has done; I have examined how Nashe was impacted by figures previously ignored or given only the barest consideration. In doing so this thesis shows how Nashe's authorial voice developed and how his writing indicates his opinions on what an author should be and how they should act.

As I have noted elsewhere my initial intention was not to focus heavily on the Nashe and Harvey dynamic and yet a large proportion of this thesis does just that because this relationship coloured a large proportion of Nashe's works. Unlike the other authors in this study Nashe does not utilise Harvey in a positive manner; he does not use the doctor's words to elevate his own, or make passing references to him as a way to praise others. Harvey's name, with the exception of that brief mention in *Anatomie*, is akin to a swear word easily replaced by one of a series of ever more derogatory nicknames. The theory that Nashe merely prolonged the argument to gain more exposure is an interesting one but one that wilts under scrutiny. Nashe did not begin the argument and all of his anti-Harvey polemics were in response to Gabriel's subsequent retaliations. As soon as Harvey ceases his attacks Nashe also ends his, with even Lichfield's *Trimming of Thomas Nashe* eliciting no reactions from either party. Why Nashe did not respond to Lichfield is unknown when his normal instinct is to follow any attack by responding in what is

usually a non-proportional manner. Harvey is the obvious example but his allies are also lambasted with Barnes and Chute being taken to task in condescending fashion and Thorius only escaping because of his claim that his was misrepresented by Harvey and would never normally have taken the opposite side to Nashe. Nashe's responses to Mary Sidney were subtler; Sidney did not respond well to Nashe's kind words in his preface to her brother's sonnets which may have led to her estate's name being given to a character in *The Unfortunate Traveller* who was as far removed from the Sidney family as possible with Jack Wilton being a craven page as opposed to a noble knight. Yet the barber Lichfield earns no response possibly because his lack of literary pedigree did not in Nashe's view make him worthy of a response. Nashe's pen was only moved into action by those who deserved it and Lichfield was one who did not; Harvey for all his flaws was one who did.

For the same reason being a friend of Nashe was no guarantee you would be spared from his gaze and yet even here he showed little consistency with Marlowe, Lyly and Greene all being treated differently. With Marlowe Nashe is mainly complimentary declaring he is a diviner muse than Musaeus whilst taking his friend's version of the epic love poem *Hero and Leander* and adding his own Nashean satiric twist to it. With Lyly while Nashe acknowledged his debt to the older man there was little more engagement other than to comment on how different he was from the author of *Euphues*, a claim that couldn't have been made at the start of his career but was more and more obvious with each publication. Greene most definitely got the most significant share of Nashe's pen with the period of their relationship coinciding with the early part of Nashe's career and

resulting in a number of his works fulfilling the secondary purpose of chronicling the two men's friendship. That Greene had a significant impact on Nashe is unquestionable; the contention that the two remained close throughout the last few years of Greene's life is what I doubt. Nashe's reactions to Greene go beyond the way in which he reacted to Marlowe both before and after his death or to Lyly when noting how his style was different from that of the Oxford man. Once again, the differing responses mirror the level of impact each man had on Nashe; the older Lyly was an early inspiration to him but had less of an ongoing effect on him whereas Marlowe was closer to his age and may have been a collaborator on various works. As such they would have been considered to be on an equal footing and Nashe's words towards him can be viewed as those of one friend to another. Greene and Nashe seemed to fall into an unofficial mentor/apprentice relationship and this is indicated in Nashe's writing with the younger man making effort to show how he has surpassed his teacher.

At the beginning of this thesis I noted the various genres that Nashe was active in and how he was difficult to define, instead referring to him as a polygraph. Despite intense study the problems remain as Nashe shows himself time and again to be a writer comfortable in a number of fields. He is firstly an accomplished satirist able to present his satire in both prose and poetry; he wrote a novel often described as picaresque which details the travel through both Europe and key moments in history paying very little attention to fact preferring to have his characters turn up at major events whether this was possible or not. His pamphlets ranged in subject from the ills of modern day living and lack of respect for the past

to dreams and the devil with a number of other subjects encountered in between. Nashe's attacks on Harvey and his ability to frame an insult are renowned; his compliments towards members of Harvey's circle are less so with Spenser and Sidney being as praised as Harvey was derided. What becomes clear is that the more one studies Nashe the more difficult it becomes to define him; he is equally adept at mimicking classical authors as writing in his own voice. This ability comes directly from the authors who preceded him and who Nashe presents throughout his own works. Each of the figures I have presented in this study left a fingerprint on Nashe's work as he showed himself to be an author fully aware of who had come before him and how this impacted on his work. Poets, satirists, playwrights and prose authors all appear heavily in his work with Nashe in each case indicating the kind of influence they had on him. The final result leaves us with a small yet rich collection of writings which encompass all of the genres that Nashe encountered and given their own distinctive Nashean twist. Thomas Nashe remains a man of contradictions; while not everything can be explained by looking at his influences there is no doubt that these figures were significant in creating the Thomas Nashe we read today.

