

CLIFF FORSHAW

“Cease Cease to bawle, thou wasp-stung Satyrist:”¹ Writers, Printers and the Bishops’ Ban of 1599

On 1 June 1599, the authorities for licensing books, Archbishop Whitgift of Canterbury and Bishop Bancroft of London, issued a decree demanding:

That noe Satyres or Epigramms be printed hereafter
 That noe English historyes bee printed excepte they bee allowed by somme of her maiesties privie Counsell
 That noe playes bee printed excepte they bee allowed by such as have auctoritie
 That all NASSHes bookees and Doctor HARVYEs bookees be taken wheresouer they maye be found and that none of theire bookees bee euer printed hereafter²

Fashionable verse satires called in by the Edict included Joseph Hall’s *Virgidemiarum*, John Marston’s *Pigmalians Image* and *The Scourge of Villanie*, Guilpin’s *Skialetheia*, Thomas Middleton’s *Microcynicon*, and Sir John Davies’s *Epigrammes* in a hybrid volume containing Marlowe’s translation of Ovid’s *Amores*.

Also called in were books whose satirical point is not so obvious: Thomas Cutwode’s *Caltha Poetarum* and two prose tracts, “the book againte woemen viz, *of mariage and wyvinge*” and *The xv joyes of mariage*. The Order of Conflagration on 4 June 1599 stayed Hall’s and Cutwode’s books from the fire, but no reason was given. In what seems like an afterthought, the innocuous (and misnamed) *Willobies Adviso* was called in.

The more we examine the documents of 1 and 4 June, the odder they seem: satires are included in a rag-bag of plays, histories, narratives, and polemics; authors' names are omitted; works are misnamed or referred to by subtitle. The ban seems particularly curious given the subsequent failure to implement the clause "That noe Satyres or Epigramms to be printed hereafter." Of the named satires, only Davies's and Middleton's had not been registered; all the rest had previously been approved by the ecclesiastical authorities: both Marston's verse satires, for example, had been approved by the Archbishop of Canterbury's office, just as Nashe's prose work *Lenten Stuffe* had barely six months before the ban on all his books.³

My aim in this paper is twofold: to shed some light on the bishops' anxieties about satire; and to show that the provisions against verse satire were policed very differently than the state's usual acts of censorship. I believe that the bishops' anxieties were largely unfounded, and that when they discovered this to be the case, they—like the Stationers' Company—tended to ignore the ban.⁴ To understand why these anxieties arose in the first place, I will look at the bishops' unusual relationship to satire during the Martin Marprelate controversy. In order to show how the ban was circumvented—and ironically gave a new lease of life to formal verse satire, a mode already showing signs of flagging—I will look briefly at the careers of the verse satirist John Weever and his printer Valentine Simmes, who in different ways both profited from the ban.

Most critics see the Edict as targeting the late 1590s fashion for "byting satyre" and indeed as being the decisive blow to end its short but vigorous boom. O.J. Campbell argued that the ban put an end to activity in verse satire until around 1613, forcing satirists to take up dramatic satire as a substitute.⁵ This is clearly not the case. Of the verse satirists mentioned by name or work, only Marston and Middleton

pursued a career in the theatre. Marston had already bidden farewell to verse satire in *The Scourge of Villanie*,⁶ and had almost certainly started to put the outlines of a Satyrist persona on the stage before the ban in his *Histriomastix, Or the Player Whipt*, probably an Inns of Court production for the Christmas revels of 1598-99.⁷

Campbell's argument fails anyway as satire on the stage was, as we shall see, much more heavily policed and potentially dangerous for its author than verse satire intended, as Marston's and Guilpin's was, for a narrow, sophisticated readership.

Though printed plays were the bishops' jurisdiction, stage censorship was exercised through the Master of the Revels. The theatre's broad appeal to all social classes, including the illiterate, and its facility for rapid response to topical events gave it a potential for subversion far beyond that of verse. Large audiences—up to three thousand per performance—meant plays became subject to closer and more frequent monitoring than print, with Privy Council intervention to suppress any previously authorised play which became politically contentious. It is not surprising that all the major dramatists of the late-Elizabethan and early-Jacobean period, in Margot Heinemann's phrase, “collided directly with the censorship.”⁸ Though Jonson suffered accusations of “libell” and threats of “the starre-chamber and the barre,”⁹ it was stage not page that caused him most frequent and serious trouble, with imprisonment for his part in *The Isle of Dogs* (1597) and *Eastward Ho* (1605).¹⁰ Marston was probably also imprisoned for *Eastward Ho*, while another lost play, likewise targeting James, probably accounts for his imprisonment in Newgate in 1608 by order of the Privy Council.¹¹ After his release, he wrote no more and sold his share in the Children of Blackfriars. It was the Privy Council policing the stage, not the bishops' edict that silenced Marston. Similarly, Middleton's later play *A Game at Chess* (1624) brought him much closer to prison than his banned *Microcynicon*.

Whereas stage satire put its authors at risk, printed verse satires, usually by and intended for gentlemen readers, more acutely jeopardised their publishers and printers. Though the Edict makes plain that “noe Satyres or Epigrammes to be printed hereafter,” of their versifiers only Hall and Davies are mentioned by name, while the titles or English subtitles of their works serve for Marston, Guilpin and Middleton; there is no reference to writers, like Donne, whose satires circulated only in manuscript. Prose satire pamphlets, printed in black letter for a larger and less gentlemanly audience, were clearly a different matter¹²—but, as I hope to show, it is likely that the bishops’ anxieties, based on a misapprehension of the literary strategies of a “Barking Satyrist” such as Marston, led them to confuse the aims of verse satire with those of political polemicists or prose satirists such as Nashe.

Verse satire: the accusation of obscenity, seditious and libel

Why did very different poets—the moral reformer Hall, the alternately flattering and scurrilous epigrammatist Davies, the dark and difficult Marston and his imitator Guilpin—all come to be included in a ban whose main thrust seemed to be the censoring of “English historyes” and “playes” by “her maiesties priuie Counsell” and “suche as have authorytie”? Some critics have argued that the verse satires were targeted on the grounds of obscenity. Of the books named, John Peter found “at least seven, and perhaps nine, could be called indecent,” seeing the ban as “perhaps an act of literary criticism” against “wanton work;” “if it was not so much Satire itself that the bishops were opposing but pornography and obscenity, then in practice their ban was quite adequate.”¹³ More recently, Bruce R. Smith, exploring the use of homosexual imagery in Marston, Guilpin and Middleton, suggested that the bishops “knew how easily scourges could be seduced by their sexual subjects and how easily

scourges could turn into scourges of moral authority.”¹⁴ Similarly, Lynda Booze claims that the bishops were concerned with satires which dangerously depicted “the pornographic pleasures of Aretino.”¹⁵ Though these critics rightly draw our attention to the “Aretinian” inheritance of sexual imagery in Marston, Guilpin and Middleton, this does not mean that the bishops banned them for these reasons, any more than they thought “Englishe historyes” or Harvey’s pamphlets likely to corrupt sexual morals. It also raises the question why one of the works Peter finds “to some degree obscene,”¹⁶ *Caltha Poetarum*—“the most fantastically erotic vision of Elizabethan court politics” as Hannah Betts has called it¹⁷—was not burned, or why most of the satires had been authorised in the first place.

