everyday speech. By giving Elizabeth’s speeches and writings the attention they deserve as part of a broader study of her era, we can begin to recognize the magnitude of her impact on subsequent English prose—even though, in her speeches at least, she cannot quite be said to have written prose herself.

**Notes**

1. Quoted in Elizabeth I’s *Collected Works* 335. Citations to Elizabeth’s works are from this edition.
2. See my earlier pedagogical article, “Texts That Won’t Stand Still.”
4. See in particular Croll.

**Works Cited**


Margaret W. Ferguson

**Thomas Nashe: Cornucopias and Gallimaufries of Prose**

Like William Shakespeare and François Rabelais, Thomas Nashe was a prodigious verbal experimenter who enriched the lexicon and played with the syntactic possibilities of the English language emerging as a “national” tongue in Nashe’s era. Through teaching his prose as a field of verbal experimentation that would have challenged his sixteenth-century readers in some of the same ways it challenges modern students, I consider Nashe’s work in relation to modern and early modern debates about the shifting and porous borders among languages, dialects, and stylistic as well as social levels. Nashe lards his vernacular texts with foreign and newly coined words, learned allusions, wildly inventive tropes, and dizzying shifts of rhetorical tone. He frequently invites his contemporary readers to question their assumptions about social and literary conventions. Nashe’s most famous narrator, Jack Wilton, for example, addresses his “Gentle Readers” but then immediately questions the convention of the complimentary apostrophe ("looke you be gentle now I have calld you so"). Nashe challenges modern readers to think about their own literary tastes as well as their practices in both writing and speaking what counts today as “standard” English.
Nashe added about 800 new words to what linguists consider early modern English. Only Shakespeare, with some 1,700–2,000 new words to his credit (depending on who is counting), enriched English more than Nashe did. Nashe boasts of his "Italianate coined verbs all in Ize" (e.g., "nummianize, anagrammatize, tyrannize") and explains his "compounding" of words (e.g., "life-expedited, thought-exceeding, care-agonizing") by comparing his practice to that of "rich men who, having gathered store of white single money together, convert a number of those small little scutes into great pecces of gold" (2: 184). It's not surprising that many literary historians think that Shakespeare credited his fellow wordsmith's talents by portraying him under the name of "Master Moth"—with a linguistic pun on mortar, the French word for word—in Love's Labour's Lost.

Unlike Shakespeare, Nashe wrote only one play (Summer's Last Will and Testament), although he probably helped Christopher Marlowe with The Tragical History of Dr. Faustus and had to flee London for his part in writing, with Ben Jonson, an offensive satirical drama, The Isle of Dogs, which is now lost through censorship. Nashe wrote a few poems too; among the ones my students like best are an erotic tour de force about a woman's preference for a dildo's prowess over that of the poet's male speaker (The Choice of Valentine) and the short poem beginning, "Adieu, farewell earth's bliss," which is often included in modern anthologies, divorced from its original context. Nashe's character Will Summer, in the witty play mentioned above, requests that the poem (titled "The Song") be sung to him with lute accompaniment to "complain my neere approaching death" (3: 282). With its powerful alternation between a repeated personal lament ("I am sick, I must dye") and a communal, prayer-like refrain ("Lord, have mercy on us"), this poem works brilliantly in the classroom as a paratext for the graphic description of the plague in Nashe's novella, The Unfortunate Traveller. Although that text, Nashe's best-known work today, includes lyric and dramatic moments that show his virtuosity in different genres, there is no question that Nashe's preferred medium was prose.

His favorite prose genre can fairly if paradoxically be called the cornucopian hybrid or—to use a popular Elizabethan metaphor—the gallimaufry, a stew or hodgepodge of different styles and discursive genres. In Nashe's works, the mix ranges from the mock oration, sermon, historical chronicle, and bombastic heraldic description to the mock epic and the melodrama. Almost all his works contain elements of satire—a term that derives from the Latin word signifying medley, or, more literally, full, as in the phrase "satura lanx," "a mixed or full platter of food." Since Nashe typically displays generic conventions in miniature and in parodic forms, he is a good choice for teachers desiring to introduce students to a variety of genres and rhetorical modes in a short space of time. Most of Nashe's writings are highly self-reflexive and display a fiery, self-advertising wit of a kind that Nashe himself associated with a foreign source of inspiration: the satiric works of the Italian writer Pietro Aretino, "one of the wittiest knaves that ever God made," a man whose "pen was sharp pointed like a pnyard" and who valued "liberty of speech" above all other things (2: 246–65). Praising Aretino's ability to "set on fire all his readers," Nashe chose prose—and, more specifically, the prose pamphlet—as his major vehicle for engaging his readers' thoughts and feelings, including, whenever possible, feelings of generosity toward the writer.

