

379
N81
No. 6491

THE RELATIONSHIP OF ROBERT GREENE AND
THOMAS NASHE 1588-1590: AN
EPISODE IN THE DEVELOPMENT
OF ENGLISH PROSE FICTION

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
University of North Texas in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

By

Gregory R. Koenig, B.S.E.

Denton, Texas

December, 1988

Koenig, Gregory R., The Relationship of Robert Greene and Thomas Nashe 1588-1590: An Episode in the Development of English Prose Fiction. Master of Arts (English), December 1988, 154 pp., bibliography, 71 titles.

Robert Greene began collaborating with Thomas Nashe as English prose was turning away from the style and subject matter of Lyly's Euphues (1578) and Sidney's Arcadia (1590). When Greene and Nashe came together in London, the two writers appear to have set the tone for the pamphleteers who would establish the realistic tradition that contributed to the development of the novel.

Greene's Menaphon (1589) may be a satire representing his abandonment of courtly fiction. The influence of the Marprelate controversy is reflected in Greene's appeals to the pragmatic character of the emerging literate middle class. Greene's Vision (1592) appears to be Greene's affirmation of his critical philosophy at a point of stress in the authors' relationship.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

1. INTRODUCTION 1
2. MENAPHON, THE ANATOMY OF ABSURDITY, AND THE
LITERARY RELATIONSHIP OF ROBERT GREENE AND
THOMAS NASHE 8
3. PASQUILL AND THE PARROT: HOW THE MARPRELATE
CONTROVERSY MAY HAVE HELPED GREENE AND NASHE
DEVELOP AS SATIRISTS 74
4. GREENE'S VISION RESTORED: A FINAL PHASE? . . . 112
5. CONCLUSION 141

WORKS CONSULTED 145

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

General discussions of Robert Greene routinely include remarks that characterize him as a very popular, prolific, and versatile professional writer of Elizabethan London. Controversy has emerged, however, on the specific question of whether Greene was a writer of influence, especially outside the drama. Ernest A. Baker, for instance, in spite of his observation that Greene "initiated a kind of storytelling which, through the rogue stories and criminal biographies, led to epoch-making developments in the hands of Defoe" (144), has written that "Robert Greene is an interesting case in literary history rather than a writer of literary importance" (90). A considerable number of scholars seem to have seen Greene as the "the most shameless of Elizabethan literary hacks" (Crupi, preface)-- appropriating the work of others and exploiting his own unsavory life and that of the Elizabethan underworld to write just enough romances, pamphlets, and plays to keep himself in wine and fine clothes. Among the exceptions is Sandra Clark, who sees the storytelling noted by Baker not only to be Greene's primitive contribution to what was to become the English novel through Daniel Defoe and others, but also to be one of Greene's experiments in the area of

English prose that establish him as "the first writer to gain a contemporary reputation as a pamphleteer" (17). In any case, Baker and Clark appear to agree that whatever literary significance Greene has in English prose is due to the innovations evident in his later fiction, which is heavily realistic.

Greene did not begin his career by writing about cony-catchers, however. His early prose works are imitations and adaptations of Euphues, the exemplary courtly romance of John Lyly, and of the Arcadia, Philip Sidney's vast and ornate pastoral romance, neither of which concerned everyday life in contemporary England and both of which demanded an elaborate, artificial, "high" style. Yet between Pandosto, an Arcadian romance of 1588, and A Notable Discovery of Cozenage, his first cony-catching pamphlet, in 1591, Greene radically modified his style and changed his subject matter altogether. Merritt Lawlis observes these changes and wonders "what happened in those three years between the publishing of Pandosto and A Notable Discovery" to cause them (395); one contributing event, says Lawlis, may have been the emergence of a new sort of reader during the later part of Greene's career--the "plain country man made gentleman," who, apparently, was literate and had enough money to be able to afford broadsides, butterflies, and other pamphlet-style publications (395). Clark concurs, explaining,

it was not for high-brow tastes in reading that those little works on the vices of London, on cony-catchers and card-sharpers, witchcraft trials, monsters, and prodigies catered; rather, it was for those literary preferences we may reasonably ascribe to . . . citizens, burgesses and yeomen who . . . constitute a kind of middle class. . . . This class was made up . . . of . . . tradesmen, merchants, bankers, shipowners, manufacturers, skilled craftsmen, and farmers, perhaps not self-aware or conscious of any group identity as are the middle class today, but literate as they would not have been in the first half of the sixteenth century. . . . New kinds of writing appeared, often designed to satisfy practical rather than aesthetic demands. . . . The pamphlet constitutes a new form of writing for a new audience. (22-23)

Greene undoubtedly was a shrewd professional, as his popularity suggests: in Thomas Nashe's words, "glad was that Printer that might bee so blest to pay him deare for the very dregs of his wit" (1: 287). Presumably, a writer as sensitive to his audience as Greene was would quite easily adapt to the stylistic demands of his bookbuying public. But as a reader may infer from Greene's middle and even later works, although he consciously worked to strip away what was not plain or idiomatic in his style, he never entirely

succeeded: even Greene's underworld pamphlets bear the characteristics of anatomies, and Greene's Groatsworth of Wit and Greene's Vision, two of the author's last works, are laced with euphuistic diction. It may be, then, that Greene was not such a literary chameleon as to have been able by himself to shift from the affected, rhetorical style of, say, Ciceronis Amor to the plain, concrete style of The Black Book's Messenger; and it may be that he was encouraged in the switch he eventually made by his friend and co-writer, Thomas Nashe.

How Greene and Nashe met is uncertain. They may have known each other at Cambridge, as Edwin H. Miller suggests (353); but, since Greene had left St. John's, Cambridge, by the winter of 1581-82, when Nashe matriculated there, the likelihood is slight. Probably they met in London. In any event, they were working together by the summer of 1589, when Greene's Menaphon appeared with a prefatory epistle written by Nashe. Greene, the experienced romance writer, seems to have taken on the young, untried Nashe almost as a pupil, to introduce him to the London literary scene and help him make a start; Nashe seems to have responded admiringly and approvingly by praising Menaphon's "attire," which "doth intitle thee [Greene] . . . to that temperatum dicendi genus which Tully in his Orator termeth true eloquence" (1: 312). But this is the last of Nashe's unqualified adulation. Shortly after Greene's death, in

fact, in Strange News, Nashe was denying Greene's influence, claiming that Gabriel Harvey's understanding of the tutor-pupil relationship was actually backward: "not Tarlton nor Greene," says Nashe, "but haue beene contented to let my simple iudgement ouerrule them in some matters of wit"

(1: 319). Nashe clarifies this claim in Have With You to Saffron Walden, saying,

none that euer had but one eye, with a pearle in it, but could discern the difference twixt him [Greene] & me; while he liu'd (as some Stationers can witnes with me) hee subscribing to me in any thing but plotting Plaies. . . . Nay, he himselve hath purloyned something from mee, and mended his hand in confuting by fifteen parts, by following my presidents. (3: 132)

Was Nashe, the younger but perhaps more visceral of the two writers, an additional, even instigative force that led Greene through a smooth transition from being the foremost writer of courtly romances to being the first Elizabethan pamphleteer and one of the best-known "realists" of the period? Tracing the two writers' relationship from Menaphon to Greene's early "autobiographical," or "realistic," pamphlets is difficult because much beyond their collaboration on Menaphon is obscure. Even so, the chapters that follow demonstrate from the available evidence that the realistic satire of Greene and Nashe may have emerged from a synergistic

relationship made up of three distinct stages through which the two authors moved. The initial stage includes their meeting and collaboration on Menaphon, which they may have understood as a transitional work. The second may have been a "practice" phase--one in which the two writers received the chance to sharpen their skills in realism and satire through their involvement in the Martin Marprelate controversy. The final stage was likely one in which Greene, equipped through Nashe's help with a suitably concrete style and point of view, re-asserted his own individuality as a stylist and storyteller in his "prodigal son" pamphlets, possibly sacrificing in the process some of the closeness he had had with Nashe.

The relationship of Greene and Nashe will thus be seen as a crucial episode in the development of realistic, mimetic prose fiction, a point of transition in which two very visible figures in the field of literary prose pioneered new areas of subject matter, style, and readership.

Works Cited

- Baker, Ernest A. The Elizabethan Age and After. 1936.
London: Witherby, 1961. Vol. 2 of The History of
the English Novel. 10 vols. 1924-39.
- Clark, Sandra. The Elizabethan Pamphleteers: Popular
Moralistic Pamphlets 1580-1640. Rutherford, NJ:
Farleigh Dickinson UP, 1983.
- Crupi, Charles W. Robert Greene. Boston: Twayne, 1986.
- Lawlis, Merritt. Foreword. A Notable Discovery of Cozenage.
By Robert Greene. Elizabethan Prose Fiction. Ed.
Lawlis. New York: Odyssey, 1967. 395-99.
- Miller, Edwin Haviland. "The Relationship of Robert Greene
and Thomas Nashe (1588-1592)." Philological Quarterly
33 (1954): 353-67.
- Nashe, Thomas. The Works of Thomas Nashe. Ed. Ronald B.
McKerrow. 5 vols. 1910. Ed., with corrections and
supplementary notes, F. P. Wilson. Oxford: Basil
Blackwell, 1958.

CHAPTER 2

MENAPHON, THE ANATOMY OF ABSURDITY, AND THE LITERARY RELATIONSHIP OF ROBERT GREENE AND THOMAS NASHE

Why Greene invited Nashe to write the prefatory epistle (referred to hereafter as "the Preface") to Menaphon is as uncertain as the question of how the two met. Perhaps, as Ronald McKerrow suspects, Nashe had by 1589 "already won some reputation as a wit" (Nashe 5: 15), or, as George Hibbard conjectures, "Greene may well have found it convenient to use Nashe as a kind of mouthpiece through whom he might pursue some of his literary quarrels" (29). At any rate, it is not this enigma, but several others about the collaboration on Menaphon that contribute to the notion that this romance is a transitional piece, already reflecting the influence of Nashe upon Greene. For instance, the Preface, Nashe's first published work, is clearly a satire, and yet is prefixed to a pastoral romance, Greene's last before he began publishing "repentance" pamphlets. Also, Nashe in the Preface defends essentially "highbrow" critical standards that imply that "Italianate" and similarly affected eloquence are unacceptable (Hibbard 30), although Greene was well known for adopting literary fashions such as Italian novelle (Wolff 370) and euphuism and had in fact made Menaphon as euphuistic as many of his earlier works.

A third significant puzzle about Menaphon is reflected in twentieth-century critical opinion of the work: while scholars seem able to reach a consensus about works such as Pandosto and Nashe's Pierce Penniless, they can come to no such accord about Menaphon. Samuel Wolff writes that Menaphon "is a tissue of absurdities; . . . a 'pot-boiler' . . ." (456). But J. C. Jordan, writing three years after Wolff, in 1915, contends that though it does not compare with Lodge's Rosalynde, it is still "a sweet story" (41). Lifting Wolff's phrase, Ernest A. Baker writes in The History of the English Novel that the romance is "a tissue of absurdities" (105). Walter Davis proclaims Menaphon on the other hand to be Greene's "masterpiece" (171) and a "highly sophisticated rendering of a rather unsophisticated view of life much like the modern 'absurd'" (178). Paul Salzman agrees with Davis that Menaphon is an "accomplished romance" (65) through which Greene contributed to that genre's development (69). Taken alone, Menaphon actually foments such ambivalence; studying it in conjunction with Nashe's Preface therefore becomes crucial, especially in light of Nashe's expressed opinion of courtly romantic fiction.

In The Anatomy of Absurdity Nashe appears to consider himself an adversary of popular romantic fiction; romances to him, in Hibbard's phrase, are "a waste of time and a disgrace to the cause of letters" (29). Whether Nashe's attitude extended to the realm of Greek-style pastoral

romances such as Menaphon is not clear, since The Anatomy explicitly names only translations and adaptations of medieval chivalric romances. Yet Salzman's assertion that in the Preface "Nashe also associated himself with the fashionable pastoral romance" (84) is without firm foundation, especially in light of Wolff's observation that Nashe "makes no use whatever of the Greek Romances" in his own fiction (459) and in light of the fact that, except for a possible allusion in the epistle dedicatory of Lenten Stuff, the only reference he makes to the great prototype of English pastoral romances, Sidney's Arcadia, is the fleeting adjectival one ("thy Arcadian Menaphon"; 3: 312) in the Preface. In addition, Nashe from the beginning of his career opposed the euphuism of Lyly; Salzman notes that in The Anatomy Nashe condemns Lyly's style (83), and passages such as the following from the Preface confirm this attitude by scorning "the sweet society of eloquence" while offering an ironic parody of euphuistic balance, paromoion, and Pliny-like "natural history":

Would Gentlemen and riper iudgements admit my motion of moderation in a matter of folly, I would perswade them to physicke their faculties of seeing and hearing, as the Sabaeans doe their dulled senses with smelling; who (as Strabo reporteth), ouercloyd with such odoriferous sauors as the naturall increase of their country . . .

sends forth, refresh their nostrilles with the unsauorie sent of the pitchy slime that Euphrates casts vp, & cōtagious fumes of Goats beards burned: so would I haue them, beeing surfeited vnawares with the sweet saciety of eloquence, which the lauish of our copious language may procure, to vse the remedie of contraries; and recreate their rebated wits . . . with the ouerseeing of that sublime dicendi genus, which walkes abroade for wast paper in each seruing-mans pocket, and the otherwhile perusing of our Gothamists barbarisme; so should the opposite comparison of Puritie expell the infection of Absurditie, and their ouer-racked Rhetoricke be the Ironicall recreation of the Reader.

(Nashe 1: 313-14)

Then, to judge from the language Nashe uses in The Anatomy, he seems early in his literary career not to have had much of a taste for Greene's work: he complains bitterly about the typical writer of foolish, high-sounding fiction whose similes involve "Minerals, stones, and herbes," in whose stories "Loue would obtaine the name of lust," whose books allege "a pretence of profit mixt with pleasure' (1: 10), and who will "blot many sheetes of paper in the blazing of Womens slender praises" (1: 11). Scholars from F. G. Fleay to Charles Nicholl, and including Ronald McKerrow, agree

that this description fits Greene strikingly well. To summarize, Nashe's opinion of romances like Menaphon makes his praise of Menaphon itself suspect and diminishes the likelihood that Greene would want anything to do with an upstart satirist such as Nashe--unless Menaphon could be read as a display of the artistic concord between Nashe and himself.

Despite the wide disparity among modern estimations of Menaphon, perhaps none of the scholars previously cited were altogether mistaken. The plot of the romance is in some ways the "tissue of absurdities" that Wolff and Baker condemn; in addition, Menaphon may be both an imitation of Sidney, as Wolff believes (367), and a stylistic reminiscence of Euphues, as G. B. Harrison (vii) and Baker (105) observe, as well as a "spoof" of the conventions of Arcadian fiction, as Ardelle Short writes (201), and "Greene's final gesture of freedom from John Lyly," as Davis contends (173). The reconciliation of these different points of view becomes possible with the idea that Menaphon, a passable work of romantic fiction, is, as Salzman asserts, ironic (66), as Short implies, humorous, and, additionally, actually a burlesque of Sidney's Arcadia and a satire upon the style of Lyly's Euphues. A comparison of the attitudes apparent in Menaphon with the contemporary opinions of Nashe shows that the artistic standards of the two writers appear in fact to dovetail at Menaphon.

Lyly and Sidney, according to Salzman, had essentially the same didactic purpose for their narratives (52): to "fashion a gentleman or noble person in vertuous and gentle discipline" (Spenser, qtd. in Salzman 53). But each work goes about achieving its purpose differently, and the difference is fundamentally one of genre. As a pastoral romance, the Arcadia gives examples of noble behavior--and contrasting examples of ignoble behavior--through a complex, prominent plot and the conventions of pastoralism and chivalric romance. Pastoral conventions such as rustic characters, singing matches, an idealized rural environment, and sensuous description (see Ruoff "Pastoral"; Evans 36) and conventions of the chivalric romance such as adventure and heroism, mystery, love and fantasy, exaggerated distinctions between social classes, and armed combat (Holman "Medieval Romance") are especially evident in the first version of Sidney's romance, the manuscript Old Arcadia (hereafter OA), which is a "straightforward, relatively modern-sounding piece of fiction" (Evans 10, 12) compared to the version of the Arcadia published in 1590 (New Arcadia; hereafter NA), and which is likely to have been the form of the Arcadia with which Greene was more familiar in 1589 (Short 192).

Euphues, as its running title, The Anatomy of Wit, suggests, belongs to the genre of the anatomy. Northrop Frye describes the anatomy as a type of Menippean satire:

it is characterized by "loose-jointed narrative" that is not primarily concerned, as the pastoral romance is, "with the exploits of heroes" (309-10); rather, it deals "with intellectual themes and attitudes," showing its author's "exuberance in intellectual ways, by piling up an enormous mass of erudition about his theme" (311). The intellectual theme of Euphues is of course "wit," an abstruse but presumably desirable trait; the heaped-up erudition is manifested in Euphues's debates, its multiple classical allusions, and its elaborate similes drawn from "natural history." The deliberate, exhaustive treatment of such an intellectual idea through debate and a reliance upon classical authority demands an approach that is much more conspicuously rhetorical than the strongly narrative approach identifiable in romances like the Arcadia; Lyly appears for this reason to have adopted the balanced, antithetical, sound-conscious style that is integral to Euphues. Specific features of euphuistic style will be treated in greater detail later in this chapter; what needs to be emphasized at this point is that the attribute for which Euphues is best known, its style, reflects the most obvious difference between Euphues and the Arcadia: Euphues is "a rhetorical display which subsumes narrative action" (Salzman 58), while the Arcadia is an adventure, to whose purpose "narrative action" is crucial.

If Greene composed Menaphon as a burlesque of the

Arcadia and as a satire upon Euphues, then, the targets of his mockery might naturally be the features that best distinguish the one from the other. For the Arcadia, these features are its concern with its plot and with its pastoral and chivalric conventions; for Euphues, its rhetorical style.

Sidney completed his early version of the Arcadia by late 1580 (Robertson xvi); by the time he began revising it in 1584, it had begun to circulate in manuscript. When Greene composed Menaphon, probably in 1589, manuscripts of the OA had circulated widely, and the revised NA, incomplete because of Sidney's death in 1586, was virtually unknown in manuscript and still to be printed (Short 192). Scholars have given varying accounts of Greene's debt to Sidney. Wolff, for instance, finds parallel elements in Menaphon and the NA to show what both derive from their apparent ultimate source, the AETHIOPICA of Heliodorus, but contends that it was the OA whose structure Greene imitated, evidently because the "technique" of the NA was too "complicated" (444). Salzman disagrees, calling the parallels "minor allusions" and arguing that Greene's use of the OA is due merely to the unavailability of manuscripts of the NA (66). Short also maintains that Greene used the OA because the NA manuscripts were inaccessible and that the OA's influence upon Menaphon is conspicuous and pervasive (192-93). In addition, while Menaphon is to Wolff a crude, clumsy imitation of whatever version of the Arcadia was easier for

Greene to manage, it is to Short a comic treatment of the themes and conventions of the OA (Short 201-02). To demonstrate that Menaphon is actually a burlesque of the OA, I have re-evaluated Wolff's list where it reflects characteristics common to the OA and NA, making some additions and expanding some important items, and I have modified Short's analysis to show that Greene's tone is not merely playful, but actually farcical.

Greene's burlesque of the OA operates in four areas. First, three elements of the major machinery of the plot reveal not only comic parody but travesty as well. Second, although Greene parodies the prose style of Euphues to a greater extent than he does the style of the Arcadia, he also distorts Sidney's use of the pastoral convention of sensuous description. Third, a number of surface elements, some of which Wolff notes, reflect a very evident tongue-in-cheek attitude. Finally, Greene alters Sidney's use of the prominent pastoral and chivalric convention of Nature so as to render the characters in Menaphon considerably less ideal than Sidney's appear.

The most prominent plot element of the Arcadia to be treated by Greene is the oracle. Ardelle Short notes that the oracle in Menaphon is more closely related to the one that begins the OA than to those in the Greek romances, from which the feature was borrowed, because both are in verse and both, unlike the several that occur incidentally in

Heliodorus's AETHIOPICA, "are frames to the action" of Menaphon and the Arcadia (194). The nature of the contrast between the two is found in the ratio of the portentousness of each oracle to the severity of its actual outcome and in the function each has in its particular romance. In the OA, the prophecy paradoxically foreshadows scandalous events that occur as foretold, while the prophecy in Menaphon predicts "manifest impossibilities" and "frighteningly unnatural events" that turn out to be neither impossible nor unnatural (Short 196); and, although each oracle is positioned ostensibly to serve as an infrastructure for the incidents in each romance, Sidney's actually achieves an overall structural purpose, while Greene's merely prescribes the conditions necessary for the restoration of order.

The oracle in the OA predicts four events: Basilius's elder daughter will be stolen from beneath his very nose by a prince; his younger daughter will engage in apparently unnatural love; he himself will commit adultery with his own wife; and a foreign monarch will assume his throne (OA 5). All four are ominous, of course; yet all are events against which Basilius can take evasive or preventive action, because all are in fact possible circumstances that might develop from human activity (cf. Short 195-96). They are unlikely occurrences, but perhaps not implausible ones. A synopsis of the prophecy in Menaphon reveals a startling contrast. When the "arcadian wonder" comes from the sea,

says the oracle, dead men will "warre, and unborne babes shall frown"; when lions guide lambs, planets rest atop hills, and the ocean fills its banks but the tide neither rises nor ebbs, the pestilence will end and all will be well (22). These are not just extraordinary occurrences; they are prodigies--signs of an upheaval of nature; and, too, they are phenomena that cannot occur through the agency of man and are therefore all the more frightening, because human beings cannot adequately prepare for supernatural catastrophes.