Richard McCabe, noting that “the presence on the bishops’ list of *Caltha Poetarum*, of *Marriage and Wiving* and *The xv Joyes of Marriage* has lent credence to the notion that its target was obscenity,”¹⁸ has pointed out that these works make much more dangerous political points and has convincingly demonstrated that the bishops’ concerns were not obscenity, but sedition. “As *Caltha Poetarum* is the most overtly salacious work on the list, its ‘staying’ clarifies the nature of the bishops’ priorities. It would be indeed ironic if the work were spared primarily on the grounds that it was judged to be merely obscene rather than libellous or seditious.”¹⁹ McCabe’s argument here is essentially an amplification of his original position that the primary target of the ban

was neither eroticism nor lewdness but satire itself. This would seem to be the only explanation for the particular choice of works which was made, for of the nine titles mentioned the first five are all formal verse satires, two are anti-feminist works, and one involves satiric epigrams; the satiric nature of the Harvey / Nashe conflict needs no comment. Satire, therefore, was the overriding concern and the new formal satires head the list.²⁰

Though McCabe is clearly right about the political nature of the ban, those familiar with Marston's work might still be puzzled why the bishops regarded his verse satires as particularly politically contentious. As his most reliable commentators indicate, Marston's main targets, and to a lesser extent Guilpin's, are stock types such as foolish young gallants and his literary competitors.²¹ Marston attacks his satirical forebear Hall, amorist sonneteers such as Barnabe Barnes, both lascivious and moralising Ovidians (often combined in the Chapman of *Ovids Banquet of Sence*), two-faced epigrammatists and flattering "Chameleons" such as Sir John Davies. Importantly, he rails against fashionable malcontents, "bifronted" hypocrites, social climbers, papists and other idolaters. He also, through the persona of the hypocritical malcontent Kinsayder, the satires' putative author, mocks "Satyre" itself. In essence, Marston supports the *status quo* and identifies the establishment's enemies—malcontents, social opportunists, Catholics and sexual deviants—as his own.

The distinction between Marston and his persona has often escaped his critics. Marston uses Kinsayder in much the same way some later writers have used obnoxious protagonists both to entertain and instruct. (The tradition has continued in British television satire through Johnny Speight's Alf Garnett, Steve Coogan's Alan Partridge and Ricky Gervais's David Brent.) Marston's use of the Satyrist figure is more clearly seen in his theatrical work. His first play *Histriomastix* mocks Chrisogonus, putting speeches into his mouth which "sound like quotations from [Marston's Kinsayder satire] *The Scourge*."²² The play, written for the Inns of Court where Marston's father was a well-respected Reader, is ultimately a celebration of the conservative virtues of the establishment. In *What You Will* (1601?), the Satyrist-type is an "Idolater," a "Don Kynsayder," a "Canker eaten rusty curre" whose hate, malice and "Envie" will traduce him "unto publicke scorne;" a "skrubbing railer" cursed by

“*Antypathy*” who “Skoules at the fortune of the fairer *Merit*.²³ Throughout the plays Marston mocks satirical bombast and identifies the Satyrist with envious malcontent outsiders who lack social status and sexual success.

It is easier to understand how Hall, Davies, or even Marston’s imitator Guilpin, could be seen as potentially seditious than the essentially conservative Marston. Hall, like Marston, theorises about the nature of the “true and naturall Satyre” but, unlike him, clearly and openly attacks social abuses such as enclosures despite knowing the danger of even an “vnpartiall mention of so many vices.” Seeing satire as moral hygiene, Hall frets about accusations of libel: “Art thou guiltie? Complaine not, thou art not wronged; art thou guiltless complaine not, thou art not touched.” Worried about whether his first satire overly resembled “the soure and crabbed face of Iuvenals,” Hall, “in the expectation of a quarrell,” omitted matter “in the rest, that so I might stoppe the mouth of every accuser.”²⁴

Davies is a very different writer; his “Chameleon Muse” inspired him to court powerful figures publicly while scurrilously mocking them in privately circulated epigrams.²⁵ Expelled from the Inns of Court in disgrace over a violent incident in 1597, he published his philosophical poem *Nosce Te ipsum* (registered in April 1599) as part of an earnest moral rehabilitation. Through the aid of powerful friends like Egerton and Cecil, Davies was restored to the Inns; he became a Member of Parliament and, after a knighthood in 1603, eventually Attorney-General for Ireland in 1606. However, in 1594 Davies had privately mocked the marriage of Richard Fletcher, then Bishop of London, and, between 1598 and 1599, that of the Attorney General, Edward Coke; ironically, Coke had also been sent *Nosce Te ipsum* with a flattering verse dedication.²⁶ Though his most scabrous poems libelling the powerful were intended only for private circulation, Davies’s activities were well known, at

least within the Inns of Court, and there are many allusions to his chameleon hypocrisy in Marston's and Guilpin's satires as well as epigrams by others jockeying for position within the Inns.²⁷ This flyting in Jonson's "Noblest Nourceries of Humanity, and Liberty, in the Kingdome: the Innes of Court"²⁸ may have been part of why Marston's and Guilpin's student satires ended up on the bishops' list. Finkelpearl points out that

political connotations lurk in Jonson's phrase. It was not only in a legalistic sense that the members of the Inns felt themselves to be living in a 'liberty', a legal sanctuary. The triumph of the common law had thrust the lawyers into a unique and powerful position.... 'Liberty' suggests revelry, rebellion, uninhibited satire, relaxed playfulness, libertine wantonness, licensed fooling, and political freedom.²⁹

It is unlikely the bishops investigated the Inns satires thoroughly; they probably decided to err on the side of caution and have the whole lot banned anyway. Their uninformed view of literature may be indicated by the unfocused nature of the list; we can draw a useful inference from Cyndia Clegg's suggestion that the calling in of *Willobie His Aviso* may relate "more to the association between the title and the name of Essex's friend Lord Willoughby than to its innocuous contents."³⁰ Both Guilpin and Marston satirise corrupt lawyers and hypocritical Inn members: often, given the context of their flyting, the target appears to be Davies, disguised as Matho or Metius.³¹ Possibly the bishops suspected attacks on more powerful figures or the law itself. Marston has Kinsayder complain:

I shall be much, much, injuried by two sorts of readers: the one being ignorant, not knowing the nature of a Satyre, (which is under fained private names, to note generall vices,) will needes wrest each fayned name to a private unfained person. The other too subtile, bearing a private malice to some greyster personage then hee dare in his owne person seeme to maligne, will strive by a forced application of my generall reproofes to broach his private hatred.³²

