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Abstract

This dissertation is an investigation of five pamphlets relating to Robert Greene and published within six months of his death in 1592. Proposing that this is a defining textual moment because of the way these pamphlets changed the nature of the satiric pamphlet through their problematic relationship with patronage and the marketplace of print, this study considers each pamphlet, in a separate chapter, as an argument in an ongoing dialectic. The first chapter sets the pamphlet culture within the context of patronage and subversion, and argues that it is in the subversive tradition of the Marprelate tracts that Greene, spurning patronage, cast himself as a popular pamphleteer. Chapter two studies Groatsworth of Wit as Greene’s self-conscious fictionalization of the typical pamphleteer’s tragic divorce from humanism and his slow deterioration in the marketplace of print. The third chapter deals with Harvey’s strategies of self-presentation, in Foure Letters and Certaine Sonnets, as both an ideal orator and an exemplary pamphleteer, as opposed to Greene, whom he sees as immoral. The fourth chapter explores the significance, in Chettle’s Kind Hartes Dreame, of the satires against official voices that sought to curb wide dissemination of knowledge through print and other media, and argues that the satire in the pamphlet is inspired by the death of Greene. The fifth chapter shows how Nashe fashions his own satirical voice in Strange Newes by openly aligning himself with Greene and refuting Harvey’s insinuations of subversion in Foure Letters. The sixth chapter, on B.R.’s Greenes Newes, argues that Riche’s evocation of Greene testifies to the potency of Greene’s influence and contextualizes
Riche's own pamphlet within the satiric tradition of the Elizabethan pamphlet. The study concludes with a look at the 1599 Bishops' ban on pamphlets as a natural consequence of the new definitions forged for the satirical pamphlet in 1592. It ends with the claim that, positioned as it is between the Marprelate controversy of the late 1580s and the 1599 ban, the textual moment of 1592 redefined the contours of the satiric pamphlet and helped shape the course of English prose satire.
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Introduction

The Elizabethan pamphlet has evoked wide-ranging scholarly interest in the past twenty years, especially for its struggle for identity, its oppositional vigor, its participation in the early modern print culture, and its crucial status in the marketplace of print.1 These studies, growing out of the new historicist and cultural materialist criticism of the 1980s and 1990s, have reconstructed the historical, political, cultural, and economic contexts within which pamphlets were produced and read, politicized the pamphlet’s subversive tendencies against political, religious, and rhetorical authorities, and theorized its materiality and status as a commodity, something manufactured, traded, and consumed in

---

1. Literature in this field is vast and can only be sampled here. For general studies on print culture, the best place to start is Elizabeth Eisenstein’s *The Printing Press As an Agent of Change: Communications and Cultural Transformation in Early Modern Europe*. Other important general studies include Cyprian Blagden’s *The Stationers’ Company: A History, 1403-1959*, Evelyn Tribble’s *Margins and Marginality: The Printed Page in Early Modern England*, Gerald Tyson’s *Print and Culture in the Renaissance*, David Carlson’s *English Humanist Books: Writers, Patrons, Manuscripts and Print, 1475-1525*, Lucien Febvre and Henri-Jean Martin’s *The Coming of the Book: The Impact of Printing, 1450-1800*, and Marshall McLuhan’s *The Gutenberg Galaxy*. Of works that deal with print and readership, Margaret Spufford’s *Small Books and Pleasant Histories: Popular Fiction and its Readership in Seventeenth-Century England* is an interesting early (pre-new historicist) example, and Peter Burke’s *Popular Culture of Europe* is a valuable contribution. Of works dealing directly with the various aspects of the collaboration between print and pamphlet, Sandra Clark’s *The Elizabethan Pamphleteers* is perhaps the most important; many other studies have also treated print’s impact on pamphlets of various kinds, for instance, Barry Taylor’s *Vagrant Writing: Social and Semiotic Disorders in the English Renaissance*, Tessa Watt’s *Cheap Print and Popular Piety, 1530-1640*, and Natasha Wurzbach’s *The Rise of the English Street Ballad*. Sharon Achinstein’s “Audiences and Authors: Ballads and the Making of English Renaissance Literary Culture” and “Plagues and Publication: Ballads and the Representation of Disease in the English Renaissance” are just two examples of a kind of scholarship that contextualizes pamphlets’ central importance in any cultural study of early modern England. Questions of authority are discussed by Lyman Ray Patterson (*Copyright in Historical Perspective*), C.J. Sisson (“The Laws of Elizabethan Copyright: The Stationers’ View”), and Joseph Loewenstein (“The Script in the Marketplace” and “For a History of Literary Property”). Alexandra Halasz’s *The Marketplace of Print* is a more substantial treatment of the same subjects. On state censorship of printed material, see Cyndia Susan Clegg’s *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England* and Annabel Patterson’s *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England*. Lorna Hutson’s study, *Thomas Nashe in Context*, is an exemplary instance of an altogether rare kind of study: a look at the material contexts of pamphlets written by a single author. On printers and their impact on the production of literature, I found Clifford Chalmers Huffman’s *Elizabethan Impressions: John Wolfe and His Press* an outstanding example.
the newly formed marketplace of print. My study, participating in this critical discourse on pamphlets, is an investigation of a textual moment that captures the satiric pamphlet in an interesting and problematic relationship with declining patronage on the one hand and, on the other, a marketplace of print seen by writers as both an alternative source of livelihood and a disreputable, and subversive, medium through which patrons could be satirized.

This moment is the death of Robert Greene. Around August 5, 1592, Robert Greene and Thomas Nashe sat down in an inn for a dinner of pickled herrings and Rheinish wine, probably, as Gabriel Harvey suggests, surfeiting on it. As a self-confessed bohemian, Greene was entirely capable of surfeiting on anything, but this particular dinner proved his last good meal. Sometime after this dinner, Greene took seriously ill and soon died, on 3 September 1592. From Cuthbert Burby, a printer who published one of Greene’s posthumous pamphlets, we learn that Greene had been sick for about a “moneths space” with “a surfet which hee had taken with drinking.” He had been “continually scowred” with purgatives, “yet still his belly sweld and never left swelling upward, untill it sweld him at the hart and in his face” (12:184-5). Harvey describes the deathbed scene, as reported by Greene’s landlady, with some relish and foxy insinuation in his Foure Letters:

...his hostisse [sam, with teares in her eies, & sighes from a deeper fountaine, (for she loved him derely) tould me of his lamentable begging of a penny-pott of

---

2 From Alexander Grosart’s multi-volume edition of Greene’s complete works. Page numbers are given in parentheses. The volumes in which particular works appear have been given in the bibliography, but where necessary, I have included them in the text. I have silently modernized the “w/v”and “ij” and normalized the long “s” throughout the dissertation.
Malmesy: and sir reverence how lowsy he, and the mother of Infortunatus were...

and how he was faine, poore soule, to borrow her husbandes shirte, whiles his
owne was a washing: and how his dublet, and hose, and sword were sold for three
shillinges: and beside the charges of his winding sheete, which was foure
shillinges: and the charges of hys buriall yesterday in the New-churchyard neere
Bedlam, which was six shillinges, and foure pence; how deeply he was indebted
to her poore husbande: as appeered by hys own bonde of tenne poundes: which
the good woman kindly shewed me: and... was a letter to his abandoned wife, in
the behalfe of his gentle host: not so short as persuasible in the beginning, and
pittifull in the ending.

_Doll, I charge thee by the love of our youth, & by my soules rest, that thou
wilte see this man paide: for if hee, and his wife had not succoured me, I had died
in the streetes._

*Robert Greene.* (21-22)

This profoundly private and human occurrence of Greene's death was also in
some sense a historic event, a turning point in the evolution of the Elizabethan writer, so
to speak, because Greene in his death became the most famous symbol and victim of
the "death of liberalty" that artists were bemoaning in the latter half of Elizabeth's reign.
The "iron age" was upon them, several of them lamented, since patronage had declined
and patron-seekers had swollen beyond control.³ Greene's death was a shocking

---

³Critical literature on Elizabethan patronage is vast. For general background on Elizabethan
patronage, _Patronage in Renaissance_ (ed. Guy Fitch Lytle and Stephen Orgel) is an excellent start. For new
historicist views, see Arthur F. Marotti's "'Love is not Love': Elizabethan Sonnet Sequences and the Social
Order," Don E. Wayne's _Penshurst: The Semiotics of Place and the Poetics of History_, and Robert C.
remainder of how badly the situation had deteriorated. Harvey’s heartless description of Greene’s dying moments is telling in its emphasis on his material want: a Cambridge scholar who, like Thomas Lodge and Philip Sidney, wrote romantic fictional narratives steeped in Renaissance rhetoric and humanism, was reduced to dying in absolute destitution because Greene did not have any patrons and therefore any means of livelihood. Ironically, Greene was a victim of a vicious cycle: lack of patronage forced him into pamphleteering, but the disrepute of pamphleteering, in turn, kept the patrons away. Thus Greene was caught in a bind that would affect almost all his contemporaries: Lyly, Nashe, Lodge, even Harvey. Greene’s death was a direct consequence of the fundamental ways in which patronage collided and clashed with the marketplace of print.

It is in this context that a group of pamphlets, all published within six months after Greene’s death, assumes importance as it presents itself as a significant textual moment. These pamphlets are: Gabriel Harvey’s *Foure Letters and Certaine Sonnets*, *Greenes Groatsworth of Wit*, Henry Chettle’s *Kind Hartes Dreame*, Thomas Nashe’s *Strange Newes of Intercepting Certain Letters*, and B.R.’s *Greenes Newes Both from Heaven and Hell*. They all expand on the dominant theme of Greene’s tragic death:

---

Evans’ *Ben Jonson and the Poetics of Patronage*. Also see articles by Simon Adams, Paul E.J. Hammer, Linda Levy Peck, Alistair Fox, Marie Axtom, M.D. Jardine, and Sherri Geller for issues related to Elizabethan patronage. On the proliferation of aristocrats during Elizabeth’s reign, see Lawrence Stone’s *The Crisis of Aristocracy* and Frank Whigham’s *Ambition and Privilege."

*I have omitted from this group The Repentance of Robert Greene and Greene Vision, both published posthumously, the former because of its fragmentary nature and the latter because of its composition date (1590; the printer Cuthbert Burbey put it together after Greene died). I have retained Groatsworth because of its appearance of completeness, especially the Roberto story, with which I am chiefly concerned. I have also omitted Pierce Penilesse, because it was written much before the death of Greene though published in the third week of September 1592. Only Nashe’s introduction to the second edition of Pierce acknowledges Greene’s death and I have treated this introduction as part of Nashe’s response in Strange Newes. Harvey’s reply to Strange Newes, Pierces Supererogation, published in*
the decline of patronage and its problematic relationship with the marketplace of print.

In this sense, a study of them transcends the short time period in which they were written and assumes, in three crucial ways, wider ramifications for our notions about Elizabethan pamphlets in general and the personal, intellectual, and material conditions in which they were produced. First, insofar as they are a direct outcome of Greene's death, they reflect and partake of Greene's importance as a writer in the Elizabethan age.

As we know, Greene stands at a crossroads representing many strands of Elizabethan literature: Euphuistic and Arcadian romance, drama, repentance literature, and satiric and cony-catching pamphlets. Greene's *Mamilia* (1583) is an example of his early fiction, which he cast in Euphuistic style. *Pandosto* (1588) and *Menaphon* (1589) are instances of Arcadian romances. By 1589, Greene was churning out repentance pamphlets, starting with *Greene's Mourning Garment* and the two-part story of *Never Too Late* and *Francesco's Fortunes* (1590). In 1591 and 1592, at least seven cony-catching pamphlets were published in quick succession, but Greene was also working on a satire called *A Quip for an Upstart Courtier* (1592) and the repentance tract entitled *The Repentance of Robert Greene* (1592), a work that Greene probably wrote in the summer of 1592 just before his death but that was published posthumously. Greene's plays, none of which can be dated with certainty, were all performed around and after 1592.

All in all, Greene's output, as prolific as it was varied, grew out of many literary traditions and partakes of a momentous shift in the nature and function of Elizabethan

September 1593, is too removed from Greene's death, both in time and in content, to merit a place in the group. The selected group, thus, presents itself as a substantial body of writing that is intimately and variously concerned with Greene and his death.
humanism among writers and their audiences. Where, so far, humanist writers had striven to bring about the perfection of the human mind as envisaged in Renaissance ideals and had sought to optimize the individual’s role in and contribution to the larger commonwealth, the new culture, typified by the pamphlet, shifted the focus from ennoblement and didacticism to entertainment and profit. As Arthur F. Kinney explains the transition from romances to pamphlets, “[in] the severe testing of time... through war, religious strife, plague, and poverty... the idea (or the ideal) of human perfectibility receded to the last reaches of man’s vision, and a fiction that rested on such claims had to find, through other Senecan or Platonic models, new reasons to exist. In the end, it gave way to the satire of pamphlet and drama” (38). Greene’s participation, early in his career, in the humanist agenda of perfecting the human mind, and his later contribution, through his commercial writings, to the decline of humanist ideals and development of satiric and entertaining writing, are an essential element of the textual moment we are about to study.

Second, implied in Greene’s pamphleteering is also the subversion that is the essence of pamphlets. This subversion is best symbolized by the figure of Martin Marprelate, the most memorable prototype of pamphlet personality in English literary history. Greene himself was a close witness to this phenomenon as “Pasquil of England” in the anti-Martinist campaign, and his strategies of self-fashioning as a rebellious writer

5Richard Helgerson’s Elizabethan Prodigals is still the best work that deals with this shift. Helgerson explores the expectations imposed on emerging writers and the way they met or circumvented them through prodigal or repentance narratives. Kinney’s Humanist Poetics is a fine exposition of how Elizabethan prose writers like Sidney, Lyly, Greene, and Nashe conformed to humanist expectations. The chapter on Greene in David Margolies’ Novel and Society in Elizabethan England sees Greene gradually transforming from a humanist writer to a popular one, largely in response to market demands.

6Greene as an anti-Martinist writer is more a tradition than a historically established fact. R.B.
in collusion with the subversive potential of print are to some extent modeled on Martin Marprelate’s brilliant self-projection and his manipulation of the authorities’ anxieties over illicit printing. And Martin’s shadow falls beyond Greene and on the pamphleteers studied here: Harvey was once suspected of being Martin, no doubt owing to his strong Puritan inclinations, though Harvey criticizes Martin for the same sins of which he finds Greene guilty. Nashe, too, crossed paths with Martin as an anti-Martianist pamphleteer as well as a secret admirer of Martin to whom scholars have traced Nashe’s linguistic and stylistic debts. B.R.’s anti-Episcopal satire in Greenes Newes has close philosophical and thematic affinities with Martin’s own satiric stance. Thus one of the most important events in the history of English prose is irrevocably joined with Greene and his pamphleteering friends, and this aspect suffuses the post-Greene pamphlet debate with importance.

Third, these pamphlets, as a response to Greene’s death, are a rich resource for our understanding of the discrepancy between the way writers fantasized about their vocation and the way they struggled intellectually to come to grips with the demeaning influence of the marketplace. The vividness, immediacy, and the many-sidedness of this irresolvable

McKerrow, in his edition of Nashe, is reluctant to identify Pasquil as either Nashe or Greene, but Charles Nicholl boldly speculates that Greene can be plausibly identified as the author of the Pasquil tracts (see 72-73). But Nashe’s characterization of Greene as “chiefe agent for the companie (for hee writ more than foure other...)” in Strange Newes is definitely a reference to their association in the anti-Martianist campaign. We know for sure that Nashe (as Cuthbert Curry Knave) and Lyly (as Pap Hatchet) were anti-Martianist writers. Munday is also a plausible candidate. The evidence from Nashe’s claim and Harvey’s contempt for Greene (Harvey loathed the anti-Martinists) reasonably proves Greene’s professional support for the prelates in the great controversy.

7 See, for example, Nicholl’s Cup of News, 75-79. and Travis L. Summerrgill’s “The Influence of Marprelate Controversy on Thomas Nashe.”

8 Print engendered a conflict between “amateur” and “professional” writers, and this conflict is
tension are readily apparent in the pamphlets I have chosen for study. Aside from the Marprelate tracts, nowhere else is this liveliness to be found in the history of the English pamphlet, not even in the Harvey-Nashe quarrel. So far, however, this moment has remained largely uninvestigated.

It should be clear, from these perspectives, that the texts I have chosen to study are of considerable significance for our understanding of the Elizabethan pamphlet. Equally important is the fact that each pamphlet is distinguished by an intelligent and energetic voice that is self-conscious about its authorial status, satiric intention, and commercial value in the marketplace. All of them regard Greene as the victim of the dilution of the aristocratic and traditional values of honor and patronage as well as the victim of the conflict between humanism and print, and this wider perspective gives each pamphlet a topical and intellectual vigor. Harvey, the Cambridge rhetorician and the most vehement critic of Greene, dislikes Greene, but is keenly, even jealously, aware of his popularity in the market; for Greene’s fellow university wit, Nashe, however, Greene is a teacher and a pioneer, somewhat flawed yet worthy of emulation, whose flaws Nashe identifies as the result of Greene’s need to write for the market; for Henry Chettle, Greene is a poignant figure tragically implicated in the confusion between humanism and the market-oriented, popular readership; for B.R., Greene’s subversive, anti-establishment satire offers a model on which he wants to constitute his own satiric voice. Each author is scholarly but poor and patron-less, and intimately involved with questions about the

________________________

usually designated by the phrase “stigma of print.” The concept was first introduced by J.W. Saunders. Also see Marotti’s “Patronage, Poetry and Print” and Steven May’s “Tudor Aristocrats and the Mythical ‘Stigma of Print.’” Richard McCoy’s “Gascoigne’s ‘Poemata Castrata’: The Wages of Courtly Success” is a relevant insight into this conflict.
commercial and satiric nature of writing. Both Harvey and B.R. had been writing and seeking patronage from the early 1580s, and Nashe, an early protégé of Greene, was an ambitious and fairly well-established writer by 1592. Chettle had entertained illusions of becoming both a printer and a writer from the 1570s and had actually been a licensed printer, so his involvement in this debate is of particular value, as he was no doubt knowledgeable about and even sympathetic to the claims of commerce in the enterprise of writing. All of them are keenly aware of the low social standing of pamphlets, yet are ready to exploit their satiric and subversive potential. Even Harvey, an accomplished writer in Latin, has fantasies about shaping the vernacular form in a way that would accommodate both his scholarly agendas and financial needs. Most important, they are all aware of the pamphlet's oppositional and subversive potential.

The choice of this particular textual moment is, therefore, richly resonant, as it embodies both the formative past and the promising future of the pamphleteer. This singular moment is made up of individual voices and differing perspectives, and I have been particularly mindful of the uniqueness of each pamphlet. Consequently, this study accords each pamphlet the privilege of an extended examination, both as a literary text and as a cultural document, and considers that pamphlet as an argument in an ongoing dialectic that is firmly rooted in a particular socio-historical context that contributed to the rise of the Elizabethan pamphlet.

Insofar as my study is concerned with patronage and the satiric pamphleteer, a new historicist critical approach may be said to have inspired it, since I draw on the dialectic of power between dominant and subordinate forms and institutions, and
acknowledge the indefinable yet unmistakable power of the popular audience. My
critique is influenced by the new historicist tendency to locate ideological struggles in
areas where such dominant cultural forces as monarchy, titled or moneyed classes,
institutions of religious authority, or male power come into contact with lesser forces. The new historicist concept of subversion provided me with a critical starting point—the
examination of the nature of the marketplace of print vis-a-vis such institutions as
patronage and humanist pedagogy. I am conscious of the problematic nature of this
concept, which is caught between the cultural materialist assertion that Renaissance texts
contest the dominant ideologies of their time and the new historicists’ argument that the
hegemonic powers of such institutions as the church and the state, even as they provoke
subversion, are nevertheless so great that they can neutralize all dissident behavior. But
unauthorized print’s potential for political mischief, as acknowledged by the authorities’
periodic proclamations against it, makes the subversion of the pamphlets chosen for this
study less problematic. Moreover, the new historicists have often been accused of

---

9The tenets of new historicism can be found spelled out in the special issue of Genre (vol. 15,
1982), The Forms of Power and the Power of Forms in the Renaissance, edited by Stephen Greenblatt. His
Renaissance Self-fashioning, considered by many to be one of the best examples of new historicist criticism,
is also a good place to start. Other representative works include Jonathan Goldberg’s James I and the
Politics of Literature: Jonson, Shakespeare, Donne, and their Contemporaries, Richard Helgerson’s Self-
Crowned Laureates: Spenser, Jonson, Milton, and the Literary System, and Louis A. Montrose’s “Of
Gentlemen and Shepherds: The Politics of Elizabethan Pastoral Form.” Though new historicism has had a
powerful influence on students of the Renaissance, it has nevertheless been subjected to serious questions
about its methodology, its theoretical framework and assumptions, its problematic understanding of the
extent to which a literary text could threaten political and religious authority, and its highly selective use of
historical documents. For critiques of new historicism, see Jean E. Howard’s “The New Historicism in
Renaissance Studies,” Montrose’s “Renaissance Literary Studies and the Subject of History,” The New
Historicism, edited by H. Aram Veeser, Edward Pechter’s “The New Historicism and Its Discontents:
Politicizing Renaissance Drama,” and Albert Tricomi’s Reading Tudor-Stuart Texts Through Cultural
Historicism. New historicists have also been criticized by some for appropriating feminist assumptions and
interpretive strategies without contributing, in return, to gender issues in early modern studies. Lisa
Jardine’s Still Harping on Daughters is a good example of feminist criticism from a new historicist point of
view.
treating “societies as if they were monolithic entities and thereby suppress[ing] the fact that in a given political formation different paradigms for organizing economic or aesthetic activity exist simultaneously” (Cadzow 539). The popular pamphlet’s marginality defies this monolithic view, and, therefore, its subversion remains outside the standard subversion-containment cycle found in the new historicist critiques. Also, notions such as “popular voice,” “class consciousness,” “popular readership,” and “public space,” major concepts in the new historicist critique of subversion, acquire greater legitimacy in a study of popular pamphlets and the marketplace of print. It is against this context that I have studied these pamphlets, setting them in their material context and letting them speak for themselves. Overall, therefore, I am interested in capturing the moment of Greene’s death as the consequence of the decline of patronage and as historically important for the emergence and oppositional nature of pamphlets. My intention in this study, then, is to show that Greene, in Groatworth, and the authors of the four other pamphlets chosen for study consciously engage with a social and cultural change, a change in the way writers lived their lives and in the way writing was being conducted, and to propose that these pamphlets are a satiric attack, in various forms, on the decline of patronage, and that this satire is effected through the manipulation of the


11 For popular voice in Shakespeare, see Annabel Patterson’s Shakespeare and the Popular Voice, Weimann’s Shakespeare and the Popular Tradition in the Theater, and Greenblatt’s “Murdering Peasants.” For class consciousness, see Michael Hattaway’s “Rebellion, class consciousness, and Shakespeare’s Henry VI.” On public space, see Jürgen Habermas’s The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere.
subversive potential of the pamphlet form in particular and the marketplace of print in general.

Accordingly, the first chapter studies the inherently subversive nature of pamphlets in Elizabethan England. It is important for my thesis to establish the fact that the very act of writing and publishing unauthorized pamphlets had an innate air of rebellion and sedition for writers against religious and temporal authorities. This peculiar nature of popular pamphlets can be fully understood only within the context of a long tradition of official suspicion towards print and its capacity for free and wide dissemination of information and opinion, especially after the creation of the Stationers’ Company in 1557 by Queen Mary. The suspicion persisted, even deepened, during Elizabeth’s reign. This official distrust, in turn, spawned in the society a print culture that was anti-establishment and proto-democratic, and which thrived by stoking and representing popular discontent. The first chapter studies this context by concentrating on two representative print events: John Stubbs’ publication of *Gaping Gulf* and the emergence of Martin Marprelate. While the circumstances surrounding Stubbs’ pamphlet clearly show the way in which official circles regarded pamphlets and printing as vehicles of sedition and disorderliness, Martin’s creators were more conscious of the subversive potential of the press and exploited its ability to cause anxiety in the authorities. The Marprelate writers brilliantly created Martin as a pamphleteer who addresses himself to common folks over the heads of church and temporal authorities, openly reveling in his incarnation as an entity constituted entirely in the medium of print and thus as a persona

\[\text{\textsuperscript{12}}\text{ Relatively, it had been easier to bring a book to print during the rule of Edward VI, largely}\]
innately seditious and rebellious. The central argument in the first chapter is that it is in this tradition that Greene casts himself as a popular and commercial pamphleteer, self-consciously spurning patronage and the courtly style implicit in writing for patrons. By analyzing an extraordinarily self-reflexive pamphlet, *Greene's Vision* (1590), in which Greene debates and shapes his print persona, and also by studying some of his cony-catching pamphlets in which this persona is further developed, I argue that Greene, despairing of patronage by the time he died, successfully fashioned himself as a cony-catcher in print, exploiting and celebrating the subversion implicit in the tainted partnership between writing and printing.

Chapters two through six deal with how the profession of pamphleteering is shaped and debated in *Groatsworth, Foure Letters, Kind Harte, Strange Newes*, and *Greenes Newes*, respectively. Specifically, chapter two studies *Greenes Groatsworth of Wit*, which is a story about a scholar, Roberto, and his degeneration into dissolution and death. Edited and published by Henry Chettle two weeks after Greene’s death, *Groatsworth* is an extraordinary pamphlet, as it continues Greene’s self-conscious engagement with print and readership. I argue in this chapter that *Groatsworth* is Greene’s fictionalization of the pamphleteer’s (and his own) tragic engagement with the marketplace of print and the emergence of the satirical voice that is dependent on and associated with print and popular readership. The third chapter deals with Harvey’s own strategies of self-presentation as both a reluctant and an exemplary pamphleteer. The first pamphlet to come out after Greene’s death, *Foure Letters* is an interesting document because the regulatory function provided by the Stationers’ Company was absent.
because it contains in its diatribe Harvey's intense disapproval of Greene and his exhortations to Nashe to relinquish pamphleteering as well as Harvey's own philosophy of writing. Harvey's favorite rhetorical strategy is to set himself up in opposition to Greene, both as an individual and as a humanist scholar. The major thrust behind Harvey's pamphlet comes from his perception of himself as an ideal orator, although his failure to achieve success, despite his qualifications, either in the university or in the court somewhat complicates his message. Harvey's identification of Greene as an immoral person and his pamphlets as a seditious affront to established moral order promotes himself as a good writer in sharp contrast to Greene. But Harvey seems to suggest (in Pierces Supererogation) that if pamphleteers relinquished their abrasive style and slanderous content, they could probably get patronage. The fourth chapter deals with Kind Hartes Dreame, a pamphlet authored by Chettle, in which he satirizes, through several satiric voices, the official views on print and print-based dissemination of information and the more traditional and privileged modes of knowledge propagation. Kind Harte is a collection of letters written in the tradition of netherworld satires, each by a famous dead person lamenting the passing of an old tradition, such as ballad singing, healing, playacting, and, in an ironic twist, juggling (cony catching). Satire is effected in the way the lamentations adopt and mimic the language of official discourse against print-mediated dissemination of ballads, cheap medical texts, play texts, and cony-catching pamphlets. Chettle's achievement in Kind Harte is the creation of a series of satiric personae, and it owes a great deal to Greene's disillusionment with figures of authority. Cuckoe the juggler's invective is particularly influenced by Greene's sly use of the figure
of cony-catcher as a low-class version of the gentrified rogue. The fifth chapter deals with the way Nashe engages with Harvey’s attack on Greene and fashions his own satirical voice in *Strange Newes*. Forced by Harvey’s *Foure Letters*, Nashe explores the reasons behind Harvey’s outburst and reveals that Harvey’s pretension to aristocratic friendships and patronage is just a facade, behind which Harvey is as insecure as every other impecunious university wit. Nashe’s anger against Harvey emanates mostly from what he perceives to be Harvey’s hypocrisy even in the face of the same kind of poverty and abandonment as Greene and he himself were experiencing. Openly aligning himself on the side of Greene, Nashe refutes Harvey’s insinuations of sedition, disorderliness, and vagrancy, and demonstrates, through his own example, that pamphlets and humanist rhetoric need not be mutually exclusive. The sixth chapter, on *Greenes Newes*, explores the ways in which Barnabe Riche uses the persona of Greene as a proxy for himself. A writer of romances and military pamphlets in the eighties, Riche was in dire straits both financially and politically by the 1590s. In 1592, Riche wanted retribution for all the insults he had endured at the hands of Irish prelates Archbishop Loftus and Dean Jones, and also for the silent refusal of higher authorities at court to intercede in his behalf. This motive finds a new weapon in his satirical pamphlet *Greenes Newes*. The fact that Riche makes use of a recently dead Greene to serve his own ends is a testament to the potency of Greene’s influence and the way satirical pamphlets evolved in the course of the 1590s and beyond. I argue that Riche’s evocation of Greene as a pamphleteer, who is resented by both Saint Peter and the cony-catchers, contextualizes Riche’s own pamphlet within the satiric tradition of the Elizabethan pamphlet, of which Greene was very much a part.
A brief final chapter, by way of conclusion, looks at the circumstances surrounding the Bishops’ ban on pamphlets in 1599 and looks at how the distinctive satirical voice of the 1590s, arising out of an anger directed at declining patronage and fostered through pamphlets in the marketplace, could be the origin of the official anger that resulted in the ban. Positioned as it is between the Marprelate controversy and the 1599 ban, our textual moment of 1592 has the advantage of partaking of, reflecting, and shaping some of the better known trends in English prose satire. The study concludes by emphasizing the critical importance of the pamphlets we have studied for our understanding of the way pamphlets developed and the way we can enrich our literary history by linking the not-so-important moments to the prevailing cultural and material conditions.
Chapter 1: The Press, the Satirical Pamphlet, and Subversion

When, in August 1579, John Stubbs anonymously wrote and published his pamphlet, *The Discoverie of a Gaping Gulf*, criticizing Queen Elizabeth's apparent determination to marry the Duke of Alençon by casting aspersions on her personal attraction and attacking the French suitor for his religious and personal failings, he drew a swift and deadly official response that revealed the inherent dangers of pamphleteering in Elizabethan England. In a royal proclamation, the Queen thundered that she would not allow a foreign prince to be abused in her dominions and accused the pamphlet's author of stirring up sedition; she also commanded the Bishop of London to instruct his clergy to deliver sermons condemning the offender and ordered that all copies of the offending pamphlet be recovered and destroyed.\(^2\)

Stubbs was soon apprehended along with Hugh Singleton and William Page, the printer and publisher of the pamphlet, respectively. Once Stubbs was arrested, the Queen invoked a moribund statute promulgated by her sister, Queen Mary, and got her

---

1. The tract, as most Elizabethan pamphlets, has a long title: *The Discoverie of a Gaping Gulf whereinto England is like to be swallowed by another french marriage, if the Lord forbid not the banes, by letting her Majestie see the sin and punishment thereof.* Lloyd E. Berry's edition of this pamphlet is useful for its introduction and other contextual material. On critical material on Stubbs' subversive act and his tract's impact on Elizabeth as woman and her policies on printing, see Ilona Bell's "'Sovereigne Lord of lordly lady of this land': Elizabeth, Stubbs, and the Gaping Gulf" and "Elizabeth I - Always Her Own Free Woman," Susan Bassnett's *Elizabeth I: A Feminist Perspective*, and Anne Somerset's *Elizabeth I*.

2. See *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, Vol.2, ed. Paul L. Hughes and James F. Larkin, 445-49. The proclamation has also been helpfully reprinted in full in the appendix by Lloyd E. Berry in his edition of *Gaping Gulf*, 147-152. The Spanish ambassador in Elizabeth's court, sensing the extraordinary nature of the event, wrote to his king in some amusement: "A printed book has recently been published here setting forth the evils arising from a union with the French. Many arguments and reasons are adduced, and examples are given of what has happened on other occasions. As soon as it was published the Queen prohibited its possession under pain of death, and great efforts were used to collect all the copies, and to discover the author, in order to prevent the circulation of the facts before the parliament" (qtd. in Berry xxviii).
reluctant Privy Council to punish Stubbs and Page by cutting their hands off. Singleton was spared the amputation in consideration of his advanced years, but the Queen showed no mercy towards Stubbs and Page, despite the public's dismay over the cruelty of the punishment. On the appointed day, a triumphant and unrepentant Page courageously walked off the chopping block, crying with his bloody stump in the air, "I have left there a true Englishman's hand" (Berry xxxvi). Stubbs, on the other hand, had seemed repentant, and, just before submitting his hand, attempted a pathetic pun: "pray for me, now my calamity is at hand." It took three blows to chop off his hand, whereupon he swooned.³

The circumstances of this case bring to the fore many of the issues involved in printing and pamphleteering in Elizabethan England. The most striking aspect of the case is, of course, Elizabeth's ire at Stubbs and his collaborators. The way the Queen and the official machinery reacted speaks of the deep threat pamphlets of this kind posed to the rulers. In this threat can be seen the emergent power of the readership as almost a political opposition, certainly still too inchoate to understand or articulate itself in political terms, but nevertheless a force that was aware of its own powers. Historians have noted the proto-democratic feelings among the low- and non-aristocratic sections of the population in the final decades of the sixteenth century. Jim Sharpe, for example, says that "conditions over the last fifteen years or so of Elizabeth's reign were bad enough

³ After a brief imprisonment, however, Stubbs retired to his house at Norfolk, from where he made it known to several of his friends at the court that he was "redeeming the time of the folly and idleness of a misspent youth." Official displeasure seems to have eased by 1585, and he achieved gainful employment until 1590, when he died a soldier's death in France (Berry xi).
to create a continual undercurrent of adverse comment among the lower orders... that at least some of the queen's subjects were given to criticizing either their monarch or the social hierarchy in which they lived" (199). The economic hardships helped create a shared consciousness among the people, a vital precondition for "class-consciousness" or a "collective voice." As Sharpe says, "As hard times continued, such sentiments acquired a tinge of something approaching class consciousness.... Some of Elizabeth's poorer subjects were capable of envisaging a social hierarchy different from that in which they found themselves" (200). Print offered the easiest way this common consciousness could be achieved and thus presented the greatest threat to those who had wealth and power. Print thus created a "public space" of shared consciousness, which often manifested its power in riots and other disturbances and which upset authorities including Elizabeth. Habermas's concept of public sphere--"a sphere which mediates between society and the state, in which the public organizes itself as the bearer of public opinion"--can be seen in the late sixteenth century at least in its infancy, and Stubbs's pamphlet is one of the many instances of the crystallization of public power.

To be sure, the main reason for the Queen's intense displeasure must have been

---

4For insights into the formation of a "collective consciousness" see Sharpe and others. This is a contested arena and others have disputed it. For example, Peter Laslett argues that the concept of class-conflict is more appropriate to nineteenth- and twentieth-century societies than to sixteenth-century England. J.H. Hexter supports Laslett in "The Myth of Middle-class in Tudor England," where he says that the so-called "middle-class" (merchants, financiers, traders, etc.) lacked a collective class consciousness. But Sharpe says that "those historians who have downgraded the importance of class as a tool for analyzing Tudor and Stuart England... have taken a somewhat optimistic view" (204). Annabel Patterson in Shakespeare and the Popular Voice argues powerfully for the existence of a popular culture of protest in late medieval and Renaissance England. As for the concept of the "public sphere," it is patently a product of an industrial society, but Halasz argues for the validity of applying it to certain early modern situations as well, the print readership being one of the most receptive situations (see Marketplace of Print, ch. 5). Also see Habermas's writings on public sphere.
the vicious attacks on Alençon by Stubbs; she also must have been deeply offended by the insinuation that she was too old and ugly to allure a young man. But the intensity of her response goes beyond wounded ego and can be explained only by her acute perception of the power of print. A close reading of the royal proclamation brings to surface the real reason behind Elizabeth’s fury. It is not just the insults, but the dissemination of those insults, the unleashing of them in the public sphere through the agency of print, that seems to have been the reason for the rage of the Queen. After all, the arguments in Stubbs’s tract were not totally unfamiliar to Elizabeth or her counselors. The parliament had actually been discussing the impending matrimony for months with arguments similar to Stubbs’s, including the Queen’s physical ability to bear a child.\(^5\) With her characteristic mix of strength and vulnerability, the Queen had been berating and cajoling her recalcitrant council and parliament to accept the marriage with Alençon. But Stubbs’s tract made it all public and, therefore, somehow seditious. The Queen saw Stubbs’s tract as “a lewd and seditious book..., compiled and secretly printed and afterwards seditiously dispersed into sundry corners of the realm,” containing “a heap of slanders and reproaches...lies and deceitful speeches.” By these disreputable means, her proclamation claims, the tract “seditionally and rebelliously” stirs up “all estates of Her Majesties’ subjects to fear their own utter ruin and charge of Government,” and also instills in the people’s hearts a “present fear” and “misliking” concerning her marriage (Berry 148). The proclamation’s charge of “secret printing and seditious dispersing” is

\(^5\)For parliamentary discussions of the Alençon affair, see J.E. Neale, Elizabeth I and Her Parliaments, Vol.I. For biographical accounts of Elizabeth’s affair with Alençon, see Somerset’s Elizabeth I, chapter 9, Neale’s Queen Elizabeth, chapter ix and xv.
especially noteworthy in the light of its anxiety about the effects Stubbs's book would have on the ordinary citizen, who, the proclamation claims, does not have the intellectual ability to discriminate between truth and untruth. The "wiser sort," according to the writers of the proclamation, are well acquainted "with Her Majesty's honorable and direct proceedings, both in government politic and in a constant maintenance of Christian true religion," and therefore might prove immune to the gossips of the tract. But it is the "simpler sort" of people, the Queen fears, who are in danger of being seduced by it:

The simpler sort and multitude, being naturally affected towards Her Majesty and her safety, might be abused with the fair title of the book and hypocrisy of the author, as well in abusing many texts and example of the scriptures perverted from their true sense, and in interlacing of flattering glosses towards Her Majesty to cover the rest of the manifest depraving of Her Majesty and her actions to her people. (Berry 148)

The appeal of the pamphlet in the hands of the ordinary citizen, seducing him or her with its "fair title" and hypocritical and dangerous interpretations of the holy scripture that seem to flatter the Queen but that only subvert her person and authority, is too dangerous for the authorities. The Queen and her counselors thus reveal an acute understanding of the dangers of wide dissemination of information among common people. The marketplace of print makes official mediation between the text and the readers impossible, and thus poses fundamental problems to a society whose order is predicated on surveillance, detection, control, and punishment. The proclamation admits the uncontrollable potency of the printed text: "Her Majesty hath no small cause to be in this
sort grievously offended, with such a lewd denunciation to the people, by so common a false libel, *like as by a trump of sedition secretly sounding in every subject’s ear*” (Berry 152; emphasis mine). The satanic nature of the libelous pamphlet, indirectly hinted at by the apocalyptic imagery of the “trump…secretly sounding in every subject’s ear,” speaks of both the anxiety and frustration of the government over the increasingly difficult task of regulating the presses, despite the Stationers’ Company’s vast powers and virtual monopoly. In response, the Queen and her counselors can only resort to the age-old, official rhetoric against sedition and to threats of destroying the offending machines and men. The defacement and destruction of erring presses is literally extended to the physical bodies of the writer and the printer: the defacement of types is chillingly similar to the amputation of hands, which leaves both implements (the writing hand and the letter types) impotent and useless. Nor is the official opprobrium limited to the printer and the writer. Implicated in this sedition is also the reader, who, through his very act of reading the offending material and internalizing it, is in danger of committing treason. The reader’s passivity and blamelessness, previously implied in the metaphor of “the trump sounding in the ear” (after all, the ear has no choice in what it hears), is soon silently revoked, and, instead, his or her participation through reading is seen as criminal and as a collusion. For, the Queen’s “pleasure and commandment” is made clear:

*no person which hath regard to her honor should esteem of such seditious book, or the maintainers and spreaders thereof, otherwise than of a traitorous device to discredit Her Majesty both with other princes and with her good subjects, and to prepare their minds to sedition, offering to every most meanest person of*
judgement, by those kind of popular libels, authority to argue and determine in
every blind corner at their several wills of the affaires of public estate, a thing
most pernicious in any estate. (Berry 152)

Print enables, the Queen concedes, even the “most meanest person” to acquire
“judgement” and the authority to argue and determine “the affairs of public estate.” In
Elizabethan England, the Queen implies, any agent that effects such empowerment of
people is the “most pernicious thing.” By logic, therefore, pamphlets, through their
intellectual empowerment of readers, are “the most pernitious things” in England in the
final decades of the sixteenth century.

