

This is the accepted version of the following article: Rebecca Hasler, “‘Tossing and turning your booke upside downe’”: *The Trimming of Thomas Nashe*, Cambridge, and Scholarly Reading’, *Renaissance Studies*, DOI 10.1111/rest.12504, Copyright © 2018, Wiley. The article has been published in final form at <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/14774658>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with the wiley self-archiving policy [<https://authorservices.wiley.com/author-resources/journal-authors/licensing-open-access/open-access/self-archiving.html>].

‘TOSSING AND TURNING YOUR BOOKE UPSIDE DOWNE’: *THE TRIMMING OF THOMAS*

*NASHE*, CAMBRIDGE, AND SCHOLARLY READING

REBECCA HASLER

The 1597 pamphlet *The Trimming of Thomas Nashe* launches a powerful attack on Thomas Nashe’s style and persona. Presenting himself as ‘tossing and turning [Nashe’s] booke upside downe’, the pamphlet’s author draws upon his close reading of Nashe’s *Have With You to Saffron-Walden* (1596).<sup>1</sup> Throughout *The Trimming*, the physical processes of reading — the ‘tossing and turning’ of pages — are aligned with a skilful critical analysis that deconstructs Nashe’s text in order to condemn and parody it. The central discursive function of reading in *The Trimming* is linked to the pamphlet’s Cambridge origins. As this article will demonstrate, *The Trimming* was published by a Cambridge bookseller for an audience of Cambridge scholars. Within this scholarly community, there was a fashion for critical reading; throughout the Harvey-Nashe Quarrel, and in dramatic works like the *Parnassus* plays, Cambridge scholars used close reading as a means of expressing their superiority to London’s professional theatres and print market. This article contends that by reading *The Trimming* within this scholarly context, it is possible not only to reassess this long-neglected pamphlet, but also to elucidate the processes by which scholars presented their literary consumption as distinct from the uneducated commercialism of the London book trade.

*The Trimming* takes its cue from *Have With You*, the final offering in Nashe’s pamphlet feud with Gabriel Harvey. In a lengthy prefatory epistle, Nashe dedicated his book to a Cambridge barber-surgeon named Richard Lichfield. He enlisted Lichfield’s expertise in his attack on Harvey, declaring that ‘trimm’d hee must bee’.<sup>2</sup> In *The Trimming*, Lichfield

took up the mantle but turned his cloak. Claiming to be offended by Nashe's satirical dedication, Lichfield chooses, instead, to 'trim' Nashe (B1r). Where Nashe had encouraged Lichfield to 'phlebothomize' Harvey, and conduct an 'Anatomie' (3.9; 3.17), Lichfield ultimately promises that 'because we cannot phlebotamize [Nashe], to anatomize him' (G4r). Lichfield adopts Nashe's conceit of the satirical barber-surgeon, as well as his rhetorical and presentational strategies, in order to turn them against him. In doing so, he demonstrates his close reading of Nashe's works, as well as his ability to emulate Nashe's distinctive style. More broadly, he situates himself as a critical reader, and presents his own literary activity as rooted in analytical reading.

In previous scholarship, *The Trimming* has been discussed primarily as a footnote to the Harvey-Nashe Quarrel.<sup>3</sup> Although the pamphlet does, indeed, respond to the feud, it can most informatively be read in a broader context of Cambridge literary consumption that incorporates — but is not limited to — the works of Nashe and Harvey. Harvey, Nashe, and Lichfield were all associated with the University of Cambridge. Nashe was an alumnus of St John's College, and had visited Cambridge during the composition of *Have With You*. Harvey had studied at Christ's College, before becoming a fellow of Pembroke Hall and later Trinity Hall. Lichfield was the barber-surgeon of Trinity College. Although, as is discussed below, it cannot be proven that *The Trimming* was written by Lichfield, the pamphlet capitalizes on its association with Cambridge personalities. In addition, its publisher — Philip Scarlet — was based in Cambridge and catered to the Cambridge market. *The Trimming of Thomas Nashe*, a text that makes extensive reference to the Cambridge literati of its day, was produced for Cambridge scholars.

By examining *The Trimming*'s emphasis on close reading as linked to the pamphlet's Cambridge connections, this article will contend that discerning processes of critical reading served to reinforce the sense of community amongst university scholars. Recent scholarship

has demonstrated that students lived, socialized, and studied in an exclusive setting. Christopher Marlow has argued that scholarly identity was founded on a sense of ‘scholarly masculinity’ that was bolstered through cultural activities that emphasized ‘the in-group status of the spectators’.<sup>4</sup> In similar terms, Michelle O’Callaghan has argued that these displays ‘incorporated performers and audience into a humanist community whose bonds of association were those of education’.<sup>5</sup> Scholars felt a sense of camaraderie that distinguished them from their less educated social inferiors.

The bonds between scholars were reinforced by their shared anxieties regarding their future prospects. In particular, there were more university graduates than available jobs for scholars. As a result, for Laurie Ellinghausen, ‘the changing economic conditions and shifting cultural conceptions of learning during the late Tudor period witnessed graduates who became colorful and controversial London literary figures’.<sup>6</sup> The London print market seemed to provide opportunities for graduates to use their scholarship to earn a living. Alexandra Halasz has suggested that, despite ‘the learned man’s anxiety about the proliferation in the marketplace of discourses hitherto more or less restricted to sites of high literacy’, graduates adapted print into a medium for performances of scholarship.<sup>7</sup> Similarly, Nandini Das and Katharine Wilson have demonstrated the extent to which prose romance was indebted to the circumstances and perspectives of graduates.<sup>8</sup> These studies have elucidated the ways in which graduate writers navigated the early modern print market. What has yet to be fully explored, however, is the extent to which their interventions in print remained embedded in a culture of scholarly reading, and were marketed to a scholarly audience.

Critics of student drama have shown that, in addition to their community-building function, plays articulated a scholarly response to social change and to the rise of the professional theatre. Sarah Knight has suggested that scholarly drama reflects ‘shared

professional and epistemological concerns', including over the rise of the graduate writer.<sup>9</sup> Similarly, Andrew Gurr has suggested that the 'social prejudice' of student drama is in part a response to scholars' jealousy regarding the success of their social inferiors in the professional theatre.<sup>10</sup> Just as student drama articulated an anxious superiority to the professional theatre, *The Trimming* demonstrates the ways in which a scholarly community used close reading to engage with — while expressing superiority to — the London book trade. Writing in 1989, Lorna Hutson remarked that 'it is important for us to appreciate just how great is the creative capacity and freedom attributed by Nashe to the reader of any discourse'.<sup>11</sup> Similar claims for Nashe's model of active readership have been made, more recently, by Georgia Brown and Per Sivefors.<sup>12</sup> Yet, this emphasis on critical reading is not unique to Nashe. Rather, it is rooted in the responses of Elizabethan students who sought to demonstrate their superiority to less educated readers by analysing, commenting upon, and parodying the texts that they read. University education placed great emphasis on disputation, encouraging students to gain the skills in critical listening and persuasive writing that are foregrounded in scholarly texts.<sup>13</sup> Scholarly readers engaged in displays of critical reading that demonstrated their educational training and superior social status.