This ironically echoes Davies's claimed abhorrence of “privat Taxing” and his pretence to describe “under a particular name / A generall vice that merits publique blame.”³³ Guilpin, in epigrams published with *Skialetheia* but probably written earlier when he was struggling under the influence of Davies, seems to mock a few disguised public figures; nonetheless, I find little evidence of Marston attacking the great and the good, nor of his intention to bring the law itself into disrepute. Marston targets stock figures and literary reputations for a good reason: his only fully drawn character, and the main butt of the whole complicated performance, is the Satyrist himself. Kinsayder’s sudden metamorphosis, from Ovidian to snarling Satyrist, mirrors his chameleon cast who are all “the same, they seeme in outward show.”³⁴ We may discern Marston’s peers among his targets, but all are ultimately insubstantial reflections of Kinsayder himself:

These are no men, but *Apparitions*,
Ignes fatui, *Glowormes*, *Fictions*,
Meteors, *Ratts of Nilus*, *Fantasies*,
Colosses, *Pictures*, *Shades*, *Resemblances*.³⁵

Marston’s dark allusive method, and his sophisticated use of a persona whose malcontent outcries are in fact the butt of the joke, however, would have made it easy for the bishops to assume offence against great ones, or the establishment itself, where none was intended—or had even previously been assumed by its censors. The personification of vices invites conjectural readings which are particularly susceptible to political change. But, as Cyndia Clegg indicates, “until circumstances arose that provided analogies between satires and some private hatred, these readings were not in themselves offensive.”³⁶ Clegg refers to Guilpin’s epigrams on the lawyers Metius and Matho and the “great Foelix” as examples of inviting “busie conjectures” as to the important personages they represent.³⁷ McCabe, though he agrees that Foelix was

traditionally “associated with the Earl of Essex,” refutes Clegg’s claim that Whitgift “seems to have extended his own authority according to the bonds to friendship” to suppress material hostile to Essex: Essex was “a symptom rather than a cause of the general malaise, and the ultimate object of satire was the crown, as the repeated attempts to suppress seditious rumours and libels demonstrate.”³⁸ McCabe makes the important point that “readers were manipulated into making identifications by direct appeals to their own experience.... Thus Middleton can ask ‘Who knows not Zodon?’”³⁹ Most Inns student satires, however, seem to have been written largely for their resident peers; in many, for example, Matho is usually associated with no greater worthy than John Davies.⁴⁰ This chameleon is a recurrent target of Marston’s, who acknowledges Davies’s metamorphic nature by allowing him to shape-shift through various classical names: Matho, Ruscus, Lucus, Curio. The point is that, in the Inns, everyone knew a Matho, a Ruscus, or a Zodon, much as they would know a malcontent, a melancholic, a brothel boaster, an ingle, an amorist sonneteer, or a gull; and that they might very likely be the same changeable fashionable youth; even the reader himself, as reflected in Marston’s satirical mirror.

Though obscenity itself was by no means the subject of the ban, the tendency for essentially political satires like *Caltha Poetarum* to cloak themselves in erotic imagery may have alerted the bishops to the possibility that “Aretinians” such as Marston and Guilpin were smuggling seditious under the guise of sex. Aretino himself, *il flagello divino*, had combined a career as a pornographer with that of a feared political satirist who could make even kings quake.⁴¹ The tradition, of course, goes back to classical satirists such as Juvenal and Martial, and here one sees the bishops’ point as Davies, “the English Martiall” as Guilpin called him,⁴² like his classical master combined flattery with libellous scurrility. In claiming that they based

their satires closely on classical models, the new breed of formal satirists invited readers to discover hidden meanings in their dark texts. Hall, the self-styled “first English Satyrist,”⁴³ was a good deal plainer; but though there is no obscene patina to his work, its very clarity reveals its readiness for political engagement—who was to say that Marston’s difficult allusive verse was not similarly engaged?

Marston’s place on the bishops’ list may also stem from the association of his “Aretinian” style with Nashe. The “true English Aretine,” as Lodge called him, claimed “of all stiles I most affect & strive to imitate *Aretines*.⁴⁴ Marston’s quarrel with Hall (Harvey’s ally against Nashe) was also reminiscent of the Nashe-Harvey flyting which, as we shall see, the bishops had good reason to forget. Flyting publicised the new satirists and promised them an audience beyond the Inns and universities. If, as the bishops suspected, this satire was dangerous, then it would be more so if it broke bounds into greater “liberties” than the Inns. *The Parnassus Plays*, a Cambridge University revue, has Kinsayder threatening to leave off his “Ram-ally meditations” and bring “The great battering ram of tearms to towne” to batter “the walls of the old fustie world.”⁴⁵ That this was probably produced for Christmas 1601, implies the bishops had been unable to do much about it; by 1600, for example, seventeen brief moralising extracts from the satires—most proverbial wisdom taken out of context—were attributed to Marston (and not Kinsayder) in Robert Allott’s *Englands Parnassus*.⁴⁶ The bishops may have done better to consider Francis Meres’s opinion that “the dissension of Poets among themselues” served an end: “that they less infect their readers. And for this purpose our Satyrists, *Hall, the Author of Pigmalions Image, and certaine Satyres, Rankins*, and such others are very profitable.”⁴⁷ The bishops, however, as we shall now see, had themselves sown some of the seeds of that dissension.

The Bishops, Nashe and the Marprelate controversy

Generally books not writers were the subject of the ban; however, the prohibition against “all NASHe’s booke and Doctor HARVEYes booke... wheresouer they maye be found” implies writers banned for a shared reason. The two had little in common but their feud was part of the literary patrimony of both the Marprelate pamphlet war and the coterie squabbles of the 1580’s.⁴⁸ Writers such as Greene, Lylly, Nashe and Harvey were, to varying degrees, partisans in both areas, and, in the case of the Martinist controversy, had sometimes been employed as propagandists by the same ecclesiastical authorities which were to turn against satirists in 1599, by which time the quarrel between Nashe and Harvey had long gone cold. Nashe seems to have had the last say, at least in regard to Harvey, with *Have With You To Saffron Walden* in 1596, though that work’s humorous dedication to Richard Lichfield, barber to Trinity College, Cambridge, sparked off another quarrel. Lichfield’s violent reply *The Trimming of Thomas Nashe*, (registered October 1597), appears to bring the protracted matter to an end. Lichfield gloats, knowing that, by July, Nashe had already fallen foul of the authorities over his involvement in the satirical comedy *The Ile of Dogges*,⁴⁹ condemned by the authorities as a “lewd plaie” containing “seditious and sclanderous matter.”⁵⁰ Nashe claimed that “hauing begun but the induction and the first act of it, the other foure acts without my consent, or the least guesse of my drift or scope, by the players were supplied, which bred both their trouble and mine to.”⁵¹ This may have been an exercise in damage limitation. In *Lenten Stiffe* (1599) he writes of:

That infortunate imperfit Embrion of my idle hours, the Ile of Dogs ... and the tempestes that arose at his birth so astonishing outragious and violent as if my braine had bene conceiued of another Hercules, I was so terrifyed with my owne

encrease (like a woman long traualing to bee deliuered of a monstre) that it was no sooner borne but I was glad to run from it.⁵²

Run he did. Nashe escaped London for Great Yarmouth where he remained for well over a year. On 28 July 1597, the theatres were closed by the Privy Council; according to Philip Henslowe specifically occasioned “by the means of the playing the Jellye of dooges.”⁵³ On 15 August, the Council commissioned Richard Topcliffe, the notorious hunter and torturer of recusants, to investigate and apprehend those responsible “to receave soche punyshment as their Lewde and mutynous behaviour doth deserve.”⁵⁴ Two of the principal players were arrested, along with Ben Jonson, who was charged as “not only an Actor, but a maker of parte of the said Plaie.”