The Stubbs episode is only one of the many instances of the tension between
official powers and print medium in early modern England. Writing was a distinctly
hazardous profession, and thinkers and writers often worked at great risk, sometimes
losing their lives for their ideas and their belief in propagating those ideas. Soon after
Gutenberg, and especially because of the Reformation, the risk extended to the printer
and publisher as well. Licenses and monopolies of various kinds from the monarch and
the church were the only way a writer and a printer could work without incurring official
displeasure. But the government’s very attempt to regulate printing and suppress
unauthorized printing activity was an acknowledgment of an unlimited potential and even
an encouragement to disaffected printers, and this tension between official suppression
and popular feelings found expression in such official mechanisms as the Stationers’
Company, set up in 1557. This official arm of regulation believed that printing must be
an authorized act under its strict surveillance and it governed the practice through the
granting of special rights, privileges, and monopolies. As well, the religious fervor of the Reformation worked in tandem with the printing press's inherent potential for easy accessibility and wide dissemination of ideas to make printing something of a revolutionary activity. While Protestant England embraced those aspects of printing that were beneficial to its religious policies vis-à-vis Rome, its own rigid political and religious hierarchies were just as open a target for the press's subversion as the Roman Catholic church was.

That the authorities realized the subversive potential of printing right from its invention is clear from proclamations regarding printing from the final decades of the fifteenth and throughout the sixteenth centuries. In the first half of the century, the Crown kept a watchful eye on the press, issuing from time to time warnings and threats to publishers and printers who broke the law. In 1557, Queen Mary granted a charter incorporating the Stationers' Company and thus set up an elaborate official machinery to control and regulate the growing book trade (Arber I. xxx-xxxiii). Queen Elizabeth seems to have realized from an early age the importance of controlling the press, and continued the firm grip on the printing trade by promulgating many laws that are considered significant in its evolution in England. Her first proclamation in 1559 openly acknowledges the growing difficulties in regulating presses and sets elaborate measures in that regard:

[B]ecause there is great abuse in the printers of bokes, which for covetousness chiefly regard not what they print, so thei may have gaine, whereby arriseth great disorder by publication of unfrutefull, vayne and infamous bokes and papers: The
Quenes maistie straytly chargethe and commandeth, that no manner of person
shall print any maner of boke or paper, of what sort, nature, or in what language
so ever it be, excepte the same be first licenced by her majestie by expresse
wordes in writinge or by vi [six] of her privy counsel, or be perused and licensed
by the arch bysshops of Canterbury and Yorke, the bishop of London, the
chauncelours of both unyversities, the byshop beying ordinary,...

And bycause many pamphlets, playes and ballethes, be often times printed,
wherein regard wold be had, that nothing therin should be either heretical,
sedicious, or unsemely for Christian eares: Her majestie likewise commandeth,
that no manner of person, shall enterprise to print any such, except the same be to
him lycenced by suche her majesties commyssioners, or iii of them, as be
apoynted in the citye of London to here.... (Arber, Introductory Sketch 49)

Thus the regulation of printing through civil and ecclesiastical vigilance, while
bespeaking an official anxiety, also constituted printing, especially those books that dared
to express ideas that were not officially sanctioned, as seditious and treasonous, a threat
to the commonwealth. In September, 1576, the Stationers’ Company empowered itself to
search all printing houses in London at will in order to keep tabs on the activities of the
printers.\(^6\) This surveillance was tightened even more by the 1586 Star Chamber decree, a

---

\(^6\)By 1583, there were about twenty-three printers operating about fifty-three printing presses, but
the Stationers’ Company, through strict observation of apprentices, printing types, and registering of copies,
knew exactly who was printing what (see Arber’s Transcripts I.248 and Introductory Sketch 50). Of
course, it is important to realize that not all printing activity was considered seditious. The extent of official
tolerance toward print is a subject of scholarly discussion at present. While Annabel Patterson emphasizes
the oppressive nature of censorship, Richard Burt considers the permissive side of licensing activities.
Clegg strikes a judicious balance. (I thank Prof. William W.E. Slights for the reference to Burt.)
"great enactment" effected on the behest of a recently appointed Archbishop Whitgift:

...no person or persons shall ymprint or cause to by ymprynted or suffer by any
means to his knowledge his presse, letters [i.e. types], or other instruments to be
occupied in printinge of any booke, work, coppye, matter, or thinge whatsoever,
except the same book, woork, coppye, matter, or any other thinge, hath been
heeretofore allowed, or hereafter shall be allowed before the ymprintinge thereof,
accordinge to th[e] order appoynted by the Queenes maiesties Iniuencyons. And
been first seen and perused by the Archbishop of Canterbury and Bishop of
London .... (Arber, Transcripts ii.810)

As we can see, this new order empowers the bishops (the Archbishop and the Bishop of
London) to exercise enormous power, by mere verbal orders, over the regulation and
censorship of all printed matter, and to seize and confiscate anything they thought
inimical to social or religious order. In short, printing had to toe the official line and
conform to the regulatory practices of the government; otherwise it ran the risk of being
considered treasonable.

But the fact that printers and publishers habitually broke the law despite the threat
of severe punishment only reinforced the subversive side of printing. Like John Stubbs
and Hugh Singleton, unauthorized writers and printers were plentiful in Elizabethan
England.\(^7\) Those printers who broke the law were mostly radical Protestants or Puritans,

---

\(^7\) For example, when Whitgift and Bancroft banned some books (among them Harvey’s and
Nashe’s) in 1599, the order was specifically directed at fourteen printers who were non-members (see
Arber III.678). This circumstance raises the question of who the real offenders were: the books for their
satiric or pornographic content or the illegitimate printers who may have printed these titles from
unauthorized copies, thus cutting into the profits of legitimate printers (i.e. members)? See Linda E.
Boose’s “The Bishops’ Ban.”
and their profession afforded them a powerful political tool, unlike anything they had ever had. They made justifications for their infractions by invoking a moral, divine, and natural law, and even implied that the Queen was brow-beaten into promulgating repressive laws by her tyrannical counselors. Thomas Cartwright, for example, in the preface to the second edition of the anonymously published *Admonition* (1573), justifies its illegal second edition of 1574 thus:

> Some perhaps will marvel at the newe impression... notwithstanding our most gracious Princes late published proclamation procured rather by the Byshops than willingly sought for by hermajestie whose mildness is such that she were easyer led to yelde to the proclamation...[because of] the subtil persuasions and wicked dealings of thys horned generation.... (Arber, *Introductory Sketch* 24)

Thus print’s wide reach, coupled with official repression of free discourse, helped constitute both a subversive press and an equally dangerous popular readership. As we saw, the collusion between these two entities, figured in the myriad controversies, regulations, fines, and arrests involving printers and writers, created almost a popular voice. This collusion formed its own distinctive voices through pamphleteers, who worked their voices in many ways by testing, challenging, and expanding the discursive potentialities of the pamphlet. This self-conscious exercise, in turn, stretched the boundaries of the discursive space, embracing in its wake not just disaffected youth in the city of London but also other literate middle-class readers, for whom satirical pamphlets were becoming more respectable than ballad sheets or sensational newsletters.

One of the most important and interesting examples in which the collusion
between the printing press and subversive writers constituted a discursive space that created for itself empowered audiences and redefined the nature of popular reading material is, of course, the Martin Marprelate controversy. Even a general study of the controversy, with its many plots and subplots involving a fictitious author, several ghost writers, a few renegade but daring printers, and an underground distribution network, reveals the way the printing press, along with its readership, had constructed itself as a powerful presence that could threaten both civil and ecclesiastical orders and hierarchies. Martin Marprelate, therefore, can be said to be the personification of this presence, a figure that is appropriately constituted of various elements such as writers, printers, and distributors, and readers.

The Marprelate controversy was a direct result of the growing presence and power of the Puritan movement from the early 1570s on. Highly resentful of the Elizabethan Settlement (a compromise in their eyes) and the church government by episcopates, a considerable number of puritan priests and preachers zealously fought for a full reformation of “God’s Church” and resolutely defied ecclesiastical authorities’ efforts to have them conform to Anglicanism. In 1573, an anonymous pamphlet titled *Admonition to Parliament* attacked the bishops, accusing them of not following “Christ’s kingdom.” The author was generally supposed to be Thomas Cartwright, and his tract was soon followed by John Udall’s *Demonstration of Discipline*, commonly known as *Diotrephes*. Emboldened by such public airing of non-conformist ideas, Puritan preachers abandoned popish garments during the service, doctored prayer books, held informal prophesyings, and created local synods under elders, modeled on the Genevan *Classics*. But John
Whitgift’s appointment as the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1583 brought the Puritan movement into direct and sometimes violent conflict with the officials. One of the fundamental features of Whitgift’s strategy against Puritan attacks was to characterize any anti-Anglican sentiments as not only heretical but also seditious. Linking religious quietness and order with political security, Whitgift shrewdly made every Puritan guilty of conspiring against the state. Thomas Cooper, the Bishop of London, is accused by Martin as having once said that “all Puritans had traitorous hearts” (Pierce 274). These bishops’ hawkish stance against religious dissension and the Star Chamber decree of 1586 effectively drove the more extreme non-conformist preachers underground and made dissenting views seditious.

It is in this atmosphere of suspicion and censorship that Martin Marprelate, as the scourge of the prelates, was engendered. As we have already noted, Martin’s pamphlet birth was made possible only through the coming together of the pen and the press, and the pen is represented, at least in part, by John Penry, a firebrand Welshman who had been a preacher at Oxford and Cambridge, and who published in 1587 a pamphlet generally known as *The Aequity* in which he complained about the state of the clergy and general health of religion in Wales. Penry’s protests in the pamphlet are directly aimed at the Queen, and the tone is dangerously provocative, indicating a Stubbs-like nerve and lack of fear:

For what will our children that rise after us and their children say, when they shall be brought up in grosse superstition, but that it was not Queen Elizabethes will, that we their parentes should have that true religion she professed, made known
to us. Will not the enemies of Gods truth with uncleane mouthes avouch that shee
had little regard unto true or false religion anie further than it belonged to hir
profite? I would some of them did not slaunderously cast abroade amongst our
people, that she careth not whether the gospel be preached or not preached. If she
did wee also should bee most sure to enjoy it after twenty eight years and upward
of most prosperous raigne. (Arber's Sketch 55)

The subtle incitement of future generations' adverse judgement of the Queen and the
faintly sinister invocation of popular discontent ("enemies of Gods truth with unclean
mouths" that "slanderously cast abroad amongst our people") did not escape the attention
of the authorities. The pamphlet was suppressed, copies destroyed, and Penry was for a
brief while incarcerated and later released. John Udall also contributed to the creation of
Martin, having been the author of The State of the Church of England Laide Open, a
similarly anti-establishment tract that provoked identical reaction from the authorities.

Both these pamphlets were printed by Robert Waldegrave, and he represents the
other, printing half of the subversive figure of Martin Marprelate. A printer with strong
puritan sympathies right from the beginning of his career in 1583, Waldegrave suffered
heavily for his involvement in the Marprelate affair. Following Udall's pamphlet, a Star
Chamber decree ordered the search of Waldegrave's house and the destruction of all his
types (Arber I. 528; also see Pierce 151-52). The search and punishment were carried out
by John Wolfe, the beadle of the Stationers' Company, himself an anti-establishment
revolutionary in the early 1580s. By the summer of 1588, Waldegrave, along with Penry and Udall, had gone underground, and Martin Marprelate was born.

From August 1588 to the end of 1589, Martin would shake the entire country with brilliant displays of his pamphleteering persona. Constantly moving around the country with his printing presses, Martin created an aura of invincibility and ubiquity around him that impressed his readers and frustrated the government. Martin fashioned himself as an ephemeral physical entity in his tracts, but as a pamphleteer, he is a fully realized person thanks to his self-constitution through language. That the identity of the “real” Martin (if there ever was one) was never discovered testifies to the verbal construct that Martin was. The figure of Martin flits about here and there, unknown even to his close circle of friends—various printers, binders, and distributors of his pamphlet—and his deepened the mystery surrounding him, whetting the appetite of his audience. One witness saw Martin going “apparelled in Greene” while another claimed that he “wert disguised in a long sky-colored cloake” (Arber’s Sketch 115). There are corresponding echoes of hide-and-

8 See Lowenstein, Halasz, Hope, Evelyn Tribble, and others. Martin calls him “John Wolfe, alias Machiavel, ...most tormenting executioner of Waldegrave’s goods” (Epistle 52-30).

9 From Molsey, near Kensington, to Fawsley, near Northampton, to Norton, near Coventry, to Manchester and finally back in London.

10 The deposition of Henry Sharpe, a book binder with Martin, in October 1589, after his arrest, reveals the conscious attempts by Martinists to create and safeguard his persona:

Before the said first MARTIN [Epistle] was published, this Examineate [Sharpe] did see it at Northampton being printed, in Master Penry’s hands, and asking him who made it, his answere was some such notes were found in Master Fields study...whereby this Examineate was satisfied, supposing it to have been Master Fields doing. (Arber’s Sketch 94)

But Sharpe claims he was given an entirely different impression later on:

When this second book came out, then this examineate...began to suspect PENRY to be the author of yt and talking with him told him as much, alleging this reason, "surely" sayth this Examineate “I think this booke (the Epitome) to be of your making, because there are two or three phrases in ye Epistle of it, which are yours certainly” Where unto Master Penry gave no answere but laughed (Arber’s Sketch 96).
seek in his pamphlets as well. The *Epistle* was given out as "printed overseas, in Europe within two furlongs of a Bowing Priest" (Pierce 13). Martin boasts of his cleverness, taunting the bewildered Bishops and pursuivants:

> Why, my clergy masters, is it even so with your Terribleness? May not a poor gentleman signify his good will unto you by a letter, but presently you must put yourselves to the pains and charges of calling four bishops together...and posting over city and country for poor Martin? (117)

For all this shadow boxing, however, Martin sketches himself quite concretely in the pages of his pamphlet. In *Hay Any Worke for Cooper*, for example, he calmly but clearly draws his own self-portrait, fully aware of the ruckus he is causing among the reading public: "I am called Martin Marprelate. There be many that greatly dislike my doings. I may have my wants I know; for I am a man. But my course I know to be ordinary and lawful.... My purpose was, and is, to do good" (238-9). But he justifies his subversion. When he says, "the Puritans are angry with me; I mean the Puritan Preachers" (Pierce 118), the opposition he seeks to draw between the ordinary common man and the preacher is evident and it is obviously important to him. He knows his power derives from his popular appeal and not from abstruse theologizing: "I am plain; I must call a spade a spade; a pope a pope" (Pierce 118). This rhetorical self-fashioning as the common man's pamphleteer who is directly addressing a popular audience is made complete when Martin adopts a style that is designed to appeal to popular taste. The choice of style is conscious:

>[M]ost part of men could not be gotten to read anything written in the defense of
[Christ's government] and against [the bishops' anti-Christian dealing]. I bethought me, therefore, of a way whereby men might be drawn to do both; perceiving the humours of men in these times...to be given to mirth[,] I took that course...[J]esting is lawful by circumstances, even in the greatest matters. (239)

This justifies the fantastic verbal plays he indulges in throughout the pamphlet war, in his mock dedications, taunts, and insults of the prelates. Verbal cavorting like the following, when Martin cackles at the bishops for being lulled into thinking that the Marprelate campaign is over because of a slight delay in the printing of *Hay Any Worke for Cooper*, reflects and appeals to common people's language:

Wo, Wo! But where have I been all this while? Ten to One, among some of these puritans. Why, Martin? Why, Martin, I say has thou forgotten thyself? Where hast‘e been? Why man, ‘cha’been a-seeking for a salmon’s nest, and ‘cha vownd a whole crew, either of ecclesiastical traitors, or of bishops of the devil, of broken and maimed members of the Church. (257)

As we can see, Martin’s status as a pamphleteer has been established through a fruitful intersection of satirical writing by such writers as Penry, Udall, and Job Throckmorton, and unauthorized printing by such rogue printers as Waldegrave and Hodgkins.

But there is yet another vital ingredient in the making of Martin that needs to be explored: official reaction that would ostracize and demonize, and thus help construct and constitute, the figure of Martin. Martin’s successful domination of the popular space was virtually assured when Burghley wrote to Whitgift immediately after the appearance of *Epistle*:
Whereas hir Majestie hath understandyng of a lewd and seditious book lately prynted as it should seme in secret manner, and as secretly dispersed by persons of unquiet spyrtes; ...hir Majesty conceaveth of these kynd of seditious attemptes... would redound both to ye dishonour of God, to ye disturbance of ye peace of ye church, and a dangerous example to encourage private men in this covert manner to subvert all other kinds of Government under hir Majesties charge, both in ye church and common Weale.... (Arber's Sketch 107)

The conjunction of religious dissension and the subversion of "all other kinds of Government" was a typical response from the state. What raises a heresy to the level of sedition is obviously the fact that it was "printed in secret manner and secretly dispersed," and that it would set an example for others. The Queen's own proclamation, issued four months later in response to the publication of Epitome (February 1589), stresses the same points: "[These kinds of] bookes, Libels, and writings tend by their scope, to persuade and bring in a monstrous and apparent dangerous Innovation within her dominions and countries. (And) to the overthowe of her highnesse lawfull prerogative..." (109). And, of course, it re-emphasizes the by-now-familiar proscription to readers not to be receptors of the pamphleteer's "innovation," as its persuasive power to make the reader think can lead to trouble.

It is clear that Marprelate pamphlets erected a persona of the popular pamphleteer as a self-conscious and self-possessed individual, verbally playful and full of innovation, and anti-establishment and even seditious in his obvious contempt for authority. Just as in Stubbs's case, official paranoia also helped in the constitution of this figure. Not
surprisingly, prominent anti-Martinists like Greene and Nashe were themselves profoundly influenced by the revolutionary zeal and stylistic genius of Martin. Nashe responded to the influence and power of Martin through his own self-constructed pamphlet personalities: Cuthbert Curry Knave, Pierce Penilesse, and Jack Wilton. But it was Greene who could more effectively transform his real-life personality into a verbal construct, a popular signifier, and a pamphleteering force.

The role of Robert Greene in the bishops’ campaign against Martin Marprelate is yet to be definitively studied, but there exists little doubt among scholars that Greene was an integral and significant part of the Episcopate’s proxy war with the Marprelate forces through anti-Puritan pamphleteers. Though anti-Martinists eventually succeeded against a beleaguered and exhausted Martin, the bishops’ realization that Martin could be foiled only by his own weapons and the anti-Martinists’ conscious imitation and parody of Martin’s style had the strange effect of valorizing Martin’s style. When there was an explosion of satiric pamphlets and scurrilous stage acts, all in the name of an anti-Martinist propaganda, the authorities must have realized that their victory against Martin was pyrrhic and their careful check on scurrilous and seditious material, both in print and on stage, had been loosened by anti-Martinism. Thus when Nashe complains that his tract, *An Almond for a Parrat*, was “intercepted” by authorities, he unmistakably refers to the restoration of hostilities between authorities and pamphleteers, whether Martinist or anti-Martinist. The Bishops definitely wanted to “ moderate the fiery fervance of [anti-Martinists’] enflamed zeale” before it reached Martinist proportion, because they shrewdly understood that their pamphlet campaign, because of its inevitable appeal to
popular readership and its inherent susceptibility to subversive interpretations, had become indistinguishable from the pamphlets of Martin Marprelate. The torrent of subversive discourse unleashed by Martin not only had not been stanched by anti-Martinists but it had actually been augmented by their own pamphlets. The result was a pamphlet debate that had developed identical rhetorical strategies and satirical themes. Martinism and anti-Martinism, in effect, had merged. As Joseph Black notes,

> Martinism and anti-Martinism are collaborative discourses, and not only because both are products of communities acting on shared beliefs. In a very real sense, they are also products of one another. What came out of this paper skirmish was not new ideas about the ideal organization of the church but new ways of presenting those ideas to a public increasingly recognized as an entity that could be addressed in print. (723-4)

For students of Greene, there is little doubt that the Marprelate controversy affected him profoundly. Greene learned from Martin not only “invention”11 but also the art of projecting himself through print, especially to a popular audience. He also gained from Martin a certain edge, that whiff of disrepute that proved so effective commercially. Like Martin, Greene actively cultivated the figure of a profligate, even as he was leading his readers into thinking that he was hobnobbing with the low-lives of London through his cony-catching pamphlets. Before Martin, Greene had been the most successful

---

11Nashe, for example, admires Greene for his “invention” in the preface to *Menaphon*: “Let other men (as they please) praise the mountaine that in seaven yeares bringeth forth a mouse, or the Italianate penne that, of a packet of piltries, affords the presse a pamphlet or two in an age ...; but give me a man whose extemporall veine in any humour will excell our greatest Art-maisters deliberate thoughts” (III. 312).
popular writer in the 1580s. He had the uncanny ability to sense the popular mood and tailor his style to fit it. While Euphuism was still in fashion, Greene participated in the fashion with *Mamillia* and *Euphues His Censure*. When Greek romance became popular, Greene responded with prose fictions such as *Pandosto* and *Menaphon*. When the popular readership turned patriotic in the Armada year 1588, Greene turned out *The Spanish Masquerado*. By 1590 Greene had published a prodigious number of works, more than twenty in all. During this period, his title pages and preliminary matter attest to his swaggering self-opinion as a didactic writer, fittingly expressed in his Horatian motto, “*Omne tuit punctum qui misenit utile dulci*” (“He who mixes profit with pleasure wins every prize”). In both his Euphuistic and Alexandrian romances, Greene elaborately played out the theme of prodigality, deploying the major literary motif of the 1570s and 1580s and conforming to the humanist tradition of cloaking his romance tales with proper moral design.\(^{12}\)

But the radical transformation that Greene goes through around 1590 is unlike anything seen in the works of prodigal writers, and is quite incomprehensible if seen as a phenomenon apart from and outside of the dialectic between print and state control we have been discussing so far. If we contextualize Greene’s switch from romance to extravagant repentance and cony-catching exposé as part of the tensions of the marketplace and the emergence of a self-conscious and satirical pamphleteer persona in Martin Marprelate, then we can see that Greene is following in the footsteps of Martin by

---

\(^{12}\)As Helgerson has convincingly pointed out, there was a tension between the humanist inheritances of University-trained writers and the pressures of the marketplace and readership, a tension they tried to resolve through the literary strategy of repentance and prodigality.
beginning a process of constituting himself as an exemplary pamphleteer, exploiting the seditious relationship between pamphlets and readers and establishing himself cleverly as a subversive and disreputable author always on the brink of getting into trouble not only with authorities but also with humanist ideals that he, along with other wits, were supposed to uphold.

This process is most clearly enacted in *Greene's Vision*, a pamphlet written, significantly, in 1590, one year after the Marprelate controversy. This pamphlet captures the defining moment in Greene’s career in an extraordinary way, as it mythologizes the self-conscious birth of Greene’s pamphlet persona through a dream vision. For the first time in Greene’s writing, we see him permeate his work, beyond the usual prefatory material, to become a self-referential character. Once this passage between real life existence and a semi-fictional figuration was achieved, Greene would flip back and forth between the two states in subsequent pamphlets. The easy assumption of various roles is nicely captured by Greene in a sartorial image that occurs at the end of *Vision*. Advertising his forthcoming pamphlet, Greene says, “Looke as speedily as the presse will serve for my mourning Garment, a weede that I know is of so plaine a cut, that it will please the gravest eie, and the most precious eare” (12:274). The word “garment” is important, as it signifies Greene’s assumption of a role, an act performed quite self-consciously in front of an audience

*Vision* is a dream vision in which Chaucer and Gower appear to a downcast

---

13It was published only after Greene died, in 1592.
Greene (the dreamer) and comfort him. The reason for Greene’s gloom is his feeling that his reputation as a writer of love pamphlets is unsavory. Chaucer approves Greene’s style and subject matter, but Gower thinks Greene is wasting his talents. Both make their point by way of telling a story, Chaucer a fabliau-like tale and Gower a dignified moral exemptum. In the ensuing debate, Greene rejects Chaucer’s subject matter and resolves to follow Gower’s example. But, at the very end, there appears another figure, grander and more authoritative than either Gower or Chaucer. It is none other than Solomon, who argues powerfully against all imaginative writing and in favor of theology, and who exhorts Greene to embrace spiritual writing. Greene obediently rejects both Chaucer and Gower and promises to spend his remaining days writing theological treatises.

Most scholars are fascinated by the dilemma Greene seems to have faced between light romance (enthusiastically approved by Chaucer) and heavily moralistic emblem stories (advocated by Gower), and have debated the choice Greene eventually makes.\(^\text{14}\) What strikes the modern reader as most remarkable about Vision is not the arguments of the debate or Greene’s eventual choice, but the presence of the debate itself. As we can see, it is no more than a brilliant ploy to focus attention on himself as a writer, because the particulars of the debate and the facts surrounding it can be seen, on close examination, to be less than strictly truthful. Greene’s romances so far had resembled Gower’s dignified exemptum more than Chaucer’s ribald tale. Greene’s decision to

\(^{14}\)See especially Carmine Di Biase’s “The Decline of Euphuism,” where it is argued that in Vision Greene rejects traditional audiences in favor of new ones for his pamphlets. Di Biase makes the important observation that Vision is about Greene and his readers, but neglects to dwell on the year it was written and thus fails to situate the pamphlet within the events surrounding the Marprelate controversy.
follow Gower rather than Chaucer is thus a perplexing decision, since it is the Chaucer-like “scurrility” that Greene resorts to after 1590, especially in his cony-catching pamphlets. And the final intervention by Solomon on behalf of theology and Greene’s quick conversion in that direction are hilarious fiction in light of what follows after 1590. With the possible exception of *Mourning Garment*, nothing Greene wrote between 1590 and 1592 can be remotely characterized as theological or spiritual, certainly not the rogue pamphlets, which are a significant portion of his output after *Vision*. Therefore, the debate in *Vision* cannot be taken to correspond to real life circumstances in Greene’s career but must be read only as an elaborate ploy to represent himself as a writer rediscovering himself in some new light.

Significantly, the initial setting of *Vision* establishes Greene as a writer in conflict with traditional norms. The opening sentence itself establishes Greene’s rogue-writer status: “After I was burdened with the penning of the Cobler of Canterbury, I waxed passing melancholy, as grieving that either I shold be wrong with envy, or wronged with suspicion” (12:197). The circumstances surrounding the publication of *The Cobler of Canterbury* are still murky and its authorship not satisfactorily established, but that the pamphlet was deemed scurrilous and widely supposed to have been written by Greene is evident from contemporary references to it. Whoever the author was, *Vision*’s readers are being asked to understand that it is because of this misidentification that Greene is in a semi-trance state that proves conducive for a dream vision. The false allegation regarding the *Cobler of Canterbury* has ostensibly triggered a self-evaluation in Greene, and in the first few pages of *Vision* Greene presents an unflattering picture of himself as a writer of
trivial pamphlets, a picture whose authenticity is severely undercut by irony. Greene’s real agenda seems to be to project his pamphleteering persona for commercial purposes, because he exhibits a full awareness of his own reputation among his readers:

[I] began to cal remembrance what fond and wanton lines had past my pen, how I had bent my course to a wrong shore, and beating my braines about such varieties were little profitable, sowing my seed in the sand and so reaping nothing but thornes and thistles. (12:197-8)

Greene is perfectly aware of the reason this has happened. It has to do with his own inclinations toward putting himself in print too readily:

I content myself with a superficiall insight, and only satisfie my desire with the name of a scholar, yet as blind Baiard wil junpse soonest into the mire, so have I ventured afore many my letters, to put myself into the presse, and have set forth sundrie bookees in print of love and such amorous fancies which some have favoured, other have misliked. (12:212)

This picture of himself as a writer caught in a conflict, portrayed in Vision for the first time, is a recurrent image in Greene’s subsequent pamphlets, both repentance and cony-catching. In the Mourning Garment, for example, he says, “I have turned my wanton workes to effectual labours, and pulling off their vainglorious titles, have called this my Mourning Garment...” (9:120). Farewell to Folly (1591) harps on the same theme: “Follies I tearme them [his romances], because their subjects have been superficiall, and their intents amorous...” (9:227). Never Too Late proclaims, indirectly, his wisdom born of experience: “The Book is little, yet drawen from a large principle, Nunquam sera est
ad bonos mores via, wherein I have discovered so artificially the fraudulent effects of Venus trumperies..." (8:6). Thus the recurrence of Greene's repentant figure should make us wonder about his sincerity and give us a clue as to the figure's status as a mere rhetorical posture.

This figure is reinforced from many angles in Vision. First, Greene constitutes himself from the point of view of Chaucer: "Wee have heard of thy worke to be amorous, sententious, and well written. If thou doubtest blame for thy wantonness, let myself suffice for an instance, whose Canterburie tales are broad enough before, and written homely and pleasantly: yet who hath bin more canonised for his workes than Sir Geoffrey Chaucer" (12:215). Then, Greene puts these words about himself into Gower's mouth, echoing similar statements made previously by Greene himself: "...thou hast applied thy wits ill and has sowed chaffe and shalt reape no harvest...thy books are baits that allure youth, syrens that sing sweetly, and yet destroy with their notes, faire flowers without smel and good phrases without any profite" (12:218). At the end of the debate, after Chaucer and Gower have finished their stories, Greene offers, by way of reply to the great writers, an estimation of himself that affirms his self-projection as a troubled writer: "My pamphlets have passed the presse, and some have given them praise, but the gravest sort, whose mouthes are the trumpets of true report, have spoken hardlie of my labours" (12:273).

It should be clear by now that Greene is beginning to project a persona of himself as a troubled writer, troubled in the sense that he is aware of his power over and appeal to impressionable young minds, and that what he is imparting to these minds somehow,
somewhere breaks certain norms. What should also be equally obvious is that this projection of the troubled persona is just that, a projection, a convention. Greene is aware of the financial success of his repentant pose. In *Farewell to Folly* written in 1591, he almost boasts of his popularity: “I presented you alate with my mourning garment, how you censure of the cloth or cut I know not, but the printer hath past them all out of his shop, and the pedler found them too deare for his packe...” (9:230).

Thus through *Vision* and other repentance pamphlets of the 1590s, Greene is creating a persona that serves him economically and, as we shall see, satirically. Economically, there is no doubt that his clever manipulation of readers' interest in the personal tribulations of a famous writer helped sell more copies of his pamphlet. Creating a pamphleteer self also freed him from dependence on patronage, as is evidenced by the fact that only some of his repentance and none of his cony-catching pamphlets carry dedications to patrons. As in the case of Martin, lack of patronage meant “masterless” disorderliness in writers, and this may have added to Greene's popular reputation as a rake and a bohemian, an image Greene tried to cultivate through his cony-catching pamphlets.

Far from the real-life reports that they were supposed to be, Greene's cony-catching pamphlets have now been convincingly shown to be fictions of a particular kind. While the stories of cheating and thieving found in these pamphlets are still being studied, the persona of Robert Greene dispersed in the pamphlets, when collected, gives us some interesting clues about the way Greene constituted himself as a disreputable writer in these pamphlets, much as in *Vision*. For example, Greene first of all justifies his
foray into crime reporting by invoking public good, just as he justified his amorous novels as being good for the misguided youth. In both cases, however, the activities described become more attractive than the didactic messages they are supposed to convey to readers. Somehow, Greene was aware that his disrepute emanated from this discrepancy, and his self-representations exploit this irony to the full. "The odde mad-caps I have beene mate to," he says, are not his companions but just his experimental acquaintances among whom he moved as a "spie to have an insight into their knaverys, that seeing their traines I might eschew their snares..." (10:5-6). This disclaimer, however, is severely tested by the sheer relish Greene shows in the narrative that follows. One gets the feeling that Greene was in fact a companion to them. As we read his cony-catching pamphlets, it becomes clear that Greene had all along wanted to create the impression that he is somehow complicit with cony-catchers. Greene's professed hatred toward them is so exaggerated that we suspect that he is merely pitching his pamphlets. For example, in Notable Discovery of Coosenage, Greene says:

[I am] threatened by the backsters of that filthie facultie, that if I set their practices in print, they will cut off that hande that writes the pamphlet, but how I feare their bravadoes, you shall percieve by my plaine painting out of them, yea, so little do I esteeme such base minded braggers, that were it not I hope of their amendment, I would in a schedule set downe the names of such coosening cunny-catchers.

(10:12)

This elaborate but sly self-promotion continues in all pamphlets. The same hints at intrepidity and integrity are continued in the Second Part of Conny-Catching, where
Greene reports that the exposed cony-catchers are threatening to "make a massacre of my bones" (12:70). In the next installment, the Third Part of Conny Catching, Greene is an investigative reporter whose function is merely to facilitate publication of information that an "insider" (a Justice of Peace, in this case) has gathered in his dealings with the cony-catchers. In the Disputation Between Hee Conny-Catcher and Shee Conny-Catcher, Greene is constituted through the words of cony-catchers themselves, who are both impressed at the extent of his knowledge about their trade and terrified at the prospect of further exposure. Where Greene himself had been the narrator of cony-catchers' deeds so far, in the Disputation the cony-catchers in turn discuss Greene and the effect his exposé is having on their trade. Lawrence, the he-cony-catcher, is openly admiring of Greene's intimate knowledge of the underworld: "R.G. hath so amply pend them downe in the first part of conny-catching that though I be one of the facultie, yet I cannot discover moe than he hath layde open" (10:206). By ventriloquizing his own praises through a cony-catcher, Greene adds legitimacy to his persona as a fearless reporter. Through Nan, the she-cony-catcher, Greene adds to his persona, and he also manages to pitch his next pamphlet: "I feare me R.G. will name them too soone in his black booke: a pestilence on him, they say, he hath there set downe my husbandes pettigree, and yours too Lawrence" (10:225).

If these pamphlets figure a morally ambivalent Greene, then the Defense of Conny-Catching, a pamphlet probably co-written by Greene and Nashe, clearly fleshes out the persona of Greene as a cony-catching pamphleteer. It is in this pamphlet that Greene most clearly casts himself as a subversive pamphleteer whose tracts on cony-catching had been a commercial venture and whose moral posturing was a sham.
Cuthbert Curry Knave, the fictional cony-catcher whose defense the tract records, accuses Greene of roguery himself:

I learned that [Robert Greene] was a schollar, and a maister of Artes, and a conny-catcher in his kind, though not at cards, and one that favor good fellows... whereupon reading his bookes, and surveying every line with deep judgement, I began to note folly in the man, that would straine a Gnat, and lette passe an Elephant: that would touch small scapes, and lette grosse faultes passe without any reprehension. (11:47)

Curry Knave’s charge that Green “straine[s] a gnat and lette[s] pass an elephant” is a familiar counter charge to cony-catching pamphlets and would recur in Chettle’s *Kind Hartes Dreame* and in Barnabe Riche’s *Greenes Newes Both in Heaven and Hell*. In the *Defense*, Cuthbert’s voice captures a self-consciously satirical Greene who problematizes his own pamphleteering themes and methods. Cuthbert’s accusation that Greene is complicit in the upper class’s far more widespread and subtle thievery is a telling moment in Greene’s metamorphosis as satirical pamphleteer. The attack on “bigger” cony-catchers is insistent: “we conny-catchers are like little flies in the grasse, which live on little leaves and do no more harme: whereas there bee in Englande other professions that bee great conny-catchers and caterpillars, that make barraine the field wherein they baite” (11: 47). Cuthbert insists that “there is no estate, trade, occupation nor mistery, but lives by conny-catching, and that our shift at cards compared to the rest is the simplest of all” (11:103). In a deliciously witty and self-referential satirical moment, Greene has Cuthbert ask this of the writer of the cony-catching pamphlets:
What if I should prove you a conny-catcher Maister R.G.[?] Would it not make you blush at the matter? ... Aske the Queenes players, if you sold them not

*Orlando Furioso* for twenty nobles, and when they were in the country, sold the same play to the Lord Admirals men for as much more. **Was not this plaine conny-catching Maister R.G.**? (11:75-76)

Cuthbert completes Greene's cony-catching self-portrait not only as a satirical pamphleteer but as one who is well aware of the problematic nature of his own status as the practitioner of a disreputable craft. Thus Greene has distinct continuities with Martin Marprelate's self-projection as a subversive force whose oppositional power issues as much from print as from his own ideas. Both Martin and Greene prove that to resort to unauthorized print is to be subversive and therefore an enemy of the authorities. It is this correlation between print and subversion that writers like Chettle, Nashe, and Riche will exploit in their own writings. Harvey, alone among popular pamphleteers, sought to restore to pamphlets a respectability by contrasting himself with Greene. The following chapters study how these writers follow in the footsteps of Greene and create their own pamphlet selves.
Chapter 2:

_Greenes Groatsworth of Wit_ Patronage, Patrimony, and Pamphleteering Wits

The textual moment to which we have been building so far has to begin with _Groatsworth of Wit_, a deathbed pamphlet written by Greene and published posthumously.¹ Unlike _The Repentance of Robert Greene_, a similar pamphlet but one that seems genuinely autobiographical with little rhetorical resemblance to other works,² _Groatsworth_ is a substantial work that has distinct continuities with Greene’s prodigal, repentance, and cony-catching motifs. But it also has the desperate realization of imminent death evident in the _Repentance_, which makes it a uniquely self-reflexive pamphlet that seeks to represent in typical Greene fashion the professional life of the humanist writer-turned-pamphleteer. In telling the story of Roberto, Greene hints that he

¹_Groatsworth of Wit_ was registered in the Stationers’ Hall on 20 September 1592 to William Wright, but the register specifically notes that it was done so “upon the peril of Henry Chettle” (Arber II. 620). This reference, which probably means that Chettle was in possession of the manuscript after Greene died, along with Chettle’s own admission, in the preface to _Kind Harte’s Dreame_, of editing it, has embroiled the pamphlet in an authorship controversy that has lasted for centuries. C.E. Sanders’ “Robert Greene and His ‘Editors’” re-ignited an age-old authorship controversy in this century. W.B.Austin’s computer-aided stylistic study of _Groatsworth_ in 1969 categorically stated that Chettle, and not Greene, was the real author. Long entertained and never fully accepted (nor, for that matter, rejected), the Chettle authorship received a shot in the arm when a new critical edition of the pamphlet by D. Allen Carroll (1994) rejected Robert Greene as _Groatsworth_’s author and accepted Chettle as the probable author. However, critics, by and large, have remained unconvinced. For example, Charles Crupi, whose _Robert Greene_ is the latest full-length study of the author, studies _Groatsworth_ as if Greene wrote it, without in any way engaging with Austin’s findings. The more I read the pamphlet, the more convinced I become of Greene’s authorship, and I shall, therefore, treat it as Greene’s.