Works Cited

Primary Sources

Apuleius, L. *The XI Bookes of The Golden Asse*, translated by William Adlington, (London 1566)

Aretino, Pietro, *La Cortigiana*, translated by Samuel Putnam, Act 1, section 180, <http://www.elfinspell.com/PutnamAretinoCourtezan.html>

Greene, Robert, *Francesco's Fortunes or The second part of Greene's Neuer too late* (London, 1590)

Greene, Robert, *Greene's Groatsworth of Witte* (London: William Wright 1592)

Greene, Robert, *Menaphon; Camilla's Alarum to Slumbering Euphues* (London: W. Stansby, 1589)

Hakluyt, Richard, *The Principal Navigations, Voiages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English nation, 2nd Edition, 3 Volumes*, reprinted in 12 Volumes (Glasgow: James MacLehose, 1903)

Harvey, Gabriel, *Four Letters and Certain Sonnets*, Early English Books Online (London: John Wolfe, 1592)

Harvey, Gabriel, *Pierces Supererogation or a New Prayse of the Old Asse* (London: John Wolfe, 1593)

'Henry VIII: September 1542, 21-25', *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII, Volume 17: 1542* (1900), pp. 448-463

Horace, *Epistles II*, Loeb Classical Library (Harvard University Press)

Jonson, Ben, *The Works of Ben Jonson: Epigrammes* (London: Printed by W: Stansby, and are to be sould by Rich: Meighen, 1616)

Lichfield, Richard, *The trimming of Thomas Nashe Gentleman, by the high-titled patron Don Richardo de Medico campo, barber chirurgion to Trinitie Colledge in Cambridge* (London, 1597)

Lodge, Thomas, *Wits Miserie, and the Worlds Madness* (1596)

Lucian, *A True Story*, translated by Harmon, A.M. (1913), *Lucian*, Loeb Classical Library (1913)

Marlowe, Christopher, *The Works of Christopher Marlowe*, Edited by C.F. Tucker Brooke (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1910)

Nashe, Thomas, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, ed. R.B. McKerrow (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1966)

Nashe, Thomas, *The Unfortunate Traveller and Other Works*. ed. J.B. Steane (London: Penguin, 1972)

Spenser, Edmund, *Complaints Containing sundrie small poemes of the worlds vanitie. Whereof the next page maketh mention* (London, 1591)

Spenser, Edmund, *The Fairie Queen*, ed. Thomas P. Roche Jr. (London: Penguin, 1978)

Spenser, Edmund, *Prospopoia or Mother Hubberds Tale* (1590)

Secondary Sources

Alexander, Gavin, *Writing After Sidney* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006)

Allen, Don Cameron, 'The Anatomie of Absurditie: A Study in Literary

Apprenticeship', *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 32, No. 2 (1935), 170-176

Allen, Elizabeth, 'Burges, John (1563–1635)', *Oxford Dictionary of National*

Biography, Oxford University Press (2004)

Andersen, Jennifer Lotte, 'Anti-Puritanism, Anti-Popery, and Gallows Rhetoric in

Thomas Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller*', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol. 35,

No. 1 (2004), 43-63

Andersen, Jennifer Lotte, 'Blame-in-Praise Irony in *Lenten Stuffle*', *The Age of*

Thomas Nashe: Text, Bodies and Trespasses of Authorship in Early Modern England,

ed. by Stephen Guy-Bray, Joan Pong Linton and Steve Mentz (Farnham: Ashgate,

2013), 45-62

Austin, Warren B, *A Computer-Aided Technique for Stylistic Discrimination: The*

Authorship of Greene's Groatsworth of Wit (Washington DC: U.S. Department of

Health, Education, and Welfare. Office of Education. Bureau of Research, 1969)