Whether Jonson was Nashe’s collaborator or was brought in to finish a topical piece that Nashe abandoned as too risky we do not know. The play has not survived. We can only guess at what it contained. We do know, however, that the Isle of Dogs was regarded as an unsavoury lawless place where both fugitives and sewage washed up. Nashe had already used the cloacal location metaphorically against Harvey: “in the full tide of his standish, he will carry your occupations out of towne before him, besmeare them, drowne them: down the riuier they goe Privily to the Ile of Dogges with his Pamphlets.”⁵⁵ The Isle’s situation opposite the royal palace at Greenwich may have prompted dangerous satirical analogies with the court; allusions to Nashe’s “voyage” to the “Ile of Dogges, / There where the blattant beast doth rule and raigne” in *The Returne from Parnassus* seem to confirm this. Nashe’s pen is a “sharper quill of porcupine” with “engoared venom” for his ink, which leaves “our feared Lordings crying villany.”⁵⁶ The *Parnassus Plays* also present Nashe as a stylistic precursor to Marston.⁵⁷ If the bishops knew Nashe to be politically dangerous, they had reason to suspect his rhetorical imitators, even if they wrote in another genre and for another audience.

The Privy Council suppressed the play with a vigour similar to that directed against religious dissenters, either puritan, such as the Martinists, or producers of papist tracts. This contrasts starkly with the apparent implementation of the bishops' ban. Whatever it was that caused them to act against verse satire was evidently not slanderous or seditious enough to concern the Privy Council. The bishops, however, may have been attempting a pre-emptive strike, however ill-judged, to avoid the sort of embarrassment Martin Marprelate had caused a decade and more before. The roles Whitgift and Bancroft had played in that controversy, and the involvement, on opposite sides, of Nashe and at least one of the printers warned by the bishops, Valentine Simmes, cast a curious light over the Edict.

As Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, John Whitgift had already established a reputation as a staunch enemy of Puritanism and published a series of establishmentarian tracts, involving himself in a pamphlet war with, among others, the puritan Cartwright. Ironically, these ecclesiastical polemics seem to share certain characteristics with the Nashe-Harvey flying, which itself foreshadowed the skirmishes between verse satirists such as Hall and Marston. Succeeding the tolerant Grindal as Archbishop of Canterbury in 1583, Whitgift set out his Six Articles, which demanded religious conformity, and suspended around two hundred ministers. His war on puritans continued through the operations of the feared Court of High Commission, which Burghley in 1584 likened to a new inquisition.⁵⁸ In this, as in the Edict of 1599, Whitgift was aided by the able Richard Bancroft, then Canon of Westminster. In 1589, Bancroft hit upon a novel strategy to "stop Martin & his Fellow's mouths: *viz:* to have them answered after their own vein in writing."⁵⁹ Wits such as Lylly, Greene and Nashe were commissioned to "combat these Pamphleteers at their own Weapon. They were attack'd in this Manner by one *Tom Nash* in his

Pasquil and *Marforio*.... This *Nash* had a genius for Satyr, a lively Turn, and Spirit for the Encounter.”⁶⁰

Anti-Martinist plays immediately proved popular. Too popular: the bishops soon found them unseemly and, in November 1589, the Privy Council expressed displeasure at entertainments in which “the players take uppon them to handle in their plaies certen matters of Divinitye and of State unfit to be suffred.”⁶¹ A committee was set up to monitor plays and censor scripts. Whitgift and Bancroft clearly had little control over essentially comic ensemble productions staged by troupes with a greater gift for farce than ecclesiastical polemic; one imagines both bishops and Martinists were portrayed in little more than Punch and Judy terms. At any rate, neither these shows nor popular rhymed broadsides did anything to stop the Martinists, but drew a larger audience into the controversy. Farce and doggerel could in no way be said to answer the Martinists “after their own vein,” and this was where the Wits were employed. The bishops’ strategy was risky: they seem to have little pondered the essential anti-authoritarian nature of satire; in their hands it proved to be a treacherous weapon.

A *Countercuffe given to Martin Iunior* by “Pasquill of England, Cavaliero” initiated a series of pamphlets turning the Marprelate style against its originator.⁶² Though we do not know if this or subsequent Pasquil pamphlets are Nashe’s work entire or in part, there seems little doubt that he had some hand in writing anti-Martinist tracts. Alone among the Wits, Nashe catches something of Martin’s comic tone and stylistic élan. Echoing his strategies, Nashe seems, despite his evident distaste for Puritanism, to admire Marprelate’s skill and sheer cheek. To some extent, Martin becomes a role-model for Nashe’s satire; even long after the last of his pamphlets something of Marprelate lived on to remind and discomfort the bishops

about their ill-judged attempt to answer satire in its own vein. It seems likely the bishops prayed for the opportunity to consign him and all his perverse progeny to eternal oblivion.

One other curious strand binds Whitgift to “his Nashe gentleman.”⁶³ In 1592, the satirist, staying at the Archbishop’s palace in Croydon, wrote an entertainment for his host, *Summers Last Will and Testament*. The work, however, did not appear in print until 1600 when, despite the previous year’s ban on all Nashe’s works, it was officially entered in the Stationers’ Register on 28 October. This, along with many other banned books openly published after the prohibition, raises important questions about Elizabethan censorship and the role of the Stationers’ Company in policing the book trade.

The Stationers’ Company: censorship and commercial protectionism

The Stationers’ Company protected the interests of publishers and printers and acted as a regulatory body. Ordinances of 1554 and 1562 had strengthened the Company’s power and demanded that all new books be licensed by its Wardens. Though “theoretically approval was quite independent of any ecclesiastical or civil authorisation... in order to protect themselves, the wardens often insisted that an entry could only be made if such outside authority were obtained.”⁶⁴ However, at least a third of books known to be printed in the latter part of the sixteenth century were not entered in the Register and, though there is no satisfactory explanation for it, only a very small proportion of these omissions was punished.⁶⁵ Under these arrangements some printers were “privileged” with the right to print lucrative texts; others were marginalised. Clearly, regulation was not as well-policed as the ecclesiastical authorities would have wished. It failed to stop the secret printing and distribution of

the Marprelate tracts, for example, or to prevent sales of unauthorised editions of the Psalms. Much of the prohibited material was of a religious nature; Marprelate may be seen as providing a link between the sermonising tradition of scolding abuses and that of contentious literary satire.

