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CHAPTER I

THE DYNAMICS OF A VISUAL MODE
Peter Bruegel's *Dulle Griet* ("Mad Meg") is a collage of feverish movement replete with monstrous figures, absurd concoctions, and soberly aggressive peasant women. A besieged village forms the lower half of the setting while a parched wasteland stretches disjunctively in the background. A conflagration surrounds the entire scene casting an eerie orange glow over the chaos. Center foreground, Mad Meg, an armour-plated witch, strides defiantly to the left lugging the spoils of an apparent victory in one arm and brandishing a sword in the other. Without even so much as a critical preface, this work possesses an emotional integrity; that is, *Dulle Griet* elicits a response, usually a combination of revulsion and nervous amusement, regardless of how knowledgeable the viewer may be as to the precise nature of the traditions and conventions which influenced Bruegel. But one critical assumption, valid for both visual art and literature, maintains that elucidation of an artistic work enhances one's appreciation for it as well as contributes to recognition of its aesthetic integrity. Consequently, a critical study investigating Bruegel's unusual imagery, for example, qualifies as a worthwhile undertaking if it assists a viewer's understanding of the *diablerie* mode.

Similarly, a study concentrating on the special characteristics of a literary mode often saves the mode from
obscurity by reassessing its artistic worth through a careful explanation of those facets which are opaque or otherwise unpalatable to the modern reader. Hallett Smith's *Elizabethan Poetry* (1952) provides an excellent example of this type of study. In his book, Smith traces the development of various poetic modes, including the sonnet, pastoral, Ovidian, and satiric, during the Elizabethan period. Smith's study deals exclusively with poetic modes; unfortunately, a counterpart study of prose modes has not been written. One mode which has suffered from this imbalance of scholarship is satire. Most studies of Tudor satire focus primarily on the formal verse satire. Those mentioning the prose satire speak of it with a condescending tone; the typical critical evaluation places it significantly below the formal verse satire in quality.  

Furthermore, the content of Tudor prose satire draws more attention than its form or technique; indeed, it might be argued that sociologists and historians have examined the mode more often than have literary critics or literary historians.  

To rectify this situation, the critical tasks here are as follows: to elucidate the artistic integrity of Tudor prose satire as a mode in its own right; to discuss briefly the essential differences between Tudor prose and formal verse satire; to sketch the background or "time-spirit" of Tudor prose satire with special emphasis on earlier continental prose satire and the tradition of caricature and the grotesque in the visual arts of the sixteenth century; and to correct the imbalance of attention placed on the content of Tudor
prose satire by shifting it more to technique.

This present study, then, entails a special reading of Tudor prose satire. Metaphorically, this study may be likened to an examination of a rough piece of ore composed of both dull and lucent particles. When the ore is held up to the light at a particular angle, its more attractive and materially valuable facets are readily discernible. The belief here is that the lackluster elements of Tudor prose satire have been the focus of critical analyses too long; a more positive perspective is needed to deliver this visually dynamic mode from its dismally low position in literary history.

Isolating the distinctive characteristics of the prose satire requires that working definitions of both satiric modes be established.\(^3\) Developed prose satire, in the Tudor period, is a broad-ranging mode encompassing a variety of forms--dialogue, epistle, anatomy and pamphlet--written in prose for predominantly satiric purposes. This definition excludes polemical tracts and prose fiction, such as Thomas Nashe's The Unfortunate Traveller, in which the satire is incidental. On the other hand, the formal verse satire possesses more narrow boundaries. Mary Claire Randolph singles out one reason:

> It is generally agreed that the formal verse satire is the only species or genre within the wide area of the genus Satire to have any sort of identifiable crystallized form or framework.\(^4\)

While Randolph does not provide a strict definition, she does identify the "minimum essentials" for the mode: "two actors or participants, a Satirist and his Adversarius; a setting of
sorts; and a thesis to be argued." This Adversarius need
not be a person, nor need it assume a speaking role.

Within the framework of these definitions, a discussion
of the similarities and differences between the two modes will
lead to a thesis as to the artistic integrity of the prose
satire. To begin with, the two modes are similar in many
respects. First, the basic content of each assumes a good
deal of semblance; for example, both modes mirror social and
economic disturbances which plagued England most of the
century. The typical medieval satiric topics--Pride, Avarice,
Envy, and others from the traditional seven deadly sins--
dominate both modes. In addition, new topics such as usury
and Italian fashions are common to the verse satire of Marston
and Hall as well as to the prose satire of Greene and Nashe.
The evil individual, as opposed to the evil institution,
gradually becomes the main target of satire. This individual
is "passion's slave," who through presumption and ignorance
has failed to avoid the clutches of folly and vice. However,
in general, the verse satire concentrates on vice while the
prose satire, especially during the 1590's, focuses more on
folly.

Another basic similarity between the two is the satiric
scene. Here, Alvin Kernan offers an accurate assessment:
"The scene of satire is always disorderly and crowded, packed
to the very point of bursting." While Kernan is speaking of
satire in general, his remark applies particularly well to
Tudor satire. The art of Hieronymous Bosch and Peter Bruegel,
sixteenth-century Flemish masters, supplies a valuable backdrop for understanding the visual impact of satiric scenes. Clearly, an affinity exists between the chaotic, disjunctive, and choking density of Bosch's The Last Judgment or Bruegel's Fall of the Rebel Angels and the bulging scenes of Greene's Quip for an Upstart Courtier and Lodge's Wits Miserie. Once again, Kernan helps solidify our concept of satiric scene:

The qualities we have isolated as characteristic of the satiric scene, density, disorder, grossness, rot, and a hint of an ideal, are present in both formal and Menippean satire; they are simply made concrete in different terms.\(^1\)

The latter part of Kernan's statement will retain significance later in this discussion. For the moment, other similarities between the modes require attention.

A plain style and a sense of drama are additional characteristics shared by both Tudor prose and formal verse satire. The satirists of the period cultivate a plain style; they see themselves as realists, as accurate reporters of a disordered world.\(^1\) Oddly enough, this plain style is often deliberately wrenched into prolonged passages of obscurity. Nashe's Have With You to Saffron-Walden is a prime example here; it is nearly impossible to read the entire work without losing the drift of its content. Moreover, the formal verse satire, because of its Juvenalian influence, generates even more obscurity than the prose satire. Yet, these stylistic tendencies do not detract from the sense of drama which permeates both modes. Whether it is an early work of prose satire such as William Bullein's A Dialogue Against the Fever Pestilence or a later piece of formal verse satire such as Joseph Hall's
Virgidemiarum, there exists in both modes an air of immediacy, of being present at the scene of the action. Naturally, there are different degrees of dramatic intensity; for example, in the prose satire, the earlier, more polemical, material employs few stage techniques, while the Marprelate Tracts reveal the spirit of comic drama native to the "jigs" of Tarleton and Kemp.

A final element common to both modes is rhetoric. The Tudor period, as is well known, receives most of its cultural impetus from the pervasive Renaissance rhetorical tradition. Madeleine Doran explains the position of rhetoric succinctly: "To the Renaissance rhetoric was a discipline, a tool, the expression of an ideal."¹² Rhetoric maintains a similar stature in the satire of the period as nearly every rhetorical device, from invective to amplification, appears in both the prose and formal verse modes. Indeed, in the Marprelate Tracts, rhetoric reaches a new plateau when Martin exposes the facile rhetoric of the Episcopates with his own complex set of rhetorical devices.¹³ However, it should be emphasized that, in general, the verse satire is more rhetorical than the prose.

Satire is an organic mode; as a result, its ordering principles create a natural flux between continuity and change. Its sub-modes must at some point flow in different directions. Having recognized this movement, Oscar J. Campbell has carefully assessed the two branches of Tudor satire as they increasingly catered to a more intelligent audience— one comprised basically of university-trained men. Two types of satirist thus evolved according to Campbell:
One wrote prose works fashioned on various sorts of medieval and early-Renaissance models; the other composed formal verse satire fashioned on the work of Latin satirists like Juvenal and epigrammatists like Martial.  

The task at hand then is to clarify the differences between these two satiric modes. Campbell establishes a starting point by referring to the structural sources of each.

As he suggests, formal verse satire is a rejuvenated mode with a strong classical tradition and a carefully defined structure. Furthermore, formal verse satire reflects a distinctive artistic method; in short, it is a well-defined literary type. In contrast, the prose satire owes its structural tendencies to medieval and early Renaissance frameworks like dream-vision allegories and compendiums of exempla.  

The anatomy most frequently accommodates the form of the prose satire. But the mode basically lacks a distinctive artistic method and a consistent structure; clearly, it is a loosely-defined literary type.  

The artistic medium of each mode serves as another point of contrast. The obvious difference is the level of sophistication. The formal satire draws upon a long, impressive tradition of English verse stretching back to the Beowulf Poet; within this tradition, poets such as Chaucer, Wyatt, Surrey, and Spenser carried the medium of verse to its zenith. The prose satire lacks a counterpart tradition for its medium. Despite sophisticated passages in the polemical prose of Tyndale, More, and Latimer, Tudor prose is a crude, undeveloped medium which, as will become apparent later, forces the satirist
into adopting a different satiric "strategy" because it fails, rhetorically, to handle the argumentative aspects of satire.18 This rhetorical weakness, in turn, alters the position of the prose satirist.

Unlike the formal verse satirist, the prose satirist, or his persona, remains in the background, subordinated to the scene. The satiric persona of Hall or Marston, posed as the traditional satyr figure, totally dominates the scene, and yet he detaches himself enough to maintain an objective stance. It must be admitted that the colorful personae of the Marprelate Tracts and several of Nashe's satires control scene and action; however, they do not attempt to detach themselves. They choose instead to shape their satire with a subjective vision.

The differences between the two modes discussed above help fill in their boundaries, but the crucial differences lie in the following areas: caricature, the grotesque, and satiric perspective. These areas provide the foundation for this study; indeed, they account for the "dynamics", the verve and energy of this highly visual mode—Tudor prose satire. On the issue of caricature, Campbell indicates that the disorders, whether vices or follies, under attack in the formal verse satire are "traits of clearly conceived individuals."19 In addition, these portraits are well-structured and comprehensive.20 Formal verse satire definitely leans toward characterization, toward the fuller, more complex portraits found in the satiric drama of Ben Jonson. The prose satire, on the other hand, reduces individuals to "types"; no characters appear here,
only caricatures. The process of caricature (explained more fully later in this study) limits figures to characteristic appearance or actions.

But these caricatures should not be mistaken for "humours" characters, Theophrastan characters or characters produced through rhetorical devices of characterization. These modes of characterization are obviously quite similar; the critical difference is that caricature sets out to reduce or diminish--its aim is extreme particularity, not just typicality. The tendency for caricature springs from a combination of medieval "type" characterization (often allegorical as in Piers Plowman) and a natural reaction to the new Tudor man--the members of the rising middle class. Kernan enlarges upon this point:

During the course of the sixteenth century in response to actual social conditions these figures, as well as many others, gradually hardened into type characters, caricatures of more complex living men.

As satiric tool, caricature is closely aligned with the grotesque. And while all satire employs the grotesque, Tudor prose satire, to a much greater extent than the formal verse satire, adopts the grotesque as its central satiric device. Ronald Paulson offers an observation remarkably suited to this mode:

What we remember from a satire is neither character nor plot per se, but a fantastic image, or a series of them. At the center of almost every satire there is an image which, if effective, the reader cannot easily forget.

But why the preponderance of the grotesque? Huntington Brown's explanation seems best:
In accordance with the principle that the background of the grotesque is realism, prose would seem to be the most convenient medium for its expression in literature, being a nearer approximation than verse to everyday speech . . . .24

Satiric perspective furnishes another possible explanation.

Satiric perspective marks the final point of divergence between the two modes. As was indicated earlier, a different satiric strategy is involved in each. The strategy of the formal verse satire is rhetorical or argumentative, while the prose satire depends upon the impact of a highly visual, grotesque scene to repulse the reader. Consequently, the denouement of the satiric action or "plot" reflects differing perspectives.25 The formal verse satirist creates a tension in his reader; in effect, he forces a sense of responsibility for correcting whatever disorders he has presented. His perspective, then, is serious, solemn, and moral. A spirit of saeva indignatio informs his work; a pessimistic tone hovers over the conclusion. In contrast, the prose satirist tries to disarm the tension he has deliberately produced, thus freeing the reader from the responsibility to mollify existing ills. The prose satire, at its best, possesses a genuine comic perspective, an amused fascination with folly, and, ultimately, an acceptance of life as it is.

This present study, then, will attempt to illustrate that the artistic integrity of Tudor prose satire resides in its employment of caricature and the grotesque as satiric tools. Moreover, as the mode develops between 1550 and 1610, the satirists become more skillful in their handling of cari-
cature and the grotesque. These satiric tools, both of which transcend style, emerge as ordering principles thus shaping a mode distinct from the formal verse satire. In the course of this development, the prose satire graduates from an interest in morals to an interest in language. The tone of its perspective evolves from sober to comic. Two main trends in English humor, the humanistic and the popular, fuse as the prose satire reaches its artistic peak in the 1590's. Finally, this satiric mode cannot be written off as a maverick form with little or no artistic heritage. Behind these works is a vibrant tradition of literary and artistic productions which capitalize upon caricature and the grotesque. Before sketching that tradition, working definitions of caricature and the grotesque must be provided.

Although caricatures have existed as long as civilization itself, the word "caricature" is of recent origin. John G. Lynch describes its history:

The word Caricature is derived from the Italian caricare, to load, so that to define the art as 'overloaded representation' has the merit of age and the convenience of brevity: but the actual word Caricatura was not used in Italy until the second half of the seventeenth century.26

Moreover, caricature did not become a dominant artistic tool until the sixteenth century. The reason becomes apparent when we recognize that caricature has primitive roots, and primitive man believed that picture and person were one. Consequently, a distorted picture of a man was a debilitating force. Thus, as Ernst Kris explains, "caricature could not develop while there was a strong belief in image-magic."27 Vestiges of
this belief held on through the Middle Ages. We can only conjecture as to why the sixteenth-century artist began to separate image and reality. Perhaps he possessed a more finely honed sensitivity than his predecessors, or the answer may lie in the natural evolution of Western Art. Regardless, the sixteenth-century artist was truly a new artist:

The artist was no longer bound by fixed patterns, as in the Middle Ages; he was not even bound to the imitation of reality—he shared the supreme right of the poet to form a reality of his own. 28

The result, in the visual arts at least, was a flowering of caricature which will be sketched in Chapter II.

Yet, caricature is not the exclusive province of the visual arts; it should then prove helpful to furnish a modern definition of literary caricature. According to Thrall, Hibbard and Holman, literary caricature is "Descriptive writing which seizes upon certain individual qualities of a person and through exaggeration or distortion produces a burlesque or ridiculous effect." 29 Often, critics contend that literary caricature is simply burlesque, but while both critical idioms employ distortion, the major difference is that caricature always contains a strong reductive or diminishing tendency, as indicated earlier. Or, as one critic maintains, "Caricature makes a subject ludicrous because it destroys the unity of his appearance." 30 He adds that the technique of caricature "consists of willful exaggeration and distortion, yet its aim is not the falsification of reality but the revelation of truth." 31

According to John Symonds, caricature as a satiric tool strives to mirror deficiencies:
It renders its victim ludicrous or vile by exaggerating what is defective, mean, ignoble in his person, indicating at the same time that some corresponding flaws in his spiritual nature are revealed by them.  

But caricature is not limited in purpose or sophistication. Henry Schmidt reinforces this view:

Used as a corrective weapon, caricature may transcend the work of art in which it exists by alluding to external reality, or caricature may itself become a work of art, existing as an object of aesthetic value and universal significance.

The definition and characteristic tendencies of caricature discussed above adequately apply to Tudor prose satire; however, our working definition requires a broader base to account fully for the nature of Tudor caricature. As a result, the following expanded definition of caricature will serve our purposes more effectively: Caricature is descriptive writing which, through exaggeration and distortion, diminishes or reduces a character to a series of individual physical features or characteristic actions so as to render the character ludicrous, revulsive, or both.

As was suggested earlier, caricature in Tudor prose satire gradually acquires more sophistication as the mode develops. In addition, four types of caricature exist within the mode: the personal, the typified, the symbolic, and the grotesque. Personal caricature is self-explanatory; it seizes upon a definite contemporary figure as the medium for satiric reduction. Typified caricature, the most common type in the period, entails a generalized attack; frequently, it reduces an individual to characteristic traits or actions. Allegory often informs this type, diminishing a satiric target
to a faceless embodiment of Pride, Avarice or some other abstract trait.

The third type, the *symbolic*, may appear as an extension of *personal* or *typified* caricature. Here, the reductive and diminishing tendencies are "designed to evoke an association to another frame of reference." These caricatures generate aesthetic value by transcending satiric purposes into a realm of universal significance. Satires involving animal characters occasionally serve as frameworks for *symbolic* caricature. In the more sophisticated prose satire, the Marprelate Tracts for instance, *symbolic* caricature appears in still another guise. The Marprelate author creates a symbolic situation which might be termed "caricature as norm." This form will be explained more fully in a later chapter; briefly, what occurs is that the satiric persona of the work is himself a caricature. The Episcopates are measured against him, and subsequently rendered ridiculous because they are even more ludicrous than the clownish persona.

The final type is the *grotesque* caricature. This type at once suggests the similarities between the two terms. As an identifiable satiric tool, *grotesque* caricature is simply caricature taken to the limits of absurdity. It retains the basic criteria for true caricature, but the distortion destroys the already fragile rational context that most caricature produces. This type necessitates establishing tenable boundaries between caricature and the grotesque as satiric devices. Wolfgang Marten's penetrating comment provides a
start:

... satiric caricature strives for social change with concrete, limited goals, whereas the representation of the unchangeable, negative quality of existence is attained by the grotesque. 37

Our focus now must shift from caricature to the grotesque.

The term "grotesque" is almost as difficult to define as satire. Especially difficult is finding a suitable definition for the term in the context of the Renaissance. Modern definitions are helpful, but more than one type of grotesque exists in the sixteenth century, thus rendering general definitions incomplete. It should be noted that the term itself originated in the sixteenth century. Arthur Clayborough explains its origin as follows:

It is generally accepted that the word grotesque originated as a term descriptive of the fanciful murals, in which human and animal motifs were combined with foliage and floral decoration, found in the chambers ('grotte') of Roman buildings excavated about 1500, particularly in the Domus Aurea of Nero. 38

The grotesque, then, is part of a long tradition. Thomas Wright's History of Caricature and Grotesque in Literature and Art (1865) reinforces this observation. Wright finds elements of the grotesque in Egyptian as well as Roman art. 39 He focuses upon the tremendous interest the late Middle Ages and early Renaissance had for the grotesque, but unfortunately, he provides no clear-cut definition of the term as it relates to the sixteenth century.

Although there were earlier attempts, the first respectable effort toward defining the Renaissance grotesque was by John Ruskin in his monumental The Stones of Venice (1851-53).
Even though Ruskin believed the grotesque related only to the visual arts, his definition establishes one form of the grotesque in Tudor prose satire:

First, then, it seems to me that the grotesque is, in almost all cases, composed of two elements, one ludicrous, the other fearful; that, as one or the other of these elements prevails the grotesque falls into two branches, sportive grotesque, and terrible grotesque; but that we cannot legitimately consider it under these two aspects, because there are hardly any examples which do not in some degree combine both elements; there are few grotesques so utterly playful as to be overcast with no shade of fearfulness, and few so fearful as absolutely to exclude all idea of jest.40

Ruskin's notion that the grotesque paradoxically combines the "ludicrous" and the "fearful" remained for years the most workable theory of the Renaissance grotesque. Indeed, his definition continues to exert a significant influence on modern definitions of the term.

Twentieth-century scholarship has tended to broaden the base of Ruskin's definition. Among recent works in this area, Wolfgang Kayser's The Grotesque in Art and Literature (1957) and Willard Farnham's The Shakespearean Grotesque (1971) stand out as valuable contributions. While both agree with Ruskin that the grotesque contains elements of the fearful and the ludicrous, they suggest a satisfactory definition demands more latitude. Kayser, for example, maintains that the grotesque is simply the "unfathomable."41 Moreover, he implies that the abiding quality of the Renaissance grotesque is the "estranged world" it presents.42

Farnham agrees with Kayser in general. He cites, in particular, that the Shakespearean grotesque, one phase in
the larger concept of Renaissance grotesque, "grows from a medieval creative spirit."43 Avoiding a specific definition, Farnham views the term as depicting that which represents a departure from the normal; it is deformity, but deformity precariously balanced between the sublime and the ridiculous. In fact, his concept seems in total harmony with Clayborough's modern definition:

... the word grotesque, both as noun and adjective, is used to describe that which is not congruous with ordinary experience. It derives from its association with a form of art characterized by its rejection of natural order not merely the sense of 'strange' but that of 'abidingly strange'.44

Thus, Kayser and Farnham provide an alternative theory of the Renaissance grotesque. Their more general concept, coupled with Ruskin's, points the way to a working definition of the grotesque as it relates to Tudor prose satire.

Recent scholarship on the grotesque helps finalize our working definition. Here, the debt to Ruskin is obvious. For example, Lee Byron Jennings, in The Ludicrous Demon, offers a definition bordering on a paraphrase of Ruskin:

We may say that the grotesque object always displays a combination of fearsome and ludicrous qualities—or, to be more precise, it simultaneously arouses reactions of fear and amusement in the observer.45

Jennings also comments on the difference between caricature and the grotesque; his distinction contributes decidedly to their use in this present study:

The grotesque displays something more than the superficial distortion of most caricature, which alters the outlines of a given original and gains its effect by exaggerating a part with respect to the whole; it is rather a distortion that penetrates to the bases of our perception of reality.46
Maintaining a strong link with Ruskin's definition, Philip Thomson, in *The Grotesque*, posits a more general definition when he calls the grotesque,

... the unresolved clash of incompatibles in work and response. It is significant that this clash is paralleled by the ambivalent nature of the abnormal as present in the grotesque: we might consider a secondary definition of the grotesque to be 'the ambivalently abnormal'.

A third essential definition appears in Michael Steig's article "Defining the Grotesque: An Attempt at Synthesis." Steig takes a psychological approach to the term and reaches this synthesis:

The grotesque involves the managing of the uncanny by the comic. More specifically: a) When the infantile material is primarily threatening, comic techniques, including caricature, diminish the threat through degredation or ridicule; but at the same time, they may also enhance anxiety through their aggressive implications and through the strangeness they lend to the threatening figure. b) In what is usually called the comic-grotesque, the comic in its various forms lessens the threat of identification with infantile drives by means of ridicule; at the same time, it lulls inhibitions and makes possible on a preconscious level the same identification that it appears to the conscience or superego to prevent.

A working definition of our term is now possible.

Consonant with the above definitions, the grotesque, as a satiric tool in Tudor prose satire, breaks into two distinguishable types. These shall be referred to as the non-vital and the vital grotesque. The term "vital" serves as a basis here because it suggests both an attunement to the comic rhythms of life as well as to its complexity. The non-vital grotesque designates a scene or situation, even a tone or attitude, exposed by the satirist as being an aberration from the natural scheme of things. It is, then,
virtually synonymous with an anti-cosmic vision; moreover, this type contains Thomson's "ambivalently abnormal" elements.

On the other hand, the **vital** grotesque is a much less generalized type. With Ruskin's definition as its foundation, the **vital** grotesque entails a scene or situation dominated by elements which evoke a paradoxical reaction of terror and amusement. The reader is revulsed by such scenes; yet, he is forced to laugh, even if it is a nervous laugh. In short, the **vital** grotesque denotes combinations of the "fearsome" and the "ludicrous."