The eponymous hero of The Unfortunate Traveller, or, The Life of Jack Wilton (1594) gives students a fascinating portrait of the Elizabethan writer as a rogue seeking his fortune through his facility with words. Usually classified as picaresque fiction, The Unfortunate Traveller is called a "pamphlet" by Nashe's own first-person narrator, Jack. The term pamphlet as Nashe uses it seems to denote a relatively short work of prose (still a key meaning of pamphlet in modern English): "I must not," Jack says, "place a volume in the precincts of a pamphlet" (2: 227). But there is much irony in this distinction between a volume and a pamphlet. The clause ostensibly signaling the writer's desire to abide by the pamphlet's boundaries, its "precinct," begins a sentence that goes on to condense a long historical narrative of two sieges of French cities by Henry VIII into an "hour or two" of sleep that the reader kindly gives to the reader in lieu of the tedious chronicle; the mention of the pamphlet, moreover, marks the point in the text where Nashe's own narrative of "travel" (punning on "pam" and "journeying") expands from its joke-book beginnings to a mock-epic, border-crossing narrative (stuffed with incident and more like a volume than a pamphlet) in which the reader follows the rogue hero from France, where the story begins, back to a plague-ridden England and from thence across Europe to an Italian landscape where Jack experiences an upside-down version of Dante's epic journey. Instead of traveling from hell to purgatory to paradise, Jack goes from an artificial Roman paradise (a summer banqueting house) to various "purgatorial" adventures in Florence and Venice to an "infernito" (darkly represented by Jack's falling into a Jew's cellar). The infernal part of the story includes various experiences of near death and of dire spectatorship as an increasingly
impotent Jack watches a rape and an execution of a villain, Cutwolfe. The “tragical” episodes of the story occur in a plague-infested Rome that recalls the plague in England from which the hero fled early on. He finally ends up back in France where he began; few readers have felt that an uplifting moral message of any kind emerges from this bleak and disjointed story, which has been described both as “grotesque” and as “realistic” by critics attempting to make sense of it.12

When Nashe (or Jack) describes The Unfortunate Traveller as a pamphlet threatening to spill beyond its limits into a volume, we see that the former term connotes something more than a brief type of discourse. In fact, Nashe places the very idea of the pamphlet into a large field of cultural inquiry, and conflict, that includes reflections on the educated but penurious English writer’s uncertain place in his own society and in relation to authority figures—literary, religious, and political—from other places and times. In Nashe’s hands, the pamphlet form displays ambivalence about what his “poor hungerstarved Muse” makes him do either to chase a stingy patron or to sell a manuscript to a stationer (publisher) for a fee rarely above two pounds (3: 225). Although pamphleteering according to Sandra Clark “was an occupation with a low status and a bad reputation” when it emerged as a distinct mode of writing for a living in the late-sixteenth century (27), the pamphlet was nonetheless a flexible, even an inspirational, genre for Nashe; as Charles Nicholl remarks, the term pamphleteer is right for Nashe “precisely because of its looseness. A pamphleteer writes pamphlets, and a pamphlet is whatever the reader will pay . . . three pence for” (5). The pamphlet as Nashe variously defines and illustrates it—from Pierce Penniless His Supplication to the Devil, in which the writer begs the devil for a loan, to Nashe’s Lenten Stuffe, which contains a comic version of the Hero and Leander story—involves frequent mixings of historical fact with fiction as well as a lively interest in the emergent discourse of international news, a discourse requiring travel, real or imagined, for its production.