If the Government could be harsh, the Company was paternalistic and often indulgent: allowing Roger Ward, for example, the right to print privileged books, including a money-spinner such as the *Grammar*, despite three separate attempts to destroy his printing materials. Valentine Simmes, also convicted of printing a privileged book, was punished by the mere melting down of the type used for the offending volume. Perhaps to soften the blow, in 1596 Simmes was given the right to print works privileged to his former master, Bynneman.⁶⁶ Attitudes towards infringement seem to have varied greatly, depending on the ordinance and the authority concerned—Privy Council, ecclesiastical servants of the state or the Stationers' Company itself. The Company's relatively lenient punishments for printing “privileged” books implies that publishers' texts were regarded as fair game: a little poaching was to be expected. Widespread infringement implies a good chance of escaping penalties or that fines were lenient enough to be regarded as business costs. The Company may have been indulgent, but the Government certainly was not. The case of Valentine Simmes, who printed work by Shakespeare, Drayton and Breton among others, is illustrative.

In July 1589, Simmes, along with another printer Arthur Tomlyn, was hired by John Hodgkins for work on “the second Marprelate press.” They printed *Theses Martiniae* (STC 17457) and *The Just Censure and Reproof* (STC 17458) near Coventry and then moved their portable press to near Manchester where they were arrested in the process of printing a third pamphlet. The three conspirators were

examined by the Earl of Derby and the Privy Council. Simmes was kept prisoner until at least 10 December and tortured on the rack. In his statement, which sets much of the tone of his later career, he claimed Hodgkins had originally hired him to print accidents, which were privileged, in return for £20 per annum, with meat and drink. Despite this, the first books bearing Simmes's imprint appeared in 1594. The following year he was in trouble with the Stationers' Company for printing the *Grammar and Accidence*, privileged to Francis Fowler. The Register for 15 July notes that his press was carried into the hall in punishment and "there remayne in the hall certen leaves of th[e] accidence amounting to about xx Reames which were siesed in th[e h]andes of valentyne Symmes."⁶⁷ The account in the Court Book for 27 September mentions "certen formes of letters and other printinge stufte... moulten according to the said decree and soe with the rest of the said printinge stufte Redelivered vnto the said Valentyne."⁶⁸ In 1598, there was a small fine for "printing a thing disorderly"⁶⁹ and in 1599 he was one of fourteen printers specifically warned by the Company on receipt of the bishops' ban. Despite this, that year he printed (or already had printed before June) *Nashe's Lenten Stufte*, though it was not entered in the Register until 11 January 1601: in six months even the Stationers' Company seems to have forgotten the ban. On 3 August 1601, Simmes was fined 3^s 4^d for "prynting A *proclamation* formerly printed for the Crowne office which he hath nowe this tyme printed without Allowance or entrance."⁷⁰ There were more fines for disorderly printing or breaking order. Eventually, in James's reign, he was sent to prison again. It is worth noting that the offending material was religious: "Valentine Symmes who now was taken printing seditious books, has done the like seven times before this; first he printed the things of Martin Marprelate, after he has been meddling in Popish books, he by forebearing has become worse."⁷¹ The Stationers'

Company, however, continued to look after its own: Simmes's name appears in the Company Poor Book, first on Good Friday 1608, when he received five shillings, and then for the rest of his life.

Faunus and Melliflora

The Edict did have one very odd and unintended effect. Without it one of the most fascinating satirical productions, John Weever's *Faunus and Melliflora* printed by Simmes in 1600, would have certainly been a much duller affair. Like Marston's *The Metamorphosis of Pigmalion's Image*, Weever's volume is a curious hybrid. It begins as an erotic poem echoing *Hero and Leander*. This epyllion, after a thousand or so lines, surprisingly metamorphoses into a comic aetiology of the origin of "Satyre" and its journey to London from Italy.⁷² The pseudo-Ovidian narrative appears to close with pointed references to Marston, "the *Rhamnusion* Scourge of Villanie." There are then, unexpectedly, translations from satires by Horace, Persius and, abruptly ending after only ten lines, "The first Satyr of Iuvenall." There is a promise that "Iuvenall, Horace, and *Persius shall hereafter all be translated*" and the moral aetiology is suddenly resumed, bringing us to contemporary London and the bishops' bonfire.⁷³ Slyly, Weever has Venus denounce the "Satyres:" they write only out of envy and lust; they might have their place in Italy, but in England all is well, or was before they brought their spite. It seems Weever has invented a new genre, the anti-Satyre satire, but Marston had already ironically satirised the Satyre vogue, for those who knew how to read him. Pretending to condemn satire, Weever settles scores with several of its practitioners, most notably Marston, whose Kinsayder he parodies. He mocks the bishops and their fire under the guise of praising them as Venus's saints. The implication is clear: they have hypocritically condemned satire on the grounds of

lewdness because they are lustfully envious of Venus. The book ends with “A Prophesie of this present yeare, 1600” which pushes the attack on “Satyres” and “quipping Epigrammatists” still further. The verse is now totally Kinsayderian.⁷⁴

The book’s odd mix of styles and genres may hint at the hybridity of classical *satura*.⁷⁵ Weever’s modern editor Davenport, however, believes that the abrupt transitions from erotic narrative to mythography and satire betray Weever’s confusion about his own aims, rather than any desire to emulate Marston’s *Pigmalion*.

Davenport sees *Faunus* as a clumsy attempt “to evade the ban by cobbling together” “two unfinished works:” “one an erotic poem very nearly completed, and the other a collection of fragments towards a book of satires translated and original.”⁷⁶ He regards the passage “accusing the licensing prelates of secret prurience” as “a young writer’s jibe at the prudery of the Authorities:” “an indiscreet burst of resentment against them for spoiling his literary plans” to “be taken as a mild piece of bravado.”⁷⁷ Weever’s Venus thrusts “herself in baudy elegies,” “Polluting with her damned luxury, / All eares which vow’d were unto chastity,” while “Some of her Saints”

Vnto her shrine their orizons did say:
Which fore she askt, this boone to her was giuing,
That all the Satyres then in England liuing
Should sacrificide be in the burning fire,
To pacifie so great a goddesse ire.⁷⁸

Keach finds Weever’s allusion to book-burning too audacious for him, or Simmes, named on the title page, to have published the poem officially; having goaded the authorities in such a manner, it would have been futile to evade the ban as Davenport suggests, merely “by cobbling together” the erotic with the satirical.⁷⁹ Keach sees Simmes’s failure to register the book as an attempt to publish a small number inconspicuously without attracting the attention of the authorities. This seems most unlikely: Simmes probably needed money badly and Weever was a relentless self-

publicist; both printer and poet would clearly have liked to sell as many copies as possible. In any event, satirising the bishops' book-burning hardly seems a good strategy for a book intended to be "inconspicuous."