With working definitions of caricature and the grotesque established, the final task of this introduction is to supply summary guidelines as to this study's scope and critical perspective. First of all, the chronological scope here encompasses the prose satire written in England between 1550 and 1609. These dates reflect the major developmental period for the prose satire; works which best represent the evolution of the mode have been selected for analysis. The chronological approach, as opposed to the topics approach, will allow this development to be illustrated most effectively. Furthermore, this study will focus exclusively on the prose satire; no satiric drama will be considered. In contrast, the critical perspective here will avoid catering exclusively to one critical approach. Instead, a "synthesis" of approaches will be the rule; that is, while the critical perspective will be largely new critical, at times it will be informed by various other approaches such as the psychological, the historical, the anthropological and
the interdisciplinary. Above all, the emphasis will be on technique rather than content. As a final note, this is not a source or influence study; however, it is in part an affinity study with respect to the treatment of caricature and the grotesque in sixteenth-century visual arts. Indeed, this tradition creates the matrix which, in turn, sharpens the aesthetic outlines of Tudor prose satire as a dynamic, artistic mode. A brief survey of this tradition is the subject of Chapter II.
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CHAPTER II

THE MATRIX OF TUDOR PROSE SATIRE
To most, Renaissance art evokes an image of power, the supreme manifestation of a sublime anima mundi, an idealization of life which exclaims in awe "What a piece of work is man!" rather than asks pessimistically "What is this quintessence of dust?" The strong figure of Michaelangelo's David comes to mind or his delicate allegorical figure of Dawn created to decorate the Medici tombs. As one's mind reflects further on this ideal world, he thinks of Titian's Charles V at the Battle of Mühlberg in all its vibrancy and martial strains, or the impeccable symmetry of Raphael's Alba Madonna, the poetic richness of Giorgione's The Tempest, or, of course, da Vinci's enigmatic Mona Lisa. Yet, this much celebrated view is but one tradition of renaissance art; an alternative tradition merits attention as well. That tradition is accurately described by John G. Lynch:

The artists of the Renaissance liked to dwell, for a moment, now and then, on the various unseemly departures made by Nature from the ideal.¹

These "departures" comprise, to a large extent, the tradition of caricature and the grotesque in sixteenth-century art and literature. The aim of this chapter is to sketch that tradition, to provide a cursory glance at how representative works of art and literature employed caricature and the grotesque. Anything more than a descriptive sketch would not be feasible; however, this tradition has such a strong affinity
with Tudor prose satire that the time spent here is justifiable. This present sketch will include Bosch, Bruegel, Reformation caricature, continental prose satire, and popular comic literature. The visual dynamics of caricature and the grotesque constitute the chapter's focus, but what should not be overlooked is the comic perspective which informs much of the art and literature discussed here. This perspective is absolutely essential to critical appreciation of Tudor prose satire; indeed, as Frank Getlein contends, this perspective possesses a definite continuity:

All through the bloody and serious events of the humanist centuries, this stream of silvery laughter runs from Boccaccio to Erasmus and Thomas More to Rabelais and Cervantes.²

A tenable starting point for our sketch is the work of the fifteenth-century artist, Hieronymus Bosch. Much scholarly effort has been exerted to solve the riddles of his drawings and paintings. In one of the more recent attempts, Walter S. Gibson argues that Bosch's work was inspired "not by medieval heresies or hermetic practices, but by the common and quite orthodox religious experiences of his age."³ At the core of most theories, however, is the recognition that Bosch's vision contains a vigorous satirical tinge. Moreover, his works clearly belong to the tradition of caricature and the grotesque. His most representative contributions to this tradition include Tabletop of the Seven Deadly Sins and the Four Last Things, Haywain, The Last Judgment and The Garden of Earthly Delights. These works date approximately from 1485 to 1510.
Tabletop reveals Bosch at his best as a caricaturist. This set of scenes encircles a large "Eye of God"—the center of which contains a portrait of Christ pointing to his wounds. In each of the scenes, Bosch has reduced an individual to epitomize a particular sin. Moreover, the selection of scene enhances the effectiveness of the typified caricatures. For example, "Superbia" depicts a young woman entrapped in her own vanity, captivated by the image in the mirror as she tries on a new headdress. The satiric message, of course, is that she fails to recognize that a demon is holding the mirror for her, abetting her vanity at every moment. She is symbolically diminished to the tiny image of herself in the glass. Similarly, in "Gula", Bosch presents the characteristic actions of the glutton. The two men, one considerably heavier than the other, voraciously consume everything the woman brings to the table. The key to this caricature, as with the others in the Tabletop, lies in the oblivious nature of the individuals represented. So intent are they upon carrying out their characteristic actions that they isolate themselves from the rhythm of life; their identities have been obliterated by sin.

Man's oblivious nature also subtly informs the central panel of the Haywain triptych. This work is a grand pageant of man's presumption and accompanying disregard for the saving grace of Christ. Less fantastic in its portrayal of the grotesque than The Last Judgment or The Garden of Earthly Delights, the Haywain triptych, nevertheless, pictures the chaos resulting from man's original sin (depicted in the left
wing) and the "wages" of sin—death and hell (depicted in the right wing). A large haycart loaded to capacity dominates the central panel. A flurry of action surrounds the cart as it moves methodically to its destination. Above the scene, nestled in a low-hovering cloud, stands Christ with open arms. But the crowd is oblivious to Him. The noblemen and magistrates on horseback behind the cart do not notice Him; neither do the skirmishing peasants beside the cart, or the young lovers seated on top of the hay. Only a diligent angel on bended knees behind the lovers looks upward. The crux of this grotesque scene is that no one notices the mob of demons pulling the cart toward hell, or that a symbolic second Christ figure is about to be trampled by the huge haycart.

Bosch's chief contributions to the tradition of the grotesque are his panoramic fantasies, **The Last Judgment** and **The Garden of Earthly Delights**, both triptychs. In these works, the "estranged world" of the non-vital grotesque assumes center stage. The perspective is serious, even solemn; any comic inclinations are mitigated by the disturbing tone of each scene. Thematically, these works assert that man is vulnerable to sin; he indulges himself and ultimately, through sin, destroys himself. It is not surprising, then, to find that the right wing of each triptych pictures hell. The central panel of **The Last Judgment** vividly portrays the grotesque manifestations of man's sinful nature. Here, man, stripped naked, literally becomes the "prey" of sin. Sin, in the form of bizarre, animal-like demons, besieges his villages leaving
only charred ruins visible in the background. The most
graphic illustration of man as sin's quarry appears in a small
segment of the lower foreground. A demon proudly carries
his "kill"; a naked man with a large arrow lodged diagonally
through his chest protruding out from his lower back. Hovering
above the chaos once again is the figure of Christ, but man,
the resolute sinner, remains oblivious to God's grace.

The central panel of The Garden of Earthly Delights
presents much more of a fantasy world than The Last Judgment,
but the emphasis on man's sinful nature is still evident.
Scholars have posited many theories about this central panel.
Its sexual overtones encourage a virtual field day for Freudian
critics; a few scholars even maintain that Bosch is celebrating
some secret erotic cult. A more sensible, and probably more
accurate, approach is to consider the work as a reflection
of man's sinful diversions. The fantastic pink and blue con-
coctions in the background seem to represent man's feeble
attempts to create, to impose a meaningful order on existence.
The naked figures riding various beasts in the center of the
work symbolically travel in a meaningless circle. Similar
pale figures loiter about in the foreground; animal and lush
fruit images abound as man is shown surrendering himself to
the pleasures of the flesh, seemingly unaware that his actions
lead to his damnation.

Bosch contributed much to the tradition of caricature
and the grotesque; moreover, his work influenced later members
of the diablerie school--most notably, another great Flemish
painter, Peter Bruegel the Elder. Wolfgang Kayser clarifies the relationship between these two masters of the grotesque. Speaking of Bruegel's art, he relates,

It is characteristic of his art that the nightmarish, infernal, and sinister elements he borrowed from Bosch are made to invade and subvert our familiar world. Bruegel's world, then, is less "fantastic" than Bosch's; furthermore, the Christian hell and concomitant apocalyptic vision so common to Bosch's work is subdued in Bruegel. It is replaced by an anti-rational, anti-cosmic vision predicated on a moral philosophy but not always directly responsible to Christian doctrine. Bruegel plays constantly with the absurd; however, his handling of it is definitely tinged with a comic perspective—the solemnity of Bosch has faded here. Our discussion of Bruegel's art will concentrate on his caricatures of peasants, *Dulle Griet*, *The Triumph of Death*, his satiric engravings, and *Flemish Proverbs*. These works span the period from 1550 to 1569.

Bruegel's affinity for caricature finds its main outlet in portraits of Flemish peasants. His caricatures here are obviously satiric as he doggedly exposes the ignorance and apathy of the lower classes. Two paintings, *The Peasants' Wedding* and *Peasants Dancing*, best represent his skills as a caricaturist. In the former, Bruegel captures his peasants mechanically celebrating a wedding. While the bride sits calmly but graciously in her place of honor, the guests busily gorge themselves or stare blankly straight ahead. Wine and food are in abundance, but Bruegel demonstrates that what
should be a meaningful occasion is blotted out by insensitivity. The empty expression of the red-shirted bagpiper typifies Bruegel's caricatures here; in contrast to the humble bride, the wedding guests are reduced to dull, innocuous individuals concerned only with filling their stomachs. The sanctity of the moment goes unappreciated.

Peasants Dancing reveals a similar perspective. Moreover, both works possess comic overtones; that is, Bruegel's indictment never reaches such a level of pessimism that one is forced to restrain the smile these paintings evoke. In Peasants Dancing, the peasants again are reduced to characteristically meaningless action. Here, the occasion is a saint's holiday; dancing and general merry-making accompany the events. However, instead of smiling and laughing faces, these peasants grimace. Their expressions signal a mysterious void. The work is alive with physical movement; yet, the participants lack spirit. At the far left, a young couple embraces; their kiss, ironically, brings them no joy. They cling to one another mechanically as the emptiness of this peasant world crystallizes before our eyes.

Occasionally, Bruegel subdues the comic perspective of his caricatures in order to focus on the demonic or macabre aspects of a character. At such times, the superficial purposes of caricature give away to the non-vital grotesque. For example, Dulle Griet ("Mad Meg") centers on a once comic figure whose diabolical nature has been restored by Bruegel. The scene, dominated by this armour-plated witch, has been
described earlier in this present study (see page 2). Bruegel's satiric purpose is unclear; there may even be allusions here to contemporary political disruption. But on the surface, at least, Bruegel is attacking the chaos and havoc that man (metamorphosed into a war-like witch) has wrought. The grotesque serves as his main satiric tool; the scene recalls Bosch's The Last Judgment, although Bruegel's vision retains more realism.

Bruegel's masterpiece of non-vital grotesque is The Triumph of Death. In this work, he employs the grotesque to attack man's presumptions about death--that is, his useless efforts to fight the inevitability of death. Once again, Bruegel alters the comic perspective of his caricatures to suit a more demonic countenance. More specifically, he borrows the figure of Death as a skeleton (popularized by Hans Holbein's Dance of Death), but rather than maintaining the comic irony of Holbein's figures, Bruegel molds his caricatures into grimly aggressive warriors bent on mass slaughter. The scene bulges with vignettes of these skeleton figures ruthlessly killing men of all social classes. Illustrative of man's futile rejection of his fate is the young courtier in the lower right foreground. His face contorted with terror, the young man braces himself to draw his sword and fight. But he is as helpless as the men being entrapped in a large seine by a pair of skeleton figures in the center foreground.

The choking density of The Triumph of Death plays a major role in the satiric strategy of Bruegel's prints as well.
His series of prints depicting the Seven Deadly Sins projects a chaotic vision of man's inclination to sin and degradation. The influence of Bosch here is readily discernible; yet, Bruegel's technique allows more of a comic perspective. In fact, several of his satiric prints, including The Witch of Malleghem dwell thematically on removing the stone of folly. Imbecilic peasants crowd around the witch in hopes she will extract the stones of folly protruding noticeably from their foreheads. Both her quackery and their stupidity are under attack here. But the grotesqueness of the scene does not merely repel, for these figures are comic as well. Indeed, Bruegel seems to be hinting at the comic overtones by placing two men near the scene who act as detached observers musing on the absurdity of all the ignorance and deception.

Among Bruegel's paintings, Flemish Proverbs is most clearly informed with a comic perspective. This tumultuous menagerie represents, in separate unrelated scenes, over one-hundred Flemish proverbs. The scene is disturbing, but, at the same time, it is filled with laughable characters acting absurdly--shaving a pig, viciously biting a post, etc. This comic naturalism is Bruegel's main contribution to the tradition of the grotesque.

It should be remembered that Bosch and Bruegel helped to shape both the Renaissance traditions of caricature as well as the grotesque. The Renaissance was a great age of caricature. Even two of the period's more idealistic artists, da Vinci and Raphael, produced caricatures; indeed, one critic
contends that da Vinci's caricatures influenced all subsequent caricature in Europe. Holbein's *Dance of Death*, Albrecht Durer's allegorical prints, and the caricatures of Jacques Callot highlight this tradition. Unfortunately, their work often overshadows the caricatures created directly in response to the Reformation. Participants in the Reformation controversy, including Martin Luther himself, found caricature to be an effective satiric weapon. In addition, they took advantage of the development of engraving and wood-cutting as popular media.

Not surprisingly, there are two types of Reformation caricature: Lutheran and anti-Lutheran. But while the caricatures of Bosch and Bruegel tend to be either *typified* or *grotesque*, Reformation caricatures naturally tend to be *personal* or *symbolic* because they serve a polemical purpose. Moreover, the tone of these caricatures usually betrays a surface perspective more serious and solemn than the caricatures of Bosch and Bruegel. However, a comic spirit, in harmony with the self-assertion of the individual encouraged by the Renaissance, is apparent in a few of these caricatures.

As one might expect, the favorite subjects of Lutheran caricature are monks and the Pope. Caricatures of monks often assume a grotesque nature; the most vivid example here is the celebrated *Monk-Calf*. This 1496 drawing (said to have been drawn by God) pictures a muscular yet repugnantely ugly calf clothed in a monk's garb. The brutish figure is standing on its back legs; a dull expression and protruding tongue
complete this grotesque emblem of the monachal character. The Pope falls victim to attacks even more malicious than those directed against monks. One woodcut of the period, entitled *Papa Doctor Theologiae et Magister Fidei*, caricatures the Pope as a donkey playing the bagpipes. The short verse accompanying this cut explains its meaning: "A long-eared ass can with the Bagpipes cope/ As well as with Theology the Pope."8

Luther himself inspired many (and even created some) of these Popish caricatures. His close friend, Lucas Cranach, functioned as an effective weapon in the Lutheran arsenal. Cranach's 1521 pamphlet of caricatures presents some scathing Popish satire including at least one print showing the Pope cast into hell. Possibly the most vicious of all Popish caricatures is attributed to Cranach. This particular woodcut appears on the title page of a pamphlet by Luther and depicts successive scenes of the Pope's birth and infancy. At the left side of the cut, an ape-like black female demon defecates the Pope and several monks. Then, Megaera, with serpents in her hair, suckles him, Alecto rocks his cradle, and Tisiphone leads him by the hand symbolically guiding his infancy. No other caricature of the Papacy, not even Tobias Stimmer's famous *Papal Gorgon*, matches Cranach's production in its combination of personal, symbolic, and grotesque caricature.

The anti-Lutheran forces fail, in general, to match the technical skill and variety of the Lutheran caricaturists. Their work achieves its greatest intensity where it focuses
directly on Luther. For example, the woodcut entitled
Martinus Luther Siebenkopff reveals the satiric zeal of an
anonymous caricaturist. The cut portrays an inordinately
large figure of Luther in monk's apparel. But instead of one
head, the figure has seven. Each, in turn, is labelled in
an ironic progression from Luther's titles to his symbolic
roles: Doctor-Martin-Luther-Ecclesiast-Visionary-Visitationer-
Barabba.

Luther's marriage to Katherine von Bora, a nun, in
1525 provided a golden opportunity for caricature and satire.
One caricature in this context pictures an extremely fat
Luther lugging his huge stomach in a wheelbarrow along with
some books and some tiny bearded faces--possibly a few of his
supporters. His left hand carries the papal tiara, but it
is upside down as if it were a large drinking cup. A wooden
box containing more small faces (enemies?) is slung over his
shoulder. Katherine walks along behind with a baby in her arms.
She leads a mysterious, man-faced dog on a leash in front of
her. The symbolic content of this print is difficult to
decipher; however, the effort to ridicule the couple is clear
enough.

Undoubtedly, the most effective anti-Lutheran carica-
ture is the Devil's Bagpipes (1521). This grotesque caricature
apparently alludes to Luther's examination before the Diet of
Worms. Here, Luther's body has been literally transformed
into a bagpipe. An ugly devil figure perches on his shoulder
and blows into a mouthpiece extending from Luther's ear.
His nose forms the pipe's chanter upon which the devil fingers the stops. The face of a demon is imbedded in Luther's chest. The message of the caricature is fairly evident--Luther receives his inspiration from hell; indeed, he is the "mouthpiece" of the devil.

Our attention now must shift from a description of caricature and the grotesque in the visual arts to that same tradition in literature. While caricature and the grotesque are manifested in a few poetic works of the period, notably Sebastian Brandt's Ship of Fools and several longer poems by John Skeleton, the focus here will be on prose satire. Early in the sixteenth century, five monumental works of prose satire were published: Erasmus' The Praise of Folly (1509), Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum (1515), Sir Thomas More's Utopia (1516), and Rabelais' Pantagruel (1532) and Gargantua (1534). Space does not permit an adequate discussion of these works, but for a clearer understanding of Tudor prose satire a brief description of caricature and the grotesque in these works is absolutely necessary. Since Rabelais' works represent the supreme achievement of Renaissance grotesque, relatively more discussion will be allotted to them.

These first three prose landmarks, each written originally in Latin, preceded many of the Reformation caricatures discussed above and may have enhanced their vitality. A spirit of humanism pervades these prose works; subtle irony (influenced by Lucian) and a "discreet humor" set them apart from the popular comic tradition of fabliau and jestbooks. Yet,
the liveliness of each owes much to caricature and the grotesque. The Praise of Folly, for example, generates its satiric force through symbolic caricature and, in turn, non-vital grotesque. The allegorical figure of Folly serves as satiric persona; her avowed purpose is to praise herself—a characteristically foolish act. But what Erasmus is actually doing here reaches beyond the classical mock encomium, for his design requires his caricatured persona to be a norm figure. That is, Folly becomes the standard against which both the immediate audience around her podium as well as mankind in general are measured. After Folly has delivered the four parts of her oration, one can only conclude that while Folly is a ridiculous, clownish figure, man, in comparison, is absurdly ridiculous.

The notion that man is governed by folly lies at the heart of the Erasmian grotesque. Man reduces his stature by succumbing to the pleasures and powers of folly. Folly stresses this fact in the second part of her oration, and emphasizes as well that her powers are vital to the conception of all life. In a jesting spirit she explains:

I ask whether the head, the face, the breast, the hand, or the ear—each an honorable part—creates gods and men? I think not, but instead the job is done by that follish, even ridiculous part which cannot be named without laughter. In short, Folly argues (with numerous tongue-in-cheek examples) that she is the source of all of man's pleasures, and that man's happiness depends on the thorough delusion she brings.
The third part of Folly's oration concentrates on her followers with the implied thesis that, in general, everyone is her disciple. In a series of typified caricatures, Folly demonstrates the foolishness of grammarians, scholars, theologians and philosophers. On philosophers, for example, she observes:

They know nothing at all, yet profess to know everything.
They are ignorant even of themselves, and are often too absent-minded or near-sighted to see the ditch or stone in front of them.

(p. 404)
The statement quickly calls to mind Bruegel's painting The Parable of the Blind in which the gray-clad blind men pathetically follow their leader into a ditch. This example is only one of several reflecting the affinity between these two great artists.\textsuperscript{11} A short fourth section follows these caricatures; here, Folly expands upon the concept of the Christian fool and St. Paul's famous words, "We are fools for Christ's sake." With a bit of wrenching, Folly is even able to prove she is sanctioned by the Bible. But here and elsewhere in the work Erasmus never allows the perspective to become too serious or solemn; that is, a comic spirit is always present to temper this indictment of mankind. In addition, Holbein's illustrations in later editions of the work lend emphasis to the comic perspective.

Shortly after the publication of The Praise of Folly two other works designed to expose the folly of mankind appeared:
Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum (Letters of Obscure Men) and Sir Thomas More's *Utopia*. The former of these is a two-part series of forty-one letters written to satirize and discredit the Cologne theologians who were engaged in a controversy with Johannes Reuchlin over the suppression of Hebrew books. Reuchlin argued largely against the suppression. When the conflict had gained the attention of most of Europe, an edition of fictitious letters addressed to Ortwin Gratius, a Cologne scholar, was published. The probable authors were Crotus Rubeanus and Ulrich von Hutten, both of whom had studied at Cologne and apparently became dissatisfied with scholastic thinking.

Francis Stokes adequately describes the satiric focus of these letters:

The satire had declared that the upholders of the musty methods of scholasticism—with which, be it always remem-
ered, the Church in Germany had disastrously identified herself—were not the repositories of all learning that they perhaps honestly thought themselves to be—but a pack of egregious dolts: . . . .

Caricature and the grotesque are among the satiric tools employed in the letters. Most of the caricature is personal as the letters reveal the puppet-like character of Gratius and other "yes" men among the Cologne officials. Reduced to the characteristic actions and speech of scholastics, such men possess no identity of their own. Rubeanus and von Hutten encourage us to smile at the intellectual laxity of these clownish schoolmen; yet, the message their attack transcribes never loses its serious tone.
The grotesque element in these letters comprises many scenes in which this comic spirit combines with the revulsion we feel toward ignorance and pedantry. An excellent example of such scenes occurs in the first letter. Here, one of the fictitious, "obscure" men, Thomas Langscheider, reconstructs a scene for Gratus in which certain Cologne theologians debate the absurdly trivial subject of the proper title for a doctoral candidate in divinity. The participants haggle foolishly until one Andreas Delitzch draws the final comically pedantic conclusion:

"... we should say 'magisternostrandus'; for, as there is a difference between 'magisternoster' and 'noster magister,' so there is a like difference between 'magisternostrandus' and 'nostermagistrandus.' Because 'magisternoster' signifieth a Doctor of Divinity, and is one word, but 'noster magister' consisteth of two words, and is used for a Master in any Liberal Science, whether it concern handicraft or braincraft. And it booteth not that 'nostrotras-trare' is not in use, for we may devise new words--and on this point he quoted Horace.

(p. 293)

The learned men stand in awe of Delitzch's explanation; finally, they recover themselves and swill Naumburg beer until vespers. Such scenes prompted More to write as follows to Erasmus in 1516:

"It does one's heart good to see how delighted everybody is with the *Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum*. The learned
deem their teachings of serious worth. Erasmus appreciated the comic grotesqueness of the work; in fact, it is said that upon first reading the letters he laughed so hard he burst an abscess on his face.

More's Utopia lacks the comic zest of the Epistolae, but it contains touches of caricature and the grotesque worthy of mention. Raphael Hythloday, the satiric persona, embodies More's most skillful caricature. Hythloday is ironically reduced to the figure of the ideal humanist; "reduced" is the correct word because Hythloday limits himself exclusively to positions and attitudes held by humanist thinkers. More seems to be signaling that Hythloday is a caricatured figure not to be taken too seriously because his name means "Mr. Healer-from-God, Talker-of-Nonsense." He is an effective satiric raider in Book I, but the undercutting of caricature evidences itself in Book II when we realize that Hythloday (Nonsense) is lecturing about Utopia (Nowhere).

On the other hand, the grotesque elements are not quite as subtle. In Book I, for example, Hythloday paints a disturbing portrait of contemporary English society with its unjust civil and canon laws, corrupt government, and a people given over to follies of every conceivable nature. The vortex of this grotesque society is the court, where opportunists, flatterers, and other such "caterpillars of the commonwealth" gather. Book II continues in this display of aberrations but with more subtlety and irony. Here, the ideal commonwealth of Utopia--a collage of political and
sociological constructs ranging from communism to euthanasia--is described. However, this Utopian society of virtuous men is not possible in the real world of men. That, in part, accounts for More's conclusion: "many things be in the Utopian weal public, which in our cities I may rather wish for than hope after."^16

The fruition of caricature and the grotesque comes a generation after the three works discussed above. In the principal works of Francois Rabelais, _Pantagruel_ (1532) and _Gargantua_ (1534), the visual and verbal gusto of this tradition powerfully manifests itself. By 1564 the two works had been combined into five books entitled _The Histories of Gargantua_ and _Pantagruel_. The writer of these works seems to have been as raucous and outspoken as the works themselves. Rabelais, a Franciscan friar and humanist, has been summed up as follows:

Francois Rabelais was a whole figure, chock-full of human contradictions, which he attempted neither to reconcile nor to apologize for.^17

Much more, of course, can be said about this fascinating literary figure. Moreover, the sources of his work, his use of language and his influence on later satirists are all worthy of intensive study. But our concern is with a brief sketch of his technical skill with caricature and the grotesque as satiric tools. Our sketch should elucidate Rabelais' mastery of symbolic and grotesque caricature as well as his unmatched creative genius with the _vital_ grotesque.

Any discussion of caricature in Rabelais must begin with the two heroes, Gargantua and Pantagruel. Both are
caricatured as inflated humanists. Their exaggerated size represents giganticism at its best. Size becomes a symbol paradoxically of both their strength and stature as well as their presumption. Rabelais, however, is not satisfied with a merely symbolic caricature as the following description of young Gargantua's clothing indicates:

His shirt required thirteen hundred and fifty yards of Chatelleraut linen, and three hundred for the gussets, which were square and put in under the armpits, not gathered. . . . His doublet took twelve hundred and nineteen yards of white satin, and his points fifteen hundred and nine dog-skins and a half. . . . His codpiece took twenty-four and a quarter yards of the same stuff [blue damask]; and its shape was that of a bowed arch, well and gallantly fastened by two fine gold buckles with two enamelled clasps, in each of which was set a huge emerald, the size of an orange.

(pp. 54-55)

Here, caricature has graduated into the realm of the grotesque. Moreover, Pantagruel apparently inherits his father's size, for at birth he is said to have devoured the milk of four thousand, six hundred cows!

At times, Rabelais' caricature assumes a more conventional, typified form as in his portraits of the foppish, stupid courtiers, Lord Kissmyarse and Lord Suckfizzle, but his more skillful caricatures take on a symbolic import. In this category is the theologian Janotus. The sophistic churchman
is chosen by the Parisians to recover the bells of Notre Dame, which Gargantua had stolen to put on the collar of his mare. Rabelais clues us to the character of Janotus with this cursory description:

With his hair cropped like a Caesar, and his doctor's hood swathed round him like a toga, having first protected his stomach with bakehouse victuals, and holy water from the cellar, Master Janotus proceeded to Gargantua's lodging, driving three red-nosed calves or beadles before him, and dragging five or six artless Masters of Art behind him, thoroughly bedraggled with mud.

(p. 76)

Yet, the crux of this caricature lies not in the physical description but rather in the absurd language of the foolish theologian. He tosses high-flown rhetoric and atrocious mock-Latin at Gargantua and couches his arguments for the return of the bells in the most idiotic logic possible. Clearly, Janotus is more than just the typical Parisian theologian; he symbolizes the massive ignorance of the sophistic tradition in Renaissance Europe. Our reaction to him matches that of Gargantua and his friends—a long and hardy laugh.