Badcoe, Tamsin Theresa, '"As many Ciphers without an I": Self-Reflexive Violence in

the Work of Thomas Nashe', *Modern Philology*, Vol. 111, No. 3 (2014), 384-407

"bal'ductum | bal'ducta, n." (2018), *OED Online*. Oxford University Press

Barbour, Reid, *Peele, George* (bap. 1556, d. 1596) (2004),

[https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/o](https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-21768)

[dnb-9780198614128-e-21768](https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-21768) [Accessed 2 October 2017]

Barker, William, *Fraunce [France], Abraham (1559?–1592/3?), poet and lawyer*
(2010)

<https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-10133> [Accessed 18 July 2015]

Berek, Peter, 'Artifice and Realism in Lyly, Nashe, and *Love's Labor's Lost*', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, Vol. 23, No. 2, Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama (1983), 207-221

Berek, Peter, 'The "Upstart Crow," Aesop's Crow, and Shakespeare as a Reviser', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Vol. 35, No. 2 (1984), 205-207

Black, Joseph, *The Martin Marprelate Tracts: A Modernized and Annotated Edition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008)

Black, Joseph, '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*, Vol. 28, No. 3 (1997), 707-725

Born, Hanspeter, 'The Date of 2, 3 *Henry VI*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Vol. 25, No. 3 (1974), 323-334

Brink, Jean R, 'Materialist History of the Publication of Spenser's *Faerie Queene*', *The Review of English Studies*, New Series, Vol. 54, No. 213 (2003), 1-26

Brown, Georgia. (ed.), *Thomas Nashe* (Abingdon: Ashgate, 2011)

Burton, Dorothy Jean, 'The Compact with the Devil in the Middle-English: *Vision of Piers the Plowman*, B. II', *California Folklore Quarterly*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (1946), 179-184.

Carroll, D. Allen, 'The Badger in *Greenes Groats-Worth of Witte* and in Shakespeare', *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 84, No. 4 (1987), 471-482

Cheek, Pamela, Prostitutes of "Political Institution", *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, Vol. 28, No. 2 (1994-1995), 193-219

Cox, John D, *Barnes, Barnabe (bap. 1571, d. 1609), poet and playwright* (2004), <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-1467> [Accessed 26 Aug. 2019]

Craig, Hardin, 'Hamlet as a Man of Action', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 27, No. 3, Shakespeare (1964), 229-237

Crewe, Jonathan V., *Hidden Designs. The Critical Profession and Renaissance Literature* (New York: Methuen, 1986)

Crewe, Jonathan V., 'Thomas Nashe', *The Spenser Encyclopaedia*, ed. by A.C. Hamilton (London: Routledge, 1990)

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

Cummings, Robert M., *Spenser: The Critical Heritage* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1971)

Day, Matthew, 'Hakluyt, Harvey, Nashe: The Material Text and Early Modern Nationalism', *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 104, No. 3 (2007), 281-305

DePorte, Michael, 'Review of A Social History of the Fool by Sandra Billington', *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 83, No. 1 (1988), 135-136

Drew, Philip, 'Review of *Thomas Nashe. Selected Works*', *The Review of English Studies*, Vol. 16, No. 63 (1965), 334

Drew, Philip, 'Was Greene's "Young Juvenal" Nashe or Lodge?', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, Vol. 7, No. 1, The English Renaissance (1967), 55-66

Duhl, Olga Anna, *Pace, John (b. c. 1523, d. in or before 1592), scholar and court jester* (2004),

<https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-21064> [Accessed 26 Aug. 2019]

Duncan-Jones, Katherine, 'City Limits: Nashe's *'Choise of Valentines'* and Jonson's *'Famous Voyage'*, *The Review of English Studies*, New Series, Vol. 56, No. 224 (2005) 247-262

Duncan-Jones, Katherine, 'Much Ado with Red and White: The Earliest Readers of Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis* (1593)', *The Review of English Studies*, Vol. 44, No. 176 (1993), 479-501

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

Duncan-Jones, Katherine, 'Shakespeare, The Motley Player', *The Review of English Studies*, New Series, Vol. 60, No. 247 (2009), 723-743

Duncan-Jones, Katherine, *Shakespeare: Upstart Crow to Sweet Swan: 1592-1623* (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2011)