Part of Greene's travesty of the oracle is achieved when he inflates it to hyperbole in this way; but a second part may be seen in the relationship between the prophecy and the events that acutally fulfill it. That is, in Sidney's romance, what happens is what the oracle foretells: a prince "steals" Pamela; Philoclea appears to fall in love with an amazon; Basilius, intent upon adultery, has a rendezvous with Gynecia, his wife; and Euarchus occupies Basilius's throne. Thus, the oracle in the OA is literal, requiring, perhaps, only the clarification that things are not always as they seem: sometimes, for instance, a prince may look like a shepherd, a woman may actually be a man in disguise, the paramour one meets in the dark may actually be his own spouse, and the assumption of authority by a foreign ruler, ordinarily a sign of usurpation and conquest, may in another context signify accession to the will of an anxious

populace in the absence of the rightful ruler. The relationship between portent and fact in Menaphon is much less straightforward; the ideas and images portrayed in the terms of the oracle are far more sensational than the actual events. Short observes, in fact, that "in each case the prediction turns out to be a mere metaphor or a verbal trick" (196). The "warring" dead men are supposed by all to be dead; the "babe" is "unborne" only in that he has not been born prior to the utterance of the prophecy; "lions" and "lambs" are metaphors for "kings" and "common folk"; and the images concerning planets and the sea refer to the devices on the shields of Pleusidippus and Melicertus, the prediction about the tide that neither rises nor ebbs referring merely to the stalemate in their combat (Short 196-97). Unlike Sidney, who creates a literal correspondence between the oracle and the events that fulfill it, Greene sets fact and portent at opposite extremes, depicting quite ordinary things as wildly unnatural phenomena.

The third part of Greene's spoof of the oracle is, as Short observes, his distortion of its structural function in the plot of the romance. The prophecy is instrumental in the development of the plot of the OA; not only does it provide a frame that guides the action, but in a way it is in itself a cause, since to avoid its consequences Basilius retires to the very setting in which the entire prophecy unfolds (Short 197-98). The function of the oracle in

Menaphon is from all appearances--its position early in the romance, its influence upon Samela's feelings for Melicertus, its importance to the climax--the same; and yet the oracle's relation to the plot is actually tenuous. Only one section of the plot, from the return of Pleusidippus (81) to the appearance of the old prophetess (105), is controlled by the prophecy; the rest, including Menaphon's infatuation with Samela, the coincidental affection between the disguised Maximius and Sephestia, the incestuous relationships threatened by Pleusidippus and Democles, and the battle between a father and his son, are not foretold by the oracle, but work, apparently independently, to supply the conditions that allow the oracle to be fulfilled. The OA's oracle is structural; Menaphon's is pseudo-structural.

Related to this difference is the climactic revelation scene in each work. Because of the literal and structural nature of the oracle in the OA, Basilius is able easily to work out how each portion of the prophecy has been fulfilled and to weigh his own fault respecting his daughters, his wife, and the princes. In Menaphon, however, no character is able to associate even a little of the prophecy with any incident in the plot (cf. Short 198-99), and this circumstance leads nearly to catastrophe. Only a deus ex machina--the prophetess who arrives to interpret the events and then vanishes--can solve the riddle that throughout the plot has been beyond the inkling of its human characters.

By putting the fulfillment of the oracle out of the reach of his characters and exaggerating prosaic events in the hyperbolic language of the prophecy, Greene makes good his promise of "darke AEnigmaes or strange conceipts as if Sphinx . . . and Roscius . . . were playing the waggess" (Greene 3).

Recognition--or non-recognition--is a theme in both the Arcadia and Menaphon that accounts for some of the complications in their plots. For example, Gynecia's detection of Pyrocles's gender and her related infatuation with him cause her to risk his becoming better acquainted with her daughter Philoclea so that she herself can pursue him; and Basilius, not recognizing that Cleophila is actually a man, increases the risk Gynecia has taken by channeling his own suit through Philoclea. Sidney's demands on the reader's suspension of disbelief may be heavy: all characters but Gynecia and Dametas readily accept that Pyrocles, in reality a warrior-prince, is an amazon; Basilius, as the reader will recall, even pursues Cleophila, and, also, Philoclea experiences discomfiture because she becomes inexplicably aroused whenever she is near Cleophila. But Greene encourages the disbelief rather than the suspension. Four characters in Menaphon who are related to each other by marriage or by birth either fail to recognize or deny recognizing a relative who ought to be familiar.

First, Democles, who, it is implied, should recall

Maximius even after fifteen years ("know Democles this Melicertus is Maximius, twice betrothed to Sephestia," says the prophetess; 107), is oblivious to the younger man's identity, even during their close contact before the siege; worse, Democles does not recognize his own daughter, Sephestia, although some fifteen years seem not to have diminished her original beauty. Then, Pleusidippus fails to recall that his mother's name is the same as that of the Arcadian beauty in a traveler's picture and fails to recognize Samela herself as his mother when he meets her in person. Even though Pleusidippus was a child when he was kidnapped and admitted knowing only that his mother was a shepherdess (70), he ought to be able to recognize his mother when he sees her, especially since the ten or eleven years he has been absent have not significantly altered her looks. Finally, Maximius denies his own recognition that Samela is Sephestia:

her eye paints her out Sephestia, her voyce sounds
her out Sephestia, she seemeth none but Sephestia:
but seing she is dead, and there liueth not such
another Sephestia, sue to her and loue her, for
that it is either a selfe same or another
Sephestia; (56)

and Samela does likewise:

consider Samela is it not thy Maximius? Fond
foole away with these suppositions; could the

dreaming of Andromache call Hector from his
 graue? or can this vision of my husband raise
 him from the seas? (57)

In fact, Samela even appears not to recognize Maximius in his own armor during his duel with Pleusidippus. The denial of recognition by both Sephestia and Maximius is one of the characteristics of Menaphon that best exemplifies Greene's tone in this romance, because it shows that Greene demands less of his characters than of his readers; that is, Greene allows Sephestia and Maximius each to repudiate the remotest possibility that the other could have survived the wreck, landed at the same spot, and joined the pastoral community, but he forces his audience to accept each premise without qualification. Thus, he appeals to the reader to look beyond the plot at his travesty by gratuitously and conspicuously flouting the reader's willing suspension of disbelief.

The Old Arcadia is not characterized by the elaborate, complicated conceits typical of the New Arcadia's three books; the prose of the OA is, on the whole, less embellished and prettified. On the other hand, where Sidney practices a "higher style," Greene is there to poke fun, through exaggeration, compression, and travesty.

Sidney's description of setting never reaches in the OA the extravagance that the NA frequently demonstrates; however, glimpses of ornate description appear in a few

passages in the OA, such as the following:

[Philoclea's] rolling eye lighted upon a tuft of trees, so closely set together as with the shade the moon gave through it, it bred a fearful devotion to look upon it. But well did she remember the place, for there she had often defended her face from the sun's rage. . . . But the principal cause that made her remember it was a fair white marble stone that should seem had been dedicated in ancient time to the sylvan gods. (OA 109)

Greene's attack upon such elevated diction does not occur in similar incidental descriptive sections; rather, he chooses to concentrate his parody of Arcadian place description in one overarching section depicting the bucolic environment. Sidney's corresponding passage in the OA is somewhat understated:

Arcadia among all the provinces of Greece was ever had in singular reputation, partly for the sweetness of the air and other natural benefits, but principally for the moderate and well tempered minds of the people who . . . were . . . not stirred with false praise to trouble others' quiet. . . . Even the muses seemed to approve their good determination by choosing that country as their chiefest resting place; . . . (OA 4)

but Greene's is pure treacle:

Menaphon . . . resting himself on a hill that
 ouerpeered the great Mediterraneum, noting how
Phoebus fetched his Laualtos on the purple Plaines
 of Neptunus, as if he had meant to haue courted
Thetis in the royaltie of his roabes: the
 Dolphines (the sweete conceipters of Musicke)
 fetcht their carreers on the calmed waues, as if
Arion had touched the stringes of his siluer
 sounding instrument: the Mermaides thrusting
 their heades from the bosome of Amphitrite, sate
 on the mounting bankes of Neptune, drying their
 waterie tresses in the Sunne beams. AEolus
 forbare to throwe abroad his gustes on the
 slumbering browes of the Sea-God, as giving
Triton leaue to pleasure his Queene with desired
 melodie, and Proteus libertie to followe his
 flockes without disquiet. (Greene 23-24)

While Sidney's description renders an image of bounty amidst serene rural surroundings, Greene's depicts a luxuriant clutter; to Sidney Arcadia is ripe, and to Greene it is overripe.

Greene takes a different approach in his treatment of Sidney's conceit-charged physical description, compressing a lengthy, simile-laden passage into a few lines of glittering clichés. Musidorus, one of the heroes of the

Old Arcadia, has the following thoughts while observing the sleeping Pamela:

her fair forehead was a field where all his fancies fought, and every hair of her head seemed a strong chain that tied him. Her fair lids (then hiding her fair eyes) seemed unto him sweet boxes of mother of pearl, rich in themselves, but containing in them far richer jewels. Her cheeks, with their colour most delicately mixed, would have entertained his eyes somehow, but that the roses of her lips (whose separating was wont to be accompanied with most wise speeches) now by force drew his sight to mark how prettily they lay one over the other, uniting their divided beauties, and through them the eye of his fancy delivered to his memory the lying (as in ambush) under her lips of those armed ranks, all armed in most pure white, and keeping the most precise order of military discipline. And lest this beauty might seem the picture of some excellent artificer, forth there stole a soft breath, carrying good testimony of her inward sweetness. (OA 201)

Sephestia (Samela) is depicted to Menaphon in these terms:

her tresses . . . hee compared to the coloured Hiacinth of Arcadia, her browes to the gray glister of Titans gorgeous mantle, her alabaster

necke to the whiteness of his flockes, her teares
 to pearle, her face to borders of Lillies
 interseamed with Roses. (33)

The passage in the OA is a set piece that aims to allow the reader space and time to savor the image elicited by the elaborate conceits; the passage in Menaphon, in contrast, is a mechanical summary that prepares the way for another hackneyed convention, Menaphon's love of Sephestia at first sight.

Finally, where Sidney borrows from epic tradition to describe the apparel, trappings, and demeanor of a major character at a critical juncture, Greene instead offers mock-epic. Sidney's two heroes appear in princely splendor as they are led before Euarchus during Book V of the OA:
 Pyrocles enters first, and the narrator describes his clothing in great detail. The next character to enter is Musidorus,
 who had upon him a long cloak after the fashion of
 that which we call the apostle's mantle, made of
 purple--not that purple which we now have, and is
 but a counterfeit of the Gaetulian purple, . . .
 but of the right Tyrian purple (which was nearest
 to a colour betwixt our murrey and scarlet). On
 his head (which was black and curled) he ware a
 Persian tiara all set down with rows of so rich
 rubies as they were enough to speak for him that
 they had to judge of no mean personage. (OA 377)

Greene begins his mock-epic parody by using Menaphon, the shepherd, as the subject of his description, and by using Menaphon's urge to declare his misbegotten love for Samela as the critical point in the plot. On the morning after he has rescued Samela and Lamedon from their shipwreck, Menaphon and his sister, Carmela, anticipate their appearance at breakfast:

Against their rising Carmela had shoven her
 cookerie, and Menaphon tired in his russet iacket,
 his redde sleeues of chamlet, his blew bonnet, and
 his round slop of country cloth, bestirred him, as
 euerie ioynt had been set to a sundrie office. . . .
Samela knowing the fowle by the feather, was able
 to cast his disease without his water, perceiued
 that Cupide had caught the poore shepherd in his
 net. (39)

Greene thus makes a travesty of what appear in the OA to be Sidney's serious attempts to suit style to matter.

The first surface parallel between Sidney's work and Greene's Menaphon is the setting itself, Arcadia. It is not the "minor allusion" that Salzman has made it out to be. By 1584, the year of the appearance of Arbasto, the earliest of the "other works of Greene sometimes cited as Arcadian imitations" (Robertson xxxviii), Sidney's Arcadia had certainly circulated widely in manuscript and therefore must have been known when Greene wrote Euphues his Censure to

Philautus (1587), Perimedes (1588), Pandosto (1588), and Ciceronis Amor (early 1589), all of which contain elements that have analogs in Sidney's Arcadia; yet, although Greene employs a variety of exotic and sometimes Arcadia-like settings in these other works (Sidon, Troy, Memphis, Bohemia, and Rome), he never capitalizes upon the popularity of Sidney's romance by setting any tales or framework scenarios in Arcadia before Menaphon, his last work of romantic fiction. By placing his "farewell" burlesque in the same idyllic land in which the prototypical English pastoral romance is set, Greene early plants his tongue in his cheek, creating the mood that eventually yields the "tissue of absurdities" described by Wolff and Baker.

"Without having seen the Old Arcadia, Greene would hardly have called his heroine Samela," Jean Robertson observes of the next surface element (xxxviii). It is tempting to suggest in an analysis of a burlesque that with this association Greene anticipated Fielding, who satirized Richardson's Pamela with his own Shamela. Whatever the source of Fielding's inspiration, Greene provides more clues which testify that Samela's character and name are part of his spoof. The parallel begins at an early point of characterization. Sidney's heroine is the king's daughter, haughty in her nobility but rustic in appearance: "The fair Pamela, whose noble heart had long disdained to find the trust of her virtue reposed in the hands of a shepherd,

had yet, to show an obedience, taken on shepherdish apparel, which was of russet velvet, cut after their fashion" (OA 37). However, when Samela, also the king's daughter, determines to adopt a disguise, she says she will not only change clothes, but "with my clothes I will change my thoughts; for being poorlie attired I will be meanlie minded, and measure my actions by my present estate, not by my former fortunes" (33). Such a profound transformation appears unlikely even in the most artificial of characters, and in fact proves to be false in Samela's treatment of Menaphon; and Greene hints symbolically that Samela's idea in effect rebels against Nature: upon her decision Pleusidippus, noble by birth and thus naturally resistant to abandoning his aristocratic station, awakes and cries. An allusion Greene makes in connection with Samela's disguise offers another possible reason for the choice of Samela's name. "Sephestia," she says, ". . . will not scorne with Iuno to turne hir self into the shape of Semeles nurse . . ." (32). Disguised as Beroe, Semele's nurse, Juno had persuaded Semele, a paramour of Jupiter, to demand Jupiter to come to her "with the same majesty as he approached Juno" (Lempriere "Semele"); Semele died as a result, but Jupiter allowed her unborn child to gestate in his thigh; this child was Bacchus, to whom the narrator of Menaphon refers in describing Pleusidippus as "some God twice born like vnto the Thracian Bacchus" (64). The allusion has the following significance to Samela: the

particular disguise she refers to is an especially mischievous one, which her disguise as a shepherdess also could ultimately become; the name "Semele" has a similarity to the name "Samela"; and the two women appear thematically linked, since tragic presumption and "unnatural" love appear in both their stories.

That Menaphon, the title character, also presents a surface parallel between Greene's romance and the Arcadia is not immediately evident, but the idea takes on greater significance as it undergoes more intense scrutiny. On the surface, Menaphon, the king's chief herdsman and guardian of the king's daughter, Samela, who dresses as a shepherdess, corresponds to Dametas, Basilius's chief herdsman and guardian of the king's daughter Pamela, who also dresses as a shepherdess. But of course the character of Menaphon is nothing like that of Dametas. Menaphon is generally nobler in mind and manners than the rough-hewn Dametas; his aspirations and ideals (notwithstanding his eventual frustration) are of a better sort than the characteristic avarice and self-importance of Dametas. In his initial disdain of love and his later bitterness over Samela's rejection, Menaphon most resembles Sidney's melancholy shepherd, Philisides. Philisides complains of the ironies of love in these lines from his "Echo" poem:

[Philisides]	[Echo]
O when shall I be known where most	
to be known I do long?	Long. [t/o]
Long be thy woes for such news, but	
how reckes she my thoughts?	Oughts. [t/o]
Then, then what do I gain, since unto	
her will I do wind?	Wind. [t/o]
Wind, tempests, and storms; yet in the	
end what gives she desire?	Ire. . . . [t/o]
What be the sweet creatures where lowly	
demands be not heard?	Hard. [t/o]
(OA 161-62)	

And Menaphon, also melancholy after Samela has spurned him, articulates the same emotion in "Menaphons Song in his bedde":

Was I not free? was I not fancies aime?
 Framde not desire my face to front disdaine?
 I was; she did: but now one silly maime
 Makes me to droope as he whom love hath slaine.
 Farewell my hopes, farewell my happie daies,
 Welcome sweete grieve the subiect of my layes.
 Yet drooping, and yet living to this death,
 I sigh, I sue for pitie at her shrine,
 Whose fierie eyes exhale my vitall breath,
 And make my flockes with parching heate to pine.
 (Greene 75)

Associating Menaphon with Philisides might indeed be significant to a burlesque of Sidney's Arcadia, because Philisides is acknowledged to be Sidney's "poetic persona"--his insertion of himself into the pastoral in the tradition of Virgil and Sannazaro (Robertson 430). Menaphon's near-perpetual "brown studie" (24), his frequent grandiloquence, and his deluded aspiration to a goal quite out of his sphere all seem to point to a jibe at someone; and the association with Philisides may indicate that that someone is Sidney himself, the author of a work that Greene may have come to consider passé. This association with Sidney may explain, also, Greene's choice of his title character's name: like Philisides, who turns out to be noble, and, like Sidney himself, Menaphon had been an eloquent noble in a recent drama, Part I of Marlowe's Tamburlaine (Short 276).

Finally, a surface parallel between the Arcadia and Menaphon that Wolff failed to explore fully is the leadership of a band of shepherds-turned-warriors by a disguised noble. Wolff notes that in the New Arcadia Pyrocles's leadership of the insurgent Helots has an analog in Heliodorus's story of Thyamis, a nobleman who leads an outlaw band known as the "Herdsmen" (310). But another subtle parallel exists in the OA and the NA alike: Musidorus, as Dorus, leads a group of actual herdsmen against the Phagonians. And Menaphon has a parallel for this also. Melicertus, who is Maximius, a nobleman in disguise, is chosen to lead real shepherds in

their attempt to rescue Samela. But Greene's treatment distorts the scene. Heliodorus's Thyamis leads a band of insurgents called "Herdsmen" to attack Memphis, and Sidney's Dorus directs a few actual herdsman in an impromptu defense against a drunken mob. Greene's Melicertus, though, leads a full-fledged martial maneuver that nevertheless appears absurd:

Melicertus, . . . gathering all his forces together of stout headstrong clownes, amounting to the number of some two hundred, he aparailed himselfe in armour, colour sables. . . . Thus marched Melicertus forward with olde Democles the supposed shepherd till they came to the castle, where Pleusidippus and his faire Samela were resident. As soone as they came there, Melicertus begirt the Castle with such a siege, as so many sheepish Caualiers could furnish. (95)

Short calls the siege scene a "mock-Trojan War" (234); whether or not the "Trojan War" conception is accurate, Greene's mockery is evident: one knight, Pleusidippus, has ensconced himself, a few retainers, and his captive damsel in a castle; some two hundred shepherds, led by Melicertus, a supposed shepherd who wears full armor and even possesses a coat of arms, lay siege to this castle; at a point of great suspense during the climactic duel, ten thousand of Democles's troops emerge from ambush, rout the two hundred

shepherds, and take prisoner both Melicertus and Pleusidippus. Sidney's rendition of the noble-leads-herdsmen motif appears implausible, perhaps, but Greene's appears ridiculous.

The siege brings up a question about the target of Greene's burlesque, however, because while the OA exhibits the motif of a disguised noble leading a band of shepherds into battle, it does not have a siege; only the NA does, and, as I have shown, Greene probably did not know the NA when he wrote Menaphon. In fact, several features of Greene's plot have parallels in the NA rather than in the OA, and two features seem not to have parallels in either. Is Greene nodding in his apparent abandonment of a rigid burlesque of the OA? Or is he merely sacrificing consistency for inventiveness? Both of these suggestions appear unlikely in light of a reassessment of the sources from which Sidney drew material for both versions of his Arcadia.

Three features of the plot of Menaphon that have analogs in the NA are Menaphon's succor of the shipwrecked Samela, Lamedon, and Pleusidippus after the three have washed ashore in Arcadia, the abduction of Pleusidippus by pirates, and the imprisonment of Samela by Pleusidippus (and later by Democles). If Greene did not have the NA before him, he may have adapted these elements from the AEthiopica, which was available in Greek (though probably not accessible to Greene) as well as in an English translation by Thomas Underdowne

(Wolff 238). In the AETHiopica, the shipwreck and the abduction by pirates are connected incidents: the pirate Trachinus kidnaps Theagenes and Chariclea during his capture of a Phoenician vessel¹; imperiled by a storm, he surrenders Chariclea to his lieutenant Pelorus, who in turn is forced by Theagenes to give her up, after which Theagenes and Chariclea are abandoned on shore (Wolff 13-14). The captivity episode occurs somewhat later, and the roles are inverted: Arsace, wife of the viceroy of Egypt, becomes aroused by Theagenes, whom she imprisons, threatens, and tortures to coerce him to yield to her (Wolff 311).

What is interesting about Greene's incorporation of these three features is that he distorts each, as he does many from the OA, and pushes them also out of the realm of the improbable into that of the ludicrous. Sephestia is shipwrecked, but has no clear reason for being on a ship in the first place, unless the reason is banishment; but then, why Sephestia and her family were banished is not satisfactorily explained. Then, too, the premise that both Maximius and Sephestia consider each other lost forever, despite their daily contact as Arcadian shepherd and shepherdess, presumes at the very least that Sephestia and her child had been adrift on the ocean long enough for

¹ Wolff maintains that the abduction by pirates is also analogous to an episode in Longus's Daphnis and Chloe during which Daphnis is kidnapped on a beach (438-39).

Maximius to reach land, blend into the rustic community, and become inured to the thought that his wife and child are dead. Such a process presumably involves several weeks, perhaps several months.

One feature that distinguishes Greene's Pleusidippus from Heliodorus's Theagenes is their ages: while Theagenes is an adult, Pleusidippus is a child of about five. Yet Greene's portrayal of him is comically inconsistent on this point. At the court of Thessaly, Pleusidippus acts his age when Agenor and Eriphila extol his beauty:

Pleusidippus not vused to such hyperbolic spectators, broke off their silence [pause in their speech] by calling for his victuals, as one whose emptie stomack since his comming from the sea was not ouercloyd with delicates. . . . [Upon their many questions, he] cut off all their further interrogatories by calling after his childish manner againe for his dinner; (70)

but earlier, Pleusidippus had demonstrated before the pirates his command of mature, eloquent invective:

Pesant, the bastard in thy face, for I am a Gentleman: wert thou a man in courage, as thou art a Kowe in proportion, thou wouldst neuer haue so much empayred thy honestie, as to derogate from my honor. (66-67)

Heliodorus's Theagenes and Chariclea are imprisoned by

Arsace, wife of the viceroy and sister to King Hydaspes, Chariclea's father, because of Arsace's lust for Theagenes; when Hydaspes quashes a dispute of Oroöndates, the viceroy, by means of a siege, Oroöndates surrenders the couple to Hydaspes, who, oblivious to Chariclea's identity, plans to sacrifice them. All is set right when Chariclea, having awaited her mother's presence, reveals that she is the daughter of Hydaspes and Persina (Wolff 15, 20-26). The captivity of Samela is similar to that of Theagenes and Chariclea, but less believable (even for a romance). While Theagenes and Chariclea are imprisoned because Theagenes is the object of Chariclea's aunt's affections, Samela is captured because her own son and her own father desire her (neither recognizes her, although both should). Then, while Heliodorus places the castle of his characters' captivity at Memphis, where the castle of a viceroy quite naturally ought to be (Wolff 20), Greene introduces the nearby castle of Democles in an afterthought that occurs to the king only when he is in disguise among the shepherds and plotting how to approach a woman who has just rejected the young Thessalian knight (85). Finally, while Heliodorus gives Chariclea a plausible motive for postponing the revelation of her identity--reliance on her mother's instinct rather than on the disclosure of her tokens, which might be supposed to be stolen (Wolff 25-26)--Greene, who affords his heroine no such motive, causes Samela to risk the king's displeasure by

rejecting him ostensibly for Melicertus's sake, while pointlessly concealing the one fact that would save her.

