

# **CLIFF FORSHAW**

The more we examine the documents of 1 and 4 June, the odder they seem: satires are included in a rag-bag of plays, histories, narratives, and polemics; authors' names are omitted; works are misnamed or referred to by subtitle. The ban seems particularly curious given the subsequent failure to implement the clause "That noe Satyres or Epigramms to be printed hereafter." Of the named satires, only Davies's and Middleton's had not been registered; all the rest had previously been approved by





scourges could turn into scourges of moral authority.”<sup>14</sup> Similarly, Lynda Boose claims that the bishops were concerned with satires which dangerously depicted “the pornographic pleasures of Aretino.”<sup>15</sup> Though these critics rightly draw our attention to the “Aretinian” inheritance of sexual imagery in Marston, Guilpin and Middleton, this does not mean that the bishops banned them for these reasons, any more than they thought “Englishe historyes” or Harvey’s pamphlets likely to corrupt sexual morals. It also raises the question why one of the works Peter finds “to some degree obscene,”<sup>16</sup> *Caltha Poetarum*— “the most fantastically erotic vision of Elizabethan court politics” as Hannah Betts has called it<sup>17</sup>—was not burned, or why most of the satires had been authorised in the first place.

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

McCabe’s argument here is essentially an amplification of his original position that the primary target of the ban

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



“*Antypathy*” who “Skoules at the fortune of the fairer *Merit*.”<sup>23</sup> Throughout the plays Marston mocks satirical bombast and identifies the Satyrist with envious malcontent

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

political connotations lurk in Jonson's phrase. It was not only in a legalistic sense that the members of the Inns felt themselves to be living in a 'liberty', a legal sanctuary. The triumph of the common law had thrust the lawyers into a u.9(s ch6-17m)5nriafwnriaf0.



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

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

Marston's dark allusive method, and his sophisticated use of a persona whose malcontent outcries are in fact the butt of the joke, however, would have made it easy for the bishops to assume offence against great ones, or the establishment itself, where none was intended—or had even previously been assumed by its censors. The personification of vices invite



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

Marston’s place on the bishops’ list may also stem from the association of his “Aretinian” style with Nashe. The “true English Aretine,” as Lodge called him, claimed “of all stiles I most affect & strive to imitate *Aretines*.”<sup>44</sup> Marston’s quarrel with Hall (Harvey’s ally against Nashe) was also reminiscent of the Nashe-Harvey flyting which, as we shall see, the bishops had good reason to forget. Flyting publicised the new satirists and promised them an audience beyond the Inns and universities. If, as the bishops suspected, this satire was dangerous, then it would be more so if it broke bounds into greater “liberties” than the Inns.

### **The Bishops, Nashe and the Marprelate controversy**

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

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

increase (like a woman long traualing to bee deliuered of a monster) that it was no sooner borne but I was glad to run from it.<sup>52</sup>

Run he did. Nashe escaped London for Great Yarmouth where he remained for well over a year. On 28 July 1597, the theatres were closed by the Privy Council; according to Philip Henslowe specifically occasioned “by the means of the playing the Jellye of dooges.”<sup>53</sup> On 15 August, the Council commissioned Richard Topcliffe, the notorious hunter and torturer of recusants, to investigate and apprehend those responsible “to receave soche punyshment as their Lewde and mutynous behaviour doth deserve.”<sup>54</sup> Two of the principal players were arrested, along with Ben Jonson, who was charged as “not only an Actor, but a maker of parte of the said Plaie.” Whether Jonson was Nashe’s collaborator or was brought in to finish a topical piece that Nashe abandoned as too risky we do not know. The play has not survived. We can only guess at what it contained. We do know, however, that the Isle of Dogs was regarded as an unsavoury lawless place where both fugitives and sewage washed up. Nashe had already used the cloacal location metaphorically against Harvey: “in the full tide of his standish, he will carry your occupations out of towne before him, besmeare them, drowne them: down the riuer they goe Privily to the Ile of Dogges with his Pamphlets.”<sup>55</sup> The Isle’s situation opposite the royal palace at Greenwich may have prompted dangerous satirical analogies with the court; allusions to Nashe’s “voyage” to the “Ile of Dogges, / There where the blattant beast doth rule and raigne” in *The Returne from Parnassus* seem to confirm this. Nashe’s pen is a “sharper quill of porcupine” with “engoared venom” for his ink, which leaves “our feared Lordings crying villany.”<sup>56</sup> The *Parnassus Plays* also present Nashe as a stylistic precursor to Marston.<sup>57</sup> If the bishops knew Nashe to be politically dangerous, they had reason to suspect his rhetorical imitators, even if they wrote in another genre and for another audience.