Dutton, Richard, 'Volpone and Beast Fable: Early Modern Analogic Reading', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 67, No. 3 (2004) pp. 347-370

El-Gabalawy, Saad, Aretino's Pornography and Renaissance Satire, *Rocky Mountain Review of Language and Literature*, Vol. 30, No. 2 (1976), 87-99

Erne, Lukas, 'Biography, Mythography, and Criticism: The Life and Works of Christopher Marlowe', *Modern Philology*, Vol. 103, No. 1 (2005), 28-50

Ferguson, John, 'Apuleius', *Greece & Rome*, Vol. 8, No. 1 (1961), 61-74

Fleay, Frederick Gard, *A Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama, 1559-1642*

(London: Reeves and Turner, 1891)

Fleck, Andrew, 'Anatomizing the Body Politic: The Nation and the Renaissance Body in Thomas Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller*', *Modern Philology*, Vol. 104, No. 3 (2007), 295-328

Folkerth, Wes, 'Pietro Aretino, Thomas Nashe and Early Modern Rhetorics of Public Address', *Making Publics in early modern Europe: people, things forms of knowledge* ed. by B. Wilson, and P. Yachnin (New York: Routledge, 2010), 68-78

Forsyth, V.L., 'The Two Arcadias of Sidney's *Two Arcadias*', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, Vol. 49, No. 1, *The English Renaissance* (2009), 1-15

Frantz, David O., '"Leud Priapians" and Renaissance Pornography', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, Vol. 12, No. 1, *The English Renaissance* (1972), 157-172

Friedenreich, Kenneth, 'Nashe's *Strange Newes* and the Case for Professional Writers', *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 71, No. 4 (1974), 451-472

Gadd, I., *Wolfe, John (b. in or before 1548?, d. 1601), bookseller and printer* (2008), <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-29834>. [Accessed 26 Aug. 2019]

Gaiser, Julia Haig, 'Teaching Classics in the Renaissance: Two Case Histories', *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974-2014)*, Vol. 131 (2001), 1-21

Gohlke, Madelon S., 'Wits Wantonness: *The Unfortunate Traveller* as Picaresque', *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 73, No. 4 (1976), 397-413

- Griffin, Benjamin, 'Marring and Mending: Treacherous Likeness in Two Renaissance Controversies', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 60, No. 4 (1997), 363-380
- Griffin, Benjamin, 'Nashe's Dedicatees: William Beeston and Richard Lichfield', *Notes and Queries*, Volume 44, Issue 1 (1997), 47–49
- Grosart, Alexander Balloch, *The Complete Works of Thomas Nashe*, ed. with intr. notes etc. by A. B. Grosart (1883)
- Groves, Beatrice, 'Laughter in the Time of Plague: A Context for the Unstable Style of Nashe's *Christ's Tears over Jerusalem*', *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 108, No. 2 (2011), 238-260
- Guy-Bray, Stephen, Linton, Joan Pong, and Mentz, Steve (eds), *The Age of Thomas Nashe: Text, Bodies and Trespasses of Authorship in Early Modern England* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013)
- Hadfield, Andrew, *Edmund Spenser: A Life*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012)
- Hadfield, Andrew, 'Lenten Stuffle: Thomas Nashe and the fiction of travel', *The Yearbook of English Studies*, Vol. 41, No. 1, Travel and Prose Fiction in Early Modern England (2011), 68-83
- Hadfield, A, *Spenser, Edmund (1552?–1599), poet and administrator in Ireland* (2008), <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-26145> [Accessed 26 Aug. 2019]
- Hadfield, Andrew, 'Spenser's Rosalind', *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 104, No. 4 (2009), 935-946
- Hadfield, Andrew, *The Cambridge Companion to Spenser*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001)