Rabelais' talent as a caricaturist is readily discernible throughout his work; however, his most effective satiric tool is the grotesque. His particular sensitivities lead him to employ the comic, or what we have termed the vital grotesque. Examples of Rabelais' comic grotesque occur on
nearly every page. A few selected illustrations should clarify his place in the tradition of the grotesque, and Gargantua's childhood pastimes provide a good starting point. Marcel Tetel offers an excellent frame of reference for appreciating the feverish representations of Gargantua's early activities:

To get a vivid picture of Gargantua's pastimes, one should consult Peter Bruegel's (the Elder) paintings, 'Children's Games' and 'The Netherland's Proverbs.' Bruegel's art expresses much of the tone and flavor found in Gargantua.18

The following description of the young Gargantua exemplifies this comic chaos:

He sharpened his teeth on a shoe, washed his hands in soup, combed his hair with a wine-bowl, sat between two stools with his arse on the ground, covered himself with a wet sack, drank while eating his soup, ate his biscuit without bread, bit as he laughed and laughed as he bit, often spat in the dish, blew a fart, pissed against the sun, ducked under water to avoid the rain, struck the iron while it was cold, had empty thoughts, put on airs, threw up his food or, as they said, flayed the fox, mumbled his prayers like a monkey, returned to his muttons, and turned the sows out to hay.

(p. 62)

This potpourri of aphorisms and proverbial expressions ties Rabelais to tradition of Renaissance artists (beginning with Erasmus and his Adages) with an affinity for proverb lore. The juxtaposition of many proverbs or aphorisms serves as an interesting technique for presenting the grotesque.
As with Swift's works later, Rabelais' comic grotesque vision retains a strong coloring of obscenity. Two examples here should suffice to illustrate the vital grotesque taken to its limits. Our first example involves Gargantua's visit to Paris and his displeasure with the Parisians. He considers them to be a motley rabble of simpletons, and becomes so annoyed at their curious stares that he retreats to the towers of Notre Dame. But the crowd of "gapers," as he calls them, continues growing, and their pestering drives him to the following reaction:

Then, with a smile, he undid his magnificent codpiece and, bringing out his john-thomas, pissed on them so fiercely that he drowned two hundred and sixty thousand, four hundred and eighteen persons, not counting the women and small children.

(p. 74)

The scene is disturbing; yet, the follow-up descriptions of the struggling "feckless idiots," their coughing, spitting, and swearing restores the comic spirit in which the entire scene is written.

The crowning touch of Rabelais' play with obscenity concerns a scene from the amorous adventures of Pantagruel's foppish companion, Panurge. As preface to the scene, Panurge desires revenge for the cold shoulder he has received from a Parisian lady. On the day before the great Corpus Christi feast, he catches a bitch sheepdog in heat, kills it, cuts out its pudendum and grinds it into small pieces. The next
day he meets the lady at church, and as she reads a love lyric from him, he sprinkles the pieces into the folds of her dress. He continues his wooing, but quickly the grotesque materializes:

Panurge had no sooner spoken than all the dogs in the church run up to the lady, attracted by the smell of the drug he had sprinkled on her. Small and great, big and little, all came, lifting their legs, smelling her and pissing all over her. It was the most dreadful thing in the world.

Panurge made a show of driving them off, then took leave of her and retired into a chapel to see the fun. For these beastly dogs pissed over all her clothes, a great greyhound wetting her on the head, others on her sleeves, others on her backside; and the little ones pissed on her shoes; so that all the women who were thereabouts had great difficulty in saving her.

(pp. 243-244)
The grotesque as a satiric tool here is wielded with consummate skill. Never has a prudish and scornful woman been attacked so effectively.

Rabelais' artistry not only represents a high plateau in the tradition of the grotesque, it also noticeably influences Tudor prose satire. While few Rabelaisian scenes occur in the early development of the mode, later prose satirists such as Greene and Lodge recapture some of the robust Rabelaisian spirit. But the figure most influenced by the Rabelaisian grotesque is Nashe, for he retrieves Rabelais' secret weapon--
a super-sensitivity to the possibilities of language. However, despite the apparent sophistication of Rabelais' technique, the thread of two very popular unsophisticated comic traditions weave their way through his work. These are the traditions of fabliaux and jestbooks.

Neither of these medieval traditions fits comfortably within the larger tradition of caricature and the grotesque, but the essentially comic perspective of each reflects a solid affinity with the humor and spirit of Tudor prose satire. Consequently, a brief discussion of the characteristic technique of works within these traditions should function as a valuable epilogue to our sketch of caricature and the grotesque in sixteenth-century art and literature. One device common to the comic vision of both fabliaux and jestbooks is the elaborate "trick" or "jest". In the fabliau, this device usually operates within a sexual context; in jestbooks, a sexual context is much less common.

Comic tricks or jests form the matrix of action in many late medieval and early Renaissance works. For example, Reynard the Fox is virtually a series of comic pranks instigated by the wily Reynard. One scene in Reynard best typifies the comic action basic to both sixteenth-century comedy and satire. In this scene, Reynard traps his old adversary, Tibert the cat, in a hole near the priest's chicken pen. Tibert's clamor awakens the priest and his friend who think Reynard has been captured. They naturally run to the trap to give Reynard, who has been stealing their chickens, a beating:
They lept and ran, all that there was. The priest himself ran all mothernaked. Martinet was the first that came to Tibert. The priest took to Locken, his wife, an offering candle and bade her light it at the fire and he smote Tibert with a great staff. There received Tibert many a great stroke over all his body. Martinet was so angry that he smote the cat an eye out. The naked priest lifted up and should have given a great stroke to Tibert, but Tibert, that saw that he must die, sprang between the priest's legs with his claws and with his teeth that he wrought out his right cullion or ballock stone. That leap became ill to the priest. 

Here, the comic jest is clearly crossing into the boundaries of the vital grotesque. This scenic technique gradually acquires a satiric purpose in Tudor prose satire, especially in the works of Robert Greene.

Hopefully, this descriptive sketch of the tradition of caricature and the grotesque has provided a matrix for a detailed discussion of Tudor prose satire. It must be stressed again that the works described in this chapter did not necessarily directly influence Tudor prose satire, but there is definitely an affinity with their handling of caricature and the grotesque. This visual affinity has been noted by a few critics; for example, C. S. Lewis maintains "There is that in Nashe which connects him with Bosch and the later Picasso." As this present study will in part demonstrate, other Tudor prose satirists besides Nashe belong in the mainstream Lewis alludes
to. Indeed, Tudor prose satire, as a mode, receives much of its exuberance and picturesqueness from the tradition of caricature and the grotesque. But the mode developed its visual dynamics gradually. The early stages of that development will now be the focus of our discussion.
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CHAPTER III

RUDE BEGINNINGS: EARLY TUDOR PROSE SATIRE
The period 1550 to 1580 witnessed a stage in the development of Tudor poetry which was to culminate in a veritable "golden age" of verse in the 1590's. During these years, Wyatt and Surrey's experiments with the Petrarchan sonnet, introduced to the English reading public through Tottel's Miscellany (1557), paved the way for a re-awakening of poetical spirit. Concurrently, the artistic shape of didactic verse was enhanced by Thomas Sackville's "The Induction," which towered above its companion pieces in the 1563 edition of A Mirror for Magistrates. In addition, George Gascoigne was polishing his aphoristic lyrics, and poetical miscellanies were affording budding poets an opportunity to display their wares. Finally, Edmund Spenser's The Shepherd's Calendar (1579) signaled that Tudor poetry was entering an era of aesthetic consciousness predicated on an interest in language rather than morals--the verse of Tusser, Googe, and Turberville was soon to be replaced with that of Sidney, Marlowe, and Shakespeare.

In many ways, the development of Tudor prose satire paralleled the rise of the poetry, but overall its growth was slower, and the landmark works were less evident. More specifically, Tudor prose satire evidenced three different developmental trends during this period. Each trend, in turn, was revived later as the mode attained an artistic integrity
of its own. The first of these trends is characterized by
a carryover of the visual and verbal dynamics found in The
Praise of Folly, Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum, and the works
of Rabelais. Representative of this phase are William Baldwin's
Beware the Cat (1553) and William Bullein's A Dialogue Against
the Fever Pestilence (1564). These works look forward to the
lively, visual technique of Nashe and Dekker.

The second trend is the satire of roguery, which
begins with Gilbert Walker's A Manifest Detection of Dice-play
(1552) and continues with Thomas Harman's A Caveat for Common
Cursitors (1566). This branch of prose satire later finds
its chief exponent in the pen of Robert Greene. The third
trend here is the polemical; Gascoigne's A Delicate Diet for
Daintiemouthde Droonkardes (1576) illustrates this early phase
effectively. In the 1580's, this trend reaches its artistic
peak in the Marprelate Tracts.

Our interest in these five representative works is
centered on their employment of caricature and the grotesque.
In them, we may see crude attempts to utilize these satiric
tools; however, at times, a glimmer of sophistication does
shine through. Clearly, each reflects an affinity with the
larger visual tradition sketched in Chapter II. In general,
these five works reveal more interest in morals than in language.
Their satiric perspective is mostly serious or solemn despite
occasional comic intrusions. Finally, the prose in these
works is noticeably unsophisticated even though the extravaga-
gances of Euphuistic prose have yet to effect the mode.
The prose is most trenchant where the writer strives for a natural dialogue, and least vigorous and readable where the writer descends into a homiletic tone. These five works rarely receive attention but they are not only important as examples of pre-Euphuistic prose, they are also essential to an understanding of the development of Tudor prose satire.

Our discussion of early Tudor prose satire begins with William Baldwin's *Beware the Cat*. This much-neglected work is probably the most sophisticated prose satire in English before the Marprelate Tracts. Indeed, William P. Holden contends:

*Beware the Cat* illustrates prose satire at a level of development commonly regarded as having been reached only in the age of Elizabeth with the Marprelate Tracts (1588-9) and the pamphleteering of writers like Lyly, Greene, and Nashe.¹

The work itself is organized in such a way that the object of ridicule serves as the "reporter" of the narrative. The context of the satire involves a dispute between Baldwin and Streamer, a Divine, over whether or not birds and animals can speak and reason. The work, then, is Baldwin's fictional re-creation of the debate; however, he wisely presents only Streamer's ridiculous attempt to argue the affirmative position--Baldwin realizes that a rebuttal is unnecessary after Streamer has delivered his ludicrous oration.

Streamer's argument is structured as a three-part classical oration. Actually, Baldwin parodies the oration format in order to demonstrate more clearly the speciousness of Streamer's reasoning. In the first part of the oration,
Baldwin establishes a complex frame-story as Streamer reports how he came to believe that animals could speak and reason. The second part contains an account of Streamer's "preparation" for hearing animals—especially the cats which gather in the alley behind his room. The third part then is Streamer's version of what these cats had been talking about. Within the structure of the oration, Baldwin relies on caricature and the grotesque to "expose" and satirize his victim. Baldwin mainly attacks the superstition, ignorance, and pedantry of Streamer, who bases his beliefs more on astrology than scripture. Some pungent satire is aimed at Catholicism as well—particularly the "false trappings" of the mass and the cultish power of the Pope.

Baldwin uses caricature as a "diminishing" tool. That is, he reduces Streamer to one character trait—his ignorance. As a result, there is no unity of appearance to his character; this distortion renders him an absurd figure. Baldwin shows deft sensitivity in wielding caricature as a satiric weapon. He wastes no time in sketching the one feature of Streamer which so dominates his character. In the opening paragraph we witness Streamer's pedantry as he launches a meaningless discussion of the origin of various gates in London:

So while the common there was vacant: grew abundantly in the same place where the gate was after builded, and called therof Eldern gate, as Mooregate took the name of the feeld without it, which hath been a very moore. Or els because it is the most auncient gate of the Citie,
was therof in respect of the other, as Newgate called
the eldergate. Or els as Ludgate taketh the name of
Lud who builded it, . . . .

(p. 29)

This digression continues through three more useless etymologies.

Beneath Streamer's scholarly pretense is a basically
ignorant man--Baldwin does not allow us to lose sight of that
fact. For example, he permits us to overhear Streamer's
recounting of how he was persuaded that animals could talk
and reason. Streamer has listened to the dubious folklore
of Grimalkin (the Prince of cats) which is told to him by
his Irish friends. This folklore, together with his knowledge
of suspect medieval natural history, convinces him and whets
his appetite to hear animals talk. Consequently, in part
two of Streamer's oration, we see him dabbling in absurd
concoctions which he believes will open the mysteries of
animal communication to him. The caricature is then sharpened
in part three as Streamer comically deceives himself into
believing that he has actually heard the alley cats talk.

In Streamer, Baldwin may be creating a personal car-
icature of a contemporary figure; however, more likely, the
caricature here is symbolic. Baldwin transforms a typified
caricature of a pedantic, scholastic thinker into a symbolic
representation of all ignorance whether it be in politics,
education, religion or any other field of human endeavor.
Yet, at times, Baldwin's caricature is carried into the realm
of the grotesque. For example, the following picture of
Streamer in part two might easily be categorized as a **grotesque** caricature:

I cast away the carcas of the Fox, & of the kite, with all the garbage bothe of them & the rest, saving the tungs and the eares, . . . then stamped I them in a morter, & when they all were like a dry gelly: I put to them Rue, Fenel, Lowach and leeke blades, of each a handful, and punned them a fresh then devided I all the matter in two egall parts, and made two little pillowes, . . . I fryed these pillowes in good oyle olife, and layed them hot to mine eares, . . . I took the cat, the Foxes, and the Kites tung, and sod them in Wine welneere to gelly, then took I them of new cats dung an ounce, of Musterd seed, Garlike and Pepper asmuch, and when they were with beating incorpored: I made losenges and trociskes therof. . . . I drank a great draught of my stilled water & anointed all my head over with wine and oyle . . . I took an ounce of Alkakengy in powder which I had for a like purpose not two daies afore bouht at the Potecaries, and therwith rubbed and chafed my back from the neck down to the mide, and heating in a frying pan my pillowes afresh & laid them to mine eares, and tied a kerchef about my head and with my losenges and trociskes in a boxe, I went out among the servants, . . . .

(pp. 44-45)

Despite the roughness of the prose, this passage is a Rabelaisian **tour de force**. It is a marvelous, comically grotesque caricature
of an ignorant man "obsessed" with the unrealistic potential of a ridiculous concoction. This scene functions adequately as a final commentary on Baldwin's caricaturist technique, for here we see the ultimate physical manifestation of his stupidity—a mirror of his madness.

Baldwin's handling of the grotesque also evidences flashes of sophistication. The non-vital grotesque pervades the work, but Baldwin's chief talent here lies in his creations of the vital grotesque. Streamer's world, like the world of Folly in Erasmus' Praise of Folly, is surrounded by an estranged atmosphere into which the comic intrudes to compound the absurdity of all that takes place. Clearly, there are scenes here which strike us immediately as humorous, but which on reflection have disturbing qualities about them. Baldwin definitely succeeds in producing an ambivalent effect throughout.

Baldwin, like Swift in several of his works, toys with a grotesque logic in this work. He allows us to view Streamer's absurd thinking process in its entirety. With some degree of skill, Baldwin ushers us into a non-rational world where life is truly a tale told by an idiot signifying nothing. But the artistic merit of Beware the Cat resides more in the lively, visual, comic scenes which remind one of jestbook or fabliau material. One such scene occurs in part two where Streamer is gathering ingredients for the concoction which will permit him to hear animals converse. Here we see Streamer stalking about the woods with skins of a fox, a hare, and a hedgehog hanging from his belt—a comical scene in itself—when suddenly a
hungry kite swoops down after the appetizing array of skins. As Streamer runs from it, the aggressive bird strikes home with its claws. Streamer finally kills his attacker, but not before Baldwin has taken full advantage of the scene's comic possibilities.

In a few of these comic scenes, the influence of *Reynard the Fox* is readily discernible. At its best, Baldwin's technique with the vital grotesque recalls the comic vision of Rabelais. A scene with genuine Rabelaisian flavor appears in part three as Streamer naively reports a tale told by one of the cats which satirizes divines or priests. Streamer is too ignorant to realize that Mousleyer, the cat, is attacking churchmen like himself. Mousleyer tells of one night when he was making such a clamor that the entire household, including an old priest, came rushing outside to see what was going on. The comedy of errors began when Mousleyer came running at them in the darkness:

But when the Preest heard mee come, and by a glimsing had seen mee: downe he fel upon them that were behinde him who with his chalice hurt one, with his water pot an other and his holy candle fel into an other Preests breech beneath, ... When I saw all this busines: down I ran among them where they lay on heaps but such a fear as they were all in then: I think was never seen afore. For the olde preest which was so tumbled among them that his face lay upon a boyes bare arse, which belike was fallen hedlong under him was so astonished: then when
the boy (which for feare beshit him self) had al to rayed his face, he neither felt nor smelt it nor remooed from him.

(p. 58)

On the surface, such a scene is merely slapstick; however, the cumulative satiric effect of these scenes builds toward a repulsive image not thoroughly mitigated by the comic elements.

Baldwin's perspective then is not, by any means, entirely comic even though he seems to be chuckling at the absurdity of men like Streamer. Baldwin's "Exhortation" at the end of the work keys us to a more accurate view of his perspective. Here, in a serious tone, he warns his reader:

And ever when thou goest about any thing: call to mind this proverb Beware the Cat, not to tye up thy Cat til thou have doon: but to see that nether thine owne nor the devils cat (which cannot be tied up) finde any thing therin wherof to accuse thee to thy shame.

(p. 62)

Yet, this serious perspective does not detract from the overall sophistication of Beware the Cat. Baldwin's skills with caricature and the grotesque put him ahead of his time in the mode of prose satire. In addition, he demonstrates considerable artistry at parody and levels of narration. Moreover, in Beware the Cat, Baldwin harnesses some of the visual dynamism of Erasmus, More and Rabelais as well as the spirit of Reformation caricature.

Like Baldwin's Beware the Cat, William Bullein's A Dialogue
Against the Fever Pestilence exhibits a sophistication beyond that of contemporary prose tracts. Bullein's work is more than just a dialogue. It is more than a compendium of tales to purge melancholy during a plague; it is even more than a conventional consolation against death. Rather it is a prose satire with something extra, for here Bullein is consciously shaping a psychological drama with serious moral implications. Or, as Harold Routh describes the work:

Its satire reaches nearly every abuse of the age, and there are passages of unmistakable eloquence and power. The influence of the morality plays is obvious, but the true historical significance of the tract consists in the fact that the thought has outgrown the literary form. 3

Bullein prefaces his satirical drama with this simple motto or sententiae in his note "To the Reader":

Good reader, when adversitie draweth neare to any Citie or Towne, and the vengeaunce of God appereth either by Hunger, Sickness, or the Svorde, the mannes nature is most fearefull, but yet worldlie prouidence to helpe theim-selves: which in the tyme of prosperitie or quietnesse is carelesse and forgetfull, neither myndefull to feare God, nor pitifull to helpe their neighbor in aduersitie. 4

In effect, then, the work becomes one extended emblem replete with motto, pictorial representation, and application of motto. The pictorial representation in this case is a dramatic series of dialogues held among twelve interlocutors. To enhance their grotesque effect, these dialogues are juxtaposed disjointedly. For example, first, the main characters, Civis and his wife, converse with Mendicus, then suddenly we are listening to the
wealthy Antonius speaking with Medicus, followed by the intrusions of Avarus and Ambodexter. We then shift back to Civis and his wife, who now are talking with Roger as they journey away from the city. This maze of dialogues moves to the climactic dialogue between Death and Civis.

The overall function of the dialogues is to support Bullein's contention that men only appreciate the power of God when He unleashes something devastating upon them such as the plague. Men will not accept death as divinely sanctioned, and they fail at times to realize that their sinfulness is what has moved God to plague them. Furthermore, most of the characters in the work itself recognize sin in others but not in themselves.

Yet, one aspect of Bullein's organizational principle might easily be overlooked. At the core of his psychological probe into the larger meanings of fear lies a desire to produce a tract against fearing the fever pestilence; cognizant of his readers' tastes, Bullein knows he must "sugar coat" his satiric pill and hope that he can lead his readers to see that death can kill the flesh, but it cannot kill the soul. Using what might be termed an interior decorating metaphor, Bullein explains this basic organizational principle in his dedicatory statement:

Right worshipfull Sir, if my Chamber, Hall, Gallerie, or any newe decked house were appareled or hanged al in one mournyng darcke colour, it would rather moue sorowe then gladnes: but no pleasure to the beholders of the
same. Therefore the diversitie or varietie of pleasaunte colours dooe grace and beautifie the same through the settyng forth of sondrie shapes: and as it were to compell the commers in to beholde the whole worke.

(p. 1)

Bullein's sensitivity to more subtle and complicated organizational principles is matched only by Baldwin in these early works. In essence, Bullein knows that more people will read a lively dialogue than a straightforward polemical tract; he is also aware that he can enhance his exposure of the "faithless" by employing caricature and the grotesque.

Although each of the major interlocutors has moments when his portrait seems life-size, a closer look reveals that Bullein depends upon caricature rather extensively for satiric purposes. Insight into the particular technique of Bullein's caricatures can be gained through Henry Schmidt's discussion of caricature as a satiric tool:

A caricature can reflect various levels of meaning simultaneously, exposing on the surface social evils of one kind or another, but indicating at the same time that the roots of disorder lie deep within human nature itself.ä That is, Bullein caricatures various individuals here, but their particular defects are merely token representations of the larger patterns of mankind's sinful nature.

A few examples should suffice for a general understanding of Bullein's caricaturist technique. Perhaps his most successful caricature is Medicus, the greedy, non-compassionate doctor, who attends the wealthy, plague-stricken Antonius. Although he displays an impressive knowledge of grotesque concoctions
for combating the plague, Medicus is reduced to an avaricious seeker of riches who claims that descriptions of exotic lands (with their wealth of precious stones) actually have a medicinal effect on him. But what is especially discomforting about him is that his greed supercedes compassion for his patients: "He loved me as I loved hym, He me for healthe, and I hym for money; . . . ." (p. 55) is his eulogy for Antonius.

It would even be accurate to say that Medicus is actually one of twelve caricatures here, for there are no fully developed characters in the work—this naturally enhances the impact of Bullein's exposures. Even Mors (Death) is caricatured. Bullein diminishes the stature of Mors by showing that while he can kill the flesh of man, he is powerless to harm the soul of man. Mors is simply a divine messenger who need not be feared.

The examples of Medicus and Mors do not represent the full range of Bullein's caricaturist technique because he also uses beast fables and emblems—both of which transcend typified caricature into the realm of symbolic caricature. The beasts in these fable-like anecdotes, especially the Fox, mirror human depravity in their treachery and sinfulness. Similarly, the emblematic paintings on the walls of an inn where Civis and his pregnant wife take a brief respite are symbolic caricatures. Here, man, in one pictorial scene, is reduced to a number of symbols which explain the essence of his character. A good example is the emblem of the three rustics described by the wife:
the firste of them with a Rake in his hande with teeth of golde, doe stoupe verie lowe, groping belike in the Lake after some thyng that he would finde; and out of this deepe water, aboue the Rake, a little steple. The seconde gapeth vp towards the Heauen, holdyng the lappe of his Goune abrode, as though he would catche something; and towards the same lappe or spred gounedoth fall as it were a churche with a stiple, and quere, &c. The third man standeth in poore apparell, with a booke in his righte hande, and his lefte hande vpon his breast, with a lamentable countenaunce, in simple apparell.

(p. 82)

The husband expounds on the demise of each--the verdict is the same: each man has followed his own evil inclination; each has been oblivious to God's grace. One can hardly read the description of this emblem without thinking of Bruegel's peasant caricatures--and the satiric attack in Bruegel and Bullein is remarkable similar.

The grotesque, as well as caricature, pervades the Dialogue, touching nearly every scene in the work. Quite naturally, Bullein shapes a grotesque vision of the fever pestilence; he plays particularly upon the absurd concoctions men like Medicus produce to ward off this horrible ailment. Yet, equally grotesque are the descriptions of the plague:

A feuer going before, noisome and lothesomenesse of stomache, wanbelyng of the harte, pulse not equall, vrine stinking, desirous of slepe, perilous dreames with
startyng through the sharpness of hotte and burnyng
humours; . . . .

(p. 45)
Thus, it is not difficult to discern why Civis thinks of the
pestilence as a horrible beast:
. . . a monsterous hungrie beast, deuouryng and
eatyng not a fewe, but sometymes whole cities that
by resperation or drawyng in their breath do take the
poisoned aire.

(p. 57)
But Bullein's central point forces its way through, and the
notion that the pestilence is the focus of the grotesque proves
false. He demonstrates convincingly that man is the ultimate
grotesque. Mankind is filled with greedy doctors like Medicus,
scheming men like Avarus and Ambodexter, and ignorant men
like Roger (who is similar to Baldwin's Streamer in that both
believe beasts can speak and reason).

Through the actions and attitudes of his characters,
Bullein manages to illustrate that the world is in a grotesque
state of disorder. Roger, Civis and his wife seem to have a
natural curiosity about the grotesque, especially the freakish
quirks of nature. During their journey away from the plague-
infested city, they tell tales of women who have delivered
cats and dogs, chickens with three legs, and of a woman who
while pregnant looked upon a picture of a Moor and then
delivered a black child. Later we hear Mendax telling of
Terra Florida, a virtual land of the grotesque with:
Nightingales as bigge as Gese, Oules greater than some horse; . . . and women doe laie eggs, and hatche them from whom doe children come.

(p. 99)

Actually, here Bullein is subtly comparing this strange land to Tudor England; both lands are similarly grotesque even though the English do not realize it. In short, Bullein presents the non-vital grotesque as vividly and comprehensively as any other prose satirist before the Marprelate author.