²_The Repentance of Robert Greene_ is generally believed, even by those who doubt _Groatsworth_’s authorship, to be Greene’s authentic work, and, as such, it forms almost the sole basis for all biographical information on Greene. There is some unverifiable information (e.g. Greene’s visit to the Continent and his travel in Italy), but by and large scholars have tended to take the pamphlet’s claims at face value, simply because it has none of the rhetorical artifices that characterize Greene’s other repentance pamphlets. See Harold Jenkins’ “On the Authenticity of Greene’s _Groatsworth of Wit_ and _The Repentance of Robert Greene_” A.B. Grosart’s general introduction to his _Life and Works of Robert Greene_, V.1, Brenda Richardson’s “Robert Greene’s Yorkshire Connexions: A New Hypothesis,” and C.E. Sanders’ “Robert Greene and His ‘Editors’.”
is actually writing about himself (the name Gorinious is Latin for Greene) and makes it quite explicit when the Roberto narrative collapses into an autobiographical confession at the end. Thus Groatsworth is a continuation of Greene’s self-constitution initiated in Vision and carried on through his repentance and cony-catching pamphlets. The extraordinary nature of Green’s entry into the fictional/allegorical narrative of Roberto’s story makes it a unique document in the story of Greene’s self-realization as a pamphleteer. And the fact that Groatsworth is overwhelmingly concerned with writing and the marketplace of print places it firmly in the tradition of Elizabethan pamphlets that exploit and manipulate the collusion between pamphleteers and print. By closely reading Groatsworth, I want to show that Greene self-consciously demonstrates that pamphlet writing is the only form of discourse he can resort to, because all other enabling institutions, such as university, church, and patronage, have abandoned writers like him, and that the pamphlet form alone reconciles the competing and contradictory demands of humanism, prose romance, and the marketplace. In Groatsworth, he finally emerges from fictional and allegorical representations of himself, which had characterized his earlier pamphlets, and reveals himself as a real-life satirical pamphleteer, firmly rooted in the commercial world that writes, prints, and sells pamphlets.

The main part of Groatsworth tells the story of Roberto, a scholar whose usurer father, Gorinius, leaves all his ill-gotten wealth to Roberto’s younger brother, Lucanio, just to spite Roberto’s superior and moralizing attitude. Scheming to get his share of the patrimony, Roberto enlists the services of the courtesan Lamilia in a plot to cony-catch
Lucanio. However, Roberto's scheme backfires when Lamilia, coveting everything for herself, exposes him to Lucanio, who disowns him. Out on the streets, Roberto is employed by a theater manager to write plays, but a disillusioned Roberto lives a life of debauchery and cony-catchng, before deciding to earn his living by turning his hard-carned experiences into a salable commodity: pamphlets. At this point in the story, Roberto reveals himself as Robert Greene and promises to repent.

The major thrust of Groatsworth is the emergence of Greene, the commercial pamphleteer. Where in previous pamphlets Greene had obliquely written about the compromises he had had to make in the commercial world of writing through his repentance tales and cony-catchng tracts, in Groatsworth Greene comes out openly to satirize his profession. This coming out is figured in the transformation of Roberto into Robert Greene. We can see that Roberto represents the frustrations and degradations of Greene's life, and in finally emerging from the guise of "Roberto" and announcing himself as the real author, Greene commits a rhetorical act that has profound consequences for the figure of the author in English prose writing. Like Martin Marprelate before him, Greene constitutes himself through his pamphlets and his audience, and partakes of the perceived corruptions of the marketplace. In fact, as Greene sees it, the marketplace eventually destroys him. But Greene achieves in Groatsworth his own voice as a pamphleteer, in spite of the allegory implicit in the Roberto story. The birth of this voice is so radical for an Elizabethan writer that he actually dies doing it, just as Martin, himself a fictional front for a group of pamphleteers, was destroyed for his
attempts. The message of Groatsworth is that pamphleteers' direct appeal to the audience is not only subversive in relation to the powers that be but also morally and rhetorically destructive because of the compromises satire and the marketplace of print exact from writers. Groatsworth is thus an astute, quasi-fictional representation of the emergence of the self-conscious pamphleteer in the marketplace.

Roberto's story can be seen to correspond to Greene's own career. His early life, before the death of his father, Gorinius, resembles Greene's university days and early euphuistic and humanist fiction phase; his ruination of Lucanio with the help of Lamilia resembles Greene's romance phase; and his dissolution during his days as a writer of plays for the Player-patron corresponds to Greene's stint as a playwright. Roberto's final phase of repentance merges with Roberto's own, and they become repentance and cony-catchers, pamphlet writers. At the end of Roberto's story, the bitter satire of Groatsworth gives way to miscellaneous writings such as moralistic messages to readers and exhortations to friends to repent, including the notorious attack on Shakespeare, ostensibly in demonstration of the didactic potential of both repentance and satiric writing. It is in this spirit of personal and undisguised repentance that The Repentance of Robert Greene should be understood: it is remarkable not just for its extraordinary death-bed repentance but also for its autobiographical material. In fact, the pamphlet can be taken as one of the first attempts in English prose at writing the self, a self-constituting

---

3 Not Greene's "life," but Greene's career. It might also be argued that Roberto serves as a composite of university-educated writers like Greene.
exercise in prose. Roberto's story is the moment of that transition from fictional to real-life existence.

The self-reflexivity of Groatsworth of Wit begins right in the title, which establishes the tension Greene feels between material necessities and humanist obligations: it sneeringly refers to the actual value of the pamphlet (usually sold for a groat, or four pence) that Greene had produced from his "wit." Though the title page claims that the pamphlet was "bought with a million repentance," it is of little value, thanks to the low value of pamphlets in the marketplace.\(^4\) Greene suggests that Roberto's (and his own) struggles in life are the result of the mediation by the world of commerce. This mediation is variously represented in the figures of Gorinius, Lamilia, the Player-patron, and Lucanio. Each of these figures manipulates Roberto's humanist notions about writing and reduces him to an abject state of being a commodity, totally devoid of his individuality and voice. From this anonymity Roberto/Greene has to break free in the end.

The first of these figures, Gorinius, is a richly complex character who serves an important function in Groatsworth's satire. Gorinius is "an old new made Gentleman," in

---

\(^4\)"Pamphlets" was a loosely used category in Elizabethan England, generally taken to mean books or treatises of short length and usually used in contrast with "books." Pamphlets were definitely considered by serious writers to be less prestigious, possibly because of their relative independence from patronage and censorship. Greene's earlier romances would qualify as books, even if, physically, they may have resembled pamphlets. By the late 1580s, however, he was producing more pamphlets than books. See Clark's The Elizabethan Pamphleteers, Halasz's The Marketplace of Print, and Carlson's English Humanist Books: Writers and Patrons, Manuscript and Print, 1475-1525.
a “citie... made riche by merchandize” (102; all Groatsworth quotations are from Grosart’s edition of Greene, vol. 12). The commercial nature of Gorinius’ milieu is established by his new money and the city’s commercial success. The “new made” quality of Gorinius’ gentle status is a highly dubious one in Greene’s work. In the Quijpe, for example, Cloth Breeches makes a distinction between himself as one who belongs to the ancient yeomanry and gentility and Velvet Breeches as one of the “proud and unmanerly upstarts” (11: 223). Significantly, at the end of the dream vision, Velvet Breeches is found against by the jury Greene assembles: “Velvet Breeches is an upstart come out of Italy, begot of Pride, nursed up by self-love, & brought into this country by his companion nufangleness” (11:294). Thus Gorinius’ newly acquired wealth and status are Greene’s satirical glance at the many new members of the gentry who do not honor the obligations of providing for poets and writers. It is only from this perspective that we can understand Gorinius’ decision to bestow what “he had gathered from many” on a single person, his younger son Lucanio, “being as himself, brought up to be goldes bondsman” (103), and not on Roberto. The crassness of the new gentry also explains why Gorinius cannot believe he is the real father of the scholarly Roberto (“My sonnes [for so your mother saide ye were] and so I assure my selfe one of you is ...” [105]). Greene is bitterly sarcastic about Gorinius’ “scholarship” as well: “he had good experience in a Nouverint [a term used in debt bonds], and by the universall tearmes therein contained, had driven many gentlewomen to seeke unknowne countries” (104). Gorinius even knows a little Latin, “which though it were but little, yet was it profitable,
for he had this Philosophie written in a ring, *Tu tibi cura*, which precept he curiously observed, being in selfe love so religious, as he held it no point of charitie to part with anything, of which he living might make use" (104). "Self-love" betrays Gorinius' membership in the new gentry, and his gift of Machiavelli's book to Lucanio ("if thou reade well this booke, ... thou shalt see what it is to be foole-holy, as to make scruple of conscience, where profit presents it selfe" [108]) establishes his Italianate depravity. The conjunction between Gorinius and ungenerous patrons becomes even more obvious when Gorinius boasts of his ability to divest young heirs of their patrimony through usury and make young scholars wait for his loans: "How many schollers have written in Gorinius praise, and received (after long capping and reverence) a sixpeny reward in signe of superficial liberalitie," he asks in some satisfaction (105-06). So, when Gorinius leaves all his considerable wealth to Lucanio, reserving for Roberto but "an olde groat...

wherewith I wish him to buy a groatsworth of wit," it is a calculated insult aimed at all moralistic and old-fashioned writers who had been habitually writing against all that Gorinius stands for. As Gorinius tells Roberto, scholars like him who have "reproved my maner of life..., shall not be contaminated with corrupt gaine" (106). Gorinius thus presents an interesting dilemma for humanist writers. Contemptuous as they were of new money, they were also dependent on it for their livelihood, so Gorinius’ assertion that Roberto has lost his inheritance because of his constant criticism and his unwillingness to support his trade and materialistic way of life seems justified. "Who would wish anything to him," asks Gorinius pointedly, "that knowes not how to use it?" (109)
Thus, when Gorinius disillusioned Roberto’s dreams of inheritance, he nudges Roberto to the painful realization that patronage is not an entitlement in the commercial climate of the 1580s and 1590s.\(^5\) Being left with only a groat, Roberto has to abandon his humanist principles and develop new ways of sustaining himself. That is why he, who has so far been moralistic, grows “into an inward contemp of his fathers unequall legacie,” and sets on “converting the sweetnesse of his studie, to the sharp thirst of revenge,” to bring Lucanio to “al possible unjurie” (110). As long as Gorinius was alive to provide for him, Roberto could affect disdain toward his father and be oblivious of his brother. However, once the power passes from Gorinius to Lucanio, Roberto takes on a different personality (from “sweetness of studie” to “sharp thirst of revenge”) in order to repossess the wealth that he thinks is his by right. Gorinius’ death thus makes Roberto abandon his scholarly and moralistic outlook on life and think commercially, think, that is, not in terms of what he was taught at his Academy, but in response to radically altered circumstances where he has to use his wiles to survive. Thus Gorinius represents the

---

\(^5\)Patronage declined despite an increase in the number of aristocracy and gentry during Elizabeth’s reign. This curious anomaly can be understood only by the quality of the “new” aristocracy. Many were tradespeople and overseas speculators who simply bought their way into prestige and privilege, and the Queen also swelled the ranks of the ruling class for political reasons. As a result, the general perception among writers, both at the Universities and elsewhere, was that money had successfully replaced traditional qualities of honor, service, and generosity in the court. This note of complaint can be seen in almost all serious writers of the age, including Spenser, Lyly, Greene, Nashe, and Jonson. For a general account of the dilution of peerage, Lawrence Stone’s *The Crisis of the Aristocracy, 1558-1641* remains the best source. On declining patronage, see especially Alistair Fox’s “The Complaint of Poetry for the Death of Liberality: the Decline of Literary Patronage in the 1590’s” and Arthur Marotti’s “Patronage, Poetry and Print.” Whigham’s *Ambition and Privilege* has an informative introduction to the problem of burgeoning gentry and their negotiations in the court and social circles. Brenda Richardson’s study of Greene’s Yorkshire connections has some interesting details on his early dedications and patrons and his later disappointments. On a related theme, see Mark Curtis’ “The Alienated Intellectuals of Early Stuart England.”
decisive moment in Roberto’s transformation from a humanistic scholar to a popular
writer concerned with making a livelihood for himself.

If Gorinius represents the aristocratic patrimony gone dry, then Lamilia is the
composite figure of all seductresses in Greene’s oeuvre who represent “fancy” and
“romance.” All “prodigal” writers had used this figure of the seductress in their romances
as dangerous temptation. As Helgerson says, Renaissance humanists’ objection to
poetry is expressed in strangely misogynic terms: “they saw poetry as soft and effeminate,
weakening boys and leading them to pursue lascivious pleasure rather than manly and
courageous accomplishment” (35). There is no doubt that Greene was fully alive to the
deception he was perpetrating on his reading audience. He would confess as much later
in his repentance pamphlets. In the beginning of Mourning Garment, for example, he
says that he “overweaned” his pamphlets “of Ninivie,” “setting forth Actions of amorous
philosophy.” In Farewell to Folly, he admits that his pamphlets have been “superficially,
and their intents amorous” (9:227). He usually cloaks his intentions as being honorable
and didactic but carefully spells out “dangers” the youth should be aware of, thus making

---

6Helgerson’s landmark study, The Elizabethan Prodigals, is still the most important inquiry into
the motif of prodigality in middle- and late-Elizabethan writers, though it does not take into account the
writers’, especially Greene’s and Nashe’s, ambivalence and attitudes toward patronage and, especially,
print. That the convention of prodigality, apart from being a rhetorical attempt to reconcile humanist ideals
with romantic and creative impulses, is also an emotional and intellectual response to the pressures of the
marketplace of print is an insight that is yet to be explored fully. For Greene’s participation in the humanist
agenda of guiding the young mind to perfection, see Kinney’s Humanist Poetics: Thought, Rhetoric, and
Fiction in Sixteenth-Century England and Margolies’ Novel and Society in Elizabethan England. For
Greene’s growing unease with this program, see Di Biase’s “The Decline of Euphuism: Robert Greene’s
Struggle against Popular Taste.” Margolies also addresses the issue of Greene’s increasing awareness of the
market forces directing reading and writing and his conscious attempts to exploit those forces. Also see
Richard Halpern’s insightful study into the economic undertones of the humanist agenda.
the dangers far more attractive than the precepts he is supposedly teaching. For example, the preface to *Never Too Late* is tantalizing:

The Booke is little, yet drawen from a large principle, *Nunquam sera est ad bono mores via*, wherein I have discovered so artificially the fraudulent effects of Venus trumperies and so plainly as in a platforme, laid open the prejudicial pleasures of love, that Gentlemen may see... love (unlesse only grounded upon vertue) breedeth more disparagement to the credit than content to the fancy. (8:6)

Elsewhere, he promises to “discover the forwardnesse of youth to ill, their restlesse appetites to amorous effects, the prejudices of wanton love, the disparagement that grows from prodigall humours...” (9:120). At another place, the promise is to show “every veine, muscle and arterie of [vanity’s] unbridled follies” (9:123). Thus, for Greene romance was a means to feed young gentleman with fancy. It is in this sense that his romances become, as he says in his repentance pamphlets, “frivolous labours,” “follies,” “wanton workes,” “vainglorious titles,” and “toyes.”

That Lamilia represents romantic fancy can be readily shown. She keeps a “hospital, which is in the suberbes of the cittie, pleasingly seated and made more delectable by a pleasing Garden” (112-13). Even before Lamilia is introduced, Greene foregrounds her character as a “city siren,” thus exploiting the allusion’s connotations of

---

7W.W. Barker, in “Rhetorical Romance: the ‘Frivolous Toyes’ of Robert Greene,” says that this is a mere posture. I think it is much more complex. Also see Roger Pooley’s “I confesse it to be a mere toy”: How to Read the Preliminary Matter to Renaissance Fiction.”
evil temptation. As well, Roberto’s exhortation to Lucanio subtly but directly attacks humanists’ warnings against fanciful and imaginative impulses in writers and readers alike: “consider brother you are yong, then plod not altogether in meditating on our fathers precepts: which howsoever they savoured of profit were most unsaverly to one of yeeres applied” (111). The clinching evidence, however, is to be found in Lamilia’s song. Structured as a two-part argument, her song, in an ironic tone, celebrates simple, artless love in the first part:

When love learned first the ABC of delight,

And knew no figures, nor conceited phrase:

He simplie gave to due desert her right,

He led not lovers in darke winding wayes

He plainly wild to love, or flatly answered no,

But now who lists to prove, shall find it nothing so.

Love, when it knew no “figures” nor “conceited phrases” merely delighted in direct language (“ABC of delight”). More importantly, it “led not lovers in darke winding wayes.” Its ways were plain (“he plainly wild to love, or flatly answered no”). This is in

---

8In all his repentance pamphlets, Greene habitually equates the courtesan’s music to the seductive, and ultimately destructive, powers of the Sirens. This conflation of feminine music and forbidden passion also reflects contemporary Renaissance polemic over art and fancy. See Linda Phyllis Austern’s excellent study on female musicians and sexual enchantment in the Renaissance. “Sing againe Syren.”

9Not necessarily monetary, but “profit” is an ideologically loaded term closely allied with “credit” and “usefulness.”
sharp contrast to the corrupting ways of the “blind fancy” of the chorus, which hinders,

Lamidia says, “youths joy”:

Fie fie on blind fancie,

It hinders youths joy:

Faire virgins learne by me,

To count love a toy.

Lamidia quite cynically claims that “Faire virgins learne by me, / To count love a toy.”

Thus the chorus undercuts the paean to the true, artless love celebrated in the first section.

That this is by a courtesan (far from a “faire virgin”) sets up the second section, where

love has been infected:

For since he [Love] learned to use the poets pen,

He learned likewise with something words to faine,

Witching chaste eares with trothlesse tongues of men,

And trayed faith with falsehood and disdaine.

He gives a promise now, anon he sweareth no,

Who listeth for to prove shall find his chargings so. (113)

The main cause of corruption is his (“Love’s”) learning to “use the poets pen.” Here,

love is just “smoothing words” from the “trothlesse toungs of men,” and it betrays “faith

with falsehood and disdaine.” Lamilia, in scorning “fancy” and teaching virgins to

“count” love as a mere toy and nothing more, actually stands for fancy and imagination

that lead to an immoral division of beauty and moral purpose. Thus she stands for the
“wanton” romantic impulse that so many university-educated prodigal writers both resisted and succumbed to. In the overall design of *Groatsworthe*, then, Lamilia is poetic fancy, leading truth astray. Roberto seems to confirm Lamilia’s status as a misleader of youth when he tells a smitten Lucanio to expect even more from her: “If the sight and hearing of this harmonious beautie work in you effects of wonder, what will the possession of so divine an essence, wherein beautie and Art dwell in their perfect excellencie” (115). Roberto’s description of Lamilia as a “divine essence” that possesses “beautie and Art” evokes all the controversial issues, such as fancy, art, nature, and beauty, in the debate between puritans and imaginative writers in the late sixteenth century.

The enlistment of romance (Lamilia) gives rise to pangs of conscience in Roberto, however much he might be determined to exploit Lucanio. The feelings of conflict that Helgerson has documented in romance writers are depicted in Roberto’s filial feeling for Lucanio. As Lucanio proves a more than easy prey for the charms of Lamilia, Roberto the moralist cannot but worry about Lucanio’s precipitous fall into the hands of Lamilia. In this concern can be seen the writers’ acknowledgment of the overpowering nature of fancy, the debilitating corruption awaiting its victims. Once resorted to, Lamilia cannot be stopped by Roberto. He fears that Lucanio is witless in falling so quickly and completely for Lamilia, and he wants to warn him of the dangers of Lamilia’s charms.

But Greene’s main point is not that Lucanio is in danger, but that Roberto himself is risking his moral authority as the “author” of the scheme: Lamilia can and does easily
overwhelm him. When Roberto "begins to reckon to bee a sharer" in the money Lamilia will win from his brother Lucanio, she disabuses him, analyzing his worthlessness in blunt terms:

It may be you will thus reason: Had not Roberto trained Lucanio with Lamilia's lure, Lucanio had not now been Lamilia's pray: therefore sith by Roberto she possesseth her prize, Roberto merites an equall part. Monstrous absurd if so you reason; as well you may reason thus: Lamilia's dog hath kilde her a deere, therefore his mistris must make him a pastie. No poore pennilesse Poet, thou art beguilde in me, and yet I wonder how thou couldest, thou hast beene so often beguilde.... Reasonlesse Roberto, that having but a brokers place, asked a lender's reward. (128)

Lamilia has entirely appropriated her "woodcocke" Lucanio, who becomes her "possession," "prize," a hunted "deere." Roberto's role in this scheme is not that of her master, nor even that of an equal partner, but her "stale," her "dog" that killed her "deere," just a "broker." The fact that it was Roberto who authored this whole scheme and "trained Lucanio" for Lamilia's lure (thus actually killing the "deere") does not mean much to Lamilia. Roberto is like a dog, relegated to a parasitical existence. Lamilia, by her ability to tempt and exploit her victims, gets all the profit. Roberto's collusion in Lucanio's ruin leaves him not only guilty but still penniless.

If Gorinius has represented the increasingly materialistic late Elizabethan environment of the court and the vanishing breed of "Maecenas" in the ranks of
aristocracy, and if he has also reduced Roberto to fend for himself, Roberto now realizes that his resort to what Lamilia represents is not the answer for his woes. What does Lucanio represent in the story of Roberto? Interpreting Lucanio is perhaps the most challenging aspect of reading Groatworth, because Lucanio's status reminds us that Groatworth, though obviously and self-confessedly intended as Greene's autobiography of sorts, is nevertheless a complex work that does not depend on easy parallels and facile allegories. For example, Gorinius, for all his usurious two-dimensionality, is also a hint at Greene's melancholic and mournful longing for a paternalistic society that would cherish writers; Lamilia, on the other hand, is a reductive caricature of Greene's genuine interest in romance, as evident in such successful fictional narratives as Mamilia, Gwydonius, Pandosto, and Menaphon. As for Lucanio, I see him as representing the shared culture between writers and readers, a filial relationship that is terminally infected by Gorinius' materialistic influence on Lucanio. Seen this way, Lucanio embodies Greene's subtle criticism of the book-buying public and, perhaps, playgoers for their failure to discriminate between good and popular entertainment. This role of Lucanio is confirmed as the story develops, when Lucanio's growing power and influence make Roberto increasingly dependent on him. Lucanio's infatuation with and eventual ruination by Lamilia complete his status as the figurative audience.

We are told in the beginning that Lucanio was "brought up to be goldes bondsman" and therefore "held heire apparent of [Gorinius'] ill gathered goods" (103). Gorinius also sees himself in Lucanio: he is sure of Lucanio's paternity, though he is not
so sure about Roberto’s. Gorinius sees in him a spirit contrary to Roberto’s—one that understands that “without wealth life is a death” (105). Is he the representative of a new generation of materialistic Elizabethans that fail to value writers like Roberto? Are they the true descendants and followers of the Gorinius in the Court? (That Gorinius is ultimately wrong about Lucanio is in no small measure due to Lamilia’s and Roberto’s machinations.) Recent scholarship has noted the shift in the source and nature of Elizabethan patronage from aristocracy to popular readership, and from court and church preferment to money. With a considerable number of Londoners literate, an ever-growing apprentice population that could at least read, and about thirty printing presses in London of which at least seven to eight were printing pamphlets of a popular nature, the Elizabethan marketplace of print and its readership wielded considerable influence in the kind of writing that was produced during that time. Greene shows this empowerment of the reader, and the power of the marketplace in general, in the way the power shifts from Gorinius to Lucanio. Gorinius’ market-oriented philosophy also shapes audiences like Lucanio, alienating scholar-writers such as Roberto. That Lucanio is being taught and shaped by Gorinius’ generation is evident from his father’s advice that parodies Elizabethan courtesy manuals, a staple in the Renaissance school classrooms:

Multiply in wealth my sonne by anie means thou maist… thou shouldest not stand on conscience in causes of profite, but heape treasure upon treasure, for the time of neede: yet seeme to be devout, else shall thou be held vile: frequent holy exercises, grave companie, and above all, use the conversation of young
Gentlemen, who are so wedded to prodigalitie, that once in a quarter necessity knocks at their chamber doores: profer them kindnesse to relieve their wants, but be sure of good assurance: give faire words till dayes of payment come, and then use my course, spare none: what though they tell of conscience (as a number will talke) looke but into the dealings of the world & thou shalt see it but idle

Words.... (108)

In being empowered by money and shaped by commercial rhetoric, Lucanio can be said to represent the “gentlemen readers” of Greene’s, and other writers’, prefaces. Moneyed and impressionable, they are the targets of both the political and humanist authorities as potential members of the commonwealth and of pamphlet writers as consumers and potential patrons. Like Gorinius, these gentlemen’s ancestry was not illustrious. In fact, he advises Lucanio that he should not “think [other gentlemen’s] Auncestors were famous, but consider thine were obscure, and that thy father was the first Gentleman of the name” (109). These gentlemen are also young and green in matters of the heart (“Lucanio thou art yet a Bachelor,” says Gorinius) and “of condition simple, shamefast, and flexible to any counsaille” (110). In other words, they are a gullible audience with time and money on their hands.

Roberto’s exploitation of Lucanio involves Lamilia, who woos Lucanio through her seductive powers. Not only does Roberto tempt Lucanio through flattery to choose a wife, but he also offers to be Lucanio’s very language: “you have wealth to maintain her, of women not a little longed for: words to court her you shall not want, for myselfe will
be your secretary" (112). Lucanio, true to his role as the empowered consumer, accepts
the offer, flaunting his economic power over Roberto: "faith Brother Roberto, and yee say
the words, lets go seeke a wife while it is hote, both of us together. Ile pay yee well, and I
dare turne you loose to say as well as anye of them all" (112). Lamilia's allurement
consists of pleasant sights, sounds, and words. Roberto's own language and Lamilia's
allurement ensnare Lucanio in a web of fancy. They construct a world of fantasy and
romance in which Lucanio seems at first to be just an onlooker who, at several times,
"had a good meaning to utter his minde, but wanting fit wordes, he stooede like a trevant
that lackt a prompter, or a plaier that being out of his part at his first entrance, is faine to
have the booke to speake what he should perform" (116-7). But though Lucanio is
impoverished in language and has to depend on his brother for winning expression, he is
still the master by virtue of his financial status.

The section where Roberto and Lamilia tell tales to influence Lucanio reminds us
of the fight for the readers' attention and patronage in the Elizabethan marketplace.
When Roberto is alerted to the possibility of losing Lucanio to Lamilia, he attempts to tell
an old wives' tale, ostensibly "as a warning to teach you both wit." But Lamilia is quick
to see through Roberto's design: "Before ye go on with your tale (quoth mistresse
Lamilia) let me give ye a caveat by the way which shall be figured in a Fable" (119-20).
In a narrative ploy reminiscent of Vision where Gower and Chaucer tell stories on sexual
jealousy from totally contrasting styles (Gower in a moral exemplum and Chaucer in a
fabliau-like tale), Lucanio is also told two stories on the subject of impetuous love.
Lamília’s tale is an allegory in the tradition of Gower’s dignified moral lessons, whereas
Roberto’s is significantly evocative of Chaucer’s more earthy style. In the fable Lamília
recounts, a Fox falsely befriends a Badger that has just lost its “dam and sire.”
Persuading the Badger to “seeke some fit mate wherewith to match,” the fox teaches him
to seduce a “wanton ewe straggling from the fold.” Attracted, the ewe follows the Badger
to his habitation, where the Fox, “drawing her aside under color of exhortation, pulde out
her throate to satisfie his greedy thrust” (120). Word reaches the Shepherd, who kills the
Badger, but the Fox somehow manages to escape. As we can see, this fable is designed
both to alert Lucanio of his brother’s nature and to warn Roberto not to do anything
inimical to her own interests. Like a veteran allegory writer, she encodes her message so
well that only Roberto the scholar is able to get her message. At the end of her tale,
Lamília tells Roberto: “now be advised Roberto... Goe forward with your tale, seeke not
by slie insinuation to turn our mirth to sorrow” (121). The character of Fox darkly hints
at a scheming Roberto, while she casts herself as the innocent ewe who is done to death
by the Fox.¹⁰

Roberto’s own tale is much more complicated. As the debate in the Vision
indicated, he is unsure of his technique, subject matter, and his audience: he does want to

¹⁰ Various attempts have been made to identify the fox, badger, ewe, etc. with different prominent
Elizabethan courtiers, as these are animals instantly recognizable as allegorical shorthand for political
figures. Carroll, among others, convincingly argues in “The Badger in Greene’s Groatsworth of Wit” that
Burghley was the intended target (the fox) and Shakespeare himself may have been intended as the badger.
But, within the framework of Roberto’s story, such interpretations, though perhaps valid, seem to me less
than germane. I think Lamília’s tale quite forcefully conveys to her audience within the pamphlet her own
situation, especially to Roberto.
warn Lucanio of Lamilia, but he is also an accomplice in Lamilia’s schemes and so has an interest in Lucanio’s being duped. Therefore, Roberto’s tale can only speak vaguely about the dangers of sudden love. It is about a young heiress who quite suddenly falls in love with a lowly country farmer and about the “yong gentleman that had beene a long suter to hcr.” Jealous and determined to get the girl for himself before her wedding, the gentleman, with the help of an old woman, tells the bridegroom that the bride means to elope with another man and the bride that the groom has arranged a secret meeting with his old sweetheart. The gullible farmer is lured to the old woman’s house where he mistakes her daughter for his bride and entertains her in the bedroom. The bride, meanwhile, also arrives at the same house with all her relatives, only to find a bewildered groom in the arms of another girl. When the commotion ends, the wedding has been stopped, the bride has rejected the groom who, in turn, has to marry the old woman’s daughter, and the scheming young gentleman is free to pursue the heiress.

But if Roberto’s intention is to warn Lucanio, the message is hardly flattering. Roberto figures himself as the gentleman “that had long been a suiter to the [Squire’s] daughter.” The daughter herself perhaps stands for Gorinius’ patrimony, and the farmer’s son, who wins the girl’s hand (unfairly, in the gentleman’s eyes) seems to represent Lucanio. The difference in their intellectual status is underscored by Roberto’s portrayal of himself as a gentleman and Lucanio as the farmer’s son, a yokel. To get what rightfully belongs to him, the gentleman enlists the help of mother Gunby and her daughter Marion (Lamilia?), and successfully dupes everyone at the end of the story.
While he gets his just reward (the gentlewoman’s “ever enduring love”), the farmer’s son has to marry Marion, because he, “condemned by all their consents, was judged unworthy to have the gentlewoman unto his wife.”  

Thus Groatsworth cunningly re-enacts writers’ manipulations of readers through various tales with hidden meanings and obscure references, and it also hints at the growing consciousness of readers. Lucanio is confused by all this and somewhat cross at Roberto: “But brother, I con you little thanke for this tale, hereafter I pray you use other table talke” (126). Despite his economic power, he is under the spell of Lamilia’s promise of romance. He appropriates Roberto’s language for making love to Lamilia. When, for example, Lamilia jestingly asks a tongue-tied Lucanio (he is in her presence for the first time) whether he can speak at all, he replies as artfully as Roberto himself would have: “Not speake Gentlewoman quoth Lucanio? That were a jest indeed: yes, I thank God I am sound of minde and lim, only my heart is not as it was wont: but and you be as good as your word, that will soon be well, and so craving ye of more acquaintance, in token of my plaine meaning receive this diamond, which my old father loved dearly” (111-8). The fact that he is rich with his father’s usurious money makes him a patron-like reader, but he is also a victim of Roberto’s machinations, a cony to Lamilia, the

---

11 Curiously, no critical attempt, as far as I am able to ascertain, has been made to interpret Roberto’s tale, though Brenda Richardson tracks down one Gunby in Yorkshire at the time Greene was supposed to have been living there. She makes nothing of this coincidence, except to suggest that some of Greene’s characters may have been suggested by real life characters he may have known. Again, within the context of the narrative, Roberto’s tale is a fairly clear representation of his own situation and a warning to Lucanio of being gullied by Lamilia and, perhaps, himself.
embodiment of the language of romance. Still, victimized as he is, Lucanio rejects
Roberto as well.

From the realization that romance ruins its audience and implicates its writer in its
deceptions, Greene presents another form of writing that is also morally corrupting. The
Player-patron represents the stage, where the writer, again, is forced to serve an end that
is incompatible with his humanist training. He is thematically closely allied with
Lamilia. The manner of Roberto’s meeting with the Player-patron is significant. Turned
out by Lamilia and Lucanio, Roberto is cursing the follies of romance when there
emerges from “the other side of the hedge . . . one that heard his sorrow” (130). That the
Player-patron is just one “hedge” away from Lamilia and that he is almost patrolling
Lamilia’s neighborhood for rejects like Roberto tell us about his own exploitative
similarities with Lamilia. Even the kind of help he offers Roberto smacks of exploitation:
“I will endeavour to doe the best, that either may procure your profit, or bring you
pleasure” (130). He knows that Roberto is a scholar and pities that “men of learning
should live in lacke” (130).

When he promises to “do his best” for Roberto, he means to exploit his
scholarship. But even here, the beneficiary is not Roberto: “men of my profession get by
schollers their whole living,” the Player-patron says (131). By making use of scholars
like Roberto, the player boasts, he is “reputed able at my proper cost, to build a windmill.
What though the world once went hard with me, when I was faine to carrie my playing
Fardle a footbacke; . . . it is otherwise now; for my very share in playing apparrell will
not be solde for two hundred pounds” (131). He claims that he knows all about writing because he had himself been a “countrie Author, passing at a morall, for it was I that pende the Moral of mans wit, the Dialogue of Dives, and for seaven yeeres space was absolute interpreter of the puppets” (132), but it is only after he has become a player that he has become rich, his almanack “out of date.”

Roberto, “perceiving no remedie,” is again reduced to “brokering” his scholarship for an audience that is easily served by the likes of the Player-patron.

Groatsworth’s anti-theatrical prejudice, as it is manifested in the attack on Shakespeare, is one of the more important controversies of early modern England. Greene held strong views on theater and he expressed them in both Francesco’s Fortunes and Groatsworth. Greene’s prejudice is predicated on an opposition between authors of plays and players, and privileges the former over the latter. In his estimation, the corruption of drama begins with the actors, while the authors, at least those who have had some education, are never to blame. The play-makers of ancient times were “worthy of honor for their Arte: & players, men deserving both praise and profite, as long as they wax neither covetous nor insolent” (8:133). But that is exactly what has happened in the sixteenth century: “people... made great resort [to plays], paide largely, and highly applauded their doings, in so much that the actors, by continuall use grewe not only

---

12 Much speculation and comment have been expended on the identity of the Player-patron. The exact identity is irrelevant to my purpose, but I accept the view that the Player is a composite or generic sketch of an Elizabethan theater manager. Carroll’s “The Player-patron in Greene’s Groatsworth of Wit (1592)” is both an engaging speculative essay and a useful summary of all past attempts at unmasking the identity of the Player-patron.
excellent, but rich and insolent, ... [and] meane men greedie of gaines did fall to practise
the acting of such plays, and in the theater presented their comedies but to such onely, as
rewarded them well for their paines” (8:133).

It is in this light that Roberto’s condescension toward the Player-patron should be
understood. Greene’s low opinion of the contemporary stage was not uncommon, at least
among the University Wits. Thomas Nashe, for example, in his preface to Greene’s
Menaphon, sardonically alludes to the players’ material well-being at the expense of
writers: “Sundry other sweete gentlemen I doe know, that have vaunted their pennes in
private devices, and tricked up a company of taffaty fooles with their feathers, whose
beauty if our poets had not pecte with the supply of their periwigs, they might have
antickt it untill this time up and downe the countrey with the king of fairies, and dined
everyday a the pease porredge ordinary withe Delfrigus” (3: 323-24). Greene’s own attack
on Shakespeare is a restatement of the strong anti-player sentiment found in his work
elsewhere. In Francescos Fortune, for example, Tully’s admonishment of a
contemporary actor who had grown insolent over his occupation bears a striking
resemblance to Greene’s notorious characterization of Shakespeare:

Art thou proud with Esops Crow, being pranct with the glorie of others feathers?