The poet John Berryman defined Nashe’s prime imaginative concern as being with “his medium, with prose itself” (8). Teachers can use selections from Nashe’s prose works as rich materials for exploring a variety of topics such as the history of the novel; the history of “creative nonfiction”; first-person narratives in the early era of what Benedict Anderson calls “print capitalism” (43–46); relations between literature and journalistic discourses; travel literature; kinds and concepts of literary genre in the

Elizabethan era; kinds of English sentence and what sentence structures—including specific choices of syntax and diction—may tell us about a writer’s interest in readers of different social ranks and degrees of education; and last but not least (this list is not exhaustive), English prose as a multicultural medium in the early modern period—a medium that challenged the idea of national borders even as it helped promote international rivalries and create national stereotypes.13

According to one of his contemporary readers, a man of letters named Gabriel Harvey whom Nashe notoriously attacked in a series of pamphlets and whom he satirized as a “bursten belly inkhorn Orator called Vandelhalke” in The Unfortunate Traveller, being the victim of Nashe’s pen was a viscerally alarming experience that required description in terms of extravagant, transnational comparisons. Nashe, Harvey writes,

layeth about him with . . . [his] quill, as if it were possessed with the sprite of Orlando Furioso, or would teach the clubb of Gargantua to speake English . . . Pore I must needs be plagued; plagued! Na brayed and squised to nothing, that am matched with such a Gargantuise, as can devoure me quicke in a saillat. (qtd. in Brown 49)

Harvey resorts again to food metaphors in an effort to describe his opponent’s style: it contains “nothing but pure Mammaday [dialect word meaning a sweet made of milk] and a few morsels of fly-blowne Euphuism, somewhat nicely mined for puling stomaches” (qtd. in Clark 238). If good discourse was aimed, according to humanist doctrine, at providing “nourishment” for the mind and soul, Nashe’s discourse provides something else altogether, though it often looks as if it is aiming at the reader’s moral improvement.

Nashe used the still relatively new medium of print to fashion various innovative but morally and epistemologically difficult personae; in The Unfortunate Traveller, he playfully refers to his narrator Jack Wilton as a “page.”14 The pun defines the narrator both as a servant seeking advancement (“Page Sb.1”) and as a printed sheet (“Page Sb.2”), a material object with the potential to become “waste paper” or, more nobly, to confer an afterlife on the author.15 Rabelais had used the same pun on page to describe the hybrid nature of his narrator in the Oeuvres he began to print in 1532; Rabelais shared Nashe’s fascination with the modes of carnivalesque discourse and with the relation among oral, written, and printed modes of communicating—or with dramatically failing to
communicate, as in the famous battle of mostly obscene hand gestures that Rabelais’s Panurge engages in with an English scholar in chapter 18 of *Panurge*. Like Rabelais in this respect, and like Shakespeare too, Nashe uses his pen to mimic but also to transform popular forms of gesture and speech, including the insult.\(^{16}\)

Nashe frequently addresses us directly—“O my Auditors” (2: 219)—as if we could hear the words coming from a speaker’s always-thirsty mouth: “soft, let me drinke before I go anie further . . . there’s great virtue (I can tel you) to a cup of sider” (209, 210); but Nashe never lets us forget for long that we are readers being constantly challenged to decipher printed signs made from a pen. “[E]xercise thy writing tongue” is the paradoxical command made by one character in Nashe’s *Have with You to Saffron Walden* (3: 33). As Lorna Hutson remarks, Nashe’s narrative “‘I’” is typically so

disarmingly frank about the ongoing processes and hazards of writing that the act of composition itself becomes vividly present behind the printed words: “now my penne makes blotts as broad as a fard stomacher,” he confides in the middle of a discourse on apparitions, “and my muse inspires me to put out my candle and goe to bed.” (1)\(^{17}\)

Nashe’s words are sent to us, like ghostly letters of solicitation, by a series of narrators who evidently resemble the author but who also differ from him in ways that anticipate the mind games made and played by modern unreliable narrators and their creators. In *The Unfortunat Traveller*, dominated though it is by the voice of Jack, the reader’s knowledge is not wholly governed by Jack’s point of view; we “hear” other voices speaking, and though they are all ostensibly filtered through Jack’s memory, various techniques of metaphor and symbolic parallelism invite us to notice and ponder things Jack does not see: his gradual change, for instance, from a prankster actively using his “lying tongue” in order to estrate his enemies (he zestfully compares his triumph over the cider merchant to that of a hunter who pursues a beaver to “bite off” its “stones” [2: 215]) to a spectator impotently watching a villain rape a Roman matron. Reading what Nashe and his ambiguous male narrators offer is not easy. My students complain of being bored and offended by certain parts of the *Unfortunat Traveller*, and they find that text’s plot so hard to follow that I’ve drawn up a summary that I’d be happy to share with fellow teachers. Nashe himself acknowledges that his often haranguing voice may be hard

for readers to “digest” (2: 32)—but a taste for Nashe is nonetheless worth encouraging. It exercises the mind, expands the vocabulary, and bracingly frustrates those who like their literary categories neat.