Behind all of the grotesque elements here is Bullein's fundamental belief that the real grotesqueries are man's sins and his concomitant fear of death. And while there are bits and pieces of comic dialogue and comic scenes, the prevailing tenor of Bullein's satiric perspective is serious. At the same time, the Dialogue, like Beware the Cat, contains much in its handling of caricature and the grotesque which links it with the visual tradition sketched in the preceding chapter. Possibly the most evident link with this tradition are the themes of the Dance of Death and the Triumph of Death which inform the Dialogue throughout.

The second trend in early Tudor prose satire is the literature of roguery.6 This vast body of popular literature seems to have fascinated its readers by allowing them to glance into a "submerged world" of human degenerates for whom they could have the paradoxical reaction of revulsion and laughter.7 One of the first pieces of rogue literature in English is Gilbert Walker's A Manifest Detection of Dice-play from which
Robert Greene later borrowed heavily in his **Notable Discovery of Cosenage** (1591). Walker's tract derives its charm from the dialogue form. Although the work makes a number of satirical jabs at "cheaters" and other "con men," its design is more clearly to expose rather than to attack. Its two interlocutors, engaged in a friendly yet quite serious dialogue, are referred to only as "R" and "M".

The anonymity works well within the form. Interested more in his message, Walker merely sketches in his characters; "R" is an aspiring, albeit naive, young courtier, while "M" is a worldly-wise friend, presumably older than "R". Walker launches the dialogue with "R," oblivious to the snares of the world, who tells "M" of his strange encounter with a colorfully dressed individual in front of Paul's Church. Because of the stranger's persistence, "R" accepts his invitation home. "R," clearly not sensing any machinations in the stranger's motives, is quickly engulfed in a world of dicing and other forms of gambling. "R" believes his new friends are gentlemen gamblers; "M" listens knowingly. Recognizing both "R's" naivete and consequent dilemma, "M" spends the remainder of the dialogue proselytizing his innocent friend. "M" wants to demonstrate, as simply as possible, what the cheaters are up to, not so that "R" can learn to do the same thing, but so that he may "open their wicked snares."

Exposure is the goal of Walker's organizational plan; to that end, his reference to the work as a "glass" wherein young men may view the image of a grotesque world of gambling is
appropriate.

Walker's use of caricature falls short of Baldwin's and Bullein's. Although he seems to understand the types he intends to caricature, Walker is less polished in his ability to focus sharply on those features to which his subject will be reduced. His caricatures are typified as opposed to personal or symbolic; they are static as opposed to organic. Striving for at least meager dramatic contrast, Walker concentrates mainly on two subjects for caricature—the naive courtier and the "cheater". "R," the naive courtier, is diminished to his typified character when the dialogue is barely underway. As he strolls in front of Paul's, his naivete is evident in his response to the stranger's growing interest in him:

... and he again, at each check made in our walking, cast earnest looks upon me, not such as by his hollow frownings and piercing aspect might pretend any malice or disdain, but rather should signify by his cheerful countenance that he noted in me something that liked him well, and could be content to take some occasion to embrace mine acquaintance.9

"M," absorbed in his friend's narrative, keys us to "R's" naivete. It is not difficult for us to visualize his recognition of "R's" predicament. More harmless than repulsive, "R" is basically a comic caricature; however, some of Walker's satiric import seems to include "R" as well as the more potentially threatening cheaters.

Caricature is likewise a tool for exposing the principal
cheator and his wife. Both are reduced to glittering fixtures spinning out smooth-flowing rhetoric. The male cheator is "fair dressed in silks, gold and jewels, with three or four servants in gay liveries" (p. 28). Commanding an equally impressive sight for the naive courtier, the cheator's wife is:

clothed in silks and embroidered works; the attire of her head broidered with gold and pearl; a carcanet about her neck, agreeable thereto, with a flower of diamonds pendant thereat, and many fair rings on her finger.

(p. 30)

She is little else except for her skill at "powdering" talk with "pretty devices." Not to be outdone by his wife, the husband displays a similarly polished tongue in complimenting the forthrightness of "R":

... for ye seem to be a man that wadeth not so unadvisedly in the deep but that always ye be sure of an anchorhold.

(p. 28)

What has Walker accomplished here? Clearly, he has created types, reduced characters to caricatures both to expose them and to provide a springboard for "M's" practical diatribe on the treachery of these cheators and exposure of their inner workings.

Lacking Baldwin's facility for painting scenes of the vital grotesque, Walker strives to introduce us to an estranged world, a grotesque world governed loosely by a brotherhood of
thieves dedicated to the pursuit of deceit. "R" stumbles into this world pathetically unaware of its ultimate design. "M" barely catches him in time. This non-vital grotesque world, a relentless cancer eating at the foundations of Tudor society, must be "anatomized" and eventually arrested if young respectable courtiers are to roam the streets of London free from such malignancies. Accepting the challenge, "M" zeroes in on the concrete realities of this alien world. He likens the art of the cheaters to a crude science spawned from economic necessity and perpetuated by a few loosely articulated rules of the street.

Nevertheless, to the cheaters, these rules are laws, grotesque burlesques of societal laws, but laws all the same. "M" goes so far as to suggest that this motley crew has a guiding principle, a fundamental precept on which their deceit is predicated:

For the first and original ground of cheating is a counterfeit countenance in all things, a study to seem to be, and not to be indeed; and because no great deceit can be wrought but where special trust goeth before, therefore the cheator, when he pitcheth his hay to purchase his profit, enforceth all his wits to win credit and opinion of honesty and uprightness.

(p. 36)

The cheator puts his skill with "counterfeit countenances" to good use in recruiting new cheators from the ranks of those unfortunate souls who have been picked clean by a member of
the brotherhood. Playing upon the ignorance of the recruit, the cheator matter-of-factly informs him that all professions cheat in one way or another. In short, the recruit is put through a grotesque "schooling" under the tutelage of an unscrupulous mentor. The recruit's "degree" in cheating qualifies him to take advantage of unsuspecting young men like "R". But the capstone of this chaotic, absurd world lies in the more disturbing reality that there is not even fidelity among cheaters. The neophyte cheator has indeed graduated into a dismal, inverted society which truly deserves the tag "grotesque."

For the most part, Walker's employment of the grotesque minimizes the comic; it focuses instead on the hauntingly vivid world of a treacherous sub-society. If we chuckle at all at such a realm, it is from a certain uneasiness rather than a genuinely humorous response. Cognizant of human nature's tendency to identify with the con-artist, walker effectively utilizes the staid, serious character of "M" as a mouthpiece of his disgust for the disjunctive, potentially dangerous underworld of cheaters. Ostensibly, the work suggests, from its title, that "dice-play" is the target of exposure here, but for Walker, dice-play is like the visible part of an iceberg—the chaotic sport of a complete anti-society floats just below the surface. A sincere moral conviction to expose this grotesque world seems to reside at the heart of Walker's satire. It is not that such an attitude precludes a comic perspective, it is merely that Walker chooses to employ caricature and the
grotesque in such a way as to subordinate the comic aspects of his content. And while the work generally lacks sophistication and polish, caricature and the grotesque lend a definite vitality that would not be apparent in a non-fictional tract on this same subject.

The most widely known Tudor pamphlet on vagabondage and roguery was Thomas Harman's *A Caveat for Common Cursitors.* This work is a series of twenty-four character sketches influenced by John Awdeley's *Fraternity of Vagabonds* (1561). A more sophisticated writer than Awdeley, Harman tries to inject a vitality into his sketches so that each portrait is seen as an integral part of this disturbing counter-society of "cursitors" (defined as runners or rangers about the country). More sociologist than satirist, Harman attempts, for the sake of other magistrates, to provide a handbook which will identify the "imposters" within the ranks of rogues, vagabonds, and the genuinely needy. However, at times, his acute observations ascend into satire. Harman views the existence of rogues as potentially dangerous to society, and while he may indeed feel that he is merely giving us a straight reportage of them, a closer examination reveals that he is employing the tools of caricature and the grotesque to expose his targets. At surface value, the work projects the image of being "courtesy literature," but in its double focus of real and fictive worlds it achieves at least modest literary success.

Kernan's statement that there are no characters in satire, only caricatures, applies to Harman's work quite readily.
In effect, each cursitor is a caricature. Striving to present types, Harman reduces each cursitor to a vita sheet of common actions and representative clothing; the caricature, in turn, points to the moral degenerancy at the core of each actor in the grotesque drama which occurs when these "rakehell rogues" converge on an unsuspecting, overly-compassionate nobleman. In not allowing his sketches to go beyond caricature, Harman ensures that their treachery and deceit will always be in sharp focus.

A few representative examples of Harman's caricaturist technique seem in order at this point. The opening lines of the "Rogue" sketch are typical:

A rogue is neither so stout or hardy as the upright-man. Many of them will go faintly and look piteously when they see, either meet any person; having a kercher, as white as my shoes, tied about their head, with a short staff in their hand, halting, although they need not, requiring alms of such as they meet, or to what house they shall come.\(^\text{12}\)

Harman next elaborates on their knavery through his own personal knowledge of their actions or a reliance on anecdotes about them. Often, one senses that Harman is particularly fascinated by a certain category of cursitor; in such cases, the caricature is especially vivid. An example of this would be Harman's discussion of the "Counterfeit Crank":

These that do counterfeit the crank by young knaves and young harlots, that deeply dissemble the falling sickness.

(p. 85)
One Crank is then described as follows:

He was naked from the waist upward, saving he had a old jerkin of leather patched, and that was loose about him, that all his body lay out bare. A filthy foul cloth he wear on his head, being cut for the purpose, having a narrow place to put out his face, with a baver made to truss up his beard, and a string that tied the same down close about his neck; with an old felt hat which he still carried in his hand to receive the charity and devotion of the people . . . .

(p. 85)

This might be accurately defined as a grotesque caricature. certainly, there are comic elements in the visual spectacle of the person just described. And despite the fullness of some of the descriptions, none really goes beyond the reduction of character to dress and actions. We see only cardboard figures, no rounded personalities, no development, and it is this stark, diminished portraiture that Harman wants us to see; it is Harman's attempt to reduce their own special form of evil into a penetrating outline which all can recognize for what it truly is.

Harman, like Walker, introduces us to a grotesque world, one with the crowded, mob tendency which Kernan has pointed to as typical in satire. He strives to show us the chaotic, inverted milieu of these cursitors. His technique is very similar to Walker's. Both use the vital grotesque sparingly. Harman, for example, tells of a "Walking Mort" (loose woman)
who planned with several good women to foil an unfaithful husband. When the husband manages to sneak away to the barn for his rendezvous with the Walking Mort, the other women gather outside and wait for a signal from their unlikely comrade. Hearing the signal, the women enter to the "untrussed" scoundrel:

... these five furious, sturdy, muffled gossips fling out, and take sure hold of this betrayed person, some plucking his hosen down lower, and binding the same fast about his feet; then binding his hands, and knitting a handkercher about his eyes, that he should not see.

(p. 104)

Again, these comic moments are rare. Perhaps without realizing it, Harman betrays a sympathy for his cursitors in such scenes.

One key to Harman's use of the grotesque is his double focus of real and fictive worlds. Much of his work purports to be first hand observation or else second hand information from "informers." Harman wants his readers to see two major aspects of these cursitors: their falseness or deceit and the ugliness or repulsiveness of each (physically and/or morally). He flashes numerous incongruities before our eyes: consider Alice Milson, a fifty year old "Autem-Mort" (women married in a church who apparently leave their husbands for a life of roguery) who cheats and robs accompanied by two very young men with whom she also sleeps; or consider the repulsiveness of "Palliards":

All for the most part of these will either lay to their legs an herb called spearwort, either arsenic, which is
called ratsbane. The nature of this spearwort will raise a great blister in a night upon the soundest part of his body. And if the same be taken away, it will dry up again and no harm. But this arsenic will so poison the same leg or sore, that it will ever after be incurable. This do they for gain and to be pitied.

(p. 81)

This kind of perversion and masochism is not uncommon in the grotesque assemblage Harman paints for us. He insists that we see the grotesqueness of this low-life; consequently, in his apparent factual reportage we see him focusing on the grotesque, highlighting their most despicable features wherever possible.

Although, as we have noted, a few comic elements appear in Harman's work, the prevailing perspective here is decidedly sober and serious. Harman is the concerned citizen doing his civic duty in exposing vice.13 Obviously, he is fascinated with these individuals and has compassion for them at times, but he never really laughs at their grotesqueness. It is a serious tone that manifests itself from beginning to end in this tract. Only later, in Greene's coney-catching pamphlets, will the satiric literature of roguery maintain a comic perspective.

George Gascoigne's A Delicate Diet for Daintiemouthde Droonkardes looks back to early Tudor polemical material—More, Tyndale, Becon and others—but more importantly, it initiates a new polemical phase of Tudor prose satire which
will dominate the mode during the 1580's. The tract is noteworthy for other reasons as C. T. Prouty points out:

A Delicate Diet is interesting from several points of view. It is among the earliest temperance tracts in the language, it reveals to us the Puritan spirit in its attacks on clothes as well as drink, and lastly, it presents us with a final picture of Gascoigne, the moralist.14

Gascoigne's work is organized around a central proposition which he plans to prove or defend: "All drunkards are beasts." Gascoigne actually calls the work an "Invectyve", and the prevailing tone suggests that his term is accurate. He channels his invective through a catalogue of drunkards which ranges from trifling drunks to sluggish drunks. He then presents a translation of St. Augustine's epistle on drunkenness.15 According to Gascoigne, the epistle is designed to inspire a horror of drunkenness in its readers. Moreover, caricature and the grotesque are fundamental to Gascoigne's expose.

Caricature is central to Gascoigne's bizarre catalogue of drunkards. In each category (based quantitatively on intemperance), the drunkard is reduced to a beast of some kind. Gascoigne launches his catalogue with the trifling drunkard, whom he compares to an ape, then the "brawlyng" and "quarrellyng" drunkard, whom he compares to a bear or a boar. Those drunkards who become sly and malicious in their drunkenness are compared to foxes and wolves; the lecherous drunkards are likened to goats, and the proud and vain drinkers to peacocks. But the lowest form of drunkard sluggishly consumes so much drink that he loses all sensitivity and falls asleep--this drunkard is compared to an ass. Unfortunately, Gascoigne's cataloguing
technique with these symbolic caricatures is crude and unso-
phisticated.

Obviously, one of the more revulsive effects of
drunkenness which Gascoigne exposes is its alleged tendency
to transform men into beasts. Just as St. Augustine's epistle
is calculated to evoke a horror of drunkenness in its readers,
so too, Gascoigne's tract is constructed to introduce its
readers to the ugliness associated with drunkenness. Gascoigne
especially points to the physical effects of intemperance; the
following excerpt is a good example of his handling of the
non-vital grotesque:

Such is the very nature and property of sinne generally
(but of this sinne especially) that where it once getteth
ye maistry and upperhand by continuall custome, it hardneth
the hart, blindeth the eyes, amaseth the understanding,
bewitcheth the sences, benoometh the members, dulleth the
wyts, provoketh unto beastlynesse, discourageth from ver-
tuous exercise, makeneth lovely to seeme lothsome, hasteneth
crooked age, fostereth infirmyties, defyleth the body
openly, & woudeth the soule unseen.16

Not satisfied with the extent of his exposé, Gascoigne goes
on to assert, in a strange progression of the grotesque, that
men in a drunken state are actually more "beastly" than beasts;
moreover, that in falling below the state of beasts, these
men are "mishapen & chaunged" into devils.

The dedication which precedes Gascoigne's work strongly
reflects a serious and moral perspective. He may indeed be
intrigued by the grotesque condition that drunkards find themselves in, but he never touches his issues lightly or with comic overtones. To terrify his readers from intemperate drinking has been his goal, and he attends to it unflaggedly. In doing so, Gascoigne leads his readers into the grotesque, into the revulsive, ugly realm of man's twisted nature. And clearly, caricature and the grotesque aid Gascoigne in his penetrating satire of drunkards.

In these five representative works, we have witnessed a variety of satiric targets. Yet, each work shares certain characteristics; for example, each employs a basically unso­phisticated, oral prose, and each reveals a strong interest in morals. Moreover, each of these works depends on caricature and the grotesque to enhance its satiric purpose. Here, we have seen an affinity for typified and symbolic caricature and the non-vital grotesque. Furthermore, three distinct trends emerge from these early works. We shall see in the next chapter that the polemical phase, perhaps in harmony with the rise of Puritanism, dominates the 1580's. The more visual and comic phase, represented here by Baldwin and Bullein, and the literature of roguery, initiated by Walker and Harman, will re-emerge in the 1590's--both will then find the appropriate blend of artistic consciousness for literary success.
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CHAPTER IV

THE POLEMICAL PHASE: 1580-1590
John Wyclif's fourteenth-century attacks on authori-
tative dogmatists spawned a spirit of controversy coupled
with a desire for free speech that remained strong to the
onset of the English Reformation. During the early years
of the Reformation, polemical prose assumed a more volatile
nature. In 1529, the heated pamphlet battle between Simon
Fish and Sir Thomas More, leading in turn to More's confron-
tation with William Tyndale, initiated a pronounced polemical
trend in Tudor literature. Later, men such as Thomas Becon,
Hugh Latimer and John Jewel contributed heavily to this already
prolific tradition throughout the middle decades of the six-
teenth century. In short, disputation was soon the accepted
vehicle for grappling with religious and political questions,
and by 1580 polemical prose had become a commonplace tradition.¹

In Chapter II, we noted this polemical tradition as
it colored the early Tudor prose satire, especially the work
of Gascoigne. As we shall see, the tradition of polemical
prose continued into the 1580's and influenced the satire of
Stephen Gosson, Phillip Stubbes and Thomas Lodge as well as
that of the anonymous authors of the Marprelate and anti-
Marprelate Tracts. Yet, at the end of the decade, as Raymond
Anselment explains, a dramatic change took place:

Sterile, rigorous polemic with its tedious attack and
counterattack is transformed into a dynamic mixed medium
which neither denies its affinity with the rhetoric of disputation nor conceals its thinly veiled dramatic fictions.  

Clearly, Tudor prose satire rapidly developed its artistic integrity as it moved away from the polemical phase.

It should become evident here that caricature and the grotesque play a significant role in the emergence of developed prose satire. We shall discover that in the Marprelate Tracts, through their use of caricature and the grotesque, Tudor prose satire achieves a highly sophisticated level. In addition, we shall witness the perspective of this satiric mode shifting from serious and solemn to comic. Moreover, a growing interest in language as opposed to morals is apparent here. Finally, we shall come to recognize the validity of Hugh Walker's observation:

It is in the polemical pamphlet that we first find satire raised to the foremost place, and at the head of the polemical pamphleteers stands the famous name of Martin Marprelate.  

And much of Martin's claim to fame relates directly to his recapturing elements of the dynamic visual tradition outlined in Chapter II.

Our survey of the 1580's begins with the following satirical prose tracts: Stephen Gosson's The School of Abuse (1579), Phillip Stubbes' The Anatomy of Abuses (1583) and Thomas Lodge's An Alarum Against Usurers (1584). This "literature of abuses" mixes satire and polemic in order to "expose" potentially chaotic forces in Tudor England. Not one of these three makes extensive use of caricature and the grotesque; however, in each we see rather crude attempts to wield them
more as polemical than as satiric weapons—in other words, wit is generally missing from these works. The tracts of Gosson and Stubbes, less lively than that of Lodge, both contribute to the popular trend of attacking the stage, most often thought to have been started by the Puritans. Moreover, in each of the growing affinity for spectacular rhetoric evidences itself, and, on occasion, overshadows the moral earnestness of the content.

Oddly enough, both Gosson and Stubbes had dabbled in literary ventures before turning to moralistic writing. In many ways, their situation is analogous to that of the later verse satirists, Hall, Marston and Donne, who abandoned poetry for the higher calling of the Church. Gosson must have felt that his tract would be appreciated by men of letters as he dedicated his to Sidney. In fact, Gosson claims a learned audience, and the spirit of civic duty which pervades the work suggests it belongs in the tradition of courtesy literature popular during the century.

Gosson's *School of Abuse* lacks a definite organizational principle. His goal is to expose the abuses of "Plaiers, Iesters and such like Catepillers of a Commonwelth"—a phrase Shakespeare honored by including it in *Richard II*. And while Gosson calls his work a "pleaunt inuective," no one, I believe, would contend that his perspective is comic. C. S. Lewis calls the work "a euphuistic oration well stuffed with classical anecdotes," and that it was "catering for a well established taste in rhetoric."⁴
Although Gosson's satiric attack is quite general, his focus is on the theater. He emphasizes that while the abuses apparent in theaters now are small, the potential for them to become corrupting influences is significant. To alert his reader to the possible iniquity of theaters ("schools" of abuse), Gosson uses very little caricature, but he does depend on the grotesque to make his point. He first paints a picture of the common player, whose evil is often difficult to discern:

They seeke not to hurt, but desire too please: they haue purged their Comedyes of wanton speaches, yet the Corne whiche they sell, is full of Cockle: and the drinke that they drawe, overcharged with dregges.5

Yet, Gosson's most effective technique is to create an air of suspense by constantly alluding to the impending chaos that the theater can bring about. For example, in this rhetorical flourish he asserts:

Small are the abuses, and sleight are the faultes, that nowe in Theaters escape the Poets pen: But tal Cedars, from little graynes shoote high: great Okes, from slender rootes spread wide: Large streames, from narrowe springes runne farre: One little sparke, fyers a whole Citie: . . . . (p. 38)

The potential, even inevitable, non-vital grotesque world is ever before the reader. Such was the effect that Lodge's zealous rebuttal to the tract was only moderately successful.6

Stubbes' Anatomy of Abuses, in terms of published copies,
was even more popular than Gosson's satirical tract.7 Stubbes had enough literary foresight to organize his "abuses" tract via the dialogue format; unfortunately, he failed to take full advantage of its possibilities. There are many similarities between the tracts of Gosson and Stubbes. Both maintain that the devil is the real instigator of abuses, both point out that they are not making a blanket condemnation of society, but rather a piecemeal attack on potential corruption, and both realize that employing the grotesque can be an effective means of "anatomizing" the abuses.

Like Gosson, Stubbes relies little on caricature; his interest is squarely on filling in the outlines of a non-vital grotesque world. He has his interlocutors, Philoponus and Spudeus, discuss the state of Aligna (a fictional country thinly disguised as England). They highlight the grotesque elements of Aligna by citing the wearing of "monstrous and ill-favored" apparel and the effects of whoredom:

... it impaireth the hearing, it infirmeth ſinewes, it weakneth the ioynts, it exhausteth the marrow, consumeth the moisture and supplemēt of the body, it riueith the face, appalleth the coûtenance, it dulleth ſpirits, it hurteth the memorie, it weakneth ſwhole body, it bringeth it into a consūption, it bringeth ulcerations, scab, scurf, blain, botch, pocks & biles, ... .

(p. 107)

They also present a repulsive discussion of the burning of adulterers. Stubbes' satiric purpose seems to involve both an attack on the abuses and a shock treatment for his readers.
Lodge's *An Alarum Against Usurers* completes this trio of "abuses" tracts. In his dedicatory statement to Sidney, Lodge asserts:

I have set downe in these fewe lines in my opinion (Right Worshipfull) the image of a licentious Vsurer, and the collusions of divelish incrochers, and heereunto was I led by two reasons: First, that the offender seeing his owne counterfaite in this Mirrour, might amend it, and those who are like by overlauish profusenesse, to become meate for their mouths, might be warned by this caueat to shunne the Scorpion ere she deououreth.  

Clearly, Lodge is pointing to a grotesque situation.

In his tract, Lodge departs from the satiric pattern of Gosson and Stubbes in that he attacks men rather than social abuses. Unlike his two predecessors, he seems to maintain that man is the source of chaos, not society. The most dangerous man, in Lodge's estimation, is the "usurer." By caricaturing the usurer, he unfolds a suitable technique for creating the repulsive "image" he desires. Rhetoric reinforces his efforts as in the following description of the usurer's characteristic actions:

These bee they, that make the Father carefull, the mother sorrowfull, the Sonne desperate: These bee they that make crooked straight, and straight crooked, that can close with a young youth, while they cousen him, and feede his humoures, till they free him of his Farmes. In briefe, such they bee, that close most fayre then,
when they imagine the worst, and unless they bee
quicklye known, they easelye will make bare some of the
best of our young Heires that are not yet stayed: . . . .

(p. 14)

But Lodge commits the same error as Gosson and Stubbes; like
them, he does not temper his use of caricature and the gro­
tesque with a coating of realistic humor. Later, in Wits
Miserie, he will correct the design of his satire—first Martin
Marprelate had to set the example.

We have seen then that these satires of abuses gener­
ally do not rely heavily on caricature and the grotesque. The
satiric perspective of the three writers discussed above is
serious or solemn. The visual techniques they employ seem
crude overall. Mainly, these prose satirists lack wit, and
their affinity for high-sounding rhetoric often interferes
with their didactic aim. Fortunately, the magic of Martin
Marprelate would soon convert this polemical phase into devel­
oped prose satire.

Tudor prose satire comes into its own as a literary
mode with the appearance of the Marprelate Tracts (1588-1589). These seven basic works are the first truly developed prose
satires written in English. In addition, one of the most
puzzling authorship problems in all of literary history surrounds
these tracts: who was this talented satirist known to his
reading public as "Martin Marprelate"? Two of the more likely
candidates are John Penry and Job Throckmorton, both of whom
were actively involved in the Puritan reaction to the positions
of the Church of England. Scholarship leans toward Penry, but there is little conclusive evidence to support the case for him. Authorship is not actually our concern here; suffice it to say that the MarpRelate author possessed more literary skills than any English prose satirist who preceded him.