Of thyself thou canst say nothing, and if the cobler hath taught thee to say Ave
Caesar, disdain not thy tutor, because thou pratest in a king’s chamber: what
sentence thou utterest on the stage, flowes from the censure of our wittes, and
what sentence or conceipte of the invention the people applaud for excellent, that comes from the secrets of our knowledge. (8:132)

Greene’s main thrust of attack is that the honorable profession of writing, ably performed only by qualified people, has been appropriated by players themselves, and thus they have become imposters and upstarts, presuming to do what they cannot do well.

The opposition educated writers drew between writers and actors was part of an on-going conflict during the Renaissance. As Carroll says, it was “first, between University Wits (Greene, Nashe, Peele and others) and actors, and second, between the Wits and the new and the not-so-educated professional playwrights (Shakespeare, Munday, Kyd, and others). ...[T]he Wits, in order to survive, had humiliated themselves by writing plays, and as a consequence had given new quality to the popular repertory, had filled the playhouses, and had seen the players grow rich while they themselves were in constant economic distress...” (141). Greene’s hostility toward the stage was, of course, rooted in his consciousness of superiority over players. Though Greene and the players were socially equal, he had won the right to gentility by his humanist education. Thus he constructed a self-presentational dialectic in which the author is defined by social superiority to the institution for which he was forced to write. Greene can hardly respect himself or others for writing for the stage. Play-making was, to him, as much a fraudulent exercise as writing romances. It has dangerous parallels with cony-catching. That is why he sports a haughty attitude toward that profession: “Marry this rule he kept, what ever he fingerd afore hand, was the certaine meanes to unbinde a bargaine, and
being asked why he so sleightly dealt with them that did him good? It becomes me, saith he, to be contrarie to the world, for commonly when vulgar men receive earnest, they doe performe, when I am paid anything afore-hand, I break my promise” (12:134). The desire to distinguish himself from “vulgar” men who perform on cue is at the center of Roberto’s conflict with the stage. It is the same sentiment that makes Greene write in the famous letter to his “sometime friends” that “rare wits” and “admired inventions” should never be exploited by players (“apes”). He urges them to write for those audiences that would value their refined wit: “seeke you better maisters; for it is pittie men of such rare wits, should be subject to the pleasures of such rude groomes” (12:144). But Greene knows that such masters do not exist any more and “men of rare wit” are few. For Greene, there is nowhere to go except to pamphlets.

If Gorinius made Roberto destitute and Lamilia poisoned his humanist mind, then the Player makes him an intellectual naught. But where poverty had kept his humanism at least flickering before, Roberto’s stint as a playwright makes him rich, and this completely severs him from any humanist heritage. In writing plays Roberto unwittingly fulfils his father’s wish to use his scholarship to make money, because now “seldom he wanted, his labors were so well esteemed” (134). He becomes “famozed for an Arch-plaimaking-poet” and his “purse like the sea sometime sweld, anon like the same sea fell to a low ebbe” (134). The ebb and flow of Roberto’s purse recalls to our mind mercantile transactions and hints at Roberto’s total transformation from an impecunious scholar to a money-making hack. As well, the earlier positions of Roberto and Lucanio
have been reversed. Where before the swaggering Lucanio had treated Roberto as his secretary and property, Roberto now figuratively uses him as a "propertie" on stage, "whereby Lucanio was somewhat provided for" (133). Where Lucanio had used Roberto as a broker between him and Lamilia, it is Roberto who now drives Lucanio to be a go-between: "being of simple nature, he served but for a blocke to whet Roberto's wit on: which the poore foole perceiving, he forsooke all other hopes of life, and fell to be a notorious Pandar" (133-34). The irony here is that Roberto's own earlier pandering role has not really changed; it has only become more profitable. If Roberto's ill-use of Lucanio drives him to despair and pandering, then the stage's ill-use of Roberto similarly drives him to despair and debauchery.

Greene makes an explicit connection between Roberto's play-making and his moral degradation. Roberto's earlier degradation under Lamilia is at least partly redeemed by faint pangs of conscience—he at least tries to warn Lucanio of the dangers of Lamilia's wiles. Under the Player, however, Roberto is heartless. When he hears that Lucanio has been reduced to beggary by Lamilia, he "had little remorse for [Lucanio's] miserable state" (133). He also openly cheats on the advance money he is paid for plays, and associates with "the lewdest persons in the land, apt for pilferie, perjurie, forgerie, for any villainie," from whom "he learned the legerdemaines of nips, foysters, connicatchers, cros-byters, lifts, high lawyers, and all the rabble of that uncleane generation of vipers" (134). Thus Roberto's moral decline bottoms out in play-making. In trying to become a commercially viable writer, Roberto has lost his soul.
Therefore, when Roberto reveals to the readers that he is Greene himself and promises to send the readers “his groatsworth of wit” and “by my repentance indevor to do all men good,” he is only striving to reclaim through pamphlets what he has lost by writing romance and plays. But, for Greene, repentance involves not only writing overtly didactic tracts (like the *Mourning Garment, Never Too Late, or Francescos Fortune*) but also re-examining his vocation as a writer (which is what he does in *Vision*) and inventing a new form of writing that truthfully and with integrity reconciles the humanist objective of educating readers with the realistic needs of making money for the author. For Greene, the answer seems to have been the satiric pamphlet.

Through satiric pamphlets Greene is able to address his readers directly as himself and make fun of what he sees as society’s ills. This direct message through print to readers about contemporary issues, as we have seen in the first chapter, was deemed subversive by the authorities, and that is why Greene plays such hide-and-seek with his authorial presence in all his satiric pamphlets (cony-catching tracts and the *Quip*). But his attack on aristocracy and gentry, those who ought to have upheld the traditional values of nobility but who have failed, is relentless. So is his attack on all that he considers spurious. That is why Greene had a negative opinion of players, and that is why he was so enraged by the “upstart crow.” Whether the “crow” was Shakespeare or someone else, its chief fault was its presumption. It is within the context of this overall animosity toward players and play-makers that the letter to “those gentlemen his quondam acquaintance,” in which he attacks, besides the upstart crow, the “famous gracer of
Tragedians,” widely supposed to be Marlowe, should be interpreted. It is also within this context that his advice to “young Juvenall” should be seen. Greene’s advice is not that Nashe (Juvenal) should not be satirical, but that his satire should be only against “vaine men” and not on scholars and others that Nashe was in the habit of attacking.

Before leaving Groatsworth, we should perhaps take note of its curious print history and its authorship controversy, if only because of their unwitting role in the constitution of Greene as a disreputable author and this pamphlet as scandalous and scurrilous material. Not unlike the suspense surrounding the Marprelate tracts, the question of Groatsworth’s authorship has created its own picture of the pamphlet’s author representing Roberto as representing Greene. It was published two weeks after Greene died, and was mysteriously registered not by any publisher or printer but by Henry Chettle, “at his own peril.” Soon after its publication, there was speculation about its authorship. Especially suspicious was the scurrilous attack on Shakespeare and a damaging slur on Marlowe about his atheism. Its printing history is also curious. The publisher, William Wright, says in a preface that the pamphlet “happened into my hands” (99), and an unsigned letter “To the Gentlemen Readers” begins in the third person, as if written by the publisher: “Gentlemen. The swan sings melodiously before death, that in all his time useth but a jarring sound. Greene though able inough to write, yet deepyer searched with sicknesse then even heretofore, sends you his swanne-like song, for that he feares he shall never againe discover to you youthes pleasures” (101). Then without any warning, Greene’s voice takes over: “However yet sicknesse, riot, incontinence, have at
once shown their extremities, yet if I recover, you shall all see more fresh shrimp... This is the last I have writ, and I feare me that last I shall write..." (101; emphasis mine).

The rumors about Groatsworth's authorship involved Henry Chettle, an aspiring writer who was a familiar figure in printing circles around London in 1592 and associated with such well-known but somewhat disreputable printers as John Danter, Henry Hoskins, and William Wright. Chettle concedes in his Kind hartes Dreame that he "edited" Groatsworth but denies writing it, though he was not above writing under somebody else's name. Thomas Nashe, Greene's friend, was understandably suspicious of Groatsworth's authorship and called it a "scald, trivial, lying pamphlet," not least because of its ill-tempered attacks on Shakespeare and Marlowe. There might also have been another reason for Nashe's displeasure: he himself was suspected in some quarters of having authored Groatsworth. Chettle refers to these rumors in his Kind Harte preface but absolves Nashe of any hand in it. Besides authorship, the pamphlet's printers also remained obscure for a long time. We now know that one half of the pamphlet was printed by John Wolfe and the other by John Danter. Thus the pamphlet was heavily


14Chettle had written a preface to Anthony Munday's Gerileon II under the initial "T.N" that was apparently widely supposed to stand for Thomas Nashe. It could not have been flattering to Nashe as it contained an intemperate attack on a printer who had issued a rival translation of the work before Munday's. In the Kind Harte preface, Chettle, perhaps in order to prove his truthfulness in disclaiming authorship of Groatsworth, absolves Nashe of any hand in the publication of Gerileon. For details of the controversy, see Harold Jenkins's The Life and Work of Henry Chettle.

15Sidney Thomas in his "The Printing of Groatsworth and Kindhartes Dreame" says that Groatsworth's copy was divided into approximately two equal sections: A1-C4 and D1-F4, the latter with
mediated by editors, printers, and publishers and has the quality of having been
“produced.”

There has long been speculation about the authorship of Groatsworth and forceful
arguments have been made in favor of Chettle. But seen as a part of Greene’s habit of
figuring himself as a character in his own pamphlets and of his preoccupation with his
own status as a writer in all his pamphlets after 1589, Groatsworth, at least that part
which deals with Roberto, is without a doubt written by Greene. The major themes of
Roberto’s story, such as the satire on usury, seduction of the hero by a courtesan, the
hero’s repentance, and his cony-catching dissolution, all have distinct continuities with
Greene’s post-Marprelate pamphlets. Moreover, the evidences linking Chettle to
Groatsworth are at best circumstantial, while Greene’s hand can clearly be seen when
the pamphlet is read in conjunction with Vision, his cony-catching pamphlets, and his
Quip, whose thematic concerns about the status of the writer, his audience, and
commercial nature of his vocation are quintessentially Greene’s. Thus Groatsworth
constitutes Greene’s voice as a satiric pamphleteer in the marketplace through print. The

different type fonts. The same is true for Kind-hartes Dreame, which is divided as A1-D4 and E1-H2. E1
begins a new sequence with different type font. Thomas says studies make it clear that we have “a
manuscript divided between two printers; and the evidence further enables us to identify the two printers...
as John Wolfe and John Danter” (196).

16 The most compelling evidence against Greene’s authorship is Austin’s 1969 computer study
comparing Greene and Chettle. For some reason, the study, though a perennial footnote in books on
Greene, has been singularly uninfluential and widely ignored. Jowett’s recent endorsement of Austin’s
conclusions, though forceful, does not cite any new evidence. Carroll’s 1994 edition of Groatsworth dwells
on the matter at some length and cautiously supports Austin’s conclusions, but still its arguments in favor of
Chettle’s authorship are predicated on Austin’s flawed and outdated study.
pamphlet is thus an elaborate explanation of why he is angry with rich patrons (all, like Gorinius, value only money), disillusioned with romance (like Lamilia, it is deceptive and ultimately ruinous), and contemptuous of players (all "upstart crows" and "apes"). The only way Greene can reclaim his vocation as a writer is through direct appeal to readers, educating them through accounts of his own personal experiences, and entertaining as well as instructing them through making fun of "vaine men." It might make him subversive, but Greene has reinvented himself as a writer and helped constitute a new form of writing.
Chapter 3

"Arte Divorced from Exercise": Harvey and the Satirical Pamphlet

Gabriel Harvey's *Foure Letters and Certayne Sonnets* was the first pamphlet about Greene to be published after he died. Registered in Stationers' Hall on 4 December 1592, the pamphlet is comprised of four letters composed over a month's period. The first letter, actually written by Mr. Christopher Bird, an acquaintance of Harvey's from Walden, is dated 26 August, and the second, third, and fourth, all by Harvey, are dated September 5, September 8 and 9, and September 11 and 12, respectively. The second letter was apparently in circulation as a separate pamphlet from September, and Harvey added the third and the fourth letters, prefixed Mr. Bird's letter as the first, and issued them in one single collection in December.\(^1\) The first three letters are preoccupied with Greene, and the fourth is a philosophical account of why Harvey holds writing, especially pamphlet writing, in such low opinion. Thus the publication of *Foure Letters* was occasioned by Greene's death and is almost entirely concerned with Greene and his profession. Harvey identifies Greene with the non-humanistic aspects of print culture, aspects that vitiated Harvey's notions of writing, and treats Greene as a representative scourge of his times. It is, therefore, an important document in the textual moment we are studying.

---

\(^1\) Thomas Nashe, in *Strange Newes*, draws a distinction between Harvey's first "butter-fly pamphlet against Greene" and his "Booke" (III.130). McKerrow concludes: "Probably the original pamphlet consisted of the second letter alone.... No copy of the 'butterfly pamphlet' seems to have survived" (IV 153). Chettle in *Kind Hartes Dreame*, which was entered into the Stationers' Register a mere four days after *Foure Letters*, reveals an awareness of Harvey's book that would be impossible if Harvey's attack on Greene had not been common knowledge in London. Chettle urges Nashe to retaliate for Harvey's scurrilous and callous attack.
Fourte Letters is the culmination of a long-running recrimination between the Harvey brothers and the anti-Martinist pamphleteers such as Lyly, Greene, and Nashe. Through it all, Gabriel Harvey had remained aloof, letting his brothers Richard and John do the sparring. Even through the Marprelate controversy, in which he himself was suspected of being the mysterious and scandalous figure of Martin, Harvey had maintained a dignified silence. It had not been easy—Lyly’s Pap With a Hatchet had provoked a rejoinder, but Harvey had elected not to publish it at the time he wrote it. But this forbearance was finally breached by Greene’s A Quip for an Upstart Courtier, in which the Harvey family was mocked for its presumption to gentility.2 To Harvey, the attack seemed an unfair and intolerable slander on his respectable father and hard-working brothers. But before he could take any legal measures against its author, Greene took seriously ill and died. Harvey had only the court of public opinion to make his case, and Fourte Letters is that case. But it is not just against Greene that Harvey is making a complaint, it is also against the very popular opinion that spawned the likes of Greene in

---

2The following is the attack on Harvey, Senior, that was subsequently removed from Quip:

"Marry, sir [answers the rope-maker] . . . I dwel in Saffron Waldon, and am going to Cambridge to three sons that I keep there at schoole, such apt children sir as few women have groaned for, and yet they have ill lucke. The one, sir is a Devine to comfort my soule, &he indeed though he be a vaine glorious asse, and writte a late the lambe of God, and yet his parishioners say he is the limb of the devill, and kisseth their wives with holy kisses, but thay had rather he should keep his lips for madge his mare. The second, sir, is a Physitian or a foole, but indeed a phisitian, & had proved a proper man if he had not spoiled himselfe with his Astrological discourse of the terrible conjunction of Saturne and Jupiter. For the eldest, he is Civilian, a wondrous witted fellow, sir reverence sir, he is a Doctor, and as Tubalcain was the first invenetor of Musick, so he, Gods benison light upon him, was the first that inveneted Englishe Hexameter: but see how in these daies learning is little esteemed, for that and other familiar letters and proper treatises he was orderly clapt in the Fleet, but sir, a Hawk and Kite may bring forth a coysstrell, and honest parents may have bad children. Honest with the devil qd. The Collier, How can he be honest, whose mother I gesse was a witch. For I have heard them say, that witches say their praiers backward, and so doth the ropemaker yerne his living by going backward, and knaves cheefe living is by making fatal instruments, as halters, and ropes, which divers desperate men hang themselves with" (qtd. in Stern 91-92).
the first place.

When Harvey entered the world of popular pamphlets through *Foure Letters*, he brought a curious mix of attitudes. He was over forty and anxiously facing disappointment in life. His academic career in Cambridge had been sabotaged by his enemies—of whom he seemed to have had many—and his aspirations to win profitable employment as a secretary or advisor to men in power had foundered with the deaths of Leicester, Sidney, and Walsingham.\(^3\) By 1592, Harvey had been out of Cambridge for some years, was without profitable employment, and could see no prospects for the future. His Latin publications—two early lectures he had read in Cambridge in 1570s and some Latin verses he had presented to the Queen when she was in progress at Audley End in the summer of 1577—were well behind him, as was the published correspondence with Spenser. Even Spenser, with whom Harvey shared a close personal and literary relationship, had removed himself to the political and cultural wilderness of Ireland, leaving Harvey desolate and friendless. His brothers John and Richard had been more successful as a physician and a divine, respectively, but John died suddenly in June 1592 at the young age of twenty-eight, leaving Harvey heart-broken. Above all, Harvey was reduced to working as a proof-reader for John Wolfe, though he was also practicing at the Court of the Arches. But as Nashe in *Have With You to Saffron Walden* says, he could not have been making much money at this time.\(^4\) Thus Harvey’s personal and financial

---

\(^3\) Virginia Stern’s *Gabriel Harvey: His Life, Marginalia, and Library* remains the best source for details of Harvey’s personal life. On his disappointments in Cambridge, see chapters 2 and 3. Also see the *Letterbook of Gabriel Harvey* (ed. Scott).

\(^4\) Why Harvey chose to take abode with Wolfe is not clear, though Wolfe was now a prosperous
circumstances were not much different from those of other university-educated and frustrated young men, such as the University Wits, driven to popular print to seek a living.

But the resemblance to the University Wits ends here. Unlike them, Harvey also brought into his pamphlet a firm conviction in and a vast knowledge of classical rhetoric that profoundly affected his views on pamphlets. According to this conviction, in any kind of writing, the style (rhetoric) and the argument (dialectic or logic) are equally important. Harvey had endured considerable hardship, much as his hero Ramus (Pierre de la Ramée) had, in breaking away from traditional Ciceronianism which had privileged style over substance. In his early Cambridge lecture, *Ciceronianus*, Harvey distilled the complex Ramist controversy into a simple yet elegant formulation for his students:

---

5 Ramus actually privileged dialectic over rhetoric in his early polemic over Italian Ciceronianism in order to promote his pedagogical method. See *Peter Ramus’ Attack on Cicero* (ed. Murphy). Harvey’s views are less extreme, though he also would consider dialectic somewhat more important than rhetoric (see his *Ciceronianus*).

6 The debate between Ciceronians and Ramists, of course, was complex and technical. In broad terms, it can be summarized thus: Traditionally, Ciceronians included invention and disposition in both dialectic and rhetoric, whereas Ramists argued that these categories belong solely, with memory, to dialectic, while style and delivery belong to rhetoric. Harvey formulates his position thus in his early lecture *Rhetor*:

For the fivefold division, which has almost alone prevailed among our ancestors, how many now do not see that invention, disposition, and memory are not the property of speech but of thought, not of tongue but of mind, not of eloquence but of wisdom, not of rhetoric but of dialectic? Therefore, two sole and as it were native parts remain as proper and germane to this art...—style and delivery, the former bright in splendors of tropes and involutions of schemes; the latter agreeable in the
"Remember that words are called by Homer Pteronta, that is winged, since they easily fly away, unless they are easily kept in equilibrium by the weightiness of the subject matter. Unite dialectic and knowledge with rhetoric, thought with language" (83).

While the impetus behind Ramus' iconoclasm was the search for a practicable teaching method, Harvey's revolutionary zeal seems to have risen out of his desire to make humanist education not just a preparation for pedagogical or scholarly life but for Church and civil careers as well. Thus for Harvey, all forms of discourse should be well-balanced between dialectic and rhetoric, and they should be directed to the common good of the society. As he told his students at the end of Ciceronianus,

Nor will you [students] merely make a vain display of your Ciceronianism in school and in the cloistered shades of the University, but you will proclaim it in all your associations with men and in your daily converse, at home and abroad, in leisure as in business, among the commonalty, the country fold, and all men-if necessary, even to the point of fighting for it. (101)

If Harvey's Ramist goal was to bring "the civilizing force of classical literature and culture to an ever-widening circle of humanity in order to reform—modernize—society"

(Henderson [1999] 53), then, conversely, anything that was not born of classical

---

modulation of voice and the appropriateness of gesture... (qtd. in Stern 29).

For more detailed accounts of this controversy, Ramus's Brutinae Quaestiones is a good place to start (trans. Newlands as Peter Ramus' Attack on Cicero [ed. Murphy]). Two outstanding critical studies are Ong's Ramus, Method, and the Decay of Dialogue: From the Art of Discourse to the Art of Reason and Sharratt's "Peter Ramus and the Reform of the University: The Divorce of Philosophy and Eloquence." For a background in Renaissance rhetoric, Montasani's "Humanism and Rhetoric" is a useful source; also see Lisa Jardine's "The Place of Dialectic Teaching in Sixteenth-Century Cambridge." For Ramus's influence on Harvey, see John Charles Adams's "Gabriel Harvey's Ciceronianus and the Place of Peter Ramus' dialecticae libri duo in the Curriculum," Vos's "Good Matter and Good Utterance: The Character of English Ciceronianism," Prewitt's "Gabriel Harvey and the Practice of Method," and Wilson's introduction to Harvey's Ciceronianus (trans. Forbes).
traditions and culture, such as the popular, satirical pamphlets, was an anti-civilizing force.

This civilizing zeal was the reason behind his coming out of the cloistered walls of Cambridge University, in 1580, to rehearse popular writing in "A pleasant and Pithily familiar discourse of the Earthquake in Aprill last," which formed a part of one of the letters in Three Familiar Letters, correspondence between Spenser and Harvey. Mockingly modeled after the many news pamphlets that came out after the earthquake of 1580, Harvey's "discourse" was a self-conscious attempt at bringing the Ramist dialectic method of argument out of the classroom and into the real world in order to propose the possibility that the phenomenon might not have the apocalyptic significance that many feared it had but was merely a natural occurrence. Harvey dismisses the sensationalistic pamphlets as "odde fresh paulting three halfe-pennie pamphlet[s]" that "without reason [set] out the right myserable, and most wofull estate out of the wicked, and damnable world at these perillous days, after the deviser's best manner" (I.62). What Harvey wishes instead is that "some learned, and well advised universitie man, would undertake the matter and bestow some paynes in deepe uppon so famous and materiall an argument" (I.62). And that is exactly what he has done in his "short but sharpe and learned Judgement of Earthquakes." Thus Harvey had a clear idea of what a popular pamphlet should be.

Harvey's views on popular writing had not changed ten years later in his An

---

7 For a detailed analysis of the use of Ramist method in the Earthquake letter, see Snare's "Satire, Logic and Rhetoric in Harvey's Earthquake Letter to Spenser." For the controversy and politics surrounding the printing and publication of Familiar Letters, see Josephine Waters Bennett's "Spenser and Gabriel Harvey's Letter-Book" and Quitslund's "Questionable Evidence in the Letters of 1580 Between
Advertisement for Pap Hatchet, the admonitory pamphlet he wrote as a reply to Lyly's Pap with a Hatchet. If the "reasonless" news pamphlets had inspired his dialectic on earthquakes in 1580, it was the "invective vein" that was most objectionable in the pamphlets of the late 1580s, especially in the writings of Martin Marprelate and others that followed him. "It was Martins folly to begin that cutting vaine," says Harvey, which other writers, such as Lyly, Greene, and Nashe, tried to emulate. The satirical tone of Martin and his pamphleteering successors can only lead, for Harvey, to disaster:

If the world should applaude to such roissterdoisterly vanity, (as impudency hath beene prettily suffered to sett-upp the creast of his vainglory:) what good could grow out of it, but to make every man mad brayne, and desperate; but a general contempt of all good order, in saying, or dooing but an universall topsy-turvy?
(I.131)

The erosion of general "good order" and the slow descent into "universall topsy-turvy" are the consequences of satiric pamphlets and an unregulated marketplace. For Harvey, Greene's Quip was part of this quickly spreading anarchy.

Thus Harvey brings long-nurtured and firmly established attitudes to the debate about popular pamphlets in the aftermath of Greene's death. Harvey's profound distrust of the popular and satiric pamphlets was quite well fixed, and, to that extent, his attitude toward popular pamphleteers was also somewhat severe: pamphleteers are what they write. So, it is not with an open mind that Harvey entered the pamphlet arena, but with

---

8. This pamphlet was not published at the time it was written (1589); Harvey included it in his Pierces Supererogation in 1593 as his rejoinder to Nashe's Strange Newes.
considerable prejudice and hesitation. As he says in *Pierces Supererogation*, he must reply to pamphleteers like Greene and Nashe not because they are influential with the wise,

but because silence may seeme suspicious to many; Patience contemptible to some; ...and there is no end of abuses upon abuses, or injuries upon injuries, of contempt upon contempt, where presumptuous impudence, and odious slander, the two errantist vagabonds in the world, may safe conduct themselves, and franckely passe uncontrolled. (II.32)

The threat to the order of the commonwealth implied in the term "vagabonds" is the most troublesome aspect of pamphlets to Harvey. And it is to counter and control them that Harvey has set out, fully convinced of his abilities and determined to change the popular pamphlet.

Harvey tries to accomplish several things in his pamphlet. He wants to construct an opposition between himself and Greene with the intention of demonizing him; he conflates the figure of Greene and the degradation of the pamphlet world, debunking both. He assumes a benevolent, if sometimes condescending, attitude toward Nashe, fashioning him as the typical pamphleteer, but one that could be redeemed; he alternately browbeats and importunes this representative figure to give up writing pamphlets; and, finally, he adumbrates, with an exaggerated attitude of futility, the philosophical basis of his aversion to pamphlets. Every letter contains some of these strategies.

The first letter, by Christopher Bird to M. Emmanuell Demetrius, fleshes out Harvey's image as a scholar and a gentleman and erects an opposition between him and
Greene. The hints at Harvey's respectable birth, material wealth, and good opinion are everywhere. Demetrius is a prosperous merchant in London; Bird is a local worthy at Walden, rich enough to requite Demetrius' courtesy and favour shown to Harvey during his stay in London. Harvey himself is introduced as "a very excellent general scholler" who is "honest, and thankful." As for the Harvey family, Harvey senior is "a right honest man of good reckoning; and one that above twenty years since bare the chiefest office in Walden with good Credite: and hath maintained four sonnes in Cambridge and else where with great charges..." (11). Against this picture of solid respectability is set Greene, the destitute, ill-reputed pamphleteer, a "lewd fellow" and an "impudent rayler," who has dared to write an attack on the Harvey family. Even the seemingly irreproachable Mr. Bird is so moved as to compose a scurrilous (and technically crude) sonnet on Greene:

    Greene the Connycatcher, of this Dreame the Autor,
    For his dainty devise, deserveth the hauter.
    A rakehell: A makeshift: A scibling foole:
    A famous bayard in Citty, and Schoole.
    Now sicke, as a Dog: and ever brainsick:
    Where such a raving and desperate Dick?
    Sir reverence, A scurvey Master of Art,
    Aunsweared inough with a Doctors fart.
    He scornes other Aunsweare: and Envy salutes
    With shortest vowels, and with longest mutes.
    For farther triall, himself he referres
To prooфе, and sound judgement, that seldome erres.

Now good Robin-good-fellow, and gentle Greene sleeves,

Give him leave to be quite, that none aggreeves. (11-12)\(^9\)

If Nashe is correct in suggesting that this sonnet was actually written by Harvey and not Bird, then it quite strikingly captures what Harvey thought of Greene and his writing. Greene is “Sir reverence, A Scurvey Master of Art,” whose satirical pamphlets can be “Answered enough with a Doctors fart.” The contrast between “Master of Art” and “Doctor” is emphatic in its implication of unequal scholarship, but the contempt obvious in the scatological remark is more ambiguous. While the remark effectively dismisses Greene’s writings, it also, perhaps not unwittingly, characterizes Foure Letters itself as nothing more than a “Doctor’s fart.” Given Harvey’s professed reluctance in entering the pamphlet world—he apologizes for writing and publishing Foure Letters in a prefatory letter—perhaps that is what Harvey thought of pamphlets, including his own: unpleasant nothings. Thus the “Master of Art” (Greene) and “fart” (pamphlets) are one and the same for Harvey. This complete reduction of Greene to gassy nothingness, in stark opposition to Harvey’s solid substantiality, is echoed, eerily, in Greene’s own passing into nothingness, his death, because the first letter is dated 24 August 1592, apparently when Greene was already on his death bed (“Now sicke, as a Dog”)—he would die four days later, on September 3.

Bird’s letter is merely a preface to Harvey’s letter that follows (“The second letter

---

\(^9\)Nashe does not think this sonnet was Bird’s, but accuses Harvey of palming off his own scurrilous sonnet in somebody else’s name (see McKerrow 1:275).
— To my loving frend Maister Christopher Bird of Walden.”). Harvey is still so angry with Greene that this letter almost entirely focuses on Greene’s personality, and directly makes a conjunction between Greene’s moral degradation and the corruption of popular print. But the broader attack on the satiric pamphlet found in the third letter is only in an incipient form here in the second—it is Greene who is under attack. Greene’s defamation against the Harveys’ humble family trade has touched a raw nerve in Gabriel Harvey and he cannot quite contain himself. Characteristically, his anger is the result of the injury his “honour” has suffered, and it is directed toward Greene, who lacks it. “Honour,” he says, “is precious: worship of value: fame invaluable: they perillously threaten the commonwealth, that go about to violate the inviolable partes there of” (16). By linking his family’s honor (“inviolable”) to that of the commonwealth, Harvey is indirectly linking Greene’s slander to the corruption of the pamphlet world.

Harvey also sees Greene and his disrepute as part of an unsavory tradition of popular and populist defamers, such as Elderton, in England:

I would not wishe a sworne enimie to bee more basely valued, or more vilely reputed, then the common voice of the cittie esteemeth him, that sought fame by differration of other, but hath utterly discredited himself: and is notoriously grown a very proverbe of infamy, and contempt. I little delight in the rehearsall of such patrye: but who like Elderton for Ballating: Greene for pamphletting: both for goodfellowship, and bad conditions? Rayling was the ypocres of the drunken rimester [Elderton]: and Quiping [satire] the Marchepane of the madde libeller [Greene]. (13–14)
The invocation of Elderton’s name confers a commercial and disreputable character on Greene’s reputation. Elderton and Greene are “two notorious mates, and the very ringleaders of the riming, and scribbling crew”(15). The common “rhymster” and “scribbler” (“a scribbling foole” as the first letter called Greene) are signifiers of the deep corruptions of the marketplace. At another place, Elderton is the “father” and his “sonne” is Greene. Nor is Elderton the only progenitor of Greene. The name of Tarleton, the famous stage actor, is also evoked. When Harvey hears that Greene is dead, Harvey says: “the king of the paper stage...ha(s) played his last part, and was gone to Tarleton”(18). Greene’s writing is also repeatedly called “Tarltonizing.” Skelton and Scoggin are also mentioned by Harvey as having provided inspiration for Greene.

For Harvey, Greene is the very epitome of commercial discourse. And his death, tragic as it was, was a fitting and inevitable result of his dissolute profession—especially his satiric writing and cony-catching pamphlets. Harvey gives an exhaustive list of Greene’s corruptions, conflating Greene’s personal failings with his professional corruptions:

I was altogether unacquainted with the man and never once saluted him by name: but who in London hath not heard of his dissolute, and licentious living; his fond disguisinge of a Master of Art with ruffianly haire, unseemely apparell, and more unseemely company: his vaine glorious and Thrasonickall braveinge: his piperly Extemporizing and Tarltonizing: his apish counterfeiting of every ridiculous, and absurd toy: his fine coosening of jugglers and finer jugling with cooseners: his villainous cogging, and foisting: his monstrous swearinge and horrible
foreswearing...his impudent pamphletting, phantastical interluding, and
desperate libelling, when other coosening shifts failed..., his contemning of
superiours, deriding of other, and defying of all good order? (19-20)

This catalogue, as we can see, critiques every aspect of Greene’s life and writing
career—his bohemian lifestyle (“his dissolute, and licentious living”), his pamphleteering
and play writing (“piperly Extemporizing and Tarltonizing”), his romances (“apish
counterfeiting of every ridiculous, and absurd toy”—he even calls him “the ape of
Euphues” elsewhere [39]), his prodigal pamphlets (“pious profaning of sacred Texts”),
and his cony-catching pamphlets (“fine coosening of jugglers and finer jugling of
cooseners”). Harvey does not spare the damning insinuation of political disorderliness
either. At the end of the catalogue, he sinisterly remarks that Greene “compare[d] base
fellowes and noblemen together” (20), in an obvious reference to Greene’s contention, in
his cony-catching pamphlets, that the yeomen are just as corrupt as the cony-catchers.
Thus Harvey is convinced that there is a correlation between the degradation of the
pamphlet world and Greene’s downfall.

The second letter also registers Harvey’s anxiety about the destructive power of
the popular pamphlet, an anxiety that he would expand in the third letter. Actually, as we
have already seen, the power of the marketplace is the main impetus behind Foure
Letters: “Nothing [is] more deere or inestimable, than a mans good name; & albeit I
contemne such petting injuries,...yet am I not to neglecte so intollerable a wrong, so
notoriously published against [my Father and brothers]” (18). The “notorious
publication” of the defamation has to be effectively countered—but Greene’s death means
that no legal remedy is possible. When he hears that Greene is dead, "I was nothing glad, as expected; but unfainedly sorry; as well because I could have wished, he had taken his leave with a more charitable farewell: as also because I was deprived of that remedy in Law, that I extended against him, in the behalfe of my Father, whose honest reputation I was in many dueties to tender" (18). That is why Harvey resorts to writing a pamphlet himself, using the very medium that had corrupted Greene. Harvey is aware of the irony but fearless of its corrupting influences. He is sure of his way in this corrupt world: "Let the worlde deale with simple men, as it pleaseth: I loath to be odious to any: and would be loth to bee tedious to you. The next weeke, you may happily have a letter of such French occurrences, and other intelligences, as the credible relation of inquisitive frendes, or imploied strangers shall acquaint me withal" (25). The letter of "French occurrences" he promises will be a far different one, thanks to the sudden appearance of Nashe’s *Pierce Penilesse*.

The second letter also indicates Harvey’s eagerness not to be thought of as a humorless pedant who does not enjoy light-hearted writing. But, in his mind, the intention of levity should not be to displease, but to please and instruct. "Nothing of friend or foe," says Harvey, "can be unwelcome unto mee, that savoureth of witte, or relisheth of Humanity or tasteth of any good" (24). In fact, Harvey claims to prefer critical writing to approbation, but only if the intention is not gratuitous hurt: "I have, and who hath not, found it better, to be tickled and stinged of a busy enemy [than] to be coyed and lulled of an idle frend. Plutarch is gravely wise: and Macchiavelli subtilly politicke: but in either of them, what sounder, or finer piece of cunning, [than] to reape
commodity by him that seeketh my displeasure” (17). Harvey’s implication is that satiric pamphleteers like Greene seek to “reape commodity” by publishing defamation against honest people like the members of his family. The casual and wanton violence that pamphleteers inflict on simple, honest people just to make money is what Harvey despises in the satiric pamphlet: “Every private excesse is dangerous: but such publike enormities, incredibly pernitious, and insupportable”(16). Satiric pamphlets, like Greene’s *Quip*, are therefore not to be tolerated.

What sensation the second letter caused when it was published separately around the time Greene died—so critical of Greene so soon after his death—can only be guessed. But Harvey’s forgiving mood, so pronounced at the end of the letter, would be sorely tested by the appearance of Nashe’s *Pierce Penilesse* (the pirated edition by the printer Abel Jeffes) in which Richard Harvey was violently attacked. Nashe had apparently been disappointed by Greene’s attack on Richard in *Quip*, and decided to take matters into his own hands. Nashe’s attack on Richard Harvey is quite gratuitous if seen from within the context of *Pierce Penilesse*. Thus it merely made Gabriel Harvey firm in his opinion that satiric pamphleteers inhabited a world that is beyond reason or decency. It is with this renewed frustration and bitterness that Harvey composed the third letter.

The fury directed toward Greene in the second letter gives way to a generalized regret about satirical pamphlets in the third. Now that, in Harvey’s mind, Nashe has shown himself to be of a piece with Greene, Harvey spends a considerable portion of this letter on Nashe, mostly trying to instill in him some of the virtues that Harvey himself thought a writer should have. Thus, in his exhortations to Nashe, Harvey’s ideal writer is
fully realized.

Before he fashions that figure, Harvey uses the pamphlet form to set aright some of the slanders that Greene and others had been circulating against him. Thus it is an intensely personal document for Harvey. Harvey had already struggled with the question of how much provocation is provocation enough for him to retaliate. As “one born to suffer,” he says he had endured many hardships and personal insults. He had been lampooned in a play in Cambridge; he had heard his family and friends ridiculed; and he had lost a university career because of slanders, insinuations, and perhaps discrimination. Having been quiet so long and maintained a dignified silence (“insomuch that even Actions of Silence and Patience have been commenced against me” [27]), Harvey now wonders:

But how far publike objections, or famous imputations require publike answers: or how insufficient the formallest judiciall remedie in any one court, may seeme, in case of a printed diffamation, that with the wings of Mallice in some, of Envie in more, and of levity in most, flieth through the Realme, and over the sea: bee it indifferentlie decided by everie judgement, or reasonable consideration. (36-37)
The swiftness and the wide reach suggested by the avian image of “printed diffamation” prove to be the decisive factors for Harvey. When somebody has dared to “cal my credite in question,” and that too in print, Harvey asserts that, despite “the plainnesse of nature, and simplicitie of my Arte,” he can defy even the “proudest” (29). Thus, in this letter Harvey takes the time to answer point by point some of the criticisms leveled against him both in *Quip* and in other attacks on him by other
pamphleteers. He addresses the scandal of his satire on Cambridge University in the Earthquake ("I was then yong in yeares, fresh in courage, greene in experience, and as the manner is, somewhat overweening in conceit...I could hardly refraine from discoveringe some little part of my reading" [29]), the rejection of his application for the University oratorship ("mine own modest petition, my friendes diligent labour, our high Chancellors most-honourable and extraordinarie commendation, were all peltingsly defeated, by a slye practise of the olde Foxe" [30]), his murky role in the publication of Three Familiar Letters ("it was the sinister hap of those infortunite Letters, to fall into the left handes of malicious enemies, or undiscreeete friends: who adventured to imprinte in earnest, that was scribbled in jest" [31]), and the general ridicule his reinvention of the hexameter in English had received ("If I never deserve any better remembrance, let me rather be epitaphed, The Inventour of the English Hexameter: whom learned M. Stanihurst imitated in his Virgill; and excellent Sir Philip Sidney disdained not to follow in his Arcadia, and elsewhere" [32]). The third letter also has a passionate and moving defense of his brothers John and Richard, whom Greene had slighted in Quip. For example, there is a poignant moment in the letter, when Harvey's emotions draw us in (even though the fact that his brother's last words were in Latin might seem somewhat quaint to the modern sensibilities):

I must ever remember some of his notable saing (for indeede so they were): and can never forget that sweet voice of the dying Cignet: O frater Christus est optimus Medicus, & meus solus Medicus. Vale Galene, Valete humanae Artes: nihil divinum in terris, praeter animum aspirantem ad coelos. That best and his
onelie Phisition knoweth, what spiritual physike I commend unto him, when I
beheld in his meager and ghastly countenance, that I cannot rehearse without some
fit of compassion. (38-39)
The fits of compassion invariably lead to fits of rage against Greene and Nashe
throughout the letter, but, by and large, the third letter is a deeply personal, and
sometimes even poignant, missive.