The siege to rescue Samela from Pleusidippus has analogs throughout literature, and the identification of any single work as the main source is improbable. A parallel occurs in the Aethiopica when Thyamis and Theagenes stand outside the walls of Memphis to demand Thyamis's reinstatement into the priesthood (Wolff 20-21). Short, however, as I have observed, takes the siege to be a comic allusion to the Iliad. Pleusidippus provides ample evidence to support such a claim, asking the "siege army" if they "have a madding humour like the Greekes to seek for the recouerie of Helena," calling himself "a Priam to defende hir with resistance of a ten yeares siege," and taunting the shepherds by asking, "I pray you tell me which is Agamemnon?" (95-96). Nevertheless, it is important to note, too, that only one other character, Samela, so much as acknowledges this allusion: she considers herself "as haplesse as Helena to haue the burden of warres laid on the wings" of her beauty (98). In fact, many of the expressions and images used in the siege section echo medieval chivalric romances such as Amadis of Gaul rather than the Iliad. For instance, the place of the siege in Menaphon is always referred to as a castle--a distinctly medieval image; the term "caualiers," used ironically to refer to the besieging shepherds (Greene 95), functions similarly. Heraldry, a

characteristic of medieval chivalry, is also strongly alluded to in the description of Melicertus in his armor (95) and in Melicertus's reference to the "Lawe of Armes" that justifies a knight's defense of his honor against someone who wears his crest (99). Other words and phrases that appear in this section and that also abound in chivalric romances are "parley," "knight," "champions" (95), "truce" (97), and "throwe downe his gantlet" (96). At any rate, the siege in Menaphon, related as it is to the point discussed above concerning Melicertus's leadership of the herdsmen, has already been shown to be as far-fetched as anything in the romance; therefore, regardless of whether Greene adapted his material from what he found in Heliodorus or from what he found in Amadis or other chivalric prose romances, the siege section also demonstrates that his treatment of that material is less than serious.

I have mentioned Amadis of Gaul as the typical medieval chivalric romance because it appears to have particular relevance to Menaphon's relationship to Sidney's Arcadia. Scholars acknowledge that Amadis is certainly a source of the OA (Robertson xxi-xxii) and of some of the chivalric themes that Sidney added to the NA (Evans 19). But the vast plot of Amadis seems also to supply two features of Menaphon that appear in neither the OA nor the NA.

The theme of the child who is lost, abandoned, or abducted by sea but who returns and is reunited with his

loved ones has many literary analogs; however, that of the child who returns as the "matchless paragon of approved chivalrie" (Greene 107) has fewer. But John O'Connor identifies just such an analog in Amadis:

The pirate Eurilochus [in Greene] who wins a pardon from King Agenor by presenting him with the kidnaped child Pleusidippus, recalls the Moorish pirates in Book VII who win a pardon from King Magadan by presenting him with the kidnaped child later known as Amadis de Grèce. Like Amadis de Grèce, Pleusidippus is raised with love by his royal foster father and has intimations of his princely birth by his thirst after glory. (215)

A further allusion to Amadis may appear in Pleusidippus's name, which seems to be derived from plusis--"a washing"--and diploos--"doubly" or "twice"--that is, "twice-washed," referring to the two times he was taken on the sea against his will (see Liddell and Scott, "diploos" and "plusis"). Amadis of Gaul--the first Amadis--was found in an ark on the ocean and was during his fosterage called "Child of the Sea" ("Amadis . . ."). Taken together, these ideas seem to suggest that Amadis, rather than Sidney's Arcadia or Heliodorus's Aethiopica, provides the source material for the "abduction" motif in Menaphon. The comic inconsistency in the character of Pleusidippus is retained in any event.

Rarer perhaps than this feature is the theme of a

climactic duel between a father and a son who do not recognize each other. Fights such as the one between Pleusidippus and Melicertus appear infrequently according to John O'Connor, but the motif "is a commonplace in Amadis"²; the typical example, he suggests, "involves Amadis de Grèce and his father" (215).

Greene's distortion of the two plot elements he apparently took from Amadis fits the developing pattern. Amadis is as much a "courtesy book" as is Castiglione's Courtier, Spenser's Faerie Queene, or Sidney's Arcadia itself, and outlines the standards of comeliness, courtesy, valor, and honor that noble persons are to adhere to. But although Greene's Pleusidippus is Amadis's equal in chivalrous valor and beauty, he is bereft of the knightly courtesy and honor that Amadis displays. Pleusidippus is fickle with Olympia, Agenor's daughter, dedicating to her "al his indeuors" and "all his aduentures" while it suits him, but ruthlessly jilting her upon merely hearing of the beauty of an Arcadian shepherdess whom, notably, he might naturally disdain as common (78-82); and then he actually behaves villainously toward Samela, abducting and imprisoning her when she rejects his suit (84-85). This villainy has implications as well for the second motif Greene uses, since,

² O'Connor also observes Greene's use of this motif in a previous work, Card of Fancy, suggesting that this establishes a link between Greene and Amadis as early as 1587 (207).

clearly, there is no honor to be won during a duel that a knight undertakes because he has mistreated a lady. Then, too, whether the idea of a father fighting his son is far-fetched, the premise that the crests of Melicertus and Pleusidippus are identical--despite being adopted for different reasons--appears certainly to be.

What is revealed by the analysis of Greene's sources other than the Arcadia is that even these parts of his "tissue of absurdities" are calculated, and this in turn suggests that Greene's target may not have been Sidney's Arcadia alone, but the romance genre itself--including pastoral and chivalric romances. But despite his evidently disdainful tone, Greene also has an alternative to propose, and it appears in his treatment of a thematic convention of romantic prose fiction, Nature.

To an Elizabethan the term "Nature" was nearly synonymous with "order." Nature consisted of the physical universe, of course; but Nature was also the system of laws that governed the operation of everything within the cosmos, from the primum mobile to the smallest known creature; and, additionally, Nature was the force that assigned all beings, including humans, to their respective places on a cosmic hierarchy. L. G. Salingar explains in the following passage how this governing, organizing feature of Nature influenced people's understanding of society:

The whole universe was governed by divine will; Nature was God's instrument, the social hierarchy a product of Nature. It followed for Tudor theorists that subordination and unity were the natural rules for families and corporations and, above all, for the state, a 'body politic' which should be subject to a single head. . . . the order founded on Nature existed for man's benefit, and man as such was an integral part of it. (18)

Quoting Thomas Hooker, Salinger adds that "the law of Nature is 'an infallible knowledge imprinted' in the mind" (19); that is, a human's place in his society was decreed and circumscribed by Natural law, and his behavior reflected this influence. The rules of Nature that govern social interaction are important features of both the Arcadia and Menaphon, serving Greene's satirical purpose as well as Sidney's romantic and didactic aims.

Two areas of human living come under the influence of Nature in the Arcadia: gender and social class. Specifically, the successes of Sidney's heroes and heroines depend at least partially upon their adherence to the following rubrics of Nature: (1) Men shall not be women; (2) Nobles shall not be shepherds; (3) Nobles shall not be romantically attracted to shepherd folk, and vice-versa; and (4) Shepherds shall not be nobles, nor wish to be. That the first is a concern is illustrated by the oracle: love

between women (amazons included), suggests the oracle, is "uncouth" and hated by Nature (OA 5). The second is evident in Pyrocles's use of "we" in the line, "Nature against we do seem to rebel" (OA 83). Here he is singing an eclogue with Musidorus, who is disguised as Dorus the shepherd. With his allusion to his own disguise as Cleophila, Pyrocles acknowledges the first rule; and with his use of the plural pronoun, he suggests that his cousin seems to have violated the second by abandoning his nobility to tend flocks. The third principle is most evident in the struggle between Pamela's reason, which leads her to reject Dorus the shepherd, and her nature, through which she instinctively senses his nobility and which allows her love toward him to grow. The narrator reports that she "would needs make open war upon herself, . . . for, indeed, even now find she did a certain working of a new-come inclination to Dorus. But . . . she did overmaster it with consideration of his meanness" (OA 55). Finally, the idea that shepherds do not aspire to nobility is reflected in a number of passages, but it may be best observed in Pamela's remonstrance with Dorus: "methinks you blame your fortune very wrongfully, since the fault is not in fortune but in you that cannot frame yourself to your fortune" (OA 100). Fortune and Nature are hardly synonymous; but the sense here is that Fortune has decreed that Dorus's is a shepherd's nature, and therefore he must be wrong for attempting to rise above it.

Sidney's characters obey these rules of Nature with nearly flawless consistency. Pamela and Philoclea, for instance, are naturally attracted to Dorus and Cleophila, but acknowledge their growing affection only when they are reasonably confident that the shepherd and the amazon are really princes. Furthermore, when Pyrocles sings, "Nature against we do seem to rebel," the word "seem" is of critical significance, because neither prince actually renounces his nature: both have assumed their respective alter egos in the pursuit of most natural goals--the love of the daughters of Basilius--and both conform to Nature in spite of their disguises, as when Pyrocles very masculinely kills the lion or when Musidorus leads the shepherds' defense against the Phagonians. The poetic, melancholy, and valorous Philisides, in addition, turns out to be a gentleman, which accounts for his unusually refined behavior. Nor do the true shepherds disdain to be shepherds. Lalus, for example, expresses his affection for Kala in shepherd fashion, truly and simply (OA 244), and is content to receive Kala's bashful favors in return. Also, the shepherds as a group want nothing to do with the weighty affairs of state that arise when Basilius is presumed dead; "their quiet hearts" have "no aptness" for such "garboils," and so they leave to sing their eclogues (OA 327).

As a matter of fact, Basilius is the only character whose behavior at first glance seems inconsistent with

Natural law. That is, while Gynecia recognizes Pyrocles's true gender and pursues him and while Philoclea does not pierce Pyrocles's disguise and is puzzled by her attraction to him (both women thereby abiding by the first principle), Basilius neither discovers Cleophila to be a man nor feels any "natural" discomfort at pursuing the amazon. The origin of this difference in behavior, however, is not in Nature, after all, but in reason. Gynecia's capacity to make rational decisions based on accurate perceptions of reality functions properly and allows her to discover Pyrocles to be a man; sixteen-year-old Philoclea, however, is naive, as she shows when, upon learning Cleophila's true identity, she refers to the "stained" condition of "the pureness" of her "virgin mind" (OA 121)--therefore, her reason is not impaired, but, rather, not developed enough to alert her that her amazon friend is not what she seems to be. But Basilius's reason is flawed, as his impatience "to know the certainty of things to come" (OA 5), his choice of Dametas as his chief herdsman, and his flight to the pasturelands suggest; and, therefore, he cannot detect Pyrocles's disguise. As it had when he decided to retire to the country, Basilius's flawed reason overrides his nature in his relationship with Cleophila. Hence, even Basilius is not truly guilty of violating the laws of Nature at work in the OA.

Although the function of Natural law in Menaphon is similar to its function in the Arcadia, Greene's perspective

is strikingly different from Sidney's. Both consciously and unconsciously Sidney's characters confirm the principles of Nature respecting gender and social order to such a degree that almost all of them appear as idealized as the Arcadian environment. Several of Greene's, though, experience sustained conflict, either between their ostensible natures and their perceptions of reality or between their natures and their expressed intentions. In fact, only two characters in Menaphon clearly exhibit a straightforward obedience to Nature, and the vivid contrast between their harmony and the chaos brought about by the other characters suggests that Greene may have been developing a different conception of the influence of Nature upon the social order than Sidney had.

Democles, the old, dangerously capricious Arcadian monarch infatuated with someone who cannot be his lover, appears analogous to Sidney's Basilius. This parallel suggests in turn that Greene has substituted a Natural principle concerning incest for Sidney's Natural law regarding homosexuality. By association, the passion of Pleusidippus for Samela falls within the purview of the same law. Charles Crupi agrees, as he implies when he writes that Samela's "instinctive rejection of Pleusidippus and Democles represents a triumph of Nature" (55). In fact, the strand of Menaphon's plot in which Democles and Pleusidippus pursue Samela is related to Basilius's love for Cleophila,

but the common element in both instances may not be Nature. A reconsideration of Menaphon reveals that Samela acts less out of her instincts as a mother or daughter than out of pure discretion. First, she has neither the disposition nor the motivation even to consider a suit from an unknown shepherd youth, whether he is a knight in disguise or not; devoted to Melicertus on the one hand and presumably as suspicious as anyone would be about the courtship of a stranger on the other, Samela is justified in rejecting Pleusidippus simply because she has no reason to be interested in him. Her indifferent banter with him supports such an inference. Second, Samela does not reject Democles until after he has declared that he is a king and she recognizes him to be her father; thus, despite the narrator's remark that Samela is "restrained by nature in that he was her Father" (Greene 105), Nature appears to be less of an influence upon her decision than reason. Furthermore, if Samela responded to Pleusidippus and Democles according to her nature, we ought logically to be able to infer that Pleusidippus and Democles would avoid courting Samela, also because of their natures. Yet they do not; we can conclude therefore that the supposed Natural law against incest is not imposed by Nature at all. How, then, are Democles and Pleusidippus related thematically to Basilius?

As I have observed, Basilius's amorous inclinations toward Cleophila do not necessarily indicate his rejection

of the Natural principle "Men shall not be women" and its implications; rather, his flawed judgment allows him to override the conflict that he ought to sense by instinct. As I have also observed, reason plays a more important role than instinct in the portion of Menaphon in which Democles and Pleusidippus attempt to seduce Samela. It is here in the relationship of reason and Nature, in fact, that the "Pleusidippus-Democles-Samela" part of Menaphon at once shares a thematic concept with, and yet diverges in its aim from the "Basilius-Cleophila" strand of the OA. Democles is a parallel character to Basilius in that his defective understanding will not allow him to recognize Samela as Sephestia and resist his attraction to her. He may be described early as "a man as iust in his censures as royall in his possessions" (Greene 21), but he loses much of his naturally-endowed good judgment after (or perhaps before) he has banished Sephestia and her family and after the death of his wife, becoming "carelesse of all weathers," appearing to be "another Heliogabalus,"³ and leaving "the succession of his kingdome to vncertaine chance" (81-82). His impaired reason causes him to interpret his perceptions erroneously and behave irrationally, as when he invites

³ According to Lempriere, Heliogabalus was a Roman emperor whose reign was characterized by decadence and administrative ineptitude.

Pleusidippus, apparently his most likely rival for Samela, to help in abducting her; when he orders the wholesale slaughter of the shepherds; or when he explains that destroying the beauty of Samela is not wrong "where the anger of a King must be satisfied" (106).

Pleusidippus's thematic relationship to Democles, and thus to Basilius, is one of intensification. From the outset of Menaphon, Pleusidippus's nature and his perception of himself are at odds, and the confusion this conflict generates also impairs any good sense he may have. He is reared among shepherd children, his mother scrupulously concealing his identity from him, and, despite his evident superiority to his comrades and his claim of gentility to Romano the pirate, he describes himself as the son of a shepherdess. Nevertheless, he is stung by the insults of Olympia and retorts, "although my parents and progenie are enuied by obscuritie, yet the sparkes of renown that make my Eagle minded thoughts to mount . . . ascertaineth my soule I was the sonne of . . . a Gentleman" (80). He thus suffers from the Renaissance equivalent of an identity crisis, which allows him one moment to become infatuated with a shepherdess, another to be haughty and contentious with a princess, and still another practically to fawn before Samela, the shepherdess, to win her affection. Confused as he is about his own nature and identity, Pleusidippus cannot hope ever to be sure that anything he

does will actually accord with his nature; and so he pursues Samela, evidently disregarding the appearance that Samela is a rustic, the presumably palpable difference in their ages, and Samela's probable resemblance to the woman that he should remember to be his mother.

In the portion of Menaphon's plot involving Samela, Democles, and Pleusidippus, Greene thus builds a thematic parody of the parallel thread in the Arcadia. Like Sidney's Basilius, Democles is led by his distorted reason nearly to violate an apparent law of Nature; but unlike any of Sidney's characters, Pleusidippus threatens to break the same rule because he has learned to be ambivalent toward both his natural instincts and his perceptions of reality. Predictably, Democles and Pleusidippus contribute to the chaos of the final scene.

Further contributions to the same chaos are made by the other principal characters, Melicertus, Menaphon, and Samela, through a variation on the Nature theme. In developing these characters Greene actually uses Nature as a force that influences their behavior, but from a different angle than Sidney does in the OA. All of Sidney's characters appear to presuppose their places in the social order, and they consciously attempt to behave accordingly; Melicertus, Menaphon, and Samela, in contrast, consciously try to deny their places in the social order, only to demonstrate that their true natures are irrepressible.

Despite several obvious hints, the reader learns only very late in the plot that Melicertus is in fact "a Gentleman, though tirde in shepheardes skincoate" (89). Throughout the rest of Menaphon Melicertus is determined to conceal his identity, and therefore his nature, by telling Doron he was "born to base fortunes" and has tended sheep in other places (47), by courting Samela "in such shepheardes tearmes as he had" (83), and by refusing to reveal his true identity when doing so might save both his and Samela's lives. But his noble nature and learning peep out: when he determines to discover from her speech how Samela was reared, he does so because someone of noble nature would be trained in the courtly art of debating; when Samela has met him for the first time, she observes, "his lookes in shepheardes weeds are Lordlie, . . . his wit full of gentrie" (56-57); and when Democles has heard Melicertus's eclogue, he marvels "that such rare conceipts could bee harboured vnder a shepheardes gray cloathing" (despite having been nearby when Melicertus revealed his nobility to Menaphon: 89, 94).

Menaphon is a shepherd by nature, but moves through much of the plot trying to transcend the limits of his estate. "Menaphon thy mindes fauours, are greater than thy birth, and thy priuate conceipt better than thy publique esteeme" (24), he remarks very early in the work, and although he realizes--perhaps instinctively--that Samela is

"too high for thy [his own] fortunes" (38), he pursues her anyway and dresses in his finest clothes, fringes his sheephook with crewel to signify his rank, and vies with Melicertus to lead the siege, all out of devotion to his lady. Yet he cannot subdue his nature, either: in his finery he excites no more than pity from Samela, "whose minde had rather haue chosen anie misfortune, than haue deined her eyes on the face and feature of so lowe a peasant" (40); in his eclogue in the contest against Melicertus he sings, "let not my sillie stile/Condemne my zeale: . . ./ Sweete Censors take my silly worst for well:/ My faith is firme, though homely be my laye" (91); and when he learns of Samela's identity, he sees "his passions were too aspiring, and that . . . he barkt against the Moone," and so he leaves "such lettice as were too fine for his lips" (108). His contribution to the chaos of the final scene is indirect in that by challenging Melicertus's claim to the leadership of the rescue party he helps to confirm Melicertus's nobility and thus guarantees the nobleman's participation in the siege and in the sharing of its consequences.

Samela's conscious rejection of Natural law has already been suggested: she resolves to be "meanlie minded" and to "imagine a small cotage to a spacious pallaice" (32), and claims before Menaphon to be of mean parentage (35). Like Melicertus and Menaphon, she occasionally allows her nature to escape; unlike them, however, she typically appears petty

and fickle when her nature is revealed. One moment she heaps proverb on proverb to explain to Menaphon that he and she are incompatible--"in nature this is an vnrefuted principle, that it falteth which faileth in vniformitie; . . . equall fortunes are loues faavorites, and therefore should fancie be limited by Geometrical proportion" (42)--and another moment she assures Melicertus that "honour hangs in high desires" (60). At one moment she promises Menaphon, "I will account thee before anie shepheard in Arcadie," and at another she tells him, "Alas pore swaine . . . thou hopest in vaine, since another must reape what thou hast sowen" (73). Her naturally aristocratic beauty is presumably what brings Democles and Pleusidippus to the pastures, while her determination to undermine her nature is in part responsible ultimately for Democles's death sentence upon her; therefore, Samela contributes greatly to the confusion of the execution scene.

Lalus and Kala, the rustics who court and plight their troth at the outset of the OA's Third Eclogues, represent Sidney's use of a pastoral convention, ideal love between shepherds and shepherdesses. Greene also makes use of this convention in Menaphon, and much as Sidney does with Lalus and Kala: Doron, Greene's shepherd, woos Carmela with plain words and a barnyard love song, much as Lalus wins Kala; and the courtship scene in Menaphon appears to be a separate incident that offsets the plot in much the same way that

the OA's eclogues offset its own prose narrative. Since love between rustics is a convention of the pastoral, to infer that Doron and Carmela are parallel characters to Lalus and Kala may be dangerous; yet, given the common characteristics of the couples and the authors' methods of introducing them, as well as the probability that several features of Menaphon have direct parallels in the OA, the likelihood is strong that Greene has created his lovers to correspond to Sidney's. And here too Greene seems to magnify what he finds in the OA. By the time the reader reaches the OA's Third Eclogues, he is attuned to the smooth turn away from the narrative action and to the idyllic pause that the Eclogues impose. Greene makes no provision for such regular intrusions into the narrative; and when he introduces Doron and Carmela, he jolts his reader, not only because the scene is unexpected, but also because it comes at a point of heightened suspense, after Democles's army has annihilated Melicertus's bucolic siege force and Democles has imprisoned both Melicertus and Pleusidippus and has captured Samela. In addition, while Sidney reports the courtship of Lalus and Kala in the third person and portrays the couple as one-dimensional stereotypes, Greene carefully develops Doron and Carmela, setting their scene in a specific place, giving them characteristic speeches and a song, and offering through his narrator a sympathetic, approving remark. What is more, Lalus and Kala mechanically

abide by the laws of Nature as well as any character in the Arcadia; but Doron and Carmela are the only characters in Menaphon (besides the minor character Pesana) who abide faithfully by the Natural law that has made them shepherds. Overall, then, Greene seems to attach a special importance to his shepherd lovers that Sidney does not attach to Lalus and Kala.