Honigmann draws on W.Craig Ferguson's monograph of Simmes to demonstrate the printer's importance to Weever's early career.⁸⁰ Simmes had already printed the *Epigrammes* (dedicated to Sir Richard Hoghton who was only knighted in June 1599) thereby breaking the order that "no satires or epigrammes to be printed hereafter." He also took the risk of printing satirical works by Nicholas Breton (*Pasquils mad-cap and his message; Pasquil passe, and passeth not*, both 1600—*Pasquil*, that creation of the anti-Martinists comes back to haunt the bishops) and Tourneur's *The Transformed Metamorphosis*. According to Honigmann, the reason he took these risks was simple: Ferguson shows a dramatic fall in the amount of typesetting done in Simmes's shop in the years 1597-1602. He had to take what work he could, even risking fines or imprisonment. Honigmann believes the 1599 ban affected Weever far more seriously than was proposed by Davenport: that in the autumn and winter of that year he had four books in progress, including the *Epigrammes*, that might not see the light of day. Simmes, short of work, risked printing the *Epigrammes*. A little later, he offered to print another book:

The printer was in a hurry, the struggling young poet realised that it was a case of now or never – therefore he broke off (or rewrote) the ending of the poem 'Faunus and Melliflora', so as to give himself a half-excuse for tagging on his translations from Horace, Persius, and other satirical odds and ends. It made up another book, though not one that Weever had planned to write.⁸¹

Weever's hybrid may remind us of the volume which mated Davies's *Epigrammes* with Marlowe's translation of the *Amores*. Like "the English Martiall," Weever's formal versatility is mirrored by a facility for the favourable attitude which culminates in turning epigrams to self-serving ends—there is as much flattery in both their

dedicatory epigrams as there is satire in the remainder. The *Epigrammes'* praise of established contemporaries brings McKerrow to note that “with the exception of the *Palladis Tamia* of Francis Meres, there is, I think, no single work of so early a date which contains references by name to so many Elizabethan writers of the first rank.”⁸² *Faunus* is dedicated to Edward Stanley, grandson to the third Earl of Derby (who had interrogated Simmes over his part in printing Martinist tracts): an unlikely recipient for a clandestine book. Weever’s strategies to get himself noticed bore rapid fruit. *England’s Parnassus* (1600), compiled by Allot, another recipient of flattering verses by Weever, already contained thirteen extracts from *Faunus*—approaching Marston’s seventeen. A flattering epigram by Weever (iv. 4) connects Allot with Middleton (as can be seen from another, less flattering, epigram mating Marston and Jonson, Weever liked to kill two birds with one stone). In 1600, Allot and Weever contributed complimentary verses to Middleton’s *The Legend of Humphrey Duke of Gloucester*. Neither the *Epigrammes* nor *Faunus* can be regarded as “inconspicuous” samizdat productions; both were clearly openly available and legitimised by the literary establishment, without a word of complaint from the bishops.

Weever’s anti-Satyre satire sparked off a new fashion. In *A Whipping of the Satyre*, authorised in 1601, he attacked the Satyrist, the Epigrammatist, and Jonson, the Humorist, just as Jonson had himself attacked similar satirical types. Though published anonymously by John Flasket, there is ample evidence for Weever’s authorship, and Flasket evidently thought it safe to put his name to the title. Weever was answered by *No Whippinge, nor Trippinge; but a kinde friendly Snippinge*, attributed to Breton, in which the poet ironically asks all Satyrists to desist and return to religious themes: satire was clearly still flourishing in the years immediately following the ban. Breton stirred the controversy further, in the guise of Pasquil, an

insolent, all-hating malcontent prone to fits of madness. Both books were printed by Simmes, though, should they have read them, the combination of religion, Pasquil and printer must have uncomfortably reminded the bishops of the Marprelate affair. The Edict was obviously no deterrent: the first part of *Pasquils Mad-cap* was registered on 20 March 1600 and the second part on 10 May. Some of Kinsayder's spirit also lived on in an attack on Weever: an anti-anti-Satyre satire, *The Whipper of the Satyre his penance in a White Sheete; or the Beadles Confutation*. This spirited defence of the “Barking Satyrist” was published anonymously like the other Whipper pamphlets, but it is almost certainly by Guilpin.

We have returned to flying. Marston's and Jonson's *Poetomachia* though conducted on the stage still fed the printers: as Clegg observes “satiric drama dominated the London stage—and printed versions of the same were “sufficiently authorized. After the death of Elizabeth (and Whitgift), epigrams regularly appeared in the Register as well as numerous satiric pamphlets.”⁸³ Satirical works published just after the ban include John Lane's *Tom Tel-Troth's Message* (1600) and, again using the Ovidian erotic narrative to cloak an allegory directed at the court, Beaumont's *Salmacis and Hermaphroditus*. Two satires by Samuel Rowlands, *The letting of Humors blood in the Head-vaine* and *A mery meting or tis mery when knaves mete*, were authorised in 1601, only to be burned by a Stationers' Court order a few days later along with “other Popishe books & things that were lately taken.” This implies offence through religious association. Nonetheless, as Greg notes: “Apparently the burning of this book was a sufficient advertisement to make it worth reprinting, for on 4 Mar. 1601 and again on 1 Mar. 1602 Stationers were fined 2^s 6^d a piece” “for their disorders in buying of the books of humours letting blood in the

vayne being new printed after yt was first forbydden and burnt.”⁸⁴ The bishops’ ban appears an irrelevance; real censorship was accomplished by other means.

Despite their algolagnic flavour, later satires seem less politically contentious. Richard Middleton’s *Epigrams and Satyres* (1608) approaches the Kinsayderian tone, spicing prurience with indignation; John Taylor’s *The Sculler* (1612) likewise echoes Marston and Guilpin; Thomas Dekker in *The Guls Horne-Booke* (1609) assures us that the public is still eager for both satires and smut.⁸⁵ After this second wind, verse satire begins to flag. Works such as *The Scourge of Folly* (1611) by John Davies of Hereford often lash out only in their titles. Peter thinks this was probably a reaction to disapproval in high places rather like that which followed the censorship of 1599. Wither’s *Abuses Stript and Whipt* is a garrulous and tepid affair but it contained some uncomplimentary references to kings which were evidently resented, for the book landed him in the Marshalsea.⁸⁶

We need not take Peter’s reference to censorship too seriously. Wither was briefly imprisoned for the first edition of *Abuses* (1613) but in a reversal of official attitudes which reminds one of the Order of Conflagration’s second thoughts on Hall and Cutwode, the book was allowed to run through eight further editions in the next four years. Wither became a *succès de scandale*: as Crispinella says in Marston’s play *The Dutch Courtesan*: “those books that are call’d in, are most in sale and request.”⁸⁷

Though Wither’s satire is general and “engages less in satiric invective than in moralizing on human passions and weaknesses,”⁸⁸ there is a tradition that he was sent to “Jayle for scandalling some Peeres.”⁸⁹ A list of abuses drawn up for the attention of the Star Chamber in 1600 by Lord Keeper Egerton ends with “masterless men and other companions that make profession to live by theyre sword and by theyre wit, to discourses and meddlers in Princes matters, and lastly to libellers.”⁹⁰ A

“PROCLAMATION against Libellers of the Queen and RUMOURS which stir discontent”(5 April 1601) indicates where the Government’s real anxieties lay.