Focusing on *The Trimming of Thomas Nashe*, this article will reveal the cultural practices of scholarly reading, its community-building effect, and its influence on the Elizabethan book trade. First, it will examine the bibliographical history of *The Trimming*, proving that the pamphlet originated in Cambridge. It will then explore how the pamphlet's rhetorical strategies demonstrate its author's close reading of Nashe. Finally, it will relate this close reading to the scholarly reading enacted on the Cambridge stage in the three *Parnassus* plays, and to the broader careers of university-educated writers like Nashe. In doing so, it will reveal that certain books were actively marketed to students, and that it was through their

reading, as much as writing, that scholars sought to create a space for themselves as discerning participants in literary culture.

### I. *THE TRIMMING OF THOMAS NASHE* IN CAMBRIDGE

The Harvey-Nashe Quarrel was rooted in Cambridge. Harvey had long been a figure of mockery in Cambridge, with Edward Forset's Latin play *Pedantius* (1581) satirizing his character. In *Have With You*, Nashe promises to 'fetch [Harvey] aloft in *Pedantius*, that exquisite Comedie', praising Forset's depiction of him as a 'firling finicaldo fine School-master' (3.80). Nashe reiterates the suggestion that Harvey's ridiculous behaviour was 'a generall *Item* to all the Universitie', and consequently that there was a scholarly audience for jokes at his expense (3.73). Nashe's writings on Harvey are, indeed, littered with allusions to Cambridge life: he describes Harvey's greed at college dinners, as well as the many debts that he owed Cambridge businessmen (3.92–5). In addition, he mocks Harvey's Italianate appearance, and particularly 'his love-lockes & his great ruffes and pantofles' (3.137). In her study of early modern barber-surgery, Eleanor Decamp has demonstrated that *The Trimming* draws upon the role of barber-surgeons in maintaining vain appearances and removing bodily waste.<sup>14</sup> In addition, Lichfield was specifically associated with Cambridge. Given Nashe's consistent portrayal of Harvey as a figure mocked by students and obsessed with his appearance, it is entirely comprehensible that he enlisted a college barber-surgeon to join in his attack.

Capitalizing on the professional identity of its purported author, *The Trimming* foregrounds its links with the university. On the reverse of the title page, the reader is presented with an indication of the target audience: a Latin motto addressed 'To the Learned'

is contrasted with an English message ‘To the simple’ (A1v). Following this, an epistle ‘To the Gentle Reader’ quickly establishes the connection with Nashe’s *Have With You* and the apparent author’s identity as a Cambridge barber-surgeon (A2r). Elsewhere, the pamphlet expects that its readers understand Latin and recognize the Greek alphabet, appreciate a discussion of the signification of ‘anima’, and are familiar with what ‘said *Diogenes* to the men of *Minda*’ (C3r; C2r; A3v). The implied reader of *The Trimming* is ‘learned’ and familiar with a quarrel between Cambridge personalities: he is a university scholar.

The impression of scholarly readership is furthered by the circumstances of the text’s publication. To date, scholars have either neglected to comment upon the identity of the pamphlet’s publisher, named as Philip Scarlet on the title page, or dismissed him as ‘fictitious’.<sup>15</sup> Although there was no London stationer of this name, in 1571 a Philip Scarlet was born to a Cambridge bookseller of the same name (who died in 1582).<sup>16</sup> It is probable that this Philip Scarlet followed his father, uncle, and brother into the book trade. Indeed, his name is frequently associated with Cambridge book-selling. John Russell’s *The Two Famous Pitcht Battels of Lypsich and Lutzen*, an account in heroic verse of the Thirty Years’ War, was printed in 1634 ‘by the Printers to the *Universitie* of Cambridge’, and ‘sold by Philip Scarlet’.<sup>17</sup> In addition, a copy of Stephanus Rodericus Castrensis’ *De universa mulierum medicini* (1603) held by St John’s College Library is inscribed ‘For Mr. Phillip Scarlet of Camb. Bookseller’, and the college’s records show that Scarlet was paid for several leather bindings between 1627 and 1628.<sup>18</sup> Although the 1597 publication of *The Trimming* pre-dates all other references to Scarlet’s Cambridge activity, he is the most likely candidate for publisher.

It is probable that Scarlet sold *The Trimming* in Cambridge, having commissioned its printing in London. This is in keeping with early modern print practices, where those who undertook the publishing of a book often employed someone else to print it.<sup>19</sup> Although no

printer is named in *The Trimming* (Fig. 1), the title page bears a printer's mark used by Edward Allde. For example, the mark appears alongside Allde's name on Thomas Kyd's *Tragedye of Solyman and Perseda*, which was probably published in 1592 (Fig. 2).<sup>20</sup> Allde had a prolific career, and usually printed books for other stationers. It is probable that he printed *The Trimming* in London at the request of Philip Scarlet, a Cambridge bookseller.

*The Trimming* was entered into the Stationers' Register on 11 October 1597 by the stationer Cuthbert Burby.<sup>21</sup> Although Burby's name does not appear on the pamphlet, it would seem that he was responsible for selling it in London. The 1597 publication of *The Trimming* falls within a two-year period during which Burby and Allde worked together on at least four other occasions, the most frequent rate of collaboration in their careers. In this period, Allde printed for Burby a news pamphlet, two histories, and a theological translation by Francis Meres, a 'Master of Artes, & student in divinity'.<sup>22</sup> Although there is no known connection between Scarlet and Burby, Burby's working relationship with Allde at this time explains his involvement in *The Trimming*. In addition, Burby frequently published books by university graduates. He published *The Unfortunate Traveller* (1594) and *Nashes Lenten Stuffe* (1599), both by Nashe. In addition, he printed Meres's *Palladis tamia, or Wits Treasury* (1598), an anthology of literary quotations, as well as works by university-educated writers including Robert Greene, Thomas Lodge, and John Lyly. That it was Burby who registered *The Trimming* corroborates the pamphlet's scholarly credentials. It was often financially necessary for Cambridge publishers to sell some copies in the capital.<sup>23</sup> That *The Trimming* was sold by a stationer known for his interest in scholarly writing further indicates the Cambridge origins of *The Trimming*. Although some copies were retained for sale in London, the pamphlet's primary audience consisted of the scholars who frequented Scarlet's Cambridge shop.

The Cambridge publication of *The Trimming* raises questions regarding the pamphlet's authorship. Despite the three occasions on which Richard Lichfield's name is signed, the author was long assumed to be Harvey, with one critic writing as late as 2012 that *The Trimming* was 'at least purportedly by Harvey'.<sup>24</sup> It has, however, been suggested that Lichfield himself could have been the author. In a 1997 essay for *Notes and Queries*, Benjamin Griffin observed the clear derivation of the pseudonymous author 'Richardo de Medico Campo' from the Latin 'medico' (leech) and 'campo' (field), as well as an unquestioning reference to 'Leichfildes trimming of Nash' in *The Pilgrimage to Parnassus* (1598/9).<sup>25</sup> Furthermore, frequent references to the paraphernalia of barber-surgery, alongside first person claims such as that the author 'never till now was acquainted with the presse', and is 'but an adujncte [sic] to a Scholler', corroborate the plausibility of Lichfield's authorship (D3r; C2r). Given Lichfield's employment within the scholarly context in which *The Trimming* was produced, his involvement cannot be ruled out.