Greene's transition from his point of heightened suspense to his placid scene between Doron and Carmela reads, "Where leauing these passionate Louers in this Catastrophe, againe to Doron the homely blunt Shepheard . . ." (99-100). To make such an abrupt change of scene in such matter-of-fact language is perhaps to suggest, "This action and suspense is all well and good, but it can surely wait while I offer you something of real importance." In fact, Greene's development points to just such an idea. Doron and Carmela in their brief, quaint tête-à-tête are drawn with as much or more delicacy and grace than all the principal characters in Menaphon. They meet bashfully in the fields: "breaking a few quarter blowes with such countrey glaunces as they coulde, they geerde one at another louingly" (100). When Doron speaks, he begins "manfully," but with a forthright rustic simile: "tis as daintie to see you abroad, as to eate a mess of sweete milk in Iuly" (100); when Carmela frets at not having seen him for a long while, "Doron, to shewe himselfe a naturall young man, gaue her a few kinde

kisses . . . and sware that she was the woman he loued best in the whole worlde" (100-01). The eclogue they sing may indeed betray the "naive vocabulary" that Charles Crupi has observed (59), but it also demonstrates the playful tone of contented lovers:

Sit downe Carmela here are cubbs for kings
Slowes blacke as ieat, or like my Christmas shooes,
Sweete Sidar which my leathern bottle brings:
Sit downe Carmela let me kisse thy toes. . . .
What doo I loue? O no, I doo but talke.
What shall I die for loue? O no, not so.
What am I dead? O no my tongue dooth walke.
Come kisse Carmela, and confound my woe. . . .
I thanke you Doron, and will thinke on you,
I loue you Doron and will winke on you.
I seale your charter pattent with my thummes,
Come kisse and part for feare my mother comes.
 (101-03)

And when the narrator cautions, "Gentlemen . . . thinke the poore Countrey Louers knew no further comparisons, than came within the compasse of their Countrey Logicke" (103), he is not excusing or ridiculing them; on the contrary, he approves:

Well, twas a good worlde when such simplicitie was vused, sayes the olde women of our time, when a

ring of a rush woulde tye as much Loue together
as a Gimmon of golde. (103)

Crupi writes that as "illiterate shepherds, Doron and Carmela are pale imitations, indeed parodies, of the other lovers in Menaphon" (58); perhaps the couple are parodies of the other lovers, but in light of the evidence that reveals the others to be burlesque characters, themselves caricatures of Sidney's Arcadian lovers, and in light of Greene's sympathetic portrayal of the rustic pair, Doron and Carmela are far from "pale imitations." Alone among the characters of Menaphon in their obedience to Nature, content in their simple but harmonious relationship, reflecting a "warmth" of characterization that even Crupi acknowledges (58), and placed as they are in stark opposition to the comically exaggerated main plot, Doron and Carmela appear to represent a deliberate effort at the portrayal of something better: real love between a real man and a real woman. By extension, the rustic lovers' scene is a comment upon the concepts of Nature and prose fiction; that is, plain, honest communication and affection between a man and a woman are always sanctioned by Natural law and lead more directly to a happy ending than do subterfuge and intrigue; and, too, a scene that contains the realistic talk of two realistic characters makes for a better story. In this connection Doron and Carmela may be further contrasted with Sidney's Lalus and Kala: although Sidney's couple are as simple,

sincere, and obedient to their natures as rustics as are Greene's couple, Lalus and Kala are mythologized, one-dimensional Arcadian figures practically indistinguishable from characters such as Strephon and Klaius; Doron and Carmela, on the other hand, spring out as carefully developed, multi-dimensional individuals who resemble, as Short observes, "bumpkins from an Elizabethan country parish" (258). Greene's different perspective thus seems to show that if Nature and love are to exert irresistible influence upon characters in fiction--upon, that is, nobles and rustics alike--a plot that includes the depiction of a plain exchange of affections between two carefully drawn rustics can be superior to one that extravagantly portrays the schemes, pretensions, and theatrics of a whole herd of stereotypical characters--whether shepherds or nobles. Fully delineated rustic characters may obey Natural law as well as stereotypical nobles, of course; but characters such as Doron and Carmela are not the elegant mannequins that Pyrocles, Pamela, Melicertus, and Pleusidippus are: they do not interact through artificial formality and practiced eloquence or display exaggerated ecstasy, furor, or pathos. They are warmer and livelier, and presumably more appealing to Greene's audience.

G. K. Hunter writes that by the time Menaphon was published in 1589, some writers were beginning to discard the rhetorical balance of euphuism in favor of the more and

more fashionable descriptive periphrasis in Sidney's style (280-83). Greene, as I have shown, may have gone an extra step in Menaphon and rejected the style of the Arcadia, also, but, as Salzman remarks, he does in fact appear to satirize euphuism in his romance by portraying it as "both outmoded and affected" (47). Salzman notes that language in Euphues is "the key to character" (40); language performs a similar function in Greene's satire on Euphues in Menaphon as well: the amount of euphuistic language a character in Menaphon employs and the degree to which he is conscious of his own and others' euphuism reveals in part whether he is to be the object of light comedy or of satiric ridicule, or of neither. Not only does language reveal certain features in Greene's characters, but the characters in turn suggest Greene's attitude toward euphuism, in that the pretentious, unfashionable style is used unconsciously by characters who are clearly pretentious or out of touch with courtly fashion and consciously by characters who presume that the style will appeal to someone who appears to be out of touch with courtly fashion. Thus Greene's satire operates through characterization; but the satire also works through direct and indirect allusions to Euphues, both in the intrusions of the omniscient narrator and in the language of the romance's title.

Hunter identifies eight features of euphuistic style:
(1) Parison, the use of the same structure in different

clauses; (2) Isocolon, the balancing of clauses of equal length; (3) Paromoion, the balancing of clauses having the same sound patterns; (4) Quasi-rhymes, usually at the beginnings or endings of clauses; (5) Alliteration; (6) Extended similes from "natural history," such as Pliny's, which is, of course, not altogether "natural"; (7) Proverbs and Exemplums (especially exemplums taken from classical mythology); and (8) Rhetorical questions (265). James Ruoff adds two other characteristics, antithesis and the dubbio d'amore ("euphuism"). Although several of these may be identified in the speech of Pleusidippus, of Agenor and Eriphila, and even of Doron and Carmela, they are most evident in the language of four of Menaphon's characters in particular: Lamedon, Melicertus, Samela, and Menaphon.

Lamedon, Samela's uncle who is shipwrecked with her, is characterized as a well-intentioned but long-winded old man. He is not given many opportunities to speak, but his garrulousness is clear when at one point Samela cuts him off just as he is "readie to goe forwarde with [a] perswasieue argument" (32) he had begun two pages earlier. Lamedon's verbosity, along with his tendency to offer advice of negligible value and his lack of any distinct role in the development of Menaphon's plot lines, suggests that Lamedon is a benignly comic character. Since the style of Euphues is consciously rhetorical, the narrator's assessment of Lamedon's speech as a "perswasive argument" is a possible

reference to euphuism; but the speech itself, part of which is given below, is certainly euphuistic, displaying examples of parison, isocolon, antithesis, proverbs, similes from natural history, and exemplums from classical mythology:

Sephestia, thou seest no Phisick preuailes against the gaze of the Basilisckes, no charme against the sting of the Tarantula, no preuention to diuert the decree of the Fates, nor no meanes to recall backe the balefull hurt of Fortune: Incurable sores are without Avicens Aphorismes, and therefore no salue for them but patience. Then my Sephestia sith thy fal is high, and fortune low; thy sorrowes great, and thy hope little: seeing me partaker of thy miseries, set all thy rest uppon this, Solamen miseris, socios habuisse doloris. Chaunce is like Ianus double faced, as well full of smiles to comfort, as of frownes to dismay: the Ocean at his deapest ebbe returns to a full tide; when the Eagle meanes to soare highest, he raiseth his flight in the lowest dales. . . . (30)

The comic effect of Lamedon is enhanced when he extends the same speech to four times the length of the quoted passage and misquotes a proverb (apparently to suit his rhetorical aim): Hope, he says, is "the daughter of time" (31); but as Short points out, Time's daughter is Truth, not Hope (208).

Melicertus stands at the opposite extreme from Lamedon

in his use of euphuistic language. "Such abstract fond compares make cunning die" (Greene 92), he says of euphuistic similes, demonstrating that he knows that the style is out of vogue. According to the omniscient narrator, who records Samela's thoughts on Melicertus's "Description of his Mistres," he is a talented poet, and is merely "dissembling" when he approaches Samela with a greeting such as ". . . I was by a strange attractive force drawne, as the adamant draweth the yron, or the ieat the straw, to visite your sweete selfe in the shade" (58). The narrator also intrudes with an allusion to Euphues to explain why Melicertus speaks to Samela in this way: "Melicertus thinking that Samela had learnd with Lucilla in Athens to anatomize wit, . . . imagined she smoothed her talke to be like Sapho Phaos Paramour" (59). Convinced as he is that Samela is "some Farmers daughter at the most," Melicertus supposes that this bumpkin has affected an outmoded style because she has equated it with courtly fashion, and therefore engages her with a glib, condescending sort of euphuism.

The narrator continues to allude to Euphues in his characterization of Samela, as in her thoughts on Melicertus's speech in the pasture: "she heard him so superfine, as if Ephaebus had learnd him to refine his mother tongue, wherefore thought he had done it of an inkhorne desire to be eloquent" (58-9). Therefore, Samela also recognizes that euphuism is passé and is equally glib

in her response to Melicertus. Yet she does not have the control that he does; in fact, she consistently unleashes floods of euphuistic figures during scenes of intense emotion. Parison, isocolon, paromoion, proverbs, and antitheses ring from passages such as, "Sweete Lamedon, once partner of my royalties, now partaker of my wants, as constant in his extreame distresse, as faithfull in higher fortunes: the Turtle pearketh not on barren trees, Doues delight not in foule cotages . . ." (32). Her emotional outbursts, in fact, reach the point of hyperbolic parody at times, as when she discovers Pleusidippus missing:

Dissembling heauens, . . . haue you therefore
 hethertoo fed me with honie, that you might at
 last poyson me with gall? Haue you fatted mee so
 long with Sardenian smiles, that like the wracke
 of the Syrens, I might perish in your wiles?
 Curst that I was to affie in your curtesie, curst
 that am to taste of your crueltie. O Pleusidippus,
 liuest thou, or art thou dead? No thou art dead,
 dead to the world, dead to thy kinsfolkes, dead
 to Cipres, dead to Arcadie, dead to thy mother
Samela. . . . O cruel Themis that did reuolue such
 vneuitable fate; hard harted death to prosecute me
 with such hate. (71-2)

Already characterized as fickle and irrational, Samela becomes a still greater object of satire through her

inability to avoid a style that she knows is out of fashion. Greene's comic portrayal of Lamedon hints that euphuism may be the style of vapid bombast; his depiction of Samela shows that euphuism may also be the style of theatrical pathos.

Although Menaphon can swear by "Pan the God of Shepherds" (73) and insist, "Alonely I am plaine, and what I say/ I thinke . . ." (91), his speech characterizes him as one who feels obliged to affect a particular style if the situation demands it. Suing for love to Samela, he sings in a pastoral "roundelay" a fable about an eagle and a fly; describing Samela in an eclogue, he calls forth volumes of Petrarchan similes; fulminating over Samela's ill treatment, he inflates invective to bombast; and aspiring to something beyond himself, whether it is Samela in particular or nobility in general, he is euphuistic. "Menaphon thy mindes fauours are greater than thy wealths fortunes," he begins in his earliest speech, a soliloquy; he packs the utterance with similar antitheses, as well as with generous amounts of parison, isocolon, paromoion, and alliteration, and plenty of proverbs and similes from natural history. Similar patterns occur when he first meets Samela and Lamedon, when he courts Samela, and when he comforts her after she has lost Pleusidippus. But Menaphon also fails when he affects artificial styles: he never becomes more than the king's chief herdsman, he loses in his singing match with Melicertus, he impresses neither Samela nor Lamedon when he

meets them, and he loses Samela herself at last to Melicertus. Menaphon's only success comes when he determines to "make his olde Mistresse some new musicke" with a pastoral lament that describes the wound which Pesana, his "olde Mistresse," will heal (76-7). Thus Menaphon's use of euphuism and other affected diction characterizes him as foolishly ambitious; the implication to be derived from such a characterization is that euphuism may in turn be the style of ambitious fools.

Related to this theme may be the associations to be detected in Menaphon's title. The second part, Camilla's Alarum to Slumbering Euphues, although denounced as "catchpenny" by Hunter (259), may convey a subtle message. Camilla, the heroine of Euphues and his England, it will be remembered, is an Englishwoman who is more receptive to sincere reason than to empty eloquence; her "alarum," perhaps native, ordinary English wit, may sound harsh, discordant; yet it is alive and alert, not "slumbering" under a mountain. Then, it seems reasonable to note both that Menaphon was not called Greene's Arcadia until well after its original publication and that Greene's use of the name of a shepherd who becomes a secondary figure for his romance's title may well be considered eccentric unless we realize that Greene may be using a Greek charactonym in the tradition of Lyly. M. W. Croll reports that "Euphues" signifies in Plato someone "well endowed with natural gifts, both physical and

intellectual" (2). "Menaphon" appears in Greene's title where "Euphues" had in Lyly's. M. M. Wehling, analyzing characters' names in some of Marlowe's plays, contends that Marlowe's Menaphon in Tamburlaine, Part I is so named because he is a loudmouth, from the Greek "ἤνω staunch plus φώνη voice" (245); however, even if Menaphon is a loudmouth of sorts, it should be noted that an omega (such as in menō) is infrequently transliterated as an "a," (as in "Menaphon") and that the compound may be divided differently without severely damaging etymological soundness. Men (or mēn), a particle, is sometimes used adverbially to signify "truly," or "certainly" (Liddell and Scott); aphōnos, an adjective, means "speechless" (Liddell and Scott). Together, as men-aphōnos, they may designate a character who jumps from one style to another with the same dismal results and eschews the style he was bred to as "truly speechless." This idea is not diminished by the difference between Marlowe's Menaphon and Greene's: the Menaphon of the first part of Tamburlaine may in fact say much and say it forcefully, but little of it is of any use; he is more a windbag than a valuable counselor, and therefore as truly speechless as Greene's Menaphon may be.

All in all, then, Greene's characterizations and allusions in Menaphon point to a satirical treatment of euphuism. Plain language and simple poetry, such as in Doron's speeches and songs, are exalted; pastoral poetry is

indulged. Clearly, then, Greene has done much to accomplish what Hunter has described as "a decisive break with Lylian imitation" (281).

I have now demonstrated that Menaphon is in a way the "accomplished romance" that Paul Salzman calls it, a work that owes much to Sidney and Lyly, as Harrison and others maintain, and a "tissue of absurdities," as Wolff and Baker believe, and that it is all these things to all these scholars because Greene calculated it to be. Two other related questions with which I began have yet to be addressed directly, however. First, if Thomas Nashe clearly opposed romance-writing and euphuism and approved of originality of invention and moderation of style in fiction, how can he be sincere when he compliments Greene on the "true eloquence" of his "temperatum dicendi genus," considering that Menaphon is a romance, is derivative, and is charged both with extravagant Arcadian prose and affected euphuistic diction? Second, how could Greene have tolerated Nashe at all--or, more specifically, if Nashe had attacked Greene in the notorious passage of The Anatomy of Absurdity that I have referred to, why had Greene, who must have seen The Anatomy in manuscript before its publication, allowed Nashe to leave the infamous passage in The Anatomy or allowed him to advertise The Anatomy in the Preface to Menaphon, or, for that matter, allowed him even to write the Preface?

Perhaps the commendation of Menaphon is not very high

praise after all. Perhaps, too, as Nicholl suggests about Greene's response to The Anatomy, Greene acknowledged that "a bit of good healthy satire was all in the game" of friendly backbiting that the University Wits played to sustain lively interest in their work (53). But what if Greene and Nashe were in agreement--if, by the summer of 1589, Greene had changed his mind about romantic fiction, Nashe had changed his mind about Greene, or Nashe had helped to change Greene's mind?

Satire was, of course, the medium Nashe generally chose for his writings, and, as can be seen in his attack on Stanyhurst in the Preface to Menaphon, Nashe regarded burlesque to be one of the tools of satire. In addition, Nashe's fondness for realism, which of course he was to develop into a trademark, is, as Hibbard observes, evident as early as The Anatomy of Absurdity (16). And taken as a whole, Menaphon, through burlesque, satire, and realistic characterization, actually satisfies Nashe's critical criteria by denigrating romance and euphuism while exalting realism in both form and content. Nashe should have approved of Menaphon. On the other hand, if Greene had begun to perceive the market for courtly fiction narrowing by late 1588 or early 1589 and had himself begun to question the worth of pastoral and euphuistic narratives, what damage could Nashe's attack in The Anatomy do to his plans for the future?

Perhaps it is hard to imagine that Greene, the older, more experienced professional writer, allowed the brash young upstart to persuade him to change his course regarding courtly fiction. But over the year during which the two must have become acquainted--from summer 1588 to August 1589--Nashe may have served as a catalyst and influenced Greene to develop and manifest ideas that the older writer had already been considering. If so, Menaphon and its Preface may represent the point at which their standards converge, and Greene's indulgence of Nashe's advertisement of The Anatomy would reflect no real personal or artistic conflict.

I will explore next how the possible accord between these two authors may have developed after Menaphon. With satire, realism, and vernacular humor fresh in their minds, Greene and Nashe may both have gravitated toward a lucrative market newly opened by the Anglican episcopacy--the one for pamphlets that would shout down the pseudonymous Puritan, Martin Marprelate. Nashe is acknowledged to have composed An Almond for a Parrot, but was Greene a member of the bishops' company of professional pamphleteers? A claim by Charles Nicholl about Greene's involvement in the controversy helps to support the idea that the Marprelate affair may have in fact provided a second phase in the development of the commercial methods of these two writers.

Works Cited

- "Amadis de Gaul." Masterplots. Ed. Frank Magill.
18-Volume edition. 1971.
- Baker, Ernest A. The Elizabethan Age and After. 1936.
London: Witherby, 1961. Vol. 2 of The History of the English Novel. 10 vols. 1924-39.
- Croll, Morris W. Introduction and Notes. Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit and Euphues & His England. By John Lyly. Eds. Croll and Harry Clemons. 1916. New York: Russell, 1964. xv-lxiv; 2-462.
- Crupi, Charles W. Robert Greene. Boston: Twayne, 1986.
- Davis, Walter R. Idea and Act in Elizabethan Fiction.
Princeton: Princeton UP, 1969.
- Evans, Maurice. Introduction. The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia. By Sir Philip Sidney. 1977. New York: Penguin, 1982. 9-50.
- Frye, Northrop. Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays. 1957.
Princeton: Princeton UP, 1973.
- Greene, Robert. Menaphon: Camillas alarum to slumbering Euphues, in his melancholie Cell at Silexedra. Greene's Menaphon and Lodge's A Margarite of America. Ed. G. B. Harrison. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1927.
- Hibbard, G. R. Thomas Nashe: A Critical Introduction.
Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1962.
- Holman, C. Hugh. A Handbook to Literature. 4th ed.
Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1980.

- Hunter, G. K. John Lyly: The Humanist as Courtier.
Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1962.
- Jordan, John Clark. Robert Greene. New York: Columbia UP,
1915.
- Lempriere, J. Classical Dictionary of Proper Names
Mentioned in Ancient Authors. 1788. Ed., with
Revisions and Additions, F. A. Wright. London:
Routledge, 1951.
- Liddell, Henry G. and Robert Scott. A Greek-English
Lexicon. Ed., rev., and augmented, Henry Stuart Jones.
London: Oxford UP, 1958.
- Miller, Edwin Haviland. "The Relationship of Robert Greene
and Thomas Nashe (1588-1592)." Philological Quarterly
33 (1954): 353-67.
- Nashe, Thomas. The Works of Thomas Nashe. Ed. Ronald B.
McKerrow. 5 vols. 1910. Ed., with corrections and
supplementary notes, F. P. Wilson. Oxford: Basil
Blackwell, 1958.
- Nicholl, Charles. A Cup of News: The Life of Thomas Nashe.
London: Routledge, 1984.
- O'Connor, John J. Amadis de Gaule and its Influence on
Elizabethan Literature. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers
UP, 1970.
- Robertson, Jean. Introduction and Commentary. The Countess
of Pembroke's Arcadia (The Old Arcadia). By Sir

- Philip Sidney. London: Oxford UP, 1973. xv-xli; 418-86.
- Ruoff, James E., ed. Crowell's Handbook of Elizabethan and Stuart Literature. New York: Crowell, 1975.
- Salingar, L. G. "The Social Setting." The Age of Shakespeare. Vol. 2 of The New Pelican Guide to English Literature. Ed. Boris Ford. 8 vols. New York: Penguin, 1982. 15-47.
- Salzman, Paul. English Prose Fiction 1558-1700: A Critical History. London: Oxford UP, 1985.
- Short, Ardelle Cowie. "A Critical Edition of Menaphon by Robert Greene with the Preface by Thomas Nashe." Diss. Yale U, 1977.
- Sidney, Sir Philip. The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia (The Old Arcadia). Ed., with Introduction and Commentary, Jean Robertson. London: Oxford UP, 1973.
- Wehling, Mary Mellen. "Marlowe's Mnemonic Nomenclature with Especial Reference to Tamburlaine." Modern Language Notes 73 (1958): 243-47.
- Wolff, Samuel Lee. The Greek Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction. 1912. New York: Burt Franklin, 1961.

CHAPTER 3

PASQUILL AND THE PARROT: HOW THE MARPRELATE CONTROVERSY MAY HAVE HELPED GREENE AND NASHE DEVELOP AS SATIRISTS.

In October 1588, about nine months before Greene and Nashe published Menaphon and its Preface, there appeared in London a pamphlet with a running title that began sarcastically, "O read ouer D. Iohn Bridges for it is a worthy worke." The pamphlet's purpose was to criticize severely an allegedly decadent and complacent Anglican episcopacy through libel and caricature, beginning ostensibly with John Bridges, Dean of Sarum and author of A Defence of the Government established in the Church of England for ecclesiastical matters, a vast tome defending the episcopal hierarchy in the Anglican Church. The pamphlet's author was a satirist who styled himself "the reuerend and worthie Martin Marprelate gentleman." Martin Marprelate was to produce six more tracts against the bishops between October 1588 and October 1589, all the while catching the public's ear with his laughing satire and evading the Anglican authorities who sought to suppress him.