- Halpern, Richard, 'Marlowe's Theater of Night: *Doctor Faustus* and Capital', *ELH*, Vol. 71, No. 2 (2004), 455-495
- Hamer, Douglas, 'Spenser's Marriage', *The Review of English Studies*, Vol. 7, No. 27 (1931), 271-290
- Hannay, M, *Herbert [née Sidney], Mary, countess of Pembroke (1561–1621), writer and literary patron* (2008),
<https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-13040>. [Accessed 26 Aug. 2019]
- Harder, Kelsie, 'Nashe's Rebuke of Spenser', *Notes and Queries*, CXCVIII (1953), 145-146
- Harlow, C. G., 'A Source for Nashe's *Terrors of the Night*, and the Authorship of *Henry VI*', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, Vol. 5, No. 1, The English Renaissance (1965), 31-47
- Harlow, C.G., 'The Authorship of *1 Henry VI* (Continued)', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, Vol. 5, No. 2, Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama (1965), 269-281
- Herron, Thomas, 'Reforming the Fox: Spenser's *Mother Hubberds Tale*, the Beast Fables of Barnabe Riche, and Adam Loftus, Archbishop of Dublin', *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 105, No. 3 (2008), 336-387
- Hibbard, G.R., *Thomas Nashe: A Critical Introduction*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962)

- Hile, Rachel E., '*Hamlet's debt to Spenser's Mother Hubberds Tale: A satire on Robert Cecil*', *Shakespeare and Spenser: Attractive Opposites*, Ed. J.B. Lethbridge (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008)
- Hile, Rachel E., 'Indirect satire: theory and Spenserian practice', *Spenserian Satire: A Tradition of Indirection* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017)
- Hilliard, Stephen S., *The Singularity of Thomas Nashe* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1986)
- Honan, Park, *Christopher Marlowe: Poet and Spy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005)
- Hopkins, Lisa, *A Christopher Marlowe chronology* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005)
- Hopkins, Lisa, *Renaissance Drama on the Edge* (Abingdon: Ashgate, 2014)
- Hunt, Maurice, 'The Politics of Vision in Shakespeare's *1 Henry VI*', *South Central Review*, Vol. 19, No. 1 (2002), 76-101
- Hunink, Vincent, '"Apuleius, Qui Nobis Afris Afer Est Notoir"; Augustine's polemic against Apuleius in *De Civitate Dei*', *Scholia. Studies in Classical Antiquity*, N.S. 12 (2003), 82-95
- Hutson, Lorna, *Thomas Nashe: In Context* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989)
- Hutton, Edward, *Pietro Aretino, The Scourge of Princes* (London: Constable & Co, 1922)
- Hyman, Wendy, 'Authorial Self-Consciousness in Nashe's *The Vnfortunate Traveller*', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, Vol. 45, No. 1, The English Renaissance (2005), 23-41

- Jacobs, Fredrika H., 'Aretino and Michelangelo, Dolce and Titian: Femmina, Masculo, Grazia' *The Art Bulletin*, Vol. 82, No. 1 (2000), 51-67
- Jack, Albert E., 'Thomas Kyd and the Ur-Hamlet', *PMLA*, Vol. 20, No. 4 (1905), 729-748
- Jardine, Lisa and Grafton, Anthony, "'Studied for action": How Gabriel Harvey Read His Livy', *Past and Present*, Vol.129(1) (1990), 30-78
- Jones, Ann Rosalind, 'Inside the Outsider: Nashe's *Unfortunate Traveller* and Bakhtin's Polyphonic Novel', *ELH*, Vol. 50, No. 1 (1983), 61-81
- Jones, H., *Thorius [Thorie], John (b. 1568), writer and translator* (2004), <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-27335>. [Accessed 26 Aug. 2019]
- Jowett, John, 'Notes on Henry Chettle', *The Review of English Studies*, Vol. 45, No. 179 (1994), 384-388
- Judson, A. C., 'Mother Hubbard's Ape', *Modern Language Notes*, Vol. 63, No. 3 (1948), 145-149
- Keener, Andrew S., 'Robert Tofte's *Of Mariage and Wiuing* and the Bishops' Ban of 1599', *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 110, No. 3 (2013), 506-532
- Kettnich, Karen, 'Nashe's Extemporal Vein and his Tarltonizing Wit', *The Age of Thomas Nashe: Text, Bodies and Trespasses of Authorship in Early Modern England*, ed. by Stephen Guy-Bray, Joan Pong Linton and Steve Mentz (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013), 99-114
- Knapp, Jeffrey., 'Spenser the Priest', *Representations*, Vol. 81, No. 1 (2003), 61-78