It is beyond the scope of this article to state with certainty whether or not *The Trimming* was written by Lichfield. If this could be proven, the production of a pamphlet aimed at scholars by an eloquent barber-surgeon would provide a fascinating insight into the complex social politics of early modern Cambridge, where town/gown rivalries were rife, and students often used their gentlemanly status to look down on citizens.<sup>26</sup> Equally, it is beyond the scope of this article to consider whether, if Lichfield was not responsible, the actual author had any personal connection with the barber-surgeon that they impersonated, or with either Nashe or Harvey. It is, however, certain that the pamphlet makes no pretence at having been written by Harvey, and rather places considerable emphasis on the identity of its purported author.

Regardless of the pamphlet's true authorship, the presentation of Lichfield as author accentuates the pamphlet's operation in a Cambridge in-group community. When Nashe

sardonically dedicated *Have With You* to Lichfield, he knew that both Harvey and his Cambridge readers would recognize his addressee, and perhaps inferred that the barber-surgeon's social inferiority would lend weight to his attempts to humiliate Harvey by describing his lowly origins.<sup>27</sup> Likewise, the author of *The Trimming* sought to turn Lichfield's familiarity against Nashe. Both writers were aware of Lichfield's Cambridge reputation. Indeed, Lichfield remained a recognizable Cambridge personality into the seventeenth century, when he was dramatized in Thomas Randolph's *Aristippus*, which was performed at Trinity College in 1630. In *Aristippus*, Lichfield is satirized under the guise of Medico de Campo, the pseudonym used in *The Trimming*. Medico is a larger-than-life comic figure, a quack physician who swaggers about the stage. The portrait is not, however, wholly unflattering, since Medico saves the day by curing the injured protagonist. Although, by profession and education, Lichfield was an outsider to the university, he was a feature of Cambridge cultural life for more than thirty years. Whether actual or facetious, the identification of Lichfield as the author of *The Trimming* further emphasizes the pamphlet's Cambridge origins.

Although it is limited, the surviving evidence for the composition and distribution of *The Trimming* indicates a consistent and considerable focus on Cambridge. *The Trimming* was written by someone familiar with Lichfield's reputation, printed in London, and sold in Cambridge. It was purchased and read by university scholars, including those who — a year later — referred to it in *The Pilgrimage to Parnassus*. Contrary to the usual narratives surrounding the dominance of the London book trade, *The Trimming* circulated amongst a scholarly group of Cambridge readers.

## II. TRIMMING AS READING: LICHFIELD'S RHETORICAL STRATEGIES

Lichfield's reading of Nashe forms the basis of his attack. In *Have With You*, Nashe invites his dedicatee to 'read and peruse' his book (3.14). Lichfield responds, derisively, that the book was so 'tedious' that he could not 'read it through' (A3v). In doing so, he draws attention to the physicality of reading: 'When first [Nashe's] Epistle came into [his] hands, [he] boldly opened it', and attempted to navigate its many marginal notes by 'tossing and turning [the] booke upside downe' (B3v). Lichfield encourages his reader to imagine his physical interactions with the book: both 'tossing' and 'turning' could connote the action of leafing through the pages of a book. In addition, both verbs suggest a state of mental agitation, encapsulating Lichfield's outraged response. By describing his 'tossing and turning' of Nashe's book, Lichfield emphasizes both the physical and mental processes of reading this objectionable text.

Elsewhere, Lichfield voices opinions on Nashe's other works, remarking of *Christs Teares over Jerusalem* (1593): 'how darest thou take such holy matters into thy stinking mouth, so to defile and polute them? Your Dildoe & such subjects are fit matter for you' (G1v). Lichfield contrasts the purportedly homiletic *Christs Teares* with 'Nashe's Dildo' (1592-3), a comic erotic poem also known as 'The Choise of Valentines'. Lichfield presents Nashe as a degraded and perverse writer ill-qualified to address moral or religious subjects. His means of doing so, however, are dependent upon his reading of Nashe. In particular, Lichfield emulates Nashe's damning insults, transforming his denigration of Harvey as a 'scabbed scald squire' (3.49) with linguistic exuberance: 'thou scabbed, scalde, lame, halting adjective as thou art, in all thy guiles, thou never hadest that guile as alone to get thee one crust of breade' (C3v). Where Nashe insulted Harvey's appearance, Lichfield condemns Nashe's superficiality: he is a frivolous or parasitic 'adjective', and his lack of substance is

reflected in his failure to procure food. As throughout *The Trimming*, Lichfield denounces Nashe and his works by employing a rhetorical strategy that is drawn from them.

Although he claims not to have finished *Have With You*, Lichfield's response draws upon his interrogatory reading of Nashe. *The Trimming* is simultaneously dependent upon and critical of *Have With You*: Lichfield attacks Nashe, but he does so by replicating Nashe's own techniques. For example, Lichfield imitates Nashe's mechanisms of attack in two passages entitled 'A Grace in behalfe of Thomas Nashe' (G3r-G4r). These are modelled on Nashe's 'Grace put up in behalfe of the Harveys' (3.11-12). The graces highlight the inadequacies of their subjects while purportedly advocating for them. Thus, Nashe argues that the Harveys 'have so fully performed all their acts in absurditie, impudence & foolerie, to grant them their absolute Graces'. Lichfield takes his condemnation of Nashe further, providing a mock-biography in the first grace, and arguing in the second that Nashe should be executed for his crimes. Lichfield summarizes Nashe's life: he was 'borne I know not where' and 'educated sometime at *Cambridge*'. At university, several 'misdemeanors' prevented his progression, and he relocated to London, 'where somewhat recovered of his wits', he scraped together a living (G3r). Lichfield brings his biography up to date, relaying how, a few months earlier, Nashe was forced to flee London following his involvement in a controversial and libellous play, 'that most infamous, most dunsicall and thrice opprobrious worke *The Ile of Dogs*: for which [Nashe is] greatly in request' (E4v-F1r). These biographical details are — in broad strokes — true. Elsewhere, Lichfield indulges in the comic potential of more overtly fictitious matter. For example, he relays a humorous anecdote that ridicules Nashe by exaggerating his poverty: Nashe and his friend Lusher could only afford one pair of breeches, so 'by course [Lusher] woore the breeches one day, and went cunny-catching about for victuals, whilst [Nashe] lay in bedde, and the next day [Nashe] wore the breeches to goe begge whilst [Lusher] lay in bed' (C3v).