In January 1589, shortly after Martin had issued the tract known as The Epitome, Thomas Cooper, bishop of

Winchester, responded to Martin's railing with the plodding Admonition to the People of England, which, far from its expressed purpose, gave Martin another target besides John Bridges and more grist for his mill: playing on the familiar cry of the barrel maker, Martin printed Hay Any Work for Cooper, in which, among his serious criticisms, he included a number of puns and allusions to barrel making, thus caricaturing the bishop and reducing to ridicule what actually had been a solemn, potent admonition. Gradually recognizing that a group of grave churchmen had not the literary skills with which to retaliate against Martin's wit, the bishops, evidently on the recommendation of Richard Bancroft, Canon of Westminster, hired some of the professional writers in London to answer Martin in kind.

A long tradition identifies Nashe as one of the scribblers hired by Bancroft; Donald McGinn argues in "Nashe's Share in the Marprelate Controversy" that Nashe wrote the anti-Martinist tract An Almond for a Parrot. Since Nashe and Greene were together around this time--the time of Menaphon's publication--Greene has for some time been suspected of having taken part in the campaign also. Richard Simpson assumes in The School of Shakespeare that Greene was in fact an anti-Martinist (363-64)¹, and R. B.

¹ Simpson may be mistaken, however; the bishops' first reply, Cooper's Admonition, appeared in mid-January 1589. Simpson's conclusion is based on a poem by Thomas Lodge that

McKerrow (Nashe 4: 75) and R. Warwick Bond (Lyly 407n) share his conviction. The suggestion has been challenged, however, by Alexander Grosart, Chauncey Sanders, and Edwin H. Miller.

If Greene were not able to shift smoothly and naturally from the affected, rhetorical prose style he used in his early romances to the concrete, realistic style he adopted for his cony-catching works, he may have passed through one or more transitional stages. One such stage may well be reflected in Menaphon, in which Greene satirizes the style he has profitably employed; perhaps another stage may be represented by the "repentance" pamphlets such as Never Too Late (1590) and Mourning Garment (1590), in which Greene makes a thematic shift from artificial stock themes about froward women and idealized lovers to themes developed around the realistic portrayal of human actions and responses. Yet another stage may have occurred between these two in which Greene found the opportunity to experiment with a new realistic style and explore the genre of social satire; I propose that the Marprelate controversy and Greene's continuing relationship with Nashe provided the

commends Greene for punishing the "gens seditieux" (Simpson 364). But the poem is prefixed to The Spanish Masquerado, which appeared less than a month after Cooper's book. Another three months elapsed after Cooper's Admonition before the first anti-Martinist tract, Mar-Martine, appeared. Greene has never been connected with this work.

conditions Greene required to move through this stage.

A passage from Nashe's Strange News (1592) is the basis for the claims both of the scholars who advocate the idea of Greene's involvement in the Marprelate affair and of those who reject it. Addressing Gabriel Harvey on the subject of Gabriel's brother Richard, Nashe writes,

Somewhat I am priuie to the cause of Greenes inueighing against the three brothers. Thy hot-spirited brother Richard (a notable ruffian with his pen) hauing first tooke vpon him in his blundring Persiual, to play the Iacke of both sides twixt Martin and vs, and snarld priuily at Pap-hatchet, Pasquill, & others, that opposde themselues against the open slaunder of that mightie platformer of Atheisme, presently after dribbed forth another fooles bolt, a booke I should say, which he christened The Lambe of God. . . .

[A number of the work's] imperfections might haue beene buried with his bookes in the bottome of a drie-fatte . . . if in his Epistle he had not beene so arrogantly censoriall.

Not mee alone did hee reuile and dare to the combat, but glickt at Pap-hatchet once more, and mistermed all our other Poets and writers about London, piperly makeplaies and make-bates.

Hence Greene, beeing chiefe agent for the
 companie . . . tooke occasion to canuaze him a
 little in his Cloth-breeches and Veluet-
 breeches. . . . (Nashe 1: 270-71)

Chauncey Sanders argues in Robert Greene and the Harveys that the context of Nashe's passage implies that while Richard Harvey's Plain Perceval the Peacemaker may have annoyed Greene because of its hostility toward Nashe and Lyly, two acknowledged anti-Martinist authors, it was not Plain Perceval, but Harvey's Lamb of God that roused Greene to retaliate. The Lamb of God had included an attack upon London's "piperly makeplaies and makebates," whom Greene, because of his prominence among them, felt obliged to defend (13-15). Charles Nicholl, however, reads the passage differently. "Greene is clearly included as an anti-Martinist," he contends:

Nashe explains that Greene's satire on the Harveys in A Quip for an Upstart Courtier (1592) was in revenge for Richard Harvey having played 'the Iacke of both sides twixt Martin and us'. If Greene was not one of 'us' he would not need to retaliate. (289 n. 45)

This is a logical interpretation of the passage, especially in its treatment of Nashe's use of the first-person pronoun "us," the appearance of which Sanders does not account for. Furthermore, Nashe appears here to balance the events that

led to A Quip for an Upstart Courtier; that is, he seems to give Harvey's Plain Perceval and Lamb of God equal weight ("hauing first . . . presently after . . . Hence . . ."; emphasis added) in "the cause of Greenes inueighing against the three brothers"; if Nashe is a reliable source, Greene may have had more to defend than the honor of a group of London writers.

If Greene had been an anti-Martinist, some of the writing he did for the bishops might still be extant. And if my suggestion is valid--that Greene's employment as an anti-Martinist pamphleteer represents a stage of transition in his career--any work tentatively attributed to him might exhibit certain distinguishable features. First, despite Greene's probable use of a persona, which Lyly, Nashe, and Martin himself also employed, a work in which Greene had a hand might demonstrate a "character" that can be identified in some of his acknowledged works. Second, although the anti-Martinist writers all consciously imitated Martin's style, a work by Greene might retain, as Lyly's Pappe with a Hatchet does, features of his own characteristic style. Third, those features might be seen to be combined with attempts at a more "extemporall," colloquial style, which might in turn reflect the influence of Nashe.

This is where a suggestion from Nicholl about Greene becomes pertinent. Not only did Greene participate in the anti-Martinist campaign, says Nicholl, but he may have been

the writer--or, perhaps more precisely, the chief writer--of the "Pasquill" tracts (72). Between August 1589 and August 1590, "the venturous, hardie, and renowned Pasquill of England, Caualliero" produced three pamphlets that exploit a martial metaphor to respond to Martin; Pasquill writes of having "taken vp your [i.e., Martin's] Gloue" (Nashe 1: 60), of having "three courses of the Launce with Th. Cartwright" (Nashe 1: 99), and of galloping "the fielde with the Treatise of Reformation [by John Penry]" (Nashe 1: 107). Pasquill's identity has eluded scholars: Grosart identified Nashe as Pasquill in his 1887 edition of Nashe's works, and William Pierce, author of An Historical Introduction to the Marprelate Tracts, assumes the same thing (226); but McKerrow, although he included Pasquill's works in his edition of Nashe, confesses that "we are not justified in concluding Nashe to be the author" (Nashe 5: 88). McGinn, confident that Nashe was not Pasquill, suggests the Cavaliero was an older man, perhaps a churchman--perhaps even Richard Bancroft himself (John Penry 178); and one might plausibly argue that Anthony Munday could have been Pasquill.² Nicholl's added suggestion that Greene wrote the Pasquill tracts thus appears only to complicate further the matter of Pasquill's identity. Yet Nicholl seems to have good reason to believe that Greene helped produce Pasquill's

² See, for instance, Nicholl 78.

works: Greene and Nashe were close during the summer of 1589 because of Menaphon, as I have also noted; Greene had recently published a "politico-religious" satire, The Spanish Masquerado, which may have shown him to be an apt candidate for the bishops' project; Greene was shortly to announce a "new mood of seriousness" (Sero sed serio) in his fiction; and though, as Nicholl admits, "It is hard to adduce stylistic evidence," the "taut, dramatic dialogue between Pasquill and Marforius" that comprises much of The Return of Pasquill is something that Greene could do--and Nashe (by contrast) could not (73). If this is not entirely persuasive, it should be remembered that Nicholl's purpose in A Cup of News: The Life of Thomas Nashe is to trace Nashe's role in the Marprelate controversy, not to account for Greene's or Lyly's or anyone else's.³ Since my aim in this chapter is to build as strong a case as possible for Greene's involvement in the anti-Martinist effort, and since equating Greene with a particular figure in the affair may strengthen such an argument, I have found it worthwhile to examine Nicholl's suggestion in somewhat greater detail than he has. I will follow loosely the method of Leland Carlson, the most recent historian of the Marprelate controversy (see

³ Nicholl is not familiar with Leland Carlson's work on the topic either: he adopts McGinn's debatable theory that Marprelate was Penry, while Carlson shows from a large body of evidence that Martin was probably Job Throkmorton.

his preface to Martin Marprelate, Gentleman xi-xiii), first assessing the character that Pasquill develops for himself, then comparing this character with the characters, identifiable predispositions, and traditions that surround the other writers to whom the Pasquill tracts have been ascribed, and, finally, comparing specific characteristics of Pasquill's writing with specific features of Greene's.

Several features of Pasquill's writing characterize him of course as a professional writer familiar with the trends in popular literature. He is quick, for instance, to advertise forthcoming works such as The Owl's Almanac and The Lives of the Saints. Also, Pasquill frequently uses the rhetorical devices associated with euphuism: antithesis, isocolon, and parison may be seen in Pasquill's remark, "What soeuer they like is Apostolicall, be it neuer so bad; and what they mislike is Diabolicall, be it neuer so good" (Nashe 1: 85). In addition, paromoion and alliteration are evident in such constructions as "Though they grinne with the mouth, grinde with the teeth, stampe with the feete, and take stones with the Iewes to hurl at me, this truth shall be defended against them all" (Nashe 1: 119). Observations such as "howe foule a Cockatrice may be hatcht from so small an egge" (Nashe 1: 77) are similes drawn from the Natural History of Pliny; anecdotes such as Pasquill's accounts of the destruction wrought by the historical factionalism of the Blue and Green in Constantinople and the Bianchi and

Neri in Florence are euphuistic exemplums; "he quenbeth the strife with a pinte of water and a pottle of fire" (Nashe 1: 111) is one of many proverbial expressions.

Among other indications that Pasquill is a professional writer acquainted with London literary life are his frequent references to the theatre; not only does he allude to anti-Martinist drama, minutely detailing The May Game of Martinism, apparently his own anti-Martinist dramatic effort, but he alludes also to the drama of Seneca in mentioning Oedipus and Thyestes. Then, he seems to have some knowledge of the printing and publishing industry, as his references to a "Text-pen" (Nashe 1: 99), an "Octauo" (Nashe 1: 101), and a "Butterflie"--a small pamphlet--(Nashe 1: 102) illustrate.

Pasquill is further characterized by his apparent concern about academic matters. For instance, he is careful to mention (through Marforius) that his Countercuff has been "Thankfullie receiued in both Vniuersities" (Nashe 1: 71), and appears pleased with himself at having attended a Puritan gathering with a "Student of Cambridge," in disguise "in the habite of Schollers" (Nashe 1: 89). At another point he taunts, "You that are Oxford men, enquire whether Walpoole were not a Puritan when he forsooke you?" (Nashe 1: 116). McKerrow writes, "It might perhaps be argued from this that the writer was himself at Cambridge" (Nashe 4: 69).⁴

⁴ This may indeed be the case, and would help support

More specifically, Pasquill demonstrates perhaps more than a commonplace-book sort of acquaintance with classical authors. His allusions span a wide range, and probably include, according to McKerrow, borrowings from Plato, Aristotle, Pliny, Horace, Plutarch, Virgil (the Georgics, Eclogues, and the Aeneid), Ovid, Seneca, Aelian, Livy, Diodorus Siculus, and Publilius Syrus. Pasquill's use of terms such as "Mood," "Figure" (Nashe 1: 60), "disputation," "conclusion" (Nashe 1: 98), and ab autoritate negatiue (Nashe 1: 128) suggests a solid foundation in academic rhetoric. Further, he is conversant not only in natural history, as his uses of Pliny demonstrate, but also in the sciences of astrology and medicine: a long passage that outlines the contents of Pasquill's forthcoming Owl's Almanac illustrates the former (Nashe 1: 60); a section in which the bishops are compared to "skilful Phisitions, acquainted with the beating of euery pulse that beates out of order" (Nashe 1: 62), is one of many examples of the latter.

Finally, some of Pasquill's character may be glimpsed in the way in which he vacillates between argumentative

my thesis; yet Leland Carlson has observed that a work of Job Throkmorton's, Master Some Laid Open in His Colors (1589), contains on the title page the remark, "Done by an Oxford man, to his friend in Cambridge" (Carlson 138); if some knowledge of a connection between the ostensibly anonymous author of this work and Martin Marprelate were available to Elizabethan readers or to writers for the episcopacy, Pasquill's call to "Oxford men" might be seen as merely an allusion.

strategies. His three tracts are laced with apparently conscious imitations of Martin's chatty, colloquial scandalmongering, but he seems to balance his racy quips with restrained scholastic techniques. Pasquill may remark sardonically that he holds a Bible in his hands "when many a Martinist hugges a drabbe in his armes" (Nashe 1: 74), but it is only after he has grimly quoted Scripture and called the Puritans "A generation that curse theyr father" (Nashe 1: 73); he may offer a homely inside joke such as his revelation that Penry could be found "At the sign of the siluer forke and the tosted cheese" (Nashe 1: 99), or a gossipy remark about club-footed Eusebius Paget, who so annoyed John Foxe that Foxe once said to him: "God send thee a right mind to thy crooked gate" (Nashe 1: 84); but often the sections in which they occur follow hard upon sober exemplums (or clusters of exemplums) such as Pasquill's report of "Lewes the sixt's" tragic loss of his eldest son because he had robbed the church (Nashe 1: 96-7). The balance may be intentional, or it may represent collaboration or pooling on the part of two or more others. Or it may have resulted from one writer's resorting to his customary style while struggling to emulate another. More specifically, Pasquill appears to be a writer whose habitual inclination is toward a classical, rhetorical strategy in argumentation, but who is self-consciously imitating the slangy satire of Marprelate, perhaps with the help of others.

Of the nominees I have listed, Richard Bancroft fits this hypothetical character the least: he was not a London writer of popular literature and uses few or no euphuistic devices in works known or believed to be his; nor does he appear from Dangerous Positions (1593), Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline (1593), or the tracts ascribed to him by Albert Peel to have had interests in natural history, astrology, or medicine. And there are additional reasons why I believe McGinn is wide of the mark in proposing Bancroft as Pasquill. For one thing, Bancroft is referred to in the third person twice in the Pasquill pamphlets, and both references are significant. In the first, although Pasquill's purpose in the passage is to illustrate the greatness of John Whitgift by boasting that a glance from the archbishop could confer more honor than all the Martinists' railing can take away, Pasquill remarks also that Bancroft's "learning and honestie . . . doe very much credit him" (Nashe 1: 103); even from a man who may have felt the need to toss in a red herring or two to obscure his identity, this appears immodest. In the second reference, Bancroft is reported to have proved in a sermon at Paul's Cross that, according to the church authorities Epiphanius and St. Augustine, the idea of equality among ministers was a heresy (Nashe 1: 132); this account provides an accurate picture of Bancroft, who begins his Dangerous Positions with gleanings from St. Augustine, Tertullian, and St.

Chrysostom (A₄r) and his Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline with Zanchius (15) and St. Jerome (78), and who, according to Albert Peel, commonly ascribed heresy to the reformers about whom he wrote (xxiii). In general, Pasquill is a different sort of writer, appealing to classical and secular sources more often than to church fathers and showing a stronger interest in satire and libel than in charging his opponents with heresy. Pasquill's numerous classical allusions raise another argument against Bancroft's authorship of the Pasquill tracts. Bancroft's references and citations come almost entirely from religious authorities--the apostles, Chrysostom, Jerome, and so on, as well as John Calvin, John Knox, Thomas Cartwright, and Theodore Beza; a solitary classical allusion appears near the close of Dangerous Positions. If he were consciously trying "his hand at 'martinizing,'" as McGinn suggests (John Penry 178), it seems unlikely that he would have modified his style in such a way as to add so many classical allusions: Martin's own "martinizing" has no corresponding characteristic. Furthermore, Bancroft's is a no-nonsense, straightforward approach, through which he confronts head on the arguments of the Puritan discipline, and his tone is always appropriately pious. But Pasquill, on the other hand, frequently opts for caricature and ridicule, as he suggests for instance in his amused admiration for the "Student of Cambridge" who was disconcertingly irreverent

at a Puritan gathering:

He chose the thirteenth verse of the Chapter to discourse vpon. Where the Apostle saith, Euery mans worke shall be tryed by fire. But to see how brauely hee trotted ouer all the meteors bredde in the highest Region of the ayre, to see how louingly hee made the sence of the Apostle and Ouids fiction of Phaetons firing of the world to kisse before they parted . . . was sport enough for vs to beguile the way . . . to Canterburie.

(Nashe 1: 89)

Finally, McGinn's implication that a churchman would have "tried his hand at 'martinizing'" after the decision had been made to hire professional writers appears inconsistent with the premise underlying the project--that help from outside was needed to produce effective responses to Martin's satire. If a bishop or a canon or a vicar could be a Pasquill, why pay John Lyly to write under the pseudonym "Double V" (or "Double U," as Bond suggests) or pay Nashe to write in the persona of "Cuthbert Curryknaue"??

In spite of a number of attributions over the years, Nashe's claim to the Pasquill tracts is only a little less tenuous than Bancroft's. To an extent Nashe fits the character outlined: he advertised his own forthcoming works, employed euphuism early in his career, wrote some drama, and extolled secular university education. But McGinn

has established that Nashe almost certainly was Cuthbert Curryknave (who also refers to himself as Mar-Martin Junior), the writer of An Almond for a Parrot; and McKerrow determines that An Almond "is not by the author of the Pasquill tracts," since Curryknave calls for the publication of Pasquill's Lives of the Saints (Nashe 4: 53). McKerrow adds that Nashe tended to quote, constantly, from the works of his favorite authors, among which were "the Parabolae of Erasmus, the prose works of Seneca," and the works of Cornelius Agrippa; Pasquill borrows from none of these (Nashe 4: 58). Finally, Pasquill uses a high number of expressions and images that appear nowhere else in Nashe's acknowledged works and uses as well euphuistic devices such as exemplums and similes from natural history, which Nashe had by this time all but abandoned. This is not to say that Nashe was not involved in the Pasquill tracts. Nicholl proposes he may have been the "news-hound" who supplied the chief author with "piping hot 'informations,'" and perhaps a co-author (72).

Anthony Munday may have been involved in the production of the Pasquill tracts. He was certainly among the bishops' pursuivants, as both Martin and Giles Wigginton (a Puritan whom Munday apprehended) attest by their references to him. As a writer, he appears to have been just what the bishops were looking for: he had written a number of prose works that were favorable to the Church of England, among which were The English Roman Life (1580), an exposé of life at the

English Catholic Seminary at Rome, and A Watchword to England (1584), which admonishes the citizenry to "beware of traytours and trecherous practices, which have beene the overthrowe of many famous Kingdomes and commonweales" (qtd. in Turner 206). Munday exhibits some additional characteristics that suggest he could have been Pasquill. First, he was a dramatist, as Pasquill seems to have been; then, he appeared fond of such doggerel verse as appears at the close of Pasquill's Counterbuff.⁵ And, too, he shares some verbal characteristics with Pasquill, notably the phrase "Credit me," which he uses throughout his works and which Greene, by contrast, appears not to use.

The case against Munday is not particularly convincing, but the available evidence is worth some attention. First, Martin himself acknowledges Munday's activity for the bishops, but refers to him only as a pursuivant (Turner 83-6). Then, as Nicholl observes, Pasquill seems to be punning on Munday's name when he states in a double-edged remark that he "sette forwarde the Munday following to North-hamptonshire" (Nashe 1: 60); the reference to Munday is ostensibly in the third person.⁶ In addition, Celeste Turner writes that most of Munday's activity was devoted to

⁵ Carlson believes Munday may have been "Mar-Martine," the writer of a doggerel poem of the same name.

⁶ Of course, in context the implication seems ambiguous (deliberately so) and therefore inconclusive.

pursuing the fugitives, and that if any one of the anti-Martinist tracts were his, it was likely to have been An Almond for a Parrot (86), which, of course, McGinn more recently has asserted to be Nashe's. Further, Munday was also at work during this time on the translation of Palmerin D'Oliua, an undertaking that would have demanded considerable time from an already busy man. Finally, though several stylistic features identifiable in Munday's contemporary pamphlets and plays have parallels in Pasquill's tracts, the proverbs he uses and the classical allusions he makes are different from those of Pasquill. One conspicuous disparity is that Munday incorporates little or none of Pliny's Natural History into his euphuism (as Jack Stillinger observes in his edition of Munday's Zelauto; xxiv), while Pasquill, as I have noted, makes copious use of Pliny. Munday may have helped produce Pasquill's pamphlets, but perhaps he was not Nicholl's "chief writer."

Greene is left to be considered, and from the available facts he is more likely than the previously named writers to have been the chief writer of the Pasquill tracts. First, Greene's identifiable character in works similar to Pasquill's or in works composed around the time of the Pasquill pamphlets corresponds to the one outlined for Pasquill. Then, additional evidence from specific works by Greene strengthens Charles Nicholl's observations on Greene's candidacy. Finally, although stylistic evidence is

"hard to adduce," as Nicholl admits, some stylistic evidence from selected works of Greene may shed some light on whether Greene could have been Pasquill.