The difficulty of digesting Nashe’s prose would have existed for many of his contemporary readers, particularly those who lacked the university education he conspicuously advertises with his use (and abuse) of Latin phrases. But his toneal shifts, his interest in criminal cant, and his delight in coining words from the “Greek, French, Spanish, and Italian” when he finds the “English tongue” too poor for his needs because it “swarmeth with the single money of monasillables” (2: 184) would have provided interpretive challenges to well-educated readers too. When modern students entertain the idea that Nashe was deliberately setting out to challenge readers of different social classes to think about what was licit or illicit in the (changing) sphere of “English,” the difficulties of his prose can seem interesting instead of simply numbing. If we look carefully at passages in which he borrows, mangles, or, in his favorite economic metaphor, “coins” new words (and values) from different sources, we can see his prose as a heady international mix of flavors. Several times a month “when my conduit of ink will no longer flowe for want of reparations,” confesses one of Nashe’s favorite personae, Piers Pennisesse, “I follow some of these new fangled Galliados and Seniour Fantastics, to whose amorous Villanellas and Quiapas I prostitute my pen in hope of gaine” (3: 30–31).

Pursuing gain, fame, and what Nashe calls “a new stile” in the letter dedicating *The Unfortunat Traveller* to the Earl of Southampton (2: 202), he compares his writing, in that same letter, to “goods uncustomed” (2: 201). The punning analogy between his writings and commodities brought illicitly from abroad (as if in the “unfortunat traveller’s” knapsack) suggests that his pages may enrich the natives of England and expand their knowledge; but his pages may also cause offense—and provoke censorship—by challenging as “mere” customs or conventions what has previously been considered natural.\(^{18}\) “I know not what blinde custome methodicall antiquity hath thrust upon us, to dedicate such books as we publish to one great man or other,” Nashe remarks to his noble reader at the beginning of the novella starring Jack Wilton. Here, the author’s impudent voice anticipates that of the servant-page who mocks, praises, impersonates, steals from, and ultimately—after begging and receiving forgiveness for his errors—parts from his master as a successful traitor, in contrast to that master himself, who is modeled on the historical Earl
of Surrey, executed for treason in 1547. Surrey, like the “banished earl” who lectures Jack on the uselessness of travel at the end of the story, shares his rank with the man Nashe addresses as a desired master or patron at the beginning of the work. Such a noble reader should perhaps beware of taking gifts from this writer.

Nashe’s habits of verbal innovation clearly owe something to the humanist ideal of rhetorical “copiousness,” an ideal taught in grammar schools through the practice of double translation (from Latin to English and English to Latin). Copiousness, as William Kerrigan explains, was usually understood as “the ability to say the same thing, cohere the same body, in a multitude of fashions”; training in copiousness was thought to guarantee a “fulsome, ready, plentitude of speech” (qtd. in Simons 18). Nashe seems to illustrate the ideal, but he does so in a “special way,” as Louise Simons aptly puts it (18). Nashe’s way tends to challenge the widespread early humanist belief that good words and good “matter”—eloquence and moral virtue—are two sides of the same coin or, in Roger Ascham’s formulation in The Scholemaster (1570), are like partners in a happy marriage that is critical to the health of the individual and the state:

For good and choice words be no more requisite for healthy bodies, than proper and apt words be for good matters... Ye know not what hurt ye do to learning, that care not for words, but for matter; and so make a divorce between the tongue and the heart. (110)