But the two most notable aspects of the third letter are, one, its contemptuous
view of the pamphlet world and, two, the way Harvey seeks to shape the role of the
pamphleteer through his direct appeals to Nashe. Harvey’s views on the popular
marketplace are peppered all over the pamphlet and are indistinguishable from his low
opinion of Greene and Nashe, whereas his direct appeal to Nashe to be a “good Orator”
occupies the central part of this letter. Both these aspects reveal the extent of Harvey’s
engagement with the pamphlet form and his desire to influence it.

Harvey’s anxieties about the marketplace arise out of his view of it as
uncontrollable and evil. In fact, Harvey sees this world as being shaped by the anarchy
symbolized by Martin Marpreate, a phenomenon engendered and nurtured in the
pamphlet world: “This Martinish and counter-martinish age: wherein the spirit of
contradiction reigneth, and everie one superaboundeth in his own humour, even to the
annihilating of any other, without rime, or reason” (53). This preoccupation with one’s
own “humour” and the complete absence of “rime or reason” are what make the
pamphlet world “a mad world, where such shameful stuffe [as pamphlets] is bought and
sould; and where such roisterly varlets [as pamphleteers] may be suffered to play upon
whom they lust, and how they lust” (37). The cannibalism of the marketplace is the result of greediness and a craving for novelties. Pamphleteers “trouble the world with trifling discourses upon pelting matters: to disease themselves: to pleasure none, but the printer and idle creatures, the only busy readers of such novellets” (64). Satire and invective sell well, so these pamphleteers “have incke at will, and paper at commandement: and a number of greedy Eares, that eagerly longe, and as it were dance attendance to heare those derradful, invincible termes, steeped in Aquafortis and Gunpowder” (64). For Harvey, the craze for new-fangled fashions has wiped out all the beauty in the world. Instead of celebrating true beauty, the commercialism of the marketplace and the vulgarity of both the pamphleteers and the readers promote the corruption and debasement of all beauty. Thus the Countess of Pembroke’s Arcadia, a towering artistic monument, is not “greene enough for queasic stomaches, but they must have Greenes Arcadia,” and the same queasy stomachs “eagerlie longed for Greenes Faerie Queene.” Harvey can only groan in hopelessness: “O strange fancies, O monstrous newfangledness” (41).

Unfortunately for the pamphlet world, Harvey applies a standard that may be a bit too high, not to say hopelessly old-fashioned. Looking at the uninspiring stuff contained in the pamphlets, the classical scholar in Harvey cannot help remarking on the world of difference between proper writing and pamphlets: “How unlike Tullies sweet offices: or Isocrates Pithy instructions; or Plutarches holesome morals: or the delicate Dialogues of Xenaphon, and Plato: or the sage Tragedies of Sophocles, and Euripides, or the fine Comedies of the daintiest Attick wittes: or other excellent monuments of antiquity, never sufficiently perused?” (41). Harvey sees in pamphlets no redeeming qualities
whatsoever. The “wit” of the pamphleteers, for example, is nothing but “gross scurrility and impudent Calumny” (54); imaginative writing in pamphlets is “unreasonable fictions,” “odious grossnesse,” and the writer who writes popular romances “must be content with the rewarde of a notable Lier, not to be credited, when he arroweth a trueth” (50); and Harvey will not grant to pamphleteers even the license of exaggeration and hyperbole traditionally claimed by writers from antiquity. The ancients may have resorted to subterfuge, but “all their forgeries were seasoned with the salt of probabilitie and only used at occasions of advantage; and although the Grecians generallie were over-light headed, and vaine-spoken, yet their levitie savoured of elegant witnesse, and the flying bird carried meate in the mouth” (50). Thus, whatever the pamphlet writers did, the Ancients had done better. So, for Harvey, there was really no need to be “new-fangled” (creative or inventive), but one merely had to study and imitate the Ancients.

It is against these rigorous standards that Greene fails miserably and Nashe, at least for Harvey, seems a potentially good writer. Harvey’s overtures to Nashe to get him to relinquish pamphlets and turn to serious writing constitute the second notable aspect of the third letter. Nashe may have fallen into bad company and his mind perhaps even been seriously corrupted by his association with Greene (“the two impudentest mates that ever haunted the presse”\(^{10}\)), and he may have attacked Richard Harvey in *Pierce Penilesse*, but Harvey is ready to forgive and forget. Actually, he has noticed “the delicate witte and…the queintest inventions of [his] deviseful braine”(46). He had even called Nashe “a proper young man if advised in time” in the second letter (21). It is true that Harvey

\(^{10}\) In *Pierces Supererogation*, p. 34.
uses harsh language against Nashe in this letter, but it is only as a necessary retaliation against his attack on Richard Harvey. There is no doubt that Harvey sees Nashe not only as a representative figure in the pamphlet world, but also as the likeliest candidate to succeed Greene in success and influence. To push Nashe toward reformation is for Harvey to stem the corrupt tide of satiric pamphlets:

    I speake generally to every springing wit; but more specially to a few; and at this instant singularly to one: whom I salute with a hundred blessings: and entreat with as many prayers, to love them, that love all good wittes: and hate none, but the Divell, and his incarnate Impes, notoriously professed. I protest, it was not thy person, that I any-way disliked: but thy rash, and desperate proceeding against thy well-willers. (68-69)

It may be recalled that the advice to “love good wittes and hate none” is the same one that Greene in Groatsworth had given “Young Juvenal,” generally believed to refer to Nashe.

But Harvey goes much further than merely asking him to respect other wits. He wants Nashe to quit pamphleteering and turn to serious writing, possibly under a patron:

    Cast not thy dreiae selfe headlong into the horrible Gulf of desperation...; either gallantlie advance thy vertuous self, maugre Fortune: (what impossible to aspiring industry?) or mightillie enchant some magnificent Mecaenas, (for thou canst doe it) to honour himself in honouring thee: and to blisse the eies of the gazing world, with beholding those Miracles, which some round liberalality, and thy super-thankfull minde, would hugelie enable thee to worke. (46-47)

But, as a closer look will reveal, this is a pragmatic and politic advice. The moral
exhortation to "Advance thy virtuous self, maugre Fortune" sits uneasily with the utilitarian suggestion to "enchant some magnificent Mecaenas." Harvey's implication that a "super-thankfullminde" and "some round liberality" are all it takes to work "miracles" that will "bliss the eies of the gazing world" begs the question about why writers write and for whom. This facile advice also seems to tap into the materialistic side of humanism. More striking, however, is Harvey's slick confidence that Nashe can "mightilie enchant some magnificent Mecaenas (thou canst doe it)." The inability of writers to attract patronage was one of the enduring complaints of the late Elizabethan age. Harvey himself languished without one, and could not achieve profitable employment throughout his life. Nashe in Pierce Penilesse deplores the lack of patronage available to writers. Those who did support writers, according to Nashe, supported only flatterers. If this was the case, how could Harvey so glibly advise writers to give up selling their efforts in the popular marketplace, "maugre Fortune"?

Still, Harvey is no "pragmatic" humanist. His inconsistency, I think, should be seen as a sugar-coated compromise to Nashe to escape the degraded and degrading the materially expedient position of the previous passage to a more idealistic one, a position more compatible with his humanist principles, according to which a "good orator is also a good [virtuous] man," even a philosophical man:

Be a Musitian, and Poet unto thy self, that art both, and a Ring leader of both, unto other, be a Man, be a Gentleman, be a philosopher, be a Divine, by thy resolute selfe; not the slave of Fortunes, that for every flea-biting crieth out-alas... but the friend of Vertue, that is richest in poverty, freest in bondage, bravest in
jeopardy, cheerfulest in calamitie, be rather wise and unfortunate, with the silver
Swanne, then fortunate and unwise, with the golden Asse. (48)

As we can see, Harvey’s humanism is clearest in this passage, even though the
exhortation to writers to be wise even if they are desperately poor might have struck his
contemporaries as somewhat heartless and characteristic of his pedantry. More
problematically, writers like Greene and Nashe could, and did, easily take the same
attitude toward their poverty – that they were poor but free, destitute but wise, etc. What
Harvey thinks of as “slave of Fortune” is, then, open to interpretation, and a writer like
Nashe could very easily turn the tables on Harvey and other “respectable” writers (those
who had patrons) by proving them slaves of Fortune.

Moreover, Harvey’s advice is also predicated on the unfair assumption that all
writers like Greene and Nashe cared for was money. It was certainly true that material
considerations were an important factor in their pamphleteering lifestyle. Equally true,
however, was Harvey’s inability to discern the vitality behind pamphlets like A Quip for
an Upstart Courtier or Pierce Penilesse, either simply as lively pieces of writing or as
works with legitimate social concerns. In this sense, Harvey’s “Musitian,” “Poet,”
“Man,” “Gentlemen,” “Philosopher,” etc. come across as strangely sterile models, devoid
of political or social consciousness. At the most, they can only be like the Harvey of the
Earthquake Letter, whose satiric point, though scholarly, is abstruse and limited to a
cliquish and privileged audience.

The next exhortation from Harvey to Nashe, indeed all writers, raises the bar even
further for writers in terms of virtue. Where before the writer was told to be a “Man” and
a "Gentleman," now Harvey goes farther afield: "Good sweet Orator, be a divine Poet
indeede; and use heavenly Eloquence indeed: and employ thy golden talent with
amounting usance indeed: and with heroical cantoes honour right virtue and brave valour
indeede: as noble Sir Philip Sidney and gentle Maister Spenser have done, with immortal
fame" (67). What was supposed to be a good "Man" is now asked to be a "divine Poet"
who uses "heavenly Eloquence." The problem with this advice is that the two men
Harvey offers as models – Sidney and Spenser – are so exclusive and rare that this lofty
exhortation, aimed at an impecunious group of popular pamphleteers, seems almost
absurd. Also, Harvey brings into the pamphlet world that functions on the economic
model of demand and supply a set of values developed to suit the needs of the academic
world and the governing class. To apply them wholesale to the commercial marketplace--
which had achieved its version of "democracy" and "modernity" in the sense that we can
understand now--is to betray a naivete both about the way the marketplace worked and
about the subversive and democratic outlet that market provided to the general populace
in a rigidly hierarchic society.

The third letter, then, began as a legitimate critique of the pamphlet form and
pamphleteers but has now become a somewhat mawkish hankering after an impossible
ideal. The ideal is impossible not only because poets like Sidney and Spenser were
supremely talented, but also because at least part of their fame and achievement were due
to the social position they enjoyed (yes, even Spenser) and to the familial and institutional
propaganda that surrounded their works. Not everyone could be a Sidney or a Spenser.
Also, Harvey's recasting of the Pamphleteer as Orator, with all the moral and rhetorical
qualities the word “orator” implies, is fraught with contradictions. Thus Harvey seems to have been carried away by his own good will toward Nashe and his general reforming zeal. Harvey has fine-tuned his ideal pamphleteer/orator right out of existence.

The fourth letter is the most important and substantial, though perhaps the least engaging, of all the letters. After the vigorous, though at times breathless, prose in the second and third letters, Harvey seems to have tired of the whole subject suddenly. There is none of that lively choler and the tremulous rage that animate his previous letters. But the fourth letter is concerned with the pamphlet world and pamphleteers on a scholarly level. On the whole, it touches on, explicates, and continues the themes of the previous three.

Writing to “fulfill the importunate requests of a fewe,” ostensibly to dilate upon “whatsoever occasion causeth me to be mistaken, as overmuch addicted to theory, without respect of action,” Harvey takes much pain to explain that he “never made account of any study, meditation, conference, or Exercise, that importeth not effectual use, and that aymeth not altogether at action as the singular marke whereat every Arte and every vertue is to levell”(77). In Ramist formulation, both rhetoric and dialectic are arts, and exercise is the practice of those arts in writing and speaking. The proper balance of “arte” and “exercise” results in proper “practise” and “effectual use” of one’s life. But if he had to make a choice between art and exercise, Harvey would rather take “Exercise without arte, then arte without exercise” (77). Harvey’s meaning is that he would prefer a skill developed through disciplined practice, even without formal instruction, to mere
book learning applied without any self-discipline whatsoever. It is apparent that Harvey considers popular pamphlets and pamphleteers as possessing merely art without the proper discipline that exercise would instill in them. As for his own apparent lack of action (not writing as much as others have done), it is actually a sign of profound action ("exercise"): proper living. He has "wedded [himself] to study and devoted [his] mind to publike quietness" (71), and these exercises are the result of a perfect harmony between "arte" and "exercise" in him. His quietness (apparent inaction) is actually a sign of plenitude: "they that understand little, write much: and they that know much, write little" (77). Harvey's inference is clear: writers, in general, know little; pamphleteers, even less.

That is why he is so dismissive of Foure Letters itself: "my first Letter [that is, the second letter] was in a manner voluntary: my second [third], in sort necessary: this, wholly superfluous, but violently extorted after the rest: all wearying unto me; but this most tedious; and anything more, would seeme intollerable" (84).

It is this lofty disdain for non-scholarly writing that informs Harvey's view not only of the pamphlet world, but of the print world as a whole: "The wayne Peacocke, with his gay collours, and the pratling Parrat with his ignorant discourses have garishly disguised the worthiest Artes, and deeply discredited the profoundest Artistes, to the pitifull defacement of the one, and the shameful prejudice of the other" (77-78). As for writing himself, Harvey's explanation is so perfectionist as to discourage all writers who write for common pleasure: "Excellent effects must flow from the spring of excellent

---

11 I owe this insight to Prof. Judith Rice Henderson.

12 Nashe, continuing the scatological quip Harvey made with his "Doctor's fart" remark earlier in the pamphlet, calls the fourth letter "hard stool" in Strange Newes.
causes: and nothing notable without notable Endeavour. The print is abused, that abuseth: and earnestly beseecheth flourishing writers, not to trouble the presse, but in case of urgent occasion or important use” (79-80). Harvey’s caution flows from his somewhat pedantic and perhaps timorous bent of mind: “an ignorant man lesse shameth himself, lesse beguileth his friend, lesse disableth the commonwealth, then a putative Artist” (79).

Harvey’s retiring spirit, as any one can see, is hardly benign – it can actually blight the budding enthusiasm of young scholars and creative writers. But that is exactly the way Harvey would want his world to be. Harvey’s world is a place where knowledge and hierarchy are respected, not creativity and enterprise. As he was settling down into middle age, the once-adventurous and enterprising Harvey wished that the pesky pamphlets and pamphleteers would simply go away, disappear. His view was now almost reactionary, his ideal world situated in the distant past. As for his own writings, he says:

That little I have done, I have done compelled and would wish undone, rather than any stome of Debate, or the least fit of Mallice should insue thereof: let them glory in pen-scolding, and paper-brabling, that list: I must not, I cannot, I will not: I hate to intend such arrant paltry, not for fear, but for contempt, not for lasinesse, but for weightier businesse: good honest youthes, spare an old Truante, meeter now to play the Dumme Dog, with some auncients, then the bauling cur, or the hissing snake, with you springals. (83)

The note of humility suggested by the images of senility and muteness is quite false. Harvey is not graciously letting the younger generation take over. He is peevishly relinquishing his place in the world, refusing to engage himself in its affairs on anything
but his own terms or even to be amused by it.

Thus *Four Letters* engages with the satiric pamphlet form on several levels. Greene represents the very worst and Nashe represents something redeemable—if only because Nashe is still alive and young. But, ultimately, Harvey’s attitude toward the popular pamphlet is one of dismissal, as being too much art and no exercise and therefore ineffectual. That is why Harvey is genuinely uncomfortable about appearing in popular print. He would “rather mitigate [the satiric vain of the pamphlet world] with twenty insinuative & persuasive orations, than any way aggravate with one offensive, or defensive Letter” (84). In the prefatory letter to *Four Letters*, he is actually apologetic about his pamphlet appearance: “may I crave pardon at this instant, aswell for enditinge, that is unworthy to be published, as for publishing, that was unworthy to be endited,” confessing that he was “exceeding loath to penne” the pamphlet (1). In *Pierces Supererogation*, written in 1593, Harvey says that “amongst all the misfortunes, that ever happened unto me, I account it my greatest affliction, that I am constrained to busy my penne, without ground, or substance of discourse, meete for an active and industrious world” (34). But he apparently saw *Four Letters* as having an “effectual use,” as a kind of “persuasive oration.” In any case, his end justifies his means: “To stop the beginning, is no bad purpose: where the end may prove pernicious, or perillous” (8). It is, therefore, one of the cruel ironies that seem so common in Harvey’s life that *Four Letters* did not stop the beginning of a “pernicious” thing but merely signaled the beginning of a notorious pamphlet war with Nashe that would last through the better part of the decade and end ignominiously for both.
Chapter 4:

Satiric Mimicking in Henry Chettle’s *Kind-Hartes Dreame*

*Kind-Hartes Dreame*, entered in the Stationers’ Register on December 20, 1592, and published soon afterwards, is ostensibly a reminder to Thomas Nashe to take revenge on Gabriel Harvey for his attack on Greene in *Foure Letters and Certaine Sonnets*. Nashe, however, was in the country avoiding the plague, and either was not aware of, or could not reply to, Harvey’s attacks.¹ *Foure Letters* had gone unanswered for over two months when *Kind-Hartes Dreame* was entered in the Stationers’ Register. The text makes it clear that Chettle was sending a message to Nashe, urging him to retaliate. Greene’s ghost appears in the pamphlet to deliver a letter to “Pierce Penilesse,” complaining of Envy spitting “out her poyson, to disturb my rest,” and urging him to “revenge thy wrongs, remember mine” (35-37). Greene’s ghost seems to make oblique references to *Foure Letters*: “There is no glory gained by breaking a deade mans skull.... Yet it appears contrary in some, that inveighing against my works, my povertie, my life, my death, by burial, have omitted nothing that may seeme malitious” (35). Chettle clearly has in mind Harvey’s attack on Greene, because in the second invective Doctor Burcot says, “I understand some greene-headed scoffers at my greene receipt have intermeddled in matters more than they conceive, and by that folly effected much less than they promised” (23). Harvey’s act of libeling a dead man is hinted at and his prescriptions for pamphlet writing are dismissed as “matters more than [he] conceive[s]”

¹Nashe replied to Harvey’s taunting about his absence by saying, “I lurke in no corners, but converse in a great house of credit” (TN L.329). The “great house of credit” was Whitgift’s, in Croydon. See Nicholl’s *A Cup of News*, 139-40.
and "rules [he] understand[s] not."²

At another level, however, *Kind Harte* is much more than a reply to Harvey's attack on Greene. It is a counter attack not on Harvey but on all that he represents: the official displeasure and the scholarly disdain toward anything popular. In *Kind Harte*, Chettle satirizes conservative and reactionary attitudes toward ballad printing, cheap and vernacular medical texts, and popular plays; there is also a mock-serious invective against those who speak against cony-catching. Disparate though these themes may be, Chettle is without doubt trying to ventriloquize and ironize official views of printing and play acting. As a printer and an aspiring writer, Chettle was well aware of the economic opportunities that the marketplace of print offered. Greene had tried to exploit these opportunities, but he was both ostracized by potential patrons and demonized by serious scholars. Thus, as we saw in the introduction, Greene's death signaled the death of liberality and patronage for writers and showed them the importance of exploring possibilities in the print market, whatever the cost. Chettle recognizes all this and has written in *Kind Harte* a pamphlet that supports market-oriented opportunities for those who were, like Greene before his death, trapped in impossible situations. Chettle's program in this pamphlet is to erase the stigma surrounding market activities; even the section on juggling is a defense of cony-catchers who, in Chettle's view, are cony-catching only because they have been driven to it by the dishonesty of the entire society.

²Dr. Burcot's rhetoric is part Harvey-speak and part establishmentarian such as the College of Physicians' attack on apothecaries and unlicensed medical practitioners. This shifting nature of Chettle's characters is fully amplified in the voice of Tarlton in the third invective and in the characterization of *Pierce Plainness* (1595), a picaresque fictional narrative, not, curiously, unlike Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller*.
Thus *Kind Harte* resolves the questions that Greene's death had raised, questions that Harvey could not resolve. By virtue of this, it is an important response both to Greene's death and the question of declining patronage in the last decades of Elizabeth's reign.

Chettle was peculiarly suited to attempt an exploration into the issues of commercialization of art. As a young man, Chettle had been apprenticed to printer Thomas East, whose works included Lyly's *Euphues*.\(^3\) It is likely that Chettle was influenced by the Euphuistic style, which we see in his later writings.\(^4\) He took up his freedom in late 1584, but for the next seven years, we do not hear much about him except that he bore "charges to Cambridge about the Companyes affaires" (Arber II. 693), perhaps during the dispute between the Stationers and the University of Cambridge in 1587 over privileges granted to universities for the printing of books. In 1591, he entered into a business partnership with William Hoskins and John Danter, printers of somewhat tainted reputation.\(^5\) Both were in the clear by 1591. The partnership first printed a book by Thomas Lodge (*Catharos*) and then two sermons by the Rev. Henry Smith, a Puritan

---

\(^3\)Harold Jenkins' *Life and Work of Henry Chettle* remains the only full-length study of this rather obscure Elizabethan writer. John Jowett's studies on Chettle update Jenkins and specifically consider Chettle's role in the writing and publication of *Groatsworth*.

\(^4\)There are three works attributed to one "H.C" in the 1570s, though whether this is really Henry Chettle is under dispute: *The Popes Pityful Lamentation for the Death of his Dear Darling Don Juan of Austria* (1578), the broadside *A doleful Ditty or Sorrowful Sonnet of the Lord Darnley* (1579), and a miscellany of verse, epistles, and short narratives called *The Forest of Fancy*. Apart from *Kind-Hartes Dreame*, published at the end of 1592, Chettle's sole remaining prose work seems to be *Pierce Plainness*, which shows faint influences of Euphuism.

\(^5\)Danter would regularly publish Nashe later in the decade, but he is, of course, most notorious for his pirated editions of some of Shakespeare's early plays. The most detailed account of John Danter I have seen is in Hoppe's *The Bad Quarto of Romeo and Juliet* (18-38). Also see McKerrow's *Dictionary*, 83-3. For Hoskins, see *Dictionary*, 144. Hoskins had been fined and imprisoned for keeping unpresented apprentices, and Danter had had his license suspended for printing books patented to some other printer.
divine. In late 1592, the partnership was dissolved. Even after the partnership, Chettle maintained links with printers, but he also apparently devoted time to writing.\(^6\) Being familiar with both ends of literary production (the pen and the press) may have brought him into contact with Robert Greene and his world. As a printer, Chettle would certainly have known John Wolfe\(^7\) and William Wright,\(^8\) respectively publisher and printer of some of Greene’s cony-catching pamphlets, as well as a section of *Groatsworth*. We know that Chettle had access to Greene’s papers after his death, not only because he claims so in *Kind Harte*, but also because both *Repentance*, one of Greene’s pamphlets published posthumously, and *Cony-Catcher’s Repentance*, an unpublished tract, had been entered into the Stationers’ Register under Danter’s name. Also, Chettle was in contact with all the publishers and printers that were involved in the publication of Greene’s own posthumous pamphlets as well as those other pamphlets that had Greene’s death as their subject matter.\(^9\) We thus see Chettle in a crowd of adventurous and even unscrupulous

---

\(^6\) Apart from *Kind-harte* and *Pierce Plainness*, Chettle would be involved in more than fifty plays under Philip Henslowe’s employ in the late ‘90s.

\(^7\) John Wolfe was a noted printer and publisher in the ‘80s. He began his career as a rogue printer but soon became an establishment man, and was instrumental in effecting significant changes to the existing laws governing the printing of books. For detailed accounts and a critique of Wolfe’s contribution to and impact on late sixteenth-century printing, see Huffman’s *Elizabethan Impressions*, Loewenstein’s “For a History of Literary Property,” and Halasz’s *Marketplace of Print* (30-33). Also see McKerrow’s *Dictionary*, 296-98.

\(^8\) William Wright, like Wolfe, also opposed monopolies by printing privileged books for which he was imprisoned briefly. See McKerrow’s *Dictionary*, 303-4.

\(^9\) The *Repentance of Robert Greene* was printed by Danter for Cuthbert Burby. Burby had been an apprentice under Wright until 1592 and had published some of Greene’s cony-catching pamphlets. Both *Groatsworth* and *Kind Harte* were published by Wright and printed by Wolfe and Danter. Gabriel Harvey’s *Four Letters and Sonnets*, a virulent attack on Greene published just days after he died, was printed and published by John Wolfe. *Strange Newes*, Nashe’s pungent reply to Harvey, was printed and published by Danter. *Greenes News both from Heaven and Hell* by one B.R. was printed and published, according
printers and publishers who had vested interest in seeing pamphlets by and about Greene published. That is probably why Chettle could gain access to Greene's papers, especially *Groatsworth*, and prepare them for publication. Chettle had already indulged in literary fraud when he wrote a preface under the initials “T.N.” for Anthony Munday's *Gerieon II*.\(^{10}\) As well, in 1592 Chettle was no longer a printer but an aspiring writer, and had developed a talent for literary imitation that is evident in *Kind-hartes Dreame*, published just four months after Greene's death.

*Kind Harte* shows Chettle's preoccupation with Greene the pamphleteer and his place within the publishing trade. In the pamphlet, Chettle writes a signed preface “to gentleman readers,” in which he acknowledges that he edited, but did not write, *Groatsworth*; asserts that Nashe did not write *Groatsworth* either, “as some unjustly have affirmed”; and confirms that Nashe was not “the writer of an epistle to the second part of *Gerileon*, though by the workmans error T.N. were set to the end: that I confesse to be mine, and repent it not” (7). Thus flippant and unrepentant over a serious breach, Chettle goes on to say that *Kind Harte* itself would have come out anonymously if not for the controversy *Groatsworth* had caused: “Had not the former reasons been, it [*Kind Harte*] had come forth without a father; and then should I have had no cause to feare offending, or reason to sue for favour” (7). Thus authority is an alarmingly loose concept

---

\(^{10}\) The first part of *Gerileon*, Munday's translation of a Continental romance, appeared in 1583, but the second part came out only after nine years, during which time a rival translation had appeared. Chettle, Munday's close friend, attacked both the translator (unidentified) and the printer (identified as Abel Jeffe) in his preface. See C. Turner's *Mundy: An Elizabethan Man of Letters*, 94-105.
for Chettle, who, perhaps because of “all the time of conversing in printing,” has a cavalier attitude toward it. In the pamphlet, as Kind Harte, he totally absolves himself of any responsibility for the invectives: “Kind Harte… only delivers his dreams; with every Apparition simply as it was uttered. It’s fond for them to fight against ghosts; it’s fearfull for me to hide an Apparition” (10). This disclaimer occurs after Chettle has claimed that he wrote the pamphlet with a serious moral purpose: “though the toye bee shadowed under the Title of kind-hearts Dreame, it discovers the false hearts of divers that wake to commit mischiefe” (7). To assert that it comes forth “with a father” (7) in the preface and to disclaim it in the guise of Kind Harte is typical of Chettle’s flippant attitude toward authority and authorship.

*Kind Harte*, through its several epistles, broadens the issues to include non-literary writings such as ballads, vernacular medical texts, commercial plays, and also, satirically, the unpretentious commercialism of cony-catching. Chettle effects his attack through irony, by using nether-world messengers who pompously repeat official propaganda. The messengers are the ghosts of Anthony Now Now, a balladeer, Doctor Burcot, a physician, Richard Tarlton, the famous player, William Cuckoe, a juggler, and Robert Greene, the pamphleteer. Like *Pierce Penilesse* and *Tarltons Newes out of Purgatorie* (1590), *Kind-Hartes Dreame* also cleverly employs messengers from the dead to be satirical without ever being openly critical of authorities.\(^{11}\)

\(^{11}\)See Hutson’s *Thomas Nashe in Context* for a detailed discussion of mock-testament and nether-world dialogues in pamphlets, especially *Pierce Penilesse* (127-54). Also see B. Boyce’s “News from Hell: Satiric Communication with the Netherworld in English Writing of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries.”
The very setting, carefully sketched in a separate section under the heading "The Dreame," positions the pamphlet in an ironic relation to the contemporary practice of printing and publishing. Nashe's *Pierce Penilesse* had effortlessly ridiculed the widely-practiced conventions of repentance, patronage-seeking, and estate complaint. Chettle invokes this methodology right in the title page: "Kind-Hartes Dreame, conteining five Apparitions, with their invectives against abuses raigning. Delivered by severall Ghosts unto him to be publisht, after *Piers Penilesse* Post had refused the carriage" (3). The thematic kinship with *Pierce Penilesse* is pushed further: "When all the five before named had made profer of severall bills invectives against abuses raigning, this devilish Messenger repulsed them wrathfully, and bad them get some other to bee their packet bearer if they list, for he had almost hazarded his credit in hell, by beeing a broker between *Pierce Penilesse* and his Lord" (14). That Kind Harte is the replacement Knight of the Post for these ghosts makes their invectives as much a mad, mock-serious supplication as Pierce Penilesse's, with one difference: where Pierce's supplication was sent from the real world to the devil, these five invectives are delivered from the nether-
world to the real world. Apart from this thematic association with *Pierce Penilesse*, the very fact that the pious protestations against “abuses reigning” issue from ghosts to a Kind Harte lying in a drunken haze at a “taphouse of Antiquity” alerts us to the carnivalesque nature of the pamphlet. By mock-mythologizing the origin of the pamphlet and by making it a product of his own dream amid “harsh and confused sound,” *Kind Harte* renders these invectives ironic and satirical.

The entire pamphlet seems to be in response to official criticisms against the loss of decorum in arts and increasing pandering to popular taste. Chettle takes a holistic view of this argument and enlarges the scope of the issue by including such popular activities as ballad singing, healing, and acting in plays. Chettle’s connecting thread, especially in the first three invectives, is the degradation of these arts in the hands of uneducated or semi-educated practitioners without proper training or talent. Even Cuckoe’s invective, the fourth one, ironically upbraids the current fashion for rogue literature and laments the bad light in which cony-catching is generally regarded. Degradation has resulted especially because of mass circulation of specialist knowledge through the enabling agent of print. The printing machine is the “divel’s instrument” for these ghosts, an echo of Harvey’s characterization of pamphleteering by Greene as the “black arte”. By incorporating official views of popular arts and the anxieties they evoked in aristocratic and official circles in the invectives of Anthony Now Now and Doctor Burcot, and portraying them as restless ghosts, Chettle hints at once at the ubiquity of such complaints and at their futility. In the third invective, Tarlton’s ironic voice, first as that of a brothel owner who has lost business to playhouses and who is glad of the recent closure of them
because of plague, and later as the famous player who pleads for an understanding of his vocation, parodies contemporary polemics over plays and seems to offer a reasoned plea on behalf of players and playhouses.\textsuperscript{14} William Cuckoe’s exposé of cony-catching is similar to those of Greene, with similar irony of a notorious cony-catcher defending himself on the grounds that the whole world operates by cony-catching. That Chettle situates Greene’s invective among these pseudo-apologies is a clever creative move because it contextualizes Harvey’s attack on Greene and successfully subverts the philosophical ground on which Harvey had mounted his attack.

\textbf{Ballads}

The first invective is “the friendly admonition of Anthonie Now [N]ow, to Mopo and Pickering, Arch Overseers of the Ballad singers, in London, or elsewhere,” beseeching them to “suppress the forenamed idle vagabonds” (15). Anthony Now Now and Mopo are untraceable characters, but Pickering was a well-known ballad printer in London during the 1580s.\textsuperscript{15} Why Now Now should specifically write to Mopo and Pickering remains a mystery, though Achinstein suggests that they may be caricatures of Bancroft and Whitgift,\textsuperscript{16} the prelates who handled the Marprelate scandal with some measure of success, but whose enthusiasm at suppressing the press had somewhat

\textsuperscript{14}This is especially so, when we take into consideration the fact that one of Chettle’s motives in writing \textit{Kind-Harte} is to assuage the hurt feelings of playwrights attacked in \textit{Groatsworth}. See \textit{Kind-Hartes Dreame}, 5-7.

\textsuperscript{15}See McKerrow’s \textit{Dictionary}.

\textsuperscript{16}See Achinstein’s “Audiences and Authors ...,” 318.
displeased anti-Martinist pamphleteers. Whatever the case, Now is obviously repeating the prevailing official view regarding ballads. “Ballates” were expressly warned against in 1559, around the inception of the Stationers’ Company. Injunctions given by the Queen, for example, warn against plays and ballads as “publication of unfrutfull, vague and infamous bokes and papers” and encourage works wherein nothing “should be heretical, seditious, or unseemly for Christian eares” (Arber I: xxxviii). As we know, most printing activity and literary production were controlled by the Stationers’ Company through licensing, conferring of privileges and monopolies, and patronage, but ballads seem to have slipped through the cracks of the system and become free from official constraints. The rise of literacy and growing urbanization created an increasing market for printed materials, so ballads flourished alongside the bestsellers of the time, such as the Bible, the catechism, and the ABC. The gradual separation of printing and selling further fueled the easy dissemination of cheaply printed books without official constraints. It was thus possible to achieve financial success through printing and distribution of ballads, but, at the same time, since the ballad functioned outside the official ken, its producers were despised by the company officials. Consequently, no ballad-printer ever belonged to the higher echelons of the company as warden or assistant,

17 Wurzbach’s introduction to The Rise of English Ballad 1550-1650, is an interesting analysis of the way ballads functioned outside the grasp of official regulatory institutions. For the way in which the patronage system worked as a regulatory mechanism, see Marotti. Hutson’s book on Nashe also has interesting information about censorship of the press in early modern England.

18 On printers and book-sellers, see Lowenstein’s (in “For a History of Literary Property:”) and Halasz’s (in The Marketplace of Print) critical readings of John Wolfe’s role in the development of printing business in the 1580s and 1590s. For a more general perspective on the separation of printing and selling, see W.W. Greg’s Some Aspects of London Publishing Between 1550 and 1650.
and a large number of ballad printers were not even members of the company.

Like ballad printers, the ballad monger also inhabited the unregulated fringes of the marketplace of print. Unlike actors, who were usually members of a troupe that was under the patronage of a great man, and whose performance was thus under surveillance, a ballad monger could sell his wares wherever and whenever he liked without any fear of restriction or regulation. As a result, "the author of a ballad could risk expressing subversive opinions through the ballad monger, thereby slipping through the censor's net" (Wurzbach 22). In addition to an anti-social image, ballad mongers were also known to work in collusion with pickpockets while performing.\(^\text{19}\) Thus, the increasing identification of ballad singers with unsavory social elements was enough to cause anxiety for the government to enforce, through the Star Chamber decree in 1586, the compulsory licensing of ballads.\(^\text{20}\) Even after this, ballad writers and peddlers were frequent targets for serious writers and polemicists. At the same time, the ballad's cheap production, wide distribution, and gullible audiences made for a certain unease in authorities concerned about its potential for political mischief.

As a result, even though ballads were popular among the masses, there was a culture of ballad-bashing among the literate section of the society. Many serious writers, both humanist and puritan, held ballads and ballad writers in contempt. That ballads were a "mischievous," "unfruteful," and "unprofitable" literary exercise was a common

---

\(^\text{19}\) See Ben Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair* (II. 1) and Greene's *Second Part of conny-catching* (X.161).

theme in all contemporary comments on ballads.21 Viewed against this backdrop, Anthony Now Now’s invective is clearly conservative and establishmentarian. For example, echoes of Stubbes can be heard when Now Now says, “I am given to understand, that there be a company of idle youths, loathing honest labour and despising lawfull trades, betake them to a vagrant and vicious life, in every corner of Cities and market Townes of the Realme singing and selling of ballads and pamphlets full of ribaudrie, and all scurrilous vanity, to the prophanation of God’s name, and with-drawing people from Christian exercises...”(15). Characterizing ballad singers as a scourge, a frequent official strategy, Now Now demonizes them as “these basilisks, these bad minded monsters” who, “brought forth like vipers by their mothers bane, with such lascivious leudness[,] have first infected London the eie of England, the head of other cities, as what is so lewd that hath not there contrary to order been printed, and in every...

21 All quotations from Wurzbach, who has helpfully collected all criticisms of ballads in early modern England in her book, The Rise of the English Ballad. Roger Ascham, for example, deprecates the fact that “many dayly in setting out booke and balettes make great shew of blossomes and buddes, in whom is neither root of learning nor fruit of wisdome at all!” (15; G.G. Smith edition (1964) of The Scholemaster). Ballad mongering was also associated with “roisterliness,” chiefly because ballads were sung in taverns and ale-houses. The well-known anti-theatrical Puritan writer, Stephen Gosson, harps on this aspect when he says, “London is so full of unprofitable pipers and fiddlers, that a man can no sooner enter a tavern, but two or three caste of them hang at his heele, to give him a daunce before he departe; therefore let men of gravitie examine the case, and judge uprightly, whether the suffrance of such idle beggers be not a grevous abuse in a commonwealth” (The School of Abuse, ed. Arbour [1868], 70). For another Puritan polemicist Philip Stubbes, ballad mongering was positively diabolical: “Every towne, citie, and countrye is full of these ministrelles to pype up a dance to the Devill, but of dyvines, so few there be as they maye hardly be seen” (The Anatomie of Abuses, ed. F.J. Furnivall, 172). William Webbe, in A Discourse of English Poesie (1586), justifies the omission of ballads from his discussion by emphasizing their prodigal nature: “If I let passe the uncountable rabble of ryming Ballet makers and compilers of sencelesse sonetes, who be most busy to stuffe every stall full of grosse devises and unlearned pamphlets I trust I shall with the best sort be held excused” (ed. G.G. Smith ed. 246-7). Even Thomas Nashe, a popular writer, held ballads in contempt on account of their supposedly low artistic merit: “Hence come our babbling Ballets, and our new found songs and sonnets, which every rednose Fidler hath at his fingers end, and every ignorant Ale Knight with breath foorth over the potte, as soon as his braine waxeth hote. Be it a truth which they would tune, they enterlace it with a lye or two to make meeter, not regarding veritie, so they may make uppe the verse” (The Anatomie of Absurditie, ed. R.B. Mckerrow 24).
street abusively chanted" (17). Now Now sees ballad singers as masterless men, and calls for their punishment: "The Rogue that liveth idly is restrained, the fidler and the plaier that is masterless is in the same predicament, both these by the law are burned in the eare, and shall men more odious [ballad-singers and sellers] scape unpunished" (18). Now Now even falls back on the stock characterization of them as pickpockets and cony-catchers, who "gathered sundry assemblies in divers places, where yere a leauld song was fully ended, some mist their knives, some their purses, some one thing, some another" (19-20).