Greene was the consummate Elizabethan professional writer, frequently displaying all three of the principal characteristics observed in Pasquill: he advertised his forthcoming works--Francesco's Fortunes, Farewell to Folly, and some of the cony-catching tracts--much as Pasquill did his Owl's Almanac and Lives of the Saints; he consciously imitated the style of Euphues in his early works, but adapted it to suit satirical ends in works such as Menaphon; and he was writing drama by 1589, perhaps reaching the peak of his dramatic success during that year with Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay (see Seltzer ix-x). Throughout his career Greene also displayed a conspicuous preoccupation with the universities, affixing "in artibus magister" and "utriusque in artibus magister" to the title pages of his works, frequently making scholars the principal characters in his works--especially "autobiographical" works such as Mourning Garment and Groatsworth of Wit--and addressing the epistle of at least one of his works to "the gentelmen students of both universities."⁷ Related to these characteristic gestures toward academia is Greene's custom of alluding to

⁷ In addition, he indulged Nashe when the younger writer addressed his prefatory epistle to Menaphon to the same audience.

classical literature and rhetoric and, to some extent, to the Natural History of Pliny.⁸

Nicholl's observations about Greene's Spanish Masquerado and about Pasquill's Return deserve elaboration. The Masquerado is not simply a "politico-religious" work; it is Greene's avowed effort at revealing his "conscience in Religion," and it is a work in which Greene attempts to suit style to subject matter, writing "barely in this Theological Phrase" (Works 5: 241). In addition, although Spanish militarism, Spanish Catholicism, and the Pope are the particular targets of the Masquerado's satire, Greene concludes the pamphlet with an exhortation that subtly bolsters Anglican orthodoxy while ostensibly excoriating papistry:

Seeing . . . that the Lorde our mercifull God
maketh ENGLAND like EDEN, a second Paradice: let
vs feare to offend him, and bee zealous to execute
the terrour of/his commaundmentes, then shall we
be sure his Maiestie will send our Queene long
life, his Church to haue faithfull Ministers, and
our Realme perfect Subiectes, and shroude vs
against Spaine, the Pope, and all other enemies of
the Gospell. (Works 5: 287-88; emphasis added)

⁸ Greene's use of Pliny is probably as much a result of his emulation of Lyly as of his university education, however.

In addition, the Masquerado brims with the jargon of warfare, from references to heraldry to lists of weapons and other trappings, a characteristic shared by Pasquill's tracts. Finally, the Pope is several times called a "monster" in the Masquerado (see 5: 249-51); Pasquill calls Martin "the Monster" in the first paragraph of the Countercuff (Nashe 1: 59).

Other works of Greene reveal much more common ground with The Return of Pasquill than Nicholl allows. More than the "taut . . . dialogue" of a capable dramatist, The Return's dramatic form is something Greene had employed since Planetomachia in 1585 and continued to adapt through Greene's Vision, which was published after his death. In fact, Greene uses a nearly identical structure in A Disputation Between a He Cony-catcher and a She Cony-catcher (1592). In each, the two characters who engage in the dialogue meet in a public place: Pasquill and Marforius on the Royal Exchange, Laurence and Nan (the cony-catcher and the prostitute) in an unidentified thoroughfare, presumably near a tavern. A slanted debate results from each meeting, Nan arguing the superiority of female cony-catchers, and Pasquill asserting the inferiority of Marprelate's ecclesiastical principles; Laurence and Marforius are essentially "straight men," eliciting the satire of their interlocutors more with offhand remarks and questions than with substantial speeches (although Laurence does tell

anecdotes to assert the superiority of male cony-catchers). At some point in each, too, a speaker interrupts what is being said in the apprehension that someone may hear. Each dialogue ends similarly, the cony-catchers concluding when the serving boy arrives with supper, Pasquill and Marforius finishing when "Vetus Comoedia" arrives on the Exchange.

Ben Jonson implies in Every Man Out of His Humour that of Greene's stock of ideas and linguistic choices very few were exclusively Greene's (2.3.200-05). In fact, Greene did borrow a great deal of his material--from Lyly and Sidney, from the common domain of idiomatic and proverbial expressions, from indigenous medieval sources, from contemporary continental literature, from the Bible, and from the classical authors. Consequently, Greene's word choice and phraseology offer little to support incontrovertibly that he was Pasquill. On the other hand, what stylistic evidence appears is worth comparing with evidence in the Pasquill tracts, because it tends in general to uphold the inference that Greene was Pasquill.

The criteria I have used in selecting works of Greene's to compare with Pasquill's tracts admit only those that are similar in subject matter or tone to the Pasquill pamphlets and those that appear to have been composed within two years of the Marprelate controversy. The criteria exclude the romances before Pandosto, the "deathbed" pamphlets such as Greene's Groatsworth of Wit, and the dramatic works other

than Friar Bacon; they permit the inclusion of Philomela, Perimedes the Blacksmith, Greene's Orpharion, Ciceronis Amor, Alcida, Pandosto, Menaphon, and Friar Bacon (within two years earlier); The Spanish Masquerado, Farewell to Folly, Francesco's Fortunes, Never Too Late, and Greene's Mourning Garment (within two years following, and having related themes or subjects); and the cony-catching pamphlets and A Quip for An Upstart Courtier (social satires levelled at clearly identifiable targets).

Pasquill's choice of words and phrases parallels Greene's in many places and spans several of Greene's fields of interest (that is, theatre, classical literature, astrology, rhetoric, and so on), and linguistic parallels evident in both writers' martial terminology are striking. In addition, several unusual or figurative expressions used by Pasquill may be found among the works of Greene that I have surveyed. Next, among the proverbs employed by Pasquill appear some of what may be considered Greene's favorites. Finally, a significant number of idioms and themes that are characteristic of Greene's style appear also in Pasquill's tracts. A list of the most significant parallels follows.

Pasquill

Greene

Martial Terms

battailes

. . . you were able to range

a faire bataille of

. . . the Kings . . .

issued out, and ordring

Pasquill

Scriptures to charge your
enemies. (Nashe 1: 84)

chape

. . . three poundes of yron
in the hyltes and chape
. . . (Nashe 1: 61)

hyltes

. . . three poundes of yron
in the hyltes . . . (Nashe
1: 61)⁹

points of war

I must set the trumpet of
Esay to my mouth, and
deliuer him nothing but
points of warre. (Nashe
1: 116)

Greene

their battailes brauely,
gawe the charge. (Works
12: 46)

Acestes . . . had broken
into their maine battaile.
(Works 12: 46)

A whittle with a siluer
chape . . . (Works 11: 142)

. . . thrust his sword to
the hiltes . . . (Works
5: 250)

. . . they caused the
Trumpette to sound them
points of warre. (Works
11: 235)

⁹ McKerrow remarks that the singular form, "hilt," was more common (Nashe 4: 46), although the OED has numerous examples of the plural.

Pasquill

Greene

trayne

. . . such stales set, such
traynes layde . . . (Nashe
1: 80)

I perceiue the priuie traine
that giues fire vnto all
this Gunshot. (Nashe 1:
86)

set down my rest

Where you sette down your
reste, you are very
resolute. (Nashe 1: 84)

she beganne thus to lay
the traine. (Works 8: 78)

. . . thus Loue wrought
the traine and fortune nay
mine owne folly performed
the treason. (Works 12:
60)

. . . his rest set down
(Works 7: 141)

. . . setting down his
rest at this period . . .
(Works 7: 191)

setting downe my rest, I
bid you farewell. (Works
9: 9)

I set downe my rest, and
ventured boldly on your
worships fauour. (Works
9: 29)

Uncommon Words and Expressionsrap out [to blurt out in staccato bursts]

. . . rapt it out lustilie
(Nashe 1: 61)

Mullidor . . . rapt out his
reasons. (Works 8: 204)

Pasquill

Greene

I cannot . . . rap out gogs
wounds in a tauerne.

(Works 9: 228)

he began to chafe, and to
swear, and to rap out Gog's
Nouns. (Salgado 209)

froes of Bacchus

. . . some [people of
Caelosyria and Phaenice]
gadded vppe and downe the
streets, like Bacchus
Froes, franticke for the
time. (Nashe 1: 95)

[Orpheus began,] . . . the
mad frowes of Bacchus . . .
stoned me to death while I
sate playing musicke to the
Rockes. (Works 12: 24)

starting hole [i.e., figuratively, an entry to a place of
security]

you may see by the starting
holes he seeketh, that hee
neuer meant to keepe hys
promise. (Nashe 1: 79)

their harts resemble a
Pumice stone, . . . full
of starting holes, that if
fancy steale in at one, he
can step out at another.

(Works 12: 20)

as loue can finde starting
hoales, he deuised this
pollicie. . . . (Works
11: 194)

Pasquill

Greene

there is no . . . law so
strict conveyed but there
be straight found starting-
holes to avoid it, as in
this. (Salgado 202)

. . . you are so witty in
your answers, and have so
many starting-holes.

(Salgado 285)

while [meaning "until"]

Let him swell while he
burst, . . . with the word
in his mouth, so long as
hee breaketh the rule of
Charitie, and cares not
whom he strike. . . .

(Nashe 1: 88)

He that hath the dropsie,
drinketh while he bursteth,
and yet not satisfied.

(Works 8: 140)

This base churle is one of
the moaths of the common
wealth, . . . as thristy
as a house leach that will
neuer leaue drinking while
he burst. (Works 11: 243)
And there he lay while the
next sessions, and was
hanged at Lancaster.

(Salgado 229)

Pasquill

Greene

. . . Maenon was murdered
by me, but for the loue of
thee, which I hope thou
holdest not in memorie
while this time. (Works
9: 32)

Other Figurative Expressions

[stoop] to the lure¹⁰

the wisdom of her most
excellent Maiestie is knowne
to be greater, then to be
traind from so high a seate
to so base a lure. (Nashe
1: 63)

. . . falcons stoop not to
dead stales. (Pandosto
260)
will . . . Fiordespine . . .
stoope to the lure of one
so base as I? (Works 9:
33)
. . . if the poor
countryman smoke them
still, and will not stoop
to either of their lures,
then one . . . steppeth
before the cony as he

¹⁰ Greene makes figurative use of much of the jargon of falconry, but he seems to be particularly fond of this phrase. In The Black Book's Messenger Greene explains that "stooping to the lure" refers to "the good ass if he be won" (Salgado 321).

Pasquill

nibbling like a minnow

I tooke another nybling like
a Minew about Bezas Icones,
. . . and the fishe that was
strooken with Beza's hooke
is Perceuell the Plaine.

(Nashe 1: 112)

Proverbial Expressions

he turned backe like a dogge
to his owne vomit. (Nashe
1: 74)

Greene

goeth. . . . (Salgado 164)

I haue playd so long with
the Mynew at the baite that
I am stricken with the
hooke. (Works 11: 139)

he forgate this patheticall
impression of vertue, and
like the dogge did redire
ad vomitum, and fell to
his owne vomite. . . .

(Works 8: 94)

after he had sent divers
of them to serve in the
king's wars, . . . they,
loath to do so well
returned to their former
vomit. (Salgado 233)

I had no feeling of
goodness, but with the dog
fell to my old vomit.

(Salgado 336)

Pasquill

. . . this dogged generation
is euer barking against the
Moone. (Nashe 1: 83)

there be a pad in the straw
that must be rousde. (Nashe
1: 123)

Greene

. . . with the Woolues to
bark against the Moone
. . . (Works 7: 67)
I feare with the Syrian
Wolues to barke against
the Moone. (Menaphon 61)
seeing . . . that with the
Syrian wolues he barkt
against the Moone, he lefte
such lettice as were too
fine for his lips.

(Menaphon 108)

Barke not with the Wolues
of Syria against the Moone.

(Works 7: 160)

barke not with the Wolues
against the Moone. (Works
9: 32)

as well as shee coulde to
hide a pad in the straw,
she expected as others did
the arriuall of her newe
corriuall. (Menaphon 50)
Eurimachus was not such a
Nouice, but he could espie

Pasquill

They stande vpon the pinnacle
of euerie Tower & Castle,
built in the ayre by theyr
owne conceite. (Nashe 1:
134)

Greene

a pad in the straw.

(Works 9: 94)

The old fox . . . was
subtle enough to spy a pad
in the straw. (Salgado
323)

he could not tell on which
eare to sleep, but builded
Castles in the ayre, and
cast beyond the moone.

(Works 9: 29)

hammering thus betwixt
feare and hope he built
castles in the ayre and
reached beyond the moone.

(Works 11: 117)

Shared Idioms

nouns: censure (judgment; also a verb, "to
judge"), shriek (shrike; also a verb), carcass,
piece of service, devise (device, stratagem)

pronouns: somewhat (for "something")

verbs: bewray, go currant for (or "go for
currant"), raze out (or "race out"; this metaphor
is pervasive in Greene's works), chop and change
(also a noun), wring, minister (i.e., "administer"),

fling (i.e., to run in some direction), jump
(i.e., "agree"; also an adverb)

adjectives: malapert, malcontented

adverbs: passing (i.e., "very"), alate

Shared Terms from Shared Themes

music: jig, roundelays, madrigals, descant,
blown bladders

May games and bear-baiting: foreman (or
foregallant) in the Morrice, May-game, Paris
(or "Parish") Garden

falconry: high seat, base lure, stales, laying
trains

Greene nowhere expresses sympathy or even receptiveness toward Puritanism, Martinism, or any sort of factionalism. In A Quip for an Upstart Courtier, for instance, his narrator approves of the vicar who describes Puritans as "vpstart boies and shittle witted fooles" who "haue taught so long Fides solam iustificat, that they haue preached good works quit out of our Parish" (Works 11: 280). Then, in Farewell to Folly, Greene is vitriolic in quipping, "I cannot Martinize, sweare by my faie in a pulpit, & rap out gogs wounds in a tauerne, faine loue when I haue no charitie, or protest an open resolution of good, when I intend to be priuately ill" (Works 9: 228). Factionalism he equates with disease, associating it with infection, stains, and blemishes. These attitudes Greene also shares with Pasquill.

In addition to characterizing factionalism in general as a "foule . . . Cockatrice" (Nashe 1: 77), Pasquill castigates Martinists in particular as "ignorant and vnlearned men" (Nashe 1: 91) and relates a fanciful anecdote about a Puritan preacher who kept beggars at a distance with a vicious dog on a forty-foot chain (Nashe 1: 61).

In "A Quip from Tom Nashe," McGinn explains that Nashe, Greene, and Gabriel Harvey all imply in numerous places that the two University Wits had "a close literary association" (177). Of particular interest to McGinn is A Quip for an Upstart Courtier, which he identifies as a collaboration by Greene and Nashe. He suggests, in fact, that the work is the culmination of an extensive partnership through which Nashe, with Greene's encouragement, gave spice to the older man's pamphlets by adding realistic anecdotal material and revisions that incorporated his colorful, vigorous idioms. Probably the partnership had not developed to this point when Nashe wrote the Preface to Greene's Menaphon and needed for further development the impetus of an experience that would have been conducive to collaboration. Such an experience may have been the Marprelate campaign.

In fact the Pasquill pamphlets show evidence of more than one mind--or one persona--at work. The vacillation I have observed between argumentative strategies may be part of that evidence; at some points Pasquill appears genuinely

self-conscious in what are apparently his own efforts at Martinizing, but at others his writing takes on a very natural, racy liveliness that is palpably Nashean, as in the following passage:

when I came to the life of the myncing Dame of Rochester with the golden locks, whose conceipt was so quick, that shee caught a childe whilst her husbande was from her, as her clappe was so suddaine, that no body knows how it came, or how it went, for since she was deliuered (passe & repasse) the childe was neuer heard of: so my pen was as swyfte as the post-horse of the Towne; I ran a great deal of ground in a litle time about her causes. (Nashe 1: 100)

Even the juggling terms "passe & repasse" echo Nashe's style.

The most that can be concluded with confidence from this analysis is that, with occasional exceptions, Pasquill writes more like Greene than like any of the other authors proposed. It is clear, though, that Nicholl's hunch about Greene, Nashe, and Pasquill has a foundation that is much more solid than even he claimed.

The inference that Greene and Nashe's literary partnership shows its first signs of collaborative activity in the anti-Martinist campaign might carry more weight if some evidence about what happened next in the authors' relationship supported it. Although neither Nashe nor

Gabriel Harvey states outright that the two writers were close before the banquet of Rhenish wine and pickled herring in August 1592 that supposedly led to Greene's death, Miller and McGinn both have suggested what may have occurred between Greene and Nashe during the two years before Greene died. Miller conjectures that the two became estranged somehow, perhaps because of Greene's annoyance at Nashe's "intemperate criticism of well-known writers in the preface to Menaphon" or because of Nashe's dissatisfaction over Greene's "reluctance to be an active anti-Martinist" (354-55). McGinn disputes Miller's suggestion, however, supposing that Nashe had a hand in the production of most of Greene's cony-catching pamphlets and that A Quip for an Upstart Courtier represented the high point of the literary association of Greene and Nashe ("A Quip from Tom Nashe" 177-79). Both Miller and McGinn may be accurate to an extent in their assessments. The following chapter shows from an analysis of Greene's Vision--in part a fictonalized account of Greene's life in late 1590--that the two authors may have been collaborating as late as the fall of 1590 but parted company shortly thereafter.

Works Cited

- Bancroft, Richard. Davngerous Positions and Proceedings, published and practised within this Iland of Brytaine, vnder the pretence of Reformation, and for the Presbiteriall Discipline. 1593. Amsterdam: Theatrvm Orbis Terrarvm Ltd., and New York: Da Capo Press, 1972.
- . A Svruay of the Pretended Holy Discipline. Contayning the beginniges, success, parts, proceedings, authority, and doctrine of it: with some of the manifold, and materiall repugnances, varieties and vncertaineties, in that behalfe. 1593. Amsterdam: Theatrvm Orbis Terrarvm Ltd., and New York: Da Capo Press, 1972.
- Carlson, Leland H. Martin Marprelate, Gentleman: Master Job Throkmorton Laid Open in His Colors. San Marino: Huntington Library, 1981.
- Greene, Robert. The Black Book's Messenger. Salgado 317-37.
- . A Disputation Between a He Cony-catcher and a She Cony-catcher. Salgado 266-315.
- . The Life and Works in Prose and Verse of Robert Greene, M. A. Cambridge and Oxford. For the First Time Collected and Edited, with Notes and Illustrations, Etc. Ed. A. B. Grosart. 15 vols. 1881-86. New York: Russell, 1964.

- . Menaphon: Camillas alarum to slumbering Euphues, in his melancholie Cell at Silexedra. Greene's Menaphon and Lodge's A Margarite of America. Ed. G. B. Harrison. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1927. 1-108.
- . A Notable Discovery of Cozenage. Salgado 155-92.
- . Pandosto: The Triumph of Time. Elizabethan Prose Fiction. Ed. Merritt Lawlis. New York: Odyssey Press, 1967. 226-77.
- . The Second Part of Cony-Catching. Salgado 193-229.
- . The Third and Last Part of Cony-Catching. Salgado 233-63.
- Jonson, Ben. Every Man Out of His Humour. The Complete Plays of Ben Jonson. Ed. G. A. Wilkes. Vol. 1. Oxford: Oxford UP (Clarendon), 1981. 4 vols. to date.
- Lyly, John. The Complete Works of John Lyly. Ed. R. Warwick Bond. Vol. 3. Oxford: Oxford UP (Clarendon), 1902. 3 vols.
- McGinn, Donald. John Penry and the Marprelate Controversy. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers, 1966.
- . "Nashe's Share in the Marprelate Controversy." PMLA 59 (1944): 952-84.
- . "A Quip from Tom Nashe." Studies in the English Renaissance Drama in Memory of Karl Julius Holzkecht. Ed. J. W. Bennett, Oscar Cargill, and Vernon Hall, Jr. New York: New York UP, 1959. 172-88.
- Miller, Edwin Haviland. "The Relationship of Robert Greene and Thomas Nashe (1588-1592)." Philological Quarterly

- 33 (1954): 353-67.
- Nashe, Thomas. The Works of Thomas Nashe. Ed. Ronald B. McKerrow. 5 vols. 1910. Ed., with corrections and supplementary notes, F. P. Wilson. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958.
- Nicholl, Charles. A Cup of News: The Life of Thomas Nashe. London: Routledge, 1984.
- Peel, Albert, ed. Tracts Ascribed to Richard Bancroft. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1953.
- Pierce, William. An Historical Introduction to the Marprelate Tracts. London: Constable, 1908.
- Salgado, Gamini, ed. Cony-Catchers and Bawdy Baskets: An Anthology of Elizabethan Low Life. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1972.
- Sanders, Chauncey E. Robert Greene and the Harveys. Indiana University Studies 98. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1931.
- Seltzer, Daniel. Introduction. Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay. By Robert Greene. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1963. ix-xxi.
- Simpson, Richard. The School of Shakespeare. Vol. 2. New York: Bouton, 1878. 2 vols.
- Stillinger, Jack. Introduction. Zelauto. By Anthony Munday. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP, 1963. vii-xxviii.
- Turner, Celeste. Anthony Munday: An Elizabethan Man of

Letters. Berkeley: U of California P, 1928.

CHAPTER 4

GREENE'S VISION RESTORED: A FINAL PHASE?

As Charles Nicholl observes, Greene entered in 1590 a phase of his commercial career in which his fiction displays a "new mood of seriousness" (72). Two romances, Ciceronis Amor and Orpharion, were published between Menaphon and Greene's first "repentance" pamphlet, Never Too Late. Both romances, however, seem to have been written before Menaphon (see Salzman 62, 65); thus Greene appears not to have composed anything between the summer of 1589 and late 1590.¹ Perhaps not accidentally, this period coincides roughly with the anti-Martinist campaign. At any rate, Greene's "new mood" must have taken about a year after Menaphon in coming. Nashe, too, seems not to have been conspicuously active during this time: The Anatomy of Absurdity appeared early in 1590, but had been written much earlier; An Almond for a Parrot was released under the pseudonym Cuthbert Curryknavé about the same time, but nothing else is known to have issued from Nashe's pen before Pierce Penniless, which was entered in the Stationer's Register in August 1592.

¹ Greene's Royal Exchange is entered in the Stationer's Register on 15 April 1590. But as Charles Crupi observes, it is a translation of Orazio Rinaldi's Dottrina delle virtu of 1585, and thus not actually "composed" by Greene.

According to Edwin H. Miller, the two authors did not collaborate again until they produced The Defence of Cony-Catching, which was registered 21 April 1592 (359).

What happened to strain the relationship of Nashe and Greene which earlier had appeared to be a budding partnership is a mystery and has been the subject of some speculation. Miller, for example, believes the writers quarrelled and became estranged, reconciling only in 1592 (355-56); Donald McGinn suggests that Miller's evidence is ambiguous and that the two may well have kept up their literary association (177-79). Both scholars operate under the assumption that no account of this period is extant for either or both of these writers.