Lichfield draws upon Nashe's damning account, in *Have With You*, of the 'life and godly education from his childhood of that thrice famous Clarke, and worthie Orator and Poet, Gabriell Harvey' (3.55). Nashe presents his account as factual and credible, announcing: 'whereof, that it is anie other than plaine truth, let no man distrust' (3.101–2). In doing so, he exerts control over the narrative of Harvey's life, refiguring it to align with his own impression of Harvey as a proud, ambitious, and quarrelsome scrounger. This is not opposed to the biographical record: Virginia Stern has corroborated Nashe's account of Harvey as socially awkward and professionally 'frustrated'.<sup>28</sup> Yet, the success of Nashe's 'Life' comes from his careful blending of truth and fiction. Nashe's 'Life' culminates in a triumphant denouement where Harvey is imprisoned for debt. Nashe refigures the learned Doctor Gabriel Harvey as a railing comic clown, juxtaposing his extravagant heroic language — 'O you prophane *Plebeyans* [...] I will massacre, I will crucifie you for presuming to lay hands thus on my reverent person' — with the respectful register of his guards: the arrest is 'but an action of debt, sayd they, good Master Doctour' (3.99). Having destroyed his opponent, Nashe claims victory. The conclusion of the 'Life' with the accurate detail that 'at *Saffron-walden* (for the most part) from that his flight to this present hath [Harvey] mewd and coopt up himselfe invisible' corroborates Harvey's defeat (3.101). Nashe presents Harvey as no longer able to reply and, indeed, Harvey did not reply to *Have With You*. Nashe declares himself the *de facto* winner of the quarrel, hounding his opponent out of the dispute.

Following Nashe, Lichfield uses mock-biography as a means of attack: usurping the narrative of his subject's life, he imposes a disparaging alternative. Lichfield assumes an air of cruel glee in predicting that Nashe's ears will be cropped as punishment for his contribution to the *Isle of Dogs*. Lichfield addresses Nashe in the present tense as if he were penning reportage rather than speculative biography: 'to have thine [ears] cropt is thy punishment: What *Tom*, are thine eares gone?' (F4v) Lichfield's exuberance is underlined by

a marginal exclamation of ‘*Ha ha ha*’. Throughout *The Trimming*, Lichfield responds to Nashe’s misfortunes with mirth. Although such exclamations have antecedents in *Have With You* — where Nashe exclaimed of Harvey ‘*Hah, ha, a destitute poore fellow art thou*’ — Lichfield’s glee is explicitly associated with pain and punishment (3.16). On two separate occasions, Lichfield encourages Nashe to hang himself: suicide cures bad breath (‘your olde breath will be gone’) and facilitates an escape from prison (C2v; E4v). Both examples are absurd. Yet, Lichfield’s descriptions of Nashe’s death and punishment are associated with silencing. Dead, Nashe’s noxious breath will be extinguished, and he will no longer write. Emulating Nashe, Lichfield employs mock-biography to silence his opponent, violently precluding any reply. In doing so, he demonstrates the power of parodic reading: turning Nashe’s rhetorical strategies against him, Lichfield revels in his mastery of the text.

Lichfield’s parody is further enacted through his pamphlet’s visual presentation, with *The Trimming* imitating the innovative textual design of *Have With You*.<sup>29</sup> Nashe makes use of marginal notes to insult his adversaries — such as mocking how ‘lameley & lubberly [Richard Harvey] strives’ to cultivate a learned persona (3.85). Parodying Nashe, Lichfield develops the margin into a consistent source of humour. Lichfield’s marginal glosses range from the mock-instructional — glossing ‘snotte’ with ‘*Mucus snotte*’ — to the insulting — ‘*Ha ha a rage borrowed from your owne dunghill*’ — to the self-congratulatory — ‘*Wel put in*’ (C4r; C2v; B1v). Lichfield dedicates every part of his page to his parodic mockery of Nashe. Similarly, he imitates Nashe’s portrait of Harvey by including a comparable portrait of Nashe (Figs 3 and 4). Both writers use a visual accompaniment to advance their verbal attacks. Furthermore, both writers explicitly comment upon their images, with Nashe explaining why he has ‘put [Harvey] in round hose’ (3.24), and Lichfield discussing Nashe’s fetters in sartorial terms as ‘a charme about [his] legges’ (E2r). In addition to facilitating

Lichfield's criticism of Nashe, the portrait furthers his parody of *Have With You*: Lichfield imitates Nashe's textual design and turns it against its originator.

Lichfield's textual presentation, marginal notes, and use of mock-biography demonstrate the pervasiveness of his borrowings from *Have With You*. He draws upon his reading of Nashe to use parody as a means of attack. This is, of course, the strategy employed by Nashe and Harvey throughout their quarrel. For example, in *Pierces Supererogation* (1593), Harvey quotes from Nashe's *Pierce Penilesse* (1592) before offering his critical judgement that Nashe lacks any 'allowance of witt'.<sup>30</sup> Nashe employs a similar strategy throughout *Have With You*, which includes five interlocutors responding to 'An Oration, including most of the miscreated words and sentences in the Doctors Booke' (3.43). Harvey's words are quoted in italics, with Nashe's speakers offering their mocking commentary on their reading, for example professing to have 'laughd at nothing so much' as Harvey's absurd neologisms (3.46). Throughout the Harvey-Nashe Quarrel, literary dispute is conducted through critical reading.

In a similar manner, Lichfield's pamphlet offers a sustained commentary on the dedicatory epistle to *Have With You*, with Lichfield answering particular points and demonstrating his close reading of Nashe's text. In particular, he engages with Nashe's discussion of wit. Nashe challenged Lichfield to contribute to his attack on 'witlesse *Gabriell*', declaring: 'It is given out amongst Schollers that thou hast a passing singular good wit: now to trie whither thou hast so or no, let me heare what change of phrases thou hast to describe a good wit in' (3.12; 3.16). Lichfield provided the requested definition: 'A good wit [...] is an affluent spirit, yeelding invention to praise or dispraise, or anie wayes to discourse (with judgement) of everie subjecte' (D2r). There are several components to this definition, which is representative of Elizabethan understandings of wit.<sup>31</sup> Witty writing is 'affluent', or abundant; it is inventive; it can be used to speak on either side of a question; and it is

judicious. In practice, it involves the use of *copia* to speak judiciously and persuasively on any subject. Much of *The Trimming* is dedicated to an analysis of Nashe's wit, and Lichfield determines that he 'hast not a good wit' (D2v). By reading *Have With You*, Lichfield dissects Nashe's style, outwardly condemning its lack of wit while replicating its witty features.

Lichfield anticipates Nashe's 'selfe-conceite that [he has] the verie quintessence of true witte', and instead proves that he 'hast not one jot nor title of true witte' (C4r–D2v). Lichfield presents this exchange with Nashe as a debate, imagining Nashe's arguments and responses. Lichfield invites Nashe to defend himself: 'if you will dispute and proove that you have a good wit [...] I will answere you directly'. Lichfield's Nashe presents illogical arguments that illustrate his lack of 'judgement': the fame of his good wit evinces its existence, and if his wit 'were not excellent and unaunswerable', it would have been challenged before. Lichfield easily counters Nashe's feeble assertions, and declares himself victorious. Lichfield's pretended reading serves to rhetorically silence his opponent, once again denying Nashe's recourse to defence.