But Now Now's invective should be seen in the proper ironic context within which Chettle has set it. The very fact that the "friendly admonition" is addressed to Pickering is ironic, because Pickering was one of the earliest printers and distributers of ballads, and for Now Now to urge him, along with one "S.P." (presumably one Stephen Peele, another ballad printer) to suppress the spread of ballads is a mockery of the real situation. And, as we noted before, the fact that Mopo and Pickering serve as caricatures of ecclesiastical authorities in charge of censorship is a further indication of Now Now's satiric intentions. Now Now himself is apparently a sardonic fictionalization of Anthony Munday's figure, himself no stranger to the commercial potential of print. Within this

---

22 For an interesting look at ballads as scourge, see Achinstein's "Plagues and Publication: Ballads and the Representation of Disease in the English Renaissance."

23 For the relationship between masterless men and ballads, see Beier's Masterless Men, 98-9.

24 See McKerrow's Dictionary.

25 See Turner and Hoppe.
 ironic framework, Now Now’s words are just a mimicry of anti-ballad rhetoric.

His invective also speaks of the exploitation of apprentices at the hands of entrepreneurial printers. His condemnation of ballad singers as mischievous vagrants assumes heavy irony in the context of the abuse these vagrants themselves suffer under powerful and unscrupulous printers and booksellers. He is insightful enough to ascribe blame to those “unworthy citizens and other freemen in Towers Corporate” (16) for the present condition of ballad singers. “Is it not lamentable,” he asks, “that after so many callings, so many blessings, so many warnings, through the covetous desire of gaine of some two or three, such a flock of Run-agates should overspread the face of this land, as at this time it doth” (16). Businessmen, in general, are as culpable as the peddlers, especially the typical ballad printer, that “worthless companion...being of a worshipful trade [printing] and yet no stationer, who after a little bringing them uppe to singing brokerie, takes into his shop some freshmen, and trusts his old servants of a two months standing with a dossen groatsworth of ballads” (19). 26 This was one way by which booksellers sought to evade regulation, as the chap men carried their wares around town. Their peripatetic behavior vexed the authorities’ attempts to regulate printing, and that made these youths look criminal. Nor does Now Now limit the blame to unscrupulous printers, but he implicates the very top of the Company: “the Governers of cutpurse hall, finding that their company wonderfully increast, however many of their best workmen monthly miscande at the three foot crosse” (19), blithely let their new and increasing

26 For the way apprentices were exploited by their employers see Mark Thornton Burnett and Steve Rapaport. Both these scholars have done extensive studies on the early modern apprenticeship methods.
membership be employed in the ballad trade. That is why, Now Now implies, there is such an excess of able-bodied young men wandering around the country singing ballads.

Chettle's ironic ventriloquism slips a bit when Now Now's invective betrays another streak of realism and says that the young apprentices who are exploited by their masters should at least serve out their entire terms:

if there be any songes suffered in such publicke sort to bee soong, beseech that they may either be such as yourselves (Mopo), that after seaven yeares or more service, have no other livinge lefte you out of pattent, but that poor base life, of itself too badde, yet made more beggerly, by increase of number: or at least if any if [sic] besides you be therto admitted, then it may be none other but aged and impotent persons: who living upon charity, may the rather draw those that delight in good songs, to have mercy on their need. (20-21)

Young apprentices, left singing in street corners and ale houses like beggars, were the responsibility of their masters. Therefore, whatever happens to these young men, or however they turn out to be in their occupation of peddling, is at least in part a direct consequence of their masters' callous exploitation of them. Thus, Now Now's perspicacity regarding printers and the commercial motives of the Stationers' Hall undercuts his attitude of scorn for ballad singers and for a moment reveals the satiric nature of his invective.

If there is any doubt as to Chettle's ironic speech so far, Kind Harte's response as soon as he finishes reading Now Now's invective dispels it completely: "When I had read this rabble, wherein I found little reason, I laide it by, intendinge at more time to seeke
out Mopo, and his mentioned companions” (23). Reminiscent of the Knight of the Post in *Pierce Penilesse*, Kind Harte adopts a nonchalant attitude toward the satiric postures of his alter ego in his pamphlets. Kind Harte’s characterization of Now Now’s invective as “rabble” heightens Chettle’s irony even as it underlines the absurdity of Now Now’s rhetoric. Through this multiple perspective, Chettle problematizes the issue of ballad singers and their supposed role in the spread of disorder in the realm. The net result is a defense of them and the easy dissemination of ballads.

**Medical Texts**

The second invective is from a physician, Dr. Burcot, deploiring the spread of spurious medical practitioners in the country. This invective makes perfect sense to readers in our own time, but for the early modern audience, it would have been heavily ironic. Dr. Burcot beseeches the “reverend College of learned Doctors and worshipful company of experienced Chirurgions to look more straightly” into those deceitful and spurious medical practitioners, so that no “poore patient should sufer losse in traill of their blind skill” (31). The target, again, is perceived abusers of a venerable art, the practice of medicine, those medical practitioners who are “injurious enemies to Arts, that have sought to make Phisick, among common people, esteemed common: and Chirurgery contemptible” (23). These “enemies of Arts” are the unlicensed medical practitioners against whom the College of Physicians, founded in 1537, was constantly complaining, considering them a “bold and ignorant Multitude” (qtd. in Pelling and Webster 182).
Apothecaries were held in equal contempt, though they were part of the tripartite division of labor in medical practice, along with physicians and surgeons ("barber surgeons"). By the final decades of the sixteenth century, leading barber-surgeons could challenge the authority of the College of Physicians and were instrumental in the translation into English of many medical texts from the Continent. Physicians were extensively, if somewhat impractically, educated in the university, whereas barber-surgeons belonged to a newly amalgamated company, built on their traditional strengths, and resisted being secondary to physicians. Barber-surgeons were well trained and well examined, if less learned than physicians, and even had to acquire Latin. They were under the jurisdiction of both their guild and ecclesiastical authorities. Apothecaries, members of the Grocers' company, were sellers of drugs, but since there was no limitation on the sale of drugs by the grocers there was room for irregularities. They were constantly persecuted by the College of Physicians for the illegal practice of medicine and for dispensing to unlicensed practitioners. Still, apothecaries were members of a powerful guild, by whom they were regulated and protected. For the vast majority of London's population, however, official medical help would at best have come from lower barber-surgeons and poorer apothecaries. In fact, most medical care was provided by the

---

27 One physician wrote about the apothecaries: "your syrups be but sauces, your purgations for the most part poisons, and...your confortatives, exhileratives, and regeneratives, are by nature so fast feltered that they cannot more against their enemies" (T.W., The Copie of a letter sent by a learned physician to his friend [1587], quoted by Pelling and Webster 178.)

28 A physician is a humanist scholar, expert in classical languages having completed a seven-year course in the Arts. He then had to study medicine for seven more years before being offered fellowship by the college of physicians. (See Pelling and Webster's "Medical Practitioners.")
local, unlicensed male practitioners or wise women having no formal authorization or education whatsoever and free of regulation from both ecclesiastical or civic bodies.

Estimates suggest that by the 1590s, there were about fifty physicians and a hundred barber-surgeons in London. Considering that most physicians and wealthier surgeons served aristocratic and wealthy subjects, the vast majority of the London population of about 200,000 must have been cared for by the poorer barber-surgeons, about a hundred apothecaries, and over two hundred and fifty unlicensed practitioners.\(^{29}\)

Thus, the elite medical practitioners' outcry against unlicensed practitioners is hardly tenable and would have sounded pompous to the pamphlet-reading masses of London, for whom the unlicensed practitioners were indispensable. Not only was there every indication that the unlicensed practitioners fulfilled their duties conscientiously and fully maintained the confidence of the community in their effectiveness in satisfying the needs of the sick (see Pelling and Webster 188-9), but the division of labor advocated by physicians was a hopeless utopian dream in a time of burgeoning urban population and frequent epidemics and plagues. Therefore, the objections from physicians, though at times genuine, were quite often materially motivated, since they were anxious to safeguard their professional exclusivity and economic interests.

If unlicensed medical practitioners posed a threat to the physicians' professional exclusivity, it was the vernacular medical books that enabled the dissemination of precious knowledge to these practitioners.\(^{30}\) Dr. Burcot's invective is directed at such

\(^{29}\) I have taken these figures from Pelling and Webster.

\(^{30}\) See Ted Brown's "Word Wars: The Debate over the Use of Vernacular in Medical Writings of
“run-agates” of the medical profession: “How faires it then, blinde abusers of the blind, your blushtes faces are so seasoned, that you can in print or publike wrintings, open the skirtes of your shame, by promising sight to the blinde, sound joyntes to the gowty...”(24). The practice of printing remedies for ailments that enable commoners or quacks is, according to Dr. Burcot, “opening the skirtes of shame,” that is, shamelessly selling secret and sacred knowledge for profit. Dr. Burcot knows how sacred that knowledge is: “If any can (in naturall sence) give ease, they must be Artistes, that are able to search the cause, resist the disease, by providing remedies”(24). Nobody but the “artistes” know the preciousness of the art of medicine.

Dr. Burcot’s diatribe against vernacular writing is similar to his criticism of unlicensed practitioners, reactionary and somewhat outdated. Chettle’s contemporaries were inundated with cheap, easily available remedies in English that they themselves or any practitioner could use for treating others. Paul Slack identifies one hundred and fifty-three English titles published in the period between 1483 to 1604. Several of the titles were reprinted again and again, and, in all, three hundred and ninety-two texts were published in the sixteenth century. Texts of simple remedies, which Dr. Burcot targets in his invective, make up almost one third of all medical texts, with quite a few titles going into many editions, five times each on an average.

Consequently, we can see that physicians’ outrage over the ready and rapid dissemination of their art was somewhat misplaced. As elite practitioners, they were assured of their own clientele and were in no danger of losing their livelihood or of being

the English Renaissance.”
upstaged by unlicensed practitioners. As well, vernacular texts added to the aura of the
learned physicians. As Slack says, "most medical works reinforced the establish-
mentarian view of physic as a complex art demanding learning and judgement, and
attacked the amateur tamperings of untrained and illiterate practitioners" (257). It is clear
that the attack on "untrained and illiterate practitioners" was a familiar exercise among
medical professionals and writers, and an exclusionary strategy by which each group
validated its own existence against an illiterate other. Chettle shrewdly captures this
tendency and makes it the defining characteristic of Dr. Burcot, who conceives of himself
as an artist, and others as "the excrementes of nature, and monsters of menne, whose
murders are no lesse common than your craftes" (28). Dr. Burcot's examples of
quackery, in which ill-trained or cozening practitioners misdiagnose their patients'
malady, are deliberately chosen to illustrate his argument against common healers. He
presumes to know their ultimate motive: "cunning is the cloake to hide your cogging:
money the marke for which ye play the makeshiftes, nay the murtherers"(30). But
physicians like Dr. Burcot are motivated not just by altruism: as one practitioner
explicitly states in 1566, if access to medical knowledge is made easy by vernacular
texts, then "...every man, woman and chyld that lyst, may use physike (idqe impune) as
well as we? And so, many tymes...hinder and defraud us of our lawful stipends and
gaynes."

Dr. Burcot's invective is thus grounded in contemporary debates about progress

31 Quoted in Ted Browne (p. 100) from John Securis, A Detection and Querimonie of the Daily Enormitic Comitted in Physick, 1566.
and free dissemination of knowledge. But by making his voice shrill and pompous, Chettle has problematized Dr. Burcot’s position. The fact that Dr. Burcot’s opinions are also passé in 1592 adds to the irony; and the fact that Chettle himself is a non-university educated “practitioner” of a different kind, one very much implicated in the business of printing, positions Chettle and his readers unambiguously in opposition to Burcot. Thus Dr. Burcot, along with Now Now, stands for a rigid, reactionary, and somewhat ridiculous figure, much as Harvey would have seemed to many of the young writers in London in 1592.

Plays

Where Anthony Now Now and Dr. Burcot served as nether-world spokesmen for official aversion to mass circulation of printed material, Tarlton’s invective is of an entirely different character. In the first two invectives, Chettle used the irony of the rhetoric of a dead balladeer and a dead physician to comment on the futility of their conservative positions. The invocation of Tarlton’s ghost serves a similar purpose for Chettle, but he uses Tarlton in a more complex and sophisticated way. Unlike Now Now and Dr. Burcot, Tarlton’s primary concern in his invective is not the popular breaching of an elite enclave, but the defense of a much maligned profession. That plays and players had been impugned by Puritan preachers and writers in the seventies and eighties is common knowledge. But Tarlton functions in *Kind Harte* as the embodiment of

---

32 These are some of the anti-theatrical writings by Puritan writers: *A Treatise* by John Northbrooke (1577), *School of Abuse* by Stephen Gosson (1579), *A Second and Third Blast of Retract from Plays and Theatres* by Antony Munday (1580), *Plays Confuted in Five Actions* by Stephen Gosson (1582), and *Anatomie of Abuses* by Philip Stubbes (1583). John Harrington’s preface to *Orlando Furioso* and Nashe’s defense of plays in *Pierce Penilesse* are replies to these tracts, but the most famous defense is, of course,
commercial art, mounting a defense of plays on the grounds of public good. Tarlton also
serves to defend Greene and attack Harvey, who first identified Tarlton as the epitome of
commercialism, and conflated Greene and Tarlton in the telling phrase ""Tarltonizing
wit." As we saw in the chapter on *Foure Letters*, Harvey equated Tarlton's
commercialism with subversive tendencies, and Greene's stylistic and thematic
associations with Tarlton brought him under similar suspicion. By invoking Tarlton in a
defense of plays, Chettle not only frees Tarlton of crass commercialism but also rejects
Harvey's dangerous equation of Greene with Tarlton and seditious tendencies.

If the first two invectives make fun of the official position on print through
narrative irony, the third invective uses situational irony: the picture of Tarlton defending
plays on the grounds of morality and public good would have been quite comic to an
ordinary Elizabethan reader. For Tarlton's admirers in late Elizabethan England,
didacticism would not have been the most recognizable feature about him. Better known
for his "extemporal wit" and boldness, Tarlton was admired by play-goers of both high-
and low-born variety, but also Tarlton represented subversive comedy and not moralistic
plays. Therefore when he assumes the voice of the "merry knave" and parrots Puritan
that of Philip Sidney in *The Defense of Poesy* (1586, published 1596).

---

33 As early as 1580, Harvey had identified Tarlton as a mercenary. Writing to Spenser in mock
anger, chastising him for making his letters public, Harvey says in a letter: "How peremptorily ye have
prejudiced my good name for ever in thy quill; thus on the stage to make tryall of my extemporall
faculty, and to play Wyson's or Tarlton's part." See Halasz's "Tarlton" for the way Tarlton serves as a
commercial enterprise, as well as a celebrity brand name, for contemporary writers and publishers.

34 Tarlton managed to be subversive even with the Queen: "Tarlton, who was then the best
comedian in England, had made a pleasant play, and when it was acting before the Queen, he pointed to Sir
Walter Rawleigh, and said: See, the Knave commands the Queen: for which he was corrected by a frown
from the Queene; yet he had the confidence to add that he was too much and too intolerable a power; and
objections to plays, we know that his speech is a parody:

Fie uppon following plaies, the expense is wonderous; upon players speakhs, their wordes are full of wyles; upon their gestures, that are altogether wanton. Is it not lamentable that a man should spend his two pence on them in an afternoone, heare covetousnes amongst them daily quipt at, being one of the commonest occupations in the countrey; and in lively gesture see trecherie set out, with which every man nowadaies useth to intrap his brother. Byr lady, this would be lookt into: if these be the fruites of playing, tis time the practisers were expeld. (39)

This speech closely resembles Philip Stubbes, who in his Anatomie of Abuses makes this argument against plays: "[D]oe [plays] not nourishe idlenesse: ...Idlenesse is the mother of vice. Do they not drave the people from hearing the word of God, from godly Lectures, and sermons? For you shall have them flocke thither thicke and threefolds, when the Churche of God shall be bare and empie" (222-3).

But Tarlton’s sarcastic voice ventriloquizes these pious objections, not through actors or preachers, but through keepers of alehouse, dicing and bear-baiting houses who habitually lose business to playhouses. The Puritan objection of wantonness in play houses takes a bizarre turn when Tarlton assumes a brothel-keeper’s voice and

---

35 To quote Philip Stubbes again: "Do (plays) not induce whoredome and uncleanness? Nay, are they not rather plaine devoures of maidenly virginitie and chastitie? For proffe where of, but marke the flockeyng and running to Theatres and Curtens, daylie and hourelie, night and daie, tyme and tide, to see plaies and enterludes, where such wanton gestures, such bawdie speeches; such laughing and flearing: such
complains of not being able to pay his rent as his business has been hit by plays: "Out upon them, they spoile our trade... Beside, they open our crosse-biting, our conny-catching, our traines, our traps, our gins, our snares, our subtilities: for no sooner have we a tricke of deceit, but they make it common, singing Jigs, and making jeasts of us, that every boy can point out our houses as they passe by" (42). Tarlton's own reputation as a jester, as a person who led a dissipated life, whose wife, Kate, was a loose person, and who himself kept a tavern in London, makes his assumption of these disreputable personae, parodying puritan anti-theatrical discourse, strangely ironic.

When Tarlton turns serious, he echoes Nashe who had, in Pierce Penilesse, defended plays, saying, "in plays, all coosenage, all cunning drifts over-guilded with outward holinesse, all strategems of warre, all the cankerwormes that breede on the rust of peace, are most lively anatomized: they shew the ill successe of treason, the fall of hastie climbers, the wretched end of usurpers, the miserie of civill dissention, and how just God is ever more punishing of murther" (213). Tarlton reinforces the same conservative, didactic nature of plays:

Everything hath in it selfe his vertue and his vice: from oneselfe flower the Bee and Spider Sucke honney and poysonn. In plaies it fares as in bookes, vice cannot be reproved, except it be discovered: neither is it in any play discovered, but there followes in the same an example of the punishment: now he that at a play will be kissing and bussying: suche chippyng and calling: such wincking and glauncing of wanton eyes, and the lyke is used, as is wonderfull to beholde. Then these goodly pageantes being ended, every mate sorts to his mate, every one brings on other home warde of their waie very frendly, and in their secrete conclaves (covertly) they plaie the sadomists, or worse" (223).
delighted in the one, and not warned by the other, is like him that reads in a booke
the description of sinne, and will not looke over the leafe for the reward. (42-3)
Thus the invective of Tarlton is a defense of plays against both puritan attacks and city
fathers’ disapprobation. It is also a justification of the stage’s commercialization as it
presents economic opportunities for young and patron-less writers. Thus, “Tarltonizing
wit,” a degrading epithet given to the likes of Greene, is not only not seditious, but also
responsible.
Juggling

Kind-Hartes Dreame’s final invective is from one William Cuckoe, presumably a
juggler, that is, a cony-catcher who had, when alive, been caught by the authorities,
exposed, and imprisoned. Cuckoe’s address to all “close” jugglers, on whom he
“wisheth the discovery of their crafts and punishment for their knaveries”(49), is an
indirect reference to those cony-catchers in the closet, as opposed to those who openly
practice their craft. This opposition between “close” and “open” cheats is important to
Cuckoe, because, for all he could see, the world is divided into just these two kinds of
people: people who cheat openly, and those who do it on the sly: “Let me see, if I can see,
beleeve mee theres nothing but jugling in every corner; for every man hath learned the
mysterie of casting mysts, and though they use not our olde tearms of hey-passe, re-
passe, and come aloft: yet they can by-passe, compasse, and bring under one another as
cunningly and commonly, as ever poore Cuckoe could command his Jacke in a Box”
(49). This dark hint at the pervasive presence of cozening in the world at large, and not just among rogues and vagabonds, is reminiscent of themes in Greene's cony-catching pamphlets and a direct hit on the upper-class people who are shown to be living a life of dishonesty and corruption.

Harvey's attack on Greene had consisted, among other things, of his lack of proper patronage and his fascination with low-life characters. Harvey had conjoined these elements together and painted Greene as a dangerous "shifter," a "masterless" vagabond with potential for mischief. Greene's cony-catching pamphlets were a significant indication for Harvey that Greene was subversive. As far as Harvey was concerned, Greene was just

some concieted witt, that could take delight to discourse knaveries, or were a fitte person to augment the history of conny-catchers: O Lord, what pregnant occasion were here presented, to display leaud vanity in his lively coullours, and to decipher the very misteries of that base Arte. Petty cooseners are not worth the naming: he they say, was the monarch of crosbiters, and the vey emperour of shifters. (Foure Letters 18-9)

Harvey's attack particularly emphasized Greene's potential for causing dissension, and his leadership role among vagabonds: he is the "secretarie" of conny-catchers, "patriarch of shifters," "monarch," and an "emporour." The hints at sedition are unmistakable. It is reasonable to assume that it is to counter these allegations of traitorous writing that Chettle adopts the persona of Cuckoe, through whom he forwards the argument that Greene's cony-catching pamphlets revealed nothing exceptional, especially in comparison
to what was going on in the so-called respectable classes of society.

Considering Chettle’s familiarity with the work of Greene and Nashe and the close thematic and narrative affinities Cuckoe’s narrative owes to Greene’s cony-catching pamphlets, it is clear that Chettle particularly imitates the pamphlet, *A Defense of Conny-catchings*.36 Here, one “Cuthbert Cony-catcher” mounts a defense of his tribe in exactly the same way Cuckoe does. Learning that the author of recent pamphlets exposing cony-catchers was Robert Greene, Cuthbert reads those pamphlets, where he notes a “folly in the man, that would straine a Gnat, and lette passe an elephant: that would touch small scapes, and lette grosse faultes passe without any reprehension.”37 The truth, he says, is that “we conny-catchers are like little flies in the grasse, which live on little leaves and do no more harme: whereas there bee in Englande other professions that bee great conny-catchers and caterpillars, that make barrant the field where they baite”(47). Cuthbert is insightful into human nature, especially its propensity for deceit, and he objects to cony-catchers alone being singled out for blame. The phenomenon of cony-catchings, he says, is widely prevalent: “this is the Iron age, wherein iniquitie hath the upper hand, and all conditions and estates of men seeke to live by their wittes, and he is counted wisest, that hath the deepest insight into the getting of gaines: everything now that is found profitable, is counted honest and lawfull: and men are valued by theyr wealth not by their vertues”

36 Charles Nicholl argues that this is the “comedy” that Greene and Nashe were supposed to have written together as Greene/Chettle says in *Groatsworth* (letter to Nashe [young Juvenall]). Nicholl’s argument is not popular, but I find it quite persuasive. The authorship is not germane to the fact that Chettle was familiar with the line of argument a “defender” of cony-catchings would take, and this is the strategy he follows in Cuckoe’s invective.

37 All quotations from the *Defense of Conny-catchings* are from Grosart’s edition of Robert Greene
(51). Cony-catching, therefore, is, for Cuthbert, the only way to survive in this world. To expose the low-class cony-catchers as the only practitioners of this “art” is quite unfair, says Cuthbert. People from the higher strata of society, like “those miserable usurers...that like vultures prey uppon the spoyle of the poore, sleeping with his neighbours pledges all night in his bosome, and feeding upon forfaits and penalties, as the ravens doe upon carren” (52), are also cony-catchers. Cuthbert implicates almost all other traders in his own art, from lawyers to butchers, and from actors to millers. He grandly asks Greene finally: “Why write you not of these conny-catchers Maister R.G?” (52).

Cuckoe brings the same point of view to his invective in Kind Harte. Chettle’s evocation of the Defense in response to Harvey’s charge against Greene’s fascination with the Elizabethan crime world is an indication that Chettle understands all the issues involved in Harvey’s accusations. But even Chettle’s use of the term “jugglers,” along with “cony-catchers,” signifies the largely linguistic and satiric nature of Greene’s preoccupation with the cony-catchers.38 By hinting that Greene’s cony-catching pamphlets are “creative” rather than real stories, and adopting the position

---

38. The old Spanish term for minstrel, jugler—somewhat out of date by the sixteenth century—reminds us that the same man might tell stories or juggle with balls, and the Latin word from which it is derived, joculator, ‘joker’ suggests that a minstrel was a general entertainer,” comments Peter Burke on the word juggler in his Popular Culture (94). That Greene was engaged in an artistic self-presentation in his cony-catching pamphlet is now a commonly accepted critical judgment. Kinney is representative of such views: “[Greene’s] book is designed not to reveal cony-catchers but to play games with the language as cony-catchers do; the author is transformed by the pamphlet into a cony-catcher himself; and we are in turn teased into becoming conies by buying this book, tricked into thinking it was the expose it proposed to be. Unless we are wary, noticing how this book keeps turning in on itself and turning us in on ourselves, we will be hopelessly unable to see the pamphlet in the way Greene saw it” (158).
that “cony-catching” is a problematic, artistic category in Greene’s pamphlets, Chettle has, to a considerable degree, followed in the footsteps of Greene in satirizing the gentry and aristocracy for their selfishness and neglect of their social obligations.

Just as Cuthbert did in the *Defense of Conny-Catching*, Cuckoe in *Kind Harte* implicates a variety of upper-class subjects in the corruptions of the cony-catchers: a gentleman (“your mas[ters]hip upon a horse whose hire is not paid for, with your Page at your stirrop...lighted pennilesse at a pretie Inne...” [50]), lawyers (“how say ye by some juglers that can serve writs without any original, and make poore men dwelling farre off, compound with them for they know not what?”[53]), adventurers and bounty hunters (“other jugglers there bee that having favour from Authority to seeke something to themselves beneficiall, under color of orderly dealing have hookt into their hands the whole living to a number poor men belonging” [55]), all traders (“ To set down the jugling in Trades... were but to tell the world that which they well knowe...” [55]), and many others from middle and high ranks of society are shown as cony-catchers. Just as in all other cony-catching pamphlets, Chettle gives instances of cony-catching that are funny and interesting, but, significantly, all his examples involve not petty thieves and vagabond cony-catchers but persons with some standing in society who betray the trust of the people around them. His satiric intentions, like Greene’s in his cony-catching pamphlets, are obvious.

Finally, the letter to “Pierce Penilesse” by Robert Greene, pathetically importuning Nashe to avenge his attackers, sets each invective and the whole pamphlet within the context of not just Harvey’s attack on Greene in *Foure Letters* but Greene’s
death and the decline of patronage and the traditional values that gave rise to and sustained it. As a printer, Chettle was aware of the possibilities that the marketplace of print presented to the opportunity-strapped scholars. The stigma that the authorities and "respectable" writers had quite successfully attached to print and pamphlets trapped well-qualified but patron-less young writers in a perpetual state of poverty and despondence. The official displeasure over pamphlets was crystallized in Harvey's attack on Greene, and that attack precipitated Chettle's pamphlet: Harvey's characterization of Greene as a progeny of Elderton and Tarlton gives rise to Anthony Now Now's invective; Harvey's tirade against Greene's cony-catching pamphlets obviously prompted Cuckoe's invective; Harvey's appeal to an elite group of literary regulators, in which he counts himself one, suggested Dr. Burcot's invective; and, finally, Harvey's anti-Tarlton and puritanical stance against creative literature necessitated Tarlton's invective. Binding all of them is Greene's nether-world letter to Nashe. When we set *Kind Hartes Dreame* within these multiple contexts, it becomes clear that it is a protest against the patronage world that had let such a man as Greene die in abject poverty and still continued to spread the propaganda that he was an immoral writer and deserved his death.
Chapter 5: The Defense of Style in *Strange Newes*

*Strange Newes of the Intercepting Certaine Letters* by Thomas Nashe (entered in the Stationers’ Register on 12 January 1593) was written in response to Harvey’s *Foure Letters and Certaine Sonnets*. When Harvey was publishing his letters one by one in September and October of 1592, there was apparently some expectation among Greene’s friends that Nashe would reply to the scandalous attack on a dead person, and Nashe does indeed indicate that he had seen Harvey’s pamphlets and was contemplating a fitting retaliation. He fired his first salvo in the preface to the second edition of *Pierce Penilesse*, where, besides regretting the appearance of the unauthorized first edition, Nashe makes fun of Harvey by mentioning that he had planned to add, just as Harvey had done in *Foure Letters*, his own letters and poems from and to various dead people, but that he had had no time to do it:

> Had you [the publisher] not been so forward in the republishing of it [the second edition of *Pierce Penilesse*], you should have had certayne epistles to orators and poets, to insert to the later end; as namely, to the ghost of Machiavill, of Tully, of Ovid, of Roscius, of Pace the Duke of Norfolks jester; and lastly, to the ghost of Robert Greene, telling him what a coyle there is with pamphleting on him after his death. (153)

But Nashe’s reply to Harvey was a long time coming, apparently because the “feare of infection [the plague] detained mee...in the countrey” during the fall of 1592 (153). By December of that year, Harvey had collected all his pamphlet letters and published them in one single volume (*as Foure Letters*, registered 4 December), and there
seems to have been some impatience among Greene’s friends over Nashe’s silence. Henry Chettle voices this sentiment when he makes Greene’s ghost chide Nashe in *Kind Hartes Dreame*, calling Pierce “more witless than Pennilesse; more idle than thine adversaries ill imployde,” and asking, “What foolish innocence hath made thee (infant like) resistlesse to beare what ever injurie Envie can impose[?]” (36). The ghost also pleads with Nashe to retaliate in Greene’s absence, implying that Nashe has to carry on from where Greene left off: “Awake (secure boy), revenge thy wrongs, remember mine: thy adversaries began the abuse, they continue it: if thou suffer it, let thy life be short in silence and obscuritie and thy death hastie, hated and miserable” (37). When Nashe did manage to publish *Strange Newes* in January 1593, he acknowledged in its preface the weight of the expectations placed on him: “Gentlemen, the strong fayth you have conceiv’d, that I would do workes of supererrogation in answering the Doctor, hath made me breake my daye with other important busines I had, and stand darting of quils awhile like the Porpentine” (259).¹ We are not sure what “other important business” Nashe had (it could very well be the play, *Summers Last Will and Testament*, that Nashe wrote for Archbishop Whitgift at Croydon late in the summer of 1592), but *Strange Newes* does resemble an attack by the porcupine “darting its quils” at Harvey.

On first reading, *Strange Newes* is a point-by-point reply to Harvey’s *Foure Letters*. In form and substance, it sticks close to Harvey’s pamphlet, quoting his

¹All quotations from *Strange Newes* are from Ronald B. McKerrow’s edition of Nashe’s works in five volumes (1903-1910), reprinted with corrections and supplementary notes by F.P. Wilson in 1958. *Strange Newes* is in volume I. I have silently normalized the i,j and u,v discrepancies and the sixteenth-century use of capital letters, but have retained the original spelling.
particular lines, either attacking or rebutting them. In this sense, *Strange Newes* is one of
the earlier instances of "literary criticism" in a popular medium such as pamphlets,
employing a critical method that engages both stylistically and substantively with its text.
But in its exhaustive attention to almost all of Harvey’s accusations against Greene and,
particularly, against *Pierce Penilesse*, *Strange Newes* tends to be tedious and repetitive,
its savage name calling of Harvey initially amusing but eventually annoying. The overkill
does demonstrate Nashe’s verbal brilliance and clear mastery over Harvey in the
pamphlet style of writing, but the overall effect is one of excessive and rambling
vituperation.

But on another level, *Strange Newes* bespeaks Nashe’s anger at Harvey’s
conservative attitude toward patronage and the new forms of writing like pamphlets.
Nashe shrewdly understands that Harvey’s attack on Greene and himself had played up
their poverty and lack of patronage; Harvey’s cruel decimation of Greene’s reputation and
dignity—after his death—was grounded entirely on Greene’s penury and destitution. If
Greene’s death represents the changing nature of patronage in Elizabethan England, then
the insensitive attack on Greene shows Harvey as the friend of the patron-class, an
advocate of the establishment, and the enemy of pamphleteers like Greene and Nashe.
Moreover, *Foure Letters*, with its introductory letters from respectable citizens, criticism
of invectives and satires, long disquisition on good "oratorship," and commendatory
verses and sonnets from "established" writers such as Spenser, shows Harvey as the
pompous, self-appointed guardian of conservative and establishment forces. It is this
posture of respectability and stability, this chapter argues, that *Strange Newes* wants to
undermine and subvert. Under the welter of abuse and name calling, *Strange Newes* is more fundamentally concerned with proving that, as far as patronage and material security go, Harvey is all show and no substance, and that he is as poor as Greene and Nashe, despite his claims to friends in high places. By thus subverting Harvey’s pretensions, Nashe shows that it is patronage that is the real problem, even for Harvey, and that it is the marketplace of print that provides an alternative source of money and power.

In *Foure Letters*, Harvey had deliberately superimposed the image of Greene over his surviving enemy, Nashe, especially after the appearance of *Pierce Penilesse*:

[W]hilest I am bemoaning his [Greene’s] over-pittious decay; and discoursing the usuall successe of such ranke wittes, Loe all on the suddaine, his sworne brother, M. Pierce Pennilesse..., Loe his inwardest companion, that tasted of the fatall herring...most desperately exhibiteth his supplication to the Divell. (44)

Interpreting the satire of *Pierce Penilesse* to issue from desperation and poverty, Harvey paints Nashe as a “shifter,” an ungrateful vagabond who will desperately proceed even “against thy well-willers.” Where Greene was called the master of black art, Nashe’s literary strategy of invoking a nether-world messenger is characterized as black magic and witchery by Harvey, who charges that Nashe “desperately exhibiteth his supplication to the Divell” and condescendingly advises him to “hate none, but the Divell, and his incarnate impes, notoriously professed” (69). That Nashe is Greene’s literary successor is implied in Nashe’s literary influences: “his good olde *Flores Poetarum*, and Tarlton’s surmounting Rhetoric, with a little Euphuism, and Greenesse
inough” (52). Harvey had already established Greene’s wit as “Tarltonizing,” a common Harvean signifier for any writing that is tainted by the marketplace of print, so the invocation of Nashe’s name in conjunction with Tarlton, in Harvey’s opinion, is a great insult.

Harvey’s identifying of Nashe with Greene makes Nashe also a vagrant, a shifter, a railer, and a diabolical discoursier. If pamphleteering had prevented Greene from being a good citizen of the commonwealth, then Nashe is going down the same road. Lamenting Greene’s death as “a pityful case,” Harvey pointedly wonders: “Who can tell, what dowty younker may next gnash with his teeth?” The pun is unmistakably a hit on Nashe (“gnash”), whom Harvey identifies with a group of over-reachers: “I have heard of Gyants in conceit, and pigmies in performance: Yong Phaetons, young Icary, young Choraebi, and I shall say young Babingtons, and how many millions of greene youthes, have in over mounting, most ruefully dismounted, and left behind them full-lamentable Histories?” (43). The axis of Greene-Nashe-Babington cleverly suggests potential treason from, and eventual doom for, Thomas Nashe.

When Harvey makes Nashe successor to Greene, implying that Nashe’s writing was as “useless,” “profitless,” and “creditless” as Greene’s, Nashe must have felt particularly galled. He had reasons to. Nashe’s own satiric and individualistic impulses at that time were hostile to patrons. Harvey deepened this anger. When Richard Harvey criticized Nashe in the Lamb of God for his presumption in critically evaluating

---

2 See Halasz’s “So beloved that men use his picture for their signs”: Richard Tarlton and the Uses of Sixteenth-century Celebrity.”
contemporary writers in the *Menaphon* preface, his implication was that Nashe was a
virtual nobody and, because he was unattached to any patron at that time, a dangerous
loose cannon. Richard Harvey shrewdly aligned Nashe's presumption with the
subversive ambitions of Martin Marprelate himself:

> It becometh me not to play that part in Divinities that one Thomas Nashe hath
> lately done in humanities, who taketh upon him in civill learning, as Martin doth
> in religion, peremptorily censuring his betters at pleasure, Poets, Orators,
> Polihistoris, Lawyers and whome not, a making as much and as little of every man
> as himself listeth. (TN V 176-83)

The accusation of subversion implicit in Richard Harvey’s gratuitous invocation of
Martin’s name would hang over Nashe’s head all his life. Nashe resented, and feared,
this slander, and that was one of the reasons for his abiding hatred for the Harvey
brothers.

Similar humiliation had resulted from his overture to the Countess of Pembroke
for patronage when he wrote a preface to the first edition of Sidney’s sonnet cycle
*Astrophel and Stella* (1591). Nashe’s preface failed to please the Countess because
Sidney’s sonnets had been printed without permission. The printer, Thomas Newman,
claimed that he had somehow “lighted upon” a manuscript copy of the poems and
proceeded to print them without the blessings of Sidney’s sister. The edition was

---

3 The atmosphere was thick with suspicion over the uncontrolled discursive power of satirical
pamphlets by the time of Greene’s death. As Gabriel Harvey says, this “is Martinish and counter-Martinish
age: wherein the spirit of contradiction reigneth, and every one super aboundeth in his owne humor, even to
the annihilating of any other, without rime or reason” (53).
immediately suppressed, and Nashe’s introduction was unceremoniously removed from
the properly authorized second edition (published within a few months after the first
edition).4

Another reason for Nashe’s anger at patron figures is that his stint as an anti-
Martinist, though successful, ended with a bitter taste. His Episcopal recruiters, Bancroft
and Whitgift, had begun to have second thoughts about fighting Martin with Martin-like
pamphleteers of their own. By 1590, the authorities had definitely cooled toward anti-
Martinist propaganda, leaving Nashe to complain in the Almond for a Parrat that the
“fiery fervance of my enflamed zeale” had been moderated by “authority.” The “mildness
and gravity” of people like Whitgift were now the real enemy. Nashe even complains of
the *intercepting of my papers* (343), referring to the delay in the publication of
Almond. By the end of the Marprelate controversy, anti-Martinist pamphleteers, instead
of being appreciated for putting down Martin, had somehow come under the same kind of
disapproval as Martinists had before.