While humanist teachers like Ascham acknowledge but deplore the possibility of a divorce between words and truths (including the truth claims of the heart), Nashe relishes the role of the talented but wild schoolboy who sees the divorce occurring in acts of rhetorical translation and imitation of many texts, including the Bible. Fascinated with themes of treason to God the father and to his earthly representative, the monarch, Nashe repeatedly plays at the level of style with modes of doubling in which one word or phrase—a translation or a metaphor or even an apparent synonym—competes with another. Jack Wilton, for example, tells his fellow “pages” that he will play a game with them called “nouns, nouns, noun, noun, which is in English, newes of the maker” (2: 207); the Latin adjectives of different genders become a noun in a phrase that plays (as Erasmus does in his famous title Encomium Moriae [Praise of Folly]) with an ambiguous genitive: is this game giving us new things made by the author or information of (about) that author-maker? Nashe invites students to think in new ways about how modes of translation work within a language as well as between languages. This is so in part because the sphere of translation overlaps historically and conceptually with that of metaphor. The Greek verb metaperein (“to transfer” or, literally, “to carry” [pherein] “beyond” [met]) is often translated into Latin as transvere; the past participle of this verb is translatus, commonly rendered in English as “translated.” And when we see Nashe boasting of his ability to “use more compounds than simples, and graft words as men do their trees to make them more fruitfull” (2: 184), we should keep in mind the old Italian proverb, Tradutore, traeditor.

To illustrate this point further, let me adduce another example of how Nashe mangles and thus makes new the meaning(s) of phrases he ostensibly translates from Latin to English. “Well, tendi ad sydera virtus,” says Jack Wilton as he’s about to trick a cider merchant into dispensing his precious liquid freely (2: 210). Apparently translating the Latin saying “virtue extends to the stars,” Jack wrinkles the Latin “sidera” into a play on the English “cider”; in so doing, he appropriates a classical notion of manly virtue for his own narrator’s (roguish) purposes. His style invites us to wonder whether what counts culturally as a “virtue” can be counterfeited by words rather than expressed or faithfully conveyed by them. This is the kind of question Nashe often poses by the very shape and rhythm of his sentences as well as by his handling of nouns and adjectives denoting “customary” kinds of virtues. During the same early episode of The Unfortunate Traveller describing the cider merchant’s duping, Jack describes his way of playing with his gullible auditor in a complex sentence that begins this way: “I, by nature inclined to Mercie (for in deede I knewe two or three good wenches of that name) bad him harden his ears, and not make his eyes abortive befor theyr time” (2: 213). Mercie, an English word with French and Latin roots and analogues, suddenly becomes the proper name of a girl, or, rather, of several girls “known” by Jack. One could easily use this sentence to launch a discussion of the paradoxes of the very concept of the “proper” name and how it works as a signifier.

One could also use this and many other sentences by Nashe to think with students about how to order a sentence’s elements for various rhetorical effects, including irony. Although the Anglo-American pedagogical tradition stresses “clarity” as a supreme compositional virtue, Richard A. Lanham has bravely challenged that tradition (in his aptly titled Style: An Anti-textbook) by urging students and teachers to analyze and imitate writers who do not model clarity—or its moral analogue.
sincerity. Nashe’s festive or carnivalesque prose, according to Hutson and other recent readers, often works precisely to disrupt ordinary practices of communication in educational, theological, and economic spheres. Hutson writes of Nashe as the producer of a discourse that is “disingenuously, ironically inefficient” as it “transforms its rhetorical conventions and strategies into the comically palpable objects of literary experience” (127). The same qualities that make Nashe “inefficient” from a moralist’s or a capitalist’s perspective are, however, what may make him exciting to teach. Consider, for instance, using the following sentence from Christ’s Tears over Jerusalem to discuss how syntactic parallelism and vivid diction work to create an image of something at once repellent and fascinating—the body’s decomposition in the grave: “As many jagggs, blysters, and sc Braves, shall Toades, Cankers, and Serpents, make on your pure skinnes in the grave, as nove you have cuts, jagggs, or rassings, upon your garments” (2: 138). A triadic direct object precedes a triadic subject to heighten the horror of the basic comparison this sentence constructs between the dead body’s pure skin and the living body’s clothes. With this sentence, students can see why analogy requires understanding of dissimilarity as well as likeness and also why word-order inversion can be an effective rhetorical technique even in prose, where rhyme and meter do not require the breaking of the “ordinary” English pattern of subject / verb / direct object. The effect of death, the triadic “object” of a force—the grammatical subject—represented here by toads, cankers, and serpents, is the main point of the sentence, its conceptual “subject,” as it were. The writer asks us to think about how the body’s covering, its once “pure” skin, will be made into jags, blisters, and scabs just as (but also not just as) the clothes we wear are made fashionable, interesting, and by implication enticing to “impure” thoughts, by the cuts, jags, or raisings on a piece of fabric. Have students look up *jag* as a noun in the *OED*; there they will discover that among the several meanings of this word relevant to the sentence in question is the following: “a slash or cut made in the surface of a garment, to show a different colour underneath.” The choice of this vividly colloquial word indicates that Nashe is comparing skin to clothes even before the terms of the analogy are made explicit.