Lichfield's condemnatory imitation of Nashe is paradoxical: if Nashe lacked wit, a parody of his style would not be witty. Yet, Lichfield's emulation of Nashe demonstrates his reproduction of Nashe's style. Throughout *The Trimming*, Lichfield imitates Nashe's affluent and associative *copia*.<sup>32</sup> In *Have With You*, Nashe emphasizes key words or concepts by riffing on their imaginative associations. For example, he dwells upon Lichfield's 'tongue': Nashe suggests that Lichfield 'hath translated my *Piers Pennilesse* into the *Macaronicall* tongue; wherein I wish hee had been more tongue-tide, since [...] it hath too much tongue alreadie' (3.33). Within the same paragraph, he notes that *Pierce Penilesse* has additionally been published in the French and English tongues, interpreted as many ways as 'tongue can tell', and condemned for having the spite of 'an adders tongue' over the flattery of 'a spaniels tongue'. Lichfield emulates Nashe, diligently parodying his repetition of 'tongue'. He

exploits the metaphorical possibilities of Nashe's unruly tongue, comparing him with mad dogs that 'alwaies run with their mouthes open and their tongues hanging out', and analysing why 'nature gave [him] two eares and but one tongue' (F3v; F4v). Elsewhere, he observes 'the effectes of [Nashe's] cankered convicious tongue', encouraging Nashe to 'locke up the doore of [his] mouth' and 'rule [his] smal tongue' (C1r-C1v). Lichfield continues, relating a moral *exemplum* of a man who, when asked to fetch the most and least profitable meats, returned with tongues because although 'of a tongue came many profitable and good speeches', nothing 'issueth worse venome then from the tongue, and this tongue [Nashe] hast, and this tongue crosse with the barre of reason'. Dissecting Nashe's tongue, Lichfield alludes to his work as a barber-surgeon: his advice that Nashe 'wash [his] teeth' to cure his 'stinkinge breath' befits his profession (C1v). In addition, he takes pleasure in the production of tongue-twisting gibberish.<sup>33</sup> Lichfield is self-conscious regarding the absurdity of this passage. His conclusion — 'why invect I so against thy tongue?' — recalls Nashe's self-conscious exclamation: 'O, peace, peace, exercise thy writing tongue'. In this passage, as throughout *The Trimming*, Lichfield's parody of Nashe is not only mocking but also indicative of his ability to analyse Nashe's stylistic techniques and to gain traction from their distinctive effects.

At times, Lichfield's attentive reading of *Have With You* serves to render Nashe's book absurd. For example, Lichfield facetiously corrects Nashe's use of 'dicker'. Following a string of puns based upon 'Dick' as a contraction of Richard (Lichfield), Nashe had observed that: 'I am sure thou wondrest not a little what I meane, to come uppon thee so straungelye with such a huge dicker of Dickes in a heape altogether' (3.6). Lichfield replies by attacking Nashe's ignorance: 'You tell mee that you come uppon mee with but a dicker of Dickes, but you come uppon mee with seventeene or eighteene Dickes, whereby I see thy ignorance in the Greeke tongue, thou knowest not what a dicker is, a dicker is but ten of any thing' (C3r).

Lichfield dissects the etymological inaccuracies of Nashe's pun to the purported ends of revealing his lack of learning and consequent rhetorical insufficiency. In a pamphlet addressed to 'learned' readers, Lichfield takes pleasure in presenting Nashe as ignorant, although to do so self-consciously misinterprets Nashe's point. Since Nashe's use of 'dicker' is clearly intended to enhance his punning alliteration, the accuracy of its application is immaterial. Lichfield facetiously misunderstands Nashe's meaning, dwelling upon the specific number of 'Dickes' rather than their cumulative literary impact. In doing so, he demonstrates his close reading of Nashe, adapting Nashe's playful and associative style while taking issue with Nashe's assertions.

Lichfield often dwells upon insubstantial details of this sort. In *Have With You*, Nashe refers in passing to the rotten teeth 'that [hang] out at [Lichfield's] shop window' and instructs Lichfield to 'steale [his] painted May-pole' (3.7; 3.9). Nashe refers to the recognizable features of any Elizabethan barber-surgeon's premises.<sup>34</sup> Yet, Lichfield dismisses the description of his 'shoppe in the towne, the teeth that hange out at [his] Windowe, [his] painted May-poole' as 'lyes that [Nashe] devisd' (C3r). Although *Have With You* is filled with 'lyes' — particularly concerning Gabriel Harvey — these details are remarkably innocuous. Lichfield disregards the substance of Nashe's pamphlet, and instead conducts his altercation at a verbal level, taking issue with each assertion made in *Have With You*. He revels in his enjoyment of the generative potential of language, drawing upon his mocking reading of Nashe's book.

Lichfield presents Nashe as responsible for his stylistic idiosyncrasies: he asks that his readers 'blame [him] not' if his pamphlet 'bee not so well set foorth as [they] could wish it were', and claims that he 'could not fit [Nashe], for if [he] had undertaken to speak of one of [Nashe's] properties, another came intoo [his] mind, & another followed that, which bred confusion' (A4r). Consequently, Lichfield presents his strange writing as the inevitable result

of his reading of Nashe; superficially, he claims that Nashe's style lacks wit and prompts 'confusion'. In reality, however, Lichfield's parody demonstrates his indebtedness to Nashe's style, as well as his interrogatory reading of Nashe's book.

### III. CRITICAL READING AND SCHOLARLY COMMUNITIES

Lichfield constructs his attack by reading Nashe's texts. Yet, his parody of Nashe's style simultaneously creates a bond between the two writers; although Lichfield purports to write against Nashe, his replication of Nashe's style demonstrates their shared literary values. The contention between Lichfield and Nashe is contained within a broader sense of community that is linked to the Cambridge origins of both writers, as well as to their shared belief that literary creation is developed through critical reading.

Towards the end of *The Trimming*, Lichfield acknowledges that his bonds with Nashe transcend their quarrel. He writes: 'though hetherto we have disagreed and beene at oddes, yet this one coate shall containe us both'. The 'coat' of *The Trimming* contains Nashe and Lichfield's disagreement, suggesting the unifying potential of their shared conception of literature. Lichfield extends a temporary ceasefire:

This I speak not to wage discord against thee, but rather to make an end of all jarres,  
that as wife & husband will brawle and be at mortall fewde al the day long, but  
when boord or bed time come they are friendes againe and lovingly kisse one an  
other: so though hetherto we have disagreed and beene at oddes, yet this one coate  
shall containe us both, which thou shalt weare as the cognisaunce of my singuler  
love towards thee, that wee living in mutuall love may so dye, and at last loving like  
two brothers Castor and Pollux, or the two sisters Ursa major and Ursa minor wee  
may bee carried up to heaven together, and there translated into two starres. (G2v)

Lichfield employs the imagery of friendship, marriage, fraternity, and sorority to suggest the possibility of his reconciliation with Nashe. Although his truce is somewhat facetious — it immediately precedes the graces that advocate Nashe’s execution — it subsumes his altercation with Nashe within deeper natural and societal bonds. Lichfield presents the quarrel as like one between relatives, showing that it can and must be amicably resolved for each party to be content within themselves. As such, he suggests a concordance between himself and his rival that surpasses petty disagreements. The effect is compounded by the repetition of the word ‘love’: husband and wife ‘lovingly’ kiss; Lichfield expresses ‘singuler love’ and ‘mutuall love’ towards Nashe, and they can be apotheosized when they are ‘at last loving’. Lichfield presents himself as intimately bound to Nashe, acknowledging the dependence of his persona and text upon his reading of Nashe’s works.