Yet an account--albeit a fictionalized account--of the period between spring and fall 1590 exists. Early in Greene's Vision, in a dream in which the narrator-character Greene encounters John Gower and Geoffrey Chaucer, Greene clearly states that "of late there came foorth a booke called the Cobler of Canterburie" (212); in the same dream Greene also pleads with Gower to allow him to complete the work he is currently writing, his Nunquam sera est (or Never Too Late; 274). Since Vision was apparently first published in 1592, after the author's death instead of preceding Never Too Late in 1590, some controversy has arisen over its actual date of composition. D. N. Ranson places it during the summer of 1590, when the anonymous work called The

Cobbler of Canterbury was printed (534), and Charles Crupi concurs, explaining that Vision's additional announcement of Greene's Mourning Garment (which he accepts as an authentic advertisement) is an error, since Mourning Garment was in print long before "the instant of" Greene's death, which is the alleged time of Vision's composition (35); J. C. Jordan, on the other hand, has contended that Vision's point of view is one of looking back upon events far removed in time (171). More important than Vision's composition date, I believe, is the story's time setting, because Greene, contrary to his usual practice, pinpoints the historical time during which the plot of Vision occurs: shortly after the summer 1590 publication of The Cobbler of Canterbury (see Ranson 534) and shortly before the appearance of his own Never Too Late later the same year. Ostensibly, Vision is exclusively about Greene and his internal working out of a moral and intellectual dilemma; but Vision may also contain clues to his relationship with Thomas Nashe.

Although its title page proclaims that the work contains "a penitent passion for the folly of his pen" (Greene 191), Greene's Vision at its outset is not an account of prodigality, remorse, and repentance. Greene's tone, in fact, is indignant, and his concern is apparently as much over an erroneous attribution of inferior literature as over the morality of his "wanton lines":

After I was burdened with the penning of the Cobler of Canterbury, I waxed passing melancholy, as grieuing that I shold be wrong with enuy, or wronged with suspition. But whē I entered into the consideratiō, that slander spareth not Kinges, I brookt it with the more patience, & thought, that as the strongest gustes offend lesse the low shrubs than the tall Cedars: So the blemish of report would make a less scarre in a cottage than in a pallace; yet I could not but conceit it hardly. . . . (197)

Even after Greene has "felt a passionate remorse" over the follies of his pen, intellectual and artistic ideals attenuate his moralizing:

Schollers deserue much blame, as out of that pretious fountaine of learning will fetch a pernicious water of vanitie. . . . [T]he outward phrase is not to be measured by pleasing the eare, but the inward matter by profiting the minde. (203)

Ultimately, Greene's concern in Vision is somewhat different from the idea that he has been immoral and has led his readers into immorality and should amend his behavior; rather, he addresses the accusation of cavilers that, because he is a scholar, he of all writers ought to know what kind of literature is best for the reading public.

His response makes Vision a masterpiece of subtle irony.

Greene is able to distance himself as a historical person from his character in Vision by combining two conventions of medieval literature to construct a narrative frame. The first convention, the dream vision, allows him to act as his own narrator to introduce the frame, and it then gives him additionally an amount of omniscience through which he can also act as a commentator and make remarks appropriate to that role: "I . . . was very attentive" (224). The result is a blurred association between the flesh-and-blood author Robert Greene and a literary character made to represent him.

Much of the rest of Greene's real-life individuality is stripped from his character by the second convention, the morality drama. The morality seems an ideal vehicle to help identify a moral standard for popular literature: characters who are types of acknowledged morality can make dour pronouncements and hold characters that are types of unsavory genres up to ridicule, and in the end no specific author is injured and everyone learns something. So it is with Vision. Greene becomes a one-dimensional figure, a character that is plagued by indecision and anxious for guidance, or confidence--"Every scholar," perhaps. Laughing, "leaning on his staffe" with a "countenance blithe and merry" (209), Chaucer is the type representing the proponent of the rollicking bawdy tale; large, broad, and pale, with

"visage graue, sterne and grim" (210), and "rising vp with a Sowre countenance" (215), Gower is the type of that "grauer and greater sort" (227) for whom "the true badge of a Gentleman, is learning ioyned with vallour and vertue" (270); ancient, majestic, cynical, and dogmatic, Solomon represents the wisdom of the ages. So that Greene does not mistake his first two interlocutors' identities, there is "written on the ones brest Chaucer, and on the others Gower" (209)--signs reminiscent of early dramas in which dramatis personae were introduced by similar, primitive means.

As a type, then, the Greene that suffers through the debate by the two "tipes of Englands excellence for Poetry" (212) perceptibly represents the flesh-and-blood author in little more than name and literary canon. The actual central idea of Vision resembles the theme on the surface of the morality about as closely.

Narrating the introductory scene in the first person, Greene relates that the ascription of The Cobbler of Canterbury led him to a serious reflection on the uselessness of his "love pamphlets," after which he expresses the apparent theme of Vision in these lines of an ode on "the vanitie of wanton writings":

Martiall was a bonnie boy,
 He writ loues griefe and loues ioy.
 He tould what wanton lookes passes,
 Twixt the Swaines and the lasses. . . .

But for the follies of his pen,
 He was hated of most men:
 For they could say, t'was sin and shame
 For Schollers to endite such game. . . .
 Tis shame and sinne then for good wits,
 To shew their skill in wanton fits.
 This Augustus did reply,
 And as he said, so thinke I. (199-201)

Finishing the ode, Greene feels profound remorse for his frivolous romanticizing, prays long and earnestly for forgiveness and guidance, and feels what Richard Helgerson calls "the movement of grace" (96); consoled, he falls asleep. In his dream he is approached in a meadow by the spirits of Chaucer and Gower, in whom he confides his distress over the worth of his works. Chaucer merrily replies that "poets wits are free" and that Greene's concern over the moral value of his love stories is needless; but Gower refutes Chaucer, maintaining that Greene's romances more often lead his readers to immoral, rather than moral, behavior. Chaucer, to illustrate that a bawdy tale is a legitimate means by which to convey a moral lesson, tells a tale of a wheelwright who becomes a cuckold as his just deserts for being jealous without cause.

Gower rejects Chaucer's tale, because "Mens minds are apt to follies," and tales such as Chaucer's "are Spurres to pricke them forward in their wickednesse, where they

neede sharpe bits to bridle their wanton affections" (235). He then answers Chaucer's tale with a long, plodding story, also about unwarranted jealousy. Gower's character Alexander Vandermast becomes mad in his unfounded jealousy and forces his patient, long-suffering wife, Theodora, out of doors; when Alexander sees an emblem and has it explained to him, he overcomes his madness and his jealousy, tests (via a magical disguise) Theodora's fidelity, and arranges a happy reunion with Theodora and his family.

Chaucer objects that this sort of tale, while virtuous, will not be effective either, but Greene, perhaps truly changed, or perhaps intimidated by the larger-than-life and sterner-than-life Gower, promises to follow Gower's example. When all is apparently settled, King Solomon suddenly appears and advises Greene to reconsider, declaring that theology is a scholar's only worthwhile pursuit. Greene, terrified at the sight of Solomon, awakens; after some reflection, he resolves to improve the moral quality of his works.

Traditionally, Solomon's opinion has been read as a confirmation of Gower's (see, for example, Helgerson 96). But the action and dialogue of the section of Vision in which Solomon appears are not always lucid and may be understood a second way; in this alternate interpretation resides the first hint of the irony of Vision.

The question arising from the final section of Vision concerns why Solomon appears at all. He materializes

abruptly, at the point at which Chaucer, Gower, and Greene are "all three rising, and ready to depart" (274)--the point, that is, at which the issue is agreed by all to have been resolved. In addition, when he approaches Greene, he does not utter the equivalent of "Do what Gower tells you," but says, somewhat equivocally, "I know thy thoughts by thy lookes, and thy face bewraies thy resolution" (276), and actually appears to disapprove of the alternatives of both Chaucer and Gower in his statement of his own intentions:

Chaucers opinion, hath his Maister Gower refelled,
and made them by his counsaile peremptory to
leauē the follies of thy penne, and all wanton
Amours, to betake them to Philosophy and higher
labours: but to diuert thee from that opinion my
sonne am I come to put knowledge in thy lippes,
and to teach thee wisdomē. (276)

In fact, Solomon asks, incredulously, "If then my Sonne, Wisdomē be so pretious, howe hast thou mispent thy youth, . . . and yet art now resolving to continue in vanitie[?]" (277). With this evidence the reader may conclude that, far from condescending to give his benediction to Gower for setting Greene right, Solomon may interpose to void the entire dispute of Gower and Chaucer. Solomon himself distinguishes the theological topics he proposes from Gower's "Martiall Discipline," "Axiomes of good liuing," and "natural philosophie" (270-71) when he makes the

pronouncement, "all knowledge, all sciences, all artes, all learning except Theologie, be foolishnesse and vanitie" (280), and neither Gower, nor Chaucer, nor Greene disputes his distinction. Additionally, all three poets defer without question to Solomon's admonition to write only of theology, and this deference implies the truth (at least for this fiction) of the suggestion that all three have been wrong from the start.

But why should the account of the poets' dispute--the section of Vision that occupies the largest part of the text--be so nullified? Whether Greene the character is sincere in his resolution to amend may not be a concern of the final section of Vision; but something in the debate that Greene the author appears to recognize and consciously manipulate certainly is at issue. Gower is profoundly deluded.

According to Chaucer, Gower's tale, a moral exemplum, is inappropriate because "youth wil not like of such a long circumstance" (270); Chaucer elaborates, "Our English Gentlemen are of the mind of the Athenians, that will sooner bee perswaded by a fable, then an Oration: and induced by a merrie tale, when they will not be brought to any compasse with serious circumstances" (270). But Gower evades this realistic assessment of what is proper in didactic literature; he replies inflexibly, "The more pittie . . . that they should be so fond" (270).

Further, Gower's tale of Alexander and Theodora is clearly intended to answer Chaucer's fabliau of Tomkins and Kate: "I will tell a tale to the same effect," he says in reference to Chaucer's tale, "and yet I hope, neither so light of conceipt, nor so full of scurrilitie" (236); but it is also meant to illustrate what he refers to by the term "well" when he tells Greene, "thou hast write no booke well, but thy Nunquam sera est. . . . The rest haue sweete phrases, but sower follies" (235-36). That is, his exemplum is also designed to contrast with all the works Greene has produced before Never Too Late. And in this he reveals himself to be tragically uninformed. Like Greene's romances, his tale is euphuistic. It teems with balanced constructions:

As in musick are many discords, before there can
be framed a true Diapasin, so in wedlock are many
iarres, before there be established a perfect
friendship; (238)

it heaps up similes and incorporates sententiae:

Like as the cleere light vpon the holy
Candlestickes, so is the beautie of the face
vpon an honest body: like as the goulden pillers
vpon the sockets of siluer, so are the faire legs
vpon a woman that hath a constant mind; (256)

and it uses natural history similar to Pliny's when the wise old man shows Alexander the fabulous limster. Also like Greene's earlier romances, Gower's tale contains verse,

"Theodora's Song," and a number of improbabilities such as the magical spell by which the old man disguises Alexander. Finally, the tale's theme--the unsung obedience, chastity, and silence of Theodora--is precisely the theme of Greene's Penelope's Web, a romance whose title page reads,

In three several discourses also are three
 especiall vertues, necessary to be incident in
 every vertuous woman, pithely discussed: namely
 Obedience, Chastitie, and Sylence. . . . (qtd.
 in Jordan 25n)

In summary, Gower's tale is indistinguishable from a number of Greene's own "fond" romances--just the sort of work from which Gower had been attempting to dissuade him. Richard Helgerson observes this inconsistency also and argues that "the Vision appears as much a covert defense of Greene's earlier work as a repentance for it. Chaucer's tale is . . . not at all like what Greene wrote." Therefore,

in preferring Gower over Chaucer, Greene is not
 so much rejecting the folly of his youth as
 preferring the kind of story he had always
 written. . . . (100)

The two thematic questions of Vision--that is, "What kind of writing best conveys a moral lesson?" and "Is this kind of writing appropriate for use by a scholar?"--appear to elicit from Greene an unambiguous answer: the scholar himself knows best how to teach a moral lesson and need pay

no attention to those who believe themselves better judges than he of taste and propriety. What is intriguing about this message is its hint of a challenge accepted, especially in light of the ironically penitent tone of the whole work. Given the facts that Greene's mottoes (Omne tulit punctum qui miscuit utile dulce, Sero sed serio, Nascimur pro patria) all suggest that the author's interest is in conveying worthwhile, moral lessons in his fiction and that the central character of Vision represents Greene himself, the speculation arises that perhaps Vision is more than a repentance pamphlet and an ironic affirmation of Greene's literary standards. Could Vision, so plainly a narrative of an identifiable period of the author's life, also be a personal allegory in the way that Never Too Late and Groatsworth of Wit have been acknowledged to be? Clues to the answer to this appear of course in Vision, but perhaps also in the works of Nashe, of Richard and Gabriel Harvey, and even of Pasquill.

A cursory assessment of the characters in Greene's Vision reveals Greene as an autobiographical figure, Chaucer as a witty, broad-minded free spirit, Solomon as a divine and a pompous meddler, and Gower as a pedant. A student of the Greene-Nashe-Harvey quarrel might naturally be inclined to associate these characters with the author, Nashe, Richard Harvey, and Gabriel Harvey respectively; yet only closer scrutiny of the literary squabble of these four can

confirm the association.

According to Greene's descriptions of his characters and to the acknowledged facts about Nashe and the Harvey brothers, there are few physical parallels between Chaucer and Nashe, Gower and Gabriel Harvey, and Solomon and Richard Harvey. Nashe does easily fit Greene's initial picture of Chaucer: "His stature was not very tall;/ Leane he was; his legs were small" (209). Judging from clues given by Gabriel Harvey and Greene, one can conclude that Nashe apparently was a small man. But the features meant to make Chaucer appear aged, his white hair and beard, are unlikely to have been shared by Nashe in 1590, when he was only twenty-three. Like Gower, Gabriel Harvey appears to have been "long of height" (210); but evidently he was neither "pale" nor "wan," as Greene further describes Gower (210), because Harvey is reported to have been dark-complexioned enough for the queen to have compared him to an Italian. Richard Harvey was apparently not tall or large, as Solomon is (see Stern 70); nor does he seem to have possessed a personality to match Solomon's face, which was "Mild and sterne . . . [and in which] Sate mercie meeklie in his eie:/ And Iustice in his lookes hard by" (275). But, as I have said, Chaucer, Gower, and Solomon are types, and it is to these types that Nashe, Gabriel Harvey, and Richard Harvey correspond.

Nashe had published only The Anatomy of Absurdity and

the Preface to Menaphon under his own name by the time of Vision's setting. But in each he parallels the attitude of Chaucer, which appears in such remarks as the following:

knowest thou not, that the waters that flow from
Pernassus Founte, are not tyed to any particular
operation? . . . Poets wits are free, and their
words ought to be without checke. (214-15)

In the Preface to Menaphon Nashe tells the "gentlemen students" of his intention to "persecute [in The Anatomy] those idiots . . . that haue made Art bankerout of her ornaments, and sent Poetry a begging" (Nashe 5: 324); and in The Anatomy he approves of Erasmus's characterization of poetry as "a daintie dish seasoned with delights of euery kind of discipline" (1: 26). Both character and author elaborate on this idea in similar terms. Chaucer explains that from "sundry men" come "sundry conceits, & wits are to be praised not for the grauity of the matter, but for the ripeness of the inuention" (Greene 214-15); Nashe claims to be "a professed Peripatician, mixing profit with pleasure, and precepts of doctrine with delightfull inuention" (1: 27). Chaucer argues that "a pleasant vaine, quips as nie the quicke as a grauer inuectiue" (Greene 219) and "a pleasant tale stuft full of conceit breedes delight to the eare and pierceth into the thoughts" (Greene 224). Nashe contends that "delight doth prick men forward to the attaining of knowledge, and . . . true things are rather admirde if they

be included in some wittie fiction" (1: 25) and that "deeper diuinitie is included in Poets inuentions, and therefore not to be reiected" (1: 29). Chaucer's objection to Gower's long, bland moral exemplum is, as I have noted, that young Englishmen will not like such a long sermon but will be more easily swayed by a merry tale. Nashe's attitude matches Chaucer's; he writes,

Young men are not so much delighted with solide substances as with painted shadowes, following rather those thinges which are goodly to the viewe, then profitable to the vse, neither doo they loue so much those things that are dooing, as those things that are sounding; reioycing more to be strowed with flowers then nourished with frute. (1: 46)

Even Chaucer's analogy, "though his [Greene's] Bee hath a sting, yet she makes sweet honny" (219) recalls an analogy from The Anatomy of Absurdity: "as the Bee out of the bitterest flowers and sharpest thistles gathers honey, so out of the filthiest Fables, may profitable knowledge be sucked" (1: 30).

From an analysis of Gabriel Harvey's copious marginalia, G. C. Moore-Smith characterizes Harvey as "a man of the Italian Renaissance," a man

who aims at universal knowledge; who can sympathize with the intellectual detachment of

Machiavelli and the audacious licence of Aretine; who yet would make scholarship a means rather than an end; who firmly holds that . . . resolution may require the casting away of many moral scruples. . . . (54)

Smith adds that Harvey was no pedant (76), and V. F. Stern observes in a recent study that Harvey cultivated a sense of humor (160-61). Yet when Greene entered St. John's, Cambridge, in November 1575, the murmurs of Harvey's aloofness, bookishness, and captiousness begun by Thomas Neville, a fellow of Pembroke who opposed the conferment of Harvey's M.A., are likely still to have been in the air; and by 1581, when Nashe entered St. John's and Greene was at Clare Hall, Harvey had been satirized in the student play Pedantius for his alleged pedantry, "intensity, vanity, and ambitions" (Stern 54). His only English publication to this time, Three Proper Witty Familiar Letters, in which he displays to his correspondent, Edmund Spenser, his "pretensions to authority as rhetorician, critic, and poet" (Stern 69), may have fostered the attitude evident in Pedantius. In the light of Cambridge legend, then, all of Harvey's areas of scholarly interest throughout his lifetime were likely to be for Greene and Nashe ready themes for satire and caricature.

In fact, the intellectual ideals expressed by the ghost of Gower parallel many that can be found in Harvey's

publications, correspondence, and marginalia composed both before and after his pamphlet war with Greene and Nashe. Gower lists what he believes to be worthy pursuits in two lengthy passages in Vision:

Men that write of Martiall precepts, or Philosophicall Aphorismes are more highly esteemed, than such as write Poems of loue, and conceits of fancie. In elder time learning was so highly prized that Schollers were companions for Kings, & Philosophers were fathers of the Commonwealth, vpholding the state with the strength of their precepts: their wits were then employed either to the censures of virtue, or to the secrets of nature: either to deliuer opinions of Morall Discipline, or conclusions of naturall philosophy. . . . And so long were poets titled with many honors as long as their poems were vertuous, either tending to suppressse vanitie with Hesiod, or to aduance arms and vallour with Homer. . . . [S]ome in their Academies, taught the motion of the Starres, the count of the heauens, some of the nature of trees, plants, hearbs and stones: . . . others, [deciphered] writs of Aconomical precepts, some of policy, some of gouernment of Commonwealthes, and how Citizens should followe vertue, and eschewe vice:

others deliuered instruction for manners.

(216-17)

Then Green, giue thy selfe to write either of
 humanitie, . . . or els of Morall vertue, and so
 be a profitable instructor of manners: . . .
 seeke to bring youth to vertue, with setting
 downe Axiomes of good liuing. . . . Thus Greene
 haue I counsailed thee, and the seuen liberall
 Sciences lie before thee as subiects whereon to
 write. (271-72)

One of Harvey's discourses on natural philosophy, his discussion of earthquakes in Three Proper Witty Familiar Letters, was well known by 1590, and although his brothers were more conspicuously active in the "natural" science of astrology, Gabriel engaged in classifying astrological data as an amusement (Stern 68). An example of Harvey's intense interest in citizenship, training in courtly manners, and martial discipline may be observed in Stern's analysis of Castillo, sive Aulicus and De Aulica, two early Latin poems based upon Castiglione's Il Cortegiano that even agree with Castiglione that skill in arms is "more important for the courtier than skill in letters" (43). Harvey's aspirations echo Gower's recommendations on several other topics in a letter in which he informs Sir Robert Cecil of his plans to publish

manie other mie Tracts & Discourses . . . sum in
 Humanitie, Historie, Pollicy, Lawe, & the sowle
 of the whole Boddie of Law, Reason; sum in
 Mathematiques, in Cosmographie, in the Art of
 Navigation, in the Art of Warr, in the tru
 Chymique . . . & other effectual practicable
 knowlege. (qtd. in Stern 125)

Perhaps Harvey was not the only scholar who advocated the espousal of all these disciplines: the popular concepts of the courtier and the Renaissance man were pervasive. Yet in 1590 the activities of Gabriel Harvey and his brothers in the "seuen liberall sciences" were notorious and had already been ridiculed in Cambridge; this fact, combined with their connection with Nashe and the Marprelate affair, makes the celebrated courtier-pedant the likely subject for Greene's caricature in Gower.

The activites for which Richard Harvey is best known--that is, the publication of a spurious astrological forecast, his intrusion in the Marprelate controversy, and his attack in The Lamb of God on writers of scurrilous pamphlets--all appear to be alluded to in the words and actions of Solomon in Vision's final section. Gabriel's younger brother had published An Astrological Discourse upon the Conjunction of Saturn & Jupiter in 1583, in which he had predicted violence, desolation, and the second coming of Christ (Stern 70); although a furor arose at the appearance of the

forecast, the date Harvey set passed without event, and the author seems to have suffered subsequent embarrassment.

Solomon's allusion to such dabbling as Richard Harvey's is left-handed and ironic, as might be anticipated from Greene:

Canst thou reach vnto the heauens with thy
knowledge, and tell the course of the Starres,
setting doune their aspects, oppositiues, times,
and sextiles, and discourse of the influence of
euery Star? . . . thou shalt finde the studie of
them [i.e., astrology and other arts and sciences]
to bee vtter vexation of minde, and vanitie: and
the fame that growes from such labours, to vanish
awaye like smoake, or a vapour tossed with the
winde. (278)

Solomon's warning in general parallels the cynical theme of the preacher of the Biblical book of Ecclesiastes--"I have seen all the works that are done under the sun; and, behold, all is vanity and vexation of spirit" (l. 14)--but there is a hint of personal chagrin in the pronouncement that "thou shalt find" only fleeting celebrity and vexation of mind.