But Nashe was not without patrons. There is evidence to suggest that Lord
Strange, later fifth Earl of Derby, was a patron to Nashe for at least a while before 1592.
Nashe offers a panegyric to the “thrice noble Amyntas” in Pierce Penileesse, though
“inserted conceitedly in the matter” rather than as a dedication. Lord Strange may also
have been the intended recipient of Nashe’s bawdy poem, The Choise of Valentines or
“Nashes Dildo.”5

4 For a full description of this embarrassing affair, see Nicholl’s A Cup of News, p. 82-87.
5 Nichols finds a fascinating thread connecting Nashe’s supplication to the devil in Pierce
By 1592, Nashe was deeply cynical about patrons and the prospects of livelihood for writers like him. Though Lord Strange is praised in *Pierce Penilesse*, it is nevertheless a scathing attack on illiberal and greedy patrons who hide away their gold from writers such as himself. A close look at this pamphlet, which was written in the summer of 1592 and published in August and again in September that year, adds new dimensions to our perspective of the frustrations that writers like Greene and Nashe experienced with their patrons. We can also see consanguinities between *Groatsworth*'s attack on Gorinius-like figures and *Pierce*’s satire on Greed and Niggardize. *Pierce Penilesse* also helps contextualize *Strange Newes* in Nashe’s fury at Harvey’s hypocritical support of the patron class and his snobbish denunciation of pamphlets.

The very name “Pierce Penilesse” is an evocation of both the quintessentially English satirical voice of Langley and Skelton and the pennilessness of the so-called Elizabethan younger generation of poets and writers. That Nashe’s Pierce derives from a national symbol is an important aspect of *Pierce Penilesse*’s force. Right in the beginning of the pamphlet, Pierce gives an indication that he is a composite and representative figure of the Elizabethan writer:

> Having spent many yeeres in studying how to live, and liv’d a long time without mony: having tired my youth with follie, and surfetted my mind with vanitie, I began at length to looke backe to repentance, and addresse my endeavours to

---

*Penilesse*, his friend Marlowe’s diabolical adventure in *Dr. Faustus*, and Lord Strange’s interest in the occult. It seems that Nashe had a reasonably good summer at Strange’s household in 1592, but that fall brought the death of his friend Greene and Harvey’s onslaughts, and life would never be the same for Nashe again. Strange, curiously, disappears from the picture completely. See Nicholls, chapter 7.
prosperitie: But all in vaine... for all my labours turned to losse, my vulgar Muse was despised and neglected, my paines not regarded, or slightly rewarded, and I my selfe (in prime of my best wit) laid open to povertie. (157)

Pierce is the typical "Elizabethan prodigal": he has lived a long time without money, then "tired [his] youth with follie, surfetted [his] mind with vanity" and, finally looked "backe to repentance," but all in vain. After running the gamut of prodigality, he is still where he started: "laid open to povertie." The main reason, of course, is the lack of patronage, certainly for writers like him ("vulgar muse") whose common origins were cause of their neglect and contempt.

Pierce displays an awareness of the contradiction of his existence as a well-educated but low-born writer. That the symbolic value of his university education had not translated into material benefit had shown both the successes and failures of humanist education: its success resided in the fact that it spread among commoners as well, and its failures grew out of the fact that in becoming more accessible to all, it stripped the humanist education of its upper-class exclusivity and employability. The result was that writers like Nashe were left to wonder about the promises of their university degrees:

I grew to consider how many base men that wanted those parts which I had, enjoyed content at will, and had wealth at command: I cald to minde a cobler, that was worth five hundred pound, an Hostler that had built a goodly Inne, and might dispende fortie pound yerely by his Lande, a Carre-man in a lether pilch

---

6This is the cycle that Greene and other so-called prodigal writers harp on in their repentance pamphlets. Helgerson, of course, has studied this motif in the Elizabethan Prodigals.
that had whipt out a thousand pound out of his horse taile: and have I more wit
than all these (thought I to myselfe)? Am I better borne? Am I better brought up?
Yea, and better favoured? And yet am I a beggar? What is the cause? How am I
crost? Or whence is this curse? (158)

The upward mobility that writers like Nashe had assumed as given upon their
degrees is recognized by no one else, and that is part of their frustration. Education
without proper birth or connection is completely useless, as Gorinius acutely realized in
Groatsworth and Pierce realizes in Pennilesse. Writers’ dependence on those who have
money is thus a consequence of the divorce between class and education, with the system
still not developed enough to employ all its educated. This is a condition Nashe seems to
have been particularly aware of, and he says, “This is the lamentable condition of our
Times, that men of Arte must seeke Almes of cormorantes” (159-60). He wistfully
declares that “if any Mecaenas binde me to him lay his bounty, or extend some round
liberality to mee worth the speaking of, I will do him as much honour as any poet of my

Nashe’s characterization of illiberal patrons as “cormorants” is noteworthy, as
writers like him thought that patrons in general were becoming materialistic and money-
minded. They are also, in Nashe’s opinion, uneducated and incapable of appreciating the
truly learned:

men [who] should employ such as I am, are enamoured of their own wits, and
think what ever they do is excellent, though it be never scurvie: that Learning (of
that ignorant [i.e. by the ignorant]) is rated after the value of the inke and paper:
and a scrivener better paid for an obligation, than a scholler for the best poeme he
can make. (158-59)

This vanity is also responsible for the patrons' partiality to flattery, with the result that
writers have perforce to write, dishonestly praising their patrons:

Mcn of great calling take it of merite, to have their names eternized by poets: &
whatsoever pamphlet or dedication encounters them, they put it up in their
sleeves, and scarce give him thankes that presents it. Much better is it for those
golden pens to raise such ungratfull Peasants from the Dung-hil of obscuritie, and
make them equal in fame to the worthies of olde, when their doting selfe-love
shall challenge it of dutie, and not onely give them nothing themselves, but
impoverish liberality in others. (159).

Patrons are thus "dunghills," totally negligent of their ethical and moral responsibilities
and living a life of excess: "where other men turne over many leaves to get bread and
cheese in their olde age, and study twentie years to distill gold out of their inke, our young
maisters do nothing but devise how to spend, and aske counsaile of the wine and capons
how they may quickliest consume their patrimonies" (160). With young, potential
patrons absorbed with themselves, writers have been left to fend for themselves:

"...those that stand most on their honour, have shut up their purses, and shifte us off with
court-holie-bread: and on the otherside, a number of hypocriticall hot-spurrees, that have
God aways in their mouthes, will give nothing for Gods sake" (161).

Even the church has let them down, Nashe says, thus making them utterly
destitute and leaving them no choice but to make their own living. "I know a great sort of
good fellowes that would venture farre [for gold]” says Nashe of his contemporaries, even if it meant abandoning their humanism (166). It is precisely because of this wish that Nashe himself is writing this “supplication to the Divel.” On the one hand, his supplication to the devil is a stunning affront to Elizabethan patrons, as Nashe prefers to petition the devil for gold for the writer’s livelihood. On the other hand, the supplication itself is a statement of independence, breaking away from traditional forms of writing and embracing the popular pamphlet and print. That words “divel” and “hell” were technical jargon used in printing houses, so Nashe’s supplication to the “divel” who is in “hell” in order to earn “gold” is a cryptic way of saying that the future of writers like him lay in pamphlets and in appealing to popular audience. Nashe is self-conscious about Pierce Penilesse’s status as a popular pamphlet. At one point, he describes the conception of Pierce Penilesse, his child, a little “paper-monster”: “I determined to claw Avarice by the elbowe, till his full belly gave mee a full hande, and lette him bloud with my penne (if it might be) in the veyne of liberalitie: and so (in short time) was this paper-monster, Pierce Penilesse, begotten” (I:161). The reproductive imagery (“full belly gave me a full hande,” “lette him bloud with my penne,” and “begotten”) finds its peak in the phrase, “paper-monster.” The “paper-monster” is probably the unnatural offspring of the writer’s union with the printer, a union necessitated by the writer’s material want. Thus pamphlets may be monsters, but they are the result of the decline of patronage. The

---

7Halasz in The Marketplace of Print: “The vocabulary of Pierce Penilesse’s premise resonates with the vocabulary of the print shop: a ‘devil’ is someone who takes sheets off the press and does other odd jobs without the promise of vocational training—a true laborer, and ‘hell’ is the pot into which worn-out type is thrown” (96).
paper-monster is begotten by the equally unnatural greediness of patrons and the want of writers.

It is from this perspective that we should look at *Strange Newes*. Nashe’s dedicatory epistle to *Strange Newes* sets up Nashe’s main strategies of attack on Harvey. The preface mocks Harvey’s methods of establishing his scholarly and gentlemanly credentials through testimonials, sonnets, and letters from his patrons and friends, such as Masters Demitrius and Bird, and Spenser. We saw in the last chapter that Harvey sought to convey through these verbal facades his status as a writer with proper patrons. Nashe subverts Harvey’s respectability not so much by denying that Harvey is respectable, as by questioning the value of respectability itself by invoking a satirical figure in the “epistle dedicatorium.” The figure is “the most Copious Carminist of our time, and famous persecutor of Priscian, his [Nashe’s] verie friend Maister Apis Lapis,” possibly one William Beeston. A bacchanalian rhymster (“Carminist”) given to “Chaucerisme” (a good-naturedly derogatory term in Nashean vocabulary), Beeston was “a famous pottle-pot to old Poets in your daies,” and “an infinite Meceenas to learned men, that not any that belong to them (as Sumners, and who not) but have tasted of the coole streams of your liberalitie” (255-56). Nashe’s dedication to Beeston is evidently in deference to Beeston’s reputations as an enemy to pedantry and as a toper and boon-companion.⁸ By dedicating *Strange Newes* to such a person as Beeston, Nashe is creating his own patron, one that is certainly more generous and appreciative than the traditional ones. This

⁸See Benjamin Griffin’s “Nashe’s dedicatees: William Beeston and Richard Lichfield” for possible connections between William Beeston and “Will-mox,” the third, besides Nashe and Greene, in the “fattall banquet” that killed Greene. Also see Nicholl, 124, and McKerrow V.19n.
barroom patron is generous, good to his friends, liberal with drinks, and a scholar in his own way:

that learned writer Rheinish Wine and Sugar, in the first booke of his comment upon Red noses, has this saying: Veteren ferendo injuriam invitas nocram; which is as much in English as one cuppe of nipitality purls on another. In moyst consideration whereof, as also in zealous regard of that high countenance your shear into schollers, I am bolde, in steade of new wine, to carows to you a cuppe of newes. (255)

By making Beeston the drunken dedicatee of his pamphlet (which is a “cuppe of newes”), Nashe metaphorically situates his pamphlet about writing and patronage within the common conviviality of a tavern house, away from the respectability of Harvey’s patrons. Nashe’s “cuppe of newes” is not totally divorced from Harvey’s world of rhetoric. The macaronic translation of the name Beeston (“apis lapis”= Bee+Stone), as well as the mock-erudite references to “classical” author “Rheinish wine and Sugar,” and his work, “Red noses,” portrays both the author and the audience as well-acquainted with scholarly ways but contemptuous of them anyway.

This, then, is the main theme of Strange Newes: Harvey’s pretensions to having patrons. The defense of Greene is not central to Nashe, and when Nashe does defend Greene, it is only because Greene was completely devoid of such false pretensions. Thus Nashe dismisses Harvey’s “long Kentish-tailed declarations against Greene” in “short tearmes.” Greene “inherited more virtues than vices,” says Nashe, and submits only Greene’s quaintly attractive beard as evidence of that fact: “a jolly long red peake, like
the spire of a Steeple, he cherisht continually without cutting, whereat a man might hang
a jewell, it was so sharp and pendent.” Greene had his share of faults, but “with any
notorious crime I never knew him tainted.” He was admittedly given to merrymaking,
but even in that he was somehow larger than the small-minded Harveys: “in one yeare hee
pist as much against the walls, as thou and thy two brothers spent in three.” His attitude
toward writing was characteristically flippant, as he could “yark up” a pamphlet in just a
night and a day, and “glad was that Printer... to pay him deare for the very dregs of his
wit.” Greene had no pretensions about his writing or his patrons, unlike Harvey:
“He made no account of winning credite by his workes, as thou dost, that dost no good
workes, but thinkes to be famosed by a strong faith of thy owne worthiness: his only care
was to have a spel in his purse to conjure up a good cuppe of wine with at all times”
(287).

For Nashe, Greene needs no defending. On the contrary, Harvey needs to be
criticized not so much for his attacks on Greene, as for his ambition “to be famoused by a
strong faith of thy owne worthiness.” It is Harvey’s self-conscious endeavor to “winne
credite” that so nettles Nashe. At one point in Strange Newes, Nashe dismisses the
defense of Greene as too trivial and concentrates more on Harvey:

Greene, I can spare thy revenge no more roome in this booke: thou hast phisition
John [Harvey] with thee; cope thou with him and let me above with the civilian
and Divine [Gabriel and Richard Harvey], whom, if I live, I will so uncessantly
haunt, that to avoide the hot chase of my fiery quill, they shall be constrained to
enscomb themselves in an old urinall case that their brother left behind him. (301)
So, *Strange Newes* is only tangentially concerned with the defense of Greene. But it is fully engaged with what Nashe considers Harvey’s central point in his attack on Greene: Writers who do not write for credit (that is, who write outside the circle sanctioned by legitimate authority) will come to no good. We have seen in the previous chapter that Harvey’s view on authorized writing is much more complex and that *Foure Letters* exhibits an inner struggle between Harvey the humanist and Harvey the angry, neglected man. This struggle remains unresolved in *Foure Letters*, but, in any case, Nashe was oblivious to such nuances in Harvey’s diatribe against Greene and pamphleteers in general. Disillusioned as he was about the patronage system, Nashe saw Harvey as an old-fashioned humanist who fruitlessly validated an obviously out-dated system that failed to take care of its writers. Thus *Strange Newes* is anxious to accomplish two things: one, to subvert Harvey’s representation of him (Nashe) as a patron-less writer wracked by want; two, to debunk Harvey’s pretensions to patronage, literary friendships, and scholarship.

Nashe is angriest when Harvey mocks him for his poverty and insinuates that want goaded him into writing pamphlets. Harvey had mocked Nashe in *Foure Letters* thus: “Greenes inwardest companion pinched with want, vexed with discredit, tormented with other mens felicitie, and over-whelmed with his owne miserie, in a raving and frantike moode, most desperately exhibiteth a supplication to the devil” (44). Harvey not only mocks Nashe for his want, but also accuses him of being “tormented with other mens felicitie,” apparently in reference to Nashe’s flashy rhetoric in *Pierce* where he compares his own poverty with the relative prosperity of tradesmen like the cobbler or the
hostler (see Pierce 158). Harvey’s mention of poverty as the motivating factor in Nashe’s pamphleteering touches a raw nerve in Nashe. Asserting that he was not “pincht with any ungentleman-like want when I invented Pierce Pennilesse,” Nashe explains the main theme of his pamphlet: “Pauper non est cui rerum suppetit usus: only the discontented meditation of learning, generally now a dayes little valued, and her professors set at naught and dishartened, caused me to handle that plaintife subject more seriously” (303). Actually, Nashe goes on to say, it is Harvey who seeks to alleviate his want through writing: “Though I have been pinched with want (as who is not at one time or another Pierce Penilesse) yet my muse never wept for want of maintenance as thine did in Musarum lachrimae” (303). The reference is to Harvey’s publishing of an elegy to Sir Thomas Smith in Latin verse in 1578, and the implication is that Harvey cynically exploited his patron’s death for his material purposes.\(^9\) As for being envious of others’ felicity, Nashe again seeks to turn the table on Harvey by charging that it is he who is jealous about others’ success:

\[
\text{How didst thou torment [thyself] with other mens felicitie, when in the 28 page of thy first tome of Epistle, thou exclaimst that in no age so little was so much made of, nothing advaunst to be something, numbers made Ciphars, that is, by interpretation, all those that were advaunst either in the court or commonwealth at that time, had little to commend them, nothing in account worthy preferment, but were meere meacocks and ciphers in comparison of thy excellent out-cast selfe}
\]

\(^9\)Most humanists generally did. Such poems were a common genre of humanist writing. Nashe may be hitting below the belt here.
that liv'dst at Cambridge unmounted. (304; italics Nashe's)

It is important for Nashe that the moral force of the satire on patronage in *Pierce Penilesse* be not blunted by imputations of materialistic motivations or envious longings. Material want, Nashe concedes, was a compelling factor in *Pierce Penilesse* but it was a factor only for Pierce:

I introduce a discontented scholler under the person of Pierce Penilesse, tragicallie exclaiming upon his partial-eid fortune, that kept an almes boxe of compassion in store for everyone but himselfe. He tels how he lost his imagination like a dogge in a blanket, searcht every corner of the house of Charitie, to see if he could light on any that would set a new nappe of an old threedbare Cloake. (306)

What Nashe wants to emphasize is the "conductedness" of Pierce. The "discontented scholler" that Nashe has created functions as a reminder of the failure of the patronage system—that is why he writes to the devil. To say that Nashe himself wrote that pamphlet to the devil is to miss the point entirely. Nashe in fact devotes a big part of *Strange Newes* to refute Harvey's criticism of *Pierce Penilesse* point by point, and most of his rebuttals are accompanied by unrestrained scorn for Harvey's reading and writing abilities and scholarship. But Nashe's point is that Harvey does not grasp his satire on the patronage system, despite himself being a victim of it. For Nashe, Harvey's pretensions to patronage and scholarship are a clear indication of his victimization, because Harvey's pretensions have earned him nothing, gotten him nowhere. If Harvey finds Pierce's writing to an unusual audience (the devil) objectionable, then Nashe cannot help noticing the hypocrisy in Harvey's attempt to woo the popular audience with his own pamphlets.
The unmasking of this hypocrisy is the other major objective of *Strange Newes*. Nashe first attacks Harvey's motives behind the writing of *Foure Letters*. Harvey had professed in writing that pamphlet to show, "mildly and calmly...how discredite redoundeth upon the autors" (9). Nashe does not believe in Harvey's so lofty a purpose. On the contrary, he is aware of Harvey's commercial exploitation of Greene's death in selling his pamphlet. He mocks Harvey's commercial tactic of issuing his letters separately, before publishing them in one volume: "[F]irst contriving his confutation in a short pamphlet of six leaves, like a paire of sumer pumps, afterward (winter growing on) clapt a paire of double soales on it like a good husband, added eight sheets more, and prickt those sheets or soales as full of the hob-nayles of reprehension as they could sticke" (263). Nor is Nashe oblivious to the fact that Harvey was staying with the printer, John Wolfe, at that time and that he paid for his own pamphlet: "Such a famous pillar of the Presse, now in the fourteenth or fifteenth yeare of the raigne of his Rhetorike, giving mony to have this illeterate Pamphlet of Letters printed (whereas others have monie given to them to suffer themselves to come to print)" (257-58). For Nashe, this is tantamount to bribing ("simonie") and, therefore, the high ground Harvey claims in *Foure Letters* is untenable.

Harvey had claimed in *Foure Letters* that it was because of Greene's attack on Harvey's father in the *Quip for an Upstart Courtier* that he was compelled to respond in a pamphlet form himself. Nashe is cynical of this claim as well. As far as he is concerned, the defense of his father is a dramatic but spurious gesture by which Harvey projects an image of the dutiful son, an Aeneas, carrying his father on his back, "through the fire of
slander,” but this is just a pretense to “filch away the harts of the ... people.” After all, Nashe implies, Harvey is a past master at writing letters: “It is not inough that hee bepist his credite, about twelve yeeres ago, with Three proper and wittie familiar letters, but still he must be running on the letter, and abusing the Queenes English without pittie or mercie” (261). Nashe is certain that Harvey wrote Four Letters not for any noble cause but because he is “a forestaller of the market of fame, and ingrosser of glorie”(261). He would exploit any private correspondence to puff up his own image as a well-regarded and well-connected person:

It hath been his wont, if he writ but a letter to any friend of his, in the way of thanks for the potte of butter, gamon of bacon, or cheese that he sent him, straight to give coppies of it abroad in the world, and propound it to yong gentlemen he came in company with, as a more necessary and refined method of familiar Epistles than the English tongue hath hitherto been privy to. (297)

This compulsive need to prop up his image through pretensions to noble friendships is also, according to Nashe, Harvey’s reason for adding Mr. Bird’s letter as the first of *Four Letters*. Nashe shrewdly understands that the letter, “by all reference or collation of stiles” is a “certificate (such as rogues have) from the headman of the Parish...that Gabriel is an excellent general scholler” (273). Harvey flaunts his letters from high-born friends “to over-beare us as poore beggars” (276). But Nashe can see through Harvey’s façade: “Lette all noblemen take heede how they give this Thraso the least becke or countenance, for if they bestowe but half a glance on him, hele straight put it verie solemnly in print, and make it ten times more than it is” (276). Thus, for Nashe, one of
the motives behind Harvey’s *Foure Letters* is the promotion of himself as a “good” writer in contrast to “bad” writers like Greene and Nashe.

But the truth, *Strange Newes* implies, is that Harvey is not so well connected to people of power and influence. He only projects such an image of himself. In Nashe’s opinion, cvcn Harvey’s avowed friend, Spenser, is not really a good friend, because Harvey would not hesitate to exploit Spenser’s name to promote himself. Nashe does not believe that Harvey did not know about the publication of *Three Familiar and Wittie Letters*, his correspondence with Spenser. In any case, Harvey’s censure of Spenser in *Foure Letters* is, for Nashe, the very depth of betrayal, especially since Spenser was under a cloud of suspicion for the tale of the Bear and the Fox in *Mother Hubbard’s Tale*. Nashe thinks Harvey “publikey accusde or of late brought Mother Hubbard into question, that thou shouldest by rehearsall rekindle against him the sparks of displeasure that were quenched” (282). Nashe’s point is that Harvey will betray even his best friend to curry favor with authorities and to show himself well liked. Nashe also wants to nullify the only unimpeachable, if inexplicable, asset that Harvey possesses: Spenser’s friendship. So, Nashe reduces Harvey’s claims of friendship with Spenser to a strange phenomenon, a negligible fault in a great personality:

> Immortall Spencer, no frailitie hath thy fame, but the imputation of this idiots friendship: upon an unspotted Pegasus should thy gorgeous attired Fayrie Queene ride triumphant through all reports dominions, but that this mud-born bubble, this

---

10 “I must needs say, Mother Hubbard, in the heat of choler, forgetting the pure sanguine of her sweet Feary Queene, wilfully over-shotte her malcontented self” (15).
bile on the brow of universitie, this bladder of pride newe blowne, challengeth some interest in her prosperitie.  (282)

Suggesting that Harvey’s association with Spenser, instead of elevating Harvey, actually pulls Spenser down is part of Nashe’s strategy to discredit Harvey completely.

Finally, Nashe debunks even Harvey’s most obvious qualification, his scholarship. Just as his claim to familiarity, his scholarship is nothing but “hypocrisie and dissimulation.” The main thrust of his criticism against Harvey’s learning is that it is old-fashioned and has not kept pace with the times. Harvey is “but a plaine moth-eaten Maister of Art,” who failed to achieve the post of University oratorship because “Doctor Perne thoroughly discovered you for a young foppe” (295). As evidence of Harvey’s “moth-eaten” scholarship, Nashe cites his attitude toward invective. Harvey had written against invectives in *Foure Letters* (15), and Nashe sees Harvey’s censure of some of the best invective and satirical writers as symptomatic of his pedantry:

Tully, Horace, Archilochus, Aristophanes, Lucian, Julian, Aretine goe for no payment with you: their declamatory stiles, brought to the grand test of your judgement are found counterfeit, they are a venomous brood of railers, because they have brought in a new kind of a quick fight, which your decrepite slow-moving capacitie cannot fadge with. (283)

This “decrepite, slow moving” mind of Harvey’s cannot keep up with the nimble minds of writers like Nashe and Greene. It is their ability to change and adapt to situations that

---

11. “Invectives by favour have been too bolde: and satyres by usurpation too presumptuous: I overpasse Archilochus, Aristophanes, Lucian, Julian, Aretine, and that whole venomous and viperous brood, of old and new Raylers....”
sets them apart from Harvey, who Nashe believes is living in the past. It is certainly strange to hear Harvey’s boast about his literary legacy in *Foure Letters*: “If I never deserve any better remembrance, let me rather be Epitaphed, The invention of the English Hexameter” (32). To which boast, Nashe has this answer:

*The Hexameter verse I graunt to be a Gentleman of an auncient house (so is many an english beggar), yet this clyme of ours he cannot thrive in; our speech is too craggy for him to set his plough in: he goes twitching and hopping in our language like a man running upon quagmires, up the hill in one syllable, and down the dale in another, retaining no part of that stately smooth gate, which he vaunts himself with amongst the Greeks and Latins. (298-99)*

This criticism of hexameter is so wonderfully resonant and nuanced that it could be taken as the very essence of Nashe’s criticism of Harvey. Like the hexameter, Harvey and his old fashioned values are like a “gentleman of an ancient house” but now “beggared.” He cannot thrive in “this clyme” and in the “craggy” speech of popular writing. Like hexameter, Harvey is just too old fashioned, losing whatever charm such old fashioned values originally had in the “twisting and hopping” of the contemporary culture. The result is that Harvey is like a man “running upon quagmires...retaining no part of that stately smooth gate, which he vaunts himself with amongst the Greeks and Latins.” On the contrary, he is now “quite foundred and tired” and “a scholer in nothing but the scum of schollership.” Harvey, in Nashe’s opinion, cannot understand nor respond to the changes in the way writers lived and wrote. By implication, Harvey’s response to Greene’s death in *Foure Letters* is old fashioned and therefore meaningless, and it shows
Harvey in an unflattering light as he himself is a potential victim of the scourge that claimed Greene's life. Thus, Nashe shows in *Strange Newes* that Harvey's views are at best simplistic and at worst hypocritical because he has not fully grasped the reality of the patronage situation, or, if he has, he still clings to old-fashioned values.
Chapter 6: The Satiric Weapon in *Greene's Newes Both From Heaven and Hell*

*Greene's Newes both from Heaven and Hell* is one of the more obscure tracts of the Elizabethan Age and certainly a curious member in this group of pamphlets. It does not engage directly with Greene's death, nor is its author known to have been associated with Greene or his friends (or enemies) around the time Greene died, but the fact that it was entered in the Stationers' Register on February 3, 1593, just six months after Greene's death, and its evocation of Greene's name in its title make it an obvious candidate for our study. More crucially, the fact that the work actually records Greene's journey through the underworld in search of his heavenly or hellish final resting place is fraught with interpretive possibilities, especially for a study about frustrated Elizabethan writers' negotiations with the marketplace of print. Nor are these the only reasons for our interest in this pamphlet. Though the title page of the tract bears only the cryptic initials "B.R.," scholars believe that this was written by Barnabe Riche, an important writer of military tracts and romances in Elizabethan England. McKerrow, in his introduction to the only modern edition of this pamphlet available, avers that Riche was the author of *Greene's Newes*, basing his claim on the strength of the tract's references to Ireland, its strong anti-Catholic tone, and the fact that it was printed and published by the same printers (Thomas Adams and John Oxenbridge) that had published many of Riche's other works. Though Melvin H. Wolf disagreed in 1965 with McKerrow on the grounds that the claims of Riche authorship were based on biographical links with Riche that are too tenuous, McKerrow's opinion has by and large prevailed, as is evidenced by Riche's biographers Cranfill and Bruce and the works of more recent scholars such as D. Allen
Carroll. If B.R. does stand for Barnabe Riche—and this chapter accepts that it does—then the pamphlet assumes even greater significance, since it raises the question of why such an established writer as Riche would write an anonymous pamphlet, evoking the recently dead Greene and ostensibly satirizing some important people in the realm. Given Riche’s circumstances in 1592 and early 1593, his writing of a popular pamphlet, in which a notorious but successful pamphleteer who had personified the very “popularity” and “subversion” of the marketplace figures prominently, indicates Riche’s understanding of, even sympathy for, Greene and his death. More importantly, it also points to Riche’s view of Greene as a vehicle for satire and subversion, through which he could vent his own frustrations and anger at his patrons and enemies alike. Thus, this chapter argues, Greenes Newes is an important document in our textual moment, because it is here that all that Greene embodied—the failure of patronage, the economic impotence of humanist learning, and the subversion of the marketplace—is transmuted into one, major literary motif: Greene. The name and presence of Greene serve as Riche’s satirical sword, which he uses against his own enemies.

Like so many Elizabethan soldiers, Riche fought in the Low Countries and France before being dispatched to Ireland around 1570, where he served, intermittently, until 1592. During his frequent visits to England, he published various books, among them military works such as Allarme to England in 1578 and romance works such as Farewell to Military Profession in 1581. His only previous popular satiric work so far had been a sensational, anti-Catholic news pamphlet, The True Report of a Late Practise Enterprised

---

1In his “Riche and Greene: Elizabethan Beast Fables in Ireland.”
by a Papist (1582), when he was on one of his many trips to England. The “practise” of
the title refers to an incident in the Chester cathedral, where Elizabeth Orton, an attractive
girl fourteen or fifteen years old, “stood forthe in open view...before the whole assembly
there present” and related how she had been misled by a Roman Catholic schoolmaster
into pretending to see visions, exhorting her hearers to avoid such “trayterous Papists,
and solicited prayers that she be forgiven” (Cranfill and Bruce 32-3). But it was his
military writings that earned him a living, even winning him a pension of two shillings
six pence a day for life from the Queen in 1587, partly because he dedicated to her A
Pathway to Military Practise.

At the time of the Marprelate controversy and in the early nineties, Riche was
embroiled in a controversy of his own. In March 1589, back in Dublin, Riche wrote an
essay for the authorities about the “negligence” and “abuse” of the Anglican clergy in
Ireland. His main targets were Adam Loftus, Lord Chancellor of Ireland and Archbishop
of Dublin, and his brother-in-law, Thomas Jones, the Bishop of Meath. The report
accused these bishops of corruption, favoritism, mismanagement of state money, and
greed. Though naturally disliked by official circles in Ireland, the report found favorable
audience with the Privy Council in London, and especially with Walsingham, with whom
Riche seems to have enjoyed a warm relationship. But Loftus’ firm grip on Ireland and
his geographical distance from a dissatisfied Privy Council in London kept the
Archbishop and his brother-in-law out of trouble and in considerable power and wealth,

---

2For the history of the Orton case and more detail about Riche’s trip and the people he met on the
way, see Cranfill’s “Thomas North at Chester.”

3They may even have been related. See the DNB entry on Riche.
despite their many corruptions. Riche, bearing the brunt of Loftus’ displeasure and
greatly inconvenienced by Walsingham’s death in 1590, remained the target of the Irish
prelates’ wrath. Still, he returned to England in November 1591 to present the Queen
with a seven-page “caveat to her majesty,” and again during Lent, 1592, to present
another report concerning the corruption in Ireland. Riche’s indefatigable crusade, along
with Loftus’ own reckless greed in Ireland, was beginning to result in stern Privy Council
messages to Loftus and Jones. Loftus even admitted that he was being “worn away with
the troubles brought on him by the accusations of ... Riche” (CSPi 1588-1592, 534-36).

Angered, the Archbishop wrote to Burghley in June 1592:

Barnabe Rych, a gentleman, of her Majesty’s pensioners in the kingdom, whom
albeit in life I never offended, yet am I advised by some of his own confederacy
that for these twelve months past and more, he and some others, have been strict
observers of all my doings, and have secretly collected and looked some
accusations both against myself and some other of my brethren of the clergy here:
which, as he himself hath commonly reported, were delivered to her Majesty’s
hands at his last being in England, the cause of which his dealing and practise
against us I cannot ascribe to any other thing but to the malicious disposition of
some papists and atheists in this kingdom (with whom for the most part Rych is
conversant) who (to disgrace our persons for our professions sake) have as I
conceive raised him as another Martin to sow the seeds of sedition by this godly
course, being a man of himself very needy, by nature immodest and subject to
many and very gross infirmities. (Hinton, Ireland through Tudor eyes 57)
The familiar equation of pamphleteering with "malicious disposition" and collusion with subversive elements ("papists and atheists") is present in Loftus' diatribe against Riche as well. Nor did he stop with this letter. In all probability, Loftus was behind a vicious attack on Riche in broad daylight on the streets of Dublin, and when Riche wounded one of his attackers, the Archbishop threatened to arrest Riche. Another attack followed soon after, in which Riche was very nearly killed. Somehow escaping and now fearing for life, Riche "suddenly departed" from Ireland in June 1592, endangering his daily pension granted by the Queen.⁴

It is in this agitated state of mind that Riche arrived in London in June 1592. Aged almost fifty and having served in Ireland for over twenty years, Riche was almost without any prospects in London, but since the Queen had received him courteously in his previous visit, Riche probably entertained hopes of some preferment at Court. But 1592 was a tense time in London with plots and conspiracies against the Queen filling the air, and access to court was restricted (see Cranfill and Bruce 67-78). Especially unfortunate for Riche, on June 24, just ten days after Riche's departure from Ireland, the Privy Council made it more difficult for "the multitude of Iryshe suitors that do repaire hether," seeking an audience with the Queen. This was followed by another proclamation a few days later:

There have ben a multitude of pryvate suitours for causes determynable in that realme [Ireland]...and many also for private suites for rewardes...And therefore her Majestie hath presentlie given order to dysmysse all soch particular suitours

⁴For more on the assault, see Bruce and Cranfill, pp.50-55; for the details of Riche's complaints about Loftus' financial mismanagement and other corruptions, see CSPI and Bruce and Cranfill. Also see
with intencion not to give audience to the same.... And for other particular suites for rewardes, her Majestie Myndeth to admytt and allowe of none suche, but upon speciall recommendacion of the Deputie and Councell [in Ireland].

(Quoted in Cranfill and Bruce 69)

Obtaining "special recommendacion" from Ireland was of course out of the question for Riche, so he faced utter destitution in London. Like the patron-less writers, Riche also felt abandoned by those he had served, and, again like the others, Riche had nowhere to turn but to the popular marketplace which alone could alleviate his hunger. Consequently, seeking to exploit the 1580s fad for romances, he published a romance, _The Adventures of Brusanus_, in October 1592 (it was entered in the Stationers' Register on the 23rd of that month), though the title page confessed that this romance was "written by Barnabe Riche, Seaven or eight yeares sithence, ...now published by the great intrety of diverse of his freendes." Opinion differs as to whether Riche had actually written this romance "seaven or eight yeares sithens" or was merely putting up a front to disguise its satirical message. But there are references that show that Riche at the very least revised and made some addition to the book in 1592. The story of the old soldier, Martianus, for example, has some resemblance to Riche's. When Martianus says, "I have

---

Hinton (58).

5 See Helgerson's "Lyly, Greene, Sidney, and Barnaby Rich's _Brusanus_" for Greene's influence on Riche. Helgerson argues that the book was written in 1592 and not in 1584 or 1585 as the title page suggests, and, as such, the influence of Greene is greater in the work than of either Sidney or Lyly. Helgerson is refuting earlier theories (e.g. in Walter Davis' _Idea and Act in Elizabethan Fiction_) that Riche's Puritan connections would have given access to Sidney's _Old Arcadia_ (from which Riche seems to have lifted many sentences verbatim) which was circulating only in manuscript form in 1585. Helgerson's insights support my own argument that, in the summer of 1592, Riche was an admirer of Greene and consciously open to his influence. Also see Don Beecher's introduction to his edition of _Farewell to Military Profession_ for an interesting discussion on Riche as a romance writer, with particular reference to _Brusanus_.
served...these thirty years as a soildier, and comforting myself with some hope of
reward. I came to the court, where I became a suter” (sig. E2), the anguish in his voice
could have been Riche’s. Loftus himself is figured as Gloriosus, “whose loftiness of...
lookes was much marveld at, but the manner of his attire was more to be laughed at”
(14). The description of Gloriosus as a courtier is highly unflattering, and hints of his
hypocrisy are abundant: “he wore a loose Mandilyon, like a counterfeit souliour, in his
hand a farme of feathers, like a demye harlot”(14). But, more than satire, Brusanus is an
Alexandrian romance, ambitiously long (over 190 pages), and deliberately imitative of
Lyly’s, Sidney’s, and Greene’s romances. We do not know how popular it was once
published, but it had a formidable rival in Sidney’s Arcadia (published in 1590). In any
case, the popular craze for romances had peaked in the 1580s with the rise and decline of
Lyly and Greene, and Riche’s attempt at cashing in on it may not have been entirely
successful. The point is, Riche’s lot was not much better after the publication of
Brusanus; it may have gotten worse: “What little money the Captain (Riche) had he spent
while trying vainly to further his suit. He was consequently reduced almost to
beggary.... At every turn he was baffled by delays, indifference, and red tape” (Cranfill
and Bruce 71). It was the familiar cycle all over: writer is neglected by patrons, writes
romance, fails, gets frustrated and angry and turns to popular pamphlets, both for revenge
and sustenance. Riche’s path to Greenes Newes was a well-trodden one. But what was
uniquely his own was the way he made a literary motif out of Greene and the way he

---

6 Certainly the pamphlet was not reprinted after 1592—there’s only one copy in existence, at
Huntington Library (available on University Microfilms, Early English Series, Reel 1003). There are no
modern editions of the work.
made his pamphlet remain conscious of its own status as a satirical vehicle through the
use of Greene’s persona.

*Greene's Newes both from Heaven and Hell* is a remarkable pamphlet, as it
denotes the successful transition from romance to satiric mode for Riche. Unlike
romances, this pamphlet was purportedly received by Riche from the ghost of Robert
Greene, which requests Riche to perform “the committing of these papers to the press,
wherein, ...I have... manifested the very drift of mine own devise...” (4). Ostensibly, it
speaks of Greene’s journey, after “pittiles Death had summoned [his] soul to leave his
transitory estate” (8), through the nether-world. In the main pamphlet itself, Greene
meets with Cloth Breeches and Velvet Breeches, two characters from his satiric pamphlet
*A Quip for an Upstart Courtier*, and they walk toward heaven, where a huge crowd
awaits in front of its gates. This is satirically meant to resemble the hordes of suitors
outside Elizabeth’s court. Nobody knows when the gates will open, but, luckily, Saint
Peter appears presently and the suits begin. He admits Cloth Breeches but not Velvet
Breeches; as for Greene, Saint Peter accuses him of exposing only the low-level criminals
of London in his cony-catching pamphlets and not the crooks in the upper reaches of
society, so Greene is barred from heaven. Dejected, Greene and Velvet Breeches proceed
hell-ward, hoping to find a final resting place at least there. Lucifer meets them at the
gate and readily grants Velvet Breeches admission, but Greene again runs into
difficulties, because the cony-catchers in hell have been mightily displeased with his
pamphlet exposure of their living brethren on the earth. Using the same arguments that
Saint Peter had used, the cony-catchers chase Greene out of hell too, and the pamphlet
ends with Greene's bitter vow to inhabit the dark corners of the earth, like the Court, exposing the corruptions of the world.