Lichfield’s insistent ‘love’ for Nashe suggests that *The Trimming* is not an attack but a tribute. Lichfield claims to have answered Nashe because ‘if thy frend commit anie enormous offence toward thee, [thou should] tell him of it in an Epistle’, and Nashe ‘wrote a foule Epistle to mee, and never told me of it before’ (B3r). Although Lichfield continues to emphasize his offence, his language is more indicative of friendship than enmity. He notes that ‘there was no hatred between us before’, and elsewhere proposes to ‘talke freendlye’ to Nashe (E2r). *The Trimming* is pervaded by a sense of kinship. Although any question of biographical acquaintance is largely moot — not least because we cannot prove that Richard Lichfield was the author of *The Trimming* — it is tempting to consider the possibility that Nashe and the author of *The Trimming* were friends.<sup>35</sup> Regardless of any acquaintance between them, however, it is clear that Lichfield considered the writers to inhabit the same cultural and literary context.

Lichfield and Nashe operate within the scholarly community of the University of Cambridge. Lichfield claims that Nashe is redeemed because he is ‘a Cambridge man, from whence all vertue flowes, and is the very fountaine and Cunduit-head of all learning’. Lichfield digresses, waxing lyrical: ‘O heere I could praise Cambridge an houre by the clocke’ (E3v). Lichfield’s image of the university as a fountain of knowledge recalls Nashe’s description, in his preface to Robert Greene’s *Menaphon* (1589), of ‘that most famous and fortunate Nurse of all learning, Saint *Johns* in *Cambridge*’.<sup>36</sup> This sentiment was repeated in *Nashes Lenten Stuffe*, with the claim that St John’s ‘is and ever was the sweetest nurse of knowledge in all that University’.<sup>37</sup> Nashe and Lichfield are united by their shared love for Cambridge, and they acknowledge each other as recipients of the university’s nurturing bounty. Rather than expressing true enmity, Lichfield’s attack on Nashe exemplifies the ‘flying’ that O’Callaghan has identified as a central tenet of scholarly communities.<sup>38</sup> Lichfield’s insults are sanctioned by his fraternal bonds with Nashe.

Nashe and Lichfield’s shared situation within a community of Cambridge readers is made further apparent through the references to their works in the *Parnassus* Plays. The plays are situated in the same Cambridge context as *The Trimming*, and were performed at St John’s College shortly after its publication: the plays’ editor, J. B. Leishman, has argued that *The Pilgrimage to Parnassus* was first performed in 1598/9, *The First Part of the Return from Parnassus* in 1599/1600, and *The Second Part of the Return from Parnassus* in 1601/2.<sup>39</sup> Throughout, the plays contrast the glories of Parnassus — which represents Cambridge — with the harsh realities of the outside world and, in particular, London. This is particularly pointed in the plays’ examination of contemporary literary culture, which decries the debasement of learning in London’s professional theatres and book trade.

*The Pilgrimage* includes ‘Leichfildes trimming of Nash’ in a list of recent literary works.<sup>40</sup> These books are contrasted with the sober output of older writers: ‘O, the gen[i]us of

xij<sup>d</sup> a quart will indite manie livelie lines in an houre, whils an ould drousie Academicke, an old Stigmaticke, an ould sober Dromeder toiles a whole month'. *The Trimming* — and other books like it — is new rather than 'ould'. Inspired by the 'genius' of the tavern, it is lively, extemporal, and witty. As this reference demonstrates, it was one of several entertaining satires familiar to an audience of Cambridge scholars, and specifically to a scholarly audience invested in critiquing recent literary works.

Like *The Trimming*, the *Parnassus* Plays offer critical readings of contemporary literature. In the opening scene of *The Second Return*, Judicio (whose name signifies judiciousness) shows Ingenioso (ingenuity) a new book: 'Looke, its here: *Belvedere*'.<sup>41</sup> Judicio refers to *Bel-vedere, or, The Garden of the Muses* (1600), an anthology of sententious quotations reminiscent of the compilation by Meres that was published by Burby in 1598. *Bel-vedere* was marketed to a readership primarily composed of university scholars: the book opens with addresses 'To the Universitie of Oxenford' and 'To the Universitie of Cambridge', which is described as 'Mother of Muses, and great Nurse of Art'.<sup>42</sup> Like *The Trimming*, the *Parnassus* Plays depict scholarly readers commenting upon a literary text marketed to scholars. Ingenioso and Judicio read and mock *Bel-vedere*. Ingenioso asks about the 'devise' of the book, and Judicio explains: 'Turne over the leafe, *Ingenioso*, and thou shalt see the paynes of this worthy gentlemen: Sentences gathered out of all kind of Poetts, referred to certaine methodicall heads'. Judicio summarizes the method employed in *Bel-vedere*, and brings to the audience's attention the physical pages of the book presumably held on stage. He instructs Ingenioso to 'read the names' of the works compiled. Although *Bel-vedere* does not contain a list of sources, this provides Ingenioso and Judicio with an opportunity to discuss contemporary poets. They comment upon the styles of luminaries including Spenser, Marston, Marlowe, Jonson, and Shakespeare. The exchange concludes with a tribute to Nashe: 'his stile was wittie, though it had some gal[l]', and, 'for a mother

witt, / Fewe men have ever seene the like of it'.<sup>43</sup> In this scene, fictional scholars debate a real book aimed at scholars, and offer an appraisal of contemporary literature. In doing so, they dramatize the scholarly reading that underlies *The Trimming*.

The *Parnassus* Plays are particularly invested in critiquing Nashe's works. In addition to the praise of his 'stile', Nashe is dramatized in the figure of Ingenioso.<sup>44</sup> Like many Elizabethan graduates, Ingenioso is disheartened by his prospects. Unable to secure patronage, he is reliant upon the London print market, depending upon 'the right honorable printing house for [his] poore shiftes of apparell'.<sup>45</sup> In expressing his discontent, Ingenioso imitates Nashe's language. He complains: 'I have burnt my bookes, splitted my pen, rent my papers, and curste the cooseninge artes, that brought mee up to noe better fortune'.<sup>46</sup> The passage is reminiscent of the opening of *Pierce Penilesse*, Nashe's semi-autobiographical portrait of an impoverished and despondent scholar. Pierce laments: 'I accused my fortune, raild on my patrones, bit my pen, rent my papers, and ragde in all points like a mad man'.<sup>47</sup> Ingenioso replicates the diction and characterization of *Pierce Penilesse*, presenting a witty portrait of Nashe. In addition, Ingenioso dramatizes the broader predicament of the graduates who moved to London to become professional writers. In *The Pilgrimage*, Ingenioso is a minor character who warns the undergraduate protagonists of the unstable future awaiting them. In the sequels, however, he takes centre stage, with his entertaining speeches providing the parodic impetus of the plays. His negotiation of the London print market becomes emblematic of the plight of all scholars, who 'still must live in discontent'.<sup>48</sup> As Ellinghausen has suggested, 'the anonymous author(s) of the *Parnassus* plays clearly viewed Nashe as an important and recognizable figure in a narrative of scholars' displacement within marketplace culture'.<sup>49</sup> By engaging with Nashe's texts, the *Parnassus* Plays explore the anxieties of scholars concerning their futures outside the academy.