- Kocher, Paul H., 'Some Nashe Marginalia concerning Marlowe', *Modern Language Notes*, Vol. 57, No. 1 (1942), 45-49
- Kocher, Paul H., 'The Early Date For Marlowe's *Faustus*', *Modern Language Notes*, Vol. 58, No. 7 (1943), 539-542.
- Kocher, Paul H., 'The English Faust Book and the Date of Marlowe's *Faustus*' *Modern Language Notes*, 55(2) (1940), 95-101
- Koslow, Julian, 'Humanist Schooling and Ben Jonson's *Poetaster*', *ELH*, Vol. 73, No. 1 (2006), 119-159
- Kott, Jan, 'Lucian in *Cymbeline*', *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 67, No. 4 (Oct, 1972), 742-744
- Kraeling, Emil G., 'Xisouthros, Deucalion and the Flood Traditions', *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 67, No. 3 (1947), 177-183
- Kumaran, Arul, 'Robert Greene's Martinist Transformation in 1590', *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 103, No. 3 (2006), 243-263
- Larsen, T., 'The Canon of Peele's Works', *Modern Philology*, Vol. 26, No. 2(1928), 191-199
- Latham, A.M.C., 'Satire on Literary Themes and Modes in Nashe's *Unfortunate Traveller*', *English Studies*, n.s. 1 (1948), 85-100
- Lee, Sidney and Steggle, Matthew, *Chute [Chewt], Anthony (d. 1594/5), poet*, <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-5411>. [Accessed 26 Aug. 2019]

- Levine, Jay Arnold, 'The Dissolution: Donne's Twofold Elegy', *ELH*, Vol. 28, No. 4 (1962), 301-315
- Lewis, Clive Staples, *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century Excluding Drama* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954)
- Lippincott, H.F., 'King Lear and the Fools of Robert Armin', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Vol. 26, No. 3 (1975), 243-253
- Lothian, John M., 'Shakespeare's Knowledge of Aretino's Plays', *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 25, No. 4 (1930), 415-424
- Mackenzie, Elizabeth, 'What About Petrarch?', *The Review of English Studies*, New Series, Vol. 34, No. 136 (1983), 458-463
- Maslen, Robert W., 'Magical Journeys in Sixteenth-Century Prose Fiction', *The Yearbook of English Studies*, Vol. 41, No. 1, Travel and Prose Fiction in Early Modern England (2011), 35-50
- May, Steven W., 'Marlowe, Spenser, Sidney and—Abraham Fraunce?', *The Review of English Studies*, New Series, Vol. 62, No. 253 (2011), 30-63
- May, Steven, 'Spenser's "Amyntas": Three Poems By Ferdinando Stanley, Lord Strange, Fifth Earl Of Derby', *Modern Philology*, Vol. 70, No. 1 (1972), 49-52
- McCabe, Richard A., 'Elizabethan Satire and the Bishops' Ban of 1599', *The Yearbook of English Studies*, Vol. 11, Literature and Its Audience, II Special Number (1982) 188-193
- McGinn, Donald J., 'Nashe's Share in the Marprelate Controversy', *PMLA*, Vol. 59, No. 4 (1982), 952-984
- McGinn, Donald J., *Thomas Nashe* (Boston: G.K. Hall, 1981)

McMillin, Scott, MacLean, Sally-Beth, *The Queen's Men and Their Plays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998)

McMillin, Scott, 'Simon Jewell and the Queen's Men', *The Review of English Studies*, New Series, Vol. 27, No. 106 (1976), 174- 177

McNeal, Thomas H., 'The literary origins of Robert Greene', *The Shakespeare Association Bulletin*, Vol. 14, No. 3 (1939), 176-181

McPherson, David C., 'Aretino and the Harvey-Nashe Quarrel', *PMLA*, Vol. 84, No. 6 (1969), 1551-1558

Mentz, Steve, 'The Heroine as Courtesan: Dishonesty, Romance, and the Sense of an Ending in *The Unfortunate Traveler*', *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 98, No. 3 (2001), 339-358

Miller, Paul Allen, 'Sidney, Petrarch, and Ovid, or Imitation as Subversion' *ELH*, Vol. 58, No. 3 (1991), 499-522

Morris, Harry, 'Richard Barnfield, "Amyntas," and the Sidney Circle', *PMLA*, Vol. 74, No. 4 (1959), 318-324

Moss, Daniel, "'The Second Master of Love": George Chapman and the Shadow of Ovid', *Modern Philology*, Vol. 111, No. 3 (2014), 457-484

Murphy, James Jerome, 'One Thousand Neglected Authors: The Scope and Importance of Renaissance Rhetoric', *Renaissance Eloquence: Studies in the Theory and Practice of Renaissance Rhetoric* (Berkeley and London: University of California Press 1983)