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **The Stationers’ Company: censorship and commercial protectionism**

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



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

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

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

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

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

### *Faunus and Melliflora*

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

lewdness because they are lustfully envious of Venus. The book ends with “A



dedicatory epigrams as there is satire in the remainder. The *Epigrammes*' praise of established contemporaries brings McKerrow to note that "with the exception of the *Palladis Tamia* of Francis Meres, there is, I think, no single work of so early a date which contains reference



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

Despite their algolagnic flavour, later satires seem less politically contentious. Richard Middleton’s *Epigrams and Satyres* (1608) approaches the Kinsayderian tone, spicing prurience with indignation; John Taylor’s *The Sculler* (1612) likewise echoes Marston and Guilpin; Thomas Dekker in *The Guls Horne-Booke* (1609) assures us that the public is still eager for both satires and smut.<sup>85</sup> After this second wind, verse satire begins to flag. Works such as



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

To some degree, satire had returned to the genre of Complaint; or at least that



## Notes

---

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

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

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

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

<sup>5</sup> O. J. Campbell,



- 
- <sup>25</sup> Robert Krueger, ed., *The Poems of Sir John Davies* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975), 163.
- <sup>26</sup> “On the Marriage of Lady Elizabeth Hatton to Edward Coke;” “On the Marriage of Lady Mary Baker to Richard Fletcher, Bishop of London,” *Poems of Sir John Davies*, 177-179; commentary 395-96.
- <sup>27</sup> See Forshaw, *Chameleon Muse*, Chaps. 6 and 7.
- <sup>28</sup> Herford and Simpson, III.421.
- <sup>29</sup> Finkelppearl, *John Marston*, 79-80.
- <sup>30</sup> Clegg, 210.
- <sup>31</sup> See Forshaw, *Chameleon Muse*, 194-213.
- <sup>32</sup> Davenport, *Marston*, 176.
- <sup>33</sup> Krueger, 129.
- <sup>34</sup> Davenport, *Marston*, 71.
- <sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 140.
- <sup>36</sup> Clegg, 212.
- <sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, 210-11.
- <sup>38</sup> McCabe, in Hadfield, *Literature and Censorship*, 85; Clegg, 208.
- <sup>39</sup> McCabe, in Hadfield, *Literature and Censorship*, 84. A. H. Bullen, ed., *The Works of Thomas Middleton*, 8 vols. (London: J. C. Nimmo, 1885-6), 8.120.
- <sup>40</sup> See Forshaw, *Chameleon Muse*, 194-213.
- <sup>41</sup> In 1533 Francis I bequeathed Aretino a gold chain with the motto *Lingua eius loquitur mendacium*—“his tongue speaks a lie;” Davis MacPherson’s “Aretino and the Harvey-Nashe Quarrel,” *PMLA* 84 (1969), 1551-58, demonstrates that Aretino was a controversial figure for Elizabethan pamphleteers.
- <sup>42</sup> Everard Guilpin, Epigram 20, *To Candidus*: ed. D. Allen Carrol, *Skialetheia* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1974), 44.
- <sup>43</sup> *Poems of Joseph Hall*, 11.
- <sup>44</sup> Thomas Lodge, *Wits Miserie, and the Worlds Madness*, in *The Complete Works of Thomas Lodge* (London: Hunterian Club, 1883), IV.63; Nashe, preface to *Lenten Stuffe*, in Ronald McKerrow, ed., *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, III.152.
- <sup>45</sup> J. B. Leishman, ed., *The Parnassus Plays (1598-1601)* (London: Ivor Nicholson and Watson, 1949), 241-42.

---

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

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

<sup>48</sup> For the history of the Nashe-Harvey quarrel, see Nashe,

- 
- <sup>71</sup> Hatfield Papers (found by David Mc. N. Lockie) probably about 1606-8.
- <sup>72</sup> Davenport, *Faunus*, 42-43.
- <sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, 62, 65.
- <sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*, 66-70.
- <sup>75</sup> Pierre LeRoy's *A Pleasant Satyre or Poesie* (English trans. 1595) had seen *satura* as a mixture of "all sorts of writings... Varro saith, that in ancient times, men called by this name, a certaine sorte of pie or pudding, into which men put diuers kindes of hearbes, and of meates" (sig. Aa4<sup>v</sup>).
- <sup>76</sup> Davenport, *Faunus*, vi.
- <sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, v-vii.
- <sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, 65.
- <sup>79</sup> William Keach, *Elizabethan Erotic Narratives: Irony and Pathos in the Ovidian Poetry of Shakespeare, Marlowe and their Contemporaries* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1977), 185.
- <sup>80</sup> Ferguson.
- <sup>81</sup> E. A. J. Honigman, *John Weever: a Biography of a Literary Associate of Shakespeare and Jonson, together with a photographic facsimile of Weever's 'Epigrammes' (1599)* (Manchester University Press, 1987), 31.
- <sup>82</sup> McKerrow, v.
- <sup>83</sup> Clegg, 217.
- <sup>84</sup> *Records of the Court*, ed. Greg and Boswell, lvii, 79, 81; Arber, II.832-33; both cited in Clegg, 216-17.
- <sup>85</sup> Thomas Dekker, *The Guls Hornbook* (London: Temple Classics, 1941), 41.
- <sup>86</sup> Peter, 156.
- <sup>87</sup> *The Dutch Courtesan*, ed. Martin Wine (London, 1965), III.i.39-40.
- <sup>88</sup> Clegg, 113-14.
- <sup>89</sup> John Taylor, *Aqua-Musa* (1645), 7; quoted in Allan Pritchard, "Abuses Stript and Whipt and Wither's Imprisonment," *Review of English Studies* 14 n.s. (1963), 337-45: 339.
- <sup>90</sup> N. E. McClure, ed., *The Letters of John Chamberlain*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia, 1939), I.97.