From this perspective, the scholarly reading enacted in the plays, as well as in Lichfield's and Nashe's pamphlets, serves a potentially therapeutic effect. Although graduates might not be able to guarantee their professional security, they could, through their shared processes of close reading, take comfort in the perceived superiority of their community. Nashe himself had endorsed an agenda for collegiate pre-eminence a decade earlier. In his preface to *Menaphon*, he addressed 'the gentlemen students of both universities', praising their judicious 'University entertainment' above the commercially driven London theatres and print market (3.311). He condemned the 'undiscerning judgement' of uneducated readers, who 'makes drosse as valuable as gold, and losse as welcome as gaine' (3.314). The implication, as in the *Parnassus Plays*, is that scholars should embrace the superiority of their community, which is encapsulated in their ability to read and critique literature. It is in this context that *The Trimming* should be read. Lichfield's pamphlet is constructed through its Cambridge references, its close engagement with the Harvey-Nashe Quarrel, and its participation in an exclusive scholarly community. Through allusions and in-jokes, as well as through practical displays of critical reading, scholarly texts like *The Trimming* and the *Parnassus Plays* sought to demonstrate their superiority to the undiscerning commercialism and unstable prospects of London literary culture.

#### CONCLUSION: SCHOLARLY READING AND PROFESSIONAL WRITING

Scholarly reading was, in part, a response to the rise of professional writing. Although students responded to the London book trade with a mixture of superiority and insecurity, they were aware that their rarefied literary community existed in relation to it. Thus, the professional authors of scholarly texts remained affiliated with their university communities.

Ingenioso visits Parnassus just as Nashe returned to Cambridge while writing *Have With You*. As we have seen, Nashe's books were read by Cambridge scholars, quoted on the Cambridge stage, and parodied in a pamphlet that purports to be by a Cambridge barber-surgeon. Similarly, although Ingenioso sees his fortunes as bound to a London printing-house, he also depends upon the Cambridge scholars who purchase his books. Indeed, in the *Second Return*, Ingenioso pitches a pamphlet entitled 'a Catalogue of *Cambridge Cuckolds*' to his publisher.<sup>50</sup> The title — and implicit readership — of Ingenioso's new book attests to his continuing relationship with Cambridge. Although the graduate might become a professional writer in London, his books nonetheless return to the universities, where they are critiqued, parodied, and emulated by other scholars.

The association between professional writers, stationers, and communities of scholarly readers can, perhaps, enable us to reassess Nashe's literary career. Despite his financial dependence upon professional writing, Nashe frequently expressed indifference towards his readers. He claimed not to care if his reader 'called [him] a hundred times dolt', and addressed prefatory epistles 'To his Readers, hee cares not what they be' (1.239; 3.151). In contrast, the implied readership of Nashe's fellow Cambridge graduate Robert Greene expanded over the course of his career from an initial emphasis on 'Gentlemen readers' to include 'Yoong Gentlemen, marchants, citizens, apprentices, yeomen, and plaine countrey farmers'.<sup>51</sup> Nashe, however, remained committed to 'the Gentlemen Students of Both Universities' that he had addressed in his first printed work (3.311). In *Strange Newes* (1592), he enlisted scholarly readers to defend him from Harvey's attack: 'judge the highest Courts of appeale from the miscarried worlds judgement (Cambridge and Oxford) wherein I have trespassed in *Pierce Penilesse*'.<sup>52</sup> Even in his last work, *Lenten Stuffe*, he included a 'jeast of a Scholler in Cambridge', inviting the learned readers of his idiosyncratic tract to join him in mocking 'gaping rurall fooles' (3.212). Throughout his career, Nashe remained

unapologetically elitist, and continued to address scholars as his true readers. Where Greene diversified in response to the London print market, Nashe paraded his continuing association with the university. By creating works that were intentionally exclusive, he capitalized on his fraternal bonds with gentlemen scholars.

Understanding the practices, values, and networks of scholarly readers expands our grasp of Elizabethan literary culture. Not all professional writers viewed the consumers of the London print market as their central audience. Rather, university scholars comprised a significant demographic of literary readers, and were addressed as such by writers and publishers in books marketed specifically towards them. Nashe's works consistently appealed to the superior taste of these readers. Likewise, *The Trimming of Thomas Nashe*, a pamphlet that interrogates the processes of scholarly reading, was aimed towards Cambridge scholars, published by a Cambridge stationer, and purportedly written by a Cambridge professional. Finally, the *Parnassus Plays* also enact a scholarly critique of the contemporary literary scene, and present the London print market as inferior to the values shared by Cambridge students. All of these texts were produced and consumed in a context of scholarly reading based around the University of Cambridge. They were aimed at readers who presented themselves as socially elite and trained in rhetoric. Scholars exercised critical reading in order to reinforce their sense of community, and, in doing so, they attempted to retain control over literary consumption and the insecurities of professional print. Although London was at the centre of the Elizabethan book trade, Cambridge readers imagined themselves to be the arbiters of literary value. Moreover, many writers and stationers actively catered to their tastes.

---

This research was undertaken during the course of a SGSAH AHRC studentship; this support was very much appreciated. I am grateful to Neil Rhodes, and to the anonymous readers for *Renaissance Studies*, for their extremely helpful comments.

<sup>1</sup> Richard Lichfield, *The Trimming of Thomas Nashe* (London: 1597), B3v. Subsequent references in parentheses.

<sup>2</sup> Thomas Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron-Walden*, in *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, ed. Ronald B. McKerrow, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn, rev. F. P. Wilson, 5 vols (Oxford: Blackwell, 1958), 3.6. Subsequent references in parentheses.

<sup>3</sup> See Maria Prendergast, *Railing, Reviling, and Invective in English Literary Culture, 1588–1617: The Anti-Poetics of Theater and Print* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012); Andrew Hadfield, “‘Not without mustard’: Self-publicity and Polemic in Early Modern Literary London”, in *Renaissance Transformations: the Making of English Writing (1500–1650)*, ed. Margaret Healy and Thomas Healy (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009), 64–7; Tamsin Theresa Badcoe, “‘As many Ciphers without an I’: Self-Reflexive Violence in the Work of Thomas Nashe”, *Modern Philology* 111 (2014), 384–407.

<sup>4</sup> Christopher Marlow, *Performing Masculinity in English University Drama, 1598–1636* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013), 7, 72. See also Darryll Grantley, *Wit’s Pilgrimage: Drama and the Social Impact of Education in Early Modern England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000), 71–102.

<sup>5</sup> Michelle O’Callaghan, *The English Wits: Literature and Sociability in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 24.

<sup>6</sup> Laurie Ellinghausen, *Labor and Writing in Early Modern England, 1567–1667* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 37.

---

<sup>7</sup> Alexandra Halasz, *The Marketplace of Print: Pamphlets and the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 23.

<sup>8</sup> Nandini Das, *Renaissance Romance: The Transformation of English Prose Fiction, 1570–1620* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), 101–3; Katharine Wilson, *Fictions of Authorship in Late Elizabethan Narratives: Euphues in Arcadia* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006), 4.