The question naturally arises as to what provoked the flurry of pamphlet activity during the closing years of the 1580's. What was the main point of debate to which the MarpRelate author and his sympathizers addressed themselves? William Pierce provides us with a succinct overview of the controversy:

The question, . . . , at issue between those seeking a further evangelical reformation of the Church and those who had accepted preferment under Elizabeth, was one of polity, of the external government of the Church. . . . The Puritans held that it could be arranged to meet the needs of the time, and that Episcopacy, as organised under Elizabeth, was such an expedient form.

Martin's zeal, as we shall see, is perfectly suited to the extreme positions on reform held by most Puritans.

Our focus here will be on the first three MarpRelate pamphlets: The Epistle (1588), The Epitome (1588), and Hay Any Work for Cooper? (1589) as they best represent the quality of satire for the MarpRelate Tracts in general. Each of these works lacks a distinctive form; they may be accurately described as running diatribes, filled with invective, dominated by the dramatic, stage-comedian persona of Martin, who displays an inordinate facility with nearly every rhetorical device in use at the time.

A lively, comic perspective informs each of these
tracts. But their purpose is primarily satiric, and, to that end, the Marprelate author's most effective tools are caricature and the grotesque. He skillfully manages both tools, deftly employing them against the polemics of the Episcopacy. The three tracts we shall examine contain marvelous personal caricatures; yet, the Marprelate author also revives a caricaturist technique which Erasmus utilized much earlier in his Praise of Folly—caricature as norm. In this special type of caricature, the persona is actually a caricatured figure; in this case, Martin is a rustic clown figure. He is a laughable symbol, but as a comparative norm, he is certainly less of buffoon than the ridiculous caricatured representations of the Episcopacy against whom the bantering Martin constantly rails.

The Marprelate author also handles the grotesque skillfully. He creates a non-vital grotesque atmosphere of absurdity by exposing the innane logic of some of the Episcopacy's chief proponents. One of the Marprelate author's main benefactors, Swift, plays with "anti-logic" similarly in the Drapier Letters and a few of his other works. As a final prefatory comment to our analysis of the Marprelate Tracts, it should be reiterated that they rekindle much of the dynamic spirit of such works as the Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum, Reformation caricature and the paintings and drawings of Bosch and Bruegel. In short, ebullience, coupled paradoxically with a solemn belief in the Puritan cause, characterizes the Marprelate achievement. Or, as William P. Holden maintains,
Perhaps the greatest single quality of the Marprelate pamphlets is this mixture of the serious and the comic to produce the thoughtful laugh, one of the common elements of satire.\textsuperscript{13}

The Epistle was written largely in response to John Bridges' voluminous work, \textit{A Defence of the government established in the Church of Englande for ecclesiasticall matters} (1587) which, in turn, had been a response to Walter Travers' tract \textit{A full and plaine declaration} (1584). Bridges had actually countered the tract in a 1585 sermon, but then spent the next two years expanding it. Martin Marprelate joined the controversy in 1588; apparently he had planned to combine \textit{The Epistle} and \textit{The Epitome} in one work. Pierce explains that Martin's task was delayed; thus, \textit{The Epistle} was issued separately. Although we are considering the two works individually here, we should heed Pierce's cautionary note:

The reader need only to be warned that, although thus formally distinguished, and separately published, \textit{Epistle} and \textit{Epitome} are continuous answers to Bridges' work.\textsuperscript{14}

As are all the Marprelate Tracts, \textit{The Epistle} is loosely organized. It rambles in a lively spirit from its opening attack on Bridges' scholarship to Martin's final advice to the Bishops. The bantering figure of Martin stands at the heart of the work's dialectical movement. But unlike the contemporary verse satire, the scene dominates the satirist rather than vice-versa. The Marprelate author shapes his epistle consciously toward the final admonition; along the way he reduces the character of Bridges (and the other Bishops in general) to caricatures and paints a grotesque backdrop of chaos and disorder within which the external Church government functions.
The issue of Martin's satirical attack in *The Epistle* is that the Bishops claim civil titles which have no scriptural basis. Martin's task then is somehow to minimize the imposing, learned statures of the Bishops. Caricature proves an effective weapon to that end. Martin's particular technique here is to demonstrate that the viewpoints held by the Bishops actually reduce them to unsavory men unfit to remain in the Christian commonwealth. More specifically, what follows is one of Martin's tongue-in-cheek syllogisms designed to diminish the integrity of the Bishops:

Whosoever, therefore, claim unto themselves pastoral authority over those Christians, with whom they cannot possible at any time, altogether, in the same congregation, sanctify the Sabbath, they are ursurping prelates, popes, and petty antichrists.

(p. 28)

Physical description is not used here, and yet the effect of caricature is unmistakable. Martin is clearly exaggerating the Bishops' position; nevertheless, the name-calling relegates the satiric targets to a more degrading stature. The added effect is that they take on a more potentially harmful position in the scheme of the spiritual realm.

Animal metaphors are also basic to Martin's caricaturist technique.15 Typical of his technique is his reference to Bridges as having "the brains of a woodcock" or that he will "prove a goose." To Martin, all Bishops are basically "beasts," and their characteristic activity has led to a grotesque
condition within the Church:

Is it any marvel that we have so many swine, dumb dogs, non-residents, with their journeymen the hedge-priests; so many lewd livers, as thieves, murderers, adulterers, drunkards, cormorants, rascals; so many ignorant and atheistical dolts, so many covetous Popish bishops, in our ministry; and so many and so monstrous corruptions in our Church?

(p. 71)

The venom in Martin's rhetorical question is then injected into a caricature of the Bishop of Winchester:

. . . for he is a very dunce, not able to defend an argument, but, till he come to the pinch, he will cog and face it out, for his face is made of seasoned wainscot, and will lie as fast as a dog can trot—'I have said it.

(p. 72)

This passage typifies the vicious subjective vision which is the mainstay of Martin's caricaturist technique.

Martin definitely sees a latent evil in the actions and viewpoints of the Bishops. The mob tendency, which Kernan recognizes as a feature of all satire, is evident; that is, the Bishops are pictured as a ruthless gang of devious individuals who distort the truth. But it is more than the general nature of the Bishops under attack here. More specifically, the element of the grotesque which Martin most abhors is the way in which the Bishops render the logic underlying their basic views. Yet, instead of simply berating their logic with
bitter invective, Martin taunts it with absurd, comic, syllogisms. A few examples here will illustrate Martin's technique; what follows is representative:

Some presbyter, priest, or elder in the English ministry is called the Vicar of hell. As, for example, one about Oxford, another near Northampton, and the Parson of Mickleham in Surrey. But the Dean of Sarum, John Catercap, is 'some priest in the English ministry.' Ergo, he is the Vicar of hell.

(p. 95)

Here is another example in the same taunting spirit:

Some men that will not have their lordships, and their callings, examined by the Word, are limbs of antichrist. As, for example, the Pope and his cardinals. But our Lord Bishops are 'some men which will not have their lordships and their callings tried by the Word.' Therefore, they are limbs of antichrist.

(p. 28)

Martin offers fourteen such witty syllogisms, all designed to expose the kind of grotesque logic employed by the Bishops. His efforts successfully handle the disorder which he believes is sanctioned by these self-righteous Episcopates.

The perspective of The Epistle is a combination of comic and serious. There is a thin layer of comic banter throughout. Occasionally, Martin will burst out with such phrases as "Ha, ha, ha!", "Tse-tse-tse!" or "So-ho" to express the comic tone he is trying to project. Indeed, early in
the work, he explains why he feels he must adopt a comic or even absurdist role:

And, May it please you, if I be too absurd in any place (either in this Epistle, or that Epitome), to ride to Sarum, and thank his Deanship for it. Because, I could not deal with his book commendably, according to order, unless I should be sometimes tediously duncical and absurd.

(p. 17)

But beneath this superficial comic perspective is a vitriolic tone which harbors a very serious perspective. Flashes of his indignation often result in passages such as this one:

But I will not be thus used at your hands; for unless you answer me, or confess (and that in print) that all Lord Bishops in England, Wales, Ireland, yea, and Scotland too, are petty popes, and plain usurpers, and petty anti-christs, I'll kindle such a fire in the holes of these foxes, as shall never be quenched as long as there is a lord bishop in England.

(pp. 43-44)

The Episcopates were indeed sinners in the hands of an angry Puritan.

Martin's *Epitome* is strikingly similar to *The Epistle* in form and tone. Its purpose is to review the first book of Bridges' *Defence*. Pierce offers a more specific description of the work:

But though formally a critical review of the first of the sixteen books into which Dean Bridges divided his *Defence*, *The Epitome* is almost more noteworthy as giving
the widest publicity to Bishop Aylmer's notorious book, An Harboration for Faithfull Subjectes, published by him at Strasburg in 1559; and expressly as a reply to John Knox's First Blast of the Trumpet against the monstrous regiment of Women which was issued the previous year. 16

At times, Martin even engages in an ironical rebuff of his Puritan brothers.

By the printing of The Epitome, Martin had discovered that not all of the negative reactions to his tactics emanated from the Episcopates. Some criticism, indeed, was voiced by Puritans. This situation forced Martin to explain his satiric strategy:

The Puritans are angry with me; I mean the Puritan preachers. And why? Because I am too open; because I jest. I jested because I dealt against a worshipful jester, Dr. Bridges, whose writings and sermons tend to no other end than to make men laugh. I did think that Martin should not have been blamed of the Puritans for telling the truth openly. For, may I not say that John of Canterbury is a petty pope, seeing he is so?

You must then bear with my ingramness. I am plain; I must needs call a spade a spade; a pope a pope. I speak not against him, as he is a councillor; but as he is an Archbishop, and so Pope of Lambeth. What! will the Puritans seek to keep out the Pope of Rome, and maintain the Pope at Lambeth?

(pp. 118-119)

This same jesting spirit which some Puritans denounced informs The Epitome from the title page on. It is the jesting spirit
evident in Martin's overview of the work:

And lest Mr. Doctor should think that no man can write without sense but his self, the senseless titles of the several pages, and the handling of the matter throughout the Epitome show plainly, that beetleheaded ignorance must not live and die with him alone.

(p. 113)

But Dover Wilson is probably correct in maintaining that despite its humorous touches and many similarities with The Epistle, The Epitome "more frequently lapses into a more serious vein." 17

There are actually two sections in The Epitome. The first is entitled the "Second Epistle," which, among other things, deals briefly with the Bishops' meetings concerning The Epistle (Martin somehow knew of these) and with the peculiar opposition of the Puritans to Martin's writings. The second part is the "Epitome"; much larger than section one, this second section expends considerable space "anatomizing" Aylmer even though the work professed to concentrate on Bridges' Defence. And, of course, the style of the entire work is couched in Martin's characteristic raillery and invective. Martin is also a master of irony, but our interests here are focused once again on caricature and the grotesque, and the way in which Martin employs these satiric tools.

It has been noted that caricatures can be comic, satiric, or a combination of the two. With respect to The Epitome, it would appear that the caricatures of Bridges, Aylmer and the other Bishops are decidedly more satiric than comic.
That is, above all, Martin is attacking the untenable (as he sees them) positions of the Bishops on external church government. Caricature is an uncompromising weapon in Martin's satiric arsenal since, by nature, it tends to simplify reality, to strip reality to its essential facets. Consequently, this simplified reality often veils a more complex dimension. Herein lies the key to the caricatures in The Epitome, for Martin is able, in one stroke of his pen, to "unmask" the surface perversions of the Bishops' stand on church government and to point to the beast-like qualities of mankind which are basically unchangeable.

Martin, as caricaturist, relies much more heavily on simple name-calling to reduce his satiric targets than on exaggerated descriptions of physical features. He is especially fond of calling the Bishops "popes," but when his indignation gets the best of him, he reduces the Bishops to beasts, calling them "wolves" and "brute beasts." Martin's subjective vision diminishes the Bishops to their ludicrous "epitome" so that they can be described adequately in a few short, flippant phrases. For example, at one point Martin chides the Bishops for maintaining that they are "in nature pastoral"; he then provides his own estimate: "In dignity they are popes; in office, proud prelates; and in ministry, plain dumb dogs, for the most part" (p. 169). The result of Martin's vociferous caricaturing is that he has satisfied his desire to demonstrate that "All beetleheaded ignorance lieth in Master Doctor" and the rest of the Bishops. The personal caricatures, having
been taken to their limits, progress into the realm of symbolic caricature. Symbolically, the Bishops represent an unswerving, insipid collage of dunces with the potential to destroy the final stages of the Reformation.

As do the other Marprelate Tracts, The Epitome occasionally touches upon the vital grotesque; for example, Martin's opening description of Bridges' large tome:

The complete work (very briefly comprehended) in a portable book, if your horse be not too weak, of an hundred, three-score and twelve sheets, of good demy paper is a confutation of The Learned Discourse of Ecclesiastical Government.

(p. 122)

Another example is Martin's general description of Bridges' facility for expressing himself: "He speaketh everything so fitly to the purpose, that he never toucheth the matter in question" (p. 124). Yet, the comic element is never able to overshadow the non-vital grotesque. Clearly, Martin sees the Bishops, especially Bridges and Aylmer, as creators of disorder, as defenders of a corrupt church government; in short, as perpetrators of a grotesque world which had enveloped the Established Church.

In terms of technique, the most effective exposure of the Bishops' grotesque milieu results from a steady focus once again upon the absurd logic which serves as a basis for their positions. Martin is quick throughout to point to specific examples of disordered logic, particularly in Bridges'
work. A few illustrations here should suffice to identify Martin's technique. Early in the work, Martin quotes as follows from Bridges: "We are His Church if we hold fast the confidence of our hope unto the end. Therefore there is no external government of the Church set down in the Word" (p. 135). Martin attacks the basic "leap in logic" here by extending Bridges' syllogism into ridiculous proportions:

A man is a man, though he go naked. Therefore by Master Dean's reason, the Lord hath ordained no covering for his nakedness. Again a man is a man, if he be once born, though he never eat meat; therefore it is not the ordinance of God he should eat meat. Let our cauilling brethren go see now, what may be brought to reproach the credit of such inforcible proofs.

(p. 162)

Martin responds quickly: "Ah, craft, craft; craft and subtilty, that can in jest deceive his brethren with a Popish reason in this sort" (p. 162). Martin goes on to suggest that Bridges presents the above reasoning merely to test his readers to see if they can discern the "Popish reasons." Here again Martin is playful, and yet, just below the surface resides a savage indignation toward what, in Martin's opinion, is the grotesque logic of evil men. In this case, he has utilized the grotesque to expose the essentially unchangeable, threatening character of the men in whom the power of the Established Church is invested.

*Hay Any Work For Cooper?* is third in the series of
Marprelate Tracts. It is Martin's reply to a tract entitled An Admonition to the People of England signed by one T. C.

On the authorship and origin of this tract we may quote Pierce:

The author of the present Admonition, however, was Thomas Cooper, Bishop of Winchester. Like all the official defences published by the hierarchy during the previous twenty years, it was a collaboration, the reputed author acting as editor to the contributions of the various episcopal disputants and revisers. 18

The title of Martin's reply derives from a familiar London street cry and is, of course, an indication of the mocking tone which pervades the tract. The subject matter of the Admonition may be described as follows:

Beyond the several replies of the Bishops concerned to the personal charges of Marprelate, the Admonition contains a general defence of the Episcopate in regard to their covetousness, the tyranny of their ecclesiastical courts, and their worldly ambitions. The scriptural authority and the expediency of the State in supplying bishops with liberal incomes are set forth at large. 19

But Martin complains that the Bishops spend too little time countering his attacks and too much time creating new slanders. However, beneath Martin's malcontent role and the invective which accompanies it, a more serious and solemn phase of his reply is apparent:

The serious part of Hay Any Worke is devoted to setting forth the scriptural authority claimed by the Puritans for the rule of the Church by Pastors, Doctors, Elders and Deacons; which offices they contend are divinely ordained, and are integral elements of the body—i.e., the Church, and cannot be changed by mere human choice. 20

Once again, Martin finds himself taking up a position of self-defence against the complaints of his Puritan brethren who disapprove of his tactics. Also, while his work ostensibly attacks Cooper and the Admonition, his invective is mainly
directed at his old nemesis, John Aylmer, Bishop of London.

Perhaps a key to the tract's organizational principles lies in the more serious tone adopted by Martin. Instead of a consistent pattern of raillery and mockery, Martin concentrates on serious reasoning. His principle is the technique of first presenting a summary of a passage from the Admonition then refuting it by picking apart its logic. Throughout the tract, Martin sounds more self-serving and self-satisfied than in the two previous tracts. Moreover, his satiric attack takes on a very serious hue when he challenges the Bishops to refute the syllogism which concludes that they are the greatest enemies to the state. Yet, at one point Martin realizes that his tone is growing oppressively serious and quickly reverts to his comic role. Overall, the technique of his satiric attacks remains the same: he first reduces the stature of the Bishops through caricature, then illustrates the grotesque nature of their actions or views, and depends largely on a comic perspective to maintain the upperhand, to give him the air of superiority (and even truth) which he needs to achieve the satiric emotion he desires.

Part of Martin's literary apparatus is caricature, and, in effect, he generates caricature as a norm. As noted earlier, Martin assumes the role of a rustic clown. If his enemies, the Bishops, can be reduced to a level below Martin, then not only will the unity of their personalities disintegrate, but as well, their actions will appear grotesque.

Again, the Marprelate author's technique is not to
present physical caricatures, but rather to let the characters remain faceless and attack essentially through name-calling. He tries to break through the anonymity of T. C. (although he knows full well who he is) by calling him a "notorious wicked slanderer" or "Tom Tub-trimmer" or at one point he calls the Bishop a "Judas". Martin is equally intent on caricaturing Aylmer, alluding to him indirectly as a "trunch-fiddle"; Pierce sees a connection here between the short stumpy fiddle and Aylmer who was a short, stumpy man.21

Much of Martin's descriptive caricature, however, does not suggest the comic reduction of the above picture of Aylmer. The following is an example of Martin's more savage caricature:

The sinful, the unlawful, the broken, unnatural, false and bastardly governors of the Church, to wit, archbishops and bishops, which abuse even their false offices, are spoken against. . . . Ah, senseless and undutiful beasts, that dare compare yourselves with out true magistrates, ....

(p. 245)

The purpose of such caricature, as stated before, is to diminish Cooper, Aylmer, and the other Bishops to figures so far below the image of a dignified churchman that their actions may more readily be treated as chaotic, disturbing, and potentially destructive—-that is, grotesque.

That the Bishops have mistresses and are anti-Christian represents only one phase of the grotesque milieu which Martin paints. The comically grotesque anecdote of the eccentric
clergyman, Glibbery of Halstead, is still another. It seems that once Glibbery was preparing to deliver his sermon when, upon seeing a boy at the back of the church leave to watch a May Game or a Morris Dance, could not resist joining him. Martin's point is that such instances reveal the state of decay in which the clergy finds itself. Martin even suggests that the clergy is dismembering the body of Christ, i.e.,

the Church:

But I hope, T. C., that thou wilt not be so mad and wicked as to say that our Saviour Christ left behind Him, here on earth, an unperfect and maimed body.

(p. 231)

Playing with the Bishop's logic, Martin is also able to show that they are actually Bishops of the devil. And yet the epitome of the grotesque presented in this satiric tract is that not only are the Bishops destroying the Church, they also are dangerous to the stability of the State as a whole:

Why, you enemies to the State, you traitors to God and His Word, you Mar-Prince, Mar-Law, Mar-Magistrate, Mar-Church, and Mar-Commonwealth, do you not know that the world should rather go a-begging than that the glory of God, by maiming His church, should be defaced?

(p. 231)

The fear is that if the Church decays and deforms then the people will fall to evil ways and chaos will naturally follow. This grotesque picture poses problems for the satirist because it may overwhelm the reader and render him helpless to dc
anything to correct the situation. For this reason, the satirist's perspective is extremely significant.

The same combination of comic and serious perspective that we witnessed in The Epistle and The Epitome is present here, with the one possible difference being that Hay Any Work has more stretches of serious discussion. Yet, we can point to several lighter aspects of this work; for example, its title page sets a definite comic tone, and the "red-cap" story is still another example of comic intrusion. However, the most obvious evidence that the Marprelate author realizes he must stick to a comic perspective if his satire is to be effective is the sudden re-assuming of character midway through the tract:

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

(p. 257)

With such a comic perspective, our satirist is able to mitigate the grotesque.

Our discussion of the polemical phase in Tudor prose satire ends here with a brief survey of the anti-Marprelate literature. This sizeable body of material includes dramatic works and poetry as well as prose satires. Our examination
will touch upon three of the more popular anti-Marp relate tracts: *An Almond for a Parrat, Pap With a Hatchet* and *Martin's Month's Mind*—each circa 1589. In general, these works fall below the literary achievement of the Marp relate Tracts; however, as we shall see, they do contain elements of caricature and the grotesque worth noting. Hugh Walker offers perhaps the most sensible explanation of the anti-Marp relate deficiency: "There is no earnestness of purpose in them; their object is mere vituperation, and they care little for the cause."22

It should also be noted that these works assume a degree of importance because later prose satirists such as Greene and Nashe, although the authorship of the tracts is a bit uncertain, probably first contributed to the mode via the Marp relate controversy.

*An Almond for a Parrat*, possibly by Nashe, is essentially a railing diatribe.23 Occasionally, there are moments in which a visually dynamic passage interrupts the invective. One such example is the following non-vital grotesque scene of what is to happen to the disciples of Martin:

Zeale her selfe will crie out vppon thee, and curse the time that euer shee was maskte by thy mallice, who, lyke a blinde leader of the blinde, sufferedst her to stumble at euerie steppe in Religion, and madest her seeke, in the dimnesse of her sight, to murther her mother, the Churche, from whose pappes thou lyke an enuious dogge but yesterdaie pluckest her.24

Earlier in the century, Bruegel had brilliantly employed this
Biblical image of the blind leading the blind.

Pap With a Hatchet has even less of a design than An Almond. The high point of this work, which was probably written by John Lyly, is a comic caricature of Martin:

I drew neere the sillie soule, whom I found quiuering in two sheetes of protestation paper. O how meager and leane hee lookt, so creast falne, that his combe hung downe to his bill, and had I not been sure it was the picture of enuie, I shoulde have sworne it had been the image of death, so like the verie Anatomie of mischiefe, that one might see through all the ribbes of his con-science, . . . \(^{25}\)

Here the anti-Marprelate tendency to equate the alleged paucity of Martin's spiritual development with an emaciated physical condition continues.

Martin's Month's Mind is the most lively and visual of the anti-Marprelate satires. The works humorously purports to be a description of the death and funeral of Martin Marprelate, but at times the highly visual caricatures reveal a serious tone:

This man, like a madde dogge runneth at euerie man without regarde, and with fomning mouth, and venemous teeth, biteth not be the shinnnes, but the verie throat, he careth not whome; not onelie those, whome hee saith untruelie men call; Puritans, . . . \(^{26}\)

The anonymous author maintains that the real threat of Martin and his "sons" is that they are traitors to the State. Consequently, the author, with a deep sense of relief, eagerly
recounts the death of Martin. Here, in a truly humorous scene, Martin issues a long confession with his sons gathered about him. After his death, a comic autopsy is performed; the findings indicate that Martin's tongue was "wonderfullie swolne in his mouth" and that his head contained "no crumme of braine within it." In such rare scenes, the non-vital grotesque is reshaped into the vital grotesque.

By 1590 the polemical phase of Tudor prose satire was clearly waning. The Marprelate author had shown those who were to write the prose satire of the 1590's that the mode functioned at its best when it combined the following adjectives: lively, comic and visual. He demonstrated new possibilities for employing caricature and the grotesque. In short, his work paved the way for the return and reaffirmation of that dynamic satiric vision which serves as a matrix for Tudor prose satire. In Chapter V we shall see evidence of that vision in the prose satire of Robert Greene and Thomas Lodge—the mode, thanks to the unknown Marprelate author, anticipated its "golden" phase.
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CHAPTER V

THE REAFFIRMATION OF THE VISION: GREENE AND LODGE
The ripples generated by the Marprelate controversy dissipated rapidly in the larger organizational problems which beset the Established Church in the reign of Elizabeth. On the other hand, the literary legacy of the irrepressible Martin survived to be a potent influence on the prose satire of the 1590's. The Marprelate Tracts presaged a reawakening of comic and satiric forces which had lain relatively dormant during much of the century. The singular quality of the Marprelate satires, apart from piquancy and rhetorical display, resided in a curious cultural synthesis that Cazamian notes as characteristic of the times:

In the great satirical age that came in with the latter years of the sixteenth century, the humanistic spirit and the popular verve were often fused.\(^1\)

Despite the discordant three-ring circus effect of the Marprelate Tracts, they do represent a sensitive fusion of these seemingly antithetical impulses.

Martin's verbal exuberance spilled into the 1590's and, through its magnetic appeal, announced that to be effective the cutting edge of satire must be tempered with a comic perspective. The death knell for the "glib and oily art" of strictly polemical prose "exposures" was being sounded. Yet, while Martin's thesis may have appeared unique, his technique merely summoned up remembrances of a highly comic, visual tradition of satire stretching from Bosch through Erasmus and
Rabelais to Bruegel. Martin Marprelate had renewed the collective vision of this tradition and had restated its premises on mitigating the grotesque facets of a topsy-turvy world absurdly governed by folly. But would the prose satirists of the 1590's reaffirm this vision? This present chapter will attempt to demonstrate that they did; and, moreover, that the affirmation was not clouded with ambivalence.

Our attention will focus on two quite different prose satirists--Robert Greene and Thomas Lodge. While Greene revived the art of rogue literature, Lodge turned to allegory as a satirical vehicle; each in his own way reaffirmed the vision alluded to above. The bulk of our detailed analysis here will entail three representative works of Tudor prose satire: Greene's _Defence of Coney-Catching_ (1592) and his _A Quip for an Upstart Courtier_ (1592) as well as Lodge's _Wits Miserie_ (1596). We shall discover that the degree to which these works recapture the visual tradition of prose satire is directly related to their effectiveness in handling caricature and the grotesque. Not only will these satires reveal innovations in the use of caricature and the grotesque, but also they will evidence a decided shift away from Euphuistic language toward a more realistic language. And while there is a moral tinge to their satiric attacks, an air of bemused tolerance characterizes the tone of their indictments.