This chapter discusses this pamphlet from three viewpoints, each one in relation to how Riche uses the motif of a fictional Greene for his own ends. First, it looks at Riche's dedicatory letter, in which he not only sets the satiric tone of the pamphlet but also explicitly adopts the voice of Greene as his own. Second, it explores how Riche uses Greene's cony-catching trope for his satirical purposes. Finally, it thinks through the significance of Greene's rejection at the gates of both heaven and hell and how it relates to Riche's own view of himself as a pamphleteer.

The pamphlet's satire starts right in its prefatory material—in fact, just as Nashe sets his satirical tone of *Strange Newes* in his dedicatory letter to "Apis Lapis," Riche's dedicatory letter functions as a defining and integral part of the pamphlet's satirical message. The title page cryptically announces that the pamphlet has been "commended to the Presse by B.R.," has a mysterious printer's sign, "marcantia Reale," printed in a circle, and blandly gives its printer's address as "at London, Printed, Anno.Domiini. 1593." It is dedicated to Riche's fellow Irish civil servant, Gregory Coole, who had endured the same kind of misfortunes as Riche. In fact, the dedicatee was at the time in prison ("the chaste chamber"): "To the renowned Gregory Coole, Chiefe Burgermaister of the Castle of Clonarde, Marquesse of merry conceits, and Grade Cavalier amongst Bounic companions and all good fellowship; At his chaste chamber at Dubylne in Irelande, B.R. sendeth greeting" (3). To dedicate a satirical work to a friend who was in prison because of trouble with the authorities is quite a bold move for a writer whose
previous dedications had been to people of note. We know that Riche was in a bitter mood in the summer and fall of 1592 on account of being driven out of Ireland by Archbishop Loftus and Dean Jones. Gregory Coole had had similar misfortune with the Irish prelates, who had appropriated Coole’s property, consisting of a mill and a stream. As one who had himself lost his pension, Riche, in commiserating with another Loftus victim by providing “restorative to recall you from that melancholy conceit, that both so long pestered your braines, for the loss of a Myll,” is gathering moral support against a powerful enemy, and we are to identify this pamphlet as a weapon.

Besides setting a satirical tone, the dedicatory letter also makes Riche a pamphleteer in the mold of Greene’s R.G, the crime reporter in his cony-catching pamphlets, Nashe’s Pierce Penilesse, and Chettle’s Kind Hart. Just as these personae serve as satiric weapons for their creators, Riche also symbolically adopts a persona that is no longer corporeal. Like all the nether-world satirists, B.R. makes contact with a

---

7 For example, his first work, A Right Excelent and Pleasaunt Dialogue (1574), is dedicated to Lord Ambrose, Earle of Warwicke, Allarme to England (1578) is dedicated “to the right honorable Syr Christopher Hatton, Knight,” with proper epistles to gentlemen readers and soldiers, His Farewell to Military Profession (1581) to gentlemen readers and soldiers, The true report of a late practise enterprised by a papist (1582) “to the right honorable Sir Francis Walsingham,” and A Pathway to Military Practise (1587) to “Princess Elizabeth,” with epistles to “the most captaines and renowned soldiers of England.” Even the work immediately preceding Greenes Newes, The Adventures of Brusamus, is dedicated to “Joyce Aston,” daughter of one of the richest men in England at that time, Sir Edward Aston. This trend continues in all the works Riche produced after Greenes Newes. Only Greenes Newes (dedicated to Gregory Coole) lacks proper preliminary material; it is also unique in being anonymously written and published without the printer’s name and address. See Wolf’s introduction to the edition of Faults Faults and Nothing Else But Faultes (1606), 49-62, for a description of Riche’s printed books. Also see Granfill’s “Barnaby Rich and King James.”

8 As agent for the dowager Countess of Sussex, Cole lived at the Countess’ manor of Clonard, which had a stream and a mill, and derived his income from the property. But there was a lengthy strife over the estate, which was in the diocese of Meath, between Loftus and the Bishop of Meath on the one hand and Cole on the other. That the prelates eventually won, as usual, is indicated by a license which Loftus issued in 1598 to his brother-in-law [Dean Jones], to “hold [the estate] forever” (Cranfill and Bruce 76).
figure from the dead only to distance himself from his own satire. The moment of
contact between B.R. and Greene’s ghost is telling:

...there appeared a most grislie ghost wrapt up in a sheete, his face only
discovered, with a penne under his eare, and holding a scrowle of written paper in
his hand....I remembered my selfe how old fathers were wont to say, that Spirits
in such cases, had no power to speake to any man, untill they were first spoken
unto, and therefore taking into me a constrained courage, I asked him what he was
and what was his meaning to trouble me in my passing. (3-4)

In this instance of identity adoption, we see Riche consciously adopting the persona of
Greene to make his own “scrowle of paper” accessible to a new audience he is courting.
Riche knows what kind of persona he is adopting and what it means in the marketplace.

In this play between B.R. and ghost, the ghost replies: “I am the Spirite of Robert Greene,
not unknown to thee (I am sure) by my name, when my writings lately privileged on
every post, hath given notice of my name unto infinite number of people that never knew
me by the view of my person” (4). By invoking the ghost of Greene, and taking on his
persona for his pamphlet, Riche is aiming to accomplish two things: one, he wants to find
the right satirical voice for the anger and frustration as a failed writer and a soldier that he
wants to articulate; and, two, he wants to achieve the same popularity and audience that
Greene had enjoyed when alive, when everyone knew him and his writings were
displayed on every post. The fantasy of material benefit from a large audience and the
attraction of taking his grievance to the court of public opinion are compelling factors in
Riche’s assuming the persona of Greene.
Once the adoption is accomplished, Riche, the military and romance writer so far, changes into a satirical pamphleteer of the nineties, following in the footsteps of Greene: satirical, tongue-in-cheek, and seemingly amoral, all characterized by Greene's cony-catching persona. Riche sees his own writing in similar light. When B.R. reads over what the ghost has given him, he makes this critical judgment of Greene's work: "spyced it was here and there with Mystlin, a kind of graine that is made of knave and Rye, mixed both together, pleasurable it was in many places to read and fittest for melancholy humors." (4). The "spice," the pun on "knavery" (knave+rye), the appeal to "pleasure," and the unabashed claim to being "fittest for melancholy humors" and not didactic are all remarkable from the writer of The Adventure of Brusanus, a complaint romance, written barely six months before, that safely shrouded its satiric message in an Arcadian garb.

The new voice has enabled the pamphleteer Riche to break free of the artistic and political conventions of creative writing and to articulate his true feelings through satire and verbal playfulness.

The allegorical fable in the dedicatory letter proves Riche's new-found confidence as a satirical pamphleteer. Drawing on animal fable precedents set by the Marprelate tracts, the fox and the badger tale in Groatsworth of Wit, and the bear fable in Nashe's Pierce Penilesse, Riche weaves his own animal fable full of satirical meanings and political jokes. As scholars of Riche agree,9 the fable is a full, frontal attack on Loftus and Jones. It would be useful to quote the entire tale, as it sets the satirical tone of the pamphlet that follows it:

---

9 See, for example, Cranfill and Bruce, Hinton, and Carroll.
I could tel you a tale (Maister Gregory) of an Asse, who leaving the place where he was first foald, fortuned to stray into strange forest, and finding the beastes of the Desart to be but simple, and had never seene the majestie of the Lyon, neyther had they felt the cruelty of the Tygar, nor had any manner of wavyes beene wronged by the oppressions of the Leopard, the Beare, the Panther, or any other devouring or ravening beastes.

This paltry Asse, seeing their simple plainnesse, founde meanes to wrap himselfe in a Lyons skinne, and then with proude lookes and loftie countenaunce, raunging among the Heardes, he would stretch out his filthy throate, bellowing and braying (as nature had taught him) with so hideous and horrible a noyse, that the poore beastes that were within hys hearing beganne already to tremble & shake for feare. Then he began to tyrannise, commaundung what himself pleased amongst them, and not contenting himselfe with that obeysance, which had beene fit for an honorable beast, and more then was due to an Asse, would many times take uppon him some duties proper to the person of the Lion himselfe: and in the end became a notable sheepe-byteer, worrying and devouring whole flockes of poore sheepe, that happened within his precincte or jurisdiction.

The Wolfe that had layne all this while close amongst the Mountaines, and having gotten understanding of the nature and disposition of this Asse, thought him a fit companion for confortshyppe, and combyned with him in such a freendly league, that betweene them the one taking opportunity to filtch and steale in the night, the other using his tyrany to raven and devour in the day, the poore harmeleesse Cattle that lived within their reach, were still oppressed, & never free
from perril. The Asse grew to that greatnes that he was surnamed Tarquinius Superbus, not Tarquine that ravished Lucretia or her honour, but it was that Tarquine that ravished a Church of her lyings; and an Asse I found him and so I will leave him. (5)

As Carroll argues, the Ass refers to Archbishop Loftus, and the Wolf is the “formidable marauder” Feagh Hugh O’Byrne, an Irish rebel, responsible for massacres of English troops (107-109). Riche’s satiric point is that Loftus is an ass (Loftus=lofty+ass) who terrifies the simple beasts of “strange forest” (Ireland) by wrapping himself in a “Lyons Skinne.” He also, “with proud lookes and loftie countenance” (note the pun again on “loftie”), ravages them. More damagingly for the Archbishop, Riche also accuses Loftus of usurping royal prerogatives when he says that Loftus “would take uppon him some duties proper to the person of the Lyon himself”(5). Even more scandalously, Riche accuses Loftus of colluding with the Irish rebels and acting traitorously against the Queen. The Wolf understands the “nature and disposition” of the ass, and, together, they “filch and steale in the night” and “raven and devoure....the poore harmlesse cattle that lived within their reach in the day” (5). Riche charges Loftus with disregarding and even maintaining O’Byrne in his rebellious role since “Loftus’s children [had] been fostered in O’Byrne’s country” (Carroll 109). This is a breath-taking piece of satire, because to accuse Loftus of corruption is one thing, but to implicate him in treason, especially in Irish affairs over which the Queen was becoming impatient, was quite another matter. The charge of treason and potential sedition against an English prelate in Ireland by a commoner itself smacks of subversion and sedition as it implicitly undermines the order and hierarchy of the realm. It is doubtless the conjunction of Riche’s new attitude as a
pamphleteer and his anger at being treated so callously by Loftus that leads him to this
daringly dangerous allegation. Thus, through this dedicatory letter to his fellow victim
Gregory Coole, Riche successfully metamorphoses his real persona into an abrasive,
satiric, Greenean satirist.

Once he establishes the satirical framework through the persona of Greene in the
dedicatory letter, Riche particularly exploits Greene’s cony-catching trope in the main
pamphlet. Readers’ recognition of Greene and his work is important for Riche’s satire to
succeed, so Riche is careful to emphasize the origin of Greene’s Newes. Says Greene
directly to the readers at the beginning of the pamphlet:

Be not dismayd (my good freends) that a deade man should acquaint you with
newes, for it is I. I per se I, Robert Greene in Arbitus Magister, he that was wont
to solicite your mindes with many pleasant conceits and to fit your fancies at the
least every quarter of the yere with strange and quaint devices best beseeing the
fashion, and most answerable to your pleasure. Having therefore so many times
taken the true measure of your appetites and finding the very height of your
dispositions inclined to novelties, that you might rather see howe willing I am to
satisfie your humors, I have sent you heere the whole discourse of my
adventures…. (7)

Riche’s mock-serious appraisal of Greene’s commercial nature conceals a thorough
understanding, on his part, of Greene’s talent as a pamphleteer and his adaptability to
popular taste. By resurrecting Cloth-Breeches and Velvet-Breeches, Riche is also
acknowledging Greene’s genius for satire. Also, in facetiously rejecting Greene both
from heaven and hell for the same “crime” of misrepresenting cony-catchers, Riche
shows an intelligence that indicates that he perfectly understood Greene’s long-running joke with his cony-catching pamphlets. Adopting Greene’s pamphleteer personality thus enables Riche to tap into Greene’s techniques as well as his hard-won multitude of readers. Riche is thus a familiar writer addressing his familiar audience about familiar subjects. He understands even the commercial nature of Greene’s repentance. Here is Riche showing Greene as boasting about his pamphlets:

My masters are very good friends both, I perceive you have not read al my bookes, which I have purposely put forth for the benefite of my countrymen, for if you had but seene Greenes farewell to folly, me thinkes the bare tytle, without turning over leafe to looke further into the matter, might have moved you to this consideration, that the very ground of your contention is meere folly and flat foolishness... and in one other of my bookes, called Greenes groats worth of wit: why if there were but one peny worth of wit equally distributed betweene you both, you would never use to quarrell... I am now to put you in mind of an other of my Bookes, called Greenes never too late: O that you had but read over that book in time...(4-2)

He also understands the essential satire behind the cony-catching pamphlets of Greene. As we saw in the first chapter, beneath the casual tone of reporting, Greene is actually figuring himself as a cony-catching writer engaged in cheating his readers through his pamphlets. Implicit in this self-mockery is his anger at the patronage system for its failure to support writers like him and forcing them to become patron-less, vagrant cony-catchers of a different kind. The main satirical targets in Greene’s cony-catching pamphlets are really those members of the gentry and aristocracy that have failed to live
up to their social obligation and have become materialistic and greedy. But, in his pamphlets, Greene always reinforced this hidden message by putting it in the mouths of cony-catchers themselves who protested Greene’s exposes. Thus for example, in the *Defense of Cony-catching*, the cony-catcher Cuthbert Curry knave addresses Greene with this counterattack:

I learned that [Robert Greene] was a schollar, and a maister of Artes, and a cony-catcher in his kind, though not at cards, and one that favors good fellows...

whereupon reading his bookes, and surveying every line with deep judgement, I began to note folly in the man, that would straine a Gnat, and lette passe an Elephant: that would touch small scapes, and lette grosse faultes passe without any reprehension. (11:47)

Cuthbert’s charge that Greene “straine[s] a gnat and lette[s] pass an elephant” is a familiar countercharge of the underworld to cony-catching pamphlets. Cuthbert’s voice captures a self-consciously satirical Greene who highlights the real, though hidden, targets of his satire. That is why the attack on “bigger” cony-catchers is insistent: “we cony-catchers are like little flies in the grasse, which live on little leaves and do no more harme: whereas there bee in Englande other professions that bee great cony-catchers and caterpillars, that make barrant the field wherein they baite” (11: 47). Cuthbert insists that “there is no estate, trade, occupation nor mistery, but lives by cony-catching, and that our shift at cards compared to the rest is the simplest of all” (11:103).

If Greene, in his pamphlets, had playfully criticized himself for focussing only on the street-level cony-catchers, Riche also plays up this criticism of Greene through Saint Peter and the hell-dwelling cony-catchers. This strategy gives Riche the opportunity to
make his own satirical hits at his social superiors. The following is what Saint Peter
gives as his reasons for not letting Greene inside heaven—but this might as well have
been Riche speaking:

I have heard of you, you have been a busie fellowe with your penne,... [who
could] finde out the base abuses of a company of varlets that lived by pilfering
cosonages, and could you not as well have discryed the subtil and fraudelent
practices of great Conny-catchers, such as rides upon footeclothes, and sometime
in coatches, and walkes the streetes in long gownes and velvet coates: I am sure
you have bee in Westminster Hall, where you have see ne poore clyants
animated to commence actions, and to prosecuted sutes till they have brought
themselves to beggery & when all is spent they are turned off like fooles, and sent
home by weeping-crosse. And let me see now if any of your crosbyters, your
Lyfters, your Nyppers, your foysters, or any other of the whole rabblement your
conny-catchers, cal him what name you list, be like unto these, or more
mischivous in a common wealth. Then have you covitous landlords, that dooth
daily so exact and cheate of their poore tennants, that they were better light into
the laps of cutpurse, then to swell within the precincts of cut-throte. Yet have you
a proude kinde of conny-catchers, that having but a Penner and ynckhorne
hanging at his gyrdle, yet creeping into some great mans favour to become his
clarke or seretary, by plaine, conny-catchting, within very fewe yeeres, will
purchase three or foure hundred pound land a yeere.

Or should I put you in mind of great conny-catchers, placed in Offices,
who are continually building of houses and still purchasing of revenewes to leave
to theyr heyres, perhaps by deceiving the Prince or cosbvn soning the subject, but how should they compass so great abundance, by some practise in conny-catching: unlesse they be such which the Prince dooth favour, of whom she bestoweth many gracious and liberall gifts: I will not say there bee conny-catchers amongst clergy men, that will catch at a benefice sometime before it fallles, and now and then by simonie or other corruption having caught two or three, can be contented likewise to catch their tythes from their poore flock, but very seldom to feede them, or to catch any of their soules to the kingdome of heaven. But now my freend take this for your answer, you that could busie your selfe to fable out so many follies without indifferency, and to become a wryter with such partialitie, I must tell you truth, heaven is not habitation for any man that can looke with one eye and wincke with the other, for there must none rest there that dooth use to haulte, but such as be plaine and true dealing people. (17-8)

As can be seen, this long speech by Saint Peter essentially repeats what Cuthbert Curry knave in the _Defense of Cony-catching_ and Cuckoe in _Kind Hartes Dreame_ had to say about cony-catching pamphlets—that the whole country is rife with corruption, especially among the ruling classes—lawyers, politicians, religious leaders, and landowners. Once this basic premise is set up, Riche can launch into specific attacks even on members of the aristocracy. One is directed particularly at the man who had so effectively kept Riche out of any royal favor by blocking his entry into the palace.
By all accounts, this man is Sir John Fortescue, the leading master of requests in 1592. Riche’s desperate pleas for help after being driven out of Ireland apparently fell through bureaucratic cracks in the court. He blames the court system of favor-mongering for his failure to regain his pension or secure an alternative career in the court, and he seems to have especially faulted Fortescue. He, along with the entire court milling with courtiers and favor-seekers, is bitterly realized in the portrayal of Saint Peter:

...he hath so many affaires to run through, that it is almost thought impossible how he should execute them all. For first, he is knight of Porter heere of heaven gates, a place I warrant you of no lesse charge than trouble: then, he is constituted the Prince of the Apostles, & confirmed in that authority by all the Popes for this three or foure hundreth yeere. So that al the rest of the Apostles can doo nothing without his allowance, and whatsoever he dooth they cannot recall: then, he is the Popes Factor, and hath the handling and determining of all causes for him, and hath lately bin more troubled with his brablements, for the holding up of S. Peters chayne, than with all the Kings & Princes again in Christendom: fourthly, he is the Master of the Requests, chosen by the papists to present their prayers to God, and they ply him everyday with more pelting petitions, than his leasure will permit to look over in a month after: these and so many other matters he hath still to looke into, that if he had sixe able bodies, they were all too little to run through his other affayres.(15)

---

10See Carroll’s “Riche and Greene: Elizabethan Beast Fables in Ireland.”
The anti-Roman tenor of the satire on Fortescue and the court was a common theme among Puritan elements in the society, who accused the court of still harboring Catholic sympathizers in preference to genuine Puritan reformers. The satire on hierarchy is particularly noteworthy, as Riche had grave misgivings about the Episcopate.

Therefore, Riche’s second attack is on the clergy, especially his *bête noir*, Loftus. Saint Peter had of course admonished Greene for forgetting about the “cony-catchers amongst clergymen” who are content to “catch their tythes from their poore flock, but very seldome to feede them or to catch any of their soules to the kingdom of heaven.” This paves the way for a lengthy attack on the clergy, and Loftus and Dean:

Some other there be that now and then will get up into a Pulpit, and there they will spend an houre, chyding against the Pope in the course of their speaking, and they are no sooner come down but they will defie God himselfe halfe a yeere after, in the manner of theyr lying: and this example of theyr ungodly behaviour, is no little corrosive to weeke consciences that do beholde their wickedness. For what is it for a Clergy man, be he Parson, be he Vicar, be he Deacon, be he Arch Deacon, be he Byshop, be he Archibishop, or let him be what he will, if he be one that will rather endeavor himself to fleece his flocke than to feed it, that hath not so much care of the children of God, committed to his charge, which he suffereth dayly to perish: as he hath to provyde marriages for his own children, in theyr very infancie, and when they are under age: that dooth builde houses, and purchase rents by corruption, extortion, and briberie, that dooth eat and drinke the sinnes of the ignorant poeple dayly at his table; that will not admit of a pardon from the Pope, yet dares not be without five or six severall pardons from the
Prince, for treason, for murther, for theft, for robbery, for conspiracy, for confederacy, for rasing, for forging, for extortion, for bryberie, and for many other filthy matters, shameful to be spoken off, were it not before this haggish assembly: and what though from a base and beggarly parentage he could shewe himselfe lofty in minde, lofty in lookes, and lofty in all the rest of his demeanures; Would not such a Prelate be fit for the devilles Chappell? (57-58)

The list of corruption—failing to lead his flock, interested in things material, being utterly corrupt, and being hypocritical—is directly aimed at Loftus, and the none-too-subtle hint that “he could shewe himselfe lofty in mind, lofty in lookes, and lofty in all the rest of his demeanures” explicitly identifies the target of Riche’s attack.

Thus Greene’s complex and nuanced use of the cony-catching trope helps Riche unleash his own satire. By making use of Greene’s mock-ambivalence about his own cony-catching pamphlets, Riche can portray, with irony, the plight of Greene as a writer in trouble for being soft on the rich and powerful rogues. Consequently, like Cuthbert Curry knave in the *Defense of Cony-catching*, Riche provides an apology for cony-catching that is itself a satire. At the same time, by making Greene the target of both Saint Peter and Lucifer, Riche has essentially valorized the satiric message of Greene. Thus at the end of the pamphlet, Greene belongs neither to heaven nor to hell but to the living world.

The final aspect of the pamphlet that catches our attention is the status of Greene and, by extension, Riche at the end of the pamphlet. What is the significance of Greene’s being rejected at both heaven and hell? For one thing, it signifies, I think, Riche’s sophisticated understanding of the ambivalent status that popular pamphleteers
occupied in the Elizabethan literary world. Riche shrewdly portrays the unclassifiability of Greene’s writing and the profound misunderstanding of which it had been the victim. We have already seen Saint Peter’s moralistic response to Greene’s cony-catching pamphlets. Let us look at the way the hell-dwelling cony-catchers respond to Greene:

[the cony-catchers] beganne to growe into confused exclamations against mee, some said, let us teare the villaine in peeces, that hath written so many bookes against us: other sayde, let us fley of his skinne, and cut the flesh from his bones in small gobbets, that hath so manifested the secrets of our trade and profession, to the world: some other sayde, let us cut the tongue out of his head, and put out both his eyes, that hath beeene an enemie to the arte of cony-catching, and hath so shamefully inveyed against the practises: then came there foorth an infinite number of women cony-catchers, and they sware they would geld me, for marring theyr Market, and hindering them of theyr taking. (60)

What is clear is that both Peter and the cony-catchers object to Greene on the same grounds (that Greene was partial to the rich), yet the former is moralistic while the latter are furious at their exposure. The result is that Greene is not “moralistic” enough for heaven and is too “moralistic” for hell. The resulting comedy of the situation is the ultimate comment on Greene’s uniqueness as a pioneer in pamphleteering.

There is a strange poignancy for Riche, too, in the plight that he has imaginatively created for Greene. We can speculate that Riche is figuring his own estrangement from political establishments in both England and Ireland. It is also possible that Riche identifies with Greene’s ambivalent status as a pamphleteer, a spirit of uncertain genealogy and taxonomy. Riche emphasizes this ambivalence in the many potentialities
he ascribes to a now-homeless ghost of Greene. Thus Greene “will bee the maddest Gobline, and Robin Goodfellow,” and will create havoc with men and women. The ghost will also be in Westminster Hall amongst the lawyers during term. By making Greene’s ghost restless, Riche, as the creator of that ghost, is himself assuming a social role of the maverick satirist, laughing at and exposing every one: “I am bent upon mischiefe, I can but therefore wish you to looke to your selves” (62). This self-assured promise of mischief and subversion is evident in *Greene’s Newes*, but whether he preserved, in later years, the new identity he had assumed for himself in 1592/93 is a question for which the answer is a sad no. Still, even by adopting a different personality only once, Riche demonstrated the potentialities of being a Greenean pamphleteer.

That Riche pressed all the right buttons as a satirical pamphleteer is evident. *Greene’s Newes* caused enough consternation among official circles that, within two months of its publication, the Privy Council issued a “warrant directed to Robert Browne, a Messenger of the [Star Chamber], for this apprehending of Barnabie Riche, and as occasion served to require the aides and assistances of her Majesty’s publicke officers as well for th’ apprehension of the said partie as for the bringing him before their Lordships in the Companie of this bearer” (Bruce and Granfill 77). What transpired of this order nobody knows, but this arrest warrant, along with a brutal assault on a country road at the hands of a man with Irish connections, made sure that Riche was soon relieved of any pretensions to the role of a popular, satiric pamphleteer. In 1614, he had so far strayed from his 1592/93 flirtation with satire that he recorded in *The Honestie of this Age*: “for satyryck investigating at any mans Pryvate person it is fare from my
thought” (Cranfill and Bruce 78). But then, in 1614, Riche was a far different man from the one who wrote *Greenes Newes* in 1592/93.

Thus, for a very brief period in his career, Riche, ripe with resentment and anger, succumbed to the spirit of Robert Greene and wrote an anonymous, subversive, and satirical pamphlet. What animated him was all that had animated the other pamphleteers in this study, the poignancy of Greene’s death, a fear of similar fate, and the fascination with the court of public opinion. *Greenes Newes* is a significant pamphlet, because it signals Riche’s conscious abandonment of romance (such as *The Adventures of Brusanus*) and a deliberate attempt at satire. Unfortunately, Riche did not evolve into a major satirist—he was too well-known and important a public servant for the authorities to allow him a free rein. But in the brief moment that Riche spent writing *Greenes Newes*, we can see Riche’s liveliness as a writer and, in that shining moment, the irresistible power of Greene’s personality and influence.
Conclusion

If the origins of the textual moment we have been studying so far followed and participated in the print subversion of the Stubbs episode and the Marprelate controversy, its end should be set in the Bishops' ban of 1599,¹ whose own origins, at least as far as it related to Nashe and Harvey, the two surviving protagonists of this story, are to be found in 1592. The Bishops' ban reiterates the continued potency of satiric pamphlets, the kind that Martin had pioneered and Greene and his friends had perfected. Ironically, it is the same bishops who had ended Martin and engendered Nashe (as an anti-Martinist

¹ The ban read as follows:
Satyres teamed Halls Satyres, vis' Virgidiemicanum,
Or his toothless or bitinge Satyres/
Pigmalian with certaine other Satyres/
The scourge of villanye/
The Shadow of truth in Epigrams and Satyres/
Snarling Satyres/
Caltha Poetarum/
Davyes Epigrams, with marlowes Elegyes/
The booke againste woemen, viz'; of marriage and wyvinge/
The xv ioyes of marrige/
That noe Satyres or Epigramms be printed hereafter
That noe Englishs historyes bee printed excepte they bee
Allowed by somme of her majesties privie Counsell/
That noe playes be printed excepte they bee allowed
By suche as have aucthorytie/
That all nasshes bookes and D Harveys bookes be taken
Wheresoever they maye be found and that none of theire
Bookes bee ever printed hereafter/
That though the nature of these he retofor
Expressed shalbe broughte unto yow under the hands
Of the Lord Archbishope of Canterburye or the Lord Bishop of
London yet the said booke shall not bee printed untill
the master or wardenes have acquainted the said lord Archbishop, or
the Lord Bishop with the same, to knowe whether it bee theire
hand or no/

John cantuan/
Richard London

Suche bookes as can be found or are already taken of the
Argumens aforesaid or any of the booke above expressed
Lett them bee presently broughte to the Bishop of London to
Be burnt/ (Arber III. 677)
pamphleteer) that were now behind this ban. In one fell swoop, Archbishop Whitgift and Bishop Bancroft dispatched the books and futures of Harvey and Nashe to flames. We would never hear from either man again: Nashe had nothing left but to die in abject poverty; Harvey would retire to his Walden estate and live out the rest of his long life in complete obscurity.

The significance of the ban itself has been under debate. Linda Boose, for example, invests the moment with transcendental importance: “1599 almost pinpoints the shift in England from a poetry culture to a theatre culture; it marks the beginning of the competition between a culture of print and one of performance” (194). Print and theater cultures began and started competing much before 1599, and one can argue that the reports of the demise of the poetic culture in England in 1599 are slightly exaggerated. As far the efficacy of the ban itself, political and sexual subversion through pamphlets and plays continued unabated into the seventeenth century.² But what is remarkable is that the ban should target Nashe and, even more surprisingly, Harvey. Admittedly, Nashe had been in trouble with a play he co-wrote with Ben Jonson, *Isle of Dogs*, which had put Jonson in prison and Nashe on the run. The play was deemed so seditious and slanderous that it was suppressed with such efficiency that no trace of it remains today. But that had been in 1596. As for Harvey, he had trudged on with his lugubrious and voluminous replies to Nashe on why he does not relish replying to Nashe: they may have been boring,

---

²For example, Dekker churned out pamphlet after pamphlet from 1603 on, when the theatres closed because of the plague, the way Greene had done in the 1580s, and most of them were satirical. His *The Seven Deadly Sinnes of London* of 1606 must have reminded many people of the pageantry King James ordered for the state visit of the King of Denmark in that same year. Nothing happened to Dekker.
but that hardly qualifies his books as seditious or slanderous. Thus, why they were targeted, and, even more drastically, why it was decreed that “none of theire bookes bee ever printed hereafter” is puzzling—unless the bishops held them responsible for creating the general satiric temper of those times.

The ban left ambiguous the criteria by which the books listed for bonfire were chosen. Whether the ban targeted satirical works or pornographic works has been a subject of controversy and debate. Richard McCabe sees all the works on the list as satirical and speculates about the reason for the ban:

By 1599, with the Queen visibly approaching death and the future of the government uncertain, the authorities must have decided that satire had gone far enough. Even when it was not a matter of political innuendo or faction-fighting, the purely generalized comments upon the state of society came too close to the truth for comfort. (192)

To be sure, the 1590s were wracked by war, droughts, and riots, and it must have been easy for satires to find a receptive audience, so we can understand the authorities’ anxiety. But the popular writing had, in the minds of the Bishops, metamorphosed into a multi-layered weapon, containing connotations of political, sexual, and moral subversion, as is evident from the presence of historical and pornographic works in the list of books banned. As Boose observes,

---

3While Richard A. McCabe writes that “the common interpretation of this ban has tended to see it as a specifically clerical attempt to improve public morality by stemming the publication of pornography” (189), Linda E. Boose, reviewing probably the same critical historical material, comes, surprisingly to the exact opposing conclusion: “To date, a single, rather dogmatic tradition has always dominated any discussion of 1599 ban. According to this tradition, the ban was strictly an injunction against satire” (187). See also John Pester (149-50).
The Bishop’s Ban marks an important line in literary representation and speaks of the state’s effort, in the final year of the sixteenth century, to plug the dike against a new kind of literature that the authorities saw inundating England. The two forms of literature put in focus by the ban are sexualized literature and the satiric invective, the two newly emergent forms that had, by June 1, 1599, been so busily cross-breeding as to become frequently indistinguishable from each other. (196)

Thus 1599 denotes another instance of the government’s periodical assertion of its power over popular print. The last time it had officially promulgated restrictions was in 1586, but unofficially, the enormous weight with which it came down on the Marprelate writers and printers in 1588-89 must have manifested its full power to printers and writers alike. Between 1589 and 1599, however, there had obviously been another mushrooming of the kind of writing that was objectionable to the authorities: either the prelates, as clerics as well as members of governing councils, saw the offending books as things subversive of public order and morality, or the Stationers’ Company was concerned about illegal and illegitimate printing and successfully persuaded the authorities to make a peremptory strike at those printers who were printing from unauthorized copies.\(^4\)

Whatever the case, it is reasonable to assume that there was enough illegal printing and subversive writing (each aiding the other) that the Stationers’ Company, to safeguard its members’ interests, and the Bishops, in order to reaffirm the official stance on offensive

\(^4\)Three days after the ban, The Stationers’ Company announced the burning of some of the books listed and staying the destruction of some others (inexplicably, Thomas Cutwode’s Caltha Poetarum, one of the “undoubtedly obscene work[s]” [McCabe 189], among them), and also listed the names of fourteen printers to whom the original ban had been especially delivered – significantly, all of them were unprivileged printers who were likely to print unauthorized copies of accepted material or original editions.
discourse, worked in tandem to put a stop to them.

Thus, the cluster of pamphlets published around 1592 assumes significance in light of the ban. It is not my case that the pamphlets we have studied directly led to the 1599 ban; what *is* arguable is that the spirit and voice shaped by these pamphlets created a self-conscious intellectuality and a commercial awareness in pamphlets that lent themselves to a kind of critical and popular discourse. The pamphlets we have studied are certainly satires in the traditional sense. Almost every satiric convention and theme that Sandra Clark has outlined in *The Elizabethan Pamphleteers* could be seen in these pamphlets. There is allegory, moral exemplum, netherworld dialogue, attacks on usury, status, and authority, moralizing, prodigal stories, satirical narratives, cony-catching episodes, warning exemplum, autobiographical elements, satirical invective, humanist rhetoric, imitations of newsletters, prosopopoeia, religious satire... the list could go on. In this sense, they partake of a tradition of satire in English literary history. But, together, these pamphlets also claim a uniqueness and a pioneer status in one important aspect: their self-consciousness as pamphlets. This self-consciousness manifests itself in two important ways: one, in a complete awareness of their subversion, and, two, in the awareness of their commodity status in the marketplace.

For these writers, writing pamphlets was a way of earning a livelihood as well as railing against those powers that could have kept them out of poverty. Thus, Greene, Nashe, and Riche are using their pamphlets as weapons of subversion, exploiting the satiric edge that Martin had bequeathed to the pamphlet. *Groatsworth* itself is no railing of offending works (see Arber III:677–78).
pamphlet, but in its very form, its shifting voices, and the dramatic end, it is a mournful as well as an angry story of a writer abandoned by his own "father," the patrons. By following, invoking, and using Greene's name and persona, other pamphleteers (except Harvey, of course) also partake of the general subversion of the Greenean pamphlet. Nashe had sharpened his satirical talents before 1592, but it is with Greene's death and Harvey's intervention that Nashe launches into that parabolic trajectory in the 1590s, ending up destitute and dead by the end of the decade, chiefly because of his satirical subversions. Chettle would disappear, literally: he would become a "ghostwriter" for the theater, earning and borrowing what money he could from Philip Henslowe. His one bright literary moment is *Kind Hartes Dreame* with its vigorous protest against authorities for the restrictions on printing and ballads, and this moment is illuminated by his mildness toward Shakespeare—who had been attacked in *Groatsworth*—and his anger toward Harvey, who had attacked Greene. The government servant Barnabe Riche reached for a weapon that would really hurt his enemies, and that reach fetched him into the ambit of Greene and his friends. Never a satirist before or after *Greenes Newes*, Riche's sole satirical outburst against his enemies and authorities is the result of that particular moment of Greene's death in 1592. Thus for Greene, Nashe, Chettle, and Riche, this moment was one of subversive anger.

Standing alone against this subversion is, of course, Harvey. We can argue that, in his own way, Harvey is doing a subversion of his own, against the pamphlet, pamphleteers, and the marketplace. Or we can claim that Harvey, willingly or otherwise, offers himself as the antithesis of the other four pamphleteers' anger. Almost similar in
personal circumstances but set apart by his "presumptions," Harvey had every reason to be as bitter about his own abandonment by his patrons as Greene, Nashe, and Riche were by theirs. But Harvey brings to the debate another argument—that there is a correspondence between what one says and what one is. In his determined marriage between thought and expression, Harvey strikes a strange figure in relation to other pamphleteers, but his continual company with them cheapens his message; finally Nashe would drag him down into obscurity. Thus Harvey's voice of reason and decency subverts and is subverted by the pamphleteers around him.

The other way all these pamphlets are self-conscious is in their status as commodities. *Groatworth* parades its commodity status right in its title and in the way Greene sets up its birth: after his degradations as a romance writer and a playwright, he has turned to pamphlets, of which *Groatworth* is the very last. Harvey, for all his protest against print, needs the wide dissemination that the marketplace assures to exact his revenge on Greene. He would be willing to be a "sheepe in Wolfes printe" and write about French matters on a weekly basis. *Kind Harte Dreame*’s commodity status is revealed in the "hawking" (a commercial activity) that a "kind hart" (tooth puller) performs; also, in its defense of cheap ballads and medical texts, Kind Hart’s invectives indirectly announce themselves as legitimate market wares. Nashe’s *Strange Newes* announces its marketability by imitating a news pamphlet in its title; it is also aware of the anticipation it has generated in the marketplace, and Nashe deliberately plays up to his audience. And finally, *Greenes Newes*, also, imitates a news pamphlet. The very invocation of the name "Greene" by Riche suggests that he knew of its market value.
Thus these pamphlets are all self-consciously commodified.

In the end, the object of this study has not been to explore a phenomenon occurring over a period of time, but to look closely at a particular moment, passed over too soon in literary histories and accounts of the development of English prose satire, to examine in detail the traces and influences of the defining occurrences around it. Thus, Greene's death and the pamphlets that respond to it register the power and potency of the phenomenon called the satiric pamphlet, the social upheaval caused by declining patronage, and rise of the popular voice implicit in the growth of the marketplace and the creation of a public sphere. Greene, Harvey, Chettle, Nashe, and Riche may not have had very many things in common, and their interests and concerns may have been widely different, but they wrote pamphlets and wrote them in some anger. All of them respond to Greene and his death. Harvey disagrees with him violently; Riche is rather cool toward him; Chettle is traumatized by his death; and Nashe is genuinely fond of him. But their pamphlets partake of the satiric vein perfected by Greene, even as they were explicitly written for a commercial purpose. They all sue for a favorable public opinion, whatever their cause may be. In these twin qualities—being self-consciously satiric and commercial—they encapsulate the routes that notions of authorial voice and authorship will take over the next several centuries in England.
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