To some degree, satire had returned to the genre of Complaint; or at least that was the view tacitly encouraged by the authorities. “Paper crimes” seem to have been regarded leniently, furnishing circumstantial evidence of sedition perhaps, but little more. It was not until the mid-seventeenth century that the definition of treason was extended to cover printed works. On the whole the authorities seem to have been satisfied with the licensing system as administered by the Stationers’ Company, and had little desire to draw attention to works that had slipped through the net. Marprelate’s real offence was his existence, not his pamphlets. He had also, incidentally, demonstrated the relative facility with which one could operate a press outside Stationers’ Company control. In later years, both Government and Company would realise that control by inclusion rather than exclusion was more effective. This implies a necessary degree of tolerance.

Which leaves us with the curious Edict and the bishops themselves. They owed their power to the Star Chamber decree of 1586. When the ruler of a country is also head of the established church then the religious is political. The Government’s interest in controlling the press was focused on stamping out sedition. The brutal treatment meted out to the Martinist conspirators and the distributors of papist tracts stands in stark contrast to the Government’s attitude to literary satire. Religious, particularly Catholic, agitators were by definition traitors to the Crown and possibly in league with Spain to boot. Mere literature, on the other hand, even the most biting satire, changed nothing, particularly the verse satire of Guilpin and Marston which was mainly aimed at literature itself and its rival practitioners. Originally the Government had naturally chosen ecclesiastical dignitaries to head its apparatus. Or

perhaps it would be more correct to note that it was Whitgift and Bancroft who had actively sought the role of censors. Political aims were disguised by moral concerns; the bishops could be relied upon to come down on unsuitable religious tracts. They, however, never quite realised that they were figureheads with power only in so much as their aims coincided with the state's. By the end of the 1590s things had moved on; the bishops were already fighting a rearguard action against Puritanism, which no longer threatening any interest but their own could not be used to mobilise Government power on their behalf. In a futile attempt to demonstrate, most importantly to themselves, that power had not slipped irretrievably from their grasp, they cobbled together a ban. Though its intentions to stamp out sedition and religious dissent may have coincided with Privy Council aims, its focus on epigrams and satirists was irrelevant to those who now wielded real power. Davies's epigrams did not prevent his rise to Attorney-General; given the prominence of Inns of Court men—no strangers to flying themselves—among the political elite, the Privy Council must have had a more sophisticated understanding of satire than the bishops.

By and large, printers and publishers blithely ignored the ban, and the Stationers' Company, set up by the book trade to protect its own interests, tacitly supported them. The bishops had overstepped the role initially envisaged for them. Satirists ignored them at best, mocked them at worst, flouted their authority anyway, in a manner inconceivable a decade earlier, when Whitgift was among the most feared men in England. The ban marks less the end of satire, than of the bishops' own political power. Now reading it, we can begin to understand why it is so inconsistent and ill-considered. It has the tone of something hit upon in panic. It couldn't have been long before the bishops realised their mistake and then they, like everyone else concerned, began to pretend that the ban had never happened.

Notes

¹ John Weever, “A Prophecie of this present yeare, 1600,” in A. Davenport, ed., *Faunus and Melliflora* (London: University Press of Liverpool and Hodder and Stoughton, 1948), 66.

² Edward Arber, ed., *A Transcription of the Register of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640*, 5 vols. (London, 1874-94), III.677.

³ See Cyndia Susan Clegg, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 200.

⁴ The present article is intended to update and amplify work upon the 1599 ban in Cliff Forshaw, *The Chameleon Muse: Satirical Personae in the Formal Verse Satires of Marston, Guilpin and Others* (unpublished D.Phil. thesis, Oxford University, 1998), 287-97; assumptions about the methods and targets of Marston’s satires are amplified and documented there and in Cliff Forshaw, “‘All Protean Forms in Venery:’ The Textual and Apparitional Body in John Marston’s Verse Satires” in Darryl Grantley and Nina Taunton, eds., *The Body in Late Medieval and Early Modern Culture* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000), 169-185.

⁵ O. J. Campbell, *Comical Satyre and Shakespeare’s Troilus and Cressida* (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library Publications, 1938), 3.

⁶ See “To euerlasting Obliusion” and “To him that hath perused me,” in A. Davenport, ed., *The Poems of John Marston* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1961), 176, 177; Philip J. Finkelpearl, *John Marston of the Middle Temple: an Elizabethan Dramatist in his Social Setting* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969), 116.

⁷ See Finkelpearl, *John Marston*, 119-124; also Finkelpearl, “John Marston’s *Histrion-Mastix* as an Inns of Court Play; A Hypothesis,” *Huntingdon Quarterly* 29 (1966), 223-43; Davenport, *Marston*, 4.

⁸ Margot Heinemann, “Political Drama” in A. R. Braunmuller and Michael Hattaway, eds., *The Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 168.

⁹ *Epigrammes*, 44.

¹⁰ C. H. Herford, P. Simpson, and E. Simpson, eds., *Ben Jonson: Works*, 11 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925-52), 11.253.

¹¹ See Chambers, II. 54; Finkelpearl, *John Marston*, 256-57.

¹² Poetry for gentlemanly readers was, as was the case with learned or technical works, usually ornamenteally printed in roman and italic. Nashe's pamphlet satires were printed in black letter, associated with more populist works. See Sandra Clark, *The Elizabethan Pamphleteers: Popular Moralistic Pamphlets 1580-1640* (London: Athlone Press, 1983), introduction.

¹³ John Peter, *Complaint and Satire in Early English Literature* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956), 150.

¹⁴ Bruce R. Smith, *Homosexual Desire in Shakespeare's England: a Cultural Poetics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 164.

¹⁵ Lynda Boose, "The 1599 Bishops' Ban, Elizabethan Pornography and the Sexualization of the Jacobean State" in Richard Burt and John Michael Archer, eds., *Enclosure Acts; Sexuality, Property and Culture in Early Modern England* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994), 185-200.

¹⁶ Peter, 149.

¹⁷ Hannah Betts, "'The Image of this Queene so Quaynt:' the Pornographic Blazon 1588-1603" in Julia M. Walker, ed., *Dissing Elizabeth: Negative Representations of Gloriana* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998), 173.

¹⁸ Richard A. McCabe, "'Right Puisante and Terrible Priests:' the Role of the Anglican Church in State Censorship" in Andrew Hadfield, ed., *Literature and Censorship in Renaissance England* (London: Palgrave, 2001), 76.

¹⁹ Ibid, 87.

²⁰ Richard A. McCabe, "Elizabethan Satire and the Bishops' Ban of 1599," *The Yearbook of English Studies* 11 (1981), 188-93: 189-90.

²¹ See Finkelpearl, *John Marston*, 89-91; Anthony Caputi, *John Marston, Satirist* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1961), 47-49; Davenport, *Marston*, 2, 30; see also Forshaw, *Chameleon Muse*, 229-53; Forshaw in Grantley and Taunton, 169-185.

²² Finkelpearl, *John Marston*, 121-122.