<sup>9</sup> Sarah Knight, ‘Fantastical Distempers: The Psychopathology of Early Modern Scholars’, in *Early Modern Academic Drama*, ed. Jonathan Walker and Paul D. Streufert (Farnham: Ashgate, 2008), 129.

<sup>10</sup> Andrew Gurr, ‘Professional playing in London and superior Cambridge responses’, *Shakespeare Studies*, 37 (2009), 43–53.

<sup>11</sup> Lorna Hutson, *Thomas Nashe in Context* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 121.

<sup>12</sup> Georgia Brown, *Redefining Elizabethan Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 90; Per Sivefors, ‘Committing Authorship: Thomas Nashe and the Engaged Reader’, *Études Épistémè*, 29 (2016), 1–13.

<sup>13</sup> See G. K. Hunter, *John Lyly: The Humanist as Courtier* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1962), 44–5.

<sup>14</sup> Eleanor Decamp, *Civic and Medical Worlds in Early Modern England: Performing Barbering and Surgery* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 183–92.

<sup>15</sup> Steve Mentz, ‘Jack and the City: The Unfortunate Traveler, Tudor London, and Literary History’, in *A Companion to Tudor Literature*, ed. Kent Cartwright (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 501.

<sup>16</sup> David McKitterick, *A History of the Cambridge University Press*, vol. 1, *Printing and the Book Trade in Cambridge, 1534–1698* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 49–50. See also, *Abstracts from the Wills and Testamentary Documents of Printers, Binders, and*

---

*Stationers of Cambridge, from 1504 to 1699*, ed. George J. Gray and William Mortlock Palmer (London: 1915), 32–3, 63, 81–2.

<sup>17</sup> John Russell, *The Two Famous Pitcht Battels of Lypsich and Lutzen* (Cambridge: 1634).

<sup>18</sup> Roderici à Castro Lusitani, *De universa mulierum medicina* (Hamburg: 1603), held by St John's College Upper Library, Cambridge, shelfmark Mm.9.3; '17th-century Cambridge blind-tooled calf (Tt.1.16)', *St John's College Special Collections*:

<[http://www.joh.cam.ac.uk/library/special\\_collections/early\\_books/pix/provenance/scarlet/scarlet.htm](http://www.joh.cam.ac.uk/library/special_collections/early_books/pix/provenance/scarlet/scarlet.htm)> (accessed February 2018).

<sup>19</sup> See Joad Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 56–71.

<sup>20</sup> For the date of *The Tragedye of Solyman and Perseda*, see Lukas Erne, *Beyond The Spanish Tragedy: A Study of the Works of Thomas Kyd* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001), 157.

<sup>21</sup> *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554–1640*, ed. Edward Arber, 5 vols (London: 1876), 3.92.

<sup>22</sup> These were: *The Honorable Over Throw of the Duke of Savoyes Troopes* (London: 1597); *The Second Part of the Famous History of the Seaven Champions of Christendome* (London: 1597); *The Sixth Booke of the Myrroure of Knighthood* (London: 1598); Francis Meres, *Granados Devotions* (London: 1598).

<sup>23</sup> Cyprian Blagden, 'Early Cambridge Printers and the Stationers' Company', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society*, 2 (1957), 275.

<sup>24</sup> 'Richard Lichfield' signs the dedicatory epistle (A4r) as well as two 'Graces' to Nashe (G3v, G4r); EEBO lists Gabriel Harvey as the author of *The Trimming*; Prendergast assumes Harvey's authorship, *Railing*, 99.

---

<sup>25</sup> Benjamin Griffin, 'Nashe's Dedicatees: William Beeston and Richard Lichfield', *Notes and Queries*, 44 (1997), 47–9; *The Pilgrimage to Parnassus*, in *The Three Parnassus Plays*, ed. J. B. Leishman (London: Ivor Nicholson & Watson, 1949), l. 211.

<sup>26</sup> For social relations in early modern Cambridge, see Victor Morgan with Christopher Brooke, *A History of the University of Cambridge*, 4 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 2.242–54.

<sup>27</sup> For example, Nashe repeatedly reminds readers that Harvey's father was a rope-maker, 3.56–7.

<sup>28</sup> Virginia F. Stern, *Gabriel Harvey: His Life, Marginalia and Library* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), 17, 81.

<sup>29</sup> For Nashe's print innovations, see Neil Rhodes, 'On Speech, Print, and New Media: Thomas Nashe and Marshall McLuhan', *Oral Tradition*, 24 (2009), 379–80.

<sup>30</sup> Gabriel Harvey, *Pierces Supererogation* (London: 1593), C2v.

<sup>31</sup> See William G. Crane, *Wit and Rhetoric in the Renaissance: The Formal Basis of Elizabethan Prose Style* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1937), 9–10.

<sup>32</sup> For Nashe's distinctive prose style, see Neil Rhodes, *Elizabethan Grotesque* (London: Routledge, 1980), 18–48.

<sup>33</sup> For the disruptive potential of references to tongues in print, see Carla Mazzio, 'Sins of the Tongue in Early Modern England', *Modern Language Studies*, 28 (1998), 93–124.

<sup>34</sup> Decamp, *Civic and Medical Worlds*, 46.

<sup>35</sup> Charles Nicholl, who supports Lichfield's authorship of *The Trimming*, has suggested that Nashe and Lichfield were 'probably acquainted', *A Cup of News: The Life of Thomas Nashe* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984), 233–4.

<sup>36</sup> Nashe, 'Preface to R. Greene's "Menaphon"', in *Works*, 3.317.

<sup>37</sup> Nashe, *Nashes Lenten Stuffe*, in *Works*, 3.181.

- 
- <sup>38</sup> O'Callaghan, *English Wits*, 6.
- <sup>39</sup> Leishman, *Parnassus Plays*, 24-6.
- <sup>40</sup> *The Pilgrimage to Parnassus*, ll. 208–17.
- <sup>41</sup> *The Second Part of the Return from Parnassus*, in *Parnassus Plays*, ll. 173–326.
- <sup>42</sup> John Bodenham, *Bel-vedere, or, The Garden of the Muses* (London: 1600).
- <sup>43</sup> *The Second Return*, ll. 316–19.
- <sup>44</sup> For Ingenioso as Nashe, see Leishman, *Parnassus Plays*, 71–8.
- <sup>45</sup> *The First Part of the Return from Parnassus*, in *Parnassus Plays*, ll. 153–4.
- <sup>46</sup> *The Pilgrimage to Parnassus*, ll. 607–10.
- <sup>47</sup> Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse*, in *Works*, 1.157.
- <sup>48</sup> *The First Return*, l. 1566.
- <sup>49</sup> Ellinghausen, *Labor and Writing*, 39.
- <sup>50</sup> *The Second Return*, l. 330.
- <sup>51</sup> Robert Greene, *Mamillia* (London: 1583), A3r; Robert Greene, *The Second Part of Conny-Catching* (London: 1591), \*3v–\*4v.
- <sup>52</sup> Nashe, *Strange Newes*, in *Works*, 1.302.