Teaching a medley of Nashian sentences or selected short passages may be an effective way of introducing students to this major (but also, in terms of the Renaissance canon, minor) writer. His corpus lends itself well to dissection. The lack of unity or coherence lamented (or laboriously refuted) by some critics of Nashe’s works, especially of his novella, may be a pedagogical asset in those many courses in which we are always teaching composition and rhetoric even when our subject, ostensibly, is literature of the past. Nashe himself was fascinated by the links he saw between the processes of proto-scientific dissection, of juridical torture, and of interpreting texts; modern students who attempt to dismember one of Nashe’s complex sentences may find the experience oddly rewarding, even eerily surprising, as was the case when, recently, I asked a class to work in small groups on the description of the “sweating sickness” from the *Unfortunate Traveller* (2: 228–31). One student, a biology major, did research that showed (persuasively) that the symptoms Nashe describes in grotesque detail—and which he also describes as beyond the reach of any doctor’s “impotent principles” (230)—are those that modern scientists ascribe to anthrax poisoning.

Teachers can devise exercises that start with close readings of Nashe’s prose and that move on to a cornucopia of strange topics (or strangely familiar ones like anthrax). His writings readily illustrate the three basic stylistic registers or levels as these were understood by classical and Renaissance rhetoricians. The categories are enlivened for modern students by Nashe’s habit of mocking instances of the high and middle styles; among the variants of the “decorated middle style” parodied in *The Unfortunate Traveller* are the “Ciceronian, Euphustic, Arcadian, homiletic, sententious, [and the] epigrammatic”; Nashe parodies the more lofty “elegiacal” or “tragick” style in the novella’s concluding episode of Esdras and Heraclide (Kaula 50). The parody emerges through juxtapositions of passages in low and higher styles, with the former often spoken by Nashe’s narrator Jack in sentences that are typically shorter and blunter in their description of physical desires than are the passages in the higher styles. Although I don’t agree with David Kaula’s claim that Jack’s “true speaking voice” is the “low style” (that is to impute a dubious psychological essence to Jack), I regularly borrow from (and give credit to) Kaula’s brilliant and detailed exposition of a stylistic contrast between low and high through two passages comparing a horse and a woman, respectively, to an ostrich in *The Unfortunate Traveller* (Kaula 50–52). The passages in question, which occur several pages apart (2: 261, 273), can be taught together as an ideologically provocative contrast between styles that both may be used to advance the narrator’s erotic and economic goals through argument by analogy. The first passage uses the ostrich to describe the sexual charms of Diamante, a woman whom Jack efficiently steals from
the verbose and ideologically confused Surrey, represented as not realizing that he cannot win Diamante’s favor while ostensibly pining in Petrarchan angst for Geraldine. The second passage, cleverly playing on our memory of the first, compares Surrey’s horse to an ostrich as part of Nashe’s bravura mimicking—and deflation—of the outdated aristocratic rituals and language epitomized in the tournament that Jack’s “master,” a version of the historical Surrey, stages in Florence, birthplace of Surrey’s beloved Geraldine and scene for Nashe’s “vivid exhibition of chivalry in its final, decadent phase” (Kaula 50).

In teaching Nashe’s prose, I have found over the years that less is more. Working with a medley or gallimaufry of passages, some from The Unfortunate Traveller, others from prefaces such as that to Christ’s Tears over Jerusalem, where Nashe vividly explains his tactics for making English a richer language, many of my students have developed a taste for this writer’s prose and for the questions it raises about what counts, now and in the past, as legitimate (much less “good”) English. Nashe, who crossed the boundaries of what some powerful people in his own society considered the “precinct” of decorum, offers students numerous opportunities to reflect on their own writing and speaking styles as these are fashioned in a language that was and is never “English only.”

Notes
1. My approach to Nashe in this essay is inspired by Terence Cave’s The Cornucopian Text and by Mikhail Bakhtin’s influential work on carnivalesque and heteroglossic discourses. I draw also on ideas I developed in an earlier essay, “Newes of the Maker.”