²³ H. Harvey Wood, ed., *The Plays of John Marston* (London, 1934-9), II.248-49.

²⁴ A. Davenport, ed., *The Collected Poems of Joseph Hall* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1949), 97-99.

²⁵ Robert Krueger, ed., *The Poems of Sir John Davies* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975), 163.

²⁶ “On the Marriage of Lady Elizabeth Hatton to Edward Coke;” “On the Marriage of Lady Mary Baker to Richard Fletcher, Bishop of London,” *Poems of Sir John Davies*, 177-179; commentary 395-96.

²⁷ See Forshaw, *Chameleon Muse*, Chaps. 6 and 7.

²⁸ Herford and Simpson, III.421.

²⁹ Finkelpearl, *John Marston*, 79-80.

³⁰ Clegg, 210.

³¹ See Forshaw, *Chameleon Muse*, 194-213.

³² Davenport, *Marston*, 176.

³³ Krueger, 129.

³⁴ Davenport, *Marston*, 71.

³⁵ Ibid., 140.

³⁶ Clegg, 212.

³⁷ Ibid., 210-11.

³⁸ McCabe, in Hadfield, *Literature and Censorship*, 85; Clegg, 208.

³⁹ McCabe, in Hadfield, *Literature and Censorship*, 84. A. H. Bullen, ed., *The Works of Thomas Middleton*, 8 vols. (London: J. C. Nimmo, 1885-6), 8.120.

⁴⁰ See Forshaw, *Chameleon Muse*, 194-213.

⁴¹ In 1533 Francis I bequeathed Aretino a gold chain with the motto *Lingua eius loquitur mendacium*—“his tongue speaks a lie;” Davis MacPherson’s “Aretino and the Harvey-Nashe Quarrel,” *PMLA* 84 (1969), 1551-58, demonstrates that Aretino was a controversial figure for Elizabethan pamphleteers.

⁴² Everard Guilpin, Epigram 20, *To Candidus*: ed. D. Allen Carroll, *Skialetheia* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1974), 44.

⁴³ *Poems of Joseph Hall*, 11.

⁴⁴ Thomas Lodge, *Wits Miserie, and the Worlds Madness*, in *The Complete Works of Thomas Lodge* (London: Hunterian Club, 1883), IV.63; Nashe, preface to *Lenten Stuffe*, in Ronald McKerrow, ed., *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, III.152.

⁴⁵ J. B. Leishman, ed., *The Parnassus Plays (1598-1601)* (London: Ivor Nicholson and Watson, 1949), 241-42.

⁴⁶ Charles Crawford, ed., *Englands Parnassus, Compiled by Robert Allott* (1600) (Oxford, 1913), 167, 95, 200, 214.

⁴⁷ D. C. Allen, ed., *Palladis Tamia* (New York: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1938), 27.

⁴⁸ For the history of the Nashe-Harvey quarrel, see Nashe, *Works*, V.65-110.

⁴⁹ For Nashe's role in Marprelate controversy, *Ibid.* V.35-65.

⁵⁰ "A Letter to Richard Topcliffe...", *Acts of the Privy Council*, New Series, xxvii (1597), 338; cited McKerrow, V. 27, n.2; see also 29-31.

⁵¹ Herford and Simpson, I.15.

⁵² McKerrow, III.153.

⁵³ Henslowe, *Diary*, 2 vols., ed. W. W. Greg (London: A. H. Bullen, 1904-8), I.203.

⁵⁴ *Acts of Privy Council*, 338, cited McKerrow, V.31, n.2; Herford and Simpson, Appendix III.

⁵⁵ McKerrow, I.280-81.

⁵⁶ Leishman, 358, 360-63.

⁵⁷ See Forshaw, *Chameleon Muse*, 58-68.

⁵⁸ William Pierce, *An Historical Introduction to the Marprelate Tracts* (London, 1908), 86.

⁵⁹ Albert Peel, ed., *Tracts Ascribed to Richard Bancroft* (Cambridge, 1953), xviii.

⁶⁰ *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. II (1714), 606^b; cited in McKerrow, V.48.

⁶¹ J. R. Darsent, ed., *Acts of the Privy Council, 1524-1604* (London, 1890-1907), xviii. 214-15.

⁶² See McKerrow, V.34-65 for involvement in the Marprelate controversy.

⁶³ Hugh Broughton, theologian, cited by Charles Nichol, *A Cup of News: the Life of Thomas Nashe* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984), 139.

⁶⁴ Cyprian Blagden, *The Stationers' Company; a History 1403-1959* (London, 1960), 44.

⁶⁵ See *The Laws of Elizabethan Copyright: the Stationers' View* (London, 1960), 5th ser., XV.

⁶⁶ For details of Simmes's career see W. Craig Ferguson, *Valentine Simmes, Printer to Drayton, Shakespeare etc* (Charlottesville, 1968).

⁶⁷ Arber, *Transcription*, I.574 and 581.

⁶⁸ Sir Walter W. Greg and E. Boswell, eds., *Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company, 1576-1602 – from Register B* (London, 1930), 52.

⁶⁹ Arber, *Transcription*, II.828.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, II.835.

⁷¹ Hatfield Papers (found by David Mc. N. Lockie) probably about 1606-8.

⁷² Davenport, *Faunus*, 42-43.

⁷³ Ibid., 62, 65.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 66-70.

⁷⁵ Pierre LeRoy's *A Pleasant Satyre or Poesie* (English trans. 1595) had seen *satura* as a mixture of "all sorts of writings... Varro saith, that in ancient times, men called by this name, a certaine sorte of pie or pudding, into which men put diuers kindes of hearbes, and of meates" (sig. Aa4^v).

⁷⁶ Davenport, *Faunus*, vi.

⁷⁷ Ibid., v-vii.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 65.

⁷⁹ William Keach, *Elizabethan Erotic Narratives: Irony and Pathos in the Ovidian Poetry of Shakespeare, Marlowe and their Contemporaries* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1977), 185.

⁸⁰ Ferguson.

⁸¹ E. A. J. Honigman, *John Weever: a Biography of a Literary Associate of Shakespeare and Jonson, together with a photographic facsimile of Weever's 'Epigrammes'* (1599) (Manchester University Press, 1987), 31.

⁸² McKerrow, v.

⁸³ Clegg, 217.

⁸⁴ *Records of the Court*, ed. Greg and Boswell, lvii, 79, 81; Arber, II.832-33; both cited in Clegg, 216-17.

⁸⁵ Thomas Dekker, *The Guls Hornbook* (London: Temple Classics, 1941), 41.

⁸⁶ Peter, 156.

⁸⁷ *The Dutch Courtesan*, ed. Martin Wine (London, 1965), III.i.39-40.

⁸⁸ Clegg, 113-14.

⁸⁹ John Taylor, *Aqua-Musa* (1645), 7; quoted in Allan Pritchard, "Abuses Script and Whipt and Wither's Imprisonment," *Review of English Studies* 14 n.s. (1963), 337-45: 339.

⁹⁰ N. E. McClure, ed., *The Letters of John Chamberlain*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia, 1939), I.97.