In addition, Solomon's entry into the poets' debate and his admonition to Greene display several similarities to Richard Harvey's intrusion into the Martin Marprelate controversy. When Greene chooses the conventional wisdom of Gower over Chaucer's scurrility, his action mirrors that of the many Englishmen who chose to remain loyal to the

Church of England; Solomon's interruption of the Chaucer-Gower debate to "divert" Greene seems analogous to Richard Harvey's stepping into the Marprelate conflict with Plain Perceval and The Lamb of God, in which Harvey criticizes both sides and reminds them that "the Apostles did not proceede by such meanes: the primitiue church did not flourish by iying or rayling" (Nashe 5: 177-78), and to "imbrace the true, christian, and excellent vertues of the Lamb, . . . in a word, all diuine and humane iustice" (Nashe 5: 181). Richard Harvey's pronouncement, "All other wisdom is folly, all other learning ignorance, . . . eyther without this [the preaching of the Lamb], or in comparison of this" (Nashe 5: 182), is at one point echoed in Solomon's language:

all knowledge except it [theology], is mere follie: and there is no wisdom, but the law of the Lord. (Greene 280)

If the characters of Vision resemble actual figures of significance to Greene and if the irony in the narrative suggests that the author's meaning is something different from or additional to the work's literal meaning, Greene's Vision may possibly be interpreted as a loose allegory. With the help of available evidence, we may be able to reconstruct the sequence of events that Greene may have allegorized in Vision.

The reconstruction begins with Gabriel and Richard

Harvey at Cambridge. Because of their Ramism and their apparent lack of tact in social matters and discretion regarding what they published, the brothers were objects of caricature and occasional scorn, despite Gabriel's popularity as a lecturer of rhetoric. Into this milieu stepped Greene in 1575 and Nashe in 1581; from Nashe's remarks in Strange News and Have With You to Saffron Walden, and from Greene's in A Quip for an Upstart Courtier, the two University Wits seem indeed to have acquired the notions that Gabriel was a pretentious and officious pedant and Richard was an arrogant and contentious clown, perhaps a charlatan.

Yet by 1588, when Nashe left Cambridge and Greene had been away five years, the paths of the two writers and the Harveys had probably never converged.² Consequently, Greene and Nashe were indifferent to the activities and opinions of the Harveys, as were Gabriel and Richard to theirs. But Nashe's Preface to Menaphon in 1589 attracted the attention of Richard, who appears to have considered Nashe too much of a neophyte to be qualified to offer the sort of sweeping criticisms that the Preface contains.

The Marprelate controversy had reached full swing in the summer of 1589; Nashe and, quite possibly, Greene had

² According to Richard Harvey, Nashe was unknown to him before Nashe's Preface to Menaphon acquainted him with the writer's name (see Nashe 5: 180); Nashe admits knowing Gabriel Harvey only from a distance at Cambridge (see Nashe 1: 269).

joined John Lyly in the bishops' attempts to shout Martin down. In the fall, under the thin disguise of "Double V," Lyly issued Pappe with a Hatchet, in which, in addition to attacking Marprelate, he derided Gabriel, the pedant "full of latin endes" (Lyly 400). Gabriel recognized Lyly's work and wrote his Advertisement for Pap-hatchet and Martin Marprelate in response, but did not publish it; about the same time, Richard, perhaps roused by the increasing seaminess of a controversy that was giving rise to such apparently irrelevant attacks as the one on his brother, scolded all the participants in the fray with his Plain Perceval, which elicited an offhand gibe from Pasquill (Greene?) in The First Part of Pasquill's Apology (Nashe 1: 112). Between Plain Perceval and Pasquill's Apology appeared Nashe's Almond for a Parrot, in which he more than matched Martin in raillery and scurrility. Richard Harvey soon after published The Lamb of God, in the Epistle of which he resumed his scolding, this time reproving Nashe by name for his audacity in the Preface to Menaphon and deriding the other "piperly make-plaies and make-bates" (Nashe 5: 180) who were Nashe's comrades.

Greene, from his caution to his "young Iuuenall" in Groatsworth of Wit and from his excision of the libelous passage on the Harveys from A Quip for an Upstart Courtier, appears to have wished to avoid openly carrying on personal feuds in print. If he was Pasquill, he may have abandoned

scandal when the bishops' money began to run out and he recognized the commercial potential of his newly developed literary skill. Perhaps no longer "contented to let [Nashe's] simple iudgement ouerrule" him (Nashe 1: 319), and possibly even confounded at Richard Harvey's sanctimonious chiding, Greene may have tried to cool his partnership with Nashe, who reacted as Chaucer reacts in Vision.

Wishing, possibly, a sort of catharsis, Greene then set to work on his Vision, presenting Nashe in the type of Chaucer, and Richard and Gabriel Harvey as Solomon and Gower. The plot of Vision enabled Greene to justify his tactful move away from Nashe's stark scurrility, to rebuke Richard Harvey for stepping in where he had no business, and to taunt Gabriel, either for his animosity toward Lyly or merely for being Richard's brother and a pedant.³

³ The suggestion that Greene was Pasquill gives rise to an additional speculation about Greene's apparent ill will toward Gabriel: Lyly had castigated Harvey in Pappe for not joining the anti-Martinists (400); Pasquill remarks that "a student at the Lawe hath vndertaken to be a stickler betweene vs all: his booke is not in print, and I came a day short of the sight of . . . it" (Nashe 1: 112); "[if he would] forsake the barre to pleade for GOD, I doubt how many hundreds would follow him" (Nashe 1: 120). Gabriel had taken up the study of civil law in 1578; although no one has equated Pasquill's reference with Gabriel, he fits the characterization, and his Advertisement for Pap-hatchet could be the pamphlet Pasquill describes. If Greene were Pasquill, his indignation at Harvey's reluctance to join the episcopacy's cause may have fueled his feelings and afforded him a special incentive to jeer at Gabriel.

Shortly after Greene completed the main section of Vision, however, he and Nashe may have settled their differences and begun collaborating again, probably, as E. H. Miller and Donald McGinn suggest, on Greene's cony-catching pamphlets (Miller, "The Sources . . ." 151; McGinn 177). Consequently, Greene may have set Vision aside but may eventually have shown it to Nashe or told him of it. Approving of the dream vision device and the opportunity to retaliate against the Harveys, but wishing to criticize them on the more general topic of social climbing rather than on the subject of propriety in literature, the two University Wits may have revived Vision, changed the ghosts of the poets to Cloth Breeches and Velvet Breeches, and composed A Quip for an Upstart Courtier, complete with the attack on the Harveys. During his illness in August 1592 Greene, having found his draft of Vision and hoping to sell it to pay off some debts, added or strengthened its tone of penitence and tried to prepare it for the press. In this state it was likely to have been found, as Charles Crupi believes, "among the 'many papers' Greene left when he died" (35).

Much of this reconstruction is speculative, and some even begs the question of Greene's participation in the Marprelate affair. But it accounts for a final phase of Greene's development as a prose writer--one in which, having recognized the usefulness of satire and realism through the

influence of Nashe and his experience with the anti-Martinists, he struck out again on his own to make his newly acquired skills work for him in commercial pamphlets. And, in addition, the argument is consistent with the major studies--by R. B. McKerrow, G. R. Hibbard, V. F. Stern, and Charles Crupi--of the relationship of Greene, Nashe, and the Harveys, offering possible solutions to some questions that these studies have not answered.

Works Cited

- Crupi, Charles W. Robert Greene. Boston: Twayne, 1986.
- Greene, Robert. Greene's Vision. Vol. 12 of The Life and Works in Prose and Verse of Robert Greene, M. A. Cambridge and Oxford. For the First Time Collected and Edited, with Notes and Illustrations, Etc. 15 vols. 1881-86. New York: Russell, 1964. 189-281.
- Helgerson, Richard. The Elizabethan Prodigals. Berkeley: U of California P, 1976.
- Jordan, John Clark. Robert Greene. New York: Columbia UP, 1915.
- Lyly, John. Pappe with an Hatchet. Vol. 3 of The Complete Works of John Lyly. Ed. R. Warwick Bond. 3 vols. Oxford: Oxford UP (Clarendon), 1902. 388-413.
- McGinn, Donald. "A Quip from Tom Nashe." Studies in the English Drama in Memory of Karl Julius Holzknacht. Ed. J. W. Bennet, Oscar Cargill, and Vernon Hall, Jr. New York: New York UP, 1959. 172-88.
- Miller, Edwin Haviland. "The Relationship of Robert Greene and Thomas Nashe (1588-1592)." Philological Quarterly 33 (1954): 353-67.
- . "The Sources of Robert Greene's 'A Quip For An Upstart Courtier' (1592)." Notes and Queries 198 (1953): 148-52.
- Moore-Smith, G. C. Gabriel Harvey's Marginalia. Stratford: Shakespeare Head, 1913.

- Nashe, Thomas. The Works of Thomas Nashe. Ed. Ronald B. McKerrow. 5 vols. 1910. Ed., with corrections and supplementary notes, F. P. Wilson. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958.
- Nicholl, Charles. A Cup of News: The Life of Thomas Nashe. London, Routledge, 1984.
- Ranson, D. Nicholas. "The Date of Greene's 'Vision' Revisited." Notes and Queries 220 (1975): 534-35.
- Salzman, Paul. English Prose Fiction 1558-1700: A Critical History. London: Oxford UP, 1985.
- Stern, Virginia F. Gabriel Harvey: His Life, Marginalia, and Library. Oxford: Oxford UP (Clarendon), 1979.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

Greene perhaps did not need to pass through one or more developmental phases between Pandosto and A Notable Discovery of Cozenage. A skilled, experienced writer who recognized changes in the demands of the reading public probably needed few clues as to how he was to maintain his readership. Even Richard Harvey, far from a "professional" writer in Greene's sense of the word, was able to shift relatively easily from a presumably rhetorical, homiletic style to his own brand of Martinism in Plain Perceval and then back again in his Epistle to The Lamb of God.

Yet a writer cannot escape his influences, and if Nashe is a faithful reporter, Greene's deference to the influence of the lively, witty young writer afforded him a versatile, colloquial style and a new way of looking for material in everyday circumstances. Also, if the suggestion that Greene was the anti-Martinist writer Pasquill is accurate, then Greene may have drawn some valuable knowledge and skill in the area of social satire from his experience as a "Martin-queller."

That Greene's apparent audience for works such as Mourning Garment, A Disputation, and A Quip for an Upstart

Courtier is the type of reader who would approve of plainly told narratives of returned prodigals, reformed prostitutes, and justly served cozeners and social climbers is not in itself proof that Greene wrote under Nashe's influence, nor that his turn toward this audience was the result of a series of stages. Rather, the audience is likely to have been part of an evolving milieu into which Greene and Nashe found themselves thrown together in 1588 or 1589. This milieu brought out the best in Nashe, caused Greene to reconsider the practical and intellectual value of the fiction that had been his mainstay, and presented a unique and fresh opportunity to develop commercial skills that would serve them as their market changed.

Greene very likely wished to maintain his individuality as a writer despite the influences he was now dealing with, and did much to preserve a certain character in his writings. Yet he approved of and adopted many of the innovations that Nashe conceived.

What this relationship resulted in is difficult to say. Greene probably died before their partnership reached maturity. During the long feud with Gabriel Harvey, Nashe was probably distracted from developing skills he had acquired from working with Greene. The social and religious controversies of the years between Greene's death and the Restoration are likely further to have undermined whatever influence their collaboration could have had. Yet echoes of

Greene's Ned Brown and Nashe's Jack Wilton can be perceived in eighteenth-century fictional characters such as Daniel Defoe's Colonel Jack; and many of Defoe's characters are reminiscent of the London folk who people Greene's cony-catching tracts and Nashe's works. Very little in the works of the early novelists, by contrast, reflects the influence of the most widely read of the prose works to survive Greene's time, Sidney's Arcadia.

The two University Wits joined forces, then, at a critical time, when the status of the plain-spoken middle class created a demand for realistic narratives written in an unadorned style and when a public controversy made satire a byword. Greene claims in numerous remarks that his cony-catching pamphlets were widely read (see Salgado 234-35, 272); Pierce Penniless, Nashe's first work of realistic social satire after the Preface to Menaphon, went through five editions between its publication in 1592 and 1595 (Nicholl 99). Greene and Nashe, therefore, appear accurately to have assessed the nature of the newly emerging English readership. They exploited the oncoming change in circumstances by abandoning romance and adopting realistic subject matter and a more natural style. This change, in turn, set the stage for Thomas Deloney and Thomas Dekker and, later, Daniel Defoe and the other early novelists.

Works Cited

- Nicholl, Charles. A Cup of News: The Life of Thomas Nashe.
London: Routledge, 1984.
- Salgado, Gamini, ed. Cony-Catchers and Bawdy Baskets: An
Anthology of Elizabethan Low Life. Harmondsworth,
Middlesex: Penguin, 1972.

WORKS CONSULTED

PRIMARY SOURCES

- Bancroft, Richard. Davngerovs Positions and Proceedings, published and practised within this Iland of Brytaine, vnder pretence of Reformation, and for the Presbiteriall Discipline. 1593. Amsterdam: Theatrvm Orbis Terrarvm Ltd., and New York: Da Capo Press, 1972.
- . A Svruay of the Pretended Holy Discipline. Contayning the beginniges, success, parts, proceedings, authority, and doctrine of it: with some of the manifold, and materiall repugnances, varieties and vncertaineties, in that behalfe. 1593. Amsterdam: Theatrvm Orbis Terrarvm Ltd., and New York: Da Capo Press, 1972.
- Greene, Robert. The Black Book's Messenger. Salgado 317-37.
- . A Disputation Between a He Cony-catcher and a She Cony-catcher. Salgado 266-315.
- . The Life and Works in Prose and Verse of Robert Greene, M. A. Cambridge and Oxford. For the First Time Collected and Edited, with Notes and Illustrations, Etc. Ed. A. B. Grosart. 15 vols. 1881-86. New York: Russell, 1964.

- . Menaphon: Camillas alarum to slumbering Euphues, in
in his melancholie Cell at Silexedra. Greene's
Menaphon and Lodge's A Margarite of America. Ed. G. B.
Harrison. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1927.
- . A Notable Discovery of Cozenage. Salgado 155-92.
- . Pandosto: The Triumph of Time. Elizabethan Prose
Fiction. Ed. Merritt Lawlis. New York: Odyssey
Press, 1967.
- . The Third and Last Part of Cony-catching. Salgado
229-63.
- Harvey, Gabriel. Foure Letters and Certaine Sonnets. 1592.
Ed. G. B. Harrison. 1922. New York: Barnes & Noble,
1966.
- Harvey, Richard. Plaine Percevall, the Peace-Maker of
England; Being a Reply to Martin Mar-prelate. [1590].
Ed. J. Petheram. London: John Russell Smith, 1860.
- Jonson, Ben. Every Man Out of His Humour. The Complete
Plays of Ben Johson. Ed. G. A. Wilkes. Vol. 1.
Oxford: Oxford UP (Clarendon), 1981. 4 vols. to date.
- Lyly, John. Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit and Euphues & His
England. Eds. M. W. Croll and Harry Clemons. 1916.
New York: Russell, 1964.
- . The Complete Works of John Lyly. Ed. R. Warwick Bond.
3 vols. Oxford: Oxford UP (Clarendon), 1902.
- Munday, Anthony. The English Romaine Lyfe. 1582. Ed.
G. B. Harrison. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1966.

- . Zelauto: The Fountaine of Fame. 1580. Ed. Jack Stillinger. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP, 1963.
- Nashe, Thomas. The Works of Thomas Nashe. Ed. Ronald B. McKerrow. 5 vols. 1910. Ed., with corrections and supplementary notes, F. P. Wilson. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958.
- Peel, Albert, ed. Tracts Ascribed to Richard Bancroft. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1953.
- Pierce, William, ed. The Marprelate Tracts. London: Constable, 1911.
- Salgado, Gamini, ed. Cony-catchers and Bawdy Baskets: An Anthology of Elizabethan Low Life. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1972.
- Sidney, Sir Philip. The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia. 1593. Ed. Maurice Evans. 1977. New York: Penguin, 1982.
- . The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia (The Old Arcadia). Ed., with Introduction and Commentary, Jean Robertson. London: Oxford UP, 1973.

SECONDARY SOURCES

- "Amadis de Gaul." Masterplots. Ed. Frank Magill. 18-Volume edition. 1971.
- Baker, Ernest A. The History of the English Novel. 10 vols. 1924-39. London: Witherby, 1961.

- Carlson, Leland H. Martin Marprelate, Gentleman: Master Job Throckmorton Laid Open in His Colors. San Marino: Huntington Library, 1981.
- Clark, Sandra. The Elizabethan Pamphleteers: Popular Moralistic Pamphlets 1580-1640. Rutherford, NJ: Farleigh Dickinson UP, 1983.
- Croll, Morris William. Introduction and Notes. Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit and Euphues & His England. By John Lyly. Eds. Croll and Harry Clemons. 1916. New York: Russell, 1964. xv-lxiv; 2-462.
- Crupi, Charles W. Robert Greene. Boston: Twayne, 1986.
- Davis, Walter R. Idea and Act in Elizabethan Fiction. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1969.
- Evans, Maurice. Introduction. The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia. By Sir Philip Sidney. 1977. New York: Penguin, 1982. 9-50.
- Frye, Northrop. Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays. 1957. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1973.
- Harrison, G. B. Introduction. Greene's Menaphon and Lodge's A Margarite of America. Ed. Harrison. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1927.
- Helgerson, Richard. The Elizabethan Prodigals. Berkeley: U of California P, 1976.
- Hibbard, G. R. Thomas Nashe: A Critical Introduction. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1962.
- Holman, C. Hugh. A Handbook to Literature. 4th ed.

- Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1980.
- Hunter, G. K. John Lyly: The Humanist as Courtier.
Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1962.
- Jordan, John Clark. Robert Greene. New York: Columbia UP,
1915.
- Lawlis, Merritt. Foreword. A Notable Discovery of Cozenage.
Elizabethan Prose Fiction. Ed. Lawlis. New York:
Odyssey, 1967. 395-99.
- Lee, Sidney. "Nashe, Thomas." DNB. 1885-1900.
- Lempriere, J. Classical Dictionary of Proper Names Mentioned
in Ancient Authors. 1788. Ed., with revisions and
additions, F. A. Wright. London: Routledge, 1951.
- Lewis, C. S. English Literature in the Sixteenth Century
Excluding Drama. London: Oxford UP (Clarendon), 1954.
- Liddell, Henry G. and Robert Scott. A Greek-English
Lexicon. Ed., rev., and augmented, Henry Stuart Jones.
London: Oxford UP, 1958.
- McGinn, Donald. John Penry and the Marprelate Controversy.
New Brunswick: Rutgers, 1966.
- . "Nashe's Share in the Marprelate Controversy." PMLA
59 (1944): 952-84.
- . "A Quip from Tom Nashe." Studies in the English
Renaissance Drama in Memory of Karl Julius Holzkecht.
Ed. J. W. Bennett, Oscar Cargill, and Vernon Hall, Jr.
New York: New York UP, 1959. 172-88.
- Miller, Edwin Haviland. "The Relationship of Robert Greene

- and Thomas Nashe (1588-1592)." Philological Quarterly 33 (1954): 353-67.
- . "The Sources of Robert Greene's 'A Quip For An Upstart Courtier' (1592)." Notes and Queries 198 (1953): 148-52.
- Moore-Smith, G. C., ed. Gabriel Harvey's Marginalia. Stratford: Shakespeare Head, 1913.
- . Introduction. Pedantius: A Latin Comedy Formerly Acted in Trinity College, Cambridge. Ed. Moore-Smith. Louvain: A. Uystpruyst, 1905.
- Mullinger, James Bass. "Bancroft, Richard." DNB. 1885-1900.
- . "Harvey, Gabriel." DNB. 1885-1900.
- Nicholl, Charles. A Cup of News: The Life of Thomas Nashe. London: Routledge, 1984.
- O'Connor, John J. Amadis de Gaule and its Influence on Elizabethan Literature. New Brunswick: Rutgers, 1970.
- Pierce, William. An Historical Introduction to the Marprelate Tracts. London: Constable, 1908.
- Ranson, D. Nicholas. "The Date of Greene's 'Vision' Revisited." Notes and Queries 220 (1975): 534-35.
- Rathnell, J. C. A. "Sidney's Arcadia and Astrophell and Stella." The Age of Shakespeare. Vol. 2 of The New Pelican Guide to English Literature. Ed. Boris Ford. 8 vols. New York: Penguin, 1982. 137-48.
- Robertson, Jean. Introduction and Commentary. The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia (The Old Arcadia). By Sir

- Philip Sidney. London: Oxford UP, 1973. xv-xli;
418-86.
- Ruoff, James E., ed. Crowell's Handbook of Elizabethan and
Stuart Literature. New York: Crowell, 1975.
- Salingar, L. G. "The Social Setting." The Age of
Shakespeare. Vol. 2 of The New Pelican Guide to
English Literature. Ed. Boris Ford. 8 vols. New
York: Penguin, 1982. 15-47.
- Salzman, Paul. English Prose Fiction 1558-1700: A Critical
History. London: Oxford UP, 1985.
- Sanders, Chauncey E. Robert Greene and the Harveys.
Indiana University Studies 98. Bloomington: Indiana
UP, 1931.
- Seltzer, Daniel. Introduction. Friar Bacon and Friar
Bungay. By Robert Greene. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P,
1963. ix-xxi.
- Short, Ardelle Cowie. "A Critical Edition of Menaphon by
Robert Greene with the Preface by Thomas Nashe." Diss.
Yale U, 1977.
- Simpson, Richard. The School of Shakespeare. 2 Vols. New
York: Bouton, 1878.
- Stern, Virginia F. Gabriel Harvey: His Life, Marginalia,
and Library. Oxford: Oxford UP (Clarendon), 1979.
- Stillinger, Jack. Introduction. Zelauto. By Anthony
Munday. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP, 1963.
vii-xxviii.

- Turner, Celeste. Anthony Mundy: An Elizabethan Man of Letters. Berkeley: U of California P, 1928.
- Watt, Ian. "Elizabethan Fiction." The Age of Shakespeare. Vol. 2 of The New Pelican Guide to English Literature. Ed. Boris Ford. 8 vols. New York: Penguin, 1982. 195-206.
- Wehling, Mary Mellen. "Marlowe's Mnemonic Nomenclature with Especial Reference to Tamburlaine." Modern Language Review 73 (1958): 243-47.
- Wilson, John Dover. "The Marprelate Controversy." Renascence and Reformation. Vol. 3 of CHEL. 14 vols. 1907-27. New York: Macmillan, 1939.
- Wolff, Samuel Lee. The Greek Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction. 1912. New York: Burt Franklin, 1961.