2. Works 2: 217. All citations of Nashe are from Works, edited by McKerrow. Teachers wanting a modern-spelling version of this narrative and a selection from Nashe’s other writings should consider using Steane’s edition of The Unfortunate Traveller and Other Works. Teachers wishing to assign Nashe’s The Unfortunate Traveller in the context of other Renaissance English prose, including Deloney’s Jack of Newbury and Lyly’s Euphues, should consider the collection edited by Paul Salzman.

3. For Nashe’s additions to English, see Crystal 328 and Crewe 65–66. For Shakespeare’s additions to the language and examples thereof, see Nevalainen 340–41. Some of Nashe’s inventions are still alive (at least in books), for example, dunciacy, ablorescent, adumbrate, multifarious, and finicality. Many of Nashe’s verbal coinages, like Shakespeare’s wonderful words “dispropriated” and “super dainty,” have gone to the graveyard of scholars’ footnotes. Among “lost Nashisms” lamented by Crystal (328) are “budgery” (“botched work”), “tonguemani” (“good speaker”), “chatmate” (“person to gossip with”), and “collaratyne” (tensaur). Wells marks words that Nashe evidently invented in the useful “Glossarial Notes and Index” included in his edition of Nashe’s selected works.


5. For the evidence for reading Moth as Nashe, see Nicholl 161. Hilliard, in contrast, finds the parallels “too general to be conclusive” (215).

6. Many of my students enjoy doing a homework assignment that asks them to interpret Nashe’s description of plague symptoms in the light of modern medical knowledge.

7. The dedication to Spenser’s Shepheardes Calendar by “E. K.” describes the English language itself as a “gallimaufry”; see the Oxford English Dictionary for this and other early uses of the word in literary contexts.

8. On this etymology—not generally accepted until 1605—see Waddington 661–62.

9. See also the praise of Aretino in the preface to Luten Stuffe, Nashe 3: 152. For an incisive discussion of Aretino as Jack’s “inspiration,” see Linton 143.

10. On Nashe as a pamphleteer see Clark; Raymond; and Halasz.

11. For the Italian portion of the narrative as an inversion of Dante’s journey, see Ferguson 178.

12. For a discussion of Nashe’s style as “grotesque,” see Rhodes 5 and 43–44; for a discussion of the early and mid-century critical tradition that saw Nashe’s The Unfortunate Traveller as the first “realistic” novel in English, see Kaula 43. Davis; Kaula; and Rhodes offer valuable overviews of Nashe’s mixing of generic modes.

13. I have experimented with various photocopies “readers” made from McKerrow’s edition, which makes many graphic puns visible because of its use of the original spelling. Nashe’s prefaces are especially interesting to include in such readers. My students generally need more help with syntax and with what Nashe himself jokingly calls his “huge words” (3: 152); modern editors such as Steane provide.

14. Jack plays on the term page in the author’s prefatory address to “the dapper Monsieur Pages of the Court” (2: 207). For useful discussions of the difficulties generated by this narrator, see Raymond; Stephanson; and Hyman.

15. For Nashe’s innovation in using “page” to mean “printed sheet,” see Simon 21. On the significance of Nashe’s vision of his pages as “waste paper” that can best fulfill the humanist ideal of doing “service” to their “country” by kindling tobacco (2: 207), see Hutson 147. On Nashe’s fascination with print and with the labor of making books, see Mentz 18–32.

16. In the prologue to Pangrammet, Rabelais defines his narrator, Alcofris Nasier, as one who has served for wages ever since he grew out of his “pagehood” (“Iay servy a gauges des ce que je fus hors de page . . .” [1: 219]). Nashe uses “Gargantuan” as a term of comic abuse in his attack on Gabriel Harvey (3: 34). For useful discussions of the stylistic similarities between Rabelais and Nashe, see Rhodes; Weimann; Jones.

18. Before he died at around age 34, Nashe had been imprisoned (probably for debt) and had fled London under threat of arrest for having coauthored The Isle of Dogs, censored by the authorities for its “sedious and scandalous matter”; for an account of this affair, see Nicholl 242–57. For a discussion of the problems attending various critics’ efforts to interpret Nashe’s works in the context of the “meagre” facts known about his life, see Hutson 1–11.
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