Such toleration of societal flaws is not typical of one who has obtained a university education. Robert Greene is an exception to the rule; moreover, he complemented his
academic experience with several years of Bohemian-like existence in the more squalid areas of London. Indeed, at least one critic has suggested that Greene's direct contact with the London underworld contributed to the realism and vitality of his prose pamphlets. As Cazamian points out, Greene's realistic reportage exudes a comic tone; a "spirit of jollity" pervades every sentence. Greene's prose style, couched in a realistic language which avoids Euphuism and Arcadianism, seems naturally suited to his broad and often comic sketches of rogues and knaves. Yet, we would render an injustice to Greene's artistic achievements if we were not to emphasize his chief facility as a prose satirist--his skill as a storyteller. Here, we shall find that much of his narrative success involves the manner in which he employs caricature and the grotesque to enliven his tapestries of satiric exempla. Furthermore, John C. Jordan has cited a final characteristic of this most intriguing literary figure:

Whatever literary form he took up, it was for exploitation; whatever he dropped, it was because the material or demand was exhausted. He did what no man before him in England had done so extensively: he wrote to sell.

One of Greene's better prose satires is The Defence of Coney-Catching; the authorship question for this tract has all but been put to rest. It seems likely that this work represents a clever device by Greene to promote forthcoming publications. Through the persona of Cuthbert Cunny-catcher, we learn that the tract was supposedly written in response to a handbook on coney-catching by one R. G. (obviously Robert Greene). The section "To the Readers" gives background as
to how Cuthbert came to write the tract. Essentially, Cuthbert's argument is that R. G. has overlooked the truly significant vices in focusing on the relatively harmless offense of coney-catching. The work itself then becomes a general satire on different "types," i.e., Usurers, Millers, Brokers, "Amarosos", Taylors, and so forth. Greene shapes his satire via a series of jest-book tales designed, in each case, to illustrate the particular vice under attack.

On the surface, the work seems loosely organized, but the structure actually closely resembles the firm ordering principles of emblem literature. Greene's method is first to introduce the "type" he wants to expose or satirize with a brief description of its characteristics. This step corresponds to the motto or sententia of an emblem. Next, Greene presents the picture or image of the vice in the form of a short, usually comic, tale. This step, of course, parallels the woodcut or engraving of an emblem. As with the emblem, Greene's second step here provides a symbolic representation of step one. Greene completes the emblematic process by drawing a lesson from the tale. Usually he has Cuthbert directly address R. G. and taunt him with the contention that the vice he has just exposed is socially more disruptive than coney-catching.

After many illustrative stories, Cuthbert's argument moves to the following conclusion:

Thus have I proved to your maships, how there is no estate, trade, occupation, nor mistery, but lives by
conny-catching, and that our shift at cards compared to the rest, is the simplest of all. . . . 9

Then Cuthbert winds up the tract with the flare of a public relations advance man as he comments on Greene's forthcoming book on coney-catching, which is to discuss the "stripping law", or abuse of prisoners. Cuthbert notes that such a book would be a "meritorious deed."

As in the Marprelate Tracts, here once again the persona is caricatured. This time, instead of the rustic, jesting clown figure of Martin, we have the "con" man par excellence, Cuthbert Cunny-Catcher. Caricature is norm here because everything is measured against the figure of Cuthbert. To a large extent, the success of Greene's satire rests on the persona's ability to reduce the objects of attack to caricatures. Simple name-calling or invective is not sufficient, although Cuthbert does engage in these devices at times.

When Greene is at his best, he can create some very sophisticated visual caricatures. One especially vivid caricature follows; Cuthbert's satiric ploy here of course is to reduce his objects of attack to types while at the same time to show that they are clearly more menacing to society than he is:

There bee in Englande, but especially about London, certayne quaint, pickt, and neate companions, attyred in their apparel, eyther /alla mode de Fraunce, with a side Cloake, and a hat of a high blocke and a broad brimme, as if hee could with his head cosmographise the
world in a moment, or else Allesppanyole, with a straight bombaste sleeve like a quaire pipe, his short Cloake, and his Rapier hanging as if he were entering the List to a desperate Combate: his beard squared with such Art, eyther with his mustachies after the last of Lions, standing as stiffe as if he wore a Ruler in his mouth, or else nickt off with the Italian cut, as if he ment to professe one faith with the vpper lippe, and an other with his nether lippe, and then hee must be Marquisadod, with a side peake pendent, eyther sharpe lyke the single of a Deere, or curtold lyke the broad ende of a Moule spade.

(1pp. 33-34)

What becomes apparent is that while Cuthbert begins by attempting a realistic description, he soon moves into the realm of caricature. The distortion is subtle; the metaphorical context blurs the lines between realism and caricature. We follow the description objectively, but after a few doses of the undercutting similes, we begin to recognize that the character is being diminished to caricature. Appended to the description is an account of how this figure, at whom we are on the verge of laughing, can easily swindle money or land from a naive young gentleman. The comic or ludicrous and the repulsive come together--the result is the grotesque.

Greene is especially effective in caricaturing through characteristic actions. For example, here he has Cuthbert type-casting an "Amarosos":

...
These youths are proper fellows, neuer without good apparel and store of crowns, wel horst, and of so quaint & fine behauior, & so eloquent, that they are able to induce a yong girle to folly, especially since they shadow theyr/ villainy with the honest pretence of marriage: for theyr custome is this.

(p. 46)
A discussion then is presented of how the Amarosos manages typically to marry a beautiful maid or widow, satisfy his lust after a month or two, and then move on to another of his wives in still another village. This ridiculous, and yet disruptive figure, is indirectly contrasted with the caricatured norm, Cuthbert Cunny-Catcher. The tactic once again is successful, particularly when Greene focuses on the grotesque.

The ominous sense of a non-vital grotesque atmosphere replete with chaotic, disparate elements which fog the boundaries between good and evil, order and disorder pervades Greene's work, but the grotesque is both a satiric and aesthetic device as he creates scenes which artfully combine the ludicrous and the repulsive. Although our emphasis will be placed on these grotesque scenes, we should not fail to recognize that Greene is demonstrating the prevalence of a disordered society emanating as much from the actions of lawyers, priests, taylors and other typical Londoners as from men of ill-repute such as Cuthbert. Cuthbert, in fact, points out that coney-catchin of sorts goes on at every level of society.

Let us now consider two grotesque scenes in the Defence
to witness the way in which Greene employs the grotesque as a satiric device. The tale of the usurer provides the setting for our first example. As we enter the story, the usurer has taken advantage of a young family. One day, while the husband is away, the usurer (a caricatured figure) tries to become better acquainted with the wife. She plays along but only to get revenge. Having led him into a back parlor, she tricks him into gazing out of a bay window. At that point, she exacts her vengeance:

The Usurer mistrusting nothing, thrust out his craftie sconce, and the Gentlewoman shut to the windowe, and called her maids to helpe, where they bound and pinyond the caterpillers armes fast, and then stood he with his head into the backeyard, as if he had beene on a pillory, and struggle durst not for stifling himselfe. When she him thus at the vauntage, she got a couple of sixe peny nayles and a hammer, and went into the yard, hauing her children attending vpon her, euery one with a sharp knife in theyr handes, and then comming to him with a sterne countenance, shee looked as Medea did when she attempted reuenge against Iason. The Usurer seeing this tragedie, was afraid of his life, and cryed out, but in vaine, for her maydes made such a noyse, that his shriking could not be heard, whilst she nayled one eare fast to the windowe, and the other to the stanshel, then began she to vse these words unto him.

(p. 21)

She then immerses him in invective and threats until he publicly
admits that he had swindled her and her husband. The scene falls into the category of the *vital* grotesque; the usurer is an evil, repulsive character, but here he is rendered ludicrous. Greene has thus completed a satiric attack by disarming the tension his audience might feel toward this socially dangerous figure through the comic perspective which exists here. Cuthbert, Greene's persona, chuckles at the usurer; nevertheless, he emphasizes that the usurer is also a disruptive force.

The tale of the Amarosos gives us our second example of Greene's skill at producing comically grotesque scenes. In this tale, the Amarosos' activities catch up with him finally, and his wife Marian, having learned of his system of infidelity, ties his feet together. With the aid of another of his wives, Marian gets her revenge:

> With that his other wife and the women clapt hold on him, & held him fast, while Marian with a sharpe rasor cut off his stones, and made him a gelding. I thinke shee had litle respect where the signe was, or obsuered litle art for the string, but off they went, & then she cast them in his face, & said, Now lustful wharemaister, go & deceiue other women as thou hast done vs, if thou canst, so they sent in a surgion to him yt they had prouided, & away they went. The man lying in great paine of body, & agony of mind, the surgion looking to his wound, had much ado to stanch the blood, & alwaies he laught hartily when hee thought on the reuenge, and bad a vengeance on such
sow-gelders as made such large slits: but at last he
laid a blood-plaister to him, & stopt his bleeding, and
to be briefe, in time heald him, but with much paine.

(p. 55)

Here we are caught in the cross-fire of the comic and the
anxiety-producing element inherent in the pain that the
Amarosos is going through. But the comic wins out as we recog-
nize that a corrupt individual is getting his just deserving.

The perspective of the Defence is channeled through
the sensibilities of Cuthbert who is himself a part of the
grotesque world of disruptive figures he is satirizing. There
can be little doubt as to whether the perspective is comic
or solemn. Throughout the work, Cuthbert handles both his
argument and the pleasant illustrative tales with a comic tone
and spirit remarkably similar to that of the popular jest-book
stories. Mainly, there is no anxiety at the end of Greene's
work. The same kinds of vice and folly had been exposed
earlier in Harman's tract, but here the difference is that
the threatening elements of the grotesque are disarmed even
though the potential disruption remains.

In general, the other coney-catching pamphlets fall
short of the achievement of the Defence. A Notable Discovery
of Cozenage (1591), for example, is largely borrowed from
Gilbert Walker's A Manifest Detection (see Chapter III of this
study) and makes no significant advances over the rogue satire
of the 1550's and 1560's. The Second Part of Conny-Catching
(1591) as well as The Third and Last Part of Conny-Catching
(1592) are only minimally more successful. In both, Greene relies very heavily on exempla to bear the burden of his satire. The caricatures here have little vitality, and the vital grotesque is noticeably lacking. These works do, however, underline Greene's propensity for story-telling, and they are not without a few good narrative passages.

A Disputation Betweene a Hee Conny-Catcher and a Shee Conny-Catcher (1592), on the other hand, attains a good deal more success than the three tracts mentioned above, although it lacks the sophistication of the Defence. Nevertheless, at least one critic has recently praised the work quite highly: "This sophisticated use of diction, narrative personae, and parallel structures demonstrates Greene's artistry and suggests his mastery of dramatic technique."10 Another critic, in comparing A Disputation with the other coney-catching pamphlets, goes so far as to call it "the liveliest and most entertaining of the group."11

The first part of the satire is couched in a witty debate between two caricatured figures: Laurence, a "Foist" or thief, and Nan, a "Trafficque" or whore. The necessary question boils down to whether a thief or a whore is more "hurtful" to a commonwealth. The disputation becomes merely a vehicle for satirizing a great many aspects of London society. The point of debate is never really resolved. And despite numerous "exhortations" from both disputants, the work itself retains a comic perspective. The second part of the satire is quite different from the first in that it entails a
Mirror-like complaint entitled, "The Conversion of an English Courtizan." Much of it is dreary moralizing, but it takes on additional interest for us in that the caricatured figure of the courtezan in part one gradually develops into a rounded literary character in part two. Here we have an early instance of the satiric "characters" which will become more prevalent in the satire of the early seventeenth century.

A Disputation does contain one noteworthy example of the grotesque. In the following passage, Greene skillfully employs an ironic, vital grotesque logic which anticipates Swift's A Modest Proposal and An Argument Against Abolishing Christianity. Nan, tongue-in-cheek, counters one of Laurence's points:

... I praie you how many badde profittes againe growes from whoores, Bridewell woulde haue verie fewe Tenants, the Hospitall would want Patientes, and the Surgians much worke, the Apothecaries would haue surphaling water and Potato rootes lye deade on theyr handes, the Paynters coulde not dispacthe and make away theyr Vermiglion, if tallowe faced whoores vsde it not for their cheekes, how should sir Iohns Broades men doo if wee were not?12

Unfortunately, such passages are rare in this work despite its overall success in exposing the hypocrisy of London society. The coney-catching pamphlets, in fact, achieved a sufficient level of popularity for other writers to want to imitate them.

Furthermore, as McPeek asserts:

But more important than all these pamphlets imitating Greene or influenced by him is the continuing even if
shadowy influence of Greene's coney-catchers as seen in the works of Jonson and Shakespeare.\textsuperscript{13}

The coney-catching pamphlets are rogue literature at its best, but they do not qualify as Greene's most significant contribution to the visual tradition of Tudor prose satire. That distinction belongs to \textit{A Quip for an Upstart Courtier} (1592). In this work, more than in any other of his prose satires, Greene reaffirms the satiric vision of Bosch, Bruegel, Erasmus, Rabelais and others whose works dominated the first half of the sixteenth century. Our particular interest in \textit{A Quip} centers around its dynamic employment of caricature and the grotesque as Greene, in portraying folly, successfully recaptures the bewilderingly chaotic scenes which are characteristic of Bosch and Bruegel and the grotesque caricatures so common to the huge canvas of Rabelais.

In search of narrative organizational patterns, Greene opted for the established format of the medieval dream vision coupled with the popular mode of the disputation. Pride, the subject matter of \textit{A Quip}, is well-suited to the form of the work. In his "Epistle Dedicatory", Greene offers a more poetic description of the content:

How since men placed their delights in proud lookes and braue atyre, Hospitality was left off, Neighbourhood was exeiled, Conscience was skoft at, and charitie lay frozen in the streets: how upstart Gentlemen for the maintainance of that their fathers neuer lookt after, raised rents, rackte their tenants, and imposed greate fines . . . .\textsuperscript{14}

The satire opens with the persona's symbolic dream vision which
sets the stage for the debate between Cloth breeches and Velvet breeches as to whether virtue harbors in riches or in virtuous deeds. Cloth breeches, who represents "the old and worthie customs of the Gentilitie and yeomanrie of England" according to Greene, not surprisingly argues for virtuous deeds. Velvet breeches represents the Italianate "upstart courtier" who is wedded to money and fancy clothes. Greene's satire, although it may not seem so on the surface, aims not primarily at these two "estates" but rather at the individual who is intemperate in all that he does. The debate, of course, becomes merely a false front for Greene's satiric purposes. Devices such as the lengthy selection of jurors effectively broaden the satire here as representatives of various estates wander through the narrative. Furthermore, that Greene places more emphasis on satire than on a clear-cut resolution to the debate topic is apparent when the Knight, a jury member, hurriedly decides in favor of virtuous deeds in the final moments of the disputation. The tools which help generate the satire are caricature and the grotesque, and Greene handles each as deftly as Cloth breeches handles his Italianate adversary.

Greene makes no new advances in the use of typified caricature, but in the areas of grotesque and symbolic caricature, he is clearly an innovator. For example, Greene's grotesque caricatures build in a descriptive movement from seemingly normal features to decidedly repulsive features. The following caricature of a Broker will serve as a representative illustration of Greene's technique:
As I bad him stand by there was comming amongst the valley towardes vs, a square set fellow well fed, and as briskly apparrayed, in a black taffata dublet and a spruice leather ierkin, with Christall buttons: a cloake facst a fore with velvet, and a couentry cap of the finest wooll: his face somthing Ruby blush, Cherry cheeked, like a shread of scarlet, or a little darker, like the lees of old claret wine: a nose, antem nose, purpled preciously with pearle & stone, like a counterfeit worke: and betweene the filthy reumicat of his bloud-shotten snowt, there appeared smale holes, whereat wormes heads peeped, as if they meant by their appearance to preach, and shew the antienty and antiquity of his house.

(p. 242)

Notice again that the description begins routinely, but gradually Greene ushers the reader into the grotesque reality of the caricature.

Equally visual, Greene's symbolic caricatures burst onto the scene with the same startling incoherency typical of action in a dream-like state. The chief examples of symbolic caricature in A Quip are obviously those of the Cloth and the Velvet breeches. With these, Greene plays, to absurd proportions, with the notion that "clothes make the man." London was a showcase for the most bizarre fashions; Greene takes advantage of this situation to create "epitomies" of not only two different clothing philosophies but two different life-styles as well.
In the following excerpt, Greene's persona describes the approach and manner of Velvet breeches:

Mee thought I saw an vncouth headlesse thing come pacing downe the hill, stopping so proudly with such a geometrical grace, as if some artificiall bragart had resolved to measure the world with his paces: I could not descrye it to bee a man, although it had motion, for that it wanted a body, yet seeing legges and hose, I supposed it to bee some monster nurishte vppe in those desertes: at last as it drew more nigh vnto mee, I might percieve that it was a very passing costly pair of Velvet-breeches, whose paines beeing made of the cheefest Neapolitane stuff, was drawn ouer with the best Spanish Satine, and maruellous curiously ouer whipt with gold twist, intersemed with knots of pearle . . .

(pp. 220-221)

Similarly, the appearance of Cloth breeches receives a rather complete description. Notice that Greene has his persona order the description in the same pattern as that used for Velvet breeches. The contrast in the caricatures helps clarify the lines of dispute and naturally keys the audience to the figure with whom they should side. Cloth breeches is catalogued as follows:

As soone as they were come into the vallie, I sawe they were a plaine pair of Cloth-breeches, without either welt or garde, straight to the thigh, of white Kersie, without a slop, the nether-stocke of the same, sewed too
above the knee, and only seamed with a little couentry blewe, such as in *Diebus illis* our great Grandfathers wore, when neighbour-hood and hospitality had banished pride out of England: Nor were these plaine breeches weaponlesse, for they had a good sower bat with a pike in the end, able to laie on load inough, if the hart were answereable to the weapon, . . . .

(p. 222)

The symbolic intentions here are clearly quite strong; however, the grotesque nature of these two caricatures nearly overshadows the symbolic. Indeed, one critic maintains that the total context of the disputation is grotesque.15

We have seen the technique of Greene's grotesque caricatures, and yet, this is only one facet of his affinity for the grotesque. Scattered throughout *A Quip*, for example, are numerous discussions of how particular estates perpetuate folly. For instance, the tailor and the barber are accomplices in the sanctioning of a non-vital grotesque world; one produces and sells the ostentacious Italianate clothes while the other provides absurd concoctions to enhance the appearance of up-start courtiers. Greene's most dynamic display of the grotesque, however, occurs at the very opening of the satire. It is in these first six or seven pages that a complete reaffirmation of the great sixteenth-century satiric vision manifests itself. More specifically, Greene recreates a veritable garden of earthly delights strikingly similar to Bosch's famous tryptich. The peculiar affinity between Greene and Bosch entails their
selection of vegetative symbols through which to comment on the tenuous state of mankind. What is especially noteworthy about Greene's highly visual opening scene is that it functions as a symbolic framework for the disputation and serves as an appropriate setting for the caricatured debaters.

As Greene's persona begins to recount his dream, one recalls the delicate vegetative growth in Bosch's Garden of Earthly Delights. The persona, a young and apparently intelligent gentleman, tells of wandering into a quiet vale covered with many different kinds of flowers. The young man assumes the flowers have a symbolic import:

... whose vertues taught men to be subtil and to thinke nature by her weeds warnd men to be wary & by their secret properties to checke wanton & sensual imperfections.

(p. 212)

Enticed with the multi-colored vale, the young man walks deeper into this strange setting. He then begins cataloguing the various flowers, naming them and recalling the supposed property of each. Soon one recognizes that each flower from the Daffodil to the Pansy contains a warning for those who would climb beyond their station in life. Among the flowers and herbs the young man sees Time and plays with its double meaning. Suddenly he reports that young courtiers are near the patches of Time:

Mee thought I saw diuers yong courtiers tread vpon it with high disdaine, but as they past away, an Adder
lurking there bit them by the heele that they wept: and then I might perceive certaine clowndes in clowte
goone gather it, & eate it with grendinesse: which
no sooner was sunk into their mawes, but they were meta-
morphosed, and looke as proudeyle though pesants, as if
they had beene borne to be princes companions.

(pp. 214-215)

The scene quickly fills with "upstart changelings" in bizarre, colorfull apparel strutting like peacocks. But as the persona stands musing at the bewilderling collection of men and plants, the changelings disappear. Then, like a slow-motion film, the persona turns to see a group of old men bending down among delicate little flowers called "thrift". The "old graibeards" gather the flowers, but no sooner do they than some children come and scatter and spoil the fruits of their labor.

The Bosch-like setting intensifies then as the young man turns again just in time to witness a grotesque group of young women:

. . . a troupe of nice wantons, faire women that like to Lamiae had faces like Angels, eies like stars, brestes like the golden fruit in the Hesperides, but from the middle downewards their shapes were like serpents.

(pp. 217-218)

They, in turn, seduce many young courtiers and representatives of different estates. Confused and a bit frightened by all the chaos, the young gentleman spies still more commotion at the lower end of the dale and finds himself attracted to it.
This part of the dale, however, is a barren wasteland similar to that depicted in the background of Bosch's The Last Judgement. Plant life in the dale is scarce, and the men and women there fight incessantly with one another:

I saw a great many of women vsing high wordes to their husbandes: some striuing for the breeches, others to haue the last word, some fretting they could not find a knot in a rush, others striuing whether it were wooll or haire the Goat bare: . . . .

(pp. 219-220)

The young man soon learns why, specifically, these women are so shrewish in this part of the dale:

. . . . these women that you heare brawling frowning and scolding thus haue seuerally pist on this bush of nettles, & the vertue of them is to force a woman that waters them to bee as peeuish for a whole day and as waspish as if she had bene stung in the brow with a hornet.

(p. 220)

Then, the vision fades; the young man is left alone momentarily until Cloth and Velvet breeches appear and request that he supervise their debate. The visual panorama had served its purpose. Just as the Bosch-like garden symbolically portrayed the evils of "false climbing," the disputation would demonstrate the erring ways of the pretentious Velvet breeches.

Greene had discovered the proper visual matrix for his satire.

Greene realized that his satire might strike his readers as heavily moral and didactic. He seems, as a result,
to make a special effort to invalidate such a reading. Several times he indicates directly that he wrote the work in a "merrie vaine". He obviously desires that at least a thin comic perspective must accompany satire. Moreover, in his own fascination with folly, Greene maintains that while we should advocate the old values (Cloth breeches) we might as well tolerate some of man's grotesque tendencies, for they have been part of his character from the beginning of civilization.

In *Wits Miserie* (1596), Thomas Lodge continued the brand of visually dynamic prose satire that Greene had re-introduced in his *Defence* and *A Quip*. Surely George Krapp misjudges Lodge's work when he concludes:

> Wits Miserie and the Worlds Madness (1596) contains highly elaborated but lifeless and medieval discussions of the seven deadly sins; illustrated by descriptions of typical characters.16

Pat M. Ryan offers a far better description: "*Wits Miserie* in a sense combines *Alarum's* realistic style (and inherently its subject-matter) with *A Fig for Momus*' satirical purpose."17 Part of the achievement of *Wits Miserie* is noted in Ryan's comment. That is, Lodge's satire successfully combines a realistic style with allegorical content. Lodge recognized that the grotesqueness of sin must be isolated and objectified. Allegory complements Lodge's satiric intentions perfectly because it allows reality to be placed momentarily in a vacuum.

The organizational framework of *Wits Miserie* might be described as an allegorical pageant. The subject matter is largely the traditional seven deadly sins, but Lodge gives
the tradition a few twists. To begin with, he does not focus exclusively on the seven basic sins, rather he presents a more extensive "genealogy" of each sin than had been charted before. Moreover, Lodge views each sin as a "devil incarnate". His satiric aim is to provide a crystal glass wherein Elizabethans may see and, in turn, reject these grotesque devils who have living counterparts roaming the streets of London daily. Consequently, Lodge's advice "To the Reader" is simple and straightforward:

Buy therfore this Christall, and you shall see them in their common appearance; and read these exorcisms advisedly, & you may be sure to conjure them without crossings: but if any man long for a familiar for false dice, a spirit to tell fortunes, a charme to heale diseased, this only booke can best fit him, let him but buy it, read it, and remember it, and if he be not well instructed when he hath ended it, he shall be a Deuill himselfe on my conscience without ending.\textsuperscript{18}

Furthermore, we shall find that Lodge depends on caricature and the grotesque as essential aids in performing his satiric "exorcisms".

\textit{Wits Miserie} is a showcase of caricature. Lodge's skill here lies in his ability to present a seemingly endless and varied stream of caricatured figures and yet maintain an objectified singularity with each. The caricatures themselves are generally not of one specific type, but rather they represent a marvelous synthesis of \textit{typified, symbolic} and
grotesque caricatures. In addition, Lodge employs a variety of caricaturist techniques. For example, he often reduces his satiric targets to mechanical objects as in this caricature of Boasting:

This is a lustie bruith amongst all other Divels, his beard is cut like the spier of Grantham steeple, his eies turne in his head like the Puppets in a motion, he draweth his mouth continually awry in disdaine, and what day soeuer you meet him, he hath a sundrie apparell: Among Sectaries he walketh poorly, dawbing his face with the white of Spaine to looke pale; fixing his eies still on heauen, as if in continuall contemplation; . . . .

(pp. 14-15)

Lodge effectively captures the "passion" of giving oneself over completely to boasting.