Newcomb, L.H., *Greene, Robert (bap. 1558, d. 1592), writer and playwright* (2004),
<https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-11418>. [Accessed 26 Aug. 2019]

Nicholl, Charles, *A Cup of News: The Life of Thomas Nashe* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984)

Nicholl, Charles, *Marlowe [Marley], Christopher (bap. 1564, d. 1593), playwright and poet* (2008),
<https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-18079>. [Accessed 26 Aug. 2019]

Nicholl, Charles, *Nashe [Nash], Thomas (bap. 1567, d. c. 1601), writer* (2008),
<https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-19790> [Accessed 26 Aug. 2019]

Nicholl, Charles, *The Reckoning: The Murder of Christopher Marlowe* (London: Pan Books, 1993)

Ogden, Daniel, 'Euclates and Demainete: Lucian, *Philopseudes* 27-8', *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 54, No. 2 (2004), 484-493

Oliphant, E. H. C., Problems of Authorship in Elizabethan Dramatic Literature, *Modern Philology*, Vol. 8, No. 3 (1911), 411-459.

Ossa-Richardson, Anthony, 'Ovid and the 'free play with signs' in Thomas Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller*', *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 101, No. 4 (2006), 945-956

Østerberg, V., "Nashe's 'Kid in Æsop': A Danish Interpretation", *The Review of English Studies*, Vol. 18, No. 72 (1942), 385-394

Smuts, R. Malcolm (Ed.), *Oxford Handbook of the Age of Shakespeare, The* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016)

Padelford, F. M., 'Spenser and the Puritan Propaganda', *Modern Philology*, Vol. 11, No. 1 (1913), 85-106

Payne, Anthony, *Hakluyt, Richard (1552?–1616) geographer* (2006),
<https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-11892>. [Accessed 26 Aug. 2019]

Pomeroy, Ralph S., 'The Ramist as Fallacy-Hunter: Abraham Fraunce and the Lawiers Logike', *Renaissance Quarterly*, Vol. 40, No. 2 (1987), 224-246

Poole, Kristen, "Saints Alive! Falstaff, Martin Marprelate, and the Staging of Puritanism", *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Vol. 46, No. 1 (1995), 47-75.

Prewitt, Kendrick W., 'Gabriel Harvey and the Practice of Method', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, Vol. 39, No. 1, The English Renaissance (1999), 19-39

Rasmussen, Eric, De Jong, Ian, *Shakespeare's Fools* (2017),
<https://www.bl.uk/shakespeare/articles/shakespeares-fools> [Accessed 04 June 2017]

Reichling, Gerard Alston, 'A Demotic Folk-Tale the Basis of Goethe's *Der Zauberlehrling*', *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 39 (1919), 295-298

Ribner, Irving, 'Marlowe and Shakespeare', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Vol. 15, No. 2, (1964), 41-53

Richards, Jennifer, 'Gabriel Harvey, James VI, and the Politics of Reading Early Modern Poetry', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 71, No. 2 (2008), 303-321

Sawyer, R., 'Rivalry, Rhetoric, and the *Groatsworth of Wit*', *South Atlantic Review*, Vol. 76, No. 2 (2011), 47-64

Romm, James & H. J. Larmour, David & Georgiadou, Aristoula, *Lucian's Science Fiction Novel True Histories: Interpretation and Commentary, The Classical World* (Leiden: Brill, 1999)

Scott-Warren, Jason, *Harvey, Gabriel (1552/3–1631), scholar and writer* (2016), <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-12517>. [Accessed 26 Aug. 2019]

Scoufos, Alice Lyle, 'Nashe, Jonson, and the Oldcastle Problem', *Modern Philology* Vol. 65, No. 4 (1968), 307-324

Shumate, Nancy J., 'The Augustinian Pursuit of False Values as a Conversion Motif in Apuleius' "*Metamorphoses*"', *Phoenix*, Vol. 42, No. 1 (1988), 35-60

Simons, Louise, 'Rerouting *The Unfortunate Traveller*: Strategies for Coherence and Direction', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, Vol. 28, No. 1, The English Renaissance (1988), 17-38

Stallybrass, Peter, Chartier, Roger, Mowery, J. Franklin, and Wolfe, Heather, 'Hamlet's Tables and the Technologies of Writing in Renaissance England', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Vol. 55, No. 4 (2004), 379-419