Another technique which Lodge experiments with is diminishing his subjects to animals or animalistic characteristics. The following caricature of Usury is representative of this technique:

This Vsury is iumpe of the complexion of the Baboun his father; he is haired like a great Ape, & swart like a tawny Indian, his hornes are sometime hidden in a button cap (as TH. N. described him) but now he is fallen to his flat cap, because he is chiefe warden of his company: he is narrow browd, & Squirrel eied, and the chiepest ornament of his face is, that his nose sticks in the midst like an embosment in Tarrace worke, here & there
embelished and decked with Verucae for want of purging
with Agarick; . . .

(p. 33)

This grotesque combination of animal characteristics reminds
one of the vivid Reformation caricatures. Notice, as well,
that Lodge concentrates on facial features which, again, recalls
the methods of Reformation caricaturists.

Lodge also contributes to the increasing propensity
in the 1590's to caricature fantastic clothing, especially
Spanish or Italianate tendencies in fashion. His description
of Brawling Contention typifies his efforts in this area:

. . . his common gate is as proud as a Spaniards, his
ordinary apparell is a little crownd hat with a fether
in it like a forehorse; his haires are curld, and full
of elues-locks, and nitty for want of kembing; his eies
are still staring, and he neuer lookes on a man but as
if he would eate him: his doublet is of cast Satten,
cut sometime vpon Taffata, but that the bumbast hath
eaten through it, and spotted here and there with pure
fat, to testifie that he is a good trencher man: his
common course is to go alwaies vntrust, except when hís
shirt is a washing, & then he goes woolward: and his
breeches are as desperate as himselfe, for they are past
mending: his weapons are a basket hilted sword, and a
bum dagger: . . .

(pp. 68-69)

Lodge's treatment of extravagant fashions contains an added
twist in that not only does he expose the superficiality of Italianate fashions, but he also identifies the state of decay which naturally accompanies such folly.

Yet, Lodge's caricatures are at their best when they solidify the visual impact of a highly grotesque satiric portrait. This "exorcism" of Dullness of Spirit serves as an excellent example of Lodge's artistry:

If you marke his gate in the streets, it is sausages and neats tongues: he shawmes like a cow had broke her forelegs: you shall euer see him sweating, and his landresse, I know, hath a good master of him, for the very pure grease of his handkerchiefe, is sufficient to find her candles for a winter time: his eies are full of cathars, and had he not a vent by them to discharge his head, his braines long since had sunk in a quagmire: hee hath cheekes dropsie proofe, and a nose, such a nose as neuer nose was greater: from the wast to the foot of equall proportion: his necke drowned in his head and shoulders, his body in his buttocks, and his buttocks in his calfes: all pure beepe of twenty pence a stone, a dog would not eat it.

(p. 85)

Here is the spirit, the vision, of Rabelais' grotesque caricatures reaffirmed.

Clearly, then, Lodge's use of caricature and the grotesque is intertwined. His most frequent employment of the grotesque is in combination with caricature. However, a
backdrop of the non-vital grotesque surrounds Lodge's satiric-allegorical pageant. He focuses on the grotesque evils which are perpetrated by the vast families of the seven major sins. His main argument boils down as follows: not only do these satiric figures commit evils against society, but they also break the laws of God. Lodge states his intent explicitly in reference to Usury:

But to shew the villany of this Deuill more fitly, I will not only prooue that usury is against the law of nature, but also against the law of God.

(p. 36)

At times, Lodge's satire bogs down in a perspective which is too serious or solemn. He does, however, realize that the grotesque can only be mitigated via a comic perspective. For that reason, Lodge suggests from the outset that vainglory is to be laughed at. While he is not always successful in maintaining a comic tone, he, along with Greene, reaffirms the visual tradition of Tudor prose satire. They give a new impetus to the mode. In addition, they continue the Marprelate author's contributions to the development of caricature and the grotesque as satiric devices. We have seen, then, the vision of Tudor prose reaffirmed. In the next chapter, this vision will reach its ultimate fulfillment in the prose satire of Thomas Nashe and Thomas Dekker.
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CHAPTER VI

THE FULFILLMENT OF THE VISION: NASHE AND DEKKER
Taking their cue from the Marprelate author, Greene and Lodge energetically opened up the visual possibilities of prose satire. They recognized the potential of caricature as a satiric tool, and they seized upon the paradoxical nature of the grotesque as the shaping force for their view of London society. Striving for narrative immediacy, they chose to write in prose, and, in so doing, reinforced its use as a valid medium for satire. Language, especially unadorned as opposed to Euphuistic, held their attention more readily than moral issues. Not surprisingly, then, the perspective of their better satires assumed a decidedly comic tinge rather than a solemn or homiletic one. In short, Greene and Lodge reaffirmed the dynamic quality of that satiric vision projected by Bosch, Bruegel, Erasmus, Rabelais and others. They reaffirmed that vision, not by superficial allusion, but by the same satiric weapons, namely caricature and the grotesque, which had vitalized the works of those earlier artists.

Chronologically, the prose satires of Greene and Lodge move us into the last developmental stage of Tudor prose satire. This stage, from approximately 1595 to 1610, is best represented by the prose satires of Thomas Nashe and Thomas Dekker. These two literary showmen brought the mode of prose satire to its zenith; however, because their literary tastes meshed with their restless personalities, Tudor prose satire experienced
an inevitable transformation. More specifically, the movement toward realistic description, spawned by the Marprelate author and nurtured by Greene and Lodge, culminated in the early years of the seventeenth century with the character-writers.

Nashe and Dekker mark the end of a special line of prose satirists reaching back to William Baldwin and William Bullein. As this chapter will demonstrate, the prose satires of Nashe and Dekker reveal, at once, both the limitations and ultimate sophistication of caricature and the grotesque as satiric devices; in essence, their work stands as the fulfillment of that earlier satiric vision which forms the matrix of Tudor prose satire. Paradoxically, just as that vision neared its complete development, its deterioration began. The subjective, reductive world of caricature subtly changed into the objective, accumulative world of the character. In turn, the clear, hard vision of the grotesque faded into the totally alienated vision of the absurd. The interest in language, nevertheless, remained strong, as did the belief in a comic perspective as the only rational means of coping with an absurd existence.

The key to both the golden and the waning moments of Tudor prose satire as an artistic mode lies in the puzzling personality of Thomas Nashe. His unsuccessful struggle to impose order on a universe plagued, in his view, with irreconcilable dualities paved the way for the atmosphere of alienation common in his later satires and in the satires of Dekker.
Not even Nashe's Cambridge education brought him solace, 
despite his strong affinity for the even-tempered humanist 
thought underlying the university's curriculum. Following 
the humanistic example, he grasped for the comic and the satiric 
as his cutting edge on existence; but something, as Cazamian 
observes, was deficient in his psychic profile:

... he lacked one of the psychological conditions of 
humor: the mental discipline that secures balance, the 
cool, delicate judgment without which the self-possessed 
manner of the humorist cannot be nicely managed or 
efficiently sustained.

The picture is not entirely gloomy, for this lack of balance 
and discipline allowed the true impetus behind his work to 
emerge. G. R. Hibbard characterizes that force as follows:

The real impulse behind his best writing is a delight in 
the multifarious variety of life, expressing itself in 
the form of comic exaggeration, not a passionate conviction 
about the nature of right and wrong, leading to moral 
censoriousness.

Tracing the development of Nashe's literary sensi-
tivities as well as his contribution to the sophistication 
of Tudor prose satire requires patience and, perhaps ironically, 
a healthy reserve of diffidence. With that in mind, the most 
representative of Nashe's satires are The Anatomy of Absurdity 
(1589), Pierce Penniless His Supplication to the Devil (1592), 
Have With You to Saffron Walden (1596), and Nashe's Lenten 
Stuff (1599) because they adequately reflect both the strengths 
and weaknesses of his writing. Even a cursory reading of these 
four satires reveals that, paradoxically, one source of rich-
ness, as well as paucity, is Nashe's verbal exuberance. Hibbard 
has identified other strong elements in Nashe's art:
His strength lay in his gift for improvisation, in his flair for the topical, in his unfailing interest in novelties and ingenuities of style, and in his facility for satire, parody, caricature and abuse.4

Cazamian adds to this list of strengths: "He had, moreover, a faculty of comic invention, verve, mother-wit, and an ample command of the raciest words and phrases."5 Unfortunately, Nashe lacked the Renaissance watchword, control; his chief weakness, then, was an inability to construct a meaningful order or arrangement for his spectacular linguistic displays.6

As our analysis of these representative works will evidence, Nashe contributes significantly to the tradition of caricature and the grotesque in Tudor prose satire. He relies heavily on highly visual grotesque caricatures, but his most noteworthy employment of caricature appears in the lively personal caricatures of Gabriel Harvey in Have With You to Saffron Walden. His innovations in the area of the grotesque possess even more import than those in caricature, for Nashe forces the non-vital and the vital grotesque to their satiric limits. That is, everywhere in his works, we hear the voice of one who maintains that mankind has lost touch with all that can bring redemption; everywhere we see the duality of the grotesque decaying into the ultimate disharmony of the absurd.7 It may well be that his innovative skills stem from his familiarity with the works of men such as Aretino, Agrippa and Rabelais—the same artists who created the satiric tradition in which Tudor prose satire has its roots.8

The Anatomy of Absurdity launched Nashe's career as
a prose satirist, and, clearly, the work suffers from the usual deficiencies of a beginning literary effort--mainly, lack of structure. McKerrow suggests that The Anatomy has a patchwork appearance as if cut and pasted together with bits and pieces of other works.9 The writing does, however, demonstrate that Nashe found prose to be a comfortable medium for his satire. Moreover, despite various continuity problems, The Anatomy presents an energetic, if not sporadic, satiric attack on "sundry follies of our licentious times." As the title indicates, the work purports to anatomize "absurdity," or what Nashe considers to be the wholesale giving over to folly by society. Nashe tries to focus his examination of absurdity on women, but he digresses consistently, jabbing here and there at the writing of romances or at Puritan pamphleteering.10

Caricature is not a strong element here; occasionally, though, Nashe succeeds in reducing women to protean figures with the aid of animal imagery and a concerted effort to confuse the commonplace tradition of praising the fairer sex. Probably the best caricature in the work involves "vpstart reformers of Art" and has little, if any, relation to the attacks on women. Nashe diminishes these culture-mongers to shadowy characters who are conscious only of what may become a fashionable attitude about "all excellent Arts":

But these vpstart reformers of Arts respect not so much the indagation of the truth, as the ayme of their pride, and coueting to haue newe opinions passe vunder their
names, they spende whole yeeres in shaping of sects.11
In Nashe's view, an absurd society is made of such stuff as
these "spirited princocks".

As a satiric device, the grotesque assumes a more
important role than caricature in The Anatomy. Nashe employs
the grotesque to illustrate the ugliness and repulsiveness
of folly. Lacking a comic touch at this point in his career,
he relies on the non-vital grotesque as his satiric vehicle.
A pessimistic tone pervades Nashe's observations on contem-
porary London society. The following is typical of his somber
reporting:

There is almost no man now a daies, who doth not in
hys secrete thought estimate vice after his vilenes, yet
securitie hath so blinded many, that loosing the habit
of vertue, they couet to restraine wisedome onely to their
wicked waies, concluding that in the imitation of their
actions, consists the hygh way to happines, because their
humor is such, condemning that state of life which is an
enemie to their vicious appetites.

(pp. 31-32)

This abandonment of wisdom, as Nashe goes on to emphasize,
alienates, and, ultimately, destroys the individual's ability
to contribute to the welfare of society. Regrettably, while
Nashe recognized the inability of many Puritan pamphleteers
to mitigate folly, he failed, as Hibbard maintains, to be any
more successful than they were:

Their shortcoming as 'satirists' was, as he realized,
that they were still writing what John Peter has
described as 'complaint', general attacks on general vices, couched in traditional terms and untouched by wit or humour.12

By 1592, the date of Pierce Penniless, Nashe had discovered what was needed in prose satire—the vitality of a comic perspective.

With Pierce Penniless, Nashe's satiric vision began to take a definite shape. This work, to begin with, has at least a loose narrative structure. Pierce, a remnant of the medieval Piers Plowman, grows weary of his youth and folly and decides to search for the devil. He is unsuccessful but does manage to meet the Knight of the Post (the devil's man) who agrees to read Pierce's "Supplication" to the devil. The dialogue which ensues between Pierce and the Knight of the Post provides a convenient framework for Pierce's satiric thrusts at various deadly sins of London. The Knight adds an allegorical exemplum of the Bear and the Fox to the comprehensive indictments of society. Finally, Pierce asks the Knight for a description of hell; the Knight obliges, then goes on his way after discussing how spirits can be overcome. Pierce is left alone to bewail the general corruption of society.

While Nashe presents no new satiric topics, he produces an innovative display of caricatures. For example, his portrait of the usurer is a tour de force of grotesque caricature. Pierce, as Nashe's mouthpiece, narrates:

At length (as Fortune serued) I lighted uppon an old, stradling Usurer, clad in a damaske cassocke, edged with Fox fur, a paire of trunke slops, sagging down like a
Shoomakers wallet, and a shorte thridbare gown on his 
backe, fac't with moatheaten budge; vpon his head he 
wore a filthy, course biggin, and next it a garnish of 
night-caps, which a sage button-cap, of the forme of a 
cow-sheard, ouer spread very orderly: a fat chuffe it 
was, I remember, with a gray beard cut short to the 
stumps, as though it were grimde, and a huge, woorme-
eaten nose, like a cluster of grapes hanging downewarde.

(pp. 162-163)

Hibbard's evaluation of this particular caricature is accurate:

It is a witty picture, expressing an attitude toward a 
social type in the process of describing him. Nashe's 
usurer, like his devil, is both comic and formidable at 
the same time.  

The latter part of Hibbard's statement identifies the vital 
grotesque working in the caricature—that combination of 
ludicrousness and repulsiveness.

Nashe's better caricatures, those in which the repug-
nant physical description satirically parallels the figure's 
moral deterioration, usually focus on an allegorical vice. 
Such is the case in the following grotesque caricature of 
Greediness. Once again, Nashe's description verges on stream-
of-consciousness as he vigorously strives to diminish vice 
and folly to ugly demi-devils:

... and in the inner part of this vgly habitation stands 
Greedinesse, prepared to deuoure all that enter, attyred 
in a Capouch of written parchment, buttond downe before 
with Labels of wax, and lined with sheepes fels for 
warmenes: his Cappe furd with cats skins, after the
Muscouie fashion, and all to be tasseld with Angle-hooke, in stead of Aglets, ready to catch hold of all those to whom he shewes any humblenes: for his breeches, they were made of the lists of broad cloaths, which he had by letters pattents assured him and his heyres, to the utter ouer throwe of Bowcases and Cushin makers, and bumbasted they were, like Beere-barrels with statute Marchants and forfeitures. But of al, his shooes were the strangest, which, being nothing els but a couple of crab shells, were toothd at the tooes with two sharp six-pennie nailes, that digd vp every dunghil they came by for gould, and snarld at the stones as he went in the street, because they were so common for men, women, and children to tread upon, and he could not devise how to wrest an odde fine out of any of them.

(pp. 166-167)

Nashe's monster could easily be mistaken for a grotesque creation from the canvas of Bosch or Bruegel.

As was suggested earlier, Nashe's caricatures are numerous and varied. They range from grotesque caricatures, such as those discussed above, to symbolic and personal in the animal caricatures of the Bear and the Fox, to the marvelous typified caricatures of various nationalities. In the latter category, Nashe creates with a satiric ease that must have resulted from close study of the ever-present foreigner in London. Notice his technique in this typified caricature of a Dane:
For besides nature hath lent him a flaberkin face, like one of the foure winds, and cheekes that sag like a womans dugs ouer his chin-bone, his apparel is so puft vp with bladders of Taffatie, and his back like biefe stuft with Parsly, so drawne out with Ribands and deuises, and blisterd with light sarcenet bastings, that you would think him nothing but a swarme of Butterflies, if you saw him a farre off. Thus walkes he vp and downe in his Maiestie, taking a yard of ground at every step, and stamps on the earth so terrible, as if he ment to knocke vppe a spirite, when (foule drunken bezzle) if an Englishman set his little finger to him, he falles like a hogs-trough that is set on one end.

(pp. 177-178)

Naturally, the comic perspective is present here as elsewhere in Nashe's caricatures; but, evident here too, is that devastating reductive technique through which a man becomes "a swarme of Butterflies". Our discussion, however, would be misleading if we failed to point out that while Nashe produced some brilliant caricatures, he was, at the same time, struggling for something beyond caricature. In the figure of Pierce, and perhaps the Knight of the Post, we see a concerted movement from caricature toward character. Later, Dekker will complete that movement as the classical form of the character becomes a fashionable literary device.

Nashe's handling of the grotesque in Pierce also deserves mention. We have viewed the grotesque element in
his caricatures, but it assumes a significant role in other parts of the satire as well. Nashe was equally at home with the non-vital and the vital grotesque. At times, his displeasure with the decay of London society would flare out in bitter attacks uncushioned by a comic perspective:

I need not fetch colours from other countries to paint the vglie visage of Pride, since her picture is set forth in so many painted faces here at home. What drugs, what sorceries, what oiles, what waters, what oyntments, doe our curious Dames vse to inlarge their withered beauties. Their lips are as lauishly red, as if they vsed to kisse an okerman every morning, and their cheeks suger-candied and cherry blusht so sweetly, after the colour of a newe Lord Mayors postes, . . . .

(p. 180)

Nashe could shift quickly from the somber tone of the non-vital grotesque to the comic chaos of the vital grotesque as we see in Pierce's guided tour of a shoddy alehouse:

It were lamentable to tel what misery the Rattes and Mise endured in this hard world; how, when all supply of vit- tualls failed them, they went a Boothaling one night to Sinior Greedinesse bed-chamber, where finding nothing but emptines and vastitie, they encountred (after long inquisition) with a cod-peece, wel dunged and manurred with greace (which my pinch-fart penie-father had retaind from his Bachelorship, vntill the eating of these presents). Vpon that they set, and with a courageous assault rent
it cleene away from the breeches, and then carried
it in triumph, like a coffin, on their shoulders betwixt
them.

(p. 168)
Nashe's purpose throughout has been to attack a materialist
society, aptly represented by monsters such as Greediness,
but in this work he changes his technique from that employed
in The Anatomy. Stanley Wells succinctly describes Nashe's
altered satiric technique in Pierce Penniless: "But Nashe's
method is that of a comedian rather than a moralist; an enter-
tainer rather than a preacher."¹⁶ The comic perspective would
be invaluable to Nashe in later satires; indeed, the challenge
of the Nashe-Harvey quarrel loomed on the horizon.

Have With You to Saffron Walden, the centerpiece of
the Nashe-Harvey quarrel, draws our attention next. Our pur-
pose here precludes any extended discussion of the background
of this strange literary exchange. Even McKerrow cautions us
against expecting a solid understanding of the quarrel.¹⁷
He characterizes the thrust of the several forays between the
two men as follows:

But above and before all, there was, I think, that ancient
opposition between the old and the new, between servility
and independence, between prejudice and the right of a man
to that consideration which his abilities and achievements
deserved.¹⁸

Here, of course, Nashe represents the new, independent, free-
thinking man; Gabriel Harvey serves as antithesis. The flyting,
or exchange of personal abuse, became the perfect format for
their satiric, and always verbose, battle of wits.
Have With You is essentially a reply to Harvey's Pierce's Supererogation. Nashe's satiric purpose, however, directs our attention not so much to a specific rebuttal of Harvey's tract but rather to one thesis which is proclaimed unflaggedly: Gabriel Harvey is a pedant! Harvey's insistence on formality provided Nashe with an infinite reserve of devices to parody. Letters, dedications, dialogues and any other scholarly format common to Harvey's writings received a mocking treatment from Nashe's pen. The work itself revolves around a mock-biography of Harvey occupying the center of the satire. The other distinguishable parts include an oration by Harvey and a reply to Pierce's Supererogation. Overall, Have With You is a consummate piece of prose satire. Hibbard offers a brief yet comprehensive evaluation:

... Have With You is a most accomplished piece of writing, a rich mixture of parody, literary criticism, comic biography and outrageous abuse that nevertheless hangs together by virtue of the art that is lavished on it and of the sheer joy in caricature and in linguistic extravagance and inventiveness that informs it from beginning to end.19

Our interest in Have With You primarily involves Nashe's use of caricature and the grotesque--the visual dynamics of this work. In both areas, Nashe gives us sophisticated examples couched in language aptly suited for comedy as well as satire. His main contribution to satiric caricature here rests in the excellent personal caricatures of Harvey which pervade the narrative. Nashe, seeking dramatic visual effects, goes so far as to include a ridiculous woodcut of Harvey fumbling awkwardly for belt buckle, to which he adds the following commentary:
. . . here let them behold his lively counterfet and portraiture, not in the pantofles of his prosperitie, as he was when he libeld against my Lord of Oxford, but in the single-soald pumpes of his aduersitie, with his gowne cast off, vntrussing, and readie to beray himselfe, vpon the newes of the going in hand of my booke.20

Such caricatures render it impossible for Harvey to reply without looking foolish.

Nashe perceived Harvey's most characteristic actions as being pedantic; consequently, many of the personal caricatures concern a comic exaggeration of Harvey's educational experiences. For example, his early training is described in mock-heroic fashion:

His education I wil handle next, wherein he ran through Didimus or Diomedes 6000 books of the Arte of Grammer, besides learnt to write a faire capitall Romane hand, that might well serve for a boone-grace to such men as ride with their face towards the horse taile, or set on the pillory for cousnage or periuie.

(p. 60)

A more devastating example of Nashe's satiric technique appears in the following excerpt from a letter written by Harvey's tutor to the pedant's father:

. . . he was cald nothing but Gabriell Ergo vp and downe the Colledge. But a scoffe which longer dwelt with him than the rest, though it argued his extreame pregnancie of capacitie and argute transpersing dexteritie of
Paradoxe, was that once he would needs defend a Rat
to be Animal rationale, that is, to haue as reasonable
a soule as anie Academick, because she eate and gnawd
his booke, and, except she carried a braine with her,
she could neuer digest or be so capable of learning.
And the more to confirme it, because euery one laught
at him for a common Mountebanke Ratcatcher about it,
the next rat he seazd on hee made an Anatomie of, and
read a lecture of 3 dayes long vpon euery artire or
musckle in her, and after hangd her ouer his head in his
studie, . . . .

(p. 67)

Through such skillful selection of absurdities, Nashe displays
his mastery of personal caricature.

Nashe, having recognized the advantage of a comic
perspective, concocts a vital grotesque vision which shapes
our view of Harvey. Part of that vision emanates from Harvey's
absurdly pedantic language. Nashe isolates this excerpt from
one of Harvey's orations to illustrate:

In manie extraordinarie remarkeable energeticall lines
and perfunctorie pamphlets, both in ambidexteritie and
omnidexteritie, together with matters adiophorall, haue
I disbalased my minde, & not let slip the least occasionet
of aduantage, to acquaint the world with my pregnant
propositions and resolute Aphorismes.

(p. 44)

However, Nashe's favorite springboard for grotesque satire of
Harvey lies not in language but rather in the events surrounding Harvey's birth. Indeed, Nashe's comic treatment of Harvey's entrance into this world reminds one of Rabelais' account of Pantagruel's birth. Like Rabelais, Nashe probes into the action preceding the actual arrival of his mock-hero. Here, for example, he records Harvey's mother's grotesque dream:

A third time in her sleep she apprehended and imagined that out of her belly there grew a rare garden bed, ouer-run with garish weeds innumerable, which had one slip in it of herb of grace, not budding at the toppe neither, but, like the floure Narcissus, hauing flowres onely at the roote; whereby she argur'd and conjectur'd, how euer hee made some shew of grace in his youth, when he came to the top or heighth of his best prooфе he would bee found a barrain stalk without frute.

(p. 62)

Nashe's play with the vital grotesque reaches its highest pitch several lines later when he describes Harvey's conception:

Whether it be verifiable, or onely probably surmised, I am vncertaine, but constantly vp and downe it is bruted, how he pist incke as soone as euer hee was borne, and that the first cloute he fowld was a sheete of paper; whence some mad wits giu'n to descant, euen as Herodotus held that the Aethiopians seed of generation was as blacke as inke, so haply they vnhappely wold conclude, an Incubus, in the likenes of an inke-bottle, had carnall copulation with his mother when hee was begotten.

(p. 62)
The passage is in keeping with the sexual and scatological
tendings of Nashe's world view; the satire is more than grotesque,
for here it reaches into the realm of the absurd. This latter
tendency continues in Nashe's Lenten Stuff, as does Nashe's
intense interest in language and his dedication to a vibrant
comic and visual spirit for his satire.

Nashe's Lenten Stuff is perhaps the most sophisticated
of Tudor prose satires. Certainly, for sheer delight in
parody, burlesque, and comic absurdity, the work stands without
equal in the period; moreover, it anticipates the best moments
of Swift's great prose satires. Nashe himself suggests to
us that the satire was written near the town of Yarmouth while
he was avoiding officials who were trying to arrest him for
his part in the scandalous play, *Isle of Dogs.*21 He made good
use of his time, producing a grand burlesque with the follow-
ing mock-proper title:

Nashes Lenten Stuffe, Containing, The Description and
first Procreation and increase of the towne of Great
Yarmouth in Norffolke: With a new Play neuer played before,
of the praise of the Red Herring.