Stern, Virginia F., 'The Bibliotheca of Gabriel Harvey', *Renaissance Quarterly*, Vol. 25, No. 1 (1972), 1-62

Steggle, Matthew, *Digital Humanities and the Lost Drama of Early Modern England: Ten Case Studies* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2016)

- Steggle, Matthew, 'Gabriel Harvey, the Sidney circle, and the Excellent Gentlewoman', *Sidney Circle Journal* 22: 1-2 (2004), 115-129
- Steggle, Matthew, 'The Names of Gabriel Harvey: Cabbalistic, Russian and Fencing Sources', *Notes and Queries*, 52 (2) (2005), 185-186
- Steggle, Matthew and Cheta, Arun, 'Thomas Nashe reads *The Nosegay of Morall Philosophie*', *Notes and Queries*, Volume 61, Issue 2 (2014), 221–223
- Stevenson, Ruth, 'The Comic Core of Both A- and B-Editions of *Doctor Faustus*', *Studies in English Literature, 1500 - 1900*, 53(2) (2013), 401-419
- Stewart, Alan, *Sidney: A Double Life* (London: Random House, 2011)
- Stillman, Robert E., *Philip Sidney and the Poetics of Renaissance Cosmopolitanism* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009)
- Taylor, Anthony Brian, 'Two Notes on Shakespeare and the Translators', *The Review of English Studies*, New Series, Vol. 38, No. 152 (1987), 523- 526
- Taylor, Gary, "Shakespeare and Others: The Authorship of *Henry the Sixth, Part One, Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* (1995), 145-205
- Thorslev, Peter, *The Byronic Hero: Types and Prototypes* (University of Minnesota Press, 1962)
- Tolman, Albert H., 'The Relation of Spenser and Harvey to Puritanism', *Modern Philology*, Vol. 15, No. 9 ((1918), 549-564
- Tomita, Soko, *A Bibliographical Catalogue of Italian Books Printed in England 1558-1603* (Farnham, Ashgate, 2009)
- Turner, Henry S., 'Nashe's Red Herring: Epistemologies of the Commodity in *Lenten Stuffe* (1599)', *ELH*, Vol. 68, No. 3 (2001), 529-561

- van Es, Bart, "'Johannes fac Totum'?: Shakespeare's First Contact with the Acting Companies', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Vol. 61, No. 4 (2010), 551-577
- Vickers, Brian, 'Incomplete Shakespeare: Or, Denying Co-authorship in *1 Henry VI*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Vol. 58, No. 3, Special Issue: The Complete Shakespeare (2007), 311-352
- Waddington, Raymond B., 'A Satirist's Impresa: The Medals of Pietro Aretino', *Renaissance Quarterly*, Vol. 42, No. 4 (1989), 655-681
- Walen, Denise A., 'Constructions of Female Homoerotics in Early Modern Drama', *Theatre Journal*, Vol. 54, No. 3 (2002), 411-430
- Walsh, Brian, "'Unkind Division": The Double Absence of Performing History in *1 Henry VI*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Vol. 55, No. 2 (2004), 119-147
- Ward, Allyna E., 'An Outlandish Travel Chronicle: Farce, History, and Fiction in Thomas Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller*', *The Yearbook of English Studies*, Vol. 41, No. 1, Travel and Prose Fiction in Early Modern England (2011), 84-98
- Warkentin, Germaine, 'Patrons and Profiteers: Thomas Newman and the 'Violent Enlargement' of *Astrophil and Stella*', *Book-Collector* 34, 4 (1985), 461-87
- Wells, Stanley, *Thomas Nashe. Selected Works* (originally published by Edward Arnold Publishers, revised edition published Abingdon: Routledge, 1964)
- Wiggins, Martin, 'When Did Marlowe Write "*Dido, Queen of Carthage*"?', *The Review of English Studies*, New Series, Vol. 59, No. 241 (2008), 521- 541
- Williams, Deanne, 'Dido, Queen of England', *ELH*, Vol. 73, No. 1 (2006), 31-59

Zurcher, Andrew, 'Getting It Back To Front In 1590: Spenser's Dedications, Nashe's Insinuations, And Raleigh's Equivocations', *Studies In The Literary Imagination*; 38, 2 (2005), 173-198