(p. 147)

Lenten Stuff, as Hibbard points out,

belongs to a definite literary tradition, that of learned
trifling, the mock encomium, of which the most important
and distinguished example in the sixteenth century was
Erasmus' *Encomium Moriae.*22

It seems likely that Nashe was aware of the rhetorical
device of "red herring" in his description of his friendly
reception in Yarmouth and his mock praise of Leopold and
Solyman herring's part in the history of that town.\footnote{23}
Perhaps the work was intended as a "red herring" to draw
attention away from the infamous \textit{Isle of Dogs}. Regardless
of his purpose, Nashe creates a lively, visual, and, at times,
richly comic prose satire. He capitalizes on his past successes
with caricature and the grotesque; Leopold and Solyman are
delightful \textit{symbolic} caricatures, and their battles against
evil forces are solid examples of the \textit{vital} grotesque. But
the satiric focus of this work subordinates the role of cari-
cature and the grotesque and highlights, instead, the pure
comic absurdity of parody at its best. Throughout his career,
Nashe had attacked popular romances and love poetry which
idealized young lovers. Marlowe's Ovidian narrative, \textit{Hero}
\textit{and Leander}, epitomized such detachments from the real world.
Consequently, Nashe turned to this popular narrative and
summoned his satiric powers to "anatomize" its absurdity.

A brief sketch of this parody should clarify the comic
nature of the absurdist vision with which Nashe ended his
efforts as a prose satirist. Nashe's account of Hero and
Leander begins, not with grand rhetorical style but with a
flat, undercutting statement:

Twoo faithfull lovers they were as euerie apprentice
in Paules churchyard will tell you for your loue, and
sel you for your mony: . . . .

(p. 195)

The comic overtones blend into the narrative throughout:

By the sea side on the other side stooed Heroes tower,

(p. 196)
such an other tower as one of our Irish castles, that is not so wide as a belfree, and a Cobler cannot iert out his elbowes in; a cage or pigeonhouse, romthsome enough to comprehend her and the toothlesse trotte, her nurse, who was her onely chatmate and chambermaide: . . . .

(p. 196)

And, instead of Leander's triumphant swim across the Hellespont to meet with Hero, Nashe tells us, "hee sprawled through the brackish suddes to scale her tower, . . . ." (p. 196).

Finally, Nashe gives us the climactic moment. Leander has completed the return swim through the raging Hellespont and lies apparently dead on the shore. Hero runs frantically to greet him, and Nashe's comic perspective takes over:

Downe shee ranne in her loose night-gowne, and her haire about her eares. . . , and thought to haue kist his dead corse aliuie againe, but as on his blew iellied sturgeon lips she was about to clappe one of those warme plaisters, boystrous woolpacks of ridged tides came rowling in, and raught him from her, . . . .

(p. 198)

Nashe, to complete the comic treatment, allows the lovers to undergo metamorphosis, not into something romantically appropriate, like flowers, but into a Red Herring (Hero) and a Ling (Leander)! The lively spirit of this parody clearly reflects a change from the solemn satiric spirit of Nashe's Anatomy of Absurdity. In effect, it took ten years, from the publication of the Anatomy in 1589 to that of Lenten Stuff
in 1599, for Nashe to complete the transformation from polemicist to comic satirist—in Shakespearean terms, to move from a Malvolio to a Feste.

Thomas Dekker, the last writer in our survey of Tudor prose satire, commands attention much in the same respect as Nashe, for both are curious literary figures. Perhaps even more so than Nashe, Dekker is a paradox. E. D. Pendry has addressed that aspect of Dekker's personality:

Though he always saw himself as a gentleman and a scholar, Thomas Dekker lived in the slums, scraped a livelihood by writing for the mass media of his day, fell into poverty and spent nearly seven years in goal.24

For our purposes, Pendry's thumbnail biographical sketch is adequate. But we should keep in mind that, despite his wretched existence for many years, Dekker displays an admirable sensitivity to the important concerns of Elizabethan society. Religion, economics, even politics, occupy his mind. Like the true satirist, when Dekker looks about, he sees a wide divergence between what is and what ought to be, especially in the political or philosophical realm. Kate L. Gregg identifies what may well be the source of Dekker's social and satiric consciousness:

Political theory inherited from medieval philosophers failed to square with Elizabethan practice, and Dekker, savage and sad by turns, gropingly reached out to the new ideals of the future.25

Our discussion must shift, however, to the more specific area of Dekker's writing. Unlike Nashe, Dekker began his career as a dramatist and produced a number of plays such as The Shoemaker's Holiday and The Honest Whore (Parts I and II)
which were successful. In the waning years of Elizabeth's reign, he turned to prose satire with a similar degree of vitality if not success. We shall examine three representative prose satires: *The Wonderful Year 1603* (1603), *The Seven Deadly Sins of London* (1606), and *The Gull's Hornbook* (1609). Some clear-cut strengths, as well as weaknesses, will be readily discernible in these works. To begin with, Dekker's handling of prose deserves special notice. Hugh Walker has recognized Dekker's strength in this area:

The advantage of the greater freedom of prose is apparent: there is something fresher here and more telling, because in closer accord with fact than in any of the verse satire of the age.26

No less significant is Dekker's treatment of character, scene and dialogue. Yet, Dekker shares with Nashe an inability to organize his materials properly. Both men lack a certain objectivity toward their work; nevertheless, they are different, and Pendry qualifies that difference:

Dekker is far less egotistic, far less arrogant: the very real gusto of which he is incapable thus appears to lie in his subject instead of in himself, and it contributes to the illusion of realism.27

They are philosophically at odds. Nashe senses an existential illusion of freedom even though the universe is constantly closing in on him; Dekker envisions only a struggle in which even the illusion of freedom disappears. Or, as Pendry explains, "For Nashe the world is a cage; for Dekker it is a trap."28

On the other hand, Dekker possesses Nashe's affinity for caricature and the grotesque. Because of his emphasis on realism, Dekker employs fewer caricatures than Nashe and relies
more on the *symbolic* and the *typified* when he turns to
caricature as a satiric device. Often, the limited scope
of caricature does not satisfy Dekker's needs for a more com-
plete view of an individual. As a result, he begins to shift
from the subjective vision of caricature to the objective
vision of the character. This movement becomes especially
evident in Gull's Hornbook; Nashe does not make such a transi-
tion. In contrast, Dekker's use of the grotesque is quite
similar to Nashe's in type and intensity. Both find the
*vital* grotesque more potent as a satiric device than the
*non-vital*. Moreover, both produce satires which are highly
visual, and both accept the necessity for a comic perspective
in satire. Indeed, Cazamian maintains:

> In Thomas Dekker we have a genuine master of humor, with
> a sure grasp of its method, no less than of its spirit,
> and a range that took in not only its broad basis of
> observation, realism, and tolerance, but many, though
> not all, of the higher and subtler shades.29

Furthermore, it is apparent that both Dekker and Nashe reach
a similar conclusion as to man's dilemma--man lives in an
irreconcilably alien universe which creates in him a feeling
of absurdity.

The Elizabethan era underwent several "cultural shocks"
sufficient to reinforce Dekker's sense of alienation. The
year 1603 was particularly momentous with the death of Elizabeth,
the accession of James, and a horrible epidemic of the plague.
Dekker addresses himself to these events in *The Wonderful
Year 1603*, a loosely organized pamphlet the first part of
which laments the death of Elizabeth and records the accession
of James. This initial section contains no satire, but the final two-thirds of the work attacks the basic insensitivity of Londoners to their fellow men and the unreasonableness of those who cannot accept death as the natural culmination of life. The horrors of the pestilence and the tragi-comic situations which befall the fugitives of the city are mirrored in lively, but often gruesome, illustrative anecdotes. However, the satire lacks resolution, and, structurally, the ending breaks off too sharply to be effective.

The artistic merit of The Wonderful Year evidences itself in the visual scenes and grotesque, jest-book tales. Although Dekker paints a colorful portrait of Death and his terrifying army and portrays London symbolically as "forsaken like a Louer, forlorne like a widow," caricature does not assume an important role here. On the other hand, the grotesque, especially the vital grotesque, serves Dekker's satiric purpose effectively. With the grotesque, he could single out man's insensitivity and presumption. His vignettes of London in the grasp of the plague often leap out at us with a combined solemn and comic perspective. For example, Dekker reports the strange marriage ceremony of two haughty lovers:

... the Priest fell to his business: the holy knot was a tying, but he that should fasten it, coming to this, In sicksnesse and in health, there he stopt, for sodainely the bride tooke holde of, in sicknesses, for in health all that stoode by were in feare shee should neuer be kept.30
The melodramatic tension heightens, the plague takes its toll, and Dekker responds tongue-in-cheek: "Death rudely lay with her, and spoild her of a maiden-head in spite of her husband" (p. 129).

In another comically grotesque anecdote, Dekker tells of a drunkard, oblivious to the misery around him, who encounters a trench filled with plague victims:

This setter-vp of Malt-men, being troubled with the staggers, fell into the selfe-same graue, that stood gaping wide open for a breakfast next morning, and imagining (when he was in) that he had stumbled into his owne house, and that all his bedfellowes (as they were indeede) were in their dead sleep, ... .

(p. 136)

Dekker sharpens the comic element in relating what transpires the next morning when the sexton walks by the trench:

... the Sexton smelling a voice, (feare being stronger than his heart) beleueed verily some of the coarses spake to him vpon which, feeling himselfe in a cold sweat, tooke to his heeles, ... .

(p. 137)

Our smiles at this "jest" fade a bit as Dekker undercuts the fun by reporting that the sexton went mad and apparently died.

Emblematic of Dekker's vital grotesque technique is the brief tale of the drunken tinker who is called on to bury a plague victim. The tinker, unlike most of his compatriots, does not fear death, thus he agrees to the task:
. . . he quickly tumbled his man into the graue, hid
him ouer head and eares in dust, bound vp his cloathes
in a bundle, & carying that at the end of his staffe on
his shoulder, with the purse of seuen pounds in his hand,
backe againe comes he through the towne, crying aloud,
Haue yee any more Londoners to bury: . . . .

(p. 145)

We are caught in a crossfire of reactions; the tinker is comic
in a grisly sense, and yet he takes advantage of the plague
financially. Dekker seems to abhor such individuals; but,
he recognizes that we cannot stand too much reality, that
such half-comic, half-satiric incidents may purge our night-
marish recollections of the horrors he has reported. In other
words, Dekker achieves success on two fronts: a satire on
man's insensitivity (of which the reader becomes a part) and
his obstinace in the face of death and an absurdist vision
of what it is like to live through such a catastrophe. Pendry
offers us a good summary of Dekker's achievement:

Around him stretched human devastation comparable to
that from the fall-out of an atomic attack. But he could
stillreach for his pen and record not just horror and
panic, but the foolish and ludicrous as well--all were
'wonderful' (he never entirely loses sight of his title). 31

The Seven Deadly Sins of London, composed three years
later, broadens Dekker's satiric perspective to encompass
general attacks on the seven basic sins which he believes
have triumphed over London society. The work is structured
on the traditional principle of the seven deadly sins. Hunt
describes the form as a "seven-fold pageant" in which each
sin enters the city victoriously in a magnificent, yet decadent, coach.\textsuperscript{32} Dissatisfied with the traditional scheme, Dekker presents a new wrinkle or two in the list of seven deadlies; his grouping includes Politick Bankruptisme, Lying, Candle-Light, Sloth, Apishnesse, Shaving, and Crueltie. While Dekker does not opt for a totally comic perspective here, Price maintains correctly that "The satire though at times caustic, is generally gay rather than bitter."\textsuperscript{33} Moreover, much of the success of Dekker's satire emanates, once again, from his use of caricature and the grotesque.

From the outset, it should be emphasized that Dekker's caricatures reveal a discernible step in the transition from caricature to character in Tudor prose satire. His taste for realism begins to turn him away from the subjective description of caricature and toward the objective description of the character. Benjamin Boyce provides a similar explanation in noting that Dekker's observations of human nature were "too intense and his artist's eye too keen to allow him to rest in either definition or abstraction."\textsuperscript{34} However, during this transition Dekker manages to produce several brilliant typified caricatures. One of his best is that of the Politician, "Politick Bankrupt,":

In words, is he circumspect: in lookes, graue: in attire, ciuill: in diet, temperate: in company affable; in his affaires, serious: and so cunningly dooes he lay on these colours, that in the end he is welcome to, and familiar with the best. . . . Sometimes hee's a Puritane,
he sweares by nothing but Indeede, or rather does not sweare at all, and wrapping his crafty Serpents body in the cloake of Religion, he does those acts that would become none but a Diuell. Sometimes hee's a Protestant, and deales iustly with all men, till he see his time, but in the end he turns Turke. 35

Thus, in a few masterful strokes, the Politician is reduced to a series of meaningless actions.

Another excellent example of Dekker's typified caricatures appears in the satiric sketch of Apishness:

... for hees a feirse, dapper fellow, more light headed then a Musitian: as phantastically attyred as a Court Leaster: wanton in discourse: lasciuous in behauiour: iocund in good companie: nice in his trencher, and yet he feedes verie hungerly on scraps of songs: he drinkes in a Glasse well, but vilely in a deepe French-bowle: yet much about the yeare when Monsieur came in, was hee begotten, betweene a French Tayler, and an English Court-Seamster.

(p. 57)

Several other sophisticated caricatures emerge from Dekker's satiric pageant; nevertheless, the interminable movement from caricature to character continues and finds even more depth of expression in The Gull's Hornbook.

Dekker's handling of the grotesque in Seven Deadly Sins falls short in sophistication of his caricaturist technique. He relies heavily on the non-vital grotesque, and
his approach recalls that of earlier Tudor prose satirists:
... for I will into so large a field single every one of them, that thou and all the world shall see their
ugliness, for by seeing them, thou mayst avoid them, and
by avoiding them, be the happiest and most renowned of
Cities.

(p. 15)

His technique resembles Lodge's in Wits Miserie in that he
focuses on the grotesque consequences which will befall London
if such sins as Lying and Cruelty are allowed to exist.
Dekker's improvement over Lodge comes largely from the more
apparent comic perspective which he retains throughout.
Even so, Dekker's comic spirit achieves vitality only in
Gull's Hornbook.

Some literary works of the Elizabethan-Jacobean period
demand our attention if for no other reason than because they
furnish insight into the world of Shakespeare's theater.
Dekker's Gull's Hornbook fits into that category because of
its description of the clientele which probably frequented
the theatres. However, Dekker's best known non-dramatic work
also merits notice as sustained piece of prose satire. Having
put aside the shock tactics of The Wonderful Year and the
medievalism of Seven Deadly Sins, Dekker turns to a new mixture
of comedy and satire in Gull's Hornbook. This more sophisti-
cated format borrows heavily from Friedrich Dedekind's Grobianus
as Dekker himself admits.36 Unfortunately, "Grobianism", with
its pungent indictments of uncomely manners may have suited
German tastes, but Londoners were simply not ready for it. Consequently, Dekker is forced to scramble a bit in his comment "To the Reader":

This Tree of Guls was planted long since, but not taking roote, could never bear till now. It hath a relish of Grobianisme, and tastes very strongly of it in the beginning: the reason thereof is, that, having translated many booke of that into English Verse, and not greatly liking the Subject, I altered the Shape, and of a Dutchman fashioned a meer Englishman. It is a Table wherein are drawne sundry Pictures: the cullors are fresh; if they be well laid on, I think my workmanship well bestowed: if ill, so much the better, because I draw the pictures onely of Guls.

(p. 199)

A lack of unity and structure naturally results from Dekker's efforts to find the proper subject matter. The final product is a courtesy book and an entertaining satire of manners bathed in a lightly comic perspective. Following Dekker's precepts, any gallant can learn how to behave in nearly any situation.

Dekker's realistic language and relaxed moral tone add to the work, but, once again, the dynamic quality of this, our final example of Tudor prose satire, owes much to caricature and the grotesque. The affinity for realism no doubt influenced Dekker's movement from caricature to character; even so, Gull's Hornbook does not contain characters in the
pure sense as they appear in the collections of Overbury and Hall. On this same issue, Boyce gives his appraisal of Gull's Hornbook:

It is a parody conduct book, but its main difference from an Overburian sketch of the same social type is that Dekker uses a chapter for what a Character would put in a sentence. 37

Moreover, if one examines Dekker's sketches closely, he will discover that they possess more of the reductive technique of caricature than the accumulating technique of the character. The image he creates is nearly always of the gallant as having been comically diminished to a series of ridiculous actions.

Dekker's best caricature must surely be that of the gallant as "play-goer". Having paid his admission, the gallant is advised to sit in one of the few chairs on stage. Dekker, tongue-in-cheek, explains the benefits of the gallant's seat:

By sitting on the stage, you have a signd patent to engrosse the whole commodity of Censure; may lawfully presume to be a Girder; and stand at the helme to steere the passage of scaenes; yet no man shall once offer to hinder you from obtaining the title of an insolent, ouer-weening Coxcombe.

(p. 248)

The lightly satiric tone heightens.

By sitting on the stage, you may (without travelling for it) at the very next doore aske whose play it is: and, by that Quest of Inquiry, the law warrants you to auoid much mistaking: if you know not e owthor, you may raile against him: and peraduenture so behaue your selfe, that
you may enforce the Author to know you.

(pp. 248-249)

With only a moment or two of digression, the comic recommendations continue ad absurdum for several pages. In essence, Dekker's achievement is having created an extended caricature of the gallant.

The grotesque as a satiric device plays only an incidental role in Gull's Hornbook. Occasionally, Dekker's mock-advice contains a touch of the grotesque. Typical of such instances is the following counsel:

... let thy haire grow thick and bushy like a forrest, or some wildernesse; lest those sixe-footed creatures that breede in it, and are Tenants to that crowneland of thine, bee hunted to death by euery base barbarous Barber; and so that delicate, and tickling pleasure of scratching, be utterly taken from thee ....

(p. 224)

The matrix for Dekker's use of both caricature and the grotesque and the impetus for his highly visual satire are organically intertwined in his comic perspective. By 1609, he had gained a genuine respect for the power that a comic spirit could lend to satire. His mock-invocation to Rusticity at the opening of Gull's Hornbook testifies to the comic tone he had come to believe in as a literary device:

Helpe me (thou midwife of vnmannerslinesse) to be deliuered of this Embryon that lies tumbling in my braine: direct me in this hard and dangerous voyage, that being safely
arrived on the desired shore, I may build up Altars to thy Vnmatcheable Rudeness; the excellency whereof I know will be so great, that Grout-nowles and Moames will in swarmes fly buzzing about thee.

(pp. 208-209)

Here, one can hear echoes of the satiric vitality common to the best works of Greene and Nashe as well as those of Erasmus and Rabelais.

With Gull's Hornbook, Tudor prose satire reaches the end of its development. The satiric weapons, caricature and the grotesque, which gave the mode its dynamic quality were no longer as readily apparent. Caricature was giving way to the literary vogue of the character, and the grotesque was evolving into an absurdist vision. It is a bit ironic, in retrospect, that Nashe and Dekker, the satirists who brought the mode to its most sophisticated level, should have fostered the changes that ultimately transformed the mode. Nevertheless, Nashe and Dekker fully recaptured the vision of visual artists like Bosch and Bruegel. Moreover, through their example, realism became a prime characteristic of Tudor prose satire; objectivity replaced subjectivity in the satirist's view of men and society. It is not surprising, then, that the new prose writers--Hall, Overbury, and Earle--turned to the character as their mode of expression. And since the character did not require satire to be effective, the mode of prose satire waned during the final years in which Dekker was writing. It was not until the Age of Swift that prose satire would
once again assume the liveliness and degree of sophistication that it acquired during the Tudor period.
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CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION
An interest in order and analytical thinking manifested itself in literature throughout the Tudor period. The reign of James I, as Benjamin Boyce concludes, did not allay the appeal of Aristotelian logic:

Aristotle continued to offer comfort, not yet dubbed false, to those who wished to believe in order and permanence.

The result is that wherever one looks in publications of Shakespeare's day, classification of men greets one.  

Tudor prose satire provided an entertaining outlet for such categorizing tendencies, but by 1610 character-writing had assumed the dominant position held by prose satire as a mode of classification. That is, through the efforts of Joseph Hall, Thomas Overbury and John Earle, character-writing became the preferred vehicle for literary prose.

As a mode, the character displayed much more latitude than prose satire; for example, it did not require satire to present effective analytical descriptions. Indeed, the character opened up the rhetorical possibilities of description for the sake of description; in short, the mode had few limitations in purpose or scope. Consequently, the rise of the character contributed to the demise of Tudor prose satire. A more significant cause, however, evidenced itself in the preceding chapter where we examined the manner in which Nashe and Dekker brought the mode of prose satire to its full development as well as to its ultimate deterioration. By focusing
on their satiric techniques, we were able to detect the subtle transition of prose satire to character-writing.

Despite our emphasis throughout on technique rather than content, we have not defined the "style" of Tudor prose satire, nor have we identified the characteristics of a "grotesque" prose style. The simple reason is that neither exists. We have found that although the more realistic prose of Greene, Lodge, Nashe and Dekker readily lends itself to the grotesque, no consistent stylistic pattern occurs which can be termed "grotesque". In other words, a variety of styles will accommodate caricature and the grotesque. One very significant discovery of this present study is that the grotesque, as a satiric device in literature, transcends style. Yet, caricature and the grotesque are not ornamental; in Tudor prose satire, they clearly function as satiric tools.

Our critical reading of Tudor prose satire has led to other findings which need to be reviewed briefly. In sketching the development of Tudor prose satire, we have found, above all, that the "dynamics" of this mode, its remarkable visual texture, owes a tremendous debt to caricature and the grotesque. Furthermore, our analysis of representative satires traced the mode as it shifted from an interest in morals to an interest in language and from a solemn perspective to a comic perspective. The chronological approach allowed us to chart those changes.

This study began with a basic definition of Tudor prose satire and a brief delineation of the differences between
the prose and formal verse satires of the period. Structure, clearly evident in the formal verse satire but sadly lacking in the prose, qualifies as the most readily apparent difference between the two modes. However, the most significant difference rests in the highly visual nature of the prose satire with its reliance upon caricature and the grotesque; the formal verse satire relies on those devices much less. Moreover, we have seen that the prose satire of the period employs four types of caricature, typified, personal, symbolic, and grotesque, and two varieties of the grotesque: non-vital and vital.

In addition, we have determined that the visual dynamics of Tudor prose satire were not created in a vacuum. Reaching back in time and spirit, the mode evidences an affinity with an early sixteenth-century tradition of visual and written satire which utilizes caricature and the grotesque. More specifically, the monstrous creations of Bosch and Bruegel seem to possess a kinship with the equally absurd concoctions in the prose satire of Greene, Lodge, and Dekker. Reformation graphic caricature and the puzzling Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum find a kindred spirit in the Marprelate Tracts. Erasmus' ironic Praise of Folly and Rabelais' masterpieces of comic grotesque, Gargantua and Pantagruel, share both visual and verbal characteristics with the representative satires of Nashe.

But the visual sophistication of writers such as Nashe and Greene did not exist in the earlier Tudor prose satire. As the mode began its slow evolution around 1550, the prominent
literary figures, men like Wyatt and Surrey, chose not to write prose satire. As a result, Tudor prose satire had, as its first disciples, literary unknowns such as William Baldwin, Thomas Harman, and William Bullein. Although their works hardly qualify as good literature, these satirists experimented with caricature and the grotesque, and they began to recognize the value of a comic perspective in satire. Unfortunately, the prose satire which immediately followed these writers did not enhance the development of the mode.

Suffering the inherent ills of polemical literature, the prose satire of the early 1580's brought the mode to the brink of stagnation. At a timely moment, the witty author of the Marprelate Tracts appeared on the scene to poke fun at the Episcopates, and, at the same time, revive prose satire through his lively, innovative, caricaturist techniques and his use of the vital grotesque. Besides bringing Tudor prose satire out of its polemical phase, he also set the stage for a reaffirmation of the satiric vision of Bosch, Bruegel, Erasmus, Rabelais and others. By 1590, then, prose satire had shaken the negative effects of Euphuistic prose; an interest in language rather than morals began to present itself more frequently.

At the beginning of the 1590's, Robert Greene, an underworld figure himself, rekindled the spirit of rogue satire which had been popularized earlier by Gilbert Walker and Thomas Harman. Greene, sensing the weaknesses of those early satirists, created a comic perspective for his highly visual
satires of contemporary London. Thomas Lodge, who turned to an allegorical framework for his major prose satire, followed Greene in producing sophisticated prose satire heavily dependent upon caricature and the grotesque. The work of Greene and Lodge, in turn, paved the way for the final developmental phase of Tudor prose satire.

With a significant tradition of prose satire behind them, Nashe and Dekker managed to carry the mode to the full realization of its potential and to fulfill the rich satiric vision with which Tudor prose satire shares a visual affinity. Verbal exuberance and comic vitality were mainstays for Nashe and Dekker. In their hands, the satiric tools of caricature and the grotesque were wielded more skillfully than by any other Tudor prose satirists. Indeed, through their efforts, these satiric devices were not just improved, they were transformed; caricature grew into character, and the grotesque dissipated into the absurd.

Admittedly, our goal has been to emphasize the strengths of Tudor prose satire rather than its weaknesses; however, it is not necessary to apologize at length for the mode because an understanding of Tudor prose satire has definite value. For example, our view of both characterization and the general visual quality of Shakespearean and Jonsonian comedy might be enhanced through this present study of the prose satire of their time. Moreover, the nature of Swift's prose satire, perhaps the finest of all English prose satire, might be comprehended more readily if one is aware of the prose satire
which preceded such works as *A Modest Proposal* and *Gulliver's Travels*. But our immediate aim has been to facilitate interpretation and reveal new meaning for the mode of Tudor prose satire; in short, to elucidate its artistic integrity. Above all, Tudor prose satire should be appreciated in the larger scheme of artistic modes which flourished during the period, for here is a rich and vital mode deserving to be read, not just for its content but for its literary technique as well.
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